UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 111—PART 20

OCTOBER 8, 1965, TO OCTOBER 20, 1965

(PAGES 26379 TO 27800)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1965

J
11
.R
v.111
pt.20

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of Scripture: I Samuel 12: 23: *Moreover as for me, God forbid that I should sin against the Lord in ceasing to pray for you.*

Eternal God, our Father, whose thoughts concerning us are always those of peace and good will, we rejoice that daily we are living under the canopy and shelter of Thy grace and goodness.

We humbly acknowledge that in our devotions and worship we have often failed to pray fervently for peace on earth and good will among men.

Let us continue to search and probe our hearts that we may find the reasons for unanswered prayer and realize that we have left so many of our fellow men out of our prayer life.

We confess that we have forgotten the poor, the sick, and the lonely, in homes and in hospitals who need Thy blessings and the help that we can give.

How frequently we neglect those who are constantly struggling with human frailty and bodily illness and the encroachments of age and infirmity.

We beseech Thee to forgive us for being so indifferent and self-centered in our thoughts and prayers.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 32. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, and for other purposes.

AIRMAIL PRIVILEGES TO MEMBERS OF THE U.S. ARMED FORCES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 11420) to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide certain airmail privileges with respect to members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I assume that the gentleman from Louisiana will take a reasonable amount of time to explain this bill?

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield; yes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11420

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 57 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following section:

"§ 4169. Mailing privilege of members of United States Armed Forces and of friendly foreign nations

"(a) First-class letter mail, including postal cards and post cards, shall be carried as airmail, at no cost to the sender, when mailed by—

"(1) a member of the Armed Forces of the United States on active duty as defined in sections 101(4) and 101(22) of title 10, United States Code, and addressed to a place within the delivery limits of a United States post office, if—

"(A) the letter is mailed by the member at an Armed Forces post office established under section 705(d) of this title in an overseas area, as designated by the President, where the Armed Forces of the United States are engaged in action against an enemy of the United States, engaged in military operations involving armed conflict with a hostile foreign force, or serving with a friendly foreign force in an armed conflict in which the United States is not a belligerent; or

"(B) the member is hospitalized in a facility under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces of the United States as a result of disease or injury incurred as a result of service in an overseas area designated by the President under clause (A); or

"(2) a member of an armed force of a friendly foreign nation at an Armed Forces post office and addressed to a place within the delivery limits of a United States post office, or a post office of the nation in whose armed forces the sender is a member, if—

"(A) the member is accorded free mailing privileges by his own government;

"(B) the foreign nation extends similar free mailing privileges to a member of the Armed Forces of the United States serving with, or in, a unit under the control of a command of that foreign nation;

"(C) the member is serving with, or in, a unit under the operational control of a command of the Armed Forces of the United States;

"(D) The letter is mailed by the member—

"(i) at an Armed Forces post office established under section 705(d) of this title in an overseas area, as designated by the President, where the Armed Forces of the United States are engaged in action against an enemy of the United States, engaged in military operations involving armed conflict with a hostile foreign force, or serving with a friendly foreign force in an armed conflict in which the United States is not a belligerent; or

"(ii) while hospitalized in a facility under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces of the United States as a result of disease or injury incurred as a result of services in an overseas area designated by the President under clause (D) (i); and

"(E) the nation in whose armed forces the sender is a member has agreed to assume all international postal transportation charges incurred.

"(b) The Department of Defense shall transfer to the Post Office Department as postal revenue, out of any appropriations or funds available to the Department of Defense, as a necessary expense of the appropriations or funds and of the activities concerned, the equivalent amount of postage due, as determined by the Postmaster General, for matter sent in the mails under authority of subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) Subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be administered under such conditions, and under such regulations, as the Postmaster General and the Secretary of Defense jointly may prescribe."

(b) The table of contents of chapter 57 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding

"4169. Mailing privilege of members of United States Armed Forces and of friendly foreign nations."

immediately below

"4168. Correspondence of members of diplomatic corps and consuls of countries of Postal Union of Americas and Spain."

SEC. 2. Section 4303(d) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) In addition to parcels to which it is otherwise applicable, the eighth zone includes, for purposes of this section only, except as provided by paragraph (4) of this subsection, parcels transported between the United States, its territories and possessions or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone.

"(4) The rates of postage on air parcel post transported between the United States, its territories and possessions or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone, and Army, Air Force, and Fleet post offices, shall be the applicable zone rates shown in paragraph (1) of this subsection for mail between the place of mailing or delivery within the United States, its territories or possessions or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone, and the city of the postmaster serving the Army, Air Force, or Fleet post office concerned.

"(5) Fourth-class parcels not exceeding five pounds in weight and sixty inches in length and girth combined mailed by or addressed to members of the Armed Forces of the United States at or in care of Army, Air Force, and Fleet post offices in overseas combat areas, as designated by the President, shall be transported by air between the point of embarkation and the overseas Army, Air Force, or Fleet post office on a space available basis on United States-flag carriers only, under such conditions and regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe and at rates approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board for space available parcel service which shall not exceed the minimum rates charged for the airlift of military cargo in scheduled airline service.

"(6) Paragraphs (4) and (5) of this subsection shall be administered under such conditions, and under such regulations, as the Postmaster General and the Secretary of Defense jointly may prescribe."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 1040 of title 10, United States Code (relating to free postage for the United States Armed Forces in combat zones), is hereby repealed.

(b) The analysis of chapter 53 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out

"1040. Free postage from combat zones.".

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides urgently needed improvements in postal service for service men and women overseas.

First, it provides free airmail service for letters, post cards, and postal cards mailed by members of the Armed Forces who are engaged in combat, or when mailed by a member of the Armed Forces who is hospitalized due to disease or injury resulting from service in such an overseas area.

Second, air parcel post rates to and from overseas military post offices are established on a basis commensurate with the air service actually provided and paid for by the Post Office Department. The mailer will pay only the air parcel post rates for the domestic movement of the parcel by the Post Office Department—that is, between the port of embarkation and the point of mailing or delivery, as the case may be. Under present law the sender would have to pay the air parcel rate for the eighth zone regardless of the distance involved.

Third, transportation by air is required, between the port of embarkation and members of the Armed Forces in overseas combat areas, for parcels not exceeding 5 pounds in weight and 60 inches in length and girth when such parcels are mailed at regular domestic parcel post rates by or to such members of the Armed Forces. For example, if the mother of a marine serving in Vietnam wants to send him a 5-pound gift she would pay the regular domestic parcel post rate from her home post office to the port of embarkation on the west coast, and the Department of Defense then would be responsible for transporting the package to destination by air, on a space available basis and using U.S.-flag carriers. The cost of transportation beyond the port of embarkation would be borne by the Department, as is presently the case.

This bill was passed unanimously by the subcommittee and it passed unanimously out of the full committee. There was favorable approval by the Defense Department and the Post Office Department.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. Is it not true there was another bill with an amendment that would have extended these same privileges to members of the Armed Forces anywhere in the world?

Mr. MORRISON. That is correct. That was taken out.

Mr. CORBETT. Is it not true that the chairman of this subcommittee has promised consideration of this legislation as early as possible in the next session?

Mr. MORRISON. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am in favor of this bill, but I do not think it goes far enough. I think it might have included the troops in Korea and Thailand as well as Vietnam. I hope we can come back to this problem early next year, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has suggested.

Mr. MORRISON. I agree with the gentleman, and we intend to go into it fully beginning the first of the year.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, a good many Members of Congress have introduced legislation similar to that before the House today. I commend them for their foresight and for their concern for the young men of our country who are defending freedom in a foreign land.

A great many times those of us who are near our loved ones lose sight of a moral and spiritual support they give us. When a time of crisis, which requires a separation from them occurs, we realize how great our dependence upon them is. We all have a tendency to take for granted the people near us; our wives, children, mothers, and fathers. In the course of everyday events they are always near to lend a hand; to support us. Only when they are gone, when we are separated from them, do we realize how greatly we rely upon them.

Someone once spoke of not being able to see the forest for the trees, and that phrase might well apply in this case.

I believe this is what is happening to a great many of our boys in Vietnam and other combat areas. They are now realizing how greatly they depended upon their friends, their relatives, their families, and their loved ones.

In a strange and alien land it is a tremendous boost to morale to be able to send a letter, or to receive a package. The content of a parcel may be little; but, the emotions of one who is able to convey his feelings to his loved ones, or who receives a package from home, cannot be measured by our inadequate standards.

The people of this Nation who have served in foreign lands know of what I speak. The people who have loved ones overseas know equally well of what I speak.

A letter received from a member of the Armed Forces is a great comfort to his family. A letter assuring that the serviceman is well and fit, greatly relieves a worried and troubled wife, or mother, or father.

There can be no doubt about the desirability nor about the necessity of this type of legislation. Any problem arising from the enactment of this legislation cannot compare with the problems of a young man leaving the comfort and security of the United States, to go to a foreign land which harbors only danger and possible death.

Can the problem of transportation compare with the problems faced by a young man leaving his wife and children? Can the problem of monetary considerations compare with the problems of a young man in a hostile and forbidden land? The answer, of course, is a resounding and overwhelming "no."

We have placed upon the members of our Armed Forces the overwhelming responsibility and awesome duty of defending freedom. This is a terrible assignment. It is often a thankless and hostile burden.

Our men have willingly and patriotically responded, and have acted in the finest tradition of America.

These men have given in full measure, they are fighting for and dying for their belief in democracy and freedom.

Let us grant them this small privilege; they deserve much more.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I shall not presume long on the time of the House today, concerning the passage of H.R. 11420. I merely want to state that I strongly support this legislation, designed to permit postage free mail from our servicemen and women in Vietnam. This was a privilege enjoyed by soldiers of other wars, including myself, in World War II. I might also add that the legislation has the very strongest backing from all the veterans organizations. I am sure that our servicemen in this far-off battlefield will be most appreciative. I am pleased that the leadership of both our great political parties have cooperated to assure early passage of this measure. I commend the committee for reporting this fine bill, and extend my personal appreciation to the committee's distinguished chairman.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL VOCATIONAL STUDENT LOAN INSURANCE ACT OF 1965

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 7743) to establish a system of loan insurance and a supplementary system of direct loans, to assist students to attend postsecondary business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965'.

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

"SEC. 2. (a) The purpose of this Act is to enable the Commissioner (1) to encourage States and nonprofit private institutions and organizations to establish adequate loan insurance programs for students in eligible institutions (as defined in section 17), (2) to provide a Federal program of student loan insurance for students who do not have reasonable access to a State or private nonprofit program of student loan insurance covered by an agreement under section 9(b), and (3) to pay a portion of the interest on loans to qualified students which are insured under this Act or under a program of a State or of a nonprofit private institution or organization which meets the requirements of section 9(a)(1)(A).

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out this Act—

"(1) there are authorized to be appropriated to the vocational student loan insurance fund (established by section 13) (A) the sum of $250,000, and (B) such further sums, if any, as may become necessary for the adequacy of the vocational student loan insurance fund,

"(2) there are authorized to be appropriated, for payments under section 9 with respect to interest on insured loans, such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and succeeding fiscal years, as may be required therefor, and

"(3) there are authorized to be appropriated the sum of $1,875,000 for making advances pursuant to section 3 for the reserve funds of State and nonprofit private student loan insurance programs.

Sums appropriated under clauses (1) and (2) of this subsection shall remain available until expended, and sums appropriated under clause (3) of this subsection shall remain available for advances under section 3 until the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

"ADVANCES FOR RESERVE FUNDS OF STATE AND NONPROFIT PRIVATE LOAN INSURANCE PROGRAMS

"SEC. 3. (a)(1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to clause (3) of section 2(b), the Commissioner is authorized to make advances to any State with which he has made an agreement pursuant to section 9(b) for the purpose of helping to establish or strengthen the reserve fund of the student loan insurance program covered by that agreement. If for any of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1966, June 30, 1967, or June 30, 1968, a State does not have a student loan insurance program covered by an agreement pursuant to section 9(b), and the Commissioner determines after consultation with the chief executive officer of that State that there is no reasonable likelihood that the State will have such a student loan insurance program for such year, the Commissioner may make advances for such year for the same purpose to one or more nonprofit private institutions or organizations with which he has made an agreement pursuant to section 9(b) in order to enable students in that State to participate in a program of student loan insurance covered by such an agreement. The Commissioner may make advances under this subsection both to a State program with which he has such an agreement and to one or more nonprofit private institutions or organizations with which he has such an agreement in that State if he determines that such advances are necessary in order that students in each eligible institution have access through such institution to a student loan insurance program which meets the requirements of section 9(b)(1).

"(2) Advances pursuant to this subsection shall be upon such terms and conditions (including conditions relating to the time or times of payment) consistent with the requirements of section 9(b) as the Commissioner determines will best carry out the purposes of this section. Advances made by the Commissioner under this subsection shall be repaid within such period as the Commissioner may deem to be appropriate in each case in the light of the maturity and solvency of the reserve fund for which the advance was made.

"(b) The total of the advances to any State pursuant to subsection (a) may not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to 2½ per centum of $75,000,000 as the population of that State aged eighteen to twenty-two, inclusive, bears to the total population of all the States aged eighteen to twenty-two, inclusive. If the amount so determined for any State, however, is less than $10,000, it shall be increased to $10,000 and the total of the increases thereby required shall be derived by proportionately reducing (but not below $10,000) the amount so determined for each of the remaining States. Advances to nonprofit private institutions and organizations pursuant to subsection (a) may be in such amounts as the Commissioner determines will best achieve the purposes for which they are made, except that the sum of (1) advances to such institutions and organizations for the benefit of students in any State plus (2) the amounts advanced to such State, may not exceed the maximum amount which may be advanced to that State pursuant to the first two sentences of this subsection. For the purposes of this subsection, the population aged eighteen to twenty-two, inclusive, of each State and of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most satisfactory data available to him.

"EFFECT OF ADEQUATE NON-FEDERAL PROGRAMS

"SEC. 4. The Commissioner shall not issue certificates of insurance under section 11 to lenders in a State if he determines that every eligible institution has reasonable access in that State to a State or private nonprofit student loan insurance program which is covered by an agreement under section 9(b).

"SCOPE AND DURATION OF LOAN INSURANCE PROGRAM

"SEC. 5. (a) The total principal amount of new loans made and installments paid pursuant to lines of credit (as defined in section 17) to students covered by insurance under this Act shall not exceed $75,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and in each of the two succeeding fiscal years. Thereafter, insurance pursuant to this part may be granted only for loans made (or for loan installments paid pursuant to lines of credit) to enable students, who have obtained prior loans insured under this Act, to continue or complete their educational programs; but no insurance may be granted for any loan made or installment paid after June 30, 1972.

"(b) The Commissioner may, if he finds it necessary to do so in order to assure an equitable distribution of the benefits of this Act, assign, within the maximum amounts specified in subsection (a), insurance quotas applicable to eligible lenders, or to States or areas, and may from time to time reassign unused portions of these quotas.

"LIMITATIONS ON INDIVIDUAL LOANS AND ON INSURANCE

"SEC. 6. (a) No loan or loans by one or more eligible lenders in excess of $1,000 in the aggregate to any student in any academic year or its equivalent shall be covered by insurance under this Act. The aggregate insured unpaid principal amount of all such insured loans made to any student shall not at any time exceed $2,000. The annual insurable limit per student shall not be deemed to be exceeded by a line of credit under which actual payments by the lender to the borrower will not be made in any year in excess of the annual limit.

"(b) The insurance liability on any loan insured under this Act shall be 100 per centum of the unpaid balance of the principal amount of the loan. Such insurance liability shall not include liability for interest whether or not that interest has been added to the principal amount of the loan.

"SOURCES OF FUNDS

"SEC. 7. Loans made by eligible lenders in accordance with this Act shall be insurable whether made from funds fully owned by the lender or from funds held by the lender in a trust or similar capacity and available for such loans.

"ELIGIBILITY OF STUDENT BORROWERS AND TERMS OF STUDENT LOANS

"SEC. 8. (a) A loan by an eligible lender shall be insurable under the provisions of this Act only if—

"(1) made to a student who (A) has been accepted for enrollment at an eligible institution or, in the case of a student already attending such institution, is in good standing there as determined by the institution, and (B) is carrying at least one-half of the normal full-time workload as determined by the institution, and (C) has provided the lender with a statement of the institution which sets forth a schedule of the tuition and fees applicable to that student and its estimate of the cost of board and room for such a student; and

"(2) evidenced by a note or other written agreement which—

"(A) is made without security and without endorsement, except that if the borrower is a minor and such note or other written agreement executed by him would not, under the applicable law, create a binding obligation, endorsement may be required,

"(B) provides for repayment (except as provided in subsection (c)) of the principal amount of the loan in installments over a period of not less than three years (unless sooner repaid) nor more than six years beginning not earlier than nine months nor later than one year after the date on which the student ceases to carry at an eligible institution at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload as determined by the institution in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, except (i) as provided in clause (C) below, (ii) that the period of the loan may not exceed nine years from the execution of the note or written agreement evidencing it and (iii) the note or other written instrument may contain such provisions relating to repayment in the event of default in the payment of interest or in the payment of the cost of insurance premiums, or other default by the borrower, as may be authorized by regulations of the Commissioner in effect at the time the loan is made,

"(C) provides that periodic installments of principal need not be paid, but interest shall accrue and be paid, during any period (i) during which the borrower is pursuing a full-time course of study at an institution of higher education or at a comparable institution outside the States approved for this purpose by the Commissioner, (ii) not in excess of three years, during which the borrower is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, or (iii) not in excess of three years during which the borrower is in service as a volunteer under the Peace Corps Act, and any such period shall not be included in determining the six-year period or the nine-year period provided in clause (B) above.

"(D) provides for interest on the unpaid principal balance of the loan at a yearly rate, not exceeding the applicable maximum rate prescribed and defined by the Secretary (within the limits set forth in subsection (b)) on a national, regional, or other appropriate basis, which interest shall be payable in installments over the period of the loan except that, if provided in the note or other written agreement, any interest payable by the student may be deferred until not later than the date upon which repayment of the first installment of principal falls due, in which case interest that has so accrued during that period may be added on that date to the principal (but without thereby increasing the insurance liability under this Act),

"(E) provides that the lender will not collect or attempt to collect from the borrower any portion of the interest on the note which is payable by the Commissioner under this Act,

"(F) entitles the student borrower to accelerate without penalty repayment of the whole or any part of the loan, and

"(G) contains such other terms and conditions, consistent with the provisions of this Act and with the regulations issued by the Commissioner pursuant to this Act, as may be agreed upon by the parties to such loan, including, if agreed upon, a provision requiring the borrower to pay to the lender, in addition to principal and interest, amounts equal to the insurance premiums payable by the lender to the Commissioner with respect to such loan.

"(b) No maximum rate of interest prescribed and defined by the Secretary for the purposes of clause (2)(D) of subsection (a) may exceed 6 per centum per annum on the unpaid prinicpal balance of the loan, except that under circumstances which threaten to impede the carrying out of the purposes of this Act, one or more of such maximum rates of interest may be as high as 7 per centum per annum on the unpaid principal balance of the loan.

"(c) The total of the payments by a borrower during any year of any repayment period with respect to the aggregate amount of all loans to that borrower which are insured under this Act shall not be less than $360 or the balance of all such loans (together with interest thereon), whichever amount is less.

"FEDERAL PAYMENTS TO REDUCE STUDENT INTEREST COSTS

"SEC. 9. (a)(1) Each student who has received a loan—

"(A) which is insured under this Act;

"(B) which was made for study at an eligible institution under a State student loan program (meeting criteria prescribed by the Commissioner), and which was contracted for, and paid to the student, within the period specified by paragraph (4); or

"(C) which is insured under a program of a State or of a nonprofit private institution or organization, which was contracted for, and paid to the student, within the period specified in paragraph (4), and which—

"(i) in the case of a loan insured prior to July 1, 1967, was made by an eligible lender and is insured under a program which meets the requirements of subparagraph (E) of subsection (b)(1) and provides that repayment of such loan shall be in installments beginning not earlier than sixty days after the student ceases to pursue a course of study (as described in subparagraph (D) of subsection (b)(1)) at an eligible institution, or

"(ii) in the case of a loan insured after June 30, 1967, is insured under a program covered by an agreement made pursuant to subsection (b),

and whose adjusted family income is less than $15,000 at the time of execution of the note or written agreement evidencing such loan, shall be entitled to have paid on his behalf and for his account to the holder of the loan, over the period of the loan, a portion of the interest on the loan. For the purposes of this paragraph, the adjusted family income of a student shall be determined pursuant to regulations of the Commissioner in effect at the time of the execution of the note or written agreement evidencing the loan. Such regulations shall provide for taking into account such factors, including family size, as the Commissioner deems appropriate.

"(2) The portion of the interest on a loan which a student is entitled to have paid on his behalf and for his account to the holder of the loan pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be equal to the total amount of the interest on the unpaid principal amount of the loan which accrues prior to the beginning of the repayment period of the loan, and 3 per centum per annum of the unpaid principal amount of the loan (excluding interest which has been added to principal) thereafter; but such portion of the interest on a loan shall not exceed, for any period, the amount of the interest on that loan which is payable by the student after taking into consideration the amount of any interest on that loan which the student is entitled to have paid on his behalf for that period under any State or private loan insurance program. In the absence of fraud by the lender, that determination shall be final so far as the obligation of the Commissioner to pay a portion of the interest on a loan is concerned. The holder of a loan with respect to which payments are required to be made under this section shall be deemed to have a contractual right, as against the United States, to receive from the Commissioner the portion of interest which has been so determined. The Commissioner shall pay this portion of the interest to the holder of the loan on behalf of and for the account of the borrower at such times as may be specified in regulations in force when the applicable agreement entered into pursuant to subsection (b) was made, or if the loan was made by a State or is insured under a program which is not covered by such an agreement, at such times as may be specified in regulations in force at the time the loan was paid to the student.

"(3) Each holder of a loan with respect to which payments of interest are required to be made by the Commissioner shall submit to the Commissioner, at such time or times and in such manner as he may prescribe, statements containing such information as may be required by or pursuant to regulation for the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to determine the amount of the payment which he must make with respect to that loan.

"(4) The period referred to in subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1) of this subsection shall begin on the date of enactment of this Act and end on June 30, 1968, except that, in the case of a loan made or insured under a student loan or loan insurance program, to enable a student who has obtained a prior loan made or insured under such program to continue his educational program, such period shall end on June 30, 1972.

"(5) No payment may be made under this section with respect to the interest on a loan made from a student loan fund established under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

"(b)(1) Any State or any nonprofit private institution or organization may enter into an agreement with the Commissioner for the purpose of entitling students who receive loans which are insured under a student loan insurance program of that State, institution, or organization to have made on their behalf payments equal to those provided for in subsection (a) if the Commissioner determines that the student loan insurance program—

"(A) authorizes the insurance of not less than $1,000 in loans to any individual student in any academic year or its equivalent (as determined under regulations of the Commissioner);

"(B) authorizes the insurance of loans to any individual student for at least two academic years of study or their equivalent as determined under regulations of the Commissioner);

"(C) provides that (i) the student borrower shall be entitled to accelerate without penalty the whole or any part of an insured loan, (ii) the period of any insured loan may not exceed nine years from the date of execution of the note or other written evidence of the loan, and (iii) the note or other written evidence of any loan may contain such provisions relating to repayment in the event of default by the borrower as may be authorized by regulations of the Commissioner in effect at the time such note or written evidence was executed;

"(D) subject to subparagraph (C), provides that, where the total of the insured loans to any student which are held by any one person exceeds $1,000, repayment of such loans shall be in installments over a period of not less than three years nor more than six years beginning not earlier than nine months nor later than one year after the student ceases to pursue a full-time course of study at an eligible institution, except that if the program provides for the insurance of loans for part-time study at eligible institutions the program shall provide that such repayment period shall begin not earlier than nine months nor later than one year after the student ceases to carry at an eligible institution at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload as determined by the institution;

"(E) authorizes interest on the unpaid balance of the loan at a yearly rate not in excess of 6 per centum per annum on the unpaid principal balance of the loan (exclusive of any premium for insurance which may be passed on to the borrower);

"(F) insures not less than 90 per centum of the unpaid principal of loans insured under the program;

"(G) does not provide for collection of an excessive insurance premium;

"(H) provides that the benefits of the loan insurance program will not be denied any student because of his family income or lack of need if his adjusted family income at the time the note or written agreement is executed is less than $15,000 (as determined pursuant to the regulations of the Commissioner prescribed under section 9(a)(1));

"(I) provides that a student may obtain insurance under the program for a loan for any year of study at an eligible institution; and

"(J) in the case of a State program, provides that such State program is administered by a single State agency, or by one or more nonprofit private institutions or organizations under the supervision of a single State agency.

"(2) Such an agreement shall—

"(A) provide that the holder of any such loan will be required to submit to the Commissioner, at such time or times and in such manner as he may prescribe, statements containing such information as may be required by or pursuant to regulation for the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to determine the amount of the payment which he must make with respect to that loan;

"(B) include such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States and promote the purposes of this Act and as are agreed to by the Commissioner and the State or private organization or institution; and

"(C) provide for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his function under this Act and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"DIRECT LOANS

"SEC. 10. (a) The Commissioner may make a direct loan to any student who would be eligible for an insured loan under this Act if (1) in the particular area in which the student resides loans which are insurable under this Act are not available at the rate of interest prescribed by the Secretary pursuant to section 8(a)(2)(D) for such area, or (2) the particular student has been unable to obtain an insured loan at a rate of interest which does not exceed such rate prescribed by the Secretary.

"(b) Loans made under this section shall bear interest at the rate prescribed by the Secretary under section 8(a)(2)(D) for the area where the student resides, and shall be made on such other terms and conditions as the Commissioner shall prescribe, which shall conform as nearly as practicable to the terms and conditions of loans insured under this Act.

"(c) There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years to carry out this section.

"CERTIFICATES OF INSURANCE—EFFECTIVE DATE OF INSURANCE

"SEC. 11. (a)(1) If, upon application by an eligible lender, made upon such form, containing such information, and supported by such evidence as the Commissioner may require, and otherwise in conformity with this section, the Commissioner finds that the applicant has made a loan to an eligible student which is insurable under the provisions of this Act, he may issue to the applicant a certificate of insurance covering the loan and setting forth the amount and terms of the insurance.

"(2) Insurance evidenced by a certificate of insurance pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall become effective upon the date of issuance of the certificate, except that the Commissioner is authorized, in accordance with regulations, to issue commitments with respect to proposed loans, or with respect to lines (or proposed lines) of credit, submitted by eligible lenders, and in that event, upon compliance with subsection (a)(1) by the lender, the certificate of insurance may be issued effective as of the date when any loan, or any payment by the lender pursuant to a line of credit, to be covered by such insurance was made. Such insurance shall cease to be effective upon sixty days' default by the lender in the payment of any installment of the premiums payable pursuant to subsection (c).

"(3) An application submitted pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall contain (A) an agreement by the applicant to pay, in accordance with regulations, the premiums fixed by the Commissioner pursuant to subsection (c), and (B) an agreement by the applicant that if the loan is covered by insurance the applicant will submit such supplementary reports and statements during the effective period of the loan agreement, upon such forms, at such times, and containing such information as the Commissioner may prescribe by or pursuant to regulation.

"(b)(1) In lieu of requiring a separate insurance application and issuing a separate certificate of insurance for each student loan made by an eligible lender as provided in subsection (a), the Commissioner may, in accordance with regulations consistent with section 5, issue to any eligible lender applying therefor a certificate of comprehensive insurance coverage which shall, without further action by the Commissioner, insure all insurable loans made by that lender, on or after the date of the certificate and before a specified cutoff date, within the limits of an aggregate maximum amount stated in the certificate. Such regulations may provide for conditioning such insurance, with respect to any loan, upon compliance by the lender with such requirements (to be stated or incorporated by reference in the certificate) as in the Commissioner's judgment will best achieve the purpose of this subsection while protecting the financial interest of the United States and promoting the objectives of this act, including (but not limited to) provisions as to the reporting of such loans and information relevant thereto to the Commissioner and as to the payment of initial and other premiums and the effect of default therein, and including provision for confirmation by the Commissioner from time to time (through endorsement of the certificate) of the coverage of specific new loans by such certificate, which confirmation shall be incontestable by the Commissioner in the absence of fraud or misrepresentation of fact or patent error.

"(2) If the holder of a certificate of comprehensive insurance issued under this subsection grants to a student a line of credit extending beyond the cutoff date specified in that certificate, loans or payments thereon made by the holder after that date pursuant to the line of credit shall not be deemed to be included in the coverage of that certificate except as may be specifically provided therein; but, subject to the limitations of section 5, the Commissioner may, in accordance with regulations, make commitments to insure such future loans or payments, and such commitments may be honored either as provided in subsection (a) or by inclusion of such insurance in comprehensive coverage under this subsection for the period or periods in which such future loans or payments are made.

"(c) The Commissioner shall, pursuant to regulations, charge for insurance on each loan under this Act a premium in an amount not to exceed one-fourth of 1 per centum per year of the unpaid principal amount of such loan (excluding interest added to principal), payable in advance, at such time and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Commissioner. Such regulations may provide that such premium shall not be payable, or if paid shall be refundable, with respect to any period after default in the payment of principal or interest or after the borrower has died or become totally and permanently disabled, if (1) notice of such default or other event has been duly given, and (2) request for payment of the loss insured against has been made or the Commissioner has made such payment on his own motion pursuant to section 12(a).

"(d) The rights of an eligible lender arising under insurance evidenced by a certificate of insurance issued to it under this section may be assigned as security by such lender only to another eligible lender, and subject to regulation by the Commissioner.

"(e) The consolidation of the obligations of two or more insured loans obtained by a student borrower in any fiscal year into a single obligation evidenced by a single instrument of indebtedness shall not affect the insurance by the United States. If the loans thus consolidated are covered by separate certificates of insurance issued under subsection (a), the Commissioner may upon surrender of the original certificates issue a new certificate of insurance in accordance with that subsection upon the consolidated obligation; if they are covered by a single comprehensive certificate issued under subsection (b), the Commissioner may amend that certificate accordingly.

"PROCEDURE ON DEFAULT, DEATH, OR DISABILITY OF STUDENT

"SEC. 12. (a) Upon default by the student borrower on any loan covered by insurance pursuant to this Act, or upon the death of the student borrower or a finding by the insurance beneficiary that the borrower has become totally and permanently disabled (as determined in accordance with regulations established by the Commissioner) before the loan has been repaid in full, and prior to the commencement of suit or other enforcement proceeding upon security for that loan, the insurance beneficiary shall promptly notify the Commissioner, and the Commissioner shall if requested (at that time or after further collection efforts) by the beneficiary, or may on his own motion, if the insurance is still in effect, pay to the beneficiary the amount of the loss sustained by the insured upon that loan as soon as that amount has been determined. The 'amount of the loss' on any loan shall, for the purposes of this subsection and subsection (b), be deemed to be an amount equal to the unpaid balance of the principal amount of the loan.

"(b) Upon payment by the Commissioner of the insured portion of the loss pursuant to subsection (a), the United States shall be subrogated to all of the rights of the holder of the obligation upon the insured loan and shall be entitled to an assignment of the note or other evidence of the insured loan by the insurance beneficiary. If the net recovery made by the Commissioner on a loan after deduction of the cost of that recovery (including reasonable administrative costs) exceeds the amount of the loss, the excess shall be paid over to the insured.

"(c) Nothing in this section or in this Act shall be construed to preclude any forbearance for the benefit of the student borrower which may be agreed upon by the parties to the insured loan and approved by the Commissioner, or to preclude forbearance by the Commissioner in the enforcement of the insured obligation after payment on that insurance, or to require collection of the amount of any loan by the insurance beneficiary or by the Commissioner from the estate of a deceased borrower or from a borrower found by the insurance beneficiary to have become permanently and totally disabled.

"(d) Nothing in this section or in this Act shall be construed to excuse the holder of a loan from exercising reasonable care and diligence in the making and collection of loans under the provisions of this Act. If the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to an eligible lender, finds that it has substantially failed to exercise such care and diligence or to make the reports and statements required under section 9(a)(3) and section 11(a)(3), or to pay the required insurance premiums, he shall disqualify that lender for further insurance on loans granted pursuant to this Act until he is satisfied that its failure has ceased and finds that there is reasonable assurance that the lender will in the future exercise necessary care and diligence or comply with such requirements, as the case may be.

"(e) As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'insurance beneficiary' means the insured or its authorized assignee in accordance with section 11(d); and

"(2) the term 'default' includes only such defaults as have existed for (A) one hundred and twenty days in the case of a loan which is repayable in monthly installments, or (B) one hundred and eighty days in the case of a loan which is repayable in less frequent installments.

"INSURANCE FUND

"SEC. 13. (a) There is hereby established a vocational student loan insurance fund (hereinafter in this section called the "fund") which shall be available without fiscal year limitation to the Commissioner for making payments in connection with the default of loans insured under this Act. All amounts received by the Commissioner as premium charges for insurance and as receipts, earnings, or proceeds derived from any claim or other assets acquired by the Commissioner in connection with his operations under this Act, and any other moneys, property, or assets derived by the Commissioner from his operations in connection with this section, shall be deposited in the fund. All payments in connection with the default of loans insured under this Act shall be paid from the fund. Moneys in the fund not needed for current operations under this section may be invested in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States.

"(b) If at any time the moneys in the fund are insufficient to make payments in connection with the default of any loan insured under this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury notes or other obligations in such forms and denominations, bearing such maturities, and subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities during the month preceding the issuance of the notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations issued hereunder and for that purpose he is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such notes and obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this subsection. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States. Sums borrowed under this subsection shall be deposited in the fund and redemption of such notes and obligations shall be made by the Commissioner from such fund.

"LEGAL POWERS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

"SEC. 14. (a) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this Act, the Commissioner may—

"(1) prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act;

"(2) sue and be sued in any court of record of a State having general jurisdiction or in any district court of the United States, and such district courts shall have jurisdiction of civil actions arising under this Act without regard to the amount in controversy, and any action instituted under this subsection by or against the Commissioner shall survive notwithstanding any change in the person occupying the office of Commissioner or any vacancy in that office; but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Commissioner or property under his control, and nothing herein shall be construed to except litigation arising out of activities under this Act from the application of sections 507(b) and 2679 of title 28 of the United States Code and of section 367 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 316);

"(3) include in any contract for insurance such terms, conditions, and covenants relating to repayment of principal and payment of interest, relating to his obligations and rights and to those of eligible lenders, and borrowers in case of default, and relating to such other matters as the Commissioner determines to be necessary to assure that the purposes of this Act will be achieved; and any term, condition, and covenant made pursuant to this clause or any other provisions of this Act may be modified by the Commissioner if he determines that modification is necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States;

"(4) subject to the specific limitations in this Act, consent to the modification, with respect to rate of interest, time of payment of any installment of principal and interest or any portion thereof, or any other provision of any note or other instrument evidencing a loan which has been insured under this Act;

"(5) enforce, pay, or compromise, any claim on, or arising because of, any such insurance; and

"(6) enforce, pay, compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, lien, or demand, however acquired, including any equity or any right or redemption.

"(b) The Commissioner shall, with respect to the financial operations arising by reason of this Act—

"(1) prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act; and

"(2) maintain with respect to insurance under this Act an integral set of accounts, which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions, as provided by section 105 of the Government Corporation Control Act, except that the transactions of the Commissioner, including the settlement of insurance claims and of claims for payments pursuant to section 9, and transactions related thereto and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all accounting and other officers of the Government.

"ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INSURED LOANS TO VOCATIONAL STUDENTS

"SEC. 15. (a) The Secretary shall establish in the Office of Education an Advisory Council on Insured Loans to Vocational Students, consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, and eight members appointed, without regard to the civil service laws, by the Secretary. The membership of the Council shall include persons representing State loan insurance programs, private nonprofit loan insurance programs, financial and credit institutions, and eligible institutions.

"(b) The Advisory Council shall advise the Commissioner in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this Act, including policies and procedures governing the making of advances under section 3, the Federal payments to reduce student interest costs under section 9 and the making of loans under section 10.

"(c) Members of the Advisory Council, while attending meetings or conferences of such Council, or otherwise engaged in the business of such Council, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including travel time, and while so serving on the business of the Advisory Council away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2), for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"PARTICIPATION BY FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS IN FEDERAL, STATE, AND PRIVATE STUDENT LOAN INSURANCE PROGRAMS

"SEC. 16. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Federal credit unions shall, pursuant to regulations of the Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, have power to make insured loans up to 5 per centum of their assets, to student members in accordance with the provisions of this Act or in accordance with the provisions of any State or nonprofit private student loan insurance program with respect to which there is in effect an agreement with the Commissioner under section 9(b).

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 17. As used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'eligible institution' means a business or trade school, or technical institution or other technical or vocational school, in any State, which (1) admits as regular students only persons who have completed or left elementary or secondary school and who have the ability to benefit from the training offered by such institution; (2) is legally authorized to provide, and provides within that State, a program of postsecondary vocational or technical education designed to fit individuals for useful employment in recognized occupations; (3) has been in existence for 2 years or has been specially accredited by the Commissioner as an institution meeting the other requirements of this subsection; and (4) is accredited (A) by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association listed by the Commissioner pursuant to this clause, (B) if the Commissioner determines that there is no nationally recognized accrediting agency or association qualified to accredit schools of a particular category, by a State agency listed by the Commissioner pursuant to this clause, and (C) if the Commissioner determines there is no nationally recognized or State agency or association qualified to accredit schools of a particular category, by an advisory committee appointed by him and composed of persons specially qualified to evaluate training provided by schools of that category, which committee shall prescribe the standards of content, scope, and quality which must be met by those schools in order for loans to students attending them to be insurable under this Act and shall also determine whether particular schools meet those standards. For the purpose of this subsection, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations and State agencies which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of education or training afforded.

"(b) The term 'eligible lender' means an eligible institution, an agency or instrumentality of a State, or a financial or credit institution (including an insurance company) which is subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or of any State.

"(c) The term 'line of credit' means an arrangement or agreement between the lender and the borrower whereby a loan is paid out by the lender to the borrower in annual installments, or whereby the lender agrees to make, in addition to the initial loan, additional loans in subsequent years.

"(d) The term 'State' includes, in addition to the several States of the Union, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(e) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(f) The term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Education."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to submit for the RECORD at this point a complete explanation of the amendments to the bill itself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, this bill has a rather dramatic history to date. For years, we have been trying to pass legislation of this nature; legislation so vital and necessary to the student pursuing his field of endeavor in a postsecondary vocational school. Only this year was favorable action taken, and that action was indeed favorable. Extensive hearings and investigations were made into the area again this year, and H.R. 7743 came before the House on June 21, 1965. The vote was a resounding and positive, 300 to 0. On September 28, the Senate passed the bill, with an amendment, by unanimous vote. The question now is: Will the House accept the Senate amendment?

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the House to do so. I have cleared this with the ranking minority member of the subcommittee that originally considered the bill, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN], and he has approved the Senate amendment. All are in accord that the bill as amended by the Senate, meets the same objectives and intentions the House ratified on June 21. Let me explain the basic difference between the two versions.

It must first be understood that the Senate amendment provides only the same benefits as those afforded college and university students in the pending higher education bill. The House bill provided a system of loan insurance and a supplementary system of direct loans to students in business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools. The Senate amendment provides the same basic arrangement, modified, however, to conform to opportunities available to college or university students.

Specifically, the differences are as follows:

First. Section 3 of the Senate amendment provides advances for reserve funds of State and nonprofit private loan insurance programs. Subsection (a) of this section authorizes the Commissioner to make repayable advances to any State with which he has made his agreement pursuant to section 9(b), for the purpose of helping to establish or strengthen the reserve fund of the student loan program covered by that agreement. If a State will not have a vocational student loan insurance program covered by the agreement under section 9(b)—as determined for each of the fiscal years 1966, 1967, and 1968—then for any such year advances could be made to one or more nonprofit private programs to cover students in that State. Advances could be made to both State and private funds if necessary in order to assure that students at every eligible institution have access through such institution to a student loan insurance program. Advances and repayments under this subsection will be upon terms and conditions prescribed by the Commissioner. The $1,875,000 authorized for advances to State and nonprofit private programs under subsection (a) is to be allocated among the population aged 18 to 22 inclusive, but with no State receiving less than $10,000. The House bill had no such provision.

Second. Section 4 of the Senate amendment prohibits the Commissioner from issuing insurance certificates to lenders in a State when he determines that every eligible institution has reasonable access in that State to either a State or private nonprofit program covered by an agreement under section 9(b). The House bill had no such provision.

Third. The Senate amendment provides for a 3-year program of loan insurance, whereas the House bill established a program without limitations on duration. The Senate amendment also limits the amount of insured loans made to a student to $1,000 in any academic year, or $2,000 in total. The House bill provided $1,500 per year, and $3,000 in total.

Fourth. The Senate amendment contains a section providing Federal payment to reduce student interest costs.

This section directs the Commissioner to make payments to holders of insured student loans to reduce student interest costs. A student whose adjusted family income is less than $15,000, and who has received a loan insured under this act or under a State or nonprofit private program and meets its standards, will be entitled to have paid on his behalf to the holder of the loan, over a period of the loan, a portion of the interest on the loan. In order to entitle the student borrowers to the benefit of the interest subsidy with respect to loans insured by any State or private nonprofit private program, such program must, after June 30, 1967, have an agreement meeting all the requirements provided in section 9(c) concerning the terms of the loan insurance programs. During the transitional period prior to July 1, 1967, such program must only meet the standards limiting the interest rate to no higher than 6 percent yearly on the unpaid principal balance of the loan and the provision that repayment of the insured loans shall not be required to begin earlier than 60 days after the student ceases to pursue his course of study at an eligible institution. Adjusted family income will be determined under regulations of the Commissioner which will take into account appropriate factors such as family size.

The payment a student is entitled to have made on his behalf under this section will, during the period which precedes the repayment period of the loan, be equal to the total amount of the interest which accrued prior to the beginning of the repayment period to the beginning of the repayment period, and will, during the repayment period, be equal to 3 per annum of the unpaid, principal amount of the loan. However, the payment may not exceed, for any period, the amount of the interest, which—but for such payment—would be actually payable by the student, taking into consideration interest payments on his behalf for that period under any State or private loan insurance program. The holder of an insured loan will have contractual right, as against the United States, to be paid by the Commissioner the portion of interest which has been determined under this section. The Commissioner will prescribe the manner of payment and the form of certain reports to be made by the holder of the loan.

Subsection (b) of this section sets forth the conditions under which students whose loans are insured under State or private programs will receive payments to reduce their interest costs under this section. Any State or any nonprofit private institution or organization which has a student loan insurance program may enter into an agreement with the Commissioner to permit students who receive loans which are insured under its program to have made on their behalf payments under subsection (a), if the Commissioner determined that the insurance program—

(A) Authorizes the insurance of up to $1,000 in loans per student per academic year;

(B) Authorizes the insurance of loans to any individual student for at least 2 academic years of study;

(C) Provides that (i) the student borrower may accelerate without penalty the whole or any part of an insured loan, (ii) the period of any insured loan may not exceed 9 years from the date of execution of the note evidencing the loan, and (iii) the note contain certain default provisions prescribed by the Commissioner's regulations;

(D) Subject to the preceding subparagraph, provides that, if a student's insured loans held by any one person exceed $1,000, then repayment of such loans will be in installments over a period of not less than 3 years nor more than 6 years beginning between 9 months and 1 year after the student ceases to pursue a full-time course of study at an eligible institution—except that if the program provides for the insurance of loans for part-time study at eligible institutions, the repayment period will begin between 9 months and 1 year after the student ceases to carry at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload;

(E) Limits interest—exclusive of the insurance premium—to 6 percent per annum on the unpaid principal balance of the loan;

(F) Insures at least 90 percent of the unpaid principal of loans insured under the program;

(G) Does not provide for collection of an excessive insurance premium;

(H) Provides that the benefits of the loan insurance program will not be denied any student because of his family income or lack of need, if his adjusted family income is less that $15,000;

(I) Provides that a student may obtain insurance under the program for a loan for any year of study at an eligible institution; and

(J) Provides, in case of a State program, that the program will be administered by a single State agency, or by one or more nonprofit private institutions or organizations under supervision of such an agency—

Agreements under this subsection will require reports and have certain other provisions necessary to carry out this act.

Fifth. The Senate amendment, in section 15 requires the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welware to establish in the Office of Education, an Advisory Council on Insured Loans to Vocational Students. The Council would consist of the Commissioner, who would be Chairman, and eight members, including persons representing State and private nonprofit loan insurance programs, financial and credit institutions, and eligible institutions. The Council would advise the Commissioner in the preparation of general regulations, and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this act.

Sixth. Finally, the Senate amendment adds an eligibility for Federal credit unions to use up to 5 percent of their assets for making to their members student loans insured under this act or under certain State or private loan insurance programs.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the House to accept the Senate amendment so as to get this program in the administration stage. Thousands of business, trade, technical, and other vocational school students anxiously await this vital program of assistance. Thousands more of potential students likewise await the decision of this body. This is no "handout" program of giveaway; it is a program of assistance to a category of student often denied, neglected, and forgotten—but a category of students every bit as precious to America as the college or university student. Let us here and now end this era of neglect and accept the Senate amendment. Let us here and now affirm our confidence in these students and provide them with equal educational opportunity. We need them and they need the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill H.R. 11420.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

RESOLUTION DISMISSING THE ELECTION CONTEST IN THE THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF IOWA

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported the following privileged report (H. Res. 602, Rept. No. 1127) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 358]

Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Arends
Ayres
Bates
Bolling
Bonner
Brock
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Celler
Clawson, Del
Cunningham
Dawson
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Evans, Colo.
Fino
Flood
Fraser
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hardy
Hays
Hébert
Holifield
Holland
Hosmer
Joelson
Johnson, Okla.
Keogh
Lennon
Lindsay
Long, La.
McDowell
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Moore
Murray
O'Hara, Ill.
Pepper
Powell
Reinecke
Resnick
Rivers, S.C.
Saylor
Senner
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Steed
Stephens
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tuck
Utt
Vanik
White, Idaho
Whitten
Williams
Wyatt

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall, 369 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS TRADE ACT OF 1965

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9042) to provide for the implementation of the Agreement Concerning Automotive Products Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1115)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9042) to provide for the implementation of the Agreement Concerning Automotive Products Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, and 12, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with amendments, as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and on page 5 of the House engrossed bill, after line 21, insert the following:

"(e) This section shall cease to be in effect on the day after the date of the enactment of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SPECIAL REPORTS TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 205. (a) No later than August 31, 1968, the President shall submit to the Senate and the House of Representatives a special report on the comprehensive review called for by Article IV (c) of the Agreement. In such report he shall advise the Congress of the progress made toward the achievement of the objectives of Article I of the Agreement.

"(b) Whenever the President finds that any manufacturer has entered into any undertaking, by reason of governmental action, to increase the Canadian value added of automobiles, buses, specified commercial vehicles, or original equipment parts produced by such manufacturer in Canada after August 31, 1968, he shall report such finding to the Senate and the House of Representatives. The President shall also report whether such undertaking is additional to undertakings agreed to in letters of undertaking submitted by such manufacturer before the date of the enactment of this Act.

"(c) The reports provided for in subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall include recommendations for such further steps, including legislative action, if any, as may be necessary for the achievement of the purposes of the Agreement and this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: On page 7, line 4, of the Senate engrossed amendments, after "specifically shall include" insert the following: ", to the extent practicable,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

W. D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
THOMAS B. CURTIS,
JAMES UTT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY F. BYRD,
RUSSELL B. LONG,
GEORGE SMATHERS,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9042) to provide for the implementation of the Agreement Concerning Automotive Products Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: Section 202(a) of the bill as passed by the House authorized the President to proclaim modifications of the Tariff Schedules required to carry out an agreement with a foreign government providing for the mutual elimination of the duties applicable to products of the United States and such foreign country which are motor vehicles and fabricated components intended for use as original equipment in the manufacture of such vehicles.

Section 202(b) authorized the President to proclaim modifications of the Tariff Schedules required to carry out a further agreement, with a foreign country having an agreement applicable to products described in section 202(a), providing for the mutual reduction or elimination of the duties applicable to automotive products other than motor vehicles and fabricated components intended for original use as original equipment in the manufacture of such vehicles.

Section 202(c) provided that, before the President enters into an agreement referred to in section 202 (a) or (b), he shall—

(1) Seek the advice of the Tariff Commission as to the probable economic effect of the reduction or elimination of duties on industries producing articles like or directly competitive with those which may be covered by such agreement;

(2) Give reasonable public notice of his intention to negotiate such agreement (which notice shall be published in the Federal Register) in order that any interested person may have an opportunity to present his views to such agency as the President shall designate, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe; and

(3) Seek information and advice with respect to such agreement from the Departments of Commerce, Labor, State, and the Treasury, and from such other sources as he may deem appropriate.

Section 202(d)(2) of the bill as passed by the House authorized the President to issue any proclamation referred to in section 202 (a) or (b) only after the expiration of the 60-day period following its delivery to Congress and only if, between the date of delivery and the expiration of the 60-day period, the Congress has not adopted a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Senate and House of Representatives disapprove of the agreement.

Senate amendment No. 1 struck out section 202(d)(2) of the bill and substituted a provision authorizing the President to issue any proclamation referred to in section 202 (a) or (b) only if the Congress has adopted a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Senate and the House of Representatives approve the implementation of the agreement.

Under the conference agreement, the House language is restored, the Senate language is omitted, and new language is inserted providing that section 202 of the bill shall cease to be in effect on the day after the date of the enactment of the bill.

In reaching agreement with respect to amendment No. 1, the managers both on the part of the House and on the part of the Senate expressed the hope that should the President, under his constitutional authority, enter into the negotiation of any agreement relating to automotive products (whether motor vehicles, parts intended for use as original equipment, or replacement parts) the President will prior thereto—

(1) Seek the advice of the Tariff Commission as to the probable economic effect of the reduction or elimination of duties on industries producing articles like or directly competitive with those which may be covered by such an agreement,

(2) Give reasonable public notice of his intention to negotiate such an agreement (and publish notice thereof in the Federal Register) in order that interested persons may have an opportunity to present their views to such agency as the President may designate for that purpose, and

(3) Seek information and advice with respect to such an agreement from the appropriate departments and agencies of the Government, and from such other sources as he may deem appropriate.

It is understood, of course, that any executive agreement that the President may enter into under his constitutional authority can, insofar as any changes in U.S. tariff treatment are concerned, be implemented only by congressional action.

Amendment No. 2. This amendment added a new section 205 to the bill to provide that, under specified circumstances, the President is to cause an investigation to be made to determine whether any manufacturer has undertaken, by reason of govermental action to increase the Canadian value added of automobiles, buses, specified commercial vehicles, or original equipment parts produced by such manufacturer in Canada after August 31, 1968. If, as a result of such an investigation, the President determines (after applying subsection (c) of the new section) that any manufacturer has undertaken, by reason of governmental action, to increase such Canadian value added, he is to suspend the proclamations issued by him pursuant to section 201 of this act. The amendment also provides for the termination of any such suspension.

The House recedes with an amendment. Under the conference agreement a new section 205, relating to special reports to Congress, is added to the bill.

Such section 205 provides that, no later than August 31, 1968, the President is to submit to the Congress a special report on the comprehensive review called for by Article IV(c) of the Agreement.

The new section 205 also provides that whenever the President finds that any manufacturer has entered into any undertaking, by reason of governmental action, to increase the Canadian value added of automobiles, buses, specified commercial vehicles, or original equipment parts produced by such manufacturer in Canada after August 31, 1968, he shall report such finding to the Senate and the House of Representatives. The President is also to report whether such undertaking is additional to undertakings agreed to in letters of undertaking submitted by such manufacturer before the date of the enactment of this legislation.

The reports provided for in the new section 205 are to include recommendations for such further steps, including legislative action, if any, as may be necessary for the achievement of the purposes of the Agreement and the Act.

Amendments Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9: These amendments make technical amendments to title IV of the bill to conform tariff designations of articles entitled to duty-free entry to changes in the Tariff Schedules of the United States made by the Technical Amendments Act of 1965. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 10: Section 502 of the bill as passed both by the House and the Senate requires the President to submit to the Congress an annual report on the implementation of the bill and required the report to "include information regarding new negotiations, reductions or eliminations of duties, reciprocal concessions obtained, and other information relating to activities under the Act." Senate amendment No. 10 requires in addition that the annual report include information providing an evaluation of the Canadian Auto Agreement and the Act in relation to the total national interest and specifically to include information with respect to—

(1) The production of motor vehicles and motor vehicle parts in the United States and Canada,

(2) The retail prices of motor vehicles and motor vehicle parts in the United States and Canada,

(3) Employment in the motor vehicle industry and motor vehicle parts industry in the United States and Canada, and

(4) United States and Canadian trade in motor vehicles and motor vehicle parts, particularly trade between the United States and Canada.

The House recedes with a technical amendment. With respect to the language quoted above from the second sentence of section 502 of the bill, it should be noted that the effect of such language (insofar as it relates to section 202 of the bill) is modified by the conference action on Senate amendment No. 1.

Amendment No. 11: This amendment adds a new section 503 to the bill which provides that nothing contained in the bill shall be construed to affect or modify the provisions of the Anti-Dumping Act, 1921, or of the antitrust laws of the United States. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 12: This amendment adds a new title VI to the bill. The new title eliminates the $10,000 ceiling on appropriations for the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. Under the amendment there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes for which the joint committee was created. The House recedes.

W. D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
THOMAS B. CURTIS,
JAMES UTT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS (during the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] and I will take some time to explain what transpired in the conference and to explain what is in the conference report, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, there has just this minute come over the ticker an announcement about our President. He has conversed with the physicians. He is out of the recovery room and has returned to his own suite. He has completely reacted from the anesthetic. The briefing at 12:15 p.m. was that the surgery was complete as expected and that the recovery is progressing nicely and the prognosis is excellent. The single or fundal gallstone was found as prediagnosed and removed along with the gallbladder—a bile concentrating reservoir as an offshoot of the vital common bile duct which runs from the liver to the first portion of the small bowel beyond the stomach. Fortunately the common bile duct was not involved. However, as a most important double feature, a known stone lodged in the narrow ureter—passage from the right kidney to the urinary bladder—was also removed. Although this may well be considered a complication or at best an additional risk, it is an extra dividend to complete both operations with one incision and one anesthetic.

I know that my colleagues in the House join me in being delighted at the outcome of this operation on and for our Chief Executive, and certainly we all join in prayers that his recovery will continue speedily, and completely.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of us are pleased at the report that our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Missouri, has just given us concerning the President's recovery from the operation.

All of us hope for his speedy convalescence and speedy return to the arduous duties that go with the high office he holds.

Mr. Speaker, the other body added five substantive amendments to the bill, H.R. 9042, during the consideration of it either in the Finance Committee or on the floor of the Senate.

The effects of two of these amendments which our conferees considered to be undesirable, and I think that was the feeling of most of us, were changed by amendments which are reflected in the conference report.

In the case of another substantive amendment, your conferees succeeded in obtaining the Senate conferees' agreement to an amendment which we think improves their own amendment.

Of the other two substantive amendments as to which our conferees recommend acceptance, one merely states explicitly what we thought was already implicit in the bill itself as it passed the House.

The other had no relation whatsoever to the Canadian-United States automotive products agreement. But because of the nature of the amendment and the situation in the conference, your conferees accepted it. I will discuss that in a moment.

The first of the Senate amendments dealt with section 202 of the bill as it passed the House. This concerned the matter of additional agreements involving automotive products including agreements covering replacement parts and Members will remember that we discussed in connection with the passage of the bill itself that the President might enter into agreements with Canada or with any other foreign nation.

As the bill passed the House, section 202 prescribed certain prenegotiation procedures and authorized the President to implement any such additional agreement after 60 days following his delivery of the agreement to both Houses unless Congress within that 60-day period adopts a concurrent resolution disapproving the agreement.

The Senate amendment took a diametrically opposed approach. Under that amendment the President would have had no authority to implement an additional agreement unless Congress adopted a concurrent resolution approving the implementation of the agreement.

The committee on conference agreed that the House would recede from its disagreement to this particular amendment and agree to the same with an amendment which restored the pertinent House language of the 60-day period within which Congress could veto. But then we added a subsection (e) providing that the whole of section 202 of the bill would cease to be in effect after the date of the enactment of the bill.

In reaching agreement with respect to Senate Amendment No. 1, the managers, both on the part of the House and on the part of the Senate, recognized that, notwithstanding what is in effect the elimination of section 202 of the bill, the President could, under his constitutional authority, enter into agreements of the character contemplated by section 202, and then seek authority for their implementation by congressional action. The managers on the part of both Houses expressed the hope that if the latter course were to be followed, the executive branch would, prior to the negotiation of any such additional agreement, follow prenegotiation procedures such as those set forth in section 202(c) of the bill.

Frankly, I thought that that was a better solution than to take the approach of the Senate. The Senate felt it could not revert to the approach of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the second amendment of the Senate added a new section 205 to the bill that I feel—and most of the Members, if not all, of the conferees on the part of the House—felt that this amendment would leave us in a most untenable position with respect to the definiteness of rates of duty involving automobiles and parts for new cars if we left it in.

Senate Amendment No. 2 added a new section 205 to the bill that provided for suspension by the President under certain circumstances of the duty-removal proclamation made under section 201 of the bill whenever he finds that any manufacturer has undertaken, by reason of governmental action, to increase the Canadian-value-added after August 31, 1968, of motor vehicles and original-equipment parts produced by such manufacturer in Canada. It will be recalled, Mr. Speaker, that Canadian subsidiaries of United States automobile manufacturers undertook in certain letters to the Canadian Government to increase the Canadian-value-added of their Canadian production by 60 percent of their increased sales after 1964 plus $241 million additional to be achieved by the end of model year 1968.

Under the conference agreement your conferees recommend that the House recede with an amendment substituting a new section 205 for that proposed by the Senate, under which the President would report to the Congress whenever he finds that any manufacturer has entered into any new or additional undertaking, by reason of governmental action, for increasing the Canadian-value-added of motor vehicles and original-equipment parts produced by such manufacturer in Canada after August 31, 1968. The substitute version of section 205 also requires a special report by the President to the Senate and the House on the comprehensive review of the progress made toward achieving the objectives of the agreement which is called for by article IV(c) of the agreement. Furthermore, reports under this section are to include recommendations for such further steps, including legislative action, as may be necessary for the achievement of the purposes of the agreement and the act.

Senate amendments Nos. 3 to 9 inclusive, are purely technical amendments required to conform the bill to changes in the Tariff Schedules of the United States recently made by Congress in H.R.7969—the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965. With respect to these amendments, your conferees recommend that the House recede.

Senate amendment No. 10 amends section 502 of the bill. Section 502 requires an annual report from the President on the implementation of the act and specifies certain information to be included in the report. The Senate amendment added additional items of information which the President is to include in these reports and your conferees agreed to recommend that the House recede with respect to Senate amendment No. 10 with an amendment that certain of the information specifically called for by the Senate amendment shall be included in the reports only to the extent practicable.

Senate amendment No. 11 adds a new section 503 to the bill providing that nothing contained in the bill shall be construed to affect or modify the provisions of the Antidumping Act, 1921 or of the antitrust laws of the United States. Your conferees consider that this was implicit in the House version of the bill and recommends that the House recede with respect to this amendment.

Senate amendment No. 12 adds a new title VI to the bill which has no relationship to the subject matter of the bill as passed by the House. The amendment eliminates the $10,000 ceiling on appropriations for the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures and authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes for which the joint committee was created. Your conferees recommend that the House recede with respect to this amendment.

Your committee recommends that the conference report be accepted by the House. I believe it is the best your managers could have obtained in this conference. Certainly I would suggest that it merits your endorsement and approval.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas.

Again I am happy to confirm what the gentleman has explained as the contents of this conference report. In my judgment, it is a considerable improvement over the bill as originally passed.

I believe those who were opposed to the bill when it appeared in the House can take some satisfaction from the fact that there has been an improvement.

To recapitulate, I would say that essentially what has happened is that the President entered into this agreement with the Canadian Government and then had to come to the Congress in order to implement it.

My own judgment was that this was a very poor agreement, that created considerable difficulties in our international trade negotiations going on at Geneva in the Kennedy round; that some of the basic principles which the United States had been adhering to in our trade policy were being neglected, to put it mildly; that we were confronted almost with a fait accompli; that the relations of our Government and our society with our friends across the border in Canada were most important to us; and that probably the damage by not approving or trying to implement what the President had done would have been greater. Accordingly, I supported the bill when it came on the floor, at the same time in effect making a speech against it, pointing out some of the dangers.

This was done with a reason, in the hope that by expressing this point of view there would be a warning with respect to future actions of this nature, so that we would not be confronted with these kinds of things in the future.

Certainly, during the hearings of the Ways and Means Committee, when we made public the agreements which had been entered into by the Canadian Government with the four automobile companies, a much better atmosphere was created. After the debate on the floor of the House, this again was put in a better light. There was a very healthy debate on the floor of the other body.

Members will notice that most of the Senate amendments which have been accepted by your conferees are further directed toward making public that which is going on under the agreement.

With the further development of the Canadian-American auto treaty, the President will be reporting these developments. Thus we will be informed. If future agreements of this nature are entered into—and there is a reason why they should be, in order to follow our commitments under the most-favored-nation clause—the President will be required to notify the Congress, so that we will be aware of it. In turn, since we are the Representatives of the people, the people of the country and the various interests in our country will be aware of these agreements before they become a fait accompli and we are put in the somewhat embarrassing position of having to go along rather than to create an embarrassment with a friendly nation.

So I think there is considerable improvement in the bill. This exercise has not been in vain. I am hopeful that the administration will be more careful in the manner in which these international agreements are entered into and that the Congress will be brought in, as we must be. We have to implement these agreements, and we will be brought in at an early stage so that we will be able to express our judgments on them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. One final thing before I yield for questions. This is a minor point, but I want to emphasize it again. Amendment No. 12 has no place in this conference report. It is a matter that does not involve taxes, so even though it is a nongermane amendment added by our friends in the Senate, it does not violate the Constitution. It is something that obviously we would have agreed to, I am certain, if it had come under its own power. I do hope in the future we will not have these bills, which are complicated enough, containing such extraneous matter. These resolutions for financing should be given to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures and should come through on their own bottom. I only point this out so that we possibly will not have it occur in the future.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think the point you are making is a very valid and legitimate one. I was one of those who did not support this legislation when it passed the House because of the concern that some of the parts producers felt about the effect this would have on them in the increased rate of production in Canada. I was interested in what the gentleman said about improvement. I was looking at page 4 of the report which does mention the fact, and of course, this applies only to future negotiations.

Mr. CURTIS. That is correct. However, let me call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the present bill is improved because of the reporting process required on an annual basis with details of the working of the agreement so that if our parts companies are affected, at least Congress will have that knowledge. And we may take action based on this knowledge.

Mr. MONAGAN. Does this do any more than as the report says: The Senate expressed the hope that the President would seek the advice and give reasonable notice and seek information.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MILLS. I think what my friend is referring to is the expressed hope of the conferees even though we are taking out, by a termination date at least, section 202, with respect to any future agreements the President may contemplate or enter into, he will follow the procedures we outline on page 4 of the conference report.

Mr. CURTIS. Could I also add this: We were faced with a very difficult situation in the conference in which the House had proceeded on one theory of trying to implement this and the Senate on another theory. There was no basis on which we could effect, within the four corners of the conference, compromise language. We were seeking for it and would like to have had it, but we could not do it. That is the reason why we followed this course, but I think by doing it we are accomplishing what both the House and the Senate had in mind; namely, that the President on future agreements of this nature would have this consultation ahead of time. I am satisfied that the executive branch of the Government will probably pay attention to it. I am glad that there were Members here who opposed this originally, just as in the Senate, representing the proper interests in their districts. If you all had not spoken up, then who would have? I was in the position of trying to represent the House in the nature of being a member of the committee taking the overall look at the bill, but it was a healthy thing that there were voices that spoke up, I will say to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. I wanted to ask the gentleman from Arkansas two questions, if I might, about the conference committee report. If the gentleman will recall, I was particularly interested in the subject of replacement parts for automobiles.

The first question I wanted to ask is whether or not the gentleman thought that negotiating with respect to replacement parts was facilitated or made more difficult as a result of the new language which will be in the bill under the conference report.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. Let us be certain that we understand exactly what is involved here in this point. Remember that we were not authorizing the President to enter into an agreement. The President has that authority under the Constitution. He has to come back to the Congress if it is an agreement or to the Senate if it is a treaty. He has that power.

What we were doing in section 202 was spelling out the conditions for the exercise of authority granted him that he did not otherwise have, that is, to proclaim changes in tariff treatment of automotive products. That section, 202, is out by the termination date. The whole of it is out.

What we were trying to do in the report was to emphasize our thought that he should, before entering into negotiations for a new agreement, follow the prenegotiation procedures that we had in section 202 initially. We were trying to retain it here as a suggestion from the conferees by including it in the report.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, if I might clarify this for just a moment. This is the basic question. Why does the President have to come to the Congress to implement this treaty, and also the International Coffee Agreement and others? It is because tariff laws are involved, and, of course, it is in the purview of the Congress and the House of Representatives to initiate such measures. That is why the Executive really does have to come here.

We could have given him less authority relating to the tariff schedules, but we do not have that authority as far as treaties are concerned.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. McCLORY. I would judge that we are in about the same position with respect to replacement parts now as we were before. There is going to have to be something negotiated and if it is negotiated it is going to have to come to the Congress.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from Illinois is correct. But bear in mind that under the Senate amendment to the bill the situation is approximately the same now under the conference agreement as it would have been had we accepted the Senate amendment, because affirmative action of the Congress would have been required.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I wanted to ask another question with regard to the Antidumping Act. Do I understand as a result of this escapement—are we recognizing that if automobiles, finished automobiles, or automobile parts intended for new equipment are manufactured and sold in Canada that they cannot be sold in Canada at a higher price than they are sold for in the United States? The reason I ask that question is that I feel that the sale in the United States would be a violation of the act. I also happen to know—at least I have heard—that some sales have been made of vehicles at a higher price in Canada and lower in the United States, which has caused considerable resentment in Canada.

As I see it, the objective of this agreement—and I assume that it does have a valid objective—is to promote good relations between the United States and Canada, greater trade and better understanding. But we would not want a violation of the antidumping law or the differential in price which would create ill feeling between the two countries.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman, that to attempt to oversimplify the Antidumping Act is a great danger. If, as the gentleman says, transactions are effected that violate the Antidumping Act then, of course, nothing in this act affects or closes the antidumping procedures, the rights that exist under antidumping legislation.

But I do warn the gentleman that there is a great deal more to the technicalities in the antidumping legislation than just a differential in price, and there may or may not be a case under the antidumping law. But, the rights are not impaired whatsoever as a result of this action.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. What my friend from Missouri I think is saying, if I recall correctly his statement, is that merely a differential in price is not all it takes. If the differential in price between home and abroad results in injury to industries in the United States, then the antidumping law applies to the situation just as it would apply to any other situation.

Mr. CURTIS. Plus the fact that there can be legitimate differentials in prices and then we get into further complications.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STALBAUM. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] commented that the present section is the result of a fait accompli. Am I correct in my interpretation of the conference report that in the future, excepting the fact that we have got this fait accompli at this time, these matters will become more public sooner? I refer particularly to page 4 and the items relating to the actions of the President and suggestions to him that he seek advice, give public notice, and obtain information from other sources. Am I right in this assumption that this is specifically to avoid getting so far into the thing as has happened this time?

Mr. CURTIS. Exactly; but I must warn the gentleman that because of technical problems which we had in conference we are not saying, "No, this is no longer true."

Mr. STALBAUM. I do not think it goes that far, because we only express a hope in the paragraph or a request or desire of the congressional intent. This is what I am trying to strengthen right here.

Mr. CURTIS. It is a little more than that.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. As my friend from Wisconsin knows, we have to be very particular in what we do when we are involved with the constitutional authority of the President of the United States. This was the most we could do under the circumstances, if we were not to have section 202 in effect. This was in lieu of section 202's elimination.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Section 205—the new section 205—contains an unusual phrase. At least, it is unusual to me, "to increase the Canadian-value-added of automobiles."

What does this mean? Does this involve their cost of parts?

Mr. CURTIS. Well, yes, it does. The term "value added" is a term that has been used in tariff and in tax law for many years. It essentially means that we will take the raw material——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. It essentialy refers to whatever is added to the value of the raw material in the way of labor costs and other inputs—in order to finish the particular material. That is what "added value" refers to.

Mr. GROSS. To increase the Canadian value?

Mr. CURTIS. Well, you could take the parts of an automobile and the cost of putting it together, and then you would have labor cost and the other costs involved in assembling it, which would then be "added value" to those parts.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I am glad the lawyers understand what "to increase the Canadian value added" means. But I would think that "added value" would of itself suggest an increase.

Mr. CURTIS. Well, it is added value in its technical sense, and the gentleman from Iowa is perfectly correct. But when we get into these technical things, we do frequently get into doubletalk and we need the help of many laymen to keep us from getting too far out in our semantics.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I have one other question on amendment No. 12 which states that "The new title eliminates the $10,000 ceiling on appropriations for the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures."

Can the gentleman give me any indication as to how much more the committee is going to ask for?

Mr. CURTIS. You mean on this nongermane amendment?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I called attention to the amendment initially when I tried to present what we had done.

Let me call the gentleman's attention also to the fact that the chairman of the Joint Committee on Nonessential Expenditures is a very distinguished, strategically located, influential, powerful Member of the Senate from the great Commonwealth of Virginia. I know the gentleman from Iowa will share the point of view I have that neither of us have to be unduly concerned about any action on the part of the committee under his chairmanship.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the gentleman is correct.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS].

Mr. BRADEMAS. I want to make one brief observation. It is one of the concerns I expressed in debate in the House on this legislation, that it may represent a move on the part of the United States in the direction of bilateralism as distinguished from multilateralism trends.

Mr. MILLS. I would join my friend from Indiana in the expressed hope that we not see that happen as a result of this action. I believe in the multilateral approach and I would not want it replaced.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I thank the gentleman. I ran into a very distinguished lawyer of this city the other day who told me he had no clients involved in this particular legislation but other clients had admonished him to keep a close eye on the programs under this particular arrangement because if it went through they would like to get in on the act.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to and that I may have permission to revise and extend the remarks I made in further explanation of the conference report.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

ABACA

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6852) to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 47 million pounds of abaca from the national stockpile, with Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

> Amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed six-month waiting period, of approximately ninety-seven million pounds of abaca from the national stockpile."

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1965

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9811) to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1123)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9811) to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Food and Agriculture Act of 1965'.

"TITLE I—DAIRY

"SEC. 101. The Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, is further amended by striking in subparagraph (B) of subsection 8c(5) all of clause (d) and inserting in lieu thereof a new clause (d) to read as follows:

" '(d) a further adjustment, equitably to apportion the total value of the milk purchased by any handler, or by all handlers, among producers and associations of producers, on the basis of their marketings of milk, which may be adjusted to reflect sales of such milk by any handler or by all handlers in any use classification or classifications, during a representative period of time which need not be limited to one year. In the event a producer holding a base allocated under this clause (d) shall reduce his marketings, such reduction shall not adversely affect his history of production and marketing for the determination of future bases. Allocations to producers under this clause (d) may be transferable under an order on such terms and conditions as may be prescribed if the Secretary of Agriculture determines that transferability will be in the best interest of the public, existing producers, and prospective new producers. Any increase in class one base resulting from enlarged or increased consumption and any producer class one bases forfeited or surrendered shall first be made available to new producers and to the alleviation of hardship and inequity among producers. In the case of any producer who during any accounting period delivers a portion of his milk to persons not fully regulated by the order, provision may be made for reducing the allocation of, or payments to be received by, any such producer under this clause (d) to compensate for any marketings of milk to such other persons for such period or periods as necessary to insure equitable participation in marketings among all producers',

and by adding at the end of said subparagraph (B) the following: 'Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8c(12) and the last sentence of section 8c(19) of this Act, order provisions under (d) above shall not become effective in any marketing order unless separately approved by producers in a referendum in which each individual producer shall have one vote and may be terminated separately whenever the Secretary makes a determination with respect to such provisions as is provided for the termination of an order in subparagraph 8c(16)(B). Disapproval or termination of such order provisions shall not be considered disapproval of the order or of other terms of the order.'

"SEC. 102. Such Act is further amended (a) by adding to subsection 8c(5) the following new paragraph: '(H) Marketing orders applicable to milk and its products may be limited in application to milk used for manufacturing.' ; and (b) by amending subsection 8c(18) by adding after the words 'marketing area' wherever they occur the words 'or, in the case of orders applying only to manufacturing milk, the production area'.

"SEC. 103. The provisions of this title shall not be effective after December 31, 1969.

"SEC. 104. The legal status of producer handlers of milk under the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, shall be the same subsequent to the adoption of the amendments made by this title as it was prior thereto.

"TITLE II—WOOL

"SEC. 201. The National Wool Act of 1954, as amended, is amended, as follows:

"(1) By deleting from section 703 'March 31, 1966' and inserting in lieu thereof 'December 31, 1969'.

"(2) By changing the period at the end of the third sentence of section 703 to a colon and inserting the following: '*Provided further*, That the support price for shorn wool for the 1966 and each subsequent marketing year shall be determined by multiplying 62 cents by the ratio of (i) the average of the parity index (the index of prices paid by farmers, including commodities and services, interest, taxes, and farm wage rates, as defined in section 301(a)(1)(C) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended) for the three calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which such price support is determined and announced to (ii) the average parity index for the three calendar years 1958, 1959, and 1960, and rounding the resulting amount to the nearest full cent.'

"(3) By deleting the fourth sentence of section 703.

"TITLE III—FEED GRAINS

"SEC. 301. Section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding the following new subsection (e):

" '(e) For the 1966 through 1969 crops of feed grains, the Secretary shall require, as a condition of eligibility for price support on the crop of any feed grain which is included in any acreage diversion program formulated under section 16(i) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, that the producer shall participate in the diversion program to the extent prescribed by the Secretary, and, if no diversion program is in effect for any crop, he may require as a condition of eligibility for price support on such crop of feed grains that the producer shall not exceed his feed grain base: *Provided*, That the acreage on any farm which is diverted from the production of feed grains pursuant to a contract hereafter entered into under the Cropland Adjustment Program shall be deemed to be acreage diverted from the production of feed grains for purposes of meeting the foregoing requirements for eligibility for price support: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may provide that no producer of malting barley shall be required as a condition of eligibility for price support for barley to participate in the acreage diversion program for feed grains if such producer has previously produced a malting variety of barley, plants barley only of an acceptable malting variety for harvest, does not knowingly devote an acreage on the farm to barley in excess of 110 per centum of the average acreage devoted on the farm to barley in 1959 and 1960, does not knowingly devote an acreage on the farm to corn and grain sorghums in excess of the acreage devoted on the farm to corn and grain sorghums in 1959 and 1960, and does not devote any acreage devoted to the production of oats and rye in 1959 and 1960 to the production of wheat pursuant to the provisions of section 328 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. Such portion of the support price for any feed grain included in the acreage diversion program as the Secretary determines desirable to assure that the benefits of the price-support and diversion programs inure primarily to those producers who cooperate in reducing their acreages of feed grains shall be made available to producers through payments-in-kind. Such payments-in-kind shall be made available on the maximum permitted acreage, or the Secretary may make the same total amount available on a smaller acreage or acreages at a higher rate or rates. The number of bushels of such feed grain on which such payments-in-kind shall be made shall be determined by multiplying that part of the actual acreage of such feed grain planted on the farm for harvest on which the Secretary makes such payments available by the farm projected yield per acre: *Provided,* That for purposes of such payments, the Secretary may permit producers of feed grains to have acreage devoted to soybeans considered as devoted to the production of feed grains to such extent and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines will not impair the effective operation of the price support program: *Provided further,* That for purposes of such payments, producers on any farm who have planted not less than 90 per centum of the acreage of feed grains permitted to be planted shall be deemed to have planted the entire acreage permitted. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), that portion of the support price which is made available through loans and purchases for the 1966 through 1969 crops may be reduced below the loan level for the 1965 crop by such amounts and in such stages as may be necessary to promote increased participation in the feed grain program, taking into account increases in yields, but so as not to disrupt the feed grain and livestock economy: *Provided,* That this authority shall not be construed to modify or affect the Secretary's discretion to maintain or increase total price support levels to cooperators. An acreage on the farm which the Secretary finds was not planted to feed grains because of drought, flood, or other natural disaster shall be deemed to be an actual acreage of feed grains planted for harvest for purposes of such payments provided such acreage is not subsequently planted to any other income-producing crop during such year. The Secretary may make not to exceed 50 per centum of any payments hereunder to producers in advance of determination of performance. Payments-in-kind shall be made through the issuance of negotiable certificates which the Commodity Credit Corporation shall redeem for feed grains (such feed grains to be valued by the Secretary at not less than the current support price made available through loans and purchases, plus reasonable carrying charges) in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, assist the producer in the marketing of such certificates. The Secretary shall provide for the sharing of such certificates among producers on the farm on the basis of their respective shares in the feed grain crop produced on the farm, or the proceeds therefrom, except that in any case in which the Secretary determines that such basis would not be fair and equitable, the Secretary shall provide for such sharing on such other basis as he may determine to be fair and equitable. If the operator of the farm elects to participate in the acreage diversion program, price support for feed grains included in the program shall be made available to the producers on such farm only if such producers divert from the production of such feed grains, in accordance with the provisions of such program, an acreage on the farm equal to the number of acres which such operator agrees to divert, and the agreement shall so provide. In any case in which the failure of a producer to comply fully with the terms and conditions of the programs formulated under this subsection (e) and subsection (d) of this section preclude the making of payments-in-kind, the Secretary may, nevertheless, make such payments-in-kind in such amounts as he determines to be equitable in relation to the seriousness of the default.'

"SEC. 302. Section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, is amended by adding the following new subsection:

" '(i) Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

" '(1) For the 1966 through 1969 crops of feed grains, if the Secretary determines that the total supply of feed grains will, in the absence of an acreage diversion program, likely be excessive, taking into account the need for an adequate carryover to maintain reasonable and stable supplies and prices of feed grains and to meet any national emergency, he may formulate and carry out an acreage diversion program for feed grains, without regard to provisions which would be applicable to the regular agricultural conservation program, under which, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines, conservation payments shall be made to producers who divert acreage from the production of feed grains to an approved conservation use and increase their average acreage of cropland devoted in 1959 and 1960 to designated soil-conserving crops or practices including summer fallow and idle land by an equal amount. Payments shall be made at such rate or rates as the Secretary determines will provide producers with a fair and reasonable return for the acreage diverted, but not in excess of 50 per centum of the estimated basic county support rate, including the lowest rate of payment-in-kind, on the normal production of the acreage diverted from the commodity on the farm based on the farm projected yield per acre. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, the Secretary may permit all or any part of such diverted acreage to be devoted to the production of guar, sesame, safflower, sunflower, castor beans, mustard seed, crambe, plantago ovato, and flaxseed, if he determines that such production of the commodity is needed to provide an adequate supply, is not likely to increase the cost of the price support program, and will not adversely affect farm income subject to the condition that payment with respect to diverted acreage devoted to any such crop shall be at a rate determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable, taking into consideration the use of such acreage for the production of such crops, but in no event shall the payment exceed one-half the rate which otherwise would be applicable if such acreage were devoted to conservation uses. The term "feed grains" means corn, grain sorghums, and, if designated by the Secretary, barley, and if for any crop the producer so requests for purposes of having acreage devoted to the production of wheat considered as devoted to the production of feed grains, pursuant to the provisions of section 328 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, the term "feed grains" shall include oats and rye and barley if not designated by the Secretary as provided above: *Provided,* That acreages of corn, grain sorghums, and, if designated by the Secretary, barley, shall not be planted in lieu of acreages of oats and rye and barley if not designated by the Secretary as provided above: *Provided further,* That the acreage devoted to the production of wheat shall not be considered as an acreage of feed grains for purposes of establishing the feed grain base acreage for the farm for subsequent crops. Such feed grain diversion program shall require the producer to take such measures as the Secretary may deem appropriate to keep such diverted acreage free from erosion, insects, weeds, and rodents. The acreage eligible for participation in the program shall be such acreage (not to exceed 50 per centum of the average acreage on the farm devoted to feed grains in the crop years 1959 and 1960 or twenty-five acres, whichever is greater) as the Secretary determines necessary to achieve the acreage reduction goal for the crop. Payments shall be made in kind. The acreage of wheat produced on the farm during the crop years 1959, 1960, and 1961, pursuant to the exemption provided in section 335(f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, prior to its repeal by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, in excess of the small farm base acreage for wheat established under section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, may be taken into consideration in establishing the feed grain base acreage for the farm. The Secretary may make such adjustments in acreage as he determines necessary to correct for abnormal factors affecting production, and to give due consideration to tillable acreage, crop-rotation practices, types of soil, soil and water conservation measures, and topography. Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection (i)(1), the Secretary may, upon unanimous request of the State committee established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, adjust the feed grain bases for farms within any State or county to the extent he determines such adjustment to be necessary in order to establish fair and equitable feed grain bases for farms within such State or county. The Secretary may make not to exceed 50 per centum of any payments to producers in advance of determination of performance. Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, barley shall not be included in the program for a producer of malting barley exempted pursuant to section 105(e) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, who participates only with respect to corn and grain sorghums and does not knowingly devote an acreage on the farm to barley in excess of 110 per centum of the average acreage devoted on the farm to barley in 1959 and 1960.

" '(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, not to exceed 1 per centum of the estimated total feed grain bases for all farms in a State for any year may be reserved from the feed grain bases established for farms in the State for apportionment to farms on which there were no acreages devoted to feed grains in the crop years 1959 and 1960 on the basis of the following factors: Suitability of the land for the production of feed grains, the past experience of the farm operator in the production of feed grains, the extent to which the farm operator is dependent on income from farming for his livelihood, the production of feed grains on other farms owned, operated, or controlled by the farm operator, and such other factors as the Secretary determines should be considered for the purpose of establishing fair and equitable feed grain bases. An acreage equal to the feed grain base so established for each farm shall be deemed to have been devoted to feed grains on the farm in each of the crop years 1959 and 1960 for purposes of this subsection except that producers on such farm shall not be eligible for conservation payments for the first year for which the feed grain base is established.

"'(3) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out this section 16(i).

"'(4) The Secretary shall provide by regulations for the sharing of payments under this subsection among producers on the farm on a fair and equitable basis and in keeping with existing contracts.

"'(5) Payments in kind shall be made through the issuance of negotiable certificates which the Commodity Credit Corporation shall redeem for feed grains in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, assist the producer in the marketing of such certificates. Feed grains with which Commodity Credit Corporation redeems certificates pursuant to this paragraph shall be valued at not less than the current support price made available through loans and purchases, plus reasonable carrying charges.

"'(6) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may, by mutual agreement with the producer, terminate or modify any agreement previously entered into pursuant to this subsection if he determines such action necessary because of an emergency created by drought or other disaster, or in order to prevent or alleviate a shortage in the supply of feed grains.'

"SEC. 303. Section 326 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, as amended, is amended by deleting the language beginning with 'the requirements' and ending with 'Agricultural Act of 1961, and' and substituting therefor 'the requirements of any program under which price support is extended or payments are made to farmers, and price support may be extended or'.

"TITLE IV—COTTON

"SEC. 401. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

"(1) Section 348 of the Act is amended by adding the following new sentences at the end thereof: 'The Secretary may extend the period for performance of obligations incurred in connection with payments made for the period ending July 31, 1966, or may make payments on raw cotton in inventory on July 31, 1966, at the rate in effect on such date. No payments shall be made hereunder with respect to 1966 crop cotton.'

"(2) Section 346 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, for the 1966, 1967, 1968, and 1969 crops of upland cotton, if the farm operator elects to forgo price support for any such crop of cotton by applying to the county committee of the county in which the farm is located for additional acreage under this subsection, he may plant an acreage not in excess of the farm acreage allotment established under section 344 plus the acreage apportioned to the farm from the national export market acreage reserve, and all cotton of such crop produced on the farm may be marketed for export free of any penalty under this section: *Provided*, That the foregoing shall be applicable only to farms which had upland cotton allotments for 1965 and are operated by the same operator as in 1965 or by his heir.

"'For the 1966 crop the national export market acreage reserve shall be 250,000 acres. For each subsequent crop—

If the carryover at the end of the marketing year for the preceding crop is estimated to be less than the carryover at the beginning of such marketing year by—	The national export market acreage reserve shall be—
At least 1,000,000 bales	250,000 acres.
At least 750,000 bales, but not as much as 1,000,000 bales.	187,500 acres.
At least 500,000 bales, but not as much as 750,000 bales.	125,000 acres.
At least 250,000 bales, but not as much as 500,000 bales.	62,500 acres.
Less than 250,000 bales	None.

"'The national export market acreage reserve shall be apportioned to farms by the Secretary on the basis of the applications therefor. No application shall be accepted for a greater acreage than is available on the farm for the production of upland cotton. After apportionments are thus made to farms, the Secretary shall provide farm operators a reasonable time in which to cancel their applications (and agreements to forgo price support) and surrender to the Secretary through the county committee the export market acreage assigned to the farm. Acreage so surrendered shall be available for reassignment by the Secretary to other eligible farms to which export market acreage has been apportioned on the basis of the applications remaining outstanding. The operator of any farm who elects to forgo price support for any such crop under this subsection shall not be eligible for price support on cotton of such crop produced on any other farm in which he has a controlling or substantial interest as determined by the Secretary. Acreage planted to cotton in excess of the farm acreage allotment established under section 344 shall not be taken into account in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments. The operator of any farm to which export market acreage is apportioned, or the purchasers of cotton produced on such farm, shall, under regulations issued by the Secretary, furnish a bond or other undertaking prescribed by the Secretary providing for the exportation, without benefit of any Government cotton export subsidy and within such time as the Secretary may specify, of all cotton produced on such farm for such year. The bond or other undertaking given pursuant to this subsection shall provide that, upon failure to comply with the terms and conditions thereof, the person furnishing such bond or other undertaking shall be liable for liquidated damages in an amount which the Secretary determines and specifies in such undertaking will approximate the amount payable on excess cotton under subsection (a). The Secretary may, in lieu of the furnishing of a bond or other undertaking, provide for the payment of an amount equal to that which would be payable as liquidated damages under such bond or other undertaking. If such bond or other undertaking is not furnished, or if payment in lieu thereof is not made as provided herein, at such time and in the manner required by regulations of the Secretary, or if the acreage planted to cotton on the farm exceeds the sum of the farm acreage allotment established under section 344 and the acreage apportioned to the farm from the national export market acreage reserve, the acreage planted to cotton in excess of the farm acreage allotment established under section 344 shall be regarded as excess acreage for purposes of this section and section 345. Amounts collected by the Secretary under this subsection shall be remitted to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

"(3) Section 350 of the Act is amended, effective with the 1966 crop, to read as follows:

"'SEC. 350. In order to afford producers an opportunity to participate in a program of reduced acreage and higher price support, as provided in section 103(d) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, the Secretary shall determine a national domestic allotment for the 1966, 1967, 1968, and 1969 crops of upland cotton equal to the estimated domestic consumption of upland cotton (standard bales of four hundred and eighty pounds net weight) for the marketing year beginning in the year in which the crop is to be produced. The Secretary shall determine a farm domestic acreage allotment percentage for each such year by dividing (1) the national domestic allotment (in net weight pounds) by (2) the total for all States of the product of the State acreage allotment and the projected State yield. The farm domestic acreage allotment shall be established by multiplying the farm acreage allotment established under section 344 by the farm domestic acreage allotment percentage: *Provided*, That no farm domestic acreage allotment shall be less than 65 per centum of such farm acreage allotment. Such national domestic allotment shall be determined not later than October 15 of the calendar year preceding the year in which the crop is to be produced; except that in the case of the 1966 crop, such determination shall be made within 15 days after enactment of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965.'

"SEC. 402. (a) Section 103 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"'(d)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas, price support and diversion payments shall be made available for the 1966, 1967, 1968, and 1969 crops of upland cotton as provided in this subsection.

"'(2) Price support for each such crop of upland cotton shall be made available to cooperators through loans at such level, not exceeding a level which will reflect for Middling one-inch upland cotton at average location in the United States 90 per centum of the estimated average world market price for Middling one-inch upland cotton for the marketing year for such crop, as the Secretary determines will provide orderly marketing of cotton during the harvest season and will retain an adequate share of the world market for cotton produced in the United States taking into consideration the factors specified in section 401(b) of this Act: *Provided*, That the national average loan rate for the 1966 crop shall reflect 21 cents per pound for Middling one-inch upland cotton.

"'(3) The Secretary also shall provide additional price support for each such crop through payments in cash or in kind to cooperators at a rate not less than 9 cents per pound: *Provided*, That the rate shall be such that the amount obtained by—

"'(i) multiplying the rate by the farm domestic acreage allotment percentage, and

"'(ii) dividing the product thus obtained by the cooperator percentage established under section 408(b), and

"'(iii) adding the result thus obtained to the national average loan rate shall not be less than 65 per centum or more than 90 per centum of the parity price for cotton as of the month in which the payment rate provided for by this paragraph is announced. Such payments shall be made on the quantity of cotton determined by multiplying the projected farm yield by the acreage planted to cotton within the farm domestic acreage allotment: *Provided*, That any such farm planting not less than 90 per centum of such domestic acreage allotment shall be deemed to have planted the entire amount of such allotment. An acreage on a farm in any such year which the Secretary finds was not planted to cotton because of drought, flood, or other natural disaster shall be deemed to be planted to cotton for purposes of payments under this subsection if such acreage is not subsequently devoted to any other income-producing crop in such year.

"'(4) The Secretary shall make diversion payments in cash or in kind in addition to the price support payments authorized in paragraph (3) to cooperators who reduce their cotton acreage by diverting a portion of their cotton acreage allotment from the production of cotton to approved conservation practices to the extent prescribed by the Secretary: *Provided,* That no reduction below the domestic acreage allotments established under section 350 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall be prescribed: *Provided further,* That payment under this paragraph shall be made available for diverting to conserving uses that part of the acreage allotment which must be diverted from cotton in order that the producer may qualify as a cooperator. The rate of payment for acreage required to be diverted in order to qualify as a cooperator shall not be less than 25 per centum of the parity price for upland cotton as of the month in which such rate is announced. The rate of payment for additional acreage diverted shall be such rate as the Secretary determines to be fair and reasonable, but shall not exceed 40 per centum of such parity price. Payment at each applicable rate shall be made on the quantity of cotton determined by multiplying the acreage diverted from the production of cotton at such rate by the projected farm yield. In addition to the foregoing payment, if any, payment at the rate applicable for acreage required to be diverted to qualify as a cooperator shall be made to producers on small farms as defined in section 408(b) who do not exceed their farm acreage allotments on a quantity of cotton determined by multiplying an acreage equal to 35 per centum of such farm acreage allotment by the projected farm yield.

"'(5) The Secretary may make not to exceed 50 per centum of the payments under this subsection to producers in advance of determination of performance and the balance of such payments shall be made at such time as the Secretary may prescribe.

"'(6) Where the farm operator elects to participate in the diversion program authorized in this subsection and no acreage is planted to cotton on the farm, diversion payments shall be made at the rate established under paragraph (4) for acreage required to be diverted to qualify as a cooperator on the quantity of cotton determined by multiplying that part of the farm acreage allotment required to be diverted to qualify as a cooperator by the projected farm yield, and the remainder of such allotment may be released under the provisions of section 344(m)(2) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. The acreage on which payment is made under this paragraph shall be regarded as planted to cotton for purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments, and farm bases.

"'(7) Payments in kind under this subsection shall be made through the issuance of certificates which the Commodity Credit Corporation shall redeem for cotton under regulations issued by the Secretary at a value per pound equal to not less than the current loan rate therefor. The Corporation may, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, assist the producers in the marketing of such certificates at such times and in such manner as the Secretary determines will best effectuate the purposes of the program authorized by this subsection.

"'(8) Payments under this subsection shall be conditioned on the farm having an acreage of approved conservation uses equal to the sum of (i) the reduction in cotton acreage required to qualify for such payments (hereinafter called "diverted acreage"), and (ii) the average acreage of cropland on the farm devoted to designated soil-conserving crops or practices, including summer fallow and idle land, during a base period prescribed by the Secretary: *Provided,* That the Secretary may permit all or any part of such diverted acreage to be devoted to the production of guar, sesame, safflower, sunflower, castor beans, mustard seed, crambe, plantago ovato, and flaxseed, if he determines that such production is necessary to provide an adequate supply of such commodities, is not likely to increase the cost of the price support program, and will not adversely affect farm income, subject to the condition that payment under paragraph (4) or (6) with respect to diverted acreage devoted to any such crop shall be at a rate determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable, taking into consideration the use of such acreage for the production of such crops, but in no event shall the payment exceed one-half the rate which otherwise would be applicable if such acreage were devoted to conservation uses.

"'(9) The acreage regarded as planted to cotton on any farm which qualifies for payment under this subsection except under paragraph (6) shall, for purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments and farm bases, be the farm acreage allotment established under section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, excluding adjustments under subsection (m)(2) thereof.

"'(10) The Secretary shall provide adequate safeguards to protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers, including provision for sharing diversion payments on a fair and equitable basis under this subsection. The Secretary shall provide for the sharing of price support payments among producers on the farm on the basis of their respective shares in the cotton crop produced on the farm, or the proceeds therefrom, except that in any case in which the Secretary determines that such basis would not be fair and equitable, the Secretary shall provide for such sharing on such other basis as he may determine to be fair and equitable.

"'(11) In any case in which the failure of a producer to comply fully with the terms and conditions of the programs formulated under this Act preclude the making of payments under this section, the Secretary may, nevertheless, make such payments in such amounts as he determines to be equitable in relation to the seriousness of the default.

"'(12) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, if as a result of limitations hereafter enacted with respect to price support under this subsection, the Secretary is unable to make available to all cooperators the full amount of price support to which they would otherwise be entitled under paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection for any crop of upland cotton, (A) price support to cooperators shall be made available for such crop (if marketing quotas have not been disapproved) through loans or purchases at such level not less than 65 per centum nor more than 90 per centum of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines appropriate; (B) in order to keep upland cotton to the maximum extent practicable in the normal channels of trade, such price support may be carried out through the simultaneous purchase of cotton at the support price therefor and resale at a lower price or through loans under which the cotton would be redeemable by payment of a price therefor lower than the amount of the loan thereon; an (C) such resale or redemption price shall be such as the Secretary determines will provide orderly marketing of cotton during the harvest season and will retain an adequate share of the world market for cotton produced in the United States.

"'(13) The provisions of subsection 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (relating to assignment of payments), shall also apply to payments under this subsection.

"'(14) The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to utilize its capital funds and other assets for the purpose of making the payments authorized in this subsection and to pay administrative expenses necessary in carrying out this subsection.'

"(b) Section 408(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended, effective only for the 1966 through 1969 crops, by changing the period at the end of the first sentence thereof to a colon and adding the following: '*Provided,* That for upland cotton a cooperator shall be a producer on whose farm the acreage planted to such cotton does not exceed the cooperator percentage, which shall be in the case of the 1966 crop, 87.5 per centum of such farm acreage allotment and, in the case of each of the 1967, 1968, and 1969 crops, such percentage, not less than 87.5 or more than 100 per centum, of such farm acreage allotment as the Secretary may specify for such crop, except that in the case of small farms (i.e. farms on which the acreage allotment is 10 acres or less, or on which the projected farm yield times the acreage allotment is 3,600 pounds or less, and the acreage allotment has not been reduced under section 344(m)) the acreage of cotton on the farm shall not be required to be reduced below the farm acreage allotment.'

"Sec. 403. Section 301 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding the following new subparagraphs to paragraph (13) of subsection (b):

"'(L) "Projected national, State, and county yields" for any crop of cotton shall be determined on the basis of the yield per harvested acre of such crop in the United States, the State and the county, respectively, during each of the five calendar years immediately preceding the year in which such projected yield for the United States, the State, and the county, respectively, is determined, adjusted for abnormal weather conditions affecting such yield, for trends in yields, and for any significant changes in production practices.

"'(M) "Projected farm yield" for any crop of cotton shall be determined on the basis of the yield per harvested acre of such crop on the farm during each of the three calendar years immediately preceding the year in which such projected farm yield is determined, adjusted for abnormal weather conditions affecting such yield, for trends in yields, and for any significant changes in production practices, but in no event shall such projected farm yield be less than the normal yield for such farm as provided in subparagraph (I) of this paragraph.'

"Sec. 404. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, for the period August 1, 1966, through July 31, 1970, (1) the Commodity Credit Corporation shall sell upland cotton for unrestricted use at the same prices as it sells cotton for export, in no event, however, at less than 110 per centum of the loan rate, and (2) the Commodity Credit Corporation shall sell or make available for unrestricted use at current market prices in each marketing year a quantity of upland cotton equal to the amount by which the production of upland cotton is less than the estimated requirements for domestic use and for export for such marketing year. The Secretary may make such estimates and adjustments therein at such times as he determines will best effectuate the provisions of part (2) of the foregoing sentence and such quantities of cotton as are required to be sold under such sentence shall be offered for sale in an orderly manner and so as not to affect market prices unduly.'

"SEC. 405. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding after section 344 the following new section:

" 'SEC. 344a. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary, if he determines that it will not impair the effective operation of the program involved, (1) may permit the owner and operator of any farm for which a cotton acreage allotment is established to sell or lease all or any part or the right to all or any part of such allotment (excluding that part of the allotment which the Secretary determines was apportioned to the farm from the national acreage reserve) to any other owner or operator of a farm for transfer to such farm; (2) may permit the owner of a farm to transfer all or any part of such allotment to any other farm owned or controlled by him: *Provided*, That the authority granted under this section may be exercised for the calendar years 1966, 1967, 1968, and 1969, but all transfers hereunder shall be for such period of years as the parties thereto may agree.

" '(b) Transfers under this section shall be subject to the following conditions: (i) no allotment shall be transferred to a farm in another State or to a person for use in another State; (ii) no farm allotment may be sold or leased for transfer to a farm in another county unless the producers of cotton in the county from which transfer is being made have voted in a referendum within three years of the date of such transfer, by a two-thirds majority of the producers participating in such referendum, to permit the transfer of allotments to farms outside the county, which referendum, insofar as practicable, shall be held in conjunction with the marketing quota referendum for the commodity; (iii) no transfer of an allotment from a farm subject to a mortgage or other lien shall be permitted unless the transfer is agreed to by the lienholder; (iv) no sale of a farm allotment shall be permitted if any sale of cotton allotment to the same farm has been made within the three immediately preceding crop years; (v) the total cotton allotment for any farm to which allotment is transferred by sale or lease shall not exceed the farm acreage allotment (excluding reapportioned acreage) established for such farm for 1965 by more than one hundred acres; (vi) no cotton in excess of the remaining acreage allotment on the farm shall be planted on any farm from which the allotment (or part of an allotment) is sold for a period of five years following such sale, nor shall any cotton in excess of the remaining acreage allotment on the farm be planted on any farm from which the allotment (or part of an allotment) is leased during the period of such lease, and the producer on such farm shall so agree as a condition precedent to the Secretary's approval of any such sale or lease; and (vii) no transfer of allotment shall be effective until a record thereof is filed with the county committee of the county to which such transfer is made and such committee determines that the transfer complies with the provisions of this section. Such record may be filed with such committee only during the period beginning June 1 and ending December 31.

" '(c) The transfer of an allotment shall have the effect of transferring also the acreage history, farm base, and marketing quota attributable to such allotment and if the transfer is made prior to the determination of the allotment for any year the transfer shall include the right of the owner or operator to have an allotment determined for the farm for such year: *Provided*, That in the case of a transfer by lease, the amount of the allotment shall be considered for purposes of determining allotments after the expiration of the lease to have been planted on the farm from which such allotment is transferred.

" '(d) The land in the farm from which the entire cotton allotment and acreage history have been transferred shall not be eligible for a new farm cotton allotment during the five years following the year in which such transfer is made.

" '(e) The transfer of a portion of a farm allotment which was established under minimum farm allotment provisions for cotton or which operates to bring the farm within the minimum farm allotment provision for cotton shall cause the minimum farm allotment or base to be reduced to an amount equal to the allotment remaining on the farm after such transfer.

" '(f) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations for the administration of this section, which shall include provisions for adjusting the size of the allotment transferred if the farm to which the allotment is transferred has a substantially higher yield per acre and such other terms and conditions as he deems necessary.

" '(g) If the sale or lease occurs during a period in which the farm is covered by a conservation reserve contract, cropland conversion agreement, cropland adjustment agreement, or other similar land utilization agreement, the rates of payment provided for in the contract or agreement of the farm from which the transfer is made shall be subject to an appropriate adjustment, but no adjustment shall be made in the contract or agreement of the farm to which the allotment is transferred.

" '(h) The Secretary shall by regulations authorize the exchange between farms in the same county, or between farms in adjoining counties within a State, of cotton acreage allotment for rice acreage allotment. Any such exchange shall be made on the basis of application filed with the county committee by the owners and operators of the farms, and the transfer of allotment between the farms shall include transfer of the related acreage history for the commodity. The exchange shall be acre for acre or on such other basis as the Secretary determines is fair and reasonable, taking into consideration the comparative productivity of the soil for the farms involved and other relevant factors. No farm from which the entire cotton or rice allotment has been transferred shall be eligible for an allotment of cotton or rice as a new farm within a period of five crop years after the date of such exchange.

" '(i) The provisions of this section relating to cotton shall apply only to upland cotton.'

"TITLE V—WHEAT

"SEC. 501. Effective beginning with the crop planted for harvest in the calendar year 1966, the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

"(1) Section 332 is amended by changing item (iv) in subsection (b) to read: 'will be utilized during such marketing year in the United States as livestock (including poultry) feed, excluding the estimated quantity of wheat which will be utilized for such purpose as a result of the substitution of wheat for feed grains under section 328 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962' and by adding the following new subsection:

" '(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary shall not proclaim a national marketing quota for the crops of wheat planted for harvest in the calendar years 1966 through 1969, and farm marketing quotas shall not be in effect for such crops of wheat.'

"(2) Section 333 is amended to read as follows: 'The Secretary shall proclaim a national acreage allotment for each crop of wheat. The amount of the national acreage allotment for any crop of wheat shall be the number of acres which the Secretary determines on the basis of the projected national yield and expected underplantings (acreage other than that not harvested because of program incentives) of farm acreage allotments will produce an amount of wheat equal to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year for such crop, or if a national marketing quota was not proclaimed, the quota which would have been determined if one had been proclaimed.'

"(3) Subsection (a) of section 334 is amended to read as follows:

" '(a) The national allotment for wheat, less a reserve of not to exceed 1 per centum thereof for apportionment as provided in this subsection and less the special acreage reserve provided for in this subsection, shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the States on the basis of the preceding year's allotment for each such State, including all amounts allotted to the State and including for 1967 the increased acreage in the State allotted for 1966 under section 335, adjusted to the extent deemed necessary by the Secretary to establish a fair and equitable apportionment base for each State, taking into consideration established crop rotation practices, estimated decrease in farm allotments because of loss of history, and other relevant factors. The reserve acreage set aside herein for apportionment by the Secretary shall be used to make allotments to counties in addition to the county allotments made under subsection (b) of this section, on the basis of the relative needs of counties for additional allotments because of reclamation and other new areas coming into production of wheat. There also shall be made available a special acreage reserve of not in excess of one million acres as determined by the Secretary to be desirable for the purposes hereof which shall be in addition to the national acreage reserve provided for in this subsection. Such special acreage reserve shall be made available to the States to make additional allotments to counties on the basis of the relative needs of counties, as determined by the Secretary, for additional allotments to make adjustments in the allotments on old wheat farms (that is, farms on which wheat has been seeded or regarded as seeded to one or more of the three crops immediately preceding the crop for which the allotment is established) on which the ratio of wheat acreage allotment to cropland on the farm is less than one-half the average ratio of wheat acreage allotment to cropland on old wheat farms in the county. Such adjustments shall not provide an allotment for any farm which would result in an allotment-cropland ratio for the farm in excess of one-half of such county average ratio and the total of such adjustments in any county shall not exceed the acreage made available therefor in the county. Such apportionment from the special acreage reserve shall be made only to counties where wheat is a major income-producing crop, only to farms on which there is limited opportunity for the production of an alternative income-producing crop, and only if an efficient farming operation on the farm requires the allotment of additional acreage from the special acreage reserve. For the purposes of making adjustments hereunder the cropland on the farm shall not include any land developed as cropland subsequent to the 1963 crop year.'

"(4) Subsection (b) of section 334 is amended to read as follows:

" '(b) The State acreage allotment for wheat, less a reserve of not to exceed 3 per centum thereof for apportionment as provided in subsection (c) of this section, shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the counties in the State, on the basis of the preceding year's wheat allotment in each such county, including for 1967 the increased acreage in the county allotted for 1966 pursuant to section 335, adjusted to the extent deemed necessary by the Secretary in order to establish a fair and equitable apportionment base for each county, taking into consideration established crop rotation practices, estimated decrease in farm allotments because of loss of history, and other relevant factors.'

"(5) Subsection (c) of section 334 is amended by adding new paragraphs (3) and (4) to read as follows:

"'(3) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the past acreage of wheat for 1967 and any subsequent year shall be the acreage of wheat planted, plus the acreage regarded as planted, for harvest as grain on the farm which is not in excess of the farm acreage allotment.

"'(4) Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection (c), the farm acreage allotment for the 1967 and any subsequent crop of wheat shall be established for each old farm by apportioning the county wheat acreage allotment among farms in the county on which wheat has been planted, or is considered to have been planted, for harvest as grain in any one of the three years immediately preceding the year for which allotments are determined on the basis of past acreage of wheat and the farm acreage allotment for the year immediately preceding the year for which the allotment is being established, adjusted as hereinafter provided. For purposes of this paragraph, the acreage allotment for the immediately preceding year may be adjusted to reflect established crop-rotation practices, may be adjusted downward to reflect a reduction in the tillable acreage on the farm, and may be adjusted upward to reflect such other factors as the Secretary determines should be considered for the purpose of establishing a fair and equitable allotment: *Provided*, That (i) for the purposes of computing the allotment for any year, the acreage allotment for the farm for the immediately preceding year shall be decreased by 7 per centum if for the year immediately preceding the year for which such reduction is made neither a voluntary diversion program nor a voluntary certificate program was in effect and there was noncompliance with the farm acreage allotment for such year; (ii) for purposes of clause (i), any farm on which the entire amount of farm marketing excess is delivered to the Secretary, stored, or adjusted to zero in accordance with applicable regulations to avoid or postpone payment of the penalty when farm marketing quotas are in effect, shall be considered in compliance with the allotment, but if any part of the amount of wheat so stored is later depleted and penalty becomes due by reason of such depletion, the allotment for such farm next computed after determination of such depletion shall be reduced by reducing the allotment for the immediately preceding year by 7 per centum; and (iii) for purposes of clause (i) if the Secretary determines that the reduction in the allotment does not provide fair and equitable treatment to producers on farms following special crop rotation practices, he may modify such reduction in the allotment as he determines to be necessary to provide fair and equitable treatment to such producers.'

"(6) Subsection (d) of section 334 is repealed.

"(7) Subsection (g) of section 334 is amended by striking out the language 'except as prescribed in the proviso to the first sentence of subsections (a) and (b), respectively, of this section' in the first sentence.

"(8) Section 335 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'This section shall not be applicable to the crops planted for harvest in 1967 and subsequent years.'

"(9) Section 339(b) is amended (1) by striking out '1964 and 1965 crops of wheat' and substituting 'crops of wheat planted for harvest in the calendar years 1964 through 1969'; and, (2) by striking out of the third sentence '20 per centum of the farm acreage allotment' and 'fifteen acres' and substituting '50 per centum of the farm acreage allotment' and 'twenty-five acres', respectively.

"(10) Section 339(e) is amended to read as follows: '(e) The Secretary may permit all or any part of the diverted acreage to be devoted to the production of guar, sesame, safflower, sunflower, castor beans, mustard seed, crambe, plantago ovato, and flaxseed, if he determines that such production of the commodity is needed to provide an adequate supply, is not likely to increase the cost of the price-support program and will not adversely affect farm income, subject to the condition that payment with respect to diverted acreage devoted to any such crop shall be at a rate determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable taking into consideration the use of such acreage for the production of such crops: *Provided*, That in no event shall the payment exceed one-half the rate which otherwise would be applicable if such acreage were devoted to conservation uses.'

"SEC. 502. Effective only with respect to the crops of wheat planted for harvest in the calendar years 1966 through 1969, and the marketing years for such crops, section 379b is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 379b. A wheat marketing allocation program as provided in this subtitle shall be in effect for the marketing years for the crops planted for harvest in the calendar years 1966 through 1969. Whenever a wheat marketing allocation program is in effect for any marketing year the Secretary shall determine (1) the wheat marketing allocation for such year which shall be the amount of wheat he estimates will be used during such year for food products for consumption in the United States, but the amount of wheat included in the marketing allocation for food products for consumption in the United States shall not be less than five hundred million bushels, and (2) the national allocation percentage for such year which shall be the percentage which, when applied to the farm as provided in this section, will result in marketing certificates being issued to producers in the amount of the national wheat marketing allocation. The cost of any domestic marketing certificates issued to producers in excess of the number of certificates acquired by processors as a result of the application of the five hundred million bushel minimum or an overestimate of the amount of wheat used during such year for food products for consumption in the United States shall be borne by Commodity Credit Corporation. Each farm shall receive a wheat marketing allocation for such marketing year equal to the number of bushels obtained by multiplying the number of acres in the farm acreage allotment for wheat by the projected farm yield, and multiplying the resulting number of bushels by the national allocation percentage.'

"SEC. 503. Effective beginning with the 1970 crop, section 379b is amended by striking out 'normal yield of wheat for the farm as determined by the Secretary' and substituting 'projected farm yield'.

"SEC. 504. (a) Effective upon the enactment of this Act, section 379d(b) is amended by striking out the third sentence and substituting the following: 'The Secretary may exempt from the requirements of this subsection wheat exported for donation abroad and other noncommercial exports of wheat, wheat processed for use on the farm where grown, wheat produced by a State or agency thereof and processed for use by the State or agency thereof, wheat processed for donation, and wheat processed for uses determined by the Secretary to be noncommercial. Such exemptions may be made applicable with respect to any wheat processed or exported beginning July 1, 1964. There shall be exempt from the requirements of this subsection, beverage distilled from wheat prior to July 1, 1964. A beverage distilled from wheat after July 1, 1964, shall be deemed to be removed for sale or consumption at the time it is placed in barrels for aging except that upon the giving of a bond as prescribed by the Secretary, the purchase of and payment for such marketing certificates as may be required may be deferred until such beverage is bottled for sale. Wheat shipped to a Canadian port for storage in bond, or storage under a similar arrangement, and subsequent exportation, shall be deemed to have been exported for purposes of this subsection when it is exported from the Canadian port.'

"(b) Section 379d(d) is amended by inserting after the word 'flour' the following. '(excluding flour second clears not used for human consumption as determined by the Secretary)', and by inserting at the end thereof the following: 'The Secretary may at his election administer the exemption for wheat processed into flour second clears through refunds either to processors of such wheat or to the users of such clears. For the purpose of such refunds, the wheat equivalent of flour second clears may be determined on the basis of conversion factors authorized by section 379f of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, even though certificates had been surrendered on the basis of the weight of the wheat.'

"This subsection shall be effective as to products sold, or removed for sale or consumption on or after sixty days following enactment of this Act, unless the Secretary shall by regulation designate an earlier effective date within such sixty-day period.

"(c) Section 379d(b) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Whenever the face value per bushel of domestic marketing certificates for a marketing year is different from the face value of domestic marketing certificates for the preceding marketing year, the Secretary may require marketing certificates issued for the preceding marketing year to be acquired to cover all wheat processed into food products during such preceding marketing year even though the food product may be marketed or removed for sale or consumption after the end of the marketing year.'

"(d) Section 379g is amended by inserting '(a)' after 'SEC. 379g' and adding a new subsection (b) as follows:

"'(b) Whenever the face value per bushel of domestic marketing certificates for a marketing year is substantially different from the face value of domestic marketing certificates for the preceding marketing year, the Secretary is authorized to take such action as he determines necessary to facilitate the transition between marketing years. Notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, such authority shall include, but shall not be limited to, the authority to sell certificates to persons engaged in the processing of wheat into food products covering such quantities of wheat, at such prices, and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may by regulation provide. Any such certificate shall be issued by Commodity Credit Corporation.'

"SEC. 505. The Agricultural Act of 1964 is amended as follows:

"(1) Amendment (7) of section 202 is amended by striking out '1964 and 1965' and substituting 'the calendar years 1964 through 1969'.

"(2) Amendment (13) of section 202 is amended by striking out 'only with respect to the crop planted for harvest in the calendar year 1965' and substituting 'with respect to the crops planted for harvest in the calendar years 1965 through 1969'.

"(3) Section 204 is amended by striking out '1964 and 1965' and substituting '1964 through 1969'.

"SEC. 506. Effective only with respect to the 1966 through 1969 crops, section 107 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1445a), is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 107. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of this Act, for any marketing year—

"'(1)(a) Price support for wheat accompanied by domestic certificates shall be at 100 per centum of the parity price or as near thereto as the Secretary determines practicable, and (b) price support for wheat not accompanied by marketing certificates shall be at such level, not in excess of the parity price therefor, as the Secretary determines appropriate, taking into consideration competitive world prices of wheat, the feeding value of wheat in relation to feed grains, and the level at which price support is made available for feed grains,

"'(2) notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1), for the 1966 crop, price support for wheat accompanied by domestic marketing certificates shall be at 100 per centum of the parity price therefor, and price support for wheat not accompanied by marketing certificates shall be not less than $1.25 per bushel. For any crop of wheat planted for harvest during the calendar years 1967 through 1969 for which the diversion factor established pursuant to section 339(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is not less than 10 per centum, the total average rate of return per bushel made available to a cooperator on the estimated production of his allotment based on projected yield through loans, domestic marketing certificates, estimated returns from export marketing certificates, and diversion payments for acreage diverted pursuant to section 339(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall not be less than the total average rate of return per bushel made available to cooperators through loans and domestic marketing certificates for the 1966 crop.

"'(3) Price support shall be made available only to cooperators, and

"'(4) A "cooperator" with respect to any crop of wheat produced on a farm shall be a producer who (i) does not knowingly exceed (A) the farm acreage allotment for wheat on the farm or (B) except as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe, the farm acreage allotment for wheat on any other farm on which the producer shares in the production of wheat, and (ii) complies with the land-use requirements of section 339 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to the extent prescribed by the Secretary. No producer shall be deemed to have exceeded a farm acreage allotment for wheat if the production on the acreage in excess of the farm acreage allotment is stored pursuant to the provisions of section 379c (b), but the producer shall not be eligible to receive price support on the wheat so stored.'

"SEC. 507. Effective beginning with the crop planted for harvest in the calendar year 1967, section 339(a)(1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting after the words 'national acreage allotment', wherever they appear, the following: '(less an acreage equal to the increased acreage allotted for 1966 pursuant to section 335)'.

"SEC. 508. Effective beginning with the crop planted for harvest in the calendar year 1966, section 379c(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the third sentence thereof a semicolon and the following: 'except that in any case in which the Secretary determines that such basis would not be fair and equitable, the Secretary shall provide for such sharing on such other basis as he may determine to be fair and equitable.', and by adding at the end thereof of the following: 'An acreage on the farm not planted to wheat because of drought, flood, or other natural disaster shall be deemed to be an actual acreage of wheat planted for harvest for purposes of this subsection provided such acreage is not subsequently planted to any other income-producing crops during such year. Producers on any farm who have planted not less than 90 per centum of the acreage of wheat required to be planted in order to earn the full amount of marketing certificates for which the farm is eligible shall be deemed to have planted the entire acreage required to be planted for that purpose.'

"SEC. 509. Section 301(b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

"(1) Paragraph (8) is amended by inserting '(A)' after '(8)' and adding the following new subparagraph:

"'(B) "Projected national yield" as applied to any crop of wheat shall be determined on the basis of the national yield per harvested acre of the commodity during each of the five calendar years immediately preceding the year in which such projected national yield is determined, adjusted for abnormal weather conditions affecting such yield, for trends in yields and for any significant changes in production practices.'

"(2) Paragraph (13) is amended by adding the following new subparagraphs:

"'(J) "Projected county yield" for any crop of wheat shall be determined on the basis of the yield per harvested acre of such commodity in the county during each of the five calendar years immediately preceding the year in which such projected county yield is determined, adjusted for abnormal weather conditions affecting such yield, for trends in yields and for any significant changes in production practices.

"'(K) "Projected farm yield" for any crop of wheat shall be determined on the basis of the yield per harvested acre of such commodity on the farm during each of the three calendar years immediately preceding the year in which such projected farm yield is determined, adjusted for abnormal weather conditions affecting such yield, for trends in yields and for any significant changes in production practices, but in no event shall such projected farm yield be less than the normal yield for such farm as provided in subparagraph (E) of this paragraph.'

"SEC. 510. (a) Section 379c(b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended, effective beginning with the 1966 crop, by striking out of the fifth sentence the words 'normal yield of wheat per acre established for the farm' and substituting therefor the words 'projected farm yield'.

"(b) Section 379i of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended, effective as of the effective date of the original enactment of that section, by inserting in subsections (a) and (b) after the word 'who', wherever it appears, the word 'knowingly'.

"Sec. 511. (a) Effective beginning with the crop planted for harvest in 1966, paragraph (9) of section 301(b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out 'cotton' and 'wheat' and by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Normal production' as applied to any number of acres of cotton or wheat means the projected farm yield times such number of acres.

"(b) Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended, is amended by changing the words 'normal yield of wheat per acre established for the farm' in paragraph (1) to the words 'projected farm yield'.

"SEC. 512. The national, State, county, and farm acreage allotments for the 1966 crop of wheat shall be established in accordance with the provisions of law in effect prior to the enactment of this Act.

"SEC. 513. (a) Section 379d(b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended by striking out the second sentence and substituting the following: 'The cost of the export marketing certificates per bushel to the exporter shall be that amount determined by the Secretary on a daily basis which would make United States wheat and wheat flour generally competitive in the world market, avoid disruption of world market prices, and fulfill the international obligations of the United States.'

"(b) Section 379c(a) of such Act is amended by striking out everything in the next to the last sentence beginning with the words 'United States' and substituting the following: 'United States. The Secretary shall also provide for the issuance of export marketing certificates to eligible producers at the end of the marketing year on a pro rata basis. For such purposes, the value per bushel of export marketing certificates shall be an average of the total net proceeds from the sale of export marketing certificates during the marketing year after deducting the total amount of wheat export subsidies paid to exporters.'

"(c) Section 379c(c) of such Act is amended by striking out 'and the face value per bushel of export certificates shall be the amount by which the level of price support for wheat accompanied by export certificates exceeds the level of price support for noncertificate wheat'.

"SEC. 514. Section 328 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 is amended by adding to the end thereof the following: 'In establishing terms and conditions for permitting wheat to be planted in lieu of oats and rye, the Secretary may take into account the number of feed units per acre of wheat in relation to the number of feed units per acre of oats and rye.'

"SEC. 515. Section 379c of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended, effective beginning with the crop planted for harvest in the calendar year 1964, by adding the following subsection:

"'(e) In any case in which the failure of a producer to comply fully with the terms and conditions of the programs formulated under this Act preclude the issuance of marketing certificates, the Secretary may, nevertheless, issue such certificates in such amounts as he determines to be equitable in relation to the seriousness of the default.'

"SEC. 516. Section 379e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, Commodity Credit Corporation shall sell marketing certificates for the marketing years for the 1966 through the 1969 wheat crops to persons engaged in the processing of food products at the face value thereof less any amount by which price support for wheat accompanied by domestic certificates exceeds $2 per bushel.'

"SEC. 517. Subsection (b) of section 379c of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended by inserting immediately preceding the words 'stored' wherever it appears, in the fourth through the sixth sentences, the words 'delivered to the Secretary or', and by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Any wheat delivered to the Secretary hereunder shall become the property of the United States and shall be disposed of by the Secretary for relief purposes in the United States or in foreign countries or in such other manner as he shall determine will divert it from the normal channels of trade and commerce. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary may provide that a producer shall not be eligible to receive marketing certificates, or may adjust the amount of marketing certificates to be received by the producer, with respect to any farm for any year in which a variety of wheat is planted on the farm which has been determined by the Secretary, after consultation with State Agricultural Experiment Stations, agronomists, cereal chemists and other qualified technicians, to have undesirable milling or baking qualities and has made public announcement thereof.'

"TITLE VI—CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT

"SEC. 601. The Soil Bank Act of 1956, as amended, is hereby repealed, except that it shall remain in effect with respect to contracts entered into prior to such repeal.

"SEC. 602. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of reducing the costs of farm programs, assisting farmers in turning their land to nonagricultural uses, promoting the development and conservation of the Nation's soil, water, forest, wildlife, and recreational resources, establishing, protecting, and conserving open spaces and natural beauty, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to formulate and carry out a program during the calendar years 1965 through 1969 under which agreements would be entered into with producers as hereinafter provided for periods of not less than five nor more than ten years. No agreement shall be entered into under this section concerning land with respect to which the ownership has changed in the three-year period preceding the first year of the agreement period unless the new ownership was acquired by will or succession as a result of the death of the previous owner, or unless the new ownership was acquired prior to January 1, 1965, under other circumstances which the Secretary determines, and specifies by regulation, will give adequate assurance that such land was not acquired for the purpose of placing it in the program: *Provided,* That this provision shall not be construed to prohibit the continuation of an agreement by a new owner after an agreement has once been entered into under this section: *Provided further,* That the Secretary shall not require a person who has operated the land to be covered by an agreement under this section for as long as three years preceding the date of the agreement and who controls the land for the agreement period to own the land as a condition of eligibility for entering into the agreement.

"(b) The producer shall agree (1) to carry out on a specifically designated acreage of land on the farm regularly used in the production of crops (including crops, such as tame hay, alfalfa, and clovers, which do not require annual tillage and which have been planted within 5 years preceding the date of the agreement), hereinafter called 'designated acreage', and maintain for the agreement period practices or uses which will conserve soil, water, or forest resources, or establish or protect or conserve open spaces, natural beauty, wildlife or recreational resources, or prevent air or water pollution, in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe (priority being given to the extent practicable to practices or uses which are most likely to result in permanent retirement to noncrop uses); (2) to maintain in conserving crops or uses or allow to remain idle throughout the agreement period the acreage normally devoted to such crops or uses; (3) not to harvest any crop from or graze the designated acreage during the agreement period, unless the Secretary, after certification by the Governor of the State in which such acreage is situated of the need for grazing or harvesting of such acreage, determines that it is necessary to permit grazing or harvesting in order to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster, and consents to such grazing or harvesting subject to an appropriate reduction in the rate of payment; and (4) to such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary determines are desirable to effectuate the purposes of the program, including such measures as the Secretary may deem appropriate to keep the designated acreage free from erosion, insects, weeds, and rodents. Agreements entered into under which 1966 is the first year of the agreement period (A) shall require the producer to divert from production all of one or more crops designated by the Secretary; and (B) shall not provide for diversion from the production of upland cotton in any county in which the county committee by resolution determines, and requests of the Secretary, that there should not be such diversion in 1966.

"(c) Under such agreements the Secretary shall (1) bear such part of the average cost (including labor) for the county or area in which the farm is situated of establishing and maintaining authorized practices or uses on the designated acreage as the Secretary determines to be necessary to effectuate the purposes of the program, but not to exceed the average rate for comparable practices or uses under the agricultural conservation program, and (2) make an annual adjustment payment to the producer for the period of the agreement at such rate or rates as the Secretary determines to be fair and reasonable in consideration of the obligations undertaken by the producers. The rate or rates of annual adjustment payments as determined hereunder may be increased by an amount determined by the Secretary to be appropriate in relation to the benefit to the general public of the use of the designated acreage if the producer further agrees to permit, without other compensation, access to such acreage by the general public, during the agreement period, for hunting, trapping, fishing, and hiking, subject to applicable State and Federal regulations. The Secretary and the producer may agree that the annual adjustment payments for all years of the agreement period shall be made either upon approval of the agreement or in such installments as they may agree to be desirable: *Provided,* That for each year any annual adjustment payment is made in advance of performance, the annual adjustment payment shall be reduced by 5 per centum. The Secretary may provide for adjusting any payment on account of failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the program.

"(d) The Secretary shall, unless he determines that such action will be inconsistent with the effective administration of the program, use an advertising and bid procedure in determining the lands in any area to be covered by agreements. The total acreage placed under contract in any county or local community shall be limited to a percentage of the total eligible acreage in such county or local community which the Secretary determines would not adversely affect the economy of the county or local community. In determining such percentage the Secretary shall give appropriate consideration to the productivity of the acreage being retired as compared to the average productivity of eligible acreage in the county or local community.

"(e) The annual adjustment payment shall not exceed 40 per centum of the estimated value, as determined by the Secretary, on the basis of prices in effect at the time the agreement is entered into, of the crops or types of crops which might otherwise be grown. The estimated value may be established by the Secretary on a county, area, or individual farm basis as he deems appropriate.

"(f) The Secretary may terminate any agreement with a producer by mutual agreement with the producer if the Secretary determines that such termination would be in the public interest, and may agree to such modification of agreements as he may determine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of the program or facilitate its administration.

"(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture may, to the extent he deems it desirable, provide by appropriate regulations for preservation of cropland, crop acreage, and allotment history applicable to acreage diverted from the production of crops in order to establish or maintain vegetative cover or other approved practices for the purpose of any Federal program under which such history is used as a basis for an allotment or other limitation or for participation in such program. Subsections (b)(3) and (4) and (e)(6) of section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, are repealed, except that all rights accruing thereunder to persons who entered into contracts or agreements prior to such repeal shall be preserved.

"(h) In carrying out the program, the Secretary shall utilize the services of local, county, and State committees established under section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

"(i) For the purpose of obtaining an increase in the permanent retirement of cropland to noncrop uses the Secretary may, notwithstanding any other provision of law, transfer funds available for carrying out the program to any other Federal agency or to States or local government agencies for use in acquiring cropland for the preservation of open spaces, natural beauty, the development of wildlife or recreational facilities, or the prevention of air or water pollution under terms and conditions consistent with and at costs not greater than those under agreements entered into with producers, provided the Secretary determines that the purposes of the program will be accomplished by such action.

"(j) The Secretary also is authorized to share the cost with State and local governmental agencies in the establishment of practices or uses which will establish, protect, and conserve open spaces, natural beauty, wildlife or recreational resources, or prevent air or water pollution under terms and conditions and at costs consistent with those under agreements entered into with producers, provided the Secretary determines that the purposes of the program will be accomplished by such action.

"(k) In carrying out the program, the Secretary shall not during any of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1966 through June 30, 1968 or during the period June 30, 1968 through December 31, 1969, enter into agreements with producers which would require payments to producers in any calendar year under such agreements in excess of $225,000,000 plus any amount by which agreements entered into in prior fiscal years require payments in amounts less than authorized for such prior fiscal years. For purposes of applying this limitation, the annual adjustment payment shall be chargeable to the year in which performance is rendered regardless of the year in which it is made.

"(l) The Secretary is authorized to utilize the facilities, services, authorities, and funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation in discharging his functions and responsibilities under this program, including payment of costs of administration: *Provided,* That after December 31, 1966, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not make any expenditures for carrying out the purposes of this title unless the Corporation has received funds to cover such expenditures from appropriations made to carry out the purposes of this title. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the program, including such amounts as may be required to make payments to the Corporation for its actual costs incurred or to be incurred under this program.

"(m) In case any producer who is entitled to any payment or compensation dies, becomes incompetent, or disappears before receiving such payment or compensation, or is succeeded by another who renders or completes the required performance, the payment or compensation shall, without regard to any other provisions of law, be made as the Secretary may determine to be fair and reasonable in all the circumstances and so provide by regulations.

"(n) The Secretary shall provide adequate safeguards to protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers, including provision for sharing, on a fair and equitable basis, in payments or compensation under this program.

"(o) The acreage on any farm which is diverted from the production of any commodity pursuant to an agreement hereafter entered into under this title shall be deemed to be acreage diverted from that commodity for the purposes of any commodity program under which diversion is required as a condition of eligibility for price support.

"(p) The Secretary may, without regard to the civil service laws, appoint an Advisory Board on Wildlife to advise and consult on matters relating to his functions under this title as he deems appropriate. The Board shall consist of twelve persons chosen from members of wildlife organizations, farm organizations, State game and fish agencies, and representatives of the general public. Members of such Advisory Board who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall not be entitled to any compensation or expenses.

"(q) The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as he determines necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS

"Sec. 701. Section 374(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

" '(a) The Secretary shall provide for ascertaining, by measurement or otherwise, the acreage of any agricultural commodity or land use on farms for which the ascertainment of such acreage is necessary to determine compliance under any program administered by the Secretary. Insofar as practicable, the acreage of the commodity and land use shall be ascertained prior to harvest, and, if any acreage so ascertained is not in compliance with the requirements of the program the Secretary, under such terms and conditions as he prescribes, may provide a reasonable time for the adjustment of the acreage of the commodity or land use to the requirements of the program.'

"Sec. 702. Section 374(c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by deleting the first sentence thereof.

"Sec. 703. Subsection (a) of section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended (i) by striking out of the first sentence thereof '1962, 1963, 1964, and 1965,' and inserting '1962 through 1969' and (ii) by striking out of the last sentence thereof '1964 or 1965' and inserting '1964 through 1969'.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection 316(c) and subsection 317(f) relating to lease and transfer of allotments for years subsequent to 1965, of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, whenever acreage-poundage quotas are in effect for any kind of tobacco as provided in Section 317 of the Act, except in the case of burley tobacco, and other kinds of tobacco not subject to Section 316, the lease and transfer shall be on a pound for pound basis and the acreage allotment for the lessee farm shall be increased by an amount determined by dividing the number of pounds leased by the farm yield for the lessee farm, and the acreage allotment for the lessor farm shall be reduced by an amount determined by dividing the number of pounds leased by the farm yield for the lessor farm.

"Sec. 704. The last paragraph of the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes', approved August 13, 1957 (7 U.S.C. 1359 note), is amended to read as follows:

" 'This amendment shall be effective for the 1957 through 1969 crops of peanuts.'

"Sec. 705. The Secretary of Agriculture shall make a study of the parity income position of farmers, including the development of criteria for measuring parity income of commercial family farmers and the feasibility of adapting such criteria to major types of farms and to selected counties. The Secretary shall report the results of such study to the Congress not later than June 30, 1966.

"Sec. 706. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary, upon the request of any agency of any State charged with the administration of the public lands of the State, may permit the transfer of acreage allotments or feed grain bases together with relevant production histories which have been determined pursuant to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, from any farm composed of public lands to any other farm or farms in the same county composed of public lands: *Provided*, That as a condition for the transfer of any allotment or base an acreage equal to or greater than the allotment or base transferred prior to adjustment, if any, shall be devoted to and maintained in permanent vegetative cover on the farm from which the transfer is made. The Secretary shall prescribe regulations which he deems necessary for the administration of this section, which may provide for adjusting downward the size of the allotment or base transferred if the farm to which the allotment or base is transferred normally has a higher yield per acre for the commodity for which the allotment or base is determined, for reasonable limitations on the size of the resulting allotments and bases on farms to which transfers are made, taking into account the size of the allotments and bases on farms of similar size in the community, and for retransferring allotments or bases and relevant histories if the conditions of the transfer are not fulfilled.

"Sec. 707. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 378 the following new section:

" 'RECONSTITUTION OF FARMS

" 'Sec. 379. In any case in which the ownership of a tract of land is transferred from a parent farm, the acreage allotments, history acreages, and base acreages, for the farm shall be divided between such tract and the parent farm in the same proportion that the cropland acreage in such tract bears to the cropland acreage in the parent farm, except that the Secretary shall provide by regulation the method to be used in determining the division, if any, of the acreage allotments, histories, and bases in any case in which—

" '(1) the tract of land transferred from the parent farm has been or is being transferred to any agency having the right to acquire it by eminent domain;

" '(2) the tract of land transferred from the parent farm is to be used for nonagricultural purposes;

" '(3) the parent farm resulted from a combination of two or more tracts of land and records are available showing the contribution of each tract to the allotments, histories, and bases of the parent farm;

" '(4) the appropriate county committee determines that a division based on cropland proportions would result in allotments and bases not representative of the operations normally carried out on any transferred tract during the base period; or

" '(5) the parent farm is divided among heirs in settling an estate.

" '(6) neither the tract transferred from the parent farm nor the remaining portion of the parent farm receives allotments in excess of allotments for similar farms in the community having allotments of the commodity or commodities involved and such allotments are consistent with good land uses, but this clause (6) shall not be applicable in the case of burley tobacco.'

"Sec. 708. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the determination of farm yields the Secretary may use projected yields in lieu of normal yields. In the determination of such yields the Secretary shall take into account the actual yield proved by the producer for the base period used in determining the projected yield, and the projected yield shall not be less than such actual yield proved by the producer.

"Sec. 709. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to use funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase sufficient supplies of dairy products at market prices to meet the requirements of any programs for the schools (other than fluid milk in the case of schools), domestic relief distribution, community action, foreign distribution, and such other programs as are authorized by law, when there are insufficient stocks of dairy products in the hands of Commodity Credit Corporation available for these purposes.

"TITLE VIII—RICE

"Sec. 801. Section 353(c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding the following new paragraph at the end thereof:

" '(7) If the national acreage allotment for rice for 1966, 1967, 1968, or 1969 is less than the national acreage allotment for rice for 1965, the Secretary shall formulate and carry out an acreage diversion program for rice for such year designed to support the gross income of rice producers at a level not lower than that for 1965, minus any reduction in production costs resulting from the reduced rice acreage. Under such program conservation payments shall be made to producers who comply with their rice acreage allotments, devote to an approved conservation use an acreage of cropland on the farm equal to the number of acres determined by multiplying the farm acreage allotment by the diversion factor, and comply with such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe. The diversion factor shall be determined by dividing the number of acres by which the national acreage allotment is reduced below the national acreage allotment for 1965 by the number of acres in the national acreage allotment. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, the Secretary may permit all or any part of such diverted acreage to be devoted to the production of guar, sesame, safflower, sunflower, castor beans, mustard seed, crambe, plantago ovato, and flaxseed, if he determines that such production is not likely to increase the cost of the price-support program and will not adversely affect farm income, subject to the condition that payment with respect to diverted acreage devoted to any such crops shall be at a rate determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable, taking into consideration the use of such acreage for the production of such crops; but in no event shall the payment exceed one-half the rate which otherwise would be applicable if such acreage were devoted to conservation uses. Such program shall require the producer to take such measures as the Secretary may deem appropriate to keep such diverted acreage free from erosion, insects, weeds, and rodents. The Secretary may make not to exceed 50 per centum of any payments to producers in advance of determination of performance. The Secretary shall provide for the sharing of payments under this paragraph among producers on the farm on a fair and equitable basis as determined by the Secretary. The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to utilize its capital funds and other assets for the purpose of making the payments authorized in this paragraph and to pay administrative expenses necessary in carrying out this paragraph.'

"Sec. 802. Section 403 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: 'In determining support prices for the 1966 and 1967 crops of rice the Secretary shall, notwithstanding the foregoing or any other provision of law, use head and broken rice value factors for the various varieties which

(1) are not lower than those used with respect to the 1965 crop, and (2) do not differ as between any two varieties by a greater amount than the value factors used with respect to the 1965 crop for such two varieties differed.' "

And the Senate agree to the same.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
WATKINS M. ABBITT,
HARLAN HAGEN,
FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD,
GRAHAM PURCELL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill, H.R. 9811, to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate struck out all after the enacting clause of H.R. 9811 and substituted a Senate amendment which, while dealing with the same subject matter, differed from it in several major respects. The amendment herewith reported embodies the agreement of the conferees on the various points of difference in the House bill and the Senate amendment and was agreed to by the conferees as a substitute for the Senate amendment.

The conference substitute follows the structure of the House bill as to the order and arrangement of titles. It adds at the end a title relating to rice which was not in the House bill.

Following is a summary of the substitute amendment as agreed to by the conferees:

TITLE I—DAIRY

The class I dairymen's base plan embraced in the first title seeks to reduce surplus milk production and stabilize the income of dairy farmers in the 75 Federal milk order areas by removing the necessity for dairymen to produce surplus milk in order to preserve their individual participation in the markets for milk for fluid consumption.

The Conference adopted all of title I of the House bill which includes provisions dealing with (a) individual voting in a farmer referendum on the class I base plan, (b) leaving the legal status of producer-handlers unchanged, (c) authorizing marketing orders for manufacturing milk and (d) entry of new producers into class I base plan order markets.

Two Senate dairy provisions were adopted. These deal with (a) an "anti-dumping" provision to prevent disruption of other markets, and (b) allowing the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase dairy products (except fluid milk for schools) for domestic and foreign donation programs even though these dairy products are not in the CCC inventory. The latter authority appears in the miscellaneous title of the bill.

TITLE II—WOOL

Continues the National Wool Act of 1954 through December 31, 1969, with modifications intended to increase the production of wool in the United States. The conference accepted the Senate formula for the minimum price support floor. This would fix the support level for shorn wool at the present level of 62 cents a pound increased by the same percentage as the percentage increase in the parity index. This would fix the support price at 65 cents a pound for 1966, about 66 cents for 1967, with the support levels for 1968 and 1969 depending on further changes in the parity index. The Senate provision on small flocks was deleted.

TITLE III—FEED GRAINS

This title continues for 4 years the provisions of the present Feed Grains Program for price-support loans, purchases, and in-kind payments to program participants at about the same levels of recent years. Participants by diverting acreage from feed grain production to conservation uses would receive, as in the past, payments-in-kind to help maintain income.

The conference accepted the House bill with the Senate amendment which permits the Secretary to set the total price support (both loan and payments) at a range between 65 and 90 percent of parity. The House had set a minimum loan of 65 percent of parity. The change allows the Secretary to lower the present loan and increase the present price support payment. The Senate provision authorizing an alternative feed grain program was deleted by the conference.

A requirement of the feed grain, cotton, and wheat programs is that land taken out of the production of these crops be devoted to conservation uses. Each farm has established a conservation base which is the average acreage of conserving uses on the farm for 1959 and 1960. Since 1963, noncropland which has been cleared and made into cropland has been added to the conservation base. The Department of Agriculture has agreed for 1966 that the farm conservation base will not reflect the acreage of noncropland brought into a cropland status since the base period 1959–1960, if such new cropland was not devoted to the production of crops in surplus. This means that this new cropland which has been devoted to the production of soybeans will not be added to the conserving base.

TITLE IV—COTTON

The one-price cotton program, wherein American mills buy U.S. cotton at the same price it is offered to foreign mills, is extended for 4 years, through 1969, with modifications. The conference substitute provides:

(1) Continuation of the 16-million-acre national minimum allotment for cotton, but establishes a domestic allotment within the farm allotment which will be not less than 65 percent of each farm allotment.

(2) Mandatory 12½-percent reduction for 1966 (instead of 15 percent in the House bill) from the farm acreage allotment for each farmer participating in the program, except for small farmers who are exempt from mandatory acreage cuts and receive special treatment with respect to income. After 1966 the extent of mandatory reduction will be not more than 12½ percent, as determined by the Secretary.

(3) Loans to cooperators at not more than 90 percent of the estimated average world market price for cotton (1966—21 cents), available on the actual production of cooperators, plus price support payments to these cooperators, in an amount calculated to reflect not less than 65 percent of parity on the projected yield of their acreage permitted to be devoted to cotton.

(4) Payments for retired acreage at the rate of not less than 25 percent of the parity price multiplied by the projected yield of the acreage required to be retired (up to 40 percent of parity on the balance) the farmer (except those under the small farm exemption) being required to retire 12½ percent of his effective allotment and having the option of retiring an additional 22½ percent of his allotment, to a total of 35 percent.

(5) A small farm exception stipulating that there will not be mandatory reduction in the acreage of farmers with allotments of 10 acres or less or for those farmers whose projected yield of the farm allotment is 3,600 pounds or less, that these small farmers will receive on their production the same level of price support provided for other producers without making the reduction required of other producers, and a land retirement payment as if they had reduced their acreage by 35 percent. If a small farmer chooses to reduce his acreage to any level down to 65 percent of his allotment, he will receive an additional diversion payment at the rate for voluntary diversion on this acreage.

(6) Any producer with an allotment may stay out of the program, receive no price support or payments, and plant and sell cotton into export without penalty, with the national total of such nonprogram acreage not to exceed 250,000 acres in 1966 and with a stipulation that this total would be reduced in 1967, 1968, and 1969 unless there is a proportionate reduction in the national carryover of cotton.

(7) Allotted cotton acreage released by farmers not wanting to plant any cotton in a given year may be reapportioned to other farmers within the county or in other counties within the state if not wanted within the county where released. Farmers releasing 87½ percent of their allotments for reapportionment would be eligible for diversion payments on 12½ percent of the allotment.

(8) Sale or lease of cotton acreage allotments between farmers is authorized within a county, or in other counties of the same state if farmers within the county approve in a referendum the movement of allotments to purchasers in other counties.

(9) Cotton farmers may assign their direct price support and diversion payments to private lending agencies in obtaining production loans.

(10) Exchange of rice and cotton allotments, within a county or an adjoining county, is authorized under terms and conditions approved by the Secretary.

(11) The price support payment is to be made one-half at the time the farmer signs up for the program, and the time of the second half of the payment is left to the Secretary's discretion. The House conferees receded from the position that the balance of payments to producers may be made only when the producer divests himself of interest in the cotton and concurred in the provision that the balance of such payments shall be made at such time as the Secretary may determine.

The committee of conference emphasizes, however, that the programs authorized by the bill are designed to move cotton into trade channels for domestic consumption and export. Reduced use of the CCC price support loan program is contemplated. In any instance where the Secretary finds that warehousemen, marketing associations, merchants or others engaged in handling cotton for producers, or participating in the program to make price support loans available to producers, are taking actions which encourage undue entries of cotton into the loan program, the Secretary shall take such corrective measures as may be necessary.

One of the major purposes of the bill is to reduce domestic production of cotton. Strong incentives are provided in the form of direct payments to producers who cooperate by planting less than their allotted cotton acreages. Very few farmers will forego participating in the program. If this approach proves effective, production will be less than domestic consumption and exports and the surplus stocks held by CCC can be gradually liquidated with minimum adverse effects on world markets. Reduced stocks in the United States will, of course, result in a better supply-demand balance for cotton on a worldwide basis. This will benefit all countries which produce cotton.

The bill represents a significant step toward establishing a free market for cotton in the United States. It is a step toward doing what other countries have been asking the United States to do for many years. The new CCC loan rate will no longer constitute an incentive to farmers to produce unneeded supplies of cotton.

With the loan rate at 21 cents for the 1966 crop and at not more than 90 percent of the estimated world price for 1967, 1968, and 1969, most of the annual production would be expected to move directly to markets through normal commercial channels of trade, with CCC having a substantially reduced role in making loans and merchandising cotton. Many foreign cotton-producing countries have expressed an interest in this arrangement for U.S. cotton.

Under the new program the U.S. export price for cotton is expected to be more competitive with prices in other exporting countries. The U.S. Government's cotton policy will be administered in a responsible manner as in the past. It is not the intention of the Congress that large quantities of CCC stocks be dumped on world markets at fire-sale prices.

TITLE V—WHEAT

This title authorizes continuation of the voluntary wheat certificate program for 4 years with modifications of current provisions aimed at boosting wheat farmers' income by about $200 million a year, and providing more freedom in the marketing system. Basically, it would call for a wheat program for the 1966 through 1969 period similar to the one in effect for the 1964 and 1965 crops.

The significant change from current operations would provide for price support for wheat used domestically as food at 100 percent of parity, and a variable export certificate, to supplement wheat farmers' income. The support price for wheat for domestic food use would be increased about 57 cents a bushel to around $2.57. This increase would be accomplished by Government payments of 57 cents a bushel. Domestic wheat users would continue to purchase certificates at the difference between the loan rate and $2 a bushel on the amount of wheat used.

The conference bill increases the total price support on wheat about 3½ cents a bushel over the House bill, to achieve a minimum support level of $1.84½ per bushel for wheat during each of the next 4 years. The escalated domestic certificate provision in the Senate bill—relating the price of the certificate to the price of bread—was deleted. In this connection, however, it is the request of the committee of conference that the Secretary of Agriculture conduct a continuing study of bread prices and that he report to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House any increases in bread prices which do not appear to be justified by increased costs of labor, materials, and other factors.

The Senate provision dealing with the exemption for second clears was adopted by the conference. This change reflects an agreement reached between all the corn and wheat industries and the Department of Agriculture as explained in the Senate Committee Report and is in accord with the basic intent of the House provision.

It is the intention of the committee of conference that the Secretary affirmatively implement the exemption provided herein so that it will become operative and provide relief from the certificate liability imposed by this act not later than 60 days following enactment of this act.

Language adopted by the conference with respect to the rate of return per bushel of wheat follows:

"For the 1966 crop, price supports for wheat accompanied by domestic certificates shall be at 100 per centum of the parity price therefor, and price supports for wheat not accompanied by marketing certificates shall be not less than $1.25 per bushel. For any crop of wheat planted for harvest during the calendar years 1967 through 1969 for which the diversion factor is not less than 10 per centum, the total average rate of return per bushel made available to cooperators on the estimated production of his allotment based on projected yield through loans, domestic marketing certificates, estimated returns from export marketing certificates, and diversion payments for acreage diverted pursuant to section 339(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall not be less than the total average rate of return per bushel made available to cooperators through loans and domestic marketing certificates for the 1966 crop."

TITLE VI—CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT

Under this title the Secretary would be authorized to enter into 5- to 10-year contracts with farmers calling for conversion of cropland into vegetative cover, water storage facilities or other soil, water, wildlife or forest conserving uses. Payments under such contracts would be at a rate of not more than 40 percent of the annual market value of the crop that would have been produced on the land, as determined by the Secretary. It is expected that about 8 million acres per year would be added to this program until it reaches its peak participation of 40 million acres in 1970. The Secretary is authorized to obligate not more than $225 million per year in new contracts signed during each of the next four years, so that by the end of the sign-up period contracts in force could involve payments to a maximum of $900 million annually.

The conference committee also agreed to (a) make tame hay, alfalfa and clovers eligible cropland for purposes of the program, (b) require a farmer to place all of at least one surplus crop into the program in 1966 in order to be eligible to participate (after 1966, the Secretary would have discretion to set the required percentage), (c) require prior ownership of the farm for at least 3 years before it could be placed in the program, (d) require the Secretary to use the bid procedure in signing up cropland unless he should find such a procedure is not feasible, (e) allow either lump sum or annual payments, (f) for 1966, cotton acreage in a county could be excluded from the program at the request of the county Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee (ASC), (g) authorize a wildlife advisory board which would serve without compensation or travel allowance, and (h) authorize additional payments to farmers who permit their land to be used, in cooperation with a State agency, for hunting, fishing, etc.

The committee of conference was concerned lest the cumulative effect of acreage reduction under both the cotton program and the CAP program should severely damage the economy of many cotton producing areas. It has, therefore, incorporated the requirement that the Secretary shall consider the impact of acreage retirement on the community—as well as the county (as provided in House bill).

The conferees also obtained from the Secretary of Agriculture the following letter regarding his intention to limit cropland retirement under the CAP program:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., Sept. 28, 1965.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: A question has been raised as to the extent to which the Department would expect to contract for reductions in base and allotment crops in any county under the cropland adjustment program proposed in H.R. 9811.

It would be the intent of the Department to limit the acreage contracted in any year insofar as a base or allotment crop is concerned to not more than 10 percent of the allotment or base acreage for that crop in the county. It would be our intent to further limit the acreage contracted over the life of the program to not more than 25 percent of the base or allotment for the crop for the county unless responsible representatives of the county government and the elected farmer ASCS committee for the county agreed that more than 25 percent could be contracted without adversely effecting the economy of the county.

Sincerely,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS

Section 701 and section 702 repeal the provisions that acreage on all farms participating in crop allotment programs must be measured and provide that the Secretary may use other methods such as certification and spot-checking to determine compliance with program objectives. The House bill had authorized this for all crops except peanuts and tobacco.

Section 703 extends for four years (the same as the House bill) authority for leasing of tobacco acreage but adds the provision that for tobacco being allotted on an acreage-poundage basis, leases may be made on the basis of pounds, rather than acres.

Section 704 extends the definition of "boiling peanuts" for four years (instead of the permanent extension provided in the House bill).

Section 705 directs the Secretary of Agriculture to make a study of the parity income position of farmers and report thereon to Congress not later than June 30, 1966. This combines related but somewhat different provisions in the House and Senate bills.

Section 706 is the House provision authorizing any State agency administering public lands to transfer an acreage allotment from one farm to another in the same county.

Section 707 enacts into law provisions of administrative regulations relating to the reconstitution of farms.

Section 708 authorizes the Secretary to use projected yields in lieu of normal yields in connection with all farm programs.

Section 709 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to use CCC funds for the purchase of dairy products when there is not a sufficient supply of such products in the Commodity Credit Corporation to meet commitments.

FARM LABOR

A provision relating to farm labor was in the Senate bill but was deleted on the floor by a narrow margin. In spite of the fact that there is no provision with respect to farm labor in either the House or Senate bills, the committee of conference recognizes that the success of any agricultural enterprise is dependent upon an adequate labor force to carry out the farming operations. It has voted to include in this statement of managers the following statement on this subject by the committee of conference:

"The committee of conference emphasizes that an adequate force of capable labor is essential to the efficient production and harvesting of agricultural commodities. It is deeply concerned over the inadequate supply of such labor this year, particularly to the producers of perishable crops.

"Agricultural labor shortages in 1965 have had serious consequences. Crops have been lost. Plantings have been reduced because of uncertainty created by governmental policies with respect to agricultural labor. Crops lost or not planted because of inadequate labor will necessarily injure the consumer and the economy as well as the farmer. They will also reduce the number of job opportunities in agriculture and related industries.

This shortage of capable labor has resulted from administrative actions which have failed to sufficiently recognize the needs and problems of agriculture and which have imposed requirements on farmers never authorized by Congress. To avoid the subordination of agriculture's interests, it is the unanimous view of the conferees that the Secretary of Agriculture should collect necessary facts concerning requirements for and availability of agricultural labor and submit such information to the Attorney General in connection with determinations as to whether farmers are to have needed supplemental foreign labor.

"The Congress recognized the need for such information and made provision therefor by authorizing the Attorney General, in carrying out his responsibilities, to consult with appropriate agencies of government. There is no question but that the Department of Agriculture is the appropriate agency to determine facts concerning the requirements of agriculture and the extent to which, and timeliness by which, they are being met.

"It is the opinion of the conferees that under the practice now prevailing in which the Attorney General has relied almost entirely on the Department of Labor, the findings and recommendations of the Secretary of Labor have been in many instances too little and too late to meet the critical needs of producers."

TITLE VIII—RICE

Title VIII of the conference substitute provides for a 4-year rice diversion program, effective only when the national allotment is reduced below that for 1965. The House bill contained no such provision. Under the provision agreed to by the conferees, if rice acreage allotments fall below the 1965 level, the Secretary will be required to carry out a diversion program similar to that for other commodities. The title also provides that for 1966 and 1967, rice value factors may not be reduced and differentials between value factors for the various varieties could not be increased.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
WATKINS M. ABBITT,
HARLAN HAGEN,
FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD,
GRAHAM PURCELL.
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I present to the House for its approval the conference report on H.R. 9811, the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965.

This legislation writes a new chapter in the success story of American agriculture. It brings together the experience of three decades of effort in the Congress, and in succeeding administrations, to achieve and maintain a parity position for the farm families of this country who produce our food and fiber; it insures abundant food at reasonable cost to consumers; it avoids the accumulation of surpluses; and it will accomplish all this at a minimum cost to the Government.

I was honored to be elected chairman of the House-Senate conference committee which adjusted the differences in the bill as it earlier had passed both legislative bodies. The conference draft of the bill I now present, in my judgment, is a refinement of, and it is superior to, the bill previously passed by either the House or the Senate.

It is a matter of pride and deep satisfaction that I now commend each member of the conference committee which developed this final draft of H.R. 9811. They are our colleagues, Representatives POAGE of Texas, ABBITT of Virginia, HAGEN of California, STUBBLEFIELD of Kentucky, PURCELL of Texas, DAGUE of Pennsylvania, BELCHER of Oklahoma, TEAGUE of California; and Senators ELLENDER of Louisiana, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, HOLLAND of Florida, EASTLAND of Mississippi, TALMADGE of Georgia, AIKEN of Vermont, YOUNG of North Dakota, and COOPER of Kentucky.

I wish also to commend the members of the staffs of the House Committee on Agriculture and of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. They worked far into the night, cooperating with the conferences in an effort to compose differences, make compromises, and to present something here that I think all of us should accept.

I never have known a committee of the Congress to work with more dedication to the accomplishment of a purpose in the public interest. Although the members of the conference representing the House minority did not see fit to sign the conference report, they worked diligently in the conference and contributed in a substantial way toward adjusting the differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 is intended to maintain farm income, stabilize prices, and assure adequate supplies for consumers, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs in farm programs, and to promote foreign trade.

The bill continues for 4 years the one-price cotton program, the feed grains program, and the wheat program. It establishes a cropland adjustment program, intended to remove 40 million acres from production. It removes the necessity for dairymen to produce surplus milk in order to preserve their individual participation in the markets for milk for fluid consumption. It continues the wool program through December 1969 with modifications to increase U.S. production. It extends for 4 years authority for leasing tobacco acreage and the exemption of certain green peanuts from marketing quotas. It authorizes lease or sale of cotton allotments within a State. It permits determination of compliance with acreage allotments through methods other than measurement. It directs the Department of Agriculture to make a study of the parity income position of farmers and report to Congress by June 30, 1966. It authorizes State agencies administering public lands to transfer acreage allotments from one farm to another in the same county. It enacts into law administrative regulations regarding reconstitution of farms. It authorizes use of projected yields in lieu of normal yields in connection with all farm programs. It authorizes use of CCC funds to purchase dairy products when needed.

I shall not attempt here to set forth in detail the provisions of all the titles of the bill. Each Member already has had the opportunity to read and study the conference report, which was printed in the RECORD, beginning on page 26391. The statement of managers on the part of the House, explaining the provisions of the various titles, begins on page 26400. For those who may not have read the RECORD, printed copies of the report now are available to each of you.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, as has previous legislation in the field of agriculture, invests in the Secretary of Agriculture a vast assortment of discretionary power. It is necessary to do this because of the complexities involved in administering the programs for the various commodities.

We are fortunate to have a Secretary who can be trusted with power. But to achieve the purposes of this new and far-reaching legislation he will need the constant counsel of the Members of the Congress who now are enacting this legislation and must ever be watchful of its administration.

In this connection, as part of the legislative record, I caution the Secretary to be exceedingly careful in the administration of the new cropland adjustment program. The broad authority in this program, used prudently, can make a very large contribution to the production and price stability in the whole of agriculture; if used unwisely—especially with respect to cotton—it can cause serious dislocations of people and damage the total economy of many areas.

Under the cotton title of H.R. 9811, cotton production will be cut by 35 percent by most farmers. Because of the huge surplus, it is necessary to reduce production sharply. But the Secretary must realize that a further cut beyond the provisions of the cotton title, by use of cropland adjustment contracts, would be imprudent and unwise in many areas where the farm economy and the well-being of rural communities depend in a substantial way upon the services provided for agriculture.

Therefore, I would prefer that no contracts whatever be made through the cropland adjustment title in 1966, to take out additional cotton land beyond the severe acreage retirement provided in the cotton title. This would permit an assessment of the economic impact of the 35 percent reduction farmers in many areas will make next year under the cotton program. This would allow the release and reapportionment program to function. It would give the cotton allotment lease or sale provisions of this new legislation a chance to function.

If the Secretary insists upon making cropland adjustment contracts, to take out cotton acreage in 1966 in addition to that idled under the cotton program, then I suggest that as a matter of moderation and wisdom no contracts be made in any county where the acreage in 1966 will be reduced overall by more than 25 percent below the actual harvested acreage in such county in 1965.

I will say to the House that I am interested in the successful operation of the legislation now before us for final approval. I want to see the cropland adjustment program operate successfully. I here want to admonish those who will administer the cropland adjustment program that if prudence and wisdom to a very high degree do not prevail, then, it is my firm conviction that the Congress will deny any further funds for the operation of this program beyond 1966.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have had a part in developing the legislation now before us. I did not get everything I wanted in the bill. Perhaps no one of us did. But this legislation overall sets up machinery which, properly administered by the dedicated people in the Department of Agriculture, will accomplish great benefits for our farmers and for the people generally who make up this great country of ours.

This bill affects all of America. Every man, woman, and child in this Nation has a great interest in the bill that we are now presenting. I think we all would agree that when the farmers of the Nation are impoverished, the Nation itself is in danger. When we have a terrific impact on agriculture, the impact is immediately felt by those in all walks of life.

I need not make an agriculture speech and tell the Members about the grand success of agriculture in this country further than to say that the farmers of this Nation have performed very magnificently. We are living in a land of great abundance, and we are told that in a few years from now we shall need to be able to use all of the food and fiber that we can harvest from our flourishing fields.

A short while ago I attended a meeting at White Sulphur Springs at which many economists told us in eloquent language that in 1975 we would need 50 million acres of additional land in production. The situation has changed. They are the same economists who recently were telling us that we need 50 million acres less than we now have in production. This bill contemplates retirement of about 40 million acres.

I hope that the House will accept the conference report. I am certain that the farmers of the Nation will be benefited and that the general economy will likewise be benefited.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. Will the gentleman explain briefly the contents of the conference report with regard to the cotton section as it relates to the House-passed bill? What is the difference between the provisions in the cotton section of the bill passed by the House and the provisions in the conference report?

Mr. COOLEY. When the bill came out of our committee, it had many objectionable features, as the gentleman well knows. Even when the bill went from the House and was sent to the committee, it was still objectionable. But in the conference we composed our differences.

The gentleman will recall that our committee and the House of Representatives authorized unlimited production of cotton for export by farmers who wished to forego all the benefits of the cotton program. I was frightened by it. I think others were frightened by that provision. The Senate provided that a man could exceed his cotton allotment by 50 percent, if he did not care to participate in the cotton program.

In the conference we agreed to do away with our provision, and we have a provision in the conference report for overplanting to the extent of 250,000 acres throughout the Nation in 1966 and, after 1966, on condition that we are able to reduce our carryover of cotton. If applications to overplant exceed 250,000 acres, the Secretary is authorized to prorate that among the applicants.

I believe we have what you might call a "muzzle" on overplanting. I do not know of anyone in my State—or anyone in Georgia—who wants to grow cotton for 21 cents or 22 cents a pound and sell on the world market, but there are some growers in the West who wanted this provision, so we went along with it, after we cut it down.

In the House bill we required a 15 percent mandatory reduction in the allotment of each farmer cooperating in the program. The Senate required a 10 percent mandatory reduction. After days and days of talking, we compromised that provision and split the difference. Now we require only a 12½ percent mandatory reduction.

The Senate had a 10-acre provision for the little grower. That likewise was changed. We had no small grower provision in the House bill. The 10 acres in California, New Mexico, Arizona, or the delta means a lot more in bales, in pounds, than it does in my State or in your State of Georgia. So we compromised that, after days and days of discussion, and we provided that the little grower with an allotment of 10 acres or less or producing 3,600 pounds or less would not be subject to the mandatory acreage cut, although he could participate in the voluntary acreage retirement under the cotton program. I believe those are the two rather substantial changes in the cotton section.

Mr. LANDRUM. I thank the gentleman. I commend the gentleman not only for his splendid efforts in bringing the bill out of his committee and managing it through the House, but also for the fine work he and his fellow conferees have done in producing this conference report.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. When the bill left the House there was a provision providing for a loan of 90 percent of the average world market price, or about 21 cents for 1966, plus a 9-cent payment. The 9-cent payment, as I understand it, was taken out in conference. What provision was made for the difference in payment between the 21 cents and the normal price support?

Mr. COOLEY. Normally it would be, I believe, 21 cents plus 9.42.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is left in?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I thought it was taken out and some substitute was made for such.

The overplanting provision, according to a press release by my chairman, of October 6, was retained. The release indicated that production from overplanted acreage could only be marketed in export. Is that correct?

Mr. COOLEY. We discussed that subject at great length. Anyone who overplants, under this bill, can only grow for export.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Could a farmer plant his normal allotment and get the normal price support on that, that is, not less than 65 percent of parity, and also overplant for export?

Mr. COOLEY. If he overplanted, having an assignment of export market acres, he would be automatically out of the program and all of his production would go to exports, without any Government subsidy, without any Government payment of any kind. If he overplanted, without an assignment of export acres, he would be subject to marketing penalties as under the current program.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I have one other question. The bill provides that a farmer with an allotment of more than 10 acres must take a 12½-percent cut if he wishes to participate in the price support program.

Mr. COOLEY. That is correct.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That leaves 87½ percent. If he plants 87½ percent of his allotment he would receive, as I understand it, under the conference report as well as the House bill, only the 21-cent price support, or 90 percent of the average world market price, and no payments?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. He will receive a loan at 90 percent of the world prices or a flat 21 cents in 1966.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is what I am speaking about.

Mr. POAGE. And then will receive a payment the minimum of which, combined with the loan, will be 28 cents for the 1966 crop, because we have the 65 percent of parity provision in here, which says that you cannot go below 65 percent of parity on the production of the permitted acres, that is the acreage a farmer can plant and still qualify as a cooperator.

Mr. ABERNETHY. When the bill left the House a farmer was compelled to idle 15 percent of his allotment in order to participate in the loan program and now it is 12½ percent. When the bill left the House, if he planted his 85 percent, he could not receive any payments except diversion payments.

Mr. COOLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Oh, yes.

Mr. COOLEY. No. As the bill left the House, a farmer who retired 15 percent of his allotment and planted the remaining 85 percent would be eligible for loans on all cotton produced and for both price support and diversion payments. The same is true under the conference report except that the percentages are 12½ and 87½.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Let us say he planted 65 percent of his allotment and he gets a loan of 90 percent of the average world market price or thereabout. Is that right so far?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, if he planted 65 percent of his allotment he is a cooperator and is eligible for the loan and price support and land retirement payments.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The 9-cent payment, then, is taken out of the bill we had in the House?

Mr. COOLEY. No.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I wish somebody would explain it. It certainly is not clear.

Suppose I planted 87½ percent of my allotment. What would I receive?

Mr. COOLEY. For 1966 you would get the loan at 21 cents on all cotton produced, the price-support payment now estimated at 9.42 cents a pound on the domestic allotment which is 65 percent of the farm allotment and, in addition, payment would be received on the 12½ percent diverted at a rate of about 10½ cents a pound.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Payments on the 12½ percent?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, and the loan and other payment I have mentioned.

Mr. ABERNETHY. And there is no 9-cent payment any more?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. The minimum price-support payment is 9 cents as in the bill as it left the House.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am not clear, but maybe it will be made clear before this is all over.

Mr. COOLEY. The cotton title, according to figures supplied by the Department of Agriculture, will provide to all cotton farmers a total income comparable to income received for the 1964 crop. On an individual farm basis, a cooperator who reduces his acreage the minimum amount required will receive a blend price of 29½ cents per pound. For a farmer who reduces his plantings 25 percent, his blend price will be 32.67 cents per pound. If the farmer elects to comply with his domestic allotment which is 65 percent of his regular allotment his blend price will be 36.07 cents per pound. All prices would be increased by the margin that the market price exceeds the loan price.

For a small farmer having an allotment of 10 acres or less, or on which the acreage allotment times the yield is 3,600 pounds or less, the blend prices would vary according to the amount of allotted acreage the farmer decided to divert. If he elects to plant his full allotment his blend price will be 30.8 cents per pound. If he takes a 12½ percent reduction voluntarily his blend price will be 33.7 cents. If he takes a voluntary reduction of 25 percent his blend price is 37.5 cents and if he elects to divert the full 35 percent and plant only his domestic allotment his blend price is 41.7 cents and is approximately 100 percent of parity.

Blend prices are computed on the basis of a 21-cent price-support loan plus a price support payment of 9.42 cents per pound on his domestic allotment plus a diversion payment of 10½ cents per pound times the projected yield for the acreage diverted.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. I yield to my colleague from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I realize all of us know the difficult task which the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and his fellow committee members have had in this legislation. As one who is particularly interested in the cotton section and the cotton title, title IV, I would like to express to the chairman, my colleague from North Carolina, and to the other conferees my commendation and appreciation for the splendid job that they have done.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman, and I want to observe that the gentleman who is now speaking represents one of the greatest textile districts in this whole country of ours. Textiles are not only important in his district but to the whole State of North Carolina where we have more textile mills and more textile workers than in any other State in the Union.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Are the release provisions in this conference report satisfactory to the growers?

Mr. COOLEY. The release and reapportionment?

Mr. JONAS. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. I think so. We are depending upon a reasonable administration of the cropland adjustment program that will not wreck the release and reapportionment program. We have stated here the right of the cotton farmer to sell or lease his allotment from one farmer to another, and we have these payments in here. Heretofore these farmers have been releasing cotton in a substantial volume without any payment at all. Now they will be paid through releasing them.

Mr. JONAS. My colleague knows how important it is to the cotton producers. I merely wanted the record to show what I think is the fact, that this provision is beneficial to them.

Mr. COOLEY. It is not only important to the producer but it is important to every little cotton community in this country.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NELSEN. Do I understand in the feed grain section the authority granted to the Secretary will permit him to drop the loan level below what he is now permitted to drop it?

Mr. COOLEY. May I suggest to the gentleman that he address those questions to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], who will take some time a little later on.

Mr. NELSEN. I shall withhold my questions for Mr. POAGE.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the managers on the part of the House in their statement included comments alleging that in 1965 as a result of agricultural labor shortages there have been first, crop losses; second, reduction of plantings; third, administrative actions which have failed to sufficiently recognize the needs and problems of agriculture; and, fourth, there have been injuries to the consumer and the economy, as well as the farmer.

I think it should be made clear at the outset that this statement on farm labor by the managers is entirely out of order and in no way a reflection of the body's view of the actions taken by the Department of Labor. I think it more appropriate that we be guided by two very salient facts: The House in its deliberations concerning the Food and Agriculture Act did not even seriously consider or discuss the Department's and the Secretary of Labor's handling of the agricultural labor situation. This matter was never brought to a vote, no amendments were proposed, and no action was taken in the House. On the Senate side, however, the Secretary's stewardship of the farmworker program was specifically considered in a proposed amendment to the act. This amendment was subsequently stricken as a result of a rollcall vote.

Let me turn now to some of the specific charges that have been made. There has been much talk and publicity, depicting in lurid detail, crop losses resulting from a shortage of agricultural labor. We have been subjected to many pathetic tales of crops rotting in the fields for want of labor, or more particularly for want of foreign labor. The Secretary has been characterized as being intransigent and arbitrary in his refusal to issue certifications attesting to shortage of domestic workers. Such certifications by the Immigration and Naturalization Service are the basis for authorizing the importation of foreign workers.

I would like to discuss one particular crop which probably has received more publicity than any other. Some of my colleagues in California have contended that the actions of the Secretary of Labor are responsible for cutbacks in the tomato acreage and stories have appeared in the Nation's press making the point over and over again that were it not for the Secretary of Labor tomato production would be significantly higher in California. The Secretary has denied these charges, but unfortunately his side of the case has not received a fair hearing. The Information Office of the Department of Labor is no match for the propaganda mills of the many grower organizations who are not really interested in whether or not there has been a loss of crop, but are concentrating their efforts in mounting a vicious propaganda campaign to discredit the Secretary and thereby reinstate the Mexican labor program, a program which this House in its wisdom and with the concurrence of the Senate decided should be terminated. Let me set the record straight. There have been decreased tomato plantings in California this year but it is in no way related to a shortage of labor. Let me quote a statement made February 10, 1965. This statement was made not by Secretary of Labor but by Robert Holt.

Mr. Holt is the manager of the California Tomato Growers Association. In his annual report to the association, he said the following:

> Recently we have reviewed the statistics showing supply and movement of canned tomatoes and tomato products. In almost all cases both the supply and the movement have increased over last year. Supply is anywhere from 13 percent down on some items to 19 percent up on others. The movement range is somewhat similar. Within the next few weeks growers will be faced with having to make a decision on whether or not to plant tomatoes. It is our considered opinion that the present indicators of supply and demand reflect that the acreage for 1965 should be cut approximately 25 percent, and that California should expect to harvest and market processed tomatoes from somewhere between 105,000 to 110,000.

And despite Mr. Holt's recommendation the actual acreage harvested in 1965 is expected to be in the neighborhood of 116,000. So much for the alleged crop loss in tomatoes.

One further word with regard to the general subject of crop losses. We are asked to believe according to the newspaper accounts and some of the statements of some of my colleagues that every crop loss occurring this year, and there have been some crop losses, is a result of labor shortages caused by the Secretary's poor administration of the Government's farm labor program. This of course is a very simple approach to what is actually a very complex situation. There are crop losses every year. Frequently unusual weather conditions, such as unseasonal frosts, or extreme heat causes crops to be lost. All of us are aware of the tragic floods affecting many parts of the country this year. In addition to the loss of lives and property, there has been some loss of crops. Market conditions at the time of harvest can affect a grower's decision whether or not it is economically feasible to harvest his crop. A grower may decide to plow his crop under, rather than harvest if the price is not right and anyone who is familiar with the agricultural industry knows that this is not an unusual occurrence. There are many factors affecting the condition of a crop and I have no intention of engaging in a long dissertation on the farmer's plight. We all know that in States other than Nevada and New Hampshire farming is the only form of legalized gambling permitted. Despite the many uncertainties affecting the agricultural industry the propaganda mills have been turning out reams of publicity attempting to convince the American public that every time there is a crop loss the Secretary of Labor is to blame.

With almost equal fervor there have been claims that consumer prices have soared as a result of labor shortages. The facts of the matter just do not support these claims. Wholesale prices in August showed a decrease in vegetable prices of 14 percent below a year ago. There were also reductions in canned fruits and vegetable items as a result of plentiful supplies from the 1965 crops. Some examples of current prices of major crops: canned tomatoes have increased from $1.50 a case to $1.61 but fresh market tomatoes are down from $4.15 a carton to $3.03; the price of lettuce, which is highly volatile was at $3.38 a carton this August compared to $3.25 last year, but in July it was $2.08 compared to $4.38 last year; a quart of strawberries sold for exactly the same price—$0.75 this year as it did last year in August; melons have increased slightly from $3.40 to $3.95 in August; but oranges have dropped significantly from $5.06 in 1964 to $3.07 this year; the price of a crate of cantaloups has fluctuated greatly over the course of the year, in August it was up to $6.25 compared to $5.75 last year; however, the month before it was only $7.50 compared to $8.19 in July of 1964. In the last example grapes were selling in August of last year for $4.06 compared to $3.59 this August. The crops I have selected were those in which foreign worker employment was significant last year. As you can see there has not been any ballooning of prices, and if we look at all fruit and vegetable prices we would find that there actually has been a decrease. The last point I would like to discuss now is the Secretary's administrative actions. The managers claim that the needs and problems of agriculture have not been sufficiently recognized. In my opinion nothing could be further from the truth. I will not burden you with a description of the many special programs initiated by the Labor Department to ease the transition from reliance on farm labor to full utilization of domestic agricultural workers. In terminating Public Law 78 the Congress gave to the Secretary a clear mandate that he use the full authority of his office to promote the employment of domestic workers and that he limit to the greatest possible extent, the importation of foreign agricultural labor. I think the record shows clearly that the Secretary has administered the farm labor program in a fair and reasonable manner. In those instances where sufficient numbers of domestic workers have not been available to harvest the crops, Secretary Wirtz has recognized these emergency situations and certified to the need for foreign agricultural workers. He has acted in a responsible manner and administered the program so that domestic workers have been fully protected from any possible adverse effect resulting from the admission of foreign labor.

I think also that this House should be made aware of the tremendous pressures that have been exerted upon the Secretary. He has been more than reasonable despite the abuse and vilification to which he has been subjected. Let me cite a specific example: New England growers predicted that their apple crop would be lost unless 1,400 Canadian workers were admitted. After carefully reviewing and considering information supplied by these growers, the Secretary certified to the need for 1,075 workers in the various Northeast States. The harvest is now virtually completed and yet only 691 Canadian workers were actually employed. In Massachusetts, growers claimed they needed 500 foreign workers. The Secretary, based on the data supplied to him by these growers, certified to the need for 350 workers, but only 179 Canadian workers were actually employed. This same pattern was observed in most of the other northeastern apple-growing States. Maine requested 341 workers, actually employed 222; New Hampshire requested 500 workers, actually employed 215; Rhode Island requested 30 workers, actually employed 25; Vermont requested 55 workers, actually employed 50.

In closing I would like to say that as Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz has continued and reenforced the policies, initiated by his predecessors in that office, designed to prevent the importation of foreign workers from adversely affecting the wages and working conditions of the domestic farm work force. He has been reasonable and he has been fair. The language in the statement by the managers on the part of the House concerning farm labor is gratuitous. I think it should be made clear that it does not reflect the sentiment of this body.

Mr. COOLEY. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE].

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, may I preface my remarks by saying that my statement is certainly no criticism of the leadership of the conference. I think we had some of the ablest leadership manifested in this conference that we have enjoyed at any time, in the hands of the chairman and the ranking majority member.

But now that the conference on H.R. 9811 has been completed, I would like to take a few minutes to explain why I did not choose either to sign the conference report, or vote for it.

First let me say that this conference committee has worked very hard for the past 2 weeks on many detailed and complex provisions. I might add that as far as the House conferees are concerned, I think the House can be assured that the position of this body was well represented. The fact that the conference committee worked diligently, however, does not alter the fact that what they worked on, was not, in my opinion, in the best long-range interest of farmers, consumers, and taxpayers.

There are two basic reasons why I feel that this legislation is not desirable. First, because it commits our farm program even further to the principle that direct Government payments should be a cornerstone of farm policy. We have, in effect, in this bill, a large part of what is known as the Brannan plan. With cotton being added to the list of crops which receive direct cash payments from the Treasury, we have moved another giant step toward the day when farmers will be absolutely dependent on Government payments for their economic survival. This trend, of course, has been developing during the past several years, and in 1964 Government payments accounted for nearly 20 percent of realized net farm income. In 1965 this percentage will most certainly be at least 20 percent. In 1966 and subsequent years this percentage is surely going to grow under the provisions of H.R. 9811. I am convinced that this trend is not in the best interest of American agriculture, and I am afraid that some day farmers will have to face an unhappy reckoning when they find that their continually shrinking numbers have resulted in a Congress no longer oriented to rural interests and the high costs of farm programs.

The second major reason that I cannot support H.R. 9811 is that I believe it will prove to be most costly and ineffective. Generally speaking, the House bill increased the costs of the programs originally proposed by the administration. For example: The House action in making the extra 50-cent payments from the U.S. Treasury on the domestic production of wheat added another $200 million a year to the original administration bill.

The conference committee bill has in many instances increased the costs of the House bill by either adopting more expensive amendments of the other body or by compromising with the conferees from the other body on provisions of their bill which were more expensive. For example: The conference committee adopted cotton provisions dealing with overplanted acreage, small farm minimums, and minimum price supports which, in my opinion, will add approximately another $100 million a year to the cost of the program as proposed by the House.

In Wednesday night's Washington Star there was a wire story reporting the progress of the conference committee. In this story, spokesmen for the U.S. Department of Agriculture are quoted as saying "this measure should cut between $300 and $400 million from the more than $4 billion now spent annually on crop control programs."

Mr. Speaker, I just do not think this prediction will turn out to be true.

Another very expensive part of this legislation, which I humbly predict will turn out to be the most expensive farm bill ever passed, is the cropland adjustment title. This program calls for the retirement of some 40 million acres of farmland during the next 4 years. Under the terms of the conference bill, up to $9 billion is authorized for making payments under this program during the life of all contracts which can run for as long as 10 years. These enormous expenditures for this new program will, of course, be in addition to the cost of present programs.

While this program has been described as one to save money on annual commodity expenditures, I feel that in the long run it will turn out to be an additional cost over and above the cost of the commodity programs involved in this bill. I predict also that the commodity programs for cotton, feed grains, and wheat during the next 4-year period will cost taxpayers more than has been the case in any previous 4-year period in time. Why is this so, one may legitimately ask. The main reason, I feel, is that the programs themselves will not be effective instruments in holding down the continuing increases in production that American agriculture is capable of generating.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage] have set forth the major provisions of this legislation. I would like to add a few comments on some of the major controversial provisions in this legislation and how these issues were settled.

The dairy title of H.R. 9811 deals with the establishment of a class I dairymen's base plan. This means that the provisions in the House bill leaving producer-handlers' legal status unchanged will be in effect during the life of the class I plan. The adoption of the House language also means that individual dairy farmers will vote in any referendum held on the class I plan. These questions were the major differences between the House and the other body in regard to dairy legislation.

On wool the House prevailed in its insistence on the deletion of authority for graduated payments to small wool producers, while accepting the other body's formula for establishing a support level during the next 4 years.

On feed grains the conference committee gives greater discretion to the Secretary of Agriculture in the administration of the feed grain program. The conference bill allows him to lower the loan price on corn below 65 percent of parity, the floor provided by the House bill. Deleted by the conference committee was the other body's amendment authorizing an alternative feed grain program which would have placed heavy emphasis on diversion payments to participating farmers.

On cotton the major issues were the degree of mandatory reduction, special provisions for small farms, the degree of permitted overplanting, and total price support level.

It occurs to me as one who claims to be no expert on cotton that this program seems to be chasing itself. While some cotton farmers will be paid not to grow cotton in order to reduce the near-record surplus, others will be permitted to grow an additional 250,000 acres a year. While the production from this additional acreage is earmarked for export markets, there seems to be little question that its existence will only negate the effectiveness of this program. Other cotton provisions are similarly written in such a manner as to not really do the job of reducing production. Therefore, in my opinion, it is unlikely that any significant results will be forthcoming from the new cotton program which most likely will cost as much or more than the present extravagant program.

On wheat the conferees agreed to delete the provision which was in the other body's bill dealing with an escalated bread tax. In reaching this agreement the conferees added another 7 cents per bushel to the taxpayers' cost of subsidizing domestic wheat production. Let us remember that the present wheat program is costing taxpayers something like $1.2 billion annually in addition to the $375 million spent each year by consumers for domestic wheat certificates which wheat millers and bakers must purchase in order to process wheat. These taxpayer costs, I predict, will be increased at least $235 million a year more by H.R. 9811.

On cropland adjustment the conferees have set up a program which allows the Secretary of Agriculture to commit $225 million per year in each year of the signup period. This means that farmers signing up under this program might run up the annual cost of this program some $900 million per year. If all the contracts signed were 10-year contracts, the total obligation of taxpayers by 1980, when this program ends, could be as high as $9 billion. Of course, no one expects all these contracts to be for 10 years, but even if only half of them were for 10 years, the total costs could run to $7.5 billion.

On rice the provisions allowing diversion payments to rice farmers during the next 2 years were adopted. These costs again represent an additional cost burden on the taxpayer.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the conference committee has added to the list of commodities involved in Federal farm programs one which apparently has escaped Federal assistance and management. It is one which I had never heard of before. I refer to that everyday commodity known to everyone as plantago ovato, a botanic cousin of what is known in the West as Indian wheat grass. Under the cotton, wheat, and feed grains sections of this bill farmers across America will be eligible to produce plantago ovato on acreage diverted from these crops, provided they accept a reduction in the diversion payments to which they would otherwise be entitled. If past patterns prevail, this will be just the beginning for plantago ovato's participation in Federal farm programs. The complexities, the controls, the subsidies, and the redtape generated by the Department of Agriculture most likely will now engulf this new and hitherto unknown and unregulated commodity.

And what a strange twist of fate this is. Plantago ovato is a plant from which chemists and scientists are able to produce birth control pills. Thus, in a bill which is distinctive for its lack of control of the public purse, a crop used to control birth in humans ends up being controlled by humans themselves.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to record my opposition to the conference report, especially as it applies to the cotton section.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Greigg].

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, today, rural America received a substantial boost. This comes as a result of the action taken by this body in accepting the agriculture conference report. While this measure directly affects the agricultural economy, it very markedly affects every facet and segment of the total American economy. As a member of the House Agriculture Committee, I can report to you that the administration sought a 2-year farm bill. I am pleased and proud that the judgment of the committee prevailed, as we now have approved a 4-year farm program. As a result of this 4-year program, our farmers can place into action some concrete plans for the future. For a long period of time, the American farmer has been caught in a severe cost-price squeeze. It is indeed imperative that the American farmer realize improved farm income. I firmly believe that, with the passage of this measure, the farmers in my area applaud the actions of the majority of the Members of this body who, by their vote in support of this program, indicated a real concern for rural America.

In representing my constituents, my concern has been for the continuance of an effective feed grains program. This program has been most beneficial to my congressional district in northwest Iowa, and throughout all of Iowa. One of the moving purposes behind my candidacy for Congress was the relationship that we, in the Midwest and particularly northwest Iowa, were in great need of representation which accepted the principle of the need for such forward looking programs as the feed grains program. However, I want to make it very clear that, while the subject of feed grains is so essential to my district, I have come to appreciate the real concerns of all of the many and varied agricultural commodities included in this measure. Mr. Speaker, the present farm bill is no panacea of perfection. We have a long way to go. But this type of program has made it possible for higher prices for our commodities and has been remarkably effective in the reduction of surpluses. I wish to commend the very able and distinguished chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HAROLD COOLEY], and my very thorough and dedicated subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROBERT POAGE], for their masterful leadership in directing this essential agricultural measure.

I wish, at this time, to bring to the attention of my colleagues some very meaningful statistics as they relate to the feed grains program.

The feed grain program has been outstandingly successful in reducing surpluses, increasing farm income, and promoting stability in the livestock and feed grain sector of agriculture during the past 4 years.

Stocks of feed grains at the end of the 1964 crop marketing season will be down to 55 million tons, the smallest since 1957 and more than one-third below the peak level of 85 million tons at the end of the 1960 crop season. The significance of this reduction becomes even more meaningful when considered against the continuing yearly buildup in the surplus during the 1961–62 period.

The feed grain program has enabled producers to realize $3 billion more for their crops than at the 1960 level. Overall net farm income in 1965 is now estimated at $13.5 billion, the highest since 1953. The feed grain program is contributing significantly to improved income level.

Farm corn prices averaged $1.16 per bushel in 1964, higher than at any time since the mid-1950's. Prices, thus far, in 1965 have generally been above this 1964 level. This price improvement is in sharp contrast to the downward direction of feed grain prices during the period prior to the program. In 1960, farm corn prices averaged less than $1 per bushel, the lowest in nearly 20 years. In November of that year, prices in my home State of Iowa dropped to 75 cents per bushel.

The improved feed grain supply situation is a tremendous stabilizer for the livestock and poultry industry which provides more than half of yearly agricultural income. A continuation into the 1960's of the feed grain production and price trend in the 1950's would have had a catastrophic impact on livestock and poultry output and prices.

The achievement in working the feed grain surplus down is even more remarkable in light of the yield increases registered during the past few years. The corn yield for the 1965 crop is now estimated at more than 68 bushels per acre, nearly 25 percent above the 1960 figure of 54.5 bushels. This means with one-fourth less acreage production would equal the 1960 level when more than 200 million bushels were added to the surplus.

Despite increased yields, the program has made substantial inroads in the surplus through a better balance between production and needs. During the first 4 years of the program, more than 1 million farmers each year have participated to hold more than 110 million acres out of production and in conservation uses.

The magnitude of this acreage is readily apparent in that it is just shy of the total yearly feed grain plantings. If this acreage had been in production during the past 4 years, as it would have under the old program, the economic distress in the feed grain and livestock sectors of agriculture would have been widespread.

Lower feed grain prices and increasing supplies would have been a powerful stimulus for higher livestock and poultry production pressuring prices for commodities to lower and lower levels. A feed oversupply means cheap feed. Cheap feed means ruinous prices for livestock and livestock products.

Even though livestock feeding would have increased, the Government accumulation of surplus grain would have gone to new record levels each year with mounting costs and unbelievable storage problems. The feed grain surplus instead of being down more than one-third from the peak 85-million-ton level as it is, would not be at least 50 to 60 percent higher. While costs under the feed grain program have been high, the ultimate Government costs because of a higher surplus level under a continuation of the old program would have been at least $2 billion more.

The popularity of the feed grain program among farmers continues to increase. This year, nearly 1.5 million farmers, a record number, have signed up to hold more than 35 million acres out of production also a record in terms of acreage. The program has enabled farmers to achieve an improved feed grain supply-demand relationship while giving their incomes a boost.

The alternative to the feed grain program is a return to the program of the 1950's with no provision for diverting acreage from production. Prices would be supported between 50 and 90 percent of parity, but at a level which would not result in increasing CCC corn stocks. This, in effect, would mean the minimum level of about 75 to 80 cents per bushel for corn and correspondingly low prices for other feed grains. The increased yields and land available for production would mean that the gains of the past 4 years in reducing feed grain stocks would be lost in probably only 2 years. Returns from feed grain would be down, and low feed prices would eventually spread as a disruptive influence on the livestock-dairy-poultry economy.

Following are two tables for the RECORD on national participation in the feed grain program and on U.S. production and carryover of feed grains:

Summary of feed grain program

	Farms participating	Feed grain acreage on participating farms	Diverted acres
1961	1,146,388	68,100,000	25,200,000
1962	1,249,633	72,600,000	28,200,000
1963	1,194,665	73,500,000	24,500,000
1964	1,243,217	78,000,000	32,400,000
1965	[1] 1,482,583	86,627,300	36,576,800

[1] Based on signup intentions.

[In millions of tons]

	Production and carryover of feed grains	
	Carryover	Production
Marketing year beginning—		
1960	74.6	155.6
1961	84.7	140.6
1962	71.8	142.9
1963	63.9	156.4
1964	68.7	136.0
1965	55.0	149.9

Iowa, the heart of the Nation's Corn Belt, has an impressive record of participation in the feed grain programs. From 1961 through 1965, the programs have increased in popularity each year. In 1964, for instance, those with base acreage ranging from 31 to 300 acres had the major share of enrollment.

Program enrollment in Iowa steadily increased from 108,730 signed up in 1961 to 123,555 enrolled for this year's program. By crop years, the percentage of all Iowa feed grain farms signed up read like this: 56.7, 58.3, 59.5, 63, and 65 percent.

Equally impressive was the amount of the State's 13.5 million acres of total feed grain base represented on enrolled farms. This percentage by years from 1961 through 1965 increased in this order: 64.2, 67.3, 69.8, 71, and 74 percent.

An amazing 91 percent of the base acreage among participants was on farms of from 31 through 300 acres in 1964. Smaller base acreage farms with 1 to 31 acres represented only 2.1 percent. Farms of 301 acres or more represented the balance.

Acreage diversion by participating farms was greatest in the 31 through 300 acre category. They had 3,146,114 acres diverted. Those with 30 acres or less diverted a total of 211,727 acres, while those with 301 acres or more diverted a total of 200,386 acres.

In summary, Iowa's commercial family-type farms of 31 to 300 acres, which depend on production of grain as one of their major sources of income, had the largest enrollment, the most base acreage, and the preponderant share of the acreage diversion in their State during the 1964 feed grain program.

What does this program participation mean in Iowa, which is the Nation's No. 1 corn-producing State?

Yield in 1965 is indicated at a new record high of 83 bushels per acre—and that is a jump of nearly 20 percent over the 1958–62 average of 69.4 bushels per acre. With the high degree of participation and acreage diversion in the State this year, production is indicated at 838 million bushels of corn—up only 13 percent from the 1958–62 average production of 743 million bushels. In other words, the acreage diverted under the feed grain program applied a brake which held down production by nearly 100 million bushels despite the phenomenal new yields indicated for the State this crop year. If the diverted acres had been planted, the State's production this year obviously would have been tremendously greater.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, I want my colleagues to know that I have found it to be an honor to serve on the House Agriculture Committee and to serve in the 89th Congress which, by its actions today, boosts the American farmer and gives new life to rural America.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Stalbaum].

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to commend the conferees and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Mr. Cooley, for the fine job they have done in legislation in the field of dairying. We recognize that dairying is found in each of the 50 States, the only commodity that is so found. Dairy legislation has been conspicuous by its absence in the past, but this year the farm bill carries several items that are good as far as dairying is concerned. It is a tribute to our leaders that these were included.

We have included a class I dairy base plan which was accepted as presented by the House. It was better than the version of the other body because ours included the right of manufactured-milk handlers to set up their own market orders. In addition to this, the conferees on the part of the House in their wisdom have accepted two amendments which the Senate put in the farm bill, one an antidumping feature which strengthens our class I plans, which is highly desirable and badly needed.

The second provision, which I feel has not been given the attention in the House it should have, is one which will permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell dairy products even when such dairy products are not labeled as being in surplus. Many of my friends in the dairy cooperatives and the dairy marketing field believe this may be one of the most effective items and one of the major pieces of legislation we have passed for dairying in many, many years in the Congress.

I feel that dairying is well taken care of in the dairy legislation here. This type of legislation is not expensive, it is not going to add to the cost of the farm program; but class I dairy plans and the right of Commodity Credit to sell dairy products which are not in surplus are two items which could go a long way in helping solve the dairy problems of the Nation.

Again I commend the committee chairman, Mr. Cooley, for the fine job he did in giving leadership in this matter and the chairman of the Dairy Subcommittee, Mr. Hagen of California, who did so much in getting this good legislation incorporated into the farm bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Hagen].

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to clarify two or three points. No. 1, on the issue of the treatment of producer handlers, we accepted the House version which says this legislation does not adversely affect him and this is what the producer handlers of the country wanted.

In addition there are a couple of other points I believe the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage], a member of our committee, wants to clarify for the Record; is that correct?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think it might be well if we clarified that for the Record. I think there is no question about what the committee understood and what the conferees intended.

But there are those of us who have questions and I think we might clarify for the Record the meaning of new producers. We make provisions for new producers and the question arises: Is a new producer confined or is that term "new producer" confined just to those who never produced any milk before in their lives or does it include all of those who produced milk but who have not participated in the particular market in which it is being produced?

Mr. HAGEN of California. Well, it would include all of those who were not in that market but were seeking entry to it. It might be a dairy farmer who had been delivering to another market where a quota plan is adopted. He could get a quota in a new area only through an allocation of an increase in class I sales, allocation of basis forfeited, or by transfer from producers who have quotas in that new order area.

Mr. POAGE. Then it would be fair to say it includes both?

Mr. HAGEN of California. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. In the second place at the present time milk is sold in Federal order markets from plants which are regulated under other Federal orders and from unregulated plants. This milk is produced by dairy farmers who are not "producers" under the order regulating milk in the receiving market. Is it intended that this milk share in whole or in part in the class I sales of the receiving market adopting a class I base plan even though such sharing displaces producer quota milk in class I sales?

Mr. HAGEN of California. The answer is "No." Producer quota milk will receive a priority assignment to the class I sales in a market to the extent such milk is available for such sales. Milk received from other sources whether from other Federal order plants or from unregulated plants will be assigned to class I sales only to the extent that such sales exceed producer quota milk.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman very much. I think it is obvious that the program could not work unless the answer were "no." It was intended to be "no" all the time.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STALBAUM. Is it not true in the establishment of the class I base plan that Congress intended to give considerable flexibility to various markets in setting up such plans as they felt would be most effective in their own market, and most designed to meet their own needs and that in passing this legislation we are not attempting to establish a pattern that must apply all over the United States but rather we are setting up enabling legislation to allow each market to meet these problems as they best see fit?

Mr. HAGEN of California. That is absolutely correct. I might comment that this bill in the dairy section should reduce the cost of the dairy program to the Federal Government depending upon the extent to which these order areas vote to use this tool.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to ask the chairman of the Dairy Subcommittee a question regarding the use and purchase of dairy products not in surplus. At the present time dairy products purchased under section 32 funds must be used.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I will say that surplus is not the proper word. It is CCC inventory. They may be surplus although not in the inventory and this provision is directed to acquisition and use of noninventory stocks.

Mr. LAIRD. Yes, they might be surplus. But if the Department of Agriculture wanted to put cheese, let us say, in the school lunch program, using this particular section, there would have to be additional language added to this conference report to provide for the packaging, reprocessing, transportation, and handling and other charges. I think the gentleman realizes in the school lunch program, loaf cheese is used and has been used most successfully in this program throughout the United States. It has been a very popular commodity in the school lunch program.

This requires repackaging and processing of the cheese that is purchased under the CCC purchase program. That language was not included in the conference report. Does this cause the difficulty that the Department of Agriculture says that it causes?

Mr. HAGEN of California. The Department is always quite cautious. They thought that additional language was necessary to accomplish usage with added costs of repackaging and so forth. The conferees thought the Department had the authority without the added language and that is our position.

Mr. LAIRD. The Department says that they cannot put the product into the school lunch program without that language.

Mr. HAGEN of California. It is my recollection that the conferees did not think it was necessary. That is to say under our language they could do everything nesessary to purchase milk and milk products and put them into the hands of donees with the Department assuming all or any part of costs of acquisition, packaging and so forth.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN of California. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. We believe the Department has all the authority that the Department needs to deal with this thing.

Mr. HAGEN of California. My view is that previously stated. The authority exists for assumption of these costs regardless of the product's destination.

Mr. LAIRD. The position of the Department of Agriculture is somewhat different. The Department has advised me that the language is necessary.

Mr. COOLEY. That must be for overseas packaging, not for domestic use.

Mr. LAIRD. This language was for both overseas use and for domestic use, and it was suggested to the conferees. The language suggested by the Department appears on page 85 of the conference committee print.

Mr. COOLEY. We were assured that they needed no authority to deal with this problem in the domestic market.

Mr. LAIRD. Is it the intent of the conferees that the processing and packaging costs may be taken?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, domestically, but not for export.

Mr. LAIRD. For the domestic market, processing, packaging, and transportation costs can be taken?

Mr. COOLEY. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS] such time as he might require.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report.

The House will today approve a farm bill historic because it is the first time such legislation has been enacted for a 4-year period. This omnibus farm bill has many details in it that are somewhat different from the regulations under which our farmers have been operating in years past. While definite details will have to await administrative determinations and will be in the hands of your local ASCS committee shortly, I felt our farmers would be interested now in some of the provisions of the program.

At the beginning of this session, Senator MILTON YOUNG and I introduced identical farm bills in the House and Senate. While the final version of the administration bill does not include all of the features we advocated, it does include the chief feature—full parity for wheat produced for domestic markets.

The House Committee on Agriculture went part way in establishing many of the principles that I had introduced in our bill. Senator YOUNG in the Senate was able to amend the administration bill to make it conform even more closely to our desires and to the needs of North Dakotans. He held many of these gains in the conference committee against unrelenting pressure from the administration which was determined to establish lower prices, principally for wheat, than we were willing to accept. This illustrates once again the wisdom of a legislative process where give-and-take results in the final bill—in this case, a bill much more acceptable than the program originally sponsored by the administration.

One of the keenest disappointments in the bill, I think, is that part of the certificates will be paid by the U.S. Treasury rather than by those who use the wheat. This could endanger farm programs in the future since we have had an almost constant fight with the Bureau of the Budget and the administration to gain funds for such programs as the Soil Conservation Service, REA loans, and other programs vital to farmers. If the Federal Government continues to expand, more and more agencies will be competing with the Department of Agriculture for a share of your tax dollars. Some experts see this as the beginning of the end for farm programs. It was interesting to note that many of those who cried "bread tax" during the debate were the very same ones who for years have demanded the end of all farm programs.

Now, what is in the major sections of the bill affecting North Dakotans?

FEED GRAINS

The feed grains section is extended without major change for 4 more years, including provisions for price support loans, purchases, and in-kind payments to program participants at about the same levels as recent years. Participants, by diverting acreage from feed grain products to conservation use, will receive, as in the past, payments in kind to help maintain income.

The main differences between the new program and the old one are: first, normal production is to be figured on the basis of projected rather than base period yields; and, second, soybeans may be planted on permitted feed grain acres—at the discretion of the Department of Agriculture—and the producer will earn the same diversion and price support payments as if he had planted feed grain.

WHEAT

The bill will furnish a blended price support of \$1.84½ a bushel. This is roughly a 15-cent-per-bushel increase compared with what cooperating farmers are now receiving. The administration, however, turned down a clause introduced by Senator YOUNG which would have tied any increase in the price of bread to an increase in returns to the wheat farmer.

In effect, here is what the wheat section of the bill means to farmers in North Dakota: full parity for domestic food use of wheat—500 million bushels; the parity of July 1—\$2.57—will be used in 1966 price support calculations; loan for the 1966 crop is to be \$1.25 a bushel, leaving a difference between loan and parity of \$1.32. The millers will pay 75 cents of this difference and the rest is to be paid by the U.S. Treasury.

The bill now provides a minimum mandatory price support for 1966. It further provides that this same level of blended price supports will be guaranteed the remaining 3 years of the program. This constitutes an important change in the administration approach as passed by the House Committee on Agriculture which, while giving considerable assurance to providing a \$1.81 for 1966, did not give a firm guarantee of this price and gave the Secretary broad authority to reduce the blended price level in future years.

PROJECTED NORMAL PRODUCTION

You may have noted that I used the term "projected yield" rather than normal yields. As a matter of practical application, the State and the county yields will be somewhat higher than they were under the normal yield. Under the old program, we used to take an average of the last 5 years available and make adjustments for weather and other factors and come up with our base normal yield. Now this yield will be based on projected figures and since there is an upward trend in yields, it should be somewhat higher than last year. For instance, North Dakota's yield last year in wheat, our biggest crop, was 21.6 bushels. Under the projected yield approach, it will come out to be about 23.7 bushels for the State.

In applying this to the individual farm, county committees will be setting farm yields by one of two methods: First, the farmer's proven yield; and, second, the assigned projected yield where no proven yield is available.

In the first instance, where the farmer has a proven yield—which is only about 10 percent of the farms in North Dakota—the committee has a starting point. They may or may not increase these yields, but in any case the farmer should not get less than his proven yield. In the second instance, where the farmer has no proven yield, the committee will consider the productivity of the land, the farmer's present operation, and to the best of their ability try to establish a yield which will be comparable. This setting of yields is a very complex and important procedure, and the farmer should be sure to get all the information possible from his county ASCS committee.

CCC RESALE PRICE

One of the disappointing features of the law is that it fails to increase the CCC resale price on wheat to 115 percent of support prices. The President in his farm message of February 4 tended to support our position on this matter and every major farm organization agreed on the value of some increase in the resale formula of commodity stocks to protect farmers against Government competition, but the Secretary of Agriculture was viciously opposed.

I believe this could have meant an average of 10 cents a bushel more to the farmers of North Dakota over the price we now receive for our grain, and we will keep on trying for such a change in later legislation.

CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

The Department of Agriculture regards this program as the most important part of the farm bill, and it is perhaps significant that it was one of the least controversial parts of the bill in passage. This section of the law is intended to take 40 million crop acres out of production by 1969.

City dwellers will be pleased with the provision that offers extra payments to farmers who manage idled acres for wildlife habitat and allow hunters to use the land without charge for recreational purposes. Maximum payment per acre under this program is not to exceed 40 percent of the annual market value of the crop that would have been produced on the land, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. Farmers signing the 5- to 10-year contracts in 1966 will be required to put all of their allotment or base of at least one surplus crop in the program. During the next 3 years of the sign-up this percentage is left to the discretion of the Secretary.

Prior ownership of the land for at least 3 years is required in order to quality for the cropland adjustment program, and the Secretary is required to consider the economic impact of this acreage retirement on counties and local communities. In this regard the Secretary has stated that it will be his intention to limit the acreage contracted in any year insofar as a base or allotment crop is concerned to not more than 10 percent of the allotment or base acreage for that crop in the community. He added that the acreage contracted over the life of the program would not be more than 25 percent of the base allotment for the crop for the county unless responsible representatives of the county government and the ASCS committee for the county agree that more than 25 percent could be contracted without adversely affecting the economy of the county.

There is no automatic acceptance of land now in the soil bank under this program and farmers will have to contact their county ASCS office to get details in their area.

COST OF THE PROGRAM

While the cost of the entire farm program has not been reduced as much as the Department of Agriculture wanted, indications are that it will cost less than the 1965 program. While I have found that cost figures on a plan of this magnitude can be controversial and confusing, it is estimated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture that this program will cost about $100 million less than the program in effect during the current crop year.

CONCLUSION

I think it is significant to note that this bill is the result of a nonpartisan approach. Every Member, Republican and Democrat alike, from our six-State upper Midwest area voted for this bill. Farmers, individually and through their farm organizations, along with representatives from the States in our area, worked hard to impress upon Congress the importance of meaningful and sound farm legislation.

Most farmers will feel as I do that this is a fairly good farm bill.

However, I also believe this farm bill still ignores by far the most important future goal of American agriculture—a stepped-up program of using our farm products to prevent hunger in a starving world. We are spending $50 billion a year or more for armaments to promote freedom in the world. Other countries are able to compete with us in saturating the world with military might, but no other nation can match the American farmer's ability to produce food—and this should be regarded as our greatest weapon in the war for freedom.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE] such time as he may require.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I express myself in favor of this measure and compliment the conferees on the fine job that they have done.

Mr. Speaker, finding a perfect solution to the farm problem is practically impossible. At least, I know this is true with respect to cotton, which is the principal agricultural product in my district. But I believe that the conferees have come out with as good a solution as we could expect under the circumstances.

The life blood of the cotton industry in my district has been the release and reapportionment program. If this had been weakened materially, it would have hurt thousands upon thousands of the farmers throughout the Nation—farmers who sincerely farm for the purpose of making a living by growing cotton. Although I think that basically the sale and lease aspect of this bill is a means to ultimately weaken the release and reapportionment program, I do recognize that we must have some means of controlling production.

This version is much better, though, than the original version which passed the House, because this allows sale and lease within a county, if approved by a referendum, and does not allow it to go out of State. And although no farmer wants a mandatory retirement, I would think that most of the farmers would agree that a 12½-percent reduction is a reasonable compromise, particularly when the loan is still based on 90 percent of parity, and in addition the cooperator would receive approximately 9.42 cents for the subsidy. It would seem that a reasonable guarantee of the subsidy is provided for since this amount is tied to parity.

I would especially like to pay compliments to this committee and the fine staff which has worked so hard on this bill. In my opinion, Congressman W. R. POAGE is the most knowledgeable man in America today on agricultural matters, and I am most mindful that the farmers of Texas owe to him, and to the splendid gentleman from Wichita Falls, the Honorable GRAHAM PURCELL, another member of the conferees, their thanks for the countless hours of work they have put into making this measure acceptable. I daresay that our State is more fortunate than any in having these two men as members of the Agriculture Conference Committee, and I know foi a fact that no one is held in higher esteem in the Congress than these two men.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to express my appreciation to the farmers of the Old Cotton Belt Association, whose advice and counsel I have sought, under the leadership of Emery Blackman, J. V. Stiles, Henry Pumphrey, George Bohlen, and Mr. Julius Wittliff, one of the most lovable and fairminded men in my district.

It was this association that invited me to meet with a group of some 75 farmers recently and helped me to better understand the problems of the cotton farmer of my district. Working with Fleetwood Richards, a knowledgeable and dedicated public servant, I believe that we have all come together with a bill that is fairest to the greatest number. Though any Texas cotton farmer wants to have "40-cent cotton and 10-cent beer," to use an early frontier saying, we know this is not possible today—but I do think that this 4-year program is the best that we could have agreed upon under the circumstances.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] such time as he may require.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman. I rise in support of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 9811 to be known as the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965.

I am supporting this legislation because, for a change, it increases farm income. While it is an omnibus bill and covers all supported agricultural commodities, it is nevertheless a vast improvement over some of the present programs.

First, with regard to wheat. The bill formulates a combined price support on wheat of $1.84½ a bushel. This is roughly 15 cents per bushel more than the price cooperators are receiving at the present time. I opposed, and I voted against, the wheat bill last year for the sole reason that it materially reduced the support price of wheat. Mr. Speaker, I have never voted to reduce farm income and I hope I never shall. Every vote I have cast has been for an improvement in the farm income situation. There is absolutely no reason why this support rate schedule could not have been passed last year instead of the poverty bill rate that was passed.

In computing the $1.84½ a bushel, it is arrived at by paying full parity for domestic food use of wheat, namely for 500 million bushels. The full parity price as of July 1 will be used in the 1966 price-support calculation which is $2.57. The loan price for the 1966 crop will remain at its present level of $1.25 per bushel or a difference between the loan price and the parity price of $1.32. Of this the millers will pay 75 cents and the balance of 57 cents will be paid out of the U.S. Treasury.

One discouraging feature in the wheat program is the fact that the conference committee failed to be able to boost the resale price to 115 percent of parity. I am convinced this would have increased the price of wheat by at least 10 cents a bushel and had introduced legislation providing for a 115-percent limitation, however, it was lost in the conference shuffle.

On feed grains the program was left pretty much as it is at the present time. The one disappointing feature is the fact that the Secretary is authorized to lower the present loan rate and increase the present price-support payment. This is, of course, a whip in the hands of the Secretary to force farmers to comply. The effect, however, is that when the Secretary lowers the loan rate this means the price of feed grains will automatically be reduced. For the complier, however, the increase of the support price offsets the loan price reduction. But, the part of the agriculture industry suffering the greatest damage is the producer and feeder of beef and lamb, because beef prices normally follow feed prices.

I would mention only briefly the extension of the National Wool Act which was changed very little in the conference. It fixes the support level of shorn wool at the present rate of 62 cents a pound with a parity index increase which would mean a support price of 65 cents in 1966 and 66 cents in 1967, with the support level for 1968 and 1969 depending upon further changes in the parity index.

There is one bad feature in the bill for the young farmer trying to get started in agriculture. That is the cropland adjustment program authorizing the Secretary to enter into 5- and 10-year contracts for the conversion of cropland from production into conservation uses. It would authorize as much as 40 million acres to be taken out of production by 1970. This program is very similar to the soil-bank program which, while beneficial to a retiring farmer, was damaging to the young farmer.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE] 3 minutes.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the conferees who did not sign the report. I wish to make clear to my colleagues that this is not because of any objection whatsoever to the performance of the House conferees. I believe that under the leadership of the chairman, and on a bipartisan, nonpartisan basis, we did the best possible, and really a good job of sustaining the House position. I am simply opposed to omnibus farm bills. I did not vote for the House bill. I would not have voted for the Senate bill. I shall not vote for the conference report. It does not make sense to me to put cheese, boll weevils, Rice Crispies, chewing tobacco, Corn Flakes, Shredded Wheat biscuits, boiled peanuts, golf courses, fishponds, bedsheets, and birth control pills all in the same subsidy bill costing the taxpayers $4 billion a year.

Thank goodness California artichokes and mushrooms were left out of the grab bag.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington whatever time she may require.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. I voted against the farm bill when it passed the House. I believe the conference version of the bill is a distinct improvement over the House-passed bill. By this I mean that title I, the class I dairymen's base plan emerged in what I feel to be in a good and workable form. Title II, the Wool Act extension, with the minor changes made by the Senate, is a program that has my enthusiastic support and for which I have worked. Title III, the feed grains program, is much improved over the House version, especially for feed deficit areas such as my State of Washington. Title IV, cotton, is immeasurably improved over the mess that was first passed by the House. Title VI, the cropland adjustment program, is worthy of support.

Only title V, the wheat program, Mr. Speaker, contains a feature to which I object. In the Agriculture Committee, and agreeing with the Wheat Growers Association and the Grange, I voted for the wheat title. But between the time the omnibus bill was reported out of committee and the time it was debated on the House floor, and without the knowledge or consent of farmers or farm groups, nonfarm interests crying "bread tax" were able to effect a change in the wheat program which is in direct contravention to the long sought-after goal of our farmers of a fair return from the marketplace. That original provision, which was in the bill when I voted for it in committee, and which would have made a fair return from the marketplace possible, was stricken from the bill by agreement and capitulation to nonfarm interests. As a result we now have what amounts to the most costly wheat program ever devised, and the drain will be on the Treasury. Our wheatgrowers certainly can use the income, Mr. Speaker, there is no question about that. But they wanted their income from the marketplace, not out of Uncle Sam's pocket. Now, with hat in hand, they will have to come to the Appropriations Committees.

This is, however, an omnibus bill, with many programs. Most of them are good and certainly better than when the bill was first before the House. Because of this, I will support the conference report.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] 2 minutes.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I might say at the outset that it is always a pleasure to follow a lady such as Mrs. MAY. I rise in support of the conference report.

THE CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, the cropland adjustment program has a broad and long-term significance for nonfarm people, especially those interested in conservation, wildlife, and the preservation of natural beauty.

The program would provide for better conserving use of up to 40 million acres of surplus cropland that are not needed now to produce farm commodities, and will not be needed for many years to come.

The cropland adjustment program, by devoting substantial amounts of land to long-term conservation practices, would allow extensive planting of trees, shrubs, and permanent, high-quality grasses and legumes that provide an attractive home for pheasants, grouse, quail, and other upland game birds.

The Government would share the cost of establishing new uses for land in the cropland adjustment program. In addition, consideration could be given to higher land rental payments to farmers who are willing to permit use of their land without charge for hunting, for watershed protection or other specific nonfarm benefits through cooperative agreements with local organizations and officials such as State game and fish commissions. Also farmers receiving regular rental rates would be permitted to convert their cropland to recreation use, for a fee as a supplement to other farm income.

One of the methods used to help farmers adjust their production of crops in surplus supply through commodity programs is the diversion of cropland to conserving uses on a year-to-year basis. The cropland adjustment program would supplement the commodity programs by providing for diversion of cropland on a long-term basis.

Diversion of cropland on a long-term basis can be accomplished at a lower cost than through annual commodity programs. Savings from cropland adjustment program as compared with annual diversion programs are expected to be in the range of $4 to $5 million per million acres contracted. If the program is built up to about 40 million acres after 5 years, it could reduce dependence on annual programs for diversion and save up to $200 million a year.

I have a question that I should like to pose to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] with reference to the cropland adjustment section. It is my understanding that in the first year of the operation of this program, you must put 100 percent of one allotment crop into the program, and that thereafter it can be on a percentage basis.

Mr. POAGE. That is correct.

This allows 100 percent of an allotted crop this coming year. After that time the Secretary may prescribe the percentage that is required, with the idea he will learn, with a year of experience, about what is going to be needed.

Mr. DOLE. In other words, a man with a 40-acre feed grain base and a 100-acre wheat allotment could put in the 40 acres of feed grains plus some additional wheat acreage, is that correct?

Mr. POAGE. That is correct.

Mr. DOLE. I have one other question, relating particularly to producers who were not producing feed grains in 1959 and 1960. Was any provision made for the relief of these people? Were the base years extended, or discussed?

Mr. POAGE. No, we did not change the law on that. It is the same it has been.

Mr. DOLE. In other words, the existing law remains the same.

Mr. POAGE. They would have the same opportunity as now to participate in the growth factor.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the gentleman. In my opinion, the cropland adjustment program will be well received throughout the country, and I am certain we all trust that it is administered in such a a way as to attract broad participation.

I do regret that changes were not made in the feed grain sections, particularly with reference to the regulation providing that the normal conserving base for a farm shall be the average acreage on the farm devoted to conserving uses during the base years 1959–60. I appreciate the fact the conferees considered this and trust that perhaps next year some relief can be provided.

Without question, the conferees have labored long and hard, and even those who did not sign the conference report would indicate the legislation embodied in the report is better than that passed by either the House or Senate earlier.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Olson].

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the House Agriculture Committee [Mr. Cooley], in his opening remarks, presented us with a very excellent statement regarding the efforts of the Agriculture Committees in the House and the Senate and the entire membership in behalf of agriculture in this session.

As a member of the committee, I know how diligently my colleagues applied themselves in presenting this legislation. No one can realistically believe that this farm bill has fulfilled completely the requirements of those who produce the commodities which are affected. Since our criticisms of any such deficits will at this time serve no good purpose I shall rather confine my remarks to the areas of progress.

First, and very important, is the fact that this act adds to and extends our farm programs for 4 years. My colleagues who do not represent a farming area, I am sure, cannot fully appreciate how significant this is. Last year, a large area of the district I represent suffered one of the most severe droughts in a quarter century. This year, only a few days ago, the same farmers saw as high as 60 percent of their crop lost because of a killing frost before the crop matured. I know I speak for the farmers of my district when I express appreciation for a 4-year farm program, thus removing the anticipation caused by not knowing what the immediate future might hold in the way of a farm program.

The additional income provided in the feed grains and wheat programs will go to pay operating costs for many producers in my district that might otherwise be unpaid or be an obligation that would merely increase because of interest costs. You notice that I specifically mention the payment of operating costs. These dollars are spent with the local businessman who can provide better service to the community with dollars in the till rather than I O U's.

This farm bill is not only important to the farmers and those who serve them directly, but it will play an important role in a healthy national economy. About one-fifth of the value of our trade with other nations is generated through agricultural commodities.

The House Agriculture Committee refined and improved farm programs that have been effective and thus we are assured that this legislation provides the framework upon which a long-range program can continue to improve income for our Nation's farmers. The feed grains program has since its enactment in 1961 proven to all those who were in doubt that incentives and administration could reduce our burdensome surpluses while increasing farm income. The surpluses are for all practical purposes gone while farm prices have continued to climb from the low point of the prefeed grains program. The correction of the feed grain supply and price situation has also resulted in current livestock prices being the highest received in many years.

It is difficult to imagine anyone being able to interpret this record as being adverse to the best interests of our farmers and the Nation as a whole.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Latta].

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to see that the conference report continues to discriminate against the producers of Soft Red Winter wheat. This conference report will permit wheat certificates on only 45 percent of their production, and it completely ignores the fact that 76 percent of the production of Soft Red Winter wheat is used domestically.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the conference report, because I believe by and large it is better than the bill which passed the House.

For instance, on the cropland adjustment program I believe we have an even better program here, as it is explained on pages 35 and 36 of the report. This will give more emphasis to hunting and fishing and to the kind of utilization of the land nonfarmers will be interested in. It will provide for long-range land retirement, the most economical way to bring about a balance of supply and demand, and at the same time be more acceptable to the nonfarm public who pay so much of the taxes on this program.

I would say, however, there is one part of this new bill about which I am disappointed. That is the revised feed grain program and the permission of the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce the loan below 65 percent of parity. It is interesting to me to see the Democratic majority now pushing down feed grain prices by pushing down the loan on feed grains, as I remember the battles we had in the Midwest about preventing low feed grain prices because low feed grain prices mean low livestock prices.

All we can do now is hope that the Secretary of Agriculture will use his authority more wisely than he has in the past and will not put the loan down and then ram the market price down by using the low resale formula, which would surely be a hardship to the farmers in my area and the whole Midwest, who for one reason or another find it impossible to participate in the feed grain program.

I remind Members that the feed grain program is different from the wheat or cotton or other programs which have had mandatory controls in the past. Because of this the history of production in the years 1959 and 1960 were completely arbitrary, not necessarily meaningful in the next 4 years and will cause an even more undue hardship on some feed grain farmers and total income of these farmers.

In the time I have remaining there is one point I should like to cover. I heard the colloquy between the gentleman from California [Mr. Hagen], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage], on the dairy section.

I have a question. In the event that in a regulated market with a class 1 base plan a handler receives a part of his milk from regulated producers and a part of it from a handler in another area who has unregulated producers, it is my understanding it would not be possible for them to allocate a base to a producer who was in the regulated area greater than any production which he made in the previous period on which the base is determined.

I see you shaking your head. Maybe I can ask the question a little more simply. Suppose there was more class 1 base to pass around than there was actually production for class 1 purposes in the Federal order during the period of time on which the bases were to be established. It is my understanding there was no intention that any producer should receive a higher base than he actually produced during this representative period. Is that correct?

Mr. POAGE. If the gentleman will yield, I am sure that was the intention. Although I do not understand that there is anything in the law stating that you could not give a base based on 110 percent of previous production so long as it was the same for all of the producers. It simply says that you may use a past period of production as the base on which you calculate. I think you can calculate up as well as down, although this is an improbable situation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. QUIE. But there was no intention, as I understand it, for a higher base to be given than the dairy farmer previously produced.

Mr. POAGE. Certainly there was no intention to give anybody more base than they could use. There was certainly no intention of that sort, and I cannot conceive of the situation working out as the gentleman suggested. However, I can say there was no intention to give a man more than he could use.

Mr. QUIE. I thank you.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Abbitt].

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the conferees have worked out a much improved farm bill. It goes a long way toward helping to solve some of our problems, and I propose to support it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to yield now to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Purcell] as much time as he may require, but before I do so I want to compliment the gentleman, as he was the chairman of the Subcommittee on Wheat which did such a wonderful job and he worked very hard on it.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much. I would like to direct a question to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage] in regard to the provisions now in the cotton bill. As I understand the law, we have always had a prohibition against grazing diverted acres in the wheat and feed grain sections of the law other than under drought conditions or adverse circumstances. Is it my understanding that the same provisions exactly would now apply to cotton on grazing diverted acres?

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly my understanding. There will be no grazing allowed on any diverted acres except in the case of these emergency situations such as a drought where the Secretary makes that kind of a finding.

Mr. PURCELL. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Dorn].

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished, able, and illustrious chairman of the Agricultural Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley], the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage], and each member of this great Committee on Agriculture have earned the gratitude of all of us in working out an agreement with the other body to provide for the American people the best agricultural bill in history.

Mr. Cooley has again accomplished the impossible. He and his committee have done a magnificent job. This bill is the result of long hard hours and dedicated efforts on the part of the members of this committee and of the Agriculture Committee in the other body.

When this bill becomes law, it will serve the best interests of the American consumer, the American farmer, industry, and labor. For the first time in many years the American people can look forward to the same program for 4 years. They can plan accordingly. This bill will promote stability. The textile industry and their employees can now look to the future with assurance. The textile industry the last few years has been through one of its most trying periods in history. The industry and its employees were faced with foreign imports, outmoded machinery, tax burdens, and with their competitors abroad buying American cotton at 8½ cents per pound less than the textile manufacturer in the United States could buy the same cotton.

With an understanding leadership here in Washington the employees of the textile industry are now fully employed and face a bright future. It is now possible, with one-price cotton assured for another 4 years, that air conditioning and modernizing of mills will continue. Improved working conditions will be the order of the day. It will now be possible for our great industry to expand, grow, and compete. Under this legislation the textile industry will help keep the cotton farmer in business by being able to purchase and use more cotton.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great day for many of us who have been in the thick of the fight to save our textile industry and our cotton farmers. For me personally, it has been a long trying experience beginning in 1953.

Today I am delighted and happy and again wish to thank my colleagues as my people face the future with optimism.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMillan].

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the conferees for approving the one-price cotton system contained in this bill. I think the omnibus farm bill has been improved since it left the House.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to my colleague from South Carolina [Mr. Gettys].

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of Mr. McMillan and Mr. Dorn, my South Carolina colleagues, and congratulate and commend Chairman Cooley and other House conferees for the wonderful job they have done on this omnibus farm bill which means so much to farmers and textile workers and the textile industry of my district.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Nelsen].

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, referring to this conference report, I would like to point out that in the area that I represent, about 70 percent of the farm income is from sales of livestock products—milk, pork, and beef. Many of the farmers who live in my area do not even have a feed grains base for reasons sometimes hard to understand. If the loan level is to be dropped and the compensatory payment is to make up the difference, which some cannot get because they have no base, then these particular farmers are in competition with finished products in a market of depressed feed grains prices.

I believe this problem can be solved if the Secretary exercises proper judgment. But I am not sure that he will because it seems that his attitude is that if the price is depressed, the farmer is forced into the program, which he cannot get into because he has no base.

I wish someone would build a record here that would indicate that it should be incumbent upon the committee to see to it at least that a farmer can participate in the feed grains program, which many have been denied the opportunity to do. If we depress the price of feed grains, the farmer who raises his own grain for his own livestock products will be driven off the farm. The very backbone of the Midwest is being damaged by this type of administration.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with this conference report on H.R. 9811 now before the House, I would like to include my remarks on a phase of this bill which were prepared for delivery at a meeting of the Rhode Island section of American Association of Textile Chemists and Colorists:

THE CONSUMER IS THE BOSS

(Remarks of U.S. Representative John E. Fogarty, Second Congressional District, Rhode Island, before the "Management Night" meeting of the Rhode Island section of American Association of Textile Chemists and Colorists, at the Wannamoisett Country Club, East Providence, R.I., on September 17, 1965)

When your committee was putting together tonight's program and asked me for a title to head up the remarks I would make here, I must confess I was a bit puzzled how best to sum up my ideas in one line.

In these situations, all sorts of fancy thoughts occur—you know, the ringing phrase, the colorful adjective—but usually commonsense—someone else's, if not mine, prevails, and we manage to get down to the basics.

Thus, the title, "The Consumer Is the Boss."

Now, that may sound too simple. I realize that. But, I chose that all-too-simple title because it describes precisely what I want to say. It describes an old, even trite, thought that most of you, I am sure, think you have in mind all the time.

A close look at events in the textile field generally, however, causes me to wonder very seriously if the textile industry at its very top echelon really is thinking that the consumer is boss.

I am not talking here about design, texture, color, and factors of that kind because I am sure that those of you who are professionals in this field must of necessity have the consumer in mind for the very good reason that if you don't, the salesmen can't sell the stuff.

My concern, rather, is with the overall outlook of the textile industry, particularly as it applies to cotton and the relationship of that natural product to the manmade fibers, the synthetics.

My concern is—and has been—with the role Government is playing in the decision which ultimately can be made only by the consumer.

During the past 18 months I have seen the cotton textile industry swallow its pride and go down to Washington to beg for a Government subsidy. And, I have seen this same textile industry get that subsidy, despite my own opposition and that of many other Members of the Congress.

During the current year, it is costing the American taxpayer about $600 million to pay that subsidy; next year, it probably will cost nearly $1 billion to make the Government payments.

All the while, the price of cotton goods to consumers has risen—despite all the promises and pledges of 18 months ago that prices would drop if only the Government would help. All the while, cotton exports have dropped to one of the lowest levels in history. As a result, cotton surpluses in Government warehouses are at nearly an alltime high.

The cotton textile industry argues that the situation would have been far worse without Government subsidies; that the subsidy has helped raise wages, and that the use of cotton domestically has climbed.

I am not impressed by any of these statements. Personally, I don't think the cotton situation possibly could be much worse. I think that raises given labor in the textile mills were justly earned on the basis of increased productivity, and I well know that those who claim an increased utilization of cotton at the domestic level are—intentionally in some cases—trying to fool the public.

Of course, the use of cotton has risen, but—and this is most significant—the use of synthetics has climbed at an even faster pace. In other words, our increased population is demanding more cloth, but that stronger demand is favoring synthetics more than cotton—and now don't we really know the consumer is the boss, no matter what the Government does.

What particularly disturbs me is that this tremendous subsidy to textile mills is a double subsidy. It is a subsidy to offset for manufacturers a subsidy we, the Government, already is paying cotton growers. Even as I describe the situation at the moment, I find myself wondering, how silly can we get?

Here we are, paying a subsidy to farmers and then turning around to pay a subsidy to textile mills to offset the subsidy we are paying to the farmers. You've heard of a dog chasing his tail.

I make these statements in the full knowledge that it was the Government which put textile manufacturers in the disadvantageous position of being forced to pay more for cotton than their foreign competitors had to pay. I know that. I know that when the U.S. Department of Agriculture increased the farm supports for cotton in 1961, U.S. textile mills were compelled to pay more than 8 cents a pound more for cotton than foreign mills. I know this is a great injury to U.S. mills.

But, I also know that this increase in the farm support price of cotton was done by an executive order from the Secretary of Agriculture, and that it could have been undone in exactly the same way. I know that American textile mills were injured, but I maintained then—and do now—that the textile mills took a cowardly way out of the problem.

This brings me to the point in my little talk where I must put up or shut up. I realize that if I harshly criticize a Government program—and private industry for being part of that program—I have the responsibility to suggest another approach.

I make no presumption that I am an expert in the field of textiles, but I think we must analyze the basic problem honestly to approach a good solution.

It seems to me that the root of our problem started many years ago in the payment of large Government subsidies to cotton farmers. In those days, those subsidies may have been necessary, but, as is usually the case with Government handouts, they became larger as time passed.

And so, for more than 35 years Government has been paying a subsidy to cotton farmers.

Looking at the record makes me wonder why.

Do you know, for example, that despite a tremendous growth in our own population, right now the United States is producing less cotton than it was in 1925? About 1 million bales less each year.

Do you know that all the foreign countries now producing cotton are producing three times more cotton than they did in 1925?

Forty years ago, the United States had 50 percent of the cotton acreage of the world. Today, the United States has 17 percent of the cotton acreage of the world.

And, all sorts of experts try to tell me that this is progress; that things would be worse if the Government had not interfered. I repeat, "How silly can we get?"

I suppose things could get worse if we continue to interfere in this situation. I suppose that if Government keeps its heavy hand in the picture—and if the textile industry continues to lobby for the wrong legislation—we well might succeed in making cotton a museum piece. I can imagine that the synthetic advocates among you might cheer, but I happen to believe the longtime best interests of the Nation rest with keeping cotton as a vital fiber—if we can.

I am well aware that this year's legislation cuts back the textile mill cotton subsidy and pays a heavier subsidy to the cotton growers. I am also well aware that the cotton textile mills fostered this change because, actually, they have been ashamed to be caught with such a large, sticky hand in the cookie jar. So, they propose putting a light-fingered touch on the Government, and making the cottongrower's hand even more sticky than it has been.

It all adds up to cheaper cotton to the mills—cheaper to the mills, but not to the taxpayers.

Relatively, the cotton textile industry has been a recent feeder at the public trough; the cotton-growing industry has been a longtime feeder. But, it was the bill of 18 months ago that first inaugurated for cotton the idea of a compensatory payment for cottongrowers. This, as you know, is the plan that makes cotton producers directly dependent upon a Government handout for a good part of their livelihood.

We have only to look at the woolen producers to see a classic example of what will happen to any industry that long allows Government—instead of consumers—to make decisions.

The woolen producers of this Nation have been receiving compensatory payments for 10 years. Here, it is said, the theory is a bit different because we do not produce nearly enough wool for our needs, while cotton is a crop in tremendous surplus.

But, with all that, look at what happened to producers of wool.

Production of shorn wool in the 10th year of this program is 6 percent below that of a year ago, while that of shorn and pulled wool, combined, was 12 percent less. On the other hand, imports of woolen textile products in the 10th year are up 129 percent and total domestic consumption was up about 8 percent. That, too, I am told, is "progress", but is it?

Now, then, to my idea of an approach to cotton: It is crystal clear to me that our problem is our own national approach to cotton production.

We in this country—in mills as well as on farms—have refused to admit the very obvious fact that the technology of cotton production has changed; that the days of 40 acres of cotton and a mule long since have—or should have—gone.

Cotton, we find, when we look, has gone west to the irrigated lands of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California—to irrigated lands where moisture can be combined, at will, to produce cotton in quantities per acre undreamed of by the man with 40 acres and a mule.

With this improvement in technology has come more economic production.

But we as a nation have refused to allow the efficient producers of cotton to produce the cotton for our Nation.

We, as a nation, have decided as a matter of national policy that we must perpetuate the man with a mule and 40 acres. Again, why? Because there are more of these men with 40 acres and a mule.

I know it doesn't take much courage for me—a Democrat from Rhode Island—to criticize the southern politicians who all these years have been fighting a rear guard action to keep their smaller cotton farmers on the land, but I submit that the textile industry of this Nation would be in a much healthier position tonight if it had recognized that factor long ago, and if it had demonstrated the courage to fight for what it thinks right. Wouldn't this be better than going to Washington to ask for a handout?

Why is cotton in trouble? It is simple. It is in trouble because we have made growing cotton a matter of Government right; we have made it a Government right by handing out these terrible things called cotton allotments.

Not satisfied with that, we have prevented the efficient growers from obtaining the cotton allotments they need to grow cotton at low cost, and so we have pushed up the production price so that foreign countries can't afford to buy our cotton unless we pay a subsidy.

And so we wind up with a double subsidy, one for the grower, one for the mill, but nothing for the taxpayer.

I am told by those who know that if we as a nation had the courage to face up to facts, we would find that the irrigated lands of the West could grow all the cotton we need at a price that would need no Government subsidy at all to move in the world market.

And why shouldn't this be so? Aren't we the most efficient agricultural producers the world has ever known? Of course we are.

Yet we refuse to allow those who can produce cotton efficiently to do so.

In my years of looking at this problem, I have had much reason to shake my head in wonderment.

During these last months, my wonderment has become even greater. Somehow, I know that the executives of the cotton textile industry know better than to ask for handouts. Once in a while, in a moment of utter frankness, some of these executives have admitted to me that mill subsidies do not make much sense.

Then why, I must ask, have not the mills fought in the Halls of Congress for a program that will allow the efficient cotton producers of this country to grow that cotton, without Government subsidy of all kinds? Why?

If these cotton textile mills can lobby efficiently enough to get these vast sums of money from the Congress—and the taxpayers—should they not turn their efficiency to production of a sane cotton policy?

I know this cannot be altered in 1 day—or even 1 year—but if the cotton textile mills persist in their blind rush for more and more Government handouts, they are sowing the seeds of their own destruction. They are selling themselves short for a paltry bag of gold.

I say all of this because we all know that people on Government dole have no incentive to produce more efficiently, to produce better products. Drug the industry long enough with Government handouts, and the synthetic producers will jump with glee.

Produce inferior cotton textiles, and the consumer will tell you—surely and quickly—that she indeed is the boss.

In short, I say that it would be much cheaper for the Federal Government to give real, honest-to-goodness handouts to those small, inefficient cotton producers.

That done, I then would turn loose the efficient cotton producers of the Nation. My wager is that these efficient producers would put cotton into our mills at a price competitive anywhere in the world. And then, the Federal Government could get out of the cotton business.

Certainly, the cotton producers of this Nation are not producing for consumers right now. They are producing for Government warehouses. If that is allowed to continue, the consumer will turn increasingly to synthetics because the competition of that industry remains high and vibrant.

My message to the cotton textile mills is "wake up" or the consumer will really show you who is boss.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965.

The conferees on the omnibus farm bill have hammered out a most excellent measure that is in the best interest of all of the people of this Nation. In accepting this proposal today, the House of Representatives will voice its concurrence with the generally favorable attitude of farmers, laborers, and businessmen toward this needed enabling legislation. The bill thus approved will continue a highly effective and popular program. With some modifications added to already good legislation, this measure will give the Department of Agriculture new and more adequate tools with which to handle the agricultural management problems that continue to face it.

The members of the conference committee are to be highly commended for the diligent work which they performed and for the development of this very fine piece of legislation.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant as Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 219, nays 150, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 359]

YEAS—219

Abbitt
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N Dak.
Annunzio
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Bandstra
Barrett
Battin
Beckworth
Berry
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bonner
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Callan
Callaway
Carter
Casey
Chelf
Clevenger
Conyers
Cooley
Craley
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Delaney
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Farbstein
Farnsley
Fascell
Feighan
Fisher
Flynt
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gettys
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Hamilton
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harris
Hathaway
Hawkins
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Jennings
Johnson, Okla.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kornegay
Landrum
Langen
Leggett
Love
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
MacGregor
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Mize
Moeller
Moorhead
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nelsen
Nix
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen. Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Patten
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Purcell
Quie
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reifel
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Scott
Secrest
Senner
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Smith, Iowa
Stalbaum
Steed
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Todd
Trimble
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vigorito
Vivian
Walker, N. Mex.
Watson
Watts
Weltner
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Yates
Young

NAYS—150

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Ashbrook
Baldwin
Baring
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Cahill
Cameron
Cederberg
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Fallon
Farnum
Findley
Fogarty
Ford, Gerald R.
Fulton, Pa.
Garmatz
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hechler
Herlong
Horton
Hutchinson
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Krebs
Kunkel
Laird
Latta
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
Macdonald
Machen
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Michel
Minshall
Monagan
Moore
Morris
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Nedzi
O'Brien
Ottinger
Passman
Pelly
Pike
Pirnie
Pucinski
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
St Germain
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Selden
Shipley
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stanton
Stratton
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Whalley
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wydler
Younger
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—63

Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Arends
Ayres
Bates
Bolling
Brock
Broomfield
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Carey
Celler
Chamberlain
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cunningham
Dawson
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Evans, Colo.
Fino
Flood
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Gilligan
Halpern
Hardy
Hays
Hébert
Holifield
Holland
Hosmer
Joelson
Johnson, Pa.
Kelly
Keogh
Kluczynski
Lennon
Lindsay
Long, La.
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Murray
O'Hara, Ill.
Patman
Pepper
Powell
Reinecke
Rivers, S.C.
Saylor
Smith, N.Y.
Stafford
Staggers
Stephens
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tuck
Utt
Vanik
Wyatt

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Stafford against.

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Lindsay against.

Mr. Gilligan for, with Mr. Utt against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Fino against.

Mrs. Kelly for, with Mr. Frelinghuysen against.

Mr. Tuck for, with Mr. Reinecke against.

Mr. Lennon for, with Mr. Martin of Alabama against.

Mr. Carey for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Martin of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Halpern against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Hosmer against.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina for, with Mr. Del Clawson against.

Mr. Joelson for, with Mr. Wyatt against.

Mr. Holland for, with Mr. Saylor against.

Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Broomfield against.

Mr. Kluczynski for, with Mr. Bates against.

Mr. Flood for, with Mr. Ayres against.

Mr. Evans of Colorado for, with Mr. Chamberlain against.

Mr. Duncan of Oregon for, with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Clark for, with Mr. Vanik against.

Mr. Cabell for, with Mr. Hardy against.

Mr. Dawson for, with Mr. Staggers against.

Mr. O'Hara of Illinois for, with Mr. Dulski against.

Mr. Pepper for, with Mr. Downing against.

Mr. Patman for, with Mr. Cunningham against.

Mr. Stephens for, with Mr. Anderson of Illinois against.

Mr. Fraser for, with Mr. Smith of New York against.

Until further notice:

Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Brock.

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Murray.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the conference report just agreed to on H.R. 9811.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2118) entitled "An act to amend sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. DOMINICK, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

STOCKPILE DISPOSAL PROGRAM

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, recently, the House passed H.R. 11096, a bill providing for the disposal of three items of excess materials from the national and supplemental stockpiles. This is the last stockpile disposal bill which I will bring before you this session of Congress. In so doing, I am happy to report that this disposal action will net the Government approximately $17,600,000, if the market prices remain firm.

I also wish to report that the subcommittee of which I have the honor to head, the Armed Services Committee, and the House of Representatives have acted favorably on every legislative proposal for disposal of excess materials which the executive branch of the Government has submitted to us this session. While certain of these administrative proposals were amended after thorough hearings to increase or decrease the amounts proposed, none of the proposals were rejected. In addition, the committee has reported out and the House of Representatives has acted on every single stockpile bill introduced by a Member of this House on which a favorable report was received from the executive branch of the Government.

The result is that the House of Representatives has passed 15 separate bills providing for the disposal of 25 different excess materials. The acquisition cost of the materials authorized for disposal totals approximately $1 billion.

We, who are charged with the responsibility of hearing and recommending a course of action in regard to the stockpile disposal program, are cognizant of the tremendous responsibility placed upon us.

We have attempted to produce sound legislation. We always seek to avoid, insofar as possible, any loss to the Government. We have strived equally hard to avoid any disruption in the market—and in no instance that we know—have there been any disruptions in the market. We have urged the administration to present a program for the prompt and orderly disposal of excess materials. We have attempted to accommodate business and industry, which, in these times of present shortages, have urgent need for such materials from the stockpiles.

And yet, at the same time, we have assured ourselves that the disposals from our stockpiles have not in any way impaired our national security.

I believe I would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to express not only my personal gratitude but also the appreciation of the members of the subcommittee and the Armed Services Committee for the reception which each of you in this august assembly, have given our legislative program in this area.

As you know, most of this legislation has passed under rules providing for unanimous consent, and in the few instances where the bills were enacted under the suspension of the rules, there were no dissenting votes to the disposal actions.

We of the committee are naturally deeply grateful to the House for the support given us in making the stockpile disposal procedures so very successful and effective.

We believe that this program has been helpful to the Government, to business and those employed in industry and is in the national interest.

Again, I express my appreciation for the confidence you have shown in this vital area of our work.

GOP TASK FORCE ON THE FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE MERIT SYSTEM

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the first anniversary of the Civil Service Commission's vigorous lack of action, its immobile mobility in resolving certain political arm-twisting cases I brought to its attention. One year ago today the Civil Service Commission advised me several Government officials in the Rural Electrification Administration were involved in illegal violations of Federal law and promised action. Since then, the Civil Service Commission has shown itself highly adept at the progressive stall, the retreating advance. It has proved with what massive minuteness it can march forward backward stealthily. Its sudden burst of inaction, its speedy slowpace, are monuments to diligent enforcement of Federal laws protecting our Federal civil service. The vigor with which the Commission has gone nowhere is remarkable, indeed.

Nor should we neglect the FBI which also investigated these charges. The alacrity with which the frozen scales of justice have not moved in the Justice Department should provide the American people with great reassurance.

Mr. Speaker, we are forced to conclude from all this that such stationary leaps as these two agencies of Government have demonstrated are no doubt the result of a political charley horse.

In a more serious vein, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from New York, Congressman Goodell, for today appointing me as chairman of the special GOP task force on the Federal civil service merit system. I can assure the gentleman, and my colleagues here in this body, that I and the other members of our task force will do our best to bring about a more forceful implementation of Federal civil service laws protecting the Federal work force.

It will be our purpose to explore all possible ways to protect Federal workers from arm-twisting pressures applied for political purposes, including shakedowns for campaign funds. We intend to investigate any charges of political manipulation brought to our attention. We will also explore the ways and means our Federal laws might be strengthened to assure that self-seeking and politically motivated Government officials keep their hands off our public servants and their pocketbooks.

We welcome this opportunity to serve. Any Federal worker subjected to such harassment is invited to bring his problem to our attention.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 11, 1965

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader concerning the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I do.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished Republican leader, we have finished the legislative business for this week and it is my intention to ask to go over upon the conclusion of the announcement of the program.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District Day and there are seven bills:

H.R. 11487, District of Columbia revenue bill;

S. 1320, to amend certain criminal laws;

S. 1715, penalties for assaulting employees of penal and correctional institutions;

H.R. 11428, Washington Channel waterfront priority holders;

S. 1719, overtime pay for police.

H.R. 10497, increasing criminal penalties for certain telephone calls; and

H.R. 11439, increasing annuities to retired teachers.

There are also four travel authority resolutions from the Committee on Rules, as follows:

House Resolution 593, Committee on the Judiciary;

House Resolution 594, Committee on Public Works;

House Resolution 595, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; and

House Resolution 596, Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, S. 2294, extension of the Wheat Agreement Act, open rule, 1 hour of debate; and House Resolution 602, dismissing the contested election in the Third Congressional District of Iowa, Peterson against Gross.

On Tuesday and Wednesday we have H.R. 11135, Sugar Act Amendments of 1965. This will come to the House under a closed rule, waiving points of order, but making in order the offering of two amendments by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley], with 4 hours of general debate.

H.R. 10065, the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1965, which comes with an open rule and 2 hours of general debate.

On Thursday there are eight unanimous-consent bills of the Committee on Ways and Means, and they are as follows:

H.R. 327, exempting from taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations operated to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations;

H.R. 7723, suspension of duty, certain tropical hardwoods;

H.R. 8210, amending the International Organizations Immunities Act;

H.R. 8436, dutiable status of watches, clocks, and so forth, from insular possessions of the United States;

H.R. 8445, retired pay, Tax Court judges;

H.R. 11216, tariff treatment of articles assembled abroad;

H.R. 10625, tax treatment of certain amounts paid to certain members and former members of uniformed services and to their survivors; and

H.R. 6319, tax treatment of expropriation loss recoveries.

For Friday and the balance of the week, the supplemental appropriation bill for 1966.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to advise the House that the leadership will request the indulgence of Members that we may have flexibility in rearranging the program during next week, as it is obvious that we are trying to finish the business of the House. We shall try to keep Members advised from day to day of any changes in or additions to the program.

May I advise further that there are 2 days when we expect not to have any rollcall votes except on procedural matters. One is Tuesday, when we will have only general debate on the sugar bill, and Thursday, when several bills will be brought up under unanimous consent.

This announcement is made, of course, subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit me to ask a question at this point?

Mr. ALBERT. Of course.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. If we follow this schedule, the Sugar Act amendments will be brought up and the rule will be passed and the debate concluded on Tuesday, and then we shall go over and finish that bill on Wednesday; and subsequent to that take up the Equal Employment Opportunity Act?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct. Wednesday, of course, is a very heavy day. We expect to finish the work on the sugar bill and to handle the Equal Employment Opportunity Act.

COMMITTEE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia have until midnight October 9 to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER UNTIL MONDAY, OCTOBER 11

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, would the distinguished minority leader yield in order that I may propound a question to the distinguished majority leader?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I wonder what would be the basis for not having any votes other than on procedural matters on two of the days, what those days will be, and so forth.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished gentleman from Michigan will yield further, I am glad the gentleman from Missouri has brought that matter up.

Tuesday is Columbus Day. It is a day in which some Members of the House have a particular interest and, of course, all Members of the House are vitally interested in that day.

Thursday is President Eisenhower's birthday and I believe there are some Members of the House who will have an interest in that day. I know I for one do.

In the spirit of the great bipartisan harmony which was displayed last night, we will all want to salute the great former President of the United States.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished minority leader will yield further, I would hope that the distinguished majority leader's prediction will be closer to coming true than his very erudite assumption when I finally withdrew my reservation of objection about coming in yesterday morning at 11 o'clock, wherein he stated that the intention was to complete the bill on Friday. I had no idea that there was to be a continuous session, but in fact that prediction was correct and we did finish it on Friday.

I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding.

IMMIGRATION ACT

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the immigration reform bill the President signed into law at the base of the Statue of Liberty is a historic piece of legislation welding this Nation to its historic ideals of equality and justice.

The action of the Congress and the President in bringing this measure into force is significant for reasons both symbolic and practical. We are moving to strike away harmful racial and ethnic boundaries in our society. The new law is a step toward that goal, for it replaces a law that for two decades has violated the principles on which America was founded and grew strong.

The 40-year-old national origins system we have replaced had little support either in logic or in principle, and it demeaned our Nation. In allocating quotas according to the supposed national origins of the American population of 1920, it favored immigrants from the countries of northern Europe and discriminated against those from everywhere else.

The quota for Ireland, for example, was larger than that for all of Asia. The quota for Switzerland was larger than for all the nations of Africa. Because of discrepancies such as this, quotas assigned northern European countries often remained unfilled, while other countries had long waiting lists.

The implications of the national origins quota system remained undisguised—it openly suggested that one kind of ancestry is better than another, that a person from England is nine times more acceptable than one from Poland or 12 times more acceptable than one from Italy.

This is an implication which was rejected by four American Presidents before Lyndon B. Johnson—from President Woodrow Wilson who vetoed the first bill to John Kennedy. It is an implication which America has finally put to rest.

In so doing we have asserted anew our confidence in the strength of our traditions of equality—traditions that are inseparable from the very origins of our country. Indeed, not only did the Declaration of Independence affirm that "all men are created equal," some of the very grievances that caused it to be written were the restrictions imposed on immigration to the Colonies by the British Crown.

From the very beginning America was thrown open to all equally. Thomas Jefferson spoke for his countrymen when he asked "Shall we refuse to the unhappy fugitives from distress that hospitality which the savages of the wilderness extended to our fathers arriving in this land? Shall oppressed humanity find no asylum on this globe?"

Oppressed humanity did find asylum in the New World. The settlers of our land came from many countries, so that America was formed both by the unity of their uprooting and the diversity of their cultures.

The diversity and unity are still reflected in our society today. We are now an amalgam, a people different from any other. At the same time, we are proud of the diversity within our country that reflects the many nations from which we came.

Men and women of every ethnic background have added to the culture and achievements of our land. Their contribution is not only a thing of the past—it is before us every day. Many of them, and their parents and their grandparents, might not have been able to emigrate here had the national origins quota system been in effect at the time of their migration.

The legislation we have enacted is simple and fair. It retains a limit on total immigration not substantially higher than present limits. But rather than imposing arbitrary limits based on national origin, it chooses among potential immigrants on the basis of their relationship to persons already living in the United States and on the basis of the skills they can bring here. We are now asking those who would come here, "What can you do and what can you contribute?"—not "Where were you born?" The new act preserves health and security safeguards but gives immigrants a preference by their skill, attainments, and training, or by family relationships, and not by ancestry or residence.

This act will, first of all, strengthen the United States domestically. We advance as we allow entrance to men and women who have special skills we need badly. Their talents will help to fill shortages in vital professional fields.

Second, this act will strengthen the United States in its foreign relations. Secretary of State Rusk has pointed out how the discriminatory features of our immigration laws damaged our conduct of foreign policy.

With the signing of this act the sincerity of our belief in the equality of men is no longer open to question.

What we have done also strengthens the morality of our position toward ourselves. We do not ask the men who are fighting in Vietnam what their national origins are before sending them there. We do not ask them whether their names are English or Irish or Italian or Japanese before sending them into action. We do not ask them in what year their ancestors came to America.

This Immigration Act merges our deeds with our faith. By adopting it we have acknowledged that people of every national background and racial origin have built America. And we have made clear our belief that people of every national background and racial origin will continue to contribute to America.

CERTAIN REMARKS MADE BY MR. DOLE, OF KANSAS

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I hope no Member of this House will make any disparaging remarks today about the wife of Representative DOLE, of Kansas, in retaliation for his despicable action on the floor last evening in reference to the First Lady of our land, Mrs. Johnson. I feel strongly that Mrs. Dole, as well as the wives of all men in public service, should be especially commended and honored for the added burdens placed upon them so that their husbands may be privileged to be in public service. I know I owe a great debt of gratitude to my wife, one which I will never be able to completely repay.

It was unfortunate to say the very least that the gentleman from Kansas should have maligned our First Lady in this way at the very moment she was accompanying her husband, our President, to the hospital where he was to undergo major surgery. There is a phrase from a popular song of a few years ago which asked "how low can you go?" I believe that last night the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] showed us how to hit rockbottom.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Not, of course, speaking for the gentleman from Kansas, my very dear and longtime friend, Congressman DOLE, but only speaking for myself I feel the gentleman from New Jersey misinterpreted the motion of the gentleman from Kansas last night. I hope the gentleman will mature and enlarge his sense of humor so that he will be able to take these things as they come without attributing to Members of the House like BOB DOLE ulterior motives and base personal attitudes and intentions. I can assure the gentleman, based on my longtime personal friendship with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], that he neither intended or said anything base or personal.

Mr. HOWARD. I think we might better narrow our sense of humor if enlarging it amounts to including statements like that about our First Lady.

THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time to challenge the correctness of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in an attempt to find out who assumes the authority to expunge from the RECORD proceedings which occur on the floor of the House.

During the proceedings last night following the adoption of the motion made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], wherein debate on title I and all amendments thereto was to close at 8:20 p.m., the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole stated he observed certain Members on their feet desiring to be recognized; and after reading the names from a list, announced that each of those Members would be recognized for 10 seconds.

This statement was expunged from the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, the charge I am making in regard to the failure of the RECORD to reflect what happened in this particular instance is of little importance, but the principle of permitting the RECORD to be changed is a serious matter.

During this session particularly, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is being thrown together not only in a sloppy manner but I maintain it has ceased to be an official record of what actually transpires on the floor of the House but rather has become a misrepresentation of what actually occurs. I believe the public is entitled to know that they cannot read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with any assurance that it is an accurate record of the proceedings of this House.

RESPECT FOR OUR FIRST LADY

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the statement by my colleague from New Jersey to this group a few minutes ago and ask that I be affiliated with and associated with those remarks in the RECORD.

HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, my vote in opposition to the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, S. 2084, was a vote of protest against the dictatorial tactics of this administration in the presentation and consideration of this measure.

Indeed, my sentiments favor the enactment of this legislation and I agree with the major provisions of the bill. However, support of an idea or of a type of legislation should never require the U.S. Congress to renounce its legislative responsibilities. The atmosphere in which this measure was considered was one of pressure and strong will.

As I listened attentatively to the early debates on this measure during the afternoon, I was of the impression that the consideration of amendments and final votes on the measure would deferred until the following day. Indeed, the legislative activity of the week had been so meager that there appeared to be no valid reason for a night session in order to jam this bill through.

In the course of the late afternoon, it appeared that a change of tactics had developed on the Democratic side of the aisle requiring a completion of action on the bill before the Congress could adjourn yesterday. The President and Mrs. Johnson had invited the Members of Congress and their wives to attend a reception at the White House commencing at 7:30 p.m. According to a later news report the change in tactics occurred because the President decided that the Highway Beautification Act should be passed in order that he could sign and present it to Lady Bird Johnson as a triumphal gesture in connection with the White House reception.

The resentment on the part of many Members of the House of Representatives, including most of the Republican Members, at this belittling concept of the legislative function was and is completely understandable. Indeed, the entire spectacle of ignoring or denying debate with regard to well intentioned, and perhaps useful and necessary, amendments was degrading and obviously damaging to the institution of the Congress itself. That such a measure, designed to promote scenic and natural beauty, should be debated and decided in an atmosphere of discord and ugliness on the part of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, is one of the most unfortunate aspects of the 1st session of the 89th Congress. The activity surrounding deliberations on this measure indicated once again that the President is indeed a strong-willed individual.

It is my view that had the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 been thoroughly and regularly considered by the Public Works Committee and debated and voted upon during the regular meeting hours of the Congress—and not the late hours of the night and wee hours of the next morning—the vote and support in behalf of highway beautification would have been near unanimous.

SUGAR BILL

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the amendments I will offer next Wednesday to the sugar bill will help everybody but the profiteers. One would help our balance of payments by about $1 billion by transferring that amount to the U.S. Treasury from excess profits on foreign quotas. The other would sweep away the lobbyists for foreign sugar interests and with them a smog of suspicion that has hung over sugar legislation for years.

These lobbyists are utterly worthless to the Congress. But because of the fantastic fees some of them get, the big money in which they deal, and the way they operate, they tend to give Congress a bad name both at home and abroad.

When I decided to take on these lobbyists and do my best to put them out of business, I suspected sugar interests would be powerful and shrewd. This power and shrewdness is being felt daily—yes hourly—on Capitol Hill. I doubt there is a Member who has not had a message—perhaps several—from influential sources at home urging support for the sugar bill and opposing amendments.

The sugar lobbyists have multi-million-dollar special vested interests to protect. They are experienced at applying pressure where it will get the desired response. They have resources and are resourceful.

How resourceful are those who want to rid Capitol Hill of the odor of sugar lobbyists and cut out profiteering? Frankly, the only hope I see to improve the sugar bill is for the people who want good government to outlobby the sugar lobbyists between now and Wednesday.

SPECIAL GOP TASK FORCE ON THE FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Republican planning and policy committee, I wish to announce the establishment today of a special GOP task force on the Federal civil service system. The gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman ANCHER NELSEN, will serve as chairman. Serving with him will be the gentleman from Virginia, Congressman JOEL T. BROYHILL; the the gentleman from Iowa, Congressman H. R. GROSS; the gentleman from Kansas, Congressman ROBERT DOLE; the gentleman from New York, Congressman CARLETON J. KING.

Mr. Speaker, each of these Members of Congress has demonstrated his unfailing support for a strong civil service merit system, and each has been especially industrious in attempting to correct the alarming abuses of Federal law which have lately become almost commonplace.

Congressman NELSEN's long and persistent effort to expose illegal pressures brought to bear on our Federal workers well qualifies him to serve as chairman of this important task force.

It was a historic milestone in good government when Congressman NELSEN forced the Government to investigate his charges of violations of the Hatch Act and the Corrupt Practices Act.

One year ago today, Congressman NELSEN was notified by the Civil Service Commission that four Federal officials had, indeed, been found to have been "involved" in illegal political shakedowns of civil service subordinates in the Rural Electrification Administration.

Since that time, we of the minority have waited patiently for further investigations to be completed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and for final resolution of these cases by the Civil Service Commission and the FBI. These actions have not been forthcoming.

In view of this, and other clear indications that violations of these laws continue at an ever-growing pace, we are establishing a special GOP Task Force to look further into these despicable practices of political coercion of our public servants.

COPYRIGHT LAW AUTHORITIES AGREE THAT RESIDUAL RIGHTS IN SUCCESSFUL PLAYS ARE WORTH MILLIONS OF DOLLARS; THERE SHOULD BE NO CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN THE WHITE HOUSE

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, despite statements attributed to Roger L. Stevens, cultural adviser, copyright law authorities agree that residual rights in successful Broadway and Hollywood productions are worth millions of dollars.

Since Mr. Stevens is refusing to divest himself of the residual rights to the 150 plays he has produced, and has, according to some reports, suggested that they are only worth $5 to $50, Congress should take a close look at his situation in relation to the new conflict-of-interest rules and regulations just announced by the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

THERE SHOULD BE NO EXCEPTIONS AND FAVORITISM IN THE APPLICATION OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S NEW CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST REGULATIONS

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the present Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, had to sell his Ford Motor Co. stock when he was appointed by President John F. Kennedy as Secretary of the Defense Department. Other Cabinet officers have had to divest themselves of all private holdings before they could be confirmed. The Secretary of Defense under President Eisenhower was required to divest himself of his holdings. This applied to such distinguished Americans as Charles E. Wilson and Neil H. McElroy, who gladly divested themselves of their private holdings in order to serve the American people.

This system, which is central to the confirmation of appointees to high public office by the Senate of the United States, has worked well throughout all the years since the founding of this Republic. It has protected the appointees as well as the citizens of this great country. It has been strongly supported by the Congress and by both major political parties. No one, until now, has challenged this system which is rooted in our Constitution. Appointees to high office have been willing to divest themselves of their private holdings, and have long recognized that such divestment of their private holdings is part of the price of public office. There is a great mass of literature and of precedent on this matter, and it is not necessary to show an actual conflict of interest, but only the possibility of such a conflict.

Now this basic system, which has always operated so well, is being probed and tested. The curious view is being advanced that this system should not apply to all Federal officials, even though President Johnson has just issued an order calling for an end of all private investments, and moonlight employment, which might conflict with the duties and responsibilities of Federal officials and employees. Under these new Civil Service Commission rules, a GS-1 clerk will have to justify the ethics of even such an activity as driving a cab on his day off or during the hours when he is not working for the Federal Government.

However, these same requirements should not apply, according to Roger L. Stevens, to the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts established by the National Arts and Humanities Act, the Special Assistant on the Arts to the President, and the Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. I have received indications that many people, in addition to myself, are deeply disturbed by this case of favoritism and special exception, and the failure to apply the same rules to the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts as is applied to the Secretary of Defense and the GS-1 Federal clerk.

In a statement Mr. Stevens made today he has denied any conflict of interest. I am pleased to include this statement, as well as his biography which he supplied to the Congress in 1962, and a number of items which shed light on the subject, at the end of my remarks.

Since the question of his royalties and residual rights to the 150 plays he has produced has been raised, I would suggest that those who are interested in the matter of royalties and residual rights to successful plays might wish to read such basic textbooks as the following "Nimmer on Copyright," by Prof. Melville B. Nimmer, of the University of California at Los Angeles; "Entertainment Publishing and the Arts," by Alexander Lindey; "This Business of Music," by Sidney Shemel; and "Residual Rights Established by Collective Bargaining in Television and Radio," by Robert W. Gilbert, Law Review of Duke University, winter, 1958.

Residual rights to a commercial play or musical may amount to millions of dollars, not the minimal $5 to $50 suggested, according to some reports, by Roger L. Stevens:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., September 17, 1965.

MR. OSCAR L. WEIR,
President, National Symphony Orchestra Association, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WEIR: I regret that I must resign from the board of the National Symphony Orchestra.

During the recent debate on the House floor, one Congressman raised a point about possible conflict of interest with regard to my being a director of the National Symphony.

This would not be so bad, but there may be problems in this area when the Kennedy Center is completed. When I accepted membership, I thought we could worry about such a situation when the building was finished.

Also, if by chance the National Symphony should qualify for funds under the National Endowment and since the question has already been raised in Congress, the orchestra might be prevented from receiving some necessary money.

Thus, although I deeply regret this action, I must herewith tender by resignation.

Sincerely,

ROGER L. STEVENS,
Special Assistant on the Arts.

OCTOBER 8, 1965.

STATEMENT OF ROGER L. STEVENS

There have been inquiries as to whether there is a conflict of interest in my position as Chairman of the National Council on the Arts and I would like to clear up any possible misconceptions and allegations made during the past few days.

First, there is an important job to be done in the field of the arts and humanities as indicated by the mandate given us by Congress. I am proceeding to the best of my ability and judgment to carry out this responsibility.

I am perfectly willing to declare unequivocably that no organization which I have an affiliation will be entitled to funds from any Government program with which I am associated.

At the time of my appointment as Chairman of the National Council on the Arts I resigned from all business and nonprofit organizations that might have any possible conflict with my present position. The only organizations in the arts with which I am affiliated now are the Metropolitan Opera Association and the American Shakespeare Academy which are nonprofit organizations and any organization I might join would be in the stame category.

I feel in carrying out my duties as Chairman of the National Council on the Arts it is important to be thoroughly familiar with as many developments in the field of the arts as possible by being a member of nonprofit organizations, as long as there is no financial conflict.

There has been some discussion of royalties that may accrue to me from plays. As soon as the first class production of a play is finished, the title of the play reverts to the author. It has been suggested that such royalties be put in trust. This is impossible to do because, as has been stated, the ownership reverts to the author and all control remains in his hands.

I would like to further state that at the time I accepted the position I had many personal commitments including those to employees who have worked with me for many years. I have had to pay very substantial amounts as a result of the continuing deficits incurred by these commitments. I would be glad to open my books to confirm these substantial financial losses.

I have worked 4 years as Chairman of the John F. Kennedy Center without any compensation, traveling a minimum of 250,000 miles for this organization and on behalf of the National Council on the Arts, to bring to the country a greater knowledge of their activities. At least 90 percent of the cost of this travel has been paid personally. For this I expect nothing in return, for I believe it is the duty of every American citizen to serve his country when asked.

As President Johnson has said concerning the arts legislation: "This Congress will consider many programs which will leave an enduring mark on American life. But it may well be that passage of this legislation, modest as it is, will help secure for this Congress a sure and honored place in the story of the advance of our civilization."

I am delighted to serve, to the best of my ability, under his leadership to see that these new programs fulfill the promise for which so many people have worked so long and so hard.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Oct. 6, 1965]

NEW CULTURE CHIEF COMES UNDER FIRE

(By Dom Bonafede)

WASHINGTON.—A dispute is slowly surfacing over Roger L. Stevens, prominent producer and real estate operator who is President Johnson's chief cultural adviser.

With increasing persistency, questions of a possible conflict of interest have been raised in Congress concerning Mr. Stevens' private theater interests and his public position.

Mr. Stevens, who has held an advisory White House position as Chairman of the National Council on the Arts, became the $28,000-a-year Director of the National Endowment for the Arts last Wednesday with the signing of the arts and humanities bill by President Johnson. The bill provides him with a $10 million fund to promote the arts the first year and $61 million over the next 3 years.

Two Republican Congressmen—ALBERT H. QUIE, of Minnesota, and WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of New Jersey—have spoken on the House floor regarding a possible conflict in Mr. Stevens' public and private roles.

Mr. Stevens, however, strongly denies the existence of any conflict and implies that the attacks are motivated by political and personal considerations.

The gist of the Congressmen's criticism is that Mr. Stevens conceivably could use his White House position for the benefit of Broadway productions in which he retains a financial interest.

Mr. Stevens has been producing partner in more than 150 Broadway productions, including "Mary, Mary," "West Side Story," "Cat on a Hot Tin Roof," "Tea and Sympathy," "The Fourposter," "The Bad Seed," "Ondine," "Pleasure of His Company" and "A Man for All Seasons."

He is a director of the Metropolitan Opera Association and Chairman of the John F. Kennedy Center for Performing Arts. He had been a member of the board of directors of the National Symphony Orchestra, but resigned on September 17, 2 days after Representative QUIE told the House during debate on the arts and humanities bill:

"President Johnson himself has put his radio and television properties in trust while he is serving as President. But the Special Assistant on the Arts in the White House, so far as I know, is still receiving royalties from the Broadway farce-comedies in which he has a major interest. His powers as Chairman of this proposed National Endowment for the Arts established by this bill makes it possible for him to receive Federal funds in aid of his own interests in a Broadway theater, if only inadvertently."

The Congressmen are also concerned over the possibility that Mr. Stevens could book plays in which he has a financial interest in 30 regional theaters he hopes to have built in shopping centers throughout the United States.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Oct. 8, 1965]

STEVENS WON'T END INTERESTS

(By Dom Bonafede)

WASHINGTON.—Roger L. Stevens, Broadway theater and real estate entrepreneur who serves as White House cultural adviser, said yesterday he does not plan to divest his theatrical interests in response to conflict of interest charges raised against him.

"There is no reason to divest anything or any reason why I should quit," he commented.

He made the statement as several Republican Congressman continued to raise questions concerning a possible conflict between his public and private activities.

Mr. Stevens, who has been involved in the production of more than 150 Broadway offerings, is Director of the National Endowment for the Arts and Chairman of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

Two Republican Congressmen, WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of New Jersey, and ALBERT H. QUIE, of Minnesota, contended that Mr. Stevens, by virtue of his Federal position, could promote Broadway productions to his own financial interest.

The Congressmen have called on Mr. Stevens to divest himself of his theatrical holdings.

Mr. Stevens, who resigned from the board of the National Symphony, said yesterday he has severed his commercial ties. The latter, he said, includes the City Investing Co., a Washington investment firm which holds the lease on the National Theater, the Capital's foremost house for legitimate drama.

He maintained that Representatives WIDNALL and QUIE did not understand the technicalities of theatrical financing and that he could not cut his ties with the Broadway productions because of his obligation to the stockholders.

"I am not in control. When a play leaves Broadway the title reverts to the author," he commented. He continues to receive revenue, he said, if a play is produced in summer stock or on the road.

He said he resigned from the National Symphony for reasons other than the appearance of a conflict of interest.

Representatives QUIE and WIDNALL have also taken issue with a provision in the arts and humanities bill which assures Mr. Stevens his position with the endowment fund without Senate confirmation. The provision provides that the Chairman of the National Council on the Arts does not need Senate approval if he is also appointed to the endowment fund. Mr. Stevens heads the Arts Council, a White House advisory group.

Mr. WIDNALL yesterday implied that Mr. Stevens, a members of the board of the Metropolitan Opera, had used his public office to the financial assistance of the opera association.

"Mr. Stevens," said the Congressman, "handed out to the Metropolitan Opera Co. $300,000 of the interest earned on money donated to the Kennedy Cultural Center. The opera company is using these funds to finance traveling productions. Some of these productions will play Washington next spring at the National Theater, which Mr. Stevens' City Investing Corp. controls through a holding corporation lease. Associated with Mr. Stevens in City Investing is Robert Dowling, who serves in Washington as chairman of the Advisory Board of the Kennedy Center."

(An aid to the Congressman said afterward Mr. WIDNALL had not been informed that Mr. Stevens no longer was associated with City Investing.)

According to Representative WIDNALL, the Advisory Board has not held a formal meeting in 5 years.

In reply to the Congressman's charges, Mr. Stevens said the $300,000 interest arrangement with the Met was approved by President Kennedy when the Center was known as the National Cultural Center, as well as by the Center's 45 trustees, which includes three Senators and three Representatives.

Mr. Stevens said he planned to release an official statement today on the charges after it was approved by other Government officials.

Yesterday, Mr. Stevens spent most of the afternoon in closed session before a House Appropriations Subcommittee. He reportedly testified in support of a $17 million supplemental for the national cultural program.

[From Variety, Sept. 29, 1965]

DENIES CONFLICT, BUT STEVENS RESIGNS ONE U.S. CULTURAL POST

WASHINGTON, September 28.—Roger Stevens, President Johnson's man for all seasons in the arts field, has resigned his chair on the board of Washington's National Symphony Orchestra—but he denied his resignation has any special significance.

During House debate on the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities bill, which has since passed, Representative ALBERT H. QUIE, Republican, of Minnesota, raised the possibility of Stevens having a conflict of interest. QUIE noted that Stevens was on the boards of the National Symphony and New York's Metropolitan Opera Co., as well as having financial interests in play productions.

Since Stevens already has plugged for building small playhouses in shopping centers around the country with the aid of Federal grants, QUIE said, Stevens "if only inadvertently" could profit from having plays produced in the shopping centers and also could aid in dispensing money to the National Symphony and the Metropolitan. Among Stevens' jobs are heading the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts and the National Council on the Arts. In the latter capacity, he would become chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts under the new Federal aid to the arts bill.

Stevens told Variety Monday, Sept. 27, that talk of a conflict of interest was "1 of about 10 reasons" for dropping the National Symphony role. He completely discounted the conflict of interest intimations and said he would not withdraw from his other cultural activities. He intends to stay on the Metropolitan board, he said.

[Text of Biography Submitted to the Congress by Roger L. Stevens in 1962]

BIOGRAPHY OF ROGER L. STEVENS

Roger L. Stevens, appointed by President Kennedy on September 2, 1961, to be chairman of the Board of Trustees of the National Cultural Center, is not only a leading businessman but is also one of America's most successful theatrical producers.

Among the more than 100 plays he has either produced or coproduced are "A Man for All Seasons," "Five Finger Exercise," "West Side Story," "The Caretaker," "A Far Country," "Mary, Mary," "The Visit," "Best Man," "Pleasure of His Company," "Time Remembered," "Major Barbara," "Cat on a Hot Tin Roof," "Bus Stop," "Bad Seed," "Sabrina Fair," "Tea and Sympathy," "The Fourposter," and many others which have consistently been among the 10 best plays of the year.

His business activities, largely in real estate, have included some of the Nation's most important projects. He was, for instance, head of the syndicate which purchased the Empire State Building in 1951. He is a director of the City Investing Co. and other corporations, as well as chairman of the Board of University Properties in Seattle and of Davidson Bros. Midwest department store chain. His business activities encompass numerous projects of similar magnitude.

Apart from being one of the country's top producers, his additional activities in the theater include being president of the Producers Theater, president of the Phoenix Theater, past president of the New Dramatists Committee. He is also a member of the executive committee of the American Shakespeare Festival and Academy, treasurer of ANTA, member of the Board of the Metropolitan Opera Co., etc.

He was born in Detroit, Mich., on March 12, 1910. After attending school in Ann Arbor, he was graduated from the Choate School in 1928 and attended the University of Michigan. His honorary degrees include doctor of humanities at Wayne State University and doctor of humane letters at Tulane University.

Mr. Stevens, as chairman of the board of the National Cultural Center, expresses the philosophy that the center is a national movement to encourage the performing arts throughout the Nation. The structures, which will cost $30 million, will be erected in Washington, D.C.—a symphony hall, a theater, and a hall for opera, ballet, and musical comedy—and will represent the cultural movement throughout the country.

To further this widespread plan there will be, in future years, regional facilities for the discovery and development of local talent in all the performing arts. Many of these new talents will thereafter enjoy the public platform afforded them by the National Cultural Center in the Capital.

YOUTH AND FREE ENTERPRISE

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD an editorial which was presented on WCYB–TV in Bristol, Va.-Tenn., by Mr. Walter Crockett, editorial director of the station. Mr. Crockett reported on a survey of high school seniors in Asheville, N.C., that was made to determine if their economic thinking was in line with the national trend. I know my colleagues and the readers will find the startling results of this survey most interesting and worthy of their contemplation:

WHERE ARE WE GOING?

Most of our high school youngsters think that money grows on trees and the trees grow in Washington. That is the general conclusion that is confirmed by a survey by the Asheville, N.C., sales and marketing executives, and reported by the Asheville Citizen newspaper.

The executives surveyed 1,202 high school seniors to determine if their economic thinking was in line with the national trend.

Eighty-one percent of the students believe the Government should keep wages from falling when times get relatively hard.

Forty-three percent subscribe to the theory that the fairest economic system "takes from each according to his ability and gives to each according to his need."

Some 37.9 percent of these students did say that business has done the most to improve American living standards, but 29.2 percent credited the Government with that accomplishment and 14.6 percent said it was "all due to the unions."

Nowhere in this survey was any indication that a preponderant majority of these high school seniors have a clear understanding for the basic principles of free enterprise.

The Asheville survey results is in line with national survey findings. There probably would be no significant deviation if specific surveys were made in Bristol, Johnson City, Kingsport, or elsewhere in our region.

What it means is that in the home, in schools, we have failed to stress the value of the free competitive system which is the heart of the American economic system.

Our children are not learning the basic facts of how jobs are created by business and industry, and how the wheels of factories must turn.

These are children who have never had practical contact with a major depression.

They have not experienced structures on the necessities of life, such as food and clothing.

We have been failing to teach them at home and in school that there would be no lavish spending by the States and by Uncle Sam if our free enterprise economic system were not operating profitably.

We are not teaching them that money alone is not the big answer—that neither this country nor any other can manufacture and guarantee full economic and social equality.

The youth survey answers are not surprising, because we are living in an era when it is popular to invent Federal spending schemes and money is being poured into fields of dubious value. The present Congress has set a new high record for so-called social legislation. Our young people are being indoctrinated into the theory that Uncle Sam is, or will be, the arbiter of all things.

The picture causes one to wonder where we are going.

NEED TO AMEND GRAIN GRADE STANDARDS

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, farmers in the Midwest have experienced a most unusual harvest season. For instance, our northwestern Minnesota farmers watched the development of what looked like a sure bumper crop, only to have the skies open up with a deluge of rain at the very moment the harvesting equipment was to have moved into the fields. The harvest consequently has been delayed by over a month in some areas as the persistent rains continued to fall. The damage has been heavy and the moisture content of some grains has become comparatively high, in fact too high for some commodities so that they do not qualify for Department of Agriculture storage loans.

This is particularly true for flax, and I have urged the Department to review the discount schedule and grain grade standards and amend them to make it easier for the farmers in the rain-soaked areas to obtain these storage loans.

The maximum moisture limit in the numerical grades of flaxseed were recently lowered from 11 to 9.5 percent. A number of people in the flaxseed industry are concerned that the producers in the rain-hit areas will not be able to qualify their crops for storage loans under the lowered limit. Therefore we have asked the Department to raise the limit for this year's crop so that flaxseed can readily be moved into storage bins under loan contracts. This change is urgently needed to avert financial problems in these stricken areas.

The areas in question are located in one of the greatest flax-producing sections of the Nation, and are in the northern reaches of the country where cool weather will permit storage of flaxseed with moisture content up to 11 percent. There is little if any danger of spontaneous heating in that region, so there is no logical reason why the limits cannot be reset to accommodate these farmers.

These farmers should not be unduly penalized by these unusual and unavoidable natural circumstances. Therefore a review of the loan requirements is in order. I have asked the Secretary of Agriculture to give every consideration to these unusual circumstances and to amend the grain grade standards as much as possible to insure these farmers of inclusion under the loan programs.

HOW DO SUGAR LOBBYISTS EARN THEIR MONEY?

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, recent developments raise questions about the role of sugar lobbyists in regard to foreign quotas.

Five Central American countries have complicated representation arrangements.

Their principal lobbyists are Attorney Sheldon Z. Kaplan, of Washington, and Miss Dina Dellale, of New York.

Miss Dellale is listed at the Justice Department as an economic consultant on sugar.

She has individual contracts with Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Nicaragua, each providing her payment of $9,000 a year. In addition, she gets $1,200 annually from Honduras.

As executive director of the Latin American Sugar Council—recently renamed the Central American Sugar Council—which consists of the same countries, she draws a salary of $7,500.

This means her gross income for serving as an economic consultant on sugar to these five countries is $44,700 a year.

Reports she has filed show she also gets reimbursement for expenses. In the first 6 months of 1965, she reports being reimbursed $2,150 by the council.

Other reports show that she was first hired in 1961 by Costa Rica alone for $5,000 plus expenses. In 1962 this was raised to $750 a month, and now her clientele has expanded to the other countries with grand total income currently at $44,700.

Kaplan received in the period from March 28, 1964 to March 28, 1965 from his five foreign principals a total of $41,200—itemized as follows:

Nicaragua	$16, 500
Guatemala	21, 500
Costa Rica	1, 500
Honduras	200
El Salvador	1, 500
Total	41, 200

As general counsel for the Latin American Sugar Council he received in the period from June 28, 1964 to June 28, 1965 a total of $8,000 plus a report of reimbursed expenses in the amount of $4,273.40.

This means his gross salary from these interests was approximately $49,000 during a 12-month period.

The two sugar lobbyists thus cost their principals about $100,000—salaries and expenses—for the year.

Each testified briefly one day last August before the House Committee on Agriculture. What other services do they perform to justify these high fees?

Among their clients is Honduras, a country which does not yet export sugar but which sought and did receive a quota for the first time in the present legislation. What part, if anything, did the lobbyists have in this accomplishment?

Two of their other clients, El Salvador and Costa Rica, received higher quotas from the committee than recommended by the administration. At present prices, the 5-year premium value of the changes including Honduras, come to $8,746,750.

What is the background of the quota proposal for Thailand?

The Calabrian Co., of New York in 1964 made a survey to determine whether an investment for sugar production in Thailand would be justified. The finding was negative. Under a customary arrangement with AID, Calabrian was reimbursed $37,500 by the U.S. Government, half of the cost of the survey.

Calabrian tried to work out a barter deal, under which Thailand sugar would be traded for U.S. tobacco. This fell through because Thailand had no U.S. sugar quota.

Former Congressman George M. Grant was hired as sugar lobbyist for Thailand, and Calabrian helped to prepare the statement he presented in August to the House Agriculture Committee. In his proposal to the committee, Grant guaranteed a barter deal similar to that earlier proposed by Calabrian if the quota was granted.

The Agriculture Committee voted Thailand a quota of 19,864 tons. At present, the 5-year premium value of the quota is $6,952,400.

All this makes it appear that the real motive force behind the Thailand quota was not Thailand itself but an American firm.

The question naturally arises, what kind of a deal does the Calabrian Co. get if the Thailand quota goes through?

Attorney Charles Patrick Clark, whose principal lobbyist background was for Spain in nonsugar matters, has received $47,500 as sugar lobbyist for Venezuela in the last 3 months, according to reports he has filed at the Justice Department. No report of any expenses has been made. Aside from reading a statement to the Agriculture Committee one day in August, what has he done? Why did the Committee on Agriculture increase the quota to Venezuela?

The administration had recommended a quota of 2,676 tons. The committee increased this to 30,809 tons. At present prices, the 5-year value of the increase is $9,846,550.

Did Clark have any role in that accomplishment? If so, what? What has he been reporting to Venezuela to justify the $47,500?

CASIMIR PULASKI: POLISH HERO, AMERICAN PATRIOT

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on the 11th of October, 186 years ago, a noble and heroic life was given to the cause of liberty. On that day Count Casimir Pulaski, famed Polish patriot and brigadier general in the American Revolution, died of fatal wounds sustained during the seige on Savannah. With his death this Nation, Poland and the world lost one of their most valiant advocates of freedom.

Each year, the anniversary of his passing is commemorated by the observance of Gen. Casimir Pulaski Memorial Day in cities across the Nation. I would like to give special emphasis at this time to the very worthwhile celebration being planned in Manchester, N.H.

Under the general auspices of the Polish American Citizens Club, the ceremonies will take place in Pulaski Park at 12:30 on Sunday, October 10. The Pulaski Day Celebration Committee of Manchester is to be commended for their industrious planning of the occasion.

General Pulaski was a man deserving of special tribute, and I am proud that this year, on the recommendation of Congress, the President has issued a proclamation designating the commemoration of this day.

It is proper—

The proclamation states:

> that the American people continue to pay grateful tribute to General Pulaski for his heroic sacrifice in freedom's cause, and to the manifold and continuing contributions of Polish Americans in the defense and progress of this Nation.

The heritage left us by General Pulaski through his heroic contributions to American independence, to the concept of liberty and to Poland has been upheld and enriched by the succeeding generations of Polish immigrants. They have entered with distinction into every profession and field of endeavor in our communities and Nation. They have shown an astounding capacity for hard work.

Just as Pulaski held firm to a deep love of liberty and an undying belief in a universal concept of freedom, our Americans of Polish descent have been resolute against communism, against bigotry, hate, and injustice everywhere. They have not forgotten that Poland and a vast part of the world remains under tyranny.

They have stood firm by their Christian faith and the prayer that the sacrifice of men like Pulaski and the thousands of other Polish sons who have given their lives someday will no longer be necessary in a world blessed with peace and freedom.

Count Pulaski came to America on July 23, 1777, to volunteer to fight for an ideal that dominated his life. He was not a soldier of fortune. He was already famed throughout Europe for his brilliant and heroic exploits against Katherine the Great on behalf of a free and undivided Poland. And to the American cause he gave $50,000 of his own estate to form the first American cavalry.

His brilliant military leadership at Brandywine in defense of George Washington's forces was acknowledged by his promotion to brigadier general, and his organization, training regulations, and tactical skill in commanding the famed Pulaski Legion earned him the title of "The Father of the American Cavalry."

His death was a loss to two continents. The ideals which he helped to gain a foothold in the New World have been a blessing to mankind. As he wrote in later life:

> I could not submit to stoop before the sovereigns of Europe, so I came to hazard all for the freedom of America.

TIME TO ADJOURN

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I regret not being on the floor earlier today when the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] mentioned my name. I do appreciate my colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] responding in my absence.

We have indeed been here too long when it becomes so obvious some have lost their sense of humor.

My amendment calling attention to the role of the First Lady in the consideration of the beautification bill was offered, without comment because of time limitations imposed by the majority. It followed, I might add, a United Press International wire story which commenced as follows:

> House leaders drove toward passage of Lady Bird Johnson's highway beauty bill tonight in the hope of handing it to her as a present at a "Salute to Congress" party at the White House.

Everyone in this country—and I thought everyone in this Congress—was aware of Mrs. Johnson's active interest in this legislation; and my suggestion that she continue to have a managerial role in the administration of her pet project was aimed at a program which I cannot approve, not at the First Lady, for whom I have profound respect.

If my timing was in someone's opinion, inappropriate, may I submit it was no more inappropriate than the timing of the consideration of the legislation. It seems strange the House would stay in session until 12:51 this morning then meet again at noon and adjourn about 3 p.m., unless, of course, the UPI story was accurate.

In the course of our history, some of our First Ladies, and wives of other public officials, have been completely content to be the devoted wife. Others have sought for a greater fulfillment through their personal involvement in public affairs.

It is not for me to judge which is proper and appropriate, but surely it is obvious that the choice is not without peril.

When one chooses to step down from the pedestal of the dutiful preoccupied wife of the President, or other public official, and to wade into the turbulent stream of public controversy, one must expect to, at least, get her feet wet.

The cries of anguish from the freshmen Member from New Jersey were not born of naivete about these facts of life, so I can only conclude my pointed humor must have been painfully telling on the gentleman.

COMMUNIST PERFIDY IN VIETNAM IS OLD STORY FIRST CITED BY DR. TOM DOOLEY IN 1954

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I wish that all those who have doubts about the justice of the overall U.S. policy in Vietnam could read and digest the following excerpt from the book, "Deliver Us From Evil," by the late Dr. Thomas A. Dooley. Most of us probably forget that Tom Dooley was in Vietnam at the time of the Geneva Agreement in 1954 when Vietnam was divided into two parts, North and South.

As a young doctor he served in a staging area for the evacuation of those people in the North who preferred exile in South Vietnam to life under the Communists. He described his initial reaction to his first case of Communist bestiality thus:

> Inside that hut I had just seen a masterpiece of systematic torture. Under the sky, I retched and vomited my insides out. I was grateful that no one followed me; they understood and were patient.

Today, 11 years later, there are those who still will not learn. Of course, you will not find them among the Americans I recently visited in Saigon or at the front lines in Vietnam. They have no delusions as to communism and can personally testify on the basis of their own experience as did Tom Dooley years ago.

As recent events indicate, the elements of doubt and opposition are to be found among a small but vocal band of college and university students and professors who have discarded the standards of scientific method used to attain all possible objectivity. At Rutgers University a recent teach-in found one professor saying he would welcome the impending victory of the Vietcong. This is all too typical of this leftist attack on our policy in Vietnam.

Tom Dooley had one purpose in including the chapter, "Communist Reeducation," in his book:

> The purpose of this book is not to sicken anyone or to dwell upon the horror of oriental tortures. But I do want to show what has come upon these people of the delta. And justice demands that some of the atrocities we learned of in Haiphong be put on record.

To further fulfill Dr. Thomas A. Dooley's wish, and to demonstrate to the American people the heinous nature of the enemy we all face, I include the above-mentioned chapter in the RECORD at this point:

CHAPTER XV—COMMUNIST REEDUCATION

The children of Vietnam become old very young. They are mature and grave while still in early adolescence, and they are often very brave.

A number of them worked for us in the camps, staying on for months. They did adult work, accepted adult responsibilities; when they could bum cigarettes, they even smoked like adults. Yet they were only 8 or 10 or 12 years old.

Each of my corpsmen had six or seven such young assistants. The badge of honor was a white sailor hat. A retinue of them followed me around day and night, sometimes to my embarrassment. They might come to me and lead me to a feeble old woman who could not leave her tent, or take me to see a man who was crippled. They would run errands for me, fetch things I wanted, boil water for the sick-call tent. Sometimes they did my laundry, but on such occasions they were apt to wash the clothes in a rice paddy, and the wrong paddy at that, so I discouraged this. And sometimes they would ride my truck just for the fun of it, as children should.

During the months when I was living in Haiphong hotels, they would sleep outside my door. They were often the go-betweens when newly arrived escapees needed help immediately.

Whenever Mr. Ham or any other Vietnamese official wanted to see me, he would spot one of these kids with the sailor hats, or one of the shoeshine boys, and tell him to "find the Bac Sy My."

When one of my assistants would leave for the south we would hold a little ceremony. Various ships' officers had given me their ensigns' bars. So, on the official day, the Quan Hi, or lieutenant, would commission his assistant a Quan Mot or ensign in the U.S. Navy. A bar was pinned on him and his sense of self-importance increased so you could notice it. I hope the Personnel Department of the Navy will be understanding when it hears about my unusual recruiting service.

The Viet Minh directed much of their propaganda at the children and adolescents of the nation, and they went to unbelievable lengths to drive the propaganda home. The first time I ever saw the results of a Communist "reeducation" class was during the month of December. What had been done to those children one December afternoon was the most heinous thing I had ever heard of.

Having set up their controls in the village of Haiduong, Communists visited the village schoolhouse and took seven children out of class and into the courtyard. All were ordered to sit on the ground, and their hands and arms were tied behind their backs. Then they brought out one of the young teachers, with hands also tied. Now the new class began.

In a voice loud enough for the other children still in the classroom to hear, the Viet Minh accused these children of treason. A patriot had informed the police that this teacher was holding classes secretly, at night, and that the subject of these classes was religion. They had even been reading the catechism.

The Viet Minh accused the seven of conspiring because they had listened to the teachings of this instructor. As a punishment they were to be deprived of their hearing. Never again would they be able to listen to the teachings of evil men.

Now two Viet Minh guards went to each child and one of them firmly grasped the head between his hands. The other then rammed a wooden chopped chopstick into each ear. He jammed it in with all his force. The stick split the ear canal wide and tore the ear drum. The shrieking of the children was heard all over the village.

Both ears were stabbed in this fashion. The children screamed and wrestled and suffered horribly. Since their hands were tied behind them, they could not pull the wood out of their ears. They shook their heads and squirmed about, trying to make the sticks fall out. Finally they were able to dislodge them by scraping their heads against the ground.

As for the teacher, he must be prevented from teaching again. Having been forced to witness the atrocity performed on his pupils, he endured a more horrible one himself. One soldier held his head while another grasped the victim's tongue with a crude pair of pliers and pulled it far out. A third guard cut off the tip of the teacher's tongue with his bayonet. Blood spurted into the man's mouth and gushed from his nostrils onto the ground. He could not scream; blood ran into his throat. When the soldiers let him loose he fell to the ground vomiting blood; the scent of blood was all over the courtyard.

Yet neither the teacher nor any of the pupils died.

When news of this atrocity came across the Bamboo Curtain, arrangements were made for escape, and soon teacher and pupils were in tent 130 at Camp de la Pagode.

We treated the victims as well as we could, though this was not very well. I was able to pull the superior and inferior surfaces of the tongue together and close over the raw portions. The victim had lost a great deal of blood and, as we had no transfusion setup, all I could do was to give him fluids by mouth. He could not eat anything solid, not even rice. For the children, prevention of infection was the important thing. Penicillin took care of this, but nothing could give them back their hearing.

The purpose of this book is not to sicken anyone or to dwell upon the horror of Oriental tortures, which we recall from World War II and from Korea. But I do want to show what has come upon these people of the Delta. And justice demands that some of the atrocities we learned of in Haiphong be put on record.

One midnight, shortly before Christmas, I was awakened by knocking on my hotel door. Two young boys asked if Bac Sy My would please go with them right away. I thought they were from the camp, and that there was something there that needed my attention. So I quickly dressed and went out to the truck. As we were heading out the road, the children motioned for me to turn off onto a path running between two rice paddies. I didn't understand, but they were so earnest that I followed their directions. We turned and drove several hundred yards to a straw paillote, or round hut-like building.

I bent, entered the low door, and then noticed first how dark it was and second how unexpectedly large it was inside. There was a kerosene lamp burning in one part of the hut and near it were several kneeling figures—an old man, an old woman, several boys—chanting prayers in a quiet monotone.

They greeted me with "Chao ong, Bac Sy My," clasping their hands before them and bowing their heads, in the Oriental fashion. Then I saw that there was a man lying on a straw mattress which in turn was atop eight or nine long pieces of bamboo, making a crude stretcher. His face was twisted in agony and his lips moved silently as though he were praying, as indeed he was.

When I pulled back the dirty blanket that was over him, I found that his body was a mass of blackened flesh from the shoulders to the knees. The belly was hard and distended and the scrotum swollen to the size of a football. The thighs were monstrously distorted. It was one of the most grisly sights I had ever seen. The idea of merely touching this man was repugnant.

I felt queasy, knew I was going to be sick and rushed outside. Inside that hut I had just seen a masterpiece of systematic torture. Under the sky, I retched and vomited my insides out. I was grateful that no one followed me; they understood and were patient.

I am not sure how long it took for me to get hold of myself, but I finally regained enough nerve and stability to go back and care for this human nightmare. But what could I do? For his pain I could give him morphine. For the belly I could do little, as the skin was not broken in more than four or five spots. All the bleeding was subcutaneous, in bruises which were turning a purple-yellow. I put a large needle into the scrotum in an attempt to drain out some of the fluid. Later I would insert a catheter into the bladder so that the patient could urinate. What else could I do?

I asked the old woman what on God's earth had happened to this poor human being. She told me.

He was her brother, a priest, from the parish of Vinh Bao, just on the other side of the Bamboo Curtain. Vinh Bao was not more than 10 kilometers away from Haiphong.

The area had been in Viet Minh hands for only about 7 months and the Viets had not yet completely changed the pattern of village life. The priest was permitted to continue celebrating mass, but only between 6 and 7 o'clock in the morning. This was the time when most of the peasants were just ready to start the morning's work and, under Communist rule, this was the hour when people had to gather in the village square for a daily lecture on the glories of the "new life."

This meant that they were unable to attend the parish priest's mass either daily or on Sunday. So, for the few who dared to risk his services, the valiant 57-year-old priest held them in the evening. The Communists decided that he needed reeducation.

Late the night before, Communist soldiers had called at the priest's chapel, accused him of holding secret meetings and ordered him to stop. Defiantly he replied that nothing could stop him from preaching the word of God. And so this is what they did: they hung him by his feet from one of the crude wooden beams under the ceiling. His head was so close to the ground that he later said, "Frequently I would place my hands on the ground to try to take the pressure off my feet."

With short, stout bamboo rods they proceeded to beat the "evil" out of him. They went on for hours; he did not know just how long. They concentrated on the most sensitive parts of the anatomy. "The pain was great," the priest said. It must have been very great indeed.

He was left hanging in the church, and early the next morning his altar boys found him there and managed to cut him down. They were only 8 to 10 years old, and they ran to their parents, attending compulsory classes in the square, and sobbed out the news.

The parents told them what to do and then said goodby to them, knowing that it might be goodby forever. The children lashed together an arrangement of bamboo poles that could be carried as a litter and floated as a raft. They put the priest on this and carried him down the back lanes of the village. They hid him near the bank of the river, which formed one of the boundaries of the free zone. After dark, they lowered the raft gently to the water and, with three on each side, paddled to the middle of the river, where they were swept into the downriver current. The coolness of the water probably did more for the priest than most of my medicines. They managed to get him across the river to the free zone without being seen. Arriving late at night, they carried the man to the hut of his sister. Then they came to find me.

I made daily visits to him thereafter and gave him antibiotics and more morphine. Miraculously, he survived; his own strong constitution and, no doubt, his faith brought about a cure.

Sooner than I would have considered likely he was sufficiently recovered to be taken to Camp de la Pagode. Although he was still crippled, he was soon saying daily mass and teaching the children their catechism; in fact, for a time he served as the camp's more or less regular chaplain.

Perhaps I should have let him do it when he insisted that he must return to the village. Perhaps the world needs martyrs, although Tonkin, I thought, had an oversupply already. Next time the Communists would have killed him for sure.

I know that it is not just to judge a whole system from the conduct of a few. However, this was communism to me. This was the ghoulish thing which had conquered most of the Orient and with it nearly half of all mankind. From December until the last day, there were two or three atrocities a week that came within my orbit. My night calls took me to one horror after another.

Early in my Haiphong stay I was puzzled not only by the growing number but by the character of Communist atrocities. So many seemed to have religious significance. More and more, I was learning that these punishments were linked to man's belief in God.

Priests were by far the most common objects of Communist terror. It seemed that the priests never learned their "Hoc-Tap Dan-Chu," their "Democratic Studies and Exercises," as well as they were expected to. This meant that they had to be reeducated more severely than others. It is difficult to take men whose life had been dedicated to belief in God and straighten them out so that they no longer believe in God. In fact, most of them proved unconquerable.

Catholics have many pious ejaculations which they utter frequently—"Jesus, Mary, and Joseph," for example, and "Lord have mercy on us." The Communists ordered the priests to substitute new slogans for them, for example, "Tang gai san u xuat" (increased production), and "Chien tranh nhan" (the people's war). Perhaps the expression most often heard in the conquered north was "Com Thu" (hatred).

The Communists have perfected the techniques of torture, inflicting in one moment pain on the body and in the next pain on the mind. When Tonkin spring came and the monsoon ended, I thought perhaps nature might bring a change in the tenor of things. I was wrong. On the first Sunday of March, I was asked by Father Lopez of the Philippine Catholic Mission to come visit a "sick man," a priest who had just escaped from the Vietminh.

We walked across the huge sprawling courtyard to the living quarters. In a back room there was an old man lying on straw on the floor. His head was matted with pus and there were eight large pus-filled swellings around his temples and forehead.

Even before I asked what had happened, I knew the answer. This particular priest had also been punished for teaching "treason." His sentence was a Communist version of the crown of thorns, once forced on the Savior of whom he preached.

Eight nails had been driven into his head, three across the forehead, two in the back of the skull and three across the dome. The nails were large enough to embed themselves in the skull bone. When the unbelievable act was completed, the priest was left alone. He walked from his church to a neighboring hut, where a family jerked the nails from his head. Then he was brought to Haiphong for medical help. By the time of his arrival, 2 days later, secondary infection had set in.

I washed the scalp, dislodged the clots, and opened the pockets to let the pus escape. I gave the priest massive doses of penicillin and tetanus oxide and went back to the mission every day. The old man pulled through. One day when I went to treat him, he had disappeared. Father Lopez told me that he had gone back to that world of silence behind the Bamboo Curtain. This meant that he had gone back to his torturers. I wonder what they have done to him by now.

Priests were not the only victims of brutality. One day an old woman came to sick call in the camp. She was wearing a cloth bound tightly around her shoulders in a figure of 8. We removed the cloth and found that both the collar bones had been fractured. En route to the camp, she told us, she had been stopped by a Viet Minh guard who, for the crime of attempting to leave her land, had struck her across the shoulders with the butt of his rifle, ordering her to go back home. This fractured the bones, making her shoulders slump forward and causing excruciating pain. Nevertheless, she managed to escape. In time, with medical care and a regimen of vitamins, she healed.

Always there was the painful thought: "My God. For every one of these who come here, there must be hundreds or even thousands who could not escape."

One day a young man came to sick call with a marked discoloration of the thumbs. They were black from the first joint to the tips. He was suffering from gangrene, of the dry type, called mummification. There was no great pain, no blood, just raw necrosis of tissue.

He said he had been hung by his thumbs to reeducate him. This had happened about a week earlier, and since then his thumbs had been getting a little darker every day. Now they were beginning to smell.

During the course of the examination, while I was manipulating the left thumb, a piece of it actually broke off. There was no bleeding, no pain; there was just a chunk of his thumb that stayed in my hand. This dried piece of flesh, like that of a mummy, had crumbled away with the slightest pressure. The circulation had been cut off for so long—he said he had been left hanging for days—that permanent damage had been done, and all the cells and tissue had died distal to the point where his thumbs had been tied with cord.

"But remember, my friend," one of the elders said to me, "these people might never have left the north if the Communists had not done these cruel deeds against those who preached and practiced their religion."

I feel sure he was right. There were many Buddhists among the refugees, but when I thought of the attendance at daily Mass I had no doubt that 75 or 80 percent of them were Catholics. Of the 2 million Catholics in Vietnam, about 1,750,000 lived in the north. Then came the Communists and inevitable disillusionment with the promised reforms. Perhaps they could have borne up under the oppressive taxes, the crop quotas, the forced labor, and the loss of freedom. But when the right to worship God was taken from them—often by the most brutal means—they knew it was time to go.

"What fools they are, these Vietminh," the elder said. "They coax the people to stay, tell them lies, and even try to stop them at the perimeter. Then they do the very things that will drive the people into exile. Perhaps it is the will of God."

To say that the Communists tried to stop the refugees at the perimeter was to put it mildly. Though under the Geneva agreement anyone had a right to leave the north who wanted to, the Communists began to violate the agreement on this point from the day it was signed.

As I have indicated earlier, they employed trickery, threats, violence, and even murder to stop the southward rush of their subjects. "It is my duty," said Premier Diem in Saigon on January 22, 1955, "to denounce before the free world and before Christendom the inhuman acts of repression and coercion taken by the Vietminh against the populations wanting to leave the Communist zone, acts which are flagrant violations of the Geneva agreement."

The Premier later estimated that a quarter of a million more would have left if there had been no harassments. My own belief is that this figure is not half large enough. The unbroken flow of the luckier, and of the wounded and mangled who made it to the American camps, was a clue to how many failed to make it. Besides, it is reasonable to assume that thousands who thirsted for freedom lacked the courage or the vitality to take the risks.

Many and various were the Communist devices to keep the people in the north. They made it illegal for more than one member of a family to travel on a bus or train in the affected area at the same time; or for more than two persons to go on foot together on the roads pointing to the evacuation zone. This made it difficult for would-be refugees, whose families were large and held by powerful bonds of unity, to break away.

Nevertheless, desperate parents often sent their children ahead, two today, two tomorrow, with instructions to get to the American camp. By the dozens and the hundreds I saw youngsters, alone, exhausted, and sorrowful, arrive and settle down on the fringes of my camp to wait for their elders. Many a time they waited in vain.

In many parts of the Tonkin the Communists ruled that special passports would be required—not to leave the country; that would have flouted Geneva too crudely—but to cross from one canton into another. Obtaining the passports involved steep fees and fantastic red tape. But only with such documents were the refugees permitted to travel as family groups.

Having at long last received its passport, a family might set out on foot on the long road to Haiphong. Fifteen or 16 days later, their food almost gone, sore and perhaps sick, they would reach a canton line. They would run into that old dodge of the expired passport.

The Communist guard would examine their hard-won document and laugh, "Comrades, this passport is good for only 14 days. Didn't you know that? Oh, you can't read? Well, anyhow, go back and get a new one."

As a leftover of the war, many roads were sown with mines and booby traps. The victorious Communists dug them up. But often they did not detonate them. Instead they tossed them with designed casualness into race paddies, swamps, and bushes close to the perimeter of our evacuation area. If citizens trying to crawl to freedom at night were blown to bits, it only served them right.

Yet here are the terms of the agreement: "Any civilians residing in a district controlled by one party who wish to go and live in the zone assigned to the other party shall be permitted 'and helped to do so' by the authorities in that district." Those quoted words, of course, are mine.

COLUMBUS DAY SHOULD BE A NATIONAL LEGAL HOLIDAY

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, next Tuesday, October 12, is Columbus Day. All over the United States, people will be paying tribute to that brave figure, Christopher Columbus, and the valiant men who sailed with him to America.

On May 3, I introduced H.R. 7804, which would establish Columbus Day as a national legal holiday. New York State and the majority of other States already recognize October 12 as a legal holiday.

On Monday of this week, the Board of Supervisors of Westchester County, N.Y., adopted Resolution 154—1965, endorsing my bill and an identical bill introduced in the other body by Senator THOMAS DODD, of Connecticut, and memorializing the Congress to enact such legislation.

I present the text of the resolution herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION 154—1965

To the Board of Supervisors of Westchester County, N.Y.:

Your committee on legislation has considered Resolution 143—1965, adopted by your Board on August 16, 1965, requesting support of bills now pending in Congress which would designate Columbus Day, October 12, as a national legal holiday.

There have been, over the years, many bills presented in both the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives, all in support of designating Columbus Day as a national holiday, and like our other national holidays setting the day aside in recognition of a memorable event or personage. Your committee feels that all Americans should indicate their interest and desire that this day, October 12, be added to those other important commemorative days, and offers the following resolution:

"Whereas the State of New York and the majority of other States recognize October 12, known as Columbus Day, as a legal holiday; and

"Whereas many businesses and industries also recognize and observe Columbus Day as a holiday; and

"Whereas it is fitting that honor and tribute should be paid to the great explorer, Christopher Columbus, who is renowned as the discoverer of America: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is respectfully memorialized to enact legislation, as set forth in S. 461 (DODD) and H.R. 7804 (OTTINGER), and/or any other bills previously considered and any amendments thereto whose main purpose and objective is to designate the 12th day of October in each year as a legal public holiday; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Members of the Senate from the State of New York, and the Members of the House of Representatives from the 25th and 26th Congressional Districts of the State of New York."

Dated, October 4, 1965.

Committee on Legislation, Board of Supervisors, Westchester County, N.Y.

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE FOGARTY AT INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR DENTAL RESEARCH BANQUET, TORONTO, CANADA

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include a speech which I delivered at International Association for Dental Research Banquet, Toronto, Canada, on Saturday, July 24, 1965:

INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIP IN DENTAL RESEARCH

(Remarks of U.S. Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY, Second Congressional District of Rhode Island at International Association for Dental Research Banquet at the Royal York Hotel, Toronto, Canada, July 24, 1965)

Mr. President, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, you honor me greatly by inviting me to become a member of a dental organization of international scope. I appreciate and gratefully accept honorary membership in the International Association for Dental Research.

During my years in the Congress I have been a strong advocate of increased support for biomedical research and, indeed, I have been privileged to assist directly in backing Federal programs which have made such growth possible. I observe with personal satisfaction the extent to which scientific investigators make use of today's resources for research. What I have been leads me to believe that the years ahead will be very exciting. I anticipate new and diversified investigations into the basic causes of disease and the development of imaginative methods for advancing the health of the nations of the world.

Many of you may know that the United Nations has declared 1965 International Cooperation Year. Tonight, therefore, I have chosen "International Partnership in Research" as my theme. For its framework, I have selected the words of the late President John F. Kennedy. At the anniversary convocation of the National Academy of Sciences only a month before his assassination, President Kennedy said, "Science is the most powerful means we have for unification of knowledge, and a main obligation of its future must be to deal with problems which cut across boundaries, whether boundaries between the sciences, boundaries between nations, or boundaries between man's scientific and his humane concerns."

In the world of health, we can be proud of the cooperation among health scientists. International rivalries seem to be inevitable in commerce and industry; probably inevitable in space technology; unfortunately rife in the fields of social ideology. In health and medical affairs, however, cooperation on an international scale is flourishing. Your gathering here in Toronto attests to the fact that contemporary scientists are eager to learn and ready to share knowledge with their colleagues all over the world.

The great achievements of scientists often are hastened and enhanced by cooperation. Partnership in research predisposes potential breakthroughs—I know scientists do not like that word, but bear with me. With the increasing complexity of research, and with the tools and techniques of scientific investigation becoming more diverse and expensive, the interdisciplinary approach to problem solving is more and more likely to produce the breakthroughs of the future. Modern health accomplishments are clear and tangible evidence of the value of scientific team efforts within institutions and within countries. It would seem to me, therefore, that international scientific team efforts are the next logical forward step in the conquest of global diseases.

The great discoveries in health research, no matter by whom developed, no matter in what nation, benefit all mankind. While discoveries may have their origin in one country, may be tested in another, and developed in a third, the application of such new knowledge eventually must be in the hands of men of healing all over the world.

The list of diseases that have been or are being conquered throughout the world is long—and needs no identification for this audience. For the most part, the international victories over disease—as you are well aware—have been in the field of medicine and largely over the infectious diseases.

Though there is increasing evidence that some dental diseases are indeed infectious, this group does not need to be told that dental research on an international basis is lagging seriously behind biomedical research in general. This gap between dental research efforts and the research activity in the many fields of medicine gives me real concern. Admittedly, dental research activities have expanded in recent years, and the handful of research workers of a generation ago has increased many times. Dental research scientists are more numerous, better qualified, and more accomplished than ever before. In the United States alone, there are over 100 institutions where more than 1,500 dental investigators are giving long overdue attention to the basic problems of dental health. Dental investigators now are working on problems concerning the structure and function of the whole body as well as conditions unique to the oral cavity and they are also providing new information about disease processes affecting life itself. In spite of these gains, however, dental research has not yet reached its full potential.

Perhaps one reason why medical research has outdistanced dental research is because dental diseases, which are universal in nature, are rarely fatal. Yet the problems caused by dental disease are of great importance. Almost everyone, everywhere, is affected by dental illness, and to citizens of developing countries, these problems can be overwhelming. Because few diseases cause so much sheer human misery for so many people throughout the world, I see a real urgency to attack dental diseases on an international basis.

The scope of investigation into dental problems must be broadened considerably if more rapid advances are to be achieved and the benefits therefrom are to be realized. Yet today in many parts of the world, dental research is minimal, sometimes virtually nonexistent. Even in those countries where sophisticated dental research is being conducted, few institutes are devoted wholly to research on dental problems. Moreover, relevant research findings in other fields such as pathology, pharmacology, microbiology, and social science often are not brought to bear on dental problems. Only when coordination is achieved among various scientific disciplines and between the scientists of the various countries can the most effective use be made of available knowledge.

Sir Arnold Toynbee said "The 20th Century may best be remembered as the first age in history in which people have found it practical to make the benefits of civilization available for the whole human race." If good dental health is to be numbered among these benefits, however, we are still a very great distance from our goal. To attain that objective, we will have to upgrade the quality and quantity of dental research throughout the world.

I would like to urge the International Association for Dental Research to take the initiative in providing research leadership to those developing nations which have not been as favored as countries in North America. I believe you could help developing nations avoid some mistakes, and assist them in telescoping their efforts to reach a comparable level of research development in a shorter period of time. The late President Kennedy said it well: "The accumulation of knowledge is of little avail if it is not brought within reach of those who can use it. Faster and more complete communication from scientist to scientist is needed, so that their research efforts reinforce and complement each other." A globe-encircling effort of this kind could produce vast benefits in dental health for people everywhere.

All of us recognize the importance of strong lines of communication in those endeavors which require people to work together for the common good. The more complex and widespread the problem—and certainly the expansion of international dental research programs is such a problem—the more urgently good communications are needed.

I suggest that the International Association for Dental Research consider the development of an international communications network to inform dental investigators about research developments in the various specialty areas as well as in related areas of interest. The complexity of the task of international communications is self-evident, but in dental research I can think of no one group more suited to lead the way than yourselves. You will have to explore the use of every device, and very probably invent new ones, in order to spread information throughout the world community of over 100 nations.

One effective communications technique which you are eminently well qualified to sponsor would be a central clearinghouse for basic and applied research findings in dentistry and its related fields. By clearly describing what has already been done and what is being done, in as many major languages as are needed for broad communication to the international profession, the clearinghouse could make possible the saving of precious research hours. I do not decry duplication of effort as so many do. I recognize that often such duplication is a necessary step toward verification and acceptance of research results. But a ready source of knowledge of what has previously been accomplished can help to avoid unnecessary duplication and often allows an investigator to speed ahead with added momentum. The clearinghouse would be useful to research workers in every setting, but has, I believe, a special value to the worker in the newly developing countries. Such an investigator today could build new research upon the solid accomplishment of world science.

As you know, the "Index to Dental Literature" and "Dental Abstracts," both printed in English, already are available. These journals are a good beginning, but other steps also must be taken. For example, three components of the U.S. Public Health Service are joining together with the American Dental Association to support the first comprehensive abstract coverage of international research literature related to dentistry and oral health.

Necessary as it is, however, a journal of research abstracts is not enough. It would seem desirable to go further and establish an international clearinghouse to provide specific information about research programs, investigators, progress and findings, similar to the research information center now being developed by the American Dental Association for the United States.

I suggest that you might wish to consider this effort as a joint project between your Association and the World Health Organization. I have observed a very close working relationship between the American Dental Association and the U.S. Public Health Service in my own country, and I should think that similar cooperative ventures between official and scientific organizations at the international level would be equally beneficial.

A second aspect of international research which has always seemed to me to need further exploration is the development of standard nomenclature, procedures, and measurement. I suspect that much wasted effort goes into unnecessary duplication of research simply because the descriptive terms, or the units of measurement, are not comparable. When one thinks of international programs, standardization seems even more necessary. Standards might be devised which can be uniformly applied and widely accepted throughout the world; terminology and techniques could be simplified so that discrepancies in research results are kept to a minimum.

In emphasizing the value of partnership in coordination, communication, and standardization, we should keep in mind that the purpose of these activities is not to hinder but to free the individual so that originality and enthusiasm can flourish. Coordination can prepare the way for greater efficiency; communication can spread knowledge and help avoid duplication for effort; standardization leads to comparability. Uniformity need not be a bridle on original thought.

If international dental research is to move forward, a third and equally necessary effort must be made to provide a continuing supply of well-trained manpower. In the international context which is our concern this evening, there should be a vigorous program of exchange of research personnel among countries, providing opportunities for investigators to work and learn together.

In the years 1963 and 1964, the international postdoctoral fellowship program of the National Institutes of Health financed the training of about 300 scientists from many countries, permitting them to work in American universities and other research institutions. Some of these scientists were dental investigators who in the course of their educational experience in the United States also taught much to their American associates. I would like to see not hundreds, but thousands, of such interchanges of scientific personnel throughout the world.

Exciting possibilities for international research partnership lie in the study of dental diseases on a global basis. Using the most advanced epidemiological techniques, research investigators are amassing quantities of data on the distribution of dental disease. An excellent example may be found in the surveys sponsored and coordinated by the Interdepartmental Committee on Nutrition for National Development. The committee in recent years has sent teams of specialists in nutrition, medicine, biochemistry, food technology and dentistry to the four corners of the world. On almost every continent these teams have studied the relationship between the nutritional status of populations and disease, including dental disease.

Another resource from which we can expect dividends of world benefit is the use of the special foreign currencies made available for research. These funds, held for us in several foreign countries, are available to support research which has relevance to the host country and to the United States. Currently, the Public Health Service is financing a few dental research projects by this method in Egypt, India, and Israel. Also included in the list of nations eligible to use counterpart funds are Burma, Pakistan, Brazil, Yugoslavia, and Poland. Research in all these countries, with their unique social, economic, racial, and geographical conditions, can provide data not obtainable elsewhere. Such information could lead to solutions to many dental problems.

In my opinion, this source of support for international dental research is not being used to its fullest potential. The expansion of biomedical research through the use of these counterpart funds is part of official U.S. Government foreign policy, and projects under this program are being encouraged. I would urge you to exploit these opportunities.

Still another possibility for enhancing international research efforts may lie in the development of dental research institutes in the United States. Many of you may know that I have been advocating the establishment of categorical dental institutes in a few selected universities where the scientific resources are adequate to support a comprehensive dental research program. I see no reason why each of these institutes, when established, might not develop a special relationship with one country, or group of countries. Such relationship might include exchange and training of personnel, conduct of research of mutual interest and other special programs designed to foster research in underdeveloped countries.

You are well aware that there is already a core of international organizations concerned about dental problems. The largest, the International Dental Federation, with over 5,000 members from 70 countries, is oriented primarily toward dental practitioners rather than toward research. Among its 70 member countries, however, 26 have only a single representative, while 3 countries (the United States, Germany, and the United Kingdom) account for the majority of members.

Two European organizations—which you call ARPA and ORCA—contribute to dental research, but their interests are devoted specifically to periodontal disease and dental caries, respectively. The World Health Organization, representing almost all the nations of the world, is only now beginning to explore its potential role in the field of international dental research. It appears to me, therefore, that the International Association for Dental Research is the most logical organization to stimulate the truly international effort necessary to advance dental research around the world.

The phenomenal expansion of biomedical research did not happen by chance. Leadership has been the forceful guide that has accelerated medical progress. Indeed, advances in medical research have set the stage for international dental health as an attainable objective. If dental research investigators like yourselves accept the challenge of providing intensified leadership for the dental profession, you will hasten the day when international dental health becomes a reality.

The spectacular growth of biomedical research in which I have been privileged to participate during my 25 years in Congress is a scientific phenomenon that has changed the world. The exciting accomplishments of research investigators in that short time of the world's history have actually underscored the feasibility of international dental health as a worthy aim. I pledge my efforts to strengthen my country's contributions to the imaginative international partnership which will be required to bring dental health to the people of the world—a partnership through which we can cut across boundaries between the sciences, between nations, and between man's scientific and humane concerns.

FATHER JOSE L. CAPOTE

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow evening I will have the great privilege of attending a testimonial dinner to honor the Reverend Jose L. Capote, pastor of Our Lady of Fatima Church in Newark. This occasion will mark the 10th anniversary of Father Capote's service to the Portuguese-American community in Newark.

When Father Capote was called to Newark there was no church, and he had to seek out his parishioners among the Portuguese-American residents. In the short period of 10 years, Father Capote founded his parish and led the fund-raising effort to build Our Lady of Fatima Church. It was dedicated in 1958 and now serves 15,000 parishioners of Portuguese heritage.

Under Father Capote's guidance Our Lady of Fatima has become the center for religious, cultural and social activities of the Portuguese-American citizens in Newark. His is an outstanding spiritual and civic achievement, and I am proud to join in honoring him. I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Newark News of October 4, 1965, describing Father Capote's work be included in the Record.

Persistent Pastor—His Church Serves 15,000 Portuguese

(By Fred Cicetti)

Rev. Jose L. Capote came to Newark 10 years ago with only a crucifix and his theology books. Today he is pastor of Our Lady of Fatima Church, which serves 15,000 Portuguese-Americans in the Newark archdiocese.

Father Capote was called by Archbishop Thomas A. Boland to set up the parish for the immigrant group.

"I had been in a similar parish in Cambridge, Mass., when I was asked to come to Newark," Father Capote said. "I wasn't completely sure what was expected of me. When I arrived in Newark, I was told there was no church and I would have to find parishioners for this nonexistent church."

MEETING IN SPORT CLUB

With the archbishop, Father Capote held a meeting in the Sport Club Portuguese at 55 Prospect Street.

"A large part of the Portuguese-American population in the archdiocese lives in the Ironbound section of the city. The Sport Club was a logical meeting place. The archbishop gave a speech and I gave a speech and the people applauded. Then I bought a street directory of Newark to find my other parishioners. It was quite a job looking through all the listings for Portuguese names."

In 1956, Father Capote began a fund drive to erect the church. With some financial aid from the archdiocese and a mortgage, the church was built in Jefferson Street and dedicated December 14, 1958.

The church is in the territorial parish of St. James Church, but it is solely for Portuguese-Americans and their children.

FOUR SUNDAY MASSES

"It was a long time coming," Father Capote said. "Portuguese are very proud of their national heritage. They were forced to attend either St. James or St. Joseph's, which is a Spanish parish. When our church was built, we grew steadily to our present total."

Today, with the help of his curate, Rev. John S. Antao, Father Capote celebrates four Sunday masses (three in Portuguese, one in English). The church has a Holy Name Society, a Catholic Youth Organization, a Boy Scout troop and a Girl Scout troop.

Father Capote said two-thirds of the parishioners were born in Portugal. Unlike other nationalities, the priest said, the Portuguese emigrated to the United States much later, primarily in the 1920's.

"The church will live on, however, after the first generation," Father Capote said. "The Portuguese people have very strong family ties and the children have inherited the same pride in their background. The kids show a strong curiosity in Portugal and their parents' native tongue. We probably have the only bilingual Boy Scouts in the State."

NEWSPAPER STARTED

In 1961, with the permission of the archbishop, Father Capote began producing a Portuguese newspaper called "Novos Rumos," or "New Paths." An 8-page, bimonthly journal with a circulation of 4,000, it is written almost entirely by the priest.

"There are a couple of contributing writers, but I do most of it—even the editorials. It's not a religious paper, as some people might think. It is a genuine paper with news of local and national importance.

"It has a Catholic slant, naturally. Archbishop Boland is on our mailing list. The archbishop doesn't know Portuguese, but with his background in Latin and Spanish, he always knows what I'm writing."

FETE SATURDAY

For a pastor, Father Capote is young at 41. He was born in Ilhavo, Portugal, and came to Gloucester, Mass., in 1947. He studied at St. Joan's and Olivais Seminaries in Portugal, and at the Pontifical University in Brighton, Mass. He was ordained by Richard Cardinal Cushing in 1949.

To mark the anniversary of Father Capote's arrival in Newark, the lay leaders of the parish have planned a testimonial dinner honoring the priest for his "dynamic leadership in founding Our Lady of Fatima Church as a religious, cultural, and social center." The dinner will be Saturday night in the Hotel Military Park.

EVE OF INDEPENDENCE DAY FOR UGANDA

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Farnum] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, Uganda became independent on October 9, 1962, and so today we are on the eve of its independence day. There is increasing evidence on this anniversary that this nation will fulfill our hopes for it, even though it is taking a course toward independence different from the one familiar to us.

It is the conviction of its leaders that a form of Socialist government in combination with Western economic concepts may prove the most direct road to quick development. Meanwhile Uganda maintains a strong voice in the United Nations and, as we are well aware, last year opened an Embassy in this city.

Our hopes for this proud nation of ancient Africa, of course, are that Uganda will develop into a strong, self-assured and independent nation, with democratic institutions which fit local and national requirements.

In our enjoyment of close, friendly relations wth Uganda, we have given encouragement to the new Government with a program to increase agricultural production and to make more efficient use of mineral resources. In addition our AID program is assisting promising Ugandan students and we are otherwise encouraging self-help programs and other programs promising to speed Uganda's way to taking a leading role in the world of free nations.

It is fitting today, Mr. Speaker, that we extend our congratulations for past accomplishments and best wishes for future hopes to Uganda's President, Sir Edward Frederick Mutesa II; to its Vice President, Sir William W. Nadiope; to its Prime Minister for Foreign Affairs, A. Milton Obote; to its Ambassador to the United States, Dr. Solomon Bayo Asea; and to its Ambassador to the United Nations, A. K. Kironde.

UGANDA'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Hara] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I am happy to extend the congratulations and well wishes of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States to the Republic of Uganda on the third anniversary of her independence.

Uganda is a rich and beautiful country, which I have visited twice and each time have left with deep regret. Lying on Lake Victoria the scenery in Uganda is fascinating and I found her people in all walks of life cordial to the stranger and of a high order of intelligence. American tourists who have visited Uganda return in praise of the country and the people.

To Sir Edward F. Mutesa II, President of the Republic, to Prime Minister A. Milton Obote, and to Dr. Solomon Bayo Asea, the able and popular Ambassador to the United States, go my warmest salutation on this happy anniversary.

On October 9, 1962, the rule of Great Britain ended and Uganda became an independent nation. The control exercised by the British had extended for almost seven decades since the establishment of a protectorate over part of the country in 1894. When it first became a free member of the British Commonwealth Uganda kept the Queen of England as its chief of state. However, on the first anniversary of independence in 1963, Uganda became a Republic. A president is the chief of state, while the ministerial form of government in the British tradition has remained.

Uganda's future is assured. She is blessed with many assets. She has a very favorable balance of trade. While this has been built on the export of agriculture commodities, some mineral extraction is providing a diversity of products. She has a high potential of hydroelectric power for the development of her industry. The power comes from the large number of waterways, such as the White Nile, and waterfalls which appear over much of the countryside.

The land itself is able to support the population. That area which cannot be used for cultivation or grazing is fortunately well suited for tourism. Generally located on a pleasant plateau, fringed on the east and west by spectacular mountains, abounding in fishing facilities and game preserves, this Nation is attracting an ever increasing number of foreign visitors. The airport at Entebee can now handle international jet transports. The official language is English.

Mr. Speaker, these assets are far from all those available to Uganda in its drive to modernize itself. A comprehensive development plan has been adopted which seeks to transform the economic life of the country. The Ugandan Government realizes that foreign aid is necessary and has enacted laws to attract private capital from abroad. Another resource of the nation which is harder to measure but which is nevertheless vital is the confidence and willingness to work shown by the free, private small farmers who form the majority of the agricultural producers.

Uganda has chosen to follow a course of nonalinement in world politics. This has not precluded strong support for the ideal of African unity.

THE RIGHT TO VOTE

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has passed a voting rights bill which is a major step toward extending the franchise to those who have previously been unable to participate in the basic act of free government—the right to vote.

I am proud to have been in Congress when this milestone legislation was added to the fabric of our democracy.

There remains, however, a group of American citizens—8 million strong—who are flatly denied the right to vote in all but four States of the Union. Yet this group of citizens serves our country well throughout the world.

As Peace Corps volunteers they are bringing a new image of America—the image of a compassionate and friendly people—to other nations throughout the world not as fortunate as our own.

As volunteers in the war on poverty they are helping to eradicate the evils of poverty and want where they exist in this country.

They represent our Nation in international athletic competition, and in the field of the arts.

Perhaps most significant of all, they represent our national security in the rice paddies and jungles of Vietnam. Some have given the ultimate sacrifice.

I am of course talking about the young men and women of America between the ages of 18 and 21 who are not allowed to vote.

I am not one of those who bemoan the morals and manners of our young people. They are being asked to do more for our Nation than ever before in our history—and they are meeting the challenge of citizenship with maturity.

I firmly believe our young people between the ages of 18 and 21 deserve the right to vote and I am introducing a bill identical with that of my good friend Mr. WELTNER introduced last August which would accomplish this most desirable objective.

In these times, we cannot afford to be without the voice at the polls of a segment of our society that has served us honorably and well.

RAPID TRANSPORTATION

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, ever since man learned to walk he has had the urge to roam from place to place. And, in all his progress in getting from place to place he has encountered added obstacles as the centuries progressed.

Now, in the 20th century, we have saturated our transportation systems to a point where each additional step to alleviate crowded transportation facilities adds to our difficulties in getting from one place to another.

With the millions of automobiles which are being produced each year there was the acute need for bigger and better highways. And, with wider and better highways, we saw the rapid expansion of suburban areas far away from the place of a person's employment. In some instances as far away as 30 to 40 miles from the center of the metropolitan area.

In this country we have accomplished miracles toward sending a man to the moon. Yet we seem to be floundering in such a simple, earthly matter as getting people safely to and from work or from one activity to another.

The crux of the entire problem is a complete lack of research and development in the field of transportation. What we now need is a breakthrough in the transit field. We should develop a new system which would provide urban and suburban dwellers with a good public transportation system—at low fares and speed which would surpass anything that we have at present.

Our expenditures on a research for intercity rail travel have not kept pace with the expenditures we have made on other modes of travel. At a hearing before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics received testimony from John T. O'Connor, Secretary of Commerce, regarding research in rapid transit. The Secretary stated that in fiscal year 1963 the Federal Government spent $275 million for aviation research, $15 million for water transportation research, $24 million for highway research and only $7 million for research into intercity rail travel.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing H.R. 11514 which would authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to carry out a survey and investigation of the feasibility of constructing and operating a passenger monorail train system between Suffern, N.Y. and Hoboken, N.J., over the rights-of-way of the main line of the Erie-Lackawanna Railroad through the use of the airspace over the present roadbed and thence across the Hudson River into downtown Manhattan.

It is my belief that the Federal Government should share in this endeavor with the State of New Jersey to provide the necessary means of getting these people into downtown Manhattan from the upper reaches of the State of New Jersey. The State of New Jersey has already recognized that fact that this problem does exist. In the last 5 years it has contributed to keeping this line open to commuters. That contribution for the 12-month period ending June 30 last was $2.2 million, which is a reduction from its contribution of $2.7 million for the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1962, a reduction that has taken place while costs have been going up and revenues down.

I would like to point out that the Erie-Lackawanna suburban service is quite extensive. It originates at 11 different points in 9 counties and transports some 35,000 people into Hoboken each weekday Monday to Friday inclusive, and approximately the same number outbound from Hoboken each evening. This requires the operation of 145 passenger trains on weekdays. Except for the Long Island Railroad, Erie-Lackawanna's service on a multiplicity of lines exceeds by far that of any other railroad in the tristate area—New Jersey, New York, and Connecticut.

Commuter travel by train has decreased substantially, and you may wonder why. I can say that the loss of revenue is a prime factor in this decrease, for the railroads cannot keep their rolling stock in first-class condition because of the increasing expense in upkeep. For the Erie-Lackawanna Railroad, we have the Hudson River barrier which requires a change of trains at Hoboken. Unless we build a system which will bring these passengers into downtown Manhattan, there will be a continued loss of revenue to this line which is badly needed to bring in commuters to town to their places of employment. Should this fail the other alternative would be to build additional highways into the lower reaches of Manhattan from the New Jersey side, highways which would require additional bridges or underwater tunnels. This in turn would further complicate the vehicular traffic situation which is already at saturation level.

The advantages such a system would have are many. Air pollution, caused by automotive exhausts which continue to aggravate city dwellers with injury to their health would be reduced. Accidents due to congested highways would be reduced, since it has been shown that private motor cars are the most serious cause of vehicular accidents. They were, in 1964, the cause of 1.7 million injuries which resulted in nearly 48,000 deaths.

Good commuter service would reduce costs to our citizens, for automobiles are expensive to operate. When we consider the cost of gasoline, oil, repairs, maintenance, insurance, parking fees, and depreciation, we can count on a cost of approximately 12 cents per mile in these costs of operation.

We must take a concerted effort in research on the project which I am proposing in my bill, a half-hearted effort will not amount to anything to alleviate this pressing problem. We have made advancements in space study through the use of Federal funds, so we must also utilize the services of the Federal Government to obtain a breakthrough in ground transportation of intercity travel. This problem, with the expanding suburban areas will become worse as time progresses and before it gets completely out of hand we should tackle it now.

Is there any hope for railroad passenger service? I say, "Yes," if we undertake the survey which my bill proposes and then complete action on the building of the monorail which I propose, which could reactivate the interest of the commuter public, if fast, frequent, up-to-date service were offered. My bill proposes this solution and it is my fervent hope that this Congress will look with a favorable eye toward its enactment.

CONCERN FOR MEMBERS OF OUR ARMED FORCES

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Hanley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Members who have joined with me in introducing legislation similar to that before the House today. In so doing, they have demonstrated their concern for members of our Armed Forces.

The President once said, "We did not choose to be the guardians at the gate." In a great many cases, I am sure, our military men feel the same.

Defending the principles of freedom and democracy in an alien land is no menial task. It requires a great deal of courage and a deep devotion to duty.

Vietnam is the most prominent example of the type of situation I have just mentioned. This is a nation torn by strife; a land which is ineffective and virtually powerless because of the turmoil which encompasses that entire State.

Yet we ask our military men to go to this land; many of our finest young men will never return.

But all this does not complicate the problems of our fighting men enough. Added to this are the actions of a small group of people in our own country. We hear a great deal about the demonstration protesting the war in Vietnam, and also daily we read of the burning of draft cards. I ask my colleagues to pause for a moment and visualize the effect this must have on a GI in Vietnam. It can only cast a shadow over the already gloomy picture.

A letter from home, when all else seems lost, has a very encouraging effect. It can give a GI the lift he needs to face the responsibilities which weigh so heavily upon him.

A letter from home can make the military man aware of the fact that he is supported by a great majority of the American public.

I am certain there is no need to urge favorable consideration of this legislation by my colleagues. Their good judgment will assure passage of this bill.

ORDER OF 4TH ARMY COMMANDING GENERAL IN SUSPENDING COURT MARTIAL PUNISHMENT METED OUT TO TRAITOR

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Williams] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the brave Americans in Vietnam must be amazed and bewildered by the action of the 4th Army commanding general who suspended the court martial punishment meted out to a traitor.

According to the press, a court martial, Tuesday, handed a 5-year prison term and a dishonorable discharge to Pfc. Winstel R. Belton for refusing to go to Vietnam. However, Lt. Gen. Robert W. Colglazier reduced the sentence to a suspended 1-year term and a suspended bad conduct discharge. No explanation has been offered.

General Colglazier, by this one deed, insulted every man and woman who served this country in time of war.

Merely to slap the wrist of a confessed seditionist is a defiance of time-honored military traditions.

Mr. Speaker, there are in America today 1,992,037 veterans who were disabled in the service of their country. Yet, one lieutenant general playing God, has disparaged their courage and valor by rewarding treason.

This general has evidenced his disrespect for the brave fighting men around the globe. He has disgraced the flag which has been carried into battle by millions of heroes.

The precious blood, the agonizing sweat and the sorrowing tears which constructed this Union of States have been cheapened by an Army officer's irresponsible invitation to insurrection.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the great Committee on Armed Services will conduct a thorough investigation of this matter and report the full facts to the American people.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Reinecke (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for today and October 11, on account of official business.

Mr. Arends (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for today, on account of official business as a U.S. delegate to the NATO Parliamentarians Conference.

Mr. Aspinall, for October 11 and 12, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Ichord, for 1 hour, on Wednesday, October 13.

Mr. Ashbrook (at the request of Mr. Grover), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Grover) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. McClory.

Mr. Rumsfeld.

Mr. Cederberg.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hansen of Iowa) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Wright.

Mr. Powell.

Mr. Hanley.

Mr. Zablocki.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 32. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 106. Joint resolution to allow the showing in the United States of the U.S. Information Agency film "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums."

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1805. An act to amend section 5899 of title 10, United States Code, to provide permanent authority under which Naval Reserve officers in the grade of captain shall be eligible for consideration for promotion when their running mates are eligible for consideration for promotion;

H.R. 5571. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of incentive pay for submarine duty to personnel qualified in submarines attached to staffs of submarine operational commanders;

H.R. 7169. An act to amend the Securities Act of 1933 with respect to certain registration fees;

H.R. 7484. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the rank of lieutenant general or vice admiral of officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force while serving as Surgeons General;

H.R. 9042. An act to provide for the implementation of the Agreement Concerning

Automotive Products Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9247. An act to provide for participation of the United States in the HemisFair 1968 exposition to be held at San Antonio, Tex., in 1968, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10238. An act to provide labor standards for certain persons employed by Federal contractors to furnish services to Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 724. An act to authorize the transfer of certain Canal Zone prisoners to the custody of the Attorney General;

H.R. 1384. An act for the relief of Theodore Zissu;

H.R. 3045. An act to authorize certain members of the Armed Forces to accept and wear decorations of certain foreign nations;

H.R. 5665. An act to authorize disbursing officers of the Armed Forces to advance funds to members of an armed force of a friendly foreign nation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6165. An act to repeal section 165 of the Revised Statutes relating to the appointment of women to clerkships in the executive departments;

H.R. 6726. An act for the relief of William S. Perrigo;

H.R. 7329. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of San Diego, Calif.;

H.R. 9336. An act to amend title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 relating to certain claims against the Government of Cuba;

H.R. 9975. An act to authorize the shipment, at Government expense, to, from, and within the United States and between overseas areas of privately owned vehicles of deceased or missing personnel, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10234. An act to amend section 1085 of title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the reimbursement procedure required among the medical facilities of the Armed Forces under the jurisdiction of the military departments; and

H.R. 10871. An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 11, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BOGGS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6319. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for treatment of the recovery of losses arising from expropriation, intervention, or confiscation of properties by governments of foreign countries; with amendment (Rept. No. 1125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. S. 1760. An act to authorize the acceptance of a settlement of certain indebtedness of Greece to the United States and to authorize the use of the payments resulting from the settlement for a cultural and educational exchange program; with amendment (Rept. No. 1126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 602. Resolution dismissing the election contest in the Third Congressional District of the State of Iowa; without amendment (Rept. No. 1127). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers. Report pursuant to (63 Stat. 377); without amendment (Rept. No. 1128). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1320. An act to amend certain criminal laws applicable to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1129). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on District of Columbia. S. 1715. An act to extend the penalty for assault on a police officer in the District of Columbia to assaults on employees of penal and correctional institutions and places of confinement of juveniles of the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1130). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on District of Columbia. S. 1719. An act to authorize compensation for overtime work performed by officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, and the White House Police force, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on District of Columbia. H.R. 10497. A bill to provide criminal penalties for making certain telephone calls in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1132). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 11503. A bill relating to the carryover of net operating losses of certain railroad corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 11504. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act so as to permit injured employees entitled to receive medical services under such act to utilize the services of optometrists; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRIDER:

H.R. 11505. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 11506. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to restore the former tariff treatment of certain perfume bottles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 11507. A bill to provide for the control or elimination of jellyfish and other such pests in the coastal waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 11508. A bill to authorize the establishment of Federal mutual savings banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 11509. A bill to amend and clarify the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Services Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 11510. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to reciprocal mailing privileges of the United States and certain countries from which foreign assistance is withheld; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 11511. A bill to provide that certain serge woven fabrics may be imported free of duty to be used in the manufacture of apparel for members of religious orders; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.R. 11512. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the withholding of income tax from wages and salaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 11513. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of dependency and indemnity compensation to widows, children, and parents of deceased veterans and to increase the income limitations governing the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to parents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 11514. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of Commerce to carry out a survey and investigation of the feasibility of constructing and operating a passenger monorail train system between Suffern, N.Y., and Hoboken, N.J., over the rights-of-way of the main line of the Erie-Lackawanna Railroad; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 11515. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.J. Res. 686. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 11516. A bill for the relief of Dr. Luis Anglo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 11517. A bill for the relief of Marton Berkovics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 11518. A bill for the relief of Miss Alda Paternoster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 11519. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Anna Brescia and children, Luciana Brescia and Maria Pia Brescia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1965

(Legislative day of Friday, October 1, 1965)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Herbert H. Richards, D.D., minister, First Methodist Church, Boise, Idaho, offered the following prayer:

O Divine Healer, we begin our Senate's day of decision with a fervent prayer for health, the health of the President of the United States. May vigor and strength return to him soon after today's operation.

We pray also for health of our Nation, her economy, her human relations. May her strength be equal to the task.

Finally, we pray for health among the nations of the world, that our generation will be worthy of peace.

In the name of Him who touched and healed. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 7, 1965, was dispensed with.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the agreement previously entered into, does the time limitation begin at this point?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703 (b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the last 13 minutes prior to 1 o'clock today be set aside for the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the majority leader or minority leader yield for 1 or 2 minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Kansas.

KANSAS NEEDS 14(b)

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, during the course of what our distinguished minority leader calls "attenuated discussion," I have noted that during the debate many editorials have been read into the Record concerning the repeal of section 14(b).

The Topeka Daily Capital issue of Thursday, September 30, contained an excellent editorial on the subject entitled "Kansas Needs 14(b)."

I shall not read the entire editorial, but I shall read one or two extracts from it:

> Kansas has a big stake in the battle in Congress by organized labor to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. This is the section of the Federal law which permits individual States to outlaw compulsory unionism within their boundaries.
>
> Kansas voters adopted an amendment to the State constitution in 1958 outlawing the union shop and the closed shop. The amendment won at the polls in November of that year by a plurality of almost 88,000 votes. Although it was an off-presidential year, more than 700,000 votes were cast in the election.
>
> There are remarkable similarities in the situation in Kansas in 1955 when the heated, right-to-work issue was being debated, and that today in Washington.

Another section of the editorial reads:

> Kansas businessmen have learned to operate successfully under the right-to-work amendment. There has been no true dilution of the labor union movement in Kansas, nor has it been less effective.
>
> But despite this working arrangement in Kansas and the other 18 right-to-work States, it seems the national leaders of organized labor feel the laws banning compulsory unionism are pesky thorns in their sides.
>
> Failing to stem the tide of public sentiment in State legislations and State elections, these union leaders have concentrated their efforts nationally through presidential and congressional campaign support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Topeka (Kans.) Daily Capital, Sept. 30, 1965]

KANSAS NEEDS 14(b)

Kansas has a big stake in the battle in Congress by organized labor to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. This is the section of the Federal law which permits individual States to outlaw compulsory unionism within their boundaries.

Kansas voters adopted an amendment to the State constitution in 1958 outlawing the union shop and the closed shop. The amendment won at the polls in November of that year by a plurality of almost 88,000 votes. Although it was an off-presidential year, more than 700,000 votes were cast in the election.

There are remarkable similarities in the situation in Kansas in 1955 when the heated, right-to-work issue was being debated and that today in Washington.

Fred Hall, then Governor of Kansas, openly opposed enactment of a right-to-work law. He was supported by organized labor but denied at the time he had pledged a veto of any right-to-work bill. Still, when the bill reached his desk from the Kansas House and Senate, Hall vetoed it. There were not enough votes to override Hall.

Two years later, when Gov. George Docking, a Democrat, was Governor of Kansas, the legislature bypassed the chief executive. It placed the right-to-work question on the 1958 general election ballot in the form of a constitutional amendment. The amendment was adopted that year.

In Washington, President Johnson reportedly pledged organized labor an all-out effort to repeal section 14(b) at this session of Congress. He obviously is nudging a reluctant House and Senate in his effort.

Placed alongside some of the lopsided votes other portions of the President's legislative program have received, the House vote to repeal section 14(b) almost appeared to be a defeat. At least it demonstrated built-in resistance to arm twisting on so controversial a measure.

Now that the 14(b) repealer is in the U.S. Senate, the picture has changed considerably. It is not that President Johnson lacks sufficient votes to pass the anti-14(b) bill. He simply lacks the horsepower to bring it to a vote. The Republican and southern Senators, particularly from the 19 right-to-work States that would be most drastically affected, have organized to present an extended debate or discussion of the overall impact and repercussions certain to follow repeal. The administration is unable to invoke cloture.

Senator Everett M. Dirksen, Republican, of Illinois, minority floor leader, is the prime mover in the effort to block repeal of section 14(b) at this session, or in the next. His State has a right-to-work law, and he is committed by common, ordinary, garden variety politics to uphold the position of his State.

Likewise, Senator Frank Carlson, Republican, of Kansas, has pledged to join in the extended debate of the 14(b) repeal bill. Carlson need not tax his memory to recall the spirited battle in his home State over the issue, and the comfortable margin by which the Kansas right-to-work amendment was adopted by the voters in a statewide election. It can only be supposed that his continual contacts with the folks at home have convinced him sentiment in the Sunflower State has not changed materially.

Kansas businessmen have learned to operate successfully under the right-to-work amendment. There has been no true dilution of the labor union movement in Kansas, nor has it been less effective.

But despite this working arrangement in Kansas and the other 18 right-to-work States, it seems the national leaders of organized labor feel the laws banning compulsory unionism are pesky thorns in their sides.

Failing to stem the tide of public sentiment in State legislatures and State elections, these union leaders have concentrated their efforts nationally through presidential and congressional campaign support.

Even recognizing the financial support and bloc-voting unions can and do deliver in congressional and presidential campaigns, the union demand that the President and Congress smack the voters and the legislators of 19 States in the face seems too great a price to pay for political aid.

Floyd E. Black, executive secretary of the Kansas Federation of Labor, AFL–CIO, estimated repeal of the 14(b) section would result in an estimated 25,000 new union members in the State. He did not explain whether they would join through compulsion, or because labor unions would, somehow, become more attractive to them.

Black has decried the support pledged by the State's five Representatives and two Senators to retain section 14(b). Still, it would seem no other course is open to the elected representatives of Kansas citizens in view of their demonstrated desires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bass in the chair). Who yields time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Fannin].

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I want to emphasize that all of us who are determined to fully inform the American people about the wisdom of retaining section 14(b) are not motivated by any narrow regional concern.

In their attempt to have this bill rammed through the Congress, some union propagandists would have the public believe that only those 19 States with voluntary unionism laws would be affected in any way.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

On the contrary, many of our colleagues from States other than the 19 feel just as strongly as I do that 14(b) must remain in the law of the land.

Ours is a conviction based on principle which knows no lines of geography or politics, because the principle involved here is above either State or party loyalty.

Our mission can be stated in very simple language, Mr. President. It is nothing less than the defense of individual freedom for American workingmen and women in all 50 States of the Union.

If this section of the law is repealed, Americans everywhere—regardless of where they live and work—will lose another significant portion of control over their own destinies.

Their right to determine in the first instance the scope and direction of legislation relating to unionism in their own States would be sharply curtailed—if not eliminated entirely.

No longer would they be able to govern their own affairs in this vital area of human activity through their own representatives at the State level. All the initiative and the power would be removed from them and transferred to the Federal Government.

As a practical matter, it would mean that the people of any State which does not now have a voluntary unionism law would be precluded from even considering such a law in the future—or any other labor legislation, for that matter.

Regardless of changing conditions and public sentiment at some future time in any of those 31 States, their citizens could not take any initiative whatsoever at the State level to express their will.

Thus it is very clear that all Americans everywhere have a vital stake in this bill—and not just those of the 19 States whose existing right-to-work laws would be nullified.

There is another reason why repeal would be national rather than sectional in its consequences, Mr. President, and even the proponents of the bill admit it.

They concede that repeal of 14(b) will add greatly to the monopolistic power already enjoyed by many giant industrial unions. Given the reinforcement of a national compulsory unionism law, union officials would then be able to employ dictatorial power and vast resources against employers in any State of the Union—regardless of the merit of their case in any given locality.

This in turn would further unbalance the collective bargaining concept which already places the small independent business enterprise at a distinct disadvantage in dealing with arbitrary demands by powerful unions.

Those who mistakenly view support of 14(b) as being merely a protectionist effort on behalf of 19 States should consider still another consequence of its repeal.

Anything that tends to encourage more responsible conduct on the part of union officials will benefit millions of union members throughout the Nation, and there can be little doubt that voluntary unionism contributes to responsibility.

The freedom which voters in any State now have to adopt a voluntary unionism law serves as a beneficial restraining influence on the extremist elements among union leadership. It requires them to think more often of their members and concentrate on working to better serve their welfare.

Without the protection afforded by 14(b), some union officials would be given a green light to divert even more attention and money to political and personal causes not even remotely connected with bargaining on wages, hours, and working conditions.

There is yet another reason why the proposed repeal of 14(b) involves the welfare of all American workers and the national interest of the United States.

It has to do with the long-term stability and progress of our national economy upon which we depend for our material well-being.

A national policy of compulsory unionism would take this country another giant step down the road toward a federally controlled economy in which the dominant force would be the power of a few officials of organized labor.

Once powerful Great Britain stands before the world today as a sad example of where that road can take us. In a most able editorial on September 16, the Wall Street Journal called attention to Britain's plight as follows—and I quote:

> The growing political power of unions, together with the complaisance of management, has threaded make-work rules and practices throughout Britain's industry. Featherbedding, which is hardly unknown in the United States, saps industry's domestic vitality and lessens its ability to sell goods abroad.

If we continue to follow in this path, it will not be long until we reach the point where we have priced ourselves out of world markets in competition with more aggressive industrial nations, and when this time comes, we shall simply be exporting jobs to these countries—the very jobs which are the livelihood of all American workers, union and nonunion alike.

It is for all of these reasons that the bill to repeal 14(b) is truly a matter of national importance.

It has been said by some proponents that 14(b) is not really that important and that it does not matter much what happens to it, one way or the other.

Fortunately, however, most Americans still believe that individual freedom is important. They still believe that to compel a man to join a union to keep his job is a fundamental violation of his most basic civil right—the right to earn a living for himself and his family without having to pay tribute to anyone.

Shakespeare said it for us long ago in the "Merchant of Venice" when he had one of his characters remark as follows:

> You take my house when you do take the prop that doth sustain my house; you take my life when you do take the means whereby I live.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Who yields time?

Mr. **JAVITS.** Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield me time?

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** How much time does the Senator require?

Mr. **JAVITS.** Ten minutes.

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S MISPLACED PRIORITIES IN LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. **JAVITS.** Mr. President, for a long time I have been on record as favoring repeal of 14(b), but I have also long been on record as feeling strongly that there had to be certain amendments to the Taft-Hartley law which ranked in importance with the repeal of 14(b) and which should become law at one and the same time.

I believe that the Congress, because of the insistence of the administration on repeal of 14(b) without any amendments of any kind or character except the so-called conscience clause—that is, dealing with problems of persons with religious objections to joining unions—has placed itself in an embarrassing position. In my judgment, taking everything together, the administration has not, in this way, served the best interests of labor itself.

While I shall support the various moves which are being made to repeal 14(b)—and right now the Senate is considering a motion to take up, and no amendments are in order—it would be my intention to propose at the minimum the two major amendments which I have filed.

One amendment deals with the use of card checks instead of elections to determine union representation; the other deals with bringing about the enforcement of no-strike, no-lockout clauses.

Nevertheless, I feel it my duty to point out that the present situation is attributable to a hard and fast position on repeal and nothing else which can and should be corrected. The impasse at which we now very well may find ourselves is at least in part the result of the administration's insistence on attaching top priority to a bill which, though it has a fine objective, lacks the balance necessary to attain the needed broad Senate and public support. For it is clear beyond question—as both labor and management would certainly agree—that there is a wide range of defects in our labor laws. Yet we have focused on only one, and we have done so not only to the exclusion of many other needed changes in the Taft-Hartley Act, but in other labor laws as well.

I note with great regret that we are about to end this session of Congress without a minimum wage for migratory laborers, without minimum standards for unemployment compensation, without extended coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act—and perhaps even without repeal of 14(b)—and in that case we will have hazarded all and gained nothing. And this impasse in which we find ourselves certainly cannot be attributed to an unwillingness on the part of Congress to legislate in the public interest, for rarely in our history has a Congress accomplished so much in so many fields in such a short period of time. But when it comes to labor legislation, we have gone just about nowhere, and the reasons for this sorry state of affairs are all too clear. The administration has chosen as the majority's priority measure a bill to strengthen the bargaining position of those who already have a union to represent them, and relegated to second place all the pending measures which are designed primarily to help those who have no union wage scale, who have no minimum wage, and who have in many cases worked for substandard wages and lived in abject poverty. Yet we are about to condemn these workers to another year of the same because the 14(b) repealer is the priority bill, which has taken precedence over all other labor legislation.

Nor do I think it would have been impossible to repeal 14(b) this year—and to pass other needed labor legislation as well—if the administration had only been willing to accept reasonable amendments to the 14(b) repealer so that it could be taken up as a balanced measure aimed at correcting a fair range of glaring weaknesses in the Taft-Hartley Act.

As it is, however, we clearly have the cart before the horse, and the cart is off balance at that.

I have repeatedly explained my reasons for favoring repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act: 14(b) is inconsistent with our national labor policy and is in unwarranted restriction on the freedom of labor and management to bargain collectively about all matters of importance to them, including the union shop. My State has never had a right-to-work law, and the existence of such laws in other States has had no effect on New York except to drain business away and foster the so-called runaway shop.

Repeal presents no civil liberties question, for representatives of a broad cross-section of established civil liberties organizations testified in hearings before the Subcommittee on Labor in support of the bill. Indeed, while it is often argued that this bill amounts to an invasion of freedom because it allegedly compels membership in a private organization, quite the opposite is true. The bill compels nothing. It permits a company and a union to bargain about the union shop. If they freely choose to agree upon a union shop, then it is the union shop agreement, and not the Taft-Hartley Act, which is controlling. An agreement is signed by an organization duly selected by a majority of the employees and responsible to that majority under the law.

Even under a union shop agreement, compulsory membership is never required in a union: all that is required is the payment of union dues. This unique legal treatment, in the case of a union, arises from the fact that the union is itself required by law to represent, at its own expense, all employees and not just members. The union may be required to hire lawyers and other experts whose fees must be paid. Thus, both the union and the employees may be required to spend money involuntarily—the union because under the law it has a kind of public franchise, and the employees because they are the beneficiaries of that franchise and must bear a proportionate cost of it.

It has also been argued that unions are too powerful and that this bill will further distort the balance of power. I find this argument far from convincing, particularly because, even if one were to assume for the sake of argument that union power is excessive in certain instances, no such power has been achieved in right-to-work States. Indeed, it is in the right-to-work States where there is no equality of bargaining power between labor and management, where the cards are often stacked against organized labor, and where substandard wages and working conditions have often been the rule rather than the exception.

But there are pressing instances in which legislation is needed to insure that union responsibility keeps pace with union power. Clearly, we need a thorough revision of the national emergency disputes provisions of Taft-Hartley. Certainly, we need a revision of the election machinery in the act, to insure that union power is exercised only by unions which have true majority support. And we need an amendment to the act to insure that when a labor agreement is finally signed and the parties agree not to strike during the term of the contract but to arbitrate their grievances instead, both sides can be made to live up to the terms of that bargain.

Beyond Taft-Hartley, and of equal importance, are the pending bills to extend coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act to additional workers, to increase the minimum wage, to provide minimum standards for unemployment compensation, and to establish minimum wage and child labor standards for agricultural and migratory labor.

The administration is not unaware of these needs. President Johnson in his labor message to Congress, dealt at length with the Fair Labor Standards Act and unemployment compensation, and then devoted only a few words, at the end of his message, to repeal of 14(b). Secretary Wirtz delivered a truly moving plea to the Senate Migratory Labor Subcommittee to act favorably on the pending migratory labor bills.

Yet I regret I must reach the conclusion that other important labor bills were forced to take a back seat to the 14(b) repealer. I had hoped we could have passed all these measures. As it is, we may well end up with none, though I shall vote with those who favor repeal now. If we do not get a result at this session, then I would certainly hope that next year the administration and the majority will take a more balanced view of the many needed labor measures urgently awaiting congressional action and as part of a balanced labor package we may accomplish a repeal of 14(b), which I have supported in the past and will continue to support in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

JOE TYDINGS, SENATOR FROM MARYLAND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute. In the Washington World for October 1965, there appears an article about "Joe Tydings, Senator From Maryland."

Joe Tydings exemplifies the outstanding qualities and abilities of this year's class of Senators. He has performed well in following in the footsteps of his father. He has made many contributions; he has conducted himself with integrity and maturity. He has demonstrated in such a short time that he shall be with us for a very long time.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Joe Tydings: Senator From Maryland

There have been many father-and-son stories in the almost two centuries of Federal Government in this young Nation, starting with the Adams family, when the United States of America was a stripling nation among nations. Over the years, there have been quite a few seats in the Halls of Congress taken by sons of deceased or retired paternal solons, and several in the White House.

The Nation's Capital, which is often called the belly of Maryland, has had on public view since January a young Maryland Senator, Joseph D. Tydings, who rode to Capitol Hill with President Lyndon B. Johnson's slaughter of the Republican Party last November, following his father's footsteps.

After almost two decades of Republican representation in the U.S. Senate from a predominantly Democratic State, Maryland's former Republican Senators, John Marshall Butler and J. Glenn Beall, had been ousted by young Kennedy-Johnson Democrats. Two-termer in the Senate, Beall reluctantly ran again against an ambitious Tydings who was half his age and had twice his vigor, but perhaps not a smidgin of Senator Beall's long political experience as a solon for Maryland and the United States. Tydings, elected in Goldwater holocaust, followed Senator Daniel Brewster into the Senate Chamber as a fellow Democrat, the latter having been elected with President Kennedy in 1960.

Senator Tydings, adopted son of the late Senator Millard E. Tydings, Democrat, of Maryland, was a college boy in the University of Maryland when his father was running for reelection to the Senate against Republican Butler. He was defeated; then Joseph Davis Tydings determinedly decided to go into politics. And he has done so with a vim and vigor equal to no other freshman Senator.

Since he is a pure Johnsonian Democrat, it was evident on Capitol Hill in January that the Maryland freshman was the administration's and the party's "fair-haired boy." Few new Congressmen get everything they want during the first weeks of a new Congress. Joe Tydings had a burning desire for appointment to three specific committees: The Senate's legislative clearinghouses for the District of Columbia, Judiciary, and Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Maryland's contiguity with the Nation's Capital gives him a vital interest in the affairs of the District, where so many hundreds of thousands of his constituents work and shop; as the former U.S. attorney for Maryland he has tremendous ties with the Federal judiciary, and his youth and vigor are natural assets for the aerospace group. He landed all three spots, while several of his incoming classmates wound up with unwanted leftovers.

Senator Tydings is a firm advocate of District of Columbia home rule, has never opposed a Presidential judiciary appointment, and goes along with all space spending requests from the White House. In the District of Columbia Committee he is particularly inflamed in behalf of birth control in the Nation's Capital, where, he points out, "There are many women, mothers of illegitimate children, on relief, who do not understand conception."

The Maryland junior Senator consistently voted against other Southern Democrats early this summer on attempts to water down the (now passed and signed) Voting Rights Act of 1965. On every rollcall he voted against other southern Democrats Democrats against the Dixiecrat bloc. Similarly, he followed the President's line on all appropriations bills so far this year except for voting against the White House on Senator Wayne Morse's, Democrat, of Oregon, cut in foreign aid for fiscal years 1966–67. Senator Brewster abstained on that one.

Curiously, the two Maryland solons disagreed on portions of the Federal Cigarette Labeling Act. In parts of Maryland, tobacco is a primary crop. Senator Tydings voted against his colleague for a 1-year, rather than 3-year, prohibition against the imposition of any requirement that cigarette advertising contain a health warning. This means he stands for the earliest possible printed warning.

A vigorous, energetic worker, Senator Tydings has veritably been nurtured for the political arena by his parents and colleagues.

The Tydings family at Oakington, their ancestral estate, in one of the most beautiful parts of Maryland, includes the Senator's lovely wife, the former Virginia Campbell, and three lively children, Mary, Millard, and Emlen, who like to re-echo Daddy's election night statement: "We're a new spirit in Maryland politics."

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield for one-half minute?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Alaska.

GIVE SARGENT SHRIVER A CHANCE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, criticism is raining down on the Office of Economic Opportunity. It is my view that this major program, carrying out one of the numerous high purposes of the Johnson administration deserves a breathing spell to allow its Administrator an adequate chance to get it started, to enable him to ascertain from experience whether the legislation itself is adequate—a very pertinent question—and to test out the capabilities of his staff. Let the critics remember that few if any Federal undertakings have ever been so successful and so deservedly acclaimed as such as the Peace Corps. Its unquestioned success was due primarily to the leadership and inspiration given it by Sargent Shriver. It may well be, as has been urged on the floor of the Senate, that retaining both these two major responsibilities—that of running the Peace Corps and the antipoverty program—is too much to expect of any one man. But that decision is up to the President. Meanwhile, I believe that a few months hence some of the current difficulties that the poverty program faces can be diminished and on the way to elimination.

A thoughtful analysis of the poverty program's difficulties appears in the October 9 issue of the New Republic. Written by James Ridgeway, it is entitled "Why the Poverty Program Seems a Muddle."

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Why the Poverty War Seems a Muddle

Trying to make sense of the antipoverty war is like wrestling in a hammock. The Office of Economic Opportunity, in Washington, seems like a bedlam even though the people in it are all earnestly striving to push the war forward on all fronts. And the reason, one finally realizes, is that the antipoverty program does not really have a strategy for conquering poverty. It has a man, Sargent Shriver, but it does not have a plan. It does not have jobs for large numbers of unemployed people. The new Housing Act will not provide anywhere enough accommodations for the large number of people living in slums. And the program is not equipped to break the hammerlock of de facto segregation in schools and housing in the big northern cities.

At best, the poverty warriors have assembled an array of tools for poking about in the slums. The people there can be provided with lawyers and doctors; little children can go to preschools where they are taught and fed; the neighborhood workers offer a more efficient means for shuttling welfare clients to Government offices where their needs can be ministered to more quickly; the project can provide training to get some people into some jobs. And if the OEO insists, as it has not yet done, on making sure the poor have a major hand in running the programs that affect them, it may provide them with a means for making city hall pay more attention to their needs, and in doing so reinvigorate the institutions of democratic government.

These are not unimpressive aims. But in the end, they will not be sufficient to stand masses of poor people on their feet, able to make a go of it in this society. This is the real difficulty with the antipoverty war. It lies behind the other, pepper-shot criticisms that are raining down on Mr. Shriver from left, right and center. He is in for another round of congressional keelhauling. And lately he has run into heavy going in his own shop.

Half a dozen top aids are leaving. And while it is insisted that their departures were planned long ago, two of them, Richard Boone, a top community action program official, and Jack Conway, deputy director, have left their associates with deep impressions of their frustrations and even bitterness in dealing with Shriver. Boone, apparently because he was increasingly displeased by the lack of real participation by the poor themselves in running local programs, found himself gradually frozen out of the antipoverty war's hierarchy. Conway tried to establish a modicum of administrative order at the headquarters office, only to be confounded by Shriver who refused to loose his own hands from the smallest administrative details and who apparently tolerates the petty slanders that go on among his employees.

Boone left to become executive director of the Citizens Crusade against Poverty, which is headed by Walter Reuther and looks very much like the beginnings of the labor movement's own war against poverty. While this group's plans still are nebulous, there are suggestions that it may find the resources and the people to begin community action programs run more openly by people living in the impoverished neighborhoods. This can be a difficult job for the Federal Government itself to do, since it may result in putting ghetto neighborhoods in seeming revolt against a mayor who may well be a Democrat. It is conceivable that if the labor unions took an active hand in promoting such neighborhood groups, reluctant city Democrat politicians might be brought to the point of letting the poor run their own poverty programs instead of bossing them around.

Conway, who had come to Shriver from the AFL–CIO, sought to establish a line of administrative order at the OEO. In part that would mean putting an end to embarrassing mistakes. For instance, last winter the Wisconsin State poverty director was given a small grant to lay out programs in the State. But within a couple of months the checks stopped arriving and he was having difficulty paying the staff. When one of Senator Gaylord Nelson's assistants called the OEO in Washington to find out what had happened, he was told the Wisconsin man was a pain in the neck and that so long as he kept pestering Washington he would not get any more money.

In another instance a VISTA recruiter got together a crew of poor Negroes in San Francisco, and promised to send them to Chicago for training. Some quit their jobs on that promise. But when the field recruiter returned to Washington, he was told the San Francisco Negroes were not needed.

Shriver has taken a personal interest in administration, and while his insistence on knowing all the details of grants before signing them probably is useful in keeping bureaucrats on their toes, these grant-signing occasions apparently from time to time degenerated into mean, backbiting sessions between Conway and William Haddad, the Inspector General. Haddad, who also has resigned, was charged with looking into field operations with an eye to finding out what was going wrong with the programs. But the trouble seems to have been that the Inspector General's people concerned themselves less with substantive difficulties of the programs than with information impugning the personal competence or character of the people working under Conway's direction. At the grant-signing sessions at poverty headquarters, one gathers, accusations flew back and forth, resulting in a good deal of ill feeling on the part of Conway, who stood up for his people. When he announced his departure from OEO, Conway told his staff that he hoped to accomplish more for the poverty program from the outside than by working within.

Reports of the arguments in the higher reaches of the OEO may be exaggerated, but they have had a pervasive and depressing effect in the lower echelons, which utterly detest the work of the Inspector General's Office. It is called "The fink shop"—not so much because of its criticisms of their programs but because of the suspicion that its files consist of personal gossip. The consequence is that far from Shriver having a staff full of new ideas, the people at the poverty program are tending to become cautious and conservative.

All of this puts the Office of Economic Opportunity and its director, Mr. Shriver, in an unenviable spot. It has no real plan for ending poverty. The employees, who always have been a spirited and restless group, now find themselves in the midst of a depressing office squabble. This sort of situation can result in the creation of just another dead bureacracy. It might end with the people who came to work in hopes of ending poverty believing that their own livelihoods depend on perpetuating the existence of the poor.

JAMES RIDGEWAY.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

AMENDMENT OF SHIPPING ACT OF 1916 AND THE SHIP MORTGAGE ACT OF 1920

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendment from the House on S. 2118.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2118) to amend sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920, which was, on page 6, line 22, strike out all after "1920." over through and including line 4 on page 7.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House and request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. DOMINICK conferees on the part of the Senate.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, on my time, not to exceed 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the last 7 minutes on my side be reserved to the minority leader; and 5 minutes for the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The following routine business was transacted by unanimous consent during the consideration of the pending motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 77:

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 32. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 106. Joint resolution to allow the showing in the United States of the U.S. Information Agency film "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums";

H.R. 9042. An act to provide for the implementation of the Agreement Concerning Automotive Products Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7059. An act to amend the Act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 724; 20 U.S.C. 79–79e), so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to the Smithsonian Institution for use in carrying out its functions under said act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7484. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the rank of lieutenant general or vice admiral of officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force while serving as Surgeons General;

H.R. 5571. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of incentive pay for submarine duty to personnel qualified in submarines attached to staffs of submarine operational commanders;

H.R. 1805. An act to amend section 5899 of title 10, United States Code, to provide permanent authority under which Naval Reserve officers in the grade of captain shall be eligible for consideration for promotion when their running mates are eligible for consideration for promotion;

H.R. 10238. An act to provide labor standards for certain persons employed by Federal contractors to furnish services to Federal agencies, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9247. An act to provide for participation of the United States in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition to be held at San Antonio, Tex., in 1968, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7169. An act to amend the Securities Act of 1933 with respect to certain registration fees.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on Thursday, October 7, 1965, the Vice President signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 306. An act to amend the Clean Air Act to require standards for controlling the emission of pollutants from certain motor vehicles, to authorize a research and development program with respect to solid-waste disposal, and for other purposes;

S. 322. An act for the relief of Choy-Sim Mah;

S. 611. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Mount Edgecumbe Boarding School, Alaska;

S. 779. An act for the relief of Henryka Lyska;

S. 903. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to painting, illumination, and dismantlement of radio towers;

S. 1012. An act for the relief of Dr. Otto F. Kernberg;

S. 1397. An act for the relief of Vasileos Koutsougeanopoulos;

S. 1576. An act to amend the act of May 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 98), as amended, providing for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., and for other purposes;

S. 1689. An act to amend paragraph (a) of the act of March 4, 1913, as amended by the act of January 31, 1931 (16 U.S.C. 502);

S. 1775. An act for the relief of Erich Gansmuller;

S. 1856. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell uniform clothing to the Naval Sea Cadet Corps;

S. 1873. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clara W. Dollar;

S. 2232. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for a loan service of captioned films for the deaf," approved September 2, 1958, as amended, in order to further provide for a loan service of educational media for the deaf, and for other purposes;

S. 2273. An act to render immune from seizure under judicial process certain objects of cultural significance imported into the United States for temporary display or exhibition, and for other purposes;

H.R. 724. An act to authorize the transfer of certain Canal Zone prisoners to the custody of the Attorney General;

H.R. 3045. An act to authorize certain members of the Armed Forces to accept and wear decorations of certain foreign nations;

H.R. 5665. An act to authorize disbursing officers of the Armed Forces to advance funds to members of an armed force of a friendly foreign nation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6165. An act to repeal section 165 of the Revised Statutes relating to the appointment of women to clerkships in the executive departments;

H.R. 7329. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of San Diego, Calif.;

H.R. 9336. An act to amend title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 relating to certain claims against the Government of Cuba;

H.R. 9975. An act to authorize the shipment, at Government expense, to, from, and within the United States and between oversea areas of privately owned vehicles of deceased or missing personnel, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10234. An act to amend section 1085 of title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the reimbursement procedure required among the medical facilities of the Armed Forces under the jurisdiction of the military departments;

H.R. 10871. An act making appropriations for Foreign Assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 69. Joint resolution to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to construct the third Library of Congress building in square 732 in the District of Columbia to be named the James Madison Memorial Building and to contain a Madison Memorial Hall, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1966 (S. Doc. No. 62)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, in the amount of $134,966,000, for various departments and agencies (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the U.S. Coast Guard for "Operating expenses," for the fiscal year 1966, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of approprition; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Post Office Department for "Operations," for the fiscal year 1966, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the U.S. Coast Guard for "Retired pay," for the fiscal year 1966 had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the U.S. Coast Guard for "Reserve training," for the fiscal year 1966, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON AIR FORCE RESERVE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Air Force Reserve construction program (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON BORROWING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on borrowing authority, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CERTIFICATION OF ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION, LEWIS CREEK UNIT, FRIANT-KERN DIVISION, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Lewis Creek Unit, Friant-Kern Division, Central Valley Project, California (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of Aurora Zvejnieks, of Indianapolis, Ind., favoring action to liberate the Baltic States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Two resolutions adopted by the Arkansas Legislative Council, of Little Rock, Ark., relating to payments in lieu of taxes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Westchester County, N.Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to designate October 12, Columbus Day, as a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Illinois Typographical Conference, Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1781, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of professional strikebreakers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Whitney Gillilland, of Iowa, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board; and

Charles A. Webb, of Virginia, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, I also report favorably sundry nominations in the Coast Guard. Since these names have previously appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing them on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

Edward L. Bailey, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Coast Guard.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 2617. A bill for the relief of Dr. Marcel Grdinic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mrs. NEUBERGER when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DODD:

S. 2618. A bill for the relief of Lok Tim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DR. MARCEL GRDINIC

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am introducing a private immigration bill for the relief of Dr. Marcel Grdinic. In this connection I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD recent correspondence on this case from Drs. V. Boekelheide, head, department of chemistry, and Arthur S. Flemming, president, University of Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the correspondence will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2617) for the relief of Dr. Marcel Grdinic, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The correspondence presented by Mrs. NEUBERGER is as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
October 4, 1965.

Hon. MAURINE NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Dr. Virgil Boekelheide, who is head of the chemistry department at the University of Oregon, has provided me with a copy of the letter which he has addressed to you relative to Dr. Marcel Grdinic.

Dr. Boekelheide has described the situation which confronts us very clearly and accurately. I would like to support the request that he has made for an extension of Dr. Grdinic's visa.

It is clear to me that a vigorous and conscientious effort was made on part of the department of chemistry to find a replacement for Dr. Grdinic. The resignation of his replacement after May 1 made it virtually impossible for us to obtain someone else. We try to adhere strictly to the policy of not extending invitations to members of other faculties to join our faculty after May 1. We believe this is the only sound and fair policy to follow.

Our staffing plans, including the position occupied by Dr. Grdinic, were based on the assumption that we would have an enrollment of 11,300 this fall. It is now clear that the enrollment will be approximately 12,000. This puts us in an even more difficult position.

I want at the same time to join Dr. Boekelheide in assuring the Department of State that we will not ask for any further extension of Dr. Grdinic's visa beyond the present academic year.

I sincerely hope that it may be possible for the State Department to grant this request.

Very sincerely and cordially yours,
ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
President.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
September 29, 1965.

Hon. MAURINE NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senator, Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: I am writing to you with regard to Dr. Marcel Grdinic who has sought your help in obtaining an extension of his visitor's exchange visa which expired September 14, 1965.

Dr. Grdinic holds an appointment in our chemistry department as a visiting assistant professor. He first came to the University of Oregon as a postdoctoral fellow doing research under a National Institutes of Health grant. With rising enrollments and because of his evident ability and his desire to gain this experience we gave him a temporary post on our teaching staff. He has been very successful in this position. He is a gifted lecturer, he works hard and conscientiously with his students, and in all respects he has discharged his duties faithfully.

Realizing that persons residing in this country on a visitor's exchange visa are expected to have only a limited stay we sought to replace Dr. Grdinic during the past academic year. In fact, we made an offer to a prospective candidate who first accepted it and then resigned in May for personal reasons. We were thus left with essentially no hope of making another suitable appointment in time for this academic year. I asked Dr. Grdinic whether he would be willing to continue his appointment for another year and he indicated that he would be pleased to do this.

As it turned out, the enrollment at the University of Oregon this fall looks to be very much larger than anyone expected. Although the final figures aren't yet available, it appears that the increase in size is about 16 percent, or double what was anticipated. With this increase we are very hard put to meet our teaching needs with Dr. Grdinic present. If he were to be denied further extension of his visa, we would be in a very difficult situation.

If there is any way in which you can be of help in securing an extension of his visa until the end of this academic year, we would deeply appreciate it.

Last year the Immigration Service granted an extension of Dr. Grdinic's visa without any difficulty. It may be that they are now taking their present position against extension of his visa because they feel that such requests will be continued indefinitely. I would be glad to assure them and I can assure you now that we will not ask for any further extension of Dr. Grdinic's visa beyond the present academic year. We have been continuing our search for personnel and have a commitment from a candidate who would be able to take over Dr. Grdinic's duties in the fall of 1966 but not before.

In summary, the extension of Dr. Grdinic's visa for this academic year, particularly now that classes are already in session, would be a great service to the university and would be very helpful to Dr. Grdinic who is seeking this additional training and experience. It is hard for me to see why the granting of this request would in any way be inimical to the best interests of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

V. Boekelheide,
Head, Department of Chemistry.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of September 30, 1965, the name of Mr. Hartke was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 2579) to amend section 5(l) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide benefits for children of deceased railroad employees who are over the age of 18 and below the age of 22 and are attending an educational institution as full-time students, introduced by Mr. Javits on September 30, 1965.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 8, 1965, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 306. An act to amend the Clean Air Act to require standards for controlling the emission of pollutants from certain motor vehicles, to authorize a research and development program with respect to solid-waste disposal, and for other purposes;

S. 322. An act for the relief of Choy-Sim Mah;

S. 611. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Mount Edgecumbe Boarding School, Alaska;

S. 779. An act for the relief of Henryka Lyska;

S. 903. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to painting, illumination, and dismantlement of radio towers;

S. 1012. An act for the relief of Dr. Otto F. Kernberg;

S. 1397. An act for the relief of Vasileos Koutsougeanopoulos;

S. 1576. An act to amend the act of May 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 98), as amended, providing for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old Saint Louis, Mo., and for other purposes;

S. 1689. An act to amend paragraph (a) of the act of March 4, 1913, as amended by the act of January 31, 1931 (16 U.S.C. 502);

S. 1775. An act for the relief of Erich Gansmuller;

S. 1856. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell uniform clothing to the Naval Sea Cadet Corps;

S. 1873. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clara W. Dollar;

S. 2232. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for a loan service of captioned films for the deaf", approved September 2, 1958, as amended, in order to further provide for a loan service of educational media for the deaf, and for other purposes;

S. 2273. An act to render immune from seizure under judicial process certain objects of cultural significance imported into the United States for temporary display or exhibition, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 69. Joint resolution to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to construct the third Library of Congress building in square 732 in the District of Columbia to be named the James Madison Memorial Building and to contain a Madison Memorial Hall, and for other purposes.

RESCHEDULING OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF FREDERICK LANDIS, OF INDIANA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE U.S. CUSTOMS COURT

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the public hearing scheduled for Thursday, October 14, 1965, at 10:30 a.m., on the nomination of Frederick Landis, of Indiana, to be a judge of the U.S. customs court, has been rescheduled for Wednesday, October 13, 1965, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Thomas W. Sorrell, of Vermont, to be U.S. marshal, district of Vermont, term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Friday, October 15, 1965, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

COLUMBUS DAY, A NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Westchester County on the subject of designating Columbus Day a national legal holiday.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution 154, 1965

To the Board of Supervisors of Westchester County, N.Y.:

Your Committee on Legislation has considered Resolution 143–1965, adopted by your board on August 16, 1965, requesting support of bills now pending in Congress which would designate Columbus Day, October 12, as a national legal holiday.

There have been, over the years, many bills presented in both the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives, all in support of designating Columbus Day as a national holiday, and like our other national holidays setting the day aside in recognition of a memorable event or personage. Your committee feels that all Americans should indicate their interest and desire that this day, October 12, be added to those other important commemorative days, and offers the following resolution:

"Whereas the State of New York, and the majority of other States recognize October 12, known as Columbus Day, as a legal holiday; and

"Whereas many businesses and industries also recognize and observe Columbus Day as a holiday; and

"Whereas it is fitting that honor and tribute should be paid to the great explorer, Christopher Columbus, who is renowned as the discoverer of America: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is respectfully memorialized to enact legislation, as set forth in S. 461 (Dodd) and H.R. 7804 (Ottinger), and/or any other bills previously considered and any amendments thereto whose main purpose and objective is to designate the 12th day of October in each year as a legal public holiday; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Members of the Senate from the State of New York, and to the Members of the House of Representatives from the 25th and 26th Congressional Districts of the State of New York."

Dated, October 4, 1965.

George D. Beverly,
Robert J. Stone,
Robert J. McCarthy,
Earl L. Vail,
John J. Reed,
Charles J. Coot,
Edward ———,
———,
Committee on Legislation, Board of Supervisors.

Westchester County, N.Y.

DO PEOPLE PREFER WELFARE?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, much has been said over the past few months concerning the refusal of unemployed Americans to do farm labor. In view of these charges, the

September 24 editorial in the Catholic Star-Herald, Camden, N.J., should be of great interest to this body.

This editorial clearly substantiates the fact that where foreign workers no longer deprive Americans of agricultural employment, Americans are willing and able to perform farm labor. The editorial illustrates that where farmwork is made available to American workers the "breadlines have dwindled to new lows" as for example in Portland, Oreg.

I now ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DO PEOPLE PREFER WELFARE?

There is a common impression among the well-to-do as well as among those who have never endured real poverty that the poor are slackers and chiselers, with rare exceptions. Such persons look on poverty as the outcome of laziness, shiftlessness, and an irresistible desire to sponge on society. Every so often they raise a cry about welfare agencies coddling such misfits and about the need for smaller doles and tougher laws that tell the poor, "work or starve."

Admittedly there are cheats, and slackers and shiftless elements among the poor—probably in equal proportion to similar characters among the rich. In our opinion there are more millionaires who have sponged on our society than can be found among the ranks of the poor. Just think of the money the Government has lost from loopholes in income tax alone. And there are other vicious practices that have enabled men to grow rich at the expense of the community.

Our concern, however, is to debunk the calumny that the poor are social leeches. In support of our thesis we offer this interesting item. A man named Al Riley directs a House of Hospitality in Portland, Oreg. For years, while the infamous bracero program was in effect (the braceros were imported farmhands from Mexico who worked for substandard wages and created unemployment for American farmers) the food handout recipients in his House of Hospitality reached 200 to 500 during the summer season. Now that the braceros can no longer be imported, unemployed American farmhands willingly seek and obtain work. The result: the breadline dwindled to a new low of 30 to 50 men daily. And who are the ones who still come for help? According to Al Riley, "Those who showed up mostly are old and handicapped men, unable to work."

Remember that when you hear the myth repeated that the poor prefer welfare to work.

THE OVERREGULATED STATE

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, one of the outstanding weekly newspapers is the Littleton, Colo., Independent. It has received several awards, and its publisher, Mr. Bemis, and its editor, Mr. Waring, both friends of mine, have been recognized by their own profession as being outstanding newspapermen.

In the September 24 edition of the Littleton Independent there appears an outstanding editorial entitled "The Over-Regulated State." This editorial puts into concrete facts the problems which continuing Federal governmental encroachment into local affairs will inevitably create.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks for the benefit of all my colleagues in the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Littleton (Colo.) Independent, Sept. 24, 1965]

THE OVERREGULATED STATE

This shot is fired in anger.

Congress, eager to please a dozen big union leaders since 1939, has made it almost impossible for little businessmen to obey the law.

There are 4 million entrepreneurs in America, and 3,900,000 of these employ only from 1 to 80 persons.

These small businessmen are the backbone of their communities. They are the stable element in a mobile society, and they are proud to provide jobs for families in their neighborhoods.

They collect taxes for the Federal Government, for the State government, and for the city government. They sit up nights preparing figures for government forms. Many can't get this done at nights, and they come back to the office on Saturdays and Sundays.

They pay out money for an accountant to calculate some of the monthly reports, but they are unable to pay a labor lawyer $20 an hour to be at their elbows day after day.

Every now and then one of them comes to this newspaper. "I am closing up my business and taking a civil service job or one with a big corporation," they are saying in substance. "I just can't keep up with all the laws."

One Main Street businessman had to surrender his records. The Government agent kept them for 6 months. The merchant worried. He thought about Disraeli who said, "A man can stand only so much uncertainty."

After his term in purgatory was up, the agent returned the records. He gave the merchant a clean bill of health.

Another businessman not far from Main Street also had a visitor. The agent asked for a desk and stayed 13 months. Morale in that office went down. At the end of the period, the agent again gave a good report.

Those two cases involved income taxes and excise collections.

It is harder to comply in other fields, such as public health requirements or on labor clauses. Until a few years ago, Littleton's chief income was derived from small dairies. Then the State government passed laws that drove every one of them out of business. Now we come close to having milk trusts.

This newspaper has had trouble with the Department of Labor for 2 months. When the agent arrived to swoop up our records, we had confidence that we were complying with the minimum wage and overtime laws.

But we didn't know what the bureaucrats in Washington have done.

We were assessed a penalty for our sins. We can pay off this penalty from the profits of 73,000 extra newspaper sales (in a town of 4,900 homes).

What was our mistake?

We made two. The first was in looking upon our staff as members of the family. Some years ago we decided to give about one-third of the monthly profits to the employees. The Department of Labor says you can't use this as an incentive. Washington has its own formula.

For example, Employee A, with 20 years of experience, draws $110 a week as a supervisor. Employee B, with 2 years of experience, gets $90. If business thrives and both men work Saturday, Mr. A gets $110 for the week as usual and B gets $117.

All of this makes a bigger profit, and when profit-sharing time comes around, it would seem logical to pay Mr. A 110 units of profit to B's 90.

The bureaucrats in Washington won't let you do that. You must pay A 110 units of profit and B (the beginner) must get 117 units.

For violating this regulation from Washington, we were heavily penalized.

Our second violation concerned monthly wage earners.

Reporters must necessarily keep odd hours. We explain the assignments to them when they are employed. The Department of Labor won't stand for this.

It will allow a newspaper to hire a reporter for $1.25 an hour. If that reporter works 42 hours a week, he is to get $3.75 for the extra 2 hours—making his pay $53.75 for the week.

It is illegal to say, "Joe, we want you to go to one meeting a week and work 2 hours at it, above your regular 8-to-5 job. For this you will get $90 a week."

Joe likes that arrangement, but Washington won't stand for it.

The employer and the employee must both keep time cards. They must become bookkeepers instead of newspapermen. The Department of Labor has given us nine paperback books filled with regulations. They must be studied.

We have asked the Denver office what some of the regulations mean, and we often get evasive answers. One agent told a supervisor that he can't spend more than 20 percent of his time on the phone or reading proof.

The fact is that the Department of Labor can send 10 men to examine our records and they would come up with 10 different reports and 10 different dollar penalties. It's that complicated.

While we were being examined, two retail stores also came under the gun. The Constitution permits Congress to regulate interstate commerce and at present the Department of Labor is only bothering big and medium-size stores, but the agent told us that the little stores will come under the law soon.

Retailers don't consider themselves in interstate commerce. But they'll learn. Maybe they deal with a wholesaler in Denver who buys brassieres in Cincinnati.

This newspaper is primarily local in news and local in circulation. But if a woman asks us to send a paper containing her daughter's wedding to Boise, that makes us interstate commerce.

Our paper sells for 7 cents. If we have to mail it, the price is 10 cents. For this extra 3 cents we get a piece of wrapping paper and a pot of paste. We write the address down just as the fond mother asked us to do. We go to our rubber stamp collection and find the proper stamp to comply with regulations. And we run over to the post office.

That isn't all. The bureaucrats in Washington require that we make a record of this transaction. We must state how much each sheet of the newspaper weighs, to six decimal points. We must state what percentage of advertising the paper contains and submit a marked copy of each inch of paper to the postoffice. We must look up the mileage (907) between Littleton and Boise so that the Government may be informed of the distance we sent the wedding story.

Washington has decreed that we cannot let our newsboys have their newspaper bags at less than cost. Violation of this section can get a newspaper in bad trouble.

Regulations take the time of America's 8,500 newspaper editors who should be devoting their energies to community projects and national problems. The smaller papers are still beyond the clutches of the Department of Labor, but the Department almost got Congress' permission to grab them last month.

The whole emphasis at the Department of Labor is on "equality instead of excellence." This is the fashion of the times, an idea that may mean the death of America.

Equal opportunity is one thing, but it should not breed laws that curb the superior individual.

Australia is worse off than we are. It tells a newspaperman what training he must have before he sits down to a typewriter, and the Government tells the editor what the man's pay should be (equality rather than excellence). Australia tells the farmer what he must pay the hired man. Our Congress has heard of this regulation, and it plans to bring 1.3 million farmhands under the law.

Many other nations of Western culture have similar redtape regulations, and not a one of them matches our production record or the living standard of the American worker. But just give the Department of Labor a little more leash.

What are the social consequences of the "over-regulated state?"

Such harassment means the slow demise of the small businessman. Most of these entrepreneurs struggle with their own affairs because they enjoy that freedom of decision which is their heritage. They like the challenge of invention and innovating. They must not be beaten into submission. They must be allowed to give jobs to 15 or 20 million Americans, some of them old, sickly, or with IQ's below 90.

Washington and Denver have to do some regulating. Otherwise the American people would be crushed by big business and big labor. But the lawmakers must put restrictions on the zealots in the various bureaus—men who think they alone can create the good society.

Uncle Sam regards anyone with fewer than 500 employees as small business. He should release small business from onerous regulations that tend to discourage solid, enterprising citizens.

If he would but keep his hands off those with 80 or fewer employees, he would give breathing time to 97 percent of the business firms. These firms do less than 20 percent of the Nation's business and would hardly upset any Government standards.

Their continued existence is essential to democratic life in 12,000 American communities.

BIG BROTHER: IRS IN THE SOUTH

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I have an article from the Birmingham News of Sunday September 12, 1965, entitled "Taxpayers Needn't Fear Bugged Line." The article consists mainly of statements attributed to Mr. William J. Bookholt, regional commissioner of IRS, and Mr. Henry C. Stockell, Jr., regional counsel. It is the essence of their statement that average taxpayers have not been wiretapped or bugged in the past and will not be wiretapped or bugged.

The obvious flaw in this assurance is "What is an average taxpayer?" and who decides when a taxpayer is average or nonaverage.

We do know some interesting things about the southeastern region, the headquarters of which is in Atlanta, Ga. A number of conference rooms on IRS premises were permanently bugged. We will never know if they were used on average taxpayers—whatever that phrase means—or not. We do know that they existed in Montgomery, Ala., and Greenville, S.C. In a letter dated September 9, 1965, we found out from IRS that Charlotte, N.C., should be added to this list.

Additionally, we know that this region permanently employs a large number of graduates of the IRS wiretap and bugging school. There is one in Albany, Ga.; two in Atlanta, Ga.; one in Charlotte, N.C.; one in Columbia, S.C.; one in Greensboro, N.C.; two in Jacksonville, Fla.; three in Miami, Fla.; and so forth.

Although IRS has said that it will not permanently bug its conference rooms in the future, it has not outlawed temporary bugging. Further, the large number of trained electronic experts are still around and active. In my mind, all of this detracts from the assurance given by IRS representatives that the average taxpayer has nothing to worry about.

I, for one, would feel much better if IRS would flatly ban the interception of any telephone communications, flatly ban the placing of any bugs, and destroy the mass of electronic equipment which has been gathered for these purposes.

I am not optimistic that this will be done. However, our hearings concerning IRS operations shall continue and it may be possible to persuade the Congress to do what we cannot persuade the IRS to do.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Birmingham News be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Sept. 12, 1965]

TAXPAYERS NEEDN'T FEAR BUGGED LINE

ATLANTA, September 11.—The "average taxpayer" in the Southeast has the assurance of the Internal Revenue Service that he need not fear that he may be bugged.

Southeastern regional representatives of IRS said today that electronic devices have not been used in the past and will not be used in the future in normal cases.

William J. Bookholt, regional commissioner of the IRS, and Henry C. Stockell, Jr., regional counsel, said in a statement, "wiretapping, 'bugged' conference rooms and similar activities have not in the past and would not in the future be used in the southeast region to acquire information regarding the possible tax liability of the average taxpayer."

They made the statement to the special liaison tax committee of the southeast region which is meeting in Atlanta today. The committee is composed of three lawyers appointed from each of the various bar associations of Alabama, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina and Tennessee, to promote a cooperative relationship between the IRS and tax attorneys.

The recently controversial matter of the use of electronic devices was among the matters brought up in the committee meeting.

In addition to their own assurances as a policy in the Southeast, Bookholt and Stockell repeated to the committee the assurances previously given the public by Sheldon Cohen, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, regarding the use of electronic devices.

A THIRD LIBRARY OF CONGRESS BUILDING—THE JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL BUILDING

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, last Tuesday, when the Senate approved the House version of Senate Joint Resolution 69, a measure to authorize the construction of a third Library of Congress Building as a memorial to James Madison, a significant step was made toward fulfilling two pressing requirements. The first need, of course, is that of additional space for the Library of Congress to meet the growing research and educational requirements of Government officials, scholars, business executives and the general public. The second need—and this is not necessarily in the order of priority—is that of a suitable memorial to our fourth President and chief architect of the Bill of Rights, James Madison.

It was gratifying to me to see this legislation enacted for I have been strongly supporting it for many years. It has been my privilege to be closely associated with the efforts to secure a memorial to James Madison and a third Library of Congress Building—as a past chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I conducted hearings on this matter.

Mr. President, I believe it is appropriate for me to mention an outstanding member of the James Madison Memorial Commission—my good friend, Mr. Clinton Hester—a private citizen who, through his perseverance and sincere efforts, has made a meaningful contribution toward the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 69. I commend Mr. Hester for his work. It should be noted that for over 2 years Mr. Hester has paid the administrative expenses of the Commission—the initial appropriations having been exhausted. Of course we are delighted that an additional $10,000 has been authorized for the future expenses of the James Madison Memorial Commission.

The James Madison Memorial Building will indeed provide educational benefits to all our citizens and foster an awareness of the significant contributions of James Madison.

RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES—A TELEVISION SERIES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, yesterday, October 7, 1965, it was my privilege to be a guest of the Taft Broadcasting Co. at a closed circuit preview of their new television program series on the first 10 amendments to the Constitution defining rights and responsibilities of American citizens.

This series, conceived by Robert T. Schlinkert, general manager of the Taft station in Birmingham, WBRC–TV, features a study of the 1st amendment to the Constitution.

As a native of our fine State of Alabama, it is with equal pride and commendation that I point to the forthright courage of WBRC–TV in taking a position of leadership in planning and bringing to fruition such a series as "Rights and Responsibilities."

The programs, which are perhaps best described as a determined effort to relate our responsibilities to our rights, present discussions by such persons as Dr. Billy Graham, recognized throughout the world as a member of the clergy who represents both leadership and a high sense of moral integrity.

There are others in this initial set of programs who share equal position in their own fields of endeavor. Pat Boone, famous on movie screen and television, presents two of these 5-minute color television features.

Others participating in this series are Art Linkletter, nationally known as an entertainer in both radio and television, and Bob Considine, one of our country's leading newspaper reporters and writers.

This series, although produced at some considerable expense by the Taft Broadcasting Co., will be offered at no cost to all commercial and educational television and radio stations in the country.

Dr. Graham addresses himself to "Freedom of Religion," while Mr. Considine reviews "Freedom of the Press," Mr. Linkletter analyzes "Freedom of Speech," and Mr. Boone presents a discussion on "Background to the First Amendment" and "The Rights of Assembly and Petition."

I am told that future programs dealing with the Bill of Rights are in production.

Mr. Schlinkert, in introducing the series, said in part:

> The great city of Birmingham has been the focus of national attention in recent years as a result of the dialog on civil rights. We recommended the development of this series because we believed that citizens everywhere would profit by a clear delineation of the responsibilities that accompany the rights reserved to us, employing the broadcast media as the most effective way to reach the most people.

Mr. Lawrence H. Rogers, II, president of the Taft Broadcasting Co., said further:

> After studying Mr. Schlinkert's suggestion, and recognizing the critical need of a restudy of the Bill of Rights and the implicit responsibilities required of every citizen, we decided to place our fullest possible resources behind this effort. We have sought and obtained the services of eminent performers and writers whose names are calculated to attract the largest potential audiences.

May I say, Mr. President, to you and to my distinguished colleagues, after seeing this preview presentation of these programs, every thought expressed by both Mr. Rogers and Mr. Schlinkert has reached full realization.

For example, a part of Mr. Linkletter's statement reads:

> The architects of our Republic put into our hands the most powerful forces for criticism and reform that have ever been accorded any people in any country. They said if you are silent when you disagree, you become the victim of your own silence. If you fail to use this freedom, you abdicate responsibility.

Or take the words of Dr. Graham, a part of his stirring presentation:

> Remember how the amendment begins: "Congress shall make no law * * *."
>
> Those five words express the most daring concept of true freedom that has ever existed—no human law can come between a man and God. But this right to enjoy freedom of religion—like all rights—has a corresponding responsibility. Not only must we give to other faiths the privileges we enjoy, but we must make sure that we ourselves do not misuse or abuse this precious heritage.

This series of programs developed by the Taft Broadcasting Co. deserves high commendation. It should make us all proud to be part of a generation that has produced such leaders in this most advanced form of communication—broadcasting.

REVITALIZATION OF THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, Adm. Wilfred J. McNeil, president of the Grace Line, recently submitted to the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation a statement of position and outline of recommendations for revitalization of the merchant marine.

The proposals of Admiral McNeil contain many positive suggestions which would require legislative action and substantial changes in present administrative policies.

I believe that his statement should be studied by all of us who have an interest in the maintenance of an adequate and healthy U.S. flag merchant marine. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to include the statement in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF POSITION AND OUTLINE OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A REVITALIZATION OF THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

I. STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

There is general agreement that the U.S. Government's policy on the merchant marine is in need of a new look if the U.S. merchant marine is to be revitalized sufficiently to play the substantial role in the carriage of our foreign commerce which the American people expect and our national well-being requires. First, it is essential that it be recognized that the merchant marine involved in foreign trade consists basically of three major and distinct segments: (a) common-carrier liners; (b) industrial carriers of proprietary cargoes; and (c) tramps or for-hire vessels. Each segment requires somewhat different treatment.

The problem is by no means impossible or even overly difficult of solution in comparison with other problems which Government and industry have met and solved in our generation. Able men who will apply common sense and vigor to the task can, with a number of specific steps which we outline below, turn the situation of the U.S. merchant marine into one of which we can all be proud.

II. LINER SEGMENT IS BASICALLY SOUND

The liner segment of the merchant marine is basically sound as a result of successful implementation of the 1936 act as a liner act.

U.S.-flag liners carry almost 40 percent of the revenue tons in the total commercial U.S. liner freight market.

With exception of the United Kingdom, our present cargo liner fleet is larger than that of any other maritime power.

Our cargo liner fleet now includes more than four times as many 20-knot ships as any other fleet in the world; the subsidized lines are currently building 75 percent of the world production of such high-speed liner ships.

When the current vessel replacement program is completed, the United States will have the newest and most modern fleet of cargo liners of any nation, with shipboard automation and cargo handling equipment second to none.

III. OBSTACLES TO GREATER PROGRESS UNDER 1936 ACT

Since the passage of the 1936 act:

Successive administrative decisions within the Maritime Administration have added a large body of regulation and interpretation to the basic language of the 1936 act, most of which tends to dilute and erode the parity concept and purpose as initially laid down by Congress and which was the basis for many of the liner companies proceeding under the U.S. flag.

MARAD has issued a long list of arbitrary rulings over the years denying parity on a number of operation and construction items. The cumulative effect has become unbearable as a result of proposed and possible major disallowances applicable to (1) manning, (2) wages, and (3) pension and other benefits arrived at through open and honest collective bargaining. (Even though some recent decisions by the Maritime Subsidy Board have been reversed by the Secretary of Commerce, the effect of the Secretary's new procedure is still retroactive since new commitments made in good faith under long term contracts would be subject to disallowance after the fact.)

The Maritime Subsidy Board is attempting without congressional approval or action to change the scope and purpose of the act by issuing a series of new regulations and policy directives which depart from the congressionally mandated parity principle:

"4. The granting of the aid applied for is necessary to place the proposed operations of the vessel or vessels on a parity with those of foreign competitors * * *." (46 U.S.C. 1171.)

Continuing inability of the U.S. liner fleet to guarantee shippers and travelers dependable and regular service because of strikes and work stoppages. (A large part of the labor problem is brought on because of a lack of adequate machinery to settle manning and work disputes of an interunion nature that are now aggravated by the trend toward shipboard automation.)

IV. OUTLINE PLAN FOR REVITALIZATION OF THE MERCHANT MARINE

A. Reaffirm the parity principle of the 1936 act and simplify administration

1. Through congressional review and executive action, rescind the large body of restrictive administrative rules and regulations that have diluted the parity principle since passage of the act. (Parity does not guarantee profits; it is intended only to put the U.S.-flag operator on an equal footing with his foreign competitor by offsetting the extra costs of having to maintain high American standards in conducting business in the United States, particularly in wages paid to seamen.)

2. Administrative requirements and accounting procedures connected with subsidy payments are unduly complicated and expensive for the U.S. Government and the operator. These can and should be simplified.

3. Create an atmosphere which will encourage private capital to invest in the shipping business under the U.S. flag.

B. Continue the trade-route concept in the liner trades

Strengthen the trade-route concept further by substituting minimum/maximum ships or ship-days per year for present system of minimum/maximum voyages in each trade route and allow for reasonable profit-making opportunities through greater flexibility in ports of call as service demands for various voyages on any given trade route.

C. Separate ship construction and ship operation subsidy support

Establish construction-differential subsidy payments on a basis of direct support to the shipbuilding industry rather than through the ship operator. The present arrangement needlessly involves the ship operator in support of the shipbuilding industry which has no direct relationship to efficient ship management or operation. (The ship operator is a buyer and user of a transportation vehicle and the separation between him and the shipbuilder should be as distinct as between Boeing and United Airlines, Mohawk Airlines and British Aircraft Corp., or any manufacturer of equipment and user.)

Establish a level of activity necessary to the maintenance of an adequate ship-construction industry. Make subsidy payments to support shipyards up to that level, regardless of the volume of shipbuilding for U.S.-flag carriers. The shipyards, with costs equalized, could then bid for work on an international basis, and be kept sound regardless of level of ship orders from American operators. Conversely, U.S. operators could build their ships abroad and register them under U.S. flag for operation should the subsidy for U.S. shipyards be exhausted or U.S. shipyards were not reasonably competitive even after subsidy. (An example of such a system is the French Government's method of subsidizing shipyards. A construction differential is paid directly to the yards who are then free to bid for foreign as well as French operators' work; in 1963, 35 percent of French yards' work of 440,000 gross tons was for foreign account and in 1964, 18 percent of a total of 538,000 gross tons was for foreign account.)

The present tripartite arrangement involving the ship operator as well as the shipyards and the Government results in:

1. Pressure for uneconomic standardization.

2. The Government exercising prerogatives of management in dictating details of design and construction of vessels because of a false sense of partial ownership of the equipment. The operator, it should be remembered, pays the full world price for his vessel, while the Government is actually helping the U.S. shipbuilder through a construction subsidy. The ship operator is benefited only to the extent that he is able to use tax-deferred reserves for construction of his vessels.

3. An inefficient, uneconomic, and often controversial contracting system between the shipowner, shipbuilder, and the Government.

As an immediate measure, the present tripartite arrangement should be modified to permit a more direct contract relationship between the builder and the operator. Also in the interim, comparisons for subsidy purposes must continue to be based on construction prices in the lowest-priced responsible shipbuilding country.

D. Broaden the national maritime policy

As a condition for a vigorous new Government policy for a larger merchant marine, as outlined below, obtain maritime labor concurrence in cutting costs for all segments of the merchant marine through automation and proper manning scales; and in reducing or eliminating problems resulting from interunion rivalry—perhaps through consolidation of seagoing personnel into two national groups, one for unlicensed and one for licensed personnel, or for some adequate permanent machinery for the settlement of disputes of an interunion nature.

With such assurance, the U.S. Government might then proceed to bring life to other segments of the merchant marine, by giving consideration to the following:

1. Approving a plan for the construction of up to 200 bulk vessels over a 5- to 10-year period, if found commercially feasible, under the terms governing liner ship construction to be conditioned upon agreement by labor to a workable mechanism for the settlement of manning and related work disputes as well as jurisdictional disputes of an interunion nature. Providing operating subsidies for such new and modern bulk carriers in the tramp trades to responsible U.S.-flag operators, including operators presently holding Government liner-operating contracts. Such operators should be required to enter into an operating contract that includes:

(a) Provisions for compulsory replacement of such vessels through tax-deferred reserves;

(b) A limitation of operation to shipload or bulk cargoes but without trade-route restrictions. Partial cargoes would continue to move in liners on trade routes under conference rules.

As rapidly as the new bulk fleet is available, permit only world rates to be charged (eliminate premium rate payments) for Government-sponsored, shipload cargoes as an offset to the cost of operating subsidies. (As an example of other beneficial effects, such action should also serve to stimulate overseas sales of farm surplus.) The plan outlined above will require additional funds for subsidies to shipyards for ship construction if an additional number of ships are to be built in U.S. yards. The overall Federal budget might well be kept at the same level through reevaluation of national priorities.

2. Making special provisions for industrial ocean carriers of proprietary cargoes to convert to U.S.-flag operation through favorable depreciation schedules, tax deferment on ship replacement reserves, permission to build abroad if necessary, and other similar incentives.

3. Undertaking an aggressive program for the replacement of passenger ships designed to compete on a worldwide basis for the seagoing traveler. (Every significant maritime nation is today embarked on such a program for prestige, defense readiness, benefits to its cargo-carrying trade, and other national interests.)

E. Other steps generally applicable to all segments

1. Establish a Federal ship mortgage corporation and make Federal credit available to all segments of U.S.-flag shipping industry at reasonable rates; permit these and reserve funds to be used for land transportation equipment and facilities where they are an adjunct to ocean transportation, in line with the modern trend toward integrated transportation.

2. Redirect efforts of MARAD to meaningful and commercially applicable research, experimentation, and cooperative assistance to the industry in developing new techniques in shipbuilding, shipping operation, port facilities, cargo handling, integration of different modes of transportation, and passenger-trade facilitation, promotion, and development. The liner fleet operators stand ready to contribute to such a program. Programs such as nuclear propulsion of surface ships, surface-effect ships, and similar long-range research should be left to the Navy to accomplish because of their facilities and the lack of immediate value to commercial operations. These programs would have more immediate promise for military purposes.

3. Take appropriate action to implement and live up to agreements providing equal access to cargoes in foreign trade. Administration of the cargo preference laws must allow for granting necessary waivers to foreign-flag carriers to maintain good faith in the equal access agreements negotiated by U.S.-flag carriers with their foreign competitors under the direction and with the approval of U.S. Government agencies.

4. Continue the present policy of cargo preference, but improve administration through centralized statistical and routing control.

5. Develop and carry out an adequately financed and manned program for promotion of the U.S. merchant marine contemplated by the 1936 act. This activity should consist of an intensive and continuing effort on the part of the U.S. Government utilizing all available information media, direct solicitation and contact, speakers' bureau, and the other standard paraphernalia of product promotion and public relations.

W. J. McNeil,
President,
Grace Line, Inc.

THE SITUATION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, while there are those who still insist that the administration failed to prove its case in arguing that the Dominican revolt had been taken over by the Communists, the news now coming out of the Dominican Republic should be sufficient to prove to all but the willfully blind that the administration's estimate of the degree of Communist influence and control in the rebel movement was, if anything, an underestimate.

Under the protection of the cease-fire, the Communists emerged openly as the real controllers of the rebel sector.

They openly operated three training centers for propagandists and guerrillas, which are reputed to have graduated more than 5,000 alumni, who have now fanned out throughout the territory of the Republic.

By various devices they smuggled most of their arms out of the zone into the countryside. Some estimates have it that more than 10,000 weapons were moved into the countryside in this manner, while the negotiations between the junta and the rebel forces were going on.

Today in Santo Domingo there is alarming evidence that pro-Communists have been given a number of highly important positions in the provisional government of Garcia Godoy.

There is also the alarming fact that the only two papers published in the entire country are the Communist papers printed in the rebel zone.

The major Dominican papers, which are anti-Communist, remain shut down because of the strike by workers under Communist influence.

There is the further alarming fact that the Communists have apparently been able to take over control of the University of Santo Domingo.

Mr. President, I would strongly urge all of my colleagues and especially those who have had doubts about the degree of Communist influence in the rebel movement, to read the several items which I now ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD.

The first item is an article by Andrew C. McClellan, AFL–CIO inter-American representative, in the Inter-American Labor Bulletin.

The second item is the transcript of a ABC radio program, in which Mr. McClellan was interviewed by Mr. Harry W. Flannery.

The third item is a remarkably detailed article by the veteran U.S. News & World Report correspondent, Mr. Howard Handelmann.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Inter-American Labor Bulletin, September 1965]

COMMUNISTS' CONTROL OF REBELS SEEN AS THREAT TO DOMINICAN STABILITY

(By Andrew C. McLellan)

(NOTE.—The following article is based on a recent visit to the Dominican Republic by the AFL–CIO Inter-American Representative.

It is a sequel to an earlier firsthand report published in the June issue of the Inter-American Labor Bulletin.)

Although the OAS Ad Hoc Commission announced that leaders of the two opposing forces in the Dominican Republic on August 11 had reached an agreement of reconciliation and defined terms for the installation of a Provisional Government, it is doubtful that, in present circumstances, the existing political stalemate will be broken for many months to come. Communist influence and dominance over the rebel forces appears to be strong enough to stall any meaningful settlement.

Prior to August 11, in an effort to pressure the leaders of the warring factions to expediate an agreement, wide publicity had been given to three documents drafted in consultation with the two warring factions. The three documents were the Institutional Act, to serve as a temporary political constitution until the election of a constitutional government 9 months from the installation of a Provisional Government; an "Act of Dominican Reconciliation" spelling out the terms of the settlement between the opposing factions; and the declaration to the Dominican people.

PROVIDE GENERAL AMNESTY

The two acts provide for a general amnesty, incorporation of the rebel zone (an estimated 80 blocks in downtown Santo Domingo) into the security zone, abolition of the zone in 30 days, collection of all arms in the hands of civilians, and negotiations between the Provisional regime and the OAS to decide the functions and programing of the withdrawal of the 12,000-man Inter-American Peace Force. Meanwhile, all Dominican officers, noncommissioned officers and enlisted men, would return to their respective bases, holding the ranks and grades held as of April 24, with full guarantees that no reprisals would be taken for their acts during the revolution, except in the cases of "acts of common crime."

While both General Imbert and Colonel Camaano had agreed to the draft documents, Camaano's Communist and extreme leftist advisers informed the OAS Ad Hoc Commission that Camaano lacked the authority to agree to the documents and that such authority rested in the Council members. It is these elements which are now blocking the adoption of the peace formula designed to end the 3-month conflict.

Foreign correspondents and other informed sources are convinced that Colonel Camaano and his collaborators are captive of the Communists and extremists in the rebel camp. The moderate elements are obviously afraid to challenge the extremists who are admittedly a minority faction but heavily armed and united.

Informed sources in Santo Domingo believe that the Communist elements concluded weeks ago that each day which passes without settlement is another day of victory for them. The delay affords them additional time for the guerrilla training and indoctrination programs they initiated weeks ago, and nourishes the seeds of anti-Americanism they have so well planted.

On August 8, the executive committee of the Popular Socialist Party (PSP) met in a "pleno" and publicly announced that it had changed the name of the party to the Dominican Communist Party (PCD) announcing in the rebel newspaper, "Patria," that the new name is "more scientifically exact and eliminates all doubts about the ends we pursue, and presents us before the eyes of the working class and the people as that which we really are—fighters for the cause of communism." The new PCD is the pro-Soviet wing of the Dominican Communist group.

The pro-Peiping group, the Dominican Popular Movement (MPD) now identifies itself publicly as the "partido marxistaleninista" and is attacking the new PCD as being "revisionist." It states that the PCD "remains in its erroneous position" in spite of having changed its name.

The MPD is calling for a "prolonged war against the Yankee invaders," while the PCD has taken a position supporting negotiations with the OAS on the grounds that the rebels are surrounded by a superior Yankee force and should agree to a provisional government rather than attempt a suicidal armed struggle.

The pro-Castro group, the 14th of June Movement (largest of the three groups) is a definite and decisive part of the rebel movement, is consulted on policy decisions, is considered extremely influential among the militia, and is opposing any settlement until the Inter-American Peace Force is removed.

INDOCTRINATED BY REBELS

During a visit to Santiago de los Caballeros, I met some young men who had received Communist indoctrination in the rebel zone. The program had lasted about 2 weeks and consisted of lectures, films, demonstrations, and a little drilling. The youngsters stated that there were large groups from the various provincial areas receiving this type of indoctrination. A second contingent of nine youngsters was to have left Santiago, Tuesday, August 17, for the rebel zone and a 2-week period of training.

Besides the indoctrination program (which, according to reports emanating from the rebel zone, is shooting for a total of 300,000); military and guerrilla training is being openly conducted with an estimated 1,500 militiamen. These are uniformed militia, training with arms.

It is reliably reported that a large contingent of young Haitians is being trained in guerrilla warfare in the rebel zone. Conatral has some 30,000 Haitian canecutters organized in the Sugar Workers Federation. There is speculation that some of the young Haitians are being trained to infiltrate the democratic labor movement through the sugar workers union in order to capture control of the broad-based, numerically strong National Sugar Workers Federation.

Obviously then, the 14th of June Movement, which is sponsoring these programs, will not permit Camaano to sign any agreement for the establishment of a provisional government until the training objectives have been reached.

Estimates vary as to the number of people in the rebel zone. American Embassy sources estimate a rebel zone total population of 10,000 people. Some correspondents estimate the total to be as high as 15,000. General Palmer, commanding the U.S. forces in Santo Domingo, feels that the 10,000 estimate is more accurate.

The best available sources report that around 25,000 arms are in the hands of civilians. This is the number of arms indiscriminately distributed to the civilians on April 24. The OAS Ad Hoc Commission naively expects that the civilians will surrender these arms as soon as the act of reconciliations is signed and a provisional government is installed. The military and paramilitary training now being conducted in the rebel zone indicates that future guerrilla tactics or campaigns lie ahead and arms will be needed. Most of the arms have already probably been cached along with ammunition and supplies for future prolonged guerrilla warfare in the interior.

THE LABOR SITUATION

Conatral, the democratic labor confederation and the Dominican ORIT affiliate, has remained neutral during the revolution. It refuses to support either General Imbert or Colonel Camaano. In the early days of the revolution, the Conatral headquarters was assaulted by rebels led by known Communist elements who stole all the office equipment, typewriters, mimeograph machines, tape recorders, and personal effects; destroyed the records and files; and set up a defense command post in the building. Five of the nine jeeps were burned or confiscated. On Saturday, August 14, a rebel defector informed us that some of the office furniture was still in the building.

The executive committee members of Conatral are now operating temporarily from the AIFLD Institute with the ORIT representative. The institute is located in the international security zone. With the four remaining jeeps, the leaders of Conatral have maintained contact with the provincial federations and most of the provincial unions throughout the country.

During my stay in the Dominican Republic, I visited the Cibao area, which is the main agricultural and industrial center of the interior. I was able to ascertain that the democratic labor movement has remained intact since the revolution started. Outside Santo Domingo there is no curfew. Except for the military roadblocks on the main highways, the country appears to be normal. Seasonal unemployment in the sugar industry is normal and the banana workers report that the same situation exists in the banana zone.

All factories are working, retail sales are slightly above those of the same period last year, agricultural produce is easily obtainable and no food shortages are evident in the interior.

The provincial Dominicans appear to be curiously detached from the political chaos in Santo Domingo.

UNEMPLOYMENT IS HIGH

Unemployment has always been a major problem in the Dominican Republic, and all available estimates at this time indicate that the unemployment and underemployment level is approximately 37 percent. In normal times, international charity organizations were feeding 7 percent of the total population. At the beginning of the revolution some 17 percent of the people were being given food. Today, it is estimated that some 12 percent are receiving free food.

Seven of the major banks are in the rebel zone. Many of the labor organizations have accounts in these banks. These accounts are now frozen. At the same time, the flow of credit has been crippled, and businessmen and industrialists operating on limited capital, are finding it difficult to pay salaries and maintain their inventories. Two-thirds of the sugar industry is owned by the Government through the Dominican Sugar Corp. Because of the shortage of currency, sugar workers' wages in the corporation are running behind 6 to 8 weeks.

The OAS, which had been funding the Loyalist government operation, has shut off the funding, with public employees and civil servants unpaid since July.

The Hotel Workers Federation has established a mutual aid fund for an estimated 300 hotel workers whose places of employment are in the rebel zone and closed down. Similar efforts are being made to assist commercial workers and retail clerks who are unemployed for basically the same reason. These two groups appear to be the most affected by the situation in Santo Domingo.

SOME UNIONS BENEFIT

Many trade union groups still find the present situation favorable. Besides those mentioned above, the transport workers and taxi drivers are busier than normal. In fact, it was the increase in vehicular traffic which caused a gasoline shortage.

The revolutionary labor arm of Bosch's PRD, FOUPSA-CESITRADO, and the CLASC affiliate, CASC, are supporting Camaano and the rebels. Because of this, a number of CASC affiliates in the provinces have disaffiliated from the parent organization. Five industrial unions in Santiago alone have disaffiliated from CASC.

Conatral leaders are attempting to fill the trade union vacuum in the provinces and are programing a campesino program in the rural areas. Emilio Antonio Checo, the Dominican leader trained at the AIFLD Institute in Honduras through the joint AIFLD/ORIT/AFL-CIO campesino program, is now setting up a 2-month campesino training program in Vega.

Latest reports from the Dominican Republice indicate that an agreement, acceptable to both factions, has been reached, on the basis of modifications to the Act of Reconciliation. The provisional presidential candidate is Hector Garcia Godoy, who is expected to be sworn in and form a coalition cabinet. The provisional government will reportedly remain in office for 9 months, and prepare for elections to be held at the end of the 9-month's period.

The provisional government will face many problems, which no amount of economic aid can solve. The matter of the arms recovery is regarded as a major problem, as is the political turmoil to which the country will be exposed as the many political parties vie for support during the 9-month caretaker period.

Garcia Godoy, according to his own statements, expects to form a cabinet of "honest, dedicated, capable men * * *." However, under the present political situation such men will be difficult to find, and those who appear to be willing to serve in a caretaker government, are politicos whose only interest will be the furtherance of the aims of the political parties they represent. Under these circumstances, social-economic development is virtually impossible, and political stability a long way off.

[Broadcast of "As We See It," AFL-CIO public service program, American Broadcasting Co., Oct. 3, 1965]

REDS STILL STRONG IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Participant: Andrew C. McLellan, AFL-CIO Inter-American representative.

Moderator: Harry W. Flannery.

Mr. FLANNERY. "As We See It."

Mr. MCLELLAN. Communist influence continues in Santo Domingo today.

Mr. FLANNERY. Andrew C. McLellan, AFL-CIO Inter-American representative, in his latest report on the Dominican Republic, as interviewed for this radio station of the ABC network and the AFL-CIO.

Mr. McLellan, prominent Members of Congress, a number of editors, writers, and professors have made the charge that the Communist threat in the Dominican Republic has been grossly exaggerated, and that the United States did not need to intervene there. What is your reaction, Mr. McLellan?

Mr. MCLELLAN. Well, of course, I completely disagree with those who felt our intervention was hasty and didn't help the situation. I think that Senator DODD, in his recorded reply to Senator FULBRIGHT's statement, stated the case quite clearly. He pointed out a number of holes in many of the hypotheses of Senator FULBRIGHT's position. I think many people in the Dominican Republic today are happy because the United States intervened when it did and with the force it did.

Mr. FLANNERY. In other words, you are saying that there was Communist influence in the revolution.

Mr. MCLELLAN. Definitely so.

Mr. FLANNERY. What about the democratic labor federation of Santo Domingo? Wasn't it attacked during this revolt period?

Mr. MCLELLAN. On the second day of the revolution, the offices of the National Confederation of Dominican Workers was assaulted, attacked. Equipment was stolen—typewriters, mimeograph machines, tape recorders—most of the written records were destroyed and the building was taken over as a rebel command post.

Mr. FLANNERY. Was the democratic labor confederation able to continue in any way?

Mr. MCLELLAN. Oh, yes. Five of the nine vehicles were either burned or confiscated by the rebels; but with four remaining vehicles, the executive committee of the democratic labor movement, Conatral, have successfully kept the labor movement in the Dominican Republic intact throughout these four very difficult months.

Mr. FLANNERY. Were there some embassies, too, that were not reported in the early stories as having been attacked by the rebels in those early days?

Mr. MCLELLAN. To my knowledge, Mr. Flannery, five embassies were attacked besides the U.S. Embassy. One was badly burned—the Embassy of El Salvador.

Mr. FLANNERY. You had knowledge of this impending event, I believe before it occurred, didn't you, because of our contacts down there?

Mr. MCLELLAN. Yes. We have been watching the situation very carefully since an incident occurred last year; that was the blowing up of an army arsenal at Fort Ozama. The head of the triumvirate, Donald Reid Cabral, invited an OAS investigating team to go down and investigate the situation. While, to my recollection, the report was never made public, they did establish the fact that there were rebellious officers in the army whom they described as the San Cristobal clique which were, in effect, setting the early stages for an insurrectional movement.

Recently, one of the top rebel military leaders defected from the rebel zone and sought asylum in Puerto Rico and on his arrival, he admitted that the insurrectional movement had actually been planned almost a year ago—which would coincide, pretty much, with this blowup of the arsenal. So, it wasn't a spontaneous insurrectional movement. The speed, the efficiency, the professional manner in which the revolution was mounted, indicates that this was planned, and very well planned.

Mr. FLANNERY. What you are saying, Mr. McLellan, is that if the United States had not intervened at the time it did, that we would have had another Communist state in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. MCLELLAN. I would say that there is a strong possibility that we would have had another Cuba on our hands.

Mr. FLANNERY. Is the situation improved today?

Mr. MCLELLAN. I don't know how you would discuss the situation as being improved. We do have peace between the warring factions. There is a provisional government.

Many of the requisites of the so-called act of reconciliation, which were signed by both warring factions, will not be lived up to, in my opinion. One, the demand that all the arms in civilian hands be turned over to the provincial government. I think it's naive to expect this. There are probably over 20,000, or maybe as many as 25,000, arms indiscriminately distributed in the early days of the revolution, in the hands of civilians. While a number of old weapons are being turned in to the arms checkpoints—as stated in the act of reconciliation—many of the new arms have already been hidden in the provinces and, I assume, will be used at some later date when another revolutionary period comes along.

Mr. FLANNERY. What about the Communist parties? I think you said previously that there are three major Communist parties in Santo Domingo. Are these still continuing and are they growing stronger or weaker?

Mr. MCLELLAN. I think they came out of this much stronger. The recent reports from the Dominican Republic indicates that when these young rebels began returning to their homes in some of the provincial areas, they went back convinced that they had won the revolution. They had intensive guerrilla training behind them—after 4 months in the rebel zone. They are very aggressive, they are returning home like heroes. They have been given intensive training, they know where arms can be located in the various caches and, more important, it was during the 4 months—or rather it was last month—when two of the Communist parties came out and openly declared themselves. The political group known as the Popular Socialist Party held a planning session in August and came out with its name changed to the Dominican Communist Party. This is a party which adheres to the Moscow wing.

The Popular Dominican Movement, or the group known as the MPD, began listing itself as the Marxist-Leninist party—this is the party which follows the Peiping line. And, of course, the larger party—the pro-Castro party, the 14th of June Movement, has never made any bones about its identification.

So, during this period, as I say, in the month of August, the three parties publicly stated what they were and what their role was in this whole revolutionary movement.

Mr. FLANNERY. What is the form of indoctrination and training in these parties?

Mr. MCLELLAN. There were two types of training going on in the zone during this 4-month period. There was indoctrination of youngsters from different parts of the country going on for 2 weeks of, I suppose, pro-Communist indoctrination. Some of the youngsters that I spoke to when I was over there some 3 or 4 weeks ago and who had received this training, said they saw Communist movies, they were lectured to by members of the Communist Party.

The other type of training was strictly paramilitary. Most of the foreign correspondents who visited the zone saw this training being conducted on a day-by-day basis. A group from 50 to 200 or 300 in different parts of the rebel zone were out daily exercising with weapons and drills and obstacle courses. There was additional information indicating that in the evenings they also were exposed to films, movies, and lectures on the manufacture of Molotov cocktails, tactics, sabotage procedures, and so on.

Mr. FLANNERY. Are these three major Communist Parties likely to get together? And, if they did get together at the time of elections, could they win the election, conceivably?

Mr. MCLELLAN. Well, I doubt that they would get together on the election front, although they had no difficulty in coordinating their activities within the rebel zone. We are thinking of a geographical area of probably 6 to 8 to 80 square blocks and they were able to live, work, and operate jointly in that zone.

At the time of the final negotiations for the termination of hostilities, the Peiping lining MPD group took the position that they should fight to the last man. The PSP, which later began the Dominican Communist Party, thought that that position was suicidal, that they didn't have the force or strength to defeat the inter-American peace force. The 14th of June movement would have supported—and stated so—the more militant position—that is to say, they would have gone along with the Peiping lining MPD.

Mr. FLANNERY. Supposing the election does occur and whether or not they do unite, are the Communists liable to take over, or do the non-Communist parties have enough strength and are they united enough?

Mr. McLELLAN. I doubt that the Communist Party could take over in a free election in the forseeable future. You must remember, Mr. Flannery, that the Dominican citizens were subjected to almost 32 years of anti-Communist tirades by Dictator Trujillo. I have traveled the length and breadth of the country and spent a considerable amount of time with plantation workers—mostly in the sugar and banana areas—and they have an inherent fear of communism. They don't know what it is, but they know it is bad, and I would imagine it would be very difficult for the Communist Parties to really build up the type of support and following necessary to win free democratic elections.

Mr. FLANNERY. That's the reason for their weapons and for their training.

Mr. McLELLAN. I would think so, yes.

Mr. FLANNERY. They probably don't want a free election then, do they?

Mr. McLELLAN. I doubt it.

Mr. FLANNERY. Meanwhile, is the situation, back in the country, in regard particularly to the production of bananas and sugar cane going on in a fairly normal basis?

Mr. McLELLAN. Yes. When I was there, which was in mid-August, it was difficult to believe, outside of Santo Domingo, that there was, in effect, a civil war underway in the country. The provincial citizens had a very curious detachment to the whole thing. They were going about their business. They were working. Businessmen were complaining about the fact that the line of credits were being weakened or shortened or being shut off because of the fact that seven of the major banks in the country were in the rebel zone. However, I found that commerce was almost normal or probably a little over normal. The sugar workers were working, the industrial workers were working. The only area effected, really, was the area controlled by the rebels—the 80 blocks in downtown Santo Domingo.

Mr. FLANNERY. Thank you, Andrew C. McLellan, AFL–CIO inter-American representative.

Your reporter, Harry W. Flannery, invites you to be with us next week at this same time when "As We See It" again comes as a presentation of the AFL–CIO and ABC public affairs. This program has been brought to you by the ABC network and the affiliated station to which you are listening.

[From the U.S. News & World Report]

DOMINICAN PUZZLE: HAS UNITED STATES TURNED OVER A NATION TO THE REDS—TWO SIDES

(NOTE.—In April, President Johnson rushed Marines to the Dominican Republic to save American lives, prevent Reds from taking over a revolution. Five months later, a temporary Dominican President is in office. The United States has exiled the leader of anti-Communist military forces. The Communists continue to wield considerable power. And American troops are still there to guard an uncertain truce. This question is raised: Who really won in the Dominican Republic—the United States or Communists? Howard Handleman of U.S. News & World Report, who has covered the Dominican crisis from the start, gives the inside story.)

SANTO DOMINGO.—This is the story of the first days under the new Government of the Dominican Republic. That government, headed by Héctor Garcia Godoy, was set up on September 3 under a compromise arranged by the Organization of American States.

During the days that followed, the rebels seemed to be having things all their own way. They retained control of their own zone—downtown Santo Domingo. Government police and troops didn't even try to get in. They retained control of their arms—thousands of rifles and machineguns that they captured in the first days of the revolution, back in April.

The antirebel station run by the military at the San Isidro air base was ordered off the air. There was no other voice to counter the Communist propaganda of the newspaper "Patria," published in the rebel zone.

Rebel officials got jobs in the Government of García Godoy, including cabinet posts. Rebels made demands on García Godoy—he made no public demands on them.

Brig. Gen. Elías Wessin y Wessin, dedicated anti-Communist, was hustled out of the country in an American Air Force transport plane.

The general was put aboard under the watchful eye of five armed FBI agents and a large detachment from the 82d Airborne Division.

The whole atmosphere was one of rebel, or Communist, victory.

Downtown, in the rebel zone, people sang revolutionary songs. Groups of rebel warriors marched through the streets chanting revolutionary slogans.

In contrast, outside the rebel zone, there were no such celebrations or victory claims.

Instead, there was gloom. Some American businessmen pulled up stakes and left. Others requested transfers, or tried to settle their affairs so they could leave. Dominican anti-Communists, too, were down in the mouth. Some diplomats, from Europe and Latin America, were convinced that all was lost to the Communists.

As an example of the general gloom, an American resident told me: "You are here for a historic event—the first time that the American Army occupied a country in order to turn it over to the Communists."

A DIPLOMAT'S VIEW

One important Ambassador of a non-Latin country said: "Please tell me one single thing that is better for your country now than it was last April, when you sent in the marines. The Communists are stronger now than they ever have been in this country. They have come out in the open, publish their own newspaper, hold conventions, even call themselves Communists, openly.

"All the concessions are being made to the Communists—none to the other side. The rebels signed the compromise agreement to settle the civil war—but now they ask for more concessions before they will live up to their agreements. First it was Wessin y Wessin. Next it will be the other military chiefs. Already, the street mobs are demanding that they go. They are calling your Ambasasdor, Mr. W. Tapley Bennett, a Nazi—and demanding that he be kicked out.

"Their gall is enormous. In one edition of Patria, the Communists bragged in one statement that they were the power in the revolution—and, in another column, attacked Mr. Bennett for saying in April that Communists were threatening to seize control of the revolution.

"In these months of revolution, the Communists have built up their political and military apparatus far beyond anything they ever had here before.

"Also, the rebels now have the mystique—the glamour and prestige that go with standing up to the giants of the hemisphere and the world—the Yankees. They have the heroes and the legends and the slogans and the songs. They think they have won this revolution.

"I am afraid they are right."

This ambassador knows what the Americans are trying to do here—divide the rebels and then conquer them. He just doesn't think it will work. The Americans believe their formula does have a chance to work.

WHAT THE REBELS DIDN'T GET

To American officials, rebel gains at this point seem more apparent than real. The first job was to clean house on the right. Now the rebel turn is coming.

Rebels have not been granted any one of their fundamental demands.

The American officials say this:

When talks about a compromise settlement opened, the rebels plopped six basic demands on the table. Not a single one was accepted. The demands were:

Withdraw the Inter-American Peace Force immediately.

Fire all Dominican military chiefs of staff.

Name a rebel officer as Dominican Army chief of staff.

Let military men who joined the rebels return to their services with the advanced ranks to which the rebels promoted them.

Restore the 1963 constitution of Juan Bosch.

Reseat the Congress elected in the Bosch sweep of 1962.

Acceptance of these demands would have meant a rebel victory. United States is pleased that a compromise was signed—without giving in on any one of these demands.

The Inter-American Peace Force troops stay, indefinitely. The military chiefs of staff stay, at least for now. Wessin was not a chief of staff.

The Juan Bosch constitution is not accepted—and a new one is to be written.

No rebel officer gets high command. Officers who fought for the rebels return to the military—with the ranks they held on April 24, not with the ranks the rebels gave them. A new Congress is to be elected.

Biggest thing working against the Communists, in the U.S. view, is the continued presence of 82d Airborne Division troops. American officials here, privately, express the hope that the troopers will be kept here at least for the 9 months that the provisional government of García Godoy is in power.

A START BY GARCÍA GODOY

American officials are pleased with the start García Godoy has made. He is anti-Communist. He is consolidating his position with the military and explained to officers in advance why he had to get rid of Wessin. He is firming up ties with the influential. "Santiago group" of businessmen. Early in the summer, United States tried to help this group form a provisional government. Now the United States is pleased that the group is helping García Godoy.

Among the things U.S. officials like about García Godoy are:

His firm stand against General Wessin. One U.S. official summed up American objections to Wessin by saying, "He is so rigidly anti-Communist that he creates more Communists than he destroys."

García Godoy's efforts to weaken the rebel side by giving good Government jobs to rebels who show signs of concern about Communist power downtown. These former rebels are watched carefully during their period of "rehabilitation." One already has been kicked out of the job of running the Government radio-TV station.

García Godoy's care to avoid actions so drastic that they carry too much risk of touching off new fighting.

The U.S. objective is to destroy the Communist power—without getting into another shooting war. Idea is to break the rebel hold on the downtown section, and have as many guns collected as possible, before even considering armed action. García Godoy shares these objectives.

The United States is willing to wait a week or two to break the rebel hold on downtown, and collect guns. But it is recognized that, in the end, it may be necessary to send in Dominican troops and search every house for weapons.

Possibility of a pitched battle between Communist and non-Communist forces inside the rebel camp is not ruled out. There have been gunfights between these forces inside the rebel zone from time to time.

ACE IN THE HOLE?

As a result, there now is a tendency among American officials to look on the rebel "president," Col. Francisco Caamaño Deño, as an ace in the hole, on our side.

Conviction is that Caamaño doesn't want the Communists to grab power any more than García Godoy does.

Caamaño pledged that he would begin delivering guns soon. He also, according to U.S. officials, has gone back into the army—and accepts García Godoy as his commander in chief.

Others share the growing conviction that Caamaño will turn out to be an important factor against communism.

A Dominican nationalist, prorebel and anti-Yankee, says: "One of the strange things about this situation is that the only man who can save this country from communism, for you Yankees, is Caamaño—and I think he will."

A ROLE FOR THE REVOLUTIONISTS?

The role of Caamaño is just one of the things that make the Dominican problem so complicated. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, member of the OAS ad hoc committee that arranged the compromise settlement, has confided to several people that this has been the most complex problem which he ever has tackled.

The reasons are multiple—and obvious.

Thirty years of Trujillo's dictatorship, to start with, sapped the spirit of the whole people. It was difficult to find anybody who would make a decision or take a stand.

The rebel forces were split into a number of splinter groups—moderates and non-Communist nationalists of various persuasions, plus Communists who follow the Chinese, Moscow, or Castro lines and fight among themselves.

On the other side, there was a lack of political effectiveness.

Old Trujillistas tried to muscle in, and did gain influence over the junta president, Gen. Antonio Imbert Barreras. Old militarists jealously guarded their power and privilege.

Economically, the country is shot.

Cheating on the Government was a national pastime. Contraband was smuggled in by the military—and merchants. For political reasons, leaders who came after Trujillo inflated wages. At the same time, the props were knocked from under the Dominican export business by the collapse of world market prices for sugar, coffee, and cacao.

To straighten out the mess, it now seems clear, the United States will have to remain deeply involved in Dominican internal affairs for a long time to come.

Economically, the United States is going to have to keep the country afloat.

Politically, the United States already is deeply involved. President García Godoy already is getting political advice from U.S. officials here—although he does not accept it all.

As an example, U.S. officials have objected to several appointments García Godoy has made to his Cabinet, or to other high Government jobs. García Godoy has rejected the U.S. protests, for the most part.

One of his main explanations to American officials who object is this: Non-Communists in the rebel camp must not be isolated, forced to side with the Communists. They must be given another way to go. He wants to offer them that "other way."

Therefore, he says, he is appointing as many moderates and non-Communists, from the rebel camp, as he can.

American officials are not 100 percent satisfied that this tactic will work—but are willing to let García Godoy give it a try. After all, American troops still are in the country, as insurance against a Communist takeover.

The García Godoy tactic is to divide and conquer—which is the U.S. tactic here, too.

THE DOUBLECROSS: A WAY OF LIFE

Involved in this tactic, of course, is the grand old practice of the doublecross. And the doublecross is a grand old Dominican habit, from way back. It is even contagious. Americans have caught the spirit, here, from time to time.

Some examples of the doublecross in this revolution:

Before the revolution, Imbert feared that former President Joaquín Balaguer, his political enemy, planned a coup. Imbert, though an anti-Communist, made a deal with the Castroite 14th of June Movement—even gave it arms.

During the first week in May, the United States decided Imbert was the man to form an anti-Communist junta. Former Ambassador John Bartlow Martin was sent in to persuade Imbert—who really was reluctant, wanted no part of the mess. Mr. Martin denies it now, but some U.S. officials believe that he promised Imbert that the United States would recognize his junta, and help it. United States had no such intention.

Once the junta was formed, Imbert and the military chiefs vowed to stand together to the end. Then, by accident, Imbert learned the chiefs were talking to Mr. Bunker—the OAS negotiator—behind Imbert's back.

The rebels signed two cease-fire agreements—and kept neither.

The rebels signed the compromise peace—then made new demands before they would live up to the agreement.

It's a way of life in Santo Domingo—this doublecross.

The doublecross has to be stressed for one reason. If the tradition of the doublecross is not kept firmly in mind, too much weight might be given to the present promises and agreements.

Ambassador Bunker and his OAS colleagues found this out during the months that they worked to get a compromise political settlement. Promises made one day were broken the next.

For this reason, Americans discussing the chances of getting a settlement in fact, as well as on paper, always preface their discussions with the assurance that the American Army is in the country to protect American interests, if it has to.

U.S. officials make no bones about the fact that they hope the American Army stays in the Dominican Republic for at least 9 months—the full term of the García Godoy government. Some say they hope the troops stay even longer than that.

ANTI-COMMUNISTS, TOO, COULD MAKE TROUBLE

Elements of future trouble are present almost everywhere. Not only are the Communists organizing action groups around the country, and stockpiling weapons, but so are anti-Communist followers of Wessin y Wessin.

In this situation, President García Godoy is moving slowly. He has to, in order to avoid touching off new fighting that will blow up the whole effort to restore law and order and set up a stable Government.

He would like to crack down on the Communist newspaper, Patria, for example. But he can't risk it right now. Instead, he hopes the two big papers, El Cáribe and Listín Diario, can resume publishing as soon as possible, so the people have something to read other than Communist propaganda. The two big papers have not published since the start of the revolution. Now the unions, presumably following Communist orders, are keeping them shut down by making exorbitant demands. Unions are demanding full pay for the 4 months that the papers were closed and had no income. Extremists in the unions also talk of handing the papers over to worker ownership and control—although they call it "people's" ownership.

Other things, too, bother U.S. officials.

Asked whether the Dominicans would be ready for elections in 9 months, one official gave a one-word answer: "No." Juan Bosch bothers the United States, too. To the U.S. Embassy people, Bosch is bad news. They blame him for much of what has gone on this summer. To them, he was a poor administrator, as President in 1962. He did things that helped Communists, like letting some of the most dangerous return from exile. Officials say his constitution of 1963 is a horror, with wording so vague that it gives the President almost any powers he wants to assume. He is anti-Yankee. He pits class against class. The bill of particulars against him goes on and on. Right now, it is thought, Bosch has lost a lot of political popularity. But Bosch is a spellbinder, who, in the opinion of U.S. diplomats, can win back much of his former popularity with a few speeches. Also disturbing to Americans is the return of exiled revolutionaries.

Concern was centered on Máximo López Molina, president of the Chinese-line MPD, or Popular Dominican Movement. López Molina had spent some time in Japan, recently moved to China—and had left China for the Dominican Republic when the provisional Government was formed—or seemed certain to be formed. The Institutional Act of the provisional government, written jointly by the OAS ad hoc committee and Dominicans of both sides, bans deportation or exile. By September 7, López Molina had reached Kingston, Jamaica. A way was found, next day, however, to block him. López Molina was shipped to Paris, where he maintains his permanent home in exile. Other key Communists, however, have returned.

García Godoy is working hand in glove with the Americans, and his goals apparently coincide with the main U.S. goals—unless, of course, there is another doublecross in the works.

U.S. officials here in Santo Domingo still talk about the beating they took from some of the U.S. press at the outset back in April, when Ambassador Bennett issued a call for the marines.

They continue to point out newly revealed evidence of Communist power within the rebel camp, to support their conclusion that U.S. intervention was necessary to save lives and keep the Communists from grabbing power.

U.S. intelligence now can demonstrate that nearly all the Communists who were listed as active when the revolt started still are important in the rebel zone.

AN INTERVIEW WITH WESSIN

Now we come to the case of Gen. Elías Wessin y Wessin. On Tuesday, September 7, the story broke that American officials had offered Wessin a bribe to leave the country.

That morning an anti-Communist Dominican newspaperman got me in to see Wessin—when four carloads of other newsmen were stopped at the outside gates.

The general said that two Americans had offered to buy his $18,000 home—at any price he named—if he would leave the country and take a tour, as honored guest, of military establishments in Panama and the United States. Wessin said his reply was that he would sell his home for $50,000, gladly, but that he would use the money to build another and better home, right in front of the old one.

Later that day, another high-ranking Dominican officer told me more about the case. He said that the CIA chief in Santo Domingo and an American military attaché went to Wessin's home at 2:30 a.m. on Sunday, September 5, with the bribe offer.

Next day, high U.S. officials told me a different story. They said no bribe had been offered, that Wessin initiated the meeting—but it was not at 2:30 in the morning. "It was much earlier than that." There had been other meetings, too. But Wessin asked for each of these, too.

Piecing these two stories together, with some things American officials told later, I think the story is this:

The United States, through García Godoy, put the pressure on Wessin to get out of the country. Wessin dickered, explained he was a poor man, would have to sell his home, liquidate other assets. During the negotiations Wessin initiated individual meetings. Wessin did tell me that he, himself, set the price of $50,000 on his home.

The story of the physical ouster of Wessin, at 8:05 on the evening of Thursday, September 9, reads like a paperback spy novel. Sometime during the night of September 8–9, Wessin began moving his tanks from the northern part of Santo Domingo back toward his base. He did not inform the Inter-American military headquarters in advance.

There was panic. Ambassador Bunker was pulled out of bed before 4:30 on Thursday morning. He was out of the hotel before 7. He didn't return until 5 in the afternoon.

Wessin's moves were confusing. On Wednesday morning he went before NBC cameras and made his bribe charges openly—the same charges that he had confided secretly to me only 24 hours earlier.

At the same time, Wessin seemed to be yielding to García Godoy's urging that he accept a post abroad for the good of the country. Godoy offered him his choice of several posts. Wessin said, on Wednesday, that he would consider them, and made a date to visit Godoy and give his answer on Thursday morning.

Wessin didn't show up for that date with his commander in chief.

Somebody ordered the Inter-American Peace Force into action—presumably Mr. Bunker. Brig. Gen. John R. Deane, assistant division commander of the 82d Airborne, was sent to Wessin's office. By all accounts, there was a scene. Then, Wessin was escorted to General Deane's headquarters. He was hustled out, an American officer on each arm, and whisked back to his own headquarters, a few miles away.

Later, in the afternoon, an American Air Force C–130 landed at San Isidro. Some baggage was put aboard. U.S. soldiers and plainclothesmen, presumably FBI, guarded the plane. After dark, just before 8 p.m., Wessin arrived by U.S. helicopter, was rushed aboard the airplane, and flown off to Panama. His family was left behind. One of his aids, a major, was the only Dominican to see him off.

The "bum's rush" for Wessin had some bad effects.

American residents, as well as Dominicans, began recalling how Wessin had led the forces against the rebels in the first days. A legend began to grow. Wessin was credited with saving the country from communism in the days before the marines landed. Wessin began to seem 9 feet tall.

American military officers have a more solid, less emotional, objection. Most of them had liked Wessin, and admired him as a military man. Generally, they agree his military did hold off the Communists in April until the marines landed. It is the diplomats who criticize his military actions during the first days.

But the main concern the American military men feel, as expressed by an officer who was brought in for a special high-level job, is this: For years, the United States has been training Latin American officers at Fort Gulick in Panama. These officers are indoctrinated with the idea that the United States depends on them as bulwarks against communism. What, asks the officer, are these Latin American officers going to think about the word of the United States now?

THE REBELS CELEBRATE VICTORY

Meanwhile, as General Wessin was being stripped of his military rank, retired from the Army and forced out of the country by the Americans, the rebels were celebrating their "victory."

At rebel headquarters, in the Copello Building on the main business street, El Conde, I talked with Bill Bailes, an American airplane pilot who has been with the rebels almost from the start.

We commented on how the guns had all but disappeared from the streets of the rebel zone. Mr. Bailes said the guns were still there—that the night before, when rumors spread that Wessin was going to invade, guns sprouted everywhere in the streets.

Mr. Bailes was exuberant with what he believes is a rebel victory. He praised the job that had been done by the "American press."

He said, "You reporters saw through the brainwashing of the American Government," and then added, jokingly, "I am recommending that we strike a medal for the American reporters who covered this story."

One of the sources of strength García Godoy hopes to keep, as a counter to the Communists in the rebel forces, is the military.

As of mid-July, the Dominican armed forces had the following strength figures: 10,000 Army; 3,800 Air Force; 3,600 Navy; more than 10,000 in national police; 1,700 in Wessin's armed forces training center.

I talked with high-ranking military officers, many of whom were gloomy.

One in particular I had seen several times, in May and July, when the purely military situation was much worse than it is now. But never had I seen him so gloomy.

This officer said:

"The situation is worse than anytime since April.

"During April and May, and into June, you at least could have faith in something—the military effort against communism. Now, even that faith has been shattered. The United States seemed to be against Communists then. Now it doesn't seem to be. The United States instead seems to be protecting the Communists.

"Exiled revolutionaries are coming back. Arms are not being collected.

"One provisional government, Imbert's, is out and another one is in—but still the Communists keep their control of downtown Santo Domingo. What did the compromise agreement accomplish?

"The Communists publish their newspapers—but the anti-Communists are ordered off the air, and have no newspapers."

The officer was puzzled by the United States—and said that he felt betrayed, adding:

"We cannot understand your Government. You send thousands to fight communism in Vietnam—but give in to the Communists here."

Neither does this officer think that all the rebel guns will be surrendered or found. He said 2,500 weapons were found in the northern part of the city, after the junta victory in May—but that many others still are there, hidden too well or too deeply to be detected. How many more are being hidden downtown, or in the rest of the country, the officer would not try to guess.

AN ECONOMIC PROBLEM

United States now has not only the political and military problems, but the formidable economic problem as well.

Here are some aspects of the aid problem:

Government budget runs $15 million a month. Collections fell to $2 million in May, got up to $9 million in September, are not expected to reach $15 million before many months.

Sugar Corporation, Government-owned, loses money and has to borrow $16 to $18 million a year to operate. Production costs are higher than the low world prices.

Coffee, a prime export, is in trouble. A few years ago, the Dominican Republic cheated on the World Coffee Agreement, exported more than its quota. Now, it is being penalized. In addition, coffee prices on the world market are very low. Result is that the little coffeegrowers, out in the countryside, aren't able to sell their coffee beans—and don't understand why. That poses a political problem for García Godoy—and the United States.

Cacao prices are down on the world market.

Since Trujillo, the Dominican Republic has been importing more than it can afford. Trujillo was killed in 1961. He had kept a tight rein on imports, showed a yearly favorable balance in current trade accounts. The figures tell the story. Current trade balances, year by year, were: 1960—plus $42.6 million; 1961—plus $41.8 million; 1962—minus $13.5 million; 1963—minus $22.8 million; 1964—minus $55.7 million.

All these problems are manageable, however, compared to the really big one:

This has been a country of easy living. People didn't need peso incomes to live. They could pick bananas and get along. But now that's not good enough for them. They want TV sets, and pesos in their pockets. They want schools for their children, and hospitals. Other people have these things, and they want them too. Only problem is that, while they want the benefits that come from a money economy, they don't really understand yet that they have to work for what they get.

Against these problems, and others, the U.S. mission for the Agency for International Development went to work on estimates of what was needed.

The mission came up with an estimate of $30 million, to start with. It recommended that United States chip in $20 million, the Dominican Republic the other $10 million. President Johnson agreed, announced his $20 million aid program.

Initial planning calls for use of the money in these ways:

Help make up the budget deficits, in monthly operating costs.

Pay half the 1-month salary bonus that all Government employees get in December.

Throw in some money to help rehabilitate manufacturing and business, generally—but not to help commerce.

Finance public works projects. Many already are underway, like the new water system being constructed for Santo Domingo. But in addition, García Godoy is being given a "pot" of $2 million to throw into public works in areas where it will do the most good politically. Idea is that United States wants García Godoy to succeed, so U. S. money is being given to him to use for semipolitical purposes.

On September 5, 2 days after the García Godoy government took office, the AID people went over the books with the Government. The Dominicans were surprised. They were "wealthier" than they had imagined.

They hadn't heard about President Johnson's promise of $20 million—because there are no newspapers of general information in the capital.

But, in addition to that, they found that they had:

Thirty-two million dollars in loans negotiated by previous governments, but never drawn.

Twenty to thirty million dollars in new loans that will be available to finance projects the AID mission now is developing.

Six and one-half million dollars in OAS emergency aid that has not been spent yet.

Total aid given since April 24 ran to $42 million. This was U.S. money, most of which was funneled through OAS.

One reason that $6.5 million of this aid money has not yet been spent is that United

States now is keeping a closer watch than ever on what is done with aid dollars in the Dominican Republic. In the past, officials say, much of the aid money went down the drain, in stopgap measures.

Now United States intends to be tougher, and make certain that aid extended will help make it possible to end aid later.

MEDICARE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, despite the many words written about it, we continue to receive questions from people who are wondering about the operation of the Medicare Act and how it will affect them and their families. Better Homes & Gardens magazine for October 1965, has done an excellent job in answering these questions with an article entitled "The Simple Facts About Medicare."

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PLAIN TALK ABOUT FAMILY HEALTH: THE SIMPLE FACTS ABOUT MEDICARE

WHAT MEDICARE WOULD PAY FOR A TYPICAL SERIOUS ILLNESS

Assume that a person 65 or older is covered by medicare's automatic hospital insurance and by the optional medical plan that costs $3 a month. His doctor orders him into a hospital for an operation followed by 3 weeks of fairly intensive care, a total of 25 days. At $26 a day for a semiprivate room, his basic bill is $650. Drugs are an additional $85. Lab tests and other hospital charges are $115. His total bill is $850. He pays $40 and medicare pays $810.

The surgeon's and anesthetist's fees, plus visits by the patient's own doctor during the hospitalization, total $400. If he has already paid $50 of medical expenses during the year, the patient's 20-percent share of this cost is $80. Medicare pays $320.

After leaving the hospital, he enters a nursing home for 30 days of additional recuperation. The cost is $365, which includes drugs his doctor has prescribed. The first 20 days and the drug costs are paid in full by medicare. For the next 10 days he personally must contribute $5 a day ($50 altogether). Medicare pays the other $315. While in the nursing home he also runs up a $90 doctor bill. Medicare pays 80 percent of it ($72). His own cost is thus $18.

Total costs of the illness are $1,705. Medicare pays $1,517. The patient pays $188.

Despite the millions of words that have been written on medicare, you may still have doubts about how the new law will affect your family. Here are the answers to common, basic questions recently posed by readers:

How much will the law increase your payroll withholdings? How do you qualify for benefits? What is the extent of those benefits? Is your wife's coverage different from yours? How can medicare increase your income tax deductions? Should you cancel your private health insurance policies?

You will help finance the medicare program, plus other expanded benefits, by paying social security tax on the first $6,600 of your annual earnings after this year, instead of the present $4,800. Also, the tax rate will go up to 4.2 percent. Thus on $6,600 or more of earnings, your withholding for social security will be $277.20, a yearly increase of $103.20. Of this amount, $23.10 will be earmarked for your "prepaid" hospital insurance after age 65. Rates will increase again in 1967, to a maximum of $290.40, with $33 of that annual tax amount set aside for medicare.

To this extent, your participation in medicare is compulsory. The supplementary insurance program covering doctor bills and certain other expenses is optional. If you sign up for it, the $3-a-month premiums begin when you reach age 65. They will most likely be deducted from your social security retirement benefits. Voluntary insurance for your wife will cost an additional $3 a month when she becomes 65.

To qualify for hospital insurance benefits once this part of the program begins on July 1, 1966, the only requirement is that you be 65. It isn't necessary even that you be covered by social security. (After 1967 this rule changes; persons who become 65 after that date will need to have had some work experience under social security.)

There is no "earnings test." You are entitled to full benefits under medicare even though you may have annual earnings over $1,500 which prevent you from collecting part or all of your social security retirement pension.

For most families (the exceptions being those who otherwise couldn't or wouldn't get proper medical attention) the only change medicare will make in health care is the manner in which it's paid for. Your doctor will be of your own choosing, and he will continue to make all the medical decisions: when and where to hospitalize you, the type of treatment or surgery needed, how long you should remain in the hospital, and what post-hospital care, if any, you need.

When your doctor has admitted you to a hospital, you will simply be asked to show your health insurance card, similar to the Blue Cross card you may now have. Next spring, persons already 65 and receiving social security benefits will receive their cards in the mail. Others will need to apply at their nearest social security office.

Now to the extent of your benefits: Your medicare insurance covers up to 60 days of hospital costs after you pay the first $40. For up to 30 additional days, you pay $10 a day and medicare pays the balance. After 90 days in a hospital during a single spell of illness, the hospital benefits stop.

You can thus expect medicare to pick up the bill for the major share of your hospital expenses: room and board, drugs normally furnished by a hospital, operating room charges, care by hospital staff nurses, laboratory fees, and the use of an oxygen tent, wheelchair, or crutches.

Certain "extras," however, must come out of your own pocket: the extra cost of a private room unless your doctor certifies there is a medical need for isolation, the cost of a private duty nurse, and of course such items as TV rental. And unless you are covered by the supplementary insurance program, medicare will not pay doctor bills, in or out of the hospital.

At any time after your third day in the hospital, your doctor may decide you can be cared for just as well and at less expense in a private nursing home that has an arrangement with a hospital. After January 1, 1967, medicare will pay the full cost for up to 20 days of this type of extended care, plus all costs over $5 a day for an additional 80 days—a total of 100 days. And even after your discharge from a hospital (following at least a 3-day stay) or from an extended care facility, your doctor may prescribe additional medical services while you convalesce at home. If so, and if you are confined to your home, medicare will pay for as many as 100 visits during a 12-month period by a nurse, therapist, or part-time home health aid.

Suppose you suffer a relapse? If it has been less than 60 days since you left the hospital or nursing home, the relapse is considered part of the same "spell of illness" and you are entitled to any unused benefits. For example, assume your initial stay in the hospital was for 40 days and that within the next 60 days your doctor orders you readmitted. You would still have 20 days during which medicare would pay the full cost, plus 30 more days during which it would pay all costs over $10 a day. And you'd have 100 days of extended care.

If your relapse were to occur after more than 60 days out of the hospital or nursing home, this would be considered a new spell of illness and you'd be eligible for a whole new round of benefits: hospital, nursing home, and at-home services.

Part of the cost of out-patient diagnostic services you get at a hospital also will be covered by medicare hospital insurance. This can occur even though you are not actually admitted to the hosptal.

Examples: X-rays, blood tests, or an electrocardiogram. You pay the first $20 and 20 percent of the cost over $20; medicare pays the remaining 80 per cent. If the total cost is, say, $60, you pay $20 plus 20 percent of the remaining $40—that is, $8. This makes your total cost $28. Medicare pays the other $32 toward your bill.

As broad as the new medicare hospital insurance program is, it still falls far short of providing full protection for your after-65 medical needs. But much of what it doesn't cover, the new voluntary medical insurance plan does cover.

Subject to a deductible provision under which you pay the first $50 of your medical expenses each year, the plan pays 80 percent of the additional costs of:

Physicians' and surgeons' care, without regard to where you receive it—in a hospital, clinic, office, home, or elsewhere. Included are the fees of any radiologists, anesthesiologists, and pathologists who may be required.

Up to 100 home health service visits a year with no requirement of prior hospitalization.

The cost of X-rays, laboratory tests, and special therapy. Some of these expenses may be only partially covered by your hospital insurance, in which case the voluntary plan can be applied to the balance of the cost.

Surgical dressings, splints, casts, ambulance service, rental of equipment such as an iron lung or wheelchair for use in your home, braces, artificial limbs, and eyes.

But remember: insurance under this part of medicare is not automatic. You will need to enroll and agree to pay the $3-a-month premium at age 65. What's more, there is a deadline. If you will be 65 by the end of this year, the deadline is next March 31. If your 65th birthday is after December 31, 1965, you will have a 7 month signup period that begins 3 months before your birthday. After that, the signup will be open to you only from October through December during odd-numbered years.

Don't let the deadline slip by. If for no other reason, you'd have to wait two years—without protection—for another opportunity to sign up. And unless you enroll within 3 years from the close of the first signup period available to you, you become permanently ineligible. Finally, there's a 10-percent-a-year increase in the premium for each full year you could have been enrolled but weren't.

Your wife's eligibility for medicare is based on her age, not yours. She qualifies for the hospital insurance program simply by becoming 65. If she is receiving social security benefits, either on her own or as your wife, she will get a medicare membership card automatically. Otherwise, she will need to make special application for one.

Suppose that she has never worked under social security. That won't prevent her from obtaining either type of medicare insurance. In the case of the voluntary program, of course, she will still need to enroll (as described above) and pay the $3-a-month premium.

What if you should die before your wife reaches 65? Assuming you die no sooner than 1968 and are covered by social security at the time of your death, it will not affect her medicare eligibility. She can still obtain both kinds of coverage once she becomes 65.

Both the benefits and the deductible features of medicare are also determined individually. The fact that you may have used up a part or all of the available benefits for a single illness will have no effect on her benefits, or vice versa.

Similarly, if you enter a hospital and pay the first $40 of the cost, she must still do likewise if and when she becomes a hospital patient. The same goes for the $50 deductible payment under the voluntary medical plan; you pay the first $50 a year of your expense and she pays the first $50 of hers.

Two new medical tax rules become effective in 1967. One is a tax increase which applies only to persons over 65. The other is a possible tax saving which applies to every family that itemizes its income tax deductions.

If you are over 65, your tax deduction for medical expenses will be limited to the amount that exceeds 3 percent of your income; up to now, after-65 medical expenses have been fully deductible under Federal income tax regulations.

The second change permits you, regardless of age, to deduct one-half the premiums you pay for medical care insurance, up to a minimum deduction of $150. This is without regard to income and applies to both private medical insurance costs and (in the case of persons over 65) the $3-a-month cost of the optional medicare plan. And the remaining half of your medical care insurance premiums can be added to other medical expenses to determine whether they exceed 3 percent of your income—and thus indicate what regular medical deduction, if any, you are entitled to.

To see how this works, assume you are not yet 65 and are paying $220 a year for a private health insurance policy. If you itemize expenses on your 1967 (not your 1965 or 1966) return you can claim a deduction of $110, regardless of your income or other medical expenses. Then you can add the remaining $110 to your doctor, hospital, and deductible drug expenses to compute your regular deduction on the amount in excess of 3 percent of your adjusted gross income.

Another way medicare can translate into money and tax savings is if you support an elderly parent. The main advantage, of course, is that it sharply reduces the drain on your own finances if the parent should require expensive medical care. Chances are medicare will pay most of the bill.

If you pay the parent's $3-a-month premium for the optional medical care plan, this is deductible on your tax return. It also counts toward determining whether you provide more than half of the parent's support costs, as do any medicare "deductible" charges you pay.

On the other hand—and this is important—any benefits the parent receives under medicare will not affect the determination of whether she (or he) is your dependent. For example, suppose your aged mother has a small income of her own, say $1,500 a year. But counting room, board, and other costs, you've been contributing $2,000 a year toward her support. Thus, of the $3,500 total, your share is more than half and you are entitled to claim her as a dependent. Now assume she enters a hospital and later a nursing home, and that her medicare benefits total $1,800. Can you still claim her as a dependent on the basis of your $2,000 contribution? Answer: Yes. Medicare benefits do not have to be counted as part of her total support cost.

As for private health insurance, it's still the only protection you have until you reach 65 and until medicare hospital insurance and the optional medical care plan becomes effective on July 1, 1966. Extended care benefits won't be available until 6 months later, on January 1, 1967.

Even then, don't be in a hurry to cancel your private insurance until you've taken a look at what the company has to offer. Obviously, the insurance industry is faced with making major revisions in its coverage for persons over 65. These can be expected to provide protection against expenses not covered by medicare. For example, a catastrophic illness or accident could require more than the 90 days of hospitalization provided by medicare. Or you could require a private duty nurse, another cost not covered by medicare. Nor does medicare cover the cost of drugs except while you are in a hospital or nursing home.

It's also possible your private insurance might cover some of the deductible expenses under medicare, as well as your "co-insurance" cost of $10 a day after 60 days in a hospital. Or the same policy might provide a weekly income to cover incidental expenses while you are hospitalized.

You'll also want to bear in mind, of course, that once you have dropped your private insurance you may not be able to reinstate it, almost certainly not without a physical exam.

Even if you are not yet 65, it would be a good idea to review your private insurance with your local agent. This is particularly true if you are 60 or older. The reason is that your policy may contain a provision that guarantees it renewable for life, and to the extent that this feature represents one part of the cost of the policy, you may be able to obtain a lower premium or increased health-insurance protection for the same amount of premium.

THE POVERTY PROGRAM IN MINNESOTA

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the poverty program is, above all, the story of people.

It is the story of men and women being helped to find their way to self-support and self-respect after a lifetime on welfare. It is the story of 4-year-old children from low-income families, learning about a new world through the Head Start program. It is teenage boys and girls trying to reverse lifetimes of failure in the Job Corps. It is young men and women now earning enough money to stay in high school, or helping finance their own college education through the work-study program. It is communities mobilizing their resources for an all-out assault on the poverty in their midst. It is community leaders, representatives of the poor, VISTA volunteers, and dedicated professionals—all working together to provide new hope for Americans too long left by the roadside in our national march to prosperity.

Three staff writers of the Minneapolis Tribune—Sam Newlund, Richard P. Kleeman, and Frank Premack—decided to tell this story to the people of Minnesota. They conducted extensive research, and they wrote a series of 10 articles entitled "The War on Poverty," which were published in the Tribune between August 30 and September 10.

These articles tell about low-income Minnesota men and women, boys and girls, who are being helped by the poverty program. They describe many projects in our State, and they discuss, frankly, both the achievements and the problems that have developed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this series of articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Aug. 30, 1965]

THE WAR ON POVERTY: HOW THEY HOPE TO HELP PEOPLE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The "war on poverty" is now a year old. Three Minneapolis Tribune staff writers Sam Newlund, Richard P. Kleeman, and Frank Premack, have pooled their efforts to explain how the major phases of the "war" are being waged in behalf of Minnesota's poor. This is the first of 10 articles.)

(By Sam Newlund)

You couldn't find a more wretched life than John Erickson's. Born to a pair of alcoholics who lived on liquor and welfare, his childhood was smashed by neglect and poverty.

Now 29, he recalled a time when he was 6: The children were living with their mother in northern Minnesota; the father had deserted to St. Paul. Mother got tired of having four kids around the house and "just put us on a Greyhound bus and shipped us to St. Paul."

Erickson (a pseudonym) was recounting the early events of his life that shoved him headlong toward failure and frustration—and made him a human target in the war on poverty.

He is one of several hundred welfare recipients enrolled in a Ramsey County antipoverty project aimed at getting people off relief and into jobs.

At age 8, Erickson was arrested for stealing $250 from a car. He was placed in a foster home. Then came the county boys' home, State training school for boys, an escape, a series of other crimes and St. Cloud Reformatory.

From there, a "suicide" attempt while in solitary confinement landed him in the State security hospital at St. Peter as a psychopath. After that * * * parole in 1956, a period of bumming across the country and finally marriage in 1958 to a petite woman of borderline intelligence.

Born of that marriage were two children who died of meningitis, a third who now has a serious kidney defect and a fourth with congenital foot defects. Mrs. Erickson is undergoing tests to determine if she has cancer.

Observed Erickson's caseworker:

"I think he has as many stresses as a man can possibly have."

Because he quit school in the eighth grade, Erickson has little to offer an employer. He has an explosive temper and a record of unreliability on the job.

Virtually all his life, he has been either in institutions or on welfare. His parents were reliefers and so are two of his three brothers and sisters.

Says Erickson: "I used to figure to myself * * * well, if I quit my job I'll go back on relief. That's the way we were brought up. When I wasn't on welfare I was in jail—that's all I know.

"Now I'm getting a little tired of having the State and county running our lives.

"I want to get out of this rut."

The Ramsey County Welfare Department has pinned its dubious hopes in Erickson's case on title V of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Title V tries to do what undermanned welfare departments have wanted to do all along—to give reliefers something approaching adequate counseling, vocational training, work experience and basic education in an effort to make them self-supporting.

It means catchup classes in English, science and mathematics, like those Erickson attends at Mechanics Arts High School. It means job training, such as the groundskeeper course Erickson hopes to enroll in.

For many reliefers, it means more money. Before enrolling in the project, Erickson's family of four lived on $112 a month in relief money plus rent and utilities. Now the family gets $231 a month and pays its own rent ($47) and utilities.

For the Ramsey County Welfare Department the $4.5 million antipoverty grant—biggest so far in Minnesota—means the hiring of 94 new employees, mostly caseworkers and vocational counselors. A new suite of offices has been set up to handle the load.

The project calls for enrolling 1,000 relief families and 500 families on Aid to Dependent Children (ADC). Only families with minor children and with adults potentially able to land jobs are selected.

The relief families, whose assistance checks ordinarily are lower than ADC families, are moved up to ADC standards. The Federal law thus is a deliberate attempt to encourage States such as Minnesota to expand their ADC programs to include families with a man—an unemployed father—in the house.

Erickson, a brawny man with tattooed forearms, doesn't look poverty-stricken. His family lives in a neat, and adequately furnished three-bedroom apartment in a St. Paul public housing project.

A cool breeze blew from the center courtyard through the Erickson home the other day as he put his feet on a coffee table and talked about his failures and hopes.

"When I was single," he said, "I didn't care whether I worked or not. I always had a roof over my head and something to drink. That was the important thing.

"But I'm getting older now, and I realize that my kids suffer."

Erickson's caseworker, Mrs. Virginia Reher, also believes he has mended his ways because of concern for his children. He was "really shook," Mrs. Reher said, when Erickson's little boy asked him once, "Daddy, why don't you go and work like other daddies do?"

"Let's face it," said Erickson, "I've been a bum."

But he saw some hope for a more stable future. Pointing to a television set across the room, he boasted of repairing it the other day and claimed the electronics field as a possible source of income. He also spoke hopefully of landing a good job as a groundskeeper after completing the course offered by the project.

Not all welfare clients have Erickson's problems. Others, like many ADC mothers, may simply be prevented from working by the need to care for small children.

Still others won't become "self-sufficient" because they are not physically or mentally able.

Erickson's prospects of getting off the dole depend on his success in qualifying for a high school diploma, his success in vocational training, the availability of a job and his family's health, among other things. It also will depend on whether his attitude toward work changes for the better.

Mrs. Reher is optimistic, although she conceded that others have considered Erickson a "100 percent loser."

"I think he's going to make it," she said.

War on Poverty Emphasizes Local Initiative, Participation by Poor

The primary vehicle for President Johnson's "war on poverty" is the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, which became law last August 20.

Legislation extending the program for a second year will be signed by the President as soon as a House-Senate conference committee works out final details of the extension approved by both bodies.

Although many Federal agencies are involved, the primary responsibility for coordinating the program and allocating Federal funds rests with the Office of Economic Opportunity, headed by R. Sargent Shriver.

The program emphasizes innovation, local initiative, and participation by the poor. Priority is given to programs coordinated through local antipoverty organizations widely representative of the communities involved.

By mid-June in Minnesota, there were 20 such community action councils either in business or in the final development stage. Thirteen others were being organized.

A State office of economic opportunity acts as an adviser to community action councils and other antipoverty efforts.

In Hennepin County, the action council is the Community Health and Welfare Council.

There has been a notable absence of political controversy over the poverty program in the county—unlike many other parts of the country—because, in the view of many observers, a nonpolitical body is doing the planning.

Here is a capsule summary of the major provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act.

TITLE I

Job Corps: Residential camps where jobless youths learn work habits and job skills.

Neighborhood Youth Corps: Youths work on a variety of jobs in the public interest while living at home, either to help them stay in school or increase their employability.

Work-study: Low-income college students get part-time jobs to help them through school.

TITLE II

Authorizes formation of local councils to devise their own methods of combating poverty.

Project Head Start: Preschool child guidance clinics set up by these councils help poor youngsters catch up to a kindergarten or first grade level.

TITLE III

Low-interest loans to poverty-stricken farm families.

Migrant: Special locally devised programs to aid migrant workers.

TITLE IV

Low-interest small business loans to low-income persons who can't get loans elsewhere, or to firms which will employ the poor.

TITLE V

Work experience: Special efforts to help unemployed heads of households in welfare families to become self-sufficient through vocational or educational training.

TITLE VI

Sets up administration of antipoverty program.

Domestic Peace Corps: Establishes VISTA, corps of volunteers to aid the poor and work in hospitals and various institutions.

The War on Poverty: Project Head Start Gives Youngsters Even Chance

(Editor's Note.—The "war on poverty" is now a year old. Three Minneapolis Tribune staff writers, Sam Newlund, Richard P. Kleeman and Frank Premack, have pooled their efforts to explain how the major phases of the war are being waged in behalf of Minnesota's poor. This is the second of 10 articles.)

(By Sam Newlund)

Vineland, Minn.—After a week as Project Head Start teacher at Mille Lacs Indian Reservation, Mrs. Dorothy Lemke wrote a report referring to the dozen youngsters who charged into her schoolroom as "little cherubs."

Sarcasm between the lines? Maybe so. But during the project's eighth and final week Mrs. Lemke spoke of incredible changes. If not cherubs, her charges at least were more angelic than before.

Project Head Start is one of the more widely heralded programs in the "war on poverty." A more apt name would be Project Catch Up, since its aim is to help poverty-ridden preschoolers catch up with middle-class youngsters.

It is deemed necessary because even kindergarten and the first grade go on the assumption that education already has begun at home. Most people assume that 5-year-olds know what a circus is, how to handle a knife and fork and a bar of soap, and have at least a corner in their homes where they can sit with crayons and coloring book.

For some children, these things are unknown.

Head Start's thesis is that if such missing bits of civilization can be supplied in a child guidance clinic, then maybe children of the poor can begin school on an equal footing with others.

Most Head Start projects, in Minneapolis and elsewhere, are for children of 4 and 5 who are about to enter kindergarten. Vineland Elementary School, which serves a community of 140 Mille Lacs families, has no kindergarten.

The Mille Lacs project, therefore, is for children of 5, 6 and 7 about to enter first grade. Some already had a taste of first grade, but had dropped out because of illness and family moves.

Who are these children and why do they need Head Start?

There's Henry Sam, Jr., age 6. He's bright-eyed, healthy-looking, and wore a vivid red shirt 1 day during the project's 8th week. He and two sisters live with parents who were high school dropouts.

The Sams live in a one-room frame dwelling measuring about 10 by 12 feet. A rusted chimney droops precariously on the roof. A misshapen screendoor, patched with cardboard, abuts a front stoop of rotting, fallen planks.

The house is atop a weed-infested hill where crickets chatter incessantly. A broken bicycle frame, a mangled baby stroller, an old shoe and a crumpled blanket litter the hard, barren ground in front of the house. A broken oar rests against the house's side.

Inside, Mrs. Sam—a pretty, dark-haired woman of 27—sits stoically making wastepaper baskets from the bark of nearby birch trees.

Mrs. Sam says her husband found work the previous week at a furniture factory. Before that, they lived on unemployment compensation and aid from the Veterans' Administration.

(Head Start records showed the family's annual income was in the $2,000-$3,000 bracket.)

Mrs. Sam agrees that Head Start has been good for her son—he now can write his name, she says. But she believes the teacher and volunteer workers tend to "baby him."

Down at the schoolhouse, Mrs. Lemke had rated Henry after the first Head Start week as having limited interest in objects and activities, as needing excessive prompting and constant reassurance to try something new and as being very anxious in new situations.

One of the new activities he and his classmates experienced later in the program was a classroom demonstration of proper toothbrushing.

Using one of the boys as a "prop," Mrs. Lemke demonstrated the correct technique and showed a filmstrip on the need for good eating habits and regular dental care. With the help of three young volunteer assistants—members of a Catholic Youth Organization group from the Twin Cities—each child was given a brush and marched off to the bathroom to practice.

The program also included medical and dental examinations and care for each child, psychological evaluations, field trips to a fire station, post office and museum, television viewing and various classroom and playground activities.

On that first day back in June, according to Ross Jorgensen, assistant director of the reservation's community action program, the youngsters stampeded in "like a pack of wild horses."

Reported Mrs. Lemke: By the end of the first week, a marked change was very noticeable. Each child was actually reading pictures, listening for new things, making decisions, speaking up, taking part in each phase, and thinking. (She underlined "thinking.")

Jorgensen singled out Eloise Wind, 6-year-old member of a nine-person household, as an example of startling change. (The family income was listed as under $1,000 a year; Eloise had been hospitalized at least four times, and she was a victim of skin disease and bronchitis.)

Last fall, the Winds moved from a tiny dilapidated dwelling into 1 of the 28 new reservation homes built by the Government.

In the project's first 2 weeks, Jorgensen wrote in a progress report, Eloise was "silent, distrustful, and withdrawn." During recess she stood fearfully with her back to the schoolhouse wall, "as still and mute as a fawn sensing danger."

The "personalized attention" from one of the volunteer aids, Jorgensen said, wrought a change that "completely reversed" that kind of behavior. After 3 weeks, he said, she was "gregarious and participating in all activities."

One important part of the Mille Lacs program is lunch. Cooked in the school's new kitchen, it is wholesome and plentiful. (All the children reportedly were either anemic or bordering on anemia when the program started.)

Head Start was an undertaking of the Mille Lacs Reservation Business Committee, the governing body of the reservation. There was no problem selecting the children: All those who were to enter first grade this fall were considered in need of the project.

The 15 children who took part were scattered among 142 families, whose income—with only 5 exceptions—fell below the $3,000 poverty line. More than half the families had incomes of less than $1,000, according to project records.

Only half the children 14 to 17 were in school, and nearly half the adults over 25 had 7 years of schooling or less.

All but 35 of the 107 housing units were "substandard."

The pothole-studded reservation on the western shore of Lake Mille Lacs is poor farmland, and opportunities for employment are sparse and largely seasonal.

"The pattern of individual family and social disorganization is clearly discernible," according to a summary submitted to Federal officials. "The social contacts of the earlier culture are no longer effective and no other set of standards has been accepted to replace them."

The War on Poverty: Education Is the Stairway To Climb From Neediness

(By Richard P. Kleeman)

(Third of a series)

In one of the University of Minnesota's everlasting "temporary" buildings, an efficient 27-year-old graduate student runs a million-dollar work-study program for needy university students.

Behind a typewriter outside Pierre (Pete) Meyer's office sits Diane Pioske, 17. The top 1965 graduate of Sandstone (Minn.) High School and a new university freshman, Diane is one of hundreds of Minnesota college students whose work-study job earnings make college education possible.

A dozen blocks away at Holmes School, 300 Southeast Fifth Street, a staff is planning the State's first real adult basic education project.

Aiming to provide the 3 R's and a bit more to at least 500 men and women over 18 with less than an eighth grade education, it is expected to start more modestly—for about 50—on September 13.

At first glance there seems little connection between one 90-percent federally financed program, used by at least 25 Minnesota colleges and universities to help low-income students, and another to teach reading, civics, and health to the illiterate, the unemployed, and the school dropout.

But, aside from the fact that adult basic education projects will provide part-time jobs for some college students, the two have a basic, philosophical link: the theory that education—whether at third grade or college graduate level—is a weapon against poverty.

Between "clients" of these antipoverty programs, however, there is a major difference: the young students generally are in college because they are eager to learn.

The adults for whom the basic education program is planned may be reluctant to admit their educational shortcomings: The program will use part-time neighborhood recruiters who may go door-to-door to drum up prospects for the classes, which will be held daytimes or evenings in schools, settlement houses, church basements—anywhere a workable group of 5 to 12 can be gathered regularly.

Diane Pioske, whose ambition is to study law, can expect no financial help from her divorced parents. Her remarried mother has been ill.

With the aid of the $300 she hopes to save from her $1.44-an-hour summer typist's job in the university's work-study program office, she'll pay her college room and board. She also will hold down a part-time job and a scholarship.

"I'm very lucky to be able to go on with my education, as one of my two brothers couldn't do," says Diane.

That she heard of the work-study program even before entering the university is a tribute to the intensive efforts of Meyer, her boss, to spread word of it through high school counselors and by speaking to any group that invites him.

That he was quoted in July as still having nearly 900 job openings available is evidence, first, that the word hasn't spread far enough, but also, in his words, that "many students eligible for this program just aren't in college."

Conversely, many college students, needy by almost any standard, still can't meet the Federal program's stiff criterion: family income of $3,000 or less if there's one child, increased by $600 for each added dependent. (Meyer's staff also must consider assets—the farmer's tractor, the family home.)

The list of vacant jobs is down to about 450, and Meyer believes he can place any eligible student who applies.

The jobs must be tasks that might have been available before but couldn't be staffed or afforded: reorganizing files, help in long-delayed research, typing that frees a professor for other duties—these are typical.

Most jobs—limited to 15 hours a week during the school term, 40 during vacations—are on campus, but the university also has agreements with eight off-campus nonprofit agencies to take student workers.

Like the university and participating colleges, a contracting agency must expect to put up—in cash—10 percent of the student's pay, to the Federal Government's 90 percent.

The university program is the State's largest: $1,586,000 in Federal funds have been earmarked (and nearly $1 million actually paid out) since its inception last January to extend through the 1965–66 school year. Of this, $1,032,000 is for students on the Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses.

One of the State's smaller programs is that of the College of St. Benedict, St. Joseph, where $8,000 in Federal funds (plus the college's 10 percent) has kept eight girls working this summer.

About twice as much will be available for the coming school year to help 25 to 27 girls at the Catholic college.

"As far as we know, every one of these eight girls would not have been able to continue college this fall if she had not been given this opportunity to work," said Sister Mary Cecelia Kapsner, college treasurer. Four girls worked on campus and four in St. Cloud.

All girls on the program have scholarships and college work contracts besides, and still must borrow either under a Federal loan program or through banks, the sister said.

Minneapolis' adult basic education program—first in the State proposed under the Economic Opportunity Act's title II—has two pilot models that preceded it: small programs, each for about three adults.

One was held at Phyllis Wheatley House in north Minneapolis without outside financial support, and one was part of a broader summer war on poverty program to rehabilitate St. Paul relief clients.

Spokesmen for both claimed modest success.

Stanley Baraga, adult education consultant for the Minneapolis public schools, is not discouraged by these tiny pilot programs:

"We know the people are here—statistically," he said, citing the 35,951 Minneapolis residents with 7 or fewer years of schooling, more than 14,000 of whom live in the core city.

The flexible, decentralized program of free classes will be open to any adult needing basic education—with emphasis on the habitually unemployed, relief clients, school dropouts, people rejected for military service for educational shortcomings, migrant workers, foreign language groups, and the culturally deprived—especially racial minorities.

One class for Spanish-speaking people—mostly Mexicans—is planned at Unity House on the North Side under a specially qualified instructor.

A dozen public and private nonprofit agencies have cooperated in planning the program, according to Baraga and Vern F. Wobig, veteran 36-year teacher of industrial arts at Henry High School. Wobig directs the program from the Holmes school office.

Hiring the first of some 20 teachers has begun, even before Federal approval of the $110,000 asked for the first 4-month program for 500 adults through December 31. Getting the right kind of teacher, Baraga acknowledges, "is one of the biggest problems of this kind of program."

Instructors may be regular teachers in their off-hours, retired educators or those who have left the profession temporarily: A teaching certificate is not necessarily required in adult programs, and all who volunteer will get special training, both before and during the program.

Besides teachers, there will be part-time neighborhood recruiters, a counselor, part-time social worker and curriculum coordinator, and a half-dozen "project newswriters"—who will be residents of the areas served and will publish weekly mimeographed news bulletins to keep up the interest of adults enrolled in the program.

State Schools Receive Work-Study Grants

The following work-study grants to 25 Minnesota colleges and universities represent funds actually provided from Washington since the program began last spring and through the fall quarter.

Funds tentatively committed for the rest of the 1965-66 academic year are not included.

	Grants
Augsburg College, Minneapolis	$3, 645
Austin Junior College	4, 400
Bemidji State College	63, 246
Bethany Lutheran College, Mankato	2, 615
Bethel College, St. Paul	26, 334
Brainerd Junior College	22, 798
College of St. Benedict, St. Joseph	16, 661
College of St. Scholastica, Duluth	17, 394
College of St. Thomas, St. Paul	21, 959
Concordia College, Moorhead	25, 904
Concordia College, St. Paul	2, 956
Ely Junior College	7, 049
Fergus Falls Junior College	2, 153
Hamline University, St. Paul	30, 629
Hibbing Junior College	65, 462
Macalester College, St. Paul	28, 551
Mankato State College	83, 892
Moorhead State College	88, 255
Rochester Junior College	3, 779
St. Cloud State College	68, 711
St. John's University, Collegeville	58, 571
University of Minnesota, Duluth	261, 311
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis-St. Paul	599, 383
University of Minnesota, Morris	109, 452
Winona State College	11, 202
Total	1, 626, 312

THE WAR ON POVERTY: STUDENT EARNING AIDS LEARNING

(By Richard P. Kleeman)

(Fourth of a series)

Dolly Roundtree, 16, a junior at Minneapolis Vocational High School, "needed money to help mother get me through school and buy school clothes."

After 2 months' work on the Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) as a typist at West High Summer School, Dolly, 3413 Third Avenue South, may not have saved much money—but she has her new clothes and "I know what it's like to work in an office with others."

Marie Gleason, 17, 3708 Pillsbury Avenue, never had worked a switchboard before—but after her 2-month role saying "West High—student speaking" she's ready to become a student operator at Central High, where she'll be a senior.

She has banked much of her summer's earnings of around $180.

These young people—and others like Konstantin Karpovs and Patricia Fox—offer evidence that the NYC, which so far has helped 750 Hennepin County young people with the aid of more than $250,000 in Federal funds, aims at—and seems to accomplish a triple objective.

It gave youngsters 16 to 21, coming from families of low income and from high schools with high dropout rates—a chance to earn money—perhaps just enough to make the difference between staying in school and having to drop out to take a job.

It exposed them—some for the first time—to the "world of work," and to the need at least for high school training to succeed in it.

And it accomplished a lot of work—work that, at least theoretically, wouldn't otherwise have been done—or done so soon.

Although many of the city's 475 NYC jobholders (and those on the other Hennepin County summer NYC project, which involved 205 youngsters in Mound and Brooklyn Center) worked for public schools, others helped in other public offices or worked for private nonprofit agencies. They earned $1.25 an hour for up to 15 hours' work a week.

Konstantin Karpovs, 16, whose Latvian-born mother is unemployed, is being helped through Benilde High School by his family's Latvian Catholic congregation. A senior, he wanted to earn money toward University of Minnesota tuition a year away.

"Konny," 2118 Dupont Avenue South, took a NYC job at the Minnesota Society for Crippled Children and Adults, supposedly to repair wheelchairs (as a youth hosteler, he's had experience with bicycle repairs).

But many other ways to use Konny's "strong back and good mind" were found, according to the society's associate director, James Beaton—including "a fringe benefit for us": the lad's ability as a photographer.

At Hennepin County General Hospital, the day care mental health center had help from four NYC youngsters—three boys and Patricia Fox, 17, 515 Northeast Fourth Street.

Pat, a vocational high senior who wants to be a secretary, "wanted more responsibility to pay my own bills."

After her summer, she has that, plus a new measure of self-confidence gained on a job that ranged from typing and filing to checking the daily free milk supply and exchanging cheery banter with waiting patients.

Or take Sally (not her real name), a good-looking teenager of average intelligence, whose parents are separated, and whose mother is on relief.

Sally was an unmarried mother in junior high school—and ever since she's been shy and withdrawn. She worked in a school office this summer, and after a slow start, gained both office know-how and ease in getting along with people.

Wrote Sally's Neighborhood Youth Corps coordinator (one of six who handled job placement out of North, South, Central and Vocational High Schools, plus referrals from other schools):

"It would appear that Sally's work experience not only served as an opportunity to gain technical skills but, more importantly, has affected her attitudes, personality and self-esteem in a very positive manner."

To qualify them for Neighborhood Youth Corps, youngsters' families had to meet the rigid Federal poverty test: If they came from a family of four (and most, actually, came from families with five or six children), the maximum family income was $3,400. For each dependent, $600 was added up to a maximum family income of $6,000.

Some 1,500 youngsters signed up for the 475 federally financed summer jobs (the local agency puts up 10 percent of a Neighborhood Youth Corps project cost—mainly by providing services and office space rather than cash), according to Paul Boranian. Boranian, a former North High School coordinator, directs the Minneapolis Neighborhood Youth Corps project.

"Many of these kids might have gone back to school without the program," he concedes. "We have just made it a bit easier for them—and there's no doubt in my mind that we've also saved a full year of learning when they get onto a regular job."

Neighborhood Youth Corps youngsters worked as aids to teachers, librarians, groundskeepers, social workers, playground directors, and other workers.

Because their work was not supposed to replace that of a full-time employee, Neighborhood Youth Corps youngsters performed many a seldom-done job: Schools' fluorescent lighting tubes were washed, athletic fields were weeded, kindergarteners' resting mats were cleaned.

Neighborhood Youth Corps, which was started during the closing months of the past school year, seemed to improve school attendance attitudes and habits even of persistent discipline problems, according to a report by the Hennepin County Community Health and Welfare Council, responsible for local antipoverty programs.

Of the 117 who had left the project as of July 15 (about a month before it ended), more than 50 took full-time jobs, 26 failed to report for an assignment and only 2 were dropped for poor work.

Local projects have concentrated on youngsters in school and planning to return there.

In applying for Federal Neighborhood Youth Corps funds for the coming school year and next summer, local officials are encountering a Federal push for emphasis on helping youngsters out of school and out of work—with the aim of encouraging their return to school or at least to job training.

Although this may alter the emphasis in future Neighborhood Youth Corps programs, these are what is now sought for Hennepin County:

A Minneapolis school project placing 700 students on jobs averaging 13 hours a week during the school year and 500 on jobs next summer. Total cost: $850,250, of which the Federal share will be $654,082 (nearly 80 percent of which goes in wages to students). Already approved: a school-year program for 625 students with a Federal subsidy of $390,000.

A Minneapolis park board project, sought since March, to provide part-time park aids' jobs for 389 city youngsters not in school. Sought for this: $800,000 in Federal funds for a year's operation.

A suburban project, involving all Hennepin County suburban schools except Edina-Morningside, for 293 school youngsters and 38 out of school, costing $342,000, with $290,000 from the Federal Government.

THE WAR ON POVERTY: YOUTH CORPS JOBS ARE FOR MONEY, NOT SKILLS

(By Sam Newlund)

(Fifth of a series)

In a press release issued last October, Minnesota Gov. Karl F. Rolvaag said the Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) antipoverty projects to be operated by the State conservation department would "expose these young men to healthful, active outdoor environment and infuse into them a new spirit of self-confidence, citizenship, and purpose."

Last week, Youth Corpsman James Smith, 19, emerged from a tree-cutting excursion into a mosquito-infested marsh on the Carlos Avery State Game Farm in Chisago County with a slightly different view:

"It's just another job," he said. "My little brother can learn how to cut trees down."

This is not to take sides either with the Governor or Smith. Obviously, whatever benefits may flow from such work are not shared equally by all corpsmen.

But it generally is conceded that the conservation department's NYC projects in dozen of parks, forests, and other outdoor places are not going to teach poor youths skills that will help them get jobs. What they can do is put idle youths to work and put money in their pockets.

This is one particular in which the NYC differs with the Job Corps in the "war on poverty." Job corpsmen not only live away from home, they're also supposed to learn a trade.

For better or worse, the trade being taught to youths 16 or 21 at places like Carlos Avery is the skill of getting out of bed in the morning, reporting to work on time, putting in a day's labor, getting along with fellow workers, and taking orders from superiors.

There is no question that many of them need this kind of training. For some, this is their first paying job. Many come from broken homes where they've developed an indifferent attitude toward what social workers call the world of work.

It's safe to say that most of them, at least at the start, are not good job prospects, either because they have little education, no skills, poor school and work records—or a combination of the above.

For example, Smith, of 1011 Fuller Avenue, St. Paul, quit Central High School at age 16 because he couldn't get along in school too good," and has made abortive attempts at working as an orderly, car washer, and the like. At one point, he said, he suffered a nervous breakdown and spent time at Hastings State Hospital.

He came to the NYC project, he said, after spending 30 days in the workhouse on a trespassing charge.

Smith, like all NYC workers, makes $1.25 an hour. On the summer project, he works 32 hours a week, Friday being set aside for visits with a counselor at the State employment service.

Smith and his fellow workers—they were clearing and burning brush for a waterfowl habitat—are supervised by a crew leader who is paid $2.13 an hour.

The St. Paul youth ventured a criticism that paralleled comments made by the game farm director.

Said the youth: "If the NYC had more qualified people to do the supervisory work, it would be better. Maybe college graduates with social work backgrounds."

Since the corpsmen and crew leaders are together for long periods, there would be great potential for influencing the attitudes and behavior of the youths, according to Smith, if the leader were a highly skilled counselor who could gain the confidence of the boys.

Mike Casey, the farm director who is in charge of the Carlos Avery project, felt the same way.

"You don't interest that kind of a fellow at $2.13 an hour," Casey said. (The job also carries no educational requirement.)

But not all youths on the Conservation Department projects, financed under the Federal Economic Opportunity Act, are high school dropouts.

Among a crew of five working elsewhere at Carlos Avery, one was a college student working for the summer, one was a high school graduate earning money for college, two were still in high school, and the fifth was a high school graduate without college plans.

Planning to go to St. Cloud State College this fall was James Hegler, 17, Forest Lake.

He said he is saving all his money for college but guessed that his parents would have been able to send him whether he worked or not.

Eligibility for NYC projects is being tightened up under new rules laid down by Federal officials. Up to now the Employment Service had no fixed income limits. The determination of what constituted an "impoverished family" was based on a number of factors and left pretty much up to the counselors.

New rules include income limits. For a city family of four, the cutoff would be $3,130 a year; for a farm family of four, $2,200.

A Federal NYC brochure published when the poverty war was being launched also promised remedial education to corpsmen who needed it. But this never materialized with the conservation projects, according to an Employment Service spokesman.

A considerable number of conservation corpsmen, many of them school dropouts, have dropped out of the corps.

At Carlos Avery, 2 groups totaling 70 signed up since March. Forty-five have left since, and about 18 of the 45 were fired, according to a project spokesman.

They were fired, Casey said, because they couldn't develop good work habits, couldn't take orders, didn't like the work, or were "troublemakers."

But the State conservation department can cite other projects where all but a handful of boys moved out of the project into better paying jobs or took on vocational training.

But because methods of recording reasons for leaving have only recently been spelled out, it is difficult to draw conclusions about statewide success.

The department said there was 1 month—July—for which adequate statewide figures are available. For July, a spokesman said, 95 boys quit the various projects. Eighty of them, according to these figures, accepted other jobs, 10 went to "vocational training programs," and 5 were fired.

THE WAR ON POVERTY: WHO SHOULD PLAN PROGRAMS—POOR OR "DOWNTOWN"?

(By Sam Newlund)

(Sixth of a series)

Despite efforts to involve the poor in antipoverty planning, the war on poverty in Minneapolis is still pretty much a creature of the professionals.

Whether this is good or bad is debatable. And if it is bad, there are circumstances to explain it, at least in part.

But there is discontent among some neighborhood leaders in Minneapolis antipoverty target areas. They feel that the poor are not adequately represented in the decisionmaking.

The Reverend James Holloway, pastor of Zion Baptist Church in the north target area and a member of the local economic opportunity committee (EOC), was asked about this point.

"I think the program is run by the boys downtown," he said.

The boys downtown are the professional staff members of EOC, which is an arm of the Community Health and Welfare Council of Hennepin County. EOC's job is to plan and screen local antipoverty schemes, principally under the community action phase of the poverty war.

Joseph Kahle, EOC coordinator, agreed that the statement about "the boys downtown" has been "true up to now."

"We've tried to involve people as much as possible in the neighborhoods," Kahle said. "Until recently there has been little response."

But there is evidence that the neighborhoods now are beginning to sit up and take notice and that the professionals are trying harder to bring the poor more deeply into planning their own salvation.

The issue is pertinent because the Economic Opportunity Act makes a big point of scrapping the paternalism of old social work methods. Whereas downtown used to tell the poor what ailed them and then proceeded to administer the cures (which haven't worked), the new plan is to ask the poor to help mix up their own poverty medicine.

Thus, the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) has decreed that community programs must be "developed, conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation of the residents of the areas or neighborhoods in which the programs will be carried out."

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat, of New York, made a fuss about this when his House Education and Labor Committee was considering the bill to extend the poverty war to mid-1967.

POWELL agreed to move the bill out of committee only after R. Sargent Shriver, OEO director, agreed to spell out the participation of the poor.

In St. Paul, a member of the Ramsey County antipoverty committee, Seth Phillips, resigned in February, claiming that assignment of work to task forces had the effect of excluding representatives of the poor from program planning. (He quickly rejoined the group by request of Mayor Vavoulis.)

In Minneapolis the mandate to involve the neighborhoods has been carried out—at the top policymaking level—by the appointment of four residents of poverty areas to EOC. Total committee membership is 44.

Kahle listed the four neighborhood representatives—not necessarily poor residents—as Arthur L. Cunningham, chairman of the North Side Community Action Committee; Mr. Holloway; Mrs. Helen M. Starkweather, who has been active in North Side community work, and Mrs. Peter Warhol, a North Side mother active in an Indian antipoverty group. Cunningham and Mrs. Holloway are Negroes.

In addition, three of EOC's four task forces have neighborhood representatives. They number 3 of 15, 2 of 16, and 3 of 25, respectively.

Besides this, neighborhood residents have been hired to help execute antipoverty programs. For example, 184 classroom aids were hired in Minneapolis in connection with summer school programs, including Project Head Start. More of the same is planned.

And as various projects began making their way through EOC's planning and screening mill, Kahle and other staff members went to neighborhood groups to ask for suggestions and criticisms.

This is roughly what has happened so far. Now, EOC is asking neighborhood antipoverty groups in both the north and south target areas to name one more representative each to EOC membership. This would increase membership to 6 on a board of 46 (fewer than 46 if plans materialize to weed out those with poor attendance records).

The idea of just one representative from her group didn't set too well with Mrs. Doris Slaughter, spokesman for the South Side Antipoverty Lobbying and Screening Committee.

"If we are offered only one representative, we will send no one," Mrs. Slaughter said.

"Put yourself in our place," she said. "If we had 1 down there against 45, we'd just be clobbered. It would be just a token thing." Ten representatives of the poor, instead of six, would be more like it, she said.

Omar Schmidt, welfare council director and topman in the OEC, said he felt that the poor had an adequate voice.

He also said the approach used in Philadelphia, Pa.—a series of poverty area elections to choose members of the antipoverty council—may have been all right for Philadelphia but was not necessary in Minneapolis because the machinery was already working.

"We've got 45 people on the board," Schmidt said. "We've touched all the bases that Shriver's office said ought to be touched. As far as I'm concerned, we have maximum feasible participation of the poor, not only on the overall committee but on the task forces and in our methods of operation."

But both the downtown social workers and a few leaders of the poor recognize the extreme difficulty in bridging the gap between the planners and the poverty stricken.

By the very nature of their predicament—their lack of education, their preoccupation with grubbing for essentials, their distrust of welfare schemes, and their isolation—the poor are the least able to organize into effective power blocs.

"Who speaks for the poor?" The question is largely unanswered.

The poor complain, too, that social workers—like members of the EOC staff—don't speak their language.

Mrs. Mary Bible, a north side member of an EOC task force, calls it a real language barrier. But the more the professionals came to talk with the neighborhood folks the more this barrier began to break down, Mrs. Bible said.

According to her, members of her neighborhood antipoverty group are finally beginning to believe that the war on poverty isn't just talk.

Others are yet to be convinced. These include the hard-core victims of poverty, the semiunderworld types that Mr. Holloway identifies as the pimp, the prostitute, the kid who hangs out in poolrooms, the dope-pusher and the "young hipster who says only fools work."

Kahle and Schmidt are known to differ on how far the committee should go in organizing the poor into power blocs that could lead to such things as a "march on city hall." Schmidt is the more cautious of the two.

But a step in that general direction was taken in June—although the outcome is far from certain. The EOC approved a revised proposal for setting up "neighborhood centers" designed to help solve poverty-related problems. It broadened the plans to include "teams" of poverty area residents to knock on doors and seek out problems.

Kahle said one result could be organizations of poor people who could pressure city officials for improvements in services like garbage disposal, police protection, and relief programs.

But in the poverty program itself, the role of the poverty stricken so far has been largely to make suggestions about programs already being planned.

At the North Side Glenwood Community Center last week, a group of 21 residents met with school principals to discuss a proposal that may be the first exception to the rule. The plan calls for hot lunches in North Side schools, and if it is adopted by the OEC it could be the first Minneapolis plan to originate with poverty-area people themselves.

The War on Poverty: Job Corps Camp Was Unready

(By Frank Premack)

(Seventh of a series)

The Job Corps at Camp Atterbury in central Indiana was born prematurely and sickly.

When it opened in haste 4 months ago, it had, in the words of its surviving men and boys, almost nothing going for it—no functioning program, makeshift quarters, little equipment.

Yet, at one time after it opened, nearly 650 youths were sent from their homes to live at the old Army camp, all with little to do. Today, only 375 of these young men, 16 through 21, from all sections of the country, half of them white, half Negro, remain at Atterbury.

The rest have dropped out, have been kicked out or have been transferred to better-run Job Corps camps.

Thirty-five of the youths have come from Minnesota, where the first small Job Corps camps are scheduled to open late this year. More Minnesota youths have been assigned to Atterbury than to any other Job Corps facility in the country.

Ten of the thirty-five from Minnesota have left Atterbury and returned to their homes.

One of them—a youth from a small town in central Minnesota—wrote his mother soon after arriving:

"I guess I made it here alright (sic) but thats all I can say for this place, it sure isn't what I thought it was going to be like. When they said it wasn't like the Army they were right, its more like a concentration camp. * * * There isn't one, not one good thing I can say about this place."

There are, of course, good things to be said about Atterbury mostly about the young men who have adjusted to life in the camp after 4 difficult months.

They have endured at Atterbury.

They have lived through countless staff shakeups, some linked to an Indiana Democratic factional war between former Gov. Matthew E. Welsh, who was instrumental in getting the program for this State, and Gov. Roger D. Branigin, Welsh's successor, who has washed his hands of the project lest it wash off on him.

They have managed despite hostility from nearby communities, including Indianapolis, 40 miles to the north; despite hostility from Indiana Republicans, who think of the Job Corps as a welfare boondoggle; despite hostility from John Birch Society and Ku Klux Klan quarters, both headquartered in a nearby town and both active in the surrounding counties.

They have survived the taint of numerous incidents, a euphemism used by the camp to describe past disciplinary difficulties that included fist fights with racial overtones, bullying, extortion, widespread thievery and homsexuality.

They have suffered the indignity of having the doors of their barracks' rooms ripped off after seven youths admitted committing sodomy.

In theory, few of these disciplinary problems were anticipated.

The Job Corps, a creature of the Economic Opportunity Act, is designed to take young men and young women who have dropped out of school, who are unemployed, and put them in camps or centers away from home to learn the habits as well as the skills of useful work.

The program is not designed for the hard-core delinquent—"the Job Corps will not be able to enroll youths who show a history of serious and repeated offenses against persons or property," says the 79-page handbook used in selecting trainees. Those youths are written off.

In practice, however, the employment services in the States, which screen applicants for the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), have done a spotty job. Minnesota's State Department of Employment Security has done a topflight job, the OEO says.

But in some other States, the employment services are interested most in the $80 a head they get for screening.

In some instances, youths have been oversold, told they are a cinch to pick up a skill at the camp and then find employment; in other cases, despite the selection process painstakingly outlined in the screening handbook, boys have been selected who do not fit into the program by any stretch of the imagination.

In addition, the OEO, responsible for administering the war on poverty, has misdirected youths seeking a particular kind of skill to a camp which offers no such vocational training.

Atterbury has suffered from all of these problems.

Its problems have become so acute that the OEO has temporarily stopped sending youths to the camp, which is supposed to grow to 2,600 corpsmen in the next year.

At the end of last month, when the Federal Job Corps Director, Otis Singletary, made a hurried visit to diagnose what had gone wrong, things had settled down at Atterbury.

"The fighting and all that stuff had died down. Most of us are going to class now and that's good. We've got something to do," Eugene Kraus, a youth from New Ulm, Minn., told Singletary, a New Frontiersman who took a leave as chancellor of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro to run the Job Corps.

While disciplinary difficulties appeared to be settled, other problems had not disappeared. Some of the youths, who spend half days in basic education classes picking up reading and mathematics skills, the other half in vocational training, were cutting one or the other to wander aimlessly about the faded and dirty military installation.

The vocational training, supposed to be the heart of the Job Corps program, was still located in temporary quarters, was still lacking some of its classroom equipment and had been in operation less than a month. Boys in food service training, for example, had been doing little else than cutting up and shredding carrots for 3 weeks.

Said Singletary at the end of his tour: "The biggest single thing wrong with Atterbury is the lack of a functioning vocational training program."

When would that be corrected? "As soon as we get all of the shops going," answered the center's third $20,000-a-year director, James Bryner, 48-year-old educator who has spent his last 11 years as superintendent of schools in a suburb of Cleveland, Ohio. And this, as it turns out, is not likely to occur much before next February 1.

Atterbury offers vocational training in a half-dozen areas: automotive repair, refrigeration and air-conditioning, food handling and preparation, small appliance repair, building maintenance and repair, and heating.

The educational systems division of Litton Systems, Inc., which is bidding for a big Minnesota Job Corps contract, runs the training program, as well as the basic education classes, at Atterbury. This was not always so.

Under the original setup, Midwest Educational Foundation, Inc., a nonprofit corporation formed by then Governor Welsh to get the $10.8 million Job Corps contract from the OEO, ran everything. Midwest used Litton to design the courses, not to run them or hire the teachers.

In August, when the lack of any vocational training program became overwhelmingly pressing, Midwest and the OEO decided to turn over all educational responsibility to Litton on a $1.8 million subcontract for the next year.

Litton has had difficulties, too. "Our expectations were given quite a shock," says Harry Stephan, the top Litton man at Atterbury, in talking about the educational levels of the youths assigned to the camp.

We had expected the range of reading abilities to fall generally between the fourth and eighth grades. Instead, reading levels ranged from illiterate to that of a high-school graduate. As a result, course materials had to be rewritten, a process that is still far from being finished.

Stephan insists that the vocational training program will turn out young men who should have no difficulty obtaining employment in the world outside the camp. The youths, themselves, believe this to be true.

But in Minnesota, which is planning for its first big Job Corps facility, there is strong doubt voiced about the ease with which this can be accomplished.

For instance, Robert Brown, Minnesota employment security commissioner and a strong believer in the Job Corps program, thinks the level of training offered at Atterbury and other Job Corps camps is too low for some of the youths and that the range of skills offered is not pegged to tomorrow's labor market.

Brown, one of the small group of planners for Minnesota's big Job Corps, also is critical of the lack of concern in the program about keeping track of its graduates to see that they obtain employment. As things are now set up, the OEO has no plans for notifying a State employment service when a youth either finishes or drops out of the Job Corps.

In Minnesota, the Job Corps planners hope to profit from Atterbury's mistakes. They are seeking something they call an experiment within an experiment, a new kind of Job Corps facility that could serve as a model for the others.

The War on Poverty: Youth Job Corps Revamped for Minnesota

(By Frank Premack)

(Eighth of a series)

The Job Corps, taking its first faltering steps across the Nation, will arrive gingerly in Minnesota this winter.

Four conservation work camps, each designed for 200 youths, are under construction in the north woods.

Two will be operated by the U.S. Forest Service—in the Superior National Forest, 4 miles from Isabella and in the Chippewa National Forest, 10 miles from Cass Lake; one by the Bureau of Indian Affairs—Chippewa Ranch, on Indian lands 12 miles from Mahonmen; one by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife—at Tamarac National Wildlife Refuge, near Rochert.

These small rural camps, reminiscent of the old Civilian Conservation Corps, represent one facet of the two-sided Job Corps. The other kind of Job Corps facility, an urban center capable of handling 1,000 to 3,000 youths, probably will never come to Minnesota.

Instead, this State is likely to get a new kind of Job Corps facility, a combination of the urban and rural aspects of the program.

The planning of this unique Job Corps is a direct result of the Federal Government's experiences, some of them distinctly unpleasant, in contracting with nonprofit corporations and industries for the operation of the dozen big camps across the country.

Its planning, in fact, was requested by the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), and is a tacit admission on the OEO's part that all has not been well with the urban Job Corps.

This has been particularly true of Camp Atterbury in Indiana, which was allowed to open without an operating vocational training program even though the Job Corp concept is committed to teaching unemployed and ill-educated young men and young women the rudimentary skills and habits of useful work.

That is why, at OEO urging, the original plan for a 2,000-youth urban Job Corps center at Grand Rapids, Minn., has been scrapped.

In its place, Youth Training, Inc., a nonprofit group formed at the request of Gov. Karl Rolvaag to get OEO money for an urban center, has submitted a plan calling for a cluster of 200-youth camps around a processing center for 400 youths at Grand Rapids.

The plan utilizes both the conservation work experience of the rural camps and the technical vocational training of the urban centers.

Youth Training, a nine-member board headed by Anoka County Attorney Robert Johnson, has submitted the plan to the OEO, which is expected to act soon.

The new kind of Job Corps, if it gets off the ground as expected, will be run by a private industry, probably the Educational Systems Division of Litton Systems, Inc.

The notion of using an industry—rather than a nonprofit group like Youth Training itself to take over operating responsibility, also derives in part from OEO experience at Atterbury, which floundered for nearly 4 months because of a schizophrenic division of responsibility in the beginning between a private board of community leaders and Litton.

The interest of industry like Litton in the Job Corps is probably twofold: The subcontracts contain profit, and the educational techniques developed at the camps could well be marketed in the future to public school systems from which the youths dropped out in the first place.

The youths who will enter the Job Corps camps in Minnesota this winter will come from all sections of the country, with all manner of backgrounds. Most of them will not come from Minnesota, however.

They will all be assigned by the OEO from young men, 16 through 21, who have volunteered, been screened and recommended by the employment service in their home State.

In Minnesota, this screening is done by the State Department of Employment Security. It has interviewed approximately 2,000 youths, recommended only 475 of these to the OEO, which, in turn, has assigned but 208 to Job Corps camps.

In its screening, employment security has discovered some unusual cases of educational failure: A rural youth, 19, who has attended school only 2 days in his life, the result of a school system that overlooked the law because it found him to be troublesome; two youths in suburban Hennepin County who were passed through the ninth grade but were functional illiterates.

Statistically, about one-fourth of the 475 youths recommended to the OEO had had a rather serious scrape with the law, and one-half had no police record at all; about one-third had never held any kind of job; 99 percent were school dropouts.

The statistics that have been accumulated do not describe the great individual differences among the corpsmen. At Camp Atterbury, to which more Minnesota youths have been sent than to any other center, a visitor found:

Michael Westlund, 20, 1011 14th Avenue North. He quit North High School in the 10th grade in 1961, worked part time as a dishwasher, then full time as a janitor and a rug cleaner, never made more than $56 a week.

He is studying the operation, maintenance, and repair of heating equipment at the camp, has put on 20 pounds because of Atterbury's 4,500-calorie diet and is a member of the boxing team, a sport he has learned for the first time.

David Gurno, 17, who came from the Red Lake Indian Reservation, where his widowed mother, three brothers, and one sister still live. He quit school in the 10th grade, was unable to find any kind of job. He has picked auto mechanics as his vocational training choice.

Or the Negro youth who grew up in a ghetto in Detroit, Mich., was orphaned at 9, ran away from a foster home at 10, and has made it, by himself, on the streets and in the gangs ever since.

When he first came to Atterbury, he took out his hostilities by swinging at other corpsmen. He may never pick up a trade at Atterbury but he has learned, in 2 months and with the help of the camp's counseling service, to try to solve problems without the use of his fists.

In many ways, the chief strength of the Job Corps, at Atterbury and elsewhere, can be found in the group living experience rather than simply in the vocational training program.

Ben Robinson, a counselor at Atterbury, puts it this way:

"I find just a fantastic quality in each boy as an individual. These boys are suffering from bad homes, from a lack of basic reading abilities, from you name it. But they are not the 'hard core'; they came here on their own initiative.

"A skill is not what they want at all. They each came here for a different reason, looking for different things—relationships, friends, new interests.

"Look around you," he said, "and you can't possibly say that something mustn't be done for these boys. Now. Not tomorrow."

THE WAR ON POVERTY; SMALL BUSINESS LOANS ARE MADE TO BOOST OPPORTUNITIES

(By Sam Newlund)

(Ninth of a series)

These are some of the Minnesota outposts in the war on poverty:

Waubun, where Mrs. Shirley LaDue will open a beauty salon with a $7,000 Small Business Administration (SBA) loan.

A farm near Hill City, where the Willard W. Leith family got $2,300 in Farmers Home Administration (FHA) loans to buy a cow, 26 sheep and certain pieces of farm equipment.

Crookston, where children of migrant workers from Texas attended a school financed with a $17,000 Federal grant.

Involved here are three of the less publicized assaults on poverty written into the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. As with most, it is too early to say much about their effectiveness.

The SBA poverty loan program, in fact, is barely getting off the ground in Minnesota. According to regional SBA officials, Mrs. LaDue's loan is one of four made so far in the State—all of them through the White Earth Business Development Center.

Total value of these four loans—three at Waubun and one at Ogema, Minn.—is $47,000.

SBA, a Federal agency, has been making loans for small business ventures for some time. The antipoverty act went a step further, permitting low-interest loans to low-income persons who can't qualify for loans elsewhere—or to persons whose businesses will employ the poor.

No collateral is needed, and the usual requirement of equity in a business is waived. Interest is 5½ percent (4 percent in distressed areas) and the borrower has up to 15 years to repay.

As with may parts of the war on poverty, these small business loans involve setting up additional local committees, although the SBA already is entrenched in the loan business.

These local groups will set up small business development centers and the committees will screen applicants. A proposal for one such professionally staffed center has been drawn for Hennepin County by Omar Schmidt, executive director of the community health and welfare council, the local poverty war agency.

Some questions, however, have been raised about the necessity of setting up separate agencies outside the SBA when the SBA already is geared for the job.

But Harry Sieben, SBA regional director, says local committees are in the best position to screen applications. Without them, SBA's job would be more expensive and time consuming, Sieben said.

In any case, SBA officials see the program as giving persons with business skills but no capital a chance to get on their feet for the first time.

They say Negroes, for example—who may be short of money and the least likely to swing a loan elsewhere—may be able to buy franchises for such businesses as ice cream stores or drycleaning outlets.

Under the program, SBA may require—and pay for—training in good business practice as a condition of the loan.

The farm loans, like the ones that went to the Leiths at Hill City, are similar. But in this case another branch of the Federal Government—the Farmers Home Administration in the Agriculture Department—gets into the act.

Under the antipoverty law's section aimed at "poverty in the rural areas," these loans are an attempt to hunt down the sometimes-hidden pockets of rural poverty and plant seeds of family income.

Ordinary FHA loans can run for 7 years (up to 40 years for real estate) at 5 percent. The poverty loans cost 4⅛ percent, and can run up to 15 years.

Poverty loan applications are screened by county committees of local residents and processed through the 52 offices of the FHA.

According to Arthur Hansen, State FHA director, 306 poverty loans totaling $569,730 had been made through his office by Aug. 16. They went for such things as a milkhouse, ponies, minkfarm and tree and brush removal.

The Leiths are using their loans for a tractor, disc, hayrake, mower, stock tank, feed, seed, fertilizer, fencing, and a jet pump in addition to the cow and sheep.

Mr. and Mrs. Leith have nine children and live on a 160-acre farm. But Leith's health has been subpar and the family has done little farming recently. Their income, Mrs. Leith said, came from welfare and veterans' benefits.

With the loan, she said, they hope to raise sheep and perhaps soybeans or other cash crops. "This," she said, "is the opportunity we've been looking for."

Also included in the poverty-in-rural-areas section of the Economic Opportunity Act is a section to aid some of the most poverty stricken of all migrant workers. Declared an announcement put out by the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity:

"Heavy guns of the President's war on poverty have been trained on the misery and squalor in which 2 million migrant farmworkers and their families exist."

So far, it's been more like small arms fire in Minnesota. One project at Crookston in the Red River Valley beef-and-potato area, has been funded so far.

Now completed, the project involved the establishment of an elementary school and day nursery for migrant children. With $17,258 in Federal funds, it was a consolidation of two similar schools that had been operated separately by the Roman Catholic and Presbyterian Churches.

According to James Turgeon, field representative for the State Office of Economic Opportunity, the nonsectarian nature of the school, staffed by public school teachers, resulted in a heavier turnout of migrant children.

Plans are being made for expanding the program in the Red River Valley, and for antipoverty migrant programs in other parts of the State.

THE WAR ON POVERTY: IN STATE, VISTA PRESSES FORWARD IN SUBTLE WAYS

(By Sam Newlund)

(Last of a series)

Cloquet, Minn.—A Harvard man with a passion for medieval English literature stretched his long arms and gathered about him a half dozen young, eager listeners.

They watched with great concentration as their mentor spoke with animation, nodding occasionally to one small boy, smiling to another and nudging a third in a gesture of encouragement.

The subject of the conference was how to advance a football beyond an opposing platoon of equally intent youngsters.

Although the Harvard man's academic concerns have little to do with touch football ("I like Chaucer and that sort of thing"), he threw himself into his quarterbacking "with vigor," as another Harvard devotee of touch football might have said.

The Harvard man in Cloquet is 20-year-old Tom Chase, of Hohokus, N.J. He is a Volunteer in Service to America (VISTA), and as such is a member of a citizens militia in the "war on poverty."

His outpost is the Fond du Lac Indian Reservation. He is one of a couple dozen of VISTA's who have served in Minnesota so far (some have since changed assignments).

VISTA is the domestic version of the Peace Corps.

The volunteers spend about 6 weeks in training, then live and work in such places as Indian reservations, urban slum neighborhoods and institutions.

In May, Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey spearheaded a VISTA recruitment drive at the University of Minnesota. VISTA officials from Washington, D.C., said at the time that they hoped to sign up 150 to 200 volunteers.

A VISTA spokesman reported Thursday that 27 Minnesotans were on the job as VISTA's in various parts of the country, as of July 31. Fifteen of them were from the university, and all but two were 26 or younger.

All VISTA's dispatched to Minnesota have gone to Indian reservations, with the exception of one group of five originally authorized to work with elderly patients at Oak Terrace State Nursing Home, Glen Lake.

Chase's assignment was not to teach Indian boys the skills of touch football.

But he does spend considerable time in recreation with the youngsters who gather at the Fond du Lac community center. And he doesn't discount the importance of such work, although more obvious antipoverty work is on his agenda.

Besides the benefits of supervised play itself, Chase sees more subtle possibilities.

For example, he said, if only one boy became so interested in football that he stayed in school so he could play the game, then his work would be worthwhile.

In VISTA work the subtleties are probably every bit as important as they are in the overseas Peace Corps. The well-meaning gung-ho volunteers who want to rush out and show the poor how to do things the right way soon realize that they must become inconspicuous, deal with the poor on their own terms, talk their language, and hope that they will do things for themselves.

And as Chase and a fellow VISTA have learned, volunteers must remain strictly neutral when they find that leaders in a poor community do what leaders of any community do. They fight.

Chase, a lanky blond who tends to neglect haircuts, has been at Fond du Lac for 4 months.

He concedes that his work has been rather nebulous so far, although he spoke of positive accomplishments at Mille Lacs, the reservation where he worked previously.

His immediate goal, though, is to survey the reservation and help plan a self-help housing project in which Indian families will do the work. Under this plan, workers will be paid union scale, but the pay will accumulate as equity in their houses.

One of the touchy jobs involved in this project, Chase pointed out, is to find the families most in need of the housing and at the same time likely to be the most dependable workers, capable of assuming a mortgage.

Chase's work is supposed to mesh with projects of the reservation's governing body, the business committee, and with various antipoverty programs of the reservation community action program (CAP). The CAP chieftains are Curtis Lind, director, and Harold LaRose, his assistant.

(Although Lind is a poverty war official, he cautioned against using the word poverty in connection with the reservation. The word has negative connotations, he said, adding that "inopportunity" is the proper term. "Reservation" also is taboo with Lind. "Resident area" is correct, he said.)

The other VISTA at Fond du Lac is Rozanne Glass, 21, Chicago, Ill. (A third volunteer is being transferred out.)

Miss Glass' activities include trying to establish an afterschool place for study and tutoring, and organizing a Brownie troop.

The study hall project also presents delicate dilemmas.

Miss Glass feels that Indian leaders would prefer, out of pride, to keep the study area in the reservation community center. But space there is limited, and children come to the center for recreation, not study.

Downtown, Cloquet school officials have agreed to a school study hall for Indians and whites alike, but they may want it to be staffed by professional teachers. But Fond du Lac children, Miss Glass points out, may avoid a place that looks like just another schoolroom manned by teachers.

Despite such difficulties, both Chase and Miss Glass expect their work to be successful. But their successes may be the kind that can't be measured for several years.

Meantime, they live among the Indian people (Chase has moved into a spare room in a small reservation home) and are paid small living allowances plus $50 a month payable after completion of their 1-year tours of duty.

Miss Glass, an English major and a graduate of the University of Illinois, said she hopes to become a writer—maybe of textbooks.

Chase, who had dropped out of Harvard before signing up with VISTA, said he plans to go back and continue studying medieval English.

THE PENDING REBEAUTIFICATION OF AMERICA: ANOTHER ADMINISTRATION ACHIEVEMENT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the beautification of our America will be greatly enhanced when S. 2084 is signed into public law. This bill to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems is very important because it brings increased meaning to the phrase "America the beautiful."

Great credit for pointing up the need for this highway beautification act goes to our President and his lovely wife, Lady Bird. It is proper to say that the efforts of our First Lady have made it much easier for the Congress to act on this bill. Mrs. Johnson is an activist. By her action she has this year truly shown how much more beautiful the countryside of America can be when it is given love and care.

By 1968, as millions of visitors come to view the wonders of the Nation's Capital, the highways along which they will travel will be more beautiful thanks to the efforts of millions of Americans. Billboards will have fallen into better perspective, outdoor junkyards will no longer be ugly landscape sores, and, hopefully, landscaping and scenic enhancement will be the objectives of every State in the Union.

The Senate version of S. 2084 was carefully studied before it was reported by the Public Works Committee on which I serve. Great credit can be given to our colleague from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] for his work on this proposed legislation which was reported by the Senate on September 14.

In his excellent message on highway beautification which President Johnson sent to the Congress in May, the President spoke of the need for action to bring beauty to our roads. He said:

> By making nature and recreation easily accessible, our highway system can become immensely more valuable in serving the needs of the American people.

So the Congress knows and is acting.

It should be noted that Alaska has no billboard problem. As Governor of the Territory in 1945, I urged adoption of proposed legislation forbidding erection of billboards on the highways. This was done, and later further safeguards were added to the law.

We know that our population increase has made it necessary to change some of America the beautiful. But necessary changes need not be repudiations of America the beautiful. I believe S. 2084 will help us help restore beauty to our land.

We do well to remember and to implement the words of "America the Beautiful" written by Katherine Lee Bates in 1895.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the song be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the song was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL

Oh beautiful for spacious skies, for amber waves of grain;
For purple mountain majesties
Above the fruited plain!
America! America! God shed his grace on thee,
And crown thy good with brotherhood from sea to shining sea.

Oh beautiful for pilgrim feet,
Whose stern, impassioned stress
A thoroughfare for freedom beat
Across the wilderness!
America! America! God mend thine ev'ry flaw,
Confirm thy soul in self-control, thy liberty in law!

Oh beautiful for heroes proved
In liberating strife,
Who more than self their country loved,
And mercy more than life!
America! America! may God thy gold refine
Till all success be nobleness, and ev'ry gain divine!

Oh beautiful for patriot dream
That sees beyond the years
Thine alabaster cities gleam
Undimmed by human tears!
America! America! God shed his grace on thee
And crown thy good with brotherhood from sea to shining sea!

UGANDA CELEBRATES THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I want to extend my compliments and best wishes to the people of Uganda who will be celebrating tomorrow the third anniversary of their national independence. In March of 1962, they received from the British full internal self-government and, on October 9 of the same year, took their place in the international community as a sovereign state.

Facing many challenges, both stimulating and frustrating, Uganda has embarked on a path of national development in hopes of bringing the fruits of modernization to all her citizens. In seeking an effective program for economic advancement, consistent with the nation's values, Uganda has counseled with the World Bank and undertaken a 5-year plan designed to further diversify agriculture, increase production, and expand education facilities.

Concentrating her energies and resources on internal progress, Uganda has adopted in international affairs a policy of nonalinement. She is a member of the United Nations and has participated in various regional activities on the African continent.

Mr. President, the United States enjoys close and friendly relations with Uganda, and it is my sincere hope that our two nations will continue to build such relations based upon mutual respect and understanding.

I join well-wishers throughout the world in congratulating Uganda on the anniversary of her national independence.

FAIR CAMPAIGN PRACTICES COMMITTEE AND ITS NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON BROADCASTING AND ELECTION CAMPAIGNS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, for a number of years I have been aware of the constant efforts of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee to help our political system to function at its best. Therefore, it is with no surprise, but with considerable pleasure, that I learn of yet another substantial effort by that bipartisan body.

I refer, of course, to next week's National Conference on Broadcasting and Election Campaigns, which will convene at the Shoreham Hotel on Wednesday, October 13. Speakers and commentators of prominence and ability have been brought together to discuss ways that broadcasting and politicians can come together and develop the best possible use of the airwaves for political communication.

Luncheon addresses by Howard K. Smith on Wednesday, and Thomas N. Schroth, executive editor of Congressional Quarterly, on Thursday offer one highlight of the 2-day conference.

I take particular interest in the four-panel sessions that will consider the realities, problems and prospects for political broadcasting. The afternoon panel on Wednesday will be addressed by Tom Wicker of the New York Times, the head of opinion research for CBS, former Republican National Committee research director William Prendergast, and Pierre Salinger. These gentlemen will consider where television has brought us and what its demands on politicians mean for our system.

In the Wednesday evening panel, broadcasters, the Federal Communications Commission, a Republican Congressman and an outstanding scholar on campaign costs will look into the difficult question of the FCC's fairness doctrine and the equal opportunity, or equal time, controversy boiling around section 315 of the Communications Act. These speakers are NBC News Vice President Julian Goodman, the FCC's Dr. Hyman Goldin, Representative CHARLES E. GOODELL, of New York, and Dr. Herbert Alexander of the Citizens Research Foundation. Commentators will be FCC General Counsel Geller and CBS General Counsel Leon Brooks, and the panel will be moderated by the president of the Federal Communications Bar Association, Arthur Woleneberg.

The Thursday morning panel is of particular interest to me. It will deal with misuses and abuses of the electronic media. Fair Campaign Committee Executive Director Bruce L. Felknor will probe the recorded telephone message technique, the so-called "dial-a-smear," that has been so abused of late by right extremists. Albert J. Zack of AFL–CIO will discuss irresponsible political broadcasting, looking again at the excesses of the radical right. Congressman WALTER ROGERS of Texas, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Communications and Power, will discuss legal remedies possible to candidates who are maligned across State lines. John Pemberton of the American Civil Liberties Union will seek to defend freedom of speech from excessive regulatory restrictions, and a conservative writer from New York, Noel Parmentel, will argue that rightwingers have to buy radio programs because of what he sees as a liberal bias in the broadcast media. I suggest that this will be a stimulating session, and it will be moderated by Paul Porter, former chairman of the FCC.

Thursday's afternoon panel will be a conclusion and a look at what we can do better, with still more distinguished participants: Louis G. Cowan, former head of CBS television and now deeply immersed in educational television and communication research; Rowland Evans, the widely read columnist; Stimson Bullitt, a Seattle broadcaster and a sensitive observer of politics and political ethics; and the outstanding student of political broadcasting and the great debates of 1960, Stanley Kelley of Princeton.

Mr. President, I intend to get full reports on this great conference, and to have members of my staff attend and follow it closely. It is a source of deep regret to me that I must be in Wyoming on those dates. But I applaud this conference and am confident that it will start a conversational ball rolling among politicians, broadcasters, and journalists, and scholars, that can only improve the political use of television.

RURAL DELIVERY MAIL SERVICE IS 69 YEARS OLD

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, too often we take for granted the reliable, and often, hazardous service of our country's rural mail carriers.

The rural delivery mail service observed its 69th birthday on October 1, and I wish to offer my congratulations for a job well done.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news story on the rural delivery service as the story appeared in the Fairmont, W. Va., Times on October 4, 1965.

There being no objection, the article was ordered printed as follows:

RURAL DELIVERY MAIL SERVICE 69 YEARS OLD

Rural delivery mail service was 69 years old Friday and as spry as ever.

The Post Office Department reported the service is provided over 1,890,953 miles daily, an increase of more than 50,000 miles during the past 2 years.

In the 1965 fiscal year, 9,823,256 families were served compared with 9,551,915 during the 1963 fiscal year.

Rural delivery was established October 1, 1896 out of three post offices in West Virginia—Charles Town, Halltown, and Uvilla—by Postmaster General John Wanamaker.

Although it is taken for granted today, the rural delivery service at first was greeted with ridicule. Critics said the idea of having a mailman trudge all over remote countrysides—often through rain and snow, and where there were no roads at all—was ridiculous.

The last surviving carrier from the original group that started on October 1, 1896, Melvin T. Strider, of Charles Town, recalled in an interview before his death several years ago that he didn't trudge a bit.

The bicycle was his original rural carrier vehicle, and the people he served didn't think the service was ridiculous at all. They were delighted to get their mail at home rather than going to the post office some miles away once in a while to see if they had any mail.

Once underway, the service grew rapidly. Five rural routes started on October 1, 1896, including 3 in Charles Town, but there were 82 routes in the first year of operation.

At the turn of the century, there were nearly 8,300 routes serving 186,000 miles.

The service reached its peak in number of rural routes in 1925, with 45,189, but only about 1,250,000 miles were served.

Rural carriers today not only serve mail to boxes in front of the homes, but they provide numerous basic postal services. They will accept parcel post, sell money orders, handle registered letters and sell stamps.

In the earliest days, the Department was concerned over a hodgepodge of mail receptacles provided by rural residents, wooden boxes to tomato cans.

Today, through the efforts of postmasters, carriers and other groups, in cooperation with the Department, rural boxes meet uniform standards providing for nice appearance, easy accessibility and protection of the mail.

The growth of rural service has been credited wiht helping to develop the Nation's highways, the Nation's approximate 31,000 rural carriers and the people they serve has reached near-legend proportions over the years. Dozens of cases are reported each year where the carriers have alerted farm families to a fire or where first aid or other emergency assistance has prevented a farm family tragedy.

WILLIAM McCOY, SR., DISTINGUISHED WEST VIRGINIA PUBLIC OFFICIAL, DIES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I would like to draw attention to the record of outstanding and distinguished public service which has just drawn to a close for Mr. William McCoy, Sr., of Franklin, W. Va.

Mr. McCoy died on October 5 at the age of 87. During his lifetime, he served as prosecuting attorney for Pendleton County, W. Va., for 30 years—from 1909 to 1939, and he served seven terms in the West Virginia Legislature. I served in the West Virginia House of Delegates with him. In addition to his private law practice and his service to the public, Mr. McCoy also founded Pendleton County's weekly newspaper, the Pendleton Times, which his son, William McCoy, Jr., now edits.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a report of the death of Mr. William McCoy, Sr., as the story appeared in the Pendleton Times on October 7, 1965.

There being no objection, the article was ordered printed as follows:

William McCoy, prominent Pendleton County lawyer and active figure in local and State political and governmental affairs for more than a half-century, died Tuesday afternoon at his home in Franklin. He was 87.

Mr. McCoy had been actively engaged in the practice of law in Franklin since his graduation from law school in 1902 until about 2 years ago when he retired after suffering a stroke. He served as prosecuting attorney for Pendleton County from 1909 to 1939, and he served seven terms in the West Virginia Legislature. He represented Pendleton County in the house of delegates in 1907–08, and later from 1941 to 1952 and was a member of the powerful rules committee of the house.

He was interested in farming throughout his life, and for many years he operated the Trout Rock farm 3 miles south of Franklin which had been in his family for several generations. In 1913 he founded Pendleton County's weekly newspaper, the Pendleton Times, and retained his interest in it the remainder of his life.

He was a faithful and loyal member of the Franklin Presbyterian Church from childhood and he served for many years as deacon of the church and later as elder.

He received his education in the public schools of Pendleton County and at Hoge Academy, Blackstone, Va., where he won a scholarship to Washington and Lee University for scholastic achievement. He graduated from the Washington and Lee University College of Law in 1902.

Mr. McCoy was born at Franklin June 2, 1878, a son of John and Martha (Price) McCoy. He was married Setpember 18, 1917, to Grace Hedrick who survives.

Surviving in addition to his wife are a daughter, Mrs. Edmund C. (Martha) Burnett of Arlington, Va.; two sons, William McCoy, Jr. of Franklin, and Robert G. McCoy of Springfield, Va.; and six grandchildren.

He was preceded in death by three sisters, Mary and Alice McCoy and Mrs. Byron (Katie) Boggs, and three brothers, Cortlandt, George, and Richard C. McCoy.

Funeral services will be conducted this afternoon at 2 o'clock from the Franklin Presbyterian Church by his pastor, the Reverend J. Wilson Rowe, Jr., and interment will be in Cedar Hill Cemetery.

NEW JERSEY CONFERENCE ON COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS AND THE ELDERLY POOR

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the war on poverty began with an almost total commitment to programs for youth. Obviously, this was a necessary first step. We had to take positive, immediate action to rescue young people from want and waste of talents and energies.

This year, however, Congress has stated in very positive terms that the Office of Economic Opportunity also has a clear commitment to help those older Americans who live in poverty. A provision in the Economic Opportunity Act amendments, sent to President Johnson last month, states:

> It is the intention of Congress that whenever feasible the special problems of the elderly shall be considered in the development, conduct, and administration of programs under this act.

Several events preceded this action by Congress. First was the realization within the Office of Economic Opportunity that more had to be done for the elderly. Mr. Sargent Shriver, in fact, had established earlier this year a task force on programs for elderly persons. The National Council on the Aging has made a valuable contribution to this task force by preparing model programs of direct potential assistance to the elderly poor.

Second, the U.S. Senate Committee on Aging, under the leadership of Chairman GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida, opened hearings in June on the war on poverty as it affects older Americans. Senator SMATHERS clearly stated the intentions of the committee when he said:

> It should be clear * * * that this committee has not decided to declare war on the war on poverty. I personally regard the OEO as the greatest effort ever made by a democratic government to destroy an enemy as old as man. * * * At the moment, however—as these hearings begin—it appears that the OEO has given only minimal attention to our older citizens. The OEO is still young enough to adjust its approach to the elderly; and it is the purpose of this hearing to make certain that it does.

Third, many State and local antipoverty leaders are planning or implementing imaginative new programs to bring the elderly within community action programs. I am proud to say that New Jersey certainly has done so within the first year of action against poverty.

When the Committee on Aging conducted a hearing in Newark, N.J., on July 10, we heard descriptions of many fine projects which enlist or help the elderly. Now, the New Jersey Office of Economic Development has taken another step. On October 1 in Trenton, Gov. Richard Hughes and the State OEO called an all-day conference on community action programs and the older poor.

The significance of the meeting was described in telegrams by Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY and Mr. Shriver.

The Vice President's message said:

> I congratulate you on initiating the Nation's first Conference on Economic Opportunity and the Older Poor. This meeting is further evidence of New Jersey's continued leadership among the States in every aspect of the war against poverty. For it is to the States that we look to perform the vital task of assisting the communities to adapt and utilize the resources developed by the Federal Government. Congress has provided us with several new instruments designed to improve the lives of those of our citizens who are in their late years. The Economic Opportunity Act, along with medicare and the Older Americans Act, is an important means of bringing the Great Society to all of the elderly.
>
> Through the genius of community planning I hope to see the development of new employment opportunities for workers over 45 on the administration of the medicare, community action, and other programs.
>
> I know that your State will attack the problems of poverty in old age with the same vigor that characterized your efforts in the urban and rural areas to provide new opportunities to disadvantaged youth.

Mr. Shriver added these comments:

> I was pleased to learn that the New Jersey Office of Economic Opportunity has acted to help us expand the war against poverty to meet the needs of the older poor. Your concern matches the determination of this office to provide expanded resources and opportunities for this group through community action.
>
> We have recently received a series of excellent recommendations from a special task force created to study the problems of the elderly, and we have already allocated $44 million to fund local action projects, some of which I understand you will be discussing today.
>
> Let me emphasize, however, that the initiative remains with the community action

agencies whose planning and applications throughout the Nation shape our program.

Your intention to review project proposals at this meeting with representatives of the older poor, as well as with public and private agency leaders, and to solicit their suggestions will make an important contribution toward the success of this effort.

Please assure the community action agencies of our active support as they enter this new phase of community action. New Jersey should be proud of its record in developing and operating important antipoverty programs in urban and rural areas, a record which is enhanced by your efforts in behalf of the older poor.

Governor Hughes and New Jersey OEO Director John Bullitt emphatically said in their remarks that New Jersey will do all possible to extend economic opportunities to the older poor.

Dr. Robert K. McCann consultant for older persons for the U.S. OEO assured audience—which included community action planners and representatives of social service and church organizations—said that the nationwide war on poverty would welome their suggestions for ways to speed practical programs of direct service to older persons living in poverty.

Mr. President, the conference was of direct help to the participants, and its findings will be of great help to others who may contemplate similar action. I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted in the RECORD the remarks of Governor Hughes and Mr. Bullitt.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF GOV. RICHARD J. HUGHES, CONFERENCE ON ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AND THE OLDER POOR, LABOR AND INDUSTRY BUILDING, TRENTON, N.J., OCTOBER 1, 1965

I welcome you to this conference on community action programs and the problems of the older poor.

It is altogether fitting that New Jersey, which has long led the Nation in assisting its older citizens to live lives of greater fulfillment, should also be the first State to launch a substantial community action program in behalf of the impoverished among the elderly.

While much of the war on poverty is, and should be, conducted at the local level, you will forgive me for observing that we have the most active State-level economic opportunity program in America. And our economic opportunity efforts extend throughout our society.

In addition to performing the normal State functions of helping community leaders establish their locally conceived action programs, we have created and are operating a rural youth development program which is serving hundreds of severely disadvantaged school dropouts; we have established an institute to train the personnel who work in antipoverty efforts; we have just completed a unique community organization effort devoted to developing self-help projects in existing pockets of rural poverty in New Jersey; we have created a mechanism which will bring to the indigent a greater measure of justice and protection in the courts; we have mobilized the resources of State government in behalf of the migrant farmworkers, and of course, we participated fully and successfully in the Head Start preschool program which aided more than 11,000 disadvantaged children.

I think that you will agree with me that such a record suggests strongly that we will also succeed in extending economic opportunities to the older poor.

Let me assure you that this gathering is not the beginning of our concern about poverty among our older citizens. It does, however, signify that our untiring State Office of Economic Opportunity is determined to do more about it. We were honored to have a member of our State office, Mr. Lawrence O. Houstoun, Jr., selected by Director Shriver to serve on a special task force which recently made recommendations to the Federal Government concerning ways in which the older poor might share more equitably in the benefits of antipoverty legislation. You will be discussing the as yet unpublished findings of that task force today, so that in a very real sense this meeting is a testing ground for a new national effort.

Such a venture will, of course, require the concerted effort of all of the new community action programs as well as those public and private agencies which have established themselves already as tested resources in this work. I know that you will be able to count on the support of Director John Bullitt of the Office of Economic Opportunity and of Director Eowe Harger of the State division of aging for help in planning and launching your projects. And I assure you that you can count on me and this administration in your efforts.

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY JOHN C. BULLITT, DIRECTOR, NEW JERSEY OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, AT THE CONFERENCE ON COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS AND THE OLDER POOR, OCTOBER 1, 1965, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRY AUDITORIUM, TRENTON

While it has been said with some truth that the role of State governments in the war on poverty is not paramount, I quarrel with those who consider the States to be an insignificant force in the difficult work of eliminating poverty. Many State agencies (as well as many local and private ones) have been engaged in this kind of work for a long time. One need only consider the major CAP programs emphasized in the act to realize the vital positions of the State capitals. For it is at the State level that most of the critical operating and policy decisions are made in retraining, adult education, public assistance, general education, public health and employment security. While each of these activities has a Federal—and many have local—counterparts, no experienced person would dispute that the authority and resources of the State level agencies is considerable.

On the other hand, those of us who are responsible for mounting new and extensive programs realize all too well that we do not have all the answers here. The war on poverty cries out for innovation—I should say courageous innovation—and in our Nation the ideas that eventually become public programs are frequently conceived, modified, and tested by nongovernmental agencies.

In no aspect of the community action programs is this more true than in its responsibility for the older poor. * * *

It is important to keep in mind when planning new ventures of this sort that great need does not always automatically produce massive response. We know, for instance, that the rapid success of the Head Start program this summer was in considerable part due to the fact that there was an extensively organized constituency immediately available to accept this organizational challenge. No organizational base of remotely comparable magnitude exists which can act as sponsors of projects for the older poor. Those who have been working in this field for many years wearily remind us that this is a youth-oriented culture and that we should not be discouraged when we fail to stir a great popular response. The fact that the economic opportunity program was nearly a year old before any overt action was taken in behalf of the older poor should serve as sufficient warning to any optimists * * *.

A second purpose of this meeting, therefore, is simply to dramatize the fact that New Jersey's war on poverty has not written off the older poor. I believe that they can bring much to our programs. I believe that our programs can help them in new and important ways * * *.

I ask only that you consider in your community deliberations each prospective project carefully—is this the best first step our community can make? Will it make significant use of local resources beyond the Federal funds? Will it reach the intended target population and make measurable changes in their ability to live outside of poverty? Will it involve the older poor in meaningful ways in its planning and administration? Is it—and only you at the local level can really judge this—is it a sound and prudent investment in economic opportunity for this group * * *.

I want to close by paying particular tribute to Paterson and Newark who have already planned important new programs in this area. Local initiative is the foundation of our work, and as usual New Jersey has no small reservoirs of this vital commodity. I welcome you to this meeting and wish you well in your work with and in behalf of the older poor.

RECESS UNTIL 12:25 P.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 12:25 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 11 o'clock and 34 minutes a.m.) the Senate took a recess until 12:25 p.m.

The Senate reconvened at 12:25 p.m., on the expiration of the recess, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BASS in the chair).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

COURTESY DIPLOMATIC PASSPORTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I believe that the correspondence which I am about to request be printed in the RECORD will be of interest to the Senate. Briefly, this correspondence concerns the practice of the Department of State in recent years of issuing "courtesy" diplomatic passports to retired Foreign Service officers of class I or above who have served as chiefs of mission, and their wives or widows. This practice has been in effect since 1956 except for the years between 1961 and 1963, when it was restricted to former Presidents, Vice Presidents, and Secretaries of State, and their wives or widows. I have no quarrel whatever with extending such courtesy to this latter group, but I continue to doubt the wisdom of including former chiefs of mission of class I and above of the Foreign Service.

It seems to me that there are entirely too many Americans abroad with diplomatic passports or other special privileges, but it is equally clear from the State Department's replies to my letters that the Department does not intend to do anything about this matter.

I do not intend to pursue the subject further at this time, but I hope the Foreign Relations Committee will consider it when the committee takes up the Foreign Service Act amendments next year. If the Department is unwilling to act administratively, perhaps the Congress can devise a legislative remedy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence referred to be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

September 30, 1965.

Hon. J. W. Fulbright,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Thank you for your letter of August 2, 1965, concerning the use of courtesy diplomatic passports by individuals engaged in private business and the value of issuing diplomatic passports to Foreign Service staff personnel.

The Department in establishing guidelines for the issuance of courtesy diplomatic passports, as you noted, stated that these passports were not to be used by the bearer while engaged in employment or representation of a private business organization. Both Messrs. Donnelly and Ravndal were issued regular passports on May 25, 1961, and May 9, 1963, respectively. It is presumed that these gentlemen will use these regular passports when traveling in a private business capacity.

The Department of State does not believe that the use of diplomatic passports by certain retired Foreign Service officers is inconsistent with the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. Your letter cites article 40 of that Convention, in particular, as one which would give a third state difficulty is not according special treatment based upon such passports of retired Foreign Service officers. The protection which article 40 of the Vienna Convention provides, including inviolability and such other immunities as may be required to insure the transit and return of the person concerned, is available only to diplomatic agents, members of the administrative and technical or service staffs of the mission, and members of their families. There is no indication in article 1 of the convention, where these categories of personnel are defined, that retired persons could also be included thereunder. It should also be noted the privileges and immunities are only accorded, in the words of the preamble to the Vienna Convention, "to insure the efficient performance of the functions of diplomatic missions," and further that "the purpose of such privileges and immunities is not to benefit individuals." In no case would the United States as a sending state request such privileges and protection for its retired Foreign Service officers, nor would any receiving state, such as Ecuador, be required to give such privileges or protection to a retired Foreign Service officer.

The status of the passports carried by Foreign Service staff officers is also not determinative of the privileges and immunities which are accorded to them either under customary international law, or under the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. Articles 5, 8, 9, and 11 make it clear the appointing of the members of the staff of a diplomatic mission is subject to certain formalities, and it is the completion of these formalities which insure that the privileges and immunities are accorded. A person is categorized under these appointing procedures as a diplomatic agent or as a member of the administrative and technical staff, or as a member of the service staff of the mission, depending upon the functions which he is to perform. Based upon the practice of most governments a person is considered to be a member of the diplomatic staff of a mission only if he is so recognized and is placed on the "Diplomatic List." Possession of a diplomatic passport alone, without reference to the functions which such a person performs, is therefore not determinative of the extent to which foreign governments are willing either to claim or to grant privileges and immunities under the Vienna Convention.

If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,
H. G. Torbert, Jr.,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

August 2, 1965.

Hon. Douglas MacArthur II,
Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. MacArthur: Thank you for your letter of March 30, 1965, in which you enclose a list of those retired Foreign Service officers who possess courtesy diplomatic passports.

The list indicates that several holders of three passports reside abroad. I have also learned that some of these are employed by business firms in the country of their residence.

The status of the Honorable Walter Donnelly, now living in Caracas, Venezuela, and employed by the United States Steel Co., and Christian Ravndal, who is establishing a fish processing plant in Ecuador, seems to be inconsistent with the Department's policy that "the passports are not to be used in conjunction with employment or representation of any private business organization."

The use of these passports might also be inconsistent with certain articles of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations now pending ratification before the U.S. Senate. Article 40 of the convention requires a third state to accord the diplomatic agent immunities required to insure his transit. While the host country may well recognize that they have no obligation to treat this individual as a diplomat, the title on his passport obviously intends to encourage special treatment. While holders of these courtesy passports would be trusted not to abuse their informal privileges, officials of a host country would most assuredly feel quite awkward if faced with the necessity of making certain legal demands upon them.

In addition, I have some doubts about the value of the recent upgrading of certain members of the Foreign Service staff corps. Article I of the Vienna Convention distinguishes the diplomatic staff of a mission from the administrative and technical staff. These categories of embassy employees affect other articles of the convention, for example, article 37, paragraph 2, which limits immunities of civil and administrative employees to acts performed within the course of their duties. The issuing of more diplomatic passports may blur these distinctions, so carefully drafted in the Vienna Convention and endorsed by Secretary Rusk in a letter dated July 9, 1965, to the President of the Senate.

I would greatly appreciate your views on these matters.

Sincerely yours,
J. W. Fulbright,
Chairman.

Department of State,
Washington, March 30, 1965.

Hon. J. W. Fulbright,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Thank you for your letter of March 17, 1965, to the Secretary concerning this Department's issuance of courtesy diplomatic passports.

This Department has issued 129 courtesy diplomatic passports during the past 2 years. I enclose a list showing the persons to whom these passports were issued and, where known, their places of permanent residence.

Please let me know if I may be of further assistance in this matter.

Sincerely yours,
Douglas MacArthur II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

(Enclosure: List.)

List of Passports Issued

Person to whom issued, passport number, and date of application:

Theodore Carter Achilles, Marian Field Achilles, 2855 Woodland Drive NW., Washington, D.C., X016515, X016264, December 9, 1963.

George Venable Allen, 4730 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D.C., X019534, July 20, 1964.

John Moore Allison, Effie Bridewell Allison, 538 Ahakea Street, Honolulu, Hawaii, X016031, X016030, November 5, 1963.

Norman Armour, Myra Armour, 825 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., X015061, X015062, October 28, 1963.

Maude Hunnewell Atherton (widow of Ray Atherton), 3017 O Street NW., Washington, D.C., X016547, December 20, 1963.

Charles Franklin Baldwin, Helen Baldwin, 14 Windsor Road, Farmington, Charlottesville, Va., X020852, X020853, September 30, 1964.

Frederic Pearson Bartlett, Jessie Hendrick Bartlett, 3410 Edmunds Street NW., Washington, D.C., X021086, X021087, October 12, 1964.

Burton Yost Berry, 900 East Sixth Street, Fowler, Ind., X020854, October 1, 1964.

Mildred Barnes Bliss (widow of Robert Woods Bliss), 1537 28th Street NW., Washington, D.C., X018152, May 19, 1964.

Pierre deLagarde Boal, Jeanne deMenthon Boal, Boalsburg, Pa., X015692, September 18, 1963; X016552, December 24, 1963.

Ellis Ormsbee Briggs, Lucy Barnard Briggs, Topsfield, Maine, X015055, August 21, 1963; X015975, October 14, 1963.

Jefferson Caffery, Gertrude McCarthy Caffery (care of Fendrich), 101 Oakley Street, Evansville, Ind.; X015279, X015280, August 22, 1963.

Ottilie Horsetzky Cannon (widow of Cavendish Welles Cannon), Rua de S. Domingos a Lapa 34–3°, Lisbon, Portugal, X016685, January 16, 1964.

Vinton Chaplin, X020825, September 23, 1964.

Mary Noyes Chapin (widow of Selden Chapin), Running Point, Seal Harbor, Maine, X015973, October 14, 1963.

James Rives Childs, Georgina Childs, 911 Rivermount Avenue, Lynchburg, Va. X015682, September 17, 1963; X016682, January 15, 1964.

Lewis Clark, Anne Covington Clark, 2317 Bancroft Place, Washington, D.C., X016710, X016711, January 30, 1964.

Robert Douglas Coe, Cody, Wyo., X015989, October, 18, 1963.

Edward Savage Crocker, Lispenard Seabury Crocker, 580 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., X017359, X017360, March 27, 1964.

Paul Clement Daniels, Main Street, Lakeville, Conn., X018861, June 18, 1964.

William Earl DeCourcy, Lucie D. DeCourcy, 321 Webster Avenue, Winter Park, Fla., X016034, X016035, November 5, 1963.

Walter Joseph Donnelly, Calle Los Jardines No. 4, Country Club, Caracas, Venezuela, X017056, February 26, 1964.

Walter Dowling, Alice Jernigan Dowling, 160 East 84th Street, New York, N.Y., X016016, October 31, 1963; X017027, February 13, 1964.

Gerald A. Drew, Doris Hunter Drew, 70 Henlopen Avenue, Rehoboth Beach, Del., X023125, X023126, March 16, 1965.

Louis Goethe Dreyfus, Jr., Grace Hawes Dreyfus, 370 Hot Springs Road, Santa Barbara, Calif., X017908, X017909, April 29, 1964.

James Clement Dunn, Mary Armour Dunn, Via delle Botteghe Oscure 32, Rome, Italy, X015426, X015427, September 5, 1963.

Cornelius Van H. Engert, Sara Cunningham Engert, 2022 Columbia Road NW., Washington, D.C., X017883, X017884, April 22, 1964.

Eleanor Davis Erhardt (widow of John G. Erhardt), Mount Sinai Road, Coram, N.Y., X016652, January 8, 1964.

Alisia Flack (widow of Joseph Flack), 110 East Ashland Street, Doylestown, Pa., X016028, November 4, 1963.

Alice Vandergrift Gordon (widow of George A. Gordon), 800 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., X016002, October 23, 1963.

Joseph Coy Green (including wife: Gertrude N.), 3610 Raymond Street, Chevy Chase, Md., X022127, Jauary 6, 1965.

Norris Swift Haselton, Elizabeth Garrett Haselton, 4540 Dexter Street NW., Washington, D.C., X019405, July 10, 1964; X019052, June 19, 1964.

Loy Wesley Henderson, 1631 Suters Lane NW., Washington, D.C., X020439, August 31, 1964.

James Hugh Keeley, Mathilde Vossler Keeley Kalorama Farm, Post Office Box 45, Kintnersville, Bucks County, Pa., X018523, X018524, June 3, 1964.

George Frost Kennan, Annelise E. Kennan, 146 Hodge Road, Princeton, N.J., X017874, X017875, April 16, 1964.

Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, (widow of former President John F. Kennedy), X019515, July 14, 1964.

David McKendree Key, Marjorie Wright Key, Water Island, St. Thomas, V.I., X021068, X021067, October 6, 1964.

Cornelia Baldwin Lane, (widow of Arthur Bliss Lane), 2442 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., X017052, February 25, 1964.

Jeannette Frances L'Heureux, (widow of Herve J. L'Heureux), 5201 38th Street NW., Washington, D.C., X021941, December 16, 1964.

Andrew Green Lynch, 3317 N Street NW., Washington, D.C., X018650, June 12, 1964.

Frederick Bronson Lyon, Elizabeth Sorley Lyon, the Westchester, 3900 Cathedral Avenue, Washington, D.C., X015422, X015423, September 5, 1963.

Lester DeWitt Mallory, Eleanor Mercedes Mallory, 2345 King Place NW., Washington, D.C., X015672, September 16, 1963; X015708, September 19, 1963.

H. Freeman Matthews, Helen Lewis Matthews, 4955 Glenbrook Road NW., Washington, D.C., X015408, August 30, 1963; X015748, October 3, 1963.

Jack Kirkham McFall, Martha Detwiller McFall, 2540 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., X017662, April 10, 1964; X017876, April 17, 1964.

Katherine Typper Marshall (widow of former Secretary of State George C. Marshall), Dodona Manor, Leesburg, Va., X015977, October 15, 1963.

Livingston Tallmadge Merchant, Elizabeth Stiles Merchant, 4853 Loughboro Road NW., Washington, D.C., X017642, March 30, 1964; X017362, March 27, 1964.

Sheldon Tibbetts Mills, Francesca Dekum Mills, 723 Chiquita Road, Santa Barbara, Calif., X021918, X021917, December 7, 1964.

Harold Bronk Minor (including wife, Helen W.), 151 Southwest Sixth Avenue, Boca Raton, Fla.; X022442, January 22, 1965.

Frederick Ernest Nolting, Jr., Lindsay Crumpler Nolting, 447 East 52d Street, New York, N.Y., X021143, X021142, October 14, 1964.

R. Henry Norweb, Emery May Holden Norweb, 9511 Lake Shore Boulevard, Cleveland, Ohio, X015968, X015967, October 9, 1963.

Dolores Cabrera Nufer (widow of Albert Frank Nufer), 1775 Southwest 14th Avenue, Miami, Fla., X017358, March 27, 1964.

Edward Page, Jr., Teresita Bartol Page, Kennebunkport, Maine, X015741, X015742, October 1, 1963.

Ely Eliot Palmer, Rancho de la Vista, 4400 Golden Avenue, San Bernardino, Calif., X016208, November 14, 1963.

Jefferson Patterson, Marvin Breckinridge Patterson, 3108 Woodland Drive, Washington, D.C., X017651, X017652, April 3, 1964.

Josephine Roberts Philip (widow of Hoffman Philip), 675 Picacho Lane, Santa Barbara, Calif., X017062, February 28, 1964.

Edwin August Plitt, Jeanne Riboulet Plitt, 3205 Cleveland Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., X016050, X016049, November 8, 1963.

Leon Baqueiro Poullada, Leila Dean Jackson Poullada, 501 Grand Avenue, St. Paul, Minn., X017327, March 17, 1964; X017911, April, 29, 1964.

Karl Lott Rankin, Pauline Rankin, Post Office Box 10, Bridgton, Maine, X015739, October 1, 1963; X015723, September 25, 1963.

Christian Magelssen Ravndal, Alberta Mor Ravndal, 700 Manor Road, Maitland, Fla., X015728, X015720, September 26, 1963.

Roy Richard Rubottom, Jr., 3720 Wentwood Drive, Dallas, Tex., X022354, January 21, 1965.

Rudolf E. Schoenfeld, 2121 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., X018158, May 19, 1964.

Robert McGregor Scotten, Ann Scotten, Nelson Gay, St. Peter, Barbados, West Indies, X018606, X018605, June 8, 1964.

Harold Shantz, care of Metropolitan Club, Washington, D.C., X016520, December 12, 1963.

George Price Shaw, Ann Hunter Shaw, 4518 Plitt Street, New Orleans, La., X021930, X021929, December 11, 1964.

John Farr Simmons, Caroline Thompson Simmons, 2915 44th Street, Washington, D.C., X017300, X017301, March 11, 1964.

Edward J. Sparks, Andree V. Sparks, La Rabida 5219, Santiago, Chile, X018159, X018301, May 19, 1964.

Philip Dodson Sprouse, c/o Marjorie S. Rappaport (sister), 1079 Creston Road, Berkeley, Calif., X020847, September 30, 1964.

Edwin F. Stanton, Josephine K. Stanton, 85 Housatonic Drive, Devon, Conn., X017278, X017279, March 5, 1964.

Howard Hobson Tewksbury, Barbara Swain Tewksbury, New Ipswich, N.H., X021948, X021947, December 21, 1964.

Harold Hilgard Tittmann, Eleanor Barclay Tittmann, 3328 Reservoir Road NW., Washington, D.C., X015424, X015425, September 5, 1963.

Somerville Pinkney Tuck, Katherine Tuck, 180 Country Club Drive, Grosse Pointe, Mich., X016026, X016027, November 4, 1963.

Henry Serrano Villard, Tamara Villard, 3312 R Street NW., Washington, D.C., X020545, September 2, 1964; X021359, October 30, 1964.

Edward Thompson Wailes, Cornelia Lyon Wailes, 2804 34th Place NW., Washington, D.C., X016211, X016212, November 18, 1963.

Walter Newbold Walmsley, Maria-Teresa Walmsley, 308 Waddington Road, Birmingham, Mich., X016044, X016045, November 8, 1963.

Clifton R. Wharton, Leonie Wharton, permanent address undetermined. Mailing address at time of application: Park Crescent Hotel, 150 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y., X020820, X020821, September 22, 1964.

John Campbell White, Elizabeth Moffat White, Barnstable Hill, Chester, Md., X017878, X017879, April 20, 1964.

Frances Elizabeth Willis, 503 West Highland Avenue, Redlands, Calif., X021340, October 22, 1964.

Orme Wilson, Alice Borland Wilson, 2406 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D.C., X017661, April 10, 1964; X017873, April 16, 1964.

Stanley Woodward, Sarah Rutherford Woodward, 3009 N Street NW., Washington, D.C., X018308, X018309, May 25, 1964.

MARCH 17, 1965.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I return to the matter of the Department of State's issuance of courtesy diplomatic passports, which was the subject of some correspondence between us in 1963.

In connection with the current balance-of-payments discussions and the proposal of the administration to discourage tourist travel abroad, I would appreciate having a list of the number of courtesy diplomatic passports issued during the last 2 years (calendar or fiscal), to whom they were issued, and the place of permanent residence of the person to whom they were issued.

Thank you for your attention to this request.

Sincerely yours,
J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., December 6, 1963,

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am responding to your October 28 letter to the Secretary of State inquiring further concerning the issuance of diplomatic passports to retired career ambassadors, career ministers, FSO–1's who have served as chiefs of mission, and to their wives and widows.

Your letter cited a passage from Hackworth, "Digest of International Law," which could be interpreted to mean that a diplomatic passport will assure diplomatic privileges and immunities to the bearer. Actually, however, the granting of diplomatic privileges and immunities by a foreign country is completely separate from the issuance of diplomatic passports by the United States. The fact that an individual has a diplomatic passport does not entitle him to diplomatic privileges and immunities in a foreign country.

Those persons in the classes referred to above who have been issued courtesy diplomatic passports have been notified that they may not use them in connection with any business trips abroad. After receiving your letter, the Department reviewed its procedures, to insure that this limitation is properly policed. To this end we will require that all requests for revalidation of such courtesy diplomatic passports be accompanied by a statement of the purpose of the proposed trip.

I am enclosing a copy of the Department's press release announcing the new policy.

If I may be of any further assistance in this matter, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely,
FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

OCTOBER 25, 1963.

Hon. FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I refer to your letter of September 11 concerning the issuance of courtesy diplomatic passports to retired career ambassadors, career ministers, Foreign Service officers, class 1, who have served as chief of missions, and to their wives and widows. I am not satisfied with the response to the questions raised in my leter of August 15 to Secretary of State Rusk.

The Department justifies its new policy governing the issuance of courtesy diplomatic passports to select categories of persons on the ground that it "felt that this was a small but meaningful tribute to their many years of faithful service to their country." If, indeed, the basis for the policy is "many years of faithful service," why not make any retired high-ranking Government official—executive, legislative, or judicial—eligible for such a passport? Assurely, I am not arguing for such an extension, although it would seem logical in view of the yardstick the Department applies.

On the other hand, it is difficult to see much, if any, relationship between the Department's standard and the case of a "wife" or "widow," especially one, let us say, whose marriage to a career ambasador, career minister or class 1 Foreign Service officer may not even have taken place until after the official's retirement from Government.

In your letter you note that from 1956 to 1961 retired career ambassadors were accorded "courtesy fee diplomatic passports." What led the Department of State to decide in 1961 not to continue this practice, and why did the Department decide this year not only to make career ambassadors eligible again, but to broaden the register of eligibles? Has a request for a courtesy diplomatic passport ever been turned down by the Department?

The eminent international lawyer, Green Hackworth describes the nature of a diplomatic passport in the following terms ("Digest of International Law," vol. III (1942), p. 452):

"A diplomatic passport serves both as a travel document and as a certification of the official identity of the bearer. It is designed to assure to the bearer the enjoyment of special privileges and immunities accruing to him on account of his official position. The transaction of business of a diplomatic character is therefore expedited, and the officials of the country in which the bearer of the passport is traveling are put on notice concerning his diplomatic status and his right to the enjoyment of the privileges and immunities flowing therefrom."

I realize a small handful of persons have been eligible for courtesy diplomatic passports in the past. Yet, in view of Hackworth's description quoted above, I wonder why the Department feels it desirable to make eligible for diplomatic passports several hundred more persons who would not be traveling abroad in any official capacity whatsoever; and yet would be entitled to enjoy special privileges and immunities.

Please send me a copy of the memorandum, order, or whatever paper put the new policy into effect. I find unclear just what restrictions will be placed on the issuance of these passports, and the policy involved seems to me very questionable.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., September 11, 1963.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: This is in response to your letter of August 19 addressed to the Secretary of State concerning the Department's recent decision to issue courtesy passports to career ambassadors and certain other retired Foreign Service officers.

Retired career ambassadors were first accorded courtesy fee diplomatic passports in 1956, as a result of a memorandum issued by Under Secretary of State Loy W. Henderson. However, in 1961 issuance of such passports was restricted to: (1) former Presidents of the United States, their wives or their widows; (2) former Vice Presidents of the United States, their wives or widows; and (3) former Secretaries of State of the United States, their wives or widows. It was stipulated that courtesy fee diplomatic passports were not to be used by any person in these categories during any period while he or she was employed by or representing any non-Federal organization. This stipulation is still in effect.

On August 9 the Department of State, by direction of the Acting Secretary, renewed issuance of courtesy fee diplomatic passports to retired career ambassadors, career ministers, and to class I Foreign Service officers who served as chiefs of mission during their careers. The Department felt that this was a small but meaningful tribute to their many years of faithful service to their country. There was no intention to discriminate against class 1 officers who did not serve as chief of mission; we considered it necessary to limit those eligible for this courtesy in order to make the honor a truly distinctive one.

With respect to your concern of possible abuses of the privilege of customs clearance, we are confident that any officer who has achieved the rank of career ambassador, career minister, or Foreign Service officer, class 1, and has been appointed ambassador would not cause embarrassment to our Government and would not abuse his courtesy passport.

The Department estimates that less than 200 such individuals, including widows, are eligible for courtesy fee diplomatic passports; moreover, it is likely that less than half would apply. Further, the Department does not anticipate that this courtesy will be extended to persons other than those specified above.

If there is any further information you would like, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

AUGUST 19, 1963.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I noted a press release of August 9, 1963, announcing that the "Department will issue courtesy passports to retired Foreign Service officers who achieved th rank of career ambassador, career minister, or class I, and who served as chiefs of mission during their careers."

It seems to me that this decision creates an undesirable precedent and raises a number of questions. Why, for example, should there be discrimination against class I officers who did not serve as chiefs of mission, or against class II officers who may have served as long as beneficiaries of the ruling?

Furthermore, I should think that the privilege of customs clearance, for example, might easily be abused by retired officers, or their wives, residing abroad for protracted periods and that such abuses might be most difficult to detect.

I would be interested in knowing the reasons why this decision was made and in having an estimate of the number of individuals who, if they applied, might be entitled at this time to receive diplomatic passports.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE RELEASE NO. 412, AUGUST 9, 1963

By direction of Acting Secretary George W. Ball, the Department will issue courtesy diplomatic passports to retired Foreign Service officers who achieved the rank of career ambassador, career minister, or class I, and who served as chiefs of mission during their careers. Wives and widows of Foreign Service officers in these three categories will also be eligible for such courtesy passports.

The passports are not to be used in conjunction with employment or representation of any private business organization. They will be issued upon application and payment of the regular passport fees.

Mr. Ball said the Department was pleased to extend this small but meaningful courtesy to this distinguished group of retired Foreign Service officers in recognition of their many years of outstanding service.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the right to work is a fundamental American right. Every American citizen has a right to seek a job and perform that job undisturbed by physical interference or by any legal barrier. To in any way deny this right, under any pretense or plan, violates the liberty guaranteed by our Constitution and prized by all Americans.

Nebraska has a right-to-work law. This is not only a statute but it is a part of the constitution of the sovereign State of Nebraska. This section of our constitution provides in substance that an individual cannot be compelled to join or remain in a labor organization in order to keep or hold a job, and it prohibits entering into a contract which would impose such a requirement. That provision was put into our constitution by a vote of the people. Many other States have similar laws. I believe that most of the right-to-work laws were enacted by vote of the people themselves.

It is my personal belief that a true interpretation of the Constitution of the United States would permit a State to have a right-to-work law if that State would so choose, without the direct permission of a Federal statute. Nevertheless, the doctrines of the courts are to the effect that the Federal Government has preempted the field of labor-management legislation and, therefore, the consent of the Federal Government must be maintained if a State is to have a right-to-work law. When the Taft-Hartley law was written, section 14(b) was inserted, which reserved to the States this right.

Now the forces of monopoly and the enemies of individual liberty seek to repeal section 14(b). This issue is now before the Senate. The effort to repeal this section is the very antithesis of true liberalism. This effort is reactionary to the "*n*th" degree. To repeal section 14(b) would be a step backward in the struggle for the rights of man.

There are those who do not favor a right-to-work law. I respect their opinion, although I disagree with them. The issue before the Senate, however, is whether or not a sovereign State shall have the right to enact a right-to-work law if the people of that State so choose.

I am for labor unions, but I believe they should be voluntary and not compulsory. It is argued that repeal of section 14(b) merely would give labor and management a right to agree to have compulsory unionism. Mr. President, constitutional rights should never be destroyed for any individual by any agreement of this nature. Such a procedure would still override the rights of individuals and the rights of minorities.

It is well established that management, when faced with a demand for a contract providing for compulsory unionism, can give in on that point without any monetary loss to the company. The argument that it must be agreed to is without substance so far as protecting the rights of individuals is concerned.

It is also argued that unions raise the wages for all and that they improve working conditions and increase fringe benefits. With this I agree. It is further contended, however, that because all workers benefit they all should be forced to join the union and pay dues or else they are free riders. I am not impressed by the free rider argument. A similar situation exists in many other areas of our national life. I know of few people, if any, who would live in a community that had no churches. Everyone benefits from churches, yet we would not think of abolishing religious liberty and requiring compulsory church membership in order to prevent having a few free riders.

Mr. President, this reactionary effort to repeal section 14(b) involves a very fundamental principle. The country is on our side. I believe that even a greater majority of the people of the United States will be opposed to repeal as the facts are unfolded in this debate. There is so much involved here that if it takes all the rest of the calendar year of 1965, and all of the calendar year of 1966, to turn back the forces of reaction and prevent the repeal of section 14(b), it is a price that can and will be paid. We will win.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum on the time of the minority leader and myself.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Who yields time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Illinois has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, since Monday of this week we have been considering the motion to take up 14(b). It is the pending business before the Senate. There have been some interruptions, such as calendar bills, nominations, conference reports, the morning hour, and a few speeches on extraneous matters.

The Parliamentarian's record indicates that we have spent only 18 hours on the business in hand. Compare this with the reapportionment amendment which covered 44 days, or the Civil Rights Act of 1960, which covered 37 days, or the Telstar proposal which consumed 18 days. The time, devoted, therefore, to 14(b) is miniscule by comparison.

I fully appreciate the majority leader's problem. No kindlier, no more forbearing, and no more tolerant person ever set foot in shoe leather, or graced this great body. His hope is to finish Senate business and adjourn. I believe every Member shares that hope.

But the issue before us is of transcendant importance. Unlike Telstar, it involves human beings. Unlike civil rights, it involves all human beings regardless of race, sex, or national origin.

Since principle and deep conviction are involved the issue is not lightly disposed. People are awakening to the issue but it takes time to alert a country of 190 million.

When we began this discussion we made it abundantly clear that the Nation must be informed. This is not the work of a day or a week. I am sensible of the fact that we have been here 9 months. I know Members are battle weary.

But so are those who slog through the monsoon mud of Vietnam. So are they who man the bunkers in Korea. So are all those who have gone before who gave us a country undominated by economic groups, free from abuses of labor barons and untained by wildcat strikes.

Shall we who are dedicated to our cause relent now in a well moving effort to advise the Nation that the very Federal-State system is at stake? Shall we now forfeit the momentum which is gaining in speed and volume in every section of the country?

The majority leader proposes to table his own motion to consider and stated on Tuesday, when he addressed the Senate, that he would vote against his own motion. He was kind enough, as he always is, to furnish me with an advance copy of his remarks. I have calmly considered the proposal. I believe he is right. The effort to educate and inform has only begun. It must continue.

To the majority, I suggest that you support your own noble leader. To the minority, I suggest that you support your humble leader. To table resolves no issue. It but sweeps it under the legislative rug. Let the debate continue in orderly fashion. Let us demonstrate to the world that this is still a deliberative body. Let us uphold the Senate tradition of free and untrammeled discussion. Let us not publicly confess that the pressures of any economic group have caused the Senate to make a mockery of the deliberative process. I therefore urge all Senators to vote with the majority leader when he votes against his own motion to table, as he will shortly do. Let the vote, in fact, be a unanimous vote of this great body.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am overwhelmed by the cooperation of the distinguished minority leader. He has gone far beyond the call of duty in urging Members on his side of the aisle to support the motion which the Senator from Montana will shortly make.

Mr. President, the Senate was advised last Tuesday that a vote would be had today. Since last Wednesday, the Senate has been on notice that the vote would occur, by unanimous consent, at 1 p.m. In a few moments, the Senate will vote on a tabling motion.

Each Senator should be clear as to the significance of the impending vote It will not be, in any sense, a cure-all for the present predicament. It will be, at best, indicative of the Senate's will on this single procedural question: "Does the Senate with the leadership, at this time, to pursue the effort to bring the question of repeal of section 14(b) before the Senate?"

The vote cannot be expected to express the sentiment of the Senate, one way or the other, on the merits of the repeal of section 14(b). Certainly, I would anticipate that Senators who desire the repeal of section 14(b) in this session will vote against the motion to table. It is also possible that those who are against the repeal of section 14(b) but who desire the issue to be disposed of one way or the other in this session will also vote against the motion to table. There may be other reasons for so voting but, in all frankness, I can conceive of no other which would be of any great relevance to the resolution of this matter.

So, I repeat, the leadership will interpret the vote as indicative only of the Senate's will on this single procedural question: "Does the Senate wish the leadership, at this time, to pursue the effort to bring the question of repeal of section 14(b) before the Senate?"

To underscore the interpretation, I serve notice now that if the outcome of the vote on tabling warrants it, I shall offer for signature, at once, a motion for cloture on the single question of proceeding to consider H.R. 77. I would urge Senators, therefore, who vote against the tabling motion to bear in mind this subsequent intention of the leadership. It is the judgment of the leadership that these two interrelated votes provide about the only practicable and orderly way out of the predicament in which the Senate finds itself.

Make no mistake, the leadership appreciates fully that each Senator decides for himself for what reasons he casts his vote, and obviously one vote does not bind for a second. But if the leadership has a responsibility for recommending a course to the Senate in a predicament of this kind, the leadership also has a responsibility to make clear the direction in which it hopes the course will lead.

If the leadership seeks a test of the sentiment of the Senate, the leadership must also form a judgment of the results of the test. So the Senate is on notice: if the vote on the tabling motion warrants it, I shall ask the Senate, promptly, to join the leadership in a vote for cloture on the single question of the motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 77. I stress that the cloture motion which may be filed will not apply on the issue of H.R. 77 itself. It will apply only to the single procedural question of whether or not H.R. 77 should be taken up by the Senate at that time.

For those who would protest that we have not had enough time to consider this question, I can only reply that the Senate has already been a week in trying to make up its mind on a simple procedural question which is normally disposed of in a matter of seconds. In fact, while, strictly speaking, the Senate has not been out of order under the rules, it has been out of logic. It has spent virtually no time at all in discussing the pending question which is to proceed to consideration. Rather, in discussion, it has jumped over that question and is, in fact, almost wholly engaged in a debate on H.R. 77 even though the matter is not even pending. That is a "hugger-mugger," designed only to delay.

To save the Senate and the press the trouble of going to the dictionary, the definition of "hugger-mugger" is "a disorderly jumble; a confusion; a mumbo-jumbo—"

As an example of its usage, Webster's International gives the following:

> Apart from the effect of all this unwholesome hugger-mugger on their minds, there was the greater tragedy that they were being short-changed educationally.

The delay, indeed, has been such that this is the first time that this leadership has been confronted with the necessity of contemplating cloture in an effort to assist the Senate over a simple procedural question. If I may be forgiven a colloquialism, I think that the Senate has reached the point of put up or shut up.

Speaking as a Senator from Montana, I should like, once again, to state my individual position. I shall vote to reject the motion to table. If the vote on that motion warrants it, I shall sponsor a cloture motion, which will bring a vote on the sole question of taking up H.R. 77. If the Senate decides to invoke cloture and H.R. 77 becomes the pending business and can then be brought to the point of final resolution, I shall vote for repeal of 14(b).

Speaking as the majority leader, however, I am constrained to point out that the impending vote is but the first limited step in the course which the Senator from Montana would like to see pursued to the end. But I am under no illusions, and the Senate ought not to be under any illusions, as to the significance of this vote. A rejection of the motion to table, even by a substantial majority, will not insure that the Senate will proceed forthwith to the consideration of 14(b), much less will it insure that the issue of 14(b) will be resolved. Insofar as the leadership is concerned, a vote against tabling will be taken to mean, and I would hope that it means, that the Senate desires the leadership to try to bring the question before the Senate at this time. Furthermore, in the context of the many currents which are running in the Senate, and, as the leadership sees the problem, this indicated desire must be confirmed promptly by cloture on the question of taking up H.R. 77. Only in that fashion, in my judgment, is there any prospect at all of a resolution of this issue during the current session.

I want to say in closing that the majority leader alone is responsible for the motion which is to be offered and the effort to invoke cloture which may follow it. I have consulted no other Member; there are no understandings, agreements, or "deals" with anyone involved. The responsibility for the procedure which is being recommended attaches to the majority leader, and the majority leader alone. All that the majority leader asks at this point is the Senate's help and best guidance in the vote which is about to be taken.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in conformity with my previous promise to the Senate, despite the fact that I intend to vote against it, I move that the pending motion to be tabled, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to lay on the table his motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 77.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent on official business and, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 0, nays 94, as follows:

[No. 284 Leg.]

YEAS—0

NAYS—94

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—6

Anderson
Brewster
Cannon
Scott
Smathers
Young, Ohio

So Mr. MANSFIELD's motion to lay on the table his motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 77 was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am almost moved to make a motion to reconsider and table once more. No leader has ever received such support on such an important question, and no leader is more undeserving.

Mr. President——

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that Senators are apparently determined by their unanimous vote to press this issue to a conclusion at this time.

CLOTURE MOTION

I now send to the desk a motion for cloture on the proposition that debate on the motion to proceed to consider H.R. 77 shall be brought to a close. It is properly signed by the requisite number of Senators.

Thanks to rule XXII, Senators will have a prompt opportunity to give procedural flesh to the skeleton of senatorial intent which this vote, in my judgment, has just established.

If there are no objections, it would be my intention, but not until after I have consulted with the distinguished minority leader, to ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in recess until 9 o'clock a.m. tomorrow, with the understanding that the Senate will come in at that time for a pro forma session only and recess immediately until 12 o'clock noon Monday.

In this fashion, the requirements of rule XXII will have been met and Senators will have the weekend to ponder their positions, and vote on cloture can be had on Monday.

Let me say to the Senate that there is—as Senators well know—a much simpler and less time-consuming way to resolve this procedural problem. If the Senate is prepared at this time to vote on the pending motion to proceed to consider H.R. 77, it can of course give immediate substance to the test vote.

If the "hugger-mugger" is now over, the vote indeed can be taken right now.

Mr. President, I ask that the cloture motion be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the cloture motion.

The legislative clerk read the motion, as follows:

> We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate upon the motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 77, an act to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.
>
> Mike Mansfield.
> Lee Metcalf.
> Pat McNamara.
> Warren G. Magnuson.
> John O. Pastore.
> Jennings Randolph.
> Vance Hartke.
> Daniel K. Inouye.
> Fred R. Harris.
> Ernest Gruening.
> Philip A. Hart.
> Maurine Neuberger.
> Claiborne Pell.
> Ross Bass.
> Paul H. Douglas.
> Joseph S. Clark.
> Frank Church.
> Abraham Ribicoff.
> Walter F. Mondale.
> Clifford P. Case.
> Birch Bayh.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me proceed first, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in recess until 9 o'clock a.m. tomorrow for the purpose of holding a pro forma session only.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish the distinguished Senator from Montana to know that I admire his forthright stand both as leader and as a Senator from Montana.

I hope the Senator realizes that there are Senators who have a distinctly different viewpoint from his own.

The Senator from Florida has had no opportunity to be heard on this matter. He has been tied up on a conference on the farm bill for 9 successive days with distinguished colleagues on that task of public service. He has also been tied up on other Senate matters. He has to go to a full meeting of the Senate Committee on Appropriations for a markup in a few minutes' time, and he will have to have at least Monday to have time enough to express himself.

This is his situation. The State which he represents in part, was the first State to become a right-to-work State. It did it by a vote of the people of Florida, who put the provision into their State constitution. We have had an opportunity to see how it works. Our State has virtually trebled its population since that time, although this is not the only reason for that. It has also greatly increased in prosperity, in per capita income, and in the average payment of wages to its workers, and in every other kind of progress that can be enumerated.

Therefore, I do not believe that the distinguished Senator from Montana wishes to cut off other Senators who have a distinct interest in this issue, though different from his, and wish an opportunity to be heard in such detail as to express what they believe to be the opinion of their States.

I hope that the Senator from Montana will not insist upon this request. If he does so, I shall be forced to object——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I do insist.

Mr. HOLLAND. I object, Mr. President.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

RECESS UNTIL 9 O'CLOCK A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana moves that the Senate stand in——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 9 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I know that the motion——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair informs the Senator from Illinois that the question is not debatable.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I know that it is not debatable, but I ask——

The VICE PRESIDENT. With that understanding, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in my judgment, the cloture motion is absolutely valid. It qualifies with respect to the number of signatures. If the Senate comes in for a pro forma session tomorrow morning, it will qualify under the requirement that there must be 1 intervening day, and that on the next legislative day the Senate must proceed to dispose of the matter.

I make this inquiry only because my understanding of the rule is that when the Senate convenes on Monday, the majority leader must first ask for a call of the quorum and the Chair must be satisfied that a quorum is present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is 1 hour after the Senate convenes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct. Thereafter, it is mandatory to proceed to a vote on the cloture motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has properly stated the rule.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me say that——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. I do not wish to have any Senator violating the rule. The motion is not debatable. A Senator must ask unanimous consent to speak on this question.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to ask a question of the majority leader.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Rhode Island may proceed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I should like to address myself to the majority leader. If the Senate does not meet tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock for a pro forma session, is there anything to preclude the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] from speaking as long as he wishes tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Nothing at all.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida will have to ask unanimous consent to do so.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address a question to the majority leader.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Florida may proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Perhaps I do not understand the meaning of a pro forma session. I am asking the distinguished majority leader if his understanding is the same as mine that a pro forma meeting is to meet and then adjourn as quickly as the Presiding Officer can put down the gavel, without any speeches and without any opportunity to be heard?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator's analysis is correct; but that is not the motion now before the Senate, as I understand, because, on the basis of his objection, that motion was washed out and now it calls for a regular session tomorrow morning, though I would still prefer to have a pro forma session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana is correct. The motion of the Senator from Montana does not relate to a pro forma session but to a regular session of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Unfortunately.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Regrettably.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. Aiken voted "yea" when his name was called.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There will be order in the galleries.

The question is on the motion to recess until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is it too late to make a parliamentary inquiry?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will indulge the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; I would like a strict interpretation of the rules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not in order.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader may be permitted to address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, in an effort to preserve the rules of the Senate, which he knows Senators would like to have him do, informs Senators that the Senator whose name was first called on the rollcall has responded.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator did not hear it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Therefore, the Chair believes that the Senate should proceed in order.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I am not sure that a unanimous consent is out of order.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader may be permitted to propound a parliamentary inquiry of the Chair.

Mr. MORSE. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will resume the call of the roll.

The call of the roll was resumed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There will be order.

The clerk will proceed.

The call of the roll was resumed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk cannot hear the responses of Senators. The Chair asks that Senators cease their conversations.

The clerk will proceed.

The rollcall was resumed and concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necesarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 285 Leg.]

YEAS—94

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—6

Anderson
Brewster
Cannon
Scott
Smathers
Young, Ohio

The VICE PRESIDENT. The vote on the motion to recess until 9 a.m. tomorrow is—94 "yeas," no "nays." The Senate is in recess.

RECESS TO 9 A.M. TOMORROW

So (at 1 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, October 9, 1965, at 9 o'clock a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Field Tradition Continues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 8, 1965

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, since September 18, 1965, much has been said and written about Marshall Field, Jr., whose untimely death saddened the Nation. I join with the other Members of this body who have already paid tribute to this distinguished editor, publisher, educator, philanthropist, patriot, World War II veteran, husband, and father.

Marshall Field, Jr., was a part-time resident of the 12th Illinois Congressional District, maintaining a home at Lake Forest. His passing represents a loss of a personal friend in addition to the loss of a great citizen which the Nation and the free world has sustained.

I am reminded today of the excellence of the lifetime pursuits of Marshall Field, Jr., as I note that two highly respected newspapermen have been promoted to carry on his plans and policies. Emmet Dedmon was named editor of the Chicago Sun-Times and Larry Fanning was named editor of the Chicago Daily News. During Mr. Field's administration of these two great metropolitan dailies, they worked closely with him and contributed significantly to the growth of their respective journals. The shadow of Marshall Field, Jr., lengthens as the institutions into which he breathed his integrity continue to develop under the able guidance of those whom he chose. That they will carry on his dedicated program, keeping these newspapers in the best traditions of the free press, is not only predictable but assured.

U.S. Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 8, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the Honorable TOM CURTIS of Missouri, discusses in a recent report to his constituents the basic concepts which he believes must underlie U.S. foreign policy. I believe this penetrating analysis of the subject should be called to the attention of the Members. The full text of the report follows:

A REPORT FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN, TOM CURTIS, REPRESENTATING ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MO.

(Member of the Ways and Means Committee, Joint Economic Committee)

OCTOBER 1965.

DEAR CONSTITUENTS: I have seldom discussed substantive aspects of our foreign policy in my newsletter. However. with constant breakdowns in our foreign policy occurring—I regard war as a breakdown, a failure, in our foreign policy—I think nothing at the present time is more important to all of us. The Korean war was a breakdown, Cuba was a breakdown, Santo Domingo and Vietnam are other breakdowns.

As most of you know my comments have been primarily directed to the economic aspects of our foreign policy, to a large degree, because my committee assignments require me to dig deeply into these areas, hopefully to inform the House on these matters. The Foreign Affairs Committee has the assignment of keeping the House informed on overall political foreign policy.

My first comment is a regrettable one. The House Foreign Affairs Committee has not done its homework and at present is not doing its homework. I think the primary difficulty arises from the little effort made by the executive department to assist in or encourage the Foreign Affairs Committee to do its homework. President Johnson thinks calling the Congressmen down to the White House to lecture to them behind closed doors or sending a State Department official to Capitol Hill for similar lecturing is an adequate substitute for knowledgeable executive officials appearing before the appropriate congressional committees to testify in public hearings under cross examination and to reply to rebuttal witnesses on the issues. Of course, it is no substitute at all. The result is that our foreign policy has been made behind closed doors at the White House with no one in the Congress or the public knowing really who participates in the decisions or what assumptions of fact and logic have been made as a base for them.

Now that the decisions have resulted in failure—to the extent that they have resulted in war, not caused war, but certainly not prevented war—certainly it is time to review the premises upon which these decisions have been made. Incidentally, most of the data upon which the decisions must be based have been published so there is little which needs to be classified secret for security reasons. Furthermore, I do not think foreign policy in a society such as ours is sound unless it is openly arrived at and clearly understood by nations abroad which means that of course it must be understood and agreed upon by our own people.

WHEELING AND DEALING

It is perfectly clear that "wheelers and dealers" can move unmeritorious legislation and block meritorious legislation in the Congress. I still would adhere to a basic point, however, that the great bulk of the legislation which passes the Congress or has failed the congressional test results from presenting honest facts and fair arguments, not from wheeling and dealing. The present administration adheres to a converse viewpoint and regrettably its wheeling and dealing tactics have been praised by some people as political astuteness. In my book, it is still political corruptness, something to fight against, not to emulate, something to regret, not to praise.

Now what has this to do with foreign policy? Simply that the American political genius does not lie in wheeling and dealing. Certain American politicians achieve a modicum of success in the American political arena from time to time through wheeling and dealing and they begin to believe what they hear about their political astuteness. Accordingly, they are encouraged to carry over these techniques which have worked well for them in American politics into international politics, they fail to perceive that their limited success comes from cashing in on the basic American belief in rules and ethics. Well, most of the world countries regrettably are based upon wheeling and dealing politics and the American champion wheeler and dealer is a neophyte when it comes to the professionals abroad. Not only do these tactics result in failure but a brand of politics has been utilized which is alien to the United States which certainly sets no good example of the American system which has moved us forward.

I find the same set of circumstances in the field of economics. I would argue that it has been the development of the marketplace theory of economics which has moved America forward economically, not the use of Government bureaucratic process to reach economic decisions. Yet our foreign economic policy utilizes the political bureaucratic process for making economic decisions and does not promote the marketplace theory. The result is that not only have we failed in our foreign economic policy, we have been promoting a brand of economics alien to the United States which again sets no good example of what has moved America forward.

THEORY VERSUS DOCTRINE

Now what I am advancing are merely theories, matters to be debated and tested. This is true no matter how deeply I believe in the theories. All I ask is that those who promote the opposite theories, of economic judgments being reached in the political sector as opposed to economic judgments being reached through the marketplace mechanism, agree to debate and testing of their theories. However, I find coupled with what I believe are errors in their theories is a belief by these advocates that their views are doctrines and hence do not need to be debated and tested. This becomes significant when one realizes that it is only when one becomes so certain of one's own theories to call them doctrine that one adopts the philosophy that the ends justify the means—wheeling and dealing.

BASIC AMERICAN POLITICAL THEORY

American political theory is based upon the belief in the right of people to self-determine their own government. Self-determination is based upon the right to exercise the franchise periodically. The right of franchise is not just the right to vote, that is only a part of the right of franchise. The full franchise consists of the right to vote and to cast the ballot without outside coercion or bribery (hence the secret ballot) and to have that ballot counted honestly along with all other proper ballots. Under this theory, what kind of government the people choose is their business even though it be a dictatorship. However, the right of self-determination requires that the choice shall be exercised periodically. For example, if a dictator is selected, then in 2 years or whatever appropriate time is set, there will be another election in which the people can exercise their judgment all over again. However, the election must not be a Hitler- or Stalin-type election where there is no real choice. There must be an opportunity provided for varying sides to present their suggestions to the people, in other words, there must be fair election campaigns and the right to nominate opposition candidates.

Perhaps these issues can be better understood by putting them into a more homely context. These were the issues involved in the Landrum-Griffin Act providing guarantees of the right to secret ballot and to periodic elections for all employees in the elections to determine whether there is to be union representation.

These are the issues involved in the recent Supreme Court decisions which would force the people of the States to adopt a one-man, one-vote type of representative government for their State legislature. Why should not the people of a State, if they wish, adopt other theories of the Republican form of government—and there are many other theories and valid ones—in exercising the franchise?

These are the issues involved in the decision to give one vote to each member nation in the United Nations, a theory supported, strangely enough, by the very one-man, one-vote advocates we find in the United States. In other words, a nation which according to U.N. standards can consist of 1 million people, or even less, is granted a vote equal to the United States consisting of 190 million people. One man, one vote, indeed. Obviously the theories lying behind the great compromise at our Constitutional Convention in 1789 between the large and the small States need to be reviewed by 20th century Americans.

We find arguments advanced against the right of self-determination couched in strange semantics. What right have we, one argument goes, to tell other people what kind of government they are to have by insisting upon free and periodic elections for them? There are many paradoxes like this. Another example is how can one be tolerant if one is intolerant toward intolerance?

I recall the strange argument advanced by an Assistant Secretary of State, under the Eisenhower administration—these issues are not divided on a Republican-Democrat basis—urging the United States to support the OTC (the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation, which would have established a permanent international trade mechanism, making the provisional GATT, General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, permanent) on a one-vote, one-nation basis. I said, "How can such a thing be suggested in economics? The United States has a gross national product of over $400 billion a year and some of these member nations do not even have a gross national product of $400 million."

Now I hope my point is beginning to come through. We set up the United Nations and adhere to other foreign policies with a disregard for the basic political and economic theories upon which our country has grown great. Certainly these are only theories, although the amazing success of the United States, both politically and economically, should suggest that maybe these theories make sense. However, our Government is not advancing these theories abroad either in thought or in deed. In the name of "tolerance" we have abandoned our theories. The test of true tolerance is adhering to one's own theories, but not insisting they are doctrines; being willing to debate them as theories. A person who has no theories has no problem being tolerant of others' theories. That person is merely a pushover for any theory whoever advances it. Now just as we should be willing to debate our theories, we should insist that others be willing to debate theirs.

WHAT TO DO

People have asked me what would I have us do in Cuba. They ask me what I would have us do in South Vietnam. My answer is: If you are talking about whether to use military force (and of what variety), economic force, or political force, or a mixture of the three, my answer is quite clear; how can I know or any American know until we first have resolved what goals we seek? I am well aware of, and approve, the negative goal we seek—to contain international communism, i.e., political dictatorship and political control over economic judgments. However, I would point up a basic American political maxim: it is hard to beat something with nothing. Or, to put it another way, the best defense is a good offense.

What theories do we as a nation believe in? Are we willing to practice what we preach or to put it more correctly preach what we practice? Do we believe in self-determination as a method of establishing our political structures for making political decisions? I think we do, but let's debate the theory to get the cobwebs of fuzzy thinking cleared out. Do we believe in the people participating in and making economic decisions through the marketplace mechanism, or through the political mechanism? I think we favor the marketplace mechanism, but here certainly we must debate this theory because there are powerful thinkers in our society who have challenged this theory with what they say is opposing doctrine. Without supporting their position as a theory, through forthright national debate, they have sought to have it implemented as national domestic policy and they have begun to succeed in certain major areas in both domestic and foreign policy. To do this without debate the wheeling and dealing techniques have been developed in the United States to a high sophistication; but the success is parasitical. It has depended for nourishment on the strength of its host, the great American system of republican government and private enterprise economics.

I certainly do approve a military holding action in South Vietnam until we make a determination what our affirmative goals are. Once we make this determination and express it clearly, I think we will find that the need for military force and even economic force to sustain our theories will be greatly diminished. I don't think the American people are much different from peoples all around the globe in their belief in the importance of the individual human being and in the theory that government should provide the proper climate so all persons can develop their God-given talents, differing as they are, meager as some may be, to their fullest. Government can provide for the pursuit of happiness, but it cannot provide for happiness, that must remain forever the choice of the individual human being, his basic bill of rights.

My honorable opponents have responded to these arguments by referring to my beliefs and theories, as myths. I reply by observing that ideals are not myths merely because they cannot be attained in a lifetime or, indeed, even in many generations or eons. They are, however, guiding stars by which we can set our earthly courses.

Now to the mundane problems that face us. I recall attention to the fact that a society cannot depend upon its political mechanism to render wise political decisions, let alone wise economic decision, until it has first been able to establish a career system for Government employees. The greatness and the stability of the U.S. Government lies in its great civil service system. We are prone to criticize our "bureaucracy," and I am a great critic here, too, albeit I hope a constructive one, but when all is said and done its excellence is the reason America can lose a President overnight in a great tragedy and continue to move forward almost as if nothing had happened. I would have inauguration day, which comes every 4 years, a national holiday merely to impress upon us the uniqueness in history and in the world today of the peaceful transition of political power.

The newly emerging countries must develop civil service systems which remove those who exercise daily the powers of political government from spoils politics. This is a 30-year job at the least, inasmuch as a social system is not fully established until 90 years have passed, three generations.

But there must be an understanding on the part of political civil servants of the right of the people to make the basic political policy judgments from time to time and of the limitations of the areas for the political mechanism to reach judgments in a society. The best conceived political mechanism does not work well in economics, religion, and education, to mention a few important fields.

The newly emerging nations must begin on a viable economic base. Just as we in America have recently gone through the process of consolidating school districts throughout the country, not just because of population shifts and new means of transportation, but to provide an adequate tax base, so that the districts can raise their own revenues and retain the freedom to make their own decisions. So it is in error to permit and to encourage scores of societies to be recognized as "nations" when they have neither the population nor economic base ever to operate with independence. It is a disfavor to them because they either become sycophants or slaves; and it is inequitable and debilitating to the rest of the world's societies because slavery has proven to be as bad for the master as for the slave.

Finally, I would observe that trade, not aid, is the economic goal for nations. Trade is dignified and free; aid is charity only if temporary and for a specific cause; if prolonged, it is patronizing and slavish.

Even when we have the world on a viable economic and political base, I would observe that the causes of war will only be 90 percent eliminated. Underlying is the mysterious difference in human races, and in people themselves. However, if we can establish societies where differences between individuals are welcomed—because people have different talents—not discouraged and sought to be forced into the mold of sameness, miscalled equality, then perhaps the differences in races will be welcomed, not discouraged, and variety will remain the spice of life.

Sincerely,

TOM CURTIS,
Your Congressman.

Pulaski Day, October 11, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. HANLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 8, 1965

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, on October 11, 1779, 186 years ago, Count Casimir Pulaski of Poland died defending America—his adopted native land.

This Polish aristocrat throughout his short life of 31 years, was devoted to the cavalry branch of the armed services. From his birth to his death, he was dedicated to the cause of freedom and the cavalry.

During his childhood, Pulaski observed the group of men who defended his father's Polish estate from invading forces of Turkey and Austria. As a young man, he became interested in the efforts of Charles, son of the Polish king, to retain the province of Courtland. In 1768, he joined the Confederation of Bar, a group composed of Polish noblemen dedicated to the redemption of Poland. Leading this group, Pulaski vigorously traversed Poland performing heroic feats. He further carried the revolt into Lithuania. From the mountains of Galicia in the winter of 1769–70, he earned a reputation as a terror to the Russians. Unfortunately his efforts to obtain funds from France and Turkey for the Confederation of Bar failed and he was forced to leave the country of his birth. He escaped into Paris, France.

It was during his stay in Paris that he met Benjamin Franklin. Having read of America's struggle for freedom, Count Pulaski was most anxious to come to America to join the American troops. Subsequently, Mr. Franklin wrote a letter of introduction to George Washington in Pulaski's behalf stating his own high regard of the count.

Upon Count Pulaski's arrival in America, he was introduced to George Washington by Lafayette. General Washington was very much impressed by Count Pulaski's charm and heroic background in defense of his country's liberty against Russia, Austria and Prussia. Washington strongly recommended to the Congress that Pulaski be commissioned an American Brigadier General.

After Congress concurred with Washington's recommendaiton, Pulaski distinguished himself in the American Revolution. In September of 1777, he volunteered in the battle of Brandywine. He served with great distinction in this encounter. Although Pulaski often erred and was in part responsible for several military disasters, Congress, supported by Washington, permitted him to organize an independent corps of cavalry to be established in Baltimore, Md.

This cavalry was to protect the American supplies at Egg Harbor, N.J. However, on October 15, the British slashed this legion at Egg Harbor. Pulaski then commanded the cavalry during the winter of 1777 at Trenton and later scouted for supplies for our famishing troops at Valley Forge. Indian massacres that followed in Cherry Valley resulted in Pulaski's orders to report for Minisink on the Delaware River. It was in the idle town of Minisink that the vigorous Count became restless for action as most energetic leaders do. He wished to return to Poland.

On February 2, 1779, 3 months later, he joined Gen. Benjamin Lincoln in South Carolina. Arriving in Charlestown on May 8, he was confronted with the approach of General Provost northward from Savannah. He rushed to aid on the defense but was decisively repelled.

During this summer, Pulaski had high hopes for victory. He now felt he could do for America what he had sought. He had devoted soldiers and an abundance of work. Furthermore, it was reported that finally Congress was to resolve to grant his requests.

Pulaski again joined General Lincoln as he prepared with a French fleet to attack Savannah. On October 9, Pulaski, heading his cavalry, charged into the enemy lines at Savannah. During his gallant charge, he was mortally wounded. Two days later aboard the ship *Wasp*, he died. The surgeons had been unsuccessful in removing the fatal bullet.

Today we commemorate Count Casimir Pulaski whose selfless devotion has become a symbol of liberty. Indeed, he was a man of honor and integrity.

Uganda Celebrates 3 Years' Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 8, 1965

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will mark 3 years of independence for the people of Uganda. Although they are still a member of the Commonwealth of Nations, Uganda was granted full internal self-government on March 1, 1962, and became independent on October 9, 1962.

The economy of Uganda is still heavily dependent upon exporting agricultural products, but increased attention is being given to exploiting sources of outside assistance. A step in this direction was the award of a loan by the World Bank for electricity development. A 5-year development plan, based largely on the recommendations made by the Bank, was started in 1962.

The United States is encouraging the Government of Uganda in a program to increase agricultural production and to make use of the limited mineral resources of the country. We also have an AID program providing educational assistance.

Mr. Speaker, on this occasion, I want to extend my congratulations and best wishes to the people of Uganda; to their President, Sir Edward Frederick Mutesa II; and to their Ambassador to the United States, Dr. Solomon Bayo Asea.

Independence of Uganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 8, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, October 9, Uganda will celebrate the third anniversary of its independent nationhood. On this memorable occasion, we wish to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency Sir Edward Mutesa, President of Zambia; His Excellency A. Milton Obote, the Prime Minister of Uganda; and Uganda's Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Dr. Solomon B. Asea.

This beautiful country located in the heart of Africa will also commemorate the second anniversary of its establishment as a republic within the British Commonwealth. On the first anniversary of its independence in October 1963, Uganda ceased to be tied to the British crown. On this occasion we send our best regards to the people of Uganda.

Before October 9, 1962, Uganda was a British protectorate. The agreements by which the native rulers of the area had accepted the protection of Great Britain date to around the turn of the century. In 1955 an important step in the process of self-government took place in the inauguration of a ministerial form of government along the English tradition. Countrywide elections were held in 1961 and 1962. Since becoming independent Uganda has taken a position of nonalinement in international politics and has been a strong supporter of African unity.

This nation has good prospects for future economic development. Last year its balance of trade was very good—about twice as much in export earnings as spent on imports. The first 5-year economic growth plan is now being completed. Future plans call for a doubling of the gross national product in the next 15 years. The basis for these plans is a diversification of the agricultural base and the creation of more industries, mainly light in nature, within Uganda. One industry which is being actively promoted is tourism.

Uganda has much to attract foreign visitors. It is one of the most beautiful nations in the world. On the western borders are the famed Mountains of the Moon of antiquity. There are several spectacular volcanoes accessible to tourists. Uganda is promoting an expansion of the fishing industry for both greater commercial sales abroad and more interest by foreign hunters and fishers. The country is widely known for its diversity of wild animals which should attract many with a hunting, photographic, or scientific interest. The internal communication system is one of the best in Africa and is being improved under the development plans. The airport at Entebbe is equipped to handle international flights.

There are other bases for the hopes of economic growth besides increased tourist income. The nation already has an excellent source of hydroelectric power in the dam on the White Nile River at Owens Falls. This dam now produces 150 megawatts of power to meet the expanding domestic electricity needs. It also provides power to the neighboring country of Kenya. Another reason for optimism is the favorable balance of trade which has existed for many years and has provided foreign exchange reserves. Furthermore, foreign capital has been welcomed and given inducements under a law passed last year. The Uganda Development Corporation, an organization with 13 years experience in planning economic growth, will aid private companies in a variety of development projects.

Mr. Speaker, Uganda is a beautiful land, mainly inhabited by independent small farmers. It has great promise for the future. Its people are working to diversify and expand their economy. We send our most earnest hopes to them for a happy and successful future of progress and development.

A Commemoration of Nikola Petkov

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 8, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on September 23, 1947, a brutal blow was dealt to the cause of human freedom and self-determination.

On that day 18 years ago Nikola Petkov, courageous leader of the opposition to the Soviet Communist takeover of the proud country of Bulgaria, was executed on the charge of "conspiracy against the state and the Soviet Union."

The murder of Nikola Petkov shattered virtually all Bulgarian hopes of resisting Soviet domination and preserving national independence. It dramatically marked the end of all legal political opposition to the entrenchment of communism in Bulgaria.

To commemorate the day on which Nikola Petkov was hanged for his efforts in behalf of Bulgarian independence, the Bulgarian National Committee scheduled a memorial meeting and reception at the Carnegie Endowment International Center on September 18 and a requiem mass at the Russian Orthodox Church of St. Nicholas in Washington, D.C., September 19. The committee is to be commended for commemorating the bravery of Nikola Petkov and of the Bulgarian resistance movement which he led.

Communist oppression and economic exploitation of the Bulgarian people have only intensified their longing for ties with the people of the Western World. The Bulgarian regime is gradually being forced to relax its rigid control and to grant the economic, political, and cultural contacts with the West which have been denied to the courageous people of this country for so many years.

Opportunities for increased human freedom in the liberalization of Communist control in Soviet bloc countries have been recognized by my Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

The subcommittee conducted hearings on the Sino-Soviet conflict and its implications earlier this year. In the report issued, the subcommittee recommended providing the countries of Eastern Europe with the incentive and leverage they need to remove themselves from complete economic dependence on the Soviet Union by expanding commercial trade of nonstrategic items with these countries. In addition, the subcommittee suggested intensifying political and cultural relations with those European Communist-controlled states who are achieving a degree of independence from Moscow and are showing moderation in their external affairs.

We are committed to help alleviate the plight of captive peoples such as the Bulgarians. President John F. Kennedy recalled this commitment to the countries of Eastern Europe when he addressed himself to the people of free Europe at Frankfurt, Germany on June 25, 1963. He said:

> All of us in the West must be faithful to our conviction that peace in Europe can never be complete until everywhere in Europe * * * men can choose in peace and freedom how their countries shall be governed.

Let us pay tribute to Nikola Petkov and to the liberty-loving heroes of other oppressed nations who have worked, fought, and died for the basic human right of self-government. May their example be an inspiration to men everywhere when the path of freedom is difficult, as it is today in Vietnam. May we also always remember our traditional, abiding commitment to the principles of liberty and human dignity and to the peoples who struggle to achieve them.

John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 8, 1965

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, a Member has recently introduced legislation to change the site of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts from the Potomac River location chosen by the National Capital Planning Commission and approved by Congress.

This legislation has stimulated a little flutter of statements by opponents of the Potomac site which are in many instances factually incorrect and extremely misleading.

Regrettably, some of those most interested in the provision of facilities for the performing arts could be misled and disturbed by rumors and distortions.

DELAY COULD BE FATAL

At a time when all the land needed for the Center has been acquired on the river site, when the site has been long since formally dedicated, when demolition has begun, when the plans for the building are practically complete, and when the general construction contract is soon to be awarded, I am simply at a loss to understand how a question of relocating the Kennedy Center now could be raised or seriously considered.

The only conceivable result of again raising the long-settled question at this late date would be confusion and hard feelings, where none should exist. The Member who has raised the question has been heard before the Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, and before the Appropriations Committee. Almost 2 years ago, the Public Works Committee considered this matter in detail and reaffirmed its earlier decision in favor of the present site.

The Member who continues to oppose the Cultural Center locaton has been heard on the floor of the House, fully and repeatedly, on this question. His testimony before the Appropriations Committee indicates some concern with protecting the Watergate Inn. This property has now been condemned and is owned by the U.S. Government. Regardless of the basis of the member's position, he has made it clear on several occasions, and it has been fully and amply considered.

And this position has been rejected repeatedly. How often can a Member wish reconsideration of an action of this House? The site has been before the Congress on four occasions, the most recent last year, since it was originally accepted on the recommendation of the National Capital Planning Commission. It has been approved by three Presidents. It was dedicated by President Johnson on December 2, 1964, in a moving speech which called the location "most beautiful." This speech was inserted into the RECORD last week by my distinguished colleague on the Board of Trustees, Senator SALTONSTALL.

I am reminded of a poem which I read many years ago. I'm not certain of the author, though it could have been Kipling. It is, I think, apropo:

They peck out, dissect, and extrude to the mind
The flaccid tissues of long dead issues,
Offensive to God and mankind,
Like vultures over an ox
That the army has left behind.

If the Center is built, without delay, where it is presently planned, we know that it will be a reality. If it is subjected to delays and reconsiderations, we have no way of knowing that it will ever be built. We have been too long a deprived capital city, in comparison with the great capitals of the world, with respect to adequate facilities for the performing arts. The Congress recognized this fact when it authorized the Center. Further delay would be not only ridiculous but indefensible.

For example, very soon the Royal Danish Ballet is to perform in the Coliseum, which experts say is perhaps as poorly suited for ballet as a place could be. But more delay is asked, to select another site, to redesign the building, to acquire more land, to raise more money. In short, we are being asked to retrace the steps taken for the last 7 years which finally have brought us within sight of the goal.

If another site were chosen, what then? After land had been acquired, a building designed, funds raised, and ground broken, suppose another site then might be proposed. We would be asked to change again, to reconsider.

If we did not proceed with present plans, it would be most doubtful that the Nation's memorial to President Kennedy would ever be built in the form of a center for performing arts. Delay after delay would kill the project, if it were not studied to death under the pretext of selecting another site.

Can the Center's critics ever be permanently satisfied, or would the Congress be perpetually reconsidering? Just as we never can expect unanimity on any site, we never can expect unanimity on the architectural design. The people legally charged with the responsibility have to make a decision and then stick with that decision, just as in any undertaking under the sun that ever finds fruition in reality.

DESIGN CRITICISMS

A group of architects has criticized Edward D. Stone's design for the Kennedy Center. We remember the anguished cries from some of that fraternity when we extended the East Front of the Capitol when we built the new Senate Office Building, when we constructed the Rayburn Building. If we had stopped each time some self-styled and self-appointed critic had disagreed, nothing would have been accomplished in the past decade.

Are these critics the same ones who proposed to surround the historic Octogon House with a modern office building? Do they feel that the Potomac will be made more beautiful by the massive apartment houses of Watergate Town than by the Kennedy Center? What assurance do we have that they could do better in the redesigning that would be necessitated by a change of location? We have no such assurance, nor do we have any reason to believe that a new design would not be then bombarded by still other architects and critics, and that the same bickering would not be repeated. In fact, we have ample reason to believe that precisely this would happen, ad infinitum and ad nauseum.

Truly, I believe that, if our modern architectural critics had been present when Moses came down from Mount Sinai with the sacred tablets of stone, they would have found something in them to criticize. Indeed, they might have demanded that they be redone.

I have been privileged to serve as one of the trustees of the Center, a member of the board that selected Edward D. Stone as architect and approved his design. Critics, apart from their esthetic taste, have argued that the building does not furnish enough facilities. In actuality, the Center will ingeniously and artistically furnish under one roof, a variety of facilities: for grand opera, musical comedy, ballet, for musical performances from the full symphony to the solo recital, for plays, motion pictures, and even for small experimental production uses.

ACCESSIBILITY

Opponents argue that the Center will be inaccessible. My recollection as a trustee was that the plans for the Center provided more than adequate access to the river site. My recollection is completely verified by information furnished by the National Capital Planning Commission. I am informed that the question of accessibility of the Kennedy Center was among the issues considered by the special task force appointed by the NCPC and by the Commission itself.

Disregarding the catchiness of the slogan which had been used to characterize the road network to the south and east of the Center, the task force, the Federal Projects Committee of NCPC which was chaired by the distinguished architect, Paul Thiry, and the NCPC itself found that the Center had adequate vehicular and pedestrian accessibility. Where the task force had criticisms of the original design, the plans were changed to accommodate design to the criticisms, with the following results:

At the north end of the building, the garage exits will be used also as entrances making it possible to enter the garage directly from New Hampshire Avenue, thereby eliminating the need for all traffic to cross the Plaza. This makes the Plaza a more attractive place for the discharge of patrons at the building entrances.

Also at the north end of the building it is possible to make an entrance to the lower level of the garage directly off Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway. Such an entrance is directly complementary to the exit which is provided there. Traffic destined to the Center from the north via the parkway can make a direct entrance into the Center.

At the south end of the garage it is possible to enter directly from the parkway. This entrance is also operated as an exit, thereby giving direct access out of the garage into the parkway for such routes as Arlington Memorial Bridge and Constitution Avenue. The maximum access to and from the parkway is provided since the Kennedy Center is a facility located in the park on park land, served directly by the parkway road system.

Vehicular access is also provided from the Inner Loop by ramps, and an entrance for official parties is provided which will cause no interruption of traffic at other entrances. By this design the road network which serves the Center is turned to positive advantage rather than being a disadvantage, providing for 12 lanes of ingress and egress.

Because the Inner Loop is designed to connect with various freeway "legs," two interstate highways, the Anacostia Freeway, both George Washington Memorial Parkways, and via these routes to the Capital Beltway, speedy automobile access to the Center site is provided to all parts of the metropolitan area. The river site takes advantage of the comprehensive highway planning for the area in a way which would be completely lost in a Pennsylvania Avenue site, where access would be impeded by a welter of grid plat streets and a barrier of traffic lights in all directions.

For passengers who arrive by bus, a 700-foot covered unloading area is provided at the plaza entrance. It is not unreasonable to predict that the generation of demand for bus transportation by the Center will result in fully adequate bus routes to it. D.C. Transit has always been most willing to service profitable areas, by regular routes, special bus service, and by minibus, as required.

The location of a subway stop in the vicinity of the Center has not been as precisely determined as have the location of stops in the downtown area. While subway service to the Center will not be available for 2 or 3 years after the completion of the Center under present plans, there is no reason to believe that planning of the subway will ignore an important facility such as the Center. Rather, it is to be expected that subway design will take due consideration of its relation to the Center, regardless of the location of the Center.

PEDESTRIAN ACCESS

Pedestrian access to the Center will be superior to pedestrian access to the unimproved Center site as regards safety, and almost all existing pedestrian routes will be preserved. Pedestrian safety will be increased and routes which presently do not exist will be opened up by the construction of pedestrian overpasses.

Apart from pedestrians coming directly from the Watergate Town and directly to the Plaza along New Hampshire Avenue, it is not really known whether pedestrian attendance at performances will be truly significant in numbers. Nevertheless, ample pedestrian walks are provided from other routes in anticipation of daytime tourist visits. Pedestrian access from all quarters is both more direct and vastly more safe than pedestrian access to the Jefferson Memorial or the Lincoln Memorial.

My conclusion is that the Potomac site is more accessible to most of the District of Columbia and to suburban Maryland and Virginia than would be the location which has been proposed on Pennsylvania Avenue. The task force also did a complete analysis of unloading from all types of vehicles: private cars, taxis, and buses, and concluded that unloading capacity is more than adequate to serve the peak demand.

LOCATION AND PRICES

Mr. Speaker, there has also been a considerable amount of nonsense in the press about the prospective price of performances at the Kennedy Center. Let me say first of all that there is no relation whatsoever between the site of the Center and the price of performances. Senator CLARK has demonstrated that the cost of the proposed Pennsylvania Avenue site would be considerably greater than building on the river site. This would lead to the conclusion that prices would have to be higher on Pennsylvania Avenue than on the river, as a simple matter of economics.

I know as a trustee that there has been consideration of the use of Center facilities by the Smithsonian Institution of educational and public service programs. Such programs would undoubtedly be free. The program committee, chaired by Mr. Arthur Schlesinger, has fully in mind the obligation to make programs available at moderate prices or free.

For example, the Kennedy Center and the Lincoln Center recently sponsored an International University Choral Festival at the National Cathedral, and at least half the audience only paid $2. The National Opera Company, a joint venture of the Kennedy Center and the Metropolitan Opera, will play in large cities and small towns and on college campuses during the coming year, at moderate prices which will result in a deficit in many places. This deficit will be absorbed to make this public service available.

Mr. Speaker, we have been very fortunate that the Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Kennedy Center, Mr. Roger Stevens, is one of the most experienced and knowledgeable men in the country on all phases of the performing arts. He has made it clear on many occasions that the facilities at the Center will be the finest in this country for both the artist and the audience and the presentations will not be made at Broadway prices.

We have in mind an endowment program to help students, children, veterans, and the handicapped.

People who are ignorant of the plans of the Kennedy Center to live up to its obligation, required by law, to foster and encourage the performing arts, are in no position to criticize these plans. Still less is it possible to relate the location to a program which is still in the process of formulation.

Mr. Speaker, there is no substance in the arguments advanced against the river site. When they are dissipated like the morning fog they resemble, we are left with the hard, practical, crystal-clear facts that the river site is the best site available, that it is the site which has been chosen, and that it is the site upon which the Center is being built now.

This was the conclusion of WTOP radio and television in an editorial broadcast on September 26 and 27.

NEW CULTURAL CENTER

There's something about Washington for almost everyone to dislike, and still it's an inspiring and wonderful city. The Treasury Building sits where it does in interruption of the White House-to-Capital vista because an irritated, temper-ridden President Andrew Jackson tired of argument and said put it there.

The Pentagon has been reviled as an architectural monstrosity, and lately the third House Office Building has been lumped into the same category. But they serve their purposes somehow and for every target, of course, there is a defender. We would like to step into that role with respect to the new cultural center.

This outstanding prospective memorial to the late President Kennedy's intense interest in the arts is to be built beside the Potomac near the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge. Critics of the plan with considerable reason have called attention to shortcomings in the site—away from the center of town, cramped for potential parking space, unsuitable as a terminal point for auto travel, and too far from anywhere to walk. The critics, their ranks newly enlarged by an informal group of close to four-score distinguished Washingtonians, would like the project delayed, restudied, and presumably moved in whole or in pieces to the central city to enhance the Pennsylvania area and downtown redevelopment plans. Something might be gained from this, but something far more, we believe, would be lost. What would be lost in our judgment, would be the cultural center itself.

It's hard to believe that trying to push the project through Congress now in some other form could meet with any immediate success. Such an effort might result in scrapping the whole thing. Faults now forseen can be resolved at least in part. We have the money, we have the site, we have the go-ahead. The thing to do now is build it and enjoy it—as one more new contribution to an inspiring and wonderful city.

This was a WTOP editorial, Frank Wilson speaking for WTOP.

SENATE

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1965

(Legislative day of Friday, October 1, 1965)

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, before whose all-seeing eyes the ages pass, apart from Thy will all the little schemes of our own devising are as futile as a painted ship upon a painted ocean.

In the midst of things as they are, so tangled and tragic, we thank Thee for stirrings of discontent within us, lighted candles of hope for brotherhood, justice, and a righteous peace that no darkness, however dense, can put out.

In this dismaying era in which our lot is cast, we are grateful for the values that cannot be shaken and for guiding beacons that no winds of violence can ever extinguish.

With this flaming faith in the permanence of goodness restore our souls, steady our faltering steps, and lead us in the paths of righteousness for Thy name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 8, 1965, was dispensed with.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the history of our American labor movement and of the laws which govern labor-management relations in this country is the history, by and large, of a battle for equality. That is the issue before us now, as well.

As the issue stands, Mr. President, our policy as a nation on the question of union shop agreements is clear. But it is not uniform because the Taft-Hartley Act contains an exception to the rule which recognizes and sanctions the union shop when freely arrived at through the process of collective bargaining. That exception is section 14(b), which permits individual States to option out from under the national law.

It makes no sense, Mr. President, for us to continue to permit States to exempt themselves from a national policy designed to encourage free collective bargaining between equals. And there is no question but that the so-called right-to-work laws are meant to undermine unions' equality at the bargaining table, to deny them the bargaining position of strength, and, in fact, to bust them. Yes, this so-called right to work which is law today in 19 States is a union-busting law. It is designed to keep wages low, to keep labor cheap. The name right-to-work is itself a fiction. These laws made possible by section 14(b) guarantee to no one the right to work. If they guarantee anybody anything it is the right to be a freeloader, the right to accept the benefits of union-won contracts without accepting the responsibility that goes with those benefits. Workingmen have a name for them; they are called right-to-scab laws.

If we are to speak of the right to work, then let us speak of the real right to work, which, admittedly is and always should be a foremost goal of this Government. And that is not the phony right to work before us today. No, the right to work, if we honestly apply that name, is the right of every person to hold a decent job, the right of every man to earn a decent living for himself and for his family. As our President has said:

> The promise of America is opportunity for our people.

And without a livelihood, there can be no opportunity. That is the essence of the real right to work.

There is another facet to this issue on which I would like to touch, Mr. President, and that is the divisiveness of these so-called right-to-work laws. I speak from experience, for Wyoming is among the States which have had such a law imposed upon them by a coalition of pressure groups which represented the same collection of antilabor interests which have for so long, and so loudly, declaimed against repeal of section 14(b) by trying to clothe that provision in the sacrosanct garb of individual liberty. The workingman himself, they claim, does not want repeal. But during the long series of secret NLRB elections on union shops between 1947 and 1951, more than 90 percent of the workers casting ballots voted for union shops. Labor won 97 percent of those elections, which numbered in excess of 46,000. So the workingman, with rare exceptions, wants a union shop. He wants this scab we call 14(b) removed from his back. That is clear.

Who is it, we can ask, who then favors these so-called right-to-work laws and wants section 14(b) retained? Understandably, there are big businessmen and groups which have bought the idea that these antiunion laws will somehow cut their labor costs, so they have jumped on the bandwagon. But there are some strange allies associated with the amalgam called the National Right-To-Work Committee, Mr. President, namely farm organizations which would better serve their own members if they would pay more attention to the job of getting a fairer share of the dollars spent for food for American farmers, and less attention to the affairs of organized labor. We have not heard organized labor telling the farmer how to farm. It is not labor's place. But we have heard much from some so-called farm leaders telling labor how it should—or, more exactly, how it should not—organize.

Then there is the other element in this campaign: the far right.

Some of the most reactionary forces in the country are the most avid supporters of these antiunion laws, and not as a guarantee of liberty, but as a union-busting device. Their purpose is not to confer any right on anyone, but to make the worker's right to bargain collectively ineffective.

And who, Mr. President, has more interest in this issue than the workers of America? The unions we are discussing are his unions and no one else's.

Management, of course, does have a legitimate interest, as one of the two principals in any labor contract. But this issue in no way affects its right to hire whom it pleases so long as other legal requirements are not violated. Whether a union shop exists or not, the contract arrived at in the bargaining which goes on between representatives of the management and the workers of any shop applies to all covered employees, whether they belong to the union or do not. Under the law, the union is required to represent all.

And our unions consider this an honor, not a burden. But to do so effectively, the union must, out of necessity, truly represent all the workers. When it does, then and only then can the representatives of the two sides go to the negotiating table as equals. The labor negotiator knows his opponent, as it were, speaks for the company. Things are equal when the company negotiator knows, too, that his opposite number speaks for all the workers involved.

In 19 States now, however, the company representative need not—indeed cannot—legally acknowledge that the union represents all the workers involved in contract talks. He cannot do so even if he wants to. And what is the result?

In Wyoming, Mr. President, where I have firsthand knowledge, the result is, as I have said, divisiveness. The question has gone to our State supreme court, where the law was, in part, nullified, and where the majority opinion upholding it in the main was not without dissent. But the litigation is nothing compared to the discord produced between neighbors, between friends, as men and women take up sides.

The great irony, Mr. President, is that, of perhaps all the States, Wyoming was one which, until this law was enacted in 1963, had achieved a history almost totally without the scars of labor strife. We simply had none—at least, not in a serious sense. Imposition of this very restrictive right-to-work law on our laboring people, then, was unwarranted and constituted nothing but a slap in the face. Why then, Wyoming? I think the answer is clear, Mr. President, that our State was chosen because such a law was possible there at that time, now more than 2 years ago, even if it was not, by any stretch of the imagination, warranted. The goal of those pushing for these so-called right-to-work laws, and hence for retention of 14(b), is to bust unions nationally. They cannot do it all at one time, in one fell swoop. So they have set about working at it step by step, State by State.

This is, perhaps more than anything else, an emotional issue. Look at the turmoil it has caused in State after State. Its appeal is one of low wages, hence cheap labor. The result is resentment on the part of those people who work for their living in our great industries. Another result is a phony, cheap type of competition among States for new industry, based on the alleged appeal of weak unions and cheap labor.

Mr. President, my State is a so-called right-to-work State, but I shall cast my vote for repeal of 14(b) and for doing what our legislature failed to do by but one vote. The so-called right to work has been a phony issue from the start. The people want shed of it.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon Monday next.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated September 23, 1965, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

ROGER WILLIAMS NATIONAL MEMORIAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 7919, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Roger Williams National Memorial in the city of Providence, R.I., and for other purposes, and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7919) to provide for the establishment of a Roger Williams National Memorial in the city of Providence, R.I., and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on September 22, 1965, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported favorably and on September 23 the Senate passed S. 1855, a bill almost identical to the House bill now before us. Shortly after the Senate passed S. 1855, the other body passed the House bill which was referred to our committee. Normally, the Senate bill would go to the President, but in this case in order to save time at the approaching end of the Senate session, the sponsors of the Senate bill, Senators PELL and PASTORE, have agreed to accept the House bill in order to assure enactment this session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I announce there will be no further business transacted today. However, there will be talks, at least one by the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed on the subject of the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center, without it being counted as a speech upon the pending business. I understand that that is agreeable with the majority leader.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INTER-AMERICAN CULTURAL AND TRADE CENTER

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I noted, as I am sure other Senators noted, in the Washington Post this morning, an article entitled "Building of Fair in Florida Swamp Bogs in Senate," written by Julius Duscha.

Mr. Duscha usually reports objectively and fairly, but since I note that there are some details in his published report which cry out for correction, both as to their objectivity and their fairness, and since I note that the writer of the headline, who I am sure was not Mr. Duscha, likewise departed from the standard of fairness which should have been exercised, I wish to make some remarks about the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Florida.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Duscha article, containing many fair statements but some which are completely unfair, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 9, 1965]

BUILDING OF FAIR IN FLORIDA SWAMP BOGS IN SENATE

(By Julius Duscha)

A 15-year lobbying effort to drain Federal funds into a Florida mangrove swamp to help turn it into a trade center—completely equipped with a Disneyland—bogged down in the Senate yesterday.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee dug into the project for nearly 2 hours and then instructed its staff to find some formula regarding the increasing demands for Federal aid to trade and other fairs.

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat of Arkansas, chairman of the Committee, indicated that the Florida project would be rejected if it came to a vote in its present form.

The Florida project is known as Interama, or the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center. It would include a Tower of Freedom and would be located on reclaimed land on Biscayne Bay north of Miami Beach's luxurious Diplomat Hotel.

TWENTY-TWO-MILLION-DOLLAR LOAN

The project was conceived in 1941 and Florida businessmen and members of the State's congressional delegation have been seeking Federal funds for it since 1950.

Last February the Community Facilities Administration approved a $22 billion loan to Interama for the construction of a building to house exhibits by the United States and the governments of several Latin American countries.

The agency's money is supposed to be used largely to help depressed cities and towns to build water and sewer systems.

An exception was made in the case of Interama after the promoters of the project hired a Washington lawyer, Raymond M. Jacobson, who served as an advance man for Vice President HUMPHREY in 1964 campaign.

TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-EIGHT SIGNATURES

Jacobson helped to get the signatures of 50 Senators and 228 Representatives on a petition endorsing Interama's application for a community facilities loan.

Also helping to lobby for Interama was Richard K. Donahue, a former aid to President Kennedy.

But the loan was made contingent on the approval by Congress of funds for the construction and maintenance of the U.S. exhibit in the building.

Two weeks ago the House approved a bill providing $15 million for the U.S. exhibit.

The approval came on the House's annual pork-barrel day when it blithely voted to authorize $1.7 billion in new public works projects and earmarked another $250,000 to study the feasibility of Federal participation in a HemisFair planned for 1968 to mark the 250th anniversary of the founding of the city of San Antonio, Tex., by the King of Spain.

ALASKA ALSO MAKING BID

Nor is HemisFair the last grab for a brass ring on the fair merry-go-round. Alaska's two Democratic Senators, E. L. BARTLETT and ERNEST GRUENING, want Federal funds to help their constituents celebrate the centennial in 1967 of the purchase of Alaska by the United States from Russia.

Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio, an implacable foe of both Interama and HemisFair, has noted that the merry-go-round began with the 1962 Seattle Fair, to which the Federal Government contributed $8.5 million for a building, and continued with the New York World's Fair, which closes this month and has had a $17.5 million Federal building.

LAUSCHE told the Foreign Relations Committee yesterday that it was time for the Federal Government to get off this merry-go-round.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in the first place, the title of the article, "Building of Fair in Florida Swamp Bogs in Senate," is not fair. As a matter of fact, the mangrove swamp in which the fair will be built will be completely reclaimed by the use of funds with which the Federal Government has no concern whatever and before the development of this important agency can be attained. So the portion of the headline which reads "Building of Fair in Florida Swamp" is misleading, and any references in the article itself to that effect are likewise misleading.

I think it is appropriate to state rather briefly the history of the planning for this important activity. In 1950, there was introduced in both Houses of Congress, and passed, a resolution giving the approval of Congress to the particular objective involved. The resolution was introduced in the House of Representatives by my then distinguished colleague in the House [Mr. SMATHERS] and in the Senate by my then distinguished colleague in the Senate, Mr. PEPPER, and myself, and passed both bodies by unanimous votes.

Later, in 1951, Florida set up the Inter-American Center Authority to administer the project, which has operated at considerable expense since that time with all costs borne by the State of Florida and local agencies, without any Federal money.

Included among the members of the commission have been some of the most distinguished citizens of Florida, including our present Governor, Mr. Haydon Burns, who at the time he served actively on the commission was the mayor of the city of Jacksonville, some 350 miles from Miami, the location of the cultural and trade center. Many other distinguished Floridians have served on the commission. I mention only one of them, the brother of my distinguished colleague in the Senate, Mr. Frank Smathers, of Miami, one of that city's most distinguished citizens. Other members of the commission have been of similar character, reputation, and stature in our State.

Mr. President, the location of the proposed Cultural and Trade Center is not in the exact place stated by Mr. Duscha, though I think the mistake was inadvertent. He says that it was north of the Diplomat Hotel, when as a matter of fact it is south of the Diplomat Hotel, and nearer to Miami and the centers of both Miami Beach and Miami than the place he indicates.

It is located on what was, and part of it still is, a mangrove swamp lying at the north end of Biscayne Bay, about opposite and west of the Bakers Haulover Inlet, which I am sure will fix the location in the minds of Senators who know Miami.

As a matter of fact, it is located within a few hundred yards of important hotels, apartments, residences, and other high-priced developments on various islands located in Biscayne Bay and in Miami Beach, as well as being in close proximity to the mainland, where North Miami, Miami Shores, and the city of Miami itself are found.

I say rather clearly, for the information of all who may be interested, that the mangrove swamp referred to is the same kind of terrain upon which most of what is now Miami Beach and other important developments of the Gold Coast were created.

The first time I saw Miami Beach, it was a little string of sand and coral rock along the Atlantic, with a long stretch of mangrove swamp, identical with this mangrove swamp, back or west of it, which has since been filled in and occupied by many, many homes, hotels, and apartments, constituting some of the most valuable real estate in the State of Florida, worth, of course, many thousands of dollars an acre.

As a matter of fact, when I was Governor of Florida, I found—and I state this as a matter of fact—that the submerged land of Biscayne Bay, shallow enough to be filled in and made into this kind of development, itself was worth many thousands of dollars an acre.

We sold for the State some of the land such as would be approved by the Corps of Engineers for such development at huge prices. It has been developed and now is the location of some of the highest priced developments in our State—I believe in any State.

The 1,700 acres was granted to the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center by the city of Miami. It extends across from the mainland to Miami Beach, on that long island, with the exception of the narrow body of water which constitutes the Intracoastal Waterway and which extends out of the northeast corner of Biscayne Bay northward leading toward Jacksonville and other points along the Atlantic coastline. The area is very valuable. Others who know more than I do about value, state that the 1,700 acres by itself, without any development, is worth approximately $60 million.

I have no reason to doubt that conclusion, because I know from my own experience something of the vast value of all lands in that general area which are developable. This area is easily developable as it is close to Miami and Miami Beach, and lies south of Hollywood and a little farther south of Fort Lauderdale. It could not be more strategically located.

Mr. President, from the standpoint of its actual development, 680 acres have already been filled and reclaimed, and settlement of the fill has taken place. They are ready for construction and for such other development as may be called for in connection with the Cultural and Trade Center. The rest can be, will be, and is capable of being developed in exactly the same way.

The State of Florida has undertaken the putting in of the many roads and bridges and other structures of that kind, without expense to the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center which, as I have already stated, is controlled by a commission appointed by the Governor and created by State law, with authority to make this development.

With reference to the value of the roads, bridges, and other structures, I am not able to say how much they will cost, but I understand the cost will be approximately $6 million, for which the State of Florida has assumed complete responsibility.

In addition, the city of North Miami, the closest area from the standpoint of availability of water and sewage service, has undertaken to accomplish, without expense to the Center, the installation of the water mains, the sewerage structures, and other structures of that kind which will be necessary for the servicing of this important area.

With reference to the other utilities, the Florida Power & Light Co. has undertaken, without expense to anyone other than itself, to build all of the facilities which will make power available in the entire area; likewise, the Southern Bell Telephone Co. has undertaken to furnish service to the area, at its own expense. It is estimated that the cost to the utility companies will be approximately $15 million.

In addition, the well-known bonding firm of Goodbody & Co. has approved a fully validated $21 million bond issue upon the area and has actually bought the first $8 million of bonds—and this was as I understand before a spade had been turned, or any development had begun—indicating that there is great value in this particular area.

I have said this much about the material things involved here, because the article of Mr. Duscha does not give a clear picture of the great value in the development already completed, and the value of the rest of the tract of approximately 1,000 acres which is to be reclaimed and which is equally accessible and equally available and valuable as the 680 acres already completely reclaimed and ready for buildings.

Mr. President, as to what the Federal Government has done, Mr. Duscha is correct, except that the linotype operator made a mistake. Mr. Duscha says that the Community Facilities Administration approved "a $22 billion loan" last year. It was, of course, a $22 million loan. The purpose of the loan was not to build only the building mentioned by Mr. Duscha, but along with other funds gained from the bonding issue, and otherwise, to construct other buildings required to house the exhibit of the United States of America, which will not have to put up a dime to construct its own building, and the buildings of the Latin American countries already interested in the fair which wish to have their own participation in this important project.

Mr. President, so much for those items. I believe that there are other points to which I might refer briefly.

Mr. Duscha has this paragraph which I believe leaves a particularly unfortunate implication. After saying that the Community Facilities loan in the amount of $22 million had been made, which he says is $22 billion—a slight difference, Mr. President, and I am sure a typographical error—and was highly secured interest bearing, and on a bank-worthy basis, he says:

> The agency's money is supposed to be used largely to help depressed cities and towns to build water and sewer systems.

Mr. President, I doubt if many of the cities which have been helped with Community Facilities would be complimented by being included within the classification of depressed towns and cities.

However, this is the part to which I specifically refer:

> An exception was made in the case of Interama after the promoters of the project hired a Washington lawyer, Raymond M. Jacobson, who served as an advance man for Vice President HUMPHREY in the 1964 campaign.

That carries the implication that the action was taken as a result of the hiring of this estimable and highly capable young man—incidentally, a Floridian—or as a result of his political activities. Neither of those things happens to be true.

This action was taken because the Housing Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives through colloquies upon the floor of the Senate and the floor of the House conducted between Members of the Florida delegation and the chairmen of those two committees, made it abundantly clear—and this appears in great detail in the record of both Senate and House—that where an area is designed for developments such as this, and does not lie within the actual limits of any city, as is the case here, it was completely eligible and completely qualified for such a loan. Both distinguished chairmen of the committees—the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] in the Senate—made it clear, as the record will show, that the Community Facilities Administration must be careful to be sure the loan was safe and worthy of the making; and that appears with complete clarity.

So far as I am concerned, I would not have wanted the loan made on any other basis.

The Senator from Florida happened to be the one who had the pleasure of having the colloquy with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] in the Senate, to which I have referred. One of my colleagues in the House, Representative PEPPER, had the similar colloquy with the chairman of the House committee, to which I have referred. In both instances it was made clear that nobody wanted a Federal loan in connection with the project except a loan that was well secured and could be approved by any eagle-eyed banker as being so secured, as it is.

In addition to the very large expense which the State of Florida has carried since 1952 in this matter and the great contribution of the city of Miami and the other agencies which I have mentioned as well as the bond issue, independent entrepreneurs are interested in this project to the extent that they have stated their willingness to put up large amounts of money in the development of entertainment and other features of great value.

I have already said that the article by Mr. Duscha contained many fair and objective statements. One of the statements he made in the article is that it would include a tower of freedom.

The tower of freedom as planned, and the financing is already planned, would be the highest structure in the world and would command the attention of all coming to that part of the State and all arriving by air from Latin America and elsewhere at the International Airport at Miami.

I want to make it very clear for the RECORD why I say Miami is the exact spot for such a cultural exchange center. It happens to be in almost the geographic and population center of the Western Hemisphere. Anyone can determine this for himself if he wants to look at a map. It happens to be the funnel through which literally millions of people going to Latin America, either from the United States or elsewhere, or coming here, pause for various periods on their way to visit Latin America or our own country. The International Airport at Miami handles literally millions of visitors going to or from Latin America.

In addition, Miami happens to be the spot where most tourists who go to Florida like to make one of their visits before they leave our State. We are getting between 15 and 16 million tourists each year.

In addition to that, it so happens that the gold coast area of Florida has grown with great rapidity. Dade County, which includes Miami, has well over 1 million permanent residents, not including the Cuban refugees. Broward County, just north, whose boundary is just a short distance from Interama, has some 350,000 people. The county immediately north of that, Palm Beach, has a population of between 200,000 and 250,000.

So this center is located at the exact spot where many people coming to or from Latin America go in the largest numbers, and where literally millions will have an opportunity to see located at that spot in Florida the exhibits and other structures which will be there.

This Cultural and Trade Center will contain the evidences of culture, education, science, industry, trade, and agriculture which we think would tend to promote greater closeness between ourselves and the Latin American peoples.

Incidentally, I may say that the Latin American Ambassadors both to the OAS and to our own country have shown very great interest in this project. Dozens of them went to the White House with us in presenting this project to the President himself before the approval of the $22 million loan, evidencing their interest and hopes and willingness to participate.

As to what would be done there, let me remind the Senate that we are now spending billions of dollars in the Inter-American Alliance. We are trying everywhere to help them in their building, in their development, in their agricultural projects, in their educational projects, to obtain greater independence and a higher standard of living for their people.

Along with that, we are trying in many ways to build a better understanding with them on a person-to-person basis.

Included in the person-to-person projects, I may mention that several cities in my State have sister cities in Latin America, and people from those cities frequently visit back and forth. Every institution of higher learning in our State has many Latin American students, and some of our students go down to some of their fine institutions of higher learning. I have been active in connection with the conduct of our helping to build the Inter-American Highway and the Rama Road. I have twice attended Pan-American highway meetings, in which the United States has actively participated. I know something of other projects in which we have helped them and they have helped us.

For instance, I remember flying in one of the helicopters of our engineers that was used in Nicaragua to help the people of Nicaragua make the first accurate map of much of their country which they ever had. That is true of several areas of Central America, where there had been no accurate mapping because of the very rough terrain.

I could mention several educational projects. I have been several times to visit officially the Panama Canal. I know of some of the friendly relations there, although we have read generally of unfriendly incidents.

At Caracas, although we hear of some of the outbreaks against our country or our important visitors, there are evidences of much closeness between those people and our own and we know of the progress being made in that country.

We in Florida have, since 1951, or prior to that time, made a great contribution toward this project. We have contributed much money and energy over the past 15 years to this project. I am not overstating it when I say that in value we have contributed over $100 million.

I can say that the real, acid test of acceptance by the Latin Americans of their invitation to exhibit in the buildings we shall construct for them is the question of whether the United States of America is to have a creditable exhibit there also.

Mr. President, I have frequently felt that as to fairs elsewhere, there was a worthwhile value for our country. Senators will recall that I handled on the floor of the Senate the item of appropriation from the funds of this country to make sure that we would have a creditable showing in behalf of our Nation at the New York World's Fair. I assisted the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] in a similar effort with respect to the Seattle Fair. I will always try to help American areas which are trying to advance the interests of our country, and the mere fact that they are at the same time advancing the interests of their own community is to be taken for granted, because if the project is successful, of course, it will serve the interests of their community.

I believe that this showing of great interest, at great investment by the State of Florida, the city of Miami, and the county of Dade, and other areas at their own cost, has not been equaled elsewhere and I doubt if it will be equaled anywhere else as a showing of willingness to spend for something that we believe worthwhile for the interest of this country and of ourselves.

I am sorry the matter has been slowed down in the able Committee on Foreign Relations. I call attention to the fact that it passed in the House of Representatives only the other day. Again, Mr. Duscha reflected little credit upon the project by saying it passed on what he calls Pork Day. Let me get the exact wording. I do want to quote it correctly. He called it "Annual Pork Barrel Day."

Mr. President, this is not a pork barrel matter. A pork barrel item is a name given to appropriation items for cities, States, or agencies, which are never asked to contribute in proportion to the contribution of the Federal Government.

In this instance we have contributed very greatly; far more than we are asking the Federal Government to contribute in this project. We only want them to put in money to finance the U.S. exhibit there and to keep it going for 4 years, which we believe will demonstrate the usefulness and the success of this project.

This is a permanent project, but if it is not successful in those 4 years the United States always has the right, if it wishes, and Congress will have control of that, to say that it is not successful and has not met the objectives and dreams of those who worked so long on it. That will be the privilege of Congress, even if Congress passes the pending bill which calls for $11 million for the exhibit with various features in it which are very unusual, such as in the facilities and films for the audio-visual features which will be in the various languages of the people who will be passing through it.

Then, it has $1 million a year for each of the 4 years for the actual operation and maintenance of the project.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope the long dreams, work, and expenditures, which are a very heavy contribution of the people and the State which I represent in part, will be recognized in an appropriate way in this Congress.

The only reason I have risen to speak today before the matter was pending on the floor of the Senate is because of this article in the Washington Post this morning in a very prominent place, which I believe does not give the real picture of this proposed cultural exhibit.

Mr. President, if there is anything we need to do to supplement our great investments through the Inter-American Alliance, which we are making by the hundreds of millions, and by the billions, it is to have more friendship and complete understanding with those people who are our neighbors. Our future and their future is going to depend more on the building of better understanding and more on the better appreciation, each for the other, than any other factor and not on the fact that we contribute heavily to the building of a system of highways. We contributed two-thirds of the cost of the Inter-American Highway through Central America which has a rugged terrain, and small populations or assets of their own upon which to draw.

That is fine, but nothing will be done to make a greater impression than will be created by a great continuing institution where we may have exhibits of their activities which show their culture as we display ours.

I do not know how many of us know that in the city of San Jose, in Costa Rica, there is a beautiful grand opera building similar to the one in Monte Carlo. I happen to have been in both places. It has a fine company playing there a large part of the year.

I can cite instance after instance of things which they are developing in their culture which we would admire and which we would love to have the chance to enjoy and which our people, if they have the chance to enjoy, would better understand why we are spending these many millions of dollars in the Inter-American program and the Inter-American Alliance.

I shall not weary the Senate further by speaking on this subject. I wish, however, to remind the Senate that the community of Miami has responded nobly to the crisis forced on it by the policy of our Nation as a whole by the welcoming of Cuban refugees. They have received in that one city better than 200,000 refugees, many of them now resettled.

The Federal Government has done a fine job there. My hat is off to it. Nothing, however, can compare to the tremendous impact on the Miami people themselves of that invasion of refugees, many of them arriving without anything except the clothes they had on their backs. The impact has fallen most heavily on the city of Miami and its people have responded in perfectly noble fashion.

So far as I am concerned, I feel that they are entitled to some credit for having done that. We are now entering into this new program which we say will bring 15,000, 20,000, 25,000 new refugees, who for the most part will be there; although some will resettle elsewhere.

Mr. President, the city of Miami is doing its part. The county of Dade is doing its part. The State of Florida is doing its part. We believe that this meeting place between the cultures of Latin America and our own, which is almost the exact center of the geographic Western Hemisphere and of the population of the Western Hemisphere, is an ideal and unique spot in which to set up a place where the cultures may meet, where people may meet, where acquaintances may be made, where we can learn the good things about them, and where they can learn the good things about us and about our people.

I am sorry that this matter has gotten into controversy, and that some of our very able friends have seen fit to make it the subject of delaying tactics in our committee. I close by reminding our good friends that. after serious debate and full discussion on the floor of the House following hearing and report, and a good record of both of the hearing and the report, the House passed this legislation by a majority of better than 2 to 1 on a rollcall vote.

I hope that we may give equally careful, equally patriotic, equally generous, equally prompt consideration to this matter in these closing days of the session, when it will be difficult to get matters up for consideration, because the interest on the bonds is being paid, and it is costing money, and the continuing expense of the whole project is something that must be considered. Therefore, the Federal Government ought to move ahead without further delay.

After all, 15 years is a good, long time for even the Federal Government to consider a project, particularly when it involves so little money as this, which will go to those who have so highly lived up, I think, to the test of Americanism as have the people and the governments of Miami and Dade County, and of the State of Florida as a whole.

I thank the Senate for yielding me this time, which does not count as time upon the pending business of the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move under the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 41 minutes a.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously entered, until Monday, October 11, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., prefaced his prayer with these words of Scripture: II Timothy 2:14: *Of these things put them in remembrance.*

Almighty God, we celebrate these many days in our national history as a time of high and holy remembrance; days that bring back a medley of memories, exaltations, regrets, and dismay.

Help us to call to mind in our prayers the heroism of the men and the fortitude of women in the days of terror and trial—those who endured with valor; those who suffered with patience; and those who gave their all, even the very blood of their bodies for the dawn of a better day.

We beseech Thee to stir our minds and the minds of men everywhere that a nobler spirit and wiser vision may rule our thoughts and ways.

May we humbly acknowledge that we are not praying for the peace of ease but for the peace of righteousness and good will and the moral law that fulfills itself in fellowship and guides humanity out of chaos and confusion into brotherhood.

Enlighten our darkness; may ignorance, poverty, oppression be done away. May the Prince of Peace reign supremely everywhere. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 8, 1965, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7919. An act to provide for the establishment of the Roger Williams National Memorial in the city of Providence, R.I., and for other purposes.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DAY

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMillan].

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener] to call up bills from his subcommittee.

PROVIDING CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR MAKING CERTAIN TELEPHONE CALLS

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 10497) to provide criminal penalties for making certain telephone calls in the District of Columbia and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10497

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) it shall be unlawful for any person to make use of telephone facilities or equipment in the District of Columbia (1) for an anonymous call or calls if in a manner reasonably to be expected to annoy, abuse, torment, harass, or embarrass one or more persons; (2) for repeated calls, if with intent to annoy, abuse, torment, harass, or embarrass one or more persons; or (3) for any comment, request, suggestion, or proposal which is obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, or indecent.

(b) A violation of this section shall be deemed to have occurred at either the place at which the telephone call was made or the place at which the telephone call was received.

(c) Whoever violates this section shall be subject to a fine of not more than $500 or to imprisonment for not more than twelve months, or both.

(d) Any person arrested, indicted, or otherwise charged with violating this section shall be requested by the court to take a pretrial mental examination, at a mental hospital designated by the court, and all costs of such examination shall be paid by the government.

(e) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to affect the application of section 927 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 24–301), to any person arrested, indicted, or otherwise charged with the violation of this section.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 10497 is to provide criminal penalties to persons found guilty of making certain telephone calls in the District of Columbia.

The bill makes it unlawful for any person to make use of telephone facilities or equipment in the District of Columbia for the following purposes:

First. For an anonymous call or calls if in a manner reasonably to be expected to annoy, abuse, torment, harass, or embarrass one or more persons;

Second. For repeated calls, if with intent to annoy, abuse, torment, harass, or embarrass one or more persons; or

Third. For any comment, request, suggestion, or proposal which is obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, or indecent.

The bill further provides that a violation shall be deemed to have occurred either at the place where the telephone call was made, or at the place where the call was received.

The bill subjects violators to a fine of not more than $500 or to imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or both. The laws of Maryland and Virginia impose similar penalties.

Present law in the District of Columbia provides a maximum penalty of a $10 fine for disorderly conduct for so-called prank telephone calls.

The bill further provides that a pretrial mental examination shall be requested by the court of any person arrested, indicted, or otherwise charged with violating the above provisions, such examination to be at a mental hospital designated by the court, and the cost thereof to be paid by the government.

Finally, provision is included in the bill to assure that nothing in the enforcement of the bill will affect the application of the provisions of the District of Columbia Code with respect to insane criminals and to the commitments thereof.

There is hardly a Member of Congress who has not heard complaints from his secretary or staff members who have been the victims of obscene, annoying, or harassing telephone calls at some time or other.

According to information filed with your committee, an increasing number of perverts, burglars, and just plain cranks are using the telephone to plague Washington area residents—particularly women.

Police and prosecutors throughout the area report hardly a day goes by without at least one complaint of an obscene call, some of them involving obscene messages to women, others decoy calls by burglars.

Between 35 and 40 cases a month are under active investigation by the telephone company's security force. Counted as one case is the caller who has given the same shockingly indecent spiel to a hundred or more women.

Washington residents, unprotected by any kind of law against telephone harassment, face this pattern of cases:

A pervert posing as a doctor was believed to have made more than 50,000 calls throughout the area over a period of several years before his recent capture, in nearby Maryland. His spiel: Telling women that their husbands had visited him for delicate medical help and asking them numerous intimate questions.

A university's telephone switchboard was tied up so completely that all school business came to a halt because of one family's domestic crisis. The man got 20 of his friends to keep calling the university where his wife worked. They said nothing, simply breathed into the telephone, but no other calls could come through.

Two District firms—a moving company and a barbershop—nearly went out of business through telephone harassment directed not at the firms but at some employee. In both cases, calls swamped telephone facilities.

A current trap for the unwary is the telephone survey. It is used by both burglars and perverts in the District.

The perverts use the survey to entice the housewife into carrying on an innocent conversation before the caller moves into obscenity.

Police believe burglars are employing the survey technique to "case" a house without running any risk of being spotted. Cited as a typical example is the housewife's responses to the seemingly innocuous qustions of a caller posing as a TV market analyst.

The bill has the support of the U.S. Department of Justice, the Metropolitan Police Department, the local telephone company, and other groups.

Your committee has not heard of any objections to this legislation, and recommends its approval by the House.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank and commend the Committee on the District of Columbia for the expeditious manner in which they responded to this legislation.

I particularly would like to commend my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], for his knowledgeable advice and counsel. I want to thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN], for their splendid support and assistance to me in bringing this bill to the floor and assuring its passage.

The residents of the Nation's Capital are really unprotected by any effective law against persons making obscene telephone calls. The present penalty upon conviction of such a charge is a $10 fine for disorderly conduct and a defendant can go scot free simply by forfeiting collateral. My bill would boost these penalties to $500 and imprisonment for up to a year. This is the same maximum penalty provided by the neighboring States of Virginia and Maryland.

The police tell me that some of these persons make literally hundreds of calls over a short period of time. The mental anguish they cause is tremendous. They pretend to be doctors, marriage counselors, survey takers, and a number of other things. The police have a difficult time tracking down the perverts who comb through telephone directories to find the numbers of women they can harass with indecent remarks.

Because of the difficulty in enforcement and the present small penalty, many—if not most—obscene telephone calls go unreported to the police. They should be reported. The police and the telephone company want them to be reported. Sometimes, just a fragment of information can be the needed clue to to provide identification of the caller.

I can also report to the House that telephone experts are currently perfecting devices which are going to make it much easier to track down persons who make obscene telephone calls. So it is important that action be taken now to make certain that tougher penalties are enacted into law.

I believe adoption of this bill by Congress would serve as a greater deterrent to the commission of such crimes. And it would give the Metropolitan Police Department a much stronger weapon of enforcement. The overall effect should be a greater peace of mind for the thousands of women in this city who have received such calls. One can just imagine the fear an obscene telephone call strikes in the heart of a woman living alone. Washington has a larger number of single women and widows than most cities because they come here to work in Government agencies. I do not think there is a Member of Congress who has not heard complaints of this kind, in many cases from women on his own staff.

I must point out also, Mr. Speaker, that this strengthening of the law is not without compassion. I am fully aware that many of the persons making obscene telephone calls are mentally ill and need psychiatric attention. This bill contains a provision for voluntary pretrial mental examinations of persons charged with violating this law. If such an individual is mentally ill, the court should have that information available at the time the case comes to trial. In that event, treatment can be required.

It makes little sense to bring such persons to justice and levy fines and imprisonment if nothing is done to remedy the cause of such antisocial behavior. If a defendant refuses to take such an examination, my bill specifically provides that the judge can still order an examination if he believes the defendant is mentally unsound.

Mr. Speaker, there has been great concern in Congress over crime in the Nation's Capital. This bill makes an attack on one aspect of that problem. The Police Chief, the U.S. attorney, the telephone company, the staff of the District of Columbia Crime Commission, and the victims of such calls are all agreed that legislation is needed. I ask you to respond to their plea for action.

The following article on this subject from the August 18, 1965, Post follows:

Layton Endorses Bill on Obscene Phoners

(By Alfred E. Lewis)

Police Chief John B. Layton said yesterday he would like to see a House bill, stiffening penalties for obscene telephone calls, become law.

The legislation, by Representative Cornelius E. Gallagher, Democrat, of New Jersey, would provide a $500 fine, a year's imprisonment, or both, for a person convicted of making an obscene telephone call—an offense now punishable in Washington by a $10 fine for disorderly conduct.

Layton said the obscene telephone caller is a hard man—only rarely a woman—to catch and the thousands of complaints registered here annually soak up a lot of police man-hours—most of them fruitless. The Gallagher bill would bring the Washington penalty for the offense more in keeping with those in suburban jurisdictions, and in some instances beyond them.

The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. also would like to see the Gallagher bill become law, and for much the same reasons Layton cites—its deterrent effects, and the possible easing of the workload on its investigative force.

The obscene phone caller's voice takes many forms. Sometimes he poses as a marriage counselor; sometimes as a physician; sometimes as the just plain nut he usually turns out to be.

Because of him, the phone company advises single women to list their phone number only by their last names and a couple of initials, and in any case to avoid the listing of the more exotic first names and the designation, "Miss." Once their listing has been discovered by the obscene phone caller, about all the phone company can do is advise a new nonlisted number, or if that is not feasible, its call-screening service.

Nor is the unwelcome phone caller always sexually oriented. Sometimes he or she has no voice at all and his target hears nothing but deep breathing at the other end of the line. Sometimes, too, his target is known to him personally and will be called regularly at 3:37 a.m. each day in vindication of some real or fancied mistreatment the caller has received at the target's hands.

Difficult as they are to catch, once an obscene phone caller is identified, dozens of complaints are cleared up, police explain.

Alexandria police records on the offense probably are typical of those in surrounding jurisdictions. There were 118 of them recorded in the year ending last July 1, but each complainant probably received a series of the calls, so the figure is not indicative of the number of such calls. The obscene phone caller is not a seasonal operator, nor does he annoy any special section of the city, the figures show.

Mr. Speaker, following are excerpts from the broadcast interview program of John Schaefer, "Talk of New York," WCBS–Radio, July 30, 1965:

Dr. Emanuel Hammer, a psychoanalyst with the National Psychological Association for psychoanalysis and the head of the psychology department of the New York Criminal Court's Psychiatry Clinic, tells of some of the reasons people make obscene or nuisance calls:

"They fall into a category very similar to the exhibitionist. If they prove by terrorizing the woman that they can be taken seriously as a man, then they are reassured. Mostly what is behind it is a sense of inadequacy as a male, and so by talking dirty on the telephone or saying, 'look at me, boy, can I talk it up; can I be a man with words,' while preserving the safety of distance. If you do recognize they are sick people, it is enough merely to not satisfy the desire, to not answer, if the person begins to talk obscenely, to merely hang up—to not reward it by response, is the best way of combating it."

Dr. Hammer goes on to describe possible treatment for these people:

"The only treatment which society has devised which has any chance of working is psychological treatment. We find locking these people up does absolutely nothing. When they are released, the same needs are existent which drove them to the symptoms to begin with. They need the same solutions, and nothing within the person, has changed. He doesn't feel any more manly; in fact, being locked up, he is apt to feel less manly. It depends on the age of the person suffering the impulse to call people on the phone and talk in an obscene manner. It depends on how long it has been going on and his own motivation for treatment."

Dr. Hammer then tells of ways to handle unwanted calls. "Not answer, put the phone receiver into the drawer, and go back to sleep. What the guy does want is a response from a female to reassure him that he is impressive as a man, that he can elicit a response from a woman with words. The best response is really nothing. There seems to be a personalized relationship, at least in the mind of a caller. It may be a victim he has seen passing across the street many times or coming down the block—here I would change the number, and somehow if the person does get hold of the new number then I think it is something more serious, and I would inform the police."

In answer to the question "Is there an accurate way of finding out whether a telephone survey is on the level?", Dr. Hammer answers, "ask what concern he is calling for. Take down the name of the concern; say you will call him right back. Look up the concern in the telephone book, and then call back that number."

When asked what people in public positions should do when they bring down the ire of extremists and are called at all hours, Dr. Hammer replies, "I think to make the phone call as brief as possible, to have a private number, invite them to put it in a written form so that you can read it at your leisure. And that way you find you discourage a certain proportion of those who are merely trying to let off steam, and those who have something to say are more prone to sit down, think it through clearly, and sometimes to some constructive advantage."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately preceding the passage of the bill H.R. 10497, I be permitted to revise and extend my remarks and that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Gallagher] be permitted to extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

OVERTIME COMPENSATION FOR POLICE AND FIREMEN

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 1719) to authorize compensation for overtime work performed by officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, and the White House Police force, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1719

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide a five-day week for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force and the White House Police force", approved August 15, 1950, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 4–904), is amended to read as follows:

"That (a) for purposes of this Act, the following definitions apply, unless the context requires otherwise:

"(1) 'Authorizing official' means the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia in the cases of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the Secretary of the Interior in the case of the United States Park Police force, and the Secretary of the Treasury in the case of the White House Police force.

"(2) 'Administrative workweek' means a period of seven consecutive calendar days.

"(3) 'Basic workweek' means a forty-hour workweek, excluding rollcall time, in the case of officers and members of the police forces specified in this Act; a forty-hour workweek in the case of officers and members of the District of Columbia Fire Department other than those in the Firefighting Division; and an average workweek of forty-eight hours in the case of officers and members of the Firefighting Division of the District of Columbia Fire Department.

"(4) 'Basic workday' means an eight-hour day excluding rollcall time in the case of officers and members of the police forces specified in this Act; an eight-hour day in the case of officers and members of the District of Columbia Fire Department other than those in the Firefighting Division; and an average twelve-hour workday in the case of officers and members of the Firefighting Division.

"(5)(A) 'Off-duty days' means the nonwork days which, when combined with the basic workdays, make up the administrative workweek.

"(B) 'Off-duty time' means the time in any basic workday outside the regular tour of an officer or member's duty.

"(6) 'Rollcall time' means that time, not exceeding one-half each workday which is in addition to each basic workday of the basic workweek for reading of rolls and other preparation for the daily tour of duty.

"(7) 'Rate of basic compensation' means the rate of compensation fixed by law for the position held by an officer or member exclusive of any deductions or additional compensation of any kind.

"(8) 'Premium pay' means compensation not considered as salary for the purpose of computing deductions for life insurance or for computing annuity payments under the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act.

"(9) 'Officer or member' means any employee in the Metropolitan Police force or the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, or the White House Police force whose compensation is fixed and adjusted in accordance with the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended.

"(10) 'Court duty' means attendance by an officer or member in his official capacity, excluding his appearance as a defendant, at court or at a quasi-judicial hearing.

"(11) 'Special event' or 'special assignment' means any planned activity or function which the authorizing official designates in advance as such.

"(b) The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Secretary of the Interior, or the Secretary of the Treasury, as the case may be, is authorized and directed to establish a basic workweek of forty hours to be scheduled on five days for the respective police forces referred to in this Act: *Provided,* That rollcall time shall be without compensation or credit to the time of the basic workweek.

"(c) All officially ordered or approved hours of work (except rollcall time) performed by officers and members in excess of the basic workweek in any administrative workweek, shall be considered as overtime work and shall be compensated for as provided by this Act.

"(d) (1) Whenever the authorizing official designates in advance an activity or function as a special event, or special assignment, all overtime work in connection with such special event, or special assignment, shall be compensated for by payment, as follows:

"(i) For each officer or member who receives compensation at a rate provided for in class 1 through class 4, in the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, the overtime work shall be compensated for by payment at one and one-half times the basic hourly rate of such officer or member and all such compensation shall be considered premium pay.

"(ii) For each officer or member who receives compensation at a rate provided for classes 5 and above, in the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, the overtime work shall be compensated for by payment at the basic hourly rate of such officer or member's basic compensation (except as otherwise limited by subsection (h) (1) and (2) of this section) and all such compensation shall be considered premium pay.

"(2) An officer or member may elect to receive compensatory time off as provided in subsection (f) of this section in lieu of payment for overtime work as provided in this subsection.

"(e) Each officer or member who on any off-duty time performs court duty (excluding the first appearance in court on each case), or who performs work, as ordered or approved, on any off-duty day shall be compensated in accordance with subsection (d) of this section.

"(f) Overtime work, other than that for which compensation by payment or time off is provided by subsections (d) and (e) of this section, shall be compensated for by compensatory time off at a rate of one hour of compensatory time for each hour of overtime work performed. Such compensatory time off shall be granted in accordance with the following provisions:

"(1) The authorizing official, or such person as he may designate to act in his place, may, at the request of any officer or member, grant such officer or member compensatory time off from his scheduled tour of duty in lieu of payment for an equal amount of time spent for overtime work, including the first appearance for court duty in each case, if to grant such leave would not unreasonably diminish the number of officers or members available to maintain law, order, and public safety.

"(2) Any officer or member who is eligible for compensatory time off and has made application for such compensatory time off, which application was denied, may within thirty days of such denial make application for compensatory pay at his basic hourly rate of compensation and all such compensation shall be considered premium pay.

"(3) Such compensatory time off shall be used within such period of time as the authorizing official shall prescribe. If such officer or member fails to take such compensatory time off within the prescribed period, he shall thereby waive all right to such compensatory time off, unless his failure to take such compensatory time off is due to an official denial of his request for such compensatory time off. Such overtime work shall be credited for purposes of compensation in multiples of one hour, rounded to the nearest hour in case of fractions thereof. Thirty minutes or more of any such hour shall be credited as one hour.

"(g) (1) Whenever any officer or member is authorized or directed to return to overtime duty at a time which is not an immediate continuation of his regular tour of duty, such officer or member shall receive credit for not less than two hours of overtime work for purposes of compensation under this Act.

"(2) Overtime work resulting from the immediate continuation of an officer's or member's regular tour of duty which, excluding rollcall time, is thirty minutes or more in excess of the basic workday shall be credited for purposes of compensation under subsection (f) of this section.

"(h) (1) No premium pay provided by this Act shall be paid to, and no compensatory time off is authorized for, any officer or member whose rate of basic compensation equals or exceeds the minimum scheduled rate of basic compensation provided for service step 1 in class 10 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended.

"(2) In the case of any officer or member whose rate of basic compensation is less than the minimum scheduled rate of basic compensation provided for service step 1 in class 10 of the Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, such premium pay may be paid only to the extent that such payment would not cause his aggregate rate of compensation to exceed such minimum scheduled rate with respect to any pay period.

"(3) Each authorizing official is authorized to promulgate such regulations and issue such orders as are necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of this Act, and to delegate to a designated agent or agents any of the functions vested in the authorizing official by this Act."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (6) of section 2(a) of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Act entitled 'An Act to classify the officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes', approved June 20, 1906, and for other purposes", approved June 19, 1948 (62 Stat. 498), as amended (sec. 4-404a, D.C. Code), is repealed.

SEC. 3. The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for granting to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and the White House and United States Park Police forces additional compensation for working holidays", approved October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 607), as amended (sec. 4-807, D.C. Code), is amended by striking the last two of the three provisos thereof, and by inserting, in lieu thereof, the following: "*Provided further,* That, when an officer or member is authorized or directed to work on a holiday and such officer or member is required to work longer than his regular tour of duty he shall be compensated for such overtime in accordance with the provisions of subsection (e) of the first section of the Act approved August 15, 1950 (64 Stat. 447), as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 4-904(e))).

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 5. This Act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins not less than thirty days after approval of this Act.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of S. 1719 is to authorize compensation for overtime work in excess of the basic authorized workweek performed by officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the U.S. Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia. This legislation implements one of the President's eight major emergency programs to fight crime in the District of Columbia.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The major provisions of S. 1719 allow overtime compensation for members of the Metropolitan Police Department, the White House Police, the Park Police, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia.

Overtime compensation is payable for all ordered or approved hours of work performed by officers or members of the various forces in excess of the basic workweek, which is stated at 40 hours for all except those in the Firefighting Division of the District of Columbia Fire Department, for whom the basic workweek is 48 hours. The basic workday for all except those in the Firefighting Division of the Fire Department is 8 hours. For those in the Firefighting Division, the basic workday is 12 hours. Rollcall time is without compensation or credit to the time of the basic workweek.

For overtime worked in connection with first, special events and special assignments—when designated as such in advance by the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia, the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of the Treasury, as the case may be—second, second appearances in court on a given case on off-duty time, or third, specifically ordered or approved overtime work performed on an off-duty day, a member of the force is to receive compensation at a rate 1½ times his basic hourly rate of compensation. Officers—class 5 of the Salary Act of 1958 and above—are to receive compensation in such circumstances at a rate equal to their basic hourly rate of compensation, which is known as straight time.

Overtime work not pursuant to a special event, special assignment, second appearance in court or ordered or approved for performance on an off-duty day is to be compensated by compensatory time off. Accordingly, overtime work performed by an officer or member of the force consisting of a first appearance in court, or an activity requiring him to extend his regular tour of duty on a duty day, would entitle that officer or member to 1 hour of time off for each hour of overtime worked.

Under the terms of the bill, however, the officer or member is not allowed an unbridled election to take time off, but must first clear his request for time off with his supervising officer, who may deny such request if to grant it would unnecessarily diminish the strength of the force.

If a request for compensatory time off is denied, the officer or member is then entitled to apply for compensation pay at straight time rates, but he must make such an application within 30 days of the denial of his request for time off. The initial request for time off must be made within such period as the Board of Commissioners or the Secretaries of Interior or Treasury shall prescribe.

Similarly, an officer or member entitled to pay and one-half for overtime worked may elect instead to take compensatory time off, but must do so on the same basis as other applicants for compensatory time off and at a rate of 1 hour off for each hour of overtime worked.

When an officer or member is authorized or directed to return to overtime duty at a time which is not an immediate continuation of his regular tour of duty, he is to be allowed at least 2 hours credit toward overtime. Overtime work performed as an extension of the regular tour, which, excluding rollcall time, is 30 minutes or more, shall be credited toward compensatory time off, unless such overtime work is performed in a second or subsequent appearance in court for which pay and one-half is allowed.

Finally, the Board of Commissioners, the Secretary of the Interior, or the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out this act. Previous laws relating to holiday pay are coordinated with this act, and the act is to go into effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins not less than 30 days after approval of this act.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

At the present time, the act of August 15, 1950 (64 Stat. 447), as amended—District of Columbia Code, sec. 4-904(f)—provides that officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, White House Police force, and U.S. Park Police force may be compensated at the basic daily rate for each day of duty performed by reason of the suspension and discontinuance of their days off for emergency purposes. A similar provision relating to the Fire Department of the District of Columbia appears in the act of June 19, 1948, 62 Stat. 498, as amended; District of Columbia Code, sec. 4-404(a). Also, the act of August 15, 1950, as amended—District of Columbia Code, sec. 4-904 (e)—provides that for each day a vacancy in a particular rank exists in the personnel strength of any of the police forces or of the Fire Department, an officer or member of such rank may voluntarily perform duty on his day off and be compensated at a rate equivalent to his daily rate.

However, these provisions do not cover the numerous special events and special assignments which require large details of officers and members of the various forces for crowd control. These special activities include parades, demonstrations, and traffic control at District of Columbia Stadium and other places of large public gatherings. During a typical year these details require approximately 140,000 man-hours of duty which, on each particular occasion, must be drawn first, from the strength of the patrol forces, thereby depleting them and weakening their effectiveness in crime deterrence, or second, from off-duty men, who are later unavailable for patrol duty when they are given compensatory time off. This drain of manpower from the normal patrol force would be relieved by using men working overtime for cash compensation to furnish manpower for these special events and special assignments.

An indication of the impact that special events have on the Metropolitan Police force is illustrated by the opening day baseball game on April 12, 1965, when details for traffic control and for movements of the President required a total of 370 privates and 65 uniformed officials and detectives; and by the demonstrations on April 17 against Vietnam policies when it was deemed necessary to require details of 551 privates and 54 uniformed officials and detectives.

During the fiscal year 1964, the U.S. Park Police engaged in approximately 18,000 hours of overtime work. Of this amount, about 40 percent resulted from six major details which include Cherry Blossom Festival, Independence Day Celebration, Pageant of Peace, President's Cup Regatta, Press Club Family Frolic, and Schoolboy Patrol Parade.

The remaining portion of overtime worked by the Park Police was incident to court duty and demonstrations that required adequate police supervision and control.

The officers and members of the District Fire Department, in fiscal year 1964 worked approximately 6,300 hours of extra duty on multiple alarms, emergency communication facility repairs, and special investigations. In addition, approximately 600 hours of work were performed in excess of regular tours of duty for fire inspections, security matters, and related department activities.

Statistical data regarding the overtime pay practices of other major cities disclose that the enactment of S. 1719 will bring the District into conformity with many of the other major cities that already compensate their law enforcement employees for duty in excess of the regular workweek. Of 20 municipalities having a population in excess of 500,000, all provide some form of compensation for overtime worked; and 11 of the 20 cities provide for monetary compensation at a straight time rate or at time and one-half.

The committee felt there were urgent and compelling reasons for adoption of a program of overtime compensation measured in terms of 1½ times basic compensation. First, such a program is not wholly without precedent but has been instituted recently in one of the most significant police systems in the country, the New York City Police Department. Second, and most important, is the longstanding disparity between objectives and attainments in the strength of the police force in the District of Columbia.

Since 1961 the District of Columbia has been striving to bring the force up to the authorized strength of 3,000 men. It is currently 109 men shy of full strength. An additional 100 positions have been appropriated for fiscal 1966. Nearly 240 men will retire or resign from the force in the next year. The Police Department will have to recruit a total of 449 members for the force within the coming year exclusive of any needs the tactical force may generate if continuation of that program is authorized in March. In the meantime crime rates are on the rise. Accordingly, your committee felt that every effort should be made to assist the chief in developing recruitment incentives, and views the enactment of S. 1719 as a concomitant part of strengthening the Police Department's personnel efforts.

The Comptroller General of the United States, in a letter relating to S. 1719, highlighted the competitive disadvantage in recruitment facing the Police Department in an area where the vast majority of employees were eligible for and received compensation for overtime work at a rate 1½ times normal compensation. The Comptroller General remarked:

> One difference between the benefits provided by S. 1719 and those provided for Federal and District of Columbia employees by section 201 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, approved June 30, 1945, chapter 212, 59 Stat. 296, as amended, 5 U.S.C. 911, is that overtime compensation at 1½ times the normal rate of pay is provided by that section, whereas S. 1719 provides for payments equal to the normal rate of pay. We believe that the committee should consider the fact that the practice of paying 1½ times normal compensation is a widely accepted practice both in the Government and outside, in connection with its consideration of the proposed legislation. Also, section (g) (2) of the proposed amendment provides for the grant of compensatory time but not for overtime compensation when overtime results from the continuation of an employee's tour of duty.

While the Chief of Police has indicated headway is being made by the recruitment programs for the Metropolitan Police Department currently underway, your committee felt every effort should be made to bring the force to full strength as soon as possible, and, accordingly, reports this bill with the heightened incentive of time and one-half for overtime in the hope and anticipation that by making police recruitment procedures more competitive with prevailing private and governmental employment practices, more qualified young men and women will be inclined to participate in one of the highest callings and become respected law enforcement officers.

The committee feels further that it would be inappropriate and unfortunate to continue to provide a smaller measure of overtime compensation to a man who risks his life daily for the public good, than is provided for a worker in the comfort and security of his office. Only by paying a police officer time and a half for overtime work can this disparity between police and nonpolice Government employees be avoided. Obviously, such a measure as the committee now recommends will be of inestimable value in heightening police efficiency and morale.

Finally, and most important, this measure is the second point of the President's eight-point emergency crime fighting package for the District of Columbia. The committee feels that by broadening its benefits, this legislation will have a greater impact on the fight against crime.

COST OF LEGISLATION

Based on the figures for fiscal year 1964, it is estimated that the annual cost to the District government for overtime pay under the provisions of S. 1719 will be approximately $697,500 for the Metropolitan Police Department, and $43,500 for the District of Columbia Fire Department. The cost for the White House Police will be $39,000 and $105,000 for the Park Police. The total cost would amount to approximately $885,000 per annum, of which $741,000 would be the annual recurring cost to the District government.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this occasion to endorse to my colleagues in the House the bill S. 1719, which is designed to provide extra compensation for overtime duty performed by the officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the District of Columbia Fire Department, the U.S. Park Police force, and the White House Police force.

My interest in this legislation, which in my opinion is urgently needed, is of long standing. In fact, I introduced H.R. 10697 on August 26 of this year, to accomplish this purpose. While my bill would have provided somewhat more liberal benefits to the members of these vital forces, which I would have preferred, as a matter of expediency I am happy to endorse the bill S. 1719 which will give a considerable measure of relief in this area.

Briefly, the major provisions of this proposed legislation are the following:

First. Overtime compensation for all ordered or approved hours of work performed by officers or members of the various forces in excess of their basic workweek.

Second. The basic workday is established at 8 hours, and the basic workweek at 40 hours, for all except those in the firefighting division of the Fire Department. In that division, the basic workday is 12 hours and the basic workweek is 48 hours.

Third. Rollcall time, which consumes approximately one-half hour per day, is not credited to the time of the basic workweek.

Fourth. For overtime worked in connection with, first, special events and special assignments; second, second or subsequent appearances in court on a given case on off-duty time; or third, specifically ordered or approved overtime work performed on an off-duty day, a member of one of these forces—class 1 through class 4 of the salary scale—shall receive compensation at the rate of 1½ times his basic hourly rate of compensation. Officers—class 5 and above in the salary scale—shall receive compensation at their basic hourly rate of compensation, which is known as straight time. The chief of any of the forces is not entitled to any overtime compensation of any kind.

Fifth. An officer or member entitled to such compensation for overtime work may elect instead to apply for compensatory time off, but at a rate of 1 hour off for each hour of overtime duty performed.

Sixth. Overtime duty other than in the three categories described above, such as a first appearance in court on a given case on off-duty time, or an activity requiring an extension of a regular tour of duty on a duty day, shall entitle an officer or member to apply for 1 hour of compensatory time off for each hour of such overtime duty performed.

Seventh. If compensatory time off, as described above, cannot be granted because such permission would undesirably diminish the strength of the force at the time in question, the officer or member will then be entitled to extra compensation at straight time rates.

Eighth. Whenever an officer or member is directed to return to overtime duty which is not a continuation of his regular tour of duty, he shall be allowed a minimum of 2 hours' credit toward overtime.

Present law provides only that officers and members of these police and fire forces may receive compensation at their basic hourly rate when emergency situations necessitate their being called to duty on their normal off-duty days, and that whenever a vacancy exists in the personnel strength of any of these forces, an officer or member may voluntarily perform duty in that capacity on his day off, and be compensated at his regular daily rate.

These provisions, however, are by no means adequate to compensate the officers and members for the great number of extra-duty hours they are required to perform, not only in emergency situations but upon such special occasions as parades, demonstrations, traffic control at large public gatherings, and so forth, which in a typical year require a total of some 140,000 man-hours of duty.

In many instances under present circumstances, these special events and assignments necessitate the draining of police manpower from the normal patrol force on duty at the time, thus weakening their effectiveness in the extremely vital work of crime deterrence. The appalling crime rate in the Nation's capital eloquently points up the seriousness of this problem, which will be relieved to a considerable degree by the use of men working overtime for salary compensation to supply the manpower needed in these situations.

I am informed that of the 20 U.S. cities of population in excess of 500,000, all provide some form of compensation for overtime duty on the part of their policemen and firemen; and 11 of these cities presently provide monetary compensation for such duty, either at straight time or at the rate of time and one-half.

With only a single exception, all the other jurisdictions in the Washington metropolitan area provide the officers and members of their police and fire forces compensation plans for overtime duty which are considerably more liberal than the meager and inadequate benefits afforded District of Columbia policemen and firemen under present law.

I am reliably informed that this present inequitable situation is causing a serious morale problem in the District of Columbia police and fire forces; and this problem is reflected in growing difficulties of recruitment and retention of personnel in these forces which are so essential to the life of the city.

For the past 4 years, the District of Columbia has striven unsuccessfully to build up the metropolitan police force to its authorized minimum strength of 3,000 men. At present, the force is more than 100 men short of this minimum strength, and it is anticipated that approximately 240 men will retire or resign from the force during the coming year. These facts, together with the appropriation of funds to add another 100 new men to the police force during the present fiscal year, mean that the metropolitan police department will be faced with the task of recruiting about 450 new men during the coming year.

In the face of these facts, and in view of the keen competition for high caliber recruits for the police departments in the entire metropolitan area and in all large cities, I feel that it is absolutely essential that the bill S. 1719, which will at least place the District of Columbia on an equitable footing with other municipalities from the standpoint of providing adequate overtime compensation for the members of these forces, is overdue and must be enacted without delay.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks with reference to S. 1719 immediately before the passage of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INCREASING PENSIONS FOR RETIRED DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 11439) to provide for an increase in the annuities payable from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund, to revise the method of determining the cost-of-living increases in such annuities, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11439

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 21 and 22 of the Act entitled "An Act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia", approved August 7, 1946 (D.C. Code, secs. 31–739a—31–739b), are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 21. (a) Effective the first day of the third month which begins after the date of enactment of this amendment each annuity payable from the fund which has a commencing date not later than such effective date shall be increased by (1) the per centum rise in the price index, adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 per centum, determined by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia on the basis of the annual average price index for calendar year 1962 and the price index for the month latest published on the date of enactment of this amendment, plus (2) 6½ per centum if the commencing date (or in the case of the survivor of a deceased annuitant the commencing date of the annuity of the retired employee) occurred on or before October 1, 1956, or 1½ per centum if the commencing date (or in the case of the survivor of a deceased annuitant the commencing date of the annuity of the retired employee) occurred after October 1, 1956. The month used in determining the increase based on the per centum rise in the price index under this subsection shall be the base month for determining the per centum change in the price index until the next succeeding increase occurs.

"(b) Each month after the first increase under this section, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall determine the per centum change in the price index. Effective the first day of the third month which begins after the price index shall have equaled a rise of at least 3 per centum for three consecutive months over the price index for the base month, each annuity payable from the fund which has a commencing date not later than such effective date shall be increased by the per centum rise in the price index (calculated on the highest level of the price index during the three consecutive months) adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 per centum.

"(c) Eligibility for an annuity increase under this section shall be governed by the commencing date of each annuity payable from the fund as of the effective date of an increase, except as follows:

"(1) Effective from its commencing date, an annuity payable from the fund to an annuitant's survivor (other than a child entitled under section 9(b)(3)), which annuity commences the day after the annuitant's death and after the effective date of the first increase under this section, shall be increased by the total per centum increase the annuitant was receiving under this section at death.

"(2) For purposes of computing an annuity which commences after the effective date of the first increase under this section to a child under section 9(b)(3), the items $600, $720, $1,800, and $2,160 appearing in section 9(b)(3) shall be increased by the total per centum increase allowed and in force under this section for employee annuities which commenced after October 1, 1956, and, in case of a deceased annuitant, the items 40 per centum and 50 per centum appearing in section 9(b)(3) shall be increased by the total per centum increase allowed and in force under this section to the annuitant at death.

"(d) No increase in annuity provided by this section shall be computed on any additional annuity purchased at retirement by voluntary contributions.

"(e) The monthly installment of annuity after adjustment under this section shall be fixed at the nearest dollar, except that such installment shall after adjustment reflect an increase of at least $1.

"(f) For purposes of this section, the term 'price index' shall mean the Consumer Price Index (all items—United States city average) published monthly by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The term 'base month' shall mean the month for which the price index showed a per centum rise forming the basis for a cost-of-living annuity increase."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia", approved August 7, 1946 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–722), is amended by inserting immediately after "this Act" in the third sentence the following: ", and for payment of administrative expenses incurred by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia in placing in effect each annuity adjustment granted under section 21 of this Act".

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11439 may well be referred to as a housekeeping bill. It carries forward, as we have done many times in the past, an equitable treatment of schoolteachers in the District of Columbia insofar as their retirement annuities are concerned.

The sole purpose of the bill is to afford these teachers the same increase in annuities as were provided for all civil service retirees under Public Law 89–205, which we recently enacted. It has no other purpose.

The legislation is necessary, in my opinion. It will serve to meet a clear and convincing obligation of the Congress to deal equitably with our teacher force in Washington as we have done with others in the Government service nationally and in the District.

I urge immediate approval of the bill.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 11439 is to afford teachers of the District of Columbia public schools the same increase in annuities, based upon increases in the cost of living, which were provided for all civil service retirees in Public Law 89–205, enacted recently.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The major provisions of this proposed legislation are the following:

First. Change the definition of the term "price index" from the annual average of the Consumer Price Index over a calendar year to that published monthly by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Further, the bill defines the "base month" as the month used in determining that the price index warrants a cost-of-living adjustment.

Second. Fix the effective date of the adjustments provided as the first day of the third month beginning after the date of enactment. The bill preserves the cost-of-living adjustment principle established for District of Columbia teachers and for all civil service retirees in 1962, but which has never resulted in any increase in annuities, but amends the plan to gear it to a more sensitive monthly indicator in lieu of the existing unrealistic average calendar year indicator. The increases provided are made up of two components which are applicable to different categories of annuitants in varying total percentages as follows:

In the first component, all existing annuities which commenced on or before such effective date would be increased by the percentage rise in the price index, adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 percent, computed on the annual average index for 1962 and the monthly price index most recently published on the date of enactment. This component will accelerate the cost-of-living adjustment and provide timely adjustment of annuities. It will give to all annuitants an increase of at least 3.7 percent, effective the third month which begins after enactment.

The second component grants additional increases effective with the first component, in percentages which depend upon the commencing date of annuity payments. All annuities which commenced on or before October 1, 1956, including the survivor annuities deriving from retirement annuities which so commenced, will be increased by an added 6½ percent. All annuities which shall have commenced after October 1, 1956, and up until the effective date of the increases, will be increased by an added 1½ percent.

The total effect will give a combined increase of at least 10.2 percent to those whose annuities are based upon the law in existence on or before October 1, 1956, and not less than 5.2 percent to those whose annuities were computed under the liberalized formula made applicable after October 1, 1956, by the 1956 retirement amendments.

Third. The bill also establishes the month used in computing the first component of the increase as the base month for determining the percentage change in the price index until the next succeeding increase may occur. It requires the District of Columbia Commissioners to determine the percentage change each month after the date of enactment. Effective the first day of the third month beginning after the price index shows a rise of at least 3 percent for 3 consecutive months over the base month, an automatic increase will become payable. All annuities which commence on or before such effective date will be increased by the percentage rise in the price index. Such an increase will be computed on the highest percent of the 3 consecutive months, adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 percent. The month forming the basis for such future increase will then become the new base month for determining the next cost-of-living adjustment.

Fourth. The bill retains the usual language precluding an increase on any additional portion of annuity that was purchased by a retiree by voluntary contributions.

Fifth. The customary requirement is retained that the monthly annuity, as increased, be adjusted to the nearest dollar. It provides, however, for reflecting an increase of at least $1 per month wherever an increase would not otherwise cause a small annuity to be adjusted to the next higher dollar.

Sixth. The Commissioners are authorized to use moneys to the credit of the retirement fund to cover the administrative cost they will incur in putting the increases provided in this bill into effect, and particularly those Consumer Price Index adjustments that may occur at indeterminate intervals in the future. The Commissioners would not be in a position to anticipate, for budgeting purposes, the frequency in which the proposed adjustments may occur during the course of any fiscal year.

Inasmuch as all the classified employees of the District government have been provided these same annuity benefits in Public Law 89–205, and since legislation for the teachers of the District of Columbia has always kept pace with that for civil service retirees, the provisions of this bill are now necessary to provide an equitable situation for these teachers.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Pension plans are long-term financial operations, and the basic purpose to be served is to enable an employee to enjoy freedom from want and a measure of economic security upon the expiration of active employment and throughout his declining years.

The unprecedented expansion of our economy is a serious problem to active workers, but a far greater one to elder citizens who are caught between the rising prices and fixed incomes. The impact upon these senior citizens, in many cases, is critical.

At a time when $3,000 yearly income is considered the borderline below which a married couple is deemed to be in the poverty class, a great many retired District of Columbia teachers and their survivors are receiving annuities of much less than that amount. It is a fact that medical costs, for example, have risen more than any other single item in the Consumer Price Index. Medical studies disclose that approximately one-third of persons 65 years of age or older are chronically ill, and that they have twice as many disabling illnesses of considerable duration as do persons under that ago. Moreover, the average disabling illness of the aged lasts twice as long as that of younger persons. During the past decade, the cost of medical services has increased more than 40 percent; doctors' fees more than 35 percent; hospital expenses more than 85 percent; hospital insurance rates in excess of 95 percent; and prescriptions and drugs over 10 percent.

As older people require more medical care, these cost items are particularly difficult for them to meet. They are confronted with reduced income, impaired health, depressed living standards, and in most cases with increased medical expenses as well.

H.R. 11439 provides fair, moderate, and direly needed adjustments designed to increase annuities for retired District of Columbia teachers where the greatest relief is needed—approximately 10.2 percent in those annuities which commenced on or before October 1, 1956, and 5.2 percent in those which commenced after that date. This difference in treatment is designed to close approximately one-half of the present lag in annuity improvements for those who retired prior to 1956 as compared to improvements benefiting those who retired after 1956. Teachers who retired on or before October 1, 1956, are approximately 10 percent behind those who retired after that date. H.R. 11439, while it will not completely close this gap, will provide a much more equitable relationship than presently exists between the two groups.

The automatic cost-of-living feature, contained in the 1962 amendments to the District of Columbia Teachers' Retirement Act, has not operated effectively, as it had been expected to do. H.R. 11439 modifies this feature, in fairness to the annuitants, by providing that whenever the Consumer Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics shall have risen by an average of 3 percent or more for a full calendar year above its average for 1962, a comparable percentage increase shall become effective on April 1 of the following year. It provides further for similar increases when a like increase in the Consumer Price Index occurs after any increase predicated upon this feature.

The rise in the Consumer Price Index over 1962, although averaging 2.6 in 1964, reached 3 percent in November 1964 and has steadily risen to 3.7 percent at present. However, under the existing formula, annuitants will receive no adjustment until April 1, 1966. To correct this obviously disappointing result, the bill proposes to accelerate the effective application of the cost-of-living principle to a more sensitive monthly price index indicator. The substantive policy will not be changed, but the revision will provide for reflecting any such increases more currently, or whenever the Consumer Price Index rises by 3 percent or more for 3 consecutive months after any previous increase resulting from this feature.

It is the opinion of our committee that the increases provided in H.R. 11439 will substantially benefit all retired District of Columbia teachers, and particularly those retirees and survivors facing the greatest need. Further, inasmuch as these same increases have recently been provided for all the District of Columbia government retirees and survivors who are under the civil service system, and since retired members of the District of Columbia Police and Fire Departments enjoy an equalization feature which the teachers do not have, we feel that the Congress cannot, in good conscience, fail to provide the benefits of this bill to the teachers of the District of Columbia public school system without delay.

The committee is informed that the additional cost to the District of Columbia resulting from this legislation will be approximately $525,000 per year.

At present, we are advised, there are 1,612 retired teachers who would be affected by the provisions of this bill.

I am pleased indeed to have introduced this legislation for the benefit of the excellent and hard-working teachers in the District of Columbia public school system, and to recommend its enactment to my colleagues in the House.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks immediately prior to the passage of the bill H.R. 11439.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMillan].

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy].

EXTEND PENALTY FOR ASSAULT ON POLICE OFFICERS TO ASSAULTS ON EMPLOYEES OF PENAL AND CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND PLACES OF CONFINEMENT OF JUVENILES

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 1715) to extend the penalty for assault on a police officer in the District of Columbia to assaults on employees of penal and correctional institutions and places of confinement of juveniles of the District of Columbia, and ask for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1715

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 432 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia (D.C. Code, sec. 22–505) is amended by inserting after "District of Columbia" the following: ", or any officer or employee of any penal or correction institution of the District of Columbia, or any officer or employee of the government of the District of Columbia charged with the supervision of juveniles being confined pursuant to law in any facility of the District of Columbia, whether such institution or facility is located within the District of Columbia or elsewhere,".

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill (S. 1715) is to amend existing law—District of Columbia Code, title 22, section 505—in order to make applicable the so-called assault on a police officer criminal statute and the penalty prescribed therein, to employees of District of Columbia penal and correctional institutions, and other persons responsible for the confinement of juveniles under the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia.

Under District law at the present time, persons who, without excusable cause, assault, resist, oppose, impede, or interfere with any officer or member of any police force in the District of Columbia while engaged in the performance of his official duties, shall be fined $5,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both. In instances where a dangerous weapon is used, the penalty is increased to a term of imprisonment of not more than 10 years.

Although police officers of the District of Columbia are included within the coverage of the above statute, District correctional officers, and persons charged with the supervision of detained juveniles, are not included. Consequently, whenever correctional officers are assaulted, without a weapon, by inmates of District of Columbia penal institutions at Lorton, Va., and Occoquan, Va., as well as the District of Columbia jail, the only charge that can be brought against such inmates is simple assault, a misdemeanor, the maximum penalty for which is a prison sentence of not more than a year.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are of the view that assault on a correctional officer of the District should be a felony offense for the reason that such increased penalty could help to maintain more effective discipline in District penal and correctional institutions.

Moreover, extending such coverage to District correctional officers would conform to Federal law which at present provides that assault on Federal penal and correctional officers is a felony offense—18 U.S.C. 111–1114.

Also, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are of the view that an assault on an employee of the Department of Public Welfare charged with the supervision of juveniles under detention at the Children's Center, Laurel, Md., or the Receiving Home in the District of Columbia, should be raised to the level of a felony offense, as provided by the bill. A juvenile being brought within the jurisdiction of such charge would permit judges of the juvenile court, in appropriate cases, to waive jurisdiction over an offender so that he could be tried as an adult. The Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia—District of Columbia Code, title 11 section 1553—provides that if a child 16 years of age or older is charged with an offense which would amount to a felony in the case of an adult, the judge may waive jurisdiction to the appropriate adult court. The Commissioners feel that this provision would be a desirable means of aiding in the maintenance of discipline at the Receiving Home and Children's Center and of empowering the juvenile court judges to take appropriate action where a felonious assault has occurred on supervisory personnel.

A public hearing on this bill was conducted by Subcommittee No. 4 on October 5, 1965. At this time, approval of the legislation was expressed on behalf of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Department of Corrections, and the District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare. No opposition to the measure was expressed.

This bill was approved by the Senate on August 25, 1965.

Following is the letter from the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, under date of March 18, 1965, requesting this legislation:

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, March 18, 1965.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to transmit herewith a bill to extend the penalty for assault on a police officer in the District of Columbia to assaults on employees of penal and correctional institutions and places of confinement of juveniles in the District of Columbia.

The purpose of the bill, as indicated in its title, is to extend the penalty contained in section 432 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia (District of Columbia Code, sec. 22–505) to assaults on certain District of Columbia employees. This provision of law imposes a penalty of not more than 5 years imprisonment or a fine of not more than $5,000, or both, for assaults and related actions against any officer or member of any police force operating in the District of Columbia while engaged in his official duties. If a deadly weapon is used, the maximum prison term is 10 years.

The Commissioners believe that this statute should also cover employees of the District of Columbia Department of Corrections in their supervision of prisoners, and employees of the Department of Public Welfare in their supervision of juveniles confined to their custody pursuant to provisions of the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia.

When, from time to time, correctional officers are assaulted by inmates of District of Columbia penal institutions at Lorton and Occoquan, Va., as well as the District of Columbia jail, the only charge that can be brought against such inmates is simple assault, a misdemeanor. However, in the case of Federal penal and correctional officers, such an assault is a felony under the United States Code (title 18, sections 111 and 1114). The Commissioners believe that assault on a correctional officer of the District of Columbia should also be a felony, not only to harmonize with the Federal statute but as a means of helping to maintain discipline in District penal and correctional institutions.

Similarly, the Commissioners believe that an assault on an employee of the Department of Public Welfare charged with the supervision of juveniles being detained at the Children's Center, Laurel, Md., or the Receiving Home in the District of Columbia should be a felony. This would permit judges of the juvenile court, in appropriate cases, to waive jurisdiction over a juvenile who has committed such an assault so that he could be tried as an adult. (Sec. 13 of the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia [District of Columbia Code, sec. 11–1553], provides that if a child 16 years of age or older is charged with an offense which would amount to a felony in the case of an adult the judge may waive jurisdiction to the appropriate adult court.) The Commissioners believe that this provision would be desirable means of aiding in the maintenance of discipline at the Receiving Home and Children's Center and of empowering the juvenile court judges to take appropriate action where such an assault has occurred.

Therefore, the Commissioners strongly urge the enactment of this legislation.

The Comissioners have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,
WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners,
District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that prior to the passage of S. 1715, and all other bills which I call up, all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDING CERTAIN CRIMINAL LAWS

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 1320) to amend certain criminal laws applicable to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1320

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 848 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 22–403), is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 848. Whoever maliciously injures or breaks or destroys, or attempts to injure or break or destroy, by fire or otherwise, any public or private property, whether real or personal, not his own, of the value of $200 or more, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or shall be imprisoned for not more than ten years, or both, and if the value of the property be less than $200 shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both."

SEC. 2. The first section of the Act entitled "An Act for the preservation of the public peace and the protection of property in the District of Columbia," approved July 29, 1892, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 22–3112), is further amended by striking out "destroy, injure, disfigure, cut, chip, break," and inserting in lieu thereof "disfigure, cut, chip,".

SEC. 3. Section 812 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 22–2101), is further amended by striking out "for ransom or reward", and inserting in lieu thereof "for ransom or reward or otherwise, except, in the case of a minor, by a parent thereof,".

SEC. 4. Section 9 of the Act entitled "An Act to enjoin and abate houses of lewdness, assignation, and prostitution; to declare the same to be nuisances; to enjoin the person or persons who conduct or maintain the same and the owner or agent of any building used for such purpose; and to assess a tax against the person maintaining such nuisance and against the building and owner thereof," approved February 7, 1914, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 22–2721), is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. In any prosecution for violation of this Act or so much of the first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to confer concurrent jurisdiction on the police court of the District of Columbia in certain cases', approved July 16, 1912 (37 Stat. 192; D.C. Code, sec. 22–2722), as relates to the keeping of a bawdy or disorderly house, the court, upon application of the United States attorney made after such attorney has given notice thereof to the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia, may order any witness to testify or to produce evidence, or both. Upon such order of the court, such witness shall not be excused from testifying or from producing evidence on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture. But no such witness shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any act, transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he has been ordered to testify or to produce evidence after having claimed the privilege against self-incrimination, nor shall testimony or other evidence ordered to be given or produced under the provisions of this section be used as evidence in any criminal proceeding against him in any court. No witness shall be exempt under this section from prosecution for perjury or contempt committed in connection with giving testimony or producing evidence under order of the court as provided in this section."

SEC. 5. The last sentence of section 46 of the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 2-137), is further amended by striking out "by said United States District Attorney when instituted on behalf of the Commission, and" and by striking out "when instituted on behalf of the Commissioners of said District or by the major and superintendent of police of said District".

SEC. 6. The fourth sentence of section 8 of the Act entitled "An Act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia", approved February 9, 1907, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 2-407), is amended by striking out "United States Attorney for the District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof "Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia".

SEC. 7. Section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia", approved May 28, 1924 (D.C. Code, sec. 2-502), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Prosecutions for violations of this Act shall be conducted in the name of the District of Columbia by the Corporation Counsel."

SEC. 8. Section 9 of the Act entitled "An Act to create a board of accountancy for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved February 17, 1923 (D.C. Code, sec. 2-909), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Prosecutions for violations of this Act shall be conducted in the name of the District of Columbia by the Corporation Counsel.".

SEC. 9. (a) Sections 425 to 428, inclusive, of the Act entitled "An Act to revise and consolidate the statutes of the United States, general and permanent in their nature, relating to the District of Columbia, in force on the first day of December, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy-three", approved June 22, 1874 (D.C. Code, secs. 4-168—171, inclusive), are hereby repealed.

(b) The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall by regulation require that bonds in the amount of not more than $25,000 shall be furnished and kept in force by all persons licensed as private detectives in the District of Columbia. Bonds required by this section shall be corporate bonds and shall run to the District and shall be conditioned upon the observance by the licensed private detective and any agent, employee, or person acting in behalf of the licensed private detective of all laws and regulations in force in the District of Columbia applicable to the conduct of persons licensed as private detectives. Such bonds shall be for the benefit of any person who may suffer damages as a result of violation of any law or regulation by or on the part of any licensed private detective or any agent, employee, or person acting on the behalf of any private detective. In addition to any right to any other legal action, any person aggrieved by the violation of any law or regulation by a licensed private detective may bring suit against the surety on a bond required by this section either alone or jointly with the principal thereon and recover damages for such violation of law or regulation in an amount not to exceed the penal amount of the bond.

SEC. 10. The last sentence of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the conservation and settlement of estates of absentees and absconders in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 8, 1935, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 20-701), is amended by striking out "The United States attorney in and for the District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia".

SEC. 11. Sections 5 through 8, inclusive, and section 10 shall take effect thirty days from the approval of this Act, but shall not in any case apply to proceedings instituted prior to the approval of this Act. Section 9 of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first full license year for licensing of private detectives and detective agencies prescribed by section 7 of the Act approved July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 622, ch. 1352), as amended (sec. 47-2301, et seq., D.C. Code), which begins at least ninety days after approval of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 6, line 14, immediately after the period insert the following:

"The provisions of the second, third, and fifth subparagraphs of paragraph (b) of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to grant additional powers to the Commissioners, and for other purposes", approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 820, sec. 1-244(b), D.C. Code), shall be applicable to each bond authorized by this section as if it were the bond authorized by the first subparagraph of such paragraph (b): *Provided*, That nothing in this subsection shall be construed to impose upon the surety on any such bond a greater liability than the total amount thereof or the amount remaining unextinguished after any prior recovery or recoveries."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

PURPOSES OF THE BILL

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purposes of S. 1320 are first, to strengthen certain laws of the District of Columbia; second, to broaden the immunity statute of the District of Columbia so that it will conform with other Federal statutes; third, to provide for certain technical and procedural changes in matters essentially local in nature; and fourth, to permit the substitution of the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia as the moving party rather than the U.S. attorney in prosecutions involving violations of various acts relating to licensing and regulation of certain professions.

This bill is a continuation of the committee's efforts to clarify and improve the Criminal Code of the District of Columbia.

Sections 1 and 2 of this bill are designed to deal with the problem of vandalism by bringing the District statutes, dealing with the injury or destruction of property, up to date and make them more effective. In brief, the first section of the bill amends existing law (sec. 22-403, D.C. Code) relating to the crime of malicious injury or destruction of property by broadening it to cover real as well as personal property. This section increases from $50 to $200 the line of demarcation between misdemeanors and felony offenses. It also revises the penalties established for felony offenses involving malicious destruction of property by eliminating the mandatory minimum and maximum sentences of not less than 1 nor more than 10 years' imprisonment and substituting a term of imprisonment of not more than 10 years or a fine of not more than $5,000, or both. In addition the section increases the maximum fine for misdemeanors from the present $200 to a maximum of $1,000 and provides that imprisonment may be imposed along with a fine up to a maximum of 1 year.

As a complement to the change provided in the criminal code by section 1 of the bill, section 2 of the bill removes language from the disfigurement of property statute of the District of Columbia Code—section 22-3112—so as to make that statute relate specifically to offenses involving disfigurement of real property, and not operate as a general statute for the prosecution of offenses involving the willful destruction of real and personal property.

The third section of the bill broadens the existing kidnaping statute which now makes it unlawful only to hold a person for ransom or reward. This bill would make the statute applicable to those kidnapings in which the motive is lust, a desire for companionship, revenge, or some other motive not involving ransom or reward. In addition, this section would make the statute inapplicable to cases involving the taking of a minor child by one of the parents of such child. The committee has been informed that these proposed changes in existing District of Columbia law will bring its statute into closer conformity with the Federal statute on kidnaping.

The bill also will broaden the immunity privilege now granted to witnesses in civil cases relating to the abatement of disorderly house nuisances. It would authorize the granting of similar immunity in criminal prosecutions for keeping disorderly houses. Under this bill, the courts could, upon application, compel a witness to testify in a criminal prosecution, notwithstanding his claim of privilege under the fifth amendment. Witnesses who have been granted this immunity would remain subject to prosecution for perjury to contempt of court in connection with their testimony, but they could not be criminally prosecuted for any substantive offenses included in such testimony. This section will materially aid the prosecution of criminal charges for keeping bawdy or disorderly houses.

Sections 5, 6, 7, and 8 amend four acts regulating the practice of professions or occupations by substituting the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia for the U.S. attorney to prosecute criminal violations of certain of such acts and as the attorney to institute certain civil actions authorized by the Healing Arts Practice Act and the Registered Nurses Act of February 9, 1907, as amended. The committee is of the view that it is more appropriate for an official of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, rather than a Federal official, to perform these functions. For the same reason, section 10 transfers from the U.S. attorney to the Corporation Counsel the right to be a party to court proceedings seeking to subject the property of an absconder to the support of the absconder's wife and minor children, and to pay debts proved against him.

The amendment made by section 9 is designed to restate in existing law a requirement that private detectives be bonded. Such a provision existed in District law for many years and has been held to have been repealed by implication in 1932—47 Stat. 559, ch. 366. It is the view of your committee that the public should be entitled to some indemnification against damages resulting from improper activities on the part of private detectives. In accordance with a recommendation by the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, your committee added new language to section 9(b), to provide that the bond requirements for private detectives will conform with the presently existing requirements for bonding of automobile dealers and of persons engaged in the business of home improvement in the District. This language assures, however, that no liability in excess of the total amount of such bond, or of the amount remaining therein after any prior recovery, shall impose upon the surety of any such bond as a result of the provision cited above.

A public hearing was conducted on October 5, 1965, by Subcommittee No. 4. Approval was expressed on the part of the Department of Justice, the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, and the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. No opposition was expressed from any source.

A similar bill (S. 468) was approved by the Senate in the 88th Congress. The subject bill was passed by that body on August 20, 1965.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1. Destruction of property: This section would amend section 848 of the act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1327, ch. 854), as amended by the act approved August 12, 1937 (50 Stat. 629, ch. 599) (D.C. Code, sec. 22–403), by—

First. Removing the language which restricts the application of the section to property which is movable.

Second. Broadening the section to cover the malicious destruction of any property whether personal or real.

Third. Increasing the value line of demarcation between misdemeanors and felonies from $50 to $200.

Fourth. Increasing the maximum fine for misdemeanors from $200 to $1,000 and changing the penalty for felonies from the present mandatory minimum of 1 year and maximum of 10 years to a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 10 years or both.

The effects of the change would be to simplify prosecutions for malicious destruction of property and, by the change in penalties, to provide a more effective deterrent.

Section 2. Disfigurement of property: This section would amend section 1 of the act approved July 29, 1892 (27 Stat. 322, ch. 320), as amended by the act approved July 8, 1898 (30 Stat. 723, ch. 638), and by the act approved April 21, 1906 (34 Stat. 126, ch. 1647) (D.C. Code, sec. 22–3112), by—

First. Striking out the language which permits a defendant who has willfully or wantonly destroyed, broken, or injured property to be prosecuted under this section which relates principally to disfiguring of property and which subjects the offender to relatively minor punishment.

Second. Conforming the coverage of the section to the expanded coverage of section 1 of this act.

Section 3. Kidnaping: This section would amend section 812 of the act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1322, ch. 854), as amended by the act approved February 18, 1933 (47 Stat. 858, ch. 103) (D.C. Code, sec. 22–2102), by—

First. Conforming the existing local law relating to kidnaping, to the Federal statute applicable in all other Federal jurisdictions.

Second. Excepting parents, as regards their minor children, from the coverage of the statute.

Third. Broadening the local kidnaping statute which now makes punishable only a holding for ransom or reward to include instances where no ransom or reward is demanded but where the motive may be lust, a desire for companionship, revenge, or any other nonmonetary motivation.

Section 4. Immunity: This section would amend section 9 of the act approved February 7, 1914 (38 Stat. 282, ch. 16), as amended by section 1 of the act approved June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 909, ch. 646) (D.C. Code, sec. 22–2721), by—

First. Broadening the coverage of the section, now applicable only to civil actions relating to the abatement of the nuisances of disorderly houses to include criminal prosecutions for keeping disorderly houses.

Second. Granting authority to the courts upon application of the prosecutor to compel a witness to testify in a criminal prosecution for keeping a disorderly house notwithstanding his claim of privilege under the fifth amendment.

Third. Granting witnesses immunity from prosecution on the matters on which testimony was compelled, after a claim of privilege against self-incrimination.

Fourth. Subjecting such witnesses to whom immunity is granted to the ordinary possibilities of prosecution for perjury or contempt of court committed in connection with their testimony.

Fifth. Harmonizing this local immunity statute to comparable Federal law.

Section 5. Healing arts practices: This section would amend section 46 of the act approved February 29, 1929 (45 Stat. 1340 ch. 352), as amended by the act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 909, ch. 646) (D.C. Code, sec. 2–137), by—

First. Substituting the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia for the U.S. attorney as the party who shall conduct certain proceedings relating principally to the suspension or revocation of doctors' licenses; this follows naturally from a recent change effected by the District Commissioners in the composition of the District Commission on Licensure by which the Corporation Counsel was substituted for the U.S. attorney.

Section 6. Registered nurses: This section would amend section 6 of the act approved February 9, 1907 (34 Stat. 888, ch. 913), as amended by the act of March 2, 1929 (45 Stat. 1521, ch. 540), and the act of June 25, 1936 (49 Stat. 1921, ch. 804), and the act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 991, ch. 646), and the act of May 24, 1949 (63 Stat. 107, ch. 139) (D.C. Code, sec. 2–407), by—

First. Substituting the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia, for the U.S. attorney as the party who shall conduct certain proceedings relating principally to the suspension or revocation of nurses' licenses issued by a local board appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Section 7. Optometry: This section would amend section 2 of the act of May 28, 1924 (43 Stat, 177, ch, 202) (D.C. Code, sec. 2–502), by—

First. Designating the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia specifically as the prosecutor for misdemeanor violations of provisions concerning optometrists' licenses issued by a local board appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Section 8. Accountancy: This section would amend section 9 of the act approved February 17, 1923 (42 Stat. 1263, ch. 94) (D.C. Code, sec. 2–909), by—

First. Designating the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia specifically as the prosecutor for violations of provisions concerning accountants' licenses issued by a local board appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Section 9. Private detectives: Subsection (a) of this section would repeal sections 425 and 428, inclusive, of the act approved June 22, 1874 (R.S.D.C., secs. 425–428), as amended by the act of June 11, 1878 (20 Stat. 107, ch. 180) (D.C. Code, secs. 4–168 to 4–171, inclusive), relating to the appointment and bonding of private detectives. This amendment would not change existing law. The sections expressly repealed by the amendment have been given no effect since 1932 when they were repealed by implication and superseded by the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 559, ch. 366) (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2341).

Subsection (b) of this section will require that all private detectives and detective agencies licensed by the District of Columbia must furnish bonds for the protection of the public. Such bonds would be in the amount of not more than $25,000, as the Commissioners might, from time to time, establish by regulation. It is provided further that these bond requirements for private detectives shall conform with those existing in present law for automobile dealers and for persons engaged in the business of home improvement. However, this conformance cannot be construed to impose upon the surety of such bond a liability in excess of its total amount, or the amount remaining unextinguished after any prior recovery.

Section 10. Estates of absentees and absconders: This section would amend section 1 of the act of April 8, 1935 (49 Stat. 111, ch. 46), as amended by the act of June 25, 1936 (49 Stat. 1921, ch. 804), and the act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 991, ch. 646), and the act of May 24, 1949 (63 Stat. 107, ch. 139) (D.C. Code 20–701). This amendment would have the effect of transferring what is essentially a local government function to the local government through its attorney, the Corporation Counsel. Under existing laws it is the District of Columbia, not the United States, to which estates normally escheat and by which support payments are made. The amendment would grant specifically to the District of Columbia the right to be made a party in every proceeding where one seeks to place in receivership property of absentees or absconders who—

A. Have left the District without making provision for the support of their dependents, and

B. Whose assets are treated under certain circumstances as if the absentee had died intestate.

Section 11. Effective date: Sections 5 through 8, inclusive, and section 10 shall take effect 30 days from the approval of this act, but shall not apply to proceedings instituted prior to the approval of this act.

Section 9 shall take effect on the first day of the first full license year for licensing of private detectives and detective agencies prescribed by section 7 of the act approved July 1, 1902.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WATERFRONT PRIORITY HOLDERS

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 11428) to amend the act of September 8, 1960, relating to the Washington Channel waterfront, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11428

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (1) the first sentence of section 4(b) of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the United States to transfer from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency title to certain real property in said District", approved September 8, 1960 (D.C. Code, sec. 5–723), is amended by striking out "by reason of the enactment of the joint resolution approved August 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 983; Public Law 85–821),".

(2) The second sentence of section 4(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "by reason of the operation of such joint resolution approved August 28, 1958,".

(3) The last sentence in section 4(b) of such Act is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "except that if after the end of such one-hundred-and-eighty-day period the Agency shall change the terms under which real property is to be leased, or the redevelopment plan for the area described in the first section of this Act is changed so as to affect the economic value of the leasehold, the Agency shall in writing notify each such owner of the change or changes so made and give to such owner so notified a period of sixty days within which to advise the Agency in writing of his intention and to demonstrate his ability to proceed as aforesaid."

(4) Section 4 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, whenever, pursuant to subsection (b), the Agency offers leaseholds to persons entitled to a priority of opportunity to lease under the provisions of this section, the rent per square foot prescribed in such lease shall not be greater than 6 per centum of the residual value of the land for the prescribed use to which any owner of a displaced business concern shall put such land under such lease; and the residual value of such land (1) shall make due allowance for the cost to the owner of the displaced business of all improvements and public charges on such land, and (2) shall not exceed the maximum fair use value economically feasible to permit him to reestablish his business."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 22, strike out "the rent" and insert in lieu thereof "the annual rent".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, H.R. 11428, is to amend the act of September 8, 1960 (74 Stat. 871), relating to the Washington Channel waterfront, by providing supplementary directives to the Redevelopment Land Agency of the District of Columbia for the relocation of displaced businesses in conformity with the urban renewal development plans for the waterfront portion of area C, urban renewal project in Southwest Washington.

HISTORY OF THE LEGISLATION

The Washington Channel waterfront of the Potomac River, title to which area was in the United States, was included within the boundaries of the project area C of the urban renewal redevelopment plan for Southwest Washington. This area, owned by the Federal Government, had, for a long period of years, been under the jurisdiction and control of the government of the District of Columbia. In 1913, on part of the waterfront area, the District of Columbia erected a fish market building and leased the market stalls to the fish dealers and to restaurant operators.

As a part of the redevelopment program for Southwest Washington, the Southwest Freeway was to run through the project area, and one of the approaches to the freeway was to pass over Maine Avenue at 11th and 12th Streets and part of the supporting structures would have to be located on the land occupied by the market building.

ACTION IN 55TH CONGRESS

To facilitate this redevelopment, legislation was introduced and passed in the 85th Congress—House Journal Resolution 630, 72 Stat. 983—to authorize the use of the land and the removal of the market facilities. At your committee hearings on this legislation, the representatives of the government of the District of Columbia and of the Redevelopment Land Agency presented testimony as to the need for the legislation. At the same hearings, the owners of small businesses which had occupied the market building, in some instances for more than a generation, testified concerning the effect of the legislation upon their businesses. These lessees of the market building proposed amendments to the pending legislation which would have provided for their relocation and continuation in business on the Washington Channel waterfront. The suggested amendments would have required the government of the District of Columbia to build facilities for lease solely to those displaced by the freeway construction or the urban renewal plan. In view of the testimony and a commitment by representatives of the Redevelopment Land Agency to provide temporary and permanent locations for businesses which might be displaced, your committee did not approve the proposed amendments and observed, in its report accompanying House Joint Resolution 630 (H. Rept. No. 2525, 85th Cong., 2d sess.) as follows:

> The committee was convinced from testimony given to the subcommittee by representatives of the Redevelopment Land Agency for the District of Columbia that a sincere desire existed to take every possible step to provide temporary and permanent locations for businesses which might be displaced by this legislation.
>
> The committee feels that this objective can be best obtained if a spirit of cooperation is manifested between the Redevelopment Land Agency, Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the tenants who might be involved.
>
> The committee urges all concerned to deal in the spirit of cooperation. If the committee feels that this is not being done it will take the matter up subsequently for consideration and possible legislation.

Following the enactment of this legislation in 1958, the construction of the approaches to the Southwest Freeway began and the Redevelopment Land Agency thereafter undertook the demolition and removal of the facilities in the project area.

In order to exercise full authority over the Washington Channel waterfront and to redevelop it according to the urban renewal plan, it was necessary for the Redevelopment Land Agency to secure authority transferring title to the waterfront area from the Federal Government to the Agency before it could legally proceed with redevelopment.

ACTION IN 86TH CONGRESS

Accordingly, legislation was introduced in the 2d session of the 86th Congress authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, acting for the U.S. Government, to transfer and donate to the Redevelopment Land Agency all right, title, and interest to so much of the area as was necessary to carry out the urban renewal plan. Such legislation—S. 3648; 74 Stat. 871—was first passed by the other body and came on to your committee for further action.

During hearings on the above bill, testimony was again received from the District of Columbia officials, the Redevelopment Land Agency, and the owners of displaced businesses in the waterfront area. Witnesses testifying before your committee indicated clearly that essentially nothing had been accomplished since the enactment of House Joint

Resolution 630 in 1958, for the permanent relocation of the businesses displaced from the waterfront area and only one had been provided with a temporary location. The Redevelopment Land Agency advised your committee that negotiations were in process with some businesses. These businesses were identified as the Flagship Restaurant and Hogate's Restaurant.

Since no relocation was in prospect for the waterfront displacees pursuant to the statements of the Redevelopment Land Agency, your committee amended the terms of S. 3648 to provide that displacees from the waterfront area would be given a priority of relocation with the understanding that the priority would likewise extend to the Flagship Restaurant and to Hogate's Restaurant.

That bill, S. 3648, as amended and enacted, provided that displaced businesses would receive priority of opportunity to lease land either individually or as a development company solely owned by the owner or owners of one or more of such business concerns. The displaced businesses were to be entitled to facilities at least substantially equal to the facilities from which they were displaced and to be in conformity with the urban renewal plan for the area. The Redevelopment Land Agency was to notify each of the displaced business concerns of an opportunity to lease a parcel of land within the waterfront area. Each business was to be allowed 180 days within which to indicate its intent to relocate in the area and to demonstrate its capability to establish facilities in accordance with the development plan.

The purpose of directing the Agency to provide such priorities was to make effective the previous pledges of the Redevelopment Land Agency, and the acceptance of those pledges by the Congress, that those businesses displaced from the area would have a reasonable and first opportunity to reestablish their businesses. The priority right was provided solely for the benefit of displacees who were ready, willing, and able to reestablish their business, and such right was not to be available for transfer, sale, or disposition otherwise in full or in part to other persons.

WATERFRONT REDEVELOPMENT PLANS

Development of urban renewal plans for the Washington Channel waterfront dates from the original commitment in 1954 of the waterfront area to the Webb & Knapp Co., which later completely defaulted in its performance. After several attempts, a plan for the waterfront was approved by the National Capital Planning Commission and the District of Columbia Commissioners. The execution of the plan then become the obligation of the Redevelopment Land Agency. Early in the 88th Congress your committee held hearings on the waterfront plan. Testimony taken by the committee at that time created substantial doubts as to the feasibility and desirability of the plan. Owners of displaced businesses presented specific criticisms although none of them, at that time, had been informed concerning the probable nature of any leases which might be offered to them.

About 1 year later, in February 1964, the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency issued notice to business displacees having priority for relocation. This notice advised the holders of priorities that they would have a period of 180 days within which to indicate their purpose to exercise their priority and to demonstrate their capacity to reestablish their businesses and construct facilities in accordance with the waterfront redevelopment plan. Priority holders were also notified concerning the terms of leases and other performances to be required of them by the Agency.

On examining the terms of the leases offered, the priority holders found themselves presented with an economic impossibility. The leaseholds offered to displacees were essentially "air rights." They were required to construct parking facilities underneath the business area, and such parking facilities were to be available to the public.

Thus, individual businesses, while providing parking space, could not reserve such space, limited as it was, for its own customers. The building, which must conform to the waterfront plan, had to be financed and built by the owner and was to be occupied for a limited period of years, at the end of which time the property right in the building rested with the Redevelopment Land Agency. The nature of the use of any structure was strictly limited to the purposes of the displaced business. Substantial setbacks from the boundaries of each parcel were required. The height of the building was limited to two floors.

The land values established by the Agency, as a basis for determining the lease rental rates to priority holders, was set by the Agency at a level far exceeding that set for most other parcels in the Southwest urban renewal project area. When this land cost was added to other charges placed on a priority holder, it appeared conclusive that no displaced business, regardless of its financial strength, could hope to operate at a profit.

After a record on these matters had been established with the Agency, the Agency reduced the land costs to the displacees by approximately 10 percent. This action proved to be a gesture since most, if not all, the displacees found the Agency's proposal economically impossible, regardless of the financial abilities of the displaced businesses.

During the 180-day period beginning in February 1964, displacees who were interested in relocation on the waterfront so notified the Agency. Thereafter, conferences and discussions between priority holders and the Agency were held. At the expiration of the 180-day period, no lease contracts had been executed, and, in fact, the priority holders had not been offered any specific parcels for relocation.

Thereafter, your committee held additional hearings in connection with the waterfront relocation problem, the latest of which were in March, April, and May of this year. At these subsequent hearings, further testimony was received from displaced businesses. Your committee also took the testimony of banking officials and private appraisers with relation to the valuations placed upon the waterfront land and the economic feasibility of financing a structure under the terms of leases proposed by the Agency.

The banking representatives advised the committee that such a lease as proposed by the Agency was wholly unsuitable as a basis on which to grant financing to displacees for the construction and equipment of the necessary buildings.

Testimony by expert appraisers indicated that the land prices established by RLA were probably at least double any reasonable appraisal under the limitations imposed as to land coverage, parking requirements, floor area, and usage.

The Redevelopment Land Agency, in the face of expert testimony showing that the terms of the lease were economically impossible, initiated a review of the land appraisals for possible further adjustment. Such appraisal was completed in May 1965, but the priority holders have received no further word from the Agency indicating the possibility of further negotiations.

Since the 180-day period provided by statute had run out and no contracts had been completed, some question appeared as to whether priority rights might be extinguished or otherwise lost in the event the Agency were to make a change in the waterfront plans or a change in the land price or conditions of lease. To avoid such possibility and to further supplement the already abundantly expressed intent of Congress as to the relocation of displaced waterfront businesses, your committee recommends approval of this legislation.

WHAT THE BILL PROVIDES

Briefly, the bill provides for equal priority rights to all businesses displaced from the waterfront area, some of which were inadvertently not included in Public Law 86-736. Those previously not entitled to notice are to receive notice of an opportunity to exercise a priority right for reestablishment of their businesses.

Your committee considers that no priority right of any displacee who has, pursuant to notice, indicated his desire to reestablish his business has been extinguished.

Further, in the event of any change in the waterfront plan or in the land price or other matters which affect the economic values of a lease, each priority holder must be notified and given at least 60 days within which to exercise his priority rights.

In view of the problems which have been described heretofore, your committee is impelled to deal, at least generally, with the matter of setting for displaced businesses some criteria to be followed by the RLA in the appraisal of parcels of land made available for relocation. Because of the numerous requirements and limitations placed upon the use of the land and upon the waterfront priority holder, this becomes essential.

Accordingly, in section 4 of the bill, the Agency is directed to use specific procedures for the establishment of land values in the waterfront area, and it must take into account the limitations and make proper allowances for improvements and any public charges placed upon the land which must be assumed by the priority holder. Further, it is provided that any valuation placed upon the land shall not exceed the maximum fair use value which is economically feasible and which will permit the reestablishment of the business. These elements are essentially those used by competent appraisers. The principles are found in standard appraisal reference publications under the heading of residual appraisals—Real Estate Appraisal and Investment, Kahn, Case, and Schimmel, page 146; McMichaels Appraising Manual, 4th edition, 11th printing, page 4223.

Your committee also observes that residual appraisals have been used elsewhere by the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency in its disposition of urban renewal lands. It is felt that such appraisal methods, if not the only suitable methods, are certainly one of the best and fully justifiable in connection with relocation of small businesses on land on the Washington Channel waterfront.

The bill specifies an annual lease rental at the rate of 6 percent of the residual value of the land. Your committee is aware of instances where the lease rate was less than the rate of 6 percent of the fair value and is unaware of any instance where the rate has been in excess of 6 percent. If such rate is adequate for purposes of the Agency elsewhere in the District of Columbia, then it should be an equally suitable rate in the waterfront channel area. Since the parcels of land are to be leased to waterfront displacees and must be developed according to the waterfront plan with the usage controlled by the Agency pursuant to such plan, your committee believes that the lease rates proposed and the appraisal methods called for are fair and just to the public interest and the displaced business concerns.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] who will call up a revenue bill.

PROVIDING ADDITIONAL REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill—H.R. 11487—to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11487

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1965".

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INCOME AND FRANCHISE TAX ACT OF 1947

SEC. 101. Section 3 of title VI of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as amended (61 Stat. 331; D.C. Code, sec. 47–1567b(a)), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. IMPOSITION AND RATES OF TAX.—There is hereby annually levied and imposed for each taxable year upon the taxable income of every resident a tax at the following rates:

"Two and one-half per centum on the first $2,000 of taxable income.

"Three per centum on the next $2,000 of taxable income.

"Three and one-half per centum on the next $2,000 of taxable income.

"Four per centum on the next $2,000 of taxable income.

"Four and one-half per centum on the next $2,000 of taxable income.

"Five per centum on the taxable income in excess of $10,000."

SEC. 102. The amendment made by section 101 of this title shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1965.

SEC. 103. Effective with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1961, section 4 of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1551c) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(aa) Notwithstanding subsection (m), any distribution in liquidation of a regulated public utility (as defined in section 7701(a)(33)(A)(iii) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) which, for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, is treated as in part or full payment in exchange for the stock in such utility, shall, if for purposes of this article the stock is a capital asset, be treated as in part or full payment in exchange for the stock."

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO THE MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX

SEC. 201. The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for a tax on motor vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved April 23, 1924 (43 Stat. 106; D.C. Code, sec. 47–1901), as amended, is amended by striking "6" and inserting in lieu thereof "7".

SEC. 202. The amendment made by section 201 of this title shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins more than thirty days after the date of approval of this Act.

TITLE III—ABATEMENT OF TAXES

SEC. 301. The Commissioners are authorized to abate the unpaid portion of the assessment of any tax, or any liability in respect thereof, other than taxes on real property, if the Commissioners determine under uniform rules prescribed by them that the administration and collection costs involved would not warrant collection of the amount due.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. Subsection (a) of section 402 of the District of Columbia Public Works Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 110; D.C. Code, sec. 7–133((a)) is amended by striking "$50,250,000" and inserting in lieu thereof $85,250,000".

SEC. 402. As used in this Act, unless the context requires otherwise, the word "Commissioners" shall mean the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or its designated agent.

SEC. 403. Any word or term used in any title of this Act, unless the context requires otherwise, shall have the same meaning as that applicable to such word or term in the Act to which such title applies.

SEC. 404. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the Act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 405. The Commissioners are authorized to make rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 406. The Commissioners are authorized to enter into such agreements with the States of Maryland and Virginia and with political subdivisions of such States as may be necessary to develop a continuing comprehensive transportation planning process for the National Capital region for the purpose of complying with the requirements of section 134 of title 23, United States Code, except that no such agreement shall require the District of Columbia to pay more than its pro rata share of the costs of such planning process. In developing such transportation planning process the Commissioners shall consult and cooperate with the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council. For the purpose of this section, the term "National Capital region" shall have the same meaning as is given it in section 103 of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 537; D.C. Code, sec. 1–1401).

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the purposes of H.R. 11487 are as follows:

PURPOSES OF THE BILL

First. To increase the District of Columbia income tax revenues.

Second. To increase the District of Columbia tax on motor vehicle fuels from 6 to 7 cents per gallon.

Third. To increase the borrowing authority of the District for highway construction from $50,250,000 to $85,250,000, an increase of $35 million.

Fourth. To authorize the District of Columbia Commissioners to abate the unpaid portion of any tax when, in their judgment, the amount of money involved would not warrant the cost of collection.

Fifth. To authorize the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners to participate with Maryland and Virginia authorities in comprehensive planning for transportation facilities for the National Capital region.

NEED FOR INCREASED REVENUES

The revenue increases provided in H.R. 11487 were requested by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. In making their request, the Commissioners stated that increased expenditures will be necessary in many fields if the District is to maintain the level of services and the facilities needed if the city is to fulfill its function as the Nation's Capital.

It is estimated, for example, that by 1971 some 167,000 children will be enrolled in the public school system, which is an increase of 18 percent over the present enrollment of 142,000. Thus, in addition to eliminating part-time sessions and providing suitable physical facilities in the years ahead, it will be necessary to provide a considerable number of new teaching positions in the years ahead so as to maintain approved pupil-teacher ratios throughout the system.

The operating costs per year of public education in the District rose $28.6 million over the period 1959–65. Aside from general actions on personnel which accounted for $15.9 million of this increase, two other major factors led to higher costs for education. The first of these was the necessity to provide 1,035 additional teachers to educate 29,000 more pupils in 1965 than in 1959. The second was the city's effort, supported by the Congress, to achieve a relationship of pupils to teachers in regular classes of 30 to 1 in elementary schools and 25 to 1 in secondary schools. It is apparent that an additional increment in these costs for purposes of improving education will be needed for the years ahead.

Your committee is of the opinion that the District of Columbia school administration's efforts in the matter of school operating costs have been highly effective, in keeping the Nation's Capital abreast of other cities of comparable size in this very vital respect, as is indicated in the following chart:

Current (operating) expenditures per pupil in average daily membership in school years 1956–57 and 1962–63, in public school systems of U.S. cities whose populations in the 1960 census were between 500,000 and 1,000,000; and relative rank of District of Columbia in each

City	1956–57	1962–63	Increase
District of Columbia	(No. 6) $328	(No. 2) $459	(No. 1) $131
Baltimore	281	409	128
Cleveland	311	388	77
Houston	228	326	98
San Francisco	410	516	106
New Orleans	242	269	27
Boston	326	407	81
St. Louis	332	411	79
Milwaukee	321	386	65
Cincinnati	320	[1] 401	81
Pittsburgh	358	403	45
Buffalo	364	447	83
Dallas	324	313	89
Seattle	(2)	445	----------
San Diego	307	430	123
San Antonio	205	[3] 270	65

[1] Expenditure is for school year 1961–62.

[2] Not available.

[3] Based on average daily membership for school year 1961–62.

Sources: "Current Expenditures Per Pupil in Public School Systems," by U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. "Selected Statistics of Local School Systems, 1962–63," by Research Division, National Education Association.

The Commissioners also pointed out that the District must go forward with necessary health and welfare programs, and that matching funds will be essential in order that the District may utilize many such programs as approved by Congress. The need for these extensive health and welfare services arises in large part from age and income characteristics of its citizens, just as does the need for expenditures for educational facilities and services. Your committee was advised that the major rise in costs of public health in the District since 1959 was due to increased costs of patient care. The care of District mental patients and the indigent sick, for example, account for a $6.6 million increase in the public health budget during the past 6 fiscal years. We are told that in District of Columbia General Hospital, the cost per patient-day rose from $24.04 in 1959 to $45 this year because of increased staffing, higher salaries, and increased costs of medical supplies and other materials. Because of this continued sharply rising cost of care per patient-day, a further increase of $2 million is projected for the care of indigent sick at contract and Freedmen's hospitals over the period from 1966 to 1971. In addition, it has been necessary to increase the public health budget by $1.7 million since 1959 to accommodate the increase in workload and to improve services in all phases of this activity.

Your committee is informed that the District of Columbia projects its financial plans ahead for 6 years. It is of interest, therefore, to note that the District of Columbia general fund operating budget is $100.3 million higher in 1965 than it was in 1959, and the general fund capital outlay budget was $10.5 million greater in 1965 than in 1959.

Of the $100.3 million increase in the operating budget during this 6-year period, $56.6 million can be attributed to general personnel legislation such as pay raises and step increases. Without counting a single additional employee, your committee is told, payroll costs rose by $38.4 million as a result of salary increases. Within-grade promotions raised personnel costs by $7.7 million, and the extension of greater employee health benefits and other costs further increased the budget by $2 million. The cost of funding retirement systems for policemen, firemen, and teachers rose $8.5 million. The District of Columbia Commissioners state that they have supported these actions in the interest of attracting and maintaining high-caliber personnel in District government service.

The District of Columbia Commissioners are of the opinion that the future portends a continuation of this trend of the past. By 1971, therefore, they predict that District government expenditures will be about $70 million higher than the estimate for fiscal 1966.

The following are two charts, the first of which shows the number of authorized positions in the District of Columbia government for each fiscal year from 1954 through 1965 and also the total gross payroll for each fiscal year. Also shown are the numerical and percent increases in each of these figures during this period of 11 years.

The second chart indicates the total percent increase in salaries for the several types of personnel in the District of Columbia, for the same period of time.

These figures reveal an increase of 47.5 percent in the number of authorized positions, and an increase of 132.5 percent in the total gross payroll, over this period, with the greatest percent salary increase being 53.1 percent to teachers.

District of Columbia government employment statistics, fiscal years 1954–65

Fiscal year	Number of authorized permanent positions	Total gross payroll
1954	19,818	$82,575,105
1955	20,686	89,673,840
1956	21,181	97,094,671
1957	21,995	102,558,852
1958	23,127	[1] 116,688,138
1959	23,794	[1] 124,672,939
1960	24,479	[1] 134,610,294
1961	25,363	143,611,577
1962	26,229	149,014,318
1963	27,253	156,985,278
1964	28,430	168,581,746
1965	29,242	[2] 192,000,000
Numerical increase	9,424	109,424,895
Percent increase	47.5	132.5

[1] Calendar year figures.

[2] Estimated.

Salary increases authorized by Congress for District of Columbia government personnel since 1954

Type of personnel	Percent increase
Classified personnel	38.8
Police and firemen	49.3
Teachers and school officers	53.1
Wage board personnel	43.3

Source: District of Columbia Personnel Office; District of Columbia Budget Office.

The District of Columbia Commissioners have advised your committee that the increase of $35 million in the borrowing authority for highway construction purposes provided in title IV of this bill, and the estimated annual increase of $2 million in revenues to the highway fund which would result from the increase of 1 cent per gallon in the gasoline tax provided in title II, are essential to meet the immediate financial requirements of the District's program of highway construction and maintenance. Further, they advise that after fiscal year 1968, even these sources of increased funds will cease to be adequate.

The following letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, under date of February 3, 1965, requesting these provisions of the bill, and the ensuing exhibit submitted to your committee from the District of Columbia Department of Highways and Traffic, present this situation in detail.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, February 3, 1965.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to submit herewith a draft bill to increase the loan authorization for the construction of District of Columbia highways and to increase the District of Columbia motor vehicle fuel tax. This draft proposes that the motor vehicle fuel tax be increased by 1 cent per gallon and that the existing ceiling on the loan authority for highway construction be increased by $35 million for the purpose of providing the revenues necessary to continue the urgently needed highway construction program in the District of Columbia.

The increasing volumes of traffic and the resulting congestion in the city are critical, and require continued large-scale construction. A major factor in the solution to this problem is the proposed Interstate Highway System in the District of Columbia. The system has been planned on the assumption that the complete areawide transit system proposed in the November 1962 Report of the National Capital Transportation Agency will likewise be constructed and utilized to the full extent predicted by the National Capital Transportation Agency. Both systems are urgently needed.

The review of the District's proposed Interstate System cost estimates this past summer, as required by section 104(b)(5) of title 23, United States Code, indicate that the entire cost of the program will be in excess of $600 million, rather than the $500 million in prior estimates. Right-of-way costs are rising. Certain additions have been made, such as a 40-percent extension in the length of the center leg tunnel under the Mall. Construction costs have been rising at the average rate of 3 percent per year, and certain sections of the system were estimated in initial studies on the basis of 1960 costs.

The District of Columbia costs for the proposed Interstate System, financed from the highway fund, will be approximately $60 million. Additional expenditures from the highway fund will also be needed to complete the supporting and connecting thoroughfare work necessary to make the Interstate System effective. In addition, local streets and facilities need to be constructed and rebuilt.

The estimated total cost during the next 6 years of constructing, maintaining, and operating the road system in the District, including related activities such as motor vehicle administration and payment of debt, is $528 million. This requires local funds totaling $182 million, of which an estimated $36 million are required for the proposed interstate program. Capital improvements on the continuing primary and secondary Federal-aid system (the so-called A-B-C program), participated in on a 50-50 basis, will require approximately $22 million of the District of Columbia highway funds during the same period. Also included is a capital improvement program for local streets not on the Federal systems, totaling $22 million during the 6-year period.

It is estimated that $68 million in addition to funds now anticipated from present sources will be required during the next 6 years for these programs, as shown in the 6-year financial plan attached. Existing legislation falls $4.7 million short of providing the funds necessary to continue these programs in fiscal 1966. In order to meet the immediate financial requirements for carrying out these programs, the Commissioners recommend that there be an increase in the existing loan authority from the present ceiling of $50.25 million to $85.25 million. At the same time, the Commissioners recommend an increase in the District of Columbia motor vehicle fuel tax from the present 6 cents to 7 cents per gallon, which would increase the annual revenues of the highway fund by an estimated $2 million annually. The proposed fuel tax increase would make the District of Columbia tax equal to the motor vehicle fuel taxes presently in effect in the Commonwealth of Virginia and the State of Maryland.

With this additional revenue from the fuel tax, the highway fund will be able to meet current operations and debt service, as well as a portion of the capital improvement program. The major portion of the local funds needed for capital outlays, however, would come from the proposed loan. After fiscal 1968, the increased current revenues and loan authorization would again cease to be adequate. Current plans and estimates indicate a deficit of approximately $4.9 million in fiscal 1969, of $8.6 million in fiscal 1970, of $7.7 million in fiscal 1971, and of about $6.5 million subsequent to 1971.

The Commissioners recognize their responsibility to propose measures to the Congress to deal with these anticipated deficits. In their opinion, however, these longer term solutions can be more appropriately adopted at a later date in order that new taxes or other proposals be most appropriate in the context of the conditions that may then exist. Appropriate solutions, taking into account the capacity of the District to support additional taxes or additional borrowing, can be developed to bridge the gap between needs and resources as the critical time approaches. By way of example, an increase in motor vehicle registration fees and a further increase in the motor vehicle fuel tax can perhaps be considered. This, as well as other possibilities, will be carefully examined by the Commissioners with a view to presenting recommendations to the Congress in ample time to meet anticipated highway fund revenue needs for fiscal year 1969 and later. The solution proposed will necessarily consist of additional tax revenues as well as a balanced borrowing program to assist in financing capital costs.

Meanwhile, the Commissioners strongly urge enactment of the legislation submitted with this letter, since the early provision of adequate new revenues is essential to continuing these programs.

The Commissioners have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that the enactment of this legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Department of Highways and Traffic—Projection of revenues and charges reflecting proposed increases in gasoline tax and loan authority, 1966 through 1971, highway fund, May 18, 1965

[In thousands of dollars]

	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	6-year total
Revenues and balances:							
Balances:							
Unappropriated surplus	1, 228	114	--------	--------	--------	--------	1, 342
Lapsed balances, prior year appropriations	270	150	150	150	150	150	1, 020
Total balances	1, 498	264	150	150	150	150	2, 362
Revenues:							
Gasoline tax (6 cents per gallon)	13, 600	13, 700	13, 800	13, 900	14, 000	14, 200	83, 200
Registration and weight tax	2, 600	2, 600	2, 700	2, 700	2, 800	2, 900	16, 300
Motor vehicle fees	970	980	980	1, 055	1, 055	1, 100	6, 140
Miscellaneous	467	470	470	545	545	550	3, 047
Federal-aid reimbursements (E projects)	1, 298	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	1, 298
Total revenues	18, 935	17, 750	17, 950	18, 200	18, 400	18, 750	109, 985
Federal loan (present authority)	3, 912	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	3, 912
Total available funds	24, 345	18, 014	18, 100	18, 350	18, 550	18, 900	116, 259
Estimated funds required:							
Operating expenses:							
Department of Highways and Traffic	6, 841	7, 100	7, 200	7, 400	7, 600	7, 750	43, 891
Metropolitan Police	3, 576	3, 600	3, 600	3, 600	3, 600	3, 600	21, 576
Department of Motor Vehicles	1, 965	2, 000	2, 000	2, 150	2, 150	2, 150	12, 415
Miscellaneous expenses	608	500	500	500	500	500	3, 108
Total operating expenses	12, 990	13, 200	13, 300	13, 650	13, 850	14, 000	80, 990
Capital outlay:							
Major improvements projects	9, 390	13, 850	13, 707	8, 715	6, 773	5, 860	58, 295
Street improvements and extensions	3, 700	3, 700	3, 700	3, 700	3, 700	3, 700	22, 200
Total, capital outlay	13, 090	17, 550	17, 407	12, 415	10, 473	9, 560	80, 495
Repayment of loan and interest (present authority)	2, 151	2, 623	2, 932	2, 932	2, 922	2, 932	16, 502
Total funds required	28, 231	33, 373	33, 639	28, 997	27, 255	26, 492	177, 987
Deficit (present authority)	(3, 886)	(15, 359)	(15, 539)	(10, 647)	(8, 705)	(7, 592)	(61, 728)
Additional loan repayment	--------	--------	118	905	1, 709	2, 060	4, 792
Adjusted deficit	(3, 886)	(15, 359)	(15, 657)	(11, 552)	(10, 414)	(9, 652)	(66, 520)
Additional gasoline tax (1 cent per gallon)	2, 000	2, 000	2, 000	2, 000	2, 000	2, 000	12, 000
Additional loan authority	2, 000	13, 359	13, 657	5, 984	--------	--------	35, 000
Additional funds proposed, total	4, 000	15, 359	15, 657	7, 984	2, 000	2, 000	47, 000
Surplus/deficit	114	--------	--------	(3, 568)	(8, 414)	(7, 652)	(19, 520)

In presenting legislation to accomplish needed revenue increases in the District of Columbia, your committee has striven to select taxes which may be increased with the least detrimental effect upon the long-range economic well-being of the District and its taxpayers. It is our studied opinion that these are the personal income tax and the present levy upon motor vehicle fuel. Although the increases in these taxes here proposed will result in a heavier tax burden on District of Columbia residents, these higher taxes will be generally in line with similar tax burdens imposed by surrounding jurisdictions.

These increases, together with $7 million available from the presently authorized Federal contribution of $50 million—of which only $43 million has been appropriated this year—will provide a cushion to absorb any further immediate expenditure needs the District government may be able to justify before the Committee on Appropriations. Also, the District thus far has used only $128.7 million of the $175 million borrowing authority authorized by the Congress for public works construction purposes.

In the course of hearings on the bill, your committee received detailed testimony in support of and in opposition to title IV, which provides increased borrowing authority for the highway fund. The approval of this title by your committee is made because of the importance attached to the measure by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and by the President. No attempt is made to determine the relative merits of the differing views expressed during committee hearings. Rather, your committee considers this bill as a revenue measure and not an authorization for any specific project included in estimates for capital outlay.

The action by your committee is premised on the expectation that those officials and agencies which bear the responsibility for the planning and construction of highways in the District of Columbia will consider most carefully the many elements presented during the committee hearings. No presumption is to be drawn that the approval of the borrowing authority means that it must be used, or that present authority or limitations applying to the planning and construction of highways is changed in any way. In the event any additional legislative authority may be required, beyond that provided in the District of Columbia Code, for the execution of meritorious projects, your committee expects that proposals requesting such authority be transmitted to the Congress for consideration.

Your committee again confirms its support of a balanced transportation system for the Nation's Capital. It is likewise recognized that determination of the element of "balance" between the diverse interests—within the city of Washington—calls for the highest good faith, forthrightness, and cooperation between the various officials and agencies charged with such responsibility and duty in the Nation's Capital and to its citizens.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Following the completion of hearings on this bill, your committee was advised that the Board of Commissioners had approved a resolution calling for participation by the District of Columbia in a continuing comprehensive transportation planning process for the National Capital region. Although, for several years, the District of Columbia has cooperated with officials of State and local government jurisdictions of the adjoining States of Virginia and Maryland on matters related to transportation planning, Congress had given no legislative authorization to the Board of Commissioners to engage in or secure appropriations for the activities called for in the resolution.

Because of the stated need for participation by the District of Columbia in such planning processes to comply with the provisions—section 134 of title 23, United States Code—relating to interstate planning on Federal-aid highway projects, section 406 was added by your committee to the reported legislation. This section approves the action previously taken by the Board of Commissioners and authorizes appropriations to the District government for its pro rata share of the costs of such transportation planning process. This is to avoid any question as to the eligibility of the District of Columbia for Federal highway aid.

Under the agreement between the District of Columbia and the surrounding jurisdictions, a Transportation Planning Board is established. The voting membership of this Board, established prior to the approval of the resolution by the Commissioners, is composed of the three area highway directors, three elected officials from suburban Maryland, three elected officials from suburban Virginia, three representatives selected by the District Commissioners, and one representative of the Federal Government appointed by the President. Nonvoting members represent the Bureau of Public Roads, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the National Capital Transportation Agency, and the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission.

Since the Congress will not have had any opportunity to review either the adequacy and balance of the representation for the Federal and District interest on the Transportation Planning Board or to review the agenda of the Board established in advance of the District becoming a party to the agreement, it is the intent of the committee that the authorization provided in section 406 shall not be construed as approval of any plans which may be developed by the Planning Board or as any limitation on or repeal of provisions of previous enactments by Congress for comprehensive transportation planning in the National Capital Planning Act of 1952, the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960, and the Highway Extension Act of 1893, as amended.

COMMUNITY DISLOCATIONS

The committee strongly urges that maximum effort be made to minimize the hardship of families displaced by highway construction. The Central Relocation Service must redouble their efforts to help displaced families. District officials must encourage the development of housing units for lower and middle income families. Full authority must be exercised to alleviate the current crisis situation that exists with respect to housing in the District.

The location and design of future highways must minimize the impact on homes and residential communities whenever feasible. Imagination and innovation must be the watchwords of the highway planners. Maximum use of tunneling and utilization of airspace above highways for playgrounds and schools should be encouraged if feasible.

A poorly planned freeway can be a terribly disruptive factor in a local community. Use of existing rights-of-way, locations of routes beside and over railroad tracks and along natural boundaries, such as rivers must be given first priority by highway planners. Construction of freeways or highways in industrial or commercial areas, particularly those past their economic prime, should be actively considered as an alternative to locations in residential areas.

Full consideration must be given to alternative routes which would minimize the impact of construction on residential communities. Federal officials are urged to cooperative fully with District officials and, to the extent possible, make federally owned land available if it is not in use.

Finally, in view of these deep concerns of your committee and other related issues which bulked large in committee hearings, there are indications of a real need for restudy and reevaluation of the highway program of the District of Columbia. Your committee has found that projections for highway needs for 1965 developed in the Mass Transportation Study of 1959 substantially exceeded actual traffic counts. Similarly, the projections of the National Capital Transportation Agency surpasses actual experience.

Analysis of traffic counts of crossing to and from the District of Columbia in recent years shows a declining ratio between population growth and daily trips. The forecasts and projections presented by highway officials cannot be reconciled reasonably with other information available to your committee. The projections and forecasts of future needs made by highway officials show trends contrary to actual experience and do not seem to justify some of the proposed program. Accordingly, a careful, objective review and reappraisal is desirable.

Such restudy should result in a highway system abundantly adequate for the needs of the Capital City and at the same time preserve as much as possible of the original character and beauty of the city with a minimum of inconvenience and dislocation to its citizens and its businesses.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

TITLE I

The effect of section 101 of title I is to increase District of Columbia income taxes. While the present rates of taxation are retained, the minimum levels of taxable income at which these several present rates apply have been reduced, as follows:

	Present	Proposed in H.R. 7066
2.5 percent on first	$5,000	$2,000
3 percent on next	5,000	2,000
3.5 percent on next	5,000	2,000
4 percent on next	5,000	2,000
4.5 percent on next	5,000	2,000
5 percent on all in excess of	25,000	10,000

While this legislation will bring the level of income taxes in the District of Columbia in general more nearly equal to the levies in Maryland and Virginia, they still will remain slightly lower in most instances, as the following table, submitted by the Finance Office of the District of Columbia Department of General Administration, will indicate.

Income taxes for a family of 4 owning a residence and a car in the Washington metropolitan area, at various levels of income

Income	District of Columbia		Maryland	Virginia
	Present	Proposed		
$5,000	$38	$38	$30	$47
$7,500	94	102	114	112
$10,000	155	180	189	225
$15,000	310	400	339	475

The District of Columbia Commissioners estimate that this new schedule of income tax would yield approximately $4 million of additional revenue annually. However, inasmuch as this provision would not become effective until January 1, 1966, it is estimated that the increased revenue would amount to only about $1 million in fiscal year 1966. These revenues are paid into the general fund of the District of Columbia, from which most appropriations are made.

Section 102 makes the income tax increases provided in section 101 effective beginning January 1, 1966.

Section 103 provides an amendment to the income tax laws of the District of Columbia. The need for the amendment arises under the following circumstances.

Under existing law, there is a disparity of treatment between the District of Columbia taxing statutes and the Internal Revenue Code on capital gains. Because of the peculiar wording of the word "dividend" in the District of Columbia statutes, transactions which are capital in nature have been classified and taxed as dividends. In many instances, shareholders of companies are required to conduct business affairs in a manner to suit the convenience of the purchaser in that they are unable to sell their stock interest directly but are forced to liquidate the company and sell the assets instead. Under the Internal Revenue Code, the tax treatment of each transaction is identical, that is, it is a capital gain. Under the District of Columbia statutes, the sale of stock is a capital transaction, while the sale of assets and the resulting distribution of the proceeds to the shareholders is a dividend.

In the case of a regulated public utility, the stock of the utility is not as valuable as the underlying assets. Because of the complexities of licensing, permits, and franchises by various State regulatory bodies and the Interstate Commerce Commission, the purchasers of such businesses generally insist on acquiring the assets rather than the stock. The proposed amendment is intended to put the stockholders in such instances in the same position taxwise as if they had sold their stock, which is the treatment accorded them by the Internal Revenue Code.

TITLE II

Title II provides for an increase in the District of Columbia gasoline tax, from 6 to 7 cents per gallon. This will put the District of Columbia tax on gasoline at the same rate as in Maryland and Virginia, and will produce an estimated increase of approximately $2 million per year, which would go into the highway fund. This increase is to become effective as of the first day of the first month which begins more than 30 days after the approval of this act.

TITLE III

Title III authorizes the District of Columbia Commissioners to abate the unpaid portion of any tax or assessment when they have determined under prescribed uniform rules that the amount of money involved would not warrant the cost of administration and collection. Your committee is advised that the District actually has been following this practice for some years as a practical matter. Thus, the only effect of this provision of the bill would be to require uniform rules for determination of these cases of abatement, and to lend the color of legal authority to a procedure which has long been utilized as a matter of commonsense.

The following letter from District of Columbia Commissioner John B. Duncan under date of May 25, 1965, and the accompanying exhibit from the District of Columbia Finance Office, present this situation in detail.

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, May 25, 1965.

Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCMILLAN: This is in response to your request of May 12, 1965, for an explanation and justification of title III of H.R. 7066, 89th Congress, authorizing the Commissioners to abate the unpaid portions of any tax, or any liability in respect thereto, other than taxes on real property, where administration and collection costs would not warrant collection of the amount due.

This title is patterned after section 6404 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and requires the Commissioners to establish uniform rules for the abatement of tax balances. It would permit the Commissioners to prescribe tolerances for processing tax returns so as to avoid preparation of numerous tax bills and the maintenance of accounts receivable records for minor amounts of tax which cost more to collect than the tax liability involved.

The Internal Revenue Service and several States, including New York and Maryland, provide explicitly in their income tax returns and instructions that an amount due of less than $1 need not be remitted, and that an overpayment in like amount will not be refunded unless the return is accompanied by an application requesting it.

Section 12.11(c) of the District's income and franchise tax regulations provides: "If the final return shows an overpayment of less than $2 it will be refunded only upon application to the assessor." There is no similar basis, however, for advising a taxpayer that he is not required to remit a balance due, no matter how small, because at the present time there is no legal authority to abate small tax balances.

Many taxpayers send coins or stamps for trivial amounts, the processing of which is more expensive than the tax involved. Also, it is required that bills be rendered for any small balances not paid with returns. Failure to pay after billing then results in followup notices and collection procedures. If uncollected after the 3-year period of limitations has expired the items are included in "writeoff" lists which require approval by the Commissioners, based upon a positive showing of the reasons for uncollectibility.

In answer to your request for a tabulation showing what taxes were assessed and unpaid in various categories over the past 6 years, I am attaching a statement summarizing the writeoff lists approved by the Commissioners during this period. The items contained in the lists reflect all accounts which had been billed and generally subjected to every available collection procedure, including levy and distraint, and the filing of a lien, but which nevertheless proved uncollectible. These lists are regularly reviewed and audited by both our own Internal Audit Office and by the General Accounting Office.

The authority requested in title III of H.R. 7066 is not intended to deal with this entire category of accounts, but rather to avoid the assessment in the first instance of small amounts which would not warrant the expense of billing and collection.

A tabulation of the 1963 District of Columbia individual income tax returns disclosed that 2,567 returns had amounts due under $2 aggregating $1,958.03 (an average of 76 cents each). It is estimated that with the authority in title III, using a tolerance of $2, the annual amount of taxes abated would be less than $3,000 for individual income taxes and $1,000 for all other taxes.

It is of interest to note that there were 15,397 individual income taxpayers who overpaid taxes in the amount of $14,706.37, an average of less than $1, which was not refunded because refunds were not requested by such taxpayers.

You are correct in your assumption that unpaid taxes on real property are collected by taxes sales of said properties and that this is the reason for excluding real property taxes from the abatement section.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. DUNCAN,
Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

Department of General Administration, Finance Office—Summary of approved writeoff lists of uncollectible District of Columbia taxes, fiscal years 1960–65, inclusive [1]

Type of tax	Fiscal year 1961		Fiscal year 1962		Fiscal year 1963		Fiscal year 1964		Fiscal year 1965	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Personal property	11,482	$516,066	3,347	$104,025	895	$26,173	1,495	$64,545	1,072	$41,435
Inheritance			54	6,635	3	173	14	27,261		
Corporation franchise	158	57,954	36	31,583	18	6,424	22	22,287	29	64,208
Unincorporated franchise	42	8,925	44	30,830	30	57,714	34	26,205	16	16,338
Individual income	5,968	281,705	4,921	107,469	5,963	109,251	6,859	177,501	7,135	181,919
Employer's withholding			150	6,907	85	6,603	166	6,030	230	10,905
Sales and use	775	45,649	356	31,140	185	24,044	386	18,260	329	20,601
Total	18,425	910,299	8,908	318,589	7,179	230,382	8,976	342,089	8,811	335,406

[1] In fiscal year 1960, no accounts were written off.

TITLE IV

Title IV is devoted to general provisions, as follows:

Section 401 amends section 402 of the District of Columbia Public Works Act of 1954—68 Stat. 110; District of Columbia Code, section 7-133(a)—by increasing the authorized limit on borrowing for the purpose of highway construction from $50,250,000 to $85,250,000. This limit has remained unchanged since the authority was first established in 1954. The basic act provides that any loan from this source must first be specifically requested of the Congress in connection with the District of Columbia budget submitted for that fiscal year, with a full statement of the work contemplated to be done and the need for such work, which must then be approved by the Congress. It is further stipulated in the basic act that these loans, at rates of interest determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall be repayable from the District of Columbia highway fund, over a period of 30 years.

Section 402 defines the word "Commissioners" for the purpose of this act in its usual context.

Section 403 states that any word used in any title of this act shall have the same meaning as that applicable to such word in the act to which that particular title applies, unless the context requires otherwise.

Section 404 is the saving clause.

Section 405 authorizes the District of Columbia Commissioners to make rules and regulations for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act.

Section 406 authorizes the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into agreements with the States of Virginia and Maryland, and with certain political subdivisions of these States, for the purpose of developing a comprehensive and continuing process of planning for transportation for the National Capital region. It is further stipulated that no such agreement shall require the District of Columbia to pay more than its pro rata share of the costs of such planning process.

Finally, it is provided that in developing such transportation planning process the Commissioners shall consult and cooperate with the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, this bill increases the borrowing authority of the District of Columbia for highway construction by $35 million. But its total impact on the District highway program is far greater than that. The committee, while approving this additional borrowing authority, has made its approval contingent on certain reforms of the highway program and its impact on the people and neighborhoods of the District.

While I support this bill because it is good business to do so, indeed it is the only thing to do under the circumstances only after the committee has put on record its conviction that future highway construction in the District must be planned to minimize community dislocation and to meet actual transportation needs. My support of future highway projects, and I believe the support of many Members of the House, will be contingent on the implementation of the committee's intentions with respect to disruption of residential areas and destruction of family dwellings.

I call to the attention of the House the following statement from pages 9 and 10 of the committee report:

> COMMUNITY DISLOCATIONS
>
> The committee strongly urges that maximum effort be made to minimize the hardship of families displaced by highway construction. The Central Relocation Service must redouble their efforts to help displaced families. District officials must encourage the development of housing units for lower and middle income families. Full authority must be exercised to alleviate the current crisis situation that exists with respect to housing in the District.
>
> The location and design of future highways must minimize the impact on homes and residential communities wherever feasible. Imagination and innovation must be the watchwords of the highway planners. Maximum use of tunneling and utilization of airspace above highways for playgrounds and schools should be encouraged if feasible.
>
> A poorly planned freeway can be a terribly disruptive factor in a local community. Use of existing rights-of-way, locations of routes beside and over railroad tracks and along natural boundaries, such as rivers must be given first priority by highway planners. Construction of freeways or highways in industrial or commercial areas, particularly those past their economic prime, should be actively considered as an alternative to locations in residential areas.
>
> Full consideration must be given to alternative routes which would minimize the impact of construction on residential communities. Federal officials are urged to cooperate fully with District officials and, to the extent possible, make federally owned land available if it is not in use.
>
> Finally, in view of these deep concerns of your committee and other related issues which bulked large in committee hearings, there are indications of a real need for restudy and reevaluation of the highway program of the District of Columbia. Your committee has found that projections for highway needs for 1965 developed in the mass transportation study of 1959 substantially exceeded actual traffic counts. Similarly, the projections of the National Capital Transportation Agency surpasses actual experience.
>
> Analysis of traffic counts of crossing to and from the District of Columbia in recent years shows a declining ratio between population growth and daily trips. The forecasts and projections presented by highway officials cannot be reconciled reasonably with other information available to your committee. The projections and forecasts of future needs made by highway officials show trends contrary to actual experience and do not seem to justify some of the proposed program. Accordingly, a careful, objective review and reappraisal is desirable.
>
> Such restudy should result in a highway system abundantly adequate for the needs of the Capital City and at the same time preserve as much as possible of the original character and beauty of the city with a minimum of inconvenience and dislocation to its citizens and its businesses.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to support fully that part of H.R. 11487 which contains the 1-cent motor fuel tax increase for the District of Columbia and the authorization for an additional $35 million borrowing authority in order that our Nation's Capital may be able to build its segments of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. My colleagues will recall that this Congress launched the building of this great nationwide freeway system in 1956 and the 41,000 miles of the new network are scheduled to be built by 1972. As all of you are aware from seeing the building of the Interstate System back in your home districts, the system is about half completed throughout the country. However, there are few, if any, large cities in America that are as far behind schedule in building the interstate freeways as is Washington.

There are 29 miles of interstate routes designated for the District of Columbia, and only 8 miles have been opened to traffic in Washington. Most of these 8 miles are east of the Anacostia River so that they hardly serve the majority of the residents, commuters, tourists, buslines and trucking services.

For comparison, the city of Chicago has built 52 miles of interstate freeways within its city limits. In fact, that includes most of Chicago's Interstate System, and that city is planning many more expressways in addition to the interstate routes. The job has been done in Chicago, a city that already had every type of rail rapid transit except a monorail. Chicago, of course, had the problem of relocating the people who formerly lived in the path of these expressways. One method that they used was to build many new high-rise public housing apartments setting in wide lawns and gardens alongside the Dan Ryan Expressway throughout the length of the South Side. Thus, new housing was provided at the same time the freeway was built.

I mention this because most of the people fighting freeways in Washington have seized the relocation problem as a method of trying to turn the public against these modern facilities that are so badly needed. Usually the positions of opponents of any issue are much more vociferous than the testimony of proponents with the result that a layman here in Washington normally only hears from the groups fighting our long-planned freeways. Those who favor freeways and other public projects normally sit at home quietly confident that their representatives will move ahead in the best interest of the community, while the opponents swarm into the hearing rooms and voice dissents far out of proportion to their actual numbers. Fortunately, commonsense generally prevails and we continue to improve our cities despite these vocal outpourings. Much of this opposition has been organized by an attorney for the antihighway lobby. The articulate minority which has been fighting the badly needed highway improvements and bridges in Washington are not likely to convince this House that modern highways are appropriate for every other city in America except our Nation's Capital.

For example, recently four of Washington's leading business organizations went on record publicly, strongly in favor of completing the highway system and supporting the 1-cent gasoline tax increase and the $35 million borrowing authority. These groups are Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, the Federal City Council, Washington Real Estate Board, and the National Capital Downtown Committee. Jointly these groups represent the economy of the Washington region and the sound men who lead these groups know that Washington's future prosperity is dependent upon completing the freeway system. They know, for example, that if freeways are not provided to relieve traffic conditions in Washington that the $400 million tourist business may decline. All future tourists will be freeway oriented and Washington surely will want to be in line with the rest of the Nation. Each of these groups strongly supported the badly needed subway for the District of Columbia, but they and we know that, as helpful as the subway will be, it does not in any way reduce the necessity for the freeways. All of the cities that currently have rail rapid transit are further ahead with their freeway programs than is Washington.

Therefore, let us pass H.R. 11487 so that Washington may have a balanced transportation system.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. **PELLY**. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names.

[Roll No. 360]

Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Ashbrook
Aspinall
Bandstra
Baring
Bates
Battin
Bingham
Bonner
Brock
Buchanan
Cahill
Cameron
Carter
Casey
Celler
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Clevenger
Cramer
Culver
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dulski
Evans, Colo.
Fino
Foley
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Gilligan
Goodell
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hanley
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Hosmer
Howard
Irwin
Jennings
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kluczynski
Landrum
Latta
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Love
McDowell
McVicker
Macdonald
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Matthews
Miller
Mize
Moeller
Morgan
Morrison
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill. Mass.
Pepper
Philbin
Pickle
Pool
Reinecke
Resnick
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rogers, Colo.
Roncalio
St Germain
Saylor
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Staggers
Stephens
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tuck
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
White, Idaho
Wright
Wyatt

The **SPEAKER**. On this rollcall, 322 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AMENDING PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

Mr. **HARRIS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 3141) to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions, and for other purposes, with amendments of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "AND OPTOMETRY" and insert "OPTOMETRY, AND PODIATRY".

Page 2, line 9, strike out "AND OPTOMETRY" and insert "OPTOMETRY, AND PODIATRY".

Page 2, line 17, strike out "and optometry" and insert: "optometry, and podiatry".

Page 2, line 24, strike out "or optometry" and insert: "optometry, or podiatry".

Page 3, line 23, after "applicable." insert "The Surgeon General is authorized to waive (in whole or in part) the provisions of this subsection if he determines, after consultation with the National Advisory Council on Medical, Dental, and Optometric, and Podiatric Education, that the required increase in first-year enrollment of full-time students in a school cannot, because of limitations of physical facilities available to the school for training, be accomplished without lowering the quality of training for such students."

Page 4, line 15, strike out "or doctor" and insert "doctor".

Page 4, line 16, after "degree" insert ", or doctor of podiatry or an equivalent degree".

Page 4, line 22, strike out "or optometry" and insert: "optometry, or podiatry".

Page 5, line 5, strike out "and Optometric" and insert "Optometric, and Podiatric".

Page 5, line 24, strike out "or optometry" and insert "optometry, or podiatry".

Page 6, line 24, strike out "and Optometric" and insert "Optometric, and Podiatric".

Page 7, line 9, strike out "or optometry" and insert "optometry, or podiatry".

Page 8, line 10, strike out "and optometrists" and insert "optometrists, and podiatrists."

Page 8, line 12, strike out "and optometric" and insert "optometric, and podiatric."

Page 8, line 15, strike out "and Optometric" and insert "Optometric, and Podiatric."

Page 8, line 22, strike out "and optometric" and insert "optometric, and podiatric."

Page 9, line 21, strike out "or Optometry" and insert "Optometry, Podiatry, or Pharmacy."

Page 10, line 1, strike out "or optometry" and insert "optometry, poditary, or pharmacy."

Page 12, line 12, strike out "and Optometric" and insert "Optometric and Podiatric."

Page 15, line 3, after "dentistry," insert "optometry,"

Page 15, line 5, strike out "authority" and insert "authority, in accordance with regulations provided by the Secretary,"

Page 15, line 6, strike out "physicians" and insert "physicians, optometrists."

Page 15, line 11, strike out "physicans" and insert "physicians, optometrists."

Page 15, line 23, strike out "each of"

Page 17, after line 13, insert

"(g)(1) Subsection (e) of section 741 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: 'Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the rate of interest determined in accordance with such provisions for the first loan obtained by a student from a loan fund established under this part shall also apply to any subsequent loan to such student from such fund during his course of study.' "

Page 17, after line 13, insert

"(2) Paragraph (5) of section 823(b) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided*, That notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, the rate of interest determined in accordance with such provisions for the first loan obtained by a student from a loan fund established under this part shall also apply to any subsequent loan to such student from such fund during his course of study.' "

Page 18, line 8, strike out all after "following:" down to and including "agency"," in line 15 and insert "any program of nurse education means a program accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner of Education, or a program accredited for the purpose of this Act by the Commissioner of Education",

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. **SPRINGER**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the distinguished chairman of our committee explain the changes that were made in the other body.

Mr. **HARRIS**. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to explain them very briefly.

The Senate passed the bill, H.R. 3141, after we had passed it in the House by an overwhelming, almost unanimous, vote.

The Senate passed H.R. 3141 with several amendments.

First, the Springer amendment requiring an increase in enrollment for schools to qualify for improvement grants was modified to permit the Surgeon General to waive the requirement if he determines that limitations of physical facilities of the school would cause such an increase to lower the quality of training.

Second, Mr. ROGERS' amendment on accreditation of baccalaureate and associate degree schools of nursing was modified. As passed by the House the Rogers amendment provides that accreditation of these schools shall be by regional or State accrediting or approval agencies; as passed by the Senate, this provision was deleted and the provisions of existing law were retained, with the addition that the Commissioner of Education is given authority to accredit programs in this area.

Third, basic and special improvement grants are extended to schools of podiatry.

Fourth, scholarship grants are extended to schools of podiatry and pharmacy.

Fifth, the loan forgiveness feature of the bill is extended to optometrists, and

Sixth, the provisions of existing law on interest rates for student loans are modified to provide that the interest rate a student pays will be the same on every loan he gets. This will make the administration of the loan program simpler.

Only two of the amendments are controversial to any extent.

One of them is the Springer amendment which the gentleman recalls very well, he having sponsored it. That amendment would require an increase in enrollment for schools to qualify for improvement grants. The amendment was modified to permit the Surgeon General to waive this requirement if he determines that limitations of physical facilities of the school would cause such an increase as to lower the quality of training. As the gentleman knows, there are a few medical schools that would have problems with the amendment as it was proposed by the gentleman from Illinois and as it was adopted by the House.

The Senate amendment would permit that kind of situation to be taken care of.

The second of these amendments had to do with accreditation of baccalaureate and associate degree schools of nursing. The amendment to the bill offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] and as agreed to, was modified by the Senate in an effort to meet the problem and still permit the purposes and objectives sought to be carried out by the Rogers amendment.

As the Rogers amendment was agreed to in the bill approved by the House, it provided that accreditation of these schools shall be by regional or State accrediting or approval agencies; as passed by the Senate, this provision was deleted and the provisions of existing law were retained, with the addition that the Commissioner of Education would be given authority to accredit programs in this area.

I have discussed this subject with the author of the amendment, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] and also the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS], who is concerned with it. In view of the discussions that have occurred, the Senate amendment appears to be a satisfactory arrangement.

A third amendment had to do with the extension to schools of podiatry of basic and special improvement grants. The gentlemen recall the discussion we had on this subject in our own committee.

The fourth Senate amendment had to do with extending scholarship grants to schools of podiatry and schools of pharmacy. The pharmacy schools are tremendously concerned—and I think with merit—about being included specifically in the program, and the Senate included them. I know that the pharmacy schools will be very happy over this arrangement.

The fifth amendment relates to the loan forgiveness feature of the bill, which would be extended to optometrists.

We had thought that that provision would be included in the bill as it passed the House. Now that is cleared up.

Finally, the sixth amendment of the Senate simplifies existing law on interest rates for student loans by providing that the interest rate a student pays would be the same on every loan he would get.

I agree with these amendments. I think they probably will resolve some of the controversy raised on some of these questions, and I believe that the bill is a better bill. As the gentleman knows, this program is one of the major and most outstanding of the programs we have considered in this or, in fact in any, Congress.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

The Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, which we approved in the 88th Congress, contained a provision which I sponsored and in which I still have great interest. The purpose of that act which we now amend was to create more health profession manpower. Particularly we have discussed here on the floor the need for many more doctors in the next few years. Certainly we are all aware of the need and are determined to do what we can to overcome the present and prospective shortage. My amendment to the original act required any medical school applying for grants under the act to give positive assurances that the enrollment would be increased by 5 percent or five students, whichever was the greater.

In the present bill we have added to the grants for building and expanding medical schools and other health profession schools a scheme to provide general and special improvement grants. These would make it possible for the schools to obtain special equipment, attract faculty, and generally upgrade curriculum. Here again we provided, wisely I think, that schools hoping to be recipients of these grants make it clear that they will produce more graduates. The bill as it passed this House provided that these increases must be 2.5 percent or three students, whichever is greater. Such increases, added to those already assured by construction grants, would go far to meet our doctor shortages. It is a good provision and I feel that we must insist that its purpose be served in any measure we finally approve here today.

After the House had acted and sent the measure on to the other body for its consideration I had occasion to talk with officials of the various professional associations concerned with health professions education. Their study of this particular requirement convinced them that a few schools, already in being and struggling desperately to survive, could not honestly make the assurances we desired. Their situations were and are such that the general and special purpose grants will, at the moment, barely save them. It is most desirable to rescue institutions now extant, rather than go through the costly and extended process of organizing and building a brandnew medical school. So it appeared that there were special problems. No one could argue that the requirement was too harsh or undesirable. I was rather inclined to let the chips fall because the long-range good might be better served by keeping the requirement intact than by trying to work out exceptions and I indicated that I would await the final action of the other body before committing myself to any change.

As amended by the other body, provisions are made for those exceptional cases of which I am aware. The language added for this purpose is thus:

> The Surgeon General is authorized to waive (in whole or in part) the provisions of this subsection if he determines, after consultation with the National Advisory Council on Medical, Dental, and Optometric, and Podiatric Education, that the required increase in first-year enrollment of full-time students in a school cannot, because of limitations of physical facilities available to the school for training, be accomplished without lowering the quality of training for such students.

Because I have talked with most of the people concerned with this problem, I am sure that their intentions are the best and they wish to accomplish the goals which the House version set. But I am also sure that the language I have just read to you could lead to a complete runaround of our restrictions if the administrators of the act felt so inclined. For that reason I insisted upon some positive assurances by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which I could bring to this House, as to the manner in which these special cases will be handled. The result was a letter from the Secretary of that Department as follows:

> In response to your oral request, this morning I discussed with the Surgeon General the effect of the Senate amendment waiving, under certain circumstances, the provisions of section 771(b) of H.R. 3141.
>
> Dr. Stewart assures me that he is in full agreement with the purpose of section 771 (b), as it was approved by the House of Representatives, to increase the output of the schools that are aided by this program. He sees the Senate amendment to that section as authority for a waiver which he would, after consultation with his advisory council, use only infrequently and only when he is convinced that expansion of enrollment in a particular school would definitely jeopardize the quality of the training at that school.

In addition to this fairly generalized statement of the intentions of the Department, I received oral assurances that the new Surgeon General, Dr. Stewart, visualized no more than three situations in the country which would require the invocation of this exceptional machinery. That is about right. There are probably two such cases which have been brought to my attention, where strict adherence to the additional enrollment criteria would make it impossible for these established medical schools to participate. I recognize the desirability of keeping these schools and go along with the amendment for this restricted purpose, but, even here I am serving notice that we expect them to improve to the extent that they can later increase their enrollments in compliance with the basic amendment and in the same manner as the large bulk of the schools must now do.

The record should be clear, as we accept these amendments, that our purpose has not changed. We shall watch carefully the application of this exception and the schools to which it is applied. You may be sure that the committee will follow through in its determination to achieve the basic purposes of this important legislation. The Surgeon General should expect to document thoroughly all cases considered for waivers under this amendment and to be called upon to justify his determination in the light of congressional intent.

Although I am aware of the other changes in the legislation and agree to them, I feel that the increased enrollment amendment is far and away the most important and have therefore taken the time of the House to make this record clear to all who will be involved in the administration of this act.

I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—gentlemen, as you are aware, I have been concerned about the problems of accreditation of programs of nurse training in junior colleges. Training programs for nurses in junior colleges date from 1952 and have grown rapidly over the past few years so that an increasing proportion of the supply of new nurses now entering the labor market comes from these schools. In addition, the potential for development of programs in junior colleges is great and I sincerely believe that these colleges will serve as a major resource for substantially increasing the quality and quantity of personnel in this critically short area.

As you know, under the Nurse Training Act of 1964, Federal grants may be made only to schools of nursing accredited by—or for which there is reasonable assurance of accreditation by—a body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner of Education. The only body approved by the Commissioner of Education for such purposes has been the National League of Nursing. Yet, the National League has not encouraged the development of junior college schools of nursing and, in my opinion, has failed to carry out its responsibility to assure the rapid accreditation of these schools in order to enable them to receive Federal support.

The purpose of the Nurse Training Act, in part, is to get money to schools to enable them to upgrade their teaching and to assure better quality of nurse graduates. I do not believe we should restrict these funds only to those schools which have been accredited by the National League and thereby deny those schools which need the funds for the purpose of being upgraded.

Our committee, in its deliberations, added an amendment with respect to collegiate or associate degree programs of nurse training which would enable either a regional accrediting agency or a State-approval agency to provide the accreditation which is a condition precedent to the receipt of Federal assistance under the Nurse Training Act. Our amendment reads as follows:

> Any program of nurse education, offered by a diploma school of nursing, means a program accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner or Education and, when applied to any collegiate or associate degree program of nurse education, means a program provided by an educational institution approved or accredited by either a regional accrediting agency or a State-approval agency.

This then would enable States or regional bodies to provide the accreditation needed. In my own State, for example, our junior colleges have done a magnificent job in training associate degree nurses. To substantiate this, I submit the fact that the rate of failure on examination for licensure in nursing in our State discloses that graduates of junior colleges do better than those in the other schools of nursing. Yet none of the junior college programs in Florida had been accredited by the National League of Nursing. I think this is sufficient evidence to show that accreditation by the National League is an unnecessarily restrictive and undesirable requirement.

The Senate has struck the amendment added by the House and substituted instead the following:

> Any program of nurse education means a program accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner of Education, or a program accredited for the purpose of this act by the Commissioner of Education.

This language obviously does not require the use of the National League for Nursing; on the other hand, it does not assure that alternatives will be found.

I have had extended discussion with officials of the Department about my concern. I have found these discussions informative and rewarding, and I have been assured by the Department of its concern in this matter. I am aware that they feel the need to assure that adequate professional training is being provided. Their chief objection to regional accrediting bodies has been that this accreditation is a general one to the school and does not examine the separate programs such as nursing to assure that they, too, are adequate. The regional accrediting bodies have not had a mechanism to try this out as a general and regular matter.

I am sympathetic with their concern and I am now assured that they understand mine. They, too, wish to seek alternative methods of assuring the proper professional quality in nursing training. To this end, Under Secretary Wilbur J. Cohen has sent a telegram requesting representatives of the American Nurses Association, the National League for Nursing, the American Association of Junior Colleges, and the Joint Commission on Accreditation to discuss this matter on October 19 with representatives of the Department. The telegram states:

> Health professions educational assistance amendments includes important amendment relating to accreditation of nursing programs. Would appreciate if representatives of your organization could meet with department officials and representatives of other interested organizations on Tuesday, October 19, beginning at 10 a.m. In room 5542, Health, Education, and Welfare Building at 3d and Independence Avvenue SW., Washington, to discuss this legislation and necessary steps to implement it in accordance with congressional legislative objectives.
>
> WILBUR J. COHEN,
> *Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.*

The Department has assured me that these discussions will be directed toward the development of alternative means of accreditation which will continue to assure the proper qualifications of nurse training programs and at the same time assure that junior colleges are adequately provided for in order that they may continue to increase the number of nursing graduates and thus assist in alleviating the severe shortage of nursing personnel. The Department has told me that they hope to establish an alternative accreditation program on at least a 6-month trial basis in selected areas to determine the best way to solve this problem.

I believe the assurance that the Department will undertake such a study and attempt new approaches to accreditation may have many benefits. Further, I believe that the language of the Senate amendment provides the necessary flexibility to the Department to carry out such a program. I support, therefore, the action of the conference in accepting the Senate position.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SHIP MORTGAGE BONDS

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2118) to amend sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection 0 of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. GARMATZ, ASHLEY, DOWNING, MAILLIARD and PELLY.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN MATTERS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I wish to call up several resolutions.

First, Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 593 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 593

Resolved, That, for the purposes of the studies and investigations specified in clause (1) and clause (7) of H. Res. 19, Eighty-ninth Congress, approved by the House of Representatives on February 16, 1965, the Committee on the Judiciary is hereby authorized to send fifteen of its members and six of its employees, three from the majority staff and three from the minority staff, to be divided into three special subcommittees: to investigate refugee matters, to inspect, study, and observe the overseas operations of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees and to attend the Fourteenth Session of the Executive Committee of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees; to inspect, study, and observe the overseas operations of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration and to attend the Twenty-sixth Session of the Executive Committee and the Twenty-fourth

Session of the Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration; to inspect, study, and observe the overseas operation of the Submerged Lands Act and the Outer Continental Shelf Act. Each subcommittee is authorized to sit and act whether the House has recessed or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings as it deems necessary: *Provided,* That the subcommittee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided,* That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88–633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation, if furnished by public carrier; or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN MATTERS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 596 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 596

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 94, Eighty-ninth Congress, the Committee on Education and Labor is authorized to send not more than five members of such committee, not more than one majority staff assistant, and not more than one minority staff assistant to such foreign countries as the committee may determine for the purpose of conducting a full and complete investigation and study of the operation by the Federal Government of elementary and secondary schools, with a view to determining means of assuring that the children of civilian officers and employees, and of members of the Armed Forces, of the United States will receive high quality elementary and secondary education.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided,* That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88–633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country where local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN MATTERS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 594 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 594

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of House Resolution 141, Eighty-ninth Congress, the Committee on Public Works is authorized to send not more than five members of such committee, to majority staff assistants, and one minority staff assistant to such European countries as the committee may determine for the purpose of conducting an investigation and study of public works in various European countries, which would include mutual problems involving rivers and harbors, flood control, highways, water pollution and related subjects.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided,* That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88–633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country where local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN MATTERS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 595 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 595

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 245, Eighty-ninth Congress, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized to send not more than thirteen members of such committee, not more than two majority staff assistants, and not more than one minority staff assistant to such European countries as the committee may determine for the purpose of conducting studies with respect to the policies, operations, activities, and administration by the governments of such countries of matters in the following fields of activity of such governments: postal rates, postal operations, postal facilities, and modernization of postal service, including research and development programs.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided,* That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88–633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country where local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the U.S. Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISMISSING ELECTION CONTEST, PETERSON AGAINST GROSS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 602) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 602

Resolved, That the election contest of Stephen M. Peterson, contestant, against H. R. Gross, contestee, in the Third Congressional District of the State of Iowa, be dismissed.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I yield half the time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN] if he requests it; and pending that, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE], chairman of the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, in the Peterson-Gross election contest we find first of all that the returns, when canvassed from the Third Congressional District in Iowa, show that Mr. GROSS, the contestee and the sitting Member, won by a majority of 419 votes. Consequently, under the law, the Governor of the State of Iowa issued a certificate to Mr. GROSS. That certificate was sent to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The Speaker administered the oath of office to Mr. GROSS when Congress convened in January of this year.

Since that date the sitting Member has performed his duties as required under his oath of office. So, as a result of these events, he has established a prima facie right to the office.

Some time after the election on November 3, 1964, the contestant, Mr. Peterson, of the Third District of the State of Iowa, made numerous and various charges against the election officials in that district. He charged many violations of the rules and regulations and even the laws of the State of Iowa in regard to the election of Mr. GROSS.

Some of the more serious charges made by Mr. Peterson, the contestant, are as follows:

He made an issue of the fact that certain ballots were burned the day after the election. When you use that phrase, of course, it sounds bad. But his petition did not go into detail and tell the Congress what sort of ballots these were. Of course, the Committee on Elections in our investigation were interested in determining what he meant when he charged certain ballots were burned.

Well, the record shows as a result of our investigation—and it was admitted by all who knew anything about the facts of this charge, that these were unused ballots; they were not ballots which had been voted by anyone. They were the ballots that were left over as a surplus after the election polls or precincts were closed on election day.

Mr. Speaker, it was further found that the custodian of the courthouse in this particular county where these ballots were burned had burned the ballots and that prior to this occasion he had done so. The auditor in the office of the county courthouse admitted that she had used the back side of some of the ballots for scratch paper. It was nothing secretive or nothing unusual to these people to do what they had done with these ballots. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it was testified before the committee that this practice had gone on for many years in this particular county and no one thought anything about it, and that is in the record.

Another point in addition to this one was that more ballots were cast than there were names listed on the polling books.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the elections subcommittee for many years in the House of Representatives I have found, and other members of the subcommittee have found, that this is not as bad as it sounds. This charge or allegation is often made in petitions for election contests. And it is not infrequently true that election judges or managers or clerks, or whatever you might call them in your particular State, sometimes do inadvertently and unintentionally fail to record the name of some voter on the poll list when they are busy about their duties and the crowds are there and everyone is wishing to vote as soon as possible.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the evidence in this case shows that such errors were wholly insufficient to change the results of the election, even if the excess ballots about which we speak here in this particular instance should all be added to the total of the contestant. In other words, Mr. Speaker, if we assume that all of those ballots that were not recorded on the poll list were cast for the contestant this still would not have changed the results of the election.

Mr. Speaker, there is a case directly in point, the case of Brooks against Fay, from the State of Iowa, in which it was held by the Supreme Court not too long ago that a contestant, like Mr. Peterson in this case, has the burden to show that misconduct or errors on the part of election judges or officials must be sufficient to change the results of the election. In this case the committee is of the opinion that no alleged misconduct or error on the part of the election judges, nor a combination of all such errors by any and all officials in the entire Third Congressional District of the State of Iowa, would be sufficient to change the results of this election.

Mr. Speaker, we have many authorities on that point including the case of *Eggleston* v. *Strader,* 2 Hinds' 878, and others confirmed by this House.

Mr. Speaker, another charge was to the effect that absentee ballots were recorded in a back room by one election official of a precinct when other people did not know what she was doing. Well, when we got into this charge and read the testimony, we found that it was not exactly like it had been alleged in the election contest papers. We found that at one polling place one lady, a judge or clerk, went into the voting booth, threw the curtains up over the top of the voting machine, stood there and recorded the ballots, the absentee ballots, as another lady, an officer of the precinct, read them out to her—nothing secret about it; no one contested or protested or challenged what the good lady was doing. It was just her way of doing it. This lady who testified and who tried to make something out of this affair, stated she was behind the lady doing the recording and could not see exactly what she was doing.

But it later developed on cross-examination that she could have seen if she had wanted to, and she made no protest of this procedure. The same lady protested later, after some people said it should be contested, but when the election was closed at the end of the day this lady signed all of the election returns and forms without any hesitation whatsoever. She thus certified to the fairness and correctness of the election at the precinct where she was an officer.

There was another charge of a serious nature, or more serious than some of them, and that had to do with one of the machines. It was disclosed that one of the voting machines had a certain number of votes already tabulated thereon when the machine was opened in the morning at the beginning of the voting; in other words, some official, an auditor, or somebody who was in charge of the voting machines, had not cleared it. The auditor of the county was called about that, and he instructed the voting officials to take down the total figures then on the machine, keep them, and to subtract therefrom the number that was there in the morning, when the votes were all added up at the closing of the polls. The lady complained she did not know where the sheet of paper got to that contained the figures.

The attorney for the contestant wanted to make it appear that somebody was holding out votes, or that they were not giving the proper returns from this machine. However, the record shows that the election official to whom these returns were sent had affixed the aforesaid disputed paper to the polling book, and it was still so attached when the votes were added up at the end of the day.

The attorney for the contestant admitted during the hearings this entire proceeding was launched with the hope that a recount would disclose enough errors to change the results of the election. The attorney admitted they knew of no fraud on the part of Mr. GROSS, and no fraud on the part of a single election official in the entire Third Congressional District of the State of Iowa. It is, therefore, evident from the record, and from all of the facts, this contest was simply in the nature of a fishing expedition so that they could turn something up that would be justifiable grounds for the subcommittee to go to Iowa to look over these records.

All of the evidence shows that no one protested to any of the election proceedings during election day and all of the officials signed the papers, the forms and the returns, and there was nobody who testified on election day that the results were anything but proper. Apparently it was after it was found that Mr. GROSS won by a margin of only 419 that somebody decided they should make a contest of this matter. So the contestant suggested then that the committee recount the ballots. It is the judgment of the committee that he has not made a showing which would justify any such action, because there is no evidence that if a recount were ordered by the subcommittee the outcome would in any way change the result as previously certified by the Governor of the State to the House of Representatives of the United States.

We quote a series of decisions in the committee report sustaining the committee's finding in this regard. The committee emphasizes that in all elections conducted under the laws of the State of Iowa, or any other State, the returning officers are presumed, as a matter of law, to have done their duty, and their returns to be correct.

This is a presumption that can only be removed by convincing evidence and we cite cases to so show.

The burden of proof, my friends, let us not forget, rests upon the contestant. It is squarely on his shoulders to show sufficient grounds to justify a recount or to unseat a Member of this House. He must meet this obligation. It is not the committee's duty to prove his case for him. The contestant must prove not just irregularities—and not just violations of the Iowa election laws, but also that if such irregularities had not existed the results of the election would have been different.

A contestant, in the opinion of the committee, should not be permitted to come to this House with a shotgun approach, criticising everything in general but proving nothing of any consequence. Any such vague and unwarranted challenge falls far short of the evidence necessary to unseat a Member of this House, and it is likewise inadequate and insufficient grounds to even support a recount.

Therefore, the subcommittee voted unanimously, 8 to 0, to dismiss this contest, and the full committee approved and confirmed the findings and recommendations of the subcommittee. I trust you will so vote.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. SISK). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. **CURTIN**. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a very unusual type of election contest. I say it is unusual because nowhere in the record is there any allegation of fraud on the part of anybody. As a matter of fact, in a letter sent out by the contestants under date of October 5, addressed "Dear Congressman"—and which I presume is similar to letters received by many, if not all, of my colleagues—the contestant says in one of the paragraphs:

> I am not asking the House to unseat the present incumbent. I have no personal animosity toward him, nor have I alleged fraud on his part or on the part of any election official or supporter of his.

Now we have a situation, ladies and gentlemen, where, on election day and prior to election day, no allegations of fraud or irregularities were made by anybody, in any of the precincts, in this election district. As a matter of fact, when the polls were closed and after the ballots were counted, every election district official signed the necessary returns and the necessary forms without any objection being raised by anybody. Then, after the totals were tabulated, and it became obvious that it was a rather close election—as a matter of fact there was a difference of 419 votes—then and at that time efforts were made to find irregularities. A contest notice was filed alleging irregularities which, as I say, were all determined upon after the polls were closed and after the returns were in. During the election, no objections were raised.

Now what is the nature of these irregularities? The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE] has indicated what several of them were, and has shown, when we looked into the record, and when we talked with and questioned the attorney for the contestant, that the reasons were rather flimsy. I will just repeat one or two of them. For example, as to the allegation of the burning of the ballots. The record discloses that the custodian of one of the courthouses who, incidentally, happens to be a member of the Democratic Party, had burned unused ballots. But there is no evidence that this is an unusual procedure at all at elections in Iowa. It was developed in the record that this happened year after year after election day and that is what they always did with unused ballots.

The record of the contestant also indicated, or tries to show, that there were refusals—repeated refusals—to let him or anybody representing him, appear and look at and examine the records. But if you examine the record which was filed in this case, you will see it is replete with numerous instances where these records were offered to the contestant or his representative.

I will just refer to one or two of them. For example, looking at page 20 of the record, we see that in Hardin County, the testimony is as follows:

> Mr. BUTLER. Now, let the record show Mr. Reed will now give you permission to see it.

He was speaking of the polling place. Continuing to read from the testimony:

> He refused you permission to remove those records from the auditor's office. That was your threat. But he will personally take you up there and let you see them at this time.

Again, a little later and on the same page:

> Mr. BUTLER. I think this has been designated the place of the hearing and this is the place we were required to attend and this is where we are present for attending. If you wish to examine the books which you requested to do, you may do so, Mr. Ballard.
>
> Mr. BALLARD. Mr. Redfern, do you have any objection to our adjourning this hearing up to the actual office of the auditor?
>
> Mr. REDFERN. No; I have no objection.

That is what happened in Hardin County.

In Bremer County—again referring to the record—page 49, the following appears:

> Question. As a matter of a clarifying question, Mrs. Slemmons, did Mr. Peterson have an opportunity to examine this particular book that Mr. Ballard is now looking at?
>
> Answer. He certainly did.
>
> Question. And did he have anyone with him at that time?
>
> Answer. Yes, he had a worker with him.
>
> Question. Do you remember the name of that worker?
>
> Answer. I believe the name is Kirk Boyd.
>
> Question. And how long did they have to examine these various records, including this book?
>
> Answer. Well, they came at noon and I think they were in the office until around 3 o'clock that afternoon, maybe a little longer.

I could go on to other counties. There are all kinds of references in the record to this effect of willingness to show the election records. So there were opportunities for the contestant to examine the records after the contest notice was filed.

So we have a contest in the nature of wishful thinking that if the subcommittee will recount all of the ballots, possibly the result of the recount would be to change the totals. But nothing fundamentally wrong has been shown at any place in the proceedings. Furthermore, nothing wrong in the nature of fraud has been alleged. Fraud is said to be a very important ingredient in all contests of this type. Therefore, it is quite obvious that this whole proceeding is nothing but a "fishing expedition." It seems to me that the action of the subcommittee in dismissing the proceeding is definitely justified, and I trust that the House will confirm the action of the subcommittee.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. **BURLESON**. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. **THOMPSON** of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, it should be noted that the report accompanying this resolution does not include a minority report. As a member of the Committee on House Administration at the time that disposition of this matter was made, I reserved the right to file a minority report. I did not do so for a variety of reasons, not the least of which was the amount of confusion involved.

As my neighbor and colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, has just emphasized, in the contestant's brief there is no ill will toward the incumbent and, indeed, I have none. I might note, however, he and I consistently disagree in philosophy. There is no allegation of fraud or any act of dishonesty on the part of the incumbent or on the part of the election officials. There is a thread running through this argument which, if one were to accept, one would say that there can be no valid contest for a seat in the House of Representatives unless fraud is alleged.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania spoke on the absence of fraud. The gentleman from South Carolina also noted the absence of fraud. I submit, as a crucial matter of record, that the precedent in this case is every bit as important as the precedent in any other case we have had before the House, and that under no circumstances should the precedents establish the need for fraud in an election.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman has made a point which I consider involves one of the great difficulties in election contests. I have never quite agreed with the apparent philosophy of the gentleman from South Carolina, because I come from a State where one does not have to prove anything to have the ballots recounted. One only has to say that he believes there could have been a mistake. He has to put a little money behind his thoughts. He has to put up a bond, and if there is not a percentage of error, he forfeits the bond.

I come from a State where a recount can be had if anybody is dissatisfied; and we often have them.

I will say, in the interest of accuracy, in the majority of cases the result is not changed, but sometimes the result is changed, because of the hurry and hectic atmosphere which surrounds an election. The people have been there all day, in our State, for 12 hours before they start to count the ballots. Sometimes they make honest mistakes.

This is one of the philosophies in which I have never been able to concur. That is not particularly so in this case, because, like the gentleman from New Jersey, I have no personal animosity against the seated Member. But I come from a State which has a tradition that one can look at the poll books and can have a recount if he wants. Therefore, I cannot quite subscribe to this philosophy that somebody has to prove fraud before anybody can take a look at the ballots.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

The one thing which I want to establish here as a matter of record—I believe this body should establish it, rather than set down a precedent which could affect all of us, each and every one of us—that there can be all sorts of mistakes; there can be all sorts of errors, there can be all sorts of human faults involved; not one of which need necessarily involve fraud. The establishment of any precedent that fraud need be shown is something this body should reject unanimously. I am sure even the contestee would agree.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to my friend from South Carolina.

Mr. ASHMORE. I should like to get the record straight. I have not stated, I do not contend, and it is not my philosophy that one must prove fraud in order to contest an election. I say that if fraud is not proved then there is more evidence required.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I do not mean to bicker with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. I just wanted to emphasize that in his remarks, as in the remarks of our colleague from Pennsylvania, there was some emphasis on the absence of fraud.

We acknowledged the absence of fraud, but in no circumstances should we establish as a condition precedent to a contest that there be fraud.

Mr. ASHMORE. I mentioned that there was no fraud because of its absence, which I believe is worth noting—the fact that there was no fraud.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. We will concede there was no fraud. Will the gentleman concede that it is not a condition precedent to an election contest for a House seat?

Mr. ASHMORE. Absolutely it is not.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ASHMORE. Let me get the record straight on one other statement, as to a recount. The law in the State of Iowa does not provide for a recount, and that should be stated. Of course, we could order one, if we felt there were sufficient evidence.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. As a matter of fact, there are only two States in the Union—Iowa and Texas—which have no provision for handling contested elections and which do not provide for recounts in cases involving candidates for the U.S. House of Representatives or for the U.S. Senate. The laws of the State of Iowa are, in my judgment, nothing short of absurd on the question of election to the House of Representatives or to the U.S. Senate. There is a complete absence of any reasonable provision or protection for the incumbent or for the contestant.

The Supreme Court of the State of Iowa would take cognizance of this matter no further than to say in effect, "We ask that everything be impounded until February 1 when the Subcommittee on Election meets, at which time we have no further jurisdiction." The Federal court in the State of Iowa, through a U.S. district court judge, said that "In this case I have no jurisdiction." The gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the subcommittee here, sent a telegram on January 28 to the county election officials in the 16 counties herein involved saying:

> Pursuant to authority vested in the election committee of the House Administrative Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, under the contested election statute and in connection with the election contest now in progress in the Third Congressional District of Iowa, I request that you preserve intact until further notice for possible use by this committee all ballots and voting machines together with all other election paraphernalia used in connection with the election.

In other words, "Hold your records intact." By this time the Federal court had said that it had no jurisdiction. The State supreme court said it had jurisdiction only until the subcommittee acts. The auditors in the 16 counties whom I do not accuse of partisanship, but the fact is that they are almost all Republicans, interpreted the word "intact" to mean that they were not able to show the records to anybody.

In other contested cases, the Subcommittee on Elections has acted. After all, we must recognize the constitutional responsibility of this body to judge its Members and their seating in view of the complete vacuum created by the Federal district court and the State supreme court where the contestant was not able to see the ballots. Now, it is perfectly well to say that the laws of Iowa are so utterly absurd that they deliver a stack of ballots, several hundred of them, to each precinct and in effect say, "Use as many as you want boys; count as many as are used and burn the others. They are not numbered." There is a complete paucity of any control. The fact is, also, that some of those who are Democratic members of election boards are not in fact Democrats or are not in philosophy Democrats. We do not accuse them of any fraud. I do not. I just think that Iowa ought to do a complete revision of its laws, but until it does this body has the constitutional responsibility. I mean no personal criticism by this whatsoever, because I have the highest regard for the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE] and I have been a member of the Committee on House Administration for 11 years and have seen him handle brilliantly a number of contested cases. In this case I really do feel sincerely that the subcommittee and the Committee on House Administration should have moved in this case, and should absolutely in the future move into any existing vacuum. If the State legislature or the State government of the State of Iowa does not want to establish the procedures for a contest or if that is the case in Texas or any place else; then in order to preserve the integrity of this body with respect to any contest, the responsibility must be assumed, in my judgment, by the Committee on House Administration and its Subcommittee on Elections.

Now, I am not going to ask for a recommittal here or have a vote on this, but I simply want to make a record involving three things:

One, in my considered judgment this contestant did not have available to him all of the records which should have been made available; two, in the absence of any State law providing for a recount, this subcommittee and the Committee on House Administration should and must assume the responsibility and count all of the ballots, if necessary. Three, we must find some procedural means, as busy as we are—and all of us on the Committee on House Administration belong to other major committees—we must find some means or we must provide the staff to undertake more expeditiously the disposition of contests. It is really nothing short of ridiculous to be considering a January contest in October.

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE].

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, since the Subcommittee on Elections of the House Committee on Administration unanimously voted to dismiss this election contest for the Third District of Iowa, an effort has been made, apparently, to impugn the subcommittee and to mislead the Members of the House as to what occurred there.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVINE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman from New Jersey did not mean to impugn the subcommittee in the slightest. I would like the record to show that that was absolutely unintended.

Mr. DEVINE. In order that the record will be made clear——

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. How anyone could possibly interpret what I have said in that way is beyond me.

Mr. DEVINE. My reference was not to the gentleman from New Jersey but to the memorandum circulated by the contestant.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That is not a part of the record and that does not disturb me in the least.

Mr. DEVINE. The memorandum circulated by the contestant, Mr. Peterson, is little more than a rehash of the allegations that were submitted originally. There is not one shred of evidence to support the allegations made in the memorandum. The record of the case is devoid of any evidence to support the ridiculous charge of "gross irregularities." There is no pun intended there. Although the contestant in his notice and petition of contest alleged that there were irregularities in each of the 16 counties involved in the Third District of Iowa, he took testimony only in 6 of those 16 counties, and in those 6 counties he failed to produce one witness who would testify that a single vote was improperly counted.

Something has been said here about the burning of unused ballots. The evidence is clear that that did occur in just one instance in the entire 16 counties involved and that this was done by, if you please, a Democratic justice of the peace; and as a matter of custom or practice he has done this year in and year out over the years. And it relates not only to the congressional election but to all candidates, Republican and Democratic alike.

There is no evidence of violation of the mandatory Iowa election laws, as was alleged by the contestant—no evidence whatsoever. The contestant was not denied access to pertinent election records as charged. For example, Mr. Peterson stated in his brief that he was denied an opportunity to examine the records in Bremer County. But the testimony—and it is clear in the record, and the subcommittee had this available and that means access to it—that the Bremer County auditor did in fact make the records available to Mr. Peterson and to his assistant and provide him a place to work and to go over these particular records.

During the course of the hearings conducted in the six counties by the contestant, Mr. Peterson, Democratic and Republican witnesses alike testified that no complaints were made or filed about how the election was conducted; that there was no reason to believe the election results were not accurate and that Mr. Peterson was not treated just as fairly as was Mr. GROSS. It is important to bear in mind that every single witness called in this election contest was a Peterson witness. Mr. GROSS called no one. The entire case was based on evidence that could be produced by the contestant. And, he completely failed to produce anything that would substantiate the charges made, as was unanimously agreed to by the subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this contest was totally without merit. Giving the contestant the benefit of the doubt, the best that could be said is that it was merely a fishing expedition based upon the slim hope that in the event there would be a recount, perhaps, he might have won rather than the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] who did win by a total of 416 votes.

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the long line of precedents in the House, in my opinion there can be no other decision by this body than to dismiss this particular contest.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have not been a direct participant in any way in this contest. I considered it to be a contest between Mr. Peterson and Mr. GROSS. I am not a member of the committee. But, after all, I am from Iowa and so I have been interested in following the procedures very carefully in this case.

I would vote in any election contest to seat whoever I believe actually received the most votes. Unfortunately, we cannot vote on that basis on this resolution today because I do not and other members do not know who received the most votes in the Third Congressional District of Iowa in 1964. All we are voting on today is to get rid of the case because so much time has elapsed, the committees have done so little to process the case, and in the closing days of the session it would be difficult to correct for the shortcomings of the procedures of the House of Representatives and the committees which were entrusted with the primary responsibility.

This is another case which spotlights the subject failure of the House of Representatives and its committees to perform the duties thrust upon it by the Constitution of the United States and we can use the case as an example to determine what reforms should be made. Therefore, the principal purpose of my remarks is to urge reform.

The facts I am stating were related to me or in the contestant's record and they must be true for they never were answered and denied.

Immediately after the election, the contestant Peterson or his attorney made several attempts to get the Special Elections Committee of the House to determine and preserve certain facts and evidence. That committee has been set up by each Congress to function during and after the election and to report to the new Congress. It has subpena powers and if it functions, I do not believe most contests would be filed because the parties would know who received the most votes before some local election officials could do anything to change the result or hide errors.

In this case, the Special Elections Committee, with a retiring Member of the House as chairman, completely failed to function. The two or three appointments made by the contestant to discuss the case were canceled. The failure to assume the responsibility that had been entrusted to that committee was total and complete.

Because evidence was being hidden and the attitude of election officials in some counties indicated they would destroy more evidence, the contestant went to both the State and Federal courts. In each case the contestee claimed the courts did not have jurisdiction and the courts said the jurisdiction is in the House of Representatives except that the State supreme court did order the voting records held until the 89th Congress had a chance to convene and organize. I do not criticize those court opinions but they do completely undercut the claim of some that the committee should not assume full jurisdiction or that the contestant should have used court procedures instead of expecting the committee to perform its duties. Only Iowa and Texas have no provision of law for a recount in a congressional contest and although the House of Representatives has primary responsibility in all States, there is less excuse for passing the buck in Iowa and Texas where State law does not give anyone authority to receive it. When the committee insisted upon passing the buck in this case, it was refusing to perform its duty.

When the 89th Congress convened and organized, and the contest had been filed, the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. ASHMORE] properly sent a telegram asking election officials to hold election material. Some of them used this telegram as an excuse not to permit inspection of it subsequently at a time when they could be put under oath and examined concerning it.

Then the contestant started through the lengthy, expensive, frustrating obstacle course laid down by the rules of procedure of the committee for these cases. Under these rules, the Elections Subcommittee passes its responsibilities off onto the contestant but without enough power to overcome delays and obstacles that can be presented when the contestee and some local election officials resist uncovering evidence.

When election officials resist producing pertinent documents upon which they should be examined, it would take more time to go through court procedures for each official involved than is allowed under committee rules to complete discovery and anyway court opinions have indicated lack of jurisdiction for supervision. Under these procedures, it costs a contestant from $10,000 to $30,000 to run through the obstacle course. Few, if any Democratic candidates for Congress in Iowa have ever had $10,000 available to spend in a general election campaign, let alone a contest, and to force a contestant to raise that amount of money for a contest while the contestee is drawing his salary and furnished a staff and office is in and of itself a very unfair practice.

All procedures were apparently followed until the contestant filed his printed brief. Then suddenly the subcommittee disregarded its own rules and let the contestee answer orally and denied the contestant the right to see a printed brief before the hearing and to have time to research and rebut contentions raised in the contestee's brief.

The procedures and practices in this case were very unfair to the contestant, as they have been in many previous cases.

Is it any wonder this House has a reputation that it is some kind of a private club which will not let outside have an equal chance to get in?

It does not help either when no member from the majority side of the subcommittee is from north of Virginia or west of the Mississippi River. No one section should have a monopoly, and especially not the section which has the least experience with general elections, for, after all, this committee deals with general elections.

I kept hearing all year that the contestant would not be given a fair chance because the Elections Subcommittee was stacked with the old coalition in full control.

I refused until recently to believe that would make any difference but the least that can be said is that the reputation of the House is clouded by appointing a subcommittee that way.

In this case the buck was passed back and forth and election officials have still been able to avoid opening pertinent records. The fact that they resisted raises the question that if they were not hiding something bad, why did they resist? If an election official did not commit irregularities for the purpose of stealing votes, I would think he would want everyone to see the pertinent records.

In one county, absentee ballots were burned. The quality election official naturally said they were unused ones and that he had done that before. The fact that someone has broken the law before does not make him immune thereafter. The only way anyone could know whether they substituted ballots and burned the ballots that were replaced would be for the committee to have a handwriting expert look at those ballots that were left.

With the adoption of this report, without pertinent records having been inspected, the officials who committed irregularities will be free to finish destroying evidence without anyone but those election officials knowing whether irregularities were committed for the purpose of stealing votes.

This report finishes the whitewash and coverup of the results of the irregularities alleged and itemized. Whether they were intentional irregularities or not is immaterial and I specifically reject and object to the assumption of the committee that fraud or intentional irregularity must be shown. All that is important is "for whom were the most votes cast." It is immaterial where the change in the totals result from fraud, or just mistakes and errors.

The procedures of the subcommittee in this case, when viewed as a whole, were such that in my opinion they imprint even more deeply and more indelibly into history the impression that the House of Representatives is a private club which will unfairly protect incumbents if possible. This image is strengthened by the fact that no incumbent contestee has been unseated in the 20th century.

The failure of the elections subcommittee to perform its duties, its operation under rules designed to pass the buck, its abject failure to remove clouds over the seating of incumbents, and its raising obstacles against contestants, in my opinion have been so evident as to constitute a bad reflection upon the reputation of the whole House of Representatives.

I strongly urge that the bad procedures and practices used in this case be turned to some good by using the case as an example of why jurisdiction for election contests should be removed completely from the House Administration Committee and placed in a special committee which is broadly representative of the Congress, will also operate during election years and especially immediately following elections, and that it be given a mandate to clean up the rules under which these contests are processed with a view to both speed and fairness and that instead of trying to follow precedents from cases wherein the responsibilities of the House have been avoided, that they begin performing the duties assigned to us by the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE].

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, in order that the record be made crystal clear on this election contest, I would like to read an insert which appears in the election contest testimony that has been filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

> In the Clerk's Office on July 30, 1965, during the course of the opening of the testimony in the contested election case of Stephen M. Peterson against H. R. GROSS, the contestant asked for additional time for filing depositions taken in Bremer County, Iowa. The contestee agreed to allowing additional time for filing of the deposition from Bremer County provided that a deadline be set. The contestant and the contestee agreed to the date of August 10, 1965, as the deadline for receipt of said deposition and that the copy be noted as to the date of filing.
>
> It was noted that the notice of contest was not filed with the Clerk's Office. It was agreed that the notice of contest be noted as to date of filing.

That is the end of the quote in this record of testimony, and I read that just in order that the record may be made clear that there was no obstacle of any type thrown in the way of the contestant so far as the contestee is concerned in this overall matter.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVINE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ERLENBORN. As a member of this committee, I heard some of the arguments when the committee considered this matter. Much has been made in the committee and again on the floor of the House today of the fact that the contestant was not given an opportunity in some of these counties to physically examine the ballots and election materials. Is it not true that no attempt was made by the contestant to obtain a subpena from this committee or from any court of record but that he merely walked in with his attorney and asked that he physically be able to examine the ballots?

Mr. DEVINE. The chairman of the subcommittee is in a better position to answer that. I know of no such effort on the part of the contestant.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that I have any time left; will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield 2 minutes?

Mr. CURTIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman if he has any other speakers?

Mr. CURTIN. I have no other speakers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the gentleman from Iowa did not intend to infer that by design the people of, we will say for the lack of a better word, conservative persuasion or from the South, have intentionally been assigned to the Subcommittee on Elections. As a matter of fact, the members of this subcommittee have been chosen because they are lawyers. Or like myself—they were lawyers. I usually speak of myself in that respect in the past tense. But they were put on that committee for that reason. Also they were recognized according to seniority, a consideration which is always given in these things.

There has never been any attempt to stack the committee and I am sure the gentleman would not intentionally make that as an accusation, but I think he did infer it.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I did not intend to reflect upon any one section of the country. I just want to say, if any one section of this country has every member on an election subcommittee, it gives a general image that is not good, no matter what section of the country they are from.

Mr. BURLESON. It may appear that way but the subcommittee and the full committee in handling these matters, during the 19 years that I have served in this capacity, have always tried to be as judicial and as analytical and objective in these matters as it is possible to be and as our capacities permit us to be. I have never seen a partisanship angle which I thought overcame or prejudiced an objective decision in these matters.

Mr. Speaker, there are two things that the gentleman from South Carolina has emphasized and he has done that, I think adequately. But I think they should be reemphasized.

Number one, as to the burden of proof—the burden of proof is on the contestant always in these matters just as in any case at law that is being tried in a court of competent jurisdiction. The burden of proof is on the one who is bringing the action. That is the way it should be and it cannot be transferred to one who is brought into a contest against his will. That is number one.

The point was made by my able friend, the gentleman from Ohio, that in cases where there is not provision for a contest to be brought in a local jurisdiction this Congress should go into the matter on its own initiative more or less. If that were the case, Mr. Speaker, we might as well set up a rule that any of us who did not win our elections by a certain number of votes, let us say a thousand votes or five hundred votes or whatever it might be—would automatically be entitled to a recount. This committee would have to investigate the case, impound and count the ballots, and all that sort of business because that is exactly what that would mean—that there is to be a limitation upon what number of votes would be necessary in order to have a recount.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. Yes, of course, I yield to my friend.

Mr. HAYS. I pointed out, without going into detail, that a person who brings a contest in Ohio must assume some financial responsibility. I was interested to note that in his remarks the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] gave some figures as to what this cost the contestant. In Ohio, one can have a complete recount in a congressional district for a maximum, I should think, of $5,000 because you are required to put up $10 per precinct, and you get a refund if more than a 3-percent error is shown.

I certainly would not advocate that we go into any and all cases. Perhaps we should have some sort of financial responsibility on the part of the contestant so that frivolous counts would not be had. There are not many in Ohio because of the fact that they have to put up the money.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I wish to emphasize that the gist of my discussion was the complete absence in the State of Iowa of adequate statutory authority for a recount. That vacuum exists in Iowa, Texas, and perhaps other States. I believe constitutionally, it is our responsibility.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman will remember a case in Texas which was contested. It has been mentioned that my State of Texas has no provision for recounts in election contests. Contests can and have been brought. Local remedies in any State are available through proper avenues of legal procedure.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am very anxious that certain misconceptions concerning this case be set to rest. First, I do not believe that the dismissal of this contest has any bearing on cases which involve allegations of illegal denial of the right to vote or to appear on a ballot. In fact, there have been no claims of such wrongdoing in this situation. Second, I think that many of us are unhappy that Iowa provides no method for securing a recount of disputed congressional election returns and that the committee did not examine the returns. However, there is no requirement that a recount be made and, in the absence of a demonstration that there was fraud or wrongdoing which could have affected the results of the election, we cannot impose such a requirement.

Finally, several of us are distressed at the knowledge that some State election officials apparently declined to furnish information to Mr. Peterson because the committee requested the officials to maintain the records "intact." Unfortunately, some Iowa officials interpreted this request to mean keeping the records secret, even from the challenger. This was not what the committee sought. However, there is no showing that the denial of access to the information prevented Mr. Peterson from perfecting a claim which would have affected the committee's decision.

I believe that this case is unique and should not be regarded as setting a precedent for the future. If anything, it should be a guide to State officials and underscore the desirability of establishing a procedure for recounts in close elections. A State does have responsibilities which it, alone, can discharge.

I think that if Mr. Peterson was denied a reasonable chance to resolve questions concerning his election contest it was due to State processes which, under the circumstances, do not constitute grounds for us to act further in this case.

Our colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI] has authorized me to say that he agrees completely with these remarks and associates himself with them.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD in connection with House Resolution 602.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE FRANK HURBURT O'HARA

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for myself and other Members of the Illinois delegation, I extend my deepest sympathy to our colleague, Congressman BARRATT O'HARA, in the loss of his brother Dr. Frank Hurburt O'Hara, who died at Phoenix, Ariz., on the night of October 8. The brothers were closely bound together. Although retaining his residence in the Second Congressional District of Illinois that he might continue to vote for his brother, Frank until recent months had maintained an apartment at 1 Scott Circle in Washington and here every Sunday afternoon the brothers would spend together. Frank had many friends on Capitol Hill.

Among the first telegrams of sympathy to BARRATT was one from Senator and Mrs. Douglas reading:

> We share your loss because we loved Frank.

President Beadle of the University of Chicago wired:

> Mrs. Beadle and I are sorry indeed to learn of the death in Phoenix, Ariz., of your brother, Frank Hurburt O'Hara, who served on our English department faculty for nearly three decades. He was intensely interested in undergraduate life on our campus and contributed greatly to the development of a creative interest in drama. Among the young men and women in our college he was a very special kind of teacher, whose retirement inspired the Alumni of the University of Chicago Dramatic Association to publish a special appreciation on his work as an expression of their gratitude to him. We regret his passing. Please accept our condolences.
>
> Sincerely.

Vice President Charles U. Daly of the University of Chicago wired:

> Please accept my condolences on the death of your brother, who acquired so many friends during his three decades of teaching and leadership in dramatics for the University of Chicago. I know that all of the university community joins me in mourning his loss.

BARRATT always took pride in saying his brother Frank, although 6 years younger, made Who's Who in America many, many years before he did. That was when, as a young man, he had been voted the leading short, short story writer of the United States. He was so affected by the death of his father in 1919 that he gave up fiction writing entirely and abandoned a field in which he had gained preeminence at an early age. Thereafter he devoted himself to the drama.

Here are quotes from the announcement of the second printing of one of his books, "Today in American Drama":

> A generation of students know Mr. O'Hara's courses in 20th century drama, play writing, and play production at the University of Chicago—courses which have, incidentally, merited praise from "critics" as varied as Beatrice Lillie, Alfred Lunt, and Whitford Kane.

Sterling North, Chicago Daily News says:

> Frank O'Hara was always a creative teacher of the drama.

Lloyd Lewis, Chicago Daily News says:

> Somehow Frank O'Hara's classes in drama are always staging plays that reveal, in one breath, awareness of dramatic tradition and originality of viewpoint—a combination rare indeed.

The Christian Century says:

Frank O'Hara is one of the ablest and most creative teachers of drama in this country.

Here is the sketch of Frank Hurburt O'Hara's career as it appears in the 1964–65 edition of Who's Who in America:

O'Hara, Frank Hurburt, writer, university professor; born: Berrien Springs, Mich., February 2, 1888; son: Judge Thomas and Mary (Barratt) O'Hara; graduate Chaffee-Noble School of Detroit, 1909; postgraduate work same school, 1910–11; Ph. D., University of Chicago, 1915; graduate work in English, same university, 1915–17; L.L.D., Shorter College-Jackson Seminary, 1962; unmarried. Began writing for newspapers in boyhood and has served as reporter, dramatic editor, and special writer for metropolitan newspapers and magazines. Principal high school, Dearborn, Mich., 1908–11; member faculty, Chaffee-Noble School of Detroit, 1909–11, University of Chicago High School, 1914–17, University of Chicago, 1917, University of Illinois, 1917–24; also extension lecturer in English, Indiana University, 1922–24; member faculty University of Chicago, since 1924, director undergraduate activities, 1924–27, director of drama, 1927–38; John Hay Whitney, New York Foundation visiting professor, College Idaho, 1953–54, summer, 1956, Fisk University, 1954–55; visiting professor at Hiram College, 1957–59. Editor: "University of Chicago Plays," 1936. Author: "A Handbook of Drama" (with M. H. Bro), 1938; "Today in American Drama," 1939; "Invitation to the Theater" (with M. H. Bro), 1951. Member Phi Gamma Delta. Democrat. Clubs: University Quadrangle. Contributor: short stories to magazines. Address: The University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

While Frank was a visiting professor at Hiram College in Ohio, Frank E. Samuel and William M. Kloss collaborated in the following article in Patterns, the student magazine:

(By Frank E. Samuel and William M. Kloss)

Frank Hurburt O'Hara, two u's in Hurburt and don't forget to capitalize the H. "Don't ever give your child a middle name. He'll have to drag it around all his life." Precise dark suit, brown hat with brim up all around, white hair, periodic spectacles. The barbed understatement. Tickler of the intellect, unassuming, curious, sympathetic, self-effacing. "You will find this to be true, I think."

His books sensible, lucid. The gilded assumption when addressing the class: "You all know, don't you * * *." Simplicity, charm. Appreciative hand on the shoulder. Undivided attention. Gentle, expressive voice and face and hands and body. The realization of the infinite capacity of man to create and understand.

University of Chicago, Hiram College. Sympathy, empathy. The theater comes alive, but "nobody on God's earth speaks that effectively." Discrimination, tolerance. Myriad facets of mind and expression. Fantastic memory for friends, fantastic capacity for friends. When before has one man known so much about so many and they known so little about him. "I've said before but I like to say it."

The ritual drink of water at the break. The insistence on attention to others though not necessarily to himself.

"Whenever I have guests in my classes I expect them to contribute." "Would you like to have our little game postponed from Monday to Tuesday?" "I make quite a distinction between things you ought to know and things you ought to read."

On literature and drama: "There are few books about Barrie because those who liked him didn't need to say anything and those who abominated him couldn't bear to." "Conrad is a dish of artichokes. Artichokes you like or you don't like. Artichokes you know how to eat or you don't know how to eat." "Latin America has not distinguished itself in literature that has reached us as it has distinguished itself, for instance, in statesmanship of various kinds."

Youthful, effervescent. Simplicity, clarity. Duty to students. Pursuit of thinking, not necessarily of knowledge. How can one capture the essence of greatness (is this greatness) beneath the appearance of—what? He is one of those whom G. B. Shaw meant who is uneasy "in the presence of error." He knows of comedies without a laugh, and refers to the future time "when you write your first novel" and then class is over: "Go thou and sin no more."

"This is a pretty swell play."

The death of Frank Hurburt O'Hara followed by 2 years the death of Mrs. Isabel O'Hara—Benjamin—Yaeger, of Phoenix, Ariz., the oldest of the three children of Judge Thomas and Mary Barratt O'Hara.

Mrs. Murphy joins me in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Congressman O'HARA in this hour of grief.

May God see fit to give him the fortitude to accept his great loss.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely sorry to learn of the passing of Dr. Frank Hurbert O'Hara, the distinguished brother of our dear friend and eminent colleague, BARRATT O'HARA of Illinois.

I have long been aware of the outstanding contribution to the American way of life of Professor O'Hara. He not only distinguished himself in academic life as one of the foremost university professors, but also became famous as a writer and dramatist. The dramatic world and academic life have both lost a truly gifted and great man, and I wish to extend my heartfelt sympathy to his brother and my personal friend and colleague, BARRATT O'HARA.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, for myself and the Delaware delegation, I extend my deepest sympathy to our colleague, Congressman BARRATT O'HARA, upon the loss of his brother, Dr. Frank Hurburt O'Hara, who died in Phoenix, Ariz., on the night of October 8.

To know our colleague, BARRATT, and then to know how close was the relationship to his brother would be to realize the loss and sadness that has come over his life. The two brothers had so much in common. They were scholars, educators, journalists, students of the drama. The brothers were closely identified with the educational and cultural life of the great city of Chicago, where they resided for so many years. As the author of many books on the drama, as well as numerous magazine articles on this subject, Dr. Frank O'Hara had become well known in the universities through the Midwest.

Ralph Waldo Emerson once wrote that the true test of civilization is, not the census, nor the size of cities, nor the crops—no, but the kind of man the country turns out.

Mrs. McDowell joins me in prayer and in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Congressman O'HARA in this hour of grief.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to my good friend and colleague, Congressman BARRATT O'HARA, in the loss of his brother, Dr. Frank Hurburt O'Hara, last Friday, October 8. Although he had a full life he will be sorely missed and only time can lessen the grief sustained in BARRATT'S loss.

Dr. O'Hara was a noted educator and writer whose contributions to education and the literary world have not gone unnoticed. He will long be remembered for his teachings in 20th-century drama, playwriting, and play production at the University of Chicago as he was considered one of the ablest and most creative teachers of drama in this country.

His thirst for knowledge was one of his greatest attributes and he made good use of his education by teaching others. He was a very special kind of teacher revered by his students for he excelled in creative thinking.

It is always difficult to accept the loss of such a good man for I am sure he had much more to contribute to the world. But let us not be overcome by the sorrow of his death but rejoice in the memory of his contribution in the art of drama. Were Judge Thomas and Mary Barratt O'Hara with us today they would be extremely proud of their son, Dr. Frank Hurburt O'Hara.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the other Members of this great body in expressing my sorrow to our colleague, Congressman BARRATT O'HARA, in the loss of his brother, Dr. Frank Hurburt O'Hara, who passed away on October 8, 1965.

Professor O'Hara, who served the English department of the University of Chicago for nearly three decades, made it evident that an author and teacher has many facets, and that among these, humility, understanding, and devotedness hold equal importance with dedication and ability. The field of education lost a greatly talented and humble man.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my deepest sympathy and condolences to my colleague BARRATT O'HARA in this hour of grief.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my condolences to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, Representative BARRATT O'HARA, on the loss of his brother, Dr. Frank Hurburt O'Hara, who died last week in Phoenix. The O'Hara brothers have been an ornament to our national life. It is indeed a rarity when two men born of the same seed make such magnificent contributions to their country as the two O'Hara brothers.

While BARRATT, the elder, has ably served his fellow citizens from Illinois, Frank has enriched our cultural life with his short stories, his drama productions, his literary criticisms and his creative teaching of literature at the University of Chicago.

Congressman O'HARA'S loss is a bereavement for the country. I join my colleagues in expressing my sympathy for the country.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the late Frank Hurburt O'Hara.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

CLEVELAND PLAIN DEALER CARRIES THE STORY OF CONGRESSMAN FEIGHAN'S EXPOSÉ OF $210 MILLION RUMANIAN COMMUNIST SHAKEDOWN RACKET

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, "People for Sale," a documentary of ransom, Iron-Curtain style—the inside story of a $210 million Communist ransom ring—appears in the national publication This Week magazine which was distributed by the Sunday edition of the Cleveland Plain Dealer of Sunday, October 10, 1965.

This venal shakedown racket was first brought to my attention by some of my constituents who paid the ransom for the release of their relatives and who were incensed because others would not be fortunate enough to have relatives with ransom money and would be required to remain in the Communist dungeon. I personally investigated this matter abroad and verified the statements by interviewing witnesses under oath. The feature story in This Week follows:

PEOPLE FOR SALE

(By Arthur and Norma Woodstone)

In 1962, Robert Martinu, a Rumanian expatriate who is now a wealthy New York businessman, bought a family of four, trapped behind the Iron Curtain, from a cartel that sells people the way a supermarket sells meat.

This produce, however, is not butchered. It arrives in the West alive, plucked, processed and priced not by the pound but according to the buyer's wealth and the emigrant's value—old men and women cheap, skilled technicians and well-educated youngsters expensive and subtle fluctuations matched to rich friends or family abroad. Average price, about $3,000 per head.

Martinu may have gotten a bargain. His four friends cost him only $10,000.

Their story of ransom—Rumanian style—began in 1961, a year when Rumania, fed up with Russian equipment and domination, began eyeing Italian, West German, British, and United States machines, tools, and production processes. But no Rumanian product would attract the lira, marks, pounds and dollars needed to pay for such machinery.

The Rumanian solution was simple: sell oppressed human beings.

In that same year, 1961, Mario Karil, Martinu's friend, had been serving at hard labor in a Rumanian political prison for more than a year. And a Rumanian prison, Karil recalls, was a vile place to be.

"They were created for only one purpose—to destroy you. One more year and I would have been dead. We got up at 5 and were made to stand until 10 at night. We had to tell the guard that we were exhausted before he would permit us to sit down for a short time, but if we stayed on the bed too long—he would look through the place in the door—we would be punished. They lived to punish us, to beat us, to humiliate us.

"I was in a cell with four, then with 20, then with 80. We were put in tiers. * * * There were 80 men in the room but only 40 bowls and spoons and just one toilet. At least eight of the men were consumptive; eight others were syphilitics."

While Rumania was suffering trade problems and Karil was enduring prison, Martinu went to Paris on a visit. There, he says, a stranger, "a man who pretended he had recently come out of Rumania," telephoned Martinu's suite at the Hotel George V.

"He said," Martinu relates, "he wished me to intercede in behalf of mutual friends still in Rumania. So I let him visit me at the hotel, where he asked me, point blank, if I was interested in getting Mario Karil out of Rumania. I said yes, but how? Would I have to pay?

"This man said, of course. How much would I pay? I threw him a figure, arbitrarily, of $7,000. He said he'd work on it—and went away."

Shortly after this, the stranger called again and said that if Martinu would pay $10,000, he would get out Mr. Karil, his wife, and his two children. Martinu agreed.

Karil's "friend" was actually an agent from the sordid ransom cartel. He instructed Martinu to put the ransom on deposit in a numbered Swiss bank account. But Martinu hadn't gotten wealthy by being a fool. He insisted the money be placed in escrow with his accountants in London. When the Karils wired their safe arrival outside of Rumania, the ransom would be released.

Several months later, Karil was instructed to gather all his personal belongings (a second shift), and to appear before the prison commandant, who smiled and asked superstitiously, "Did you have a dream last night?"

"I said no," Karil recalls. "He said, 'How long have you been in prison?' I told him 2 years and he said, 'How long were you supposed to be in prison?' 'Fifteen years,' I said."

Karil will always remember what came next. "Well, Karil, the party, in its magnanimity, is offering you amnesty. You can go home at once."

"LIKE A DEAD BODY"

The sick, emaciated man was given enough money, the commandant assured him, to reach home several hundred miles away. Actually, it covered only third-class train fare. In its magnanimity, the party let him starve for the next 24 hours. He reached home wearing the clothes he'd been arrested in 2 years earlier. His wife, who hadn't even been sure he was alive, fainted. His daughter remembers how he smelled. * * * "It was like they took a dead body out of the ground."

Karil was out of jail—but not yet free. Every day he had to report to the police for another interrogation, and, each time, his wife expected never to see him again. The entire Karil family underwent constant surveillance.

The day Karil was arrested, the security police had confiscated everything he owned. Nevertheless, after his release, they exhaustively reexamined his finances, making sure the cleanly plucked family would take nothing with them.

Eventually, the Government ordered Karil to buy airplane tickets to Paris. Two tickets. The children, they were told, must stay in Rumania.

Karil and his wife talked it over, decided to chance it. Once outside, they agreed, they could perhaps negotiate for the children.

Finally, after 67 days of harassment and doubt, Karil and his wife were abruptly ordered to the airport in Bucharest. There they were led into a barren room, stripped and searched. There was a 9 a.m. plane for Paris but at 8:55 the Karils were still isolated from other passengers.

"Would we leave or not? It was torture * * * that's the way they often worked."

NOT EVEN BUS FARE

When the engines had started and the other passengers were aboard, the security police led the Karils to the plane and gave them their visas, one nearly empty suitcase—and no money. When they landed at Paris they had to walk several miles from Orly Airport to a friend's apartment in town. There they learned that Martinu, whom they had not seen in 25 years, had paid for their freedom and for their children's.

Their children. Karil called Martinu in New York, and Martinu counterattacked. His accountants in London wrote two new checks, each for $5,000. The first was for prompt payment to the cartel; the second would be paid only when Karil's children came out.

The Karils stayed in Paris 6 months with aid from an emigree welfare agency and the ever-diminishing hope that their children would be freed. As a last resort, Karil promised to borrow $3,000 and add it to the $5,000 already on deposit for the cartel. Finally, in the fall of 1962, with the despondent senior Karils trying desperately to begin life anew in New York, the cartel quit haggling. At a cost of $8,000, the young people were permitted to leave Rumania.

The four of them, $13,000 worth of Rumania export, are now reunited in New York.

Today Karil is certain his children were retained by the security police as hostages. "They wanted to wait and see how I would act on the other side, once I was free of them," he explains.

The real names of Martinu and Karil (which are on file with a congressional investigating committee) have been changed here—but their story is true. It is not even unusual.

It is estimated that between 5,000 and 10,000 Rumanians have been ransomed since 1961. The cheapest price was purportedly a flat $1,000, set before the traffic became sophisticated. The highest was $20,000—paid, ironically, for an important Rumanian Communist who was suspected of being a double agent and finally shipped to Paris.

As much as $20 million may already have been made by the cartel. Representative MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Democrat, of Ohio, said during hearings by his House Subcommittee on Immigration, that the ransom potential is 10 times that. There was, he says, "a plan to take out 70,000 persons at an average of $3,000."

A $210 million plot.

Actually, the man in the Western World most likely to know the exact count of ransomed Rumanians and the exact price their freedom has cost is one named Heinrich (Henry) Jacober. And the only nation likely to know the total ransom potential is the Rumanian Government itself.

Last year, testimony before the Feighan subcommittee disclosed that Jacober, described as a Rumanian Jew of Hungarian ethnic background, "has considerable knowledge of persons who have been arrested and incarcerated in Rumania on political charges * * * and has a considerable number of runners (agents) throughout Western Europe, South America, and the United States."

Jacober, who used to live in the fashionable Mayfair section of London, poses as a businessman, a dealer in lumber and grain, and he gets around. FEIGHAN says that twice Jacober passed through the United States on a circuitous route to Lima, Peru. Each time he returned via the United States.

American authorities were well aware of his activities and his only reason for being here. For actually, he is the cartel's "sales manager." From a list of Rumanian prisoners who have relatives or close friends "outside," which could not be obtained without cooperation by Rumanian officials, he picks a likely name and puts a runner on the case. The runner approaches the relative or friend and tells them that, for a price, an exit visa can be secured.

These runners are well trained; sometimes they toy with the ransomer for weeks until they determine exactly how much money they can extract from him. Ten percent goes to Jacober as commission; the rest goes into a fund to be used to buy machinery in the West.

One buyer thinks Jacober is venal and callous. But a U.S. clergyman who has worked through Jacober to free several Rumanians feels Jacober is a realist. Karil himself says, "It's a shame but without his help we'd be dead."

ISRAEL A GOOD CUSTOMER

Indirectly, Israel is one of Jacober's best customers. The Israelis have a great stake in the ransoming because an estimated 50 percent of the ransom victims have been Jews. About 350,000 Rumanian Jews survived nazism—Rumanian as well as German—and they are a bother to the Communists because they resist the teachings of Marxism in favor of the Talmud. But the Rumanian racketeers hit a bonanza when they found Zionist agencies anxious to help their coreligionists out of bondage and into the Promised Land.

Once the fee is agreed upon, the money is deposited to one of Jacober's numbered Swiss bank accounts. This constitutes a signal to the Rumanian Government to let the man, woman, or family out—after he (or they) have been forced by the secret police to sell everything in order to pay them off. "By the time a prisoner leaves he has nothing but the clothes on his back," says Congressman FEIGHAN.

By 1964, the system was operating so efficiently that the Rumanian Government was releasing innumerable prisoners through Jacober and receiving from him a steady supply of freshly purchased Western machinery in return.

Then on June 1, 1964, Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman and Deputy Premier Gheorghe Gaston-Marin signed a United States-Rumanian trade agreement pledging liberal long-term credit from the West and closer diplomatic relations.

With this treaty, the United States hoped to gain a new outlet for exports, secure liberalization of human rights within Rumania, and further undermine the struts of world communism.

Rumania had it even better. By treaty, the United States was not only supplying machines and tools, but also money, or at least credit, to buy them.

PARADE OF VICTIMS

After Gaston-Marin finished trade talks in the United States, he went to London, where it is believed he gave new instructions to Jacober because, shortly thereafter, Jacober's ransom channels were closed. The Feighan committee believes he is now operating out of Morocco. But not before several of his victims had risen in cautious testimony to the heartlessness of his ransom ring.

One of the most touching cases is that of two sisters. One worked for the British Embasy and one for the U.S. Information Service in the American Legation in Bucharest. Both were arrested, charged with being agents for those two countries and held in torture chambers.

After 12 years the women were let out of prison and runners contacted an American relative. The relative was forced to pay $6,000 apiece for the women. The one who had worked for the British was then given citizenship by Britain.

FEIGHAN currently is seeking to help the other woman, who is still stateless. Her name is Nora Isabella Samuelli, and she is hiding out somewhere in this country waiting for a bill, introduced by FEIGHAN but not yet passed, to permit her to become an American citizen.

Another man came before Representative FEIGHAN'S subcommittee in closed session, and told the following frightening story. He was, he said, a graduate of a college in Rumania, a scientist. He had a wife and one child with him, a girl of 10. They had been bought for $3,000 a head. "The party told him," reports FEIGHAN, "that if he would become a member they would give him a better job. He refused, pretending that as a scientist he didn't want to mix in politics.

"After that he was treated as a low grade person, and his family was deprived of the ordinary necessities. He feared for the physical health of his wife and child and was horrified at the materialistic, Godless attitude that was instilled in his child at school.

"He now is working in the United States and he came to the committee despite his fear that he might be discovered. But he said, 'Even if they kill me, it is all right. I have given my child a chance to live in freedom.' "

Another person who was "bought" for $2,500 had to sign a statement that he had no claim against the Rumanian Government or any person in Rumania, and a second statement that he was very grateful to the Rumanian Government for all that it had done for him. And one victim told the committee he hadn't been allowed to leave Rumania until he'd found two persons who would agree in writing to stand responsible for any of his debts or obligations which might come to light afterward.

All the cases mentioned in this article are Rumanian. However, FEIGHAN says, "A similar-type racket seems to be opening up now in Bulgaria. And also in Poland. The American public has the right to know about this shameful shakedown and how American citizens are being victimized. * * *"

Is the Rumanian Government actually involved? Obviously, yes.

Does the U.S. Government know of this? Flatly—yes. Aside from the Feighan committee's work, there is Martinu's story of how, after turning over ransom arrangements to his people in London, he returned to New York and "told an FBI man the whole story as I now tell you. He did not offer any response as to whether I should give the money to Jacober or I shouldn't. He merely said that the FBI knows of many such cases. That was in 1961."

WHY DO WE PLAY BALL?

A third question is more complicated. Is the United States putting up with Rumanian ransom and, if so, why?

Are we, perhaps, willing to let the ransom trade continue as the only way of rescuing prisoners and Jews from behind Rumania's Iron Curtain—like one Orthodox Jew, who compares the urgency to the days of nazism? "We failed," he says, "when we did not give the Nazis 10,000 trucks for the lives of 250,000 Jews. We can never let that happen again."

Or do we feel the broad goal of peace might be jeopardized if the U.S. administration were to take a position on Rumanian-style ransom? The administration is pleased that the recent trade pact has helped Rumania move that much further outside the sphere of Soviet influence and some 19 million persons are being helped to prosper. A pleased, prosperous nation, the United States believes, ceases to be an enemy.

One wonders. With friends like Rumania?

NEWS REPORTERS AND THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the war on poverty has a special attraction for well-paid reporters holding full-time positions with newspapers.

To combat their own poverty situation, three reporters for the Washington Daily News have been doubling their regular salary by "moonlighting" down at poverty headquarters, the Office of Economic Opportunity.

George E. Clifford, Jr., makes $240 per week at the Daily News. At poverty headquarters, he made $3,900 between March 15 and July 31, 1965. That should put Mr. Clifford ahead of the poverty game.

Likewise, Mr. Hugh D. MacLean is not letting poverty catch up with him. His salary at the News is $13,000 annually. Between March 24, 1965, and July 15, 1965, the taxpayers subsidized him to the extent of $3,040—a tidy moonlighting sum. Mr. MacLean quit the Government on July 15, 1965.

Mr. Thomas V. Kelly worked for the Daily News at the annual salary rate of $12,600. He fought poverty from March 24, 1965, to July 31, 1965, and the taxpayers awarded him $3,600 for this period. I understand he has quit the News but I am not certain of the date.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to understand how news reporters can fulfill the requirements of their regular employment during a week in which they work up to 56 hours for the Office of Economic Opportunity. Can they do a creditable job for the taxpayers? Can they do an honest job of reporting while receiving a Government salary of $350 per week?

For the week ending April 3, Clifford was paid for 56 hours of work against poverty. He was paid for 56 hours of work for the week ending June 12 and again for the week ending June 19. His column appeared during that time in the Daily News. OEO was so happy with Mr. Clifford's services that he was paid $50 for a day he did not work but the Comptroller General caught it and the $50 is being recovered.

Mr. MacLean was paid for 56 hours' work by OEO for the weeks ending April 3 and June 12. He reportedly worked 56 hours the week ending July 10 but was paid for only 40 hours under an agency directive issued on July 1. I do not know whether this had any bearing on his decision to quit OEO the next week but I am pleased to note for the record that Mr. MacLean contributed 16 hours of his time that week to the war on poverty. Perhaps it could set an example for other $40-a-day consultants who simultaneously hold full-time positions outside Government.

The Washington Daily News is a Scripps-Howard newspaper. The chairman of the board of Scripps-Howard newspapers is Mr. Charles E. Scripps in Cincinnati. I asked Mr. Scripps whether he thought it is good public policy for working news reporters to hold simultaneously a compensable position with the Federal Government.

Mr. Scripps gave me a candid reply. He shares my misgivings over reporters working in a sideline capacity for the Federal Government.

Mr. Scripps said:

> Your letter of July 29 asks my opinion as to whether it is good public policy for working news reporters to hold simultaneously a compensable position with the Federal Government.
>
> In my opinion, it is not good public policy. I believe that this applies not only to news reporters but to anyone else who works in the editorial department of a newspaper and is in a position to influence the content or the makeup of the newspaper. Also, it should apply to jobs in any level of Government.
>
> My reason for this position is that I believe a newspaper should be as independent as it is possible to make it. You understand, of course, that one of the important functions of a newspaper is to report on governmental activities and to provide comments and criticism that may be favorable or unfavorable. Also, there is the function of providing active support for, or opposition to, candidates for office, legislative programs, and other governmental functions.
>
> As you no doubt know, a news reporter doing his very best to be objective sometimes is accused of slanting a story.
>
> I don't believe the problem is so much that journalists would lose their integrity or objectivity if involved with Government. Any journalist worth his salt is fully aware of his own personal leanings or sympathies and does a good job of keeping these disassociated from his professional work. The main problem is that when it is known that someone working for a newspaper in a journalistic capacity also holds a government job, the reader, rightly or wrongly, may have doubts about the objectivity or integrity of that newspaper.
>
> It occurs to me, too, that a journalist holding a Government job might have his effectiveness on the Government job impaired if it were felt that he or his department were receiving undue support, or opposition, from his newspaper. It could be said that he got the appointment in order to buy the newspaper's support, or it could be said that if his own paper would not support him, he could not be much good.
>
> If the compensation for Government work is important, the situation would be doubly dangerous. If the journalist is motivated only by a desire to perform public service, then the newspaper should offer ample outlet. In addition, there are many service organizations in every community which can use all the help they can get.
>
> I feel that the people will be best served if Government and the press remain as separate as possible, maintain a mutual respect, if possible, and coordinate their efforts whenever possible.
>
> Only in a democracy can Government and the press coexist as two separate power centers. Any intermingling of the two is done at a risk.

Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. Scripps' reasoning is sound. He is interested in protecting the integrity of the press. He is interested in protecting the integrity of Government. I hope his thoughts on this subject will receive the careful consideration of the House.

There are a growing number of consultants in the various agencies of the Federal Government. I have no doubt but that most perform a useful function but I question the necessity of employing the large number that are found on the payrolls. There are inevitable conflicts of interest. There is the problem that information not available to the public can be used for personal gain. I am not accusing anyone of acting in any way but honorable; however, there is always suspicion which can handicap the vital work of the Government.

IMPROVING VISITORS' GALLERIES IN CONGRESS

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, there has been a proposal recently that a visitors' center be established for the purpose of greeting and informing people who visit Capitol Hill. I fully support such a center, since I feel that Congress must concern itself more with the educational aspects of a visit to our Nation's Capitol.

My concern about Congress goes beyond the establishment of such a center, however. It seems to me that we must give more consideration to those who visit the public galleries to attend the sessions of Congress. Frequently those who come to see the House in session go away disillusioned by the noise, the apparent inattention, of the few people who may be present on the floor during their visit. But most particularly, I believe they are disturbed by their inability to understand what is going on before them. Lacking understanding, their impressions of the group are worse than if this element of frustration were not present. For these reasons I believe we should provide better facilities for the citizens who visit the sessions.

A great improvement could be made by glassing in the galleries and installing a multicourse earphone set at each seat. Over one course a taped discussion about the House and the Chambers could be presented for those visiting the galleries for the first time. Over the second course, to which a visitor could switch at will, a current commentary could be made by a trained observer who could report the significance of what is going on as it happened.

For instance:

> This is a call for a quorum, being made by Representative H. R. Gross, of Iowa. The speaker will now count to see if 218 Members are present, and, if not, the majority leader will request a call of the House. Congressmen will then be summoned from their offices and other points on Capitol Hill by a bell system with which they are familiar.

Or:

> The Congressman now speaking in the well is Representative Bob Sikes, Democrat, of Florida, a member of the Committee on Appropriations which is responsible for the legislation now being considered. He has been granted 5 minutes by the chairman of the committee. This 5 minutes will be deducted from the 2 hours of debate remaining to the majority.

Much additional information could be offered, of course. The commentary should be provided by representatives of both parties, or, at least, some safeguard should be adopted against biased commentary.

Much House debate is at microphones and, in any event, there would be no difficulty in piping all floor debate directly to the galleries over such an electronic system. The effect of glassing in the galleries would greatly reduce the noise problem in the House Chamber itself, and would make it easier for visitors to hear what of significance was occurring on the floor.

By using thick glass, a much higher degree of security also could be granted to those on the floor against possible intrusion or interruption from the gallery. We have had another example in recent weeks of the need for this.

Press galleries would not need to be enclosed in this manner.

An alternative to a multicourse earphone system would be to divide the gallery so that the earphones in one small part were providing the historical and statistical discussion of Congress and the Chamber, and people could be moved in and out of this section regularly. The rest of the galleries could have the current debate and commentary only, and could be reserved for longer periods for those interested in seeing what goes on with respect to specific legislation.

Although the beauty of the Chamber would be somewhat diminished, I am convinced that this loss would be more than offset by the increased understanding of the institution by those in the gallery. For many people, a visit to Washington is the high point of their political consciousness. The White House appears distant and austere to them, the Supreme Court dignified and beautiful. But Congress, the one representative branch of Government, is, in many ways the branch which should receive the most sympathetic interest of the citizen. Yet, it appears to many an indifferent and unruly group, following incomprehensible rules, and unaware of its need to be understood. Improved amplification and an explanation of the debate on the floor would make a visit more interesting and also give the visitor a better understanding and appreciation of the important work of Congress.

I do not believe that this improvement of the galleries would be of great expense. The executive branch probably spends as much every day to explain its activities to our citizens. Certainly, if these improvements have the effect of better informing our visitors and casting representative government in a better light, it would be well worth the investment. The representative legislature is the keystone of our system of government. There is great concern today that its role is waning. It seems to me more important than ever that we endeavor to have its role and responsibility more thoroughly explained to the American people. Where better to start than on Capitol Hill itself?

Mr. Speaker, I feel this proposal which I am submitting in detail at this time would help a great deal in the image that Congress presents to the public at large.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S RECOVERY

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I know I express the feelings of the people of Washington State and all Americans in saying how grateful we are at the successful conclusion and speedy recovery of the President, Lyndon B. Johnson.

He is the President of all of us, of Republicans as well as Democrats, and all of us are indeed happy that he is doing so well.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION DISREGARDS PRESIDENT'S SCIENCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PROJECT MOHOLE

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, according to Daniel S. Greenberg, writing in the October 8 issue of Science published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the President's Science Advisory Committee voted against the proposed construction of the platform for Project Mohole. Nevertheless, the National Science Foundation decided to proceed, apparently on the theory that the project had advanced so far that it would be politically embarrassing to stop it.

Serious questions have been raised about the wisdom of committing so much research funds to this project. There are other areas of earth science research which scientists feel should have greater priority. In view of the doubts which have been expressed, a fresh look should be taken at Mohole.

I call the attention of my colleagues to the following article by Daniel S. Greenberg:

[From Science, Oct. 8, 1965]

Mohole: Last-Minute Opposition Turned Aside

The National Science Foundation last week announced plans to commence construction of the Mohole platform, but it did so only after an extraordinary closed-door meeting that was hurriedly called to quell a sudden outburst of opposition among some of the country's leading earth scientists.

With cost estimates for construction and 3 years of operation of the deep-ocean drilling platform now totaling $110 million—more than double the figure cited a few years ago—some researchers expressed fears that Mohole would restrict the availability of funds for other research in earth sciences. The response from the National Science Foundation and the White House science office was that Mohole is now so far along that it would be economically and politically infeasible to delay or cancel it; and it was also suggested that the earth sciences would be able to ride the coattails of Mohole and attract expanded support.

The outburst of opposition occurred in August during a summer study on Federal support of science, convened at Woods Hole, Mass., under the auspices of the President's Science Advisory Committee. In the course of a meeting of a panel on solid earth geophysics, two votes were taken on the subject of Mohole. In the first, the panelists were asked to predict what they thought would happen (as distinguished from what they thought desirable): "Mohole, Slow-Hole, or No-Hole." The outcome, according to persons present, was a 7-to-2 prediction of "Slow-Hole," meaning, apparently, that NSF would proceed with the project, but at a slower pace than had been announced. The second vote was to determine preference, and on this ballot several participants associated with the project did not vote. The ontcome in this case was a unanimous vote for "No-Hole."

When word of this vote reached Washington, several of the panelists, as well as a larger number of persons prominent in the earth sciences, were asked to meet in Washington during the following week with Leland J. Haworth, Director of the National Science Foundation. Also present at this meeting was Donald F. Hornig, director of the Office of Science and Technology, and several NSF staff members. According to several persons who were present, Haworth indicated that the commitment to Mohole has proceeded to a point where it would be politically embarrassing and financially wasteful to turn back. When it was suggested that perhaps the pace of the project could be reduced to stretch the costs over a longer period, the response was that it would be most economical to get the platform built and out of the shipyard as quickly as possible. This conclusion was accompanied by the prediction that while Mohole would take a large portion of funds going into research in the earth sciences, it could also serve as a device for bringing greater attention and support to the entire field. No votes were taken at this Washington meeting, and it concluded with what was described as a consensus that, under the circumstances, the only choice was to proceed.

NSF, which is providing all the funds for the venture, has now gone ahead. Last week it announced that it was authorizing the award of a contract for construction of the platform to the National Steel and Shipbuilding Co. of San Diego, Calif., on a bid of $29.9 million. This was the lowest of four bids, which ranged up to $45.09 million. NSF had originally estimated that construction would cost approximately $18 million. The prime contractor for Mohole remains Brown & Root, of Houston, which, in addition to compensation for its design efforts, is receiving a $1.8 million management fee for supervising the project. It is expected that the shipyard will complete drawings within 90 days, and that construction, now estimated to take 2 years, will begin in January.

D. S. Greenberg.

THE SUGAR SCRAMBLE

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, when the sugar bill comes to the floor, I hope all Members of the House will thoroughly examine this special interest legislation. The bill provides for an increased allocation for domestic producers which will encourage further protection of an industry that requires raw sugar prices to be maintained at close to 7 cents per pound, whereas foreign producers can produce profitably at 4 cents and in some instances at 3 cents a pound. The implications of this protection for the American consumer are obvious. He pays higher sugar prices.

Furthermore, the foreign allocation is to be made on the basis of country-by-country quotas. The Committee on Agriculture carved up the U.S. market among 29 foreign countries. What criteria were used to decide the allocation among various countries? No one seems to know. If a country-by-country allocation is to be used, it would seem that clearly defined foreign policy objectives should guide the determination. And the Committee on Agriculture is certainly not the proper body to make such evaluations.

Sugar quotas are a highly desirable source of income leading to the lucrative activities of lobbyists. The lobbyists have been swarming over the sugar plums to such an extent that there is a legitimate public outcry. Today's New York Herald Tribune in an editorial points out that it is the American consumer who suffers. I include the editorial at this point in the Record:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Oct. 11, 1965]

The Sordid Sugar Story

There must be a limit to which we permit our sugar to be politically polluted and morally corrupted, and it would seem that the limit has now been reached with the bill which Representative Cooley and his friends and trying to put through Congress and to put over on the American public.

The existing Sugar Act, which cost U.S. consumers an estimated $700 million annually in hidden subsidies, is bad enough; and its entire philosophy can be seriously challenged, as Paul Findley, Republican Congressman of Illinois, has done. But the bill advanced by Congressman Cooley and his Democratic-controlled House Agriculture Committee, amending the act and extending it another 5 years, has brought the manipulators of the foreign sugar quotas into still greater disrepute.

The different treatment accorded two South American Republics illuminates the sordid sugar story being written in Washington. Argentina, though importuned to hire a Washington lobbyist to secure a fat slice of the sugar quota, refused to do so. Accordingly, the 63,000 tons allocated by the Johnson administration's bill as Argentina's annual quota was slashed by Cooley and company to 21,500 tons.

Venezuela, however, having offered lobbyist Charles Patrick Clark $50,000 annually for 2½ years as his prize for delivering a good chunk of the sugar pie, got its proposed quota, fixed by the administration at 2,676 tons annually, increased to 30,809 tons. Mr. Findley estimates that the increased portion of the quota landed by Mr. Clark will be worth more than $9 million over the 5-year period of the bill.

All this may be a good deal for the foreign sugar producers, their Washington lobbyists, and the Democratic Party's treasury, but it's an outrageous and shocking deal for the American taxpayer who is paying the bill. He can break the back of the lobby and those involved in it by simply insisting that Congress clean up his sugar. Mr. Findley's

proposed amendment to bar a quota to any foreign country which employs a lobbyist would be a good beginning.

WATER AND AMERICAN-CANADIAN RELATIONS

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Representative TUPPER, of Maine, has introduced into the RECORD the thoughtful report by Dr. Bailey on United States-Canadian relations. Appropriately, this report dealt at particular length with water problems related to the Great Lakes, which are of increasingly widespread concern to both nations. Once the Great Lakes seemed the exclusive treasure and charge of our States and the Canadian Provinces bordering on them. Recently, however, the water shortages felt in this country, due to an unprecedented drought, expanding population and industry, and rampant pollution of our rivers, have focused attention on the Great Lakes system as a water resource of the entire continent.

Water is a resource less local than many others because it does not remain in one place. Economic development, however, sometimes leaves the natural routes of streams and lakes inadequate to our needs. Water is always indispensable for agriculture and industry, and we have moved water hundreds of miles to offset its unequal natural distribution. We have moved the Colorado River to Los Angeles. We are going to build a canal to bring good quality water to Mexico. New York City ferries water down from the Adirondack Mountains so that its citizens will not be endangered by the polluted Hudson. In other countries the courses of major rivers have been altered. It is essential to continued economic development that we use our engineering skills to redistribute water resources in the most productive way. Within this country there is still resistance to this concept, and there will no doubt for some time continue to be those who feel that because they live on a river it is theirs. There has been something of this feeling in Canada in response to various proposals for the purchase and movement of Canadian water to the United States. It is natural to desire to protect one's local resources, but in time it will be realized that the world's water supply, well distributed, is ample.

One of the most interesting proposals for continental redistribution of water is NAWAPA—the North American Water and Power Alliance. NAWAPA would construct a 900-mile "Rocky Mountain trench" to bring water from the Arctic to the Western United States through the Canadian and Purgatoire Rivers to the Midwestern United States, and through the Peace River Reservoir outflow to the Canadian-Great Lakes Canal. Over 40 million acre-feet of water a year would reach Lake Superior and provide water for Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and western Ontario. The plan also includes several canals which could bring the extra water all the way to the eastern seaboard.

Unfortunately, the Canadian Government has thus far resisted bilateral talks on this or any similar water distribution plan, preferring to complete a reevaluation of national water needs first. Canadian reluctance to give up water resources to its more arid neighbors is understandable. Certain States in this country have been similarly resistant to surrender water to drier States. But water resources, like all other of the world's raw materials, must be shared. The United States has sold and given away its more plentiful natural resources. We expect merely the same willingness to share from others.

A logical organization to initiate discussions of the NAWAPA plan is the International Joint Commission, a bilateral United States-Canadian organization for safeguarding boundary water quality, established in 1909 by treaty. Unfortunately, as Dr. Bailey's study pointed out, the IJC has not been as effective as it should be. It has been without a chairman on the U.S. side for over a year. Its total appropriation is only $356,700, and requests for its enlargement in fiscal year 1966 were rejected by the House Appropriations Committee. The Commission operates by appointing advisory boards to study specific bodies of water. Seven advisory boards are in operation, on the Red River of the North, the St. Croix River, the Rainy River and Lake-of-the Woods, Lake Erie, Lake Ontario, and on the connecting channels of the Great Lakes. These boards have power to make recommendations to the full Commission, which itself has only recommendatory power. The occasional recommendations issued by the Commission have not been notably successful in stimulating action to correct problems in resource development. Our national experience in conservation has been that firm regulatory powers are essential to protect resources from destruction or contamination. Without such powers, the IJC cannot be expected to be an effective policeman.

In recent years the IJC has been most concerned with water pollution. In this area much greater progress has been made by the United States acting unilaterally than by either the IJC or Canada. On the Red River of the North, for example, which flows northward from Minnesota and North Dakota into Canada, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare recently held an enforcement conference under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. The Federal Government and the two States concerned agreed upon a detailed schedule for pollution correction which will guarantee excellent water quality as it flows into Canada. In the much more significant problem of pollution in the Great Lakes, when the water generally flows from Canada into the United States, the Canadians have not shown as much zeal as I had hoped for in ending their contribution of pollution. The report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare tactfully omitted mention of this problem, since it has no jurisdiction over international pollution problems. Scientists who have studied Lake Erie and its inflow route, the Detroit River, know that the water contains many pollutants before it gets to the United States shores. The Federal Government and the Great Lakes States have committed themselves to a comprehensive schedule for ending pollution in the Detroit River, Lake Erie, and the southern end of Lake Michigan. The pollution problem will remain even after this program is accomplished, however, unless the Canadian Government puts into effect a similar corrective program.

The Canadian Government has apparently been less alarmed about the pollution problem that about reputed damages to the Great Lakes water levels from the small diversion through the Chicago sanitary and ship canal. Dr. Bailey's report, repeats the common fallacy that the Chicago diversion adversely affects the entire Great Lakes system. In fact, the Chicago diversion is negligible in the problem of the Great Lakes. A variety of natural and manmade factors, principally precipitation, influence lake levels vastly more than any diversions, present or contemplated.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has determined that the total impact on Lake Michigan of all the artificial diversions from it, which includes not only the Chicago diversion but three others as well—Long Lake, Ogoki, and Welland Canal diversions—is to reduce its level approximately 2⅝ inches. The corps has also pointed out that water levels vary naturally as much as 7 inches. Claims that the Chicago diversion could lower water levels enough to reduce the loads that freight ships could carry and reduce electric power production are also in error.

The Bailey report, on the basis of these groundless fears, recommended that Lake Michigan, which lies wholly within the United States, should be defined as "boundary waters" for the purposes of our treaty with Canada.

Mr. Speaker, such a revision of the treaty would be absurd. To classify a body of water or piece of land as part of a boundary when it is in fact entirely within a single country is meaningless. To call Lake Michigan "boundary waters" because it eventually flows into boundary waters would also be absurd. Eventually all the water on the earth is interconnected. Nevertheless, we continue to consider the Missouri River distinct from the Mississippi, the Mississippi distinct from the Gulf of Mexico, and the Gulf of Mexico distinct from the Atlantic Ocean.

The recommendation that Lake Michigan be included in the "boundary waters" is obviously directed at interfering with the Chicago diversion. The 1909 treaty, negotiated by Chandler Anderson for Secretary of State Elihu Root, was amended by the Senate specifically to exclude Lake Michigan so as not to interfere with the Chicago Canal diversion. Even at that time it was recommended that the diversion was essential to protect the health of the lake and those who live along it. It is equally true today.

The city of Chicago has led the country in the development of efficient sewage treatment. In March of this year the city of Chicago, in connection with a Federal conference on the pollution of Lake Michigan, pledged itself to further expansion of its sewage treatment facilities, making them among the most advanced in existence for a city of such size.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we want to cooperate with Canada in the distribution of water resources. Cooperation is a two-way street and we look forward to mutuality in our relationship. Canada has not looked upon Chicago's problem with nearly the friendliness or the understanding which we believe is essential to our city's survival, let alone her progress. We hope for a greater understanding in the future.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Sept. 26, 1965]

LAKE-LEVEL MYTH DOWN THE DRAIN

(By Richard Lewis)

Recent studies of Great Lakes water levels have exploded the notion that they are significantly affected by Chicago's diversion of Lake Michigan into the Illinois-Mississippi Rivers and Gulf of Mexico.

For that reason, claims by other Great Lakes States and Canada that diversion lowers levels enough to reduce loads that ships can carry on the lakes and electric power production has become increasingly tenuous.

Such claims are involved in a half century of litigation in Federal courts and the U.S. Supreme Court. In the pending case, other Lakes States want Chicago to return to Lake Michigan the 3,200 cubic feet of water a second the sanitary district now flushes down the Illinois Waterway for sanitation and navigation purposes.

From a modern engineering and meteorological point of view, this is a drop in the bucket.

Studies by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and meteorologists show a variety of natural and manmade effects influencing lake levels far more than Chicago's diversion.

The principal one is precipitation—rain and snow—on the lakes and the land which forms their watershed.

Curiously, the land area from which precipitation drains to the lakes is relatively small, compared to the vast watersheds of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers. Because of this, it takes a great deal of rain falling directly into the basin to maintain lake levels.

When it rains in Chicago and north shore suburbs, for example, only a fraction of the rain drains into Lake Michigan. Runoff that finds its way into Chicago sewers empties into the Illinois Waterway and ultimately flows into the Gulf of Mexico.

In addition, the drainage west of Ridge Avenue and Green Bay Road flows naturally into the Mississippi watershed, not into the lake.

Next to the icecaps on Antarctica and Greenland, the Great Lakes contain the largest supply of fresh water on the planet. The water surface is 95,000 square miles in a basin of 295,000 square miles, gouged out of ancient sedimentary rocks by the last ice age.

Much of the land surface in the basin consists of glacial gravel and sand. Water is held by this porous mixture and may not reach the lake system for months or years.

Ivan W. Brunk, supervising public service meteorologist for the U.S. Weather Bureau here, has pointed out that there is a timelag in the flow of precipitation into the lakes on this account. Some of it may take several years to move through the subsoil into the lakes and runoff from rainfall in 1 year may not reach the lakes until the next.

Despite exacting studies, like Brunk's, which show the relationship of rainfall to lake levels, no one has been able to demonstrate cycles of high and low water.

There are seasonal fluctuations, with the lakes tending to be higher in early summer and lower in winter. But no long-term ones have been detected despite popular notions there are 7- and 11-year cycles, according to John E. Hanna, chief of publications for the Corps of Engineers' authoritative Lake Survey at Detroit.

The lack of lake-level trends is not remarkable in view of the fact that lake-level records have been kept only since 1860. Because of the apparently random fluctuations, levels cannot be predicted over the long term any more readily than the weather.

However, one trend has appeared in another of the natural forces affecting the lakes, the force called isostasy. That is the mattresslike tendency of the earth's crust to bounce back to its original shape when depressed by a heavy load, such as a sheet of thick ice.

The entire Great Lakes Basin still is bouncing back from being pressed down for many thousands of years by the great Wisconsin ice sheet which retreated out of the basin about 11,000 years ago.

At the present time, the land is rising more rapidly in the northeast of the basin than in the southwest, where Chicago is located. This causes the water level to fall in comparison to the land in the northeast and appear to rise in the southwest. The effect can be demonstrated by tilting a dishpan full of water.

The effect of this tilting of the earth's crust in this region has been measured by American and Canadian experts. On Georgian Bay, north of the St. Clair River, the water level is falling 10 inches a century with respect to the land, because the land is rising.

Around Chicago, the water level is rising with respect to the land at the rate of about 6 inches a century. While this effect is masked by lake level fluctuations, it ultimately will change present shorelines.

Brunk has pointed out that a major factor in the levels of Lake Michigan and Lake Huron is their rate of outflow through the St. Clair and Detroit Rivers into Lake Erie. This is affected by depth of the channel.

All five Great Lakes flow toward the sea. Lake Superior at 600.4 feet above sea level has its outflow via the St. Marys River into Lake Michigan-Huron at 578.8 feet. Hydraulically, engineers consider Lakes Michigan and Huron one lake because their broad connection through the Straits of Mackinac keeps their levels the same.

From the Michigan-Huron system, water flows through the St. Clair River, Lake St. Clair and the Detroit River into Lake Erie at 570.4-feet elevation.

From there, the flow is through the spectacular Niagara River and over Niagara Falls, through the gorge and into Lake Ontario at 244.8 feet. And from there the outflow is to the mighty St. Lawrence River descending to the sea.

Lake levels are determined by their elevation above sea level, as measured at a landspit on the Gulf of St. Lawrence called Father Point. It is just about where the continental shelf begins a gradual slope into the Atlantic Ocean.

Once the flow of lake water across a third of the continent is visualized, it is easy to see how the depth of an outflow channel could affect lake level. The deeper the channel the greater the flow.

Brunk proposes that natural and artificial deepening or "downcutting" of the 84-mile St. Clair-Detroit Rivers channel into Lake Erie has lowered the Lakes Michigan-Huron level at least 18 inches in 68 years.

This is the principal reason the Michigan-Huron level has not in this century reached the peaks it did in the 19th century, according to the meteorologist.

The highest levels in the last century came during the decade of the 1880's, in the 10-year period which ended in 1887, when the water surface averaged 580.5 feet above sea level.

In the decade when the lake reached a peak level so far in this century—the 10 years ended in 1955—it was 1.61 feet lower than 68 years ago.

During this span, Brunk calculated that isostatic rise of the land from relief of the glacial ice load reversed the downcutting of the channel by .08 inches.

Part of the downcutting was artificial. The St. Clair and Detroit Rivers were dredged to make them navigable between 1885 and 1897 and after 1909 a good deal of commercial sand and gravel was scooped out of the channel.

In addition to the 18-inch drop in 68 years, the Michigan-Huron level has been lowered about 3.12 inches by dredging the St. Clair River since 1955 to assure a channel 27 feet deep.

The sum of these channel changes which, of course, increase the rate of Michigan-Huron flow into Lake Erie has been to reduce the level of the double lake by more than 21 inches since the 1880's.

While the drop does not hinder power projects downstream on the Niagara River, it affects lake freighters bound for Milwaukee, Chicago, and Calumet ports by reducing their draft and hence the amount of cargo they can carry during low water seasons.

By comparison, Chicago's diversion of 3,200 cubic feet of water a second has lowered Michigan-Huron about 2.75 inches and Lake Erie 1.6 inches, according to the lake survey. It has had less effect on Michigan-Huron than the dredging of the St. Clair River.

Moreover, Chicago's diversion is more than compensated for by the channeling of water from the Hudson Bay watershed into Lake Superior which has raised the Michigan-Huron lake level 4.5 inches.

This would give Lakes Michigan-Huron a net increase of 1.75 inches if it were not for the fact that the Welland Canal which increases the flow of water out of Lake Erie also affects Michigan-Huron. The effect is to lower the double lake about 1.25 inches.

Thus, when all the diversion, in and out, is balanced, Michigan-Huron shows a net increase of a half inch.

If there was doubt about the effect of rainfall on lake levels, it should have been dispelled this year. The rains came and the level of Lakes Michigan-Huron went up.

At the end of August, the lake which had dropped to an alltime low last year, reached 576.8 feet. This level is called low water datum by Army Engineers. It is a baseline from which the ups and downs of all the Great Lakes are computed.

The level this August was a good 10 inches above that of a year ago. Still, it was a foot below the 10-year average.

The lake survey expected a fall of 1 inch in September, but with heavy rains this month the seasonal drop may be reversed.

In spite of the evidence that natural forces affect the lake level much more significantly than diversion, the effect of litigation over diversion has been to retard the piping of lake water to communities beyond the Chicago area.

But as the population of northern Illinois rises and ground water supplies become less and less adequate, more communities will be compelled to turn to the lake for water.

Historically, the relationship between the lake level and rainfall is illustrated dramatically by the Chicago fire of October 8 and 9, 1871. Records of the newly established weather bureau were destroyed, but the journal of the bureau in that year observed that the fire followed a prolonged drought.

Between the summer of 1871 and the spring of 1872, the lake level dropped 2½ feet—the largest fall ever recorded.

TAX CREDITS FOR TRAINING

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rumsfeld] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the Human Investment Act of 1965—a bill which has been sponsored by some 100 Republican Members of Congress—has been receiving tremendous support from all parts of the Nation. Especially rewarding to those of us who are sponsoring this bill is the high quality of newspaper editorials expressing approval of the bill's goal, which is to complement the manpower training programs under Government supervision by offering a 7-percent tax credit to employers who train workers in new job skills.

On Friday, October 8, 1965, Chicago's American published an editorial which ventures the view that Congress ought to hurry the Human Investment Act of 1965 along the legislative trail. I include the American editorial at this point in the Record:

Tax Credits for Training

Columnist Jack Mabley called attention in yesterday's Chicago's American to an excellent measure now before Congress: A bill that would allow tax credits for employers who start their own training programs for the unemployed. As Representative Robert McClory, Republican, of Illinois, told Mabley, the idea is so good that people keep asking why no one thought of it before.

The bill, whose sponsors include McClory, would apply to training and apprentice programs the same 7-percent tax credit now allowed to companies for investments in new plants and machinery. The tax credit is intended to stimulate industrial growth and produce more jobs; the new bill would apply the same stimulus more directly still to efforts against unemployment. It would enlist private industry in attacking a root cause of unemployment—the inability of many workers to find jobs because they lack the skills needed in today's automation-conscious job market.

Another great point in favor of this approach, as Mabley emphasized, is that it wouldn't require hiring more Federal personnel and setting up another cumbersome piece of Government machinery. Private firms which took advantage of the program would do all the work of hiring, screening, and training people for jobs; the Government role would be largely limited to checking more tax forms.

The leading complaint about Federal manpower programs—about the administration's whole approach to the Great Society, in fact—is that their first effect is to increase spending and multiply redtape. This program is admirably designed to get an important job done without the unpleasant side effects, and we hope Congress hurries it along.

APPLE-PICKING TIME IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a vast amount of discussion and debate concerning the use of foreign labor in the harvesting of crops in various States. I believe that the Department of Labor has undertaken commendably sincere efforts to increase the employment of domestic labor at adequate wages, and accompanied by decent working conditions.

The implementation of the policy has in many respects been a frustrating one. West Virginia's experience has been watched with interest. I believe that Secretary of Labor Wirtz made a very wise decision when permission was granted to the applegrowers to utilize Bahamians in harvesting the apple crop.

In evolving new policies, there are inevitable headaches and difficulties. I know not what ultimate conclusions can be drawn from the experience with the beginnings of a new policy. I believe, however, that it is necessary to weigh the facts objectively in attempting to point the way toward a constructive future policy. I have always found Charleston, W. Va., Gazette Reporter Harry Ernst to be an objective writer, and it is for this reason that I believe his on-the-spot report may be helpful to my colleagues:

Frustration Blighting Apple Orchards—All-America Picker Goal Breeds Crisis

(By Harry Ernst)

Martinsburg.—The U.S. Secretary of Labor's black limousine drove into an orchard near here and one potential apple picker stepped out.

Untrue, says the U.S. Labor Department. But, if only a folk tale, it does reveal a truth about the unhappy affair involving West Virginia's applegrowers and the Labor Department.

No one can knock the Department's goal, which was to encourage unemployed West Virginians and other Americans to take the apple-picking jobs that have been filled by British West Indians since 1953.

The Labor Department labored hard to achieve that goal although its recruiting efforts were considered frustrating and naive by growers in the Eastern Panhandle, where the $20 million apple industry does more than keep the doctor away.

"We can't say it's bad because we had exactly the same results when we tried to recruit Americans ourselves," commented C. A. Hehle, manager of the Tri-County Labor Camp near here. "The recruiting effort was a failure, a flop."

RELENTED

Just before the fall harvest began to escalate last month, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz relented and permitted the apple growers to import 270 Bahamians (they had 364 last year).

The growers insist that they don't care who picks their apples as long as they don't rot or fall off the trees. But they also admit a preference for the experienced Bahamians who work fast and don't bellyache.

A young Bahamian, wearing a beret and boots, demonstrated why his countrymen are held in such esteem. With both hands moving faster than the eye, he hurried up and down a ladder with a 40-pound sack of apples slung over his shoulder. He picked an incredible 230 bushels in one day (100 bushels is considered a good day's work).

"It's a habit (using the Bahamian pickers) more than anything else," observed a Labor Department official. "The growers are accustomed to using them and other domestic farmworkers go elsewhere to harvest crops."

But kicking the habit, even under continuing pressure from the Labor Department, may prove to be as difficult as the ordeal of a cigarette smoker who tries to quit.

The 150 growers in Berkeley, Jefferson, and Morgan counties need about 1,500 pickers for 6 weeks each fall to harvest their apples. About a fourth of them usually are Bahamians.

Virginia, however, imports 700 to 1,000 British West Indians who crisscross the State boundary line picking apples for the area's biggest grower, Senator Harry F. Byrd, Democrat, of Virginia, and others.

PLENTY

There were plenty of desperate men available to pick apples at practically any wage during the depression. Prisoners and German prisoners of war later were used when manpower became scarce.

Postwar prosperity brought new plants into the area, encouraged growers to expand their orchards, inspired citizens to migrate and financed a welfare system that soft Americans prefer to the rigors of apple picking (according to the growers).

So during the Korean war, with Washington's help, growers began recruiting the additional pickers they needed in the Caribbean where tourists are big spenders but the natives are often unemployed.

Meanwhile, the plight of America's migrant farmworkers had begun to seep into the national conscience. The availability of foreign workers depressed their wage rates and last year Congress all but closed the floodgates.

The Labor Department's first attempt this year to recruit enough domestic workers proved that the growers are right about the dismal chances of recruiting enough unemployed coal miners and city slum dwellers to pick their apples.

CONDITIONS

On September 29, only 16 of 125 pickers recruited elsewhere in West Virginia remained at the tricounty labor camp near Martinsburg. And at least half of those who were still there said they probably wouldn't return next year even if they were assured higher wages and better living conditions.

Why?

"This is nothing to make a living at," explained 21-year-old Kermit Blair, of Williamson. "You can't get ahead."

He and others from the southern West Virginia coalfields complained bitterly that Labor Department recruiters misled them about the life awaiting them after traveling more than 300 miles to pick apples 10 hours a day, 6 days a week.

Ezekiel Burger, 29, of Vivian, McDowell County, said $60 worth of his clothes were stolen because the camp doesn't provide lockers in which to keep them. Burger said he was told to report the theft to police when he returned home.

"We get grits and rice with every meal and once we were served meat that must have been alligator," commented Wilson Conley, of Chapmanville, Logan County. "It's food we're not used to eating.

"You don't eat grits unless you're in the jailhouse," he quipped. Conley said he is a mine foreman with three sons in Vietnam.

He charged that the camp is disorganized (he cited pushing and shoving in the chow line as an example) and the growers aren't patient enough with inexperienced pickers who should be given more training.

And Conley complained that the Labor Department charged him $20 for a seat on a chartered bus from Logan to Martinsburg which would have cost him only $15.50 on a regular bus line.

If he stays on the job for half the season, the growers will pick up the $20 tab. They also will pay for his bus ticket home if he remains until the end of the harvest about November 1.

WAGES

The pickers are guaranteed at least $1.15 an hour for their first 64 hours on the job. After that they are paid 15 cents a bushel and a 2-cent bonus for each bushel they have picked when the harvest ends.

If they fail to pick enough bushels to make $1.15 an hour, they are either fired or required to sign a waiver that they will continue working even if they can't earn the minimum wage set by the Labor Department.

Deducted from the picker's paycheck is $2.25 a day for food and $2.30 a week for hospitalization-sickness insurance.

So the 8 southern West Virginians, who were picking from 60 to 80 bushels a day, can expect to clear about $55 a week for their exhausting 6 weeks of work. (An experienced picker can clear $85 a week or more.)

The prospect of such meager returns for their labor explains why many of the West Virginians deserted the harvest. Others found the work too hard or just didn't want to work.

Some weren't physically able to pick apples and shouldn't have been signed up by the Labor Department in the first place. They included a preacher who was afraid to climb ladders and a 240-pound man who fell off a ladder and was hospitalized.

Others looked upon the recruiting program as a poor man's expense account. They simply signed up to get a free bus ride (at the growers' expense) to Martinsburg, which is conveniently located near the Washington-Baltimore area where they either had jobs or planned to seek them.

INJUSTICE

Trying to make migrant farmworkers out of coal miners and unskilled city laborers, who are accustomed to working for higher wages in a radically different environment, is obviously an injustice to them and the growers.

When they enlist as apple pickers, they in effect join an army that offers only a lifetime of basic training. They live in drab barracks without women (apple picking is too hard for migrant families) and bitch about the food.

Their tour of duty as pickers lasts only 6 weeks and they are lucky if they return home with $200 because of their inexperience. Even if they become experienced and earn more how are they expected to make a living the other 10 months between apple harvests?

It is unlikely that they will abandon their homes and become migrant farm workers. They know that life can be better. Apple picking to them is a one-time, desperate effort to make some money and, if society offers them nothing better to do, then a life on welfare with a guaranteed annual income is certainly more appealing.

None of the pickers brought golf clubs to take advantage of the Tri-County Labor Camp's location on a knoll overlooking Golf Club Road near Martinsburg.

Hehle, the camp manager, said 26 growers spent about $100,000 building and equipping the five heated, cinderblock dormitories with shower rooms that provide free housing for 426 pickers.

The camp, which is rated as a Hilton among farm labor camps, also includes a kitchen-dining room and a recreation room with a canteen, benches, and TV set (several pickers were watching teen-age dancing that appeared to be good training for apple picking).

FUTILITY

Hehle estimates that the Labor Department's Hire American Campaign has cost the 26 growers about $18,000—$15,000 to build a family housing unit for 80 that only 10 persons are using and $3,000 in bus fares for men who took President Johnson's advice and toured America but didn't stay to pick apples.

The growers would be delighted if the Labor Department would forget the whole thing and let them import as many British West Indians as they need to help harvest their apples.

But there is every indication that the Labor Department will be more determined than ever next year to achieve an all-American harvest.

Critics of the growers ask why the Federal Government should help them import foreign workers. Why shouldn't they compete on the open market for labor like any other employer?

The theory is that such competition would force the growers to increase the pay of the apple pickers so they could attract enough of them. It also might encourage the growth of unions for migrant farm laborers, with hiring halls assuring an adequate supply of pickers.

Some growers, however, insist that they can't afford higher labor costs because the chain stores determine what the processors will pay for their apples and the best ones already have become luxury items.

But a Government economist said if the piece rate for picking apples was raised from 17 to 30 cents a bushel, it would result in only a half-cent increase in the price paid for 3 pounds of apples.

The West Virginia and Virginia growers now pay the lowest rate for picking in the Nation, which is highest at $1.37 an hour in the State of Washington.

They argue that pickers can earn as much money by picking more bushels in the Virginias because a larger proportion of their apples are used to make cider, apple juice and apple sauce and thus don't have to be picked as carefully as eating apples.

Apple growers in Washington, Michigan, and neighboring Pennsylvania didn't have to import foreign workers to harvest their fruit this year. New England growers needed Canadians and New York also used some British West Indians despite their higher wage rates.

CONVINCED?

This year's experience should convince the Labor Department that hit-or-miss recruiting of miners and slum dwellers is costly and won't achieve its goal even if higher wages are offered.

Higher wages, however, might attract enough migrant American farmworkers to harvest the Eastern Panhandle apple crop.

"If they paid more money, they would get more pickers," said Herbert Mathews 32, a crew leader of 10 Florida workers who are helping harvest Eastern Panhandle apples for the first time this year.

"A lot of the time a penny raise will make a difference," he commented, pointing out that there weren't enough watermelon pickers until the growers raised their pay from $1.50 to $1.75 an hour.

Another possibility is recruiting and training unemployed, able-bodied fathers who now earn their welfare checks by working for $1 an hour on Government projects in West Virginia.

But first Government regulations would have to be waived so their families could continue receiving welfare checks while the fathers were picking apples to supplement their meager incomes.

Some economists think automation in our largely unplanned economy will leave West Virginia with a permanent pool of unskilled, unemployed fathers on welfare.

If they could become 6-week apple pickers without losing their welfare checks, they could earn additional income to help keep their children in school while providing the growers with a stable labor force.

There also is an ultimate solution to the problem of finding enough Americans to pick apples—a mechanical apple picker that several universities are trying to develop.

Hehle, the Martinsburg labor camp manager, became angry when asked about automation's potential impact on apples. "What are men going to do to make a living when machines do all the work," he asked.

It's a good question. So far the Great Society hasn't made any serious effort to answer it.

CENTENNIAL OF WEST VIRGINIA EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, as a former schoolteacher, I am proud to note the observance of the 100th anniversary of the West Virginia Education Association this week. To honor this event, the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette on October 10 carried a series of articles on the work of the West Virginia Educational Association, and the progress of education in West Virginia, which under unanimous consent I include with my remarks:

EDUCATION SUFFERED BEFORE STATEHOOD

(Dr. Charles Lord, a Martinsburg native and now professor of history at Millersville State College in Pennsylvania, began work on a history of the West Virginia Education Association in 1954. The study was part of his work for a doctoral degree. The West Virgina Education Association has now published the history in book form, "Years of Decision." The following is a condensation of the association's history taken from the book.)

The area that became West Virginia suffered considerably, educationally and otherwise, largely because the constitution of Virginia failed to mandate a permanent system of free schools.

It was not until West Virginia became a State and formed its own constitution that a strong position on education was taken.

When West Virginia became a State in 1863, a strong statement on education was adopted.

This first legislature also gave its official sanction to teacher organization for it urged the State superintendent of schools to aid the teachers to improve themselves whenever possible and, "For this purpose he shall encourage the formation of county associations of teachers for mutual improvement."

It was because of this mandate by the legislature that Superintendent W. R. White called a meeting of teachers at Fairmont in the summer of 1865.

Superintendent White was elected president of this organization at Fairmont; thus began a long period during which the teachers organization was under the influence of the State superintendent.

It didn't take long for the question of salary to come into the picture at these meetings for as early as 1867, meeting in Wheeling, Superintendent White charged that the teacher should have the "missionary spirit and should follow his vocation whether or not he made any money at it."

An upcoming constitutional convention in 1872 had the concern of the teachers of that period for the fear that the convention might abolish the free school system altogether.

This was a busy session for delegates to the convention in 1872. Beside the problems coming up in the constitutional convention called for later in the year, they also concerned themselves with textbook concern over an official educational periodical.

Delegates at the Clarksburg meeting in 1874 renamed their organization the Educational Association of West Virginia and set up some hopeful objectives for the association.

Annual meetings of the organization, always held during the summer months when the weather was hot and interest in education at its lowest ebb, excited few educators to attend.

During this period, the relations of the association with educational publications had its ups and downs. It was not until 1881 when State Superintendent B. L. Butcher founded the West Virginia School Journal at Wheeling that the association was able to retain a continued interest by editors in the work of the organization.

During a period beginning in about 1876 certification of teachers and examinations for teachers comprised a great deal of the interest and discussion at the summer meetings. The legislature got into the fight and passed measures detrimental to educational progress. Most of the time these acts were without the support of the teachers or the State superintendent of schools.

All through its early history the association fought for the strengthening of the county superintendent's position in the school system. Also during the period the State legislature threatened to weaken it.

Textbook selection seemed to plague both the association and administrators alike during this period. As early as 1882 the question of free textbooks arose but apparently got little serious consideration.

Compulsory school attendance had not reached a point where it was an issue, but as early as 1877 the association had created a committee to consider its advisability.

The evils of tobacco and alcohol created much more of a furor. In 1884 agitation began for the adoption of textbooks illustrating the effects of alcohol, tobacco, and narcotics on the human nervous system. This proposal received the endorsement of the association again in 1886 and the following year this agitation bore fruit.

Teachers apparently were reluctant to bring up the subject of their own salary for the subject arose only twice in this 17-year period. The first time was in 1882 and again in 1885 although interest in tenure came as early as 1878.

In the late 1890's and early 1900's the West Virginia Educational Association grew slowly and haltingly," Dr. Lord said.

The meetings were oftimes held in for two of the annual sessions that were held at Mountain Lake Park and at White Sulphur Springs. But indications soon appeared that many were ceasing to regard the association meetings as a pleasant summer interlude and were beginning to think of them as a means whereby teachers might "protect themselves against unjust treatment and advance their own interests."

During this period county organizations seemed to strengthen themselves.

Before the county organizations became firmly established a new type of local organization appeared: the round table, an association of teachers from several adjoining counties. Area after area formed round tables until the entire State was covered.

In this period some effort was made to break down the conventions into areas of interest. In 1904, four sections were established: county superintendents, city superintendents, normal school principals and primary teachers.

Teacher qualification, by examination, still caused much discussion and as one writer of that day put it, "many certificates were issued for 'love and affection' and perhaps a 10-dollar bill."

Educational opportunities varied from county to county and from magisterial district to district. The legislature further complicated the situation through the creation of independent districts. This condition existed until the creation of the county unit system.

Compulsory attendance came into being in 1897 and although this increased school attendance and enrollment, counties were hard pressed to put it into effect.

Agitation for a teachers' retirement system appeared in 1898 and the association went to work on the idea but it was several years before a full-fledged system became a reality.

The year 1904 marked the end of an era. For the first time the association elected a man as president who was not the State superintendent of schools.

The early 1900's to the end of World War I marked a period of membership growth and financial stability for the education association. The first step toward divorcing membership from convention attendance was achieved during these years and consequently both grew.

Although the membership in the organization grew, the financial condition did not improve quite so rapidly.

A new constitution adopted in 1909 had set up a permanent executive committee with a president, vice president, secretary, treasurer, and two members of the committee elected for a 2-year term.

The need for a breakdown of special interests at convention time had become obvious with the county superintendents association being the first to actually hold meetings apart from the business of the convention. Other such groups began to hold sessions during convention separate and apart from the business of the convention.

County education associations were still in their infancy but the round table, an organization of several counties which formed into regional groups, was probably at its greatest strength.

That the association was a working organization is evidenced by the fact that no longer did the group meet at resorts, take sightseeing trips and vacation during the convention.

During these years the school journal, not yet an official organ of the association, was experiencing a "checkered career." State Superintendent of Schools W. T. Miller had sold the publication to two West Virginia University professors and a rival educational publication had been started by Morris Shawkey, who was to be later named State superintendent.

As the association grew so did its effectiveness. It was beginning to be looked upon as the voice of the teaching profession.

The association sought to have the longstanding "institutes" improved and was joined in this effort by the State superintendent T. C. Miller.

It took the leadership in liberalizing the entrance and graduation requirements at West Virginia University.

The association sought to increase the school term of the public schools which in 1905 was still only 5 months. By 1906 they had gained the support of Gov. W. M. O. Dawson and the term increased to 6 months. Other efforts to increase the minimum school term were thwarted for one reason or another and it was not until 1919 that the legislature provided for an increase of 10 days each year until a total of 160 days, or 8 months of school, would be reached in 1923–24.

The first serious thoughts of making the county the basis for taxing, as it might apply to the school system, was taking place during this period. As usual, the teachers' organization favored the broader tax base but was met with considerable opposition by those who favored the district units. Well within the memory of many teachers today is the final and ultimate success of the county unit in 1933.

Salaries, although frequently mentioned, had never played an important part in the objectives of the association. With the coming of World War I, and the accompanying high cost of living, the need for improvement in salaries became urgent.

The 1913 convention at Parkersburg urged the establishment of a sick leave program and soon afterward a permissive retirement act was enacted by the legislature.

Between 1923 and February 1926, about 3 years later, the question of the need of a full-time secretary occupied the discussion of practically every executive committee meeting and every convention. On that date, the executive committee, meeting in Washington, D.C., employed W. W. Trent, who had been serving for several years on a part-time basis, as editor and full-time secretary.

Headquarters of the association had been kept at Elkins, where Secretary Trent lived, but in 1926 office space was rented in Charleston and headquarters moved to that location. In 1929 property was purchased at 1816–18 Washington Street and the association most frequently referred to now as the SEA, had its first association-owned home.

Spurred by the activity of the association officers, the employment of a full-time secretary and purchase of headquarters, membership grew from slightly more than 2,000 in 1920 to nearly 7,000 by 1931.

As the 1920's came to an end, and with the coming of the great depression, one issue above all others came to be the center of attention: that was the financial support of education. Financial support had never been satisfactory and the real crisis came to a head with the passing of the tax limitation amendment in 1932.

This was truly a period of decision as one crisis after another occurred. County school boards were unable to secure needed finances to carry on an adequate school program due primarily to the depression and to the ratification of the tax limitation amendment approved by the voters in the fall of 1932.

Incoming Gov. Guy Kump had expressed doubts about the soundness of constitutional limitations on levies but promised State assistance if the schools would put into effect economies in line with reductions commonplace in other fields at this critical time. The salaries of teachers for a period of 4 months was assumed by the State with the local districts responsible for the balance of the months, either seven or nine, whichever they could afford.

Promised State aid was slow in coming because the legislature was unable to pass a budget bill due to the difficulties in interpreting the new amendment. Before the end of the term more than 4,000 schools were forced to close their doors early.

The legislature, meeting in March, adjourned after only being in session a few days but knowing full well they would be called back to Charleston. This took place in April when Governor Kump issued a call for a special session and included in the call were two items of considerable importance to the schools of the State.

The county unit proposal went before this group of legislators amid opposition, much of it within the ranks of the association. By the time it was passed, in May of that year, sentiment had begun to change in favor of the bill. State aid to schools was set at $5,500,000 that year, the largest ever allocated to schools up to that time.

Another extraordinary session of the legislature was called by Governor Kump in December to find a solution to the school problem. This crisis was finally solved by a levy adjustment and the State assuming the payment of salaries for a period of 8 months instead of only 4.

The most important association developments during the 1930's were the growth of the county associations, the employment of an executive secretary and the constitutional provision authorizing five statewide affiliates.

The duties of the Journal editor and the secretary were divided in 1936 when R. B. Marston was named the first executive secretary and J. H. Hickman, former secretary, accepted the post as full-time editor.

The move for reorganization, which consequently led to the formation of the affiliates, came about as a result of the large attendance at the Charleston convention in 1935.

Differences in school philosophies developed early between Superintendent of Schools W. W. Trent and Governor Kump. These differences continued under Kump's successor, Homer Holt, and the association had a decision to make: to support the State department's legislative program and be out of favor with the Governor; to support the Governor or to develop their own program. The legislative and executive committees felt the latter was the wise choice rather than take sides or a middle-of-the-road policy.

By convention time, 1938, the rapport between the association and the Governor's office had considerably improved. Governor Hold addressing the convention that year proposed the foundation program in which local effort in support of schools would be rewarded. This and a number of other recommendations made by the Governor closely paralleled the SEA program.

Wartime restrictions aided indirectly in strengthening the county association. Legislators were informed of the SEA program at a local level prior to the session instead of waiting to hear about the program after they got to Charleston.

M. M. Neely succeeded Homer Holt as Governor and the relations between the association, the State department of education, and the Governor's office was peaceful and tranquil. This "honeymoon" feeling extended into the legislature. But this era of good feeling would only last during the tenure of Neely. With the election of Clarence Meadows in 1945 the end was in sight.

Because State aid to schools had increased over the years, and especially during Neely's administration, the school became the target of the West Virginia Chamber of Commerce who opposed higher State taxes and expenditures.

In 1943 Phares Reeder had succeeded R. B. Marston as the association's executive secretary and he took up the battle against the chamber, a battle that continued through the years until the retirement of the chamber's longtime director, Harry Stansbury.

Although the Governor severely criticized the association as having the "heaviest and most effective lobby I have ever witnessed," a $30 salary increase was put through in addition to a $3 increment.

Membership activities of the association centered around attempts to institute the unified dues plan—a plan whereby members joined national, State and local associations rather than select a single organization. Membership in the SEA was already high but the national (NEA) was barely half that of the State organization. By 1950, however, spurred by the election of Corma Mowrey as NEA president and the hard work done to bring about unification, NEA membership was about equal to the State association.

In 1949, because the title, State Education Association, was frequently confused with the State Department of Education another constitutional amendment changed the name to the West Virginia Education Association, dropping the word "State" from the title.

Higher salaries continued to be the No. 1 objective of the WVEA especially in the light of the higher cost of living that ensued following the war. In 1947, when a proposed salary bill already passed by the house of delegates became bogged down in the senate, threats of "strike" and "walkout" were heard throughout the State. The association leadership, under the direction of Reeder and President Rex Smith, continued to press for passage and in the closing days of the legislative session a bill increasing the base pay and adding $3 to the experience increment went to the Governor for his signature.

The need for new headquarters became apparent as activities increased. The executive committee, in 1951, after consideration of several sites, recommended to the delegate assembly the purchase of property at 1558 Quarrier Street. This was done and the 1952 delegate assembly authorized the start of construction in line with the specifications of a Charleston architect.

Ground-breaking ceremonies were held on March 6, 1954. In December of that year the staff started moving into the building and the building was officially dedicated the following spring.

The WVEA and the State teachers association, a Negro education organization, completed details for unification into one organization after years of working on the problem.

Gains in retirement and sick leave, plus social security coverage for teachers through county referendum, were made during this crucial period of history. As for salaries, Gov. Okey Patteson, in his message to the legislature in 1951, simply indicated that if funds could be found, the teachers should receive a raise.

Despite pessimistic reports from legislative leaders, the teachers received a salary boost, although the cigarette tax had to be increased to do it.

Incoming Governor, William Marland, in 1953 recommended the extension of the employment term from 9 to 9½ months. To finance this and other educational measures, he proposed a "severance tax" on exportation of natural resources. Although supported by the association and various labor groups, the fight over this measure was one of the most severe the association has ever experienced.

The world was changing at breathtaking speed and the Russian achievements only served to pinpoint this change. Schools were called on to help meet this rapid advancement in practically every phase of our life. If West Virginia was to share in the industrial development move, certain to come about in the next decade, then educational development must take place also.

It was during this period that the association nearly got into politics * * * that of endorsing candidates. After several setbacks in the legislature, particularly in the senate, a policy was set by the executive committee that the association would evaluate candidates for Governor, legislature, and Congress and make this material, with the candidates voting record, available to local associations. No funds were ever involved and the hesitancy of local leaders to meddle into politics kept the association leaders from making a big issue of this decision.

Most notable was the effort of the association to make the selection of the State superintendent appointee rather than elective. The 1957 legislature put it to a public referendum and it was adopted effective in 1958.

A State constitutional amendment to permit the laying of levies at 100 percent for 5-year periods instead of 3 failed in 1956 largely because of its unfortunate title, "Taxation and Finance Amendment." The amendment, in practically the same form, passed in 1958 under the title of the "Better Schools Amendment."

Efforts were made in the latter part of the fifties to steer the emphasis for improved education to the pupil instead of the teacher.

Efforts in the 1959 session to pass an income tax had the support of the association and for their support of this measure were censored again, severely, by the Charleston Gazette. 1960 was not a major legislative year, a regular budgetary session, but the association pushed for a stronger property appraisal act. With senate help, this time, a bill was enacted requiring county courts and the assessor to use new appraisal values, as a result of the reappraisal program going on, and to assess at not less than 50 percent of these values.

The 1961 year ushered in the first term of W. W. Barron as Governor and a period of good relations with the Governor's office and the legislature. Superintendent of Schools Virgil Rohrbough died in office and was succeeded by Rex Smith. Both public schools and higher education fared well under the Barron administration and, despite association efforts, West Virginia still lagged in the amount of money spent on a per pupil basis, and teachers' salaries were still short of the national average by about $1,000.

COMPLEX—YEAR-OLD GEORGE WASHINGTON HIGH SCHOOL MUST HAVE COMPUTER TO COMPLETE SCHEDULES

The services of an electronic computer are needed to keep things straight at what is probably West Virginia's most complex innovation in education.

The computer is used to complete class schedules and keep them from conflicting for the students at Charleston's year-old George Washington High School.

When it opened last year, county school officials said George Washington contained little that was actually new but, rather, represented a pooling of a number of new educational practices that had been developed in recent years.

The South Hills school's curriculum represents a whole new structure and the heart of the program is a complex but seemingly smooth-working scheduling system.

Utilized are such techniques as team teaching, large and small group instruction, independent research and seminars.

The school's schedule is tailored to the requirements of each teaching team and to some extent can be modified to accommodate individual differences among students.

Each school day is divided into modules of time—a 10-minute module to start the day with routine activities and then 20-minute modules from then on. A class or study period may last for one or several modules. Some students change classes every 20 minutes but only about one-third of the student body is on the move at any one time.

Students spend from 10 to 30 percent of their time in individual study. This may be either scheduled or unscheduled, depending upon the responsibility of the student.

George Washington had the advantage of having its building and educational program planned simultaneously. Without the specially designed building, the school's new curriculum would have been difficult, if not impossible, to institute.

The library is the center of both the building and the educational program. It is nearly surrounded by a cluster of small rooms called academic laboratories where individuals and small groups of students can meet in faculty offices and conference rooms.

There also is flexibility in four classrooms which can quickly be turned into eight seminar rooms by extending folding walls.

Principal Gene E. Stanley believes that while all parts of the school's program are important, the small group seminar is where the learning really takes place.

"Teachers are sold on it,'" he said. When we started, the teachers felt large group instruction was most valuable. Now they consider it almost a necessary evil."

State Ex-Teachers Hold Posts in NEA

Two West Virginians, prominent in educational circles, hold responsible positions with the National Education Association headquarters, in Washington, D.C.

Miss Corma Mowrey, for 20 years a classroom teacher in Harrison County schools and a former staff member of the West Virginia Education Association, was recently named the director of the Dvision of Organization Relations for the NEA. Prior to this promotion she served for several years as the assistant to the director of the Office of Lay Relations.

Sam Lambert, also a former West Virginia teacher and former WVEA staff member, who has been with the NEA since 1950, was recently named an assistant executive secretary in charge of informational services for the NEA. For several years Dr. Lambert has been the NEA's director of research.

While a teacher in West Virginia Miss Mowrey served 1 year as president of the WVEA and in 1950 was honored nationally by being selected president of the NEA.

Dr. Lambert is a native of Bluefield and prior to joining the NEA held a number of important posts in the education field in West Virginia. He was the director of school transportation and director of surveys and planning with the West Virginia department of education; served as the deputy director of the war finance division with the U.S. Treasury, chief statistician and research associate with the George Strayer Research Group in New York City and a specialist on school finance with the U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C. He served as the WVEA director of research and public relations from 1946 to 1950.

Education Business Growing

Public education in West Virginia is a big business and its getting bigger all the time.

A total of $132 million was spent last year for public schools in the State's 55 counties. For the current school year, appropriations have jumped to $145 million.

During the past 30 years, the State has assumed a large responsibility for financing public education and today State aid provides county school boards with more than half of their operating funds.

An increasingly important factor in school finance in West Virginia and elsewhere is the role of the Federal Government.

Relatively small amounts of Federal aid have been received by the school systems for years. Federal funds for education shot up in 1958 with passage of the National Defense Education Act.

Public education got its biggest financial boost from the Federal Government earlier this year with passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This legislation will provide about $18 million for West Virginia's public schools this year.

During the 1964–65 school year, West Virginia received a total of $6,381,426 in Federal funds through the State department of education.

Technical—Wood, Wetzel Counties Meet Crucial Training Need: Teaching Youths, Adults Skills of Data Processing

Two school systems in the State, those of Wood and Wetzel Counties are meeting one of the most crucial training needs of industry, that of teaching youth and adults the skills of electronic data processing.

In both school systems the courses are vocational technical study offered under the direction of the Division of Vocational Education of the State Department of Education.

At Parkersburg the courses are free to both groups. At New Martinsville courses are conducted under the technical education program for high school students, and are offered for fees to adults in the area.

Parkersburg conducts the training center for adults under the Manpower Development and Training Act. Wetzel County is serving industries in the area that want their employees upgraded. Their adult classes come from the Ohio Valley on both sides of the river.

In order to meet increasing demands for programers, many industries are offering their own courses and high schools across the Nation are adding courses as rapidly as they can. In spite of these efforts the supply cannot keep pace with the demands.

The Wetzel County Center is built around an IBM 1440 disk pack system.

Wood County Center has a Burroughs 283 computer with magnetic tape and punchcard capabilities, as well as paper-tape capabilities.

The center offers computer programing courses for the Burroughs 283. Cobol (comman business-oriented language) techniques are also taught for the B–283. IBM 1401 Audocoder programing language, and concept of the IBM 360, are offered as theory courses.

The courses in Wood County were started in August 1964, and students from last year's classes are already working as computer programers in the Washington, D.C. area, in Pennsylvania industries, in the computing centers of three universities, as teachers in training centers, in computer manufacturing, and in tabulating wiring as far away as Phoenix, Ariz.

The Wood County Center is more versatile than the Wetzel County Center, having a greater capacity for breadth of training, but the Wetzel County Center is equipped to serve a sizable number of students in the area in which training is offered.

The data-processing center in Wood County is temporarily housed in a portable metal building on the campus at Parkersburg High School until a building program is completed. The program carried on there is four faceted. It includes adult retraining, student training, county administrative work, and community services. The community services are offered at cost to nonprofit organizations, especially to local government. For example, the center is in a position to do personal and real taxbooks for a county government.

Trainees have done work for the Boy Scouts and are doing some small jobs for industry. The money from these jobs helps pay for operating the center.

At Parkersburg six types of training are being offered. The least complicated course is for the key-punch operator. One trained in that operation can find employment opportunities in almost every business that uses accounting machines. The Bureau of Public Debt in Parkersburg, through which every U.S. savings bond sold anywhere in the world is processed, is the largest employment source in the mid-Ohio Valley for key-punch operators.

A second area of training is that for tabulating machine operators who are concerned with sorting, reproducing, collating, and tabulating in card processing.

In the computer area there is the computer operator, who loads programs, files, mounts magnetic tapes, and checks printouts. There is also the computer programer who plans the system to achieve the desired output after he is advised of the material that will be fed to the machine. He solves the problem, writing in a language that the machine can understand, so that the desired results can be produced.

A bit of incidental information on the modern collegiate front is the fact that some colleges are accepting symbolic computer languages for language credit.

Smith Backs Centennial Observance

The following is a statement issued by Gov. Hulett C. Smith on the West Virginia Education Association's centennial observance:

"As one concerned most sincerely about the future of our State and Nation, I am pleased to salute the West Virginia Education Association on the occasion of its 100th anniversary. I join with the association's innumerable other friends in offering warm congratulations.

"The growth and continued progress of West Virginia depends, in a great sense, upon what we do in education.

"I am confident that with the assistance and cooperation of organizations like the West Virginia Education Association our State shall continue to move forward by improving our schools and providing for a more attractive atmosphere for the teaching profession."

Message for 1965—Teacher Welfare Not Sole Aim of State Association

Phares E. Reeder has been executive secretary of the West Virginia Education Association for the past 23 years. This is his 100th anniversary message to parents:

"The West Virginia Education Association, commonly known as the WVEA, is 100 years old. Our centennial commemoration will be brought to a climax at the annual convention in Charleston on October 13–15.

"So much of that which we write and say is for the teaching profession itself. Through this opportunity made possible by the Sunday Gazette-Mail, we should like for you, the parents, to know more about this professional association which serves the cause of education.

"The WVEA is not an agency of State government. It is to the teachers what the bar association is to the lawyer, the medical association is to the doctor. It is supported solely through the dues paid by the teachers—95 percent of whom belong to their county, State, and national associations.

"Possibly surprising to you, the WVEA does far more than work for the improvement of the welfare of the teachers. But even this work is not done with a selfish motive. As a profession, teachers want the best possible in the way of an educational program for their product—the children and youth of West Virginia. In our competitive American way of life, the WVEA has had to fight for improved teacher welfare. Had it not done so, our schools today would be in a deplorable state.

"In spite of having lost hundreds upon hundreds of newly trained and experienced teachers to other States, we still have increased the educational qualifications of our teachers. Today, 87 percent have 4 or more years of college training whereas 25 years ago only 41 percent had comparable training.

"Some of the welfare accomplishments, effected during the last quarter of a century, that have made the difference between the good school system which this State has and what could have been a most inferior one are as follows:

"Periodic salary increases—with a real boost through the passage of the Decision 1965 program last winter.

"Job security through a tenure system.

"Development of one of the better retirement systems in the country.

"A plan of sick leave, yet not nearly adequate.

"Such association-sponsored benefits as health and sickness, automobile occupational liability, and life insurance; legal consultative help and service to teachers.

"Of parallel importance from WVEA point of view, are its efforts and contributions toward the overall improvement of education at all levels. The WVEA is deeply concerned with the kind of educational program offered. It is concerned with the improvement of the organization and administrative structure of our school system at all levels. It is ever at work through committees, staff research, and study to improve education in all areas. Naturally, final determination of policies and program is made by the legally constituted authorities—boards of education, et cetera. However, through the creativity of the profession, new concepts of education and new approaches are projected. Many find their way into the program of education itself."

SYSTEM OF TRANSPORTATION DESIGNED TO SERVE CHANGING NEEDS OF SCHOOLS

School transportation in West Virginia is recognized and accepted as an integral part of a total comprehensive school program.

Probably no group agrees with this more than the 253,444 West Virginia schoolchildren who ride schoolbuses each day.

They represent more than half of all the students in the State's schools.

In pursuing a philosophy of equal opportunity for all children to receive quality education, the State's county public school systems are operating the largest public transportation system in West Virginia. The bus fleet continues to grow each year.

Some understanding of this growth can be realized by referring to 1933, the year during which the legislature passed the county unit law. At that time a number of county districts were transporting comparatively few pupils to and from school. In 1933–34, 711 schoolbuses were used in transporting 57,444 pupils in 54 counties. At that time the counties owned 393 of the 711 buses while the remainder were operated by contract carriers.

The school transportation system must be designed to serve the changing school attendance patterns. As dozens of schools are closed and consolidated into new modern buildings encompassing larger school and community areas, more youngsters must be transported. In many cases as school programs become more comprehensive transportation requirements further increase.

To do this tremendous transportation task the 55 counties own and operate 2,111 buses daily. Forty-three privately owned vehicles on contract to transport schoolchildren also operate for a total daily vehicle operating figure of 2,154 units. About 270 spare buses are maintained by the counties to run when regular buses are being serviced or repaired.

These schoolbuses traveled 21,010,337 miles during the 1964–65 school year. Until 1963 there had not been one West Virginia schoolchild fatally injured while riding on a schoolbus since 1939. West Virginia has received some of the highest honors in school transportation safety from national organizations. In one mishap in late 1963, where a schoolbus driver and a girl student died, the only fatality since 1939, State police investigation reports say the bus driver was in no way at fault.

Walter says this excellent record can be attributed to the well-regulated policies and procedures in the employment of schoolbus drivers. Not everyone can be a schoolbus driver—only persons between the ages of 21 and 51 years are eligible to make application.

Written examinations, as well as physical examinations, are required of all drivers at the beginning of each school year.

Prescribed training following employment is required before any driver can report for duty. Inservice training is required as a further assurance that all drivers are properly prepared to assume their responsibilities.

THEORY—HANCOCK SCHOOLS OUTLINE EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION

Educational innovation in West Virginia's northern panhandle is most pronounced in Hancock County where two new high schools are now in their second year of new programs in new surroundings.

The new schools are campus type facilities with well-designed buildings in quiet, scenic locations.

But the important parts of the schools are teachers and programs, students and initiative.

That's the theory and that's why the new facilities were designed not just as educational plants but rather as facilities particularly adapted to a progressive system of secondary education.

They are, in effect, research centers where well-directed students may educate themselves and develop attitudes which will motivate them to expand their knowledge in the years following formal education.

Hancock County school officials say that one of the reasons for establishing a research-centered program, which is the real new look in the system, is that knowledge is expanding and becoming obsolete so swiftly that it seems almost dangerous to teach a child facts rather than how to discover and organize facts.

If carried out effectively the independent research requirement can individualize high-school education. Under the program the student must examine some topic in depth; he must organize his efforts toward a substantial accomplishment; and he must accomplish enough, largely on his own, to impress a faculty member.

Each student in his final 3 years of high school must earn 12 points, half of those in the senior year, on a project requiring "that the work be described in detail and in formal style in a research paper, a recital, an art showing or a form appropriate to the subject area in which the independent research is done."

Opened in 1964, the two campus-style schools are Weir High in Weirton and Oak Glen in the northern part of the county. Weir, because of its size, is organized on the "little school" concept with each of these units having about 400 students and its own principal. English, social studies and math are taught in the little schools and students go to other buildings for their independent research and other classes.

Both schools center on the library and efforts have been taken to make them distinctive and attractive. In both schools, all manner of space, tiny and large, also has been made available for the independent research program. Some of it is as obvious as allowing a science student to work in a laboratory when neither is scheduled for a class. Mostly, though, it's an ingenious use of nooks and crannies.

Weir High is an eight-building complex on 56 acres of ground. There are the three little schools, a library-science building, theater arts center, gymnasium, business-education-administration building and service building.

Oak Glen's 97-acre site contains an academic building, arts center, little theater and gymnasium.

SCHOOL TAX ROCKETS IN 10 YEARS

Dramatic changes are taking place in the effort exerted to support schools at the local level. For example, in 1953–54 property tax collections for school operations totaled $26.3 million. In 1963–64, the figure was $51.6 million—an increase of $25.3 million.

Some benchmarks which have contributed to this increase are:

Statewide property reappraisal: The forerunner for a Statewide property reappraisal program was enacted in 1947. The original measure has been modified, strengthened, and extended on several occasions by the legislature. Reappraisal is complete in 22 counties with July 1966 set as the target date for completion statewide.

Better schools amendment: In 1958, the voters of West Virginia approved an amendment to the constitution which increased levying and bonding capacities of county schools. Counties may now increase the basic levy rate by 100 percent and extend this rate for a 5-year period. A county may borrow, through bonds, up to 5 percent of the total assessed property valuations in the county. In either case, 60 percent of the voters must approve at a special election.

Local effort: Through special levy and/or bond elections counties have extended effort to improve schools. At the present time 28 counties have both a special school levy in effect, 8 counties have a bond issue in effect, and 6 counties have neither a special levy nor bond in effect.

Improvements at the local level have come as a result of increases in property assessments stemming from higher appraisal values, increased tax leeway under the better schools amendment, and voter approval of school bonds and levies.

THREE-YEAR DRIVE—ALL OF STATE'S COUNTIES HAVE APPROVED PLANS FOR COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM

West Virginia's 55 county school systems are getting started this year on a program that could make significant changes in the kind of education that is offered in the State's public school classrooms.

The 1965 legislature appropriated $1 million to initiate the Comprehensive Education Program (CEP), a plan of school improvement devised over a 3-year period by the State department of education.

The CEP is designed to use the $1 million, and whatever money it gets in the years ahead, to encourage counties to improve their educational programs. Long range educational planning is an essential feature of the CEP.

All of West Virginia's 55 counties now have approved plans to expand their educational offerings under the CEP.

The plans include 92 programs in 10 subject areas with 11,499 teachers and 418,000 directly involved, State Supt. Rex. M. Smith said.

The detailed plans were drawn up by county school staffs and curriculum committees in each county.

All of the $1 million provided by the legislature will be used. A second distribution of funds will be made to counties which have plans beyond the minimum required to qualify for the participation. Under the CEP, the money will not pay for expanded programs, but will only stimulate improvements.

"I am very pleased that all counties not only studied their educational systems very carefully, but were able to plan projects that would mean more opportunities for the pupils," Smith said.

The 10 general subject areas in which programs have been approved include language arts, social studies, science, guidance, foreign language, mathematics, school lunch, home economics, vocational agriculture, and physical education.

Forty-two counties are expanding their language arts programs under the CEP to provide better opportunities for students to develop reading, listening, speaking, and writing skills.

Fifteen counties are expanding social studies opportunities to allow pupils to gain better understanding of the world in which they live. Science teaching and facilities will be improved in nine counties. One county each is expanding opportunities in the areas of guidance, foreign language, home economics, vocational agriculture, and physical education.

The broad outline for general school improvement under the CEP would make it possible to improve in 22 subject areas. Educators say that if their evaluations of the new projects are favorable, many more projects will be planned next year.

Several counties have undertaken two or more projects under CEP guidelines although receiving funds for only one or two.

"More important than money is the fact that stimulation of effective, detailed planning and analysis of educational programs at the county and State level has really begun in West Virginia," Smith said. "The CEP has caused the most intense examination of our educational systems in recent history.

"This progress does not mean that we have a statewide comprehensive educational program, only that we have made the first significant step," he continued. "We must have funds to maintain the expanded opportunities already begun and then additional funds to expand other areas not touched this year."

Smith explained the background of the CEP this way:

"The CEP grew out of a need for change in West Virginia. Although there are many excellent educational programs now operating in West Virginia and there are continuous untiring efforts on behalf of educators and interested laymen to bring better programs to our State, there can be no argument about the fact that we still need many improvements.

"For example, out of every 100 high school graduates in the State, 30 go to college and 16 receive vocational training. That means that 46 percent of our graduates are prepared to make a go of it in this competitive world.

"What happened to the other 54 percent? Unfortunately, many of these 'forgotten' students are headed for the unemployment lines and the relief rolls unless something is done. We have got to provide meaningful education for every child.

"In addition to these forgotten students, we must also provide for adult citizens who want to continue learning after high school, for those whose jobs have been eliminated by automation and other change, and for those whose jobs depend on continuous education and training. And, of course, we must not forget the preschool child.

"This was the situation the State department of education faced when it set out to develop a plan which would give school board members, administrators, supervisors and teachers an understanding of the need for comprehensive educational programs and direction for the development of such programs."

The plan, representative of the thinking of educators from all over the State and country, features a flexible program which will better serve individual needs and interests of everyone.

It aims to provide three basic things:

A good general education for all, which begins with kindergarten and extends throughout life. This area provides fundamentals of basic courses that everyone needs whether he is going to be a physicist or a mechanic and includes language arts, social science, math, science, creative arts, health, physical education, practical arts and many others.

A good elective curriculum providing salable skills and leading to readiness for productive employment. This area is for students not going to college but who need a job after graduation from high school or post high school. Opportunities should be provided for supervised work experience in such areas as business education, vocational industrial programs and technical education.

A good elective curriculum for those who will continue their formal education provides a background for more advanced work in areas such as English, physics, biology and chemistry.

In addition to an individualized, far-reaching curriculum, a comprehensive educational program also must include other services essential to the successful operation of the program.

These include library and instructional services, health services, guidance, administrative services, school lunch services, transportation and other types of pupil personnel services.

WVEA Convention Due To Start; Drama To Highlight Observance

An estimated 12,000 to 14,000 teachers and visitors will be in Charleston Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday for the 100th Annual Convention of the West Virginia Education Association. The expected record attendance and special events will mark the 3-day convention program as the WVEA, with headquarters at 1558 Quarrier Street, observes its 100th anniversary.

The teachers association, founded in 1865 when a few hundred teachers gathered at Fairmont to discuss common problems, today represents more than 16,500 State teachers.

Highlighting the anniversary observance will be a historical drama to be presented at 7:30 p.m. Wednesday and Thursday nights at the civic center and a downtown parade at 2:30 p.m. Friday. The public is invited to the Wednesday night showing of the drama.

The drama, which depicts the history of the WVEA, is entitled "That Untraveled World." It was written by Dr. Kermit Hunter, author of "Honey in the Rock," and other historical dramas, and is directed by Tom Murphy, of Charleston. A color film depicting the goals of education developed by State teachers during the past 2 years will be incorporated into the drama.

The parade will proceed down Kanawha Boulevard from Morris Street, out Capitol Street to Washington Street, and to the civic center. It will spotlight education with 13 floats, bands, and all that goes with a parade. There will be a special WVEA float and a float sponsored by the West Virginia Classroom Teachers Association. Representation of the 55 counties will be divided among the other 11 floats, and a teacher representing each county will ride them. The county representatives were selected earlier this year in the naming of a Miss WVEA to represent the profession during the centennial year. She is Mrs. Martha Jarrell, a Ravenswood elementary teacher who will occupy the place of honor on the special WVEA float along with 10 regional winners.

Walter F. Snyder, Kanawha County superintendent of schools, will welcome the teachers to the convention at the Thursday morning session at the civic center. Judge Harold C. Kessinger, of New Jersey, will be the main speaker. Judge Kessinger, best known as a humorist, is considered one of the Nation's leading speakers and once was the subject of a TV show typifying an American institution—the public speaker.

On Thursday afternoon, secondary teachers will gather at 19 meetings throughout the city according to their fields of teaching. Elementary teachers will meet at the civic center, where they will hear Dr. Roma Gans, of Columbia University, one of the country's leading authorities on the teaching of reading.

Speaking at the Friday morning general session will be Gov. Hulett C. Smith and Dr. Andrew Holt, president of the University of Tennessee. Jane Hobson, nationally known concert singer of Huntington, will appear on the program. Honor guests will be West Virginia's congressional delegation, members of the board of public works, and State legislators.

Luncheon meetings will be held Friday by four WVEA affiliates—the West Virginia Association of School Administrators, West Virginia Association for Higher Education, West Virginia Classroom Teachers Association, West Virginia Secondary Principals Commission.

A birthday party and ball at the civic center will climax the convention Friday night. Activities will include cutting of a 100th anniversary cake and introduction of "Miss WVEA."

Heritage of State on Display

Visitors by the thousands have come to the campus of Fairmont State College since 1963 to view the little One-Room School Centennial Museum, one of the first permanent mementos to the 100th birthday of the State of West Virginia.

Oldsters and youngsters alike have seen this vanishing segment of American heritage.

Now, 3 years later, portions of the valuable memorabilia will come to Charleston during the 100th anniversary of the West Virginia Education Association, and will be housed in the windows of the Diamond Department Store as a project of the Association of Higher Education, an affiliate of WVEA.

The 23- by 26-foot, white country schoolhouse was taken down in 13 sections 22 miles from the Fairmont State campus where it was erected in 1871, and trucked to the campus to be reassembled amid the halls of learning. There it not only serves as a memory of the early years in rural America, but also is used as a visual aid center to the many young teachers who are trained on the campus each year.

Tribute—WVEA President's Centennial Address Cites Growth, Achievements of State Education

Mrs. Beatrice Burns Harvey of Lewisburg is serving as president of the West Virginia Education Association during its 100th anniversary year.

Following is her centennial message to the State's teachers:

"May I remind you, as we celebrate this occasion, that from a few hundred teachers, called together in 1865, the pioneer spirit has dominated until now the organization has grown to more than 16,500 active members.

"This force of unlimited resources has had a tremendous part in the growth and progress of education in West Virginia. Educators at all levels, have been a part of the existence, growth, and achievement of the WVEA as it has moved forward in the great adventure of rendering service to the youth and teachers of this State.

"One hundred years of living are never uniformly smooth and without struggle. They are years of shadows intermingled with sunshine. Years of experimentation, of trial and error. Years mingled with disappointments and rewards, years of seeking change, of discovering better ways of doing things. All of these experiences have given strength and stature to the association, until it has become the recognized symbol for progress in education.

"As president of the West Virginia Education Association, I welcome the opportunity to pay tribute to the teachers of our State for their devotion, loyalty, integrity and abundant faith.

"Time after time, in the face of inadequate financing of education you have united your efforts and faced the crisis with rededication of spirit and faith in the future.

"You have dramatically demonstrated your dedication to West Virginia and its growth as you have resolutely refused to be lured to other States by higher monetary rewards, fringe benefits and better working conditions. For this spirit of loyalty and dedication every citizen surely offers a prayer of gratitude.

"You have seen, and continue to see, the State's children as its greatest resource. You have also seen, and will continue to see, your united organization as the most effective way to improve teaching conditions and child opportunities. I salute you for maintaining one of the highest percentages in the Nation in membership in the professional organization. This in itself is indicative of your attitude and devotion to the upbuilding of your profession.

"You have strengthened, and will continue to strengthen, education by demanding high standards for training and certification of teachers. You have taken the lead in demanding excellence in performance of duty, and have set yourselves high goals.

"Be assured that as we move into the next century, the WVEA will take whatever risk is necessary to dream, to build, to move forward. There may be time we will fail, but these will mark only temporary defeat. We will never forsake our goal, and will never compromise for less than excellence."

ASSOCIATION REQUIRES B.A. AT LEAST FOR MEMBERSHIP

Fully certified teachers are the rule today, but 100 years ago they often were hardly better educated than their students.

As late as 1921, there were 4,800 teachers who had not gone beyond the eighth grade.

Today, more than 87 percent of all teachers have at least 4 years of college preparation—79.2 percent of elementary teachers and 96.8 percent of secondary teachers. This is above the national average. Twenty-five years ago, only 41 percent had comparable training.

Of the 17,461 teachers in 1963–64, there were 2,248 nondegree teachers, 10,846 B.A. degree teachers, and 4,367 with masters degrees.

VOCATION STUDY PLANS RESHAPED

Vocational education programs in the public school system of West Virginia have been undergoing redirection, expansion and improvement with the aim of adapting the program to the impending needs of youth and adults who must acquire competency to compete in the changing world of work.

Some of the impetus given to vocational education came from the recent Federal legislation that was designed to encourage the development of more diversified and comprehensive vocational education programs.

Vocational programs in West Virginia are administered through the Bureau of Vocational and Adult Education of the State Department of Education in cooperation with Federal, State, and local educational and other agencies.

Educators estimate that only 2 of every 10 students now in elementary school will graduate from college. If this prediction comes true, the labor market will be flooded with jobseekers in a few years.

By 1970, when many of these students begin graduating, the American labor force will already total about 100 million people. Twenty-six million of this total will be young workers entering the labor force during the current decade. Three million will be women entering or reentering the working world.

These people must have sufficient programs of job training and retraining.

Assistant State Superintendent Fred W. Eberle, who heads the vocational bureau, said that so far West Virginia's programs are staying abreast of the rapidly changing times.

"Regardless of the field involved, our training is based on current needs and subject to rapid readjustment," he said. "Our people are being trained for useful employment."

During the 1964–65 school year, 22,869 students in 182 high schools were enrolled in programs of vocational and technical education. These courses, also taken by 14,414 adults, were offered in 53 counties.

CALLING—TEACHER LOOKS BACK ON 60-YEAR CAREER

Early on a mid-November morning in 1894, 21-year-old Alonzo A. Hopkins walked into the log Belle School in rural Summers County and began a teaching career which would span 60 years, a record that few—if any—West Virginians would ever equal.

The spry, silver-haired Hopkins, who observed his 92d birthday at his home in Bluefield last month, is quick to reveal his philosophy of education:

"Teaching," he says, "is man's greatest calling with the exception of preaching."

In his gray stucco home lying almost in the shadow of East River Mountain, Hopkins keeps many mementos of his years spent in the classroom and still keeps informed of activities in the Mercer County school system where he spent 56 of his years of teaching.

With the exceptions of 1 year's illness and three leaves of absence granted to allow him to serve in the State legislature, Hopkins taught continuously from 1894 until 1945. After his retirement from active teaching in 1945, he served as a substitute teacher until 1954.

Hopkins was elected a member of the West Virginia House of Delegates from Mercer County in 1939 and again in 1941. In 1945, he was appointed as an attaché in the house of delegates to hold the position of secretary of the committee on education.

"It was in 1945," he recalls, "that I saw myself legislated out of a job. That year, the legislature passed a bill making it mandatory for teachers to retire at the age of 65. I was then a teacher at Bluefield High School and was 72 at the time."

Hopkins was born September 28, 1873, at his parents' farm on Ugly Branch near Lerona in Mercer County.

At the age of 9, he began his formal education at the Bitch's Spring School, so named from the fact that two female dogs got engaged in a fight while workmen were constructing the building in the summer and fall of 1866.

The name of the facility, located just across the Mercer County line in Summers County, was changed to Belle School in about 1885 and, in later years, was consolidated with the Pipestem School.

Hopkins received his State teaching certificate August 24, 1894, approximately 3 months before he was employed as the teacher at Belle School.

In 1894, he began taking classes offered by Concord Normal School in Athens and received his diploma in 1900. He was awarded a bachelor of arts degree from Concord College in 1931 and attended Marshall College to do graduate work in the summer of 1932.

Hopkins married Sadie Clair Caldwell, whom he had known from childhood, in 1903. The couple had four children, two boys and two girls. Hopkins' wife died in the spring of 1914 at Lerona.

Eleven years later in 1925, Hopkins married Lula Pearl Robins Bray, of Oakvale, in Mercer County. He had a son by his second wife.

He recalls that the school term during his first teaching experience at Belle School lasted only 2½ months. In 1895, he taught at the Knob Ridge School, also in Summers County, but returned to Belle School the following year. He served as the teacher at the Panther Branch School in 1897 before starting his Mercer County teaching career at Brown's Ridge the following year.

Hopkins points out that the school terms were so short at that time he only taught a total of 12 months during his first 4 years in the profession.

"I was paid $25 a month, or $62.50 for my first term of teaching," he relates. "During my first 5 years as a teacher, I made less than $400.

Hopkins came to Bluefield in 1900 as a teacher at Ramsey School. He remained there for three terms before returning to the Brown's Ridge School.

During the period from 1905 until 1918, he was a teacher in the Brown's Ridge, Athens, Oak Grove, and Green Springs schools.

An influenza epidemic struck the area in 1918 and Hopkins did not teach because of illness.

In 1919, he assumed teaching duties at Lerona which he held until 1924 when he was named supervisor of rural schools in Beaver Pond Magisterial District which encompasses the Bluefield area.

From 1927 until his retirement in 1945, he was a member of the Bluefield High School faculty.

Following his retirement, he was offered a teaching position in North Carolina but decided not to accept. His name was placed on Mercer County's substitute teacher list where it remained until 1954.

Hopkins estimates that he taught approximately 10,000 students during his 60 years of classroom experience. Among his prized possessions is a list of the 40 students who enrolled at the Belle School in 1894.

Since his retirement, Hopkins, still active despite his 92 years, has authored a comprehensive geneological history of the Hopkins, Farley, Cook, Keaton, and Brown families which live in the Mercer County area.

The Belle and Panther Branch schoolhouses are now only a part of southern West Virginia's colorful history but the service of Alonzo A. Hopkins, the man from Ugly Creek who firmly believes that teaching is man's second-greatest calling, will always stand as a living monument to their memories.

FOUR SECRETARIES SERVE WVEA IN 100 YEARS

Only four full-time executive secretaries have served the West Virginia Education Association in its 100-year history.

The first secretary was W. W. Trent, former State superintendent of schools, who at the time of his appointment was serving as part-time secretary and editor of the School Journal while associated with the school system in Randolph County.

In 1920 he was named the association's first full-time secretary and served in this post until August 1927.

The position remained open until the following October and at its annual convention the organization chose J. H. Hickman to succeed Trent. Hickman served until 1936 and was succeeded by R. B. Marston who held the post until 1943.

Marston resigned to accept an appointment with the National Education Association in Washington, D.C., and Phares Reeder, who was serving as the Classroom Teacher Association president succeeded him.

Reeder has served in this position for the past 22 years, longer than all his predecessors' terms combined.

SURVEYED—FURTHER EDUCATION DOUBTED BY 61 PERCENT OF SENIORS

Based on recent records, about one-third of high school seniors can be expected to go on to college. What will the other two-thirds do? Are they adequately prepared to get jobs, or do they need some kind of additional training? Are new facilities for schooling beyond the high school needed in the State?

In order to establish a basis for studying these questions, the West Virginia Education Association, under the auspices of its committee on education beyond the high school, went to the students themselves. An opinion survey was made of 1,826 graduating seniors at 180 high schools in 54 counties.

Ninety-two percent of the seniors were interested in continuing some type of schooling. Of these, 53 percent were "greatly interested" and 38 percent were "moderately interested." However, 61 percent of the seniors said they believed they couldn't continue their education. The lack of money was the most frequently mentioned reason, followed closely by the desire for immediate employment.

Asked to select from three choices the type of education beyond high school in which they were primarily interested, the seniors chose from 1 to 4 years of regular college education first (43 percent). Following closely was vocational-trade and/or commercial education (37 percent). The third choice was 2 years of college education combined with vocational-technical schooling. Of the seniors 6 percent were interested in none of these types of education.

Eighty-six percent of the students replied in the affirmative when asked if they would be for or against an advanced area school which would include the 12th, 13th, and 14th grades offering a wider variety of 12th grade subjects plus college and/or vocational-trade courses for 13th and 14th year students.

Slightly more than one-third of the seniors favored one of the professions as a life career. Engineering and teaching were the most popular professions with the boys, while teaching and nursing were most favored by the girls. Only 4 percent of the boys were interested in science and even fewer in medicine and law.

State Makes Progress Toward Educational TV for Schools Through New Authority

The educational uses of broadcasting came to West Virginia with the advent of radio in the mid-1920's. Almost from the very beginning the operators of broadcasting stations made their facilities available for school and college programs, and a great deal has been done through the commercial stations of the State.

However, it is impossible for a commercial station, generous as it might be, to make available enough time during the school day to serve the educational needs of a community, and with educators turning more and more to mass media for solutions to their problems, educational broadcasting over stations licensed to school systems or colleges has been gaining ground.

West Virginia so far has lagged behind the rest of the Nation and the only educational station in the State is a 10-watt FM radio station operated by Marshall University.

Cooperative efforts to secure educational broadcasting for West Virginia began in 1952 when educators in the northern and central sections of the State secured the allocation of channel 5 in Weston for educational purposes, but funds could not be found to build the station.

In May 1960, six colleges and West Virginia University formed the North Central West Virginia ETV Committee to promote educational television in that part of the State. With the aid of a Ford Foundation grant five visitation teams from this committee visited ETV operations in various parts of the United States.

In November 1960, six West Virginians attended the North Central Conference on the Educational Uses of Television at Ohio State University. While there they drafted a tentative plan for State action which was reported to the State superintendent of schools. In July 1961, the State superintendent called a meeting of broadcasters and educators and a State advisory committee on educational broadcasting was formed.

A steering committee from this advisory group helped plan a statewide dissemination conference sponsored by the North Central Association. This was held at Jacksons Mill in October 1961. County school officials and college representatives from all over the State attended this meeting where statewide plans were prepared and approved by the North Central representatives.

These plans called for more educational use of existing commercial facilities, for greater student participation in broadcast activities, for the preparation of teachers for the advent of broadcast instruction in their classrooms and for the creation of a State educational broadcasting authority to supervise the development of educational radio and television in West Virginia.

To implement the plan, the State superintendent of schools retained an educational broadcasting consultant and the county superintendents were asked to appoint educational broadcasting committees. A pilot area workshop was held in Beckley in December 1961.

However, this procedure was deemed too slow to cover the entire State and it was decided to use television in order to reach the educators in most parts of West Virginia.

On April 21, 1962, a special statewide telecast was carried by WCHS–TV in Charleston and WJPB–TV in Weston on which the State superintendent and his staff talked to the county educational broadcasting committees and the public concerning television and radio and the schools.

In June 1962, the Governor appointed an interim Educational Broadcasting Authority and charged it with making plans for the use of radio and television in education. In October this authority secured a grant of $10,000 from the Benedum Foundation of Pittsburgh to make a Statewide technical ETV survey.

In December 1962, the interim authority also received approval of a $1,500 grant from the Southern Regional Education Board of Atlanta to inform the public about ETV through workshops.

The 1963 legislature formally created the Educational Broadcasting Authority. Six members are appointed for overlapping 6-year terms. One is designated by the West Virginia University Board of Governors, one represents the State board of education, and the ninth member is the State school superintendent.

The authority was given its first budget by the 1965 legislature when $75,000 was appropriated for the 1965–66 fiscal year. The authority has opened an office at 1033 Quarrier Street and the staff consists of Harry M. Brawley, executive secretary; Mrs. Susan Keith-Lucas, coordinator; and Mrs. Shirley B. Jones, office manager.

The authority has two goals. The first is to get as many stations on the air as possible in the shortest possible time by encouraging efforts on the local level and by seeking Federal funds to supplement State money.

REPORT ON THE 54TH CONFERENCE OF THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pirnie] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a brief report on the 54th Conference of the Interparliamentary Union which was held in Ottawa, Canada, on September 8–17. The Conference was attended by some 554 delegates from 61 member countries of the Union. Delegates from Congo/Léopoldville and Nicaragua attended for the first time.

At the opening ceremony, messages of welcome were received from Mr. Alan Macnaughton, Speaker of the House of Commons; from the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Lester B. Pearson; from the president of the Canadian group, Senator J. M. Dessureault, who was elected President of the Conference, and from the Governor General of Canada, the Right Honorable Georges P. Vanier. All the plenary sessions of the Conference were held in the impressive Chamber of the House of Commons.

The U.S. delegation consisted of 11 Representatives and 2 Senators, as follows: Representative Alexander Pirnie, of New York, who served as chairman of the delegation in the absence of Senator Talmadge, of Georgia, who, with most of the appointed Senate delegates, was detained in Washington by the current debate on the farm bill; Representatives E. Ross Adair, of Indiana, Emilio Q. Daddario, of Connecticut, Edward J. Derwinski, of Illinois, Eligio de la Garza, of Texas, Paul C. Jones, of Missouri, Clarence D. Long, of Maryland, Catherine May, of Washington, Robert McClory, of Illinois, W. Robert Poage, of Texas, and B. F. Sisk, of California. The Senate delegates who were able to attend part of the time were Senators Stephen M. Young, of Ohio, and Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina. Former Representative Katharine St. George was also a member of our delegation.

The staff consisted of Dr. George B. Galloway, executive secretary; Darrell St. Claire, administrative officer; Dr. Charles Gellner and Donald R. Morris, advisers; Milrae Jensen and Martha Price, secretaries. They performed their duties with faithfulness and efficiency, contributing materially to the success of the Conference.

I am happy to report, Mr. Speaker, that our delegation played a prominent part in the proceedings of the conference. We were represented at the meetings of the IPU Council by Representatives Derwinski and Poage. During the general debate that followed the opening session Senator Young spoke on the importance of 1965 as the International Cooperation Year, and I spoke on controlling the spread of nuclear weapons as an essential task for international peace.

Representative Daddario opened the debate on "The United Nations: Instrument of International Cooperation for Peace and Disarmament" which was a central theme of the conference. He and

I also participated actively in the sessions of the Committee on Political Questions, International Security and Disarmament which hammered out one of the major resolutions adopted by the conference.

Representative W. Robert Poage addressed the conference on "New Prospects for International Economic Relations" and served on the Economic and Social Committee with Representative Paul Jones, who spoke on "The Process of Economic Development." Representative Clarence Long also served on the Economic and Social Committee, which authored another resolution adopted by this conference.

Representatives Adair and McClory represented the United States on the Parliamentary and Juridical Committee, while Representatives Sisk and McClory addressed the conference on "Means of Strengthening the Effectiveness of Parliamentary Institutions."

On the Cultural Committee of the Union we were ably represented by Representatives Catherine May and Robert McClory who was the rapporteur of this committee.

Representatives Derwinski, Sisk, and de la Garza were the spokesmen for the United States on the Committee on Non-Self-Governing Territories and Ethnic Questions.

All five standing Study Committees of the Union met during the conference and considered amendments to their draft resolutions and formulated their work programs for 1966.

In addition to the subjects of debate which I have already mentioned, the conference also adopted without debate four resolutions on the following topics:

First. The demographic problem and the forthcoming United Nations conference on world population.

Second. Relations between the Interparliamentary Union and UNESCO.

Third. The use of television and other modern technical media for the education of children and adults in a spirit of international peace and friendship.

Fourth. The problem of apartheid in the light of the universal declaration of human rights and the United Nations Charter.

During the conference Senators Dessureault, of Canada, and de Baeck, of Belgium, were elected to the Executive Committee of the Union for 4-year terms to fill two vacancies on that body. Rainieri Mazzilli, of Brazil, was reelected President of the IPU Council for 2 years.

The most significant matters with which the conference was confronted lay in the political area. These reflected the issues of the cold war—Vietnam, Communist China's representation in the United Nations, disarmament, means of assuring world peace, and others. If one subject could be singled out as a matter of the deepest concern as manifested in the remarks of the delegates, it was the conflict in Vietnam.

Many things were said about Vietnam, some of them critical of the policy and actions of the United States. Congressman Daddario of the U.S. delegation skillfully presented an analysis of the American position on Vietnam in his statement as a rapporteur of the political committee. He stressed American willingness to enter into unconditional negotiations on Vietnam, and cataloged the many efforts already made by the United States to open a path to a peaceful solution. The United Nations had a role to play in the Vietnamese situation, he said, and the member states should search for any effective way in which an agency of the United Nations could promote peace. The United Nations would be judged by history, he declared, on the basis of its performance in situations like that of Vietnam. In short, Congressman Daddario portrayed convincingly the defensive and peaceful aim of the American role in the tragic Vietnamese crisis.

From the very beginning of the proceedings there were specific motions attacking U.S. policy regarding Vietnam that had to be met. In the meeting of the Interparliamentary Council on Tuesday, September 7, preceding the formal opening of the General Conference, consideration was given to resolutions introduced by the U.S.S.R. and the United Arab Republic condemning U.S. actions in defense of the Republic of South Vietnam. The Soviet resolution appealed "to the Congress and the Government of the United States" to stop the "barbarian bombings" of North Vietnam, to withdraw American troops from South Vietnam, and to "respect the right of the people of Vietnam to settle their own affairs by themselves."

The resolution of the United Arab Republic was less direct but called for "cessation of American air raids," the application of the 1954 Geneva Agreements, and insisted on the necessity of negotiations "between all interested parties."

The Council voted against recommending that the Conference take up these resolutions for debate. Under the rules of procedure this meant that the resolutions could be placed on the agenda of the Conference only by a two-thirds vote of that body. The full Conference took the procedural vote on these on Friday, September 10, and they were rejected.

Some delegations felt, however, that the Conference should not remain silent on the Vietnam situation, which they felt to be one of the most dangerous crises on the international scene. In its meeting on September 15, the Interparliamentary Council voted to recommend to the Conference a resolution on Vietnam introduced by Mr. Moutet, of France. This resolution, which was essentially an urgent appeal to the parties concerned to start negotiations to end the conflict without any preconditions, was not objectionable in itself to the United States, but it was thought that if it became a subject of debate in the full Conference it could be a lightning rod attracting acrimonious accusations and extended discussion. The U.S. group, therefore, sought to convince other delegations of the imprudence of placing it on the agenda.

When the question of placing it on the agenda came before the Conference on September 16, I raised a point of order to which the Secretary General replied that if it were placed on the agenda it would be open to debate and to amendments. I observed, if one voted against placing the resolution on the agenda, that would not be a vote against the resolution as such but merely an expression that one felt the subject had already been adequately considered by the Conference. Mr. Moutet himself in presenting the resolution also assisted the situation by saying that he had no wish that his action should result in the reopening of discussions. The resolution failed to receive the necessary two-thirds vote and thus was barred from the agenda. Consequently there is no direct reference to Vietnam in the resolutions finally approved by the Conference.

The formal political item on the agenda of the Conference was entitled, "The United Nations, Instrument of International Cooperation for Peace and Disarmament." In this title the word "disarmament" is closely linked to that of "peace." The need for disarmament as a means of assuring peace was often stressed at the Conference. In my statement in the general debate I urged action on one of the most pressing arms control tasks the international community should undertake today in the interest of peace; namely, action to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. I advocated three principal ways of doing this—conclusion of an antiproliferation treaty along the lines of that recently proposed by the United States in the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva, the conclusion of a treaty providing for a comprehensive ban on all nuclear weapon tests including those underground, and the adherence of Communist China and other countries which have not yet done so to the currently effective treaty prohibiting nuclear testing in the atmosphere, in space and underwater, and finally the conclusion of agreements to limit nuclear weapons and nuclear delivery systems.

At the Dublin session of the Interparliamentary Union in the spring of 1965 the Political Committee had not adopted a draft resolution on this subject, but envisaged that such a resolution would be prepared at the Ottawa Conference. Six draft resolutions were submitted for the consideration of the Political Committee, each reflecting the particular political positions of the parliamentary groups of the countries concerned. I would like to describe these briefly so that you may obtain an idea of the range of political problems the Conference considered.

The first draft resolution was submitted by the U.S.S.R. parliamentary group. It appealed to all the parliamentary groups to influence their governments to make the United Nations an effective instrument for peace and to defend the principle of noninterference in the internal affairs of other countries. It condemned "aggressive actions" against the democratic Republic of Vietnam and the "armed intervention" in South Vietnam. It also condemned the "military intervention" in the Dominican Republic. These two latter points were, of course, obviously aimed at the United States.

The Soviet draft also called for various disarmament measures, among them agreements to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, however, with an anti-NATO multilateral force clause, to ban the use of nuclear weapons, and establish "in different areas of the world" nuclear-free zones, to eliminate foreign military bases, and for nonaggression between NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries.

It also covered other matters such as the adoption of a United Nations Declaration on the Principles of Peaceful Coexistence and the implementation of the U.N. Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

Another resolution introduced by the Czechoslovakia group was shorter than the Soviet proposal but similar in tone. It said that the United Nations was "crippled by the aggressive policy of the United States" and called for adoption of a declaration on the principles of peaceful coexistence by the United Nations General Assembly. It was critical of the 18-Nation Disarmament Committee in Geneva and called for a World Disarmament Conference. It also advocated representation of the Chinese People's Republic in the United Nations.

The Yugoslav resolution was somewhat more moderate. It called for strengthening the efficiency of the United Nations and to uphold its "democratization" by adapting it to "changed world conditions." It urged "resolving the question of Chinese representation" within the framework of support of the "universality of the United Nations." In regard to disarmament it called for a World Disarmament Conference, banning all nuclear tests, prohibition of the use and proliferation of nuclear weapons, but it avoided the more objectionable Soviet points such as the "elimination of foreign bases." There was no condemnation of U.S. "aggression" but only a general call for "noninterference in internal affairs" so that peoples could decide their future "without pressure, threat, or the use of force."

The Israeli resolution was quite moderate. It was general in phraseology and called for the strengthening of the United Nations, expressed faith in the future of the United Nations, and stressed the necessity for each nation to fulfill the duties set forth in the charter.

The resolution proposed by the Argentine group was very short and stressed the necessity for parliaments to "reaffirm the spirit of universality and humanism contained in the charter."

The draft resolution submitted by the British group professed a need to make the United Nations an effective instrument for peace. It cited principles endorsed by the United Nations committee of 27 relating to friendly relations between states, such as to refrain from force and settle international disputes by peaceful means, to respect the sovereign equality of states, refrain from interference in the domestic jurisdiction of any state, and to respect the principle of self-determination.

It also cited an earlier resolution of the Interparliamentary Union favoring organization of a world police force and the formation of a core unit of military and other specialists at the disposal of the United Nations to send to troubled areas.

Finally, it called for moves toward certain disarmament measures including general and complete disarmament, the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons, and the extension of the partial test ban treaty to underground tests.

In general, the British resolution expressed views compatible with those of the U.S. delegation.

In order to facilitate the work of the political committee in reconciling the widely varying resolutions before it, the Secretary General announced on September 11, that the steering committee had decided to appoint a drafting committee composed of representatives of the countries that proposed the six resolutions and of the three rapporteurs that had been designated to lead off the discussion in the political committee: Mr. DADDARIO, of the United States, Mr. Kriegel, of Czechoslovakia, and Mrs. Chakravarty, of India.

The drafting committee met on Monday, September 13. After a preliminary exchange of views among the members regarding various aspects of the proposed resolutions, Mr. Kriegel, of Czechoslovakia, noted that there were certain subjects common to the proposed resolutions, such as the membership of the United Nations, disarmament, colonialism, and so forth.

It was generally agreed that efforts would be made to focus on these various common points and attempt to agree on language to cover them. The British, Czechoslovak, and Yugoslav delegates undertook this specific drafting task. They achieved a large measure of agreement and reported back to the drafting committee a single draft containing two major unresolved provisions, one relating to Communist Chinese representation in the United Nations and the other relating to colonialism. After further discussion the drafting committee submitted an agreed text to the full political committee on September 14. It is noteworthy that the U.S. representative, Mr. DADDARIO, had succeeded in obtaining deletion of specific reference to Communist China in the clause on participation of states in the United Nations.

In the full political committee on September 14 several amendments to the agreed text were proposed. The first sought to mention Communist China by name in the clause on participation in the United Nations. This was defeated. The Soviet Union proposed the addition of two clauses in the section of the resolution on disarmament. One called for the dismantling of foreign bases and the withdrawal of foreign troops. It was defeated. The other clause which provided for establishment of nuclear and nuclear-free zones "in different areas of the world" was adopted. Since no reference was made to specific geographic regions, such as Europe, this clause was not deemed unacceptable by the U.S. delegation.

In the final meeting of the full conference on September 17 this resolution as proposed by the political committee was adopted with an addition to the clause on nuclear and nuclear-free zones proposed by the British Delegation.

Let me close this brief report, Mr. Speaker, by making grateful acknowledgments to our Ambassador to Canada, the Honorable Walton Butterworth and the staff of the American Embassy for their briefing of our delegation and all their help, including the reception given in honor of our delegation by the Ambassador at his residence in Rockcliffe Park.

May I also express appreciation of the devoted and efficient participation by the members of the delegation who were faithful in their attendance during the long hours of the sessions and presented our country's position on vital issues in incisive and forceful speeches in committee and before the full conference. In conclusion, I include the text of these speeches and also the resolution adopted at this conference:

CONTROLLING THE SPREAD OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS: AN ESSENTIAL TASK FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE

(Speech by Mr. ALEXANDER PIRNIE (United States) at the 54th Conference of the Interparliamentary Union, Sept. 18, 1965)

Mr. President and my colleagues, it is a great happiness and a rich privilege to meet in this stately edifice, the home of our sister parliament to the north. Our closeness is more than a geographic fact—it is a way of life which has permitted our peoples to share mutual problems and objectives in an atmosphere of friendship and cooperation. Our delegation is very happy to be here and appeciates greatly the warmth of our welcome and the generous hospitality we are experiencing.

May I also compliment our distinguished Secretary General upon his comprehensive report in which he highlights so well our accomplishments and our frustrations.

My Nation has long exhibited its deep concern for the welfare of mankind and many members of this body can testify to the timeliness and effectiveness of its assistance. Even as we are meeting here this afternoon, the House in which I am privileged to serve is taking action to continue this humanitarian partnership.

We are all concerned with the Vietnam ordeal and wish for an early peace. My country has made very clear its unconditional desire to negotiate a just and lasting peace—a peace which will preserve national integrity and the right of self-determination. This should be the concern of all peoples.

Our Australian colleague put the problem in correct perspective when addressing this body this very morning. May we meet the crisis of today in a way that will promote a secure and a happy tomorrow.

I hope that the comments I will now make may contribute to our constructive thinking and objective action.

One of the most urgent tasks the international community must undertake in order to strengthen international peace is to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons. We welcome the wide dissemination of peaceful nuclear technology because it promises to bring untold benefits to people everywhere. At the same time, however, it is a source of a potentially dangerous security problem. This danger springs from the fact that nuclear armaments, which were once the technological prerogative of just a few powers, have now been brought within the practical reach of many. In some countries, only a governmental decision is required to initiate military atomic production and to trigger an expanded phase of the nuclear arms race.

This is an ominous situation. If the number of nuclear powers should increase, then it is plain mathematics that the chances of a nuclear confrontation, intentional or accidental, will greatly multiply. In view of the incalculable risks of escalation, the proliferation of nuclear-capable powers would constitute a threat to world security of unprecedented gravity.

Conscious of this, the United States has long sought to contain the spread of nuclear weapons. Dating back to the Baruch proposals of the early postwar period, these efforts may be traced through many subsequent proposals presented to the United Nations and other international organizations. At present, U.S. proposals include the following aims:

The first is the conclusion of an agreement to halt the spread of nuclear weapons. The draft treaty recently proposed by the United States at the 18th Nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva has this purpose. Under it the nuclear powers would undertake not to transfer nuclear weapons to the national control of states not now possessing them, and would agree not to help nonnuclear powers to make nuclear weapons. The nonnuclear countries in turn would agree not to acquire national control of, or to manufacture such weapons. A major goal of the treaty would be not to increase the present number of states and organizations with an independent nuclear capability.

If the nonnuclear countries forgo nuclear arms under such a treaty and thus contribute to everyone's security, this should not be at the sacrifice of their own safety. Recognizing this, the President of the United States in October 1964 promised "strong support" to nonnuclear states against threats of nuclear blackmail.

One immediate way all states can counter the nuclear proliferation danger is by fully utilizing the international safeguards devised by the International Atomic Energy Agency to prevent diversion of peaceful nuclear materials to military purposes. The United States has admitted these safeguards to certain of its own atomic reactors, and urges all governments, possessors as well as nonpossessors of nuclear weapons, to facilitate the application of these or equivalent safeguards.

Another major aim of the United States is a comprehensive ban on nuclear weapons tests. Some one hundred states have now subscribed to the treaty concluded in 1963, banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in space, and underwater. Unfortunately, the failure of a few significant countries to adhere to this treaty creates a gap in the barrier to nuclear arms proliferation. The United States strongly backs the resolution adopted by the United Nations Disarmament Commission last June calling on all states to accede to this treaty. It also firmly supports the call in this resolution for extending the 1963 treaty to nuclear tests underground, thus making it comprehensive. The United States is ready to discuss at any time the current technical requirements of an adequate verification system for an agreement to ban this type of testing.

Finally, the United States proposes a limitation of nuclear weapons and nuclear delivery systems. The United States has standing proposals for the major nuclear powers to cease production of fissionable materials for military purposes, to transfer substantial quantities of such materials to peaceful uses, and to impose a freeze on their strategic missiles, aircraft, and other nuclear delivery vehicles.

All these United States proposals are in harmony with the wishes of the United Nations as these have been expressed in General Assembly resolutions. They comprise a viable and effective program for curbing the perils of nuclear arms proliferation and containing the nuclear arms race. We urge their active consideration by this Conference and by all members of the United Nations as valid contributions to international peace.

The Process of Economic Development

(Speech by Representative Paul C. Jones, U.S. Delegate, Sept. 13, 1965)

Although the developed countries have been pouring hundreds of millions of dollars of developmental assistance into the underdeveloped countries, the gap between living levels in the developed and the underdeveloped countries is becoming wider, rather than narrower. The obvious question is "Why?"

During the past 20 years the United States alone has contributed more than $110 billion to more than 100 nations in an effort to assist the peoples of those nations to attain a higher standard of living. While in some areas, particularly the war-ravaged countries which were assisted through the Marshall plan, these programs were highly successful, in other areas, particularly the underdeveloped countries, the efforts were most disappointing, and many of my colleagues in the U.S. Congress have recognized that some of these programs have been dismal failures.

You need to understand the feeling of most of my colleagues in Congress. They are generous and sympathetic to relieving suffering, want and hunger wherever it exists, and for years did not hesitate to appropriate the billions of dollars recommended under both Democratic and Republican administrations. They were prepared to accept some disappointments—yes, even failures—in some of the untried programs, but they did expect to see some successes and to be able to point to worthwhile accomplishments through the expenditure of these tens of billions of dollars which were being added annually to the national debt which now approximates $325 billion, upon which our taxpayers are paying interest.

These taxpayers are voters, the constituents to whom each of the 535 Members of Congress must render an accounting as the Members of the House of Representatives present themselves for reelection every 2 years. Many Members have learned from the bitter experience of defeat that foreign aid is not the most popular issue on which to make a campaign. That is why so many of us want to be more certain that the programs of assisting our friends at least maintain these ties of friendship while contributing to the development of the underdeveloped countries.

Policies advocated and practiced by our State Department, based on the principle that "there are no strings attached" to any aid given by Uncle Sam who apparently has been willing to be maligned, insulted, and even to having his property defaced, destroyed, and taken over by uncontrolled mobs who leave the impression that they resent these well-intentioned acts of neighborly love and friendship, these policies are not supported by all Members of Congress.

In appraising the results of the hundreds of programs which have been financed by the U.S. taxpayers, I think it is becoming more apparent that financial aid alone will not bring about development in underdeveloped countries, and that more attention must be given to the development of plans which can be activated through mutual cooperation, confidence, and understanding. There must be clear statements of priorities before any foreign aid can be effective. There must be coordination in developing programs affecting health, education, transportation, power development, and industrialization.

It is time to dispel the fallacious belief that economic development is primarily a problem of capital investment and that with the availability of sufficient capital all of our problems automatically are solved. There must be changes in economic and social organization, there must be changes in the habits of thought and the ways of life of the people. In short, it seems to me there must be a shift in the emphasis from the material to the human aspects of economic progress.

THE PROBLEM OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The problem of economic development is a process of changing a whole society. Perhaps the most serious aspect of development planning is what the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations calls the vicious circle of population backlash. The more extensive, and the more developed, health services in an underdeveloped country become, the more serious the population problem seems to be. In some countries population doubles every 25 years. Preventive medicine, including the increasing use of vaccines, antibiotics, is radically reducing mortality rates, while birth rates remain high. The largest increases in population continue to be in countries where poverty is most acute.

Economic development depends more upon people than upon capital. The most important ingredient of all in economic development is education in its broadest sense. Indeed, education, in the narrow sense of training, can sometimes be harmful if it is not accompanied by education in the larger sense, which means acquiring the ability to understand the nature of the forces that make for a rising level of living. It means appreciation of the cause and effect relationship between resources and production, on the one hand, and population growth, on the other.

It is dangerous when economic planning creates a revolution of rising expectations without making it clear that the expectations can be realized only after long and arduous effort. It appears that disappointment can easily turn into resentment, even of the best intentions of the donors. Until men and women in the underdeveloped countries want education for their children enough to make sacrifices, it is not likely that there will be effective development. Education and abundance must be desired enough to sacrifice leisure, elaborate ceremonials, and religious codes that make a virtue of resignation and suffering.

It is especially important that plans not attempt to do too much, too soon, by building elaborate superstructures without first laying adequate human foundations.

Means of Strengthening the Effectiveness of Parliamentary Institutions

(Speech by Robert McClory, Member of Congress, U.S. Delegate, 54th Conference of the Interparliamentary Union, Ottawa, Canada, Sept. 16, 1965)

My colleagues, the great hope of mankind is in the strengthening of the functions and influences of the parliaments of the nations of the world.

As representatives of the people and as their direct voices in the government, the opportunity for the people to gain expression and to articulate their hopes for international understanding and peace is vested in us.

The role and powers of representative assemblies have frequently been questioned during the 20th century. The development of the welfare state and the management of the national economy have greatly increased the tasks imposed on governmental institutions during recent decades and augmented the authority of the executive branch. The substantive content and volume of the legislative program have also changed. During the 19th century such matters as rivers and harbors legislation, tariff revision and the like comprised a large portion of the legislative agenda of the American Congress. Today problems of foreign policy, social welfare legislation and the exploration of outer space are major items on our calendars.

Meanwhile, there has been a general shift toward expanding executive initiative in public policymaking, away from the legislature and toward bureaucracy. Moreover, it is the present practice in the United States for the President to make detailed recommendations to Congress and to exert pressure on Congress for the adoption of measures to carry out these recommendations.

The superior position held by the President of the United States since 1932 has stimulated recurring demands for a restoration of legislative initiative and of the coequal place of the Congress in the political scheme of checks and balances. The question of the proper role of Congress in our politcial system has become a matter of much concern to legislators and to students of government.

Many proposals for congressional reforms and improvements are being made at hearings being held now by a joint committee of the American Congress. Numerous suggestions are being made to modernize parliamentary practice in various ways. Some of these proposals call for strengthening party government in Congress, others are designed to correct the dispersion of power in Congress by strengthening the central leadership and by integrating foreign and military policies.

One set of suggestions would expand our research and information services by enlarging the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress to increase its staff in order to provide a central research pool for Members. This expansion would include the establishment of a separate unit to handle constituent inquiries comparable perhaps to the ombudsmen in some Scandinavian countries. It has also been suggested that advisory councils should be created of nongovernment experts in specialized fields to aid Members in researching technical matters. This might include a congressional institute of scholars drawn from the finest minds of the academic community. Committees could also conduct seminars and enter into private contracts for research studies in depth.

A second set of suggestions calls for strengthening the power of the purse. Under this head are proposals to establish a joint committee on the budget designed to provide for a more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of executive agencies. It also has been suggested that the size of the staffs of the Appropriations Committees be enlarged to include accountants, attorneys, economists, and investigators. Others propose that joint hearings should be held by the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses, that the President be given the power of an item veto on appropriation bills, that appropriations be made for 2 fiscal years rather than annually, and that two sessions of the Congress be scheduled each year with one devoted to money matters and the other to general legislation.

With a view to strengthening legislative oversight of the executive, it has been suggested that the minority or opposition party be given control of the House and Senate Committees on Government Operations, that permanent subcommittees on legislative oversight be created in each standing substantive committee, and that periodic review of Federal grant programs should be conducted.

Finally, the Special Joint Committee on Reforming and Modernizing the Congress has received suggestions to strengthen the central leadership by giving the leaders the authority to determine the agenda of the House, a power now largely exercised by the Rules Committee; giving the Speaker the right to schedule legislation; and by giving the majority party leadership in both Houses the power to take bills from committee and bring them to the floor.

These are only a few of scores of suggested changes in the organization and operation of the American Congress that have been made during recent weeks by Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, as well as by political scientist witnesses and by spokesmen for various national organizations, at hearings being held by the Special Joint Committee of Congress. The committee has taken no position on any suggested reforms and will study all meritorious proposals with an open mind before arriving at any conclusions. However, the creation and composition of this committee and the character of the testimony it has received reflect the widespread interest in the United States in strengthening our Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relations with other branches of the Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution.

We parliamentarians must demonstrate our efficiency. We must adopt modern procedures. Our strength lies in large measure in our ability to meet the demands of Government which we can perform best and which at the same time assure the people of the greatest amount of individual liberty.

My colleagues, the great hope of mankind is in the strengthening of the functions and influence of the parliaments of the nations of the world.

As Representatives of the people—and as their direct voices in the Government—this opportunity for the people to gain expression and to articulate their hopes for international understanding and peace—is vested in us.

New Prospects for International Economic Relations

(Speech of Hon. W. R. Poage, U.S.A., at the 54th Interparliamentary Conference, at Ottawa, Sept. 14, 1965)

Mr. Chairman, my friends and colleagues, the need for a sweeping change in the conditions of trade between the nations of the world has long been recognized. The continued deficits which some countries are facing in their trade balances evidences the need. At the close of the last World War the problem was for the countries of the world, particularly those of Europe, to be able to buy at all. They had so little productive capacity and their needs were so great that they simply could not repair their industries without help. They were in the position of a man with a truck loaded with valuable produce who was out of gasoline and out of money. With the gift of a little gasoline he could soon become a factor in the market.

The United States of America, under the Marshall plan, provided the needed gasoline and most of Europe has become strong and prosperous. This is as it should be and we are all happy that it is so.

But the real longtime problems of trade do not exist between the developed countries. There is plenty of trade between such countries. Trade between the United States on the one hand, and Japan or Canada on the other, had run into the billions of dollars each year. These countries have the capacity to produce everything they need and they also have the capacity to buy what they want if they feel that it is more advantageous to buy than to produce.

No, my friends; the real problems of trade are those which confront the underdeveloped nations. They have no gasoline for their truck but if they did they have nothing to sell which would buy the fuel for the movement of the next load.

It is true that the United States and a number of other of the more fortunate countries have in recent years sought to give aid either directly or through credits to those countries which have no industrial base of their own.

I am sure that all of us applauded the humanitarian aspects of this help. It has fed millions of starving people. It has provided medical treatment. It has reduced the death rate, and I am afraid that in many instances it has increased the birth rate. In the final analysis it has increased the pressure of population on inadequate resources. In all too many lands this succor to the unfortunate may have actually aggravated their problems. Definitely it is no lasting answer to a low standard of living for a third party to provide food and shelter.

Of course, these needs can and should be met by the developed nations on an emergency basis—when an area is the victim of an earthquake, a fire, or a tidal wave. The United States is ready, and I am sure every nation represented at this conference is ready, to respond with aid in such catastrophies, but speaking only as a parliamentarian, and for my Government, I think it is a vain hope to expect aid to ever take the place of sound trade.

Aid beyond the disaster assistance of which I have spoken, inevitably debilitates the recipient country. All nations know this fact and secretly acknowledge it. It is all very well for a people to say we will accept no aid where there are any strings attached. But it is impossible to receive gifts or aid without obligations. There may be no expressed or publicly recognized obligations, but there is certainly an element of gratitude in even the most debased individual, or even animal, and so there must be in nations. The great God who made us all, and who most of us recognize, put that trait of gratitude in our hearts and consciences. If I eat bread for which I did not work I am obligated, no matter how loudly I protest to the contrary.

How, then, are the underdeveloped people to secure the capital needed to develop their resources and to raise their standard of living? I think that we all know that this would be a much better world if the people of every land enjoyed higher standards of living and most of us will agree this can only be accomplished by the accumulation of capital with which to build the machines and industrial plants which so enormously extend man's productivity.

In years past this accumulation of capital was a slow and painful process. Capital was first borrowed at fantastic interest rates. My own people borrowed very heavily from Britain, France, and Holland. It took us hundreds of years to repay. The Soviet Union in effect borrowed from the living standards of its own people. It has only been within the last few years that it has been possible to relax this pressure. Other nations have used other devices but in the end all have found that some way or other they must pay for the capital they need.

Most of the undeveloped countries have little with which to pay except primary products—the products of the forest, the fields, and the mines. As I see it what we need is higher prices the world over for these primary products.

Obviously in the limited time I have I cannot analyze any plans for higher prices. I can only point out that if the price of coffee, the price of rubber, the price of wheat, of beef and of oil were increased to something like what the wheat farmer gets in France or the cattle raiser gets in Britain that most of the people of the world would be able to buy much of the capital goods which they must have to start the spiral in the right direction—and that all this is largely a matter of cooperation.

Almost every developed nation now administers prices of its homegrown products. The United States has gone further and has administered the production of many primary items of world commerce like cotton, wheat, and sugar. But I doubt that our people are going to long continue to make all of the sacrifice. We simply cannot expect American farmers to continue to reduce production unless others do likewise. If we are to have any real increase in the value of primary products all producers the world over must join in the effort.

The United Nations, Instrument of International Cooperation for Peace and Disarmament

(Resolution adopted by the 54th Inter-Parliamentary Conference)

The 54th Inter-Parliamentary Conference;

Aware of the need to make the United Nations an effective instrument for peace and disarmament;

Welcoming the ratification of the amendments contained in Resolution 1991 (XVIII) of the General Assembly, widening the representation of states on the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, as an expression of the democratization of the United Nations and its adaptation to changing world conditions;

Conscious that it is of great importance to recognize the principle of the universality of the United Nations by accepting the participation in the organization of all states which are prepared to accept all the obligations stated in the charter;

Invites all states strictly to abide by the principles of the United Nations in their international relations and, in particular, to respect the principles of sovereign equality and noninterference in matters within the domestic jurisdiction of states in order that all peoples may freely decide their own future without pressure, threat or the use of force;

Welcomes the efforts made by the Special Committee on Friendly Relations and Cooperation Among States and calls upon this Committee to expedite its work;

Urges the U.N. further to pursue its efforts to resolve in a peaceful manner the international conflicts which are currently occurring in various quarters of the world;

Supports, in accordance with "The Joint Statement of Agreed Principles for Disarmament Negotiations" of 1961, moves toward:

(a) general and complete disarmament, including the elimination of nuclear weapons, under effective international control;

(b) an international agreement to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons on the basis of the principles set out in United Nations General Assembly Resolution 1665 (XVI) on the prevention of the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons;

(c) the conclusion of a treaty banning nuclear weapons tests underground to supplement the agreement signed at Moscow on August 5, 1963, and the adherence to that agreement of all other states which have not yet done so;

(d) measures to relax international tension, and halt and reverse the arms race;

(e) the establishment in different areas of the world of nuclear and rocket-free zones, as proposed in the resolution adopted by the 52d Inter-Parliamentary Conference in Belgrade entitled "The Creation of Denuclearized and Limited Armaments Zones as a First Step Toward General and Complete Disarmament";

Reaffirms the utility of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament and its continuing efforts;

Welcomes further the resolution of the Disarmament Commission of the U.N. which called for the convocation of a World Disarmament Conference and requests the United Nations Organization to set in motion adequate preparations for the successful convening of such a conference at the earliest possible time;

Welcomes the fact that, since the adoption by the U.N. General Assembly of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and the adoption by the 53d Inter-Parliamentary Conference of its resolution on the implementation of that declaration, a number of former colonial territories have achieved independence and membership of the U.N.;

Urges further that the process of the liberation of peoples still under colonial rule be pursued expeditiously;

Notes that, since the adoption by the 53d Inter-Parliamentary Conference at Copenhagen of the resolution on the Adaptation of the U.N. Charter and Working Methods to the Requirements of an Enlarged International Society, the U.N. has set up its Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations;

Expresses its support of this Committee in its efforts to achieve agreement on a method of carrying out such operations in full accordance with the U.N. Charter;

Urges national parliaments to bear in mind these principles and considerations, and press the governments to act accordingly and to implement the resolutions adopted by the United Nations.

Resolution—The Demographic Problem and the Forthcoming United Nations Conference on World Population

The 54th Inter-Parliamentary Conference,

Taking into consideration that, according to U.N. data, today's world population of approximately 3.3 billion people is expected to double by the year 2000;

Further taking into consideration that this growth of population will occur especially in the developing countries;

Noting that the decline in the mortality rate, a result of the general advance in the application of medical science and of an almost complete stop in the spread of epidemics which previously caused the death of millions, is the main reason for this future, rapid growth of world population;

Recognizing that, if any nation's population rises faster than its wealth, its standard of living must inevitably fall and therefore it follows that control of population, by whatever means acceptable, is as important as the increase of the national wealth;

Taking into consideration that measures to solve the population problem should be carried out in conformity with the demographic conditions of each country;

Also taking into account that, for the future number of world inhabitants and for the growth of their living standards, it is essential to insure a speedier increase of their vital resources, such as foodstuffs and other consumer goods, housing, etc., in relation to the growth of population;

Believing that an increase of vital resources must be insured by a faster economic expansion, particularly in the underdeveloped regions;

Noting that, in the developing countries, favorable social conditions, such as political and economic sovereignty, economic growth, development of the public sector, solution of the agrarian problems, etc., are necessary for the solution of population problems;

Commending the United Nations for organizing a World Population Conference to be held in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, in September 1965;

1. Recommends that the United Nations and the specialized agencies, including the World Health Organization, proceed as rapidly as is feasible in expanding the scope of the assistance which they are prepared to give, at the request of governments, in the development not only of statistics and research, but also of experimentation and action programs relating to population problems;

2. Urges the governments of developed countries which are in a position to provide assistance for dealing with population problems to cooperate to the fullest extent possible with the United Nations and with the governments of interested developing countries in providing such assistance;

3. Calls upon the United Nations, interested governments and appropriate nongovernmental scientific institutions and organizations to intensify research on all aspects of population problems, including medical research and research on economic, social, educational, cultural and organizational problems involved in implementing effective population programs;

4. Urges all parliaments to exercise influence on governments to facilitate participation in the forthcoming World Population Conference of outstanding scholars, scientists and other experts in all relevant fields from both developing and developed countries;

5. Calls on all countries to mobilize their resources for the growth and fairer distribution of the world's wealth and for the harmonious development of the world's population.

Resolution—Relations Between the Inter-Parliamentary Union and UNESCO

The 54th Inter-Parliamentary Conference,

Welcoming the resolution adopted by the 13th General Conference of UNESCO authorizing the Director-General of that organization to consult with the Secretary General of the Inter-Parliamentary Union on the most effective and practical means of strengthening existing links by establishing closer working relations between the two organizations,

Noting that the Inter-Parliamentary Union was admitted in 1962 to a status of information and consultative relations with UNESCO (category B),

Mindful that organizations admitted to this category have obligations to acquant their members with UNESCO activities and achievements and also (1) to give advice and provide assistance on UNESCO studies when requested (2) to contribute to the execution of certain parts of UNESCO's program (3) to invite UNESCO to be represented at meetings whose agenda is of interest to that organization, and (4) to submit to the Director-General periodical reports on their activities and the assistance they have given to UNESCO's program,

Endorses the fundamental concept of UNESCO that collaboration among the nations through education, science, and culture contributes to peace and security;

Expresses its support of the UNESCO program, particularly those aspects relating to strengthening the educational and scientific bases in the less developed countries;

Directs the Secretary General to take the necessary measures to fulfill the IPU's obligations under its consultative status;

Appeals to members of the Interparliamentary Union to continue and expand their international cooperation in educational, scientific and cultural matters, and to encourage the exchange of students, teachers, scholars, political and community leaders, and other persons engaged in educational, scientific, cultural, political, and other such activities;

Urges parliamentarians of all member states to take an active part in shaping and carrying out the UNESCO program through such means as participation in national commissions and advisory groups to national delegations to the UNESCO General Conference, informing their constituencies about UNESCO and its activities, encouraging private organizations to cooperate in the UNESCO program, and supporting legislation contributing to educational, cultural, and scientific advancement.

Resolution—The Use of Television and Other Modern Technical Media for the Education of Children and Adults in a Spirit of International Peace and Friendship

The 54th Interparliamentary Conference,

Identifying itself with the principles contained in the draft declaration on measures designed to promote among youth the ideals of peace, mutual respect, and understanding between peoples submitted to the 18th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations,

Aware of the size of the illiteracy problem in many areas of the world and the limited number of teachers available,

Recognizing that the increasing populations will make this a continuing problem for many years,

Considering that the responsibility for the proper education of youth and for the welfare of the younger generation should be the concern of all,

Recalling the resolution adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO noting the impossibility of eliminating mass illiteracy through the use of traditional methods alone,

Noting the recommendations of UNESCO to promote the use of new media for educational purposes in the developing areas of the world and suggesting the possibility for international organizations to undertake projects for training technicians and developing radio, television, and other modern techniques for the use of these areas.

Stating that the upbringing of children and youth in the spirit of the ideals of peace, friendship among all nations, and respect for human labor and all mankind are important elements for preserving and consolidating peace, mutual understanding, and cooperation of the peace-loving nations of the world, which is the proper responsibility of Parliaments and parliamentarians elected by their people, and hence rests upon the Interparliamentary Union,

Taking into account the fact that television and other mass media constitute an important factor which can play a significant role in fulfilling the task of educating children, young persons and adults, particularly so since television and its influence have undergone tremendous development,

Convinced that an exchange of television programs between different countries, particularly those programs directed toward young people, can and should support the idea of better mutual acquaintance, cooperation, brotherhood, and humanitarianism,

Believing that such programs should contain progressive educational values in a humanitarian sense,

Urges that the new educational media also be used for increasing the awareness of science and technology in the developing countries and for the training of technicians at every level to apply existing scientific knowledge to problems of economic development,

Calls upon national groups of the Interparliamentary Union and all parliamentarians to use their influence upon their respective governments and institutions so that TV programs whose subject matter is within their direct competence should serve the particular needs and culture of their own countries and the ideals of peace, mutual understanding, and friendship among all nations.

Resolution—The Problem of Apartheid in the Light of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the United Nations Charter

(Presented by the Committee on Non-Self-Governing Territories and Ethnic Questions)

(Rapporteur: Mr. F. Mohieddine (United Arab Republic))

The 54th Inter-Parliamentary Conference,

Stressing the great importance of the historic documents aimed at abolishing racialism in all its manifestations; namely, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination,

Noting that the Government of the Republic of South Africa, in defiance of the said declarations, of the principles of the United Nations Charter and of the numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and other U.N. organs condemning apartheid, continues these policies which constitute a grave crime against humanity,

Strongly condemns the policy of apartheid prevailing in the Republic of South Africa;

Appeals to all the parliaments of the world to urge their respective governments to insure the immediate carrying out of the resolutions and recommendations of the Security Council and the U.N. General Assembly for putting an end to the policy of apartheid.

New Prospects for International Economic Relations

(Resolution adopted by the 54th Inter-Parliamentary Conference)

The 54th Inter-Parliamentary Conference,

Appreciating the great importance of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development for the solution of problems of international trade and economic progress in the developing countries;

Recognizing the great significance of an international division of labor, and of the rapid expansion of trade for the economic development of all countries, and especially developing countries;

Aware of the need to take urgent measures on an international scale to speed up the economic and social progress of the developing countries and remove obstacles to international trade;

Emphasizing that the main task faced by the developing countries on their way to economic progress is the elimination of the economic and social aftermath of colonialism;

Recognizing that the principal problems of developing countries in their efforts toward economic progress are the instability of prices of primary commodities and tariff and nontariff barriers that affect their trade in semimanufactured and finished goods;

Noting that, since the conclusion of the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development, no real progress has been achieved in putting its resolutions into effect;

Appeals to the national groups of those countries which did not approve the Conference recommendations, and particularly those which were opposed to the principle of extending preferences in favor of developing countries, to assist their industrial development, to bring their influence to bear on their respective governments to revise their positions and establish, to their mutual advantage, useful cooperation between the industrialized and the developing countries for the future harmonious prosperity of mankind;

Recommends that all countries should cooperate in evolving suitable international arrangements so that measures may be taken for stabilizing primary-product prices at equitable and remunerative levels, due account being taken of each country's purchasing power;

Approves the recommendations of the Geneva Conference that the developed countries should give high priority to the removal of tariff and nontariff barriers affecting trade in manufactured articles of interest to developing countries;

Calls on the advanced nations in their own long-term interest to increase their contribution to the rapid progress of the developing countries;

Expresses the conviction that active participation of parliamentarians as members of national delegations to UNCTAD would do much to further its aims;

Invites the United Nations fully to support the Trade and Development Board in its efforts to implement the recommendations approved by the 1964 Trade and Development Conference.

The remarks of our colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Daddario], regarding the conference were placed in the Congressional Record by the gentleman from California [Mr. Sisk] on September 14, 1965, and appear on pages 23692–23693.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the delegation from the Congress to the annual meeting of the Interparliamentary Union held in Ottawa last month, I would like to make the following observations:

We observed the deliberate and consistent determination of Communist governments to use every means at their disposal to launch propaganda attacks against the United States. This year's conference of the Interparliamentary Union was to have considered such items as strengthening of the United Nations, the road to disarmament, educational TV, colonialism, and strengthening of parliamentary government. Instead, every subject was used by the Soviet Union and its satellite spokesmen as a vehicle for an anti-U.S. harangue.

However, whenever any formal resolutions were introduced condemning the United States for its policy in Vietnam, we were able to defeat them in the votes which were held. Thus, despite the propaganda barrage against us, from a practical standpoint, U.S. policy was sustained by a majority of the nations attending the conference.

Representatives of 62 parliamentary bodies were in attendance at the conference in Ottawa, and it is our belief that we helped to stimulate the minds of many representatives from new lands toward an appreciation of the virtues of sound and independent legislative bodies.

My specific assignment at Ottawa was to serve as one of the two U.S. delegates to the Interparliamentary Council. My colleague, the gentleman from Texas, [Bob Poage], shared this assignment with me. The proceedings of the Council were, by IPU standards, rather normal. As I have indicated, anti-U.S. resolutions were substantially defeated.

Due to the complications on the India-Pakistan border, delegates found themselves distracted from the other items that were on the agenda.

I am especially pleased to note that the agenda of the conference for the spring meeting in Canberra, Australia, will include in the Committee on Non-Self-Government Territories the subject of "new colonialism." This will permit us to explore Soviet colonialism in Eastern Europe and Asia and turn the conference to a practical purpose of exploring present-day abuses of human rights, rather than succumbing to the Soviet propaganda against Western imperialism.

As indicated by our chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pirnie] the members of the U.S. delegation were extremely vigorous and effective in meeting the challenges of the Conference, while at the same time working persistently to develop and expand good will among the delegates from the other countries in attendance.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman for the efforts he has made in this matter. He is one of the best men we have to send to these Interparliamentary Union meetings. He comes back and gives us such a clear picture of what has gone on. He takes great courage with him, and it comes back intact.

I want to thank the gentleman particularly for the splendid work he has done.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio, particularly in view of her distinguished background in matters relating to our relations with the other countries of the world. She has given the minority outstanding leadership on the Foreign Affairs Committee for a long time and strives consistently for international understanding.

I am sure all members of the delegation deeply appreciate our colleague's words of commendation.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington, a very effecfective member of our delegation.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE], chairman of our delegation for the Interparliamentary Union conference. He gave us not only diligent, conscientious and effective leadership, but also created an excellent impression of the United States with the other countries of the world. We were all gratified and impressed by the warm admiration and deep respect evinced by the individual members of foreign countries' delegates toward Mr. PIRNIE. I would be remiss if I did not express my admiration for the way the entire delegation worked in such excellent rapport to handle several difficult problems and issues with both forthrightness and finesse. And certainly it seems to me these qualities are necessary in giving the United States successful participation in such an important international conference.

This was my initial experience as a delegate to the IPU conference. I felt it was a privilege to share this experience with my colleagues in Congress who represented their Nation so ably and so well.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Washington.

May I say that although this was her first appearance as a member of the delegation, I am sure it will not be the last. It was very evident that she had a deep appreciation of our mission, and she contributed greatly to its success.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE] who has been addressing us, certainly does the House great credit in bringing before it this concise yet inclusive report upon the events and matters under discussion at the Interparliamentary Union meeting just held in Ottawa. Certainly for those who were not able to be there as a part of the delegation, but who have a concern, as I suspect most of us do have, over international affairs, it will be worth a reading of these remarks to discover the scope of matters which are under consideration at these meetings, specifically the one from which we have returned.

It will give those who are interested in foreign affairs an idea of the things that are discussed and the problems that confront our delegation or our group and the efforts that are made to resolve the sometimes trying situations that arise.

Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I think it is worthwhile to note that there is another advantage and that is the matter of being able to become personally acquainted with the people in the legislatures of other nations. In this way, in less formal ways than in the debates that have been described here, we are able to hold conversations and to get ideas about problems and their views concerning these problems perhaps better than we can through the formal discussion and in the formal presentation of such matters.

I do not believe this matter of personal contact can be overemphasized and as the years go on and friendships are renewed and ripen year after year, they tend to become more productive. Even if those people with whom we find ourselves in disagreement on matters of political philosophy, there is an advantage in being able to have a face-to-face exchange of views.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has performed a most useful function in presenting this excellent report to the House today.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman. the gentleman together with our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] through their able service on the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House know from firsthand experience the tremendous responsibility when in communication between ourselves and other nations.

If this mission is to achieve its fullest potential, it has to have the participation of Members of this House who are as dedicated as you people in this work of improving the international climate in which we are now living, and so improving it that we hope we may live in peace for years to come.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri who was a very valued member of our delegation.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to add anything to what has already been stated. But I do want to congratulate the gentleman from New York for the brief but very clear résumé that he has given us of this Conference. I think it is unfortunate, of course, that more Members are not actively interested in what takes place at these conferences. As one who has attended several of them, it has not only been a pleasure but it has been most enlightening so far as I am concerned to have a better understanding of what motivates some of the leaders in other countries. I think that this is one opportunity the Congress of the United States has of having the representatives from other nations understand the responsibilities that we have and to better acquaint them with the operation of our own Government so as to enable them to have a better understanding of our motives and understanding our cooperation. At the same time we have the opportunity to let them know that we do feel they have certain obligations, the least of which is to maintain a friendship and an appreciation for what we are trying to do.

Again I want to congratulate the gentleman who for the second time has been the chairman of the group that attended these conferences. The gentleman has done a magnificent job. I am sure that all of us, as has been expressed by other delegates who were there, are proud of the manner in which the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE] conducted himself in representing the Congress of the United States.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman has been a very faithful member of the delegation and has been able to see the purposes and the problems of the Interparliamentary Union at close range for a very long time. His contributions have been outstanding and I appreciate his comments very much.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas, who was also a member of our delegation.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to add my congratulations to the gentleman from New York on the wonderful report which he has given on this Interparliamentary Union Conference. As a freshman Member of this House, I was greatly honored to participate in the Conference. I regretted very much that I could not participate the full length of the Conference, for I had to come back. Nonetheless, I can add no more to what my colleagues have already said except that, being able to converse in their own languages with many of the delegates there, I discovered the great admiration and respect held for the Members of this House who had heretofore participated in those conferences. I refer to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO].

I was very proud to participate for the first time and to be received with such respect by the other members, a respect and admiration that had been gained for me by those who had participated before I had gone to the Conference.

The affairs of the United States, when they are handled in the manner in which these affairs were handled, are indeed in good hands. I wish to commend the gentleman from New York and all of those who participated in the conferences before who made it so easy for me and enabled me to be so proud of my delegation because of their conduct, demeanor, and actions at past conferences.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman. I join in his commendation of the delegation for their faithfulness throughout the session. I am very glad if the impression created by his initial visit was that which he has outlined to the House.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, a most active Member of our delegation.

Mr. McCLORY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wish to commend the gentleman on his splendid leadership of our interparliamentary delegation at the recent Interparliamentary Conference in Ottawa, Canada, and also I wish to point out the very competent way in which the delegation under the gentleman's leadership handled the interests of our Nation at this conference. It is certainly noteworthy, and I believe it arises not only because of the parliamentary experience which the delegation members had but also because of the very complete and able way in which the members prepared themselves for the task. I know there was a great deal of advance work which was done. There was a lot of preparation done before the Conference.

I noted with particular interest the active participation of all the members in the morning briefings which were held before entering upon the debate. We also had close cooperation and close coordination with representatives of the State Department and others in the Government in order that our views would coincide, in order that we would share opinions, and in order that we would represent accurately as well as actively the best interests of our Nation.

As the gentleman has brought out, several very difficult and sensitive subjects arose during the conference, including, of course, the attacks leveled by several delegations against the United States because of the Vietnamese situation. I think that the votes which were conducted and which were cast with regard to this issue were particularly significant in behalf of our Nation, and they demonstrated our influence, friendship, and the respect in which we are held by the nations of the free world particularly.

I should like to recall briefly that this is the oldest international organization in existence, having weathered two world wars. It does provide a great meeting ground for parliamentarians of the world. It is becoming increasingly effective.

I know in regard to my own committee, the Health and Education Committee, we have now established a liaison between our committee and UNESCO with regard to the subject of educational programs in underdeveloped nations. This is another forward step.

I might say, too, that with regard to the resolutions that were adopted at the recent Conference, two of the resolutions were recommended by that committee and received the unanimous support of the Conference at this session.

I note, with regard to the further program of my committee, that the agenda which was adopted by the Conference was that which we recommended to the Conference. It will result in closer study of the application of science to the economic development of the emerging nations.

So I want to call to the attention of our colleagues the significant role the Interparliamentary Union plays as a world and international organization and the importance of that organization to the United States of America and its citizens. I urge the Congress to increase its interest and to expand our influence through this fine organ.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman from Illinois and commend him for his faithful efforts and sustained interest.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut, one of the outstanding members of our delegation to this conference.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE] has given a most exemplary example today of the bipartisan support which our foreign policy receives. He has done this both in the manner in which he has made his report to the House of Representatives today and by his own individual actions.

It deserves to be told that the gentleman was not only the chairman of our delegation to Ottawa but that this fell on his shoulders at the last moment, when Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, the head of the delegation, was unable to go. He quickly took the reins of leadership in his hands and set together the activity of the delegation in the conference, and he did this in such a way to deserve not only the admiration and respect of each and every member of our delegation, but also of all the other delegations.

It is necessary for us to understand that the head of the American delegation must, in quick order, make contact with the heads of other delegations, to come to some kind of understanding with them in a quick period of time, in order to carry out the duties and obligations which are his as the head of the delegation with these responsibilities in his hands alone.

We here in the House should all have nothing but great commendation for the gentleman because of his activities. He deserves not only our admiration for the report which he has given us, but also our respect as an individual and as a leader in the American action at this time of such great crisis.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman. He has been very modest in any reference to his own participation in this Conference. I should like to say that it was a source of great satisfaction to me to watch his handling of a very difficult situation, particularly with respect to the resolution which came forth from the committee for which he was the rapporteur. He had a very trying task ahead of him, which he handled with a dignity and perspective that enabled him to achieve a most satisfactory result. We are grateful for that type of representation, because it serves to make friends in a situation where we could make enemies.

I should like also to make reference to the participation of our distinguished former colleague, Katharine St. George, who served as secretary of this delegation. This talented lady has maintained a lively interest in the field of international relations, to which she gave such distinguished service during her years in the House. She is widely respected not only for her knowledge and gracious manner but also for the determination she displays in assuring that the Interparliamentary Union will at all times reflect a high level of international thought and purpose.

We were very, very proud and pleased that she was again able to accompany our delegation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a word in closing with respect to the participation by the members of this delegation. It was a great pleasure to come into the position of leadership of the group because it is no problem to direct people who have a full appreciation of the purpose of the mission and a desire to do their very best to accomplish it. We met early each morning in order that we might study the problems facing us that day. As your chairman, it was a source of great strength to me that these meetings were invariably attended with the full membership present, so that we might study the issues lying ahead of us and present a united viewpoint. There is a great deal to be learned from this close association with other nations. When you realize that there were 61 nations represented at this Conference, most of them having delegations of substantial numbers, headed by people of responsibility in their several governments, you get an idea of its importance. Therefore, whatever we were able to say on the floor of the Conference and whatever we were able to express in private conversation did serve to convey a message from this country to our fellow members of this body. I believe that the representation this time through the distinguished appearances of the people that I have listed as serving with me on the delegation was outstanding. It was one of the most dedicated groups that we could ever expect to assemble. They were faithful to their task throughout. I hope we were able to fulfill the purpose of the House in adequately presenting to this distinguished meeting some of the ideals and ideas of our great Nation. I consider it a distinct privilege to have been their leader.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include various speeches made by members of the delegation and resolutions passed there.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL 1966

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Thursday, October 14, to consider the supplemental appropriation bill for 1966.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CONSIDERATION OF A CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to consider a resolution making continuing appropriations on Wednesday, October 13.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if this has been cleared with the minority side and the Members on this side of the aisle.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I will be glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. BOW. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has cleared this with the leadership on our side, with Mr. Ford and with myself, with the understanding, I think, that they know we are going to make a fight on this continuing resolution. We are opposed to it, and we will raise some questions. However, we do agree to the continuing resolution being brought up on Wednesday.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, may I ask why is it necessary to move this up, and for what length of time will the continuing resolution be for?

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will yield, the Committee on Appropriations plans to meet on Wednesday morning in respect to that matter. I do not know, but it would be my thought that we should make it through the 23d of October. That would be 1 week from this coming Saturday. This would seem to be in order and reasonable in the circumstances. Regardless of how fast we may move toward adjournment, I think we would not be likely to get House and Senate approval on the pending conference reports on the agriculture appropriation bill and the public works appropriation bill as well as the supplemental appropriation bill, much prior to that date. The Senate Committee on Appropriations has to hold hearings before reporting the supplemental appropriation bill.

These bills have to go to the White House and they have to be signed. So we have to have a continuing resolution and it seems to me that the 23d of October might be desirable. I expect to recommend that date to the Committee on Appropriations, but the committee will, after consultation with the leadership on both sides, determine what to present to the House.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the House will recall that the last time a continuing resolution was presented it was for 15 days, and only after some discussion and colloquy when we withdrew our objection. I would certainly hope that with the light of adjournment fever burning high, as did the ancient light of Phoebus on high we might, perhaps, have adjournment on Saturday evening with all of our work done. If we did not sacrifice our afternoons, such as we are here today, for example, and if we would bring up and calendar the bills so that we might progress toward orderly adjournment sine die, the 16th appears to be a Saturday, the close of this week and, if we are going to bring up this appropriation bill containing deficiencies and supplemental items of appropriation, it would seem entirely within possibility that with just 1 day intervening we might have no difficulty in accomplishing our objective.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I hope we will be able to achieve adjournment as early as possible in the coming week. I, for one, would be willing to undertake to pile Mount Pelion on Ossa in order to achieve this goal.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, with that assurance, and on the basis that we probably can and will adjourn next week, and with notice being served that this resolution will be opposed, which the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations has done, does the distinguished gentleman know whether this will be calendared as the matter of first consideration on Wednesday?

Mr. MAHON. I could not speak for the leadership, but I have mentioned it to the Speaker and I understand that probably it will be the first order of business on Wednesday.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, surely the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon] chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, was not referring to a former Member of this body, from Buffalo, N.Y., who was defeated in the last election, whose name was Pillion.

Mr. MAHON. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT ZALESKI, OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, His Excellency August Zaleski, President of the Republic of Poland, the legitimate government in exile of that country, addressed the Council of the Republic of Poland meeting in London on October 2. I believe that President Zaleski's comments merit the attention of Members of the House:

> Since I had the honor of addressing this assembly in April this year, the tragic plight of Poland has not been marked by the slightest improvement. True, so-called elections were held in Poland but they brought no real change. It could not have been otherwise under the electoral system current in all the countries with a totalitarian structure. The single list of candidates on the ballot papers bore only a tiny percentage of representatives sponsored by non-Communist parties (if these really merit the name); even so, these groupings could figure on the electoral single list only if the Communist regime approved their existence. It is not strange therefore that things are as bad in Poland after the elections as before them.
>
> It is true there is much talk about a possible change at the post of First Secretary of the Polish United Workers' (Communist) Party. But in any case such a change can have no real significance as each and every head of the Polish politburo will be nothing but the faithful executor of Moscow's orders.
>
> The upshot of this state of affairs is that the standard of life among the population of Poland is far lower in every respect than in the countries of that Western civilization to which Poland has belonged for the last thousand years, still belongs and desires to belong—despite the efforts of Russia and her devoted Communist rulers of Poland.
>
> The persecution of the church, the absence of personal liberty and of freedom of speech continues whilst the economy is steadily deteriorating. Earnings are between 500 and 5,000 zlotys per month; the average wage of a manual worker is 1,500 zlotys (equivalent to £7.10.0 or $21 per month at the official rate of exchange of the Bank Polska Gasa Opieki (PKO in Warsaw) and such a sum is naturally quite insufficient to maintain a family. Hence the great majority of the population is forced to supplement its income by illegal earnings. But, even this is no simple matter.
>
> The whole economic life of Poland is dependent on Russia. Most of the country's export trade is with Russia and most of Poland's imports come from Russia. Under these circumstances, with the Communist regime in Poland completely dependent on Moscow, these transactions not only bring Poland no profit but also provide Russia with a field for arbitrary exploitation. The Communist regime in Poland has recently been striving to expand foreign trade with the countries of capitalist structure. Exchanges of official visits between Western European politicians and representatives of the Communist regime in Poland usually end with announcements that trade turnovers will increase, as no other understanding would be allowed by Moscow. The implementation of even these trade agreements can be undertaken only insofar as Russia grants her consent. The picture of the extremely difficult situation of our native country would be incomplete without mention of the considerable unemployment now rife there. The only heartening feature is that the regime has not succeeded in introducing the collective-farm system. The farmers in Poland are therefore in better plight than the others. However, the natural increase of population and the evident impossibility of adding to the area of agricultural land result in rural overpopulation, with the excess unable to find work in industry or homes in the towns, where housing construction in any case fails to keep up with the increase in the number of inhabitants.
>
> Poland's exceedingly serious position is further complicated by the world situation. The fact that her western frontiers remain unrecognized not only by the German Federal Republic but also by her wartime allies undoubtedly plays into the hands of Russia who exploits this circumstance in her relations with present-day Poland.
>
> In general, the indefinite postponement of a peace treaty after the Second World War—perhaps even complete renunciation of the idea of concluding one—has created the difficult world situation which has marked international relations for the last 20 years.
>
> When the Yalta and Potsdam agreements were concluded, the three signatories imagined they would harmoniously wield authority over the whole world. Reality very quickly cut short these dreams. It transpired that Russia exploited the situation to consolidate her imperialistic position in Europe by a permanent occupation of Eastern

Germany. This was followed, in fact, by a period during which the defense of Western Europe was organized against a further extension of this imperialistic peril. Nonetheless, it is not surprising that, after the dire experience yielded by Yalta and Potsdam, there is a breakdown of confidence in many lands toward the countries chiefly responsible for this state of affairs. Some west European countries started a movement for the creation of a union not only as an economic factor but also as an independent center of defense. Despite the great difficulties which stand in the way of this gigantic undertaking, there is hope that the organization of Europe will sooner or later assume concrete forms.

The rise of a united Europe is undoubtedly desirable from the Polish standpoint. We hope that the menace of the present world situation will cause mutual concessions to be made by the interested parties and bring about the formation of an organization of European states able not only to stop the further expansion of Russian imperialism in Europe but also to incorporate those countries which lost their independence after the last war. This would seem to follow from President de Gaulle's latest policy enunciations.

The emergence of China with her enormous population as a fresh imperialistic element in Asia and the rift between her and Russia caused by diverse ideological interpretations of Communist doctrine have aroused hopes in many political centers that a conflict will break out between these two Communist lands. Such a conflict may possibly come about as Russia is now the only European county with a great colonial empire in Asia, whilst Communist China claims the right to control the whole Asiatic Continent. But it can be supposed that both those countries, with their well-known caution, will try to avoid this conflict or at least postpone it as long as possible.

The very thought of such a conflict implies a great danger. The possibility of a new setup amongst the non-Communist countries is already taking shape. Depending on their geographical location, some of them may consider it to their advantage that Russia gain the upper hand whilst others may favor China. Fortunately, this danger has been realized by many of the decisionmaking centers. Its significance is marked by the fact that the Pope is to visit America in person with a view to calling on the United Nations Organization, and hence the whole world, to preserve peace.

In this exceptionally complicated situation, we Poles who remained in the free world to struggle for the real independence of our country should unite the more effectively to cope with the great difficulties which face us.

COINCIDENCE OR COERCION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, this is another chapter in the saga of the march of the U.S. Office of Education down the road toward control of education. In remarks I made on the floor a few weeks ago, I referred to that "one more step" Mr. Keppel and his centralist-thinking associates were taking on that road, but I fear we must now refer to it as a "headlong dash."

Mr. Speaker, I have warned before that the Office of Education is not satisfied with being just a junior partner on our local boards of education. Their high-handed social climbing tactics are designed to make the Office of Education the chairman of the board. They have deliberately used devious means to circumvent the intent of Congress.

Members of this Congress in both bodies worked long and arduous hours to hammer out a Civil Rights Act that would be as fair and as equitable as possible for all of our citizens. After careful consideration Congress determined that congressional and judicial review of all executive branch actions in carrying out the civil rights law must be assured.

In the Office of Education's headlong thrust to attain their goals for more control, they have embellished the civil rights law itself; and if there is any doubt left in anyone's mind that the education centralists will stop at nothing in order to reach their goals, I can think of no better example than the recent fiasco perpetrated by the Office of Education in Chicago.

The Office of Education announced the authorization of Elementary and Secondary Education Act funds for the State of Illinois on September 28, of which Chicago was to get $30 million. Two days later it became pointedly clear that Chicago Superintendent of Schools Benjamin Willis would definitely recommend that Chicago not participate in the equal education opportunities survey, one of the Office of Education's pet assessment projects. On the following day, the funds for Chicago were "deferred."

Mr. Speaker, I charge this action was worse than a chance misinterpretation of the law. One sentence has deliberately and surrepticiously been added to the rules and regulations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which would permit the Department to waive the provisos of section 602 of the Civil Rights Act, and 45 CFR 80.8(c), and which would frustrate the congressional guarantees so laboriously worked into the bill. Let me quote that one little sentence:

> The Department shall not be required to provide assistance * * * during the pendancy of the administrative proceedings (45 CFR 80.8(b)) to determine if there has been a noncompliance with the Civil Rights Act.

In other words, they can withhold, or refuse, or suspend, or defer grants, or whatever word you want to use, for an indefinite time if they want to, until the so-called administrative proceedings are concluded.

In the opinion of Alanson W. Willcox, General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department had authority by implication under title VI of the Civil Rights Act to withhold funds from a city "where we feel there may be a violation at some future time." This, he added, was why the Chicago school funds were impounded. Authority by implication. Just what are they talking about?

This is so far from congressional intent as to the almost ludicrous. During the Senate debate Senator PASTORE, of Rhode Island, stated:

> While the matter is pending before the congressional committee involved, there will be further opportunity to end the discrimination without the necessity of cutting off of Federal funds or in other ways curtailing the particular assistance program in question.

Apart from this consideration, however, the legislative history of title VI makes clear that no action to refuse to grant assistance could be accomplished without compliance with the requirements of section 602. As Senator PASTORE has so succinctly outlined:

> There is, finally, one additional feature of title VI which demonstrates beyond doubt that it is not intended to be vindictive or punitive. I am referring to the fact that the authority contained in the title to cut off funds is hedged about with a number of procedural restrictions and requirements. These would hardly be necessary or appropriate if the bill were designed as a punitive or vindictive measure. These restrictions have already been briefly described, but let me here again summarize what must be done before funds can be cut off. The following would have to occur:
>
> First. The agency must first adopt a general nondiscrimination rule, regulation, or order.
>
> Second. The President must give his approval.
>
> Third. The agency must seek to secure compliance by voluntary means.
>
> Fourth. A hearing must be held before any formal compliance action is taken.
>
> Fifth. The agency may, and in many cases will, seek to secure compliance by means not involving a cutoff of funds.
>
> Sixth. If the agency determines that a refusal or termination of funds is appropriate, it must make an express finding that the particular person from whom funds are to be cut off is still discriminating.
>
> Seventh. The agency must file a written report with the appropriate congressional committee and 30 days must elapse before further action is taken.
>
> Eighth. The aid recipient can obtain judicial review and may apply for a stay pending such review.

That should have made it imminently clear—even to the Office of Education what the intent of Congress was when this law was passed—an orderly, measured procedure, allowing for enough time to permit a complete and fair investigation of any charges or allegations.

However, the Office of Education in its glee at having slipped the aforementioned sentence past the Congress has failed to make sure the action it took was "consistent with achievement of the objectives" of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. To quote section 602 of the Civil Rights Act, any department and agency which would be dispensing Federal funds was directed to make "rules, regulations, or orders of general applicability which shall be consistent with achievement of the objectives of the statute authorizing the financial assistance in connection with which the action is taken."

Consistent. That is a good word. I wonder if the Office of Education knows what it means. In a speech this past week to the Education Writers Association, Mr. Keppel said that the funds under these acts are designed to help strengthen State departments of education, which he termed "the pivotal agencies on which we must depend if we mean to keep American education strong and decentralized." I agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Keppel's words, but unfortunately his actions have not in the least been consistent with his words.

In spite of the fact that in the testimony before the House and Senate committees concerned with title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, it was made crystal clear that the Federal Government would deal only through State education agencies. The Commissioner "deferred" Chicago's funds under this act without even consulting with the State of Illinois superintendent of public instruction, Mr. Ray Page. Mr. Page first received word by a hand-delivered letter of the Office of Education's action on Friday, October 1, which stated that "preliminary investigation indicates probable noncompliance." One October 2 Mr. Page telegraphed Mr. Keppel as follows:

> You have not advised what these complaints contain and have not furnished the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction with a copy. No investigator from your office has called upon me and I am completely uninformed as to the specific charges. What noncompliance is alleged? Is not the State Office of Education entitled to complete information on these matters, including a copy of the complaint? Will the investigators confer with the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Illinois? I have not been contacted by them.
>
> I stand ready and willing to lend every assistance possible in resolving this situation in the interest of all the schoolchildren in Chicago and in the State of Illinois.

In view of this, it is apparent that the Office of Education most certainly did not work through the State office.

Mr. Speaker, on September 9, I produced an administratively confidential memorandum from an executive group meeting of the Office of Education in which they had already decided:

> No Office of Education hand is to be tied by (1) having to deal only through a backward State education agency.

I submit that Illinois certainly is not a "backward State" by any stretch of the imagination.

Now, it is easy to see that in the strange logic they have over there, they have advanced from "backward" to "unnecessary," and have completely ignored the language of the Civil Rights Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

No matter how many protestations of innocence or high-sounding ideals we hear from various officials of the Department of HEW and the Office of Education, I do not see how anyone can now have any doubt in his mind about the true goals of the Office of Education to directly control our entire education system. Chicago is a prime example of what could happen to any school district. When a scream was raised in Chicago, it carried all the way to the White House, and the Office of Education quickly back-pedaled.

But why did it take this precipitous action in the first place? Could it have been that pet assessment project I have referred to was about to go down the drain because so many schools had refused to give it?

Mr. Speaker, I spoke at great length on September 23 about this educational opportunities survey that the Office of Education gave last September 28 and 30 to 4 percent of our schools. Originally, it was intended that this test be given to 5 percent but all indications are that 20 percent of the schools contacted are refusing to give it. This high refusal rate should cast a shadow on the validity of the results.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert the Office of Education's "conjecture" as to what they consider to be the "legislative intent of the civil rights survey":

> MEMORANDUM OF JUNE 16, 1965
>
> To: Participants in June 17 meeting at Bureau of the Budget.
> From: Equal opportunities survey staff.
> Subject: Legislative intent of the civil rights survey.
>
> The conception of the civil rights survey changed considerably during the early stages of the legislative history.
>
> The bill as originally introduced required the Commissioner to "conduct investigations * * * upon the extent to which equal educational opportunities are denied to individuals by reason of race." The thinking is reflected in Attorney General Kennedy's testimony of June 26, 1963, at the House hearings. Mr. Kennedy stated: "It is expected that the Attorney General will call on the Commissioner of Education for information and advice in deciding which cases to file and preparing cases * * * and the Commissioner will obtain much useful information from the nationwide investigation of discrimination in education which title III (later, title IV) would direct him to make" (p. 1378, pt. II, of House hearings). On July 10, 1963, Secretary Celebrezze testified on the civil rights survey: "As the Attorney General indicated in his June 26 testimony before this committee, the information obtained will be needed in carrying out section 307, dealing with suits on desegregation by the Attorney General. It will also be essential to the Commissioner of Education in administering the provisions of sections 302–305 which provide assistance to school boards in the desegregation of schools" (p. 1526, pt. II, of House hearings).
>
> The implications of racial imbalance for the civil rights bill received considerable attention in the hearings after this time (cf. pp. 1422–1427, 1509–1520 and 1584 of pt. II and much of pt. III). Much of this dialog centered around a fear of how the Government would resolve the complex issues involved in questions of racial imbalance, especially with regard to title VI (nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs). The result of these concerns was the deletion of references to racial imbalance and the addition of the following statement to section 401(b): "'desegregation' shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance." Also, section 402 was changed to require the Commissioner to "conduct a survey * * * concerning the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities for individuals by reason of race."
>
> Note that "investigations" was changed to "a survey" and "the extent to which equal educational opportunities are denied" was changed to "the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities." Both the concern over investigations dealing with racial imbalance and the changes in wording of section 402 suggest a shift of congressional intent away from the investigative approach. This interpretation is consistent with Senator HUMPHREY's analysis of section 402 in Senate debate on March 30, 1964. Senator HUMPHREY said: "Since the matter to be reported on is not merely the statistics as to the extent of segregation and desegregation but the quality of education available to whites and Negroes, it is appropriate that responsibility for the survey and report be vested in the Commissioner of Education" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 110, pt. 5, p. 6542).
>
> The staff of the civil rights survey discussed the intent of Congress with regard to the survey with Mr. David Filvaroff, Assistant to the Attorney General, who worked extensively on the civil rights bill. Mr. Filvaroff's statement supported the interpretation that the intent of Congress shifted away from the investigative approach. He said that the survey will not be used as an investigative tool of the Justice Department. He also said that the survey is not intended to provide data for particular communities in court cases, although the general results of the survey might be used in such cases. He emphasized at several points in the discussion that quality of education should be the focus of the survey. Data on the extent of school segregation in the South would be useful, he felt, but are not as important as data on quality of education.
>
> The staff also spoke with Mr. Harry Chernock and Mr. Michael Wyatt of the HEW Office of General Counsel. They felt that section 402 is so loosely worded that it allows the Commissioner ample latitude in determining the content and scope of the survey. They felt that the intent to discriminate would not have to be part of the survey.

Mr. Speaker, I would call your attention specifically to a statement made by the then Senator HUMPHREY. The Office of Education has taken a sentence out of that statement, completely out of context, to support their conjectures. I quote his statement in full:

> Title IV also provides, in section 402, for a survey and report to Congress, by the Commissioner of Education, concerning "the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities for individuals by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin" in public schools and colleges. This survey will cover not only continued existence of unconstitutional racial segregation, but all forms of discrimination and inequality of treatment.
>
> The existence of inequality, of deprivation of educational opportunity because of race and color, is obvious. But their extent is not yet fully known. An authoritative survey and report is needed, and will be most useful to the Congress. Since the matter to be reported on is not merely the statistics as to the extent of segregation and desegregation but the quality of education available to whites and Negroes, it is appropriate that responsibility for the survey and report be vested in the Commissioner of Education.

Now, this is a survey concerning the deprivation of educational opportunities because of race and color and it is to show the extent of this. This is not what they are going to do at all.

To read Senator HUMPHREY's statement as if it contained no more than the last sentence is to misread it completely, and this is exactly what the Office of Education has done. To interpret section 402 as if its principal purpose were to determine the quality of public education being obtained, or the level of learning being reached at the several grade levels, by members of the different races, creeds, and ethnic groups in various regions of the United States, is to deliberately misinterpret it.

There is no evidence in the record to warrant an inference from Senator HUMPHREY's statement that Congress is principally, or even at all in this case, interested in differences in "quality of education available to whites and Negroes" in the abstract and apart from the question of whether any differences in quality are "by reason of race."

Moreover, the record is completely devoid of any specific references to testing pupils. If testing is necessary in order to report on "the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities" within a given school system, then testing pupils would have been authorized by section 402; since it does not, the authority of the Commissioner to test pupils is extremely doubtful. Also, if the Commissioner felt that his authority under section 402 to test pupils were clear, he undoubtedly would have made such testing mandatory rather than voluntary.

The survey required by section 402 was intended principally to furnish Congress with information about the continued existence and extent of unconstitutional racial segregation and other forms of discrimination of treatment "by reason of race." Differences in quality of education received by Negroes in the North and South are not at all relevant to the question of unconstitutional segregation or discrimination. Only "the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities for individuals by reason of race" within a given school system, or at most a State, are relevant to the question of unconstitutional discrimination.

"The quality" of educational opportunities is relevant only in those school systems in which there are some schools serving primarily children of minority groups and other schools serving primarily children of the majority group. In such systems, if in the schools attended by minority groups, the buildings are older, the classes larger, the teachers less well trained, the libraries less well stocked, and the guidance departments less well staffed, the Commissioner would certainly not need to test the pupils to find all of this out.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Office of Education have deliberately ignored the plainly stated intent of Congress and even the very language of the act. In the case in Chicago, the Office of Education not only acted illegally, but also any claim of coincidence in their "deferring" the education funds for Chicago right after Chicago strongly indicated the likelihood of nonparticipation in the educational opportunities survey is beyond belief. In addition, the present form of this survey represents another deliberate attempt to bypass congressional intent.

Since it is quite apparent that the Department of HEW is getting off on the wrong foot in proper administration and interpretation of not only the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, but also in the carrying out of certain provisions of the Civil Rights Act, it may be appropriate for the Judiciary Committee to take a "look-see" in addition to the Education and Labor Committee which normally would exercise the responsibility of legislative review.

We have been so busy railroading through this Congress so much ill-conceived and little thought-out legislation that it is no wonder the bureaucrats are having a field day in promulgating administrative rules and regulations that go far beyond congressional intent and, in many cases, in direct conflict with the expressed will of the Congress.

The two instances I have dealt with today are certainly testimony to this charge.

I include the following at this point:

[Excerpt from the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Public Law 88-352]

Title VI—Nondiscrimination in Federally Assisted Programs

Sec. 601. No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

Sec. 602. Each Federal department and agency which is empowered to extend Federal financial assistance to any program or activity, by way of grant, loan, or contract other than a contract of insurance or guaranty, is authorized and directed to effectuate the provisions of section 601 with respect to such program or activity by issuing rules, regulations, or orders of general applicability which shall be consistent with achievement of the objectives of the statute authorizing the financial assistance in connection with which the action is taken. No such rule, regulation, or order shall become effective unless and until approved by the President. Compliance with any requirement adopted pursuant to this section may be effected (1) by the termination of or refusal to grant or to continue assistance under such program or activity to any recipient as to whom there has been an express finding on the record, after opportunity for hearing, of a failure to comply with such requirement, but such termination or refusal shall be limited to the particular political entity, or part thereof, or other recipient as to whom such a finding has been made and, shall be limited in its effect to the particular program, or part thereof, in which such noncompliance has been so found, or (2) by any other means authorized by law: *Provided, however,* That no such action shall be taken until the department or agency concerned has advised the appropriate person or persons of the failure to comply with the requirement and has determined that compliance cannot be secured by voluntary means. In the case of any action terminating, or refusing to grant or continue, assistance because of failure to comply with a requirement imposed pursuant to this section, the head of the Federal department or agency shall file with the committees of the House and Senate having legislative jurisdiction over the program or activity involved a full written report of the circumstances and the grounds for such action. No such action shall become effective until thirty days have elapsed after the filing of such report.

Sec. 603. Any department or agency action taken pursuant to section 602 shall be subject to such judicial review as may otherwise be provided by law for similar action taken by such department or agency on other grounds. In the case of action, not otherwise subject to judicial review, terminating or refusing to grant or to continue financial assistance upon a finding of failure to comply with any requirement imposed pursuant to section 602, any person aggrieved (including any State or political subdivision thereof and any agency of either) may obtain judicial review of such action in accordance with section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act, and such action shall not be deemed committed to unreviewable agency discretion within the meaning of that section.

Sec. 604. Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to authorize action under this title by any department or agency with respect to any employment practice of any employer, employment agency, or labor organization except where a primary objective of the Federal financial assistance is to provide employment.

Sec. 605. Nothing in this title shall add to or detract from any existing authority with respect to any program or activity under which Federal financial assistance is extended by way of a contract of insurance or guaranty.

[Excerpt from the Federal Register, Dec. 4, 1964]

Title 45—Public Welfare

SUBTITLE A—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Part 80—Nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Effectuation of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

§ 80.8 Procedure for effecting compliance.

(a) General. If there appears to be a failure or threatened failure to comply with this regulation, and if the noncompliance or threatened noncompliance cannot be corrected by informal means, compliance with this part may be effected by the suspension or termination of or refusal to grant or to continue Federal financial assistance or by any other means authorized by law. Such other means may include, but are not limited to, (1) a reference to the Department of Justice with a recommendation that appropriate proceedings be brought to enforce any rights of the United States under any law of the United States (including other titles of the Act), or any assurance or other contractual undertaking, and (2) any applicable proceedings under State or local law.

(b) Noncompliance with § 80.4. If an applicant fails or refuses to furnish an assurance required under § 80.4 or otherwise fails or refuses to comply with a requirement imposed by or pursuant to that section Federal financial assistance may be refused in accordance with the procedures of paragraph (c) of this section. The Department shall not be required to provide assistance in such a case during the pendency of the administrative proceedings under such paragraph except that the Department shall continue assistance during the pendency of such proceedings where such assistance is due and payable pursuant to an application therefor approved prior to the effective date of this part.

(c) Termination of or refusal to grant or to continue Federal financial assistance. No order suspending, terminating, or refusing to grant or continue Federal financial assistance shall become effective until (1) the responsible Department official has advised the applicant or recipient of his failure to comply and has determined that compliance cannot be secured by voluntary means, (2) there has been an express finding on the record, after opportunity for hearing, of a failure by the applicant or recipient to comply with a requirement imposed by or pursuant to this part, (3) the action has been approved by the Secretary pursuant to § 80.10(e), and (4) the expiration of 30 days after the Secretary has filed with the committee of the House and the committee of the Senate having legislative jurisdiction over the program involved, a full written report of the circumstances and the grounds for such action. Any action to suspend or terminate or to refuse to grant or to continue Federal financial assistance shall be limited to the particular political entity, or part thereof, or other applicant or recipient as to whom such a finding has been made and shall be limited in its effect to the particular program, or part thereof, in which such noncompliance has been so found.

(d) Other means authorized by law. No action to effect compliance by any other means authorized by law shall be taken until (1) the responsible Department official has determined that compliance cannot be secured by voluntary means, (2) the action has been approved by the Secretary, (3) the recipient or other person has been notified of its failure to comply and of the action to be taken to effect compliance, and (4) the expiration of at least 10 days from the mailing of such notice to the recipient or other person. During this period of at least 10 days additional efforts shall be made to persuade the recipient or other person to comply with the regulation and to take such corrective action as may be appropriate.

Release From the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Illinois

(By Ray Page, superintendent)

Yesterday I received the following communication from Commissioner Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education:

"Hon. Ray Page,

"Superintendent of Public Instruction, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Springfield, Ill.

"Dear Superintendent Page: Under the state of compliance files by the Illinois Office of Public Instruction and your supplementary letter of March 17, 1965, your office is concerned, along with this Department, with assuring compliance with title VI of the Civil Rights Act and the Department's regulation under that act.

"Complaints of discrimination in violation of title VI of the Civil Rights Act, and the Department's regulation, have been filed with regard to the Chicago school system. A departmental team has begun the investigation of these complaints. Some of the complaints are very complex and may require analysis over some period of time. The preliminary investigation of certain of the complaints, however, indicates probable noncompliance with the act and the regulation, and brings into serious question the assurance of compliance made by the Chicago school authorities pursuant to section 80.4 of the departmental regulation. We believe that these latter complaints can, with the full cooperation of the Chicago school authorities, be fully investigated in a relatively short time and that they can and must be satisfactorily resolved before any new commitments are made of funds under Federal assistance programs administered by the Office of Education, either directly or through your office.

"In view of our joint responsibility for assuring compliance with title VI of the Civil Rights Act and the regulation, we are sending members of our staff to discuss the matter with you in further detail and we will keep you fully informed of the status of the investigation. It is our hope that the complaints being intensively investigated at this time can be resolved with a minimum of delay so that new commitments of funds to the Chicago school authorities can be permitted as soon as possible. This is particularly important, of course, with regard to making available funds under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

"Sincerely yours,

"Francis Keppel,

"U.S. Commissioner of Education."

This morning I have dispatched by Western Union the following reply to Commissioner Keppel's letter:

"I have your letter of September 30 concerning complaints of discrimination in violation of title VI of the Civil Rights Act with reference to the Chicago school system. Prior to the receipt of your letter and the time that it reached the public through the news media, I had dispatched the following telegram to Mr. Albert A. Raby, convenor, Coordinating Council of Community Organizations, Chicago, Ill.:

"Albert A. Raby,

"Convenor, Coordinating Council of Community Organizations, Chicago, Ill.:

"I have received your telegram dated September 29, 1965, the content of which I had previously read in the public press. Some of the conclusions you state are based on erroneous information. You also express doubt as to the legality of some action the Office of Public Instruction plans to take.

"Nonetheless, I will be happy to meet with you and representatives (not exceeding three) of the Coordinating Council of Community Organizations, such meeting to be held at a mutual convenient time and place. My only desire is to serve the schoolchildren of the State of Illinois. In that effort I am more than willing to meet with those who express similar attitudes.

"Ray Page,

"Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Illinois."

As shown in my reply to Mr. Raby, my office is prepared and has expressed willingness to lend every assistance possible to resolve these difficulties.

You have not advised what these complaints contain and have not furnished the office of the superintendent of public instruction with a copy. No investigator from your office has called upon me and I am completely uninformed as to the specific charges. What noncompliance is alleged? Is not the State office of education entitled to complete information on these matters, including a copy of the complaint? Will the investigators confer with the office of the superintendent of public instruction of the State of Illinois? I have not been contacted by them.

I stand ready and willing to lend every assistance possible in resolving this situation in the interest of all the school children in Chicago and in the State of Illinois.

GENERAL CASIMIR PULASKI

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, again this year the House of Representatives pauses in its deliberations to acknowledge the richness and variety of our American heritage by commemorating the life of Casimir Pulaski, patriot and hero of our Revolutionary War, who 186 years ago today gave his life on the altar of America's freedom.

General Pulaski came to America at the request of Benjamin Franklin. His many years of experience in battle, valiantly trying to stem the tide of partition of Poland, made him an invaluable addition to our young Army.

A brilliant tactician and a man of exceptional personal courage, Pulaski quickly was appointed to command the entire cavalry force of the American Army. He inspired his officers and men with his unswerving devotion to honor and to liberty. His unyielding experience in the effort to preserve a united Poland against overwhelming odds was invaluable in his command of the American cavalry forces. He refused to acknowledge defeat.

In the Battle of Savannah on October 11, 1779, Casimir Pulaski gave his life for an ideal of freedom and personal integrity which has persisted for almost two centuries.

Our country would not be the richly endowed and abundantly talented Nation it is if we had not accepted men and women from other nations as individuals, free to add their personal stamp to the tapestry of our history.

Casimir Pulaski was a great American. He gave his life that Americans of all nationalities might be free. We honor him most fittingly when we strive to preserve the standards of liberty and integrity which he set for us so long ago.

It is fitting to remind ourselves that the dignity of Pulaski's cause for freedom is alive today as much as it was during the American Revolution. His spirit and devotion to freedom continues to be a source of inspiration to all of us.

COLUMBUS DAY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, at this time a year ago many Members of Congress were active in giving voice in support of making Columbus Day a national holiday. Today, interest in that legislative item has somewhat waned. I do hope that the appropriate committees of both Houses may again consider the matter and that the Congress will support the legislation necessary to establish October 12 as a national holiday so that the memory of Columbus will be honored throughout the entire country just as it is today in some States and in some communities. The huge, colorful parade on Fifth Avenue in Manhattan, New York City, tomorrow will mark the 473d anniversary of the discovery of the New World.

The observance of the birthday of Christopher Columbus not only serves us as a reminder of the heroism, the courage, the imagination, and the navigational skill of the intrepid Italian explorer but it causes us to pause and reflect upon the influence which so many of our great forefathers of foreign birth have had upon our lives.

Our very heritage of freedom and independence is ours today largely because of the ideals, the wisdom, the courage, and the determination of those tens of thousands of freedom-seeking migrants who adopted this country for themselves and the generations to follow them.

Columbus showed great leadership in maintaining discipline aboard his own and sister ships and in holding steadfast to his westward course when each day the fears and uncertainties of the unknown seas ahead became more pronounced. This is the type of leadership which the founder of this Nation displayed in wresting our independence from the British Redcoats. It was the same brand of leadership in establishing a new nation based on the equality of men and the inalienable rights of the individual. And it was the kind of leadership which governed and hastened America's westward expansion, the leadership which bound up the wounds of a severed nation, and the leadership which has guided us successfully through the series of foreign wars in which the preservation of our liberties and the rights of freemen have been at stake.

Mr. Speaker, it is most important that Americans give adequate heed to commemorating the birthday of Columbus. It is important that every adult be reminded and every child be instructed concerning not only the initial historic voyage of Columbus and his courageous followers, but of the subsequent voyages.

Our debt to Columbus should remind us of our debt to all the patriots who lived and died that we might have a nation of the people and for the people.

When America takes its blessings of freedom for granted; when America fails to realize that our independence cost the lives of thousands of our forefathers through whose veins flowed the blood of more than a score of alien nationalities; and when Americans forget to honor the memory of those to whom we are eternally indebted—then, Mr. Speaker, America's greatness is doomed and its future as a leader among nations is jeopardized.

We can be grateful indeed that the members and officers of the loyal and patriotic Italian American societies are doing so much to honor Columbus. Theirs is a magnificent contribution but they need the help of all Americans to make the celebration of the birthday of Christopher Columbus most meaningful. We should especially pay tribute to Fortune Pope, president of the Columbus Citizens Committee and grand marshal of tomorrow's New York celebration.

ROGER L. STEVENS EXPLAINS CERTAIN ACTIONS HE HAS TAKEN TO AVOID CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, during debate on the arts and humanities bill on September 15, I raised the question of a possible conflict of interest on the part of Mr. Roger L. Stevens, the new Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts.

I am pleased to be able to report today to you and to my colleagues that this question has been amicably and fully resolved. Mr. Stevens has written me an extensive letter, explaining certain actions he has taken to avoid conflict of interest in his new post and I find his answer entirely satisfactory. I surely want to commend him for thus avoiding any possible conflict of interest in his new post as chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts and I wish him every success.

My concern was grounded in my sincere belief that any appearance of conflict of interest must be avoided in such a new and untried program as that to be conducted by the National Endowment for the Arts. I must say that I still have sincere reservations concerning the Endowment and my efforts in regard to Mr. Stevens were separate and apart from the question of the Endowment itself. I believe that it is entirely possible that we may, within not too long a time, find that we have created another French Academy of Arts. The French Academy has a long record of bypassing great art, while subsidizing secondary creations. Time after time, it has officially recognized the work of men long forgotten. With equal authority it has declared unfit the work of such painters as Renoir, now thought the greatest of the impressionists; Cezanne, who was forced to retire in disgrace, but whose work found great fame after his death; Van Gogh, who shot himself after his paintings were officially banned. Toulouse-Lautrec, Dages, Gaugin and Rodin were never recognized or were actually rejected by the Academy.

However questionable the concept of a National Endowment for the Arts, I am now convinced that it will be headed by a gentleman free from any conflict of interest.

My fears that conflict of interest could exist were based on two major premises. First, in an unusual procedure, the legislation was written in such a way that the new chairman of the endowment did not need to face Senate confirmation hearings, which is the normal place where possible conflict of interest is explored. Second, Mr. Stevens is well known for the vast holdings which he has previously had in the theater world. These holdings have included over 150 plays, many of them leading hits, as well as theaters themselves.

Recognized as perhaps the most comprehensive study ever conducted into conflict of interest is "Conflict of Interest and Federal Service," issued in 1960 by the New York City Bar Association. On the very first page of this report, prepared by many distinguished and nationally known lawyers, we find that they write:

> A conflict of interest does not necessarily presuppose that action by the official favoring one of these interests will be prejudicial to the other, nor that the official will in fact resolve the conflict to his own personal advantage rather than the Government's. If a man is in a position of conflicting interests, he is subject to temptation however he resolves the issue. Regulation of conflict of interest seeks to prevent situations of temptation from arising. An internal revenue agent auditing his own tax return would offer a simple illustration of such a conflict of interest. Perhaps the agent's personal interest in the matter would not affect his discharge of his official duty; but the experience of centuries indicates that the contrary is more likely, and that affairs should be so arranged as to prevent a man from being put in such an equivocal position.

Mr. Speaker, it was because the legislation did not provide for a Senate confirmation hearing that I offered an amendment that would have required the chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts to face such a hearing, the same as the chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities. If my amendment had prevailed, there would have been no necessity for me to pursue other means of determining that no possible conflict of interest was involved. I feel strongly that conflict of interest must be avoided and likewise any appearance of conflict of interest must be equally avoided, if the people are to maintain confidence in their government. After my statement, Mr. Stevens resigned from the board of the National Symphony.

Thus, I wrote to Mr. Stevens and later had the opportunity to talk with him. It was as a result of that correspondence and conversation that he reduced to writing the letter which I shall offer today. I asked him to explain in detail his present associations with various semipublic organizations in which he has held positions which could lead to possible conflict of interest, as well as the current status of his private business dealings, which could also have a conflict of interest status.

Specifically, I asked Mr. Stevens to write to me and state either that he was going to resign from the Metropolitan Opera Association and the John F. Kennedy Cultural Center for the Performing Arts or that they would not be eligible for endowment funds so long as he is chairman of the Endowment, for he also serves on the board of directors of the Metropolitan Opera and is chairman of the Kennedy Cultural Center. I also asked for further information concerning other specific organizations and business interests with which Mr. Stevens has been associated in the past and their effect on his dispensation of endowment funds without conflict of interest.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the legislation which prevented Mr. Stevens from appearing before a Senate confirmation hearing was unwise, for it did not give him the usual channels through which to state unequivocally the manner in which he has acted to divest himself of any interests which might constitute a conflict of interest.

However, I believe it is certainly to Mr. Stevens' credit and helpful to the operation of democratic government that he has chosen to make such a statement in correspondence with me. In order that it may be a matter of public record, I am placing this sequence of events in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, following is the letter from Mr. Stevens:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 8, 1965.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
Room 1211, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. QUIE: Thank you for your cordial letter of October 6. Since receiving your letter, I testified before the Appropriations Committee of the House, and this morning I made a public statement on the question of conflict of interest. I said:

"There have been inquiries as to whether there is a conflict of interest in my position as Chairman of the National Council on the Arts and I would like to clear up any possible misconceptions and allegations made during the past few days.

"First, there is an important job to be done in the field of the arts and humanities as indicated by the mandate given us by Congress. I am proceeding to the best of my ability and judgment to carry out this responsibility.

"I am perfectly willing to declare unequivocably that no organization with which I have an affiliation will be entitled to funds from any Government program with which I am associated.

"At the time of my appointment as Chairman of the National Council on the Arts I resigned from all business and nonprofit organizations that might have any possible conflict with my present position. The only organizations in the arts with which I am affiliated now are the Metropolitan Opera Association and the American Shakespeare Academy which are nonprofit organizations and any organization I might join would be in the same category.

"I feel in carrying out my duties as Chairman of the National Council on the Arts it is important to be thoroughly familiar with as many developments in the field of the arts as possible by being a member of nonprofit organizations, as long as there is no financial conflict.

"There has been some discussion of royalties that may accrue to me from plays. As soon as the first class production of a play is finished, the title of the play reverts to the author. It has been suggested that such royalties be put in trust. This is impossible to do because, as has been stated, the ownership reverts to the author and all control remains in his hands.

"I would like to further state that at the time I accepted the position I had many personal commitments including those to employees who have worked with me for many years. I have had to pay very substantial amounts as a result of the continuing deficits incurred by these commitments. I would be glad to open my books to confirm these substantial financial losses.

"I have worked 4 years as chairman of the John F. Kennedy Center without any compensation, traveling a minimum of 250,000 miles for this organization and on behalf of the National Council on the Arts, to bring to the country a greater knowledge of their activities. At least 90 percent of the cost of this travel has been paid personally. For this I expect nothing in return, for I believe it is the duty of every American citizen to serve his country when asked.

"As President Johnson has said concerning the arts legislation: 'This Congress will consider many programs which will leave an enduring mark on American life. But it may well be that passage of this legislation, modest as it is, will help secure for this Congress a sure and honored place in the story of the advance of our civilization.'

"I am delighted to serve, to the best of my ability, under his leadership to see that these new programs fulfill the promise for which so many people have worked so long and so hard."

I now want to supplement this public statement by answering your questions directly.

As far as the National Opera Co., which is cosponsored by the Metropolitan Opera and the Kennedy Center for the purpose of bringing opera to the country at large and giving young American singers and musicians an opportunity to perform in their own country, it is carrying out the philosophy and the intent of Congress.

Section 4 of the Kennedy Center Act provides:

"The Board shall—

"1. Present classical and contemporary music, opera, drama, dance, and poetry from this and other countries;

"2. Present lectures and other programs;

"3. Develop programs for children and youth and the elderly (and for other age groups as well) in such arts designed specifically for their participation, education, and recreation;

"4. Provide facilities for other civic activities at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts;

"5. Provide within the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts a suitable memorial in honor of the late President."

It is logical that in carrying out this purpose the joining hands with the Metropolitan Opera, whose reputation for management is worldwide and second to none in this country, was a logical step. Our participation in this national project was approved by the late President Kennedy, announced from the White House (copy of this press release enclosed), and approved by the trustees. The Center's share of the financing was supplied from unrestricted funds, which were not used for matching the Federal grant.

Also, it might be of interest to you to see the enclosed clippings evidencing that this National Opera Company has had a most successful premiere in Indianapolis and is fulfilling its purpose in a manner which the trustees hoped.

As to the future of the Kennedy Center, which is a Bureau of the Smithsonian, Congress is represented on the board with 4 Senators and 3 Congressmen, as well as 9 other Government officials. Since I am only one of the 45 trustees, I don't see how there is any possibility of concern about a conflict of interest at this time.

The biography that you mentioned in your letter is an old one. About the time I was appointed as chairman of the National Council I resigned my directorship and sold all my stock in City Investing.

Producers Theater has been an inactive organization which stopped producing plays when my partner, Robert Whitehead, became director of the Lincoln Repertory Theater, and if for any reason I have inadvertently not resigned, I will of course immediately do so. As to the Phoenix Theater and ANTA, I have resigned from these organizations.

Several months ago I thought I had done everything necessary to forestall any public criticism. However, in order to avoid any future criticism regarding the so-called royalties, I have requested my lawyers to look into some plan that can cover this possible question.

I am enclosing a clipping, in case you have not noticed it, which appeared in the Washington Post by the distinguished drama critic, Richard Coe, which I think is a good summary from a knowledgeable person of the importance of having someone who is qualified and experienced to be chairman of this Foundation.

I hope the above is satisfactory in answer to the questions involved in your letter, and I do appreciate your interest in this matter.

Sincerely,

ROGER L. STEVENS,
Special Assistant on the Arts.

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE FOGARTY AT STATE BREAKFAST, NEW ENGLAND READING ASSOCIATION, BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include a speech which I delivered at the State breakfast, New England Reading Association, Boston, Mass., Tuesday, September 28, 1965.

READING—A NATIONAL CONCERN AND CHALLENGE

(Address delivered by Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY at the State breakfast, New England Reading Association, Boston, Tuesday, September 28, 1965)

I am delighted to be with you in New England and to speak to you about the importance of reading as a national concern and challenge. This is one audience that clearly does not need to be sold on the importance of reading. As individuals and as a group, you have long sought to encourage and promote the involvement of children and adults in the world of books. But today's educational needs call for greater effort on the part of both the teacher and the Congress in improving reading instruction.

In the last decade we have seen a lively, often controversial public reappraisal of the ability of the educational establishment to cope with the problems of modern society. Today, every informed parent, the press, and a host of new experts both within the schools and outside them are caught up in a mood of questioning. Can Johnny read and how should we go about seeing that he can if he cannot? Are the new alphabet systems we hear about anything more than a way of confounding teachers and parents? Will small ungraded classes in schools fitted with the new educational hardware—computers and teaching machines—make enough of an educational difference in learning to read and write to justify the sums and efforts necessary to incorporate them in our schools?

As one looks at these recent developments, two important factors emerge from research and experience: First, we are making real progress in improving the curriculum materials used by children in schools; and, second, reading skill—the ability of the child to gather and store information about his world—is the key to the successful use of the new courses, and it is here that we must concentrate if we want excellence in our schools.

First, let me speak of the research being accomplished in educational curriculum development. There has been a subtle, quiet development taking place in the growth of new insights and concepts concerning the learning process of the child. Largely through cooperative research administered by the Office of Education scores of universities and schools throughout the country are studying the learning process and the curriculums of our elementary and secondary schools. Here are some of the important results to date:

At Yale, and more recently, at Rutgers, Social Psychologist O. K. Moore demonstrated that children as young as 2 can be taught to read by using their own natural curiosity in an atmosphere of encouragement rather than an atmosphere of stultifying drill and repetition.

At Syracuse University and Webster College, mathematicians Robert Davis and Sister Jacqueline Grennan developed programs to guide elementary school children in "discovering" the basic concepts of modern mathematics. The programs tested in Scarsdale, N.Y., and western Connecticut as well as in Syracuse and St. Louis are progressing so well that teachers are now being trained in their use and school systems throughout the country are eagerly adopting them.

At Stanford University, Philosopher-Mathematician Patrick Suppes is teaching advanced algebra to fifth graders. Nobel Prize Winner William Shockley is working on teaching the concept of conservation of energy to ninth graders.

At the University of California in Berkeley, Mark Schorer, the biographer of Sinclair Lewis, has been developing kinescope models on the teaching of poetry, drama, the short story, and the novel in the 10th grade.

Throughout the country we are beginning to see the results of these developments in curriculum in the schools. Children 2 and 3 years old are learning to read and write; first graders are dealing with the fundamentals of economics and algebra; second and third graders are learning physics and how to write music; fourth and fifth graders are discovering new theories of mathematics; junior high school students are studying anthropological concepts; and high school students are studying physical theory and literature courses usually taught in colleges.

These are not isolated instances of experimentation in scattered individual classrooms. New math programs are now taught in three-fifths of all American high schools and two-thirds of all high school physics students are now studying the new physics. New English curriculum materials are in experimental use in 16 States. New foreign language programs have become widely accepted with 50 percent of all foreign language teachers in the country trained in their use.

What has led to this dynamic eruption of new courses which have been affecting the schools as they adopt them? First, the scholars and scientists have come into the classrooms and along with experienced teachers, they have created, tested, and revised materials and methods that incorporated the best knowledge available today. Second, the new teaching techniques which have been developed to present these new courses rely heavily upon honest and rigorous teaching of basic concepts from the academic disciplines.

Finally and most important, the new curriculums represent the merging of two broad developments in our approach to learn: new understanding of the basic structure of each of the subjects taught in the schools, and a new and liberating approach to our estimates of the capacity for learning inherent in children. This is perhaps best expressed in a classic remark of the psychologist, Jerome Bruner, "Any subject can be taught effectively to any child at any age, in some form that is honest and useful."

But despite these impressive gains, we still see indications of failure in our educational system. Consider this set of figures on the Nation's tremendous talent loss each year; talent which we need to manage our schools and our colleges; talent which we need in our armed services; talent which will run our factories and laboratories. We know, for example, that:

One out of every three students in the fifth grade now drops out of school before high school graduation. Only 2 of every 10 now graduate from college.

Almost a million youths drop out of our elementary and secondary schools each year; 250,000 of these fail to complete even elementary school.

Over 23 million Americans 18 years of age and older have completed less than 8 years of schooling. Included in this figure are some 8 million adults aged 25 and older who have completed less than 5 years of schooling.

Thirty percent of the high school seniors in the 80–90 academic percentile of their class and 43 percent of the 70–80 percentile fail to enter college.

And even more disturbing results turn up when we look at the basic problems of reading and spelling among those youngsters who do stay in school. Some of the results from a continuing program of research sponsored by the Office of Education underline this problem.

Project Talent is a series of studies done by the University of Pittsburgh for the U.S. Office of Education and some other Government agencies, with an expenditure of more than $2,500,000 of Federal funds. In the spring of 1960 a 2-day battery of tests and questionnaires was given to 440,000 students in 1,353 different public and private high schools throughout the Nation. The number represented 5 percent of the total number of students in grades 9–12. The undertaking was the largest and the most representative testing of high school students ever done. For example, in reading the student's ability was tested on representative paragraphs selected from current periodicals and from classic novels. Test questions were developed to estimate the completeness of the reader's understanding of these paragraphs. The average 12th grader was able to answer correctly 78 percent of the questions concerning matter from typical articles in motion picture magazines, but his comprehension declined swiftly to 28 percent on material selected from the more literary type of periodicals such as the Atlantic Monthly and the Saturday Review. On reading materials selected from writing of well-known novelists it was found that the average 12th grader was able to comprehend only about half of the broader ideas of the authors of typical classic novels.

At first glance, spelling looks much better; they found that the average senior could spell 93 percent of the test words, which were a representative sample of the 5,000 words used most frequently in published materials. But then we find that almost all of these words are very easy, such as corn, five, pages, rain, sang, and tea, all of which were spelled correctly by all seniors. On the other hand, over half of the 12th graders could not correctly spell "breathe." To illustrate the difficulty of the words given in the tests, the authors report that the test results mean that the average senior would misspell about 4 words in the preamble of the Constitution, which contains only 40 different words. When the students were asked to write two 1-paragraph themes, 99 out of 100 of these high school students committed errors in spelling and usage, a revelation which shocked the test administrator.

Why do we continue to see problems of this sort cropping up in our society when we have made such great advances in recent years? The key to the problem seems to be that despite our great advances, despite our greatly increased funds for research in education, and despite our efforts at improving the learning situation, we are still just on the threshold of discovery in the area of reading. There is much that we know, but even more that we do not know about how children learn to read and how well they could read if we had the proper tools and knowledge. No area of learning is more important and yet needs so much new attention.

But we are now making some progress—both in the Congress and in the laboratory. One important area is in making more and better library resources available, for as Thomas Carlyle, the great 19th century English philosopher, once noted: "All that mankind had done, thought, gained, or been * * * it is lying as in magic preservation in the pages of books."

Several important pieces of recent legislation are aimed at improving the materials available for readers of all ages and with all sorts of interests.

The Library Services and Construction Act of 1964, for instance, provides Federal assistance in the construction of libraries as well as in improving libraries' services. Funds may be used for salaries, books and other materials, equipment, and various operating expenses and for construction, expansion or remodeling of public libraries.

Title II of the new Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is directed at helping the schools cope with the staggering explosion of knowledge.

It provides money for improving school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials such as films and records. States have considerable leeway in the use of funds to improve instructional materials, but they may not substitute them for money already being spent.

And the Higher Education Act, which is expected to be approved by the Congress this week, provides for college library assistance and for library training and research. The legislation would not only help colleges in acquiring appropriate library materials but also would help prepare individuals for working in information sciences, thus contributing to improved services by personnel in all libraries.

In addition, under the recent amendments to the National Defense Education Act, institutes are provided to train school librarians, teachers of reading, and personnel who work with disadvantaged youth. During the summer of 1965, there were 54 institutes for teachers of reading.

Meanwhile, in laboratories and schools throughout the country the improvement of instruction in reading also has been receiving greatly increased attention through the U.S. Office of Education's cooperative research program and will continue to receive it under the increased appropriation we made available only last week.

Already underway is the first large-scale comparative study of the teaching of reading to first-grade children. Twenty-seven separate but interrelated studies in this effort involve children from all sections of the country and try out a variety of techniques, but use the same evaluative tests.

More than 26,000 children and 800 teachers are participating. Results of these studies will contribute substantially to the improvement of the teaching of reading. Also, the large body of data accumulated should be useful for other studies related to reading habits and skills.

While the 27 studies are scheduled for completion in December of this year, already 17 follow-up studies are in process to gather additional information on the progress of the young participants in the second and third grades.

When this study is completed we may at long last have the information we need to settle questions about which of the many ways of teaching reading is most effective with which type of child.

Another major cooperative research reading effort is Project Literacy, which is being coordinated by Cornell University. It is a truly significant scientific project to stimulate and carry out research concerned with the development of reading skills and to relate the findings to other research and curriculum developments. This program is being conducted by psychologists, linguists, and reading specialists from 20 of our greatest universities. Some of the early results already confirm the importance of early language training for later excellence in reading.

And besides the coordinated projects on first-grade reading and those in Project Literacy, the Office of Education currently has in process over 40 other studies specifically concerned with reading and numerous other studies that are tied into reading.

The Office of Education also is supporting research and development activities in programed instruction and in teaching by machine.

This technique holds great promise for teaching certain aspects of beginning reading, and new reading programs based on this type of instruction are currently being tested at several places in the country.

One interesting result of these investigations has been the dramatic improvement in reading skills of little boys. As you well know, boys too often lag behind girls in reading, sometimes because they feel that reading is for sissies.

A study in California found that after a year of programed instruction, boys surpassed girls in reading proficiency, and further investigation is being made to determine under what general conditions programed instruction is most successful in teaching reading.

Technological advances also are being used to improve the reading skills of handicapped children. In an experimental program at this University of South Florida, for example, mentally retarded youngsters taught by programed instruction learned words six times faster than those taught by traditional methods.

Compressed speech recordings are still another advance made possible by modern technology.

Studies supported by the Office of Education show that these recordings hold great promise for use by the blind, who normally read Braille at only 60 words a minute or listen to sighted individuals who read at about 250 words a minute. With compressed speech, recorded reading can be speeded up to 240 words per minute with little or no loss in comprehension. This means that we can now teach blind children to read with their ears at four times the speed of Braille.

Much of the research aimed at studying disadvantaged students also recognizes education as an essential means of relieving the harassments—chiefly ignorance and illiteracy—that paralyze the poor. It also points to reading as the most important factor in programs to improve the education of the disadvantaged.

Adult and basic literacy programs, programs to prevent school dropouts. Project Head Start for preschool children, and a variety of community action undertakings all have implications for development and utilization of reading skills, and all lean heavily on improved reading. Without reading, there cannot be learning. It is utterly impossible to conceive of one without the other.

And the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, in the key title I section which provides financial assistance to local educational agencies to improve education of poor children, enables schools to make renewed efforts to attack the reading problems of the disadvantaged.

As teachers of reading, I am sure you are all aware of how closely reading is tied to oral expression and how the development of reading skills is geared to the formation of ideas and concepts by young people. So if we can improve the reading ability of these youngsters from pockets of poverty, we can open up new vistas of learning.

That the country will benefit from our efforts to improve reading no one can gainsay. Reading is the key to education and education is the key to just about everything we do as a nation. The time, if there ever was one, when we could be complacent about our education, about what we already know, is past.

Our future as a nation and as individuals depends upon the capacity to keep informed. In a world in which yesterday's solutions may be wholly inadequate for today's problems, and in which broadened human understanding and compassion are necessary if we are to survive, a literate public is a basic requirement.

For it is only in knowing and understanding the wisdom of the ages and the latest insights of our best thinkers, scholars, scientists, and writers can we hope to build a better world for ourselves and children. In this effort, the schools, the universities, Government agencies, and the Congress must become cooperating parties in a new and bolder effort.

Perhaps the greatest need in this area is a growth and continuation of the existing cooperation between the schools and the Government. This has not always been a comfortable relationship, for in many ways the teacher—like the artist and the poet, resents the association with the bureaucrat and the politician. I can think of no better answer to this problem than to quote from President Kennedy's remarks recorded for the television program on Robert Frost which was presented on February 26, 1961. In these remarks, President Kennedy said:

"There is a story that some years ago an interested mother wrote to a principal of a school, 'Don't teach my boy poetry. He is going to run for Congress.' I have never taken the view that the world of politics and the world are so far apart. I think politicians and poets share at least one thing, and that is that their greatness depends upon the courage with which they face the challenges of life. There are many kinds of courage—bravery under fire, courage to risk reputation, friendship, and career for convictions which are deeply held. Perhaps the rarest courage of all—the skill to pursue it is given to very few men—is the courage to wage a silent battle to illuminate the nature of man and the world in which he lives."

TRIBUTES TO FATHER SANTIAGO NUNEZ, FOUNDER OF CASA HISPANOAMERICANA FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING PUERTO RICAN CITIZENS OF SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Spanish-speaking Puerto Rican citizens of my home city of Springfield, Mass., have had the benefit of spiritual guidance from a congenial Central American priest during the past few years, the Reverend Santiago Nunez. The soft-spoken, warmhearted priest now returns to his home diocese in Costa Rica after many accomplishments in Springfield, not the least of which was the founding, organizing, and very effective leadership of Casa Hispanoamericana—Spanish-American House—for our Spanish-speaking neighbors in Springfield. Father Nunez had come to Springfield specifically at the invitation of the Most Reverend Christopher J. Weldon, D.D., bishop of the Roman Catholic diocese of Springfield, to labor among the city's Spanish-speaking people. Civic officials and leaders of the Puerto Rican community last week gave Father Nunez a testimonial before his departure for Costa Rica.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks a column about Father Nunez' work at Casa Hispanoamericana, written by Jim Mason for the Springfield Union of October 8, and the story of his testimonial in the Springfield Union of October 4:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, Oct. 4, 1965]

Praise Heaped on Father Santiago at Testimonial—200 Turn Out To Honor Priest Returning to Costa Rica Parish

City officials, lawyers, and clergymen joined with day laborers, tobacco workers, and the unemployed at Springfield Turn Verein Sunday to pay tribute to a Central American priest who came here 4 years ago to work with this city's Puerto Rican community.

MAYOR SPEAKS

Amid words of praise by Mayor Charles V. Ryan, one of the special guests, more than 200 persons expressed their gratitude for the work of "Father Santiago"—Rev. Santiago Nunez, who will return this month to his home parish in Costa Rica.

Other special guests included Rt. Rev. John F. Harrington, representing the Roman Catholic Diocese of Springfield; Rabbi Samuel Dresner of Temple Beth El, representing the city's Jewish clergy; Rev. Albert Garner, head of the Urban Ministry of the Greater Springfield Council of Churches; State Representative Philip Kimball; Rev. Thomas McCarthy of Sacred Heart Church, a coworker with the Puerto Rican community, and Dr. Walter English, municipal director of intergroup relations.

MEMORY BOOK PRESENTED

John V. Shea, Jr., director of the city's antipoverty program, presented Father Nunez a memory book, and Neri Perez, toastmaster, presented a purse and cash gift.

The testimonial dinner was sponsored by Casa Hispanoamericana, an organization for assistance of the city's Puerto Rican populace conceived and organized by Father Nunez.

Father Nunez came here at the invitation of the Most Reverend Christopher J. Weldon, bishop of the Springfield Roman Catholic Diocese, specifically to work among the city's Spanish-speaking people.

During his stay here, his niece, Miss Martha Monge, also of Costa Rica, came to live in this city with the mayor's mother, Mrs. Charles V. Ryan, Sr., of Oxford St.

She married Robert Hafey, executive secretary of the Springfield Action Commission, and they reside in Caracas, Venezuela.

Mrs. Dolores Perez was chairman of the banquet and reception, and Mrs. James Fiorentino was ticket chairman.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, Oct. 8, 1965]

Father Nunez' Work With Puerto Ricans: Casa Hispanoamericana Embodies It

(By Jim Mason)

Rev. Santiago Nunez, who has been a kind of ex officio citizen of this city for 4 years, returns this week to his home diocese in Costa Rica, and he will be sorely missed here.

UNDERSTANDS POVERTY

"Father Santiago," as he has been known in the Puerto Rican district at Memorial Square, was probably one of the handful of people in the city with a deep understanding of poverty and its paralyzing effects on those it touches.

It was this insight, no doubt, that facilitated his working closely in secular neighborhood projects with Rev. Hugh Wire, Protestant mission minister in the North End, and Mr. Wire's successor, Rev. Albert Garner, long before the ecumenical movement made such relationships fashionable.

The realities of poverty and the scarcity of leaders willing to live with it, and share its frustrations, were such that these men, and a few others like them, easily found a common bond.

This was indicated in the spring of 1963 when Father Nunez, Mr. Wire, and Rev. Thomas McCarthy, another North End priest, protested when two young Puerto Rican mothers were separated from their children and jailed, not for a crime, but because they were material witnesses to a murder in Holyoke.

The mothers were unwed, sinners in the eyes of the church, and therefore not inclined to engender public sympathy, but Father Nunez and a few others looked beyond the law of Christ to the love of Christ in their vain attempt to get justice for these women, who remained in jail for more than 3 months until the court heard the case.

In one of the early police commission meetings this summer when civil rights groups raised charges of police brutality, Father Nunez stood quietly in the rear of the meeting room. He had been here before, but Puerto Ricans had never been able to dramatize their claims of mistreatment by law enforcement officials the way the civil rightists' claims were dramatized then.

On one occasion, however, a Puerto Rican delegation led by Father Nunez had achieved the transfer of a policeman from a beat in the Puerto Rican neighborhood.

CONSTANTLY AFRAID

But the Police Department was only one of the many points on Father Nunez' busy itinerary in his search for answers to problems of the poor. His dealings with welfare departments in Springfield, Chicopee, and Holyoke prompted him to say in 1963, "President Roosevelt said in 1940 we should have freedom from fear. Believe me. These people, whether they are Puerto Rican, Negro or white, are constantly afraid when they go to the welfare departments.

"Welfare workers sometimes withhold aid on the slightest legal technicality. It doesn't matter if a family is hungry or needs medical attention or shelter," he said.

In the last 2 years, Father Nunez' major effort, and possibly his lasting contribution to the city, was the organization of Casa Hispanomericana (Spanish-American House).

The frustrations he encountered in his first 2 years here, both with the Puerto Ricans themselves, and the community institutions designed to help them, made him realize that this tiny minority of powerless citizens had to learn to organize and communicate their grievances and needs in a fashion that city officials and other agents of the community power structure would understand.

By drawing all Spanish-speaking people of the area into a cultural and civic organization, the advantaged members could help the disadvantaged to develop leaders and spokesmen, Father Nunez reasoned.

COMMUNITY'S VOICE

Starting with many friends but few funds, Father Nunez set to work organizing Casa, and it soon caught the imagination of Puerto Ricans themselves. Quarters at Memorial Square were scrubbed, painted, and carpentered by Puerto Rican volunteers and by early 1964, the new organization was gaining prestige as the voice of the Puerto Rican community.

Discouragements have been frequent in Father Nunez' work here. He said in 1963 that hostile feelings toward Puerto Ricans could be greatly alleviated by changes in the Puerto Ricans themselves.

Most came to the U.S. mainland from rural areas with no skills for urban employment, little or no English, and customs alien to urban life. All this must change, but the roots of tradition are deep, and Father Nunez' constant nudging has not always been successful.

But perhaps the seeds of change actually have been sown most effectively in Casa Hispanoamericana. If this fledgling institution can survive without the forceful leadership of Father Nunez, his work here may ultimately prove to take years off the social assimilation process which Puerto Ricans are now only entering.

EXTREMISM AT ITS WORST

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. RACE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, all of us, regardless of political affiliation, should be and are concerned about threats to our democratic processes and institutions. I do, therefore, applaud recent efforts by the leadership of the Republican Party in disclaiming the John Birch Society.

An editorial comment on this matter, written by the respected editor of the Fond du Lac (Wis.) Commonwealth-Reporter, Carl Keyser, appeared in that paper on October 7.

I include that editorial as part of my remarks:

EXTREMISM AT ITS WORST

The Republicans in the sixties are suffering from the same kind of infection as did the Democrats in the thirties—the infiltration by extremists who purportedly share the ideals of the party but who in actuality are working to destroy them.

The most basic of these ideals is the one called "democracy," which has to do with the free and open interplay of competing ideas, majority rule tempered by a loyal opposition, compromise, fair play.

Democracy is a dirty word to the rightist John Birch Society, just as it is in its true sense, to the Communists. The guiding principles of the Birch Society founder, Robert Welch, could have come directly from the lips of Lenin.

The John Birch Society is an authoritarian structure. Orders come directly from the top, with none of this nonsense about democratic discussion. Every member of the society acknowledges the right of the leader to oust him at any time without explanation.

The most fantastic and insidious thing about the Birch Society is that it does not hurt its ostensible enemy, the Communists, in the slightest. It does not even pay much attention to liberals. Its most bitter venom is directed against responsible and respected American conservatives.

Clearly, as Representative GERALD R. FORD of Michigan, has said, "There is no place for it in the Republican Party."

Nor, it might be added, in any association of Americans.

HILL-BURTON AMENDMENTS INTRODUCED BY REPRESENTATIVE DOW

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOW] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year this Congress passed medicare provisions which help pay the costs of long-term nursing care for our Nation's elderly. When these provisions take effect in January 1967, we can expect an increase in applications to our Nation's nursing homes and other long-term-care facilities, which are already trying to cope with the problem of having half a million less beds available than are needed.

Over the years, increases in the funds authorized for Hill-Burton Act grants have helped to gradually decrease the deficit between the number of beds available and the number of beds needed. But now, to keep from backsliding due to medicare, I am convinced we are again going to have to increase the funds made available to public and nonprofit organizations for the construction, expansion, and remodeling of long-term-care facilities.

I am introducing today a bill which would double our annual grant program for such facilities, from $70 to $140 million. This bill would also allow the Surgeon General to redistribute to all other States those funds remaining unused from any one State's allotment. Under the present law these funds revert to the Treasury if not used by the State for which they were earmarked.

With so many of our States suffering a serious shortage of beds for long-term care, it is a crime if all the funds authorized by Congress are not used.

Present Hill-Burton appropriations are helping to provide about 15,000 new beds annually. My bill would help to provide about 30,000 beds a year. The extra 15,000 should help to meet the peak demand caused in 1967 and 1968 by medicare. In the third year, which is the final year for the present act, which my bill would amend, the extra 15,000 beds would accelerate the elimination of the half-million-bed deficit.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE PEOPLE OF UGANDA ON THEIR INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the people of Uganda celebrated on October 9 a deeply satisfying event in the history of their nation. On that day in 1962 they achieved their independence from Great Britain. One year later, on the first anniversary of becoming a sovereign nation, Uganda became a republic within the British Commonwealth of Nations. Now, on this third anniversary, the people of this African country are looking forward to a future of striving for a bettering of their lives through a plan of economic development to increase their national product at a rate of 4 percent per year for the next 15 years. This effort will involve great changes in the way of life of the Ugandans. New industries are to be created. The traditional reliance on two agricultural products—cotton and coffee—for foreign exchange will partially give way to a diversification of goods which come from the nonindustrial sector of the economy. Education and new skills will be learned. Mineral extraction will increase. This modernization of the means of production will be a phenomenon which we should applaud. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to extend my sincere congratulations to the people of Uganda as they enter the fourth year of their free and proud nationhood.

THE FEDERAL FINE ARTS AND ARCHITECTURE ACT CAN BEAUTIFY OUR PUBLIC BUILDINGS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill, H.R. 11523, to foster outstanding architectural design and decoration of Federal public buildings outside the District of Columbia.

H.R. 11523, the Federal Fine Arts and Architecture Act, would provide for Federal public buildings in the 50 States the same sort of expert advice on design and decoration and on the selection of architects and artists that the Fine Arts Commission gives for Federal structures in the Capital. The bill would do this by creating an Architectural Advisory Board and an Art Advisory Board in the General Services Administration.

Equally as important, the bill provides for the creation of a cumulative fund for the acquisition and maintenance of works of art for Federal public buildings outside the District of Columbia. It authorizes annual appropriations for the art fund of 1 percent of the amount appropriated during the preceding fiscal year for design and construction of Federal public buildings outside the District.

Such a fund would allow the United States to build beauty into Federal buildings in the 50 States to a degree that has not been possible in the past.

The new fund for the acquisition of works of art would have three major advantages:

First. The continuing threat that highly desirable artistic embellishments would be squeezed out of a building because of other cost problems would be avoided since the funds for works of art would not be tied to the cost of specific building projects, as at present.

Second. The fund would also allow a decision to include works of art at the earliest stage of planning. The artist could be selected at the beginning and would work with the architect throughout the design and construction of the building to assure that the artistic embellishment would be an integral part of the building and not something stuck on as afterthought.

Third. The fund would allow the Administrator of the General Services Administration and his advisers flexibility to make larger allocation of funds for art for Federal buildings where beauty is of particular importance. Thus, much more than 1 percent of the construction and design cost might be allocated for the acquisition of a major art work or works for a Federal building that would be a landmark in the center of one of our cities. On the other hand, use or location might dictate little or no spending for art in other buildings. In all cases, the amounts allocated would be determined according to expert judgment of the need for artistic embellishment, rather than by a procrustean formula.

The Art Advisory Board to be established under H.R. 11523 would advise the Administrator of the General Services Administration on expenditures from the art fund, on the selection of artists whose work is to be acquired by means of the fund, and on designs or models of works of art to be purchased.

The Art Board would consist of the Assistant Commissioner for Design of the General Services Administration, as chairman, and six distinguished artists who would serve staggered 3-year terms.

The legislation specifies that two of the artists be painters, with one of them experienced in mural decoration; two would be sculptors, with one of them experienced in monumental sculpture; one would be an interior designer, and one an artist specializing in the decorative arts and crafts, such as mosaic, stained glass, and grillwork.

The Administrator of the General Services Administration would make the appointments to the Art Board after considering nominations from leading national professional organizations in the fields and after consulting with the Commission on Fine Arts and the Director of the National Collection of Fine Arts and the Director of the National Gallery of Art.

The Architectural Advisory Board would make recommendations on Federal public buildings and leased post offices whenever it considered the buildings of "sufficient significance" to justify the Board's consideration. The Architectural Board would give advice on the selection of architects and would review and make recommendations on designs. Its recommendations would go to the Administrator of the General Services Administration on buildings to be built by him under the Public Buildings Act of 1939 and to the Postmaster General on buildings to be built for lease as post offices.

The membership of the Architectural Board would consist of the Assistant Commissioner for Design of the General Services Administration, as chairman, and at least five distinguished architects appointed for 3-year staggered terms. A sixth member would be an expert in city planning, who could also be an architect.

Liaison between the two Boards would be provided not only through the presence of the Assistant Commissioner for Design on both Boards but also by the assignment of one member of the Art Board to meet with and advise the Architectural Board.

These boards and the cumulative fund would be used only on projects in the 50 States. The legislation would not interfere with the duties and prerogatives of the Fine Arts Commission within the District or upon the Commission's functions which are not related to Federal public buildings outside the District.

Mr. Speaker, I believe H.R. 11523 will meet a real need.

Nearly four centuries ago, Sir Henry Wotton gave us an enduring definition when he said:

> Well-building hath three conditions: commodity, firmness, and delight.

As we look at the Federal buildings around the Nation, we must conclude sadly that all too often we have not built well because we have neglected the delight that comes from works of art and from outstanding architecture.

For many years we placed too little emphasis on obtaining imaginative, striking, handsome designs which would represent the dignity, the vitality, and power of the United States in its buildings and structures. The post offices built after World War II under the lease-construction program were remarkable for their uniformly dull and nondescript architecture.

Little attention and money has been devoted to adorning Federal public buildings outside the District with appropriate works of art. During the depression, the New Deal gave hungry artists jobs and put murals and other art works in public buildings. But the United States soon slipped back into its old ways.

The Kennedy Administration opened a new era. President Kennedy was concerned with the architecture of Federal buildings and with what their appearance said to us and to the world about America.

He revitalized the Fine Arts Commission. He saved Lafayette Park. He appointed an ad hoc committee on Federal Office Space consisting of Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg, Budget Bureau Director David Bell, General Services Administrator Bernard L. Boutin, and his special assistant, Timothy J. Reardon, Jr.

The ad hoc committee on Federal Office Space reported in June 1962, recommending the following three-point architectural policy for the Federal Government:

First. The policy shall be to provide requisite and adequate facilities in an architectural style and form which is distinguished and which will reflect the dignity, enterprise, vigor, and stability of the American National Government. Major emphasis should be placed on the choice of designs that embody the finest contemporary American architectural thought. Specific attention should be paid to the possibilities of incorporating into such designs qualities which reflect the regional architectural traditions of that part of the Nation in which buildings are located. Where appropriate, fine art should be incorporated in the designs, with emphasis on the work of living American artists. Designs shall adhere to sound construction practice and utilize materials, methods, and equipment of proven dependability. Buildings shall be economical to build, operate, and maintain, and should be accessible to the handicapped.

Second. The development of an official style must be avoided. Design must flow from the architectural profession to the Government, and not vice versa. The Government should be willing to pay some additional cost to avoid excessive uniformity in design of Federal buildings. Competitions for the design of Federal buildings may be held where appropriate. The advice of distinguished architects ought to, as a rule, be sought prior to the award of important design contracts.

Third. The choice and development of the building site should be considered the first step of the design process. This choice should be made in cooperation with local agencies. Special attention should be paid to the general ensemble of streets and public places of which Federal buildings will form a part. Where possible, buildings should be located so as to permit a generous development of landscape.

In line with these excellent recommendations, Mr. Boutin and Karel

Yasko, the Assistant Commissioner for Design of the General Services Administration and former State architect of Wisconsin, set about enthusiastically to upgrade the quality of the architecture of Federal public buildings.

We are already seeing the first fruits of their efforts for outstanding design in new Government structures.

And, following the recommendation of the ad hoc committee, Mr. Boutin issued a directive that—

> If the architect-engineer recommends some form of art embellishment, and if the limit of cost indicates some margin of funds available, the funds not to exceed one-half of 1 percent of the estimated construction cost must be set aside in a reservation.

The directive also provides that fine arts must be "appropriate" to the building and that they will not "ordinarily" be included in buildings with an estimated construction cost of less than $250,000.

Projects carried out recently or under design include interior fountain sculpture in the Federal Office Building in St. Louis; a ceramic tile mural in the Federal Office Building in Cincinnati; carved wood panels in the courthouse and Federal Office Building in Denver; interior and exterior mosaic murals at the customhouse and Federal Office Building in Los Angeles, and stained glass panels in the courthouse and post office in Gainesville, Fla.

We have come a long way in the last few years. President Johnson, like his predecessor, is deeply concerned with beauty in our national life.

H.R. 11523 is designed to build upon the progress that has been made and to provide the legislative basis for even higher standards of art and architecture in Federal buildings outside the Capital.

The art fund will assure more and better artistic embellishment of our public buildings. I believe it is time for the United States to move on from the rather limited use of artistic decoration possible under the present General Services Administration directive to the greater program possible with the art fund and the Art Advisory Board.

The value of a board of experts on architecture in improving Federal buildings has been demonstrated more than once. The Fine Arts Commission, though the subject of controversy in the past, has made significant contributions to good architecture in Federal and other structures in the District.

The State Department used an advisory board somewhat similar to the one proposed in H.R. 11523 in designing the the American Embassies which have shown the excellence possible in American public architecture when the Nation's talents are brought into full play.

On a much smaller scale, my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], and I have used an advisory committee on art and architecture to promote beauty in the new Milwaukee main post office which will be a dominating feature in the center of our city. The advisory committee has made a number of very useful recommendations which, I believe, will lead to a more pleasing building in a more attractive setting than we would otherwise have had.

It may be asked why H.R. 11523 does not provide that the Fine Arts Commission should advise on Federal public buildings outside the District as well as those within the Capital. The Fine Arts Commission, however, is fully occupied with its concerns in the District. Its members serves on a part-time basis and would be overwhelmed if confronted with the task of advising and making carefully-considered recommendations on Federal buildings to be built outside Washington.

Mr. Speaker, in an eloquent message to Congress earlier this year President Johnson pointed out:

> Association with beauty can enlarge man's imagination and revive his spirit.

I hope we shall make this truth our watchword in providing for the construction of Federal buildings. I hope that Congress will soon consider and pass this bill to continue and step up our progress toward higher standards of art and architecture in our Federal public buildings.

The text of H.R. 11523 follows:

H.R. 11523

A bill to foster high standards of architectural excellence in the design and decoration of Federal public buildings outside the District of Columbia, and to provide a program for the acquisition and preservation of works of art for such buildings, and for other purposes, to be known as the Federal Fine Arts and Architecture Act

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is hereby declared to be the purpose of this Act to provide—

(1) for the maintenance of high standards of architectural design and art for public buildings outside the District of Columbia; and

(2) a program for the acquisition and preservation of suitable works of art for public buildings outside the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of General Services.

(b) The term "public building" shall have the same meaning as is provided in section 13(1) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959.

SEC. 3. (a) The Architectural Advisory Board is hereby established in the General Services Administration. The Chairman of the Board shall be the Assistant Commissioner of Design of the General Services Administration, ex officio. There shall be six other members of the Board each of whom shall be appointed by the Administrator to serve for a term expiring during one of the first three calendar years succeeding the year in which he is appointed, as designated by the Administrator at the time of appointment, subject to the limitation that not more than two members may have a term expiring in the same calendar year. Five of the six appointed members shall be distinguished architects, one of whom shall be experienced in landscape architecture. One appointed member shall be a city planner who may also be an architect. The Administrator shall give consideration to any nominations submitted to him from time to time by leading national organizations in architecture, and shall consult with the Commission of Fine Arts on such nominations. No appointed member of the Board shall be eligible for reappointment for a term beginning less than two years after the expiration of his term.

(b) In all cases where the Board determines that the buildings involved are of sufficient significance, it shall make recommendations—

(1) to the Administrator on the architect and design of public buildings outside the District of Columbia, and

(2) to the Postmaster General on the architect and design of buildings to be constructed outside the District of Columbia for lease to the United States for use by the Post Office Department.

The Board may where appropriate recommend to the Administrator or to the Postmaster General the holding of competitions for the selection of such architects.

(c) Each appointed member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 per diem for each day on which he is engaged in the performance of his duties as such, and shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of such duties.

SEC. 4. The Administrator is authorized to acquire and maintain works of art for public buildings outside the District of Columbia. In addition to any amounts otherwise authorized, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for this purpose in each fiscal year, to remain available until expended, an amount equal to one percent of the total amount appropriated for the preceding fiscal year for the design and construction of public buildings outside the District of Columbia.

SEC. 5 (a) The Art Advisory Board is hereby established in the General Services Administration. The Chairman of the Board shall be the Assistant Commissioner of Design of the General Services Administration, ex officio. The remaining six members of the Board shall be appointed by the Administrator from among distinguished representatives of professional fields as follows:

(1) painting, two members, of whom one shall be experienced in mural decoration;

(2) sculpture, two members, of whom one shall be experienced in monumental sculpture;

(3) the decorative arts and crafts, one member; and

(4) interior design, one member.

Such appointments shall be made by the Administrator after giving consideration to any nominations submitted to him by leading national organizations in the respective professional fields, and after consultation with the Commission of Fine Arts, the Director of the National Collection of Fine Arts, and the Director of the National Gallery of Art. Each appointed member of the Board shall serve for a term expiring in one of the first three years succeeding the year in which he is appointed, as designated by the Administrator at the time of appointment, subject to the limitation that not more than two members and not more than one painter or sculptor may have a term scheduled to expire in the same calendar year. No appointed member of the Board shall be eligible for reappointment for a term beginning less than two years after the expiration of his term.

(b) The Board shall make recommendations to the Administrator concerning the artists and works of art to be acquired under section 4. The Board may where appropriate recommend to the Administrator the holding of competitions for the selection of artists and of designs or models of works of art.

(c) The Board shall designate one of its members to meet with and advise the Architectural Advisory Board.

(d) Each appointed member of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 per diem for each day on which he is engaged in the performance of his duties as such, and shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of such duties.

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF NATIONAL EMPLOY THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED WEEK

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on October 5 here in Washington, D.C., the 20th anniversary of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week was celebrated at a large luncheon for more than 400 persons from public and private life.

Four awards were presented: The President's Committee Distinguished Service Award to the General Services Administration for its work in eliminating barriers to entry by the handicapped in Government buildings; the Blinded Veterans Association 1965 Award to the Internal Revenue Service as the top Government employer of blind persons this past year; the first award of the District of Columbia Commissioner's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped to the Sidwell Friends School for its cooperation with the District of Columbia Department of Vocational Rehabilitation; and to the U.S. Treasury Department, a special award from the National Capital chapter of the National Association of the Physically Handicapped for their work in hiring the handicapped, presented by Mrs. Eunice Kennedy Shriver.

It was a real pleasure to see three Federal agencies and one private school receive recognition for service over and above the call of duty.

I ask unanimous consent that the press release on the President's Committee Distinguished Service Plaque, signed by President Johnson, be inserted in the RECORD, together with my own remarks on this historic and significant occasion.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION TO RECEIVE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD

Leadership in the nationwide program of furthering employment opportunities for the handicapped in and out of the Federal service has earned for the General Services Administration the Distinguished Service Award of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

The award will be presented at the National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week Luncheon of the District of Columbia Commissioners' Committee on Employment of the Handicapped at the Presidential Arms, 1320 G Street, NW., on Tuesday, October 5, 1965, at noon.

The award will be presented by William P. McCahill, Executive Secretary of the President's Committee. It will be accepted by John H. Finlator, Director of Manpower and Administration of GSA.

The General Services Administration was cited for its cooperation in the nationwide program to eliminate architectural barriers. The agency took the initiative to make buildings used by Federal agencies accessible to the handicapped by assuring that design and construction of new Government buildings meet specifications adopted for the accommodation of persons with ambulatory limitations.

In addition, GSA in cooperation with the President's Committee, established a two-pronged program in July of last year to increase subcontracting opportunities in America's sheltered workshops.

Under this program, GSA urges firms holding prime Government contracts to give area sheltered workshops opportunities to bid on subcontracts. The Agency's Business Service Centers all over the Nation provide counseling to sheltered workshops wishing to submit bids for subcontracts. This program is actively promoted in all GSA regions.

In addition to providing increased employment for handicapped persons in sheltered workshops, the program serves constantly to remind contractors of the capabilities of the handicapped.

GSA has made an outstanding record as an employer of the handicapped in all of its 10 regions. When a civil service program of hiring retarded persons on certification of a rehabilitation agency was instituted in January 1964, GSA hired a number of retardates.

Each year during National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week the Agency helps to publicize the abilities of its handicapped employees through displays and exhibits in the lobbies of Federal buildings in 11 major cities. In addition, GSA carries on an internal campaign to gain acceptance for handicapped workers through articles and statements in its employee publications.

INTRODUCTION OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, BY WILLIAM P. MCCAHILL, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED

For a decade and a half now, it has been my pleasure to appear before our speaker along with Admiral McIntire, General Maas, and now Harold Russell in support of our annual appropriation. Incidentally, the President's Committee as an independent unit of the Government is the only such unit I know of which has a private citizen defend its appropriation. I must say that our relations with our speaker today have always been most harmonious and, if anything, he has asked us to take on more responsibility rather than less.

It is no news to this audience that Congressman JOHN FOGARTY has been such a booster for medical research and other help to the handicapped that is generally known in the House of Representatives as champion of better health for the Nation. He not only honors us with his presence here today, but we honor him for a long record of distinguished leadership in the legislative branch of the Government. If there was as much harmony in all branches as there is between the legislative and executive in the area of rehabilitation and health, I feel sure we would be a long way further down the road to our national destiny.

Winning the Albert Lasker Award in 1959 for his work in medical research and public health, Mr. FOGARTY typically donoted the $5,000 honorarium to the Rhode Island Parents Council for Mentally Retarded Children. He also donated an $8,000 Kennedy Foundation Leadership Award to public service. He is the only living American to my knowledge to have three health and educational facilities in his home State named after him while he is still living.

Our speaker's trademark is a fighting heart for the underprivileged, which he wears on his sleeve, and a sporting bow tie, usually green, which he wears on his neck. The first time I met our speaker, however, he was wearing dungarees. This was on Guam during World War II when he was on a special mission for the President. He was a temporary Seabee at the time, the only group of men that marines give precedence to.

I had the pleasure of introducing our speaker at a goodwill luncheon in 1958 and at the time emphasized his part in passage of Public Law 565. I also said:

"Formerly President of Bricklayers Union No. 1 of Providence our speaker lays bricks of logic and rhetoric in helping shape the destiny of a free people.

"For 18 years he has represented Rhode Island's Second Congressional District. Here in the Capital, a town more notable for brick throwing than bricklaying, he has laid aside the tools of his early occupation and today builds lasting monuments in support of and expansion of such major breakthroughs on the social front as Public Law 565.

"Our speaker is not only abreast of the times, but ahead of the times, and always eager to embrace new and imaginative programs for the betterment of his fellow countrymen."

It is a pleasure to present a 24-year Congressman, the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, and rehabilitation plantation.

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND, AT KICK-OFF LUNCHEON FOR THE NATIONAL EMPLOY THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED WEEK, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMISSIONERS' COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED, WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 5, 1965

I have been asked to talk about the handicapped worker and his place in the Great Society. You have asked the right person. If I have anything to say about it, and I have, the place of the handicapped worker is front row center. This should be the case in any society, but particularly in our society which means a sharing of our God-given abundance with those willing and eager to take their place and to play their part in the society we are building.

It has not always been so, and for too many handicapped people in our great country, it is not yet a fact of life, but the plans we have laid and the dreams we have dreamed on Capitol Hill—together with planners and dreamers of the administration and the body public—are speeding the day when all the well-motivated handicapped will take their rightful place front row center in the world of work.

Too long have too many toiled on the side aisles, too long have too many worked in the galleries of business and industry, too long have too many not even been able to get into the theater of our workaday world. In spite of what you and I know has been a most remarkable two decades of progress and of almost revolutionary breakthroughs in both attitudes and practices, we still have hundreds of thousands of persons with limitations of body or mind who can perform and produce as well or better than persons now working, but who have not yet gotten out of the standing room only area. Some of them do not even have standing room, they are seated on the sidelines in their chromium thrones.

After 25 years on Capitol Hill, I have become firmly convinced that there is nothing more important than work. God expects it. Man needs it. Society demands it. That is one reason I am so sold on vocational rehabilitation leading to employment. That is why so many of our so-called problems would be solved overnight, for when people are working, problems tend to vanish or grow smaller.

There is no brighter story on our Nation's role of honor today than the progress that has been made in the field of employment of the mentally retarded. Just a few years ago, the dedicated and persuasive Eunice Shriver who graces our table today delivered a fiery speech about what was not being done by Government to hire the retarded. She could not make that speech today, thanks to the leadership and vision of our late President who threw open the doors not only of Government, but of business and industry in one magnificent and dramatic appeal to the conscience of the Nation.

At his insistence, the Congress coupled his vision with its own imagination and today, the retarded are working at places nobody ever dreamed they would be able to enter. And you have not seen anything yet. If our beloved President John F. Kennedy is remembered for any one special act or program, I think that his work in behalf of the mentally retarded and mentally restored may well be one of the brightest areas on his battle shield.

You are familiar, generally, with what has been done in placing more than 700 retarded workers on the Federal rolls in a few short months. What you may not be aware of is the encouragement which the Federal program has given employers in the private sector. The demonstrated competence of hundreds of qualified workers who happen to have mental retardation is giving countless employers of good will the courage to go forth and hire the retarded themselves.

Many of you are familiar with the policy of the W. T. Grant Co. which has been honored for its enlightened policies of hiring qualified retardates, but do many of you know that the president of the Grant Co. has written his fellow retail merchandising executives urging them to investigate the relatively untapped manpower which the retarded can provide in jobs which have been plagued for many years with rapid turnover. This progress is the best kind, for it benefits both employer and employee. It is almost like the gentle mercy that drops from heaven, if a bricklayer can paraphrase Shakespeare, being twice blessed, blessing him that gives and him that takes.

I am honored to be here at this head table with people who are on the firing line. We in the Congress generally can only load and point the weapons to correct injustice. It takes people like my friends up here and my friends out in the audience to zero in on the target and knock out the opposition.

People like the General Services Administration which has hired the retarded in large numbers and which has rendered distinguished service in the elimination of architectural barriers. People like Mrs. W. Willard Wirtz who has given so generously of her time and talents to provide the spark of leadership needed to generate extra enthusiasm in jobs for the handicapped through useful work in workshops and at home. The arts and crafts project which she heads up may make a very real and lasting solution to the problems of the severely handicapped. And people like Eunice Shriver who somehow seems to have invented a day stretcher, for it does not seem possible that the good she does could be accomplished in one movement of the earth around the sun.

Thus, the fine work of these dedicated volunteers brings me to the subject closest to my legislative heart today, H.R. 8310, which passed the House of Representatives without a single dissenting vote after 2 hours of debate.

What they have done, will do, and are doing is fine, but it is not enough. For that reason, the Congress hopes to make 1965 a rehabilitation year, a year that will rank alongside of 1954 when Public Law 565 gave new hope to added hundreds of thousands. I would like to tell you about our bill and our hopes for it. I know that you do not vote on legislation, except indirectly through the force of public opinion, but let me give you the highlights so that you will know that the Congress is aware of the problem and is taking dramatic steps to help in its solution.

The Federal-State rehabilitation program has, through the years, proved to be a happy partnership. It has provided the physically and mentally handicapped—the neglected and bypassed—new hope for life and work. The present public program owes much of its strength to the muscular amendments of 1954 which pumped new vitality into the skeleton rehabilitation structure that had grown out of the problems presented by returning veterans of World War I. But just as 1920 legislation did not meet the needs of the early 1950's, just so the amendments of 1954 are not sufficient today to carry the full load of our complete national rehabilitation potential.

By mustering the energies blended together in the Federal-State relationship, we were able last year to count 135,000 rehabilitated men and women who successfully availed themselves of the services provided by their local agencies. Even though this was a record, the number should have been 300,000 if we merely hoped to keep abreast of the new disability cases which come into the picture each year. Because we cannot cope with the current number of new disabilities each year, our backlog is growing recklessly and disastrously. Because the Federal Government and the States have permitted this program to operate far below its potential, we face the backlog of about 3½ million persons in need of rehabilitation services.

This is why the U.S. House of Representatives has strengthened and expanded the force of the Federal-State rehabilitation programs. The changes are far reaching. Their effects will certainly influence the history of rehabilitation, and result in the return to productive and constructive lives of many persons who until now were denied the right to vocational opportunities.

We hope that in just a few short years the number of yearly rehabilitants will reach 300,000, to take care of the new persons needing rehabilitation each year, so that we then can turn our attention to reducing the tremendous backlog.

H.R. 8310 proposes to do this by changing a number of existing legislative provisions:

Financing of the basic Federal-State program would be changed to provide for a more liberal allotment of Federal funds to the States. At present the Federal share of funding the program under a variable matching formula ranges between 50 and 70 percent. Eventually this Federal share would climb to 75 percent for all States without varying.

Another important feature is that the States will be authorized to accept severely disabled persons, for whom the outlook for employment is obscure, and provide services to them for a period up to 6 months to test the feasibility of providing intensive rehabilitation training. Heretofore uncertainty of employment possibilities precluded many severely handicapped persons from undergoing services. The agencies has just so much money to wager, and they had to bet only on likely winners. Now they can be a bit more long sighted in choosing a winner.

In the case of mentally retarded persons, this special provision authorizes such exploratory services for as long as 18 months. This will provide the time to find the hidden talents which more often than not are brought out by patient probing and skillful counseling, so that the person with retardation can take his rightful place one day in the working community.

A program of grants to assist in meeting costs of construction of rehabilitation facilities and workshops is also authorized by H.R. 8310. In the past, only a very limited effort was authorized in this field—usually confined to alterations, expansion, and equipment—without any funds available for construction. Approved projects from public and nonprofit private rehabilitation organizations will be eligible for grants to cover 50 percent of new construction costs.

And when these newly constructed workshops are ready to be staffed, grants will be available to pay part of the costs of initial staffing. These grants can start off paying as much as 75 percent of the staffing costs for professional personnel, and will gradually reduce to 30 percent in the later months of the 51-month period authorized by the bill.

Grants would also be available to pay 90 percent of the cost of providing training services to handicapped persons in private, nonprofit workshops and rehabilitation facilities. Grants would also be authorized to pay part of the costs of projects to analyze, improve, and increase professional services and to provide for technical assistance in existing workshops.

In connection with these new programs for workshops and rehabilitation centers, an advisory group would be established to provide assistance in the administration of these facilities.

The nationwide campaign to eliminate architectural barriers would receive a tremendous boost through the establishment of a National Commission on Architectural Barriers, with members drawn from among the general public, and private and professional groups concerned with architectural problems which impede the rehabilitation of physically handicapped individuals.

In the training program administered by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration in which students pursue degree work in preparation for a career in rehabilitation, financial assistance for the student would be extended from a period of 2 to 4 years.

The amendments also provide for the establishment of a national data service in rehabilitation, using modern automated data systems to collect, store, analyze, retrieve and disseminate research information essential to rehabilitation programs and to the hundreds of voluntary organizations serving the disabled throughout the country.

Many other important features and technical amendments have been included to improve the operation of both the public rehabilitation program and the cooperating voluntary programs. They give ample encouragement to the many private agencies which are sharing in the burden of disability. The philosophy behind this piece of carefully considered legislation recognizes the worth of voluntarism as a vital force in our Nation's concerted battle against disability, and the legislators recognize that humanitarian problems are best solved by humans in a way that best benefits humanity.

This is why we have weeks like National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. And this is why volunteers count so much. More rehabilitated persons mean more jobs must be found to assure their acceptance in the world of work. Your mission is clear. One week of enthusiasm during the year is not sufficient to sustain the pace of victory. The need for opening up job opportunities for the handicapped applicant continues year round and demands your energies on a year-round basis. It is the only way we can assure his position in front row center.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Pepper (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. Foley, for Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, October 11, 12, 13, inclusively, on account of official business.

Mr. Hosmer, for 2 weeks, on account of official business.

Mr. Marsh (at the request of Mr. Smith of Virginia), indefinitely on account of a death in the family.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MICHEL (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON), for 15 minutes, on Tuesday, October 12, 1965; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY of New York, for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. QUIE (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HANSEN of Iowa) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. REUSS, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. FOGARTY, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PUCINSKI.

Mr. TODD.

Mr. QUIE.

Mr. PELLY on the subject of Leif Ericsson Day.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BRAY.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

Mr. HORTON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HANSEN of Iowa) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. CAMERON in three instances.

Mr. GARMATZ.

Mr. EVERETT.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. HELSTOSKI.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1805. An act to amend section 5899 of title 10, United States Code, to provide permanent authority under which Naval Reserve officers in the grade of captain shall be eligible for consideration for promotion when their running mates are eligible for consideration for promotion;

H.R. 5571. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of incentive pay for submarine duty to personnel qualified in submarines attached to staffs of submarine operational commanders;

H.R. 7059. An act to amend the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 724; 20 U.S.C. 79–79e), so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to the Smithsonian Intitution for use in carrying out its functions under said act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7169. An act to amend the Securities Act of 1933 with respect to certain registration fees;

H.R. 7484. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the rank of lieutenant general or vice admiral of officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force while serving as Surgeons General;

H.R. 9042. An act to provide for the implementation of the agreement concerning automotive products between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9247. An act to provide for participation of the United States in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition to be held at San Antonio, Tex., in 1968, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10238. An act to provide labor standards for certain persons employed by Federal contractors to furnish services to Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 12, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1666. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Commerce for "Salaries and expenses, Patent Office," for the fiscal year 1966, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1667. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the President to retire Lt. Gen. Robert Wesley Colglazier, Jr., in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1668. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on analysis of certain aspects of bidding by both sealed bids and oral auction bids on national forest timber in the northern region (region 1) and the California region (region 5), Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1669. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to approve a contract negotiated with the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1, Texas, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House on October 8, 1965, the following bills were filed on October 9, 1965:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 11428. A bill to amend the act of September 8, 1960, relating to the Washington Channel waterfront; with amendment (Rept. No. 1133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 11439. A bill to provide for an increase in the annuities payable from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund, to revise the method of determining the cost-of-living increases in such annuities, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 11487. A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 7526. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of San Antonio; without amendment (Rept. No. 1136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 11520. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 11521. A bill to amend title 37 of the United States Code with respect to dislocation allowances paid to members of the uniformed services under section 407 of that title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 11522. A bill to amend title VI of the Public Health Service Act (the Hill-Burton Act) so as to double the amount authorized for assisting the construction of nursing homes and other long-term care facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 11523. A bill to foster high standards of architectural excellence in the design and decoration of Federal public buildings outside the District of Columbia, and to provide a program for the acquisition and preservation of works of art for such buildings, and for other purposes, to be known as the Federal Fine Arts and Architectural Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 11524. A bill to aid in the development of a coordinated system of passenger transportation for the Northeastern Corridor; to create a Northeastern Corridor Transportation Commission; to authorize negotiation to create an interstate agency; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.J. Res. 687. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.J. Res. 688. Joint resolution to give effect to the Agreement for Facilitating the International Circulation of Visual and Auditory Materials of an Education, Scientific, and Cultural Character, approved at Beirut in 1948; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 603. Resolution to authorize travel by the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any subcommittee thereof, outside the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 11525. A bill for the relief of Filomena Quaranta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 11526. A bill for the relief of Maria Logoteta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11527. A bill for the relief of Rocco Manfre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 11528. A bill for the relief of Dr. Marshall Ku; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 11529. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hedwig Hauke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 11530. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Ekonomides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11531. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Stabile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII:

279. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., relative to tenure in the U.S. House of Representatives, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1965

(*Legislative day of Friday, October 1, 1965*)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Mr. Richard Langham Riedel, of the Senate staff, a deacon of the Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Thou Great Spirit of the universe, our Father and our God:

We thank Thee for Thy presence. We thank Thee for the Senate of the United States. We are especially grateful for the rapid recovery of the President of the United States. We ask Thy blessing upon the Chaplain, Dr. Harris, as daily he leads so many hearts and minds toward Thee. We seek Thy blessing and guidance for the Vice President and each Senator, in all their thoughts and actions throughout this day and always.

In the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, October 9, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On October 7, 1965:

S. 1620. An act to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable provisions with respect thereto; and

S. 1766. An act to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply, water systems, and waste disposal systems serving rural areas and to make grants to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with the construction of such community facilities, to increase the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder, and for other purposes.

On October 10, 1965:

S. 1065. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire through exchange the Great Falls property in the State of Virginia for administration in connection with the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2084) to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 32) to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury to persons, and for use of and damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after August 15, 1945, and before April 28, 1952, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 6852. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 47 million pounds of abaca from the national stockpile; and

H.R. 7743. An act to establish a system of loan insurance and a supplementary system of direct loans, to assist students to attend post-secondary business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools.

The message also announced that on October 8, 1965, the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9042) to provide for the implementation of the Agreement Concerning Automotive Products Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 318) to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 318) to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar beginning with new reports, and not including nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles A. Webb, of Virginia, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1972.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Whitney Gillilland, of Iowa, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for a term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1971.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

COAST GUARD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, sundry nominations in the Coast Guard are on the desk. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to their consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that for the 13 minutes preceding 1 o'clock I may have the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in conjunction with the majority leader's request, I ask that the last 15 minutes preceding the allotment requested by him be allotted to the minority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. These will not be considered second speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements during the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there morning business?

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the following Senators as members of the Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization, to be held in Rome, November 20, 1965: GEORGE S. MCGOVERN, GAYLORD NELSON, and JACK MILLER.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Commerce for "Salaries and expenses, Patent Office," for the fiscal year 1966, had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

RETIREMENT OF LT. GEN. ROBERT WESLEY COLGLAZIER, JR.

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the President to retire Lt. Gen. Robert Wesley Colglazier, Jr., in the grade of lieutenant general (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

APPROVAL OF CONTRACT WITH EL PASO COUNTY WATER IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 1, TEXAS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to approve a contract negotiated with the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1, Texas, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

INCREASING THE FEDERAL MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico with respect to bills proposing to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act; and I ask that the resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Resolution to express the feeling of the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico with respect to the bills amendatory of the Fair Labor Standards Act now under consideration by Congress and as to the continuance of the system of industrial committees without automatic wage increases, and to declare that the present jurisdiction of the law should remain unaltered

Be it resolved by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico:

First, to express, on behalf and in representation of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, to the Congress and the President of the United States its solidarity with the purpose of increasing the Federal minimum wage contemplated in the bills amendatory of the Fair Labor Standards Act at present under consideration by Congress, at the same time that it declares its conviction that if approved, the main amendments to said act, concerning Puerto Rico, will adversely affect the development of Puerto Rico's economy and the living conditions of our laborers.

Second, to express the solidarity of the legislative assembly with the standpoint assumed by the executive branch of the Government of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in support of the continuance of the flexible system of fixing wages through the industrial committees and soliciting that Puerto Rico be exempted from any provision contained in the said bills providing for automatic increases in the minimum wage.

Third, to declare that the present coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act should remain unaltered.

Fourth, that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Labor, to the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the U.S. Senate, to the members of the Committee on Education and Labor of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to the Resident Commissioner for Puerto Rico in Washington.

I, Carlos Roman Benitez, secretary of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, do hereby certify that the S. Subs. to House Concurrent Resolution 9, entitled: "Concurrent resolution to express the feeling of the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico with respect to the bills amendatory of the Fair Labor Standards Act now under consideration by Congress and as to the continuance of the system of industrial committees without automatic wage increases, and to declare that the present jurisdiction of the law should remain unaltered" has been approved by the Senate of Puerto Rico and the House of Representatives and signed by the speaker and the president of the respective houses on September 23, 1965, as appears from the printed copy attached herewith.

CARLOS ROMAN BENITEZ,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment:

H.R. 10779. An act to authorize the Pharr Municipal Bridge Corporation to construct, maintain and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Pharr, Tex. (Rept. No. 859).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

H.R. 23. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate with the several States a cooperative program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 860).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 168. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 861).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. HARTKE):

S. 2619. A bill to establish a system for the sharing of certain Federal tax receipts with the States; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PELL:

S. 2620. A bill to aid in the development of a coordinated system of passenger transportation for the Northeastern Corridor; to create a Northeastern Corridor Transportation Commission; to authorize negotiation to create an interstate agency; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. PELL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2621. A bill for the relief of Ioannis A. Vasilopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2622. A bill to authorize project grants for construction and modernization of hospitals and other medical facilities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 2623. A bill to amend chapter 33, subtitle II—"Other Commercial Transactions"—of title 28, District of Columbia Code, with respect to charging or deducting in advance interest on loans to be repaid in installments; and

S. 2624. A bill to authorize grants for planning and carrying out a project of construction for the expansion and improvement of the facilities of Eastern Dispensary and Casualty Hospital in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 2625. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alfredo Esparza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NORTHEAST CORRIDOR TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to establish a Northeast Corridor Transportation Commission.

This bill is designed to fill the need for interim developmental planning in the complicated matter of intercity transportation in the crowded megalopolis of our Northeast States. It follows logically, and will supplement, the high-speed ground transportation act of 1965 which was signed into law by President Johnson on September 30, providing $90 million for research and demonstrations in ground transportation. The bill I introduce today suggests a way for insuring that the findings of the Government research program will be put into action.

Specifically, the bill provides for a framework for interstate cooperation in the form of a commission whose members would represent each of the eight northeast seaboard States, plus the Federal Government and the District of Columbia. The Commission is empowered to formulate a development program which shall include such features as the routing of future facilities, the location of terminals and other facilities, the method of financing such developments, and finally, the organizational plan under which new facilities may be constructed and operated.

It is this last feature—the matter of organizational structure—which is perhaps the most basic element of this bill. The Commission is directed to consider such alternatives as a Federal corporation, an organization established by interstate compact, or continuation and modification of the Commission itself, presumably with added provisions for financial support. To my mind it is very important that the Federal, State, and local governments involved start thinking now about this very important question of how best to operate our future transportation systems with maximum participation by the private sector of the economy.

It is my hope and my belief, for example, that the public-authority concept which I first advanced in 1962 and which is incorporated by Senate Joint Resolution 16 which I introduced in the present Congress, will prove to be the appropriate structure for long-range development of interstate transportation facilities. But the negotiation of such a public authority, involving eight States and dozens of other municipal and county jurisdictions, undoubtedly will require protracted and complex discussions before the agency could evolve. This bill would provide a framework for such discussions and thus begin, none too soon, the protracted job of translating plans into action.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to make special mention of the important role which Congressman CARLTON SICKLES, of Maryland, has played in preparing this legislation, a companion version of which he is introducing in the House today. Congressman SICKLES, in connection with his work with the Commission to create a transportation compact incorporating Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia, has experienced, at first, the complex difficulties of multilateral negotiations and has played a primary role in preparing the legislation we introduce today. I am happy to be associated with him particularly now that the Governors of the States involved are holding preliminary discussions on this very problem in Trenton, N.J., October 15.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2620) to aid in the development of a coordinated system of passenger transportation for the northeast corridor; to create a Northeastern Corridor Transportation Commission; to authorize negotiation to create an interstate agency; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PELL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] may be added as a cosponsor to S. 2579 to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, at its next printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill S. 2460 the name of the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] be added as a cosponsor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the next printing of a bill which I introduced, S. 2180, a bill to improve the safety of rail transportation, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] be added as a cosponsor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], I ask unanimous consent that the names of three Senators be added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 51, to express the sense of Congress that the United Nations provide for the self-determination of the Baltic States—the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of October 1, 1965, the names of Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. MUNDT were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2596) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the percentage depletion allowance for gold and silver produced in the United States, introduced by Mr. BIBLE (for himself and other Senators) on October 1, 1965.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON AMENDMENTS TO THE EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I announce as chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, that the subcommittee will hold hearings on amendments to the Employment Act of 1946. The bill was introduced by me on March 25, cosponsored by Senators MONTOYA, MORSE, NELSON, RANDOLPH, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and YARBOROUGH.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement setting forth the details with respect to these hearings, which will take place on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, October 18, 19, and 20, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, announced today that the subcommittee will hold hearings on amendments to the Employment Act of 1946. The bill, S. 1630, which was introduced by Senator CLARK on March 25 this year is also sponsored by Senators MONTOYA, MORSE, NELSON, RANDOLPH, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and YARBOROUGH.

"Hearings have been scheduled," Senator CLARK said, "for Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, October 18, 19, and 20, at which time the subcommittee will hear testimony from a number of distinguished economists, including former members of the Council of Economic Advisers, as well as representatives of labor and industry. Additional hearings may be scheduled at a later time.

"The bill would require the President, as part of his Economic Report, to submit to Congress each year a full employment and production budget which would anticipate for the approaching fiscal year and the next 5 years, the projected performance of the national economy and the degree to which this performance will exceed or fall short of conditions necessary to assure full employment and production with stable prices. Under the bill, the President would also be required to submit a Federal budget and a tax monetary program designed to minimize any full employment surplus or deficit which might be anticipated.

"Thus, these amendments would enable the President to provide Congress and the Nation with rough targets in employment and the investment needed to fully utilize our manpower and production resources so that the levels of unemployment could be reduced below 3 percent within the near future."

Senator CLARK noted that "in spite of the fact that this country has experienced more than 56 consecutive months of the greatest prosperity in its history, we are still plagued with joblessness at a rate of 4½ percent of the Nation's work force.

"Many of the unmet needs which have plagued our Nation and held us back from meeting our full economic potential will be met by the programs enacted by the 89th Congress in the fields of regional economic development, education, and poverty. Nevertheless, allocations of Federal expenditures in the public sector of our economy have never been governed by considerations of how such expenditures might effect our annual employment levels."

Senator CLARK invited comments from all interested persons and stated that his subcommittee would be happy to hear testimony or receive statements from interested Members of Congress.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the following nominations:

Franklin H. Williams, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Ghana; Herman F. Eilts, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia; William M. Rountree, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of South Africa; and William H. Weathersby, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Sudan.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 11, 1965, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 32. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 106. Joint resolution to allow the showing in the United States of the U.S. Information Agency film "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums."

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Comment on report of the first national conference on the problems of rural youth in a changing environment, edited by Mrs. Ruth Cowan Nash, of West Virginia.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL-STATE TAX-SHARING PLAN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to establish a tax-sharing formula to distribute to the States and through them to local governments a portion of Federal tax revenues.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for additional sponsors until close of business Monday next, October 18, 1965, unless the Senate adjourns sine die before that time, and that it lie on the desk until the Senate does adjourn if sooner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 2619) to establish a system for the sharing of certain Federal tax receipts with the States, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. HARTKE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the bill now implements what has become rather popularly known as the Heller plan developed in June 1964, by Dr. Walter Heller, then Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

I introduce this bill on behalf of myself and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE]. A parallel measure is being introduced today in the House by Congressman REID of New York and other Members.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some tables and a study showing what the States would receive under my bill.

There being no objection, the tables and study were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State-local government revenues, existing Federal outlays to the States and localities and additional Federal allotments under the Javits revenue-sharing proposal

State	Total general revenues 1963-64	Revenues from Federal Government		Federal revenue sharing allotment		
		Amount	As percent of total general revenues (col. 1)	Amount	As percent of total general revenues (col. 1)	Percent increase of revenues from Federal Government (col. 2)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Millions	*Millions*	*Percent*	*Millions*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Alabama	$904	$214	23.7	$84.3	9.3	39.9
Alaska	180	91	50.6	2.6	1.4	28.6
Arizona	592	95	16.0	19.0	3.2	20.0
Arkansas	502	138	27.5	47.4	9.4	34.3
California	8,929	1,257	14.1	213.6	2.4	17.0
Colorado	802	136	17.0	21.8	2.7	16.0
Connecticut	1,018	134	13.2	23.1	2.3	17.2
Delaware	199	26	13.1	4.4	2.2	16.9
Florida	1,870	251	13.4	62.6	3.3	24.9
Georgia	1,189	234	19.7	105.8	8.9	45.2
Hawaii	314	64	20.4	8.5	2.7	13.3
Idaho	239	45	18.8	18.1	7.6	40.2
Illinois	3,576	437	12.2	88.8	2.5	20.3
Indiana	1,597	170	10.6	47.4	3.0	27.9
Iowa	1,003	134	13.4	30.2	3.0	22.5
Kansas	821	114	13.9	25.4	3.1	22.3
Kentucky	861	205	23.8	76.5	8.9	37.3
Louisiana	1,252	278	22.2	96.0	7.7	34.5
Maine	300	52	17.3	10.0	3.3	19.2
Maryland	1,136	129	11.4	30.5	2.7	23.6
Massachusetts	1,959	244	12.5	49.7	2.5	20.4
Michigan	3,125	404	12.9	86.3	2.8	21.4
Minnesota	1,426	195	13.7	42.7	3.0	21.9
Mississippi	589	128	21.7	61.1	10.4	47.7
Missouri	1,355	244	18.0	36.4	2.7	14.9
Montana	302	74	24.5	8.4	2.8	11.4
Nebraska	$488	$80	16.4	$14.4	2.9	18.0
Nevada	218	52	23.9	4.4	2.0	8.5
New Hampshire	197	36	18.3	5.9	3.0	16.4
New Jersey	2,179	187	8.6	57.3	2.6	30.6
New Mexico	429	103	24.0	28.4	6.6	27.6
New York	8,096	650	8.0	202.2	2.5	31.1
North Carolina	1,233	188	15.2	119.0	9.7	63.3
North Dakota	273	55	20.1	8.7	3.2	15.8
Ohio	3,182	440	13.8	88.7	6.4	20.2
Oklahoma	870	213	24.5	26.8	3.1	12.6
Oregon	800	172	21.5	20.7	2.6	12.0
Pennsylvania	3,526	439	12.5	101.8	2.9	23.2
Rhode Island	289	49	17.0	8.2	2.8	16.7
South Carolina	568	93	16.4	62.4	11.0	67.1
South Dakota	267	61	22.8	19.0	7.1	31.1
Tennessee	1,011	216	21.4	92.8	9.2	43.0
Texas	3,144	505	16.1	103.2	3.3	20.4
Utah	380	95	25.0	11.0	2.9	11.6
Vermont	150	36	24.0	4.5	3.0	12.5
Virginia	1,176	207	17.6	38.4	3.3	18.6
Washington	1,285	204	15.9	34.3	2.7	16.8
West Virginia	509	98	19.3	44.3	8.7	45.2
Wisconsin	1,591	168	10.6	48.9	3.1	29.1
Wyoming	191	64	33.5	4.2	2.2	6.6
District of Columbia	355	100	28.2	6.3	1.8	6.3

State allotments under the Javits revenue-sharing proposal (assuming total distribution of $2,500,000,000, with 80 percent going to all States and 20 percent going to 13 low-income States)[1]

State	State and local revenue from own sources (1963–64) (1)	Personal income (1963) (2)	Revenue effort ratio (col. 1÷col. 2) (3)	Relative State effort ratio (col. 3÷13.0) (4)	State percentage of total population (1964 estimated) (5)	Unadjusted State allotment (col. 5×$2 billion) (6)	Adjusted State allotment (col. 4×col. 6) (7)	State percentage of 13-State population, total (8)	Extra allotment (col. 8×$.5 billion) (9)	Total allotment (10)
	Millions	*Millions*				*Millions*	*Millions*		*Millions*	*Millions*
Alabama	$690	$5,538	12.5	96	1.8	$35.6	$34.2	10.0	$50.1	$84.3
Alaska	89	704	12.6	98	.1	2.6	2.6			2.6
Arizona	497	3,340	14.9	115	.8	16.5	19.0			19.0
Arkansas	364	2,986	12.2	94	1.0	20.2	19.0	5.7	28.4	47.4
California	7,672	52,317	14.7	113	9.5	189.0	213.6			213.6
Colorado	665	4,831	13.8	106	1.0	20.5	21.8			21.8
Connecticut	889	8,490	10.4	80	1.4	28.9	23.1			23.1
Delaware	174	1,570	11.1	85	.3	5.1	4.4			4.4
Florida	1,619	11,933	13.6	105	3.0	59.6	62.6			62.6
Georgia	954	7,715	12.4	95	2.2	44.9	42.6	12.6	63.1	105.8
Hawaii	250	1,667	15.0	116	.4	7.3	8.5			8.5
Idaho	194	1,366	14.2	110	.4	7.2	8.0	2.0	10.1	18.1
Illinois	3,138	30,020	10.5	81	5.5	109.6	88.8			88.8
Indiana	1,427	11,648	12.3	94	2.5	50.4	47.4			47.4
Iowa	869	6,399	13.6	105	1.4	28.8	30.2			30.2
Kansas	707	5,017	14.1	109	1.2	23.2	25.4			25.4
Kentucky	656	5,545	11.8	91	1.7	33.0	30.0	9.3	46.5	76.5
Louisiana	974	6,072	16.0	124	1.8	36.3	45.0	10.2	51.0	96.0
Maine	248	1,971	12.6	97	.5	10.3	10.0			10.0
Maryland	1,007	9,163	11.0	85	1.8	35.9	30.5			30.5
Massachusetts	1,715	14,889	11.5	89	2.8	55.8	49.7			49.7
Michigan	2,721	20,624	13.2	102	4.2	84.6	86.3			86.3
Minnesota	1,231	8,152	15.1	116	1.8	36.8	42.7			42.7
Mississippi	461	3,183	14.5	112	1.2	24.2	27.1	6.8	34.0	61.1
Missouri	1,111	10,900	10.2	79	2.3	46.1	36.4			36.4
Montana	229	1,553	14.7	114	.4	7.4	8.4			8.4
Nebraska	408	3,376	12.1	93	.8	15.5	14.4			14.4
Nevada	166	1,246	13.3	103	.2	4.3	4.4			4.4
New Hampshire	161	1,450	11.1	86	.3	6.8	5.9			5.9
New Jersey	1,993	18,861	10.6	82	3.5	69.8	57.3			57.3
New Mexico	327	1,953	16.7	129	.5	10.5	13.6	3.0	14.8	28.4
New York	7,445	53,361	14.0	108	9.4	187.3	202.2			202.2
North Carolina	1,046	8,601	12.2	94	2.5	50.7	47.7	14.3	71.4	119.0
North Dakota	218	1,300	16.8	129	.3	6.7	8.7			8.7
Ohio	2,742	25,164	10.9	84	5.3	105.6	88.7			88.7
Oklahoma	656	4,858	13.5	104	1.3	25.7	26.8			26.8
Oregon	628	4,568	13.7	106	1.0	19.5	20.7			20.7
Pennsylvania	3,082	28,017	11.0	85	6.0	119.8	101.8			101.8
Rhode Island	240	2 153	11.1	86	.5	9.6	8.2			8.2
South Carolina	475	3,944	12.0	93	1.3	26.7	24.8	7.5	37.6	62.4
South Dakota	206	1,390	14.8	114	.4	7.5	8.5	2.1	10.5	19.0
Tennessee	795	6,588	12.1	93	2.0	39.7	36.9	11.2	55.9	92.8
Texas	2,640	21,351	12.4	95	5.4	108.7	103.2			103.2
Utah	286	2,083	13.7	106	.5	10.4	11.0			11.0
Vermont	114	827	13.8	106	.2	4.3	4.5			4.5
Virginia	968	8,907	10.9	84	2.3	45.8	38.4			38.4
Washington	1,081	7,575	14.3	110	1.6	31.2	34.3			34.3
West Virginia	411	3,348	12.3	95	.9	18.8	17.8	5.3	26.4	44.3
Wisconsin	1,424	9,617	14.8	114	2.1	42.9	48.9			48.9
Wyoming	127	834	15.2	117	.2	3.8	4.2			4.2
District of Columbia	256	2,645	9.7	75	.4	8.4	6.3			6.3
Total			[2] 13.0							2,456.4

[1] Details may not agree because of rounding.

[2] Average.

TABLE B–64.—*State and local government revenues and expenditures, selected fiscal years, 1927–63*

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year [1]	Revenues by source [2]							Expenditures by function [2]				
	Total	Property taxes	Sales and gross receipts taxes	Individual income taxes	Corporation net income taxes	Revenue from Federal Government	All other revenue [3]	Total	Education	Highways	Public welfare	All other [4]
1927	7,271	4,730	470	70	92	116	1,793	7,210	2,235	1,809	151	3,015
1932	7,267	4,487	752	74	79	232	1,643	7,765	2,311	1,741	444	3,269
1934	7,678	4,076	1,008	80	49	1,016	1,449	7,181	1,831	1,509	889	2,952
1936	8,395	4,093	1,484	153	113	948	1,604	7,644	2,177	1,425	827	3,215
1938	9,228	4,440	1,794	218	165	800	1,811	8,757	2,491	1,650	1,069	3,547
1940	9,609	4,430	1.982	224	156	954	1,872	9,229	2,638	1,573	1,156	3,862
1942	10,418	4,537	2,351	276	272	858	2,123	9,190	2,586	1,490	1,225	3,889
1944	10,908	4,604	2,289	342	451	954	2,269	8,863	2,793	1,200	1,133	3,737
1946	12,356	4,986	2,986	422	447	855	2,661	11,028	3,356	1,672	1,409	4,591
1948	17,250	6,126	4,442	543	592	1,861	3,685	17,684	5,379	3,036	2,099	7,170
1950	20,911	7,349	5,154	788	593	2,486	4,541	22,787	7,177	3,803	2,940	8,867
1952	25,181	8,652	6,357	998	846	2,566	5,763	26,098	8,318	4,650	2,788	10,342
1953	27,307	9,375	6,927	1,065	817	2,870	6,252	27,910	9,390	4,987	2,914	10,619
1954	29,012	9,967	7,276	1,127	778	2,966	6,897	30,701	10,557	5,527	3,060	11,557
1955	31,073	10,735	7,643	1,237	744	3,131	7,584	33,724	11,907	6,452	3,168	12,197
1956	34,667	11,749	8,691	1,538	890	3.335	8,465	36,711	13,220	6,953	3,139	13,399
1957	38,164	12,864	9,467	1,754	984	3,843	9,252	40,375	14,134	7,816	3,485	14,940
1958	41,219	14,047	9,829	1,759	1,018	4,865	9,699	44,851	15,919	8,567	3,818	16,547
1959	45,306	14,983	10,437	1,994	1,001	6,377	10,516	48,887	17,283	9,592	4,136	17,876
1960	50,505	16,405	11,849	2,463	1,180	6,974	11,634	51,876	18,719	9,428	4,404	19,324
1961	54,037	18,002	12,463	2,613	1,266	7,131	12,563	56,201	20,574	9,844	4,720	21,063
1962	58,252	19,054	13,494	3,037	1,308	7,871	13,489	60,206	22,216	10,357	5,084	22,549
1963	62,890	20,089	14,456	3,269	1,505	8,722	14,850	64,816	24,012	11,136	5,481	24,187

[1] Fiscal years not the same for all governments.

[2] Excludes revenues or expenditures of publicly owned utilities and liquor stores, and of insurance-trust activities. Intergovernmental receipts and payments between State and local governments are also excluded.

[3] Includes licenses and other taxes and charges and miscellaneous revenues.

[4] Includes expenditures for health, hospitals, police, local fire protection, natural resources, sanitation, housing and community redevelopment, local parks and recreation, general control, financial administration, interest on general debt, and other and unallocable expenditures.

NOTE.—Data are not available for intervening years.

Data for Alaska and Hawaii included beginning 1959 and 1960, respectively.

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

101. *State and local total expenditures, revenue, and debt, selected fiscal years 1902–63*

[In millions]

Year	Expenditures				Revenue				Gross debt [4]		
	Total, direct [1]	State		Local direct	Total, State and local [3]	From own sources		From Federal Government	Total	State	Local
		Total [2]	Direct			State	Local				
1902	$1,095	$188	$136	$959	$1,048	$183	$858	$7	$2,107	$230	$1,877
1913	2,257	388	297	1,960	2,030	360	1,658	12	4,414	379	4,035
1922	5,652	1,397	1,085	4,567	5,169	1,234	3,827	108	10,109	1,131	8,978
1927	7,810	2,047	1,451	6,359	7,838	1,994	5,728	116	14,881	1,971	12,910
1932	8,403	2,829	2,028	6,375	7,887	2,274	5,381	232	19,205	2,832	16,373
1934	7,842	3,461	2,143	5,699	8,430	2,452	4,962	1,016	18,929	3,248	15,681
1936	8,501	3,862	2,445	6,056	9,360	3,265	5,147	948	19,474	3,413	16,061
1938	9,988	4,598	3,082	6,906	11,058	4,612	5,646	800	19,436	3,343	16,093
1940	11,240	5,209	3,555	7,685	11,749	5,012	5,792	945	20,283	3,590	16,693
1942	10,914	5,343	3,563	7,351	13,148	6,012	6,278	858	19,706	3,257	16,449
1944	10,499	5,161	3,319	7,180	14,333	6,714	6,665	954	17,479	2,776	14,703
1946	14,067	7,066	4,974	9,093	15,983	7,712	7,416	855	15,917	2,353	13,564
1948	21,260	11,181	7,897	13,363	21,613	10,086	9,666	1,861	18,656	3,676	14,980
1950	27,905	15,082	10,864	17,041	25,639	11,480	11,673	2,486	24,115	5,285	18,830
1952	30,863	15,834	10,790	20,073	31,013	14,330	14,117	2,566	30,100	6,874	23,226
1954	36,607	18,686	13,008	23,599	35,386	15,951	16,468	2,966	38,931	9,600	29,331
1956	43,152	21,686	15,148	28,004	41,692	18,903	19,453	3,335	48,868	12,890	35,978
1957	47,553	24,235	16,796	30,757	45,929	20,728	21,357	3,843	53,039	13,738	39,301
1958	53,712	28,080	19,991	33,721	49,262	21,427	22,970	4,865	58,187	15,394	42,793
1959	58,572	31,125	22,436	36,136	53,972	22,912	24,684	6,377	64,110	16,930	47,180
1960	60,999	31,596	22,152	38,847	60,277	26,094	27,209	6,974	69,955	18,543	51,412
1961	67,023	34,693	24,578	42,445	64,531	27,821	29,579	7,131	75,023	19,993	55,030
1962	70,547	36,402	25,495	45,053	69,492	30,115	31,506	7,871	80,802	22,023	58,779
1963	75,760	39,583	27,698	48,062	75,317	32,750	33,846	8,722	87,451	23,176	64,276

[1] Direct expenditures are amounts as finally disbursed by units of government for their own functions regardless of source of receipts. Include expenditures for utility, liquor stores, and insurance trust; exclude payments for debt retirement.

[2] State payments to localities are included in State total expenditures and in local direct expenditures. They are excluded from State direct expenditures.

[3] Excludes duplicating interlevel transfers of funds.

[4] Short- and long-term debt outstanding at end of fiscal year. See table 48 for data on net debt.

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

104. *Per capita State and local direct expenditures, by function and State, fiscal year 1963*

State	Total	Education	Highways	Public welfare	Health and hospitals	Police and fire	General control	Insurance trust	Other
Total	$408	$129	$60	$29	$25	$19	$13	$27	$105
Alabama	297	88	51	35	17	10	9	10	78
Alaska	760	215	215	25	33	21	29	29	194
Arizona	446	165	66	23	15	17	15	21	125
Arkansas	273	90	58	33	18	8	9	10	47
California	579	184	57	45	30	28	19	56	159
Colorado	466	179	57	52	27	18	18	23	91
Connecticut	412	132	70	28	22	23	14	26	97
Delaware	435	165	84	21	21	15	15	17	96
Florida	375	109	59	20	31	19	16	12	109
Georgia	314	100	56	26	29	11	11	10	70
Hawaii	505	147	40	19	35	22	23	25	195
Idaho	379	126	83	24	20	17	13	19	77
Illinois	387	126	50	35	24	22	12	27	92
Indiana	343	145	51	14	21	15	11	15	70
Iowa	378	140	78	28	23	12	12	8	77
Kansas	384	148	72	26	23	12	14	10	80
Kentucky	331	103	86	27	18	10	9	12	66
Louisiana	392	115	71	56	19	14	10	16	91
Maine	354	110	75	30	15	14	11	17	81
Maryland	384	132	56	17	29	22	12	23	92
Massachusetts	435	105	53	43	34	28	15	40	116
Michigan	429	151	57	24	32	18	12	23	113
Minnesota	437	151	66	36	28	14	13	21	108
Mississippi	276	88	58	26	23	8	8	7	58
Missouri	329	112	56	35	24	18	11	13	61
Montana	453	155	113	23	16	13	17	24	92
Nebraska	429	126	86	17	18	11	11	10	151
Nevada	614	174	114	20	46	31	29	43	157
New Hampshire	397	111	88	24	21	16	11	16	109
New Jersey	367	113	43	17	23	26	15	39	91
New Mexico	408	172	74	30	17	12	15	15	73
New York	528	140	58	33	43	31	18	48	157
North Carolina	268	103	39	19	18	10	9	10	60
North Dakota	417	152	93	27	13	8	13	14	98
Ohio	370	109	59	26	19	15	11	38	92
Oklahoma	382	121	67	62	19	11	11	11	80
Oregon	492	175	81	27	22	17	19	34	117
Pennsylvania	373	113	51	26	19	15	12	34	101
Rhode Island	370	103	52	31	21	23	15	40	87
South Carolina	246	90	38	15	20	9	7	9	58
South Dakota	362	141	98	24	11	10	14	6	58
Tennessee	345	87	64	18	22	12	8	13	121
Texas	323	112	59	23	16	14	10	11	78
Utah	439	184	76	24	16	14	14	17	96
Vermont	444	134	114	34	18	10	16	18	101
Virginia	315	108	68	11	17	12	9	6	85
Washington	559	175	74	36	19	18	14	38	184
West Virginia	296	97	51	37	17	8	9	23	54
Wisconsin	431	148	73	27	26	21	14	20	102
Wyoming	599	184	175	21	36	15	18	33	117
District of Columbia	497	85	75	34	62	43	16	32	150

Source: Computed by Tax Foundation from data in table 105, based on population at the beginning of the fiscal year.

107. State and local revenue, by source, selected fiscal years 1902–63

[In millions, except per capita]

Year	Total [1]	From own sources							From Federal Government	Per capita [5]	
		Total own sources	General revenue			Liquor stores [3]	Utility	Insurance trust [4]		Total	Taxes
			Total general	Taxes [2]	Charges and miscellaneous						
1902	$1,048	$1,041	$979	$860	$119	$2	$60	----------	$7	$13.37	$10.97
1913	2,030	2,018	1,900	1,609	291	----------	116	$2	12	21.08	16.71
1922	5,169	5,061	4,673	4,016	657	----------	266	122	108	47.29	36.74
1927	7,838	7,722	7,155	6,087	1,068	----------	403	164	116	66.30	51.49
1932	7,887	7,655	7,035	6,164	871	----------	463	157	232	63.38	49.53
1934	8,430	7,414	6,662	5,912	750	91	499	162	1,016	66.92	46.93
1936	9,360	8,412	7,447	6,701	746	189	558	218	948	73.32	52.49
1938	11,058	10,258	8,428	7,605	823	272	605	953	800	85.51	58.81
1940	11,749	10,804	8,664	7,810	854	294	704	1,142	945	89.40	59.43
1942	13,148	12,290	9,560	8,528	1,031	390	887	1,454	858	98.30	63.76
1944	14,333	13,379	9,954	8,774	1,180	567	1,066	1,792	954	107.06	65.54
1946	15,983	15,128	11,501	10,094	1,407	864	1,169	1,593	855	116.47	73.56
1948	21,613	19,752	15,389	13,342	2,047	946	1,565	1,851	1,861	149.14	92.07
1950	25,639	23,153	18,425	15,914	2,511	904	1,808	2,016	2,486	170.11	105.59
1952	31,013	28,447	22,615	19,323	3,292	1,037	2,071	2,724	2,566	199.75	124.46
1954	35,386	32,420	26,046	22,067	3,979	1,093	2,403	2,877	2,966	220.48	137.50
1956	41,692	38,357	31,332	26,368	4,964	1,136	2,718	3,171	3,335	250.06	158.15
1957	45,929	42,085	34,320	28,817	5,503	1,183	2,944	3,638	3,843	270.46	169.69
1958	49,262	44,397	36,354	30,380	5,974	1,170	3,041	3,832	4,865	285.07	175.80
1959	53,972	47,596	38,929	32,379	6,550	1,216	3,320	4,131	6,377	307.05	184.21
1960	60,277	53,302	43,530	36,117	7,414	1,264	3,613	4,896	6,974	337.25	202.08
1961	64,531	57,400	46,907	38,861	8,045	1,260	3,856	5,378	7,131	355.21	213.91
1962	69,492	61,621	50,381	41,554	8,827	1,282	4,026	5,932	7,871	376.45	225.11
1963	75,317	66,596	54,169	44,281	9,888	1,316	4,474	6,637	8,722	401.86	236.26

[1] Excludes duplicating interlevel transfers of funds.

[2] Excludes unemployment compensation tax collections included in insurance trust revenue.

[3] Principally receipts from sales in States with alcoholic beverage monopoly systems. Excludes alcoholic beverage taxes.

[4] Collections from employers and employees for financing unemployment compensation, accident and sickness, workmen's compensation, retirement, and like social insurance programs.

[5] Based on estimated population, excluding Armed Forces overseas, at the middle of the fiscal year.

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Per capita computations by Tax Foundation.

117. State expenditures, revenue, and debt, selected fiscal year, 1902–63

[In millions]

Year	Expenditures			Revenue			Gross debt
	Total	Direct	Payments to local governments [1]	Total	From own sources	Intergovernmental [2]	
1902	$188	$136	$52	$192	$183	$9	$230
1913	388	297	91	376	360	16	379
1922	1,397	1,085	312	1,360	1,234	126	1,131
1927	2,047	1,451	596	2,152	1,994	158	1,971
1932	2,829	2,028	801	2,541	2,274	267	2,832
1934	3,461	2,143	1,318	3,421	2,452	969	3,248
1936	3,862	2,445	1,417	4,023	3,265	758	3,413
1938	4,598	3,082	1,516	5,293	4,612	681	3,343
1940	5,209	3,555	1,654	5,737	5,012	725	3,590
1942	5,343	3,563	1,780	6,870	6,012	858	3,257
1944	5,161	3,319	1,842	7,695	6,714	981	2,776
1946	7,066	4,974	2,092	8,576	7,712	865	2,353
1948	$11,181	$7,897	$3,283	$11,826	$10,086	$1,740	$3,676
1950	15,082	10,864	4,217	13,903	11,480	2,423	5,285
1952	15,834	10,790	5,044	16,815	14,330	2,485	6,874
1954	18,686	13,008	5,679	18,834	15,951	2,883	9,600
1956	21,686	15,148	6,538	22,199	18,903	3,296	12,890
1957	24,235	16,796	7,440	24,656	20,728	3,928	13,738
1958	28,080	19,991	8,089	26,191	21,427	4,764	15,394
1959	31,125	22,436	8,689	29,164	22,912	6,252	16,930
1960	31,596	22,152	9,443	32,838	26,093	6,745	18,543
1961	34,693	24,578	10,114	34,603	27,821	6,782	19,993
1962	36,402	25,495	10,906	37,597	30,117	7,480	22,023
1963	39,583	27,698	11,885	40,993	32,750	8,243	23,176

[1] Principally shared taxes and fiscal aids.

[2] Principally grants-in-aid from the Federal Government. Includes minor amounts from localities for shares of programs administered by the State, payments for services performed by the States, and repayment of advances.

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

118. State direct expenditures for own functions, selected fiscal years 1902–63

[In millions]

Year	Total	General expenditures								Insurance trust	Liquor stores
		Total general	Education	Highways	Public welfare [1]	Health and hospitals	Natural resources	General control	Other [2]		
1902	$136	$134	$17	$74	$10	$32	$9	$23	$39	----------	$2
1913	297	297	55	26	16	53	14	38	95	----------	----------
1922	1,085	1,031	164	303	38	125	61	69	271	$54	----------
1927	1,451	1,380	218	514	40	170	94	96	248	71	----------
1932	2,028	1,965	278	843	74	215	119	114	322	63	----------
1934	2,143	2,009	228	738	363	203	85	108	284	64	70
1936	2,445	2,223	297	754	422	221	93	130	306	79	143
1938	3,082	2,576	347	815	453	268	128	146	419	302	240
1940	3,555	2,730	375	793	527	300	144	151	440	601	224
1942	3,563	2,769	391	790	523	299	159	164	443	505	288
1944	3,319	2,666	489	540	577	331	164	162	403	226	426
1946	4,974	3,153	518	613	680	424	207	192	519	1,158	663
1948	7,897	6,186	1,081	1,510	962	663	344	266	1,360	1,020	691
1950	10,864	8,033	1,358	2,058	1,566	947	468	317	1,319	2,177	654
1952	10,790	8,653	1,494	2,556	1,410	1,132	539	361	1,161	1,413	723
1954	13,008	10,109	1,715	3,254	1,548	1,276	563	419	1,334	2,096	803
1956	15,148	12,319	2,138	4,367	1,603	1,470	670	477	1,594	1,984	845
1957	16,796	13,647	2,341	4,875	1,745	1,652	787	531	1,716	2,313	836

See footnotes at end of table.

118. *State direct expenditures for own functions, selected fiscal years 1902–63*—Continued

[In millions]

Year	Total	General expenditures								Insurance trust	Liquor stores
		Total general	Education	Highways	Public welfare[1]	Health and hospitals	Natural resources	General control	Other[2]		
1958	$19,991	$15,448	$2,727	$5,507	$1,855	$1,848	$875	$569	$2,067	$3,675	$869
1959	22,436	17,319	3,093	6,414	2,007	1,967	976	619	2,243	4,259	860
1960	22,152	17,783	3,396	6,070	2,221	1,896	842	654	2,704	3,461	907
1961	24,578	19,004	3,792	6,230	2,311	2,059	906	725	2,981	4,701	873
1962	25,494	20,373	4,268	6,635	2,509	2,161	973	763	3,064	4,238	882
1963	27,698	22,491	4,954	7,425	2,712	2,330	1,097	830	3,143	4,306	900

[1] Principally categorical public assistance. See table 126.

[2] Principally police, correction, interest, and social insurance administration.

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

123. *State payments to local governments, by function and State, fiscal year 1963*

[In millions]

State	Total	Specified function				General local government support
		Education	Highways	Public welfare	Other[1]	
Total	$11,855.4	$6,993.0	$1,415.8	$1,918.9	$545.4	$1,012.3
Alabama	171.4	123.8	34.9		6.6	6.1
Alaska	16.3	14.4			.4	1.6
Arizona	105.7	62.3	10.0		2.0	31.5
Arkansas	74.4	49.2	15.1	.1	4.2	5.9
California	1,804.1	881.5	136.6	587.2	116.7	81.5
Colorado	151.5	51.3	21.1	74.9	4.1	.2
Connecticut	88.3	72.7	4.7	3.6	6.3	1.0
Delaware	50.1	46.6	1.3	1.3	.8	
Florida	269.1	233.4	15.2		20.3	.3
Georgia	218.5	174.5	28.5	5.8	9.7	
Hawaii	22.6				3.2	19.4
Idaho	33.9	21.0	8.9		1.8	2.2
Illinois	434.3	244.8	122.5	60.6	6.4	
Indiana	250.7	134.9	67.2	35.9	4.9	7.8
Iowa	138.1	49.3	52.6	.3	2.2	33.8
Kansas	121.6	55.2	14.1	40.9	1.5	9.8
Kentucky	129.6	115.5	2.3		10.2	1.5
Louisiana	257.5	182.6	17.6		7.1	50.2
Maine	24.0	18.6	3.5	.7	.7	.5
Maryland	267.6	115.9	45.3	43.8	9.7	52.9
Massachusetts	355.4	75.4	14.2	153.5	34.7	77.6
Michigan	653.1	360.9	132.4	59.0	20.4	80.4
Minnesota	278.4	154.1	37.8	62.6	5.8	18.1
Mississippi	128.7	84.8	25.3		5.6	12.9
Missouri	$158.1	$131.7	$15.0		$5.0	$6.3
Montana	23.5	21.0		$0.6	1.9	
Nebraska	46.0	7.3	15.7	20.3	1.8	.9
Nevada	26.8	21.0	3.0		.3	2.5
New Hampshire	7.3	4.2	.5	.1	.4	2.2
New Jersey	209.8	113.9	15.5	62.7	15.4	2.4
New Mexico	92.9	81.6	4.6		1.4	5.1
New York	1,731.4	1,017.1	85.7	406.9	114.6	107.1
North Carolina	339.2	238.1	7.6	67.6	9.2	16.6
North Dakota	26.7	16.5	8.2	.7	.6	.7
Ohio	538.8	205.4	138.2	121.4	7.2	66.5
Oklahoma	135.0	87.0	38.0		8.0	2.0
Oregon	110.1	71.6	28.6	1.4	2.5	6.0
Pennsylvania	492.7	392.0	56.3	7.4	30.8	6.2
Rhode Island	29.4	19.2	.4	2.2	.7	6.9
South Carolina	115.2	89.3	7.9		6.4	11.6
South Dakota	12.4	7.8	2.4	.1	.6	1.6
Tennessee	180.0	123.6	36.7	.1	4.4	15.2
Texas	445.2	435.5	7.9		1.7	.1
Utah	61.5	54.5	3.9		2.0	1.0
Vermont	14.2	7.3	5.7	.5	.7	(2)
Virginia	179.6	121.1	12.1	26.2	6.9	13.2
Washington	288.5	217.0	33.9	7.1	15.7	14.7
West Virginia	73.6	70.4		.4	2.7	
Wisconsin	475.8	98.8	74.4	58.0	18.6	226.0
Wyoming	27.0	17.3	2.6	4.1	.6	2.5

[1] Largely health and hospitals, other, and unallocable.

[2] Less than $50,000.

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

130. *Total State revenue, by source, selected fiscal years 1902–63*

[In millions, except per capita]

Year	Total	From own sources						Intergovernmental		Per capita[4]	
		Total own sources	General revenue			Insurance trust[2]	Liquor stores[3]	From Federal	From local	Total	Taxes
			Total	Taxes[1]	Charges and miscellaneous						
1902	$192	$183	$181	$156	$25		2	$3	$6	$2.46	$2.00
1913	376	360	360	301	59			6	10	3.92	3.14
1922	1,360	1,234	1,128	947	181	$106		99	27	12.49	8.70
1927	2,152	1,994	1,857	1,608	249	137		107	51	18.28	13.66
1932	2,541	2,274	2,156	1,890	266	118		222	45	20.50	15.25
1934	3,421	2,452	2,243	1,979	264	119	$90	933	36	27.27	15.78
1936	4,023	3,265	2,914	2,618	296	168	183	719	39	31.67	20.61
1938	5,293	4,612	3,460	3,132	328	890	262	633	48	41.13	24.34
1940	5,737	5,012	3,657	3,313	344	1,074	281	667	58	43.88	25.34
1942	6,870	6,012	4,274	3,903	370	1,366	373	802	56	51.67	29.36
1944	7,695	6,714	4,484	4,071	413	1,702	528	926	55	57.86	30.61
1946	8,576	7,712	5,419	4,937	482	1,494	798	802	63	62.90	36.21
1948	11,826	10,086	7,517	6,743	774	1,711	857	1,643	97	82.09	46.81
1950	13,903	11,480	8,839	7,930	909	1,831	810	2,275	148	92.74	52.90
1952	16,815	14,330	10,944	9,857	1,087	2,462	924	2,329	156	108.87	63.82
1954	18,834	15,951	12,417	11,089	1,328	2,560	974	2,668	215	117.96	69.45
1956	22,199	18,903	15,093	13,375	1,718	2,791	1,019	3,027	269	133.78	80.60
1957	24,656	20,728	16,454	14,531	1,923	3,209	1,065	3,500	427	145.86	85.96
1958	26,190	21,427	17,008	14,919	2,089	3,361	1,058	4,461	302	152.23	86.72
1959	29,164	22,912	18,196	15,848	2,348	3,631	1,085	5,888	364	166.64	90.56
1960	32,839	26,094	20,619	18,036	2,583	4,347	1,128	6,328	363	184.53	101.35
1961	34,603	27,821	21,911	19,057	2,854	4,791	1,119	6,412	370	191.29	106.35
1962	37,597	30,117	23,677	20,561	3,116	5,306	1,134	7,108	373	204.54	111.86
1963	40,993	32,750	25,640	22,117	3,523	5,950	1,161	7,832	411	219.65	118.51

---

[1] Excludes unemployment compensation taxes included in insurance trust revenue and shown in table 132.

[2] Collections from employers and employees for financing unemployment compensation, accident and sickness, workmen's compensation, retirement, and like social insurance programs.

[3] Gross receipts from the sale of liquor and associated products in State alcoholic beverage monopoly systems.

[4] Based on population, excluding Armed Forces overseas and District of Columbia, at the middle of the fiscal year.

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Per capita computations by Tax Foundation.

168. Local expenditures, revenue, and debt, selected fiscal years 1902–63 [1]

[In millions]

Year	Expenditures			Revenue			Gross debt
	Total	Direct	Payments to State governments	Total	From own sources	Intergovernmental [2]	
1902	$965	$959	$6	$914	$858	$56	$1,877
1913	1,970	1,960	10	1,755	1,658	97	4,035
1922	4,594	4,567	27	4,148	3,827	321	8,978
1927	6,410	6,359	51	6,333	5,728	605	12,910
1932	6,420	6,375	45	6,192	5,381	811	16,373
1934	5,735	5,699	36	6,363	4,962	1,401	15,681
1936	6,095	6,056	39	6,793	5,147	1,646	16,061
1938	6,954	6,906	48	7,329	5,646	1,683	16,093
1940	7,743	7,685	58	7,724	5,792	1,932	16,693
1942	7,407	7,351	56	8,114	6,278	1,836	16,449
1944	7,235	7,180	55	8,535	6,665	1,870	14,703
1946	9,156	9,093	63	9,561	7,416	2,145	13,564
1948	$13,460	$13,363	$97	13,167	$9,666	$3,501	$14,960
1950	17,189	17,041	148	16,101	11,673	4,428	18,830
1952	20,229	20,073	156	19,398	14,117	5,281	23,226
1954	23,814	23,599	215	22,402	16,468	5,933	29,331
1956	28,273	28,004	269	26,352	19,453	6,899	35,978
1957	31,057	30,757	300	29,021	21,357	7,664	39,301
1958	34,023	33,721	302	31,348	22,970	8,378	42,793
1959	36,341	36,136	205	33,572	24,684	8,888	47,180
1960	39,056	38,847	209	37,324	27,209	10,114	51,412
1961	42,641	42,445	196	40,483	29,579	10,904	55,030
1962	45,279	45,053	226	43,147	31,506	11,642	59,255
1963	48,309	48,062	247	46,534	33,846	12,689	64,276

[1] Debt as of end of fiscal year.

[2] Largely shared taxes and fiscal aids from State governments.

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the[Census.

TAX SHARING: A BRIEF LIST OF REFERENCES, 1961–65

"A Plan To Divert Part of Federal Tax Take to States Hits Snags," Wall Street Journal, November 17, 1964, page 1.

Abiko, Nabuo, and William H. Stringer, "Federal Funds Debated," Christian Science Monitor, December 30, 1964, pages 1, 10.

"Dollars from District of Columbia," Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco Monthly Review, February 1965; pages 26–29.

Ecker-Racz, L. L., and I. M. Labovitz, "Practical Solutions to Financial Problems Created by the Mutilevel Political Structure," Conference of the Universities—National Bureau Committee for Economic Research, Princeton University Press, 1961.

"Governors Look to United States," Washington Post, March 24, 1965, page A20.

Heilbroner, R. L., "The Share-the-Tax Revenue Plan," New York Times magazine, December 27, 1964, pages 8, 30–31, 33.

Lutz, Harley L., "States and Surpluses: Why Federal No-Strings Distributions Would Be Unwise," Wall Street Journal, December 28, 1964, page 6.

Maxwell, James A., "Tax Credits and Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations," Washington, D.C., the Brookings Institution, 1962.

"No String Federal Aid Finds Backers at Forum," Business Week, April 3, 1965, pages 28–29.

Otten, Alan L., and Charles B. Seib, "No-Strings Aid for States?" the Reporter, January 28, 1965, pages 33–35.

"President Favors Giving the States Share of Revenue," New York Times, October 28, 1964, page 1.

"Revenue Rebates Sought by States," Christian Science Monitor, January 25, 1965, page 11.

"States Bid Johnson Revive Plan To Give Them Share of Tax," New York Times, March 23, 1965, page 1.

"States Look to Heller Plan," New York Times, May 23, 1965, page 12F.

"Tax Sharing Plan May Get Review," New York Times, March 24, 1965, page 18.

"United States Is Still Considering Revenue-Sharing Plan," Washington Post, February 24, 1965, page 1.

"Western Governors Urge States Share in U.S. Revenues," Washington Post, July 13, 1965, page A7.

Worshop, Richard C., "Federal-State Revenue Sharing," Editorial Research Reports, volume 2, December 23, 1964, pages 943–960.

FINANCING STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

(By Joseph A. Pechman)

(NOTE.—Reprinted August 1965, with permission, from the "Proceedings of a Symposium on Federal Taxation" sponsored by the American Bankers Association (1965).

(This reprint of a paper based on research sponsored by the National Committee on Government Finance is issued for general distribution. The National Committee on Government Finance was established in 1960 by the Trustees of the Brookings Institution to supervise a comprehensive program of studies on taxation and Government expenditures. These Studies of Government Finance are supported with funds provided to the Brookings Institution by the Ford Foundation.

(The interpretations and conclusions in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of members of the Brookings staff, the administrative officers of the institution, or the National Committee on Government Finance.

(The Brookings Institution is an independent organization devoted to nonpartisan research, education, and publication in economics, Government, foreign policy, and the social sciences generally. Its principal purpose is to serve the American people and their representatives by helping to bring knowledge more effectively to bear on major and emerging issues of national importance.)

Expenditures of the States and local governments have grown rapidly in recent years, and will continue to grow rapidly in the foreseeable future. These governments are already spending more than $70 billion per year; they will be spending more than $100 billion in 1970. The rise in State-local spending reflects the demands of an expanding population for more and better public services. These demands have strained the fiscal resources of the States and local governments, and they have responded with an unprecedented tax effort. Nevertheless, the need for State-local services will increase faster than State-local revenues.

In the past, State and local needs have been met in part by Federal grants-in-aid for particular purposes. These specific Federal grants have helped to finance programs in which the national interest was particularly strong. But it is now clear that the States and local governments also need help to meet the needs of their citizens in areas of traditional State-local responsibility.

Until recently, the Federal Government has not been able to provide general assistance to the States and local governments, simply because it has had rapidly growing commitments for defense and defense-related programs. But the pressure for larger expenditures for these Federal activities seems to have abated. Unless the Federal Government takes on new responsibilities, it now seems likely that its potential revenues at present tax rates will increase more rapidly than its expenditures. This prospect provides the opportunity for consideration of methods of helping the States and local governments out of their fiscal plight.

This paper discusses the reasons why the States and local governments need assistance, examines several methods of providing such assistance, and suggests the outlines of a new approach that seems worthy of further exploration.

STATE-LOCAL NEEDS AND FISCAL RESOURCES

The burdens placed on State and local governments in the past two decades have been extraordinarily heavy. They found themselves at the end of World War II with a large backlog of unmet needs; and rapid population growth has added new demands on top of this backlog. Between 1953 and 1963, the school-age population (those 5 to 19) rose 40 percent while the total population increased only 19 percent. In the same period, the number of persons over 65 increased 35 percent. Thus, the age groups which require the costliest Government services and contribute least to the tax base—the old and the young—increased much faster than the rest of the population.

The problems of population growth were aggravated by mobility. People moved freely from State to State and from region to region in the search for new jobs and better living conditions. They migrated from the rural to the urban areas, and left the central cities for the suburbs. New communities were developed while others were being abandoned. New schools, roads and sewers, and more teachers, policemen, firemen, and other personnel were urgently needed in most parts of the country. As a result, the largest growth industry in the United States has been State and local government.

The story of how the States and local governments tried to meet the challenge of growth has been told many times. I shall review it briefly here as background for the discussion of the fiscal problems it has created.

Recent expansion of State-local expenditures

In the 10 years ending in 1963, annual State-local expenditures for general governmental purposes (current operations, capital outlay, and interest on debt) more than doubled, rising from $28 billion to nearly $65 billion. About 53 percent of the increase went for education, health, and welfare (table 1).

TABLE 1.—*General expenditure of State and local government, by major function, fiscal years 1953 and 1963* [1]

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Function	Amount		Increase, 1953–63		
	1953	1963	Amount	Percent distribution	Percent increase
Total general expenditure	$27,910	$64,816	$36,906	100.0	132.2
Education	9,390	24,012	14,622	39.6	155.7
Highways	4,987	11,136	6,149	16.7	123.3
Public welfare	2,914	5,481	2,567	6.9	88.1
Health and hospitals	2,290	4,681	2,391	6.5	104.4
Police and fire	1,636	3,468	1,832	5.0	112.0
Natural resources	705	1,588	883	2.4	125.2
Sewerage and sanitation	908	2,187	1,279	3.5	140.8
Housing and community redevelopment	631	1,247	616	1.7	97.6
General control and financial administration	1,263	2,474	1,211	3.3	95.9
Interest on debt	614	2,199	1,585	4.3	258.1
Other	2,572	6,343	3,771	10.2	146.6

[1] Excludes insurance trust, liquor stores, and public utility expenditures. Includes Federal grants-in-aid.

Source: Bureau of the Census.

Most of the expenditure increase reflected the need to provide services for the large increase in population, but price increases also played an important role. Equipment and construction costs rose rapidly. Salaries of teachers and other Government employees had to be brought into better alinement with salary levels in the private economy. Even moderate adjustments in compensation involved large expenditures, since personal services constitute a large part of State-local budgets.

While State-local outlays increased everywhere, the level of expenditures varies greatly in different States. For example, in fiscal year 1963, the five States with the lowest per capita income spent $262 per capita for State-local services, while the five States with highest per capita income spent $417 per capita, and this despite the fact that the five poorest States made a larger tax effort (as measured by the ratio of State-local general revenues to personal income) and received more Federal aid per capita than the five richest States. In fiscal year 1964, expenditures per pupil in average daily attendance in public elementary and secondary schools were over $550 in four States, but less than $350 in nine States. Average monthly payments to families with dependent children in June 1964 varied from less than $20 per recipient in 6 States to more than $40 in 11 States. These wide variations in expenditure levels indicate that deficiencies are far more serious in some parts of the country than in others.

The available expenditure figures reflect amounts spent and not amounts that would have been spent if adequate resources had been available to finance a level of services consistent with need. Satisfactory measures of the degree to which State-local expenditures fall short of need are not available, but many of the deficiencies are obvious: overcrowded classrooms, inadequate health and hospital facilities, poor housing, blighted areas with high levels of juvenile delinquency, clogged streets, and polluted air and water. These deficiencies are all the more glaring against the background of rapidly rising private consumption standards.

Sources of funds

Federal grants to State and local governments tripled between 1953 and 1963 (from $2.9 to $8.7 billion), but this increase accounted for only 16 percent of the $35 billion increase in State-local general revenues. The remaining 84 percent—close to $30 billion—was raised from their own sources (table 2). State-local tax collections increased by $23 billion, or 111 percent during this period (while Federal collections increased by $24 billion, or only 38 percent). State-local debt rose from $34 to $87 billion (table 3).

TABLE 2.—*General revenues of State and local government, fiscal years 1953–63*

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Source of increase	Amount		Increase 1953–63		
	1953	1963	Amount	Percent distribution of total increase	Percent distribution of tax increase
General revenue [1]	$27,307	$62,890	$35,583	100.0	----------
Revenue from Federal Government [2]	2,870	8,722	5,852	16.4	----------
General revenue from own sources	24,437	54,169	29,732	83.6	----------
Taxes	20,908	44,281	23,373	65,7	100.0
Property	9,375	20,089	10,714	30.1	45.8
Sales and gross receipts	6,927	14,456	7,529	21.2	32.3
Individual income	1,065	3,269	2,204	6.2	9.4
Corporation income	810	1,505	695	1.9	2.9
Other	2,731	4,962	2,231	6.3	9.6
Charges and miscellaneous	3,520	9,888	6,359	17.9	----------

[1] Excludes revenue from publicly operated utilities, liquor stores, and insurance trust systems.

[2] Includes in addition to direct grants-in-aid, shared revenues, amounts received from the Federal Government for contractual services, and payments in lieu of taxes. Excludes grants-in-kind (distribution of commodities, technical assistance, etc.) and net loans and repayable advances.

NOTE.—Because of rounding, detail may not add to total.

Source: Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 3.—*State and local government debt, fiscal years 1953–63*

End of fiscal year	Debt outstanding	
	Amount (in millions)	Index 1953=100
1953	$33,782	100
1954	38,931	115
1955	44,267	131
1956	48,868	145
1957	53,039	157
1958	58,187	172
1959	64,110	190
1960	69,955	207
1961	75,023	222
1962	81,278	241
1963	87,451	259

Source: Bureau of the Census.

Almost the entire increase in local tax collections and 46 percent of the combined State-local increases came from higher property tax revenues. While new construction and higher property values contributed significantly to the property tax base, tax rates were increased substantially. In many cities and towns, property tax rates are already too high and further substantial increases in these rates are undesirable.

Consumer taxes provided 32 percent of the 1953–63 increases in State-local tax collections; income taxes provided only 9 percent. These revenue increases also came in large part from the higher incomes and increased spending made possible by economic growth, but new taxes and increases in the rates of old taxes were important contributors. Since 1952, five States have entered the general sales tax field, and two-thirds of the 33 States with general sales taxes in 1952 have raised their rates (some two or three times during this period). Nineteen States now have 3 percent sales tax rates and eight States have rates in excess of 3 percent. Only two States have enacted new individual income taxes since 1949, but tax rates have been raised in most of the other 31 States with income taxes. Income tax rates have been increased most at the lower income levels, and the degree of progressivity has declined. Local governments in several States have moved into sales and payroll taxes; and many States and localities have introduced new taxes on business activities, many of them of the nuisance variety.

Outlook for the future

The fiscal pressure on the States and local governments shows no sign of easing. Although these governments have made great efforts in the past decade, serious deficiencies remain and new needs will be created by continued population growth, increasing urbanization, and rising expectations. There is little doubt that without substantial assistance from the Federal Government, State-local revenues will fall far short of their expenditure needs. The basic problem is that needed State-local expenditures rise faster than gross national product, while State-local taxes, unlike Federal taxes, are relatively unresponsive to economic growth.

The magnitude of the problem may be roughly illustrated by the following projection. Suppose gross national product grows at 5 percent per annum and State-local receipts (including Federal grants) keep pace with this growth. On these assumptions, State-local receipts would reach about $88 billion by 1970. But if needed State-local expenditures grow at 7 percent per annum—which seems conservative in the light of past experience—they would reach $103 billion by 1970, leaving a gap of about $15 billion.

In the absence of additional Federal aid, the States and local governments would have to raise their tax rates to fill this gap of $15 billion. But this is hardly likely to occur. In every State and municipality, fear of driving commerce and industry to competing jurisdictions or of discouraging the entry of new businesses restrains new and increased taxes. Recent elections in many States demonstrate the political hazards facing elected officials who support tax increases. Furthermore, from the standpoint of tax equity and economic policy, it is undesirable to finance these long-run requirements almost entirely by property and consumer taxes—the revenue sources on which State and local governments largely depend.

In brief, the States and local governments cannot—and should not—meet all of their foreseeable revenue needs from the revenue sources now available to them. Given the present division of functions and of revenue sources, it is a matter of national concern that many essential government services may not be provided because of the inadequacy of State-local financial resources.

THE FEDERAL BUDGET OUTLOOK

By contrast with State-local receipts, Federal receipts rise rapidly as the economy expands because they are based largely on personal income and corporate profits. With continued economic growth, Federal budget receipts will grow about $6 billion per year in the next 5 years. At the same time, defense expenditures seem more likely to decline a bit than to increase (unless, of course, international conditions worsen), and expenditures for space exploration will probably level off. This means that a dividend of $6 billion will probably be generated each year for nondefense purposes, or a total of $30 billion for a 5-year period.

The availability of such a dividend is a blessing only if it is used wisely. Recent experience suggests that the rate of private saving will exceed the rate of private investment. For this reason, it will not be good economics to allocate a substantial part of the dividend, if any, to debt retirement. Further tax reduction and/or expenditure increases will be needed to avoid an increase in unemployment. Indeed, unless the dividend were used in this way, it would probably not be available at all. Efforts to hold down expenditures while maintaining tax rates would add to the fiscal drag that has already made the achievement of full employment so difficult.

The remedy is to continue to maintain a fiscal policy that stimulates demand if the private economy is not strong enough. This can be done either by reducing taxes or by increasing expenditures for needed Government services. The difference is that tax cuts favor private spending, while expenditures increase investment or consumption in the public sector. It is important to note that public spending need not be at the Federal level. Even though the revenues are Federal, they may be used in part to finance State-local public services.

In the present circumstances, there are too many pressing public needs to justify reliance on tax reduction as the sole mechanism of eliminating the fiscal drag. Some portion of the growth of $30 billion in Federal receipts over the next 5 years will doubtless be needed to finance growing Federal activities. Since so many of the public needs are within traditional State and local responsibilities, it would also be in the national interest to use part of the $30 billion to help finance the more rapidly growing State-local activities. In fact, unless inflationary pressures develop, there will be room in the Federal budget for increased Federal expenditures and additional assistance to the States and local governments, as well as for some tax reduction.

ALTERNATIVE METHODS OF ASSISTING STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

There are many possible ways to help the States and local governments. In choosing among them, most people will agree that we should be guided at least by the following three criteria: First, the amount of assistance should be large enough to make possible a significant increase in the level of State-local services; second, the funds should help to equalize the services available to citizens of different States; and, third, the plan should not reduce the progressivity of the total Federal, State, and local tax system.

The most frequent proposals for accomplishing these objectives involve reduction of the Federal tax take. They include: (1) Federal tax reduction to enable the States to raise their own taxes; (2) relinquishment of specific Federal taxes; (3) tax credits for State and local taxes against Federal taxes; and (4) sharing of Federal tax collections with the States. In addition, suggestions are made to expand Federal grant programs of the type now existing or adding new ones. As the following discussion will indicate, the four tax alternatives fail, in varying degree, to meet the criteria for an appropriate method of fiscal assistance to the States and local governments.

Federal tax reduction

A reduction of Federal taxes does not, in the first instance, have any effect on the fiscal resources of the States and local governments. State-local receipts would increase indirectly as a result of the effect of the Federal tax cut on the national income, but this would be only a small fraction of the revenue released by the Federal Government. The State legislatures and county and city councils would have to take positive action to pick up the remainder of the lost revenue. Although some of this will occur, there is little likelihood that all of the lost Federal revenues will find their way into the budgets of the States and local governments.

Furthermore, to the extent that State-local taxes increase, they will be largely of the sales or property tax variety. These taxes are already overworked and are regressive besides. From the standpoint of tax equity, there is nothing to commend the replacement of Federal income taxes by State and local sales and property taxes.

Relinquishment of Federal taxes to the States

Relinquishment of one or more Federal taxes in the hope that the States and/or local governments will pick them up is also not a practical alternative. State and local governments find it difficult to move into an area vacated by the Federal Government, because of local opposition to tax increases and fear of interstate competition. Past experience with the admissions tax and the electrical energy tax has indicated that reduction or elimination of a Federal tax is not necessarily followed by State and local adoptions. Local governments had long sought reduction or repeal of these taxes on the ground that they were particularly suitable for local use. Following repeal of the Federal electrical energy tax and drastic reduction of the Federal admissions tax, local governments did not make the anticipated use of these taxes. Similarly, it is doubtful that the States and local governments will pick up more than a small proportion of the reduction of Federal excises which will soon be considered by the Congress.

The response of the States and local governments to the release of any tax by the Federal Government is bound to be spotty, because it depends on action by many separate executive and legislative bodies. Moreover, tax relinquishment, like general tax reduction, would fail to channel larger shares of the released revenues to the poorer States.

Tax credits

A more effective way of increasing the chances that the States and localities would pick up the revenue released by the Federal Government would be to give a credit against Federal income taxes for certain State and local taxes paid. However, a credit would not automatically increase State-local revenues. The States and localities which already impose the taxes eligible for the credit would have to raise their rates. Since this could be done without raising total taxes paid by their citizens they might be encouraged to do so, but there would be strong opposition from the groups that would prefer to enjoy the tax reduction provided by the credit. The 17 States without individual income taxes would benefit from the full amount of the credit, provided they imposed such a tax and the credit applied to income taxes. Encouraging these States to enact income taxes would be desirable, but such a move might be regarded as Federal coercion and, in some States, would run up against constitutional barriers.

Tax credits, like the two previous alternatives, fail to redistribute resources to the neediest States. At best, the credit simply diverts the same revenues from the Federal Government to the States where they originate.

Tax sharing

Proposals have been advanced recently that the Federal Government share with the States all, or a portion of, the collections originating in each State from certain Federal taxes. Sharing of tax collections is a common arrangements at the State-local level, but not at the Federal-State level. All States share one or more taxes with their local governments. The usual basis for sharing, however, is not source of collection, but some measure of local need (such as population).

One tax that has been mentioned as a possibility for Federal-State sharing is the Federal tax on local telephone service. But the volume of telephone business is not distributed in a manner that corresponds with financial need. Other suggestions for tax sharing would also help the richer States more than the poorer ones. By the very nature of the plan, tax sharing cannot meet the criterion of equalizing resources of the State and local governments.

Specific grants-in-aid

Federal financial assistance to State and local governments is now given almost entirely in the form of grants to support specific types of government services. Total Federal grants already exceed $11 billion in this fiscal year. Further substantial increases have been recommended to the Congress and are likely to be enacted in the present session. If the administration's plans go through, Federal grants will amount to $13.6 billion in the fiscal year beginning July 1 of this year.

The main advantage of the specific grant approach is that the Federal Government regulates the conditions under which the funds are spent. It can choose to support activities in which there is a particularly strong national interest. It can set minimum standards. Through matching provisions and similar devices, it can insure that the federally supported programs receive State support as well. Various formulas can be used to allocate funds to States where the need for the particular program is greatest or where fiscal capacity is least.

The new plan for assistance to primary and secondary school education proposed by the administration is a good example of the specific grant-in-aid approach. The Federal Government considers it essential to increase the educational opportunities of the children of low-income families. To this end, the administration proposes to distribute Federal funds to school districts (through the State government) on the basis of the number of schoolchildren in families with incomes below a certain specified level. The funds are to be used to meet the needs of educationally deprived children, on the basis of plans formulated by local school boards and approved by State boards of education. Special incentive grants are provided for school districts that increase their current expenditures by 5 percent or more. Public reports are required both from the school districts and from the State boards, so that the Commissioner of Education can evaluate the effectiveness of the program.

The support of particular activities through specific grants-in-aid will, and should, remain the basic method of providing assistance to the States and local governments. Only in this manner can the Federal Government assure itself that programs in which it has an interest are carried out by the States and local governments. At the same time, there are many State-local services of national importance that cannot be appropriately dealt with by specific grants. Unnecessary administrative burdens on the Federal Government would be avoided, and the varying preferences of States and localities could be allowed for more fully, if their ability to render these services were strengthened by the adoption of a more general grant system to supplement the specific grant programs.

A GENERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR THE STATES

The discussion so far suggests that the States and local governments will need assistance from the Federal Government over and above the assistance they will receive in specific grants. If a general assistance program were adopted, it would be desirable to devise some method to assure the States and local governments of a dependable source of funds that will grow with the needs of the growing population. Various methods have been proposed to achieve these objectives. For example, a certain percentage of Federal revenues, or of Federal income tax collections, or of the Federal individual income tax base might be set aside for this purpose. Each grows more rapidly than national income, and each would provide a satisfactory basis for calculating the amount to be allotted for State-local purposes. The difficult questions are (1) How should the funds be allocated among the States? and (2) What constraints should the Federal Government impose on the use of the funds?

Method of allocation

Ideally, the amounts to be distributed to the States should be based on their need for public services and their fiscal capacity. Unfortunately, both need and capacity are very difficult to measure.

A State's need depends on its population and age distribution, population density, distribution of income, local costs, and other factors. A State's fiscal capacity also depends on a variety of factors, including population, per capita income, and the value of taxable property and sales. One formula that reflected all these factors would be difficult to construct and highly complex. However, population is probably the simplest and most appropriate measure of the relationship between need and capacity. On the one hand, population is a reasonably good indicator of general need for public services. On the other hand, a per capita allocation would make some allowances for varying capacity: since residents of high-income States pay more Federal taxes per capita than do residents of low-income States, distribution on a per capita basis would redistribute resources from high- to low-income States.

Per capita distribution may not adequately reflect the more urgent need for fiscal assistance by the poorest States, but this deficiency could be recognized by reserving a part of the funds for distribution among States with the lowest per capita income. It is not necessary to allocate more than a small proportion of the funds for this purpose to achieve a substantial redistributional effect. Even if as little as 10 percent of the total were divided among the poorest third of the States (say, in proportion to population weighted by the reciprocal of per capita personal income), the grant to the poorest State would be almost double the amount it would obtain on a straight per capita basis.

It might also be desirable to include a measure of tax effort among the factors determining the share of a particular State. A simple and effective way of allowing for effort would be to weight the per capita grants by the ratio of State to average tax effort in the country, where tax effort is defined as the ratio of State-local general revenues to personal income. Inclusion of such an effort factor would give the States an incentive to maintain and increase their own tax collections and allay the fears that States with lower-than-average tax rates were getting a free ride.

Limitations on State uses of the funds

I have already indicated that the most urgent national need is to allocate more of our resources to public programs which are primarily State and local responsibilities. Experience during the last several years indicates that, without central direction or coercion, State governments have actually used most of their scarce financial resources for those urgent needs. They have also allocated increasing amounts through grants-in-aid to local governments for education. (Between 1953 and 1963, 47 percent of the increased expenditures by States went to education—most of it through grants to local governments.) This evidence suggests that, if the States were to receive unencumbered funds from the Federal Government, they would spend them on urgently needed State-local services whether the particular services were stipulated in the legislation or not.

The Federal Government should satisfy itself that the funds would be shared with the local governments in an equitable manner, but this is also much less of a problem than most people might suppose. The extent to which the States delegate responsibilities to, and share revenues with, local governments varies greatly. All States give aid to local units and most give substantial amounts. (In the aggregate, intergovernmental transfers from State to local governments account for more than a third of State general expenditures and nearly 30 percent of local general revenues.) In view of the differences among States in forms of intergovernmental cooperation, it would be difficult to specify that some uniform percentage of the general grant be reserved for local use in all States. The individual States are in a better position to make the allocation in the manner suited to their particular circumstances. Moreover, legislative reapportionment will help assure that the needs of the communities will be recognized by the State legislatures. Several States are already making plans to use existing or new grant-in-aid programs for distribution to the localities of any unencumbered Federal funds that may become available in the future.

On the other hand, it can be argued that it is bad financial management for the Federal Government to give away its funds without exercising a minimum amount of supervision to see that they are employed productively and in the national interest. One method of achieving this objective, and also of allowing flexibility for each State to meet the needs it considers most urgent, would be to require the Governors to file statements showing the plan for the use of the funds in detail. As guidance for the development of such plans, the Congress might indicate the general areas which it regarded as most urgent, including the need for making funds available for local government services. To be sure that the plan represented a broad spectrum of opinion in the State, the Governor might be directed to consult with local officials and representatives of citizens organizations before incorporating the plan in his budget. A detailed audited report on the actual use of the funds might also be required, as well as a certification by appropriate State and local officials that all applicable Federal laws, such as the Civil Rights Act, have been complied with in the State and local activities financed by these grants.

CONCLUSION

The States will be unable to meet their growing needs without substantial additional assistance from the Federal Government. Part of this additional assistance will come from specific grant programs which are already enacted or are now being considered by the Congress. But the States will need supplementary assistance in the form of general aid to help finance other State-local programs.

The States have important functions to perform in our system of government. They have been subject to criticism in the past, in part because of their inability to carry out these functions with the resources available to them. If we expect the States to play their role effectively, we should increase their ability to do a good job. The alternative is to shift their functions to the Federal Government, which is a solution that most people in the United States would rightfully oppose.

The type of general assistance program I have discussed would help revitalize State governments in this country. It would provide them with a growing source of revenue from taxes that are much more equitable than those that are now available to them. It would help eliminate the recurrent fiscal crises that have impaired their ability to function effectively. It would help them attract the caliber of people they need in executive, judicial, and legislative capacities. It would provide an additional margin for funds for strengthening their grant programs to local government units. And it would encourage them to solve their own problems rather than to vacate their responsibilities to the Federal Government.

In the light of the inadequacy of their finances, the States have made a remarkably good record in the postwar period. With reapportionment, they will do even better. Improvement of the finances of State governments, and through them the local governments, would strengthen our federal system and, at the same time, increase the welfare of all our citizens.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed with my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2619

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Tax-Sharing Act".

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the "Tax-Sharing Fund". The Tax-Sharing Fund shall consist of such amounts as may be appropriated to such fund as provided in this section.

(b)(1) There is hereby appropriated to the Tax-Sharing Fund, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1967, and for each fiscal year thereafter, an amount determined by the Secretary of the Treasury equal to one percent of the aggregate taxable income reported on individual income tax returns during the preceding calendar year.

(2) For purposes of this subsection—

(A) The term "taxable income" shall have the same meaning as specified in section 63 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(B) The term "individual income tax returns" means returns of the tax on the income of individuals imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(c) The Secretary of the Treasury (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall, from time to time, but not less often than quarterly, transfer from the general fund of the Treasury to the Tax-Sharing Fund the amounts appropriated by subsection (b). Such transfers shall, to the extent necessary, be made on the basis of estimates by the Secretary of the amounts referred to in subsection (b). Proper adjustments shall be made in the amounts subsequently transferred to the extent that prior estimates were in excess of or less than the amounts required to be transferred.

SEC. 3. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (d), the Secretary shall, during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1967, and during each fiscal year thereafter, pay to each State, from amounts appropriated to the tax-sharing fund for the fiscal year in which payments are to be made, a total amount equal to the allotment or allotments of such State in such fiscal year under this section. Such payments may be made in installments periodically during any fiscal year, but not less often than quarterly.

(b) From 80 percent of the amount appropriated to the tax-sharing fund pursuant to section 2 for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall allot to each State in such fiscal year an amount equal to the product resulting from multiplying—

(1) an amount which bears the same ratio to such 80 percent of the amount so appropriated as the population of such State bears to the total population of all of the States, by

(2) a number which is the quotient resulting from dividing the revenue effort ratio of such State by the average national revenue effort ratio.

(c) From 20 percent of the amount appropriated to the tax-sharing fund pursuant to section 2 for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall allot to each of the thirteen States with the lowest per capita income of individuals an amount in such fiscal year which bears the same ratio to such 20 per centum of the amount so appropriated as the population of such State bears to the total population of all of such thirteen States.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, (1) the amount of any State's allotment in any fiscal year under either subsection (b) or (c), (2) the total amount of any State's combined allotments in any fiscal year under subsections (b) and (c), or (3) the total amount resulting from combining any State's allotment or allotments in any fiscal year and any reallotment to such State under this subsection, shall not exceed 12 per centum of the amount appropriated pursuant to section 2 for such fiscal year. In the event of any reduction of a State's allotment or allotments in any fiscal year under the provisions of the preceding sentence, the Secretary shall reallot and pay, from time to time during such fiscal year, the amount of such reduction to other States in proportion to the original allotment or allotments to such States under subsections (b) or (c) for such fiscal year.

(e) For purposes of this section—

(1) The term "State" means any of the various States and the District of Columbia.

(2) The term "revenue effort ratio", when used in relation to any State, means a fraction (A) the numerator of which is the total of the revenues derived by such State (including revenues derived by any political subdivision thereof) from its own sources, and (B) the denominator of which is the total income of individuals residing in such State.

(3) The term "average national revenue effort ratio" means a fraction (A) the numerator of which is the total resulting from adding together all revenue effort ratios of the States, and (B) the denominator of which is 51.

(4) The term "income of individuals", when used in relation to any State, means income subject to the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(5) The population of a State and of all the States shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of the most recent data available from the Department of Commerce.

SEC. 4. (a) Each State may use payments from its allotment or allotments in any fiscal year under section 3 for activities, programs, and services in the fields of health, education, and welfare.

(b) Each State shall apportion in accordance with equitable criteria, from its allotment or allotments in any fiscal year, to each local government within such State an amount not less than an amount which bears the same ratio to such allotment or allotments as to such local government from revenues of such State derived from all sources during the five years preceding such fiscal year bears to the total amount of revenues of such State derived from all sources during such five year period.

(c) Whenever the Secretary, after giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a State, finds that such State, or any local government to which such State has apportioned part of its allotment or allotments—

(1) has used any amount of such allotment or allotments for purposes not within the scope of subsection (a),

(2) has not apportioned any amount of such allotment or allotments in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b), or

(3) has not obligated any amount of such allotment or allotments within five fiscal years immediately following the fiscal year in which such allotment or allotments were made

the Secretary shall subtract, from any subsequent allotment or allotments to such State, a total amount equal to the amount referred to in paragraph (1), (2) or (3). In the event of any reduction of a State's allotment in any fiscal year under this subsection, the Secretary shall reallot and pay, from time to time during such fiscal year, the amount of such reduction to other States in proportion to the original allotment or allotments to such States under subsections (b) and (c) of section 3 for such year.

(d) For purposes of this section—

(1) The term "health, education and welfare", when used in relation to any activity, program, or service, shall not include any activity, program, or service designed to provide—

(A) Administrative expenses for State and local government.

(B) Highway programs.

(C) State payments in lieu of property taxes.

(D) Debt service.

(E) Disaster relief.

(2) The term "local government" means any city, township, village, municipality, county, parish, or similar territorial subdivision of a State, but shall not include any department, agency, commission, or independent instrumentality of a State.

SEC. 5. (a) (1) Any State desiring to receive its allotment in any fiscal year under this Act shall, on behalf of itself and any local government which may receive any apportionment thereof, certify and provide satisfactory assurance to the Secretary that such State and local government will—

(A) Use such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for any allotment paid to such State, and any apportionment made by such State to local governments, under this Act;

(B) make such reports to the Secretary, the Congress, and the Comptroller General, in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this Act including a statement of intent as to how and for what purpose the fund shall be spent, except that any State may make such reports on behalf of any local government thereof; and

(C) adhere to all applicable Federal laws in connection with any activity, program, or service provided solely or in part from such allotment.

(2) For purposes of this subsection, the provisions of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 shall be deemed to be applicable to any activity, program, or service provided solely or in part from any allotment received by a State under this Act.

(b) Whenever in any fiscal year the Secretary, after giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a State, finds that such State, or any local government thereof, is not in substantial compliance with the purposes of subsection (a), the Secretary immediately shall—

(1) in the case of the failure of compliance of any State, cancel any subsequent payments to such State under this Act in such fiscal year and reallot any remainder of such State's allotment in such fiscal year to other States in proportion to the original allotment or allotments to such States under subsections (b) and (c) of section 3 for such fiscal year, or

(2) in the case of the failure of compliance of any local government, require satisfactory assurance that such State will cancel any subsequent payments to such local government under this Act in such fiscal year and reapportion any remainder of such local government's apportionment to other local governments of such State in proportion to the original apportionments to such local governments under section 4(b) for such fiscal year.

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall report to the Congress not later than the first day of March of each year on the operation of the Tax-Sharing Fund during the preceding fiscal year and on its expected operation during the current fiscal year. Each such report shall include a statement of the appropriations to, and the disbursements made from, the Tax-Sharing Fund during the preceding fiscal year; and estimate of the expected appropriation to, and disbursements to be made from, the Tax-Sharing Fund during the current fiscal year; and any changes recommended by the Secretary concerning the operation of the Tax-Sharing Fund.

SEC. 7. The Appropriations Committee and the Finance Committee of the Senate and the Appropriations Committee and the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, respectively, shall conduct a full and complete study at least once during each Congress with respect to the operation of the Tax-Sharing Fund and the activities, programs, and services provided by the States from allotments received pursuant to this Act, and report its findings upon such study to each House, respectively, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable at the earliest practicable date. This section is enacted by the Congress as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the bill would accomplish a number of objectives in an effort to bring about better equalization between the tax resources upon which State and local governments can draw and those which are preempted by the Federal Government. This is a problem which every State—including my own State of New York, which has the second largest tax revenues in the country—must solve.

The Javits plan would provide as follows:

First. Establishment of a trust fund in which 1 percent of aggregate taxable income would be deposited from the Treasury, beginning July 1, 1967. Under present conditions, this would amount to $2.5 billion a year and would grow as the tax base grows. Transfer from the Treasury to the tax-sharing trust fund would take place at least once every 3 months.

Second. Payments from the trust fund to the States under the following formula: (a) 80 percent would be distributed on the basis of population. This amount would be increased or decreased depending on the State's own tax effort, which would be measured by the ratio of the total revenues derived by the State over total personal income of individual State residents, as compared with the national average; (b) 20 percent of the fund would be paid each fiscal year to the 13 States with the lowest per capita income. This would be distributed according to population of the States involved.

Third. No State could receive a total payment for a fiscal year in excess of 12 percent of the trust fund in that year.

Fourth. A State may use its allotment of funds for programs in the fields of "health, education, and welfare," but not to include (a) debt service of the States, (b) general administrative expenses for the executive, legislative, or judicial branches of State and local government, (c) highway programs, (d) State payments in lieu of real property taxes, (e) disaster relief.

Fifth. To benefit from the plan, a State must file reports with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller General and the appropriate committees of Congress, including a statement of intent as to how and for what purposes it shall spend the money. States must also comply with all applicable laws including title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Secretary of the Treasury must provide a detailed audit report to the Congress annually on the operation of the trust fund during the preceding fiscal year and on its expected operation during the current fiscal year.

Sixth. Failure to comply with prescribed conditions would require cancellation of future payments and permit reallocation of the remainder of a State's allocation to other States in proportion to the original allotment.

Seventh. The State must distribute to its local governments an equitable portion of its allotment. The amount distributed to local governments must be no less than the average of the State's distribution of its own revenues to local governments over the previous 5 years.

Eighth. Appropriations Committees of both Houses and the Finance Committee of the Senate and Ways and Means Committee of the House, responsible for appropriations and tax legislation, must, at least once during each Congress, conduct a complete study of the operation of the trust fund and provide such legislative recommendations as appropriate.

The measure I introduce today is designed to provide a workable formula to channel Federal revenues to the States with a minimum of strings attached in order to restore fiscal balance to the Federal-State partnership and to strengthen the capacity of local governments to serve their citizens effectively.

The general outlines of a plan to distribute Federal tax revenues to the States was first suggested in June 1964 by Dr. Walter Heller, then Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. It has since been endorsed by a task force of economists headed by Joseph W. Pechman, of the Brookings Institution. It was supported by the Republican Governors Association last July as well as by numerous conferences of local officials. But no concrete plan has yet been formulated as to the precise allocation of Federal funds for a wide range of State activities. Despite its complexity, I believe Congress should have before it now a carefully drawn proposal embodying this plan so that it may be fully considered by congressional committees during the period between sessions and may be the subject for hearings early in the second session.

State and local governments face a severe crisis. While the future with its demands for new services is rushing in on them, they remain victims of a financial revenue base which is years out of date. In the past 18 years, total State and local government expenditures have multiplied six times over. State and local outlays for education alone increased from $3 billion at the end of World War II to $22 billion last year. In the past 10 years, these expenditures, now totaling about $87 billion per year, have risen at 8 percent per year, twice as fast as the gross national product. In contrast to this, the Federal Government made cash expenditures during fiscal year 1965, excluding costs of national defense, of $66 billion.

The sad fact is that the present resources of State and local government are not sufficient to meet the expanding needs caused by exploding population, rapid urbanization, and advanced technology; nor is there any indication that this situation will correct itself. Indeed, almost every imaginable tax resource has already been subjected to increasing and sometimes undesirable pressures. State taxes alone have gone from $4.9 billion in 1946 to $24.2 billion in 1964, an average increase of over a billion dollars a year. In 1965, property taxes increased 7.3 percent over the previous year; sales taxes went up 8.7 percent, corporate and individual income taxes rose 7.5 and 6.3 percent respectively—all in 1 year.

In 1964, State tax increases siphoned off one-third of the $6.5 billion Federal tax cut. Despite warnings from economists, a bewildering variety of consumption, payroll, and service taxes have appeared at the local level from Detroit to Oakland, Fairbanks to Mobile, Los Angeles to Baltimore. Over 40 cities have recently imposed motel and hotel taxes in an effort to shift some of their tax burdens to nonresidents. In a frantic search for additional revenues, New Hampshire has instituted a State-sponsored sweepstakes on horseracing.

The end is not in sight. Twenty-six Governors have asked for tax increases this past spring and many of those who are relying on larger yields from present taxes have warned their legislatures that increased taxes are a future necessity. Yet there is evidence that traditional taxes have already reached the limits of desirable expansion.

Dramatic proof of the growing disparity between government responsibilities and government resources is found in the increase in State and local debt. From a $15.9 billion level in 1946, public indebtedness at the State and local level almost doubled by 1952. Since that year, State and local debt has tripled, an average increase of more than $4½ billion per year.

State governments, which can tap a wider variety of revenue sources than local authorities can, have been active in using these sources. Between 1946 and 1963, no less than 14 States instituted a tax on cigarettes, while general sales taxes were added as a source of funds by 13 States. At the same time, four States added an individual income tax. Of course, virtually all States have also increased rates on previously tapped tax sources.

The financing of local government expenditures has been a problem of at least similar difficulty. These governments rely almost exclusively upon property tax revenues. While the postwar increase in property valuations has swelled the property tax base, there has still been a steady need to raise the property tax rates themselves.

Interstate competition to attract new industry—and similar competition among localities—has undoubtedly hampered efforts to add to current revenues, particularly in the case of corporate taxes. States and localities generally offer some form of inducement to attract new corporations to their areas, with the long-range objective of creating new job opportunities and increasing the overall tax base, and this competition tends to restrain local governments from increasing tax rates.

In the face of heavy demands placed upon State and local governments, the increase in their taxes and borrowing has been insufficient to prevent them from becoming gradually more dependent upon financial assistance from the Federal Government. The bulk of Federal assistance in the form of grants-in-aid programs has grown from a total of $884 million in 1946 to approximately $11 billion in 1965. In 1964 the Federal expenditure of $9.8 billion represented approximately 16.7 percent of total taxes and other general revenues raised by State and local governments, compared with only 7.3 percent in 1946. Grants to help support public welfare programs and to help build public roads and highways have shown the sharpest increase over the postwar years, and together they totaled some $7.5 billion in 1964.

Despite their achievements to date, State and local governments will continue to face a wide variety of additional public needs, and they do not want to curtail their responsibilities. They have doubled their employment over the past 13 years and increased their budgets many times. Obviously, problems of water and air pollution, overcrowded schools, and substandard recreation and housing facilities, as well as inadequate health care exist. In our vast and diversified country, these services can often be most effectively provided only through programs run at the State and local level. Thus, the immediate problem is to develop intergovernmental relationships that will enable State and local governments to carry out their vital role. Innovation and experimentation will be needed in future Federal-State cooperation and in planning and budgeting public programs if we want to get maximum benefit out of every dollar spent.

Under the plan I introduce today, New York whose 1963–64 State and local revenues amount to $7,445 million—the second largest in the Nation—would receive $202 million; Alaska, with State and local revenues during this period amounting to $89 million—the smallest in the Nation—would receive $2.6 million. Similarly, California would receive $213 million and Arkansas, $47 million. Through this plan, for example, New York would receive a 31-percent increase in Federal aid; California, 17 percent; Ohio, 20 percent; Alabama, 39 percent; Colorado, 16 percent, and Kentucky, 37 percent.

It may be argued by some that State and local governments will not use these Federal funds wisely or that they will use them to reduce their own taxes and expenditures for necessary programs. Experience of the past, however, indicates that such fears are groundless. A large proportion of total State and local outlays over the past years have been used for educational, health, and welfare purposes—an indication that local governments are cognizant of the needs of their people in these areas and are attempting to meet them.

Grants made to State and local governments under a plan such as this will enable these bodies to operate more independently. Local officials will be free of Federal domination, and the spread of a growing Federal bureaucracy may be halted. State and local governments will be in a stronger financial position, and a better fiscal balance will be achieved between Federal, State, and local governments.

Now, let me direct one word to those who may feel that the sort of tax-sharing plan I propose would mean further incursion on State prerogatives. Of course, there is always a possibility that this can happen, but the choice we face is not between State dollars and Federal dollars, but between Federal dollars bound by strings and conditions and funds which are relatively unconditional and can help buttress the capability of State and local governments to carry their responsibilities and not to abdicate authority to the Federal Government due to financial inability to discharge it.

For, we have to look to the days and years ahead when the demand for more and better local governmental services will increase.

Critics on the one side of the political spectrum are suspicious of the States and seemingly convinced of Federal "infallibility"; critics on the other side are suspicious of Washington. But mutual suspicions should not produce a deadlock, for this country cannot be governed well unless Government is imaginative and active and responsible and works at all levels in a Federal-State system.

I feel that the proposal embodied in the bill I introduced today can help prepare our governmental system to meet needs of the coming decades, and can help us to put cooperative federalism into practice for the benefit of all our people.

HARRY C. McPHERSON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in yesterday's Star there appeared a story extolling the merits of Harry McPherson, formerly general counsel of the Senate policy staff on the Democratic side.

Harry McPherson is an extraordinary and outstanding individual. He performed his duties in the Senate with intelligence, integrity, and humanity. I am delighted that this recognition is being given to this outstanding American.

Mr. President, when a man reaches the age of retirement and can look back at a fruitful career, he feels that his life has been well spent. But when a man in his middle thirties can look on a single decade of his life and can feel the same broad sense of accomplishment, he has even greater reasons to be proud. Such a man is Harry C. McPherson, who at 36 years of age has already won the admiration and respect of his colleagues for his intellectual and personal qualities, his drive and wide-ranging interests.

An anonymous colleague of his at the Department of State put it well when he said, "he has a brilliant mind, he has a sensitivity for other people's feelings." What greater tribute can a man be paid?

Harry McPherson came to Washington fresh out of law school in 1956 as a bright, cheerful, and unassuming young man whom everybody liked immediately—he is still a bright, cheerful, and unassuming young man whom everybody still likes. But now, only 9 years later, he is also a man who has served with distinction in the Senate, the Departments of State and Defense and now the White House.

The past for Harry has been a fine one—he has already had a rich and varied career—the future, I am certain, holds even greater promise.

It is to President Johnson's great credit that he has selected a man like Harry McPherson to serve as a member of the outstanding White House staff.

I am happy to join all Harry McPherson's friends in commending him for his many achievements which merited this fine article in the Washington Star of yesterday.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article which appeared in the Sunday Star of October 10, 1965, entitled "New White House Aid, a Man of Versatility," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW WHITE HOUSE AID A MAN OF VERSATILITY

(By Robert Walters)

Harry C. McPherson, Jr., the White House's unofficial resident playwright, peered from behind a pile of papers on his desk to explain one of the problems confronting him.

"I'm just not the kind of guy who can turn off, then turn on and go full blast," he said. "I do an awful lot of scrabbling before I get any ore."

The method may not be orthodox, but ability and creativity have more than compensated for McPherson's "scrabbling" since he came to Washington in 1956.

One of the most recently appointed presidential aids, McPherson moved into his second-floor White House office in late August.

He is one of several Texans working there who disprove the theory—embraced by some cynics—that presidential staff members are so many "old cronies" of Lyndon Johnson, and are hired for that reason.

BRIGHT YOUNG MEN

If he must be stereotyped, McPherson can best be classified as one of Washington's bright young men on the way up. At the age of 36, he is earning $28,500 and quickly gives the impression he is worth every taxpayer dollar.

A bouncy, cheerful, and soft-spoken young man, McPherson describes himself as "something of a utility infielder" at the White House, handling everything from speech writing to legal assistance on such diverse topics as agriculture and international education.

His outside interests range from squash and tennis to drama and archeology. He is an Air Force veteran, a former senior warden of his church, and holds two graduate degrees.

POLITICALLY ASTUTE

McPherson's former associates at the State and Defense Departments have nothing but praise for him. "He sees the political significance of a problem with intellectual penetration," said one.

"Harry's a good and rather quick judge of character. He's got good political instincts. And he's very unlikely to let you know something he doesn't want you to know," said a State Department official, a former coworker. He added:

"He's usually pretty sure his judgment is right—and he lets you know it, but never in any oppressive way. You don't get the impression he's a know-it-all.

"His personal inclination is somewhat in the direction of his cultural interests. He enjoys music and has written and directed plays.

"He has a good feel for personal relationships in a bureaucratic government. He's bright, forward-looking and not doctrinaire. He's obviously dedicated to the President, personally as well as professionally. He's got a long way to go."

McPherson is considerably more modest in describing himself. But one quickly perceives the vast range of his interests when, during a half-hour conversation, he quotes Homer, Mort Sahl, and Albert Camus, then goes on to discuss Bertold Brecht, Joseph McCarthy, and Jelly Roll Morton.

For someone born 9 weeks before the 1929 "Black Friday" stock market collapse, McPherson has come a long way. After 2 years at Southern Methodist University, he transferred to the University of the South and graduated in 1949 with a B.A. degree in English.

He began graduate studies at Columbia University, but left to join the Air Force in 1950, shortly after the outbreak of the Korean war. In 1953, he returned to civilian life, only to find Senator McCarthy terrorizing the country with his "anti-Communist" crusade.

"That was one of the things which made me decide to enter law school," he explained. "At Columbia, I thought what I wanted to do mostly was to write poems and be a teacher, but I later became more interested in politics."

TEXAS LAW GRADUATE

Entering the University of Texas Law School in 1953, he graduated with his law degree in 1956. The Senate Democratic policy committee was seeking an assistant counsel at the time.

The committee chairmanship is held by the Senate's Democratic leader, who at that time was Lyndon Johnson. To fill the slot, Johnson asked the law school faculty to recommend a bright young graduate.

"I guess he was looking in the right month," McPherson explained with a grin. "I took the job and came up here for what I thought was 2 years. I certainly didn't have any plans for moving permanently."

He never made it back to his hometown of Tyler, Tex. In 1958, he was named associate counsel of the policy committee. Three years later, he was elevated to general counsel. All during that period he worked closely with Johnson.

TO EXECUTIVE BRANCH

When Johnson assumed the Vice-Presidency, however, McPherson remained in the Senate employ. In 1963, he moved to the executive branch, serving first as deputy executive branch, serving first as Deputy Under Secretary of the Army for International Affairs.

In April 1964, he received the additional title of Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Army for civil functions. Four months later, he moved to the State Department where he served as assistant secretary for educational and cultural affairs.

He remained there until receiving the White House appointment—a post which involves responsibility for agriculture, rural life, urban affairs, international education and tariff and trade matters.

When he can forget about those concerns after a 10- or 12-hour day, McPherson turns to a wide variety of personal interests. Chief among them is drama.

Brecht is probably his favorite playwright, but he acknowledges considerable interest in Eugene Ionesco, Tennessee Williams, George Bernard Shaw and Shakespeare as well.

About 10 years ago, McPherson began writing and directing one-act plays for an amateur company of fellow parishioners at St. Marks Episcopal Church. "It developed beyond my expectations, it probably was the most fecund experience I have ever had in the church," he said.

McPherson said he did "only the most modest kind of occasional reading in archeology" but friends described him as something of an authority on the subject.

The family expert in archeology, McPherson insisted, is his wife, Clayton, who watches over a daughter, Courtenay, and a son, Peter, in the McPherson's Capitol Hill home.

"Most of our income since we were married has been spent on records," said McPherson, who described himself as a "Mozart fiend and a Bach lover," before launching into a discussion of Louis Armstrong and Jelly Roll Morton.

CHURCH INTERESTS WIDE

His added governmental responsibilities have forced McPherson to give up his post of senior warden at St. Marks—the highest lay office in the parish—but one church leader recently described him as "a man who always has been a leader in the church." He added that McPherson has lectured at colleges on the relationship of theology and politics.

"Harry is an excellent theologian. In the councils of the church he is very much respected," the man added. "He's very active, but he's more than just a 'good Joe' who helps to run the bazaars."

The church leader went on to describe McPherson as "one of the coming great men—but one who has no yearning for the public spotlight at all."

FELLOW WORKERS

Other former coworkers echoed that opinion. Because they weren't sure McPherson would appreciate anything said about him for publication, they asked to be quoted anonymously.

"There's no question in my mind that this guy will make his mark in life," said a State Department official who once worked closely with McPherson. "He has a brilliant mind; he has a sensitivity for other people's feelings."

He continued:

"Books seem to fascinate Harry. He also likes to swim, but I don't think he gets enough time for it anymore. And he likes a good cigar.

"He does his homework. When we went before Congress with our budget presentation, he had the answers at his fingertips. They appreciate someone who knows what he's doing."

From a former coworker at the Defense Department came this praise:

"He's a terrific guy to work for—a very yeasty kind of man who sees life as a challenge. He's a very effective and agile speaker on his feet. When he talked off the top for his new boss, he described himself well."

McPherson has similar praise for his head. He always handled Johnson as "the most tremendous man to work for I ever encountered in my life." Asked if he regretted having to give up some outside interests because of the heavy White House responsibilities, he said:

"I've got only one life. If I get a chance to become involved in the affairs of state, it's well worth it."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, every Senator remembers when Harry McPherson used to sit at the front table. He had, indeed, one of the most cordial personalities of anyone I have ever encountered, and along with it there was a real desire to help Members on both sides of the aisle. Coupled with that was a singular capacity not only for legislative but for executive work. I watched Harry McPherson when he went to work on the White House staff. I know he has made a steady advance on that staff. I salute him and join in any encomium that reflects glory and recognition to a former staff member of the U.S. Senate. Harry McPherson richly deserves the compliment paid him in the article in yesterday's Sunday Star.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished minority leader for the kind words he has had to say concerning Harry McPherson.

WISHING THE PRESIDENT WELL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, like most of the people in the United States, we in West Virginia send our best wishes to President Johnson for a complete and speedy recovery from his recent illness.

I believe the sentiments of the country are well expressed in an editorial which appeared in the Fairmont, W. Va., Times of October 8, 1965. I ask that the editorial be printed in the record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered printed as follows:

TIME FOR A REST?

The prayers of the Nation today will go to Lyndon Baines Johnson, President of the United States, for successful surgery and a speedy recovery. As was the case when President Eisenhower suffered three serious illnesses while in the White House, politics will stop at the sickroom door.

Removal of the gall bladder has become an almost commonplace operation, but the procedure still involves the excision of a human organ from the abdominal cavity and a layman cannot look upon the surgery with the same matter-of-factness as a physician. The President, of course, is assured the best in the way of professional care under hospital conditions both for surgery and recuperation that are unparalleled.

Possibly the enforced slowdown which will be the President's lot as he convalesces will be good for him and the country. It will give heated congressional tempers a chance to cool and pave the way for enactment of the rest of his program when the lawmakers return to work next year.

In the Senate, a filibuster led by Minority Leader EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN is underway on the repeal of section 14(b). Ol' Ev has worked with President Johnson closely during most of the long session, and it is possible he feels he must assert his prerogatives as the Republican leader in order, so to speak, to keep the franchise.

The House also is chafing under the amount of legislation it has passed in the extraordinarily productive session. Its mood is not unusual after Labor Day when the days begin to drag and thoughts of adjournment fill the air.

Some tired and frustrated Members are getting fed up with being called rubberstamps for writing one of the great achievement records in history. Some want to go home to mend fences—or just to rest.

Republicans recently tied up the House for 12 hours in protest against what they claimed was overuse of the process by which bills can be taken away from the Rules Committee after 21 days of inaction. The lower Chamber whipped through a resolution endorsing unilateral action against communism in the Western Hemisphere—a measure that was in no way part of the administration's foreign policy program—and it passed a wage bill for several employees much higher than recommended by the White House. Home rule for Washington, which the administration decided to push, was beaten, and only by 10 votes was an attack on the foreign aid appropriation bill beaten off.

President Johnson's postoperative convalescence would give him a thoroughly sound excuse for telling Congress it could go home and come back when it was in a better humor. He already has got more at this session than any President in history, and most of his major legislative goals have been attained.

L.B.J. doesn't ordinarily surrender without battling to the last ditch—and he may not this time. But prudence dictates that he take it easy for a while, and he might as well let Congress do the same.

HIGHER RANKS FOR WOMEN IN U.S. ARMED FORCES

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, great strides have been made in recent months to break down barriers which discriminate against women in various fields of employment. Much of this progress results from recommendations advanced by the Commission on the Status of Women, created by the late President John F. Kennedy. It was my pleasure to serve on that Commission and to consider ways to discard outmoded limitations on the full and effective use of women in our labor force.

On September 23, 1965, the Council of Trustees of the Association of the United States Army met in Washington, D.C., and adopted a resolution petitioning the Secretary of Defense to establish higher ranks for the women who direct the women's branches of our Armed Forces—WACS, WAVES, Women Marines, Nurse Corps and medical services of the three armed services.

Trustees of the association have explained that the women directors of these units are "outranked by a number of male officers who are charged with equal or lesser responsibilities."

It is my hope that the Secretary of Defense will give favorable consideration to the recommendations of the association's trustees. Such action would be in keeping with policies of our Government to accord equality of opportunity to women. I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks the text of the petition presented to the Secretary of Defense by the Council of Trustees of the Association of the United States Army.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF TRUSTEES OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY PETITIONING THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RELATIVE TO HIGHER RANKS FOR DIRECTORS OF THE WOMEN'S BRANCHES OF THE ARMED FORCES

1. The Council of Trustees of the Association of the United States Army respectfully requests the Secretary of Defense to initiate steps for the creation of field and flag ranks in the several women's branches of the Armed Forces, and for the increase in the number of senior officers thereof.

2. It is the considered opinion of this council that the role of women in the military forces of the United States will be an expanding one. The experience of World War II, and years subsequent thereto, have demonstrated beyond doubt the value of the talents and ability of women in the successful prosecution of the missions of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. Recognition of this fact is best evidenced by the permanent status accorded women in these branches of the Armed Forces by Public Law 625, 80th Congress, June 12, 1948.

3. Currently the highest grade or rank which any woman can achieve is that of colonel in the Army, Marine Corps, and Air Force, or captain in the Navy, and in the law there is provision for only one such officer in each, to wit, the officer charged with the overall direction of the particular branch.

4. It is submitted that the responsibility which is now vested in the directors of the WAC, WAVES, Women Marines, and WAF, and in the chiefs of the Nurse Corps and the medical services in the three armed services, justifies revision in ranks so that each director should be accorded the rank of brigadier general or equivalent. In addition, the commanding officer of the WAC Training Center and Schools at Fort McClellan should be accorded the rank of brigadier general. This is the mobilization base for expansion of the Women's Army Corps in time of war and hence has responsibilities for planning that merit a higher rank. Provision should also be made for the promotion of more lieutenant colonels to the rank of colonel, who would be assigned to positions in which a male colonel is normally assigned. It is firmly believed that there are positions for from 5 to 10 WAC colonels.

5. Under the present organizational structure the ceiling on rank imposes certain inequities which place women at a disadvantage, and we believe them to be inconsistent with the policy of the U.S. Government to accord equality of opportunity to women. For example, the director of the WAC is outranked by a number of male officers who are charged with equal or lesser responsibilities.

Moreover, the present ceilings on rank are bound to have an adverse effect on morale and the incentive of female officers who are performing their duties in such an outstanding manner that under similar circumstances male officers could expect promotion to higher rank. This is confirmed by the rising trend in the number of those voluntarily retiring from the Women's Army Corps after 20 years' service.

6. In the congressional hearings on legislation designed to give the WAC permanent status in the U.S. Army, General Eisenhower said in part:

"In tasks for which they are particularly suited, WAC's are more valuable than men, and fewer of them are required to perform a given amount of work. * * * In the disciplinary field they were, throughout the war, a model for the Army. * * * More than this, their influence throughout the whole command was good. * * * I assure you that I look upon this measure as a must. * * * You are at perfect liberty to quote me privately or publicly in this matter."

(House Committee on Armed Services subcommittee hearings on S. 1641, February 18, 1948, including letter from Chief of Staff to chairman of House Committee on Armed Services, January 30, 1948.)

Similar laudatory remarks on other women's branches of the Armed Forces during World War II can be cited. Time has confirmed the value of women as an integral part of our military forces.

THE COMING WAR OF HUNGER

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, no proposal made during this session of Congress is as important as the call to a war against worldwide hunger urged by the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota and former Food for Peace Director, Mr. McGOVERN. And no proposal is receiving more deserved attention than his International Food and Nutrition Act of 1965, S. 2157, introduced June 17. I am glad to say that I am a cosponsor of that bill.

My mail almost daily contains articles from newspapers and magazines telling of the coming world food and population crisis and our colleague's proposal to meet it.

My weekend mail includes an interview with Senator McGOVERN and a subsequent editorial in the October 4 and October 7 issues of the Christian Science Monitor. I ask unanimous consent for these two items to be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Monitor editorial concludes:

> Senator McGOVERN has proposed sweeping changes in American agricultural policy. If we have to reverse the basic theory of our farm policy, we had better find it out and find a way to do it. As the Senator noted, we have spent billions to launch man into outer space. If it takes an effort of similar magnitude to cope with the problem of global hunger, we had better face that fact and begin.

I believed very strongly when I joined the Senator from South Dakota as a coauthor of S. 2157 that our agricultural production capacity is our greatest asset in the struggle for world peace, and that this would ultimately be widely recognized. It is gratifying that this recognition is coming with great speed.

Typical of press response to our proposal is one I have received from Mr. McGOVERN's home State—an editorial which filled the editorial column of the Rapid City, S. Dak., Journal on Sunday, October 3. It contains endorsement of both the Senator's proposed war against hunger and of his effort to remove restrictions which now prevent our sale of surplus wheat to Russia.

I ask unanimous consent that the Rapid City Journal editorial also be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, Senator McGOVERN's world food proposal began to receive widespread attention very quickly after it was made last June.

The press saw it both as a foreign policy tool, and as a new domestic farm program—producing to meet human need instead of subsidizing acreage restrictions to control surpluses.

United Press International distributed a background article by Marguerite Davis which was printed in a great many papers across the Nation. I ask unanimous consent that the article as it appeared in the Springfield, Ill., Statesman, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, perhaps most significant is the breadth of the ideological spectrum from which endorsements have come.

An article and editorial by Carroll Streetor, editor, which appeared in the very conservative Farm Journal has already appeared in the RECORD.

I shall not ask to include the full text, but I was struck by an advertisement which appeared in Life magazine, September 24, indicating that even the usually very conservative business world is becoming alert to the constructive value in the foreign relations field of our capacity to produce food.

The top two-thirds of the full-page advertisement was a magnificent picture, in color, of a wheat field at harvest time. There were fleecy clouds in an otherwise blue and sunny sky. On the ground, combines were moving through the field.

It was a beautiful, modern-day harvest scene.

The caption on the picture was: "This Is a Battlefield."

Beneath the picture the Republic Steel Corp., the advertiser, told its readers:

> Day in, day out, giant weapons of peace are fighting the whole world's common enemy, hunger—right here on your own vast farmlands. And it is many battles later than you think. Creeping hunger is advancing over much of the world's bursting population. The biggest barrier to widespread starvation is grain from the breadbaskets of America.

The text of the advertisement then deals with the merit of Republic Steel Corp. steels used in farm machinery.

A reader could not avoid, Mr. President, observing how much greater satisfaction the men of this corporation appeared to reflect in this ad from the contribution their products make to machinery for the battlefields of peace, than they find when their steel must be shaped into instruments of war, destruction and death.

It was a very forceful advertisement; forceful in the cause of a world food program, forceful in its demonstration that there is economic benefit for all—farmers, urban workers, and industry—in waging the war against want, and forceful in its revelation of the pride that men and corporations will find in making a constructive contribution to the welfare of man.

I am convinced that we have seen the beginning of a movement in the session of the Congress now drawing to an end which will become a reality in the next session and a very powerful instrument of foreign policy, and peace building, in the years just ahead.

I want to congratulate and thank the Senator from South Dakota for the leadership he is providing in this and other fields.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 4, 1965]

UNITED STATES URGED TO DECLARE WORLD WAR ON FAMINE

(By Saville R. Davis)

WASHINGTON.—"We ought to declare an all-out war against hunger on this planet," says South Dakota's Senator GEORGE McGOVERN, "and do it now."

"The number of people is outracing the amount of food available at an almost unbelievable rate," he says. "In the next 35 years the population of the world will double—from 3 billion to 6 billion. And the food supply is not going up significantly.

"The enormous food gap in prospect is the No. 1 problem of the last third of the 20th century," the Senator contends.

"Hunger and malnutrition are serious enough today. But major starvation will be the most painful fact of life on this planet within 10 years, unless we start today to tackle it."

The American people are not aware of the facts, Senator McGOVERN said in an interview. They still think of large American surpluses when in fact these are sharply reduced and approaching dangerously low levels. They see great efforts being made to produce birth-control programs, but these cannot be expected to solve the problem in time.

"Our position of moral leadership will not permit us to turn our backs on this problem. Nor will our national security. Much of the tension and unrest that opens the way for violent upheavals and Communist inroads have their roots in hunger and misery."

Senator McGOVERN has a bill before Congress to attack this problem. It would turn American farms back from crop controls to deliberately stimulated production.

"If we begin now to divert a portion of the $2 billion annual farm control budget into the purchase, shipment, and distribution of farm commodities abroad, where they are needed, we could double our food-for-peace effort with little increase in overall expense."

The McGovern bill would spend $500 million next year for three purposes:

To purchase needed nutritious foods in the United States for distribution abroad.

To help the receiving countries to store and distribute the food more efficiently, with better facilities.

Greatly to strengthen the food-producing capacity of farm people in the underdeveloped world, by all available technical and educational means.

A similar sum would be added each year for 6 years. The total would then equal the amount spent on foreign aid of all sorts by the United States in the coming year.

FARMERS CORPS SUGGESTED

But the switch from negative cropland restriction to a program of stimulating production in the United States would be a strong stimulus to the American economy, Mr. McGOVERN said.

One of the Senator's more intriguing suggestions is that of an American farmers corps, not unlike the Peace Corps except that its members would have high professional ability.

It would consist of "retired farmers or working farmers willing to take leave of their own farms for a time."

They would go out like the highly successful agricultural county agents in the United States, as teachers who can show how, as well as tell how, and who know how to combine new technology with old skills.

"When I was Food-for-Peace Director under President Kennedy," he recalled, "I reached the conviction that the most overwhelming paradox of our time was to permit half the human race to be hungry while we struggle to cut back on surplus production.

"The sciences have broken the space barrier, at a cost heading toward $20 billion, but not the bonds of hunger."

The Senator based many of his facts on the rapidly enlarging hunger gap on a new official study of the situation by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

It compared for the first time, it is said, comprehensive figures on population growth with similarly careful figures on expectable food production.

OWN RESERVES CHECKED

A typical conclusion: In Asia, merely to maintain present meager diets, yields per acre must increase by more than 50 percent between now and 1980. This would require an annual use of an additional amount of fertilizer that would nearly equal the world's entire output of fertilizer today.

For many Americans, however, the Senator's account of the present state of American farm surpluses will be equally suprising.

"They are not much above the level, now, that is needed for our own national reserves," he said. "For example: Wheat stocks have been worked down from 1.4 billion bushels at the start of this decade to 800 million bushels today. Corn and other feed grain supplies have been sharply reduced.

"The present composite reserve of wheat and feed grains is scarcely equal to 6 months' consumption in the United States."

Senator McGOVERN recalled that President Johnson recently suggested that Congress build a food reserve. If this were done on a 6-month supply basis, the present food-for-peace program of American aid abroad would have to be eliminated, or American farm production sharply enlarged.

Senator McGOVERN wants the United States to work with and through the United Nations, as well as on its own, in the big enterprise that he recommends. The effort will have to be cooperative and international, he said.

Senator McGOVERN, coming from a farm State as he does, is aware of the great complexity of the task of helping other countries with their farm production. The collapse of the high hopes for technical assistance after the last World War, he agrees, are illustration enough.

He mentions, as reasons why these hopes were not justified, the lack of an all-around approach to the problem: lack of rural education, adequate credit, forms of landownership that reward incentive, rural extension services, farm to market roads or cash markets for produce. He blames the shortage of fertilizer, pesticides, good irrigation facilities and methods, hybrid seed and feed mixing equipment—and the knowledge to apply them.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 7, 1965]

WAR ON HUNGER

Two of this newspaper's Washington correspondents recently took a long, hard look at the world's rapidly approaching food crisis. Their purpose was not to alarm but to alert.

They report that data produced by demographers, agronomists, economists, and other specialists point to a coming world famine of unbelievable proportions. It can be averted only by a worldwide effort far greater than anything now on the horizon.

One fact alone explains the profound concern expressed by authorities: World populations are soaring way beyond the unimpressive growth in food production. Every single week there are over 1 million more people living on this earth than were here the week before.

Senator GEORGE McGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, sees the enormous food gap in prospect as the No. 1 problem of the last third of the 20th century. He asks that we declare an all-out war against hunger on this planet and do it now.

To meet the world hunger challenge is not only an imperative moral responsibility but a matter of the utmost practical urgency to every inhabitant of this globe, including those in the most affluent societies. A world half of which is well fed and half of which is starving cannot long endure.

The most radical and violent political and social movements feed on extreme desperation born of the threat of mass starvation. Knowledge of this ought to be sufficient warning to the more affluent North Atlantic community to bend every effort to find solutions while there is yet time.

American efforts to meet the problem, while commendable, are still far from adequate. Nor can the United States solve a problem of this magnitude merely by its own efforts, however great.

The export of food, fertilizers, insecticides, credits, agricultural know-how, and so on, together with the recent tentative steps taken toward encouraging effective birth control programs, when all put together, still fall far short.

Only greatly increased food production coupled with much wider use of effective birth control methods will solve the world's hunger problem. And only then will conditions be conducive to world peace. In view of this, we question Pope Paul VI's statement before the United Nations, apparently advocating reliance on the one but not the other.

Senator McGOVERN has proposed sweeping changes in American agricultural policy. If we have to reverse the basic theory of our farm policy, we had better find it out and find a way to do it. As the Senator noted, we have spent billions to launch man into outer space. If it takes an effort of similar magnitude to cope with the problem of global hunger, we had better face that fact and begin.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Rapid City Sunday Journal, Oct. 3, 1965]

SURPLUS FOODS SHOULD BE USED

What to plant and how much is the problem plaguing legislators and farmers. The 4-year proposal now approved in Washington is a temporary, patched job which seems to have appeased very few.

It is known the United States can produce more food, whatever the crop or animals might be, on fewer acres than ever before. For those in the cities, it is difficult to understand why millions of dollars are paid each year to store more grain, bury more lard, give away butter, fail to process cotton for fabric or oil.

It is equally difficult for millions of Americans to understand why other people on this globe go hungry.

South Dakota's Senator GEORGE McGOVERN offers a solution which could head off world famine and aid the cause of world peace. On September 20, Senator McGOVERN told a regional Methodist conference in Sioux Falls:

"Food is a better form of aid than guns, and a whole lot safer for the world." He suggested hunger is a focal point where the United States can earn good will, rather than ill will.

Carl A. Quarnberg, Rapid City businessman with wide interests as operator of a flour mill and feed, seed, and grain buyer, processor, and distributor wrote the following letter to Senator McGOVERN:

"Press reports on your address greatly intrigue me.

"You are right. 'Food is a better form of aid than guns, and a whole lot safer for the world.' In that statement, you may have uncovered a really great idea that can be of real service to wheat farmers as well as starving people of the world.

"Wheat programs of the past have not been fully acceptable to farmers of South Dakota. And wheat farmers of western South Dakota are even more independent than those living on the east side of the river. Western ranchers and farmers are definitely individualistic. They like standing on their own feet. They definitely resent the idea that a government employee sitting at a mahogany desk in Washington, D.C., must tell them what to plant and how much. They want their independence back. They want to use their own judgment as to what and how much.

"Again you are right. 'It is time to tell the world that we have a great unused farm capacity and that America is going to use it to help end hunger in the world.'

"Over the past many years, the United States has continually reduced wheat production while at the same time and under the same world conditions, Canada, Australia, and Argentina (even Germany and France) has encouraged increased wheat production, much to the benefit of their farmers as well as consumers.

"Again you are right when you say, 'If we spend as much money purchasing and distributing our farm surplus production as we now spend paying farmers not to produce, we would lay a foundation for a greater farm prosperity at home and much less hunger abroad.' You have expressed a perfect two-point idea: Food for starving millions of the world; and in the very same breath, a possible answer to the ever-present but still unsolved farm problem.

"Your experience as director of food for peace points to you as better informed on world food problems than any man in public life today. I urge you to pursue your idea to final conclusion. Laying all politics aside, I pledge my personal support to this end."

The capacity to produce seemingly unlimited supplies of commodities for citizens of the United States has been challenged by the farm bills. More production results on fewer acres Subsidies for unplanted acres merely add to the total cost for taxpayers.

McGOVERN served as director of the food-for-peace program under the late President Kennedy. Subsequently he was elected U.S. Senator from South Dakota.

McGOVERN and Senator KARL MUNDT do not see eye to eye on the farm bills, nor on how best the surpluses might be utilized. Senator MUNDT does not believe in giving aid and comfort to the Communist enemy in any manner. Yet it seems there should be a way to win good will.

What better way to win than with our surplus food?

EXHIBIT 3

[From the Springfield (Ill.) Statesman]

SENATOR URGES CROP USE TO FEED A HUNGRY WORLD

(By Marguerite Davis)

WASHINGTON.—For years, a bountiful America has struggled—and spent millions—to control its farm surpluses.

Now a farm-State Senator wants an about-face which would let farmers grow more food on more land and would distribute more of it to the world's hungry millions.

Led by Senator GEORGE S. McGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, a group of midwestern Democrats in Congress contend it is neither sensible nor moral for the United States to follow a program of sharply curtailed food production when every day half a billion people go to bed hungry.

And they warn that strict Federal controls have reduced the Nation's food stockpiles to such a low point, that there are not enough of some of basic commodities to maintain a 6-month reserve for home consumption.

They admit that the problems in their plan could be many and complicated. But they argue that the results would be good for American farmers as well as for international relations. They believe President Johnson agrees.

The roots of the food-for-peace (FFP) program lie in a 1954 law which provides for the distribution of surplus U.S. crops to have-not nations. The food may be given, bartered, sold for the currency of the receiving nation, or bought through a 40-year American loan plan.

In 1961 the program was designated food for peace, with McGOVERN as its first Director. But he found his office carried little authority. He resigned in 1962 to run for the Senate. But his 18-month exposure to food for peace left its mark.

On one side of the world he had seen mass graves of those who had starved to death; children whose gaunt limbs and distended stomachs testified to their hunger, and some blind from lack of proper nourishment.

At home were millions of acres taken out of production in a continuing battle against too much food, even while farmers declared that their private economic depression could eventually engulf the cities.

President Johnson suggested in his farm message to Congress establishment of strategic reserves of food but he submitted no bill to accomplish this.

Representative CLAIR A. CALLAN, Democrat, of Nebraska, did so June 3 with a measure which called for reserves of food equal to half a year's requirements. According to his calculations, this would wreck the food-for-peace program.

Under his proposal, for example, 600 million bushels of wheat would be kept on hand. That would leave only 41 million for distribution abroad.

Two weeks later McGOVERN submitted to the Senate an "International Food and Nutrition Act of 1965." It would authorize an additional $500 million of foods of all kinds, not merely those now surplus, for distribution to hungry nations.

The program would be increased at the rate of $500 million a year until it reached $3.5 billion in 10 years.

His bill went to the Foreign Relations Committee whose chairman, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, has indicated he believes food-for-peace program should be stepped up from the mere dumping of surplus foods to providing the vitamins and proteins which hungry children require.

Support for his plan was forthcoming.

Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY promised whatever help he could give. Senator WALTER F. MONDALE, Democrat, of Minnesota, claimed that McGOVERN's plan would work for this country's own interests.

"For every 10 percent the less-developed countries increase their income level, they expand their dollar purchases of our farm products by 16 percent," he said. "Italy, Japan, and Nationalist China have moved from the status of food aid recipients to major dollar customers for our farm exports."

THE PRESIDENT'S SURGICAL OPERATION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer be printed in the RECORD.

It expresses the wishes of us all for the successful and speedy recovery of our President.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Oct. 7, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT'S OPERATION

The prayers of all Americans will be with President Johnson as he enters the hospital on Thursday for a gall bladder operation the following day.

Happily, medical science has reached the stage where this type of surgery is regarded as fairly routine. The President is expected to spend no more than 10 to 14 days in the hospital following the operation; then will probably have a period of reduced activity for several weeks. But when he gets back on the job, there is no reason why he should not be as vigorous as ever—and vigor is one of Mr. Johnson's prime characteristics.

When the President is ailing, every American is deeply concerned. That is why it is so important that the public be kept fully informed. In taking it upon himself personally to announce his impending operation, and in making it possible for newsmen to obtain all the information they desired from his physicians, President Johnson is pursuing the intelligent course instituted by President Eisenhower, during his several illnesses.

Mr. Johnson has been careful also to make sure that, if the need should arise for any Presidential decision when he is under sedation, Vice President HUMPHREY would act in his place. He has pointed out that "the doctors expect there will be a minimal time during which I will not be conducting business as usual," but every contingency, obviously, must be covered.

The strains upon the President, and the burdens of responsibility placed upon him, are very great. The hope has been expressed many times that Mr. Johnson would slow down his amazing pace, and take more time out for rest and relaxation. Considering the demands of the office, and the President's devotion to duty, that has been something easier to hope for than to achieve.

The country, extending its best wishes to Mr. Johnson, will look forward to his emergence from the hospital, a few days hence, completely recovered.

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH BY FORMER NEW YORK ATTORNEY GENERAL GOLDSTEIN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, former New York State Attorney General Nathaniel L. Goldstein was installed as president of the American Friends of the Hebrew University last Sunday. Mr. Goldstein is one of New York's most distinguished citizens. He served the State as attorney general from 1942 to 1954 and was my immediate predecessor in that post. During his terms of office under Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, New York moved forward and led the Nation, in many areas of government concern, including civil rights, education, and health. Also during that time, Mr. Goldstein was a leading figure in the National Association of Attorneys General. In addition to the bar, he has also distinguished himself in philanthropy and community service.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the acceptance speech of Attorney General Goldstein on the occasion of his installation be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE ACCEPTANCE REMARKS OF FORMER ATTORNEY GENERAL NATHANIEL L. GOLDSTEIN OF NEW YORK, UPON HIS INDUCTION AS PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN FRIENDS OF THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1965

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your very kind introduction. May I also express my deep appreciation to the Minister of Commerce of the State of Israel, His Excellency, the Honorable Haim Zadok, for his most gracious remarks. Were I, in turn, to present him to you, I should characterize him succinctly as a brilliant lawyer, a superb public servant and, above all, a gentleman of the highest order.

I accept the indicia of office today with due humility, realizing the duty which goes with it and the accompanying obligation to that great citadel of learning, standing at the crossroads of the Middle East, in all of its majestic glory, beaming its rays of knowledge throughout the civilized world.

The Hebrew University performs a dual function. It supplies the professions to administer to the needs of the people of Israel, the scientists, the doctors, and the lawyers. It produces the teachers so essential to man the primary and secondary schools, for brick and mortar without teachers can be of no avail. I know I need not stress its importance, for it is self-evident and axiomatic.

For the next few minutes, I should, therefore, like to tell you what impelled me, with all of my manifold duties and obligations, to accept the presidency of the American Friends. It is inherent in the second great historic mission of the Hebrew University.

We are the people of the Book, and learning has sustained us throughout the ages, in all of our travail and suffering—and it is learning which can bring peace and tranquillity to the world.

Nuclear weaponry is not the answer, for in a span of 50 years we have fought and won two world wars, steeped in blood, sweat, and tears. Checkerboard diplomacy will not do it, for with all our statesmanship and diplomatic maneuvering, we find ourselves on the brink of world war III.

Knowledge, learning, education, and understanding must supply the tools, by which the human race can survive, in a world of plenty and splendor.

Unfortunately, America, the most powerful nation on earth, which has done so much good for so many people, has been unable to reach the underdeveloped and newly developed countries of Asia and Africa. Unless there is a rapport with them, I fear that mistrust and misunderstanding will continue. Unless we can infuse them with our democratic way of life, we shall be groping in the dark and in the abyss of dismal failure. We, who are living under the best form of government conceived by man, cannot transmit our good and our blessings to these people.

But there is one ray of hope. In an era when the use of force as a weapon in diplomacy has become an anachronism, the example of Israel stands forth as a guiding light. The diplomacy of economic and technical assistance waged so ably by Israel is doing much to win the hearts and the minds of the people of these developing countries. Dedicated young people trained by the Hebrew University are now practicing the diplomatic art and setting an example which the free countries of the world can follow and learn from.

Let me name a few specifics where the Hebrew University is now playing its important role, helping their Asian and African neighbors. There is, at the university, a unique program for training Africans in modern medicine, under the auspices of the World Health Organization, an arm of the United Nations. The program, now in its third year, will soon graduate the first group of physicians, who will return to their native lands in Africa and head hospitals, research centers, and, before long, be training physicians and technicians essential to the health of their people.

Similarly, there are African and Asian students in economics, social work, the law school, as well as in the multifaceted fields of modern science.

There is presently underway a newly created Institute for American Studies. Although less than a month old, this institute is teaching American history and an appreciation of the guiding principles of American democracy. I can think of no more direct channel to the consciousness of the people of the emerging nations than through the tutelage of another new democracy which has benefited so dramatically from the American experience.

This little State of Israel has been able, in a short time, to reach the eyes and the ears of these Asians and Africans. It has been able to gain their confidence and trust. And this little State, through the Hebrew University must be the catalyst by which these people can be reached.

To eradicate poverty of the body is all important, but to feed the poverty of the mind is also important, if we are to live in a world of rule by law.

We, in America, must provide the wherewithal, for the Hebrew University can supply the manpower and the brains. All that we are being asked for is dollars, and dollars, unless put to good use, lie fallow and helpless. This, believe me, my friends, is the cheapest insurance premium we can pay for the survival of civilization.

THE CIGARETTE ADVERTISING DOLLAR AND THE PUBLIC WELFARE

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, earlier this year the Congress passed the Cigarette Labeling Act, requiring a hazardous warning statement on each cigarette package. The Congress declined to act favorably on the companion proposal to include a similar warning in all cigarette advertising. One of the reasons for this reluctance to act was the claim that the effects on consumption of the cigarette advertising were not known. As a useful contribution to this discussion, I would like to include in the RECORD an article by Julian L. Simon, which appeared in the May 1964 issue of the Illinois Business Review, and I ask unanimous consent that this be done.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIGARETTE ADVERTISING AND THE NATION'S WELFARE

(By Julian L. Simon, assistant professor of advertising)

The Federal Trade Commission is now holding hearings about whether cigarette companies should be required to post a "danger to health" warning on packs of cigarettes and in advertisements. These hearings are an outgrowth of the recent report by the Surgeon General on the health hazards of cigarette smoking.

Some individuals and groups, including Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER and Consumers Union, favor the proposed regulation. Some want cigarette advertising prohibited completely. However, no responsible person has suggesting outlawing the manufacture or sale of cigarettes themselves.

People who oppose the warning proposal and the ban on advertising base their opposition on grounds of legality as well as of economics. This article will consider only the economics of a warning requirement or a ban. It will not consider other economic alternatives such as an increase in cigarette taxes.

I shall discuss the possible effects on cigarette use, and the consequent economic impacts of these two proposals on the groups that have a stake in what happens. Mostly, I shall talk about the ban on advertising, because its effect is better understood. The effect of a warning requirement would probably be much less than an advertising ban, but of the same general nature.

EFFECT ON CIGARETTE CONSUMPTION RATE

Opponents of a warning or ban will say that forbidding cigarette advertising, or requiring a danger warning, will have "practically no effect" on consumption. Supporters of the warning, however, argue that advertising has a "substantial" effect in influencing people to start smoking, and in keeping them smoking. Where is the truth?

It is perfectly clear that advertising has the power to influence the purchase of particular brands of cigarettes. The $220 million spent annually for cigarette advertising is proof-positive of that. But we are not interested in the power of advertising to shift smokers from one brand to another. We want to know how cigarette advertising as a whole starts people smoking or keeps them smoking.

Neil Borden examined the role of cigarette advertising in the astounding growth of cigarette smoking starting about 1900, when the annual per capita consumption of cigarettes was 49. By 1962 the rate had risen to 3,958 cigarettes per capita. Borden did not say that advertising caused the rise in cigarette consumption. He argued that if the public had not been ready to take up cigarette smoking, advertising could never have caused such a large increase in consumption. Nevertheless, Borden concluded that advertising was an important factor in the size and speed of increase in cigarette smoking.

But we want to know the effect of advertising now, when cigarette smoking is a very prevalent habit. We want to know what would happen if advertising were banned, or if a warning were required.

Robert Basmann carried out an intricate statistical study of the rise and fall in cigarette advertising from year to year in the United States, and its apparent effect on cigarette consumption. He found that for each 1 percent change in total cigarette advertising, the number of cigarettes smoked changed one-twentieth of 1 percent. In other words, the consumption of cigarettes is affected by the amount of advertising, but it takes a big change in the amount of advertising to make much of a difference in consumption. This is typical of an industry once it has become well established, but it may also result from the degree to which the smoking habit takes hold of people and the fact that nothing else is a good substitute for smoking.

What would happen if all cigarette advertising were cut off? An extension of Basmann's finding would suggest that if there had been no cigarette advertising last year, consumption would have been about 5 percent less than it was. If the ban on advertising continued, we might expect further decreases in the amount of consumption each year, but the absolute decrease would be less each year. These predictions are subject to many technical reservations, and they go far beyond the data. But they are the best that we can do at this time.

A required danger-warning in the ads would be a type of negative advertising. We cannot estimate how much the warning would cut smoking, but certainly the effect would not be as drastic as a ban on advertising, or no firm would continue to advertise. Our inability to come up with any better prediction is testimony to how little scientific knowledge we have about the effect of different forms of advertising copy. But it should certainly be possible to pretest ads that contain warnings, just as other ads are pretested, in order to obtain an estimate of the effect of a warning.

Now let us estimate the health effect of an advertising ban and the resulting reduction in cigarette consumption:

1. For each cigarette smoked, someone's life is shortened by 5 to 9 minutes. We shall figure 7 minutes per cigarette.

2. About 523 billion cigarettes were smoked last year. A decrease of 5 percent in consumption for just 1 year would mean an increase of human life in the United States of about 183 billion minutes, 349,000 years of life. Remember, this is the amount of lifetime increased by a decrease of 5 percent in smoking for just 1 year.

3. People who are kept from starting smoking will live, on the average, 5 years longer than if they had started smoking.

EFFECT ON EMPLOYMENT AND LOCAL ECONOMIES

An estimated 225,000 people make a substantial part of their living in tobacco agriculture, earning approximately $600 million last year, of which about $450 million came from cigarettes. Some 31,000 factory workers earned $150 million last year from cigarette manufacture. In total, then, cigarette purchases put about $600 million into the pockets of workers and farmers. How will a ban or a warning affect them?

Notwithstanding the frantic reactions of Southern State officials, however, a drop in consumption would have no immediate effect on farm earnings, because of the Government subsidy program. Unless the Government removed the subsidy, the taxpayers at large, rather than the farm population, would take the loss. But let's assume that the subsidy would be cut.

If the subsidy were cut, the effect of a loss in earnings would probably be worse than the figures show, because the effect would be concentrated in a few States that are already economically backward. Many tobacco farmers are already poor and would find it hard to find new jobs. For example, North Carolina is an agricultural State and almost half of its farm income comes from tobacco.

Using our estimates above, employment and earnings would be cut by 5 percent at most during the first year of an advertising ban. In subsequent years, the further cut in jobs and/or dollars would be less. I say "5 percent at most" because there is good reason to believe that an important proportion of smokers who quit smoking cigarettes, or young people who never start, would use other forms of tobacco instead. The accompanying table shows that cigarettes largely replaced other forms of tobacco and did not create much new demand for tobacco. To the extent that smokers switch to pipe tobacco, cigars, chewing tobacco, and snuff, the damage to tobacco farming would be reduced, even though cigarette tobacco is a more expensive product than other types of tobacco.

Furthermore, some or many tobacco workers who are thrown out of work would get other jobs, so we are overestimating greatly when we assume that the equivalent of lost cigarette industry wages would be lost to the economy as a whole. But we assume the worst, or close to it, for the sake of argument. Later we shall look at the potential effects on employment again, when we consider the overall picture.

EFFECT ON CIGARETTE COMPANIES

To understand the effect of a ban or a warning requirement on the cigarette companies, we must first understand the nature of advertising as a business investment.

When a firm spends a dollar in advertising a brand of cigarettes this year, the advertising bought with that dollar increases cigarette sales this year. But it also increases cigarette sales next year, and the year after, and in subesquent years. Customers get into the habit of buying a given brand, a habit that may continue for many years. To say it another way, a dollar of advertising may create some goodwill or brand loyalty that persists long into the future, though each year the effect of that single dollar of advertising is less than the year before. Cigarette advertising is really an investment, just like an investment in a new machine that will produce for many years after it is bought.

Lester Telser studied the pre-World War II cigarette market in considerable detail. He found that only 15 to 20 percent of the advertising investment is used up in the year in which the advertisements appear. This means that for each dollar of sales created in the advertising year, much more than $3 of sales will be created in subsequent years. (However, because of the chaos in the postwar cigarette market, investment is probably used up faster than Telser's estimate.)

Therefore, even if all cigarette advertising were stopped tomorrow, the established cigarette brands would continue to sell well for many years, though at continually diminishing rates. During that time the cigarette companies would be recouping the investments they have already made. Furthermore, since all the firms would have to stop advertising, the investments already made would not be used up as fast, which would give the cigarette companies a better return on their invested dollars than they expected to earn when they made the investments.

The total effect, then, would be that in future years the sales of any brand would gradually decrease. But the gross profits on a brand would be at a very high rate for a while, because the firm would not be making any further investment in advertising. The cigarette companies would have a fine opportunity to milk their brands for profit.

The cigarette companies already know how to milk a brand after they cease advertising it. For example, substantial quantities of nonfilter Old Golds have been sold in the last couple of years despite the fact that Lorillard practically quit advertising them.

If advertising were stopped, the cigarette companies would generate large amounts of cash each year, which they could either liquidate to stockholders or use to diversify. The former is not likely because of our tax structure and because no executive likes to liquidate himself out of a job. In the latter case, much of the capital would go to create new jobs in other industries.

Either way, I would guess that a cigarette stock would have a very solid value if advertising were banned. The same type of predictions would apply if a warning were required, but the effects would not be as sweeping.

EFFECT OF ADVERTISING MEDIA

The advertising media have already been hit by the Surgeon General's report. Some radio and television stations have voluntarily restricted cigarette advertising to certain hours of the day, while others have cut it off completely. Some magazines and papers have always refused to accept tobacco advertising, notably the Reader's Digest. And now the cigarette advertisers have set up an authority to regulate copy and media.

A warning requirement would not hit the media as hard as a ban, of course. But a warning that really affected consumption would make advertising less profitable for the firms, and they would therefore advertise less.

Television would lose more than $120 million in advertising revenue, about 7 percent of its total revenue last year. But that would not represent a dead loss to television stations and networks. Television time is limited, especially on networks, and the time is therefore rationed among potential advertisers. If cigarette advertising were banned, the television time could be sold to other advertisers, though at a somewhat lower price.

Television stations are charged with the public interest to a greater extent than are other communication media, because they are given a free franchise for a channel. This franchise gives them some monopoly power. Therefore, the television people should be particularly slow to complain about the loss of cigarette advertising revenue if it is in the public interest.

Radio would lose an estimated $20 million in cigarette advertising revenue, less than 3 percent of its total revenue. Other advertisers would not replace this revenue. But radio stations also have a free franchise granted by the public.

The $34 million loss to general and farm magazines would be a complete loss, about 7 percent of their total revenue. The magazines would not find other advertisers to replace cigarettes, and some magazines would feel a considerable strain. But since it would hit them all, they could all be expected to reduce their editorial cost somewhat, without fear of losing advertisers or circulation to competition. This might cushion the impact somewhat.

The $18 million lost to newspapers would be only one-half of 1 percent of their advertising revenue.

EFFECT ON ADVERTISING AGENCIES

The advertising agency business would take a beating if cigarette advertising were banned. Agencies would also be hurt if a warning were required, because in that case total cigarette advertising would decrease. Madison Avenue-type agencies would lose approximately $200 million billing of their total of perhaps $4 billion, about 5 percent of their total. (Actually, only 15 percent of the $200 million—$30 million—stays with the agencies. The rest goes to the media.) Perhaps a thousand copywriters, account executives, and other agencies would be scurrying about looking for jobs, and the job market would be glutted for a while.

It is interesting to note that some major advertising agencies have said, after the Surgeon General's report came out, that they would refuse to handle cigarette advertising, because they now consider it immoral. Expectedly, none of those agencies now has a cigarette account. But their statements do mean something, nevertheless.

EFFECT ON THE ECONOMY AS A WHOLE

The total cigarette market is about $6.8 billion. Excluding taxes, the industry accounts for $3.6 billion, much less than 1 percent of the gross national product.

We have some evidence that Americans tend to spend a fairly constant percentage of their total yearly income, year after year. This suggests that a decrease in cigarette sales would lead to a compensating increase in other spending. If so, the effect on the economy as a whole would be lessened. Exactly how much the first impact would be, we cannot say. It would be somewhere between no effect and $180 million (5 percent of $3.6 billion).

On the other side of the ledger, the "multiplier effect" would magnify the ill effects of whatever decrease in spending does take place, by a factor of two or three. This effect is due to the spending of money again and again by people in the business chain. In other words, if people saved half of the $180 million drop in cigarette sales, the drop in national income would then be between $180 million and $270 million.

In any case, a small yearly decrease in cigarette sales and cigarette advertising, made even smaller by a shift to other forms of tobacco, would not be even a drop in the bucket for the economy as a whole.

Cigarette smoking does affect the Federal economy and the economies of the States and some cities, too, by way of taxes paid on cigarettes. Federal excise taxes amount to $2 billion, State taxes are above $1 billion, and municipal taxes are $40 million. These taxes are important to the tax-collecting bodies. But at first the loss would only be 5 percent of taxes that represent 2 percent of total government revenues. Furthermore, if taxes are not collected one way, they can be collected another way, at the same total cost to the public.

On the other hand, cigarettes may cost the economy far more than they contribute. Louis Lublin, a retired vice president of Metropolitan Life Insurance, estimates that cigarettes cost the Nation $10 billion annually in the lost services and earnings of men killed prematurely by cigarettes. My own estimate is a loss of more than $4 billion, based on 1.1 years of life lost by the average smoker before the age of 65, half of the men in the United States being smokers, and an annual payroll of $322 million.

In sum, then, we must balance the expected effects on health against the expected effects on employment and earnings.

Putting together our previous estimates, we can say that it takes a reduction of 880 cigarettes to produce a drop of $1 in tobacco-worker's earnings. And a drop of that many cigarettes means that someone's life expectancy goes up by 880 times; 7 minutes equals 104 hours. The drop in both consumption and earnings would be less in subsequent years. But they would stay in step with each other, so the same type of dollars-for-hours-of-life relationship would hold.

When we consider the $4 to $10 billion in earnings lost each year by men killed prematurely by cigarettes, it is clear that the country will gain more in live-men's earning power than it will lose in revenue. And, in fact, the gain in earning power for people kept alive by not smoking would be 10 to 20 times the loss in earning power of tobacco-industry workers.

Then, too, deaths caused by smoking decrease consumption spending. In the 104 hours lost by each dollar of cigarette-industry earnings, a live person would spend more than $20. This consumption spending is important to the economy.

This, then, is the decision that will eventually be made, if our assumptions are correct. Should the Nation decrease employment temporarily to gain 104 hours of life per dollar of earnings lost? Should the Nation reduce the tobacco industry revenue, gaining $2 in earnings from live men for each dollar decrease in tobacco industry revenue, and a gain of $10 to $20 in earnings of men kept alive for each dollar of tobacco workers' earnings lost?

CONCLUSION

There is much to gain, little to lose, by stopping the advertising of cigarettes. My chain of reasoning goes like this:

1. Advertising could be banned without prohibiting smoking;
2. A ban on advertising would bring about no boomerang noneconomic ill effects and the economy's overall vitality would hardly be affected;
3. A prohibition on cigarette production could have harsh repercussions, as with the prohibition of alcohol in the twenties;
4. There are other commodities (e.g., contraceptives, medical services, liquor on radio and television, and many others) that are sold but cannot be advertised, so this would be no new precedent; and
5. Therefore, let's ban cigarette advertising.

POSTSCRIPT

If the Nation wishes to decrease cigarette consumption, raising the tax on cigarettes is an obvious alternative or additional measure that might be taken. There is no doubt that fewer cigarettes will be bought if the price is higher. However, the tax would take a larger proportion of some people's income than of others. And if the price of cigarettes goes up, people will smoke the butts closer to the end. The more of a cigarette that is smoked, the more dangerous it rapidly becomes. So an increase in taxation may not be a good alternative solution.

DISTINGUISHED AMERICAN: ELWOOD HAYNES

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, recently in my home State, I had the pleasure to visit the Howard County Historical Society and witness the excellent work being done in Kokomo, Ind., to preserve a vital portion of our heritage.

During my trip I was reintroduced to the noted American—Elwood Haynes—whose place in the history of the automobile is well established and well known. His laurels, however, rest not alone with his gasoline automobile of 1894; Elwood Haynes is widely recognized for his activities ranging from industrialist, metallurgist, and inventor to educator and philanthropist. His accomplishments are numerous, and his contributions to these many fields are significant yet today.

Mr. President, it is fitting that the Howard County Historical Society should nominate Mr. Haynes for the Hall of Fame for Great Americans. He certainly merits consideration for such an honor. It is my hope, however, that the distinguished electors for this honor will not be alone in reviewing Mr. Haynes' record. It is important for all American citizens to come in contact with the achievements and qualities of greatness that inhere in men such as Elwood Haynes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief summary of his life, prepared by the Howard County Historical Society, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELWOOD HAYNES NOMINATED TO THE HALL OF FAME FOR GREAT AMERICANS

Elwood Haynes (1857–1925) was nominated by the Howard County Historical Society, Kokomo, Ind., for the Hall of Fame for Great Americans at New York University, as inventor, scientist, metallurgist, industrialist, educator, and philanthropist. In nominating Mr. Haynes our thought was that he rightly belonged among the most notable men and women of the country. The nomination has been accepted by the Hall of Fame.

A brochure has been published to substantiate the claim, all facts being taken from Haynes papers now in possession of the historical society and other recognized authorities.

Judging from the bibliography mailed with the brochure to the 100 electors (two from each State) and the directors, we must conclude that the original Haynes car is his best known invention. This Haynes car is in the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., labeled as follows:

"Gasoline automobile, built by Elwood Haynes in Kokomo, Ind., 1893–94. Successful trial trip made at a speed of 6 or 7 miles per hour, July 4, 1894. Gift of Elwood Haynes, 1910 (262–135)."

Mr. Haynes was the first to introduce aluminum in the automobile, a standard for automobile motors today, and first to use nickel steel in the automobile. He is credited as being the first to depart from the horseless carriage idea, since every part was made specifically for the car except the buggy seat and the horsepower Sintz marine upright 2-cycle gasoline engine. He also invented and built in 1903 a rotary gas valve engine. His place as a founder of the automobile industry is deserved.

However, "of the many industrial and social contributions of Elwood Haynes, perhaps the most significant may be his invention of the basic cobalt-base alloys. As a perpetual living memorial, his alloys are in use today. The need was so urgent and his provision was so complete that in many applications, no improvements have been necessary in his alloys after 60 years of effective and valuable use.

"The alloys known as Stellite alloy No. 4, Stellite alloy No. 6 (also 6B and 6K), Star J Metal and 98M2 are produced today throughout the world, exactly as invented by Elwood Haynes as early as 1899 and described in his patents granted in 1907 and 1913. These alloys continue to be valuable for use as cutting tools, well and mine drilling bits, bearing materials, and hand-facing for articles that must endure severe wear conditions: tractor plowshares, discs, machinery parts and the like. Several original Haynes alloys are in use in many modern severe-service applications: jet aircraft, nuclear energy installations, rocket motors and the like."

(Examples of the above are nuclear steamship, *Savannah*, alloy No. 6; nuclear submarine, alloy No. 1; Jet plane, No. 12; modern cars; manufactured diamonds No. 12; Snap 8, a compact experimental nuclear reactor using the more adaptable materials commercially available, No. 6B. All these are late developments using Elwood Haynes' original formula—E.P.R.)

"In 1911 Elwood Haynes discovered some valuable properties in stainless steels and made significant improvements and advances in the art. His patent granted in 1915 based on his stainless steel improvements, was a foundation of the American Stainless Steel Corp. (about 1920) in Pittsburgh, Pa.

"In keeping with his characteristics as a benefactor and teacher, Mr. Haynes shared his knowledge and discoveries by publishing many technical papers disclosing his contributions to metallurgy." (Joe J. Phillips patents engineer, Steelite division, Union Carbide Corp., Kokomo, Ind.)

Of his lesser known contributions that should be mentioned are natural gas industry, education, philanthropy.

Natural gas industry: Elwood Haynes was manager of the Portland Natural Gas Co., Portland, Ind., 1886–90, at which time he became field superintendent of the Indiana Natural Gas Co., Chicago, Ill., with headquarters at Greentown, Ind. In 1886 Mr. Haynes invented a small vapor thermostat used on natural gas.

During Mr. Haynes' superintendency of the Indiana Natural Gas Co., "He found that the pipeline carrying gas to Chicago would freeze up in winter, and he decided to dry the gas to prevent the trouble. After considering chemical absorbents he made the proper choice of drying by refrigeration and designed a workable unit. At the time this was pioneer engineering. * * * considerable ingenuity was required. He found that this process not only removed the water vapor from the gas, but also condensed some of the lower boiling constituents and he was one of the first or perhaps the first to produce casing head gasoline. There was no market for this gasoline and it was dumped in an open space and allowed to evaporate." William A. Wissler, former director development and research, Haynes Stellite Co., served in research and development, Union Carbide Corp., Niagara Falls, N.Y. Presently retired.

In education Elwood Haynes was principal of the Portland High School 1883–84 and taught science in the Eastern Indiana Normal School in 1885–86, both in Portland, Ind., his birthplace. At the time of his death April 13, 1925, at his home, Elwood Haynes had been a member of Indiana Board of Education and a member of the Indiana Library Board since 1921. His special interest was vocational education. Some of his ideas are just now being initiated.

(NOTE.—Between his time as principal of the Portland High School and science professor at the Indiana Normal School he did postgraduate work at Johns Hopkins University in chemistry, biology, and German.)

The main areas of philanthrophy were the Presbyterian Church; the Worcester (Mass.) Polytechnic Institute; the Prohibition Party and movement. He was especially generous to struggling young churches of all denominations; small colleges and students needing assistance.

Other lesser known facts about Kokomo's famous inventor were his candidacy for the U.S. Senate in 1916 on the Prohibition ticket; the honorary LL.D. by Indiana University in 1922; the Liberty Ship No. 269 named for him January 26, 1944, from the Permanente Metals Corp., launched at Richmond, Calif. Mr. Haynes' alloys had significant use in World War I, II, and the Korean episode.

Many seem interested that his work in metallurgy started, when at 15 years of age, he succeeded in melting brass, cast iron, and high carbon steel, using furnace and blower of his own construction; also invented an apparatus for making hydrogen and another for oxygen.

His thesis at Worcester Polytechnic Institute was "The Effect of Tungsten on Iron and Steel." There, he also wrote both the words and music for the class ode, 1881.

Perhaps his greatest honor was the John Scott Medal given by the University of Pennsylvania, the American Philosophical Society, and the National Academy of Science, one of the highest awards given to a scientist of the United States.

The monument erected at the site of the trial run of the original Haynes car by the Indiana Historical Commission and the Hoosier State Automobile Association, dedicated in an elaborate ceremony July 4, 1922; the bronze plaque on the site where he invented and designed the first Haynes car and started work on the alloys; and the boulder marking the site of his birth, attest his contribution to the American way of life.

The Bernice Haynes Hillis family has purchased the Haynes House, now being renovated to receive the Haynes papers and collection, and "The Kokomo Firsts," a monument to Kokomo industry. The house is expected to be dedicated later this year. Come, visit Kokomo, Ind.

EOS PETTY RICHARDSON,
Curator, Howard County Museum.

A PLANNING MEETING FOR SPRUCE KNOB-SENECA ROCKS NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it was my pleasure to speak Saturday, October 9, 1965, at the first planning meeting for the newly created Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area. The meeting was held on Spruce Knob, near Elkins, W. Va., and was arranged by several national and State conservation clubs as a preliminary work session for the development of what will eventually become a 100,000-acre recreation center for the entire country.

The Honorable Stewart Udall, Secretary of the U.S. Department of the Interior, was also present and spoke of the great contribution that can be made by conservation clubs to the recreation needs of the country.

I was happy to have the opportunity to trace some of the natural and legislative history of this new recreation area. I have long had a deep appreciation for the natural and scenic wonders of Spruce Knob and introduced legislation in the Senate in 1963 to reserve the area for public use. The Congress did not have an opportunity to act upon the measure in the 88th Congress, but I was pleased to reintroduce it during the opening days of the 89th Congress in January on behalf of myself and Senator RANDOLPH. It was later included by President Johnson in his message on natural beauty and was signed into law by the President on September 28, 1965.

I have also been active in securing appropriations for the purchase of lands within the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area, and, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I shall continue in my efforts to secure the necessary funds to implement the authorizing legislation and make the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area the No. 1 recreation spot for the tens of millions of Americans who live within a day's automobile travel.

I hope that each Member of Congress will some day visit Spruce Knob and I ask unanimous consent that my address to the members of the conservation clubs be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed, as follows:

LOOKING ON FROM SPRUCE KNOB

We gather here tonight because of our common interest in this area, which has now become the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area. We will spend but a relatively short time talking about this area on this occasion. By contrast, it took nature millions of years to create it.

But we take these moments because we value this wonderful world of mountains, valleys, streams, and forests—a wonderful world that is far too rare in our crowded, mechanized society. We know how much we need such places. And, sadly, we know how easy it is for us to destroy them. Here in this magnificent region, we have a heritage of natural beauty that is ours to protect and use providently; or it is ours to destroy, if we ignore the lessons of the past.

But, wisely, we are not going to destroy our heritage. This meeting is evidence of a public determination that this portion of the Monongahela National Forest will remain, unspoiled, always to enrich the lives of those who come here. That determination, expressed through the active support of people such as you, is the force that has encouraged the Congress of the United States to designate these 100,000 acres in the highest, and a most beautiful, part of this State for public enjoyment. The Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area is now established by an act of Congress, and, I firmly believe, welcomed by all who seek to preserve a little more breathing space.

You are witness to the capacity of this region to fulfill its purpose for healthful outdoor recreation. Each year thousands of others share the same pleasures that you enjoy as you come to visit this region. People will continue to come—next weekend, next year, and the year after—in growing numbers.

Most of the visitors will come from among the 30 million people who live within 250 miles from here, chiefly from cities and towns, for this area is right next door to the most populous, most crowded part of the entire country. This is an area of great open spaces easily accessible to those who need open space the most.

But this is a national recreation area, not a regional one; and I want very definitely to emphasize the word "National." These mountains are a national asset. Thomas Jefferson wrote that the view at Harpers Ferry was worth a voyage across the Atlantic. Well, then, I will say that it is worth traveling a little farther to see the top of West Virginia, the Smoke Holes, and the great rocks standing above narrow valleys. Who here tonight would not recommend this region to any visitor searching for America's scenic grandeur?

With such a fine area as this now in public ownership, and managed in the public interest, I wonder if many people realize how close we came to losing it. The harsh details of the past have faded. The beautiful countryside shows little of a different kind of scene that was once all too apparent. It was a scene of waste and destruction. We might well remember that the spirit of conservation did not come easily to the mountains of West Virginia.

In the early part of this century, the ancient forests of these mountains were cut—without thought of new forests to replace the old—without thought of the needs of another generation. Timber was stripped to feed hungry mills; and, as part of this boom period, the great sod areas were plowed up to grow food for loggers and millhands.

Then fire swept through cutover lands and destroyed healthy forests as well. Floods were spawned on denuded slopes and rolled down into the valleys with tragic regularity. Moreover, the location of many farms on steep slopes, on poor soil, only added to the ruin of the land.

At that time, no authority existed to protect or manage these lands in the public interest. There was no system of forest fire protection, no game management, no organized erosion control, none of the conservation measures so widely recognized today.

Fortunately, the abuse did not go unchallenged. Public protest found voice in a growing conservation movement, inspired by public-spirited Americans of national stature. People cared about the land then, as they do now. They wanted the land managed for all time, not just for a quick profit. And their concern was expressed in new laws and in government action.

One of the early conservation laws was the Weeks law of 1911. It provided authority by which 20 million acres of wornout, abused lands were brought under national forest production, mostly in the East where no public domain lands remained. It authorized the Federal Government to work with the States for forest fire control. Because of that law, the Federal Government—during the last 50 years—has purchased and restored more than 800,000 acres in West Virginia. We are standing on some of that land. These are among the acres we are now proud to call the Monongahela National Forest.

I think you will agree that the Monongahela National Forest is an effective monument to the conservation movement. It is particularly impressive when one considers the raw area with which the Forest Service started working. They used to call this the Monongahela National Burn—it looked that bad. But foresters went to work—and they were content to work for long-range goals, knowing that they might never live to see the end result of their labors. So here, on the Monongahela, they have gradually brought the land back. They planted trees, checked erosion, fought fires, and improved the fish and wildlife habitat. Bit by bit, they acquired land that needed better management. Today the crystal waters of Seneca Creek flow from the national forest, showing us what our Potomac River might again become. And, encouragingly, the work still goes on.

However, I need not dwell on the continuing struggle for conservation. Most of us are made aware of this by the abundance of manmade ugliness, by silt-choked streams, by endless urban sprawl, and by many signs of neglect or outright destruction of our greatest resources.

I shall dwell, rather, on what we have accomplished here in the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks region. A law has been passed which I think we can call a milestone in West Virginia's quest for the golden fleece of tourism. Not only you and I, and the people of West Virginia, but also the people of the United States have recognized that we have something special here.

We can be grateful for that recognition, and proud, too, for it did not come automatically. Some years back, I looked for a means of drawing attention to Spruce Knob, the Smoke Holes, and Seneca Rocks. I found, happily, that many others shared my interest; therefore, in March of 1963, I introduced a bill in the Senate, in behalf of myself and Senator Randolph, to establish this country as a national recreation area. The bill did not pass in the 88th Congress, so I introduced it again in the 89th. Subcommittees of the House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees held hearings. Support began to build up. President Johnson added his endorsement, specifically, mentioning this area as a "must" item in his message on natural beauty. The bill, S. 7, was finally passed by Congress on September 14 of this year, and, on September 28, President Johnson signed it into law.

Now that this law has been enacted, the question might well be asked, "What will we do with this area?" Quite appropriately, that is the question that appears to be on everyone's mind. With the national spotlight on Spruce Knob, it is very much on my mind as well.

In response, let me say that I believe this region to be in good hands—responsible hands. After all, the evidence is all around us.

First, let us consider that this region has been made a national recreation area because of what it is—not because of what we propose to do to it or with it. People come here, and will continue to come, because this is a magnificent realm of natural wonders.

Nevertheless, there will have to be some developments to accommodate the many visitors to the area. And that is what causes most of the concern at this moment. What sort of developments?

I would prefer to meet the question by looking at the provisions of the act that is now on the law books. Let us see just what the law has done.

First, it has placed the congressional stamp of approval on the management of this area for outdoor recreation. It has provided the spotlight for the area which it has so deserved—for a long time.

Second, it has provided a means of assuring that all of the conservation programs in this area will move ahead more rapidly—under the force of congressional sanction. This includes programs in all resource activities, with particular emphasis on scenic protection and outdoor recreation.

The act provides that the Forest Service will continue to manage the land, which is a vote of confidence for the way it has been handled so far. The Forest Service will continue to work closely with the West Virginia Department of Natural Resources, and other groups interested in developing the full potential of this area for outdoor recreation.

There is a provision that deserves special mention: the overall size and boundaries. The area will total about 100,000 acres, which will include 4,000 acres not heretofore within the national forest boundaries. Since land acquisition will depend heavily on the land and water conservation fund, the act specifically makes these additional 4,000 acres eligible for acquisition by using these funds.

But the question of development remains. On the basis of congressional hearings and conferences with Forest Service officials, I believe I can look ahead and give you some idea of what I foresee.

One of the first jobs is going to be the acquisition of key tracts of land, either through full Government title or in the form of easements. Already 40,000 of the 100,000 acres are federally owned. Full development will require acquisition of title or easements on another 45,000 acres—privately owned land within the national forest. The Forest Service has indicated that approximately 60 percent of this remaining acreage will eventually be owned by the Government. Scenic or conservation easements will be used as much as possible to protect the appearances of the landscape and to continue many of the present compatible uses, such as certain types of farming, grazing, and timber management.

The physical developments of this area will move ahead concurrently with land acquisition. It will provide basic facilities to accommodate 1 million visitors by 1970 and will eventually have a capacity to serve 5 million visitors a year.

What sort of facilities? More of the same, properly located, giving each of the many types of users the kind of recreation he seeks. There will be scenic roads and overlooks for those traveling by car. There will be campgrounds, picnic areas, and related facilities. There will also be rugged back country for those who want less of civilization's trimmings. Rock climbers and cave explorers will continue to enjoy this country. The clear headwaters of the South Branch will continue to provide pleasure for whitewater canoeists and fishermen alike.

I consider the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area as one of the best investments that this Nation can make in its public lands. We will be making needed capital improvements in an outstanding area adjacent to the populous northeastern and midwestern regions.

In West Virginia, the development of this area will have definite benefits for the surrounding communities—and I think such an area as this should contribute something tangible to the lives of its people. The building of roads, trails, campgrounds, and picnic areas will provide jobs in an area that for too long has had too few jobs. The continued development of other resources, such as timber and wildlife, will require willing workers.

But beyond the benefits of direct Federal employment, this area will attract a growing number of visitors who will stimulate local trade through their purchase of goods and services. Many visitors will want the comforts of home, so they will look for motels, restaurants, and resort facilities which will be provided by private enterprise in the surrounding area. Even those who choose the more rugged outdoor life will need gas, food, ammunition, fishing tackle, and many other such items that can be provided locally.

Economic benefits are not, of course, the only ones that West Virginia will receive. The greatest benefit will be the enjoyment of the national recreation area—a benefit available to everyone regardless of where he lives. People will come here, not so much because of new motels or clean campgrounds, but because the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks region is one of the most magnificent examples of mountain scenery in the Appalachian region. They will come—and come again—everyone finding something to enjoy according to individual interests. They will hunt. They will camp. They will fish. Or perhaps they may just sit and listen to the wind in the trees.

Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area will be the place to come to absorb the majesty of West Virginia—the place to see and feel the world as it ought to be. This is the essence of what West Virginia will soon offer to the citizens of our Nation.

THE PRESIDENT'S SURGICAL OPERATION

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point an editorial published in the Wall Street Journal of October 7, 1965.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The President's Operation

It's inevitable that the illness of a President will be cause for not only some sincere public concern but for a good deal of political flap. But taken on the whole, it strikes us that Mr. Johnson has sensibly acted to minimize the one and avoid the worst of the other.

Faced with a gall bladder operation, he had two choices. He could have slipped quietly into the hospital, had his operation and said nothing about it until it was all over. Secrecy about the President's health has not been unknown in the past. President Cleveland underwent surgery while in office and the public learned of it only long afterwards; President Roosevelt ran for reelection when all but the public knew he was seriously ill.

President Johnson chose instead to follow the example of President Eisenhower, who saw that the public was fully informed after his heart attack and his abdominal surgery. Everybody knows about Mr. Johnson's illness, its cause and the planned remedy, even the day of the operation.

For one practical thing, this puts a check on the rumor mill and avoids the surely unsettling effects from a dramatic and unexpected announcement after the event that the President of the United States had been operated upon. Beyond that, it has the virtue of treating people as adults, not as children to be shielded from the fact that a President can suffer the ills all of us are heir to.

The candor will not remove the concern with which everyone will await word from the hospital tomorrow. It should, if people react in adult fashion, keep that concern in perspective and dampen the political disturbance. A small point, perhaps; but in contrast with the past, one not without its importance.

SALUTE TO PRESIDENT AND MRS. JOHNSON

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the passage of the highway beautification bill seems to me to be a most fitting conclusion for this great Congress. I think it is one of the brightest stars in the crown of achievement of the Johnson administration. It is a tribute not only to the vision of a great President and a hard-working, constructive Congress, but it is especially a tribute to the First Lady of our land, Mrs. Lyndon Johnson.

Mr. President, the United States is fortunate that we have in Mrs. Johnson a woman of rare intelligence and dedication to the public interest. Her dream of a more beautiful America may very well be one of the most enduring monuments of the 1960's. Through her tireless efforts, her travels, her public statements and her numerous related activities, she has added a dynamic new dimension to "America, the Beautiful."

I think it is regrettable that a few Members of the other legislative body, instead of discussing the merits of highway beautification, utilized their allotted discussion time for some scoffing comments about the First Lady's concern for the quality and beauty of our countryside. These gentlemen not only delayed action with irrelevant attacks on the highway beautification bill, but they also created a needless delay which made Members of the House of Representatives miss one of the most stirring and dramatic evenings I have ever experienced—the President's salute to Congress.

I would like to take this occasion to salute both President Johnson and his gallant lady for the inspiring vision of America that they have held up to us all. We are about to complete the most constructive and impressive legislative session in American history. Much of the credit for that accomplishment belongs properly to the President. All of this has been accomplished at a time when the administration was grievously burdened with dangerous and difficult foreign policy crises, including the war in Vietnam. While I have not always agreed with every aspect of our foreign policy in recent years, I have developed a growing appreciation for President Johnson's long-rang commitment to peace.

My prayers are with him in that commitment and for his speedy recovery and return to the White House.

PROPOSED MEDICAL TRAINING FOR ARCTIC DOCTORS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, a story appeared in the Anchorage Times for September 15 announcing that a committee of the American Academy of General Practice was recommending a special training program for doctors who will be practicing in the Arctic regions of Alaska. The practice of medicine in the Arctic is complicated by many factors. Dr. Carroll L. Witten, of Louisville, Ky., president of the academy, chose a particularly apt phrase to describe one of the complications. He said that Alaska has many peculiar problems as to the size and availability of villages.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Anchorage Times be reprinted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks so that Congress will better understand the recommendations soon to be made to the Surgeon General.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDIC TEAM TO ASK BUSH AREA TRAINING

The recommendation which would provide a 2-year training program to qualify physicians to practice in remote regions of Alaska is being advanced by a committee from the American Academy of General Practice.

The committee which will present its recommendations to the Division of Indian Health in Washington is composed of Dr. Edward J. Kowalewski, Akron, Pa., chairman; Dr. Carroll L. Witten, Louisville, Ky., president of the academy and consultant to the Surgeon General; Dr. Paul S. Read, Omaha, Nebr., and Dr. Herman E. Drill, Hoskins, Minn.

Dr. Kowalewski said the new program would provide new or additional services to interior Alaska, and also would relieve the Alaska Native Hospital of an overflowing number of patients.

Twelve to sixteen volunteer physicians would be trained at the hospital and in the bush, then would remain at an assigned area. Many times the physician would be the only doctor in a wide area of Alaska.

Another recommendation by the committee would provide volunteer help to replace doctors who presently are practicing in remote areas but cannot leave because no other physician's services would be available.

The volunteer help would allow the regular physician to take 3 or 4 weeks to brush up on new advances in medicine and to take a vacation from his duties.

In a third recommendation, the committee would increase the number of Health Aid program volunteers who are operating in remote Alaska. The volunteers, which have been serving Alaska nearly 28 years, are young people trained to recognize symptoms of patients and to radio the information to a central station.

A physician then prescribes medicines which the volunteer has available. The system is under the direction of the Public Health Service.

"We were very impressed with the proficiency of medical care in Alaska," said Dr. Witten, "even though Alaska has many peculiar problems as to size and availability of villages.

"The Health Aid service is especially well developed, and we are recommending that these volunteers be commended both publicly and officially."

SUPPORT FOR UNDERGROUND TRANSMISSION LINES

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I recently introduced two measures, S. 2507 and S. 2508, to promote research and development into an economic and practical program of burying underground transmission lines. An article in the September 27 issue of the trade magazine Electrical World reviews the interest generated by my proposals within the utility industry and the appropriate departments and agencies of the Johnson administration. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW MUCH R. & D. FOR BURIED TRANSMISSION?—EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE CREATES TASK FORCE TO CONSIDER STEPPING UP EXTRA HIGH VOLTAGE CABLE PROGRAM—FEDERAL AGENCIES WEIGH RESPONSE TO PRESIDENT'S PLEA

The investor-owned utility industry is seriously considering stepping up its R. & D. program in underground transmission. At the same time, Federal agencies are pondering their next step in response to President Johnson's call for accelerated research in this area. But there are questions all around as to just what the President is after and what direction industry and Government efforts will take.

At a meeting September 9, the Edison Electric Institute Board approved creation of a task force that would suggest ways for accelerating the extra high voltage cable research and development program now being conducted by the Edison Electric Institute Transmission and Distribution Committee. The new task force is also directed to consider the feasibility of an expanded research activity relating to both a.c. and d.c. cable in the extra high voltage range. The Edison Electric Institute Board is asking the new group to come up with cost data on an expanded program by December.

Announcement of Edison Electric Institute's action carried no reference to President Johnson's statement of August 24 in which he reported that he had instructed his science adviser, Dr. Donald Horning, "to work with the appropriate Federal Departments and agencies to speed our research into the technology of placing high voltage lines underground." The statement was issued at the time the President signed the bill permitting the Atomic Energy Commission to build overhead transmission lines to serve its Standard Linear Accelerator Center.

Also in the statement, Johnson said, "I have instructed the AEC to give great weight to the natural environment in constructing the line, including not only the design of the poles but to their location and to the clearing operations." A vertical configuration on metal poles has been proposed for the 220-kilovolt Stanford line.

Acting on the President's instructions, Horning has talked with the Federal Power Commission and the Interior Department on spurring underground transmission research. But neither Hornig nor the agencies has seen fit to disclose the nature or content of these conversations.

Yet, there is talk among Government power men of the possibility that the administration may begin a drive this year for legislation to authorize research, development, and demonstration projects on underground transmission. Measures along these lines have previously been introduced in the House by Representative RICHARD L. OTTINGER, Democrat, of New York, and Senator MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon. The Ottinger bill (H.R. 10514) calls for a $30 million program; the Neuberger bill (S. 2508) calls for a $150 million research program.

There is some feeling at Interior that no big push on underground transmission R. & D. can be mounted without a new appropriation such as would be authorized under terms of the Ottinger or Neuberger bills. While relatively little attention has been paid to these bills up to now, they would assume significance if chosen as an administration vehicle for expanding Federal effort in the underground transmission field.

Meanwhile, at FPC, the industry task force on underground transmission continues its work. A report is expected from this group early next year. It is looking into research only in a general way—being concerned specifically with such matters as: (1) Finding ways to express underground transmission terminology in layman's language so utilities can discuss the situation with Government leaders at local and other levels; (2) determining the state of the art; (3) determining the economics of overhead versus underground lines; (4) defining the relation of underground costs to overall utility costs as these apply to individual power bills.

The FPC effort at this time appears more concerned with determining costs and evaluating applications. Interior seems more concerned with initiating some type of research and development program.

Earlier this year, a three-man Interior team (Special Research Assistant Morgan Dubrow, Reclamation Engineer Ted Mermel, and Bonneville Power Administration Engineer Eugene Starr) reviewed underground, but this was aimed directly at what should be done about the controversial 345-kilovolt lines from the Cornwall pumped-storage plant in New York. That group decided it would be uneconomic to mount a campaign to urge that the lines be buried. The recommendation went directly to the White House for the President's consideration.

Informed observers in Washington think there is a likelihood that hearings may begin before the end of the year on underground transmission. But just what form such hearings take, and in what forum they will be conducted depends on what President Johnson and his administration are after. If hearings are not conducted this year due to the impending adjournment of Congress, then these observers look for a real push early next year.

Comment on the industry role in the larger natural beauty campaign came from still another administration source in recent weeks. Speaking before a gathering of conservationists groups in Wyoming, the President's wife made passing reference to several contributions made toward improving the appearance of utility installations.

BIG BROTHER IN THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE: EDITORIALS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, recently I have received a large number of editorials dealing with the curbing of Big Brother in the Internal Revenue Service. All of the articles, with the exception of one, are critical of the IRS practices exposed by the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure in recent hearings.

In the interest of fairness, I wish to bring some of the more outstanding editorials to public attention—both favorable and unfavorable.

I ask unanimous consent to have the one critical and seven favorable articles printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Amsterdam (N.Y.) Recorder, Aug. 2, 1965]

WIRETAP EVIDENCE

The Internal Revenue Service admits it has resorted to the use of wiretaps, hidden microphones, and two-way mirrors while investigating suspected tax frauds. But it insists such tactics have been limited to the campaign against organized crime and never in probes of ordinary taxpayers.

Neither the IRS nor the average American citizen condones trickery. But the fact remains that income tax violations constitute about the only charges against racketeers that result in conviction.

The record proves that it is difficult to obtain evidence against organized racketeering. Informers must be able to identify criminals without being seen, and the devices being used by the IRS appear to be the only way of accomplishing that.

So either the Government employs available techniques to break up crime rings or permits them to operate unmolested. Of the two choices this allows, we think the IRS has made the right one.

[From the Progressive, Sept. 1965]

Due process still has its champions in the Congress of the United States, wiretapping is frowned upon, and illegal searches and seizures are condemned. This is our hopeful conclusion after observing Senator EDWARD V. LONG's investigation of illicit surveillance techniques employed by the intelligence division of the Internal Revenue Service. We would be more encouraged still if LONG's Senate Judiciary Subcommittee were to go on to scrutinize the practices of the sacrosanct FBI and the score or so of other Federal agencies that maintain their own police and intelligence forces. Incursions into the rights of alleged tax evaders seem to strike a more responsive chord than assaults on the liberties of other citizens.

This is not to suggest that IRS was unworthy of the subcommittee's attention. On the basis of testimony taken by LONG and his colleagues, the Treasury's electronics devices school is clearly one of the more advanced educational institutions of its type. IRS apparently operates its blacklight scopes, concealed recorders, two-way mirrors, and wiretapping gear with a deftness worthy of 007 or the Man from U.N.C.L.E.

The philosophy of the Service's operatives, on the other hand, seem to be more reminiscent of Dick Tracy or Little Orphan Annie. When Senator LONG asked O. Burke Yung, who teaches at the electronics devices school, whether questions of guilt and innocence should not be decided by juries rather than agents, Yung protested that he had taken an oath to defend the Constitution against all enemies, and that he believed he had done so.

We were not present when Yung and his fellow agents took their oath of office, but if it followed the usual Federal form, it called on them to uphold the Constitution as well as to defend it.

[From the Evansville (Ind.) Courier, July 31, 1965]

MORE IRS SNOOPING

A Senate subcommittee investigating Government invasions of privacy goes on piling up evidence that the Internal Revenue Service is one of the worst offenders. Some might argue that the IRS, after all, does its snooping in a good cause and thus should be leniently judged. What this argument boils down to is a contention that collecting money for Uncle Sam's coffers justifies violating the safeguards written into the Constitution. We do not think so.

The argument is even thinner than that. For snooping devices, electronic and otherwise, do not necessarily make the difference between catching or not catching an income tax evader; often they are simply an easier way of doing the job.

At one recent hearing, an IRS agent testified that on orders he broke into the home of a Boston tavern owner to sneak a look at what was believed to be a vault in the basement. The vault turned out to be a cedar clothes closet, but that makes no difference so far as the IRS method is concerned. The agent broke the law; both in spirit and letter, he violated one of our most honored traditions—that a man's home is his castle, not to be entered without a warrant. The agent's testimony that he also observed the tavern owner's wife through a long-range snooperscope while she was sunning herself merely adds to the distastefulness of the whole proceeding.

Yet this was a comparatively mild and simple invasion of privacy. Hearings have brought to light instances of eavesdropping with various electronic devices. Such gadgets, and the even more sophisticated ones likely to be developed, pose a serious threat to individual privacy. The Government simply has no business using them, in violation of the law, no matter how laudable its purpose.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) American, Aug. 10, 1965]

CONTROLLING TAX SNOOPS

When it comes to collecting taxes, it seems clear that some agents and officials of the Internal Revenue Service do not consider themselves bound by such trivialities as fairness or citizens' rights to privacy. A Senate judiciary committee under Senator EDWARD V. LONG, Democrat of Missouri, is continuing to turn up evidence of an "anything goes" philosophy in the IRS, including its use of hidden microphones and two-way mirrors in supposedly private conference rooms.

LONG said Sheldon S. Cohen, Internal Revenue Commissioner, had given him a list of 22 cities across the Nation—Chicago was one—in which the IRS had bugged conference rooms, and 10 cities in which the trick mirrors had been used. (These gimmicks look like normal mirrors from the front, but allow an observer behind to watch everything going on in a room.)

LONG has denounced such snooping practices by Federal agencies as unnecessary invasions of privacy—which of course they are. But there is a further consideration that makes it particularly important to stop them.

It is that Federal agencies seem to adopt these practices without a qualm as long as they are not specifically forbidden by law. Such abstract ideas as "right to privacy" plainly have no power to keep such an agency from using any method it can to get information, as long as the method has not been forbidden by name.

In short, we'd better not expect the IRS or any similar Government body to police its own methods. The tax men are out to do a job, and will not deny themselves any useful tool in doing it. The policing will be up to Congress and the courts—and we hope Senator LONG's findings will prompt them to tighten controls on Government snooping.

[From the New York (N.Y.) World-Telegram & Sun, Aug. 11, 1965]

BUGS IN THE PHONE BOOTH

Of all the disclosures emerging from a Senate subcommittee inquiry into Governmental wiretapping, perhaps the damnedest yet is the admission by the Miami Chief of Intelligence for the Internal Revenue Service that agents had bugged a public telephone booth and recorded all conversations.

The reason? The booth had been used often by a suspected bookmaker.

So, in the process, all other dialogs rippling across the wires were also eavesdropped by big brother.

A Senator asked the Miami sleuth if it wasn't a moral, if not legal, violation to eavesdrop on people who were not even under suspicion. The witness paused, then said yes, he guessed it was.

Obviously this bugging business has gone beyond all bounds of necessity, sense, or taste. Out of the Senate hearings had better come some stern restraints on electronic snooping, Government style.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Morning Tribune, Aug. 11, 1965]

U.S. Agencies Need Rules on Snooping

Although confession may be good for the soul, it is hardly sufficient for the Internal Revenue Service and other Government agencies that have engaged in a surprising amount of wiretapping, use of two-way mirrors, and other secret techniques in overzealous efforts to keep the public honest.

The latest disclosure is that the IRS since 1958 had installed and sometimes used two-way mirrors and hidden microphones in 26 cities. Yet, by what authority were these widespread installations made, and what real steps have been taken to prevent their use again? The answers thus far have been few.

Apparently the former IRS Commissioner, Mortimer M. Caplin, had developed an eager group of antiracketeer specialists who reported directly to Washington and who were not closely supervised by district and regional directors. Senator Edward V. Long, Democrat, of Missouri, chairman of the Senate subcommittee investigating these things, said some agents abused this freedom by engaging in illegal wiretapping. Then the present Commissioner, Sheldon Cohen, ordered his local directors to assume close supervision of the racket investigations.

But simply closer supervision at a lesser level is not a satisfactory deterrent, for it is rather unlikely that some local IRS officials were not aware of this organized spying. Explicit legislative or administrative controls, with procedures that will back check on their enforcement and leave no doubt about their meaning, are what is lacking.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, Aug. 16, 1965]

"Bugs" in the Revenue Service

Under the prodding of a Senate subcommittee, the Internal Revenue Service now acknowledges that it has made a widespread practice of spying and snooping on citizens. In at least 22 cities, IRS offices had bugged conference rooms, and at least 10 instances of two-way mirrors were uncovered.

It is small comfort to be told that the hidden microphones in Chicago and other cities "were not used on the average taxpayer," but only in investigating organized crime. The mikes were there, and the chance remarks of any unsuspecting visitor to the conference rooms could have been recorded.

The practice of eavesdropping spread in spite of instructions to the contrary from the top levels of Government. It came to light only because of the persistent digging of Senator Edward V. Long, Democrat, of Missouri. Commissioner Sheldon Cohen, head of the IRS, "was not aware of the extent to which these devices were used," said a spokesman.

The insidious growth of such practices in a supposedly free society is shocking and degrading. We expect this sort of spying on citizens in a police state, but not in America. And the lengthening list of bugged rooms eloquently supports the proposition that wiretapping is an evil that, once begun, all too easily gets out of hand.

If the IRS needs broader powers to investigate tax evasion and assist in the war on organized crime, let it seek and use such powers openly, if it can justify them to the public. But until or unless it gets such powers, the agents who have been playing "big brother" should have their knuckles rapped.

[From the Daily Mail, Anderson, S.C., Sept. 8, 1965]

It's Time To Unbug

The Internal Revenue Service has informed Senator Edward V. Long that it's going to stop doing what it should never have been doing in the first place.

In a letter to the Missouri Democrat, who is in charge of a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee investigating the ofttimes illegal spying by Federal agents, especially revenuers, into the lives of private citizens, IRS Commissioner Sheldon S. Cohen has revealed the names of cities in which the agency had installed various survelliance gadgets in its conference rooms.

In 10 cities, including Greenville, S.C., and Montgomery, Ala., agents had been using two-way mirrors with which they could watch taxpayers without themselves being watched.

In 21 cities, also including Montgomery, concealed microphones had been placed so that the agents could hear without being overheard. Not a very pretty picture. And not very legal, either. The privacy of communications between a lawyer and his client is supposed to be respected, even by investigators looking for evidence of illegal activities.

Now the IRS says it will unbug its conference rooms. This is, we suppose, progress, and perhaps we should be grateful, but we can't help wondering what other malpractices Senator Long's subcommittee is going to uncover.

The IRS seems to be "hooked" on wiretapping, even though the agency knows and the agents know that wiretapping evidence can't be used in Federal courts and can even ruin a case that's based on it. The IRS is under Presidential orders to kick the habit, but the attitude of some of its agents suggests that won't be easy. In Miami, Fla., the other day, the longtime head of the agency's intelligence division there confessed to Senator Long that his agents had bugged a public telephone and recorded all conversations from the booth.

"Was this not a moral, if not a legal violation to eavesdrop on people who were not even under suspicion?" the Missouri Democrat asked. "Yes," replied the division chief after a long pause, "I guess it was."

And a Pittsburgh, Pa., special agent asked if he hadn't felt embarrassed about his illegal entrance into a private citizen's office to plant an illegal bug, replied: "I never gave it a thought."

No one ought to be allowed to get away with evading his taxes. But no one either should be allowed to get away with evading the letter or spirit of the laws, and that includes in particular those sworn to uphold them. "Criminal prosecution," said the late Justice Felix Frankfurter, "should not be deemed a dirty game in which 'the dirty business' of criminals is outwitted by 'the dirty business' of law officers."

If IRS agents or any other governmental officers at any level flout the law they breed contempt for the law, and if anything may truly be called subversive this is it.

PRESIDENT RENEWS THE FLAME

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the torch of freedom must eternally be rekindled with acts of justice.

The recent signing of the immigration bill was such an act, and it was fitting that this should be done by the colossal statue, designed by Bartholdi, and presented by the people of France on the 100th anniversary of American independence.

Emma Lazarus' inscription on the Statue of Liberty is well known:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed, to me:
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

In the beginning, of course, there was unlimited immigration to this country.

Then, shortly after World War I, immigration was definitely restricted.

Immigrants numbered over 1 million in 1910. Very few came during the war. By 1920, over 400,000 were admitted.

Then a national policy of strict limitation was adopted.

Immigrants, except those from the Western Hemisphere, were admitted only in definite quotas from each country.

When signing the new bill, President Johnson said the old system represented a "harsh injustice," that the system violated the basic principle of our democracy, the principle that values and rewards each man on the basis of his merit as a man.

Now, "Those who come will come because of what they are—not because of the land from which they sprung."

PULASKI DAY CELEBRATION

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, on Sunday, October 10, I was privileged to attend the parade and banquet honoring Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski in Wilmington, Del.

This celebration annually highlights the contribution that General Pulaski made to this country and the continuing contributions that have been made by Americans of Polish descent.

At this year's celebration the Council of Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware and the Delaware Division of the Polish-American Congress adopted a resolution. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be included as a part of my remarks and commend its reading to my colleagues in the Senate.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution

Whereas in a rapidly changing and increasingly chaotic world, we must cling to the fundamental principles among nations, those of freedom and justice, and we should feel it our duty to restore them where they are missing, and

Whereas inspired by the thought of Casimir Pulaski's life who came to this land to help other people in their struggle for freedom and finally sacrificed his life for their cause and common ideals: we, Americans of Polish descent, assembled in the afternoon of October 10, 1965, at the Pulaski Triangle in Wilmington, Del., at a meeting held on the occasion of celebrations in memory of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, sponsored by the Council of Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware and the Delaware Division of the Polish American Congress; and mindful that, because of our origin, our opinion on the chaotic world affairs can be of service to our country, the United States of America, and to our leaders,

Resolved, That in any policy adopted toward Eastern Europe in general and toward Poland in particular, a distinction should be made between the countries and their rulers who may have been imposed by force on the peoples concerned, and that the policy of "building bridges" should be referred to the people and not to their governments;

That, while endorsing the above policy, it cannot accomplish a great deal without a resolute diplomatic action at an opportune moment;

That, any agreements with Soviet Russia, who may be pressured by circumstances to come to terms with us, should be preceded by restoration of freedom to the people of Poland deprived of it by Russia after World War II;

That the recognition of the present border between Germany and Poland on the Oder and Neisse Rivers will not change the "de facto" status of the questionable territories as they are populated by Poles, integrated with Poland and regarded as a return of previous national possessions of Poland; and that such recognition will become a factor in helping the Poles release themselves from the Communist yoke, and of arresting the encouragement of German revisionism, a reaction increasingly strong in Germany;

That the celebrations of Poland's millennium of christianity during the next year will be an occasion for our country to emphasize our links with Poland and to demonstrate our common cultural heritage, and that such celebrations will give the people of Poland hope and courage toward attaining so greatly desired and so greatly deserved freedom from oppression; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, Delaware Senators and Representative to Congress, the Governor of the State of Delaware, and the U.S. Ambassador to Poland, to whom we extend our wishes of success on his new appointment.

For the Council of Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware and the Delaware Division of the Polish American Congress.

ADAM J. ROSIAK, *President*
ANGELA C. TUROCHY,
Corresponding Secretary.

SHIPMENT OF WHEAT TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES IN AMERICAN BOTTOMS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on Friday, October 8, 11 members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, headed by the chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], wrote a letter to the President of the United States, which was subsequently released to the press, advocating that the 50-percent requirement of shipments of wheat in American bottoms to certain Communist countries, including the Soviet Union, should be revoked administratively.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
October 7, 1965.

The PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Committee on Foreign Relations has completed 2 full days of hearings on the shipping restriction affecting sales of grain to the Soviet Union and other nations of Eastern Europe. This letter is sent to advise you of the concern of the undersigned members of the committee over the problems created by that restriction.

During the course of the hearings, serious doubts were created as to whether or not the requirement places the United States in violation of the nondiscriminatory shipping clauses in our treaties with some 30 nations. We believe that it violates the spirit, if not the letter, of these treaties. Persuasive legal arguments have also been made that the regulation is not in keeping with the intent of the Congress in enacting section 3(c) of the Export Control Act placing agricultural commodies in a special category for export regulation. We do not think, however, that this issue should be decided on the basis of legal niceties, but on the grounds of whether or not the restriction furthers the national interest.

We are unable to find any evidence that the existence of the 50-percent requirement helps the American merchant marine, the intended beneficiary, or any other segment of our economy. On the contrary, we are convinced that it is a self-defeating device which has hurt the interests of the maritime industry, farmers, and taxpayers. No one benefits from the restriction, yet its existence is a burden on our trade policies generally.

We do no know if the Soviet Union will buy additional wheat from us if the 50-percent requirement is removed. But it is clear that they will not do so as long as they must pay a higher price than that paid by countries not affected by the restriction. Even if additional sales are never made, the regulation should be canceled. Its existence undermines our attempts to get other industrial powers to remove nontariff barriers to trade; it is an unnecessary irritant to many of our major trading partners, such as Germany, Great Britain, and Japan; and it tends to defeat the administration's policy of improving trade relations with the nations of Eastern Europe. It is obvious also that sales of additional wheat would help solve our critical balance-of-payments problem. These and other factors justify a change in policy whether or not additional wheat sales to the Communist countries are likely.

In view of these facts, we recommend strongly that this provision be eliminated.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT, FRANK J. LAUSCHE, MIKE MANSFIELD, EUGENE J. McCARTHY, STUART SYMINGTON, JOSEPH S. CLARK, JOHN SPARKMAN, ALBERT GORE, FRANK CHURCH, CLAIBORNE PELL, FRANK CARLSON.

AN AWARD FOR DR. WEAVER

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, swiftly moving events in the realms of science and math are among the most spectacular and noteworthy achievements of our age.

We all experience a thrill when we hear of great discoveries in the laboratory or major explorations in the world of numbers. Yet, the new vocabulary, the unusual terms have little meaning for too many people. In fact, they are denied any real understanding of the most exciting ideas of our time—that stimulate the scientific community to produce even more of the same.

Dr. Warren Weaver is a rare human being. A mathematician and benefactor of the sciences, he not only understands and contributes to these ideas, but he also eases the plight of the interested public that wants to reach for comprehension but needs the services of an understanding interpreter.

Last week the Pacific Science Center Foundation awarded Dr. Weaver the Arches of Science Award "for the outstanding contribution to the public understanding of the meaning of science to contemporary man." This prize acknowledges the fact that so many people are indebted to Dr. Weaver. Those of us who are interested—but uninitiated—are at least a little wiser for his efforts to make the achievements of science and mathematics more comprehensible.

Naturally, I am proud that Dr. Weaver is a resident of New Milford, Conn.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Science World Honors Weaver," which appeared on October 6 in the New York Herald Tribune, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCIENCE WORLD HONORS WEAVER

(By Earl Ubell)

For more than 30 years, Dr. Warren Weaver has played Alice to the crazy wonderland. As the public has viewed the mysterious goings on, he has tried to make sense out of it and helped others to make sense out of it, too. He had more luck than Alice did.

Yesterday the public and the scientists rewarded the sharp-witted shaper of science who is at once a mathematician, a science benefactor, a writer, an orginator, a needler, and an expert devotee to the lore and writings of Lewis Carroll: They gave him the $25,000 Arches of Science Award for the outstanding contribution to the public understanding of the meaning of science to contemporary man.

STUNNED

Dr. Weaver took the whole proceedings at the Overseas Press Club with cheerful astonishment. All he had been doing for the last three decades was giving away a few million dollars to scientists through the Rockefeller and Sloane Foundations, starting science television programs, writing science books for bright children, cajoling newspaper editors to cover science, increasing the number of science writers, and saving a little time to start a new field of mathematics—information theory.

"I was so stunned when I could not say one single word," he said at a press conference.

There he was, playing Alice again. In Carroll's masterpiece, Alice had just presented all the animals with prizes as equal winners in a caucus race. The dodo bird, however, insisted that Alice get a prize herself—a thimble.

"The dodo solemnly presented the thimble, saying, 'We beg your acceptance of this elegant thimble,' and when it had finished this short speech, they all cheered. Alice thought the whole thing very absurd but they all looked so grave that she did not dare laugh, and as she could think of nothing to say, she simply bowed, and took the thimble looking as solemn as she could."

ESSENTIAL

Dr. Weaver was not entirely dumb. He reserved to his wife the right of disposal of his prize, which he gets in Seattle on October 25. It was put up by the Pacific Northwest Telephone Co., and awarded by the Pacific Science Center Foundation. He also said he was leaving for Paris to pick up an international award: the Kalinga Prize, given for the popularization of science.

He also pointed out that he hardly thought the Arches of Science prize was absurd:

"It is essential that we today have individuals who are willing to live their lives partly within science and also partly within the world of affairs. These persons, working at the interface of science and society are more than useful—they have become essential."

He said he hoped the Arches of Science prize would be a stimulation to such people.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR GRADUATE EDUCATION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, representatives of various States recently met in Kansas City, Mo., to discuss the role of the Federal Government in education. An incisive editorial from the Eugene, Oreg., Register-Guard points out graduate education particularly as being in need of a comprehensive Federal program.

It also warns that "50 State programs, no matter how well coordinated, can be as messed up as 1 Federal program."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record the Register-Guard editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Too Much for the States To Cope With

Thursday and Friday, representatives of most States will meet in Kansas City, Mo., to talk about a compact for education. It is the brainchild of Terry Sanford, former Governor of North Carolina. The Governor shares with others concern over the increasing role of the Federal Government in education. Governor Sanford and friends have taken note of the warning of James Bryant Conant, former president of Harvard and America's education elder statesman, who has warned of a "tangled mess that no one can straighten out" in Federal education programs. The State representatives will try to get control back into their own hands.

Good luck. Unfortunately, however, they are likely to find that 50 State programs, no matter how well coordinated, can be as messed up as one Federal program. And one increasingly troublesome area of higher education must eventually become the primary responsibility of the Federal Government. That is graduate education, the cause of major problems in Oregon this year.

Sooner or later State legislatures must decide to what extent individual States are willing and able to provide the highly expensive kind of education that leads to Ph. D. degrees. Sooner or later, legislatures will discover that there is little relationhsip between what a State contributes to the national Ph. D. force and what it gets from it. For the American graduate student is one of the most mobile persons on earth. Only rarely does he stay in the State where he earned his graduate degree.

Many State schools discourage their graduates from taking advanced degrees on the campuses where they earned their B.A.'s. Also, many refuse to hire their own Ph. D.'s. There is a reason for this. The schools want to prevent inbreeding, believing that it is as beneficial to get a teacher into a new environment as it is to get a student away from home. That's one of the ways we become a nation instead of a bunch of regions. Therefore, it is not unusual for a native of Utah to get his bachelor's degree in Utah, his Ph. D. in Oregon and then to teach in California or Arizona.

The tendency of the educated to move away from home begins with high school. The more education a person has the more likely he is to forsake his hometown for the big city and a big job, or the more likely he is to flee his home in the city for less populous regions where he can grow with the country. Among Ph. D.'s only 1 out of 5 lives in the State where he got his degree.

Oregon is still a debtor State in this regard. We import two Ph. D.'s, mostly professors, for every one we train and send away. Washington imports 1½ for every one it sends out. California, with its vast educational plant to train and consume Ph. D.'s, breaks even, as do North Carolina, Kentucky, and Ohio. Massachusetts, Wisconsin, and Iowa, however, train five for every one they import. Importing five for every one they train are Maine, Pennsylvania, and some Southern States.

Plainly, legislatures will someday look at the benefit-to-cost ratio. Oregon's will not be the first to do so. For Oregon is still benefiting. But even in Oregon, the national problem can be seen. At the University of Oregon from 1961 to 1964, undergraduate enrollment increased by 1,774 students, or 20.2 percent. But in the same period, graduate enrollment increased by 974 students, or 64.7 percent. And this graduate enrollment was costly—in money, in teaching time, and in critically short space.

Not only are more students attending college, but more are deciding that commencement is just that, only the beginning. State representatives in Kansas City may find they can make some arrangements among themselves to help out. But in the long run, they're going to have to grant that graduate education, as we now know it, should be as much a Federal as a State responsibility.

THE WORLD'S BIGGEST PROBLEM: THE PACE BETWEEN FOOD AND PEOPLE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the cover of the October 4, 1965 issue of U.S. News & World Report, is headlined "The World's Biggest Problem." This heading is explained in an excellent article pointing up the challenge to mankind posed by the acceleration of population and the strain on future world food supplies. The editors of U.S. News & World Report have been on top of this problem for some time. Their first issue of 1964—January 6—carried a cover story headlined "Why Hunger Is To Be The World's No. 1 Problem." This well-informed earlier report which was based in considerable part on the findings of the Department of Agriculture's brilliant Dr. Lester Brown was printed in the Congressional Record at my request following an address to the Senate on this theme, September 23, 1965.

Believing that the editors of U.S. News are performing an invaluable service to the Nation and to the world in giving attention to the vital problems of food supplies and world population, I ask unanimous consent that the article of October 4, 1965, be printed at this point in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Oct. 4, 1965]

The World's Biggest Problem—How Experts See It

How can the world feed all its people, at the rate the population is growing?

That is becoming the world's No. 1 problem.

A look at what's happening shows why experts are worried. The human race is doubling in numbers every 35 years. That means the food supply must be doubled, too—in just 35 years.

Can that be done? Or is famine ahead?

For United States, it means a new challenge. And officials already are moving to meet it.

Startling facts that dramatize the world's biggest problem are brought to light by an international industrial conference sponsored by Stanford Research Institute and the National Industrial Conference Board.

The problem is this:

In the next 35 years, the world's population, now about 3.3 billion, will skyrocket to about 6 billion—almost doubling by the year 2000.

Biggest population increases—more than 100 percent—will come in the less developed nations, where population already is pressing severely against food supply.

Smallest increases—about 40 percent—will come in the well-fed, industrial nations best able to handle growth.

These United Nations estimates of future population are conservative. Actual increases may prove to be much higher.

The story of what these figures mean was reported by experts at the conference, held in San Francisco in September.

NEEDED: TWICE AS MUCH FOOD

The drama of the population story is this:

The world, even now, is facing a food problem. Diets are inadequate in the huge underdeveloped areas of the world, which include almost all of Asia and Africa and most of Latin America.

Just to maintain the present inadequate level of diet will require a virtual doubling of the world's output of food in the next 35 years.

This vast increase in food production must be achieved at a time when nearly all of the virgin lands of the world already have been brought into production.

There is no assurance that the job can be done in time.

Great famine, as a result, could be the outlook.

This warning is voiced by Dr. Earl L. Butz, dean of agriculture at Purdue University and onetime chairman of the U.S. delegation to the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations:

"The world is on a collision course. When the massive force of an exploding world population meets the much more stable trend line of world food production, something must give. Unless we give increased attention now to the softening of the impending collision, many parts of the world within a decade will be skirting a disaster of such proportion as to threaten the peace and stability of the western world."

SPEEDUP IN POPULATION GROWTH

But, it is asked: Hasn't the world always found a way to feed its ever-growing population?

The answer, according to the exports, is that the problem today is far more complex than at any time in the past.

For one thing, population growth is faster now—and getting faster all the time. Dr. Butz paints this picture:

"At the beginning of the Christian era, world population was estimated to have numbered around 250 million.

"In the next 16 centuries it doubled, reaching 500 million by 1600.

"Three centuries later, by 1900, world population had tripled, and stood at about 1.5 billion.

"In the less than two-thirds of a century since 1900, world population has approximately doubled again.

"Reliable estimates indicate that in the little over one-third of a century remaining until the year 2000, it will double again.

"The astonishing fact is that the human race is currently doubling in numbers every 35 years.

"Obviously, this rate of growth cannot persist indefinitely, because of the sheer limitation of space and food."

Complicating the problem is the fact that food production is not increasing as fast as the population. Dr. Butz reports this:

"The man-food ratio around the world, never high enough to be very exciting to two-thirds of the world's population, has actually been in a decline the last half dozen years.

"Total food output has increased during those years, to be sure, but at a slower rate than population increase. In many of the world's underdeveloped areas, the man-food ratio is in a serious decline."

WHERE FOOD CRISES LOOM

The drama of the food problem that lies ahead will center in the following areas: Latin America, Asia, Africa.

Latin America's population in the next 35 years will zoom 157 percent—from 245 million people now to 630 million people by the year 2000.

Even now, Latin America as a whole is compelled to import food to feed its own people. The only Latin American countries classified by the U.S. Department of Agriculture as having adequate diets are Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay. Ahead, for Latin America, is the problem of finding food for 385 million more people within 35 years.

Asia, which already holds 55 percent of the world's population, is expected to show a rise of 89 percent in population in the next 35 years, up from 1.8 billion now to about 3.4 billion in the year 2000.

Here, too, is an area that must import food to live. Today Red China is forced to buy grain in large quantities. The millions of India are heavily dependent on food supplies from the United States. Few Asian nations are able to provide their people an adequate diet.

Asia's problem, loaded with potential for future tragedy, is where to find food for the 1.6 billion additional people that it must feed 35 years hence.

Or take the case of Africa, heading for a population growth of 151 percent in the remainder of this century. Only South Africa, in this whole vast continent, is classified as having an adequate diet today. Africa, already importing food, faces the problem of feeding 466 added millions by 2000.

Taken all together, the hungry countries of the world—those considered by experts to have deficient diets—now contain about two-thirds of the world's population but produce only about one-third of the world's food. And it is almost exactly these hungry areas that face the biggest population growth in the years ahead.

A TURN IN THE FOOD FLOW

What makes the food problem even worse is the decline of underdeveloped areas as food producers. Only a generation ago, Asia, Africa, and Latin America were regions with food surpluses. They exported grain to the more advanced countries, especially to Europe.

Now the food flow is reversed. The underdeveloped areas that once grew more food than they ate now must import food from the developed nations.

The reason is that food production in those hungry, underdeveloped areas is not increasing fast enough to keep pace with the increase in population. From 1953 to 1963, there was an actual drop in the amount of food produced locally per person in the underdeveloped regions.

DILEMMA OF THE WEST

Here's a problem for the free world: Communist countries, including Red China, face a smaller population explosion than non-Communist countries.

The outlook, as analyzed by the experts, is that the population in the Communist world will grow about 49 percent while the population in the free world will grow about 98 percent between now and the year 2000.

What this means is that growing food problems could fan agitation for revolution in areas not now Communist.

OVERCROWDING

Not only food but living space will become a serious problem in the population explosion ahead. Even now, many parts of the world are overcrowded. The following figures show the density of population in 1965 and the density expected by 2000:

Population per square mile

	1965	*2000*
Asia	108	202
Africa	26	65
Europe	167	192
Latin America	31	78
North America	26	41
Oceania (Australia, New Zealand, etc.)	5	10

As these figures show, North America will continue to be a part of the world that offers its inhabitants the most elbowroom. But even Americans will begin to feel crowded.

NOTE OF HOPE, TOO

One hopeful note is sounded by the experts: The world is not likely to run out of essential fuels or industrial materials in this century.

Sir John Cockcroft, winner of the Nobel Prize for physics in 1951 and now master of Churchill College at Cambridge, England, told the conference:

Reserves of coal, oil, gas, and uranium will be adequate to provide increasing amounts of power for many years.

By the time uranium supplies run out—if they ever do—man will know how to extract energy from water.

Industry will have to turn to lower grade sources of raw materials. But the ocean floor may yield large quantities of manganese, copper, nickel and cobalt. And plastics will be improved to replace metals in many uses.

A WATER SHORTAGE?

Water, in the crowded world of the future, looms as a problem almost as serious as that of food. Sir John Cockcroft discusses the water situation in these words:

"Water supplies could be a limitation on the development of the economy, especially water supplies for industrial and agricultural use, since requirements are likely to double in the next 20 years. The future of Asia, Africa, and Australia could be vitally affected by water shortage, and even in some parts of the United States this is becoming a problem.

"Desalination of brackish and sea water may help in some areas of the world, especially if combined with less wasteful methods of using water for agriculture and the development of plant varieties which require less water."

WHAT EXPERTS BELIEVE

Is there an answer to the worlds biggest problem? Two things must be done, say the experts:

1. Increase food production greatly.
2. Reduce the world's birth rate.

"In the long run," says Dr. Butz, "say by the close of this century, birth control is the only solution."

But Dr. Shiroshi Nasu, of Toyko University, warns:

"The control of population growth, although it might become a kind of necessity in the future, cannot be depended upon too much now as the major means of adjusting the unbalanced food and population relationship.

"As the adoption of birth control among the developing nations will presuppose a raised standard of living, a wider diffusion of general education, as well as a changed mental outlook, it will certainly take many years to come. During this time, the predicted crisis will not stop approaching.

"It will be a race between the two, and our prospect of winning the race is not too bright at present.

"So we have to turn our attention toward the increase of food production."

U.S. ROLE IN FOOD BATTLE

The United States, it is clear, will play a leading role in the coming battle to feed the world.

This country produces so much surplus food that the official policy has been to limit grain production.

Now official thinking is beginning to change.

On September 23, a new policy was proposed by Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, former Director of the food-for-peace program. He told the U.S. Senate:

"The most overwhelming paradox of our time is to permit half the human race to be hungry while we struggle to cut back on surplus production. * * *

"I believe that we ought to declare an all-out war against hunger. * * * We should announce to the world now that we have an unused food-producing capacity which we are willing and anxious to use to its fullest potential."

A bill has been introduced by Senator MCGOVERN which would authorize the Federal Government to buy American-produced food to give to hungry nations or to sell to them at bargain prices. Other countries also would be given help in improving their own food production.

President Johnson is known to be thinking about the world food problem. He has expressed his conviction that the United States cannot remain secure as an island of abundance in a world full of starving peoople.

The time is seen approaching when U.S. farmers will be asked to spur food production—instead of curb it.

THE CHALLENGE FOR AMERICA

Can the United States really feed the world of the future?

"The opportunity for increased food production on the North American Continent is tremendous," says Dr Butz, a former Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

However, he points out: "We can add only a limited supply of additional arable land. We can get some additional food from the sea—but here again we face practical limits.

"The only practical alternative available to us is the accelerated application of capital and technology to our own agricultural system in an effort substantially to increase output per acre and per man."

This also is pointed out by the experts: United States and Canada themselves face a population growth of about 64 percent in the next 35 years. Those additional people will take a large part of any increase in production.

Feeding a population the size of that foreseen by 2000 is going to be a job too big for any one country. Yet, for the United States, says Dr. Butz: "There is no realistic alternative for us except to gear up to meet this challenge."

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Oct. 4, 1965]

WORLD'S BIGGEST PROBLEM—BREAKTHROUGH IN BIRTH CONTROL: ANSWER TO POPULATION EXPLOSION?

As birth rates soar—governments, in the United States and elsewhere, are moving into "family planning" as never before.

It's a big break with the past. And the story is just beginning to unfold.

Birth control is breaking more and more into the open as governments begin to look for ways to curb the world's population explosion.

Japan, in the years after World War II, was the first nation to go in for birth control on a massive scale. There it was considered a success in causing population to level off.

Now other countries are moving rapidly in the same direction.

India has opened a factory to produce an intrauterine device—itself a revolution in birth-control technique. Goal is a supply for 20 million users by 1970.

In Latin America, predominantly Roman Catholic, Chile has started making birth-control services available to the poor, and private clinics are flourishing in Brazil.

Korea, Tunisia, and other countries are in the midst of birth-control campaigns, or are planning them.

In the United States the Government is taking a greatly changed attitude toward the idea of supporting birth-control programs at home and abroad.

As recently as 1959, President Eisenhower rejected the idea of Government support for birth-control programs abroad.

Laws in most States prohibiting distribution of birth-control information or devices were seldom enforced—but efforts to get them repealed met with repeated failure.

Today, by contrast—

The Child Health and Human Development Institute of the U.S. Public Health Service is spending about $6 million for research on human reproduction, much of it related to the search for universally effective and acceptable methods of "family planning."

The Department of the Interior is offering birth-control services on Indian reservations, in Pacific Trust Territories, and to Indians, Eskimos and Aleuts in Alaska.

Birth control is becoming part of the "war on poverty," too.

St. Louis and Buffalo, for example, are getting Federal money for birth-control clinics, publicly or privately operated, as part of their overall grants from the Office of Economic Opportunity, subject to meeting specific conditions aimed at minimizing controversy.

Expansion of Federal activity in this field already is being mapped.

A "RIGHT" FOR PARENTS

On September 9, Mrs. Katherine B. Oettinger, head of the Children's Bureau in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, said that family planning services should be available as a "right" to all parents. She added:

"The conviction has grown that education and instruction in effective family planning should be an essential component of both the health and welfare agencies * * * for dependent families."

State and local governments, meanwhile, have started moving in the same direction.

In the last 2 years, 12 States have removed, in whole or in part, legal barriers to the distribution of birth control information and devices.

Twenty-seven States and the District of Columbia are offering family planning advice as part of their maternal-care programs for the poor. In a dozen other States, local tax money is going into birth control programs.

In addition, birth control services are being offered free of charge, or at nominal cost to more and more people by the 275 privately run clinics of the Planned Parenthood Federation.

Last year this organization reported a 44 percent increase in its caseload over the previous year.

BIG PROBLEM: THE POOR

The family planning campaign is being centered on America's poor—who are found, on the average, to have larger families than others, with less ability to support them or raise them properly.

Public officials, worried by soaring welfare costs of more than $1 billion a year for dependent children alone, are attracted to the idea of making birth control aid available to the poor.

This availability, it is stressed, would leave individual parents free to accept or reject family planning—and, if they accept, to decide which method to use.

In Illinois, where 65,000 illegitimate children are on welfare, the legislature this year extended birth control aid to any mother, married or unmarried, who is 15 years of age or older and on public welfare.

Chicago's Board of Health, since March, has been prescribing oral contraceptives for women applying at 7 of its 34 clinics.

New York City operates eight clinics in slums. Detroit and San Francisco recently launched municipally run clinics for indigent women seeking birth control help. In Washington, D.C., where 1 in every 5 births is illegitimate, about 8,000 women over the past 12 months have received birth control services at public hospitals from funds that were provided by Congress.

Just what impact such programs are having is being debated widely.

It is the claim of Planned Parenthood that an intensive campaign in one slum area of Chicago brought a 25-percent decline in the birth rate between 1960 and 1965. In North Carolina's Mecklenburg County, a birth control project involving 180 women, each getting relief money for 5 or more children, reduced pregnancies to zero after a few years.

On the other hand, Detroit's health commissioner, Dr. John J. Hanlon, reported that response so far to the municipal birth control program was "not as great as we expected." He explained:

"Basically, we are dealing with the most indigent, who suffer from a lack of education. There is a cultural lag. They have to become aware of the advantages of limiting the number of dependents."

WATCHING AN EXPERIMENT

Population experts are closely watching the outcome of studies in Corpus Christi, Tex., where Planned Parenthood has been running a central clinic for 6 years and now is setting up "satellite" clinics in neighborhoods with the help of $8,500 in Federal funds.

To date, studies show this:

The number of live births to indigent parents at the charity clinic in Corpus Christi declined 24 percent between 1961 and 1964.

Postabortion treatments at this hospital declined from 374 to 224 during that period.

At present, obstetrical cases of all kinds at the charity hospital are running at about 60 percent of the rate of 1963, the year before the birth control center began distributing oral contraceptives on a large scale.

HELP FOR FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Federal funds to support birth control programs soon are to start flowing abroad, too.

President Johnson last January promised that "I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population * * *." In August, he urged United Nations delegates to "act on the fact that less than $5 invested in population control is worth $100 invested in economic growth."

Word has gone out to foreign governments that the United States will consider all requests for aid except for the providing of contraceptives themselves. Assistance could be given, for instance, to a nation in the training of family planning workers, in research, or in the purchase of mobile clinics and other equipment to be used in birth control programs.

Foreign governments, at the present time, are drawing up applications for U.S. aid on birth control programs—and advance signs are that the number of such requests will not be small.

Korea, which hopes to reduce its rate of population growth from 2.9 percent to 2 percent by 1971, has already made a big start in plans to distribute a million intrauterine devices.

Formosa, where a birth control drive already is well under way in the cities, expects to extend it to the countryside.

India, despair of the world's population experts, is just beginning a mass campaign to reduce the number of births from 40 per 1,000 to about 25 by the early 1970's. That would make a sizable dent in the present baby crop, estimated at 14 million births a year.

Before the war between India and Pakistan, the latter also had plans for a birth control drive that was to require substantial U.S. aid.

Tunisia is mapping a large-scale campaign to reduce births—the first Arab nation to do so. Turkey, which recently repealed a ban on contraceptives, is to apply for large amounts of American help.

Even Latin America, where the subject is highly controversial, is getting into birth-control programs.

Chile, already offering contraceptive devices to the poor in cities, soon expects to extend that service to peasants in the countryside.

In Peru, the Ministry of Public Health and Social Assistance has set up a population-study center that is seen as leading, almost inevitably, into a campaign to promote birth control.

In Brazil, privately operated clinics offering help on birth control are functioning in cities—some with the support of Catholic priests behind the scenes. Numerous churchmen are privately encouraging family-planning promoters to go ahead with any type of contraceptive that seems effective.

Communist nations, too, are joining in the worldwide rush to curb explosive population growth.

East Germany is quietly liberalizing restrictions on abortion, and plans to manufacture oral contraceptives. In Red China, oral contraceptives are beginning to make an appearance, amid signs that the Communist leadership intends to intensify its drive against early marriages and childbearing.

BRINGING PRICES DOWN

Technical developments are accelerating the worldwide movement toward birth control.

Until a few years ago, the contraceptives then available seemed impractical for mass campaigns. Even the oral contraceptive, which must be taken for 20 consecutive days at a cost of $25 or more a year, was not popular among slum dwellers and peasants of low income, literacy, and responsibility.

Legalized abortion, largely responsible for bringing Japan's population growth almost to a standstill, is being used in Red China and Eastern Europe—but elsewhere is making little headway. Sterilization, in India and some other nations, is found to require more physicians than usually are available in such countries.

In that situation, the appearance of intrauterine devices is considered of major importance to mass programs of birth control.

One type of device, made of plastic and shaped like a double S, can be manufactured in Asia to sell for about 2 cents—and, once inserted by a physician, can remain indefinitely in about 75 percent of the cases. Satisfactorily in place, it is found to prevent conception in 98 or 99 percent of its users.

What is also giving a push to Government programs to curb birth rates is growing worry about the population crisis.

Former President Eisenhower, once opposed to Government action in this field, is publicly urging that the Government assume a more active role. Congressmen who once considered the birth-control issue "political dynamite" are considering a bill that would establish "population offices" in two departments of the President's Cabinet.

Early this year, a Gallup poll reported that 78 percent of Catholics questioned believed that birth control should be made available to anyone wanting it. This was a substantial increase over the 53 percent noted in a June 1963 poll.

In Chicago, it was Catholic politicians who led the way for approval of that city's birth-control program. In Massachusetts, Richard Cardinal Cushing urged repeal of that State's law against birth control, although the legislature voted against repeal.

A RELIGIOUS VIEWPOINT

For Catholics themselves, church teaching is that "artificial contraception" is immoral. The "rhythm method"—abstinence from marital relations during a woman's fertile period—is cited as the only permissible method of regulating family size.

Some Catholic scholars are calling for a reexamination of this stand. Pope Paul VI, after getting the report of a papal commission, is expected to make a pronouncement on the subject soon.

In the meantime, much debate is building up among Catholics on the growing role of governments.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference, representing U.S. Catholic bishops, approved a statement to Congressmen asserting: "If the power and prestige of government is placed behind programs aimed at providing birth-control services to the poor, coercion necessarily results and violations of human privacy become inevitable. * * *"

On the other hand, some prelates are endorsing this view, given last year by the Rev. Robert F. Drinan, S.J., dean of Boston College's law school:

"The exploding population of the world * * * and the tragedy of more than 1 billion human beings living on a substandard diet can hardly be said to be a problem on which the modern state can be neutral by being inactive."

This much is becoming clear:

Technically and politically, governments are finding that many obstacles to the launching of mass programs of birth control are being removed.

Programs already underway are far from solving the world's population worries. In America itself, for instance, best estimates are that birth control for the poor is reaching 10 percent of 5 million impoverished women.

Even so, population experts say that the situation today is far different from what it was 2 or 3 years ago—and that even bigger changes are likely to come in years just ahead.

SBA REGIONAL COUNSEL FOR ALASKA

Mr. **BARTLETT**. Mr. President, earlier this year Eugene P. Foley, then Administrator of the Small Business Administration, established Alaska as a region in itself, and Robert E. Butler, an outstanding Alaskan, was named regional director. This was one more step Mr. Foley took to aid in Alaska's economic development. Few public servants have brought as much vigor and imagination to their jobs as Mr. Foley did for SBA and now will in his new position as Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development.

Today I can announce that a final step in making Alaska a full region has been taken. The positions of regional counsel and assistant regional counsel have been established in the Anchorage office.

This is an important, indeed, a vital step in permitting the Small Business Administration to operate as it should. Until now all loans had to be closed in Seattle. By road, Seattle is over 2,500 miles away from Anchorage, the city where most of the business activity takes place. The establishment of Alaska as a region in permitting the Anchorage regional office to operate as a region should be a demonstration of the fact that Alaska is growing and growing at a rapid pace. The Small Business Administration is playing an essential role in the growth of the State and I want to take this opportunity to commend all of those in SBA who have contributed so much.

THE HUNGER OF CHILDREN

Mrs. **NEUBERGER**. Mr. President, despite efforts to fight hunger around the world, Latin America faces the severe crisis of population growth racing ahead of food production. The extent of the problem is often difficult to envision. An article in Today's Health poignantly sketches the urgency of coming to grips with the widespread hunger in parts of the lands to the south. It places in perspective the efforts now being made to overcome hunger and how far behind the problem these efforts are. I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a portion of this excellent article by Gwen Schultz.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A new baby can bring into a home bright hope of happiness ahead. But in a rueful number of Latin American families hope shrivels all too soon to sorrow—sorrow caused by malnutrition. That insidious "hidden hunger," whose easiest victims are children and whose confederates are poverty, illiteracy, and out-of-control birth rates, is rampant in large parts of Central and South America. A defense as simple as a balanced diet could rout it, but still its menace grows.

In those lands there are far too many tiny coffins carried to cemeteries, too many little bodies dwarfed and distorted, too many baby smiles that fade into irritable frowns, sparkling eyes that dull with disinterest or stop seeing altogether, and energies that flag into limp apathy.

Why have Americans, renowned as militant hunger-fighters around the world, tolerated this mass misery in their own backyard? Their earnings go generously to governmental agencies, the United Nations, universities, churches, and various other organizations which assiduously attack hunger in underdeveloped areas. Every day an average of five 10,000-ton ships leaves the United States carrying food-for-peace around the world. Then why isn't hunger in our hemisphere whipped into retreat? It is, but not everywhere and not fast enough.

Of all the world's major regions, Latin America has the highest rate of population growth. It has had the highest rate in every decade since 1920. Between 1920 and 1960, while the United States and Canada increased 72 percent and south Asia 85 percent, Latin America zoomed up 136 percent. By the year 2000, its present population, if unchecked, will triple and in some areas it will quadruple while the world as a whole only doubles.

Latin America's food production must increase faster than population if hunger is to diminish, but it is not even keeping pace. There, where population growth is the fastest in the world, agricultural production per capita has paradoxically been decreasing. Children are produced faster than food to feed them.

The food shortage may seem unrealistic in view of the large grain and meat exports from South America. But these come from the pampas of Argentina and Uruguay, a region much like the North American Corn Belt but smaller in area. In all of Latin America this is the only first-class agricultural region of any important size, and these are the only two countries that have an ample food supply.

The Institute of Nutrition of Central America and Panama (INCAP) recently investigated the deaths of children aged 1 to 4 in several Guatemalan villages. Civil registers indicated malnutrition was the cause of only 1 of 109 deaths in a given period. INCAP investigators, reexamining the cases, clearly determined that not 1 but 40 were due to malnutrition.

This surreptitious killer has escaped detection, too, because its method of operation has not been fully understood, even in medical circles. For decades the need for minerals and vitamins has been explored, and we know that severe deficiencies of certain of them still cause numerous cases of anemia, blindness, scurvy, rickets, pellagra, and other illnesses in underdeveloped areas like Latin America. Now medical science is advancing into another nutritional realm. It has put the finger on the world's most critical childhood deficiency—protein, particularly high-quality protein found in animal foods such as meat, milk, fish, eggs, cheese, and butter. These vital foods do not keep well in farm climate; they are high priced, and besides, taboos and superstitions prohibiting their consumption by children are widespread.

Marasmus and kwashiorkor—still unfamiliar words probably; but these are the two most destructive childhood diseases of underdeveloped tropical and subtropical areas. Protein shortage is a factor in both. Marasmus afflicts children under 1 year of age; kwashiorkor afflicts those somewhat older. These two diseases, somewhat allied, often merge with one another. The infant with marasmus has a wasted, "skin-and-bones" look. Eating little but watery gruels, he is literally starving. If he survives he will in time be fed more calories but still not enough protein. Then, usually following an infectious disease, kwashiorkor will be superimposed upon the marasmus condition.

Protein deficiency diseases are curable if treated in time. Skimmed milk, mixed from dry milk powder, has proved highly successful in recovery and preventive diets. Mothers are being encouraged to use an inexpensive milk substitute, Incaparina (named for its developer INCAP), where it is available. A formula mixture of corn, sorghum, cottonseed flour, yeast, calcium carbonate, and vitamin A, it contains protein of good quality although no animal protein.

The basic use for Incaparina is as a gruel for infants and for older children. Presently, considerable thought is being given to special ways of incorporating it into the diet of children beyond the age when they will eat whatever is placed before them.

Fish flour can be a boon to low-protein diets. Said to be the world's cheapest, richest potential source of high-quality protein when properly prepared, it keeps and ships well and can be made tasteless and odorless. Waters off the coasts of Peru and Chile are excellent for fishing. The annual catch of Peru alone is about 7 million tons, most of which is now exported as fertilizer and food for animals.

Fish flour has been produced for experimental studies in both these countries. They could become manufacturers of this product for human consumption.

Many Latin American governments have, since 1956, taken advantage of the offer of the U.S. Interdepartmental Committee on Nutrition for National Development (earlier called the Committee for National Defense) to collaborate in assessing the nutritional state of their countries. Health teams from the United States work with local personnel, examining individuals, sampling food from home kitchens, analyzing food distribution, and determining ways to improve the country's nutrition.

The white hospital ship *Hope* (health opportunity for people everywhere) has docked at Peru and Ecuador during her worldwide mercy voyages, and next year will drop anchor at Nicaragua. Her staffs on ship and on shore conduct health education programs. Her milk plant, said to be equal to 2,500 cows, reconstitutes dry milk. To obtain it, mothers must attend nutrition classes. Edith S. Clark, *Hope*'s director of nursing, says that one mother was so grateful for the improvement in her baby that she tried to give it to a *Hope* worker.

Many devoted hands and minds are at work. But their effect in this enormous, craving land is a light sprinkle of raindrops, vitalizing spots here and there, when what is needed really is a saturating flood.

Education could be that flood. About 45 percent of Latin America is illiterate. School enrollments are far below what they should be.

Operation Ninos (ninos means children), the food-for-peace child-feeding program, is luring children to school with snacks and lunches. Begun in 1954, the project uses food from the United States. Through volunteer agencies, local governments, and teachers, it now helps feed one-third of Latin America's schoolchildren, serving them as little as a cup of milk or as much as a full hot meal. Some school kitchens are no more than an oven formed by three stones. The workers' instruction manual indicates the rudimentary level on which the program operates:

"A sturdy aluminum cup is an all-purpose utensil that will stand up under hard treatment. A spoon can later be provided to eat food from the cup if this seems desirable and funds permit."

Although recipes are not exactly the gourmet type, they are planned with good nutrition in mind: bulgar wheat pilaf, peanut soup, cornmeal fruit pudding, cereal pie with meat, molasses milk.

By serving milk and food in schools, malnutrition and illiteracy are attacked simultaneously. Hungry students are inattentive and learn slowly.

Parents who never sent their children to school before now want them to go. School lunches are credited with doubling rural school attendance in Peru, cutting absenteeism in Bolivia from 38 to 2 percent, and adding 8 pounds in 4 months to third-graders in Chile. Many youngsters get their only wholesome meals, their only milk, at school.

A questioning of Brazilian students revealed that for breakfast 2 out of 10 had nothing, 3 had just coffee, 4 had bread and coffee, and only 1 had more than that. Now a basic meal is enjoyed by 3 million schoolchildren in that country and by 12 million in Latin America as a whole. Gardens kept by students demonstrate home gardening methods and provide vegetables for the meals.

Health centers, mobile units, and river boats reach children who are not in school and—just as important—they reach their parents, who may need education too. Some mothers, tied to tradition, lose two or three children before daring to try new lifesaving foods. Some tell their sons that only sissies drink milk. Some paint their breasts with vile-tasting substance to repel their infants.

A farmer may sell his eggs, chickens, or milk (protein desperately needed by his children) to buy larger caloric quantities of food. Corn, rice, wheat, potatoes, cassava, beans—these satisfy hunger for a low price. If he slaughters one of his few precious animals it is likely to be prime one, leaving the scrawnier ones for breeding. Andean farmers are repeatedly told, "Eat the small potatoes and use the big ones for seed," but they do just the opposite. Can farmers at starvation's brink gamble with alien methods which some tall stranger assures them will pay off in the future?

There may still be skeptics who think, "Things can't really be as dismal as all that." Surely, a farmer with initiative, who cannot make a go of it in one place can move elsewhere, for Latin America is still in the pioneer stage—a big, beautiful, thinly settled land. However, the best land is already under production, much in large ranches and plantations. Ninety percent of the agricultural land is owned by 10 percent of the landowners. About a third of Latin America is dry. Mountains rumple Central America and western South America, and much more land is dissected badly. The luxuriant rain forests? Deceptively infertile. Soils are leached and eroded by year-round rains, and clearings are overrun with insects and weeds. What marginal land remains is far from market and requires energy—as well as capital—to develop.

Yes, the destitute farmer can leave his wornout plot of ground—even though several children are buried there; even though he cannot read; even though he has no money and his wife is pregnant; even though his creativeness is dulled by the drugging coca leaf used since childhood to deaden hunger pangs, or by alcohol, or the greater depressant, failure.

Why not go to the big city? Latin America has 10 cities over a million, several over 3 million. With their modern architecture, bustling thoroughfares, and handsome, healthy people they beckon promisingly. Work must be there.

But throngs of other farmers are migrating to cities too. Unskilled, illiterate, and poor, they cannot easily find jobs or even a place to live. In magnificent Caracas, a metropolis of more than a million and a half, 65 percent of the inhabitants are squatters. On the farm a family might have had access to some vegetables, fruits, and animals, but here with little money they are restricted even more to starchy staples. And poverty does not prevent children from being born.

Urbanization is accelerating. Fewer hands are left on the farms. If farmers do increase their yields their own families can in most cases consume the increase. Incomes of unskilled city workers are pitifully low. There is less food to be bought and little to buy it with. Should a family's income rise, many things beside proteins and vitamins must be paid for—clothes, a home, furnishings, a few luxuries—and so the diet remains meager.

The skeptic still has reason to doubt the extent of the children's suffering when he looks at the vital statistics. It is true that death rates of Latin American children are dropping dramatically. For instance, from about 1948 to 1962 the infant montality rate (deaths of infants under 1 year of age per 1,000 live births) dropped from 102 to 70 in Mexico, from 78 to 42 in Puerto Rico, from 147 to 117 in Chile, from 105 to 70 in British Honduras. But these are still high compared with United States' 25, Canada's 28, and the United Kingdom's 22. Goals are set to bring these rates lower still.

To conduct a health program in a hungry land without increasing food supplies proportionately is to invite disaster. And disaster is at the door. Each saved life is an added drain on the available food. Yet who would even think of retarding medical and technical progress? Plans are to step it up.

We see the ironic truth: The more we help, the worse the hunger situation becomes.

Death rates fall fast. Birth rates remain frighteningly high in a fertile, youthful population. No wonder there is panic at the prospect. Ultimately, we trust, all countries will find a way to feed themselves properly, but what of the meantime? It is the children who will suffer most.

Some look to industrialization as the quick solution because it can increase a nation's buying power while it lowers birth rates. Japan and Great Britain are often cited as classic examples of countries where industrialization solved the overpopulation problem. But no nation has successfully industrialized without first having had a sound agricultural base. The British and Japanese are some of the world's most expert agriculturalists. Except for certain limited regions and large commercial enterprises, Latin America's agricultural base is poor, even primitive.

Land reform, which will eventually give more land to the small farmer, progresses slowly, and while it takes place agricultural production will be disrupted as new patterns and techniques are put into operation.

Change will take time. Meanwhile malnutrition slithers along—killing, crippling, stunting, weakening, and mentally numbing, through one generation after the other. A country's outlook is a composite of the outlook of its people individually. How much more vigorous, progressive, and satisfied a country would be if the bulk of its citizens grew to full stature with strong bodies, healthy ambitions, and normally happy dispositions.

Food is not all youngsters need for the good life. If they do manage to keep alive and healthy, can their other requirements be met? Will their environments be uplifting ones where characters can develop in healthful channels too? Will rescued lives find opportunity, stimulus, and fulfillment?

PULASKI DAY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, today is Pulaski Day, a day during which we express our gratitude to Gen. Casimir Pulaski, the Polish military hero who gave his life on October 11, 1779, to help us achieve our independence.

In a proclamation that today, October 11, 1965, be set aside as Pulaski Day in Connecticut, Gov. John Dempsey pointed out:

> The observance of this day is an occasion for the expression of our sympathy and concern for the freedom-loving people of Poland, now subject to oppressive Iron Curtain rule, who look forward to the day when they will regain their rightful independence. It serves, also, to recognize the noteworthy contribution to progress made by the many citizens of Polish extraction who reside in Connecticut.

I heartily concur with Governor Dempsey's thoughts on why we should observe Pulaski Day and I ask unanimous consent to have the Governor's proclamation printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION BY HIS EXCELLENCY JOHN DEMPSEY, GOVERNOR, STATE OF CONNECTICUT

Our Nation will ever be grateful to Gen. Casimir Pulaski, the Polish military hero who gave his life for the cause of American independence in the historic siege of Savannah on October 11, 1777.

A fearless champion of liberty in his native land before he generously offered his services to the struggling Colonies, General Pulaski, a brilliant strategist, brought strength and inspiration to the Colonial troops in their long battle to establish an independent nation.

The General Assembly of Connecticut, mindful of the esteem in which the name of General Pulaski is held, has directed that a day be set aside annually to honor the memory of this gallant officer. Accordingly, I hereby proclaim Monday, October 11, 1965, to be Pulaski Day.

The observance of this day is an occasion for the expression of our sympathy and concern for the freedom-loving people of Poland, now subject to oppressive Iron Curtain rule, who look forward to the day when they will regain their rightful independence. It serves, also, to recognize the noteworthy contribution to progress made by the many citizens of Polish extraction who reside in Connecticut.

I urge that national and State flags be displayed on public and private buildings in Connecticut on Pulaski Day and that schools and civic organizations conduct appropriate memorial exercises.

Given under my hand and seal of the State at the capitol, in Hartford, this 25th day of September, in the year of our Lord 1965, and of the independence of the United States the 190th.

JOHN DEMPSEY,
State of Connecticut.

By His Excellency's command:

ELLA T. GRASSO,
Secretary of State.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR REPORTS ON WORLD FOOD CHALLENGE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the Christian Science Monitor, which I have long regarded as one of the world's greatest newspapers, has given careful attention in recent weeks to the world food and population crisis. I have especially appreciated a report by the distinguished journalist, Saville R. Davis, on my efforts in this field which appeared in the October 4, 1965, issue of the Monitor, and a supporting editorial in the October 7 issue. A third article, entitled "Experts Warn of Global Hunger Challenges," appeared in the October 4, 1965, Monitor. I ask unanimous consent that this piece be printed in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 4, 1965]

EXPERTS WARN OF GLOBAL HUNGER CHALLENGES

WASHINGTON.—What happens when soaring world population crosses the line of food production? Some experts here think it has already happened.

Maduri is a 7-year-old girl in Rajpur, India. The village had 400 people a generation ago; today 700. Maduri is small for her age, has big hungry eyes. She has never had a square meal. Foreign experts look and sigh.

Carlos Busto tries to support five ragged children in a shack in northeast Brazil. His situation is abject—desperate even.

The country imported 3 million tons of wheat last year. Yet the soil is rich. It is a classical example of unused potential.

In Egypt the great Aswan Dam is rising. When completed it will add 2 million arable acres on either side of the Nile. Engineers hail it "to feed the hungry." But by the time the dam is built, the new acreage will not be able to feed the new population.

IRONY SEEN

So it is around the world—Turkey, China, Africa. A terrible irony is that almost without exception Communist countries which rebelled against deprivation now import food more and more. It is true of China and the Soviet Union.

The forthcoming world hunger may be the single most important fact in the latter part of the 20th century, demographers here say. It will be, they argue, unless something is done quickly.

A world famine, experts say, doesn't "start"; it has no fixed time of beginning. There was no "start" of the New York water shortage, for example. What happened was that New Yorkers suddenly discovered a condition that was there already.

World hunger is present today. One international food agency (Food and Agricultural Organization) estimates 10,000 fatalities a day due to malnutrition.

CRISIS SIGHTED

By 1980, Lester R. Brown, staff economist of the Department of Agriculture, says that 1 billion more people will have to be fed. Primarily they will be in underdeveloped, hungry countries.

Swedish Economist Gunnar Myrdal puts the acute stage closer. "Five or Ten years," he told a correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor. "I am frightened," he added.

Thomas M. Ware, head of the Freedom From Hunger Foundation testified here in June before a Senate subcommittee:

"Very few grasp the magnitude of the danger that confronts us * * *. The catastrophe is not something that may happen; on the contrary, it is a mathematical certainty that it will happen."

VIEW SHARED

This view is commonplace among anxious agronomists and economists.

The U.S. Ambassador to India, Chester Bowles, testified that approaching world famine threatens "the most colossal catastrophe in history."

When world famine is discussed experts are talking about an area that embraces one-half the earth's population. It is too big for most people to grasp. They tend to survey country by country—Algeria, for example. Algeria is going through characteristic post-independence adjustment difficulties. Result: Food production per person is down one-sixth in the early sixties over the early fifties.

It is not fashionable to say famine is inevitable or to admit that it is already here. Most experts simply call the situation explosive. They think they can hear a ticking. Will somebody defuse the bomb?

TIME FACTOR ACCENTED

"Famine is not inevitable," Lester Brown says, "but it's going to take a real step-up to prevent it. The critical thing is time."

Take India, for example.

India and the United States have about the same acreage under cultivation—350 millions. But India's grain yield per acre is a fourth of the American. The United States has only 4 million farmers, India 60 million. Over 60 years India's grain yield rose by only 3 percent. Officials hope to add 6 million acres in the next 15 years. That's 0.2 percent a year. But India's population is growing 2 percent a year—10 times as fast.

The U.S. reaction to this problem has gone through four phases:

First came straight compassionate food exports. Millions of tons have been sent. Public Law 480 ("food for peace") passed in 1954. Ten years later it was almost universally recognized that just exporting food wouldn't do the trick. Population grows faster.

KNOW-HOW EXPORTED

Second came exports of fertilizer, insecticides, and know-how. The hungry countries often have good soil. Let them grow their own food, not import it. But population grew faster.

The third stage came 2 weeks ago. Instead of sending fertilizer in bulk, send money and credits to build local plants. This is still going on. Population is growing faster.

Now is the fourth stage. President Johnson both in his State of the Union message, and at the 20th-anniversary meeting of the U.N. cited the need to cope with population. Now, increasing efforts by the United States to help hungry lands are adding the element of family planning—birth control.

Nobody knows the ending of the story. Nobody can turn to the back of the book of world hunger and see how it turns out. But the plot line is plain; accelerating births bring hunger; hunger brings turmoil; turmoil brings war.

The affluent United States can draw no iron wall around itself. As Barbara Ward, the British economist put it, the economic gap is steadily growing; a gap, she said, "between a white, complacent, highly bourgeois, very wealthy, very small North Atlantic elite, and everybody else."

AMERICA: LAND OF THE FREE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, once again our President has established that this land where our forefathers sought their freedom from oppression and tyranny will remain the land of the free.

Fidel Castro, of Cuba, made a statement the other day saying those Cubans who wished to leave the way of life he has imposed on them will be able to leave the island.

President Johnson answered affirmatively, and in the best tradition of this country.

He said, in ceremonies at Liberty Island, with Ellis Island and the magnificent symbol of the Statue of Liberty in the background, that the people of Cuba who seek refuge here will find it.

The dedication of America to our traditions as an asylum for the oppressed will be upheld.

Those in Cuba who seek freedom may now "make an orderly entry into the United States."

The U.S. emphasis will be on orderly movement, and the President is asking the Department of State to seek through the Swiss Government the agreement of the Cuban Government in a request to the President of the International Red Cross Committee.

The request is for the assistance of the Committee in processing the movement of refugees from Cuba to Miami.

Miami will serve as a port of entry—the temporary place for refugees as they move on to settle in other parts of the country.

The President has asked all States in the Union to join with Florida "in extending the hand of helpfulness and humanity to our Cuban brothers."

Here again is an example of how America can grow stronger—by extending a hand of fellowship to men and women who declare their devotion to freedom by their action, not just by speech.

We grow not by being selfish and content with the status quo—but by initiative and positive actions of faith.

Now, America opens its arms and its hearts to those Cubans who have been separated from their loved ones, and to those who want to live and work in this atmosphere of freedom. Here, it is what the man can do that matters.

As Americans we know that it is not just enough to be strong. We want to be strong, and also to be able to say to the oppressed: Welcome, come in to the land of the free.

It was my privilege over a period of several years to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees of the Committee on the Judiciary. During that period a number of hearings were held across the country to analyze the effectiveness with which Cuban refugees were resettled, and resettled, indeed, at points which one would think, by virtue of language, local conditions, and even climate, were not conducive to success. Actually, the reverse was the case. Our efforts were dramatically successful.

In Michigan, the Cuban refugees have settled in the region of Grand Rapids in the number of more than 300. There are more than 1,000 Cuban refugees in the entire State of Michigan.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a telegram sent to me by Jose Tagle, a leader in the resettlement in the Grand Rapids Cuban community, reacting to the President's message be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.,
October 3, 1965.

Senator PHILIP HART,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Cuban families in Grand Rapids will support their relatives coming from Cuba please be our leader in getting them out of there according to the President's speech. Your presence here will be helpful.

JOSE TAGLE.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, the Senate is in the process of deciding one of the most basic issues ever to face our form of government and our economic system.

It is an issue which needs the very careful consideration of every citizen of the United States because it involves the rights of every citizen of the United States who works for a living or who is dependent upon our economy for his livelihood.

I am strongly opposed to limiting debate in any form on this question because I am confident that when the people of this country have considered all of the facts involved they will strongly oppose Congress taking any action that would repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I have always felt that the Federal Government should refrain as much as possible from intervening in the relationships between organized labor and management in this country.

To me, it is completely contrary to the free enterprise system when any person, whether he be on the side of labor or management, is required to join any organization in order to pursue his work or his profession.

Because of the basic principles involved, I am perfectly willing for the Senate to remain in session on an around-the-clock basis for the rest of this year and next year, if necessary, to prevent the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Because of my deep feelings regarding this matter, I will vote against limiting debate on the question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous agreement, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Senate will be in order. Personnel around the wall will take seats and cease their conversations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is now pending before the Senate a cloture motion on the motion to proceed to consider and nothing more. It has been properly signed. There has been an intervening day under the rule. That motion, therefore, is properly before the Senate for a vote at 1 o'clock, after the Vice President or the Presiding Officer ascertains that a quorum is present.

The purpose, of course, of the cloture is to end debate on the motion to consider 14(b). There is nothing unusual about this continuing discussion on the motion to take up. It has been done many times. I believe the Senate anticipates that when that motion is made on a highly controversial bill that is the very point at which the issue will be joined.

The motion to proceed to consider is debatable, but when adopted, the bill then would be subject to amendment. I would anticipate that there might be as many as 50 or more amendments offered to the Taft-Hartley Act of various shades and descriptions.

The rather interesting fact under the rule must be remembered that when an amendment has been offered and has been discussed, it is then subject to a tabling motion, and that shuts off all debate.

Under the motion to consider, we are free to debate and to get this story out to the country.

There is a better reason for opposing cloture, and that is that up to this time we have had about 18 hours of discussion, and no more. That goes back to Monday of last week, when I opened the discussion on the motion to take up.

But I recite this for the RECORD because, unless my figures are incorrect—and I do not believe they are—we had 37 days on the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1960. There were actually 74 days after House passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It was before the Senate for a period of 57 days. The satellite bill was before the Senate for a period of 18 days. I did not check the voting rights bill, but there was quite an intervening time before it came on for action.

It would be singular, indeed, if the Senate imposed upon itself a gag under which, if adopted, each Senator would have 1 hour and no more; he could not transfer his hour; he must either take it, or the hour is lost. If every Senator took his hour there would be only 100 hours and no more. That is a short period because there are speeches prepared and ready that would take 5 hours, 6 hours, and 7 hours.

The distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who was Governor of his State when the Right-To-Work Act was signed in that State, is prepared to speak at length.

The distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], who has been waiting, has a 6- or 7-hour speech. He is waiting patiently for his opportunity to be heard. There is a long list, because Senators are beginning to hear from the country.

The job we are trying to do for the right of all to work, to live, to survive, and perhaps to start on some of the union abuses would be rather cavalierly shut off if the cloture petition were adopted.

When I mention the distinguished Senator from Texas, I call attention to the fact that on the 24th of September the distinguished Governor of Texas appeared before the Executives' Club in Chicago. Knowing about that club, I presume that at that luncheon 1,500 persons were present.

In the question period this question was asked:

> I know you have stated your position on Taft-Hartley and the poverty program. Could you state your position specifically?

Governor Connally, in his second term as Governor, elected last November by 73 percent of the vote in Texas, responded:

> Yes, I have taken the position specifically, as I did when I ran for Governor in 1962, as I did on our State program in 1962. I am for retention of 14(b) in the Taft-Hartley Act. I see no justification whatsoever for its repeal. I am as concerned and interested in the working people of Texas as any union leader in that State. But, I can assure you that the fact that we have—that we are one of the 19 right-to-work States in this Nation, that it has not in the least hampered the activities of the unionman, his wages, his standard of living, or his welfare. I think if the leaders themselves will get out and do the job without asking the Government to do it for them, they can make progress. I am not against the unions; I am for them. But I think they are going to have to hoe their own row just like a lot of the rest of us do.

That is the Governor of Texas speaking, the Governor of the great State which gave us the great President of the United States who occupies the White House, except for an interim period while he is in the hospital.

I say now what I said to his staff this morning and yesterday, and when I talked with him before he went to the hospital: that our prayers are with him.

What a colossal mistake it would be because when a vast segment of freedom is at stake, when the right to work is at stake, and when the principle is at stake, we have a duty, Mr. President, to cite our case.

Under the rules of the House, the bill was gagged, and it could not be amended. What a crying shame it would be if the Senate did not take abundant time to educate the people on the bill. Education takes time.

The Governor of Texas, when he stood before that group in Chicago, said he looked at the Gallup poll recently, and that 8 out of 10 who responded to that poll thought that Texas was a desert; that it was flat; that it was barren; and that it had no water.

That is great talk, but Texas has more water than any State in the Union, except Alaska, and up there I suppose it is frozen half of the time.

That indicates what has to be done in an educational effort in order to present an abstruce problem to the attention of the people. We are beginning to make some real progress in that field. We seek only to present the facts; to present the truth to the people.

This is the country of the people. It does not belong to the unions. It does not belong to the Congress. It belongs to the people and they are not only entitled to be heard, but they have got to be heard because much is at stake.

Mr. President, when the first national headquarters of the American Federation of Labor was dedicated in this city many years ago, inscribed on the cornerstone was the following:

> This edifice erected for service in the cause of labor, justice, freedom, and humanity.

What is at stake before us is the whole question of freedom, and it cannot be lightly disposed of or swept under the rug. So I reaffirm that when we make our fight on the motion to consider the bill, that is the proper place for those who believe a great stake is involved to make the fight, so that they will not be jeopardized at a later time by amendments, by motions, and by the employment of the tabling process, because I have seen how that procedure works in committee and on the Senate floor, and I prefer uninhibited debate now, at this point, on the motion to consider.

I fervently hope and trust, for the sake of the country and for the sake of the people, that the cloture motion will be rejected and that untrammeled debate can go forward in the interest of truth and in the interest of light.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, of the time remaining before 1 o'clock, 3 minutes be allotted to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the senior Senator from Oregon for 3 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall support the cloture motion. Since 1947, this issue of so-called right-to-work laws has been debated in the Senate of the United States. Every Senator knows the pros and cons of the issue.

The Senator from Illinois talked about the country belonging to the people. The Constitution also belongs to the people—and to all the people. In 1947, I led the fight in this body against segmentizing the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution. That is exactly what the Congress did when it passed the Taft-Hartley law including a delegating to the States of certain powers reserved to the Federal Government under the interstate commerce clause. What is involved in this issue is whether there shall be a uniform application of the interstate commerce clause among the 50 States, or whether 19 States shall be permitted to take advantage of an unfortunate delegation of power to the State by Congress under that clause. Such a delegation of interstate commerce authority to the States permits them to maintain the shocking low labor conditions that they maintain under right-to-work laws to the competitive disadvantage of employers in high-labor-standard States.

The Senator from Illinois cites the Governor of Texas as being in support of right-to-work laws. I shall cite Texas as an outstanding reason why the right-to work laws should be repealed. Texas maintains some of the most shocking low labor standards in this country. For years, Texas has been taking competitive advantage of high-wage-paying employers in the Northern States. I shall give a sordid example of what the Governor of Texas is maintaining in his State.

In Texas, every morning trucks leave to cross the river into Mexico. Mexicans are loaded onto those trucks and are brought across the river and through the gate of low-labor-standard textile factories in Texas. These migrants have daily immigration permits which allow them to work in Texas and live in Mexico. They are hauled to work each morning and back home each night. Those factories have been moved into Texas from the New England and other high-wage-paying States. That is an example of what can be accomplished in States which have the so-called right-to-work laws. These Mexican workers are exploited by Texas employers with the full knowledge of the Governor of Texas. This truck transportation system is so devised as to prevent these workers from being approached by union organizers. This is part of the right-to-work law union-busting system. The Governor of Texas is notorious for his advocacy of low labor standards in Texas in order to pirate away from high-labor-standard States industries and plants such as are involved in the Mexican worker textile sweatshops in Texas. Some other industries are involved too.

As a Senator from Oregon, I can testify that my State is confronted with the same unfair competition from Southern right-to-work States in the lumber industry.

To the senior Senator from Oregon, the issue is very clear. It is whether we shall apply the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution uniformly across the country by having Congress take back the unfortunate power it delegated—mistakenly, in my judgment—in 1947. The time for us to do so is now. By our vote we should make perfectly clear that we intend to reestablish the uniform application of the interstate-commerce clause among the 50 States and stop the so-called right-to-work law States from taking advantage of workers by maintaining low labor standards, such as are so prevalent in Texas. Texas is a good example of what I mean.

The time has come for the Senate to apply cloture today. In spite of everything the Senator from Illinois has said, what he really designs is to kill the bill by dilatory tactics known as a filibuster, irrespective of the adjectives he applies to describe his tactics.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is under control. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Montana until 1 o'clock.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield me a minute?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; I am sorry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, since last Friday, I have been a little gun shy. I must admit that I have no rabbits to pull out of my hat. The only thing I am interested in is votes; and the only factor which will decide the issue before us, and the substance, as well, if we ever get to it, will be votes—nothing more, nothing less.

In my opinion, every Senator has his mind made up as to how he will vote on the question of cloture; and if by chance cloture is invoked today, how he will vote on the question of the passage of the bill to repeal section 14(b). So we must face up to the realities of the situation and recognize them.

I hope we shall move away from the emotionalism involved in this issue and will recognize the facts for what they are and treat this subject accordingly.

Mr. President, it is possible, as some persons have contended, that Friday's vote was rendered meaningless by its unanimity. So far as the majority leader is concerned, he prefers to believe that the Senate does not deliberately engage in meaningless gestures. On Friday the Senate was provided with an opportunity to get off the issue of section 14(b) by a simple tabling motion. The Senate chose not to put the motion aside. It chose not to do so by a unanimous vote.

The majority leader takes Friday's vote at face value. Insofar as the majority leader is concerned, therefore, that vote was, in no sense, without meaning. On the contrary, it has been immensely helpful and the leadership is most appreciative.

In all frankness, if the motion to table had carried on last Friday, the majority leader was prepared to recommend immediately that the Senate pass over this issue for the session. On the other hand if the motion to table had been defeated by a slim majority, the Senate would have remained in a difficult predicament. The majority leader would have been hard-pressed to decide whether the margin against tabling warranted an effort to invoke cloture on a simple procedural question of whether the Senate would take up H.R. 77.

But the vote on Friday was such as to resolve all doubts on the matter insofar as the majority leader was concerned. Indeed, when unanimity against tabling was indicated in the early stages of the tally the majority leader drew from his pocket a cloture motion. The motion had been prepared in advance but was unsigned because, I confess, that until that moment I did not quite know what to do with it. Once the vote began to be recorded, however, it was clear what had to be done with it. The motion was circulated among the Members while the vote was in process and, before the tally was complete, the requisite signatures had been obtained.

It was possible, therefore, for the majority leader to move without waste of time at the conclusion of the tally to give substance to the overwhelming, indeed, unanimously indicated inclination of the Senate, as expressed in the vote against the motion to table.

The Senate, in effect, had said—indeed the minority leader did say it—that it did not want to leave this issue. So, in accommodation, the majority leader offered the motion for cloture. He offered it, in the first place, to make sure that he had heard correctly and, second, to act on the Senate's indicated wish in the only procedural way which is believed practical at this time.

The nature of the predicament and the need for a cloture motion becomes clear in the light of the proceedings on the floor during the last 2 weeks. Ten days is a lavish and wasteful expenditure of the Senate's limited floor time of any simple procedural question, which usually takes 10 seconds or less. Indeed, during this session of Congress many complex pieces of legislation have been completely disposed of in a fraction of that time. The Voting Rights Act of 1965, for example, was both novel and controversial; yet the motion to proceed to its consideration was passed by the Senate in less than a minute. Similar swift treatment was given to the procedural question of taking up the proposed constitutional amendments on reapportionment and on Presidential inability. The same is true for Appalachia, poverty, and aid to education, to name but a few. That is part of the background for the vote which is about to be taken. Here is the rest.

On October 1, 10 days ago, the majority leader moved that the Senate turn to consideration of H.R. 77. It was an entirely orderly and routine procedural motion. The bill, itself, had passed the House. It had been considered at length by the appropriate Senate committee and reported favorably. It had been on the Legislative Calendar for a month. What was there to debate on the question of taking up this measure? Whether it was too late in the session for a major and controversial issue of this kind? Whether the Senate should take up some other bill first? Whether the Senate should adjourn? These, indeed, would have been legitimate matters to discuss in an orderly fashion prior to a vote on the motion to take up H.R. 77; an hour or so might have reasonably been consumed in the process. But these matters were not discussed at all, except as they were mentioned by the majority leader on Monday. On the contrary, a long and continuing tirade on the evils which would attend the repeal of 14(b) was launched even though the Senate had not yet decided to consider H.R. 77.

I submit that that is not useful and pointed debate. That is an unconscionable delay on a procedural question for the purpose of obfuscating the issue of substance. If it is not a filibuster, it is, to say the least, a prefilibuster.

And so, on October 5, 5 days ago, the leadership indicated its concern to the Senate over the delay in reaching a decision on the simple procedural question of taking up 14(b). At that time, the Senate was asked, via the tabling motion, to give the leadership some guidance as to its wish on the sole question of taking up 14(b). The majority leader was at great pains to point out that what was involved was in no way a test of sentiment on the issue of 14(b) itself.

Therefore, on Friday, the distinguished minority leader whose own position against repeal of 14(b) is no secret, urged defeat of the tabling motion, so that the matter would not be put aside. And the majority leader, whose own position in favor of repeal of 14(b) is no secret, urged defeat of the motion to table so that the matter could be moved forward in an orderly fashion. The Senate responded magnificently to the appeal of the joint leadership.

In the vote which is about to be taken, the Senate will be able to make clear that it does not toy, as some have suggested, with the hopes of millions of Americans who are members of the great labor unions of the Nation. The Senate can make clear that, regardless of how it may feel on the issue of 14(b) itself, it does not make light of their sincere petition by dabbling in parliamentary parlor games. The Senate can make clear that labor is entitled to a fair and decent consideration of an issue of great importance in labor-management relations duly and properly brought before the Senate, even as corporations are, even as the aged and the poverty stricken are, even as immigrants are and even as racial minorities are.

The Senate can make this clear, in the only way that it can be made clear at the present time, in the judgment of the majority leader, by voting to invoke cloture on the simple procedural motion of taking up H.R. 77.

I stress again that this vote will not, any more than the motion to table on Friday, bind anyone for or against repeal of 14(b). What it will do—and let there be no doubt—is to determine whether or not the Senate means to get down to business on the issue of 14(b) itself or to pass over it. On the basis of the performance of the past days, the majority leader, in all frankness, sees no other rational way at this time in which this point can be nailed down except via the path of cloture on the single issue of whether or not to proceed to consider H.R. 77.

So, Mr. President, at 1 o'clock, thanks to rule 22, and the cooperation of the distinguished minority leader on Friday, a significant moment of truth will have arrived for the Senate.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under rule XXII the Chair lays before the Senate the pending motion to bring to a close the debate upon the motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 77. A two-thirds vote of Senators present and voting, a quorum being present, is required for this motion to carry.

Under the rule, the clerk will now call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 286 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent on official business.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** A quorum is present. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?

Under the rule, a yea-and-nay vote is required.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. A "yea" vote would be in favor of cloture, and a "nay" vote would be against cloture. Is that correct?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator has properly stated the present situation. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER]. If they were present and voting, they would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay," and the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent on official business, and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 45, nays 47, as follows:

[No. 287 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Burdick
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Douglas
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Mondale
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Smith
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

NAYS—47

Aiken
Allott
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McClellan
McGovern
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Prouty
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—8

Anderson
Brewster
Cannon
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Scott
Young, Ohio

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** On this vote, there are 45 yeas and 47 nays. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting not having voted in the affirmative, the cloture motion is rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate?

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** The question recurs on the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to consider H.R. 77.

The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished Vice President has just stated the question. We shall continue with the debate.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT

The **VICE PRESIDENT** laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1516) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in federally owned buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes, which were, on page 2, line 5, strike out "five", and insert "three".

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services, to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in federally owned buildings for periods not to exceed three years, and for other purposes."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may we know what the business before the Senate is?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

Mr. JAVITS. What is the bill about?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall be glad to state the purpose of the bill. Its purpose is to permit the Administrator of the General Services Administration to enter into contracts with private concerns over the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment and equipment systems in Federal buildings, for periods not to exceed 5 years.

The House amended the bill and changed it from 5 to 3 years. I have suggested that the Senate accept the House amendments.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, the amendments of the House are concurred in.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1715. An act to extend the penalty for assault on a police officer in the District of Columbia to assaults on employees of penal and correctional institutions and places of confinement of juveniles of the District of Columbia; and

S. 1719. An act to authorize compensation for overtime work performed by officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, and the White House Police force, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2118) to amend sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. MAILLIARD, and Mr. PELLY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3141) to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9811) to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 11420) to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide certain mailing privileges with respect to members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 11420) to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide certain mailing privileges with respect to members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee appointed by the Committee on the Judiciary to take the testimony on the Morrissey nomination to a Federal judgeship be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a) (3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I am firmly opposed to repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. I take this position as a member of the Senate Labor Subcommittee which conducted hearings on the bill, as a resident of the State of Arizona with an elective responsibility to the people of that State, and as an individual American citizen who is firmly convinced that the vast majority of my fellow citizens object strenuously to being forced to join any kind of an organization in order to secure or retain a job.

We have come down a long and controversial road to the point where we can now conduct what I trust will be a thorough discussion of this issue.

In traveling down that road I have been repeatedly impressed by public reaction—by the hundreds of polls, thousands of newspaper editorials, and by private letters from concerned citizens who urge this body to reject the repeal amendment.

I regret that not all of my colleagues have had an opportunity or the time to read these pleas to the Senate for our help in retaining this fragment of our vanishing individual freedom.

We have a war against poverty—a war on waste—a war on ignorance—and a war on ugliness and pollution. All of us have heard about these widely publicized wars.

What we are discussing here, however, is a war against freedom.

This is a war we should avoid at all costs—a war that is totally uncalled for—a war generated by minority greed and a lust for power over many thousands of our people.

It is a war most Americans do not understand—and will not support if they do.

I propose to begin speaking about it in some detail, but not merely as a perfunctory task to comply with the obligations of my office. My approach is that of a deeply concerned citizen who has gone through previous campaigns in similar wars against freedom of choice in this great land of ours.

At the beginning, I want to give Senators a brief capsule summary of the origin and history of the right-to-work law in my State of Arizona.

It was adopted as an amendment to our State constitution in November 1946, as a result of a citizen initiative campaign to put the question on the ballot. The people approved it by a margin of approximately 62,000 to 49,000.

Again in 1948, after pressure from organized labor, the question was put before the people on a one-man, one-vote basis in a statewide referendum. This time the voters expressed themselves even more emphatically by a margin of nearly 87,000 to 60,000 in favor of voluntary unionism.

Four years later, in 1952, a related initiative measure to prohibit secondary boycotts and regulate picketing was placed on the ballot. This time the electorate was even more decisive. They adopted the measure by a count of 115,000 to 67,000.

This brief period of Arizona's history coincided with the beginning of our State's tremendous postwar expansion.

Yet is is significant to note that despite substantial increases in the numbers of registered voters from 1946 through 1952, the relative strength of compulsory unionism supporters declined in all three elections, while the majority percentage increased each time.

My discussion of this period is based on my own personal experience and observations. These events occurred while I was in private business and active in the Phoenix Chamber of Commerce, where I had the pleasure of serving as chairman of the Industrial Development Committee.

Later on, it was my privilege to serve three terms as Governor of my State, and this permitted me to gain more first-hand knowledge of labor-management relations in Arizona and the progress of our economy.

I am proud of what Arizona has accomplished in those years. With all due respect to other States, the record demonstrates that Arizona's economic growth rate since the end of World War II has been one of the highest in the Nation.

It is difficult to appreciate or understand what has happened in Arizona without some facts and figures to illustrate the development. Let me cite just a few of the outstanding statistics to put the situation in proper perspective for the Senate.

For many years prior to World War II, Arizona was known as the 3-C State—for copper, cotton, and cattle. Tourism gradually developed into a fourth major element in our economy.

Dollar income from manufacturing climbed 178 percent since 1946. Manufacturing forged into first place in 1958 and has been the No. 1 element in our economy in Arizona ever since. Manufacturing employment has increased by 329 percent.

The last 5 years also have witnessed a strong comeback of our mining industry, principally copper, to the point where last year it accounted for more than a half-billion dollars.

Nearly 3,000 more persons are working today in Arizona mining jobs than were employed 10 years ago. This enabled Arizona to maintain its position as the producer of more than half of our domestic copper supply—more than all other States in the United States combined.

The copper figures are important because the mining operations are heavily unionized. The mine, mill, and smelter workers have strong representations, as do the AFL–CIO unions, the independent machinists, and others.

I could go on citing figures until the listener went to sleep and I ran out of breath. They would boil down to the simple fact that in this postwar era Arizona has been among the national leaders in just about every major economic index of growth.

To put it another way—we now have more people working at more jobs producing more goods and earning more income than at any previous time in Arizona's history.

No doubt everyone is familiar with most of the standard arguments in the organized campaign to belittle right-to-work laws. Some are plain distortions of the truth. Others simply have no basis in fact.

I will cite an example.

In a recent radio broadcast, the president of the Communications Workers of America charged that right-to-work laws attracted only "cheap" industries to a State.

I will answer that. So far as Arizona is concerned, I would mention names: RCA, Motorola, General Electric, Reynolds Metals, Sperry Phoenix, Hughes, Goodyear, Aerospace, Unidynamics, Spreckels Sugar, Emerson Electric, Airesearch, and many others.

It is common knowledge that these are among the leading industrial names in the world.

It would require another 10 minutes just to read off the names of new companies that have located in Arizona in the last 5 years, because there are 280 of them.

We know these companies have located in Arizona because of the many advantages our State had to offer. We also know that many of them have long histories of effective partnership with union workers.

In short, the record is quite clear that Arizona's right-to-work law has not hampered the legitimate and useful function of collective bargaining in our State.

The right-to-work law has not acted to unfairly restrict normal growth in union membership in proportion to the gain in population and total work force.

I cite AFL–CIO membership for example.

The Labor Department began keeping figures on AFL–CIO membership in 1958. I have been informed by the Department that AFL–CIO locals in Arizona claimed approximately 40,000 members in 1958.

By 1962—the last year for which the figures are available—the total had increased to about 76,000. I read from an article appearing in the Arizona Republic of June 11, 1965.

UNIONS CLAIM GAIN OF 4,200 IN VALLEY

AFL–CIO unions in the valley now represent about 4,200 more workers than they did 6 months ago at the outset of a drive to "organize the unorganized."

This was announced last night by Robert Hutto, president of the Phoenix-Maricopa County Federation of Labor, during a training conference for union leaders in the laborers union hall.

The campaign, slow in getting off the ground in its initial state, is gaining momentum, Hutto indicated.

Cited as one of the brightest spots of the movement were efforts of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, directed by National Representative Nick Pinto.

Since last November 1, Hutto said, about 220 Phoenix city employees have joined local No. 317 of the federation. Beginning June 1, when an intensive drive to organize city hall employees was started, a daily average of 10 persons joined the union, Hutto reported.

About 66 new members have been signed up among various State agencies. In one case, in which no previous membership existed, a new local charter will be issued, said Hutto, a Democratic member of the Arizona House of Representatives.

The federation drive will climax with a mass meeting of city, county, and State employees at 8 p.m. next Tuesday in the laborers union hall. Speakers will include James McCormack, federation area director, and Daniel V. Flanagan, of San Francisco, AFL–CIO regional director.

Among victories enumerated by Hutto in elections conducted by the National Labor Relations Board was that of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers at the Westinghouse Electric Corp. maintenance and repair plant.

Another gain for the AFL–CIO, Hutto stated, was a unanimous vote for the United Packinghouse Workers at the Phoenix plant of the Lewis Food Co., which he said is noted nationally for its opposition to unions.

The Communications Workers of America, whose present membership in Arizona is dominated by employees of Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Co., is working on a "large target," which Hutto declined to name.

The actual number of workers who have signed union cards since the campaign began, the labor council president concluded, "doesn't tell the whole story." Since last January, he said, unions have made significant inroads which are expected to pay big dividends in the future.

President Johnson promised in his state of the Union message to submit proposed changes in the Taft-Hartley Act, including section 14(b). But the President was very careful to use the word "changes" and not the word "repeal."

Regardless of the semantics, however, organized labor has interpreted this as a promise. They have made repeal of 14(b) their No. 1 objective in this Congress.

Furthermore, they now believe they have enough political muscle to get the job done.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I wish to make my position very clear.

To me, the issue at stake here is a fundamental human right—not just special interest legislation. It involves the right of any individual to join—or not to join—a labor union.

I should emphasize that right-to-work laws in 19 of our States are laws for individual worker freedom. Other States have statutes that would be revoked if section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act is repealed.

They are not laws against unions, no matter how much propaganda is put out to the contrary.

To classify these right-to-work laws as antiunion is a complete misrepresentation of the laws and the facts.

Yet the union leaders have been beating the drums loudly for repeal of 14(b) this year—louder and stronger than ever before.

Notwithstanding this there appears to be a growing opposition throughout the country to these demands of labor leaders.

Many Senators and Representatives already have expressed themselves strongly in favor of retaining section 14(b).

Some spokesmen for organized labor would have the country believe that right-to-work laws are a relatively recent development—just one of the many things they do not like about the Taft-Hartley Act.

What they do not talk about is the fact that voluntary unionism laws—in one form or another—have been around long before the Taft-Hartley Act.

Labor leaders have always referred to the Wagner Act of 1935, for example, as the "magna carta" of organized labor in the United States. They acknowledge it as one of the historic milestones in the progress of unions—and indeed it was.

But I believe the people of this country should be reminded that under the Wagner Act itself the States had the right to adopt laws prohibiting the compulsory union shop.

Furthermore, 11 States adopted such laws before Taft-Hartley was even considered.

Not only that, but the right of the States to adopt such laws under the Wagner Act was upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in the Algoma Plywood case. The late Justice Felix Frankfurter wrote the opinion.

Now, after all these years, we hear complaints about the alleged unfairness of section 14(b).

There is evidence recently of growing citizen opinion against any effort by Congress to further infringe upon the right of States to legislate in this field.

The results of several surveys recently support this and I know others are going to discuss this in depth.

In my judgment, unions have no inherent right to expand by forcing new members to join.

They can and should grow, but only if they can convince, not coerce, the worker that his best interests will be served by joining the union.

This takes performance—not persuasion by the force of an unfair law. Senators know that in their home towns and States an individual businessman or firm cannot be forced to join an organization. It is necessary to convince prospective members that it will be worth their while to join and participate.

The situation is no different with unions. They must earn their way.

To me, this is the fair way, the American way.

Mr. President, the bill should be defeated because it is wrong in principle and cannot be justified by the facts. It would not meet any demonstrated national need; on the contrary, it is the product of a long, expensive propaganda campaign by organized labor officials to gain dictatorial economic and political power through the force of Federal law. Even the proponents of this bill concede it would give virtual monopolistic power to unions. This proposed legislation would, if enacted—

First, compel American working men and women to join unions, or to pay money to unions against their will and beliefs;

Second, compel workers to join even in many instances where a majority involved do not desire "union security" clauses in their contract or in fact do not even desire union representation;

Third, lessen the initiative of union leaders to work for the benefit of employees in all the States;

Fourth, make national policy a principle contrary to that of other leading democratic countries including Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Holland, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and West Germany, in each of which compulsory unionism is prohibited by constitutions, laws, or judicial decisions;

Fifth, provide organized labor with the additional economic and political power to secure its real objective—abolition of the ban on the "closed shop";

Sixth, result in a tremendous increase in strikes, picketing, and violence in the 19 States which now have right-to-work laws;

Seventh, deprive 50 States of their traditional and historic American right to prohibit all forms of compulsory unionism; and

Eighth, adversely affect the interests of small business.

There are many other compelling arguments against the bill. Considered together, they present an overwhelming case for retention of section 14(b) in the National Labor Relations Act.

The fundamental issue posed by the bill is the freedom of an individual to join—or not to join—a labor union. It involves the freedom of association guaranteed in the Bill of Rights. In effect, it translates into the question of whether Congress should compel millions of Americans to pay tribute to a labor organization in order to earn a living for themselves and their families.

This is a basic civil rights question and not merely a matter of labor legislation. Proponents may argue that a union shop contract does not force any individual to actually join the union to retain his job; the requirement is merely that he must pay dues. In practical terms, the distinction is absurd.

A direct illustration of this point is afforded by longstanding and documented practices of the American Federation of Musicians. No member of a local musician's union may exercise his freedom of choice to work with any nonunion musician without forfeiting his own union membership, and in turn, his opportunity of earning a living. Nor may a nonunion musician work with union members merely by tendering dues; he must, in fact, belong to the union before he can work with a union group.

This is true throughout the entertainment industry, irrespective of the usual 30-day decision period granted new employees under union shop contracts in other fields of employment. In virtually every field, many pressures, both direct and subtle, are brought to bear on the new worker in a union shop to join the union regardless of any personal reasons he may have for not wanting to join.

The attention of the Nation has been focused for an extended period on the subject of civil rights—and rightly so. A historic and comprehensive law on this subject was passed last year. Congress has followed that with a law to guarantee the constitutional right of every qualified citizen to register and vote.

Yet the passage of the bill would take away an equally important, if not paramount, right of all Americans. All other individual liberties and civil rights long cherished by the people of this Nation have little value if a person can be forced to pay money to a union to keep a job.

Many times in our history we have sent American people to die in defense of freedom elsewhere in the world. Americans are being killed today in the jungles of Vietnam to defend this principle. What a tragic paradox it would be if Congress were to withdraw individual liberty at home while we are defending it abroad.

The repeal of section 14(b) would further erode the already restricted authority of the citizens of the States to legislate according to their expressed desires in this field. Not only would repeal nullify "right-to-work" laws which are now part of the constitutional or statutory law of 19 States; it would also deprive all of the 50 States of their regulatory power in this vital aspect of labor-management agreements.

The passage of the bill would mean that citizens could not legislate specific guarantees of economic and political freedom in the constitutions or labor codes of their States. This vital area of local and State concern would be preempted by the Federal Government and could be relinquished only by a subsequent act of Congress.

I repeat—it should not be forgotten that voluntary unionism laws preceded the Taft-Hartley Act. Even the Wagner Act, justly regarded as their Magna Carta by organized labor, clearly did not prevent States from adopting right-to-work laws, and, indeed, some of them did. The courts have repeatedly upheld the constitutionality of such laws.

Furthermore, the people of the several States now have the power, as they should have, to modify or repeal any existing State law or constitutional provision at any time. One of the former right-to-work States, Indiana, did just that earlier this year, and the opponents of H.R. 77 have no quarrel with the people of Indiana on that score. We respect their right to make that decision for themselves.

The fact that repeal of right-to-work laws carried in Indiana and five other States over the years and failed in Iowa and Wyoming, for example, reflects honest differences of opinion among the States which should be respected. To repeat: The people of any State with a voluntary unionism law can readily bring about its repeal at any time they may desire. This remedy is always available to the people.

There is much to be said for diversity rather than conformity with respect to State laws on union security agreements. This land remains a collection of striking State and regional distinctions which, far from weakening the Nation, contribute much to its strength and progress.

Repeal of section 14(b) would trample on the remaining sovereignty of the 50 States. It would further accentuate the already alarming trend toward an oligarchy of big business, big labor, and Big Government in which the larger public interest and the interest of the individual worker are subordinate to the special privilege of a minority.

Congress has a solemn obligation to consider the views of the citizens who elect its Members. "Representative government" means what it says, or at least it should. And in the case of this particular bill, there can be no doubt that a substantial majority of the American people oppose it.

Recent national polls by Samuel Lubell, Louis Harris, and Opinion Research Corp.—three of the most reputable organizations in the field—show that upward of two-thirds of the voters oppose compulsory unionism. The Gallup poll of June 15, 1965, supported this conclusion and also disclosed that a majority of the public believes unions already have too much power.

Mr. President, I shall cover what happened in my own State of Arizona. After the right-to-work law had been overwhelmingly passed, the union officials decided that they would seek to do away with the right-to-work law. So they, by a referendum, secured by an appeal to the legislature, had this matter placed on the ballot. They naturally worded it in wording that would be extremely beneficial to the union position.

The people turned this referendum down by an even greater vote than had been obtained when the bill was originally passed, even though that referendum was so worded as to put the right-to-work law in the worst possible perspective.

It had been said, when the right-to-work law was originally passed, that it was passed by means of wording which, it was claimed, portrayed the measure as giving the people a right to work which was different from that which actually existed in the law. Even though that referendum was placed in the perspective most favorable to the union, it was even more overwhelmingly defeated than it had been prior to that time.

Mr. President, from my own experience I feel it is quite evident that section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law is not antilabor or antiunion. It affords a great protection to American workingmen.

In my experience as a State official, I had the privilege of working with both union and management officials. There was a statewide strike in the State of Arizona in 1959. It was my privilege to consult union and management officials to determine whether I could bring them together after the strike had continued for an undue length of time.

I brought the union and management officials to my offices at 7:30 one morning and asked them if they would start negotiating. At that particular time, they had not met for 11 days. I did not find it disadvantageous because of the right-to-work law to get them together to start negotiations. In fact, I felt that they were ready and willing to negotiate and needed only encouragement.

I emphasize this because I believe that it illustrates that we can negotiate, we can have adverse opinions, and we can still get together, in a right-to-work State as well as in a non-right-to-work State.

I do not believe that the statement that the existence of this section hinders labor negotiations has any significance.

It is significant to note that 42 percent of union members themselves agreed that section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, providing for the establishment of right-to-work laws, should be retained. This fact was very much in evidence in my State from the experience I had as Governor.

Augmenting these widely known national polls are many selective State polls which reflect similar public sentiment. Editorial opinion in the Nation's press also is heavily arrayed against repeal of 14(b). Even such usually divergent publications as the New York Times and the Chicago Tribune agree that 14(b) should remain the law of the land.

By all accepted techniques of measuring public opinion, including a heavy volume of constituent correspondence, there is a distinct national consensus against repeal of this provision of law. At no point in the hearings before the subcommittee was any evidence put forth to justify overriding the clearly expressed will of a majority of Americans on the issue. Repeal of 14(b) would be an obvious and flagrant disregard of the will of the people.

Congress, by law, and the courts, by upholding many questionable decisions of the National Labor Relations Board, have already granted many special privileges to organized labor during the last three decades. Many of these advantages conferred upon trade unionism by law are not enjoyed by any other private institutions or economic interests in our society. For example:

Unions are largely exempt from application of the antitrust laws.

They are immune, in many instances, from the issuance of Federal court injunctions.

They can compel employees in 31 States to pay dues to the union in order to hold their jobs.

They can—and certainly do—use funds which their members have been compelled to contribute as a condition of employment, to finance political campaigns opposed by some of their membership.

Some unions for many years have practiced racial discrimination in determining who shall be allowed to join.

They have the exclusive right to act as collective bargaining agents even for those employees who do not want to be represented by the union.

Added to this list are a growing number of NLRB decisions which have vastly increased the scope and power of union authority. For example:

In the Wisconsin Motors case—145 NLRB No. 109, 55 LRRM 1085—the Board specifically upheld the right of a union to fine members for exceeding union-imposed production quotas.

In the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. case recently—149 NLRB No. 10, 57 LRRM 1242 affirmed by the court of appeals—the Board held that a union member could be fined and threatened with legal action to collect the fine if he exercised his right not to respect a picket line.

Earlier this year, the Board held that an employer who moved his apparel manufacturing company from New York to Florida must bargain with the union in Florida, even though the union cannot prove it represents a majority of the workers in the new location.

Aside from this tendency of the NLRB to regard itself as an advocate of the unions instead of as an impartial administrator of the law, many large unions over the years have not demonstrated the responsibility that should accompany the extraordinary privilege they have.

Consider the staggering loss to the economy from industrywide strikes in which the public interest was not represented at the bargaining table. Consider the unreasoning opposition of many union officials to the technological change which is necessary for survival in a competitive market. And finally, consider the violence and corruption disclosed by work of the Senate Committee on Government Operations in recent years.

Given this record, it is difficult to understand how the granting of additional coercive power would result in more responsible statesmanship by unions.

Unions represent only about 17 million workers in the United States. By contrast, more than 53 million workers do not belong to any union.

Many of these nonunion workers are employed by the millions of small business enterprises which are such an integral part of the Nation's economic and commercial structure. They are the ones who would be hit hardest by repeal of 14(b).

Giant corporations in basic industries can meet monopolistic union power at the bargaining table with at least some degree of equality. This is not true for the independent small employer, who may be starting a new enterprise or struggling to survive on a thin profit margin in a fiercely competitive field.

It is this small employer—and there are approximately 4 million of them—who can be put out of business or ruined financially by powerful union officials. There are many small contractors in the right-to-work States, for example, who operate an open shop and thus afford an opportunity both for apprentices to learn a trade and for skilled workmen to work. They would soon be eliminated if 14(b) is repealed.

Adoption of H.R. 77 would directly contradict long-established Federal policy to encourage and support small business in this country.

The Secretary of Labor has based his arguments for repeal of 14(b) on philosophical rather than economic grounds. This is understandable in view of the fact that proponents of repeal have no solid economic ground to stand on. The same statistics used for years by union spokesmen in their campaign to discredit right-to-work laws can be turned around and exploited with even more weight to support retention of such laws.

For example, it is true that some Southern States, only recently embarked upon industrialization programs, have wage scales ranging below the national average because of the relatively large proportion of rural and farm labor in their population. But it is also true that in the seven right-to-work States outside of the South earnings of production and manufacturing workers surpass the national average.

Furthermore, there is hardly any accepted index of economic growth in which the rate of gain in the 19 right-to-work States does not exceed that of the remaining States. The union contention that voluntary unionism laws tend to depress wages simply ignores the facts.

Take the State of Arizona, which has a right-to-work law, and compare it with our neighbor New Mexico, which permits compulsory unionism. They are neighbors of approximately equal size and similar in resources. They are approximately the same age, having been admitted to the Union in the same year. Both have approximately the same support so far as Federal programs are concerned. The State of Arizona, with a great mining industry, produces, as I have stated, more copper than all the other States in the United States. But New Mexico has even a greater dollar-volume industry, the oil and gas industry. So we have two States that economically and in many other respects are very similar.

Ten years ago, the average wage rate of a production worker in New Mexico was $85, and in Arizona it was only $82. Now, in 1965, 10 years later, the average production worker in New Mexico receives an average weekly earning of $90, but in Arizona the figure is up to $111. As I stated, New Mexico has compulsory unionism, Arizona has voluntary unionism.

The economic progress, or lack of it, of any State or region is compounded of many complex factors. It is quite clear that State laws relating to union security agreements are at best only a minor one of these factors.

I am not stating that progress in Arizona has been so much more rapid than in New Mexico because we have voluntary unionism, but I am saying that the attitude of the people, as indicated by their desire to have voluntary unionism, has contributed in that regard In other words, there has been greater encouragement for industry in Arizona than there has been in the wonderful State of New Mexico.

I could illustrate what has happened in many of the other States. Senators have heard remarks to the effect that our right-to-work States pay starvation wages. I have stated the average weekly earnings of production workers in Arizona—$111. In some of the non-right-to-work law States, the wages are far below $111. Let us pick out some of the New England States. We have Connecticut, $109. We have Maine, $83—I am cutting off the fractions; it is $83.84, but if I said $84, the difference would still be manifest. Rhode Island, $85, or almost $86. Vermont, practically $90. Massachusetts, $96. Compare this to $111 in Arizona.

So, Mr. President, it is not factual when people say that in the right-to-work-law States starvation wages are paid.

In the highest three States in the Nation, so far as the wages of production workers are concerned, we find the right to work in our State to be in second place with a wage rate of which we are very proud; namely, $121.52 a week.

Returning to the Southern States, we are proud of what has been happening there. We know that over the years they have not been industrialized, that they have been agricultural States in most instances; but since they have begun industrializing, they have made more rapid progress than other States of the Union. I am pleased that that has come about, because it is extremely important to realize that the Southern States are making progress and that most of them have right-to-work laws.

Union leaders and the labor press generally have characterized section 14(b) as a major obstacle to their continued progress. Yet, there are no facts anywhere in the record to support this contention.

The combined population of all 19 right-to-work States represents only a small portion of the total population of the country. An even larger proportion of the Nation's industrial plant is located in the 31 States which now permit union-shop agreements. It can even be demonstrated in some right-to-work States—Arizona, for example—that unions have gained members in recent years. I quoted those figures a short time ago.

The available studies and information on union membership present an understandably mixed growth pattern. Rapid technological change typified by automation, new patterns within old industries and competitive market conditions are by common agreement the major impediments to continued union-membership growth in most fields.

Some unions have maintained or improved their relative position since 14(b) was enacted, while others have not. It would appear that the absence or presence of right-to-work laws in the States has been of little consequence.

The truth is that neither unions nor companies they bargain with have any inherent right to grow or any guarantee of success in our economic system. Both must earn their way.

This Nation was founded by men and women who wanted to escape compulsion and seek opportunity. The maximum amount of individual liberty consistent with the public interest is guaranteed in our Constitution and exemplified in the diversity of American life and the multitude of voluntary associations in our society. Repeal of 14(b) would arbitrarily restrict individual freedom in the most basic way; namely, by prescribing conditions of employment for millions of Americans.

Compulsion in the trade union movement has been opposed on principle by some of the greatest leaders of organized labor, such as Samuel Gompers, as well as by the foremost jurists of this century. One of the most ardent supporters of trade unionism, the late Mr. Justice Brandeis, argued forcefully against compulsion. Summing up his views on the subject, he once wrote:

> It is not true that the success of a labor union necessarily means a perfect monopoly. The union, in order to attain or preserve for its members industrial liberty, must be strong and stable. It need not include every member of the trade. Indeed, it is desirable for both the employer and the union that it should not. Absolute power leads to excesses and to weakness: neither our character nor our intelligence can long bear the strain of unrestricted power. The union attains success when it reaches the ideal condition, and the ideal condition for a union is to be strong and stable, and yet to have in the trade outside its own ranks an appreciable number of men who are nonunionists.[1] Such a nucleus of unorganized labor will check oppression by the union as the union checks oppression by the employer.

The case against compulsion also was put persuasively in recent times by another Supreme Court Justice, Arthur Goldberg, who spoke from a background of experience as union attorney and also as Secretary of Labor. He was quoted at a 1962 meeting of the American Federation of Government Employees by the Washington Daily News as follows:

> In your own organization you have to win acceptance not by an automatic device which brings a new employee into your organization, but by your own conduct, your own action, your own wisdom, your own responsibility, and your own achievements.

Mr. President, that is the way most organizations function. Civic organizations earn the right to expect members to join, pay dues, and participate in the activities of such organizations, by rendering a service. I feel that unions should earn that same right. They should render a service to their members, to justify their becoming dues-paying members of the organization.

There is another aspect of compulsory unionism which deserves mention. In 1950, the CIO expelled several unions because they were either led or controlled by Communists.

Some of these unions survive today with hundreds of thousands of members for whom they are the legal bargaining agents. They have not been readmitted to the AFL–CIO. The result is that thousands of loyal Americans are being compelled to contribute their dues money toward the support and propagation of causes they detest.

It is extraordinary that exponents of what is today called the liberal philosophy should wish to diminish individual freedom of association by Federal statute instead of to preserve it.

In this connection, the following article was published on August 11, 1965, in the Valley Monitor newspaper in McAllen, Tex. I will read it in its entirety:

> A month or so ago, before the House passed a bill to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law, a special subcommittee on labor held hearings on the proposal. Among those who appeared to speak out against repeal was LaRue Berfield, a man who had been fired from his job for refusing to join an organization the Attorney General had charged was subversive. Here's what he had to say:
>
> "My name is LaRue Berfield of Driftwood, Pa. I faced the hard choice of joining a union I believed to be Communist-dominated, or being fired from my job at a plant where I had worked for 19 years, with time out for combat duty in the Air Force in World War II.
>
> "The choice was forced upon me when the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, known as the U.E., entered into a so-called union shop contract with my employer, the Sylvania Electric Co. plant at Emporium, Pa., in 1958.
>
> "I had been a member of the U.E. when it was expelled by the CIO on grounds that it was Communist dominated. The U.E. had been classified as subversive by the U.S. Attorney General.
>
> "I took an active part in an unsuccessful fight to have the U.E. replaced by the newly chartered International Electrical Workers (I.U.E.) in a national labor board election. As a result of this, I wound up being expelled from the union, but still was able to hold my job because there was no union shop agreement at the plant at that time.
>
> "Eight years later, the U.E. and Sylvania signed an agreement with a compulsory union membership clause and I was subsequently notified by the company that I must join the U.E. or at least pay dues. I refused to do either and was fired from the job I had held so long.
>
> "I did not pay dues to this union because I felt that in so doing I would be supporting a Communist-dominated organization under the guise of a labor union.
>
> "I am sure that any American citizen would agree that it is wrong to force any citizen of our Nation to, in any way, pay tribute to the Communist conspiracy that exists in our Nation, no matter under what guise it may lift its ugly head.
>
> "I was a member of my local school board and the civil defense organization. I would have had to resign from these positions because I took loyalty oaths in both cases, swearing that I have never been and would not be a member of an organization advocating the overthrow of the Government. It was a choice between keeping a job and betraying those oaths. I chose not to violate these oaths, even though it cost me my job.
>
> "I can't understand why our laws do not protect an American citizen from being forced, at the expense of his job, to join and support an organization dedicated to the destruction of our American Government.
>
> "Unable to obtain redress under Federal labor laws, I took my case before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, whose members expressed sympathy and promised to do what they could by way of seeking remedial legislation. Press reports quoted members of the committee saying I was a martyr of a legal system which protects those who associate with Communists, but not those who oppose such association.
>
> "I have no desire to be classified as a martyr. I only want my constitutional rights as an American citizen to be protected, but more importantly, I want to preserve those rights for my children.
>
> "Things were not easy in that period after I lost my job and 19 years of seniority with one company. Today, my wife and I own and operate a service station and grocery store in the small town of Driftwood, Pa. We put up with a lot of hard work and long hours, but we are getting along all right now.
>
> "I submit to you that if the State of Pennsylvania had a right-to-work law that I would not have had to suffer this injustice. I feel that the repeal of section 14(b) of Taft-Hartley Act would be a grave blow to my hopes for the protection of my constitutional rights and those of my children."

When this company did not have a union shop, this gentleman had the privilege of working there without paying tribute to any organization. This is true of any of the right-to-work States. If section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law is repealed, this freedom will be taken away from them.

---

[1] Quoted by the late Mr. Justice Frankfurter in his concurring opinion in American Sash & Door Co., 335 U.S. 538–559, which upheld the constitutionality of Arizona's right-to-work law.

The people of the States which have right-to-work laws in some respects are in the same position as the people in States which do not have right-to-work laws so far as section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law is concerned. If it is repealed, they will be precluded from taking any direct action in regard to labor legislation.

Regardless of the activities of union organizations, or business organizations, many people take it for granted that all unions are good unions. This is a false premise, as I have illustrated, because a Communist-dominated union cannot be considered a good union. Not every business organization can be assumed to be a good organization, either. We have laws and rules and regulations concerning their operations, and the States have the privilege of passing additional legislation regarding business operations. The people should retain that same privilege so far as unions are concerned.

As it now stands, an individual can go to his legislator in my State—he may go to his Senator or his House Member—and give his views as to actions of a union, or of a business organization, and his voice will be heard. If he had a just cause—if necessary, he could have others join him—the people could have an initiative that would provide for the changes that would be necessary to give protection to the residents and workers in that State.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FANNIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. As I recall, his good State, the State of Arizona, has a constitutional provision including the right-to-work principle. Is that correct?

Mr. FANNIN. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. As I recall, it was perhaps the second State to adopt such a constitutional provision.

Mr. FANNIN. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. The State which I happen to represent in part having been the only State to precede it in that course.

Mr. FANNIN. That is my understanding.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that citizens in the Senator's State who wanted to repeal the constitutional provision have on one or more occasions requested that the question be submitted to the people, and upon the submission, the people, after reexamination, could have changed their verdict if they cared to do so?

Mr. FANNIN. The Senator from Florida is correct. It has been before the people three different times. The second time it was before the people it was initiated or referred to the people as a result of the union officials deciding that they wanted to repeal that law. It was overwhelmingly approved again, by an even greater vote than at its initial passage.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. If that is true, those who feel that they are aggrieved by the right-to-work law and its presence in their constitution or, for that matter, in their statutes, will have ample opportunity to have their grievance heard and to have a resubmission, with the election of their legislatures, if it is a statute matter, and by a referendum back to the people in the event it is a constitutional matter; and they have not hesitated to do that on three occasions in the fine State which the Senator represents.

Mr. FANNIN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have one more question to ask. As his State of Arizona has grown so rapidly and improved, and increased in stature and national importance, has the Senator felt that in the wages paid to workers, in relation to population, and in every other way, any handicap was visited upon his State by the existence of the right-to-work provision in the constitution of the State?

Mr. FANNIN. I am pleased that the distinguished Senator from Florida asked me that question because it gives me the opportunity to say that in the first 6 months of this year the AFL–CIO has been boasting about having a greater increase in union membership in Arizona, percentagewise, than any other State in the Union.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I am not surprised. That indicates, does it not, that union members of good standing, loyal to their organizations, have not felt any unwillingness to come into his good State, but to the contrary have gone there in large numbers, have joined unions, and are prospering at the present time under the right-to-work provision in his State constitution?

Mr. FANNIN. The Senator is correct. I would add to the words of the distinguished Senator from Florida that the unions have performed a service for the members and earned the loyalty of those members, instead of being compelled to do so.

I feel that we shall have far better unions so long as the unions must perform a service to justify a member joining. If there is compulsion, members will not have interest, will not care, and though they will be good members, they will not get the service which they deserve.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for that comment.

Is it not true that the officers of unions know that in order to enlarge their membership, they have to show service, they have to show fine values rendered to their membership, and they are put on notice to do that?

Mr. FANNIN. The Senator is correct.

I would say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that with regard to unions, they have been performing in many instances better than others. Many have good management, and those which do not have good management improve. Right-to-work laws have not been a deterrent; they have been of assistance to the working people of our State.

I feel confident that our growth has been greater because of the right-to-work law, because of the attitude of the people. It has not been that firms did not go there because we had a right-to-work law. They went there because, as I explained, the right-to-work law indicates the political attitude and the business attitude of the people of that State.

Rather than twist it around, as many have done, the right-to-work laws bring industries into the State. They bring industry to the State because of good management, good political atmosphere, and good business atmosphere.

Mr. HOLLAND. And the good wages paid.

Mr. FANNIN. And the good wages paid.

I would say to the Senator from Florida that his State is one of the best examples. They have some of the finest industry in this Nation because they have not catered to low-wage industry.

There are electronic industries, industries that do research and development, and some of our finest services such as technical development, and aerospace development. Because of the attitude of the public, and because they have had good laws, and business concerns that are practical, additional concerns have been brought to the State.

I commend the Senator for that service which has been rendered.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator for these gracious remarks.

I cannot help but say, before I take my seat, that I think the great progress and the great and permanent prosperity which have been accomplished in his State with the right-to-work provision in its constitution, and also in the State of Florida, with a similar provision in our constitution, clearly disprove the contention of those who say that right-to-work provisions are found hand in hand with poor wages and slack industry, and with little appeal to either businesses or people to come in and settle there. I believe that fact is about as clearly disproved by the record in his own fine State and in the State of Florida.

Unless I incorrectly remember the census data of the past few years, Arizona and the State which I represent, in part, have, first one and then the other, been No. 1 in the States of the Nation in gain of population and other means that have to do with their prosperity and their attractiveness to good people.

While I am sure he would not give full credit for that to the right-to-work provision in his constitution—just as I would not in Florida—I wish to say that not only has it not been a handicap, but I believe it has been an added industrial attraction. I believe the fine records made by these two States clearly show that in the right-to-work provision there is a fine value in any good State interested in progress, and development, and freedom of its citizens.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. FANNIN. I thank the Senator for the information.

I wish to answer the question which the Senator posed in regard to the fine economic position of his State with some figures as to what is happening in Florida. I would like to boast about it especially, for although we are not neighboring States, we are in a similar situation and our climates are similar. We like to boast that our climate is like that of the State of Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I will never yield the floor while the Senator is talking in such kindly fashion about my State. Proceed at will and at great length.

Mr. FANNIN. The following information discloses what happened in the State of Florida:

From 1953 to 1963 nonagricultural employees increased 69.5 percent. What does that mean? In non-right-to-work States it increased 9 percent. In new manufacturing jobs it increased 78.2 percent. In non-right-to-work States there was a minus 7.6 percent. In production workers there was a 51-percent increase in Florida and a minus 14 percent in non-right-to-work States. People have sought to have industry come into a State which pays good wages and has good working conditions. There was an increase of 86.4 percent against 27.2 percent in non-right-to-work States. Per capita personal income increased more than the national average: 35.7 percent to 35.4 percent. Personal income is more than double what it is in non-right-to-work States—136.7 percent against 60.2 percent.

Hourly earnings by manufacturing workers increased 57.3 percent, against 41.5 percent in non-right-to-work States. Value added by manufacturing increased 202.7 percent, as against 41.5 percent in non-right-to-work States. That is the highest in the Nation.

Population increased 105.9 percent. That is another illustration of the point brought out by the distinguished Senator from Florida. We are proud that our State is going along with his State. That was against 26.2 percent in non-right-to-work States. Bank deposits, of course, are very important to all of us. That was 137.3 percent, more than double the 63.5 percent in non-right-to-work States.

Motor vehicle registrations, which indicate the prosperity of the people, were 109.8 percent, as against 44.3 percent.

All the way through the list I could continue to illustrate what is happening. I know that the Senator is proud of what has taken place. The attitude of the people has been expressed by a willingness to have the right-to-work law to protect the people and to give them the privilege of making decisions one way or the other. They can do away with the right-to-work law or take care of it under present conditions. If section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act is repealed they will not have that privilege.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for putting those facts in the RECORD relative to my own State. Similar facts could be placed in the RECORD with reference to the State of Arizona.

I wish to add one additional fact which I think illustrates the great growth that my State has had.

I had the honor of being inaugurated as Governor in 1941. The census of 1940 showed a little less than 2 million people in the State of Florida.

That population has been trebled since that time, and the annual estimate as of July 1, 1965, is 5,805,000. Florida has risen from 27th State among the States in population at that time to 9th State now.

Again, I hurry to say that the right-to-work provision is not the sole reason for this growth, but it has helped to create the fine atmosphere and environment under which great growth and prosperity have been possible, just as the same values have been created in Arizona by the same right-to-work principle.

I thank the Senator from Arizona for yielding.

Mr. FANNIN. I thank the Senator from Florida. I commend him for assisting in bringing forth the benefits that have accrued to his State by the attitude of the people. This is expressed in their retention of the right-to-work law.

With respect to the contention that workers are unable to obtain redress under right-to-work laws, what has happened to the gentleman whom I mentioned, who has carried the fight through, is indicative of what has occurred in many other cases throughout the Nation. When people make the argument that right-to-work laws do not give protection to workers, we should refer them to what happened in this individual's case. It is significant.

Mr. President, several nationwide polls have shown that between 65 and 70 percent of the people favor retention of the right-to-work clause, but Washington observers predict its passage. If the provision is stricken from the lawbooks, Congress will be responding to pressure from President Johnson who promised big labor it would be repealed in return for support of his candidacy for the Presidency. Repeal will not reflect the will of the majority.

The only reason stated by the President in his message of May 17 recomending repeal of 14(b) was that repeal would eliminate conflicts between varying State laws. This feeble argument has no merit. No evidence was put forth to suggest that any such alleged conflicts have in any way damaged the public welfare. Moreover, the same argument could be used with better logic to demand a Federal right-to-work law banning compulsory unionism in all 50 States.

It is illuminating to recall what the President was quoted by the Dallas Morning News as saying in a Senate campaign speech on August 10, 1948:

> I have never sought, nor do I seek now, the support of any labor bosses dictating to freemen anywhere.

So although we have heard much about what was said by Governor Connally, of Texas, in support of the right-to-work law in his State, and about his appeal to Members of Congress to support the retention of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, we also have a statement by one of Governor Connally's close associates, our President, in this regard.

Yet in their public statements many union officials have repeatedly declared they believe the administration is obligated to support repeal of 14(b) in return for the material contributions made by organized labor in the 1964 election campaigns. They are entitled to this opinion, but the administration obviously is under no such real obligation, since the President's popular and electoral vote majority was among the largest in our national history.

The President is elected to serve as the Chief Executive for all Americans. Neither he nor the Secretary of Labor should be under any obligation to serve as a pleader for special interests. Neither should organized labor expect further privileged status under law.

Mr. President, none of the various arguments advanced for compulsory unionism bear up under analysis. Secretary of Labor Wirtz, for example, has contended that right-to-work law unfairly restricts freedom of contract between employers and unions. This overlooks the fact that Federal laws already have severely restricted employers' freedom of contract in dealing with unions. "Yellow dog" and "sweetheart" contracts have long been prohibited. No employer may bargain for wages or working conditions below minimums established by Federal law. And there are substantial restrictions on employer freedom in communicating management's views to employees during representation or bargaining procedures.

The freedom-of-contract argument and its companion majority rule contention both ignore the fact that minorities in our system of government have rights which cannot be bargained away by majorities. Moreover, the record discloses many instances where unions have acquired exclusive bargaining status without any election whatsoever. Nor for that matter is the question of a union shop demand always put to the union membership for a vote.

As for the oft-repeated "free rider" argument by organized labor officials, it should be remembered that labor actively sought the privilege of exclusive bargaining agent for all employees of a unit, union member and nonmember alike. Labor willingly assumed the responsibility for representing nonmembers.

The fallacy of the free rider argument was well stated by Donald Richberg in his book "Labor Union Monopoly." Mr. Richberg wrote:

> The unions took away by law the right and freedom of individual employees to contract for themselves, and now the unions demand that nonmembers be compelled to pay for having their freedom of contract taken away and exercised against their will. The nonmember is not a free rider; he is a captive passenger.

It has also been suggested that repeal of section 14(b) would contribute to increased stability and peace in labor-management relations. That kind of peace and stability can be found in a prison.

The truth is that the repeal of section 14(b) would inevitably lead to heightened tensions and conflict throughout the land as individual employers and employees struggled to resist coercion by powerful unions. Repealing a law strongly supported by a clear majority of the American people would create discord, not stability.

Organized labor, representing approximately one-fifth of our work force, has expended millions of dollars in a propaganda campaign to create a simulated demand for repeal of section 14(b). Yet the evidence unquestionably shows a strong majority of the American people want section 14(b) retained.

Mr. President, amid all the arguments involved in the pending issue, the one which assumes prime importance is individual freedom. Section 14(b) makes it possible for the people of the States to act to preserve the vital ingredient of personal liberty in labor-management relations, repeal would destroy this freedom of choice.

A national policy of compulsory unionism would place the United States in a position contrary to that of virtually all Western European democratic nations. Compulsory unionism is prohibited either by constitutions, laws, or judicial decisions in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and West Germany. By adopting this bill the United States would aline itself with the Soviet Union and other totalitarian regimes where labor freedom does not exist.

Finally, a word about organized labor's real objective, the closed shop. This form of union security, made illegal by section 8(a)(3) of the Taft-Hartley Act, requires a prospective employee to be a member of the union before he may be hired. When this arrangement is accompanied by the "closed union" (a union which does not admit new members) the power of the unions becomes overwhelming.

Mr. Biemiller, testifying for the AFL–CIO said:

> A closed shop—and an open union—is from our point of view a more desirable situation. The union shop permitted by the Taft-Hartley Act is not ideal from our standpoint, but rather, as was well understood, at the time, is itself a compromise.

That is in the record.

However, the legitimizing of union hiring halls, preferential union hiring and practices followed in the building trades, printing trades, shipping and the entertainment industries amount to a "closed shop."

The union campaign for repeal of section 14(b) started with the passage of Taft-Hartley, grew upon failure to repeal this law in 1949, and blossomed to full fruit after the last national elections when union leaders claimed that they then controlled a sufficient number of Members of Congress in both Houses to obtain repeal. If successful in the Senate as they were in the House it is predicted that the campaign for the "closed shop" will immediately commence.

Compulsion is alien to our heritage and does violence to one of the American citizen's most basic and cherished human rights. Congress cannot preserve freedom by extending it to a few while denying it to many. This is the reason why the Senate should reject H.R. 77.

For the convenience of the Senators and to assist them in understanding the issues involved I will list some of the arguments for repeal advanced by the administration and spokesmen for organized labor. Following this listing there is presented a refutation of each argument. References are to the record of hearings on this legislation before the Senate Subcommittee on Labor.

First. All other provisions of the National Labor Relations Act apply uniformly in the States and that accordingly a uniform national policy should be adopted in the area of union security.

Second. The "free rider" argument.

Third. Section 14(b) prevents freedom of contract as between employers and unions.

Fourth. Union security provisions make a very real contribution to industrial peace and union responsibility.

Fifth. The Railway Labor Act permits union security agreements.

Sixth. During the period between 1947 and 1951 when secret ballot elections were a condition precedent to a union shop agreement workers demonstrated that they were overwhelmingly in favor of the union shop.

Seventh. Repeal of section 14(b) would reduce existing conflicts between various State laws.

Eighth. Section 14(b) is in conflict with the principle of majority rule.

Ninth. Section 14(b) has hindered union organizations, resulted in substandard wages and working conditions, and caused migration of industry.

(1) ALL OTHER PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LABOR LAW APPLY UNIFORMLY IN THE STATES AND, ACCORDINGLY, A UNIFORM POLICY SHOULD BE ADOPTED IN THE AREA OF "UNION SECURITY"

Even assuming, for purposes of debate, that there is virtue in uniformity, this argument does not stand up under investigation. The Supreme Court has held that State boards may enjoin "quickie" or intermittent strikes, can regulate the conduct of strikers on picket lines, and that State courts may entertain suits for breach of collective agreements (336 U.S. 245; 346 U.S. 485; 368 U.S. 502).

Section 14(c) of the present law permits the States to assume jurisdiction over labor disputes even in industries affecting commerce if the board has relinquished jurisdiction.

Section 18 of the Fair Labor Standards Act allows the States to impose higher wages or shorter workweeks than are prescribed by that act.

Section 603(a) of the Landrum-Griffin Act preserves State laws regulating the actions of union officials and the remedies available thereunder to individual members.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 gives wide latitude to the States to legislate in the area of racial or religious discrimination in the field of employment.

In the National Labor Relations Act, "union security" is not applied alike to all employees. A special rule applicable only to the construction industry is written into section 8(f) of the act. The act similarly abandons uniformity in section 8(e) which writes in special rules regarding "hot cargo" arguments applicable to both the construction and garment industries. Since the garment industry centers largely in New York it follows that here is an exception which is principally applicable in just one State.

Workmen's compensation and unemployment compensation benefits vary from State to State. The States also have varied laws about injunctions in labor disputes, about payment of wages, about employment of minors and females, and many other matters that affect the employer-employee relationship.

The Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act recognizes authority of the State when it provides in section 16(a) that States shall not be prevented from obtaining information regarding a plan in addition to that required by the Federal act.

Without further examination of the exceptions to uniform national policy, we go to the heart of the matter and say we believe that the States still have some rights. If there is to be legislation limiting or guaranteeing freedom of association, let it be by State action as the Founding Fathers intended. As the Founding Fathers drafted it, the Constitution guaranteed to the States and to the people the unused reservoirs of power and authority. As a nation we suffer from too much centralism already. Let us keep a little power in the States, and thus give a small nod of respect to the Constitution as written and intended.

We have examined in vain the record of testimony before the subcommittee to find any citation of problems created by the lack of uniformity on "union security." There are none. Proponents of repeal of 14(b) rest on the mere statement that there is someting good about uniformity.

(2) THE "FREE RIDER" ARGUMENT

Almost every proponent witness appearing before the subcommittee stressed the argument that every employee's wages and working conditions are fixed by union contract and that, therefore, as a beneficiary of this contract, he should contribute his share of the cost of union representation.

The argument ignores the fact that employees in a competing nonunion plant are frequently better paid. It assumes that the wages and fringe benefits of the worker in the union plant would be less if it were not for union negotiations. Obviously, this applies only to the less skilled, less dexterous, or less diligent members of any working force, for an employer could afford to pay more to the more competent workers, were it not for the union goal of uniformity in job rates. Moreover, almost all union contracts have seniority provisions which require the newly hired to be laid off first and the older to be rehired first. Young workers or new workers in industries where there are frequent layoffs simply do not benefit by union representation.

Consider also the fact that many nonunion employees have serious doubts whether excessive union demands are in their ultimate best interests, particularly when they are involved in costly long strikes over issues where they do not stand to gain. For example, where the issues—union shop, checkoff, maintenance of membership, and so forth—result in a strike, the employees have much to lose and little to gain. Employees may choose not to join for many reasons apart from the dues requirement. To list a few: Confidence in the leadership of management, objections to the union leadership; or objections to the union policies.

In fact, 39 million of 56 million workers in nonagricultural establishments have not joined unions, and this has not been due to a lack of opportunity to do so.

The American Farm Bureau Federation in its testimony on this legislation asks some very pertinent questions:

First. Does the member benefit when the union supports political causes he abhors?

Second. Does the member benefit when the union helps elect political candidates to whom he is opposed?

Third. Does the member benefit if the union prices him out of a job?

Fourth. Does the member benefit if the union destroys his employer?

Fifth. Does the member benefit if the union falls into the hands of criminal elements, racketeers, or subversive elements?

Sixth. Who is to decide whether or not the individual benefits—the union or the individual? The McClellan committee hearings document these reasons for concern.

The free-rider argument is basically unsound because throughout America many voluntary organizations carry on meritorious work which benefits many persons who contribute neither financial or other support. Fraternal organization, churches, civic and political organizations are examples. Any organization so lacking in the confidence of its members that it can exist only through the protective cloak of compulsion rests on such insecure foundations that it needs a reappraisal by its membership.

Proponents of the bill also use a secondary argument, that the law requires a union to represent all employees in a bargaining unit—members or not. This is hypocritical. Unions have steadfastly insisted that the union be the exclusive bargaining agent for all employees. They have resisted all suggestions that the law of exclusive representation be modified.

If a union serves the persons in the bargaining unit it represents wisely and unselfishly, it will have no difficulty in maintaining a strong and nearly universal membership.

(3) SECTION 14(b) PREVENTS FREEDOM OF CONTRACT AS BETWEEN EMPLOYERS AND UNIONS

This argument could be dismissed with the simple observation that we are concerned here with the protection of the rights of employees. They and they alone are affected by union shop agreements. Freedom of contract between employers and unions has no relevance here.

However, it is interesting to look at the record to see what freedom of contract has meant in non-right-to-work States.

The testimony of small retailers establishes that the word "freely" is a grim joke. There is bargaining on wages, working conditions, and fringe benefits. There is no bargaining on the union shop. The employer is reduced to the position of saying yes or no. If he says no and sticks to it, he must expect a strike or picketing. A retailer is vulnerable to strikes and picketing. When his store is shut down or his customers do not cross a picket line, he loses customers which he may never regain. Thus, he is easily forced to agree to compulsory membership and the dues checkoff.

Too often employers quickly agree to compulsory membership contracts in exchange for a better break on wage and fringe benefits. Thus the employees lose.

Consider this testimony of a small businessman:

> The bargaining which Mr. Meany and Mr. Wirtz refer to just does not exist at the small business level. Experience has shown that a union demand for a compulsory membership contract is invariably accompanied with threats of the most drastic economic reprisals upon the employer if he does not accede to the demand. This bargaining, which Mr. Meany and Mr. Wirtz refer to, is comparable to a situation where a highwayman puts a pistol at your head and says I want to bargain with you for the contents of your wallet. The small businessman yields on the union shop just about as willingly as the highwayman's victim gives up his money.

The American Farm Bureau Federation testified during the hearings that:

> It is bad enough in principle to force a person to join a good union. But what shall we say to a law which forces a worker to belong to some of the racket-ridden unions investigated by the McClellan committee? Yet, monstrous though it may be, this could be required everywhere if section 14(b) should be repealed.

The printing industry went on record as follows:

> Very few small companies can afford an extended strike on a union shop issue, as the bulk of orders which come to a printing plant—legal briefs, periodicals, timetables, have a deadline. A suspension of operations means that these customers will go to a nonunion plant, and possibly will never return. But if these employers yield to the union shop demands, it means that every one of their workers forced into membership will also be trapped by the union rules on jurisdiction and other practices which drive up costs and prices in this highly competitive industry.

The Associated General Contractors made this observation:

> The act allows construction contractors and the construction unions to make prehire agreements; that is, before there are any employees on the job. The prehire agreements can, of course, contain union shop provisions, unless banned by the States. Construction workers coming on the project will be required to join the union at the end of 7 days. This means it is a "closed shop" in our industry which is also known for its closed unions.

The manufacturers made this point:

> The major impact of this legislation would fall on medium and small sized companies which could not possibly withstand the assault of such organized power in a demand for a union shop and compulsory membership. Thus you come to the "agreement" between a union and an employer entered into under the coercion of a potentially ruinous strike and without regard to the ultimate desires or wishes of the employees who will be compelled to sign up or look elsewhere for a job.

(4) "UNION SECURITY" PROVISIONS MAKE A VERY REAL CONTRIBUTION TO INDUSTRIAL PEACE AND UNION RESPONSIBILITY—LET US EXAMINE THIS FALLACY

In support of this statement Secretary of Labor Wirtz said:

> The resultant assured continuation of the union's status removes one of the most serious sources of bitter labor-management suspicion and conflict. Without such a clause, union energies better devoted to making a cooperative bargaining relationship work for the mutual benefit of the employer and employees are likely to be drained off in abrasive defensive efforts—guarding against willful attrition, continuous organization of newcomers, watchfulness against antiunion solicitation.

Thus, the Secretary of Labor departs from the role of a neutral Government official to that of the all-out advocate of the union shop.

It cannot be denied that the employer who agrees to the union shop has made his job of employee relations easier. But that is not the point of this dissent. I believe the welfare of the employees is the paramount consideration. The abuses which flow from compulsory unionism are felt principally by the individual worker at the local level, and for this reason it is felt that they create essentially local problems which should be dealt with by the States on the basis of their special knowledge and judgment as to what is necessary in the best interests of their people.

My colleagues in the Senate are urged to read the statements of 22 individuals relating their personal experience with union shop conditions in the hearings. Their stories illustrate the frustration and helplessness of union members who are unable to do anything about the corruption, mismanagement, and abuses of power which exist under union shop conditions.

Many unions in many plants have 100-percent membership without the compulsion of union shop contracts. They have sold themselves to their members. I agree with the statement:

> Good unions don't need compulsory unionism, and bad unions don't deserve it.

Proponents of repeal argue that this legislation would not require anyone to join a union—all an employee has to do is tender the dues and initiation fees. This argument ignores the practicalities of the matter. For example, the American Federation of Musicians do not permit their members to work with nonmembers and the nonmember can tender dues as often as he pleases, but he will not work because he cannot work alone.

Moreover, it is not true that all an employee has to do is tender initiation fees and dues. His job also depends upon his payment of special assessments. In 1948 as a result of a ruling of the Department of Justice, unions were given authority to classify whatever special assessments they wished to levy as dues by the simple subterfuge of amending their constitution. Union hiring halls and agreements giving preferential employment to union members have been legalized by the Supreme Court.

Secretary Wirtz's statement might well have read that existing law permitting union security has produced long and costly strikes. I refer my colleagues to the hearings, pages 118–119 and 195, for illustrations of long strikes on this one issue.

(1) THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT PERMITS "UNION SECURITY" AGREEMENTS

Prohibitions against all forms of "union security" agreements and the checkoff were made part of the Railway Labor Act in 1934. The 81st Congress repealed this prohibition. The report of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare recommended this action because the committee believed that railway unions should have the same freedom to negotiate union shop conditions as unions representing employees in industry generally—page 3, report 2262, 81st Congress, 2d session. The report is silent on section 14(b). The report states:

> It is the view of our committee that the terms of the bill are substantially the same as those of the Labor Management Relations Act as they have been administered and that such differences as exist are warranted either by experience or by special conditions existing among employees of our railroads and airlines.

While the committee did not develop the point, the "special conditions" could only have reference to the fact that railroads are instruments of interstate commerce and many of the employees move daily between States.

It is interesting to note that at least one railway union president opposed the amendment. The president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers said that his union for 25 years had held to the position that it was such an outstanding organization that men should seek its membership. He "did not want any compulsion; he did not want any closed shop; he did not want any union shop"—May 1, 1950. Hearing To Amend Railroad Labor Act, page 86.

The statement that the Railway Labor Act permits union shop contracts in all States has little relevance to the issue now before us.

Sixth. During the period between 1947 and 1951, when secret ballot elections were a condition precedent to a union shop agreement, workers demonstrated that they were overwhelmingly in favor of the union shop.

Secretary of Labor Wirtz testified that:

> Over 97 percent of the 46,146 elections which were conducted went in favor of the union shop, and 91 percent of the almost 6 million employee votes cast in these elections were in favor of the union shop.

To the Secretary, these figures demonstrate that the American workingmen overwhelmingly favor the union shop.

The figures, like most statistics, do not tell the whole story. Only a small percentage of the establishments in this country which now have compulsory membership provisions in contracts were ever the subject of these popular referendums. It must be remembered that because such polls were taken only upon the petitions of labor organizations, the union officials rarely picked any establishment where they were not sure to win. In cases where the Board has entertained deauthorization petitions from dissident employees—and it takes a 30-percent showing to file—the results of such balloting indicate a disillusionment with compulsory unionism. Of the 34 such referendums conducted in 1964, 67 percent resulted in a majority vote for revocation of the union shop. In 1963 unions lost 71 percent of such elections.

It should be noted that these deauthorization proceedings have every force working against them. Employees cannot campaign for deauthorization in the shop or plant. They can hardly campaign at the union hall. The employer cannot assist or even suggest such without being guilty of an unfair labor practice. Advocates of deauthorization can expect threats and abuse and future retaliatory action from the union. Their employers, fearing union pressures, may be expected to make every effort to discourage deauthorization campaigns. It is surprising that such elections ever occur.

The Secretary's statistics are also debatable when one considers the timing of those union shop authorization elections. They were held after the union had already become the bargaining agent by certification or recognition. They were held before bargaining began. The issue in those 1947–51 votes was bargaining power. They were sought by the union to demonstrate a show of strength to the employer. Employees were propagandized to insure a belief that a strong vote for union shop was the way to win wage and benefit demands at the bargaining table.

The report of the Joint Committee on Labor Management Relations dated December 31, 1948, discussed the problems involved in the union shop authorization (section 9(e)(1)). While this was only a little over 1 year after passage of the Taft-Hartley Act, that committee recommended the amendment which became law in 1951. The reasons for its recommendations were: First, many elections were being held where there was already a contract with union security provisions; second, unions were requesting authorization elections in situations where they have reason to believe they have the best chance of success; third, the practical difficulties of conducting such elections where employment is intermittent, most often in the building trades; and fourth, the cost of such elections was average 40 cents per vote.

In any event, the results could have been expected. The Smith-Connally Antistrike Act, which during World War II required an employee vote to authorize a strike, resulted in a similar statistical record. Although the ballot was worded to the effect, "Do you want to interfere with the war effort by going on strike?" in almost every case the employees nevertheless voted overwhelmingly to authorize the strike. The reason then, as in 1947–51, was that the real issue was bargaining power with the employer.

I believe that forcefully brings out the manner in which union members accepted this prerogative. They felt it gave them the opportunity to express themselves so far as bargaining power over the employer was concerned.

The Smith-Connally votes do not prove that employees wanted to go on strike during the war and the 1947–51 votes do not prove the employees wanted a "union shop."

Seventh. Repeal of section 14(b) would reduce existing conflicts between various State laws.

The only conflict which proponents were able to cite was in the political arena when States pass or attempt to pass right-to-work laws. Secretary of Labor Wirtz testified:

> It is time to put an end to fruitless and acrimonious political controversy by adopting the rule of uniformity.

Mr. Biemiller, testifying for the AFL–CIO, said:

> There have been innumerable legislative contests and in 13 instances referendum votes—all accompanied by highly emotional charges and countercharges, which, quite apart from the merits of the case, did not contribute to labor-management peace or stability in the States involved.

This type of "conflict" can hardly be persuasive to any Senator. To abolish it would be to demolish democracy itself.

If "conflict" means that the States do not have uniform laws, the field of "conflict" covers innumerable subjects as broad as the body of laws of any given State.

I could cite eight definite reasons for the differences in the laws of the various States. I could refer to my State of Arizona, which has more Indians than any other State in the United States. In one county of our State there are approximately 26,000 Indians and 6,000 non-Indians. I would not like to have the same rules and regulations apply to the organization or the hiring of Indian people, to dictate to them the conditions under which they can work, as would apply in an industrial area of our land. Those people are not in a position to meet those conditions. If we based all of our laws on a basic uniformity it would be a definite injustice to these people. They have not had an opportunity to go forward as many people in our great Nation. I would oppose any attempt at uniformity to bring them to apply to any metropolitan center of a highly industrialized area.

Eighth. Section 14(b) is in conflict with the principle of majority rule Secretary of Labor Wirtz testified:

> There is no violation of freedom in a minority's having to accept a majority's fair judgment fairly arrived at. There is no "right" of minority to endanger the freedom of a majority of the employees to protect the security of the bargaining representative that gives them a voice in the shaping of their wages, hours, and conditions of employment. The view of a few who oppose belonging to a union or to any other organization as a matter of conscience or religious principle must be accommodated to the obligations of living together, and is respected to the fullest practical extent in section 8 of the Labor-Management Relations Act.

The Secretary's argument on "majority rule" is quoted in full text because it is believed that he is wrong both in the principle he states and in his assertion that in the majority of cases there is an expression of desire by a majority.

In the first place in talking about majority rule the Secretary and union spokesmen erroneously assume there is no difference between public government and private labor organizations, so far as power over the individual is concerned. Sovereign rights cannot be claimed by a labor union or any other private organization.

I wish to emphasize that statement: Sovereign rights cannot be claimed by a labor union or any other private organization.

If a minority of employees does not want to be unionized, no democratic principle will support action which compels that minority to join the union of a majority. Second, although a properly constituted government may take some rights from an individual under the principle of majority rule, even in this case there are certain basic rights which cannot be taken from him. It takes a compelling national purpose to deprive an individual of a basic right.

Mr. Justice Jackson eloquently expressed this when he stated:

> The very purpose of a bill of rights was to withdraw certain subjects from the vicissitudes of political controversy to place them beyond the reach of majorities and officials and to establish them as legal principles to be applied by the courts. One's right to life, liberty and property, to free speech, a free press, freedom of worship, and assembly, and other fundamental rights may not be submitted to votes; they depend on the outcome of no elections (speaking for the majority in *West Virginia State Board of Education* v. *Barnette,* 319 U.S. 1187).

I cannot agree with Secretary Wirtz that a great national purpose would be served by requiring American workingmen to join unions even if the majority will it. In the case of the Government a majority decision may decide issues. It should never decide who shall join what private association.

This country has been moving rapidly forward in the area of civil rights and civil liberties, the motivation being the result of personal convictions, legislative action, and court decisions. Repeal of section 14(b) would be a long step in the other direction.

While the United States regards itself as and hopes to convey the impression abroad that it is the citadel of democracy and individual liberty, the passage of H.R. 77 can only be regarded as a rejection of voluntarism. We would become the only major power outside of the Iron Curtain to permit compulsory unionism. Compulsory unionism is prohibited in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Holland, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and West Germany.

The majority-rule argument can also be shown to be fallacious on other grounds. Unions and employers customarily enter into union shop contracts without ever having obtained an expression of the desires of the majority of employees in the bargaining unit. Even in the best run unions, the business agent presents proposed demands in a package at a meeting of employees—in almost all cases just those who are already members attend—prior to bargaining. Then in bargaining, everything is bargainable except the union shop. That is a "must". The employer agrees or a strike is called. An attorney-witness before the subcommittee described a 427-day strike in Kansas City, Mo., where the sole issue was "union shop." After the strike the employee union leader admitted on the witness stand that he did not even know what the term "union security" meant.

As a matter of fact, it is even possible for a worker to be forced into a union by so-called "majority rule" where there has never been a majority of employees even wanting union representation. During the hearings witnesses pointed out that the National Labor Relations Board has circumvented the elections provisions of the act to require bargaining on the basis of union membership cards by what it calls the Joy Silk and Bernel Foam doctrine. It is submitted that the use of card checks to determine a majority can be justified only in the most extreme cases—cases where the employer is guilty of gross misconduct. This is so because cards can never be a reliable indicator of employee intent. Employees sign cards believing the purpose is only to obtain an election at which time they will have an opportunity to express their real intent. Cards may be signed today by a group of employees who next week may change their minds on union representation. Cards are signed because of various pressures—some, just to please a friend. Many cards are forgeries. It is no answer to say that motivation may be inquired into on the witness stand because few people wish to admit that they did not know what they were doing or yielded to pressure in signing a card.

The whole practice is detrimental to employee rights. He is prevented from hearing both sides of the question of representation which occurs if an election is held. He becomes a victim of the union shop in many cases where there has never been a majority of employees desiring union representation. Card checks are the handmaiden of "sweetheart" contracts where the employee loses wage increases and benefits and the opportunity to choose a different union to represent him.

Thus, the arguments of majority rule fail in every respect.

Ninth. Section 14(b) has hindered union organization, resulted in substandard wages and working conditions, and caused migration of industry:

There was an attempt to show that right-to-work laws cause migration of industry from non-right-to-work States with resulting loss of jobs. This was an argument without supporting proof.

This subject is much misunderstood, and many people who have discussed it in recent weeks have been under illusions. They have considered that in the right-to-work States starvation wages have been paid. They have not taken the time to determine how their particular States stand in relation to the right-to-work States. I gave statistics, and I shall submit more, covering that particular item. But in making the determination, it was found that of the top 15 States, in relation to wages paid, 6 are right-to-work States. One of the right-to-work States is the second in the Nation so far as wage payments are concerned. But such statistics are not valid in proving arguments one way or another. Even if statistics were available in all categories, they would be meaningless, because an employer may move his business for myriads of reasons.

There have been movements both to and from right-to-work States, between right-to-work States and between non-right-to-work States. The National Labor Relations Board has extremely few "runaway shop" cases—it is an unfair labor practice for an employer to move his business to get rid of a union.

The subcommittee was presented with many tables of statistics on wage rates and on union membership in the various States by both proponents and opponents of repeal of section 14(b). From these, one may logically argue that there is or is not motivation for an employer to move to a right-to-work State. Statistics were also offered on man-days lost by strike in the various States from which one might argue that there is motivation to move to States where there are fewer strikes.

When one makes comparison between two States, the statistics lose their persuasiveness.

Compare Arizona with the neighboring State of New Mexico, which does not have a right-to-work law. Similar in size, climate, and resources, 10 years ago the average weekly earnings of a worker in New Mexico was $85 compared to $82 in Arizona. Today the average wage in Arizona is $111 a week compared to $90 in New Mexico.

I do not feel, as I stated before, that this is occasioned merely because one State is a compulsory-union State and the other is a voluntary-union State.

The AFL–CIO gained 36,000 members in Arizona between 1958 and 1962, and gained 5,000 members in New Mexico during the same period. Later I give statistics showing that gains in the year 1965 have been highly significant in my State of Arizona.

In 1964, Arizona ranked 13th and New Mexico ranked 36th in average hourly earnings in manufacturing. I do not say that this is due merely to the right-to-work law. However, I emphasize over and over that the States which have right-to-work laws have been seeking industries. They have had a good political climate, and a good business climate. I believe that this is important.

I believe this indicates that a State is a right-to-work State not because it wants to take advantage of the working man, but because, in most cases, the people involved look favorably upon industry and want industry to come to that State.

That is proved by the statistics, if we want to accept the statistics as proof. The per capita personal income in Arizona was $2,218 for 1964, and it was $2,010 in New Mexico for the same year. Incidentally, both those States have a large Indian population with a very low per capita income. I believe that we are on about the same percentage basis in this relationship.

Arizona has more Indians than has any other State in the United States. The State of New Mexico is second in that regard. That does affect our per capita personal income. In New Mexico—as an example, to show that compulsory unionism has not been beneficial, strikes accounted for 69,300 man-days idle in Arizona and 93,500 man-days idle in New Mexico.

If we look back over the years, we see that we have had a better relationship between mangement and labor and a far better situation with reference to union activities in the State of Arizona, which is a right-to-work State.

The value of these statistics is diminished by the fact that they do not show the number of employees belonging to affiliated unions, such as the Mine Workers, the Teamsters, and a large body of independent unions. Statistics reflecting such total membership are not available.

Another factor should be noted when examining tables of union membership. Under the act a union is certified to represent all employees in the bargaining unit. Since union shop is forbidden in the 19 right-to-work States, there are more nonmember employees represented in such States. As pointed out by Mr. Biemiller, it should also be remembered that total union membership declined between 1958 and 1962. Total membership fell from 17.1 million in 1958 to 16.6 million in 1962. However, this is not true today. The union membership has increased and the statistics show now that it is at a high point.

While Mr. Biemiller is able to make the overall statement that percentage drop was greater for the right-to-work States than for States without right-to-work laws, reference to some individual States demonstrates that there must have been factors other than right-to-work laws operating to create losses and gains. Among the non-right-to-work States, for example, Michigan lost 50,000 members, Ohio lost 250,000, California lost 200,000, Vermont lost 500, Illinois gained 50,000, Massachusetts gained 125,000, and Washington gained 150,000, Tennessee lost 25,000, Iowa lost 30,000, and there were no changes in Alabama, Arkansas, and North Carolina.

Senators are urged to examine the tables of strikes and man-days lost for the 4 years, 1960–63, for the various States. It is interesting to note that when the States listed above were considered, gains and losses in union membership bear a close relationship to the number of strikes and man-days lost.

Statistics from the U.S. Departments of Labor and Commerce for the decade ending in 1963 indicate that determinative factors of an expanding economy such as wage improvements, increased number of production workers, greater capital investment, larger bank deposits, accelerated personal income, and other similar indexes of increased prosperity showed a greater percentage rate of increases in right-to-work States than in either non-right-to-work States or the national average.

Mr. President, I shall read a few statements from individuals whose testimony was given before our committee.

This is a statement of John Seeley, of California. It reads as follows:

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOHN SEELEY, SEPULVEDA, CALIF.

> It was almost exactly 2 years ago that I walked for the last time out of the gates of the Douglas Aircraft Co. plant where I had worked for 27 years. An old union man, I had taken my stand on the principle that no man should be forced to join or pay fees to a union except by free choice. I knew it meant the loss of my job and I was fired.
>
> I had helped organize one of the first unions in the Douglas plant at Santa Monica, Calif., years ago—the Aircraft Workers Union. Later, during World War II, I was a member of a CIO union at the plant and served as an assistant shop steward. Those were voluntary unions, which employees were free to join as they chose. I believe in that type of union.
>
> But when the International Association of Machinists (AFL–CIO) demanded of Douglas an "agency shop" contract, under which every employee of the plant had to either join or pay fees to the union, I was one of hundreds of other Douglas employees who fought against it because they believed it was wrong. We organized the Douglas Employees Right-To-Work Committee and did all we could to prevent imposition of the "agency shop," but were defeated.
>
> After the signing of the "agency shop" contract at Douglas, I was 1 of 25 or 30 employees who stuck by their guns and refused to pay forced tribute to the union—even though they knew it meant their jobs.
>
> Speaking of those who accepted the "agency shop" against their beliefs, I found that most people can't afford the luxury of integrity.
>
> When I received official notice that I had to pay a fee to the union or be fired, I went to call on the president of the company, Donald W. Douglas, Jr. Told that Mr. Douglas was not in, I left my 25-year pin with the secretary. Later Mr. Douglas called me to make sure he understood the company's position and my rights under the contract. I assured him that I did. Asked why I had returned my 25-year pin, I replied: "I don't want the pin any longer because I can't wear it with pride."
>
> During my 27 years in the Santa Monica Douglas plant, I worked in almost every phase of tool and diemaking. My last assignment was in a department where highly skilled men were building special machinery. My supervisor gave me the highest rating in the plant.
>
> I hold no resentment against my employer, or even the union—only against the compulsion which I feel is robbing rank-and-file workers of their freedom and is hurting the union movement.
>
> Today I am employed as an instructor at the North American Aviation Co. My duties include use of a special skill I possess in teaching classes for the deaf.
>
> I continue to fight against compulsory unionism. I serve as a director of the organization, California Employees for Right To Work, which is working toward adoption of a law to make compulsory union membership illegal in that State.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of of quorum.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before doing that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold his request for a quorum call?

Mr. FANNIN. I withhold my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. I should like to ask a question or two of the Senator from Arizona.

Before doing so, however, I wish to state that he has made an excellent analysis of the situation. The Senate is favored with his statement, because the Senator from Arizona speaks with authority, having served as Governor of his State for a long enough period of time to have had the benefit of an opportunity to observe precisely what has happened on the industrial scene, the labor scene, and the economic scene, as affected by the law in effect in his State, and is in a good position to predict what the impact and effect would be should repeal occur.

The question which I should like to put to the Senator from Arizona has to do with work stoppages. There was a comment by him as to the greater number of work stoppages in non-right-to-work States than in right-to-work States such as his own. I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona whether, in his State, there has been the same experience that we have in this Senator's State of Nebraska, where, for the 11-year period from 1952 to 1962, the percentage of estimated total working time lost due to stoppages was 0.118, while during that same period of time nationally, the percentage of estimated total working time lost was 0.303, a figure not quite but nearly three times as great.

I ask the Senator from Arizona, therefore, whether there was a similar experience in his State.

Mr. FANNIN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for his question, as well as for the information regarding his State. I am proud of what has happened in Nebraska, just as I am proud of what has happened in Arizona, both being right-to-work States. I have carefully checked the figures over the past 5 years, and the record is highly encouraging. We find that Arizona has been fortunate in having fewer work stoppages than most of the States of our Nation. I cannot say that we have the fine record that Nebraska has, but we do have an outstanding record as compared with the other States of our Nation; and I am pleased that in our area, we have proved that in comparison with New Mexico, our neighboring State, we have had far fewer work stoppages and fewer man-days lost by strikes than has that State.

So although we have not maintained such a fine record as have the people of Nebraska, whom the distinguished Senator represents, I am proud of the record of our State.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FANNIN. I yield for another question.

Mr. HRUSKA. It has been called to my attention that in States which permit what we call enforced unionism, that is, where they do not have right-to-work laws, the work stoppage record is nearly twice as great, through time lost as a result of strikes and other labor stoppages, than in States where right-to-work laws exist. I know that the Senator, being a member of the Subcommittee on Labor, has come across figures of that kind. The percentages which I have are 0.09 in all States which ban compulsory unionism, compared with 0.14 in the remaining 31 States—not quite twice as much, but nearly so.

I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona whether that is his recollection, and whether that is the information which was developed during the course of hearings on the bill.

Mr. FANNIN. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska is correct. I have here the record on the economic progress in the various States of our Nation. The Senator's information is correct. We are proud that that is the record and has been the experience in the right-to-work States.

Mr. HRUSKA. Is it not true that often in work stoppages and strikes, strikes not necessarily caused by it but nevertheless prolonged by it, the issue of enforced unionism was the issue which caused the work stoppage, and that that is one of the prime reasons for the more adverse record on work stoppages in States where that can be done?

Mr. FANNIN. I agree with the Senator from Nebraska. He has brought out some very valuable information, which discloses that a better working relationship exists between unions and management in States which have voluntary unionism.

The record of time thus lost through strikes, as shown by the statistics the distinguished Senator has mentioned, is very impressive, and it is encouraging to see that the record in right-to-work States is still improving. That is highly commendable.

I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska to the fact that the attitude of the people is reflected, in States which have voluntary unionism, in the better relationship which has accrued to them as a result of their working together, because the union management of a voluntary union is, by necessity, compelled to provide service to members to a much greater degree than in the case of a compulsory union.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator very much for his responses to my questions, and congratulate him on the clarity of his statement, made, as it is, from his vantage point of authority.

Mr. FANNIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I rise in support of H.R. 77, a bill to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

In all my years in public life, Mr. President, I have never seen an issue upon which there was a more confused public debate, upon which misunderstanding was so rampant, upon which there was so much heat and so little light as there is on the so-called right-to-work issue.

Perhaps one reason for this is the fact that the right-to-work dispute has absolutely nothing to do with anyone's right to work.

What it does have to do with is labor's and management's right to negotiate a union security agreement. That right it gives a State the power to deny.

I come from a State that has never enacted a right-to-work law. The proposed repeal would not affect Alaska, or 30 of the other States, in any way. In these States labor and management in a given plant have an unfettered right to determine whether they want a union-shop or open-shop arrangement. They are free to decide either way.

It is only in the 19 right-to-work States that labor and management are forbidden this choice. There they are compelled to operate under the open shop.

The repeal of 14(b) would simply remove the State's power to impose this sort of arrangement.

It would not end the open shop or establish the union shop. It would merely guarantee that in all States labor and management are free to determine which arrangement they prefer.

I find it difficult to understand why advocates of the right-to-work clause argue in the name of freedom. It seems to me that they are instead arguing for a compulsory situation which restricts the free bargaining process.

Now if we wanted to talk about the freedom of the working man, about the right to work, we might talk about a number of things.

We might talk about the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and certain NLRB or court decisions which provide that no person shall be denied employment or union membership because of race, creed, or sex.

We might mention the numerous statutes which provide that a union shall preserve the liberties and serve the best interests of its members. The law completely bans any arrangement whereby a man may not be hired if he is not a union member. It provides that a union shall not bargain on behalf of a body of workers unless it represents a majority of them, as determined by free elections. It provides that union members shall not be compelled to participate in union activities nor to pay excessive dues and fees. It prohibits unions from denying membership to workers for reasons other than their failure to pay uniformly required dues and fees. All this effectively precludes unions from denying or burdening a laborer's right to work.

We might look at the restraints placed upon employers to guarantee that they shall not discriminate against union members in their hiring and firing practices, that they shall not impede legitimate labor activity nor refuse to engage in bargaining. We might indeed look at the wage and hour guarantees, the fair-labor standards, and the job security agreements to which management has agreed, largely because of the growth and strength and activity of the labor movement.

We might talk about all these things if we were interested in the right to work.

But we would not talk about right-to-work laws.

The only person to whom a right-to-work law conceivably gives a right to work is the person who would choose to work in a unionized plant, who would reap the benefits of past and continuing union activity, and yet who would choose not to pay the dues that maintain the union. The argument in favor of a compulsory open shop sometimes makes little more sense than suggesting that the person who participates in a company's health or retirement program should be "free" not to pay the requisite fees. The union shop does not compel active unionism. It merely provides that each shall share in the financial maintenance of union benefits.

But the point is not to defend the union shop—though I think it undeniable that such arrangements have contributed immensely to the welfare of the working man. The point is not that union shops are good and open shops are bad. The point is that labor and management should be free to negotiate whichever kind of arrangement seems best for a given situation. That freedom 19 States have seen fit to deny through the powers granted them under 14(b).

14(b) represents an unwarranted exception to the national labor policy outlined in the Taft-Hartley Act. It provides for the irregular and arbitrary intrusion of State law into a delicate field otherwise preempted by Federal statute. It disturbs the balance of interests represented by the otherwise uniform regulation of labor and management policy and practice.

The progress of the working man and the operation of the free bargaining process have been inhibited in 19 States by misnamed and misguided right-to-work laws. The repeal of the clause which made such restrictions possible is long overdue.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 288 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the 47-to-45 majority vote today was to me a clear demonstration that the Senate prefers to postpone until next year the issue raised by the proposal to repeal section 14(b). I am fairly certain that, before the end of this week, the Senate will go on to other matters and that the present attenuated discussion will come to an end. However, until the signal is given, it remains the responsibility of those who oppose the repeal of section 14(b) to continue to discuss the measure.

I rise tonight for the first time in my Senate career to participate actively in such an extended debate. I do so, fully convinced that the cause which I defend is supported by a large majority of the American people.

In my own State, which has a right-to-work law, made possible by section 14(b), the available figures are quite dramatic.

The mail which I have received from Utah shows that 83 percent of the people who write me oppose the repeal of section 14(b) and only 17 percent favor it. This is a 5-to-1 margin.

The mail that I am beginning to receive from outside my State is running more than 98 percent in opposition to the repeal of section 14(b).

When we take all this mail and average it out, the average is 87.5 percent against, and 12.5 percent for, or a ratio of 7-to-1.

Two great Americans, both from Illinois, have brought the issue into sharp focus. Abraham Lincoln, perhaps the greatest defender of freedom this Nation has known, described the American political system as "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." His definition left little room for private forms of government, special interest groups, and compulsion. The other man of whom I speak is the distinguished minority leader from Illinois, whose leadership and courage in this battle will go down in history as a classic defense of freedom, and under whose leadership I am proud to serve.

The issue of 14(b) is, of course, a power grab by certain labor bosses who have called at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue and at the offices of certain Congressmen and Senators to collect their political I O U's for the 1964 elections. This fact has not escaped the attention of the American people and the American press. It was placed clearly in focus by the distinguished minority leader when, upon being asked if he had enough support to mount a successful drive against the repeal of 14(b), replied that he did, but even more importantly, he knew that those Congressmen and Senators who opposed compulsory unionism also had the country in their corner.

Mr. President, what a comfort it is to know that out in the States, the cities, the towns, villages, farms, factories, and offices of America, at least two-thirds of the people believe that this cause is just and that section 14(b) should be preserved. At a time when consensus has come to mean so much to some Americans and to one in particular, I find it difficult to understand how this classic case can be ignored, but ignored it is. But not for long, for our people are becoming aroused and are beginning to speak. I feel that if the discussion of this proposal is to be dropped for the remainder of this session, that by the time we come back in January, that voice will have made itself so clear that the proposal to repeal section 14(b) cannot be passed.

Let me point out for the sake of those who, for obvious reasons, choose not to listen to what the citizen of my State have said regarding compulsory unionism. Every Utah newspaper of which I have a record has spoken in favor of retaining section 14(b). The largest broadcasting firm in Utah has spoken against compulsory unionism. Other people, business leaders, farmers, teachers, housewives, young people and more workers than some would care to admit, have spoken.

I received a very interesting postcard today. Its writer said that he had been urged to send to me a postcard asking me to vote for the repeal of section 14(b). He said:

> I have followed your political career and I have known how you stood from the beginning. And I am sure you are not prepared now to desert the principles for which you have stood so long. And even though I don't agree with those principles, I hope you have courage to stay with them.

Utah is the one State in the Union the majority of whose citizens have always belonged to the same church. Therefore, the leaders of that church, when they speak, are entitled to special attention.

Our church leaders, whose right to present their point of view to Congress has been attacked by some of their own members who serve in this body, have joined hundreds of other churches in opposing this form of compulsion over the individual.

It has interested me to know that 28 different religious organizations have taken a position on the repeal of section 14(b). Most of these organizations have opposed its repeal during the hearings held on the measure in the House and in the Senate.

Yet when the Mormon Church leaders made their views known, certain Members of Congress refused them a decent hearing. In my office, Mr. President, the voice of the people of Utah is being heard. The people of my State, by the latest count of telegrams, letters, and postcards to which I have referred, oppose repeal of section 14(b) by a margin of nearly 5 to 1. How can I ignore the people I was elected to represent? They know that the central issue in this debate is individual freedom. They have not chosen to ignore this glaring fact.

Mr. President, let us examine the issue in its historical perspective. Let us look back into the history of American political development. Let us examine the writings of the men who attended the birth of this Nation and those who wrote its Constitution. Let us examine the great issues of the Civil War and issues of our own industrial and political development to see whether or not the forces of freedom or compulsion were the victors.

A candid examination will, of course, show that throughout our history as a Nation there have been forces which would reduce freedom for self interest, but I think that our general approach, as a people and as a Government, has been to favor freedom over compulsion.

It should never be forgotten that one of the first acts of defiance in recorded American history was the refusal by certain members of the established churches in England to be subject to the dictates and will of a private organization. Rather than submit, they left for the New World with all its uncertainties to forge a new land of religious and political freedom. For 170 years these people underwent the long and agonizing process of developing and cultivating the forces of freedom. It was a time when further contests over religious freedom and between private power centers were fought. It was also the time when this Nation saw the establishment of human slavery, where one man's life came to be the property and subject of another man. We are, Mr. President, still attempting to eradicate the problems caused by this tragic institution.

After 170 years as British colonies, our people made the historic decision to declare their independence. It was an event dedicated to the proposition that:

> All men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—that to secure their rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Then as now, Mr. President, the central issue was life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. These were God-given and unalienable. They remain so today. I submit that to force a man to join a private organization and to force him to pay money to it against his will is a violation of these great principles.

Mr. President, Thomas Jefferson and those great men who signed the Declaration clearly, emphatically, and correctly declared that government was instituted to preserve these rights. It follows then that its task is not to destroy them. Yet this administration and those elected officials, who would force compulsory unionism upon the American people would do just that. Is it liberty if a free man must become a member of a private organization to earn his livelihood? Is this administration now about to place certain shackles on the "pursuit of happiness"? Can a man obtain this worthwhile objective in life if he must pay tribute to a private organization and to private individuals? Mr. President, we outlawed this principle of individual servitude a century ago. Let us not reinstitute it under the guise of "labor peace" and the erroneous claim of the "free rider."

From Independence Hall our people, cast upon their own resources, stumbled through 11 years of independence without a constitution or a strong central government. This was rectified at the Philadelphia Convention in 1787 after which the finished Constitution was sent to the various States for ratification. Here it met resistence of the American people because it did not contain what most Americans considered the necessary safeguards to individual freedom. Consequently, the first 10 amendments were submitted to the States in 1789 and finally became law in December 1791. This Bill of Rights was no outline of government powers or government responsibilities. It was a limitation or prohibition against Government interference with the rights which are enumerated therein. Let us examine two of those articles as they bear upon the issue of compulsory unionism.

> Article I. Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Mr. President, I believe, and reason supports me in this argument, that if a man is guaranteed the right to exercise religion, it follows, as night follows day, that an American is also free not to practice a religion.

Because he is free to speak, he is also free to remain silent. Because he has the right to express freely his views in the press, he also has the right to refrain from using the press. Now the classic as far as this debate is concerned is the right of the American people to assemble peaceably. Has anyone ever stopped to think that most of our assemblies and associations are of a private nature? The authors of this amendment were concerned over the right of Americans to assemble in their churches, in their clubs, in their public squares, and in their private homes.

Is it not obvious, Mr. President, that an American who has the right to join a church also has the right not to join a church? If he chooses to join a club, he may also choose not to join. If there is a public rally in the city square and he chooses to attend, he may also choose not to attend. If his friends gather in a private home, he may attend, or he may stay away. Is a labor union any different? I believe it too is a private organization. It too can assemble. The first amendment is one of its guarantees. But is it not quite obvious that an American who chooses freely and independently not to join a church, a club, a PTA or attend a public meeting, should also be free to choose not to join a private labor organization? Have we come to the point, for the sake of political debt, that we are about to qualify the first amendment at the cost of personal freedom? This administration would do it. The labor bosses would force it. But, Mr. President, the American people would not. The people of Utah would not. For the last 10 years the legislatures in the State of Utah would not. They knew that they represented the people of Utah and not just the labor bosses.

Let us turn to the fifth amendment, Mr. President. Here the Congress is prohibited from depriving any American of life, liberty, and property without due process of law. Money is property. If Congress is forbidden from taking an individual's property without due process, how can anyone justify the taking of a man's property, against his wishes, by a private organization and by private officials to be used for purposes which he opposes? How far have we come in the loss of individual freedom?

Those who advocate the repeal of section 14(b) base their arguments mainly upon the need for a uniform and national labor policy. This, they argue, is possible because Federal law is supreme and State laws should not be permitted to override the Federal laws. Of course, this position is based largely upon the commerce clause in section 8 of article I and the supremacy clause of article VI. This power, no one denies, belongs to the Congress. But I emphatically deny that this power to regulate commerce gives Congress the right to override and set aside the rights guaranteed under the first and fifth amendments. These are individual rights which Congress shall not bridge. Have we forgotten about the ninth amendment? Let us put it in the RECORD:

> The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

These take precedence over the power of Congress to regulate commerce. Congress, in violation of these rights, may not give private labor organizations the power to force membership in private organizations and allow labor bosses to take a man's private property and deny him the right to earn a livelihood under the guise of the commerce clause. Mr. President, this poor clause has been stretched, abused, and maligned in the past, but this is taking the matter much too far. The commerce clause was never intended to nullify the freedoms guaranteed in the Bill of Rights.

Someone may question my use of the term "involuntary servitude," but in order that this may not be misunderstood, let us examine its meaning and compare it with "compulsory unionism."

On the 13th amendment, one the leading law journals, the Journal of Public Law, volume 6, 1957, had this to say about compulsory unionism and involuntary servitude:

[From the Journal of Public Law 6, 1957]

(By Jack P. Ashmore, Jr.)

> The amendment is directed not only toward slavery but also against serfage, vassalage, villeinage, peonage, and every other form of compulsory labor. In striking down an Alabama statute making it a crime not to carry out the labor condition of a contract, the Supreme Court held that the statute violated the 13th amendment since all mandatory servitude is prohibited except as punishment for a crime. Of course, the Hanson situation is not "mandatory" in that the individual does have the choice of working elsewhere. But realistically is this a choice? "Necessitous men," it has been said, "are not free men." Can a personal right, a right which Justice Douglas called "the most precious liberty that man possesses," be denied on the ground of such a weak alternative? In large measure, forcing a person to join a union is a form of latter-day bondage.

The first item to examine is the basic and all-important requirement in the lives of all men, that of earning a livelihood and sustaining life itself. Without the compensation which one derives from holding a job, it is, Mr. President, impossible for a man and his family to pursue happiness, enjoy liberty, and even to sustain life. How then can a man who does not work enjoy the blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?

In this light, let us then examine the sad and deplorable similarities between involuntary servitude and the un-American and morally wrong principle of compulsory membership or service in private organizations, such as unions, businesses, or any other group of private individuals who would compel membership and dues payment against the free will of an individual and against his God-given and constitutionally guaranteed rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and to assemble or not assemble peaceably.

May I, for the sake of accuracy, give the Webster definition of these two words:

> Involuntary: (1) done contrary to or without choice. (2) Compulsory: not subject to control of the will.

Servitude implies in general lack of liberty to do as one pleases, specifically lack of freedom to determine one's course of actions and conditions of living.

Let us measure the two—involuntary servitude and compulsory unionism. Under the terms of compulsory unionism, a man is allegedly required to join a union in order that he may share the economic costs of collective bargaining. First, therefore, we must measure the few dollars involved against the fact that a man is forced against his will to join a group which he may oppose and which often acts contrary to his self-interest by conducting strikes, and so forth. How in the name of liberty can anyone make a choice for the few dollars involved? Mr. President, the free exercise of thought, independent judgment, the free will, each separately and all collectively are worth much more to each American than the few dollars which the union bosses are trying to demand from the nonunion employee.

Unions claim that a nonunion man should help pay the cost of collective bargaining. Are the unions claiming that they cannot afford to carry on this function as a private organization? Are they asking the American people to forget about the huge sums of money that unions have available to them for operations completely unrelated to collective bargaining?

Mr. President, the American people are not blind. They know that the unions are extremely wealthy and have no cause to gripe about the lack of funds available to bargain collectively for nonunion members, a right which the unions themselves demanded under the Wagner Act and left intact by the Taft-Hartley law. This is not a matter of simple economics. It is a case of pure power grab based on coercion which would destroy some of the most basic of American freedoms.

During the past week we have read about Federal Government employees' unions who feel that if section 14(b) is repealed, they will then move to have the right to collect dues from all Federal employees, just as is done by unions representing employees in private collective bargaining.

If this happens, of course, the unions will have taken over a part of the fundamental sovereignty of the American Government.

Let us measure the paltry few dollars the unions would gain against the evil consequences a man must face if he chooses not to knuckle under to demands of the private union organization. Under the terms of union shop, he can be fired from his job if after 30 days he refuses, by exercising his free will, to join this private organization. Consequently, his ability to earn a livelihood can be cut off. This the unions would do for a paltry few dollars. Has a man's right to earn a livelihood become less important than the demands for a few measly dollars? Let us measure those few dollars again against the fact that by forcing a man to join a private organization we would be depriving him of his right under the first amendment to join or not to join a private organization. Mr. President, have we as a Nation come to the point where we will sell our rights under the first amendment for a few dollars in union dues?

Again, let us weigh the circumstances of forced union membership and how it requires a free man involuntarily to serve masters and causes which he opposes. The American people know that a unionman's dues are used for many purposes other than collective bargaining. He is not only paying a union leader's salary, he is also, in a few cases, paying for a union leader's vacation, for his mansion, for his liquor, for his limousine, and in a few cases, for his corruption. But beyond this, an unwilling union member is also paying for the election of some public officials whom he may oppose in principle, or for other reasons. He is helping to pay for the printing of propaganda sheets, the contents of which he may oppose. He is forced to help pay for lobbying agents and lobbying projects which are often contrary to his convictions. His very involuntary membership in this private organization requires him to serve, with his own dollars, to pay the debts and costs of people, projects, and policies which he in his own mind opposes.

Mr. President, in the past, we have permitted only the duly elected representatives of our republican form of government to exercise this power. Are we now foolishly about to give a blank check to a private organization to do it, also? The whole concept of compulsory unionism, therefore, is closely related to the involuntary servitude expressly outlawed by the 13th amendment, in that certain free men are forced to support with their property private causes of private individuals against their own free will.

Mr. President, involuntary servitude can take many forms, and it was not long after the 13th amendment went into effect that it was violated, if not in letter, in the spirit. All American history students know that the industrial power of the North was one of the major reasons why the Civil War was won by the northern armies. After the war was concluded, this industry, new and largely unregulated, began to expand and give to the American people an improved standard of living which has gradually come to be the standard of the world. This long process of development, however, was not without its black pages. The growth of American industry carried with it the employment of children, which was very often a matter of abuse, the creation of large trusts and monopolies, and the emergence of something akin to private economic governments. The evils, Mr. President, were there and our Government and people were eventually moved to the point of eradicating most of the evils.

In 1890 the Sherman antitrust law was passed which reduced some of the power of the large corporations. In 1938 the child labor laws were finally accepted by the Supreme Court. This must be considered one of America's most humane pieces of legislation. In 1932 the Norris-LaGuardia Act was passed which outlawed the "yellow dog" contracts. What did these laws do and how do they affect the current debate? No one can deny that the circumstances under which children worked in the 50 years preceding the child labor laws were deplorable. To a certain extent they were in a condition of involuntary servitude. They were paid a very small wage, worked extremely long hours, and often forced to perform the most dangerous and unpleasant tasks. They could do little to improve their conditions and economic requirements quite often precluded their quitting the job. Technically, of course, there was no involuntary servitude, but in many ways they were slaves to the industry they served. The child labor laws, both State and Federal, went far to correct this great injustice.

About this same time, Mr. President, the American labor movement, under the leadership of Samuel Gompers, was beginning to organize itself in order better to deal with the problems the individual workingman faced vis-a-vis industry and management. One of the big problems which they had to combat was the yellow dog contract, an agreement which abridged the right of an employee to join a union. This was a major issue. I fully believe that the right to organize and to join a private organization, such as a labor union, is guaranteed by the first amendment which, as noted above, provides that "Congress shall make no law abridging the right of the people to assemble peaceably." This, the Federal Government found necessary to guarantee in 1932. This simple fact I do not dispute. On the other hand, I say, and the American people back us in this demand, that if a person has the right to join a union, he also has the right not to join a union. Mr. President, why in the name of human freedom must the yellow dog contract be reinstated, in reverse, this time against the man who chooses not to join a union. Somehow in the course of time the men who now claim to be leaders in the American labor movement have repudiated the advice of their most distinguished predecessor, Samuel Gompers. Have they forgotten the sound advice he gave regarding union membership when he said:

> I want to urge devotion to the fundamentals of human liberty, the principle of voluntarism. No lasting gain has ever come from compulsion. If we seek to force, we but tear apart that which, united, is invincible. * * * No man shall be deprived of livelihood for his family because of employment conditional upon membership in any union.
>
> There may be here and there a worker who for certain reasons unexplainable to us does not join a union of labor. This is his right no matter how morally wrong he may be. It is his legal right and no one can or dare question his exercise of that legal right.

James F. Byrnes, a famous man of our own times, said:

> A workingman must have the right to join a labor union. It is equally important that a worker have the right to refuse to join a union, and no government or union should have the right to force him to join in order to get a job.

The Charter of the United Nations, section 2 of article XX, provides:

> No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

Gompers was speaking in the great tradition of America, a tradition based upon the time honored and wise premise that private organizations under no circumstances can compel membership, collect dues, or demand financial support for private causes which a private citizen may oppose. Mr. President, how wise he was. How foolish are those who would destroy this tradition and sell the American workingman into a situation akin to involuntary servitude, subject to the dictates of private and ofttimes corrupt labor bosses for the very essence of life, the right to earn a living. The price of freedom is eternal vigilance. We have fought this war in the past and have won. We are fighting it now, and because all America backs our cause we shall win again.

From the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the Congress moved to the Railway Labor Act, originally passed in 1926 and amended in 1931. The basic premise of this statute was that compulsory membership in railroad unions was undesirable. Wisdom and constitutional rights prevailed. Then in 1935, Congress acted again on the subject of compulsion and passed the Wagner Act. This time, however, the forces of freedom, constitutional rights, and commonsense, gave way to the forces of compulsion, forced memberships, and those who would ignore the first and fifth amendments. Unions were permitted under Federal law, unless a State acted otherwise, openly to compel a man to join a union in order to get and hold a job. This mistaken concept was not permitted to remain unchallenged, however. In 1944, Americans in several States began to challenge this violation of freedom, and eventually in that same year two States adopted right-to-work laws, which the Wagner Act sanctioned.

These laws, Mr. President, were fair and reasonable. All right-to-work laws now existing in 19 States are also fair and reasonable. Did these new laws say to the unions "You cannot organize yourself nor can you bargain collectively"? Absolutely not. Rather, in keeping with the traditional fairness of the American people, these laws encouraged, as have most labor laws, the right of private individuals to join together in a private association designed to improve themselves. They did not trample on the rights of labor. They did not attempt to destroy what was acknowledged then and now as a great American institution and contribution, the organized labor movement. What these laws said, and rightfully so, was that the labor unions could not coerce a man into joining what is admittedly and legally a private organization. What these right-to-work laws said to organized labor was that "Your drive for members is just, but under no circumstances will you as private individuals be permitted to abridge the God-given and constitutionally guaranteed rights of free Americans."

What these laws were saying to the labor unions is that "If you have got a service to sell to the great Americans who man the machines, build the buildings, operate the transportation system and industries, and perform the honorable tasks of labor, you had better get out and sell it to these men and women on its merits. You had better convince them in the marketplace, as free men traditionally have done in America, that your service is worthy of their consideration, acceptance, and financial support. What you had better do is get out and serve the public and the union member in such a way that he will see the worth and benefits of union membership. You had better get out there and sell your product voluntarily, because as Americans we neither believe, nor will we condone, the claim that a man can be compelled to join your private organization or pay you his money against his will. You had better do this on a voluntary basis because this is the American way, and the Constitution protects a man against the coercive practices now being pursued under the Wagner Act."

What these laws were saying to the unions was that we do not allow our churches to force a man into membership or donate to the cause, even though it would be nice to save all men's souls and enjoy the increased donations for new buildings and to assist the poor. What is more, our churches have not even asked for this power. How could they? The Master whose Gospel they teach set them an example of freedom. In his finest hour, the Humble Carpenter of Nazareth never went beyond the practice of persuasion in trying to convince His fellow men that His teachings would bring a better life now and in the hereafter. Mr. President, is it not quite evident that if all men could be forced to adhere to a church that the world might be a better place or might seem to be a better place? Yet in the wisdom of our Maker this has not been done.

What these laws are saying about the unions is that we do not permit the Elks or the Eagles or the Kiwanis or the Rotary or anyone else to compel membership because it would be morally wrong. They, too, are private organizations and people daily benefit from their activities, but these organizations are not crying for the right to compel membership. What these laws are saying is, "You have no reason to compare your cause with the integrated bar associations simply because in most cases they are an arm of the State governments designed mainly to regulate a profession."

What these laws are saying to the unions is that Americans have always judged a man by his service and on his merits. If we do not like a certain company or its products, we buy those of another one. This makes the business and the salesman whose product and service we have rejected work a little harder to regain our allegiance and our sale. No coercion here, Mr. President.

What these laws are saying to the unions is, "We will defend to the end your right to organize and bargain collectively, but we deny your demands that it be based upon coercive membership, upon destruction of our freedom of choice."

What these laws are saying, Mr. President is, "We believe that a union has every right under the Constitution to organize and deal with the management collectively, but you had better do it standing on your own two feet without the assistance of a Federal crutch. You had better realize that you are no longer a struggling, young labor movement fighting for your very existence. You are now a fullgrown labor organization, and it is time that you came to respect the freedoms and rights of all men as espoused by Samuel Gompers."

It was under these circumstances, concern for individual freedom, that the Congress wisely considered a national law which would permit the States to protect the rights so aptly described by Gompers and guaranteed by the Constitution, particularly, the first and fifth amendments. It had been a long contest, Mr. President, between the forces of freedom and those of compulsion. To preserve freedom is never easy and the watch must be eternal. Under the Wagner Act the forces of compulsion had scored a sad, but temporary victory. For 9 long years the American workingman, without choice of the exercise of his free will, was forced to join a union in all States in order to get a job. The American people, who had taken time out to fight a long and difficult war for the preservation of freedom around the world, after the war were turning to the task of building the peace, and as they looked around it became apparent that some changes had to be made for the cause of individual freedom right here at home. The result was the Taft-Hartley law, which was a great blow to the forces of compulsion and a great victory for the cause of individual freedom and the Bill of Rights.

Now, Mr. President, what does Taft-Hartley really do? First it permits, as did earlier legislation, labor unions to represent all employees, union and nonunion in the collective bargaining process. Do the American people know why this right was placed in the law? It was placed in the law because the labor people insisted that it be there. Dead, gone forever, soundly beaten, and refuted, therefore, should be the labor cry of "free rider." The nonunion man is really a "captive passenger." He has no right to bargain himself with his employer. I suggest, therefore, that the next time a union leader cries "free rider" to the American people he be asked to explain in the same breath the meaning and legislative history of this practice.

Mr. President, what does 14(b) itself say? It says:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State or territory in which such executive or application is prohibited by State law or territorial law.

I quote, Mr. President, from the conference report on the Taft-Hartley law:

> Many States have enacted laws or adopted constitutional provisions to make all forms of compulsory unionism in those States illegal. It was never the intention of the National Labor Relations Act, as is disclosed by the legislative history of that act, to preempt the field in this regard so as to deprive the States of their powers to prevent compulsory unionism. Neither the so-called closed shop proviso in section 8(3) of the existing act nor the union shop and maintenance of membership proviso in section 8(a)(3) of the conference agreement could be said to authorize arrangements of this sort in States where such arrangements were contrary to the State policy. To make certain that there should be no question about this, section 13 was included in the House bill. The conference agreement, in section 14(b), contains a provision having the same effect. (H. Rept. No. 150, 80th Cong., 1st sess., 60.)

Let us also examine what Senator Taft said about 14(b) during the Senate discussion on the conference report:

> I merely wish to make it clear that in the report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to the Senate, we stated that in our opinion there was nothing in the bill as originally reported by the committee which in anyway would invalidate the provisions of a State law prohibiting the closed shop. That statement appears in the committee report to the Senate, on page 6. In it we pointed out that when the National Labor Relations Act was enacted, it was made clear in the report at that time that the proviso in section 8(3) was not intended to override State laws regulating the closed shops.
>
> In other words, the whole spirit of the Wagner Act and its provisions would prohibit a closed shop, because it prohibits discrimination against people who are not members of labor unions. In order to preserve that right and to keep the Wagner Act itself from abolishing the closed shop everywhere, it was necessary to write in this provision (in sec. 8(c) permitting the closed shop). But that did not in any way prohibit the enforcement of State laws which already prohibited closed shops.
>
> That has been the law ever since that time. It was the law of the Senate bill; and in putting in this express provision from the House bill (sec. 14(b)), we in no way change the bill as passed by the Senate of the United States. (93 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 6679.)

Mr. President, by tacit admission the Federal Government was saying to the States that in the field of union membership, Federal law was not supreme. How could it? How can the laws regulating commerce overrun the Bill of

Rights? The Wagner Act recognized this and the Taft-Hartley Act simply restated it in clearer and broader terms. By its own admission the Federal Government was saying that it would be wrong for a union to be able to compel membership. In terms not open to doubt, the Congress was saying that the power of the Federal Government to regulate commerce was subordinate to the power of the States to guarantee the individual rights of the first and fifth amendments. What was really needed then and now was a Federal right-to-work statute which would guarantee organized labor the right to sell its services freely to the American workingman, who would be left free to accept or reject the services on their merits. The Taft-Hartley law, however, left this open to the States alone and 19 States currently are protecting those basic rights of the individual.

The Taft-Hartley law was simply restating the essence of the State laws banning compulsory unionism. It took no right away from labor. Rather it took away, in part at least, an unnecessary and in my opinion an illegal Federal crutch. Did it, Mr. President, deny labor the right to organize or bargain collectively? Did 14(b) take away the ultimate weapon of labor, the strike? Did 14(b) really hamper the growth of the labor movement. No, Mr. President, it did not. We know it did not, labor knows it did not, and the American people know it did not. What Taft-Hartley was saying to labor was a good old American standard: "Freedom had better be the foundation of our labor policy whether you like it or not and you had better get out there and sell your service and your program on its merits. You had better leave a man free at least in those States which will guarantee his freedom, to make a voluntary choice, to exercise some free will in this matter of union membership."

What Congress was saying, Mr. President, was that the pendulum of compulsion had upset the forces of freedom and that the time had now come as it had in 1607, 1776, 1791, 1865, 1890, and 1938—child labor laws finally upheld—to redress the balance in favor of freedom. What the Taft-Hartley law was saying was that we had better start guaranteeing in part at least the freedoms of the first and fifth amendments. Mr. President, is there anything wrong with that? I do not think so. The American people do not think so.

Now, Mr. President, may I give you the views of two Americans, who in their lives as public servants have been very close to the American Labor movement. The first is an American who is currently very much in the national spotlight and one who has just recently helped to achieve a great victory for world peace. Speaking to a group of government labor leaders in 1962 in his capacity as Secretary of Labor, Mr. Arthur Goldberg said:

> In your own organization you have to win acceptance not by an automatic device which brings a new employee into your organization, but you have to win acceptance by your own conduct, your own action, your own wisdom, your own responsibility and your own achievements * * * from my experience representing the trade union movement this is not a handicap, * * * This is a great advantage * * * you have an opportunity to bring into your organization people who come in because they want to come.

If voluntary membership is desirable in government unions why is it not desirable in private unions? Perhaps this debate before the America people will answer that question.

There has been much said by the unions leaders regarding the principle of majority rights. Perhaps it would be well if this subject were openly and honestly discussed. Then maybe the confusion which has surrounded it would no longer be so great. From the beginning our own modern political system, the principle of majority rights has played an important role. James Madison in the 10th Federalist paper examined this problem in great depth. Acknowledging that majorities and factions were necessary and operative in our body politic, he examined the dilemma which the country faced:

> By a faction I understand a number of citizens, whether amount to a majority or a minority of the whole, who are united and actuated by some common impulse of passion or of interest, adverse to the rights of other citizens or the permanent and aggregate interest of the community.
>
> There are two methods of curing the mischiefs of faction: the one, by removing its causes; the other by controlling its effects.
>
> There are again two methods of removing the causes of faction; the one by destroying the liberty which is essential to its existence; the other by giving to every citizen the same opinions, the same passions and the same interests.
>
> It could never be more truly said than of the first remedy, that it was worse than the disease. Liberty is to faction what air is to fire and ailment without which it instantly expires. But it could not be less folly to abolish liberty which is essential to political life because it nourishes faction, than it would be to wish the annihilation of air, which is essential to animal life because it imparts to fire its destructive agency.

It is truly amazing, Mr. President, how accurately James Madison described the present controversy of union membership in the United States.

To Madison the problem was factions, which experience shows can be a minority or a majority, each of which can be motivated by a common passion or interest. Now the labor union leaders are indeed a faction. They are also a minority and even the total union membership in the United States is a small minority of the total population. Now these union leaders have in fact attempted to secure passage of legislation; namely, the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law, which is adverse to the rights of other citizens or the permanent and aggregate interest of the community. Below we shall examine a little more closely what and how these interests and rights will be affected. But first let us examine the basic claims of this minority faction. First they argue that union membership is based upon the time-honored principle of majority rule itself. This is basically true. However, what is never admitted is that this is a situation where majority rule operates in a private environment. Can anyone honestly say that under the circumstance of private majority rule, the majority should continue to bind the minority, to the point of denying a man his job? This, Mr. President, is a vote on membership in a private association. We cannot, therefore, in good conscience and honor permit the majority of workers in a plant to force the minority to join their private association. The Congress can, of course, guarantee the majority the right to associate and organize, but this is the ultimate of its authority. A second question arises of equal importance. Can the Senate, bound to uphold the Constitution, permit a majority of private citizens to deny someone, or the minority, certain public and inalienable rights which, according to article 9 of the Constitution, are not to be abridged even by Congress? Are we as a body of duly elected public servants about to give this liberty destroying power to a private group? Are we about to succumb to a tyranny of the private labor union majority over the minority whose rights are publicly guaranteed? Not if I can help it.

Mr. President, this minority faction, the labor bosses, has through various means, but particularly through the use of union dues as political contributions, extracted from a majority of the Members of Congress, a commitment to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law thereby giving their private majorities a liberty destroying power. For the sake of the people, perhaps this relationship between the minority faction of labor bosses and the majority of Congress should be explained. It is like the old mule. Labor is now demanding a repayment for past election contributions and is also reminding the representatives elected by all the people that future campaign funds would disappear if labor demands are not met. Thus the labor bosses not only carry a carrot, they also carry a whip. Senators have no doubt heard it cracked over the heads of two great Senators already. Now they have no doubt heard some of the proponents of repeal say that the majority of the Members of Congress favor repeal, so why not let the majority vote on the issue and settle the matter? The sad truth is that the majority which voted to repeal in the House did not represent the majority of the people in the United States. The purported majority in the Senate also fails to represent the entire American people. Has this body failed to recognize the wishes of the people? Have we come to the point where we are about to inaugurate "Government of the factions, by the factions, and for the factions?" I want to say in the Senate Chamber today that in this case the only majority will that has any efficacy in this debate is the majority will of the American people. They have wisely and loudly made their views known, and it is ironic that their cause, constitutionally supported and founded on liberty, is being defended by a minority. But right is on our side. The large majority of the American people know that their position on section 14(b) will preserve liberty rather than destroy it. Therefore, we can justly and legally dismiss the demands of a minority of labor bosses and base our position upon the will of the American people, which has been spoken to all who would hear. Loudly and clearly they have told us through letters, telegrams, editorials, columns, and in person that they stand for freedom. Freedom of all Americans to join a union or not to join a union as guaranteed by the Bill of Rights of the U.S. Constitution.

Mr. President, the subject of voluntary unionism is closely tied to several constitutional amendments. Liberty is a major issue in each one, according to Mr. Ashmore:

> Other possible constitutional objections include the 9th, 10th, and 13th amendments. The content of the ninth amendment and its historical background definitely seem to indicate that it was intended to be a protection of individual personal rights as distinguished from public or collective rights. As a recent commentator on that amendment says, "Whenever we lost the distinction between individual liberty and the necessities of the general welfare the virtue of our form of government is lost * * *." But as that same commentator says, this amendment has been largely forgotten and has received no significant interpretation. Based, thus, on present doctrine it could not be used in the context of the Hanson case.

Much has been said by the unions of the power of Congress to regulate national labor policy. In fact many of those in Congress have based their support of repeal of 14(b) on this premise. I have argued that the freedoms of the first amendment take precedence over the commerce power. Mr. Ashmore takes a similar position:

> Although the clear and present danger test may have been watered down somewhat in recent years, nevertheless it does indicate that invasions of first amendment freedoms must be justified on the basis of grave dangers to interests which the state may lawfully protect. Whether those freedoms are given a preferred position or not, it takes a strong case of public necessity in order to uphold an interference. As Mr. Justice Brandeis stated in *Whitney* v. *California*, these freedoms are subject to restriction only "if the particular restriction proposed is required in order to protect the state from destruction or from serious injury, political, economic or moral."

Mr. President, I turn to another distinguished American who is currently serving this Nation in high office. Writing as a university law professor, W. Willard Wirtz, our incumbent Secretary of Labor, eloquently defended individual freedom against the inroads of private power centers in an article in the Louisiana Law Review in 1952:

> Here is no invitation to even the slightest heresy. Powerful private organizations must be recognized, under present circumstances, as having some of the same essentiality to capitalism and democracy as do the agencies of government. But no institution has any significance except as a means to the end of individual satisfactions, and of these we count freedom the greatest, both for itself and for what it, in turn, produces. It is devotion to the basic democratic ideal which demands emphasis today upon the increasing evidence that individual freedom can be either enhanced or destroyed by either public or private group force. Not fear, but caution, comes from the realization that democracy's destruction in other nations has been less a consequence of an incumbent government's tyranny than of some private group's uncontrollable ascendancy.

Then Mr. Wirtz begins to examine the problems posed by private associations and membership therein. His comments regarding freedom, group membership, and the ballot box are particularly noteworthy.

W. Willard Wirtz, Louisiana Law Review, volume 13, 1952–53:

> The American Legion and the Daughters of the American Revolution and the Elks and the Moose are the very embodiment, in our thinking, of our privilege as individuals to choose our own company. It is a basic assumption in American traditions and emotions that any group power other than that which funnels through the public election booths is part of democracy's private functioning—part of the exercise of freedom rather than in any sense a threat to it.

Next, Mr. Wirtz examines the problem of restraint on the part of government and private officials. His views seem to underscore the need of some kind of counterforce to government and private agents.

> More generally, and most basically, this record appears to confirm those doubts, mentioned at the outset, as to whether our concern about the threat of group force to individual freedoms has been broad enough. It seems to emerge as a relatively obvious proposition, not just of logic, but now of actual experience, that the danger of group force does not depend upon whether the agency exercising it is called "government" or a "labor union" or a "corporation," or a "momewrath;" it depends rather upon the degree of counterforce which operates against it. All that we have long recognized about the concentration in "the Government" of power delegated by individuals begins to appear equally true of concentrations of power resulting from similar delegations to any agencies. The question is not who has the power, or whether his use of it is in an exercise of "sovereignty" or of "free enterprise." Private group agents manifest no more self-restraint than do public group agents. The only question, in either case, is what outside restraints are operative. (W. Willard Wirtz, Louisiana Law Review, vol. 13—1952–53.)

Mr. President, if government will not serve as a counterforce to the private agents and groups in our society, what check or balance is there for the labor union? Of course, the finest and most effective would be the right of an employee to withdraw while still retaining his job. This would force the union officials to care and be concerned over the welfare of the individual employee.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stands in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEIF ERICSON DAY AT THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on Saturday I was invited to go to the World's Fair in New York, and particularly to the Danish Pavilion—which pavilion was filled with other Scandinavians at the time—and participate in making the annual Leif Ericson Day Award.

The Leif Ericson Foundation, a nonprofit foundation, gives this award each year to worthy people throughout the world who excel in the pioneering spirit. This is, of course, based upon the fact that Leif Ericson was a great pioneer himself and was the discoverer of America. Several people of Italian descent were present who had some doubts about this.

It so happens that Leif Ericson Day, which was on Saturday, is followed on tomorrow by Christopher Columbus Day. These dates fall rather closely together.

Many years ago the Senator from Washington introduced a resolution, with many cosponsors, to provide for a Leif Ericson Day. The Senate passed that resolution last year. Last Saturday was the first official Leif Ericson Day.

The award was given to Dr. Albert Schweitzer before he died this year. This necessitates that we, at some future time—although the award was publicly announced on Saturday—present the award posthumously. Either his sister or his daughter will come to America at the proper time and accept the award.

An amazing historical discovery has been made since Saturday pertaining in the matter of the discovery of America.

Many historians and others have participated in this discussion over the years. Some sound historical facts have been revealed concerning Leif's two voyages to the United States. Apparently definite proof has now been discovered. This was announced today in this morning's Washington Post and, I suspect, in all the other newspapers throughout the country.

It was pointed out in an article on the first page of this morning's Washington Post that:

> An unknown 15th century monk who could not afford top-grade parchment charted a historical whodunit that has all but wiped Columbus off the map as America's discoverer.
>
> In a fascinating, now-it-can-be-told story, a research was conducted by Yale University and British museum scholars.
>
> This research disclosed the existence of the first pre-Columbian map showing the Western Hemisphere based upon the travels of Leif Ericson.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled, "Leif Ericson Hailed as Discoverer—America of Vikings Shown on Pre-Columbian Map," appearing in this morning's Washington Post be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEIF ERICSON HAILED AS DISCOVERER—AMERICA OF VIKINGS SHOWN ON PRE-COLUMBIAN MAP

(By Howard Simons)

An unknown 15th century monk who could not afford top-grade parchment charted a historical whodunit that has all but wiped Columbus off the map as America's discoverer.

In a fascinating, now-it-can-be-told story, Yale University and British museum scholars yesterday disclosed the existence of the first pre-Columbian map showing the Western Hemisphere. It is based on the travels of the intrepid Leif Ericson.

Ingredients for the incredible tale of the map's existence and discovery include two 11th century Viking explorers; a Papal emissary to the Tartars of Ghengis Khan; an unknown 15th century scribe; three ancient manuscripts; worm holes; and a book dealer in New Haven, Conn. A dash of absurd coincidence completes the recipe.

It was in October 8 years ago that the map's existence came to light. New Haven bookseller Laurence Witten dropped by the Yale University Library to show Scholars Alexander O. Vietor and Thomas E. Marston a new acquisition from "a private collection in Europe."

A slim volume, bound in recent calf, the book contained a hitherto unknown account called the "Tartar Relation," of John de Plano Caprini's mission to the Mongols in 1245–47, and a world map including Iceland, Greenland, and Vinland.

Map and seemingly unrelated text appeared authentic. Yale scholars judged that both were written by the same hand somewhere in the Rhineland about 1440—50 years before Columbus set sail.

Still, there were puzzling features about the volume. Why didn't the worm holes on the map and the "Tartar Relation" match? More disconcerting, how could the scholars account for the statement on the first leaf of the map: "Delineation of the first part, the second part (and) the third part of the Speculum"?

"Mr. Vietor and I believed," relates Marston, "that until these two factors could be satisfactorily explained, the map would remain suspect, no matter how convinced we were of its genuineness."

Six months later Vietor and Marston got their answer in a bizarre act of chance.

In April 1958, Marston received a catalog of manuscripts for sale by a London bookseller. To add to a collection, he went off to cable an order from Bruni't translation of Plutarch's lives of Cicero and Demosthenes.

On his way to place his order, Marston leafed through the catalog again. He spotted a copy of a portion of Vincent of Beauvais' Speculum Historiale, an encyclopedia of world history first published in the early 13th century.

As an afterthought, Marston ordered the Vincent.

Three weeks later two manuscripts arrived in New Haven. Marston invited Witten to examine them. Witten asked if he could borrow the Vincent and Marston readily agreed.

"That evening," says Marston, "I did not return home until after 10 o'clock. I had hardly entered my house when the telephone rang. It was Mr. Witten, very excited. The Vincent manuscript was the key to the puzzle of the map and the Tartar Relation. The hand was the same, the watermarks of the paper were the same; and the wormholes showed that the map had been at the front of the volume and the Tartar Relation at the back."

RELATIONSHIP SWORN

Obvious now was the physical relationship of the three documents. Once they had been bound together; the Vincent Speculum between the map and the account of Carpini's mission to the Mongols. Sometime later, the manuscripts were separated and rebound into the two volumes now in Yale's possession.

This story and the detailed account of 7 years of painstaking research to authenticate and determine the origin of the map are told in a handsome, 291-page book entitled: "The Vinland Map and the Tartar Relation." The book is being put on sale today by Yale University Press—2 days after Leif Ericson Day and on the day before Columbus Day.

The account of scholars Vietor, Marston, R. A. Skelton, and George D. Painter about the map's genesis and its relation to the text—much of it based on educated assumptions—amounts to this:

Between the years 1000 and 1004, Leif Ericson and the lesser known Viking explorer Bjarni Herjolfsson voyaged from Norway to Greenland and then chanced upon America, which they called Vinland. The discovery was recorded in Norse sagas. And though no Norse map charting the discovery ever has been found, it is conceivable that such a map or maps do exist.

CARPINI MISSION

More than 200 years later, in 1245, Pope Innocent IV sent Franciscan Friar Carpini on a diplomatic mission to the Mongols in Asia. On Carpini's return journey he and other members of the mission lectured extensively on their experiences. One of these lectures, by a Friar Benedict, was copied and edited by a C. de Bridia. De Bridia's transcription thus became the original Tartar Relation.

Two hundred years after that, a church council was held in Basel, Switzerland. This important meeting stretched from 1431 to 1449. Church dignitaries from throughout Europe gathered to spread their ideas of intellectual history.

Sometime during the meeting an unheralded monk was assigned the task of copying a world history. He bought some parchment, "definitely second quality, perhaps the best he could afford," and began his task. At times, it was tedious and frustrating. The monk ran into a rough hair that bothered his writing and tried a finer pen. From time to time he used different inks.

His was not an original history. Rather, the monk copied a portion of Vincent's Speculum and the Tartar Relation that had been put together by someone else, perhaps in the 13th century, with the map added in the early 15th century.

RELEVANCE NOTED

How had the three documents originally come together? The most plausible explanation, according to the scholars, is that an early historian saw the relevance between the Tartar Relation and that portion of the Speculum that dealt with Carpini's mission and bound them together.

Then, much later, came the map as a product of a cartographer asked to illustrate the twin accounts of Carpini's mission. What this cartographer did presumably, was to stretch the mid-15th century knowledge and view of the world across his map—from the Asia of Carpini to the America of Leif Ericson.

What happened to the original text and map is not known. The scholars hold forth the prospect that it or even more revealing maps still exist; hidden away in someone's bookshelf as was the Vinland Map and Tartar Relation.

MAP OF "VINLAND"

The map, itself, which will be exhibited at Yale University Library, is done in brown ink on a piece of parchment measuring 11 by 16 inches. Europe is easily recognizable. Africa and Asia are much less so. But it is the upper lefthand area of the map that is most significant.

Here is Iceland, an uncannily accurate representation of Greenland and a large island labeled "Vinland." This is the America discovered by Leif Ericson and Bjarni Herjolfsson, according to the legend on the map. Scholars suggest that the two large river inlets cut into "Vinland" are the Hudson Straits and the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

Together, the Yale and British Museum researchers tried every imaginable way to authenticate the map and text short of subjecting them to modern scientific tests, which would destroy parts of the manuscripts.

BACKS VIKING THEORY

Nonetheless, the scholars are convinced that map and accompanying text are genuine; products of a hand that flourished at least 50 years before Columbus "rediscovered" America. Accordingly, the scholars take the view that the map proves claims of America's discovery by the Vikings.

Moreover, speculation by the scholars raises these possibilities:

That the hypothesis of a 12th century Norse settlement in Vinland now deserves serious consideration and further search.

That Columbus and other early explorers either heard about or saw copies of the Vinland map or similar maps of America based on Norse accounts before embarking for the New World.

Columbus Day may never be the same.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, it is unfortunate that we cannot print the map. However, the map is reproduced in full in this morning's Washington Post and in other newspapers throughout the United States. It shows the voyages of Leif Ericson. Apparently this is now real, definite, and uncontroverted proof of his travels to what we now call the United States of America and the North American Continent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record an address delivered by me on Saturday on the occasion of the annual Leif Ericson Day Award to Dr. Albert Schweitzer. I would not do this for myself. The speech does not mention the Senator from Washington, but does mention Leif Ericson and Dr. Schweitzer and his fine work.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Pioneering for the Future

(By Senator Warren G. Magnuson)

It is a singular honor to have the opportunity to address you on the occasion of the presentation of this fine award to such an outstanding man.

It is altogether fitting and proper that Dr. Albert Schweitzer receive the award that bears the distinguished name of Leif Ericson. Each risked his personal comfort and his personal safety to advance the cause of mankind. Leif Ericson opened new worlds of abundance to burgeoning early man, and he and his followers penetrated to the very midwestern North American frontiers—where my ancestors proudly trace their Viking heritage. Albert Schweitzer lived an example of humanity to his fellowman as he devoted his inestimable talents to bringing Christianity and a modicum of modern medicine to the remote regions of Central Africa.

Dr. Schweitzer was a true pioneer, in every sense of the word. His accomplishments—his findings, his writings, his teachings, and his care for the ill and the infirm, are well known. Whether writing a definitive biography of Bach, or a sensitive portrayal of Christ, his achievements were always memorable. Yet, the glory in which we rejoice is not the achievements themselves, but the contributions to the immortality of all mankind, in theology, medicine and in music. Popular acclaim and public recognition were sedlom Dr. Schweitzer's reward, although they were his for the taking.

It was a further measure of his humanity and humility that he preferred to employ all his energies and his hours to his chosen tasks, which certainly must have been drudgerous, dreary and often discouraging, rather than bask in the applause of other men.

He sought judgment not for himself, but for the fruit of his works. It is that basis upon which we must bestow honor on Dr. Schweitzer.

Still, one might well ask, "Just what did Dr. Schweitzer accomplish in one small leper colony in the middle of a continent across the world from Western civilization? Wasn't it really a waste of a long life of a man who was acknowledged to possess vast abilities?" In the answer to those questions lies the identification of Dr. Albert Schweitzer as a pioneer for the future of humanity. First, we must count as positive achievements the medical relief and the spiritual and cultural guidance he administered to his followers. But his contribution to the immortality of all mankind, which is the essence of true pioneering, is discernible in his example for present and future generations. His dedication of a life that, beyond question, could have produced for him a level of social and material security in the first rank stands as a monument to selflessness and humanity in a world too often characterized by self-service and a total absence of concern for one's fellow man.

I hope his story will be told and retold, so that it may serve as an inspiration for others to follow. He has lighted the way along the path of conviction, of belief that man is capable of compassion unknown in the lower forms of life, as no other person has done within our memory. He is the pioneer who calls to the attention of the timid, of the unconcerned and uncaring, that there is a route through the wilderness of a life devoid of meaning to a greater and extradimensional life that sparkles with purpose and with quality. I hope, and I am certain, that among those who will pause to listen to the story of Albert Schweitzer, there will be some who will reflect, and then will perceive that Dr. Schweitzer realized pinnacles of satisfaction and contentment, in an environment outwardly brutish and primitive, that most of us will never enjoy in our rose-scented, cushionaire drive through life. These incisive listeners will properly regard Dr. Schweitzer as the pioneer who blazed for them the trail of a meaningful life of service, of compassion, and of feeling.

According to Viking legend, and I am proud to claim the heritage of descendants of those brave and fearless Scandinavians, Leif Erikson was a powerful, fierce, and dauntless warrior and adventurer. He was a pioneer in the classic tradition, braving the unknown in boats and under circumstances that would deter ordinary men from confronting perils that were both known and understood. Erickson was fierce; Schweitzer was gentle, Erikson lived the tempestuous life of an adventurer; Schweitzer lived the quiet life of a healer and a teacher, Erikson was motivated by desires for conquest, acquisition, and adventure; Schweitzer sought only to conquer illness and spiritual defects. Yet, they shared an indomitable spirit that made them oblivious to adversity and seemingly insurmountable obstacles. With both Leif Erikson and Dr. Albert Schweitzer the result was the same. Each made it possible, by his life and his example, for mankind to advance. Leif Erikson encouraged further exploration and inhabitation. Of course, the tangible result of that encouragment was the development of the North American Continent.

Dr. Schweitzer has encouraged a commitment to the improvement of the quality of life for mankind everywhere. However, it is up to us to provide the tangible result of Dr. Schweitzer's encouragement.

For, we, too, are pioneers—all of us. Giants like Leif Erikson and Albert Schweitzer have attained the stature of symbols, whose virtues we pursue and strive to attain. In my home city of Seattle a large and handsome statue of Leif Erikson stands at the water's edge and surveys with a steady gaze the incoming waters of the vast Pacific Ocean. In that symbol there is an enthusiasm for and a confidence in what the future will bring, if only we follow the pioneering course.

We Americans are a nation of pioneers. Every elementary school student learns of the hardships and uncertainties our Founding Fathers endured in the Jamestown and Plymouth settlements, how their journey across the sea in search of individual freedom was regarded as folly by the well-placed gentry in the Old World. Truly the pioneering spirit dominated the personalities of those hardy families who clung to life and liberty in the face of hostile natives, unrelenting forces of nature and designing foreign monarchs. Yet they not only survived, but they prospered, and confounded those they left behind with the resiliency and strength of the human spirit.

Then, as their numbers and prosperity increased, strife with heavy-handed rules across the seas induced a bold Declaration on Independence. And again, they were successful, much to the surprise of the rest of the world. That done, they set out to establish a government that dared, in Thomas Jefferson's words, to "let dissenters stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reaon is left free to combat it." Can it be doubted that this was a pioneering venture in popular government? Yet, the descendants of these industrious patriots were not content to live in conditions made by and for an earlier generation, and the westward movement began. No one needs to be reminded of the difficulties, despair, and heartbreak experienced by those who undertook the long and arduous trek across the Mississippi, through the Great Plains fraught with danger from hostile savages and merciless drought, and up and over the formidable Rocky Mountains to the fertile valleys of the Pacific coast. We are as familiar as we are proud of the everyday heroics of these American pioneers of the last century, and the better remembered names: Jim Bowie, Linus Rawlins, W. C. Cody, the Donner party, Fort Laramie, symbolize for us the pioneering spirit that has always been ours.

We Americans unquestionably pioneered the presentation to the world of the age of nuclear physics. Of course, from our present and limited vantage point we often are tempted to regard that pioneering venture as a mixed blessing, presaging an uncertain future. But it is this very uncertainty of the future that emphasizes both our most recent pioneering achievement and our role as pioneers for the future.

I repeat, we are all pioneers. The future is as exciting as it is challenging. In America alone the prospect of growth and change is staggering. A prominent research economist reports that by the year 2000 there will be 150 million more Americans than there are now. Such a population increase will produce a demand for two homes, two schools, two hospitals, etc., for every one we have today. In other words, as President Johnson has said, in the next three decades—decades, not centuries—we will have to build another America. Five times as much electricity as the present production will be required. There will be 244 million cars on our streets and highways, and urban development and highway construction will devour 33 million more acres of land.

Therefore, while we thrill to the explorations of celestial reaches of outer space, and to probes to the darkest depths of the ocean floor, there is much pioneering waiting for us in the social sciences. While present-day pioneers of space must journey far above the earth and far below the surface of the oceans Leif Erikson so daringly crossed, and Albert Schweitzer forsook the more pleasant circumstances of 20th-century civilization for the difficulties of a more primitive existence, many of us daily pioneer from our armchairs, in offices in the commercial world, in academic institutions and research centers, and in legislative halls in Washington, D.C., and across the land.

Massive technological breakthroughs in the physical sciences are reported with breathtaking frequency and rapidity. New uses for computers and refinements in computer technology are continuously contrived. From astrophysics to zoology, the sciences are contributing to man's potential development.

Yet all these pioneering advances in pure science remain to be translated into solid improvement in the lot of the human race by those of us engaged in the social sciences and the humanities. It is what we do with these new and better tools the scientists provide for us that really counts.

Each time a business executive makes a decision relating to a new use or adaptation of automation techniques, he is pioneering in a small way. When a Peace Corps volunteer in Latin America shows a local farmer how to improve his crop and his land through contour plowing, he is pioneering. When a researcher at a great university arrives at a tentative conclusion after observing the effects of air pollutants on a rabbit under controlled conditions, he is pioneering. And each one of them is making a contribution to the future of mankind, in the same manner—if not to the same extent as Leif Erikson and Albert Schweitzer. All of them identify with some facet of the aspirations of man: cultural, social, material, spiritual. The point is, you, too are pioneers in your daily affairs. Although the rugged, heroic individualism in the sense that we think of Leif Erikson no longer characterizes leadership, still the same necessity for an individual dedication and perseverance and determination are crucial to success and progress: In addition to Albert Schweitzer, the names of Dag Hammarskjold and Admiral Rickover quickly come to mind as contemporary pioneers who possess those attributes. To pioneer for the future we must do as these leaders have done, and you are doing in your own ventures, be unafraid to forsake a harbor of security and to embark upon the treacherous seas of the unknown.

Those of us who have devoted our energies to the governing of our vast and growing society like to believe we are sometimes pioneers, too. Many words have been written and spoken about the enormous quantity of important legislation we have enacted in this Congress, and I believe our record is a good one. And you know, we have done a little pioneering in the U.S. Senate Commerce Committee, too—the committee I serve as chairman. This session, for example, we authorized a study of new and revolutionary concepts in high-speed ground transportation, that will perhaps result in the development of a system of rapid transit that will transport large numbers of people up and down the east coast at speeds of up to 400 miles an hour. Also, in this session of Congress, the Senate unanimously passed our bill to make possible the development of new programs and techniques in the exploration of the oceans. Through that action we hope someday in the near future to be able to utilize fully the manifold resources buried in the sea—to use them for the further advancement of mankind. Right now the potential of oceanographic research and employment is barely underway.

Just a few years ago, you may remember the Commerce Committee initiated the action that led to the formation of the Communications Satellite Corp., which has now made possible live television transmission from one continent to another. That certainly was a pioneering step.

Compared with the fundamental issues and questions confronting us in the Congress in the next few years, these present and recent achievements will pale into lesser shades of significance. Although Leif Ericson pioneered for material gain and adventure, and Albert Schweitzer pioneered for physical and spiritual advances, we are pioneering for all the future. And we will need all the help we can get from the business and academic worlds.

Our ancestors came to America and then moved on westward to escape various oppressions, to maintain independence and individuality, and to avoid the pressures of the industrial revolution. We still covet the same values, but the problems seem to be ever-more complex, and we must continually renew our resolve to prevail. Although the environment has changed, and the dangers appear in new and more subtle forms, the individual qualities required for triumph have not changed. The same spark and courage that Leif Ericson had on his perilous voyages must accompany us as we pioneer for the future.

The multitudinous technological breakthroughs that I mentioned earlier demand that we answer new questions about the quality of human life, about relationships between man and man, and man and his environment that never before were ours to control. We must delineate anew the responsibilities of private individuals, the responsibilities of private associations and groups of individuals, and the responsibilities of government. We are forced to fit new and startling concepts into value systems that were constructed long before such scientific developments were ever contemplated. For example, biologists report the day is not far when we will be able to influence the traits and intelligence and personality characteristics of unborn infants, and perhaps even create life itself, artificially. Although our first reaction may be to recoil in horror at the prospect of such a "brave new world," someone must reach some conclusions and establish some guidelines, all within the framework of our reverence for the sanctity of the individual and devotion to democratic principles. Is it for some government agency to prohibit any such further biological experimentation? That would only impose a temporary delay, and be a suppression of truths already discovered. History has amply shown us the futility of attempting, by sovereign order, to close doors science has opened. What, then is the proper approach? Should government, in the name of all the people, assume any role at all? Or should government retire to the sidelines and permit private interests to make all the decisions concerning the very personalities of the next generation of Americans? If government does have a role, what is it? What are the criteria? How do we equate personal freedom of the individual with the ability of a single mortal man to determine what characteristics an unborn person shall have?

Additionally, we are told the future promises us the power to control the weather, and even the climate. Who should decide if we have rain on the Fourth of July? Should it be the National Safety Council, with an eye toward keeping motorists off the highways? Should it be the Congress, with some Members representing constituencies that rely heavily on tourism, with others representing agricultural areas badly in need of rain? Should we refer the question to a national election each week or each month? Or is this an individual decision?

International complications aside, what will we do with the moon once we establish regular passenger and freight service to that curious place? Will it be placed under public ownership, on the theory that public funds provided the means to establish the link, or will we put it up for grabs, like the Oklahoma Territory, to maintain consistency with our principle of private property?

Or, in a more personal sphere, is there a government function in the life of the individual as he finds more and more leisure time available? Is there a public interest in the utilization of the time that has been released to the individual through the progress of automation? Are some decisions we once believed to be reserved for individuals now a matter of public concern?

We must recognize these problems, must face up to them, and must do our best to resolve them. There is no doubt that we are pioneering for the future when we approach any one of these modern, complex issues. Perhaps a resolution of one or more of them will occur when we in Washington decide that we should not participate any further in the particular matter. But that, too, will be pioneering, for we will be affirmatively declaring that this is a matter for determination in the private sector of our society, and is not properly within the jurisdiction of government.

Ladies and gentlemen, the problems Leif Erikson met were difficult, but he succeeded. The problems that Albert Schweitzer faced were difficult, but he succeeded. The problems we all face together are difficult, but, working together, facing decisions in government, and in business, and in academic research and civic activity, we must and will, succeed.

Thank you.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator on having his position sustained by this recent discovery.

The Senator from Washington has made a study of this matter for a number of years, and has written articles to the effect that Leif Ericson had, in fact, discovered the United States.

It appears from the article which the Senator has just caused to have printed in the RECORD that hundreds of years before Columbus is reputed to have discovered America, Leif Ericson had discovered Greenland and sailed from there across a large body of water and discovered an area that he described as Vinland. Apparently no one realized at that time that Vinland was the North American Continent, and that it was thought to be merely a remote place beyond Greenland. Apparently no one grasped the significance of what had been discovered. It was felt that this was perhaps a big island, such as Iceland or Greenland, when, in fact, Leif Ericson had actually made a landing on North America.

The maps, to which the Senator has referred, have apparently been completely authenticated. The writers, writing one or two hundred years before Christopher Columbus discovered America, had actually had maps and discussed the discovery of Vinland by Leif Ericson on his voyages.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Yale and British museum scholars came to the further conclusion that the circulation of this map—and in those days many of the stories were passed by word of mouth—probably led to discussions with other mariners from Portugal and other European countries, who believed that this land did exist. Those people became enthusiastic over hoping that they could find out about it, which they did.

The old Norwegian sagas—and I have read many articles in fine publications such as the Sons of Norway Bulletin, the Order of Vasa, or some such magazine—has been an area of great research. I believe this authenticates the claim for Leif Ericson's discovery when Yale and British museum scholars categorically say that this map is correct. I am sure that they have nailed it down as much as historians can.

There is a great deal of history involved in this.

We talk now about changing weather conditions and the fact that the world weather seems to run in cycles. In those days Greenland was actually green. The first Christian church was established in Greenland by Leif's mother. Leif's father and mother were kicked out of Norway by the king because they were pagans. They finally ended in Iceland. They first fled to Ireland. One can stir up a great argument concerning St. Patrick's Day by suggesting that Leif's grandfather ruled Ireland for some period of time and then was kicked out of Ireland.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, were they related to the O'Murragh clan by any chance?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know. They went to Scotland, and then to Ireland, and then ended up in Greenland, which they explored in almost open boats. Of course, the boats of Columbus were not too seaworthy either, as one can see from examining the replicas. They ended up in Vinland. On the second voyage, according to the sagas, they lived on a part of Long Island. No one knows the location. It could have been Martha's Vineyard. There were a great many wild grapes in the place. That is what the name Vinland comes from. They had trouble with the Indians, as most of those first pioneers did, and finally sailed back again. Because they were not in communication much with Europe, since they had been banned from coming back to Scandinavia, I suppose their maps and accounts encountered difficulty in being communicated throughout Europe.

But everybody is happy now, and reconciled to the fact that Christopher Columbus and Leif Ericson both were the discoverers of America, and John Smith, of course, was its first permanent settler.

We take great pride in those Scandinavians, because they were adventurers. They moved a great deal by sea. They could hardly sit still; they were going all the time. A well-known fact in history is the invasion of what is now Normandy by Scandinavian warriors in boats. The Irish became a little tired of them, apparently, and kicked Olaf the White out. He went to Scotland and had terrific battles there, as was typical.

So I am glad that we have both a Columbus Day and a Leif Ericson Day, and history now seems to be settled, unless the Irish come up with some voyage prior to the time of Leif Ericson, perhaps by some leprechaun who might have come here, stayed a while, and then left; I do not know.

Mr. MURPHY. No doubt the Senator will yield for the suggestion that the consideration now would be to join the Scandinavians with the Spanish and the Italians; and we Irish will join such an association if the others will let us have first place.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Louisiana for placing in proper perspective some of the pages of our country's history. Though I think we have created no history here, I thank the Senators for correcting some erroneous impressions which may exist.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am glad to receive this support, because our next project is to have an appropriate statue of Lief Ericson erected in our Nation's Capital, down by the Potomac.

Mr. FANNIN. I thank the Senator.

WHEAT SALES TO RUSSIA AND EASTERN EUROPE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, for many months I have been doing all in my power to persuade our Government to drop a foolish, self-defeating restriction against the exchange of American wheat for Russian gold. That 2-year-old administration ruling requires that if the Russians or certain other Soviet-bloc countries in Eastern Europe wish to buy our wheat, they must pay premium shipping rates on 50 percent of it by utilizing higher cost American ships. This restriction is applied only to wheat and only to wheat sold to Russia and Eastern Europe. It has the effect of pricing our wheat out of a market that is now netting Canadian wheat farmers and exporters hundreds of millions of dollars a year.

I regard the continuance of this barrier as the most obviously harmful and ridiculous policy now being pursued by our Government. It hurts every American and helps not one single American citizen, except our cartoonists who are beginning to see it as an appropriate theme for biting cartoons. It costs American wheat farmers $200 or $300 million a year in lost sales, it damages our balance-of-payments position to that extent, it costs our taxpayers continued farm storage and farm program costs for surplus wheat that we could otherwise exchange for urgently needed gold, it denies our exporters, our railroad industry, our dockworkers, and others profitable labor. It generates not one dime of business for the maritime unions who are insisting on it. It does permit a handful of maritime labor leaders to demagog on a phony issue. But it gives the maritime workers and their industry 50 percent of nothing since it kills our sales opportunities in Eastern Europe and Russia and therefore, we are shipping no grain to these countries in our ships or in any other ships.

Furthermore, it is a violation of our commercial treaties with 30 nations and of the U.S. Export Control Act. A resolution introduced by Senator Symington and me has led to hearings by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. A majority of that committee has found the restriction to be not only wrong on legal grounds, but harmful to the interests of the United States. Eleven members of the committee signed a letter to the President dated October 7, the basic facts of the letter being supported by other members of the committee, urging that the restriction be dropped, not only on legal grounds, but more significantly because it is in the national interest to drop it.

As the committee's letter to the President put it:

> We are unable to find any evidence that the existence of the 50-percent requirement helps the American merchant marine, the intended beneficiary, or any other segment of our economy. On the contrary, we are convinced that it is a self-defeating device which has hurt the interests of the maritime industry, farmers, and taxpayers. No one benefits from the restriction, yet its existence is a burden on our trade policies generally.
>
> We do not know if the Soviet Union will buy additional wheat from us if the 50-percent requirement is removed. But it is clear that they will not do so as long as they must pay a higher price than that paid by countries not affected by the restriction. Even if additional sales are never made, the regulation should be canceled. Its existence undermines our attempts to get other industrial powers to remove nontariff barriers to trade; it is an unnecessary irritant to many of our major trading partners, such as Germany, Great Britain, and Japan; and it tends to defeat the administration's policy of improving trade relations with the nations of Eastern Europe. It is obvious also that sales of additional wheat would help solve our critical balance-of-payments problem. These and other factors justify a change in policy whether or not additional wheat sales to the Communist countries are likely.
>
> In view of these facts, we recommend strongly that this provision be eliminated.

The letter was signed by Senators J. W. Fulbright, Frank J. Lausche, Mike Mansfield, Eugene J. McCarthy, Stuart Symington, Joseph S. Clark, John Sparkman, Albert Gore, Frank Church, Claiborne Pell, and Frank Carlson.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Foreign Relations,
October 7, 1965.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: The Committee on Foreign Relations has completed 2 full days of hearings on the shipping restriction affecting sales of grain to the Soviet Union and other nations of Eastern Europe. This letter is sent to advise you of the concern of the undersigned members of the committee over the problems created by that restriction.

During the course of the hearings, serious doubts were created as to whether or not the requirement places the United States in violation of the nondiscriminatory shipping clauses in our treaties with some 30 nations. We believe that it violates the spirit, if not the letter, of these treaties. Persuasive legal arguments have also been made that the regulation is not in keeping with the intent of the Congress in enacting section 3(c) of the Export Control Act placing agricultural commodities in a special category for export regulation. We do not think, however, that this issue should be decided on the basis of legal niceties, but on the grounds of whether or not the restriction furthers the national interest.

We are unable to find any evidence that the existence of the 50-percent requirement helps the American merchant marine, the intended beneficiary, or any other segment of our economy. On the contrary, we are convinced that it is a self-defeating device which has hurt the interests of the maritime industry, farmers, and taxpayers. No one benefits from the restriction, yet its existence is a burden on our trade policies generally.

We do not know if the Soviet Union will buy additional wheat from us if the 50-percent requirement is removed. But it is clear that they will not do so as long as they must pay a higher price than that paid by countries not affected by the restriction. Even if additional sales are never made, the regulation should be canceled. Its existence undermines our attempts to get other industrial powers to remove nontariff barriers to trade; it is an unnecessary irritant to many of our major trading partners, such as Germany, Great Britain, and Japan; and it tends to defeat the administration's policy of improving trade relations with the nations of Eastern Europe. It is obvious, also, that sales of additional wheat would help solve our critical balance-of-payments problem. These and other factors justify a change in policy whether or not additional wheat sales to the Communist countries are likely.

In view of these facts, we recommend strongly that this provision be eliminated.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. Fulbright, Frank J. Lausche, Mike Mansfield, Eugene J. McCarthy, Stuart Symington, Joseph S. Clark, John Sparkman, Albert Gore, Frank Church, Claiborne Pell, and Frank Carlson.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I am most grateful for the hearings conducted by Senator Fulbright and the members of his committee on this issue. I commend them for their thoughtful conclusions and ask unanimous consent that the letter of the committee to the President be printed at this point in the Record.

My belief that continuation of the requirement that 50 percent of wheat sold to Russia be carried in U.S. ships is costing the United States tens of millions of dollars in wheat trade is strongly supported by an article in the current Southwestern Miller. The Miller carries an article from New York, reporting on an unexpected address of Party Chief Leonid Brezhnev to the Communist Party Central Committee, indicating that Russia still needs more wheat, and some high-grade wheat, to avoid a bread shortage.

The story confirms an estimate I have cited previously that the Russian shortage is still at least 3 million tons, of 110 million bushels. It is quite probable that the Russian shortage may still be as high as 6 million tons or something over $300 million in potential sales in this current purchasing year. I ask unanimous consent that the Miller article be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

MARITIME LABOR LEADERS DICTATE U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I am a longtime supporter of a strong merchant marine. Furthermore, I believe that in a democracy, spokesmen for our merchant marine industry should properly participate in full and frank public discussion and debate of both foreign policy and domestic issues. I am disturbed, however, by the threat of certain maritime labor unions to go beyond the debate and the exercise of their democratic right to criticize the adoption of certain policies. They are using their union power to subvert American foreign policy—to force their mistaken views on the Nation.

The Washington Post, in an editorial of Tuesday, October 5, called the conduct of the maritime unions "blackmail." The editorial points up an aspect of these maritime union activities which cannot be taken lightly, for here is a challenge to the execution of adopted foreign policy decisions made in the national interest. I ask unanimous consent that the Post editorial be printed in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. **McGOVERN**. Mr. President, the attitude of certain maritime labor leaders on this issue was revealed in a story in the Baltimore Sun of October 6 under the byline of Helen Delich Bentley. Reporting on a recent meeting of a joint maritime labor committee, the article said:

> The joint maritime labor committee, headed by Thomas W. Gleason, president of the AFL–CIO International Longshoremen's Association, went on record to reiterate its original stand that unless American ships are given an equal share of any cargo to Russia, the maritime unions will boycott all such sales.
>
> "We will not deviate from our original position," Gleason told the 15 AFL–CIO international unions and departments present at the emergency session called to discuss both the Russian wheat movement and a Government report aimed at revising American policy.

Mr. President, I believe that it is inconceivable that a group of labor leaders would deliberately set aside American foreign policy decisions merely because they do not happen to like them. I do not think our Government can tolerate such a lack of patriotism. No matter how these labor leaders try to mask their efforts in some kind of anti-Russian position, what they are basically taking is an anti-American position. One is hard pressed to imagine a more unpatriotic act than a deliberate pronouncement of influential labor leaders that their unions will not load wheat to the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe even though our Government has decided officially that it is in our interest to do so.

I do think, Mr. President, that the maritime industry has a legitimate concern about its future economic wellbeing. That is why I have always supported the Cargo Preference Act, which is of great value to our maritime industry. Under the Cargo Preference Act, 50 percent of our food-for-peace shipments are carried in American ships. That is perfectly proper since these shipments represent either gifts or concessional sales of American wheat and other farm commodities. These are not regarded as normal commercial sales and as such, they do not come under the terms of our commercial treaties with other countries. These shipments generate 25 percent of the entire income received by the American merchant fleet. They represent 100 percent of the cargo carried by many of our bulk carrying grain ships. It would be a disastrous blow to the merchant marine if these food-for-peace shipments under the Cargo Preference Act were lost to American industry.

Let me make it very clear that while I do not favor applying the Cargo Preference requirement to normal commercial sales of the kind that are proposed in Eastern Europe and to the Soviet Union, I do favor very strongly continuing the food-for-peace Cargo Preference principle. I have felt for some time, based on conversations with maritime industry leaders, that the real reason labor leaders are opposing the removal of the restriction on sales to the Soviet Union is that they fear this will eventually lead to the loss of the Cargo Preference Act. For that reason, I would like to suggest, as I have previously in private communications, that the administration give assurances to the maritime industry that the Cargo Preference Act will be continued as it relates to food-for-peace shipments. Such assurances should be coupled with an announcement that the administration is dropping the 50-percent shipping requirement on commercial sales to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. This kind of package announcement would provide adequate assurance that the valuable Cargo Preference Act will not be jeopardized by removing the totally worthless 50-percent shipping requirement on Soviet sales.

I strongly urge that some such package announcement be made by the administration at an early date, in the interest of the merchant marine, in the interest of American farmers and taxpayers, in the interest of the U.S. balance-of-payments position, and, indeed, in the interest of a commonsense commercial and foreign policy for the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Miss Bentley's article referred to above be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Oct. 6, 1965]

SHIP POLICY CHANGE HINTED ON WHEAT SALES TO RUSSIA

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

WASHINGTON, October 5.—The White House is seriously considering removal of the American-flag shipping restriction regarding the sale of wheat to Russia, it was learned today from high administration sources.

"This is so even though the President knows that not a bushel will be loaded once the requirement that 50 percent move on American bottoms is lifted," is was said.

About the same time that the White House discussions were revealed, the Joint Maritime Labor Committee—headed by Thomas W. Gleason, president of the AFL–CIO International Longshoremen's Association—went on record to reiterate its original stand that unless American ships are given an equal share of any cargo to Russia, the maritime unions will boycott all such sales.

WE WILL NOT DEVIATE

"We will not deviate from our original position," Gleason told the 15 AFL–CIO international unions and departments present at the emergency session called to discuss both the Russian wheat movement and a Government report aimed at revising American policy.

When the emergency meeting was first called, the AFL–CIO joint committee had intended to concentrate on the Interagency Maritime Task Force report, which it condemned today. However, in the interim, Gleason said he was tipped off that something was about to happen on Russian grain by a telephone call from Washington last night.

EXPECT MOVE IN SENATE

Labor officials today thought there might be a move by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to have the Senate rescind a resolution it had passed nearly 2 years ago calling for the use of American ships in transporting one-half of any wheat sold to Russia.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted last Friday to call for the lifting of the American-flag stipulation. However, as far as could be learned late today, its action has not yet been transmitted to the White House.

Most of the Senate committee members are from States with large agricultural interests all of which are condemning the American merchant marine for wanting to move part of the goods—at a higher rate than foreign ships.

BENEFIT HELD DOUBTFUL

The pressure to lift the 50-percent restriction has been tremendous even though top Government officials and a spokesman for the wheat interests testified before Senate committee, headed by Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, that they did not know whether the Russians would buy a single bushel from the United States if the ship-American restriction was removed.

The State Department also has been applying extreme pressure on the administration to wipe out the 50-percent stipulation.

In testimony before the Fulbright committee last month, Thomas C. Mann, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, stated that policy concerning the Russian wheat movements would be forthcoming soon.

Gleason indicated today that he was having trouble getting his dockers in Duluth, Minn., to load Canadian wheat moving through there aboard Canadian ships bound for Montreal, where the wheat would be reloaded aboard oceangoing vessels, primarily Russian, bound for Communist bloc countries.

Russia purchased 217 million bushels of wheat from Canada August 11 and additional amounts from Australia and Argentina earlier that month. Ever since the American wheat interests have been complaining about and attacking the shipping restriction.

Because American-flag shipping costs are higher, the freight rate aboard American ships ranges from $3 to $7 a ton higher on wheat. Supposedly the higher price makes American wheat undesirable, the agricultural interests contend, while maritime and labor sources argue that the Russians are going to buy wheat from the United States only as a last resort regardless of what the circumstances are.

The joint labor committee was born as a result of the initial boycott against Russian wheat movements in February 1964. All segments of the maritime labor movement have participated in it ever since.

The President's Maritime Advisory Committee also was formed at the same time; its establishment was part of the agreement reached between President Johnson and George Meany, AFL–CIO president, when it was determined that 50 percent of all Russian and Communist agricultural sales then and in the future would move on American-flag ships.

"If we give in on the wheat, then we might as well fold up, because that gave us our start," Gleason declared.

"My people don't want to load anything for Russia anyhow and if they thought the American ships were not benefiting in the least from it, they'd balk regardless.

"The Great Lakes longshoremen feel that some of the Canadian wheat is going to help North Vietnam and Cuba and they don't like being a part of it whatsoever."

Exhibit 1

Hint of Added Russian Wheat Buying Need—Communist Party Chief Tells Central Committee "Improvement" Is Needed To Increase Bread Supply "Qualitatively and Quantitatively"

New York, October 4.—In an unexpected address on the state of the Soviet agricultural economy to the Communist Party's Central Committee last Wednesday, Leonid Brezhnev, party chief, hinted that the wheat Soviet Russia already has bought from Western nations might not be sufficient to prevent a bread shortage and that further purchases would be undertaken.

Mr. Brezhnev told the policymaking committee that the party and the Government "envisage further improvement in supplying the population with bread, both qualitatively and quantitatively."

MIGHT NEED AS MUCH AS IN 1963–64

According to some Moscow observers, the present Government may need to purchase almost as much as the 12 million tons bought from Western sources in 1963–64 under the leadership of Premier Khrushchev. Thus far, Russia has bought about 9 million tons from Western countries for 1965–66 delivery.

"Mr. Brezhnev's statement was a hint that this summer's wheat purchasing efforts had already failed to meet the goal of enough bread for the population during the coming year," said Stuart H. Loory on the staff of the New York Herald Tribune in Moscow.

Because the Khrushchev purchases came rather late in the 1963–64 crop year, shortages of bread did develop during that year. The present Russian leaders began their 1965–66 buying program much earlier in an effort to avoid a similar situation.

BUREAUCRATIC BRAKES ON AGRICULTURE

In his address to the Central Committee, Mr. Brezhnev also criticized bureaucratic inference with agricultural progress in Russia, particularly for giving priority to industrial advances. "The tendency has not been overcome to improve other affairs, to balance the figures at the expense of agriculture, to infringe on the interests of the collective and state farms," he said. "And this happens despite the absolutely clear-cut decisions of the March plenum of the Central Committee."

Exhibit 2

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 5, 1965]

Blackmail on Wheat

In threatening not to load wheat sold to the Soviet Union if the requirement that 50 percent of it be carried in American ships should be lifted, the maritime unions are attempting to blackmail their own Government. The telegram to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee from Thomas W. Gleason, Chairman of the Joint Maritime Labor Committee, is clothed in all sorts of patriotic anti-Communist sentiments. But in fact it amounts to an unconscionable attempt to dictate foreign policy so as to preserve union perquisites.

If the United States were engaged in a total boycott of Communist countries, as Representative Feighan among other advocates, restrictions on grain shipments might make some sense. But this has never been American policy, because we have found nonstrategic trade to be a useful door-opener. At the same time, because of the higher cost of the shipping requirement, we make sure that we can't sell the wheat we are perfectly willing to sell for hard currency. Thus we administer a good stiff uppercut to our own jaw.

This constitutes, really, an ineffective subsidy of the merchant marine and maritime unions at the expense of the wheat producers—and of the balance-of-payments position, which would be improved by dollar exports. It may be technically true that no country has recently expressed interest in American wheat—because of the cost. But there are sizable grain deficits in the Soviet Union and several countries of Eastern Europe. Meanwhile Canada, Mexico, and other grain exporting nations get the market at a time when expanded American trade might be a significant lever.

It is within President Johnson's power to end this artificial requirement imposed by President Kennedy at the behest of the unions during the 1963 wheat deal with Russia. Similar restrictions in another context inhibit the effectiveness of our economic aid to free nations by reducing their purchasing power. If there is reason to subsidize the merchant marine, better ways can be found—and the new maritime policy now under study might offer an opportunity to develop them. For the administration to yield to this blackmail would be to invite every other special interest to put its oar into the conduct of foreign policy.

THE CONNECTICUT RIVER

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the Hartford Times has performed another great public service for Connecticut, New England, and people concerned about preserving and restoring our natural beauty everywhere. On October 5, 1965, the Times published a special 12-page supplement called "The Connecticut—River Going to Waste." The articles and photographs in that section graphically illustrate the tremendous need for action in saving one of the most precious assets of the Northeastern United States—the Connecticut River.

I pay special tribute to Ivan Robinson, the Times reporter who wrote the stories. Mr. Robinson traveled the length of the river, flew over it and interviewed those who know the river, care about it, and have plans to clean it up. He talked to sportsmen, officials of the State and Federal Governments, boaters, and countless others. And out of his experience he has written a compelling account of the history, the potential—and the sad neglect—of the Connecticut River.

I also salute Times photographer Charles Vendetti, whose pictures add so much to the impact of the Connecticut River story. All those who want to restore the Connecticut to its former glory and who want to save the beauty we have left owe a debt of gratitude to the Hartford Times, Editor Robert Lucas, and those who made the Connecticut River special supplement possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of "The Connecticut—River Going to Waste" be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Connecticut—River Going to Waste

(By Ivan Robinson)

(Note.—How dirty is the Connecticut River? Why clean it? What's being done? What must be done? To find the answers, Times Staff Writer Ivan Robinson and Photographer Charles Vendetti traveled the river by boat, walked its banks, scouted it from Long Island Sound to the Canadian border in a low flying airplane. Newsman Robinson talked to a wide cross section of people concerned with the river—officials in Washington and four Connecticut Valley States, conservationists, skindivers, fishermen, boaters, sanitary engineers. The result is this special section, a comprehensive view of the Connecticut River and its pollution problems.)

THREE CENTURIES AFTER BLOCK—A NEED FOR REDISCOVERY

The Connecticut River was 70 million years old when Adrian Block, the Dutch explorer, discovered it in 1614.

On February 2, 1900, a mere 286-year speck later in its lifetime, it had become so polluted and full of disease that Connecticut's State Health Department declared it an "open sewer," unfit to drink from or to swim in, and Hartford stopped using it as a water supply.

At fault: The 368 towns, 3,000 industries, and 1.7 million persons that followed Block's little ship, the *Restless*, into the 400-mile valley.

Also to blame: The frontier philosophy that America's riches were inexhaustible. Natural resources like rivers, forests, and fertile soil were to be exploited until they choked up, petered out or blew away. There were always more next door—up north or out west.

Now the picture has changed. Connecticut and her valley neighbors—Massachusetts, Vermont, and New Hampshire—are taking a harder look at the long untidy river they have been treating as a sewage canal for so long. The reasons are obvious:

The river is a future source of drinking water.

It must meet the needs of a burgeoning population for places to swim, fish, picnic, and go boating.

A clean river will be a big boost to commercial fishermen and shellfish growers.

The river deserves to be cleaned up for its own sake, as natural beauty in our midst.

The Federal Government is ready to step in if the States don't do the job.

It is certain the river will have to be used eventually—experts say in 20 to 35 years—as a drinking water supply. Reliance on upland reservoirs, a Yankee peculiarity, is becoming a worrisome luxury. There won't be enough to go around someday and, despite our druthers, we'll have to start drinking "second-hand" water.

The current 4-year drought and New York City's water panic have spotlighted the problem.

But water famines come and go. The real crisis is in the population boom. About 1,680,000 persons now live in the Connecticut Valley in all four States. By the year 2000, the figure is expected to nearly double to 3,110,000.

Water use will surely more than double. Americans, who already use more water per capita than any other people, are continually buying more heavy-use appliances like air conditioners and dishwashers and building more swimming pools.

The average person in the Hartford area used 50 gallons a day in 1960. By 2000, he will be using and estimated 73. Factories, stores, government buildings, parks, and unmetered users now account for another 69.7 gallons per capita daily. By 2000, their use will total 84.

It will take more water to feed, clothe, entertain and inform the 2000 population, too. It takes 5 gallons to process a gallon of milk, 600,000 gallons to make a ton of synthetic rubber, 2.5 gallons to make a phonograph record and 150 gallons to make a 5-pound Sunday newspaper.

The Hartford Metropolitan District Commission's water supply, which will reach a maximum storage capacity of 60.5 million gallons in 1968, will be unable to meet the demand in 2000. Like others along the Connecticut River, it will undoubtedly be tapping the stream at its door.

The river is a reliable faucet. Its average flow is 11 billion gallons a day. During the lowest flow ever recorded (1,060 cubic feet a second Aug. 28, 1949), it was still delivering 700 million gallons a day past Hartford. The MDC's peak daily demand is 73.5 million gallons, or about 10 percent of that record low flow.

Since most of the water used by homes and industry ends up in a sewer line and back into the river, the effect on the river's level would be negligible.

Other cities have been taking their drinking water from rivers for years out of necessity. Los Angeles pipes it from as far away as the Colorado River and is now looking 800 miles to the north to Washington's Columbia River. Here in the East, Lowell, Mass., has started taking water from the Merrimack River, treating out the pollution from paper mills and upstream cities.

At the moment, the cry for recreational space is more insistent than that for drinking water. Families tired of bucking the traffic to the shore or to the lakes scattered around Hartford want a place near home, like the river, where they can fish or swim.

"Cleaning up the river," said one boatowner, "would be like adding 120 miles to the State's coastline if you count each bank."

The public's feeling against swimming in the river is strong. There's no law against it, just State and local health advisories. But few swim in it.

One of the best beaches on the river, in fact, is a lovely strip of sand in South Glastonbury and its sole occupants are cows, which amble down from a nearby farm, lie in the shade of trees along the bank, wade in up to their ankles and sometimes, health warnings notwithstanding, take a drink.

One longtime Hartford resident said people used to swim by the hundreds on the first sandbar north of the city's Riverside Park until typhoid fever struck some of them in the 1920's.

"That's when the swimming really stopped," he said.

Now at Riverside Park, the no swimming signs are in both English and Spanish and the children swim only in the pool.

A Puerto Rican boy, asked what the "Se Prohibe Nadar" signs means, replied, "No swimming. The river's too dirty."

But some people are forgetting what this boy has learned.

A Windsor Locks father lets his children go swimming near the upper end of the canal, as he did when he was a boy. "I just tell them to keep their mouths shut," he said.

Water skiing, a contact sport, is common downriver from Hartford and swimmers can be seen diving from moored boats, especially in Hamburg Cove and other places below Middletown where the water looks cleaner.

"Five years ago," said David Wiggin, chief sanitary engineer for the State health department, "we didn't seriously consider cleaning the river for swimming again because nobody was interested in swimming there. Now people are getting interested and, whether we want them to or not, they're going into the water."

A new public park has sprung up on the west bank in North Cromwell, made from sand recently dredged from the channel. Upriver, there are riverside parks everywhere. The stretch below Northampton is busy with a large marina and a combination campside and beach. There are boats above every campsite and beach.

Joseph N. Gill, State commissioner of agriculture and natural resources, has estimated that pollution of the Connecticut River is costing this State at least $840,000 a year in recreation dollars, half of it from swimming alone.

His figure is based conservatively on getting a capacity crowd of 140,000 persons on 12 days during the recreation season, paying an average of 50 cents a day for facilities.

"It's a shame," said Bernard W. Chalecki, director of the State boating safety commission, "that a river consisting of half the best waterways in the State is not being used."

Mr. Chalecki said lakes are highly developed and crowded with boats, causing conflicts between boaters and the cottagers who have invested money there for peace and quiet.

"The river, on the other hand, is not populated," he said. "Boats pretty much have it to themselves."

An estimated 5,000 to 7,000 boats now use the river on a good weekend day. Ten years ago, the number was half that. Ten years from now, it is expected to be double.

Most of the boating along the stretch in Connecticut is below Essex, from where a boat can easily get to the sound. When small craft warnings are flying at sea, the river gets even more play.

To meet the demand, the State has built nine public boat launching areas between Old Saybrook and the Enfield Dam to supplement about 30 marinas, town facilities and yachting clubs.

The Enfield Rapids and the shallows north of the Bulkeley Bridge prevent anything except rowboats and canoes from going farther upriver during most of the year. In the spring, when the water is high, some Massachusetts boatowners take their craft down to the sound, using the Windsor Locks Canal to bypass the rapids. They bring them back up in autumn after heavy rains.

Dredging the river to make it navigable all the way to Holyoke Dam would attract even more boats since it would connect its two largest cities on the river, Hartford and Springfield.

The idea, still alive through dormant, has been talked about since the turn of the century.

Bulkeley Bridge, opened in 1907, was designed as a drawbridge, in fact, because the Federal Government felt the river was navigable in theory above Hartford.

The 100-foot steel draw was eliminated at the last minute and a ninth stone arch (the first on the Hartford side) went up in its place. Hartfordites had convinced Washington the draw was a waste of money. Their main argument: Of the 11 bridges between Hartford and Holyoke, only one—a railroad bridge to East Hartford—was a drawbridge and its draw was partly over dry land.

A clean river, besides becoming a highway for pleasure boats and a source of drinking water, would also be an important resource for commercial fishermen and shellfish growers.

Fish, finned or shell, have a tough time surviving in polluted waters. They can't spawn on a riverbed thick with sludge. They can't find the insect larvae and other food that usually lives in clean water. And they suffocate because human waste and other organic material deplete the oxygen in the water in the process of breaking down.

Fish kills occur periodically in the river. They usually happen in hot weather when the water is low, the ratio of pollution high, and the water warm and less oxygenated.

The State board of fisheries and game has the power to haul into court anyone who pollutes the water badly enough to cause fish kills. But, because so many factors may be involved, it doesn't try too often.

One kill wiped out so many fish it was impossible to count them. They lined both sides of the river for miles. The estimate was tens of thousands. No legal action was taken, however, because no one could tell who or what was to blame.

One reason for this stalemate in fighting pollution is the tide. The Connecticut River is affected by Long Island Sound tides all the way to Hartford, where it falls and rises an average of 1.2 feet twice a day. (The range is 3.4 feet at the mouth.)

"Tests have shown," said Cole W. Wilde, the board's chief of fisheries, "that if you throw a cork into the river at any point below Hartford it will drift back and forth seven times before finally staying below that point."

It's difficult, therefore, to tell where fish were killed. The spot where they are first seen belly up can be miles from the pollution.

Salmon and shad were once plentiful in the Connecticut River. Settlers used to catch 40-pound salmon with torch and spear as far upriver as Lancaster, N.H., 300 miles from the sound.

The salmon were so thick, noted one historian, that " a man could walk from bank to bank on their backs if he was wearing snowshoes."

Shad, often called "the poor man's salmon," also were numerous. At one time it was against the law in Connecticut to feed bonded servants the cheap fish more than three times a week.

The small number of salmon and shad today is blamed by pollution foes on the foulness of the river. Mr. Bampton says, however, the decrease results from the many dams that have been built, preventing these anadromous fish from going upriver to spawn. His department has been building fishways to overcome this problem.

The shad run, although smaller than in colonial times, is still substantial. For Connecticut it is a $13-million-a-year industry when you count manpower, boats, and tackle involved. The commercial catch has averaged 98,200 fish a year; the sport catch 27,200.

Amateur shad anglers spend 14,000 man-days a year wetting their lines at Enfield Dam. Most of the sport catch is taken between there and Wilson and between Holyoke Dam and the mouth of the Chicopee.

No fun fishing

Shad now go as far as the dam at Deerfield, thanks to an elevator built for them in 1955 at Holyoke Dam. The elevator carries up 30,000 shad a year.

As for other fish, any kind found in other waters in the State can be found in the Connecticut. These include trout, largemouth and smallmouth bass and great northern pike as well as the more pollution-resistant rough fish like carp, eels and suckers.

Taking a fish from the river is one thing. Eating it is another.

"A fish caught between Middletown and Hartford," said Mr. Wilde, "has a high flavor of petroleum. Cook it and it smells like you are frying gasoline." It is ironic that the Latin name for the kind of shad found in the Connecticut is alosa (shad) sapidissima (tastiest).

Local Tom Sawyers know the score. Wrote a Cromwell fourth grader earlier this year in a letter to the editor about the river: "It is not much fun to go fishing in it because you are never sure what the fish have been eating."

Shellfish, which siphon huge amounts of water through their systems and screen food out of it, are seriously affected by pollution. Shellfish areas are closed off every year by the State health department to prevent people from getting hepatitis, an intestinal disease.

Connecticut oyster growers, who farm about 67,000 acres, transplant their oysters on Long Island for final maturing before market. It takes an oyster about 2 weeks to flush the Connecticut pollution from its system.

The net worth of Connecticut's shellfish crop (both clams and oysters) is $550,000 a year. The emigrant oysters are worth another $1.5 million but are credited to New York's economy.

Saving the river as a future water supply appeals to planners, as a recreational area to boaters and swimmers, as a fishing ground to fishermen, but saving it for its beauty appeals to all. Significantly, "The Long Tidal River," a film about the history and abused beauty of the Connecticut, drew more viewers at the Plaza 7 Arts Festival this summer than a documentary about President Kennedy.

Everyone who has seen the river beyond Hartford's roller coaster highways and equally view-proof bridge railings has a warm feeling for it, highly personal and deeply felt.

The reason may be partly psychological. Man has always been fascinated by water, which is why he builds fountains, vacations at the shore and travels hundreds of miles to see Niagara Falls and why his children run delightedly toward it when they first see it.

The Connecticut is undeniably beautiful meandering through the meadows of Massachusetts or surging into the sea at Old Saybrook. In purer days, travelers extolled it as one of the world's three most beautiful rivers, along with the Rhine and the Hudson. It is a comfortable river, tree-lined, always twisting and turning in surprising ways, seldom treacherous, never too broad to overwhelm. It is the kind of little river the American essayist, Henry Van Dyke, wrote about.

"A river is the most human and companionable of all inanimate things," said Van Dyke. "Little rivers seem to have the indefinable quality that belongs to certain people in the world—the power of drawing attention without courting it, the faculty of exciting interest by their very presence and way of doing things."

Beauty may be antipollutionists' biggest selling point in the fight to clean up the river. The public's need and desire for it is becoming an immeasurable political force which has just started being tapped by President Johnson's Great Society plans, Connecticut's open space program and, more recently, Senator ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF'S campaign to make the river a national parkway.

Herculean task

Hercules, when he had to clean up the huge Augean stables, simply diverted two rivers through them. He didn't have to clean up the rivers afterward. This sort of super-Herculean labor is what the four valley States now face. Among their problems:

Places like Chicopee, Mass. (population 61,550) that still dump all their sewage raw into the river.

Places like Hartford which, as part of a metropolitan sewage district that serves eight towns of about 350,000, gives its sewage only primary treatment, which is 35 to 50 percent effective.

Combination sewers that carry both sewage and storm waters. During rainstorms, when these sewers are roaring full, the treatment plants are bypassed to avoid overtaxing their limited capacities and the whole load goes into the river.

Low river levels in the summer, accentuated by old industrial rights such as those of the Holyoke Water Co., which literally turns off the entire river on weekends.

The abundance of papermills (11 between Northampton and Hartford alone), discharging thousands of tons of fiber waste each day.

Textile and chemical plants streaking the river with dyes and poisonous substances, some so new and complex that no one knows how to treat them.

Pesticides, herbicides, and other agricultural control chemicals, also complex, from the farms that cover about 25 percent of the valley.

Barges and boats discharging human waste and leaking oil and gasoline.

How polluted is the Connecticut River?

"The Long Tidal River," the popular film by conservation-minded businessman Ellsworth Grant, of West Hartford, has given popular currency to the phrase, "the world's most beautifully landscaped cesspool."

William S. Wise, director of the State water resources commission, contends the statement is not based on one iota of fact and has enormous eye and ear appeal for the uninformed. But it's easy for a layman to agree with Mr. Grant.

In the stretch between Hartford and the Massachusetts line, an observer will see many signs of our effluent society—streaks of oil and dye in the river as well as flotsam from riverside dumps, paper and other material of dubious origin, spongy cakes of yellowish grease, strange plastic pellets, and an overall peppering of scum.

In inlets like Wethersfield Cove, he may see men raking up filth that has washed up on the beaches after a rainstorm and he will see algae slime at the waterlines of the 50 or so pleasure boats moored there, a sign of organic matter in the water.

A typical reaction was expressed by a Simsbury man who was on an afternoon cruise with his family on the riverboat *Dolly Madison*. "I don't know how bad it is exactly," he said, leaning over the rail and studying the water, "but I would never let a child of mine go swimming in it."

Those who must go swimming in it, skindivers who recover bodies from the Connecticut River, take every precaution.

Already protected by typhoid and tetanus shots they usually get boosters after working the river. On the job they wear basketball sneakers because, if they don't sink up to their waists in the bottom muck, they are sure to step on tin cans, wire fencing, car parts, refrigerators or oil drums.

After a river search they rush for the showers for a thorough scrubbing—of themselves—to prevent infection, and of their bright orange rubber suits to prevent rot.

Pollution experts, going beyond sight and smell, have drawn up objective yardsticks to measure contamination.

An ABC report-card grading is used by the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission, a group formed in 1947 by interstate compact and made up of the six New England States and New York.

The commission's designations:

From Northampton to the mouth of the Farmington River in Windsor and from Hartford to East Haddam—Class D (good only for sewage and industrial wastes, power, navigation and some industrial uses).

From Northampton to Massachusetts' north boundary, from East Haddam south to the Sound and along the brief stretch between the Farmington River and Hartford—Class C (good for boating, irrigation of crops that must be cooked before eaten, habitat for wildlife and food and game fish, industrial cooling and most industrial uses).

The river has not yet been classified in Vermont and New Hampshire. Indications are it will be class C in the more developed stretch below Lebanon, N.H. Above Lebanon, it will be class B (Good for swimming, irrigation and esthetic value and for drinking if filtered and chlorinated.)

Obviously, most of the pollution is in the class D waters between Northampton and East Haddam The concentration, as a U.S. Public Health Service team found in October 1963, is in the Springfield-Holyoke-Chicopee and Hartford areas.

Sampling along the 62 miles between Hatfield just above Northampton and the Rocky Hill-South Glastonbury ferry 12 miles below Hartford, the team noted sharp increases downstream in coliforms, the rod-shaped bacteria typically found in human waste.

Such bacteria, if they come from a diseased person, can transmit disease to someone else. Organisms that have escaped sewage treatment and found their way into streams, according to one study, have included the bacteria of typhoid, paratyphoid, cholera, salmonellosis, tuberculosis, anthrax and tetanus; all the known viruses including polio, and tape, round, hook and pin worms and blood flukes.

Nowhere did it find the coliform count below 1,000 per 100 milliliters of water (about half a cup), the Connecticut standard for swimming.

The count totaled 31,000 above Northampton, reached a peak of 947,000 where the Chicopee River enters the Connecticut from the east at Chicopee, dropped to 315,000 at the State line and 41,000 above Hartford, then jumped again below Hartford to 162,000.

Noting that the count at the State line was 315 times the swimming standard, the team reported: "Anyone ingesting a single drop of water at this point would have swallowed at least 26 bacteria that originated in excreta that entered the river in Massachusetts."

Sewage from Hartford and East Hartford, given only primary treatment, made conditions farther downriver just as unpleasant.

Below Hartford, the team said, a drop of water contained 33 fecal bacteria, "of which not more than one probably originated in Massachusetts."

Foul bottom

Massachusetts accounted for 63 percent of the bacteria load along the 62-mile reach and Connecticut for 37 percent. Biggest sources: Hartford, 31 percent; Springfield, 20; Holyoke, 13, and Chicopee, 13. Fifteen other towns accounted for the remaining 23 percent, with no one town exceeding 6 percent.

The Connecticut River is also loaded with solids—and not just the silt that makes the Mississippi River "too thick to navigate and too thin to cultivate."

The Public Health Service team discovered that 145,000 pounds a day entered the river in Massachusetts and about half that in Connecticut.

Massachusetts industries accounted for 22,300 pounds. Sources were 10 papermills (46 percent), three syntehtic chemical plants (also 46 percent) and a brewery, a rendering plant and a textile mill. Connecticut's only industrial source, a Windsor Locks papermill, discharged 900 pounds daily.

Organic or decomposable solids giving off gas bubbles and the rotten-egg odor of hydrogen sulfide totaled 63,600 pounds daily. Much of them settled to the bottom and formed a sludge.

"In the areas of major sludge deposits," said the team, "decomposing clumps and rafts of sludge boil to the water surface, buoyed by gas bubbles of decomposition. These unsightly masses decrease the esthetic appeal of the stream below Holyoke and in the vicinity of Springfield."

Such muck cannot support insect larvae and other fish food but sludge worms thrive on it.

The team counted eight sludge worms per square foot on the relatively clean bottom above Northampton, 1,408 at the mouth of the Chicopee, 994 at the State line, 50 above Hartford and 211 below Hartford.

It found only three per square foot below Holyoke. "Conditions in the major sludge deposit were so foul," it observed, "that even the worms could not thrive here."

In short, the team found that nearly two-thirds of the sewered population of 734,265 between Northampton and South Glastonbury might as well have been dumping raw sewage straight into the river.

The pollution in the river was equal to the waste from 412,910 persons in bacteria, 444,600 in suspended solids and 559,010 in biochemical oxygen demand (the amount of oxygen required by organisms to break up organic matter).

More recent, though less comprehensive, measurements of Connecticut River pollution echo the 1963 report. Little, if anything, has changed.

In the face of all this pollution, State agencies are making headway but their work is slow, cumbersome, and often timid.

Their most optimistic forecast is that it will take another 10 years to clean the river—and then only to swimming condition above Holyoke and below East Haddam. The stretch between, passing by Springfield and Hartford, will be good for noncontact recreation like boating.

Of the four valley States, Connecticut is unquestionably the leader in fighting water pollution.

Its first action was in 1886 against Meriden for dumping raw sewage into the Quinnipiac River. This led to construction in 1891 of the State's first treatment plant, a simple sand filter system.

Connecticut courts ruled early against pollution (***Morgan* v. *Danbury*, 1963**), declaring that a property owner along the river had a right to expect clean water and that this right was more important even than a city's need to use a stream for sewage disposal.

One cannot, said the courts, deprive another of his property without compensation "on the plea that the injury to the one would be small and the advantage to the other, or even to the public, would be great."

The general assembly subsequently sent four study groups into the field—in 1897, 1913, 1917, and 1921. They all reported pollution was bad and getting worse. So in 1925, the assembly passed antipollution laws and created a State water commission to administer them. Connecticut became the third State in the country to have such laws, after Rhode Island and Pennsylvania.

At this point, as a result of 40 years of study and court actions, certain fundamentals had been established. As seen by Merwin E. Hupfer, the commission's principal sanitary engineer, they were:

The State has the power to direct treatment by a municipality.

Private riparian rights, even though small, cannot be abused, even for public benefit.

Primary emphasis should be on municipal sewage discharges.

Pollution affects more than public health.

Correction of problems should be systematic, constructive, and reasonable.

The program should protect existing pristine water.

Industrial pollution should also be controlled by the State.

The commission of three men—increased to seven in 1957 when the agency was renamed the Water Resources Commission and took over supervision over flood control, water policy and dams—was given the power to call a polluter to a hearing and, if necessary, order him to correct the pollution and get a court injunction to stop him from polluting. New pollution after 1925 was prohibited unless the commission found it in the public interest to permit it.

Soft sell

Armed with a strong law and backed by enlightened courts, the commission had an attack of benevolent fuddy-duddyism. In its first biennial report, it noted two possible courses:

To rely on the authority conferred by law and, after proper investigation, to issue orders to eliminate specific causes of pollution.

To "attempt by education and personal conference to develop a sentiment calling for correction and, by assistance to and cooperation with both industry and communities, and in bringing about the desired results."

The commission chose the second, which was like David laying down his sling and inviting Goliath to talk things over.

It has spent the last 40 years alternately cajoling and threatening towns and industries, doing research for them on their treatment problems, wrestling with him—first attitudes, trying to pry sewage plants from the bottom of their priority lists, waiting out long delays and trying again.

At the same time, it has tried to get the most possible use out of the river. It has allowed pollution, for example, where it felt a nuisance would not be created or where natural purification should take care of it. The dump on the East Hartford side of the Charter Oak Bridge, which has a permit from the commission to be on the waterline, is an example. So are some new apartments on the bank in Warehouse Point, which received permission this year to discharge partly treated sewage until that community builds a treatment plant.

Commission Director William S. Wise's definition of clean water is "what is practical to get under existing conditions."

The commission has picked up its sling, the hearing process, 61 times since 1925, always as a last resort. (The first time was in 1932.) The hearings resulted in 42 orders against polluters who remained uncooperative—towns in 34 cases, industries in 8. Five orders were appealed—two by towns, three by industries. The commission was upheld in each case.

The persuasion technique has worked of course.

Statewide, 95 percent of all human waste running through sewers from towns and cities is treated and 52 percent of all industrial waste.

On the river, every community provides at least primary treatment except Warehouse Point, which has delayed because half its sewage comes from a State facility, the receiving home for children. The State this year agreed to pay its share and plans are proceeding. Industrial pollution on the river is relatively small and sporadic although it includes disturbing elements such as paper fiber, acids, dyes and, in Middletown, blood and offal from a slaughterhouse.

Of the 59 Connecticut towns in the watershed, 56 either have plants, are planning them or don't need them. The remaining three are Colchester, Avon and Chester, which need them but have not committed themselves to construction.

Persuasion has shown results but it has taken the commission 40 years to get this far. That is a long time, even considering delay caused by the depression, World War II and the Korean war. The commission has just started its "second phase"—getting all towns to build secondary plants and to chlorinate the treated effluent.

Target dates are 1968 for chlorination and 1975 for secondary treatment. This would make the river swimmable below East Haddam and good for boating and other noncontact recreation above.

In Massachusetts, sources of most of the industrial pollution and two-thirds of the human waste contamination in the river, control measures along the Connecticut did not start until 1945. Before then, Massachusetts considered the river, along with the Merrimack, an "industrial stream" only. Its pollution was not banned in Boston.

Of the 99 Massachusetts towns all or partly in the watershed, only 10 had treatment plants in 1945. Now 24 have them and at least 4 others are planning them.

Nine towns are dumping raw sewage into the river and need plants but have no plans for them.

Chicopee, with 61,500 persons, is the biggest offender. It has plans for a $3 million plant at the mouth of the Chicopee River and for $5 million worth of sewers, including interceptors to connect Westover Air Force Base. It failed to get 50 percent Federal aid under the APW (Accelerated Public Works) program for depressed areas because the money ran out.

"Now," said a Massachusetts State official, "Chicopee won't go with 30-percent Federal aid under Public Law 660 (the Water Pollution Control Act of 1956). It's waiting to see if more Federal aid will become available."

"We should be referring Chicopee to the Attorney General," said Worthen H. Taylor, chief sanitary engineer of the State's public health department and head of its antipollution efforts.

Also on the verge of legal action is Westfield (population 26,000), which so far has given only lip service to correcting its pollution. It received a study report from a consulting engineer a year ago, has gone no further.

Athol (population 10,000) is another problem town. It has started new plans for a treatment plant after its old ones became outdated. The six other problem towns, all small, are Orange, Erving, Hatfield, Palmer, Wilbraham, and Templeton.

ACTION UPRIVER

The two large Massachusetts cities of Springfield (population 174,000) and Holyoke (population 53,000) are polluting the river but are taking corrective action. Springfield is studying ways to improve the effectiveness of its two primary plants. Holyoke has completed a primary plant and is planning sewers to pick up waste from 65 percent of its population.

Like Hartford, the big and old Massachusetts cities have their problems with combination sewers. The expensive job of separating these into storm and sanitary pipes is a long way off. As a result, heavy pollution will occur in heavy rains when the sewers are filled and the treatment plants must be bypassed. But, fortunately, this usually occurs in early spring when the river is not used for recreation.

In New Hampshire and Vermont, where the population served by sewers is small and river pollution has never been extensive, control measures on the Connecticut River began even later than in Massachusetts.

The two Upper Valley States started their major effort in 1957, after 30-percent Federal aid (up to $600,000) for building town treatment plants became available under the Water Pollution Control Act.

Unlike Connecticut and Massachusetts, both provide further incentive with State aid. New Hampshire pays 40 percent of a town's cost and Vermont 20 to 45 percent, with more going to poorer towns under a 1965 law. To be fair to towns that already had plants, New Hampshire made its aid retroactive to 1947, the year it passed its first antipollution laws.

As Connecticut has started to do this year (under public act 465, enacted July 1) and

Massachusetts has done since 1961, the Upper Valley States allow local property tax exemption for industrial pollution abatement equipment.

Before 1957, only three Vermont towns had treatment plants, none in the Connecticut River watershed. Less than 5 percent of the sewered population was served. Today, the State has 24 plants serving 73 percent. The only city in the Connecticut River watershed that has a plant, however, is Brattleboro (population 6,355) and its plant is inadequate. Of the other 115 towns in the watershed, 2 others are planning to build plants and 8 need them but have not approved construction.

The only pollution court case pending in Vermont involves a dairy in the Lake Champlain Valley.

R. W. Thieme, director of the State's pollution control agency, the three-man water resources commission, said money has been the big problem. The no-action town represent only 4 percent of the sewered population, he said, and they will probably move now that up to 45 percent State aid is available.

Mr. Thieme believes, however, that some pollution should be allowed since the river's natural purification process can take care of a certain amount.

"Vermont has no coastline," he said, "so industry must have the capacity to use its inland waters. It's either that or we will wind up doing nothing but entertaining tourists."

In New Hampshire, of 94 towns in the watershed 7 have plants and 11 are planning or building them. Eight other towns need plants but have not gone beyond preliminary studies.

William Healy, director of the State's water pollution board, said no legal action has been necessary since Federal aid became available.

"The towns are well acquainted with the need," he said. "The drought has emphasized the need for preserving water quality. So now it's just a matter of timing and priority."

JOBS AHEAD

With neighboring Vermont also focusing its efforts on the Connecticut River now, said Mr. Healy, the waterway should be up to class B standards from Canada to the northern Massachusetts line in 10 years.

To get a clean river by 1975—swimmable everywhere except between Holyoke and East Haddam and possibly a few industrialized areas in Vermont and New Hampshire—the States have three jobs to fulfill:

Optimum sewage treatment. The cost: $90 to $100 million each to Connecticut and Massachusetts, $35 to $50 million each in Vermont and New Hampshire.

Chlorination, which Massachusetts is now doing during the recreation season, May 1 to September 15, and which Connecticut hopes to start doing by 1968.

Constant and forceful pressure on industries to clean up their pollution.

If the States fumble or advance too slowly, the Federal Government is in the background ready to pick up the ball. Washington has become avidly interested in natural resources as a result of the New Frontier and Great Society programs.

Senator Abraham A. Ribicoff's bill to save the Connecticut as a national parkway and recreation area, if passed, is sure to hasten its cleanup as would another bill of his to increase Federal aid for town sewage plants from $100 to $400 million a year.

Washington's big stick, however, is the Muskie bill (S. 4), now up for action in Congress.

The bill, introduced by Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Democrat, of Maine, with Senator Ribicoff among the cosponsors, would strengthen the Federal role in pollution control by taking it away from the Public Health Service, a branch of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and giving it to a new HEW branch answerable directly to the HEW Secretary.

This would be recognition of a view the States have been reluctant to accept—that water pollution is more than a health problem, that it affects welfare as well.

The bill, as passed by the Senate, authorized the HEW secretary to set Federal standards for clean water. The States have opposed this, fearing that Washington will not make allowances for local conditions—that is, the practical need of a town or industry to pollute and a river's ability to absorb this pollution. The House, going along with the States, amended the Federal standards out of the bill and threw it to the compromise committee.

On September 17, the committee recommended passage of a compromise on standards—allowing the setting of Federal standards only if a State does not set its own standards by June 30, 1967, or if a State's standards are not adequate.

State officials, who feel they are doing a good job, would prefer to see Washington provide money but otherwise keep hands off. They subscribe to a statement of the engineers joint council:

"Pollution of water should be regulated at the lowest governmental level adequate for the particular situation. Federal jurisdiction and participation should be limited to the administration of existing laws and to research investigation and guidance upon which sound State laws and local regulations may be based."

"If interstate pacts can't get the States together," said David Wiggin, chief sanitary engineer in Connecticut's State health department, "then we need Federal legislation. But we don't need it every time somebody complains. Let's not insinuate that the program will be lost without the Great White Father in Washington."

Mr. Wise, who joined Connecticut's water resources commission as an associate engineer in 1928 and has been director since it was reorganized in 1957, believes in that agency's stability and has been critical when Washington looked over its shoulder.

Of the 1963 Public Health Service report on pollution in the river, Mr. Wise said:

"It does not represent a balanced picture of the river's condition but purports to show it in the most unfavorable light. It leaves the inference that pollution has robbed the river of all its normal useful purposes.

"It emphasizes recreational uses but it ignores the fact that, in the reach above Hartford, shallow water, exposed riverbed, shoals, topography and physical conditions greatly restrict its use for waterborne recreational activities during most of the recreation season.

"It appears to discount the habits and customs of the large percentage of people in this area who prefer sandy beaches and salt water to muddy riverbeds even if the fresh water is clean.

"It neither presents meager data nor offers criteria in support of its conclusion that the river's condition endangers the health and welfare of the people of Connecticut, nor does it offer any interpretation of that statement.

"It * * * ignores the impractical aspects of controlling the frequent contamination of the river during periods of rain and natural drainage from the many municipalities and agricultural lands located along its banks.

"Finally, the report does not acknowledge the progress that has been made in pollution abatement along the entire river, the activities which are now directed toward accelerating these programs or the policy for achieving the ultimate goal—a river of beauty, utility, and enjoyment."

Mr. Wise advocated continued State control with Federal financial help. "Money," he said, "is the critical need."

"We believe in State authority," said Mr. Taylor in Massachusetts. "We like to take advantage of natural purification. The Federal Government would raise a river to its highest use."

Mr. Thieme, of Vermont, said parts of the Connecticut River should be like the Ruhr Valley, which is often cited as an example of industry and beauty living together.

Francis J. Lariviere, executive secretary of the New England Interstate Pollution Control Commission, feels Federal intervention will mean waste.

"An industry or an individual can do the pollution control job cheaper," he said. "When a State or a Federal agency enters the picture, you get a lot of people just looking over other people's shoulders."

And costs will rise, he said, because technology and construction will not be able to keep up with the outpouring of money from Washington. With jobs for all, competition will disappear and bids will be higher. A study, he said, has shown that bids in the accelerated public works program were 30 percent above normal.

A group of Congressmen opposing Federal standards, led by Representative William C. Cramer, Republican, of Florida, said in a report:

"Standards of water quality are concededly badly needed but should be established by the State and local agencies, which are most familiar with all aspects of the matter in a given locality, including the economic impact of establishing and enforcing stringent standards of water quality."

Furthermore, the group said, authorizing the HEW Secretary to set standards would discourage the States from developing their own plans and standards and it would give a single Federal official the power to establish local zoning measures since he would be controlling use of land in watershed areas.

There are many arguments in favor of Federal power, however.

President Johnson himself proposed it last February 8 to Congress in his message on natural beauty. He urged legislation to "provide, through effective water quality standards, combined with a swift and effective enforcement procedure, a national program to prevent water pollution at its source rather than attempting to cure pollution after it occurs."

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, in a statement before a congressional committee early this year, criticized the traditional State view that some pollution should always be allowed.

"For too long," he said, "even so-called good waste disposal practice has been geared merely to the concept of limiting pollution loads to the assimilation capacity of streams. This is a negative approach. We must begin now to adopt a positive approach to insure clean water."

Senator Ribicoff, champion of the Connecticut River, has emphasized that the States must stop looking at pollution as a limited health and welfare problem with the focus on disease prevention.

"I will say to my good friends in the State agencies," he said here in January at a meeting of fish and game commissioners, "that pollution which prevents a man from fishing or a child from swimming or a teenager from water skiing or a family from going to the beach for a Sunday picnic certainly has affected the welfare of the people of Connecticut and I am pleased to note that the Federal officials agree with that interpretation of the term."

Mr. Ribicoff has also noted that "prospects of Federal action seem to expedite compliance, oftentimes in situations which have dragged through State and local courts for years."

"The complaint about invasion of States rights," said the New York Times in an editorial, "is the rallying cry of the chemical, leather, paper, steel, power and other industrial firms that oppose Federal action because they find it much easier to put pressure on State and local governments."

Murray Stein, HEW's chief enforcement officer in the water pollution field, said in a talk with the Times in his Washington office that the States fear of an insensitive big brother in Washington is baseless.

"Anyone can stop pollution by denying industry and population," he said. "Our challenge is controlling them. We are not dealing with pollution in a vacuum. Our job is to help people. One way to help people is to make sure they have jobs."

Mr. Stein believes each waterway is unique and should be treated that way.

"All we ask," he said, "is that once a State agrees to a standard it should be lived up to. You can't set a 25-mile-an-hour speed limit and let a few people go 45."

Even Mr. RIBICOFF doesn't expect perfection.

"It would be unrealistic," he said, "to expect to restore the river to the pristine condition of bygone days (when Adrian Block sailed it). It would be defeatist, however, not to hope and to work to restore it to a condition that will permit men and women, boys and girls, to find recreation—for many of them release from the pressures of crowded city life."

Increased Federal action, whether the States like it or not, is coming. There is talk in Washington of a "massive" antipollution effort in Congress next year, now that President Johnson has gotten his top priority medicare and civil rights programs.

Bills are already in the works. The Muskie bill is one. The Ribicoff parkway and increased aid bills are others. Also proposed—by Representatives JOHN S. MONAGAN and ROBERT N. GIAIMO, of Connecticut, as well as others—is legislation to increase Federal aid in various ways and to give industries a 3-year tax writeoff on antipollution equipment. The momentum comes from a renewed interest in natural beauty in outdoor recreation, awakened by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

Meanwhile, the pace of State programs is quickening. The evergrowing need for the Connecticut River as a recreational strip, a place of beauty and eventually a water supply is a reality that can no longer be denied. The heavy pollution that now defiles it, everybody realizes, will have to be cleaned up.

This generation, as a result, may be the lucky one that sees the river again as Yale President Timothy Dwight did in the early 1800's. He wrote:

"The purity, salubrity and sweetness of its waters, the frequency and elegance of its meanders, its absolute freedom from all aquatic vegetables, the uncommon and universal beauty of its banks—are objects which no traveler can thoroughly describe and no reader can adequately imagine."

TO THOSE WHO CARE—THE BEAUTIFUL

Seen from a low-flying airplane, the little pond in the northern tip of New Hampshire seems insignificant. Boggy, half full of vegetation, its couple of acres hidden in scrub spruce, it is a puddle misplaced high on a mountainside.

It is the source of the Connecticut River.

Called Fourth Connecticut Lake, the pond is the first accumulation of water that will flow 404 miles through four States—New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts and Connecticut. A drop of rain that falls here eventually ends up in Long Island Sound. A drop that falls 600 feet away, on the north side of the ridgeline that forms the Canadian border ends up in the St. Lawrence and the sea at the heart of Canada's Maritimes.

Fourth Lake is perched on Mount Prospect, 2,600 feet above sea level. It is surrounded by wild, wooded, bear and moose country. At the foot of the mountain is the only building around, a red-roofed customs house flying the Canadian maple leaf.

"Almost the only sound that relieves the monotony of the place," wrote a New Hampshire geologist, "is the croaking of the frogs, and this must be their paradise."

From Fourth Lake, the river—at this point merely a stream a man can straddle—tumbles half a mile to the Third Connecticut Lake, which spreads out at the base of the mountain 500 feet below. It flows on through Second and First Connecticut Lakes and then Lake Francis. From the air, it appears only as a narrow cut in the trees where it links the lakes.

The river bears the mark of man almost from the beginning. Route 3 winds along Third Lake into Canada. There are power dams on Second and First Lakes and Lake Francis. The first community on the river in Pittsburg, N.H., a lumber town whose small white houses stretch out below the Lake Francis dam, 20 miles downstream from the source.

At Pittsburg, the Connecticut stops being a lake connector and becomes a full-formed river. Here, where log drives to Massachusetts were staged as late as 1910, the river gurgles over a rocky bed, ankle deep and 30 feet wide. It has already picked up its characteristic tea color from tannin, the strong dye in the vegetation along its banks.

The river at Pittsburg begins its long, enchanting, winding way to the sea between the Green Mountains of Vermont on the west and the White Mountains of New Hampshire on the east. It will play, as one writer said, the roles of "damsel, vixen, lusty matron and eccentric dowager."

It will go through a watershed of 11,265 miles (twice the size of the State of Connecticut) and through a country that is 67 percent forest, 23 percent farmland, and 10 percent towns, cities, roads, lakes, and rivers. It will spill over some 16 dams on its main route and will pick up water from 16 major and many minor tributaries. The width of its valley will generally run from 20 to 50 miles. The river itself will rarely get wider than 2,000 feet. In the watershed are all or part of 368 towns—94 in New Hampshire, 116 in Vermont, 99 in Massachusetts, and 59 in Connecticut—and about 1.7 million persons.

At West Stewartstown, N.H., 11 miles from Pittsburg, the river takes a sharp bend southward and assumes the grave responsibility of dividing New Hampshire from Vermont. The line runs, not in the middle of the river, but at the waterline on the Vermont side, so anyone wishing to fish on the river must have a New Hampshire permit.

As testimony to the mountainous terrain, the river drops 1,500 feet by the time it reaches West Stewartstown. The descent from here on is gradual—200 feet in 50 miles.

The first industry on the river is New Hampshire's largest, the Groveton Paper Co. in Groveton, about 70 miles from the source. Here, logs jam the river from bank to bank, waiting to be processed into pulp. Two mountains of logs on the shore tower over nearby houses and a tiny covered bridge. Waste taints the river a greenish white.

Twenty miles south of Groveton, the Connecticut swells into a lake behind the upper dam at Fifteen Mile Falls. Power from this and the lower dam lights lamps as far away as Boston. Barnet, at the foot of the falls, was the extreme head of navigation in the early 1800's although the practical limit was Wells River 12 miles downriver.

Between Barnet and Hanover, home of Dartmouth College, the river takes some dramatic turns, sweeping in great oxbows and turning on itself to form shapes that look like pretzels and the longhand "e."

The river is so crooked, an ancient local historian once wrote, that a hunter could "stand in New Hampshire, fire across Vermont and lodge his ball in New Hampshire again."

A few more industries appear on the reach south to the Massachusetts line, mostly on the New Hampshire side—paper and textile mills in the Claremont-Newport area and paper mills and a tannery in Hinsdale.

The first sign of sewage—cigarettes in pools of waste—shows up between Bellows Falls and Brattleboro, just before the river enters Massachusetts at Northfield. Yet, there is attraction here. At Bellows Falls, the loitering stream becomes a foaming torrent in a narrow, rocky channel, rushing and leaping in zigzags to a grand finish 50 feet below. (A historian with a penchant for exaggeration wrote over 150 years ago that the speed and pressure of the water were so great here "between the pinching rocks" that an iron bar could not be forced into it). Brattleboro is where Rudyard Kipling lived for a while and wrote "Captains Courageous."

When it enters Massachusetts, the river is tranquil again. Now in one of its most attractive phases, it turns through lush fields, cleaves a chasm of rock and winds through a quilt of vegetable and shade tobacco farms. At Turners Falls, it plays a joke and actually flows north for a short distance, then settles down to cleave the green-rock gorges of Deerfield and flow by Mount Sugarloaf into the land of the dinosaurs around Northampton (the footprints are still visible).

The river idyll, fairly consistent all the way down from Canada, comes to a stomach-turning halt at Holyoke, which Author William Manchester of Middletown, who followed the river a few years ago, calls the "eyesore of the valley."

"Here," he said, "the river plunges 60 feet and an intricate, century-old system of canals provides power for paper factories which repay the Connecticut River by defiling her waters and blighting her banks with Dickensian tenements."

No far below on the opposite bank, where the Chicopee River enters from the east at Chicopee, the Connecticut gets slugged with its heaviest dose of pollution. Human waste from Chicopee, North Wilbraham, Ludlow and Westover Air Force Base raises the bacteria count to 947,000 per 100 milliliters (half a cup), or 947 times the maximum for swimming. Here also are the most sludge worms, which thrive on organic wastes that have settled to the bottom. Fifty-four percent of all industrial wastes discharged into the river between Northampton and Rocky Hill enter here.

The Connecticut River is virtually a sewage canal from Holyoke to the State line.

It spills over its last fall, the 4-foot Enfield Dam, just after crossing the line, cleans itself a bit along the 5-mile Enfield Rapids thanks to natural purification and dilution from the relatively clean Farmington River, then gets belted again by pollution from the Hockanum River, Hartford and East Hartford.

At Hartford, the river begins to live up to its name, Indian for "long tidal river." Tides here average 1.2 feet between high and low water.

Hartford founder Thomas Hooker is probably whirling in his grave behind Center Church at the way the city has turned its back on the river. In his day, it was the lifeline to the sea and the highway to the frontier up north. Columbus Boulevard, now walled off from the river by dikes and highways, was then a river road connecting Hartford with the other two settlements of Windsor and Wethersfield.

The river was vital to transportation of freight and passengers right up to 1931, when the city of Hartford stopped making overnight trips to New York. Its heyday was in the early 1800's, when 60-foot flatboats negotiated the canals and rapids all the way to

Barnet, Vt. Before the Windsor Locks canal was built in 1829, goods were taken to Warehouse Point at the foot of Enfield Rapids, stored there and eventually taken by wagon to boats above.

Tall-masted vessels stood two and three deep in the Hartford harbor in the days of sail. To the frustration of skippers, a sailing ship took 2 weeks to get from the West Indies to Old Saybrook and another 2 weeks to sail up the winding river to Hartford. Wethersfield, a privateers' nest in the Revolution, became a trade center because the river then looped south there (in what is now Wethersfield Cove), the straw that broke many a captain's back.

From Hartford to Middletown, the river is surprisingly empty of activity. The banks are thick with uninterrupted foliage. Civilization seems far away. But the reason is simple: The banks are low and level and flood danger is high, so construction has been light and most of the land is used for farming.

At Middletown, the river's principal port in the late 1700's, the river gets busy again but does not suffer too much pollution. Middletown treats and chlorinates its sewage. Chances are good the river will become suitable for swimming again below East Haddam.

From Middletown southward, the Connecticut is as lovely as anywhere in its upper reaches. And it has the added appeal of salt marches below Hamburg, where the river becomes briny 7 miles from the sound.

This is the stretch that impressed Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall on his recent river trip in connection with the proposal to make the river a national parkway.

The banks along these last 25 miles of river are full of attractions—the Goodspeed Opera House at Middletown, four shoreline State parks, Gillette Castle high on a hill at East Haddam, a mixture of modern and colonial homes and numerous boat moorings.

Selden Creek, making an island of Selden Neck just below Hudlyme, invites the canoeist or small boat owner to explore its long, narrow channel, which divides marshes from wooded cliffs.

At Old Saybrook, the river completes its long journey and empties into the sea, pouring a daily average of over 11 billion gallons of fresh water into the sound. Because of the Saybrook sandbar, curse of ship captains since colonial days, the Connecticut is unique among rivers in not having a major city at the mouth.

From the little mountainside pond near the Canadian border to Old Saybrook, the river rarely loses its charm. Those who get to know it invariably agree with a historian who wrote in the early 1800's:

"This stream may perhaps with more propriety than any other in the world be named the Beautiful River."

"YOU CAN'T SEE A FOOT IN FRONT DOWN THERE"

Hartford police skindivers know what it's like to swim in the murky, dirty Connecticut River. They go in it to recover bodies, guns, and loot.

"We have to go in," said Lt. Robert Pilon, head of the 13-man team. "The bottom is so covered with debris it's impossible to grapple."

Swimming for them is anything but carefree. They have to worry about disease equipment damage, debris, and turbidity.

The men guard against disease by having typhoid and tetanus shots periodically and, usually, boosters after they have been in the river. Even then, some have gotten sick. The bacteria in the river can also cause dysentery, diarrhea, and other illnesses.

Equipment must be carefully tended. Suits will rot if the algae is not scrubbed off soon enough or thoroughly enough. An air regulator, a vital device which a diver treats like a fine Swiss watch, can be wrecked by the oil that streaks the water.

To protect themselves against debris, the divers wear basketball sneakers and work from boats instead of wading out from shore. If they're lucky, they don't get snagged on the car parts, refrigerators, fencing, tin cans, wire, oil drums, and other junk on the bottom.

The river's turbidity—a tea-colored opaqueness caused partly by vegetation and partly by pollution—defies countermeasures.

"You can't see a foot in front of you down there," Lieutenant Pilon said. "Lights don't help. You have to search by feel."

Training Officer Dennis Hurley said that 5 feet down, a diver can no longer see daylight overhead.

"He has to rely on his bubbles to see which way is up," he said, "but he has to look quick. The bubbles are only visible for about a foot."

Divers always maintain positive buoyancy when they're working in the Connecticut. This enables them to float up if they get into trouble.

In contrast, the diver's train in the No. 5 reservoir in Farmington where a man working on the bottom 50 feet down can be observed from the surface. In a search for bodies in a mica quarry in Cromwell a few years ago divers could see daylight 70 feet overhead and could see 15 feet ahead of them, despite the unreal glitter of myriad specks of mica in the water.

The turbid river hides bodies well.

Two years ago, a boy drowned at Hartford's Riverside Park and disappeared. A diver, taking part in his first search for a body was groping blindly along the bottom muck when his hands suddenly touched the boy. The diver panicked and shot to the surface. Although the location of the body had been pinpointed and other divers went down repeatedly, it could not be found again. Six days later, it came up downriver.

CHEAP SEWAGE TREATMENT

Cities looking for a cheap but efficient way of treating their sewage may find the answer in an ancient resource, coal.

The Rand Development Corp. of Cleveland, seeking new markets for the coal industry, believes it has found an important one in sewage treatment.

The Health, Education, and Welfare Department in Washington thinks it may be a breakthrough, has awarded Rand a $617,000 contract to build a small pilot plant.

"It's the kind of idea that is so simple it could be great," said Murray Stein, HEW's chief enforcement officer in the water pollution field. "It's like the paper clip. You wonder why nobody ever thought of it before."

Activated charcoal has been tried in the past as a final polishing-off agent in the filtering process, Mr. Stein said, but nobody had thought of using it at the beginning.

Basically, Rand's idea is to grind coal down to the graininess of sugar and then filter raw waste through it.

A 1,500-gallon-an-hour plant it has been operating for the last 20 months in Cleveland has removed 80 to 85 percent of organic matter, 90 percent of detergents, 85 percent of phosphates, and 100 percent of odor.

What's more, the coal can still be burned after it has become saturated. A city can thus reduce costs by selling it to powerplants or using it itself.

Rand estimates it will take 5 tons of coal to treat a million gallons of sewage.

The Hartford Metropolitan District's big sewage plant at Brainard Field treats an average of 39 million gallons a day, so would need 195 tons of coal daily.

But the MDC would have no trouble getting rid of the coal. The Hartford Electric Light Co.'s powerplant at South Meadows uses an average of 1,000 tons daily, and its Middletown plant uses 3,000 tons a day. Each plant has equipment to grind the coal down to the graininess of talcum, the consistency at which it is blown into the boilers to be burned.

A Rand official said operation costs have not been figured out yet, but will certainly be less than that for the activated sludge process, a secondary treatment with which the MDC is experimenting as a possibility for its Hartford plant.

The Hartford plant now gives primary treatment—chopping up and removing large material from sewage, taking out grit and settling out the suspended solids. The method is 35 to 50 percent effective in cleaning polluted water.

The most popular form of secondary treatment now—the kind used by the MDC in its new Poquonnock plant—is the trickling filter method. In this treatment, the primary effluent is further cleaned by spraying it through a rotating boom over crushed rock inhabitated by bacteria that oxidize organic matter.

The activated sludge process, and its modifications, contact stabilization and step aeration, oxidize the primary effluent by bubbling air up through it, much as a pump does in a home fish aquarium. They are about 85 percent efficient.

Metcalf & Eddy of Boston, MDC's consultant engineers, have estimated it will cost $7,322,000 to add secondary treatment to the Hartford plant.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR RIBICOFF

I commend the Hartford Times for its concern with the future of the Connecticut River.

As you know so well, the Connecticut River is a priceless heritage—not only for Conecticut but for New England and the Nation. But if future generations are to enjoy its beauty, all of us—public officials at the Federal, State, and local levels, industry, private organizations, and concerned individuals—must work together to clean it up and preserve its scenic splendor.

Cleaning up the river is more than a matter of beauty. In 15 years, the Connecticut River will be one of our most important sources of life-giving water—for drinking, for industry, and for the hundreds of uses of our urban civilization.

Time is running out and, for these reasons, I have moved on two fronts: To establish a Connecticut River National Parkway and Recreation Area; and to quadruple the Federal effort in water pollution control.

I intend to do everything possible to have my bills enacted into law, but it will take public awareness and cooperation to insure that the efforts to save the Connecticut River are successful. I take off my hat to the Hartford Times for the great contribution it is making to the battle.

RECESS TO 12 O'CLOCK NOON TOMORROW

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, we have now reached the time at which the Senator from Utah was authorized by the majority leader to move that the Senate take a recess. Therefore, under the authority given me by the majority leader, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 12, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, October 11 (legislative day of October 1), 1965:

U.S. Marshal

William H. Terrill, of Colorado, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Colorado for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

U.S. Circuit Judge

Wilfred Feinberg, of New York, to be U.S. circuit judge, second circuit, vice Thurgood Marshall.

Associate Judge

Charles W. Halleck, of Maryland, to be associate judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions for the term of 10 years, vice Harry Lee Walker, resigned.

Ambassadors Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary

Hermann F. Eilts, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Franklin H. Williams, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ghana.

William M. Rountree, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of South Africa.

William H. Weathersby, of California, a Foreign Service Reserve officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Sudan, vice William M. Rountree.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, October 11 (legislative day of October 1), 1965:

Interstate Commerce Commission

Charles A. Webb, of Virginia, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1972. (Reappointment.)

Civil Aeronautics Board

Whitney Gilliland, of Iowa, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1971. (Reappointment.)

In the Coast Guard

The nominations beginning Edward L. Bailey to be lieutenant commander, and ending Charles H. Leckrone to be lieutenant commander, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 24, 1965; and

The nominations beginning Frank C. Morgret III to be lieutenant, and ending Stephen L. Richmond to be lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 20, 1965.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Horton Salutes Polish Americans on Pulaski Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, Count Casimir Pulaski came to these shores to serve the cause of freedom by fighting in the American Continental Army commanded by Gen. George Washington. He received an appointment from the Continental Congress as one of Washington's cavalry commanders, and distinguished himself in many engagements with the enemy. While leading an attack to relieve the captured city of Savannah, Ga., he received the wounds from which he later died on October 11, 1779. It is the anniversary of the death from battle wounds of this great American patriot, and this great Pole, Casimir Pulaski, that we observe here in this Chamber.

He fought the Russian domination of Poland, and he fought the British domination of America. It is his memory and his achievement in these causes that we celebrate today on the 186th anniversary of his heroic death.

His military career in America was tragically short. In September of 1777, Pulaski served with Washington at the battle of Brandywine, and fought with great distinction. He commanded the cavalry during the winter of 1777 at Trenton, and later at Flemington. He served with General Wayne in scouting for supplies for the starving troops at Valley Forge.

In March of 1778, Pulaski was asked to organize an independent cavalry corps. He established headquarters at Baltimore from which he was sent to protect American supplies at Egg Harbor, N.J., where his legion was ambushed and defeated because of information given to the British by a deserter. Indian massacres in the Cherry Valley caused Pulaski to be sent to Minisink on the Delaware River. After 3 months there he was ordered to go to the support of General Lincoln in South Carolina.

He arrived at Charleston in May of 1779, and was defeated by the superior forces of General Provost. Joining General Lincoln and the French fleet in their attack on Savannah, he bravely charged the enemy lines at the head of his cavalry, and fell gravely wounded. He was removed to one of the ships of the fleet, the *Wasp,* whose surgeons were unable to help him, and he died on board.

His was a gallant death in the cause of his adopted country, and worthy of remembrance on this day by all Americans, whatever their descent may be. Polish Americans should take special pride in the fact that at the time of the birth of the American Republic a Pole was at the head of an heroic cavalry charge against the enemy of this new country dedicated to liberty. Since those days, Polish Americans have made many contributions to American struggles against tyranny. In so doing they have followed the example set for them and for all Americans by the brave Pulaski.

Americans of Polish descent, like their great hero, Count Casimir Pulaski, have died in the defense of freedom while fighting in the Armed Forces of the United States. During the height of the fighting of World War II, President Roosevelt recognized the extent of the service and sacrifices made by Polish Americans when he told the Polish American Congress in Buffalo on May 28, 1944, that, "All of us are proud of the unsparing efforts of this group of Americans in our war effort, at the front, in our factories, and on our farms."

Some Polish American mothers had as many as 11 sons on active duty at the same time. It is estimated that from 900,000 to 1,000,000 Americans of Polish descent saw active duty in our Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force during the Second World War. Over a hundred Polish American priests served as chaplains. Whether they were on the battlefield or on the home front, Americans of Polish descent served the United States during the war with a full measure of devotion, just as they do today. Then, as now, they were true to the momory of Pulaski.

Mr. Speaker, throughout our land, by Presidential proclamation, and especially in my home State of New York, by gubernatorial proclamation, this day, October 11, is being observed as Pulaski Day. For their pertinence to my remarks and their further tribute to the memory of this great Polish patriot, I am pleased to include the text of President Johnson's and Governor Rockefeller's proclamations.

Proclamation 3665—General Pulaski's Memorial Day, 1965, by the President of the United States of America

Whereas Casimir Pulaski, Polish patriot and valiant defender of freedom, offered his services to the Continental Army during the American War for Independence; and

Whereas Congress acknowledged his brilliant military leadership at Brandywine by awarding him the rank of brigadier general and allowing him to form an independent corps of cavalry and light infantry which won acclaim as Pulaski's Legion; and

Whereas this year marks the 186th anniversary of his death from wounds received while leading a cavalry charge during the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas it is proper that the American people continue to pay grateful tribute to General Pulaski for his heroic sacrifice in freedom's cause, and to the manifold and continuing contributions of Polish Americans in the defense and progress of this Nation;

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate Monday, October 11, 1965, as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and I direct the appropriate Government officials to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on that day. I also invite the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies in honor of the memory of General Pulaski and the noble cause for which he gave his life.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this third day of August in the year of our Lord 1965, and of the Independence of the United States of America the 190th.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

By the President:

Dean Rusk,
Secretary of State.

Proclamation

October 11, 1965, will mark the 186th anniversary of the death of Count Casimir Pulaski, Brigadier General of the Continental Army. Wounded at the Battle of Savannah while leading a cavalry charge, this gallant leader of Poland's fight for independence gave his life in order that America might be free.

If General Pulaski were alive today he would see the Nation he helped to create grown to be the richest and most powerful country in the world. He would expect it to be a haven for those who seek liberty and a champion of those who are oppressed.

Today Poland, the land of General Pulaski's birth, his homeland for which he fought unsuccessfully as head of the Confederation of Bar, is once more under the domination of the foreign power whose shackles he had sought to remove. Pulaski's spirit is still alive in his people here and overseas. Poland was not lost in Pulaski's day. It is not lost today.

On this occasion therefore, in honoring the memory of one of Poland's most illustrious sons, we call upon all who love freedom to remember in their prayers and resolves the gallant people of Poland—still our allies in our efforts to preserve freedom wherever it is found in the world.

New Yorkers of Polish origin quite properly commemorate General Pulaski with parades and other appropriate festivities.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim October 11, 1965, as Pulaski Day in New York State.

Given under my hand and the Privy Seal of the State at the Capitol in the City of Albany this 16th day of September in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-five.

Nelson A. Rockefeller.

By the Governor:
William J. Ronan,
Secretary to the Governor.

Rural Youth in a Changing Environment—A Report by Ruth Cowan Nash, of the National Conference, Sponsored by the National Committee for Children and Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the first national conference on the problems of rural youth in a changing environment was held at Oklahoma State University in Stillwater in 1963.

The objectives were to bring into national focus the complex problems of youth; to understand what causes these problems and to provide suitable answers.

Many of the Nation's top educators participated in this conference, including Dr. Paul A. Miller, president of West Virginia University, and conference cochairman.

Mrs. Ruth Cowan Nash, an able author and also a West Virginian, edited the report of the conference which provided a factual summary. Considerable attention was given to the needs of special groups, including Negro, American Indian, Spanish-American youth and also children of migrant workers. The recommendations of the conference are presented in "Rural Youth in a Changing Environment," and there is also an interesting "Profile of the Rural Juvenile Court Judge," included in the Appendix.

Winthrop Rockefeller, chairman of the conference, in his keynote address stated that he was gratified in the answers of youth relative to self-employment or working for the Government or a large corporation. The individualism of the majority came out when they replied that they would rather be on "their own," and Mr. Rockefeller admired the spunk of this generation. He said:

> Today, young people by and large are literate, intelligent, vibrant with courageous response to life. They are challenged by an educational experience that far exceeds anything which confronted past generations.

Many students from varied backgrounds were interviewed in a study analyzed by Dr. William Osborne, Arkansas State Teachers College. From these interviews came an insight into the thinking of rural youth—their views, fears, challenges, and hopes of the future.

As Dr. Miller stated:

> Rural young people are acquiring skills and work habits to go with them which, to considerable degree, may not relate to aptitude or aspiration; may not be realistic in terms of employment in or out of the rural community, and in fact, may be oriented to jobs or occupations that are obsolescent and disappearing.
>
> This characteristic is rooted in the very complex nature of values in the rural community, in the lagging aspirations of the family, in the quantity and quality of educational and other community services, and in the presence of special features of the community expressed through race, minority groups, and the extent of delinquency and retardation.
>
> Since the rural child is up against the natural reality of family, community, and kinship, we must face the possibility that the range and quality of his visual and verbal impressions, in and out of school, tend to limit his knowledge about alternatives in work as in other fields, to reduce his ability to deal with abstractions and concepts, and to emphasize a probably inward-facing disposition toward change.
>
> If this characterization is correct, we must conclude that rurality exacts the price from its young of relatively less awareness of the nonfarm world.

From this frank discussion, the conference gained an insight into the types of adversities rural youths face.

The postconference activities included reports, one of the foremost being the strengthening of our schools. This is so fundamental to an increased awareness and with the passage of the Higher Education Act of 1965, which was considered in the Senate Subcommittee on Education of which I am an active member, our schools will be strengthened.

Among other suggestions were: First, increasing the awareness of rural youth; second, mobilize the rural community for action; third, initiate and expand related educational programs; fourth, improve programs in guidance and counseling; fifth, expand opportunities for employment; sixth, provide necessary community services; seventh, foster moral and spiritual values; eighth, assist in adjustments to urban living and to conduct appropriate research.

The areas of concern in West Virginia were education, prevention of dropouts, and youth employment, as well as the development of human resources and economic resources. Also needed are ways of extending basic services to remote areas and job training, not for specific skills that may become obsolete, but to train young people to live in an era of change and in urban situations. The latter is being accomplished by the Job Corps centers, exemplified by two now functioning well in West Virginia, and more being planned for our State.

Memorial Dedication to the Late B. Carroll Reece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it was an honor to be present yesterday, October 10, at the memorial dedicated to the late B. Carroll Reece who served the First District of Tennessee so faithfully for more than three decades.

First elected to the 67th Congress, Representative Reece served, except for two short periods, until his death on March 19, 1961. He is well remembered as a dedicated statesman and Republican who also served as National Republican Chairman during 1946–48.

I would like to share with my colleagues the excellent remarks of another outstanding Republican, Jimmy Quillen, who gave the dedication speech. Those of you who served in Congress with Mr. Reece will be especially interested in this fine tribute by our colleague, Mr. Quillen.

> I am indeed honored to have the privilege of being here today and to have this opportunity of participating in the dedication of the B. Carroll Reece Memorial Museum and Archives, a lasting memorial to our beloved friend.
>
> My feelings are so profound because I know that Carroll Reece would be especially pleased to have this building, which is named in his honor, located on the campus of East Tennessee State University and in the district that he loved so well. He was always interested in the growth of East Tennessee State College, as he knew it, and he would have been extremely proud to have known it as a university.

I know, too, that everyone who is here today shares the same pride as I do in the dedication of this living memorial.

It is not only a memorial to Carroll Reece—it is also a tribute to his loving wife and helpmate through all of his trials and tribulations, his successes and his glories, the Honorable Louise G. Reece, who is with us today. It is also a tribute to their lovely daughter, Louise, and their lovely grandchildren, who are also present.

A former university professor himself, Mr. Reece watched closely the developments in American education when he left the college classroom to serve his country and his district in the Halls of Congress. One of his strongest desires was that our educational system would instill in our people those virtues which build strong and noble characters. He insisted that "freedom was for strong men," and that each man must accept the "moral responsibility to be free."

Carroll Reece could well ask and expect the virtues he did of our people because he practiced them so well himself. For he was a man of great faith, of outstanding personal courage, both in war and in peace. He also was a man of great intellect and unquestionable integrity. He had a wonderful sense of humor and there was no bitterness ever in his heart toward those who did not agree with him. If there was ever a gentleman in the truest sense of the word, it was Carroll Reece. The charm of his manner, the warmth of his friendship, and his straightforward character inspired confidence and courage. He gave of himself without reserve and he was unafraid.

If we recall for a moment the inspiring story of his life, we will think first of that large but proud family from which he went forth into the world to become nationally, yes, even internationally known. His life exemplifies that a man from lowly beginnings can attain majestic heights.

One of 13 children, he pursued his education from Watauga Academy to Carson-Newman College, and then on to New York University for the study of law, and to the University of London for advanced study. When he completed his graduate studies, he returned to New York University as an assistant instructor. But his patriotism and loyalty to his country soon drew his path to the U.S. Army.

During World War I, Carroll Reece bravely fought on the front lines for 210 days. Rising from the rank of private to lieutenant, he was appointed to command the 3d Battalion of the 102d Regiment at the very moment in 1918 when the fighting was most intense. He performed so well, so bravely, and with so much soldierlike ability, that he was awarded an extraordinary number of decorations and citations.

Both France and the United States commended him for his "energy, initiative, and military ability of a high order." He was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal, the Purple Heart, and many more. He was personally cited for his bravery by General Pershing and Marshal Petain.

When he returned to civilian life, he became the director of the School of Business Administration of New York University. Later he passed the Tennessee bar. He was also a successful banker and businessman.

But his greatest accomplishments will be those he made as he served our country and the people of the First District as a Member of Congress. His interests were the hopes and desires of his people, for whom he labored for over 40 years—as Congressman and as national chairman of his party. His success and his glory followed from the unselfish way in which he worked for others.

He entered the Congress as the youngest Member of either House, and throughout his long and noble career, he practiced the motto which he proudly displayed on the wall of his office, a motto to challenge us all in every endeavor of life—"Nothing is politically right which is morally wrong."

Mrs. Reece, after serving out the unexpired term of her husband, gave me the motto and I have it proudly hanging on my wall, as a remindful testimony.

One of Mr. Reece's greatest assets was the lovely and wonderful lady he married, Louise Goff, whose father and grandfather served in the U.S. Senate, and who was ever at his side as his stanchest supporter, his gracious hostess, and loving companion. Intensely interested in the political affairs of the Nation, she was for him a wise counselor and devoted wife.

Carroll Reece used to tell me about some of his heroes, the greatest of whom was Andrew Johnson, the 17th President of the United States. During Mr. Reece's last campaign, he told me he was writing a biography of President Andrew Johnson and that he had spent years researching the facts.

Mrs. Reece had this biography, "The Courageous Commoner," published in 1962, and it is truly one of the most interesting biographies of Johnson that I have ever read.

This month his second book, "Peace Through Law," is scheduled to be published.

Carroll Reece was a scholar and he loved the art of politics. But his greatest love was for the people of the first district; his greatest joy was in serving them. I remember when I rode around with Mr. Reece during many of his campaigns. He would point to the hills, or down into the valley, or to the distant mountains, and say: "My friend lives there." He would call his friend by name and tell how he had written him about a problem. Mr. Reece believed that if it was important enough for his friend to write him, it was important enough for him to try to help in every way that he could.

And he did help thousands and thousands of people, not only in the first district, but throughout the country as well.

He was not one to speak of the things he did for others. He did not have to; for the people spoke, and still speak, about the wonderful things that he did.

His love for his people was returned by them many times over. Their love and respect sustained him in his efforts to keep the Nation strong and free, and it led him to ever stand up for their interests, even to the very end. Early in 1961, when he was deathly ill, he left his hospital bed to go to the Capitol for a vote, because the well-being of his people was so important to him. Such devotion to others is rarely seen among us.

On his passing, his colleagues in the House said: "A sturdy oak has fallen," and such was our feeling when the news reached us here in the first district. Yet his memory lingers on in the hearts of all of us.

This museum will perpetuate this memory for generations yet to come. And this perpetuation will be the most fitting honor for B. Carroll Reece, for whatever memorials we dedicate, whatever monuments we erect, none will speak more eloquently than those he built himself in the hearts of men.

Pulaski Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Pulaski Day is significant in the history of the United States and also in the history of civilization. Casimir Pulaski in his career both in his native Poland and as a general in the American Revolution, was a champion of freedom. He fought for the independence and the importance of the individual as a necessary element in the building of a free society.

It was his devotion to liberty which prompted Pulaski to aid in the fight for American independence. It was in fighting an invasion of his homeland that Pulaski gained the military experience which so well served our country in the American Revolution.

Pulaski reflected the spirit of his ancestors and the tradition of liberty which had prevailed in Poland throughout the centuries, despite its domination politically by surrounding enemies. He was unwilling to submit to the yoke of Poland's oppressors.

Still in pursuit of a noble cause, Count Casimir Pulaski left his ill-fated country and came to America. He joined the army of George Washington in 1777. Distinguishing himself in the battle of Brandywine, he was made a brigadier general and chief of cavalry by Congress. He fought at Germantown and in the battles of the winter of 1777–78, sharing the hardships and near desperation of Washington's troops during severe conditions that tested to the utmost the endurance and the devotion of all who survived.

As brigadier general in the American Army, Pulaski raised the mixed corps which came to be known as Pulaski's legion, and with which he defended Charleston, S.C., in May 1779. That fall he was mortally wounded at Savannah, Ga., and died in the service of our country on October 11, of that year.

His gallant, distinguished, and honored part in our fight for independence which our country has continued to enjoy, it was a part in that greater and continuing fight for the freedom of all mankind.

On the 186th anniversary of his death, we honor this great patriot, both for his service to his native Poland and to the United States of America, the Nation for which he gave his life.

Mrs. Helen Delich Bentley Recipient of Council Maritime Service Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I have had occasion before to call to the attention of Members of this body the exceptional work being done by Helen Delich Bentley, maritime editor of the Baltimore Sun, in reporting and assessing activities of the maritime industry.

As was to be expected, her excellent writings have gained recognition far beyond the confines of the great port of Baltimore. On Sunday last Mrs. Bentley was honored by the Maritime Port Council of Greater New York Harbor at its annual dinner at the Americana Hotel where she was the recipient of the council's Maritime Service Award.

I am sure I speak for my associates of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee when I say that Mrs. Bentley is doing an enormous service to America's maritime industry, and to the entire Nation, by her accurate, knowledgeable reports of what the U.S. merchant marine is accomplishing, what our shipping means to the national economy and what irreparable damage could be done to that economy if the ill-conceived proposals that have been put forward lately by the maritime task force and others who fail to understand what a basic need there is for a virile shipping and shipbuilding industry adequate to serve American commerce as well as the defense need of our country in war or emergency.

Turmoil in Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the aftermath of the revolt in Indonesia demonstrates the great complexity of trying to deal with nations in such political turmoil, especially when local Communists are a part of the turmoil.

President Sukarno has been one of the most persistent and acid critics of the United States and particularly of our interest in Asian affairs. While his policies have frequently been in harmony with Communist objectives, he has not seemed to be simply subject to the orders of either Moscow or Peiping.

His power has rested largely on a delicate balance between the Communist forces and the anti-Communist military forces. In the past, if one element seemed to gain in prominence, Sukarno would try to regain a balance by aiding the other side.

The attempted coup, about which facts are still sketchy, was originally supported by the Indonesian Communist Party—PKI. At least six top military commanders were brutally murdered, including the chief of staff of the army, Achmad Yani.

Sukarno disappeared for a brief time, but then announced that he was safe and in command. The military forces, despite the loss of some of their leadership, had put down the revolt. It would seem that Sukarno would be in their debt.

Yet, within a few days, he had a cabinet meeting, following which the Deputy Premier, Subandrio, a strong leftwinger himself, indicated to reporters that there was little rancor at the Communists who had supported the revolt.

To the contrary, the impression was conveyed that Sukarno was impatient with the army for cracking down on the Communists.

It was said that Sukarno sought foremost an atmosphere of calm, in which he would seek political solutions to the problems raised by the attempted revolution.

When asked if the murderers of the generals would be punished, the reply was that Sukarno "does not condone murders" but that "it is a political problem which he will deal with later on."

The question then arises as to whether this answer will satisfy the army officers whose colleagues were slain.

To most people, it is fantastic that a president would be making up to the forces which had supported an effort to overthrow him within 2 weeks of the event. The most obvious explanation is that Sukarno is trying to reestablish the balance which allowed him to remain in power.

Perhaps he was glad to see the army cut down, although recent reports had indicated it was the Communists who were gaining in power.

There have also been many reports about Sukarno's poor health, and some have indicated his health was so bad as to seriously affect his judgment.

The political disputes are heightened by the religious hostility of some to the Moslem dominance in the country, which sometimes is expressed as Communist loyalty.

The United States would have little reason to mourn the passing of Sukarno from power, but we are always led to wonder what might come in his place. It could even be worse. However, reports have come from Indonesia of crowds cheering the United States. It is gratifying to know that, in spite of mountebanks and dictators who seek to stir up their countrymen against us, and in spite of all our own errors, there always seems a residue of good will for us among the common people.

First Monument to Unknown Confederate Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, of course, we are all proud of our congressional districts and the county in which we have lived all of our lives. I am from Obion County, Tenn., with Union City as the county seat. We have the distinction there of erecting the first monument in the Nation to the Unknown Confederate Soldiers.

The monument was dedicated nearly a century ago, some 4 years and 3 months after the War Between the States. It was rededicated last year in Union City. The ceremonial, arranged by Rebel C. Forrester, Jr., and Mrs. Robert W. Wood, was held on March 22, 1964, on a Sunday. The date was 2 days short of the 100th anniversary of Confederate Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest's recapture of Union City from the Federals.

An account of historical first monument to Confederate Unknown Dead was reprinted in the Union City, Tenn., Messenger of March 23, 1964. In part it reads:

> The cemetery was planned to accommodate the Confederate dead buried all over the county, and when it was finished, these bodies were disinterred and reburied there. * * * This (the first) dedication took place 4 years after the Civil War when purses were short but sentiment high.
>
> There are 31 graves in the cemetery, arranged in circular form around the monument, grouped into the four corners. * * * Each grave is marked by a small white headstone.

The date of the dedication of the memorial is definite, prior to any other group monument to Confederate dead. But the date of the erection, before the dedication, has not been established from the last account.

In the survey to find the first Confederate Monument to Unknowns, two organizations assisted, the U.S. Civil War Centennial Commission and the hundred odd Civil War Round Tables of the World. Dr. James I. Robertson, Jr., Executive Director of the U.S. Civil War Centennial Commission carried a request in the Newsletter for information. None of the State directors of centennial commissions reported a monument earlier than that in Union City.

I wrote to all the round tables, as well as the entire membership of the District of Columbia Civil War Round Table. Replies from several States did not reveal any earlier monument to unknown Confederates. The replies on the subject were from:

California: Lt. Col. Willard L. Jones, Sr., USA, retired, and Earl H. Study, APO San Francisco.

District of Columbia: Dr. J. Walter Coleman, staff historian, National Park Service; Senator SAM ERVIN, JR., of North Carolina; E. L. Forrester, the then Representative from Georgia; Victor Gondos, Jr., editor, Military Affairs; Herbert E. Kahler, chief, Division of History and Archeology, National Park Service; Capt. F. Kent Loomis, Acting Director of Naval History; Linda M. Miller, secretary of the Civil War Centennial Commission of the District; the then Representative Fred Schwengel of Iowa; and Gen. U. S. Grant III orally through Elden E. Billings of the Library of Congress.

Florida: Dana B. Johannes, Clearwater.

Maryland: Col. Charles J. Norman and John M. Hardy, Silver Spring.

Mississippi: Dr. William D. McLain, president of the University of Southern Mississippi and adjutant-in-chief of the Sons of Confederate Veterans, Hattiesburg.

North Carolina: John R(ebel) Peacock, High Point.

Ohio: John R. Hood, Jr., and Bob Younger, Dayton.

Pennyslvania: Kittridge A. Wing, superintendent of Gettysbury National Park.

Virginia: J. F. Featherston, sponsor of the Prison Civil War Round Table, Richmond; Charles E. Gage, Falls Church; Capt. O. A. Kneeland, USN, retired, Arlington; Rear Adm. Thomas L. Wattles, USN, retired, Alexandria; Claude S. Williams, Warrenton; and Francis S. Wilshin, superintendent of Manassas Battlefield Park.

West Virginia: Ralph W. Donnelly, Huntington.

The Tennessee Civil War Centennial, Stanley F. Horn, Sr., as chairman and Campbell H. Brown, executive director, issued a "Directory of War Monuments and Memorials in Tennessee." It carries a picture of the Obion County, Union City, monument with these overlines:

> In Confederate cemetery. Inscription reads: "Unknown Confederate Dead."
>
> "Erected through the efforts of the Union City and Obion County citizens.
>
> "Dedicated October 21, 1869."

The Problem of Organized Dog and Cat Stealing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, every day that passes there seems to be more and more attention focused upon the vicious problem of dog and cat stealing all over the United States and their sale to various institutions to use them for experimentation and research.

In connection with this practice, there appeared an article in the Parade magazine of October 10, a Sunday supplement to many newspapers and, here in Washington, a part of the Washington Post, which covers this subject quite thoroughly in the space limit given to the author to comment on this problem.

Under unanimous consent granted to me, I would like to have this story inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I would also like to have, as part of my remarks, the text of my bill (H.R. 10743) included with this article so that the animal lovers across the Nation would be cognizant of the efforts we are taking in Congress to combat this evil.

The material follows:

ANIMAL LOVERS: BEWARE THE PET THIEVES

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Rustlers as vicious as any who ever roamed the Old West are preying on the Nation's pets. Organized dog- and catnaping rings are stealing animals all over the United States and selling them to hospitals and research institutions. They are making millions by bringing heartbreak to children and elderly and lonely people as well. These pet smugglers are also guilty of the most callous cruelty to animals imaginable.

A congressional committee recently heard one dog-and-cat farm in Pennsylvania, described as an animal "Dachau," as horrifying as the notorious Nazi gas-chamber camp. Investigators found 700 dogs jammed into a dozen 10-foot-square pens. One pen contained more than 70 dogs, so closely packed they couldn't even wag their tails for their rescuers. Some 400 cats were crammed into stacked chicken crates. Dead and diseased animals lay among the living.

Worse, pet rustling is subsidized indirectly by the taxpayers. That is why, in recent years, it has blossomed from a penny ante crime to its present astounding proportions. Originally, dogs and cats were stolen to be resold as pets or to be returned for the rewards. But the increasing use of animals in medical research has created a boom market, not only for strays but for any cats and dogs that can be delivered. Few questions are asked and fewer answered once a collar has been removed.

Last year laboratories and hospitals receiving Federal research grants spent between $30 million and $50 million on dogs and cats. More than 1.7 million dogs and 500,000 cats were sold to tax-supported institutions. One Federal agency alone, the Poolesville, Md., Animal Center of the National Institutes of Health, spends more than $100,000 a year on dogs and cats.

With such money in the market, supply is bound to meet the demand. Result—wholesale pet smuggling has been reported in most of the 50 States.

IN GOOD FAITH

Most persons do not dispute the need for animals in medical research. Immense benefits in human health have come from such experiments. When laboratories buy animals for research, they do so in good faith. Many suppliers are also reputable breeders and brokers.

Yet investigators believe the overwhelming majority of the dogs and cats that wind up in medical tests are strayed or stolen pets. Once snatched, they are quickly whisked out of the State to make tracing more difficult. To further confuse the trail, they may change hands a number of times. Most transactions are in cash with no meaningful bills of sale. Identifying tags are immediately removed and destroyed.

Ultimately, the animals wind up at pet auctions. Sometimes dogs and cats are sold by the head, more often by the pound. The going rate is about 10 cents a pound. Puppies and kittens fetch as little as 10 cents apiece.

The rustlers have become increasingly brazen as their profits have zoomed and their smuggling networks have become more elaborate. One mother in Arlington, Va., watched a dognaper get out of his truck, stride boldly into her yard, snatch a pet right out of her small son's arms, then beat it down the highway. Bravely, she gave chase in her car and so harried the dognaper that he finally pulled up and released the puppy.

But the owners of most stolen dogs and cats never see their pets again. A 77-year-old lady in Utah watched helplessly as a dognaper enticed her pet out of her yard. A wheelchair patient last month phoned the New York Humane Association to report the loss of her dog. "Is there nothing you can do?" she pleaded. Elaine Beck, a Columbus, Ohio, dog trainer, recently wrote to the U.S. Humane Society—"We in Columbus are having such a wave of dognaping we are almost desperate."

The rustlers have many ruses. If the coast seems clear, they may simply grab pets off the streets or out of yards. Female dogs are used to entice male dogs into wire cages. Meat scraps and dog candy are also used as bait. A Jacksonville, Fla., rustler painted his truck to look official, complete with the lettering "animal shelter" on the sides. Then, posing as a dogcatcher, he used phony pretexts to take pets from their owners.

Some dealers go from door to door pleading for pets to make needy children happy. No child will ever see these animals; they will die on the operating table if they don't die from starvation and cruelty before they get there. A New York high school teacher, who rustled pets as a profitable sideline, trained his 6-year-old daughter to beg for cats, saying her parents needed them to catch mice on their farm.

KENNEL GIMMICK

Other rustlers operate behind the front of kennelkeepers. They advertise, offering to board pets while their owners are away. The hapless owners, upon their return, are told with many regrets that their pet became unmanageable and escaped, or had to be destroyed as an act of mercy after contracting virulent distemper.

Many successful pet peddlers, with money to bribe, have persuaded keepers of dog pounds, animal shelters and even humane societies to sell them pets under the counter. One dog dealer, who tried to bribe Frank Whelan, superintendent of the Freeport, N.Y., animal shelter, claimed two other Long Island animal shelters were smuggling dogs to him. One had used the bribe money to pay for an addition to his house; the other to build a swimming pool.

But in Whelan, the dog dealer picked the wrong man. Not only was Whelan aware of the cruelty in the illegal pet traffic, but only a few days earlier, a collie from the shelter, Shep, had roused Whelan and his wife in time to pick up their 5-year-old son and escape from their burning apartment building. Shep led them to safety. Pretending to go along with the dealer, Whelan helped to convict him on a charge of commercial bribery.

A veteran Connecticut State detective, who broke up a dognaping ring and recovered a number of stolen pets, declared tersely, "I've worked on every kind of larceny, but dognaping is about the meanest. It's tough for parents to tell a 4-year-old that his dog has been taken."

Can the vicious pet rustling racket, with all its animal and human cruelty, be curbed? And can this be done without depriving medical science of much-needed research animals? A current bill would require all dealers to be licensed and inspected for humane conditions. The Agriculture Department would also set standards for transportation, as it does for other livestock. Dealers would be required to house each animal for 5 days, which, coupled with strict provisions for recording the description and origin of each animal, would at least help owners to recover pets that have disappeared.

A dog is a man's best friend, but there are times when a dog needs a friend.

H.R. 10743

A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to protect the owners of dogs, cats, and other animals from theft of such pets and to prevent the sale or use of stolen dogs, cats, or other animals for purposes of research and experimentation, it is essential to regulate the transportation, purchase, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals by persons or organizations engaged in transporting, buying, or selling them for use in research or experimental purposes.

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "person" includes any individual, partnership, association, or corporation;

(b) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture;

(c) The term "commerce" means commerce between any State, territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia or Puerto Rico, and any place outside thereof; or between points within the same State, territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, but through any place outside thereof;

or within any territory or possession or the District of Columbia.

(d) The term "dog" means any live dogs of the species Canis familiaris for use or intended to be used for research tests or experiments at research facilities.

(e) The term "cat" means any live domestic cat (Felis catus) for use or intended to be used for research, tests, or experiments at research facilities.

(f) The term "animal" means any vertebrate animal.

(g) The term "research facility" means any school, institution, organization, or person that uses or intends to use dogs, cats or other animals in research, tests, or experiments, and that (1) purchases or transports such animals or certain of such animals in commerce or (2) receive any funds from the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof to finance its operations by means of grants, loans, or otherwise.

(h) The term "dealer" means any person who for compensation or profit delivers for transportation, transports, boards, buys or sells dogs, cats, or other animals in commerce for research purposes.

SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful for any research facility to purchase or transport dogs, cats, or other animals in commerce except from a dealer licensed in accordance with this Act.

SEC. 4. It shall be unlawful for any dealer to sell or offer to sell or to transport to any research facility any dog, cat, or other animal to buy, sell, offer to buy or sell, transport or offer for transportation in commerce or to another dealer under this Act any such animal, unless and until such dealer shall have obtained a license from the Secretary in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe pursuant to this Act, and such license shall not have been suspended or revoked.

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall promulgate standards for the humane care of animals by dealers. The term "humane care" shall mean the type of care which a responsible and conscientious owner would ordinarily provide for an animal kept as a household pet to prevent the animal's suffering, sickness, injury, or other discomfort and shall include but not be limited to housing, feeding, watering, handling, sanitation, ventilation, shelter from extremes of weather and temperature, and separation by species, sex, and temperament both in the dealer's facility and in transportation. The sale, offer to buy or sell, transport or offer for transportation in commerce or to another dealer of any sick, injured, unweaned, or pregnant animal is expressly forbidden.

SEC. 6. All dogs and cats delivered for transportation, transported, purchased, or sold in commerce or to research facilities shall be identified by a photograph or by such other humane and painless manner as the Secretary may prescribe.

SEC. 7. Research facilities and dealers shall make and keep for a period of no less than two years such records with respect to their purchase, sale, transportation, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals, as the Secretary may prescribe. Such records shall include a bill of sale for each animal and any collars, tags, or other identifying equipment which accompanied the animals at the time of their acquisition by the dealer. The bill of sale shall contain such information as shall be prescribed by the Secretary. Any bill of sale which is fraudulent or indicates larceny of any animal shall be grounds for prosecution and revocation of license called for in section 14 and for the penalty called for in section 12. Records made and kept by research facilities shall be open to inspection by representatives of the Secretary or to any police officer or agent of any legally constituted law enforcement agency.

SEC. 8. The Secretary shall take such action as he may deem appropriate to encourage the various States of the United States to adopt such laws and to take such action as will promote and effectuate the purposes of this Act and the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with the officials of the various States in effectuating the purposes of this Act and any State legislation on the same subject.

SEC. 9. No dealer shall sell or otherwise dispose of any dog, cat, or other animal within a period of five business days after the acquisition of such animals. Representatives of the Secretary, any police officer or agent of any legally constituted law enforcement agency shall assist any owner of any animal who has reason to believe the animal may be in the possession of a dealer in searching the dealer's premises, after obtaining the proper search warrant from the local authorities in whose jurisdiction the dealer's premises are located.

SEC. 10. Dogs, cats, and other animals shall not be offered for sale or sold in commerce or to a research facility at public auction or by weight; or purchased in commerce or by a research facility at public auction or by weight. No research facility shall purchase any animals except from a licensed dealer.

SEC. 11. The Secretary is authorized and directed to promulgate such rules, regulations and orders as he may deem necessary in order to require compliance with the standards for the humane care of animals called for in section 5 and all other purposes and provisions of this Act. Such rules, regulations, and orders shall be published within a reasonable time after enactment of this Act.

(a) Representatives of the Secretary shall inspect dealer's facilities no less than six times a year to determine whether the standards and other provisions of this Act are being complied with. The Secretary shall also require the regular inspection of transportation of animals by and from dealers to research facilities and may delegate that responsibility to law enforcement officers of the States or to agents of any legally constituted law enforcement agencies.

SEC. 12. Any person who violates any provision of this Act shall, on conviction thereof, be subject to imprisonment for not more than one year or a fine of not more than $10,000 and to the revocation of the license described in section 4 and shall not be eligible for another license under this Act. The penalty created by this section shall be recovered by civil action in the name of the United States in the circuit or district court within the district where the violation may have been committed or the person or corporation resides or carries on business; and it shall be the duty of the United States attorneys to prosecute all violations of this Act reported by the Secretary, or which come to their notice or knowledge by other means.

SEC. 13. When construing or enforcing the provisions of this Act, the act, omission, or failure of any individual acting for or employed by a research facility or a dealer within the scope of his employment or office shall be deemed the act, omission, or failure of such research facility or dealer as well as of such individual.

SEC. 14. If the Secretary has reason to believe that a dealer has violated any provision of this Act or the regulations promulgated thereunder, the Secretary shall suspend such dealer's license temporarily, and, after notice and opportunity for hearing, shall revoke such license if such violation is determined to have occurred. The Secretary shall also suspend temporarily the license of any dealer prosecuted for cruelty under the laws of any of the States for the prevention of cruelty to animals and in the event of a conviction under any of such laws of the States, the Secretary shall revoke the dealer's license.

SEC. 15. If any provisions of this Act or the application of any such provision to any person or circumstances, shall be held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the application of any such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 16. In order to finance the administration of this Act, the Secretary shall charge, assess, and cause to be collected appropriate fees for licenses issued to dealers. All such fees shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 17. EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act shall take effect one hundred and twenty days after enactment.

Leif Erikson Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, official recognition of the magnificent achievement of Leif Erikson finally came last year when the President, acting under the authority of a joint resolution approved by Congress in the 2d session of the 88th Congress, proclaimed October 9, 1964, Leif Erikson Day. The terms of the resolution authorized the issuance of a similar proclamation each year, and therefore one was issued again for this year's Leif Erikson Day.

In the committee hearings that were held last year on the resolution, the evidence relating to Leif Erikson's discovery of the North American Continent was adduced by expert witnesses. Foremost among these was Dr. Helge Ingstad.

For years, Mr. Speaker, scholars have pored over the literary evidence that exists for the discoveries in America by the Norsemen. There have been areas of disagreement, especially concerning the year of Leif Erikson's landing on our continent and the location of that landing here. The location of Leif's Vinland has been fixed by scholarly authorities at various points, but there has been no dispute about the fact that Leif did land at least once on the American continent, and did spend some time here, probably staying over the winter, and returning to Greenland in the spring.

Now we have the corroboration of the recent announcement of the existence of a map of Vinland by two Yale University professors and of recent archeological investigations under the sponsorship of the National Geographic Society conducted in northern Newfoundland. On November 5, 1963, Dr. Helge Ingstad announced the discovery of the ruins of a Viking settlement predating Columbus' voyage to the New World by 500 years. His results were supported by experts of the National Geographic Society, the American Museum of Natural History, and the Smithsonian Institution.

Prior to excavating the site of L'Anse Aux Meadows, a small fishing village near the northern tip of Newfoundland, it was Dr. Ingstad's belief that Leif Erikson's "Vinland" was farther north than the alleged locations in Cape Cod, Mass., or in Rhode Island, places where wild grapes grow, the grapes and vines believed to have been referred to in the name "Vinland." Dr. Ingstad's belief was based on an old map, and on the linguistic research of a distinguished Swedish professor who had asserted that the first syllable of "Vinland" might refer to grass rather than to wild grapes.

Mr. Speaker, the remains of the settlement which Dr. Ingstad found show that it was built like those which have been uncovered in Greenland. It was occupied for only a short time. The proof that the settlement was Viking in origin rests on carbon-dating evidence, together with the nature and details of the structures which Dr. Junius Bird, of the American Museum of Natural History, has said, "clearly cannot be attributed to either the Indians, Eskimos, or later European inhabitants of the area." He also stated his belief that "the settlement is of pre-Columbian Norse origin."

Dr. Henry B. Collins, an anthropologist of the Smithsonian, has stated:

> All of the evidence points to a Norse settlement, and there is no contrary evidence.

The primitive smithy and the deposits of bog iron found at the site also confirm the Viking origin of the settlement. Dr. Collins has pointed out that Eskimos and Indians, both prehistoric and modern, "had no knowledge of extracting iron from the bog deposits." The Vikings did. Collins said that later Europeans never used the technique, and that therefore the inference that the Norsemen had been there was strong indeed.

Mr. Speaker, the Vikings were unexcelled as seafarers. There can be no assertion that it was in any degree unlikely that they made the voyage from their Greenland colonies to the mainland of America because of any lack of seamanship. They often sailed directly over the open ocean from Greenland to Scandinavia, as did Leif Erikson on several occasions. This distance is greater than that from Greenland to New England, and the course covered from Greenland to Scandinavia is through one of the most turbulent bodies of water in the world, the northern reaches of the Atlantic.

Centuries later, the descendants of the Vikings crossed that same Atlantic to America. The contributions to the growth of the United States by the men and women of Scandinavia who came here as immigrants have been immense. Their descendants have continued that great tradition and even improved upon it, at the same time never forgetting how much their greater achievements owe to their forebears' sacrifices, iron will, determination of purpose, keenness of mind, moral fervor, and devotion to God, country, and family. In their achievements they have followed the precedent established for them by their first countryman, Leif Erikson.

I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to acknowledge that I joined with a majority of the Members of Congress who, aware of the great contributions made to our national life by Americans of Scandinavian descent, wished to honor the achievements of this distinguished group by officially observing Leif Erikson Day under the terms of the resolution for which they voted. A long and difficult legislative effort was required before the vote approving the resolution, but with the support of many thousands of Americans, those who were of Scandinavian descent, and those who were not, we won an eventual and deserved success.

Americans of Scandinavian descent, like their great hero, Leif Erikson, were men and women who made their way to the New World despite all hardships and dangers. They shared in the building of our Nation, and bequeathed their traditions to the Scandinavian Americans of the present day. On their own day, on Leif Erikson Day, I salute the industrious, thrifty, law-abiding, dependable, honest, intelligent, warmhearted, and progressive Scandinavian Americans.

Pulaski Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud and happy to be able on this occasion of the 186th anniversary of the death of that great Polish American hero, Casimir Pulaski, to pay tribute to the great achievements in this country of Polish Americans.

The Polish contribution to American life extends back to the time of the earliest voyages of exploration. Poles have participated in every American conflict. They made notable contributions to the American revolutionary effort. At the time of the Civil War there were some 30,000 Poles in the United States. Of this number, 4,000 fought in the Union Army and 1,000 in the Army of the Confederate States. When President Lincoln made his appeal for volunteers, typical of those who responded was General Krzyzanowski, who distinguished himself at the Battles of Cross Keys, Bull Run, Chancellorsville, and Gettysburg. He was appointed the first Governor of Alaska, served in Panama, and died in 1887; in 1938 his remains were transferred to the Arlington National Cemetery. Polish-Americans have fought in the Spanish War, both World Wars, and the Korean War. Their heroism is one of the great parts of the tradition of the Polish people in America.

Pulaski Day will be celebrated throughout the country to honor Casimir Pulaski, a man who was a patriot of Poland and the United States. He fought both Russian and British tyranny. The celebration of this hero's dedication and devotion to the cause of freedom will be fervently observed by Polish Americans across the land, and in those celebrations will be shown the talent for organization that is a characteristic attribute of Polish Americans.

The devotion to the United States and to its institutions felt by Polish Americans is in the tradition of the great Pulaski who came to these shores to serve the cause of freedom in General Washington's Continental Army.

The man whose heroism we celebrate today, was born at Podolia, Poland, on March 4, 1748. As a young man, after acquiring military experience in the guard force of Duke Charles, of Courland, he joined his father, Count Joseph Pulaski, in active rebellion against King Stanislas Augustus. Pulaski's military exploits were heroic, and for a time were successful, but his forces were eventually defeated and scattered, and his family's estates were confiscated.

He fled to Turkey where he tried in vain to persuade the Turkish Government to attack the Russian enemy. He then went to Paris where he met the representatives of revolutionary America, Benjamin Franklin and Silas Deane, who wrote to General Washington in Pulaski's behalf.

Arriving in Philadelphia in the spring of 1777, he joined the Continental Army as a volunteer and distinguished himself at the Battle of Brandywine. Four days after the battle, on September 19, he was appointed a brigadier general by the Continental Congress and given command of the cavalry. He next took part in the Battle of Germantown on October 4, 1777. He then resigned his command, and in a letter to Congress in March 1778, suggested the formation of an independent corps, a suggestion that General Washington approved.

After Pulaski's letter had been read on March 28, 1778, the Continental Congress passed the following resolution:

> *Resolved,* That Count Pulaski retain his rank of brigadier in the Army of the United States, and that he raise and have the command of an independent corps to consist of 68 horse, and 200 foot, the horse to be armed with lances, and the foot equipped in the manner of light infantry; the corps to be raised in such way and composed of such men as General Washington shall think expedient and proper.

This corps, afterward known as Pulaski's Legion, was officered principally by foreigners serving enthusiastically in the American cause. It rendered important service in the southern campaigns of the Revolutionary War.

Pulaski arrived at Charleston in May of 1779, where he was defeated by the superior forces of General Provost. He then joined General Lincoln and the French fleet in their attack on Savannah, bravely charging the enemy lines at the head of his cavalry, and falling gravely wounded. He was removed to one of the ships of the fleet, the *Wasp,* where he died on October 11, 1779.

Pulaski Day, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on October 11, 1965, we observe the 186th anniversary of the death of the gallant young Casimir Pulaski, who took his mortal wound in leading his troops in an attack upon the British at Savannah, Ga. Pulaski is a patriot justly remembered with affectionate admiration, both by Poland and by America, since he devoted his life, his fortune, and his outstanding military talents, first to the the service of his native Poland, and, after tragic defeat in that effort, to the service of the cause of liberty in America. He was consistently, through two glorious careers in his one short life of 31 years, a devoted soldier of liberty. Though he did not live to see the victory of the American cause for which he gave his life, he ranks high among the architects of that victory, and the battle in which he fell was one of the last efforts of the fading British power in America.

Pulaski is rightly remembered today as one of the shining heroes who came voluntarily, from many nations in the old world, to aid the new birth of freedom on our continent. He is remembered, too, as a worthy representative of Poland, and one to whom Americans of Polish descent can look back with pride. Every American shares in the heritage of Pulaski's daring and devotion, and every American owes much to the military skill and organizing genius that Pulaski devoted to the cause of the American Revolution. America will live in glory as long as her people cherish the ideals for which the heroic Pole, Casimir Pulaski, lived and died.

Sugar Act Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, the Sugar Act amendments bill is a terrible one. As written, the bill is obscure and confusing. Once understood—and I confess I have spent a lot of time trying to understand it, even partially—it appears to have almost nothing to recommend it.

In effect, the bill makes sure the American consumer will be forced to pay unnecessarily high prices for sugar, at a time of inflationary pressures and rising food costs.

According to figures I obtained yesterday from the Agriculture Department, the present world price for sugar is around $2.20 per 100 pounds. To this should be added 96 cents per 100-pound charge for duty and freight charges. This makes the operative world price of sugar delivered at American ports around $3.16 per 100 pounds or $63.20 per ton. The present American price—a price subsidized by Government legislation—is $6.85 per 100 pounds or $137 per ton. The per ton differential which the American consumer is forced to pay is $73.80.

In real terms, this means a lot, particularly to the American consumer. A housewife pays 11 cents for a pound of sugar in a store in Detroit but just across the river in Windsor, Canada, she pays only 8 cents. Canada does not go in for legislating high prices for the consumer.

As my distinguished colleague, PAUL FINDLEY, has pointed out, this legislation would impose a terrific burden on the U.S. taxpayer. With a $73.80 per ton price differential between world and subsidized domestic sugar prices, and assuming a 10-million-ton sugar consumption in America in 1966, this bill will cost the American taxpayers $738 million next year.

This bill will authorize the sugar program for 5 years. If prices average out at present levels, this means that the program will cost the American taxpayers nearly $3.7 billion.

The implications of this bill abroad are nearly as disturbing as they are at home. Supposedly, paying foreign producers a subsidized price for sugar brought into America is one way of improving living standards abroad. Proponents of this bill argue that the sugar quota is justified by the "trade, not aid" philosophy.

This may be so, and it may be that American money from sugar purchase finds its way into the pockets of those who really need it. But I doubt it. In foreign countries, most sugar refineries and a substantial part of the land used for growing sugarcane are owned either by large corporations or very wealthy individuals. Some of these corporations are American-owned, which puts the U.S. Government in the uncomfortable position of subsidizing an American company, with a foreign aid justification. Regardless of American corporate involvement, sugar money does not really get down to the peasants; it stays in the hands of the rich, of the oligarchs, and of the big shots. Usually it then finds its way out of the country, into a numbered bank account in Switzerland. If this program really is foreign aid, I would like to see someone explain just how it aids those who really need it.

As presently written, this bill continues the American quota for Haiti at the same levels set in the past. If we assume a total American sugar consumption of 10 million tons, Haiti's quota under this bill would be 32,603 tons. At the $73.80 per ton price differential, this bill would subsidize the Haitian economy to the tune of $2,406,101.40.

Over $2 million subsidy to a dictatorship. Although not all this money may wind up in the tills of the Duvalier government, it certainly helps it out. Mr. Speaker, it seems curious to me that innocent American children, as they lick their artificially high-priced lollypops, may well be subsidizing the witch-doctor dictator of Haiti.

Mr. Speaker, all these things stem from the bill before us today. It was conceived in confusion, compiled in obscurity, and concocted by high-priced lobbyists. It will legislate high prices for the American consumer. It will subsidize the landlords abroad. It will divert money to Switzerland. But most of all, it will add yet another push to what I fear is a developing pattern of inflationary pressure in America. Food prices are up; this bill will insure they will stay up. I think the bill as drafted is entirely wrong, and I urge its defeat.

Congressman Annunzio's Remarks at Wreath-Laying Ceremony at Pulaski Statue, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, our colleague and friend, Congressman FRANK ANNUNZIO, was asked to participate in a commemorative ceremony at the Gen. Casimir Pulaski statue in Washington today.

Each year, the Congress pays tribute to the great heroes of American history and this year is no exception to this honored tradition. Congressman ANNUNZIO spoke at the commemorative ceremony on Pennsylvania Avenue and paid tribute to Casimir Pulaski for his courage and his outstanding contribution to our American victory in the Revolutionary War.

General Pulaski inspired his men and his Nation and it is a pleasure to bring Congressman ANNUNZIO's remarks to the attention of my colleagues today, as we commemorate the death of one of America's noblest patriots.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman ANNUNZIO's remarks follow:

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN FRANK ANNUNZIO AT LAYING OF THE WREATH CEREMONIES AT GEN. CASIMIR PULASKI'S MONUMENT IN WASHINGTON, D.C. ON OCTOBER 11, 1965.

I want to express my deep appreciation to Charlie Burke and to all of you for inviting me to participate in this year's ceremony honoring the memory of the great patriot and brilliant military leader, Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who assisted the Americans in their fight for freedom during the Revolutionary War.

Casimir Pulaski was born in the Province of Podolia in 1748, and from his earliest childhood, demonstrated the qualities of organization and leadership which were manifested all his life. Before he reached the age of 20, he had organized a small group that fought valiantly to prevent the partition of Poland. However, his efforts were to no avail, and he barely managed to escape with his life.

In 1777, he met Benjamin Franklin in Paris, and Franklin was so favorably impressed, he gave Pulaski a letter of introduction to Gen. George Washington. It was Washington who suggested to the Continental Congress that young Pulaski be entrusted with the grave responsibility of reorganizing the American cavalry forces. This Pulaski accomplished with such skill that he was placed in command of all our cavalry forces, and proceeded to distinguish himself in every subsequent encounter with the enemy.

In the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress, there exists a large Polish population. In fact the Poles comprise the largest single ethnic group in my district. I have lived among the Polish people, I have nieces and nephews who have Polish fathers, and I am proud of my close affiliation with the Polish people.

From this close association, I have come to know the Poles as a courageous people, as a dedicated people, as a patriotic people, as a religious people, and as a warm and loving people. Their courage in the face of tyranny has been demonstrated time and again over a span of centuries, their dedication to their principles has not faltered in the face of overwhelming odds, their patriotism has been manifested in their continuing struggle for a free Poland, and their devotion to their church and to their families is evident to us all.

All of these characteristics serve to make up an extraordinary people, and General Pulaski, as a descendant of the extraordinary Polish people, is a man to be remembered with pride and gratitude. In 1779, at the age of 31, Pulaski gave up his life on the battlefield while leading his famous cavalry legion in driving the British out of Savannah. He neither lived to see victory achieved on that battlefield, nor did he live to see America win her fight for independence, yet his valiant efforts were instrumental in establishing this wonderful country of ours which recognizes and upholds the inherent dignity of man and the fundamental rights of the individual.

I am proud to join you at this monument to commemorate the 186th anniversary of General Pulaski's supreme and inspiring sacrifice in the age-old struggle for freedom and liberty. Once again, thank you, for giving me the opportunity to join you in paying tribute to this great man.

Being an American "Square"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the evening of October 8, I happened to see a portion of a nationally televised program known as the "Jimmy Dean Show" over one of the leading networks. Jimmy Dean, a country-western singer, closed his program with a short speech, in which he said some people would call him "square," perhaps, but he was "going to do a little flag-waving."

And he did. He sang a song, which I must agree some people today might have called "square." It was a patriotic song. It included the line:

> What can I do for America, after all she's done for me?

I want to commend Jimmy Dean for singing this song and for daring to be "square" on nationwide television. The lines of the song reminded me of President Kennedy's famous words:

> Ask not what your country can do for you. Ask what you can do for your country.

What a comparison between Jimmy Dean's short, sincere talk and his song and the federally sponsored program "It's What's Happening, Baby" that was aired some months ago. As I recall it, the message of that program was simply "ask what your country can do for you."

It is good to know that some young people in our country can still stand up and "wave the flag a little." If they wave it, we know they will save it, as many thousands of their fellow young Americans are doing today in Vietnam.

Cameron Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, my fourth and final rollcall report on the 1st session of the 89th Congress closes the door on what is perhaps the most productive period in the history of the world's greatest legislative body. But we would be in error to evaluate our work simply in terms of productivity. How much we have done is not the measuring device which should be applied. It is the quality, not quantity, of what we have done that the people should and must judge us by.

As we stand on the threshold of adjournment few of us would look back and comment that we are completely satisfied or completely disappointed with Congress' record. I supported many measures which were adopted and I supported some which failed of enactment. Likewise, I opposed some which received approval and I opposed others which were successfully blocked. Each of us racked up similar legislative box scores for this is the very essence of democratic lawmaking, and not one of us would have it any other way. In the legislative game those who hit a thousand are losers just as surely as those who bat zero. Call it consensus, compromise, accommodation, middle-of-the-road-ism, or what you will. I choose to simply call it good government.

In my judgment, adjournment is overdue. I think that perhaps we have done too much too fast. Before the second session convenes in January it behooves Congress to minutely assess its past actions so that it may carefully chart a future course. Continuing on a dead run at this year's legislative pace would be a disservice to the Nation. As the distinguished Senate majority leader recently pointed out, Congress has the duty and the authority to examine the effects of laws it has enacted with a view to correcting them, if necessary. When we return to this Chamber in 1966 we should spend the year viewing and correcting—if necessary. Hopefully, little correcting will be necessary.

Mr. Speaker, my rollcall report includes commentary on the following: repeal of section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act; the farm bill; immigration reform; the Automotive Products Trade Act; Republican obstructive tactics; establishing the National Foundation of the Arts and Humanities; post office employees and political patronage; the effort to unseat the Mississippi delegation; House Resolution 560 regarding Latin America; amendments to the Bank Company Holding Act; aid for rural water and sanitation facilities; home rule for the District of Columbia; the Federal pay bill; highway beautification; and the sugar bill.

ROLLCALL NOS. 208 AND 209—REPEAL OF 14(b)

Mr. Speaker, perhaps no issue of this session has aroused more emotional fervor both on and off Capitol Hill than the proposed repeal of section 14(b)—the so-called right-to-work provision—of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Opponents of repeal mounted a costly propaganda campaign designed to distort the issue and hide from the public the facts necessary to form a reasoned opinion on H.R. 77. To a large extent this powerful lobby was successful and the public should know exactly how it has been misled.

Few persons realize that the Taft-Hartley Act as originally proposed in 1947 by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, of which Senator Robert Taft was chairman, did not contain section 14(b). This section was first proposed in the House and the legislative record of its birth is so obscure that its conceivers cannot even be determined.

Senator Taft's view on the union shop—which right-to-work laws prohibit—is summed up in his statement of May 9, 1947:

> So I think it would be a mistake to go to the extreme of absolutely outlawing a contract which provides for a union shop, requiring all employees to join the union, if that arrangement meets with the approval of the employer and meets with the approval of a majority of the employees and is embodied in a written contract.

But, Mr. Speaker, State right-to-work laws, which are permitted by section 14(b), do absolutely outlaw the union shop. Repeal of 14(b) would therefore restore the Taft-Hartley Act to the form which was intended by Senator Taft, a man who was vitally concerned throughout his life with the protection of individual freedom.

As was Senator Taft, I am opposed to right-to-work laws because they deprive the working man of certain decisionmaking and bargaining powers which are his by right. By their very nature, these laws produce definite inequities in their application both among individual workers and among the 50 States. The repeal of 14(b), on the other hand, would not encroach upon the right of individuals to choose their conditions of employment. It would insure that right.

That 14(b) deprives employers and employees of decisionmaking is clear. The first consideration is one of semantics: a right-to-work law guarantees no one the right to work. A right-to-work law means a ban on the union shop within a State, a weapon which 19 States currently use to pirate industry and jobs from prosperous States like California by exploiting cheap labor and undermining the legitimate efforts of organized labor. I hasten to point out that the people of California, believing in the principal of free collective bargaining between employees and employers, went to the polls in 1958 and overwhelmingly rejected a proposal to establish a right-to-work law in our State. The repeal of 14(b) will have no effect on existing California statutes or on relationships between management and labor.

I realize that many people who object to repeal of 14(b) are convinced that it would mean unrestricted compulsory union membership for all workers in any industry organized by a union. This is simply not so. It is the closed shop—not the union shop—which requires employers to hire applicants who are union members. The closed shop is now outlawed by the Taft-Hartley Act and it will continue to be outlawed even after 14(b) is repealed.

It is the union shop—not the closed shop—which right-to-work laws destroy. Assume, for example, that workers in a certain industry decide they want a union, that an election is held according to National Labor Relations Board regulations, that the election shows a majority of employees favoring the union shop, and that employer and employees subsequently reach a free and voluntary agreement in favor of a union shop. It would then seem completely unreasonable and undemocratic to deny them the right to do what the majority by legitimate means had elected to do. Yet this is exactly what right-to-work laws do—deny workers the right to have a union shop if they so desire.

The National Labor Relations Act does not require membership as such in a union as a condition of employment in a union shop. No one is required to take an oath or obligation to the union, to attend union meetings, to participate in picket lines, or to engage in other union activities. What is required as a condition of continued employment in a union shop is a tender of nominal dues and initiation fees that are not excessive or discriminatory. Thus each employee bears an equal part of the cost of the collective bargaining unit that the law says must represent him equally with other employees in seeking worker benefits. It is simply a case of requiring those who share in the benefits to also share in the responsibilities.

ROLLCALL NOS. 243–244—FARM BILL

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that nature seldom makes a fool. She merely furnishes the raw material for a do-it-yourself job. And a do-it-yourself job the House did with passage of this year's legislative monstrosity known as the farm bill, perhaps the most complex and costly package of poor proposals which any Secretary of Agriculture within memory has had the audacity to thrust upon the Congress.

I do not profess to be an expert on all the incredible provisions of the bill, and I doubt that anyone can claim to know all of its ins-and-outs. There are so many special interest subsidies for so many products grown, plus an abundant share for those not grown, that it is impossible to conclude that the overall public interest was considered when the package was glued together. Some solace can be had, however, in the knowledge that the original proposal's most odious section, the infamous bread tax, became unglued and fell by the legislative wayside before any votes were taken. And while this fantastic scheme to line the pockets of wealthy wheat growers by tapping the pockets of consumers was given up as a sacrifice for votes needed to effect passage, the entire bill was so impure that it could not be made pure even with elimination of its most objectionable feature.

What were the remaining impurities? A tome is required to spell them all out but I will attempt to hit the high—or more accurately, low—points in a few paragraphs. The farm bill calls for spending more than $18 billion over 4 years on programs that have failed in the past, are failing today and are doomed to fail tomorrow. As just one example, examine the feed grains program, started in 1961 as an emergency measure.

This year the Department of Agriculture is spending more than $1.5 billion for feed grains, not for growing or storing, but to prevent growing. Known as the land retirement program, it is billed as an effort to cut supply and bring it into balance with demand. The $1.5 billion retired 36 million acres. The taxpayers, in other words, rented the land from farmers so that they would not reap a harvest which would only add more feed grains to already overburdened and costly storage facilities. According to reliable crop reports, this year's feed grain production is going to hit the highest level in history. Why? Because price support levels are attractive enough to cause farmers to use more and more fertilizer and other scientific methods to boost the output of acres still under cultivation. This same boondoggle approach to solving problems of the farm economy is also used for cotton and wheat—and with the same disastrous results.

As has been pointed out by former Budget Director Kermit Gordon, about 80 percent of our assistance goes to the 1 million farmers whose average income exceeds $9,500. The other 20 percent of assistance is spread thinly among the remaining 2.5 million farmers.

Four years from now the Treasury will be $18 billion poorer, large corporate farming complexes will be almost that much richer, the small farmer and sharecropper will still be in the grip of poverty, and the country will still be in the grip of the vicious cycle that we call a farm program.

I could, and probably would, support a well-conceived farm bill which introduced a gradual phaseout of these uneconomic and costly subsidies, even if the plan was spread out over many years. It would be foolish to expect that we can get out of the mess we are in overnight. But we have to start crawling out of this almost bottomless pit sometime, instead of slipping deeper and deeper each year. Until the Congress creates a program aimed at taking us up instead of down I will continue to oppose.

ROLLCALL NOS. 248 AND 249—IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. Speaker, being a cosponsor of the immigration reform bill which abolishes the discriminatory national origins quota system I was elated that the measure received overwhelming approval by the Congress.

As I noted when I introduced the bill many months ago, it does much to restore our traditional attitude on a fundamental issue, an attitude which prevailed among countless generations of Americans who labored long and hard to make this country great. That attitude did not ask an immigrant from where he came or how he spelled his name. It was an attitude—a way of life—perhaps best summed up in these words with which we are all very familiar:

> Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

And if it was found that an immigrant did—and could—indeed want to do something for his adopted country, he and his family were given an opportunity to carve for themselves a safe and secure place in the American community.

However, Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago this traditional attitude was amended when discrimination was written into law. It became official policy to welcome immigrants only if they came from the right country or were of the right nationality. Among those nationalities not considered right were Japanese, Polish, Spanish, Italian and Greek, to name just a few of many.

The measure which we have now approved erases discrimination from our immigration law and writes into it a policy compatible with our historic traditions, a policy which is committed to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Bigots and extremists of the rightwing variety bitterly opposed passage of the bill and laid down a propaganda barrage designed to foster the false impression that the proposal would open the floodgates to hordes of undesirable aliens and spies and inundate the country with unemployables. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The overall annual immigration total is increased only slightly above its existing level of 158,361. The new limit would be 170,000 persons, an increase of only 11,639 souls in a country with a population nearing 200 million.

It is also important to note that future immigrants will be selected on a first come, first served basis with preference given to those with special skills and talents which will enrich the whole spectrum of our national life. No individual will be permitted into the country without a certificate from the Secretary of Labor guaranteeing that no American will be displaced from his job if entry is granted. Intending immigrants will also have to prove that they will not become public charges. Contrary to the allegations of its few but vocal opponents, the bill contains safeguards designed to prevent exactly what its critics claim it will promote.

I was disturbed that the bill was amended on the floor to include a provision which I fear will damage our relations with other nations of the Western Hemisphere. Under the so-called MacGregor amendment, the United States will, for the first time in 40 years, set a ceiling on the number of Mexicans and other Latin Americans who can emigrate to this country. During this critical period in our relations with Latin American nations, I think it very unwise to create more ill will among peoples who already have grave questions about our basic attitude toward them.

During the past 40 years we have not placed barriers on Latin immigration to the United States and now is the wrong time to implement such a policy. Not only is it bad timing, but it is unnecessary. Over the past 10 years regular immigration from other countries in the hemisphere has averaged 110,000, a figure less than the ceiling of 115,000 which the MacGregor amendment imposes. And the ceiling does not include the spouses, children, and parents of persons who are American citizens. According to reliable estimates, this group could account for an additional 25,000 immigrants annually which in effect boosts the MacGregor figure to 140,000, or 30,000 more than the current immigration rate.

As I said, the amendment was ill-advised because of our delicate position in Latin America, a position made even more precarious by the incredible resolution which the House adopted on September 20, a matter which I will discuss later in this report.

ROLLCALL NO. 255—AUTOMOTIVE TRADE ACT

Mr. Speaker, during debate on the Automotive Products Trade Act proponents failed to give a satisfactory reply to the question: To what extent will this agreement result in exporting U.S. automobile parts manufacturing firms and the jobs of American workers to Canada?

Although an effort was made to mask H.R. 9042 as legislation designed to promote free trade and thereby strengthen the domestic economy, the facts contradicted the claim and I was constrained to vote against the bill.

It was less than 2 years ago that the Studebaker Corp. closed its automobile plant in South Bend and moved its operation to Canada. More than 7,000 American workers lost their jobs and Canadian employment increased by a similar figure. I predict that we will soon see Canadian plants, currently operating well below capacity, increase their production and sell on the American market cars which cannot be absorbed in Canada. There will be no U.S. duty on these automobiles and thus they will be sold here at prices substantially below what they are going for in Canada. This can hardly be called selling at the fair market value.

My record clearly indicates that I support free trade legislation and the gradual reduction of tariff barriers. But the act cannot be interpreted as a free trade agreement since only certain Canadian manufacturers and subsidiaries of American automobile firms are eligible for duty-free imports. It is discriminatory legislation designed to benefit America's auto giants—Ford, General Motors, Chrysler, and American Motors—at the expense of smaller independent auto parts producers. An automotive parts dealer in Canada, for example, will be able to import parts from the United States duty free—but only if he is dealing with one of the Big Four. Yet the small American parts dealer importing Canadian-made products will have to pay the regular tariff.

H.R. 9042 also violates our Government's established policy of liberal multilateral—not bilateral—trade relations based on the most-favored-nation principle. All countries which subscribe to the General Agreements on Tariff and Trade have a right to be accorded the same treatment as Canada.

I can still remember when Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson, formerly top executive at GM, said:

> What is good for General Motors is good for the United States.

I did not believe it then and I do not believe it now. The Automotive Products Trade Act is good for GM, but it is bad for the United States. The fact that the proposal is also good for Canada does nothing to mitigate its negative effect on our country's economy and its work force.

ROLLCALL NOS. 258–293—21-DAY RULE

Mr. Speaker, in my periodic rollcall reports I do not normally discuss House activity which occurred while I was attending to important business in my congressional district. But conscience does not permit me to observe without comment the irresponsible tactics which were employed by the Republican leadership in their ill-advised effort to prevent the House from working its will on September 13.

I cannot recall any other time during my tenure as a Member of this body when the opposition has displayed such flagrant contempt for the legislative process and the rules under which it functions. We have only to examine what took place on the floor of the House on September 13 to verify the validity of this observation.

Let us briefly review the record:

On opening day of the 89th Congress the House voted to reinstate the 21-day rule which permits its 435 members to determine whether any piece of legislation, approved by its standing committees, shall be brought to the floor for debate and vote—rather than have that legislation killed by failure of the Rules Committee to act upon it. In other words, the House decided that it would no longer tolerate tactics designed to keep it from working its legislative will. And it wrote that decision into the rules under which we operate.

On September 13, under the 21-day procedure, four rules were sought in the House which, if approved by majority vote, would permit consideration of four pieces of important legislation—The Equal Employment Opportunities Act of 1965, amendments to the Bank Company Act, establishment of a National Foundation of the Arts and Humanities, and the Federal Salary Adjustment Act of 1965.

On August 3 the Committee on Rules was asked to permit the Equal Employment Act to come to the floor. On June 21 a rule was requested on the Bank Holding bill. A rule was sought on July 14 for the Arts and Humanities legislation. On August 16 a rule was requested on the Federal pay bill. None of these rules was granted.

It is regrettable but very revealing that the chairman of the Rules Committee, responding to criticism from highly respected Members of the House, declared:

> Why should we be kicked around in this way by picking up all the garbage out of the Rules Committee in instances in which the 21 days have expired and dumping it on the floor of the House on one day?

Mr. Speaker, I would not presume to speak for other Members of the House, but I view it as a direct insult to the American people and their elected representatives when legislation which is reported from committee after many hours of public hearings and careful deliberation is referred to as "garbage."

With this appraisal of important bills it is no wonder that the House found it necessary to resurrect these measures from the legislative graveyard known as the Rules Committee.

It was because the House decided that the time had come to work its will, not on "garbage" but upon matters of vital concern to the American people, that the Republican leadership engaged in its disgraceful obstructive tactics on September 13.

A front page story in the Washington Post summed it up this way:

> When the House adjourned at 12:30 a.m., after a 12½-hour session and a recordbreaking 22 rollcalls, the only forward motion had been adoption of resolutions permitting Democratic leaders at some future date to call up for House action four bills stuck in its Rules Committee.
>
> Republicans—frustrated by their yearlong winless record, opposed to the 21-day rule and several of the bills, and irritated at being tossed such a big load of work on a Monday in mid-September—began a series of stalling tactics when the House met at noon.
>
> The coalition forced repeated quorum calls, demanded that the entire Journal of the previous day's session be read and insisted upon rollcall votes on such usually pro forma motions as "dispensing with further proceedings" under the quorum calls.

Mr. Speaker, it was a wise man who said: "As I grow older I pay less attention to what men say. I just watch what they do."

If my Republican colleagues are really sincere in their alleged desire to promote a vigorous two-party system in this country, they will do well to reflect upon what the wise man said.

ROLLCALL NO. 301—ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Mr. Speaker, having introduced a bill on the opening day of Congress calling for establishment of a National Humanities Foundation, I was elated that more than 100 Members subsequently joined in cosponsoring similar legislation. The fact that the President saw fit to include the measure as a part of the administration's specific legislative proposals was also a source of great satisfaction. The bill, however, cannot be interpreted as a partisan effort. It was President Eisenhower's Commission on National Goals which stated in a 1960 report:

> In the eyes of posterity, the success of the United States as a civilized society will be largely judged by the creative activities of its citizens in art, architecture, literature, music, and the sciences.

Most opposition to the bill focused on the old bugaboo with which we are all familiar: Federal aid means Federal control. Not only has this mothworn charge been refuted time and again by the facts, but it is interesting to note that in recent years it has rarely been leveled at programs designed to aid the sciences. Yet it was dragged out against the arts and humanities, despite the clear wording of section 4(c) of the bill:

> In the administration of this Act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, or curriculum, or the administration or operation of any school or other non-Federal agency, institution, organization or association.

The Foundation receives additional independence through the provision permitting it to receive private donations and gifts. Thus the private sector gains a vested interest in insuring that the Government keeps its hands off the freedom of the individuals and institutions to be assisted.

Briefly put, the National Foundation of the Arts and Humanities is being established to develop and promote a broad national policy of support for the arts and humanities. The National Council on the Arts through its endowment will provide matching grants to groups and individuals engaged in the creative and performing arts for the whole spectrum of artistic activity, including construction of necessary facilities. The National Council on the Humanities will provide nonmatching grants and loans for research, award fellowships and grants to institutions and individuals for training, support publication of scholarly works, provide for the exchange of information, and promote understanding and appreciation of the humanities.

Few Americans would quarrel with these goals and the means which the Congress has devised to achieve them.

ROLLCALL NO. 303—POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 574 was a Republican effort to strike back blindly at the Post Office Department for its stupid and ill-advised effort to dispense patronage to Members of Congress who represent both political parties. I voted against the measure for one reason only: caught in the vicious political crossfire would be thousands of innocent victims whose only offense was that they happened to be postal employees during a period when some temporary jobs were being handed out as political plums.

Although he was very tardy, the Postmaster General, a few days before this resolution was brought to the floor, directed all postmasters to release the names of summer or temporary employees to anyone who asked, including newspapers. Thus, the information which the resolution sought to make public was already available to any interested party.

The information which would have been supplied under the blanket resolution would include the names of all persons employed by the Department from May until September. Publication of the names in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would infer that all of those persons, thousands of them, were employed solely because some Congressmen got them the job. This was certainly not the case, yet the innocent would have suffered along with the guilty had the resolution carried.

If nothing else was gained from the resolution, I hope it taught the Post Office Department a needed lesson, a lesson which I as an individual Member of Congress unsuccessfully tried to impart this spring. When I received a call from the Department advising me that a certain number of summer jobs would be available in my district, and that I should submit names of persons to fill these jobs, I firmly stated that I found the offer offensive and wanted no part in such an odious operation. I also warned the Department to steer clear of my congressional district if it decided to implement its patronage program for if I learned of any hanky-panky the boom was going to fall.

I had occasion to drop it only once when a postmaster in my district informed me that he had been forced to hire a person who had been recommended by a Member of Congress. That employee was on the job exactly 2 days before he was fired at my insistence. The word must have spread in a hurry because I received no further complaints from postmasters.

ROLLCALL NO. 307—MISSISSIPPI DELEGATION

Mr. Speaker, after the unsuccessful effort to unseat the Mississippi delegation, syndicated columnists Evans and Novak in a perceptive analysis of the issue summed up the feelings of many Congressmen who have championed civil rights: "I've never seen people so hard to say yes to." The reference was to members of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party which led the drive to unseat. The columnists explored many facets of this emotion-laden issue and I would be happy to provide a copy of the article to any constituent who requests one.

During debate on the resolution it was declared in support of unseating that every Member must face his moral responsibility to the great democratic processes of our Nation. It was said that once the "technical and legal points" were argued and assessed, there still remained an overriding consideration—the moral issue.

I was disturbed to see this argument put forth with such a casual dismissal of law. In my judgment, the primary moral issue facing every Member every day is his dedication to technical and legal points—the very guts of the great democratic process—as opposed to how he, as an individual, might feel about the rights and wrongs of any secondary moral issue, in this case the systematic disenfranchisement of Negroes which I personally abhor.

It was precisely this issue which prompted Congress earlier this year to produce the Voting Rights Act. We took our personal convictions on a moral issue and wrote them into the technical and legal points which are now a part of the great democratic process. Henceforth, in the area of voting rights, morality will no longer be a sometimes thing—as it was in the Mississippi challenge. Morality in voting practices is now an alltimes thing—not because every American agrees with the provisions of the Voting Rights Act, but because all Americans are morally bound to respect the law of the land.

I was concerned, however, with the poor manner in which the House Administration Committee, the Clerk of the House, and the Democratic leadership handled the Mississippi challenge. I question the need for the delays which took place, the need for limiting the hearings to 3 hours, and the unavailability of the hearing record to every Member who had to sit as a judge on the challenge. And I resent the secrecy which accompanied the hearings. It seemed to me there was a need for further investigation and amplification. Thus I supported the effort to recommit the resolution for further study and when this unrecorded vote failed to carry I voted to dismiss the challenge as it then stood. The issue developed into a standoff when the resolution was amended on the floor to delete the statement that the Mississippi Members were entitled to their seats.

As one of the Nation's leading newspapers noted editorially, the House action was clearly one of expediency:

> Ordinarily this would be an inexcusable course of action * * *. But the challengers had no valid claim to election. If the Mississippi seats had been declared vacant in these circumstances, the House would have acquired an obligation to vacate seats in other States which have systematically disenfranchised Negroes. Such drastic action could not reasonably be taken at a time when the whole picture of Negro voting in the South is undergoing revolutionary changes because of the new Voting Rights Act.

ROLLCALL NO. 310—LATIN AMERICA RESOLUTION

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 560 has been universally condemned, to put it mildly, and rightly so. Regrettably, only 51 of my colleagues in the House joined me in opposing the measure while 312 Members supported it. As one of this country's leading newspapers summed up the situation:

> Cry "communism," and the House of Representatives seemingly is ready to rush pell-mell over almost any cliff.

But not all of the blame for this foreign policy disaster should be heaped upon the House. The State Department must also stand accused of retreating from our country's longstanding treaty commitments to the nations of Latin America. I am still trying to get an acceptable answer from the Department on why it so blindly went along with a "sense of the House" resolution which suggests, authorizes and even importunes each sovereign state in the Western Hemisphere to violate its solemn obligations under the Rio Treaty and under the charter of the Organization of American States. The resolution does this by declaring that each nation—not only the United States, but each nation—is free, in the opinion of the House, to unilaterally interfere—including the use of armed force—in the domestic affairs of its neighbors if, in its sole discretion, it suspects there is too much subversive Communist activity in a neighboring state. In other words, the House has called for anarchy in this hemisphere. And I would only remind my colleagues that it is but a brief period before the soil of anarchy sprouts the weeds of communism.

The State Department's schizoid stance on a foreign policy position with such grave consequences cannot be completely erased by its action subsequent to the shock waves which hit Washington, although I am pleased to see the Department is moving to try and correct the damage which it helped wrought. As one perceptive newsman observed in writing a recent story on the subject:

> The State Department, having marched up the hill behind a controversial House resolution on Latin American intervention, marched down again yesterday by joining a Senate drive to counteract the House action.

But it is no credit to the administration or to the State Department that it was a Republican Senator who took the lead in trying to untie the knot which the House resolution put in our relations with our allies in Latin America.

Hopefully, the Senate will promptly adopt a resolution, and send it to the House for its concurrence, which conforms with the OAS position for action against Communist aggression. The Senate resolution should reaffirm that U.S. policy is unchanging in its support of democratic social and economic reform in Latin America. It should emphasize that the United States believes in collective action as the best method for combating hemispheric crises. It should make clear beyond any doubt that this Nation respects the principles of nonintervention unless specifically requested to intervene as we were in the Dominican Republic.

Mr. Speaker, it always saddens me to see this legislative body take precipitous action, especially when this body erroneously but consistently refers to itself as "deliberative." Bringing up House Resolution 560 under suspension of the rules, a procedure which bars amendments on the floor, and then giving opponents of the measure only 8 minutes in which to state their objections can hardly be described as "deliberative."

Let us be blunt but truthful. The House was sold a package wrapped in red, white and blue—a package which turned out to be a can of worms. If a vote was taken today on the resolution I doubt that its sponsor could round up 52 supporters. We all have 20-20 vision when it comes to hindsight. Hopefully, the day will soon arrive when the cry of "communism" will not blur our legislative foresight, and 20-20 vision before we act will restrain each and every one of us from again rushing pell-mell over almost any cliff.

ROLLCALL NO. 320—BANK HOLDING ACT

Mr. Speaker, there was scant controversy on the aim of H.R. 7371 as reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency. It was clearly and carefully designed to plug a loophole in the 1956 Bank Holding Company Act which permits the Du Pont Estate in Florida to control 31 banks with deposits of more than $600 million, as well as a number of nonbanking businesses, including the Florida East Coast Railway, the St. Joe Paper Mill Co., and various real estate interests. Like other large holding companies already regulated under the 1956 act, Du Pont would have to choose to divest itself either of its bank or nonbank holdings. The Congress has long decreed that it is a sound principle that banking and nonbanking activities should be kept apart to avoid conflict of interest, and I subscribe to that principle.

But I also subscribe to the principle that Congress should not act on the spur of the moment and enact sweeping legislation which could adversely affect large segments of the business community, without first giving the business community an opportunity to present its views before congressional committees. This is the principle which was at issue on the only recorded vote on H.R. 7371. I supported that principle and I regret that I was not joined by a majority of the House.

I think this body was ill-advised in adopting the Bennett amendment and thereby bringing under the act some 340 holding companies which were never given their day in congressional court, as it were. And when I speak of 340 holding companies I am speaking of thousands of stockholders who believe in our free enterprise system, citizens who were denied the opportunity to state fully and fairly their case for exemption. In my judgment this principle is no less important than the principle that banking and nonbanking interests should be separate and distinct. It is for this reason that I opposed Mr. BENNETT's sweeping amendment.

ROLLCALL NO. 322, RURAL WATER AND SANITATION

Mr. Speaker, no one can quarrel with the objectives of legislation designed to provide Federal loans for the improvement of rural water supplies and waste disposal systems. I was constrained to vote against H.R. 10232, however, because in my opinion we already have many programs operating which accomplish the same purposes set forth in the bill. This measure is clearly a duplication of effort, another addition to what is rapidly becoming a bureaucratic hodgepodge of agencies all doing the same thing. There is a serious question as to whether the sewage provisions of the bill do not overlap the authority of the Community Facilities Administration. And the 1965 Housing Act authorizes grants for water facilities in communities of any size. This would certainly include rural communities.

It seems to me that the House, in adjournment-fever haste, feels it must legislate in every single area so that it can hold up its record and say, "See, there is something in here for you, too. And if you do not believe it just look at the title of this bill which we have passed." The fact that we should legislate by content, not title, seems to matter little when we are gathering material for postsession speeches to the folks back home. Being 1 Member of only 10 who voted against the bill, my vote was obviously merely an expression of discontent with this type of lawmaking.

ROLLCALL NOS. 336 AND 339, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME RULE

Mr. Speaker, it would do little good to recount here the series of events and the intricate political and parliamentary maneuvering which led to defeat of a meaningful home rule bill for the District of Columbia. Suffice it to say that the House was denied a chance to vote on a good piece of legislation, H.R. 11218, the compromise version of Congressman MULTER's original proposal, H.R. 4644. We had to settle for registering our position on the Sisk bill, a weak measure which I predict in the long run will do little or nothing to bring the citizens of Washington closer to self-government. I grudgingly supported the Sisk amendment after earlier having voted against it simply because it was, however weak, the best that could be obtained at that time.

The Sisk proposal would permit the citizens of Washington to hold a referendum to see if they want home rule, as if there were any question about the matter. This referendum would include the election of a board to draw up a city charter to be submitted to the voters for approval at another referendum. The rub is that this electoral decision would be subject to congressional veto, the same type veto which the Congress now holds over all affairs in the District of Columbia. This can hardly be termed self-rule.

On the other hand, H.R. 11218, the bipartisan bill, was truly in harmony with the American concept of self-government. It would have established a home rule formula which would automatically go into effect if approved by the voters. It would have permitted nonpartisan elections for a mayor, city council, board of education and a nonvoting delegate to the House. Because so much of the taxable property in the District is owned by the Federal Government, the bill also provided for annual congressional approval and appropriation of the tax assessments. This indirect taxing of Federal property is exactly the same principle that applies to the impacted school funds that are received by nearly every school district in the 25th Congressional District each year—an in-lieu payment on nontaxable Federal property.

The local government structure which would have been established by this bill can in no way be described as radical—unless we are to apply the term to every city government from Maine to California. Yet opponents of home rule declared that it was extreme, that self-government was unnecessary because Washingtonians could look to a generous and paternalistic Congress to shower favors upon them. Ironically, it was the ultraconservatives who parroted this theme the loudest. In doing so they showed a complete lack of understanding of man's whole political history: no matter how benevolent an autocratic society—be it left, center or right on the political spectrum—the people prefer democratic self-rule.

During a 70-year period in the 1800's when the United States was still basking in the newness of independence—a period which included the administrations of Presidents Jefferson and Madison—the citizens of Washington had self-government. The Senate has voted on six different occasions for a return to this cherished principle. The House has yet to do so and I am deeply disappointed that during this session it passed up an excellent opportunity to correct a grievous wrong.

ROLLCALL NOS. 342 AND 343, FEDERAL SALARY ACT

Mr. Speaker, House passage of the Federal employees pay bill was a follow-through on a commitment which Congress made in 1962 when it embraced the principle of comparability—Government employees should receive pay comparable to that of private industry for the same type of work. Concerned that too many well-trained and experienced Federal workers were leaving Government because they were unable to support their families on the poor pay, we sought to stem the flow by promising 1.7 million of our fellow Americans a fair shake from the paymaster. This we have tried to do in H.R. 10281, and although we did not quite deliver all that was promised and due we made a big leap forward.

But we must remember that the job is not yet finished. The lower levels on the Government pay scale, who comprise a high percentage of the total, will receive a wage boost sufficient to bring them up only to the Bureau of Labor Statistics index for February–March 1964. This means that they are still more than a year behind comparability. We are granting a 4-percent increase when the market dictates that 7 percent is needed to achieve comparability. The middle and upper levels are lagging about 3 years behind the private sector.

Importantly, however, the bill incorporates an automatic feature which will be triggered in October 1966, 1 year after the effective date of the House-approved 4-percent raise. This feature is based on a two-part formula: a cost-of-living adjustment computed on the basis of comparability with private enterprise for 1 year, and an increase at each salary level equal to one-half the amount by which Federal pay now lags behind comparable civilian pay. It is impossible to predict exactly what next year's pay boost will be, but we are assured that there will be an across-the-board raise.

Another important provision of the bill deals with overtime and holiday pay for postal employees, perhaps the most dedicated and hardest working single group in our Government's ranks. Thousands of postal substitutes are working 70 and 80 hours a week at straight time pay. We are long overdue in cutting out this reactionary practice and I am hopeful the Senate will accept our proposal to guarantee all postal field service employees time and one-half for work officially ordered in excess of 8 hours a day or 40 hours a week. The House bill also decrees that employees who work on legal Federal holidays will receive double time, with double time and one-half for Christmas Day. Other sections of the bill provide increased allowances for uniforms, a system of severance pay, and relocation expenses for postal workers displaced by the ZIP code and sectional center system.

Just one word, Mr. Speaker, about the recommittal motion which killed the proposed legislative machinery that would resolve forevermore the question of salaries for Cabinet officers, Members of Congress, Federal judges, and other Federal executives.

As Congressmen we are the only persons in the Federal Government who are called upon to set their own salaries. Over the years too many in this body have failed to take a stand on the matter, not because they doubted a salary increase was justified, but because they feared reprisals at the polls. A majority of the Members finally screwed up enough courage in the last Congress to substantially increase salaries in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. It was the first time in 9 years that Congress had the guts to do so, and it was precisely because raises were so long overdue that they were so substantial.

Nevertheless, this year we had an excellent chance to break the shackles which bind us to the archaic and embarrassing practice of establishing our own pay. This would have been easily accomplished by tying any future raises to the whole Federal salary structure: when comparability raises were provided to civil service employees all along the line a proportionate increase would also be granted to members of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. It was a simple solution to Congress' historic problem.

ROLLCALL NOS. 356 AND 357, HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

Control the signs and hide the junk,
  It's all we ask or seek.
Behind yon hill the sun has sunk,
  We hardly had a peek.

Mr. Speaker, my poetic effort is meant to counter allegations by opponents of the Highway Beautification Act to the effect that the only person interested in its passage was the First Lady. I would merely remind those who hold this view that the vast majority of motoring Americans consider the principle of controlling billboards and junkyards along our major highways a very worthwhile one. It was President Eisenhower, not Lady Bird Johnson, who in 1957 and 1958 submitted to Congress specific recommendations for billboard control, recommendations which were much more stringent than those enacted by the National Legislature.

It is only the unfortunate blind who have traveled this wide and wonderful country who have not been appalled at the garish clutter of signs which sock the eye from every direction, obliterating the scenic wonders which the Creator made for all men to enjoy. While billboard entrepreneurs have an economic right to hawk their wares, I also believe that the motoring citizen whose tax money has been invested for him in a vast network of Federal highways has a right to some relief from the hucksters of the road. We have long regulated airwave frequencies so that the amateur radio operator down the street does not interfere with our favorite television viewing. The Nation's highways, like its airways, are public property and it was time Congress decided that the motorist is also entitled to some degree of scenic viewing.

The Highway Beautification Act gives full consideration to enhancing our highways, while properly balancing this factor with legitimate business and industrial operations adjacent to these highways. Examination of the act's provisions attests to the equitable balance which was achieved: on-premise advertising is fully authorized and not subject to Federal regulation, as is outdoor advertising in commercial and industrial areas, either zoned or unzoned. With these exceptions, billboards will be excluded within 660 feet of the edge of the right-of-way along interstate and primary systems.

The exercise of zoning authority is left entirely with the States and local governments. Existing signs which are in control areas will not have to be removed for 5 years, and just compensation will be paid to sign owners and to property owners on which the sign is located. Motels, restaurants, service stations and other businesses catering to the motoring public will be assisted by official signs at appropriate places giving specific information, including names and brands, of interest to the traveler.

Public hearings will be held in each State before specific rules and regulations are promulgated, and before the Secretary can cut a State's apportionment of highway funds by 10 percent for failure to control billboards and junkyards an opportunity for a hearing will also have to be granted. If the decision is adverse to the State it can receive full judicial review in Federal court.

Control the signs and hide the junk,
  It's all we ask or seek.
Behind yon hill the sun has sunk,
  We hardly had a peek.

With enactment of the Highway Beautification Act it should not be very long before American motorists get more than a peek.

ROLLCALL NOS. 363 AND 367, SUGAR ACT

Mr. Speaker, take almost any derogatory adjective in the dictionary, apply it to H.R. 11135, and you have my definition of the sugar bill—a measure that will cost American consumers at least $2 billion over the next 5 years. Paying through the nose would be an understatement of fact. Not only will consumer dollars be used to pay a high subsidy to foreign sugar producers, but this economic felony will be compounded when the subsidies jack up the price of sugar at the grocery store.

I suspect the average housewife is unaware that sugar is one of the most rigidly controlled commodities on the kitchen shelf. H.R. 11135 specifies the exact sugar tonnage which can be produced and marketed by domestic growers, and it fixes the number of tons that foreign countries can ship to the United States. When the foreign sugar arrives at U.S. ports, the producers receive a large subsidy. To determine the amount we have only to know that the average world price for raw sugar last month was 1.8 cents a pound, and that foreign sugar producers were paid 6.85 cents per pound for raw sugar delivered to New York. This means that the American consumer is now forking over to foreign producers a bonus of about $100 for every ton of sugar which they deliver to the United States. No wonder, then, that this year 29 foreign countries hired high-priced lobbyists in an effort to get a sugar quota assigned to them or to get their present quotas increased.

Supporters of the sugar bill tried to strengthen their arguments with the nonsense that it was a form of foreign aid. This is utterly ridiculous. Foreign aid is designed to benefit the people, not multimillionaire plantation owners, large corporations, and foreign dictators. In the Dominican Republic the tyrant Trujillo amassed a personal fortune of $800 million with profits from his sugar quotas. "Papa Doc" Duvalier is doing the same thing today in Haiti. In fact, very few of the countries on the quota list qualify for aid under our foreign assistance criteria. In the Bahamas, for instance, Owen-Illinois, which has a plant in my congressional district, would be the sole beneficiary of a $1 million annual subsidy for 5 years. This company has never produced sugar but now wants to go into the sugar business in a land where sugar has never been grown. Their lobbyist succeeded in securing a 10,000-ton special quota for Owen-Illinois.

Arguments that American consumers would be without sugar if the bill failed to pass were also without foundation in fact. Under existing legislation the current quotas would continue to apply if the House had voted down the proposal. With the defeat of H.R. 11135, we could then have come up with a bill which would have permitted domestic sugar producers to expand their output with no ties to foreign quotas.

SENATE

Tuesday, October 12, 1965

(Legislative day of Friday, October 1, 1965)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-living God, as we bow in this quiet moment dedicated to the unseen and eternal, confirm our sustaining faith, we beseech Thee, in those deep and holy foundations which the fathers laid, lest by foolish futility in this dangerous and desperate day we attempt to build on sand instead of rock.

In a day of ruthless aggression and of savage violence, of swift and shifting change, when the angry passions of men are bursting anew into devouring flame, enable Thy servants here in the discharge of grave responsibilities of public trust to be calm and confident, wise and just; their hope in Thee an anchor sure and steadfast, their faith unshaken, that out of the ruin and wreck of such days as these Thou art making all things new.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, October 11, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States, submitting a nomination, was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Dr. Philip Randolph Lee, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1320) to amend certain criminal laws applicable to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 10497. An act to provide criminal penalties for making certain telephone calls in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 11428. An act to amend the act of September 8, 1960, relating to the Washington Channel waterfront;

H.R. 11439. An act to provide for an increase in the annuities payable from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund, to revise the method of determining the cost-of-living increases in such annuities, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11487. An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1516. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in federally owned buildings for periods not to exceed 3 years, and for other purposes;

S. 1715. An act to extend the penalty for assault on a police officer in the District of Columbia to assaults on employees of penal and correctional institutions and places of confinement of juveniles of the District of Columbia; and

S. 1719. An act to authorize compensation for overtime work performed by officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, and the White House Police force, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H.R. 10497. An act to provide criminal penalties for making certain telephone calls in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 11428. An act to amend the act of September 8, 1960, relating to the Washington Channel waterfront;

H.R. 11439. An act to provide for an increase in the annuities payable from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund, to revise the method of determining the cost-of-living increases in such annuities, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11487. An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TODAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Nominations of the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MONTANA: SITE OF WORLD'S MOST ADVANCED SEISMOGRAPH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, even in this, the age of technological revolution, when almost anything seems possible, the pace of scientific advance never ceases to amaze me.

Today in Billings, in my home State of Montana, the Advance Research Projects Agency is dedicating a large aperture seismic array, more handily called LASA. I am not a scientist nor am I familiar with the complex technical terminology involved, but as I understand it, this cluster of seismometers will be the most advanced yet developed. This project is an experiment in long-range detection and identification of earth tremors induced by both natural causes, such as earthquakes, and by artificial means, such as underground nuclear explosions. The LASA seismograph is expected to differentiate more accurately than existing equipment between nuclear explosions and background noise signals which result from frequent, small-scale natural earthquakes. If LASA lives up to expectations, it could have great influence in the field of nuclear weapons control and disarmament, partially dissolving the problem of onsite inspection which has heretofore prevented negotiation of an all-inclusive nuclear test ban treaty.

This instrument will be extremely valuable from a purely scientific standpoint as well. It is expected to add greatly to our ability to study and understand earthquakes and their related phenomena.

I am sorry that the compelling business of the Senate prevents me from attending today's dedication ceremonies in Montana. Senator Lee Metcalf will attend and he will deliver the main address at the banquet tonight in Billings. I am delighted that representatives of 22 nations will be present at the ceremonies marking this important and significant event. I extend to all of them a hearty welcome to our beautiful State of Montana, which today proudly takes its place as the site of the world's most advanced center for the detection and analysis of earth tremors.

MONTANA COLLEGE OF MINERAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on a number of occasions I have addressed the Senate or made note of the very fine school of mines that we have in Butte, Mont. The Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology, formerly the Montana School of Mines, has a fine record of achievement, is one of the great technical schools in the world, and has a great record as a small but extremely competent school of mining and engineering. Among my fondest memories, and I may say my happiest, are those of my years as a student at the school of mines.

The school at Butte is a part of the university system in Montana and is the smallest of the 6 units with an average enrollment of 300. The College of Mineral Science and Technology is suffering growing pains like many other colleges and universities. Several years ago a campaign was started to increase the enrollment. This effort was most successful and I am now informed that the school has an enrollment of 600. When I attended the Mines, the enrollment was 119. The Montana Tech Alumni Association is to be commended for this effort. The college is playing an increasingly important role in the day-to-day activities of one of the busiest and growing cities in the State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the Congressional Record an editorial from the October 8 issue of the Montana Standard.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Over the Top—Montana Tech Enrolls 600

Some 4 years ago, the Alumni Association of Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology (formerly Montana School of Mines) launched a campaign to secure 600 students for their school.

This was a lofty goal; at that time, enrollment was about 300.

The alumni set to work with determination. They conducted programs of education, to inform prospective students, especially of the Butte-Anaconda area, of the economic and academic advantages of attending the Butte college. They inaugurated a number of programs, joining with the student body in lighting the big block M which has given Butte a mark of distinction; and securing funds for construction of the $250,000 Alumni Stadium west of the campus, all to improve the image of the college.

The alumni drove home the importance of a college education, and how the high school graduate might benefit from attending Montana Tech.

They explained the savings in room and board for the local area student who could commute; the freshman and sophomore curriculum which would permit the student to transfer to another college or university, if he so desired, without loss of credit. They hammered at the importance of the vital courses offered at the Butte college, and how the Montana Tech graduate was in demand because of the education he received in engineering fields.

Now that enrollment has been completed, Montana Tech can, for the first time, boast a student body of 600. There may be several reasons—more students desiring to attend college, more students prefering to study closer at home, and, simply, more students.

But the efforts of the Montana Tech Alumni Association definitely have played a big part in this forward movement. It proves what can be done for our community by a group with energy and determination.

Our congratulations are extended to Montana Tech and its alumni association.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions adopted at the fourth annual convention of the Independent Bankers of Minnesota, expressing their opinion of matters of serious concern to the public; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The petition of Christina A. Maloof, of Decatur, Ga., relating to world peace; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 11096. An act to authorize the disposal of graphite, quartz crystals, and lump steatite talc from the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both (Rept. No. 862).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the committee on Commerce, without amendment:

H.R. 1582. An act to remove a restriction on certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of California (Rept. No. 863).

By Mr. TYDINGS (for Mr. Morse), from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

H.R. 8126. An act to amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law to provide broader coverage, improved standards of minimum wage and overtime compensation protection, and improved means of enforcement (Rept. No. 864).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 2626. A bill for the relief of Dr. Argyrios A. Tsifutis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Harris, Mr. Mundt, and Mr. Curtis):

S. 2627. A bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act for the purpose of providing additional protection for the interests of participants in and beneficiaries of employee welfare and pension benefit plans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. McClellan when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2628. A bill to amend chapter 73 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits alleging malpractice or negligence in furnishing medical care and treatment against physicians, dentists, nurses, and other medical or paramedical personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration;

S. 2629. A bill relating to the number of hospital and nursing home beds that may be established and operated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and

S. 2630. A bill to provide a border highway along the U.S. bank of the Rio Grande River in connection with the settlement of the Chamizal boundary dispute between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH (by request):

S. 2631. A bill to provide for improved employee-management cooperation in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2632. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to establish a Commission on National Economic Goals; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2633. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to the several States for the acquisition and operation of artificial kidney machines; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

S. 2634. A bill for the relief of Anthi Panagiotou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 2635. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 7-percent increase in all annuities and pensions payable thereunder; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Nelson, and Mr. Scott):

S. 2636. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to make construction grants available for reimbursement of State and local funds used for certain construction; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 2637. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow the deduction of certain indirect contributions to political parties; and

S. 2638. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to disallow the deduction of certain indirect contributions to political parties; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 2639. A bill to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Louisiana when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF WELFARE AND PENSION PLAN DISCLOSURE ACT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, for myself, and on behalf of the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], and the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], I introduce a bill, for appropriate reference, which would amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, for the purpose of providing additional safeguards for the interest of American workingmen and women.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2627) to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act for the purpose of providing additional protection for the interests of participants in and beneficiaries of employee welfare and pension benefit plans, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the rapid financial growth of welfare and pension benefit plans has been phenomenal in recent years. Private pension plans alone, at the end of 1964, were estimated by the Securities and Exchange Commission to have assets totalling $77 billion. This is an increase of $25 billion since the end of 1960, when such funds had assets of $52 billion. Employers' contributions to pension funds amounted to $3.8 billion in 1964, more than twice the total contributed 10 years earlier.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an extra 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the assets now held by noninsured private pension funds are exceeded only by those of commercial banks, savings and loan associations, and life insurance companies. The influence of these funds upon the capital market is enormous, since their holdings of corporate securities, including stocks and bonds, rank next in size to those of life insurance companies.

The Department of Labor has amassed approximately 163,000 individual files on such plans. These are increasing at an annual rate of 9,400 new files. It receives 118,000 annual reports on plans that cover about 25 million workers. The Labor Department estimates that by the year 1980 benefit plans holding $225 billion in reserves will cover 42 million workers.

These funds are increasingly important to the national economy and to the basic security of their participants and beneficiaries. The laws that govern them should be examined carefully by the Congress to make sure that the funds are protected and preserved to carry out the purposes for which they were established.

Mr. President, most of our labor statutes are primarily concerned with the rights and privileges of labor unions as organizations rather than with the interests and welfare of their membership. While we recognize that benefits provided by law to organized labor as a whole may ultimately benefit the individual union member, existing labor statutes do not provide full protection to individual members. A major step was taken when the bill of rights was included in the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 to safeguard the interests of rank-and-file union members. The bill I introduce today is intended to take another major step in an effort to better protect the rights of the laboring men and women who are participants in employee benefit plans.

The Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations recently held hearings in the welfare and pension fund field, particularly relating to the affairs of two unions in the New York area, the Allied Trades Council and Teamsters Local No. 815. Investigation disclosed that the welfare funds of these unions had been shamelessly manipulated to divert approximately $4 million from their assets to certain overseas corporations, one in Puerto Rico and one in Liberia, which ostensibly were organized for research and educational purposes.

Documented testimony showed that the members of the two unions were robbed of the welfare benefits that eventually would have accrued to them. On the other hand, the principal figure in the scheme to divert the funds, a man named George Barasch, a high official who dominated both unions, assured for himself and for certain of his associates the exclusive control and benefit of the $4 million that was removed from the welfare funds.

George Barasch still controls the overseas foundations and is still the dominant influence in the affairs of both unions and their welfare and pension plans. He has the power to dissolve the foundations, should he consider that course advantageous, and to dispose of their assets in any way he wishes. Barasch and a group of his subordinates, upon advice of counsel, invoked the fifth amendment to the Constitution in refusing to answer the subcommittee's questions, on the grounds that their answers might tend to incriminate them.

Members of the subcommittee were shocked to hear that the assets of the welfare funds could be diverted so readily from the interests of the rank-and-file membership of the unions into the absolute control of the fiduciary who supposedly held the money in trust. Nevertheless, testimony by officials of the Departments of Justice and Labor shows that this adroit scheme to deplete the trust funds apparently had been accomplished with impunity. At least the present welfare and pension statute is not sufficiently restrictive to prohibit such scandalous manipulations.

Barasch and his subordinates flagrantly disregarded their duties and responsibilities as union officials and as fiduciaries of the funds. They were aided in their complicated manipulations by the subservience and indifference of the management trustees, whose testimony disclosed that they acted only at the command of George Barasch, and that they either did not know or were not concerned about the diversion of the money or the deceit practiced upon the union membership.

Mr. President, it is evident that the Congress has failed to enact laws that will deter and prohibit the actions of corrupt and dishonest men. The testimony shows that existing laws do not adequately safeguard the rights of union members and other employees. Thus it is incumbent upon the Congress to revise and strengthen the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

The measure I am introducing is intended to strengthen existing law and to provide Federal agencies with additional enforcement powers that are sorely needed. When the measure is considered by the appropriate legislative committee, further amendments to the act may be added to it, or certain of its provisions may be changed to substantially improve it. However, the bill's several proposals should serve as a good foundation for new legislation.

The bill would carry out its purpose of protecting the rights of employees who participate in welfare and pension plans by, first, providing minimum standards and requirements for the operation of such funds; second, providing minimum fiduciary standards of conduct, responsibility, and obligation upon trustees and administrators of the funds; third, providing penalties for violations; and fourth, providing for the recovery of losses suffered by such funds through mismanagement, dishonesty, or the receipt by any fiduciary of secret personal profits derived from the funds.

It further provides that the assets of all welfare and pension trust funds shall be subject to the provisions of the act, and that all funds and their incomes shall be used only for established benefits and for reasonable administrative costs.

Gifts of money or assets from the funds for any purpose are prohibited. It also regulates the terms of service of trustees.

An important provision of the bill prohibits the transfer or investment of money and assets of trust funds outside the United States and beyond the jurisdiction of Federal courts, without the approval of the Secretary of Labor. Investments in federally supervised securities are not barred, even though such investments may represent overseas holdings. The measure also provides that no loans exceeding $500, which are not fully secured and legally executed, may be made from welfare and pension funds.

Essential new safeguards in the proposal establish that all persons who handle or control welfare and pension funds are fiduciaries and are charged with performing their duties and responsibilities with the same degree of care and skill as would be exercised by reasonably careful, diligent, and prudent men. The minimum standards for fiduciaries are as follows:

First. No fiduciary shall act as an adverse party toward the fund or its beneficiaries.

Second. No fiduciary shall borrow from a fund, directly or indirectly, without the approval of the Secretary of Labor, nor shall investments be made with contributing employers unless the Secretary determines that such investments are in the interests of the fund and its participants.

Third. No fiduciary can hold any interest in a fund that is in conflict with his duties and responsibilities.

Fourth. Fiduciaries are prohibited from accepting from the assets of the fund any gratuities, commissions, kickbacks, or shares of any accrued profits.

Fifth. No fiduciary can accept any payment or other assignment of assets from a fund, except reasonable compensation for his services and for his expenses.

Sixth. All fiduciaries are held personally liable for losses incurred by willful breaching of the act, and for agreeing to or condoning such actions.

Seventh. No exculpatory provision or resolution shall relieve any fiduciary of his duties, responsibilities, and obligations established by the act.

All fiduciaries will be required to file with the Secretary of Labor affidavits stating that they are not members of or affiliated with the Communist Party, and that they do not believe in or advocate the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or illegal methods.

A person who has been convicted of any crime among those listed in the bill is barred from serving in any fiduciary capacity for 5 years after conviction or after termination of his prison sentence, just as such persons similarly are barred by the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act from holding union office. This prohibition has always been needed in the law; the subcommittee has information that such criminals presently hold administrative positions in certain trust funds, although they are barred from holding union office.

This bill also will close a serious gap in the present law, which governs the contributions and other income of trust funds, but does not regulate the ultimate disposition of the assets. It further prohibits the dissolution or merger of any fund exceeding $25,000 excepting as approved by the Secretary of Labor, and it prohibits such actions whenever they would benefit anyone but participants or other person who have legal and equitable interests in the funds. Any party of interest is allowed to petition against the Secretary's decision on dissolution or merger, and jurisdiction is given to the U.S. Court of Appeals on such petitions. The judgment of the court would be subject to review by the Supreme Court.

All persons are prohibited from transacting business with fiduciaries of trust funds whenever such actions would violate the act.

Federal courts are authorized by this proposal to remove fiduciaries from any trust funds for violations of the act or other sufficient reason, whenever proper petition is made for such removal. When a fiduciary is removed, he cannot serve again in any fund for a 5-year period.

Mr. President, the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act does not contain any provision for the recovery of any pension or welfare funds that are diverted or expended improperly. Section 211 of this bill enables the Secretary of Labor or any participant or beneficiary to sue in Federal courts to recover such assets.

This bill provides that the Secretary of Labor or any party of interest may bring action in Federal courts to enjoin any violation of the act. The Federal courts are authorized to grant injunctive or other appropriate relief. The Solicitor of the Department of Labor will act on behalf of the Secretary in civil actions.

A provision of the bill requires that employees shall be informed about their rights in benefit plans and about the financial status of the plans. Title I of the existing law is amended by requiring that welfare and pension benefit plans shall make available to each participant or beneficiary a description of the plan and an annual financial report.

The Secretary of Labor is charged in this proposal with additional duties and responsibilities relating to welfare and pension plans, but the existing law gives the Secretary no meaningful investigatory powers. Therefore this measure authorizes the Secretary to conduct investigations whenever necessary to determine whether the law has been or is about to be violated. This power is similar to the authority for investigation given to the Secretary by the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act.

The several sections of this bill provide appropriate penalties, wherever necessary, for violations of the act.

Mr. President, the corrective and preventive provisions of this legislative proposal are sorely needed to put an end to the abuses in the welfare and pension field and to protect the rights of the many millions of American workers who rely upon employee benefit plans for a wide range of financial assistance. This bill will place no burden upon the administrators of or contributors to trust funds which are operated with honesty and integrity; it will, however, serve to deter and eliminate the raiding and looting of welfare and pension plans by dishonest and corrupt persons.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be printed in the RECORD and also a statement giving a summary of the provisions of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill and summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2627

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, as amended, is amended by adding the following new title:

"TITLE II—SAFEGUARDS FOR THE PROTECTION OF EMPLOYEE WELFARE AND PENSION BENEFIT FUNDS

"Statement of purpose

"SEC. 201. It is the purpose of this title to provide additional safeguards for the protection of the interests of participants in and beneficiaries of employee welfare and pension benefit plans (1) by providing certain minimum standards and requirements for the maintenance and management of employee welfare and pension benefit funds; (2) by providing certain minimum fiduciary standards of conduct, responsibility, and obligation, upon all persons engaged in, or responsible for, receiving, holding, managing, investing, lending, disbursing, or otherwise handling any of such funds; (3) by providing sanctions and penalties for breaches of such fiduciary standards; and (4) by providing for the recovery of losses suffered by such funds by reason of the refusal or failure of such persons to maintain and abide by such fiduciary standards.

"Definitions

"SEC. 202. As used in this title—

"(1) The term 'employee welfare benefit fund' means any fund established pursuant to or in connection with an employee welfare benefit plan subject to this Act, for the purpose of providing medical, surgical, or hospital care or benefits, or benefits in the event of sickness, accident, disability, death, or unemployment, for the participants in such welfare benefit plan and/or their beneficiaries.

"(2) The term 'employee pension benefit fund' means any fund established pursuant to or in connection with an employee pension benefit plan (including a profit-sharing plan) subject to this Act, for the purpose of providing pensions, annuities, or other retirement benefits for the participants in such pension benefit plan, and/or their beneficiaries.

"(3) The term 'fund,' when employed in a context which refers to the holding, distribution, investment, or earnings thereof, or to payments or transfers therefrom, means the moneys, stocks, bonds, debentures, or other assets thereof, or deeds, mortgages, or other evidences of ownership of assets or ownership of interests in assets; but such term, when so employed, does not include any welfare or pension insurance policy or plan issued by an insurance company organized under the laws of the several States of the United States and does not include any premiums, money, or other thing of value which has been paid thereon.

"Requirements respecting funds

"SEC. 203. (a) All employee welfare benefit funds and all employee pension benefit funds, whenever established, shall be deemed to be trust funds and to be subject to the terms and conditions provided in this section whether or not established pursuant to trust agreements or other written instruments.

"(b) Any employee welfare benefit fund and the income accruing thereto shall be available for expenditure only for the sole and exclusive purpose of (1) paying to the participants in the employee welfare benefit plan pursuant to which such fund was established or their beneficiaries (or both), medical, surgical, hospital, sickness, accident, disability, death, or unemployment benefits provided under such plan and (2) defraying the reasonable costs of administration of such plan.

"(c) Any employee pension benefit fund and the income accruing thereto shall be available only for the sole and exclusive purpose of paying to the participants in the employee pension benefit plan pursuant to which such fund was established or their beneficiaries (or both), the retirement benefits (including disability retirement benefits) and death benefits (if any) provided under such plan and for defraying the reasonable costs of administration of such plan.

"(d) No gift of money or other assets shall be made or accepted from an employee welfare or pension benefit fund for any purpose.

"(e) The term of a trustee appointed after the effective date of this title for any employee welfare or pension benefit fund shall not be for a period longer than 3 years, and the term of any person serving as a trustee of any employee welfare or pension benefit fund, on the effective date of this title, shall expire not later than 3 years after such date. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prohibit the reappointment of any qualified individual upon the expiration of such term.

"(f) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this section shall be fined not more than $2,000, or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

"Situs of employee welfare and pension benefit funds

"SEC. 204. The situs of every employee welfare benefit fund and every employee pension benefit fund shall at all times be located within the jurisdiction of one or more of the district courts of the United States, or one or more of the United States courts of any territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, and no part of any such fund shall be transferred, deposited, invested, loaned or held outside the United States except pursuant to a plan submitted to and approved by the Secretary pursuant to regulations promulgated by him. Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to require approval by the Secretary of the purchase by an employee welfare or pension benefit fund of securities listed and traded on an exchange subject to regulation by the Securities and Exchange Commission, or securities in an investment company registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, or securities of a public utility holding company registered under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935.

"Loans

"SEC. 205. (a) No loan of moneys or other assets shall be made from any employee welfare or pension benefit fund, unless such loan is secured by assets which are pledged and obligated by the borrower as collateral and which are of a value not less than the amount of such loan. No such loan shall be made except pursuant to a duly executed and signed instrument which specifies the amount and term of the loan, the rate of interest to be paid by the borrower, and the location and complete description of the property which is being pledged by the borrower as collateral for such loan.

"(b) No loan shall be made from an employees welfare or pension benefit fund to any borrower if the situs of either his legal domicile, or of the assets, if any, which he proposes to pledge as security for such loan, is located outside the jurisdiction of the courts referred to in section 204.

"(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the making of unsecured loans from any employee welfare or pension benefit fund to any individual who is a participant or beneficiary of such fund, but the aggregate amount of the unpaid balance of such loans to any individual outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $500.

"(d) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this section or section 204, shall be fined not more than $2,000, or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

"Fiduciary status of certain persons with respect to funds

"SEC. 206. (a) Each administrator, officer, director, trustee, and member of any executive board or similar governing body of any employee welfare or pension benefit fund, and any employee of such fund who receives, disburses, or otherwise exercises any control or authority with respect to the moneys or other assets of such fund, is a fiduciary and occupies a position of trust in relation to such fund and its participants and beneficiaries individually and as a group. It is, therefore, the responsibility, obligation, and duty of each such fiduciary, taking into account the purposes and functions of such employee welfare or pension benefit fund, to hold its money and other assets solely and exclusively for the participants and beneficiaries of such fund, and to handle, manage, invest and expend the same in a manner consistent with the purposes for which the fund was established and the provisions of this title, and in his conduct of the affairs of such fund, to exercise the same degree of care and skill as would be exercised by a reasonably careful, diligent, and prudent man.

"(b) No person who is a fiduciary of an employee welfare or employee pension benefit fund shall deal with such fund, represent any other party dealing with such fund, or use his influence in behalf of any other party dealing with such fund, in any matter in which such fiduciary or such party has a financial interest the advancement of which would be contrary to the financial or other interests of such fund, nor shall any such person otherwise act as an adverse party or in behalf of an adverse party in dealing with such fund.

"(c) No person who is a fiduciary of an employee welfare or pension benefit fund, a labor organization (including an official thereof) which represents employees who are participants in or beneficiaries of such fund, or an employer (including an official thereof) of any employee who is a participant in or beneficiary of any such fund, shall borrow, directly or indirectly, any money or other assets from such fund, nor shall any investment be made from such fund, except that a loan or investment may be made from such a fund to any such employer in any case in which the Secretary determines, in accordance with regulations promulgated by him, that such loan or investment would be in the interest of such fund or its participants or beneficiaries.

"(d) No person shall directly or indirectly hold or acquire any pecuniary or other interest in an employee welfare or pension benefit fund of which he is a fiduciary, which conflicts with his responsibilities, obligations and duties toward such fund and its participants and beneficiaries.

"(e) No person shall accept any gratuity, commission, or kickback, or share in any accrued profit, in connection with the management, investment, disbursement, or other handling of any of the moneys or other assets of an employee welfare or pension benefit fund of which he is a fiduciary.

"(f) No person shall, directly or indirectly, receive or accept any payment, pledge, hypothecation, assignment or other transfer out of the moneys or other assets of an employee welfare or pension benefit fund of which he is a fiduciary.

"(g) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit any person from receiving (1) any benefit to which he may be entitled as a participant in or beneficiary of an employee welfare or pension benefit fund, or (2) any reasonable compensation for, or reimbursement of expenses properly and actually incurred in, the performance of his duties as a fiduciary of such fund.

"(h) Any fiduciary of an employee welfare or pension benefit fund who willfully breaches any of the responsibilities, obligations, or duties imposed on fiduciaries of such funds by this title, shall be held personally liable to such funds for any losses resulting from such breach and their personal assets shall be subject to attachment in behalf of such fund for purposes of reimbursement.

"(i) Any fiduciary of an employee welfare or pension benefit fund who knowingly agrees to or condones the breach by any other fiduciary of such fund, of the responsibilities, obligations, or duties imposed on fiduciaries of such funds by this title, shall be held liable to such fund for any losses resulting from such breach, individually and jointly with the fiduciary whose breach is condoned or agreed to, and the personal assets of each such fiduciary shall be subject to attachment in behalf of such fund for purposes of reimbursement.

"(j) Any fiduciary of an employee welfare or pension benefit fund who willfully breaches any of the responsibilities, obligations, or duties imposed on fiduciaries of such funds by this title shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

"(k) Any exculpatory provision and any exculpatory general or special resolution which purports to relieve any fiduciary of an employee welfare or pension benefit fund from liability for any breach of the responsibilities, obligations, or duties declared by this title, shall be void as against public policy.

"Prohibition against certain persons holding positions of trust

"SEC. 207. (a) No person shall serve as an administrator, officer, director, trustee, or member of any executive board or similar governing body of an employee welfare or pension benefit fund or as an employee who receives, disburses or otherwise exercises any control or authority with respect to the moneys or other assets of such a fund, unless there is on file with the Secretary of Labor an affidavit executed by such person, contemporaneously with his entry into such position, or within the preceding twelve-month period, that he is not a member of the Communist Party or affiliated with such Party, and that he does not believe in, and is not a member of, nor does he support, any organization that believes in or teaches or otherwise advocates the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods. With respect to all employee welfare and pension funds already in existence as of the effective date of this title, the affidavits required by this subsection shall be filed within ninety days following such effective date. The provisions of section 1001 of title 18 of the United States Code shall be applicable in respect to such affidavits.

"(b) (1) No person shall serve as an administrator, officer, director, trustee, or member of any executive board or similar governing body or an employee welfare or pension benefit fund, or as an employee who receives, disburses, or otherwise exercises any control or authority with respect to the moneys or other assets of such a fund for any period which is within the five-year period which commences with whichever of the following dates is the later—

"(A) the date he was convicted of (i) robbery, (ii) bribery, (iii) extortion, (iv) embezzlement, (v) grand larceny, (vi) burglary, (vii) arson, (viii) violation of any Federal or State law dealing with narcotics, (ix) rape, (x) murder, (xi) assault with intent to kill, (xii) assault which inflicts or is intended to inflict grievous bodily injury, (xiii) any other crime which involves moral turpitude and for which a prison term of one year or more may be imposed, (xiv) conspiracy to commit any of the aforesaid crimes, (xv) violation of any provision of the Labor-Management Relations Act, violation of any provision of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, or violation of any provision of this Act, if a fine or prison term is imposed as a result of conviction of such violation, or (xvi) conspiracy to commit any such violation, if a fine or prison term is imposed as a result of such conspiracy, or

"(B) the date of the termination of any prison term imposed as a result of the conviction of any crime or violation referred to in paragraph (A),

unless prior to the expiration of such five-year period such person shall have been granted a duly executed pardon for the commission of such crime or violation and fully restored to all rights of citizenship which were revoked as a result of the conviction of such crime or violation.

"(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), a conviction shall be deemed to have occurred on the date the judgment of conviction is entered by the trial court, or, if later, the date the judgment of the trial court is sustained on appeal.

"(3) The provisions of this subsection shall apply to convictions occurring before as well as on and after the effective date of this title.

"(c) No administrator, officer, director, trustee, or member of any executive board or similar governing body of an employee welfare or pension benefit fund, and no employee who receives, disburses or otherwise exercises any control or authority with respect to the moneys or other assets of such a fund, shall knowingly assent to any person's assumption or holding of any of the positions herein designated, in violation of this section.

"(d) Any person who willfully violates this section shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"Dissolution or merger of employee welfare and pension benefit funds

"SEC. 208. (a) No employee welfare or pension benefit fund having assets in excess of $25,000 shall pay out or transfer any of its assets upon dissolution or merger with any other fund except in accordance with a plan (1) complying with general regulations issued by the Secretary or (2) the provisions of which have been approved by the Secretary as being fair and equitable to the participants and beneficiaries, and to any other person who has a legal or equitable interest in such fund or the assets thereof by reason of having made financial contribution thereto or otherwise.

"(b) The Secretary shall not approve any plan of dissolution or merger of any employee welfare or pension benefit fund which provides for the distribution directly or indirectly to or for the benefit of any person occupying or who previously occupied a position involving fiduciary responsibilities, obligations, and duties in respect to such fund except to the extent that such person may be entitled thereto as one of the participants or beneficiaries for whose benefit such fund was established, or as a person who, because of financial contributions made to such fund or otherwise, has a legal or equitable interest therein the enforcement of which would be fair and equitable, the interests of all parties considered.

"(c) Proceedings on application for approval of plans of dissolution or merger shall be conducted in accord with the provisions and requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"(d) Any person aggrieved by the final determination of the Secretary may within 60 days thereof, file with the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, or with any other United States circuit court of appeals having jurisdiction of the situs of the employee welfare or pension benefit fund, a petition for review of such final determination. A copy of the petition shall forthwith be transmitted by the clerk of such court to the Secretary. The Secretary shall thereupon file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based such final determination as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

"(e) The findings of fact by the Secretary, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Secretary to take further evidence, and the Secretary may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous determination, and shall certify to the court the transcript and record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

"(f) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretary or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

"(g) If no petition for review is filed pursuant to and within the time prescribed in subsection (d), the final determination of the Secretary shall become final and shall not thereupon be subject to review by any court.

"(h) The Secretary shall from time to time issue such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

"Improper transactions with fiduciaries

"SEC. 209. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to accept any money or other thing of value from the assets of any employee welfare or pension benefit fund pursuant to any transaction with any person occupying the position of a fiduciary in relation to such fund, if such transaction is contrary to or involves any violation of the responsibilities, obligations, and duties imposed upon such fiduciary under any of the provisions of this title, and any contract or agreement providing for such transaction shall be null and void.

"(b) Any person who knowingly violates the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.

"Civil suits—Removal of trustees

"SEC. 210. (a) The Secretary or any person who has a legal or equitable interest in any employee welfare or pension benefit fund or the assets thereof may petition the appropriate District or other Court of the United States to remove any person occupying a fiduciary position in relation to such fund and, pending the replacement of such person, to appoint an appropriate individual to carry out the duties of the person to be removed.

"(b) If the court finds that (1) such person is failing to carry out his fiduciary responsibilities, obligations, or duties with respect to such fund, or (2) such person is, because of past criminal activity, past record in serving in a fiduciary capacity in relation to a similar fund, or because of other provisions of this title, disqualified or unsuitable to act in a fiduciary capacity for such fund, the court shall issue an order prohibiting such person from continuing to serve as a fiduciary of such fund, and, if the court deems the same to be necessary or desirable to protect such fund and its assets or the persons having legal or equitable interests therein, the court shall appoint a competent and appropriate person to serve as a fiduciary of such fund, in the place of the person being removed therefrom, until such time as another person may be appointed or elected.

"(c) No person who has been removed (other than a person who has been removed because of physical or mental incapacity) pursuant to this section as a fiduciary of an employee welfare or pension benefit fund shall thereafter be eligible to serve in a fiduciary capacity for or in behalf of such fund or any other employee welfare or pension benefit fund for a period of five years.

"Recovery of funds

"SEC. 211. (a) In any case in which (1) any person has engaged in acts or practices in relation to any employee welfare or pension benefit fund in violation of any provision of this title and (2) such employee welfare or pension benefit fund or the participants or beneficiaries of such fund have suffered financial loss (including losses resulting from any failure to credit to such fund, any of the income accruing from any investment or other use or manipulation of the assets of such fund by such person) by reason of such acts or practices, and (3) the amount of such loss has not been recovered by or on behalf of such fund or its participants and beneficiaries, the Secretary or any such participant or beneficiary may bring an action in the proper district court of the United States or in the proper United States Court of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States to recover any such unrecovered amount on behalf of such fund.

"Injunctions and prosecutions of offenses

"SEC. 212. (a) In any case in which any person is engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of this title, any person who has a legal or equitable interest in any employee welfare or pension benefit fund (or the Secretary, upon request of the person having such interest) may bring an action in the proper district court of the United States or in the proper United States court of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, to enjoin such acts or practices and for such other relief as may be appropriate. Upon a proper showing a permanent or temporary injunction or restraining order shall be granted without bond.

"(b) The district courts of the United States, and the United States court of any territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, to grant injunctive and other appropriate relief in any action involving any violation of this title.

"Secretary to be represented by solicitor

"SEC. 213. Any civil action authorized to be brought under this Act by the Secretary may be brought in his behalf by the Solicitor of the Department of Labor, who shall represent the Secretary in all such actions.

"Effect of other laws

"SEC. 214. Except insofar as any present or future law of the United States or of any territory or State may be inconsistent with this Act, nothing in any provision of this title shall be construed as exempting any person from liability, duty, penalty, or punishment provided by any such law in regard to any criminal offense referred to in this title or in regard to the operation or administration of employee welfare or pension benefit funds, or in any manner to authorize the operation or administratin of any such fund contrary to any such law."

Technical and Miscellaneous Amendments

SEC. 2. The Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act is further amended as follows:

(1) After the first section insert the following center heading "TITLE I—DISCLOSURE AND REPORTING".

(2) In section 2(b), strike out "Act" and substitute "title".

(3) In section 9(a), strike out "Act" and substitute "title".

(4) Amend section 5(a) to read as follows:

"(a) The administrator of an employee welfare benefit plan or an employee pension benefit plan shall publish in accordance with section 8 to each participant or beneficiary covered thereunder (1) a description of the plan and (2) an annual financial report. Such description and such report shall contain the information required by sections 6 and 7 of this Act and such other information as the Secretary shall determine to be necessary and appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act. The Secretary may by regulations provide for the exemption from all or any part of the reporting and disclosure requirements of this Act of any class or type of welfare or benefit plans, if the Secretary finds that the application of such requirements to such plans is not required in order to effectuate the purposes of this Act."

(5) Section 9(d) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Secretary shall have power, when he believes it necessary in order to determine whether any person has violated or is about to violate any provision of this Act, to make an investigation and in connection therewith he may enter such places and inspect such records and accounts and question such persons as he may deem necessary to enable him to determine the facts relative thereto. The Secretary may report to interested persons or officials concerning the facts required to be shown in any report required by this Act and concerning the reasons for failure or refusal to file such a report or any other matter which he deems to be appopriate as a result of such an investigation."

Effective date

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective ninety days after the date of its enactment.

Summary of Proposed Bill To Amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act for the Purpose of Providing Additional Protection for the Interests of Participants In and Beneficiaries of Employee Welfare and Pension Benefit Plans

The bill would amend the act by adding a new title: Title II—Safeguards for the Protection of Employee Welfare and Pension Benefit Plans.

TITLE II

Section 201. Statement of purpose

The bill would protect the interests of participants and beneficiaries of welfare and pension funds by: (1) providing minimum standards and requirements for such funds; (2) providing minimum fiduciary standards of conduct; (3) providing penalties for violations; (4) providing for the recovery of losses from funds.

Section 202. Definitions

This section provides definitive language for "employee welfare benefit fund" and for "employee pension benefit fund" in keeping with the existing act which it amends. It includes, within pension funds, all benefits received from profit-sharing plans operated upon a pension or annuity basis. It defines the term "fund" to cover all assets, interests, earnings, and other moneys of the benefit plan, but it excludes welfare and pension insurance policies and the premiums already paid to insurance companies who have contracted to pay benefits.

Section 203. Requirements for funds

(a) Deems all welfare and pension funds to be trust funds and subject to requirements of this title, whether or not they have trust agreements or other written agreements.

(b) Requires that welfare funds and their incomes shall be used only for stated benefits and reasonable administrative costs.

(c) Requires that pension funds and their incomes shall be used only for stated benefits and for reasonable administrative costs.

(d) Prohibits gifts of money or assets from funds for any purpose.

(e) Sets terms of trustees at 3 years, and allows reappointment.

(f) Provides penalties for violations of this section: $2,000, 2 years or both.

Section 204. Situs of funds

This section provides that funds must be held within Federal court jurisdiction in the United States or territories. No funds shall be moved or invested outside the United States unless the Secretary of Labor approves. Provides, however, that funds may invest in securities listed under SEC jurisdiction, or securities registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940 or under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935.

Section 205. Loans

This section (a) prohibits loans of money or assets not fully secured by collateral. Loans must be legally executed with statements of amount, term, and interests. Full description of the collateral is required. The section (b) prohibits loans to persons whose domicile and/or collateral are located outside Federal Court jurisdiction. The section (c) allows unsecured loans to participants or beneficiaries not exceeding $500. Penalties (d) for violations are not more than $2,000, not more than 2 years, or both.

Section 206. Fiduciary status of certain persons

(a) States that all persons who handle or control funds, including employees, are fiduciaries in positions of trust, and are charged in all respects to handle and control the funds, according to their functions and purposes and the provisions of this title, with the same care and skill of reasonably careful, diligent, and prudent men.

(b) No such fiduciary shall act as, or in behalf of, an adverse party toward the fund or its beneficiaries.

(c) No such fiduciary, including labor unions or employers or their officials, shall borrow from the fund directly or indirectly, except that approvals of loans or investments may be given by the Secretary of Labor when they would be in the interest of such fund or its participants and beneficiaries.

(d) No fiduciary can hold in a fund any interest which conflicts with his duties and responsibilities.

(e) No fiduciary shall accept any gratuity, commission, kickback, or accrued profits connected with a fund.

(f) No fiduciary shall, directly or indirectly, accept any payment or other assignment from the fund.

(g) However, fiduciaries may accept benefits as participants or beneficiaries, and may accept reasonable compensation for their services and for their expenses.

(h) A fiduciary will be held personally liable for losses incurred by willful breaching of this title, and his personal assets may be attached for reimbursement.

(i) A fiduciary will be held jointly and severally liable for losses incurred by agreeing to or condoning the willful breaching of this title by another fiduciary, and the assets for both may be attached for reimbursement.

(j) Penalties for violations: not more than $10,000, not more than 5 years, or both.

(k) No excuses are permitted to relieve fiduciaries of responsibilities, and any such excuses offered shall be void as against public policy.

Section 207. Persons barred as trustees

(a) All fiduciaries, including employees, must file with the Secretary of Labor affidavits stating that they are not members of or affiliated with the Communist Party, and that they do not believe in, belong to, or support any organization teaching or advocating the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or illegal methods. For funds already in existence, affidavits shall be filed within 90 days of the effective date of this title.

(b) No person shall be a fiduciary during a 5-year period following:

(A) His conviction for robbery, bribery, extortion, embezzlement, grand larceny, burglary, arson, Federal or State narcotics violations, rape, murder, assault with intent to kill, assault with grievous bodily injury or intent to injure, any other crime involving moral turpitude for which 1 year or more in prison may be imposed, conspiracy to commit any of the above, violations of Labor-Management Relations Act or Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act or this act if a fine or prison term is imposed, or conspiracy to commit such violations if a fine or prison term is imposed; or

(B) The termination of his prison term for such convictions noted in (A) above, unless he is pardoned within that 5-year period and his citizenship rights are returned.

Convictions occur on the date the judgment of conviction is entered, or the date the judgment is sustained on appeal.

Provisions of (b) above apply to convictions occurring before as well as after the effective date of this title.

(c) No fiduciary shall knowingly assent to or condone violations of (a) or (b) above.

(d) Penalties for violations: not more than $10,000, nor more than 5 years, or both.

Section 208. Dissolution or merger of funds

(a) No fund exceeding $25,000 shall be dissolved or merged excepting with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, who will issue general regulations on the subject, or who will determine if the action is fair and equitable to all parties having interests.

(b) The Secretary will not approve a dissolution plan that pays or transfers to a current or former fiduciary any moneys or assets except those due him as a participant or those he merits through legal or equitable interest in the fund.

(c) Proceedings for approval of dissolution or merger plans will follow the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act.

(d) Any person may, within 60 days, petition the U.S. Court of Appeals for review of the Secretary's decision.

(e) The Secretary's findings shall be conclusive, but the Court may remand the case to the Secretary, whereupon the Secretary may make new findings, which will also be conclusive.

(f) The Court shall have the right to affirm or set aside the Secretary's finding; review may be made by the Supreme Court.

(g) If no petition is filed, the Secretary's determination is final.

(h) The Secretary will issue regulations to carry out the provisions of this section.

Section 209. Improper transactions with fiduciaries

(a) No person shall take money or assets from funds because of transactions with fiduciaries if such transactions are violations of this title, and any contracts relating to them shall be null and void.

(b) Penalties: not more than $10,000, not more than 5 years, or both.

Section 210. Removal of trustees

(a) The Secretary of Labor, or any interested person, may sue in Federal court for the removal of a fiduciary and the appointment of a temporary successor.

(b) The Federal court may, for violations of this title or other sufficient reason, remove such fiduciary and appoint a successor to serve out the term.

(c) No person so removed can thereafter serve as a fiduciary for any such fund for a 5-year period.

Section 211. Recovery of funds

When any fiduciary has violated this title and when funds are depleted by such acts, without recovery of the money, the Secretary or any participant or beneficiary may sue in Federal courts to recover the money.

Section 212. Injunctions and prosecutions

Provides that any person with a legal or equitable interest in a fund, or the Secretary of Labor upon request of such person, may bring action in Federal court to enjoin any acts or practices which violate this title or may bring action in Federal court for such other relief as may be appropriate. Permanent or temporary restraining orders or injunctions shall be granted without bond.

The section grants the appropriate Federal courts the jurisdiction to grant injunctive or appropriate relief.

Section 213. The Solicitor of the Labor Department

The Solicitor of the Labor Department may bring any civil action under this act on behalf of the Secretary of Labor.

Section 214. Effect of other laws

This title shall not be construed to exempt any person from the provisions of other laws in regard to criminal offenses mentioned in this title or in regard to welfare and pension funds.

TECHNICAL AND MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS

There are several technical amendments to the bill, all of which amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act to bring its provisions into conformity with the new requirements of the new title.

Two amendments are of considerable importance as follows:

Section 5(a) of the act: Furnishing of information

The amendment provides that administrators of benefit plans shall make available to each participant and beneficiary a description of the plan and the annual financial report of the plan, which shall contain such information as the Secretary of Labor may direct. The Secretary may by regulation exempt certain plans from this provision.

Section 9(d) of the act: Investigatory powers

The amendment provides that the Secretary of Labor shall have powers of investigation similar to those granted to him under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

The effective date of these amendments to the act will be ninety (90) days after the date of the bill's enactment.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma, whom I am pleased to have as a cosponsor of the bill and who is a member of the subcommittee. Mr. President, of the nine members of the subcommittee which held hearings, eight have signed the bill as cosponsors.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for his kind remarks and for yielding to me at this time, since I must return to the chair.

Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, I am pleased to join our distinguished and able chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], in cosponsoring the bill he has introduced today to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

The provisions of this bill, and the need for their enactment, are based upon information disclosed by testimony in recent hearings held by our subcommittee relating to the diversion of welfare and pension funds by two New York union locals.

Our distinguished chairman has given the shocking details of how officials of those two local unions were able to divert approximately $4 million of pension and welfare funds to investments overseas and remove them from the effective control of the employees for whose use and benefit they were established.

Our hearings in no way cast aspersions upon the American labor movement or the honesty and integrity of the vast majority of its leaders. The testimony, however, did reveal some glaring loopholes in present law which must be plugged if the interests and welfare of American workers are to be properly safeguarded.

This bill, introduced today, proposes to correct inadequacies of the existing law and to protect the rights of participants in pension and welfare funds. This would be done by providing minimum standards for the operations of such funds and the use thereof, minimum standards for the conduct of trustees and administrators, and provisions for recovery of losses suffered by such funds through dishonesty or mismanagement.

The bill would also prohibit the transfer or investment of such pension or welfare funds outside the jurisdiction of U.S. courts without the approval of the Secretary of Labor. While the committee to which this bill is assigned will want to study this section of the bill carefully to be certain the finally approved language does not deter the present excellent program, administered by AID, under which union funds may be loaned for development in poorer countries, there is no question that unconscionable foreign transfer or investments of such funds, as were disclosed in our hearings, must be more tightly regulated.

Our distinguished chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], has again done a very fair and thorough job of spotlighting an area of the law to which the Senate should give its attention. This bill, I hope, will serve as a vehicle for the intensive further study by the appropriate Senate legislative committee of the problems raised by our hearings, and I trust that such committee may want to perfect and refine our thinking and language but will take action to accomplish the ends sought.

Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Arkansas and again express appreciation to him for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as the ranking Republican member of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, I am happy to join our distinguished chairman as a cosponsor of this bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act so as to provide much-needed safeguards for the protection of employee welfare and pension fund plans.

Throughout my 27 years in Congress, in serving on one investigating committee or another, I have come into contact with many unsavory circumstances. Few have approached this present situation in its propensity to perpetrate a cruel hoax upon the unwary.

The virtue of saving and preparing for our golden years has been impressed upon all of us since our childhood. The vast majority of our populace has attempted to set up a systematic saving procedure to accomplish such a goal. In today's growing industrial society one of the most popular arrangements is to participate in a plan whereby a company will agree to deposit a certain percentage of the wages of their workers in a central trust fund which is intended to be used for pension and welfare benefits.

Unfortunately, this admirable plan has at times been perverted by unscrupulous persons in a shocking display of calloused disregard for the rights of those they supposedly represent. Investigative hearings have disclosed that certain labor union pension and welfare plans have been raided by union officers who have diverted funds intended for beneficiary purposes to other uses that are highly unlikely to be of direct benefit to the plan members, leaving these individuals, the rank and file union members, without legal recourse. Honest industrial working men and women, who believed that the money for which they have worked so hard and which supposedly was deposited in a fund held in trust for their benefit and that of their families, discovered that what could have been a substantial part of their retirement plan was gone.

Very obviously, Mr. President, the existing laws are not sufficient to cover these situations—situations with which I will deal at length in a moment. If this be the case, then I believe it is incumbent upon us to close those loopholes in the law so that the rank and file union members receive the type of protection that they expect and they deserve. I say this because I am convinced that the national economic interest lies not only with such surface factors as maintaining a high employment ratio and a growing economy but also in keeping faith with that vast majority of individuals who comprise the sinews of our industrial society, who live on a fixed income and in turn rely upon the Government to protect that income with laws as well as a stable economy. Above all, we owe a duty in this connection to the laboring men and women of America.

In saying this, I am not unaware of the fact that I am presently engaged in an attempt to defeat the repeal of of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. This effort has led some to label me as antilabor and that I am incapable of being cognizant of the plight of the workingman. Such a charge is fiction, at best, and a gross falsehood, at worst, for stands upon an issue are motivated by principles, as well as political realities, and characterizations, such as antilabor, and their consequences are applied by those who are more interested in headlines than accuracy, and therefore it is of little interest to me as to what particular label is attached to me by those who oppose my position.

What does interest me, however, is the objective of a law and the way that law will effect the people to whom we owe our allegiancce. The people, not as a group or as a lobby but as individuals. To each individual, I believe I owe a solemn trust—that of providing sound and fair laws for the protection of all our citizens. It was this same trust to these same individuals that led me to stand in this same spot 2 weeks ago and speak on behalf of legislation that I was cosponsoring to tighten up the banking laws in this country. At that time I was not attempting to be antibanking any more than I am prolabor in cosponsoring this legislation today. The primary purpose in both instances is to provide needed protection for the people of this country.

In the year 600 B.C., Anacharsis, a wise but cynical Scythian philosopher, in commenting on the attempts of the Athenian legislator, Solon, to pass laws that would make men generous and honest, said that "such laws do rightly resemble the spider's cobwebs, because they take hold of little flies and gnats which fall into them, but the rich and mighty will break and run through them at will."

Some cynics of the 20th century would agree with this observation made over 2,000 years ago. I am not a cynic. I am a legislator, and as a legislator I am interested primarily in arriving at the facts that I believe will provide the Congress with laws that will protect those who are incapable of protecting themselves, and I worry about neither the application of the laws or that the application of those laws is directed toward the common or the mighty, business or labor, union or nonunion.

My only concern is to see that justice is done or rather provided for. To do this, it is necessary to gather needed information so that we may pass laws and the executive branch enforce them.

Our subcommittee held hearings on this important subject, first in a 1-day executive session in New York City on June 29, 1965; thereafter in 3 rapid days of hearings in our regular committee room on July 20, 21, and 22, 1965. This we were authorized to do through Senate Resolution 54 of the current Congress, the salient portion of same for such a purpose being as follows:

> SEC. 2. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is further authorized from February 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been engaged in, in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Acting pursuant to this resolution, our subcommittee took a look at the activities—actually, improper activities—of two unions. This proposed legislation is the direct outgrowth of these hearings. One was Local 815 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters which was actually more closely associated with the Drug, Chemical, Cosmetics, Plastics & Affiliated Industries Warehousemen in the New York City area. The other was the Allied Trades Council, more properly associated with the International Leather Goods, Plastics & Novelty Workers Union Local, AFL–CIO in northern New Jersey, both being located in the New York City-northern New Jersey area. These two locals were comprised of 8,000 to 10,000 retail clerks, for the most part, and were under the complete domination and control of one man, George Barasch, 107 Colonial Parkway, Yonkers, N.Y. Parenthetically, I mention Mr. Barasch's name and address because, throughout the course of the hearings, this was the most significant bit of information that the subcommittee was able to derive from him, in that Mr. Barasch chose, time and time again in consultation with his attorneys, to utilize the fifth amendment in response to subcommittee interrogation, on the standard grounds that to answer the question might tend to incriminate him.

I have examined the record of these hearings in some detail and I find that abuses of the welfare and pension funds by this man, Barasch, in his official administrative and fiduciary capacities, is shocking almost beyond disbelief. The machinations of this cool, calculating, devious individual compromise a series of diabolical and outrageous raids on the treasuries of the unions that he controlled and the welfare and pension funds which came from the contributions of employers in lieu of wages, or as collective bargaining fringe benefits, for the union employees that Barasch was supposed to represent. Let me explain how Barasch performed his magic.

Local 815, International Brotherhood of Teamsters was chartered in August 1952, and Barasch became an official of that union. The welfare fund for this local, the affiliated fund, was first established in October 1952, with Barasch a trustee of the fund. By 1957, there was approximately $1,882,000 in employer contributions in this fund. However, in 1954 Barasch had established a second welfare fund, the New York Affiliated Fund, and directed the employers to transfer their contributions to this second fund, gradually and on an incremental basis, so that by 1957 all employer contributions had been switched to the second fund. However, this still left the approximate amount of $2 million in the first fund, which remained until July 10, 1959, when all of it was transferred to a new entity entitled the Cromwell Research Foundation, a Puerto Rico corporation, incorporated by George Barasch.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, an example of the way Barasch effected the transfer of these funds is contained in a letter concerning the affiliated fund, of which Barasch and a Morris Shey were trustees, dated July 3, 1959, and addressed to the Manufacturers Trust Co., 55 Broad Street, New York, N.Y. Therein, Barasch refers to a trust indenture of December 16, 1953, and that the trustees have now exercised their discretion, according to that indenture, and have determined that all the corpus and income of the affiliated fund should be transferred to the Cromwell Research Foundation, and that, pursuant to a letter agreement between the Trustees & Manufacturers Trust, dated January 5, 1955, the trustees now terminate that letter agreement and direct Manufacturers Trust to deliver the corpus and all accumulations of income "to the custody account existing under the provisions of an agreement with said Cromwell Research Foundation, Inc., dated July 10, 1959." This letter was signed by Barasch and Shey and, significantly, contained a footnote to the effect that, "this letter of instructions is ratified, approved, and confirmed by the undersigned executive board members of Local 815." Thereafter all seven board members'—who also took the fifth amendment during our hearings—signatures appeared and, to no one's surprise, Mr. George Barasch turned out to be a member of that board.

In effect, then, the trust agreement creating the affiliated fund in 1952 or 1953 stated that if in the future there were no longer contributing employers, the trustees, in other words Barasch, could use its assets for charitable purposes.

When the employer contributions were directed by Barasch to be funneled into the New York affiliated fund, by 1957 the earlier affiliated fund was eased out so that it no longer received employer contributions, and beneficiaries, limited as they had been, no longer drew from it. Thereafter, Barasch, as a trustee, directed the affiliated fund's exercise of its broad powers in its trust indenture, changing it from a welfare trust into a charitable trust, moving it to a Puerto Rico corporation entitled Cromwell Research Foundation, where Barasch again controlled it.

Barasch could well have transferred the approximately $2 million in accumulated employer contributions of the affiliated fund to the New York affiliated fund, for the ultimate benefit of local 815's employees, but he obviously did not choose to do so. Significantly, although these funds were jointly administered by employer and employee trustees pursuant to section 302 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, the employer trustee was selected on a 5-year term basis while Barasch was appointed irrevocably as the union trustee, with the right to appoint his successor. And, in practice the employer-trustee turned out to be of the "rubberstamp" variety, signing his name to complicated documents without adequate study and with small financial remuneration, while Barasch, among other things, was at all times until 1964, when he went with Churchill Associates, Inc., the only individual empowered with the authority to write checks for the fund, pursuant to the trust indenture.

In essentially the same manner and in approximately the same time frame Barasch managed to transfer another $2 million in employer contributions, through two welfare funds, from the Allied Trades Council union to another foreign corporation, this one known as the Chemical Research Foundation, Inc., a Monrovia, Liberia, corporation.

Both of these foreign corporations had other incorporators, but in the course of events they came under the control of Barasch and his brother-in-law, Sam LaMar, another "fifth amendment artist," and are ostensibly set up as nonprofit corporations established for educational purposes. Needless to say, while there has been one grant of $100,000 to a Parochial Educational Institution, any other expenditures of this nature have been quite minimal. And, as these organizations are allegedly nonprofit in makeup, there are no requirements for the filing of periodic reports of earnings in the jurisdictions in which incorporated, and, in fact any control of same is completely in the hands of Barasch and brother-in-law LaMar, even to the extent that the corporations, by the terms of their certificates of incorporation, may be dissolved and their assets distributed by the unanimous consent of the members—Barasch and LaMar.

As if this were not enough, Mr. Barasch then went on to "bigger and better" things. On September 12, 1958, he and Sam LaMar formed a New Jersey corporation known as Churchill Associates, Inc. Again, three office girls were the incorporators but Barasch and LaMar soon became the only members. This was organized as a not-for-profit corporation, a classification which rapidly became a misnomer. Its charter is as broad as its Puerto Rican and African counterparts. However, its purpose is to administer the surviving welfare funds and a large joint pension fund, known as the Union Mutual Fund, of Local 815 and the Allied Trades Council unions. Prior to the formation of Churchill Associates, Inc., these funds were administered by the union officials, including Barasch, and the clerical help at the union hall. After the formation of Churchill's, the same individuals performed the same functions, at the same address, but now Churchill Associates received a fee of 10 percent of all the income from the welfare funds and 8 percent of all contributions to the pension fund for their services.

These services included the mailing of about 100 checks once a month to those who had worked long enough to have retired. The entire files for the pension operation are contained in one file drawer. Indeed, the total amount disbursed from the pension funds was a mere $120,030. For this, Churchill has been paid $338,427 in fees by the union mutual fund in the past 5 years. In effect then, Mr. President, Churchill is taking a service fee of almost $3 for every dollar it expends for pensions. In this way, and through investments which I will explain, Churchill Associates, Inc., had a net profit, from its September 12, 1958, formation through September 30, 1964, of $681,646.41, or an average annual net profit of $113,607.77, $327,844.99 of this amount, or 48.1 percent was through fees. And, as of September 30, 1964, the net worth of Churchill Associates, Inc., was $500,735.51.

Such a rapid expansion enabled Barasch to resign from his dual positions as an officer of local 815 and the Allied Trades Council, to be placed on the Churchill Associates' payroll. In fact, our investigation disclosed that in 1964, Barasch received $500 per week as a salary, which was increased to $700 per week on October 9, 1964, plus a $600 Christmas bonus. Also, he received $100 per week as expenses throughout this time, and even prior thereto when he was not on the payroll.

How did Churchill Associates, Inc., make the rest of their money? Simply by Barasch borrowing $1.5 million from the two research foundations and a third fund, pledging the paper of Churchill as "security," and then proceeding to speculate on the stock market with these funds. He caught an upward trend in the market and, in 1963 and 1964, made a total of $418,204.74 by trading in the following securities; Scovil, $366,305.30; Union Tank, $46,910.24; and General Aniline, $4,989.20. The net profit through investments during the aforementioned period, September 12, 1958, to September 30, 1964, amounted to $353,801.43, or 51.9 percent of the total net profit. The subject of a conflict of interest was apparently of no concern to Barasch.

Additionally, Mr. Barasch, who exhibited a much greater interest in his own welfare than that of the union members whom he supposedly represented, has provided for his old age in the course of his endeavors. He has taken $150,000 of the welfare money and has coupled it with some $200,000 he "milked away" from the treasury of the Allied Trades Council, to provide himself and his brother-in-law $350,000 in the form of a lifetime pension fund. (In this respect, it is interesting to note that Allied Trades Council's officials pension fund is $350,000—for Barasch and LaMar—but the Allied Trades Councils' treasury recently contained only $5,000.) Barasch did not stop there. He took $850,000 out of Local 815, Teamsters' treasury and put it into a private pension fund to provide benefits for just a handful of union officials, including, of course, Barasch. He has also managed to become eligible for a third pension, through the Teamster Joint Council 16, and, for a fourth pension through the Teamsters International. All of these will commence running late this year, when he is 55 years of age, and will give him a total annuity of over $54,000 per year for life. This is far in excess of most private annuity funds, is considerably more than a high-level Government employee with 30 years of service would receive, and, in fact, is more than twice as much as the retirement benefits that we presently provide for the President of the United States.

How did these things come about? It really is an oversimplification at best to attempt to explain this without resorting to the entire transcript, and documents admitted into evidence, during the subcommittee's hearings. Barasch's maneuvers were intricate; his henchmen played no substantive role; the trust indentures were extremely complex; and the similarity of names of the various trust funds were obviously designed to confuse the management trustee so as to eliminate any serious interest on his part. However, let me attempt to synopsize a part of his method of operation.

There are approximately 165 small- and medium-sized plants whose workers were organized by Barasch's two unions. Each has a shop steward. None of these 165 shop stewards, although elected by the individual employees, may hold office unless he has been approved by Barasch. It is mandatory for the shop steward to attend the infrequent general membership meetings and he is fined $15 for failure to do so. On the other hand, if he does attend regularly, he is wined and dined at a lavish New York night club and is given an annual gift of money. The subcommittee staff found that all of the important actions which affected Barasch took place at, and were supposedly approved by, these general membership meetings. However, upon checking the books and records, an amazing similarity of attendees, plus fined-absentees, was shown. These hand-chosen stewards represented less than 2 percent of the rank and file membership, but yet they continually elected and reelected Barasch and his cronies to office. On the other hand, no one was permitted to effectively oppose them through elections because any potential candidate had to submit a petition signed by 200 other employees before he could even be placed on the ballot—and there were only 6 or 7 shops that have that many employees. Other employees from other shops cannot feasibly join in on a petition because, under Barasch's rules, a nonapproved potential candidate is forbidden to use circulars, pamphlets, leaflets, or posters, or other campaign material of any type unless it is first approved by Barasch. Therefore, it is easy to understand that for the past 7- or 8-year period which the subcommittee staff examined, no

Barasch official has ever been opposed. As a matter of fact, the general membership composed of the shop stewards is given the choice of voting "yes" or "no" for Barasch, and "yes" or "no" for each of his associates listed on the ballot. There are no opponents. There are no other choices. Such an election device has appropriately been called a "Russian ballot."

I have gone to great lengths to explain the method of operation of this organization. I have done so because I believe it is necessary to have this background so that the urgency of this legislation may be appreciated. I have also included it because I feel that this is a perfect example of the saying "that power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely." What we have here is one-man domination and control and all the adverse results that accompany such a power structure.

Mr. President, the question might well be asked, "Why do not the rank and file members quit these two unions?" The answer is simple. They are required to join the union. This is compulsory unionism at its worst.

This is one of the matters we are talking about in the discussion of section 14(b). This is what can happen when a man is forced to join a union, over which he has no control and when he cannot have an effective voice in the selection of his own leadership.

All of these contracts, without exception, are union shop contracts which require union membership within 30 days after an employee first comes to work. Workingmen and women are required to pay union dues to this unscrupulous combine after having had to join such an organization. But more on this subject at another time.

It might well be asked, "Senator MUNDT, why are you spending so much time on this one union? Isn't this just an isolated case of one bad apple in a whole crate of good ones?" The answer is, "No." Our subcommittee staff has looked at, and is looking at, other union welfare and pension funds to the point that a similar pattern of improper practices and activities is developing so as to cause growing concern over the fate of the rank and file union member in this vital area of employee need. The distinguished chairman has appropriately described the magnitude of these welfare and pension plans and, needless to say, the loss to the worker, and the self-aggrandizement of the "sharpshooters" like Barasch require that some constructive action be taken by the Congress in this matter.

I agree with Senator MCCLELLAN when he states that, in reference to the testimony of the Justice and Labor Department officials who appeared before the subcommittee, that it appears George Barasch has operated with apparent impunity. I am hopeful, but not overly optimistic, that after careful study of the transcript the Justice Department will be able to fit Barasch's activities into some form of embezzlement charges under our general criminal statutes.

Concerning ourselves with the proposed legislation, and its antecedents, it appears to me that this is a further refinement needed to clarify, strengthen, and aid the position of the rank-and-file worker with respect to his position with union—particularly dishonest—officials and fiduciaries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. The Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, as amended in 1959 by what is commonly described as the Landrum-Griffin bill concerned itself, in section 302, primarily with conflicts of interest, and other improper practices, as existed or might exist, between employers and employees. Welfare and pension trust funds were excluded from such treatment as we seek here. Additionally, while we have the Welfare and Pension Funds Plans Disclosure Act of 1948, and its 1962 amendment, it is, as its name implies, confined primarily to voluntary reporting and disclosure of welfare and pension plans, and annual financial reports. In certain circumstances, the Secretary of Labor may investigate into the existence and amount of investments and actuarial assumptions or accounting practices as determined in section 9(h), as amended but, if determined to be other than originally thought to exist, the Secretary can then only ask the nonconformist to comply. In other words, there is no enforcement machinery available to him pursuant to the disclosure acts.

As the distinguished chairman has so aptly explained the purposes of this proposed legislation, I will not repeat it in detail. Suffice it to say it will go beyond the existing legislation in and is designed to eliminate one-man control of welfare and pension plans such as we found in George Barasch. Such pension and welfare funds shall be used only for stated purposes for the ultimate benefit of the employees; the trustees will be limited to terms of years; and the corpus of the trust will not be transferred to foreign countries without the expressed permission of the Secretary of Labor. Furthermore, the activities and overall good character of the trustee shall be much more carefully scrutinized, with enforcement machinery for violations of the fiduciary capacity provided, and with the Secretary of Labor, or any person with a legal or equitable interest in the fund, able to petition the appropriate Federal Court to remove fiduciary who are not properly carrying out their duties, with the further right of the Secretary, or any participant or beneficiary to sue in Federal Court for the recovery of any funds depleted by the improper acts of such fiduciary.

However, we need additional legislation in this field because it is obvious the Federal authorities are unable to cope with the situation now prevailing and operating under existing legislation on the statute books.

The purpose of this legislation, again, is to guard and control welfare and pension funds, designed for the worker, to make certain that they are utilized for that worker and not to be diverted from such purposes so as to end up in the hands of other "Barasches" that lurk around the corner of the honest labor movement in America today.

My concern now is as it has been and as I remarked on this Senate floor on September 3, 1959, during the discussion over the then pending Landrum-Griffin bill. I believe my statement is as appropriate now as I felt it was then when I said:

> However, I believe that close students of trade-union legislation and of the national economy at this time must reach the conclusion that the greatest lack of balance in the trade-union area of the country today is not the lack of balance between employer and employee, or not even the lack of balance which comes so startlingly and so strangely, and with such terrible consequences at times, between the little businessmen and the big unions, but that the most significant lack of balance is between the power of the individual member and the power of the labor boss who has authority over that member's destiny and over his economic life. Union leaders have often grown too strong. The control exercised by dues-paying members over their own affairs has grown too weak.

I close my statement with another remark I made at the same time and in reference to the same discussion. It is as follows:

> I think it should also be made perfectly clear, Mr. President, that this is not punitive legislation. In no sense is it antilabor legislation. But it is very markedly preventive legislation—preventing, we hope, in the future the types of abuses which have brought injury and unhappiness to so many in the past. And it is very definitely antilabor boss legislation, because it takes from those who prefer to be labor bosses instead of responsible labor leaders the undue authority which they have been accumulating and redistributes it among the rank and file trade union members, where it rightfully belongs. This is what we mean when we have argued so long and so energetically for a bill of rights for the American workingman and woman whose dues support the trade union movement.

These are among the reasons I have cosponsored this legislation today. I hope that it will be enacted into law. I hope Senators will keep in mind as we continue with the debate on 14(b) and its proposed repeal, that this has happened, it does happen, and it can happen under compulsory unionism when members are compelled to join unions over which they cannot exercise control.

I am sure that most of the pension funds in most of the unions are honestly and honorably administered, just as I am certain that most labor unions are honestly and honorably operated. In fact, there is very little wrong in the labor movement which could not be corrected by the proper and appropriate utilization of democratic procedures—including the right of secret ballot—in our American labor unions.

But here is a glaring case in point illustrating what happens when dictatorial coercions replace democratic processes, one in which fraud has been perpetuated on union members. Here is the case of a get-rich-quick, Wallingford slick operator hiding behind the mantle of union leadership. He has made deposits in foreign banks to his own credit and members will not get the pension funds and welfare funds to which they are entitled, and which they are forced to provide by paying dues in unions they may or they may not desire to join.

It seems to me that this legislation is very much in keeping with the tempo of our times. I hope that it will receive a prompt hearing before the committee and that it will be enacted into law.

PROTECTION OF VA MEDICAL PERSONNEL AGAINST MALPRACTICE SUITS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the protection of physicians, dentists, nurses, pharmacists, or paramedical—for example medical and dental technicians, nursing assistants, and therapists—or other supporting personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration against the costs of possible malpractice suits against them, brought because of treatment given in a Veterans' Administration facility.

The bill, if enacted, would add a new section 4116 to chapter 78, title 38, United States Code, Department of Medicine and Surgery. The measure is patterned after the so-called Driver's Liability Act—Public Law 87-258—which affords Government operators of motor vehicles the same type of protection against legal actions arising from incidents occurring within the scope of their employment. In practice, the enactment of this measure would mean that upon certification by the Attorney General that the defendant, physician, dentist, nurse, pharmacist, paramedical, or other supporting person was acting within the scope of his employment at the time of the incident out of which the suit arose, any civil action or proceeding arising therefrom would be deemed to be a tort action against the United States under the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act.

The essence of this procedure is that the Attorney General would defend any civil action against a physician, dentist, nurse, pharmacist, paramedical, or other supporting person arising out of his employment. If successful, this would end the matter. However, if the Government should lose the case and a claim be approved by the courts in favor of the plaintiff, the Government would bear the cost of meeting the claim. Based upon past experience, which indicates that most "malpractice" suits dealing with medical and technical employees of Veterans' Administration facilities are filed against the Government, rather than against a person in his individual capacity; any increase in the cost to the Government would be minimal.

Mr. President, this measure falls directly within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Its subject matter is properly within the qualifications and interests of the members of that subcommittee. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs I introduce the proposed legislation for the legal benefit and protection of those dedicated medical professional and technical employees who devote their lives to the health needs of the veterans of this Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2628) to amend chapter 73 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits alleging malpractice or negligence in furnishing medical care and treatment against physicians, dentists, nurses, and other medical or paramedical personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AUTHORIZATION OF VA HOSPITAL BEDS AND NURSING CARE BEDS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill relating to the number of hospital and nursing home beds that may be established and operated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. This bill, if enacted, would amend section 5001, chapter 81, title 38, United States Code, Hospital and Domiciliary Facilities, to provide that the administrator, subject to the approval of the President, is authorized to establish and operate 129,000 hospital and nursing care beds in facilities over which the Administrator has direct and exclusive jurisdiction for the care and treatment of eligible veterans who are tuberculosis, neuropsychiatric, medical, surgical, or nursing home cases. The measure would further provide that of the 129,000 beds authorized, not less than 4,000 beds are to be established and operated as nursing care beds.

Shortly before the passage of the bill which became Public Law 88-450, authorizing 4,000 nursing-care beds in addition to the 125,000 authorized hospital bed ceiling, President Kennedy issued a memorandum indicating that he expected to create 2,000 nursing-care beds and that this number would be in addition to the 125,000 hospital bed ceiling. Following the enactment of Public Law 88-450 in August 1964, with an authorization of 4,000 nursing-care beds, it has been the interpretation of the Bureau of the Budget that it "is not entirely clear whether the Congress intended the 4,000 nursing-care beds to be in addition to the 125,000 hospital bed ceiling."

There was no doubt in my mind, and I think there was no doubt in the minds of other Senators, when the Senate passed that bill last year that the 4,000 nursing-care beds for veterans were to be in addition to the 125,000 beds; but since the Bureau of the Budget refused to recognize that addition, the bill I am introducing today makes crystal clear to all concerned, including the Director of the Bureau of the Budget—I hope—that the 4,000 nursing-care beds authorized in Public Law 88-450 in 1964 are to be in addition to the 125,000 hospital bed ceiling established in 1959 by President Eisenhower by an Executive order to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and now authorized specifically by this legislation.

Mr. President, this measure falls directly within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs I am proud to introduce this worthy legislation to guarantee adequate medical facilities and care to those most outstanding of our citizens—the veterans of America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2629) relating to the number of hospital and nursing home beds that may be established and operated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2629

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (2) of section 5001(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The Administrator, subject to the approval of the President, is authorized to establish and operate one hundred and twenty-nine thousand hospital and nursing home beds in facilities over which the Administrator has direct and exclusive jurisdiction for the care and treatment of eligible veterans who are tuberculosis, neuropsychiatric, medical, surgical, or nursing home cases. Of the total beds authorized herein not less than four thousand beds will be for the purpose of furnishing nursing home care."

IMPLEMENTATION OF CHAMIZAL SETTLEMENT WITH MEXICO

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to further carry out the Chamizal settlement with Mexico by authorizing construction of a border highway in El Paso along the embankment of the realined Rio Grande Channel.

By the Chamizal Treaty with Mexico, ratified by the Senate in 1963, the United States ceded a considerable tract of land in El Paso, Tex., to Mexico and received some other land in settlement of a century-old border dispute. In spite of the fact that some thousands of El Paso citizens would lose their homes by the boundary relocation, the El Paso community generally approved the settlement because of the desirable improvements that could be made incident to the treaty. The Rio Grande is being rechanneled to form the new boundary with associated flood control benefits. Much of the land acquired from Mexico is to be devoted to park purposes. And the new north bank of the Rio Grande is to be the site of a border parkway, replacing the streets being ceded, and enhancing the prospect of the city and the river.

As a supporter of the Chamizal Treaty in 1963 and the related compensation bill in 1964, I am pleased to continue my work for completing the undertakings of the treaty by sponsoring today this bill authorizing the Bureau of Public Roads in the Commerce Department to construct 12½ miles of border highway along the realined Rio Grande in El Paso. Congressman RICHARD WHITE, of El Paso, is offering companion legislation in the House of Representatives. The bills we introduce will carry out the intent of the Chamizal Treaty as recently announced by the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2630) to provide a border highway along the U.S. bank of the Rio Grande in connection with the settlement of the Chamizal boundary dispute between the United States and Mexico, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

IMPROVEMENT OF EMPLOYEE-MANAGEMENT COOPERATION IN THE FEDERAL SERVICE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, a bill codifying a comprehensive plan for the representation of Federal employees by their unions, and setting up appropriate machinery within the Federal Government for regulating the Government-employee unions relationships. The bill has been characterized as a Taft-Hartley Act for Federal employee unions.

This bill is very similar to H.R. 6883, introduced earlier this session in the House by the distinguished Congressman from Louisiana, the Honorable JAMES H. MORRISON. Its drafting represents the dedicated work of Mr. Charles A. Rockwood of Oklahoma City, Okla., who is chairman of the National Association of Internal Revenue Employees Committee on Employee-Management Relations.

This bill will be widely discussed because of the innovations it would bring into the regulation of Federal employee unions. By introducing it, I do not wish it understood that I support every provision of the bill, but rather that making this draft bill available for discussion and comment by those interested will be useful and fruitful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2631) to provide for improved employee-management cooperation in the Federal service, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

COMMISSION ON NATIONAL ECONOMIC GOALS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to establish a Commission on National Economic Goals, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2632) to amend the Employment Act of 1946, to establish a Commission on National Economic Goals, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the bill provides for an independent, 12-member group of nongovernmental experts who would conduct a continuing, objective study of the Nation's long-term economic policies and would make annual reports of its findings and recommendations to the President and the Congress. The reports would be published as part of the Economic Report, already required under the Employment Act of 1946.

I offer the bill as a feasible alternative on the part of the minority to the idea of governmental economic planning, based on the fact that we do not have in our system as yet any procedure for obtaining a long-range forecast as to what government and the private sector can do with respect to the economy. The present, long period of economic prosperity presents an excellent opportunity to review dispassionately the adequacy of our national economic policymaking machinery, which in my judgment is definitely inadequate.

The Bureau of the Budget, the executive departments, and the Council of Economic Advisers, under the Employment Act of 1946, perform a vital part of this function, but they do so necessarily as an integral part of the administration and on a relatively short-range basis. A number of private groups provide valuable independent analyses and recommendations in periodic published reports, but they are not privy to the data and the hard choices which are really being presented to the administration in its inner councils. The result is that even the Congress is not sure whether the right questions are being asked and the hard choices really being faced. The public at large is certainly not left in a position to know.

Only an independent group, not tied to the administration or partisan politics, but with access to the governmental data upon which policy is in fact being made, can be expected to make the kind of objective analysis and evaluation of the Nation's domestic and foreign economic goals, of the existing programs designed to realize those goals, and of priorities among such goals. Only such a group, for example, can be expected to make reasoned recommendations as to how to reduce unemployment below the persistently unacceptable present level, as to what level would even be acceptable, as to the extent to which other goals, such as price levels, for example, would have to be accommodated in order to achieve an acceptable level of unemployment, and as to the relative costs of the various alternative goals. The range of factors involved in economic policy is, of course, much wider than this, but the example is illustrative of the kinds of questions on which an informed, but independent, Commission could be of inestimable help as the complexity of the many interdependent factors increases.

The Eisenhower administration recognized this need for independent analysis and recommendations by establishing the high level, nonpartisan Commission on National Goals, which issued its report in 1960. My proposal would build on that useful experience by creating a permanent institution, with its own full-time Executive Director and staff, but limited in its responsibility to the field of domestic and foreign economic policy. A similar body, the National Economic Development Council, was established in Great Britain several years ago and is now fully integrated into the British governmental structure. It performs the somewhat broader service of actually setting broad economic goals for the British economy and enunciating means for their achievement.

The Commission I am proposing would make findings and recommendations. Whether those recommendations were accepted and implemented would remain solely within the powers of the President and Congress. But both the Council of Economic Advisers and the Bureau of the Budget would be specifically required to consult with the Commission during the course of their functioning and in the preparation of the Economic Report and the annual budget. The Commission's report would be printed as a separate part of the Economic Report and would be considered by the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, which is presently required to hold hearings on the Economic Report.

In previous Congresses I have introduced measures to create a somewhat analogous National Productivity Council, which would have acted through local and regional labor-management productivity councils. Several parts of that proposal have now been written into law: the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, and the local and regional Labor-Management Advisory Committees under the Manpower Development and Training Act, as well as the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy, which was created by Executive order. What remains to be done is to afford the Government and the public the benefit of a high level, independent overview of economic and fiscal issues, and this is what is incorporated in my present bill.

The members of the proposed Commission would be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and thus would be of high rank. The Commission's independence would be guaranteed by the requirement that its members would be appointed for terms of 6 years from nominees named by various well-recognized private national groups, with the additional requirement that the two appointees from each category must be from different political parties. Two members would be selected by the President from each of six categories of nominees:

First. Two from nominees named by organizations representative of business and finance;

Second. Two from nominees named by national labor organizations;

Third. Two from nominees named by organizations representative of agriculture;

Fourth. Two from nominees named by professional associations of economists;

Fifth. Two from nominees named by organizations representative of colleges and universities; and

Sixth. Two who are representative of the general public as determined by the President.

In this way it is expected that the best national cross-section of expertise could be assembled. In addition, the Commission would also be required to consult from time to time with leaders from the various fields of private endeavor.

The ability of the Commission to carry out its assignment would be assured by a specific provision—which was used, for example, in the Automation Commission legislation—authorizing the Commission to secure any information it deems necessary directly from executitve departments and agencies.

The Commissioners themselves would not be full-time Government employees. But they would be required to meet no less than four times a year and would be paid their expenses on a per diem basis.

At a time of continued high unemployment and an international monetary crisis, I believe a Commission on National Economic Goals would add to the existing policymaking machinery a highly valuable balancing voice, equal in prestige and competence to existing sources of economic advice but free from special pleading and bureaucratic pressures.

I believe it will be extremely valuable to include the bill in the hearings, scheduled by the Employment and Manpower Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on improving the Employment Act of 1946 so as to make it a more effective planning mechanism. The proposed Commission on National Economic Goals, based upon the Goals Commission created by the Eisenhower administration for temporary purposes, represents a proper Republican alternative to proposals to inject the Government into a greater measure of economic planning. The proposed Commission is the way in which we can best carry out the modern need of governments, including our own, for charting the economic future of the Nation beyond a 1-year term, which is essentially the function of the existing mechanisms of the Council of Economic Advisers, the Bureau of the Budget, and the executive departments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2632

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1021–1024) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"COMMISSION ON NATIONAL ECONOMIC GOALS

"SEC. 6. (a) The Congress finds and declares that there exists a need to strengthen the Nation's economic policy making machinery by providing (1) for objective and independent analysis and evaluation of the Nation's long-term domestic and foreign economic goals and of existing programs designed to realize those goals, and (2) for the formulation of revised economic goals, and priorities among such goals, whenever it is deemed necessary, on the basis of such analysis and evaluation, in order to meet the continuing responsibilities of the United States for the development of its own economic strength and that of the free world. It is the purpose of this section to provide for such analysis, evaluation, and formulation on a continuing basis by a permanent high-level body composed of eminently qualified persons from various fields of private endeavor.

"(b) To meet this need, there is established a Commission on National Economic Goals (hereinafter referred to as the 'Commission') which shall be composed of twelve members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as follows:

"(1) Two from nominees named by organizations representative of business and finance;

"(2) Two from nominees named by national labor organizations;

"(3) Two from nominees named by organizations representative of agriculture;

"(4) Two from nominees named by professional associations of economists;

"(5) Two from nominees named by organizations representative of colleges and universities; and

"(6) Two who are representative of the general public as determined by the President.

The persons appointed from each category referred to in clauses (1) through (6) shall be from different political parties. Each member of the Commission shall serve for a term of six years. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its power, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made. The Commission shall select its chairman and shall meet, in no event less than four times a year, on the call of the chairman. At any meeting of the Commission, seven members shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of transacting business.

"(c) (1) The Commission shall make a continuing study in furtherance of the objectives set forth in subsection (a), and shall make an annual report of its findings and recommendations to the President. Such report shall be made prior to January 20 of each year, and shall be printed as a part of the Economic Report.

"(2) The Commission shall in carrying out its functions under this section consult from time to time with leaders from the various fields of private endeavor, including but not limited to business and finance, labor, agriculture, and the professional and academic fields.

"(3) The Council of Economic Advisers and the Bureau of the Budget shall from time to time consult with the Commission in the exercise of their functions. In advising and assisting the President in the preparation of the Economic Report, and in the preparation of the annual budget of the United States, the Council of Economic Advisers and the Bureau of the Budget shall respectively consider the recommendations of the Commission.

"(4) The Joint Economic Committee shall, in connection with its consideration of matters set forth in the Economic Report, hold hearings with respect to that part of such report which comprises the report of the Commission, and shall include in its annual report its findings and recommendations with respect thereto.

"(d) Members of the Commission shall each receive $100 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of the duties of the Commission. Each member of the Commission shall also be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of such duties.

"(e) The Commission shall appoint an Executive Director who shall be the principal executive officer of the Commission and shall be paid compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum. The Commission shall appoint, in accordance with the civil service laws and Classification Act of 1949, such other employees as may be necessary. In addition, the Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals.

"(f) The Commission, or on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out this section, hold such hearings, take such testimony, and sit and act at such times and places as the Commission deems advisable.

"(g) The Commission may secure directly from any department, agency, or instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions, and each such department, agency, or instrumentality shall cooperate with the Commission and, to the extent permitted by law, furnish such information to the Commission upon request made by the chairman.

"(h) Such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section are hereby authorized to be appropriated."

Mr. DIRKSEN subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill introduced today by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to establish a Commission on National Economic Goals be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WATER POLLUTION PROGRAMS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the signing by the President more than a week ago of the Water Quality Act of 1965 is a great step forward in the Federal effort to combat water pollution. All of us who supported the measure have high hopes that it represents a significant beginning of an all-out national effort on this problem which is fast reaching crisis proportions.

At a recent meeting of the Senators from Great Lakes States, however, it became apparent that the $150 million a year for construction grants and $20 million a year for demonstration projects is meager indeed in comparison with the magnitude of the pollution problem. HEW officials advised us, for example, that to eliminate pollution in the Great Lakes would require an expenditure of $20 billion over the next 10 years. Massive commitment on the local, State, and Federal levels will be required before the crisis abates.

The State of New York is proposing to undertake such a crash program and so, I know, are many of the industrial States which recognize the gravity of the situation and can make funds available. For example, in November, the voters in New York will be asked to authorize a $1 billion bond issue to finance Governor Rockefeller's $1.7 billion water pollution control program. But New York, will receive only $9,888,000 as its share of the Federal funds. This, of course, does not begin to provide 30-percent Federal financing of our program.

In January, my colleague, Senator KENNEDY, and I offered a package of amendments to S. 4 which we reintroduced as a separate bill on February 10. Two of our amendments were substantially incorporated in the final version of S. 4. One which has not yet been enacted, however, provides reimbursement of its share by the Federal Government, of money spent by States to clean their waters. This simply means that States which are ready and willing to spend large amounts of money immediately, will not be penalized for swift and early action. The situation is analogous to that of the New York Thruway and other similar great turnpikes built entirely with State funds before Federal highway funds became available.

We believe that States should be encouraged to initiate emergency water pollution control programs now with the assurance that if Federal funds become available at a later date, they will be reimbursed. I, therefore, offer on behalf of myself and Senators McCARTHY, NELSON, and SCOTT my earlier indemnification amendment as a separate bill, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2636) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to make construction grants available for reimbursement of State and local funds used for certain construction, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (c) of section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by inserting after "The allotments of a State under the second, third, and fourth sentences of this subsection shall be available, in accordance with the provisions of this section, for payments with respect to projects in such State which have been approved under this section" a comma and the following: "except that in the case of any project constructed in such State after June 30, 1965, which meets the requirements for assistance under this section but was constructed without such assistance, such allotments shall also be available for payments in reimbursement of State or local funds used for such project to the extent that assistance could have been provided under this section if such project had been approved pursuant to this section and funds available."

AMENDMENT TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 RELATING TO DEDUCTION OF CERTAIN CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills which relate to the deductibility of certain expenditures with respect to political functions and affairs. One of these bills makes these expenses deductible in full. The other disallows any deductions whatsoever for the same items. I care not which bill is enacted; but I expect the Treasury Department to express a preference for one or the other of the bills, and I shall then press for enactment of that bill which they prefer. I am asking that these bills be studied carefully during the coming recess so that action can be taken on one of them promptly in the next session of Congress.

For nearly 5 years I have been corresponding with the Internal Revenue Service and the Treasury Department regarding the deductibility of numerous politically inspired expenditures. I have been unable in this period to get any categorical answer regarding the tax treatment of many of these amounts. To the contrary, I have received reports from the Service that while political contributions are not deductible, various types of politically oriented expenses are deductible in varying degrees under various circumstances.

For instance, with respect to the treatment of expenses for advertising in political convention programs, I am advised that such expenses are deductible in full provided only that they are "reasonable in amount and bear a direct relation to the advertiser's business." On the other hand, if they are not reasonable in amount or do not bear a direct relation to business or if they exceed the advertising value of the space required—whatever that means—they are not deductible or may be only partially deductible.

But who is going to make these determinations and what guidelines are provided? Is an amount going to be considered reasonable if incurred for space in a Democratic convention program and unreasonable if it relates to a similar Republican function? Is the value of advertising space going to be fixed in terms of volume of programs printed, in terms of the political stature of the particular function, or by other criteria? These questions suggest the present rules are entirely too subjective to be applied dispassionately in an area as sensitive as politics. Complete objectivity is the only way we can be sure of uniformity of treatment of expenses incurred by supporters of different political parties.

As for tickets to political fundraising dinners, sometimes selling for as much as $1,000 apiece, Commissioner of Internal Revenue Sheldon Cohen advises me that it is the position of the Internal Revenue Service that to the extent the cost of tickets to a dinner held for the purpose of raising political campaign funds represents a contribution to a political organization, it is not deductible. The cost of the ticket not in excess of the value of the meal is deductible if it satisfies the provisions of sections 162 and 274.

But then he goes on to say, in less certain terms, that the part of the cost of the ticket—whatever that is—in excess of value of the meal is considered to be a political contribution. But it is not at all clear what the value of the meal is. For instance, does it go up for a Democratic meal and down for a Republican meal? Is the value of the meal higher if the President or a Presidential candidate appears than if it is only a Senator? Suppose the speaker is an ex-President. Does that make the meal more valuable or less valuable? Or maybe professional entertainers such as movie stars or television luminaries are to perform. Does that make the deductible portion of the ticket larger? Once again, the present tests are too subjective for the ordinary individual to have any confidence that his cost of participation in a politically oriented function is or is not going to be allowed as a deduction for income tax purposes.

In the case of tickets to inaugural balls and other functions of a victorious political party I am advised by Mr. Cohen that the rule with respect to political parties "is not believed to be applicable." The Service treats the cost of these particular political items in the same manner as the expense for any other tickets to entertainment events such as concerts, sporting events, or the theater. The Commissioner advises me that "customarily, expenses for Presidential inaugural ball tickets are deductible whether used by the purchaser or given away if the taxpayer can satisfy the provisions of sections 162 and 274." I do not quarrel that these expenses are deductible if they qualify under these sections. I do believe however, that they are politically inspired just as the advertising expenses and the tickets to political fundraising affairs are politically inspired. Moreover, I wonder how Commissioner Cohen would treat expenses of attending a "consolation ball" if such function were held by a defeated political party. Would he say here that the rule with respect to political parties "is not believed to be applicable"? It would be strange, indeed, if victorious political parties are treated more favorably under the tax laws than defeated political parties.

In my opinion all these political expenses should be treated alike. One political party should not be in a position to charge that the other political party is handing out favors in the form of tax deductions for expenditures made for political reasons unless the statute specifically authorizes it.

Let us not hedge the deduction with such meaningless, weasel-worded terms as "to the extent that," "reasonable amount," or "exceed the advertising value of." If these expenses are to be deductible let us write a law that makes them deductible in clear unambiguous terms. If they are not to be deductible then let us write a law that makes that clear in equally unambiguous terms.

I am asking the Senate Finance Committee to submit both these bills to the Treasury Department for recommendations as to which procedure it endorses. Personally I care not which position they take. All I ask is that a clear-cut decision be made and then enacted into law so that contributors to both political parties will be treated alike.

Under no circumstances can we allow the impression to stand that contributions to the winning party will be treated more leniently than those made to the loser.

After the Treasury Department has had an opportunity to study both bills and has made its decision I will then reintroduce its choice as an amendment to the first revenue measure handled by our Finance Committee after Congress reconvenes next January.

Or if the Treasury Department has any clear and understandable alternative to deal with this problem, I am asking that it submit such a proposal for our consideration.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point an editorial appearing in the Washington Evening Star of September 15, 1965, entitled "Fundraising Ads."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUNDRAISING ADS

The Democrats apparently plan to overcome the hesitancy of individuals to contribute funds to the party coffers by using a technique that proved successful last year—soliciting corporate funds under the name of advertising in a party-produced program book. For the 1964 presidential campaign they came up with the Democratic convention program book. For the congressional elections next year they reportedly are planning an ad-filled history of the 1st session of the 89th Congress to be distributed at fundraising movie premieres in major cities around the country.

Political parties and candidates need money—increasing amounts of it—to run for office. The public, for the most part, just isn't willing to contribute. If the only answer is to raise funds from corporations and unions—as is being done with the program books—then Congress should make such activities legal.

The public image of American politics is not helped by the spectacle of the President's party running a questionably legal solicitation of defense contractors, companies in federally regulated industries, and others who do Government business for ads costing substantial amounts of money—$15,000 a page last year.

Legislation making such fundraising legal—and requiring clear reports on contributors and disbursements of money—would be in the public interest. It wouldn't be the best solution to the campaign fund problem. But it would be better than what is happening now.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that copies of the two bills being introduced today be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2637

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow the deduction of certain indirect contributions to political parties

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to itemized deductions for individuals and corporations) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 183. CERTAIN INDIRECT CONTRIBUTIONS TO POLITICAL PARTIES.

"(a) DEDUCTION ALLOWED.—There shall be allowed as a deduction the amounts paid or incurred during the taxable year in carrying on any trade or business for—

"(1) advertising in a convention program of a political party, or in any other publication if the net proceeds thereof inures to a political party,

"(2) admission to any dinner or program, if the net proceeds thereof inures to a political party, or

"(3) admission to an inaugural ball, inaugural gala, or similar event identified with a political party.

For purposes of this section, the term 'political party' has the meaning assigned to it by section 271(b)(1).

"(b) LIMITATION.—Paragraphs (2) and (3) shall apply with respect to any item only if the deduction of such item is allowable after the application of section 274 (relating to disallowance of certain entertainment, and so forth, expenses).

"(c) SECTION 162 NOT TO APPLY.—Section 162 (relating to trade or business expenses) shall not apply to any amount which is allowable as deduction under subsection (a)."

(b) The table of sections for such part VI is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"SEC. 183. Certain indirect contributions to political parties."

SEC. 2. Section 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1964 (relating to definition of "adjusted gross income") is amended by inserting after paragraph (8) the following new paragraph:

"(9) CERTAIN INDIRECT CONTRIBUTIONS TO POLITICAL PARTIES.—The deduction allowed by section 183."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1965.

S. 2638

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to disallow the deduction of certain indirect contributions to political parties

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part IX of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items not deductible) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 276. CERTAIN INDIRECT CONTRIBUTIONS TO POLITICAL PARTIES.

"No deduction otherwise allowable under this chapter shall be allowed for any amount paid or incurred for—

"(1) advertising in a convention program of a political party, or in any other publication if the net proceeds thereof inures to a political party,

"(2) admission to any dinner or program, if the net proceeds thereof inures to a political party, or

"(3) admission to an inaugural ball, inaugural gala, or similar event identified with a political party.

For purposes of this section, the term 'political party' has the meaning assigned to it by section 271(b)(1)."

(b) The table of sections for such part IX is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"SEC. 276. Certain indirect contributions to political parties."

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1965.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. I listened to the Senator's remarks with regard to contributions for advertising, and I should like to point out, if I may, that generally, it is my understanding that with respect to inaugural functions, they have never been considered political or partisan functions. And inauguration is a function of a bipartisan committee set up within the District of Columbia—at least that was true during the two inaugurations of President Eisenhower, when I was concerned with those committees. Possibly since then those functions have been used for political purposes. But I was told at the outset that this historically had been the function of a bipartisan committee, and that neither political party was supposed to defray any political campaign debts with moneys raised thereby. They were merely supposed to break even, and it was the policy that any money remaining after payment of expenses would be donated to charity.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct, and the letter to which I have referred so states.

However, the questionable part is that under certain circumstances the Treasury Department rules that such tickets are deductible as business expenses, and under other circumstances they are not deductible. The point I am raising is, How is the decision made that one person's cost for a $1,000 box at an inaugural ball is a deductible item and another's is not, or which is and which is not?

Mr. MURPHY. In other words, the Senator would like to have one set of rules apply to all.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. MURPHY. I concur in the Senator's view. I think that would be very good.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not say that this uncertainty is the fault of the Commissioner. This is a delicate area in which we are dealing. What we need is more clear-cut laws that would specifically spell it out so that every individual taxpayer, regardless of his political affiliation or whether he is buying the $100 ticket, the $1,000 ticket, or advertising in the convention program, will be able to know, based on rules spelled out in law, whether the item is deductible as a business expense or not. A taxpayer should not have to curry favor with some Treasury agent who will perhaps rule more favorably if the political contribution goes in the direction he thinks it should.

Until recently any excess collected on inaugural ball tickets was turned over to charity. Lately this has been changed, and now we hear that a part of this amount is used to defray campaign costs. Can one political party raise funds in this manner and the other not?

Mr. MURPHY. I believe this observation will be helpful, because in my experience, I have found that from time to time one has to depend upon a ruling by a particular agent in a particular town, and that very often there have been deviations in the rulings, with one ruling in one place and a different ruling in another.

Further, I have found that there have been times when the political parties involved may have made some difference. One is at the whim of the particular agent whom he asks for the ruling. I think it would be most helpful if there were a ruling clearly spelled out that would apply to all political parties under all conditions, and that would not be too difficult.

I commend the Senator for bringing the matter to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator, and I point out one other area where clarification is needed.

It has always been the custom that in the sponsoring of a convention in any city, whether it be San Francisco, Los Angeles, Chicago, or New York, that the business interests advance a certain amount of money. To raise that money they sell advertising space on programs for the convention.

We are dealing now with a political convention. The political party will sell advertising space on the programs of that convention. Some who advertise figure that they can rent more hotel rooms or, as restaurant owners, they will make some extra money. Such advertising costs are very properly allowed as business deductions.

Heretofore it has been the custom that the political party holding the convention try to raise enough money through advertisements and other sources to finance the cost of the convention, but if there were any money left over after defraying the cost of the convention, the excess would not be used to defray campaign expenses on the basis that if so used it would not be a deductible expense for the company advertising. Officials of one of the political parties with whom I discussed the matter said that in one instance, they came up with a $25,000 or $30,000 surplus, and to avoid confusing their advertisers, in that a portion would not be deductible, this surplus was blocked off in a special fund to be used to defray the cost of the next convention, 4 years later.

But last year we had it called to our attention that advertising space in programs for one national convention, instead of being sold at a rate of $1,000 a page, was increased to $15,000 per page, and one of our political parties raised about $1.5 million over and above the cost of the convention with the extra money used to defray the cost of the ensuing political campaign.

Now, were the costs of that advertising allowed as a deductible expense? Unquestionably these were contributions to the subsequent campaign; yet were they allowed to be written off as deductible business expenses, or if partially so, to what extent?

That is the point which, under the law, we cannot find out. In talking with many of those who made such contributions I was given to understand that most of them got away with writing off the entire cost. Many of them were defense contractors, and some said they advertised on the basis that it would help them with the administration. Is such advertising worth more when made on programs published by the party expected to win? That is a bad way to raise campaign funds.

All I am asking here is that the Treasury recommend a proposal which will be so clear that every taxpayer in America who advertises in any program of either political party for any function or who makes any contribution, may know exactly how that contribution will be treated for tax purposes and may know also that the political party which he is supporting will in no way be the determining factor as to whether or not it is a deductible item.

I make no accusation that the Commissioner has been using this lack of clarity in the regulations politically, but I do say that in an area this delicate, in an area where not even the members of the committee themselves can understand the rulings, certainly the taxpayers cannot.

In this connection, I shall read one letter which I have received from the Commissioner, which shows up the difficulty very clearly. This is from a letter of October 26, 1964, signed by the Acting Commissioner, Mr. Harding. I shall put all these letters in the RECORD, but I read this one in part:

> The question as to whether expenses incurred for advertising in political publications is deductible was clarified in Revenue Ruling 56–343, published in Cumulative Bulletin 1956–2, page 115, which states that expenditures for the purchase of advertising space in the official program of a national political convention constitute ordinary and necessary business expenses, deductible from gross income under section 162 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, provided such expenditures are reasonable in amount and bear a direct relation to the advertisers' business. However, to the extent that amounts paid for such advertising (1) are not reasonable in amount, (2) do not bear a direct relation to the avertiser's business, or (3) exceed the advertising value of the space required, they will be considered as contributions to a political organization and are not allowable as deductions for income tax purposes.

Continuing, Mr. Harding says:

> Also, in the case of *Denise Coal Company, et al.* v. *Commissioner*, 29 T.C. 528 (1957) acquiescence C.B. 1958–2, 5, the Tax Court held that an expenditure for the cost of an advertisement in the 1948 Democratic National Convention program represented an ordinary and necessary business expense and was deductible for income tax purposes.
>
> The Commissioner proposed to disallow the $7,500 paid by Denise for the space in the program on the grounds that it represented a political contribution. The expenditure was considered to be a political contribution mainly because the president of the company, Charles J. Margiotti, was a prominent political figure in Pennsylvania and because the subject matter extolled the Democratic Party rather than Denise's products.
>
> The Tax Court was satisfied from the record that the purpose in making the expenditure was to publicize and create goodwill for Denise. In sustaining the taxpayer, the court noted that Denise's name clearly appeared on the page, the page itself was printed in very attractive color form, and the readers of the program undoubtedly knew who sponsored the page in question.

I shall put the rest of the letter in the RECORD, but this letter emphasizes the uncertainty as to how the existing law will be interpreted. In this instance the taxpayer, the Commissioner, and the Tax Court all had different ideas.

If we are to let the determining factor be that only a company's name must be clear to show who has paid for it in order to qualify the advertising as a deductible expense item, then the door will be wide open.

That is why I am raising the point here today and saying that we need a clear redefinition as to what constitutes a political contribution, and what is a permissible business expense. Business organizations would like to have this point cleared up. Both political parties should want this uncertainty cleared up. This is a problem that is applicable to both political parties and one that should be of concern to them. For that reason I am introducing these two bills which represent the extremes of two points of view. One bill proposes to make all purchases of advertising space and all purchases of $1,000 or $100 tickets deductible, and the other makes none of them deductible. I am submitting both to the Treasury in the hope that somewhere, perhaps between the two extremes, we can reach an agreement that all taxpayers can understand. Let the Treasury Department recommend a legislative proposal which will clearly spell out what is and what is not deductible so that every American citizen who is contributing to either political party, whether in the form of advertising or in any other way, will know that what he contributes is a deduction as a business expense or that it is not.

Let us clear up this suspicion that the administration in power may favor its own contributors more leniently than it does contributors or advertisers to the losing party.

This confusion now exists with respect to contributions to both political parties. The Treasury Department frankly admits that it is about as confused as I am. There is a gray area in which advertising may or may not be a normal deductible expense. Let the law state clearly when it is a legitimate advertisement and when it becomes a contribution.

In order to get this question before Congress and in the hope that before the next election we can arrive at a solution, I am today introducing these two extreme approaches.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Treasury Department, dated April 13, 1960, signed by Jay W. Glasmann, Assistant to the Secretary.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, April 13, 1960.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: You have asked for Treasury's comment on the article appearing on page 2 of the Washington Post of April 12, 1960, headed "Convention Gifts Backed by Butler," wherein it is reported that contributions toward political conventions are deductible, as a business expense for income tax purposes, if made by firms which would directly benefit from having such an affair in a city in which they operate.

It is the position of the Internal Revenue Service that if a taxpayer engaged in a trade or business in a locality makes a contribution to a committee organized for the purpose of bringing a national political convention to such locality, and such contribution is made with a reasonable expectation of a financial return commensurate with the amount of the contribution, the amount contributed constitutes an allowable deduction for Federal income tax purposes as an ordinary and necessary business expense under the provisions of section 162(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. This position is set forth in Revenue Ruling 55–265, Cumulative Bulletin 1955–1, at page 22.

On the other hand, however, contributions made to a political party or candidate for political purposes are not deductible on Federal income tax returns under any circumstances. The position of the Internal Revenue Service on this point is set forth in I.T. 3276, Cumulative Bulletin 1939–1, at page 108, and in section 1.162–15(c) of regulations under section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

A copy of our recently promulgated regulation, T.D. 6435, which deals with these questions, is attached for your information.

I trust this brief explanation will satisfy your purpose. If you have any further questions on this matter, please call on me.

Very truly yours,

Jay W. Glasmann,
Assistant to the Secretary.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I next ask unanimous consent to have purinted in the Record an article published in the U.S. News & World Report of January 28, 1963, entitled "Were Arms Twisted at $100 a Plate?"

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Ervin in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Were Arms Twisted at $100 a Plate?

Washington.—The $100-a-plate dinner, staged by Democrats here on January 18, brought an outcry that still hasn't died down.

Federal employees in a dozen agencies complained that they were solicited—in Government buildings and on Government time—to buy $100 tickets. Stories of high-pressure tactics finally found their way into print, just before the dinner. Senator John J. Williams, Republican, of Delaware, demanded a Senate investigation.

Some Government employees were surprised to be told they were "expected" at cocktail parties given by top administrators—parties that turned out to be limited to $100-a-plate diners. Others said they were urged to buy tickets "on the installment plan"—$10 down and the balance monthly.

Jerry Klutz, Washington Post columnist, reported that one career employee said: "If I go, the price I pay later could be my job when the Republicans return to power. But if I don't go, it could cost me a grade promotion, which is several hundred dollars a year in higher salary."

A corporation executive in Washington had a theory as to why Federal workers were subjected to unusual pressure: Under new Treasury regulations, companies no longer could buy "the usual $1,200 table" with any assurance that the cost could be charged off against Federal income taxes.

As for Democratic officials, they said care had been taken to avoid violating the law. Said one: "I hope every ticket was purchased voluntarily."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I next ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record my letter dated January 28, 1963, as well as the reply thereto dated February 25, 1963, signed by Mortimer M. Caplin, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, commenting on this question, along with a press release of the Internal Revenue Service dated March 22, 1957.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Tydings in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

January 28, 1963.

Hon. Mortimer M. Caplin,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Department of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Caplin: Under the Treasury Department's ruling are corporations allowed to deduct as business expenses the purchase of tickets of $100, $1,000, etc., to political functions?

If there have been any rulings issued to this effect or if any companies have been allowed such deductions I would appreciate receiving a complete report.

Yours sincerely,

John J. Williams.

U.S. Treasury Department,
Internal Revenue Service,
Washington, D.C., February 25, 1963.

Hon. John J. Williams,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator Williams: This is in reply to your letter dated January 28, 1963, asking whether corporations are allowed to deduct as business expenses the purchase of tickets of $100 or $1,000 to political functions. In addition, you asked if any rulings have been issued on this subject and if companies have been allowed such deductions.

Expenditures for tickets to political functions are not deductible for Federal income tax purposes. This position is based on section 1.162–15(c)(1) of the regulations which provides that expenditures for political campaign purposes including the support of or opposition to any candidate for public office are not deductible from gross income.

On the question of rulings, I.T. 3276, published in Cumulative Bulletin 1939–1 (pt. I) 108, makes it clear that contributions to political organizations are not deductible by the donors. Again it was stated in the attached copy of Internal Revenue News Release IR–188 dated March 22, 1957, that contributions made to political parties or candidates are not deductible on Federal income tax returns under any circumstances.

We have no record of any rulings allowing such expenditures as business expenses or of any such deductions having been allowed.

I trust that the above information satisfactorily answers your inquiry.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

Mortimer M. Caplin,
Commissioner.

U.S. Treasury Department,
Internal Revenue Service,
Public Information Division,
Friday, March 22, 1957.

NEWS RELEASE IR–188

Commissioner of Internal Revenue Russel C. Harrington today reminded taxpayers that contributions made to a political party or candidate do not qualify as deductible contributions, and are not deductible on Federal income tax returns under any circumstances.

Mr. Harrington also reminded taxpayers that, in general, every individual who made gifts during 1956 to any one donee of more than $3,000, including political contributions or gifts, must file a gift tax return on form 709. Donees or trustees receiving reportable gifts must file information returns on form 710. These returns for 1956 must be filed on or before April 15, 1957, with the District Director of Internal Revenue for the district in which the taxpayer resides or has his principal place of business.

Gift tax forms 709 and 710, together with complete instructions and necessary assistance, may be obtained from all District Directors of Internal Revenue, Mr. Harrington said.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, next, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record my letter of September 21, 1964, addressed to Mr. Caplin, former Internal Revenue Commissioner, in which I asked questions concerning advertising space in programs of the 1964 Democratic convention, and his reply of October 26, 1964.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

September 21, 1964.

Mr. Mortimer M. Caplin,
Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Caplin: It is my understanding that at the recent Democratic Convention advertising space in their programs was sold at $15,000 per page.

Will you please advise me whether or not these contributions or advertisements as they were described have been ruled as deductible as a business expense, and if so I would appreciate receiving a copy of all such rulings that have been issued by your Department during the past 3 years as they would apply to either of our two major political parties.

Yours sincerely,

John J. Williams.

October 26, 1964.

Hon. John J. Williams,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: This is in reply to your letter of September 21, 1964 concerning the deductibility of the costs of advertising space in the programs of the recent Democratic Convention. You inquire whether these expenditures are deductible for income tax purposes and request copies of all rulings issued in this area during the past 3 years.

The question as to whether expenses incurred for advertising in political publications is deductible was clarified in Revenue Ruling 56–343, published in Cumulative Bulletin 1956–2, page 115, which states that expenditures for the purchase of advertising space in the official program of a national political convention constitute ordinary and necessary business expenses, deductible from gross income under section 162(a) of the Internal Revenue Code, provided such expenditures are reasonable in amount and bear a direct relation to the advertiser's business. However, to the extent that amounts paid for such advertising (1) are not reasonable in amount, (2) do not bear a direct relation to the advertiser's business, or (3) exceed the advertising value of the space required, they will be considered as contributions to a political organization and are not allowable as deductions for income tax purposes.

Also, in the case of *Denise Coal Company, et al.* v. *Commissioner*, 29 T.C. 528 (1957) acquiescence C.B. 1958–2, 5, the Tax Court held that an expenditure for the cost for an advertisement in the 1948 Democratic National Convention program represented an ordinary and necessary business expense and was deductible for income tax purposes.

The Commissioner proposed to disallow the $7,500 paid by Denise for the space in the program on the grounds that it represented a political contribution. The expenditure was considered to be a political contribution mainly because the president of the company, Charles J. Margiotti, was a prominent political figure in Pennsylvania and because the subject matter extolled the Democratic Party rather than Denise's products.

The Tax Court was satisfied from the record that the purpose in making the expenditure was to publicize and create good will for Denise. In sustaining the taxpayer, the court noted that Denise's name clearly appeared on the page, the page itself was printed in very attractive color form, and the readers of the program undoubtedly knew who sponsored the page in question. In addition, the court stated that the fact Denise's advertising expenses in other years were much less than in 1948 did not render the expense nondeductible, and the fact that advertising in a different medium or in a different manner might have achieved more desirable results did not require it to substitute its judgment for that of the taxpayer.

The Commissioner acquiesced in the decision merely because it was a factual determination, supported by some evidence and could not be said to be clearly erroneous.

No rulings have been issued with respect to this matter during the past 3 years since final determinations must be made by the appropriate field offices upon examination of the income tax returns in which the deductions are claimed based on the facts in each particular case.

We are enclosing a copy of Revenue Ruling 56-343 and a copy of each of the published rulings cited therein and trust that this letter will supply the information you requested.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

BERTRAND M. HARDING,
Acting Commissioner.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, finally I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my letter dated January 26, 1965, addressed to Mr. Sheldon Cohen and his reply thereto dated April 6, 1965, commenting further upon this same subject.

I am confident that anyone reading this correspondence will agree that there is confusion as to how the present law should or will be interpreted.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 26, 1965.

Mr. SHELDON S. COHEN,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COHEN: On October 26, 1964, I received a letter from your predecessor, Mr. Bertrand M. Harding, Acting Commissioner, which in effect confirmed that the Department was ruling that all political advertisements at the recent national conventions were deductible as business expenses for income tax purposes. These advertisements appearing in the programs were being sold at around $15,000 for a partial page, and of course we both recognize that this was a contribution and not a bona fide advertisement.

More recently a widespread practice has developed wherein political fund-raising committees are holding dinners and selling the tickets at $1,000 each.

Will you please advise me whether or not those purchasing tickets to these $1,000 dinners are, under any circumstances, allowed to charge off the cost of the tickets as business expenses. If so please forward a copy of all such rulings which have been issued during the past 5 years.

I would also appreciate your advising me whether or not the payments for tickets or boxes at the inaugural balls would be considered as a necessary business expense and thereby deductible for tax purposes.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1965.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in reply to your letter of January 26, 1965, commenting on our letter of October 26, 1964, concerning expenditures for the purchase of advertising space in the programs of the 1964 Democratic Convention. You request advice whether the cost of tickets to political fundraising dinners is deductible as a business expense and wish to be furnished with copies of all rulings issued on this question during the past 5 years. You also request advice whether payments for tickets or boxes at the inaugural balls would be considered as necessary business expenses and thereby deductible for tax purposes.

Our letter of October 26 should not be interpreted to mean that all expenditures for the purchase of advertising space in the official programs of national political conventions constitute ordinary and necessary business expenses deductible from gross income. These expenditures are deductible only if they meet the various tests outlined in our letter.

It is the position of the Internal Revenue Service that, to the extent the cost of tickets to a dinner held for the purpose of raising political campaign funds represents a contribution to a political organization, such cost is nondeductible. Cf. I.T. 3276, C.B. 1939-1 (part 1), 108, a copy of which was furnished you with our previous letter. Normally, the part of the cost of the ticket in excess of the value of the meal is considered to be a political contribution. It makes no difference whether the purchaser, his family, his business associates, or others actually use the tickets.

While the above-cited ruling was published in 1939 under the Revenue Act of 1938, it has remained in effect under the succeeding internal revenue laws and codes. A search of our records fails to disclose the issuance of any rulings within the past 5 years to the effect that any expenditures of this type are deductible for income tax purposes.

Regarding your question of whether expenditures for tickets to presidential inaugural balls will give rise to deductions for income tax purposes, it is important to note that the Presidential Inaugural Committee is quite distinguishable from a political party and thus the treatment described above with respect to payments for political fund raising dinners will not prevail. Such Committee is originally organized on a bipartisan basis by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. In 1961, the excess of receipts over expenses (except for certain profits contributed to a reserve fund to be used for operations by the succeeding Inaugural Committee), over $200,000, was donated to the United Givers Fund. Accordingly, the rule with respect to contributions to political parties is not believed to be applicable and hence the cost of tickets to presidential inaugural balls are treated in the same manner as the expense for any other tickets to entertainment events (e.g., tickets to concerts, sporting events, or theaters). Consequently, expenses for presidential inaugural ball tickets are deductible whether used by the purchaser or given away if the taxpayer can satisfy the provisions of sections 162 and 274. In other words, the taxpayer must, in general, establish that such expenses are ordinary and necessary to he carrying on of his trade or business and either (1) directly related to the active conduct of his trade or business, or (2) in the event that the inaugural ball directly precedes or follows a substantial and bona fide business discussion, associated with the active conduct of his trade or business. In no event may a taxpayer deduct the cost of tickets which he uses solely for personal reasons.

Determinations under sections 162 and 174 of the Code, referred to above, are primarily factual and are customarily made by the field organization of the Service when a taxpayer's return is examined.

We trust that the foregoing is all the information you desire. If not, please do not hesitate to call on us again.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

SHELDON S. COHEN,
Commissioner.

RECONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES OF FLORIDA, LOUISIANA, AND MISSISSIPPI

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I introduce a bill on behalf of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and myself.

This is a measure to provide relief for those who have suffered losses of an uninsurable nature as a result of damages from Hurricane Betsy.

Mr. President, for the most part, this measure has the approval of the agency of the Government that would have the responsibility of administering it, as well as having the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

There is one change that I have suggested in this meaure, which I have incorporated and undertaken to clear with my cosponsors. That concerns the situation in which the Bureau of the Budget has been willing to indicate its agreement to forgive $1,800 of a loan, insofar as that loan exceeds $500.

It is my view and the view of others that it would be better to reduce the amount of the loan forgiveness to $1,500 and not have the $500 deductible feature. This would be better for poor people and the people who had very little to lose, although everything they had might have been wiped out. By virtue of leaving out the deductible feature, the Administrator might desire to be somewhat conservative in the appraisal of the amount of damage for which the loan was made. The Administrator might decide, for example, that it might want to insist that the loan would not be made unless the damage exceeded $200, or perhaps a lesser figure. However, for people who owned very little and had what little they did own wiped out, and are left with nothing with no money with which to pay, it would make better sense if their loans would be completely forgiven. In that event, we would be doing much more, relatively speaking, for a person with more resources.

I will testify in behalf of this change tomorrow. I am hopeful that when the House committee conducts a hearing on this measure tomorrow it may see fit to report the measure with the suggested change that I have made. I believe it would then be a better bill.

Mr. President, this is a bill which I believe marks a very respected principle with this Government. That concerns the principle that, when a hurricane or a disaster is so fantastic and destructive that it exceeds anything for which people have been able to insure or protect themselves, the Government will consider the terrific destruction which occurred to its citizens and undertake to help provide them in some way, within the means of the Government, with some assistance to offset the loss for which these people were not able in any way to protect themselves.

This relates to the uninsurable loss, so far as Federal money would be available to help the Hurricane Betsy sufferers. The bill is designed to provide assistance to those who need it the most.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The bill (S. 2639) to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane, introduced by Mr. Long of Louisiana (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and by unanimous consent, referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, Hurricane Betsy, while not hitting Florida as severely as it hit Louisiana, did do an estimated $100 million of damage to the lower Gold Coast and some of the Keys.

The principle of the bill is good and sound. I am delighted to be able to join the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana and avail myself of that privilege.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in Louisiana the damage was estimated to be the greatest property damage in the history of the country. It was estimated by the insurance adjustors who will have to appraise the damage that the insured losses will far exceed any losses resulting from any disaster in the history of the country. By the same token, it stands to reason that the uninsured losses will be of a similar nature.

The assistance that we hope to give to these victims of Hurricane Betsy would be perhaps 3.5 percent of the total losses. However, it would go to those people who were injured the most and who were unable by any approach, insurance, or private enterprise, or any other measure available, to protect themselves against this loss.

FREE ENTRY OF ONE MULTIGAP MAGNETIC SPECTROGRAPH FOR USE OF YALE UNIVERSITY—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 472

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on October 5 the House approved H.R. 9903, a bill introduced by my colleague from the Third Congressional District in Connecticut, Representative Giaimo.

H.R. 9903 would permit the duty-free importation of a multigap magnetic spectrograph which has been purchased by Yale University.

A similar provision was added to a previous bill, the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act, by the Senate Finance Committee but it was dropped in conference with the House.

Today I am submitting an amendment to H.R. 9903, intended to permit the duty-free entry of one MS–9 mass spectrometer, an instrument which has also been purchased by Yale University.

When Yale University asked me to help out on this matter I was told the following concerning the background to the purchase of this spectrometer from a foreign supplier:

> The spectrometer was purchased on a NASA grant to Yale University for the development of instrumentation to analyze the atmospheres and surfaces of planets by gas chromatography and mass spectrometry.
>
> Qualified manufacturers of such equipment in this country were unable to produce evidence that the spectra with which we are concerned can be conveniently and satisfactorily analyzed.
>
> The chosen source produced satisfactory evidence that such spectra could be conveniently analyzed.

The free entry of the magnetic spectrograph has been approved on separate occasions by the House and the Senate. My amendment to permit the free entry of a spectrometer seems to be just as meritorious a request, and I hope the Finance Committee will add it to H.R. 9903 when it meets to consider this proposal.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 472) was referred to the Committee on Finance.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 12, 1965, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1516. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in federally owned buildings for periods not to exceed 3 years, and for other purposes;

S. 1715. An act to extend the penalty for assault on a police officer in the District of Columbia to assaults on employees of penal and correctional institutions and places of confinement of juveniles of the District of Columbia; and

S. 1719. An act to authorize compensation for overtime work performed by officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, and the White House Police force, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 21(a), Public Law 89–236, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Celler of New York, Mr. Feighan of Ohio, Mr. Rodino of New Jersey, Mr. McCulloch of Ohio, and Mr. Moore of West Virginia as members of the Select Committee on Western Hemisphere Immigration, on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9220) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp., the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Kirwan, Mr. Fogarty, Mr. Evins, Mr. Boland, Mr. Whitten, Mr. Mahon, Mr. Rhodes of Arizona, Mr. Davis of Wisconsin, Mr. Robinson, and Mr. Bow were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Speech by Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor at opening ceremonies of the glassware exhibition sponsored by the glass industry of Morgantown, W. Va., Sunday, October 10, 1965.

THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF COMMERCIAL INTERNATIONAL AVIATION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, this coming November 22 will mark the 30th anniversary of commercial international aviation, planned and carried out by American enterprise under the American flag by an American airline. It was the harbinger of events to come which have changed our American way of life.

Thirty years ago, on November 22, 1935, the *China Clipper* of Pan American Airways took off from the waters of San Francisco Bay for the world's first scheduled flight over a major ocean.

The *China Clipper*, a four-engine, American-made Martin M–130 flying boat, headed for Manila via island stepping stones which had been prepared by American enterprise the preceding year. The 110-mile-an-hour flying boat reached Hawaii 21 hours later—terrific speeds in those days, just 30 years ago when Hawaii was 4½ days from the mainland by ship.

The *Clipper* stopped for successive nights on Midway, Wake, and Guam islands and then headed for Manila in the Philippines. It landed in Manila Bay, alongside Dewey Boulevard. Word flashed around the world that the first commercial aerial crossing of a major ocean, in this case the Pacific, the world's biggest ocean, had been completed successfully. From this beginning, scheduled air service by commercial carriers is now linking all continents and the capitals of all countries of the world. Today these capitals are linked by jet aircraft which bring the peoples of the world within a day or less of each other.

The significance of the event, as marked by changes which have been brought about by 30 years of scheduled overocean flying:

On the inauguration of air service across the Pacific, the fare from California to Hawaii was $360. Today it is $100.

From a flight time of 21 hours or more, today 550-mile-an-hour jets bring Hawaii within 5 hours or less from the mainland.

In the commencement of overocean flying, the amount of mail and cargo which could be carried depended upon favorable or unfavorable winds—seldom could more than 1,800 pounds be carried.

Now, air freighters carrying over 90,000 pounds per flight are routinely scheduled across the Pacific, across the Atlantic, and to South America, linking our country by bonds of commerce with the major countries of the world. Coincident with the increase in air cargo flights—and cargo as well as mail is carried on passenger flights as well as on all-cargo planes—has been a steady lowering of tariffs for air freight. Each cut in tariff has made it possible to export goods by air which formerly were sent by surface or which could not be shipped at all. This has enabled U.S. manufacturers and exporters to expand their foreign markets greatly. This in turn helps out in our balance-of-payments problem.

Furthermore, commercial aircraft, both passenger and cargo, are now aiding the Department of Defense in providing airlift of military passengers and strategic military cargo to South Vietnam, Japan, and European theaters of defense. American air carriers have committed their fleets of commercial aircraft to the Civil Reserve Air Fleet program, which strengthens the military might of our country.

Today, thousands of American families of moderate means take vacations overseas, visiting countries of the world which formerly they could never hope to see. The counterpart of this American travel is equally important. In 1964 just under 1 million—960,000—citizens of other countries visited the United States for pleasure and for business. The Department of Commerce estimates they pumped $375 million into our domestic economy.

In 1935, total employment in aviation transportation in California was numbered in the few hundreds. Today, those involved in air transportation at San Francisco International Airport alone number approximately 18,000. In the span of 30 years, not only has a new industry developed, a great industry has come into being—an industry which in the United States alone already employs more than 800,000 people. More than the railroad industry, more than the steel industry, even more than the automobile industry. It contributes $6½ billion to the gross national product.

It was from San Francisco Bay that the world's first scheduled flight over a major ocean departed. It was this and succeeding flights which emphasized the need for four-engine aircraft, aircraft which could span the greatest oceans and the longest distances with regularity, reliability, and while carrying increasingly large numbers of passengers and volumes of cargo and mail.

American ingenuity has been equal to the challenge of this demand. American manufacturers have produced such planes and are continuing to provide even better ones. Before long, we will be in the supersonic age, where travel times again will be reduced by a factor of four. With continuing reductions in air tariffs an ever-increasing number of people are finding it convenient and desirable to fly. Manufacturers and exporters are using air freight to develop new markets, all of which calls for the production of more aircraft. The manufacture of aircraft has thus become one of the major industries of California, as well as a major industry of the United States. Coupled with the electronics industry which it has spawned, aircraft manufacturing is one of the bellwethers of our American economy.

I commend Pan American, its founder, Juan Trippe, and the bay area which provided the opportunity for commencement of a new industry, which now plays a significant role in international commerce, and which augurs good for international peace and international understanding.

GUILFORD WELCOME AND INFORMATION CENTER

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, Vermont is adding another first to its record.

Tomorrow, October 13, there will be a dedication of a welcome and information center in the town of Guilford, where U.S. Interstate Route 91 crosses from Massachusetts into the Green Mountain State.

This will be the first center of its kind anywhere on a U.S. interstate highway.

Not only will a competent staff dispense maps and travel information, but literature and other information concerning Vermont will be prominently displayed in an effort to make the traveler's trip more enjoyable.

Through the alertness, foresight, and hard work of the Greater Vermont Association, which raised the necessary construction funds by private contribution, this project has now become a reality.

Credit must also go to the Vermont Legislature, which has appropriated funds for the cost of the maintenance personnel, and to the Federal Bureau of Public Roads for its cooperation in permitting the establishment of this trailblazing public convenience.

The traveling public will be greatly benefited, and I commend all those who have made this information center possible.

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on October 4, Mr. Hollis Williams, a native of my State of Arkansas, who is Deputy Administrator for Watersheds of the Soil Conservation Service in the Department of Agriculture, spoke before the annual meeting of the South Dakota Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts at Huron, S. Dak. His speech contains information and raises challenges for the future which are vitally important to all of us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this speech printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICTS' ROLE IN THE FUTURE

(Address by Hollis R. Williams, Deputy Administrator for Watersheds, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, at annual meeting of South Dakota Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, Huron, S. Dak., October 4, 1965)

It is a real privilege to be with you. And it is a high honor to speak at your annual meeting.

Indeed, it is an honor to be in South Dakota, a great State large as Indiana, New Hampshire, and South Carolina combined, the State that occupies almost the geographical center of the North American Continent.

I am proud to be in this diverse State made up of a broad, flat farming section, a rugged ranching region, and a mountainous mining and recreation area.

I am proud to be in such a young land—a land that was still a territory until 1889 when it was thrown open for homesteading.

I am proud to be in the State where Gen. George A. Custer, better known for the disaster at Little Big Horn, headed the expedition that discovered gold—the State of John B. Pearson, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, GEORGE McGOVERN, KARL MUNDT, and of Don Williams.

Yes, I am proud to be here. And I am honored to meet with a group of my favorite people—soil and water conservation district supervisors. No finer people walk this earth, and all of my days I shall count it among my blessings to have worked closely with such as you most of my professional life.

This is an important occasion, and I am proud to share in it. This may not be a particular anniversary in your affairs but it is not just another meeting. The occasion is broader than that. The meeting is merely the thing of the moment that draws us together.

Actually, we are here because this is another milestone in our age-old struggle to live in harmony with our environment. This is another step forward in the long series of continuing adjustments we must make if we would develop and use fully for all the people the natural resources from which stem our well-being and our American way of life. This is a time when we must take stock of what we have done, and where we are going, and what we must do in the years ahead. It is a time for taking inventory, and for making up the profit and loss statement. It is a time for reflection on the things we failed to do, and how we could have better done the things we did do. It is a time to plan ahead. It is a time to think, and think long and serious thoughts, about the future of this work we all love and to which we have dedicated ourselves for more than a quarter century.

No, this isn't just another meeting, pleasant though the social aspects of it may be. Indeed, this affair marks another step forward by bold and far-seeing descendants of a pioneering people who sought and found this land, adopted it as their own, and built upon it a great State, perennial land of promise and hope.

You are still building, and you must continue to build. You are still moving forward. And you must continue to move forward. For you believe in the future of this land and are willing to invest in it. You want to make this a better land in which to live, a better land for those who come after you.

Some say that we have no new frontiers, that the day of the pioneer is over and done with. I say to you that this is not true. You were pioneers when you started the soil conservation district movement in 1937, just as much so as those who migrated westward to and beyond the wide prairies. Those sturdy forebears of yours were pioneers, and you are pioneers. The only difference is that they were trying to conquer and settle a wilderness. You are trying to improve and develop the resources of that original wilderness—the resources that our forefathers thought were inexhaustible—and you are trying to do it for a pyramiding number of people who are more dependent on those resources than ever before.

In many ways, your pioneering job is more difficult than the pioneering job in the 1890's. Certainly it has become more complex. Certainly the competition for our resources—land, water, space, and other natural resources—is much keener. Certainly the cost is greater. An ax and a team and a wagon and a plow and a strong back are no longer enough. Today's problems must be met with today's tools. We must meet 1965 problems with 1965 ideas.

It was Oliver Wendell Holmes who said: "Man's mind stretched to a new idea never goes back to its original dimensions."

In 1937, you South Dakota conservation pioneers stretched your minds to a new idea—soil conservation. You persuaded your State legislature to enact legislation authorizing the formation of soil conservation districts. You sparked the organization of such districts. You made them work.

You have a right to be proud of your accomplishments in the past 28 years. You have built well; your achievements are many, and they are worthwhile.

The progress you have made and the role districts enjoy did not just happen. It was made to happen, by you and your colleagues across the land.

I need not dwell on your many achievements in South Dakota and that of your colleagues in every State—including our two new ones, Alaska and Hawaii—and our neighbors in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. You know what you have accomplished in detail but I sometimes wonder if you realize fully the terrific impact of your activities on the national scene.

Future historians will record the movement you began in 1937 as one of the most remarkable in the history of this land. Nothing quite like it ever happened in this country. Starting with only an idea, you caused enabling acts to be passed in all the States and the organization of local districts under those laws to sweep across the country far faster than any other movement in our agricultural history.

More important than the speed of your movement is the fact that you won almost immediate acceptance. You made soil and water conservation household words. You inspired and guided the formulation of new and related programs to augment your original work—such as the small watershed and Great Plains conservation programs. You persuaded State and local governments to contribute financially to your work. You enlisted the cooperation of nonagricultural segments of the community.

All this and more in the span of less than three decades. You have a right to glory in this unprecedented success. And the temptation may be great to let the satisfaction you feel over a job well done degenerate into a complacent and secure feeling that all is well and we may now rest for awhile and consolidate our gains and carry on much the same as we have in the past.

This, I say to you, is the very thing you cannot and must not do.

You attained your position by refusing to accept the status quo, by refusing to fear change, by ever pushing forward. If you stalled, it was only for a moment until you could either go over or around the obstacle or push it out of the way.

For of one thing we can always be sure: Change, constant change, is as certain as death and taxes. Times change, and swiftly, and those who would maintain their position of leadership and discharge their responsibilities must change with the times. Time does not stand still. Needs do not remain the same. Problems alter. New solutions develop. To stand still is eventually to turn back.

It would be foolish indeed to believe that the problems of conservation districts are exactly the same today as they were in 1937—or that the solutions to them are the same, or that farming and ranching have not changed, or that the social pattern of our population is the same as it was.

At Kansas City, Marion Monk, the president of your national association, said this: "It is incumbent on your national association to look beyond the events and programs now current to the probable needs and developments of the years ahead, not only in terms of the resources involved, but in terms of districts as serviceable units of government."

At an area meeting recently in Georgia, President Monk said: "It is incumbent on you and I as progressive district officials to look ahead in our resource conservation work in each of our districts. It is true, but it is not enough, to say that everyone has an interest in the conservation of natural resources. It has been natural during the first 25 years of the District program that only farmers and ranchers signed petitions to organize districts, or were elected as district supervisors, and that district programs concentrated chiefly on erosion control and water retardation on farms and ranches."

Let me quote President Monk again: "One of the products of this quarter century of emphasis on soil and water conservation is that the urban interests have also become aware of their own large stake in the conservation of natural resources and are beginning to feel uneasy about a program that concentrates primarily on soil and water conservation on farm and grazing lands. The conservation program of the next quarter century will have to give the appropriate amount of attention to the conservation of all natural resources. The interests of the city man, the industrialists, the sportsman, the recreationists, will demand attention, side by side, with the continuing demands of the farmer and rancher.

"These social pressures are obviously becoming so strong that districts, as we know them, will soon have to make a major decision. We must either broaden our programs and our interests so that they can truly serve as the local conservation operating agency for all the various groups in the American society, or we can expect to see the Federal and State legislatures provide for the establishing and financing of other local conservation agencies that will concern themselves with all the natural resources that we have ignored in our district work in the past; that is, forests, wildlife, city, and industrial water supplies, recreation, and wilderness areas. As I see it, we have no choice."

Those are words of your president, Marion Monk, and they are words of foresight from a man who sees the whole picture as well as his own local one.

A rural and limited soil conservation concept will no longer suffice in a society that has become increasingly urban, a society in which the interests of the users of resources has become equal to that of the owners of resources.

This increasing urbanization may not be as apparent here as it is in some parts of our Nation, but you are aware of the trend, just as you are aware of the lessening numbers and influence of rural people—even on the basis of representation in your State legislatures and the Congress. Do you realize, for example, that 40 percent of the Congress is from the Northeastern States? And you may have heard that the California Legislature just passed a law authorizing local governments to create agriculture preserves and contract with landowners to limit land use to agricultural purposes.

In signing this bill, Gov. Pat Brown said: "California's continuing growth has already caused the loss of much prime agricultural land as our urban areas leapfrog into the surrounding countryside. The result has been unsightly urban sprawl, high costs for community services, and destruction of productive agricultural resources."

As cities enlarge, serious problems of land-use, erosion, sedimentation, pollution, recreation, and the like spring up around urban areas. This is a whole new series of major conservation problems affecting large numbers of people that simply did not exist a few years ago.

These are problems demanding solution, and the demands come from the urban society that is now in the majority, that now decides what programs we shall have, including conservation, and how much financial help they shall receive. And these people, as I have said, are looking at the picture from the standpoint of resource users.

The late Adlai Stevenson capsuled the changing scene when he said: "There is a new America every morning when we wake up. It is upon us whether we will it or not. This new America is the sum of many small changes—a new subdivision here—a new school there—a new industry where yesterday there had been vacant swampland—changes that add up to a broad transformation in our lives. Our task is to guide these changes, for though change is inevitable, change for the better is a full-time job."

To meet unlimited demands on our limited resources we must have intensive management of resources. We must maintain a productive agriculture. We must give increasing attention on the development and better use of existing resources.

Producers and consumers—rural and urban people—owners of resources and users of resources—must be intimately involved in resource management. The people themselves must share in the work.

How is this job to be done in the future? Who will do it?

These, my friends, are questions you must think about seriously—perhaps more seriously than any single thing you have contemplated in your long conservation experience.

There are only two ways to do tomorrows' resource conservation and management job. One is to have programs handled directly by

State and Federal agencies. The other is to keep the job in the hands of the people of the community, with State and Federal agencies in assisting roles.

We can all agree that the principle of local responsibility and control is the desirable system. The other system would work, but what might happen to our society in the process? What, for example, might happen to our concept of private property? What might happen, indeed, to our democratic form of government? Dictatorships may be efficient, but who wants one?

What is needed to do the job?

You know the answer. What is needed is an organization that is legally authorized to do the total resource conservation and development job, one that involves both rural and urban people.

The nearest thing we have to that—note I said nearest—is today's soil and water conservation district. But it isn't enough. It doesn't quite fill the bill. It must undergo some changes. It must be broadened and strengthened. It must have some new authorities.

Changes must be made if soil and water conservation districts are to have a prominent role in resource programs of the future.

If changes are not made, then, as Marion Monk has said: "The Federal and State legislatures will provide for the establishing and financing of other local conservation agencies that will concern themselves with all the natural resources."

You may not realize how much this has been happening in recent years. In 1962 there were more than 8,000 natural resource districts in the Nation. These include soil and water conservation, irrigation, drainage, park and recreation, and water supply districts. Since 1954, when the small watershed program started, more than 700 new special-purpose districts have been created to carry out the local aspects of this program. Of these, more than 400 are completely independent of regular soil and water conservation districts.

Why were these special-purpose districts established?

They were created under new legislation because the existing soil and water conservation districts did not have the powers thought necessary to carry out watershed projects, and they did not seek those powers.

I believe you will grant these things:

1. That our conservation problems are greater and more complex than ever.

2. That they concern urban people directly now more than ever.

3. That entirely new conservation problems have developed that are related to our population growth and the expansion of cities.

4. That conservation work must be done under local direction and control, by participation of the people, both urban and rural, and not by Government decree under Government direction.

If you are still with me, then you must go one step further. You must agree that the soil and water conservation district can be the perfect instrument for the conservation job of today and tomorrow if it is broadened and strengthened.

What broadening and what strengthening? Now we are down to the meat in the coconut. Now we are up there in the wide blue yonder. Admittedly, this is an area in which nobody has many of the answers. But we must find those answers, and find them soon. Let us speculate about a few. And, mind you, this is speculation.

State soil and water conservation district laws would require amendment—extensive amendment in many States.

Districts would need additional authorities to cover the entire natural resource field.

Districts would have to represent all the people of the community—not just the rural people. This could mean enlargement and expansion of district charters to provide for representation on the governing body of all community interests. It could mean election by all the people of such governing bodies. It could mean the right of eminent domain. It could mean coordination of rural, urban, and suburban land-use planning. It could mean new and additional kinds of technical help. It could mean district staffs and payrolls and budgeting. It could put district boards in the same position, say, as school boards.

Does this speculation startle you? I'm sure it does not because you don't spook easily. If you did, districts would have fallen by the wayside long ago. This is some of the stuff that you must face up to as you make the hard decisions about your future role in this great work in which you have pioneered for nearly three decades.

As I said, you are still pioneers. Once a pioneer, always one. Now you must break new ground. Now you must move out again, and point the way.

No one knows this job as you do. You have had the experience. You have the understanding. You appreciate its importance to all America and all her citizens. You have demonstrated the zeal for public service in this field. You have given unselfishly of your time, your energies, and yes, of your pocketbook for a job that has as its only reward the satisfaction of serving your fellow man and those who come after you.

It would be nice if you really had a choice. But the probabilities are, as Marion Monk has said, that districts only have the choice of growth if you broaden your work, or gradual decline if you don't; to grow or shrivel—that is the choice.

"Man's mind stretched to a new idea never goes back to its original dimensions."

How true. The ideas and dreams of men spread far and wide and have infinite capacity for the good of mankind. Ideas and dreams do not become realities unless the men who believe in them fight for them, and work for them.

Nothing just happens. Things happen because men of vision and will and determination make them happen.

You are men of vision, men of will and determination.

You have dared to dream and you have had the courage to fight for your dreams, to make them come true.

But the job you started nearly 30 years ago isn't done. The hardest part is ahead because the job has changed. It has become more complex.

You can't turn back. You can only move ahead.

Days of decision are at hand.

Growth through broadening your purpose and strengthening your authorities to cope with today's problems in a rapidly urbanizing society.

Or stand pat, business as usual—and shrivel.

That is the decision.

I know you will make the right decision because you love this land more than any group in America. And you have proved your love, through dedicated action.

I know you will make the right decision because you realize the job is too vital to the future of America to be turned over to inexperienced hands.

Your descendants will bless you always for what you have done. They will bless you even more for what you do in the future.

COLUMBUS DAY, 1965

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at this time a year ago many Members of Congress were active in proclaiming support for making Columbus Day a national holiday. Today, however, interest in this legislation seems to be lagging. Yet, in light of the recently enacted revisions of our immigration system, it is especially appropriate to turn our attention to the passage of this legislation now—in this session of Congress. For, just as we have now acknowledged through much-needed reform of our immigration laws, the invaluable contributions of those coming to our Nation, so we should likewise give the deserved recognition through designation of October 12 as Columbus Day to the man whose undaunted heroism and courage, whose dream of exploration resulted in his coming to this country, and the great discovery and subsequent blessings in which we all share. The question of whether Leif Erikson preceded him is not vital. There is enough glory for both of them.

The observance of the birthday of Christopher Columbus causes us to reflect upon the impact which he and the tens of thousands of freedom-seeking men born in other lands have had upon our lives. It was his pursuance of a vision, his wisdom and ideals, and his perseverance which gave impetus in the development of our Nation on the cornerstones of freedom and independence.

I do hope that the appropriate committees of both Houses may again consider the matter and the Congress will support the legislation necessary to establish October 12 as a national holiday, which I have cosponsored, so that the memory of Columbus may be commemorated throughout the entire country just as it is today in some States and some communities including our own where a colorful parade on Fifth Avenue in Manhattan, New York City, today marks the 473d anniversary of the discovery of the New World.

Italians can be proud of Columbus. I am going to New York to help with the parade.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, 473 years ago Christopher Columbus and his 3 ships and 120 men reached the Western Hemisphere. Few men have fought so stubbornly for their ideas or have faced so many obstacles in attempting to carry them out. He fought poverty, ridicule, disappointment, ingratitude, and even treachery, but finally he prevailed. His triumph was far more than a personal victory; it was a triumph for all civilization.

That is true regardless of whether Leif Erikson or anyone else came ahead of Columbus. As the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] said, there is certainly enough credit to go around so that all the early explorers can share in it.

Every American schoolboy is familiar with the difficulties Columbus encountered in the preparation of the journey and during the trip itself. The financial and physical problems were serious. Even more troublesome, however, was the fact that Columbus was gambling not only his future but his life and the lives of those who accompanied him in his effort to prove some concepts which were dismissed as absurd by most people of his day.

Today our Nation also faces a future that is both challenging and uncertain. We, too, will need all the courage and wisdom we possess if we are to move forward and bring new understanding to a troubled world. Like Columbus, we must continue to fight for our ideals and the fundamental principles in which we believe. In his tradition we must strive to bring to all mankind a better world. Today the need for men of his courage and sense of purpose is greater than ever before. In the nuclear age in which we live the question is no longer whether a few will succeed or fail but whether all civilization will perish or prevail.

It is appropriate today not only to honor Columbus as a man of vision and inspiration but also to pay tribute to his native land. We are in Italy's debt not only for the achievements of Columbus but also for the many Italians who have come to the United States, made significant economic, cultural, and political contributions to the development of our country. Today there are some 12 million Americans of Italian descent here and we are proud of their achievements. The Governor of my State of Massachusetts, John Volpe, is of Italian background and he has proved himself a man of courage and foresight. My New England colleague, JOHN PASTORE, has proved himself in the U.S. Senate. Unquestionably we are a better Nation because of the contribution of Governor Volpe, Senator PASTORE, and others of similar background.

There is a lesson for us all in the achievements of Columbus. He was willing to sacrifice personal comfort and to risk life itself to defend a concept in which he believed. Today all who would enjoy the blessings of human liberty must be of equal courage and commitment.

COLD WAR VETERAN WRITES OF NEED FOR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, although the techniques and form of military service have changed during recent years, the one thing that can be said for any veteran of the cold war period is that he returned to civilian life with his mission accomplished.

The cold war servicemen are poised around the world ready to raise their arms in defense of our freedom, and when they return to civilian life they warrant the same considerations that other veterans have been given in our history, in the form of a cold war GI bill.

The hardships of pursuing education without assistance after sacrificing 2 to 4 years in military service were recently brought to light in a letter from Mr. Earl F. Phipps of Perrysburg, Ohio.

Mr. President, the Senate passed this bill by a vote of more than 4 to 1. It has become bogged down and sat upon by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I hope that in the closing days of this session of Congress, the House will have heart enough to loosen up and let the veterans have the opportunity to go to school.

To illustrate the plight of Mr. Phipps and thousands of cold war veterans who need the cold war GI bill to receive an education, I ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERRYSBURG, OHIO.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: Although thousands of us men and women who served our country since the Korean war have not been under direct fire from any enemy or won any assaults our mission was still a success. We were deployed where we were needed—all over the world—and our job was the prevention of war. We faced our enemy wherever he showed his face and our willingness to confront him sometimes defeated him.

After our discharge some of us wanted to better ourselves and we turned to college for this. But a battle none of us fully realized was the steadily rising cost of tuition and books. The Government's national defense loan is issued mostly to education and engineering students. What is left over is divided between business, liberal arts, medicine and whatever else students were majoring in for a degree. Bank loans are available but who wants to be paying for their education 10 years after graduation? This is the time money is needed for buying homes and raising families.

Speaking for thousands of cold war soldiers I want to wish you luck.

EARL F. PHIPPS.

SENATOR MOSS SPEAKS IN LUBBOCK, TEX.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on October 7, last Thursday, my good friend, TED MOSS, the distinguished junior Senator from Utah, spoke to the Intercity Rotary meeting sponsored annually by the Lubbock Rotary Club. Nearly 600 Rotarians drove from as far away as 150 miles in Texas and New Mexico to hear Senator Moss speak on a subject he knows well: water. Earlier this year the Senator from Utah spoke at a water symposium held at Texas Tech. He was asked to return to Lubbock because of the great interest in his subject.

Senator Moss was a member of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources and also served as chairman of the Senate Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee. In 1960 he was a member of the delegation which studied the relative water and power resource development in the U.S.S.R.

Existing withdrawals of water in the United States are now on the order of about 300 billion gallons a day and will be doubled by 1980 if present trends continue. Our friends in New York City are all too well aware of the need for water, and, indeed, all Americans should be concerned. I ask unanimous consent that the speech by Senator Moss be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NAWAPA CONCEPT

(Speech of Senator FRANK E. MOSS, Democrat, of Utah, Intercity Rotary meeting, Lubbock, Tex., Oct. 7, 1965)

I appreciate being invited back to Lubbock. To be asked to speak a second time in any city is always a special honor. I must say, however, that I am constantly amazed at the docility with which the American people submit to speeches—particularly speeches from people in political life.

However, I am always happy to come to Texas. I admire your State very much. I learned long ago never to ask a person what State he is from. If he is from Texas, he will tell you, if he is not, don't embarrass him.

Also, there is nothing I would rather do than talk about water, because I am convinced that if we do not talk about it often enough to arouse everybody to do something about it there will soon come a time when there will not be enough of it to go around—and that would be a catastrophe too serious to contemplate.

I am sure you are all aware of the dimensions of the water shortage in the United States. It plagues us daily despite the fact that 5,500 billion tons of water—over 4 billion acre-feet—are precipitated in our country every year. Of this, only about 30 percent actually remains on or under the land surface to supply our rivers and ground water supplies, while the rest of it evaporates into the atmosphere.

One would think that this 30 percent would be plenty for us. But it is not. We are now diverting about 300 billion gallons of water a day for use in irrigation, industry, and in our homes. Demands are expected to double by 1980, soaring to almost 600 billion gallons daily, and to triple by the year 2000, reaching almost 900 billion gallons per day. This is close to the average annual runoff of all rivers in the United States.

When the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources—on which it was my privilege to serve—published the results of its 2-year study in January 1961, and outlined to us the immensity of the U.S. water problem, we suddenly realized that our water crisis was not something to be feared in the future, but that it was already on us. The facts demanded major recommendations and action.

Since that time we in the Congress have been grinding out legislation to give the country some of the tools it needs to head off the water crisis. We know that we must use every tool at our command. We must expand water storage facilities, purify brackish and salt water, increase streamflow by eradication of worthless vegetation, develop and utilize underground water, control snowmelt, and expand all phases of water research. We are doing serious research on weather modification to induce precipitation. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act, signed by President Johnson last week, signals an heroic effort to purify and reuse water. All of these we must do—and at an accelerated pace.

As I left Washington this morning there was a meeting in that great city of engineers, scientists, construction experts, and governmental representatives from 65 great nations of the earth, to discuss in a week-long symposium the problems, challenges, and benefits of desalinization of sea water and brackish inland water. Today, at 2 p.m., they met in the East Room of the White House to hear a Texan exhort them to still greater efforts as he sketched the growing need of fresh water, and the bright promise attendant upon the achievement of dependable, low-cost desalinization, and I'm for this, even as President Johnson is for it. Desalinization is the hope of many coastal areas, but this is only one facet of the water picture, and a limited facet. We must move on other fronts too.

We must achieve optimum development of what water we have underground and above ground. We must improve coordination between Federal, State, and local activities. We must work hard—and work together. Population growth alone demands increased supply—per capita use makes it imperative.

Congress took a giant step this session in improving cooperation between areas and States in water development when we passed a measure to provide for water resource development and planning in the United States on a river basin basis.

It is manifest that State and regional lines must be disregarded if water resource planning is to be fully efficient. Water flows downward by gravity, sweeping over man-designated boundaries at will. The fact that we have drawn arbitrary lines to set one State apart from another, or one county apart from another, is of no concern to a river or stream rushing to the sea, or a lake which spreads out in nature's valley.

With water resource development now launched on a basinwide basis in the United States, the next logical step is importation of water from water surplus areas to water-short areas. This is a bold concept, and one which will require more imagination and will and understanding and cooperation than has been displayed so far.

There has been stiff resistance to exporting water from water surplus areas. This is natural and understandable. No one wants to give up something which he holds valuable. On the other hand it is hard to justify wasting away a valuable resource which belongs to all the people when others desperately need it.

Therefore, water importation is now becoming a topic of discussion at water parleys all through the West. We are beginning to feel our way on it. A close examination of all the signs and portents indicate that some of the objections to water importation are dissolving.

For example, Governors from all of the Western States meeting in Portland, Oreg., earlier this year unanimously adopted a resolution establishing a Western States Water Council to effect cooperation in water resources development. This resolution recognized the fact that water problems in one water basin of the West are water problems of all Western States and basins, and that full integration may require the removal of water from areas of water surplus to areas of water deficiency.

But dividing up available water—importing it from where it is to where it isn't—is much wider than just a western problem, or even a nationwide problem. It is a continentwide problem. The most imaginative approach to the water shortages in the United States, and our greatest hope of solving our water problems in a vast area from the Great Lakes to the Pacific Ocean, and from Canada to Mexico lies, in the bold new concept which has been called the North American Water and Power Alliance. This is the concept advanced by the Ralph M. Parsons Co. of Los Angeles, one of the outstanding engineering and construction firms in the Nation, and is the concept that I am here today to discuss.

NAWAPA, as the program has become known, would trap the wasted water of Alaska, the Yukon territory, and British Columbia, and channel it to the Canadian plains, the Great Lakes, all of Western United States and to Mexico.

It would be history's biggest public works program. It would cost roughly $100 billion and it would take 30 years to build.

It would provide a vast complex of canals, trenches, reservoirs, aqueducts, lift pump stations, and other waterworks, including a 500-mile-long Rocky Mountain trench in the upper reaches of the Columbia, Fraser, and Kootenay Rivers. Water for irrigation and other uses would be distributed from the trench to Idaho, Oregon, Utah, Nevada, California, Arizona, and New Mexico, and several areas of old Mexico. From the proposed Pecos River Reservoir water would be pumped into the Canadian and Purgatoire Rivers and would be delivered east of the Continental Divide into Colorado. This water would be drawn upon, also, by New Mexico, Texas, Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, and Oklahoma. Another diversion would provide more water for southern California.

NAWAPA would also establish a Canadian-Great Lakes canal system which would provide a seaway from the Great Lakes into the heart of Alberta, Canada, and bring more desperately needed water into the Great Lakes themselves, now at their lowest level in years. Branching off from the Canadian-Great Lakes Canal, a barge canal would connect with the Missouri and Minnesota River system to serve Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Iowa.

The Columbia River Basin would also benefit from NAWAPA. The Bonneville Power Authority is presently hampered by tremendous seasonal variations, with the demand for power greatest in the fall and early winter when the water is lowest. NAWAPA would regulate the flow of the Columbia in a way which would double the firm power generating capacity. There also would be a series of new hydropower plants developed along Snake River in Idaho.

It would also provide water to recharge our existing underground aquifers. The capacity of these underground storage areas is tremendous, providing a reserve supply of water to meet most current needs. In many sections of the Nation, people have been taking more water out of these aquifers than nature has been putting in. New sources of water are needed to recharge them. NAWAPA, with its tremendous reserves of water is an answer to this pressing problem.

So you can see, the benefits from NAWAPA will spread out across most of the United States, and much of Canada and Mexico. In all, 33 of our States would benefit directly from NAWAPA, including the Panhandle of west Texas, and the entire country would benefit from its economic impact. In Canada, direct benefits would accrue to seven Provinces and one territory, and three of the largest and most arid States in old Mexico would receive water of untold value.

It is estimated that these developments would produce an annual income of $4 billion. The overall NAWAPA concept, fully implemented, would put 56 million new arid acres under irrigation, 40 million of them in the United States. Its construction would assure adequate water supplies for the next hundred years or more.

As chairman of the special Senate Subcommittee on Western Water Development, established to decide how to implement the NAWAPA concept, I made several efforts in 1964 to have it considered by the Canadian Government, and the Governors of the Canadian Provinces which would be most directly involved. I informed Secretary Rusk of the formation of the special subcommittee to consider the NAWAPA concept and requested that the Government of Canada be asked to join with the United States in conducting a detailed engineering survey of the project. The Canadians indicated they did not wish to enter into such a study. A Governor of British Columbia, a key Province in the program, was outspoken in his opposition to it.

Since that time, however, there have been some signs of a softening of attitude on the general question of transporting water from water-surplus areas in Canada to the United States.

As an example, the Federal Governments of Canada and the Province of Ontario have now agreed to a northern river water survey to find out whether waters now flowing wastefully into the Hudson Bay might be diverted southward.

Both Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson and Premier John Robards have stressed that water should not be exported to relieve acute U.S. shortages until after Canada's needs are met—a most reasonable attitude, of course. The implication is that it should be exported when Canada's present and future needs have been guaranteed, in order to sustain life in water-short areas.

There is, of course, a long history of the recognition of the mutual interest of the United States and Canada in water. Cooperation between the two countries in seeking solutions to our joint water problems dates back to 1909, when a boundary water treaty between the two countries was signed to establish a procedure for settling questions on our boundary waters. This was followed in 1912 by the establishment of the International Joint Commission. Since that time there have been a series of agreements dealing with matters ranging from tolls in boundary waters, to Great Lakes pilotage, to Lake of the Woods boundary levels, to the Niagara diversion.

Some time ago we concluded the basic agreements which make possible the development of the mighty St. Lawrence Seaway. More recently we have seen our common interest served in the Canadian-United States Columbia River Treaty, signed last year by President Johnson and Prime Minister Pearson at the Peace Arch on the border between Washington State and British Columbia. Even though there are still some problems to be ironed out, the signing of the treaty assures us that the water and energy resources of western Canada and western United States will be utilized for all time to come for the common good of both countries.

Now the drastic decline in the water level of the Great Lakes has brought our two countries together again in negotiations to consider our rights, obligations and interests. The lake level problem has been referred to the International Joint Commission to find a solution—if one is within man's reach.

It was my privilege to speak at the Third International Conference on Water Conservation in Montreal, Canada, in June of this year. It is significant, I believe, that representatives of the Parsons Co., were also invited to the Conference and given time to explain in detail the NAWAPA plan, with special emphasis on the facets of it which would bring more water into the Great Lakes.

Most of the Conference was devoted to the deterioration of water levels in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system, and to the steps it will be necessary to take to head off disaster.

By resolution, the Conference recommended the establishment of a single continuing national authority to achieve a real and efficient coordination of all competent Government and private agencies to work out a comprehensive water management policy.

By resolution, the Conference also urged the International Joint Commission to proceed with all dispatch into the already authorized studies on the Great Lakes.

And finally, by resolution, the Conference urged that studies be undertaken on the feasibility of utilizing additional northern Canadian waters to augment the receding waters of the Great Lakes.

I was greatly heartened by the fact that both here in the United States and in Canada, we are beginning to consider the feasibility of importing water from areas where it is wasting away to areas which are water short. Discussion is the father of action.

I was encouraged, also, by the fact that this willingness to discuss mass transportation of water from one area to another comes in the country of our neighbor to the north with whom we have a well-established mutuality of interest, and a long history of the fair and just recognition of the valid rights of each.

Since my June appearance in Canada, I have introduced a resolution in the U.S.

Senate which declares it to be the sense of Congress that the Government of the United States refer to the International Joint Commission the subject of the North American Water and Power Alliance with instructions that the concept be fully studied and that a detailed engineering survey be conducted on it. It is my hope that the Parliament of Canada will pass a like resolution directed to the Government of the Dominion of Canada.

The International Joint Commission is the logical international agency to make a study of the NAWAPA concept. There is ample precedent for referring the concept to it with the request that an engineering study be made.

I have no illusions about the difficulties of getting the Canadian Parliament to pass such a resolution. The Parliament is composed of representatives of the various Provinces, just as our Congress is composed of representatives of our various States, and Provincial Governments with valuable water resources—or any other kind of natural resources—are naturally anxious to conserve their assets.

On the other hand there are water short Provinces in the great plains of Canada just as there are water short areas in the Great Plains and elsewhere in the United States. We are already working hand in hand on our mutual problem of the drastic water shortage in the Great Lakes. Surely this is good brickwork for the larger study of our continentwide problems. We must take these facts and make the most of them.

For years Canada and the United States have enjoyed the world's greatest economic trade relationship. Regardless of what may be happening in other parts of the globe, our economic cooperation has remained unchanged and mutually advantageous. Canada has continued to need and seek U.S. markets and U.S. investments for Canadian economic growth. The United States has continued to need and seek Canadian resources, and they have become the most significant single foreign ingredient in our economy.

The time has now come when we must move closer together in the development of all of our unused water resources. It has been said that the shortage of water anywhere is equal only to man's inability to manage water resources that are available. There could not be a truer statement about the water resources of the North American Continent. There is no reason to have a water shortage anywhere here—whether in America's great Southwest of which Texas is a part, or in the Canadian prairie provinces—if we develop to our mutual advantage all of the water available to us.

I am hopeful that the United States and Canada, in our traditional spirit of friendship and cooperation, can work out ways to develop our continentwide water resources to the mutual advantage of both of us—and without neglecting the needs or interests of either one of us.

It will not be easy—but I think we can do it. I borrow a phrase from the late John F. Kennedy's inaugural address. After pointing up the problems that there were to solve, he said simply "Let us begin."

WILLIAM MATHEW BURNETT: AN OUTSTANDING TEXAS JUDGE AND LEADER—A NOTABLE CITIZEN

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the finest men in this Nation ever to serve as a county judge was Judge Will Burnett, of Hays County, Tex. Judge Will Burnett looked more like Will Rogers in appearance than any other man I have ever known. He served in the difficult days of the great depression when people turned to their local governments, often the counties, for aid when there was no money for taxes, for food, for medicine, for schools, for the sustaining of life itself.

I first became acquainted with Judge Burnett when he was county judge of Hays County in the early days of that great depression, and I was a young assistant attorney general for our State of Texas, serving with the late Judge James V. Allred. On the basis of our working closely together at that time, we remained fast friends for more than 30 years and worked together governmentally and politically during this time. In every political contest in which I engaged he was a strong ally, a valued friend, a trusted counselor. His wit and wisdom enriched our democratic endeavors.

During all the time of my acquaintance with Judge Burnett, I have never encountered a man who was more genuine, capable, or devoted to the welfare of the people than this hardy, witty, rough, and ready rancher, judge of Hays County, with his Will Rogers wit, his range similes, and his great-hearted genuine concern for people. His range life did not dull his sensitivity for people in distress.

Judge Burnett was a credit to the bench, and a credit to my State of Texas through all the years of his life, and with his death, the cause of progress has suffered an irreplaceable loss.

In the Hays County Citizen of September 1, 1965, numerous tributes to this fine gentleman were published in honor of his outstanding life. This newspaper is one of the finest weeklies in my home State of Texas, and its editor, Bob Barton, Jr., is an outstanding man in the field of journalism. With the editing done by Mr. Barton, and the fine writing by Carolyn Chandler, Jack Major, Dot Moore, and John Moore, as well as the article by Bob Barton, Jr., himself, this is an outstanding tribute to Judge Will Burnett.

I ask unanimous consent that the attached articles from this issue be printed at this point in the RECORD, along with the letters of tribute which appear on page 8 of this newspaper.

There being no objection, the articles and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hays County Citizen, Sept. 1, 1965]

JUDGE WILL BURNETT—HIS DEATH MARKS THE END OF AN ERA

In searching for adjectives to characterize Judge Will Burnett, several came to mind: genuine—for there was not one iota of pretense or sham about the judge; compassionate—he seemed to have an innate understanding of and sympathy for the underdog; loyal—he was consistently faithful to his principles, his friends and his family; courageous—on all issues important to him he took a stand boldly and proudly for what he considered to be right, and let the chips fall where they would; independent—everyone knew, or soon learned, that the judge would let no man call the tune for him.

Many other adjectives occurred to me—reasonable, witty, persevering, gracious, generous, forthright—and they all seemed appropriate, yet none of them seemed adequate.

Next I turned to a consideration of the causes, institutions and principles dearest to the heart of the judge, and I realized that any attempt to list them in the order of their importance to him was, for me, impossible. There was his church. He took great pride in the history and tradition of the Episcopal Church, and was thoroughly familiar with both, from its founding in England during the Reformation to the present. Having been a lay reader in the church for many years, he could recite much of the Book of Common Prayer from memory, and most of his numerous public speeches were embellished with quotations from that book. He was very, very tolerant of other denominations and of those of us who differed with him religiously, but I don't think I ever knew anyone who got more satisfaction from his church than did the judge.

There was also politics, and with him politics was synonymous with the Democratic Party. Few men in this State have given longer or more faithful service to the Democratic Party than Judge Will Burnett. He was a long-time office holder himself (he loved to remind people that "Franklin D. Roosevelt and I both came into office in 1932 and together we saved the country"); but he continued to contribute heavily in time, effort, and money to his party long after his office-holding days were over.

His greatest political idol was F.D.R., and his supply of Roosevelt stories was endless. The last Roosevelt story he told was in the hospital shortly before his death: "Once when asked why the conservatives always seemed united and the liberals divided, F.D.R. remarked that the answer was simple: There are many ways of going forward, but only one way of standing still."

Besides F.D.R., there was Harry Truman, Adlai Stevenson, John F. Kennedy, John Kenneth Galbraith, and RALPH YARBOROUGH whom he also counted as heroes.

In State Democratic circles the judge was always alined with the liberal faction of the party. This made him the critic and opponent of the power structure in Texas, and so he was cut off from many honors and appointments which doubtless would have been his had he played along with the establishment.

The recently organized Hays County Democrats Club was to a large extent the result of his initiative and his efforts. Future meetings of that organization will seem colorless and quiet without the pungent wit and biting jabs of the judge.

Then there was farming and ranching. This was one of his great loves, and he derived almost as much satisfaction from being a farmer-rancher as from being an Episcopalian. It was his way of making a living, but it was also to him a way of life. He grieved deeply because this country was allowing the family farm to disappear. He believed that those who love the soil and are close to the earth give a stability and a continuity to this Nation which other nations have suffered and eventually crumbled from a lack of. This conviction led him, late in life, to become active in the Farmers' Union, which is dedicated to preserving the small family farm. Having become convinced that the Farm Bureau (the farm organization to which he originally belonged) was no longer controlled by farmers, but by bankers, doctors, oil men, etc., to whom farming was a hobby and a way to lose money, in order to count it off their income tax, the judge took it upon himself to organize the Farmers' Union in his home area. Thus was established the Plum Creek Local of the Texas Farmers' Union, and the judge became its first president.

His death marks virtually the end of an era in Texas agricultural history. How many true Texas cattlemen of the old breed are there left? He had the bearing, the dress, the language, the hardiness of the old time Texas rancher. And he made his way without benefit of a single oil well. No drugstore cowboy was this man.

There was also conservation of our natural resources which was very dear to the judge's heart. He was an authority on soil and water conservation. He made it a point to know about the subject, to keep informed on the latest problems and the latest statistics in this field. What is more important, he cared about the problem and practiced what he preached in regard to conservation. The judge traveled widely on his own time and at his own expense to plead for a stop to the erosion of the land and the pollution of the water of this State and Nation.

Books were another great interest which the judge had. He was an avid book collector, but he did more than collect them; he read them. His wife has said that she never saw the judge cry but twice in his life—once when his mother died, the other time when his books were destroyed by a flood that ruined their home on the Blanco River several years ago.

The table by his couch where he rested was always piled high with books. I will always picture the Judge in my own mind's eye reclining on the couch by the window where he could look out at the hills, the trees, and the river which he loved so much, with a book in his hand from which he was eager to read aloud a few choice passages as I came in the door.

Books on church history, politics, and nature were among his favorites, but he read widely in newspapers and magazines also. Harpers, the New Republic, the Texas Observer, the Tulia Herald, and the Hays County Citizen were periodicals which he read religiously. Many a fine book and article I have been led to read because of the judge's recommendation.

Often I marveled at how he found time to work hard on his ranch and farm, be a lay reader in the church, be the campaign manager for candidates for more than one office, organize the Farmers' Union, make conservation speeches, attend meetings of the Federal Land Bank Board, etc., and still have time to keep so well informed.

And finally there was his love for people. I think the Judge could have truthfully said, as Will Rogers did: "I never met a man I didn't like." He instinctively trusted and respected people; he understood human nature and made allowances for it. He could get on well with all manner of men, women, and children. He was a true gentleman, always showing women the utmost courtesy. In all the stories he told, I never heard him tell a vulgar or offcolor one. He showed particular gentleness and kindness to children, and found them both interesting and amusing. His grandchildren were among his greatest delights. My own children loved him almost as much as their lone surviving grandfather.

Even his adversaries respected the Judge. He could be a no-holds-barred fighter for things he believed in, but he never stooped to conquer, and his opponents knew it. He could be brutally frank with people and not make them his enemies. He once said, "I have told more people to go to hell and gotten by with it than any man alive." And he was not exaggerating. I walked out of a meeting place behind the Judge one night after he had a particularly rough word battle with a longtime acquaintance over an issue that was important to the Judge. Halfway down the aisle the Judge caught up with his opponent of the evening. The two men shook hands, the Judge put his arm around the man's shoulder, and calling him by his first name, said, "You didn't know a damn thing 20 years ago, and you haven't learned anything since." The man laughed and the two parted friends.

All my reflections and reminiscences led me to the conclusion that the most striking and appealing thing about the Judge was his attitude or outlook. Here was a man who long ago came to terms with life. He met its events head on, assured that there would be some benefit, if not pleasure, to be gained from every experience. And so he was always ready and willing to take whatever life had to offer, including death, without complaining.

DOT MOORE.

[From the Hays County Citizen, Sept. 1, 1965]

JUDGE WILL BURNETT: HAYS COUNTY'S ICONOCLAST—HE LEAVES US THIS LEGACY

On Franklin Roosevelt:

"To me he is the epitome and the climax of all the great political leaders and humanitarians who have gone down through the halls of time. The world has had many reformers, from the Grachi brothers in Rome to Henry George and his 'I am for men,' but they have accomplished little. But F.D.R., by the magic of his voice and his political finesse, through the medium of the Democratic Party, wrote into law most of the great social gains that man has striven for during the past 100 years."

On materialism:

"God has given us a bright and glorious world to live in. God has endowed us with life eternal, for it is stated in the 26th verse of Genesis that God created man in his own image and likeness and gave man dominion over all the earth, so it follows that we are but tenants of God while we dwell on the earth, so it measures not how much money we make or how much land we may own, for in the hour of death and the day of judgment, we give it back to God from whence it came. As Ogden Nash has said, "There are no pockets in a shroud," so why let the idea of wealth dominate our life."

On soil conservation:

"If the landowner is charged with the responsibility for the care of his soil and water and he doesn't make money enough to do it, and in many cases he does not, particularly on land that needs the care of the greatest, I think that society is charged with the responsibility to assist him in the program. I do not think this theory is socialistic or communistic, but merely good sense.

"Furthermore, I believe that if the landowner is unable or unwilling to put his land in proper state for farming or grazing, that the State should do it for him and the State should have the right to see that proper practices are thereafter maintained. For to spend money, if necessary public money, on private property for conservation purposes and then allow a careless landowner to destroy the good work is unthinkable."

On the Farmers Union:

"The Farmers Union is dedicated to promote and protect the family farm. President Kennedy described the family farm as a farm family that could make a decent living and he emphasized 'decent.' If we lose the family farm our agriculture will degenerate into the old European system of peasant farming or to the California system of corporation farming. We of the Farmers Union want neither."

[From the Hays County Citizen, Sept. 1, 1965]

THE JUDGE WANTED FREEDOM

(By Jack Major)

It was my privilege to have been associated with Judge Will Burnett for many years. I feel I can make a few comments concerning "the judge" that might interest and challenge our young people to seek those things that last, and those things that help to make this a better land because we were privileged to travel through it. I find it difficult to write of this man of so many varied and wide interests—rancher, soil conservationist, humorist, politician and churchman to name but a few of his interests. The judge was a man that desired freedom for himself and his fellow man. Freedom from ignorance, from poverty, freedom to express one's self.

The judge was a champion of soil conservation. He and his twin brother, Walter, bought several thousand acres of worn-out cotton land near Golforth. This land was badly washed; clay gullies were everywhere; there was little grass. The judge began terracing the land, reseeding native grasses and building stock ponds to catch the water that before had rushed madly to Brushy Creek and then to the gulf. Today, those acres of prairie land are covered with bluestem, curly mesquite, tallow weed, and a dozen other native grasses. The ponds or lakes abound with bass and catfish—all because of a man who practiced what he preached.

Judge Burnett never shot a deer. His beautiful Blanco River ranch protects hundreds of deer and wild turkey. To the hunter it is like hunting game in a zoo.

To hear the judge preach the Rogation Sunday sermon was a real treat. No one could doubt his sincerity as he pleaded for his fellow man to preserve and conserve those things that God has so wonderfully blessed us with.

Judge Burnett loved children, and they loved him. My own children were thrilled when that real cowboy, the raiser of big steers, the wearer of the cowboy boots, took time out to come by and talk to them. Chewing gum and nickles were always passed out by the Judge.

Judge Burnett was a "born politician"; a dedicated public servant; a real Democrat. Devoted to a political party he believed in, he worked for its candidates for public office—provided those candidates truly represented the ideals of the Democratic Party. The judge believed that "the little man" had to have representation, and he worked to that end. The judge fought for the rights of all men, the right of equal opportunity, the right to accomplish by initiative.

The judge believed that the ranch and farm people needed an organization that would scream out the needs of the family farmer in high places of government. Under the leadership of Judge Burnett, and his dear friend Otto Graef, the Plum Creek local was organized, with over a hundred ranch and farm families banded together to seek a better way of life for those that loved the farm.

In conclusion, let me say this: if all of us were as dedicated to our church and political party as the judge was to his, we would never have to fear those things that cause men to fear.

A narrow bridge crosses a narrow, rocky, moss-covered chasm at the approach to the Burnett Ranch on the Blanco. A tall tree, growing from the foot of the draw beside the bridge bears a bronze plaque with these words from one of Will Burnett's favorite hymns.

I visited the judge in the hospital a few days before he died. His faith was a thing I shall never forget.

The poor, the needy, the friendless, the forgotten, the neglected, we, the common people, have lost a champion, we have lost a friend. We shall not soon forget "the kindly judge" who counted us as a friend.

[From the Hays County Citizen, Sept. 1, 1965]

AND THEN I MET THE JUDGE

As a kid I remember the stories told of the rugged individuals of the cattle country and how I wished I could have lived and been a part of that era.

I can visualize this man today that was pictured to me in those stories. He was slightly over 6 feet in height, broad shoulders, rudded complexion, legs slightly bowed, a well worn "several gallon" hat, a red bandana knotted around his neck, "high heeled" boots, piercing eyes with a grim smile on his face and above all he must have a six-gun slung low on his hips. You could probably find the remains of a plug of Brown's Mule in his shirt pocket and at least a pint of "red eye" in his saddle bag.

This man was always on the side of justice regardless of the circumstances. He welcomed the company and aid of men with similar feelings but he never avoided a battle if allies were not around when the battle broke. He never turned down a friend in need.

He earned his living by the "sweat of his brow." He never sought shelter from a blizzard when his cattle needed protection; nor the shade in the summer when the windmill wouldn't turn. As he rode the range he kept one eye on the land and the other on the sky. To the land he looked for the condition of the grass and the water holes and to the sky he looked for a rain cloud that could revive the grass and replenish the water holes.

He never killed wildlife for the sake of killing but only to supply his needs for survival. He was willing to "live and let live" and expected you to grant him the same privilege.

For most of my preschool years I kept expecting this individual to show up and invite me to join him for a "spell." After entering school some of my teachers began undressing this man. I was led to believe this character was gone—and as far as they were concerned it was a jolly good thing. I should turn my sights to the man in the derby with the more sophisticated ways of dealing with people. For the next 20 years I had similar experiences with high school teachers, college profs, military personnel, more college teachers, professional associates, and various other friends and associates.

I finally gave up the physical features (with some regrets), but I could never stop looking for this individual who was willing to fight for other individuals with a just cause whenever or wherever he found them, and was willing to do battle for the simple reason that he thought he was right; and for the one who never looked to see if he had an army to back him up, but would do what he could with what he had.

After 40 years I met Judge Will Burnett and my faith in humanity was restored.

He was a solid and reliable individual with whom I felt as secure with my back to him as when face to face.

I shall never walk the Blanco River, look at a 2-year-old steer, a shrub cedar, a limestone boulder, a good native pasture, or a lake of water in the dry Southwest without hearing the judge's voice saying, "John, what do you think of that?"

[From the Hays County Citizen, Sept. 1, 1965]

TRIBUTES TO THE JUDGE

THE PRESIDENT

(Written prior to last year's barbecue honoring the judge.)

DEAR BOB: I don't know of a more cheerful way to spend my time than to be with you as you honor my old friend, Judge Will Burnett.

Only the problems and the duties that go with this office keep me from personally joining with you today.

Judge Burnett is an honored Texan who has served his neighbors, his State, and his Nation with courage and integrity.

To all of you who pay your respects and your friendship to a good man, I send my warm and affectionate greetings.

Sincerely,

LYNDON JOHNSON.

A SENATOR, THE SENATE OF THE STATE OF TEXAS, AUSTIN

DEAR CAROLYN: I was pleased to learn that the Hays County Citizen is planning a section in its August 25 edition dedicated to the memory of Judge Will Burnett. Judge was a very special individual, and it is fitting and proper that he be the subject of a special tribute.

Judge was a colorful composite of rugged frontiersman—a rancher's rancher, as it were—an intellectual sophisticate. He revered the simple things of life, yet keenly felt and appreciated the subtleties of government and human relations. He combined an intense concern for the needs of his less fortunate fellows with a strong appreciation of individual effort and self-reliance. He was both idealist and realist.

He was a dedicated liberal in his zeal for justice, brotherhood, and progressive efforts at coping with the problems of a world growing more congested and complex by the day. He was, at the same time, a conservative in his appreciation of personal effort, thrift, and integrity and in his impatience with boondoggling and waste.

Judge was a hearty man—fond of good food, good conversation, and good humor. In a crowd he could usually be spotted by the appreciative Will Burnett fans massed around him. He was never dull.

Judge was cut from the same cloth as Frank Dobie and Will Rogers, both of whom, in my opinion, he favored physically as well as otherwise. He was a bit of a maverick in an era of conformity. He was a man without pretense. He had convictions and the courage to express them.

There will never be another Will Burnett—and more's the pity.

Sincerely,

WALTER RICHTER.

HIS BISHOP

CATHEDRAL HOUSE,
San Antonio, Tex.

From Will Burnett's bishop, Everett H. Jones:

"Will Burnett was a person who made a vivid and lasting impression on all the persons he met. It was my pleasure to see him from time to time as I visited our churches, and it was very evident that he was a devoted and sincere churchman. He was not ashamed to talk about the Christ he served and the church he loved. The God he found in worship was the same God he found in nature, especially in the trees and hills of Texas.

"He bore his Christian witness to the end, meeting his illness with the same cheerful and courageous spirit with which he met other things. We thank God for his life and influence, and pray that he may continue to grow in His love and service."

FARMERS UNION

Memorial resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Texas Farmers Union in regular session Thursday July 22, 1965, at Waco, Tex.

Wheras Judge William Mathew Burnett has been claimed by death, while serving as president of the Plum Creek Farmers Union, as director of district IV on the State executive committee of the Texas Farmers Union;

Whereas he worked diligently for the local and State organizations, building membership and serving as legislative representative during the recent session of the State legislature;

Whereas he devoted himself unselfishly and tirelessly in accomplishing the objectives of Farmers Union: Be it

Resolved, That the executive committee of the Texas Farmers Union unanimously express in behalf of the State organization these words of tribute to Judge Burnett:

"Judge William Matthew Burnett was a great farm leader and a champion of causes to improve the lot of Texas farmers, ranchers, and rural dwellers. He was a courageous and stalwart defender of principle and gave freely of this time and energy in fighting inequity and injustice. He believed in people and opposed those who oppress them. Judge Burnett was a practical man who had vision. He was unwilling to leave this life without contributing unselfishly to his community and to his fellow man everywhere"; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of the above tribute be sent to his widow, Mrs. Gatha Burnett of Wimberley, with the deepest condolences of the members of the executive committee.

CONSERVATIONISTS

DEAR EDITOR: Was glad to see the tribute you planned for Judge William Burnett in the planned special edition. He was a foremost conservationist of our time and era. He practiced soil and water conservation and preached it. He will be remembered for many things; to us of the S.C.S. work unit he will be remembered for his outstanding work in soil and water conservation.

ANDY ANDERSON.

A FRIEND

Will Burnett, a gentleman and a scholar, was a man whose boundless enthusiasm and energy were always directed to the improvement of our natural resources and the betterment of our social and economic life. He was fearless and courageous in his convictions, regardless of the obstacles and opposition which sometimes arose.

LEX WORD.

KYLE.

THE CAMPAIGNER

A favorite tactic while campaigning for Walter Richter for Senate was to stop and engage one of the county's many German farmers in conversation, then turn the talk toward politics in general and Richter in particular. After making his pitch he would close his appeal for support by saying, "I sure hope you won't hold it against Walter because he's German."

GUADALUPE-BLANCO RIVER AUTHORITY

GENTLEMEN: I read the article concerning the death of Judge Will Burnett in the July 28 issue of the Citizen. Judge Burnett served as a member of the board of directors of the Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority in the same exemplary manner in which he undertook all activities. The current board of directors passed a resolution on July 22 in memory of his service to the authority. I have enclosed a certified copy of that resolution for use in the Will Burnett issue you are planning.

JOHN H. SPECHT,
Assistant to the General Manager.

"Resolution and order of board of directors of Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority adopted at postponed regular meeting on July 22, 1965

"At a postponed regular meeting of the board of directors of Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority had on July 22, 1965, at New Braunfels, Tex., a quorum being present, the following resolution and order of the board was unanimously adopted, that is:

"'Noting the passing of the Honorable William M. Burnett, formerly a director of the board of the Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority, Director Engelke offered the following resolution which, upon being seconded by Director Deviney, was unanimously adopted:

"'Whereas the Honorable William M. Burnett died at Austin, Tex., on July 21, 1965; and

"'Whereas the said William M. Burnett served the Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority long and faithfully as a member of the board of directors from May 16, 1947, until August 31, 1959; and

"'Whereas, Mr. Burnett contributed greatly to the progress of the authority in developing and conserving water resources in the Guadalupe River Basin: Now, therefore, be it

"'*Resolved by the Board of Directors of the Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority,* That it does hereby express its sorrow at the passing of a greatly respected and esteemed former colleague and friend and that this expression, along with those of sympathy and condolences, be forwarded to Mrs. William M. Burnett, surviving widow of said William M. Burnett'."

HIS WIFE

Gatha McBurnett—the Judge called her Gay—was a schoolteacher when she met Judge through mutual friends who thought they should get together because of their similar names.

In recalling the meeting she says that she told herself that night that here was the man she wanted to marry if she could get him. "He was kind and well read but above all he was a real man and not some dude," she added.

Mrs. Burnett has developed through the years into a real authority on water conservation, primarily because anything that interested the Judge interested her.

She has also labored beside him in other causes that were dear to them both, particularly the Farmers Union and the espousal of the election and reelection of RALPH YARBOROUGH.

A BURNETT STORY

The story was frequently told by the Judge about the visit of a new Episcopalian minister from Blanco to the bachelor abode of his and his brother Walter's.

Glancing at several objects on a nearby table the reverend remarked, "I see you two are good Episcopalians, you've got a deck of cards and a Book of Common Prayer and they both appear well used."

[From the Hays County Citizen, Sept. 1, 1965]

OF WILL BURNETT: A CHRONOLOGY

Born July 5, 1891, at Kerrville, William Mathew Burnett and his twin brother Walter were the sons of William W. and Capitola Burnett. The father was county judge of Kerr County for a number of years.

After being forced to drop out of the University of Texas Law School because of illness, he moved in 1913 to the Blanco River ranch about halfway between Wimberley and Blanco and began ranching. Shortly afterward his twin followed him and they formed a partnership which through the years saw the ranch build into a sizable place. Before the two divided their land several years ago, large holdings in the Niederwald-Uhland area were also acquired.

Always active in Democratic Party affairs, Will Burnett was elected county commissioner from Mount Sharp in 1922 and served until 1932 when he decided to seek the office of county judge.

His opponent was J. R. Wilhelm, who had served a 10-year term and was liked and respected by the voters. However, a vigorous campaign and the 7-to-1 support of his home box gave Commissioner Burnett a narrow 1,198-to-1,130 victory.

Two years later he was unopposed for reelection, but in 1936 he met a stiff challenge from Charles Decker and Lloyd G. Johnson. Burnett won spectacularly, without a runoff.

When the votes were counted Burnett had 1,590 to Decker's 876 and Johnson's 660. His countywide popularity was further emphasized by the fact that he carried 18 of the county's 19 boxes.

There was no opposition in 1938 and the following year he resigned to accept the postmastership at San Marcos.

Responsible for the appointment was young Congressman Lyndon Johnson, who had received strong support from Judge Burnett. Both men were fervent admirers of Franklin Roosevelt and both were products of the Texas hill country.

The friendship formed in the 1930's held true, even when the two would part company over intraparty matters.

Another close friend of Judge Burnett was Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH. The judge served as the Senator's campaign manager in his last two successful races.

In 1963 Judge Burnett found himself disagreeing vehemently with existing policies of the Texas Farm Bureau, of which he had been a longtime member. In typical fashion and with the energy of a man of 30 instead of 70 plus, he embarked on a drive to organize a Farmers Union chapter in Hays and Caldwell Counties. The group, of which he became the first and only president, now contains more than 100 members and at last year's State convention Burnett was given a plaque for his recruiting efforts.

Noted for his efforts on behalf of soil conservation, he was a director of the Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority for 12 years and was a former president and longtime board member of the San Marcos Farm and Loan Association.

He and his wife, the former Gatha McBurnett, were married July 9, 1929, at St. Mark's Church in San Antonio. They are the parents of Mrs. Weymouth K. Symmes (Gay), and Mrs. Howard J. Speer (Esther), of Dallas. There are also five grandchildren.

A very active Episcopalian, Judge Burnett was a lay reader for many years and was well known for his Rogation Sunday sermons.

His death occurred July 21, at St. David's Hospital in Austin, following a short illness. Memorials are still being accepted by the American Cancer Society, Box 269, San Marcos.

[From the Hays County Citizen, Sept. 1, 1965]

SOME RECOLLECTIONS OF A RUGGED INDIVIDUALIST

(By Bob Barton, Jr.)

I can't remember when I first met the Judge. In the murky recesses of my mind I can recall a trip with my grandfather to the county courthouse back on a hot summer afternoon in the late 1930's and being introduced to a man who looked and talked like a real Texan and not some drugstore cowboy.

An 8-year-old boy may not be able to explain the difference, but since he lives much of the time in a make-believe world he can spot a fellow traveler without much difficulty. There was nothing make-believe about Will Burnett, and I knew it then.

It was not until about a decade ago, when Dwight Eisenhower was President and the fortunes of national-minded Democrats were at a low ebb in Texas that I came to know Will Burnett well.

Many people now caught up in the enthusiasm of the Great Society have conveniently forgotten the stifling conformity which enveloped Texas and the rest of the Nation in the early 1950's. Few Hays Countians were willing to speak out in defense of the eloquent Illinoisan who had dared make the presidential race against the great general whose first few months of life were spent in Texas, but the Judge was one of those who did. He spoke out, with all the sparkling humor, biting sarcasm, and political acumen he possessed.

When Allen Shivers (and the Judge could roll this name off his tongue in a way that made you know what he thought of him) decided to try to retain control of the State party in 1956, national Democrats rallied around Lyndon Johnson, RALPH YARBOROUGH and loyal local leaders.

In this county Will Burnett was, of course, in the Johnson camp. He and other loyalists such as Ernest Morgan and H. Y. Price, Jr., did such a good job that they captured every precinct and Democrats were for the first time in some years picked to go to the State convention.

At a preconvention caucus the judge had interrupted a tirade by one of us against a local "Shivercrat" with the suggestion that the man be appointed a delegate. "He's a pretty good boy and we might even convert him," he drawled.

Although the judge carried Lyndon Johnson's banner at that convention, he was no man's lackey and he refused to accede to Johnson's wishes, despite a personal appeal from the most persuasive senior Senator, when the matter of choosing a national committeewoman was considered.

Johnson's candidate was a wealthy Eisenhower Democrat from the valley and the judge thought Mrs. Frankie Randolph, a longtime liberal leader from Houston, deserved the appointment. The majority of the delegates agreed with the judge. Mrs. Randolph was elected. Despite this disagreement, and others that occurred later the two men remained friends.

The judge had a way of disagreeing without being disagreeable and a political favor paid him never meant that it would be repaid in kind if the repayment interfered with his personal conviction on a matter. He didn't subscribe to cronyism in government by his friends any more than he did by his political enemies.

And political enemies were about the only kind that he had. He numbered many conservative Democrats and Republicans among his friends, and he loved to engage them in running repartee which at times would grow loud and heated. But he didn't fall out with very many people over their politics, even during the bitter campaigns of the past decade.

First, and very erroneous, impressions would lead you to believe that he was a gruff, blustery man.

He looked the part, with a cigar clamped between his teeth (he chewed them but didn't smoke 'em), and a quick wit that rolled off his tongue with a special inflection which sometimes turned into biting ridicule.

He cussed no more in public than he did in private, and few men can make a similar claim. But his cuss words were those old Anglo-Saxon standbys and from his lips they were more descriptive than denunciatory.

His language was earthy, but not vulgar. The judge's frequent jokes might contain a damn or a hell or occasionally something stronger, but they were never off color in the sense of those of many an afterdinner speaker who wouldn't think of offending a lady in the audience, but frequently does.

With the Southern charm of his Alabama ancestry he treated every woman like a lady. His courtesy extended to opening the doors of autos for female companions and this is a small kindness which is remembered forever.

An avid reader, the judge loved the old English classics, particularly Sir Walter Scott and Charles Dickens. According to his wife, he would reread them each year.

His memory was phenomenal. He couldn't carry a tune, but that didn't keep him from memorizing hundreds of songs and he sprinkled his speech with frequent quotations.

Although he loved the activity of a political campaign and enjoyed the company of sophisticated and urbane city dwellers, he loved the Blanco River country and the eastern prairie land of the county even more.

He had a special feeling for the people in and around Neiderwald, where he owned a large prairie ranch. He always assured political candidates, "I'll handle Wimberly and Neiderwald," and he usually did.

The prairie people reciprocated. Many had bought their farm with the judge's help during the New Deal. Or perhaps he had aided them in getting electricity through his work with the REA.

They also remembered him as one of their own in another way. An antiprohibitionist when it was virtually political suicide in Texas to be one, the judge enjoyed stopping at Heidemeyer's for a beer after a long day in the hot sun. Unlike some dry-county politicians who sneaked off to have a drink, the judge proclaimed the fact he was going to quench his thirst.

Even after he was past 70 he would be up before daylight and soon afterward he would jump in his pickup and start the long trip toward the prairie.

Sometimes he would stop coming or going for a quick game of dominoes at the Bon Ton in Kyle with an old friend like Charlie Bales, but he would be at work before the sun had risen very high and he would stay with it until dusk.

Then likely as not, it would be the 40-mile drive home, a change of clothes, and then off to a farmers union or Democratic meeting.

Although certainly not a pious man, the judge was an Episcopalian whose faith never wavered. Not many people could be as philosophical as he was the last time I saw him.

Only days before he had been told that he had only a few weeks to live. He asked me if I knew about his condition and I said yes I did.

"Well it's all right," he replied. "I have lived a full life. I have been active in my church and the Democratic Party. I just wish I could be here to be in on some of the changes that are occurring, but I'm prepared to go."

And then in typical fashion, he chuckled, "I told more people to go to hell in 10 years in public office than any man alive, and got by with it."

He got by with it because he served the people wisely and well. He had the courage to be different and he inspired others to try to retain their individualism too.

We agree with Ronnie Dugger, editor of the Texas Observer, who in referring to the judge and paraphrasing Walter Lippmann's remarks about Adlai Stevenson, said, "The future of our Nation depends on whether we can occasionally produce men of the caliber of Judge Burnett."

[From the Hays County Citizen, Sept. 1, 1965]

The Burnett Twins—Some Reminiscences

(By Carolyn Chandler)

Although my assignment was to collect anecdotes about Will Burnett's youth, one thing obliquely uncovered was more indicative of his adulthood. Whenever I approached someone and said I was writing an article on Will Burnett and wanted some information about him, my informant-to-be was invariably wary and reluctant to talk until I had got across the fact that I was not referring to his politics.

What this indicates is not only that the first thing one thinks about in connection with Will Burnett is politics, but more significantly, that his politics were almost invariably out of kilter with those of his oldest acquaintances. His newer and younger friends would say Will "outgrew" his friends politically, but the older friends would surely have it that he "went astray" in 1932 and never got straightened out again. We will leave it to them to argue about.

Anyway, having once got past the political barrier, the stories came thick and fast, and they indicated not only that Will, and Walter, his twin brother, were unusual boys, but they came from unusual parents.

The day that I interviewed Harry Schlameus, I thought perhaps that he was on his way out and that I should come back at a more convenient time, because he was wearing a hat and a bow tie. But he said during the conversation that due to Will's father's influence he had not gone a day in the last 40 years without a bow tie on. One simply never saw, he said, old Mr. Burnett without his bow tie. He would go out to the fields in a blue work shirt and a black bow tie.

Will's friends remember his mother, too. She was blind, but she cooked meals and patched clothes. She could, it is said, reach into the hottest oven, thump a loaf of bread and tell by the sound and feel whether it was done or not. Bub Meeks says that she always knew him, if she was within the sound of his voice.

Being a twin was a source of both some amusement and some concern to Walter. The story is told of the time when Will was a county commissioner and a constituent, meeting him on the street, began to upbraid him vigorously. The only thing was, it wasn't Will at all, it was Walter. Mr. Schlameus tells of the time he saw Will go over and start questioning one of the Smith twins (James and George Smith of San Marcos). He said he wanted to ask him something personal, and he asked Mr. Smith if he felt any different toward his twin brother than he did toward his other brothers or sisters. Mr. Smith told Will that he loved all his brothers and sisters, but there was just something a little different about his twin. For instance if his twin would borrow his car or charge something on his account without asking first, he wouldn't mind, but it would bother him if somebody else did it. This seemed to satisfy Will. Apparently he had felt the same way and was bothered by it until he assured himself that other twins had the same feelings.

Another thing that most of their old neighbors agree on, is that the Burnett brothers were very hard workers. Bub Meeks, Hays County deputy sheriff, remembers hearing them out calling cattle at 4 o'clock in the morning.

Schlameus remembers that when goats first came into this part of the country, right after World War I, he and the Burnett brothers and some other neighbors went down to buy some Army surplus wire for fencing. They bought a thousand spools at 50 cents a spool. Will had to stop off at the bank to see if they would back him to buy the wire. Then he and his brother fenced in their 5,000 acres entirely by themselves. But their capacity for hard work was matched by their love of reading, and it is said that they would go down to the mailbox in the morning, sit under a tree and start reading the newspapers, and be hours getting back to the farmwork. After Will's mother died, he and Walter batched it and they didn't get many home-cooked meals.

Harry Schlameus tells of being out fishing with his brothers and knowing that as soon as the fire to fry the fish would get going good, they would hear the clump, clump, clump of the Burnett brothers' horses coming over to throw in their provisions and share the picnic. Mr. Schlameus' mother nearly always provided them with a layer cake and Will and Walter would really wade into it. They and their neighbors also used to go out hunting timber wolves, and one time they found a mother and nine pups.

There used to be dances held at Fisher's store on Saturday nights and music provided by traveling bands out of San Antonio or Austin. Will loved to dance and would come by horseback or buggy to join in, but, says Mrs. Schlameus, with a laugh, dancing was never his strong point. And, say his old friends, he loved music, but could never carry a tune.

Regardless how they felt about his politics, people who knew him were always impressed by the depth and breadth of his religious conviction. Will was an Episcopalian, and he never failed to end a political speech by a quotation from a hymn or a passage from the Book of Common Worship. Mrs. Laura Ramsay tells of how both Will and Walter used to sing their children to sleep with the "Te Deum." "They went to sleep in self-defense," she quotes Will as saying.

Will was never a pretentious dresser and he retained some of his habits suited to horseback long after he switched over to automobile transportation. A man moved into Wimberley with a large herd of white face cattle and one day found a male Jersey had somehow got in with the herd. Inquiries revealed that it might be the Burnett's as they had over 500 head of cattle themselves. The neighbor rode over and left a note for Will to come see if that was his Jersey. The next day a man came riding up with a torn vest, a grass saddle girt, lopsided boots, and a torn sweat band. The neighbor couldn't get over it. He just couldn't believe that a man who owned 500 head of cattle would dress like that.

Harry Schlameus used to run a filling station up in Wimberley, and says every time Will drove in he had to clean the tobacco juice off his car. He said that when Will got ready to spit, he didn't take time to see if the window was up or down.

Besides reading, working, and politics, another passion of Will's was dominoes. When he had goats to sell in San Antonio he would load up in a hurry, drive down in a hurry, unload in a hurry and spend the rest of the day playing dominoes. Once Harry Schlameus and his brother got lost when coon hunting at night. It was pitch dark so they just started following the river. Eventually it took them by the Burnett place and they found Will and Walter still up, playing dominoes at 4 o'clock in the morning.

The stories about Will and Walter could go on and on. No matter whom we talked to, they always had a story we hadn't heard before and knew someone else who "could really tell you some stories about Will." We regret that we couldn't get around to even half the people we wanted to talk to for this issue, but we will continue our search. Legends will undoubtedly grow up about the man, but they will never be able to equal the true stories told by those who "knew him when."

Ballad of Will Burnett

(Written in 1964 and sung at a barbecue given by his friends)

Oh come hear our story while we sing to you
About a brave Democrat, loyal and true.
From the hill country above Wimberley
A foe of the Shivercrats and GOP.

For many long years he has fought unafraid
Against wealth and power so strongly arrayed.
And those who have known him will never forget
That straight-shooting, hard-drinking Judge Will Burnett.

Back in '32 in our Nation's worst days
Burnett became judge in the county of Hays.
And the judge will still tell how he modestly felt
"Two men save the country—me and Roosevelt."

He traveled Hays County to fight the Old Guard.
To the Pleistocene Age they were holding on hard.
San Marcos to Driftwood, Kyle, and Niederwald
He conquered the dimwitted Neanderthal.

The tories of Texas would all shake with fear
When Will threw his voting machine into
gear.
They hollered to Heaven when Judge Burnett
stung
He could sure raise a welt with his blistering
tongue.

Though many brave leaders have carried the
flame
And the rollcall of heroes will honor each
name.
We owe them our homage, our praises, and
yet
The one we'll remember is Judge Will
Burnett.

By *Bill Malone and Charles Chandler.*

POLITICAL FUTURE OF THE WORLD—ADDRESS BY HON. CYRUS R. VANCE, DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Cyrus R. Vance, delivered an address to the National Security Industrial Association on October 7, at the Sheraton-Park Hotel in Washington which should be of interest to the Senate.

In his address, Mr. Vance examines a highly significant document written by the Defense Minister of the Peiping Government of China, Lin Piao. This is the Chinese Communist document which has been reported widely in press and which expresses Peiping's concept of the political world and its future. The document equates the continents of Europe and the United States with cities and the continents of Asia, Africa, and Latin America with the countryside from which the cities will eventually be engulfed in the pattern of the revolution on the Chinese mainland.

Mr. Vance sets forth for the consideration of free peoples a most thoughtful response to this concept of the political future of the world. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE CYRUS R. VANCE AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY INDUSTRIAL ASSOCIATION, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., THURSDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1965

Distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am honored to be here, and to participate in your 22d annual dinner.

I deeply appreciate this opportunity to speak before a group so concerned as you are with the security of our country, and so directly involved with the preservation of its strength and freedom.

Exactly 5 weeks ago tonight—in a distant country—a political document appeared.

It was written by the defense minister of the most populous nation on earth.

It was written by Lin Piao, the Vice Chairman of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party—Vice Premier of Red China, and the Minister of National Defense.

Ostensibly, it is an article commemorating the 20th anniversary of the defeat of Japan in World War II. But that was merely a convenient occasion for its publication. For it is no ordinary commemorative article.

I want to talk to you about that document tonight. For it tells us not only what Peiping's intentions are in Asia—not only what Peiping's intentions are in Vietnam—not only what Peiping's intentions are toward the United States—but what Peiping's plans are for the whole expansion of world communism.

The document begins with a lengthy analysis of the Communist revolution in China.

Lin Piao states bluntly: "It was on the basis of the lessons derived from the people's wars in China that Comrade Mao Tse-tung, using the simplest and most vivid language, advanced the famous thesis that 'political power grows out of the barrel of a gun.' He clearly pointed out: The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war is the central task and highest form of revolution. This Marxist-Leninist principle of revolution holds good universally, for China and for all other countries."

Lin Piao then goes on to note that the Chinese Communist revolution differed from the Russian revolution in one essential respect. The Russian revolution, he says, "began with armed uprisings in the cities, and then spread to the countryside; while the Chinese revolution won nationwide victory through the encirclement of the cities from the rural areas, and the final capture of the cities."

Now, he comes to his central point. The "rural areas of the world" today, he asserts, are Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The "cities of the world" are North America, and Western Europe.

Just as communism in China, says Lin Piao, succeeded by capturing the countryside; and then encircling and defeating the cities; so the global Communist movement will ultimately succeed first by capturing Asia, Africa, and Latin America—thereby encircling North America and Western Europe— and then by finally and decisively defeating the United States and its Western allies.

Win Asia, Africa, and Latin America through "wars of national liberation," says Lin Piao, and the United States and its Western allies will be surrounded, will be encircled, will be overwhelmed.

And where is all this to begin? he asks.

It has already begun, he replies. And the place in which it has begun is Vietnam.

Vietnam, says Lin Piao, is now the "focus" of the revolutionary movement against the United States. No matter what action America may take in Vietnam, he adds, the Communist Chinese determination is "unshakable" to drive the United States out.

But, ladies and gentlemen, it is not Peiping that is fighting in Vietnam; it is Hanoi. Mao is not risking his own troops to achieve his ends. Rather, Hanoi is being used to attempt to prove the validity of his thesis.

For the whole point of Mao's doctrine is that Hanoi and the Vietcong should fight on; that they should reject any offers of reasonable settlement or negotiations; that they should be prepared to wage a prolonged and dirty war—whatever its cost in North Vietnamese blood; whatever its cost in North Vietnamese well-being.

Hanoi might well ponder whether its future is best secured by fully submerging its own separate interest to Peiping. The North Vietnamese people deserve a better future than that.

Meanwhile, the leaders in Hanoi—much to Peiping's pleasure—continue to make a reasonable settlement impossible. They continue their aggression in the south. They continue to infiltrate soldiers, equipment, and supplies across the border. They continue to employ the twin pressures of temptation and terrorism—tempting the peasants to renounce their loyalty to their village leaders in return for hollow promises; and terrorizing them if they refuse.

Ladies and gentlemen, there could be no clearer justification of why we are standing firm in our resolve to help defend the 14 million people of South Vietnam, against Communist aggression and subversion from the north.

What is the U.S. policy there?

Our policy is simple and straightforward. It is not complicated by any doctrinaire theories of world domination.

First, we are determined to keep our commitment to the people of South Vietnam. We are going to continue to assist the South Vietnamese to resist aggression. We are going to continue to make it clear to Hanoi and to Peiping that terrorism, murder, subversion, and infiltration from the north cannot—and will not—succeed.

As President Johnson has pointed out: "We are * * * there to strengthen world order. Around the globe from Berlin to Thailand are people whose well-being rests in part on the belief that they can count on us if they are attacked. To leave Vietnam to its fate would shake the confidence of all these people in the value of an American commitment and in the value of America's word. The result would be increased unrest and instability, and even wider war."

Second, we are committed to help create a better life for the people of South Vietnam. We are engaged in a major program of economic and social development there, and we want to see it extended to the whole south Asia region, including North Vietnam.

Everything that we do in Vietnam is governed by those simple reasons for being there.

Our goal is a peaceful settlement. We are ready—now—to go to the negotiating table. We lay down no preconditions for such discussions. We seek a cessation of aggression by North Vietnam. We seek a just peace—and we have made that offer clear on many occasions. We seek the withdrawal of all foreign forces—including our own—from South Vietnam once peace has been restored. And we seek a peace that guarantees freedom of choice for the South Vietnamese people.

Our purpose is firm; our patience is long; and our perseverance is unshakable.

But, as both Hanoi and Peiping have pointed out, the issue is larger than merely Vietnam.

General Giap, the North Vietnamese strategist who defeated the French at Dien Bien Phu, has put the matter candidly: "South Vietnam is the model of the national liberation movement of our time. * * * If the special warfare that the U.S. imperialists are testing in South Vietnam is overcome, then it can be defeated anywhere in the world."

And—as we have seen—Lin Piao describes the struggle in Vietnam as merely the curtain-raiser in the whole global drama of Communist expansionism.

The issue, then, in Vietnam, important as it is, is not the only task facing the United States and its partners in freedom around the world.

It is an essential task. But it is not the total task.

The total task of free men on this planet is to preserve and nurture freedom everywhere that it is growing.

Lin Piao sees a major crisis in human society in the second half of the 20th century; he sees it taking place on the perimeter of the industrialized world—in Asia, in Africa, and in Latin America.

I think we can agree with him on that.

Let us examine why.

We can begin by reminding ourselves that the Communist mind is a curious combination of ideological rigidity—and tactical suppleness.

The Communist mind is, at one and the same time, philosophically closed—and pragmatically open.

In the past half century we have witnessed an imaginative display of aggressive Communist tactics.

The goal has always been the same: political domination. But the path to that goal has often switched direction.

In our own lifetime, Communist tactics have ranged through a broad and brutal spectrum: everything from outright occupation by the Red army in Eastern Europe * * * through conventional aggression in Korea * * * to the guerrilla operations in Greece, Malaya, the Philippines, and now in Vietnam.

Communist tactics have sometimes fomented revolutions, and at other times have captured those initiated by others.

Communist tactics have learned to be as much at home with legal means, as with illegal means; with sophisticated societies, as with primitive ones; with rightist dictators, as with leftist demagogs.

Thus, if one surveys the total Communist movement of the past half century, one cannot fail to be struck with a profound bit of irony: that the Communists in their ultimate view of history are almost insufferably dogmatic and doctrinaire. But in their efforts to manipulate that history, they are almost incredibly pragmatic and practical.

What, then, is our answer to the Communist manifesto of Mao Tse-tung, as written by Lin Piao?

First, our answer is that we agree that the "focus" of the challenge lies, at the moment, in Vietnam.

But the Government of Vietnam and the United States will not be defeated by Communist aggression from the North. We will continue our support of the people of South Vietnam until a just and reasonable settlement is reached—whether by agreement at a conference table or by a cessation of the aggression, as in Malaysia, the Philippines, and Greece.

Secondly, we agree with Mao that the lands arching across the southern half of the globe—Asia, Africa, and Latin America—are to play a decisive role in the future of humanity.

But we disagree that their role is to be the hapless victims of Communist externally directed so-called wars of national liberation. On the contrary, we believe that these nations desire to remain fully and freely themselves—uncoerced by subversion stage-managed and supplied from without. We believe that these nations desire, with wisdom and dignity, to seek their own national progress in their own national way. And we stand ready to assist them to do precisely that.

Thirdly, we agree that Mao's clear intent is that his brand of communism should eventually surround, encircle, and finally cut off and defeat Western Europe and the United States.

But we disagree that that is going to happen. Our defenses are strong, and we remain alert and ready for whatever the future may bring. But more important is the fact that the free nations of the world offer a better future for the individual, and a peaceful path to that future.

Finally, we agree with Mao that just as there are cities and countryside within nations, so the world at large—in its current uneven rate of technological advance—can be viewed as a series of industrialized centers, surrounded by a less-developed countryside.

But we disagree that the historical process suggests that the global countryside will storm these centers, and put them to the torch of Communist insurgency.

On the contrary, we believe that the historical process will be precisely the reverse; that the industrialized centers—the fortunate nations of the world—will increasingly seek to bring to the countryside—to the poorer nations of the world—the very assistance and skill that will help these nations to close the poverty gap. And the rich nations will do this by measures that will share talents and resources—by measures that will increase the self-confidence and self-reliance of the poorer nations to achieve their own self-sustaining political and economic growth.

In the United States we issue no global manifestos.

But we do indulge in one dream. We do entertain one grand vision. We do look to one great goal.

We are dedicated to continuing the dialog with the rest of the world that began in an obscure hall in Philadelphia on July 4, 1776.

The men in that hall were revolutionaries.

The men in that hall did not believe that true political power can grow out of the barrel of a gun. They believed that true political power can grow only out of the people themselves—for that is precisely where it is: within each individual human being.

Those men did not rant about class struggle. They said bluntly that all men are created equal.

Those men did not theorize about a dictatorship of the proletariat. They proposed something far more explosive than that. They declared that all men had an inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Those men in 1776 fused, primed, and set off a political explosion that has had more ultimate effect on society than all the dictators of history rolled into one.

The fires of that Revolution still burn in this country; and the sparks of that Revolution still fly, igniting the tinder of human aspiration all over this globe.

One of the greatest challenges to this generation of Americans is to refine the formulas for creating the driving sparks, for cultivating the leadership talent, for unleasing and organizing the earth's bountiful natural resources, for breaking down the out-of-date barriers to progress, throughout the world. We have an enormous challenge to perfect the formulas to do all of these things to permit what Lin Piao calls "the countryside" to find their way up the rocky path.

We must meet that challenge.

We must offer the more durable stuff of true, creative revolution.

Lin Piao's statement of Communist China's goals for the world is 18,000 words long.

President Johnson has summed up our goals for the world in three simple sentences:

"Our own freedom and growth have never been the final goal of the American dream. We were never meant to be an oasis of liberty and abundance in a worldwide desert of disappointed dreams. Our Nation was created to help strike away the chains of ignorance and misery and tyranny wherever they keep man less than God means him to be."

Ladies and gentlemen, it is for you and me—and all of us on this small, whirling planet—to insure that this forecast will prevail.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY BANQUET IN HONOR OF SENATOR ANDERSON OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON will be honored at a banquet on his 70th birthday on Saturday, October 23, 1965, at Las Cruces, N. Mex. That afternoon, New Mexico State University will dedicate its new physical science laboratory as Clinton P. Anderson Hall.

Members of the Congress who desire to extend greetings to the Senator on this occasion can forward them to the Mesilla Valley Chamber of Commerce, Post Office Box 996, Las Cruces, N. Mex., for presentation to him.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN W. CRONIN

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, appropriate recognition was recently given John W. Cronin, Director of the Processing Department of the Library of Congress, in the award of the Library's Distinguished Service Award in recognition of his 40 years of service at the Library of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the September 27, 1965, issue of the Information Bulletin of the Library of Congress with reference to this matter be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERSONNEL

John W. Cronin: four decades and a title: The chiefs and principal officers of the Processing Department were called to a 4 p.m. meeting in their department office last Friday, September 24, upon notice that the legislation now briefly referred to as title II would be discussed with the Librarian. The Librarian was prompt to arrive in Director John W. Cronin's office and opened the session with a few words that went right to the heart of the situation.

"I appreciate the impact of title II on the Processing Department * * * but," he said, "before we take up that subject, there is a little personal matter I want to discuss. It concerns John Cronin, and I think Mrs. Cronin should hear about it."

At that moment the door opened, and Mrs. Cronin entered beside the Library's photographer, who caught the baffled smile on the face of Mr. Cronin and the Librarian's enjoyment of the surprise. If Mr. Cronin was able to speak, he was given no time to think. The Librarian advised him to sit down and plunged into reading a citation to the assembly. When he had finished, John W. Cronin, Director of the Processing Department, was—on the eve of the 40th anniversary of the date on which he first came to work in the Library of Congress—the recipient of the Library's Distinguished Service Award.

The citation noted:

"A few of your many achievements include your direction of the project for publishing the original 167-volume "Catalog of Books Represented by Library of Congress Printed Cards," your establishment of "The National Union Catalog: A Cumulative Author List," and its companion publications, including the "Register of Additional Locations," your efforts to make available in published form the pre-1956 National Union Catalog, the improvements you have effected in the Library's accessions lists and technical publications, your promotion of the "all the books" plan and the "cards with books" program the guidance you have given to the card distribution service, your counsel in connection with the revision of the cataloging rules, your personal supervision of the third edition of the "Union List of Serials," and your farsighted planning for the implementation of title II of the Higher Education Act." It added: "You have not only developed and strengthened the bibliographical services of the Library of Congress, you have also extended these services to other libraries throughout the country and the world to the enduring benefit of scholarship."

When Mr. Cronin had struggled to his feet and expressed his response, it became apparent that title II had been used as a short title for Distinguished Service Award; the Librarian adjourned the meeting:

Mr. Cronin first joined the Library of Congress staff on September 25, 1925, left the Library in 1926, and returned in 1928. A graduate of Bowdoin College (1925), he received an LL.B. degree from the Georgetown University Law School in 1929. Appointed Director of the Processing Department in 1952, he has received both the

Margaret Mann Citation (1961) and the Melvil Dewey Medal (1964) from the American Library Association.

THE POSITIVE ROLE PLAYED BY AMERICAN FORCES IN VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD a remarkable article by Mr. Mark S. Watson, military correspondent for the Baltimore Sun, which appeared in the Sun's issue of October 7, 1965.

The news from Vietnam all too often places emphasis of the destructive aspects of the war. This is perhaps inevitable. But I do believe that our correspondents would be performing a public service if they devoted somewhat more space to the positive constructive aspect of the American effort in Vietnam.

Mr. Watson in his article quoted extensively from an eloquent speech made by Gen. Wallace M. Greene, Marine Corps commander.

> The winning of the people is fully as important to victory as is the winning of the battle—

General Greene told an American Legion audience in Indianapolis—

> Unless we win both we will ultimately lose the country and seriously jeopardize our stake in all southeast Asia.

General Greene said that while the people in many villages were originally afraid and suspicious of marines because of Vietcong propaganda, they now recognize the marines as friends and benefactors.

Let me quote a few paragraphs from General Greene's remarks:

> The winning of the people is fully as important to victory as is the winning of the battle—

General Greene told an American Legion audience at Indianapolis—

> Unless we win both we will ultimately lose the country and seriously jeopardize our stake in all southeast Asia.
>
> Considerate conduct, the kind word, the helpful deed, the cheerful response to local needs, all give the lie to Vietcong propaganda.
>
> Small gifts of candy, gum, and toys for the children, sharing of a meal, bandages for a cut, medicine for a sore, soap for a body, are little things which pay big dividends. But these things, given more in kindness than in hope of gain, must be followed by something more substantial.
>
> Where there is hunger (as where the Vietcong has stolen the harvest), we bring in food. Since doctors are almost nonexistent, we furnish doctors, corpsmen, and aid stations. We give farming tools. We furnish building tools. We train and arm local popular forces.
>
> In the Golden Fleece classic example of combined military and civic action, still continuing, we transported villagers to their rice fields, guarded them from the Vietcong during harvest, and brought them and the whole harvest back to the village.

In this one section of South Vietnam, General Greene reported, the marines have distributed 45 tons of food, fed 25,000 refugees, treated 50,000 patients, evacuated 3,000 critically ill to hospitals, trained 36 men and women to give medical aid.

I hope my colleagues will find the time to read Mr. Watson's account of the speech by Gen. Wallace M. Greene.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREENE LAUDS MARINES' VIET AID

(By Mark S. Watson)

WASHINGTON, October 6—The lesser known activities of the U.S. marines in the Vietnam operation—their peaceable and friendly and apparently fruitful contributions to civilian Vietnamese welfare—were the theme of an eloquent speech today by Gen. Wallace M. Greene, Marine Corps Commandant.

"The winning of the people is fully as important to victory as is the winning of the battle" he told an American Legion audience at Indianapolis. "Unless we win both we will ultimately lose the country and seriously jeopardize our stake in all southeast Asia."

METHODICAL PROCESS

The No. 1 marine described the methodical process by which the Marines in the northernmost section of South Vietnam—about the size of Maryland with its 2,500,000 people living chiefly along the narrow coastal strip—have solidified their holding.

Here lies the air bases of Da Nang Chu Lai, and Phu Bai, which the Marines' prime mission was to set up and protect by amphibious operations and by later area expansions "with our back to the friendly sea, a prime source of our strength," thanks to the U.S. Navy.

"These military operations were but the sharp, cutting edge" he continued. "Military victories had to be exploited by winning the friendship and confidence of the people, or the Vietcong would seep back.

"The war for minds and hearts is not fought with a single weapon or tactic, but rather is a coordination of psychological, economic, political and military activities designed to liberate both hearts and minds from Vietcong influence and offer a better way of life."

IT MAKES NEWS

"Unfortunately the Vietcong occasionally use the civilian population as a shield. Houses used by the Vietcong as forts are sometimes destroyed and Vietnamese people, sometimes used as shields or hostages, are sometimes killed.

"This is the ugly face of war. It makes news.

"As the marines march into hamlets, women and children, frightened by the Vietcong propaganda and the noise of battle, frequently become distraught and cry.

"This is the pathetic face of war. It also makes news.

"But when the cutting edge of battle has passed through, the war puts on another face—the face of compassion and help.

"Unfortunately this does not always make the news.

"As the marines liberated hamlet after hamlet we discovered the truth of what has been said. The people are held captive by false propaganda, oppression, and terror. They support the Vietcong only out of ignorance and necessity. They have a great burning desire to be free of the Vietcong."

THEY RESPOND QUICKLY

Originally afraid and suspicious of marines because of Vietcong propaganda, they respond quickly to acts of kindness and soon recognize marines as friends and benefactors.

"Measures taken by the military to win the people as they win the battle are called civic action. First steps are taken when the population are spared as much as possible from the indiscriminate scars of battle. They continue with the friendly and helpful attitude of the American servicemen as they pass through the hamlet.

"Considerate conduct, the kind word, the helpful deed, the cheerful response to local needs, all give the lie to Vietcong propaganda.

"Small gifts of candy, gum, and toys for the children, sharing of a meal, bandages for a cut, medicine for a sore, soap for a body, are little things which pay big dividends. But these things, given more in kindness than in hope of gain, must be followed by something more substantial.

"The next step is to try to minimize the damage caused by war. If reparable, we repair it. If not, we pay for it. This presents a sense of justice and fair play, of builders rather than destroyers, and it paves the way for the third step in civic action."

NEED IS OBVIOUS

"This begins by asking the village chiefs 'What can we help you to do?' The need is obvious, but the initiative is theirs. In response marines have built roads and bridges and schools, dug wells, trained local people to be medics and nurses, opened markets, taught school, protected farmers gathering their crops furnished transportation, and cleared ground for resettlement.

"Where there is hunger (as where the Vietcong has stolen the harvest), we bring in food. Since doctors are almost nonexistent, we furnish doctors, corpsmen, and aid stations. We give farming tools. We furnish building tools. We train and arm local popular forces.

"In the Golden Fleece classic example of combined military and civic action, still continuing, we transported villagers to their rice fields, guarded them from the Vietcong during harvest, and brought them and the whole harvest back to the village.

"This is assistance rather than charity. It supplements their own capabilities, strengthens their desire to help themselves. It gives them security, hope, ambition, and self-respect.

"These are the hallmarks of civic action:

"1. It must be undertaken by the military, to identify the military as friends rather than conquerors.

"2. It must be responsive to local needs and aspirations, in such a manner that it leads to independence of the population, rather than making them dependent on continuation of the program."

In this one section of South Vietnam, General Greene reported, the marines have distributed 45 tons of food, fed 25,000 refugees, treated 50,000 patients, evacuated 3,000 critically ill to hospitals, trained 36 men and women to give medical aid.

PRIVATE DONATIONS

They have completed 83 construction projects, distributed 8,000 pounds of clothing, given $1,225,000 to local causes, conducted local classes in English, and, thus far in Golden Fleece, transported 21 tons of rice. These gifts come from Americans' private donations, not from Defense funds.

"These people no longer fear the Americans" the Marine Commandant continued. "In fact they help us by giving information about the Vietcong, and the Vietcong no longer find a safe haven among them.

"You can tell all America that the Americans are in Vietnam, are there for a greater purpose than to kill and destroy. They are there to build peace where there has been no peace, to give security where there has been none, to create order where there has been no order. * * * We are demonstrating the truth of a free society."

NEW SOURCE OF FRESH WATER HOLDS PROMISE FOR DELMARVA

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, it is most welcome news that an underground river has been discovered on the Delmarva Peninsula near Salisbury, Md.

Adequate fresh water supplies are absolutely essential if the Delmarva Peninsula is to fulfill its great promise of growth. My own State of Delaware is part of this area, of course, and already the demands of new homes and industries have focused attention on the need for a continuing supply of good water.

It has been said that discovery of a fresh water supply is as important as discovering oil. Who knows how many other water strikes there might be if an intensive search is carried on?

With the coming growth of the peninsula in mind I introduced a bill (S. 2287) recently providing for a 5-year water study of Delmarva. Joining me in sponsoring this measure were Delaware's senior Senator and Maryland's two distinguished Senators. Discovery of this underground river emphasizes the need for undertaking a thorough study of this kind as soon as possible.

Mr. President, an editorial in the Washington Post of October 11, 1965, comments on the necessity for investigation of all available sources of fresh water, and because I think it is timely not only for the Delmarva Peninsula, but for other areas of the country as well, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 11, 1965]

OUR BURIED RIVERS

The discovery of an underground water channel near Salisbury, Md., comes at a time when the East is acutely conscious of the need to expand and conserve its water resources. From the long-range view the discovery may be far more valuable than a similar finding of oil or gold. Water is becoming more and more a limiting factor on growth and development, and demands for new sources become more acute with each passing decade.

This channel is said to be a legacy from the ice age when the Atlantic was smaller than it is today. Rivers draining the coastal areas cut channels into the clay of older geologic ages. As the sea rose again these channels were filled with gravel and sand from melting glaciers. Now they are buried far below the surface, but the sand and gravel are still there and they are infiltrated with water, making natural underground reservoirs. Drillings have shown that the underground channel near Salisbury is half a mile wide and at least 2 miles long, but geologists believe that it may extend inland for 50 to 70 miles. If so, it can become a prolific source of water for the area.

Especially significant is the assumption that this is one of many channels that once drained the eastern slopes of the continent—channels that are now underground reservoirs. There seems to be a good possibility that the ancient buried bed of the Potomac and other rivers will be found. Preliminary studies have already shown the existence of extensive sand and gravel blankets in the area south of Washington. These as well as the ancient riverbeds are reported to be excellent sources of water as soon as it becomes economical to pump such water into the channels of consumption.

Underground reservoirs of this type also have the special virtue of collecting water in wet periods and holding it in storage without loss from evaporation. They may be drawn down in dry years or dry seasons and will replenish themselves in periods of heavy rainfall. The strange thing is that so little has been done to explore these rich potential sources of water. The Salisbury channel was found during routine explorations in which the U.S. Geological Survey and the Maryland Geological Survey are cooperating. There is no such program in Virginia.

Far too little work of this kind is being done. With the current emphasis upon conserving and expanding water resources, a more intensive search for the buried channels which were draining this area some 50,000 years ago might prove to be an extremely valuable investment.

THE SITUATION IN INDONESIA

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, a cloud of mystery still hangs over the recent events in Indonesia, and we cannot say with any certainty just what has happened or is happening in that nation, the world's fifth most populous. But we have, from Sunday's Washington Post, an excellent commentary on the country and on the background of its politics by Howard P. Jones, former U.S. Ambassador to Djakarta.

Events have continued since Ambassador Jones' work was published. We read that Lieutenant Colonel Untung, the apparent leader of a leftwing coup d'etat, has been captured in central Java, for instance. But the confusion in Indonesia remains the most apparent result of what the Post says was "a Red bobble." For the light it sheds on the situation in this vital area of the world, Mr. President, Ambassador Jones' article should be widely read by those in and out of this Chamber.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 10, 1965]

INDONESIAN COUP WAS A RED BOBBLE—EX-AMBASSADOR BELIEVES THAT PKI LAUNCHED COUP BECAUSE IT FELT ITS TIME WAS RUNNING OUT

(By Howard P. Jones)

(NOTE.—Chancellor of the East-West Center at the University of Hawaii, Jones was U.S. Ambassador to Indonesia from February 1958, to last June. The Washington Post invited him to comment on developments at Djakarta because of his long experience there.)

HONOLULU.—Although the situation in Indonesia is still fluid and remains somewhat unclear, partly because communications with the outside world have not yet been completely restored, the picture that is beginning to emerge may be summarized as follows:

An attempted coup d'etat was launched against President Sukarno and his government by a left-wing element led by Lieutenant Colonel Untung, a relatively unknown battalion commander in the palace guard.

The coup came within an inch of succeeding through the assassination of 6 of the top military command. It might well have succeeded had not Defense Minister Nasution and a number of other senior generals also marked for assassination acted fast in a dramatic counter-coup.

The anti-Communists, led by General Nasution, are apparently in control as of this writing.

President Sukarno is safe in his palace at Bogor, 40 miles from Djakarta. He has made one public appearance and two radio broadcasts urging his people to be calm and to cooperate in the restoration of order.

The six top army generals assassinated, most of them anti-Communists, were given heroes' funerals and Sukarno publicly condemned their slayers although he did not fix the blame on the Communists.

The Indonesian Cabinet denounced the killings, urged the need for an orderly atmosphere but did not condemn the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI). It is noteworthy that the country's No. 2 and No. 3 Communists were at the meeting.

Two days later, anti-Communist demonstrators burned down the Communist headquarters in Djakarta. As they passed the American Embassy, a few of them yelled "Long live America."

A TYPICAL EXPLANATION

The foregoing summary leaves more questions unanswered than answered. The first unknown quantity is the circumstances that led up to the attempted coup.

Colonel Untung attempted to explain his move in the first hours when it appeared that it might succeed. He accused Indonesian military leaders, who he said were working with the American CIA, of planning a coup against Sukarno, October 5, Armed Forces Day. It was essential for the left wing to get there first, was the gist of his story—typical Communist propaganda.

The alleged CIA plotting against Sukarno had been the theme of the Communist chorus for nearly a year before my resignation as Ambassador June 30. It was this baseless accusation that led to the threats against Bill Palmer, representative of the American motion picture industry in Indonesia, who was one of the best friends the country had.

The Communist press hounded him out of the country, dinning into the people's ears the charge that Palmer was the leader of the CIA in Indonesia and was involved in a conspiracy against the Government. There was not one iota of truth in this or in the accusation that the CIA was working against Sukarno.

An American Ambassador in a country is the representative of the President of the United States. Every agency of the U.S. Government within that country reports to him. This has been true for years, so I speak with authority on this point.

A RACE FOR SUCCESSION

If the reason given by Untung for the timing of the coup was specious, this leaves unanswered the question as to why the leftwing group chose that particular moment to attempt a coup. The real story may never be known, but it might not be too farfetched to reason as follows:

President Sukarno was 64 on June 6. At various times in recent years, he has been reported in ill health. It was no secret in Djakarta that the race for succession was on.

The PKI leaders were known to be fearful of the moment when Sukarno would step off the stage. At that point, a struggle for power between the PKI and the Indonesian military appeared inevitable, with the military having the bigger muscles.

Some 6 months ago Aidit, the Communist boss in Indonesia, called for arming of the peasants and workers to resist the British-Malaysian military forces defending Malaysia against Indonesian threats. Aidit, of course, was preparing for the moment when he would have to fight for the power he seeks.

There have been recent reports that Sukarno was ailing again, although I have no idea how accurate they may be. Newspaper correspondents said he was his usual ebullient self in his public appearance last week. But if the PKI leadership believed that Sukarno was soon likely to be unable to exercise the powers of leadership, it would seem logical for the PKI to strike before it was too late.

Time was running out for the Communists under this set of suppositions. They had waited as long as they dared. Anyone who knows Indonesia knows that the PKI is resourceful, inventive, and unscrupulous. It is, however, no match for the army in a direct military clash.

The Communist leaders presumably calculated that their only chance of success lay in liquidating the top army command. They would have to make a clean sweep so that no ranking officer would be left to take charge. Confusion would thus reign long enough so that the Communist bully boys could seize control.

In Indonesia, the Communists control most of the labor unions. The big overall labor organization, SOBSI, is Communist-controlled. The PKI thus had power to cause riots in the streets, to tie up shipping and communications and to close down factories. Aside from some small secret caches, however, it was believed that it had no arms.

The PKI coup attempt missed killing General Nasution, and that was its Achilles heel. And so it lost—or apparently lost, for this game is not yet over.

For one thing, we know little of what is happening in central Java, long regarded as a Communist stronghold, or in eastern Java, whose capital is Surabaya, which has a Communist mayor. It is known that fighting took place and may still be going on in central Java. Also, the whereabouts of Aidit, the Communist leader, is unknown.

On the basis of what we know, however, what is likely to be the shape of things to come in this turbulent country? If we can assume that the coup was indeed an attempt by the PKI to take over the Government, then it would seem almost incredible if the honeymoon between Sukarno and the Communist Party had not come to an abrupt end. If we can also assume that the coup has been overcome and that moderate elements are in control of the Government, this could mean the beginning of a better era for that turbulent country.

There have been reports, however, that Sukarno was aware of the coup and gave it his blessing. This seems highly improbable to me, for Sukarno is not the man to play second fiddle to anyone. Had the coup succeeded, it would have placed the President, who has kept himself in power by balancing forces around him, in the power of the Communists. In my opinion, that would have been quite out of character.

At this moment, it is safe to say that no one really knows who is calling the shots in Indonesia. Is Sukarno trying to reunify his country? Did General Nasution lead the countercoup? Is General Suharto in command of the tactical forces? Or someone else?

General Nasution, the Defense Minister, started his army career by being elected by his men to his first command. He is a natural leader, and able tactician, and an expert in guerrilla tactics—so much an expert that the American Army is still using a book he wrote more than 10 years ago to train U.S. soldiers in jungle fighting.

Nasution is known as an anti-Communist. He should not be thought of as pro-American, however. He is pro-Indonesian. If in power, he would undoubtedly disagree with America's policy in many areas. He is, nevertheless, an example of the kind of Indonesian leader that may assume greater importance if the moderates gain control of the Government.

Events in Indonesia are of more than ordinary concern to Americans. Probably relatively few Americans realize that Indonesia is the fifth largest country in the world in population and, in addition to possessing impressive natural resources, that it sits athwart strategic international crossroads.

Following its birth as a new nation in December 1949, Indonesia adopted the most sophisticated form of Western democracy, the parliamentary system, based upon the list form of proportional representation. One of the indirect results of this was the formation of some 45 political parties, 26 of which ultimately were represented in Parliament.

Unstable government was the inevitable result: Indonesia changed its cabinets every 8 months in its first years as a nation.

It was this instability that Sukarno was attempting to correct in his "guided democracy." As a part of his program, the number of political parties was reduced. At one point, all political parties were required to subscribe to the Pantjasila, the five principles that comprise the state philosophy. The first principle is "Belief in God."

The extent to which the Indonesian Communist Party was a wolf in sheep's clothing may be gaged by the fact that the PKI publicly subscribed to the "five principles." The party has been all things to Sukarno, subservient to his wishes in every respect. This tactic was responsible for its progress through the years until it felt strong enough to attempt a coup.

The internal political forces prior to the coup can be loosely divided into two broad categories. The pro-Communist grouping centers on the PKI but also includes less powerful political forces closely allied with it. There are several small but vocal puppet parties and an impressive array of satellite front organizations devoted to youth, students, women, labor, etc. Much of the central leadership of the Nationalist Party has for opportunistic reasons also begun to cooperate more closely with the PKI and there are a number of prominent individuals not actual members of these groups who cooperate closely with the pro-Communists.

The second grouping includes the large religiously based political parties, much of grassroots strength of the Nationalist Party, the remnants of the banned parties (participants in the rebellion of 1958), significant portions of the bureaucracy and university faculties and most of the army leadership.

Ninety-five percent of Indonesia's 105 million people are Moslems. Most of them are non-Communist and many are anti-Communist. Strong as it has been, therefore, the Communist Party is still a minority party.

"But I thought Sukarno was a Communist." This common comment demonstrates a basic misunderstanding of the man. Sukarno is a revolutionary nationalist. He is, to be sure, a Marxian socialist; but he is, above all, Mr. Indonesia.

I believe that Sukarno's greatest and most consistent goal is a unified country. He assumes that this is the sine qua non of all else for Indonesia. Sukarno feels that Indonesia's basic wealth and largely nonmonetized rural economy can tide her over without economic collapse until development can get under way, and that political chaos and fragmentation would make purely economic gains transistory and meaningless if he did not succeed in making the nation a unified and purposeful concept in the minds of its people.

He has thus chosen somewhat different priorities than we might have chosen, but they are understandable priorities. The late 1950's saw both political and geographic fragmentation of Indonesia an imminent possibility.

Sukarno faced an Indonesia of thousands of islands and hundreds of languages and cultures in which local loyalties had been fostered over hundreds of years of colonial rule. The creation of a unified nation that can survive the still-significant centripetal forces after he passes from the scene is therefore a goal close to his heart.

But where does Sukarno stand today? We can assume that he will do all in his power to unify his country by attempting to negotiate a truce or modus operandi between the army leaders and the Communists. The alternative is further turbulence and perhaps civil war.

Whether it will be possible to paper over the splits in Indonesian society opened by the PKI remains to be seen. The bodies of the murdered generals were mutilated, and mutilation is most un-Indonesian.

This savage violation of human dignity must add fuel to the flames of the intense emotional reaction that followed the discovery of the bodies. I share this reaction. I knew these men. My wife and I know their wives and children. They were personal friends despite differences of view between us.

Even should Sukarno succeed in stopping the fighting, the basic conflicts in the society will remain and someday will break out again. In the words of one of Indonesia's most distinguished leaders, "Islam and communism are oil and water. They cannot be mixed."

RECOVERY OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON FROM SURGERY

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, everyone is heartened by President Johnson's rapid and complete recovery from his recent surgery. Mr. William Prescott Allen, publisher of the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Tribune, has suggested a unique way in which residents of suburban Maryland can express their good wishes to the President. I ask unanimous consent that a brief front-page editorial entitled, "Get Well, Mr. President," be printed.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GET WELL, MR. PRESIDENT

The White House on Tuesday announced that President Lyndon B. Johnson would enter the Bethesda Naval Medical Center for removal of his gall bladder.

For the next 10 days or 2 weeks President Johnson will be a fellow Bethesdan. While we certainly welcome him, we regret the unfortunate circumstances which bring him here.

We know that the people of Montgomery County, regardless of political attraction, will want to wish the President a speedy recovery from his surgery.

We have a suggestion:

Thousands of cars travel the Rockville Pike in front of the Bethesda Naval Hospital every day. When we go by, for the duration of the President's stay there, we will turn on our lights in the daytime simply as a silent expression of "Good luck, Mr. President. Get well soon."

We hope our fellow motorists will follow suit.

AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, at its recent convention in Chicago, the American Bankers Association unanimously adopted a set of resolutions formulated by its resolutions committee of which Mr. Roy L. Reierson, senior vice president and chief economist of the Bankers Trust Co. in New York, was chairman.

These resolutions cover a variety of topics, domestic and foreign. The views of this great association on such matters as our national economic policy, the balance of payments and international monetary reform, as well as the association's views on matters relating specifically to banking, such as the dual banking system, the student loan programs and the relations and status of the various banking agencies, deserve the careful consideration of the Senate and the public.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent to have the report of the resolutions committee, together with the list of members of that committee, printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

(By Roy L. Reierson, chairman, before the second general session of the 91st Annual Convention of the American Bankers Association, Chicago, Ill., Oct. 6, 1965)

APPRECIATION

The American Bankers Association acknowledges a debt of gratitude to Reno Odlin for his outstanding service as president of the association during the past year. Our industry has greatly benefited from his devotion to the cause of sound, progressive banking, and from his wise and skillful guidance of the association's affairs.

SAVINGS BONDS

U.S. savings bonds have demonstrated their usefulness to the Treasury as an instrument of debt management, and they have contributed significantly to the encouragement of individual and family thrift programs throughout the country. We believe that the public-service contribution of commercial banks in promoting the sale of savings bonds is an important one, and we pledge our efforts to insure the continuing success of the savings bond program.

COORDINATION OF FEDERAL SUPERVISION OF BANKING

Our system of Federal bank supervision and regulation has served us well, but close working cooperation and coordination are essential in order to minimize the possibilities for difficulties arising out of conflicts in policy and jurisdictional disputes. We therefore commend the Secretary of the Treasury for his efforts to achieve closer liaison among Federal banking agencies.

STATE BANKING SYSTEMS

Bankers and the public have an important stake in the preservation of our dual banking system, and it is the responsibility of all bankers in each State to exert every effort toward assuring that their banking systems are fully capable of meeting the challenges which lie ahead. In some States the banking statutes and regulations under which commercial banks operate are outmoded, and some State banking departments are inadequately financed and understaffed.

We, therefore, urge every banker—National and State—to help build a more effective dual banking system by seeing to it that banking laws, regulatory policies, and supervisory practices are brought into conformity with modern requirements. We also urge that the resources made available to supervisory authorities be consistent with current needs, including adequate salary standards and attendant benefits. The State bankers associations and the American Bankers Association are now initiating a program to alert bankers throughout the country to the importance of attaining these objectives.

STUDENT LOAN PROGRAMS

The continuing rise in the cost of higher education has made necessary the development of new methods of financing to help qualified students obtain a college education. Commercial banks, as well as other lenders, have responded actively to this need. Bank lending to students has been facilitated greatly by the development of private and State-sponsored programs for the guarantee of student loans.

As a supplement to these State-sponsored and private programs, the administration has proposed a new Federal program which would provide a system of advances from the Federal Government for enlarging the insurance reserves of State and private funds. The proposed plan also would provide for a standby program of Federal loan guarantees. Congressional approval of this legislation appears imminent.

While we have supported this proposal, we nonetheless hope that the necessity for activating the standby Federal program can be avoided. We note that the extent to which this may be possible will rest on the contribution of the commercial banking industry to the further expansion of student loans from private sources, including banks. Banks already are doing a substantial business in financing the education of students in their areas, and we urge them to increase their efforts along these lines.

INDEPENDENCE OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Attacks against the independence of the Federal Reserve System take many forms and occur almost continuously. Bankers are firm in their conviction that the independence of the Federal Reserve should not be compromised either by legislation or by attrition through more indirect ways. We urge that the independence of the Federal Reserve in its present form be safeguarded as a vital part of the mechanism of our free society.

BANK MERGER LEGISLATION

The congressional authors of the Bank Merger Act of 1960, as well as the commercial banking industry, believed that the legislation provided clear standards and procedures for regulation of bank mergers.

Subsequent events, climaxing with decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in the *Philadelphia* and *Lexington Bank* cases, have been at sharp variance with this belief. The resultant confusion is unfair both to the public and to banking.

We are resolute in our support of legislation providing for rational and orderly governmental regulation of bank mergers, and we stress that such legislation should provide for equitable treatment of bank mergers approved by appropriate Federal supervisory agencies in the past.

We are heartened by Secretary Fowler's report that "there is now a substantial meeting of minds between the Attorney General, the bank regulatory agencies, and the Secretary of the Treasury on the two central aspects of antitrust policy which have been of growing concern to the industry and those responsible for its regulation in the public interests." As the Secretary has stated, there is a basis for hope "that this development will lead to a speedy resolution of the issues in a way that will both protect the legitimate interests of the Government and meet the legitimate needs of the banks."

We express our appreciation to those in the Congress and the administration who have shown initiative in promoting appropriate legislation, and we urge that the needed legislation be enacted in this session of the Congress.

NATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY

The American Bankers Association believes that changing economic conditions require a reappraisal of current monetary, fiscal, and debt management policies. Partly as a result of the expansive monetary and fiscal policies pursued since 1960, the economy has enjoyed a sustained rise in business activity without appreciable departure from the pattern of cost and price stability which is so essential to our continued economic well-being. If this progress is to be maintained, it is imperative that public officials adapt policies to changes in domestic and international economic conditions which are becoming noticeable.

As evidence of such changes, we cite a strong and still rising demand for goods and services in the private sector of the economy, significant increases in Federal expenditures growing out of civilian programs enacted by the Congress, and prospective increases of uncertain amounts in defense expenditures. Combined, these public and private demands are exerting an increasing strain on the economy's capacity to expand production, and cost and price pressures appear likely to increase in the months ahead. Unutilized capacity in the economy is relatively low, strains on the supply of labor grow more intense, and both labor costs and industrial prices are rising. In spite of possible bumps in the road ahead, the outlook is for continuing vigorous economic growth in 1966.

Monetary policy

Monetary policy has made a significant contribution to economic expansion in recent years. Growth in bank credit has been of record proportions, reflecting both the generous provision of reserves by the monetary authorities and the greater freedom of action permitted commercial banks in competing for time and savings deposits under regulation Q.

One of the continuing objectives of public policy has been to maintain substantial stability of long-term interest rates, while short-term rates were allowed to rise in response to balance-of-payments adversity. Recently, however, credit requirements have burgeoned and interest rates in all sectors of the market are rising.

The recent firming of interest rates is the inevitable result of a protracted period of business expansion, with record sales for consumer durable goods, rising outlays on plant and equipment as production has put pressure on capacity, accumulation of business inventories, and some firming in prices of industrial products. In addition, commercial banks have seen loan-deposit ratios move to new highs and liquidity ratios decline substantially.

In view of existing economic conditions and prospects, the need for a less expansive monetary policy is now apparent. In fact, one of the arguments used in support of the reduction of individual and corporate tax rates was that by stimulating investment and economic expansion, more freedom of action would be possible in the use of monetary policy. The conditions then visualized now prevail.

However, if public policy should endeavor to prevent an upward adjustment of interest rates in response to market forces, serious risks—both unnecessary and undesirable—would be involved. Economic conditions are strong, and prospects point to the probability of continuing expansion and increased exposure to inflationary pressures. Such pressures, if allowed to go uncurbed, could do irreparable harm to our international financial position and cut short the current economic expansion.

There is no need to adopt extreme measures in monetary policy which would jeopardize the country's prosperity. What is called for is a flexible response to the present tempo of the economy, so that the rate of credit expansion is reduced and interest rates are permitted to respond to market forces.

Fiscal policy

In our judgment, the performance of the economy following the 1964 income tax reduction demonstrates the superiority of soundly structured tax cuts over increased Federal spending as a means of promoting economic growth without inflation. This objective could not have been attained had the administration not limited Federal spending.

In the light of the rising burden of defense expenditures and the substantial and persistent increases in nondefense spending by the Federal Government that will result in the years ahead from programs already initiated, there is danger that the opportunities for future tax reductions are being jeopardized. We therefore express our conviction that greater efforts are required to limit the cost, size, and scope of new and existing spending programs. We note with approval the introduction of measures within the administration to improve the process by which spending priorities are allocated, and we hope that more progress can be made along these lines.

Debt management

The maintenance of flexibility in the management of the public debt, including the freedom to offer new issues in whatever maturity range may be most appropriate, is essential for sound debt-management practices.

In view of recent increases in market rates of interest, it is clear that Treasury officials could not now find buyers for new issues of Treasury bonds within the 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling. Moreover, there is little prospect that this situation will change in the near future. In fact, growth of credit demands and the overall strength of the economy suggest that market rates of interest may rise still further above the 4¼-percent ceiling. The harmful effects of the interest rate ceiling are therefore a source of immediate concern. Retention of this ceiling could force the Treasury to rely on short-term issues precisely at a time when such reliance could reinforce existing inflationary pressures.

We stress that the ceiling constitutes an immediate threat to the ability of Federal financial officials to relate debt management decisions to the economic needs of the country, and we reiterate our belief that it should be removed.

THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

The deficit in the balance of payments of the United States dropped significantly in the first half of this year and this has helped to improve international confidence in the dollar. These developments are encouraging, but they provide no basis for complacency. The small payments surplus attained in the second quarter reflected some nonrecurring factors such as a reduction in the amount of foreign loans by commercial banks and the repatriation of short-term funds held abroad by American business corporations. Looking ahead, prospects are far from favorable. Direct investment overseas will show a big rise this year, the drain of tourism will set a new record, and the trade balance will show a significant decline from last year. As a consequence, another substantial payments deficit is in prospect for 1965. Gold losses will be much larger than in 1964, despite American drawings on the International Monetary Fund.

The gains achieved so far this year reflect in part measures which were meant to be temporary—the interest equalization tax and the voluntary restraint program. In view of the adverse payments prospects, these measures will doubtless have to be continued for the present. As in the past, banks will continue to cooperate in these programs. We believe, however, that additional efforts will be required to reduce the outflow of dollars through the more effective application of the voluntary restraint program to nonbank financial institutions and to business corporations.

We believe that it would be a serious mistake to continue the interest equalization tax and the voluntary restraint program for a protracted period. These devices are a form of selective controls inconsistent with free markets and are similar in their effects to exchange controls. Our Government traditionally has criticized such controls when used by other countries, and history demonstrates the difficulties of administering such programs effectively and equitably over a sustained period. Protracted curtailment of direct investment abroad would impair the international competitive position of American industry and would limit the growth of investment income. Continuing limitation on lending by commercial banks would weaken the relative position of the United States as an international financial center, and protracted restriction on the outflow of capital would have an adverse effect upon American exports, upon the merchandise trade surplus, and upon employment and business activity in the United States.

The necessity to examine further steps which may be required to achieve sustainable payments equilibrium is therefore as urgent as ever. Such a program of action would include the following, as a minimum:

1. Unrelenting efforts to maintain stability in prices and to limit wage increases to gains in productivity;
2. The adoption of a credit policy more consistent with the continuing adverse American balance-of-payments position. In this connection, we note that a less expansionary credit policy is now indicated by domestic as well as by balance-of-payments conditions;
3. Intensified efforts to reduce the dollar cost of our foreign military operations. This need is underlined by the fact that military expenditures overseas are rising; and
4. A more critical appraisal of the Government's foreign economic programs, with special attention to the volume of exports stemming from tied loans.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY REFORM

The American Bankers Association endorses the continuing efforts on the part of the United States to achieve improvement in the international monetary system. Although we believe that there is no present shortage of international liquidity, we also recognize the prospect that it will be necessary, in the long run, to provide supplements to gold and to national currencies for use as international monetary reserves.

In our judgment, the immediate problem in the international monetary area is not to increase the aggregate supply of international monetary reserves, but rather to assure confidence in the dollar and in the pound sterling. Unless such confidence can be sustained, a decrease in international liquidity through the conversion of dollars and sterling into gold will be inevitable.

If confidence in the world's reserve currencies is to be maintained, both the United States and the United Kingdom must provide convincing evidence, through performance, of their willingness and ability to achieve substantial equilibrium, on a sustainable basis, in their international accounts. We are convinced that neither of these countries can rely upon future changes in the international monetary system to relieve them of the necessity for correcting their balance-of-payments difficulties. In fact, until the key currency countries succeed in achieving sustainable payments positions, it will be extremely difficult to reach agreement on any plan to increase the aggregate supply of international monetary reserves.

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Chairman, Roy L. Reierson; senior vice president and chief economist, Bankers Trust Co., New York, N.Y.

Secretary, Leslie C. Peacock; vice president, Crocker-Citizens National Bank, San Francisco, Calif.

From the divisions: Paul Hinkle, president, Charleston National Bank, Charleston, W. Va.; D. James Pritchard, vice president, Society National Bank, Cleveland, Ohio; G. Russell Clark, chairman of board, Bank of North America, New York, N.Y.; Paul I. Wren, president, Old Colony Trust Co., Boston, Mass.

From the sections: Vern Waldo, vice president, First National Bank of Nevada, Reno, Nev.; Belden L. Daniels, executive manager, Pennsylvania Bankers Association, Harrisburg, Pa.

From the committees: Ted P. Axton, president, Lafayette Savings Bank, Lafayette, Ind.; Frank M. Dana, executive vice president, Bank of America, N.T. & S.A., San Francisco, Calif.; Stetson B. Harman, senior vice president and senior trust officer, First National Bank of Oregon, Portland, Oreg.; Wesley Lindow, senior vice president and secretary, Irving Trust Co., New York, N.Y. Thomas O. Cooper, president, Jefferson State Bank, Jefferson, Iowa; J. W. McLean, vice president, Bank of America, N.T. & S.A., Los Angeles, Calif; Richard P. Chapman, chairman of board, New England Merchants National Bank, Boston, Mass.; Jack T. Conn, chairman of board, Fidelity National Bank & Trust Co., Oklahoma City, Okla.; Keith G. Cone, senior vice president, La Salle National Bank, Chicago, Ill.; Reid Sass, vice president, the Fort Worth National Bank, Fort Worth, Tex.; W. Dewey Presley, president, First National Bank, Dallas, Tex.; Elwood F. Kirkman, president, the Boardwalk National Bank, Atlantic City, N.J.

Appointed by the President: J. Howard Laeri, executive vice president, First National City Bank, New York, N.Y.; Arthur F. Maxwell, president, the First National Bank of Biddeford, Biddeford, Maine; Roy L. Reierson, senior vice president and chief economist, Bankers Trust Co., New York, N.Y.; Thomas G. Wilson, president, First State Bank & Trust Co., Conway, Ark.

Ex officio: Reno Odlin, president, the American Bankers Association, 1964–65; Archie K. Davis, vice president, the American Bankers Association, 1964–65; Charles E. Walker, executive vice president and executive manager, the American Bankers Association.

THE PEACEKEEPING ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the United Nations has received much deserved praise for its role in helping damp down the war between India and Pakistan. Americans know that no one nation can hope to keep the peace in today's complex world, not even a nation as strong as our own. Several leading newspapers in my area, conservative as well as liberal, have praised the work of the United Nations in this dispute. In its September 22 issue, the Deseret News of Salt Lake City commented:

> This much is sure: Americans are tired of finding their country in the role of one-nation police force for the globe. The U.N.'s action is welcome and deserves strong support.

In its editorial of September 24, the Idaho Statesman of Boise concludes:

> All told, Americans can view better the U.N. on its peacekeeping missions. Arch-critics will not be silenced, of course. They'll continue to spew forth allegations that the United Nations is so Red-dominated that it is a threat to the United States. How very wrong they are. But for once, it seems that the anti-U.N. forces at work in America will be in concert with the atheistic Red Chinese in hating the world peace organization.

I ask unanimous consent to have these two excellent editorials printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Deseret News, Sept. 22, 1965]

THE U.N. TAKES A STAND

The United Nations, seriously weakened by financial bickering and compromise, has put its prestige—and possibly its future—squarely on the line in the India-Pakistan dispute.

While the risks are grave that it will be repudiated, most Americans, we suspect, will applaud the U.N. action. The risk had to be taken. Moreover, there is a reasonably good chance of success.

What puts the U.N. prestige at stake is the Security Council's resolution Monday demanding a cease-fire Wednesday, offering to supervise the truce, and warning other nations to keep hands off.

This is clearly a direct challenge to Red China, which is threatening military action against India. Russia joined with the United States and the rest of the Security Council in issuing the resolution.

If the resolution succeeds in stopping the shooting and leading to a permanent peace, it will represent a great victory for the United Nations and the cause of world security.

Will it succeed? The odds against it are great—chief among them being China's record of intransigent disregard of world opinion or world interests.

But there are factors weighing for its success, also.

One is that there can be no winner in the India-Pakistan fighting, except possibly Red China. Even China, whose economic base is so tenuous, would suffer from an extended war.

Another is the fact that China is working hard to develop an effective nuclear arsenal and apparently is much nearer to it than is generally believed. China can hardly risk any situation that would give its enemies an excuse for bombing its nuclear facilities. Aggression against India could provide such an excuse.

A third is the heavy reliance of both India and Pakistan on Western aid. Since the early 1950's, the United States has poured nearly $6 billion into India and $3 billion into Pakistan. In addition, both countries rely heavily on the West for their military hardware. Discreet economic pressure could do much to back up the U.N. resolution as far as they are concerned.

This much is sure: Americans are tired of finding their country in the role of one-nation police force for the globe. The U.N.'s action is welcome and deserves strong support.

[From the Idaho Statesman, Sept. 24, 1965]

THE UNITED NATIONS AT WORK

American critics of the United Nations must reappraise the work of this organization in light of the successful cease-fire approach taken to the India-Pakistan war over Kashmir.

U.N. Secretary-General U Thant acted with dispatch in prescribing policies and meeting with the two nations involved in order to bring about a cessation of hostilities.

The Security Council of the U.N. also moved rapidly in an attempt to silence the guns over Kashmir.

Most capitals in the world were active in promoting a cease-fire. Only Peiping kept trouble stirred up, by supporting Pakistan, and menacing India by sending Red Chinese troops to the border. Red China has now unleashed a propaganda attack against both the United Nations and the United States.

If peaceful means are found to settle the Kashmir dispute, Red China hopes to continue disrupting the Asian fronts and blaming "Yankee imperialists" for the state of disorder.

The conscience of the United States is clear with respect to the Pakistani-Indian rivalry. President Johnson has answered this difficult matter with firmness. He has pledged support to the United Nations as its secretary-general sought to bring about the cease-fire. The President states that the "job has just begun." The United Nations will continue to receive American support "every step of the way by our actions and our words."

All told, Americans can view better the U.N. on its peacekeeping missions. Archcritics will not be silenced, of course. They will continue to spew forth allegations that the United Nations is so Red-dominated that it is a threat to the United States. How very wrong they are. But, for once, it seems that the anti-U.N. forces at work in America will be in concert with the atheistic Red Chinese in hating the world peace organization.

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT NEWS REPORT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, work is now ready to proceed on the $323.8 million Bonneville unit of the central Utah reclamation project. This project is the key to the development of Utah's resources and economy for the next 100 years. It will enable Utah to make the most beneficial use of its share of the Colorado River.

This year the Appropriations Committees in the House and Senate amended the administration's public works request and added a total of $3.5 million in the budget for the start of construction of the vital Bonneville unit. As the only member of the Utah congressional delegation who fought and worked for the authorization of the upper Colorado River storage project, it has been indeed a privilege to watch the development of the various participating projects.

In Utah we have seen the establishment of two enormous and dramatic dams at Flaming Gorge in the northern part of the State and Glen Canyon in the south. Now that these dams have been completed we are beginning to move into the participating projects—the projects which will make the change in the water picture and which will bring water to the taps and farmlands of the Bonneville Basin.

So that Congress and other interested parties can have an up-to-date report on the status of the central Utah project and the Bonneville unit, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD at this point a news report on the central Utah project issued by the Central Utah Water Conservancy District which has done outstanding and yeoman service since its inception. I commend the district, Sterling D. Jones, the president; Jay R. Bingham, of the Utah Water and Power Board, as well as all others from Utah who have contributed to these water projects and to this report.

NEWS REPORT

The central Utah project is considered the key to development of Utah's resources and economy for the next 100 years. It is the largest participating project of the upper Colorado River storage project and includes four units—Vernal, Bonneville, Upalco, and Jensen. It is through these units that Utah will be able to put to beneficial use most of its share of the Colorado River water.

The Vernal unit has already been completed. Now work is ready to proceed on the $323.8 million Bonneville unit. The Bonneville unit will, among other things, provide for the transfer of water from the headwaters of the Duchesne River to the Bonneville basin. This project will make water available to meet future needs for irrigation, municipal, industrial, recreational, and power purposes in the Uinta and Bonneville basins.

WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT

The Central Utah Water Conservancy District was established as the legal agency to represent the citizens of the district. It is the agency to operate and maintain most project works, to administer the sale and delivery of project water, and to contract with the Federal Government for repayment of reimbursable costs of the central Utah project.

The district was formally created on March 2, 1964 by order of the Fourth Judicial District Court of Utah.

Creation of the district was a long, painstaking, give and take process. Leaders of the seven counties—Salt Lake, Utah, Duchesne, Uintah, Wasatch, Summit, and Juab—had to iron out differences. They had to agree how best to serve and protect the interests of each area and county as well as the overall district and State.

A petition was drawn up by a drafting committee headed by Utah Water and Power Board director, Jay R. Bingham, was signed by property owners in the seven counties and submitted to the court. Inasmuch as there were no protests, Fourth District Judge Maurice Harding legally created the district on March 2, 1964. He announced the appointment of the district's board of directors on March 12, 1964.

There are 17 members on the board. A traditional check and balance is maintained between rural and urban areas. The urban counties of Salt Lake and Utah have eight members on the board. The rural counties have nine.

Representing Sale Lake County are Clifford L. Ashton, Royden G. Derrick, Robert B. Hilbert, Herbert F. Smart, and C. Rell Swensen. Representing Utah County are Leo P. Harvey, G. Marion Hinckley, and Sterling D. Jones. From Duchesne County are Leo Brady, Leo Haueter, and William J. Ostler. Uintah County is represented by H. LeRoy Morrill, L. Y. Siddoway, and Briant H. Stringham. Representing Summit and Wasatch Counties are John A. Lambert and Clyde Ritchie. Juab County is represented by R. Roscoe Garrett.

The board of directors has selected a general manager and legal counsel. Headquarters have been established in Provo.

REPAYMENT CONTRACT

Agreement has been reached between the district and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation on a repayment contract.

A deferral agreement regarding the use of water in the Uinta Basin by the Ute Indian tribe has been worked out between the tribe, the district, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. It awaits final approval by the U.S. Secretary of the Interior.

The tribe on the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation agreed to defer its use of water on new lands until a later phase of the central Utah project.

Full cooperation was sought and obtained by the district with various State, Federal, and local groups in reaching general agreements on water rights, fish, wildlife, and recreational aspects of the project.

CONGRESS APPROVES APPROPRIATION

Congress has approved a $3.5 million appropriation to begin construction on the Bonneville unit.

The $3.5 million appropriation will be used to initiate construction on the Starvation Dam and Reservoir. This will provide supplemental water for land along the Duchesne River and make possible the diversion of water through the Strawberry Aqueduct and Strawberry Reservoir to the Bonneville Basin.

The funds will also be used to start construction of Soldier Creek Dam permitting the enlargement of Strawberry Reservoir, and to initiate construction of the Strawberry Aqueduct.

It is the enlarged Strawberry Reservoir that will ultimately regulate the diversion of water from the Uinta to the Bonneville Basin. This will make more water available in the Bonneville Basin for municipal, industrial, and irrigational use. Studies are being made on the possibility of also delivering Bonneville unit water into the Sevier River area.

BROAD PUBLIC SUPPORT

The public is aware that water is the lifeblood of Utah's development and that the Colorado River, through the central Utah project, is the State's last major water resource.

Backing for immediate appropriation of funds to begin construction comes from most major State and water users' groups—including Utah's congressional delegation, the State legislature, the Governor, the Utah Water and Power Board, the Utah Water Users Association, the Utah Association of County Officials, the Upper Colorado River Commission, Colorado River Basin Consumer Power, Inc., the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and Sevier River Water Users, Inc.

BENEFITS OF BONNEVILLE UNIT

The most important benefit of the Bonneville unit is that it makes water available to sustain continued economic growth.

Communities within the district will be assured of a future water supply permitting their unceasing growth and expansion.

Water will be available to meet the needs of new industries seeking to establish new plants within the State.

Fishing and recreational opportunities and facilities closer to population centers will be greatly increased.

As a result of the project the assessed valuation of property in the area affected by the Bonneville unit is expected to increase by about $500 million.

The gross annual income of farm families affected will increase by about $15 million. These farmers will invest another $30 to $40 million.

Roughly 360 million kilowatts of power will be generated and used locally for domestic and industrial growth.

Of the $323.8 million cost of the Bonneville unit, about $220 million will be spent on materials and equipment over the 15- to 20-year construction period. An estimated $80 million will go for wages and $24 million for transportation. Approximately 9,000 man-years of employment will be provided during the construction period.

RESOLUTION OF ARKANSAS HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION ON THE USE OF SURPLUS PROPERTY BY HOSPITALS AND OTHER INSTITUTIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, recently I received a resolution by the Arkansas Hospital Association commending the work of certain U.S. Senators and Representatives for the amount of time, effort, and attention they have given in attempts to secure surplus property for hospitals, health centers, and other health institutions. Under the Federal surplus property donation program, it is possible to work through various States and local surplus property agencies to provide many different types of equipment for these institutions. It is to the credit of the Senators and Representatives who have worked so tirelessly in behalf of the Federal surplus property donation program that the board of trustees of the Arkansas Hospital Association has expressed its sincere gratitude in the form of this resolution. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution by the Arkansas Hospital Association

Whereas many hospitals, health centers, and other health institutions have for many years come to depend on the surplus property agencies for many needed and useful items for the operation of their institutions; and

Whereas in recent years, through forces beyond the control of the States, the amount of common-use items have been decreasing, thus depriving these health institutions of this much needed property; and

Whereas certain U.S. Senators and U.S. Representatives have been devoting much time and effort in attempts to correct the deficiencies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of trustees of the Arkansas Hospital Association commend the actions of Senators John L. McClellan, of Arkansas; Ernest Gruening, of Alaska; Lee Metcalf, of Montana; Edmund S. Muskie, of Maine; Abraham A. Ribicoff, of Connecticut; Joseph M. Montoya, of New Mexico; Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota; Carl T. Curtis, of Nebraska; and Congressmen John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts; William L. Dawson, of Illinois; John S. Monagan, of Connecticut; J. Edward Roush, of Indiana; and John N. Erlenborn, of Illinois; and be it further

Resolved, That the executive director of the Arkansas Hospital Association be instructed to send copies of this resolution to each of the above-named U.S. Senators and U.S. Congressmen as evidence of our support of their efforts in behalf of the Federal surplus property donation program.

Attest:

Robert W. McCuistion,
President.

THE SOUND OF MUZAK

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the Richmond Times-Dispatch of July 20, 1965, there appeared a most interesting editorial entitled "The Sound of Muzak."

This editorial points out that the Revenue Service in Austin will now collect their taxes with a musical background furnished by the Johnsons but at the expense of the American taxpayers.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Sound of Muzak

As most people know by now, the Johnson family has the Austin, Tex., franchise for Muzak, the all-purpose canned music that's piped into homes, offices, and factories. Apparently the family business has picked up a new customer—the American taxpayer. The President's near-chartreuse-draped offices in Austin's new Federal building have a Muzak system. So do Internal Revenue Service quarters on a lower floor.

No one has said how much the taxpayers are giving the Johnson firm to provide Mr. Johnson with these office-hour delights. No one has said how much the taxpayers are shelling out for the privilege of hearing a rendition of "Music To Lose Your Shirt By" while you're visiting the IRS downstairs. If the Johnsons are supplying this service free, no one can object. If they are, though, none of the Johnson spokesmen seems to have said so, and usually officials show an uncanny concern for the public's right to know when there are facts like that to be dispensed.

Under these circumstances, it looks as if the taxpayers are paying the Johnson piper—and they're definitely not calling the tune.

TRIBUTE TO EUGENE M. ZUCKERT, FORMER SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I was not on the floor recently when so many of my colleagues paid tribute to retiring Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert. Mr. Zuckert has compiled an outstanding record in his many years of public service and I should like to join my colleagues in honoring him.

Let me first say, with a sense of pride, that Mr. Zuckert is an adopted son of Maryland. He lives, with his wife, Barbara, and three children in Montgomery County, Md. Eugene Zuckert is a man of many talents: lawyer, teacher, administrator, author, and public servant. In each of these fields he has been successful and distinguished.

Mr. Zuckert's association with the Air Force dates back to 1946, when he served as Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary of War for Air. When the Air Force was first established as an independent service, in 1947, he was appointed Assistant Secretary under the then Secretary of the Air Force, Stuart Symington. He served in that capacity until 1952, when he was appointed a member of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. In 1954, Mr. Zuckert returned to the private practice of law, specializing as a consultant in the field of atomic energy. With Arnold Kramish, he coauthored the book, "Atomic Energy for Your Business."

Mr. Zuckert has served as an attorney for the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, and was an instructor in relations between Government and business at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, where he advanced to the post of assistant dean.

He is presently a director of the People-to-People Health Foundation, Inc., a nonprofit organization which is operating the ship *Hope* as part of the President's people-to-people program.

Eugene Zuckert has had a long and varied career. He has served as a shining example to all who would enter government service. With a sense of deep gratitude, his country wishes him well.

THE $600 EXEMPTION PER CHILD GROSSLY INADEQUATE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in the past 2 years the Congress has given the American people two big tax cuts. And yet the pitifully inadequate $600 per dependent Federal income tax exemption remains Federal law.

Twenty-five years ago when the value of the dollar was nearly twice as high as today the exemption was $1,000. If we had simply allowed for the burdens inflation imposes on child rearing we would today have a $2,000 or more exemption.

But the tough, wartime reduction in the dependency exemption remains, imposing a cruel tax cost on the large family.

Sylvia Porter, in a recent column in the Washington Star, reports on how drastically the cost of raising a child has become. Her figures are startling. For a family with a modest $6,000 per year income, the cost of raising a child to the age of 18 will cost a total of $23,835. For the family with a $15,000 income the cost is $60,000.

This means an annual cost of from $1,350 to $3,500 per year per child. And the income tax allowance is only $600.

Twenty-five years ago the cost of child rearing was estimated at about $500 per child, the dependency exemption was $1,000.

Mr. President, this does not make any sense. It is grossly unfair to children as well as parents. No wonder the Congress must consider special tax allowances to enable parents to send their children to college.

If and when the Congress gets around to the next tax reduction, raising the exemption should be high on the list.

Incidentally, Miss Porter's estimates are from the accurate and conservative Institute of Life Insurance in New York.

I ask unanimous consent that the column by Sylvia Porter, entitled "Rearing a Child Extremely Costly," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REARING A CHILD EXTREMELY COSTLY

(By Sylvia Porter)

Memo to today's bride and groom: the cost of rearing one child until age 18 will be $23,835; the cost of rearing today's average of 3.2 children will come to $76,272; the cost of rearing four children will be close to $100,000.

The rising cost of rearing children is, quite possibly, a major factor behind the shift toward later marriages, later childbearing, fewer children. Since 1957 the fertility rate (live births per 1,000 women of childbearing age) has dropped from 122.9 to 99. This year the number of babies born is slated to drop below 4 million for the first time in 12 years and the overall rate of population growth is expected to be the smallest in 20 years.

These shifts, says Robert C. Cook, president of the Population Reference Bureau, are "unquestionably related to a recognition that rearing children is an expensive undertaking."

BREAKDOWN OFFERED

Here's how the $23,835 cost of rearing a child, calculated by the Institute of Life Insurance in New York, breaks down:

Expenditure:	*18-year cost*
Food	$6,460
Housing	7,470
Clothing	2,720
Transportation	3,530
Medical care	1,675
Personal care	810
Recreation	935
Education (not college)	235
Total	23,835

These sums apply strictly to today's average family with an annual income of $6,600. As incomes rise, the cost of rearing a child may be much higher. At a family income level of $15,000, for instance, the cost of rearing one child for 18 years is estimated at nearly $60,000.

Even the $23,835 is unrealistically conservative. The allowance for medical care breaks down to $93 a year—hardly enough to cover any unusual expenses. The item for education works out to $13 a year. The allotment for personal care is $45 a year, or a scant $3.75 a month.

Moreover, the institute's rundown of child-rearing costs does not attempt to add in the extra thousands of dollars that the certain rise in our cost of living inevitably will tack on during the next 18 years. It does not cover the cost of having children to begin with—on average, another $700 or so.

It does not cover the cost of a college education—which will be a basic minimum for the majority of jobs 18 years from now. Within 5 years the average yearly cost of a year in a public college will be $1,840 and in a private college, $2,780.

LIVING STANDARD RISES

It does not take into consideration the fact that children, as well as adults, are raising their standard of living all the time—in their preferences in food, clothes, entertainment, personal care, transportation. What "everybody else" has today is a lot more and a lot better than what anybody else ever had before.

Two decades ago, when average annual family income was $3,000, the total cost of rearing one child to 18 was estimated at about $9,000—or three times one year's family income.

Today, the child-rearing cost to the age of 18 is the equivalent of nearly 4 years of family income—and the expenses climb relentlessly ever upward.

If you're a full-fledged family today, the steep cost of rearing children is hardly news to you. But if you're a young couple or couple-to-be, it's only commonsense to study the strictly financial facts of familyhood.

COLUMBUS DAY

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, as our astronauts begin their journeys into the mysterious realm of space they feel the same sense of challenge and adventure that was experienced by Christopher Columbus over five centuries ago. Certainly his achievement was no less spectacular then, than our technical and scientific feats in space are now.

Today we are reaching out to probe the limitless expanse of a universe—an effort which will test the fiber of the men and nations working to meet it. Then in 1492, when Columbus set out from Spain in three wooden ships, each not more than 70 feet in length, he was probing the uncharted seas in search of the fabled wealth of an unknown new world. He did not find the wealth, but he altered the face of history and in doing so, brought to Europe the revolutionary vision of new peoples and a new continent.

Four times he undertook the long voyage to America in a relentless search for gold or treasure; finally he died in defeat without knowing the magnitude of the discoveries he had made. Others who followed in his wake recognized the untapped treasure in land and people.

Columbus demonstrated the qualities of courage and perseverance which are necessary to meet the challenge he faced then and which we face today with our space program. His example should be our guide.

All Americans can be proud of this explorer who opened the doors of the new continent to the trade, religion, culture, and the courageous ambition of the European nations. Italian Americans can be especially proud of their ancestor who is now recognized as a giant within his age.

The imagination and daring shown through his life have been seen again and again in the many deeds and contributions of Americans of Italian descent to every aspect of our society. It is fitting that we set aside a very special day to pay tribute to a great man and a great people who have helped make our country a better place to live.

THE HIGH COST OF SNOOPING

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in today's issue of the Washington Post there appears an editorial entitled "The High Cost of Snooping."

This editorial emphasizes Commissioner Cohen's concern over the bad image which the Treasury Department is getting as a result of its illegal snooping on the taxpayers.

I would suggest to Commissioner Cohen that the best way to correct this image would be for him to issue an emphatic statement that in the future the Treasury Department would under no circumstances engage in any future wiretapping or intercepting of the mails unless such action is taken after first having obtained a court order.

In other words, let the Treasury Department tell the American people that they do not consider themselves above abiding by the law.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HIGH COST OF SNOOPING

With disarming candor and good humor, Internal Revenue Commissioner Sheldon S. Cohen has been defending his embattled Bureau against criticism that has grown out of the revelation of investigating excesses by a Senate subcommittee. Addressing the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants recently, he made a cleanbreast confession that "in a few cases, in the organized crime area, without the knowledge of its top officials, a few of our criminal investigators engaged in wiretapping." And then the Commissioner added a simple and, in our view, most commendable declaration: "Wiretapping is wrong whether it is done wholesale or retail."

As Mr. Justice Roberts said many years ago, "The plain words of section 605 (of the Federal Communications Act) forbid anyone, unless authorized by the sender, to intercept a telephone message, and direct in equally clear language that 'no person' shall divulge or publish the message or its substance to 'any person.'" This clear command ought to be recognized, and obeyed by every Federal bureau.

Commissioner Cohen has taken remedial action against practices instituted before he assumed office. But he fears that the "relatively few cases of wiretapping have been so publicized as to give the impression of widespread use of electronic devices." And he pleaded, in extenuation, that all of the violations "were in the organized crime area and did not involve the average taxpayer."

Here is the very root of the wiretapping evil. When law enforcement authorities resort to it at all, they create at once an anxiety that their resort to it is widespread; and when they say they are employing it only against organized crime or against espionage, they make the average taxpayer wonder how loosely they may be defining these terms. Thus the effect of their violation of law is to diminish respect for the law in general and, worse, to put a serious damper upon that freedom of communication which is indispensable to a free society.

MENTAL HEALTH LEADERSHIP IN IDAHO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, "The Coming Upheaval in Psychiatry" is the title of an article in the current Harper's magazine. The upheaval referred to is that which will have to take place if the Community Mental Health Centers Act of 1964—designed to bring mental health treatment down to the local level where millions stand in need—is to be successfully implemented. Can techniques be found to deal with large numbers of people? How much of the load can be carried by volunteers lacking years of professional training?

One place where a determined group of professional and nonprofessional men and women are looking for the answers and meeting with success is in the State of Idaho. Idaho is one of a handful of States which has legislation to establish mental health centers in local communities. Already Lewiston, Boise, Pocatello and several smaller towns, have established centers and more are sure to follow.

As I am speaking, these men and women are meeting in Burley, Idaho, to elect State officers and widen the reach of the services they provide. Although a small and often embattled group, these fine people are beginning to see the fruits of years of anonymous service, as they look toward the day when mental health services will be available to all where they should be—in their own home town.

Mr. President, I think it would be well to reprint the Harper's article in the RECORD because, although it deals more with New York City than smaller rural communities, it emphasies the need for grassroots treatment and the challenge to both local professionals and volunteers. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have "The Coming Upheaval in Psychiatry" printed here in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMING UPHEAVAL IN PSYCHIATRY

(By Maya Pines)

American psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers are about to be tested as never before. Leaders in all these fields have long argued that all mental patients—and not only the rich—should have access to treatment in their own communities, rather than choose between total neglect and commitment to a State institution. Financially, at least, the opportunity to supply such facilities is at hand.

The Community Mental Health Centers Act of 1964 provided $150 million to build mental health centers across the country. Now—despite the opposition of the American Medical Association—Congress has decided to contribute handsomely not only to bricks and mortar but to the salaries of the people who will work in the new centers. There, it is hoped, treatment will become available to everyone who needs it—the poor as well as the rich—and it may thus become possible to attack mental illness in its early stage before it has caused too much harm. In the process mental health services will have to be reorganized along lines that are both more democratic and more efficient.

These goals are now economically feasible. But the task remains a formidable one and how it is to be accomplished is by no means clear. As to the need, however, there is no doubt.

Seven years ago A. B. Hollingshead and Dr. Frederick C. Redlich, chief of the Department of Psychiatry at the Yale University School of Medicine, coauthored a book, "Social Class and Mental Illness," which documented for the first time the affinity, both economic and cultural, of psychiatrists for well-heeled patients. Even in the overcrowded State institutions where most poor patients are dumped, the study demonstrated, middle-class patients usually receive more attention and care. On the rare occasions when poor patients find their way to free clinics, they are put off by long waiting lists and elaborate intake procedures. They are also bewildered by doctors who give no pills and expect the patient to do most of the talking. Similarly, in recent years, social workers have been told by critics in and out of their own ranks that they have turned their backs on the neediest members of our society because of their preoccupation with individual therapeutic case work.

Within the past year or so, community organization has become an increasingly fashionable field of study at schools of social work. And along with many other Americans, psychiatrists and psychologists have been busily discovering the poor and seeking ways to bridge the immense gap in culture and custom which separates them from middle-class Americans. In the case of the mentally ill patient, this gulf can be an insuperable obstacle to effective treatment.

The geographical gap is equally serious. Outside of a handful of cities such as New York City, Chicago, San Francisco, or Los Angeles, middleclass patients who cannot afford expensive private psychiatrists are hard put to get any help at all. It is generally true that no public facilities of any kind exist for mental patients in their own communities.

At the same time there is a continuing dearth of the psychiatrist, psychologists, and psychiatric social workers needed to do an effective job even at existing mental health clinics and hospitals. The critical shortage of personnel led one psychologist to remark ruefully when Congress passed last year's Mental Health Act, "What will we do with the new buildings when they're finished—rent them out?"

As one way of attacking the shortage, many clinics are organizing their scarce professionals into teams in the hope of getting more mileage out of them. Group therapy is also increasingly being used instead of the traditional one-to-one treatment. In some places there is a growing emphasis on helping troubled people get through immediate crises—which may be emotional or practical or both—instead of attempting deep, long-range psychotherapy. Still another approach is an attempt to develop new, lower-echelon mental health aides and counselors who can supplement the work of the scarce professionals and also provide a means of reaching out to the people long excluded from mental health services.

NO WAITING LIST OR REDTAPE

By combining such techniques, many general hospitals around the country are now taking the first steps toward becoming community mental health centers. Among the newer entrants is New York City's Lincoln Hospital, in a congested area where until last year 350,000 people had no psychiatric services whatsoever, short of commitment to an institution. Lincoln's mental health program is sponsored by the department of psychiatry of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine, with which the hospital is affiliated. The plan is roughly analogous to a military medical scheme. At the front lines are neighborhood service centers (supported by a grant from the poverty program), which serve as first-aid stations. Functioning as a kind of field hospital is the free mental health clinic at Lincoln Hospital. The base hospital—for those who cannot be treated on an ambulatory basis—remains a long ambulance ride away, in Jacobi Hospital, Albert Einstein's major-teaching center. There the patient may be hospitalized for a short time, or sent on to a State institution for longer treatment. Eventually Lincoln expects to set up a "day hospital" of its own, in which psychiatric patients may spend the whole day, going home to their families only at night. But even without this service, it is believed that this program will cut in half the number of patients who actually need to be hospitalized.

Recently I visited one of the first-aid stations—a neighborhood service center located in a store wedged between a dry cleaner and a beauty salon, on a nondescript street in the Bronx. The store window is adorned with colorful children's paintings. There are some bright orange, turquoise, and yellow chairs near the door, a few painted bookcases, a potted plant in a corner and half a dozen desks.

Anyone can stroll in and tell his troubles immediately—without waiting lists or red tape—to a mental health aide who speaks his language both literally and figuratively. The aides all live in the neighborhood; many were born there and are in the same economic group as the people they now serve. Before taking their present jobs, most of them were earning less than $3,000 a year as ward attendants, clerks, or nurse's aides. Others were on relief. When I arrived, a young woman sat hunched miserably at one of the desks whispering to a plump Negro aide who was wearing a black leather coat. In the back of the store two men were talking in Spanish.

Mrs. Doris Jefferson, one of the aides, told me that people usually come in to discuss a pressing practical emergency rather than their serious emotional troubles. These emerge only as the aides prove that they are really interested in being helpful. "For instance, one widow said her problem was to get new mattresses from welfare," Mrs. Jefferson said. "I talked to her for a while, and then I went to her apartment. This is what I found." She pulled out her notes.

Of her nine children, only three were living at home—a 7-year-old girl, who weighed 39 pounds (the normal weight for a 3-year-old), an 11-year-old daughter with an arrested case of TB, and a 14-year-old daughter who was 3 months pregnant. Six sons, all drug addicts, had left home and were constantly in and out of jail. The mother was an alcoholic. In an unbelievably filthy apartment, the three girls all slept in the same broken-down bed, on a dirty mattress without sheets.

After much prodding, Mrs. Jefferson persuaded welfare to place the pregnant daughter in a home for unwed mothers and to find foster homes for the other two. To help the mother overcome her alcoholism, Mrs. Jefferson, who had become her friend, then talked her into attending a meeting of Alcoholics Anonymous; before recommending this, she attended a meeting herself on her own time to see what it was like.

Like Mrs. Jefferson, all the aids I met were warmhearted individuals who easily put themselves in their client's place and seemed deeply committed to helping them as best they could. On their own initiative, and on their own time, they do things which few ordinary social workers would think of: One, for instance, accompanied a distraught mother of four to a cemetery for the funeral of her infant son, and even read the service in the absence of a minister.

During the first 6 weeks of the center's existence, 239 persons came in for help. Only 10 were referred to the next link in the chain of services, the mental health clinic. Among these were an extremely disturbed man who had lost control of himself and was afraid he might do something violent; a young fire-setter, aged five, who had burned his family out of its apartment; and a hysterical woman. The majority of cases involved such practical matters as the dreaded dispossess order which leaves a family homeless, unemployment, or frustrating dealings with the welfare department.

There was, for example, a young woman born in Puerto Rico who had been living in the Bronx with a common-law husband for 2½ years. When he learned that she was pregnant he got drunk and beat her up. She took refuge in her brother's tiny rented room. After a few days she came back to her apartment—and found her husband had sold all the furniture, stopped paying the rent, and disappeared. She then went to apply for welfare. In due course, she received a complicated letter which seemed to mean that she had to produce her husband to receive any money. Still living in her brother's cramped quarters, as the date of her delivery approached, she felt mounting panic. Finally she heard about the neighborhood service center.

The aid who saw her there, Ralph Acosta, is himself of Puerto Rican origin, although he was born right at Lincoln Hospital and has spent most of his life in the area. He pointed out that she had misinterpreted the welfare department's letter and that she could still ask for help. Mr. Acosta—after futile efforts to produce the husband—accompanied her to the welfare department. There she was told that she had not made an adequate effort to locate her husband, or else she was lying. Neither her explanations nor Mr. Acosta's testimony helped. A few days later, administrators of the Lincoln Hospital Mental Health Services talked to administrators at the welfare department. The young woman was finally assured of funds for food and a layette, and told to find herself an inexpensive apartment. With Mr. Acosta's help, she did. On a Saturday, with a friend's car, Mr. Acosta helped her move.

"This is the most important work I've ever done in my life," says Mr. Acosta, feelingly, about his new job. "Is it mental health? Oh, sure. People come to you with problems they can't solve, and if you can help to solve them while they're still little problems, actually what you're doing is securing their mental health."

A phone rang, and another aid got up, grabbed her handbag and said, "One of my clients is threatening to do something drastic. I'm taking her straight to the hospital. I had a feeling she was nearing a breaking point." And she rushed out.

RATIONED PSYCHOTHERAPY

When patients are referred to the clinic at Lincoln Hospital, the staff tries its best to see the whole family at the time of the first interview. This is seldom possible, however, because intact families are rare in this neighborhood. Fathers, particularly, are hard to locate. Many of the patients are on welfare, and the clinic—which is just a year old—charges no fees at all. Its staff includes four full-time and three part-time psychiatrists, one psychologist, three social workers, and two nurses, plus two mental health aids who are still being trained. They work under the direction of Dr. Levon Boyajian, a psychiatrist who makes a point of explaining that he is not an analyst.

Regardless of the staff's background, "we all do the same thing here," Dr. Boyajian says, "with the exception of giving out medicines." Not only the psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers, but also the nurses see patients. "Why not—pretty soon we'll let the aids do it." The nurses get on-the-job supervision, and also take part in seminars on group and family therapy.

Patients are assigned to whatever member of the team is available, although to some extent the choice is determined by language (roughly half the staff speaks Spanish) and the apparent severity of the problem. However, no one is turned away—someone on the staff sees anyone who arrives during working hours. Some patients are referred to the clinic by the hospital's emergency room, many more by the neighborhood service centers, by schools, or by other social agencies. Not surprisingly, considering the newness of the venture, the clinic procedures have an air of great spontaneity. "Nothing has been very formalized yet," says Dr. Boyajian. "We're glad we're running."

Once a staff member has seen as much of a family as possible he discusses the case briefly with Dr. Boyajian and other members of the team—psychologist, social worker, or nurse—to decide on the next step. At a recent meeting, for example, the discussion began with the case of a 24-year-old Negro woman, the mother of five children, who had come in complaining that she was "nervous." The psychiatrist who interviewed her noted that her face and arms had been badly bruised and scarred by her alcoholic husband. She had secured a temporary "order of protection" from the police; but the day it expired, her husband renewed his attacks. Now she wanted a legal separation. The psychiatrist diagnosed her "nervousness" as a reactive depression and prescribed medication. Dr. Boyajian and the other staff members agreed that this medication should be continued for a while and also suggested sending her to the service center for practical help in getting the separation and better housing (all seven members of the family were living in three rooms). "OK" said Dr. Boyajian, "who's next?" The discussion had taken precisely 10 minutes.

After the initial interview no more than six sessions of psychotherapy are allowed each patient or family. As one of the psychiatrists explained, "If we were to take the current staff and provide long-term psychotherapy too all those who could profit from it, all the staff would quickly be utilized and we would make practically no dent in the mental health problems of the community."

"We mustn't fool ourselves," he continued. "In an area this size, a large number of people could profit from psychotherapy—but we can't provide it. That is the honest answer."

He also pointed out that the traditional forms of psychotherapy would be of little use to all those who could profit from it, all the area—people overwhelmed by unemployment, high infant mortality, juvenile delinquency, or other evils of slum life. For them the most effective therapy may well be the kind of emergency treatment and practical assistance offered by the clinic and the service centers. Help given in a time of crisis may prevent the breakdown which leaves no alternative but commitment to a State institution.

For people who need further help after the crisis is past, and for patients recently discharged from State hospitals, the clinic runs two large groups—one Spanish, the other English speaking. Each group consists of about 15 to 20 patients, and meets once a week with a psychiatrist and a nurse. These sessions are extremely informal—patients walk around, drink coffee, or even sew while taking part in the discussion.

Apart from these therapeutic gatherings, the Lincoln Hospital mental health program takes a lively interest in existing community groups, including juvenile gangs and the older folk who sit around together on stoops. On the theory that you stay sane through your ties with other people, the program's directors see as an essential part of their job promoting activities which increase self-esteem and reduce the individual's sense of powerlessness. Two months after the first neighborhood service center opened, for example, it held an evening meeting, complete with guitar music by a Puerto Rican aid. Those present were encouraged to speak up about their grievances and to form committees to improve education, hospital services, garbage disposal, housing, and relations with the police and welfare departments.

Social action of this kind is far afield from the traditional concerns of psychiatrists. Even the more accepted practices of community mental health, such as working in psychiatric teams and giving group therapy remain alien to the bulk of psychiatrists. These practices are now included in the training of residents in psychiatry at a few universities, notably Harvard and Columbia. However, at most medical schools and hospitals the emphasis is still entirely on individual, long-term psychotherapy. As a result, most of the current crop of young psychiatrists—along with those long in practice—are ill-equipped for the very different approach being launched under the new community mental health programs. They may also be opposed to it in principle. At one center, all eight staff psychiatrists quit during the first year because they could not adjust to the new methods of treatment.

While appropriately trained and willing psychiatrists are scarce lower level personnel is virtually nonexistent and there are no suitable programs as yet in schools and colleges. Lincoln Hospital recruits its mental health aids in the neighborhood and gives them 3 weeks of full-time training before they start on the job. For the next 3 weeks, they work only half a day, spending the other half in training. From then on they attend weekly training sessions, and meet with a psychiatrist to discuss their clients. On the job, at the neighborhood service centers, the aids are supervised by a clinical psychologist or a social worker. They are taught to think of themselves as people who give help but do not treat the sick.

One more ambitious but much smaller experiment—at the National Institute of Mental Health—did attempt to turn laymen into psychotherapists. After 2 years of part-time study and on-the-job training, eight women who participated in this NIMH program were given the title of mental health counselors and are now working professionally in clinics and schools. The program remains a much-admired though little-imitated model of what can be done to reduce the shortage of therapists. Dr. Margaret Rioch, a psychologist who directed it, is now training another batch of women to do preventive counseling with mothers of preschool children. For practical experience the trainees work in child-health clinics in low-income neighborhoods.

In common with other people who attempt to bring mental health to the poor, the trainees have communication problems. "You just have to tailor your middle-class ideas to what's feasible," Dr. Rioch said. "You can't recommend giving the child special loving care at bedtime when the mother works at night. You can't tell the mother to send the child to his room if he has a tantrum—often the entire family lives in one room. And talk about a father's role is pointless when the father has deserted the home." In many cases the trainees find themselves spending nearly as much time advising the mothers on housing or jobs as on child-rearing problems. "Who shall I say sent me," asked one of the mothers after a trainee had made an appointment for her at a city agency, "the lady who helps people to get their rights?"

"IS EVERYTHING A MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEM?"

The personnel squeeze in mental health is also forcing a reappraisal of the potential of volunteers. Outstanding volunteer work has been done in mental hospitals recently by young men and women fresh out of college, college students, and even high school students.

At Boston State Hospital, for example, some 200 student volunteers from Harvard and Radcliffe now work with the most severely ill patients in the back wards either in groups or as individual "case aids." They make friends with a chronic schizophrenic, learn his needs, help improve his behavior, take him out on trips, and if he is well enough to leave the hospital, help him settle down in the community.

"They've done very well indeed," says Dr. Milton Greenblatt, superintendent of the hospital. "About 30 percent of the chronic patients they worked with were able to go back to the community. Without their help, they'd be in the hospital maybe all their lives."

Before the students came on the scene, he recalls, the hospital volunteers were mostly "matrons in their forties on whom fortune has smiled. They were afraid of getting close to the patients. They'd come every 5 or 6 months, run a party and then go away. There was too big a gulf between them—after all, the patients are not very attractive to look at, unkempt, sometimes offensive. But the students are very different. They want to take up the big challenge. It's more like revolutionary zeal—it's youth and enthusiasm, rebellion, and an attitude of 'we're going to show them. We can do better than their doctors and nurses.'" Not only does this enthusiasm help the patients, but it results in considerable savings to the State and in tremendous personal growth for the students, Dr. Greenblatt says. He sees the use of volunteers and subprofessionals in many State hospitals as the only way to make do with the desperate shortage of trained professionals.

To date, attempts to recruit and train volunteers and salaried mental health aids are no more than tentative token efforts. What will happen when the new community mental health program really gets going is anyone's guess. To qualify for Federal funds the centers will be required to provide, as a minimum, in-patient and out-patient service, partial hospitalization, round-the-clock emergency services, and consultation services. These need not be in the same building, but they must be integrated so as to offer a continuity of service to all persons, for all types of psychiatric illness, regardless of ability to pay.

Neighborhood service centers and walk-in clinics with sliding scales of payment may spring up in many cities. In rural areas, on the other hand, a way will have to be found to arrange telephone consultations, and to enable the few psychiatrists and psychologists in the area to help local general practitioners handle mental disorders either in general hospitals, or in their own offices or their patients' homes.

The goal set by the National Institute of Mental Health is the creation of some 1,000 community mental health centers across the country. None of them yet exists in complete form, and most of them have not begun to come into being. While they are being built, thousands of new mental health workers must be trained, without any general agreement on where or how this is to be done. And they are to serve not only the middle class, which has been poorly enough served in the past, but a much larger population of lower-class patients with which psychiatry has had almost no previous contact.

At the same time, the definition of mental health itself seems to be expanding without any limits. "We're going off in all directions," Dr. Redlich complained recently. "When I go to professional meetings nowadays, I hear more about poverty, segregation, and racial strife than about schizophrenia and neuroses."

Last spring the American Orthopsychiatric Association held a round table entitled, "Is Everything a Mental Health Problem?" There was a lively debate on such questions as, "Has mental health overextended itself, trying to use clinical models and experiences to solve major social problems like delinquency, crime, and poverty?"

Nobody knows the answers to these questions at present. But if the professions involved fail to carry off the revolution in mental health while hopes are high, they will never get the necessary support from the States, and all that may be left a few years from now will be a few unfinished buildings in which poorly trained people dispense third-rate care.

Meanwhile the hardest hit of the mentally ill—and the most ignored—are still the poor, and nearly everything about how to reach and treat them still remains to be learned.

THE ALL-AMERICAN CANAL—25TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, today marks the anniversary of an historic event in the history of California.

Twenty-five years ago today, the first water began to flow through the 80-mile All-American Canal from the Colorado River into the Imperial Valley in California.

It has been said that it took big men with courage, vision, and fortitude to make an agricultural mecca out of this desert region in the extreme southern portion of my State—men who suffered privation, hardship and want in a vast sprawling desert region hostile to man. With their imagination, initiative and calloused hands they conquered the region and made it a showcase for farming.

The Imperial Valley is about 110 miles long and 40 miles wide. The Imperial Irrigation District encompasses an area of approximately 600,000 gross acres and extends generally from the Salton Sea on the north, to the Mexican border on the south. At the present time, approximately 530,000 irrigable acres are capable of being served by the district system through the facilities of the All-American Canal. The farm based economy has an annual output of crops valued at more than $200 million.

The valley is one of the world's richest agricultural regions—a land of almost perpetual sunshine with a frost-free growing season of about 300 days annually. It is in fact a desert in that the rains are irregular in occurrence with the annual average rainfall being only between 2 and 3 inches.

Because of the extremely arid climatic conditions, no dryland farming is practicable. The soils are exceptionally fertile and the topography of the below-sea-level area is well fitted to irrigation farming. Water is the valley's lifeline.

The All-America Canal replaced the old Alamo Canal which went into operation in 1892. The Alamo Canal, built with private capital, was generally unsatisfactory because part of it flowed through Mexico and there was little or no regulation of the constantly flooding river.

The All-American Canal, as the name implies, lies entirely within the boundaries of the United States. It was authorized in 1928 as a part of the Boulder Canyon Project Act which was to be built for flood protection, river regulation and water storage.

The act provided for the diversion of water to be stored behind the therein authorized Hoover Dam on the Colorado River to the lands of the Imperial and Coachella Valleys. Construction proceeded during the 1930's and on October 12, 1940, water was first turned into the East Highline Canal of the Imperial Irrigation District, permitting for the first time the irrigation of more than 400,000 acres of what has become one of the garden spots of the world.

The canal, one of the world's largest, has a capacity of over 15,000 cubic feet per second. During its 25 year history, it has carried about 126 million acre-feet of water. It has been the lifeblood which has allowed the production of crops with a cumulative gross value of $2.5 billion, crops which do not add to the Nation's surpluses.

The canal was constructed at a cost of approximately $68.5 million and will be repaid almost 90 percent by the water users. The return in agricultural production alone represents a dividend to the Nation of roughly 37 times the Federal investment in the project costs.

Mr. President, I am pleased to salute the vision and accomplishments of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of the Interior, and those great Californians, who with foresight constructed and operated this superb man-made river and helped to create a vast agricultural economy in the southern part of California.

THE PROPOSED NETWORK PROGRAM RULE OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the Journal of the Screen Producers Guild devoted its September 19, 1965, issue entirely to the proposed network program rule of the Federal Communications Commission. This is the proposal put forth by the Federal Communications Commission that would limit the financial participation and/or ownership of TV programs by the national networks. A series of articles by prominent and knowledgeable people discuss the various sides of this controversial proposal at great length.

One of the articles was prepared by Lawrence Laurent, television-radio editor of the Washington Post. It is entitled "'Fifty-Fifty' or Fight."

Because of the significance of this proposal, I commend it to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"FIFTY-FIFTY" OR FIGHT

(By Lawrence Laurent)

(NOTE.—Lawrence Laurent has been television-radio editor of the Washington Post since June 1953. His columns also appear in the 110 newspapers that subscribe to the Los Angeles Times-Washington Post News Service. Mr. Laurent holds the rank of adjunct professor of the American University in Washington, D.C., where he teaches courses in radio and television programing. He is the editor of "Equal Time: The Public Interest and the Private Broadcaster," by Newton N. Minow, published last winter (Atheneum). The following article was written by Mr. Laurent exclusively for the Journal.)

Right on schedule—and just as expected—wails, groans, and predictions of disaster followed the news that the Federal Communications Commission is considering a rule that would cut a network back to 50-percent ownership of its entertainment programing. The wails, groans, and forecasts of doom don't make much of an impression here, probably because this act has been worn thin and it no longer has impact. After all, only one decade ago, Dr. Frank Stanton, president of CBS, claimed that television would lose its magic if the industry converted to film. A few years later, Washington heard that a network's schedule would be shattered (beyond repair) if the FCC outlawed network option time. And you may have heard that the marginal (fractional) profits of a network hung in the balance when rigged quiz shows had to be abandoned.

This is not a case to be compared with the boy who cried "Wolf" one time too often. It is more like the wolf who yelled "boy" once too often for the township to heed and come running.

For about 5 years, attorneys general have been receiving complaints from those persons who produce programs for television. Persistently, producers have said that a man cannot get his show on television unless he cuts a network in for:

1. A piece of the ownership, meaning a share of present and future profits;

2. Full domestic syndication rights (where—producers claim—most of the profit is made from a short-run television series); or

3. Foreign syndication rights (and—again producers claim—this is the film series maker's hedge against the "dry period" and old age).

The complaints haven't gone unheeded. Nor are these gripes without discernible, documented proof. Producers came to Washington and told stories about screenings that were followed by conferences that began with a network chieftain saying, "Yes, I like your show—but first, I will have to look at the house packages."

This, by nearly anyone's definition, is restraint of trade. Free enterprise, by any economist's definition, means unlimited access to the marketplace. It means that any individual can enter into competition and that the man with the best goods will thrive and prosper.

But, by some curious quirk of the television marketplace, the three television networks in 1964–65 had room for only about 15 programs in which a network didn't have a share of future profits. Such programs usually had a backing of muscle. It might be one of the T/L productions of Danny Thomas and Sheldon Leonard, with the backing of an organizational sponsor called General Foods. Or it might be a "Hazel," produced by Screen Gems and sold in advance to a tiny, struggling organization such as the Ford Motor Co.

With this kind of documentation, the Justice Department—nor the FCC—could not long ignore such complaints. The long legal opinions and documented citations made the bureaucratic rounds and eventually some found their way to the desk of the Attorney General. He called a secret, off the record, conference with the Chairman of the FCC.

The starting point of the discussion between these two lawyers was the celebrated case of *U.S.* v. *Paramount*. In this case the Supreme Court held that a producer cannot be an exhibitor. This case is known to laymen as the antiblocking booking decision that divorced moviemakers from ownership of movie theaters.

Under the philosophy of this decision the Attorney General was certain that he could go to court and win—hands down—a decree that would separate television program production from television program exhibition. He had one additional worry: If networks were separated from production the public might lose one of TV's greatest benefits—the documentary, public affairs, nonfiction schedule of programs. What could be the solution?

In response to that question, one who is not schooled in the complexities of the Federal Government might reply that illegal monopoly can simply be declared to be illegal. But life, legally, hasn't been that simple for at least 70 years (or, if you insist on being technical, since passage of the vaguely worded Sherman Antitrust Act). No, students, "monopoly" means control of 51 percent of the market. Now, scholars, do you see why the proposed rule is 50–50?

First, of course, the FCC won't even consider "sustaining," meaning "unsponsored" programs. Nor will it count news and public affairs programs. Also excluded are the lucrative, profitable daytime hours. All that would count are the prime time, entertainment programs.

To restate, then, the FCC is considering a rule that would limit a network (and there are only three TV networks) to 50 percent ownership of the entertainment programs scheduled between 7:30 p.m. and 10:30 p.m.

There are other considerations. Each spring the New York Times publishes a report on how much money the networks lose in the creation of television programs. The most recent article put this figure at about $70 million. One might logically expect that this story, so carefully documented, would be a plea by networks to be relieved of an awesome, burdensome responsibility. But, no, it seems that in spite of the terrible losses, networks actually enjoy a function that is so dreadfully expensive. This curious attitude might lead one to a conclusion that figures have been carefully isolated and that in the long run there is some profit in the selection, creation, and care and feeding of new programs. This is certainly indicated in the FCC's second interim study of network operation. The networks took over programing control in 1960, following the quiz show scandals. Between 1960 and 1964 network profits rose from about $21 million to more than $60 million (before Federal taxes). These figures indicate only one thing—one can easily lose money searching for just the right program—and, in the tripoly of network television reap a bonanza through absolute control of everything that goes into the prime time schedule.

We come now to that amorphous thing called public policy, governing what is happily called the publicly owned airwaves. Here, one might understand a policy that says the independent entrepreneur is entitled to every dollar that results from his risk of an investment in a new program. Further, unless we reverse all sound thinking of the past 70 years, this entrepreneur ought to be able to reach the marketplace without having to cut others in on his potential profit. In terms of public policy, the 50–50 ruling would mean that the creator has a 50–50 chance of getting every dollar that his risk earns in the marketplace.

It would not mean, in terms of the smokescreen so carefully laid in recent months, that advertising agencies would have to control programing. It would mean, in simplest terms, that a network couldn't control more than half of the prime time entertainment schedule.

Of course the networks are going to fight such a ruling—for a time. In the background, however, is the specter of a Justice Department complaint reaching the courts and—under the *U.S.* v. *Paramount* decision—the exhibitor of television programs (a network) could be ruled out—completely—from the production of programs.

This, then, is the Government's case. The other side will be covered, I am certain, by Senator HARTKE and others. Here one should keep in mind several economic facts:

1. Such a ruling would not mean the end of the networks as a central, contemporaneous source of programing and sales. Anytime, in our society, that a need exists for goods and services, some organization is going to supply those goods and services—and for a reasonable profit.

2. Obviously, networks did exist, and make a profit, in the years between 1948 and 1960—without complete domination of program production. By their own testimony, a network makes most of its money as the broker for time to a group of affiliated stations. This will not change.

3. A strong argument can be made in favor of the greatest possible number of sources for programs, each competing equally, without having to bargain away future profits in order to reach the public. This, essentially, is what the FCC is seeking.

On a more personal note, it is my business to know what is being considered at the FCC before proposed rules are announced. I knew, for example, in February of 1965 that a 50–50 ownership rule might be proposed publicly during the summer. This is why I went to Los Angeles in March to ask TV film producers what the effects of such a ruling might be. The most forthright answer came from one of the most successful producers in all television.

We sat in his office and I carefully explained the rule that was being considered (and which now has networks in an uproar). I asked: "What do you think of this rule?"

The answer came quickly: "It's a timid step in the right direction."

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in commemoration of the 473d anniversary of the discovery of the New World, the city of Bridgeport, Conn., last weekend unveiled an impressive statue of Christopher Columbus.

I had the honor and privilege of contributing a few words to this dedication ceremony, and, as we pay tribute to Columbus today, I would like to insert the text of my remarks in the RECORD.

There has been a continuing debate over the significance of Columbus' venture as opposed to the earlier voyages of Leif Erikson and his Norsemen. New fuel has been added to this argument by Yale University's recent publication of a pre-Columbian map and a tribute to the Norsemen.

It seems to me that this longstanding discussion does not, and should not, in any way dim or detract from the momentous importance of Christopher Columbus in the annals of history.

For, as an editorial in today's New York Herald Tribune aptly puts it, it was the voyage of Columbus which "turned the full light of European interest and acquisitiveness upon the Western Hemisphere. It was Columbus who changed the history of the world by his courage and determination, and it is Columbus who best deserves the day we celebrate in his honor."

I ask unanimous consent to insert my Bridgeport statement and this Herald Tribune editorial in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The dedication of this memorial today is more than a tribute to a great man.

It is also a special tribute to all people of Italian descent who have followed in the footsteps of Columbus, for they have made an invaluable contribution to America and the Western Hemisphere.

Christopher Columbus was our first pioneer.

He was a man of great determination, courage and conviction.

He was a man who possessed a profound faith not only in the correctness of the calculations of science but also in a divine destiny and the protection of a God who guides those of vision and purpose.

He was a romantic and an idealist.

But he was also a realist who well understood that he faced two great challenges. He had to conquer the unpredictable and perhaps unknown elements of nature. He also had to overcome the skepticism and ridicule of most of the then known world.

Christopher Columbus probably endured moments of doubt, disappointment and despair, as do all men. But once on the westward course with his three frail ships, this captain never wavered in his determination to reach beyond the horizon.

Columbus had hoped to open a route to the East Indies, but his discovery, his contribution to civilization, is known to all.

This New World of magnificent beauty and freshness and seemingly unlimited resources offered mankind a new hope for the realization of human freedom, justice and happiness.

With this statue, Bridgeport pays impressive tribute to the man who undertook this historic voyage.

As many of you may know, I and some of my colleagues have worked long and hard to see legislation passed which would honor Columbus by making October 12 a national holiday.

During the last Congress we were partially successful in our efforts, and we are continuing this work this year.

I hope, as I know you do, that Columbus Day will soon be observed across the Nation as a public holiday.

Actually, however, our debt to Christopher Columbus cannot be fully repaid by declaring a holiday or erecting a memorial.

The discovery made by Columbus presented mankind with a challenge for a better life.

We pay best tribute to him and to the many contributions of Italian-Americans by striving to retain his vision and courage and to live up to his challenge.

THE ROLE OF COLUMBUS

There is a good deal of irony in the fact that the Yale University publication of a pre-Columbian map showing the new world (in much abbreviated form), with a tribute to the explorations of Bjarni and Leif Ericson, should have been announced on the eve of Columbus Day.

For while it has long been undisputed that Norse seamen had preceded Columbus across the Atlantic, very little was known about the effect of this upon the intellectual climate of Europe—whether, that is, geographers and navigators and merchants were predisposed by the Norse expeditions to accept that of Columbus as something less than a venture into the completely unknown. The existence of a map drawn in Switzerland, perhaps 50 years before the *Nina*, the *Pinta* and the *Santa Maria* set sail from Palos, showing a large island beyond Greenland, is at least an indication that the Vikings had left some impress upon European consciousness.

The Yale map, therefore, which is of uncertain provenance but has impressive testimonials to its authenticity, is certain to stir new researches into the efforts of the largely nameless voyagers who may have followed Leif Ericson, fished on the Newfoundland banks and possibly explored the edges of the main—and told their tales along the waterfront of Europe's 15th-century ports.

But while this search may turn up useful materials for the history of Europe's great explosion across the seas, and may produce stories of detection as fascinating as that by which the Yale map was found and authenticated, it is hardly likely that anything will be uncovered that would seriously impair the greatness of Christopher Columbus and his achievement.

For even if Columbus had known of the Basel map—had, in fact, a copy of it—the little patch of Vinland in "the most distant remaining parts of the western ocean sea" would have had little bearing upon his attempt to reach the Indies by sailing westward. And what is more important, the Viking forays left America in obscurity; the voyages of Columbus turned the full light of European interest and acquisitiveness upon the Western Hemisphere.

There is high drama in the saga of those intrepid Norsemen in their high-prowed little ships, reaching ever westward across the stormy North Atlantic; drama, too, in the as yet unsung journeys of those who may have followed them. But it was Columbus who changed the history of the world by his courage and determination, and it is Columbus who best deserves the day we celebrate in his honor.

SENATOR MANSFIELD'S CONTRIBUTION TO U.S. POLICY ON VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, no Member of the U.S. Senate has had a more constructive influence on the evolution of U.S. policy in Vietnam than has the distinguished majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, of Montana.

Much editorial comment favorable to Senator MANSFIELD's statements on Vietnam has appeared in American newspapers. Representative of such comment is an editorial which appeared in the September 16 issue of the Rexburg Journal, which is published by John Porter. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rexburg (Idaho) Journal, Sept. 16, 1965]

NUDGE TOWARD TALKS

Though Senate Majority Leader MANSFIELD has not always publicly agreed with administration policy in Vietnam, his recent address on the subject offers perhaps the clearest and most concise summation of that policy yet heard. His speech was entitled, "Vietnam: Narrowing the Issues." Its main usefulness lies in this—that MANSFIELD has intensified the focus on America's aims in the Vietnam conflict.

The majority leader did more than this. The whole tenor of what he said was also a reiteration of our Government's willingness to negotiate for peace without demanding any restrictive preconditions. There is reason to hope that this renewed emphasis on peace talks, evidently made with President Johnson's blessing, may help to nudge the situation off dead center where it now rests.

Senator MANSFIELD rightly said, without seeking to commit the United States to final agreement, that there is at least a basis for discussion in the frequently stated views of Moscow and Peiping—that Vietnam should continue to be split into two zones, and that all foreign military presence should be withdrawn. There is nothing objectionable in such conditions, as long as the people of South Vietnam are assured the right to choose their own government without coercion.

This is one of three conditions MANSFIELD regards as basic. Another is that there could be either an independent South Vietnam or a unified Vietnam, if either kind of setup is based on free elections in accord with the Geneva agreements. The third condition, as MANSFIELD sees it, is that all foreign forces and bases should be withdrawn when peace—with guarantees of non-interference—has been achieved.

Excessive optimism is certainly not justified. But MANSFIELD's summation, along with diplomatic efforts behind the scenes, may have brought us nearer to peace.

THE STEALING OF HOUSEHOLD PETS FOR RESEARCH WORK

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, a vicious black market, operating in the supply of pets for research work, is in operation across our land. It is a scandal which cannot be overlooked because it brings heartbreak to the owners of pets spirited away and results, too, in the most callous type of cruelty to dumb animals.

The scandal, Mr. President, is compounded because this racket—and that is what it is—has grown up around the need for animals in conducting research which is meant for the benefit of mankind. It is true, also, that such research is greatly supported by public money, a fact which means that these dognappers are operating, in a sense under subsidy from the Government.

Parade magazine, in its issue of Sunday, October 10, exposed these rustlers for what they are. I ask unanimous consent that the article from Parade be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANIMAL LOVERS: BEWARE THE PET THIEVES

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Rustlers as vicious as any who ever roamed the Old West are preying on the Nation's pets. Organized dog-and cat-naping rings are stealing animals all over the United States and selling them to hospitals and research institutions. They are making millions by bringing heartbreak to children and elderly and lonely people as well. These pet smugglers are also guilty of the most callous cruelty to animals imaginable.

A Congressional committee recently heard one dog-and-cat farm in Pennsylvania, described as an animal "Dachau," as horrifying as the notorious Nazi gas-chamber camp. Investigators found 700 dogs jammed into a dozen 10-foot-square pens. One pen contained more than 70 dogs, so closely packed they couldn't even wag their tails for their rescuers. Some 400 cats were crammed into stacked chicken crates. Dead and diseased animals lay among the living.

Worse, pet rustling is subsidized indirectly by the taxpayers. That is why, in recent years, it has blossomed from a penny ante crime to its present astounding proportions. Originally, dogs and cats were stolen to be resold as pets or to be returned for the rewards. But the increasing use of animals in medical research has created a boom market, not only for strays but for any cats and dogs that can be delivered. Few questions are asked and fewer answered once a collar has been removed.

Last year laboratories and hospitals receiving Federal research grants spent between $30 million and $50 million on dogs and cats. More than 1.7 million dogs and 500,000 cats were sold to tax-supported institutions. One Federal agency alone, the Poolesville, Md., Animal Center of the National Institutes of Health, spends more than $100,000 a year on dogs and cats.

With such money in the market, supply is bound to meet the demand. Result—wholesale pet smuggling has been reported in most of the 50 States.

IN GOOD FAITH

Most persons do not dispute the need for animals in medical research. Immense benefits in human health have come from such experiments. When laboratories buy animals for research, they do so in good faith. Many suppliers are also reputable breeders and brokers.

Yet investigators believe the overwhelming majority of the dogs and cats that wind up in medical tests are strayed or stolen pets. Once snatched, they are quickly whisked out of the State to make tracing more difficult. To further confuse the trail, they may change hands a number of times. Most transactions are in cash with no meaningful bills of sale. Identifying tags are immediately removed and destroyed.

Ultimately, the animals wind up at pet auctions. Sometimes dogs and cats are sold by the head, more often by the pound. The going rate is about 10 cents a pound. Puppies and kittens fetch as little as 10 cents apiece.

The rustlers have become increasingly brazen as their profits have zoomed and their smuggling networks have become more elaborate. One mother in Arlington, Va., watched a dognaper get out of his truck, stride boldly into her yard, snatch a pet right out of her small son's arms, then beat it down the highway. Bravely, she gave chase in her car and so harried the dognaper that he finally pulled up and released the puppy.

But the owners of most stolen dogs and cats never see their pets again. A 77-year-old lady in Utah watched helplessly as a dognaper enticed her pet out of her yard. A wheelchair patient last month phoned the New York Humane Association to report the loss of her dog. "Is there nothing you can do?" she pleaded. Elaine Beck, a Columbus, Ohio, dog trainer, recently wrote to the U.S. Humane Society—"We in Columbus are having such a wave of dognaping we are almost desperate."

The rustlers have many ruses. If the coast seems clear, they may simply grab pets off the streets or out of yards. Female dogs are used to entice male dogs into wire cages. Meat scraps and dog candy are also used as bait. A Jacksonville, Fla., rustler painted his truck to look official, complete with the lettering "animal shelter" on the sides. Then, posing as a dogcatcher, he used phony pretexts to take pets from their owners.

Some dealers go from door to door pleading for pets to make needy children happy. No child will ever see these animals; they will die on the operating table if they do not die from starvation and cruelty before they get there. A New York high school teacher, who rustled pets as a profitable sideline, trained his 6-year-old daughter to beg for cats, saying her parents needed them to catch mice on their farm.

KENNEL GIMMICK

Other rustlers operate behind the front of kennel keepers. They advertise, offering to board pets while their owners are away. The hapless owners, upon their return, are told with many regrets that their pet became unmanageable and escaped, or had to be destroyed as an act of mercy after contracting virulent distemper.

Many successful pet peddlers, with money to bribe, have persuaded keepers of dog pounds, animal shelters, and even humane societies to sell them pets under the counter.

One dog dealer, who tried to bribe Frank Whelan, superintendent of the Freeport, N.Y. Animal Shelter, claimed two other Long Island animal shelters were smuggling dogs to him. One had used the bribe money to pay for an addition to his house, the other to build a swimming pool.

But in Whelan, the dog dealer picked the wrong man. Not only was Whelan aware of the cruelty in the illegal pet traffic, but only a few days earlier, a collie from the shelter, Shep, had roused Whelan and his wife in time to pick up their 5-year-old son and escape from their burning apartment building. Shep led them to safety. Pretending to go along with the dealer, Whelan helped to convict him on a charge of commercial bribery.

A veteran Connecticut State detective, who broke up a dognaping ring and recovered a number of stolen pets, declared tersely, "I've worked on every kind of larceny, but dognaping is about the meanest. It's tough for parent to tell a 4-year-old that his dog has been taken."

Can the vicious pet rustling racket, with all its animal and human cruelty, be curbed? And can this be done without depriving medical science of much-needed research animals? A current bill would require all dealers to be licensed and inspected for humane conditions. The Agriculture Department would also set standards for transportation, as it does for other livestock. Dealers would be required to house each animal for 5 days, which, coupled with strict provisions for recording the description and origin of each animal, would at least help owners to recover pets that have disappeared.

A dog is a man's best friend, but there are times when a dog needs a friend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the pending question.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9811) to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Harris in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 8, 1965, pp. 26391-26402, Congressional Record.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not recall any farm bill ever considered by the Senate that received longer and closer attention than the bill now before the Senate. Hearings were held on the Senate side for 3 weeks and on the House side for many more weeks than the three I have just mentioned. When the Senate committee completed its hearings, the committee held executive sessions for 9 successive days until we hammered out the bill that was presented to the Senate last month.

After the passage of the bill by the Senate last month, a conference was had with the House. The Senate and House conferees sat for 9 days, morning and afternoon, in attempting to reach agreement, which we did.

Mr. President, I highly compliment the Senators who joined me in the conference with the House. We had quite a few battles. However, at the end of 9 days, we hammered out what I consider to be a fair, comprehensive, and most flexible piece of legislation.

Mr. President, I pay my respects to the two gentlemen sitting to my left—Harker Stanton, who is the counsel on the committee and has been for quite some time; and Henry Casso, our economist.

In my opinion both these men have greatly distinguished themselves before the conference, particularly in the explanation of the bill and its implications.

I spent many hours with these two gentlemen in trying to grasp every facet of the bill. As we all know, the bill dealt with five commodities. I believed that it was necessary for me, as chairman of the committee, to become well acquainted with all the provisions of the bill.

Mr. President, I have a written statement which I shall read into the RECORD. The statement indicates, to a large degree, what the conference finally did.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, would the Senator prefer to yield now or later? I have three or four questions to ask.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should prefer that the Senator wait until later. Does the Senator wish to discuss wheat?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I shall discuss that subject shortly, and when I reach that point, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Very well.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this legislation represents a great step forward in our continuing struggle to provide for orderly production and marketing of agricultural commodities and to produce adequate but not excessive supplies for the protection of both the consumer and the farmer.

Since 1933 we have provided for so-called action programs designed to adjust production to demand, and do away with the excessive overproduction that drives farm prices down, as well as with underproduction which brings high prices and hardships to consumers. I have participated in the agricultural legislation enacted during most of this period, and I think we have been steadily moving forward to meet our objectives. Technology and marketing methods have changed greatly during this period, making our legislative task more difficult.

That abundance should be a serious problem in this world seems ironic. But U.S. farmers would not be able to survive economically without a bulwark against the staggering impact of surplus production on their incomes. The Congress has a solemn responsibility to provide the protection and assistance agriculture must have, not only in the interest of the farmer but of all our citizens and even of the whole world.

Consumers and others should not take lightly the importance to their own well-being of a sound and healthy agriculture. Abundance to consumers has meant an unlimited supply of food and fiber. As a result, the low-cost of food to American consumers in relation to income is not duplicated in any other nation in the world.

In opening the debate in the Senate on farm legislation several weeks ago, I reviewed many aspects of the importance of agriculture in our economy. I shall dispense with the details today but I do wish to point out that many of us do not fully appreciate the tremendous contribution of farmers to our high standard of living. Their willingness to produce even to their own economic disadvantage has kept our store shelves filled to the brim with reasonably priced food.

The dramatic success story of agriculture is all too frequently completely overshadowed by headlines and intemperate statements about farmers and their difficulties and trying problems. One of the most frequent targets is the high cost of Government farm programs. This, too, I discussed in considerable detail in my remarks when the debate began in early September and I shall not repeat. Doubtless farm programs are costly in terms of dollars and cents. But would anyone of us care to put a dollars-and-cents price on starvation or even on a little starvation because of insufficient food supplies?

In addition to the abundance of food and fiber provided to consumers at home and abroad, agriculture contributes substantially to the well-being of our national economy. Farmers are truly good customers.

In recent years farmers have been spending about $29 billion a year for goods and services needed to produce their crops and livestock, plus an additional $15 billion a year for the same things that city people buy, such as food, clothing, drugs, furniture, household appliances, and other products and services.

For example, each year farmers spend over $3 billion for new farm tractors and other motor vehicles and machinery and equipment; about $3.3 billion for fuel, lubricants, and maintenance of machinery and motor vehicles; and about $1.6 billion for commercial fertilizer and lime. Agriculture uses more petroleum than any other single industry; enough rubber to provide tires on nearly 6 million automobiles; more electricity than the six New England States combined; and about 5 million tons of steel in the form of machinery, trucks, cars, fencing, and building material.

This Congress has a great opportunity to complete the enactment of legislation that will benefit everyone through the adoption of the conference report on the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965.

It will protect farm income.

It will give the Government the opportunity to take more positive steps toward eliminating costly farm surpluses.

It will put U.S. farmers on a firm competitive footing with foreign producers with little or no Government export subsidies.

It will assure U.S. consumers an adequate supply of food and fiber at fair and reasonable prices.

It will enable us to continue our unselfish sharing of abundance with those less fortunate at home and abroad.

It has much flexibility.

It is a 4-year program which will make possible more effective planning as a means of achieving our goals.

The pending measure rests on much of the legislation that has preceded it. It provides new tools that have been found necessary and modifies existing tools to make them work better. If used properly, with thought and imagination, and a minimum of politics, these tools should enable us to provide an orderly production and marketing system.

I have long advocated a mandatory control program for corn, with penalties for those who exceed the acreage necessary to provide an adequate supply. In 1937 when we held hearings that led to enactment of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, we had before us a picture of shortages caused by drought in 1934 and 1936, as well as a record crop in 1937, which threatened to bankrupt farmers. We passed a law providing for an ever-normal granary with marketing quotas on corn enforced through marketing penalties of 15 cents per bushel on the excess production. Following enactment of the 1938 law supplies remained in line with demand, and quotas were not proclaimed until 1941. That quota was suspended because of the national emergency. In 1954 the authority for marketing quotas was repealed. This was a mistake. Thereafter our supplies grew to unmanageable proportions and our Government was forced at tremendous expense to buy its way out of this mistake. Since 1961 we have been gradually returning to the type of control we provided for in 1938, although not as rapidly as I thought we should. In fact, history has been repeating itself. Faced with problems much like those we had in the 30s, we moved step by step to meet them in the way we found most effective. In 1961, as in 1936, and in 1956, we provided for payments for diverting land from corn to soil-conserving crops. For 1963 we provided that 18 cents of the support price should be in the form of payments in kind, so that to this extent the protection or the price support umbrella would be removed from noncooperators. For 1964 and 1965 we provided the Secretary with full authority to make such part of the price support available in the form of payments in kind as he found desirable "to insure that the benefits of the price support and diversion programs inure primarily to those producers who cooperate in reducing their acreages." The legislation before us reiterates this, and then goes further to state that the loan level may be reduced below the loan level for 1965 by such amounts and in such stages as may be necessary to promote increased participation. Thus the bill points in the direction to be followed and gives the Secretary the authority needed for a more effectives program. Some of the tools provided in the feed grain portion of the bill are:

First. Authority to promulgate acreage allotments as low as 50 percent of the base acreage.

Second. Authority to penalize violators by depriving them of diversion payments up to 50 percent of the support price—62½ cents per bushel under the current program.

Third. Authority further to penalize violators by loss of price support payments.

Fourth. Authority to bunch up payments on any part of the permitted acreage to remove any incentive for overproduction.

Fifth. Authority to reduce the support level, both loan and payment, to as little as 65 percent of parity—about $1.03—or to increase it to as much as 90 percent of parity.

Sixth. Authority to hold market prices to the loan level through use of payment-in-kind certificates.

Seventh. Authority to encourage the production of soybeans instead of feed grains on the acreage allotment.

Eighth. Authority to encourage diversion of permitted feed grain acreage to wheat or vice versa.

Ninth. Authority to encourage long-term diversion under the cropland adjustment program from feed grains to recreation, or other use.

These are but some of the tools provided by the bill. They permit imposition of much greater penalties than the 15 cents a bushel we provided in 1938. The Secretary has many other tools in the legislation that has been passed since 1933. He has many able assistants here in Washington, as well as in the States, counties, and communities. The feed grain producers should work with him to the end that a truly effective program with a reasonable Government cost may be developed.

Obviously, all of us are not completely satisfied as to specific provisions, but let me assure you that all views have been considered and that this legislation has been carefully worked out and improved step by step to meet all valid objections. From our starting point last spring, it seemed as though any agreement would be impossible. Those working on the legislation through many months and long hours have hammered and fashioned out provisions that are effective and fair to all.

For example, because of the substantial disagreement early this year as to the proper type of program for cotton, that commodity was omitted from the draft bill submitted to the Congress by the administration. The cotton legislation that was worked out in the House provided protection primarily for the domestic cotton mills, but in so doing all but eliminated the protection given the farmer by previous Congresses both as to acreage and as to price. The 16 million acre minimum national allotment, and the 65 to 90 percent of parity price support range were preserved in name, but not in reality. Cooperators were limited to 85 percent of their allotments and received no assurance that they would receive anything for the 15 percent they were required to divert. Noncooperators who had allotments in 1965 could plant all they wanted without being subjected to marketing penalties. The marketing quota referendum was retained, but the only producers subject to marketing quotas were those few who had no allotment in 1965. While the language providing price support at 65 to 90 percent of parity was retained, it was applied not to the production of the acreage allotment, nor to the production of the 85 percent of the allotment that a cooperator was permitted to plant, but only to 65 percent of the allotment. Many improvements were made by the Senate Committee On Agriculture.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture studied the subject very carefully and although there was disagreement, finally approved a version sponsored by me.

During Senate debate, the Committee was not successful in persuading the Senate to adopt its recommendation. However, the plan finally adopted by the Senate contained some of the major recommendations of the committee—among other provisions, the small farm program contained in the committee version was retained. A guarantee of 65 to 90 percent of parity on a farmers entire allotment was also retained. The authority to exceed allotments was limited. Cooperators were permitted to plant a greater percentage of their allotments. The minimum allotment and price support range were given some meaning, and cooperators were given price assurances on their entire allotments, as I have just indicated.

These provisions were further developed in conference and now provide substantial protection for our cotton farmers.

The 16 million acre minimum allotment and the 65 to 90 percent of parity price support range were preserved not only in name, but also as actual effective guarantee of farm income.

The acreage above the 16 million minimum that may be planted without penalty is limited to 250,000 acres in 1966, less in future years unless the carryover is reduced by at least 1 million bales each year.

Mr. President, I think this is a good compromise. It will be recalled that the Senate version provided for a 50 percent overplant of an allotment; but in conference, we struck from the bill the House provision which provided for an open end planting, and reduced that to a maximum of 250,000 acres.

Cooperators may plant at least 87½ percent of their allotments in 1966, more, at the discretion of the Secretary, in future years. On that part which the cooperator is not permitted to plant, the Secretary must make diversion payments available, and those payments must be not less than 25 percent of parity. On that part of his allotment which a cooperator is permitted to plant, price support must be made available through loans and price support payments at not less than 65 nor more than 90 percent of parity. These price support payments, while large enough to assure the farmer of 65 percent of parity on all his permitted acreage, will actually be made on the projected yield of the acreage planted within the farm domestic allotment. This means that a farmer planting less than his total permitted acreage will receive price support at above 65 percent of parity on the yield of such smaller acreage.

Thus, the effect of the minimum national allotment and the 65 to 90 percent of parity price support range are preserved in effect. A producer planting his full permitted acreage must receive at least 65 percent of parity on the acreage he plants, and at least 25 percent of parity on the part of his allotment he is required to divert. The Committee had testimony concerning a farmer in Fresno, Calif., who received a Ford Almanac Farm Efficiency Award for producing cotton at a cost of 18.1 cents per pound. If 28 cents represents 65 percent of parity it would appear that a farmer receiving a diversion payment of 10.5 cents—25 percent of parity—on that part of his allotment not permitted to be planted to cotton would be at least as well off as if he had received 65 percent of parity for planting cotton.

In addition to the price support and diversion payments described above, the producer and the Secretary are permitted to agree upon further diversion of acreage from cotton to conserving uses for payments not exceeding 40 percent of parity.

To emphasize and demonstrate the benefits under the conference agreement on cotton I will use an example of both a small and a large farm.

For the small farmer having an allotment of 10 acres or less, or on which the acreage allotment times the yield is 3,600 pounds or less, the blend price per pound would vary according to the amount of allotted acreage the farmer decided to divert. If this small farmer in 1966 elects to plant his full allotment his blended guaranteed return would amount to 30.8 cents per pound, composed of the price support payment of 21 cents per pound on 100 percent of the allotment; the price support payment of 9.42 cents per pound on the projected yield of the domestic allotment, and the diversion payment of 10.5 cents per pound on 35 percent of the allotment guaranteed notwithstanding the fact that he does not divert. On the other hand, if he elects to divert the maximum permissible 35 percent of the allotment and plant only his domestic allotment, his blend price would amount to 41.7 cents per pound, which is approximately 100 percent of parity. This would be composed of the price support loan of 21 cents per pound, the price support payment of 9.42 cents per pound on the projected yield of the domestic allotment; and double diversion payments totaling 21 cents per pound on 35 percent of the allotment.

The large cooperator who in 1966 reduces his acreage the minimum 12.5 percent required would receive a blend price of 29.5 cents per pound on the projected yield of his permitted acreage. This is composed of a price support loan of 21 cents per pound; price support payments of 9.42 cents per pound on the projected yield of the domestic allotment; and diversion payments of 10.5 cents per pound on the mandatory 12.5 percent acreage reduction. If this same farmer elects to comply with his domestic allotment, which is 65 percent of his effective allotment, his blend price would be 36.07 cents per pound or about 86 percent of parity. This is composed of the guaranteed 21-cent price support loan; the guaranteed price support payment of 9.42 cents per pound on the projected yield of the domestic allotment; the guaranteed 10.5 cents per pound on the projected yield of the mandatory diversion; and 10.5 cents per pound earned on the projected yield of the voluntary diversion. Thus the conference substitute provides the farmer with essentially the same income guarantees which have been developed through the years, while providing for such adjustments in cotton acreage as are required to bring supplies in line with demand.

Both the House and Senate versions and the conference substitute provide for a so-called one-price cotton program, under which the mills will obtain cotton at the world price. I was not in favor of that proposal last year, and I do not favor it this year. But, I express the hope that it will work. I believe it is incumbent upon the textile industry which sought to make it work. Domestic consumption has not increased as the industry said it would. Domestic consumer prices have not been reduced as prophesied. Exports have been curtailed. The bill provides the Department of Agriculture with the necessary flexibility that it and the industry have asked us to provide; and I think they should use this flexibility to increase consumption, reduce consumer prices and expand exports to the general benefit of the cotton economy.

The act's provisions would extend to cotton the basic principles of acreage diversion utilized for wheat and feed grains. This would enable farmers to reduce their cotton acreage without suffering a loss of net income. The lower production level in combination with increased exports and expanded domestic consumption would make substantial inroads in the cotton surplus.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As the Senator knows, the bill is of great interest not only to the domestic cotton producer, but also to 11 countries in Latin America, all of which produce cotton and all of which may well be affected by the action taken by Congress.

These countries are Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Paraguay, and Peru.

Of these nations, Mexico is the most important in this respect and sells its cotton, I understand, at present, at approximately 24.7 cents. What would be the effect of the 21-cent price in this bill on the world price of 24.7 cents?

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me say that the purpose of the support loan is to prevent cotton prices from taking a drastic dip. Further, the loan level of 21 cents refers to Middling inch cotton. As a rule, the cotton produced in Mexico is long staple and therefore commands a premium price.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Personally, I do not believe that it would materially affect the 24.7-cent price to which the Senator has referred. All we are trying to do is to put the cotton producer of the United States in a fair competitive position with other world producers.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator from Louisiana yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What would be the effect——

Mr. EASTLAND. If the Senator will permit me to interject——

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator will allow me to follow through with this continuity——

Mr. EASTLAND. But I have something pertinent to the question asked by the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Go ahead.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, what the 24.7 cent price would do would make Mexico repeal its export tax on the farmers down there. The price is 21 cents and the tax is 3 cents.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is a matter for the Mexican Government to decide.

Mr. MANSFIELD. My second question is: What would be the effect, let us say, on the Mexican cotton economy in view of what has just been said? I believe it would be well to bear in mind that the balance of trade between the United States and Mexico is heavily in our favor, and that this is a factor worth considering.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree thoroughly with the Senator from Montana. I repeat, cotton production in Mexico has been increasing for quite a few years. It is not the purpose of this bill, nor of the administration, to dump cotton we now have in surplus on the market and thereby break world prices.

I assure my good friend from Montana that the purpose is merely to provide a realistic method of competing in world markets so far as we are concerned.

Under the law the Secretary is not permitted, nor is it the intention of the Secretary, to use the huge surpluses we have in the Commodity Credit Corporation—we will have a carryover, in August of 1966, in excess of 15.6 million bales, and dump any portion of that cotton on the market at bargain basement prices. Cotton will be withdrawn from the Commodity Credit Corporation to make up for reduced U.S. production of cotton as a result of our acreage cutback under the bill. Cotton will be withdrawn from the Commodity Credit Corporation to supply our requirements, both domestically and for export. At no time, in my opinion, will the Secretary of Agriculture dump this cotton on the market indiscriminately. The bill provides that cotton will be sold by the Commodity Credit Corporation for unrestricted use at not less than 110 percent of the loan rate, except that the Commodity Credit Corporation can sell at market prices that amount of cotton by which estimated requirements exceed the production of upland cotton but in an orderly manner and so as not to affect market prices unduly.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if I may say a word at this point, the 21 cents a pound loan price is not intended to establish a world market price or even a selling price. The 21 cents would be the loan price to the producer, but he can take advantage of any higher price in the marketplace. The bill places the minimum resale price of regular Government stocks of cotton at 110 percent of the loan price. If you add carrying and handling charges, this will price most of our cotton inventory at 24.7 cents, which is approximately the world market price. It may vary a penny or two, but the loan price is not intended to establish the market price.

Mr. ELLENDER. This is really provided in order to prevent a crash in the market. Before 1964 the law provided for a support price of a certain percentage of parity and an export subsidy. In the past the Secretary of Agriculture announced the support price, and the export subsidy. Under those circumstances our competitors abroad had only to market their cotton at a quarter of a cent or a half a cent below that price and they got the markets, while we became the residual supplier of cotton.

Mr. AIKEN. We also must consider the fact that a good share of the cotton produced in Latin America is marketed by Americans.

Mr. ELLENDER. And produced by Americans.

Mr. AIKEN. And produced by Americans as well.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not believe our friends abroad should be alarmed at this. All we are trying to do is let them know we expect realistic competition from them.

Mr. AIKEN. We are the ones who should be alarmed at any threat to cut the world market, because every cent it goes down it will cost the United States in the neighborhood of $75 million.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. The bill will not play havoc with the world price of cotton, but rather it will enable the American farmers to compete abroad and domestically with synthetics and foreign-produced cotton. What has happened with our price support program in prior years is that cotton acreage in the United States has decreased from 42 to 16 million acres at the present time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And will be decreased still further.

Mr. TALMADGE. And will be decreased still further. While we have been decreasing our acreage and production, foreign production has shot up astronomically.

Fifteen years ago we produced 53 percent of the world's market, or 15 million bales. All the remaining cotton-producing countries of the world produced only 12 million bales. We still produce the same 15 million bales, but the rest of the world has increased production to 36 million bales. So the effect of our high support loan was to hold an umbrella over prices for the entire world, compelling a reduction of acreage in the United States while encouraging increased production abroad. The new cotton program contained in this farm bill, with a loan level based on the world market, eliminates the iniquitous price umbrella system. This will enable producers to compete on the market, both at home and abroad, on a national and realistic basis. It will free the Government from the burdensome task of buying, selling, storing, shipping, and completely dominating cotton and the industry.

And most importantly, it will allow for greater flexibility in future production after the immediate surplus problems have been met.

The conference committee carefully and judiciously analyzed the matter of how increased U.S. exports might affect the foreign producers. There is a very clear, firm statement of policy and intent in the report of the conferees which directs the Secretary of Agriculture to exercise care and caution to market our cotton so as not to break the world price.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted and encouraged by what the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, chairman of the committee, has said, and what the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the ranking minority member of the committee and the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], have said. In their remarks and in some of their statements they have anticipated questions which I dictated this morning.

For example, one of the questions was: What, in effect, does the 21-cent price of cotton mean when other charges are piled on, at least insofar as it affects the American farmer?

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] answered that question.

Another question I intended to ask was that I noted on page 34 of the conference report that—

> It is not the intention of the Congress that large quantities of CCC stocks be dumped on world markets at fire-sale prices.

The question I intended to ask was, Could the Senator amplify that statement and give us assurance that there will be no dumping which would in effect tend to drive the price of cotton down on a worldwide basis?

The answer to the question was that there would be no dumping.

Another question I had was, Has it been the practice in the past for Latin America and other cotton producing countries to shave U.S. prices, whatever they might be pegged at?

I gather, from what the distinguished chairman has said, that that does happen on occasion on a minute basis.

Mr. ELLENDER. It has always happened in the past 10 years under our price support program. They knew in advance that it would have this effect.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Another question: Is my understanding correct that this legislation will lower U.S. production and thereby introduce balance in both the U.S. market, and hence the world market, and very likely have a stabilizing effect?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. That is one of the main purposes of the bill. If cotton farmers cooperate with the Department of Agriculture, there is no question that we can reduce our surpluses. In other words, we are making it possible now for farmers to plant 65 percent of their allotted acres.

It would be up to the farmers to work for the Department of Agriculture in the hope that the enormous surpluses that will face us in August of 1966, which will be 15.6 million bales, as I indicated a while ago, will be cut considerably.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for two more questions?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. First, are world prices established on the basis of the U.S. position on cotton?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not believe they are. Like any other commodity, cotton is sold on the basis of world prices, on supply and demand, on quality, and things of that nature. It is no different than any other commodity.

The only thing that makes our foreign friends fret is the fact that we have so much of the commodity on hand.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Therefore, they are afraid of dumping?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. It is not the intention of the Department to do any such thing.

As pointed out, it would cost an enormous sum to the Government to try to dump, and get nothing for that cotton. All that cotton is there, and it has cost the Government a great deal of money by way of price supports.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The statement of the Senator coincides with the statement of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. Each 1-cent drop costs the U.S. Government $70 million.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is not in our interest to have the price drop.

Is it the opinion of the Senator that the price of cotton will or will not drop by 3 cents as projected between interested countries of Latin America, merely because of U.S. legislation, or is world price affected by world supply and world demand and by price decisions of cotton-exporting countries as well?

Mr. ELLENDER. The world price is affected by world supply and demand as stated by the Senator in the latter half of his question. It is like any other commodity.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The first part would be incorrect. The second part would be correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. And we hope our foreign friends will not attempt to dump their own cotton on the market. It must be sold in an orderly manner.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is no other country except our own which can do any dumping of any significance. It is not our intention to do so. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Although our foreign competitors have no surplus now, when their cotton comes on the market they should make every effort to sell it in an orderly fashion and not dump whatever they produce on the market.

That is one thing that may tend to break the market; not the things that we do, but the things that others will do.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If they have the assurance that we will not dump, on the basis of the limited production they have—they do not have a good deal—they could dump and it would not affect the market.

There may be a question as to why a Senator interested in title I, the dairy section, title II, the wool section, title III, the feed grain section, or title V, the wheat section, all of which I approve, has seen fit to comment on cotton and its relation in the bill to Latin America.

I do so because there is a foreign policy question in the bill before us, just as there will be an important foreign policy question in the sugar bill when it comes over from the House of Representatives.

I believe we ought to recognize so far as this hemisphere is concerned—and I am speaking only of this hemisphere—that there is an interdependence between all the countries which inhabit this part of the world. So far as our own country is concerned, we have a heavy balance of trade in our favor and we have to recognize that when we take we ought to give something for it.

I am delighted, on the basis of this conference report and the statements of the able and qualified Senator from Louisiana, that this assurance is being given to Mexico and 10 other Latin American States which are interested in cotton. All those countries are good customers of ours, and all of them buy more from us than we sell to them.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The bill, if enacted into law, will not greatly improve the world cotton situation unless we have the cooperation of other cotton-producing countries. As I understand the proposed legislation, what we are trying to do is increase the use of cotton greatly, not only in the United States, but throughout the rest of the world as well. If we do that, it will have the effect of reducing our present very large carryover and improve the market not only for the United States producer, but also for producers in other countries. That, as I understand, is the real purpose of the proposed legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is entirely correct. As I pointed out previously, we have provided the Secretary of Agriculture with ways and means of curtailing production in this country. It would seem to me that it would be to the advantage of the cottongrowers of this country to look into the possibility of planting 65 percent of their allotted acres. If they did that, they would find that they would receive about as much net income on 65 percent of their acres as they do now. In doing that they would also be reducing the enormous surplus we have on hand.

It would seem to me that within the next 5 or 6 years we might be able to reduce the huge inventory we have by from 5 to 6 million bales.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. In the event this program does not achieve the purpose for which it is intended, the time may come when we shall have to consider an international cotton agreement, along the same lines we now have on sugar, coffee, and wheat. If everyone does his part, the program will work so far as the world cotton market is concerned.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join other Senators in stating that, so far as the relationship between cotton and synthetics is concerned, cotton is by far the superior product. I hope that the Cotton Council and other groups interested in cotton will do more to propagandize their product, because they have a product which is very much worthwhile. I believe it is being displaced by synthetics in part because of a lack of recognition on their part of the need for propagandizing the values of cotton, which are many, as anyone who has tried both can testify. Cotton is by far the superior product.

I was greatly interested in the proposal, made by the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont, the ranking Republican Member of the Senate, to the effect that consideration might well be given to calling a world conference on cotton, so that some consideration could be given to doing for it what is now being done for wheat, coffee, and other products. I am hopeful that the chairman of the committee and other members of the committee will give serious consideration to the proposal, to the end that it may be brought to the attention of the executive branch of the Government. On that basis some initiative might be taken by that branch of the Government.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks that the majority leader has made, particularly with respect to the use of cotton.

If those who grow cotton and use cotton, the textile industry, the Cotton Council and others, were to spend 50 percent of what is now being spent to advertise synthetic goods, and show that cotton is far superior to synthetics, it would increase consumption substantially.

I express the hope to Senators who are connected in some way with the cotton textile mills that they will persuade their constituents to use as much cotton fiber as possible, because if they fail to keep the cotton farmer in business it may affect the economy of our country.

There is no doubt that if the users of cotton cooperate with the producers of cotton we can go far toward utilizing more of the fiber and thereby permit the growing of cotton again to become a healthy business.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to make a statement relative to the international cotton agreement. If it is going to be handled by the Department of State, God help the cottongrowers of this country.

Now I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana a question: Is not the purpose of the bill to have the cotton farmers of the United States reduce their acreage so as to hold world stocks in line?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. There is a provision that if farmers desire to cooperate, they must curtail their allotted acres by 12½ percent; but on those diverted acres they would receive a payment of 25 percent of parity. Then it would be optional with them whether to plant the 87½ percent remaining acreage. However, if they desire, they can plant as low as 65 percent of the allotted acres and obtain payment.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct; but if that is to be done, the surplus will be locked up and not sold, as has been intimated in this debate.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; the surplus will not be locked up.

Mr. EASTLAND. If that were to happen, the American farmer would bear the brunt of holding world stocks in line. Are we not going to use the surplus to regain our historic share of the international cotton market, as the law requires, without dumping?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Under the bill, if production in 1966, let us say, is below our requirements by 2 million bales, cotton from the Commodity Credit Corporation can be sold in order to make up the 2 million bale deficiency between production and the amount sold abroad and used in this country. In addition, CCC stocks may be released in redemption of payment-in-kind certificates. And, of course, there is no restriction on the price at which CCC may sell for export. Section 203 of the 1965 act requires CCC to sell for export at competitive world prices.

Mr. EASTLAND. The law provides that the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be used to regain and maintain our historic share of the world cotton market.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the law. We hope that that will happen. I was attempting to explain to the Senator from Mississippi that by reducing production, we shall be able to draw cotton from the Commodity Credit Corporation to fill in the gap between production and our requirements for domestic use and for export.

Mr. EASTLAND. And to export more cotton than we have been exporting; is that not correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. I do not wish to alarm the Senator by saying that we hope the farmers of the country will reduce their acreage to 65 percent of their allotment. They may do that if they please. In my opinion, it would be to their advantage to do that so long as there is so large a surplus on hand.

What will happen? If we assume that our domestic and foreign consumption will aggregate, let us say, 15 million bales, and we produce only 13 million bales, under the law 2 million bales can be drawn from the Commodity Credit Corporation and sold at the market price. If there is a shortage of 3 million bales, that amount can be taken from the Commodity Credit Corporation and sold in order to meet domestic and foreign needs for that year.

Mr. EASTLAND. Fifteen million bales would be about the right figure. If production is 13 million bales, 2 million bales would come out of stocks.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Mississippi knows that under the law we have a one-price system, but that there is no limitation on the price at which the Corporation can sell for export. If we can find customers, we can sell all we have on hand.

Mr. EASTLAND. Production is being cut in this country, and it is being cut for the benefit of Latin America.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; the Senator is in error. The Senator is raising a hobgoblin, and he knows it.

What does it cost either the CCC or the cooperatives to store a bale of cotton for a year?

Mr. ELLENDER. That depends on a number of factors. In some warehouses, it may be as much as 55 cents per month.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is an interesting figure; I think it should be placed in the RECORD.

Mr. ELLENDER. It would be between $5 and $6 a bale for a year.

Mr. EASTLAND. Normally, it would cost the Commodity Credit Corporation 37 cents a bale.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Figures supplied to me by the Department of Agriculture show that the cost of acquisition and retention of a bale of cotton in the Commodity Credit Corporation is $25.15, or about 5 cents a pound.

Mr. MANSFIELD. A year?

Mr. TALMADGE. For 2 years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. For what length of time is a bale of cotton usually held?

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the Senator speaking of storage?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of storage.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Georgia is including interest, insurance, and handling charges in his figure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct; everything.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is beyond storage.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. The figure includes interest and other fringe charges.

How long is a bale of cotton usually kept in storage? Two years? Four years?

Mr. TALMADGE. That depends upon the surplus, the grade, the demand, and a number of other circumstances. It would also depend upon the area where the cotton is grown.

I would estimate that the period averages, perhaps, 20 months in the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Just under 2 years?

Mr. TALMADGE. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the same be true of cooperatives?

Mr. TALMADGE. There would be no direct cost to the taxpayer in that case. We were attempting to develop a cost——

Mr. MANSFIELD. But it would be a 20-month cost?

Mr. TALMADGE. The cost of storage during a 20-month period is $20.15. That includes the cost of acquisition, interest, handling charges, grade deterioration, and all other items connected with storage and handling.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand.

THE FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the feed grain program would continue on much the same basis as it has been with some modifications designed to increase its effectiveness at lower cost. As in the case of cotton, feed grain acreage may be held out of production with income-maintaining payments to farmers. Market price support would continue at around world price levels, with direct payments to producers to bolster farm income. This pricing would provide the base for feed grain exports to move upward to new record levels without Government export payment assistance.

The reduction which has occurred in the feed grain surplus in the face of dramatically rising yields is most welcome, even though it has been extremely costly. On the other hand, the program over the past 4 years has made a substantial contribution to the higher farm income level which this year may reach $13.5 billion for realized net income, the highest in more than a decade. One of the factors contributing to the high cost is the relatively low participation so that the acreage diversion efforts of program participants is partially nullified by others. My own personal belief is that a mandatory program would be more effective and less costly. My views have not prevailed and this is one of the areas of compromise. The act does have a provision that would enable the Secretary of Agriculture to increase the direct payment portion of price support as a means of encouraging higher participation through lower market prices. This provision, of course, must be used most judiciously in order to prevent an unwarranted expansion in livestock output through lower priced feed.

The wheat provisions of the conference substitute are essentially the same as those passed by the Senate, except that a new provision has been substituted for the Senate version assuring the producer of a blended support from all Government sources of $1.90 per bushel for 4 years. The substitute provides that, for 1966, the support price for wheat accompanied by domestic marketing certificates must be 100 percent of parity, and price support for wheat not accompanied by marketing certificates shall not be less than $1.25 per bushel. This should assure producers of a total support of $1.84½ in 1966 if parity remains at $2.57 per bushel. For 1967, 1968, and 1969 the substitute measure assures the producer of returns from Government support and payments equal to not less than the toal support per bushel provided for 1966 This gives the wheat producer a minimum assurance that he can rely upon for all 4 years. Any additional returns that might be provided by the market on the basis of market needs for the particular quality of wheat produced, or on the basis of general market factors, would increase the producer's return above that assured by the Government.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee explained very well the provisions of the bill dealing with the wheat section. However, there seems to be a certain amount of misinformation being printed in various farm letters and other publications. I wish to ask a few questions to pin down the provisions of the wheat section a little more firmly.

For 1966 and the 3 following years, the price support for wheat consumed domestically for food is set at not less than 500 million bushels, and that would be at full parity.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. For all other wheat the price support will be $1.25 a bushel for 1966. According to the Department of Agriculture these two support levels would figure out at $1.845 a bushel blended price support for 1966. However, if parity, which was $2.57 a bushel, on June 30, 1965, should drop below that figure by June 30, 1966, the price support could then be a little lower.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. If parity should increase above $2.57, the price support for that portion consumed in the United States for human food would be increased.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The chances are that parity will increase since the costs of farm production are constantly increasing.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Parity on June 30, 1961, was $2.37. On June 30, 1962, it was $2.42. On June 30, 1963, it was $2.51. On June 30, 1964, it was $2.52. On June 30, 1965, parity was $2.57 a bushel.

As the Senator stated, this would bring the blended price to $1.845 a bushel, as estimated by the Department of Agriculture. Then not less than this level of the price support would be guaranteed for the future years of the program.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. Whatever price total support the farmers received in 1966 will be the minimum that they will receive for the years 1967, 1968, and 1969.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. If the loan rate were lowered because the feed grain price support were lowered to which wheat price supports are tied, provision would then be made to pay wheat farmers for their mandatory acreage reduction for which no payment is made now.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. If the allotted wheat acreage were to increase above 50 million acres, this mandatory provision for minimum supports would not be in effect.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The small farm allotments are not a part of the 47.5-million-acre allotments now in effect, and they would not be in the estimated 50-million-acre allotment.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. They would not be counted in the allotment for the purpose of determining whether this mandatory minimum support provision applied.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Is it not correct that, while not stated explicitly in this bill, it was the intent of the Senate-House conference committee to limit the authority to graze acreage diverted under the cotton, wheat, and feed grain programs to disaster situations, and that authority for this would have to be granted by the Secretary?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I believe the Senator has answered all my questions.

I share the feeling of satisfaction of the Senator from Louisiana on finally approaching enactment of a farm bill. A few months ago it did not seem possible that we would have a farm bill. The farmers will now have a 4-year program to look forward to. They will know almost exactly the type of program they will have, so will be able to plan their operations much better.

I pay special tribute to the chairman of the committee and to the staff members for this accomplishment. If it had not been for the patience, ability, and endurance of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, we would not have had a bill at all.

We have had the able assistance of one of the best staffs any committee has ever been blessed with.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is very kind. I return the compliment to him. The Senator from North Dakota was a member not only of the committee, but also of the conference. Except for his patience and diligence in working with us—as is also true of my good friend the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]—we might not have had any bill at all.

We all had our hard times before the conference committee. There is no doubt that if we had not all maintained our patience we would have had no bill at all. However, with the full cooperation of the conferees and our knowledge of what we were trying to do, we succeeded, I believe, in hammering out a good bill. It will all depend on the administration of the measure.

We provided the Secretary of Agriculture with many tools in this bill. I am hopeful that he will use them. The Secretary will have ample opportunity to assist consumers and maintain farm prices at a fair level.

If the Secretary does not do this, we shall, of course, have an opportunity to criticize him and do something about his failure.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I should not want to let this opportunity pass without paying tribute to the chairman of the committee and the manager of the conference report.

The distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana chaired hearings on this bill week after week, sometimes when he was virtually the only member of the committee present. Many of the other committee members were engaged in markup and executive sessions elsewhere.

As the Senator has pointed out, we sat for 9 long days in executive session in an effort to carefully mark up the bill so it would, in every way, be responsive to the needs of the various agriculture commodities. Then, when the measure went to conference, it involved another 9 long days of the same arduous process. It is a complex bill. The viewpoints were rather different, although in the end result, we were able to resolve the most glaring divergencies.

As the chairman of the committee has pointed out, if we had not all kept our heads, we would likely have had considerable bitterness and perhaps no bill at all, had we not approached each dissimilarity in the spirit of fairness and compromise.

In paying tribute to the chairman, I wish to say that every conferee on the part of the Senate executed his duties seriously and diligently. Every conferee worked hard with the dedicated purpose of trying to draft the best bill possible while upholding the position of the Senate. They did this very effectively.

As the chairman of the committee has already pointed out, I do not think that any Senate committee has a more capable, more dedicated, more loyal, or more efficient staff. I refer to Harker T. Stanton, the committee counsel, and to Henry J. Casso, the economist. I have called on them time after time and they have always been most cooperative. If they did not have the information at hand, they always got it.

The other members of the staff, James M. Kendall, Cotys M. Mouser, and all the others have handled their duties in an exemplary manner. I am happy, indeed, to pay tribute to them.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator on behalf of the staff. I know they are deserving of every word he has uttered.

The House bill provided that wheat accompanied by domestic certificates would be supported at parity, or as near thereto as the Secretary determines practicable, but in no event less than $2.50 per bushel. This has created the impression in some quarters that the Secretary had a certain amount of discretion in fixing the support level between $2.50 and full parity. The House conferees and the Department, however, explained that this was not the case. The $2.50 minimum was intended as a floor in the event parity should drop below that figure. The language "as near thereto as the Secretary determines practicable" refers only to the problem of rounding to the nearest penny. The conferees felt that the support level should be full parity, neither more nor less than that, and so struck out the $2.50 minimum provision. With the assurance that any problem of rounding that the Department might have could not affect the support level by as much as a penny a bushel, the conferees left in the language requiring the support to be "as near as practicable" to full parity. Actually the parity price is already a rounded figure, and since the percentage to be applied to it is 100, the support level should be 100 percent of parity without any additional rounding.

The loan level of $1.25 for 1966 should be about the world value, so that wheat will be able to move freely into world markets with no Government subsidy. For 1967, 1968, and 1969 the Secretary is given complete authority to fix the loan value so that wheat will continue to move into export without any subsidy of any kind.

Farmers will receive part of their parity price for domestic consumption from domestic users and part from the Government. The conference substitute adopts the provision of the House bill which limits the cost of certificates to domestic processors for all 4 years to not more than the difference between the loan value and $2 per bushel. On exports, variable certificates will be in effect and farmers would share in any net gain in total export returns over and above Government export payments.

The program would encourage production in line with needs and continue the improved supply-production relationship achieved during the past 5 years. Exports would continue at high levels, and hopefully a larger share would be sold for dollars.

The cropland adjustment provisions would supplement the commodity programs by providing more permanent retirement of cotton, wheat and feed grain acreage with less expenditure of funds. Substantial acreages could be taken out of cultivation under this program. It would be particularly attractive to those farmers who want to shift their farming operations but cannot under their present circumstances. It would also give older farmers who find it difficult, because of their age, to continue farming a chance to make a contribution to the surplus solution by retiring their land.

The assured return that farmers would obtain for long time retirement should enable them to take their acreage out of production at a lower cost to the Government. At the same time, their incomes would be maintained.

It would provide for shifting the land to other uses in recognition of our dynamic and changing land needs. These shifts could enhance our recreational opportunities. The act specifically would provide assistance in using the land taken out of production for hunting, trapping, fishing, and hiking. Our expanding urban populations have greater and greater need for more recreational areas. Conservation practices on these lands could contribute to the prevention of air and water pollution. However, I must emphasize that the major direction of this title would be aimed at less costly retirement of land from the production of surplus commodities.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I have a question relative to the cropland adjustment program. The Senator will recall that after considerable effort, he obtained the inclusion of land producing tame hay, alfalfa, or clover which had been planted within the past 5 years as cropland which might be retired. That 5-year provision was insisted upon by the House.

Then we find another provision applicable to the agreements entered into for the first year, 1966, which requires the producer to divert from production all of one or more crops designated by the Secretary.

As I understand, the Department of Agriculture already has interpreted such crops to mean crops in surplus, or price-supported crops, such as corn, wheat, barley, sorghum, cotton, peanuts, rice, and tobacco, which have acreage allotments or diversion programs.

Mr. ELLENDER. Any crop; that is correct, but the Secretary has indicated that he will attempt to obtain retirement of those crops with allotments or base acreages.

Mr. AIKEN. That requirement is for the year 1966. Then, as I understand, for the following 3 years, agreements entered into do not have the same requirement, unless the Secretary so decides; he can decide how much of what crop shall be retired, and as I understand, it could be any amount from zero to 100 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Am I correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is left to his discretion.

While previous provisions basically reflect in large part the recommendations by the administration, the rice title reaffirms the current program and does not reflect the administration's recommendations for a certificate program. The conferees approved the Senate-passed version to extend to the rice producers the same income protection that cotton, feed grain, and wheat producers are afforded when their acreage is reduced. Rice producers increased their production to meet our increased needs for rice for export and for our foreign assistance programs. It is equitable that if their acreage should be reduced below the present 1.8 million acres, payments should be provided to offset the loss of income on the acreage taken out of rice. However, in no event could acreage be reduced below the present 1.6 million acreage minimum now in the law. The payment provisions would be similar to those for other commodity programs. Another provision would keep the support price relationships between the different varieties where they are presently. The price difference between long- and short-grain rice has been widening rapidly in recent years. This provision would prevent a greater spread than now prevails.

The dairy title would enable producers in the Federal milk marketing order areas to tailor their production to the amount needed for fluid milk consumption. Milk for this use commands a higher price. At present, this higher price and the lower price for milk used for other purposes such as butter, ice cream and nonfat dry milk, are blended together and the producer gets a price reflecting both uses. Under the base plan, he would be able to supply his share of the fluid market and get the higher price on what he produced. This would enable him to discontinue producing for the lower price use if he wished. To the extent that producers in the higher cost fluid areas would utilize this provision, Government surplus purchasing would be reduced.

The plan could go into effect only after approval by producers voting individually in a milk marketing order area.

The wool title continues the payment program on much the same basis as it now is authorized. In an effort to improve the income of sheep producers, the minimum level of price support would be increased. Currently, this increase would amount to about 3 cents per pound. The provision for an increase to small producers have been eliminated from the bill.

The miscellaneous title would—

Permit the Secretary of Agriculture to use acreage measurements or any other means to determine farm eligibility under a USDA program. The Secretary could thus provide for certification by the farmer of his compliance, saving the costs involved in measurement.

Set forth conditions for the sharing of acreage allotments, history acreages, and base acreages in reconstituting farms.

Provide for use of projected farm yields instead of normal yields for all commodities. The farmer would be permitted to prove his actual yields during the base period, and the projected yield could not be less than such actual yield.

Extend the provision authorizing the leasing of specified tobacco allotments.

Continue the exemption of boiled peanuts from the peanut definition for acreage allotment and marketing quota programs.

Authorize the Secretary of Agriculture in cooperation with the Congress to study the parity income position of farmers and report not later than June 30, 1966.

Permit transfer of acreage allotments or feed grain bases on public lands under certain conditions.

Authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase dairy products from market supplies to fill needs of domestic and foreign donation and aid programs.

The eight titles of this act cover a broad spectrum of agriculture. The 4-year life of the proposed legislation fashioned out of many months of hearings and discussions offers an opportunity to execute a more orderly and better planned assault on farm problems than the 1- and 2-year programs of the past few years.

The success of these titles in achieving their goal of more stable agriculture will require more than the passage by Congress or good administration by the Department of Agriculture. Much responsibility rests with farmers, users of farm commodities, exporters and others who by their conduct will govern its success, part success or failure in the final analysis.

The Government with its program can do only so much to protect farmers from themselves. I can sympathize with individual farmers' desires to squeeze the maximum production out of his acreage. But when this added production contributes to a mounting surplus, the farmer is only doing himself economic harm in the long run. Further, when the practices leading to increased production also affect the quality of a commodity adversely as has been demonstrated in some instances, farmers will be losers.

Markets will have an opportunity to operate more freely than under past programs. But with this increased freedom goes the need to act responsibly and not indulge in practices that could lose or limit the new freedom.

As I pointed out earlier, the cotton textile industries have a grave responsibility now to live up to their predictions of the past, if this program would survive. But others who use farm commodities must tax their ingenuity to keep consumption of farm commodities growing and expanding, both in the interests of more people sharing in adequate diets and in the interests of keeping pace with expanding farm production.

Exporters would have an opportunity to move to higher levels of shipments under the world pricing provisions of this act. But, price alone is not enough, the importing countries must be supplied with high quality and uncontaminated commodities suited to their needs.

The bill can open the door to a better and more prosperous agriculture, and I recommend that the Senate approve it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a summary of the principal provisions of the act.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1965

TITLE I—DAIRY

Milk marketing orders: The act amends the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act to provide authority to incorporate in milk marketing orders a so-called class I base plan under which the producers under an order can be allocated their proportionate share of the class I fluid milk marketing on the basis of their marketings in the marketing area during a prior representative period. Producers receiving such a base would be assured that for the amount of milk marketed within their base representing their share of the class I market they would receive payment on the basis of such high value use. On milk which they marketed in excess of their base they would receive only the manufacturing milk price (lowest value use). New producers under an order could only acquire a base by allocation from any overall increase in class I fluid milk consumption in the market or from abandoned bases, or by acquiring a base through transfer from a base holding producer. This plan where adopted would guarantee the producer having a base that he could receive the highest value use price for his base milk while reducing his total production. This authority is permissive and the provisions authorized by this act can only be adopted for a marketing area when separately approved in a referendum by individual producer votes.

In order to protect other markets from being unfairly adversely affected by producers under an order containing a class I base plan getting the advantage of the highest value return for their base milk and then diverting their over base milk to other outlets, authority is provided for providing in connection with a class I base plan for the reduction of payments to be received by such producers under the order to compensate for such diverted marketings and assure equitable participation in marketings (sec. 101).

Title I further amends the act with respect to the issuance of marketing orders limited in application to milk used for manufacturing. For such an order the pricing standards now provided for milk orders on a marketing area basis are to be effective on a production area basis (sec. 102).

It is specifically provided that the legal status of producer-handlers will not be changed by the provisions of this act (sec. 104).

The provisions of this title will automatically terminate December 31, 1969 (sec. 103).

TITLE II—WOOL

Extension of Wool Act: The Wool Act is extended until December 31, 1969, and the support level for shorn wool is fixed at the present level of 62 cents per pound increased by the same percentage as the increase in the parity index (sec. 201).

TITLE III—FEED GRAINS

The present voluntary feed grain program with minor changes would be extended for 4 years—1966 through 1969.

Price support: Price support for corn shall be between 65 and 90 percent of parity and at comparable levels for the other feed grains. A portion of the price support for any feed grain included in the acreage diversion program will be in the form of a payment in kind. That portion of the support price made available through loans could be reduced below the 1965 loan level gradually to promote increased participation in the diversion program but so as not to disrupt the feed grain and livestock economy (sec. 301).

Acreage diversion program: The act provides for a feed grain acreage diversion program for the 1966 through the 1969 crops of feed grains similar to the program presently in effect. Payments will be made for diverting feed grains at such rate or rates as the Secretary determines will provide producers with a fair and reasonable return for the acreage diverted not in excess of 50 percent of the estimated basic county support rate. The feed grain diversion program will include corn, grain sorghums, and, if designated by the Secretary, barley. (Malting barley may be exempted by the Secretary.) Oats and rye (and barley if not otherwise specifically included) may also be included by a producer who so requests in order to utilize such acreages for the purpose of substituting wheat and feed grains. The provisions of law permitting the substitution of wheat and feed grains are continued in effect (sec. 302).

TITLE IV—COTTON

The act provides a 4-year program for cotton—1966 through 1969.

Price support: (1) The act continues cotton allotments at the 16-million-acre minimum national allotment level; but in order to be eligible for price support, producers, except those on small farms, must reduce their acreage of cotton below their allotment by 12½ percent in 1966 and by such amount not to exceed 12½ percent as the Secretary prescribes for the 1967 through the 1969 crops. Producers on small farms (farms on which the acreage allotment is 10 acres or less or on which the normal production on the acreage allotment is 3,600 pounds or less) do not have to reduce their acreage below their allotment in order to qualify for price support (sec. 402(b)).

(2) Loans to cooperators will be made at not more than 90 percent of the estimated world market price for cotton (21 cents in 1966) (sec. 402(a)).

(3) Additional price support will be made available to cooperators in the form of direct payments of not less than 9 cents per pound

on the cotton planted within the farm domestic allotment (a domestic allotment is to be established for the farm of not less than 65 percent of the farm acreage allotment representing the producer's share of the cotton used for domestic consumption). This payment when added to the loan rate, however, must be sufficient to reflect at least 65 percent of parity to producers on the estimated yield of the acreage permitted to be planted by cooperators. In order to be eligible for price support payments, the producer must also participate in the diversion program (sec. 402(a)).

Diversion payments: For reducing their acreage of cotton by the amount necessary to qualify as cooperators, producers will receive diversion payments at a rate of not less than 25 percent of the parity price on the estimated yield of the acreage diverted. In the case of small farms, the producer will receive a diversion payment at this rate on the estimated yield of an acreage equal to 35 percent of the farm acreage allotment without actually diverting such acreage. The Secretary may permit small producers to reduce their cotton acreage, and other producers to reduce their cotton acreage further, but not below the domestic farm allotment, in which case the producer will receive diversion payments at such rate as the Secretary determines but not more than 40 percent of the parity price. Price support payments and diversion payments are conditioned on the farm devoting to conservation uses the acreage diverted from cotton, in addition to the acreage normally devoted to conservation uses. Provision is included for protecting the interests of tenants and sharecroppers, including sharing the payments on a fair and equitable basis (sec. 402(a)).

Minimum CCC sales price: The act provides that for the period August 1, 1966, through July 31, 1970, CCC shall sell upland cotton for unrestricted use at the same price as it sells cotton for export, in no event, however, at less than 110 percent of the loan rate, and that CCC shall make available for unrestricted use at current market prices a quantity of cotton equal to the amount by which the production is less than the estimated requirements for domestic use and for export in-kind certificates issued to cover price support and diversion payments could be redeemed by CCC for cotton at a value per pound equal to not less than the current loan rate. In-kind certificates issued under the 1964 and 1965 programs are not subject to these restrictions (sec. 404).

Export market acreage: Producers with allotments may at their election forgo price supports or payments, and plant cotton in excess of their allotment to the extent of the acreage allocated to them for this purpose and may sell it into export without paying marketing quota penalties. However, the total acreage which may be allocated to producers for this purpose is limited to 250,000 acres for 1966, and this amount will be reduced in 1967, 1968 and 1969 unless there is a specified reduction in the national carryover of cotton (sec. 401, amdt. (2)).

Sale or lease of allotments: The sale or lease of cotton acreage allotment between farmers is authorized, subject to certain restrictions, within a county, or in other counties of the same State if farmers within the county approve in a referendum the transfer of allotments to purchasers in other counties (sec. 405).

TITLE V—WHEAT

The present wheat program would be extended for 4 years—1966 through 1969—with certain changes.

Wheat marketing certificates: The wheat marketing certificate program would be similar to the one presently in effect, with the following changes:

(a) Producers would be assured 100 per centum of parity or as near thereto as the Secretary determines to be practicable for the domestic allocation of wheat (i.e., the wheat used for human consumption in the United States). For 1966, producers would be assured full parity for the domestic share (sec. 506).

(b) Producers will be eligible for loans on the rest of the wheat planted within their allotment at a level based on competitive world prices of wheat and the feeding value of wheat in relation to feed grains. For 1966, producers would be assured not less than $1.25 (sec. 506).

(c) For any of the years 1967, 1968 or 1969, in which a national acreage allotment is established which requires producers to divert 10 percent or more from the 1959–60 base, the Secretary is required to assure producers a total average rate of return per bushel at least equal to the return assured for the 1966 crop. This may be accomplished, however, through a combination of loans, domestic certificates, export certificates and diversion payments (sec. 506).

(d) Domestic wheat users will be able to purchase marketing certificates from Commodity Credit Corporation at the difference between the loan rate and $2 a bushel on the amount of wheat used in the processing of food products (sec. 516).

(e) Domestic wheat users would not have to purchase marketing certificates to cover wheat used in the manufacture of "second clears" used for industrial purposes (sec. 504(b)).

(f) The Secretary is authorized also to exempt processors from purchasing marketing certificates on (i) wheat processed for use on the farm where grown, (ii) wheat processed for donation, and (iii) wheat grown by a State institution or other agency and processed for use by the State or agency (sec. 504(a)).

(g) Authority is provided for a variable export certificate to replace the present export certificate of a fixed value. Variable export certificates will be priced to exporters on a daily basis at the difference between prices on the domestic market and prices in the world market. The net proceeds from the sale of export market certificates, after deducting export subsidies paid to exporters, would be distributed to eligible producers on a pro rata basis (sec. 513).

Diversion program: The diversion program would be similar to the present program. Producers may divert an acreage of wheat, in addition to the acreage required to be diverted, not in excess of 50 percent of their allotment or sufficient acreage to bring the total diverted acreage on the farm to 25 acres whichever is greater. The rate of payment for diversion may not exceed 50 percent of the loan rate for wheat (sec. 501, amdt. (9)).

Computing allotments: A number of minor changes are made in the existing law to simplify the method for computing allotments effective beginning with the 1967 crop. Under the new method, State, county, and farm allotments will simply be computed on the basis of the preceding year's allotment, being raised or lowered, as the national acreage allotment is raised or lowered (sec. 501, amdts. (3) through (8)).

Substitution of wheat and feed grains: The provisions of law permitting substitution of wheat and feed grain acreages would continue in effect.

Minimum CCC sales price: The minimum price for sales of wheat from CCC stocks would be 105 percent of the loan rate, as under the program in effect for 1964 and 1965 (sec. 505, amdt. (3)).

TITLE VI—CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT

Cropland adjustment program: (1) The act authorizes a long-term cropland adjustment program under which the Secretary is authorized to enter into long-term agreements with farmers to assist farmers in turning their land to noncrop uses and promoting the development and conservation of soil, water, forest, wildlife, and recreational resources.

(2) Agreements may be entered into during the calendar years 1965 through 1969 for periods of not less than 5 nor more than 10 years. Agreements entered into in each of the next 4 fiscal years may not obligate more than $225,000,000 per calendar year.

(3) The total acreage placed under agreement in any county or local community would be limited to a percentage of the total eligible acreage so as not to adversely affect the economy of the county. Agreements entered into under which 1966 is the first year of the agreement shall not provide for diverting from production upland cotton in any county in which the county committee determines that there should not be such diversion in 1966.

(4) Agreements cannot be entered into covering land with respect to which the ownership has changed in the 3-year period preceding the first year of the agreement unless the new ownership was acquired by will or succession as a result of the death of the previous owner or was acquired prior to January 1, 1965, under circumstances which the Secretary specifies by regulation will give adequate assurance that such land was not acquired for the purpose of placing it in the program.

(5) Producers would be required to carry out a conservation practice on a specifically designated acreage of land on the farm not regularly used in the production of crops and to maintain the practice for the duration of the agreement; not to harvest any crop from or graze the land except in cases of natural disaster; and to comply with such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary prescribes. Agreements entered into under which 1966 is the first year of the agreement shall require the producer to divert from production all of one or more surplus crops (after 1966 the Secretary would have discretion to set the required percentage).

(6) Payments under such agreements may not exceed 40 percent of the estimated value of the crops diverted. The rate or rates of the payment may be increased if the producer agrees to permit access by the general public for hunting, trapping, fishing, and hiking under cooperative agreement with State and local wildlife authorities.

(7) Provision is made for protecting the interests of tenants and sharecroppers including sharing on a fair and equitable basis in payments under the program.

Transfer of funds to other agencies: The act would permit the Secretary for the purpose of obtaining an increase in the permanent retirement of cropland to noncrop uses to transfer funds available for carrying out the program to any other Federal agency or to States or local governmental agencies for use in acquiring cropland provided he determines that the purposes of the cropland adjustment program would be accomplished by the action and provided the terms and conditions are consistent with and the cost no greater than those under cropland adjustment agreements with producers.

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS

Checking compliance: The act authorizes the Secretary to use other methods in lieu of actual measurement in ascertaining the acreage of any commodity or land use (secs. 701, 702).

Lease and transfer of tobacco allotments: The act extends through 1969 the authority to lease and transfer tobacco allotments. In addition, it provides that when acreage-poundage quotas are in effect for any kind of tobacco (except burley, cigar-filler, and cigar-binder (types 42, 43, 44, 53, 54, and 55)) the lease or transfer is to be on a pound-for-pound basis (sec. 703).

Boiled peanuts: The act continues the exemption of boiled peanuts from marketing quotas through the 1969 crop.

Parity income studies: The Secretary is directed to make a study of the parity income position of farmers and to report the results to Congress by June 30, 1966 (sec. 705).

Transfer of allotments on public lands: The act authorizes the Secretary subject to certain conditions to transfer, upon request of a State agency, an allotment from any farm composed of State-owned public land to another farm composed of State-owned public land in the same county (sec. 706).

Reconstitution of farms: The act prescribes rules for dividing allotments when part of a farm is sold (sec. 707).

Use of projected yields: The act authorizes the Secretary to use projected yields in lieu of normal yields in the determination of farm yields. It provides that the projected yield may not be less than the actual yield proved by the producer (sec. 708).

Purchase of dairy products: The act authorizes CCC to purchase dairy products when there is not a sufficient supply of such products in its stocks to meet commitments for schools, domestic relief, and foreign distribution (sec. 709).

TITLE VIII—RICE

Price support: The act provides that for 1966 and 1967 the head and broken rice value factors for the various varieties of rice may not be reduced below those used for the 1965 crop and the differentials between the value factors for the various varieties cannot be increased (sec. 802).

Acreage diversion program: The act authorizes an acreage diversion program for rice for 1966, 1967, 1968, and 1969. The program is to be operative, however, only if the national acreage allotment for such year is reduced below the 1,818,638 national acreage allotment in effect for the 1965 crop. Such program would be similar to the diversion programs for other commodities. Payments would be made to producers who comply with their rice allotments, divert a specified acreage to an approved conservation use, and comply with requirements prescribed by the Secretary (sec. 801).

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, as a junior Member of the Senate, and also as a junior member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I have already expressed my commendation to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana in stating my very deep interest and concern with the enactment of the proposed legislation.

With the highest of admiration and commendation for the Senator from Louisiana, I do not believe that we would have had a farm bill if it had not been for the determination and patience of the Senator from Louisiana. I know that many provisions in the conference report were not to his liking but, apart from that, he was determined that the American farmer should have, this year, an omnibus farm bill. It is to him, more than to any other Senator, that we owe the conference report today. I also commend him and the other conferees of the Senate for what I believe to be an excellent conference report. It is a report which, in many respects—and in this connection I refer especially to the controversial cotton provisions—is an improvement over both House and Senate versions.

I particularly commend the Senator from Louisiana because I believe that he played a vital part in the fashioning of the provision of the conference report on the overplant of cotton.

It will be recalled that the House bill had almost an open end, so far as the overplant provision was concerned. The Senate attempted to provide a tightening in that provision, but I believe that the final version, as incorporated in the conference report, is far superior and makes much more precise the overplant provision which could, in a way, if unchecked, defeat the basic purpose of the cotton provisions of the conference report.

There was a provision in the original House bill adding two limitations; first, that the farmer exercising the overplant provision must have an allotment; second, if the farmer exercising it had more than one farm, he could not use the overplant provision on one farm and come in under the provisions of the act on the other farms.

But the conference has added precision by definitely fixing the limited number of acres that may qualify under the overplant provision. I recall that the provision contemplated that there should be no more than 250,000 acres. Again that figure, while fixed definitely for the crop year of 1966, is tied to succeeding years of the conference report.

Another condition of the cotton surplus assures, therefore, that the provision for the overplant may not be utilized to counter the purposes of the conference report; namely, to reduce the surplus of cotton in storage.

The overplant provision after 1966 will be reduced if there has not been a substantial reduction—as I understand the conference report—in the carryover of cotton in storage. It therefore fits in with the basic purpose of the conference report. I know from conversations which I have had with the Senator from Louisiana that most of the provisions, in this instance, derive from the Senator's ideas.

Therefore, I wish in particular to express my appreciation to him for what he has done in this regard, as well as for the many other contributions he has made to the proposed legislation.

I believe that this is a landmark in farm legislation, and has provided the American farmer with a period of time which will enable him to set up an orderly program and to demonstrate—I believe fairly—how American agriculture can progress.

In particular the cotton provision, as it maintains and preserves the one-price cotton system, will contribute to the progress, protection, and salvation of the American cotton farmer and the American cotton industry.

Reference was made by the distinguished chairman of the committee to the fact that, in a way, the American textile industry was on trial in connection with the legislation. I am sure the American textile industry, a large part of which is located in my State, will measure up to meeting the challenge.

A few days after the passage of the bill a distinguished and able leader of the industry, Mr. James P. Harrell, connected with the J. P. Stevens Co., in a public statement referred to the fact that the American textile industry was in the planning stage for the development of plants costing $190 million—representing a substantial expansion in the textile industry of this country and in the consumption of cotton goods.

I believe, therefore, that this presages not only faith on the part of the industry, but also of the cotton farmer.

Before I conclude, I wish to pay a special tribute to one who I think made a great contribution to the cotton section of the bill, the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE]. In that connection, it is only fair that I should incorporate in the RECORD a paragraph from a fine article which appeared in the September 18, 1965, issue of the London Economist, under the title "Farms Break Free." It comments on the Senate version of the cotton provisions of the bill before us. It pays a deserving tribute to the Senator from Georgia. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD that paragraph from the article which refers to the contribution of the Senator from Georgia in this field.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Whether political science purists like it or not, the committee system is crucial to the operation of Congress and committees are rarely overturned in a vote on the floor. But Senator TALMADGE, whose plan for cash subsidies for cotton had been rejected in the committee, of which he is a member, chose this moment to make what would ordinarily be a daring gamble. He rallied the Senators from New England with their still-remaining textile mills, all of whom wanted low cotton prices. He rallied his southern colleagues from the two Carolinas and Alabama, which grow cotton but also have even more textile mills than New England. He rallied the Californians, who grow cotton so efficiently that they want no Government controls or subsidies and are happy to live with low prices because they can sell both at home and abroad. He also argued his case brilliantly. In an unusual victory for sensible change, Mr. TALMADGE won last week by 62 votes to 24 on the floor of the Senate; for once the majestic Committee on Agriculture was beaten. Senator ELLENDER, the chairman, shook hands with the Georgian with good grace after the defeat was inevitable and the debate finished. The rest is just a matter of reconciling technical differences between the House and Senate bills on cotton and other crops.

Mr. President, in connection with the Colloquy that took place with reference to the purpose and effect of the cotton provisions of the bill, a colloquy in which the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] participated, I particularly call the attention of the Senate to an analysis of the cotton provisions of the bill as made by the distinguished editors of the London Economist. This is their comment:

> Cotton exchanges and cotton merchants will awake from their Government-induced slumber. Buyers in Liverpool will once again find American cotton competitive. For bet-

> ter or worse, Mexicans, Guatemalans, Turks, and Sudanese will no longer be able to sell their entire crop by shaving the price a half cent below the fixed American price (fixed even with an export subsidy), which up to now has left the Americans as mere residual suppliers. At home the textile mills will no longer receive a subsidy but they will get their cotton at the lowest price for 20 years.
>
> None of this would amount to more than an interesting incident if it did not illustrate how determined the United States is to get and keep its share of world markets for farm products. Sales of maize are growing dramatically. Sales of wheat, which admittedly depend to a great degree on the hazards of weather abroad and on gifts under the food-for-peace program, are also doing extremely well, at least at present. In cotton, the American share of the world market has dropped from more than 40 percent at the end of the Second World War to probably less than 25 percent this year, but now it is a foregone conclusion that American cotton will again be a vigorous competitor. * * * The issue was decided by the transparent idiocy of the former policy, which kept American prices higher than the world price and allowed other countries with less efficient methods of production to reap the profit.

That is fair comment on the bill. An attempt is being made to enable the American farmer to sell at the world price and not to allow other countries with less efficient methods of production to reap the profit and steal the market from American farmers.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina also played a crucial and important role in connection with this bill. He was influential both in the committee and in the Senate.

Does the Senator agree, with reference to the cotton surplus of 15 million bales, that it does not mean we are going to dump it on the marketplace? Dumping is one thing; competition is another thing. But the meaning of the bill is that we are going to compete actively in the markets of the world and use Commodity Credit Corporation stocks to do it.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. That is my understanding. That is the intention of the bill, as stated by the commentator in the very fine and able London publication.

In conclusion, let me commend the members of the conference for what I believe is a very fine conference report and one that will contribute a great deal to both the cotton farmers and the cotton industry.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. First let me express my deep appreciation and gratitude to the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina for his complimentary personal references. Second, let me say I have seen no new Member of the Senate, in the relatively brief period of time I have served in the Senate, who has applied himself more diligently and effectively to the task of being a U.S. Senator than the able junior Senator from South Carolina. We are fortunate indeed to have him on the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee.

His knowledge of all phases of agriculture is deep and intense. His knowledge of cotton in particular is of great value to the committee. He comes from a State where cotton is a crop of major importance, not only to the farmers who produce cotton in South Carolina but to the textile mills in the State as well.

The textile mills in South Carolina employ more people than does any other industrial activity in the State. The same thing is true of Georgia.

The able Senator from South Carolina has done a magnificent job on this particular farm bill. I was pleased to have him as an associate. His work was highly effective. I commend him.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia. No one has a better understanding of cotton than does the Senator from Georgia. Certainly, so far as the cotton provisions of the bill are concerned, they are largely his handiwork. I heartily commend him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to commend the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Russell] for the great work he has done as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and for the outstanding work he has done as a Member of the U.S. Senate. No one has represented his State with more diligence, vigor, integrity, and industry than has the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Russell].

I want the record to show that, as majority leader, I am indebted to him for the cooperation and understanding he has shown and also to the people of South Carolina for having him represent them here.

Mr. AIKEN. Having served with the Senator, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for a long time, and under him as chairman for much of that time, I naturally have listened with considerable pride to the testimonials which have been given to him on the floor of the Senate today.

So far as I am concerned, I shall not repeat what I have said many times before. I believe I shall merely get a tape recording expressing my approval of the operation of our chairman and ask to have it played every time he handles an agriculture bill on the floor. That will save everybody time.

I agree with what has been said about him. He has brought out the best bill that it was possible to get. It is not a perfect bill. It will not be a cheap bill, as far as cost is concerned, but we hope it will help considerably in stabilizing and increasing the income of the agricultural producers of the United States.

Mr. President, I do not wish to take any more time. It appears to me that discussion on the bill is about finished.

The discussion by the House sets forth very ably the understanding in regard to the dairy title of the bill in which I am interested, since about 80 percent of the agricultural income of my State comes from dairying.

I agree with the interpretations which were placed in the Record when the House considered the conference report.

I ask to have printed in the Record a statement, which I have prepared, setting forth my understanding of the dairy provisions of the conference report.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Dairy Provisions of the Conference Report—Statement by Senator Aiken

The conferees accepted the House version of the class I milk base plan under which the bases or quotas would be allocated to producers on the basis of their marketings of milk during a representative period selected by the Secretary. It was the understanding of the House Committee on Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the author of the Senate version that the language of the House bill would provide for allocation of bases only to producers who had a history of marketings within the milk marketing order area during the base period.

The House Committee on Agriculture, in its report on the bill (Rept. No. 631) on page 12, explains the provision as follows:

"The new clause (d) would provide authority to include quota or base provisions in Federal milk orders under which the higher values of the preferred sales under an order would be distributed only to those producers who supplied milk to the marketing area in the base period. Bases would be assigned to such producers based on their respective marketings in the base period. Milk marketed by a producer in excess of his allocation would not share in class I sales and the producer would receive only the surplus value of such excess regardless of its use. Producers not having such a base would not share in the class I sales of the market. They could, however, obtain a base if transfers of existing bases were authorized under the order or in the event of an increase in the total class I sales in the market or the abandonment of bases by other producers, such producers could be assigned a base representing part of such increase or abandoned bases."

Various Members of the House made clear their understanding of the House provision was the same as that of the House Committee. Mr. Smith of California, in discussing the House rule for consideration of the farm bill, made the following statement on August 17, page 20700 of the Congressional Record:

"The dairymen's base plan seeks to reduce surplus milk production by removing the necessity for dairymen to maintain maximum production in order to preserve individual participation in the markets for milk. Title I would assign to each producer in a milk order area a fluid milk base, enabling him to receive a higher price for milk consumed in fluid form on a specified part of his production, in lieu of a price on total production for all purposes. This title was not part of the administration's original bill."

On August 18, Mr. Olson of Minnesota expressed his concern over the House provisions restricting allocation of bases to producers marketing in the particular order area. I quote Mr. Olson's remarks from page 20922 of the Congressional Record:

"The dairy title of the bill will grant a monopoly to the local fluid milk producers. It does this by authorizing provisions in orders which would allocate fluid milk sales to producers currently on the market, with such allocation based on the producers' production record which may cover more than a year. This means that all the high value market would be assigned to fluid milk producers and none of this market would be left to pay producers who are seeking to enter the market and better their economic condition.

"Thus, present producers will be granted a right to these markets and other producers will be denied entry and the right to sell their milk to the best advantage.

"The only time a new producer can earn a base or quota, as this proposed legislation is drafted, is when fluid milk—class I—sales increase."

In the hearings on the bill before the Senate Agriculture Committee, Senator MONDALE, on July 15, 1965, queried Secretary Freeman on this point as follows:

"Senator MONDALE. * * * Would a class I base plan be administered to divide fluid milk sales among producers under the order at the time of the adoption of the plan or would new sources be permitted to come in freely?

"Secretary FREEMAN. I think new sources could be permitted to come in freely under the bill that has been before the Senate. I think they would not be permitted to come in freely under the bill that has passed the House.

"Senator MONDALE. Will new producers of outside milk be able to enter the market and receive its full class I value without first having to earn a base during some specified production period?

"Secretary FREEMAN. The answer is the same as to the previous question.

"Senator MONDALE. In other words, your understanding of the Senate version as we now see it is that outside milk could come in freely and earn a class I base and receive a class I price.

"Secretary FREEMAN. Yes, that is my understanding. Under the Senate bill, both new producers and those who have been in the milk business but not in a given market can come in and get a base in due course as well.

"Senator MONDALE. Now, can an outside milk producer ship class I milk into the milk market order area?

"Secretary FREEMAN. Under the Senate bill, yes.

"Senator MONDALE. And sell it in the first instance for class I price?

"Secretary FREEMAN. That is my understanding."

At no time during its consideration of the farm bill did the Senate committee develop any other interpretation of the House provisions.

The Senate version of the class I base plan was inserted as an amendment in the Senate by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. In his presentation of the amendment, he noted the differences between his amendment and the dairy title of the House bill. I quote his explanation of the difference between the two versions with respect to entry of new producers under an order when quotas are in effect (p. 23533 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 13):

"Mr. PROXMIRE: * * * Here is how the amendment differs from the House dairy section—title I of the agriculture bill as it passed the House.

"First. With respect to the entry of new producers into the market, the House bill provides only that an increase in class I sales, or forfeited bases would be made available to new producers and hardship cases. My amendment safeguards free access to a milk marketing order by providing that producers who delivered milk, but not under the order, at the time the allotment provision becomes effective under an order, would receive allotments on the same basis as those who were at that time delivering under the order."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, since I expect to speak briefly in opposition to the conference report, I shall be glad to defer to any Senators who wish to speak in support of it. If any Senator wishes to speak in support of the conference report, I yield to him.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator from Florida. I believe the Senate owes a debt of gratitude to the conferees on the farm bill for the thorough and expeditious manner in which they handled this long and complex bill. They brought it through the conference and to the Senate in a minimum amount of time. I commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for his leadership in steering the bill through the many pitfalls of a Senate-House conference.

My State has over 300,000 farm families. That is more than any State in the Union. It is the stronghold of the family-type farm.

There is a division of opinion in Texas on the conference report. Some of the communities in my State are opposed to certain sections, but they believe it is better than the law we have now.

I supported the committee version of the cotton title on the floor of the Senate. It was called the Ellender program, after the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana. When the program of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] was adopted, I thought that it was a much better plan than that contained in the House bill. I commend him for his work on it.

My State has 152,618 cotton farms contrasted with California which has 10,467. Last year the value of our cotton was $566 million; in California it was less than one-half of that, $295 million. California with 10,000 farm families raises $295 million worth of cotton, and yet Texas, with 152,000 cotton farming families, raised $566 million.

Texas is the stronghold of the small farm. We have 30,000 families, I believe, with less than 10 acres apiece. Naturally, with that diversity of interest it is impossible to write a cotton provision that would meet the approval of everyone.

We find objections in some quarters of the cotton-growing industry and cotton-producing industry of my State to the provisions of the bill. We are caught in a complex situation where we have been losing a foreign market.

After the invention of the cotton gin, cotton was the chief bulk export of America for more than 100 years. It was the greatest export of America and gave us our trade balance for more than 100 years.

There is some objection by the dairy interests to the dairy section of the bill.

Laying all of that aside and considering the difficulty that the committee had wrestling with the bill, I believe it is one of the most difficult bills that comes before Congress and the country. As a lawyer and as a former judge I see no matter that comes before Congress that is more complex than this legislation. I believe that the committee has done a good job and has tried to be fair to all concerned.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Texas, of course, does not believe that foreign countries should write our farm policy on exports?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I do not.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator agree with me that this surplus should not be locked up, but should be used to go into the export markets aggressively, and that we should export American cotton and capture those markets for the American farmer?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I agree with the Senator from Mississippi. The fact that other nations compete with us and hold a share of the cotton market is no reason why we should lock in the cotton farmers of America merely because many nations are beginning to raise cotton, some with the encouragement of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator believe that we ought to write the tax laws, or subsidize the tax laws, which we are doing, such as the 3-cent export tax?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Does the Senator mean that this country ought to pay for that?

Mr. EASTLAND. If we lock up the surpluses and refuse to sell it above the market plus export tax, are we not subsidizing an export tax?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. We have a large surplus of cotton and I believe we should aggressively market that surplus. Our loss of the world market is not due to American inefficiency.

Mr. EASTLAND. If we lock up the surplus and refuse to sell it above the market price plus export tax, we fix our export prices at that figure. Is that not really a subsidy of the Government?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I have not studied the export tax laws of other cotton raising nations. I have studied the provisions of the bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. Assuming that what I say is correct, would we not be subsidizing those governments?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is a hypothetical question, which I am not prepared to answer at this time. However, I can categorically state to the Senator that I am not in favor of locking up our surpluses. I am not in favor of withdrawing from the competitive cotton market. I say that our farmers can produce cotton and hold their own in competition.

Mr. EASTLAND. Competition is one thing; dumping is another. What the Senator means is that he would aggressively enter the export market.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes.

COTTON

The cotton section of the bill is of great importance to my State. Although the language of the bill is quite technical and complicated, the total price which the farmer receives for his cotton, commonly referred to as the blend price, can be broken down into three component parts.

First. A price support loan not to exceed 90 percent of the world price for Middling 1-inch upland cotton. This loan is set at 21 cents per pound for the 1966 crop.

If the price of cotton rises above the loan level, the farmer can sell it on the open market, and pay off the loan. If the market price stays below the loan level, he can deliver his cotton to the Commodity Credit Corporation in lieu of paying off the loan.

Second. A price support payment of not less than 9 cents a pound. This is a direct payment to the farmer. For the 1966 crop the rate is set at 9.42 cents per pound.

Third. Diversion payments. In order to participate in the program at all, a farmer—except those under the small farm exemption—must retire at least 12½ percent of his effective allotment. He has an option of retiring an additional 22½ percent, for a total of 35 percent.

The rate of payment for the acreage required to be diverted shall be not less than 25 percent of the parity price. The rate of payment for the additional diverted acreage shall be not less than 40 percent of the parity price. For 1966 the farmer will receive 10½ cents per pound for the projected yield of the acreage diverted.

The sum of these three payments adds up to the total that the farmer receives for his cotton.

It is obvious that the cotton farmer has many options open to him. The pricing system is designed to discourage overproduction by providing a higher price per pound the more the farmer reduces his plantings. A farmer who reduces his acreage the minimum amount of 12½ percent will receive a blend price of 29½ cents per pound. If he reduces his acreage 25 percent, the price per pound rises to 32.67 cents per pound. If the farmer reduced his acreage by the maximum 35 percent, his blend price will rise still further to 36.07 cents per pound.

Small farmers are exempted from diverting acreage in order to be able to participate in the program. For the purposes of this program a small farmer is one with 10 acres or less or a projected yield of 36,000 pounds or less. If he plants his full amount he receives 30.8 cents per pound. With a reduction of 25 percent his blend price rises to 37.5 cents a pound. If he diverts the full 35 percent he receives 41.7 cents per pound, almost 100 percent of parity.

The more acreage a farmer diverts, the higher the price he will receive per pound. This should encourage a reduction in the number of acres planted and hopefully, a reduction in our current surplus of cotton. At the same time, the program is designed to maintain the income of cotton farmers. As a member of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee I shall be watching closely the results under this new program to be sure that the cotton farmers' income in fact does not suffer.

OTHER PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The other sections of the bill are also of great importance to Texas, which ranks third in the Nation in cash receipts from farming, with a total of $2,304 million in 1964.

The bill enacts a new dairy program designed to stabilize the production of milk.

The National Wool Act of 1954 is extended for 4 more years, with modifications to encourage increased wool production.

The present feed grains program of price-support loans, purchases, and payments is continued for 4 years, with minor modifications.

The wheat title should raise wheat farmers' incomes by about $200 million per year. A minimum support price of $1.84½ per bushel is established. The most important change is that the price of wheat used for domestic food consumption will be supported at 100 percent of parity, around $2.57 per bushel.

The very important cropland adjustment title is expected to add 8 million acres per year to uses such as vegetative cover, water storage facilities, and other conservation purposes.

Finally, Mr. President, I would like to renew my plea, which I made on September 14, when this bill passed the Senate, that the Secretary of Agriculture initiate a study to determine how we in America can better utilize our enormous agricultural capabilities to alleviate hunger both at home and abroad. When many of our own people go to bed each night hungry, when most of the people of the world go to bed each night hungry, and when this great country of ours produces so much food that it has to devise ways to cut down on surplus production, then the signs are clear that we are suffering from myopic vision as far as our farm programs are concerned. We must end this shortsightedness and design our farm programs so that they will serve the needs of our whole society.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, unless other Senators wish to speak in support of the conference report, I shall make my brief remarks in opposition to it now.

Before I begin my brief remarks I should like to say that no one could speak too highly about our distinguished chairman and the other conferees on the part of the Senate, excluding, of course, the present speaker. I have never seen a more cooperative conference.

I have never seen finer leadership than that which was shown by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

His able remarks in support of the conference report will serve as a text for many people throughout the Nation who will be trying to discover for themselves what this complicated measure may mean.

Since I signed the pending conference report as a Senate conferee, and since I intend to vote against its adoption by the Senate, I feel that I should make a brief statement of my position at this time.

The RECORD will show that I voted against the Senate bill at the time of its passage. Nevertheless, as a Member of the Senate conferees it was my clear duty to represent the Senate and to endeavor to work out a conference bill which would be as near as possible to the Senate action and would represent a tolerable compromise between the Senate version and the House version. We all understand that there were many differences between the two bills.

The conference was a long one and a highly controversial one, though entirely free from personal animus of any kind on the part of all conferees. For 9 days the conferees worked on this task, and I truly feel that the conference version of the bill is an improvement over either the Senate bill or the House bill. It was in my opinion the best bill that the conferees were able to work out. Feeling that way, and after 9 days of cooperation with other conferees from both Houses, I signed the conference report to help get this final measure before both Houses for adoption. As a Senate conferee, I tried to represent the Senate.

When it comes to my vote on the conference bill on its merits I shall, of course, represent what I deem to be the convictions of the people whom I represent as well as my own convictions, and I am frank to say that I feel sure that a great majority of Floridians who are engaged in agriculture are strongly opposed to much that is included within this bill. I share that conviction and will therefore vote against this conference bill on final passage as an accurate expression of the convictions of my constituents and of myself.

Without attempting to outline all of the reasons why I oppose the bill, or to mention those provisions in the bill which I could and would gladly support if they stood alone, such as the wool program and the program for cropland adjustments, I wish to state for the record five of the principal reasons which now impel me to oppose the conference bill and vote against it:

First. I think the bill is much too expensive. It is my belief that the bill will require the expenditure of more than $4 billion in each of the 4 years covered by it. I think that friends of agriculture in the Senate, in the House, and in various agricultural groups who support the bill are contributing to the early demise of a meaningful agricultural program by making the bill so expensive.

Second. I strongly feel that the bill delegates too much discretion to the Secretary of Agriculture. No matter how well intentioned any Secretary of Agriculture may be, I do not feel that it is wise to give him such wide discretion in administering a program which carries with it the power of economic life or death to literally thousands of American citizens who are engaged in agricultural pursuits.

Third. I greatly deplore the fact that the bill takes the largest step yet taken by any Federal legislation in this field to adopt the so-called compensatory payment or production payment program which was the principal feature of the long ago discredited Brannan plan. This feature is made the essential part of the cotton price-support program. Once applied to a large basic commodity such as cotton, there will be an increasing trend to apply it to other and perhaps all basic commodity programs. I know that there are thousands of American farmers who dislike this approach exceedingly and regard it as in essence a welfare or dole program in which they want no part. I deeply regret that the passage of the bill will launch us on a general price support program which is headed in that direction and which I think will ultimately contribute to the abandonment of any reasonable program for the assistance of American farmers.

Fourth. I am particularly concerned about the provision in the cotton title of this bill which, while the production of cotton in most areas is being discouraged and decreased, will open the door to the expansion of cotton acreage and cotton production in those areas principally the Far West where the production per acre is vastly above the national average. This bill provides that in the first year, expanded acreage to a total of 250,000 acres is permitted to those producers who are willing to forego any reliance upon the price-support program and to market their total production of cotton in the foreign market. For the second, third, and fourth years of the program, the expanded acreage might equal 250,000 acres or less, depending upon the amount of carryover from the preceding year.

In my judgment, this provision may easily lead to a substantial increase in the production of certain premium grades of cotton and to a reduction of our opportunity to sell in the foreign markets our heavy surplus of cotton now on hand. Since the principal purpose of the cotton title of the bill is to allow us to regain world markets and dispose of our heavy stockpile of cotton on the world market, it seems to me that this unfortunate provision of the conference bill may go far to defeat the principal objective of the cotton program instead of to assist it. In addition, such expanded acreage and production which would largely come in the irrigated areas of the West would bring further disaster to the cotton farmers of the Southeast and particularly to the thousands of small producers whose acreage is limited and who are already existing on an economic basis that scarcely enables them to live.

Fifth. I am also opposed to the dairy provision which I voted against when it was inserted in the Senate bill on the floor. I have received many telegrams from Florida dairymen stating that the dairyman class 1 base plan authorized by title I creates a trade barrier on the movement of bulk milk or packaged milk between Federal marketing order areas in such a way as to create a monopoly condition which, in turn, can only set up higher consumer prices.

I have been informed that the plan is almost identical to the plan ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in the Lehigh Valley case.

Under the Federal milk marketing order system we could have three marketing orders in Florida and, as an example and as stated in the many wires which I have received, milk could not be shipped from a plant in Winter Haven to Orlando or from a plant in Jacksonville to Orlando without creating chaotic conditions.

Mr. President, I shall read into the RECORD a telegram I received from C. H. Birdson, of Winter Haven, Fla. Mr. Birdson is a reputable dairyman in my own county. I shall read the telegram for emphasis and then read the names of the senders of a large number of other telegrams from dairymen of the State of Florida, all of whom are strongly opposed to the dairy title of the conference bill. The telegram from Mr. Birdson reads as follows:

> MIAMI, FLA.,
> *October 12, 1965.*
>
> Hon. SPESSARD HOLLAND,
> *U.S. Senate,*
> *Washington, D.C.:*
>
> The dairyman class 1 base plan authorized by title I of the omnibus farm bill creates a trade barrier on the movement of bulk milk or packaged milk between Federal marketing orders in such a way as to create a monopoly condition which in turn can only set up higher consumer prices. This plan is almost identical to the plan ruled unconstitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court in the Lehigh Valley case. I urge you to please vote to send this bill back to conference until the inequities have been corrected. In Florida we could have three marketing orders and could not ship milk from a plant in Winter Haven to Orlando or from a plant in Jacksonville to Orlando without creating chaotic conditions.
>
> C. H. BIRDSON.

Mr. President, Florida has only one Federal marketing order at this time. It is confined to the Gold Coast area—Miami, Fort Lauderdale, and West Palm Beach. However, other marketing orders are in prospect of negotiation at this time.

One refers to the Tampa-St. Petersburg area, and the other to the Orlando-Jacksonville area.

The cost of production in those three areas is different. The conditions of production and of marketing are different. Therefore, these three areas have to go into different marketing areas.

The illustrations given by Mr. Birdson relate to the one marketing area already created and the two which are hopefully in the process of creation at this time.

Mr. President, I have also received similar telegrams. I shall not ask that these telegrams be printed in the RECORD, although they are here for any Senator to examine if he wishes.

I have received similar telegrams from Mr. Paul Crum, of Tallahassee; Mr. Reed Hetherington, of Hollywood; Mr. William M. Keeler, of Miami; Mr. J. T. Butler, of Lakeland; Mr. Milton J. Roberts, of Jacksonville; Mr. Cecil Lewis, of Miami; Mr. John S. Poston, of Hollywood; Mr. Russell Nicholl, of Fort Lauderdale; Mr. Sherman Templeman, of Tampa; Mr. Marion Baccus, of Key West; Mr. Vernon Malin, of Plantation; Mr. Robert G. Atchinson, of Winter Haven; Mr. Richard Stucky, of Jacksonville; Mr. Ellis W. Walker, of Miami; Mr. Blaine Phillips, Jr., of Jacksonville; Mr. Walter Falardeau, of Delray Beach; Mr. O. P. Hatch, of Live Oak; Mr. J. Johnson, of Jacksonville; Mr. P. N. Smith, Jr., of Ormond Beach; Mr. J. C. Searcy, of Winter Park; Mr. Mason Copeland, of Plantation; Mr. Charles Dunlap, of Plantation; and Mr. G. W. Weber, of Plantation.

Mr. President, such an outpouring of protestation from reputable dairymen in all parts of our peninsula, and extending as far over in the Panhandle as Tallahassee, indicates strong opposition indeed on the part of the dairy industry of my State to the provisions of this dairy title, which is title I of the pending conference report.

Mr. President, for the five reasons which I have just outlined and for other reasons which I regard as less important, I shall vote against the adoption of the conference bill.

Having stated my position as to why I shall vote against the adoption of the conference report, I want to call the attention of the Senate to a provision contained in the statement of the managers of the House and approved by the conferees of the Senate concerning farm labor which appears on pages 37 and 38 of the report and in which I am in complete accord. This provision reads as follows:

> Farm labor: A provision relating to farm labor was in the Senate bill but was deleted on the floor by a narrow margin—

I digress long enough to say that the vote of the Senate was a tie vote, and the vote of the Vice President was required to defeat the amendment in the Senate bill just referred to.

I continue to read:

> In spite of the fact that there is no provision with respect to farm labor in either the House or Senate bills, the committee of conference recognizes that the success of any agricultural enterprise is dependent upon an adequate labor force to carry out the farming operations. It has voted to include in this statement of managers the following statement on this subject by the committee of conference:

I emphasize the fact that this action was taken by the conferees of the House as well as by the conferees of the Senate, although the statement is made only by the conferees of the House.

I continue to read the statement:

> "The committee of conference emphasizes that an adequate force of capable labor is essential to the efficient production and harvesting of agricultural commodities. It is deeply concerned over the inadequate supply of such labor this year, particularly to the producers of perishable crops.
>
> "Agricultural labor shortages in 1965 have had serious consequences. Crops have been lost. Plantings have been reduced because of uncertainty created by governmental policies with respect to agricultural labor. Crops lost or not planted because of inadequate labor will necessarily injure the consumer and the economy as well as the farmer. They will also reduce the number of job opportunities in agriculture and related industries.
>
> "This shortage of capable labor has resulted from administrative actions which have failed to sufficiently recognize the needs and problems of agriculture and which have imposed requirements on farmers never authorized by Congress. To avoid the subordination of agriculture's interests, it is the unanimous view of the conferees that the Secretary of Agriculture should collect necessary facts concerning requirements for and availability of agricultural labor and submit such information to the Attorney General in connection with determinations as to wheth-

er farmers are to have needed supplemental foreign labor."

We are speaking of supplemental farm labor from the Dominion of Canada, from the Republic of Mexico, and from the islands of the Caribbean area generally spoken of as the BWI, the British West Indies Islands.

I continue to read:

> "The Congress recognized the need for such information and made provision therefor by authorizing the Attorney General, in carrying out his responsibilities, to consult with appropriate agencies of Government. There is no question but that the Department of Agriculture is the appropriate agency to determine facts concerning the requirements of agriculture and the extent to which, and timeliness by which, they are being met.
>
> "It is the opinion of the conferees that under the practice now prevailing in which the Attorney General has relied almost entirely on the Department of Labor, the findings and recommendations of the Secretary of Labor have been in many instances too little and too late to meet the critical needs of producers."

I express my fervent hope that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Attorney General will take cognizance of the will of the Congress as expressed in the statement of the managers of the House and approved by the Senate conferees, including the provision which I have read.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I was a member of the conference committee on behalf of the Senate.

I have never known a group of men who did harder work and put forth more effort and were more zealous in trying to report out a farm bill that was adequate and helpful to all areas of the country than was the conference committee.

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], our leader, did outstanding service. He is one of the great agricultural leaders in the history of this country.

The present bill is one of the best bills that could have been reported, based on what the Senate passed and what the House of Representatives passed.

The distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] did highly intelligent and outstanding work. He has written a new chapter in the history of farm legislation.

I do not agree with it. I believe that a farmer is entitled to a support price in the marketplace. However, the Senate has decided otherwise. Congress has decided otherwise. Our chairman and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are to be complimented and congratulated upon the fine work they have done.

It is an old rule that if we reduce cotton acreage in the United States, that same acreage will be planted abroad. That has happened for many years. I am alarmed by what I hear on the floor of the Senate today. Evidently the Latin American countries are being permitted by our State Department to write our cotton export program, to lock up the surplus, to pay the American farmer not to produce, and to permit the foreign countries to take over the markets of the American farmer.

That would be a catastrophe of the first order. This bill will dry up many small towns in the South. I should not like to see the State Department transfer the prosperity of those small towns to foreign areas under the guise of foreign policy.

The pending bill contains a provision for the old, discredited soil bank. I shall vote against the conference report. I believe that people have to work and produce for a living. The way such legislation, in our prosperous economy, has worked in the production of wealth violates the principle that we cannot build a prosperous economy based on a dole from the Federal Treasury.

The bill, in my judgment, is the result of the confused thinking and the muddling efforts of our State Department. It is a negative approach to a positive problem. The abundant productive capacity of the American farmer is placed in a straitjacket at a time when all restraints should be removed.

Our problem is not one of overproduction, but one of poor distribution. We should not be restraining production but encouraging it. The time, personnel, and money devoted to policing the controls placed on our farmers should be devoted to developing the means of exchanging food and clothing with a hungry and naked world of underdeveloped countries rich in the raw materials needed so badly by our industrial plants.

Mr. President, every newscast I have heard in recent years, and every newspaper I have read, is full of the fighting between hungry people around the globe. We have the capacity to reduce that hunger, but by this bill we will be further restricted from the opportunity. We need the iron ore of Brazil—they need our food. We need the minerals of many nations that need the food we cannot produce under this bill.

Mr. President, this bill reactivates the old discredited soil bank concept that the Congress refused to finance for its duration a few years ago. It aims at taking 40 million acres of cropland out of production. Cropland adjustment will result in downward adjustment in community economies, downward adjustment of farm employment, further maladjustment of urban communities in a farm labor migration to the towns to complicate housing, schools, and welfare programs.

This bill will dry up small southern towns which depend on agriculture for their economic base. It will adjust downward the volume of business done by cotton gins, compresses, implement dealers, gas and oil distributors, seed and fertilizer dealers, and the whole gamut of farm production suppliers. This reduced volume will eliminate profits and dividends and all across the country will liquidate businesses in rural communities with the loss of capital investment.

Mr. President, the cropland adjustment program will permit the retiring of up to 25 percent of the cotton allotment in any county. This in itself could be destructive to the cotton oriented business establishments. The bill goes further and requires the farmer, in order to be eligible for price supports and payments, to reduce his acreage by 12½ percent. The inducements in the bill would encourage farmers to reduce their acreage by 35 percent. Over the life of this bill it is possible for the Government to require and induce farmers to reduce their plantings of cotton by up to 60 percent of the allotted acres. No small town can withstand this type of curtailment in its production activities and remain alive economically.

Many of the communities in areas where farmers are going out of cotton production have already made their adjustments and redirected their production activities. Farmers in these communities have released their cotton acreage to be reapportioned to other farmers in the county or within the State. Through this device the community economy has been sustained and other communities have increased their economies through the production of cotton on the reapportioned acres.

Though this bill does not change the reapportionment provisions of the law, it has in effect nullified the effects of the existing law by providing that the farmer who releases his acreage will receive a Government rental on 12½ percent of it and the cropland adjustment portion of the bill can tie it up for periods as long as 10 years. This bill is designed to destroy the cotton industry and the rural communities in the Cotton Belt. I am sure it was not deliberate, but the effects will be there just the same.

At the end of the 4-year period that this bill covers the cotton farmer will have reduced his productive capacity in equipment and labor and it will be impossible for him to retool and obtain labor to begin producing for export. It simply means that we have now restricted the American cotton farmer to the domestic market. Never again will American farmers have the opportunity to supply world needs of this fiber that contributed so much to the development of this country in its formative years.

Mr. President, it is an injustice to force the American cotton producer to pay for the sins of his Government. In 1956 we enacted legislation directing the Secretary of Agriculture to exercise his existing powers to price American cotton at the world level and to regain and maintain our historical share of world cotton markets. Following the enactment of this legislation we averaged nearly 6 million bales annually over a 5-year period. During the last 4 years, however, exports have dropped to an average of 4,500,000 bales or a reduction of a million and a half bales annually. If we had exported the 6 million bales that were required under the law our carryover in cotton would have been of manageable size and our surpluses would be practically nonexistent.

This bill is too hard on the southern farmer. It hangs the cotton farmer for the crime committed by his Government. It is the greatest injustice ever done to an economic segment of our economy in the history of this country.

In this bill we have taken away the very moderate loan level guaranteed under previous law and thrown our farmers on a support price less than the estimated world price. In order to recover the costs of production and any profits that might accrue from his operations, the cotton farmer must look to his Government on bended knee for a check. His future is made dependent upon a declining world price and the generosity of the taxpayer represented by the Congress. In my judgment these are the first agonizing throes of sure death. My own view is that cotton farmers must have adequate acreage and a support price which will give them adequate income in the marketplace.

We force our cotton farmers to produce by buying the inputs of fertilizers, insecticides, and labor in a protected market. Through our tax structure, minimum wages, and other legal provisions we insure that his costs will be higher than his foreign competitors, and then we very liberally provide him with a loan level at 90 percent of the estimated world price.

Mr. President, the Government has been entirely too hard on the cotton farmer. Apparently we have decided that he is expendable because we have put together in this farm bill the means of assuring his demise. We have taken away all of the incentives toward efficient utilization of land, human capabilities, and capital. We have insured that his income will be restricted on these investments to a very limited level. With the passage of this bill we have insured the accelerated relocation of rural people in urban areas, with the resultant disturbances that must necessarily take place in both economic and social fields.

I cannot condone the effects of such legislation, and am forced to vote against the bill as a protest, because I believe it will destroy the cotton producers and allied establishments which are basic to the economy of my State.

The land retirement provision would destroy the economy of the towns and cities in many areas of the South and West. I admit that I am shocked at what is evidently the policy of the State Department: That rather than entering the market and aggressively competing for the farmers of the United States in the export markets, they would lock up the surplus and transfer the great American cotton industry abroad.

I heard the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] describe what cotton meant to his State. It means the same, to a smaller degree, to my State. If that is the program, the bill will be doomed to fail. I do not believe, that we should pay American farmers not to produce, and then turn foreign growers loose to produce whatever they desire. Why is this not a mutual affair? If world stocks are to be brought into line, why should not all cotton-producing nations participate therein?

Again I say, as we have reduced in the United States, the same amount of additional acreage has been planted abroad.

Mr. President, for these and other reasons, I am opposed to the conference report and opposed to the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I spoke briefly regarding a special problem reflected in the bill that was originally before the Senate, the bill which came before us from the Senate Agriculture Committee. I then referred to the land retirement feature contained in that bill. I find now, on further study and analysis—and I say this with great deference to those who worked on this bill, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and others—that on the feature of land retirement, the bill as now presented is more pronounced and goes even further than did the Senate bill as presented to the Senate originally. That is my understanding and analysis of the bill.

Mr. President, in the area of the Cotton Belt where my State is located, and particularly the area of that State where I live, these land retirement provisions have been devastating to the economy of the community, the county, and the entire surrounding area.

In early 1961, the Senate passed the Small Grain Act, and I voted for that measure. We understood at that time it was a temporary measure, to meet a temporary situation. But it is still on the books, and still retiring acreage from grain production. Further, since 1950, Mississippi has lost, in round figures, one-third of its cotton acreage. In 1950—that was before the Korean war started, when the acreage had theretofore been determined—we had in round numbers 2,225,000 acres in cotton production in Mississippi. For 1964, we had in round numbers, 1,545,000 acres, a difference virtually one-third, a reduction of 750,000 acres has occurred in the last 14 years.

When we apply, on top of that picture, the reductions which are possible under the pending bill, we are faced with a situation where the producer, as a practical matter, is almost compelled to surrender 35 percent of his acreage, or plant only 65 percent thereof in order to take advantage of the high price supports.

There are further provisions which provide for the possible retirement of acreage. For the first year, the farmer can apply for a 10 percent additional reduction, and then, if he wishes, an additional 15 percent for the second and succeeding years, for a total of 25 percent added reduction; and we will have a further possibility of voluntary reductions in acreage in county where cotton is not a major part of the economy. But even if we have only the 35 percent reduction, which I take to be a certainty, we will have—on top of the general reduction which has occurred over the last 14 years—and the impact of such a major added reduction on the entire economy of the communities in my area will be terrific.

Were we to take out of production a third of the factories which exist in any industrial area, we would have a fair comparison of the impact which will be caused by taking away one-third of the acreage in production. Those who manufacture and sell fertilizer will have their business reduced that much; those who manufacture and sell farm machinery will be reduced that much. The business of the country crossroads store will be greatly and adversely affected. Those who sell fuel, those who sell all the products that go into making a cotton crop, the suppliers of bagging, ties for the balers, the gins, and all the items which go into making up the economy of a cotton producing area will be cruelly affected. For some it will mean going out of business. For the community it can bring stagnation. The laborers, the tenants, the renters, all those who live on the land where they have always lived and made their living will be left without a job and without land. They will be forced to leave. They are the ones who serve the economy, who are the consumers, the purchasers at the store. They buy in the towns; they are a part of the going concern of the community. They are left without anything to do. They leave. They go to the towns; if they do not find jobs, which is usually the case, they get on the welfare lists, or drift further across the country.

In a few years we shall probably have a relaxation of acreage controls, after we have reduced the surplus. We shall then have to turn back and put more cotton acreage into production. However, the same acreage will not be returned to production. The workers will be gone. The economy will have been destroyed. Land will not have been cared for in many instances. The older citizens will have passed on and the young ones will have moved away. The land will therefore not be returned to production. Nevertheless, it will show up in the overall acreage of the Nation, but as in the past, it will show up in the cotton States to the west.

Those are the conditions which will really take the heart and life out of the agricultural economy in many areas of the South. Congress enacts bills day after day, from the antipoverty program on to gifts and grants and financing of programs that cost many billions of dollars. We have been providing something for everyone. This bill however, literally cuts the lifeblood out of large areas of the agricultural communities where countless thousands of citizens are working and making an honest living on the land and earning enough to provide them a good standard of living.

To that extent this bill is a reversal of the many remedial acts which Congress has been enacting, at this session.

I know how difficult it is for those who represent us on committees to put together a bill and adjust the differences as well as they can be adjusted, and take care of the multitude of situations with which they are confronted.

I appreciate particularly the skill, dedication, and devotion of Senators some of whose names I have already mentioned, including with emphasis the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] who is one of the most valuable Senators on hand. I should like especially to include the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who is always a highly valuable member on committees. I deeply appreciate the hard work that these men do. There is no more important work anywhere in the Senate. They have done it year after year. Yet, the pending conference report, I believe, will adversely affect great areas of my State and of many other States in the Cotton Belt. Then it will be too late to repair the damage.

Therefore, with the greatest deference, I cannot support the bill. I hope that somewhere along the line a better bill can be worked out here, one which I can actively and vigorously support.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I cannot support the conference report on this bill. I believe that it should be turned down with instructions to the conferees to go back to the House conferees for the purpose of restoring the alternate feed grains program to the bill.

Let me say, however, that I shall support the agriculture appropriations bill, as I have consistently done every year, because without the money to carry out a farm program, we would have no farm program. I fully recognize that without a farm program the agricultural economy of this Nation would be in even worse straits than it is now. As I pointed out in my supplemental views in the Senate Agriculture Committee's report, studies by research economists at Iowa State University, Cornell University, Penn State University, and others make it clear that without Government farm programs, net annual farm income would seriously decline. One may question the amount of the decline which the economists estimate would occur, but all are generally agreed that the situation would be deeply serious.

As I pointed out in my supplemental views, the present feed grains program is not getting the job done. Since 1961, production of feed grains instead of going down has gone up—a total of almost 17 million tons. Our Iowa farmers have no apologies to make to anyone over the extent to which they have signed up under the feed grains program. Nationally, fewer than 50 percent of the farmers have done so, but in Iowa over 65 percent have complied. But due to the defects in the feed grains program, only 25 percent of feed grains acreage in Iowa has been retired from production and only about 15 percent of feed grains production has been eliminated.

There are two principal reasons for the failure of the feed grains program to bring about a reduction in production:

First. The program makes it advantageous for a farmer to retire only 20 percent of his feed grains acreage—the minimum amount; instead, he should be given an incentive to retire more of his acreage, which would tend to avoid the retirement of the poorest acreage, as is now being encouraged.

Second. The program is on an annual basis, so that different acreage can be retired from one year to the next, bringing into production acreage which has lain fallow the previous year and is thus capable of better production with less fertilization.

My alternative feed grains program, which the Senate committee approved and which the Senate also approved, would have avoided these defects. We received assurance from representatives of the Department of Agriculture that there was no objection to having the alternative program included in the bill. While these representatives indicated that they planned to use the present feed grains program for 1966, they gave assurance that they would give consideration to the alternative program for later years. Also, since this is a bill calling for a 4-year program and since it is almost impossible to forecast developments, it was felt that the alternative program gave the Department another tool to use in a flexible response to developments.

In the face of this, the action of the conference committee in deleting the alternative program is inexcusable. The fact that the report simply states the alternative program was deleted, demonstrates the lack of reason for such action. Instead, the conferees have decided to persist with a program for 4 years which is not going to reduce production except at an excessive cost to the taxpayers. And the failure to bring about a balance between production and consumption is going to continue the problem of farmers receiving a fair price for their production. With parity below 80 for the past 3 years, with costs of farm production steadily increasing, the cost-price squeeze on our Nation's farmers has worsened; and there is every indication that it will continue—forcing more farmers off the farm. Administration spokesmen generally claim that there is no intention to reduce the number of farmers to 1 million, but the actions of their leaders in Congress belie their words.

The approach adopted by the modified feed grains program is to give the Secretary of Agriculture the power to lower the loan support price for feed grains—and to increase the production payments to offset this action—for the purpose of forcing more farmers to volunteer to come into the program. I know that the bill recites this lowering of the loan price shall be done in such a manner as to not disrupt livestock prices, but it will, nonetheless, leave in the hands of one man, the Secretary of Agriculture, a nonelected public official, the power to determine what does and what does not constitute a disruption of livestock prices. Furthermore, the approach of compulsion vitiates the alleged voluntariness of the program. It fails to recognize that there are many farmers who will not come into the program regardless of this action by the Secretary. There are some who simply cannot cut back their feed grains acreage and make a decent living for themselves and their families; there are others who have an unfairly low feed grains base acreage compared to their neighbors; and there are still others who prefer to feed their production and take their chances with the livestock market.

Iowa is one of the greatest feed grains producing States in the Union. I do not believe that the farmers I represent should have the income of themselves and their families placed under the discretionary power of one man, not elected to office, no matter how friendly to farmers he may profess to be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. Président, I move that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. TALMADGE moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], a faithful member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, is devoted not only to the agricultural interests of his own State, but also to the well-being of farm families throughout the Nation. During the time when our committee met day after day in executive session working out details of the bill later passed by the Senate, the Senator from Kentucky contributed much to our discussions, and on several occasions helped work out solutions incorporated in the bill. Later, after the Senate passed the bill, he was named as one of the Senate conferees to work out the final form of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, and I know that he canceled several engagements in Kentucky because he knew that his first duty lay in helping us complete the work on this important measure. The Senator from Kentucky participated in the work of the conference during those 9 days, and was one of those signing the conference report, which has brought the omnibus farm bill in agreed form before the House and Senate today.

The Senator from Kentucky could not be here today, but he has asked that a brief statement concerning several provisions of the farm bill, and a more comprehensive statement reviewing the general situation with respect to surplus production and farm prices be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statements of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] are as follows:

SALE OF ALLOTMENTS THROUGH LAND TRANSFER PROHIBITED

The Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 as reported to the House and Senate by the committee of conference, contains in section 707 essentially the Senate provision on the reconstitution of farms, which will become a new section 379 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. As the Senate provision is the one which I offered and which was adopted by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and later by the conference, I think it appropriate to refer to its purpose so that the legislative history will be clear.

The purpose of the provision is to prevent the effective sale of allotments through the transfer of land, which it seemed to me could have been accomplished through a device contained in regulations issued by the Department of Agriculture on April 22, 1965, authorizing a new and different criterion for the division of a farm's allotments when part of the farm is sold. A description of this situation and the intent of my amendment are contained in my individual views on pages 133 and 134 of the Senate committee report.

I considered that the new regulation could have led to the consolidation and concentration of allotments, particularly burley tobacco allotments, and that the regulation provided a means for indirectly accomplishing the sale and transfer of burley allotments—even though burley is now specifically excepted from the authority to lease and transfer tobacco allotments. The effect of my amendment, therefore, is to strike down the April 22 change in regulations and to remove the possibility that it or some subsequent ruling would be used as a device to effect the sale of allotments, but to preserve the comprehensive September 26, 1964, regulations of the Department governing the reconstitution of farms.

The new section 379 requires that when part of a farm is sold, the allotments for the farm shall be divided according to the proportion of cropland on the parent farm and the tract sold—which is the basic method which has always been followed—specifying, however, five areas of exception in which the Secretary is provided discretion to regulate the method to be used in determining the division, as he had done under the regulations issued on September 26 of last year and for some time previously.

During the Senate-House conference, officials of the Department of Agriculture indicated that the Department had no objection to the new section 379, and that in fact it would be helpful to have these long-established criteria expressed in the statute, but sought a further exception for discretionary regulation by the Secretary, presented as clause (6). It seemed to me that under the Department's suggested addition, the Secretary might again authorize a device similar to the April 22 change, which it was the purpose of my amendment to strike down. It was for this reason that I offered an amendment to the Department's suggestion, making it clear that the additional clause (6) shall not be applicable in the case of burley tobacco. My amendment excepting burley allotments from clause (6) was opposed by the Department, but adopted by the conference.

I have made this statement so that the effect of section 707 will be understood, and to make clear that when the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 is signed into law the April 22 regulations of the Department will have become inapplicable in the case of burley allotments.

OTHER PROVISIONS

The Senate bill contained another provision I offered, supported by the Department of Agriculture, which would have authorized the Secretary to increase by up to 5 cents per pound the support price for producers marketing not in excess of 1,000 pounds of wool annually. I thought the provision would help to maintain family farm flocks throughout the native sheep States, and that it was consistent with the small farm provisions included in the cotton, feed grains and other programs. I am sorry that the provision was not maintained by the conference, but am glad a 4-year extension of the National Wool Act, which I cosponsored, was provided in this bill.

In the Senate, I voted to add to the bill the provisions of S. 399 as adopted by the Senate in 1963, known as the Proxmire amendment, authorizing class I base allocations for producers selling milk within Federal marketing orders. I considered the Senate dairy title a modest proposal which could be useful in certain order areas toward discouraging increased surplus production, and superior to title I of the House bill in that it provided free access to markets both for new producers within the order and for old producers outside the order.

I am glad the conference adopted the Senate provision on feed grains, which I helped work out in committee, to maintain the voluntary program and to encourage participation and control Government costs by authorizing the Secretary to reduce the loan level for corn while maintaining the support level through direct payments.

The conference bill in effect renews the conservation reserve of the soil bank, permitting farmers to sign up for 5- to 10-year cropland retirement contracts during each of the next 4 years. I have urged extension of the conservation reserve for years, and am glad that it will now be extended. Technically, the House title adopted by the conference with Senate amendments repeals the Soil Bank Act of 1956, which the administration bill implemented, but it provides substantially the same authority. I am glad also that the voluntary wheat program proposed by Senator MILTON YOUNG of North Dakota, which I cosponsored, had been essentially maintained, for it will provide some increase in the income of wheat producers without increasing the cost of certificates purchased by processors.

In the committee, I supported the cotton program proposed by the chairman, Senator ELLENDER, which was adopted by our committee, but replaced in the Senate itself by the Talmadge amendment. I believe the cotton program worked out in conference has improved in several respects the House proposal and it evidently represents the best that can be done at this time. I do not think anyone yet knows how this new program may work out, and it rests on certain assumptions which may not be realized. I think it would have been better to try out the new proposal for a limited period of 2 years. But cotton is in the most serious difficulty of any commodity, and the problem of maintaining the income of cottongrowers while preserving the domestic and export markets for their cotton is acute. I hope very much that the program will work—and without unreasonably heavy costs to the Government.

I have agreed to the conference amendment and signed the conference report—as a majority of the Senate conferees must do in order to return an agreed bill to the House and Senate for their respective approval. I have been glad to vote for the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 for, whatever its shortcomings, I believe this 4-year program offers farmers a more stable, assured approach than the temporary enactments of recent years.

PROGRESS UNDER THE FARM PROGRAM

The omnibus farm bill now before the Senate for final approval deals with major commodities—including feed grains, wheat and cotton—and also renews the longer range cropland retirement authority begun under the Conservation Reserve of the Soil Bank. Further, the Food and Agricultural Act of 1965 is a 4-year program. For the first time in many years, it offers farmers a more stable, assured approach than the series of temporary programs which, since 1960, have attempted to deal with specific problems as they became acute—with constant changes nearly every year.

I think it is fair to say that unlike the omnibus farm bill proposed in 1961, this bill grants no large new powers to the Secretary of Agriculture, nor does it contain unique and radical departures from past programs; it extends authorities for the voluntary programs worked out in recent years, which are designed to maintain and improve farm income while reducing Government-held stocks of surplus commodities.

It has been correctly said, in the Senate Committee report, that the bill directly or indirectly affects commodities, including livestock, that account for nearly three-fourths of all farm cash receipts—and that "the entire economy as well as the farm segment will benefit from such action and would suffer from lack of it." I think it appropriate, therefore, to review briefly at this time the need for farm programs, and some recent trends.

It has only been a few years ago—for I remember the situation shortly after I became a member of the Committee on Agriculture 6 years ago—when the "farm problem," usually meaning the accumulation in Government bins of surplus stocks acquired in the effort to support farm prices, was considered nearly hopeless. The farm programs were easy to criticize; but when it came to practical solutions nearly everyone threw up his hands. Even today, there is not much interest. But the situation has changed gradually, and progress is being made.

For example, on June 30, 1961, the cost value of CCC inventories was $6.8 billion and, after a revaluation adjustment, $5.6 billion—including over 1,243 million bushels of wheat, 1,261 million bushels of corn, 392 million bushels of sorghum, 159 million pounds of butter, and 307 million pounds of dried milk, and nearly 2 million bales of upland cotton. Four years later, as of May 31, 1965, CCC inventories have been reduced to $4.2 billion—including 701 million bushels of wheat, 589 million bushels of corn, 603 million bushels of sorghum, 114 million pounds of butter and 294 million pounds of dried milk, and 6.8 million bales of cotton.

I remember when I voted for a change in the wheat program, I said that I would do so because wheat was in such difficulty that unless something were done it could bring down all the farm price support programs. Now the total supplies of wheat and corn have been brought to manageable levels, and the Senate bill prescribes a somewhat higher level of price support for wheat. Almost alone among the basic commodities, cotton has gotten into serious difficulty, and it is our hope that the program contained in this bill will reverse that trend. Supplies of tobacco have increased, but since enactment of the acreage-poundage authority earlier this year, already being tried in the Flue-cured areas, reports indicate that for the first time in several years production of Flue-cured tobacco will be less than use.

These changes have not been brought about without cost. For example, the acreage reserve of the soil bank program of the late 1950's was an attempt to divert allotment acreage into conservation uses, and its authorization of $750 million annually was attacked at the time as very large. But that is about the amount estimated for the voluntary feed grain program alone in its first year in 1961, and the cost last year exceeded $1.4 billion. But more than 3 million farmers have feed grain allotments, and the feed grain crop is worth $6.7 billion, so that the cost per farm is reasonable, and the cost per harvested acre of $15 is far less than for the other commodities. The feed grains program has also helped bring stability to the Nation's largest agricultural enterprise—the production of livestock and livestock products—and we are very glad that today beef cattle prices are around $27 and hogs are selling at $23, a large improvement over the situation a year or two ago.

I think we have learned several things from the better results secured by the farm programs in recent years. First, to have a chance of success in this vast field, it is necessary to be able to make a commitment large enough to deal with a large problem; otherwise, the benefits sought will be dissipated and the funds appropriated will be used up and disappear before reaching the critical point of reversing the trend toward a growing surplus and declining farm prices.

Second, we have learned that voluntary programs for feed grains and wheat can work. They have done so through price support loans at a lower level, amounting to the world price or feed value, combined with direct payments to cooperators who agree to reduce their production. The principal result has been to transfer the cost of the programs from storage of surplus stocks to direct support of farm income.

It is true that the National Wool Act, which the bill before the Senate extends, was enacted during the Eisenhower administration, and provides for direct payments to producers representing the difference between the market price and the support price of wool; but it was often pointed out that wool and sugar are deficit commodities. Now we have direct payments in the feed grain program, initiated by a Republican amendment in the House; direct payments in the wheat program, through certificates accompanying wheat used in this country for food; and direct payments in the new cotton program in this bill, representing the difference between the world and the domestic support price. However one feels about the theory of so-called "compensatory payments," these direct payments are proving to be a means for allowing market prices to reach a competitive level while maintaining a fair return to farmers for their domestic production and at the same time avoiding the tremendous build-up in Government stocks of previous years—surplus stocks which became nearly impossible to dispose of, and for which storage charges are almost sheer economic waste.

Third, we are learning to relate the commodity programs to each other in a more practical way. I think of the provisions permitting the substitution of wheat for feed grains and feed grains for wheat, which can help many farmers maintain a practical rotation plan, made possible by the combination of direct payments with support loans at market value. Amendments to the conservation reserve program extended by this bill would encourage longer range cropland retirement which can be coordinated with the farmers participation in the commodity programs. A refinement in the feed grains authority permits the Secretary to present a program which a farmer can better adapt to his rotation plan and size of fields without the artificial divisions formerly required.

Fourth, I think it has been learned again, and I hope it will be remembered, that arbitrary increases in acreage and increases in price-support levels, perhaps in response to political pressures or campaign promises, lead quickly to grief. It takes years to correct a program once it has been permitted to get out of hand. This is not to say that the question of how much it is worth to the country, and to consumers, to preserve an abundant supply of food and to maintain farm families in a decent and fair relationship to the income level of other segments of the economy, is not a legitimate area of political decision. But again, the method of providing support for farm income through direct payments, while relying to a larger extent on market forces to utilize rather than to store production, has avoided the awkward consequences of past attempts to support farm income wholly through market prices guaranteed at an artificial level by nonrecourse Government loans and purchase agreements.

So I think it can be said in general that the old bogey of the farm problem, surplus stocks, is being brought under control, and that with continued restraint and with vigilance on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture, we look forward to the time when Government stocks will be worked off, allotments may be increased slightly, and farmers will be producing for the marketplace.

But surpluses are not the only problem. They have resulted from attempts—by farmers themselves through increasing production, and by Government support-price programs—to maintain and increase farm income.

For years, farmers have been acutely aware of the "cost-price squeeze." For example, farm production expenses in 1961 were $27,013 million, up $5 billion from the 1951 level of $22,165 million, and continued to increase steadily by more than $2 billion to $29,368 million last year. Cash receipts from farm marketings increased only $2 billion during the decade from $32,958 million in 1951 to $34,923 million in 1961, and again increased less than production expenses, to $36,748 million last year. As a result, realized net income has not exceeded the 1951 level of $15,158 million since that time, and since 1961 has increased only slightly from $12,573 to $12,644 million.

In general, I think it can be said that farmers have been working hard to maintain their income by improving their methods and increasing yields, but that unit prices received by farmers have not increased as have the prices of other goods, so that their increased productivity has not kept pace with the increase in farmers' costs. What improvement has occurred in total net income in recent years has been almost wholly the result of the increase in Government payments—and without these programs, the situation of farmers would be desperate.

But it is not enough to talk about totals. Realized gross income per farm has increased from $10,387 in 1961 to $12,100 last year, including Government payments. But net income per farm has increased only $341, from $3,299 to $3,640. This has been true at a time when the exodus from rural areas had been taking place at an increasing rate, with fewer farmers operating proportionately larger farms each year. For example, in 1950 there were 134,586 commercial farms in Kentucky averaging 113 acres, but in 1960 there were 86,656 commercial farms averaging 142 acres. The College of Agriculture at the University of Kentucky estimates that in the decade 1960–70 only half these farms will survive and they will be nearly doubled in size; a similar development is projected before the year 2000. Therefore, with fewer farmers maintaining larger, more efficient operations, it is small comfort to show that net income per farm is improving slightly.

As the Senate committee report points out, farmers receive about $1.05 per hour for their work at a time when the minimum wage is $1.25 and industrial workers average $2.60 hourly.

Here is an industry which employs more workers than the steel and automobile, transportation and public utilities industries combined. The farmer spends from $28 to $29 billion a year for goods and services to produce crops and livestock, and another $15 billion annually for the same things that city people buy. Each year the farmers' purchases include $3.1 billion in new farm tractors, machinery and equipment, $3.3 billion for fuel and maintenance; $1.6 billion for fertilizer and lime; enough rubber to put tires on 6 million automobiles, and $3 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity.

Three out of every 10 jobs in private employment are related to agriculture. One hour of farm labor now produces five times as much food as it did in 1919–21, and productivity of the American farmworker has increased by more than 5 percent a year—double the rate in nonagricultural industry. The United States is the world's largest exporter of agricultural products, and 83 million of our 300 million acres are producing for export.

Yet the farmer's share of the market food basket has declined steadily to 37 cents of each dollar spent for food. It has been pointed out repeatedly that our citizens are able to provide their food for 18½ percent of their disposable income—the lowest figure in the world. In these circumstances, a sound, permanent program of Government support for the farmer is necessary, is justified, and is fair.

While we want our programs to work without waste, and they deal with difficult problems, I do not think we are paying too high a price to maintain the system of family farms which produce abundant food of a better quality than we have ever known, for our own citizens and for many of the hungry people of the world. In other fields it may not be difficult to raise market prices by creating a shortage or keeping supply under demand. But to create a food shortage would be a sin, and we can be glad that most of the people in this country are more concerned about going on a diet than with securing enough food to eat.

Several years ago I joined with Congressman Brooks Hays, and later with Senator Flanders, in introducing what I believe were the first bills calling for the establishment of a second Country Life Commission, similar to the first Country Life Commission established by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1908 from which flowed the county agent system, rural free delivery, farm-to-market roads, and other advances. I think it is correct that the problems of surplus production have been so overwhelming, and it is so natural to become preoccupied with the decline in parity prices, that few have looked ahead to consider what the future holds for farm families and rural America. Legislation has proceeded almost piecemeal, dealing year by year with the most immediate commodity problems, and little thought has been given to a national policy looking ahead over a span of a generation and further toward a policy which would recognize the proper place of agriculture in a developing economy, the value to the Nation of the family farm and rural life, and the organization of small towns and rural communities into the economic and social fabric of the Nation.

The commodity programs with which this bill deals, and the price support operations of the Department of Agriculture, give effective support largely to what is called the commercial farm—which will continue to produce significantly for the market. It is true that many small farmers in Kentucky are sustained by their tobacco allotments, and the Agricultural conservation program and some of the farm credit programs of the Farmers Home Administration reach small farmers. But on the whole, most of the efforts of the Department of Agriculture over many years have chiefly helped the productive commercial farms. To a large extent this is true even of services provided by the county agent and the soil conservationists, of the educational efforts of the land-grant colleges and the research efforts of the experiment stations—all of which have been largely oriented to the problems and needs of progressive farmers and productive operations.

I know that Secretary Freeman has established a Rural Community Development Service, following the work in pilot counties begun by Under Secretary True D. Morse. For example, the extension of the antipoverty program authorizes transfer of funds by the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Department of Agriculture, and I hope this authority will be used. But I think it can be said that as the problems of surplus production are brought under control, the next great area of concern ought to be with the rural areas which have been left behind and the problems of rural poverty, which, while dispersed and less concentrated than those of urban slums, are no less human, no less difficult, and no less demanding of the Nation's attention.

In recent years, we have begun to appreciate the need for planning transportation systems in conjunction with the growth and development of urban areas, including provision of "open spaces" around cities, toward the day, for example, when the eastern seaboard will become an urban continuum. It is too soon to think about what super highways do when they cut hundreds of farms in two, what becomes of thousands of acres of our most productive land when reservoirs are constructed, and how to maintain as clusters of economic vitality and social value small towns and rural trading centers, which without thought to the total development of the Nation will be bypassed and left to stagnate in the backwaters of change.

I hope that soon we will recognize that our material and human agricultural resources are not limitless, and that we cannot settle for talent which only "stays down on the farm" because others prefer to leave.

I am glad to say that my own State of Kentucky, which is an agricultural State, is maintaining and improving its place in the Nation's agriculture. Since 1950, Kentucky has moved up from 19th to 14th among the rank of States in cash receipts from farm production, which reached $744 million last year—$100 million more than the year before and an all-time high. Production of crops amounted to $429 million, of which $349 million was received by farmers for their burley and dark leaf tobacco. The State has advanced from 20th to 14th in dairy production, and ranks third in the production of cheese.

Perhaps the greatest progress in diversifying Kentucky's agricultural enterprise has been in the production of quality feeder calves and quality feeder pigs, with dozens of feeder calf sales now being held all over the State, supplying beef and pork-producing operations across the Corn Belt. The State has also made wonderful progress in recent years in pasture renovation and improvement.

Cash receipts from Kentucky livestock amounted to $324 million last year, $134 million from cattle and calves, $94 million from dairy production, $60 million from hogs. But I am sorry to say that income from sheep and lambs has declined to nearly $3 million. Poultry and eggs brought Kentucky farmers $30 million last year, and while not so large, the State has a growing and progressive turkey enterprise. Our dairy cooperatives are among the most progressive in the Nation, and the Federal Milk Marketing Orders in the State have greatly expanded the areas they serve.

The State has set itself a goal of becoming a "billion-dollar farm State," and this income level for her farm families may well be achieved by 1970.

I have voted for the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 because it extends, with improvements and for a 4-year period, the programs of recent years which have brought farmers and all of us signs of hope for the first time in many years. I hope the progress which has been made will be continued. And I point out now, as these programs begin to bring the surplus problems under control, that it is time to think about a permanent and constructive long-range policy, not only for the Nation's productive agriculture, not only to deal with the entirely separate problem of rural poverty, but also toward bringing rural communities and areas into the full enjoyment of our national life and progress.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], a loyal and effective member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, who is deeply interested in the welfare of all farm people, be printed in the RECORD as his expression of the conference report on this subject which was adopted today by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] is as follows:

A STEP TOWARD JUSTICE FOR AMERICAN FARMERS

The action the Senate has just taken on the conference committee report on the farm bill completes congressional approval of what I believe to be the strongest farm legislation passed by Congress in a quarter of a century. I congratulate Chairman ELLENDER and the splendid staff members of the Senate Agricultural Committee as well as the other conferees for their tireless effective work on this bill.

I am pleased with it especially because it contains proposals which I have made to strengthen wheat producers' income and to insure the continuity of humane food programs here and abroad, as well as an extension for 4 years, with improvements, of other commodity programs.

The amendment which I sponsored to authorize purchase of dairy products in the market to maintain school lunch and nutrition programs, both here and abroad, when Commodity Credit Corporation has no surplus stocks, has been enacted. It is a significant improvement in these valuable programs. It is even more significant as a policy decision. It is a decision to use our ability to produce dairy products to meet human need rather than making such programs depend on the existence of surplus Government stocks. It is a decision I hope will be extended to other commodities next year in the adoption of a world food and nutrition policy.

On January 19, the distinguished majority leader, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Senators METCALF, BURDICK, McCARTHY, MONDALE, McGEE, MOSS, YARBOROUGH, and NEUBERGER joined me in a bill (S. 598) to assure wheat producers 100 percent of parity support for the wheat they produce for domestic food use through the voluntary wheat certificate program I had sponsored in 1963 and which Congress adopted in 1964.

There have been a number of variations on the original concept of that bill during the course of consideration, but the farm bill just enacted gives wheat producers the very return we proposed in January—100 percent of parity on domestic food wheat which, combined with the $1.25 basic loan on all wheat produced by farmers in compliance with the wheat acreage allotment, gives them an average return of $1.84½ per bushel on total production.

The Congress has again recognized parity—100 percent of parity—as a proper goal of farm price support. This is especially pleasing to me for I have always deplored lack of consideration—even abuse and criticism—of the farm people who have built and now maintain the foundations of America's greatness. They have acquired the ability not only to feed our people but to produce beyond our own necessities. As a result, agricultural production provides capital, strength in war, and the materials and tools with which peace can be built if we determine to use it for that purpose.

My appreciation for support given the farm bill this year—which passed the House with a good majority and the Senate overwhelming—is very great. I am especially grateful to the Congressmen from city districts and those Senators from the more urban States who demonstrated their understanding of the value of a strong agricultural economy by supporting the bill in spite of efforts to arouse consumer opposition to it. I am grateful to the consumer groups who supported the bill knowing that they will gain more in the long run from a strong and prosperous agricultural community than from temporary farm price reductions which would be followed by concentration of production, and then scarcity and managed food prices in the years ahead.

The greatest test of my patience is criticism of American agriculture and the American farmer.

First generation farmers in the United States of America were the brave and hardy men and women who settled this land. A very large proportion of them went to the frontier as a result of a determination to be free, and not to submit to either economic, political, or religious restrictions on their freedom. Farmers in America have always been a bulwark of strength behind our American ideals.

Why are they criticized?

Is it for laziness because they do not get up until 4 or 5 a.m. to milk, get the chores done, and be in the fields at an early hour?

They are the hardest working segment of citizens in America today.

Is it because they are uneducated and ignorant?

We like to talk about the marvels of automation, nuclear energy, and space technology.

In spite of their existence, in 1961 President Kennedy's Science Advisory Commission reported to him:

"Nowhere are the benefits of research more dramatically revealed than in food production. Fifty years ago in this country an agricultural worker produced food for only 3 or 4 others in contrast to his capability to feed 27 individuals today."

The National Academy of Sciences, in a report on natural resources, also characterized our agricultural achievements as the outstanding scientific achievement of our times.

This means that several million American farmers have mastered the lessons of science, have acquainted themselves with new techniques in land management, in agricultural chemistry, in biology and animal husbandry, in physics and a dozen other sciences and have applied this knowledge to bring about a productive capacity that is the marvel of the whole world.

No, farmers are not uneducated and ignorant. They are one of the most highly trained groups in our society today. A large proportion of them are college graduates and most of the remainder are self-educated men who have acquired extensive knowledge of new techniques—involving many fields of learning—in the course of their farm operations. There are few professional fields which require the extensive knowledge essential to modern farming. The recognition which our leading scientific groups have given to agriculture's achievements, which have repeatedly been described as the unrivaled scientific achievement of the century, are abundant testimonial to the high level of intelligence of our farm people.

Nowhere in America has the importance of schools—the first public facility provided in most of our pioneer communities—been more recognized. If rural school facilities have sometimes lagged, it has been for economic reasons—because our society failed to provide parity for agriculture—not because farm people wanted their schools to be cheap or inferior.

Criticism of farmers for failing to educate themselves to produce in abundance is groundless and a reflection of the critic's ignorance of the requirements of modern agriculture.

Is criticism made of farmers because they are inefficient?

Actually, agricultural productivity has risen three times faster than nonagricultural productivity in this Nation during the last 25 years.

On the other side of the critics' coin is the charge that farmers produce too abundantly, that they should limit their production themselves. A case can be made that the man who voices this criticism—the policymakers who have deplored instead of making use of our American abundance—have failed, not the farmers. There are people who need every calorie and every fiber our agriculture can produce. Society has failed the farmers in not yet arranging our institutions so our production capacity is fully utilized.

In Russia, and Red China, and many other lands, the man who excels in food production is honored with medals. Those countries ration food to their own population to have foodstuffs for export to earn dollars, and to hold the allegiance of their satellites. They parade their top food producers in Red Square.

Instead of parading our agricultural heroes down Pennsylvania Avenue, we have paraded many of them to bankruptcy. We are right now permitting 90,000 to 100,000 farm closures every year. I hope the bill we have just enacted will slow up the liquidation of farm operations. It will not end it. Stability in agriculture will require more than there is in this bill. It is only one step toward an adequate farm policy. The next step must be utilization of the production plant and capacity our farmers have built.

We ought to have a ceremonial when a farm bill is enacted and signed. We ought to bring into Washington a representative group of real farm people and convey to agriculture, through them, our Nation's appreciation of what they have done, and are doing for this country.

Recently I was working on a manuscript about agriculture and I ran across a terse tribute to farmers written by Wayne Darrow, a lifetime observer and student of agriculture.

Darrow reminded his readers that they purchase a fine diet for only 18.4 percent of their income, the lowest percentage in any nation in world history. He compared this to 42 percent in Japan, 45 percent in West Germany, and 56 percent in Russia. Then he added:

"Farm exports supplied the dollars to service European loans that built the cities after the Civil War. Farmworkers migrating to the cities replenished the labor force of industry after World War I immigration restrictions.

"During the 1930 depression, farmers sustained U.S. gross national output when industry cut it, and furnished a haven for millions of broke cityites.

"During World War II agriculture met all wartime demands for food and actually supplied civilians 12–14 percent more food than in prewar years.

"Since World War II farm abundance has made farm exports one of America's best dollar earners in foreign markets (two-thirds of 1961–62 exports were for dollars), and has buttressed U.S. foreign policy with mountains of food—$4 to $5 billion worth annually in recent years.

"The American farmer supplies more for less money and profit than any other major segment in the economy."

There are many agricultural accomplishments that could be added to Darrow's synopsis of agriculture's historical role. There will be many more if we free our farmers to produce in abundance to meet human needs.

Periodically, some editor wonders why farmers get so much attention. After all, they are now a small minority, less than 8 percent of total population. The editor investigates and finds, as did U.S. News & World Report in 1964, that farming is still America's No. 1 enterprise. That magazine told its readers in February 1964 to explain the necessity for farm legislation:

"Farming industry, though declining in relative importance in the United States, remains the country's biggest single enterprise.

"Farm employment at 6.7 million people is larger than the combined labor forces of primary metals, metal fabricators, machinery, electrical equipment, autos.

"Agriculture is estimated to be responsible for 40 percent of all jobs in the country, including some 6 million people working to provide goods and services that farmers buy.

"Capital outlay of farmers in 1962 was larger than the combined total for iron and steel, nonferrous metals, machinery, electrical equipment, autos.

"Agriculture * * * provides support for most of America's small towns. Farm spending in 1962 came to a total of $41 billion. But less than $2 billion of this was spent in cities of more than 30,000.

"Farm operators mostly fall in the class of small business. But their combined activities add up to a major factor in the country's economy."

On October 6, when President Johnson proclaimed the annual Farm-City Week for November 19 through November 26 of this year, he mentioned that food costs have been brought down to 18½ percent of disposable income, and added: "* * * this Nation's abundance now brings within our reach the world's first victory in the war against poverty and offers new hope to the impoverished peoples of the world * * *."

If I know President Johnson as well as I believe I do, there will be a followup on this statement next year, and we will be advised then (if not sooner) of administration backing for a worldwide effort to banish want. The President will undoubtedly endorse loosening the shackles of production control we have had to impose, and freeing our farmers as rapidly as distribution can be arranged to produce for peace and abundance. If that is done, as I have uged for many months, farmers will make another historic contribution, not just to America, but to the welfare of all mankind.

The other day I put in the RECORD a column by James Reston of the New York Times, in which he wrote:

"It is in the production of food rather than in the production of missiles that the United States has gained the greatest advantage over the Communist world, and this just happens to be the field that concerns the undernourished and underdeveloped countries of the world—more than any other."

Reston attributed the truce in Kashmir to the fear of the participants of losing U.S. food-for-peace supplies. I placed the column in the RECORD, although I do not think we should penalize the hungry men, women, and children of a Nation because misguided leaders resort to force, to indicate the power which food assistance can exercise.

We have justified multibillion dollar space expenditures with the argument that we will lose the cold war unless we overtake the Communists in space and continue, in the eyes of the people of the world, as the world's leaders in science and technology.

Our farmers stand ready at much less cost than our $6 billion space budget—and this is not an either/or matter—to launch food shots from the fields and pastures of America that will demonstrate to the world that we are whole generations ahead of the Communist world in the sciences and technologies by which mankind lives—the know-how for managing our own earth resources to produce food, fiber, and shelter for the human race in much greater abundance.

I have tremendous admiration for our space pioneers, for the scientists who have made travel in space possible, and especially for the great, personal courage of the astronauts who have entered the capsules and made the voyages into the little-known voids without the certainty of safe return.

I have the same sort of admiration for the American pioneers who went out into little-known areas of this continent, knowing that some would lose their lives, to explore and settle the land. The forebears of the present generation of farmers were men—and women—of great courage, too.

Farmers have brought into production resources far more exciting in their potentialities for meeting the needs of man than the desolate craters of the moon. They have explored not only the geographic reaches of the new land, but the climates, the microscopic and submicroscopic nature of its soils, the ecology, adaptable plants and animals and their life cycles, the dietary needs of both the men and the animals they supply, methods of countering dangers in the production cycles from floods to nematodes and viruses, and literally hundreds of other aspects of their production techniques.

Our farm men and women have been through two eras of discovery—mechanization and now technology—they stand ready today to use all their enormous production capacity for the benefit of mankind, if we will but release them to do the job.

I am proud that in 1965 this Congress has shown an appreciation of farmers by passing improved farm legislation and passing it by a considerably better majority than in past years. I hope that in the near future we will enact the legislation which will lead to full utilization of our farmers' power to produce to meet human need.

American farm productivity can buy us time to develop underdeveloped lands and to adopt necessary population control measures to avoid the widespread famines that are inevitable in our times without these steps.

Agriculture always has been, and remains today, the great basic source of this Nation's strength in both war and peace.

American farmers and their rural brothers abroad hold the key to world history in the last third of the 20th century. If we will only let them write that history, it can be the most glorious chapter in the whole saga of the human race and our century can be the era in history when the human race utilized its resources wisely and found peace.

U.S. COMMISSION ON FOOD AND FIBER

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I asked the majority leader to inquire, if he might, in connection with the conference report on the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 about the appointment by the President of a U.S. Commission on Food and Fiber policy which has been assured. Senators who introduced an amendment for that purpose to H.R. 9811, the farm bill were assured that the President would appoint the commission within a month and that was the middle of September.

I have asked the majority leader about this appointment and he will, in the course of a discussion on the conference report, insert a statement in the RECORD on that point.

I express my gratitude to him for his courtesy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be glad to furnish a statement to that effect.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today, the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] asked a pertinent question relative to a statement made by me on September 14, when the farm bill was under discussion in this body. At that time I stated—and this was recalled to me in general terms by Senator JAVITS:

> It is my understanding that the President intends to issue an Executive order shortly

to establish this National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber. The National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber would be composed of 25 members appointed by the President. The President would designate the Chairman of the Commission from among its members.

It is my understanding that the members of the Commission have been selected and cleared and that the President has decided on a Chairman.

Following the inquiry made by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], I contacted the White House. I was informed that a commission had in fact been named, but that because its membership was confined too closely to a single region, the President returned the names to Mr. Macy with the request that the commission be composed of members more widely dispersed over the United States.

So I have no doubt that this matter will be attended to. While it may be a little beyond the 1 month which I indicated, because the end of that month is 2 days away, nevertheless it will be in that general period. I feel certain that the statement I made will be borne out and that the President will appoint a commission.

CONSERVING BASIS FOR NEW FARMLAND

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on September 10, 1965, during the debate on the so-called Talmadge amendment to H.R. 9811, I made a brief statement and placed in the Record a letter addressed to me by the Secretary of Agriculture. The letter dealt with lands which were in timber in 1959 and 1960 but which have since been cleared and planted in soybeans.

There has been concern among my constituents relative to the exact interpretation of the Secretary's letter. I have now received a response from Mr. E. A. Jaenke, Acting Administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, who states "that any land which has been closed, planted, or in the process of clearing prior to October 1, 1965, and used for soybeans or other nonsurplus crops, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, will not be added to the conserving base for the farm."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Jaenke's letter be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Agricultural Stabilization and
Conservation Service,
Washington, D.C., October 7, 1965.

Hon. John L. McClellan,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator McClellan: This is in response to an inquiry from Mr. M. J. Probst, of your office, relative to the establishment of conserving bases on farms where new land has been brought into cultivation since the base period (1959–60). There appears to be some question in the letter of September 10, 1965, from the Secretary to you pertaining to land that has been cleared or in the process of being cleared.

In order to clear up any misunderstanding occasioned by different interpretations of the Secretary's letter, we wish to make it clear that any land which has been cleared, planted, or in the process of clearing prior to October 1, 1965, and used for soybeans or other nonsurplus crops, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture will not be added to the conserving base for the farm.

Sincerely yours,

E. A. Jaenke,
Acting Administrator.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 289 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Bass
Bennett
Burdick
Church
Clark
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Harris
Hart
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Long, La.
Mansfield
McGee
McGovern
McNamara
Monroney
Montoya
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Neuberger
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Scott
Sparkman
Stennis
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], is absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Fannin] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McClellan, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Morton, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Smathers, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Symington, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Young of North Dakota entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

(Mr. HOLLAND obtained the floor.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill] without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADEQUATE HEALTH SCIENCE LIBRARY SERVICES AND FACILITIES

Mr. HILL. Mr. President I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendments of the House to S. 597.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Montoya in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 597) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting the need for adequate health science library services and facilities, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

Section 1. This Act may be cited as the "Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965".

Sec. 2. Title III of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART I—ASSISTANCE TO MEDICAL LIBRARIES

"Declaration of policy and statement of purpose

"Sec. 390. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that (1) the unprecedented expansion of knowledge in the health sciences within the past two decades has brought about a massive growth in the quantity, and major changes in the nature of, biomedical information, materials, and publications; (2) there has not been a corresponding growth in the facilities and techniques necessary adequately to coordinate and disseminate among health scientists and practitioners the ever-increasing volume of knowledge and information which has been developed in the health science field; (3) much of the value of the ever-increasing volume of knowledge and information which has been, and continues to be, developed in the health science field will be lost unless proper measures are taken in the immediate future to develop facilities and techniques necessary to collect, preserve, store, process, retrieve, and facilitate the dissemination and utilization of, such knowledge and information.

"(b) It is therefore the policy of this part to—

"(1) assist in the construction of new, and the renovation, expansion, or rehabilitation of existing, medical library facilities;

"(2) assist in the training of medical librarians and other information specialists in the health sciences;

"(3) assist, through the awarding of special fellowships to physicians and other practitioners in the sciences related to health and scientists, in the compilation of existing, and the creation of additional, written matter which will facilitate the distribution and utilization of knowledge and information relating to scientific, social, and cultural advancements in sciences related to health;

"(4) assist in the conduct of research and investigations in the field of medical library science and related activities, and in the development of new techniques, systems, and equipment for processing, storing, retrieving, and distributing information in the sciences related to health;

"(5) assist in improving and expanding the basic resources of medical libraries and related facilities;

"(6) assist in the development of a national system of regional medical libraries each of which would have facilities of sufficient depth and scope to supplement the services of other medical libraries within the region served by it; and

"(7) provide financial support to biomedical scientific publications.

"Definitions

"SEC. 391. As used in this part—

"(1) the term 'sciences related to health' includes medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, and public health, and fundamental and applied sciences when related thereto;

"(2) the terms 'National Medical Libraries Assistance Advisory Board' and 'Board' mean the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine established under section 373(a) of this Act;

"(3) the terms 'construction' and 'cost of construction', when used with reference to any medical library facility, include (A) the construction of new buildings, and the expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, including architects' fees, but not including the cost of acquisition of land or off-site improvements, and (B) equipping new buildings and existing buildings (whether or not expanded, remodeled, or altered) for use as a library (including provision of automatic data processing equipment), but not with books, pamphlets, or related material;

"(4) the term 'medical library' means a library related to the sciences related to health.

"National Medical Libraries Assistance Board

"SEC. 392. (a) The Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine established pursuant to section 373(a) shall, in addition to its functions prescribed under section 373, constitute and serve as the National Medical Libraries Assistance Advisory Board (hereinafter in this part referred to as the 'Board').

"(b) The Board shall—

"(1) advise and assist the Surgeon General in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this part, and

"(2) consider all applications for construction grants under this part and make to the Surgeon General such recommendations as it deems advisable with respect to (A) the approval of such applications, and (B) the amount which should be granted to each applicant whose application, in its opinion, should be approved.

"(c) The Surgeon General is authorized to use the services of any member or members of the Board, in connection with matters related to the administration of this part, for such periods, in addition to conference periods, as he may determine.

"(d) Appointed members of the Board who are not otherwise in the employ of the United States, while attending conferences of the Board or otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General in connection with the administration of this part, shall be entitled to receive compensation, per diem in lieu of subsistence, and travel expenses in the same manner and under the same conditions as that prescribed under section 373(d), when attending conferences, traveling, or serving at the request of the Surgeon General in connection with the administration of part H which deals with the National Library of Medicine.

"Assistance for construction of facilities

"SEC. 393. (a) In carrying out the purposes of section 390(b)(1), the Surgeon General may, upon application of any public or private nonprofit agency or institution, make grants to such agency or institution toward the cost of construction of any medical library facility to be constructed by such agency or institution.

"(b) A grant under this section may be made only if the application therefor is recommended for approval by the Board and is approved by the Surgeon General upon his determination that—

"(1) the application contains or is supported by reasonable assurances that (A) for not less than twenty years after completion of construction, the facility will be used as a medical library facility, (B) subject to subsection (c), sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal share of the cost of constructing the facility, and (C) sufficient funds will be available, when construction is completed, for effective use of the facility for the purpose for which it is being constructed;

"(2) the proposed construction is necessary to meet the demonstrated needs for additional or improved medical library facilities in the community or area in which the proposed construction is to take place;

"(3) the application contains or is supported by adequate assurance that any laborer or mechanic employed by any contractor or subcontractor in the performance of work on projects of the type covered by the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended, will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–276a5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this paragraph, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"(c) Within such aggregate monetary limit as the Surgeon General may prescribe, after consultation with the Board, applications which (solely by reason of the inability of the applicants to give the assurance required by clause (B) of subsection (b)(1)) fail to meet the requirements for approval are set forth in subsection (b) may be approved upon condition that the applicants give the assurance required by such clause (B) within a reasonable time and upon such other reasonable terms and conditions as he may determine after consultation with the Board.

"(d) In acting upon applications for grants under this section, the Board and the Surgeon General shall take into consideration the relative effectiveness of the proposed facilities in meeting demonstrated needs for additional or improved medical library services, and shall give priority to applications for construction of facilities for which the need is greatest.

"(e) The amount of any grant made under this section shall be that recommended by the Board or such lesser amount as the Surgeon General determines to be appropriate; except that in no event may such amount exceed 75 per centum of the necessary cost of the construction of such facility as determined by him.

"(f) Upon approval of any application for a grant under this section, the Surgeon General shall reserve, from any appropriation available therefor, the amount of such grant as determined under subsection (e), and shall pay such amount, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine. Such payments shall be made through the disbursement facilities of the Department of the Treasury. The Surgeon General's reservation of any amount under this subsection may be amended by him, either upon approval of an amendment of the application or upon revision of the estimated cost of construction of the facility.

"(g) In determining the amount of any grant under this section, there shall be excluded from the cost of construction an amount equal to the sum of (1) the amount of any other Federal grant which the applicant has obtained, or is assured of obtaining, with respect to the construction which is to be financed in part by grants authorized under this section, and (2) the amount of any non-Federal funds required to be expended as a condition of such other Federal grant.

"(h) If, within twenty years after completion of any construction for which funds have been paid under this section—

"(1) the applicant or other owner of the facility shall cease to be a public or nonprofit institution, or

"(2) the facility shall cease to be used for medical library purposes, unless the Surgeon General determines, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him after consultation with the Board, that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation to do so,

the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the facility the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which such facility is situated) of the facility, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of construction of such facility.

"(i) For the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this section, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed $10,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary.

"Grants for training in medical library sciences

"SEC. 394. (a) In order to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(2), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed $1,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary. Sums made available under this section shall be utilized by the Surgeon General in making grants—

"(1) to individuals to enable them to accept traineeships and fellowships leading to postbaccalaureate academic degrees in the field of medical library science, in related fields pertaining to sciences related to health, or in the field of the communication of information;

"(2) to individuals who are librarians or specialists in information on sciences relating to health, to enable them to undergo intensive training or retraining so as to attain greater competence in their occupations (including competence in the fields of automatic data processing and retrieval);

"(3) to assist appropriate public and private nonprofit institutions in developing, expanding and improving, training programs in library science and the field of communications of information, pertaining to sciences relating to health; and

"(4) to assist in the establishment of internship programs in established medical libraries meeting standards which the Surgeon General shall prescribe.

"(b) Payment pursuant to grants made under this section may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Surgeon General shall prescribe by regulations after consultation with the Board.

"Assistance to special scientific projects

"SEC. 395. In order to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(3), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed $500,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary. Sums made available under this section shall be utilized by the Surgeon General for the establishment of special fellowships to be awarded to physicians and other practitioners in the sciences related to health and scientists for the compilation of existing, or writing of original, contributions relating to scientific, social, or cultural, advancements in sciences related to health. In establishing such fellowships, the Surgeon General shall make appropriate arrangements whereby the facilities of the National Library of Medicine and the facilities of libraries of public and private nonprofit institutions of higher learning may be made available in connection with the projects for which such fellowships are established.

"Research and development in medical library—Science and related fields

"SEC. 396. (a) In order to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(4), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed $3,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary. Sums made available under this section shall be utilized by the Surgeon General in making grants to appropriate public or private nonprofit institutions and entering into contracts with appropriate persons, for purposes of carrying out projects of research and investigations in the field of medical library science and related activities and for the development of new techniques, systems, and equipment, for processing, storing, retrieving, and distributing information pertaining to sciences related to health.

"(b) Payment pursuant to grants made under this section may be in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Surgeon General shall prescribe by regulations after consultation with the Board.

"Grants for improving and expanding the basic resources of medical libraries and related instrumentalities

"SEC. 397. (a) In order to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(5), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed $3,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary.

"(b) Sums made available under this section shall be utilized by the Surgeon General for making grants of money, materials, or both, to public or private nonprofit medical libraries and related scientific communication instrumentalities for the purpose of expanding and improving their basic medical library or related resources. The uses for which grants so made may be employed include, but are not limited to, the following: (A) acquisition of books, journals, photographs, motion picture and other films, and other similar materials, (B) cataloging, binding, and other services and procedures for processing library resource materials for use by those who are served by the library or related instrumentality, and (C) acquisition of duplication devices, facsimile equipment, film projectors, recording equipment, and other equipment to facilitate the use of the resources of the library or related instrumentality by those who are served by it, and (D) introduction of new technologies in medical librarianship.

"(c)(1) The amount of any grant under this section to any medical library or related instrumentality shall be determined by the Surgeon General on the basis of the scope of library or related services provided by such library or instrumentality in relation to the population and purposes served by it. In making a determination of the scope of services served by any medical library or related instrumentality, the Surgeon General shall take into account the following factors—

"(A) the number of graduate and undergraduate students making use of the resources of such library or instrumentality;

"(B) the number of physicians and other practitioners in the sciences related to health utilizing the resources of such library or instrumentality;

"(C) the type of supportive staffs, if any available to such library or instrumentality;

"(D) the type, size, and qualifications of the faculty of any school with which such library or instrumentality is affiliated;

"(E) the staff of any hospital or hospitals, or of any clinic or clinics with which such library or instrumentality is affiliated; and

"(F) the geographic area served by such library or instrumentality and the availability, within such area, of medical library or related services provided by other libraries or related instrumentalities.

"(2) In no case shall any grant under this section to a medical library or related instrumentality during any fiscal year exceed $200,000, or, if lesser, an amount equal to—

"(A) 60 per centum of the annual operating expenses of such library or related instrumentality, if such fiscal year is the first fiscal year with respect to which a grant under this section is made to it;

"(B)(i) 50 per centum of the annual operating expenses of such library or related instrumentality, (ii) or, if lesser, five-sixths of the amount of its first year grant under this section, if such year is the second fiscal year with respect to which a grant under this section has been made to it;

"(C)(i) 40 per centum of the annual operating expenses of such library or related instrumentality, (ii) or, if lesser, four-fifths of the amount of the second year grant under this section, if such year is the third fiscal year with respect to which a grant under this section has been made to it;

"(D)(i) 30 per centum of the annual operating expenses of such library or related instrumentality, (ii) or, if lesser, three-fourths of the amount of the third year grant under this section, if such year is the fourth fiscal year with respect to which a grant under this section has been made to it; and

"(E)(i) 20 per centum of the annual operating expenses of such library or related instrumentality, (ii) or, if lesser, two-thirds of the amount of the fourth year grant under this section, if such year is the fifth fiscal year with respect to which a grant under this section has been made to it.

"The 'annual operating expense' of a library or related instrumentality shall, for purposes of the preceding sentence, be an amount equal (if such annual operating expense is to be determined with respect to the first grant to be made to such library or instrumentality under this section) to the amount of the average of the annual operating expenses of such library or instrumentality over the three fiscal years preceding the year in which such grant is applied for; and if such library or related instrumentality has been operating for less than three years prior to applying for such grant, its 'annual operating expense' shall be an amount determined by the Surgeon General pursuant to regulations prescribed by him. For the second or succeeding fiscal year in which a grant is made to a library or related instrumentality, the 'annual operating expense' of such library or related instrumentality shall, for the purpose of such sentence, be equal to its operating expense (exclusive of Federal financial assistance under this part) for the preceding fiscal year.

"Grants for establishment of regional medical libraries

"SEC. 398. (a) In order to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(6), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed $2,500,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary. Sums made available under this section shall be utilized by the Surgeon General, with the advice of the Board, to make grants to existing public or private nonprofit medical libraries so as to enable each of them to serve as the regional medical library for the geographical area in which it is located.

"(b) The uses for which grants made under this section may be employed include, but are not limited to, the following—

"(1) acquisition of books, journals, and other similar materials;

"(2) cataloging, binding, and other procedures for processing library resource materials for use by those who are served by the library;

"(3) acquisition of duplicating devices and other equipment to facilitate the use of the resources of the library by those who are served by it;

"(4) acquisition of mechanisms and employment of personnel for the speedy transmission of materials from the regional library to local libraries in the geographic area served by the regional library; and

"(5) construction, renovation, rehabilitation, or expansion of physical plant considered necessary by such library to carry out its proper functions as a regional library.

"(c)(1) Grants under this section shall be made only to medical libraries which agree (A) to modify and increase their library resources so as to be able to provide supportive services to other libraries in the region as well as individual users of library services, (B) to provide free loan services to qualified users, and make available photoduplicated or facsimile copies of biomedical materials which qualified requesters may retain.

"(2) The Surgeon General, in awarding grants under this section, shall give priority to medical libraries having the greatest potential of fulfilling the needs for regional medical libraries. In determining the priority to be assigned to any medical library, he shall consider—

"(A) the need of such library, as determined by the levels of research, teaching, and medical activities of the library in relation to other existing library and medical communication services in the region;

"(B) the adequacy of the library (in terms of collections, personnel, equipment, and other facilities) as a basis for a regional medical library; and

"(C) the size and nature of the population to be served in the region in which the library is located.

"(d) Grants under this section for construction, renovation, rehabilitation, or expansion of physical plant shall be made in the same manner and subject to the same conditions as are provided for grants made under section 393, except that the eligibility for any such grant would be determined on the basis of the construction requirements of the library so as to be able to serve as a regional medical library. Grants under this section for basic resource materials to a library may not exceed 50 per centum of the library's annual operating expense (exclusive of Federal financial assistance under this part) for the preceding year; or in case of the first year in which the library receives a grant under this section for basic resource materials, 50 per centum of its average annual operating expenses over the past three years (or if it had been in operation for less than three years, its annual operating expenses determined by the Surgeon General in accordance with regulations prescribed by him).

"(e) Payment pursuant to grants made under this section may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Surgeon General shall prescribe by regulations after consultation with the Board.

"Financial support of biomedical scientific publications

"SEC. 399. (a) In order to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(7), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed $1,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary. Sums made available under this section shall be utilized by the Surgeon General, with the advice of the Board, in making grants to, and entering into appropriate contracts with, public or private nonprofit institutions of higher education and individual scientists for the purpose of supporting biomedical scientific publications of a nonprofit nature and to procure the compilation, writing, editing, and publication of reviews, abstracts, indices, handbooks, bibliographies, and related matter pertaining to scientific works and scientific developments.

"(b) Grants under this section in support of any single periodical publication may not be made for more than three years.

"(c) Payment pursuant to grants made under this section may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Surgeon General shall prescribe by regulations after consultation with the Board.

"Continuing availability of appropriated funds

"SEC. 399a. Funds appropriated to carry out any of the purposes of this part for any fiscal year shall remain available for such purposes for the fiscal year immediately following the fiscal year for which they were appropriated.

"Records and audit

"SEC. 399b. (a) Each recipient of a grant under this part shall keep such records as the Surgeon General shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such grant, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such grant is given or used, and the amount of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of such recipients that are pertinent to any grant received under the provisions of this part."

Regional branches of the National Library of Medicine

SEC. 3. Part H of title III of the Public Health Service Act which deals with the National Library of Medicine is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Regional branches of the National Library of Medicine

"SEC. 378. (a) Whenever the Surgeon General, with the advice of the Board, determines that—

"(1) in any geographic area of the United States, there is no regional medical library adequate to serve such area;

"(2) under the criteria prescribed in section 398, there is a need for a regional medical library to serve such area; and

"(3) because there is located in such area no medical library which, under the provisions of section 398, can feasibly be developed into a regional medical library adequate to serve such area,

he is authorized to establish, as a branch of the National Library of Medicine, a regional medical library to serve the needs of such area.

"(b) For the purpose of establishing branches of the National Library of Medicine under this section, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums, not to exceed $2,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary. Sums appropriated pursuant to this section for any fiscal year shall remain available until expended."

Compensation of members of the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine

SEC. 4. Part H of title III of the Public Health Service Act which deals with the National Library of Medicine is amended by striking out, in section 373(d) thereof, "$50" and inserting in lieu thereof "$75".

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting the need for adequate medical library services and facilities."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, through the 100 years since its founding by Dr. John Shaw Billings, the National Library of Medicine has contributed importantly to the health of mankind through its services to medical research, to medical education, and to the practice of medicine.

The Library today is faced with new challenges due to the rapid accumulation of new medical knowledge in recent years. Scientists have stated the period of the past 25 years has been the most productive of new medical knowledge in the entire history of medicine.

If this new knowledge is to be used to the fullest advantage it is imperative that we provide an adequate level of support for the National Library of Medicine.

The plight of the Nation's medical libraries is critical. They are cramped for space, critically deficient in trained manpower, inadequate in terms of basic resources, and desperately in need of new methods for handling the growing medical literature.

In recognition of the need for action to remedy the deficiencies of medical libraries the Senate on September 22 of this year approved S. 597 that authorized appropriations totaling $117.5 million over the 5 fiscal years 1966–70.

The House of Representatives recently passed the legislation, S. 597, with amendments that reduced the authorization for appropriations to $105 million over the same 5 years, 1966–70. As approved by the House, the legislation provides for the same authorities and programs that were in the bill as it passed the Senate.

The legislation before us would authorize the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to award grants-in-aid to assist: First, in the construction and renovation of medical library facilities; second, in the training of medical librarians; third, in the compilation of existing and original scientific knowledge; fourth, in the conduct of research and development in the field of medical library science; fifth, in improving and expanding the basic resources of medical libraries; sixth, in initially supporting biomedical publications; and seventh, in developing a national system of regional medical libraries.

This legislation is supported by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Medical Library Association, the Association of Research Libraries, the Special Libraries Association, the Chairman of the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine, the Association of American Medical Colleges, the American College of Physicians, the American Heart Association, the American Medical Association, the American Dental Association, and the American Public Health Association, and many other associations, universities, colleges, and individuals.

Mr. President, the major difference between S. 597 as passed by the Senate and House is in the amount of funds authorized to assist in the construction of medical libraries. The Senate approved $50 million over the 4 years 1967–70 while the House approved $40 million for the same period. As we gain experience under the new program we will be in a better position to assess the level of funds that is required.

I move, therefore, that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 597, so that the legislation can be forwarded to the President.

The motion was agreed to.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the State of Florida, which I have had the honor to represent in the Senate since 1946, was the first State to adopt a right-to-work law protecting individual workers in the exercise of their free choice to join or to refrain from joining a labor union. Section 12 of the declaration of rights of the Florida constitution was adopted in the general election of 1944 by vote of the people of Florida to provide as follows:

> The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union, or labor organization; provided, that this clause shall not be construed to deny or abridge the right of employees by and through a labor organization or labor union to bargain collectively with their employer.

While this constitutional amendment was the first of its kind, a number of other States followed suit, and adopted constitutional provisions or statutes protecting these basic individual rights. As is well known, 19 States now have right-to-work laws in effect. The question now before the Senate is whether we should wipe out all of these State laws, and in the process strike down this protection of the right of the individual workers in those 19 States to work for a living without being compelled to pay tribute to a private labor organization. I am opposed to the bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act because, first, it sanctions and encourages compulsory unionism, a concept contrary to the fundamental American principles of individual liberty, and, second, because it is a wrongful and unjustified interference with the authority and obligation of the individual States to protect their citizens and to maintain public order.

This is, therefore, both a moral issue and a political issue. In my opinion, it is morally wrong to deprive a man of his right to earn a living because he refuses for reasons of conscience or any other reason to join or pay money to any private organization as the price for his right to work. This principle was eloquently expressed by the late and revered Mr. Justice Glenn Terrell of the Florida Supreme Court in *Carpenters Union* v. *Miami Chapter, Associated General Contractors*, 55 So. 2d 794, (1952) as follows:

> The right to work is equivalent to the right to eat and the right to eat and provide raiment for his dependents is man's most dominant urge. In a free country like ours such a right should not depend on one's race, color, the lodge, craft, church or other organizations to which he belongs. Such a requirement is contrary to the spirit of our institutions, the basis on which our democracy was founded and every impulse of the forefathers who gave it existence. I can think of nothing more out of harmony with true Americanism. Membership in one's lodge, craft or church may be a means of enlarging spiritual, cultural, and physical assets, but to make his bread depend on craft, or church membership would be the worst species of anti-Americanism.

Mr. President, I am happy to have the record of this debate show that when I was inaugurated as Governor of the State of Florida, I was honored by having the oath of office administered to me by Mr. Justice Glenn Terrell, a member of the Supreme Court of the State of Florida. I am very proud of that fact.

There is also the practical moral problem which results from the fact that compulsory membership weakens the control that workers have over their own union organizations, and this lack of control has resulted in the corruption of union power which we have seen and continue to see on many sides.

We are in the midst of a tremendous struggle to secure the civil rights of members of minority races, and we have heard over and over that this is a moral problem, and that it is a moral obligation, as well as a political obligation, of the government to protect individual rights. Why, if this is true, is not the same equally true in respect to the protection of the rights of individual workers from compulsory unionism? Compulsory unionism creates a moral problem as equally pressing as the securing of civil rights of racial minorities, but here we are being asked to strip away the existing protections which 19 States have adopted to preserve and protect these rights of workers. We are thus being asked to create and perpetuate a moral wrong.

We are also being asked to commit a grievous political wrong by further circumscribing the sovereign power of the individual States to protect the rights of their citizens, and by withdrawing an area of State authority which the States have had from the very beginnings of this Nation.

The proponents of repeal of section 14(b) seek to create the impression that the authority of the States to enact right-to-work laws began with the adoption of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947. This is utterly and completely false. The States had the power and authority to adopt such laws before the Taft-Hartley Act and before the Wagner Act and before any of the other labor statutes which have been adopted by the Federal Government. As I have pointed out, the State of Florida adopted its right-to-work amendment in the year 1944, 3 years prior to the time that Congress considered and passed the Taft-Hartley Act. Ten other States had also adopted right-to-work laws before Taft-Hartley, and their constitutional right to adopt such laws has been upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States in a number of decisions including *Algoma Plywood and Veneer Company* v. *Wisconsin Employment Relations Board*, 336 U.S. 301 (1949); *Lincoln Federal Union Company* v. *Northwestern Iron & Metal Company*, 335 U.S. 525 (1949); *Whitaker* v. *State of North Carolina*, 335 U.S. 525 (1949), and *American Sash & Door Company* v. *AFL–CIO*, 335 U.S. 525 (1949).

Shortly after the adoption of the Florida right-to-work amendment, the American Federation of Labor launched a challenge to the constitutionality of this amendment. This challenge was heard by a three-judge Federal court sitting in Tampa, Fla., and extensive arguments were presented by attorneys for the AFL–CIO and by the Honorable J. Tom Watson, at that time attorney general of the State of Florida. The case which was styled Federation of Labor against Watson, was decided by the court June 11, 1945. The opinion of the court, rendered by Judge Waller, carefully reviewed the constitutional basis for the adoption of this amendment by the State of Florida and upheld the exercise of the State's authority in all respects. Since the opinion itself presents a very lucid and scholarly analysis of the constitutional question involved, I believe it would be well to quote the substance of this opinion. Judge Waller wrote, in pertinent part, as follows; and I ask unanimous consent that the quoted portion of Judge Waller's opinion, later becoming the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States in other cases, be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my statement.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The 1943 session of the legislature submitted to the people of Florida the following amendment as an addition to section 12 of the declaration of rights of their constitution:

" 'The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union, or labor organization: *Provided*, That this clause shall not be construed to deny or abridge the right of employees by and through a labor organization or labor union to bargain collectively with their employer.'

"The people, at the general election of 1944, adopted the proposed amendment.

"The American Federation of Labor, other State and national labor unions affiliated therewith, certain individuals suing as such and in their capacities as presidents of certain local unions, and certain corporate and individual employers of labor in Florida, all as plaintiffs and representatives of a class, brought suit in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida, Tampa Division, against the attorney general and the Governor, as well as the State attorney, county solicitor, and sheriff of Hillsborough County, as defendants and representatives of a class, and also against certain corporations named as nominal defendants, asserting that said amendment was in conflict with several provisions of the Federal Constitution and statutes and praying temporary and permanent injunctions against the defendants in said suit.

"The district judge granted the temporary restraining order and caused this three-judge court to be assembled.

"Jurisdiction of the Federal court was predicated upon the allegations that the suit arises under section 10 of article I, article VI, and the 1st and 14th amendments to the Constitution of the United States as authorized by section 41(1) of title 28, United States Code Annotated, and that it is also a suit for redress for the deprivation of civil rights as permitted by section 41(14) of title 28, and section 43 of title 8, United States Code Annotated. Jurisdiction of the three-judge court is asserted under section 380, title 28, United States Code Annotated.

"The motion of the attorney general of Florida to dismiss presents the legal issues upon which the case has been heard and which form the basis of the controversy, to wit:

"I. Whether the allegations of the complaint are sufficient to vest jurisdiction in the district court of the United States:

"(a) As a controversy arising under the Constitution and the laws of the United States involving an amount in excess of $3,000 under section 41(1) of title 28, United States Code Annotated; or

"(b) As a suit for the redress of the deprivation of civil rights under section 41(14) of title 28, United States Code Annotated or section 43 of title 8, United States Code Annotated, under which sections the amount in controversy is not material to a suit; and

"(c) Even if the district court of the United States has jurisdiction under either of the aforementioned sections, whether a case for the convening and consideration of a three-judge court under section 380, title 28, United States Code Annotated, has been shown.

"II. Whether the amended section of the constitution of the State of Florida deprives the plaintiffs of any rights under the following provisions of the Constitution and laws of the United States.

"(a) Section 10 of article I of the Federal Constitution, prohibiting any State from passing any law impairing the obligation of contracts;

"(b) Article VI of the Federal Constitution, providing that the Constitution, and laws of the United States which are made in pursuance of the Constitution, shall be the supreme law of the land.

"(c) The first amendment of the Constitution of the United States prohibiting Congress from making any law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for redress of grievances;

"(d) The 14th amendment, which prohibits any State from making or enforcing any law abridging the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States or from depriving any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law or from denying to any person the equal protection of the law;

"(e) Sections 151 to 166 of title 29, U.S.C.A., commonly known as the National Labor Relations Act.

"III. Whether or not the allegations of fact in the complaint, as distinguished from conclusions of law, show irreparable injury on the part of the plaintiffs, or either of them.

"IV. Whether or not the plaintiffs, or any of them, are entitled to maintain a suit for the deprivation of civil rights under the Constitution and laws of the United States.

"V. Whether or not the constitutional amendment is a valid and lawful exercise of the police power reserved to the State under the Constitution.

"VI. Whether or not there is any conflict between the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act and said constitutional amendment.

* * * * *

"[5] The motion to dismiss, admitting all of the facts appropriately alleged in the complaint, but not legal conclusions, presents three important legal questions:

"1. Is the Florida constitutional amendment in violation of any provisions of the Federal Constitution?

"2. Is the constitutional amendment a valid exercise of the police power of the State of Florida?

"3. Is the constitutional amendment in conflict with the provisions of any Federal statutes which were enacted within the power delegated to Congress?

"No substantial question of fact is involved requiring the taking of testimony or the making of express findings of facts.

"[6] The authority of the United States is supreme on all subjects which the Constitution has committed to it, and a State constitution, like a State statute, must fall if it is contrary to any provisions of the Federal organic law, or if it is in conflict with any provisions of the Federal statutes that were enacted within the scope of the power conferred upon Congress by the Constitution.

"[7-9] The wording of the Florida constitutional amendment is difficult, but it definitely does not violate the first amendment by abridging freedom of speech or of the press or of the right of assembly, or the right of petition to the Government for redress. The assaulted amendment undertakes to preserve to employees, in full vigor, the right of collective bargaining. Instead of preventing or abridging the rights of speech, press, assembly, and petition, the amendment seeks to preserve it to those who do not join a labor union as well as to those who do. This amendment has no similarity to antipicketing statutes or statutes which require the payment of a license by a labor organizer. The amendment is not in violation of the first amendment to the Federal Constitution. The same is true of the allegations as to its violation of the 14th amendment. There is no prohibition against a citizen belonging to any union that he chooses, but the prohibition seems to be against requiring membership in the union in order for a citizen to be eligible for work. Under statutes of the United States, such as section 102, title 29, U.S.C.A., a citizen is declared to be free to join a union or not, and one of the purposes of that statute, as well as the National Labor Relations Act, was to accord to employees full freedom to belong, or not to belong, to a union. The Florida constitutional amendment prohibits no one from joining a union but undertakes to declare that it shall not be a condition precedent to the right to work. It does not deny the labor union member the equal protection of the law, but appears to be designed to give the nonunion worker a protection of law which he had not theretofore enjoyed.

"[10] There is no vested right to have the police power of a State remain static. Every contract, involving subject matter that affects the public interest, into which a citizen may enter, is subject to the right of a State to regulate or to prohibit whenever it is deemed by the State to be essential in the public interest, and when it violates no provision of the superior national or State law. Contracts entered into prior to State and Federal prohibition against the manufacture or sale of intoxicating liquor were not held to have been illegally impaired by the adoption of prohibition when the States, and subsequently the Nation, deemed prohibition to be in the public interest.

"There are general allegations in the complaint as to contracts entered into prior to the amendment and alleged to have been impaired by it, but even if these allegations meet the requirements for definiteness and specificity in order to call forth the injunctive processes of the court, the question first to be answered would be whether or not the State was without authority in the exercise of its police power to adopt the amendment in question.

"There are certain principles relating to the police power of the States so axiomatic as not to need a statement as to their source, that might well be restated here.

"[11] 1. The United States is a Government of limited, enumerated, and delegated powers, having only such authority as has been granted to it by the Constitution or necessarily implied therefrom.

"[12] 2. In construing a law of the United States we look to see if power has been granted, but in construing a law of the State we look to see if it has been prohibited, realizing that all attributes of the government that have not been surrendered by the adoption of the Federal Constitution and its amendments have been retained by the State.

"[13] 3. It is fundamental that State laws must yield to the superior force of Federal laws which were passed within the sphere of delegated powers. However, a State law is superseded by a congressional law only to such an extent as the two are inconsistent.

"[14, 15] 4. An act passed under the police power of a State cannot be cast aside as inconsistent with an act of Congress unless there is an actual repugnancy or a complete taking over of the legislative field by Congress, and the rule has been laid down that a State statute is in conflict with a Federal statute when one may incur the penalty of the Federal statute by obeying the State statute or vice versa.

"[16] 5. The police power of a State is very broad and comprehensive and is liberally understood and applied. This principle is so well recognized and the police power is of such elasticity that the principle of stare decisis has no application to an exercise of this power. This position is justified, for if it were not thus mistaken decisions might destroy the power of society to protect itself. The State cannot contract away its police power and the courts cannot decide away that which the State itself cannot contract away.

"[17] 6. The courts cannot create a new Constitution. Laws and court-made rules of expediency must not be placed above the Constitution.

"[18] 7. Labor and labor unions are affected with a public interest and are subject to the regulatory power of the States for any reasonable regulation which will not be inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States and statutes enacted within the scope delegated by the Constitution to the Congress.

"[19] 8. Collective bargaining, self-organization, and other kindred union activities necessarily involve the rights of free speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and freedom of petition, which may not be denied by State statute or constitution, but we also must recognize that the total of union activity is directed toward economic objectives which involve purely commercial activities and which may be regulated by the State upon any reasonable basis when not in conflict with superior law.

"9. The very existence of the State as well as 'the security of the social order, the life and health of the citizen, the comfort of existence in a thickly populated community, the enjoyment of private and social life, and the beneficial use of property,' depend upon the police power of that State.

"[20] 10. 'The powers are not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.' The States existed before the Constitution of the United States, and they possessed the police power before the adoption of that organic document, and that police power was not by the Constitution delegated to the United States, and hence under the 10th amendment it is reserved in the States or in the people.

"[21] 11. There is, in the strict sense, no Federal police power.

"12. Rule by the majority is the essence of democracy. Members of a labor union are citizens first and subject to the will of the majority, lawfully exercised, and where that will has been exercised by a direct expression of the people at the polls the result is the fullest exercise of the democratic process and the fullest expression of the source of all political power—the people. 'All rights are derived from the purposes of the society in which they exist; above all rights rises duty to the community.' Dissenting opinion of Justice Brandeis in *Duplex Co.* v. *Deering*, 254 U.S. 443, 41 S. Ct. 172, 184, 65 L. Ed. 349, 16 A.L.R. 196.

"[22] 13. The wisdom or lack of wisdom of a State statute or of a provision in a State constitution is not a matter for the courts. The people, through their representatives in the legislature and through their vote for an amendment to their constitution, have the right to commit folly if they please, provided it is not prohibited by the Federal Constitution or antagonistic to Federal statutes authoritatively enacted concerning the matter involved. 'The conditions developed in industry may be such that those engaged in it cannot continue their struggle without danger to the community. But it is not for judges to determine whether such conditions exist, nor is it their function to set the limits of permissible contest and to declare the duties which the new situation demands.' Dissenting opinion of Justice Brandeis in *Duplex Co.* v. *Deering*, supra.

"[23] 14. It is the duty of the court to indulge in the presumption that the amendment is not in conflict with the organic law unless the contrary is clearly made to appear.

"[24] A consideration of these fundamental concepts impels the conclusion that the Florida constitutional amendment does not contravene any provision of the Federal Constitution and for aught that now appears it is a valid exercise of the police power of the State of Florida. Definitely labor unions are affected with a public interest as exemplified by the National Labor Relations, the Norris-La Guardia, and Fair Labor Standards Acts, 29 U.S.C.A. sections 151 et seq., 101 et seq., and 201 et seq., passed by Congress in and about the regulation of interstate commerce, and by numerous acts by State legislatures regulating labor unions in phases not embraced within the scope of the power of the National Congress.

"In view of the fact that no labor legislation by Congress has required an employee to belong to a labor union or has made the closed shop mandatory, but on the contrary the Federal public policy in regard to compulsory membership in labor unions is stated in section 102 of title 29, U.S.C.A., as follows: '* * * the individual unorganized worker is commonly helpless to exercise actual liberty of contract and to protect his freedom of labor, and thereby to obtain acceptable terms and conditions of employment, wherefore, though he should be free to decline to associate with his fellows, it is necessary that he have full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of his own choosing, to negotiate the terms and conditions of his employment, * * *' and in view of the provisions of the Florida amendment that it shall not be construed to deny or abridge the right of employees by and through a labor union to bargain collectively with an employer, there does not appear to be any provision of the Federal labor regulatory statutes with which the constitutional amendment collides. So long as the right to organize into a union and to bargain collectively is not abridged, there is no denial of freedom of speech, press, assembly, and petition. Whatever was traditionally a part of the process of collective bargaining seems to have been left unabridged by the second clause in the amendment.

"[25] The amendment makes it possible for the nonunion worker to have 'a free ride,' that is, to have the benefit of the gains and advantages that have accrued through the planning, the effort, the expense, the struggle, and the influence of the unions, without bearing any of their burdens, but this permissive incidence of poor sportsmanship is not new in the law. A substantial portion of the population in many communities have all the benefits of government, yet pay no taxes. Occasions are not singular when free riders in government are the recipients of its greatest solicitude, and the fact that the law gives an unearned advantage to the dissident or disinterested is but slightly dissimilar to the building of a schoolhouse largely from taxes paid by corporations which have no children to educate. This ground of objection was one for the legislature and the people rather than the courts.

"[26] It will be observed that the constitutional amendment is not self-executing and no enforcing legislation has been enacted. No prosecution under a criminal statute is involved, and although the Attorney General contends that a closed shop was illegal under section 1 of chapter 4144, Laws of Florida, acts of 1893 (sec. 833.02, Florida Statutes, 1941, F.S.A.), nevertheless, it is noted that the supreme court of Florida, in the case of *Jetton-Dekle Lumber Co.* v. *Mather et al.*, 53 Fla. 969, 43 So. 590, held that the act 'will not be applied to the case of union laborers who strike in order to secure all the labor for themselves,' which seems to say that the statute did not prohibit a closed shop. This decision under *Erie R.* v. *Tompkins,* 304 U.S. 64, 58 S. Ct. 817, 82 L. Ed. 1188, 114 A.L.R. 1487, is binding upon the Federal court.

"[27] A three-judge court cannot be convened merely to prevent a multiplicity of suits in the State courts by the Attorney General against employers of labor. But it does not seem necessary for us to determine whether or not irreparable injury to plaintiffs can result, nor do we here undertake to decide what complications might arise out of the operations of the National Labor Relations Act and the Florida constitutional amendment, but deem it necessary only to say that the Federal act and the amendment on their face do not appear to be in conflict, and it will be time enough to judge of such conflicts if and when they actually arise. This is not an action for a declaratory judgment but an injunction suit in anticipation of irreparable injury.

"From the foregoing it appears that the temporary injunction granted herein should be dissolved and vacated, and the motion of the Attorney General to dismiss the complaint should be sustained.

"Let an appropriate order be submitted."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, to conserve time—and I know we are all interested in conserving time—I should like to read briefly some of the paragraphs from Judge Waller's statement:

> [5] The motion to dismiss, admitting all of the facts appropriately alleged in the complaint, but not legal conclusions, presents three important legal questions:
>
> 1. Is the Florida constitutional amendment in violation of any provisions of the Federal Constitution?
>
> 2. Is the constitutional amendment a valid exercise of the police power of the State of Florida?
>
> 3. Is the constitutional amendment in conflict with the provisions of any Federal statutes which were enacted within the power delegated to Congress?

I have already placed in the RECORD all of this able opinion, but I may have occasion to read some portions of it again to supplement that which I have just read, showing clearly that the questions raised by the learned Attorney General went straight to the heart of the constitutionality, under Federal constitutional provisions, of the provisions in our State constitution.

The result of the opinion was to the effect that the court upheld thoroughly, in all respects, in answering the questions raised by the attorney general of Florida, the constitutionality of the Florida provisions as measured by Federal constitutional law, and upheld that provision as one that was salutary in protection of the people of the State of Florida.

Perhaps this paragraph might point up the decision of the learned three-judge court:

> A consideration of these fundamental concepts impels the conclusion that the Florida constitutional amendment does not contravene any provision of the Federal Constitution and for aught that now appears it is a valid exercise of the police power of the State of Florida. Definitely labor unions are affected with a public interest as exemplified by the National Labor Relations, the Norris-La Guardia, and the Fair Labor Standards Act—

And several others—

> passed by Congress in and about the regulation of interstate commerce, and by numerous acts by State legislatures regulating labor unions in phases not embraced within the scope of the power of the National Congress.
>
> In view of the fact that no labor legislation by Congress has required an employee to belong to a labor union or has made the closed shop mandatory, but on the contrary the Federal public policy in regard to compulsory membership in labor unions is stated in section 102 of title 29, U.S.C.A., as follows: "* * * the individual unorganized worker is commonly helpless to exercise actual liberty of contract and to protect his freedom of labor, and thereby to obtain acceptable terms and conditions of employment, wherefore, though he should be free to decline to associate with his fellows, it is necessary that he have full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of his own choosing, to negotiate the terms and conditions of his employment. * * *"

That last quotation was from the United States Code Annotated.

This strong opinion of an able three-judge court, issued in 1945, well before the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act, made it very clear that the Federal Constitution contravened in no respect whatever the right of Florida to enact a right-to-work amendment in its constitution, but upheld the action of the State of Florida in that regard.

Mr. President, I am skipping at great length the reading of these opinions, because I do not want to unduly take up the time of the Senate, which is here late this afternoon, and because I understand I shall be followed by my able colleague the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

Following this action of the three-judge district court the American Federation of Labor appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court. In this appeal the principal question raised was whether under the Federal judicial code a three-judge court had jurisdiction to dismiss the action. The Supreme Court in disposing of this jurisdictional question concluded that the Federal courts could not properly pass upon the constitutionality of the Florida law until it had been interpreted and explained by the Supreme Court of Florida.

I ask unanimous consent that the opinion of the Supreme Court be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the decision was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> As stated by the Supreme Court:
>
> "A decision today on the constitutionality of this Florida law would be based on a preliminary guess concerning its meaning, not on an authoritative construction of it. We have already noted that this law may be so construed as to eliminate any conflict alleged to exist between it and the National Labor Relations Act. If so, one of the constitutional questions presented by this case would disappear. It is suggested, however, that the due process question is ripe for adjudication no matter how the Florida law is construed. But if the law does no more than to grant an individual workingman a cause of action in case he is denied employment unless he joins a union, or if it goes no further than to make closed-shop agreements unenforceable between the parties, no case or controversy raising the due process question would be presented for decision by the present bill. For individual workingmen are not here asserting rights against unions or employers. Nor does the present case involve litigation by unions to enforce closed-shop agreements against employers. Fur-

> thermore, if, as the district court thought, this Florida law is not self-executing, suits seeking to raise the due process question or any other constitutional question would be premature until Florida supplied sanctions for its enforcement. A decision today on the merits might, therefore, amount to no more than an advisory opinion. In *Railroad Commission* v. *Pullman Co.*, 312 U.S. 496, 85 L. ed 971, 61 S. Ct. 643; *Chicago* v. *Fieldcrest Dairies*, 316 U.S. 168, 86 L. ed 1355, 62 S. Ct. 986, and *Spector Motor Service* v. *McLaughlin*, 323 U.S. 101, 89 L. ed 101, 65 S. Ct. 152, all supra, we held that under such circumstances the proper course was for the district court to retain the bill until a definite determination of the local law questions could be made by the State courts. The doubts concerning the meaning of the Florida law indicate that such a procedure is peculiarly appropriate here. Quo warranto proceedings presently pending in the Florida courts may resolve the doubts. And other actions, such as suits for a declaratory judgment, would seem to be available in the State courts."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Supreme Court held that it could see nothing unconstitutional about the decision of the Florida court, but at that stage it was untimely for the Federal Court to pass upon it, and the matter was returned to the three-judge court to await later decision of the State courts with reference to this matter.

For this reason the Supreme Court remanded the cause to the district court to retain the action pending the determination of proceedings in State courts. Apparently the American Federation of Labor did not initiate any subsequent proceedings or legal actions in the State courts of Florida as a followup to this action of the U.S. Supreme Court. There have been, however, a number of other legal actions in which the Supreme Court of Florida has interpreted and applied the Florida right-to-work amendment. The value of this amendment in safeguarding the fundamental rights of workers from coercion by either employers or labor unions is clearly illustrated and spelled out in these various court decisions, and for this reason I feel they are well worth reading in their complete text.

Time does not permit me to read the full body of opinions of the Florida Supreme Court fully upholding our constitutional amendment. I shall merely cite them by name: Miami Typographical Union against Ormerod, Plumbers Local Union 519 against Robertson, and Plumbers Local Union 234 against Hanley and Beckworth.

These decisions of our own Supreme Court of Florida upheld the validity by both the State and Federal courts of our State constitution.

In addition to these decisions of the Supreme Court of Florida which I have cited, there have been numerous actions in the lower courts of Florida in which individual rights have been brought within the blanket of protection of the Florida right-to-work amendment. The frequency with which citizens of Florida have invoked the protection of this amendment gives abundant testimony to its usefulness, and even indispensability as a constitutional guarantee.

I wish to reread that sentence. The frequency with which citizens of Florida have invoked the protection of this amendment gives abundant testimony to its usefulness, and even indispensability, as a constitutional guarantee. As a result, the people of Florida overwhelmingly support this law and regard it as a precious adjunct to their fundamental rights.

Not only is that attitude on the part of the people of Florida shown by numerous polls taken at various times, and particularly in recent times, but it has been shown by other public actions, which I shall cite briefly.

On a number of occasions since the adoption of the Florida right-to-work amendment in 1944 the people of Florida through their elected representatives have turned back union supported efforts to have it revoked. For example, in the 1949 session of the Florida Legislature separate resolutions were offered in the house and senate to amend section 12 of the bill of rights so as to eliminate the right-to-work provision. Public reaction against these resolutions was so powerful that after they were referred to the respective legislative committees no further action was taken. That died in committee. Again in the 1951 session of the legislature a union-sponsored bill to repeal the right-to-work provision of the bill of rights was allowed to die in committee, as had the earlier proposal.

In spite of these setbacks organized labor never abandoned its efforts to nullify the protections which the amendment afforded the individual worker to exercise his freedom of choice with respect to joining or refraining from joining a labor union. Not being successful in their head-on assault on the right-to-work amendment the unions set out to circumvent it by various devices and stratagems. One such device which deserves special attention is the agency shop contract, which, as we shall see, became the subject of a celebrated case which went through the Florida courts and on to the Supreme Court of the United States on two separate occasions.

The agency shop is a form of agreement under which an employer agrees that all of the employees must pay to the union, as a condition of employment, amounts equivalent to the union's established initiation fee and regular monthly dues. That is, whether they are members or not, they must make these payments.

This form of agreement expressly provides that the employees need not become members of the union, but must pay these dues and fees to the union to help defray the costs of collective bargaining. An employee who fails or refuses to pay over to the union these specified dues and fees must, under the terms of the agreement, be discharged by the employer.

In substance, this form of agreement imposes upon employees the same terms and conditions as unions are permitted to impose under the union shop provisions of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, namely, the obligation to pay union dues and fees as a condition of employment. Under section 8(a)(3) a union, it should be noted, cannot compel the discharge of an employee for nonmembership in the union, as long as the employee tenders the initiation fee and periodic dues.

Since the Florida right-to-work amendment speaks only in terms of abridgment of the right of persons to work "on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union," union lawyers in Florida concluded that they could circumvent the effect of the right-to-work amendment by entering into contracts with employers requiring that all employees must pay union dues and fees but shall not be obligated to become or remain members of the union.

The first test of this device to circumvent the Florida law arose in connection with an agreement between Food Fair stores and the Retail Clerk's International Association covering employees in a number of supermarkets in southern Florida. Following the execution of this agreement, Food Fair notified all of its employees that they must, in order to retain their jobs, pay the prescribed union initiation fee and regular monthly dues. A number of employees objected to this requirement, and in order to protect their rights under the Florida constitution brought an action to enjoin the company and the union from enforcing the provisions of this agency shop agreement or to discharge any of the plaintiff employees for failure to comply with the provisions of this agreement. The company and the union moved to dismiss the complaint on the ground that the agency shop contract was not in violation of the Florida right-to-work amendment. The trial court granted the motion to dismiss, and the plaintiffs appealed. The District Court of Appeals for the Third District of Florida, which was the first appellate court, reversed the action of the trial court in dismissing the complaint, and held that the agency shop contract was clearly in violation of the State right-to-work law. As stated by the court:

> Under section 12 of the Declaration of Rights of Florida what is prohibited is the denial or abridgment of one's right to work "on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union, or labor organization." When, because of his nonmembership, an employee is required to pay labor union dues, or sums equal to the dues, as a condition of employment or continued employment, his right to work is abridged.
>
> Anything which imposes a charge or expense upon the free exercise of a right, abridges it in the sense of curtailing or lessening the use or enjoyment of that right. As defined in Webster's New International Dictionary, to abridge is "to deprive; to cut off; to diminish, curtail." And "abridge" is defined in the Oxford English Dictionary as being "to curtail, to lessen, to diminish (rights, privileges, advantages, or authority)." The Louisiana Supreme Court adopted this meaning and definition of "abridged" as contained in the right-to-work law of that State, saying:
>
> "The public policy of Louisiana is expressed in the Right-to-Work Act, section 1, supra. In analyzing 'the right of a person or persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or labor organization,' we must look to the meaning of the word 'abridged.' A study of various law dictionaries and Webster's Dictionary will show that the legislature intended the word 'abridged,' as used in the act, to mean

> 'diminished, reduced, curtailed, or shortened.'"
>
> The natural and reasonable interpretation of the Florida constitutional amendment, which prohibits compulsory membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment or of continued employment, is that it necessarily forbids forcing a nonmember employee to pay union initiation fees, dues and assessments or equivalent amounts as a condition of employment or of continued employment. A contrary construction of the right-to-work law would leave it little or no useful purpose to serve.
>
> For the reasons stated, we are impelled to hold that the agency shop provision in the contract here under attack violates section 12 of the Declaration of Rights of Florida, which declares the right-to-work policy of this State. Accordingly, the decree is reversed and the cause remanded for further proceeding not inconsistent herewith.
>
> Reversed and remanded.

This became a famous case because the unions and the employer went first to the Supreme Court of Florida and later to the U.S. Supreme Court.

I shall not read in full the decisions of the courts in both those appeals, but this paragraph from the opinion of the able Supreme Court of Florida, construing section 12 of the Declaration of Rights, the Florida right-to-work amendment, stated:

> This section clearly bestows on the workingman a right to join or not to join a labor union, as he sees fit, without jeopardizing his job. Inasmuch as the Constitution has granted this right, the agency shop clause is repugnant to the Constitution in that it requires the nonunion employee to purchase from the labor union a right which the Constitution has given him. The Constitution grants a free choice in the matter of belonging to a labor union. The agency shop clause contained in the contract under consideration purports to acknowledge that right, but in fact, abrogates it by requiring the nonunion worker to pay the union for the exercise of that right or, in the alternative, to be discharged from his employment.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. I ask the Senator from Florida, when we strip the argument of compulsory unionism of all sophistries annexed to it, does it not come down to this: That the right to work is a right which a union may sell and a right which the individual workers must purchase if he is going to be permitted to earn his daily bread for himself and his family?

Mr. HOLLAND. The distinguished Senator is correct. His statement echoes and reechoes forcefully the opinion of the Supreme Court of Florida which I have just read. There is no doubt about it. If a worker has to pay dues and pay an initiation fee to an organization to which he does not care to belong, he is paying so that he will enjoy that work rather than be deprived of it. The Senator is correct. I thank the Senator for his intervention.

I am calling the Senator's attention to this statement by the Florida Supreme Court because it so clearly restates, as the court has again and again stated, the sentiment and the conclusive fact which the Senator has so ably stated.

I continue to quote:

> Such an arrangement is palpably and totally inconsistent with the freedom of choice contemplated by our declaration of rights, section 12.
>
> The appellees contend that, except for the agency-shop provision, the nonunion employees of the appellant Food Fair would be free riders, that is, they would reap the benefits of union representation without having to bear any of the cost thereof. This argument is grounded on the fact that the union is, by law, the bargaining agent for all employees—those who do not belong to the union as well as those who do (29 U.S.C.A., sec. 159.) This argument may be answered by reference to the section of the Constitution under consideration. Clearly, it is the intent of this section to leave as a matter for individual determination and preference the question of whether the worker will derive any benefit from association with a labor union. The choice is his to make. Presumably, the appellants in the instant case have decided that union membership is not an overall benefit to them personally, else they would have joined.
>
> The appellees further assert that our State courts are without jurisdiction to determine this matter, because of the preemption by the Federal Government of the field of labor relations, by virtue of the Labor Management Relations Act (29 U.S.C.A., secs. 141–188). We hold, as did the Supreme Court of Kansas in the case of *Higgins* v. *Cardinal Manufacturing Company*, 188 Kan. 11,360 P. 2d 456 (42 LC par. 50,186), that section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act (29 U.S.C.A. sec. 164(b)) preserves the jurisdiction of the States in matters involving State right-to-work provisions. It is true that section 14(b) specifically deals only with agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a consideration of employment, however, it is not to be presumed that Congress would preserve to the States the field of right-to-work legislation, while, at the same time, intending that unions and management could, by the use of subterfuge of an agency shop clause, circumvent and, in effect, nullify a paramount provision of the organic law of any of the several States.

Following this decision of the Supreme Court of Florida upholding the right of the individual worker to hold a job without being required to pay union dues and fees, the Retail Clerk's Union filed a petition for certiorari with the Supreme Court of the United States, and the Supreme Court granted such petition and agreed to review the decision of the Florida court. This case was then heard by the U.S. Supreme Court on two main issues: First, whether the authority reserved to the States under section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act permitted the States to outlaw the agency shop form of contract as well as union membership contracts, and second, whether the State courts of Florida or the National Labor Relations Board had enforcement jurisdiction in regard to such matters.

These two issues were heard in two separate appearances before the U.S. Supreme Court. Mr. Justice White wrote the opinion in the first case, on the question of whether or not the National Labor Relations Board had jurisdiction or the State courts had jurisdiction. Justice Douglas wrote the opinion in the second case on the ultimate question of whether or not the Florida constitution prevented the use of the agency shop agreement device to go around or to curtail the workers' rights under our Constitution.

Because of the importance of the issue here involved, the attorneys general of 19 States filed amicus curiae briefs with the U.S. Supreme Court urging the Court to uphold the power of the States to deal with agency shop agreements.

Mr. President, the right-to-work States stood together. They realized that this question was vital to the upholding of their State provisions, whether they were statutory provisions or constitutional provisions. Therefore, every State with a right-to-work provision asked to be heard, to supplement the briefs and the appearance of the Attorney General of the State of Florida and those who were associated with him.

They pointed out that if the right-to-work laws of the various States were to be held unenforcible in respect to agency shop agreements, the net result would be that all of these various State laws would be meaningless, and would have little or no effect in restraining compulsory unionism.

Mr. President, if it was a subterfuge, once approved by the Supreme Court, by which the clear meaning of the right-to-work provisions could be defeated, that subterfuge would be used in any and all cases, and the right-to-work provisions, whether constitutional or statutory, would become meaningless.

Such a result, the attorneys general pointed out, would frustrate the congressional intent expressed in section 14(b) and would frustrate the desires of the people of the States that had adopted right-to-work laws.

When this issue was first presented to the U.S. Supreme Court, the Court, in a decision delivered by Justice White, held that the individual States had adequate authority to prohibit agency shop agreements. The Court left open, however, the further question as to whether the enforcement of such State prohibitions of compulsory unionism agreements was properly within the jurisdiction of the State courts or within the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board. Following subsequent reargument, the Court in a decision rendered by Justice Douglas ruled that the State courts have enforcement authority to protect rights of individual workers under State right-to-work laws.

At this point, I would like to read the substance of the two decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in Retail Clerk's Union against Schermerhorn.

This was the Florida case which came up as a result of the Food Fair closed shop agreement, which I have already mentioned. I shall not attempt to read these decisions in detail. I will hold them in abeyance until future appearance in the course of this debate, because they are well worthy of careful reading and objective consideration. I believe the decisions would be interesting to the present occupant of the chair, the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who is a former U.S. attorney. I know that he respects and reveres the opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States.

I shall first read excerpts from the opinion of Mr. Justice White. I do not pretend that they cover the whole decision. I want it distinctly understood that I selected these particular paragraphs myself. Anyone is welcome, at any time, to read the entire decision. I reserve the right to read the decision later, if there is proper occasion to do so. But I shall read these two paragraphs from the decision of Mr. Justice White, speaking for a complete Court, except for Mr. Justice Goldberg, who did not participate, for obvious reasons.

EXCERPTS: FIRST SCHERMERHORN DECISIONS

[Argued Apr. 18, 1963; decided June 3, 1963]

> An agency shop arrangement which, without requiring employees to join the contracting union, imposes upon them, as a condition of employment, the only membership obligation enforcible by discharge under 8(a)(3) of the amended National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 158(a)(3)), namely, the obligation to pay to the union initiation fees and regular dues, is the practical equivalent of an "agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment," which is exempted from the prohibitions of 8(a)(3) by the proviso thereto.
>
> An agency shop arrangement by which employees, without being required to join the contracting union, are required to pay, as a condition of employment, an initial service fee and monthly service fees to the union, is not, because it provides that the fees are payable for the purpose of aiding the union in defraying costs in connection with its legal obligations as the exclusive bargaining agent of the employees, excluded from the scope of 14(b) of the amended National Labor Relations Act, stating that nothing in the act shall be construed as authorizing the execution of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State in which such execution is prohibited by State law.

Mr. President, those are partial quotations from the able decision of Mr. Justice White in the first Schermerhorn case, argued April 18, 1963, and decided June 3, 1963.

The case came back for a second argument on the other question. The decision for the full Court in this case, except for Mr. Justice Goldberg, who did not sit, was written by Mr. Justice Douglas. This case was reargued on October 16 and 17, 1963, and was decided on December 2, 1963.

These cases had great general interest. The reargument of this single phase took 2 days of the precious time of the Supreme Court of the United States, indicating the gravity of the case, in the judgment of the Court, and the fact that the Court was willing to hear the arguments of the various attorneys general who were pleading for the provisions of their own States, whether statutory or constitutional provisions. I read excerpts from the decision of Mr. Justice Douglas in the second hearing:

EXCERPTS: SECOND SCHERMERHORN DECISION

[Reargued October 16 and 17, 1963; decided December 2, 1963]

> Senator Taft in the Senate debates stated that 14(b) was to continue the policy of the Wagner Act and avoid Federal interference with State laws in this field. As to the Wagner Act he stated, "But that did not in any way prohibit the enforcement of State laws which already prohibited closed shops." He went on to say, "That has been the law ever since that time. It was the law of the Senate bill; and in putting in this express provision from the House bill (14(b)) we in no way change the bill as passed by the Senate of the United States."

That last quotation from the Court is also a quotation from a statement by our late distinguished colleague Senator Robert Taft, of Ohio, whose name is half of the name which marks this particular law, the Taft-Hartley Act—

> In light of the wording of 14(b) and its legislative history, we conclude that Congress in 1947 did not deprive the States of any and all power to enforce their laws restricting the execution and enforcement of union-security agreements. Since it is plain that Congress left the States free to legislate in that field, we can only assume that it intended to leave unaffected the power to enforce those laws. Otherwise, the reservation which Senator Taft felt to be so critical would become empty and largely meaningless.
>
> But 14(b) gives the States power to outlaw even a union-security agreement that passes muster by Federal standards. Where Congress gives State policy that degree of overriding authority, we are reluctant to conclude that it is nonetheless enforcible by the Federal agency in Washington.

That is a very fine point made by Mr. Justice Douglas. It made that exclusion under the Taft-Hartley Act cover only the closed-shop arrangement, and held that if the NLRB had jurisdiction it could proceed upon the theory that only the closed shop was prohibited.

He said it is a fact that Congress gave to the States more plenary power by their own State law and certainly did not take away from the State court the right to enforce and to protect such State laws even though they went further than the Federal law.

Congress, in other words, chose to abandon any search for uniformity in dealing with the problems of State laws barring the execution and application of agreements authorized by section 14(b) and decided to suffer a medley of attitudes and philosophies on the subject.

I ask all Senators who may have any question of constitutionality in their mind, who may have any question as to the morals that are involved, to read in full the decisions of the State and Federal courts which I have mentioned here tonight. Such Senators will find that, while the opinions of those courts may differ from their own attitudes, those courts made it powerfully clear that, in their opinion, there was ample political reason and ample moral reason for the enactment of section 14(b) and for the procedures adopted in various States, some of which had acted before the Taft-Hartley Act was enacted, and some later, in adopting right-to-work laws.

Mr. President, I had the great privilege of being associated with those in the Senate who originally supported the Taft-Hartley Act. I had the great privilege 2 years later of participating rather actively in the debate when our former able colleague, the late Senator from Utah, Mr. Elbert Thomas, brought to the floor a bill which would have eliminated much of the Taft-Hartley Act, including section 14(b).

It was my privilege to address my own argument in that particular debate in 1949 largely to the question of section 14(b).

I trust that I may have the pleasure at a later time during the course of this debate, to refresh my own recollection and the recollection of other Senators who were here at that time, and also to call to the attention of Senators who have joined us at a later date—and we have many valuable Senators who have done so—of the arguments which seem to me so powerful, and which prevented the Congress in 1949 from overriding its former action which, by the way, Congress had taken in the face of a veto by overriding the veto of the then President, President Truman.

As can be seen, these Supreme Court decisions are the latest chapter in the history of the Florida right-to-work amendment. We in Florida have zealousy fought for and guarded this important provision of our State constitution for more than 20 years—it will soon be 21 years, Mr. President—and we intend to continue to fight for this amendment and for the individual liberties which it seeks to protect. The people of Florida are overwhelmingly opposed to the proposal now before this Congress which would, by repealing section 14(b), strike down a vital part of our State constitution. The elected representatives of the people of Florida have a clear mandate to resist to the utmost this flagrant infringement of the will of the majority of our citizens, and I, for my part, intend to follow this mandate.

Mr. President, one further brief statement of fact, and then I shall be glad to relinquish the floor to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], who has been so patient and who, I understand, has a very thoughtful speech on this subject which he wishes to make before having to leave Washington.

The first thing about which I wish to comment is that the State of Florida has found that, in fighting for this provision, it has been fighting for its own existence. I have before me the census figures, beginning with the census of 1940, coming through the census of 1960, and down to the estimate of the Census Bureau to July 1, 1965, this year, for the State of Florida, which I in part represent.

In 1940, the year in which I was elected Chief Magistrate of Florida, the Federal census showed that we had a population of 1,897,414. In 1950, that census figure had gone up to 2,771,305. In 1960 it had gone up to 4,951,560. In 1965, the estimate, as of July 1, was 5,805,000.

In other words, we are at the very threshold of having 6 million residents. Aside from the fact that we have 15 to 16 million tourists every year, and aside from the fact that we have entertained and still entertain large numbers of refugees, as the Senate well knows, which takes us over the 6 million figure, our permanent residents totaled 5,805,000 persons, on July 1 of this year, according to the estimate of the Bureau of the Census—and I have found that they are generally highly conservative, because ever since I have known about the estimates, the actual count in my State has exceeded the estimates.

During this period, not only has the State trebled in population, but the State has also gone up in relation to its place among the great 50 States of the Nation, from 27th place, which it occupied in 1940, to 9th place, which it has occupied for these last 2 years and still occupies.

We know perfectly well that the right-to-work provision is by no means the sole contributor to that condition, but we know that it has been an actual contributor to the vast growth of the State of Florida.

If we look at the State of Arizona, which, along with Florida, has had the most phenomenal growth in all the Nation, we will see the same kind of statistics—again, not caused wholly by the right-to-work provision in their constitutions. I believe that Arizona was the second State to include the right-to-work provision in its constitution but, nevertheless, its growth has been phenomenal.

The prophets of doom who declare that the right-to-work provision spells disaster, spells poor wages, spells lack of prosperity, and spells lack of opportunity, must get on to some other point, because they cannot prove it.

The two great States of Florida and Arizona have led the other States during the past 20 years in growth and prosperity, and they both have right-to-work provisions written into their State constitutions.

Mr. President, I wish to place the following statistics in the Record, taken as they are from many sources, including the Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, and from the Department of Commerce; and I shall cite the official sources from which the figures have been taken.

From the figures of the Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics: In the field of nonagricultural employees, in the years 1953 to 1963, Florida has increased 69.5 percent as compared with 9 percent in the average of all non-right-to-work States in the Nation.

From the figures of the Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics: In the field of new manufacturing jobs, in the years 1953 to 1963, Florida has increased 78.2 percent compared with minus 7.6 percent, the average of all non-right-to-work States in the Nation.

From the figures of the Department of Commerce: In the field of production workers, in the years 1953 to 1962, Florida increased 51.1 percent as compared with minus 14.1 percent in the average of all non-right-to-work States in the Nation.

From the figures of the Department of Commerce: In the field of capital expenditures, in the years 1953 to 1962, Florida increased 86.4 percent, compared with 27.2 percent in the average of all non-right-to-work States in the Nation.

From the figures of the Department of Commerce: In the field of per capita personal income, in the years 1953 to 1963, Florida increased 35.7 percent compared with the close figure of 35.4 percent in the average of all non-right-to-work States in the Nation.

From the figures of the Department of Commerce: In the field of personal income—a very important field—in the years 1953 to 1963, Florida increased 136.7 percent compared with 60.2 percent in the average of all non-right-to-work States in the Nation.

From the figures of the Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics: In the field of hourly earnings by manufacturing workers, in the years 1953 to 1963, Florida increased 57.3 percent compared with 41.5 percent in the average of all non-right-to-work States in the Nation.

From the figures of the Department of Commerce: In the field of valued added by manufacturing, in the years 1953 to 1962, Florida increased 202.7 percent compared with 41.5 percent in the average of all non-right-to-work States in the Nation.

From the figures of the Department of Commerce: In the field of population, in the years 1950 to 1964, Florida increased 105.9 percent, compared with 26.2 percent in the average of all non-right-to-work States in the Nation.

From the figures of the Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics: In the field of average weekly earnings of production workers, in the years 1955 to 1965, Florida increased 56.6 percent, compared with 42.8 percent in the average of all non-right-to-work States in the Nation.

From the figures of the Department of the Treasury: In the field of bank deposits, in the years 1953 to 1964, Florida increased 137.3 percent, compared with 53.5 percent in the average on all non-right-to-work States in the Nation.

From the figures of the Department of Commerce: In the field of motor vehicle registrations, in the years 1953 to 1963, Florida increased 109.8 percent, compared with 44.3 percent in the average of all non-right-to-work States in the Nation.

From the figures of the Department of Commerce: In the field of annual retail trade payroll, in the years 1954 to 1958, Florida increased 51.5 percent compared with 17.5 percent in the average of all non-right-to-work States in the Nation.

From the figures of the Department of Commerce: In the field of retail trade sales, in the years 1954 to 1958, Florida increased 45.5 percent, compared with 16.7 percent in the average of all non-right-to-work States of the Nation.

From the figures of the Department of Commerce: In the field of retail trade establishments, with payroll, in the years 1954 to 1958, Florida increased 28.5 percent, compared with 3.4 percent in the average of all the non-right-to-work States in the Nation. In the total, Florida increased 20 percent, compared with 2.6 percent in the average of all non-right-to-work States in the Nation.

From the figures of the Institute of Life Insurance: In the field of value of life insurance, in the years 1953 to 1963, Florida increased 271.3 percent, compared with 132 percent in the average of all the non-right-to-work States of the Nation.

From the figures of the Institute of Life Insurance: In the field of number of life insurance policies, in the years 1953 to 1963, Florida increased 63.3 percent, compared with 26.8 percent in the average of all the non-right-to-work States in the Nation.

Again, I do not claim the right-to-work provision was the only factor contributing to that great prosperity, increase in wages, purchasing power, and population. I know it is making a distinct contribution in that field, and all the agencies in my State which keep up with that matter know that to be the case. In Washington they know perfectly well that it is so, though I find no official publication stating that as a fact. I wish they would measure those factors as against the official policy and announce it in public, even if it would have to be against their pet theories, because of the fact that the right-to-work States, including my own good State, have shown phenomenal growth, elasticity, resourcefulness, and aggressiveness, just as we have shown in our fight for 21 years to keep that provision, and will keep on fighting. That kind of spirit brings about great growth, and that kind of spirit makes for freedom and the right to work where one pleases without having to pay for the privilege of working there.

Mr. President, I have over 50 excerpts from letters of members of organized labor who have written me, imploring me to stand up for the right-to-work provision and to keep that right by retaining section 14(b).

During any further continuation of this educational debate, if it should continue, I shall make these letters the subject of my talk, because in many instances members of labor organizations tell about abuses of power which they have seen and other things they have seen which they deplore. I shall, of course, not place their names in the Record, but if any Senator doubts the authenticity of those statements, he will be at liberty to see the original letter in every case.

I see present on the floor my distinguished friend from Nebraska, who has been waiting patiently. I apologize for having kept him so long. I yield the floor at this time.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, there is certainly no need for apology from the Senator from Florida. He has given an excellent statement and documentation of many things that have happened in the last 20 years, since his State was the leadoff State in having a constitutional provision on the State level which was later implemented by section 14(b). That constitutional provision approach, which was implemented by statute, was followed in my State of Nebraska. It was followed as being fourth in line among the States which approached this problem by constitutional amendment and which was later implemented by statute. I shall come to that in just a little while.

I am grateful to the Senator from Florida for his fine statement. I am honored to be able to follow him in making this speech.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I wish to reply to statements made on this floor yesterday which I feel mistakenly impugn the integrity and dedication of both the State of Texas and its Governor. Since this is, in effect, a matter of personal privilege, I ask unanimous consent that my brief remarks not be charged against me as a speech on the pending issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Oregon is a most learned and astute man. He is my good friend and cherished colleague. I agree with him and vote with him on many occasions, and I value his judgment in his many and varied areas of expertise.

I regret that Texas is not one of his areas of expertise, for I would like him and all Americans to know a great deal about the State I have the honor to represent here. However, he has made some unintentional mistakes in speaking of Texas; and I feel I must clarify the situation in complete good humor and complete candor.

Yesterday on this floor, in a description of alleged labor conditions in Texas, my State and its chief executive were maligned—referred to in a most deprecating manner. Some of the allegations against my State and our Governor were merely misleading, other unfortunate allegations were completely erroneous.

The word "sordid" was used in describing conditions attributed to Governor Connally. The word "exploitation" was used against our employers. It was stated that such exploitation was accomplished with knowledge of the Governor. The implication was that the exploitation was, in fact, encouraged by the Governor. It was stated further:

> The Governor of Texas is notorious for his advocacy of low labor standards in Texas in order to pirate away from high-labor-standard States industries and plants such as are involved in the Mexican worker textile sweatshops in Texas.

Mr. President, no documentation can be provided that shows our Governor ever advocated any such thing.

The statement was made, and I quote:

> Texas maintains some of the most shocking low labor standards in this country.

It was stated that empty trucks crossed the Rio Grande to Mexico and that Mexican laborers were loaded into them to be carried across the international border back into Texas to work in alleged low-labor-standard textile factories.

Mr. President, this is not correct. It is illegal to drive empty trucks into Mexico. There is no hauling of workers back and forth into and out of Mexico.

It was further said that textile factories have been moved into Texas from the New England States and other States. Mr. President, if this is so, it is without the knowledge of those involved in the textile industry of Texas.

I have rechecked closely this afternoon and reaffirmed the fact that in order for a worker to work in a U.S. plant that is covered by the Federal wage and hours laws—as are all the textile mills in Texas that are in question here—the worker must have indicated that he intends to become an American citizen and have his first papers.

In fact, the vast majority of those working under these conditions are full American citizens already.

As an example, one plant I have contacted today informs me that of 600 employees, only 43 live in Mexico, and all 43 are American citizens. They live in Mexico by choice because they find it cheaper to live there than in the United States.

Further, all the workers in question are covered by minimum wage provisions of present law. These plants are checked constantly by Federal inspectors to be sure that no violations occur. I emphasize that all these employees, whether living in Mexico or the United States, are covered by Federal wage and hour standards.

Mr. President, there has been no influx of eastern mills to Texas, although we would, of course, welcome them if they prefer our climate and progressive economy. The mills along the border, and the only ones that could be affected by the situation described by the Senator from Oregon, are all old mills, firmly established in Texas many, many years ago, by Texas citizens.

There is the possibility that confusion exists over the commuter problem. These commuters who come back and forth across the border under Federal regulation, and who are Mexican citizens, do so on temporary work visas and are employed as domestics and the like. They do not work in textile mills. Textile mills are covered by Federal wage and hour standards, and employees in these mills must be American citizens or have indicated that they will become Americans. They must have demonstrated this by taking the first steps toward citizenship.

In actual practice, the person who has indicated this desire for citizenship, and thus become eligible for work, maintains his residence on the American side of the river, for he is seeking to establish his residence as an American. The few persons who live in Mexico and come across the river to work in industries covered by Federal wage and hour standards are American citizens living in Mexico for their own convenience.

There are more than 60 textile mills in my State, and more than 30 employ in excess of 20 persons each. In total the industry employs some 7,300 Texans at an annual payroll of some $22 million.

It is important to note, however, that virtually none of these plants is situated in the border area where it would be feasible to hire workers who live in Mexico.

In addition, employment in the Texas textile industry is down by some 2,000 from its level of the early 1950's, which does not indicate that our State has gained textile jobs at the expense of other States—as was mistakenly indicated here yesterday.

These Texas cities are host to the principal textile work:

Broadwoven fabric mills, cotton—Bonham, Brenham, Corsicana, Cuero, McKinney, Denison, Hillsboro, Houston, Mexia, New Braunfels, Post, San Antonio, Sherman, Waco, and West.

Broadwoven fabric mills, manmade fiber and silk—Sequin.

Broadwoven fabric mills, wool—including dyeing and finishing—Brownwood, Eldorado, Houston.

Narrow fabric and other smallwares mills, cotton, wool, silk, and manmade fiber—Dallas.

Full-fashioned hosiery mills—New Braunfels.

Seamless hosiery mills—New Braunfels.

Knit outerwear mills—San Antonio.

Knitting mills—Dallas.

Finishers of broadwoven fabrics of cotton—Dallas, Frisco, Italy, Waxahachie, Fort Worth, San Antonio.

Finishers of broadwoven fabrics of manmade fiber and silk—Amarillo.

Dyeing and finishing textiles—Taylor.

Woven carpets and rugs—Lubbock.

Tufted carpets and rugs—Lubbock.

Yarn spinning mills, cotton, manmade fibers and silk—Bonham, League City.

Thread mills—Galveston, Houston.

Felt goods, except woven felts and hats—Dallas, Denison, Fort Worth, Houston, Lamesa, Longview, Tyler, Athens, Beaumont, Dallas, Midlothian, Denison, Fort Worth, Houston, San Antonio, Taylor.

Processed waste and recovered fibers and block—Dallas, San Antonio.

Artificial leather, oilcloth and other impregnated and coated fibers except rubberized—Houston.

Wool scouring, worsted combing and tow-to-top mills—Brady, Del Rio, San Angelo, San Marcos.

Cordage and twine—Aransas Pass, Bonham, Dallas, Fort Stockton, Houston, Port Isabel, West.

Unclassified textile goods—Dallas, Galveston, Gonzales, Houston, Marfa.

This, then, Mr. President, is the list of Texas cities having an interest in the wide-ranging industries classified under the general manufacturing term "textiles" the weaving or making of cloth. This is the Texas textile industry which has been mistakenly maligned here in the Senate.

For those familiar with the geography of my State, it is obvious that the bulk of this work is done in central and northern Texas. Most of it is done by firms founded by Texans many years ago. Virtually none—in fact, none that I have been able to identify—moved to Texas from New England, as was mistakenly stated here yesterday.

There are two textile-type firms in the border area. One in Port Isabel and one in Del Rio. I have today been in contact with officials of the plants in both those cities—in Del Rio the Associated Processors plant, and in Port Isabel the Bayside Net & Twine Co.

Neither of these firms has any employee who is not an American citizen.

Neither these two border-city firms, nor any other Texas textile mill operates what was called here yesterday "Mexican-worker textile sweatshops." My State happens to enjoy the best relations of any State with the Republic of Mexico. We have demonstrated many times over our willingness and desire to work with

Mexico in improving the lot of citizens on both sides of the Rio Grande. Cases in point are the Chamizal settlement and the now building Amistad Dam.

Texans enjoy good relations with Mexicans. Texas officials enjoy and cherish good relations with Mexican officials. Specifically, our Governor has been honored throughout the Mexican border States on his visits there. I am pleased to be acquainted with such Mexican officials as the Governor of Coahuila, with whom I joined recently in ceremonies at the Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I point out that Texas in no way maintains—as was said here yesterday—"the most shocking low labor standards in this country." Texas is certainly not—as was said here yesterday—"an outstanding reason why the right-to-work laws should be repealed."

In my humble judgment, Texas is a very good example of why States should retain the right to have right-to-work laws if they so see fit.

I will illustrate briefly by just a few percentage comparisons between Texas and the non-right-to-work States:

Rate of increase, last 10 years

[In percent]

	Texas	Non-right-to-work States
Nonagricultural employees, 1953–63	20.8	9.0
New manufacturing jobs, 1953–63	14.3	−7.6
Production workers, 1953–63	9.7	−14.1
Value added by manufacturing, 1953–62	82.5	41.5
Personal income, 1953–63	64.1	60.2
Population, 1950–64	34.8	26.2
Bank deposits, 1953–64	69.9	63.5
Motor vehicle registration, 1953–63	50.9	44.3
Annual retail trade payroll, 1954–58	23.8	17.5
Retail trade sales, 1954–58	19.5	16.7
Number of retail trade establishments, 1954–58	8.5	3.4
Value of life insurance in force, 1953–63	167.3	132.0
Number of insurance policies in force, 1953–63	40.2	26.8

Mr. President, Texas is a better State and has better unions because of our right-to-work law. We have enjoyed long and cordial management-labor relations. We enjoy good relations with our good neighbor of Mexico. And, our Governor is a man of honesty and integrity who contributes fully to these good relations.

It is unfortunate that misinformed comment here in the Senate may have cast aspersions upon our State and our Governor. I know such comments were wholly unintentional, and I hope this brief recitation will serve to set the facts straight.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD certain editorials from Texas newspapers, namely, the Dallas Morning News, the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, the Wichita Falls Record News, the Wichita Falls Times, the Lubbock Avalanche Journal, the San Antonio Light, the Abilene Reporter News, the San Angelo Standard-Times, the El Paso Times, and the Houston Chronicle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorials ordered to be printed in the RECORD are as follows:

[From the Dallas Morning News, Sept. 27, 1965]

MAJORITY RULE

An argument frequently voiced by those who seek the destruction of State right-to-work laws runs along these lines: When the majority of the workers in a plant want a union, others should go along, on the principle that a majority rules.

The principle of majority rule is well nigh sacred in our view of government. The argument sounds mighty convincing until the listener remembers that a union is not a part of the government, but a private, supposedly voluntary association.

When this majority-rule argument is used to support the institution of the compulsory union shop, the listener should examine it closely and think about the effect of the theory if it were in fact the foundation of our other private associations. The argument holds that if those who voluntarily join a union are in the majority in a plant, the minority who do not want to be members must either join the union or be fired.

Let us apply this view of the principle of majority rule to other aspects of American life and see if this is a logical or desirable use of the principle.

During the 1964 presidential election, approximately 60 percent of the voters voted Democratic. By applying the principle of majority rule to voters as we are told it should be applied to workers, we would have to force the minority who voted Republican to choose between these alternatives:

Either you join the Democratic Party and contribute to its treasury or within 30 days you will no longer be allowed to vote in this country.

Or let us examine this view of majority rule in another context. Protestants in this country outnumber the combined totals of both Catholics and Jews by more than two to one. If we apply the principle of majority rule to believers as we are told it should be applied to workers, then every Catholic or Jew in this country must be faced with this alternative:

Either you adopt a Protestant faith and contribute to it or within 30 days you will no longer be allowed to worship in this country.

There are many cities and towns in the United States in which the majority of the business owners belong to the local chamber of commerce. If the principle of majority rule were applied to proprietors as we are told it should be applied to workers, the owners of businesses in these communities who did not belong to the local chamber would have to choose between these alternatives:

Either you join the chamber of commerce and contribute to it or within 30 days you must cease operating a business in this town.

A union is, according to the dictionary, "a voluntary association of working people," just as chambers of commerce are voluntary associations of businessmen, churches are voluntary associations of worshippers and political parties are voluntary associations of voters holding similar political views.

To contend that the principle of majority rule should be used to force anyone into any of them is to tarnish both the principle of majority rule and the concept of voluntary association.

[From the Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram, Aug. 1, 1965]

LOSS OF FREEDOM IN 14(b) REPEAL

Nearly two centuries ago, in 1784, a bill was introduced into the Virginia General Assembly that would have required all Virginians to pay a tax for support of religion, whether they were church members or not.

The argument for the bill was that because everyone benefited from the existence of religion in a State, everyone should be required to contribute to its support.

This religious tax bill was defeated, and in its stead was enacted a bill which was the forerunner of the freedom of religion clause in article I of the American Bill of Rights.

Some 35 percent of the people of this country do not belong to any church. Yet who would suggest that they be compelled to join and financially support a church? Or that everyone be required to contribute to the Red Cross because it gives aid to members and nonmembers alike in the time of disaster? For that matter, who would say that all military veterans should be required to join a veterans organization just because it acts in the interest of all who have fought in the Nation's wars?

Yet it seems that the equivalent of this is due to come about in regard to labor organizations. Only one more barrier remains to repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law and prompt action by the U.S. Senate is expected to sweep it away. Then the right-to-work laws which forbid compulsory union membership in 19 States will not be able to stand.

The "free rider" issue—the argument that those who benefit from union activities should be required to help bear the financial burden of them—is the most appealing argument advanced against 14(b). But this is something like the justification offered for the Virginia religious tax proposal, and it ignores some of the facts.

Existing Federal law gives to a certified labor union the "extraordinary privilege"—so labeled in a case which went to the Supreme Court—of representing all employees in a company's bargaining unit, whether union members or not. So the nonunion employees in such a unit become "forced riders" as much as "free riders."

Union leaders sought this exclusive bargaining right, and then complained they were unjustly burdened by it. The avenue of relief they proposed was to compel all members of such units to belong to the union.

They are on the verge of getting it. This, of course, means the diminution of an employees right to choose—a loss of a part of his freedom. It also means that a part of his earnings, the dues he pays the union, will be used for political or other purposes with which he may strongly disagree.

On this point we quote a U.S. Supreme Court decision of 1961:

"There can be no doubt that the federally sanctioned union shop contract, as it actually works, takes a part of the earnings of some men and turns it over to others, who spend a substantial part of the funds in efforts to thwart the political, economic, and ideological hopes of those whose money has been forced from them under authority of law. There is, of course, no constitutional reason why a union or other private group may not spend its funds for political or ideological causes if its members voluntarily join it and can voluntarily get out of it."

It is the principle of voluntariness that will go by the boards in Texas and 18 other States if and when repeal of section 14(b) is finally voted.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Oct. 6, 1965]

VOLUNTARY OR COMPULSORY

The issue is now joined on the fight to conserve section 14(b). That cheerful old warrior, Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, has opened Senate debate on the administration's bill to abolish the States right-to-work laws.

A great deal has been said about the right-to-work law by those who would benefit by its demise, but none of this outpouring of propaganda has been intended to inform. Most of the impassioned pleas for the destruction of 14(b) have been pitched on the contention that collective bargaining is a good thing. It is hard to see what bearing this has on the question of compulsory unionism. Community service is a good thing, too, but this fact is not used to justify forcing all Americans to join the Red Cross.

Shorn of the propaganda trimmings that are draped around it by labor leaders, the right-to-work law is simply a law that assures every worker the right to join or not to join, to support or not to support, a union. In right-to-work States—Texas is one of them—union membership cannot be made a requirement for getting or keeping a job.

The law does not, as labor propaganda will lead you to believe, forbid unions, nor does it forbid their use of collective bargaining, nor does it forbid their going on strike.

What it does forbid them to do is this: They cannot force a worker to join a union to keep his job.

Labor leaders imply that unions cannot function without this compulsion. Yet union membership has increased in Arizona, which has a right-to-work law, while it has stagnated in Michigan, which does not have one.

This is not hard to understand. Logically, which organization could be expected to have more strength and spirit—one whose members joined because they wanted to be in it or one whose members joined because they had no other choice?

The answer should be obvious. The basic issue at stake for the American who does not belong to a union is whether or not he can be forced to join one. But for the union member, there is the equally important principle of keeping voluntary membership as the main strength of unionism.

The father of American unionism, Samuel Gompers, warned his successors of the dangers to the labor movement that are inherent in compulsory membership. In his last address to the American Federation of Labor, he declared:

"No lasting gain has ever come from compulsion. If we seek to force, we but tear apart that which, united, is invincible."

[From the Dallas Morning News, Sept. 26, 1965]

WHY USE COMPULSION?

The battle over the right-to-work law that now looms in the Senate will ultimately affect every American. But the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, long sought by labor and the liberals, may have an immediate effect on the employment of 34,000 Texans.

According to the National Right-to-Work Committee, each of those Texans now works for firms having an inoperative union shop clause. The reason it is inoperative is the Texas right-to-work law, which makes it illegal to force a worker to join a union in order to get a job, or to keep one he already has. If that law is struck down by Congress, the 34,000 will join either the union or the unemployed.

In 1947, the Taft-Hartley Act confirmed the right of the people of individual States to decide for themselves whether they wanted a State right-to-work law. Today 19 States have such a law.

The unions have fought the right-to-work law from the beginning. They call it a union-wrecking law. But is it?

The law does not ban or even restrict unions. It does not prevent them from recruiting members or from organizing plants. It does not prevent them from telling their story and advertising the benefits of union membership to the public or to the workers who might be prospective members.

All that it does is to forbid the compelling of a worker to join a union as a necessary condition of getting or keeping a job.

The fundamental issue is the freedom of the individual to join—or not to join—a labor union.

The overwhelming majority of the American people, as shown by the four top opinion polls in the country, believe that the individual should have this freedom. The Gallup poll on June 15 reported this feeling by the public. It also indicated that the majority believe unions have already grasped too much power. Interestingly, 42 percent of the union members questioned agreed.

The enormous power of the union leaders is nowhere better demonstrated than in the current steamroller drive to smash the State right-to-work laws. They have gained the support of the President in a drive to destroy a statute that he not only helped vote into law, but also used as the proudest symbol of his qualification for election as U.S. Senator. They have gained the acquiescence of Congressmen to the destruction of a law which the will of the majority clearly favors.

Compulsory unionism has been opposed by such outstanding advocates of the trade-union movement as Samuel Gompers and the late Justice Brandeis, who once wrote:

"Absolute power leads to excesses and to weakness; neither our character nor our intelligence can long bear the strain of unrestricted power. The union attains success when it reaches the ideal condition and the ideal condition for a union is to be strong and stable, yet to have in the trade outside its own ranks an appreciable number of men who are nonunionists * * *. Such a nucleus of unorganized labor will check oppression by the union as the union checks oppression by the employer."

In 1962 Arthur Goldberg, who rose to fame as a union attorney, was quoted by the Washington Star as telling a union meeting:

"In your own organization you have to win acceptance not by an automatic device which brings a new employee into your organization, but by your own wisdom, your own responsibility and your own achievements."

A good union, there is no doubt, offers benefits for its membership and the economy. Why, then, is it necessary to use compulsion to force all workers to join? Many unions have won 100-percent membership in their plants on their own merits, without it.

This underlines the truth of the saying: "Good unions don't need compulsory unionism and bad unions don't deserve it."

[From the Wichita Falls Record News, May 21, 1965]

A BASIC FREEDOM

It is inconsistent with the basic theory of the Constitution of the United States that anyone should be compelled to belong to any organization, church, or political party. For this reason it has been a happy circumstance for Texans that under section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act this State has adopted a right-to-work law.

Operating under this section both employers and employees have enjoyed the basic freedom of being able to make a free choice. Too many other freedoms have been eroded by the increase in the powers of the Federal Government.

Texas has been joined by 18 other States in the Nation in adopting such a valuable law under the provisions of the section. We believe the Texas House State Affairs Committee has acted wisely in urging Congress not to repeal the important section of the national labor law.

President Johnson, himself, indicated a lack of enthusiasm for the repeal by the brevity of his message to the Congress and the timing of the message so late in the session of Congress.

Texans who have been notable for their demands for freedom should all inform their Senators and Representatives how they feel about the right to work without being compelled to pay tribute to those leaders of the various unions.

Why should we have a situation existing under which the unions can force membership while the privilege is extended to no other group in the Nation? Why, in the face of this nationwide, nonpartisan groundswell of support for voluntary union membership, are certain labor bosses so adamant in their demand for repeal of 14(b)? The answer is power.

[From the Wichita Falls Times, Sept. 29, 1965]

A RIGHT AT STAKE

One of the issues at stake in the strike which has silenced six daily newspapers in New York City is related to the controversy that has involved Congress over repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

For at least two decades the New York Times has successfully fought union demands that all its writers and editors join the American Newspaper Guild. The ownership of the Times has held firm to its conviction that those who report and edit the news have the responsibility of first loyalties to their readers and to their employers and not to the union. It has insisted that the effort to present the news fairly and completely should not be fettered by the priorities which unions demand of their members.

Those members of the news staff of the Times who want to join the American Newspaper Guild are free to do so, but the Times reserves the right to choose its key people in the editorial department regardless of their union affiliation or nonmembership.

This issue is only one of several differences between the striking unions and the newspaper management in the current difficulty, but it is revealing of an important right that is at stake in the movement to repeal 14(b).

The argument against repeal of the Taft-Hartley section under which State right-to-work laws are permissible involves not only the personal right of an employee but the right of his employer, as the New York newspaper makes clear.

[From the Wichita Falls Times, May 23, 1965]

TO JOIN OR NOT TO JOIN

Concern over the civil rights of individuals and minority groups has been voiced in legislative halls in Washington and State capitals. But what of the right of the American worker to join—or not to join—a union?

Involved here is the issue of compulsory unionism, with its denial of a man's right to work where he pleases if employment is available, and the voluntary choice to join a union or not—his choice, not someone else's.

In 19 States workers are protected by right-to-work laws in their voluntary choice. Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act upholds the States in enacting these laws.

Now the push is on in Washington to repeal 14(b)—pressured by organized unions and union leaders whose self-interest in the matter is obvious.

Competent survey of public opinion indicates the American public is against the repeal of 14(b). In fact, almost as big a majority of the public favors a Federal law which would make all union membership voluntary.

It is certain that unionism is rallying its ranks to let Members of Congress know their attitude on 14(b).

Is the public that is opposed to repeal of 14(b) as responsive to their Congressman by letting him know their stand on the issue?

[From the Lubbock (Tex.) Avalanche-Journal, May 19, 1965]

Right-To-Work Laws in Danger

Monday will have to go down in history as a sad day in the Presidency of Lyndon B. Johnson.

In calling on the Congress to destroy the right-to-work laws of 19 States, Mr. Johnson has repudiated one of his most strongly held beliefs of a political lifetime. He has done this to implement a plank in the 1964 national platform of the Democratic Party and to repay a political debt to union labor leaders for "massive support" in the 1964 election.

It is ironical indeed that he considers it necessary to take care of this supposed debt, since all political observers know that he had this support in his pocket with or without a pledge.

Some of these same observers profess to believe that Mr. Johnson included this appeal in his special labor message for show, and that he will not really push for passage.

There is even more reason, however, to suspect that he means it. For one thing, the request was long delayed, presumably to permit dissipation of some of the bad odor which arose from the corrupt United Steelworkers and International Union of Electrical Workers elections.

For another, the special message turned down two other AFL–CIO demands, those for shortening the 40-hour workweek and for increasing the minimum wage to $2 an hour. The presumption here is that Mr. Johnson feels he must come through on repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law to keep the union chieftains reasonably happy.

There is a sickening feeling that the President is applying to this cause the same callous disregard for individual and State rights which he has shown in phases of the civil rights and voting rights pushes.

A great many Americans will not be happy with Mr. Johnson's reasons for asking removal of the provision which permits States to ban the closed union shop in which workers are required to pay dues to keep their jobs. There is no virtue in the uniformity of application of national labor relations policy when it destroys the basic American freedom to join a union voluntarily. And the conflicts he speaks of are as nothing compared with the conflicts which would result from repeal as unions rushed to establish jurisdiction and to force closed shops on both unwilling workers and employers.

No one has explained satisfactorily yet why labor must have closed shops. Unions should be able to offer so many advantages, such as assured labor supply and apprentice training, that they would be demanded rather than resisted.

Texas, one of the States in which right-to-work laws are cherished, must resist, with a strong resolution from the legislature, and with appeals for "no" votes by its Members in Congress, from plain citizens as well as public officials.

This is a fight for individual liberty and for the civil rights of our working people.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Light, May 20, 1965]

The Right To Say No

President Johnson has raised a fundamental democratic issue with his request that Congress abolish the so-called "right-to-work" laws.

These laws exist in 19 States. Basically, they prohibit the compulsory union shop, which rules that a worker cannot hold a job in a particular shop unless he is a member of a union.

We are for labor unions. The Hearst newspapers were among the first in the newspaper industry to reach agreements with labor unions.

But we are also for freedom of job choice, and opposed to compulsion by governmental legislation.

It seems elementary that no one should be compelled to join a union if he doesn't want to, just as no businessman should be compelled to join any commercial organization.

We have found ourselves in agreement with most things L.B.J. has done. We feel that in most matters we think as the President does.

Our thinking usually being alike, we have often concurred with his views.

We are, for example, wholeheartedly in favor of his proposals to reduce excise taxes by $3.9 billion. This will help reduce car prices, and we are all for that. And we are with him all the way on foreign policy.

But we think he is wrong in urging abolition of laws that give the worker the right to belong, or not to belong, to a union, and we urge the President to reconsider his request to Congress.

[From the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Record-News]

Section 14(b) Repeal Said Unlikely

One of the bitterest undercover battles in Washington this year has been the fight over the proposal to repeal the section of the Taft-Hartley Act (14(b)) which permits States to have right-to-work laws.

At the start of the present session of Congress, it was generally believed the repeal of this section had a very good chance. As the session progressed this belief gradually faded. Now most experts are predicting Congress will adjourn without the action.

The President waited late in the session to give Congress a special message, preferring to act on other vital laws first. His proposal was none too emphatic when he did deliver the request.

It is said now by Washington observers that three things are working against the repeal of the provision. The most important factor is that time is running out. Most of the Members of both the House and Senate hope to get out of Washington by the middle of September.

This has been one of the most difficult sessions Congress has had in many years, with pressure mounting from every direction. The Members wish to get back home and sound out their constituents or go overseas somewhere and forget the whole thing for a while.

Two other factors have exerted force against action on the 14(b) provision. The attitude of the steel workers union and the action of shipping industry unions have combined to lose friends in Congress.

A final factor blocking likely action is the House and Senate have other legislation which is described as must already in progress. These laws will get priority attention.

The President, who along with other Democratic leaders hopes for early adjournment, already has called this the best session of Congress in history. It is unlikely that he would advise pressing for the repeal if it faced a filibuster. The opponents of repeal have said they have strength enough to force a talkathon.

[From the Abilene (Tex.) Reporter News, May 21, 1965]

Right-To-Work Should Be Kept To Balance Power

The issue is now joined on whether 19 States, including Texas, can retain their right-to-work laws, and others can be free to adopt them or not.

President Johnson's labor legislation message to Congress asked for repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which permits right-to-work laws.

The President's brief remarks on 14(b) in the full context of his labor message indicate he does not have his heart in it. We hope a majority of Congress will not either.

Johnson's comments on 14(b) were:

"With the hope of reducing conflicts in our national labor policy that for several years have divided Americans in various States, I recommend the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act with such other technical changes as are made necessary by this action."

The argument is this:

Shall union membership be made compulsory to hold a job in a plant covered by contract, or shall the individual worker have the choice of belonging to the union or not.

The Taft-Hartley law has been on the books since 1947. It has been assailed by unions since as "the slave-labor law." Section 14(b) nettles them most of all.

The facts refute the "slave-labor law" tag, as anyone with even a casual knowledge of current news and trends since 1947 knows. Unions have grown in membership, have repeatedly hammered out new contracts in collective bargaining which have brought higher pay and fringe benefits, and certainly there is no scarcity of strikes, big and little. Strikes don't happen in "slave-labor" States such as Russia.

What big labor wants now in repeal of section 14(b) is to destroy the final obstacle which maintains some balance of power between unions and management, or better, unions and the public.

Repeal of the right-to-work laws would give labor chieftains the final stranglehold which would bring them monopolistic control over the Nation's political and economic life.

The unions argue that because they help nonmembers as well as members, everyone who labors should be forced to join a union.

That's just as logical as arguing that every business in a community should be forced to join the Chamber of Commerce because it improves business conditions for both its members and nonmembers. Or that everyone should be made to join the Kiwanis, Rotary, or Lions clubs because of the good they do the whole community.

Texans should use every resource at their command to fight repeal of section 14(b). How? By writing to Texas Senators and Congressmen.

Our Senators are Ralph W. Yarborough and John G. Tower, both of whom can be addressed in care of the U.S. Senate, Washington.

Congressmen representing this area are Omar Burleson, of Anson; George H. Mahon, of Lubbock; O. C. Fisher, of San Angelo; Graham Purcell, of Wichita Falls; and Joe R. Pool, of Dallas (Congressman-at-large). Their address is in care of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

[From the San Angelo (Tex.) Standard-Times, May 11, 1965]

Work Choice a Vital Right

President Johnson is doing a vast deal to protect the freedom of little nations when Communist threats are evident. What will he do for the little man and his right to work here at home?

The question is posed by Columnist McGowan on this page today as to the Johnson attitude toward 14(b). Time is getting short, and the AFL–CIO is getting anxious about it.

As it now stands 14(b) is in the position of a boxer who has been punished around the ring but who ultimately is saved by the bell. Congress may not have time to do anything about it this time if President Johnson merely delays his message on 14(b) and puts some stress on other proposed legislation.

He must give pause, too, to the records of the 19 States which maintain right-to-work laws under the section in question. These States are leading the Nation today in economic growth, according to information from the National Right to Work Committee.

Its compilation of economic statistics, completed recently, makes a comparison with the nonright-to-work States. The U.S. Department of Labor provided most of the statistics, which show that during the period from 1953 to 1963, the number of nonagricultural employees rose 23.3 percent in right-to-work States and only 9 percent in the others. The national average increase during this 10-year period was 12.6 percent.

The three States with the fastest increase in nonagricultural jobs are Arizona, Nevada, and Florida. All of these have right-to-work statutes.

New manufacturing jobs in right-to-work States increased 12.8 percent, and there was a decline of 7.6 in nonright-to-work States, while the national average was off 3.3.

Capital expenditures in the right-to-work States went up 37.1 percent; in nonright-to-work States 27.2 and the national average stood at 29.8.

The source of these figures must challenge not only union leaders in their thinking, but also our Congressmen.

[From the El Paso (Tex.) Times, May 19, 1965]

HOPE L.B.J. LOSES

President Lyndon B. Johnson has redeemed a pledge to organized labor by asking Congress to scrap right-to-work laws in 19 States, including Texas.

We hope Congress turns the President down.

The Taft-Hartley Act specifically gave the States the right to enact right-to-work laws. That was known as section 14(b).

If Congress repeals that section of the Taft-Hartley Act it will have encroached that much farther on what is left of States' rights.

We think the Taft-Hartley Act is all right the way it is.

We see no reason for organized labor to become unduly exercised over section 14(b) anyway. It receives scant attention when it comes to negotiations between management and powerful labor unions. Everyone knows that the unions maintain their membership regardless of the right-to-work laws.

It looks as though Congress will go along with the President again, but we can still hope it does not, this one time at least.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Mar. 20, 1965]

WHAT TEXAS THINKS

Lyndon Johnson was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1948 from the State of Texas after strongly supporting the infant Taft-Hartley law which permits States to pass their own right-to-work laws.

Now, as President Johnson, he feels differently. He wants that part of the law repealed. But Texas doesn't feel differently. The Belden poll, published in this newspaper March 19, asked the following and gave the results:

"Do you think people who work in a plant where there is a union should or should not be required to join the union to hold their jobs in the plant?" A substantial majority of Texans—65 percent—replied that workers should not be required to join the union. Only 25 percent said they should be required to join and 10 percent had no opinion.

When the question was phrased differently, opposition to the compulsory membership union-shop principle was even more pronounced.

A breakdown of the poll's result showed that a majority of rank-and-file Democrats in Texas—61 percent—do not agree with President Johnson on the right-to-work issue, in spite of the fact that the national platform of the Democratic Party called for repeal of right-to-work laws in the last two presidential elections. Among Republicans and independents in Texas, 80 percent oppose repeal.

The views of Texans are not exceptional. Other polls taken nationwide indicate strong public support for voluntary unionism and opposition to repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law which has permitted 19 States to prohibit the union shop.

Opinion Research Corp., of Princeton, N.J., last fall found that support for the right-to-work principle today is at an alltime high, nationwide. Earlier polls taken by the same organization revealed a steady increase in public support for voluntary unionism—from 46 percent in 1956 to 62 percent in 1962 to 67 percent today. Right-to-work laws, in other words, have become more popular with the public the longer they have been in effect.

It seems ironic that, in spite of this widespread majority support for voluntary unionism, the President would endorse labor's campaign for repeal of the right-to-work laws of 19 States, including Texas, replacing them with a compulsory system which would force many American workers to become dues-paying union members—or lose their jobs.

It is especially ironic that Congress should be asked to override the will of a vast majority of Americans and to deny many of them the basic right of freedom of thought and choice at the very same time that numerous demonstrations and other dramatic maneuvers are being conducted in the name of freedom and new laws are being proposed to guarantee the rights of minorities. As David Lawrence concluded in a recent column: "When it comes to the right of a citizen to work without being coerced into surrendering his beliefs, all the pious rhetoric about human freedom goes by the boards."

[From the Houston Chronicle, May 20, 1965]

LEAVE SECTION 14(b) UNTOUCHED

President Johnson handed his long-awaited labor message to Congress on Tuesday, following his request on Monday for an excise tax cut of nearly $4 billion. Some people evaluate these two proposals as one White House prescription; give business a healthy stimulant, then give labor equal dosage.

The President urged repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which reads:

"Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in a State or territory in which such execution or application is prohibited by State or territorial law."

These 44 words give 19 States, including Texas, the right to ban compulsory labor contracts which insist that a worker join a union to keep a job. Their repeal means compulsory unionism and an end to the right-to-work law.

Capitol Hill is now braced for its stiffest political hurricane of the season, labor's forces in Congress militantly mixing it with defenders of the 44 words. And the stakes are higher than most people realize.

Unions have spent countless millions since 1947 fighting section 14(b). Also, the money lost in union dues not paid by millions of workers in States with right-to-work laws amounts to hundreds of millions. Even so, money is no measure of the manpower expended on this 18-year running battle.

If these 44 words are repealed, as Mr. Johnson has urged, "with the hope of reducing conflicts in our national labor policy," labor will be able to funnel millions of dollars into politics and unionization drives. And its manpower can be diverted from the fight against right-to-work into precincts.

The Chronicle believes in Texas' right-to-work law and opposes repeal of section 14(b). We see no merit in nationwide uniform labor laws that favor a special-interest group. If a worker prefers to join a union, that's his choice. Fine. But we cannot agree that all workers should be forced to pay a union fee to hold a job. That eliminates the individual's right to choose.

The right-to-work laws of 19 States are experiments for the workingman in 50 laboratories of social change. They do not discriminate against unions, because such tactics are illegal.

Union labor has earned and deserves a strong, rightful place in a free society. But it should not have 100-percent control of who gets and holds a job. To have that much power is too one sided to be healthy in the long run for organized labor and too discriminatory against nonunion workers.

We hope Congress will maintain section 14(b).

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, perhaps never in the history of our Republic have the elected representatives of the people been called upon to enact legislation which so baldly seeks to restrict basic American freedoms for the benefit of so small a pressure group as does the measure presently under consideration—that is, the measure on which there is pending a motion to take up.

Although it is true that individual freedoms have been eroded rather seriously by the acid of Federal control in recent years, the legislation and Executive orders which have produced these changes rarely have been presented so brazenly as the demands—not the requests—of a minute minority of our people.

The repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, aside from the much-debated denial of freedom of choice it would entail, concerns, in the opinion of many students of constitutional law, an even greater democratic principle—that of the individual to express himself at the polls on an issue of grave concern to himself, his family, his community and his nation, and their future.

This principle dates from the founding of our Republic. It is not, as most proponents of repeal have argued, a new concept which was written into the Taft-Hartley Act as an afterthought and which has failed in its practical applicability

Each of our States has historically been guaranteed the right to decide for itself whether or not compulsory unionism should be declared illegal. The legislation before us would not end a 20-year experiment. It would, instead, destroy a freedom the American people have enjoyed since the U.S. Constitution became our organic, basic law, nearly 200 years ago.

This blatant attempt to make our Federal Government a collection and membership agency for the labor bosses is so openly and obviously a punitive measure aimed at Nebraska and the other 18 States which have forbidden compulsory unionism that many of my colleagues from the remaining 31 States, which permit such practices, sometimes may overlook the effect which repeal would have on their own constituencies. I can assure them, without fear of contradiction, however, that the loss of freedom entailed in the repeal of section 14(b) will be every bit as great, when considered in the light of individual rights, of the liberty their own people presently enjoy to decide such issues for themselves. If successful, this legislation would disenfranchise their own constituents just as abruptly as it would disenfranchise the residents of States which have freely and openly voted to continue the guarantees which were given all Americans by our Federal Constitution.

My two distinguished colleagues from the State of Indiana should understand this better than most in this body. They have had the rare experience of witnessing in two recent elections in their State the democratic process about which I speak. In the first of these, the people of Indiana voted to outlaw compulsory unionism. In the second election, those same people voted to reverse their previous action. Had they not been guaranteed this freedom to govern themselves, then compulsory unionism could neither have been outlawed nor legalized. Any prohibitions placed upon a right which resulted in this legalization, I feel confident, would have been greeted with something far less than hearty approbation by those who today seek to deny that same right nationally.

Paradoxically, Mr. President, the greatest momentum for the drive to repeal section 14(b) in this session of Congress comes from those whose States would not be affected in the least by the simple legalization of compulsory unionism nationally. The vast bulk of support for this legislation comes from those who represent States which either have never considered the question of voluntarism or which have chosen not to protect it.

The motivation for the repeal drive thus becomes highly suspect. With the possible exception of the two distinguished and honorable Senators from Indiana, to whom I referred a few minutes ago, it would be difficult, if not impossible, for any of my colleagues who represent the non-right-to-work States to assert, with any degree of substantiation, that they are carrying out the will of their constituencies.

And I do not believe that the gentlemen I have excepted could, in fairness, say that their constituents wish to be denied the right they exercised in repealing Indiana's ban on forced union membership so short a time ago.

I do not intend to take up the time of this body with a detailed analysis of the political contributions and campaign expenditures of the labor hierarchy, which has boasted publicly that it can and will effect repeal of section 14(b).

But I certainly do not believe anyone here is unaware that the labor bosses—not the working people of America—would be the principal beneficiaries of such a move.

The repeal of section 14(b), if it is successful, will have been accomplished primarily by those of my colleagues whose States and constituencies have never been asked for an opinion on the matter. It will have been accomplished by the elected representatives of people who are not now protected by laws which ban enforced payment of tribute to union overlords, and consequently would be, as far as I and more than 90 percent of the Nation's press can determine, solely for the benefit of the labor czars who feel they should be relieved of the tiresome task of recruiting their own members and extracting funds from the rank-and-file worker for their own power-mad objectives.

I long have been dedicated to the belief, Mr. President, that anyone who is honored with election to this body has a dual responsibility, one to the Nation as a whole and the other to the people of his State who entrust him with their well being—not on an immediate, politically expedient basis, but one of long range.

As a Nebraskan, and as an American, I fully intend to meet and honor these obligations. I would consider it a gross and flagrant violation of my responsibility, as well as a negation of the personal principles I have held sacred throughout my lifetime, were I to do other than reject, with all the vigor at my command, this legislation which would repeal the basic liberties of all Americans for the benefit of the overlords of less than one-tenth of our population.

I say this, Mr. President, because I am convinced that such a rejection is in full keeping with the beliefs expressed by the framers of our Constitution and with the expressed wishes of the citizens of my State, who nearly 20 years ago chose, by constitutional amendment, to protect the rights of association, speech, and choice of Nebraska workingmen.

Nebraska was the fourth of our American States to approve such a constitutional amendment. Its citizens have experienced its benefits for nearly two decades. Hence, we feel we are far better qualified to speak on the merits and demerits of the pending proposal than are those who know of such things only through hearsay.

I should add, parenthetically, that hearsay and purposely warped propaganda have punctuated the great majority of the arguments presented in behalf of repeal before committees considering this legislation in both bodies of Congress.

Nebraska's experience with free trade unionism has proved, and is proving, one of the best single refutations of the pap being circulated by lobbyists, propagandists, and ordinary political arm twisters for the labor dynasty.

For this reason, Mr. President, I intend to cite some of the principal arguments presented in behalf of repeal and refute them by pointing to the experiences of my State. Beyond mere refutation, I hope to underscore, for the benefit of my colleagues some of the willful and malicious distortions resorted to by proponents of repeal.

One of these centers around the basic question upon which this entire controversy is built.

The proponents of repeal legislation have insisted that right-to-work laws are, in reality, no such thing, because they do not guarantee anyone a job, such as would a giant WPA or antipoverty program. They say that repeal means nothing more than a legalization of something called union security clauses in labor-management contracts. Repeal spokesmen ranging from the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Willard Wirtz, on down to officials of local unions have hawked this same line.

The first of these arguments is as ridiculous as it would be to say that our American rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness guarantee each of our citizens longevity, freedom from imprisonment if he commits crime, and a completely carefree irresponsible existence in all other respects.

It is interesting to note that even the Department which Mr. Wirtz heads takes no such restricted view in its own publication. "Growth of Labor Law in the United States," published by the Labor Department and available at the Government Printing Office, for instance, gives an entirely different interpretation, recognizing right-to-work laws as what they are without getting into false semantics. This publication states, on page 247:

> A right-to-work law makes unlawful union security agreements entered into by labor organizations and employers whereby membership or nonmembership in the labor organization is a condition of obtaining or retaining employment.

And lest the proponents of repeal believe that the term "right to work" applies to other statutes which restrict certain union activities, an argument frequently used in attempting to prove that laws banning compulsory union membership have been repealed or defeated in several States, this same publication states on page 250:

> In addition to right-to-work laws, there are other types of State legislative restrictions on union security agreements.

Of course, the punchline is, "in addition to right-to-work laws."

The fact is, Mr. President, that right-to-work laws have been repealed fully in only one State, Indiana, and partially in only one other, Louisiana. They have been enacted in 21 States, and presently are in force in 19.

This attempt to disguise the true activity of the States in this field, this effort to convince the Congress and the people that various numbers of other States have repealed laws banning union compulsion, are belied in all their glaring falsity by the effort of labor bossism to repeal section 14(b). Certainly, no monumental political acumen is required to understand that if, indeed, the people in so many States are opposed to bans on enforced union membership, there would be no need for Messrs. Meany, Reuther, Hoffa, and their henchmen to press for Federal legislation in this area.

The fact is, the people are overwhelmingly opposed to such compulsion, as has been proved repeatedly, and the pending legislative legerdemain is but a shallow and transparent effort to circumvent the will of the American voter to gain the selfish ends of the big-time labor bosses.

Despite these attempts to disguise the nature of the laws which would be nullified by the legislation under consideration, the language of the law itself is so simple as to defy complication or obfuscation. Nebraska's law on the subject is typical of these measures. It was adopted by the voters of my State on November 5, 1946, and proclaimed by Gov. Dwight Griswold as effective on December 11 of that same year. Its first paragraph reads:

> No person shall be denied employment because of membership in or affiliation with, or resignation or expulsion from a labor organization; nor shall any individual or corporation or association of any kind enter into any contract written or oral, to exclude persons from employment because of membership in or nonmembership in a labor organization.

As can be seen, there is nothing ambiguous or devious about the language of Nebraska's constitutional amendment. There are no restrictions on "union democracy" or "union security" or any of the other catch phrases which have been hurled at our people and at Congress to befog the issue. The amendment simply forbids anyone or any organization from barring a worker from employment either because he chooses or refuses to belong to a union.

This is made plain in the first section of the Nebraska constitutional amendment which I have just read. When the entire text of all three sections of the amendment are considered, the clarity stands out to even greater degree. They read as follows, being sections 13, 14, and 15, of article 15:

> Section 13. No person shall be denied employment because of membership in or affiliation with, or resignation or explusion from a labor organization or because of refusal to join or affiliate with a labor organization; nor shall any individual or corporation or association of any kind enter into any contract, written or oral, to exclude persons from employment because of membership in or nonmembership in a labor organization.
>
> Section 14. The term "labor organization" means any organization of any kind, or an agency or employee representation committee or plan, which, exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work.
>
> Section 15. This article is self-executing and shall supersede all provisions in conflict therewith; legislation may be enacted to facilitate its operation but no law shall limit or restrict the provisions hereof.

This constitutional amendment had been proposed by initiative petition in 1946. It was adopted by voters at the general election of November 5, 1946, by an overwhelming vote. It became effective December 11, 1946, through proclamation of then Gov. Dwight Griswold.

I believe that Governor Griswold served as Governor of Nebraska at the time that the present senior Senator from Florida was serving as the Governor of his State, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Speaker is correct in his conclusion.

The then Governor Griswold entertained members of the Executive Committee of the National Governors' Conference, of which I happened to be a member, at Lincoln, the capital of Nebraska. We were most hospitably treated. I have never forgotten it. I was happy to see Governor Griswold in the Senate later.

We mourned, with the people of Nebraska, his untimely death. He was a great Senator and a great Governor.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator for that observation. We remember Governor Griswold well in Nebraska.

Many Senators will recall that Governor Griswold was later elected to the Senate, where he served with distinction during the years of 1953 and in 1954 until his untimely decease on April 12 of that year. He had served three terms as Governor of his native State, after serving in the State legislature as senator. He later served as a director of the military government in Germany in 1947, and as chief, American Mission for Aid to Greece in 1947 and 1948, during a very critical and trying time in the history of that country.

In 1947, the year after adoption of the right-to-work amendment, the Nebraska Legislature under the leadership of Gov. Val Peterson, did enact legislation to facilitate the operation of the amendment pursuant to its third section.

This legislation is to be found in the Nebraska Statutes in sections 48-217, 48-218, and 48-219; in chapter 177, Laws of 1947, approved June 10, 1947, and effective September 7, 1947. Their text is as follows:

> Section 48-217: To make operative the provisions of section 13, 14 and 15 of article 15 of the constitution of Nebraska, no person shall be denied employment because of membership in or affiliation with, or resignation or expulsion from a labor organization or because of refusal to join or affiliate with a labor organization; nor shall any individual or corporation or association of any kind enter into any contract, written or oral, to exclude persons from employment because of membership in or nonmembership in a labor organization.
>
> Section 48-218: The term "labor organization" means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rate of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work.
>
> Section 48-219: Any individual, corporation or association that enters into a contract after the effective date of the act in violation of the provisions of section 1 of this act, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof, shall be fined in a sum of not less than $100 nor more than $500.

In 1961, section 48-217 was amended by passage of L.B. 653. That amendment was approved June 14, 1961, and became effective on October 9, 1961. It reads as follows:

> To make operative the provisions of sections 13, 14, and 15 of article 15 of the constitution of Nebraska, no person shall be denied employment because of membership in or affiliation with, or resignation or expulsion from a labor organization or because of refusal to join, affiliate with, or pay a fee either directly or indirectly to a labor organization; nor shall any individual or corporation or association of any kind enter into any contract, written or oral, to exclude persons from employment because of membership in or nonmembership in a labor organization.

As to the 18 other States with right-to-work laws, their statutes and their constitutional amendments, where the latter were adopted, contain pretty much the same, simple, and unequivocal language. Variations where they exist are minor.

The question which naturally arises in the mind of one who listens to the twisted reasoning of repeal proponents is: If these laws are really so bad, and should be repealed, should not the Federal laws which contain much of the same kind of language be repealed also?

If anyone here believes that such logic would prevail in the halls of the AFL-CIO, or the Teamsters Building, or in the headquarters of the Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers Union, I can save him the time and trouble of even asking.

For, in actuality, the union leaders only want to do away with that part of the Nebraska amendment and similar provisions and statutes in other right-to-work States which ban compulsory union membership as a condition of employment. They do not seek to repeal that portion of the law that prohibits nonmembership of unions as a prerequisite of employment.

That goes back to the days of the famous Norris-La Guardia Act, and has a brilliant chapter in the history of Nebraska because it was Senator Norris, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I believe, who in the Senate led the fight to get that law enacted. That was the law which went into the matter of allowing direct contracts and similar measures.

Of course, Federal law already outlaws nonmembership of unions as a prerequisite for employment. I mention it here only because of the constant repetition from repeal advocates that these laws are totally bad and have been enacted only for the purpose of "union busting."

Mr. President, I am proud and honored to represent a State whose people reject with equal vigor Goebbels-like propaganda techniques and the legislation which would give power to one type of worker by enslaving another. Nebraskans oppose compulsory union membership as they oppose prohibition of union membership. They have had the courage and the honesty to say exactly what they mean.

As I have pointed out, the laws of Nebraska and her sister states which ban compulsion in union membership are amply clear to eliminate all doubt as to their meaning and they cannot be changed by the more mouthings of their opponents.

When the proponents of repeal legislation shout hollowly for something they deceitfully refer to as "union democracy," they need only to look to Nebraska for the real thing, where true democracy prevails. There every working man has the same rights in pursuing his chosen line of employment. He may not be denied work because of his refusal to pay tribute to union overlords.

On the other hand, he is free to join any labor organization of his choice and not be denied his right to work for doing so.

Union democracy?

I believe I speak for the vast majority of the citizens in my State when I say that Nebraskans, taken as a whole, consider it anything but democratic for two persons to enter into a contract which is binding upon a third, who has never been consulted and who may be completely and irrevocably opposed to its terms. When Nebraskans become ill, they like to select their own physicians. If they become involved in litigation, they insist upon choosing their own lawyers. They enjoy and jealously defend these rights of free choice and will not be told, even by another Nebraskan, much less by an imported agitator, who and what will represent them in their dealings with their employers.

Nebraskans are also quite capable of electing their own representatives at local, State, and Federal levels. They would defend this capability and right with the same dedication our forefathers did at Lexington and Concord, when they overthrew the power of a foreign tyrant and his own handpicked Quislings.

They are not going to be told how to vote any more than they are going to have their wages extracted from them for the financing of political campaigns to which they are opposed. Should this body attempt to subject them to these practices by repealing section 14(b), the officials of labor who will thus be given Federal protection for their every offense against law, morality, and freedom will be in for more trouble than they have experienced in the long and turbulent history of trade unionism.

The labor bosses and other proponents of repeal have repeatedly denied that the eradication of 14(b) would enable them to exercise such control over the rank and file. But the record of hearings before committees of both this body and that on the other side of the Capitol, belies these claims, often in their own words.

Representatives of the AFL–CIO, the Teamsters Union and the Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers Union, at one time all openly admitted that they use dues money extracted from all their members for political purposes to which some of those members are opposed. All admit that the repeal of 14(b) will enable them to collect untold millions of dollars from workers who do not presently pay them tribute. All boast that a great percentage of the money thus raised will be used to further strengthen the political power of the labor hierarchy.

But these are just some of the practices, Mr. President, which the labor leadership insists constitute such a glowing example of "democracy in action." There are, of course, countless others, all equally steeped in the tradition of totalitarian rule. If the proponents of repeal in this body sincerely wish to restore true democracy to the field of labor-management relations, then they would vote to retain section 14(b) and thus help the States to eliminate the principal cause of these practices.

And they would not stop there. They would vote to enact legislation which would restrict some of the highhanded and arbitrary activities of labor leaders in the 31 States which permit compulsory unionism.

They would guarantee, for instance, the individual workers some protection against the evil of the so-called sweetheart contract, wherein union thugs are allowed to force management into contracts covering all employees, even though the employees themselves are never consulted about the matter.

There can be no question that the truly democratic manner of arriving at a contract for representation is by secret ballot vote of all employees. Presently, of course, only a majority of those voting in such an election is required for certification of a union as bargaining agent. But the labor bosses tell us that any requirement which would make it necessary to include all the workers who are subject to coverage is unfair, that such a thing is contrary to the system used in our own National and State elections.

But then, in the same fetid breath, they insist upon a majority vote of all employees, not just those voting, in a decertification election.

These and other matters, vital both to the union movement and the welfare of the Nation as a whole, are covered in amendments which have or will be introduced in due time in conjunction with the pending legislation. It is more than just passingly ironic that those Senators who are sincerely interested in guaranteeing the American workingman some few of the benefits which should be his in any democratic society, find that they can present their corrective legislation only as amendments to a measure which seeks to deny our workers even more sacred democratic rights.

If the labor bosses, who so loudly and ostentatiously boast of their control over this body, are to have their way, our working people will be forced to surrender the rights of free choice and association which they now enjoy in 19 States. And they will be denied the protection against the other abuses which are covered in the meaningful amendments to this bill and which exist in the remaining 31 States.

These are problems, of course, which need solution in those States which have not yet chosen to guarantee certain basic American rights to their citizens. These are not problems, and consequently, require no solution in Nebraska and her sister right-to-work States. In short, what we are confronted with is the alternatives of solving or further compounding some of the more serious problems confronting our people today.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Is there anything whatever in the right-to-work law of any State which would prevent any union from numbering among its dues-paying members all those it can persuade to join the union?

Mr. HRUSKA. There is no law which would prohibit that practice or that achievement.

Mr. ERVIN. Is there anything unjust in requiring a union, as the right-to-work law does, to obtain its members by persuasion, just as churches and civil, fraternal, and political organizations obtain their members?

Mr. HRUSKA. There is nothing unjust about that, in the opinion of the voters of 19 States. Their popular vote has said there is nothing unjust about it. That puts trade unions in the category of voluntary organizations, which they claim they are, except that they say they want to be buttressed in certain respects by the majesty, power, and might of the Federal Government. This threat to repeal section 14(b) is one of those attempts.

We are being asked by an extremely selfish interest to steal from the working segment of our population many of the basic freedoms which Americans have enjoyed since our independence was asserted.

We are being asked to retrogress, in a period when all our national leaders—left and right, Democratic and Republican—are speaking of progress.

We are being asked to destroy programs and legislation which have proved contributory to progress, human liberty, and economic success everywhere they have been instituted, by those who have had no such experience.

This Senator is aware, as is every Member of this body, of the many arguments put forth by proponents and exponents of repeal concerning the effect of laws banning compulsory unionism.

Statistics have been quoted freely on both sides to prove or disprove the contention that States which ban compulsion have enjoyed greater economic growth than those which do not. When rates of income growth are cited as proof of this contention by the opponents of repeal, for instance, the proponents have countered with figures to show that actual wage scales are higher in most non-right-to-work States.

The proponents of repeal repeatedly have selected a few Southern States where the economic base was so low to start with that they have not yet, despite unprecedented growth rates, reached the national average in actual dollars and cents.

These spokesmen for repeal have studiously avoided some other States in their arguments, for they know that both from the standpoint of rate of growth and actual dollars-and-cents economics they far outstrip the rest of the Nation.

Nebraska is such a State. Our industry is booming. Our payrolls are rising. Our employed work force is increasing. All this under laws which ban compulsory unionism—laws which the labor officials insist stifle progress and place fetters on the workingman.

The total unemployment as a percent of total work force in Nebraska last year, as an example, was but 2.9 percent, the second lowest of our 50 States.

I should add, incidentally, that the only State with a lower rate was Iowa, which also bans compulsory unionism.

The Nebraska unemployment rate was 1.8 percentage points below the national average and 2.1 percentage points lower than the average for all non-right-to-work States.

All the States which ban compulsory unionism had an unemployment rate of but 4 percent, 1 full percentage point lower than those which permit forced union membership and 0.7 percentage point lower than the national average.

These are statistics that cannot be argued two ways, because it would be even more startling to compare, let us say, the total unemployment in a State like New York with that of Nebraska without making the proponents of repeal even more ridiculous.

Similarly, the increase in average weekly earnings of production workers in Nebraska, a State whose laws supposedly drive wages mercilessly downward, will bear comparison.

During the 10-year period which ended in January of this year, these weekly earnings of production workers rose by $36.35.

The actual increase was $4.83 higher than the national average for that period and $4.38 greater than the figure for States which permit compulsion in union contracts.

If the proponents of repeal would like to speak of rates in this connection, a thing they usually shun, then it may help to point to Nebraska's 52.4 percent increase in wages over this period. This was 8.6 percent higher than the national average and 10.1 percent higher than the rate for non-right-to-work States.

One of the most persistent plaints of labor leaders and some of our Government officials who side with them, is that the repeal of 14(b) will lead to industrial peace. The Secretary of Labor is among those who so complains. Nevertheless, Work Stoppages, Bureau of Labor Statistics Report No. 256, which bears Mr. Wirtz' name on the cover, clearly and unequivocally refutes this contention.

It shows that for the 11-year period, 1952 through 1962, the percentage of estimated total working time lost in Nebraska due to stoppages was 0.118.

Nationally, during the same period, the percentage was 0.303, or nearly 3 times as great.

The fact is, Mr. President, that in States which permit enforced unionism, nearly twice as much time currently is lost through strikes and other work stoppages as is lost in States which ban compulsion. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has reported that man-days idle during work stoppages in 1963, as a percentage of working time, was but 0.09 percent in all the States which ban compulsory unionism, while they were 0.14 percent in the remaining 31 States.

On the face of it, Mr. President, it would appear that the labor bosses and Mr. Wirtz feel that the best way to insure industrial peace is to enact legislation which has a long record of causing or prolonging strikes, or both.

Perhaps no better example of the falsity of these arguments can be found than that set by the State of Indiana, where laws banning union compulsion expired this year. Since that time, Indiana has been rocked by the most violent eruptions the Nation has witnessed in years. The most significant of these occurred in Garrett, Ind., on June 9, during a strike by the International Union of Electrical Workers, Local 997, for a contract which would force all workers to join that labor organization. The following article, taken from the Chicago Tribune of June 11, 1965, describes graphically what took place because of the repeal of Indiana's right-to-work law:

> GARRETT, IND., June 10 (special).—A mob of men and women pickets imprisoned 70 workers, mostly women, throughout the night in a struck motor plant here. Dozens of fires were set outside the plant and most of the plant's windows were smashed.
>
> The siege ended this morning and the workers left after Mayor C. E. Miller ordered the factory closed for the safety and welfare of the community.
>
> The night-long lawlessness and terror occurred at the Electric Motors & Specialties, Inc., where members of the International Union of Electrical Workers' Local 997 have been on strike since May 17.
>
> #### MOB PUT AT 200
>
> Observers estimated that between 200 and 300 persons were in the mob that besieged the plant. Many of them were husbands of women strikers and male sympathizers from factories in Fort Wayne and other communities in this northeastern Indiana area.
>
> A deputy sheriff estimated that 30 to 40 fires were set in the rioting. Fourteen automobiles, all belonging to workers, were damaged. One, a 1965 Mustang, was destroyed by a gasoline bomb.
>
> More than 100 windows in the plant, many of them large, factory-type apertures, were smashed by barrages of stones, lumber, and other objects. Imprisoned workers were periled by splintering glass and flying missiles.
>
> An abandoned church near the plant was set afire, as was the factory loading dock. Fires were started three times in a company bus. The tires of the bus also were slashed. Gasoline bombs and railroad flares were used to set the fires.
>
> #### FALSE ALARMS SOUNDED
>
> On several occasions, the Garrett Fire Department received a false alarm for a site in another part of town when a fire was set at the plant. The department was called to the plant four times to put out fires. Other outbreaks of flames were extinguished by police, spectators, and even some of the pickets.
>
> The violence began at 6 p.m., after the daytime shift of production workers, office employees, and supervisory personnel failed to emerge at quitting time, apparently in fear of personal injury from the mob that had swelled to many times the normal number of 15 to 20.
>
> The small force of three Garrett policemen, one deputy sheriff, and several State policemen * * * the State policemen apparently acting only as observers * * * was unable to cope with the violence that continued until 3 a.m.
>
> Ted Nolan, an international representative of the IEU, said the union offered to disperse the crowd if the company would agree to a shutdown until the strike is settled. The company rejected the offer, but the mayor ordered the plant to close. The beleaguered workers then came out and the pickets withdrew.
>
> Several persons were reported to have received bruises from being struck by stones, but the police reported only one such case. Don Gillespie, a picket, said his foot was run over by the car of a husband of an imprisoned worker who stopped long enough for his wife to dash from the plant to the auto.
>
> Circuit Judge Harold D. Stump today issued a temporary restraining order against the union and its officials. This order limited picketing to authorized union personnel and prohibited interference with company employees entering and leaving the plant.

That is how repeal of laws banning compulsory unionism "restores," according to opponents of section 14(b), "industrial peace."

Actually, the last time the State of Indiana experienced such an outbreak of labor violence was in 1955, in the Perfect Circle strike, which also was called in an attempt to force union membership on all employees. That was the strike, it should be recalled, in which labor goons carved steaks from live cattle owned by employees who dared to work and numerous strikers and others were wounded in an open gunfight. This also was the strike which so sickened the people of Indiana with what the labor bosses today insist is "industrial peace" that the State enacted its right-to-work law.

I can only add that the people of the great State of Nebraska do not want that kind of labor peace. They have no desire to subject our industry and our workers to the gangsterism, terrorism, and bloodshed which is inherent in the type of legislation under consideration today.

In nearly every economic, social, and moral area, the record will show that Nebraska, as well as her sister States which ban union compulsion, are better off than those States which permit coercive union membership.

One of the favorite arguments of labor spokesmen in seeking repeal of section 14(b), Mr. President, concerns a loss, real or fancied, in union membership where laws banning compulsion are in effect. This, however, is a strictly self-serving contention, and completely glosses over the fact that wherever State laws force workers to join unions against their will, memberships naturally will be higher.

As an example of this, I point to a statement made recently by Floyd Black, executive secretary of the Kansas State Federation of Labor, AFL–CIO, who estimated that the repeal of section 14(b) would force 25,000 workers into unions in that State. Similarly, AFL–CIO spokesmen in Texas expect to add tens of thousands of members to their rolls in the event of repeal. In Georgia, the same is true, as it is in all right-to-work States.

That is a huge total of workers in States who presently are exercising their right to join or not to join a private organization. If section 14(b) is repealed, they will be dragged into union membership completely against their will. The alternative, of course, is loss of their means of livelihood.

I have no way of knowing how many workers in all 19 right-to-work States would be affected by this repeal. But it is safe to say that the coffers of the AFL–CIO and other organizations would would be glutted with many more millions of dollars annually. And these additional millions would be used to increase the stranglehold the labor bosses boast that they have on this Nation's political life.

This argument about union membership—the truth of which is doubtful—has no relationship to the actual employment picture and can be compared only to the statement that when our draft quotas are increased, our military becomes larger.

It does not mean, as the AFL–CIO implies, that the unemployment rate rises. I already have cited figures which disprove this implication.

Neither does it mean that the number of jobs decrease. According to "Employment and Earnings Statistics for States and Areas, 1939–63," published last year by the Department of Labor, for instance, employment in Nebraska rose from 280,200 in 1946, the year that a right-to-work law went into effect, to 397,200 in 1963, an increase of more than 40 percent. Nationally, the increase for the same period was but 37 percent.

I believe that five other vital indexes of employment and income—nonagricultural employees, new manufacturing jobs, production workers, per capita personal income, and personal income—may shed some light on the contentions by repeal proponents that right-to-work States stifle employment and decrease wages. I submit the following comparison of these indexes for Nebraska and the non-right-to-work States:

Rate of increase

[In percent]

	Nebraska	Non-right-to-work States
Nonagricultural employees, 1953–63	13.8	9.0
New manufacturing jobs, 1953–63	4.4	−7.6
Production workers, 1953–63	0	−14.1
Per capita personal income, 1953–63	46.5	35.4
Personal income, 1953–63	60.3	60.2
Average weekly earnings of production workers, 1955–65	52.9	42.8

Nearly 12 years ago, when Nebraska's right-to-work law was but 7 years old, Robert A. Nelson, my State's assistant attorney general, appeared before the Labor Committee of this body and was asked whether, in his opinion, Congress would be justified in preempting the field concerned with the legislation before us today. Mr. Nelson's reply: "The answer is an emphatic 'No.'" He submitted the following information on how Nebraska's right-to-work law had operated:

> First, a better relationship has developed between the union and its members. Union membership is now obtained by persuasion rather than coercion. This is the American way. Individual members are free to think and act and need have no fear of losing their jobs if they express ideas which are contrary to those of the union leaders. Under a compulsory union agreement, the union leaders have no particular interest in whether or not the members attend union meetings, they either did as they were told to do or lost their jobs. Now the individual members must be satisfied with the action of the union or they are free to sever their membership. The result has been that members are now urged to attend meetings and participate in the action taken. The individual employee feels that his union now is a democratic institution and that he has a part in the conduct of its affairs.
>
> Second, a better relationship exists between the employer and the union. No employer wants to be told that he must fire an employee, perhaps one who has been in his employ for years and whose competency and loyalty to the employer is without question, merely because such employee cannot agree with certain principles of the union or union leaders. The result has been that unions and employers work more closely together in bringing about conditions that are satisfactory to the individual employee.
>
> Third, union membership has not decreased. I make this statement without statistical proof. I have attempted to secure statistics as to the number of union members in my State prior to the adoption of our right-to-work amendment, and at the present time, but have been unable to find a source where such figures are available. However, it is the general opinion of both employers and employees that union membership has increased.
>
> Fourth, one of the greatest causes of strikes has been eliminated. The closed shop has been one of the primary causes of strikes. Although the question of wages, hours and working conditions were all agreed upon, a strike would be called because the employer refused to agree to a closed shop. This has now been eliminated, and our State has had comparatively few strikes since the enactment of our law.
>
> Fifth, public confidence in labor unions is being restored. This, in my opinion, is one of the important achievements in labor-management relations under our law. Our amendment was adopted because the people believed that the concentrated power of labor unions has become arbitrary. As stated by Justice Frankfurter in the opinion hereinbefore discussed:
>
> > "A union is no more than a medium through which individuals are able to act together; union power was begotten of individual helplessness. But that power can come into being only when, and continue to exist only so long as, individual aims are seen to be shared in common with the other members of the group."
>
> While I have limited my statement to giving the results of the trial in my own State, I am confident that the results in other States, where right-to-work laws have been on trial, are similar to those of Nebraska. With these proven accomplishments, is Congress now justified in enacting legislation which will strike down the good which has been done and take from the States the right, which under the Constitution is theirs, to preserve to all individuals the inalienable right to work? The answer is an emphatic "No."

Everything Mr. Nelson said in his testimony years ago is as applicable today as it was then. If anything, it is even more significant today because the ban on union compulsion has been tried and proved over a longer period.

The proof is there, established in nearly 200 years of individual freedom under our Federal Government and in the 20 years since Florida and Arkansas became the first two States to adopt a constitutional amendment banning compulsory unionism.

To ignore this record would be the blindest of bigotry against the vast majority of the American people who reject slavery of any type, whether it be based on race or labor union membership.

We ended racial slavery in a costly internecine conflict 100 years ago.

Let us not condone another type of human bondage today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks a number of editorials which have been published in newspapers in various parts of my State of Nebraska.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the unicameral legislature of Nebraska, memorializing Congress on the issue of the repeal of section 14(b) and the consequent nullification of our constitutional provision of the State statute which implements it.

There being no objction, the editorials and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nebraska City News-Press, June 2, 1965]

FREEDOM OF CHOICE

(Association of Manufacturers)

In the current controversy over whether section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed, the argument is frequently made that the 19 States presently involved—those with the so-called right-to-work laws—are relatively unimportant industrially. The facts deny this contention.

While it is true that none of the 19 individually could be called an industrial giant, these States collectively represent one-fifth of the manufacturing activity of the entire United States. In 1962, the latest year for which statistics are available, these States accounted for some $33 billion of a total $179 billion. That's an impressive ratio and it can be assumed that it's increasing, for the right-to-work States for the most part are in growing sections of the country.

Now that we've set the record straight on the industrial importance of these States, we'll state flatly that this is all beside the point. The relative importance of the States, industrially speaking, should not be at issue in the 14(b) controversy.

The issue simply is this: Should Americans be compelled to join a union in order to hold a job? We say that they should be free to join if they wish; that they should be equally free not to join if that is their preference.

Union leaders, naturally, would like to have 14(b) repealed. Compulsory union membership makes their job easier, for they don't have to prove that the rank-and-file members are getting value for their dues dollars.

Do we enact laws to make things easier for union officials or to protect the liberties of the American people? We think most people would agree that 14(b) should stay on the statute books and thus hold open the door for other States to guarantee a basic freedom for their workers.

[From the Scottsbluff Star-Herald, Feb. 16, 1965]

RIGHT TO WORK IS UNDER ATTACK

Since no less a person than the President of the United States is openly supporting repeal of the right-to-work clause of the Taft-Hartley Act, it is to be presumed that this historic principle will be under severe attack in 1965 and may, perhaps, become extinct, along with the dodo bird.

Nebraskans, resident in a State still oriented to agriculture, nevertheless have already expressed their interest in section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act by voting in favor of a State law, permitted under this section of the act, which prohibits making membership in a labor union a condition for employment.

Nebraska is one of the only 20 States to enact such right-to-work statutes. If the President, while paying off a debt to organized labor, is successful in his repeal campaign, the expressed desire and will of many Americans will be nullified and union labor organizations will be able to obtain control in areas heretofore free and independent.

While this is being accomplished, as it very well may be, opposition to it may be supercharged with emotion and sentiment without taking into consideration what will be the economic effects of widespread unionization in agricultural States.

C. Wilson Harder, president of the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., says that if economically underdeveloped States of the Nation are forced to comply with labor terms imposed by big industrial complex cities there will result a system of "economic colonialism" in America.

In a mailing released to the economic departments of the Nation's high schools, colleges, and universities, Harder's organization takes the position that "more than 50 percent of the people live in 25 percent of the land area of the Nation, and that enterprise located in other parts of the country, in order to compete in this market, must compensate for increased transportation expense."

What is required to furnish a high level of living for a worker in so-called underdeveloped States is much less than that required by a worker in the crowded industrial areas of the east, it is claimed.

Moreover, this concentration of industry in eastern areas has created urban problems for which the entire Nation is now being taxed in an attempt to find solutions.

In the asphalt jungles, the need for relief is high, as is the need for slum clearance and redevelopment, and a reduction in the cost of crime.

Nebraskans should aline themselves in behalf of a retention of this right-to-work principle. It may be eliminated, before they know it.

[From the Scottsbluff Star-Herald, July 23, 1965]

Section 14(b) Doomed

Should a free citizen of the United States be required to join a labor union in order to hold a job, regardless of personal beliefs and convictions?

The Legislature of Nebraska has reaffirmed its State's stand in opposition to this unprincipled theory by adopting a resolution, No. 60, favoring retention of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law. Gov. Frank Morrison has signed the resolution.

We wonder how much good this will do. President Johnson is hellbent on eliminating the workingman's last defense against compulsory unionism, and he is being supported by an odd assortment of bleeding hearts who, for still unexplained reasons, have abandoned traditional democratic principles of personal freedom in favor of subservience and coercion.

Nebraska and 18 other States where right-to-work laws exist may oppose but our guess is that they will not prevail, unless there occurs an upset on the order of the congressional rejection of the infamous Rooseveltian court-packing proposal in 1937. We do not believe this will happen. On the contrary, it is apparent that Mr. Johnson has the influence and the political power to win and section 14(b) will be axed, regardless of the desires of the majority.

[From the Alliance Daily Times-Herald, Aug. 3, 1965]

The Case of Mr. A

Let's call him Mr. A.

Mr. A is a machinist. He is a good machinist and has held down many jobs requiring a man with great technical skill.

Mr. A has just gone to work in a new shop which is unionized. It is the first union shop in which he has worked. He knows and appreciates the fact that the union is strong in this shop because it came in and through effective dealings with management helped provide much improved working conditions and considerably higher pay.

Mr. A is not now and does not intend to become a union member. He does not approve of some of the union's stands on domestic issues, and does not approve of the way in which it handles members' money. As a matter of general principle he is not a joiner and does not want to join the union. He is willing, however, to contribute something to defray expenses of salary negotiations, realizing that in this area the union has done a good job. But he does not want to pay dues.

Mr. B, the union leader in the shop, comes to him after a while and solicits his membership in the union. Mr. A refuses. The union insists that management dismiss Mr. A. The management argues that this man has skills none of the other men in the shop have. That this man's presence attracts business and thus increases profits and helps to support the salaries being paid the others in the shop. But the argument is futile because this is a closed shop, and is legal according to the laws of the particular State involved. Management has not alternative but to dismiss the employee.

The employee's right to choose his job has been denied. The employee's civil rights have been denied. Is this justice to the American laboring man?

Is it justice that the Congress is now about to pass a law, which will make it national policy to deny the civil rights of even one workman? Is it justice for the U.S. Government to tell Nebraska to junk the right-to-work law placed in our State constitution by a vote of all the people?

Somehow we can't feel it is. And somehow we can't see the consistency of the present administration, where on the one hand it defends civil rights, and on the other is committed to deny them.

[From the Grand Island (Nebr.) Independent, June 22, 1965]

Arguments Mainly Irrelevant

After being deluged with material on right-to-work laws, most of it from those who favor retention of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, we have come to one conclusion:

We, too, favor retention of 14(b), but practically we don't think it makes much difference. That's the same opinion we had to begin with, and the material we've read has just served to confirm it.

That statement, admittedly, is hardly designed to please either the proponents or opponents of right-to-work laws. This is a highly emotional issue, and the partisans don't take kindly to viewpoints contrary to their's or to any belittling of its importance.

We base our opinion in favor of 14(b) on several thoughts.

First of all, the repeal move is so blatantly a political payoff that we find it objectionable. And make no mistake, there are now enough Congressmen who support every whim of organized labor to bring about repeal of 14(b).

While it is difficult to determine which phase of labor-management relations should be covered by Federal legislation and which by State laws, we feel there is so much variety among our States' economic structures that some State responsibility is involved.

Yellow-dog contracts which prohibit union membership might be enacted in some States, whereas legislation forcing all workers into unions could conceivably be passed in others. Both, however, so violate individual freedoms that it seems proper to impose Federal jurisdiction in such broad areas.

But there are intermediate areas in which it seems State differences should be recognized, and whether or not to force the so-called union shop seems to us to be one of these.

As we said, however, we don't think that it makes much difference. Few indeed are the workers who would stay out of a union, even though by choice they can, in right-to-work States. And few indeed are the employers who would put diehard nonunion members to work in a plant which had a union and invite the trouble which would inevitably result. The issue is just more theoretical than practical.

That view has been stated, too, by respondents in a survey made by the Christian Science Monitor in 19 States. We'd like to quote from the Monitor article reporting on that survey. It said:

"Primary finding (not surprising) was that most arguments on both sides have been overstated. Many are irrelevant. And some arguments are plainly misguided.

"Briefly, these were the findings * * *.

"Right-to-work laws have only incidentally blocked union efforts to organize in these States. Other factors—conservatism—anti-union sentiment, spotty economic growth—are far more important factors in slowing union organizing.

"Repeal of the laws would have little immediate effect in strengthening unions in these States; management dominates, and it is expected to continue for some time, law or no law.

"Except for isolated instances, the laws have not of themselves attracted new industry, nor, on the other hand, have they driven away skilled labor. New industry has come generally for other reasons.

"Unions bargaining with management in these States are sometimes put at a disadvantage because of these laws, but unions have found ways of compensating for the disadvantages—and management generally wants to avoid controversy."

Those views seem to bear out our thinking, although we're certain the partisans will never agree.

[From the Lincoln Evening Journal, June 24, 1965]

Right to Work in Nebraska

On many national issues, expressions of concern by a State legislature might be wholly irrelevent, as well as futile.

In the case of legislation before Congress to repeal State right-to-work laws, however, the issue is not at all irrelevant to State lawmaking bodies. And it can be hoped that expressions from State legislatures will not be futile.

A resolution before the Nebraska Legislature, reaffirming Nebraska's belief in the right-to-work principle and opposing the proposed congressional change, is as pertinent as any legislation before the State lawmakers.

For the State's right-to-work provision, which bans the union shop requiring workers in unionized plants to belong to a union in order to hold their jobs, is a basic part of Nebraska State law. It not only has been enacted by the legislature but has been written into the State constitution by the people of the State.

This provision means that no person in Nebraska can be barred from holding a job simply because he does not choose, for whatever reason, to belong to a labor union. This freedom of choice would seem to be as basic as anything in this land of freedom.

The Taft-Hartley Act now gives States the right to protect this freedom. The proposed change before Congress would take away this right of the States.

Testimony on Nebraska's legislative resolution on the subject, Legislative Resolution 60, will be taken by the legislature's labor committee next Monday afternoon. This will be the time for Nebraskans to speak out loudly and clearly in behalf of preserving this freedom within the State.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Public Ledger, June 25, 1965]

Unions Hit Bottom

Ten thousand dollars seems a mighty low price for a congressional vote to repeal 14(b), yet this was the union price tag indicated in a Washington Sunday paper last week—and not in the funny pages, either. Nor have we seen or heard of any higher quotations since.

Preston Callison, the Democratic candidate in a special election in the Second Congressional District of South Carolina, was reported by the paper as saying "that he has turned down an offer of $10,000 from the AFL–CIO Political Committee because it was contingent on his support of repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act which permits States to prohibit the union shop." The article goes on to say that South Carolina is one of the 19 States that have passed such a right-to-work law.

No one seems to gag too much nowadays at unions giving a bundle of compulsory dues money to a favored candidate-in-need as a campaign contribution—no matter how much of it may have come from members who would vote for the other fellow. But, when the cash is frankly labeled as advance payment for a specific vote in Congress, the odor (toujours moi) becomes unmistakable.

Or so it appears to Reed Larson, executive vice president of the National Right to Work Committee, who sent a clipping of the article to the Attorney General with a letter demanding immediate investigation into possible violation of the Corrupt Practices Act in this South Carolina special election.

Mr. Larson also complimented Mr. Callison for turning the offer down and expressed his confidence that "no present Congressmen could or will be swayed by any financial attempts to influence their votes on an issue of great importance to the people of this country." But, he emphasized, it is vital that such bribery attempts are exposed so that the people may know how far the power-gluttons of big labor will go to cheat and enslave their fellow men and women.

Only the 44 words of 14(b) stand between American workers and nationwide compulsory unionism, the right to join or not to join a union, the right to work without paying tribute to a labor trust. To strike those words would be cold-blooded betrayal. We do not think the men and women of the Congress of the United States, whatever their involvements, their fears, their attitudes toward unions, are any more capable of such collective cynicism than of entertaining bribery.

[From the Norfolk (Nebr.) Daily News, May 12, 1965]

Civic Right of the Jobholder

What gives importance to the fight in Congress over the right-to-work issue is that the bill the administration is trying to force through the two Houses would take away two rights we have long respected. It would invade the domain of the States and forbid them to exercise their right to protect every worker in his right to work to support his family, one of his most sacred rights.

The bill to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law would do both of these things, and with the prestige of the President behind it it may be enacted by this or the next Congress.

Nebraska is especially interested because our right-to-work law was adopted by a vote of the people. We are aroused then when Congress proposes to tell us that we cannot protect our workers in this right. Eighteen other States have also thrown their protection around a man's right to hold a job without union membership.

And backers of the repeal action are active despite the evidence that the people want this protection given the workingman. A poll taken by the Opinion Research Corp. of Princeton, N.J., found that the people queried favored the right-to-work law by 2 to 1. Furthermore, union members themselves voted 4 out of 10 in favor of such protection.

Among college-educated adults the vote was more than 7 out of every 10 in favor of right to work.

There is terrific pressure being exerted to bring about the enactment of the law forbidding States to pass right-to-work laws.

There is much talk of protecting the individual in his civic rights. The right to hold a job regardless of membership in any organization is a civic right that Congress should be concerned about.

[From the Norfolk (Nebr.) Daily News, May 12, 1965]

President Johnson Pays a Debt

In his message asking Congress to ban State right-to-work laws, President Johnson said his aim was to reduce "conflicts in our national labor policy that for several years have divided Americans in various States." Yet, as the New York Times, usually a Johnson policy supporter, observes "the immediate effect will be to touch off what gives every sign of becoming the most divisive fight of this congressional session."

As has previously been pointed out the bitter fight over the threat of this Federal ban on State action, in a field always presumed to be the province of the State, is set off by two factors in the President's measure. These are its attempt to take away the right of the States to protect workers in their jobs, and to take away from the individual the right to decide whether or not he will join a labor union.

And the opponents of the bill to nullify clause 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law is not confined to opponents of organized labor.

There are those whose major concern is in organized labor who believe that the interests of their organizations are best served under a system in which their officials will have to earn the support of their members by the merits of their work, rather than gain it by compulsion of law.

One of the founders of the National Right-To-Work Committee is S. D. Cadwallader, who has been a union member for 23 years and who is now a member of the Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen. Mr. Cadwallader is devoting the greater part of his time to the work of defending right-to-work laws.

Arthur Goldberg, who, before becoming Secretary of Labor, was counsel for labor unions, has promoted the idea that union membership should be earned, not forced upon workers by law.

President Johnson was paying off a political debt to labor leaders when he asked Congress to enact this ban on the States. He was going against public opinion as shown by polls, but he owed a debt and he paid it. But it is not a debt owed by Congress nor the public. Congressmen should vote their own minds and their constituents should let them know just what the sentiment back home is.

[From the Norfolk Daily News, Jan. 27, 1965]

Nebraskans Against 14(b) Repeal

Word from Washington is that President Johnson has promised union leaders that he will get behind the Democratic platform plank that calls for repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law.

This section graciously permits the States to adopt right-to-work laws. Nebraska is interested because we have adopted such a law by popular vote, and it is working well. It creates a healthful industrial climate in which our efforts to attract industry can operate.

But the union leaders are against our law. There is evidence that the bosses are more enthusiastic for repeal of 14(b) than the rank and file of the labor unions. This is because right-to-work laws take away from the bosses one of their most powerful disciplinary weapons for use against their own members.

Under a union shop agreement, one in which a worker must belong to a union in order to hold a job, expulsion from the union is an extreme penalty because it takes away from a man his right to work to support his family. If union leadership can hold the threat of expulsion over a member's head, it has a most powerful weapon against those who may have their own views as to union policy.

A case in point is that of eight employees of the Southern Railway who rebelled against the use of their dues to support political causes they did not agree with. They were expelled and threatened with loss of their jobs. They went into court and when a decision seemed about to go against the union bosses, the bosses relented and agreed to allow the members to remain on their jobs. The court had held it was a violation of the workers' constitutional rights if dues money, obtained from them under compulsory membership, were spent for political purposes which they opposed. Faced with such a decision the union leadership, rather than reveal what portion of the dues were used for political purposes, agreed to allow the defendants to remain on their jobs without payment of dues. But it took long and expensive court litigation reaching to the U.S. Supreme Court, to get them their rights.

Nebraska and 19 other States have voted to protect workers from this kind of tyranny and it is reported that the President is preparing to back the repeal of 14(b) which would take from us our right to protect workers in their right to work.

That Nebraskans will fight repeal goes without saying.

[From the Omaha World Herald, July 8, 1965]

Consensus on 14(b)

As both the House and Senate move to take up repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, opponents say they are determined to make a real fight of it.

South Dakota's Senator Karl Mundt foresees "long, long debate in the Senate."

Other Senators have predicted that once the public becomes aware of what is at stake—namely, the right to work as against compulsory union membership in the 19 States which have right-to-work laws—the administration will find itself on the defensive in spite of its massive voting strength in Congress.

Senator Winston Prouty, Republican, of Vermont, has gone so far as to propose that the administration, which professes to want to solve every major problem by "consensus," should permit a national referendum on the controversial repeal measure.

No machinery exists for taking such a national vote and there is very little chance that the administration would use it if the machinery did exist. Nevertheless, the idea is an intriguing one.

It will remind some Americans of the fact that a good many things the Federal Government does are accomplished in the name of the people but without their consent. And it suggests rather strongly that if their consent were asked, Washington probably wouldn't get it.

Section 14(b) is that part of the Taft-Hartley Act which permits the States to pass laws preventing compulsory union membership. The pressure for its repeal comes from leaders of organized labor. Administration backing for repeal is interpreted as political payment for the union leaders' backing of the Johnson-Humphrey ticket last year.

Thus, a pressure group representing a minority of the American people is trying to tear down what millions of Americans regard as a safeguard against labor tyranny. They would nullify State right-to-work laws which in many instances were adopted by vote of the people, in some cases by lopsided majorities.

Senator Prouty is convinced that if all Americans were privileged to vote on this important issue the verdict would be thunderous defeat for the labor leaders and for the administration.

We shall probably never know whether he is right.

But it is an intriguing notion that if the people were permitted to express themselves on important national issues the National Government might very well end up with less power and that the States and individuals might very well have greater power.

[From the Nebraska City News-Press, May 24, 1965]

RIGHT TO WORK

The Iowa Legislature refused to follow the Johnson-Humphrey-AFL-CIO line with respect to the repeal of the right-to-work law.

Despite the pleadings of Governor Hughes, the Iowa senate refused to go along with the house and left the right-to-work statute on the books.

It is likely that Johnson arm twisting will secure repeal of the Taft-Hartley provision know as 14(b) and thus nullify what is the law of the land in Nebraska and Iowa. But despite this impending flouting of the ideals of those who still believe in freedom of choice, Iowa stood firm.

Nineteen States believe firmly in giving workers the freedom to choose if they want to belong to a labor organization in order to hold their jobs. Johnson has demanded that Congress smash down the laws of these 19 States and because the success of his strong-arm ways is well known he probably will get the job done.

Meantime, Iowa refused to knuckle under to the demands of the minority.

[From the Nebraska City News-Press, May 28, 1965]

RIGHT TO WORK

Commenting on the refusal of the Iowa Legislature—Democrat dominated, by the way—to repeal the right-to-work law, my friend, Willard Archie, the Shenandoah editor, had this to say:

"Hated to see the labor bill defeated. Republicans ganged up solidly against it, and thereby saved face for the Democrats. It was an issue where Republicans could have made some needed gains, but they did not think so. Labor now comes into discussions with a chip on their shoulder. They are people just like you and I and hate to have laws passed against them. Seems to me it would make just as much sense if we passed laws that newspapers could not join together in an association. In our case we make newspapers pay dues to belong. If they do not pay dues they cannot belong. Is this, or is it not, the same? We do not allow those to benefit from the association, who refuse to pay. This is true with every other business organization. They are not restricted by laws."

Of course, neither Iowa nor Nebraska has laws "against" unions. The so-called right-to-work law gives the working man an opportunity to join a union, or not to join a union. Willard would force every workman to belong to a union, if there were one where he worked, whether he wanted to or not.

I believe in the doctrine of freedom of choice. When you take away freedom of choice you are on the way to dictatorship.

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 60 BY THE LEGISLATURE OF NEBRASKA, 75TH SESSION

Whereas the people of the State of Nebraska in the year 1946, by initiative referendum adopted by a vote of 212,443 to 142,702 amendments to the constitution of the State of Nebraska now designated sections 13, 14 and 15 of article XV which provide in part that: "No person shall be denied employment because of membership in or affiliation with, or resignation or expulsion from a labor organization or because of refusal to join or affiliate with a labor organization; nor shall any individual or corporation or association of any kind enter into any contract, written or oral, to exclude persons from employment because of membership in or nonmembership in a labor organization"; and

Whereas the legislature of the State of Nebraska in the year 1947 adopted sections 48-217, 48-218, and 48-219 of the statutes of Nebraska which provide in part that: "To make operative the provisions of sections 13, 14 and 15 of article XV of the constitution of Nebraska, no person shall be denied employment because of membership in or affiliation with, or resignation or expulsion from a labor organization or because of refusal to join or affiliate with a labor organization; nor shall any individual or corporation or association of any kind enter into any contract, written or oral, to exclude persons from employment because of membership in or nonmembership in a labor organization"; and

Whereas section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act of our Federal statutes provides that States may forbid agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment; and

Whereas President Johnson has recently sent to Congress a message urging the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act which would have the practical effect of invalidating the right-to-work laws of Nebraska and other States having these statutes; and

Whereas the citizens of Nebraska desire to retain their right-to-work law and believe that each State should have the right of self-determination in this regard: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 75th session assembled:

1. That the Nebraska Legislature reaffirms its belief in the necessity of sections 13, 14, and 15 of article XV of the Nebraska constitution and the statutes implementing these sections.
2. That the Nebraska Legislature disagrees with the efforts of the present national administration to take from the States the right to self-determination in this area.
3. That the Nebraska Legislature forward printed copies of this resolution and the position of the State of Nebraska's Legislature to the Nebraska delegation in Congress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—MOTION TO ADJOURN UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the vote on cloture yesterday, while it was a disappointment, was, in no sense, a judgment on the merits of the repeal of 14(b).

It was, in fact, a failure on a simple procedural motion, a failure compounded not only of opposition to 14(b) but of other elements in the Senate at this time. Nevertheless, the opponents of repeal have won their point. They have been able, by the vote yesterday, to make clear that they can prevent the Senate at this time from even getting to, let alone coming to grips with the issue of repeal of 14(b). They can, indeed, under the tolerant rules of the Senate, forestall a clear-cut test of the issue of repeal of 14(b).

In view of the margin of yesterday's vote, I no longer find myself looking through a glass darkly. The image is clear, the Senate does not wish the majority leader to press the attempt to take up 14(b) at this time. Whatever the reasons, the earlier assessment of the procedural problem—that cloture would be the essential factor in reaching a decision on 14(b) at this time—is now persuasive insofar as the majority leader is concerned. And I am persuaded, now, that it cannot be obtained at this time.

The President has done what he could do to resolve the issue of repeal of 14(b). The Senators who have voted for cloture on the procedural question to take up 14(b) have done what they could do. This is no defeat for them. Indeed, it is no defeat on the merits for repeal of 14(b). It is a defeat for the majority leader and it is a victory for procrastination.

It remains for the majority leader, on his own responsibility and without consultation with anyone—not even the minority leader—to accept the inevitable and to recommend to the Senate that it move on with the remaining business of the session.

Therefore, I move that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I appreciate that the motion——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand. I ask unanimous consent only that I may ask the majority leader a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I gather from the statement of the majority leader that there will be no endeavor to take up the repeal of section 14(b) this session.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I believe that perhaps I ought to be assured that no effort will be made to undertake to attach this measure to any other measure that might come to the attention of the Senate.

I would hesitate, and in fact, I would be grievously reluctant to undertake similar action on any measure that comes before the Senate if the repeal of section 14(b) were attached. It could not be attached to an appropriation bill. However, it could be attached to any calendar bill, or even to the sugar bill if the sugar bill comes before the Senate soon.

I wonder if the majority leader could give me some assurance.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has my assurance that, as far as the Senator from Montana is concerned, no such attempt will be made to attach the provisions of H.R. 77 to the sugar bill or any other bill on the calendar.

With respect to the sugar bill, I would consider such a course of action without merit. Even if it were successful in the

Senate, it would necessitate a conference with the House and the two legislative committees who would then have to consider it in conference would not be those whose jurisdiction and expertise covered these matters.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am grateful to the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana, that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, the issue that draws us together, from both sides of this Chamber, to strive, no matter the cost, for justice, is not a mere item in a transitory piece of legislation.

The issue is the right of men to choose their own way, their own ways. The issue is whether the voice of this Senate can be quieted on a matter of conscience, only to be made shrill when matters of convenience arise.

Let those who will deride this issue and this way of stating it. Let those who will say that there is no principle, but simply good political expediency in abandoning the right of the States of this Union to establish laws in the area we are debating. Let those who will say that it is not worth the trouble. Let those who will say that the political risk is too high—too high to defend the very thing to which our political system supposedly is consecrated.

Let those who will deride those who speak, and say that we are overstating our case, or overstating our argument. Let them say this and then go before the American people and tell them that freedom is no longer an issue in this Nation, that States must not be permitted a freedom which beyond any doubt they have proven an ability to handle to the detriment of none and the advantage of all. Let those who oppose the freedom of choice speak in those terms. Let them say that they speak for coercion, that they speak for the denial of State decision, that they speak for the privilege of the few and the denial of the many.

How else are we to view the raw terms of this debate? I can see it no other way.

How simple it would be for me to sit on the sidelines and hold my peace and bury my beliefs. The people of my State have exercised their right of choice and have voted against a right-to-work law in Idaho.

Now there is the simple issue of this particular legislative item. The people of my State have chosen on its basis. I do not in my action now oppose their decision.

I do not and would not seek a Federal right-to-work law. I do not and would not seek to upset the choice of Idaho. I do and always will seek to uphold the rights of Idaho.

I support absolutely the right to make a decision. What is decided is not the issue. The right of the people to decide is and was and always will be the issue.

The people of my State have decided. They have rejected right-to-work. But the people of my State, Mr. President, would be the last people in this land to demand that their decision be imposed on every other person in every other State. And, let me remind you, that by the very same token the people of Idaho do not expect the local decisions of other States to be imposed upon them.

No, sir, freedom is a two-way street or it is a dead end and a dead issue. Freedom is the right to decide—freedom is not the decision itself. The nature of freedom is embodied in the right of choice, it is not embodied in the nature of the choice. Freedom does not say that there is only one right choice. Freedom simply says there is a right to choose.

If this were not involved in this debate, I would not be standing on this floor pledged to remain here as long as necessary to preserve the freedom of which I speak. But the people of my State know what is involved and they expect more than passive submission.

I have been told that inasmuch as my State voted against right-to-work, there is a mandate for me to seek the repeal of 14(b). Not at all, Mr. President, and let me repeat this so that all may hear in this Chamber and, hopefully all may hear in my State and in others. The people of Idaho treasure first of all their right to make their own decisions. And, Mr. President, that is precisely, emphatically, exclusively, centrally, vitally, and crucially what is involved in the matter before us—the right to choose, the right to choose.

Who better to defend this right than the representatives of people who have exercised that right. We have in this body representatives of other States who have used this right to choose. None need defend their support of 14(b) on the basis of which way their neighbors decided. All may defend it on the basis of the fact that they did decide, that they had the right to decide and that every man and woman born to America's freedom should have the right to decide.

No doubt should arise before, no distortion should becloud the fact that in defending 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act we who dedicate our efforts here do not defend any particular form of labor-management regulation. We defend the right of people in their own communities to decide that for themselves. It must not be decided for the many by the few. I would speak, as I speak today, if the situation were reversed; if this Senate were seeking to impose the opposite will upon all the people, if we were debating a single Federal rather than many local right-to-work laws. I would oppose that Federal imposition as well.

I plead again. Do not confuse the issues. We are not setting ourselves up in this body as arbiters of local practices that shall be binding upon everyone. We do not seek to deny the right to join a union. We would protect that right every bit as strenuously as our current efforts—that is a basic right of choice also. We do not seek to deny anyone. We do not, however, seek to coerce anyone. We are not debating whether men shall or men shall not join unions. There is not a diminishment of that right envisioned or possible in a single action we will take in this discussion.

Let one American be denied the right to join a union, let one American be kept from joining a union by fear or by pressure or by rule and I shall lead the opposition to that denial and I know that many of my colleagues would join me.

I support absolutely and unequivocally the right of every American, regardless of race or creed or color to join the union of his choice and his trade.

I support, for precisely the same reasons and because of precisely the same responsibility to freedom under law, the right of people freely to make that choice within the framework of laws to which locally they have been a party. I support, in the short and long of it, the right of choice. And that is why, no matter the short and long of it, I support that section of the labor law that permits people in their States to decide upon the matter of compulsory unionism.

Who can look at the most obvious facts and conclude that the right to choose is somehow hostile to the best interests of American workingmen and women. What else but the right to choose was involved in the first corrective labor laws passed in this country? It was to gain the right to choose that we fought so hard then and it is to preserve the right to choose that we will fight so hard now.

How can we see the simplest facts—take those of the railroad unions—and still claim that the right to choose hurts honest workingmen and women?

For 17 years the railroad unions operated under a wholly voluntary system of membership. Were they damaged? Their membership increased by threefold. Case after case is the same. The right to choose is not the right to destroy. It is the right to build, to create, to grow.

And, as with every right, there are reciprocal rights. The right of unions, by agreement with their neighbors in a State, to establish compulsory unionism is not being debated here. The section of the law which we seek to preserve does not deny this right. No. We are debating and the law preserves the right of every State to decide for itself by the free choice of its citizens.

In this above all, let there be no deception—for deception is what it would be—in regard to rights and the protection of rights. We who want to preserve section 14(b) are seeking the preservation only of the right to choose. Those who seek to destroy 14(b) are flatly and unmistakably seeking to destroy the right to choose.

Our rallying cry is the freedom to choose. Those who seek the destruction of 14(b) rally behind the cry of denying the right to choose. How else can it be described?

The overwhelming majority of our friends in the press, even those most notably and properly concerned with the welfare of American trade unionism, agree that the right to decide is what is involved and they editorially ask for the retention of 14(b). The majority of our individual citizens—the men and women who send us here—agree that the right to choose is the right involved and they support that right.

I cannot imagine any area of human choice where such opinions would not be clearly heard. How, in any area, could you argue against the freedom to choose between responsible alternatives? Let us assure that this single area of labor legislation does not become an exception to the general rules of choice and of freedom. Let us assure that this single area of labor legislation is not exploited for special purposes and special advantages. Let us assure that this single area of labor legislation is not so distorted that rather than preserve the rights of our citizens to choose we deny them the right to choose—and then, in a travesty beyond belief, call that denial an act of justice.

When you face men with responsible alternatives, the only justice is to say "choose." Justice does not derive from the choice. It derives from the choosing.

If there is to be a single standard of justice in this country then it must involve also a standard of choice. If men are free to join unions—then other men should be free to agree or disagree with that choice. They should be free to establish, as local agreements, the limits of agreement and disagreement.

How are we to free people by coercing them? How are we to uphold the rights of some States to agree with compulsory union contracts when we deny the right of others to disagree? And how, in the name of all that is sensible, can anyone say that the people of any given State are not to be trusted with the decision between the courses.

Are those who seek the repeal of 14(b) prepared to go to every State that has voted a certain way and tell the people of those States that they are wrong and that their decision must be nullified? I do not hear them speaking this bald truth—and it is the truth. Instead, we hear side issues, cover issues, diversion issues, cross issues, every kind of issue but the real issue.

Are those who seek the repeal of 14(b) going to tell citizens who may have reserved judgment that they are not ever to be permitted to have a judgment? That their judgment is not trusted? That, too, is the truth of what those who oppose 14(b) are truly saying.

Slice it thin, slice it long, slice it short, slice it up, slice it down and the result is the same: repeal of 14(b) would be the repeal of the judgment of individual Americans, the repeal of their right to decide. It would say that Americans cannot be trusted. It would say that Americans must be silent.

How truly ironic such a silence would be on this particular day of all days. We have been visited by the pontiff of the Roman Catholic Church. That visit should remind us of some of the great moral pronouncements upon the right to choose. Pope Pius XI stated the point as clearly as possible. He wrote:

> Moreover, just as inhabitants of a town are wont to found associations with the widest diversity of purposes, which each is quite free to join or not, so those engaged in the same industry or profession will combine with one another into associations equally free for purposes connected in some manner with the pursuit of the calling itself. Since these free associations are clearly and lucidly explained by our predecessor (and here he refers to Pope Leo) of illustrious memory. We consider it enough to emphasize this one point: People are quite free not only to found such associations, which are a matter of private order and private right, but also in respect to them "freely to adopt the organization and the rules which they judge most appropriate to achieve their purpose."

Surely, in those measured words, we do not hear a call for the rejection of the right to choose. Surely we hear, instead, a call for the right to choose.

We have that right under section 14 (b). Let us not destroy it. We are faced with this issue today—not with any other. And let me speak frankly now of the major factor in denying us a more clear picture of what is involved, the sad fact that promotes so much misunderstanding of a perfectly clear-cut decision which we must make in regard, not to union welfare, but in regard to freedom's welfare.

The shameful fact is that there are men in this land who have decided that the emotions of this issue outweigh the truth. There are men who have decided that the politics of this issue outweigh the principle. There are men who balance the effectiveness of lobbyists on this issue rather than the effect of their own conscience.

I have heard it said that to take a position on 14(b) leaves one vulnerable, that the American people do not understand the real issue, that propagandists can make it appear that support of 14 (b) is opposition to trade unionism. I have heard all of these things and I know that others have. I know that some have heeded what they heard.

I know of no less worthy motive for debating this issue than the motive of personal fear or personal pride or personal advantage.

I know of no less worthy motive for failing to sound the issues clearly than to admit that they are easily distorted. Because they are there is all the more reason to speak for understanding.

If there must be a choice in this debate between being popular and being right, then let me say for our time what has been said for other times of history—I would rather be right. As a matter of fact, I would rather be right than even be popular—with the President.

No, there is no argument in justice for the repeal of 14(b). As it stands, 14(b) does not deny a single right; it considers rights, guarantees rights, establishes rights. It does not impinge upon the freedom of trade unions or of working people. It permits them and their neighbors, partners all in their own communities, to decide the basic conditions of contractual arrangements. It does not deny the workingman a right. It does not weaken his cause.

Only by repealing 14(b) would we be involved in the deprivation of choice, in the deprivation of rights.

Leave 14(b) as it is and no trade union opportunity or safeguard is infringed by so much as a comma. My State of Idaho proves part of the point. My State permits the unions the full sweep of their lawful authority. The provisions of 14(b) did not deprive them. In other States, where people vote as freely as in my State, other decisions have been made. Surely the trade union cannot fault the decision of an entire State. Surely trade unionism does not demand that the expressed wishes of the electorate be subordinated to the vested rights of the labor organization.

If that is what is being asked, then let it be asked in plain language so that we will know what is being sought—and so that we will know that 14(b) is not the issue of which they speak, that special privilege for some, and denial of rights for others is what they seek.

For the part of those who speak on behalf of 14(b) we seek no special privilege and we seek no special punishment. We ask only the protection of law for the protection of a fundamental right—the right to choose.

But how often do we hear a chorus of technicalities trying to drown out the simple basis of this great debate—the alternatives of trusting the people to decide, or mistrusting them and denying them the right to decide.

It is said, for instance, that 14(b) represents an exception to the nationally uniform nature of other items of labor legislation. It is said that it gives the States power to act on one particular aspect of labor law while reserving all other aspects to the Federal Government.

Oh, Mr. President, how long will fantasy overcome fact in this matter?

Just last year we ourselves enacted a Civil Rights Act which specifically reserves to the States an area of discretion in labor law. That title, in the fair employment practices section of the Civil Rights Act, sets up certain Federal rules regarding discrimination by both unions and employers—but it provides in particular that State laws, going even further on the subject, shall not be ignored.

Clearly here is an area, and a vital one, in which in all wisdom it has been decided that States may make different decisions in an area of labor legislation.

State laws governing the actions of union officials also differ and are specifically protected in Federal statutes. States, of differing mind and mood, of differences of any sort, can and do enact laws governing the actions of men during strikes. Others legislate so that State agencies may have the power of injunction in certain strikes. Other States do not. All have the right to decide in important areas of labor law.

The Labor Relations Reporter, an accepted and authoritative journal in the field, has pointed out other areas which prove beyond any question that the repeal of 14(b) cannot be sought on the basis of remedying the single exception to national uniformity in labor law.

Such an argument, again, is a diversion as well as being a deception.

State laws, of differing impact, cover the matter of reinstatement with back pay for employees let go under union shop agreements. In one State, the decision may be to pay. In another State, the decision may be different. The point is that there is a difference, that choices are made, and that choices are protected, with the right of choice ultimately resting with the people closest to the situation and the conditions.

A State may take action regarding sitdown strikes. State law may govern in the award of damages in certain trade union actions. The list goes on and I shall not repeat what so many of my able colleagues undoubtedly will explore in detail. The fact that there is a list is the proof of the point.

Section 14(b) is not an exception to be ended in the name of uniformity. I hope, as a matter of fact, that I never see the day when Americans will say that simply because something is different it must be abolished. The point is that 14(b), taken simply as an item of law, is fully precedented and fully protected by practice.

The more important point is that commonsense defends 14(b) beyond any matter of quibble or technicality.

Try commonsense, as a matter of fact, and the need for learned references and long citations becomes less and less. Commonsense, for instance, tells us that if one group of men can exact from this or any Congress a law denying States this right of decision that another group, in another time, just as justifiably, could exact from the Congress a law that would repeal it and reverse it.

If a stroke of our legislative pen today can say that in every State, despite the wishes of its citizens, only one sort of union contract may exist—then the stroke of another pen can say that no union contract can exist.

I am well aware that no Congress we can imagine would take any such action. And I pray that we in this Congress will not so abuse this notion as to commit the exactly equal and exactly opposite enormity.

Commonsense speaks all the defense that 14(b) should need. Common observation would add what I have said, and said again, that 14(b) does not demand a single thing of a State—it merely offers a freedom. It does not say that the State should think or act one way or the other. Only by repealing 14(b) would coercion be involved. How many times must this commonsense fact be repeated before the simple truth is plain to all; retention of 14(b) retains the right of all to decide, repeal of 14(b) denies that right. Retention of 14(b) does not deny freedom to unions. Repeal of 14(b) would deny even the freedom of voice to all.

Perhaps it would be far better for the purposes of this debate if we stopped fooling ourselves and trying to fool the public with the deceptive label of right to work. The right to work is not essentially what we are debating. We are debating the right to decide. We are not saying that a State should decide to have or not to have right-to-work laws. We from States that have rejected such laws should not say that we encourage others to reject them. Those from States which have right-to-work laws should not argue that everyone should have them. We can agree on a single and a different point. We can and do agree that the people of each State should have the right to decide for themselves.

The right-to-work argument is a secondary issue of this debate in which we are engaged. Section 14(b) does not take sides on that issue.

The debate in which we are engaged is the debate to decide, very flatly and very fully, whether the States of the Union are to have the right to decide.

If States are to be denied the right to decide in this instance then we will have established a powerful precedent for denying them the right to decide in other instances. We shall have taken a step, for which we would have to bear historic responsibility, toward the establishment of a tyranny of national regulation which would permit no local volition, no regional or local difference.

Again, we should be aware lest, in the emotions and haranguing of this issue, we permit ulterior issues a back-door entry to national power.

Let us debate what is the point, not that which is the special picture of special pleading. Read 14(b) as many times as you will and it still comes out the States' right to decide. Read the reasons for its repeal as many times as you will and they still come out distrust of the States' right to decide.

Here we are head on with the issue that truly confronts us.

If we are to argue, as some do, that the States should not have the right to decide on compulsory unionism under 14(b), then we must detect in that argument a rejection of the States' right to decide on any other equally intimate and important issue.

To argue against the States on such a detail must be to argue against them as a whole. If their citizens cannot be trusted here, then where? If not now, then when?

Our Federal system itself is nothing but a structure built upon firm foundations of accommodation with diverse State decisions. It is a structure built of many, many pieces—each one of them alike in nature if not in detail, each one of them akin to the provisions of 14(b), each one of them saying but a single thing. The tie between all the pieces is simply the right of differing levels of government, of different communities of people, to be different. Therein lies the strength of our Federal system.

If we find no merit in difference, if we find no merit in a system of interdependent units, then we would, of course, find no merit in 14(b). If we say that conformity is the goal of government, then we would find no merit in 14(b).

If we say that freedom, and the protection of individual rights—protection of those rights from official abuse as well as individual abuse—if we say that this is the goal of government, then we must retain 14(b)—no matter how we may stand otherwise on the matter of right-to-work laws.

It is understandable, of course, that those who have a singleminded view of labor legislation would view 14(b) as a mere tool or lever rather than a principle. In fairness it must be said, however, that those who advocate its repeal are advocating a tool of destruction rather than one of construction. Leaving 14(b) alone, assures all a constructive chance to accept or reject. Repealing it simply builds new barriers.

Of course there are those who would feel great pleasure if what they viewed as the single best way to do things became the only way to do things. How can we tell such men that through such precedents of coercion they make possible the day in which they may be the target of coercion rather than the perpetrator? It has happened before to men impatient of cause and careless of principle.

We speak, for instance, of improving understanding in the labor field. How better to do it than by permitting a choice in such a basic matter as compulsion? We speak of presenting arguments on their merit. How better to do it than by permitting people the right to decide in their own homes and in their own ways? Is fact, how else can we do it?

Reliance on the people, faith in our Federal system rests in the long run on the attitudes of our people. Every expression that we have of popular will in this matter of compulsory unionism, in this matter of 14(b), shows that our people generally believe that they should have and be trusted with the right to make their own decisions in this area. Here is the sort of attitude upon which the Federal system can endure. Here is the attitude that forged it, in fact.

This attitude has confidence in people. It expects them to make choices, to seek solutions in their own neighborhoods and by their own lights.

Above all, it tolerates differences between people, between regions, between cultures, between convictions of many sorts.

It tolerates differences so that in diversity we may learn and grow. It knows that conformity—except conformity to consented law itself—stultifies and stunts a society.

As the political scientist, Alfred de Grazia, put it, writing in the Conservative Papers:

> The Federal system does not insist upon the one best solution, though it may fight against the one worst solution. It has a sympathy for local sentiments, customs, and interests.

Today we face an issue involving that entire attitude. Are we to have no sympathy for local sentiments? Are we to abandon difference? Worse, are we to abandon even the right to decide?

This is what brings us to our debate today. This is the issue; not the right to work but the right to decide—for that is all, absolutely all that 14(b) does, it guarantees the right to decide.

Our choice is simply choice itself. Our course may be charted for the Nation as a whole, or for some special interest in particular. I say that we should serve the Nation, and respect its citizens, respecting particularly their right to decide matters of crucial importance by themselves.

Mr. President, because I am convinced that the matter of choice and popular decision is not only germane to, but actually the key to, the decision that must be made in considering section 14(b) of the current labor law, I should like to read for my colleagues some pertinent notes on the origin of our Federal system.

I shall quote excerpts from a book "We, the States" which is an anthology of historic documents and commentaries, thereon, expounding the State and Federal relationship. It was published by the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government, 1964.

I quote from the jacket cover:

> In some quarters, there is a tendency to denigrate the role of the States in the American plan of government, and to urge that public administration in the future be left to great cities, on the one hand, and to the Federal Government on the other. Yet the position occupied by the States under our Constitution is of the first importance. The States, acting as States, formed the Union; and only the States, acting as States, validly may amend the Constitution.
>
> The significance of the States, and the need for preserving their vitality, have been recognized by many of the greatest political thinkers of the Nation's history.
>
> An introduction by James Jackson Kilpatrick, editor of the Richmond News Leader and vice chairman of the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government, pleads for a revitalization of the States and a return to the original grand design of American Union.

I quote excerpts from Mr. Kilpatrick's introduction to "We, the States":

> On Monday, August 6, South Carolina's John Rutledge submitted to the Philadelphia Convention of 1787 the first full draft of a tentative constitution. His Committee of Detail had been hard at work, during a 3-day recess, trying to knit together a hundred different provisions for fashioning a new government for the United States of America. History does not record that anyone paid much attention to the committee's draft of a preamble. It read: "We the people of the States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, do ordain, declare, and establish the following Constitution for the Government of ourselves and our posterity."
>
> On the following day, as Madison's Notes of the Convention of 1787 disclose, the preamble was approved in that form, "nem. con." Not until Thursday, August 30, when the weary delegates worked their way to the very end of the tentative document, did a disturbing uncertainty creep into the debate: How many States were likely to ratify any Constitution at all? This was a Union being formed—a voluntary union of separate, sovereign States. Maryland's Daniel Carroll thought that the ratification of all 13 States should be required. Roger Sherman, of Connecticut, was willing to settle for 10. James Wilson, of Pennsylvania, pointed out that the Constitution would be binding only upon the States that agreed to it; he thought eight ratifications would be sufficient to start a new Union. James Madison proposed that the operative clause be based upon the ratification of seven States entitled collectively to 33 Members of the House. In the end, the convention compromised upon the ratifications of nine States as a sufficient number to establish the Constitution among themselves. The following week, debate moved on to other issues.
>
> But as one reads over the notes of these historic conversations, one senses that some intensely practical questions of political tactics were beginning to assume larger proportions. By the first of September, the convention plainly was drawing to a close. There seemed no hope whatever that Rhode Island would ratify. North Carolina was most uncertain. Virginia's George Mason had just remarked "that he would sooner chop off his right hand than put it to the Constitution as it now stands." The vote in New York predictably would be close.
>
> With all these considerations in mind, it becomes easier to grasp the prudent deletions recommended on September 12, when the Committee on Style and Arrangements, headed by Connecticut's conciliatory Samuel Johnson, brought in a new and substantially final draft of a Constitution. This time the preamble read:
>
> "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, to establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."
>
> The diplomatic change, from "we, the people of (certain named) States," to "we, the people of the United States," aroused no recorded debate in the Philadelphia Convention. As the context of their daily discussion makes clear, the delegates were perfectly well aware that the Constitution would have to be voted up or down by the States, acting individually; there was no thought of any "nationwide" referendum among the people as a whole. But the change did not escape the angry eye of Patrick Henry. The following June, in Virginia's great convention of 1788, he seized upon the revised preamble as evidence that the Philadelphia delegates had sought to fashion a consolidated government.
>
> "I have the highest veneration for those gentlemen," he cried, "but, sir, give me leave to demand, what right had they to say 'we, the people'? My political curiosity, exclusive of my anxious solicitude for the public welfare, leads me to ask, who authorized them to speak the language of 'we, the people', instead of 'we, the States'? States are the characteristics and the soul of a confederation. If the States be not the agents of this compact, it must be one great consolidated National Government, of the people of all the States."
>
> One by one, proponents of the Constitution arose to assure the suspicious Henry that no such thing as a consolidated national government was being proposed. Edmund Pendleton, one of the Constitution's strongest advocates, agreed with Henry that a consolidated government, annihilating the States, necessarily would "terminate in despotism." Col. Henry Lee said that "we, the people" obviously meant, "we, the people on whom the Constitution would operate"—that is, the people within each separate State. "It is not binding on the people until it becomes their act." Madison gave positive assurances: The people who were mentioned in the preamble were "not the people as composing one great body," but, "rather the people composing 13 sovereignties."
>
> The question thus raised by Patrick Henry, and thus answered by the foremost spokesmen for the Constitution, provides a useful title and a pervading theme for the anthology of documents, statements, and essays here complied. The principal concern of the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government, a century and three-quarters later, is to raise again some of those warnings against centralism voiced by Henry and Mason, and to urge a renaissance of those sound principles of federation advanced by Madison, Pendleton, Franklin, Hamilton, Jay, and others.
>
> We speak here for the States, qua States, and for the people who are by constitutional definition citizens of each of them. Our dedication is to the structure of constitutional union erected by the ratifying States of 1788, and to the beautiful plan of checks and balances by which this house of our fathers was designed. We take the view that neither the Reconstruction amendments, nor any other amendments, have altered the statement of historic truth approved by the U.S. Senate in 1837:
>
> In the adoption of the Federal Constitution, the States acted severally as free, independent and sovereign States. Each for itself, by its own voluntary assent, entered the Union with a view to its increased security against all dangers, domestic as well as foreign, and the more perfect and secure enjoyment of its natural political and social advantages.
>
> "In delegating a portion of their powers to be exercised by the Federal Government, the States retained, individually and respectively, the exclusive and sole right over their own domestic institutions and police, and are alone responsible for them."
>
> Today it is apparent to even the most casual eye that the house of our fathers has fallen into decay. The great beams that gave it strength—the separation of powers within the Central Government, the division of responsibility between the States and the Federal authority—now tend to crumble under subtle and insidious attack.
>
> The men who framed our Constitution built tight doors against the despotism they knew so well; now the doors hang awry, and a cold wind of judicial construction sweeps along the corridors. The States themselves, falling into impotence, often seem helpless to halt the destruction. And too many Americans, afflicted with the ills of an affluent society, are indifferent to the fundamental principles by which the greatness of the American Republic was achieved.
>
> In the 15th article of Virginia's Declaration of Rights, George Mason in 1776 laid down a maxim for the sound guidance of our own generation: "Be it declared," he said, "that no free government, or the blessings of liberty, can be preserved to any people but by a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, frugality, and virtue, and by frequent recurrence to fundamental principles."
>
> We often tend to imagine, today, that our fundamental principles are to be dated from the Declaration of Independence or from the Constitution of 1787. Yet, clearly, Mason in 1776 was urging a recurrence to fundamental principles much older than this. What was he talking about? What did he ask the people to recur to?
>
> Mason's fundamental principles, we submit, were grounded in the rights of man and the duties of government. Man was free; government's first duty was to keep that freedom inviolate. There was never much more than this. Man had rights; government had a duty to secure those rights. These were the fundamental principles, the alpha and the omega of the American Republic.
>
> "All men are by nature equally free and independent," said Mason, "and have certain inherent rights, of which, when they enter a state of society, they cannot, by any compact, deprive or divest their posterity."
>
> What were these inherent rights? They were in essence as Jefferson was to proclaim them in the Declaration of July 4: "Namely, the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety."
>
> Consider, if you will, Mason's clear and simple definition. He did not hesitate to define the inherent rights of man, in part, in terms of "the means of possessing property." In our own day, "property" has become a dirty word; it was not so in Mason's time. Property rights meant something then; they do not seem to mean as much now.
>
> What were some of Mason's other "fundamental principles" to which he urged man's frequent recurrence?

"That all power is vested in, and consequently derived from, the people; that magistrates are their trustees and servants, and should at all times be amenable to them. * * * That government is, or ought to be, instituted for the common benefit, protection, and security of the people, nation, or community. * * * That the legislative and executive powers of the state ought always to be separate and distinct from the judiciary. * * * That the people ought never to be taxed or deprived of their property (again that word) for public uses without their consent. * * *." There were other fundamental principles important to Mason—trial by jury, freedom of the press, freedom of religion—but the first principles he set forth went to the liberty of man and to the nature of the state. These were the essential relationships he asked us to reflect upon; we cannot do better than to act upon his sage advice today. Once the thoughtful citizen clarifies this relationship in his own mind—once he grasps the fundamental flow of power in its sure and proper channels—contemporary questions of political conflict lose some of their obscurity. In our Republic, political power springs from the people in their States—or as Madison said, from the people in their separate sovereignties—and out of the reservoirs of the States, some of this power flows on to the Federal sea. But the source is always in the people themselves; and it is a part of the beauty of the Constitution, when it is taken with the first 10 amendments and treated as a whole, that it begins with the people—"We, the people"—and it ends with the people, in that familiar reservation of power "to the States respectively, or to the people."

"All authority belongs to the people," said Jefferson, but he knew this principle would be forgotten. "The spirit of our times may alter," he wrote in his notes on Virginia; and then he corrected "may alter" to read "will alter." The spirit of our times will alter: "Our rulers will become corrupt, our people careless. They will be forgotten and their right disregarded. They will forget themselves, but in the sole faculty of making money, and will never think of uniting to effect due respect for their rights."

Contemporary examples of the truth of Jefferson's prophecy may be found at every hand. Yet the people have become careless not only of abstract principle but also of the political machinery by which our rights and powers are distributed. "The capital and leading object of the Constitution," said Jefferson, "was to leave with the States all authorities which respected their own citizens only, and to transfer to the United States those which respected citizens of foreign or other states: To make us several as to ourselves, but one as to all others." It was this aspect of the Constitution that most captivated Tocqueville. He thought the Constitution of 1787 "the most perfect Federal Constitution that ever existed," the work of a small convention that contained "the finest minds and the noblest characters that had ever appeared in the New World." No aspect of their genius seemed to him more appealing than the plan by which "each colony became an independent republic, assumed an absolute sovereignty," and then took its place as one of the United States that form "not only a republic, but a confederation." When Tocqueville wrote, in the 1830's, he gazed with admiration on what he termed "the 24 small sovereign nations, whose agglomeration constitutes the body of the Union." And he added: "The great political principles which now govern American society undoubtedly took their origin and their growth in the State. We must know the State, then, in order to gain a clue to the rest." To Tocqueville, the sovereignty of the Union was "an abstract being," but the sovereignty of the States was "perceptible by the senses, easily understood, and constantly active."

Yet this perceptive French critic, though some of his prophecies have proved as wrong as some of Madison's and Hamilton's, shrewdly foresaw the dangers to the Federal plan he praised so warmly. The most fatal defect he saw in the Constitution at the time was "the relative weakness of the government of the Union." He was certain this defect would be corrected in time, but then a greater danger would arise: "I cannot conceive," he wrote, "that a nation can live and prosper without a powerful centralization of government. But I am of the opinion that centralized administration is fit only to enervate the nations in which it exists, by incessantly diminishing their local spirit." The trouble, he added, is that when the social power is centralized in legislative hands, it often forgets "the maxims of wisdom and foresight in the consciousness of its strength. Hence arises its danger. Its vigor, and not its impotence, will probably be the cause of its ultimate destruction."

One hundred and thirty-five years after Tocqueville wrote, the acuity of his insight commands our admiration. It is indeed the vigor of our central government, and not its impotence, that steadily threatens to destroy the American confederation. We are encountering, in our own time, the very persuasive arguments Tocqueville anticipated: It would be said, he predicted, that the central government in Washington could manage local affairs much more efficiently and more uniformly, than local governments could manage them on their own. But he added reflectively: "It profits me but little, after all, that a vigilant authority always protects the tranquillity of my pleasures and constantly averts all dangers from my path, without my care of concern, if this same authority is the absolute master of my liberty and my life, and if it so monopolizes movement and life that when it languishes everything languishes around it; that when it sleeps, everything must sleep, and that when it dies the state itself must perish"

It is important, in this discussion, to ask ourselves the key question of why? Why did the people, as the source of all political power, devise the finely balanced mechanism of the Constitution of 1787? The abstractions of sovereignty and the legalities of ratification to one side, why the States? The most cursory reading of the Constitution will disclose the vital role assigned them. Under the compact, they were to have equal representation in the Senate; their electors were to choose a President—or if that failed, the States themselves, voting as equals, were to choose a President; the final power of constitutional amendment was to rest in the States as States, and not in a mere majority of the States but in not fewer than three-fourths of them; and finally, in that ringing amendment insisted upon by New Hampshire and New York as firmly as by Virginia and North Carolina, the States wanted it known that all powers not delegated to the Central Government by the Constitution, nor prohibited by the Constitution to the States, were reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

The architecture of the Constitution is familiar to us all. The question that occupies our reflection is why the structure was designed this way. Two reasons suggest themselves, one negative, the other affirmative, and these are as applicable to our Union today as they were at the time of its formation. First, the Founding Fathers feared the excessive centralization of power; second, they wanted to secure the advantages of political experiment that arise from a diversified control of political authority.

Both doctrines are old; they were part of the fundamental principles Mason and Jefferson and Patrick Henry had in mind. Aristotle warned of the dangers that arise when a government of laws is corrupted by a government of men. In his "Politics," Aristotle praises the rule of the law and says this: "Therefore, he who bids the law rule may be deemed to bid God and reason alone rule, but he who bids man rule adds an element of the beast; for desire is a wild beast, and passion perverts the minds of rulers, even when they are the best of men. The law is reason unaffected by desire."

Two thousand years later, in the Virginia Convention of 1788, the same abiding truths were to be eloquently expressed. One of the most interesting men in that constellation of greatness was a rough countryman, William Grayson. On June 21, he arose to respond to the pleas of Madison, Marshall, Edmund Randolph, and others that greater trust and confidence should be reposed in the men—and especially the judges—who would occupy high office under the new constitution.

"Mr. Chairman," said Grayson, "it seems to have been a rule with the gentlemen on the other side, to argue from the excellency of human nature, in order to induce us to grant away the rights and liberties of our country. I have no doubt the same arguments were used in a variety of occasions. I suppose, sir, that same argument was used when Cromwell was invested with power. The same argument was used to gain our assent to the stamp act. I have no doubt it has been invariably the argument in all countries, when the concession of power has been in agitation. But power ought to have such checks and limitations as to prevent bad men from abusing it. It ought to be granted on a supposition that men will be bad; for it may be eventually so."

This same theme was sounded relentlessly by Patrick Henry: "I may be thought suspicious," he cried, "when I say our privileges and rights are in danger. But, sir, suspicion is a virtue, as long as its object is the preservation of the public good, and as long as it stays within proper bounds. * * * Guard with jealous attention the public liberty. Suspect every one who approaches that jewel." Henry was not persuaded that "we need not fear, because those in power, being our representatives, will not abuse the powers we put in their hands."

"I am not well versed in history," he said at another point, "but I will submit to your recollection, whether liberty has been destroyed most often by the licentiousness of the people, or by the tyranny of rulers? I imagine, sir, you will find the balance on the side of tyranny."

George Mason was still another who sounded this alarm repeatedy in the Virginia Convention: "It is ascertained by history," he said, "that there never was a government over a very extensive country without destroying the liberties of the people; history also * * * shows us that monarchy may suit a large territory, and despotic governments ever so extensive a country; but that popular governments can only exist in small territories. Is there a single example, on the fact of the earth, to support a contrary opinion? Where is there one exception to this general rule? Was there ever an instance of a general national government extending over so extensive a country, abounding in such a variety of climates, where the people retained their liberty?"

So, too, with Jefferson. In a letter sent from Paris to Madison the December preceding the Virginia Convention in June, he discussed at length the features he did not like in the proposed Constitution. There was no bill of rights; there was no positive provision for rotation of the presidential office, there was no clause expressly reserving to the States the powers not delegated to the Central Government. Jefferson was suspicious that too much authority would be concentrated in Federal hands. "I own I am not a friend to a very energetic government," he said, "it is always oppressive."

How were the oppressions of centralized authority to be avoided? Jefferson provided a thundering answer in his famed Kentucky resolution: "In questions of power, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

The chains rust. The prudent warnings of these great men go unheeded now. They looked upon government with a suspicious, jealous eye. "Too much suspicion may be corrected," said Henry. "If you give too little power today, you may give more tomorrow. But the reverse of the proposition will not hold. If you give too much power today, you cannot retake it tomorrow; for tomorrow will never come for that purpose." In our own time, a trustful and gullible people daily yield more of their liberties and responsibilities to the State, until government, like the Minotaur, feeds upon the very body of our freedoms.

What were the links the Founding Fathers forged—or thought they forged—that were to bind down our magistrates? The powers delegated to the Congress were accompanied at every hand by powers specifically withheld. The Executive was set in check against the legislature, with a power in two-thirds of the legislature to override the Executive. The President's power to negotiate treaties was to be checked by the Senate's right of advice and consent. Against both of these branches of government, the judiciary was to provide still a third check and balance, but the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court was to be made subject, in certain particulars, to the powers of the Congress. And standing watchfully over the whole apparatus were to be the States themselves, holding the power of amendment, and ready (as they thought) to reassume their powers and withdraw from the Union if the peoples' liberties should appear in danger. "Our peculiar security," said Jefferson in 1803, "is in possession of a written Constitution." Then he added a fateful warning: "Let us not make it a blank paper by construction."

So much, then, for the first, negative, reason that explains the "why" of the States: The structure of the American Union was intended to prevent the accretion of excessive political power in the hands of the Central Government. With sound reason, our fathers feared such power. It was not that they loved order less, but they loved freedom more.

There is a second, affirmative, reason for the reservation of undelegated powers to the States. Jefferson once summed it up in a blunt declaration that, "Our country is too large to have all its affairs directed by a single government."

The country was too large then; it is much larger now. The strength of our Federal superstructure lies in the fact that it rests upon 50 pillars, not upon one. Former Justice Burton remarked in a famous opinion that "the differing needs and customs of the respective States and even of the respective communities within each State emphasize the principle that familiarity with, and complete understanding of, local characteristics, customs and standards are foundation stones of successful self-government. * * *

"No national government, however benevolent, that governs over 130 million people in 48 States can be as closely in touch with those who are governed as can the local authorities in the several States and their subdivisions."

Many writers have referred to the States as "50 separate laboratories for experimenting in self-government." The metaphor is apt. Political wisdom is not concentrated in congressional retorts alone. It exists also in State capitals from coast to coast, and in the offices of State agencies. Here ideas may be tested individually: Georgia and Kentucky may experiment with an extension of the franchise to 18-year-olds; Nevada may experiment with gambling laws that seem unwise to other States; legislation dealing with highway safety, medical care, the regulation of labor, civil rights, air and stream pollution—in all these fields, the States, familiar with the needs and desires of their own people, may experiment with varying remedies. Some experiments will fail. Of course they will fail. Who should imagine otherwise? But if an experiment does fail, the consequences may be confined; and if an experiment succeeds, the good may be emulated.

This is one of the great "whys" of the States: Diversity in political solution, experimentation, refinement, innovation, the testing of governmental process on the hard anvil of trial and error. And to the extent the States are deprived of their powers in this regard, or discouraged in the use of their powers, the vitality of the Union as a whole inevitably must decline. More than this, the freedom of the people, and their responsibility for their own destinies, surely must be diminished. Uniformity is a benevolent god; smiling gently, he snuffs out the human spirit.

Organized blocs turn to Washington primarily for this reason: Because that is where the money is; and second, because the Congress is an easy mark. City councils and State legislatures, close to their people, sensitive to reality, know when to resist. But the Congress is conscious of Aristotle's maxim that a proposal "which is common to the greatest number has the least care bestowed upon it." Accountability is spread thin on Capitol Hill. Within the realm of their domestic concerns, the States have a right to be wrong—wrong, that is, in the view of other States and other peoples. This is not to say that the States have a right to be unconstitutional; they have a right to be "wrong," and it is a travesty upon the political and judicial process that an action thought wrong or unwise is held to be, for that reason, unconstitutional. Courts ought never to concern themselves with the wisdom of the lawmaker, but solely with his power to enact. "State constitutions and State laws," said Holmes, "may regulate life in many ways which we might think injudicious, or if you like, tyrannical." This is the States prerogative, and judges have no authority to substitute their own policies out of some personal convictions of social or economic propriety. The States have an unquestioned right, Holmes said again, to engage in experiments that "may seem futile or even noxious to me and to those whose judgment I most respect."

Mr. President, on this issue there are two sides: the side of the people and the side of the cynics. The cynics say that the people should not have the right to decide lest they decide yea when the cynic says nay. But the people say that they should.

This time the voice of the people will be heard in this Chamber and heard constantly until their right to decide for themselves is protected from one more assault in the long, hard history of liberty.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, it is indeed unfortunate that the Senate has been refused an opportunity to vote on the merits of H.R. 77, the bill to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

By blocking the will of the Senate through the use of dilatory tactics, opponents of the bill have done a disservice to sound labor-management relations, as well as to the rules of the Senate.

The record they have made in the past 10 or more days contributes little to clarifying the issue involved here.

On the contrary, they have succeeded only in adding further confusion and distortion to a subject that is really rather simple when viewed in the light of logic and unemotionalism.

I have no doubt that the opponents of H.R. 77 consider the results of their tactics as a great victory.

But the dubious fruits of this victory may serve, in the long run, to help poison the careful and conscientious efforts over the years to build a sound national policy of labor-management relations.

Every feature of our national labor policy, every feature designed to protect the rights of the worker, management, and the public, applies equally throughout the 50 States.

That is—every feature but one: The right of unions and management to negotiate the union shop.

The union shop is—no more and no less—the requirement that the employees in a given plant or shop contribute toward the cost of protection their union must provide for them under law and agreement.

It is not an arbitrary servitude imposed upon unwilling workers. It is subject to free collective bargaining as is any other condition of employment, and it may be revoked by the workers if they so choose.

The legitimacy of such arrangements has been upheld by the Supreme Court, and it is part of our national labor policy.

However, through section 14(b), the States, in this one instance, are given the power to negate national policy.

There is no logic to this. There is no justice to this.

A State cannot decide that its citizens need pay no Federal income tax, or that its young men are exempt from the draft.

To consider such action would be ridiculous, because that would be contrary to national law and policy.

A State cannot similarly choose, for example, to refuse to permit its employers to recognize labor unions. That would be contrary to national law.

A State cannot similarly choose to reject the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board. That would be contrary to national law.

But, in the case of the union shop, States are permitted to flout national policy.

There is, of course, much more impetus to the bitter opposition to repeal of section 14(b) than the phony arguments of constitutionalism and "freedom" that we have heard endlessly in past days.

The right-to-work States see their statutes as an advertisement of an antiunion atmosphere, and thus as a lure to industry.

Antiunion managements see these laws as a means to keep unions weak or nonexistent.

Therefore, the real argument against repeal is economic and not philosophical.

It is to be regretted that the opponents of H.R. 77 did not have the courage to permit a majority of the Senate to decide the issue once and for all.

Now, the issue remains before the Congress and the Nation as unfinished business.

Mr. President, one of the clearest discussions of this matter in the public press, which generally has contributed to the misinformation and distortion, appears in this week's issue of Newsweek in the column authored by Kenneth Crawford.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Storm Over 14(b)

(By Kenneth Crawford)

The Senate's attenuated discussion of a bill to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act—the provision granting States the option of outlawing the union shop—is filling the Congressional Record with more cant per column inch than any debate of this session. The fact that much of it is couched in the florid prose of Everett McKinley Dirksen makes it more entertaining but no less hypocritical.

It is the contention of Dirksen and his associates in this filibuster that the temple of American freedom will come tumbling down if the Federal Government dares prescribe a uniform rule governing management-labor contracts. As matters stand, each of the 50 States is free to make its own rule. Nineteen of them forbid the union shop; the other 31 permit it. The closed shop is universally forbidden by law. It is not permitted even where both labor and management might prefer it. Nobody suggests that this is un-American.

Under the closed shop contract, once quite common, a worker had to belong to the recognized union to qualify for employment. Under the union shop contract, the employer is free to hire whom he pleases, but his employee, after a period of grace, usually 30 days, must join the union which has qualified as bargaining agent by enlisting a majority of workers in the plant or craft affected. The bill now under consideration by the Senate would exempt conscientious objectors, provided they paid the equivalent of union dues to an approved charity. Dirksen professes to see all this as an affront to the tradition of freedom, a levy of tribute for the benefit of union bosses.

MAJORITY RULE

To leaders of organized labor and to a majority of Representatives and Senators the union shop arrangement is equitable. It conforms to the democratic principle of majority rule. Once a majority of workers in a given unit choose a union to bargain for them about wages, hours, working conditions, vacations, pensions, and all the rest, that union bargains not only for its members but for everyone. This service is paid for in union dues. Everyone who benefits from the service shares the cost. Never mandatory, the union shop can be installed only with management consent. Repeal of 14(b) would not change this.

Ever since 1935, when the Wagner Act became law, there has been a well-defined national labor policy, adopted by Congress, approved by the President and upheld by the Supreme Court. Its purpose is to encourage free collective bargaining between labor and management sitting together as equals. This purpose has not always been served. During the Second World War, the unions waived the use of their ultimate weapon, the strike. After the war, trying to catch up, they called a series of costly work stoppages. Reacting to this, Congress in 1947 passed the Taft-Hartley bill to alter the bargaining balance in management's favor. Section 14(b) was part of the bill.

PLATFORM PROMISES

The last two national Democratic platforms have flatly promised repeal of 14(b), which is the reason, among others, that President Johnson and most Democratic Members of Congress are pushing it in the closing days of this session in the teeth of a filibustering opposition. Because of the lateness of the day, prospects for success are not very bright.

The union shop is the only aspect of national labor policy buck-passed to the States. It gives employers in 19 States an advantage over their competitors in the other 31. The 19 have been known to use it as a lure to runaway shops. Texas is the only big industrial State among the 19. Nine States, including California and Ohio, have refused to ban the union shop by referendum. Only Kansas has made the contrary decision by the same method. Antiunion shop advocacy has been political poison in State elections when it has been at issue.

This is not essentially a fight over principle but rather a fight over the question: How difficult should the law make it for unions to organize and maintain their strength? Every American has a stake in the answer. Industrial payrolls are a big contributor to national prosperity. The average weekly industrial wage in 1935, pre-Wagner Act, was $19.91. Today the comparable figure is $102.97.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the statement by Secretary of Labor Wirtz before the Subcommittee on Labor also be printed at this point in the Record:

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpt From Testimony of Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz Before the Subcommittee on Labor, June 22, 1965, Concerning Repeal of Section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act

You will know I appear here in strong endorsement of the provisions of S. 256 which means strong endorsement of the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act as it presently stands.

My position in support of that repeal may be summarized under two headings of consideration.

It seems to me there are two very important issues here before Congress and before the country and this morning before this subcommittee.

The first of those questions can be stated best, it seems to me, in terms of whether the matter of an appropriate union security agreement in a particular collective-bargaining contract is or is not a proper subject for private determination, or whether it should be the matter of public legal determination, and I would press very strongly the view that this is a matter within the appropriate competence of an employer and a majority group of his employees, that is the kind of decision which should best be made privately and that it involves no public interest which would dictate the public superseding that decision of the private employer in his union except as rules are presently laid down in other provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

On that point again and this briefer form, it seems to me that what we have involved here is a right to decide, a right to decide publicly rather than any other particular right, and I press strongly the lesson of what seems to me now clear experience, that this is a decision which we can expect private companies and private unions to make and to make responsibly.

The agreement that we are talking about comes down to an agreement that all of those employees who are represented by a union should, upon agreement of the employer and the majority of the employees, be required to pay their part of the costs of representation because that is what is involved here.

It seems to me that is a decision which is properly made privately.

I want to make it clear that I think there is no contrary countervailing public policy involved here.

The law established in section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act is that the general rule as far as this is concerned is that it is a matter to be left up to the private parties.

Section 14(b) permits States to establish a different rule. It is important that in the light of the experience now of what is some 18 years, 30 of the States have decided, as the Federal Congress decided in section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act that this matter should be left up to the private parties—31 of them. There are 19 who have taken a different course as reflected in the State right-to-work rules.

I make note of the argument which has been made that there is an invasion here of the individual liberties of employees where a company and a majority of its employees enter into a union shop agreement.

It is important to realize that that point has been made not by representatives of employees but by representatives of employers. The views of American labor, and I mean the individuals who make up American labor, on this matter are clearly a matter of record.

As you know, the law provided from 1947 to 1951 that there could be no union shop without the holding of a secret election conducted by the NLRB.

There were 46,146 such elections held during that 4-year period. Ninety-seven percent of them showed the employees voting in favor of the union shop, and if you take the individuals, the count among the individuals, some 91 percent of American employees, individually, voted in favor of the union shop.

That decision as to what the interests of American labor considered individually would be was made during that period, and it was so clear that in 1951 Congress terminated the holding of those elections because the result would be in every case so clear.

I make note, too, of the fact that the argument has been made that there would be some individuals who, as a matter of conscience, even of religious principle, would oppose membership in a union organization.

I call attention to two facts on this: One is the broad fact of the necessity of our all adjusting ourselves in a community now of 190 million people to some situations in which there is the necessity of institutional representation for the effective presentation of private interests, even though we might feel that we would like to continue entirely as individuals.

I call attention, second, to the fact that must be made clear, that as the law stands, with the repeal of section 14(b) it will not require any individual under any circumstances to participate in the right you always have union membership or anything of that kind as a condition of his continued employment.

What section 8 requires and what it will continue to require with the repeal of 14(b) is only that as a condition of employment he must pay the union dues, the union initiation fees, which are the price of representation as far as union representation is concerned.

The second point and the one already alluded to by Senator Javits in his opening statement is simply that the lesson of experience after these 18 years seems to me clearly that there should be a single law with respect to this subject.

It does seem to me that the decision of a majority of the Congress in 1947 that there should be State interpretation with this issue completely consistent with the decision now that the lessons of that interpretation are in and the lessons are that the general view of employers and employees in the country is that they should have the right to make a determination and an agreement with respect to this matter, a determination that the costs of representation should be spread among all of those why by law are represented by the union.

Thirty-one States have so decided, some of them passed "right-to-work" laws and then repealed them.

I call attention to one other point in this connection. There can be no question from the record that as the law now stands the question of the State union security provisions is made the subject of what I think is quite unfortunate, bargaining between the States with respect to the attraction of industry.

There is the advertisement on the part of some States that companies should come to that State because there is a State "right-to-work" law.

Now, at this point the facade of protecting the individual rights of individual workers is dropped completely. These advertisements, for that is what they are, these advertisements are in effect, "come here, because we assure you that the unions will not have the strength of the union shop provision."

I think that is an unfortunate development that there should not be in the economy policy of this country that kind of bargaining among the States.

I call attention, too, to the fact that this has resulted in a degree of political argument, controversy, antagonism which I think has had no compensation as far as the development of good law is concerned. This has been a hot political issue in a number of States, and I think it has had a derisive effect in an area of labor-management relations for all of the rest of the course of the last 20 years has been toward the working out of the coordination, combination, cooperation between labor and management.

I think the divisive effect of the discussion about the State "right-to-work" laws has been most unfortunate.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the right-to-work laws of the 19 States which have them preserve to Americans in those States a very basic liberty—the freedom to join or to refrain from joining a union at their own election.

It is absurd to say right-to-work laws are antiunion. This is true because such laws give unions the same right to acquire members as that enjoyed by churches and civic, fraternal and political organizations. They may number among their dues-paying members all those whom they can persuade to join.

When all is said, the argument for compulsory unionism comes down to this astounding theory: That the right-to-work is a right which a union may sell, and which the individual American must buy if he is to be permitted to earn daily bread for himself and his family.

Those of us who opposed this motion to take up have been fighting for one of the most basic freedoms, the right of a man "to eat his own bread in the sweat of his own face," without the permission of anyone or any organization on the face of the earth. Because I have not had an opportunity, due to the ending of the debate, to make a speech on this subject, I want to say now that I am glad that North Carolina, which I have the honor to represent in this body, has a right-to-work law. I am glad that my State believes that no man should be drafted into membership in any voluntary organization without his own consent.

I am glad that the fight here is at least temporarily won—and it will remain won as long as the love of liberty lives in the hearts of the majority of the American people.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of morning business tomorrow, the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 13, 1965, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 12 (legislative day of October 1), 1965:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Dr. Philip Randolph Lee, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer, prefaced with this verse of Scripture: Hebrews 12: 2: *Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith.*

Eternal God, may we renounce our allegiance to the lesser loyalties which have such a hold upon us but may we commit ourselves in faith to the lofty values of the spirit toward which Thou art directing our minds and hearts.

Help us to break down those barriers within us which seek to imprison the free spirit of faith and may we bring our life into a blessed harmony with the passion and purpose of our blessed Lord.

When the world seems to be falling to pieces may we believe with increasing tenacity of faith that our times are in Thy hands and that Thy goodness is eternal and Thy word is unchanging to which we may always turn for counsel and strength.

Help us to trust Thee each day so that no cowardice, or fear, or despair shall assail us and give us the moral urgency to use each day wisely as an aid in our spiritual growth and culture.

We often wonder that some men have any faith at all for so little care do they take to nurture it and keep it alive.

Help us to realize that the time is short and that we should be more concerned about our trust in Thee for we need the power of a mighty faith.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1516. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in federally owned buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes.

THE PRESIDENT'S SALUTE TO CONGRESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include therein a statement by the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues in the House know very well, it was the President's intention to address the Congress last Thursday night upon the occasion of the "Salute to Congress" ceremony.

And as you also know, the circumstances of the evening precluded his doing so—the circumstances in this case being a crush of business and his preparation for entering Bethesda Naval Hospital later that same night for surgery the next morning.

The President has expressed to me, as I am sure he has expressed to many of you, his deep regret at not being able to deliver this message.

It is for this reason that I have asked and received his permission to offer his prepared remarks for insertion in the RECORD. It is altogether fitting that they should be in the RECORD, for they reflect in very positive terms the President's evaluation of this Congress and its accomplishments.

As you read the remarks which the President had hoped to deliver himself, I believe you will share the pride that I feel.

I am particularly pleased, and I know you will be, at his statement that from this Congress has come "the greatest outpouring of creative legislation in the history of this Nation."

As I read the President's summary of the achievements of the 89th Congress thus far, I could not help but feel a sense of pride and satisfaction at having played a part in the enactment of legislation which will improve the lives of literally millions of people in this great land.

For one, I take pride in the President's words that the long list of major measures passed by this 89th Congress "contains one example after another of new thinking, bold thinking, imaginative thinking."

I believe that Members of this Congress have every reason to be proud of these words.

As the President pointed out in his remarks, there have been times when the legislative and the executive branches did not work in such harmony.

But in those times, the people and the purpose of this Nation suffered.

I think that all of us have learned much from the warnings of the past, and I think that this Congress in particular has heeded the dark spots of the past to steer a path of progress for the future.

Never has there been a time in which a President and a Congress have sought and achieved such an effective and true consensus aimed at furthering the common good.

There have been differences of opinion. There have been differences of procedure. But, in the end, the differences have been resolved to create and promote whatever was best for this country and its people.

No greater tribute could be offered the Members of this Congress.

And I think that this is what President Johnson had in mind when he said in these remarks: "You have honored the highest hopes of a Nation."

Under unanimous consent, I include the President's remarks at this point in the RECORD:

SALUTE TO CONGRESS

I consulted the leadership last Tuesday at breakfast about suitable entertainment for this evening.

Speaker McCORMACK, CARL ALBERT, and MIKE MANSFIELD volunteered to sing "Show Me the Way To Go Home." I don't even know that song. I was brought up singing, "Work—For the Night Is Coming."

Finally, I called a Congressman whose advice I respect, but I got no answer. When I asked him about it tonight, he said, "Mr. President, I heard the phone ringing, but I couldn't answer it. Larry O'Brien was in my office and he wouldn't let go of my arm."

Several columnists have written recently that the Congress has been "reversing the President." Well, my answer to that is in that old song we used to sing when I was a young man in the hills of Texas: "Just keep on doing what you're doing, 'cause I love what you're doing to me."

In the beginning, one evening last January, I was your guest on Capitol Hill. In my state of the Union message, I spoke of our common challenge to enlarge the meaning of life for every American. I spoke of our goal to elevate the quality of our civilization. I spoke on that hopeful night of the excitement of great expectations.

There haven't been many times in our history when the President could stand before Congress, at the end of a session, and express the gratitude and the pride that I feel tonight.

There were many Congresses which weren't interested in hearing what the President had to say.

All too often, the relations between the executive and the legislative branches have been marred by bitterness.

George Washington warned that his legislature would "form the worst government on earth" if some means were not found to stem its corruption.

A great Republican, President Theodore Roosevelt, once wished he could turn loose 16 lions on his Congress. When someone pointed out that the lions might make a mistake, he replied, "not if they stayed there long enough."

We all remember the time Harry Truman named the 80th Congress "the second worst Congress in the history of the United States." I can bring this up without fear of hurting anyone's feelings here tonight, because I was a Member of that Congress, too.

Well, now we are going to balance the ledger. Tonight, the President of the United States is going on record as naming this session of Congress the greatest in American history. And I am well aware of what that statement means.

I know the outstanding record of the 59th Congress under Theodore Roosevelt. That record included the Pure Food and Drug Act, the Meat Inspection Act, the railroad rate bill, and the Employer's Liability Act.

You have done more.

I know the outstanding record of the 63d Congress under Woodrow Wilson. That record included the Federal Reserve Act, the Clayton Antitrust Act, the Federal Trade Commission bill, and the tariff bill.

You have done more.

I know the great record of the 73d Congress under Franklin Roosevelt. That record included the Emergency Relief Act, the Securities Act, the CCC Act, the Home Owner's Loan Corporation, the TVA, the Economy Act, the Agricultural Adjustment Act, NRA, and the FDIC.

You have done more.

From your committees and both your Houses have come the greatest outpouring of creative legislation in the history of this Nation.

You passed legislation to fulfill the century-old promise of emancipation. Today, where once men were afraid, they now walk proudly to the polling place.

You passed legislation to ease the burden of sickness and want for older Americans. Today, though millions must face old age, they are no longer dependent on kinfolks for their medical care.

You passed legislation that should brighten every classroom in America. Once the children of poverty began life on the hopeless road toward despair. Today they have a new chance to hope and to achieve.

You have promised to millions of American families better housing and better homes, and a rebirth for our cities.

You passed a poverty program so that poor families can train and work.

You passed a bill that will meet head on the Nation's top murderers—cancer, heart disease, and stroke.

You told our cities and our industries that they must stop polluting our water and poisoning our air.

You passed legislation to dam our rivers—to prevent floods, to produce power, and to provide beaches and playgrounds for our children.

You gave us the blueprints for a rapid rail system to carry our commuters to tomorrow.

You passed a farm bill that puts more income in the farmer's pocket and at the same time allows him to compete at home and abroad.

You passed an immigration bill that no longer asks a man "where do you come from?" but "what can you do?"

You have given local officials the tools to restore law and order on our streets.

You passed the excise tax reduction. In a little over 20 months, at current income levels, taxes have been cut a little over $20 billion.

And tonight you serve notice on the spoilers of our landscape that we will battle with all we have to preserve the bounty of our land and the beauty of our countryside.

I read criticism in one newspaper not long ago that there was nothing new about what you have done. I read that you have simply enacted programs that have been "kicking around since New Deal days."

But let us look at the record.

This year you passed a voting rights bill that for the first time tears down the barriers of bias that barred the way to the polling booth.

This year you passed a program of rent supplements for low income families—a program which provides a brandnew approach to met an ancient and long-neglected need.

This year you passed, and yesterday I signed, an act to establish heart, cancer, and stroke centers throughout the Nation. It is a new way to bring the miracles of medical research to the people.

This year you passed a law to establish the Arts and Humanities Foundation—a vital new beginning to stimulate the creative talent of our Nation.

Legislation to provide hospital services for the elderly has been before Congress for a long time. But you added a voluntary plan to furnish doctors' services. You made the Medicare Act the biggest and boldest piece of health legislation ever to become law.

Federal aid to education is also a battle-scarred veteran in Congress. But the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 contains a wealth of new and imaginative ideas to enrich our Nation's schools.

It provides more money than any aid-to-education legislation ever considered by any Congress.

It offers every community a chance to bring the new techniques of teaching to the old art of learning.

The higher education bill, now in conference, also embodies daring new programs for dealing with old, old problems.

These bills and many more had their beginnings and their end in the 89th Congress.

The long list of major measures you have passed contains one example after another of new thinking, bold thinking, imaginative thinking. This has been the fabulous 89th Congress.

All of us know that much remains to be done. But you have begun a march which will not be stopped. You are on the way to a society which produces not only goods, but greatness.

It has been said that "great achievements raise a monument which shall endure until the sun grows cold." Those words, though they were written many years ago, belong to you.

You have honored the highest hopes of the Nation—and so tonight we honor you.

Many years ago Woodrow Wilson said of a Congress: "A little group of willful men, representing no opinion but their own, have rendered the Government of the United States helpless and contemptible."

Tonight, as we balance history's ledger, I want to say of the 89th Congress: "An inspired group of dedicated Americans, representing a sense of national purpose, have written for the United States a new chapter in greatness."

I want to say to every Member of the 89th Congress—Democrat or Republican—who wrote and supported this record: Your people will revere you and reward you, and the Nation will honor you long after you are gone.

HILDA SHEN TSIANG

Mr. **FEIGHAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 10292) for the relief of Hilda Shen Tsiang.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10292

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hilda Shen Tsiang shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of January 17, 1949, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FEIGHAN

Mr. **FEIGHAN**. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. **Feighan**: On page 1, line 6, strike out the date "January 17, 1949" and substitute in lieu thereof the language "the date of the enactment of this Act".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. **ZABLOCKI**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ZABLOCKI**. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan] for calling up H.R. 10292, a bill for the relief of Hilda Shen Tsiang, the widow of Dr. Tingfu F. Tsiang, former Chinese Ambassador to the United States. I am sure all my colleagues will agree that the National Republic of China has lost an esteemed patriot and the world a distinguished statesman.

It was my privilege to have known Dr. Tsiang for some years. I first met him in New York in 1959 when he was the permanent representative of his Government to the United Nations. I found him a most impressive figure, particularly because of his skill and eloquence in putting forward the Nationalist Chinese case for the exclusion of the Peiping regime from the world organization.

These initial impressions were reinforced during the almost 3 years, from 1962 to June 1965, when Dr. Tsiang was Ambassador to the United States and stationed here in Washington.

The continuing excellent relations between our two governments owes much to the diplomatic finesse and warm personality of Dr. Tsiang. It was his final illness which caused his resignation from that post.

Dr. Tsiang first came to our shores in 1911. Taught English by Christian missionaries, he worked his way through Park Academy in Parkville, Mo. Later he obtained his college degree from Oberlin College in Ohio and received his doctorate in history from Columbia University.

A respected and dedicated scholar, Dr. Tsiang taught history at several universities in China after World War I. He joined the Nationalist Chinese Government and in 1936 was appointed Ambassador to the Soviet Union, a post he held for 3 years.

During his career Dr. Tsiang held many important positions in the Government of Chiang Kai-shek. Among them was the post as director of Chinese national relief and rehabilitation in 1945, at the end of the war. A devoted humanitarian, Dr. Tsiang was responsible for easing the misery of many thousands of his fellow countrymen.

Mr. Speaker, death has taken from us a firm friend of the United States, a renowned and esteemed world statesman, and a fine, upstanding man. Dr. Tsiang's loss is mourned here in the United States as it is being mourned by his fellow countrymen on Taiwan and around the world.

I know that my colleagues in this body join me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Dr. Tsiang's widow and his family in this time of sorrow.

MEMBERS OF SELECT COMMISSION ON WESTERN HEMISPHERE IMMIGRATION

The **SPEAKER**. Pursuant to the provisions of section 21(a), Public Law 89-236, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. Celler, of New York; Mr. Feighan, of Ohio; Mr. Rodino, of New Jersey; Mr. McCulloch, of Ohio; and Mr. Moore, of West Virginia.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 5026

Mr. **FALLON**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tonight to file the report on H.R. 5026, to authorize the Burt County Bridge Commission, a public body politic and corporate in the county of Burt and State of Nebraska, to refund the outstanding revenue bonds of said Burt County Bridge Commission heretofore issued to finance the cost of the construction of a bridge, together with the necessary approaches and appurtenances therefor, from a point located in the city of Decatur, Burt County, Nebr., across the Missouri River to a point located in Monona County, Iowa.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Fallon]?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. **CABELL**. Mr. Speaker, due to a longstanding engagement in my district, I knew it would be impossible for me to be on the floor to vote on S. 2084, the highway beautification bill, and I left a pair. Unfortunately, a mistake was made in entering that pair. I wish the Record to reflect that had I been present on the floor, I would have voted against passage of S. 2084 on the pair.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. **SISK**. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 598 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 598

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11135) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by the direction of the Committee on Agriculture; an amendment to page 12, after line 14, proposing to insert the following: "'(h) Effective January 1, 1966 and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the quota of any country shall be reduced to zero for the balance of the period covered by this Act if any authorized person appearing or working in the interest of such country in regard to sugar legislation is registered or required to be registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act; except that the quota shall not be reduced below any treaty obligation.'"; and an amendment on page 21 to strike out lines 8 and 9 and insert in lieu thereof: "Sec. 9. Section 213 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. **BELL**. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 361]

Abbitt
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Annunzio
Aspinall
Baring
Bates
Battin
Bingham
Bonner
Brock
Cahill
Carter
Cederberg
Clawson, Del
Clevenger
Cunningham
Curtis
Delaney
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dulski
Evans, Colo.
Flood
Foley
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Grider
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Hardy
Harris
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hébert
Holifield
Holland
Hosmer
Howard
Karth
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Krebs
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McEwen
McVicker
Macdonald
Mackie, Mich.
Madden
Marsh
Mathias
Minish
Morrison
Murray
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
Olson, Minn.
Philbin
Pool
Powell
Purcell
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rodino

Satterfield
St Germain
Saylor
Smith, Calif.
Steed
Stephens
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Vivian
Walker, Miss.
White, Idaho
Wright
Wyatt

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT. On this rollcall 348 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will continue the reading of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

" 'SEC. 213. (a) As a condition for importing sugar into the continental United States pursuant to sections 202(c) and 204 of this Act, an import fee shall be paid to the United States, which fee shall be 75 per centum of the amount which the Secretary determines from time to time will approximate the amount by which a domestic price for raw sugar at a level that will fulfill the domestic price objective set forth in section 201, exceeds the prevailing world market price for raw sugar (adjusted for freight to New York, and most-favored-nation tariff). The fees provided for in this paragraph shall be imposed on a per pound, raw value, basis, and shall be applied uniformly except that the import fee imposed on any direct-consumption sugar shall be ½ of one cent per pound more than the import fee imposed on raw sugar under this paragraph. Such fees shall be paid by the person applying to the Secretary for entry and release of sugar. Such payment shall be made in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary. The Secretary shall promulgate regulations permitting any importer of sugar to apply for a quota set-aside, furnishing such security as the Secretary may require, which will fix the import fee for any sugar under his control to be imported at any time during a calendar year at the rate then in effect for such calendar year. The Secretary shall determine, from time to time, the rate of import fee and the initial such determination shall be made by October 1 in each year for the succeeding calendar year, except for the calendar year 1966, in which case such determination shall be made at the earliest practicable date.

" '(b) The funds collected as import fees by the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.' "; and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Agriculture may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment; nor shall the two additional amendments permitted under this rule be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 598 provides for consideration of H.R. 11135, a bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended. The resolution provides a closed rule, waiving points of order, with 4 hours of debate, making in order two amendments, which shall not be subject to amendment.

H.R. 11135 modifies and extends the Sugar Act for 5 years, to December 31, 1971.

The sugar program of the U.S. Government is intended to do three things: first, make it possible, as a matter of national security, to produce a substantial portion of our sugar requirements within the continental United States and to do this without the consumer-penalizing device of a high protective tariff; second, assure U.S. consumers of a plentiful and stable supply of sugar at reasonable prices; and third, permit friendly foreign countries to participate equitably in supplying the U.S. sugar market for the double purpose of expanding international trade and assuring a nearby stable and adequate store of sugar.

These major objectives have been achieved.

Under this act, more than 40 percent of our total consumption of sugar now is produced by beet and cane growers within the continental limits of the United States, and total domestic production—including Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands—fills 65 percent of our sugar needs. The sugar act has given us this security in supplies, and sugar prices to consumers have been remarkably stable during the lifetime of the act.

H.R. 11135 strengthens the program by temporarily assigning a greater portion of the U.S. market to domestic beet and cane producers, and by an equitable and dependable distribution of quotas, for the remainder of our market, among the producers of friendly nations, principally to good neighbor countries in the Western Hemisphere.

The bill rejects the "global quota" concept of foreign sugar purchases which contributed in 1963–64 to the only peacetime domestic sugar crisis during the life of the act, and it reestablishes the tried and long-proven quota system on a country-by-country basis.

The bill, as reported rejects the import fee, and thereby aims to restore to these countries the opportunity to sell sugar in the U.S. market at the American price. One of the amendments made in order by the rule would require an import fee.

To accomplish supply and price insurance for the American consumer H.R. 11135 would increase marketing quotas for domestic areas by 580,000 tons beginning with the current year, but would assign all market growth to the foreign quotas until such quotas reach approximately the same proportion of the market as provided under the current act.

With annual national requirements of 9.7 million tons the marketing quota for the domestic beet sugar area would be increased by 375,000 tons to 3,025,000 tons and the quota for the mainland cane-sugar area, by 205,000 tons to 1,100,000 tons. These quotas would be unaffected by any change in requirements between 9.7 and 10.4 million tons but would absorb 65 percent of any reduction from or addition to requirements outside of that range, apportioned between the two areas in relation to their basic quotas.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that House Resolution 598 be adopted in order that we may consider H.R. 11135.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion and controversy surrounding this act over the years. Certainly experience, it seems to me, has proven beyond any question of doubt that the act basically has given to the American consumer and the American housewife a stable supply of sugar at a stable price; not one that was going way up one year and way down the next.

Because of this, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would tell the House why this bill comes to us under a closed rule, and whether he agrees that the extension of the act ought to be for a period of 5 years.

Mr. SISK. Let me say to my friend from Iowa, first, that I believe to bring this bill to the floor of the House under an open rule, where you would have a lengthy discussion on each one of these national quotas, would mean that we would find ourselves involved in a foreign policy debate here which might go on and on. Very frankly I have been one who basically likes open rules, so that the House can work its will. However, I do believe as I understand the problems here in connection with this country-by-country quota, that if we opened it up I can see some situations developing which would affect our relations, particularly with Latin American countries, which would not be in the best interests of our country.

I might say that this is my basic reason for supporting, in this instance, a closed rule, of course, waiving points of order. I know that my good friend has always disliked this procedure. As the gentleman I am sure knows, there are certain taxes involved which basically would fall under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. That is the purpose and the reason for waiving points of order.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SISK. I am very glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I might say in that connection for the information of my friend from Iowa that there are certain tax features connected with this bill. It has been the custom for years and years that all tax bills come out with a closed rule. Such bills involve complications which make it almost impossible to arrive at a satisfactory legislative conclusion, in view of all the ramifications, except under a closed rule. That is the basic reason why the Committee on Rules approved a closed rule, in addition to the very cogent reason given by the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the statement of my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Virginia, and I join with him in those remarks.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Whatever merit there may be—and I think it is questionable—with respect to the tax features of this bill, the merit certainly does not extend, in my humble opinion, to a closed rule with respect to the attempt to stifle amendments dealing with the quota system. I cannot agree with my friend from California that the House is not competent to discuss foreign policy as it relates to quotas under this or any other bill. I regret very much that the closed rule applies to the quota system as here applied.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the statement of my friend and colleague from Iowa, and as one who loves this House and who has great respect for it and great respect for every individual Member here, I do not question the responsibility of the Members to discuss in a proper way matters with which we are concerned here. However, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has rather well stated, there are matters of taxation involved and particularly, as I mentioned earlier, matters of foreign affairs which, frankly, in a rather delicate state in certain areas of the world right now as concern the items involved here.

It seems to me simply that it would not be in the best interests to get into a full-scale debate at this time pitting one country against another as these quotas would be reflected thereby.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from Iowa, my good colleague [Mr. GROSS], I think he knows my voting record on closed rules. He knows that I am basically opposed to closed rules and as I recall have never since being a Member of this House favored a closed rule or voted for one. But I will say as one who has served on the Committee on Agriculture for 7 years, and who has seen that committee struggling with this problem of what is really almost a tariff type of legislation in connection with the many countries involved, that this may be one exception for those of use who are in principle violently against closed rules.

I should like to say, reluctant as we may be to support a closed rule, that in this case this type of rule is the only way that we can handle the matter practically.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Washington very much for that statement.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from California yielding. However, I want to change the subject. I am opposed to closed rules, although I understand the extenuating circumstances. But the question I would like to raise is this: I understood the gentleman from California to say that our Sugar Act in the past and, perhaps, the gentleman believes this bill, will stabilize the flow of sugar to the housewives of the Nation.

Will the gentleman from California agree with me that whether it produces an adequate flow or not, it certainly has upset the stable prices and has raised to between 8 and 11 cents a pound, vis-a-vis the Canadian price of sugar to the housewife or the difference of $2 per 1 hundredweight world market price, and $5.50 per 1 hundredweight in the United States?

Mr. SISK. If the gentleman from Missouri will defer that question, I might say that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS]—I do not see the gentleman on the floor at the moment—later I am sure will be speaking and he has some figures that are rather amazing.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to my good friend that the figures which he quotes as I understood them are correct as of this moment. But, if the gentleman will look back over the history of this act—and I believe he has only to go back to last year—the price of sugar in Canada was substantially, as I recall, some 5 or 6 cents a pound higher than it was in the United States. And, when we examine country by country around the world, we will find just as many countries today in which the price is substantially above the price being paid by the American housewife, as there are those where you will find a lower price. So that actually it is my firm conviction, after having studied the history of the act over the past 10 years, during the ebb and flow of world prices as between one country and another, this act has been good for the American consumer.

Mr. Speaker, as I say, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] and other members of the committee with whom I have discussed this matter have far more information than I have on that particular item and I would hope that the gentleman from Missouri will be here particularly when the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] makes his presentation because he does have some very fine information on the subject.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman does not need to worry, as I am always here. I appreciate the gentleman's explanation which has covered the past few years. I believe, however, that the gentleman will agree with me that since World War I we have been susceptible as consumers to fluctuating sugar prices, and especially since the London control of the international cartel on coffee which has cost us some 30 cents a pound, was confirmed by vote in this House, that as consumers and lawmakers we should look at this very closely.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the discussion that has just taken place concerning the price of sugar, I call the attention of the Members of the House to page 10 of the report by the committee, the second paragraph, under "Consumers."

The committee reports that—

> The Sugar Act is an insurance policy on adequate supplies at reasonable prices for American consumers. Under the program, the consumption of sugar in the United States has increased from 6,574,000 tons in 1934 to an estimated 10 million tons in 1965. Under the program, the per capita use of sugar in the United States is three times the per capita consumption around the world. Under the program, American consumers enjoy lower prices for sugar than consumers in virtually all nations that do not produce their entire sugar needs. On January 1, 1965, the retail price of a pound of sugar in the United States averaged 11.64 cents, in France 12.6 cents, Italy 16 cents, Japan 14.2 cents, United Kingdom 11.1 cents, West Germany 14 cents, Sweden 15 cents, and Yugoslavia 13.3 cents.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. I would like to inquire of my colleague, my distinguished friend from Ohio, whether or not the price that he quotes in foreign countries is not the result of a tariff structure rather than as a contributing factor to the prices that the gentleman has just established as the consumer prices in those countries?

Mr. LATTA. I am not prepared to say whether or not these various countries have a tariff. They might have.

The price the consumer has to pay is what the discussion was all about, what the American housewife has to pay for sugar as compared to what they have to pay in France, Sweden, Germany, and so forth.

I think this is one act, even though I disagree with some provisions of the bill, H.R. 11135—this is one act that has netted a profit to the American taxpayer. I think the exact figures on this will be brought out during the discussion on the bill.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RESNICK. While it is true that it has netted a profit to the American taxpayers; is it not true that the American consumer is paying for the difference?

Mr. LATTA. The American consumer pays the difference but the American consumer would also pay a higher price when the world supply demanded it if we did not have a Sugar Act. Under the Sugar Act, as we have been operating for the past several years, they are assured of a given price on a given date and are not subject to the price fluctuations that would take place without it. This happened just a few months back.

Mr. RESNICK. If the gentleman will yield further, is it not true that they do not get any fluctuation because the price of sugar is fixed at a relatively high level?

Mr. LATTA. That is the way we assure the American consumers of an adequate supply of sugar at a reasonable price in this bill.

I might say there has been a lot of adverse publicity put out on this bill and, therefore, I think it is high time that we discussed some of the provisions of the bill.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. MAY. I realize the gentleman is going into another important facet of the subject, but I think in view of the colloquy that has just taken place we should at this time make the point, as to U.S. consumer prices, which of course concern all of us, that a fairer way of gaging the reasonableness of prices paid for sugar by our U.S. consumers is to compare the prices actually paid by consumers here and housewives or other consumers in other nations around the world. Every such study in recent years has shown that U.S. consumers pay less per pound than the average price per pound paid by consumers in other leading countries around the world.

I have just a few examples here, if the gentleman will allow me to name some of them. For example, on January 1 of this year the retail sugar prices in a score of nations around the world averaged out at 12.2 cents per pound. While the American housewife paid 11.6 cents per pound. In other countries, for example, Italy, sugar cost 16 cents per pound. In Sweden, 15 cents; West Germany, 14.2 cents; the Netherlands, 14 cents; Belgium, 13.9 cents; France 12.6 cents; Switzerland, 11.2 cents; United Kingdom, 11.1 cents; Australia, 10.2 cents.

If you measure sugar prices on the basis of the amount of worktime that a laborer puts in on his job in order to earn enough money to buy a pound of sugar, you will then find that sugar prices in the United States are the lowest in the world.

I might say this has been shown repeatedly in studies by both the United Nations and the National Industrial Conference Board. Also surveys throughout the United States show that in the American food basket sugar has remained probably the most stable or at least one of the most stable food commodities as to price over a period of many decades—outside of wartime, of course. This as compared to the other food commodities in the food basket that the American housewife carries out of the grocery store.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentlewoman from Washington for her very valuable contribution.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RESNICK. Is it not true, I would like to ask the gentlewoman from Washington, that these countries to which she has referred are buying this sugar on the open market at 2 cents a pound and the reason for the high prices in these other foreign countries is because of the tariff arrangements and not because of the cost of the sugar.

I would like to point out further that my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] during his testimonty before the Committee on Rules pointed out that in Canada sugar costs 8 cents a pound while here in this country it costs 11 cents a pound. So the high cost of sugar in foreign countries is not due to the cost of the acquisition of the sugar but because of the tariff being too high.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Let me say again what I said at the outset of my remarks. I do not agree with all the provisions of H.R. 11135. If I had my way in writing this bill, I would make certain changes.

This bill extends the Sugar Act for a period of 5 years. The Sugar Act does not expire until December 31, 1966. So the bill would extend it until December 31, 1971. The appropriate provisions of the Internal Revenue Code would be extended until June 30, 1972.

The bill would give domestic producers some 60 percent and foreign producers some 40 percent of the U.S. sugar market, starting at 9.7 million tons. The growth in the U.S. market, up to 10.4 million tons, would go to foreign producers. After that, domestic areas would get 65 percent of the growth.

Quotas for domestic areas would be increased from the present levels by 375,000 tons for beets and 205,000 tons for cane. All domestic deficits would go to foreign producers, and all foreign deficits would go to foreign producers. This is one feature of the bill that, if I had my way in writing the legislation, I would change. I would give all of these deficits to the domestic producers. But that is not the way the bill is written.

Foreign quotas are established by using the basis of the 1962 sugar law. The administration had proposed foreign quotas on the basis of a formula using 1963 and 1964 as a basis.

Let me stop to comment that this is a country-by-country quota bill and not a global quota bill, which the administration requested and received from the Congress a couple of years ago. The administration found out that a global quota would not work. It did not work, and now the administration is supporting a country-by-country quota bill, which proves that the Committee on Agriculture did the right thing a couple of years ago when they objected to the global quota idea, but were overruled in the other body and by the administration.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I should like to call to the attention of the Members of the House that there is available on the desks on each side of the aisle a committee print which just came out today entitled "The Development of Foreign Sugar Quotas in H.R. 11135." This committee print was written and signed by the members of the special subcommittee which worked on this problem. I happen to be one of those members. I think if the Members will read this committee print before voting time arrives, it might be enlightening.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LATTA. Under the provisions of H.R. 11135, all the Cuban reserve is allocated. The import fees are not included in this bill. I will discuss this further in a moment. A special reserve is set aside for domestic beet and cane sugar processors to allow for adjustments for certain minimum production. It extends and amends the provisions of the present law dealing with expropriation of American-owned property in foreign countries. It eliminates the quotas for Belgium and Ireland.

Let me come now to the resolution bringing this bill to the House and say that I agree with the Rules Committee in its wisdom in granting a closed rule with certain amendments being permitted. For the Rules Committee to grant an open rule on a bill of this nature would have been ridiculous. We would have had 435 Members of this House with 435 different ideas as to how many tons of sugar should go to each sugar producing country in the world.

If the Members will look at page 56 of the report of the committee, they will find that the Agriculture Committee made some changes in the quotas for various countries and there has been a great deal of discussion about these changes. What kind of prolonged discussion would we have if all 435 Members of the House were making amendments to incorporate their individual thoughts on this foreign quota matter alone.

One amendment made in order by the Committee on Rules is:

> Effective January 1, 1966, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the quota of any country shall be reduced to zero for the balance of the period covered by this act if any authorized person appearing or working in the interest of such country in regard to sugar legislation is registered or required to be registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act; except that the quota shall not be reduced below any treaty obligation.

This is one of the Findley amendments. I support it but would have liked to see the amendment go further. If we are going to rule out lobbyists of foreign countries, perhaps, if this is possible, we should also rule out lobbyists for the domestic interests.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for indicating his support of this amendment. I also wish to express my appreciation to the Rules Committee for its unusual action in making in order not only this amendment but also a second amendment, which I presented to the Rules Committee for its consideration. The second amendment deals with the import fee.

Ordinarily I do oppose closed rules, but under these circumstances the two amendments which have been made in order for consideration, in my opinion, constitute such a tremendous stride forward in putting this act on a proper basis and removing the cloud of doubt and suspicion which hangs over the legislation that I do urge the adoption of this resolution so that we can proceed with the debate and the consideration of amendments.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Further, in reference to the matter of lobbying, we have read a lot in the past few weeks about lobbying on this bill. I commend the Committee on Agriculture for not taking the so-called administration bill, which was sent down here, and for working its will, which it is supposed to do, on this legislation. Whether or not we agree with the final product the Agriculture Committee has come up with, it has worked its will. The important fact is that the Committee on Agriculture did not rubberstamp a proposal sent down here by the administration.

From all that I have been able to learn of this so-called administration bill, if we are going to label any of these bills a "lobbyist bill," it is the lobbyist bill. Why? They would not even send a bill down to the Committee on Agriculture for consideration until they had had all of these lobbyists in and jointly agreed on a bill. Then the lobbyists all came in and said, "This is it, we support it, and oppose all amendments."

Now, why all the "heat?" We get the "heat" because the Committee on Agriculture fulfilled its legislative responsibilities and dared to change a few insignficant features of this bill.

I for one, as a Member of the House, want to salute the Committee on Agriculture for not knuckling down to these big lobbyists—and there were some big ones in here—for not taking the bill just as it was written downtown by the administration and the big lobbyists. I hope that in the future the committee will continue to work its will on legislation and will not turn this responsibility over to the administration and the sugar lobbyists.

I will say further on the matter of lobbying that I am not bothered by many of them but I did have a certain lobbyist from the beet industry tell me to my face after the Agriculture Committee worked its will, that they are going to have to go over to the Senate and "correct" the amendments that were made by the House Agriculture Committee, because they were not endorsed by big lobbyists.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is it possible that the executive branch of Government has been in league with these lobbyists?

Mr. LATTA. I am not saying that in so many words. The gentleman can interpret my position from my remarks. It is interesting to note that we had very few witnesses before our committee from the industry, and we had very few individuals appear before the committee in opposition to the bill.

A few of them did dare to come before the committee and say that they did not agree with all of the conclusions reached during these administration discussions, and had some reservations about it. I think that the committee saw their individual problems and measured up to its responsibilities in helping these small companies stay in business. I say whether or not we agree with everything the committee came up with, it did carry out its legislative responsibilities, and I commend the committee for so doing.

The second Findley amendment, made in order by the Committee on Rules, reads as follows:

> SEC. 213. (a) As a condition for importing sugar into the continental United States pursuant to sections 202(c) and 204 of this Act, an import fee shall be paid to the United States, which fee shall be 75 percentum of the amount which the Secretary determines from time to time will approximate the amount by which a domestic price for raw sugar at a level that will fulfill the domestic price objective set forth in section 201, exceeds the prevailing world market price for raw sugar (adjusted for freight to New York, and most-favored-nation tariff). The fees provided for in this paragraph shall be imposed on a per pound, raw value, basis, and shall be applied uniformly except that the import fee imposed on any direct-consumption sugar shall be one-half of 1 cent per pound more than the import fee imposed on raw sugar under this paragraph. Such fees shall be paid by the person applying to the Secretary for entry and release of sugar. Such payment shall be made in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary. The Secretary shall promulgate regulations permitting any importer of sugar to apply for a quota set-aside, furnishing such security as the Secretary may require, which will fix the import fee for any sugar under his control to be imported at any time during a calendar year at the rate then in effect for such calendar year. The Secretary shall determine, from time to time, the rate of import fee and the initial such determination shall be made by October 1 in each year for the succeeding calendar year, except for the calendar year 1966, in which case such determination shall be made at the earliest practicable date.
>
> (b) The funds collected as import fees by the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Let me say at this point that when the lobbyists met with the administration, they agreed with the administration to take out the import fee. This was not an action of the House Committee on Agriculture. It was not in the bill when it was presented to the committee by the administration.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

A little history on the language of the amendment which you have just read might be of interest to the House. This language was included in proposed legislation recommended to the administration and the Congress by the domestic sugar industry. This included the refiners and beet and cane producers. They issued the statement on March 28 in which they did not accept or agree, but recommended an import fee. I lifted the very language for this import fee out of their legislative proposal, making only the changes as to the level, that is, 75 percent, and providing for the problem represented by the delayed enactment of this bill to enable the Secretary to set forth his determination in time for the 1966 apportionment. However, the language of this amendment came out of the proposal of the domestic sugar industry which they made on March 28. They recommended this import fee at that time. If they really meant what they said on March 28 I wonder if they mean what they say now when they say they are opposed to an import fee.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman, and let me say further that as I understand your amendment, you are asking for only 75 percent of the import fee rather than 100 percent. I understand that this import fee amounts to about $80 million a year and I would prefer to continue to collect all of it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I will yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. COOLEY. The bill referred to by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] was never sent to our committee. As the gentleman from Ohio pointed out, the bill which we received from the administration did not have any import fee in it, and the witness, speaking for the administration, supported the bill without the import fee in our committee room. The domestic producers appeared there and presented their views through one spokesman, Mr. Frank Kemp, of Colorado, who spoke for all segments of the domestic industry, and said that he would have no part of the import fee, and it was none of the domestic industry's business, and that they were not concerned in it, or words to that effect.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. I wonder if the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture will clear up a little point in respect to the history of this legislative proposal that came from the domestic sugar industry?

I have heard it said that the reason why this proposal did not come to the Committee on Agriculture was because the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture would not accept it if it had an import fee as a part of it.

Mr. COOLEY. There is no secret about that. I made a public statement and a public speech indicating that I thought it was impossible and unbelievable that we would use that import fee in this sugar bill; that it would cut across all of our international relations and would be calculated to offend our best neighbors, our best customers, and our best allies. And when I said that—and I am not conceited enough to believe that I shook the foundations of the whole administration from the ground to the White House—but the gentleman knows, and I know that the President is opposed to it, the Secretary of Agriculture is, and the Secretary of State told me less than 2 hours ago that he is against it. And yet the gentleman wants to put it into the bill over everybody's opposition.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, the fact is that last March 28 the domestic sugar industry, acting upon the request of the administration, to quote their press release, said that certain key Members of Congress did present this language to the administration, and subsequent to that——

Mr. COOLEY. What key Members of Congress?

Mr. FINDLEY. I can only quote the release of the domestic sugar industry in which they recommended an import fee; and in reciting the position of the administration, I think in fairness we ought to point out that less than a year ago the Secretary of Agriculture made an announcement which I understand was fully cleared with the White House in which it was made plain that an import fee would be a part of the legislation.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the point that I want to make is that no one now recommends the import fee except the gentleman from Illinois, that I know of.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I assure the gentleman that there are many people who would like to see the import fee placed in this legislation. Included are a good many newspapers across the country, a good many people who have taken the trouble to write to me and to encourage me in my effort to take some of the pure profit out of the foreign sugar projects.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I think it is correct that at one time the domestic sugar industry had views in favor of an import fee. They had the good sense, in my opinion, to change their views. Now they are opposed, as are the refiners, the best and cane sugar people, and the administration, and apparently the vast majority of the House Committee on Agriculture.

In connection with the views expressed at one time by the domestic sugar industry on import fees, I point out that their recommendation set a limit of 1 cent per pound.

The proposal now before us, which cannot be amended under the parliamentary situation, would fix an import fee of 75 percent of the difference between the domestic and the world market price. Assume, for instance, that today the domestic price is $6.80 per hundred pounds raw sugar. Assume that the world market today is $2.80 per hundred pounds raw sugar. The difference is $4. Three-fourths of $4 in any man's book is $3. The cost to produce that sugar is more than $3. The gentleman is therefore proposing an amendment to impose an import fee exceeding the cost of production of that offshore sugar that we are talking about.

Furthermore, we went through a trial period under global quotas, and an import fee. What happened? Two or three years ago, under that mechanism, the price of world sugar, the price in the world market, shot up above the domestic price and it stayed there. The price of sugar in the United States went up to 14 cents a pound.

The price of sugar in Canada went up to 18 cents a pound. We were in a situation of seeing the American domestic sugar, whose price is usually higher than the world price, being carted by trucks across the Canadian line.

And, in order to stop that we had to impose an export license on the shipment of domestic sugar out of this country. So, that is what this import fee is about.

Mr. LATTA. I want to thank the gentleman from Louisiana, but my time is about consumed. I do want the RECORD to show that most of the Republicans voted to reimpose the import fee. Certainly, I for one, am not for abolishing it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the rule and the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlemen from New York in opposing the rule and the legislation it would bring to the floor. By its built-in limitations, the rule will not permit consideration of an acceptable bill.

This legislation is offensive because it provides the domestic sugar industry with an unwarranted protective tariff insuring both high prices and a limitation on foreign export. No other agricultural crop receives such tender treatment.

The legislation is also offensive because it provides a system of foreign import quotas to so-called friendly countries. I have always supported foreign aid, but I prefer to make it direct and on the record instead of a sugar tax imposed upon on every pound of sugar by American consumers.

This Congress has been a "sugar daddy" for too long a time. This bill would constitute a dreadful mistake at the expense of the American consumers.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK].

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, in light of the sugar legislation now being considered by this House——

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 362]

Abbitt
Anderson, Tenn
Andrews,
George W.
Annunzio
Aspinall
Baring
Bates
Battin
Bingham
Blatnik
Bolton
Bonner
Brock
Brown, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Carter
Casey
Celler
Chelf
Clawson, Del
Clevenger
Conte
Cunningham
Curtis
Delaney
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dulski
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Flood
Foley
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Goodell
Grider
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hébert
Holifield
Holland
Hosmer
Howard
Irwin
Johnson, Okla.
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Krebs
Landrum
Leggett
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McEwen
McVicker
Macdonald
Mackie
Madden
Marsh
Mathias
Miller
Minish
Morrison
Murray
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
Olson, Minn.
Patman
Philbin
Reuss
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rodino
Satterfield
St Germain
Saylor
Smith, Calif.
Springer
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Vivian
Walker, Miss.
White, Idaho
Wright
Wyatt

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 334 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 9220) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KIRWAN, FOGARTY, EVINS of Tennessee, BOLAND, WHITTEN, MAHON, RHODES of Arizona, DAVIS of Wisconsin, ROBISON, and BOW.

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 9220

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight Thursday to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 9220.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK].

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, the sugar legislation now being considered by the House has aroused more than usual attention. And for good reason. There has been considerable discussion about what is wrong with the bill reported out by the Agriculture Committee. I am more inclined to ask what is right about it, because it is one of the most mystifying pieces of patchwork legislation we have seen in a long time.

I would like to point out at this time that this is not an administration bill that has been reported out.

I am frankly disturbed over the fact that there seems to have been an attitude expressed that this bill is too complicated for the Members to understand, and that we are expected to simply rubberstamp the decisions made by a handful of men gifted with superior vision, intelligence, and understanding. I am not willing to accept such a role, and I doubt that any other Congressman is either. We are here to think for ourselves.

I am also greatly disturbed over the manner in which this costly and far-reaching legislation is being presented to us. It is a first-class blackjack job. In voting on this bill we must choose between all or nothing and we are told in a dark and threatening tone that to reject this bill would bring chaos to both foreign and domestic sugar markets. These threats are false, as we will see later on.

Our action on sugar legislation has great international significance. It involves the parceling out of the foreign share of our sugar market to more than 30 countries. This raises the most delicate issues of foreign relations, and has a direct bearing on the economic well-being of many of our friends abroad. At current prices, $2 billion in premium payments over the next 5 years are involved. The committee bill virtually throws the administration's foreign quota proposal out the window and establishes new ones. Logical reasoning lay behind the administration's quotas, and they approached the problem with great care. The administration decided to use a strictly objective formula, and fortunately there was one at hand. During the years 1963 and 1964 sugar prices in the world market were more attractive than our own. These were years when every foreign country had an opportunity to ship to the United States without any restrictions. Many did, and at lower prices than they could have obtained in other markets of the world. Their willingness to do so stabilized our prices and supply at a time when world markets were chaotic.

Accordingly, the administration recognized their cooperation by proposing that foreign quotas be allocated on the actual record of performance by foreign countries in exporting sugar to the United States during these 2 years. Though some countries may not like the result of this formula, no one can question its fairness, and no one can complain of favoritism. As far as I know, no one did complain. Each country realized that it had really made its own quotas, and that this was a fair and equitable solution.

But now, we are suddenly asked to take a completely different set of quotas as decided by the Agriculture Committee—quotas that were established on the wings of personal whimsy, without a yardstick, without logic, without a formula, and without consistency.

Let me illustrate. The committee has granted the Bahamas a 10,000-ton special quota, even though that country did not ask for one and, as a matter of fact, grows no sugarcane. This quota exceeds the allotment of more than half the processors in the State of Louisiana. With sugar in substantial surplus throughout the world what justification is there for encouraging a new sugar enterprise in a country that has never grown any—and keep in mind that this quota to the Bahamas deprives other countries of quotas they have earned on the basis of past performance.

This is just one example. The committee changed the quota for every country except the Republic of the Philippines which were protected by treaty.

For some countries the changes were smaller but for others they were staggering. Venezuela, for example, got more than 10 times what its 1963–64 performance warranted. In contrast, Argentina, a country that shipped us sugar when we needed it, was cut by two-thirds. In another case, Thailand, which has yet to ship a single pound of sugar into the United States, received a quota of almost 20,000 tons. Ireland, on the other hand, was effectively prevented from exporting any part of its quota to the United States.

When unjustified new quotas are established or old quotas increased, legitimate quotas to other countries must be severely cut back. Even more than the monetary loss is the damage to U.S. prestige, because a world leader is expected to act logically and to honor its obligations.

The foreign quota provisions of this bill have received the most publicity and criticism. But they are not the only bad aspects of the bill. On the contrary, it contains a number of strange and perplexing provisions on the domestic side which are damaging to the interest of American producers and the U.S. Government which will be discussed later.

Furthermore, the bill weakens the protection provided for consumers. As originally recommended in the administration bill, the Government would be able to get sugar in an emergency on a first-come, first-served basis. The value of this provision has been destroyed in the committee bill by a requirement that the Secretary, in exercising it, must give special consideration to countries which agree to purchase additional U.S. agricultural products, whatever this means. Such consideration would, of course, require an open offer with a time period for countries to submit their bids. During this time lapse, other sugar importing countries, knowing that the United States is in the market for a substantial quantity of sugar, would go into the market immediately. The United States would have to sit by, however, awaiting receipt of offers to purchase U.S. agricultural commodities. By this time, the sugar would be long gone. The first-come, first-served provision is worthless as a result of this requirement. It would become an administrative monstrosity.

Finally, the bill would also weaken the protection for domestic producers of sugar crops. In its bill, the administration requested authority to impose quarterly limitations on total imports when needed to keep markets stable. This recommendation has been deleted. In its report, the committee indicated its belief that if the annual limitation of supply, as provided, did not successfully support prices, the Secretary could then resort to time limitations within the year.

There is no way to accurately predict what the net effect of this might be but this much is clear: It greatly weakens the ability of the Secretary of Agriculture to manage the supply of sugar, and consequently the price of sugar, in the United States. And, like so many other mystifying provisions of this bill, for no apparent reason.

Mr. Speaker, this is important legislation. Every consumer of sugar is affected. Our foreign relations are affected, domestic producers and processors are affected.

In voting on this bill, we are being asked to take all or nothing, and then being told that nothing would mean chaos. How much validity is there to this threat—this unwarranted ultimatum? The fact is that we can reject this bill without causing the slightest ripple in the sugar market. Because if this bill is rejected, the present quotas would automatically be extended for another year. There would be a lot of disappointed lobbyists floating around town—but that is about all.

True, we should keep in mind that the new bill provides for increased domestic sugar allotment following commitments made by the administration to domestic producers. Based on these commitments, domestic producers have already taken steps to expand production. In order to protect these producers, a new bill increasing domestic sugar allotments would have to be passed. But this could simply be lifted out of the existing bill, and would not have to be tied with foreign quotas in any way.

After the committee's sugar bill is defeated, I would like to see a Presidential commission established to study, redefine, and reshape our entire sugar policy. It is time we put an end to this degrading, periodic "beggar's opera" that brings the representatives of sovereign nations to the Halls of Congress, hat in hand, to plead for a piece of the American sugar-pie. It is unbecoming to them, and it is an embarrassment to us.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I simply want the Members of the House to understand the facts. I fear that our colleague who has just addressed us has devoted himself more to the reading of newspapers than to a reading of the official documents.

I can understand that on the part of the ordinary Member of the House, but when a Member attempts to give us information, it seems to me he should go to the source of information, and be especially careful that his statements are accurate.

The gentleman has just stated that we have no way of knowing whether the Bahamas would accept a quota or not. Here is a letter from the British Embassy written on August 20, 1965, to our State Department. It reads in part as follows:

> My purpose in passing this information on to you is to acquaint you with the Bahamas' plans and with the fact that the Premier and the Governor of the Bahamas hope that the application made on behalf of Owens-Illinois for a sugar quota on behalf of the

Bahamas would, when the time comes, receive the sympathetic consideration of the U.S. Government.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me right clear that if the gentleman wanted to resolve the question—whether the Bahamas would accept a quota or not—the best evidence is what their diplomatic representatives here in Washington say and not what some newspaper may have said.

Here is the statement—I hold it in my hand and any Member can come and look at it.

Mr. **RESNICK**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. **POAGE**. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **RESNICK**. Would the gentleman agree that this is the first time this letter is available and that all during the hearings and all during the controversy following and on this Bahama quota that this is the first time this letter is mentioned.

Mr. **POAGE**. I do not think this is the first time this letter has been available. I think it would have been available to the gentleman any time he sought to inquire about it. He has spoken as one who is in a position to give definite information. This letter, as I mentioned, is dated August 20, 1965. The gentleman knows that the British Embassy is the official spokesman of the Bahamas. How could the gentleman be sure of his facts unless he took the trouble to ask those who could give the official answer. Evidently, the gentleman made no effort to secure the facts. He just stepped out here on the floor and made unsubstantiated statements, and when he is shown the inaccuracy of his claims, he complains that we did not tell him that we could prove him to be in error. Is there no obligation on the gentleman to inform himself before he attempts to inform the House?

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. **SISK**. Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to adopt this resolution to permit the Committee on Agriculture to debate the subject under discussion.

I am concerned only about one thing and that is the well-being of the American people and the quantity and quality and price that the housewife is going to have to pay this country. I think this is our basic concern. I think if you will give an opportunity to well informed Members who will be discussing the history of this act, you will come to the conclusion as I have that over all and over the years this sugar act has been in the best interest of the American consumer and in the best interest of everyone in this country.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. **SISK**. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. **SISK**. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. **RESNICK**. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair will count.

Mr. **RESNICK**. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The point of order is withdrawn.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. **RESNICK**. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused

Mr. **RESNICK**. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair will count.

One hundred and eighty-six Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 253, nays 80, not voting 99, as follows:

[Roll No. 363]

YEAS—253

Abernethy
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Ayres
Baldwin
Bandstra
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Berry
Betts
Boland
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Callan
Callaway
Carey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clark
Colmer
Conable
Cooley
Corbett
Craley
Culver
Curtin
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Dent
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farnsley
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fisher
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Gubser
Gurney
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Henderson
Hicks
Horton
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Keith
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kornegay
Kunkel
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Love
McCulloch
McDade
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meeds
Michel
Mills
Mink
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nelsen
O'Brien
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
St. Onge
Schisler
Schweiker
Scott
Selden
Shriver
Sickles
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thomson, Wis.
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Ullman
Utt
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—80

Adair
Adams
Andrews, Glenn
Bennett
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Burton, Calif.
Cameron
Clancy
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Corman
Cramer
Davis, Wis.
Denton
Derwinski
Dwyer
Dyal
Edwards, Calif.
Erlenborn
Farbstein
Farnum
Fino
Gibbons
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Haley
Hall
Harsha
Hawkins
Hechler
Helstoski
Hutchinson
Joelson
Jonas
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McDowell
McEwen
Minshall
Moore
Nedzi
O'Konski
Ottinger
Patten
Pike
Powell
Race
Resnick
Robison
Roudebush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Scheuer
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Secrest
Senner
Shipley
Springer
Stanton
Sullivan
Todd
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Weltner
Williams
Wydler
Yates

NOT VOTING—99

Abbitt
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Annunzio
Arends
Aspinall
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Bonner
Brock
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Carter
Casey
Celler
Chelf
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Clevenger
Conte
Conyers
Cunningham
Curtis
Daddario
Delaney
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dulski
Edwards, Ala.
Evans, Colo.
Flood
Foley
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Giaimo
Green, Oreg.
Grider
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Hardy
Harris
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hébert
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Hosmer
Howard
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Krebs
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McVicker
Macdonald
Madden
Marsh
Mathias
Miller
Minish
Morrison
Murray
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
Olson, Minn.
Patman
Philbin
Reuss
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rodino
Satterfield
St Germain
Saylor
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Steed
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Vivian
Walker, Miss.
White, Idaho
Wilson, Bob
Wright
Wyatt

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Battin.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Bates.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Miller with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Minish with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Carter.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Evans.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Foley.
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Grider.
Mr. Thomas with Mr. Reuss.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Hagen of California.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Roberts.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Kluczynski.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Holland.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Howard.
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Harris.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Abbitt.
Mr. Krebs with Mr. Bonner.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. King of Utah.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. McVicker.
Mr. Marsh with Mr. Murray.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. O'Hara of Illinois.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Olson of Minnesota.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Vivian.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Aspinall.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. FARNSLEY changed his vote from "present" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time, after consulting with the distinguished minority leader, to announce certain modifications of the program for the remainder of the week.

Tomorrow, the first order of business will be a resolution for continuing appropriations.

Also tomorrow, following the disposition of the sugar bill, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] may call up bills to be considered by unanimous consent that previously had been scheduled for Thursday. This is being done in view of the change in the program for Thursday.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. On Thursday the supplemental appropriation bill will be considered?

Mr. ALBERT. On Thursday, as previously announced, the supplemental appropriation bill will be considered. If we dispose of that bill, I hope we will be able to adjourn over until Monday.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Could the distinguished majority leader tell us what date is proposed for the resolution continuing appropriations?

Mr. ALBERT. I believe it is October 23, but I should like to consult with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. I do not see him present on the floor. I believe that it is October 23.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I have heard that it was October 23.

Mr. ALBERT. I now see the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] in the Chamber.

Would the minority leader mind addressing his question to him? I think it is October 23, but I should like to hear from the gentleman from Texas. The continuing resolution will be effective until what date?

Mr. MAHON. It is the expectation of the Appropriations Committee to approve a resolution for continuing appropriations tomorrow. I believe the committee will agree on the date of October 23. I believe that is probably in keeping with the wishes of the leadership.

Mr. ALBERT. I believe the gentleman is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. May I ask the distinguished majority leader whether that foretells the happy prospects for the adjournment of the Congress sine die on or before that date?

Mr. ALBERT. I hope so.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11135) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 11135, with Mr. BURKE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] will be recognized for 2 hours, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE] will be recognized for 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I shall try to be very brief in presenting this bill for your consideration.

I might remind some of the new Members of Congress that the sugar program has been in existence since 1934. The program operated under a country-by-country quota system, until 1962, when we were forced to capitulate in some degree to the Senate and to the administration and to embrace the global quota.

Under the program which has been approved by all the Presidents with whom I have served—Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and now Mr. Johnson—we have had a stability of supply and a stability of prices, and the program has operated so successfully and so well—except in 1963 and 1964 when we experimented with the global quota—that the average housewife in America was not even aware of the fact that we had a program at all. The program operated well both in times of peace and in times of war.

This means much to the consumers of America, because without the program we could not be assured of an adequate supply at reasonable prices at all times.

The program is designed to accomplish three things: first, to make it possible, as a matter of national security, to produce a substantial portion of our sugar requirements within the continental United States and to do this without the consumer penalizing device of a high protective tariff; second, to assure U.S. consumers of a plentiful and stable supply of sugar at reasonable prices; and, third, to permit friendly foreign countries to participate equitably in supplying the U.S. sugar market for the double purpose of expanding international trade and assuring a nearby stable and adequate store of sugar.

The program went well until we broke diplomatic relations with Castro in Cuba. Up to that time Cuba had supplied 96 percent of the foreign sugar coming into this market. After the break with Castro it became necessary for us to look elsewhere in the world for our foreign sugar needs, and that is exactly what we did. We granted quotas to many foreign countries.

We tried to preserve a quota for Cuba and hoped that she might come back into the family of free nations and that we could then return the quota to Cuba. But Cuba has not come back into the family of free nations, and that quota has been cut down from more than 3 million tons to 1.5 million tons in 1962—and now to about 1 million tons in this bill.

Speaking for our committee, I want to tell this House that we have from time to time been unjustly accused of dragging our feet and deliberately delaying consideration of sugar legislation.

Nothing could be further from the truth. During the entire 88th Congress we waited patiently for recommendations from the administration regarding sugar. No recommendations were forthcoming. During the 89th Congress we waited from January until May or June for such recommendations, but they were not forthcoming. Realizing that something should be done, especially because of the interests of the domestic producers, we started out to consider sugar legislation. We started considering it in conferences weeks and months before we ever received any official recommendations from the Department of Agriculture. I have had numerous conferences with those in the domestic industry, and they came to me first badly divided.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I insisted that they confer and try to compose their differences and compromise their views and bring us something they could all agree upon. After months of conferences they finally came to our committee and said "We are ready to report." They selected one spokesman to speak for the industry. Now, this was a remarkable achievement when you appreciate the fact that this is a vast industry which spreads from the east coast to the west coast, and from north to south.

The domestic industry is vitally interested in this bill, because it is vital and essential to their survival. They cannot produce sugar in competition with foreign producers using cheap tropical labor They now have on hand hundreds of thousands of tons of sugar that cannot legally be sold in this market unless they are authorized to do so by law. This bill now before you would authorize that sale.

I think there are 26 or 28 States in this Union that grow sugar, beet, or cane. People are interested in this legislation all the way from Boston to Houston because all of the refineries up and down the eastern seaboard, and the stevedores and the dockworkers, and all of the people employed in the processing plants, depend on the processing of sugar for their livelihoods. They are in agreement in supporting this bill which was presented to us. After they brought the bill to our Committee on Agriculture, I sent them back downtown to confer with the Departments of State and Commerce and Agriculture, the Bureau of the Budget, to see if all were in accord on the bill. Finally, in May or June I was advised that they were ready to report.

Frankness requires me to admit now that I was told the bill they presented to me then would contain a provision imposing a recapture import fee. I had announced publicly in June that I did not think it was fair and I did not think it was feasible, and I did not think it was the thing we should do in the light of our international situation.

Here we have an Alliance for Progress program in which we are aiding these needy nations, many of them dependent on the production and sale of sugar. The idea of imposing a tax on the only commodity that they have to sell to us was somewhat repugnant. So I stated that I would have no part of it, and would not introduce a bill with that import tax in it.

Everybody knew my views, and I submitted them to the committee. They knew how I felt about it, and I knew how they felt about it. Finally when I was about ready to introduce the sugar bill, I was requested to hold up the bill for 3 days, which I did. During that 3 days we were advised the administration would no longer advocate an imposition of the tax.

Even this morning at 10 o'clock I talked to our Secretary of State to be sure that I would not misquote the administration. I asked them to advise me if there had been any change in the views of the administration, and he notified me there had not been any change in the views of the administration, and that they were still against the import tax.

The reason why I mention that is an amendment will be in order to impose this tax over the objection of the administration, over the objection of our committee, and over the objection of the President of the United States. The President's position has been well known and publicly announced.

Now we come to these country-by-country quotas. First, let me say, however, that we made very slight changes in the program submitted to us by the domestic industry. We gave a little relief here in Louisiana, and a little relief in Ohio and a little somewhere else. Now, with respect to the country-by-country quotas, you have heard a lot of talk about this Bahamas business. The man who represented the Bahamas I think came from Ohio somewhere, and he submitted his case to this 35-man committee in open session. They have a pulpwood industry down there. There are 500 strong men who earn a living there producing pulp. The pulp was running out. The land is fertile and is adaptable to the growing of sugarcane. They asked for a little quota. So when this land was cleared of all roots and runners and planted in cane they might be able to sell some of their sugar in our market.

They asked for about 20,000 tons. We gave them 10,000 tons if by 1968 they could satisfy the Secretary of Agriculture that they could produce and deliver. Otherwise they would have nothing for these families of 500 workers to do. There would be probably 2,000 or more workers who would be idle just off our shores.

Contrary to what anybody says, this is not a bonanza for any corporation or an allotment to any corporation. There is not an allotment in this bill to any individual, person, or corporation.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I decline to yield. The gentleman was heard in the committee and was heard before the Rules Committee, and he has been heard here.

Mr. Chairman, here is the situation. Here is a friendly people a short distance off the coast of our country willing and ready to produce 10,000 tons of the 10 million tons we consume in this country annually. That is how insignificant that allotment is. And if we do not buy the 10,000 tons from the Bahamas we will buy it from some other country at the same price. This allocation to the Bahamas will not cost our consumers or taxpayers one cent. That is what that controversy adds up to, and I do not want to hear any more about it.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. Is not the Bahamas the closest point, other than Mexico, of any American country that produces sugar to be shipped to the United States?

Mr. COOLEY. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. And had we refused Bahama a quota, would it not have been the only country that does produce sugar for export in the Western Hemisphere without a quota; is that right?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out this to my colleagues. I was one of the members of the special committee which worked out and recommended to the full committee the division of these foreign imports. This was a rather unusual situation. This is intended as a compliment to the chairman. There were four Democrats and four Republicans on the committee instead of the usual 2-to-1 ratio. Perhaps more by good luck than good judgment I refused to see any lobbyists representing foreign importers, with the exception of, early in the game, two people who came all the way from South Africa. Speaking for myself, and I am sure that I express the experience of the other members of that special committee, I was not influenced in any way by the representations, oral or written, of these representatives of foreign importers.

We had three or four or five meetings; and I repeat, there were four Republicans and four Democrats. We met, in my opinion, in an entirely objective and, I think, fair manner and worked out a bill to take to the full committee in the matter of the division of foreign imports.

I compliment the chairman on his fairness in handling these meetings. He did not write or dictate this bill. It was and is the consensus of the members of the special subcommittee.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman if any lobbyist representing our domestic or foreign industry appeared at any one of these sessions?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Absolutely not.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask another question, if I may. Did I not announce before the whole committee what I intended to do, and that was to select a top-notch subcommittee to work on this matter to see what we could do?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. You did, and you expressed an opinion or a position with which I wholeheartedly concur and that is the matter of dividing up these foreign imports should be a matter of decision by the legislative body rather than a small group of bureaucrats down in the Department of Agriculture and in the Department of State.

We have been complaining around here for a long time about the executive department taking away our prerogatives. This is a case where we stood up and hoped to be counted, and were.

Mr. COOLEY. Following that discussion, I would like to say that the responsibility to adjust these foreign quotas is the responsibility of Congress. It is not the responsibility of the executive branch of the Government or some bureaus or some bureaucrats or any number of bureaucrats, to sit down there and have these foreign diplomats down there come to them with their caps in their hands to ask for some quota. That responsibility is to come before our committee in open session and present their case and subject themselves to cross-examination, and furnish us and provide us with valuable information.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong this discussion, but if the members of the Committee will look at the record——

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COOLEY. No, I am making a statement now. If you will look at the record, you will see the numerous factors that we considered in making these allocations and as I say, we took into consideration the political situation, we took into consideration the economic situation in some of the countries involved as well as the trade balances between countries, and various and sundry factors. And, Mr. Chairman, I might point out to the members of the Committee that the fact that we have a limited closed rule is not because we are trying to gag anyone, but it is because——

Mr. RESNICK. You are not trying to gag anybody? Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COOLEY. No, I do not yield. I do not yield to the gentleman from New York. The quotas in this bill are fixed on a percentage basis and when you change the percentage for one country you upset all the other countries. The reason the bill is here under a committee rule is for that reason.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to put into the RECORD the unanimous statement of the eight members of the Special Subcommittee on Sugar on the manner in which the foreign quotas in this bill were developed.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF FOREIGN SUGAR QUOTAS IN H.R. 11135

In 1962, when it became necessary to replace Cuba as a major source of U.S. sugar supplies, the committee sought a mathematical formula under which the former Cuban quota could be partially reallocated. Since there was then very little history of sugar shipments to the United States by foreign countries other than Cuba, the formulas explored by the committee were based upon production, domestic consumption, world exports, and other relevant statistical data.

After considering thoroughly every formula suggested, the committee came to the conclusion that it was impossible to apply a statistical formula to a matter so complex as assigning foreign sugar quotas equitably and in the best interest of the United States.

It proceeded, therefore, to develop the quotas in the 1962 act on a country-by-country basis taking into consideration not only the ability to supply sugar to the U.S. market but other factors such as friendship for the United States, trade with the United States, support of U.S. foreign policy, and other matters which cannot be measured statistically.

The wisdom of this procedure by the Committee on Agriculture, in allocating the 1962 quotas to foreign countries is evidenced by three facts:

1. In conference on the 1962 act, the Senate insisted on changing only two of the quotas: reducing substantially the quota for the Dominican Republic and eliminating entirely the quota for Argentina. Ten days later the Senate found it necessary to completely reverse its position with respect to the Dominican Republic and Argentina, by passing an amendment to a "honeybee" bill authorizing the President to distribute 150,000 tons of the temporary Cuban quota as he saw fit, with the understanding that 130,000 tons was to go to the Dominican Republic and 20,000 tons to Argentina.

2. The State Department has never, at any time, received from a foreign country a serious protest over the quotas assigned by the committee in the 1962 act.

3. Although more than 3 million tons of sugar were shipped to the United States in the years 1962–64 under the global quota provisions of the 1962 act, with every friendly country in the world eligible to ship sugar into the United States, only 229,951 tons came from countries which the Committee on Agriculture had not designated in its foreign quota allocations—indicating that these quota countries were eminently able and willing to supply U.S. sugar requirements.

SEARCH FOR A FORMULA IN 1965

In spite of its experience with formulas in 1962, the committee again in 1965 hoped that foreign quotas might be allocated on a formula basis and several months prior to any formal consideration of the bill extending the Sugar Act it started the search for such a formula.

At the request of the committee, the Department of Agriculture prepared figures for the committee showing the application of more than 30 different possible formulas. Since there was, by this time, a history of sugar deliveries in the years 1961–64, these formulas were based upon sugar deliveries during every possible combination of these years. They included a straight average of the 4 years 1961–64, a straight average of the 3 years 1962–64, and of the 2 years 1963–64, the 2 years 1963–64 with double weight to 1964 (the formula adopted by the Department of Agriculture), a formula based on the best 2 years out of the 4, one based on the best 2 years out of the 3 years 1962–64, and others.

After examining the figures resulting from the application of all these formulas, the committee again came to the conclusion that there was no formula which would assure the timely availability of ample sugar supplies for the United States, carry out the foreign policy of the United States, and serve adequately to assist the economies of developing countries, thereby carrying out one of the major objectives of the Sugar Act, to develop the foreign trade of the United States.

Each formula studied by the committee required so many exceptions and variations that, in the end, quota determinations would become a matter of judgment rather than of formula. Therefore, the committee found that it is impossible to apply a sliderule solution to a problem containing so many intangibles that it is not susceptible to solution by mere statistical formula.

THE FORMULA PROPOSED IN H.R. 10496

This principle applies to the specific formula proposed by the Department of Agriculture, as well as all the others. This is apparent from the fact that in the Department's bill a page and a half of fine print following the printing of the formula is required to make exceptions to that formula. More space would have been used had the Department made all of the exceptions to its formula necessary to deal equitably with the quota problem.

The formula favored by the Department, and submitted in the administration's sugar bill, would have based foreign quotas on 1963–64 sugar deliveries by the foreign suppliers, with double weight given to deliveries in 1964.

The fundamental fault with the Department's formula (aside from the impossibility of applying any mere statistical formula to this complicated situation) is that it completely disregards 30 years of experience under the Sugar Act (including the statutory quotas enacted by Congress in 1962) and bases its foreign quota recommendations solely on the experience of the 2 years 1963 and 1964. In his testimony before the committee, Tom O. Murphy, Director of the Department of Agriculture's Sugar Policy Staff, conceded that these 2 years (1963 and 1964) were the most abnormal and unrepresentative 2 years in the history of the Sugar Act. And yet it is these 2 years which are the sole basis of the Department's recommendations for permanent, statutory quotas, that are to be the foundation of our Sugar Act and our foreign commerce in sugar for the next 5 years, and by implication, for the years to come.

In 1964, the Department of Agriculture was expected and required by law to allocate for "global quota" purposes all of the quota withheld from Cuba—slightly more than 1.5 million tons. In late 1963, it allocated 1 million tons of this Cuban reserve and asked foreign suppliers to commit themselves for this amount, requiring delivery early in 1964. Any foreign supplier who might not happen to have supplies readily available at that time had the right to assume that the remaining 500,000 tons of the Cuban quota would be allocated later in the year, and to wait to make its commitment against this later allocation.

Contrary to the provisions of the Sugar Act, the Department never allocated the remaining 500,000 tons of the withheld Cuban quota. Yet this abnormal year of 1964 is the one to which the Department of Agriculture would give double weight in its so-called formula.

As the committee discovered in its own studies of the many formulas proposed for possible use this year, it is entirely possible to give unfair advantage to one country over another by picking the years or combination of years on which the formula is based. This is the reason the committee, after exhaustive studies, rejected all of the formulas.

SHORTCOMINGS OF THE DEPARTMENT'S FORMULA

1. The Department's statement supporting its formula makes a gesture toward maintaining the largest possible part of our foreign sugar supply within the countries of the Western Hemisphere. But, compared to the allocations in the 1962 act, its formula more than doubles the proportion of the foreign quota which would go to countries outside the Western Hemisphere. Every ton of this sugar comes from quotas which would otherwise be assigned to countries in the Western Hemisphere.

2. Some of the abnormal quotas outside the Western Hemisphere required by the Department's formula are—

A quota of 97,000 tons to India, a country receiving general and substantial support from the United States with much of its foreign exchange needs met from our Public Law 480 and AID programs—and with hungry people in its own country who could well use this vital food;

A quota of 97,000 tons to South Africa, a country rich in resources which depends on sugar for only 2.6 percent of its foreign exchange, and which has access to the British Commonwealth market for a substantial part of its sugar; and

A quota of 45,000 tons to Fiji, a nation of 428,000 people, which in 1964 had a preferential market in the British Commonwealth for 228,000 tons of sugar.

The quotas assigned under the Department's formula to Australia, China, India, and South Africa were larger than its proposed quotas to any of the Central and South American countries except Peru and Brazil.

3. Even in the Western Hemisphere, the inadvisability of relying on a straight, unadjusted formula, is apparent.

The Department's formula would give the five friendly, developing countries of the Central American Common Market (Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras) a total of only 128,000 tons. The committee bill gives them 148,000 tons.

Although the "big four" (Mexico, the Dominican Republic, Brazil, and Peru) are about equal in their ability to produce and export sugar the Department's formula allotted them quotas varying from 222,000 tons for Peru, to 390,000 tons for Mexico.

The Department's formula would give Argentina, an erratic sugar producer, a quota of 64,000 tons—in spite of the fact that it was able to export to the United States in 1964 only 20,000 tons.

The Department's formula would give Panama, a country the United States is striving to help develop, a quota of only 14,349 tons. The committee bill allots it a quota of 25,134 tons.

In spite of the unsettled and uncertain political situation in the Dominican Republic that country would receive a statutory quota of 386,000 tons under the Department's formula. The committee reduced this to 340,000 tons (the same as Mexico and Brazil) but suggested that the President use his authority under the bill to increase this quota on a year-by-year basis by assignment to the Dominican Republic of such portion of the deficit (usually about 300,000 tons) as he deemed appropriate.

DECISION NOT TO USE DEPARTMENT FORMULA

After hearing all the public testimony on the sugar bill, including that of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State, and after an executive session of the full Committee at which the committee heard spokesmen for the Department of Agriculture explain details of the bill and defend the Department's recommendations, the first action taken by the Committee on Agriculture was to vote not to follow the formula recommended by the Department in H.R. 10496. This vote was taken in executive session of the full committee and was virtually unanimous.

The sugar bill follows the administration's recommendations in every other major aspect. The division of quota between foreign and domestic suppliers is exactly as proposed by the administration. The division of domestic quota between beets and cane is exactly as proposed in the bill.

The new provisions authorizing the President to suspend or withhold a quota from any foreign country "in the national interest" and to allocate deficits among Western Hemisphere countries in the national interest as he "finds appropriate" are in the bill exactly as proposed by the administration.

In addition, the committee has strengthened the President's hand by reenacting and strengthening a provision of the 1962 act authorizing the President to suspend quotas from any country which expropriates property of American citizens without proper compensation. There was no such provision in the Department's bill.

The only substantial difference is that the committee has exercised its collective judgment in recommending, for consideration by the House, the assignment of quotas to foreign countries. The committee believes that the combined judgment of the Members of the Congress, informed on all factors relating to the national interest and to the foreign policy of the United States, is superior to any formula adopted by a small committee of employees of the executive departments.

THE NECESSITY OF A RESERVE

One of the basic functions of the Sugar Act is to assure price stability and adequate sugar supplies for consumers. This it has done, with remarkable success, over a 30-year period. Essential to the performance of these functions is the necessity of having readily available, on short notice, an adequate reserve of raw sugar.

Stability has been possible under the act because of the availability of ample sugar supplies close to the United States which can be delivered to the U.S. market within a very short period should domestic supplies become short and prices increase. The Sugar Act stipulates a target price which the Secretary of Agriculture is to maintain. He can maintain this price, if domestic supplies become short, only by bringing in sugar from offshore source on very short notice. Countries outside the Western Hemisphere, with a delivery time to the United States of 6 to 8 weeks, cannot be relied upon to provide the sugar we need in times of emergency or in times of unusual price increase.

The administration bill encourages all supplying countries to carry a reserve of 15 percent of their U.S. quota. But in the case of countries outside the Western Hemisphere and countries with relatively small quotas, this has very little meaning. The committee bill amends this provision to require that the four large Western Hemisphere suppliers carry a reserve of 30 percent of their U.S. quota (about 500,000 tons) until July 1 each year—by which time our annual sugar requirements are usually well established. They would be required to carry the 15-percent reserve for the remainder of the year.

FACTORS CONSIDERED BY COMMITTEE

Foreign quotas in the Sugar Act (for countries other than the Philippines) are expressed in percentages. The reason for this is that quotas for all the domestic areas (including Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands), and for the Philippines, are expressed in fixed tonnages. When the Secretary of Agriculture estimates and announces the total quantity of sugar which will be needed by U.S. consumers in a calendar year, the fixed tonnages for the areas mentioned come off the top, and foreign countries other than the Philippines share percentagewise in the remainder.

In working out the quotas in this bill, the committee started with the quotas in the 1962 act. No country except Cuba has received a smaller quota than it had in the 1962 act. Several countries not included in the 1962 act have been added because of their friendship for the United States, their strategic locations, their deliveries of sugar in the years 1962–65, and for other reasons.

Following are the factors which were considered by the committee in making adjustments in 1962 quotas and in allotting quotas to new countries:

1. Ability to supply the stipulated amount of sugar to the U.S. market.

2. Ability (particularly among the larger suppliers) to carry reserves of up to 30 percent to meet emergencies or increases in demand.

3. Ready availability of supply, with preference to Western Hemisphere producers, because of a delivery time of 2 to 3 weeks, compared to a delivery time of 6 to 8 weeks for other countries.

4. Stability of supply—including the element of stability of the local government.

5. The economic need of the country for a U.S. quota and the relative value of a quota to such country.

6. Purchase of, and potential market for, U.S. agricultural commodities, including the balance of trade relationship with the United States.

7. Reasons of national policy and strategy, including unusual military or strategic importance of the nation receiving a sugar quota.

8. Friendliness of the government and support of U.S. foreign policy—particularly in the U.N., and the OAS.

9. The record of performance in making deliveries to the United States in 1962, 1963, and 1964.

PROCEDURE

Following is the procedure which was used by the Committee on Agriculture in arriving at the foreign quotas set out in H.R. 11135.

1. Immediately following the public hearings on the sugar bill, there was an executive session at which the top sugar official of the Department of Agriculture went over with the committee the details of the bill. Also present were representatives of the domestic beet and cane industry to explain details of the bill as it applies to the domestic areas.

2. Following the discussion of the bill in executive session, the committee, as heretofore noted, voted overwhelmingly not to follow the foreign country allocations recommended by the Department of Agriculture but to develop a more equitable system of foreign country quotas based upon the interests of the United States and of the nations participating in our sugar market.

3. At the suggestion of various committee members, the chairman appointed a special subcommittee to consider the matter of foreign country quotas and make recommendations to the full committee. The subcommittee consisted of the chairman, three members of the majority, and three members of the minority, as follows: Mr. POAGE, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. PURCELL, Mr. DAGUE, Mr. TEAGUE of California, and Mrs. MAY. Mr. QUIE replaced Mrs. MAY when it was necessary for her to be absent on public business.

4. The subcommittee met first with Thomas C. Mann, Under Secretary of State, and another representative of the State Department and discussed at length the Department of Agriculture's quota recommendations and the foreign policy aspects of all the proposed foreign quotas. The State Department's recommendations with respect to each country were carefully considered by the subcommittee.

5. At its next two meetings, the subcommittee studied the various formulas which had been proposed, including that of the Department of Agriculture. It used for this purpose the tables on each formula which had been prepared for the committee by the Department of Agriculture.

6. The subcommittee concluded that no formula which had been proposed was adequate, and it determined that it would use as the basis of 1965 allotments the foreign quota allotments in the 1962 act with such modifications as might be appropriate.

7. At its next three meetings the subcommittee made adjustments in the 1962 quotas on the basis of the factors stated in the preceding section and in consideration of all these factors.

8. At its final meeting, the subcommittee unanimously approved the allotment of quotas which had been developed.

9. The Republican and Democratic members of the subcommittee then met separately with the minority and majority members of the full committee to discuss the proposed quotas. As the result of these meetings, two or three minor changes were made in the allotments. Democratic and Republican

members, in separate caucuses, approved the quotas.

10. The full committee met in executive session three times to consider the quotas. At each meeting each member of the committee was free to make any motion he cared to with respect to any country quota. Several such motions were made and several adjustments in quota were adopted.

11. Following the final markup session, a clean bill was introduced and this was approved by the full committee.

THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

The committee has tried to keep as much of the foreign sugar quota as possible in the Western Hemisphere, for four principal reasons:

1. Because of our traditional national policy of friendship for and assistance to Western Hemisphere countries.
2. Because of the ready availability of sugar in the Western Hemisphere and the short delivery time required to move that sugar to U.S. consumers.
3. Because virtually all the dollars earned through sales of sugar to the United States will be used to purchase exports from this country.
4. Because all of the foreign quotas now being reassigned is coming from a Western Hemisphere country (Cuba).

Under the 1962 act, only 4.77 percent of the foreign quota (other than that for the Philippines) was assigned to countries outside the Western Hemisphere. The bill submitted by the Department of Agriculture would have assigned 10.08 percent of the foreign quota (exclusive of the Philippines) to countries outside the Western Hemisphere.

The committee has added two Western Hemisphere provisions not contained in the administration bill:

1. The provision that the countries of the Central American Common Market will have an opportunity to fill their own deficits before these deficits are prorated to other countries.
2. A provision that any increase in the Cuban quota resulting from consumption exceeding 10 million tons in the United States will be distributed exclusively to quota countries which are members of the Organization of American States.

THE "BIG FOUR"

With Cuba no longer eligible to serve as the bottomless sugar bowl, ready at any time to meet unexpected or emergency demands of U.S. consumers, it seemed important to the committee that several other substantial sugar suppliers should assume Cuba's former role in this respect. It has, therefore, divided a substantial portion of the foreign quota among the four largest sugar producers of the Western Hemisphere (Mexico, the Dominican Republic, Brazil, and Peru) and expects each of these countries to carry a reserve of not less than 30 percent of its quota until July 1 of each year. Thereafter these countries, in common with others having sugar quotas, will be expected to maintain reserves of approximately 15 percent.

All four of these large producers appear to be well able to meet the quotas assigned to them but only three (Mexico, the Dominican Republic, and Brazil) have the potential to expand their production substantially, should this become desirable. Sugar production in Peru is at approximately the highest level it can be expected to attain and it is also reported that Peru may have some difficulty in maintaining the 30-percent reserve required by the bill.

In assigning quotas to these countries, the committee can see no reason why any one of the three largest (Mexico, the Dominican Republic, and Brazil) should have preference over the other and has, therefore, assigned to these countries quotas exactly equal in quantity. It has assigned a smaller quota to Peru for the reasons given.

Quotas for each of the countries named in H.R. 11135 were considered carefully and on their own merits and each represents the combined judgment of a majority of the 35-member Committee on Agriculture.

Harold D. Cooley,
W. R. Poage,
Thomas G. Abernethy,
Graham Purcell,
Paul B. Dague,
Charles M. Teague,
Albert H. Quie,
Catherine May,
Special Subcommittee on Sugar.

Mr. Chairman, we are bringing to the members of the Committee a bill which is merely our recommendations. You can take it or leave it. However, if you tear it to pieces, you will not have a bill. And, if we do not have a bill, the foreign countries will continue to ship their sugar in here, but their quotas will be decided by someone in the Department of Agriculture or the Department of State rather than the Committee on Agriculture, the House of Representatives—by the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the bill is fairly drawn. We have done the best job we could do.

Mr. Chairman, in talking about the evils of lobbying, I happened to notice one of the highest paid lobbyists was paid some $50,000 and he lost 50,000 tons, when comparing this bill with the administration bill. Again, that was a point where the committee worked its will, without regard to the lobbyists.

Mr. Chairman, when a Member of Congress cannot evaluate the testimony of lobbyists and the propaganda, he ought to quit and get out.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is a man on my committee that will yield to any improper influence. I believe every man on that committee is entirely scrupulous. All of these vicious insinuations and innuendoes and calling people bad names and casting reflections upon Members of Congress, those who write such articles do not intimidate us by the articles.

Mr. Chairman, that is where I want to leave that proposition.

Mr. Chairman, this city is filled with lobbyists. Of course, they can appear before the committees of the House. Ninety percent of the witnesses who testify before congressional committees are paid spokesmen for someone or some organization.

Someone observed the other day that if you outlawed lobbyists there would be a lot of vacant office space in the city of Washington.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that in the past 2 or 3 weeks every Member of Congress has seen some of the articles appearing in the press relating to the sugar bill. I am sure Members have wondered why stories telling the true facts and discrediting some of the unwarranted charges and insinuations which have been made in these articles have not also appeared in the press.

Let me assure the House that it is not because Members of the Committee, including myself, have made themselves unavailable to reporters or have failed to tell them the true story of how this sugar bill was developed by the committee.

It is singly and solely because that part of the press which seeks to make a sensation out of the sugar story is simply looking only for something that is salacious or scandalous.

I bring you an example.

Yesterday afternoon, in plenty of time for it to be used by morning papers, I released a statement giving the true facts in connection with some of the reckless and untrue statements which have been made. I assumed that some cognizance of this statement would appear in the morning paper. As far as I was able to ascertain, there was not one single line in the morning Washington paper about this statement which I made yesterday afternoon.

This has happened to my committee today. It may happen to your committee tomorrow. I believe very strongly in the freedom of the press, and I know its history and potential in advancing our democracy and our civilization. I am greviously disappointed and discouraged by the performance of some newspapers with respect to the legislation now before us.

I now think it will serve the cause of free information if I read to you the press release that was issued from the Committee on Agriculture yesterday afternoon and which had been completely ignored by the local press.

This press statement is as follows:

Cooley Deplores Untruth on Sugar Legislation

(For release on October 11, 1965)

Chairman Harold D. Cooley, of the House Committee on Agriculture, said today the sugar program of the United States "stands in danger of being destroyed by sensation-making columnists, by some persons seeking notoriety, and by others who should have the Congress abdicate its constitutional authority to set the sugar policy of the United States."

"If this should occur," he said, "it will hurt many people. It would destroy the domestic sugar industry.

"The sugar program of the United States, first established in 1934, is intended to do three things: (1) Make it possible, as a matter of national security, to produce a substantial portion of our sugar requirements within the continental United States and to do this without the consumer-penalizing device of a high protective tariff; (2) assure U.S. consumers of a plentiful and stable supply of sugar at reasonable prices; and (3) permit friendly foreign countries to participate equitably in supplying the U.S. sugar market for the double purpose of expanding international trade and assuring a nearby stable and adequate store of sugar.

"These major objectives have been achieved.

"Without the Sugar Act it is unlikely that a significant amount of sugar would be grown in the continental United States, since American producers would have to compete on the open world market with sugar produced with cheap tropical labor or under subsidy in other countries.

"But it seems some people would risk the destruction of the program, for their own selfish advantage. Some are going so far as to assail by implication the integrity of the Congress.

"In the process, I personally have been subjected to abuse and vilification.

"This apparently is the price I am paying for daring to take the position that the 435 Members of the House of Representatives and 100 Members of the Senate, in open debate—and not a half dozen downtown bureaucrats behind closed doors—should determine this country's policy for purchases of sugar abroad to meet our needs beyond our own domestic production."

Mr. COOLEY said he has no interest whatever in the pending sugar legislation "beyond my responsibility to all the people of the United States in my position as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture." He pointed out that no sugar is produced in his district in North Carolina, that there is no sugar refinery in his district, and "there is no trading or speculation in sugar among the people I represent in the Congress."

"However," he said, "the pending sugar bill is vitally important to sugarbeet producers, to sugarcane producers, to consumers, and to refiners and others located in other parts of the country. The domestic sugar producers desperately need this legislation, and I shall work with their Representatives in the Congress to bring about its passage."

"But I will say to the Members from sugar producing areas that all the misinformation and all the untruth that is being spread about the development of this legislation may prevent final action upon any sugar legislation at this session of the Congress. I personally will support no alternative or substitute legislation that will strip the Congress of its power to deal with the Nation's overall sugar policy and invest the making of this policy in a few bureaucrats in the executive departments.

"The abuse and vilification that has been pointed in my direction does not disturb me personally, but the misinformation and untruth must be set straight, not only to protect the sugar program but to guard the integrity of the Congress. It will be the responsibility of the Members of the House to do this when the debate on the Sugar Act extension opens tomorrow.

"Meanwhile, in this statement I shall point to some glaring examples of untruth.

"A columnist for the Washington Post who is nationally known for the inaccuracy of his statements alleged, for example, that I had phoned the Department repeatedly, sometimes threatening, sometimes cajoling, to urge it to give his favorite lobbyists what they wanted.

"I do not know where this columnist got his information, but this assertion is a direct misstatement of fact.

"I have never, at any time, either telephoned or talked in person to anyone in the Department of Agriculture about quotas for specific foreign countries. I never saw the foreign quotas proposed by the Department in its bill until that bill had been submitted by executive communication and was in print.

" 'When agriculture officials resisted his pressure,' the column goes on to say, 'he ignored their proposals and drafted a bill to suit the lobbyists.'

"I did not draft this bill. It was drafted and developed by the whole 35-member Committee on Agriculture and reported with only 2 dissenting votes. The details of its development will be discussed in full with the House tomorrow.

"Another misstatement is that I 'admitted lobbyists into a closed meeting to help the committee draft the bill.'

"This is another misstatement of fact. Never, at any time, did any lobbyists participate in a drafting session of the Committee on Agriculture on this bill.

"Domestic sugar interests drafted, and submitted to the Department of Agriculture, most of the bill which was adopted by the Department and sent up by executive communication as its own. It is a long and complicated bill. Therefore, it was reasonable that at the first executive session following open hearings on the bill, Mr. Phil Jones, of the United States Beet Sugar Association, and Mr. Irving Hoff, of the Cane Sugar Refiners Association, should be invited along with Mr. Thomas O. Murphy, director of the Department of Agriculture's sugar policy committee, to explain details of the bill to the committee and answer questions.

"Foreign quotas were not discussed at this session of the committee. No drafting whatever was done at this session. Its purpose was simply to give committee members fuller information about the details of the bill and permit them to ask any questions they might wish to ask.

"I repeat, never, at any time, was anyone other than a member of the Committee on Agriculture and its staff present at any session at which drafting on the sugar bill, or amendments thereto, took place.

"As is customary with this particular columnist, he took credit for revealing that the mysterious Bahamas quota would be filled, if at all, from sugar produced in a plant to be constructed by the Owens-Illinois Co.

"This was quite a revelation. It occurred several days after the vice president of the Owens-Illinois Co. appeared in open public session before the Committee on Agriculture, stated that his company hoped to replace a worked-out pulpwood operation with a sugarcane operation which would continue to offer employment to 500 or more natives of the Bahamas, and requested a small sugar quota in order to help assure the success of the venture.

'The statement was made in open session of the committee. Mimeographed copies were distributed to the press. And yet, this columnist, claims he revealed this mysterious situation many days later.

"Never at any time did a representative or lobbyist for a foreign country appear before our committee, except in open public hearings.

"Perhaps the greatest disservice this column does to American citizens, who depend on their daily newspapers for accurate information about national affairs, is the repeated statement and implication throughout the article that an allotment of 10,000 tons of sugar to the Bahamas will cost American taxpayers $1 million, or some other sum.

"The truth is that an allocation of 10,000 tons to the Bahamas will cost neither the taxpayer nor the consumer 1 red cent. The price of sugar in the United States is established by the Sugar Act. Over the years it has been a stable and a very reasonable price and U.S. consumers pay less for their sugar than consumers in virtually any other developed country of the world.

"The sugar program has not cost U.S. taxpayers anything. Collections from the program have paid the way of the program and left almost half a billion dollars of profit in the Treasury, not counting the income from a tariff of 62 cents per hundred pounds which is collected on all sugar that comes in from foreign sources except the Philippines.

"Nor would the allocation of 10,000 tons of sugar to the Bahamas cost consumers anything. Refiners would pay exactly the same price for the sugar they get whether it comes from the Bahamas, from Australia, from Puerto Rico, or from Louisiana."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am concerned as to what would happen in the event this bill is not passed. I have asked numerous members of the Committee on Agriculture what the situation would be and their answer is usually in more or less general terms, simply saying that we would have a chaotic situation.

I would hope that the gentleman might give us the alternative to this act.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman asks what would happen. In the first place, the domestic producers who are now burdened with a great abundance and surpluses of sugar could not sell their sugar.

Mr. WILLIAMS. For what reason?

Mr. COOLEY. They cannot sell it under existing law because they have no allocation covering their surpluses. They have exceeded their allocation and they have these surpluses. Under this bill they are given an additional 580,000 tons of sugar which we otherwise would acquire from some foreign source. Unless we pass the bill, sugar will not move freely into the marketplaces. These allotments will be made pursuant to the provisions in the bill. If this is defeated, then the only way we can bring foreign sugar in would be for some official downtown to set up quotas to suit himself, and no authority for domestic producers to sell their surplus.

Everybody in this House is affected by this. Every consumer that you represent is affected by this bill. All the industrial users, all the bottlers and bakers and candymakers in your district and in your State and my State who are the industrial users and who use most of the sugar that is consumed in this market are affected. So the bill is generally important to everybody in the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do I understand that without the passage of this bill, there would be no stability in the prices?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Nor would there be an assured supply?

Mr. COOLEY. There would not be an assured supply. Nor would there by any stability in the prices. Just as I pointed out here and the argument was made in our committee, when we had the global quota, sugar at retail went to 17 or 18 cents per pound.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do I understand, just to boil it down and express it in simple terms, that this bill provides more or less for a contract type of agreement to pay a specified price for a certain amount of sugar, with the guarantee that we will receive the sugar for that price?

Mr. COOLEY. That is it exactly. That is right.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. MAY. I certainly agree with the gentleman's explanation and the answer given to the gentleman in the previous colloquy, but I would like to put in correct context for the RECORD one statement that my distinguished chairman made when he explained that if we did not get this bill, we would have no right to sell this sugar which the beet growers and the cane growers, our American farmers, need to sell so desperately. He said that they exceeded their allocation. I would not like the implication or impression to be made on this record that this was the result of willful overplanting.

I want the RECORD to show that at the time those allocations were exceeded, it was because our cane and beet growers were doing this planting and growing at the request of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. I appreciate the observation of the gentlewoman and agree with what you have said.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LATTA. As I indicated earlier during my remarks on the rule, I want to commend the gentleman for permitting the Department of Agriculture to work its will on this legislation. Because it is now before the House and I think it represents the consensus of opinion of a great majority of the members of the Committee on Agriculture in not yielding to the lobbyists who wrote this bill downtown and the administration that sent it down here. I just want to say, I assume that now when the House acts on this bill favorably, which I hope it will, and that when this matter gets over to the other body, the good chairman, when this matter goes to conference, will stick by the position of the House. Is that a true statement?

Mr. COOLEY. I assure the gentleman that I will do so.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has consumed 21 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE].

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the sugar bill, H.R. 11135.

It has not been too often during my service as a member of the Committee on Agriculture that I have taken a position on agricultural legislation in accord with my chairman, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina. More often than not we disagree on farm bills, as was the case just last week on the omnibus farm bill.

Today, however, I join with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] in supporting this bill which is of such great importance to all Americans. Everyone is a sugar consumer. This law affects every sugar consumer. Thousands of people depend on the sugar industry for their livelihood. This law affects them. Every citizen is affected by foreign commerce and foreign policy. Yes, this law truly affects all Americans.

Let me say at the outset that H.R. 11135 is a committee bill and not any one Member's bill. It has undergone extensive public hearings at which each and every person interested in sugar legislation had an opportunity to present his case for the record. It was developed and perfected by the members of the committee, and it holds the overwhelming support of members of the committee from both sides of the aisle.

The debate on this bill will, I predict, show that it does have broad bipartisan support in this great body. It will no doubt show too that it has some bipartisan criticism.

Let me say also at the outset that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has been both forthright and fair in his handling of this bill. He has afforded all segments of the industry, each member of the committee, and the executive branch a fair opportunity to express their points of view; and I repeat, while more often than not I find myself in disagreement with him on matters of substance concerning agricultural policy, I can truthfully say that after 19 years on the Committee on Agriculture, I have come to know him as a fair and honorable gentleman.

H.R. 11135 is an extremely complex and highly technical piece of legislation. While I do not intend to go into all of its various details, I would like to point out that basically it is a 5-year extension and amendment of the Sugar Act.

The bill itself reflects the agreement of the U.S. sugar industry, the recommendations of the administration, and the independent action of the Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 11135 is, with very slight change, the administration's sugar bill on every major point except for the assignment of foreign country quotas.

On this question, the assignment of country quotas, the committee has exercised its independent, collective judgment.

The difference between the administration bill and the committee bill on this point comes down to a difference in the basis used for determining the size of each country's quota.

The administration used a mathematical formula based on the years 1963 and 1964, adjusted for certain exceptions. The committee bill used the statutory basis in the 1962 Sugar Act, either increasing or leaving at the same level every country quota assigned under that law.

Obviously, when one uses a different basis, a different result will occur. If the choice were mine alone to make, I do not believe I would have approved the country-by-country quotas on exactly the same basis as H.R. 11135. Nor would, I imagine, any of the 35 members of the committee or the 435 Members of this body make the exact same decisions.

The fact is that each member of the committee had a full opportunity to suggest any changes he felt were desirable and to ask for a rollcall vote to see if his colleagues agreed. In some instances this was done. In some cases I was on the prevailing side; in others the position I supported did not prevail.

But that, in essence, is the legislative process. No member of this body can have what he exclusively desires in legislation. In the case of this bill, no Member can say this is exactly how he wanted it.

Let us remember that throughout this discussion we are talking about how the foreign sugar quotas are distributed. Under both the administration bill and under the committee bill the same amount of sugar—about 4 million tons annually—was available for foreign quota assignment.

When everything is said and done, the question comes down to this: Which method for distributing these quotas is best?

Some may say the administration formula is best. Others may say that country X should have 10,000 more tons and country Y should have 15,000 tons less.

The Committee on Agriculture has done its best to distribute these quotas in a fair and sensible manner. H.R. 11135 represents that collective effort. Frankly, I feel that any responsible criticism of the distribution of foreign quotas made by H.R. 11135 should be accompanied by a suggestion and a justification for distributing these quotas in a different manner.

In other words, if anyone in this body is displeased that country X got too large a quota and suggests that it should be cut 10,000 tons, he should be prepared to justify why one or more other nations should be reduced by an equal amount.

I think that the Members of the House will agree that this is a most difficult assignment, and if they believe they can do a better job, I urge them to volunteer for service on the Committee on Agriculture.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 11135 is legislation which is badly needed this year by the domestic sugar industry, especially the beet and cane producers. It is a bill which has broad bipartisan support from the Committee on Agriculture.

It is a bill which has been handled fairly and forthrightly by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

It is a bill which represents the independent, collective judgment of the third largest committee of the House.

Finally, it is a bill which I intend to support unless someone is able to develop a better formula than that adopted by the committee.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, it has often been said that Denver, Colo., is the sugar capital of the United States—and certainly it is the headquarters for two of the largest beet sugar companies in the United States. My State of Colorado is, in fact, headquarters for four beet sugar companies, and together they produce almost exactly one-half of all the beet sugar in the entire United States.

And so you see, Mr. Chairman, that the welfare of the domestic beet sugar industry is of tremendous importance not only to my own district in Colorado, which is principally the city of Denver, but also to the entire State. Sugarbeets are a major cash crop in Colorado, and the State is, indeed, the second largest producer of beet sugar in all the Nation.

Therefore this sugar bill is of particular importance to my State, and of particular interest to me.

I wish to associate myself, Mr. Chairman, with my colleagues who have pointed out that although we recognize serious complications in the foreign provisions of this bill we should not forget that the domestic provisions, particularly the domestic quota provisions, are of tremendous importance to American producers. While we should recognize that the foreign provisions do have a bearing on our foreign policy, we should not penalize our own domestic producers by failing to pass this bill.

The domestic quota provisions would increase the marketing rights, above the rights now in the present law, for the domestic beet sugar producers and the mainland cane sugar producers, for a few years. This increase is being provided so the producers in these two areas will be able to work off in the marketplace, in an orderly manner, excess sugar that they now have on hand and are forbidden to market under the present law.

Now it is important, Mr. Chairman, that we recognize that this excess sugar, that they now have on hand, was produced not irresponsibly, but was produced in direct response to urgent pleas of the U.S. Government that it be produced. We were in a period of crisis on sugar, and the Government turned to our own domestic producers and urged them to increase their processing capacities, and to plant more acreage, and to produce all they could produce.

Well, our producers responded by planting more acres and expanding their processing plant capacity, and producing more sugar. Some of that extra sugar they were able to market, and it was a large and perhaps deciding factor in bringing the sugar situation under control in 1963.

But now our beet sugar companies are carrying in storage, at their own expense, huge quantities of extra sugar, produced in response to the pleas of the Government, which they cannot market unless we—in the Congress—give them the authority to market it.

Mr. Chairman, we would be doing a disservice to the American sugar farmer if we fail to provide that authority, which is in this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. RONCALIO].

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, the passage of this bill, H.R. 11135, is of unusual importance to the people and to the economy of the great State of Wyoming—which is my district—because of the features that pertain to the domestic sugar industry.

Mr. Chairman, the Government called upon the beet sugar industry to increase its production a short while ago—in 1963—in order to meet a sugar emergency that resulted when certain foreign sugar interests that have access to this market were not filling their obligations here. In Wyoming, the sugarbeet growers and the companies heard the pleas of the Government and increased their sugar production in 1963 some 42 percent over 1962, an increase of nearly 700,000 hundredweight of refined sugar, with the resulting increase in capital expenditures for equipment, for machinery, and for other obligations on the part of the farmers in my State.

The production of the beet sugar industry, the response of our farmers and our beet sugar companies to the urging of the Government, has been repeatedly acknowledged as a significant factor in quelling the sugar storm of 1963, and halting the climb in sugar prices which so disturbed the whole country. The Congress now has the opportunity to do something truly beneficial to the consumer and to the industry—we in this House now have the opportunity to increase the beet sugar marketing quota, as provided in this bill, and let the industry sell, over a period of years, the excess inventories which have been built up because of the Government-requested production.

The alternative to permitting the beet sugar industry to market more sugar over the next few years is to curtail production even more drastically than it is being cut back now. In Wyoming, sugarbeet growers were required to take a 13-percent cut in acreage this year, and a further reduction of magnitude will be required next year unless this bill is passed. Some reduction may be necessary next year even with the marketing permitted under this bill, but the cut would be prohibitive and severely damaging not only to the sugarbeet growers, but also to the State's entire economy, if production had to be curtailed immediately to the marketing level authorized by the present Sugar Act.

Mr. Chairman, you have only to visit the irrigated valleys of Wyoming at this time of year, during the sugarbeet harvest, to get some inkling of the tremendous importance of this crop to our economy. You see the seemingly endless parade of trucks coming from the farms to the beet sugar factories or the outlying receiving stations. You see long, long trainloads of beets. In the towns in the beet-growing areas, and especially in the factory towns—Torrington, Worland, and Lovell—there is an atmosphere of bustle and "busyness" that you see at no other time of year. And when you talk to the merchants and to the bankers, you learn that the sugarbeet not only makes "busyness"—it makes more business throughout the community.

When this industry is strengthened, the benefits flow throughout the State. When it is curtailed, the deleterious effects are felt throughout the State. I have read the Sugar Act Amendments of 1965 and the report accompanying that bill. I have paid particular attention, Mr. Chairman, to the minority views and to the opposing views. I have heard with some sympathy the presentations of other Members of the 89th Congress in urging opposition views. But I cannot help but feel that the best interests of the American consumer and of the people of the United States would be served by the enactment of this bill without amendments of any kind.

Sugarbeets are tremendously important to us in Wyoming, Mr. Chairman, and beet sugar is tremendously important to the Nation. Because of the beet sugar quota provisions of this bill, I urge my colleagues to consider it favorably.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TUNNEY].

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would at this time clarify the intent of certain language contained in H.R. 11135.

An amendment to H.R. 11135 was adopted by the House Agriculture Committee which provides for the production of sugar from sugarcane in new areas of the country. This amendment is contained in section 5 of H.R. 11135 which amends section 205 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; and also in section 10, paragraph (B) of H.R. 11135, which amends section 302 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

The gentleman from California, Congressman HARLAN HAGEN, introduced the amendment before the Agriculture Committee at my request. The language of the amendment was drafted by me with the assistance and concurrence of Congressman HAGEN.

The amendment provides for the growth and expansion of the mainland sugarcane industry in States other than Florida and Louisiana. The amendment would give a sugarcane quota to a "sugarcane processing facility or mill which begins operation for the first time after calendar year 1966." I would like to have the intent of the language clarified to insure that an established sugarbeet processing plant, which will be converted to begin operations to process sugar from sugarcane after calendar year 1966, be considered a "sugarcane processing facility or mill which begins operation for the first time after the calendar year 1966," for the purpose of obtaining a sugarcane quota under H.R. 11135. This was the original intent that Congressman HAGEN and I had at the time we drafted the amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with my friend that his interpretation is accurate and that is exactly what the Committee intended to do.

Mr. TUNNEY. As I stated, the amendment adopted by the committee would make it possible for sugarcane to be grown in areas outside of Louisiana and Florida, the two States for which the production of sugarcane is now reserved.

If the Secretary of Agriculture grants increased quotas for sugarcane as a result of increased national consumption, Florida and Louisiana would be the only two States eligible to participate in the increased quotas. In 1962, the Sugar Act was amended to allow new areas and additional States to participate in increased quotas for sugar produced from beets. The same privilege, however, was not extended to produce sugar from cane. The amendment in H.R. 11135 would make it possible to produce cane sugar outside of Florida and Louisiana.

I would like to make it clear than the purpose of this amendment is not to take any portion of the extant sugarcane quota from Florida or Louisiana. It merely gives other areas a chance to produce cane sugar if there is to be a future increase in cane quotas. It is the intention of this amendment to allow new areas to receive a share of the reserve which would be created by the increase of population which would go into effect only after the yearly sugar consumption of the United States reaches 10,400,000 tons of raw value sugar.

The west coast, and particularly southern California, is experiencing a tremendous population growth, and it can be reasonably assumed that a ready market would exist for any additional sugar that could be produced. According to the Census Bureau, the rate of population increase for a 5-year period is 23.5 percent for Arizona, 11.2 percent for Utah, 54.2 for Nevada, and 18.4 percent for California.

Farmers in the Imperial Valley have been forced to seek new crops. The production of flax for seed was, until just a few years ago, one of our major crops. Synthetic ingredients in paints have replaced the linseed oil, and the demand for this oil has dropped to a very small percentage of what it was just 10 years ago. Imperial County is well suited for the growing of sugarcane and this amendment will open up a new industry in the area. For more than 12 years a group of farmers from my area have carried out research on the planting of sugarcane for the production of sugar. These farmers believe that they now can grow sugarcane efficiently and profitably.

The Holly Sugar Corp. has a mill in Imperial Valley for the production of sugar from sugarbeets. This corporation is also interested in commercial production of sugar from cane to the extent that they are now participating in the experimental phase of the program. This mill can be adapted to processing of cane.

I want to thank the members of the Agricultural Committee for adopting this amendment and hope that the Members of the House will support the bill as amended.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK].

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a lot of question about who wrote this bill and the motives for writing it. Our distinguished chairman seemed to be very perturbed about the things that have been said about this bill. I do not know why the chairman feels that way. I pointed out in the committee on this quota for Owens-Illinois—I call it a quota for Owens-Illinois because under the terms of the arrangement, as I understand, not one single pound of sugar can be grown by anybody in the Bahama Islands but Owens-Illinois.

Again the point is made that it is only 10,000 tons out of 10 million, but there were any number of people who were interested in these 10,000 tons. I remember the country of Swaziland wanted 9,000 tons so that they could fill up a shipload and, if I recall correctly, they did not get it.

I would like to point out once again that this is a 5-year bill and based on today's figures we are talking about $2 billion.

I would like to point out again that this is not an administration bill; that, for example, the administration bill recommended for Argentina 63,000 tons, and the committee bill gives Argentina 21,000 tons. Argentina is the only country that did not have a lobbyist working for it.

For Haiti the administration bill recommended 18,000 tons. The committee bill carries 28,000 tons. That is 28,000 tons of sugar to the worst dictatorship in the Western Hemisphere, if not in the entire world.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it has been said that this sugar bill represents a part of our foreign aid commitments. If it is part of our foreign aid commitment, certainly countries like Australia, South Africa, Venezuela, and the French West Indies do not belong in this list.

If it is a foreign aid bill, then these quotas should be set by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs or by the State Department. The Committee on Agriculture certainly should not dabble in foreign aid. Surely this is an area for the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

For example, Mr. Chairman, the Irish quota—and I tell the members of the committee this in order to show how arbitrary rules were set up and were not set up—the same 10,000 tons of sugar that was set up for the Bahamas, the Irish quota was in there since 1962, but it has been very effectively cut out, because they wanted to make sure that Ireland did not get in on this particular item.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RESNICK. I would be very happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. LENNON. The gentleman from New York is a member of the House Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. RESNICK. That is correct.

Mr. LENNON. The gentleman, at least by inference, is trying to point out that some members of the committee were influenced by lobbyists. Are you directing your accusations at the chairman of the committee or the full committee of which you are a member?

Mr. RESNICK. I am not directing any accusation at any member of the committee. I am just pointing to the results. I would not want to accuse any member of the committee or any Member of this House as being affected by lobbyists. But I would like to point out if I may that I intend to vote against the Findley amendment on lobbyists.

Mr. LENNON. If the gentleman will yield further, is not the gentleman suggesting to the American public through his appearance in the well of the House today that the great Committee on Agriculture was to an appreciable degree influenced by lobbyists of these Latin and South American countries? Does not the gentleman recognize that? Does not the gentleman recognize that is what he is doing?

Mr. RESNICK. No, I would not say that. I am just pointing out what has happened. The conclusions have to be drawn by the Members of the House.

Mr. LENNON. Was that by a majority vote of the members of the House Agriculture Committee that these allotments or quotas were set on these foreign countries?

Mr. RESNICK. These allotments were changed from day to day and hour to hour. If the gentleman really wants to know——

Mr. LENNON. Was it not the will of the majority of the committee which has the legislative responsibility——

Mr. RESNICK. That is correct.

Mr. LENNON (continuing). To make this determination?

Mr. RESNICK. That is correct.

Mr. LENNON. What is the gentleman complaining about, then?

Mr. RESNICK. I am not complaining. I am just bringing some facts out in the open. I am not complaining. As a matter of fact one of the Members used that same word, "complaining." We are discussing this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes. I wonder if he will yield to me for a question? However, I do not want to interrupt the line of questioning by the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I believe the gentleman's name was mentioned in an article or a syndicated column that was written recently and appeared in a substantial number of the great newspapers of our country in which he was referred to as the very brave and capable member of the committee; is that not true?

Mr. RESNICK. That is true.

Mr. LENNON. And would the gentleman tell us who wrote that story?

Mr. RESNICK. Who wrote it?

Mr. LENNON. Yes.

Mr. RESNICK. It came out in the Drew Pearson column.

Mr. LENNON. In the Drew Pearson column? And what was the gentleman, Drew Pearson, called by President Truman?

Mr. RESNICK. I do not believe that question is relevant.

Mr. LENNON. How did Mr. Drew Pearson know that our distinguished friend, a member of this great committee, the gentleman from New York, was so brave and so courageous and so intelligent and so articulate and so eloquent?

Mr. RESNICK. I think I have yielded the floor enough on this. I do not believe that has anything to do with the issue. But I will point out that my views are stated in the minority report. If the gentleman will read the minority report.

Mr. LENNON. I have read the minority report and I violently disagree with it.

Mr. RESNICK. That was my amendment that I offered and I also offered it in the Committee on Rules and I believe the report would contain the information.

Mr. LENNON. I regret that the gentleman attempts to attack the integrity of the committee of which he is a member.

Mr. RESNICK. I am not attacking the integrity of the committee. I am questioning its judgment which I think is our job here, to question their judgment on any bill that comes up here.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RESNICK. I yield to the gentleman, my distinguished vice chairman.

Mr. POAGE. Reference has been made to the allocation of 10,000 tons to the Bahamas as being an allocation to the Owens-Illinois Co. and the charge has been made that it was not made to the Government. The bill reads on page 5, and I think this is the only place in the bill where it is mentioned: "for the Bahama Islands, in the amount of 10,000 short tons, raw value, of sugar:"

The words "Owens-Illinois Glass Co." are not in the bill so far as I can find but the words "Bahama Islands" are in the bill. It does seem to me, there is a rather unfair implication to say that the committee gave a quota to anybody other than a foreign country and to suggest that a quota was given to an American company rather than to a country is, as I see it, completely unwarranted.

I believe when the gentleman offered his amendment to cut out the Bahama Islands—not to cut out the Owens-Illinois Glass Co. but to cut out the Bahama Islands from a quota—the committee voted by a rollcall vote of 21 to 11 not to do so. I do not think that that indicates there was some secret group that got together and conspired in some way. Does the gentleman mean to imply that there is some kind of a conspiracy here to help some individual company?

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. RESNICK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. I wish the gentleman would answer my question.

Mr. VANIK. It seems to me as an observer here that the words "conspiracy and implication" seem to be brought to the attention of the House by other members of the committee. I think the gentleman has a perfectly fair and legitimate complaint about this bill. He has not said anything about any Member of the House. He has not said anything about the action of the committee other than he disagrees with it.

I think it is too bad that the time has come here that a Member of the House cannot have a legitimate complaint about a bill without having the time extended to him so that he can be abused by other Members of the House. I think the gentleman has a perfect right to do what he is doing. I agree with him. There are many others who agree with him. There are some 80 Members of this House who disagreed on the rule under which the House is limited as to what kind of a bill can come out of this committee. I felt along with others that under the rule a good bill could not possibly be passed by this House. That is why I took the position I did on the rule. I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick]. I think he is doing this House a great service and I think he is doing it in the proper way and again I commend him for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. RESNICK. Would the gentleman yield me some more time?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman and I hope the gentleman answers the question that I asked before he answers any other questions.

Mr. RESNICK. Yes, I would like to answer that question because as I said in the committee, and I hope I made it perfectly clear, I never accused anybody of being in a conspiracy and never made any innuendos or anything else about anybody. It seems to me "the lady doth protest too much" about this whole thing. All I have said is this. These 10,000 tons were requested by any number of other countries. The Bahamas were picked out—the only country that was permitted to go into the sugar business when we have this worldwide sugar glut. The answer here, I think, is simply this.

As I understand it, the Owens-Illinois Co. has an exclusive arrangement with the Bahamian Government and therefore no Bahamian national will be able to grow one acre of sugar. I understand that the Owens-Illinois Co. also has an internal monopoly on 8,000 tons to grow for the Bahama Islands. So we are in the position of turning back the clock on land reform. Here we are asking the South American countries to reform their land holdings and we are saying to Owens-Illinois Co., "You go down into the Bahamas and you can start up as a latter-day United Fruit Co."

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. RESNICK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman has suggested, I believe, that the Bahamas were the only country which was granted a quota to begin to produce. I believe there was granted to the British Honduras something in excess of what we granted to the Bahamas. I believe it is equally true that there is no sugar mill in the British Honduras at the present time. But this grant of a quota would enable that country to go into the sugar business just as the bill authorizes the Bahamas to produce and sell sugar. I believe it is correct, as our chairman has stated, that had this grant not been made to the Bahamas, it would be the only sugar exporting country in the Western Hemisphere that did not have an American quota, and yet Bahama is, with the single exception of Mexico, closer to the United States than any other sugar-producing country. If these people lose their only source of employment do you think they wil stay there and starve or will they take advantage of the new Immigration Act, which I believe the gentleman supported, and move 90 miles to the U.S. mainland and draw U.S. relief. After all what is wrong from our viewpoint with giving a quota where it will help the United States?

Mr. RESNICK. I should like to remind my distinguished colleague that when I spoke to the man from Owens-Illinois, he told me he was not going into the sugar business unless he got the quota. So, as we say in poker, he was "checking a cinch." In other words, he wants the quota first; then he will go into the sugar business.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RESNICK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STALBAUM. Is it not true that in the past, sugar has been grown in the British Honduras?

Mr. RESNICK. That is my understanding.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York 1 additional minute.

Mr. RESNICK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STALBAUM. Is it not true that in British Honduras sugar has been grown in the past, and the point on the Bahamas quota is the fact that they have never grown a stick of sugar cane, at least in modern times, and therefore any quota which may have been established for the British Honduras—and I am not too keen about when either—had some historical justification, whereas there appears to be no historical justification for the quota for the Bahamas?

Mr. RESNICK. That is correct.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RESNICK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Is there any other agricultural industry, outside of sugar, that enjoys the benefit of the tax that we put on every pound of sugar that is consumed in the United States, in addition to the quota provisions? Is there any other agricultural crop that enjoys this benefit?

Mr. RESNICK. I do not believe there is any.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RESNICK. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I believe that the sugar industry is about the only industry that does pay the tax.

Mr. VANIK. Who pays the tax? The U.S. consumer.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RESNICK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. To answer the gentleman's question, wool and bread.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashley].

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture and, quite honestly, I arise at this time mainly because some discussion has focused on a corporation located in my district which I do not believe has been accurate.

The Owens-Illinois Corp. is a major corporation with major plants in scores of States producing jobs for tens of thousands of our citizens. In all truth, this is a corporation that for many years has made a very substantial contribution to our economy and to the industrial technology which means so much to both the security and welfare of our country.

The separate views contained in the report on H.R. 11135 attack the 10,000-ton sugar quota that has been allotted for the Bahama Islands on the basis that this is actually a quota for the Owens-Illinois Co., which will serve neither the interests of the U.S. Government, the sugar industry, nor the people of the Bahamas.

It is said that inasmuch as the Bahamas do not presently enjoy a sugar quota, and since sugar is in oversupply, there can be no useful purpose in deliberately encouraging more production—that by doing so we deprive other countries of their proportionate share of the American market.

I respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, that no country has a "right" to a "proportionate share of the American market." One purpose served by congressional review of the sugar program is to weigh current consideration in light of changing national interests and to adjust sugar quotas—and grant new ones—if our national interest so requires.

It is undoubtedly true, as stated in the separate views, that there is already intense competition for the American market. But this hardly seems a logical or legitimate reason for refusing to consider new quota applicants whose interests may well be closer to our own than countries presently enjoying a favorable quota position.

Certainly it cannot be denied that a quota for the Bahamas would result in a close-by, dependable, low-cost source of sugar and would support a friendly, nearby, stable government.

It is also said that this quota would not serve the interests of the people of the Bahamas. This simply is not so, Mr. Chairman.

The fact is that the Bahamas are an undeveloped area badly in need of the kind of capital investment that provides expanding employment opportunity. Owens-Illinois in recent years has been engaged in a pulpwood operation in the Bahamas which in less than a decade has provided a viable base for an economy which before was primitive and almost completely lacking in job opportunities. Because the pulpwood operation will terminate in 1967 until a new crop of pulpwood reaches cutting size—almost 25 years—Owens-Illinois has explored the possibility of shifting its Bahamas operation to sugar production. No one contends that they seek to do this on a philanthropic basis; they intend the operation to be profitable, just as any other corporation would. However, the further fact does remain that the proposed quota would be granted to the Bahamas—not Owens-Illinois—and that the government of the Bahamas would be in a position to set terms and conditions with Owens-Illinois or any other interested producer. Contrary to implications contained in the separate views, plans to undertake sugar production have been supported enthusiastically by the Bahamian Government—so much that it has agreed to make available some 45,000 acres of land once the project is assured.

On balance, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the interests both of the United States and the people of the Bahamas may well be served by inclusion in the bill before us of the 10,000-ton quota in question. I find no evidence whatever that Owens-Illinois has acted other than honestly and for objectives which would do credit to any enlightened corporation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and one Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-four Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 364]

Abbitt
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Annunzio
Arends
Aspinall
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolling
Bolton
Bonner
Brock
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Carter
Cederberg
Chelf
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Clevenger
Collier
Conte
Craley
Culver
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dulski
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Farnum
Flood
Foley
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Green, Oreg.
Grider
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Hanna
Hardy
Harris
Harsha
Hays
Hébert
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Hosmer
Howard
Jacobs
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
Madden
Marsh
Mathias
Michel
Minish
Morrison
Morton
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
Olson, Minn.
Patman
Philbin
Pool
Powell
Purcell
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rodino
Satterfield
St Germain
Saylor
Smith, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Vivian
Walker, Miss.
White, Idaho
Whitten
Wyatt

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker, having resumed the chair, Mr. BURKE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, H.R. 11135, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 318 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] is recognized for 9 minutes.

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CALLAN. Will the gentlewoman tell the committee how the foreign allocations were made by the Committee on Agriculture?

Mrs. MAY. First, I should like to point out to the Members of the House that there is a committee report just released today by the ad hoc sugar committee, of which I was a member, which explains in quite some detail the formula on which we worked to reach the various allocations for the foreign countries. It is not a lengthy document, and it should throw factual light, rather conjectural heat, on how we arrived at these foreign quotas. I urge the Members of the House to read that report. The report shows the procedures by which we arrived at the quota allocations to foreign countries. This then became a part of the recommendation that was made to the Committee on Agriculture as a whole and was voted upon.

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield further?

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CALLAN. Is it not true there were four Members of the majority and four Members of the minority on that committee?

Mrs. MAY. Yes. Their names, including my own, are found on page 8 of the report.

Mr. CALLAN. Is it not true that you made the recommendations and then came back with these recommendations to the Committee on Agriculture?

Mrs. MAY. That is correct.

Mr. CALLAN. And these recommendations were adopted?

Mrs. MAY. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, before I was so pleasantly interrupted by the quorum call I was trying to make the point that I should like to caution the critics of that section that in their zeal to clean up whatever soil—real or imagined—they may feel is now on the fair name of this House—I should like to caution the critics, Mr. Chairman, that in this zeal do they not destroy a sound and workable program, the sugar program, a program which for more than 30 years has served the Nation well.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, in our pique let us not throw out the baby with the bath water.

I have heard the suggestion made, Mr. Chairman, that the quota system for sugar be abandoned, and that a high tariff be substituted. May I remind my colleagues that the quota system for sugar was evolved after nearly 150 years of experience with the tariff as the primary and usually the sole instrument for effecting national sugar policy had demonstrated that the tariff alone would not do the job of implementing a sound national sugar policy.

We have had experience with sugar tariffs from the beginning of our existence as a nation. The second law passed by the first Congress under the Constitution—the second law passed during the first term of George Washington—was a law to raise revenue for the new Nation, a tariff law which included a tariff on sugar.

The rate on brown sugars incidentally, was 1 cent a pound, while on loaf sugars the rate was 3 cents a pound. The sugar loaf was the form in which most household sugar was sold in those days, I understand, and so the higher rate on loaf sugar, in addition to providing income for the young Government, also provided protection for the small cane sugar refining industry which existed in New York at that time. We had no sugar producers when our Nation was born, and the sugar tariff was already on the books when the first sugar producers came under the American flag through the Louisiana Purchase in 1803.

A hundred and thirty years later the sugar situation of the United States was vastly more complex, and it was obvious that that tariff alone was not implementing an effective national sugar policy. By that time, sugar producers in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines—as well as on the continental United States—were under the American flag. Moreover, there were substantial American interests in Cuba, which, because of a preferential tariff and low labor costs, had captured a large part of the American sugar market. And the entire sugar industry, foreign as well as domestic, was on the verge of bankruptcy.

That was the situation when the U.S. Tariff Commission, in April 1933, pointed out that something in addition to a tariff was needed, and proposed that a system of marketing quotas be developed. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that it is significant that the initial suggestion that sparked the development of our present quota system for sugar came from the Tariff Commission itself.

In the law that the Congress later enacted, the Congress determined that our Nation's sugar policy should have several goals, not just a single goal. One of the objectives, the Congress decided, should be to assure American consumers an adequate supply of sugar at reasonable prices. Another goal should be to help provide an economic climate for a healthy and competitive domestic sugar industry. A third goal, the Congress decided, should be to encourage an export trade.

Mr. Chairman, through the years, for more than 30 years the sugar quota system has been in existence, this legislation has achieved at least two of its three intended goals to a remarkable extent. I fervently wish, Mr. Chairman, that all the other laws we enact in this Chamber achieved their high purposes to the degree that the Sugar Act has, in its various amendments, for nearly a third of a century.

Let us look at the first goal, for example—assuring adequate supplies of sugar for American consumers at reasonable prices:

In contrast to the decades before the first Sugar Quota Act was passed, decades during which consumers alternately faced sugar shortages with sky-high prices and oversupply with cheap prices, American sugar consumers for more than 30 years have been assured of ample supplies at prices that are not only stable but that are reasonable by any fair standard of measurement.

In this respect let me point out, Mr. Chairman, that using prices on the so-called world market as a standard for measuring sugar prices in the United States, or in any other country, is patently unfair. The so-called world market is not a true world market in any sense of the word—it does not reflect prices all over the world—it is a thin, residual market, on which only 10 to 15 percent of the world's sugar is traded. It is homeless sugar, which has no other place to go. Nearly all the world's sugar trade—production as well as marketing—is regulated by national sugar systems, or by special arrangements between nations. For example, there is the British Commonwealth system, and there is the French colonial system, among others. In addition, there are bilateral arrangements between some nations. The only sugar traded on the so-called world market is the residual production, the sugar that is not consumed in its country of production, that is not traded within the Commonwealth, the French, the United States, and other large national systems, and sugar that is not covered by some other arrangement between or among nations. Since sugar in the world is usually in surplus, the residual, homeless sugar consequently is usually sold at depressed prices—often below the actual cost of production.

Anyone who presents the so-called world market price as a standard for measuring U.S. prices, or who implies that everyone else in the world buys at the depressed, so-called world price, while we, alone, pay a higher price, is either displaying his abysmal ignorance of the true world sugar situation, Mr. Chairman, or is deliberately attempting to deceive his audience—whether his audience is the public at large, or the Members of this House.

Mr. Chairman, the only true and honest way to obtain an idea of whether sugar prices in the United States are reasonable and fair is to compare the prices paid by our consumers with the prices paid by consumers in other nations. Such a comparison shows conclusively that in terms of cents per pound, the price of sugar to U.S. consumers is near—sometimes below—the average of prices paid by consumers in other nations. For example, a United Nations survey made a few years ago showed that the price of sugar in the United States was no more than the average of the sugar prices in 121 nations around the world. In fact, consumers in the United States, under the Sugar Act, usually pay less per pound for sugar than do consumers in many other countries. Recently, for example, a spot check was made of average sugar prices on January 1 of this year in representative countries, and the check showed that on that date the average retail price for a pound of sugar in the United States was 11.62 cents; in France, 12.6 cents; in Italy, 16 cents; in Japan, 14.2 cents; in the United Kingdom, 11.1 cents; in West Germany, 14 cents; in Sweden, 15 cents; in Yugoslavia, 13.3 cents, and so on.

As measured in terms of wages—that is to say, the amount of time a workman must labor, at average wage rates, in order to buy a pound of sugar—the price of sugar in the United States is the lowest in the world; for nowhere else does the average worker need to work fewer minutes at his lathe or workbench to earn the price of a pound of sugar.

CANADA

It has been pointed out that the price of sugar in Canada is lower than in the United States. This is true because Canadian sugar prices are permitted to reflect the world prices of sugar. In making this comparison, however, it should be remembered that there is a significant difference between the Canadian and United States sugar programs.

In Canada domestic sugar beet producers account annually for some 150,000 short tons of sugar, which represents about 20 percent of Canadian consumption. The balance is supplied by imports which are governed by world price conditions. Canada protects its own growers by means of deficiency payments designed "to relate the assistance to beet producers directly to fluctuations in world prices, thus protecting the industry against price uncertainties on the world market." The result of the substantial influence of world prices is that sugar prices in Canada vary much more sharply than in the United States. This price behavior is illustrated in the attached table which compares Canadian wholesale prices, Montreal, with the wholesale price of cane sugar in the Northeast United States.

The table shows that from May 1963 through February 1964 the Canadian price was more than double the average for 1962 and at times was 4 to 5 cents per pound higher than the U.S. price. At the same time the price in the United States remained comparatively stable.

In essence, the difference between the two systems is this: the United States considers price stability a primary objective while Canada, with the need to protect a domestic sugar source supplying only 20 percent of its needs, allows its main sugar supply to follow the fluctuations of world prices which are at times substantial.

The Canadian system is quite unsuitable to the United States and, in fact, could be very dangerous. Two-thirds of American sugar consumption is accounted for by industrial users organized in a complex system which would find a lack of stable prices injurious and uneconomical. It would be virtually impossible to maintain complicated manufacturing schedules which contemplate advance pricing of finished goods and sales methods involving extensive advertising.

As the largest buyer of sugar in the world, the United States places a premium on assurances of supply and accompanying price stability. Price is the principal means of support of the American sugar producing industry since direct payment to growers is a small proportion of the total cost of production. Canada's system permits her to take advantage of the current low dumping world price of sugar, even increasing imports of Cuban sugar from about 40,000 metric tons in 1961 to 67,000 metric tons in 1963. However, Canada does this at the risk of a highly fluctuating internal domestic price, a risk which the United States has not taken in the past and should not run in the future.

Canadian and United States refined wholesale sugar prices compared by months, 1962–65

Year and month	Wholesale granulated,[1] standard Montreal, 100-pound bag	Refined cane[2] sugar, wholesale, Northeast
1962		
January	6.55	9.37
February	6.60	9.50
March	6.85	9.50
April	7.00	9.60
May	7.10	9.60
June	7.10	9.60
July	7.20	9.60
August	7.30	9.62
September	7.30	9.70
October	7.30	9.70
November	8.40	9.70
December	8.40	9.72
Average	7.20	9.60
1963		
January	10.00	9.99
February	10.60	10.05
March	10.95	10.16
April	12.30	10.98
May	15.15	14.09
June	15.90	14.15
July	14.60	13.03
August	11.85	11.42
September	12.30	10.76
October	16.60	12.34
November	18.65	13.43
December	16.15	12.95
Average	13.75	11.94
1964		
January	17.10	13.06
February	15.10	12.63
March	12.75	11.85
April	13.15	11.30
May	13.05	10.78
June	10.15	10.01
July	9.80	9.85
August	9.40	9.95
September	8.20	9.67
October	8.20	9.60
November	8.20	9.60
December	7.45	9.83
Average	11.02	10.69
1965		
January	7.15	10.20
February	7.15	10.25
March	7.50	10.14
April	7.00	10.05
May	7.10	10.12
June	6.80	10.20
July	6.55	10.20
August	(3)	(3)
September	(3)	(3)
October	(3)	(3)
November	(3)	(3)
December	(3)	(3)
Average	----------	----------

[1] From "Prices and Price Indexes," Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Prices Division, Catalog 62-002, monthly, Canada, tables 10, 4, and 5 (filed in Commerce Library).
[2] USDA Sugar Reports.
[3] Unavailable.

Only a little more than 2 years ago, Mr. Chairman, in the spring of 1963, we had a dramatic demonstration of the Sugar Act's importance in obtaining adequate supplies of sugar for American consumers at reasonable prices. During a world sugar crisis, when supply suddenly fell short of demand, and prices elsewhere in the world climbed to levels much higher than prices in the United States, certain foreign sugar interests were reluctant to ship to the United States the quantities of sugar we needed, at the times we needed it, at reasonable prices. In that time of emergency our Government, while continuing to scour the world for available sugar, turned to domestic producers and asked for all-out production to meet the needs of American consumers. The splendid record of the domestic industry, and particularly the domestic beet sugar industry, in responding to the call of our Government is well known. It is difficult to imagine the catastrophic effect of that sugar crisis on the American consumer if there had been no domestic sugar producing industry to stem the tide of rising prices. The importance of the Sugar Act in this connection was emphasized by a Government official appearing before the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Banking and Currency Committee shortly after the crisis. The then Under Secretary of Agriculture, Charles S. Murphy, told the subcommittee:

> Finally, let me say that all of us should be grateful for our sugar legislation over the years and the assurance it has made possible for sugar supplies at this time. It should be abundantly clear that U.S. sugar supplies today would be infinitely more precarious if we had not had the protection of this law and the quota system over the past 30 years. For without this system, our domestic sugar industry might not have survived the disastrously low world prices of 1960–62. U.S. farmers today are producing and the U.S. processing industry is manufacturing 6 million tons of sugar that constitutes nearly 60 pecent of our sugar supplies. The protection that the Sugar Act has afforded over the years has maintained a healthy and growing domestic sugar industry which is indispensable in such a period of tight world supplies.[1]

The Sugar Act thus obviously has achieved two of its three principal purposes—to assure American consumers of adequate supplies of sugar at reasonable prices, and to help maintain the economic atmosphere in which a healthy, competitive domestic sugar-producing industry can exist.

The third purpose—to encourage the export trade of the United States—has fallen short of fulfillment. There is no assurance that the dollars we send abroad to buy sugar will ever return to us through the purcase of American goods. Attempts to tie sugar purchases by us directly into the purchase of American agriculture commodities have failed miserably. In too many cases, Mr. Chairman, the dollars we sent abroad for sugar wind up in the hands of the oligarchies that own most of the foreign sugar industries, particularly in the Latin American countries, and at least some of the dollars wind up, I am told, in numbered accounts in Swiss banks.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, although one of the purposes of the sugar program may and does fall short of accomplishment, this is no reason, I maintain, to destroy the whole program. The perennial critics of the sugar program, who have a heyday of capturing headlines whenever the Sugar Act is being considered by the Congress, have never once proposed a better program for meeting the needs of the United States.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues who for one reason or another may not like the foreign section of the present bill: Do not destroy a proven and worthwhile program, one which has operated in the overall interest of the United States for nearly a third of a century. Do not destroy such a program because you do not like one part of it.

I may say that during the debate on the rule on this legislation I presented the formula for arriving at a true, a reasonable, and a fair way of seeing whether the prices paid by the consumers of the United States are reasonable and fair. In that debate the question was brought up as to the difference between the price of Canadian sugar and United States sugar. In essence the difference between the two systems is this. The United States considers price stability a primary objective while Canada, with the need to produce a domestic sugar supply, and being able to supply only 20 percent of its needs, allows its main sugar supply to follow the fluctuations of the world price which are, at times, substantial. At the proper time, as I have said, I shall make this comparison of prices a part of my remarks.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield for a question?

Mrs. MAY. I yield.

Mr. FRASER. I do not mean to interrupt the gentlelady's statement, but as long as she was referring to this table, I should like to ask a question or two about the foreign allotments in this bill. As one who has taken quite an interest in this, I thought she might be able to help me. Let us take the country of Venezuela. Up until this year, as I understand, Venezuela had no quota at all. Suddenly she has a very substantial quota, one that is substantially larger than that recommended by the administration. Venezuela, which is an important country in Latin America, also has one of the highest per capita incomes. We do not provide that country with any foreign economic assistance or, if we do, it is very little, because they have very substantial natural resources in iron ore and in oil and other items. Could the gentlelady explain why it is that Venezuela has such a substantial quota? What process was employed to arrive at that decision?

Mrs. MAY. First of all, has the gentleman read the basic formula on which we worked? We went back to the 1962 quota formula. The gentleman will have to start with the basic formula on which the committee recommended these quotas. If the gentleman wants to have a breakdown country by country, that would consume more time than we have here. Although, I am sure, the chairman would be glad to supply this information to the gentleman, if he wished.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield, I would like to say to the gentleman that Venezuela is the very best customer we have in all of Latin America. In 1964 they produced 378,000 tons. They asked for a quota of 50,000. We gave them a quota of about 30,000.

Mr. FRASER. It was my understanding that one of the bases on which we gave a quota was the country needed help that would come from substantially higher prices than prices on the world market. Venezuela does not do very well against that kind of consideration for a relatively well-off country.

---

[1] From p. 28 of printed record of hearings re factors relating to recent sharp increases in sugar prices, before Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, June 5, 1963.

Mr. COOLEY. They have money, the gentleman is right. But they have a source of supply for sugar which we need in our country. This is one time when we have given a quota to Venezuela.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield further, I am curious to know about the Dominican Republic, along the same lines. This is a country which is very much in need of rehabilitation of its economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. May] has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman 2 additional minutes.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman that, as I have already said, it would consume a great deal of time to go into this matter country by country as to quotas. I would ask the gentleman to read this report and see that we tried to give special weight to countries that did trade with us. As a matter of fact there were many members of the committee including me who thought that we should have given a greater accent to this. But this was one factor we used in the basic formula.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, if I may make one further comment. Venezuela had no allotment in 1962. That is why I do not understand the historical relationship.

Mrs. MAY. There is an economic relationship, however, as the chairman has tried to explain.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, for the record I think I can say to the gentleman that it is expected that if the Dominican Republic straightens out its government and comes into the society of free nations of the world, the deficit which we always have probably will all go to the Dominican Republic other than that which must of necessity go elsewhere.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman that if Venezuela or any of these countries have lobbyists here, I personally do not know any of them. I worked on this formula independently within this ad hoc committee. I would like to make it clear that this refers to the Members on my side of the aisle, too, who were on the committee.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I might point out with reference to Venezuela that we have an unfavorable balance of trade. As pointed out on page 48 of the report it amounts to about $370 million with that country, due, I understand, to the large amount of oil imports.

I, of course, raised this question in the committee. There are several countries that have substantial quotas with whom we have an unfavorable balance of trade.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Indeed, the unfavorable balance of trade that the United States has with Venezuela is the greatest in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to confirm with the gentlewoman from Washington that in our State of Washington we have a great interest in the sugarbeet allotment under this bill. As I understand it, it would be particularly helpful in that area where the Hanford plutonium work has been curtailed and, therefore, as contained in this bill our sugarbeet growers would be benefited as against the existing situation; is that correct?

Mrs. MAY. The gentleman is correct and he has struck right at the heart of the problem in representing our American farmers who must have this bill. As I said earlier, regardless of our disagreement over the foreign country quotas, the domestic farmers—American beet growers and American cane growers—will be seriously hurt as a result of severe cutbacks if they do not get this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues therefore as I do to my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly], who is supporting me on this, do not destroy a worthwhile program, one which has operated in the overall interest of the United States, for one-third of a century. Do not destroy such a program just because you do not like one part of it.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentlewoman from Washington on her presentation and upon the work which she has done for the domestic sugarbeet industry.

Mr. Chairman, as one who respresents numerous sugarbeet growers in my own district, I certainly want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from Washington and I want her to know that I rise in support of this legislation and will do anything I can to assure its passage.

I believe the gentlewoman has stated very well what this bill represents, not only foreign interests but the interests of our domestic growers as well and that is what we have to remember.

Mr. Chairman, I rise also in support of H.R. 11135, the Sugar Act Amendments of 1965. The enactment of this bill is essential to our domestic sugarbeet industry. I say it is essential because our domestic industry is now holding sugar in storage from previous years, and only the increase in the domestic quota provided by this bill can solve the problem.

Much has been said, Mr. Chairman, about the evil of the sugar lobbyists for the foreign nations. Certainly, I share the fears of those who feel that the actions of these lobbyists cannot be justified. But, Mr. Chairman, this bill affects the domestic sugar industry as well as foreign nations. If no bill is enacted, believe me, our domestic industry will suffer. A way must be found to increase the quota of our domestic sugarbeet industry, and this bill accomplishes just that.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. Hansen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, on the opening day of the 1st session of the 89th Congress I introduced a bill, H.R. 311, to increase the amount of domestic beet sugar and mainland cane sugar which could be marketed during 1965 and 1966. It called for an increase of 1 million short tons, raw value, in each of those calendar years.

On March 4 I called the attention of the House to House Joint Memorial 6 of the Idaho State Legislature urging the Congress to give much-needed relief to the sugarbeet growers of the State of Idaho. This memorial appropriately calls attention to the fact that domestic sugarbeet growers and processors have amply demonstrated their ability to produce sugar when it was needed for consumers in 1963 and 1964. Due to the fact that they met this emergency at the request of our Department of Agriculture which, in the middle of the stream, then changed its course, the U.S. domestic beet sugar industry is now confronted with excessive inventories of sugar in relation to permitted marketings under the existing Sugar Act. Because of this there is urgent necessity for enactment of legislation extending and amending the Sugar Act and thus providing a market for the domestic production. If this is not done, production will have to be cut back in 1966.

Mr. Chairman, the sugarbeet industry in Idaho has been concerned with the delay in action by this Congress, and awaits our action. I had hoped that we would be considering legislation which would have increased our domestic marketing quotas by the 1 million short tons contained in H.R. 311. But, in the wisdom of our Committee on Agriculture, this increase was limited to 580,000 short tons, raw value. While this is not all I had hoped for, it is a step in the right direction and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 11135.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11135 and ask permission to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the Record. Mr. Chairman, a proposal for an import fee on foreign sugar equal to 50 percent of the difference between the U.S. and world market prices was rejected this year by President Johnson. The gentleman from Illinois, Representative Findley, proposes an even heavier import fee of 75 percent.

This proposal should be rejected as harmful to the American sugar consumer as well as to foreign sugar suppliers.

The proposed amendment would require that 75 percent of the difference between the world market price and the price paid by the United States for foreign sugar would be paid into the U.S. Treasury rather than to foreign sugar suppliers. This would have the effect of narrowing the gap between the U.S. price and the world price and will therefore discourage foreign suppliers from shipping to the United States. In the past when this gap has been narrowed, or when the U.S. price has fallen below the world price as occurred in 1964, foreign suppliers have turned to the world market and the price of sugar to the American housewife has shot sky high.

The proposed amendment is absolutely in conflict with U.S. trade policies. A duty of 62 cents per 100 pounds, or about 10 percent of the sales price, is already imposed on foreign sugar. Based on the current spread between the U.S. and world market prices, the proposed amendment would impose a tariff of an additional $2.60 per 100 pounds. When this is added to the present tariff of 62 cents per 100 pounds, the result is a tariff of $3.20, or over 50 percent of the sales price. In an era when U.S. trade policies have cut tariffs on imports into the United States to an average of 10 percent, a 50-percent tariff is absolutely unthinkable. The present 10-percent duty is in line with U.S. trade policies and is all that is needed.

Finally, as President Johnson noted in proposing elimination of a special import fee on sugar, the tariff would be extremely harmful to the Alliance for Progress nations who are the primary foreign suppliers of sugar to the United States after the Philippines. To impose a 50-percent tariff on the sugar supplied by these countries, when at the same time we are trying to help them toward economic stability, would defeat our own policies and would be against the interests of the United States.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, with the uncertainty of the time situation, I would like to say at the outset I hope that during my remarks there will be time to respond to questions and I hope that questions will come.

But I do have a number of things I would like to review for the Members and if any who wish to question me would kindly withhold their questions until the conclusion of my statement, I would appreciate it. Then I will gladly yield and if necessary will seek additional time to consider and answer any questions that may be presented to me.

Mr. Chairman, I suspect I speak the truth in saying that there is probably no one in this House of Representatives who has not been embarrassed in some way in respect to the foreign sugar lobby and the activities of this group over the years.

The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] yesterday issued a very interesting statement. One thing he said, I thought, had particular application to the amendments that have been made in order by the Committee on Rules and which will be voted on shortly by the Committee of the Whole.

He spoke of the need—and I use his direct words "to guard the integrity of the Congress." My sole reason for offering the amendment which would put the foreign sugar lobbyists out of business is to guard the integrity of the Congress and hopefully to sweep away this cloud of doubt and suspicion which I think all of us know has hovered over this legislation for a good long time.

I have presented to each Member's office a copy of both amendments in full and a comment about the history of each. I have clarified as clearly as I know how what the amendments will do and what they will not do. I will not take the time to review those documents.

In summary, the important fee amendment will help our balance of payments. Just how much nobody knows for sure. It depends upon the volume of sugar. It depends upon the world price of sugar. It depends upon the precise price objective that the Secretary establishes each year as the goal for the domestic price of sugar.

But if I may make an assumption, and assume present prices, the gain for the balance of payments during the 5-year term of this act will exceed $1 billion or over $200 million a year.

It is obvious we still have a serious balance-of-payments problem, so this is a major consideration, or should be a major consideration, on this import fee proposal. To the extent that this import fee puts dollars in the U.S. Treasury, it benefits the entire Government. We have concluded a fiscal year with a heavy deficit and we are going into a year which it is certain will have another deficit.

I cannot imagine anyone arguing against the wisdom of putting about $200 million a year into the Treasury of the United States if it would have no serious adverse effect on the interest of the United States in other respects. It would have no such adverse effect. It would have no effect whatever on the domestic price of sugar.

It would reduce the profiteering and the opportunity for profiteering. Therefore, it would cut back the danger of wheeling and dealing which is implicit in the hefty big money which is a part of the foreign sugar quotas.

This import fee would return to the U.S. Treasury 75 percent of the difference between the world price and the domestic price of sugar. This would still leave an ample incentive for all of the foreign producers to ship to the United States to the limit of their quotas.

Mention is made of the effect this import fee might have on foreign policy. The proposed legislation lets Latin American and other producers who pay as low as 7 cents an hour for canefield workers and a top rate of 30 cents an hour—in one lone country—get almost as much for the sugar that they sell to the U.S. market as the U.S. producers do. I see present Members from the State of Hawaii, where the income of canefield workers is in excess of $3 an hour. Compare that with 7 cents an hour and you can get some small idea of the big profit that is involved in the foreign sugar quotas.

At present prices, the pure profit is nearly double the world market price of sugar. The world price is less than $40 a ton; the U.S. price is about $110. So each ton has about $70 of pure profit in it for foreign producers. Would the profit in this bill assure any better wages or living conditions for the workers in the cane fields? There is no assurance whatever in this legislation that that would result. Very likely it would simply make the rich even richer.

The proposed bill would lock in for a 5-year period profiteering on this incredible scale.

I voted for the Alliance for Progress. Foreign aid, which goes to a friendly government for a specific purpose and social improvements, is one thing. Profiteering, which lines the pockets of the rich and powerful, and perhaps helps to finance some of the oppressive regimes which have flourished off and on in Latin America, is quite another thing.

Does it help our foreign policy, I wonder for us in this legislation to guarantee 5 years of pure profit to Dr. Francois Duvalier of the government of Haiti, who is, without any question, the most oppressive tyrant in the Western Hemisphere?

Is it to our foreign policy's best interests to give him access to quotas in our sugar bill, access to quotas which carry a 5-year premium value of $10 million?

We speak of foreign policy. Well, the President, in announcing his reversal of position on the import fee, referred to our Latin American policy. But in withdrawing the import fee, we also withdraw the import fee for the non-Latin countries, too.

How about Swaziland, South Africa, Australia, Rhodesia, and Fiji? Is Australia an underdeveloped area which must be showered with excess profit on sugar quotas? This bill would give Australia unless my import fee amendment is adopted, an annual premium of $11 million over the world price of sugar.

And South Africa: Is it our foreign policy to help finance apartheid by dropping the import fee on sugar we buy from that land?

And Fiji, a part of the British system, which already has access to the protected British market. Is it our foreign policy to lock in for 5 years excess sugar profit worth $1.7 million a year to Fiji?

And India: In this bill the Indian quota has an annual premium value of over $4.5 million. Is it our foreign policy to lock in this bonanza for India, no matter what the next 5 years may bring in relation to the policy of India regarding Pakistan?

And Panama: This bill would lock in for Panama a quota of 25,134 tons. At present prices, the quota is worth $1.7 million a year. Is it our foreign policy to guarantee $1.7 million a year in excess profit to Panama for 5 years, regardless of what Panama may do in regard to the Panama Canal, regardless of what they may do in the way of insults to our flag, including destruction and threats to our property down there? Is our memory so short?

This bill would guarantee $1.7 million a year in excess profit to Panama for 5 years. I say it is not wise policy for Congress to do that.

Now I should like to talk a little about the lobbyist amendment. My reasons for proposing this amendment are twofold. First, let me make clear that I distinguish—and the amendment distinguishes—between foreign and domestic lobbyists. These foreign sugar lobbyists, to which my amendment applies—and it applies only to foreign sugar lobbyists—do not benefit the United States in any way, shape, or form. They supply no information whatever that is not readily available to the Congress from any of several official sources.

The Committee on Agriculture, to my knowledge, is the only committee of the House of Representatives which permits direct testimony by an agent of a foreign government at any time. Think about that. Can anyone cite another committee of this House which permits it?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. We do not permit it. Foreigners are not permitted in that committee room, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. FINDLEY. My good chairman is twisting my words. I did not say "foreigners." I said "foreign agents."

Mr. COOLEY. The agents the gentleman is talking about are registered at the Department of Justice. He went down one Monday morning and looked up the names, and they were published in the paper.

Mr. FINDLEY. They are agents of foreign governments and are given access to the committee room and permitted to testify, and I say that this is the only committee of the House of Representatives where that type of policy is permitted.

Mr. COOLEY. They come in only because we do not let representatives of foreign governments come in.

Mr. FINDLEY. I might say to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture that whenever any question of quotas or trade policy or the financial interests of any other foreign government is involved, no other committee permits either the national of that country, to appear before the committee or an American, for that matter, to represent that government. This is the only committee which permits the foreign agents of a government to testify before the committee.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I cannot vouch for this personally, but I have just been informed that both the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Committee on Foreign Affairs permit testimony by foreign agents.

Mr. FINDLEY. I have made inquiry on that. I could be wrong, I grant to the gentleman, my good friend from California, but I have made direct inquiries and I am informed that this is not the case, that neither of these permit any testimony from foreign agents.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If there have been any foreign agents who testified before the Committee on Foreign Affairs this year or last year, I do not know who they are or where they come from.

Mr. FINDLEY. If I may proceed for a moment, this bill is a revenue bill.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. The gentleman said he knew of no other committee. I might advise the House that the Committee on Armed Services had testimony from representatives of the Philippines. Philippine citizens were heard in connection with the disposal of the Abaca stockpile. Certainly this practice is not barred from other committees.

Mr. FINDLEY. The disposal of what?

Mr. STRATTON. The disposal of our stockpile, or in connection with the disposal of our stockpile. We had testimony from Philippine citizens.

Mr. FINDLEY. With respect to the disposal of U.S. property over there.

Mr. STRATTON. I just wanted to correct the point the gentleman made.

Mr. FINDLEY. I am glad to have that contribution, but my point still stands that no other committees permit representatives or agents of foreign governments to testify.

Mr. Chairman, I started to mention that this is a revenue measure, and one might have thought that it would go to the Ways and Means Committee. But it did not. By custom, it has gone to the Committee on Agriculture.

Had this measure gone to the Committee on Ways and Means, I raise this question: Would the foreign sugar lobbyists have lasted 1 day?

I am informed that the Ways and Means Committee has a firm and fixed policy that if any foreign government wants to make a representation to it, that representation must come through diplomatic channels by way of the State Department. The Ways and Means Committee, so I am informed, will not permit any foreign interest to testify directly to it.

The main point about the lobbyists is that they make Congress look bad at home and abroad. Countries are led to believe that they have to pay somebody in order to get a quota. I cite the Government of Argentina on that point.

Lobbyists appear to influence the size of quotas. Here I cite Argentina and Venezuela. Lobbyists appear to influence the value of quotas.

The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, as a part of the hearings, paid tribute to one of the lobbyists, Arthur L. Quinn, and gave him credit for bringing about a protest in Latin America which caused the administration to reverse its position and drop the import fee.

Lobbyists try to puff their own influence. This leaves a bad impression. John A. O'Donnell, for example, tried to convey the false idea that Senator HUMPHREY, now our Vice President, did his bidding by introducing a bill. The law firm of Surrey & Karasik passed to Dominican officials utterly misleading information about their efforts to influence Senator BYRD on sugar legislation by way of a Virginia law firm.

The size of lobbyists fees causes suspicion and raises questions. Charles Patrick Clark, who had little if any experience in sugar, has had $44,000 paid to him in the last 3 months from Venezuela. What did he do to earn the money as a sugar lobbyist for Venezuela? What is he telling his principal back home to justify this money? Cannot you see how this sort of thing raises a cloud of doubt and suspicion over the entire Congress?

Between them, two lobbyists for five small Latin American countries, Sheldon Z. Kaplan and Miss Dina Dellale, get nearly $100,000 a year. How do they justify these fees? What do they tell their clients?

These are proper questions which we ought to consider as we consider my amendment.

The lobby shows no sign whatever of purging itself. Several of these lobbyists with unattractive past records are still in business. John A. O'Donnell, formerly on the Philippine War Claims Commission, was charged in 1962 by the Senate committee with collecting fees from clients on claims he had earlier helped to adjudicate, was charged with deceiving and misleading the Congress and the executive branch and his own clients; was charged with failing to file required information with the U.S. Department of Justice; served as middleman for Philippine sugar interests in passing out over $15,000 for 1960 congressional campaigns.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DAGUE. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. FINDLEY. How much of this still goes on? This is a proper question in your mind and in my mind, and in the minds of the American people and in the minds of the foreign countries.

Ernest Schein, now representing Colombia, was associated with O'Donnell during the war claim days, first as chief examiner with the Commission and then as a fee-splitting associate.

Walter Surrey, charged with misleading clients and failing to comply with the Foreign Agents Registration Act, originally got paid for sugar lobbying partly with contingency fees, as did several others.

It makes one wonder how much of this is going on behind the scenes.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RUMSFELD. There is a saying that one hears in Washington time after time, that the way to get along is to go along, and do not rock the boat. The gentleman from Illinois is not going along, and is rocking the boat. I think he is performing a real service for the Congress and the country by bringing this matter before the House for discussion and debate. I want to associate myself with his remarks and amendments.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman. Whether these lobbyists are effective in their influence peddling or not, they harm the public interest.

They deal in foreign policy, whether you like it or not. They have set up, in effect, their own state department. If they have influence and succeed in peddling it, they disturb and soil our governmental system, and compromise public officials, and weaken the moral foundation of our Nation.

If they have no influence they take their client's money without rendering expected service.

Either way, the United States is worse off.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute to ask this question: Did not the gentleman make the public statement that he had observed closely in the Committee on Agriculture and observed nothing inappropriate in the appearance of any witness before that committee?

Mr. FINDLEY. I will say to the gentleman that I charge no wrongdoing. I charge poor judgment and I include myself. I freely confess my sins of omission. I should have protested about this lobby long ago. I should have dug in 5 years ago when I first came on it.

Mr. COOLEY. Why did you make the statement that there was nothing inappropriate about it?

Mr. FINDLEY. I suggest that the reason for this amendment is not because of wrongdoing but because of the appearance. I think it is high time to sweep away this cloud of doubt and suspicion.

Mr. COOLEY. Has the gentleman read the bill before us?

Mr. FINDLEY. If I may respond to the gentleman, I have seen four different prints of this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. I am talking about the bill before us now. Does the gentleman know what is in it?

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes, I think I am reasonably well informed on the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Is the gentleman informed about Panama? Did he say that if somebody seized the Panama Canal we could not do anything about the sugar quota, when it says on page 6 of the bill that the President can discontinue the quota from any country if he finds that it would be contrary to the national interest of the United States?

Mr. FINDLEY. I am glad to have the information with respect to Panama, and if the Panamanians act up, I hope the authority will be used.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, although I do not pretend to be an expert, since I represent the sugar bowl of Louisiana, the greatest cane sugar producing district in the United States, I think I know enough about the sugar program to set the record straight on some of the things you have been hearing and reading about it lately.

Prior to 1934 we went through periods of booms and busts and rags to riches so far as sugar is concerned. Since 1934, the sugar program has beyond doubt been the most successful of all the farm programs. I want to tell you why.

Unlike wheat, cotton, corn, and other crops, sugar is not a surplus item in this country. We consume more sugar than we produce and we must import the difference from friendly countries.

Now prior to 1934, some people reasoned in this way. We live in a land of plenty, but because of soil and climatic conditions we do not produce all the sugar we need. Since we must obtain the difference mostly from people to the south of us, let us make them pay through the nose for the privilege of supplying our deficit requirements—let us impose a heavy or high tariff; and we did. But to every act there is a reaction and the people to the south of us took the position that world trade is a two-way street. They realized that we needed bananas, coffee, rubber, mahogany trees, and many other things besides sugar. And they found out that they could shop around for their imports. With respect to sugar they said, in effect, "You Yankees will be sorry. During periods of world tension we will make you pay through the nose"—and they did, from about 1913 on to a long time thereafter. During and after World War I, for example, housewives in the United States had to pay 25 cents per pound for sugar. The industrial users—the bottlers, the bakers, the cakemakers, and so forth—lived in fear that the value of the working stocks they had on hand would suddenly shrink. They were compelled to carry excessive stocks of sugar as a hedge against a sudden large price rise. All of this caused violent price fluctuations from time to time.

As a consequence, the cane farmers in Louisiana and Florida and all the beet farmers in the midwestern States had to take it on the chin. The refiners on the west coast and all those along the east coast from New Orleans to Atlanta to Boston were insecure and the workers were threatened with the loss of their jobs. In my own congressional district many raw sugarcane mills had to close down and their employees were thrown out of work.

Such were the conditions prior to 1934. Then a man by the name of Cordell Hull, dedicated experts in the Department of Agriculture, unselfish members of the great Committee on Agriculture, joined by Members of Congress in their finest hour of bipartisanship, decided to do something about the situation. They realized that the people to the south of us were our neighbors and that the time had come to stop repressive measures between friendly neighbors. This was how the Sugar Act was born.

Why has the Sugar Act worked so well, as enacted in 1934, and why was it renewed every few years by both Democratic and Republican Congresses?

The program has worked and is working well precisely because it is a give-and-take program.

The import tax was reduced to ½ cent per pound, and friendly countries to the south of us and elsewhere were given a fair share of our sugar deficit. But on their part all of these friendly countries have to live up to three principal conditions. They must pay the import tax of ½ cent per pound. They must deliver their allotted shares on time and at all times at reasonable prices and irrespective of world tensions. Finally, they cannot ship refined or white sugar into this country; they can only ship raw or brown sugar.

The imported raw or brown sugar is refined in the American refineries I referred to. On their part, the refiners must pay a refiners' tax of ½ cent per pound.

The combined 1 cent per pound collected from friendly foreign countries and the American refiners is used to support the price of cane and beet farmers, who could not otherwise compete with offshore suppliers. However, on their part, in order to qualify for payments under the program, producers must comply with production restrictions; they must pay fair wages to workers; they cannot employ child labor, and if they are processors they must pay fair prices for sugarcane and sugarbeets to the growers.

At this point I want to emphasize that the income to the Government from the combined 1 cent per pound has been very substantially in excess of the amount disbursed as payments to domestic growers. Despite confusing statements to the contrary, since 1937 the sugar program has turned over to the Treasury a net dividend of $550 million. In other words, the sugar program is more than self-supporting.

In short, the Sugar Act has established three policies since 1934: first, to provide for U.S. consumers an ample supply of sugar at reasonable and stable prices; second, to maintain a strong domestic sugar industry without the use of a high protective tariff, and third, to promote world trade, thereby permitting friendly foreign countries to participate in supplying the U.S. sugar requirements.

The purposes of the sugar program have been admirably achieved.

A reasonable price for sugar has in fact been maintained. For example, in 1957 the U.S. retail price averaged 11 cents per pound. On January 1, 1965, the price was 11.64 cents, which means that in the past 8 years the average retail price has increased only sixty-four hundredths of a cent. I do not know of any commodity whose price has remained so stable—do you?

A strong and growing domestic sugar industry without the consumer-penalizing device of a high protective tariff has been achieved. For example, when I first came to Congress in January 1949, the marketing allotment for continental United States was 2,300,000 tons, raw value, while the marketing allotment next year will be 4,125,000 tons, raw value.

Under this bill the quotas of the domestic beet and sugar cane industry will be immediately increased. And under the act which we are now considering for extension, more than 40 percent of our total consumption of sugar will be produced by sugarcane and sugarbeet growers within the continental United States. The total domestic production, including Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands will fill 65 percent of our national sugar requirements.

The Sugar Act has certainly promoted our world trade and every State of the Union has been the beneficiary. For example, in exchange for the sugar we have imported, the friendly foreign countries involved have been purchasing from us not only tractors, cane-cutters, and other sugar producing equipment, but huge quantities of farm produce such as rice, wheat, and cotton, and every conceivable type of foodstuff and manufactured goods, and we enjoy a very favorable balance of trade vis-a-vis such countries.

Furthermore, the friendly countries supplying our sugar deficit have lived up to their obligations under the Sugar Act. They have paid the modest import tax of ½ cent per pound, and they have lived up to their promise to deliver their allotments, even in times of world tensions. Thus during World War II and during the Korean conflict, unlike the period during World War I when there was no Sugar Act, they supplied our requirements at reasonable prices.

Those are the reasons why the domestic cane sugar and beet sugar industries; the growers who produce the crops; the refineries who refine the raw sugar and their workers, and all segments of the industry, as well as the administration, support this bill. And those are the reasons why the Members of Congress, by an overwhelming bipartisan vote, have always renewed the Sugar Act and will do it again today.

Now, what is all this fuss about the so-called world price as compared with our domestic price? It results from almost total lack of understanding and a great deal of misinformation concerning the very meaning of world price or world market.

World consumption of sugar amounts to about 64 million tons. Three-fourths of it remains in the respective countries where the sugar is produced. Only about one-fourth, or 16 million tons, moves in world trade. Of this amount, however, almost 10 million tons have what is called preferential arrangements with countries where it is sold. Therefore, the world market or world price involves only about 6 million tons. This is the distress sugar floating around without a home and, of course, the so-called world market price is usually below the domestic price in this or any European country. And then, too, it must be that some of the countries that sell sugar to us also sell some world market sugar so that they really get a blend price somewhere between our domestic price and the world market price for their total output.

But despite outlandish and irresponsible claims to the contrary, the domestic price paid by consumers in the United States is not by any stretch of the imagination excessive as compared with prices paid elsewhere. For example, on January 1, 1965, the retail price of a pound of sugar in the United States averaged 11.64 cents; in France, 12.6 cents; Italy, 16 cents; Japan, 14.2 cents; United Kingdom, 11.1 cents; West Germany, 14 cents; Sweden, 15 cents; Yugoslavia, 13.3 cents; and in Russia, 45 cents.

I think I have said enough to indicate that the Findley proposal to impose on friendly countries an import fee of 75 percent of the difference between the domestic price and the world market price would be a step backward. At present the fee would exceed the cost of production generally prevailing in those countries. This alone should be a sufficient reason to vote down the amendment. But, what is equally true is that the amendment, if adopted, could be a return to the days of booms and busts and rags to riches. I say this because we tried the global quota and import fee approach before. What was the result? Two or three years ago when these provisions were in effect the world market price jumped above the domestic price. The domestic price here went up to 14 cents per pound, while the price in Canada shot up to 18 cents per pound. Of course, no fee could be collected and the housewives and the consumers had to pay through the nose.

The other Findley proposal to cut out lobbyists appears to have merit on its face, but let us take a good look at it. It says that any friendly country who dares to employ an American citizen to represent it in Washington concerning sugar legislation shall not be permitted to buy 1 pound of sugar from us.

Any common criminal is entitled to representation. How can we deny that right to friendly countries supplying sugar to us? We, of course, cannot make a law to single out one group for punishment or for special or worse treatment, and no court would uphold the constitutionality of this amendment. Furthermore, does anyone really expect that any sovereign country would take this amendment lying down? Does anyone really believe that these countries would not retaliate against our representatives abroad? If he does, he is merely dreaming.

And if anyone should say that I approve of anything wrong, or improper, or evil, he is not only dreaming; he is also being very unkind and very unfair.

We already have a foreign agents registration law on the books. If it needs amendment, let us amend it; if loopholes need to be plugged, let us plug them; if more teeth should be put in this law, let us put them. This would be the right way to do it; the Findley way is the wrong way.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Suppose we had no sugar program. What would be the situation in relation to the American housewife?

Mr. WILLIS. We have to make up our minds very clearly about this. Do we want to maintain or destroy the domestic industry? Do we want to maintain or destroy the beet producers in about 18 or 20 States in the Midwest? Do we want to protect or destroy the cane producers in Louisiana, Florida, Hawaii, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico? What would happen? We could not compete. I frankly admit that. That is why we must have the device of that 1 cent a pound I referred to a moment ago. The price would rise sky high. That is what would happen. After a while they would have us by the throat. We would be out of business. They would be the only ones in business. Then they would command the price. I have been chairman of the Subcommittee on Antitrust, and I know something about what happens in that connection.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I should like to associate myself with those of my distinguished colleagues who are voting for this bill, H.R. 11135, because it contains long-overdue quota relief for American beet sugar producers. The quota increase for the domestic beet sugar industry in this bill is a necessity if the industry is to sell the extra sugar, produced at the request of the Government, that is now being carried in storage at tremendous cost to the industry.

When the Government, in 1963, urged sugarbeet farmers and beet sugar companies to produce more sugar for American consumers—and lifted acreage restrictions, and promised "unrestricted operations" for 2 more years—it was the obvious intent that the additional sugar was to be produced for selling to American consumers and not for putting into cold storage forever.

May I remind you, Mr. Chairman, that we waited all last year for a sugar bill, increasing the beet sugar quota, to come out of the Committee on Agriculture, but none was forthcoming. We also waited in vain for the administration to show the same zeal in asking for legislation that would authorize marketing the extra beet sugar production as the officials of the administration showed in asking our farmers and sugar companies to produce the extra sugar.

Well—that was last year.

This year is different. At long last we do have a sugar bill. And the bill contains authority for the beet sugar industry to market, over a period of years, the extra sugar that has accumulated in the sugar bins and the warehouses as a result of the industry's great response to the Government's emergency plea for more domestic sugar production.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the domestic quota provisions of this bill have the support of the domestic beet sugar producers, the domestic cane sugar producers, the cane sugar refiners, and the administration. It is my understanding that the domestic quota provisions represent a compromise worked out at the request of the leadership of the House Agriculture Committee and at the request of responsible officials in the executive branch of the Government. Personally, I would like to see a larger increase in the beet sugar quota, because I firmly believe it is in the national interest for us to obtain more of our sugar from domestic sources. But I recognize that by the very nature of a compromise, no one gets out of it all that he desires. It appears that under the circumstances, and in view of the realities of the political situation today, the domestic quota provisions of this bill are the best that could muster the widespread support which is necessary for passage in this era of the consensus.

The great sugarbeet industry of Michigan has a definite stake in this bill. Our producers increased their production by some 45 million pounds in 1963, when the needs of our consumers were greatest, and under the impetus of Government urging, they increased production last year by almost 12 million pounds. Although like the rest of the industry, Michigan producers expect to take some acreage cuts under this bill; the cuts will not be so severe as the drastic reductions they would have to take if there were no bill.

The sugarbeet industry is tremendously important to Michigan, and in the areas where the beet is grown it is not only an essential cash crop, but it is a key to crop rotation and to sound farming operations. Michigan, Mr. Chairman, was a pioneer in beet sugar production in the United States—sharing honors with Massachusetts as the site of the first beet sugar factory in this country, more than 125 years ago.

It is vital to the sugarbeet growers and processors that this legislation be adopted.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute just to make one observation.

When Mr. FINDLEY was talking he quoted from some press release that I issued yesterday to the effect that I was attempting to protect the integrity of the Congress. I just want to call attention to the fact that I said Congress, and not Congressmen. I do not think any Member of this House needs anybody to protect or defend his integrity. I only meant we did not want to sit idly by and see Congress bypassed and let bureaucrats take over the functions that the law provides we should discharge. When you talk about lobbyists I would like you to look at this: Here is a list of 28 pages of lobbyists. There are too many for me even to mention. If you want to look at them all, that suits me. I second Mr. WILLIS' comments.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, the great State of Utah, in its long and colorful history, has made major contributions to the beet sugar industry of the United States—and, in turn, the beet sugar industry has made and is today making many contributions to the welfare of the people of Utah. And since the beet sugar quota provisions of this bill are so vital to the continued progress of this industry in Utah, and elsewhere in the United States, I support the bill and I urge my distinguished colleagues to vote for it.

The temporarily increased beet sugar marketing quota contained in this bill will help to alleviate a serious inventory problem with which the Nation's beet sugar industry now is burdened because it responded to the Government's pleas for greater production, for the sake of American consumers, during the sugar crisis 2 years ago.

What happened is that the sugarbeet growers and the beet sugar companies greatly increased their production, in response to the Government's urging, far in excess of the beet sugar marketing quota in the present law. Congress last year was not given the opoprtunity to increase the statutory beet sugar quota, and consequently vast quantities of sugar have accumulated that cannot be marketed—but must be carried in storage at enormous expense—unless we enact the beet sugar quota provisions of this bill, H.R. 11135.

In Utah and more than a score of other States—from the shores of the Great Lakes to the shores of the Pacific Ocean—the growing of sugarbeets and the processing of beet sugar provide the economic foundation for hundreds of our farming communities. In many of the areas where sugarbeets are grown they are the only true satisfactory cash crop not now in surplus, that can be grown. Anything that is of benefit to the producers of sugarbeets, therefore, has wide and beneficial ramifications throughout large regions of our great country.

Our sugarbeet producers rose to the challenge presented when the Nation was in dire need of additional sugar a short while ago. The temporary increase in marketing rights which this bill provides will help to soften the blow as our sugarbeet producers gradually attune their production to the levels provided for in the present law—after having so greatly increased production to meet a national emergency.

Mr.. Chairman, for the sake of the American sugar producer, I intend to vote for H.R. 11135.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. BURTON]. Domestic beet growers have made a very significant contribution to the welfare of our country; not only to their individual States such as Utah and North Dakota, but also to the entire Nation. Two-cent sugar, which was brought out in the debate earlier, is not a true world price, Mr. Chairman, and does not represent an accurate presentation of the facts. Most sugar in this world moves under agreements, and very little sells at this 2-cent distressed price. It is important to our Nation that our supply of sugar be dependable. We can find no more dependable supply than to have American farmers producing it in America. They have supplied sugar in adequate quantities and at a fair price—the normal growth of this domestic industry should be allowed to continue in fairness to farmers and farm areas.

We have been told it is important to give increased quotas to foreign countries because foreign countries are good customers of American industry. But, Mr. Chairman, there is no better customer of American industry than the American farmer. So in the interest of both the American farmer and the American consumer I urge the support of this bill. While it is not all that we in beet raising areas had hoped for, it is far better than the disaster which would befall us if we had no Sugar Act at all.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from North Dakota for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add one legislative footnote to this debate. This is, that the day the department bill came up to the full committee, I was there. Someone asked the question, Why do we have to have the department downtown determining these quotas?

Is not this a legislative function? Some of us feel strongly that the Congress in many instances has abdicated some of its constitutional responsibility in this regard. We raised this question. I see the chairman of the full committee is on the floor and he can correct me if I am wrong, but I think perhaps the chairman has been given too much credit for trying to have the Agriculture Committee take over the writing of these quotas because it was some of the young Turks in the committee that morning that wanted it done then and a decision made then and there and I think it would be fair to say that it was the chairman who prevented the vote, so he could check with the Department downtown and determine the criteria that they use to establish these quotas for foreign countries.

Later on the committee in its wisdom did take it over and wrote the quotas as they are now.

I would like to say, too, that I have been a member of the Committee on Agriculture for only 9 months. But at no time during that brief period have I ever been contacted by any lobbyist for a foreign sugar producer or foreign government. That is not to say that I pack too much water on that committee; I do not. Maybe that is why they did not come to see me.

I want to say to my friend from Illinois that I appreciate the service he has done in calling some of these problems to the attention of the Members. I am inclined to support his amendment because I can see that there might be questions raised when American law firms and lawyers are hired at $40,000 and $50,000 a year to represent foreign governments before Members of Congress.

These foreign governments could very appropriately ask, "What services are you performing?" I hesitate and I hate to think what the answer might be.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman for his comments. He has touched upon the central question. I think it logically can be granted that these foreign sugar lobbyists perform no legitimate service to the Congress. Why should we put up with this cloud of doubt and suspicion which these highly paid people cast over the Congress? To me it makes sense for us to put them out of business. We would be no worse off for it and as long as they are in business they do create this doubt and suspicion.

There is no public interest to be served by keeping them on the job here.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Dole].

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to discuss one or two points in the bill and also to ask a question or two of the chairman of the committee [Mr. Cooley] or the vice chairman [Mr. Poage]. We have been concerned, on both sides of the aisle, with the possibility of aiding any country which might either ship to or trade with our enemy in North Vietnam, or Cuba, Red China, or North Korea. I have reviewed the committee report and also the confidential files with reference to those countries which may or may not be shipping to or trading with North Vietnam or the other countries referred to. Under this bill there is a grave possibility some countries now actively engaged in either shipping to or trading with our enemy could possibly receive sugar quotas. We will all agree, whether or not we agree on the import fee or any other phase of the bill, that U.S. sugar quotas are very valuable.

I offered an amendment in the committee, and at that time the chairman suggested there was language in the bill, which appears on page 6, subparagraph (B), which could be interpreted to provide that any country which received a quota and was thereafter actively engaged in either trading with our enemy or shipping to the enemy, could have its quota suspended. I would ask the Chairman [Mr. Cooley], if I have interpreted the language on page 6 correctly.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman has page 6 before him, I assume?

Mr. DOLE. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. It says:

> Whenever and to the extent that the President finds that the establishment or continuation of a quota or any part thereof for any foreign country would be contrary to the national interest of the United States, such quota or part thereof shall be withheld or suspended, and such importation shall not be permitted.

Mr. DOLE. Right. My question is, in view of the language just read by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, is it his opinion the language would cover this point and would require suspension of a quota to any country which either ships goods to or trades with North Vietnam, or the other countries referred to?

Mr. COOLEY. Well, I suppose the gentleman has reference to what is known as the Battle Act. If the President found that it was in the national interest to discontinue the quota, he has the authority to discontinue it.

Mr. DOLE. I believe the gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, will agree that it certainly was not the intent of the committee or anyone on the committee to give any country any quota under this act which might be conducting business with North Vietnam or any other Communist country.

Mr. COOLEY. I will say "conducting business in violation of the Battle Act," which is the "trading with the enemy" act. We do not know of any country listed here that is now trading with the enemy.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from North Carolina knows that the Battle Act—and I am sure the gentleman from North Carolina was here when the Battle Act was enacted and I am sure he knows that the same discretionary power is lodged in the Battle Act—that the Battle Act is today and has been almost since its enactment a dead letter in the law. It has not been enforced by any President who has been President since the Battle Act was enacted. Let us not go back to the Battle Act, because it is meaningless and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman from Kansas will yield further, no President has advocated its repeal because it is still on the books.

Mr. GROSS. That is right. That is why I said it was a dead letter.

Mr. DOLE. I would point out to the gentleman from Iowa and to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley] that this matter was first called to the attention of the Members of the House by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Chamberlain] on July 22, 1965. On that date Mr. Chamberlain provided for the Record certain unclassified figures obtained from the Department of Defense, showing that 401 ships flying the flags of friendly world nations called at North Vietnam ports during 1964, and that another 74 had visited the ports of North Vietnam from January through June 1965.

I would also like to point out to those members of the committee who may be interested that there are even more recent figures which will include—if you wish to check the classified information—along with the countries listed in the report which will be receiving sugar quotas, there are countries which are now or have in past months been either shipping to or trading with the enemy which may receive sugar quotas under this act.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, this is basically wrong and I trust the language referred to on page 6 of the bill will cover that situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I have listened to what the gentleman has said with a great deal of interest.

Would the gentleman care to name in the Record the countries which have been trading with North Vietnam and who under this bill, if enacted, would receive a sugar quota? Can the gentleman name them?

Mr. DOLE. I cannot name them but I have looked at the classified information. It is still classified hence I would not be at liberty to name them. I would state to the gentleman that our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Chamberlain], has the list and would be happy to have anyone inspect it who desires to do so.

This is a serious matter and for that reason I have called it to the attention of the Members of the House in hopes some useful legislative history on this point will be made.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, may I ask the gentleman if he can tell us how many countries are involved—I realize this is still classified information which he is not allowed to reveal; he may see it but not reveal—can he tell us how many countries there are, whether it is one, two, three, or four?

Mr. DOLE. In checking the classified information and then the report before us I found a total of four.

Mr. SPRINGER. That are now trading with North Vietnam and who under this bill will receive a sugar quota?

Mr. DOLE. Yes; they are either now trading, or shipping, or have in the recent past been trading with or shipping to North Vietnam. There is nothing to indicate they might not trade with them again. My only point is that this record should be perfectly clear that this should not be permitted. We all agree that the U.S. sugar quotas are very valuable and there is no reason for giving any bonus to any country that might be making it more difficult for us, whatever country it may be. This Congress should not be giving any bonus to any country making it more difficult for us in Vietnam.

Mr. SPRINGER. My last point is this. Does the gentleman intend to introduce an amendment to prevent a sugar quota from being granted to any country that in recent months or that might in the future be trading with North Vietnam?

Mr. DOLE. There is a possibility that this might be included in the motion to recommit. I will point out, of course, under the rule the amendment cannot be offered. I presented this material to the Committee on Rules in hopes such an amendment might be made in order. It has been offered in the committee so this is not anything new that I attempt to do.

I was assured by the chairman in the committee that the language on page 6 does cover this situation. All I seek to do now is to make some clear legislative history that this is the intent of the House—that we will not knowingly give any quota to any country which might be now or hereafter trading with or shipping to North Vietnam, Cuba, Red China, or North Korea. My amendment is set forth in full on page 49 of the report. It specifically mentions Cuba, North Vietnam, or any other nation with which the United States does not have diplomatic relations.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STRATTON. I am sure the gentleman from Kansas would not want to leave any misapprehension of misunderstanding with the Members of the House. Is it not true that these foreign-flag ships that he refers to that have been trading with North Vietnam, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] of course referred to them frequently, are actually under charter to the Communist bloc. Therefore, the countries involved are not trading with North Vietnam—the ships are chartered to the Communist bloc and the trade is being conducted I think in almost every case by the Communist countries.

Mr. DOLE. That is right. In fact, provision is made for that in my amendment by saying, "that are either selling, furnishing or shipping." I attempted to cover every contingency. If the gentleman has another one, it should be included.

Mr. STRATTON. Of course, the gentleman realizes if the ships of these countries were barred from North Vietnam, the Communist bloc itself would simply rearrange its own shipping and continue to conduct its own trade with North Vietnam and use these foreign chartered ships and other ships so that we would not really cut down the Communist supplies that are now being supplied to North Vietnam. I think the point the gentleman makes is a good one but its effect on the fighting in North Vietnam would really be trivial in my judgment.

Mr. DOLE. The gentleman understands what I intended to do and I am hopeful the amendment offered, which cannot be offered on the floor, of course, would accomplish this. I do appreciate your contribution and trust that we can make some history, that we intend this will not happen if this bill is enacted.

I have listened with great interest to the amendments discussed by my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY]. The key to the lobbyist amendment is the fact there is such a big slush fund because no import fee is imposed. If an import fee were imposed there would be no need to worry about lobbyists in my opinion. The key amendment the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] will offer is the one relating to the import fee. This amendment should be supported and adopted.

I strongly feel quotas should be given to those countries which buy our surplus commodities. On pages 47 and 48 of the committee report, I have pointed out with the assistance of a Library of Congress analyst, that certain countries receive large quotas notwithstanding our unfavorable balance of trade with them. There was discussion earlier about Venezuela; however, the list also includes the Philippines, Brazil, the Dominican Republic, British Honduras, Colombia, Ecuador, Haiti, and Malagasy Republic. The complete list and the amounts are found on pages 47 and 48 of the report. It seems we should assist those countries who spend dollars in this country, particularly those buying our surplus commodities.

I would call the attention of the Committee to a press release issued today by the Department of Agriculture in which they announced sugar deficits of some 135,000 short tons raw value. The release states:

> In allocating deficits to countries of the Western Hemisphere, special consideration will be given those offering to purchase and import U.S. agricultural commodities prior to July 1, 1966, on the same basis as in initial 1965 deficit allocation announced August 13.

The point is that under existing law special consideration is given, in allocating deficits, to those countries who have purchased our agricultural commodities.

This is not required in the pending legislation, and it seems a serious mistake that this Congress does not direct the U.S. Department of Agriculture to give special consideration, in the allocation of deficits, to those countries who purchase our surplus commodities with dollars.

During the committee's consideration of this bill, we attempted to put effective language into the provision of the bill dealing with both the little global quota and the allocation of deficits. This attempt failed by a vote of 16 to 14.

The language of my amendment, which would have amended the bill in regard to both the little global quota and the allocation of deficits is as follows:

> In making allocations to foreign countries under the provisions of this paragraph preference shall be given to those friendly countries agreeing to purchase for dollars additional United States agricultural commodities.

At another place in the bill, I would have added:

> In making allocations to foreign countries under the provisions of this section (except as to deficits allocated among countries of the Central American Common Market) preference shall be given to those friendly countries agreeing to purchase for dollars additional United States agricultural commodities.

This amendment would have clearly established a preference, in the distribution of foreign and domestic deficits, for those friendly countries agreeing to purchase for dollars additional U.S. agricultural commodities. While the exact benefit is somewhat speculative—depending upon the deficits—a conservative estimate could mean disposal of around $40 million worth of U.S. surplus farm commodities per year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, in the controversy on this legislation, my strongest reason for supporting the legislation is the fact that it gives the protection needed for the beet growers in my area. My feelings on the foreign sugar quotas are pretty well developed in a little brochure that was put out by the committee. I believe that we have better reasons for dividing the quota among the foreign countries than the administration was able to give for theirs.

With regard to the amendments that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] will offer, I shall support both of them. I can see no reason for the work of the foreign lobbyists on this legislation. As we worked on the needs of the various countries and the allocation of quotas to them, I never saw the necessity of any of them being around, and what was done, was done through the knowledge of the members of the committee in regard to the various countries.

I feel that we would have made exactly the same decisions if the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois with regard to sugar lobbyists was in effect at the present time. I believe that we need lobbyists in the domestic interests, but I see no need for the foreign lobbyists here at all. We have some earthy comparisons in agriculture language that I could state but which I will not state right now. I think they are absolutely unnecessary.

I think we should be imposing import fees. There is a great gap between our high domestic price and the low world price. The import fee helps impede this unjustified outflow of dollars. I am pleased that the gentleman from Illinois has brought this up and will give us an opportunity to vote on the question in the House.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, one of the many distinctions of the district which I have the honor to represent is that it is the site of the world's largest sugar refinery.

At Crockett, Calif., on the Carquinez Straits, an upper arm of San Francisco Bay, is located the refinery of the California and Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corp. For almost 60 years this refinery has been one of the major employers of the San Francisco Bay Area.

The C. & H. Refinery, which refines practically all the raw sugar produced in the State of Hawaii, is the key link in the sugar partnership of California and Hawaii. Sugar is the most important commodity in the vigorous and growing trade between our two States, and contributes an essential part of the income of both areas which makes that trade possible.

As a member of the California delegation, I also take pride in the fact that California is our country's most important producer of beet sugar. Some of these sugarbeets are produced in my congressional district.

California produces almost 18 percent of the refined sugar which is consumed in the continental United States, and my district contributes about half of that total. Therefore, many of my constituents whose livelihood depends upon the sugar industry are interested in the passage of a fair and equitable sugar bill. I believe that H.R. 11135 is such a measure, and I therefore support it.

The different groups within the domestic sugar industry compete vigorously with one another in the distribution and sale of their products. This is nowhere more true than in California, where substantially more sugar is produced than consumed. These competitors have shown a cooperative spirit in participating in the decisions and realistic compromises which are incorporated in the present bill. H.R. 11135 is supported by the entire domestic sugar industry—the mainland sugarcane growers, the beet growers and processors, the Hawaiian sugar producers, the Puerto Rican producers, and the cane sugar refiners.

But this is not merely a sugar industry proposal. The essential provisions of the bill are supported by the Departments of State and Agriculture. Further, at a time when about 65 percent of all sugar is sold to food manufacturers, the bill is also supported by the organized industrial users of sugar. Therefore, H.R. 11135 represents a real and national consensus as to a fair and equitable sugar bill.

H.R. 11135 takes account of the lessons on sugar taught by the past 3 years. It rejects the novel and disastrous global quota concept introduced by the 1962 Sugar Act amendments. It assigns foreign quotas on a country-by-country basis, and in doing so tells our suppliers what we expect from each of them. It includes rewards and penalties to assure that these expectations will not be disappointed. It makes realistic and reasonable provision for the domestic sugar producers. Beet and mainland cane marketings are increased, but provisions to maintain a proper relationship between production and marketings are also included. Perhaps of most importance, the bill lays down the rules under which our domestic sugar industry and our foreign suppliers are to function through 1971. Any business, and most especially sugar, can plan and grow to best advantage in an atmosphere of reasonable stability. H.R. 11135 would contribute the stability needed for the orderly conduct of the sugar industry.

For purposes of emphasis, I have left for last the contribution which the Sugar Act, as amended and extended by H.R. 11135, has made and will continue to make to consumers. It provides the machinery to assure, as nearly as anything can be assured, that this country will always have an ample supply of sugar at fair and reasonable prices. It largely insulates the United States from the volatility of the so-called world sugar market, a market which is dangerously subject to manipulation by the Communist bloc. It will be a major force in keeping sugar one of the most reasonably priced commodities available to the American homemaker.

For all of these reasons, I support adoption of H.R. 11135 as reported by the Committee on Agriculture.

Under the rule governing consideration of this bill, there will be offered an amendment to reestablish an import fee on sugar brought to the United States from all foreign countries except the Philippines. The adoption of such a fee was one of the innovations and one of the mistakes of the Sugar Act Amendments of 1962. In 1962 proponents of an import fee predicted that this fee would develop income for the U.S. Treasury at a rate of $180 million per year. During the entire 2½ years the fees were in effect, collections came to less than $38 million. The higher prices resulting from the global quotas and import fees prescribed by the 1962 act cost consumers many times the amount paid to the Treasury. The present predictions of income from an import fee may very likely prove to be no more reliable.

An import fee would introduce into the Sugar Act the serious weakness of a direct tie between the U.S. sugar supply and the erratic and dangerously thin world market. It would make the false promise of a bargain purchase of cheap sugar, but it would also put this country in the precarious position of the chronic bargain hunter when faced with a tight supply. There are no suppliers who care about his business or feel any loyalty or long-term interest in his account. This is truly a penny-wise and pound-foolish amendment, and I urge its defeat.

Our sugar dealings with foreign countries, mostly in Latin America, will be most healthy and satisfactory if we pay a fair price, avoid short term and oppressive bargains, and rely on stable and enduring trade relationships to assure our needed supplies.

The committee bill takes this approach. The import fee amendment does not.

Therefore, I urge enactment of H.R. 11135 as approved by the House Committee on Agriculture and rejection of the proposed import fee amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished member of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to speak at quite some length in support of H.R. 11135, but the hour is getting late and we have had some very fine contributions from other Members of the House, especially the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. Chairman, despite all the "flack" we have gotten in recent weeks about the Sugar Act of 1965, the bill is simply designed to look out for the American housewife as the Congress has been doing for the past 31 years since 1934.

It attempts to assure for her a steady and uninterrupted flow of sugar at a stable price that she can depend on. It tries to protect her from the uncertainties of what would be a wildly fluctuating market.

The only time in the past 31 years this has not been accomplished was during the 2½ years that Congress reluctantly agreed to let the administration experiment with certain innovations that proved to be failures—one of them the import fee.

The program has worked exceedingly well in achieving its three basic purposes which are: First, to assure consumers a supply at fair and reasonable prices; second, to maintain and protect the domestic industry; and third, to promote the Nation's foreign trade. One of these experimental failures, the so-called import fee, was abandoned by both the administration in its recommendations to the Congress and by the Committee on Agriculture in its recommendations to the House. Yet, it is this very failure which the distinguished gentleman from Illinois might have us repeat.

In both peace and war the Sugar Act has worked exceedingly well in insuring consumers adequate supplies at reasonable prices. Even during the dark days of World War II, when rationing was required, the United States—despite the shipping shortage—continued to enjoy a relatively satisfactory level of sugar consumption. And certainly in times of peace, the act has continued to achieve its basic objectives, except for the brief period during which the mechanism was tampered with by the institution of so-called global quotas and the import fee.

The domestic provisions of the bill as reported by the committee represent a series of compromises among various competing segments of the domestic sugar industry which meet with the approval of the administration. The bill permits domestic beet and cane producers to work off certain surpluses over the term of the act without impairing the long-term relative position of other segments, notably the domestic refiners and our friendly foreign producers. It continues to assure that the domestic industry will be maintained and protected at reasonable levels and that the consumer will have supplies always available at fair prices. On the question of price, it is most interesting to note that sugar alone among all of the basic foods has increased least in cost since World War II. When sugar was decontrolled or unrationed in 1947, the price of raw sugar in New York was 6.32 cents per pound. Today the price of raw sugar in New York is 6.85 cents per pound. This is indeed a remarkable record. In fact, throughout the period since World War II, the only time sugar prices in the United States reached substantially higher levels was during the ill-fated experiments with so-called global quotas and import fees of 1962, 1963, and part of 1964.

The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois should be defeated for many reasons. To begin with it is contrary to the foreign policy of the United States as declared by the President as recently as August 17, 1965, in speaking to the ambassadors from Latin America.

But equally important with our foreign policy is the effect of this amendment on our own consumers, the American housewife and the industrial users of sugar whose supplies would be impaired and who would inevitably suffer from unstable and higher sugar prices. It is said by the gentleman from Illinois that he would simply be taxing away the "gravy" by levying an import equivalent to 75 percent of the difference between so-called world sugar prices and the U.S. market price. The term "world sugar market" is a complete misnomer. Nearly 90 percent of all of the sugar produced in the world is either consumed in the areas in which produced, or sold in protected preferential market systems such as ours, the British, the Germans, and the French. The world market is really just a dumping market in which only a small fraction of the world's supplies, which are not required within the areas of production or not required within protected systems are traded. As a consequence this market is an extremely volatile and unreliable one.

In 1962, Congress was so uncertain about the desirability of an import fee that it granted permission for its trial for only a period of 2 years. Within 6 months after passage of the 1962 amendments, world sugar prices doubled from a bit over 2 cents to 4.75 cents and by May 1963, the so-called world price had reached 12.6 cents per pound. By depriving our friendly foreign suppliers of price incentives during times of abundant supply, they naturally no longer felt the obligation to hold supplies for this market at the price level provided for in the Sugar Act. While supplies were made available, they were provided at or close to world prices, and therefore, U.S. prices rose sharply to the highest levels since the passage of the first Sugar Act in 1934. To reinstitute an import fee in the face of this experience is to do the American housewife, the bottler, the baker, and the candymaker along with their millions of customers a marked disservice.

The gentleman from Illinois tells us that if his import fee is reinstituted, the Treasury will enjoy a bounty of approximately $280 million annually or a total of $1,400 million during the life of the act. He does this by assuming that present depressed prices in the so-called world sugar market will continue throughout the term of the statute. This argument is unsupportable. Recent prices in the world market are at their lowest level in over 25 years, and inasmuch as such prices are far below the cost of production in the major export areas, it is obvious that they cannot remain at such levels for very long. The facts are that in the 2½ years during which we experimented with the import fee following the 1962 amendments, this levy yielded only $38 million whereas the proponents of this measure, I am told, had boldly claimed an annual yield of $180 million. The doubling of prices to consumers, the uncertainties of supply and the general instability in the market proved costly to consumers. Estimates are that our consumers paid an extra $300 million during the disastrous import fee experiment.

It is claimed that the domestic industry has, in the past, supported an import fee. The facts are that, when the domestic industry met earlier this year at the suggestion of both the administration and the Committee on Agriculture, the industry was informed by responsible officials of the Departments of State and Agriculture that the Administration would urge legislation containing an import fee. As a consequence, the industry, most of it reluctantly, agreed to the imposition of an import fee if in the judgment of the administration this were desirable. This reluctant agreement was given, despite our recent experience to the contrary, provided the level of such an import fee were not confiscatory, meaning by that not more than 50 percent of the difference and with a ceiling of 1 cent per pound. Quite clearly, the decision on the import fee, when finally determined by the President, was that such a levy was undesirable, and he so announced this position to the Ambassadors from Latin America. I am told that the domestic sugar industry unanimously supports the position of the President and the administration that the reimposition of an import fee ought not be legislated and that we ought not repeat our recent failures to provide sugar at fair and reasonable prices.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to pass the bill as reported by the Committee on Agriculture with the amendments recommended by the Committee and to defeat the amendment which would have us ignore our foreign policy commitments, jeopardize our supplies of sugar, and inevitably raise prices to consumers. This is a complex piece of legislation and the domestic provisions represent the consensus which all of us seek whenever greatly divergent interests are involved. The domestic provisions represent inevitable compromises between competing segments of our domestic industry and meet with the approval of the President and the executive agencies concerned with sugar matters.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the lovely lady who comes from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 11135 and urge my colleagues to support this measure. This bill is of vital interest to our State and is essential for the economy of the people of my State. I urge all Members to support it.

Hawaii's sugar industry has been one of the great success stories of our Nation, to the point where not only is sugar the largest industry of our islands, but Hawaii is the major sugar producing State of the Nation.

Hawaii's eight principal islands comprise 6,423 square miles, slightly larger than Connecticut and Rhode Island combined. Only about one-twelfth of this area is suitable for agriculture, and only four of the islands produce sugarcane.

Even now, some 231,000 acres comprise the total cane land area. Yet that area is so productive, and the application of scientific agriculture is so intense, that slightly more than 100,000 acres of cane harvested each year now provide more than 10 million tons of cane and more than 1,100,000 tons of sugar. These are record high yields for the sugar growing areas of the world.

Hawaiian production represents roughly 2 percent of world production and more than one-tenth of U.S. consumption. About $200 million of capital has been invested in this major industry of the islands since World War II, and returns to the economy in 1963 were about $188 million. The annual payroll, going to about 13,000 year-round employees, is in excess of $60 million. Applied scientific technology, mechanization, high yields per acre, and exceptional pay per hour for labor are characteristics which make the Hawaiian sugar industry outstanding in comparison with mainland production or with that of other countries in the world.

Sugarcane is an old, old story in Hawaii. Apparently it was brought to these islands either at the time of original settlement, perhaps as early as 500 A.D., or during the period down to about 1300 A.D., when voyages to and from Tahiti were thought to have continued. Botanists hold that it was one of 25 plants introduced in ancient times.

When Captain Cook discovered the islands in 1778 he noted "several plantations of sugarcane" growing on high ground. However, no sugar was made from the cane. It apparently was used as a kind of hedge around garden patches, and pieces were broken off and chewed for their sweet sap.

It has been said that all beginnings are difficult. This certainly was true for sugar production in Hawaii. During the first quarter of the 19th century, references to sugar production in the islands were fleeting. There was some experimentation in 1802 by Chinese, who tried to produce sugar on the island of Lanai with a crude granite roller and a few boiling pans. Lanai even today is not productive of sugar.

A few individual attempts to manufacture sugar were noted including that of an Italian resident, who in 1823, made sugar by pounding cane with stone beaters on the boards used by Hawaiians for making poi and then boiling the juice down to crystals.

It took severe tests and several failures before sugar was firmly established in the second quarter of the century, and great labor and infinite ingenuity to establish and extend the first cane plantations.

In 1825, John Wilkinson, an Englishman, set out a small cane plantation. Although he was dead by 1827, the juice of his first cane crop was converted to rum—at which the royal government ordered that the plantation's still be broken, its cane plowed under, and the land planted to sweet potatoes.

Three young New Englanders incorporated themselves as Ladd & Co. in 1835 and set out to produce sugar on 980 acres of land they leased from the Hawaiian king for 50 years at $300 a year. They went bankrupt, although about a third of their tract has since proved to be good cane land. Their plantation, Koloa on the island of Kauai, proved to be Hawaii's first permanent plantation. It exported 4,286 pounds of sugar and 2,700 gallons of molasses in 1837 and was finally merged with another plantation. Truly, the adventure of producing sugar in Hawaii in those days was not for the fainthearted.

There was perseverance, however. By 1838, there were 20 small sugar mills in operation in the islands, of which 18 were animal powered and two were water-powered. During the California gold rush, sugar prices rose to as much as 20 cents a pound, and Hawaii, in 1851, exported 162 tons of sugar.

From this small beginning, the development of Hawaii's sugar industry was rapid during the third quarter of the 19th century. Even then, mechanical improvements through the use of modern technology were a major factor.

The first sugar centrifugal, perhaps the most significant invention in the history of the sugar industry was introduced; it separated sugar crystals from molasses by its whirling action. The first steam engine was installed in 1853 and the first steam mill in 1857. Exports climbed to 913 tons in 1859, then declined to 722 tons in the next year.

But the introduction of the vacuum pan in 1863, together with the stimulus provided by the vast Civil War market in the United States, resulted in exports of 8,869 tons in 1866. Thereafter, production trended sharply upward, except for a few drought years.

The fascination of the establishment of this new enterprise attracted a wide diversity of pioneers. Among them were young New Englanders, the sons of early missionaries to Hawaii, American sea captains, the son of a president of Norway, Irishmen, Englishmen and Germans. They included bookkeepers and bankers as well as others with agricultural backgrounds.

As the need for labor grew in the burgeoning industry, 300 Chinese arrived from Hong Kong in 1852, to be followed by 500 more in 1865. This was the start of a long line of immigrants to the islands, called to work in the sugar fields and mills.

It is estimated that 46,000 Chinese migrated to Hawaii between 1864 and 1900, of whom 8,000 came from the mainland United States rather than directly from China. More than half came unassisted, and slightly more than half of them returned home after fulfilling their contracts. The others tended to congregate in Hawaii's urban areas, and it was estimated that 14,000 of the 20,000 Chinese in Hawaii in 1886 were in Honolulu, either in trade or raising truck vegetables in small farms just outside the city proper.

Japanese migration began in 1868, when the Hawaiian consul in Japan arranged for 148 laborers to come to Hawaii. It was 20 years before others followed them, however.

Rapid expansion of Hawaiian sugar production continued through the final quarter of the 19th century. After unsuccessful attempts in 1848 and 1852, the Hawaiian Government succeeded in negotiating a reciprocity treaty with the United States in 1876. That trade agreement admitted sugar duty free to the American consumer market.

Subsequently, land for sugar cane was substantially increased by the use of irrigation on four of the islands; and the irrigation also increased the reliable productivity of the land on which it was used.

The first and most famous irrigation project in Hawaii was the Hamakua Ditch, which was 17 miles long and capable of moving 40 million gallons of water a day. It was built by Alexander and Baldwin, sons of early American missionaries, at a cost of $80,000, to tap the rainfall of nearby mountains to water their then barren plantation in the hot but dry lowland plain of central Maui.

This success prompted the California capitalist Spreckels to build another ditch on Maui, this one 30 miles long and capable of delivering 50 million gallons of water daily.

Subsequent irrigation projects involved great tunnels through mountains, miles and miles of pipes, inverted siphons, large reservoirs, and even portable ditches. Water from wells for irrigation started in 1879, when the first artesian well was put down. Eventually, hundreds of pump and well combinations dotted the drier cane areas of the islands, providing hundreds of millions of gallons of water daily.

The efforts to irrigate also spotlight the growing importance of the use of science to increase productivity. The irrigated lands were assured of reliable growth conditions for a large segment of the acreage growing cane. Breeding work resulted in new cane varieties which yielded higher tonnage per acre and juice with a greater sugar content than the original varieties. Chemists were employed by the industry. Commercial fertilizers were introduced. As a result, the first 100,000-ton sugar crop was produced in 1886, to be followed by the first 250,000-ton crop only 11 years later.

Meanwhile, the sugar industry's labor needs continued to feed the famous Hawaii melting pot. Portuguese immigrant families had arrived in 1878, mostly from the island of Madeira. German immigrants followed them in 1881. After formal arrangements were made between the governments in 1885, the major Japanese immigration began in earnest. By 1907, more than 180,000 Japanese had come to Hawaii to work, of whom about 126,000 had left to return home. By 1913, the number of Portuguese immigrants had swelled to 20,000 men, women and children, with the majority of them again coming from Portugal's island provinces.

CHART I–A.—*Cane sugar production in Hawaii, 1908–63*

Production year (beginning Oct 1, ending Sept. 30)	Tons sugar per acre	Tons cane per ton sugar	Total cane land area	Cane used for sugar			Sugar produced		Raw value 96° sugar made per short tons of cane	Recovery o equivalent refined sugar from cane ground
				Acreage harvested	Average yield per acre	Production	Converted to 96° raw value	Equivalent refined		
			Acres	*Acres*	*Short tons*	*Short tons*	*Short tons*	*Short tons*	*Pounds*	*Percent*
1908–09	5.14	7.42	201,641	106,127	38.2	4,050,000	545,738	510,048	270	12.59
1909–10	4.81	7.78	209,469	110,247	37.4	4,122,000	529,940	495,282	257	12.02
1910–11	5.16	7.94	214,312	112,796	41.0	4,623,000	582,196	544,120	252	11.77
1911–12	5.34	7.75	216,345	113,866	41.4	4,711,000	607,863	568,109	258	12.06
1912–13	4.90	7.99	215,741	113,548	39.1	4,445,000	556,654	520,249	250	11.70
1913–14	5.54	8.01	217,470	112,700	44.4	5,000,000	624,165	583,345	250	11.67
1914–15	5.75	7.96	239,800	113,164	45.8	5,184,393	650,970	608,397	251	11.74
1915–16	5.17	8.14	246,332	115,419	42.1	4,859,424	596,703	557,679	246	11.48
1916–17	5.57	7.98	247,476	117,468	44.4	5,220,000	654,388	611,591	251	11.72
1917–18	4.86	8.34	246,813	119,785	40.5	4,855,804	582,192	544,117	240	11.21
1918–19	5.07	7.81	239,844	119,679	39.6	4,744,070	607,174	567,465	256	11.96
1919–20	4.91	7.98	247,838	114,105	39.2	4,473,498	560,379	523,379	251	11.71
1920–21	4.83	8.53	236,510	113,056	41.2	4,657,222	546,273	510,547	235	10.96
1921–22	4.98	8.23	228,519	124,124	41.0	5,088,062	618,457	578,010	243	11.36
1922–23	4.85	8.23	235,134	114,182	39.9	4,559,819	554,199	517,954	243	11.36
1923–24	6.42	7.91	231,862	111,581	50.7	5,661,000	715,918	669,097	253	11.82
1924–25	6.47	8.06	240,597	120,632	52.2	6,297,000	781,000	730,000	248	11.59
1925–26	6.58	8.07	237,774	122,309	53.1	6,495,686	804,644	752,020	248	11.58
1926–27	6.68	8.41	234,809	124,542	56.1	6,992,082	831,648	777,258	238	11.12
1927–28	7.00	8.37	240,769	131,534	58.6	7,707,330	920,887	860,661	239	11.17
1928–29	7.16	8.05	239,858	129,131	57.7	7,447,494	925,140	864,636	248	11.61
1929–30	7.02	8.36	242,761	133,840	58.7	7,853,439	939,287	877,858	239	11.18
1930–31	7.43	8.33	251,533	137,037	61.9	8,485,183	1,018,047	951,467	240	11.21
1931–32	7.57	8.38	251,876	139,744	63.4	8,865,323	1,057,303	988,155	239	11.15
1932–33	7.34	8.05	254,563	144,959	59.1	8,566,781	1,063,605	994,045	248	11.60
1933 (Oct. 1 to Dec. 31)							127,317	118,990		

CHART I-B.—*Cane sugar production in Hawaii, 1908–63*

Production year (beginning Jan. 1)	Tons sugar per acre	Tons cane per ton sugar	Total cane land acre	Cane used for sugar			Sugar produced		Raw value 96° sugar made per short tons of cane	Recovery of equivalent refined sugar from cane ground
				Acreage harvested	Average yield per acre	Production	Converted to 96° raw value	Equivalent refined		
			Acres	*Acres*	*Short tons*	*Short tons*	*Short tons*	*Short tons*	*Pounds*	*Percent*
1934	7.14	8.33	252,237	134,318	59.5	7,992,260	959,337	896,596	240	11.22
1935	7.82	8.67	246,491	126,116	67.8	8,555,424	986,849	922,309	231	10.78
1936	7.97	8.80	245,891	130,828	70.1	9,170,279	1,042,316	974,149	227	10.62
1937	7.46	9.32	240,833	126,671	69.5	8,802,716	944,382	882,619	215	10.03
1938	6.92	9.39	238,302	135,978	65.0	8,835,370	941,293	879,732	213	9.96
1939	7.18	8.66	235,227	138,440	62.2	8,609,543	994,173	929,154	231	10.79
1940	7.16	8.76	235,110	136,417	62.7	8,557,216	976,677	912,802	228	10.67
1941	7.24	9.04	238,111	130,768	65.5	8,559,797	947,190	885,244	221	10.34
1942	7.58	9.10	225,199	114,745	69.0	7,918,342	870,099	813,195	220	10.27
1943	7.79	9.24	220,928	113,754	71.9	8,185,400	885,640	827,719	216	10.11
1944	7.99	8.95	216,072	109,522	71.5	7,832,185	874,947	817,725	223	10.44
1945	7.96	8.98	211,331	103,173	71.4	7,371,158	821,216	767,509	223	10.41
1946	8.06	8.83	208,376	84,379	71.1	6,002,127	680,073	635,596	227	10.59
1947	7.72	9.11	211,624	113,020	70.3	7,942,216	872,187	815,146	220	10.26
1948	8.35	9.03	206,550	100,042	75.4	7,542,613	835,107	780,491	221	10.35
1949	8.76	8.44	213,354	108,794	73.9	8,045,941	955,890	893,375	238	11.10
1950	8.78	8.51	220,383	109,405	74.7	8,174,821	960,961	898,114	235	10.99
1951	9.09	8.51	221,212	109,494	77.4	8,477,201	995,759	930,636	235	10.98
1952	9.44	8.52	221,990	108,089	80.4	8,693,920	1,020,450	953,712	235	10.97
1953	10.15	8.19	221,542	108,337	83.1	9,003,967	1,099,316	1,027,421	244	11.41
1954	10.02	8.75	220,138	107,480	87.75	9,431,781	1,077,347	1,006,889	228	10.68
1955	10.74	8.66	218,819	106,180	92.94	9,867,978	1,140,112	1,065,525	231	10.79
1956	10.28	9.01	220,606	106,956	92.65	9,909,990	1,099,543	1,027,633	222	10.37
1957	10.16	8.71	221,336	106,742	88.51	9,447,647	1,084,646	1,013,710	230	10.73
1958	9.09	9.87	221,683	84,136	89.77	7,552,750	764,953	714,925	203	9.47
1959	8.83	9.66	222,588	110,371	85.31	9,416,225	974,632	910,891	207	9.67
1960	9.03	9.20	224,617	103,584	83.15	8,613,317	935,744	874,546	217	10.86
1961	10.09	8.78	227,027	108,320	88.58	9,595,342	1,092,481	1,021,033	228	11.39
1962	10.31	8.78	228,926	108,600	90.36	9,812,580	1,120,011	1,046,762	228	11.41
1963	10.25	9.12	231,321	107,436	93.39	10,033,969	1,100,768	1,028,777	219	10.97

In the 20th century, the history of Hawaii's sugar industry has continued along the lines set down for it earlier.

Use of the most modern technology has continued the upward trend of production, and two World Wars have provided both stimulus and some dislocations. Since 1937, because sugar prices had fluctuated widely, new legislation to meet this problem became necessary.

The discovery of new and improved techniques brought more land, previously considered worthless, under cultivation after the turn of the century. Once again, the call for labor went out, and in 1906 the last influx, that of Filipino labor, commenced. By 1910 there were 2,361 Filipinos in Hawaii, the total rising to 66,049 in 1931, when Filipino men comprised the bulk of plantation labor. Their recruitment was carefully planned. Pay and living conditions were publicized. Immigrants had to pay their own way over, although they were promised their passage home after 720 days of work within a 3-year period.

The pattern of development in the islands has been such as to develop large units that could respond to long-range planning and operations utilizing modern technology. As sugar boomed after the 1879 reciprocity treaty, the farmers turned to Honolulu merchants for financial and other help, resulting finally in a present-day network of 26 separate sugar plantation companies, plus about 1,200 independent cane planters.

CHART II.—*Sugarcane acreage, acreage harvested, production, average number of adult hourly rated employees, and total man-days of all hourly rated employees on Hawaiian sugar plantations*

	1940	1945	1950	1955	1960	1963
Acreage	235,110	211,331	220,383	218,819	224,617	228,926
Acreage harvested	136,417	103,174	109,405	106,180	103,584	107,436
Production, 96° tons	976,677	821,216	960,961	1,140,112	935,744	1,100,768
Adult hourly rated employees	35,062	20,806	20,258	16,773	12,111	10,722
Total man-days, hourly rated employees	8,870,704	6,350,489	5,069,682	3,896,761	2,917,459	2,582,706

Technical progress continues to be the keynote to improved production. As a result, in the 1960's Hawaii has produced bigger yields on small acreages than anywhere else in the world.

The harvest sugar acreage in Hawaii reached an average yield of nearly 95 tons of cane an acre in 1964. Because cane is a 2-year crop in Hawaii, halving this gives a comparison of 42.5 tons per acre with the 29-ton average in Louisiana, the 32-ton yield for Florida, and the 33-ton yield for Puerto Rico.

One of the newer technical developments is the use of overhead irrigation, which is adaptable to areas not easily irrigated by earlier methods and which apparently requires only one-fourth as much water as would be used with ditch irrigation. This has led to the use of some additional land for sugarcane.

In addition, replanting with improved cane varieties continues, and new and improved loading machinery, unloading equipment, boilers, and other machinery are being installed. And new tests are being conducted on techniques of loading, cutting seed, utilizing bagasse—sugarcane waste—and mill processing.

The continuing importance of technological advances is of major importance in the light of tight limitations on land resources. From a high of 250,000 acres in 1932–33, sugarcane acreage in Hawaii declined to less than 207,000 in 1948 before rising again to more than 231,000 acres in 1963. It is believed that only about 250,000 acres throughout the State can ever be used profitably for sugarcane production, in the light of present sugar prices.

Growing hand in hand with modern plantation technology has been a program of industrial relations and cooperation with labor organizations that has seen Hawaii's sugar workers become the highest paid in any sugar growing area. Hawaii's sugar plantation and mill workers are represented by the International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union.

The Hawaii plantation worker is employed the year around. He produces more and gets paid more. His hourly earnings are from one-third to three times higher than field workers' earnings in other sugar producing areas of America, and vastly above those of foreign sugar producing areas. In addition, there are fringe benefits of medical care, paid vacations and holidays, insurance and pensions.

In 1963, the average daily wage of nonsupervisory employees in the Hawaii sugar industry was $16.68, with fringe benefits valued at another $5 a day. This $21.68 total in 1963 rose to an estimated $24.10 a day in 1965.

A recent 1-year collective bargaining contract covering employees of 25 plantations provided for wage increases of 7 cents an hour, starting February 1, 1965; an additional paid holiday on the day before New Year's; and extension of the industry's dental health insurance plan for children of employees.

It is estimated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture that average hourly cash earnings of field workers in Hawaii's sugar industry was $2.22 in 1964, compared to $1.29 for beet area workers, and that in 1965 Hawaii's cane field workers will be earning $2.30 an hour, compared to $1.35 for beet workers.

Meanwhile, the sugar shortages of 1962–63 have developed marketing problems for Hawaii's sugar industry. Surplus supplies became troublesome for western sugarbeet growers who had expanded production from 2,213,000 tons in 1957 to 3,110,000 tons in 1963 as the result of lifting or acreage restrictions. Much of this must be marketed in the same western areas of the United States in which Hawaii's cane sugar is sold. At the same time, the price of sugar has dropped from its scarcity highs to a more normal level.

The agreement among sugar industry segments on recommended legislation would appear to solve these problems in a manner satisfactory to Hawaii's cane producers as well as to the sugarbeet growers of the Western States.

In addition, it is indicated that Hawaiian cane growers will continue to depend, as they have in the past, on efficient utilization of the latest and best in technology. Fully 25 varieties of specially bred cane occupy important acreages in Hawaii. Applied science continues to be related to fertilization, irrigation, and insect and disease control.

Management engineers continue to apply themselves to new and more efficient methods of producing, harvesting, transporting, and milling cane. Major savings have been realized in bulk sugar unloading costs.

The 1964 sugar crop of 1,178,770 tons set a new record high, breaking the record of 1,140,112 tons established in 1955. It produced the highest amount of sugar production per acre in the world, with its 10.64 tons per acre, just one-tenth of a ton lower than the record figure of 10.74 tons set in 1955. Cane land in production reached a post-World War II high of 233,145 acres, while total acres harvested amounted to 110,759 acres.

Because of the drop in sugar prices, receipts are estimated at about $157 million which is equal to 1962 but well below the $188 million recorded in 1963.

So it is that Hawaii's sugar industry maintains its position as one of the most important in the world in the face of the constant fluctuation of price, competitive position, and international relations with which it has had to contend since its inception.

We in Hawaii proudly look forward to continuation of this success story far into the future, with advantageous results to the State and its citizens as well as to the entire Nation.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STALBAUM].

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Chairman, while I have not disturbed myself with the presentations of lobbyists I am disturbed at the treatment by the committee of the one country who would not operate through a lobbyist but preferred to work through her Embassy. That country is Argentina.

This matter was not brought up at the time of our committee action because I—and probably many others on the committee—had the impression that Argentina was not interested in our market for their sugar. It is my belief that a country should be permitted to present its case in such manner as it desires.

As a result of Argentina's nonappearance we were not aware of her case—and in my opinion she has a good one.

In 1963 Argentina shipped 216,000 tons to us—in a year when world factors were not always favorable to our market. In 1964 she fulfilled her quota of 20,000 tons and this year in the first 9 months—1965—she has already filled her quota of 66,000 tons. On the basis of this I feel that the statement on page 4 of the report of the ad hoc committee stating that Argentina is an erratic producer is unfair. She has always met her obligation to us. Contrast this with Brazil who shipped 184,000 tons in 1964 but was given a quota of 341,000 tons, or Venezuela, who did not ship us any sugar in 1964 but was given a quota of 31,000 tons.

In spite of shipping 216,000 tons in 1963, 20,000 tons in 1964, and 66,000 tons in 1965 the committee assigned Argentina a quota of only 21,485 tons. The original recommendation of the Department of Agriculture was for nearly 64,000 tons. This cut from 64,000 tons to 21,000-plus tons does not square with her shipments to us.

During the past 4 years six nations in South America sold sugar to us. In total shipment Argentina ranked third—after Peru and Brazil.

Yet—when the quotas were established Argentina received the lowest quota of the six countries. Even Venezuela, which had shipped only 3,000 tons a year for the past 4 years, received a quota nearly 10,000 tons a year higher than did Argentina.

I regret that these factors were not known at the time of the committee's deliberation. Had they been known to me I am sure that I would have favored giving Argentina more consideration than she received.

The ad hoc committee on page 7 of their report "The Development of Foreign Sugar Quotas in H.R. 11135," state that they have "tried to keep as much of the foreign sugar quota as possible in the Western Hemisphere." This is laudable. I only regret that the only country who did not hire a lobbyist seems to be the most unfairly treated of all the Western Hemisphere countries.

Nor is this the first time this occurred. In 1962 the Honey Bee Act had to be passed after the Sugar Act in order that Argentina be assigned any quota at all.

The following figures give a comparison of the recommendations with the committee approved bill H.R. 11135 for sugar quota for South American nations, as well as a comparison of the shipments of the seven South American nations for the years 1961 through 1964 as compared with the recommended quota:

Comparison of U.S. Department of Agriculture recommendation and committee-approved bill (H.R. 11135) for sugar quotas for South American nations

[In tons]

	USDA shipments	Committee
Peru	240,824	272,013
Brazil	221,558	340,925
Argentina	63,685	21,485
Ecuador	49,770	50,267
Colombia	27,829	42,970
Venezuela	2,676	30,809
Bolivia	0	4,054

Comparison of average annual shipments to the United States by South American nations (1961–64) and quotas as established by committee-approved bill (H.R. 11135)

[In tons]

	1961–64 shipments	Committee
Peru	441,750	272,013
Brazil	340,250	340,925
Argentina	64,750	21,485
Ecuador	54,000	50,267
Colombia	46,250	42,970
Venezuela	3,000	30,809
Bolivia	0	4,054

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to use to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] a distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, although the hour is late, since I have waited all afternoon for this opportunity to address the House, I ask my colleagues to bear with me.

Mr. Chairman, although we have heard a great deal of criticism of H.R. 11135, the Sugar Act of 1965, no one has adequately described the conditions that would prevail if the proposed legislation is defeated. It is true that existing legislation continues until December 31, 1966. However, if this bill fails the greatest sufferers will be our own domestic producers of sugar. It will mean that they will be denied the opportunity to market domestically an additional 580,000 tons each year, for the next 5 years, out of their large surplus stock. And to make matters worse this 580,000 tons, unless this bill is passed, will have to be bought from foreign producers. This bill is needed to help our own domestic sugar industry.

Much has been made of the fact that the world price of sugar is now about 2 cents a pound, while the United States pays over 6 cents a pound for imported sugar into this country. Actually, however, there is no assurance that the world price of sugar will continue at this low level. In late 1963 and early 1964 the price of sugar in world markets rose to 12 cents a pound, and exporters to the United States sold their sugar for less than they could have obtained in other markets. No one knows when this situation will be repeated. If this happens, our foreign suppliers will not gain a windfall, as has been alleged here by the opponents of this measure, but will suffer a loss. We need to bear this in mind because there is no guarantee that the present low level in the world market will continue. It would be a mistake to assume that the present low world sugar prices, which are below production costs in all exporting countries, will continue over the next 5 years.

As producers in the higher-cost countries cut back their production in the face of today's low prices, sugar production may be cut back too far again, as it was in 1963. World prices may again shoot up 8 to 10 cents a pound if a little too much adjustment is made in production. If and when this happens the provisions of H.R. 11135 will stabilize U.S. supplies and prices, with savings to consumers.

H.R. 11135 recognizes that as a matter of national security a substantial portion of our sugar requirements should be produced within the United States without resort to a high protective tariff. It assures U.S. consumers a plentiful and stable supply of sugar at reasonable prices. It also permits friendly foreign countries to participate equitably in supplying the U.S. sugar market.

Without sugar legislation of this type, U.S. sugarcane and sugarbeet producers would be subject to wide swings in prices, and probably would be operating at a loss most of the years due to competition from low-cost sugar producing areas near the equator.

Although it is common practice to speak of a world price for sugar, actually relatively little of the world trade in sugar is conducted by private trading firms. Most of the industrialized nations of the world have domestic sugar-producing industries which are insulated from outside supplies and prices to a considerable extent.

For various reasons, most sugar moving in world trade is moving under government agreements, directed by government monopolies, or subject to government quotas.

We in the United States cannot allow our sugar supplies to be dependent on the actions of other governments. We believe as a matter of national security that we should have an efficient sugar-producing industry in the United States. It need not produce all our supplies, but it should produce a substantial portion of them, and our imports should be on a planned basis.

We now have a domestic sugar industry which directly provides employment for over 300,000 workers, of which about 240,000 represent the seasonal peak in employment on farms. In 1961, investments in the U.S. sugar industry totaled $1,650 million, over half of which was in sugar factories and refineries. Investment in sugarbeet and sugarcane producing farmlands and production equipment make up a little less than half of the total.

As pointed out in the committee report the proposed sugar legislation does not provide for fixing the price of domestic sugar. The U.S. price is kept within a desirable range by the limitation and regulation of sugar imports.

Small conditional payments are made to domestic sugarbeet and sugarcane growers who comply with production restrictions, pay fair wages to workers, and avoid the use of child labor. A tax of 0.53 cent a pound is imposed on all sugar manufactured or imported into the United States which more than covers the conditional payments to producers. Since 1937, tax collections have exceeded compliance payments under the sugar program by $550 million. Sugar is the only controlled agricultural product which can make this claim. It has more than paid for its own program.

All domestic areas including Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands will supply approximately 65 percent of the U.S. sugar needs under the proposed Sugar Act of 1965. It provides an insurance of adequate and stable supplies for American consumers at reasonable prices—prices which are lower than in most other countries.

The retail price of sugar in the United States is now about 11 cents a pound. In Italy, however, where consumers' incomes are much lower, the retail price of sugar approximates 16 cents a pound, in Sweden 15 cents a pound, in Germany and Japan 14 cents, in France and Yugoslavia sugar costs about 13 cents a pound, in the United Kingdom about 11 cents, and in Russia 45 cents a pound.

In all of these countries, per capita incomes are much lower than in the United States. In relation to consumers' buying power, therefore, sugar prices in the United States are much lower than anywhere in the world.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 11135 continues the objectives of the Sugar Act of 1948 which has served this country exceptionally well. It is fair and equitable to the domestic producers, to the domestic consumers, and to the producers of friendly nations.

The Agriculture Committee was virtually unanimous in its decisions on major provisions of this bill, and as a member of the committee I resent the insinuations that have been made on this floor that some lobbyists got to the members of the committee. Everything was above board and I am proud to have had a part in reporting this bill to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, in urging support of H.R. 11135 I speak for the passage of a bill which will not only result in good for my home State of Hawaii, but which will also continue in effect a law which has proven itself over the course of more than 30 years as being good for the entire Nation. Let us not abandon the good; let us continue it without any crippling amendments.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, Mr. POLANCO-ABREU, such time as he may require.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Chairman, I add my voice to many others urging swift approval of H.R. 11135 the Sugar Amendments of 1965. I represent a sugar producing area, and sugar is an enormously important commodity in our economy.

The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico supports the Sugar Amendments of 1965 and urges continuation of the system under which the domestic consumers are assured a continued supply of sugar at a reasonable price.

I realize that there are some who believe that improvements are possible in the system of our allotting foreign quotas and who may be otherwise disenchanted with the legislative procedures devised years ago to protect producers and consumers alike. I maintain, however, that this system works and that the Sugar Act and the stability which it brings to the sugar industry are fundamentals to the welfare of the thousands of Puerto Rican families that I represent and also fundamental to the welfare of all American consumers throughout the length and breadth of the United States.

I am sure in my mind that continued workable and effective legislation, based primarily on the decisions of the administration and reflecting the industry position, is essential for the growers and refiners and consumers, and moreover, is a valuable asset in connection with our relationships with our sugar-producing neighbors, as well as to the welfare of their people.

Puerto Rico has been unable to fill its quota for several years because of the effects of a disastrous hurricane, followed by an unprecedented drought combined with a 4-year spell of especially bad harvesting conditions.

The Puerto Rican government has been devoting its efforts and finances to improving the industry. Large investments are being made to mechanize, to replant, and to apply modern techniques. Our production is on the upgrade again, and we hope to regain some of the ground that was lost during the past 8 years. The provisions in the bill before us will allow Puerto Rico time in which to recover lost production levels.

I hope that this bill may be promptly considered and approved, and that the Senate, which has already set hearings this week on the measure will likewise be able to debate and approve the legislation next week, perhaps as one of its last, but very important actions of this session.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. The Sugar Act has worked successfully since 1934. It operates in the consumer's interest by insuring a stable supply of sugar for the U.S. market, and it does so without a consumer-penalizing tariff. It operates in the producer's interest by providing him with an assured market not subject to the uncertainties which plague the world market, and it allows the United States to produce a substantial portion of its own sugar needs within the continental United States.

The legislation before the House today wisely allows 65 percent of the Nation's sugar needs to be filled by American producers. I am pleased to note that the mainland cane area is allotted an additional quota of 205,000 tons.

For Florida's sugar producers this increase will allow our State to sell some 23 percent more sugar.

Florida's economy is now showing the dramatic effects of the sugar expansion which has taken place in our State since 1960. Production of sugar in Florida totaled 160,000 tons in 1960, and climbed to 574,000 tons in 1964—an increase of 359 percent.

With acreage alone, Florida showed an increase of 451 percent more cane in the ground between 1960 and 1964. While there has been a reduction of 17 percent less acreage planted for the 1965 crop, this new bill before the House will add much to an already booming commodity for Florida's diversifying economy.

Since 1960 there have been seven new sugar companies formed to participate in this growth. Representing an overall investment of approximately $150 million, there are now 11 new sugar mills in Florida which have arisen since 1960.

The 1965 Florida crop is estimated to be worth over $70 million. Clearly, sugar has taken a place alongside citrus and vegetables as a major Florida agricultural commodity.

I urge the House to enact this measure to continue the stability of the U.S. sugar market.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN].

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I realize as well as anyone that the hour is late and that again we have arrived at the point where we do not have time to discuss a matter as important as this one, and we are about to use whatever methods there are to curtail the debate. I shall try to be as brief as possible and I shall try to bring out only a point or two that I think needs further emphasis.

In so doing I wish to state that I shall include some additional items that will be a part of the RECORD for tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, the writers of this sugar bill before us today are trying to tell us that its passage is urgently needed to help the domestic sugar industry, but actually this bill represents another 5 years of decreased production for our beet farmers, and completely denies them the right to share in the growth of the U.S. sugar market. If there is any urgency in this bill, it was created by this Government when it asked the domestic industry to produce more sugar when world supplies were low. The American growers responded magnificently and their right to market that sugar is now being used as an excuse by those who want this bill passed without question. But when you look at the facts, there are no favors in this bill for the domestic producers. While the bill provides for an increase of 375,000 tons to domestic beets and 205,000 tons to domestic cane, these increases are very costly. The bill provides that they must sacrifice the allocation of 65 percent of any increase in our needs from 9.7 million tons and 10.4 million tons or a total of 700,000 tons. Therefore there is little or no benefit to domestic producers as has been implied by many.

As we read this bill, it becomes obvious where the favors are being dispensed. Section after section directs special attention to foreign sugar interests in preference to our domestic growers.

I have prepared an analysis of sugar policies in this country over the past 4 years and have compared this history with the proposals for 1966. When the facts are put on paper, with the figures for quotas and purchases set forth in columns for easy analysis, an interesting and strange story emerges. It is a story that shakes a warning finger at the decisions of the past that have led us to this moment today. The table thereby follows:

TABLE I.—*Quotas and purchases for sugar, 1962 to 1966*

[In tons]

	Quota 1962	Purchased 1962	Quota 1963	Purchased 1963	Quota 1964	Purchased 1964	Quota 1965	Quota 1966
Peru	132,939	530,312	206,243	413,418	192,096	232,780	222,691	272,013
Dominican Republic	191,834	861,523	336,243	589,999	322,096	398,462	357,566	340,925
Mexico	118,734	397,574	206,243	379,379	192,096	480,120	358,617	340,925
Nicaragua	18,193	47,129	27,048	38,392	25,193	50,340	37,395	38,511
Netherlands	1,970	7,319						
Haiti	12,145	34,347	21,823	40,423	20,326	14,957	20,168	28,782
China	16,441	121,473	38,114	71,269	35,499	81,156	63,026	67,293
Hong Kong	2	43						
Canada	316	3,654						
United Kingdom	258	1,742						
Belgium	182	1,863	182	7,546	182	180	1,744	
Guatemala	8,325	32,870	21,823	51,050	20,326	37,251	36,828	32,836
Honduras								4,054
El Salvador	4,221	19,137	11,065	18,955	10,306	20,571	15,820	30,403
Venezuela				11,907			2,458	30,809
Costa Rica	12,215	26,629	27,048	40,637	25,193	40,526	32,143	42,159
Panama	8,116	3,774	16,290	10,183	8,832	19,216	13,298	25,134
British Guiana and British West Indies	37,447	181,661	98,050	141,356	91,325	142,228	112,690	150,397
Brazil	74,694	391,157	195,793	469,822	182,363	182,363	204,057	340,925
Australia	16,534	148,624	43,339	223,584	40,366	215,098	171,913	162,152
French West Indies	12,430	43,706	32,581	94,297	30,346	34,286	39,706	42,970
Colombia	12,430	66,127	32,581	45,030	30,346	28,292	27,038	42,970
Ecuador	10,319	66,861	27,048	56,482	25,193	57,920	45,652	50,267
India	8,325	144,677	21,823	118,963	20,326	110,553	89,224	64,861
South Africa	8,325	93,091	21,823	132,272	20,326	119,960	98,047	29,593
Argentina	10,000	9,757	20,000	228,568	20,000	19,751	59,244	21,485
British Honduras	4,104		10,758	1,712	974	5,988	3,845	19,864
Fiji Islands	4,104	15,754	10,758	48,565	10,020	54,517	41,954	24,323
Ireland	5,000	9,977	10,000	9,973	10,000		7,983	
Paraguay	4,104		10,758					
France				22,953		845	5,315	
Malagasy Republic						11,599	6,723	6,081
Mauritius		13,475		66,605			13,866	14,188
Reunion				9,893			2,038	
Southern Rhodesia				10,589		10,260	8,403	6,081
Turkey		65,304		6,578			1,408	
Thailand								19,864
Bolivia								4,054
Swaziland								6,081
Unallotted reserve	4,680		11,908		36,577			
Total	837,387	3,339,561	1,459,342	3,360,382	1,370,307	2,369,179	2,100,860	2,260,000
Philippines	1,050,000	1,256,164	1,050,000	1,194,833	1,050,000	1,217,393	1,050,000	1,050,000
Domestic beet	2,795,769	2,415,000	2,990,127	2,965,000	2,698,590	[1] 2,699,000	2,698,579	3,025,000
Mainland cane	944,231	787,000	1,009,873	1,072,000	911,410	[1] 905,000	911,410	1,100,000
Hawaii	1,110,000	1,084,000	1,110,000	1,033,000	1,110,000	[1] 1,110,000	1,110,000	1,110,000
Puerto Rico	1,140,000	904,000	1,140,000	875,000	1,140,000	[1] 793,000	915,000	1,140,000
Virgin Islands	15,000	11,000	15,000	15,000	15,832	[1] 16,000	15,832	15,000
Cuban to other countries	2,206,613		1,625,658		1,503,861		[2] 398,319	
Total quota	10,000,000		10,400,000		9,800,000		9,200,000	9,700,000
Total purchases		9,796,725		10,515,215		9,109,572		

[1] Rounded off to nearest thousand.

[2] Unallocated.

NOTE.—Bahamas in 1968 has 10,000-ton quota.

Source: "Sugar Reports", U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Stabilization Service, H. Rept. 1046, 89th Cong., 1st sess. "Selected Data on Sugar," prepared by the Department of Agriculture for the House Committee on Agriculture, Aug. 16, 1965.

The first startling conclusion is that the domestic sugar industry has barely held its own while the favors extended foreign sugar suppliers pyramided at an alarming rate. Between 1962 and the present proposed quotas in this bill for 1966, the domestic sugarbeet growers of this Nation will have received an increase in their quota of a modest 8 percent, including the extra sugar to be marketed at the insistence of the Federal Government during the sugar shortage. Foreign quotas during that same time, however, increased a whopping 170 percent. Quotas for these foreign nations increased from 837,387 tons in 1962 to 2,260,000 tons for 1966 under provisions of the bill being considered today. That is a figure almost three times as large as it was in 1962, during the very same time period when the domestic industry was forced to virtually stand still. These figures were obtained by comparing the exact same list of nations for each year, and clearly indicates the preferential treatment received by foreign nations in the sugar bills passed by the Congress.

Of course, when you look at the actual tonnage purchased each year from these quota countries, you get an even stranger picture. An almost consistent pattern emerges whereby we see that "Uncle Sugar" purchased at least double the amount of the quotas from most of the countries listed. In fact, a number of them actually sold us six times as much sugar as specified by the quotas. This also is an interesting and puzzling aspect of our sugar policies. Our domestic producers cannot market one single ounce of sugar beyond the established quota. But the favored foreign nations are not bothered with such inconveniences at all. In fact, their quotas too often become meaningless compared with our purchases from them.

Not only have these foreign countries been given ever-increasing quotas and been allowed to sell sugar to us well in excess of these quotas, but we even see a list of entirely new nations from whom we have not been buying sugar. In other words, we tell our domestic growers that they must curtail production and that no new growers are to be allowed into the sugar business. But in the same breath we welcome increased production in other nations and even start buying in new areas. You will note that in this 5-year bill the Bahama Islands will be brought into sugar production in 1968. The Bahamas have never raised sugar before, but we have told them to go ahead and try and that we will provide premium prices for it.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is obvious where the favors are being dispensed under the legislation before us.

The comparative figures relative to quotas and purchases reveal a host of unanswered questions that need to be aired here today. Why has Peru's quota more than doubled since 1962? Why has Haiti's quota more than doubled? What are the reasons for the Dominican Republic's quota being increased by 150,000 tons a year? Why is Brazil's quota now almost five times as great? Why did Venezuela's quota jump from 2,500 tons in 1965 to over 30,000 in 1966? Or, on the other hand, why does Argentina's quota under this new bill stand out like a sore thumb because her quota was slashed to barely one-third of what it was before?

TABLE II.—*Information on sugar lobbyists*

Name of attorney and firm	Client's name	Compensation for most recent 12-month period
Charles Patrick Clark, 500 World Center Building, Washington, D.C	Venezuelan Sugar Distributors Association	$50,000.00
Oscar L. Chapman, of Chapman & Friedman, Washington, D.C	National Union of Sugar Producers of Mexico	50,000.00
Albert S. Nemir, A. S. Nemir Associates, Washington, D.C	Brazilian Sugar & Alcohol Institute	31,511.06
Arthur L. Quinn, of Quinn & Quinn, Washington, D.C	Privately owned sugar companies in British West Indies, Ecuador, Panama, and British Honduras.	25,000.00
Sheldon Z. Kaplan, of Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, Washington, D.C	Latin American Sugar Council, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Costa Rica.	24,800.00
Charles H. Brown, Washington, D.C	Fiji	24,000.00
Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, Washington, D.C	Indian Sugar Mills Association	20,000.00
John R. Mahoney, of Casey, Lane & Mittendorf, New York City	South African Sugar Association	19,320.08
Robert C. Barnard of Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, New York City	Colonial Sugar Refinery, Sydney, Australia	19,175.12
John A. O'Donnell, Washington, D.C	Philippine Sugar Association and National Federation of Sugarcane Planters of Philippines.	18,000.00
Arnold F. Shaw, Washington, D.C	Sugar Producers Committee of Peru	15,000.00
Ernest Schein & John G. Laylin, Washington, D.C	Associated Sugar Producers of Colombia	15,000.00
James M. Earnest, Washington, D.C	Mauritius Chamber of Agriculture & Sugar Syndicate	13,952.00
Walter Sterling Surrey, of Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Greene, Washington, D.C	Sugar Producers of Guadalupe & Martinique	12,500.00
Seymour S. Guthman, Washington, D.C	Sugar Producers of the Madagascar Republic	7,500.00
Attorney Ganson Purcell, of Purcell & Nelson, Washington, D.C	Southern Rhodesia Sugar Sales, Ltd	5,000.00
Attorney George Grant, Washington, D.C	Thailand	3,500.00
Robert L. Farrington, Washington, D.C	Republic of China	3,000.00
Robert D. Larsen, of Royall, Koegel & Rogers, Washington, D.C	Swaziland Sugar Association	(1)

(1) Filed Aug. 2, 1965 (nothing received up to time of filing).

Source: Foreign Agents Registrations Section, U.S. Department of Justice.

A published report tells us that one of these lobbyists even sat in on some of the hearings conducted on this legislation by the Committee on Agriculture; and how this lobbyist was even praised by the committee chairman. This man represents the British West Indies, British Honduras, Ecuador, and Panama. There must have been a lot of sweet talk going on because those four countries all received increased quotas that total almost 60,000 tons a year.

Haiti, that unhappy land ruled by the worst tyrant in the Western Hemisphere, was represented by a lobbyist who has not even had the courtesy to register with the Justice Department. Prior to that, Haiti was represented by a close friend of the White House. Haiti will get an 8,500-ton increase in its quota, a quota that has more than doubled since 1962. As one report noted, the premium price will give Dictator Duvalier access to an extra $10 million, most of which will probably end up in his Swiss bank accounts. It is another example of how we grease the palm of an unfriendly dictator who keeps his people starving.

A brandnew lobbyist showed up to represent Thailand and that country gets a quota for the first time of almost 20,000 tons.

Venezuela's quota jump of 27,500 tons helped one lobbyist earn his $50,000 fee.

Peru's quota jump of 50,000 tons reflects the efforts of the Washington attorney retained by that Nation.

Brazil, also with a lobbyist on hand, will see its quota jump by 115,000 tons. Brazil will have increased its quota by over 260,000 tons just since 1962, which is a total ton increase well over the increase experienced by all of the sugarbeet growers in the United States during the same period.

But, what happened to Argentina, the country that had its quota slashed to barely a third of what it was? Was its lobbyist sleeping on the job? No, Argentina had the old-fashioned idea that it was enough for a foreign nation to be represented in America by its Embassy, so that country had no lobbyist at all. The implication did not go unnoticed by that friendly nation.

Mr. Chairman, the American public is getting wise to the questionable activities of these lobbyists. Thanks to the press of the Nation, the story is being told, and the people are reading with amazement about those working in Washington who peddle sugar for the foreign interests. It is unconscionable that such lobbying should influence a decision that is strictly the business of the United States. These lobbyists are not concerned with foreign policy. They are not concerned with the effects of their activity on the economy of U.S. agriculture. They are not concerned with anything except getting a larger quota for the countries they represent, with the consequently larger fee for their own pockets. That is why we must act to rid the Halls of Congress of these parasites.

I certainly cannot understand why these lobbying activities should come as a surprise to anyone. A number of us have talked about them for years, and there are hundreds of pages of testimony taken by a Senate Investigating Committee a few years ago that should have been made required reading for every Member of Congress. Here in my hand, for instance, is a part of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing report that contains incredible testimony relative to lobbying for the Dominican Republic. This testimony is important because it concerns the dealing with people who represented a country that has seen its sugar quota almost doubled since 1962. The entire history of our sugar purchases from the Dominican Republic has been cloaked in mystery and intrigue. We have poured millions of dollars into that country in various ways, including the gravy from our premium sugar payments, but it has not solved many problems for that beleaguered nation. Just last month the Agriculture Department announced an additional sugar allocation of almost 32,000 tons to the Dominican Republic. The gratitude for this additional consideration was graphically portrayed less than 2 weeks later with anti-American demonstrations led by former Dominican President Juan Bosch.

You will recall that the Dominican Republic also was involved in that infamous debate held on the floor of this House in 1962 when we considered what was supposed to have been a relatively minor piece of legislation called the honey bee bill. Just 10 days earlier, the Congress passed a sugar bill that for all intent and purpose would become the law of the land. But, lo and behold, an amendment was attached to the honey bee bill to reallocate 150,000 tons of sugar. You will remember that 130,000 tons a year out of that 150,000 went to the Dominican Republic. It was strange, indeed, that a sugar bill could make its way through the Congress with committee hearings, House and Senate consideration, and the Presidential signature, only to be found inadequate 10 days later. Obviously, someone was unhappy with the quota, and the finger pointed directly to the Dominican Republic.

Compare such action to the requests that have been made by the farmers throughout the United States for the past 25 years; requests that have literally begged for the opportunity of raising a few sugarbeets and producing a little larger share of our sugar need. We have never seen any 10-day action on such requests. In fact, we have seen little action in 10 years. But the foreign influence on our domestic sugar affairs continues unabated.

The 150,000 tons allocated in that honey bee bill, Mr. Chairman, would have provided the acreage for three new domestic sugarbeet plants in such areas as Minnesota where beets have been proven to be a profitable venture.

We have other examples of questionable lobbying practices, fully documented by Senate investigators. Two of them are John A. O'Donnell and Ernest Schein, representatives of the Philippines. Their labors certainly were reflected in the recent discussions and actions relative to the Philippine sugar quota contained in the bill before us. The Philippines will get an extra quota of 70,000 tons in addition to the 980,000 tons they get under a long-standing treaty. They also enjoy a sliding scale on the tariff. In addition, they get 10.86 percent of all increases in sugar consumption between the levels of 9.7 million tons and 10.4 million tons, which could mean an extra quota of about 30,000 tons. The Philippines also get 47.22 percent of any deficit that occurs in the domestic quota production. And to show what power these lobbyists have, after the Philippines examined the language of the original bill, they complained that they were not given 47.22 percent of deficits which might occur in all foreign quotas as well as domestic. Their complaints were heard and the bill before us was changed to give them what they wanted. This, of course, represents a paradox. Deficits from the domestic quotas always go to the supplying foreign countries, but foreign deficits never go to the domestic industry, even when there is a surplus of sugar on hand. The American farmer is not only shortchanged by foreign nations, he is also shortchanged by his own Government.

Political considerations also are evident in other areas of consideration relative to the domestic sugar industry. I have in my files a copy of a speech made by Irvin A. Hoff, executive director of the U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners' Association on June 10, 1964, before the annual convention of the National Confectioners Association. Mr. Hoff was playing games with a double-edged sword. In his speech he stumped for the overseas suppliers of sugar that is processed in U.S. plants, and at the same time attempted to smear the sugarbeet growers of America. A short time later Mr. Hoff found himself named as coordinator of the Democratic presidential campaign in 11 Western States. These Western States raise sugarbeets, the very commodity Hoff said should not have an increase in quota.

Mr. Chairman, I understand we are to be permitted to consider an amendment relative to recapture or import fees in addition to the amendment relative to lobbying activities by representatives of foreign nations. I am certainly pleased that the distinguished Committee on Rules has at least permitted these two amendments to be considered under the limited rule granted this bill.

As to these import fees, permit me to dwell a moment on the recent history of such transactions. A fee was imposed under the Sugar Act Amendments of 1962. In fiscal 1963, $37 million was returned to the Treasury, a figure that would have been much higher except for the fact that the world price rose higher than ours during the last half of the year. We also collected an additional $4 million late in 1964 when the world price of sugar dropped below ours. The authority for the fees expired at the end of 1964 and we have had none since. However, if we had collected fees during 1965, using a recapture figure of 50 percent between the world price and ours, we would have theoretically collected about $140 million. Or, the Treasury could have been $210 million richer if the 75-percent formula had been used, as is suggested by the amendment being considered today. Even a recapture levy of just 1 cent a pound would amount to $80 million. Of course, these figures assume that world prices would have remained the same with or without the import fee. It is reasonable to assume that the difference between the world price and the U.S. price would have been less under the fee setup than without it, but the arguments in favor of a fee remain equally valid.

Consider for a moment just what happens when the United States pays a high premium price for sugar. Most of the supplying nations sell sugar on the world market as well as to us. Therefore, the average price any nation receives for its total sugar production is a blend of the high U.S. price and the low world price. The average figure is somewhere between the two extremes. This means that our premium price on sugar, financed by the taxpayers and consumers of America, results in a higher average price on all of the sugar produced by these foreign countries. In other words, we are subsidizing every pound of sugar they sell on the world market. Our premium price actually contributes to the unusually low world price, so our subsidy actually makes it possible for other countries, including the Communist bloc, to buy sugar at a lower price than they could buy it if the United States did not create the subsidy through premium prices. The use of a realistic import or recapture fee would eliminate much of this direct subsidy and the natural workings of the world market prices would conceivably be influenced by such fees. Not only could the United States recapture some of the money being given favored nations for their sugar, but the rest of the world would pay a realistic price for their own sugar needs.

Unfortunately, under the present system, the American taxpayer is providing gravy for too many individuals who line their own pockets and rarely pass the bonanza on to the people of their countries.

The argument has too often been made that increased allotments, premium payments, and the like, are needed in foreign countries to improve the economic and agricultural climates of those nations. It has rarely worked that way. Instead, we have created hardships for our own farmers, who are already on the financial ropes in many ways. It is tragic to consider that the American farmer has made it possible for our consumers to spend the least percentage of income on food of any nation in the world, but he does not participate in the abundance himself. Saddled with a ceiling on his income, mounting costs of production, the American farmer is searching for something to raise that would help himself and his Nation. Sugarbeets are the answer to both problems in so many areas, but the red light continues to flash on his efforts.

Naturally, we cannot pin all of the blame for American agriculture's problems on the foreign lobbyists, even though the lobbyists have contributed to its problems in the field of sugar. Our own Government officials have often worked at cross purposes with our farmers. The few times when a modest increase has been noted for sugarbeet expansion, much of it has gone to areas in which sugarbeets have never been grown and are actually considered to be unsuited for profitable production. As I stated earlier, this bill before us has absolutely no increase for either established growers of new growers. It actually reflects a reduction in acreage for the present growers. The increased quota represents sugar already on hand, produced at the request of this Government in time of need and at last being released for marketing. This bill represents another 5 years of reduced plantings on the domestic scene and a continuation of unduly high quotas for foreign producers.

It is strange, indeed, that the domestic sugar industry, which responded so magnificently when we so sorely needed sugar back in 1962 and 1963, has now been forgotten so completely and so soon. I did not hear much from the foreign lobbyists when there was a lack of supply around the world. But they were back in a hurry when they again had something to peddle.

As I have said on so many occasions, an increased percentage of our national consumption for our domestic growers is the only way of assuring this Nation of an adequate and dependable sugar supply.

I realize we can but start on the road to sensible sugar legislation through the amendments and bill before us today. But we must make that start and hope that the Senate carries the battle a step further when they consider this same legislation.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. Do you not realize that the domestic producers picked up 580,000 tons of this so-called foreign sugar that ordinarily would have come from foreign countries? You have producers right out in your State of Minnesota. As I said, the domestic producers picked up 580,000 tons.

Mr. LANGEN. I should recall for the chairman in the event that he was not listening to what I said earlier, that that 580,000 tons was gotten at a price whereby we sacrificed 65 percent of any increase in American consumption between a total of 9.7 and 10.4 million tons.

Mr. COOLEY. What do you mean you got it at a price?

Mr. LANGEN. I shall read to you from the committee report so that we will be sure it is correct. The report reads:

> These quotas would be unaffected by any change in requirements between 9.7 and 10.4 million tons but would absorb 65 percent of any reduction from or addition to requirements outside of that range.

So we paid for the increase by giving up 65 percent of 700,000 tons.

Mr. COOLEY. Is the gentleman in disagreement with the domestic industry agreement? Is that what you are complaining about—because they got 580,000 tons more?

Mr. LANGEN. You are no doubt referring to the agreements that were reached downtown somewhere all of these lobbyists were operating.

Mr. COOLEY. And our committee approved it. So you are complaining about that.

Mr. LANGEN. I am complaining about the fact that the American producers should receive the same kind of equity and consideration as producers of foreign countries.

Mr. COOLEY. The domestic producers are very well satisfied.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. LANGEN. I shall be glad to yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. MAY. What the gentleman is trying to state here I believe is that the beet sugar industry's agreement with other portions of the sugar industry in America was a shotgun wedding—right?

Mr. LANGEN. That is a mighty good expression and I think it fits the occasion well.

There has been a lot said about world prices and about blend prices. Yes, they are pretty pertinent factors particularly when it gets to the recoverment fee.

One of the points that has been somewhat missed that should be remembered is that once these quotas have been set for foreign countries, we buy that volume of sugar from them at the predetermined price as established in this country which is much higher than the world price today. When you do that what is the income to the producer in the foreign country? It is a blend price. What he gets for that sugar and what he gets for the additional sugar that they sell on the world market then becomes his income. So then what happens? Actually what we are doing is that we provide all of the profit to these producers and we make it possible for them to sell at this low world price—yes, to Communist countries if you will—so that we are subsidizing to a substantial degree the sale of that surplus sugar to all of the other countries.

Mr. COOLEY. If we had not had a sugar program, what do you think would happen to the domestic producers in America?

Mr. LANGEN. I am not talking about a situation where we have no sugar program. I am talking about this sugar program and I am talking of the manner in which we might be able to improve it.

Mr. COOLEY. I am talking about the sugar program too. If we did not have it, you would go bankrupt. That is what would happen to you.

Mr. LANGEN. I do not believe we should continue subsidizing the sale of sugar on the world market with much of it going directly to the Communist countries. So in view of that, it would seem to me that this House might do well to give consideration to a couple of these points because the bill can be improved in favor of American producers and I say our American producers are entitled to that. They took a 6-percent reduction in my area this year and they are apt to take a further reduction next year if this year's crop turns out as well as some predictions have indicated.

So anyone who thinks that there is a big bonanza in this for the American domestic producer had better give it a second thought.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the proposed sugar bill. The deficiencies of H.R. 11135 in both conception and construction are of such magnitude as to mark it—in the eyes of the U.S. public and of foreign governments—as an archetype of selfish special interest legislation. A number of my colleagues have dealt at length, both here on the floor and in committee, with the defects of the committee's bill—with the illogic of quota allocations, with the frenetic but highly lucrative activities of the lobbyists. I wish merely to add some comments on the incongruities and inconsistencies that arise from constructing such special-interest legislation.

In the postwar period the United States has consistently urged the other nations of the world to move toward freer trade—to the elimination of quotas and the reduction of tariffs. Currently, U.S. negotiators at the highest policy levels are working in Geneva for a reduction in international trade barriers.

Yet at the same time we are now asked to approve a bill which is virtually airtight in its restrictiveness—controlling imports, production, marketing, and price. And this is being done to protect an industry which requires raw sugar prices in the United States to be maintained at close to 7 cents per pound to assure profitable operations, whereas foreign producers can produce profitably at 4 cents a pound and in some instances at 3 cents a pound.

It is true that many domestic producers have established and expanded their businesses in reliance on continued quotas. They are entitled to protection and to readjustment assistance where they acted in good faith. However, many of their foreign competitors are poor countries of the tropics which rely on foreign exchange earned from sugar for their very survival. In the fact of this situation, is it a rational allocation of international resources to raise—as this bill would—the domestic quotas from 3,545,000 short tons to 4,125,000?

In discussing the elimination of the import fee, the committee report states on page 6:

> It did not seem to be good policy to members of the committee that the United States would assess a fee upon trade with a friendly neighbor and then, in effect, return the proceeds from the fee in the form of aid. The committee prefers to give trade precedence over aid in our dealing with friendly peoples.

If the committee is suggesting that it allotted quotas on the basis of foreign aid principles, I am curious to know what those principles were. Is there any reason, for example, why on this basis over 6 percent of foreign imports should be set aside for such developed areas as Australia, South Africa, and China? Is there a foreign aid reason for giving equal quotas to Mexico, the Dominican Republic and Brazil? Is there a foreign aid reason for allotting Peru a smaller percentage than the preceding three countries?

Beyond these mystifying allocations, however, there is an obvious way in which H.R. 11135 may injure those friendly sugar-producing countries which are given small allocations or none at all.

Countries which are subsidized with U.S. allocations can expand their production beyond the limits justified by costs and dump low-priced sugar on the world market forcing down the price to the detriment of those countries which have no important outlets. A simple example demonstrates this point. If a country which produces 200,000 tons of sugar a year at a cost of 4 cents a pound can sell 100,000 tons in the U.S. market at 5½ cents a pound, it can dispose of the rest on the world market for as low as 2½ cents per pound and still break even.

Is this kind of trade policy better for the development of these countries than a rational foreign aid program?

Foreign aid through the Alliance for Progress is designed to reach the people. The sugar premium often goes directly to the American companies conducting the sugar operations abroad.

While it is certainly within the province of the Department of Agriculture and the Committee on Agriculture to draft legislation which intimately affects the efficiency and well-being of that part of the U.S. agricultural community which is engaged in sugar production, I fail to understand what special competence the Department of Agriculture or the Committee on Agriculture have in alloting quotas among foreign nations. It would seem to me that the Department of State and the Foreign Affairs Committee of this body would be the competent groups for resolving the enormously complex issues involved in distributing quotas.

Just to point to one of the anomalies that arises when those concerned with agriculture attempt to write foreign policy, let us consider the case of Cuba. Under current legislation a total of 57.77 percent of the total foreign allocation is held in reserve for Cuba against the time when she may return to the world of free nations. This reserve serves as both an incentive for Cuba to do so and as a guarantee that once she does, she will have some of the resources needed to reestablish herself. Nevertheless in its desire to spread the quotas a little further among all those insistently requesting them, the committee has reduced Cuba's permanent share to 44.25 percent—a cut of almost one-quarter. Does such an action conform to the best interests of U.S. foreign policy?

Then there is the proposed 10,000-ton quota for the Bahamas which does not even produce sugar. This quota may increase the profits of the Owens-Illinois Corp. which owns the land. But what foreign policy objective will be possibly served?

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RESNICK. The question of a quota for the Bahamas has arisen. If the gentleman has seen the development of the foreign sugar quotas in H.R. 11135, he has observed that there are some nine factors which the committee quotes as the criteria of the reasons for giving quotas.

I remind the gentlemen of these factors:

1. Ability to supply the stipulated amount of sugar to the U.S. market.

2. Ability (particularly among the larger suppliers) to carry reserves of up to 30 percent to meet emergencies or increases in demand.

3. Ready availability of supply, with preference to Western Hemisphere producers, because of a delivery time of 2 to 3 weeks, compared to a delivery time of 6 to 8 weeks for other countries.

4. Stability of supply—including the element of stability of the local government.

5. The economic need of the country for a U.S. quota and the relative value of a quota to such country.

6. Purchase of, and potential market for, U.S. agricultural commodities, including the balance-of-trade relationship with the United States.

7. Reasons of national policy and strategy, including unusual military or strategic importance of the nation receiving a sugar quota.

8. Friendliness of the government and support of U.S. foreign policy—particularly in the U.N. and the OAS.

9. The record of performance in making deliveries to the United States in 1962, 1963, and 1964.

Would the gentleman agree with me that the Bahama Islands do not meet one single one of these criteria set up by the committee itself?

Mr. RYAN. The gentleman makes a valid point concerning the allocation to the Bahama Islands. There is simply no criteria on which to base such an allocation.

Mr. Chairman, it is no secret that the cost of this legislation amounts a burden of over $600 million a year borne by the consumer in the form of U.S. sugar prices as compared to those on the world market. I should like to note, however, two little-discussed aspects of these high prices. Dextrose and artificial sweeteners are taking over an increasingly larger proportion of the total market for sweeteners.

While the main reasons for this development probably relate to dieting, the high price of sugar certainly helps to encourage the shift to sugar substitutes. Thus through its high price protectionist policies the domestic sugar industry may well be setting the stage for its own eventual displacement. Generally, the trend of dextrose prices relative to refined sugar has been downward since the early 1950's. Currently—August 1965—dextrose, on a dry basis, sells at 88 percent of the cost of refined sugar. This compares to 91 percent in the 1952–55 period.

As far as the individual consumer is concerned, the burden of this legislation is likely to fall much more heavily on the poor—and particularly those with large families. Sugar as a basic food accounts for a much larger proportion of the budgets of the poor than it does of those of the rich.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 11135 should be defeated. The present law does not expire until December 31, 1966. Meanwhile, a comprehensive study can be be made of all of the issues involved in this legislation, and a bill can be drafted which puts the interests of the consumer and our foreign policy objectives ahead of special interest lobbies.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT].

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

The statistics show that the largest sugarbeet district in the United States is the Fourth Congressional District in California, which is mine. We also have, I believe, one-third of the employment payroll from the largest cane manufacturing plant in the United States, in close by Contra Costa County in the district of my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

I believe that one of the primary things accomplished in this legislation has been the fact that there has been an agreement between the cane and beet industries. This is no insignificant matter.

I believe that this legislation is going to be good, because the consumer prices will be assured for an additional period of time. Nobody can complain that the consumer has been the victim of unscrupulous processors or producers in the recent past.

With respect to the cost to the Government, I should like to remind the House that recently we all received a listing of the budget, of the cost of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which has expended some $2.6 billion to maintain prices to producers, to provide export payments, and a host of different inventory items, storage, and handling expenses. In all of those items, totaling $3.3 billion, we do not find any sugar.

As opposed to that, we all know that the current legislation has provided a profit of $550 million over the past 10 years, the last decade of the operation of the program. What has not been mentioned is the fact that the 62-cent tariff raises between $35 million and $50 million a year.

There is some hiatus in the positions of the two gentlemen from New York. Apparently the last speaker would have us take off the tariff entirely, whereas the previous gentleman from New York who spoke would raise the tariff by four times.

Certainly we cannot do everything in one piece of legislation.

I do not believe it is to the advantage of the United States, in its relations with South American countries, when we are trying to expand the Alliance for Progress program and trying to negotiate, perhaps, a new canal route through Panama, in the interest of saving $1 million which apparently some Panama producers are going to get, to jeopardize our future negotiations with this small country concerning a very important item to the United States.

It is rather ridiculous that we should put quotas on immigration for Latin American countries at the same time we take off quotas on sugar. That just does not make sense.

Confronted with House Resolution 560, which we passed in this House a short time ago, I believe the South American countries and the Latin American countries could very easily get the idea that we are attempting to abort the Good Neighbor Policy, which we have expanded and nurtured over the past two or three decades, in the interest of a policy of discrimination.

There has been some talk about the balance of payments, but I do not believe we will find any gold loss occurring to South American countries. We all know the only problem on the balance of payments is loss of gold, and we know that the loss of gold does not flow to South America, but to Western Europe, which does not participate in this program at all.

Now, as far as lobbyists are concerned, I think the gentleman from the Midwest who suggested that we cut off all foreign lobbyists first should keep in mind that if we keep the foreign lobbyists out of our country from trying to tell us how to sell their sugar, they will probably reciprocate by cutting off the corn and wheat merchants of the Midwest from going to their countries. With $280 million in feed grain price support payments last year, and $19 million in wheat price payments, it is certainly to our interest to expand this very critical foreign trade.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEGGETT. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Is the gentleman under the impression that the U.S. Government has any representatives or agents which attempt to influence legislation in any of the parliaments of other countries?

Mr. LEGGETT. I would not be so naive as to think that does not happen. Certainly if it does not we should certainly get on the ball.

Mr. FINDLEY. I will tell the gentleman that the State Department Legal Office assured me there is no such activity and, if any such activity were undertaken, it would be a violation of article 47 of what I am informed is the Vienna Convention. They further tell me that the foreign governments are urged to channel all of their representation which they wish to make to the Congress through diplomatic channels.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11135, and against the two amendments made in order by the rule under which we are currently operating.

I rise with some trepidation to discuss this sugar legislation because, like all farm legislation, it is complex. Those who have not had any particular opportunity to understand some of the background out of which these pieces of farm legislation arise are often inclined to be readily attracted by one or two phrases or one or two slogans that can be directed against them. We are all indebted to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY], for having put this sugar bill into some kind of understandable perspective by indicating the background out of which it has come.

I have been particularly concerned, Mr. Chairman, because there seems to be, at least, there was earlier in the day when we had more Members on the floor, an indication that some of those who have worked hardest during this session of Congress to pass the Great Society legislation, who have supported efforts to help our farmers, who have supported legislation to reduce unemployment, who have supported legislation to assist private enterprise in such fields as housing and rapid transit, somehow feel now that when it comes to the sugar bill there is something rather immoral about trying to assist private enterprise, and something bad about trying to help individual farmers. They are going to give this bill the works, they say.

I would like to take just these few moments to try to give one particular case history as to how this kind of legislation can be just as effective as some of these other measures we have passed in meeting human needs.

I speak here, Mr. Chairman, as the representative of the greatest sugar-growing district in the State of New York. That may not be a very large production in terms of total output, or as compared with Colorado or California, but believe me it is important to all of us in the State of New York.

In fact, back after the 1962 Sugar Act was adopted you may recall that we provided some small quotas for new areas, to see whether such areas could not grow sugarbeets successfully. We in New York State, who are proud of what we already do in dairying and in wheat and in red beans and in grapes and in all of these other commodities that are now located in my rather extended rural district, have now added sugar to our list of crops. And I would like to remind this House that 3 years ago the entire New York State delegation appealed both to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] to see that the Cayuga County, N.Y., application was approved.

Our farmers were suffering. They were looking for a new crop. I am happy to report, Mr. Chairman, that we got that small allotment. And today there has been constructed a $25 million plant in my district. The farmers are today beginning to bring in a crop which is expected to pay them some $4 million in return. Some 20,000 acres have been planted in sugarbeets, and 1,000 farmers in upstate New York are participating in this program, in some 16 counties covering a half dozen congressional districts.

I might point out, too, that Cayuga County which 3 years ago was suffering heavily from unemployment, is now off the unemployment roll. Our new sugar plant has given a shot in the arm not only to my county and to my district but to the entire agricultural economy of upstate New York. This is one practical effect of this Sugar Act and one of the reasons why I want to see it continued, and one reason why Great Society members should support this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have just two other points to make in commenting on the two amendments that will be in order. We are told that we ought to impose an import tax on foreign producers presumably because they are not supplying anything appropriate in return for the higher prices they get.

Well, frankly, Mr. Chairman, anybody familiar with farm legislation knows that we very frequently have found it wise and sound to pay a higher price for farm commodities in order to assure a stability in their supply. That is why we have a milk marketing order, for example. That is why the price of milk to the dairy farmer is pegged at somewhat more than might otherwise be the case, simply because we want a stable supply and because we do not want to go back to the milk strikes of the 1930's. We do not want to see milk dumped in the ditches again and farmers taking after one another with sticks or something stronger in that kind of a cutthroat, unstable market, where you have feast one day and famine the next.

This bill has supplied that stability in sugar and that stability is something that redounds to the economic benefit of the sugarbeet farmers in my district, not just to foreign sugar growers; make no mistake about that.

Second, we have been told that we ought to ban foreign lobbyists and that we should pass an amendment to this bill that would get them out of the picture. Well, I have no particular interest in foreign lobbyists. None of them has been around to see me, either. But, as a matter of fact, we already have a law on the books which says that these lobbyists should register. The facts with regard to them are printed regularly in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

If we want to look into the question of lobbying, then I think we ought to do it in connection with all lobbyists and not single out those in the field of sugar and sugarbeets it this particular bill.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I support this bill as reported from the committee because I believe that the important job it will do will be to continue the effective help that has already been given to the farmers and the small businessmen of my State and my district. It will give these producers their fair share of an expanding American consumption. It will mean more prosperity for them, more dollars in upstate New York farm pockets. Let us remember that, and not just vote on hasty slogans.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago the House passed a bill to provide for the disposal of abaca from the stockpiles of this country. Earlier this afternoon the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON], said that foreigners had appeared before the House Armed Services Committee to testify in connection with that disposal. It is my understanding that abaca deteriorates. Further it is my understanding—I did not know it at that time—that the Filipinos were probably here testifying in behalf of legislation that would provide for the disposal of abaca from the huge stockpile that we have accumulated over a 20-year period. I now understand why the Filipinos were here testifying, so that they could stretch this out over a 20-year period.

I did not know that the Government of the United States yielded to foreigners in that respect.

In other words, we are going to wind up with deteriorated abaca and at the end of 20 years it will be virtually worthless.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from North Carolina yield me 1 minute to respond to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. COOLEY. Just go ahead and take it. I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. STRATTON. May I say to the gentleman from Iowa that the Committee on Armed Services did not yield to the Filipinos. The program that was in the original legislation was adopted by the committee. But because the sale of our abaca stockpile would have a very serious impact on the Philippine economy——

Mr. GROSS. Sure.

Mr. STRATTON. And because the Filipinos are friends of ours in the Far East at a very critical hour, as the gentleman knows, we wanted to be advised at the very least what the Philippine members of this industry thought about our plans to dispose of the stockpile. But our committee took its own action.

Mr. GROSS. And, so you followed their lead and stretched it out in dribbles over a 20-year period when a lot of this stuff will have deteriorated and be worthless.

Mr. STRATTON. I think the gentleman from Iowa is mistaken on that. The time period in the bill is only 10 years.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know about that.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, Venezuela with a $50,000-a-year lobbyist got from the committee a quota more than 10 times as big as that recommended by the administration. At present prices, the 5-year premium value of the difference is nearly $10 million.

Argentina which hired no lobbyist was cut to one-third—from 63,685 to 21,485. The 5-year premium value of the cut is over $14 million. The Argentine Embassy's agricultural counselor, Gaston Valente told a reporter his country "thinks it is entitled to claim a quota without the government having to pay anyone."

Did Argentina's failure to hire a lobbyist contribute to the quota cut? I do not charge this was the case.

Did the lobbyist for Venezuela use undue influence to get the quota increased 10-fold? I do not charge that he did.

But I do recognize—and so must you—that the circumstances are so remarkable that suspicion and doubt are inevitable.

I do not charge wrongdoing, but I do charge poor judgment.

It was poor judgment for the Committee on Agriculture to open its doors to the foreign lobbyists for the Government of Venezuela. It was poor judgment for the Committee on Agriculture to set up its own private little State Department.

I know of no other committee of the House which receives direct testimony from the agents of foreign governments, certainly never on the scale permitted in the Committee on Agriculture.

This is a revenue bill and might properly have been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. If it had been I predict that the foreign sugar lobby would have gone out of business at once. I am informed that the Ways and Means Committee never receives direct testimony from foreign governments or their agents. The Ways and Means Committee insists that information from a foreign government be channeled to the Congress through the State Department. This is as it should be.

Our Government does not employ agents to lobby the parliaments of other nations, to try to influence directly legislative proposals. U.S. representations are made through diplomatic channels. To try to lobby the British Parliament, for example, would violate article 41 of the Vienna Convention.

The blame for the foreign sugar lobby rests on the Committee on Agriculture. The lobby is in business because the committee permits it to be in business.

I do not shield myself from criticism. I should have dug into this long ago. I should have objected when lobbyists appeared before the committee. I should have moved that the committee bar them from the witness stand and committee offices. Whether these efforts would have been effective is another matter.

But tomorrow we have the opportunity to act, to clear out this unhealthy, unattractive, useless curiosity called the foreign sugar lobby. Thanks to the Rules Committee we have the opportunity to put this lobby out of business.

Foreign lobbyists have impact on foreign governments. They touch foreign policy intimately and bear just as directly on the formulation of the attitudes of these governments toward the United States as do the regular diplomatic representatives of these governments.

Foreign lobbying could be habit forming. If influence peddling works, or appears to work, in regard to juicy sugar quotas, why not foreign agent lobbying for foreign aid, Public Law 480 grants, grants for military assistance? Maybe this practice is already widespread.

Pakistan might decide to hire somebody to try to pressure Congress into reinstating an arms program.

Yugoslavia might try to push through legislation to give that country better access to the U.S. tobacco market.

One of the factors said to be used to set quotas is reliability. Argentina was cut to one-third despite its record of coming through in grand style in 1963-64 when the United States was eager for extra sugar. What happened to the reliability rule there?

Bolivia had no sugar production at all until very recently, but got a quota. Was reliability the standard for Bolivia?

Honduras has never exported any sugar, but got a quota this time. Was reliability the standard for Honduras?

Another factor given was trade with the United States.

Argentina, with a strong trade favorable to the United States was cut to one-third.

Venezuela, which sells to the United States almost twice as much as she was buying, got a tenfold increase. U.S. trade with Venezuela is more unfavorable than with any other Western Hemisphere country.

Why was the balance-of-trade factor applied in reverse in regard to Venezuela and Argentina?

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I join my other colleagues supporting H.R. 11135.

Chicago and its environs are high-sugar consumption areas and it is important that adequate supplies of sugar be available at reasonable prices in these areas. The bill before us would accomplish this purpose.

The "global quota" and "import fee" concepts introduced in sugar legislation for the first time in 1962 as experiments have been eliminated in the bill before us, and their elimination should restore stability to the sugar market. The experiments, as we all know, proved disastrous.

The bill would also protect the employment of many workers in the Chicago area. Two cane sugar refiners, American Sugar Co., and SuCrest Corp., have installations in Chicago providing direct employment for hundreds of workers, with a large total annual payroll. Each year well over 1,000 barges and many railcars deliver nearly half a billion pounds of sugar to these plants, providing additional employment in the transportation industry.

The bill before us is a compromise, but I urge its passage as fair and equitable legislation. It will serve consumers well and will protect the livelihood of workers in Chicago's cane sugar industry and in many other fields.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 11135 and urge the Members of this House to give careful consideration to the debate which has been so clearly and carefully presented by the various proponents of this measure.

I am proud to associate myself with those who support H.R. 11135, and I urge that the bill, together with the amendments recommended by the Committee on Agriculture, be approved.

The United States has had a Sugar Act since 1934. The basic national sugar policy throughout this period can be stated briefly. It has been:

First. To assure an ample supply of sugar to American consumers at reasonable prices;

Second. To maintain a limited domestic sugar producing industry in a state of reasonable prosperity, and

Third. To secure our requirements of foreign raw sugar from friendly countries who will commit themselves to supply our needs at prices which, over the long run, are fair to both buyer and seller.

The Sugar Act has, with remarkably few exceptions, been a most successful instrument for realizing this policy. Under the Sugar Act our domestic producing areas have been sustained and permitted a reasonable growth; our needs of foreign sugar have been supplied at generally stable and reasonable prices, and the American consumer has been furnished, in abundant supply and at reasonable costs, the great variety of sugars which our market demands. Further, all of this has been accomplished under an agricultural program which is not only self-supporting, but actually returns an annual profit to the U.S. Treasury. Each year the excise tax on the manufacture of sugar, an integral part of the program, collects approximately $5 to $15 million more than all payments and expenses under the Sugar Act.

It is fair to say of the Sugar Act: It works, and works well. And what more can be asked of any farm program?

A healthy sugar industry is essential to the economy of Hawaii. It is our major commodity; next to tourism our most important source of private sector income. Hawaii, to whom sugar is so very important, has followed the course of sugar legislation in this Congress with the greatest attention. It is most encouraging and reassuring to know that Hawaiian sugar, together with the rest of the domestic sugar industry, supports H.R. 11135.

Finally, I would like to explain briefly my reasons for opposing the floor amendment which will be offered and which would reintroduce into the Sugar Act the concept of an import fee on foreign sugar. An import fee was one of the new features written into the Sugar Act by the 1962 amendments. Briefly stated, it did not work. It did not raise the money its advocates promised, nor did it give us any protection against runaway world sugar prices. Instead, it tied us in a most dangerous manner to the thin and undependable world sugar market. It, together with the closely related global quota, deserves the major blame for the sugar difficulties of 1963.

The floor amendment would in major part put back into the act what our 1963 experience proved does not belong there. Further, restoration of an import fee would directly repudiate President Johnson's recent assurance to the OAS Ambassadors that the import fee would form no part of the administration program. The fee has been an irritant in our dealings with Latin America, it violates the sound policy of "Trade, not Aid," it does not belong in the act.

I urge that you join with me in voting down these amendments which will be offered, and then vote in favor of this measure.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, under the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments are in order to the bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Agriculture; an amendment to page 12, after line 14; and an amendment to page 21 to strike out lines 8 and 9 and insert language in lieu thereof; but such amendments shall not be subject to amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11135

A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Sugar Act Amendments of 1965."

SEC. 2. Section 201 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out of the first sentence the words "month of December in" and substituting the words "last three months of"; and (2) by striking out of the second sentence "October 31" and substituting "September 30".

SEC. 3. Section 202 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended as follows:

(1) Paragraphs (1) and (2)(A) of subsection (a) are amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) For domestic sugar-producing areas, by apportioning among such areas six million three hundred and ninety thousand short tons, raw value, as follows:

"Area	*Short tons, raw value*
Domestic beet sugar	3,025,000
Mainland cane sugar	1,100,000
Hawaii	1,110,000
Puerto Rico	1,140,000
Virgin Islands	15,000
Total	6,390,000

"(2)(A) To or from the above total of six million three hundred and ninety thousand short tons, raw value, there shall be added or deducted, as the case may be, an amount equal to 65 per centum of the amount by which the Secretary's determination of requirements of consumers in the continental United States pursuant to section 201 for the calendar year exceeds ten million four hundred thousand short tons, raw value, or is less than nine million seven hundred thousand short tons, raw value. Such amount shall be apportioned between the domestic beet sugar area and the mainland cane sugar area on the basis of the quotas for such areas established under paragraph (1) of this subsection and the amounts so apportioned shall be added to, or deducted from the quotas for such areas."

(2) Subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For the Republic of the Philippines, in the amount of one million and fifty thousand short tons, raw value, plus 10.86 per centum of the amount, not exceeding seven hundred thousand short tons, raw value, by which the Secretary's determination of requirements of consumers in the continental United States pursuant to section 201 for the calendar year exceed nine million seven hundred thousand short tons, raw value."

(3) Subsection (c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1) For foreign countries other than the Republic of the Philippines, an amount of sugar, raw value, equal to the amount determined pursuant to section 201 less the sum of the quotas established pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

"(2) For the calendar year 1965, for individual foreign countries other than the Republic of the Philippines, by prorating the amount of sugar determined under paragraph (1) of this subsection among foreign countries on the basis of the quotas established in sugar regulation 811, as amended, issued February 15, 1965 (30 F.R. 2206).

"(3) For the calendar year 1966 through 1971, inclusive, for individual foreign countries other than the Republic of the Philippines, Ireland, and the Bahama Islands, by prorating the amount of sugar determined under paragraph (1) of this subsection, less the amounts required to establish quotas as provided in paragraph (4) of this subsection for Ireland, and the Bahama Islands, among foreign countries on the following basis:

"(A) For countries in the Western Hemisphere:

"Country	*Per centum*
Cuba	44.25
Mexico	8.41
Dominican Republic	8.41
Brazil	8.41
Peru	6.71
British West Indies	3.71
Ecuador	1.24
French West Indies	1.06
Colombia	1.06
Costa Rica	1.04
Nicaragua	.95
Guatemala	.81
Venezuela	.76
El Salvador	.75
Haiti	.71
Panama	.62
Argentina	.53
British Honduras	.49
Bolivia	.10
Honduras	.10

"(B) For countries outside the Western Hemisphere:

"Country	*Per centum*
Australia	4.00
Republic of China	1.66
India	1.60
South Africa	.73
Fiji	.60
Thailand	.49
Mauritius	.35
Swaziland	.15
Southern Rhodesia	.15
Malagasy Republic	.15

"(4) For the calendar year 1966 and each subsequent calendar year, for Ireland, in the amount of ten thousand short tons, raw value, of sugar; and for the calendar year 1968 and each subsequent calendar year, for the Bahama Islands, in the amount of ten thousand short tons, raw value, of sugar: *Provided,* That the Secretary obtains such assurances from each such country as he may deem appropriate prior to January 1 of each such calendar year that the quota for such year will be filled."

(4) Subsections (d), (e), and (f) are hereby amended and subsection (g) is added to read as follows:

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

"(1)(A) During the current period of suspension of diplomatic relations between the United States and Cuba, the quota provided for Cuba under subsection (c) shall be withheld and a quantity of sugar equal to such quota shall be prorated as follows:

"(i) any quantity up to and including the amount of quota withheld from Cuba at a determination of ten million short tons, raw value, under section 201 shall be prorated to other foreign countries named in paragraph (3) of subsection (c) on the basis of the percentages stated therein; and, in addition,

"(ii) any quantity in excess of the amount of quota withheld from Cuba at a determination of ten million short tons, raw value, under section 201, shall be prorated to other foreign countries named in paragraph 3 (A) of subsection (c) that are members of the Organization of American States on the basis of the percentages stated therein.

"(B) Whenever and to the extent that the President finds that the establishment or continuation of a quota or any part thereof for any foreign country would be contrary to the national interest of the United States, such quota or part thereof shall be withheld or suspended, and such importation shall not be permitted. A quantity of sugar equal to the amount of any quota so withheld or suspended shall be prorated to the other countries listed in subsection (c)(3)(A) (other than any country whose quota is withheld or suspended) on the basis of the quotas then in effect for such countries.

"(C) The quantities of sugar prorated pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall be designated as temporary quotas and the term 'quota' as defined in this Act shall include a temporary quota established under this subsection.

"(2)(A) Whenever the Secretary finds that it is not practicable to obtain the quantity of sugar needed from foreign countries to meet any increase during the year in the requirements of consumers under section 201 by apportionment to countries pursuant to subsections (b) and (c) and the foregoing provisions of this subsection, such quantity of sugar may be imported on a first-come, first-served basis from any foreign country, except that no sugar shall be authorized for importation from Cuba until the United States resumes diplomatic relations with that country and no sugar shall be authorized for importation hereunder from any foreign country with respect to which a finding by the President is in effect under subsection (d)(1)(B): *Provided*, That such finding shall not be made in the first nine months of the year unless the Secretary also finds that limited sugar supplies and increases in prices have created or may create an emergency situation significantly interfering with the orderly movement of foreign raw sugar to the United States. In authorizing the importation of such sugar the Secretary shall give special consideration to countries which agree to purchase for dollars additional quantities of United States agricultural products. In the event that the requirements of consumers under section 201 are thereafter reduced in the same calendar year, an amount not exceeding such increase in requirements shall be deducted pro rata from the quotas established pursuant to subsection (c) and this subsection.

"(B) Sugar imported under the authority of this paragraph (2) shall be raw sugar, except that if the Secretary determines that the total quantity is not reasonably available as raw sugar, he may authorize the importation for direct consumption of so much of such quantity as he determines may be required to meet the requirements of consumers in the United States.

"(3) No quota shall be established for any country other than Ireland for any of the years following a period of twenty-four months, ending June 30 prior to the establishment of quotas for such year, in which its aggregate imports of sugar equaled or exceeded its aggregate exports of sugar from such country to countries other than the United States.

"(4) Whenever in any calendar year any foreign country fails, subject to such reasonable tolerance as the Secretary may determine, to fill the quota as established for it pursuant to this Act, the quota for such country for subsequent calendar years shall be reduced as follows:

"(a) the quota established under section 202(b), and the quotas established under sections 202(c) and 202(d)(1) for any country having a quota at the end of the preceding year of less than two hundred thousand short tons, raw value, shall be reduced by the smaller of (i) the amount by which such country failed to fill such quota or (ii) the amount by which its exports of sugar to the United States in the year such quota was not filled were less than 115 per centum of such quota for the preceding calendar year; and

"(b) the quota established under section 202(c) and section 202(d)(1) for any such country having a quota at the end of the preceding calendar year of two hundred thousand short tons, raw value, or more shall be reduced by the smaller of (i) the amount by which such country failed to fill such quota or (ii) the amount by which its exports of sugar to the United States in the year such quota was not filled were less than 130 per centum of such quota for the preceding calendar year: *Provided*, That (i) no such reduction shall be made if the country has notified the Secretary before August 1 of such year (or with respect to events occurring thereafter, as soon as practicable after such events), of the likelihood of such failure and the Secretary finds that such failure was due to crop disaster or other force majeure, unless such country exported sugar in such year to a country other than the United States, in which case the reduction in quota for the subsequent years shall be limited to the amount of such exports, as determined by the Secretary, (ii) the reduction in quota for any country having a quota established under section 202(c) and section 202(d)(1) at the end of the preceding calendar year of two hundred thousand short tons, raw value, or more shall be limited, if the quota for any such country on July 1 of the year in which such quota was not filled is less than 130 per centum of its quota for the preceding calendar year, to the larger of (A) the amount by which its exports of sugar to the United States in the year such quota was not filled were less than 125 per centum of the quotas for the preceding year or (B) the amount by which its exports of sugar to the United States in the year such quota was not filled were less than such quota on July 1, and (iii) in no event shall the quota for the Republic of the Philippines be reduced to an amount less than nine hundred and eighty thousand short tons, raw value, of sugar.

"(5) Any reduction in a quota because of the requirements of paragraphs (3) and (4) of this subsection shall be prorated to other foreign countries in the same manner as deficits are prorated under section 204 of this Act. For purposes of determining unfilled portions of quotas, entries of sugar from a foreign country shall be prorated between the temporary quota established pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection and the quota established pursuant to subsection (c).

"(e) Whenever the President finds that it is in the national interest of the United States to reestablish a quota or part thereof withheld or suspended under subsection (d)(1)(B) of this section, and, in the case of Cuba under subsection (d)(1)(A) of this section, diplomatic relations have been resumed by the United States, such quota shall be restored in the manner the President finds appropriate: *Provided*, That the entire amount of such quota shall be restored for the third full calendar year following such finding by the President. The temporary quotas established pursuant to subsection (d)(1) shall, notwithstanding any other provision of this section, be reduced pro rata to the extent necessary to restore the quota in accordance with the provisions of this subsection.

"(f) Whenever any quota is required to be reduced pursuant to subsection (e) or because of a reduction in the requirements of consumers under section 201 of this Act, and the amount of sugar imported from any country or marketed from any area at the time of such reduction exceeds the reduced quota, the amount of such excess shall, notwithstanding any other provision of this section, be deducted from the quota established for such country or domestic area for the next succeeding calendar year.

"(g) The quota established for any foreign country and the quantity authorized to be imported from any country under subsection (d)(2) of this section may be filled only with sugar produced from sugarbeets or sugarcane grown in such country."

SEC. 4. Section 204 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary shall from time to time determine whether, in view of the current inventories of sugar, the estimated production from the acreage of sugarcane or sugarbeets planted, the normal marketings within a calendar year of new-crop sugar, and other pertinent factors, any area or country will be unable to market the quota for such area or country. If the Secretary determines that any domestic area or foreign country listed in section 202(c)(3)(A) will be unable to market its quota, he shall revise the quota for the Republic of the Philippines by allocating to it an amount of sugar equal to 47.22 per centum of the deficit, and shall allocate an amount of sugar equal to the remainder of the deficit to the countries listed in section 202(c)(3)(A) on the basis of the quotas then in effect for such countries: *Provided*, That any deficit resulting from the inability of a country which is a member of the Central American Common Market to fill its quota shall first be allocated to the other member countries on the basis of the quotas then in effect for such countries: *And provided further*, That if any quota is restored to Cuba, the maximum per centum of 47.22 of the deficit to be allocated to the Republic of the Philippines shall be reduced to a per centum equal to that which the Philippine quota under subsection (b) of section 202 bears to the sum of such Philippine quota and the quotas then in effect for all foreign countries pursuant to subsection (c) of section 202. If the Secretary determines the Republic of the Philippines will be unable to fill its share of any deficit determined under this subsection, he shall allocate such unfilled amount to the countries listed in section 202(c)(3)(A) on the basis of the quotas then in effect for such countries. If the Secretary determiles that neither the Republic of the Philippines nor the countries listed in section 202(c)(3)(A) can fill all of any such deficit, he shall apportion such unfilled amount on such basis and to such foreign countries as he determines is required to fill such deficit. If the Secretary determines that any foreign country with a quota established pursuant to section 202(c)(3)(B) or section 202(c)(4) will be unable to market the quota for such area or country, he shall revise the quota for the Republic of the Philippines by allocating to it an amount of sugar equal to 47.22 per centum of the deficit, and shall allocate an amount of sugar equal to the remainder of the deficit to the countries listed in section 202(c)(3)(B) on the basis of the quotas then in effect for such countries: *Provided*, That if any quota is restored to Cuba, the maximum per centum of 47.22 of the deficit to be allocated to the Republic of the Philippines shall be reduced to a per centum equal to that which the Philippine quota under subsection (b) of section 202 bears to the sum of such Philippine quota and the quotas then in effect for all foreign countries pursuant to subsection (c) of section 202. If the Secretary determines the Republic of the Philippines will be unable to fill its share of any deficit determined under this subsection, he shall allocate such unfilled amount to the countries listed in section 202(c)(3)(B) on the basis of the quotas then in effect for such countries. If the Secretary determines that neither the Republic of the Philippines nor the countries listed in section 202(c)(3)(B) can fill all of any such deficit, he shall apportion such unfilled amount on such basis and to such foreign countries as he determines is required to fill such deficit. Deficits shall not be allocated to any country whose quota has been suspended or withheld pursuant to subsection (d)(1) of section 202. The Secretary shall insofar as practicable determine and allocate deficits so as to assure the availability of the sugar for importation during the calendar year. In any event, any deficit, so far as then known, shall be determined and allocated by August 1 of the calendar year. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, if the President determines that such action would be in the national interest, any part of a deficit which would otherwise be allocated to countries listed in section 202(c) may be allocated to one or more of such countries with a quota in effect on such basis as the President finds appropriate.

"(b) The quota established for any domestic area or any foreign country under section 202 shall not be reduced by reason of any determination of a deficit existing in any calendar year under subsection (a) of this section: *Provided,* That the quota for any foreign country shall be reduced to the extent that it has notified the Secretary that it cannot fill its quota and the Secretary has found under section 202(d)(4) that such failure was due to crop disaster or other force majeure."

Sec. 5. Section 205 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended, (1) by inserting after the third sentence thereof the following two new sentences: "The Secretary is also authorized in making such allotments of a quota for the mainland cane sugar area for any calendar year after 1966 to take into consideration, in lieu of or in addition to the foregoing factors of processing, past marketings, and ability to market, the need to establishing an allotment which will permit such marketing of sugar as is necessary for reasonably efficient operation during each of the first two years of operation of a new sugarcane processing facility or mill that begins the production of sugar from sugarcane for the first time after the calendar year 1966. The Secretary is also authorized in making such allotments of a quota for any calendar year to take into consideration, in lieu of or in addition to the foregoing factors of processing, past marketings, and ability to market, the need for establishing an allotment which will permit such marketing of sugar as is necesary for the reasonably efficient operation of any nonaffiliated single plant processor of sugarbeets or any processor of sugarcane and as may be necessary to avoid unreasonable carryover of sugar in relation to other processors in the area: *Provided,* That the marketing allotment of any such processor of sugarbeets shall not be increased under this provision above an allotment of twenty-five thousand short tons, raw value, and the marketing allotment of a processor of sugarcane shall not be increased under this provision above an allotment equal to the effective inventory of sugar of such processor on January 1 of the calendar year for which such allotment is made, except that the marketing allotment for 1965 of a processor of sugarcane, other than a processor-refiner, who had a physical inventory of sugar on January 1, 1964, equal to 55 per centum or more of his 1963 crop production may be increased by an additional six thousand, two hundred short tons of sugar, raw value: *Provided, further,* That the total increases in marketing allotments made to processors in the domestic beet sugar and mainland cane sugar areas pursuant to this sentence shall be limited to twenty-five thousand short tons of sugar, raw value, for each such area for each calendar year"; and (2) by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following sentence: "If allotments are in effect at the time of a reduction in a domestic area quota for any year, the amount marketed by a person in excess of the amount of his allotment as reduced in conformity with the reduction in the quota shall not be taken into consideration in establishing an allotment in the next succeeding year for such person, and any allotment established for such person for the next succeeding year shall be reduced by such excess amount."

Sec. 6. Section 206 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 206. (a) If the Secretary determines that the prospective importation or bringing into the continental United States, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico of any sugar-containing product or mixture will substantially interfere with the attainment of the objectives of this Act, he may limit the quantity of such product or mixture to be imported or brought in from any country or area to a quantity which he determines will not so interfere: *Provided,* That the quantity to be imported or brought in from any country or area in any calendar year shall not be reduced below the average of the quantities of such product or mixture annually imported or brought in during the most recent three consecutive years for which reliable data of the importation or bringing in of such product or mixture are available.

"(b) In the event the Secretary determines that the prospective importation or bringing into the continental United States, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, of any sugar-containing product or mixture will substantially interfere with the attainment of the objectives of this Act and there are no reliable data available of such importation or bringing in of such product or mixture for three consecutive years, he may limit the quantity of such product to be imported or brought in annually from any country or area to a quantity which the Secretary determines will not substantially interfere with the attainment of the objectives of the Act, provided that such quantity from any one country or area shall not be less than a quantity containing one hundred short tons, raw value of sugar or liquid sugar.

"(c) In determining whether the actual or prospective importation or bringing into the continental United States, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico of a quantity of a sugar-containing product or mixture will or will not substantially interfere with the attainment of the objectives of this Act, the Secretary shall take into consideration the total sugar content of the product or mixture in relation to other ingredients or to the sugar content of other products or mixtures for similar use, the costs of the mixture in relation to the costs of its ingredients for use in the continental United States, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, the present or prospective volume of importations relative to past importations, the type of packaging, whether it will be marketed to the ultimate consumer in the identical form in which it is imported or the extent to which it is to be further subjected to processing or mixing with similar or other ingredients, and other pertinent information which will assist him in making such determination. In making determinations pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall conform to the rulemaking requirements of section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act."

Sec. 7. Subsections (d) and (e) of section 207 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, are amended as follows:

"(d) Not more than fifty-nine thousand nine hundred and twenty short tons, raw value, of the quota for the Republic of the Philippines may be filled by direct-consumption sugar.

"(e) None of the quota established for any foreign country other than the Republic of the Philippines and none of the deficit prorations and apportionments for any foreign country established under or in accordance with section 204(a) may be filled by direct-consumption sugar: *Provided,* That the quotas for Ireland, Belgium, and Panama may be filled by direct-consumption sugar to the extent of ten thousand short tons, raw value, for Ireland; one hundred and eighty-two short tons, raw value, for Belgium; and three thousand eight hundred and seventeen short tons, raw value, for Panama."

Sec. 8. Section 209 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended by striking from subsection (e) thereof the words "any sugar or liquid sugar" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "any sugar or liquid sugar in excess of one hundred pounds in any calendar year"; and by adding a new subsection (f) as follows:

"(f) From importing into the continental United States from foreign countries any raw sugar within the applicable quota, or the proration of any such quota, unless the weight of such raw sugar has been determined after arrival into the continental United States and has been certified by a person who is primarily engaged in the weighing of commodities for others and who directly or indirectly neither buys or sells sugar nor is owned, controlled, or associated with a person that buys or sells sugar."

Sec. 9. Section 213 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is repealed.

Sec. 10. Section 302 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended as follows:

(1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) The Secretary shall determine for each crop year whether the production of sugar from any crop of sugarbeets or sugarcane will, in the absence of proportionate shares, be greater than the quantity needed to enable the area to meet its quota and provide a normal carryover inventory, as estimated by the Secretary for such area for the calendar year during which the larger part of the sugar from such crop normally would be marketed. Such determination shall be made only with respect to the succeeding crop year and, beginning with the 1966 crop year, only after due notice and opportunity for an informal public hearing. If the Secretary determines that the production of sugar from any crop of sugarbeets or sugarcane will be in excess of the quantity needed to enable the area to meet its quota and provide a normal carryover inventory, he shall establish proportionate shares for farms in such areas as provided in this subsection, except that the determinations by the Secretary of proportionate shares for farms in Hawaii and the Virgin Islands in effect on January 1, 1965, shall continue in effect until amended or superseded. In determining the proportionate shares with respect to a farm, the Secretary may take into consideration the past production on the farm of sugarbeets and sugarcane marketed (or processed) for the extraction of sugar or liquid sugar (within proportionate shares when in effect) and the ability to produce such sugarbeets and sugarcane."

(2) The first sentence of paragraph (3) of subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) In order to make available acreage for growth and expansion of the beet sugar industry, the Secretary in addition to protecting the interest of new and small producers by regulations generally similar to those heretofore promulgated by him pursuant to this Act, shall reserve each year from 1962 through 1966, inclusive, from the national sugarbeet acreage requirement established by him, the acreage required to yield sixty-five thousand short tons, raw value, of sugar."

(3) Paragraph (3) of subsection (b) is amended by inserting "(A)" after the figure (3) and by adding at the end of paragraph (3) the following subparagraph (B):

"(B) In order to make available acreage for the growth and expansion of the mainland cane industry by a new sugarcane processing facility, the Secretary is authorized to reserve each crop year for three consecutive crop years an amount of acreage estimated to yield twenty-five thousand short tons of sugar, raw value, from the acreage which would be allocated to sugarcane producers in the mainland cane sugar area for each of three consecutive crop years beginning not earlier than the year immediately following the first calendar year after 1965 for which the Secretary's determination of requirements of consumers pursuant to section 201 exceeds ten million four hundred thousand short tons, raw value: *Provided*, That the quantity allocated to the mainland cane sugar area for such calendar year pursuant to section 202(a)(2)(A) is not less than twenty-five thousand short tons of sugar, raw value. The acreage so reserved for each of the three consecutive crop years shall be distributed for each such crop year on a fair and reasonable basis, when it can be utilized, to farms without regard to any other acreage allocation for establishing farm proportionate shares determined by him, on the condition that the sugarcane produced on such farms shall be delivered for each of such three consecutive crop years to the new processing facility in the locality to which reserve acreage is committed as hereafter provided. The Secretary shall commit the reserve acreage estimated by him to yield twenty-five thousand short tons of sugar, raw value, for each of the three consecutive crop years to the locality determined by him to receive the reserve, and such commitment of reserve shall be irrevocable upon issuance of the determination of such commitment by publication in the Federal Register; except that if the Secretary finds in any case that construction of the sugarcane processing facility has not proceeded in substantial accordance with the representations made to him as a basis for his determination of commitment of the reserve acreage, he shall revoke such determination in accordance with and upon publication in the Federal Register of such findings. In any State in the continental United States where there was no mill for commercially processing sugarcane into sugar in 1965, commitment of reserve acreage shall be made to the locality where sugarcane will be delivered from farms for the commercial recovery of sugar by a sugarcane processing facility or mill which begins operation for the first time. In determining commitment of the reserve acreage and if proposals are made to construct sugarcane processing facilities in two or more localities where sugarcane production is scheduled to commence in the same year or succeeding years, the Secretary shall base his determination and selection upon the firmness of capital commitment, suitability for growing sugarcane, the lack of proximity of other mills, need for a cash crop or a replacement crop, and accessibility to sugar markets, and the relative qualification of localities under such criteria. The commitment of reserve acreage shall be determined by the Secretary after investigation, the publication of notice and such informal public hearings, if any, as the Secretary deems appropriate under the prevailing circumstances."

(4) Paragraph (5) of subsection (b) is amended by striking the words "In determining farm proportionate shares" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Whether farm proportionate shares are or are not determined".

(5) Subsection (b) is amended by adding new paragraphs (8) and (9) as follows:

"(8) In order to protect the sugarbeet production history for farm operators (or farms) who in any crop year, because of a crop-rotation program or for reasons beyond their control, are unable to utilize all or a portion of the farm proportionate share acreage established pursuant to this section, the Secretary may reserve for a period of not more than three crop years the production history for any such farm operators (or farms) to the extent of the farm proportionate share acreage released. The proportionate share acreage so released may be reallotted to other farm operators (or farms), but no production history shall accrue to such other farm operators (or farms) by virtue of such reallocation of the proportionate share acreage so released.

"(9) The Secretary is authorized to reserve from the national sugarbeet acreage requirements for the 1966, 1967, and 1968 crops of sugarbeets a total acreage estimated to yield not more than twenty-five thousand short tons, raw value, for each such crop to provide any nonaffiliated single plant processor of sugarbeets with an estimated quantity of sugar for marketing of not to exceed twenty-five thousand short tons of sugar, raw value. The Secretary is also authorized to reserve from the acreage which would otherwise be allocated to sugarcane producers in the mainland cane sugar area for the 1965 and 1966 crops of sugarcane a total acreage estimated to yield not more than twenty-five thousand short tons of sugar, raw value, for each such crop to relieve hardship on the part of producers who planted sugarcane for the first time for harvest in the crop years 1964 and 1965 and in allocating such acreage the Secretary shall give consideration to the amount by which the acreage of sugarcane in 1965 exceeds the proportionate share for the 1965 crop: with first consideration in allocating such acreage to farms on which the 1965 crop proportionate share has been overplanted by more than 200 per centum in an amount sufficient to bring the proportionate shares of such farms up to the acreage growing: *Provided*, That acreage allocated hereunder for the 1965 crop shall be in addition to the total acreage heretofore allocated in such area for the 1965 crop. The Secretary shall allocate the acreage provided for in this paragraph to farms on such basis as he determines necessary to accomplish the purposes for which such acreages are provided under this paragraph."

SEC. 11. (1) Subsection (b) of section 402 of such Act is amended by adding the following sentence thereto: "The Secretary is authorized to use the services, facilities, and authorities of Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of making disbursements to persons eligible to receive payments under title III of this Act: *Provided*, That no such disbursements shall be made by Commodity Credit Corporation unless it has received funds to cover the amounts thereof from appropriations available for the purpose of carrying out such program."

(2) Subsection (a) of section 408 of such Act is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "During any period that the operation of the provisions of title II is so suspended by the President, the Secretary shall estimate for each year the amount of sugar needed to meet requirements of consumers in the United States and the amount the quota for each country would be if calculated on the basis as provided in section 202 of this Act. Notice of such estimate and quota calculation shall be published in the Federal Register. If any country fails to import into the continental United States within the quota year, an amount of sugar equal to the amount the quota would be as calculated for such country by the Secretary for such year, the quota established for such country in subsequent years under the provisions of title II shall be reduced as provided in section 202(d)(4) of this Act: *Provided*, That quotas for subsequent years shall not be reduced when quotas are suspended under this subsection and reestablished in the same calendar year."

(3) Subsection (b) of section 408 of such Act is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof and substituting in lieu thereof the following: "Any quantity so suspended shall be allocated in the same manner as deficits are allocated under the provisions of section 204 of this Act."

(4) Subsection (c) of section 408 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) In any case in which a nation or a political subdivision thereof has hereafter (1) nationalized, expropriated, or otherwise seized the ownership or control of the property or business enterprise owned or controlled by United States citizens or any corporation, partnership or association not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens or (2) imposed upon or enforced against such property or business enterprise so owned or controlled, discriminatory taxes or other exactions, or restrictive maintenance or operational conditions not imposed or enforced with respect to the property or business enterprise of a like nature owned or operated by its own nationals or the nationals of any government other than the Government of the United States or (3) imposed upon or enforced against such property or business enterprise so owned or controlled, discriminatory taxes or other exactions, or restrictive maintenance or operational conditions, or has taken other actions, which have the effect of nationalizing, expropriating or otherwise seizing ownership or control of such property or business enterprise or (4) violated the provisions of any bilateral or multilateral international agreement to which the United States is a party, designed to protect such property or business enterprise so owned or controlled, and has failed within six months following the taking of action in any of the above categories to take appropriate and adequate steps to remedy such situation and to discharge its obligations under international law toward such citizen or entity, including the prompt payment to the owner or owners of such property or business enterprise so nationalized, expropriated or otherwise seized or to provide relief from such taxes, exactions, conditions or breaches of such international agreements, as the case may be, or to arrange, with the agreement of the parties concerned, for submitting the question in dispute to arbitration or conciliation in accordance with procedures under which final and binding decision or settlement will be reached and full payment or arrangements with the owners for such payment made within twelve months following such submission, the President shall suspend any quota, proration of quota, or authorization to import sugar under this Act of such nation until he is satisfied that appropriate steps are being taken. Any quantity so suspended shall be allocated in the same manner as deficits are allocated under section 204 of this Act."

(5) Section 412 of such Act (relating to termination of the powers of the Secretary under the Act) is amended by striking out "1966" in each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1971".

SEC. 12. Section 4501(b) (relating to termination of taxes on sugar) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out "1967" in each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1972".

SEC. 13. Except as hereinafter provided, the provisions of this Act shall become effective January 1, 1965. The amendments made by section 4 of this Act shall become effective January 1, 1966.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment as printed in the reported bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 5, line 6, strike out the period and quotation marks and insert "with sugar produced in such country."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. If we are going to continue to consider the bill, let us have a quorum.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, has the Clerk read the first amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has completed the reading of the first amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MOSS, having assumed the chair, Mr. BURKE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11135) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 11135 and include extraneous matter, and tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

COLUMBUS DAY SHOULD BE A LEGAL HOLIDAY

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, since today is October 12, I take this occasion to urge support of a joint resolution to designate Columbus Day as a national legal holiday. More than ever, it is important that our Nation give due honor to the great navigator who proved so inspiringly that science and faith are not incompatible but are indeed allies.

In this atomic and space age in which we live, it is important to be mindful of this fact, and I would urge prompt action to designate Columbus Day as a legal holiday.

A CONCERTED EFFORT TO PRESERVE OUR SHORES, WATERWAYS, AND WILDLIFE

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide for a study to devise a master plan for the conservation and development of one of the most important links in our Intercoastal Waterway—Long Island Sound.

This study looks toward development of a comprehensive plan to preserve, develop, and make accessible for the public benefit, inspiration, and use, the scenic beauty and natural fish and wildlife values of the coastal areas bordering Long Island Sound in the States of New York, Connecticut, and Rhode Island.

In this region, as in many other areas of our Nation, water pollution, shoreline erosion, destruction of marine and waterfowl life, the ruin of wildlife-protecting wetlands, has reached alarming proportions. The indiscriminate building of piers, and marinas, as well as uncoordinated dredging, all add up to one thing—the steady destruction of the natural physical values of this wonderful area.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that a coordinated effort on the part of all the government units bordering the Sound is the only way to arrest and reverse this unfortunate trend. I feel that all the governments involved, and certainly the citizens of the area, are firmly in favor of this effort. What has been lacking is coordination and cooperation, and I think the master plan that I am proposing today will provide these indispensable factors.

I would like to make it clear, however, that the plan I am proposing will not compromise the autonomy of any of the government units involved; rather, it provides through coordination what should be the objective of all—preservation of the physical integrity of our Long Island Sound area. I think this proposal of a regional master plan for conservation could be a pilot program of great value to other sections of the country in the constant war against destruction of our natural resources, and commend it to this House for consideration.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD MOBILIZE ALL OF ITS CAPABILITIES TO REDUCE AUTOMOBILE ACCIDENTS

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, Congress should designate the motor vehicle accident as public enemy No. 1 and should mobilize all of the capabilities of our Federal Government to reduce the staggering losses of life and property on our Nation's roads and highways.

We have spared nothing in our effort to achieve safety for air travelers and we have gotten results. Yet, less than 40 percent of our people have ever been in an airplane and less than 12 percent fly annually. And, the airplane is considered to be safer than the automobile.

By striking contrast there is no agency or program which has statutory authority to investigate car accidents, to research their cause and ways of prevention and to protect the 99 percent of our population which daily travels some part of our 750,000-mile Federal highway system.

We could reduce our losses by simply applying our present knowledge and through research we could make further reductions.

For example, a Federal vehicle safety testing center should be established. This would lead to the adoption of higher safety standards in driver training and testing, in highway and vehicle design, and in traffic control signals and signs. This could be done nationally for a fraction of what it would cost the States to do separately.

Vehicles should be certified for road safety before they reach the consumer.

There could be marked improvement in highway design and we could eliminate some of the death traps we know about.

The Federal Government could promote a more uniform traffic environment for drivers by fostering intergovernmental cooperation.

Data on highway accidents could be quickly improved through the adoption of a uniform reporting form.

Regional training programs for traffic officers could upgrade the investigation and reporting of traffic accidents.

Accelerated research as to the cause and prevention of accidents should be initiated. University centers of research and scholarships for individuals should be supported.

These are just a few of the positive steps which should be taken without further delay.

The jurisdiction and the responsibility of the Congress is clear. Motor vehicles are constantly engaged in interstate commerce and nothing is more destructive to the public health than the traffic accident.

Furthermore, there is a need for a national attack on this problem in cooperation with State and local government. There are obvious limitations on what any one State can do.

We have the power to act. We have the duty to act. And we can act effectively. Former Congressman Kenneth Roberts, of Alabama, fought for highway safety in the 82d through the 88tn Congress. Senators RIBICOFF and NELSON have spoken out in this Congress.

That 47,000 were killed and 1,700,000 were injured last year should spur us to action. If statistics will not move us, then the memory of Representative Ashton Thompson, of Louisiana, who was killed this summer on our Interstate System should.

Every Member of the Congress should join in an effort to curb the heartache and the agony associated with the motor vehicle accident—our public enemy No. 1.

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS WAS A TRULY GREAT MAN

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, as every schoolboy knows, in 1492, Columbus sailed the ocean blue. Today is Columbus Day. And it was poor taste, to say the least, on the part of Yale University to announce Sunday that it has a map of dubious origin which purports to prove that Leif Ericson, a Norwegian, reached the New World before Columbus, an Italian.

I think Yale's point is superfluous. There are also indications that a Spaniard, Sanchez de Huelva, and the Irish missionary St. Brendan, touched the shores of North America in their pre-Columbian voyages.

The important historical fact is that Christopher Columbus' historic voyages sparked the colonization of the New World by the old.

And to downgrade Columbus is like downgrading Joe Di Maggio, Arturo Toscanini, Leonardo da Vinci, and Enrico Caruso.

Columbus was one of the truly great men of all history and all the maps in the world will never dim his fame.

NATURAL DISASTERS IN OUR COUNTRY THIS YEAR

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately this great country in the past several months has been hit by several major disasters, running from floods to hurricanes and even earthquakes. I have been authorized by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], to announce that the Subcommittee on Flood Control will this week hold public hearings on a score of bills introduced by colleagues of the House and Members of the other body.

These hearings will begin on Thursday morning of this week at 10 a.m. in the Public Works Committee room. We invite all interested members to appear in person or submit statements. We welcome all views concerning the need for general legislation to cope with local and national disasters. This is a very important matter and it is our desire to have the best advice we can get before our committee.

THE BOOMING ECONOMY OF JACKSON, MISS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, with pardonable pride, I would like to call the House's attention to the booming economy of Mississippi's capital city—Jackson.

In the past two decades, the economy of Jackson has ably met the challenges of economic growth, thus continuing to achieve new business highs. At this time all business signals point upward, and discounting unforeseeable free market forces which can distort any economic projection, the upward trend of the local economy will continue through 1966. The facts substantiate this optimistic forecast.

People are necessarily the essence of markets; therefore, by an analysis of population trends, Jackson's future economic growth can be determined. Jackson's population area is known as the Jackson standard metropolitan statistical area, comprised of Hinds and Rankin Counties. The economic ties between these dominant central Mississippi counties are so pervading and intertwined that a smaller geographic area detracts from a meaningful analysis of population trends. Currently, the population of the Jackson metropolitan area has exceeded 250,000. Of this total, an estimated 166,500 people reside in Jackson, truly Mississippi's metropolitan center.

A population forecast prepared by Michael Baker, Jr., consulting engineers, projects the population of the metropolitan area as follows: 288,000 in 1970, 335,000 in 1975, 379,500 in 1980, and 438,000 in 1985. This population forecast indicates a continuation of the 47-percent population growth enjoyed by Jackson during the 1950–60 period. With Jackson as the focal city for the pronounced urbanization trend underway in Mississippi, the population outlook for the State's capital city is indeed bright.

Jackson's present-day population is comprised of well-educated citizens. The following facts compiled from publications of the Bureau of the Census indicate Jackson's rank in relation to all cities in the United States which had populations in the 100,000 to 250,000 range at the time of the 1960 census. These statistics also use regional groupings of States established by the Department of Commerce.

Jackson ranks first among East South Central cities in the percentages of residents 25 years and over who are college graduates—13.4 percent—ranks second among Southern States and eighth in the United States. In the population of 25 years of age and over, Jackson claims a median of 12.1 school years completed, the highest of all southern and East South Central cities. In the entire United States, Jackson's overall level of education ranks 10th. The median age of Jackson's young, dynamic population is only 26.1 years, which is the 2d youngest in the East South Central region and 13th in the United States.

Jackson is an attractive new city with room to grow. Jackson's population density is only 3,106 people per square mile, 2d only to one East South Central city and ranking 11th in the whole United States. Jackson's attractive living conditions, cultural advantages, and economic opportunities have caused an influx of new residents. Some 22.4 percent of all residents, 5 years old and over, were reported as living in a county different from the one in which they lived 5 years earlier. This record is 2d of any East South Central city and 19th in the United States. Jackson is a city of fine, modern homes, with 38.4 percent of all housing units built in 1950 or later. As measured by this gage, more up-to-date, high-quality housing is located in Jackson than in all but 12 cities in the United States.

EMPLOYMENT

The prevailing reason for substantial increases in population is the abundance of employment opportunities. Job gains led the parade of a long list of record-breaking indicators of prosperity in the Jackson metropolitan area during the past year. In August of 1965 the Jackson labor market area, also defined as Hinds and Rankin Counties, claimed a civilian labor force of 94,200 and employment of 92,050. Throughout the year unemployment remained at a level of 40 to 50 percent below that of the United States, standing at 2.3 percent in the Jackson area in August.

A comparison of employment levels by industry groups in August of 1965 with those in August of 1964 traces the structure of employment generators at work in the Jackson area economy during the past year:

Industry group	Employment in—		Net change from August 1964 to August 1965
	August 1965	August 1964	
Civilian labor force	94,200	92,850	+1,350
Unemployment	2,150	2,450	−300
Employment	92,050	90,350	+1,700
Nonagricultural wage and salaried	74,200	72,500	+1,700
Mining	850	950	−100
Contract construction	5,850	5,800	+50
Manufacturing	12,450	11,750	+550
Transportation, communications, and utilities	4,650	4,600	+50
Wholesale and retail trade	17,500	16,950	+550
Finance, insurance, and real estate	5,300	5,200	+100
Service and miscellaneous	11,900	11,800	+100
Government	13,750	13,750	+350
Domestic and self-employed	13,750	13,750	----------
Agricultural	4,100	4,100	----------

Source: Mississippi State Employment Service. Totals may not add due to rounding.

The Michael Baker, Jr., firm, referred to earlier, projects total employment at 102,500 in 1970, 112,500 in 1975, 126,000 in 1980, and 138,000 in 1985. Employment in the Jackson area is highly diversified and stable and concentrated in those industry groups showing a pronounced growth trend.

BUYING INCOME AND RETAIL SALES

The economic research division of the Jackson Chamber of Commerce issued in October of 1965 a study of retail and wholesale markets served by Jackson entitled "A Decade of Growth and Market Development." Using data compiled from several sources, including Sales Management's Survey of Buying Power, the study shows that the Jackson wholesale trade area encompasses a $27 billion overnight market comprised of some 75,000 retail establishments with total sales of $12 billion. Effective buying income in the Jackson metropolitan area, comprised of Hinds and Rankin Counties, is $7,412 per household. This level of spendable income puts Jackson in fifth place among the 32 metropolitan areas within a 400-mile radius of Jackson. Standard metropolitan areas larger than Jackson in population but with less family buying income included Birmingham, Little Rock, Memphis, Mobile, Nashville, and New Orleans. Retail sales per household in the Jackson area totaled $4,286 in 1964.

Jackson's complete retail shopping facilities attract customers from an ever-widening area. The Jackson metropolitan area contains 11.2 percent of the population of Mississippi but accounts for 13.8 percent of the total retail trade in the State. Retail dollar volume in the Jackson metropolitan area in 1964 was $278,564,000, according to Sales Management.

Jackson is the retailing center of a 31-county regional market. The latest available data on this expanding market shows a population of 874,500, households numbering 230,500, buying income of $1,292 million, and retail sales of $820,100,000.

WHOLESALE SALES

Wholesale trade is a major growth industry in the economy of the Jackson metropolitan area. This fact was substantiated in a study of "Jackson's Position as Mississippi's Wholesale Trade Center," released in September of 1965 by the economic research division of the Jackson Chamber of Commerce.

With total sales rising from $321,284,000 in 1958 to $411,312,000 in 1963, wholesalers in the Jackson area achieved a 28-percent growth between the 1958 and 1963 Censuses of Business-Wholesale Trade. Over the same timespan, payrolls attributable to employment in wholesale trade climbed from $18,877,000 to $27,588,000.

The number of wholesaling establishments in the Jackson area grew from 389 in 1958 to 438 in 1963. A marked improvement in sales per wholesaling unit was characteristic of the industry in both Jackson and the State over the period.

Despite competition from both in-State as well as from out-of-State wholesalers, Jackson wholesale firms boosted sales by $90 million over the 1958–63 period. Jackson wholesalers have demonstrated their ability to compete by expanding the Jackson wholesale trade area throughout Mississippi and into bordering States.

In addition to these accomplishments, the Jackson economy possesses certain characteristics that point toward its development as the leading growth center of the Deep South. The Jackson area offers a highly favorable business climate and package of growth-stimulating laws to new firms locating in the area and to existing firms desiring to expand their production and distribution facilities. As the financial, transportation, and business services center of Mississippi, Jackson has the facilities to nurture the industrial expansion in the central Mississippi area. Jackson has a highly productive work force with proven low labor costs per value of product produced. Labor-management harmony, exemplified by a low ratio of man-days lost through plant shutdowns to man-days worked, is the rule rather than the exception.

Jackson is Mississippi's metropolitan center. The anticipated near-term completion of facilities for the Mississippi Research and Development Center and the Mississippi Universities Center in Jackson will cause the city to achieve even more national prominence as a regional growth center.

So, it can readily be seen that Jackson is the spearhead of the South's aggressive drive for progress through education and industrialization.

TAX-SHARING OF REVENUE

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which would establish a workable program for the sharing of Federal tax revenues with the States. This legislation has been introduced in the other body by the distinguished senior Senator from New York, JACOB K. JAVITS.

The need for remission of a share of Federal tax moneys to the States—and through them to local governments—is clear, and the bill I have introduced today would help strengthen the capacity of local governments to serve their citizens effectively and restore fiscal balance to the Federal-State partnership.

Dr. Walter Heller, then Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, first suggested in June 1964 the general outlines of a plan for remission of Federal tax revenues to the States. A task force of economists headed by Joseph W. Pechman, of the Brookings Institution, endorsed the plan. It was supported by the Republican Governors Association last July as well as by numerous conferences of local officials.

Our States and local governments face a severe crisis and need additional funds if they are to institute and maintain vital programs—particularly with regard to air and water pollution, inadequate health care, education and overcrowded schools, and substandard recreation facilities. They are facing the demands of the future with a financial revenue base which is years out of date.

Property taxes on which much of education depends have risen about as high as they can go, yet the cost of education and other needed services and facilities continues to rise at a rapid rate. In the past 18 years, total State and local government expenditures have multiplied 6 times over. State and local outlays for education alone increased from $3 billion at the end of World War I to $22 billion last year.

Almost every imaginable tax resource has already been subjected to increasing and sometimes undesirable pressures. State taxes alone have gone from $4.9 billion in 1946 to $24.2 billion in 1964, an average increase of over a billion dollars a year. In 1965, property taxes increased 7.3 percent over the previous year; sales taxes went up 8.7 percent, corporate and individual income taxes rose 7.5 and 6.3 percent respectively—all in 1 year.

In 1964, States tax increases siphoned off one-third of the $6.5 billion Federal tax cut. Despite warnings from economists, a bewildering variety of consumption, payroll, and service taxes have appeared at the local level from Detroit to Oakland, Fairbanks to Mobile, Los Angeles to Baltimore. Over 40 cities have recently imposed motel and hotel taxes in an effort to shift some of their tax burdens to nonresidents.

The end is not in sight. Twenty-six Governors have asked for tax increases this past spring and many of those who are relying on larger yields from present taxes have warned their legislatures that increased taxes are a future necessity. Yet there is evidence that traditional taxes have already reached the limits of a desirable expansion.

There has been a dramatic increase in State and local debt, and this illustrates the growing disparity between government responsibility and government resources. From a $15.9 billion level in 1946, public indebtedness at the State and local level almost doubled by 1952. Since that year, State and local debt has tripled, an average increase of more than $4½ billion per year.

New York, whose 1963–64 State and local revenue amount to $7,445 million—the second largest in the Nation—would receive $202 million under the bill introduced today.

The legislation provides—

First. Establishment of a trust fund in which 1 percent of aggregate taxable income would be deposited from the Treasury, beginning July 1, 1967. Under present conditions this would amount to $2.5 billion a year and would grow as the tax base grows. Transfer from the Treasury to the tax sharing trust fund would take place at least once every 3 months.

Second. Payments from the trust fund to the States under the following formula: 80 percent would be distributed on the basis of population. This amount would be increased or decreased depending on the State's own tax effort, which would be measured by the ratio of the total revenues derived by the State over total personal income of individual State residents, as compared with the national average; and 20 percent of the fund would be paid each fiscal year to the 13 States with the lowest per capita income. This would be distributed according to population of the States involved.

Third. No State could receive a total payment for a fiscal year in excess of 12 percent of the trust fund in that year.

Fourth. A State may use its allotment of funds for programs in the fields of "health, education, and welfare," but not to include debt service of the States; general administrative expenses for the executive, legislative, or judicial branches of State and local governments; highway programs; State payments in lieu of real property taxes; and disaster relief.

Fifth. To benefit from the plan, a State must file reports with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller General and the appropriate committees of Congress, including a statement of intent as to how and for what purposes it shall spend the money. States must also comply with all applicable laws including title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Secretary of the Treasury must provide a detailed audit report to the Congress annually on the operation of the trust fund during the preceding fiscal year and on its expected operation during the current fiscal year.

Sixth. Failure to comply with prescribed conditions would require cancellation of future payments and permit reallocation of the remainder of a State's allocation to other States in proporttion to the original allotment.

Seventh. The State must distribute to its local governments an equitable portion of its allotment. The amount distributed to local governments must be no less than the average of the State's distribution of its own revenues to local governments over the previous 5 years.

Eighth. Appropriations Committees of both Houses and the Finance Committee of the Senate and Ways and Means Committee of the House, responsible for appropriations and tax legislation, must, at least once during each Congress, conduct a complete study of the operation of the trust fund and provide such legislative recommendations as appropriate.

COLUMBUS DAY

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as the Fourth of July surely makes us all proud to be Americans, and Christmas makes us rejoice in our Christian heritage, and Yom Kippur is a time of spiritual atonement for the Jewish faith, so today, Columbus Day here in America, makes me proud of my Italian ancestry and traditions. That heritage and those traditions are exemplified nowhere better than in the spirit of the Italian explorer, Christopher Columbus, for whom this day is named.

This man's courage, faith, and unwavering vision are virtues all men strive for, but few attain. His personal triumph over adversity in nature and in society are symbolic of man's eternal struggle against ignorance, superstition, and self-interest. We can only pray for the kind of faith and courage which this giant among men possessed in such measure to sustain him through the bitter frustrations of personal betrayal, and through the agony of public ridicule and ultimate ignominy.

In his own time, of course, his renown was that of an explorer, a navigator of great skill and intelligence. Although he did in fact discover the North American Continent, neither he nor his contemporaries realized that fact. He died thinking he had found the East Indies, had pioneered a westward course, and had proven the world to be round instead of flat. He was an explorer and a discoverer.

After his famous voyage of 1492, Columbus made three succeeding trips to the North American Continent bringing with him carpenters, masons, artisans, agriculturists, as well as seeds, plants, and implements with which to build the foundation of a new civilization. For all his tireless work and achievements, he received no personal reward. He never knew a life of comfort or ease and he died in virtual poverty.

The Honorable Michael A. Musmanno, Justice of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, has written an excellent book entitled "The Story of the Italians in America," published this year by Doubleday. Justice Musmanno, who has done a monumental amount of research and organizing for his book, devotes considerable attention, naturally, to the first and perhaps greatest Italian-American, Christopher Columbus.

I would like to cite the following passage from Justice Musmanno's book which suggests the powerful impact Columbus has had upon all mankind. Justice Musmanno writes:

> October 12 each year should be a day of great rejoicing, not only because it is the anniversary of the birth of the New World, but also because the life of Columbus is and can be a constant reminder of life's most powerful admonition: Never despair. Go look at Christopher Columbus in painting and marble and talk with him. Study that countenance which never accepted defeat, no matter how crushing the forces against him. Take heart from him, never raise the flag of surrender. If you believe in your cause, a world of opportunity unfolds before you, as it did before the noble Genoese who never accepted no for an answer.

Justice Musmanno also traces some of the events leading up to the great navigator's greatest voyage:

> For 18 years he had plodded through Europe like a mendicant seeking means and ships with which to make his epochal discoveries, and for 14 years, he had plowed the heavy seas in leaky ships, subsisting on nothing more substantial or palatable than salt pork, hardtack, and dried peas. He lived and voyaged over unknown waters, he fought his way through jungles and hostile tribes, he was without medicines, doctors, adequate sleeping facilities or shelter. During many nights of perilous passage he kept the watch in sleepless vigil and bone-chilling exposure.

Forty years after his death on May 20, 1506, his body was returned to one of the islands discovered on his first voyage, Santo Domingo.

Since his death, of course, Columbus has received all the fame and honor that was denied him during his lifetime. Today scores of cities, including our Nation's Capital, and countless monuments and landmarks are named for Columbus. Columbus Day, while not a national holiday, is celebrated as a holiday in many States, including my home State of Massachusetts.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would again like to cite a passage from Justice Musmanno's book in which the writer pays personal tribute to the spirit and memory of the man for whom this day is named:

> Oh noble Genoese, daring mariner, navigator of genius, and dreamer of worthy dreams. You have imparted the grandest lesson of all time—never despair. You will constantly be an encouragement, an inspiration, a constant urging to all of us to sail on and on until we too may find the San Salvador of our dreams, until we too may enter the port of Columbia in the realization of our fondest hopes of love, of peace, and unbroken happiness.

HORTON SPONSORS BILL TO MAKE COLUMBUS DAY A LEGAL HOLIDAY

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to announce to my colleagues in the House today, Columbus Day, that I have introduced a bill to make this date of October 12 in the years to come a duly authorized legal holiday as a mark of our national respect to the great navigator and the millions of Italians who followed him to the new world, thereby enriching and embellishing our American life by their civic and cultural contributions.

It was my privilege to offer a similar proposal in the last Congress. I urged then, as I do now, that we realize and recognize the deserved nature of this tribute and, thus, take the legislative steps to enact this measure.

In grammar school we learned that Columbus had a difficult time in obtaining support for his scheme to find the Indies by sailing west, and that it took a long time before the Spanish Government provided him with men, money, ships, and equipment. We all remember how agonizing Columbus' long wait was described to us as being. Is it not remarkable that the attempts to make

Columbus Day a Federal holiday have been unsuccessful for an even longer time than Columbus was unsuccessful in his own strivings for support and recognition?

Bills have been introduced for this purpose since 1906. Nothing has ever come of them, despite widespread support both in Congress and throughout the country. Making Columbus Day a Federal holiday would meet the test for the creation of new holidays which has been stated to be as follows: "The occasion called for must be national in scope and of widespread significance, serving the Nation as a whole."

As a tribute both to Columbus and to Italian Americans, Columbus Day as a Federal holiday would indeed be "national in scope and of widespread significance." We owe to Americans of Italian descent the pride of celebrating the great triumph of the discoverer of America. But all Americans, whatever their descent, would be happy to have an opportunity to pay tribute to this Italian navigator who sailed Spanish ships by the use of Portuguese charts. The varied character of the discovery is reflected in the diverse origins of the population of the United States.

The few remaining States which do not observe the day would be encouraged to do so if Columbus Day were to be made a Federal legal public holiday. Nevertheless, this is a decision that must be made by the States for themselves. The Congress and the President may designate holidays only for the District of Columbia, for Federal reservations, and for Federal employees, but such a designation of Columbus Day would have persuasive effect in influencing the decision of the States in this matter.

More than 40 States have granted some degree of recognition to Columbus Day. It is the Federal Government which has failed in its obligation to the memory of the great man who discovered America.

The great navigator achieved the most spectacular, the most far-reaching, and the most important geographical discovery in the history of the world. His qualities were those of stubborn persistence despite danger and discouragement, indomitable will, faith in God, and absolute fearlessness.

Such are the very qualities that have been exhibited here in the United States by Italian Americans. In their early days in this country they performed heavy labor in industry and in the construction trades. Through their loyalty to each other and to their families, through their native intelligence and their unflagging aspiration, it was not very long before their children became doctors, teachers, lawyers, judges, legislators, and businessmen.

Their achievements are unsurpassed by any other group, and their patriotic performance of military duty has been notable indeed. They deserve the recognition which honoring their Italian countryman, Columbus, by a Federal holiday would give them.

In a remarkably short number of years, in difficult times, and under severe handicaps, they have come to take their place in the leadership of the free American society. An Italian discovered America, and Italian Americans help to lead it and to preserve its freedom.

This achievement should be recognized. Columbus Day should be made a Federal legal public holiday of the same character as New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Veterans' Day, and Thanksgiving and Christmas Days. This should be done now, not later. It should be done by this Congress, not by a subsequent one.

Mr. Speaker, in support of this bill, I would call the attention of the House to the action of President Johnson recognizing the importance of Columbus Day to our Nation. The President again this year issued an official proclamation that Columbus Day, 1965, be appropriately observed today. His words in this regard provide further tribute to Christopher Columbus and the descendants of his native land and I take pleasure in including them with my remarks:

PROCLAMATION 3673—COLUMBUS DAY, 1965

(A proclamation by the President of the United States of America)

Whereas Christopher Columbus 473 years ago journeyed westward across forbidding and unknown seas to open the way for the eventual establishment of our Nation and its free institutions; and

Whereas the compelling drive of Columbus to seek new horizons has been an inspiration through the centuries to millions with the same enterprising spirit; and

Whereas the persistence and daring of Columbus has left a heritage which sustains us now as we explore the unknown reaches of outer space; and

Whereas the Congress, in recognition of our indebtedness to Christopher Columbus, by a joint resolution approved April 30, 1934 (48 Stat. 657), requested the President to issue a proclamation designating October 12 of each year as Columbus Day:

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate Tuesday, October 12, 1965, as Columbus Day; and I invite the people of this Nation to observe that day in schools and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies in honor of the memory of Christopher Columbus.

I also direct that the flag of the United States be displayed on all public buildings on Columbus Day.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 22d day of September in the year of our Lord 1965, and of the independence of the United States of America the 190th.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

By the President:

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Speaker, I also take this occasion of Columbus Day to report on an activity which will take place in the New York State capitol this afternoon. A bust of Columbus is to be dedicated by Governor Rockefeller.

I am proud that my distinguished constituent, the Honorable John P. Lomenzo, New York State secretary of state will officiate at these ceremonies.

For the information of my colleagues, I am including with my remarks a news release detailing this afternoon's observance of Columbus Day at my State's capital city:

Governor Rockefeller will dedicate a bust of Christopher Columbus in the State capitol, Albany, as part of Columbus Day observance on October 12, 1965.

The dedication ceremony will begin at 4:30 p.m. in the State Street lobby of the capitol where the white marble bust carved by the Italian sculptor, Ferruccio Vezzoni, will be permanently placed, facing the site of the South Mall. Secretary of State John P. Lomenzo will be master of ceremonies at the dedication.

The 700-pound bust was commissioned by the office of general services as authorized and directed by an act of the 1965 legislature. The act appropriated up to $2,500 for the bust and the commemorative exercises. The bust cost $1,362. The legislation was introduced by State Senator Joseph E. Marine, of the Bronx, and Assemblyman Anthony B. Gioffre, of Port Chester.

Sculptor Vezzoni, who was born in Pietrasanta, Italy, on September 11, 1908, and is associated with the Palla Studio in the town of his birth. He has won a number of prizes abroad for his work. Among his best-known works is the national monument to Generosi Del Mars in Genoa, Italy, and works in the Church of Pizza Asti, Rome.

ADMINISTRATION OF WALTER REED ARMY HOSPITAL

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago Jack Anderson of the Washington Post wrote a column which was sharply critical of the administration of Walter Reed Army Hospital.

The column in question which was published in the Jersey Journal, a leading newspaper in the northern New Jersey area, caused much consternation in veterans circles throughout the 14th District of New Jersey.

On September 28 I took the House floor to report to the Members of this House the findings of a group of Legionnaires from Hudson County who came to Walter Reed to ascertain for themselves whether the conclusions made by Mr. Anderson were justified or not.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a story entitled "Hudson Panel Hits Viet Vets Hospital" which appeared in the October 2 edition of the Jersey Journal be included at this point in the RECORD.

"INADEQUATE," SAYS LEGION REPORT—HUDSON PANEL HITS VIET VETS' HOSPITAL

"These young men were only boys, but all of a sudden you could see in their faces that they had gone through a lifetime within a period of 6 months to a year."

So reads a report by a five-man Hudson County American Legion committee, which visited Walter Reed Hospital, Washington, D.C.; found facilities there "inadequate" for disabled veterans of the war in Vietnam, and made six recommendations for improvements.

Joseph P. Hanrahan, the Legion's executive committeeman for Hudson County, after releasing the report, stated the committee plans to continue the investigation, which was prompted by a Drew Pearson column in the Jersey Journal last week. Jack Anderson, Pearson's associate, wrote that the hospital was overcrowded and understaffed.

The report by the committee headed by Hamilton Irving, the Legion's county commander, is being forwarded to the Legion's national headquarters, according to Hanrahan, first assistant county prosecutor.

During its September 24 inspection tour, the committee found most of the soldier-patients of the Vietnam conflict "without arms and legs. A few were waiting to be through the ordeal of losing (by surgery) one limb or the other."

The group found "the facilities of Walter Reed Hospital are definitely inadequate for these war-torn veterans of Vietnam."

They stated 45 enlisted men were crowded in a ward on the second floor and 46 on the third floor, most of them amputees, with inadequate toilet facilities and air conditioning.

Three nurses and two corpsmen (orderlies) took care of the men during most of the day, but from 3 to 7 p.m. one nurse took care of both wards, aided by an orderly in each.

"It was almost impossible for this staff to render the necessary treatment these boys needed," the report stated.

"We could see that depression had set in" and "morale was pretty low" in some cases, it noted.

Philip Rossiter, of Jersey City, a World War II amputee and committee member, spoke to several of the amputees about his artificial limb, told how it was fitted, boasted it never interfered with his way of life and demonstrated how he walked without limping.

The report noted that most patients ate in a messhall in another building. En route, they had to travel through a long corridor with a steep incline, making it difficult for those with crutches or using wheel chairs.

The committee stated it got complete cooperation from Representatives Cornelius E. Gallagher and Dominick V. Daniels, who promised to help in following through on its recommendations. The group also praised aid given by Gerard Devlin, Daniels' legislative assistant.

In addition to Irving and Rossiter, other committee members are Stephen Gregg, Congressional Medal of Honor recipient, and Clay Petty, both of MacKenzie Post, Bayonne, and Frank Riccardi, county Legion vice commander.

The committee recommends:

1. These boys should be housed on a ground floor, where there are level corridors.
2. Adequate messhalls and latrines to accommodate the groups of men to the amount housed in each ward and on the same floor.
3. More nurses and corpsmen to take care of these men.
4. Adequate air conditioning.
5. A recreation room on the same floor.
6. Clear and brighter wards.

"This committee feels that these wounded veterans of Vietnam, who have put their lives on the line for this country and what the American people stand for, surely deserve much better than has been provided for them at Walter Reed," the report concludes.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I went to Walter Reed Army Hospital to see for myself what the conditions were. With me were the Honorable Edward T. Conroy, a member of the Maryland General Assembly and past commander of the Maryland Disabled American Veterans who is a 100 percent disabled veteran having lost an arm at Heartbreak Ridge during the Korean conflict; Gary Anthony, legislative assistant to our colleague, Congressman James G. O'Hara of Michigan; and my legislative assistant, Gerald F. Devlin, who had accompanied the Hudson County Legionnaires on their inspection trip through the hospital 2 weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that any shortcomings at the hospital are not the fault of the staff, who are—in my judgment—a very dedicated group of men and women trying to do a most difficult job.

The hospital is clean and antiseptic in appearance. Perhaps it is a good deal cleaner than it was before the Anderson story was published.

However, my criticism of 2 weeks ago remains valid. The hospital is inadequate for the number of patients being treated and as I said before, it is woefully understaffed.

I was told this morning that at night they have one nurse covering two wards on different floors, one ward, No. 35 has 43 patients, and the other, No. 34, has 45 more patients. However dedicated she may be this is asking too much from one person.

Further, as one high ranking staff member conceded, "The hospital is not the most modern but it is functional." When you consider the sacrifices being made by our young men every day in Vietnam, can we be satisfied with average or ordinary treatment?

I cannot help but conclude that the Army—in view of the military buildup in Vietnam—is desperately short of hospital facilities. As one Member of Congress who is willing to assist in any way he can, I repeat my offer to introduce legislation to correct the situation I am not a member of the House Armed Services Committee, but I know that the very distinguished chairman, Congressman Mendel Rivers, will do anything he can to see that our fighting men are being taken care of.

Two weeks ago, I wrote to the Army Secretary Stanley R. Resor asking for information on the Walter Reed situation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my letter to Mr. Resor at this point in the Record:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., September 28, 1965.

Hon. Stanley R. Resor,
Secretary of the Army,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: A week ago, Jack Anderson of the Washington Post, wrote a column which was sharply critical of the administration of the Walter Reed Hospital, Washington, D.C., which I am sure has been brought to your attention.

One of the newspapers which published Mr. Anderson's nationally syndicated column is the Jersey Journal, a leading newspaper in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent.

The Anderson column caused much consternation in veterans circles in Hudson County, N.J., as I am sure it did throughout the United States.

Officials of the Hudson County American Legion sent a blue ribbon group to Washington to investigate conditions at Walter Reed. I might point out that this five-man group included Stephen Gregg, of Bayonne, N.J., a holder of the Congressional Medal of Honor and Philip Rossiter, of Jersey City, a leg amputee in World War II.

Accompanied by my legislative assistant, Gerard F. Devlin, the Hudson County American Legion group investigated those wards which Mr. Anderson discussed in his article. They spent some time interviewing patients in the wards where Mr. Anderson stated that conditions were less than adequate.

I am unhappy to relate that their findings were that the general conditions in the wards reserved for enlisted men at Walter Reed fall short of what was felt to be adequate for our wounded and ailing soldiers.. As was pointed out by Mr. Anderson, there were two crowded wards each containing 45 beds, all occupied, which in both cases were served by a single latrine which contained only one shower, one bathtub, four washbasins, two urinals, and three toilet bowls. In addition to the general condition of overcrowding, the wards were extremely inaccessible to many of the hospital's facilities notably the mess hall.

I am very much alarmed that the Army should treat our young men in uniform in this manner. I urge you, Mr. Secretary, to take action immediately to correct the situation at Walter Reed Hospital.

If you feel that additional funds are needed, I shall be more than happy to sponsor legislation to make these funds available. I am sure that all Members of Congress share my feeling that these patients at Walter Reed, many of whom are wounded veterans of the Vietnamese conflict, deserve nothing but the very best from their country.

If, Mr. Secretary, immediate steps are not taken to correct the situation at Walter Reed I shall be forced to ask the House Armed Services Committee to undertake an investigation of the situation. I assure you that the American people and their Representatives in the Congress will not allow these conditions to be continued.

Sincerely,

Dominick V. Daniels,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks have passed and the only reply I have received I shall insert at this point in the Record.

October 7, 1965.

Hon. Dominick V. Daniels,
House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Daniels: The Secretary of the Army has askd me to provide an interim reply to your inquiry concerning the administration of the Walter Reed Hospital, Washington, D.C.

Your inquiry has been referred to the appropriate staff agency, for information on which to base a reply. You will receive an answer in the very near future.

Sincerely,

J. L. Blackwell,
Colonel, GS, Office, Chief of Legislative Liaison.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress I am alarmed at the attitude of the Army which is apparently so ensnarled in its own bureacuracy that it is incapable of finding out what is happening in its own hospital.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is time that Mr. Resor gets off his swivel chair and takes himself over to the hospital to find out what is happening. I am dissatisfied with an answer that "your inquiry has been referred to the appropriate staff agency." I am not asking the arm chair generals at the Pentagon to go to South Vietnam. I am only asking that they stir themselves enough to cross the Potomac and go to Walter Reed—a distance of about 5 miles.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, there is not a single Member of this House who will not do all in his power to see that our hospitalized servicemen receive the best care that the world's greatest nation can afford. Our young men deserve at least this much.

ALL THE EARMARKS OF A PAYOFF TO BOBBY BAKER

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the story in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of October 10, 1965, dealing with the large cash payments that a few west coast savings and loan industry representatives made to Bobby Baker in the fall of 1962. Apparently these savings and loan people collected the cash and delivered it to Bobby Baker a short time after the passage of the Revenue Act of 1962 that provided certain loopholes for the stock savings and loan companies.

There may be the usual efforts to explain these big cash payments in terms of campaign contributions or in other ways. It may be that the executives of these firms have broken the larger amounts down to make it appear as possible campaign contributions, or something other than a direct payoff.

I do not care what the explanations are for this big cash deal with Bobby Baker, for the circumstances reek of a payoff in connection with legislation. When any group collected $25,000, or $50,000 or $100,000 in cash there is reason for us to question the propriety of the fund accumulated. When such a huge cash fund is collected by one group and delivered to Bobby Baker immediately after the passage of legislation that benefits the savings and loan group, it has all of the earmarks of payoff for legislation.

Indications are that only a few institutions were involved and they are located out on the west coast. I mention this because I want to make it crystal clear that these revelations are not meant to indict the entire industry, nor to implicate any of the institutions which were not directly involved.

But insofar as the perpetrators are concerned, it makes no difference how they try to explain it, I think the average citizen, the average grand juror, the average juror will recognize this kind of a deal for just what it is—a payoff. Any other explanation is as phony as the explanations that were given by Mickey Weiner on his $5,000 deal with Bobby Baker. It is as phony as the explanation that Matt McCloskey gave the Senate Rules Committee on the $35,000 "goof" that his company made that resulted in another $25,000 in cash being delivered by Don B. Reynolds to Bobby Baker.

I hope that the reports are correct that the savings and loan officials have decided to tell the truth about this sordid deal with Bobby Baker. I hope that the Johnson administration is now serious about calling a halt to the coverup for Bobby Baker, and that there will be serious efforts to indict and convict Bobby Baker and his associates for their crimes.

We are all indebted to Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS of Delaware for his great effort in pushing the Bobby Baker case in the face of the Rules Committee coverup. He deserves the highest praise, and there should be an end to the administration efforts to smear him for his courage in pushing to expose the whole Bobby Baker story.

I request unanimous consent to insert the Mollenhoff article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks.

PROBE CENTERS ON $100,000 BAKER CACHE

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A mysterious $100,000 in cash, traced to Robert G. (Bobby) Baker in the late fall of 1962, has become an important focal point in the investigation of the former influential Senate employee.

The Federal investigation of Baker's affairs has included the questioning of many top representatives of the savings and loan industry who have been established as the source of at least $100,000 in cash that flowed to Baker in that period, it was learned Saturday.

The flow of the large amount of cash to Baker took place during a period immediately after passage of legislation that included multimillion-dollar tax benefits to the savings and loan industry.

It is known that Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, has received information on the identity of the officials of three major savings and loan holding companies who collected the money and arranged for the delivery to Baker—most of it in $100 bills.

The Delaware Republican tried unsuccessfully to force the Senate Rules Committee, headed by Chairman B. EVERETT JORDAN, Democrat, of North Carolina, to conduct an extensive and thorough investigation of the large amounts of cash proven to be in Baker's possession in the late fall of 1962 and early 1963.

JORDAN and his counsel, Lennox P. McLendon, did not conduct the full-scale investigation that WILLIAMS demanded, and the Delaware Senator continued to prod in Senate speeches with broad hints.

"Any man who is a public official and has $50,000 to $100,000 in $100 bills stashed away in his Government office should be required to answer the questions by a congressional committee," WILLIAMS declared. He told JORDAN and McLendon they should ask Baker: "Where did you get that money?"

WILLIAMS has declared that when Baker took the fifth amendment it should not have meant the end of the search, but only a more intensive questioning of others to determine the source of the big cash payments and the reason they were made.

"Why has not more emphasis been placed on determining where Mr. Baker got the $100,000 in cash," WILLIAMS complained to JORDAN. "Why has not more interest been expressed in the fact that here was an employee of the U.S. Government who during the span of 4 years by his own statement had pyramided his net worth from $84,000 to over $2 million."

When JORDAN and the Democratic majority killed the investigation without resolving the question of the large cash payments, WILLIAMS continued with his own private investigation of this and other matters.

He made several quiet trips out of Washington in recent months in connection with the Baker investigation, and the most recent of these mysterious trips took place in the last week.

Also, he has pieced together the legislative history of the Revenue Act of 1962 with special emphasis on the origin of those sections of the tax law that tossed the huge benefits to the major stock holding companies involved in delivering the large amounts of cash to Bobby Baker.

Witnesses who have appeared before the Federal grand jury in Washington have included many key figures in the stock savings and loan companies who were involved in the large cash payments to Baker. Also, other persons who have appeared before the grand jury have indicated that the questioning placed a heavy emphasis on their knowledge of Baker's activities and connections with passage of the tax legislation.

The grand jury that is charged with a full investigation of the Bobby Baker case has been in action for nearly a year, but it is reported that only in the last 2 months has the focus seemed to be on Baker's relationship with the west coast savings and loan officials. Witnesses have reported surprise at the aggressive work of the lawyers handling the Baker grand jury in the light of Baker's past close association with high Democratic political figures in the legislative branch and the executive branch.

There is speculation that the Federal grand jury has about completed at least one phase of its work, and that some action on the savings and loan payments to Baker and other matters will take place within a month.

Informants within the savings and loan industry first called WILLIAMS' attention to what was contended was a relationship between the tax benefits for the savings and loan industry in 1962 and the existence of large amounts of cash in Baker's Capitol office file case in late 1962 and early 1963.

It was pointed out to WILLIAMS that the cash started to appear in Baker's possession shortly after the Revenue Act of 1962 became law. The conference report on the revenue act was agreed to on October 2, 1962, and on October 16, 1962, the legislation was signed by President Kennedy.

It was reported that, within a week after the legislation was signed, Baker made a trip to Los Angeles, Calif., where he was given the first large amount of cash to bring back to Washington. It was reported that other large cash payments were made later.

Later, WILLIAMS received written reports from informants giving further details that named the large stock savings and loan firms involved and identified some of the officials who had collected the money.

It was reported to the Delaware Senator that the money was collected in cash, and with some understanding that it would be regarded as political contributions to various Washington officials who had been sympathetic with the tax problems of the savings and loan industry. Baker at that time was handling the political campaign funds for the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee.

There was testimony before the Senate Rules Committee that Mrs. Trudy Novak, formerly Baker's partner in the Carousel Motel, had gone to Baker's office on a number of occasions in November 1962 and later had received large sums of cash—as much as $13,000 at one time—from Baker.

She testified that the money was in $100 bills and that it was taken out of one of Baker's filing cabinets and counted out to her. Mrs. Novak said she never had handled such large amounts of cash and had been frightened at the prospects of carrying it to a Silver Spring, Md., bank where it was placed in an account to be used for the expenses of the Carousel Motel.

This firm testimony on the cash Baker had given Mrs. Novak was corroborated by the bank records showing that Mrs. Novak had taken such amounts of cash to the bank for deposit on the Carousel Motel account.

WILLIAMS used this testimony of Mrs. Novak and other information he considered to be reliable to piece together the facts establishing his contention that Baker had access to at least $100,000 in cash in that period.

The evidence that savings and loan officials delivered $100,000 in cash to Baker is in many respects only a larger version of several other transactions involving cash payments to Baker by other industry groups which have been characterized as "gross improprieties."

There was a $5,000 check that was traced to Baker's law firm from Myron (Mickey) Weiner, a Washington lawyer, a few days after passage of legislation favorable to Wiener's client, an association of freight forwarding firms.

The Rules Committee concluded that "the payment was, in fact, made for Baker's help in getting the law passed.

"This impression was fortified by evidence that Wiener had used Baker's office almost as his own since early 1960," the Rules Committee stated. The committee rejected Wiener's explanation that the $5,000 was only a legal retainer to Baker, paid in advance, for which he admitted Baker never did any work.

The committee lashed out at this transaction as a "most flagrant" example of Baker's use of his position for personal financial profit.

The committee did not see fit to go into the information that pointed to similar questionable transactions involving the savings and loan industry.

THE 186TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF CASIMIR PULASKI, POLISH PATRIOT

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, October 11, marked the 186th anniversary of the death of Casimir Pulaski, the great Polish patriot who fought valiantly and sacrificed his life in the American struggle for independence.

Pulaski, the eldest son of Count Joseph Pulaski, was born in Poland in 1748 and was a member of the Polish nobility. He fought with his father in the popular uprising against Russian control after Poland had been partitioned by Germany, Russia and Austria. When it became evident that the forces of freedom who had fought so gallantly against enormous odds and with inadequate equipment would be slaughtered by the Russians, Pulaski chose to disperse his men and seek aid for their cause abroad. Although a penniless refugee, and having lost his father and brother in the fight for freedom for Poland, he sought help in Prussia, Turkey and then France. In Paris, Pulaski met Benjamin Franklin, who told him of the need for trained soldiers and leaders in the American Revolutionary War. The Polish hero traveled to the United States, seeing our struggle as another opportunity to fight for freedom and presented a letter of introduction from Franklin to General Washington.

Pulaski distinguished himself in the battle of Brandywine and was commissioned a brigadier general by Congress and given command of the entire American cavalry. Believing fervently in the cause for which he was fighting, Pulaski led his men for 2 years before being struck down during the siege of Savannah. Seriously wounded on October 9, he died on October 11 at the age of 31, having made an outstanding contribution to the success of the American Revolution.

In paying tribute again this year to General Pulaski, we who now enjoy American freedom must rededicate ourselves to the restoration of freedom to Pulaski's homeland, Poland, which still suffers under the foreign domination of Russian imperialism.

WE WON'T PAY THE BRITISH DEBT

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, on November 23 this year the citizens of Frederick, Md., will mark an important bicentennial, the 200th anniversary of Repudiation Day. On November 23, 1765, the judges of the Frederick County Court struck a resounding blow against tyranny by handing down a decision which repudiated the Stamp Act imposed upon the American Colonies by the British Parliament. This historic decision, the first judicial ruling upon the validity of the Stamp Act, was a landmark in the American fight for freedom and judicial independence.

House Joint Resolution 401, which I introduced last February and which has been passed by the House, would commemorate Repudiation Day by authorizing the President to issue an appropriate proclamation. I hope that the Senate will act on House Joint Resolution 401 in the few days remaining in this session.

Because many of my colleagues have asked me for more information on Repudiation Day, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD an interesting and entertaining article, "We Won't Pay the British Debt," by Mr. Max Fullerton, former chief of the Baltimore bureau of the Associated Press and a man well versed in the history of the Free State of Maryland.

WE WON'T PAY THE BRITISH DEBT—JUDGES IN MARYLAND'S FREDERICK COUNTY RENOUNCED THE STAMP ACT 10 YEARS BEFORE THE REVOLUTION STARTED

(By Max Fullerton)

Repudiation Day? What a queer designation, you might opine.

What does it mean? What is its significance?

It has considerable significance in the history of our Nation. It also is a half holiday which legally may be celebrated only in Maryland's Frederick County.

And in November of this year, the many who have never heard of the day will listen to the blood-warming story told and retold.

As I am going to tell it to you now.

It was quiet, almost somnolent, in old Frederick Town that early fall of 1765. On the surface at least.

The Monocacy River flowed peacefully, its waters only broken now and then by a leaping trout or bass.

But things soon were to happen, things which from Frederick Town would shape the future of the American Colonies. The big event was the seldom-mentioned, and usually misunderstood, repudiation decision.

It was a harbinger. This is how it all came about:

The last of the French and Indian Wars had ended. Sir Edward Braddock rested in his grave along what is now U.S. Route 40 near Uniontown, Pa. Fort DuQuesne, which General Braddock could not wrest from the French and their Indian allies, was now Fort Pitt. This strategic piece of ground controlled the traffic on the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers where they met to form the big Ohio.

The need for Fort Necessity in the Pennsylvania mountains beyond Cumberland was long past. Col. George Washington had turned his attention to other pursuits.

So, the drums of war were muffled in 1765. But the 12 judges of Frederick County issued a historic decision which started the beats once more, albeit slowly and not too loudly. Then years later their tympanic thunder reached a crescendo at Lexington, Mass., and the Revolution was on.

Two centuries ago, the wars which made Great Britain master of the American Colonies and Canada had been costly. They had been costly in British lives and British gold. The colonists had also suffered losses.

But Parliament felt the Colonies should be called upon to pay at least part of the English debt. Therefore, in 1764 the historic stamp tax was decreed. This levy, somewhat nominal in scope, covered among other things charges for affixing stamps on such as legal and public documents.

At that time, the area of Frederick County was about the same as today's Sixth Congressional District encompassing the western part of the State.

The Stamp Act, already a phrase which caused most Americans to gag, became effective November 1, 1765.

On November 23, the dozen Frederick County judges gathered in a house on Record Street in Frederick Town. The reasons for failure to meet in the courthouse itself are obscure. However, it was generally believed the men of the bench wanted secrecy until they had completed their deliberations.

From that meeting came this resolution defying the British Parliament:

"It is the unanimous resolution and opinion of this court that all business thereof shall and ought to be transacted in the usual and accustomed manner.

"And that all proceedings shall be valid and effective without the use of stamps."

The court cited two reasons for the resolution. One was the judges had no official notification of the Stamp Act. The other was they didn't have any stamps anyway.

The decision was construed in Maryland and elsewhere as one holding the loathsome Stamp Act as unconstitutional.

The court clerk, Jack Darnall, declined to obey the order, whereupon the court remanded Darnall to the custody of the sheriff. The clerk subsequently complied.

The stamp tax was not the first one levied by Britain on the Colonies. For instance, there was an impost on molasses of such proportions scarcely anyone paid it. Nor was there any concerted effort to collect it.

There also were a group of 17th century statutes known as the Navigation Acts. These prohibited Americans from trading with any nation except Great Britain. No one paid any attention to them, either, and American ships came and went to whatever ports they please. Also there were few attempts to search homes without warrants.

This business of laissez-faire over the years was largely due to a feeling of camaraderie between colonists and redcoats because they were brothers in arms. At the end of the wars, however, British military leaders got across the notion that American volunteers and militiamen were too lacking in discipline and spirit to protect all of the land claimed by the English. This rubbed colonial fur very much the wrong way.

The Stamp Act was supposed to bring in 50,000 pounds annually. It was estimated the quartering of 10,000 British troops cost the crown 300,000 pounds a year.

Because total enforcement was impossible, the stamp tax was repealed in 1766.

But soon thereafter came levies on tea and some other commodities. The British East India Co. had found itself in financial difficulties and wanted to recoup.

Actually, the tea tax was so small it would have been cheaper to pay it than bring the tea in from Holland, a custom of long standing.

But also came orders for enforcement of the Navigation Acts, collection of the molasses tax and search of homes when the military deemed it advisable.

So the damage not only was done, but compounded.

On the night of December 16, 1773, more than 50 men disguised as Mohawk Indians boarded a ship in Boston Harbor and threw all the tea overboard. The famous Boston Tea Party was the most daring bit of defiance of the times.

This incident was followed on October 19, 1774, when the tea ship *Peggy Stewart* was burned in Annapolis Harbor.

By this time, the Colonies were on the brink of war although they did not know it at the time.

The old house where the Frederick County judges convened was razed around 1900. But 61 years ago, the Frederick Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution installed in the present courthouse a bronze tablet which reads:

"In memory of the 12 immortal justices of the Frederick County court who repudiated the Stamp Act, November 23, 1765."

It lists the men on the bench as follows: Justices Joseph Smith, David Lynn, Charles Jones, Samuel Beall, Josiah Beall, Peter Bainbridge, Thomas Price, Andrew Heugh, William Blair, William Luckett, James Dickson, and Thomas Beatty.

By act of the Maryland General Assembly, Repudiation Day is a legal holiday after noon on November 23 each year. Business houses, banks, schools, and so on don't observe it by closing.

However, the DAR always holds a ceremony at the courthouse where the tablet is ensconced.

In this bicentennial year elaborate preparations are being made for an all-out observance of Repudiation Day in Frederick.

Representative CHARLES MATHIAS, of the Sixth Maryland Congressional District, has introduced a resolution in Congress asking President Johnson to issue a proclamation.

MATHIAS had this to say about the decision of 200 years ago:

"This truly was one of the preambles of the American Revolution. It is an act we should remember in 1965. Far more important that it set the stage for the Revolution, was the fact that these judges illustrated the power and importance of an independent and courageous judiciary."

Although the many, many years have dimmed the scythe-like repercussions to the defiance of King George III, his Parliament and his Ministers, there was immediate reaction from many colonial sources.

Naturally, Tories were not happy about it, but the Sons of Liberty and their supporters were greatly encouraged. The first open stand against taxation without representation was hailed from Maine to Georgia. One of the first bursts of reaction came from Frederick Town itself. The Stamp Act was put in a coffin to simulate a corpse. The Maryland Gazette reported the "funeral" thusly:

"The Stamp Act having received a mortal stab at the hands of justice on Saturday last, gave up the ghost to the great joy of the inhabitants of Frederick County.

"The lifeless body lay exposed to public scrutiny till yesterday when it was thought proper, to prevent infection from its stench, to bury it."

The funeral procession was quite gay. Colors flew, people shouted, and enthusiastic folk carried banners.

The coffin had a prominent place in the cortege. It was liberally decorated with slogans, all of which denounced the Stamp Act.

At this late date, it might be fitting to find some kind thoughts for one Zachariah Hood, of Annapolis. It was he who held dubious distinction of being the first and last stamp tax collector in Maryland.

When Parliament made its decree formal, Zachariah was in London. He was appointed stamp distributor for Maryland, which caused him to become one of the most hated men ever to live in the land of the Lords proprietary.

Since news of his appointment had preceded him, Hood had to disembark secretly upon his return to Annapolis.

His onetime friends ignored him. Utter strangers found great amusement in insulting and berating Hood.

Zachariah was dispatched in effigy in Frederick, Baltimore, and Annapolis. Then his Annapolis home was burned.

That decided Brother Hood. Certain he had outstayed any welcome, he hurried away to New York.

The demonstration against Hood in Frederick Town was in the full tradition of the 18th century.

A special chariot was provided for Hood's stuffed effigy as the "sole mourner" in the "funeral" for the Stamp Act.

A procession led by the Sons of Liberty meandered through the town to the appointed place—a gallows on the courthouse lawn. Directly beneath, a grave had been dug.

Through it all, bells rang, mobs cheered, and lady spectators cheerfully proclaimed their approval by laughing loudly.

After a somber roll of drums, "Mr. Hood" was asked if he had anything to say. One of the crowd saw a letter protruding from his pocket. These words were read from it:

"Good people, for countrymen I dare not call you, having forfeited all claim or title to that distinction.

"Cursed be the day, that direful day. May the 23d of November be struck out of the calendar and never be reckoned in the future annals of time."

Just then "Mr. Hood" toppled from the carriage.

One of those assembled shouted: "Let him die like a dog."

As cheers echoed and drums beat furiously, the effigy of Zachariah Hood and the coffin of the Stamp Act were buried.

While the years moved along and armed resistance became a certainty Frederick County played a vital part in the War of Revolution.

One of the most noteworthy military marches up to that time started on July 8, 1775, soon after the war began. The Frederick County riflemen tramped more than 500 miles in 22 days to reach Boston. They missed the Battle of Bunker Hill. But they were on guard when the British evacuated Boston in March 1776.

The riflemen also were part of the Maryland line attacked by Redcoats on Harlem Heights, N.Y., in November of that year.

Lt. Peter Hanson, son of John Hanson, who was the first President of the Nation under the Articles of Confederation was fatally wounded in that fight.

There was anything but peace and quiet in Frederick Town itself in the early days of the war for liberty. Three Tories were tried and hanged for treason. Others were banished and fled for protection under the British Crown.

Because Frederick Town was strategically located on the important Pennsylvania Virginia Road it saw plenty of coming and going during the war.

This historic road was the one traveled by Gen. "Mad Anthony" Wayne and his army from York Valley to Culpeper, Va. The soldiers crossed the Monocacy and poured through the town in May of 1781.

After the battle of Bennington Heights, Frederick County was selected to take charge of captured Hessian mercenaries.

Many and varied are the western Maryland stories which could be and have been told of the fateful 18 years in which the United States of America was molded.

Suffice it to say the going was tough. But after General Washington resigned his command at Annapolis in 1783 rejoicing and celebrating soon were replaced by restoration of the old order of things.

Without any Stamp Tax of course.

ALASKA'S RAMPART DAM IS WANTON AND UNNECESSARY

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have always believed, along with most people, that one should not destroy something if the destruction is wanton and unnecessary. This is exactly why I oppose the proposed Rampart Canyon Dam of Alaska. To arrive at this decision, it was necessary for me to examine the project from three angles: What would be destroyed if the dam were built? What would be the principal benefits to Alaska and to the Nation? And, what are the alternatives?

To answer the first question, What would be destroyed? I examined the extensive study of the Department of the Interior on what effect Rampart Dam would have on wildlife. A line on page 8 of this report sums up the findings:

> Nowhere in the history of water development in North America have the fish and wildlife losses anticipated from a single project been so overwhelming.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, construction of Rampart Dam would result in the destruction of 270,000 salmon; the destruction of ground that has the potential to support 12,500 moose; destruction of a greater percentage of grizzly bears and possible destruction of a portion of the caribou herds. Also, 95 percent of the mink of Alaska would be destroyed, as well as 12,500 geese and 10,000 cranes—representing a significant portion of North America's supply of these birds. Destroyed, also, would be 1.5 million ducks and enormous numbers of many other species of waterfowl, big game and small game, other similar resources and large areas now carrying valuable timber.

In terms of economics this would result, for example, in the partial crippling of Alaska's commercial salmon fisheries; the elimination of an area where 2.5 million valuable pelts per year could be harvested; the loss of 300,000 man-days of duck hunting per year—a loss that would be felt in States from the Pacific to the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico.

All of this—gruesome as it sounds—will become reality if the Rampart Canyon Dam is built.

Now, to move on to the second phase, or to answer the question, What would be the principal benefits to Alaska and to the Nation?

Proponents of the project—the most avid of whose views could be colored by personal involvement—claim that Rampart Dam will eventually supply about 1 percent of the Nation's power needs. They also claim that Rampart power will provide cheap electricity for their State, thereby drawing industry there. They claim, therefore, that the dam will help both Alaska and the Nation. However, in their enthusiasm, they overlook some important factors. These proponents say that Rampart Dam will produce the enormous amount of 34.2 billion kilowatt-hours and claim that this could be sold to their coast cities for as little as 2 to 3 mills per kilowatt-hour. When this statement is made, it is assumed that all of the power produced can be sold; however, Alaska, itself, limited as it is, cannot possibly use all of this power. Therefore, if all of the power is not sold, then the cost of the portion sold will, of course, rise proportionately to cover the increased costs of its production and transmission.

At the same time, some groups advocating this dam say that surplus power could be sold in the continental United States, and my own Pacific Northwest is sometimes cited as an area that will buy this surplus. For example, the Yukon Power for America, Inc., in one of its pamphlets, claims:

> For, huge as it it, Rampart will constitute but 1 percent of the country's power needs in 1980. And that 1 percent will place at America's disposal—as nothing else can—the bounty of its largest State.

Or, as Senator GRUENING said before the Committee on Projects, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, on June 9:

> For the enormous demand shortly upon us, Rampart will supply less than 1 percent of the total needed in the United States by 1980, but every kilowatt will be needed.

However, Mr. Speaker, this type of statement ignores the cost of transmitting electricity—the greater the distance, the greater the cost. Indeed, the transmitting costs to any part of the continental United States would raise the ultimate cost to the consumer, I am told, to a point where other sources of electricity would be cheaper.

Another fact ignored is that my own Pacific Northwest already has cheap electricity, a surplus of electricity, and has no need for the higher cost electricity of any other region, such as Alaska.

Therefore, if Alaskans want to build a dam to produce power, it seems reasonable that they themselves would have to be the principal users of their own power, because Rampart Dam holds little in the way of benefits to other States.

Will Rampart Dam aid Alaska to any significant degree? Again, according to the Yukon Power for America, Inc., only "35 percent of Rampart's energy would be used by consumers who could use the power whether Rampart is built or not." In other words, they say that Alaska could use only 35 percent of Rampart's power.

For the rest of the consumption needed to keep costs down, this organization suggests that the availability of power would lure new industries to Alaska, which would use the remaining 65 percent. To me, this figure of 65 percent is wishful thinking and a gross overstatement. In 1964, Alaska used only slightly more than 627 million kilowatt-hours of electricity, or, in other words, a mere 1.8 percent of the 34.2 billion kilowatt-hours of the proposed Rampart Dam. Using this figure, Alaska would have to multiply its present consumption by about 55 times in order to use all of the dam's power and thereby keep the cost of the power low.

Mr. Speaker, this question springs to mind: Is the lack of cheap power the reason industry does not go to Alaska?

According to many experts, and substantiated by a study by Howard Kuhns of the University of Alaska, this is simply not the case. It is felt that even if there were low-cost electricity, industry would still stay away from Alaska. Two reasons are cited for this—reasons which are either carelessly or deliberately overlooked by the proponents of the dam. The first reason cited is that Alaska has the highest cost of labor in the country. The second reason is that the cost of transportation would cut into profits too deeply. Transportation costs are high. It is cheaper and more profitable to manufacture close to population centers.

In order for companies to go to Alaska, therefore, the cost of electricity would have to be so low that it would overcome these two great obstacles, and this is impossible.

The third aspect of justifying Rampart Dam is the answer to the question: What are the alternatives?

In this connection, if and when Alaska needs more electric power, she can turn to other sources, which are much more modest in cost and economically more feasible. The first of these possibilities is hydroelectric power supplied by a dam or dams which would be smaller and more in line with Alaska's real needs. Some believe that there are at least six dam sites of this nature available, any one of which would have an advantage over Rampart, in that there would not be such massive destruction of wildlife resources.

The other possibility is one which used to be science fiction, but which has now become reality—nuclear power. The future of atomic power for electricity production is demonstrated; this year, for example, General Electric estimates that of all the new power production ordered in 1965, 10 percent will be nuclear power. The Federal Power Commission states that by 1980, atomic power will account for about 19 percent of the power used in the United States. This compares with the Commission's estimate that by 1980, hydroelectric's share of production will have dropped about 19 percent. Finally, it is estimated that by the year 2000, 50 percent of the Nation's power will be nuclear, and by the year 2050, all new power facilities will be nuclear.

Atomic power has a definite future, Mr. Speaker, but those who want the dam claim that the cost of hydroelectric power will always be cheaper than this type of power. Again, they are ignoring the facts. To begin with, there is already in existence a nuclear plant that can produce cheap electricity. This is the Westinghouse-built Yankee Atomic Electric Plant, which will eventually produce electricity at a cost of only 2.4 mills per kilowatt hour—lower than Rampart's power.

Therefore, I feel that the proposed Rampart Dam should not be built. It is not what Alaska or the Nation needs, and there are far more practical alternatives.

Mr. Speaker, I am against this unnecessary expenditure of funds and against such unnecessary destruction of wildlife and natural resources.

If the American people get the true facts about Rampart Dam, public opinion, I am sure, will sidetrack this unwise venture, in favor of more practical projects to advance and improve the economy of Alaska.

RUSSIA REVISITED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Charles L. Dancey, editor of the Peoria Journal Star recently made a return trip to Russia and Rumania and his observations with respect to the difference in development of other countries as compared to the difference in the last 6 years in the Soviet Union in building communism is startling. After reading Mr. Dancey's series, it is not surprising that we hear more and more about the Soviet Union turning to private free enterprise as the answer to their problems.

Mr. Dancey's junket, as congressional junkets can be, was very important to the people of Peoria and the area. As editor, Mr. Dancey was able to disseminate his interesting and informative comments to the readers of the Peoria Journal Star and to those who attended his subsequent lectures. Likewise, a Member of Congress is also in a position to enable his constituents to gain from his own travel experiences.

However, in this case it is my desire for my colleagues and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to gain from Mr. Dancey's travels. Rather than try to tell the story myself, at this point, I include the series of articles which point out what it is really like in that other world:

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, July 11, 1965]

RUSSIA REVISITED: "BOY, AM I EVER GLAD TO BE BACK HOME"

(By Charles L. Dancey)

Never was I so glad to get back from a trip, as to return to the United States from this stay "behind the Iron Curtain"

I went in at Leningrad in the north some weeks ago in a jolly mood, got launched with a visit to a Russian night club to the strains of a rollicking, "Hello, Dolly."

And I came out from Bucharest in the south on a steaming old airplane jammed with the halt, the lame and disabled, including a deaf-mute, and several virtually helpless people two of whom fell down trying to debark—en route to a new home in Israel.

Then, I went on to Tel Aviv and got a glimpse at the difference in development in the past 5 years there in building that new country as compared to the difference in the last 6 years in the Soviet Union in building communism.

The route I followed (taking purposely obscure "memory notes" along the way to be used for this writing as soon as I got back) is as follows:

Leningrad: Where it was clear that Soviet women have now discovered lipstick, hair styling, high heels and brassieres—but still are careless about girdles and slips. Where there are more cars than before, but a U.S. car still produces amazement and awe. And where I met a very strange character named Rugal.

Moscow: Where the party line has softened considerably. Where a bunch of laughing Red Chinese crossed my bow, and a fellow insisted that somebody—you'll never guess—really killed President Kennedy.

Tbilisi: There was trouble making the plane, but it turned out in an interesting way and wound up with a Soviet citizen being kicked out to make a seat for me. More talk came up on the same line about Kennedy, plus subjects ranging from the Liston-Clay fight to Vietnam * * * and some insight into Socialist dentistry.

Rostov-na-Don: Here was a unique monument to free men who no longer exist in modern Russia, and there was a weird session in my hotel room with a Soviet newspaperman.

Volgograd: The name is changed (from Stalingrad) but it looked much as it did 6 years ago—good and bad—except that they are busy building a monument in the form of a statue of a woman, carefully planned to be bigger than the Statue of Liberty and thus the biggest in the world. (They hadn't heard of Mount Rushmore.)

Odessa: Students talked prices, wages, music, and automobiles, and a jerk Russian moviemaker talked nasty. This is also a place of Bikinis, and sometimes sort of makeshift Bikinis.

Kiev: A lot of shopping and a little buying rounded up such activities in various kinds of stores across the country, plus a last check of Russian movies and TV shows, which includes some rather weird practices. (Among other things, James Bond is a softhearted sissy.)

Bucharest, Rumania: Here was a strange contrast in many ways between communism in Rumania and in Russia, especially on a trip to Ploesti and thence into the Carpathian mountains of ancient Transylvania. Here, too, I ran into a stranded American college student and bailed him out. One wonders if prostitution here is a "state industry," duly socialized?

That was it, except for the ghastly ride from Bucharest to Sofia, Bulgaria, and thence to the very pleasant real "exit" landing at Athens, on to Tel Aviv for a quick look at a little country that started so recently with more problems than Russian Communists faced 47 years ago, and home.

That's generally the way it went. The conditions under which I traveled were that the official "Tourist" agency of the Soviet Union would see me off and meet me at each new location, that I should have to have a car-guide-and-interpreter 3 hours every 2 days, and that the rest of the time I could do as I pleased within the limits of a mess of laws as to where you can't go, and what you can't photograph.

Being alone, and supplied with coupons providing for three meals a day plus a fourth snack as part of the official deal, during the whole time I actually ate with Americans or Europeans about six or eight times * * * and all the rest of the time with Russians, Georgians, Ukranians and other citizens of the Soviet Union, an automatic social contact and opportunity for social conversation—that wasn't always too sociable. Also, another collision with their habit of breakfasting first off on vodka or cognac.

I tried to sample everything I could reach with eyes, ears and conversation, and sometimes the process of trying proved as exciting as the success or failure of the result.

There were many contradictory sights and happenings, and the only way I know to tell such a jumbled series of experiences is pretty much as they happened along the way, good and bad.

I'll try to do that starting tomorrow.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, July 12, 1965]

RUSSIA REVISITED: FIRST IMPRESSIONS ARE FAVORABLE

(By Charles L. Dancey)

LENINGRAD.—My first impressions and original "mood" on entering Russia again were all on the "good" side.

And let's not kid ourselves, little things count in how you feel.

In the first place, I checked my suitcase at the Ozark counter at Greater Peoria Airport boldly, and never messed with it as I switched at Chicago, changed again to a Finnish airline in Paris, and finally got aboard the Russian jet of Aerflot at Helsinki. The last connection worried me. We were late, and had only 10 minutes to go through the official formalities, debark, find the right gate, and get aboard the Soviet plane.

I just got off, went through passport control, and straight on into the plane for Leningrad, literally without stopping. Most people were debarking at Helsinki, and it was now night, to boot.

I had fears for my luggage in these circumstances making the plane, assuming it was still with me through the other series of changes by different airlines of different countries.

It seemed to me a good omen when I debarked in Leningrad, was directed to a private room, went through the passport business, turned around, and there was the suitcase I'd checked at Peoria, big as life, and as much alone in my "private" reception room as I was.

I was packed off in a private car to the Astoria Hotel, where I had a so-so meal and a delicious chocolate souffle.

It was quite late, but the sun hardly sets in Leningrad. They call the summer nights there "the white nights" because while the sun does disappear over the horizon it never gets over far enough to actually darken the sky itself—and they just turn off the street lights altogether at this season.

It is a beautiful city, with great wide streets and graceful parks and buildings. Peter the Great built it to be his "window on the west," and it remains that for Russia.

The streets are brightened now by advertising signs, to a point, including a liberal use of neon although not as we are used to seeing it.

They are also brightened by the way Russian women have come out of their shell into clothes that fit and have color, high heels, lipstick, and fancy hairdos.

This is a startling difference in the whole appearance of city streets that one wouldn't think of and, if you haven't seen it, cannot imagine. We don't realize how much of the color and variety of our own downtown depends on women's mode of dress.

To add to everything pleasing, at the hotel I was gobbled up by two ebullient young Swedes, Guy (pronounced Gee) and Ingrid, students of language at Uppsala, who had been on the plane from Helsinki but were spirited off somewhere else with the rest of the students from Sweden on landing.

We set gaily off for the Neva Restaurant because it was Swedish Independence Day or something.

The Neva proved to be a gala place with tables seated around a great sunken circle bathed in light from spots in the ceiling, but at first entrance one couldn't see the tables well, only the bright center.

We sat down, and suddenly an orchestra right behind and beside me burst forth loud and strong.

The tune that suddenly blasted my eardrums was a rollicking one.

It's called "Hello, Dolly."

The dancers flooded the floor, dolled up fit to kill, and a number of them resplendent in military uniforms.

The five-piece band (it sounded like 60 pieces when "Hello, Dolly" first burst on my eardrums) and a girl singer continued with a good deal of familiar sounding music, but the tunes I remember are, "I'm in the Mood for Love," and "Juanita" (of all things). The gal sang to the tune of "Juanita," but used "Amore" where the "Juanita" goes in the song—otherwise, the same words, sung in English.

On the more spirited American music, the dance floor was very interesting. Some did the twist, and some a variant of the Charleston, and some a kind of jitterbug deal, but all danced together. None did any of the stand back from each other and jerk type stuff so common in the United States nowadays. On the Charleston deal they swung in and out of it, and held hands. On the twist they parted, but you could tell who were partners. Most just danced, and the variations went on at the same time.

Ingrid and Guy danced and she danced right out of a shoe, creating quite a little stir on the floor.

At this point the Iron Curtain seemed to be made of gauze.

However, another day was to dawn, and I was to go down to the Neksky Prospect (the main drag) in the middle of the day, not the white night, and be reminded that this was not Peoria by a long shot, rather early in the game.

And within 2 days, I was to be reminded even more pointedly.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, July 13, 1965]

RUSSIA REVISITED: RUSSIANS PLAGUE VISITOR WITH BUYING ROUTINE

(By Charles L. Dancey)

LENINGRAD.—The Iron Curtain seemed thin, indeed, and unreal my first night in Leningrad, but a real barrier does exist between West and East, free and Communist, and you get evidence of it within the first block you walk on a major street in the normal daytime.

"Have you any cigarettes?" says a youth who has learned a little English—specifically, several "Have you's" and "I will buy."

"Have you a raincoat to sell?"

It is so incessant as you go along that you can accomplish nothing else but to say, "No. No. No." and that's all most are interested in. Then they quickly peal off.

"Have you a ballpoint pen?"

"Oo menya nyet, nichevo. ("I haven't got anything.")

But another comes.

"Would you sell your shirt?"

And another, "Have you any dollars? I will give you 50 percent more than the exchange rate." There'd been a little of this when I was with the Swedes, but now in daytime * * * wow.

One slicker, named Victor, started a social conversation, said he as a student in the technical school in electronics, aged 26—and swung into the "buy dollars" routine. His English was limited but pretty good, too.

"I can't understand why you won't," he would say.

"Why should I break the law just to make a few dollars?" I would say.

"Yes, but wnat about me?" he replied.

I shrugged.

"You don't trust me," he said. "You think, perhaps, I am not what I say I am?"

"That's not it. It makes no difference. I signed a statement about currency when I entered your country, and I won't break it."

"That is just official," he said contemptuously. "It means nothing. They, themselves, have official shops that sell below the rate."

(This is true. There was one at the hotel, and I later saw many. You pay the basics, shelter, travel, food etc., at an "official" rate set by the Russian Government for the ruble—which is not listed on any foreign exchange to shake out and reveal its true value—and then the state runs its own black market to tempt the extra dollars or pounds or francs from you.)

Finally he said, "Well, at least, sell me your sunglasses."

"They are optical in any case, and not plain sunglasses you could use."

He shrugged and dropped aside. As I turned the corner, he was writing something on a pad of paper up against the wall of the building.

I turned into side streets to duck the "buyers," and my memory notes of the day read "Passed rows of Niagara hotels." (Has anything been done with that wreck yet?) It was a reminder intended to tell me but not say much to any other reader of my notebook. However, to any Peorian, what more needs be said? Except to add, that these were jammed with people.

I did not have a raincoat to sell, but I needed one in Leningrad. (As it turned out that was about the only place.) So I circled back to Nevsky Prospect, the long-famous shopping center of Leningrad, and bought the cheapest one I could find: $23. Those from Poland were at 33 bucks and those for women double that and more.

(What are wages? From the examples I ultimately hit along the way, the range for working people, 80 to 120 a month; one doctor was high at 200 a month, he said. One fellow made 70 and his wife worked and she made 35 a month.)

Against this, it should also be said, that there were many more shops than I had seen before, and a great many more customers than 6 years ago, and the goods were of much greater variety, including many kinds of children's toys, bicycles, radios, TV sets, cosmetics, and a whole category of "happy type" merchandise that has now appeared.

The streets are busy, instead of dreary. They are lively, colorful. The women are getting these things and using them—whether the men are or not, and so are the children—and there are many children and many young couples. It used to be you saw 10 women for every man, and little of youth. Not now.

Neither should you think these clothes, and toys, etc., are anything like the variety of choice available in any Western country, or the spruced-up women of Russia are yet coming close to those on the streets of Peoria, or Paris, or Athens, or Rome, or Tel Aviv, or Berlin, etc. Not yet.

And they don't do it, themselves. Every third shop is a hairdresser. (Imagine what that change meant in a planned, organized, and state-run national economy.)

The result is assembly-line hairdos they have obviously been trying to keep intact as long as possible. Indeed, obviously, often longer than possible.

But the improvement is startling over 6 years ago—and significant. They are trying with great effort to do something that is simply human. That isn't new for Russian people, but it is something new for the Russian Communist state that runs everything.

It should also be said here that before I was done I also met some very young boys who wanted to trade their pins (all Russians wear pins on their coats) for something American.

I traded, and then examined the pins I got. The Russian on them said, "Tourist Club." Pretty cute. Some of the trades 6 years ago included Young Communist pins, Pioneer pins, and other such items that were supposed to be "sacred" but which the kids would cheerfully give away for an American postage stamp or penny. It must have been embarrassing.

A simple and clever solution. They give the kids pins to trade, very cheap, encourage them to be nice to tourists, and at the same time the best any innocent tourist gets as a trophy is a pin that merely labels him as a tourist.

As it turned out however, one of those pins with Lenin's bust on it turned out to be one of the best deals I made in the entire trip.

However, that was much later.

I don't know quite how all this balances out, good and bad—more goods, more variety, but still great limits, high prices, low wages, and a massive effort to keep the real standards (and hence better goods) out of the market. (This particular problem of the black market, incidentally, only happened in Leningrad and Odessa, port cities near the border where seamen and tourists come and go in large numbers, and not in any of the inland cities.)

However it may balance out, the balance got pretty far tipped over the next day as far as I was concerned, to the side that Russia is still Russia, when I met a certain so-called "Mr. Rugal."

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, July 14, 1965]

Chummy Mr. Rugal Had Peculiar Odor as Typical Yank

(By Charles L. Dancey)

The deal under which I was admitted to the Soviet Union was a pay in advance tourist pension classification, whereby I was not to be required this time to have a guide constantly, but was required to hire a car and guide for 3 hours every 2 days—whether I used such or not.

So, along with documents providing coupons for each night to be spent in some unnamed hotel in the Soviet Union, and coupons for every breakfast, lunch, and dinner, plus one for "tea," (four coupons for every day makes a thick book) and airline tickets in substantial thickness, I was also given nine coupons for car and guide.

When I checked in the first night, the administradora had smiled and said, "You want an 'excursion' tomorrow?" And I said, "no," that I would get settled before worrying about that.

Next morning, completing the paperwork, she said, "You want an excursion tomorrow." (It was not a question.) "I suggested the Hermitage. It is world famous. You must not miss it."

"Thank you," I said, "but I notice that the Hermitage is only 3 blocks from here. I can easily walk down there without assistance and save the excursion for something else.

When I returned that evening, the administradora hailed me again in the lobby. "Did you go to the Hermitage?" she asked.

"No. I went to Neksy Prospekt to get a raincoat and found that busy area too interesting, I never got to the Hermitage."

"You have not used any of your coupons for excursions yet," she said. "Should not you schedule one for tomorrow?"

"Thank you, but probably I will try the Hermitage then."

"You could take an excursion of general sightseeing in the morning, all around the city, and go to the Hermitage by yourself in the afternoon."

"Well, all right. What time?"

"Ten o'clock."

"Fine."

So, at 10 a.m. I showed up at the appropriate desk to pick up my guide for the scheduled excursion. But somehow, between 8 or 9 o'clock of the evening before and 10 in the morning a shortage of guides had developed.

"Never mind," said the administradora. "A countryman of yours, Mr. Rugal, has his guide and car to go sightseeing and has consented to have you accompany him. It will then cost you no coupon, and is just as good as a private excursion."

I looked around without answering immediately, and a heavy hand whacked me on the back, a grinning face appeared at my shoulder, and Mr. Rugal issued his own invitation.

"Take a gander," he said. "We have a classy looking chick for a guide, anyway, so what have you got to lose? Might as well latch on, boy. OK?"

So, OK.

"Where you from, Mac?" he asked as we got in the car.

"Peoria, Ill."

"Oh? Don't know much about that neck of the woods. Live in Connecticut myself. Little suburban town of about 3,000. Business in New York. Retiring, took off for a couple of weeks to see the old country."

Rugal may have been one of the very few Americans I have ever met under such circumstances who didn't react in some way to Peoria, or at least try to think of some business or professional connection there, but he was certainly an authority on a lot of things American—especially about New York.

And Nina, our guide, fired a regular catechism of questions at him. More questions than I'd ever heard before from a guide, although they often do display a great deal of curiosity. She asked detail questions about everything under the sun from the U.S. name for plants and trees and where they grow to U.S. museums, population mixtures in New York, and all sorts of specific figures.

Rugal rattled off the answers when he wasn't slapping me on the back and making slangy remarks. I think he used every expression I've ever heard except "23-skiddo"—and I wouldn't swear that he didn't use that.

What a character.

Incidentally, Rugal was pretty much of an authority on baseball, too. Especially the two New York teams and their players, but of all the things he knew that I didn't I think he drew a blank on the Astrodome and their troubles with it.

We were looking at Leningrad's Kirov stadium, and the guide was praising it and giving the seating capacity, etc., and I said: "We have one now with a new experiment—a roof over it," I said. "It's for baseball, but it hasn't worked out too well. They call it the Astrodome."

Rugal looked at me completely blank, and I said, "The Houston Astrodome."

He said, "Oh, yeah. The Astrodome."

We went on to the famous "Peter, Paul Fortress." (I was wondering how "Mary" got left out, when the guide said "Peter, Paul Fortress," but that didn't go over at all * * * another total blank. This was the place Peter the Great first built in founding the city. Then we visited the Cruiser Astoria, got a big handshake from the "Captain." This ship fired the signal shot for storming the winter palace, and is now a "museum."

After 3 hours of this sort of thing, we duly got rid of the guide (who wasn't a very "classy looking chick" incidentally) and were about to split up when Rugal said, "Hey, wait a sec."

I thought he was going to suggest we wash up and meet for lunch, but that wasn't it.

"This after," he said, "I thought I'd shuffle down and take a look-see at (guess where, dear reader?) the Hermitage. Nothing like it according to all the dope.

"I speak a bit of Russian lingo, y'know. Born on the Baltic coast, and went to the United States 48 years ago.

"Why don't we hook up again after lunch, take a walk, see if it's all it's cracked up to be, and maybe snag a riverboat after and just see what cooks? Okedoke?"

So, okedoke.

By this time, I wanted to try a few more "astrodomes" on him, anyway.

So, we went to the so-called Hermitage, the old palace of the Czars, crammed with masterpieces of painting, and sculpture, and furniture, and of the ancient armorers art and other treasures from all over the world, and we rode the river taxi up the Neva, got off and had a beer on a houseboat cafe * * * and then walked through the Czar's summer garden, even to the Prospekt and back to the hotel.

I wish I could remember all the details, but I felt I had to be a little discreet in keeping reminder notes.

My notebook says, for example, of this interlude: "Rugal has three daughters about the same ages as my three sons. One also in college like Ric and one a year away from college, like Burt."

That actually reminds me, as it was intended to when I wrote it down, that in this chummy comparison of families, Rugal didn't say "a senior in high school" but "a year from college," and he got confused for a few moments about whether high school was not a form of college or a part of the free school period in the United States. And he didn't ever really classify his daughter who is my Clinton's age. (He's a high school sophomore.)

A very, very odd uncertainty for a Connecticut Yankee with teenage daughters—even if, in fact, he had his own in a private school. (He never said about that, one way or the other.)

Mr. Rugal bothered me.

And I think what bothered me most was one of those hard to describe things of manner and attitude. I can only say that he wanted very badly to have all the right answers to everything, important or unimportant—and to have them promptly. It was as if he was under a pressure that most of us don't feel. I mean, if somebody asks, "How many museums of art are there in New York City?" It's perfectly easy and natural to say, "I haven't the faintest idea." Not Rugal. He had to have the answers, and kept glancing at me when he made them as if for confirmation or something.

It was as if he was trying to prove something.

And I think he was.

I think he was trying to prove that he really was an American.

In the inevitable, one American to another confidential conversation that arises in such circumstances, right or wrong, you stay pretty much awake with a guy like Rugal. You don't feel inclined to be careless.

But, you know, later on when the endless accumulation of little things has collected to a depth deep enough to smother you, you do get careless and shoot off your mouth in the wrong way, the wrong place, to the wrong people.

But that's a good deal later in the sequence of events.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, July 15, 1965]

RUSSIA REVISITED: CHANGES SHOW SOVIET'S PROGRESS

(By Charles L. Dancey)

What about the little physical facts of life in the Soviet Union? Those little things that may have a profound significance * * * like the fact that they now have telephones in a variety of bright colors.

Superficial? Unimportant? Ridiculous? Far from it, I think.

Six years ago, when I was there before, most certainly the Soviet Government and the Communist Party regarded such a consideration as completely ridiculous and not worth bothering themselves about.

But, now, they think it is worth bothering about.

Six years ago, the Soviet Government and the Communist Party most certainly thought such "bourgeois" things superficial and unimportant if not downright sinful.

But, now, apparently they think otherwise.

What changed their minds? What does it mean?

There are other obvious physical changes.

Six years ago there were little old ladies with rubber aprons squirting hoses without nozzles in the parks and working on the greenery with hand tools and no men.

Now they have sprinklers in the parks, and in Leningrad I saw a muscular young man cutting the grass * * * and with a power mower. You just about have to see it to realize what a revolution that is at first sight. (Incidentally, they still have some little old ladies and their hoses, too.)

I've talked about the revolution in women and how they now brighten the streets, but there's always an element of contradiction, something just offbeat about it, too. There's the occasional girl, for example, duded up pretty good, but wearing a completely sheer white blouse and under it a black or a pink brassiere and no slip * * * or a sheer pink or black blouse with a white brassiere. You get the impression they don't dream about walking down Nevsky Prospekt in their Maidenform bra * * * as a practical matter, they are doing it.

The bras are a new thing in the past 6 years, too, pretty much, and its amazing how much it changes the appearance en masse to give a generally smarter, neater, cleaner, sharper look.

Now, don't think about the effect on an individual person. It's a different thing entirely when we're dealing with the whole street scene—the whole moving mass of hundreds of people on a busy street, and the general appearance that results.

Unfortunately, that's as far as it goes. Girdles and slips are obviously still very rare, and it looks as if no people on earth, for some reason, needed them worse or more generally.

I never knew they made that much difference. It must include a combination of no girdle, no slip, and the kind of dress material they have, as well as other factors.

Anyway, the result is unbalanced to say the least. You might say that the "free and equal" Soviet woman is still "free" below the waist—and much more than equal.

Men are mostly their old dowdy selves, in dingy, dark colored shirts, open at the throat, and slacks that tend to be too loose and either too dreary or too gawdy. No in-between, at all.

High heels sharpen the girl's appearance and manner amazingly, too, when you have this mass contrast from the "old days," while men still plod around in sandals, canvas slippers, and what-have-you. The problem of producing decent shoes for men is notorious in the Soviet Union, and the cost is very high, to boot.

But as the women brighten the streets, also now the children enliven them. Somehow the kids were much more scarce and much more docile 6 years ago. That may sound funny, but when you're going along with a camera looking for zippy action you now keep saying to yourself: "If I could get close enough to those kids, what a shot." Or, "If I'd just seen that quick enough to get the camera focused," et cetera.

Six years ago, such scenes were very rare, and of a more quiet type. I didn't miss any good action pictures then. There weren't any. This time I missed a million of them. Kids diving over rails into fountains, zipping around on bicycles, climbing the statues of Soviet heroes, and raising Ned in general while the parents clucked and smiled.

And the all-wise, thoughtful, ingenious men who run this country have thought of a clever new goody for the kids and young ladies, especially, that is just plain lots of fun, too. Something very new.

It's called a hula hoop. How about that?

I've told about the shops, brighter, busier, with more different things, and there are more shops by far. This includes many "Gastronoms," which when large is a kind of supermarket, and when small is like a delicatessen, and many "Univermags" * * * department stores. (Six years ago, a Univermag was one to a city if the city was big and lucky, and then except for Goom's in Moscow, there was nothing decent in it. It is far different now on both scores.)

But again there is the difficulty, the kind of contradiction that comes because they operate on an entirely different level of values. Don't get the idea that the department stores are anything like Bergner's or Carson Pirie Scott & Co. They aren't.

You make a selection if you can fight your way through 50 other customers who want one, too, before the store runs out. The salesgirl figures it out on an abacus and gives you a handwritten slip of paper. You take the slip to the cashier, fight your way through another 50 people, and hand her the slip and your money. She has a modern-looking cash register, but first she refigures the deal on another abacus setting alongside the cash register. Then she rings up your money, stows the slip also, and writes you out another slip, by hand.

You take this back to the original salesgirl and fight your way through another 50 people and give it to her. She then wraps your purchase and gives it to you.

The anachronistic oddity of the modern cash register side by side with the abacus is a clue to the mixed and contradictory nature and quality of the merchandise available. That is the nature of things.

The system is one clue in hundreds that pop at you every time you turn around that tells you that the lowest thing in the whole system is the "customer" or the "user."

This is a "boss" system where you live in a company apartment, go to the company doctor, buy in the company store, are checked by the company police, etc. The "worker" jumps when he's told to jump, but when he really becomes the guy who's lowest of all on the totem pole is when he's off work and becomes a user or a customer. Then, he is nobody.

That still prevails, in spite of the fact that such a massive effort is now being made to make the populace a bit happier with lipstick, high heels, hula hoops, and bicycles. The attitude comes through loud and clear that it was damned nice of the party bosses to bother to make such stuff available at all, and you should be very thankful. You should get what you can, any way you can, and like it.

In this same contradiction, there are many more cars. The difference is startling. Traffic is actually enough of a problem that you have to look and sometimes even wait a minute before crossing the street, and sometimes when something stops traffic, several cars will line up. Downtown traffic in a constant stream is very impressive, but don't get the idea it is downtown Peoria, much less Chicago. It may be a continuous flow in the busiest downtowns of the biggest cities, but it is also all two-way streets with single-lane traffic—even where the street is wide enough for more.

I never saw a license plate with more than four numbers. And when a Chevrolet parked in downtown Leningrad, it drew a crowd of curious sightseeing Russians to examine this vehicle as closely as the cops would allow and as long as the police would allow. There were sufficient police to keep them moving, too.

Their effort is significant, but it musn't be confused with the quality and class of autos or other merchandise or the kind of numbers we deal with here.

Also, impressions do vary with different experiences and circumstances to add to the basic contradiction, and I had never been to Leningrad before. So, at the time I wasn't sure if this was "typical" or just Leningrad's unique near-the-border, big-city, port-city situation. But from there I was bound for Moscow, which I did see 6 years ago, and from there to some rather familiar interior cities.

Would I have the same impressions there, I wondered. And what incidents would either add to them or change them? Well, there was some of each, of course.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, July 16, 1965]

RUSSIA REVISITED: MOSCOW GIVES ANSWERS BUT ASKS QUESTIONS

(By Charles L. Dancey)

MOSCOW.—On to Moscow, the New Jerusalem of the Communist faith. The leading edge of the "wave of the future."

Well, you know, an ocean swell seems both impervious and irresistible until it approaches the shore. Then, it starts to peak. The leading edge sharpens, and a thin line of white spray appears along its tip. This first betrays that the surface is responding to the effects of the rising ocean floor beneath. Then the wave breaks with a roar, and finally fritters away into little eddies in the sand.

It's a nice thought, because in Moscow as in Leningrad, the thin white spray is beginning to show at the top as the dark, rolling swell that has shaken this world reacts to the rising expectations of its population * * * to the basic human nature so long submerged beneath the surface of the planned and controlled society.

The ticket agent of the Soviet travel bureau took my ticket to confirm the reservation for Moscow, riffled through it, smiled prettily under her upswept hairdo and "doe" eyes, and said: "This is a ticket to the whole wide world." She also took it and kept it for several hours with no receipt, of course. What took hours to do what takes minutes here?

There was a clue in the process she went through before even taking the ticket, which consisted of opening a big ledger book filled with longhand scriggles, leaf through it, ultimately find my name—cross it off with her pen, leaf through to another page, and write it down again.

A little experience with their telephone system makes it easy to figure why the simple communication and recordkeeping involved was to take some hours.

I got the ticket back, and they duly delivered me to the airport. The driver was as talkative as a cab driver anywhere—more so considering the language complication, and very friendly. I gave him my ballpoint pen, and found that they still cause as big a commotion today as 6 years ago.

The official at the airport handled most of the routine for me and then leaned over and said, "Do you happen to have a Kennedy coin?"

No.

And why didn't I think of that? With a handful of Kennedy half dollars I'd have been the most popular man in the Soviet Union, I do believe.

"What American coins do you have?"

He picked out a Roosevelt dime and a buffalo nickel.

"I'll trade," he offered. "Here's something pretty special—a czarist coin."

We traded.

Well, I checked in at the Ukrain Hotel in Moscow again, where I'd been 6 years before. It was brand new then, and part of it still under construction. It has gone somewhat to pot already. An accumulation of little things like my toilet seat was broken and the door latch also. The elevators were hopelessly inadequate and there were no stairs.

The restaurant is still grandiose, but the waitress just leaned over and wrote out my bill on the tablecloth. You get the idea? Just off center a bit.

The place was aboil with Africans, Arabs, Germans, Orientals, and Russians. It isn't an "Intourist" hotel.

I booked an excursion right away. I didn't want them worrying too much about my unused book of "guide-and-car" coupons, and I wanted to see what the official line of chatter by the guides is now. I asked for the Kremlin tour, because I made it before and remember the propaganda pitch pretty vividly. It certainly has changed.

The Kremlin is stacked with gold-domed cathedrals, and 6 years ago I received a running blast of ridicule against religion there as in other places.

This time the cathedrals were treated with great respect. People, including the official guides, whispered when inside. There was no antireligious propaganda at all. Instead, they made a point that "Even the revolutionary soldiers when they broke in here in the wild confusion of those times, respected the sacred icons and damaged nothing."

They pointed out the beauties, works of art, and such of each, identified the Czar who got credit for building it, and usually added that he did so to "celebrate his victory over the Tartars" (or the Turks, or the Swedes, and so forth).

That's a new public respect for the Czars, too.

In one place, a policeman stopped me from taking a picture, and the guide said: "I tried to get in his way so he wouldn't see you, but it didn't work."

"Why did you do that? Why didn't you tell me it was forbidden?"

"Because it's silliness. This is hardly a strategic bridge."

That's certainly new.

We passed a group of blue-uniformed Chinese, laughing it up around the Czar cannon (biggest in the world back in 1812—but it wouldn't shoot) and a Russian turned his head and said: "Chinese." I couldn't read his expression. It was as if he was communicating something to us, but absolutely deadpan.

In the course of things, Nicolai, the guide, quoted John Kennedy on Marx having been a journalist who might never have written "Das Kapital" if he'd gotten the New York job he sought and gone to America. He thought that very amusing.

"Kennedy was a very fine man, wasn't he?" he said. And then, "Did Oswald really shoot him?"

I told him yes, the head of the Commission (Warren) had accused the rightwing publicly right after the shooting and before he had any facts, so he certainly wasn't covering up for the rightwing in the investigation and report.

As it turned out, I gathered that Nicolai wasn't thinking of the rightwing in the first place. He was wondering if a fellow named Lyndon Johnson hadn't somehow arranged it. I ran into that suggestion repeatedly as I continued my travels later.

(It's the kind of political assassination the Russians can understand, apparently, out of their own history and experience. The crazy kind that happens in a democracy where the chief executive exposes himself to all kinds of people is hard for them to comprehend.)

Another time in Moscow I was asked, "Did you know Goldwater?" And, "When two men seek the same position, how do they both get their ideas and criticisms before the people? What is a campaign? There is more to an election in America than just voting. What happens?"

I also took another excursion with another guide, to an art gallery, to see if Nicolai was an exception. He wasn't. This guide, named Ludmilla, or "Lucy," was very stiff and mechanical, but again the basic pitch has changed.

Full credit was given to the "rich merchant" (bourgeois) who founded the gallery originally before the revolution, and praise given another "rich merchant" pictured in it who had founded the first orphanage.

And when we were through the examples of all types of art in the development to its present perfect state—Socialist "realism"—Lucy said: "But the intellectuals say that this is really just a giant canvas and a great waste of paint." And she laughed * * * mechanically, too.

Note: Socialist realism is a return to the primitive form of Russian art when it was all done in glorification of the nobles. The great period and the one they fuss over at the gallery is when the paintings were filled with social criticism of conditions and the system. The modern realism contains no criticism, but is back to glorification solely—only of the new regime instead of the old.

Anyway, it was markedly different from the hard sell approach of 6 years ago.

Some other things are quite different, too, such as Lenin's tomb (which still held two corpses 6 years ago when I was here). The change makes a drastic difference in the total effect. But that will take more telling tomorrow.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, July 17, 1965]

RUSSIA REVISTED: LENIN'S POPULARITY LIVES—OTHERS SIMPLY DON'T EXIST

(By Charles L. Dancey)

MOSCOW.—"Lenin Is More Alive Today Than When He Walked Here."

So say large signs, here and there.

But he looked pretty darned dead to me.

They've preserved him but not made him look alive. I doubt if they tried to. They did make him unusual. In his dark, cold tomb not far from Ivan the Terrible's still preserved execution platform, they have dressed the mortal remains of V. I. Lenin all in black, and then put tiny hidden lights that just illuminate his white face and white hands.

As a result, he looks luminous * * * as befits an "Angel of the Lord."

There lies, the Soviet messiah, their saviour. Their special messenger carrying the "word" of the great god Marx. The writer of the Red New Testament which completes their holy book. The Old Testament of course are the prophecies and commandments of Jehovah Marx * * * "Das Kapital."

Both are truly Gods, in the Communist dogma, for are they not infallible? And Lenin's tomb is the strange, black, cold temple with its mystically lit face and hands to which the faithful come with bowed heads in total silence.

Behind the temple of Lenin you then file past a row of massive gravestones, each topped with the sculptured bust of one of the "old original Bolsheviks." I didn't count them. Are their 12 such disciples of the Red messiah, do you suppose?

And at the end of that row, you also inescapably file past a grave with a large flat stone and no sculptured bust or raised marker * * * the grave of the fallen angel, the lucifer of the Red heaven, bearing the name of Josef Stalin.

All this, and "Lenin Is More Alive Today Than When He Walked Here."

And this is the dogma that says all religion is foolishness and an opiate of the people.

But, we must admit, this faith admits of no Judas, even though Stalin charged that such existed among the original disciples. There is no trace of Leon Trotsky, Lenin's closest confidant. Later in the history museums, I saw statues, photos and tributes to all sorts of heroes of the civil war by which the Red achieved actual power * * * all men who took their orders from Leon Trotsky, but not a trace of the original organizer of the Red Army, its first commanding general, the architect of Soviet victory.

What a strange thing about this supposedly powerful faith, that it must pretend its second greatest hero, the actual agent of achieving full physical power, didn't even exist.

Somebody betrayed either Trotsky or Stalin, and crimes they can attribute to Stalin—monstrous crimes. But they dare not admit that either was a Judas. They dare not admit beytrayal of the faith.

And what of the new leaders?

Nothing. Nothing whatever.

The statues and signs that used to glorify Stalin are gone. The signs and huge photos that replaced them that used to glorify Khrushchev are gone.

And in their place any signs glorifying Kosygin and Brezhnev?

None.

In their place, signs glorifying only the party.

"Glory to the Communist Party" blares the neon on top of a huge building.

"Our Century Is the Communist Century" says a huge sign over the highway.

"Forward to Communist Victory" says a huge sign across the front of a big building under construction.

No faces of Kosygin, large or small. None of Breshnev. No signs bearing their names.

The so-called newspapers, full of the usual ringing "official" statements, that used to carry in lead after lead. "Marshal Stalin says," and later, "Comrade Khrushchev says," don't quote any more. The statements are there baldly with what's what, but no "according to Kosygin" and "Breshnev said today."

I didn't see their names in the paper once.

These fellows are bending over backward to be anonymous.

They are as silent as Calvin Coolidge who didn't want to interrupt the real business of the country with governmental statements, and they make it look like the only exponent of the personality cult left around is Lyndon Johnson.

So long as it helps preserve their power rather than disturb it, the party will associate past evils with the personality and operate its dictatorship or oligarchy, or whatever it is, with as much anonymity as possible.

That back-and-forth switch from oligarchy to outright one-man dictatorship and back again will hardly seem new or embodying any basic change, however, to anyone who has watched the same game played for years in some of the Latin American countries.

But it is a major change in Russia, nevertheless from 6 years ago.

Indeed, it is the first time they have not glorified a single man as the great leader in the whole history of Communist rule.

Now, they just glorify Lenin.

It was after this visit, incidentally, and its glimpses of the Soviet "religious" rites, that I ran into a small crisis.

A zipper began to pull away from the basic cloth to which it was sewn. Of all the little gadgets I thought to pack for all traveling emergencies, I had not included a safety pin, much less needle and thread.

In casting about for some way to save the situation, the only pins I found were those I'd traded for with the small boys in Leningrad.

That turned out to have been a good deal, after all.

One pin bearing Lenin's visage proved just the thing to hold the zipper in line.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, July 18, 1965]

Russians Right To Be Unfriendly

(By Charles L. Dancey)

Moscow.—Are the Russian people themselves friendly, or unfriendly?

Well, they have good reason to be something less than friendly. The Government press and radio and TV (and there is no other, of course) refers to us as "the aggressors" almost exclusively.

They show pictures of a dead child, and his mother crying out, and the only caption is violent propaganda on the theme, "Answer for this, America."

They show pictures of marines, ostensibly in Santo Domingo, several of them, and one lone unarmed civilian being manhandled. The only caption is one deriding the terrible, brutal, cowardly U.S. marines, who are so "unfair" to the poor, struggling, helpless civilians of a nation they have invaded.

And so? So most people look you over pretty good. On top of this vicious and unadulterated propaganda directed at them, they know you have a better life than they. They know your clothes are better. Above all, they know that you have little gadgets and outside knowledge that they don't.

They don't know what you are thinking, or what you are up to. They wonder. They don't want to be laughed at as hicks, or regarded as primitive barbarians.

They've had hundreds of years of being called barbarians by Europeans, and are the more sensitive to it because right down through Stalin there has been this barbarism in their official history.

But many respond, anyway, with instant friendliness, even the harried service people who are so autocratic with the whole public, Russian as well as, and often more than, foreign. Subjected to all the complaints, and with lousy jobs in an economy always planned to avoid any extras—which means there is a constant, never-ending condition of shortages—even these service people respond with high good humor and open friendliness, given half a chance.

I made it my business to test them.

There were many cases, but there really isn't much to them because it was always one simple little thing, almost, and they accepted you and that was all there was to it.

So, let me given you just a couple examples of the worst scowlers and surliest Russians that I ran into while in Moscow * * * and what happened when I pulled a very simple and crude switch on them and their obvious expectations, together with a gesture which in itself was mildly amusing.

First: On every floor in Russian hotels, usually, there is a slooshaski who bosses all the services for the one floor. She takes and dispenses your key when you come and go. She bosses the maid service. She arranges the laundry. She is room service. She may also sell buffet snacks and drinks right there, too.

They work in shifts, of course.

One in Leningrad, and two in Moscow were especially friendly. While I observed that they dispensed keys mechanically as asked in most cases, they would grin, speak my number upon approach, and have it ready and hand it to me with a flourish just as I reached the desk.

One of them always came around the desk and met me halfway, swung the key in her palm in a wide arc, grinning and slapped it into my palm, took hold, shook hands, and then bowed leaving the key in my palm.

But one of them in Moscow was as grim as death. Straight mouth. Firm chin. Cold eyes. She'd look at me and stare coldly without even a question on her expression or lips until I requested the key and then she'd place it firmly on the desk.

I decided to get some kind of reaction out of her.

There was really nothing to it. I knew there were no stairs at the Ukraina Hotel, so once after a very long wait and still no elevator, I walked toward the desk. She looked uncomfortable and colder than ever—doubtless expecting a complaint. (There were plenty made.)

I went up to her desk and said, "Ooo vas * * *.?" I didn't have the word for stairs, and didn't want it. I then walked two fingers across the top of her desk, like a person's legs walking.

It caught her unaware and off balance, with instant comprehension, and she laughed out loud at my gesture and then smilingly apologized that there were none.

After that, she was friendly and even chatty.

As simple as that. Given half a chance, or an excuse they open up.

The headwaiter at the Ukraina was a more severe challenge, and I had set out to find the grimmest and seemingly most unfriendly ones I could and make them smile.

In ordering breakfast, he had to report that they had no apple juice, and it seemed to anger him to have to do this. I don't quite understand why they didn't offer orange juice because he suggested an orange, instead. That was the most special thing he could offer, too. Oranges are a big deal in Russia.

He was a mean looking, mean acting cuss. He brought the orange, set it down, himself, and then got a waiter to produce the rest of my breakfast.

I ignored the orange. I did not peel it. I did not eat it while waiting for my eggs. I let it sit there.

Now among other things, oranges are hard to come by in Russia. They are costly, and have become a status symbol of a sort that they can now furnish them at all. They heard a lot of criticism over the years because of their absence. Now it's the first thing they hand you when you board the inbound Russia plane, for example. They are proud of them.

So, I let it set, and his scowl deepened.

He was staring balefully at me the whole time, more intently than ever.

I could just see him wondering if I was being insulting, or if the mixup about juice had been a misunderstanding or if I was going to pay for it, or have a row with the waiter, or what.

I picked it up, and he moved his head.

I began to mash it and roll it in my hands, methodically, reducing it to pulp.

He looked like the wrath of God.

When I had it completely soft, like a rubber balloon full of liquid, I got up, with the orange in my hand, walked across the big room directly toward him, with his hard eyes on me all the way.

I held the orange right in front of his face over the desk, and rolled it in my hand pressing with each finger after the other in sequence to show how soft it was and pliant.

He stood up, glaring down at me.

"Now I'll have juice," I said, smiling for the first time.

And I made a motion like punching a hole in the outer skin of the juice-filled orange skin, and another holding it up and squeezing, opening my mouth as if the juice was squirting into it from the hole in the orange.

His eyes opened wide, out of their scowl, and he literally fell into his chair roaring with the most undignified laughter.

He was still gasping with uncontrollable mirth when he got up again and walked with me all the way to the door, patting me on the back shaking his head and chuckling.

After that I was hailed upon entry, given personal service * * * with a smile.

That's the kind of people they are. Human beings, like us.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, July 19, 1965]

Russia Revisited: Georgia Hospitality Started in Moscow and Kept on Flying

(By Charles L. Dancey)

Moscow.—The Georgians or "Gruzheen" are the most mysterious, the proudest, most intriguing, and also most hospitable people in the Soviet Union for my money, and that proved true this second trip as well as the first.

I got tangled up with a bunch of them before I left Moscow. Indeed, it was how I managed to leave Moscow successfully for Tbilisi, the Georgian capital deep in the forbidding Caucasus Mountains that lie beyond the Black Sea and plunge down to the Caspian Sea and Central Asia.

Whereas in Leningrad, Intourist had dutifully delivered me to the airport, the airplane and even the seat on the airplane, at Moscow they just furnished a car and shipped me off to the airport where I was supposed to check in at the full-time Intourist office maintained right at the airport and be taken care of for the rest of the business by them.

However, when I checked at that office at the airport, the door was locked and they were, for the moment, at least, absent.

Okay, I figured. It will be interesting. Let them worry about me, there is no sense in my worrying about them. So I went to the counter, checked my baggage, got my boarding "talon" and went off to find out which plane and where and when to get aboard.

This is not quite as simple as in a Western airport.

In the first place there is only one airline, the Soviet Aeroflot, and one gate, and in Moscow this means that groups are issuing from that one gate every few minutes. That could be the answer, just a matter of leaving at the right time * * * but the schedules are not that exact.

The flights go by numbers and are announced on the P.A. system, but they use series of four-figure numbers, and when these are rattled off in Russian in a noisy, crowded lobby, you have to be quicker on the uptake than I am to get the numbers straight.

However, the solution was very simple. I looked around and saw a cluster of people in which all the men had mustaches. It figured that they were, therefore, Georgians. It also figured that they were, therefore, the folks also heading for Tbilisi.

I asked if they were going to Tbilisi. They grinned and announced that they were and invited me to join them. One of them immediately pointed to his mustache and said: "Gruzheen." Then he added "Roosky," pointed to his mustache, and shook his head.

Our plane was an hour late. We were almost an hour early.

In those 2 hours we got along famously. Communication was awkward only for a few moments. Somehow, Russian in the Georgian accent sounds plainer and easier to understand to me than good Russian, and likewise my own accent seemed to bother them less than "real" Russians.

On boarding, both tickets and passports were checked, although it was a domestic flight, and most of those going were Soviet citizens.

At this point it turned out that I and a French U.N. scientist had been assigned the same seat. When the stewardess found out he was a foreigner, she just turned to the guy across the aisle. "Are you a Soviet citizen?" she asked.

His tough luck, he was. She told him to move, and both she and he bowed me into his vacated seat.

This placed me in a three-seat row with two Georgians, a man and a woman. I cleaned my knife with a funny little all-metal knife that flips two ways, thus clearing the blade, and doesn't look at all like it is a knife.

The lady laughed when she saw it, and we started to struggle into conversation. The man reached inside his coat and pulled out a long thin handle with a little swerving curve to it, and flipped out a long thin, pointed, sharp blade. He grinned and made a quick flicking stabbing motion with it * * * and joined in our talk. Another fellow came back for "a light" for his cigarette, and stayed around to talk, and so on.

When we landed, the Intourist greeter missed me (something they rarely do), probably because I was with the Georgians. The lady, Zoi Masobivili (I think that was her name. Something like that. Georgian names are unpronounceable much less spellable) took time from her own homecoming to track down Intourist.

I really needed Intourist there because I had a room at a hotel, but no way of knowing what hotel except from them, plus transportation to it.

The very first morning in Tbilisi I breakfasted in a public "cafe" that was handy, and promptly found myself eating with two Georgians who didn't talk too much, this time. They were too busy offering me all kinds of food from their plates, and trying to get me to start the day with a liberal load of cognac.

Vodka for breakfast is pretty commonplace, and in the wine country of the Caucasus, where they don't drink Russian vodka, it's cognac.

Now, cognac is a bit rich for my tongue, day or night, and certainly a frightening way to even think of starting the day, but you can maybe see why I have a special feeling for the Georgian people * * * a people who, together with their language and completely weird alphabet, are more ancient than the memory of man.

But, people are people, some good and some bad, and one of the Georgians from this very city of Tbilisi was a guy named Josef Stalin.

Six years ago, although Khrushchev had denounced him, there remained large statues and a good deal of public attention toward Stalin and his memory in his native Tbilisi. They were proud of his power (over Russians) regardless of how he used it.

I wonder how many of those traces were left. And I planned an easy way to find out the very first day.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, July 20, 1965]

Russia Revisited: Georgians Called Christians—Guide Mum About Stalin

(By Charles L. Dancey)

Tbilisi.—In old Tbilisi, as in all "Georgia," the ancient churches were also massive citadels from which to fight invaders in the last extremity, and the prize when I was there 6 years ago was one which had been converted to use as a prison and had held the "great Stalin" prisoner at one time.

I returned to it with a 1965-type guide, Timo.

He gave the basic background, and then said: "This place is especially famous because Kalinin and Gorky were both once imprisoned here."

Not a word about its most famous prisoner, Josef Stalin.

"The Georgians are Christians," said Timo. (Not were Christians, but are Christians.) "And have been since earliest times, hundreds of years before the Russians became Christians. They were very devout, and all our history is closely linked to the church.

"But there were never any inquisitions here."

No mention of Stalin, but did the ghost of him lurk behind the urge to make that statement?

The great statues, all the glorification are all gone, and even Stalin's name taken out of the guide's résumé.

But in an "exposé" "first released" of the Yalta conference, published in a special English paper for visitors and whether elsewhere I don't know, he is, of course, repeatedly mentioned in a very mechanical and offhand way.

In one history museum I saw his photograph as a very young man with some other revolutionaries relating to activities of that old time.

On one building, as part of the walk, high above the street and largely hidden by trees, his figure looms large here in his hometown of Tbilisi among other figures in a kind of frieze—the closest thing to a surviving statue that I saw.

And in the underground vaults of a winery, his picture hung on the wall over the desk of one of the executives.

That's as much as I found of his former prominence.

The winery "incidentally" was where I went on the only time I have ever been promised to see a "factory" in Russia. Every time on either visit I sought to see a "farm," I wound up in a vineyard, so I shouldn't have been surprised when the "factory" turned out to be mostly a wine cellar. But the offer to "go through a factory" had persuaded me to make another "excursion," and this was it.

Timo and I and the winemaster, or whatever you call him, sampled the wine, of course, and our host reeled off about 50 toasts—25 to the glass, fortunately. Most of them to peace, friendship, family, peace, womanhood, peace, success, peace, a good journey, friendship, and peace.

He kept saying that wine makes for good feelings, friendship, and peace. In fact, he extolled wine as having almost every conceivable virtue.

Here, too, curiously, the bourgeois original builder of the wine factory was given due credit and revered, and there was a welcome absence of the line of 6 years ago in which nothing happened until after the revolution.

But talk drifted to other things. Again, "Who really killed President Kennedy?" And again, the suggestion that nobody really had anything to gain from it except the Vice President. So that makes the Russian version reach several thousand miles inside the Soviet Union, at least from Moscow to deep in the Caucasus Mountains.

The Clay-Liston fight, being somewhat scandalous, seems to have gotten a lot of attention and questions were asked about it.

No mention of our astronauts just back from the spacewalk here or anywhere else. I never found any mention in the Soviet papers, although I understand it appeared as a brief paragraph in one of them one day. I knew they got back, because I was sure that if anything went wrong the Russian newspapers, radio, and TV would have been full of it.

One thing pleased me curiously. While the Liston-Clay bout didn't do us much credit, a good many Russians did get to see the Globetrotters on tour and the ones I talked to about it volunteered the conviction that they could beat the finest amateur team, including Russia's professional Olympic amateurs without drawing a breath "by 40 points" and some were curious if a similar gap actually exists between our professionals and their great athletes in other sports.

Somehow, I was less pleased that afternoon, after having taken a long walk through the backstreets to see a fellow in dull greenish brown shirt and slacks lean around a wall at the corner and take a quick snap of me with a long telescopic lens.

When I speeded up a bit to get to that corner of the wall (after looking behind me to see if there was any other possible reason for the photo), I just got a glimpse of him turning into a wooded park, with no camera visible, only a large briefcase.

[From the Peoria Journal Star, July 21, 1965]

Russia Revisited: Housing Conditions Biggest Problem Facing Soviet Union

(By Charles L. Dancey)

Tbilisi.—"Of course, we're going to tear all this stuff down and build beautiful new apartment houses," I was told as we passed a very shabby old string of ancient buildings.

I'd passed down the same street, passed the same slums 6 years ago and been told exactly the same thing.

Lipstick, high heels, hair styles, bicycles, and more cars have come to Tbilisi as they had to Moscow and Leningrad, but there is no question that a much more massive effort has been made in the two largest Russian cities, the two most important, and the two doing the most of the contact with the outside world than here in the interior.

There is new construction, of course, in 6 years. New public buildings like the new fieldhouse, and a sizable swatch of new apartments, but the population has increased by 50,000 people, too, and a good deal of new housing was certainly needed just to stay even.

The "new city" seems to contain most of this new building, and there is at least the suggestion that the new city is "Russian." I went to a "Cossack" musical show there, and the whole deal was in Russian, the material was pitched pro-Russian, and the audience was Russian.

The downtown entertainment in the older city is Georgian in language, tone, and audience.

And in the old city, the shocking slums remain on narrow, winding, often cobblestoned streets—undisturbed by this progress. So do the ancient churches, many of them back in active use, and other colorful and historic old structures. These and the cobblestones made the city interesting, unusual, and quaint to the casual visitor.

But the living conditions for many thousands are very bad indeed. Indeed, what we regard as our housing problem on the near South Side, which I had recently visited with a legislative investigating committee, would go down as middle class housing and exceptionally desirable in many ways in Tbilisi. And lest that be misunderstood, I still feel very strongly that improving that near South Side area and maintaining and improving the housing standard is one of Peoria's most critical problems.

The point is merely that housing conditions represent perhaps the biggest problem and an unbelievable one in our standards in the Communist perfect state—and while like all countries they've done a good deal of new building in the past 6 years, they haven't made any very promising inroads on that problem.

I also managed an auto ride about 150 miles into the mountainous countryside which includes some of the most fruitful valleys in the Soviet Union. On the way, I saw one bulldozer and one grader working on the road, which was more of such machinery than I saw 6 years ago in the whole trip, when road gangs were exclusively pick, shovel, and rake, and made up mostly of women.

At the same time, several times we had to run the car through rushing streams of water where the asphalt road was abandoned altogether and the stream path merely stacked with rocks so you could get traction through the water.

We were also stopped a few times by herds of sheep, cattle, donkeys, and once by some geese, being handled by what can only be described as "peasants."

There were no billboards to mar the view which was often spectacular, but on the other hand you can often drive for miles without seeing a thing, because the road there is continually lined with a high wall. Other miles are equally blacked out because both sides of the highway are lined with trees, often a thick strip of 20 or 30 feet jammed with trees so that you can't even see through.

From the high ground you can see lush fields, and I saw some evidences where machinery had apparently been used. It is also obvious that a tremendous amount of farm work is still done by hand, with animals, and by women.

Which reminds me. Most people, I guess, have seen pictures and heard about the traditional Russian women sweeping the streets at night often with the old fashioned "witches brooms" of bundled sticks—right in Moscow.

Well, I have already seen three street sweeping machines this time, which is completely new * * * and I have also seen women swinging the broom as of old.

In this regard, the streets and parks are not nearly as clean as they used to be, although still clean by our standards. Now, there are more people using the streets and parks than before, and they are able to buy more things with which to create a bit of litter.

In the old days, the simple fact was that much of the material with which we have created litter was simply not obtainable by the average Russian in the first place.

But now that they have such a worldwide reputation for clean streets, they make a great effort to have trash receptacles handy and to sweep them one way or another * * * and they still do a pretty good job in this respect.

And even now, the brave and hungry Russian sparrows help keep the open air cafes clean by eating the crumbs right out from under your feet as you dine there.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, July 22, 1965]

Russia Revisited: Russian Progress Depends on Where You're Standing

(By Charles Dancey)

Tbilisi.—"I've read where there are still lineups at the food markets, here, and I haven't seen any lines. They seem to have plenty of everything," said an American dentist on a group "professional" tour in Tbilisi.

I had run into the group * * * specifically to Doug and Dixie Hoyt, first, who were with the group. (Doug was one of the heroic figures on Guadalcanal and the books written about it, as a member of the medical corps team with the 1st Marine Division there.)

Now, a group tour eats at pre-set tables at 9 a.m. (in this case) and gets in the bus with the guide at 10, and the "line" business takes place before 9 a.m.

When the food places are not yet open, lines of women do form at their doors * * * every morning that I cruised about early this was visible. The reason is obvious. The shelves are not bare, but if you want any specific item you'd better be there early.

I didn't say anything, but that evening I volunteered and a dozen of us went out to eat dinner on our own, away from the tour. We went to a charming place, down stairs from the street, with a fountain (small) in the middle of the tile floor.

Everybody began ordering this, that, and the other thing.

"Butter."

"Masla?" I asked the girl.

Her eyes opened wider as if to say, "Are you nuts?" and she said no. One lady kept insisting on "Water. Not mineral water. Just plain cold water." (There was some confusion.)

Twice I told them the girl said they didn't have any, and they obviously thought the girl just didn't understand me. So, a third time, I asked her about "Voda naturalne," and she grinned, turned, pointed at the fountain.

We wound up with delicious shash-lick, no salad, no dessert, coffee, and everybody having exactly the same meal.

Down the street we stopped and bought a few pastries, and a little further on we had ice cream, and ate the pastries with it.

We had a grand time, actually, and the dentist who didn't understand about lack of variety and shortages in terms of choice indicated that he had the message.

As a group, they had a variety of general impressions, but no illusions in the field of dentistry whatsoever.

"Actually," as one of them put it, "the State has done a remarkable job of providing mass dental treatment, fast service, with a minimum of dentists and equipment and expense."

How?

"Well, it's all readymade. They don't try to 'custom' a tooth, or a bridge, or a plate, or anything to the existing tooth structure. They have a mess of parts, factory made, in various sizes, like shoes, and you come in, and they 'fit' you with the closest one.

"It meets the mass problem very well."

I asked, "Is stainless steel still their chief material?"

"Oh, yes. It's very efficient. Of course, it looks like hell, but it does the job."

"Are they much interested in orthodontistry?"

"Yes, where there's a serious functional problem. I don't know if they are going to get much interested in just making pretty kids out of deformed ones, though, where it doesn't interfere with chewing, so to speak."

"Do they have high-speed drills, and these other tools that have made dental work so much quicker and easier on the patient?"

"Oh, Lord, no."

This pattern fits the basic attitude when services and goods have become the Government's responsibility. They meet the mass problem in the fastest, easiest, and most practical way for the State management, and the beneficiary of this generosity on the part of the State is supposed to appreciate it and not expect a first-class job, too.

(It reminded me of the military days when some clown in Washington decided two sheets of toilet paper per man was the proper, sensible, sufficient, and economical amount. We discovered in practice that it depended on the circumstances whether this was anywhere near adequate. But they stood by their research, and the little fact of dysentery in the tropics wouldn't shake them.)

I had also run into a bunch of telephone men briefly in Moscow on a visit to telephone people in Russia. They had been much impressed with everything except the telephone system. This left them horrified at the service, the nature of the equipment, the methods, and, above all, at the lack of preventive and programed maintenance.

I talked also to another professional observer of wide experience in the Soviet Union who had better remain unnamed here, who independently made this same point regarding maintenance.

They seem to be fanatic about trying to build new things and add to the total capital plant of the Nation, but do not seem to have ever learned on so many fronts that a stitch in time saves nine, and program for maintenance. They don't calculate what we call depreciation, and reinvest enough to keep a maximum economic level of efficiency in the capital plant that exists.

It's the same reason, I guess, why building people often say of their new apartment houses: "They are building new slums."

But, of course, much of that is applying our standards to housing instead of theirs, which makes everything hopeless and ignores the fact that progress does exist within their frame of standards.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, July 23, 1965]

RUSSIA REVISITED: FREEDOMS APPEAR TO VARY LIKE BRANDS OF VODKA

(By Charles L. Dancey)

NOVACHERKASK.—"Come to the task, brothers. We must fight against this (Moscow) tyranny that is worse than even the Turks. We must fight for freedom."

So says the letters carved on stone on the wall of a little museum in the little town of Novacherkask, the former "Cossack" "capitol."

The speaker of those words is the biggest of the heroes honored in the museum, and honored by Russians and Communists as well as "Cossacks" * * * if there are any Cossacks. He fought against the Czar.

The handsome, blond, blue-eyed college student that took me to Novacherkask, Valodya, by name, told me about them.

He said that the Cossack is the same as the American cowboy in far more ways than his fame as one of the greatest horsemen in the world. The Cossacks were really Russians, he said. But they were given special privileges and lands in border areas providing they did not farm, but kept themselves as fit warriors by living by hunting and fishing and fighting border marauders.

The famous Don Cossacks were stuck down with the Tartars on one side and the Turks on the other * * * so this was the Russian "wild west."

Valodya showed me through the museum of statues and paintings of Cossack warriors, and collections of their weapons, tools, and banners, and of those they captured from their many enemies.

There were also a series of paintings by a famous Cossack painter which showed their ways, every man doing as he pleased, each doing what suited his fancy.

This was their life, said Valodya.

Again he said: "They were not really a different nation. They were Russians. But they were different in the life they led of complete individual independence. And that is what the word 'Kazak' really means. It means an independent person * * * a free man, who does as he pleases."

"But that is all that was really meant by 'Cossacks.' They were always Russians, really.

"And now, of course, there are no more 'Kazaks.'"

I didn't say anything.

After a while, he said, "Are there any more 'cowboys' in America?"

"A few * * * and a lot of 'Kazaks.'"

He just looked at me.

"People who do as they please," I said. "Free men."

Valodya smiled—politely.

In nearby Rostov-na-Don, I had taken a general excursion the first 3 hours which takes you very briefly around the town and points of what they regard as the chief sights * * * then you can more easily figure out where you want to go and what you want to see on your own. I figured this was a pretty good way for me to operate.

We passed through an area with a good many private homes, and the guide explained that this was the former Armenian-Greek city, and that was the reason. (They had been invited to Rostov by Catherine the Great for some reason or other related to some of their specific skills.)

"It's not Armenian or Greek, anymore," he added. "Once in a while you may see someone who looks a bit Armenian, perhaps, but even then chances are it's a Russian. Rostov is all one city now."

I was also told, in a manner of "see how liberal we are," that there is a "functioning church" here. One, in a city six times as big as Peoria. How generous of them.

The "No more Cossacks," and no more "Armenian city" in Rostov, and the "new city" (Russian) in the Georgian capital of Tbilisi, and similar things which came later, including, "The Ukrainians are really Russians. We just got separated for a while," came back to haunt me when the trip was over.

I was talking to a very careful and discreet Israel diplomat who refused to discuss the plight of the Jews in Russia or any prospects for either communication with them or possible permission for them to leave, but who suggested with a good deal of intellectual assurance that the Jews would be restored their full religious, language, printing, and similar rights, including the right to communicate with their religious brothers, because, "Preserving the individual national character of peoples is a very basic premise of the writings of both Marx and Lenin. They said it enriches the Communist social order. The Communists cannot ignore such a basic principle of their own doctrine forever, especially when they do act on it with all other nationalities."

Do they, really?

I'm sure this gentleman is 100 percent right, intellectually, and certainly 100 percent right in his analysis of Marx and Lenin.

But they also had some things to say about religion, and just as Hitler chose to make Jewishness a matter of race and blood, the Communists have chosen to make it a religious definition, largely.

And even where they deal with nationalities as nationalities, they seem to preserve the national history as a kind of quaint cultural subject of some academic interest to be viewed as ancient history, with no application to the present.

The standard for the present is to be Russian if there is any angle whatsoever to so classify a people, and be like the Russians if not. There is only one standard for modern Communist man, and it seems to me that standard is Russian.

I remember the signs in Moscow, showing in pictures the things you should not do (such as jaywalk, litter the street, etc.). They showed what shouldn't be done graphically, and the only writing on the signs, in large letters with an exclamation mark was: "Nye Roosky!" "Not Russian!"

They didn't say, "Not Communist!"

They said, "Not Russian!" The standard of good behavior was Russian behavior.

It reminded me of the clever master-race policies of Hitler in all German armed forces training manuals and films. All the examples of what a soldier shouldn't do, and what would get him killed, wore British or Russian uniforms to illustrate the goof-offs. All the examples of how to do it right, wore German uniforms.

The same technique. And Russian chauvinism is older than German.

From what I've seen, the Russians are about as likely to accord the Jews full rights and freedoms in accordance with the writings of Marx and Lenin, as President Johnson is likely to turn the other cheek in Vietnam, in accordance with the reading some intellectual foreign diplomat might make of our gospel and call to his attention.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, July 24, 1965]

RUSSIA REVISITED: INTERVIEW PROVES ORDEAL-JOLTING TO RED NEWSMAN

(By Charles L. Dancey)

ROSTOV.—In Rostov-na-Don, I was interviewed by a Soviet newspaperman under some of the oddest conditions and after some of the strangest maneuvering.

In the first place, it was suggested by the local Intourist boss that I might be interested in visiting a city newspaper and talking to its editors. I said, sure, if it proved convenient and practical.

A young guide had been with me on the first excursion together with an older man of obviously more authority who came along not to see how the young man performs, but only to improve my English, if you don't mind.

The youngster told me it was all set for 2 o'clock in the afternoon. When I showed up, he was somewhat nettled in manner, and said, "Come back at 2:30, please. There's a little delay."

At 2:30, he said, "It's all set for 3 o'clock," and he seemed happy again.

At 3 o'clock, we were about to set off when the same older man who had accompanied us on the excursion, Pyotr (Peter) by name, came out and said: "They just called, and the place is all torn up and in so much confusion getting ready for a special commission from Moscow, that they said it would be far more comfortable for you if they came over here, and so they are sending one of their people here."

I sat down in the special private but large service bureau lounge, which was fairly cool and very comfortable, and the young interpreter went to the front door to meet our visitor.

A few minutes later, Pyotr, the older man came in from the service bureau's inner office door with a second man, whom he introduced as representing the Rostov city local newspaper.

He sat down, offering to interpret in the absence of the youngster (who was just outside the door waiting for this guy to show?).

We talked for a few minutes, with Pyotr as interpreter, and the youngster came in the door looking puzzled, and then surprised.

Pyotr smiled assuredly, got to his feet, motioned his hand, and said, "Here is your original interpreter, excuse me."

He spoke to the youngster very briefly and quickly in Russian, and the kid sat down, and we started again.

But the first thing the newsman said, after Pyotr left, was that it wasn't comfortable enough in our corner of the lounge. It would be better to go up to my hotel room.

The kid duly translated, and I replied: "You haven't seen my room. I don't even remember if I've got three chairs. Would you rather go to a table in the restaurant, which is empty now, and maybe have a 'limonahd' while we talk?"

"The room will be better."

I explained that my room on this occasion happened to be very small indeed, and hot, with a couple of wooden, straightback chairs, and considerably less comfortable than where we were.

They insisted that it would be better.

And so, what the heck, we went up to my room, and I showed them what we were up against, and asked them again if they wouldn't prefer some other place. No, this was fine.

I asked him how many reporters they have, and how they are organized, directed, and distributed to cover the news of the city.

"We have a great many reporters," he said. "So many, I couldn't put a number to it. You see there is somebody assigned in every branch, each factory, the theaters, the government branches, and so on who is on their staff to prepare articles about those activities, and they send them to us and we print them."

"A representative of the party writes your political news, and is not a member of your staff?"

"Yes. We don't deal with politics very much. It is a city newspaper. The largest, most popular, and best one here."

"And there is a special 'worker' representative who writes the articles for them, but is not on your staff?"

"That's right. Can the workers write their own news stories and get them printed in your newspaper?" He said it triumphantly, like a good debater.

"Only if they buy the space," I said, "and the same thing goes for all the people you have described as 'reporters.'

"Well, that's a little blunt. Actually, we deal with the kind of people you have described constantly. Only we call them press agents. They exist in America in as much profusion as they apparently do here. However, we do not accept and print their material automatically as news, because it inevitably is the special view useful to whatever it is he represents, and not necessarily the whole truth."

I asked how they make up the pages. He said there was a special department for this, of which he was the head.

"We try to plan everything 6 months ahead," he said, "But sometimes events cause us to alter such plans."

I could only shake my head. We weren't even talking about the same thing. How can you plan "news" 6 months ahead, if you give a hoot about what actually happens, even allowing for "events causing alterations"?

They have to be printing a planned, programed "article" filled propaganda piece, including the specialized propaganda of each kind of activity in the community as prepared and approved by those bosses, in each activity.

"Who decides on the headlines? Your department? The reporter?"

"It depends on the importance of the material entirely."

"Yes, but who decides what is important?"

"We don't handle much political news."

I never could get an answer?

Then he claimed the privilege of asking me questions. They ranged from the "Negro question," which didn't last long when he asked if we employed any and found that we did, and have for some years. He relegated that to "the South," took a few potshots at the Klan, and turned to Vietnam.

"Does the United States support Johnson's policies in Vietnam," seemed to be the key question.

I told him polls indicate that 65 percent of the folks do, in spite of a vocal intellectual and liberal protest, and that he could measure the size of the so-called student protests against the fact that we have 18 million youngsters now in that age group.

He asked if the American people would support an extension of that war.

"Nobody wants it, but whether it is extended or not and whether people approve or not depends on what the other side does."

Then I leaned forward and added, "Just what the hell do you think the American position in Vietnam actually is, in the first place. What is your version?"

He waited a moment, and then answered: "I think it is very unfair."

"Well," I said. "Can I just tell you something between the two of us?"

He didn't wait for a translation, but held up his hands and looked alarmed, and shook his head, no.

He asked the "politics" of the newspaper. He was very formal with all of this talk, until my answer.

I said that "we don't believe any politician is God, and any party the side of the angels."

He laughed at that but somehow got the impression I had said that our own political position was we didn't believe in God.

When I explained what I really meant it wasn't so funny.

He asked if we had any Democrats on the staff, and then any Republicans.

Then he paused dramatically, looked at me accusingly, and asked: "Have you one, single Communist on your staff?"

It was my turn to laugh.

It had been a very stiff and formal session, and he stood up formally and thanked me. I thanked him. We walked to the door and out of the stuffy room, down the corridor.

He stopped again, shook my hand a bit less formally this time, smiled, and in a different manner said: "If you ever run into George Carter of Los Angeles, give him my best regards. We have a very pleasant conversation one time." And he left.

I am willing to bet that if that was a "pleasant" conversation it was not held in a Russian hotel room.

In my room, this guy never relaxed once.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, July 25, 1965]

RUSSIA REVISITED: TV FEATURES OLD MOVIES, STILLS, MUSIC

(By Charles L. Dancey)

Buildings in all the cities of Russia, and particularly the "modern" big block apartment houses are topped with forests of TV aerials, which were not there 6 years ago.

It is quite impressive.

The programs are something else.

It is plain before you see the programs that they haven't affected Soviet life as they have ours. In the first place there are large numbers of movie houses obviously doing landoffice business, just as before. And the parks and streets are crowded as ever at night. Folks don't seem to be staying home glued to the tube.

They don't even broadcast in the daytime usually. At night, the prime time is apparently from about 8 to 9:30 p.m., during which they showed very old movies.

Let me describe a typical sample of such movie and you can compare it to our own and the complaints of violence, etc. on U.S. TV.

This was about World War II, and specifically a band of Soviet partisans operating behind the German lines.

The climax came when the beauteous Natasha, radio operator for the partisans, fell for a line of schmaltz and promises from the obviously evil Ivanovich—one of the band. He diverted her long enough to start clicking out a message over her shortwave.

Natasha "read the key" as he clicked out his message, and was horrified to realize that he was betraying their location to the Germans deliberately. A traitor.

He tried to persuade her that they would be richly rewarded and live a life of luxury for this and to come in with him. Otherwise, they were already doomed, the damage was done, and she'd be killed.

Natasha shoved him off balance and dashed out of the shack, flung herself in sobbing remorse at the feet of the Russian commander and revealed to him that they had been betrayed and were doomed. The Germans now knew their secret hiding place.

The commander was first a bit angry, but then very noble about the whole thing.

The next thing we know the commander is holding a kind of council of war. Germans, sure enough, come rushing in from all sides, and capture them.

A villainous Nazi commander then demands who among the mob is the commander, and chin high the Russian steps forward.

The Nazi arrogantly demands cooperation and makes dire threats if he doesn't get it. At this point, the Russian commander defies him in a loud, gesticulating speech about our country.

The Nazi tells him what he thinks of that country and acts very nasty, but doesn't shoot him or anything.

The Russian makes another shorter, defiant speech, ending with an upraised hand and, "Now, Comrades." (Tepyer, Tovareeshee.)

At this point every window in the place suddenly sprouts a forest of gun barrels and the Germans are blasted left and right. Ambush.

Somehow, of course, the nasty head Nazi escaped being shot, but was captured physically after a crouching retreat, firing his pistol.

He is dragged by two huge Russians, each holding one arm pinned, before the partisan chief, their situation is now reversed.

Our hero, the Russian commander really tells the German off this time and how they will just get enough Russian ground to be buried in.

The Nazi makes no defiant answer in his turn—or any other kind. He never gets the chance.

At the climax of his speech, our Soviet hero swings his huge pistol around and with loud bangs and columns of smoke pouring from the muzzle slams three slugs into the pinned and helpless body of the dirty Nazi, whose twitching body is then cast contemptuously aside.

That is only the beginning, however, because that horrible traitor, Ivanovich, really has escaped.

Ah, but who glimpsed him slipping away? The wronged Natasha. She has already taken off after him, carrying another huge cannon of a pistol in her dainty hand.

It is far different now from one scene where she sang very sweetly in a fine soprano voice beside the campfire, with the soft lights on her pretty face, and her blond hair shining.

The vengeful beauty turns a corner and runs smack into a couple of German soldiers. She promptly guns them down in a burst of fire that topples them spectacularly, and charges on to find her betrayer.

Frightened and furtive, he has sneaked into an old Russian Orthodox church, and is gliding evilly up the spiral stairs of the belfry, his eyes looking fearfully back to see if she is on his trail.

That was a mistake, for while looking back he whacked his head on the old church bell. It bonged slightly, and he quickly grabbed its ornate surface with both hands to silence it, looking furtively about.

But Natasha got the sound.

She comes up the winding stairs, big gun in little hand.

Ivanovich cuts off the bell rope, or a portion thereof, and ties it to the belfry rail, and swings over the side to escape, but just as he gets over the rail, Natasha clears the belfry stairs and her cannon starts booming, and so does Ivanovich's.

There is a flurry of such firing at each other at a distance of about 4 feet that fills the belfry with gunsmoke, but results only in Ivanovich getting hit in the hand and dropping his gun.

At this point the cowardly traitor cringes and begs piteously as he holds himself precariously to the outside of the railing, helpless and unarmed. Sweet Natasha stops—long enough to tell him what a no-good lousy so-and-so he is, and then swings her cannon up and blasts him twice, clean off the belfry in a long back swandive to death below.

This brings the victorious partisan charging up to the belfry where Natasha tells them how the old Russian church bell put the finger on the Russian traitor.

The commander nobly decrees that the victory and new freedom of the town will now be proclaimed by ringing the Hero Bell.

A soldier steps forward, crosses himself solemnly before the bell, then grabs the remaining couple of feet of rope and starts ringing away.

That's it, except as the bell tolls, across the screen in large letters comes the print: "Blood for Blood." This fades and in still larger letters: "Death for Death."

The end.

Other contents than this sort of thing, it should be said, include long periods of music—records being played—while the screen reveals a still photograph, usually of a public building. One building per record. Average time, 2½ minutes.

And I'm talking like 7:45 at night just before the "big show."

TV is unobtainable in your room, but there is one in the lounge at the head of the stairs on each floor of the hotel, and I presume a similiar system applies to apartments.

It would be the only sensible thing. After all, there's no argument over what programs you want to watch. There's only one.

Besides that, even with that many potential customers, the only time I saw as many as a half dozen actually watching TV (besides me) was when it carried a big soccer match. They do that.

Other physical facts, exactly three out of four sets I attempted to watch were out of order, and I never did watch on my own floor. I always had to go up or down to find one that was in working order on another floor.

Finally, the cost is about $400 for a set smaller in screen but considerably heavier and thicker than our standard portables.

No commercials, unless you regard the whole contents one big commercial. In any case, our commercials now seem good to me—more entertaining than a still picture of a plain block building for 2½ minutes while a record plays.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, July 26, 1965]

Russia Revisited: Volgograd Building Boom Devoted to Battle Memorial

(By Charles L. Dancey)

Volgograd.—I got a lift hitting Volgograd, in many ways.

A good Russian jet zipped me there, although I missed lunch in the process since they don't feed you on Russian planes regardless of the hour or duration of a flight.

(To Rostov I had flown in an ancient DC–3, obviously at something over 20,000 feet, right along the rim of the Caucusus main range. These aren't the highest mountains in the world, but they are close, and unique in that the whole range is uniformly high presenting a seemingly unbroken barrier for over a 100 miles, all topped with snow and glaciers even in this tropical climate. There was no smoking at any time, obviously because they were mixing raw oxygen into the cabin air. Even their jets don't seem to be pressurized.)

The hotel in Volgograd was the same one I'd stayed in 6 years ago, (when they called the place Stalingrad), and was an efficient one. I took a hot bath for the first time in sometime and there was hot water. The furnishings, etc., were all intact, and there was some air and a light you could actually read or write by * * * all of which was a change.

Knowing that I'd missed lunch, they opened the restaurant of the hotel at an odd hour in order to offer me something to eat.

They warned me that I must not cross the river (the Volga), that only a certain portion of the river front on this side was "legal," and reminded me of camera restrictions, but seemed exceptionally thoughtful, considerate, and glad to have me around.

They knew I had been there before and at the same hotel, and they gave me an identical room location although on a different floor to what I had before.

And when all these mechanics were taken care of I just walked out the front door and took off on my own and found that I remembered and could find my way all around town with no trouble.

It was a kick to see bustling activity in buildings that were still under construction 6 years ago, and to try to take the same picture of the changed scene from much the same place that I had taken some 6 years ago.

The great dam and hydroelectric plant that they were building and where I got to watch the construction activity 6 years ago is all finished, of course, and functioning (but they wouldn't let me go upriver from the city to where it stands this time).

A trip to the dam is one I really missed, because that route previously had taken me past a series of mammoth ravines, jammed with the kind of slums we used to have at places like Cinder Point * * * the real old-fashioned packing-crate shacks kind of slums that came before the tar-paper shack slums, which in turn preceded the kind of dilapidated housing we now call slums. I wanted to see what they had done about that and I didn't get the chance.

I did walk to the railroad station, through a very imposing area, and the station itself is a fancy, huge monument of a building. I crossed behind it to the "wrong side of the tracks" and found, immediately, that this was still an ancient and very rough neighborhood. And no television on these crowded and dilapidated places.

There is a large open field behind the Square of Fallen Heroes, and when I inquired about it, I was told that there had been a plan to build a huge beautiful hall for the meetings of the Supreme Soviet there, but it had been canceled because building apartments for "the people" seemed to be more important and urgent.

The only trouble was that while I saw a good deal of finished construction, and whereas 6 years ago a bustle of construction activity, I saw virtually no construction under way in the city and plenty of places needed it.

The only major construction effort that I saw was the huge effort going into building, not apartments, but a massive memorial to the Stalingrad battle.

Incidently, the reason given for changing the name to Volgograd was that the river meant so much to the region and was the line on which they fought that the citizens asked that the name be made Volgograd.

But there is no slightest flinching from the former identity or the battle being the "Battle of Stalingrad."

People were friendly in a large measure. I met an engineer in town on business and hence alone, like myself, as well as the usual students * * * a contact that is confusing since by and large the Russian students seem to run to ages of 24, 25, and 26 years of age. (Partly because every male does a full tour in duty in the armed forces, with no deferments, so that college inevitably comes after military service.)

Then there are people you run into doing the routine necessities of such simple things as just getting something to drink in a very hot climate where plain water is simply not available.

Yet, the system discourages this sort of thing. All foreigners were asked and expected to eat in a special room beyond the main dining room from the hotel. Outsiders could also come in from the street, but there was an anteroom of considerable size and a coat-check there, and a uniformed attendant. You had to register to enter from the street, or you were turned away. I don't have any way of knowing whether you were turned away if you did register and didn't qualify in some other way. I do know that if you mixed with us foreigners, at a regular proper meal in the place we were supposed to eat, they had a record of it automatically, and you knew in advance that they had such a record.

Most of the tables in this special room were reserved, and the drinks, appetizers, etc., laid out in advance for scheduled groups that came in on schedule, were automatically served set courses, and ate and left.

I met only one guy for one meal who came and ordered what he wanted and paid for it with a coupon plus (or) cash, depending on the amount of the meal, like myself.

Of course, I didn't have to eat there, but the meal coupons of necessity were paid in advance and part of the required deal in the first place, and I found them very difficult to cash or use for eating outside the prescribed places.

If I did not go to the specified room in the hotel, but sat down in the regular dining room. I was asked to move instead of being served.

Circumstances like this caused me to end the trip with some 20 meal coupons left over unused, and a little expense for food that wasn't anticipated * * * but I did have some especially interesting conversations there, and it was worth it. These revealed among other things I must tell you about that the Goldwater campaign caused many Russians to make a new discovery about the whole election process.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, July 27, 1965]

Russia Revisited: Politics, U.S. Style, Gets Through

(By Charles L. Dancey)

Volgograd.—"Did you ever see Mr. Goldwater?"

"Did you ever hear him speak?"

"Did many other people?"

"How did people know what he was saying?"

"Yes, but when he criticized the President, did that go out on the radio and television? Was that printed in the newspapers?"

In Volgograd, once again, I was cross-examined about the "campaign," although the whole idea of a "campaign" was new and fuzzy to the Russians.

There was very little said about the issues, they went straight to the fascinating central point—that there were issues publicly debated, and "a choice."

In Russia, of course, there isn't even "an echo."

This idea of having two people run against each other for an office, and lay their ideas out for public scrutiny and acceptance is new to them.

It demonstrates how they live in a government-enforced information vacuum.

Goldwater broke through it. In their violent opposition to him, the Communist finally gave some genuine attention in their home communication media to a presidential contest over a little period of time, and in the process it got through to thinking people that this is an interesting system as compared to their own, where you get to vote, but you don't have a contest and you don't have a campaign and you are not informed about any issues at all.

So the Goldwater campaign was not a total loss. It served the United States in this way, for sure.

Conversations at times went further than this. I actually got into a discussion of the owner's role in our "capitalist" system, and found they are still using 100-year-old definitions. A stock company idea stunned them, for example.

They think in terms of one owner over vast empires who actively runs it in a despotic manner. They have never been exposed to the concept that has now produced 20 million stockholders in the United States, the board of directors system, and the employment by such a group of professional management. It's all been one simple one-man operation in their eyes.

I told them flatly, that in terms of large capital distribution, the principal role of "owners" in our country is as stockholders and stock sellers and stock buyers, not as managers.

They are the ones who decide where to put new money, trying to find a "soil" in which it will "grow." If they are good at this, they by the nature of things have more money or "capital" to invest. If they are not good at it, they soon have none. Thus there is a "natural selection" of people who exercise good judgment in deciding the direction of capital expansion, instead of, and I put it bluntly, that decision being made exclusively by a political party, a party that has also assumed the role of a big business total monopoly of production.

This did not seem to be a scary subject, but one of considerable interest to several people at the upper education level and responsible job level that wouldn't discuss anything with me 6 years ago.

In my notes I also marked Volgograd as the fourth city in a row where I had again seen, in addition to the appearance of modern machinery in use, the old familiar pick-and-shovel gangs doing hard labor—and made up, in a large part, of women.

Here, too, there came to hand a Russian newspaper article on the creation and development of a government department of advertising.

It said flatly that in a modern economy as it becomes more diverse and complicated, advertising becomes an absolutely vital necessity. Now that it is possible (after wartime destruction, etc.) to get into sizable production of consumer goods, they reported, they cannot function without advertising.

However, in the budget breakdown of the "neon sign bureau," and others, it is pretty clear both from the article and from observation, that a major hunk of the advertising budget still goes to whooping it up for the Communist Party.

But it wasn't all that pleasant.

I was advised with some excitement by a representative of "Intourist" that three Dutch journalists were scheduled to interview a group of veterans of the Battle of Stalingrad at the defense museum, and asked if I wanted to participate.

Fine. So they gave me a bright young man of about 29 or 30, called Kolya, as an interpreter and we sailed off to the museum.

The Dutch hadn't showed up so we looked around the museum for a while and chatted.

When we came to the room containing all the fabulous gifts sent from foreign countries (including the famous "Stalingrad Sword" presented by Winston Churchill on behalf of the British Government), there was Cuba's gift—a photograph of Fidel Castro.

I snickered at that. Kolya looked at me with a smile, and a glint in his eye, and said: "Why don't you Americans like Castro?"

"Because he's a liar and a cheat who got into power under false pretenses," I said.

Kolya sobered and shrugged his shoulders. "Leaving politics out of it," he said, "we still recognize him as a hero who fought against odds and freed his country. Don't you, at least, give him credit for that?"

"The Cuban people freed themselves," I said with some heat, "in response to Castro's promises in broadcasts and pamphlets, and the promises were these: (1) An immediate return to the constitution of 1940; (2) free elections within 6 months; and (3) that he only wanted to get rid of Batista and would not himself seek or accept any high public office. He broke all three in the most direct kind of betrayal."

"Then you don't like him," said Kolya, "because he betrayed you. He fooled you."

"The promises were not made to us, but publicly, and addressed to the Cuban people. He betrayed them."

I thought this conversation on my part was a waste of time and probably a bit foolish, too, but I'm not altogether sure that it was.

In view of Kolya's attitude on Castro, and almost baiting me on this, his attitude on Vietnam was most interesting, but that's another story, and that took place in a most interesting other setting.

As for the big interview with the veterans, there were four of them representing the infantry, tanks, artillery, and air, and a fifth who was a political commissar with a Stalingrad regiment.

As we left, one of the Dutch journalists muttered: "Too bad the commissar did all the talking."

That sums it up. It was a waste of time for all of us.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, July 28, 1965]

Russia Revisited: Monuments Rise Instead of Houses

(By Charles L. Dancey)

Volgograd.—"The people built these little houses themselves after the war when housing was terribly short * * * and now," Kolya shrugged his shoulders, "they don't want to move.

"But, of course, this will all be torn down and new apartments built."

We were on your way to Mameyev Hill, the key terrain feature of the Battle of Stalingrad and the most hotly contested piece of real estate in that climactic battle.

I had seen the same rows of small but attractive private homes 6 years ago, and been told then that they would all be torn down and replaced. The homes, themselves, are not fancy, but snug-looking, and most of the attraction comes from the gardens, flowers, trees, and grass which are so obviously lovingly cared for in each case.

"They don't want to move."

I don't blame them. This might be regarded as substandard in the United States, but it is certainly better than overcrowded block apartments. But, of course, they are squatters because the Government owns all land including that bought and paid for in blood in battle and sweat afterwards.

Stalingrad was a bustle of construction 6 years ago. Now its name is Volgograd, and while thrilled to see the new buildings actually up and working, I saw fewer signs of construction going on now than in most cities, although there are still massive slum areas by our measure.

On Mameyev Hill, however, there was an unbelievably large construction job underway. They may have canceled the congress hall for the Supreme Soviet to meet housing needs instead, but it wasn't housing under construction—it was the biggest monument in the world.

Hugh terrace after terrace has been carved out from the river clear to the top of this highest hill in the area, and each terrace is flanked with massive statutary, concrete pools, and landscaping topped first by a huge and impressive work showing "Mother Russia" and her fallen son, finally at the crest of the hill with the not-yet-finished statue of a woman holding a sword high, representing the city, itself. This figure will be larger than the Statute of Liberty, Kolya proudly announced.

But he didn't say it that way.

He said "It will be bigger than that big statute of a woman in New York Harbor, that the French gave to you." And he added, "This will be the biggest statue in the world."

I couldn't resist saying: "You mean you've never heard of Mount Rushmore."

He looked hit, 'What's that?"

"Never mind." I shrugged.

"No, what is it?"

"It's a mountain, and we carved the rock face of it into the heads of four Presidents. We are now carving one whole mountain into an immense statue of an Indian on a horse."

I shouldn't have done it, but this was the same Kolya who had been so insulting the previous day about Castro, and I didn't see any sense or benefit in indulging him.

It should be noted here that after my return Premier Kosygin visited Volgograd and spoke at a dedication of this tremendous monument to one of the great battles of history.

Standing before the huge, triumphant figure of the woman with her sword held high, and flanked by heroic figures in stone of soldiers in battle with their battle slogans carved in huge letters, the Soviet Premier talked of "peaceful coexistence," said not an unkind word about the United States and never even mentioned Vietnam.

It is regarded as one of the most significant events to occur there in many months.

Kolya was not as discreet as Premier Kosygin.

Perhaps irked by the comments on their relative accomplishments in sculpture, he brought up Vietnam, asking me what I thought about events there.

By this time I'd been through a number of conversations which seemed to inevitably feature "Alabama," the murder of Mrs. Liuzzo, and Vietnam, so I'd adjusted my responses accordingly.

(One thing about the repetition that faces you in these situations, after the first encounter you get a chance the second time to say the things you wished you had said the first time.)

"You know about the Ku Klux Klan," I said. He nodded.

"They are a minority who refuse to abide by democratic, free election government and its legal decisions. They have tried to replace true democracy and impose their political aims by terror, by murdering some people, by bombing some places, and by frightening others."

He agreed enthusiastically.

"We do not like political decisions to be made by gunfire and fear, and we oppose as a people, and our Government opposes the Klan and its methods.

"Now, as we understand it, some people under encouragement from the Chinese, tried to impose their political desires in South Vietnam by the same means as the Klan in Alabama only on even a wider scale. Murder and terror bombings.

"This is not democracy by either your description or ours. It is murder, and it is aggression.

"We are resisting it in both Alabama and Vietnam with the best tools to be found for each situation.

"You think the Chinese are behind it?" he asked.

"Yes, and we think that if they succeed in South Vietnam, they will be encouraged to use these same Klan tactics in many other countries. If we have to face that sooner or later, it might as well be now in Vietnam There are other versions," I added. "This is how it looks to us."

He looked for a long time, and then shook his head as if to change whatever was going on there, and mumbled: "We don't know who is right."

And we went on to other things.

So, Kolya wasn't such a bad guy after all.

I met a much worse one the next day when I went on to Odessa.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, July 27, 1965]

Russia Revisited: Flight to Odessa Has Its Frills

(By Charles L. Dancey)

Odessa.—The last time I landed at Odessa it had been in a rickety DC–3 setting down on a grass field. This time it was in a jet and at a fully developed airport facility.

To add a bit of flavor, the stewardess spoke English and really made a production out of it. Right after takeoff she walked down the aisle, stopped at my seat, put her hands on the arm, bent over, eyeball to eyeball, and smiled and said quietly to me alone: "The pilot, all the crew, and I want to offer you a special welcome to our airplane and hope you have a pleasant trip. If you have any questions, or want anything, just let me know." A final, big bright smile—my "thank you" and she went on about her business.

Several times during the flight she came to deliver in the same manner the odd bits of information that are often given on U.S. flights in the same individual manner to the one American aboard.

Such frills are not standard on Soviet planes. They are strictly functional. They do not include public address systems, for example, and I was no longer accustomed to these amenities en masse much less in this directly personal, even intimate, way.

On arrival, I went into the dining room and was waved to a seat at his table by a Russian named Victor Gorshakov who promptly reeled off the names of the many Americans he knew "personally"—among whom by my memory were Jess Gorkin of Parade magazine, Gregory Peck, John Steinbeck and the late Senator Kefauver.

He said he was in Odessa "making a movie."

Maybe Gorshakov was having a bad day, or maybe he was trying to "put me down," or maybe he assumed I was some kind of arty critic of U.S. life who thought the same way he did—or maybe he just believes the one-sided stuff he proceeded to ladle out. I don't know.

Anyway, the name dropping was only the beginning.

He announced that he had debated with Senator Kefauver on the subject of crime and smilingly boasted that he had verbally backed the Senator in a corner.

"I knew all about crime in America" he explained, "I asked the Senator if the reports of the Kefauver Crime Commission were reliable, and he said they were. I told him I had read them in detail. So there was no denying the terrible crime conditions in America.

"As to the Soviet Union, we have some small human crimes of robbery and an occasional murder, but there are some whole classes of crime common to the United States that simply do not exist in the Soviet Union. Drunkenness, for example. We just have none. Kidnaping is unheard of."

"Do you count official crimes?" I inquired, annoyed and tired.

"What do you mean?"

"I have read Khrushchev's report on crime in the Soviet Union."

He breezed right by the remark. I was sorry he did because I wanted to explain that I meant his speech on Stalin's career. Whatever else he may have been, however, he was also quickwitted and he may have gotten it. At any rate he didn't want to pursue it.

He turned to his own field, the movies.

He said, "I have seen 'Dr. Strangelove' and 'Seven Days in May,' and may I say I was shocked to learn that such elements actually exist in American society."

By this time, it seemed hardly worth while getting a word in.

But as he went on with this subject I finally murmured: "You understand these were fiction, indeed farce, intended in part as comedy. They were not history and are not history as far as America is concerned. In fact, we have never had a czar or a dictator, crazy or otherwise."

(You will remember both movies referred to involved screwy generals who either wanted to take over the United States or attack Russia, or both.)

We moved on once again to the flat charge that the Kennedy killing has been whitewashed, only instead of implicating the Vice President, as had repeatedly happened when other Russians talked of it, Gorshakov blamed the rightwing.

Before we finished, and on his own intiative with no prompting from me, he grandly volunteered: "Of course, we still have troubles with small things. We still can't make proper shoes, and we've not yet mastered the ballpoint pen after years, but these little things will come."

Later, happily, I again ran into friendlier types, including some 11th grade students, whose principal spokesman was a boy called Vladimir.

They were first interested in sunglasses (another little thing the Soviets still can't make decently), then turned to automobiles and movies.

"Is it true that everybody in America has a car?"

"Almost, but some are old cars, you understand," I replied.

"Who are the big movie stars now? We seldom get American movies. Now, Yul Brynner is here in 'The Magnificent Seven.' It's very good but it is a cowboy picture. We had Mario Lanza in 'The Great Caruso,' but that was many years ago."

And, finally, "Who is your minister of culture?"

It confused them that we have none, and that all of our movies, plays, the music they love so much over there, etc., are spontaneous and rise or fall on the basis of public acceptance instead of by government decision.

I learned once again that these boys who might be regarded as high school sophomores or juniors here, all work at regular jobs and attend evening school. This seems to be very common.

Then, there is the stopper, the final question, that was asked me just three times in exactly the same words, and with the same indescribable far-off look:

"Is life good in America?"

I wasn't sure what they meant, or what the question implied. And how do you answer a question as completely broad as that?

On one occasion (not this one in Odessa), I asked: "Is it good, here?"

The kid looked straight down at his feet, and just said, "No."

I never asked another youngster that question.

If you had been there, you wouldn't either.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, July 30, 1965]

Russia Revisited: Changes in Odessa Make City Alive

(By Charles L. Dancey)

Odessa.—Six years ago I had been booked to spend more time in Odessa than any other city (it was my first stop that time). And the guide they assigned me then was a genuine beauty.

This time the Intourist people knew I'd been there before, knew I'd been at the same hotel, and one of them looked at me intently and asked: "Would you like to have the same guide you had before?"

I said I didn't remember her name, and it had never occurred to me she might still be around, but that if she were, I would certainly like to see her and talk to her again.

(That was the end of it, but it was the only time such a suggestion has been made.)

When I did take my one "guided tour" session while there, the guide kept saying, "What's down this street?"

I answered, "The Opera house."

"Where are we heading now?"

"We'll come out on the esplanade at Pushkin's statue."

Much of that sort of thing, until it got to be a game.

Eventually, she said, "You have a good memory," and somehow that comment marked the end of the game. Then, she turned to, "Didn't you bring any American literature, a copy of your paper? Who are your new writers since Faulkner and Hemingway? We are hungry for English."

Odessa was very familiar in terms of landmarks and ways of getting around, but it has changed very drastically like the other cities.

The "downtown" was very drab 6 years ago. Stores were shabby, with flat, simple signs, small show windows, if any, and nothing in them, no traffic and no people.

This time the city was alive with stores, new fronts, windows, goods, people, automobiles, and motorcycles, while it also retained a particular charm from the older habit of building even commercial buildings with decorative touches, statuary, and such. It is a blend of prerevolutionary and 1960-modern, with very little of the stiff interim period of bare, barracks-type construction.

I managed to take a couple of pictures that were almost identical in place and circumstance to 6 years ago, and the difference is reflected in them.

Yet, in this summer construction season I saw virtually no construction actually under way, and no clearing of older areas.

There is one new block-apartment suburb beyond the railroad station and before the airport, and that's it.

In the park fronting the railroad station, incidentally, there were several people sleeping on the benches with various belongings stacked alongside.

There were two construction efforts going on in the main city area; one was the asphalting of a one-block street, and the other the building of a new statue picturing heroes of the revolution. They were using a motorgrader and a dragline—heavy equipment.

Most statues in Odessa are still of poets or are just Grecian-style art, and apparently somebody decided that there ought to be one typical Soviet Communist statue included, so they made it the biggest one and right in the middle of the main downtown.

They were putting the finishing touches on it, and the hardest work was being done by three women in the work gang, perched high on top the thing, scrubbing it after the actual construction was done.

Aside from perked up makeup for the girls, and children who have far more implements like bicycles and playground equipment, the most startling change on the streets still remains the appearance of bicycles, motorcycles, and motor scooters.

A motorcycle can be had for $320. A TV console costs about $400, and the cheapest, smallest black and white is listed at $160. The $400 is a bit smaller in screen than our standard portables.

A vacuum sweeper is $80 and up.

Cigarettes are about 25 cents a pack with virtually no filters. The cigarettes are not fat and fully packed, but tend to be flat, like roll-your-owns—except the "papirosi" which have about an inch of tobacco on the end of 2 inches of thick paper, completely hollow like a straw.

Beer is 30 cents a bottle. Hard liquor runs about $3 to $6.

Wash-and-wear shirts are available, but you are looking at $15 for starters. Most suits and such did not have price tags on display, but citizens told me the prices are much higher than those I cited for my own clothes—shoes once again being $15 for the cheapest and poorest (which are very poor indeed) and going much higher.

Food prices are hard to figure because the range is so great. A limited number of things seemed to be very inexpensive, and any departure almost exotic, going into very high prices, indeed—and there was never visible anything like the variety of choice we are so accustomed to.

Movies generally seem to run about 60 cents to a dollar.

With all the change and all the improvements, after this much time, one cannot escape the feeling that he has done an "Alice in Wonderland" or more accurately "Through the Looking Glass," that is, you have the eerie feeling that you have passed through the TV screen into the middle of a very late night, old, old movie, and can't get out.

The cars look like our old models. The motorcycles look like old-fashioned, side-car types we used to have. The traffic is that of many years ago. The streets are brick, cobblestone, blacktop, narrower usually, and still flanked by too many oldstyle buildings.

The clothes for the most part while showing more consciousness of appearance were not "chic" in any modern sense. The total effect is greater than the sum of the parts.

Buses are crowded. An occasioned horse and cart of some sort comes down the street. There are lots of small movie houses and they are busy. Nobody talks about TV, but they talk much of movies.

People walk, and sit in the sun (or shade depending on climate), and women don't smoke, only the men.

There's one good thing about all this, but it adds only to the strange sensation of being time-machined back. The popular and ever-available "Good-humor" stands sell an ice cream that really does taste like that which used to come out of the old hand-crank buckets of yesteryear.

(You see it isn't just that youth's taste is different from age. The "old fashioned ice cream" tastes like the good old fashioned ice cream.)

And the bread is like homemade bread—heavy and solid.

The popular music in public places is mostly the "old songs" and United States.

One thing all this proves to the participant pretty quick, going back to the good old days is quite an experience—for about 3 weeks—and then you get pretty doggone eager to get back to 1965.

Think how much more eager you would be if you worked at one of these jobs, like the Russians do, using the same old methods and tools—whether it is long-hand bookkeeping or digging excavations with pick and shovel.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, July 31, 1965]

RUSSIA REVISITED: "GREAT ADVENTURE" BUSTS U.S. STUDENT

(By Charles L. Dancey)

KIEV.—The telephone rang.

I picked it up and answered "Hello," in English, figuring it was another wrong number and using English would make the situation far clearer and far easier than any other approach.

"Hello," said a clipped British-accented voice on the other end. "Is this Watkins?"

It took me back a moment, because while Kiev shares with Moscow and Leningrad a near-Western-Europe location and hence has more Westerners, you don't expect to pick up a phone and have English or Americans at both ends.

"No," I replied.

And before I could go on to proclaim it a wrong number, he proceeded briskly: "Well, please put Watkins on, will you?"

"This is room 477," I told him.

"Yes, of course. Isn't Watkins there somewhere?"

"Sir," I told him. "I just checked into this single room of this hotel. It was vacant. I am its only occupant, and I am not Watkins."

"What is your name?" (The English response apparently confused him a little at this point, too, at this point of adjustment.)

"Dancey." And I never heard of your man.

"Watkins isn't there now." It wasn't a question but a rather explosive exclamation as he finally got it through his head.

A dead pause followed and the crunch of the other party then hanging up.

Nothing, except for the coincidence of inheriting a room in this large hotel previously occupied by another person whose native language was English—with so few such around.

But it does intrigue one to be left hanging like that, and I kept expecting or hoping for something else to come along to give a clue as to just who Watkins was, what his business in Russia was, and what became of him.

Kiev is a beautiful city, full of parks, hills, a large busy shopping area on famed Krestchavik Street, a full-dress amusement park with Ferris wheel and all—but most of the things that happened there for the most part were echoes of conversations, conditions, or events that happened in other cities, too, and would only be repetition here.

I did notice that Ukrainians boast of Kiev as the capital of the Ukraine, while the official Soviet travel dope and information describes it as the "mother city" of the Russian people, and there is a new doctrinal line to the effect that the Ukrainians are really Russians who just happened to get separated from the other Russians a few hundred years ago—for a while.

Inasmuch as Kiev was founded before Moscow, I don't know why you couldn't argue that the Russians are really Ukrainians who got separated, but that isn't the way it works.

The Dnieper Hotel (they spell it Dnipro in Ukrainian) is very large, very new, and very good. One device seems somewhat typical of the Russians at their best when they take a simple and direct approach to something.

You know that in some fancy U.S. hotels, where folks are always looking for a gimmick, there are towel warmers—a grill device that is electrified. You punch a button and the grill lights and warms the towel or towels that hang on it.

Well, at the Dnipro they had a pipe network in a similar design as a towel rack—but no complex and expensive electrical gadgetry. The pipes were simply the hot water pipes leading into the shower and it really worked fine.

I left Russia from Kiev, and here ticket confirmation was simple and but a matter of a moment in contrast to the previous experience. The same was true of customs and related procedures.

It is illegal, however, to take any Russian money out of the country, and also to take out Russian newspapers. This literature thing seems to be the biggest thing—either bringing any of ours in or taking theirs out.

The customs people hardly bothered with my luggage at all but insisted on counting my money to the penny, and checking it against the record I was obliged to carry of stamped official exchanges.

They obtain a record of the money you have in cash, checks, etc., when you arrive, and check it meticulously when you leave along with this record of official exchanges to see that there are no missing transactions or cash unaccounted for.

Going on the plane there were four Americans and we went through the procedure separately from the rest of the passengers.

One of these was a student from the University of Texas, Tony Rand. The other two were a Francis Buckley of Fort Lauderdale, Fla., and his daughter. In customs, they were cursory with all of us but the girl. They ransacked her stuff item by item, completely, to her great confusion and embarrassment.

The student, Tony (whose home is El Paso, Tex.) was in a jam.

He had embarked on a kind of great adventure for an extended lone trip as far as he could go, including crossing Siberia (in a sealed train) by the famed Trans-Siberian railroad, and coming back the other way.

However, after the three largest and most western of Soviet cities, Moscow, Leningrad, and Kiev, he was completely fed up. For long stretches of time, he had been ostentatiously followed by two men right on his heels through every turn of routing that he took.

He spoke no Russian at all.

He found the business of just getting along with the routine necessities of life a full-time struggle under these conditions, and he decided that what looked from a distance like a great adventure would become an endless and isolated bore, so he changed his mind.

That really complicated matters, of course. He finally, with much difficulty, had gotten scheduled on the plane from Kiev to Bucharest, but discovered at the last minute that funds paid out for other transportation as originally planned were not transferable but largely forfeit—even though considerable advance notice of the change was involved in most.

He expected to arrive in Bucharest a trifle short of the cash needed to get out of that Communist country, and the ability to effectively wire home for cash there, or find an American consulate there was highly questionable.

I loaned him $50 which would get him to Athens, where he could very quickly get contact with U.S. officials and home, either one.

And off we went to Bucharest, Rumania.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star Aug. 1, 1965]

RUSSIA REVISITED: RED POLICEMEN ARE TICKET WRITERS TOO

(By Charles L. Dancey)

Before we leave the subject of the Soviet Union, there are a couple of general subjects as collected over the route that should be reported—like the relationship with policemen and the tremendous change in their movies.

The most amusing, and in some ways significant, incident involving police was one wherein a truck was "parked" illegally and left actually blocking an "entry" street. A policeman walked over and paced up and down angrily, obviously waiting for the truckdriver to return in order to give him a blast, or a ticket, or whatever.

A little old man in old clothes and a jaunty workman's cap, smoking a cigarette, came sailing across the street after some time, timed to arrive on the right side of the truck from that direction just as the officer reached the left-side extreme of his "patrol."

At this point, he removed his cigarette with one hand, and his cap with the other, waved the cap with excess courtesy, and shouted in a very loud voice:

(Rough translation.) "Congratulations, Mr. Policeman, for guarding my truck for me."

And he hopped in and drove off.

The policeman stood, stunned, and stopped awkwardly in his tracks, while the huge crowd of passers-by roared and roared with laughter.

Police are impressive by their numbers. They are always visible it seems, in uniform, and often several of them at one time. They are not frightening, however.

I have often accosted them, asking questions of this or that, and every time they would literally jump to be helpful.

In one park, the inevitable policeman was a very young man, and the sun got to him and he fell asleep on a park bench—until another policeman awakened him harshly, and then he resumed his patrol.

A good many are on motorcycles now, and I saw them make a sizable number of traffic arrests. This is a new function which reflects two things: (1) There is enough traffic to make rules necessary, and (2) there is no longer the situation whereby anybody with a car was automatically such a big shot 3 years ago that a policeman wouldn't think of "pulling him over." Now, they do.

Incidentally, although they have more police than anyplace I've ever seen, the official Soviet line is that "There are no policemen in the Soviet Union. Only the capitalist states require police."

They support this typical sophistry very simply. The police are called "militia."

However, there is also a kind of "police" function on the job, as a result of the total power of the state management over its "employees."

I ran into small samples, the most dramatic or drastic of which was a sales girl who had made a $10 error in totaling up some large purchases made by an English tourist.

She collared other English tourists the following day, and her fellow workers lent a hand in doing likewise, trying to find a "friend" of the original buyer who would produce the short $10 immediately.

There were only casual acquaintances, and they were unwilling to meet the missing man's obligations.

The girls in the establishment became very distraught.

One gentleman tried to reassure them, saying that he did know who the fellow was and his business address, and that we would be going back to England in a few days, and would assure them that the money would be forthcoming.

"Don't send it through the mail," they blurted out.

And the further truth came out. If the shortage was found, they revealed, the girl would not be "out" just $10, but would automatically be fined $70 for the error and that could be a month's pay, or very nearly.

It seemed to us the obvious answer was to cough up the $10 before the shortage was found and save $60, but this was a foreign currency shop and there was no way the girls could come up with the equivalent of $10 in either English or United States currency.

The "worker's state," indeed.

This reminds me of the incident, not unlike my own in being provided an airplane seat at the expense of a "citizen," whereby somebody goofed about advance notice of a whole tour group. They arrived at an airport with no provisions for being met, no transportation, and no hotel arrangements. What's more the appropriate hotel was full.

The tour group of "foreigners" was never aware that there was more than a minor "hitch" in the efficiency of the Soviets. Transportation was literally "grabbed," and meanwhile about 25 Soviet citizens were hastily and unceremoniously kicked out of the hotel—and the tour group moved in.

I picked up a piece of this from observation, a piece from understanding some Russian and finally the complete story from one of those involved in fixing things who was angrily too eager to make it clear where the mistake started.

Ah, but movies have softened. The grim, dreary, propaganda pieces I saw 6 years ago have been replaced with attempts at genuine entertainment and only echoes of propaganda. Indeed, some are very surprising in contrast to the harsh duty messages of yesteryear.

The best example was "Keys to the Sky," a sort of musical comedy about the soldiers in an antiaircraft missile battery.

Now, the missile setup was very impressive and all sorts of miraculous gadgetry was displayed, and radar, and all, and they never missed blasting occasional enemy intruding single planes to smithereens.

But this was incidental to the tangled double-love story of the principals and the slapstick comedy, dancing (with a hula hoop), acrobatics, and love, love, love.

Incidentally, it was also in color.

The top comedian was not only gifted at slapstick (and a very good technician at the missile site), but was a very bad soldier.

He was always in trouble with the military police, breaking the military rules, fouling up the system, making a fool out of the commanding officer, and getting into wild situations.

In pursuing his romance, for example, he loses his boots and is out of uniform in town plus facing his deadline for reporting in. There is a long, acrobatic chase at which he fools and eludes the military police patrol, but gets caught with a street sprinkler and his appearance further ruined, only to come smack face to face with his colonel.

He sneaks onto the back bumper of the colonel's auto, rides to the base, jumps off and zips through the corporal of the guard, so that when the colonel goes to put him on report, he is advised that the soldier is on the base and not missing.

They check his bunk, and there he is, of course, snoring.

The colonel goes to see the doctor, afraid he is having hallucinations.

Needless to say, this is not in line with the attitude of Soviet movies a few years ago, when disrespect for authority and getting around it was not humorous at all.

It was entertaining, and one youngish ex-soldier told me: "Such stunts really do go on in the Army." He enjoyed it immensely.

In short, it was like an American movie in its basic attitude—and the audience responded like an American audience.

Or maybe I should say—like people anywhere.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, Aug. 2, 1965]

Russia Revisited: Rumania's Contrast With Soviet Union Like Day and Night

(By Charles L. Dancey)

Bucharest.—Rumania is not Russia.

Far from driving people out of their private homes, the Government is encouraging those who want to assemble materials and build their own.

The result is that one sees hundreds, and there are undoubtedly thousands upon thousands of new private homes built and under construction, and each one, whether on the outskirts of town or deep in the country, seems to include some special decorative effort.

The huge apartment buildings that have been erected in Bucharest and Ploesti also have varied and special decorative designs and color in contrast with the standardization so common in the Soviet Union.

The streets have more autos and of every size, kind, color, and country, and the stores have more variety including all manner of goods from other lands.

All this in contrast with the Soviet Union.

In all the former "formal" talk of guides, or the political commissar discussing the Battle of Stalingrad, etc., the Russians carefully referred to "Fascists," and never said anything bad about the Germans. It was the "Fascists this" and "the Fascists that," in obvious respect to the Communist East German state.

In Rumania, the "Germans" are still just plain "Germans" and no monument is more ostentatious than a duplicate of the Arc de Triomphe, which copy in Bucharest marks their victory in World War I over the Germans, and also, (they make no bones about this) the recovery of Transylvania from the Russians.

The closest thing to it is a great new movement at the military academy founded by King Carol II—a frieze picturing the struggles of the Rumanian people to achieve independence from the whole galaxy of rapacious neighbors.

A huge monument also has been erected with just soaring geometric figures above an eternal flame to the "revolutionary Communist dead" set in the middle of a great park * * * but they make no bones about the park being King Carol Park.

They have a big industrial program to make basic changes in a chiefly agricultural country at considerable sacrifice, a program initiated and to be executed by a Communist government under a Communist party, and the reason they give in promoting it is flat out * * * to become completely independent of any foreign power.

It is pretty obvious the only foreign power that stands in a position to really make independence questionable is Russia—the Soviet Union.

In Russia, I never heard a peep about our space exploits. In Bucharest, I saw a newsreel that gave much time, colorful pictures, and glowing comment to our Gemini success.

(There was also a fashion segment to the newsreel which ended with a comic bit showing Salvadore Dali and some virtually nude models wearing nothing but three extra "eyes" strategically placed—something unthinkable on a Soviet screen and considerably more carefree than even U.S. practices these days in movies.)

Right when I got off the plane, a smiling lady stepped up and said: "Mr. Dancey? We've been expecting you. I'm from Carpati."

And I was zoomed through customs without ceremony, accompanied by a guide named Valentino, and to the fancy Lido Hotel. (Carpati is the name of the official Government travel bureau.)

Immediately, Valentino began instructing me that Rumanians are Western people of Latin origin, that their language is basically Latin with Latin grammar and a smattering of Slavic words thrown in.

He pridefully reported that Rumania had "saved the Western World and Western Europe from the Turks who had penetrated the "soft underbelly of Europe" through Bulgaria and what is now Yugoslavia, and halfway through Rumania, but were stopped in the Carpathian Mountains of Transylvania.

He boasted of the Rumanian kings who had ultimately and early thrown the Turks out of the occupied portions of their country * * * but regarded the last King Carol as a bum whose peccadillos with his mistress were a minor fault indeed compared to sending his country into a losing war against Russia.

(It was, in fact, the Rumanian Army that was deepest inside Russia at Stalingrad and was smashed by the Russian counterattack north of that city. They were the broken hinge through which the Soviet attack poured to entrap the Germans to the south.)

The car in which Valentino and I rode was a Chevrolet.

And the older portions of Bucharest through which we first traveled include many private homes and larger structures featuring a variety of familiar architectures, including what we are inclined to call Californian (red tile roofs and all), and a good many that might otherwise have been considered early Midwestern or Victorian. These latter being the turreted, filigreed styles one may see on Moss Avenue, in Princeton, or along Washington or Park Avenue in Pekin.

It seemed almost like home after the Soviet Union.

I immediately went to the first American movie in sight, which was "The Son of Captain Blood," undistinguished and, as in Russia, a costume picture, but it did show us fighting against Negro slavery a long time ago, and some of the sacrifices made by capitalistic white folks for a principle of simple moral justice and not self-interest.

It included the newsreel I've already mentioned, and the film was not dubbed but in English with Romany subtitles.

When the English sound-track was turned down, the audience immediately kicked up a noisy fuss until it was turned up again (thank heaven), and while I'm sure they couldn't speak English, they were interested in hearing the English and could make out some of it.

It's easy to see how that can develop by the subtitle business while you hear the spoken words and see the action in which the words fit.

Besides, there really are a lot of Latin words in the Romany language, plus Spanish, plus French, and some Slavic * * * so there is a relationship.

Indeed, it struck me that there were times when a total stranger to the language could understand it—but never speak it in a million years, because you wouldn't know which words are in which tongue.

Example, the first five numbers are (uno, dos, tres, etc.) Spanish: the next five, identical with French; and the days of the week are the same as in Russia. (Voskresenya, Ponyedelnik, Vtornik, Srayda, Chetverk, Piutnitsa, Subota.)

And when we took off for a long drive to Transylvania and the mountains the following day, there were several things that reminded me of Peoria.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, Aug. 3, 1965]

Russia Revisited: Rumania Brings Peorians to Mind

(By Charles L. Dancey)

Bucharest.—My first full day in Rumania inescapably brought to my mind Mayor Robert Lehnhausen, Bill Rutherford, and Forest Park Foundation, and Joe Kelly, and the bus system.

I thought of the mayor because the road that took Valentino and I to Transylvania and the mountains passed through Ploesti. There the Rumanians have made a shrine and care for it proudly and meticulously—to whom? To the American and British fliers buried there after being killed in bomb raids on Ploesti.

It struck me, of course, because these men they honor were bombing them.

But what really struck me, of course, was that but for a small turn of the wheel of fate, our mayor, Bob Lehnhausen, might very well be lying in this far-off little cemetery instead of presiding over council meetings.

And when you visit Ploesti, you really come to recognize how difficult and dangerous it had to be to penetrate to such a location, so deep in the heart of enemy defenses, in that famous, successful and costly raid on the oil center in which Lehnhausen played a major role.

Today, Ploesti is notable because virtually all its structures are new and besides the original industry a host of new factories are up.

We also passed Banasea Forest, a huge park that is literally a forest, interlaced with footpaths, with a great flowery garden and a restaurant at the center. It is cool, inviting, beautiful and popular although some distance from town, and the average Rumanian doesn't have transportation like we do.

Great numbers of motorcycles, riding double, may be seen heading that way, and their scattered cycles are here and there.

Around Bucharest there are also several large beautiful lakes with sailing, fishing, and at least one water skier behind a powerboat that I saw.

There are a number of parks in the city, incidentally, that are somewhat similar with sizable overgrown areas of woods and footpaths.

Bill Rutherford, who is making such an effort to save woodlands for the future as park areas, would be fascinated, I'm sure, by this place.

As for Joe Kelly, he would flip completely in Bucharest. There the buses go by, unbelievably jammed, all seats filled, the aisle a mass of squashed people, the doors open and six or eight people crowded in the entry and hanging out, and very often half a dozen or more boys riding the back bumper to boot.

It isn't hard to figure out why business is good, either.

For while Bucharest has more cars and more variety and more traffic than the Russian cities, and the Russian cities have much more traffic than they had 6 years ago, the volume still doesn't begin to compare with the number of cars on American streets, in this specific relationship, Peoria.

The pictures I have of crowded buses also reveal otherwise virtually empty streets, and that's the scope of the gaps in traffic.

The drive from Bucharest streets, through the outskirts of park and lake, past Ploesti took us on to Transylvania and the Carpathian Mountains.

I saw nothing resembling Castle Dracula there, but did see the very rugged mountains, an ancient peasant cottage impressively surrounded by an impenetrable woven fence topped with thatch and spikes, and the fairytale castle of the first King Carol.

It is tiny compared to the Czar's winter palace, for example, and yet a forest of spires, turrets and rooms, crowded with collections and gifts from the whole world. Each room is entirely done in the sumptuous style of some other country or some other age from Florentine to Turkish, French to Persian and the Armory remains as the King had it—a completely disorganized but artistically arranged collection of the weapons of all ages and nations. Knightly armor and weapons, Arab rifles, Tartar bows and arrows, Turkish pistols, Spanish helmets, arquebuses, and even a special sword used only for beheading nobility.

The castle also had a secret entrance and stairs leading from the double-deck library via a fake bookshelf up to the King's bedroom, and another leading from the library through a closet's back wall into the council chamber.

I suspect the King seemed to do a lot of reading.

He also had his own private theater right in the castle.

The most illuminating thing of all, perhaps was the council room—wherein the table would sit just four persons. Some councils.

Outside was actually too crowded with Grecian statues, and a main entry flanked by fierce Germanic lions and a couple of artillery pieces.

Valentino, the guide, our pleasant driver, and I stopped at Sinai, a mountain village, were shown through the church by a gracious priest and had a snack and a lot of conversation. It was free and easy.

Coming back they tried to talk me into going to Mamaia Beach, which they described in glowing terms of interest and activity. If I could go they would both have gone with me so they had a special interest.

But when it came right down to it, they just haven't the facilities there as yet to make it easy, and when I found how complex and uncertain it would be to go through all the redtape, I canceled any such effort.

The Lido Hotel was wild enough, anyway, without sampling Mamaia, except that at Mamaia it might have been much easier to photograph.

The Lido, where I stayed, had behind it a large dining room which ran on a terrace or porch above the large swimming pool and partway around it on two sides. Then, there was another stair and another deck to the restaurant above that.

This place, complete with orchestra, was going night and day, and hit its full blast peak about 2 a.m.—right outside my window.

The pool, beside its size, has some remarkable arrangement whereby every now and then they "turn it on" and surflike waves sweep the length of the pool breaking in the very shallow end (designed for that purpose).

It seems to be a mecca for middle-European Communist hotshots who like to live it up in what they think is the corrupt capitalist way, but Russians are very scarce.

A French engineer, arrived to help build a new Rumanian factory, thought he had it made because he speaks excellent Russian. He sat down very confidently, grinned and said to the waiter: "Vwee govareetye Pa-Rooski?" Obviously expecting a "Da" and litup face. He got a stony blank look of studied ignorance, as if the waiter didn't even understand the question—which is ridiculous.

He kept trying to communicate with the tables around him in this manner and the headwaiter and bevy of service personnel for a moment or two—getting the same reaction.

Finally, the only person who spoke to him in Russian was I, and I found he was, in fact, French, and told to speak French.

He had no trouble at all in French. (I had trouble in English.)

Here and on the streets now that my "guided period" was over I was about to see the really soggy side of this odd independent-minded European, but very Communist country.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, Aug. 4, 1965]

Russia Revisited: Swank Hotel Has Its Attractions

(By Charles L. Dancey)

Bucharest.—Bucharest's Lido Hotel is swank, its restaurant and nightclub double-decked around the swimming pool with surf, and much money flowed in that Communist mecca—apparently a good bit of it for girls.

The pool by day and nightclub by night appears to offer a unique facility for prostitution on a sizable scale in this flossiest of hotels in the land.

The appearance of such was obvious, but one can hardly be sure of first impressions in a land as foreign and language as foreign as this.

However, it became crystal clear when I could understand the crude, loud, and often insulting bargaining going on at the next table between a would-be patron, the apparent madam, with her blond merchandise sitting silently alongside, being discussed like a side of beef.

Brunel, the French engineer whom I met because of his attempt at a Russian-language gambit there, turned up with one of the likelies at his table for breakfast and hollered across this high-class restaurant that she had been his partner for the night.

By this time, guests and guest combinations had become somewhat known and the whole scale of the dealing became unquestionably identifiable for what it was.

If I may here digress, I saw no outward signs of prostitution in Russia. It is pretty clear that the Soviets take a very dim view of prostitution and are reasonably effective about it, but then they take a dim view of any form of private, commercial activity so that it is a double crime and much more serious at law there, undoubtedly, than it is here.

Rumania obviously doesn't agree, but I'd be curious to know if the prostitution there is a state enterprise or just pays protection and operates as a private, capitalistic enterprise.

I ran into the inevitable young man when I went into the street. One who told me in very limited English: "It isn't all like this, very nice." (The street was no great shakes, really.) "There is one place for the rich and another for the poor. You should see the other."

Another young fellow said he teaches English in the lower grades by day and attends college at night. The tuition is free but he must live on his own resources, hence the teaching job. His pay, he said, was 70 lei a week—that's $38 on the exchange.

Then there was a very sharp well-dressed and very proud and patriotic young fellow with whom I had a couple of beers. He discussed politics and economics freely and without any sign of fear, or hesitation, although he stood in defense of Rumanian plans by the Communist Party and their actions since the war especially efforts at independence, however, he seemed "pro-Russian" whether it was pre-Communist or post-Communist.

At the close of our conversation, however, he looked at me meaningfully, and said: "The thing to do is the best a small country can with the circumstances of the moment."

But the real shock came when it was time to leave, and I boarded the Russian jet for Rumania's "Tomar" at Banasea field.

Like all Russian jets it has no air conditioning or such frills and you board long before take-off, because it has to be towed into the take-off position by a truck, and then hooked up to a generator and the motors started, and then detached from the generator and that vehicle moved out of the way, and this docking kind of procedure takes 30 to 45 minutes generally.

It was a boiling hot day and I found myself apparently the only normal passenger aboard, as far as I could see.

The man in front of me was completely helpless except for a 2-inch at a time per step shuffle with a minute between steps—like someone recently stricken by a stroke.

The man beside me was ancient with unseeing dull eyes, fumbling hands, a totally blank expression, hanging lip, and a better shuffle than the fellow ahead, but great difficulty in just getting into the seat.

A hawk-nosed bony fellow across the aisle was a deaf-mute who was constantly and terribly confused and seemed to try to talk by opening his mouth and making air sounds but no noise while making desperate motions with his bony hands.

A woman was carried aboard clumsily because apparently she couldn't bend completely in the right places or do anything to help the one man trying to maneuver her down the narrow aisle.

There were a couple of children, too, under the loud and constant and excited jurisdiction of a man in a worker's peaked cap.

Everyone had bundles of various sizes, shapes, and makeshift materials that they stuffed here and there.

It was immediately obvious that not one of them had ever been on an airplane before. In the sweltering heat, the confusion was beyond description as a result of the total lack of knowledge of what to be done in all the small things, the uncertainty, and the basic physical incapacities which was tremendous to start with.

I helped the only two I could reach as best I could from the seat where I got pinned. Neither could physically hook the seat belt even if they knew how.

This, it soon became clear, was a planeload of Jewish emigrants being "permitted to leave Rumania to go to Israel.

I cannot help but think of it as a "refugee" plane, and suspect that most of those being permitted to leave, if this is a sample, are the sick, sore, lame, disabled, and dying.

We flew to Sofia, Bulgaria, and apparently a handful of people who were not part of the emigrant deal did get off there. The rest of us were not permitted to leave the plane (as is the usual procedure) while we sat for 45 minutes in blistering heat in our aluminum cigar.

Airborne again, I discovered that a meal was part of the standard service for this international flight. That produced the greatest comic-tragedy of all because it involved extricating trays from the seat in front of you and slipping little pipes into slots in the handles of your own seat, an operation of which half the passengers were physically incapable and the other half didn't know how to do.

Again I did it for those I could reach, and the harried pair of hostesses did the best they could in bedlam. They really tried throughout, I must say.

Finally, the meal. It was pork.

I once ate K-ration with some satisfaction in an open clearing littered with what turned out to be the bodies of about 800 men in the various postures and conditions of which they had been shot and died, but that was a long time ago. On this plane, I couldn't eat a bite.

And, yet, as one got a bit adjusted, in spite of all the physical problems and physical misery, there was some excited chatter, especially from the women, and even a touch of gaiety at times in the group—as gay as you can get with such physical limitations.

Debarking at Athens, I could only see the handful right around me, and I had to catch one old man who fell (he didn't trip or stumble, he just fell) trying to walk down the aisle, and in front of me a couple of yards another one went down.

I arrived at the Athens Hilton in the late evening, hot, tired, and without food since breakfast, took a shower, and just as I came out, there was a knock on the door.

It opened on a grinning Tony Rand, of El Paso, Tex., with 1,500 drachmas in his hand, and a tall, cold drink. (My $50 loan in Bucharest when he was stranded a few days before.)

We ran into Francis Buckley and his daughter in the lobby, and all went into a lovely air-conditioned dining room and got hamburgers and milkshakes from bright, smartly dressed, and pretty English-speaking girls, and sharp, crisp, efficient young men.

We hardly knew each other, having met briefly in the waiting room and then being together briefly in customs at Kiev Airport, but all greeted me like the long-lost Charley Brown, and each talked excitedly.

They treated me like a brother just escaped from a concentration camp.

It is impossible to describe the difference or the impact of suddenly returning to Western circumstances—even though Athens, Greece, is hardly Peoria, Ill.—but the way they affected the Buckleys and Tony and me is, perhaps, the best clue of all as to what it is really like in that other world.

I've done the best I could just telling things that happened, but it is impossible to produce the effect of the steady accumulation.

I can only say that not only do the Russians fail to realize a fraction of what it is like in our world, but we, ourselves, don't begin to realize what we've got.

If only they knew, and if only we realized, how different the whole world would be.

AMERICAN YOUTH FOREWARNED

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the following words are attributed to Nikolai Lenin in a speech made in 1923:

> Give me a child for 8 years and it will be a Bolshevist forever.

In recent years national organizations such as the American Legion, the National Education Association, and the American Bar Association have stressed the importance of educating American youth on the philosophy, strategy, and tactics of the world Communist movement.

How urgent is the need for responsible information and education on this issue can best be established by considering the program which the CPUSA has set up to snare American youth into its camp. In his annual statement before a House Appropriations Subcommittee earlier this year, J. Edgar Hoover again warned that the loyalties of our Nation's youth are coveted by designing masters of deceit.

Speaking engagements on college campuses by Communist Party leaders is an excellent case in point. Mr. Hoover reminds us that one of the purposes of such speaking engagements is "to project the image that the party is a legitimate political party." Yet, how many students, exposed to the wiles and duplicity of a Communist Party speaker, are aware, through training, of the existence of official governmental rulings concerning the true nature of the CPUSA? How many have been academically armed with the findings of the U.S. Congress, the Subversive Activities Control Board, the rulings of the Supreme Court, or other authoritative sources to demolish Communist claims to political legitimacy?

A student could possibly expose himself with impunity to Communist campus chicanery if he were aware of the Supreme Court ruling in the Communist Party case of 1961 in which the Court upheld the Subversive Activities Control Board's finding that the CPUSA was a disciplined organization operating in this Nation under Soviet Union control, with the objective of installing a Soviet-style dictatorship in the United States.

One would not be so apprehensive of the qualifications of our future leaders, now students on American campuses, if they were acquainted, among other findings, with the determination of the Internal Security Act of 1950 regarding Communist action organizations, among which the CPUSA is now legally classified:

> Although such organizations usually designate themselves as political parties, they are in fact constituent elements of the worldwide Communist movement and promote the objectives of such movement by conspiratorial and coercive tactics, instead of through the democratic processes of a free elective system or through the freedom-preserving means employed by a political party which operates as an agency by which people govern themselves.

Responsible education would never permit one to discount membership in the CPUSA as merely a political belief in view of the finding of the Communist Control Act of 1954 that:

> The Congress hereby finds and declares that the Communist Party of the United States, although purportedly a political party, is in fact an instrumentality of a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States.

There are many advantages to recommend responsible courses on communism in our schools. Imagine how fast Communist campus speakers would go out of style if they faced hard-nosed, knowledgeable students, trained to know the enemy and prepared to do academic battle with arsenals of cold, brutal facts.

Consider the advantages to students well trained in this area who, as future voters, will better appraise the qualifications of candidates for public office on an issue which concerns every village and hamlet in these United States.

How reassuring it would be to know that future U.S. representatives abroad had been trained from youth to defend the free world better by a thorough knowledge of the greatest threat to all mankind, the world Communist movement.

It is hoped that proper training of our youth in the future in the fundamentals of Communist philosophy, strategy, and tactics will equip them to recognize the Communist Party of the United States for what it is, and enable them to defend against the traps designed for them as outlined in the following program:

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT OF J. EDGAR HOOVER, DIRECTOR OF FBI, BEFORE A HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, MARCH 1965

EMPHASIS ON RECRUITMENT OF YOUTH

"Give me a child for 8 years and it will be a Bolshevist forever." These words are attributed to the prophet of world communism, Nikolai Lenin, in a speech made in 1923. Now as a voice from the grave, the Communist Party, U.S.A., a dedicated group of latter-day disciples of Lenin, acts with a determined program to recruit youth into the Communist conspiracy. Regarding our youth as a formless but pliable mass which can be shaped or molded, the Communist Party, U.S.A., has made clear its purpose and interests. The language jargon utilized is directed toward a single aim—the inculcation in young minds of a perverted theological faith in the ideals and objectives of a Communist society.

The Communist Party, U.S.A., plans to launch a recruiting drive to last from April 1, 1965, through July 1965. Emphasis will be directed toward the recruitment of Negro youth.

The party also plans to hold a training school for youth in New York City in the summer of 1965 to give intensive Marxist-Leninist orientation to at least one youth from each party district. Some of these youths will then be sent to other areas to train additional youths. In addition, certain Communist Party, U.S.A., youths will be asked to go to the South during the summer of 1965 to work with civil rights organizations.

FORMATION OF NEW YOUTH ORGANIZATION

Ever since the demise in 1957 of the Labor Youth League, the former youth organization dominated and controlled by the Communist Party, U.S.A., the establishment of another nationwide youth organization has been a goal of the party. A positive step was taken in this direction in late 1963 when Gus Hall ordered the formation of a Marxist-oriented youth organization to attract non-Communists as the first step toward their eventual recruitment into the party. The founding convention of this new youth organization was held June 19–21, 1964, in San Francisco, Calif. The name selected for the new organization was the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America, in honor of the late Dr. William E. B. DuBois, a prominent crusader for civil rights who, at the age of 93, joined the Communist Party, U.S.A.

In memorializing the late Dr. DuBois, the new organization apparently hopes to win recognition and support from both domestic and international civil rights proponents, African nationalists, and more particularly the Negro youth of the United States. Following the trend of recent years of playing down the Communist label, the new Marxist youth organization is designed to attract youth interested in peace, disarmament, civil rights, and the like.

PUBLIC APPEARANCES BY PARTY LEADERS

The increased number of public appearances by leaders of the Communist Party, U.S.A. in the last few years, whether it be in the form of press conferences, on radio programs, or on college campuses, is utilized in an effort to project the image that the party is a legitimate political party; to gain increased acceptance and respectability for the party; to generate an atmosphere of good will and understanding; and to spread Communist propaganda.

Since students constitute a primary Communist target group, party leaders in their public appearances continue to concentrate on college and university campuses throughout the country. Over the past 3 school years, party spokesmen have averaged 50 campus appearances each year. Their audiences ranged in size from an intimate 13 to a huge 4,000. The latter number heard Dorothy Healey, a member of the party's national committee, when she spoke in the stadium of the California State College at Los Angeles, Calif., on May 20, 1964. Audiences from 500 to 800 were common.

While almost all of the public appearances of party functionaries before students took place at colleges and universities, several speeches were made at secondary educational institutions.

That some success is achieved by the party in the many appearances of its leaders on college campuses is indicated by the fact that party youth clubs have been established recently at the University of Chicago and the University of California.

Skillfully imparting the Communist line with espousals paralleling Soviet views, party spokesmen made 44 appearances before college groups during the calendar year 1964.

SPEAKING ENGAGEMENTS ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES BY COMMUNIST PARTY LEADERS, CALENDAR YEAR 1964

University of California (Santa Barbara campus): Dorothy Healey, January 13, 1964.

Wayne State University: Herbert Aptheker, February 19, 1964.

Lake Forest College: David Englestein, February 19, 1964.

University of Wisconsin: Herbert Aptheker, February 21, 1964.

Santa Rosa Junior College: Albert J. Lima, February 28, 1964.

University of Wisconsin: James E. Jackson, March 1, 1964.

Yale University: Hyman Lumer, Arnold Johnson, March 15, 1964.

Upsala College: Daniel Rubin, March 16, 1964.

DePauw University: Gilbert Green, March 17, 1964.

New York University: Herbert Aptheker, April 3, 1964.

Earlham College: Herbert Aptheker, April 6, 1964.

Harvard University: Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, April 8, 1964.

Lycoming College: Arnold Johnson, April 13, 1964.

American River Junior College: Albert J. Lima, April 17, 1964.

University of New Hampshire: James E. Jackson, April 24, 1964.

Shimer College: James West, April 25, 1964.

Penn State University: Herbert Aptheker, April 29, 1964.

Rutgers University: Arnold Johnson, April 29, 1964.

College of San Mateo: Albert J. Lima, April 30, 1964.

Amherst College: Herbert Aptheker, May 4, 1964.

College of San Mateo: Albert J. Lima, May 5, 1964.

University of Las Vegas: Dorothy Healey, May 6, 1964.

Union University: Herbert Aptheker, May 8, 1964.

University of Wisconsin: Claude Lightfoot, May 10, 1964.

Brown University: Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, May 11, 1964.

Wake Forest College: George Meyers, May 13, 1964.

City College of New York: William Patterson, May 15, 1964.

Stanford University: Albert J. Lima, May 19, 1964.

California State College: Dorothy Healey, May 20, 1964.

San Jose City College: Albert J. Lima, May 28, 1964.

San Francisco State College: Henry Winston, September 28, 1964.

University of California: Henry Winston, September 28, 1964.

Reed College: Henry Winston, October 7, 1964.

Portland State College: Henry Winston, October 9, 1964.

University of Washington: Henry Winston, October 12, 1964.

University of Wisconsin: Henry Winston, October 21, 1964.

University of Hawaii: Gus Hall, October 23, 1964.

Oberlin University: Henry Winston, October 24, 1964.

University of Buffalo: Herbert Aptheker, November 13, 1964.

State University College (Cortland, N.Y.), Herbert Aptheker, November 17, 1964.

Western Reserve University: Hyman Lumer, December 3, 1964.

Syracuse University (Utica, New York branch): Herbert Aptheker, December 8, 1964.

Miami University (Oxford, Ohio): Herbert Aptheker, December 11, 1964.

University of Wisconsin: Fred Blair, December 13, 1964.

THE PHYSICIAN AND NATIONAL PROGRESS IN HEALTH

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a speech which I delivered before the American College of Osteopathic Internists, Philadelphia, Pa., September 1965:

THE PHYSICIAN AND NATIONAL PROGRESS IN HEALTH

(Speech by Congressman FOGARTY)

I am highly honored to receive this award (honorary fellowship of the American College of Osteopathic Internists) and to have an opportunity to address the members of the college on this momentous occasion. In holding your 25th annual convention, you are celebrating a quarter of a century of progress and dedicated service to humanity. You have much to be proud of and I congratulate you and wish you continued success in your important work.

It has been a momentous quarter century not only for you but for the whole field of medicine. I doubt that there has ever been a 25-year period in which there has been such intense activity in man's fight against his most ancient enemy—disease.

The most dramatic and most significant postwar development on the health scene has been the expansion of the scientific effort related to health. I do not need to describe to this audience the great advances that have been made in the science and technology of medicine. The size and scope of this effort is usually measured in terms of our total national expenditure on medical research which has increased more than twentyfold during the past 20 years—from $87 million in 1947 to about $1.8 billion in 1965. The Federal Government was, of course, a major factor in making this growth possible. I am proud of the fact that, during my 18 years as chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee responsible for this part of the Federal budget, the Congress has taken the lead in providing this country with the means for building up a unique national system for the support of the biomedical sciences. But the Federal Government cannot claim all the credit. During this same period, industry has increased its own expenditure twelvefold and support for research from the voluntary health agencies and foundations has grown about sixfold.

These figures are impressive but they do not give us a very satisfactory measure of what has really been accomplished. To appreciate what has happened we should look not at the dollars we spend but at the tremendous increase in the number of competent men and women who are now dedicating themselves to medical research, at the growth of the facilities for productive research and, above all, at the effectiveness of the work being done.

The pace at which progress is being made has been so much accelerated that it is threatening to outrun the ability of those not directly involved in a particular area of research to keep up with the knowledge being made available. I am told that the training we give young physicians now starts to become obsolescent 5 years after they finish their medical training. That alone presents a problem which should concern not only the profession but all who will sooner or later turn to it for help.

We must develop a framework for dealing realistically with this rate of obsolescence in health knowledge. I think we are going to have to consider ways for making it possible—and mandatory—for every physician to spend every 5th or 6th year of his career in formal continuing education as a means of keeping abreast of the advances in knowledge that will bear critically upon his future practice. This may seem to be a fairly drastic proposal but the problem of bringing new knowledge quickly into widespread use is too important to be left to chance or the odd-moment reading of a busy practitioner.

I do not want to belabor this point—there may be other ways of providing for the reeducation of physicians—but I do want to talk about the broader question of bridging the gap which our extensive research programs are creating between medical science and medical service.

I raised this question yesterday at the opening session of a regional forum of the National Conference on Community Health Services which is meeting here in Philadelphia this week. I want to talk about it again with you because I believe that this is one of the major problems with which we shall have to grapple in the years immediately ahead.

The problem has several aspects. First there are the obvious questions: to what extent and how quickly are the results of research applied in medical practice throughout the country? How soon does the ordinary citizen receive the benefit of new preventative, diagnostic, and therapeutic measures for whose development he—as a taxpayer—may very well have paid? To what extent does his receiving this benefit depend on where he lives or on how much he is able to pay for medical service? What are the profession and the community doing to make the best that medical science has to offer available to him?

The amount and effectiveness of the help that a patient receives should be solely dependent on the state of the art—not on the State in which he happens to live.

Today, geography is far too much a factor in determining the quality of medical service available to an individual. In large areas of this country—even in places just 100 miles from a major medical center such as Philadelphia—people do not have ready access—in a practical and realistic way—to recently developed treatments and techniques which, in some cases, could speed their recovery, minimize a disability, or even save their life. And when I say "recently developed" I am not talking about something that finished its clinical trials last month. I am not even talking about something that was done 3 years ago but was only published last month—and that seems to be far too common a pattern. I am talking about diagnostic and therapeutic procedures already in regular use in our large metropolitan centers.

I am not suggesting that every small town should have—or could effectively use—the elaborate facilities available in our large cities. I do suggest, however, that there is too long a lag before improved techniques that do not depend on elaborate and expensive facilities are applied in smaller communities. I also suggest that we do not have adequate arrangements for insuring that a patient is brought to the facilities that he may need but which do not exist where he lives.

An important step toward remedying this situation will be made possible by a bill which has already been passed by both Houses of Congress and which will become law as soon as the differences in the two versions have been ironed out. This bill, which deals specifically with heart disease, cancer and stroke and related diseases, grew out of the recommendations made by the Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke which the President appointed last year to develop a program for conquering these three major killers.

The principal feature of this bill is that it provides funds—$340 million over the next 3 years—with which the Federal Government will encourage and assist the establishment of regional cooperative arrangements among medical schools, research institutions and hospitals designed to forge a closer link between the centers of scientific and academic medicine, on the one hand, and community health services, on the other.

The bill specifies that this program must not interfere with present patterns of patient care and professional practice but it is, nonetheless, a revolutionary piece of legislation. It holds enormous promise for advancing the quality of medical service available to the people of this country. But, more importantly, it marks, I believe, the beginning of a series of steps designed to accelerate the pace of progress in medical service to match the pace of medical research.

The implementation of this dramatic piece of legislation demands your most imaginative and foresighted cooperation. Nowhere in the bill, or in the testimony in its support before the congressional committees, will you find a blueprint for this program—because there is no Federal blueprint and it is not intended that there should be one. The pattern of grants-in-aid already so well established and so successfully in the support of medical research will also be followed in this new program. Grants will be made in response to local initiative, to facilitate local planning, and to assist local execution of the plans. The bill makes this quite clear. Let me read you two extracts from its statement of purposes:

"To afford to the medical profession and the medical institutions of the Nation, through cooperative arrangements, the opportunity of making available to their patients the latest advances in the diagnosis and treatment of these diseases; and

"By these means, to improve generally the health, manpower and facilities available to the Nation in cooperation with practicing physicians, medical center officials, hospital administrators, and representatives from appropriate voluntary health agencies."

The emphasis of this program is clearly on bringing this country's proven research capability into a closer relationship with medical practice, as a resource for the practitioner and the community health services in a wide geographic area. The way in which this can be most effectively done is up to you—both as a member of the health profession and as a responsible member of your community. I expect to see a number of different plans emerge and I hope that they will compete fiercely in their efforts to outdo each other in bringing the best of medical service to the most distant and tiny settlement.

This new program will be administered by the National Institutes of Health. The decision to place responsibility for it in this highly respected branch of the Public Health Service not only emphasizes its direct link to the research community but will insure that the program is carried forward with vigor and imagination.

The heart disease, cancer, and stroke bill is just one of the many pieces of health legislation acted on by the present Congress. There has been so much legislation concerned with medical matters this year that it would be quite appropriate to call this Congress the health Congress.

No less than 26 bills concerning health and medicine have been introduced. Of these, 10 have already become public law, 5 others have passed one or both Houses, and hearings have been held on another 8. Altogether, about half of these bills will become law by the end of this session.

A number of the new programs will play important parts in bridging the gap between research and the application of its results. The Community Health Act will extend and liberalize the programs of immunization assistance, medical aid to migratory workers, and public health grants to the States. Two other acts extend and expand the program providing for mental retardation facilities and community mental health centers. A major expansion in the activities of the National Library of Medicine is also on the way which should make a substantial contribution to the difficult task of making published research results more readily accessible and more quickly available. Great progress is being made in exploiting the capabilities of computers for this purpose and we are, I think, well on the way toward making the National Library of Medicine a truly national resource. The day is coming when its outstanding collection of books and journals will be as useful to a physician in Washington State as it now is to one in Washington, D.C.

One of the major problems underlying the improvement of health services is the availability of the necessary manpower in numbers and quality equal to the tasks that lie before us.

In this area the Congress has also taken significant action. Two years ago the Congress passed the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act which provides matching grants for the construction of teaching facilities in the health professions. Amendments to this act are now before the Congress which will increase the effectiveness of this important program by providing a measure of operating support for the teaching institutions. The new bill will also set up a scholarship program to eliminate the economic barrier that has seriously limited the number and quality of students entering medical education. I have urged legislation of this kind for almost 15 years and I regard this bill as a major step forward.

But I do not think that it is enough to fully resolve the medical manpower problem. I believe that any program is inadequate if it does not enable us to draw a fairly constant proportion of the college age population into medicine and the health professions. Despite the increases in new schools that this legislation will make possible, the total student capacity will still leave a declining proportion of the college age population moving toward the critical health fields. A further major expansion of our medical teaching facilities must thus be undertaken.

The Congress has also extended the program of grants for the construction of research facilities in medical schools and other non-Federal institutions.

The growing concern over the environmental factors that affect our health is reflected in the Water Pollution Control Act; the Air Pollution Control Act; and the new Drug Control Act which this Congress has passed.

All these measures will play important roles in advancing the health of our citizens. They represent significant progress. However, we must not let satisfaction with this progress lead us to rest on our oars. We still have a long way to go.

The current legislation, in which we can take great pride, represents, in very large part, the final action on ideas that were generated many years ago. The length of time to bring them to fruition indicates how hard we must struggle to achieve progress in the health field. The future and its new problems demand new ideas—innovations and major departures from past concepts—and new struggles.

The obstacles that still stand between the present situation and the kind of national health scene to which we all aspire present a challenge which we—but especially you who are engaged in the health professions—must rise to meet.

There is another aspect of medical service which concerns me deeply and to which we must give earnest attention. This is the economic side of health care. It is one thing to have improved medical service but quite another thing to pay for it.

The rapid and dramatic increase in the costs of medical care and health services is alarming. It is alarming because it means that despite our general prosperity we are still putting some forms of medical care beyond the reach of many of our citizens. This is not a tolerable situation. I am not contending that the charges made for medical service are excessive in relation to costs, or in relation to value, but merely that they are still too often excessive in relation to ability to pay. Fear of the bill should not be the fact that keeps members of any economic group from availing themselves of medical care—particularly the preventive medical care which many a hard-pressed person now finds the most difficult to justify.

We must approach this problem realistically. There is little prospect of any substantial reduction in the rate of increase in medical care costs. Health services are clearly an uneconomic activity. They are designed to do things that could not be done before—saving lives, diminishing suffering, curing disease, in circumstances that previously made this impossible. It is often an uneconomic activity because saving a life may mean months or years of further medical care. The sharp reduction in mortality from infectious diseases means that more people live to fall victim to chronic diseases which impose heavier burdens on our health care facilities. Is it feasible—or fair—to charge the resulting costs directly to each patient?

I believe it is not fair and I know it is not feasible without the callous denial of care to some of those who need it. We must therefore face up, as a community, to the financing of medical services. The passage of the legislation establishing the medicare program is directed toward solving a small part of this problem.

Despite all the controversy, it is only a very modest program with quite restricted aims but it is a beginning—a beginning on which we can build until we achieve an effective and satisfactory solution for the larger problem.

We can, I think, view all of the new legislation which I have mentioned—and the existing programs which it complements—as parts of a broader national effort designed progressively to improve medical care and advance the health and well-being of all our citizens. The goals of these programs can be briefly summarized:

First, to provide stable, long-term support and underpinning for research, particularly against the major chronic diseases.

Second, to provide substantial Federal aid to medical education in the form of fellowships and student loans, construction grants, career support for teachers, and direct aid to the schools themselves.

Third, to improve local medical services by linking the research community more closely to the practicing community throughout the country; through the expansion of community services in mental health, mental retardation, and other fields; and through a general increase in resources for the practitioner, such as library services and diagnostic facilities.

Fourth, and sweeping in its implications, is the underpinning of the costs of medical care through social security and health insurance programs.

The need now is for fresh ideas, imaginative leadership, and a stubborn determination to make these programs work.

Let me emphasize that. We must develop new ideas and approaches to make the machinery for medical education, for research, and for service function more effectively. This is a time that calls for an attitude of constructive change on the part of medical groups as well as legislators.

You—as individuals and as members of an important professional group—must take an active part in this development. All sectors of the health profession must work together to design and guide and carry out the programs that will usher in a new era of public health in America. It is a big job. It presents a real challenge. I have every confidence that you will rise superbly to meet it.

Thank you very much for the honor you have bestowed on me tonight—and for giving me this opportunity to voice some of my concerns and hopes for the future.

ADDITIONAL AID TO VICTIMS OF HURRICANE BETSY

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining with my colleagues from Louisiana and with the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES]—Representative ROBERT E. JONES, Jr., Democrat—in introducing a comprehensive bill which will give help and assistance to the homeowners, farmers, and small businessmen, and to schools and colleges in the areas devastated by Hurricane Betsy.

During the course of the intensive hearings conducted last month in Louisiana by Congressman JONES' subcommittee, damage estimates were submitted from all over south Louisiana, Mississippi, and Florida. At that time, the splendid work of the Federal, State, and local agencies, before and after the disaster, was recounted in full.

On Tuesday last, October 5, in a talk on the floor of the House, I set out in detail the amount of aid provided by our National Government in food, drugs, medicines, the housing of refugees, the clearing of debris, the reestablishment of communications, the reopening of ports and highways, the reconstruction and renovation of public buildings and public schools, and the providing of housing through trailers, and so on.

At the same time, I pointed out the necessity for legislation which would help the small businessman, the homeowner, farmers, and the colleges and universities, particularly those operated privately or through religious institutions and not covered by insurance. This bill, Mr. Speaker, goes into those areas and gives relief where it is desperately needed.

In addition to that, we provide for a comprehensive study of flood insurance and other programs, which, when implemented, will remove the necessity for legislation of this type in the future.

Although the session is late, I am most hopeful that this legislation will be passed this week or next week. It brings hope to countless people who have suffered tremendously from the ravages of Hurricane Betsy.

I cannot find words to adequately thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] and the other members of his subcommittee, Representatives W. J. BRYAN DORN, KENNETH GRAY, HAROLD T. JOHNSON, RAY ROBERTS, ROBERT A. EVERETT, JAMES KEE, JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER, ROBERT E. SWEENEY, JAMES J. HOWARD, and PRENTISS WALKER, who spent a whole weekend in Louisiana gathering information.

I must also express my profound appreciation to Gov. Buford Ellington, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning; Mr. Elmer B. Staats, Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget; Mr. Franklin Dryden, Deputy Director of the Office of Emergency Planning; Mr. Robert Phillips, Office of Emergency Planning; Mr. Milton Semer, Deputy Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Administration; Mr. Richard Still, Acting Administrator of the Community Facilities Administration; Mr. John Baker, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture; Mr. Howard Campbell and Mr. Jack Frost of the Department of Agriculture; Mr. Richard J. Sullivan, chief counsel, House Committee on Public Works, and many other officials—Federal, State, and local—who have devoted so much of their time and effort to help our people.

MUTUAL COOPERATION FOR THE COMMON INTEREST

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, at the recent annual meetings of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, the Honorable Takeo Fukuda, Minister of Finance of Japan and Governor of the Bank and the Fund for Japan, delivered a thoughtful and comprehensive address.

His belief that "we must do our utmost to combine our efforts to manage our economies in a spirit of mutual cooperation for the common interest of prosperity for the world as a whole" is a standard to which all nations should repair.

I should like to bring the full text of his remarks to the attention of the House, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE TAKEO FUKUDA

On this occasion of the 20th annual meetings, I should like to join my fellow Governors in paying highest tribute to the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and its affiliates for their outstanding accomplishments in the development and strengthening of the economy of the free world, and for their continuing leadership in the field of international financial cooperation and economic development under the wise guidance of Mr. Schweitzer and Mr. Woods.

As economic interdependence and solidarity among nations grow ever closer, no one nation can prosper unless others also prosper. Today, the economic management of a nation cannot be insulated from that of others. Much to our satisfaction, the world economy has continued its expansive trend in the past year. However, we have to watch carefully disquieting developments in the world economy referred to in the Fund's current annual report, such as the slowing down of economic activity in several of the major countries, the balance-of-payments pressures in the two main reserve centers, the strain in the payments position of primary producing countries, and the general rise in interest rates. Even though nations may differ in their stages of economic development and have different economic problems, I believe that we must do our utmost to combine our efforts to manage our economies in a spirit of mutual cooperation for the common interest of prosperity for the world as a whole and to try to avoid stagnation and retrogression that will undermine the advantages of a system of free and multilateral trade and payments. This, I am sure, is what article I of the fund agreement stands for and, based on this very spirit, all of us should endeavor to strengthen our international cooperation and jointly search for roads to prosperity for the whole world.

Let me take this opportunity to make some remarks on the economic situation in my country. The deterioration of our balance of payments in the latter half of 1963 necessitated the adoption of corrective measures from the end of that year. The effect of the adjustment process permeated gradually, and economic activity since last fall has calmed down. The balance of payments recovered to a surplus position due mainly to an improvement in the trade account. As a result, adjustment measures were gradually removed from the end of 1964. However, recovery of business activity was slow and a recessionary mood continued to prevail. Since I took office as Finance Minister last June, I have been endeavoring to stimulate demand by adopting positive fiscal and monetary measures in order to accelerate the recovery process. Some indications of a favorable turn have already appeared, and I am confident that the Japanese economy, with its indigenous vitality and adaptability, will resume its upward trend before long.

The objective of the economic policy of my country is to realize a high level of national welfare through continued expansion. We aim to maintain a satisfactory balance of payments and a stable price level, while at the same time promoting the modernization and rationalization of every sector of our economy, and furthering social development in harmony with economic development. However, this objective cannot be realized without economic prosperity of the world as a whole and without a stable international monetary system.

Turning now to the subject of international liquidity, I highly appreciate the efforts made by the executive directors since last year to consider the question of adjusting quotas of Fund members. I am happy to say that my country has already consented to the increase in her quota. I hope that the Fund quota increases will become effective as soon as possible.

It is noteworthy that the general arrangements to borrow have functioned effectively. They were activated in the past year on two occasions for drawings by the United Kingdom, thus demonstrating their usefulness. In the light of the important role which the arrangements play in replenishing Fund's resources, I am prepared to support the renewal of these arrangements.

Also, in the past year a number of experts from 10 countries participating in the general arrangements to borrow have studied various methods by which new reserve assets can be created for future needs. I believe that the report of the study group, analyzing various aspects of the problem, has laid a good foundation for future discussions on this matter.

In the examination of international liquidity, creation of new reserve assets is the important facet of the problem, but we cannot lose sight of the importance of credit facilities and the balance-of-payments adjustment process. I should like to reiterate the important function which credit facilities play in promoting free and multilateral international trade and payments, and to stress the need for all countries to observe discipline in their balance of payments in such a way that both deficit and surplus countries will make every effort to achieve, without undue delay, balance-of-payments equilibrium. Each country quite obviously should find and adopt the policies of its own, appropriate both to external as well as essential internal objectives.

The problem of international liquidity should, I believe, be approached from the viewpoint of providing adequate liquidity to assure future expansion and prosperity of the world economy. However, I think it would be a matter of great regret if the absence of fundamental consensus about the future concerning international liquidity should lead various countries to timid management of their economic policies and, consequently, to a contraction of world economy. In this sense, I think it has become more urgent than before for countries concerned to reach a common agreement on the prospects for the international monetary system, at least on its basic points.

The present international monetary system is a tested one with a historical background. I believe the contributions it has made to the balanced growth of the world economy should be appraised highly. Therefore, should any reform become necessary in the future, it is desirable that it be undertaken gradually on a practical basis by supplementing, not supplanting, the present one. My conviction is that the most important criteria for considering the creation, if necessary, of new reserve assets in the future are compatibility with the evolution of the existing system and the contribution they will make to greater stability of the international monetary system. I think the creation of new reserve assets too closely linked with gold would not be desirable, not only because of its unfavorable impact on the present international monetary system through possible acceleration of the propensity to hold gold and the inducement to speculation in gold markets, but also because of the danger that it might lead the world economy ultimately into contraction.

Although I can understand the view that the purpose of deliberate creation of reserve assets, when necessary in the future, should be not so much for meeting indivdual balance-of-payments needs but for meeting global needs, I do not thing that global needs can really be assessed entirely separately from individual needs. In this connection, I believe that the International Monetary Fund, which has played the central role of providing credit facilities to cover individual needs, is the most appropriate institution through or by which deliberate creation of new reserve assets may be effected.

Another important problem before us is that of the promotion of economic assistance to developing countries. The way for the developing countries to raise their standards of living, is not an easy one but is attended with many difficulties. The Bank's current annual report has stated the fact that, as a result of the rapid growth of population, developing counties generally were unable to increase their per capita product faster than 2 percent even in the year 1964, when their terms of trade were remarkably improved.

The World Bank group has been increasing its financial and technical assistance to developing countries year after year. In order to make full and most effective use of assistance for economic development extended to them by the World Bank group as well as by other countries, it is of urgent significance to have coordination of assistance. I greatly appreciate the role played by various consortia and consultative groups sponsored by the Bank in this field, and I hope that the meeting of the coordination group held under the auspices of the Bank on the occasion of the current meetings will attain full success.

With regard to the question of a further replenishment of IDA resources, I support the suggestion that the executive directors should be entrusted with the further study of this question and the submission of specific proposals. I think that the countries capable of furnishing additional funds should do so in due proportion to their ability.

Japan has recently signed the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes. This Convention will help to promote an environment favorable to induce private investment to developing countries, and I hope its effectiveness will be enhanced through the participation of as many countries as possible.

I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to address a few words on the proposed Asian Development Bank, which is now in process of establishment upon the initiative of the ECAFE countries. I am firmly convinced that the establishment of a regional development bank in Asia will greatly contribute, not only to the promotion of economic development in the area, but also to worldwide prosperity in the end. The resources of the Asian Development Bank are to be mobilized not only from within the region but also from outside the region as long as the Asian character of the Bank is not impaired. I earnestly hope that this Bank will be participated in by as many developed countries outside the region as possible to help its future development, and that, in collaboration with the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank will be able to contribute as early as possible to the promotion of economic development and to the enhancement of welfare in the region.

In concluding, I confidently expect that the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and its affiliates will make best use of their wisdom and ability for the stability and the development of the world economy.

LITTLEVILLE DAM DEDICATION: ONLY DUAL PURPOSE FLOOD CONTROL AND FUTURE WATER SUPPLY PROJECT IN NEW ENGLAND

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Littleville Dam and Reservoir on the Middle Branch of the Westfield River in Huntington, Mass., was dedicated Saturday, October 10. This facility is the first dual purpose dam in New England to incorporate flood control and future municipal water supply features. As an original sponsor of the legislation in 1956 to authorize construction of this project, following the devastating hurricane-floods of August 1955, I take great pride in the role that I have played in bringing this much needed dam and reservoir to fruition.

As a supporter of the legislation to authorize the Army Corps of Engineers to incorporate future water supply features in flood control dams, I subsequently arranged conferences here in Washington in 1960 between Springfield municipal officials and the Army Engineers so that a contract could be negotiated to include a water supply guarantee for my home city of Springfield in the planning of the Littleville Dam and Reservoir. Saturday I had the distinct honor of being one of the speakers at the project dedication. During my speech, I said in part:

> As a Member of Congress who sits on the Appropriations Subcommittee for Public Works, I have been invited and have traveled to many places in this country to join in ground-breaking and dedication ceremonies of public works projects.
>
> But none have given a greater sense of satisfaction or personal pride than those I have been invited to in the New England region, and particularly, in our own locality.
>
> It has been written and proclaimed many times that the public works bill is the pork barrel bill of the Congress, that it provides taxpayers money for unneeded and wasteful programs, that it is fattened by politics, and that it is a gigantic boondoggle.
>
> The programs and projects that come from the Public Works Committee are an investment in America. They preserve our land and conserve our natural resources. They protect life and property.
>
> If it had not been for these programs, this great Nation of ours would be stripped bare by the ravages of storms, the rapaciousness of rivers, the savage winds and driving rains. It would be exposed by the ferociousness of forest fires and floods, and, sometimes, too often, by the greed of man.
>
> These projects contain the elements and enable the rivers, the rains, the mountains, the lakes and harbors to work for man and not against him, to be the friend of mankind and not his enemy.
>
> This great project we dedicate today is a splendid and telling example of what can be done to harness nature's forces in the public's interest.
>
> The devastation brought by Hurricane Diane in August 1955 caused damages and record losses in the Westfield River Basin of some $9,160,000. Additional losses in scores of millions occurred in the basins of the Chicopee and Connecticut Rivers in our area.
>
> The flood control program for New England has been designed to combat this kind of destruction. And we are moving rapidly ahead to complete the job, with such nearby projects at Conant Brook Dam and Reservoir in Monson, local protection dikes and flood walls in Chicopee Falls and Three Rivers, here at Littleville and, hopefully, the local protection project in Westfield.
>
> This Littleville project is unique in that it is the first Corp of Engineers dam and reservoir in New England that has been designed and constructed for the joint purpose of providing flood control and future water to the regional water supply.
>
> The drought of the past months made painfully clear that the Northeast and New England no longer can be confident of a never ending supply of water. We now know that we must seize every opportunity to conserve and to build our water potential. This is not always easy, and this project is proof of that.
>
> We dedicate this dam and reservoir project as a bulwark against devastation and as a protector of life and property. By this dedication we insure a healthier, happier and safer place for the people of this locality and those who live downstream in this great Connecticut River Basin.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks an editorial entitled "The Dam at Littleville" from the October 9 edition of the Springfield Union, the story of the Littleville Dam dedication printed in the Springfield Sunday Republican on October 10, and the dedication program:

[From the Springfield Union, Oct. 9, 1965]

THE DAM AT LITTLEVILLE

Dedication today of the dual-purpose Littleville Dam on the Middle Branch of the Westfield River comes at a time when its function of flood control is hardly a matter of urgency. But its companion role as an added water supply for Springfield and several communities in the Westfield River Valley would have been valuable in these past years of drought. For the future, the $7 million dam, which took the Federal Government a total of 10 years to plan, finance, and build, promises to save much hardship and expense for all these communities.

Ten years ago this month, when U.S. Representative EDWARD P. BOLAND, Democrat, and the late U.S. Representative John W. Heselton, Republican, were jointly seeking authorization for the project, the Army Corps of Engineers estimated $7.5 million in damage would have been prevented along the Westfield and Connecticut Rivers in the flood of August 1955, had the dam been in service. It was natural then to put emphasis on the flood control feature, and the two Congressmen were hopeful of getting clearance of funds in time for a start on the work by 1957. But the request, one of many for flood works in the Northeast, was knocked from pillar to post for 4 years before the initial funds were made available, and it was another year before ground was broken.

The water supply role of the Littleville Dam was the subject of some controversy in the State legislature as Springfield sought in 1961 to establish a city reservoir at Littleville. A strong move on behalf of the city of Westfield to deny such water rights to Springfield was overcome through the efforts of State Representative Bernard J. Foley, Democrat, of Springfield, and others. Now, while Springfield will be able to tap the reservoir in return for sharing dam construction cost with the Federal Government, the communities in the Westfield River Valley will be able to buy water from the reservoir if they wish. But until this city begins drawing water—and it must first construct a 15-mile pipeline—the reservoir will be available for picknicking and boating.

The Littleville Dam project has drawn abundant criticism over the years—much of it, understandably, coming from residents of the settlement of Littleville, which had to be inundated. But the forces of drought and flood can be highly destructive, and no temporary measures can control them. The memory of past flood emergencies may have dimmed, but the water shortage is still a reality. The Littleville Dam will be able to serve in either contingency.

[From the Springfield Republican, Oct. 10, 1965]

LITTLEFIELD DAM ACCLAIMED FOR BENEFIT TO LARGE AREA

Littleville Dam and Reservoir, the first dual purpose flood control dam in New England to incorporate a municipal water supply, was dedicated Saturday with officials from the Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Congress, State legislature, and Westfield Watershed Association praising the new structure.

The $7 million project, for which ground was broken 3 years ago, is located on the Middle Branch of the Westfield River in Huntington and Chester with some 1,700 acres of land associated with the complex.

REDUCE FLOOD RISKS

Acting in concert with a comprehensive system of reservoirs in the Connecticut River Valley, Littleville Dam will substantially reduce flood stages in the Westfield River Basin which suffered some $9 million in damages during the flood of 1955, and in addition, will serve as a back-up water supply for the city of Springfield.

Lt. Gen. William F. Cassidy, Chief of Engineers for the Army Corps of Engineers, keynote speaker at the dedication, called the project another monument to the true American spirit of public endeavor to serve greatest good of the greatest number of people.

PROJECT "UNIQUE"

General Cassidy called the project unique, in that "it is the first Federal reservoir in New England specially planned to conserve water for municipal use in addition to its flood control."

Littleville will provide water storage sufficient to meet the full requirements of the city of Springfield, General Cassidy said, for a period of 2½ months when it is called upon to augment present sources.

"Should the climatic conditions which produced the flood of 1955 reoccur," the general said, "Littleville alone would prevent damages well in excess of half its total cost. It contributed not only to local security, but to the benefit of people living many miles down the Westfield and the Connecticut Rivers," he added.

RECREATIONAL AREA

Col. Edward J. Ribbs, division engineer for the New England Division of the Corps, and under whose charge the dam was constructed, called the project "another in the chain of bulwarks against natural disasters," and a "beautiful, safe 1,700-acre" recreational area for Massachusetts residents.

Colonel Ribbs told of a projective economic study made by the Corps of Engineers covering the next 60 years, and said revealed the State's population will reach 13 million by that time.

The recreational needs of that population, Colonel Ribbs said, will be met in part by the area created by the Littleville project.

RATES ESTHETICALLY

Richard A. Waite, executive director of the Westfield River Watershed Association, spoke on the recreational advantages provided by the dam and reservoir in addition to its flood control functions.

Waite, commenting on the fact the dam is the first multipurpose structure constructed by the Corps of Engineers in New England, said, "We also think it should rate first esthetically, as it appeals to us as blending beautifully into this New England landscape."

Waite called attention to the people whose functions made the dam a reality.

"WONDERFUL, MARVELOUS"

Among those introduced by Waite were Philip Shutler, director of the Connecticut River Valley Flood Control Commission; Frank L'Annunziata and Spiros Manolakis of the Springfield Water Commission; Donald Weinle, Westfield city engineer, and Malcolm E. Graf, director and chief engineer for the Massachusetts Water Resources Commission.

Springfield Mayor Charles V. Ryan called the project "wonderful and marvelous," and said on behalf of the city, "We are pleased and delighted to be part of this project."

Westfield Mayor Harold J. Martin called the project a forerunner of a new and invaluable system of water storage and control, and said the "tremendous importance," of the project is realized when "you remember the ravages of the 1955 flood."

PROMISE OF FUTURE

U.S. Representative SILVIO O. CONTE said the completed dam and reservoir "marks the culmination of a longstanding dream and years of hard work."

The dedication of the complex, Representative CONTE said, fills "a promise not only to ourselves, but to our children and to the generations of the future."

Representative CONTE said the dual features of the dam, that of keeping back potential floodwaters and providing water storage, are "especially meaningful to me and in a sense, a kind of vindication because I have long felt that this kind of dual function should be a part of all such flood control dams."

BECOMES A BARGAIN

Speaking on the cost of the project, Representative CONTE said, "Had the Littleville Dam been standing in 1955, we might be $2 million ahead of ourselves today. The floods of 1955 * * * tore something like $9 million of commerce and industry out of the soil of this river basin. Compare that to the $7 million cost of this dam and this becomes a bargain. A bargain like that certainly justifies the investment we have made here," he added.

U.S. Representative EDWARD P. BOLAND, offered congratulations to all of the people who made the project a reality, especially noting the contribution made by the contractual firm which built the complex, Savin Brothers, Inc., of Bloomfield, Conn.

Representative BOLAND said to show appreciation to those who had worked "so hard and so long," on the project, the dedication should be "in the name of the U.S. Government, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and the people who made it a reality."

PROJECT IMPORTANT

State Senator George D. Hammond of Westfield represented Gov. John A. Volpe at the dedication and called the public's attention to the importance of the project.

"This dam shows we are well on the way to minimizing damage caused by floods, and the public needs to be made aware of such actions by public officials," Senator Hammond said.

Since the flood of 1955 caused $9 million damages, and the dam cost $7 million to construct, the possibility exists that in 1 year, the dam can save more in damage than it cost to build, Senator Hammond declared.

TWO BRONZE PLAQUES

Public works projects, the Senator said, need the support of the residents of the Commonwealth, and the Littleville project needs the support of the residents of the Westfield River Basin.

The dedication concluded with the unveiling of two bronze plaques, which will be affixed permanently to the water supply tower and the floodgate control.

The plaques, unveiled by Mrs. Lillie Cassidy, mother of Gen. William Cassidy, commemorate the officers of the Corps of Engineers and the date of the dedication, and list the names of the engineers in charge of construction.

1,360 FEET LONG

The dam itself consists of a rolled earth and rock slope protective barrier some 1,360 feet long and 164 feet high. The width at the crest measures 25 feet, and a dike 935 feet long is located at the east end of the dam, connected by a bridge across the spillway channel to the main structure.

The spillway is a curved concrete weir 400 feet long and the discharge channel, excavated out of solid rock, is 1,200 feet long.

The flood control outlet discharges through an 8-foot diameter tunnel through two hydraulically operated gates. The permanent supply pool will be maintained at an elevation of 518 feet above sea level, with a capacity of about 3 billion gallons.

CEMETERIES RELOCATED

During construction of the dam and reservoir, some 50 homes and two cemeteries were relocated. More than 3 miles of North Chester Road, running from Littleville to Chester and Middlefield, was relocated. That section will be covered with water when the reservoir fills.

When the dam originally was conceived, it was solely for flood protection, but was changed to incorporate its unique dual function at the instigation of Springfield water officials.

In gaining the water rights, the city agreed to accept approximately 30 percent of the cost.

FIFTEEN MILES OF PIPE

Following the official dedication ceremonies Saturday Peter Karalekas, chief water engineer of Springfield, announced the city probably would not start taking water until about 1980.

Karalekas said this would mean the pipelines would be constructed sometime early in 1976, and would consist of some 15 miles of pipe and pumping units from the dam to Granville, where the water would be incorporated into the Cobble Mountain supply.

Karalekas said the estimated daily runoff taken from Littleville will be about 15 million gallons daily.

PERMANENT POOL

The permanent pool created by the dam is estimated to cover some 275 acres of land, with a depth of about 86 feet. The width of the pool will vary from 1,200 feet about 1½ miles upstream from the dam to about 200 feet at its outer limit.

Corps of Engineers officials said "just about every type of recreation a lake can provide will be permitted at the reservoir," and Westfield Watershed authorities added plans are underway to develop the recreational facilities.

Springfield water officials said if and when the city begins to draw water from the reservoir, the State board of health will regulate the recreational activities, and swimming and boating may be prohibited.

Communities intervening between the Littleville complex and the city water filters in Granville will have the right under State permissive legislation to buy water from Springfield at cost, should they so desire.

PROGRAM DEDICATION CEREMONIES, LITTLEVILLE DAM AND RESERVOIR, WESTFIELD RIVER, HUNTINGTON, MASS., OCTOBER 9, 1965

National Anthem: 8th Air Force Band, Westover Air Force Base, CWO–3 William D. Berkly, commander.

Master of ceremonies: Joseph E. Beatty, Jr., town moderator, Huntington, Mass.

Invocation: Rev. Richard J. McIntyre, St. Thomas' Church, Huntington, Mass.

Welcome and introduction of guests: Mr. Beatty.

REMARKS

Mayor Charles V. Ryan, Jr. is serving his second term as mayor of Springfield, having been reelected in 1963 by the largest margin in city history. He entered public life in 1959 as chairman of the New Springfield committee, a nonpartisan group which successfully worked for adoption of the plan A mayor system.

The mayor is a graduate of Classical High School, Springfield, Georgetown University, and of Boston College School of Law where he was top student in the senior class. He is an attorney.

Married to the former Jean McCarthy of Springfield, they are the parents of 10 children.

Mayor Harold J. Martin of Westfield, a former newspaperman, is serving his first term in public office.

Educated in Westfield and at Niagara and Columbia Universities, his career includes work with the Springfield Union, the Associated Press and the Boston Globe, and in an editorial capacity for the General Electric Co. He is president of the Westfield Whip Manufacturing Co., Inc.

The mayor is married and has two children, Carol, a junior at New York University, and Peter, a junior high school pupil.

George D. Hammond of Westfield is serving his second term, representing the Hampden-Berkshire District. He is a member of banks and banking taxation, public service and senate rules committees.

Active in the interests of conservation, he spearheaded legislation for chemical control programs against submerged vegetation; supports retention of the beauty of Mount Greylock, and the protection of wildlife habitat.

He introduced legislation necessary to the development of the Clam River watershed project in Sandisfield. The seven-dam project would enhance recreation and control floods.

Col. Edward J. Ribbs, division engineer, New England Division, Corps of Engineers.

Congressman Edward P. Boland, Second District.

ADDRESSES

Lt. Gen. William F. Cassidy, Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, Corps of Engineers.

Congressman Silvio O. Conte, First District.

Dedication of Littleville Dam.

Benediction: Rev. Samuel R. McLure, the United Church, Chester, Mass.

Closing selections: 8th Air Force Band.

UNITED ITALIAN-AMERICAN SOCIETIES AND CLUBS OF GREATER SPRINGFIELD, MASS., OBSERVE COLUMBUS DAY

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on the 12th of October 1492, a lone cannon shot anounced to the world that land had been sighted, and the long, stormy voyage of the Genoese mariner, Christopher Columbus, was climaxed with the earthshaking discovery of the New World.

Each year we celebrate the anniversary of this historic event, an event of such tremendous magnitude that some have singled out Columbus as the one man in modern history to whom the world is most indebted.

During the 15th century, when the vision of Columbus was about to change the course of history, the picture of western civilization was not encouraging. The great Christian domain seemed to be shrinking and dividing into hostile factions. There had been few important advances in science for many decades. The universities which had once given such promise were decreasing in influence as their courses of instruction became stereotyped and barren. Cynicism, decay, and a desire to escape reality were evident in western man.

Contrasted against this background was the inquisitive mind, the determined, daring, and courageous spirit of Columbus. Every schoolchild knows the long story of frustration and ridicule which he was forced to endure before finally meeting success.

But the fact that he did succeed broadened the perspective of humanity. His vision gave the impetus to others to seek new paths and open new windows to the vista of knowledge. He not only discovered a new continent, he ushered in the era of modern civilization.

Columbus battled great odds with remarkable determination. The result was a dramatic alteration in the earth's history. All Americans and the peoples of all the family of nations are deeply indebted to this man. It is fitting that we should pay him tribute.

Mr. Speaker, tonight in my home city of Springfield, Mass., the United Italian-American Societies and Clubs, will pay tribute to Christopher Columbus during a banquet at the Kimball Towers. I have sent the following telegram and ask that it be included with my remarks in the Record:

> Mr. Pasquale Romano,
> *Invitation Chairman, United Italian-American Societies and Clubs Columbus Day Dinner, Kimball Towers, Springfield, Mass.:*
>
> Because Congress is meeting today, I deeply regret I cannot be personally present. I had looked forward to joining with you again this year in this outstanding tribute to the great explorer and navigator, Christopher Columbus. Because of the long, devoted and active interest of Italian Americans in immigration, I had planned to personally present to your honorary chairman, Father Peter Toretta, one of the pens President Johnson used in signing the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965. It was given to me by the President the day he signed the bill at the base of the Statue of Liberty on October 3, 1965. I will present it to Father Peter at a later date.
>
> My best wishes for a successful event and convey my congratulations to the scholarship winners. The combined Italian-American societies and clubs deserve the praise of our community for this continuing interest in the youth of the area.
>
> Edward P. Boland,
> *Member of Congress.*

BEST WISHES FOR A SPEEDY RECOVERY FOR THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Sickles] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, for the duration of his stay at the Bethesda Naval Hospital, President Johnson becomes, you might say, a temporary constituent of mine.

Another of my constituents, Mr. William Prescott Allen, publisher of the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Tribune, has welcomed President Johnson to Bethesda in a front page editorial in the October 8 issue of his fine community publication. At the same time, he has offered a suggestion which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues. His editorial, the sentiments of which I know we all share, follows:

> GET WELL, MR. PRESIDENT
>
> The White House on Tuesday announced that President Lyndon B. Johnson would enter the Bethesda Naval Medical Center for removal of his gall bladder.
>
> For the next 10 days or 2 weeks President Johnson will be a fellow Bethesdan. While we certainly welcome him, we regret the unfortunate circumstances which bring him here.
>
> We know that the people of Montgomery County, regardless of political attraction, will want to wish the President a speedy recovery from his surgery.
>
> We have a suggestion: Thousands of cars travel the Rockville Pike in front of the Bethesda Naval Hospital every day. When we go by, for the duration of the President's stay there, we will turn on our lights in the daytime simply as a silent expression of good luck, Mr. President. Get well soon.
>
> We hope our fellow motorists will follow suit.

JUSTICE AND RESPONSIBILITY TOWARD PANAMA

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Farnsley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, in his report to the people a few days ago on the progress of negotiations between Panama and the United States, President Johnson reminded us that when these negotiations began more than a year ago he had instructed U.S. representatives to seek solutions which would be fair and just for the people of both countries. He said that it should make no difference that the United States is big and Panama is small. He said, in effect, that as far as the United States is concerned, might does not make right.

A distinguished newspaper, the Louisville Courier-Journal, has recently endorsed President Johnson's philosophy. In an excellent editorial, the Courier-Journal observed:

> Simple justice will be served by the new treaty. And the magnanimity with which the United States is treating tiny Panama will remove one of the most inflammatory weapons in the arsenal of Yankee-baiters throughout Latin America and the world.

In truth, the current negotiations between Panama and the United States are conclusive proof that the age of gunboat diplomacy is gone forever. Our enemies abroad, who are fond of accusing us of their own sins, will be hard put to explain the reality of American actions with the false image they try so hard to create.

The Courier-Journal eloquently states the reasons why, in our own national interests, we should support the course of justice and magnanimity which President Johnson has charted. With permission granted I include that editorial in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Sept. 28, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT MOVES TO UNDO AN OLD WRONG TO PANAMA

The general welcome accorded by Congress to President Johnson's outline of a new treaty with Panama is heartening evidence, in these changing times, that the United States is prepared to correct if not to admit its mistakes of the past.

Negotiations, under way for some 18 months, are still not complete. But the new treaty will recognize Panama's sovereignty over the 10-mile-wide Canal Zone linking the Atlantic and the Pacific—sovereignty reserved by the United States "in perpetuity" under the 1903 pact. Panama will share in the administration, management, operations, and profits of the canal. And discrimination in pay and benefits to Panamanian employees in the Canal Zone, long a sore point, is expected to end under the President's pledge to "do what is fair and what is right."

Simple justice will be served by the new treaty. And the magnanimity with which the United States is treating tiny Panama will remove one of the most inflammatory weapons in the arsenal of Yankee-baiters throughout Latin America and the world.

For the historic truth is that the United States by sheer force "took the isthmus," as Theodore Roosevelt himself openly boasted, helped create a new republic from what had been Colombia, then "negotiated" a treaty in the best imperialistic tradition. In the days of gunboat diplomacy every other great power was behaving in similar fashion in almost every corner of the world.

A LONG TIME AGO

But that was two world wars and a lot of lesser ones ago. And though we did do handsomely by the Panamanians, by ourselves, and by the world, in building and operating the great canal, the manifest imperialism of its origin and of our claim to perpetual sovereignty over territory cutting athwart an independent small nation long ago, with the rise of new and more decent concepts of international behavior, made the U.S. posture in Panama, a red-flag symbol of great power oppression of the small.

Twice in the past we have renegotiated upward the rental we pay for the canal. And in 1959 President Eisenhower in effect changed the terms of the old treaty by directing that Panama's flag be flown alongside our own within the zone—disputes over which led to the violence of January 1964. Two international commissions subsequently absolved the United States of the "aggression" hotly charged by Panama at the time, the current negotiations began—and President Johnson gave new leverage to our negotiators by initiating exploration of possibilities for a new canal across Colombia, Nicaragua-Costa Rica, and Panama itself.

That exploration is continuing. So, too, is the spadework on military base rights and a status-of-forces agreement such as those we have now in Korea, Japan, and elsewhere And much needs to be done, as well as we can do it in dealing with a sovereign nation, to insure that all Panamanians and not just a few ruling families will be the beneficiaries of the new arrangement.

But we have already committed ourselves to undoing an ancient wrong, to making the Panama Canal a partnership by agreement, not a fief by imperial power. It is a new day for us and for our relations with Latin America.

CORRELATION BETWEEN STREET LIGHTING AND CRIME

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNSLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, it has long been my opinion that there is a direct correlation between street lighting and crime.

I would like to include in the RECORD a copy of a memorandum that was prepared at my request by the Library of Congress concerning this correlation:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C.

To: Hon. CHARLES P. FARNSLEY.

From: Education and Public Welfare Division.

Subject: Correlation between street lighting and crime.

In answer to your inquiry concerning the correlation between adequate street lighting and crime, we submit the following data.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CRIMES AND DARKNESS

Twelve times as many crimes of violence are committed at night as in the daytime. Major crimes that occur at night cost the Nation about $20 billion every year.

J. Edgar Hoover has said, "It is axiomatic that darkness is an ally to crime. The thief, the arsonist, the rapist, the peepingtom and all other perverse individuals often depend on darkness to cloak their misdeed and conceal their identities." (A Brighter Las Vegas, Las Vegas Sun, Jan. 10, 1965.)

In Salt Lake City over 95 percent of all aggravated assaults take place at night. In Minneapolis 92 percent of the burglaries occur after dark. In Pittsburgh 85 percent of the stolen cars are taken at night. (Don Murray, "How Bright Lights Reduce Crime," Coronet, February 1960.)

STREET LIGHTING AND CRIME RATES

The data below was taken from studies made of the number of crimes committed before and after the installation of adequate street lights.

Gary, Ind.: More than 5,000 new lights were installed along every mile of the Gary, Ind., streets. As a result, the number of criminal assaults reported declined more than 70 percent and robberies more than 60 percent. This decrease occurred in spite of a 27 percent increase in the population of Gary during the period (1953–55) when the lights were installed (Coronet, February 1960, p. 33).

McPherson, Kans.: In a comprehensive street lighting effort, officials in McPherson installed a light for every 2½ homes in the residential area. The project resulted in a sixfold increase in brightness. The incidence of nighttime prowling, window peeping, and burglary in residential areas was reduced 92 percent (Don Murray, "How Bright Lights Reduce Crime," Coronet, Fedruary 1960, p. 32).

New York City: After trying to reduce crime by saturating a high-crime area with plainclothesmen, authorities in New York City ordered an extensive street lighting program of the 111-block area. Crime statistics for the 3-month period (May–July 1958) after the installation of the new lights revealed a 71-percent reduction in the number of crimes reported (Hyman Goldberg, "Crimes of Darkness," Cosmopolitan, April 1959, p. 60–65). Over the next 2 years, the incidence of murder, assault and rape dropped 49 percent in these districts, and juvenile complaints declined 30 percent ("Lighting Can Cut Crime," the American City, May 1964, p. 131).

Chattanooga, Tenn.: The relighting of a 12-block district brought about a reduction of more than 70 percent in the major crimes committed (Coronet, February 1960, p. 32).

Cleveland, Ohio: In 1949, officials in Cleveland began a comprehensive program to improve street lighting. When one-third of the lights had been installed, a check of crime statistics showed that the number of assaults had dropped by one-third. Purse snatching had been cut 78 percent, and the incidence of other night crimes was down 17 percent (the American City, May 1964, p. 131).

Flint, Mich.: In the downtown area of Flint 60 percent fewer felonies were committed following a street lighting program (Las Vegas Sun, Jan. 10, 1965).

Indianapolis: In Indianapolis, 1,000 new lights are installed each year. Crime and traffic accident reports are used to pinpoint those streets most in need of new lights. In 1960, the year after new lights were installed on certain streets, there was a 60-percent reduction of nighttime crimes in this area ("Planned Light Prevents Crime and Reduces Accidents," the American City, March 1963, pp. 125–126).

STREET LIGHTING AND ACCIDENT RATES

In many of the cities experiencing lower crime rates as a result of increased lighting, a drop in the number of traffic accidents was also noted.

Nashville, Tenn.: The night traffic accident rate was cut from 40 to 29 percent, after a lighting program, despite a 50-percent increase in motor vehicle registration over the same period ("A Brighter Las Vegas," Las Vegas Sun, Jan. 10, 1965).

Indianapolis, Ind.: A greatly increased budget for new lights in the city was followed by a decrease of 54 percent in night traffic accidents despite an annual increase of 4 percent in traffic flow (the American City, March 1963, pp. 125–126).

Hartford, Conn.: The reduced number of traffic accidents resulting from improved lighting led to the lowering of insurance rates by 8 percent ("Modern Lighting for $1 a Year," the American City, August 1964, p. 121).

Chicago, Ill.: Chicago's Northwest Expressway is continuously lighted over its 16-mile length. The traffic fatality rate on this highway was 0.74 per 100 million vehicle miles in 1961, as compared with a national average of 2.3 deaths per 100 million vehicle miles (the American City, September 1963, p. 128).

Virginia: Officials of the Virginia Department of Highways have reported a study of accidents at nine locations on Virginia highways before and after the installation of roadway lighting. They found that the number of traffic accidents decreased 38 percent and traffic fatalities dropped 90 percent at these locations. The lights were installed at various times between 1953 and 1960 ("Lighting Cuts Accidents on Virginia Highways," the American City, March 1964, p. 133).

According to J. Parker Heck, education director, street and highway safety lighting bureau, fewer than 100 of the more than 18,000 incorporated towns and cities in the United States meet minimum lighting code standards prescribed by the American Standards Association ("Lighting Can Cut Crime," the American City, May 1964, p. 131). The major obstacle cited is cost, though it has been stated that street lighting is 20 percent cheaper per unit of light than it was before World War II. New York City officials found that each of the new lights installed there uses $9 less electricity per year than the type previously in operation.

The police chief of Gary, Ind., justifies such expenditures this way, "A good street light is as valuable as a good policeman, and a lot cheaper" ("Lighting Can Cut Crime," the American City, May 1964, p. 131).

Speaking at the Community Lighting Conference, October 29–30, 1962, John E. Ingersoll, assistant director, Field Service Division, International Association of Chiefs of Police, made the following statement:

"It is the considered opinion of many responsible law enforcement officials that well conceived and developed street-lighting programs have decidedly beneficial effects on crime and traffic conditions. * * * Most crimes are committed at night. Many crimes are more easily perpetrated under the cover of darkness, and certainly darkness makes identification of criminals more difficult. This is especially true in cases of burglary and many street crimes such as strong-arm robberies, purse snatching, theft of auto accessories and auto theft itself. In these crimes, the black of the night is the criminal's best friend. Most police chiefs would welcome some way to minimize the effects of darkness. Many of our problems would then be solved. Because we obviously cannot completely eradicate darkness, then we must look for ways to minimize its dangers to public safety. We must learn more * * * about the effective use of artificial light."

INFORMATION ON COSTS OF STREET LIGHTING PROGRAMS

The many variables involved make it difficult to give a cost estimate for improving street lighting in a city or a nation. The economics division has contacted the Edison Electric Institute about this problem and has given us the following information:

Although a great deal of interest has been shown in improving street lighting in many communities of the Nation, we have been unable to find any estimates of total cost of a nationwide street lighting program. The Edison Electric Institute in a letter to our economics division, dated March 19, 1965, stated on this subject:

"So much depends on the existing local conditions that such an estimate if it were to have a semblance of validity would have to be made for each individual community. For example, the present level of street lighting intensity varies great not only between cities, but also between areas in the same city. There is also a wide variation in the type and cost of fixtures used to obtain the same level of illumination. Some communities own all the street lighting equipment and contract with the utility for electricity and also inspection and maintenance. Others only buy electricity. In still others the utility charges include provision for ownership of some or all of the equipment as well as inspection, maintenance, and electricity."

The most basic source on this subject we have been able to locate is the "Street Lighting Manual," issued by the Edison Electric Institute in 1963. This manual provides the following information which gives some indication of the magnitude of the problem:

"Only in recent years have case histories provided proof positive that proper street lighting can cut nighttime fatalities by 50 percent. For the entire Nation, this means a saving of 20,000 lives annually, plus an economic saving estimated to be $2 billion per year. The fact is that a small percentage of the Nation's streets and highways are lighted in accordance with ASA recommended standards. In downtown streets, despite the proved benefits and many improvements since 1945, not more than 15 percent are adequately lighted according to a recent study. In residential areas, the percentage of streets meeting ASA practices is about one-tenth of 1 percent. The Nation's great new system of highways is unlighted, except at toll plazas, occasional interchanges, and a notable stretch of highways in Connecticut."

In connection with the material on crime and street lighting some data on the cost in specific areas was gathered, as follows:

Las Vegas: 3,000 street lights to be installed on 73 miles of streets. Cost estimated to be $1.5 to $2 million ("Ambitious Lighting Program," Las Vegas Sun, Jan. 3, 1965).

St. Louis, Mo.: 1,180 new mercury-vapor fixture, $807,790 (the American City, July 1964: 106).

Hattiesburg, Miss.: 117 units, $50,000 (the American City, July 1964: 104).

Salt Lake City: 70 fluorescent units, $97,000 (the American City, March 1964: 131–3).

Saginaw, Mich.: $404,000 investment, 481 new units, 421 miles of street (the American City, October 1964: 126).

Seattle, Wash.: 24,000 new fixtures to bring 1,225 miles of residential streets up to IES standards. Cost of project $4 million (the American City, January 1965: 117).

New York City: 111 square blocks; $500,000 to buy and install new equipment; $9 less electricity to operate each year (Don Murray, "How Bright Lights Reduce Crime," Coronet, February 1960: 29–33).

If we can be of any further help to you in this matter please contact us. We would be most happy to discuss the matter with you at any time.

COLUMBUS DAY—THE DISCOVERY OF AMERICA

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Italian people on the commemoration this day of their great forebear, Christopher Columbus. These great people, of whom a large number are resident within my district, I consider amongst the finest citizens that I represent.

Although I am not a student of medieval cartography, there is no doubt in my mind that Christopher Columbus, despite the aspersions cast on his achievements this week by Yale University, did genuinely discover America. Yale, as you know, came up with a map that it claims was drawn about 1440, more than a half century before Columbus' feat. If it is an authentic map, it does indeed prove that the Norwegians knew about the island of Greenland and about North America itself. But have we not a right to be suspicious of this document since Yale will not tell us how it was acquired and where it came from?

More significant frauds than this, Mr. Speaker, have been perpetrated against the savants of the world; and to my mind immediately come the cases of the Piltdown Man and the protocols of the Elders of Zion. I do not intend to desecrate a scholarship, but I do say that Yale must be much more persuasive before I believe anyone before Christopher Columbus deserves the credit for discovering the New World.

And on this day, which incidentally happens to be Columbus Day, let me pay homage to the great discoverer and express my admiration of the Italian people of which he was a part.

May I close with the observation that if it was Mr. Erickson and not Signor Columbus who first visited our shores, he was certainly slow on the uptake. When Columbus discovered America, he understood it was worth doing something about. For truth's sake, I urge Yale to study its map a little further before it seeks to rewrite this magnificent chapter of history.

FARM BILL WILL HAVE FAR-REACHING EFFECT ON PROBLEMS OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, more than 7 months ago, the wheat subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, began the hearings which have resulted in H.R. 9811 passed by the House Friday.

I am proud to have been chairman of this subcommittee. As a result of the many hours and days and weeks of work, this House has passed a farm bill that will have far-reaching effect on the problems of agriculture. It is most gratifying to have taken part in this work for the benefit of the Nation's farmers and the national economy.

During our hearings, the subcommittee heard from all segments of the wheat industry from farmers to bakers. And we heard time and again of the need for better income now for wheat farmers, and the opportunity for increasing that income in the future.

This legislation, a distillation in a conference committee of the bills passed by the House and the Senate, will meet both of those goals.

It will bring an immediate increase in wheat farmers income through support of domestic production at 100 percent of parity.

And it offers a chance for increased income in the years to come through the probability that wheat priced to meet foreign competition will give farmers a bigger share of the world market.

Experience has shown that there is little chance for expansion of the domestic market. Although the population of the Nation is growing, the consumption of wheat has remained fairly stable. Our fabulous economy has enabled most Americans to live high on the hog, and that—let us face it—means most families have beefsteak on the table instead of extra slices of bread.

The only logical place to look for expansion is in world markets, where millions of people are ready to make the shift from low-protein diets into wheat foods. And where other millions are hard put to find enough food of any kind.

This legislation will help meet that market expansion when it happens.

As the wheat bill passed the House originally, it called for price support for domestic food uses at or near 100 percent of parity. That support would have been made up of a price-support loan set by taking into consideration the world price and the feeding value of wheat in relation to feed grains plus a domestic marketing certificate valued at the difference between the loan rate and 100 percent of parity.

The House bill authorized the use of export certificates as needed to facilitate exports and benefit farm income.

The Senate required a blend price at the rate of $1.90 per bushel on the projected yield of the farm. This would have been made up of a price-support loan at the world price, plus domestic marketing certificates plus proceeds from export certificates plus diversion payments to bring the total support to the $1.90 figure.

These, then, were the major differences between the House and Senate bills as they were considered by the conference committee. They boil down to this: A blended rate for all wheat in the Senate bill; and parity support for domestic wheat and world-price support for export wheat in the House bill.

In international negotiations, the United States is constantly faced with charges that it supports its wheat prices at a high rate, and dumps grain on the world market through its export subsidy. This charge helps create a barrier to trade expansion.

The Senate bill would have left the United States open to this charge. The House bill belied those charges through its support at world levels for export wheat and its high support on only that portion of the year's production which moves in domestic markets.

Any expansion of the U.S. share of the world wheat market will benefit farmers directly. Such an expansion would probably require an increase in production, most likely through a larger national allotment.

With wheat grown for export supported only at the world level, increased world demand could be passed on to the farmer immediately. His allotment could be increased without a resulting increase in support prices.

With all wheat supported at a high rate, as in the Senate bill, any increase in the acreage allotment would require high support for the production on the added acreage. This would also result in a continued high export subsidy payment. The added costs of increasing the allotment would most likely stop any plans for increasing it.

Thus, when the conference committee began its study of the two bills, they kept in mind that farm income needs to be increased now, and it needs to be increased more in the future through more sales on the world market.

The resulting wheat legislation answers these needs. It will enable American farmers to produce for export, and it helps farm income now. This is what the conference report provides: For 1966, price support through a nonrecourse loan will be available to cooperators at $1.25 a bushel, national average. In addition, for each cooperating producer's share of the domestic market, he will receive a certificate to bring his total return on that domestic share to full parity as of the beginning of the marketing year July 1, 1966. In addition, any net proceeds from the sale of export certificates will be paid to the cooperators on prorata basis.

There has been a great deal of confusion about what this provision really means. As chairman of the Wheat Subcommittee, I feel it is my duty to help clarify this situation.

First, and this is most important, there is no blend price guarantee in this bill. The conferees deliberately avoided the inclusion of a blend price concept. We do not know what the average rate per bushel to the cooperating producer will be for his 1966 crop, because we do not know what parity will be as of next July 1 when the Secretary must determine the value of the domestic certificate. We were advised by Department of Agriculture technicians that it was their best estimate that it would be somewhere within the $2.50 to $2.60 range. Obviously, anyone reading the language approved by the conference should see that this is clear in specifying what I have said above. Unfortunately there has been some misinformation concerning this feature. There was discussion in terms of $1.845 as an "average price." What was meant and what should have been said was that based on wheat parity for August of $2.57, there was an average return required in the bill of $1.845. Based on our current parity—that of September—this average return would be $1.839. But it is clear that as parity changes between now and next July 1, this average will also change.

After 1966 whenever the national average allotment is below 50 million acres, using the terms most familiar to farmers, or more technically, when the diversion factor is greater than 10 percent, the Secretary is directed under the wheat title to insure a return to producers equal to that in 1966. If the diversion factor is less than 10 percent in any year after 1966, there is no requirement for relating 1966 average returns to cooperating producers. Instead, the Secretary will continue to establish the value of the domestic certificate at or near full parity and the value of the loan to cooperating producers at the world market price, taking into consideration the feed equivalent value of wheat.

This carries out the purpose of the conferees in increasing farm income for 1966. It also takes into account the opportunities for an expansion of acreage and, in effect, opens the door for that expansion if supply and demand considerations warrant it.

The wheat title of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 has a number of provisions that will benefit the wheat farmer and the Nation. Among them are:

First. Marketing quotas are suspended while the program is in effect.

Second. Beginning in 1967, computation of State, county, and farm wheat allotments is simplified. Each will be computed on the basis of the preceding year's allotment instead of on the basis of 5- and 10-year history. It will not significantly change the present acreage relationships between States, counties, and farms, and will reflect the increases made in small farm allotments under existing law. For 1966, State, county, and farm allotments are computed under the law existing before passage of the law and will remain in effect.

Third. Projected yields established for each farm for computing program benefits will be indicative of the yield per acre expected for each farm using current cultural practices and normal weather conditions.

Fourth. Producers become eligible for price support by planting within their wheat allotments on all farms in which they have an interest, maintaining on participating farms the normal acreage of conserving crops, and devoting to conservation uses the acreages they divert from wheat.

Fifth. Diversion payments are authorized on additional voluntary diversion up to the larger of (a) 50 percent of the farm allotment or (b) sufficient acreage to bring the total diversion to 25 acres. The payment rate would be not more than 50 percent of the county loan rate times the farm projected yield.

Sixth. Domestic marketing certificates will be issued to producers to cover estimated domestic food use but not less than 500 million bushels a year.

Seventh. Wheat with domestic certificates will be supported at 100 percent of parity, or as near as practicable. For 1966, wheat accompanied by domestic certificates will be supported at 100 percent of parity.

Eighth. Wheat not accompanied by certificates will be supported through loans at a level based on competitive world prices and the feeding value of wheat in relation to feed grains. For 1966, the national average price-support loan level will not be less than $1.25 per bushel.

Ninth. The price of domestic certificates sold by Commodity Credit Corporation to domestic food processors of wheat will be the difference between the national average loan level and $2 a bushel.

Tenth. Authority for export certificates is continued. Exporters will be required to purchase export certificates. and the cost of such certificates to exporters will be determined daily. At the end of the marketing year, the proceeds from export certificates, minus export subsidy costs, will be distributed to eligible producers on a pro rata basis.

Eleventh. Producers can plant feed grains on their wheat allotments and wheat on their feed grain permitted acres as in 1965, if they so desire. Wheat can also be planted on oat-rye base acreage, however, an adjustment may be made to allow for the difference in feed units produced per acre.

Twelfth. Minimum price of CCC wheat for resale is not changed.

Thirteenth. Authority is included to exempt flour second clears not used for human consumption from the marketing certificate requirement.

Fourteenth. Provision is included to give the same program benefits to producers who are prevented from planting wheat because of natural disasters as they would have received if they had planted provided the land is not planted to any other income-producing crop.

Fifteenth. Authority is given, under certain conditions, to allow planting of diverted acreage to the production of guar, sesame, safflower, sunflower, castor beans, mustard seed, flax, crambe, and plantago ovato at reduced payment rates.

Sixteenth. Producers who have planted not less than 90 percent of the wheat acreage needed in order to earn the full amount of certificates will be considered as having planted the necessary number of acres.

Seventeenth. Authority is given to adjust or withhold certificates on farms where undesirable wheat varieties are planted.

DICKEY-LINCOLN SCHOOL PROJECT

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, recently the House by a rollcall vote referred the $300 million Dickey-Lincoln School project back to the Corps of Engineers for further study. The majority of the Members voting felt that there were many unanswered questions concerning this project, and 20 of the 25 Congressmen from the New England region supported my motion for this further study. This would certainly appear to indicate that, as of the moment, these Representatives feel the project would not be good for that area. During the course of debate on the subject I stated that not only would it not be good for New England but, additionally, that it would have adverse effects on the economy of other parts of the Nation. Since that time I have accumulated some statistics which further support this position and which may be of interest to the membership.

First. Let us take the effects on steel production first. This Federal project according to my estimates would use about 11,000 tons of steel since it would be mostly an earthen dam. But its equivalent—a conventional or nuclear thermal electric plant would consume considerably more steel and this is what has been proposed by the electric industry in that region. A conventional thermal electric plant would use about 22,000 tons of steel and a nuclear plant would use 16,500 tons—both plants being in the 750,000-kilowatt range. So it is clear that the construction of this plant would have detrimental effects on the steel industry since it would use only two-thirds of the steel required for a nuclear equivalent and only one-half of that required for a conventional electric generating station.

Second. In the instance of the coal industry, in 1 year a 750,000-kilowatt conventional electric plant would consume 1,750,000 tons of coal—at $10 a ton this means some $17,500,000 of income for a depressed area and industry. It is interesting to note in this regard that the 1964 coal consumption by New England region electric companies amounted to 8.3 million tons; at a cost of $10 a ton this equaled $83 million to the coal industry.

Third. What about the hard-pressed railroad industry? Estimates indicate that construction of this Dickey-Lincoln School project would mean an annual loss in revenue of more than $1 million in freight to the struggling east coast lines.

Fourth. What of the effects on electrical construction workers in the New England area? Estimates, based on the last large hydroelectric plant in that region—and that was more than a decade ago since they are no longer considered an up-to-date source of power—indicate that roughly the Lincoln School-Dickey job would produce about 340,000 man-hours of work—electrical construction work only. Figures based on the most recently completed 500,000-kilowatt conventional plant in the area indicate that it consumed 300,000 man-hours of electrical construction work. Now the construction of a new 750,000-kilowatt conventional plant would then mean some 450,000 man-hours of work for the electrical construction workers. Once again the private companies plan comes out ahead in terms of benefit to the region.

Fifth. Plants built, under construction or planned in the New England area, total 7,535,000 kilowatts between this year and 1972. This tremendous expansion program will add 40 percent to the electric capacity of this area and it will be low-cost, high-efficiency power sources. The construction program will mean the expenditure of hundreds of millions of private capital in this region and will create thousands of man-hours of work in the electrical construction industry, in steel, in coal, and the railroads.

Now the most important factor to keep in mind is that while these companies are doing all of these things there will be no expense to the Government and they will produce power at a lower cost than the Dickey project will be able to do in the midseventies. All of this only serves to confirm the recent judgment of the House in requiring further study of this outmoded project.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Hagan of Georgia (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. Culver, for October 16–November 10, on account of official business.

Mr. Grider (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. Wolff (at the request of Mr. Gray), for Wednesday, October 13, 1965, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Moore (at the request of Mr. Andrews of North Dakota), for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Ashbrook (at the request of Mr. Andrews of North Dakota), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Gross (at the request of Mr. Andrews of North Dakota), for 30 minutes, on October 18; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Hall (at the request of Mr. Andrews of North Dakota), for 30 minutes, on October 18; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Cooley during general debate on the sugar bill and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Langen during his remarks in the Committee of the Whole on the sugar bill and to include a set of statistics in connection with his statement.

Mr. Rosenthal.

Mr. Martin of Alabama.

Mr. Irwin.

Mrs. May and to include extraneous matter and tables in her remarks today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Krebs) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Evins of Tennessee.

Mr. Wolff.

Mr. Minish.

Mr. Rodino.

Mr. Annunzio.

Mr. Stalbaum.

Mr. William D. Ford.

Mr. Hanley.

Mr. St. Onge in two instances.

Mr. Schmidhauser.

Mr. Krebs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1516. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in federally owned buildings for periods not to exceed 3 years, and for other purposes;

S. 1715. An act to extend the penalty for assault on a police officer in the District of Columbia to assaults on employees of penal and correctional institutions and places of confinement of juveniles of the District of Columbia; and

S. 1719. An act to authorize compensation for overtime work performed by officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, and the White House Police force, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 13, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1670. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting texts of ILO Convention (No. 120) concerning hygiene in commerce and offices, and ILO Convention (No. 121) concerning benefits in the case of employment injury, adopted by the International Labor Conference at its 48th session, at Geneva, on July 8, 1964 (H. Doc. No. 303); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1671. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting notification of the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain additional facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1758. An act to provide for the right of persons to be represented in matters before Federal agencies; with amendment (Rept. No. 1141). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 516. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), to provide that eight members of such Commission shall be appointed by the President, to provide that such Commission shall not terminate prior to December 31, 1966, and to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of such joint resolution; with amendment (Rept. No. 1145). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5493. A bill to provide that the flag of the United States of America may be flown for 24 hours of each day in Lexington, Mass.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1146). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 571. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning October 25 in each year as National Parkinson Week; with amendment (Rept. No. 1147). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 12. Joint resolution to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day at the grave of Capt. William Driver in Nashville, Tenn.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1148). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3993. A bill to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone; without amendment (Rept. No. 1155). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 5026. A bill to authorize the Burt County Bridge Commission, a public body politic and corporate in the county of Burt and State of Nebraska, to refund the outstanding revenue bonds of said Burt County Bridge Commission heretofore issued to finance the cost of the construction of a bridge, together with the necessary approaches and appurtenances therefor, from a point located in the city of Decatur, Burt County, Nebr., across the Missouri River to a point located in Monona County, Iowa; with amendment (Rept. No. 1156). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 337. An act for the relief of F. F. Hintze; without amendment (Rept. No. 1137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2349. A bill for the relief of Robert Dean Ward; with amendment (Rept. No. 1138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.H. 3500. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emilie Boulay; without amendment (Rept. No. 1139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8353. A bill for the relief of Becky Jo and Charles R. Smith; with amendment (Rept. No. 1140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 374. An act for the relief of Dr. Guillermo Castrillo (Fernandez); without amendment (Rept. No. 1142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1647. An act for the relief of Kim Sung Jin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1143). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2039. An act for the relief of Ken Allen Keene (Yasuo Tsukikawa); without amendment (Rept. No. 1144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 619. An act for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli; with amendment (Rept. No. 1149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3236. A bill for the relief of Louis Shchuchinski; without amendment (Rept. No. 1150). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6112. A bill for the relief of David Glenn Barker (Jai Yul Sung) and Richard Paul Barker (Pil Su Park); without amendment (Rept. No. 1151). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6728. A bill for the relief of Morris L. Kaiden; without amendment (Rept. No. 1152). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6729. A bill for the relief of Vivian Cohen Kaiden; without amendment (Rept. No. 1153). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MacGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9442. A bill for the relief of Ki Sook Jun; without amendment (Rept. No. 1154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 11532. A bill to provide a program of Federal assistance to elementary schools throughout the Nation to improve educational opportunities through provision for the services of child development specialists and to provide a program of Federal assistance for the training of such elementary school personnel in the institutions of higher education, and for other educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 11533. A bill to deduct from net tonage spaces used for slop oil on board vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 11534. A bill making Columbus Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 11535. A bill to establish a system for the sharing of certain Federal tax receipts with the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 11536. A bill to require Members of Congress, certain other officers and employees of the United States, and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in securities and commodities; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 11537. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to remove certain abandoned ships from the Potomac River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHITE of Texas:

H.R. 11538. A bill to authorize the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States reserved or retained in certain lands heretofore conveyed to the city of El Paso, Tex.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 11539. A bill to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 11540. A bill to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 11541. A bill to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 11542. A bill to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 11543. A bill to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 11544. A bill to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H.R. 11545. A bill to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.R. 11546. A bill to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 11547. A bill to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.R. 11548. A bill to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 11549. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 11550. A bill making Columbus Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 11551. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 11552. A bill to provide for the compensation of persons injured by certain criminal acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 11553. A bill to establish a system for the sharing of certain Federal tax receipts with the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 11554. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study and formulate a comprehensive plan containing recommendations regarding the action that should be taken to preserve, develop, and make accessible for public use and benefit the Long Island Sound and related shoreline areas in the States of New York, Connecticut, and Rhode Island; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Texas:

H.R. 11555. A bill to provide a border highway along the U.S. bank of the Rio Grande in connection with the settlement of the Chamizal boundary dispute between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 11556. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Jackson, Miss., certain lands situated in such city which have been declared surplus to the needs of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 11557. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study and formulate a comprehensive plan containing recommendations regarding the action that should be taken to preserve, develop, and make accessible for public use and benefit the Long Island Sound and related shoreline areas in the States of New York, Connecticut, and Rhode Island; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 11558. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.J. Res. 689. Joint resolution to designate Columbus Day, the 12th day of October in each year, a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.J. Res. 690. Joint resolution to designate Columbus Day, the 12th day of October in each year, a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.J. Res. 691. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H.J. Res. 692. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 693. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the eligibility of certain persons to vote for any candidate for elector of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.J. Res. 694. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H. Res. 604. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Export Control Act of 1949, and related acts; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Res. 605. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 11559. A bill for the relief of Adeline A. Russell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 11560. A bill for the relief of Hanna Lerner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 11561. A bill for the relief of Aurelio Passalacqua; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11562. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucia Spadola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 11563. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Carlos Silvino Dominguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11564. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alberto Fernandez-Bravo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 11565. A bill for the relief of Christina von Renner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 11566. A bill for the relief of Adrian A. Kyriakopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 11567. A bill for the relief of Mario Caruso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 11568. A bill for the relief of Hazel Marjorie Leason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 11569. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Granite City Army Depot, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 11570. A bill for the relief of James R. Kemp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. Res. 606. A resolution opposing the granting of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Columbus Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, October 12, 1492, is a day that all Americans, regardless of age, color, or creed, know and remember as the day the great Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus, discovered the New World.

In my own city of Chicago, Columbus Day is celebrated every year with a large parade on our main street, State Street, the greatest street in the world. This parade attracts 1 million people and is televised for 1½ hours with an estimated television audience of over 2 million people.

This is a gigantic patriotic parade with over 225 units from every branch of the U.S. military forces, bands, marchers, drum and bugle corps, and over 50 floats depicting every region of Italy. On these floats women will ride in the native costumes of the various regions of Italy, and it will be a truly beautiful and magnificent display. The costumes have been handmade by the women wearing them, and they have spent months designing, cutting, sewing, and finishing the costumes which are accurate and authentic to the smallest detail.

This year the judges have picked Cathy and Frank Vitacco, 610 North Ridgeway, Chicago, a brother and sister team, as first prize winners for the best costume in the parade, and each will receive a $100 U.S. savings bond. Mrs. Frances Cokinis, 525 East Turner, Roselle, Ill., and Miss Teresa Tomasello, 2447 North Marshfield, Chicago, tied as second place winners and each will receive a $50 U.S. savings bond. The third prize winner is Dr. Mary Ellen Batinich, 9215 South Troy, Chicago, who is giving her prize of $25 to 16 children who participated in the costume contest but did not place as winners.

The prizes for the Columbus Day Parade costume contest have been donated by the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans, which represents over 700,000 Italo-Americas in the Chicago metropolitan area and which sponsors the Columbus Day Parade each year.

Miss Linda Terone, 8958 South Claremont Avenue, Chicago, an 18-year-old Marquette University freshman, has been chosen by the judges to reign as queen of the Columbus Day Parade and she will receive a 1-week, all-expenses-paid trip to Italy which has been donated by Alitalia Airlines.

The judges for the costume contest were Miss Maggie Daly, well-known columnist for Chicago's American, Mr. Maurice Fischer, assistant managing editor of the Chicago Daily News, and Mr. Adelmo Cacciotti, midwestern regional manager of Alitalia Airlines. The judges for the beauty contest included Miss Daly, Mr. Fischer, Mr. Cacciotti, and Dr. Mary Ellen Batinich, principal of the John A. Walsh Elementary School in Chicago.

The 1965 parade will be led by Governor of Illinois, Otto Kerner, by mayor of Chicago, Richard J. Daley, by one of America's outstanding entertainers, Jimmy Durante, and by the Italian Consul General, Dr. Augusto Russo. Following the leaders in the line of march will be political dignitaries, civic leaders, and businessmen from the community.

The general chairman of the Columbus Day Parade this year is Mr. Fred Bartoli, president of the Red Top Cab Co. The cochairmen of the parade are Mr. Anthony Paterno, president of the Pacific Wine Co.; Mr. Frank Armanetti, president of Armanetti Liquors; Dr. Mario J. Rubinelli, Mr. Nello Ferrara, president of the Ferrara Candy Co., Mr. Martin Buccieri, insurance executive; Mr. Victor J. Failla, one of Chicago's outstanding labor leaders, and myself.

The other leaders of the Italian community who are participating in the parade are Vincent Ferrara, president of the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans; Rev. Armando Pierini, chaplain; Mr. Robert S. Tomaso, chairman, and Mrs. Serafina Ferrara and Mr. Joseph Fusco, cochairmen, of the finance and souvenir book committee; Mr. John G. Rovetto, chairman, and Mr. Joseph Rovetto, cochairman, of the floats committee; Mr. Victor A. Arrigo, chairman of the program and arrangements committee; Mr. Domenick DiFrisco, chairman of the publicity and queen contest committee; Mr. Frank Esposito, cochairman of the labor committee; Mr. Marco DeStefano, parade marshal; Mr. Anthony Bottalla, chairman, and Dr. James F. Greco, cochairman, of the bands and marchers committee; Mr. Frank Pitarro, chairman of the transportation committee; and Mr. Joseph DeSerto, chairman, and Mr. Arthur Pullano and Mr. Frank Aliotta, cochairmen, of the Italian Organizations Committee.

The other members of these committees are: Dr. Nicholas J. Bruno, Mr. Vincent F. Lucchese, Mr. Anthony Sorrentino, Mr. Peter Scalise, Mr. Vincent Lucania, Mr. N. R. Dispenza, Mr. M. R. Notaro, Mr. Peter Lavorata, Mr. Fred Mazzei, Mr. Umberto Mugnaini, Mr. Fred Parisi, Mr. Lawrence Spallitta, Dr. Joseph DeLeonardi, Dr. August F. Daro, Mr. Louis Farina, Mr. Horatio Tocco, Mr. Tom Baratta, Mr. Michael Epifanio, Mr. Jordan Canzone, Dr. Michael Abene, Mr. Jasper Campise, Mr. Dominic Dolce, and Mr. John Spatuzza.

The Columbus Day celebration will begin this morning with a solemn high mass at the Holy Name Cathedral at 9:30 a.m., followed by the kickoff of the parade at 12 noon at State and Wacker Streets, and then the wreath-laying ceremonies at 2:30 p.m. at the Columbus Monument in Grant Park. The day's festivities will come to a close at a cocktail party at the skyline room of the Sherman House in Chicago.

One of the highlights of the parade will be the presentation of a 9-foot, 14-ton bronze statue of Christopher Columbus to Mayor Daley. Depicting this event, a float will carry the statue and a large sign stating that Hon. FRANK ANNUNZIO, Congressman from the Seventh District of Illinois, welcomes Christopher Columbus to his new home in the seventh district. The presentation of this statue to Mayor Daley will mark the opening of a project to erect the statue in a plaza with a reflecting pool and fountains on the axis of West Polk Street in Chicago, located in my congressional district, to be known as Columbus Plaza.

It is a source of pride to know that Americans of all national origins will participate in our Columbus Day Parade, an annual patriotic event commemorating Columbus' discovery of America. The magnitude of this discovery is obvious to all of us. It opened the door to the future not only of our great country but the whole Western Hemisphere as well. It may even be interpreted as the greatest historical event of our times in view of the tremendous strides and the great advances that mankind has made since that eventful day—October 12, 1492. It is entirely fitting, then, that this day be celebrated as a national legal holiday. Toward that end, I have introduced in the Congress H.R. 1754 and I urge my colleagues to join in the early enactment of this legislation in order that our Federal Government may give this long overdue recognition to Christopher Columbus' great achievement, and may pay tribute to his faith, his vision, and his courage which made this achievement possible.

Columbus Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, today is Columbus Day. And on this occasion I am introducing legislation to designate Columbus Day a legal public holiday.

As of now, we have national holidays celebrating the independence of this country and the birthday of our first President. On May 30, we take pause in respectful memory of Americans fallen in battle, and on the 11th of November we take a holiday to acknowledge our veterans. It is strange, then, that the very discovery of this country is in no way acknowledged among our national holidays.

Mr. Speaker, more than four-fifths of our 50 States officially recognize Columbus Day. In my own State of New York, Columbus Day is an official holiday. The discovery of the New World is commemorated in 44 States and Puerto Rico. We ought to ratify in Federal law what is already the custom of so many localities.

A national holiday on Columbus Day, moreover, will acknowledge the enormous contribution made to this country by Americans of Italian descent—whose land of origin is that of Columbus.

A holiday to celebrate the courage and fortune of the discovery of this Nation is completely in fitting with our other national holidays, celebrating the great moments and forces of American history.

Glass Industry of Morgantown, W. Va., Sponsors Month-Long Exhibition—Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor Keynote Speaker—Governor Smith Participates at Opening Ceremonies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 12, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there are approximately 70 glass manufacturing firms in West Virginia. It is a well-known fact that glass produced in our State has adorned the tables of the White House and is widely prized for its striking design and high standards of workmanship.

Artistry in glassmaking is especially evident in the Morgantown area, where Seneca Glass Co., Beaumont Co., Davis-Lynch Glass Co., and Morgantown Glassware Guild have become household names. These firms are responsible members of the community. They have a combined business age of over 200 years, and have a total average payroll in excess of $200,000 per month. They are valued participants in the commercial expansion of the Appalachian region.

Sunday, October 10, 1965, the Morgantown glass industry opened a month-long exhibition at which they will display examples of the quality merchandise manufactured there. The exhibit is one of a series produced by the West Virginia Aviation Foundation, Inc., through the leadership of Walter L. Hart, to publicize aspects of the Morgantown economy, and is being held at the beautiful municipal airport terminal building.

Principal speaker at the opening ceremonies was the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Commerce, the Honorable John T. Connor. Also participating were: the Governor of West Virginia, Hon. Hulett C. Smith; U.S. Representative HARLEY O. STAGGERS, Democrat of West Virginia; Hon. John R. Goodwin, mayor of Morgantown; local Chamber of Commerce President Richard A. Raese; James Benson, vice president of Sterling Enterprises; J. Ray DePaulo, director of the West Virginia Department of Commerce; and Dr. Irvin Stewart, president-emeritus of West Virginia University. Master of ceremonies was Walter L. Hart, editor of the Morgantown Dominion-News and Aviation Foundation president.

Secretary Connor, whom I had the privilege of presenting to the audience, including listeners over two radio stations, brought an inspiring message, emphasizing West Virginia's leadership in focusing attention on the national problem of eliminating poverty. He pointed out that "West Virginia opened everyone's eyes to the necessity of doing something for communities all over the country, because economic distress was not an Appalachian problem, not a West Virginia problem, but a national problem."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address of Secretary John Connor on this significant occasion be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed.

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE JOHN T. CONNOR PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT THE "FABULOUS SHOWCASE" GLASS EXHIBITION, MORGANTOWN, W. VA., OCTOBER 10, 1965

One of the most fascinating qualities of the beautiful Morgantown glassware is that our impression of the glass changes as we see it in a different light, or look at it from a different point of view.

And I'm beginning to think that this characteristic is also true of the State of West Virginia.

Before I came to Washington to be Secretary of Commerce, I regarded myself as a reasonably well read person.

I tried to keep up with what was going on in the country and in the world.

My most vivid impression of West Virginia in those years was that West Virginia was a State plagued by severe economic distress, loss of industry, high unemployment, declining job opportunities, and worst of all, that an air of hopelessness hung over the towering mountains of this State.

The problems seemed almost to defy solution.

After I joined President Johnson's administration, I found out in the course of my duties that important things were happening in West Virginia.

I became closely acquainted with the dynamic work of Senator RANDOLPH and Congressman STAGGERS.

I learned more about the partnership being formed in the Appalachian Regional Commission between the Federal Government, West Virginia, and other States in this great area.

And I heard about the courageous efforts of your West Virginians.

I heard about the cooperation among business, labor, and local government here.

I heard about how you were working together among yourselves to make a greater contribution to the national prosperity and to share more fully in it, in order to provide a better life for your families and a brighter future for your children. And it was a heart-warming story that I heard.

Now, I've come to see for myself.

I've met Governor Smith, and Mayor Goodwin, and other leading citizens of Morgantown and this State.

And, as though I'm watching the changing lights on the glassware made by your skilled workmen, I'm getting an impression of the true depth and reality of the minor miracle that is taking place in West Virginia.

I don't see the typical signs one would expect in a town or a State or a region that is in economic trouble.

What I see is a civic spirit that is almost fierce in its pride and determination to move ahead.

What I see is business and industry that is attuned to all the subtle crosscurrents in the economy today.

What I see is an educational community that is prospering in a friendly and fertile climate. And I certainly was most favorably impressed with the new facilities of West Virginia University that I saw for the first time today.

What I see are governmental and political leaders who are using their knowledge and skills to insure that West Virginia rides the crest of the wave of the future and not the trough of despair.

This is the story of West Virginia today, and it's a thrilling story of hope and determination that I'll carry away with me when I go back to Washington.

The whole essence of what I'm trying to say is symbolized in the high achievement of your Morgantown glassware.

Here is one of the oldest industrial skills known to man, surviving every social upheaval in history, surviving because it is based on man's creative imagination and his ability to shape the material world.

There will always be a market for imagination and hard work.

So one of your homemade crystal goblets carries not only beauty but also knowledge in the field of economics.

The Nation is indebted to West Virginia for this marriage of industry and art.

It graces the tables as well as adorning the prestige of this country.

But we are also indebted to West Virginia in another way, and you may have forgotten this other debt, so I'd like to acknowledge it today.

West Virginia is the State that woke the Nation up to the fact that we had a job to do.

West Virginia reminded us that the good times we thought we were enjoying just didn't exist in some parts of the country.

This came to our attention quite forcefully during President Kennedy's primary campaign here in 1960.

You people of the State of West Virginia may have thought that there was something unique about you and your problems.

You may have thought that there was some way in which you had failed.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

At a time when most of the economic indicators were practically going straight up, and when most people thought the country had never had it so good—100 areas in 28 States had an average unemployment rate of 13.6 percent.

Many hard-hit rural areas had incomes less than one-third of the national average.

This means that in these rural areas many families were subsisting on less than $1,900 per year.

There were 100 counties in the country where the average family income was 70 percent below the national average.

One out of every five American families lived in an area where economic opportunities were deficient.

One out of every four American counties could be identified as having serious economic problems.

All this was happening at a time when many people thought that economic distress was something that had disappeared after the great depression.

Well, Appalachia and West Virginia opened everyone's eyes to the necessity of doing something for communities all around the country, because economic distress was not an Appalachian problem, not a West Virginia problem, but a national problem.

So President Johnson determined that a nationwide program must be launched to help cure the economic ills of the distressed regions of the country.

When he sent the Economic Development Act to the Congress, he said:

"A growing nation cannot afford to waste its human and natural resources—too often neglected and unused in distressed areas.

"Nor can we afford to shut out large numbers of our fellow citizens from the fulfillment of hope which is shared by the rest of us.

"The millions of people living in those areas and regions of our Nation which have not shared fully in our general prosperity are in urgent need of help.

"Moreover, the distress or underdevelopment of any part of the country holds back the progress of the entire Nation."

The most important element in the Nation's program for attacking regional economic distress is the cooperative, partnership approach to the problem.

Today we live in a complex society.

Its needs are complex, and so are the pattern of interaction and cooperation among the groups making up the society.

The growing interdependence of these groups upon each other is greater than many realize and more crucial to our progress than many appreciate.

No one has expressed more forcefully than President Johnson that building a great American society depends upon the wholehearted cooperation of all its components—the National, State, and local governments, the business community, labor, the academic world, professional societies, and the other groupings of our people.

At a businessmen's luncheon in the White House last year, the President stated: "I believe that we are entering a new era of cooperation between Government and business and labor and the many groups which form this Nation. * * *

"It is an economy where the health of business benefits all the people.

"It is an economy where the prosperity of the people benefits the health of business.

"It is an economy where, in large measure, the fortunes of each are tied to the fortunes of all."

While the spirit of working together for mutual benefit has been a powerful force for progress since the beginning of our country, I think today there is a growing recognition that human society can attain true maturity and material well-being only when we all work hand-in-hand in its development.

The success of our society rests upon its pluralism—the fact that decisions are made and policies are set as close as possible to the source and by a great many people, rather than by monolithic government from above.

The system works as a coordinated whole through consensus and compromise, through checks and balances.

All of the vital forces in West Virginia life are represented here today.

You can take justifiable pride in what all of you have accomplished.

But more than that, you have set an example to the Nation, an example of what people can do—an example of courage and hope and determination.

This outstanding exhibit we view here today testifies to those qualities—and on behalf of our National Government, I salute you for your achievements as a people and as a State.

The 89th Congress: Building the Great Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1965

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an address by my Wisconsin colleague and very good friend, Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, before the ninth annual Democratic Party Jefferson-Jackson-Kennedy Day dinner at Racine, Wis., on Sunday, October 10, 1965.

Congressman ZABLOCKI traced the legislative record of the 89th Congress in its first session and voiced praise for Wisconsin Democrats who gave their complete support and assistance to their representatives.

He told his audience that if the second session is as determined as the first, it will likely rank in history as this country's most productive and significant Congress of all times.

The full text of Representative ZABLOCKI's speech follows:

THE 89TH CONGRESS: BUILDING THE GREAT SOCIETY

(Speech of Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI of Wisconsin, before the ninth annual Democratic Party Jefferson-Jackson-Kennedy Day dinner, Racine, Wis., October 10, 1965)

My friends, it is indeed a pleasure for me to be with you tonight, to celebrate together the origins of the great political party—the Democratic Party—to which we belong.

I want to thank Jim Arena, your Racine County chairman, for his kind invitation to me. It certainly is a privilege to be able to be among so many fine Democrats—and Democratic officeholders.

We all are aware of the outstanding job being done by Pat Lucey as the Lieutenant Governor of our State, and by Bronson La-Follette as attorney general. It is reassuring to all of us to know that men of their caliber are providing leadership for our party in this State.

Although at present an outlander holds the Wisconsin governorship, I am confident that there will be a Democrat sitting in the executive mansion in Madison before very long. And what is more, I think that Democrat is here with us tonight.

I also want to apprise all of you First District Democrats on the job your Congressman, LYNN STALBAUM, is doing in Washington.

Of course, that will come as no surprise to you, since you are aware of the outstanding achievements of LYNN as a Wisconsin State senator. You all know of his broad knowledge of governmental procedures, his expertise in matters of taxation and agriculture, and his leadership of the Democrats in Wisconsin's Legislature.

These amply earned him the opportunity to represent the people of this area in the Congress of the United States.

Although he has been in Washington a relatively short time, Congressman STALBAUM's abilities have become widely recognized in Congress and throughout the Federal Government. He has earned the reputation of being one of the hardest working Members of the House of Representatives.

He has gained the respect and admiration of his fellow members for his dedication to duty in his committee assignment on the House Agriculture Committee. LYNN is considered the top expert on dairy legislation. Just last Friday two of his proposals to aid the dairy industry—so important in our own State—were passed by Congress as amendments to the omnibus farm bill.

Just as we are proud of Congressman STALBAUM and our other Democratic officeholders, we can be proud of our party affiliation.

Our Democratic Party is the Nation's oldest; in fact, it was born almost at the same time as our revered Constitution. The Democratic Party is our Nation's largest—a truly national party, with representatives at all levels of government in every State of the Union.

But most important of all—the Democratic Party is the party of greatness. This greatness is exemplified in the two outstanding Democratic Presidents whom we honor in a special way today: Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson.

Jefferson, as we know, was the great political philosopher. His ideas shaped the democratic form of government which we enjoy today. The principles which he enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and his other writings even today provide an inspiration to those seeking freedom from tyranny.

Andrew Jackson, on the other hand, was a man of action. Through him, the democratic philosophy of Jefferson was brought to fruition. It was Jackson who fulfilled the promise of America, who insured the equality of all our citizens, regardless of wealth or class or occupation.

In our own time, we have seen a similar situation. In our late beloved and martyred President, John F. Kennedy, America had a modern Jefferson. President Kennedy had a vision for our Nation, just as Jefferson had in his time.

President Kennedy expressed his vision in his speeches and—most of all—in the farsighted legislative programs he proposed. Cut down in the prime of life by the bullet of an assassin, John Kennedy—truly an outstanding world figure—never saw the fulfillment of many of his plans.

Although his loss was a tragic one for our Nation, we indeed are fortunate that his successor is a man of the stature of President Lyndon Baines Johnson.

President Johnson—like Andrew Jackson—is a man of action, a man who has brought to fruition the vision of his predecessor.

All of you may justly have a deep sense of satisfaction for the role you have played in the remarkable Democratic record which has been achieved since 1960.

Thanks to you—and thousands of other Democrats across our land—John Kennedy was elected against what often seemed overwhelming odds.

Thanks to you, President Johnson was elected in 1964 by the largest plurality in American history. Carried into office with him was the largest Democratic Congress since 1936.

The phenomenal record of accomplishment of this administration-congressional team is the first and major result of your support and assistance.

It is on that record that the Great Society is being built. In a sense, every bill we have passed in this 89th Congress has been another hammerblow shaping the dream of the Great Society into solid accomplishment.

Last November, the people of the United States—through their action at the ballot box—indicated their trust in President Johnson and the Democratic Party, and their belief in the Great Society platform and the principles on which it is based.

The time has come to look at the record—to examine how that pact between the American people and the Democratic Party has been fulfilled.

Without any exaggeration, the 89th Congress in its first session passed more far-reaching legislation than any other Congress in recent history.

If the second session proves as fruitful as the first—which appears likely—the 89th Congress may go down in history as the Nation's most productive and significant of all time.

Tonight I would like to review with you briefly some of the many important programs which have been enacted in the past few months.

These programs are aiding people in all walks and stages of life; the elderly, young people, workers, small businessmen, farmers, city dwellers, consumers, and others.

What have we done for older Americans?

The 89th Congress passed a medicare program which—to my mind—is one of the best, most comprehensive and most practical programs ever proposed in this area.

This legislation will aid the more than 19 million men and women in the United States who are over 65.

It will free the lives of these senior citizens from fears that ill health may rob them of the savings of a lifetime. It will help insure that no elderly person—no matter how poor—will languish, suffer, and die without needed medical care.

The same bill which established medicare also provided a 7-percent increase in social security benefits and expanded medical care programs for the blind, disabled, and dependent children.

This Congress also enacted into law the Older Americans Act which establishes an Agency on Aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and promises to provide $17 million to assist public and private groups develop programs for the aged.

It should be a source of deep satisfaction to you, as it is to me, to know that your Congressman, LYNN STALBAUM, contributed much to both the Medicare and Older Americans Act passage.

This Congress also has enacted programs to assist our young people.

The youth of America is our best hope for a better world tomorrow and is our greatest natural resource. The Congress and the administration, recognizing this, worked together to pass a $1.3 billion elementary and secondary education act.

This program of Federal aid to education truly is historic. It marks a milestone in the progress of our Nation. Because of this new act, more than 5 million educationally deprived children from low-income families throughout the country will be helped.

What is more, all eligible schoolchildren are being assisted regardless of the kind of school—public or parochial—which they attend.

All of us are aware of the problem of our school dropouts. It is a very real, human problem. Almost 1 million young people quit school each year. Another 100,000 of our brightest high school graduates are prevented from attending college because of a lack of facilities and scholarship funds.

Today the dropouts have several programs working for them where they can direct their energies productively. Some 12,000 have enrolled in the Job Corps. Another 200,000 youngsters are participating in Neighborhood Youth Corps projects. And 80,000 more of these eager young citizens are finding new opportunities in the work-study programs.

In the field of higher education, Congress has expanded and improved existing programs designed to provide the university facilities and scholarships so necessary to the full education of our youth.

This Congress also has worked to assist the workingman—and here we are talking about 75 million Americans.

In August, the unemployment rate dropped to a nationwide 7-year low. Put in human terms, more people had jobs—more people knew the security and confidence of having steady work.

And still more jobs are being created. To help in this task the Economic Development Administration has been established. This new agency is charged with the responsibility of aiding the development of new jobs and new industries in economically distressed communities.

Another one-half million Americans will have the opportunity to be retrained in new and needed job skills through the extension and expansion of the Manpower Development and Training Act. More than three-fourths of those trained will find full-time work in their new specialty.

The businessman also has fared well. The monetary fiscal policies of the administration have sustained the longest peacetime economic expansion in history. The American economy is now in its 56th month of uninterrupted expansion.

The small businessman will benefit from two bills enacted this year which will provide $250 million in small business loans. This imposing amount will be broken down into many small—but important—sums to help individual small businessmen get ahead with their private enterprises.

Both the consumer and the retailer have benefited from the excise tax repeal accomplished by the 89th Congress. For the consumer the repeal has meant that he pays less for hundreds of items, including automobiles, luggage, gift items, and telephone calls. For the retailer the repeal means less bookwork and more business.

And what about the people who live in our cities? There are 135 million of them now—70 percent of our population. In 50 years that number is expected to more than double to 320 million Americans living in urban areas.

This rapid growth of our cities is causing—and will continue to cause—serious problems in housing, education, transportation, and family life.

One program to handle part of our urban difficulties was signed into law in August—the Omnibus Housing law. It provides an expanded housing program, including rent supplements for low income families, housing rehabilitation grants, and public housing for the handicapped.

Another important step was the creation of a new Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development which will coordinate and administer nationwide Federal programs of physical improvement of our urban areas.

For the farmers there is the omnibus farm bill which will result in increased income for the individual American farmer and still lead to reduced Government costs in running the program. One provision of that bill should be of particular interest to all of you because it was sponsored by your Congressman, LYNN STALBAUM.

It provides that the Agriculture Department may buy dairy products on the open market for such Federal programs as the school lunch program and food for peace when surplus stocks are not sufficient to meet the demands. This amendment could be an important factor in providing adequate income to our dairy farmers.

The list of those who have benefited goes on and on. Our Negro citizens have benefited. Women have benefited. Indians, migrant workers, and immigrants have benefited.

The fact is—my fellow Democrats—that all Americans have benefited from the work of the 89th Congress.

I am proud and grateful—just as Congressman STALBAUM is proud and grateful—to have had the opportunity to serve in this historic 89th Congress.

This Congress has moved with speed on programs:

To improve our educational programs;

To fight poverty and its causes;

And to provide equal oportunity for all our citizens.

This Congress has taken steps:

To develop our natural resources to the benefit of all America;

To protect the natural beauty of this bright and fair land;

And to prevent the increase in crime.

Further, this Congress has worked:

To master the new frontier of space;

To assist the free people of the world attain peaceful progress;

And—most important—to keep our Nation's defense strong against potential aggressors.

That, my friends is the outstanding record of the 89th Congress and the Johnson administration in fulfilling the trust placed with them last November by the people of the United States.

This Democratic success is reflected in the sorry state of the Republican Party.

They have a candidate for mayor of New York who will not run as a Republican.

They have an excellent candidate for Governor of California—Senator KUCHEL—but he would not run at all, and what is more he criticizes his State party for Birchite influences.

They have only one active potential candidate for the Presidential office. His name is Richard Nixon. If you try hard, you may remember him.

Further, the Republicans can attack our party and our President only on peripheral issues. They cannot attack us on basic principles, because on those we Democrats and the great majority of Americans are agreed.

They cannot attack us on our legislation, because the measures enacted are needed and sound.

They cannot attack our success because it reflects the kind of dynamic and dedicated Congress which is in the highest and best tradition of our American system.

That success—our Democratic success—could not have been accomplished without your support. You are partners in the progress of this Nation.

The Democratic Party needs your help—the kind of help you are giving by being here tonight and by going out tomorrow to aid our cause in our State of Wisconsin, in this community, in your precinct.

Now is the time to move on. To continue our march toward the promise of America—the promise so clearly seen by Presidents Jefferson and Jackson, Roosevelt and Truman, Kennedy and Johnson.

Firm in the principles of our party's great heritage, and heartened by our contemporary success, let us—all together—continue to work for a stronger and a better America.

Commemoration of Christopher Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KREBS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1965

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, on this day set aside for honoring Christopher Columbus an uproar comparable to a small-scale volcanic eruption has been recorded in my congressional district. Three days ago, discovery of a medieval map was publicized by Yale University in an unconvincing effort to credit someone other than Christopher Columbus with the earliest discovery of America. I submit that the disclosure is unconvincing because it served only to focus increased attention and fervor on today's ceremonies honoring the navigator who will continue to be recognized as America's discoverer long after any of his detractors, scholarly or otherwise, are forgotten.

I pick no quarrel with any non-Columbus claimants to the discovery of America, but I do take these few minutes to remind our House Members that Columbus undertook and completed at least four voyages to our great shores. Whether they were the first or not, let the quest for proof go on. But for today, I join my Columbus-admiring constituents in shouting, with proper dialect, "Viva Cristoforo Colombo."

Columbus Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1965

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, each year at this time we testify to the high regard in which we hold our friends and neighbors of Italian descent. Columbus Day, when we honor the great navigator who discovered America, is the appropriate time for remembering the contributions that have been made to our way of life by Italian Americans.

Christopher Columbus, the discoverer of the New World, was first and foremost a sailor. He was born and reared in Italy's Genoa, one of Europe's oldest seafaring communities, and as a boy had made voyages in the Mediterranean where the world's greatest mariners were trained in ancient times and in his own days.

In Lisbon, Portugal, the center of European oceanic enterprise, Columbus worked as a chartmaker by the time he was 24, and shortly afterward, he sailed on a long voyage under the Portuguese flag. It was then that he conceived the idea for the great adventure that only a sailor could have planned and executed. That was to reach eastern Asia, the Indies, by sailing west.

It took him 10 years to find support for his idea, and of course, he never did succeed in it, because a continent stood in his way. This continent, which he discovered by accident, was named for a man who had had nothing to do with its discovery. Yet we are right in honoring Columbus for doing something that was unintended, because no other sailor had the knowledge, the persistence, and the dauntless courage to find land by sailing thousands upon thousands of miles into the vastness of the unknown and uncharted ocean. Columbus has been described by Adm. Samuel Eliot Morison, the eminent historian of U.S. naval operations in World War

II, as "one of the greatest mariners, if not the greatest, of all time."

The countrymen of Columbus, the Italian Americans of the United States, have shown much the same intrepid courage as their great hero. At the end of the last century there were about 484,000 of them here seeking a better life than the one they had known in the disrupted agricultural economy of the Italian peninsula. By 1910, they numbered over 1,343,000.

In those days, many of them performed the hardest kind of labor. Yet it was not long before their children became doctors, teachers, lawyers, judges, legislators, and businessmen. As a group, Italian Americans, in a remarkably short number of years, in difficult times, and under severe handicaps, have come to take their place in the leadership of American society. An Italian discovered America, and Italian Americans help to lead it and to preserve its freedoms.

Columbus Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 12, 1965

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, nearly five centuries ago, a man named Columbus stood on the shores of Portugal and looked westward onto the seas. From the way the winds blew across the ridge, from the seasonal steadiness of them and the direction, this man conjectured that there must be land beyond the winds. It was a wild thought, a bold dream, and yet this slim adventurer was willing to follow his convictions, a high gamble. If he followed his bold plan, he would face unknown hazards struggling with nature. That struggle was not the only struggle he would have to face. As it is with most men with unorthodox ideas, he would have to convince men that his theory was correct—that there would be land beyond rather than the vastness of an infinite ocean. Yet, on a perilous horizon, America took shape and was realized.

Today as we commemorate the founding of America by the young courageous adventurer, let us remember that there are numerous challenges unmet, but also that we are adventurers. New challenges demand new solutions. We have inherited from our ancestors the ability to adjust, to change and to meet whatever challenge arises, and we shall continue to do so. Even though, we as a nation have made progress in the fields of human relations and understanding, social reform, science and technology, we still must explore further and probe deeper into these areas.

Thus it is fitting that on this day, we pledge to embark on a journey with faith and sincerity examining our innermost selves. If the free world is to be saved from communism, if we are to have universal brotherhood, then we must have a standard of personal dignity and integrity to emulate. Let us set our compasses and link the old traditions with a new understanding. Let us set sail today and we too shall be Columbuses. We are searching for brotherhood—aboard the ship of understanding. If this ship is to survive, its foundation must be strong, must not crumble in the waves of human pride, the currents of tradition, the winds of strife and misunderstanding. Let us continue our heritage of boldness.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 12, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include my report to the people of the Seventh District of Alabama for October 11, 1965:

WASHINGTON REPORT: DO IT FOR LADYBIRD

(By Congressman JIM MARTIN, Seventh District, Alabama)

In one of the most ruthless displays of tyranny by the majority, Congress was forced to stay in session for more than 12 hours last Thursday to pass the highway beautification bill. Riding roughshod over reasonable legislative procedure and acting on instructions from the White House to "do it for Ladybird," the Democrat majority passed a badly written bill which is going to cost the taxpayers millions in direct Federal spending and will also cause many States to lose millions of dollars in highway funds. Congress was kept in session continuously until 4 minutes to 1 o'clock in the morning in spite of the fact that the President and the First Lady had already invited them to a White House reception to honor the 89th Congress.

It is reported the President sent word that he would "rather they missed the party and give this gift to Ladybird." The heavy liberal majority gave in to this pressure and shouted down every attempt by the Republicans to improve what may prove to be one of the worst of many bad bills passed in this session under the same kind of pressure.

As usual, those who opposed the legislation, were accused by the majority of "being against beauty," or not caring about America. The fact is, the highway beautification bill is not a product carefully thought out by Congress, but is a bill created by the executive branch and rammed through Congress without adequate hearings, study, or debate.

The minority report from the Committee on Public Works, which I signed as a member of that committee, puts it this way:

"We support the concept of beautifying areas adjacent to highways, but we are opposed to the enactment of this bill in its present form, for three basic reasons:

"1. It is not the product of careful, independent congressional deliberation. Instead, it is a poorly thought out proposal which was brutally forced upon the Committee on Public Works by spokesmen for the administration who wielded the power and influence of the White House, to an extent which we have never before seen, to make certain that the bill is reported, and reported now, regardless of the consequences.

"2. The bill is replete with unworkable, unwise, and unfair provisions insisted upon by spokesmen for the administration who did not know and probably did not care about the many ramifications and adverse impacts of such provision.

"3. The bill will unjustly penalize States which, in good faith, may attempt to control outdoor advertising and junkyards under the bill, but are unable to do so within the short time allowed, because of constitutional or other impediments; it will have a destructive impact on small businesses, such as motels, hotels, restaurants, service stations, and the like, which depend upon patronage by the motoring public for survival, and it will deprive the motoring public of needed travel information."

UNWORKABLE, UNWISE, AND UNFAIR PROVISIONS

Briefly, here are some of the most objectionable provisions of the "Ladybird bill": (1) Mandatory withholding of highway funds even when a State cannot comply with the beautification bill; (2) Broad and inconsistent powers given to the Secretary of Commerce which will give him the same kind of power over the States in the matter of highways that we have seen so unjustly exercised by Francis Keppel, Commissioner of Education, in the matter of schools; (3) Federal control of the use of land; (4) Gives the Secretary of Commerce power to determine the content of commercial advertising on highway signs; (5) Makes it possible to eliminate all outdoor advertising on certain highways, and this is not good for the traveling public or the Nation; (6) The bill makes it possible to force the removal of junkyards and highway signs, but no provision is made for payment of just compensation to the owners; (7) There is no prohibition against future junkyards; (8) It contains completely illogical provisions concerning landscaping on highways; (9) There is a complete lack of information as to the cost of the beautification programs. The bill authorizes the appropriation of $320 million for fiscal years 1966 and 1967, but no one knows and no estimate was given as to the long-range costs.

In spite of the brutal pressure methods to get this bill through, and in spite of the many bad provisions of the bill, in spite of its discrimination against the small businessman and the States, a majority of Democrats backed the leadership in Congress and knuckled under to the President and "did it for Ladybird."

STUDY MISSION TO VIETNAM AND FAR EAST

Within a few weeks I hope to leave on a study mission to see for myself what the situation is in Vietnam and other countries of Asia where communism is creating problems for the United States and the free world. This trip will be entirely at my own expense. I will report to you by newsletter and radio as often as possible while I am away and give you a complete and full report on my return. My regular weekly newsletter will be discontinued with the next issue until Congress reconvenes in January. During the time Congress is adjourned and I am in Asia, I hope we can get the names of all those who have requested the newsletter on the mailing list so that you will receive it regularly when I begin sending it out at the start of the 2d session of the 89th Congress. If you have not requested to be on the mailing list, send me your name and address now.

As you know this newsletter is not paid for through Government funds. I believe it is important in keeping you informed about your Government and what is going on in Washington. I want to take this opportunity to thank so many of you who have sent in voluntary contributions to help pay the cost of printing the newsletter.

Columbus Day, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 12, 1965

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is important and necessary that we pause each year to commemorate one of the great moments in all of recorded history, the moment of discovery of the New World.

I have been privileged to serve in the House of Representatives since 1949, and this year, more so than in any previous year since my coming to Congress, I can truthfully say there is good reason to celebrate Columbus Day. For this year Congress at last has sent to the scrap heap an immigration program based on national origin quotas. In its place we have substituted a new law that reasserts America's democratic heritage and spirit of fair play.

No longer does our immigration policy attempt to perpetuate the fiction that the accident of birth in one country makes a man more or less acceptable for admission to this land of the free.

Christopher Columbus, it should be remembered, was the Father of Immigration. The towering achievement of the onetime weaver from Genoa did not end with discovery and exploration.

On his subsequent voyages, Columbus made the first attempts to colonize the lands he had discovered. He brought the Old World to the New World, here to begin a stirring new chapter in the exciting story of mankind.

And since the time of Columbus, year after year, the tired and the poor, the downtrodden and the oppressed, the lovers of liberty and the seekers of freedom have come.

With faith and hope and heart, they have come in search of dignity, equality, and opportunity—and with bare and bleeding hands they pushed the frontiers of freedom forward, and they helped to make America great.

As with Columbus before them, they found the way to the New World was long and trying, but still they came, your fathers and mine, braving the hazards and the perils on their arduous, difficult trek from countryside and mountainside, from city and hamlet, across the wide ocean to this land of promise.

They became intertwined in the fabric of their adopted land, and they enriched the tapestry of America's heritage. And their love and their loyalty helped this Nation grow strong and prosperous.

Today, as we probe the mysteries of outer space and seek to build a better, richer, fuller life for all people—in this country and throughout our shrinking world—it is well that we keep before us a mental picture of that indomitable sailor who refused to turn back.

Columbus Day should be a national holiday, a day to recall the great discoverer's indestructible faith, his penetrating vision, and the example he set in pressing onward, ever onward, in the face of staggering difficulty.

Columbus Day should be a national holiday when all of us dare to dream bold Columbus dreams and dedicate ourselves to the task of finding solutions to the challenging problems that beset us, that we may leave to our children, and to their children after them, a living legacy of liberty and light, of freedom and knowledge, peace and prosperity.

Christopher Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 12, 1965

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that we pay tribute here in the Congress today to the glorious memory of Christopher Columbus, the discoverer of the New World. May I suggest it would be even more fitting if the Congress would enact the legislation introduced by me and many other Members to make Columbus Day a legal holiday. As the sponsor of H.R. 2025 in the 88th Congress and H.R. 831 in this Congress, I urge that the memory of Christopher Columbus be perpetuated by making the date of his discovery of the New World a legal public holiday. The fact that 38 States now celebrate Columbus Day as a legal State holiday and 7 other States mark the day by Governors' proclamation reflect the national consensus for full recognition for this memorable event.

As the son and grandson of immigrants whose land of origin was that of Columbus, I am most happy and gratified that on this Columbus Day our immigration policy has once again been made worthy of the spirit of the great explorer. In the Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments of 1965, we have removed the pettiness, the prejudice, the inequities from our selection process. We have brought our policy into conformance with our ideals by affirming that a man is to be judged and judged exclusively on his worth as a human being.

The same qualitative tests on the same basis will apply to all who seek the privilege of admission to America, the land that Columbus opened to colonization and to the spread of civilization.

As Columbus doubled the size of the known world and expanded the horizons of man's knowledge, so our country is engaged in a most laudable effort to give to every individual the opportunity to develop his full potential and to achieve his goal in life. The Italian navigator sailed Spanish ships by the use of Portugese charts. The polyglot nature of the discovery is mirrored in the varied origins of our population. The strength of our Nation has been built from many groups from many lands, and all groups in our society must be given the opportunity to play an equal role in our national life.

Today, as we face new worlds of space, new worlds of scientific discovery, new worlds of human relationships, it is most appropriate that we remember Columbus' virtues and spirit and hold them up to our youth for their admiration and emulation. I urge that we give Christopher Columbus the official and permanent national recognition that will be conferred by making the anniversary of his landing a national holiday.

Big Man Keeps Moving, Praises Tennesseans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 12, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, one of the great experiences of democracy is the personal meeting of leadership from communities with leadership in Washington. Such a meeting occurred last week when a number of leaders from the upper Cumberland section of the great Fourth District of Tennessee met with President Johnson and other high Federal officials.

It was a unique and challenging experience for the members of the Upper Cumberland Development Association. And it was a rewarding experience, I am sure, for President Johnson and other officials of the Federal Establishment. As their Representative it was my great pleasure to accompany this fine group of citizens to the White House and participate in these ceremonies and to arrange for them briefings and opportunities for discussions with Federal officials in the Capitol.

The delegation greatly appreciated your kindness and thoughtfulness, Mr. Speaker, in stopping by to chat with them at the Capitol and giving them your informed views on domestic and foreign affairs.

In this connection, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial written by a distinguished editor and journalist, Mr. Coleman Harwell, publisher of the Putnam County Herald, Cookeville, Tenn., and a copy of the Capitol Comments, my newsletter on this subject, believing both of these to be of widespread interest to communities throughout the Nation.

The editorial and newsletter follow:

BIG MAN KEEPS MOVING, PRAISES TENNESSEANS

(By Coleman A. Harwell)

Lyndon B. Johnson has become in his time one of the legendary characters of American history.

When has the opportunity been given to a President of the United States to announce that he is going to have a serious operation under sedation at a certain time at a certain place?

And when has a President announced plans for: (1) His operation, and (2) the manner of his succession, temporary or permanent, according to the need?

More to the point—when has a President greeted a crowd of folks from the hill country in hearty manner, on the eve of such an operation, in a jampacked room with photographers and reporters falling over one another and with a presidential pet (in this case "Him," the Beagle hound) wandering rather aimlessly on his leash, with first one and then another of the President's "hill country" guests, patting the pooch and keeping him close on the presidential heels?

All this took place in the famous Cabinet Room of the White House, which you have probably seen on TV and in newsphotos, and which gives the impression in pictures of spaciousness around the big octagonal table.

Well, you would be surprised, as we were, to discover that it is a pretty small room for the purpose in the White House basement. That is, when you get 35 or so special guests standing on one side, and an equal number of reporters and photographers (some with 3 and 4 cameras about their necks and with complicated wires leading to numerous cameras) standing on the other side, the room is full.

HIGH ON ELLINGTON

That's the way it was Wednesday as the delegation from the Upper Cumberland Development Association gathered for their appointment with the President which had been arranged by former Gov. Buford Ellington and Representative Joe L. Evins.

In case there was anyone who didn't know that Governor Ellington was one of the most important figures on the Washington scene, this occasion was sufficient to clarify the picture. And this was the case also with respect to Representative Joe L. Evins.

We should note here, incidentally, that Senators Albert Gore and Ross Bass are also major characters in the esteem of President Johnson, and their importance would have been impressed upon us had it not been for the fact that Senator Gore was back in Carthage for a cattle sale on his great farm in Smith County and that Senator Bass was presiding in the Senate, which gives you a pretty good idea of the fact that the Tennessee delegation is among the most important in Congress and that the President of the United States is no stranger to Tennessee—or, perhaps we should say, Tennessee is no stranger to him.

TENNESSEANS, TEXANS

It always seems to be the case—certainly it should be—that Texans are familiar with Tennessee and that there is no strangeness between us.

This is particularly true of Lyndon B. Johnson. His mentor in Congress was Sam Rayburn. In case you don't remember, L.B.J. does, that Sam Rayburn was a native of Roane County, Tenn., a fact which he recalled as he reminded us of the ties that bind the two States.

He said, "There is a saying that every schoolboy knows that there would not have been a Texas if there had not been a Tennessee."

We hope our youngsters know this and keep it in mind—not in terms of obligation of the people of Texas to those of Tennessee—but to remind us that all our people are closely knit together and that the welfare of one segment of the Nation depends upon that of the other parts of the country.

Speaking personally of President Johnson, we'd say that he never seemed in better form than when he greeted our group. Governor Ellington and Representative Evins took him along the line of the Tennesseans and introduced him to each one of us. As we were from Representative Evins' district, he took over the task and called our names.

As he neared the end, President Johnson said, "Joe, you'd better stop while you're ahead—you may forget the name of the next fellow."

To Representative Evins' credit, he did not forget a single name!

LOOKS VIGOROUS

President Johnson looked vigorous.

We were standing 10 paces or so from him and as he spoke, he looked squarely in our direction two or three times. He has that amazing knack, you know, of giving everybody in the room the impression that he is looking straight at them. His eyes were clear and his glance steady. His voice was strong and calm.

Incidentally, if you'd never had occasion to hear L.B.J. talk directly to a small group, we hope you'll do so—it is a remarkable example of a man's ability to project himself to others.

There are people in public office who sound like they're making speeches even when they are talking to only one or two people. L.B.J. to the contrary, talks in a conversational tone, even to a roomful.

But, with his quiet self-assurance, he's a powerfully persuasive fellow. His size helps, no doubt, as his 6 foot, 5 inch towers over people who are big.

Typical of him, he had a jam-packed calendar all Wednesday though he was heading next day for the hospital. He keeps things buzzing where he is. Bill Moyers, his young press secretary, obviously fits his style because Moyers was on the go all the time we were there, bringing in messages, carrying a cartoon the President wanted to show us, telling the cameramen to stop making photos after L.B.J. had talked a few minutes.

The White House has terrific organization. You feel as you walk through the executive offices that everybody is on the job. This is one Government office where we are confident the coffee breaks are short, if any.

UCDA'S BIGGEST JOB

The Washington trip was not the first arranged by the UCDA, but it was by all odds the most important.

It underscored again the value of this group. It now has great momentum and we hope the able men who have had a hand in getting it underway will remain active in it and that others will join them.

They have shown what group action can accomplish. As one member commented, "A group from a single county could never have received this recognition."

Though the UCDA has done big things, we believe its greatest achievements lie ahead.

CRITICS AT IT AGAIN

Johnson's critics are having a field day about press management at the White House. This is largely baloney.

For instance, they got excited about the fact that news of the UCDA visit was announced by the White House. There's nothing unusual about that.

We do feel the White House should have announced the visit several days, in advance, but with all that's going on there, this oversight can be understood.

Some of those yelping about news being managed at the White House are off base. The news is still right where it was for reporters to dig out. That's what reporters are for.

CAPITOL COMMENTS—CUMBERLAND GROUP MEETS WITH PRESIDENT, GETS BRIEFING ON PROGRAMS BY TOP U.S. OFFICIALS—HEARS SPEAKER MCCORMACK DISCUSS NATIONAL ISSUES

(By Joe L. Evins, Member of Congress, Fourth District, Tennessee)

Certainly one of the highlights of this week in Washington was the visit to your Nation's Capital of a distinguished group of citizens from the Fourth District of Tennessee.

It was my pleasure to accompany this group from our area to the White House where President Johnson received them the day before he was to enter the hospital.

The President was most gracious and deeply appreciated the gratitude expressed by William Johnson, president of the association, for the Appalachian development program and its benefits to our area.

It was my pleasure to tell the President of the fine leadership and good work of the Upper Cumberland Association. Former Governor Buford Ellington, Director of Emergency Planning, had a major part in arranging the White House meeting and was also present.

Following the White House meeting, the group was our guests on Capitol Hill for a luncheon. At an afternoon meeting in the Capitol, top officials in a number of agencies briefed the leaders on Federal assistance programs available to communities.

During our afternoon meeting the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable John W. McCormack, came to the conference room, sat down and chatted with the group about the workings of the House, the President's program and his appraisal of foreign affairs and the world situation.

"This is an amazing Congress," he said, in response to one question. "In the Roosevelt days there were 12 to 15 million unemployed. There was a spontaneous public opinion in favor of legislation. Public opinion is the most potent factor in a democracy.

"Today we have a wonderful prosperity with some areas of adversity. Our Nation generally is very prosperous.

"But the personality of President Johnson has been able to penetrate to the people to arouse a response in support of the legislation. This is a great tribute to the President."

He said the world situation now could be compared to the period prior to World War II when Hitler moved through the Saar, Austria, and Czechoslovakia without serious challenge.

If this same course of appeasement were followed in South Vietnam, the Speaker said, it would "be an open invitation to communism to go ahead—to take the Philippines, to take Malaysia. Appeasement is the road to war."

Those who appeared at our invitation to outline their programs for the group included:

Mr. John Sweeney, regional cochairman of Appalachian Regional Development Commission.

Mr. Milton Semer, General Counsel and Deputy Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Mr. Richard Still, Acting Administrator of Community Facilities Administration.

Mr. Ross Davis, Acting Administrator of Small Business Administration.

Mr. Harold Williams, Deputy Administrator of Economic Development Administration, Department of Commerce, and others.

Specialists in specific program areas accompanied these officials. Following a general explanation of the specific programs, members of the delegation questioned the Federal officials about the programs available—with particular emphasis on grant programs for projects beneficial to our area.

Semer outlined four basic grant programs:

1. Grants under the Economic Development and Public Works Act for public facilities.

2. Grants under title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 for water and sewer facilities.

3. Water and sewerage grants available from the Department of Agriculture.

4. Grants for sewage treatment facilities in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The group presented a rocking chair made in our area to Federal Cochairman John L.

Sweeney of the Appalachian Regional Development Commission in appreciation of his services.

The association concluded its day with an informal Tennessee banquet. It is apparent that this group is dedicated and determined to work for greater progress in Tennessee. A spirit of cooperation prevailed and it is my belief that the meeting will result in continued progress in the great Fourth District, in a closer working relationship between the various communities and the Federal Government, and in a greater understanding of the laws and programs of Congress.

Pulaski Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 12, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, this week we observe the 186th anniversary of the death of a gallant fighter for freedom, Gen. Casimir Pulaski, the great Polish-American hero of the Revolutionary War period. He died on the field of battle during the siege of Savannah on October 11, 1779.

In appreciation of his services to the cause of American freedom and independence it has become customary to pay a well-deserved tribute to the memory of this gallant soldier who left his native Poland and came to the American Colonies to join in their struggle for a righteous cause. Pulaski participated in the battles of Germantown and Trenton, and also was with the main army at Valley Forge in the winter of 1777–78. He was only 31 years old when he lost his life at Savannah.

Freedom-loving Americans observe each year the anniversary day of the death of this brave patriot. We have named that day Pulaski Day and observe it in many parts of our country with appropriate ceremonies, as we acknowledge the debt we owe to him as one of the great fighters for the cause of American democracy.

Americans of Polish descent are justifiably proud of General Pulaski's role during our Revolutionary War period. He hated tyrany and fought against it, first in his native Poland which sought to free itself from the domination of Russia, and later with the American Colonies. To him, it was a struggle for mankind's freedom from tyranny and he gave his life for that struggle.

On this day when we honor the memory of General Pulaski, we also honor all Americans of Polish descent who helped in the development of America as a great Nation and fought in its wars for its freedom and security. They have contributed of their talents and their energy toward our cultural and religious life, our political institutions, and our economic growth. I salute them on this day and voice my fervent hope that General Pulaski's ancestral home, Poland, will soon be liberated and its people will once again live in freedom.

Cooperative Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 12, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the Governor of the great State of Iowa, the Honorable Harold E. Hughes, has proclaimed the month of October "Cooperative Month" in Iowa. I would like to take this opportunity to compliment our electric cooperatives in our State who have done so much to bring a higher standard of living to our many farm families, and the families who inhabit our many small hamlets who obtain their livelihood from agricultural related businesses. This truly cooperative effort of providing low-cost power to these many families and businesses has truly played a very large role in bringing quality food products to the consumers of this Nation at very reasonable prices, and at the same time made Iowa the wonderful place that it is to live. I would like to extend my very best wishes for many successes in the future to our Iowa electric cooperatives.

Columbus Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER L. WOLFF
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 12, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, today we honor one of the world's greatest men and one of the world's greatest explorers. He has been called the great navigator, the discoverer, the first American, and admiral of the ocean sea.

Christopher Columbus was above all else a mariner. His childhood was spent in Italy's port of Genoa and as a boy he voyaged throughout the Mediterranean. He later found employment as a maker of charts in Lisbon, Portugal, a seaport that was in his days the very center of oceanic enterprise in Europe.

When Columbus came to Lisbon in 1476, the idea of sailing west to reach the Orient had reached about the same stage of development as the idea of a manned flight at the turn of the last century. It was considered theoretically possible, but also impossibly difficult in any practical sense. After long and heartbreaking efforts, the young Genoese obtained the support he needed to make the attempt.

He was sustained in his quest by his deep religious faith. The religious motivation of Columbus is clearly shown in the circumstances of his first landing in America, the event we celebrate today. According to the log kept on that first voyage, "All having rendered thanks to our Lord, kneeling on the ground, embracing it with tears of joy for the immeasurable mercy of having reached it, the Admiral rose and gave the island the name San Salvador—Holy Savior."

Italian-Americans have emulated the qualities of their great hero, Columbus. In honoring him today, we honor also all Americans of Italian descent. Their achievements in the United States have been magnificent, and in the great tradition of accomplishment established so long ago by Columbus. An Italian discovered America, and in it Italian-Americans have come to realize their dreams and aspirations for a life of hard-won success.

Columbus Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 12, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, although some people at my alma mater would have you believe differently, Columbus did discover America 473 years ago today.

And it is on this occasion that we Americans share in the same spirit of adventure and achievement that brought Christopher Columbus from the port of Genoa to the shores of the New World.

Columbus showed great leadership in holding steadfast to his westward course each day in the face of uncertainties and doubts. For him there was no turning back—despite the threat of the unknown sea.

And it is this leadership and resolution that can provide a lesson and an inspiration for us in the nuclear age when our will and purpose is being constantly tested.

The spirit of Columbus has figured large in our history. Inspired by him, succeeding generations of Americans made their way over the seas to the New World to make a meaningful and lasting contribution to our national life. Americans of Italian descent have made significant contributions in music, art, literature, education, science, business, and labor—to name some areas that come to mind.

Therefore, it is only fitting that we join in the efforts of members and officers of Italian-American societies who are doing so much to honor the great explorer. Theirs is a great contribution to a meaningful day in the life of our Nation.

Columbus Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 12, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, today, October 12, we observe the 473d anniversary of the discovery of America by the intrepid Italian navigator Christopher Columbus. Nearly 5 centuries have gone by since that historic event in human affairs which began a new era for all mankind, but most especially for us who live in the Western Hemisphere.

In the course of history, mankind has come to recognize Columbus as a great navigator, explorer, and dreamer, but also as a dedicated and religious man who by his exploits inspired countless generations to great deeds. I believe that much of our heritage of freedom and justice is due in large measure to the courage, the determination, and the ideals of Columbus.

It is to be regretted that to this day we have not yet given to Christopher Columbus the full recognition to which he is entitled. Both in the last Congress and also in the present Congress I have introduced bills to designate October 12 of each year as a legal holiday and that it be known as Columbus Day in recognition of the achievements of the great navigator. I also suggested that this day be observed as a day of rededication to the ideals of peace, justice and democracy which have helped make America the great Nation that it is today.

I believe the time has come to make Columbus Day more meaningful, and for this reason I commend our fellow Americans of Italian origin for their efforts each year in observing this day in accordance with the ideals and dreams envisioned by Columbus. We join with them on this day in paying tribute to Columbus. We recall with pride and appreciation the magnificent contribution and the invaluable role of Italian-Americans in the growth of development of America. We salute them for their loyalty and their patriotism.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1965

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Reverend William Kenneth Amiott, of Cardinal Muench Seminary, Fargo, N. Dak., offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, Your Son once said to us, "Peace be to you, peace I leave with you; my peace I give unto you." O God, help us, for we have lost that precious gift.

Enlighten our eyes, for in our search we might walk past it, since without You we are blind to the light of peace. Encourage our hearts, for without Your strength we shall falter along the way; so few men seem to have joined the search.

Inflame our imaginations with the beauty and worth of peace, for we have so long been without it that we cannot recall it. Enrapture our minds with the glories to come to this world from peace, for we are much burdened with the ugliness of waging war. Enable us to lead our Nation to unbroken peace; let us lead men who follow freely into the path of Your bounty, for so few men are free. Encompass us all with Your love in these last days of our arduous task, for without You the builder builds in vain.

Embrace us in the fervor of peace, Almighty Father; give us peace in our time, for Thy name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, October 12, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 305)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

This is the ninth annual report on the trade agreements program, as required by section 402(a) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

In 1964, United States and free-world trade continued to set fresh records.

U.S. exports reached a new high of $25.6 billion, $6.9 billion more than our imports.

U.S. farm exports rose to $6.4 billion, an alltime peak.

Free world exports reached a record $152 billion.

The major trading nations agreed to take further steps under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to assist exports from developing countries.

The policy of two-way trade expansion and liberalization, initiated with the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 and continued by every administration since that time, has brought great benefits to this country. In general, U.S. goods have enjoyed progressively easier access to foreign markets. Low cost, high-quality U.S. exports, sold and used in every corner of the world, have provided immediate evidence of the vitality of our free enterprise system. Our processors have gained ready access to essential raw materials, and have profited from the stimulus of keener competition. Consumers have enjoyed the wide range of choice which the world market provides.

But we have only begun. We must build on past success to achieve greater well-being for America, and for all the world's peoples. In particular, we must make every effort to assure the success of the current Geneva negotiations, known as the Kennedy round.

In this International Cooperation Year of 1965, all nations should pledge themselves to work together for the steady expansion of commerce. Continuing its steady course begun in 1934, the United States will do its part in achieving that goal.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 13, 1965.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 798.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLARIFYING AND PROTECTING THE RIGHT OF THE PUBLIC TO INFORMATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1160) to amend section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act, chapter 324, of the act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 238), to clarify and protect the right of the public to information, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 3, line 8, after the letter "(C)", to insert "administrative"; on page 4, line 4, after the word "Records.", to strike out "Every" and insert "Except with respect to the records made available pursuant to subsections (a) and (b), every"; in line 6, after the word "shall", to insert "upon request for identifiable records made"; in line 8, after the word "place", to insert "fees to the extent authorized by statute"; in line 9, after the word "make", to strike out "all its" and insert "such"; in line 14, after the word "records", to strike out "and information"; in line 15, after the word "records", to strike out "or information"; on page 5, line 12, after the word "from", to strike out "the public" and insert "any person"; in line 14, after the word "letters", to strike out "dealing solely with matters of law or policy" and insert "which would not be available by law to a private party in litigation with the agency"; in line 20, after the word "party", to strike out "and"; and, in line 24, after the word "institutions", to insert a semicolon and "and (9) geological and geophysical information and data (including maps) concerning wells"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section

3, chapter 324, of the Act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 238), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. Every agency shall make available to the public the following information:

"(a) Publication in the Federal Register.—Every agency shall separately state and currently publish in the Federal Register for the guidance of the public (A) descriptions of its central and field organization and the established places at which, the officers from whom, and the methods whereby, the public may secure information, make submittals or requests, or obtain decisions; (B) statements of the general course and method by which its functions are channeled and determined, including the nature and requirements of all formal and informal procedures available; (C) rules of procedure, descriptions of forms available or the places at which forms may be obtained, and instructions as to the scope and contents of all papers, reports, or examinations; (D) substantive rules of general applicability adopted as authorized by law, and statements of general policy or interpretations of general applicability formulated and adopted by the agency; and (E) every amendment, revision, or repeal of the foregoing. Except to the extent that a person has actual and timely notice of the terms thereof, no person shall in any manner be required to resort to, or be adversely affected by any matter required to be published in the Federal Register and not so published. For purposes of this subsection, matter which is reasonably available to the class of persons affected thereby shall be deemed published in the Federal Register when incorporated by reference therein with the approval of the Director of the Federal Register.

"(b) Agency Opinions and Orders.—Every agency shall, in accordance with published rules, make available for public inspection and copying (A) all final opinions (including concurring and dissenting opinions) and all orders made in the adjudication of cases, (B) those statements of policy and interpretations which have been adopted by the agency and are not published in the Federal Register, and (C) administrative staff manuals and instructions to staff that affect any member of the public, unless such materials are promptly published and copies offered for sale. To the extent required to prevent a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, an agency may delete identifying details when it makes available or publishes an opinion, statement of policy, interpretation, or staff manual or instruction: *Provided*, That in every case the justification for the deletion must be fully explained in writing. Every agency also shall maintain and make available for public inspection and copying a current index providing identifying information for the public as to any matter which is issued, adopted, or promulgated after the effective date of this Act and which is required by this subsection to be made available or published. No final order, opinion, statement of policy, interpretation, or staff manual or instruction that affects any member of the public may be relied upon, used or cited as precedent by an agency against any private party unless it has been indexed and either made available or published as provided by this subsection or unless that private party shall have actual and timely notice of the terms thereof.

"(c) Agency Records.—Except with respect to the records made available pursuant to subsections (a) and (b), every agency shall, upon request for identifiable records made in accordance with published rules stating the time, place, fees to the extent authorized by statute and procedure to be followed, make such records promply available to any person. Upon complaint, the district court of the United States in the district in which the complainant resides, or has his principal place of business, or in which the agency records are situated shall have jurisdiction to enjoin the agency from the withholding of agency records and to order the production of any agency records improperly withheld from the complainant. In such cases the court shall determine the matter de novo and the burden shall be upon the agency to sustain its action. In the event of noncompliance with the court's order, the district court may punish the responsible officers for contempt. Except as to those causes which the court deems of greater importance, proceedings before the district court as authorized by this subsection shall take precedence on the docket over all other causes and shall be assigned for hearing and trial at the earliest practicable date and expedited in every way.

"(d) Agency Proceedings.—Every agency having more than one member shall keep a record of the final votes of each member in every agency proceeding and such record shall be available for public inspection.

"(e) Exemptions.—The provisions of this section shall not be applicable to matters that are (1) specifically required by Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of the national defense or foreign policy; (2) related solely to the internal personnel rules and practices of any agency; (3) specifically exempted from disclosure by statute; (4) trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from any person and privileged or confidential; (5) inter-agency or intra-agency memorandums or letters which would not be available by law to a private party in litigation with the agency; (6) personnel and medical files and similar files the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy; (7) investigatory files compiled for law enforcement purposes except to the extent available by law to a private party; (8) contained in or related to examination, operating or condition reports prepared by, on behalf of, or for the use of any agency responsible for the regulation or supervision of financial institutions; and (9) geological and geophysical information and data (including maps) concerning wells.

"(f) Limitation of Exemptions.—Nothing in this section authorizes withholding of information or limiting the availability of records to the public except as specifically stated in this section, nor shall this section be authority to withhold information from Congress.

"(g) Private Party.—As used in this section, 'private party' means any party other than an agency.

"(h) Effective Date.—This amendment shall become effective one year following the date of the enactment of this Act."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 813), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

In introducing S. 1666, the predecessor of the present bill, Senator Long quoted the words of Madison, who was chairman of the committee which drafted the first amendment to the Constitution:

"Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives. A popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it is but a prolog to a farce or a tragedy or perhaps both."

Today the very vastness of our Government and its myriad of agencies makes it difficult for the electorate to obtain that "popular information" of which Madison spoke. But it is only when one further considers the hundreds of departments, branches, and agencies which are not directly responsible to the people, that one begins to understand the great importance of having an information policy of full disclosure.

Although the theory of an informed electorate is vital to the proper operation of a democracy, there is nowhere in our present law a statute which affirmatively provides for that information. Many witnesses have testified that the present public information section of the Administrative Procedure Act has been used more as an excuse for withholding than as a disclosure statute.

Section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act, that section which this bill would amend, is full of loopholes which allow agencies to deny legitimate information to the public. Innumerable times it appears that information is withheld only to cover up embarrassing mistakes or irregularities and the withholding justified by such phrases in section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act as—"requiring secrecy in the public interest," or "required for good cause to be held confidential."

It is the purpose of the present bill to eliminate such phrases, to establish a general philosophy of full agency disclosure unless information is exempted under clearly delineated statutory language and to provide a court procedure by which citizens and the press may obtain information wrongfully withheld. It is important and necessary that the present void be filled. It is essential that agency personnel, and the courts as well, be given definitive guidelines in setting information policies. Standards such as "for good cause" are certainly not sufficient.

At the same time that a broad philosophy of "freedom of information" is enacted into law, it is necessary to protect certain equally important rights of privacy with respect to certain information in Government files, such as medical and personnel records. It is also necessary for the very operation of our Government to allow it to keep confidential certain material, such as the investigatory files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

It is not an easy task to balance the opposing interests, but it is not an impossible one either. It is not necessary to conclude that to protect one of the interests, the other must, of necessity, either be abrogated or substantially subordinated. Success lies in providing a workable formula which encompasses, balances, and protects all interests, yet places emphasis on the fullest responsible disclosure.

HISTORY OF LEGISLATION

After it became apparent that section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act was being used as an excuse for secrecy, proposals for change began.

The first of these proposals, S. 2504, 84th Congress, introduced by Senator Wiley, and S. 2541, 84th Congress, by Senator McCarthy, arose out of recommendations by the Hoover Commission Task Force. These were quickly followed in the 85th Congress by the Hennings bill, S. 2148, and by S. 4094, introduced by Senators Ervin and Butler, which was incorporated as a part of the proposed Code of Federal Administrative Procedure.

S. 4094 was reintroduced by Senator Hennings in the 86th Congress as S. 186. This was followed in the second session by a slightly revised version of the same bill, numbered S. 2780. Senators Ervin and Butler reintroduced S. 4094 which was designated S. 1070, 86th Congress.

More recently, Senator Carroll introduced S. 1567, cosponsored by Senators HART, LONG, and PROXMIRE. Also introduced in the 87th Congress were the Ervin bill, S. 1887, its companion bill in the House, H.R. 9926, S. 1907 by Senator PROXMIRE, and S. 3410 introduced by Senators DIRKSEN and Carroll.

Although hearings were held on the Hennings bills, and considerable interest was aroused by all of the bills, no legislation resulted.

In the last Congress, the Senate passed S. 1666, upon which this bill is based, on July 31, 1964, but sufficient time did not remain in that Congress for its full consideration by the House. The present bill is substantially S. 1666, as passed by the Senate, with amendments reflecting suggestions made to the committee in the course of the hearings.

INADEQUACY OF PRESENT LAW

The present section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act, which would be replaced by S. 1160, is so brief that it can be profitably placed at this point in the report:

"PUBLIC INFORMATION

"Section 3: Except to the extent that there is involved (1) any function of the United States requiring secrecy in the public interest or (2) any matter relating solely to the internal management of an agency—

"(a) Rules: Every agency shall separately state and currently publish in the Federal Register (1) descriptions of its central and field organization including delegations by the agency of final authority and the established places at which, and methods whereby, the public may secure information or make submittals or requests; (2) statements of the general course and method by which its functions are channeled and determined, including the nature and requirements of all formal or informal procedures available as well as forms and instructions as to the scope and contents of all papers, reports, or examinations; and (3) substantive rules adopted as authorized by law and statements of general policy or interpretations formulated and adopted by the agency for the guidance of the public; but not rules addressed to and served upon named persons in accordance with law. No person shall in any manner be required to resort to organization or procedure not so published.

"(b) Opinions and orders: Every agency shall publish or, in accordance with published rule, make available to public inspection all final opinions or orders in the adjudication of cases (except those required for good cause to be held confidential and not cited as precedents) and all rules.

"(c) Public records: Save as otherwise required by statute, matters of official record shall in accordance with published rule be made available to persons properly and directly concerned except information held confidential for good cause found."

The serious deficiencies in this present statute are obvious. They fall into four categories:

1. There is excepted from the operation of the whole section "any function of the United States requiring secrecy in the public interest * * *." There is no attempt in the bill or its legislative history to delimit "in the public interest," and there is no authority granted for any review of the use of this vague phrase by Federal officials who wish to withhold information.

2. Although subsection (b) requires the agency to make available to public inspection "all final opinions or orders in the adjudication of cases," it vitiates this command by adding the following limitation: "* * * except those required for good cause to be held confidential * * *."

3. As to public records generally, subsection (c) requires their availability "to persons properly and directly concerned except information held confidential for good cause found." This is a double-barreled loophole because not only is there the vague phrase "for good cause found," there is also a further excuse for withholding if persons are not "properly and directly concerned."

4. There is no remedy in case of wrongful withholding of information from citizens by Government officials.

PRESENT SECTION 3 OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT IS WITHHOLDING STATUTE, NOT DISCLOSURE STATUTE

It is the conclusion of the committee that the present section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act is of little or no value to the public in gaining access to records of the Federal Government. Indeed, it has had precisely the opposite effect: it is cited as statutory authority for the withholding of virtually any piece of information that an official or an agency does not wish to disclose.

Under the present section 3, any Government official can under color of law withhold almost anything from any citizen under the vague standards—or, more precisely, lack of standards—in section 3. It would require almost no effort for any official to think up a reason why a piece of information should be withheld (1) because it was in the "public interest," or (2) "for good cause found," or (3) that the person making the request was not "properly and directly concerned." And, even if his reason had not a scintilla of validity, there is absolutely nothing that a citizen seeking information can do because there is no remedy available.

WHAT S. 1160 WOULD DO

S. 1160 would emphasize that section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act is not a withholding statute but a disclosure statute by the following major changes:

1. It sets up workable standards for what records should and should not be open to public inspection. In particular, it avoids the use of such vague phrases as "good cause found" and replaces them with specific and limited types of information that may be withheld.

2. It eliminates the test of who shall have the right to different information. For the great majority of different records, the public as a whole has a right to know what its Government is doing. There is, of course, a certain need for confidentiality in some aspects of Government operations and these are protected specifically; but outside these limited areas, all citizens have a right to know.

3. The revised section 3 gives to any aggrieved citizen a remedy in court.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF BILL

Description of subsection (a)

Subsection (a) deals entirely with publication of material in the Federal Register. This subsection has fewer changes from the existing law than any other; primarily because there have been few complaints about omission from the Federal Register of necessary official material. In fact, what complaints there have been have been more on the side of too much publication rather than too little.

The principal change in subsection (a) has been to deal with the exceptions to its provisions in a single subsection, subsection (e).

There are a number of minor changes which attempt to make it more clear that the purpose of inclusion of material in the Federal Register is to guide the public in determining where and by whom decisions are made, as well as where they may secure information and make submittals and requests.

There is also a provision, suggested by a number of agencies, for incorporation of other publications by reference in the Federal Register. This may be helpful in reducing the bulky present size of the Register.

The new sanction imposed for failure to publish the matters enumerated in section 3(a) was added to expressly provide that a person shall not be adversely affected by matters required to be published and not so published. This gives added incentive to the agencies to publish the required material.

The following technical changes were also made with regard to subsection 3(a):

The phrase "* * * but not rules addressed to and served upon named persons in accordance with law * * *" was stricken because section 3(a) as amended only requires the publication of rules of general applicability.

"Rules of procedure" was added to remove an uncertainty. "Description of forms available" was added to eliminate the need of publishing lengthy forms.

The new clause (E) is an obvious change, added for the sake of completeness and clarity.

Description of subsection (b)

Subsection (b) of S. 1160 (as subsec. (b) of sec. 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act) deals with agency opinions, orders, and rules. This Administrative Procedure Act subsection is replaced by a detailed subsection, specifying what orders, opinions, and rules must be made available. The exceptions have again been moved to a single subsection, subsection (e), dealing with exceptions.

Apart from the exemptions, agencies must make available for public inspection and copying all final opinions (including concurring and dissenting opinions); all orders made in the adjudication of cases; and those statements of policy and interpretations which have been adopted by the agency and are not required to be published in the Federal Register; and administrative staff manuals and instructions to staff that affect any member of the public.

There is a provision for the deletion of certain details in opinions, statements of policy, interpretations, staff manuals and instructions to prevent "a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." The authority to delete identifying details after written justification is necessary in order to be able to balance the public's right to know with the private citizen's right to be secure in his personal affairs which have no bearing or effect on the general public. For example, it may be pertinent to know that unseasonably harsh weather has caused an increase in public relief costs; but it is not necessary that the identity of any person so affected be made public.

Written justification for deletion of identifying details is to be placed as preamble to "* * * the opinion, statement of policy, interpretation or staff manual or instruction * * *" that is made available.

Requiring the agencies to keep a current index of their orders, opinions, etc., is necessary to afford the private citizen the essential information to enable him to deal effectively and knowledgeably with the Federal agencies. This change will prevent a citizen from losing a controversy with an agency because of some obscure and hidden order or opinion which the agency knows about but which has been unavailable to the citizen simply because he had no way in which to discover it. However, considerations of time and expense cause this indexing requirement to be made prospective in application only.

Many agencies already have indexing programs, e.g., the Interstate Commerce Commission. Such indexes satisfy the requirements of this bill insofar as they achieve the purpose of the indexing requirement. No other special or new indexing will be necessary for such agencies.

Subsection (b) contains its own sanction that orders, opinions, etc., which are not properly indexed and made available to the public may not be relied upon or cited as precedent by an agency.

There are also a number of technical changes in section 3(b):

The phrase "* * * and copying * * *" was added because it is frequently of little use to be able to inspect orders or the like unless one is able to copy them for future reference. Hence the right to copy these matters is supplemental to the right to inspect and makes the latter right meaningful.

The addition of "* * * concurring and dissenting opinions * * *" is added to insure that, if one or more agency members dissent or concur, the public and the parties should have access to these views and ideas.

The enumeration of orders, etc., defines what materials are subject to section 3(b)'s requirements. The "unless" clause was added to provide the agencies with an alternative means of making these materials available through publication.

Description of subsection (c)

Subsection (c) deals with "agency records" and would have almost the reverse result of present subsection (c) which deals with "public records." Whereas the present subsection 3(c) of the Administrative Procedure Act has been construed to authorize widespread withholding of agency records, subsection 3(c) of S. 1160 requires their disclosure.

The records must be identifiable by the person requesting them, i.e., a reasonable description enabling the Government employee to locate the requested records. This requirement of identification is not to be used as a method of withholding records.

Subsection (c) contains a specific court remedy for any alleged wrongful withholding of agency records by agency personnel. The aggrieved person can bring an action in the district court where he resides, has his place of business, or in which the agency records are situated. The court may require the agency to pay costs and reasonable attorney's fees of the complainant as in other cases.

That the proceeding must be de novo is essential in order that the ultimate decision as to the propriety of the agency's action is made by the court and prevent it from becoming meaningless judicial sanctioning of agency discretion.

Placing the burden of proof upon the agency puts the task of justifying the withholding on the only party able to explain it. The private party can hardly be asked to prove that an agency has improperly withheld public information because he will not know the reasons for the agency action.

The court is authorized to give actions under this subsection precedence on the docket over other causes. Complaints of wrongful withholding shall be heard "at the earliest practicable date and expedited in every way."

Description of subsection (d)

This subsection provides that a record be kept of all final votes by agency members in every agency proceeding and that this record of votes be available to the public.

Agency practice in this area varies. This change makes the publication of final votes of agency members a uniform practice and provides the public with a very important part of the agency's decisional process.

Description of subsection (e)

Subsection (e) deals with the categories of matters which are exempt from disclosure under the bill. Exemption No. 1 is for matters specifically required by Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of the national defense or foreign policy. The change of standard from "in the public interest" is made both to delimit more narrowly the exception and to give it a more precise definition. The phrase "public interest" in section 3(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act has been subject to conflicting interpretations, often colored by personal prejudices and predilections. It admits of no clear delineations, and it has served in many cases to defeat the very purpose for which it was intended—the public's right to know the operations of its Government. Rather than protecting the public's interest, it has caused widespread public dissatisfaction and confusion. Retention of such an exception in section 3(a) is, therefore, inconsistent with the general objective of enabling the public readily to gain access to the information necessary to deal effectively and upon equal footing with Federal agencies.

Exemption No. 2 relates only to the internal personnel rules and practices of an agency. Examples of these may be rules as to personnel's use of parking facilities or regulation of lunch hours, statements of policy as to sick leave, and the like.

Exemption No. 3 deals with matters specifically exempt from disclosure by another statute.

Exemption No. 4 is for "trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from any person and privileged or confidential." This exception is necessary to protect the confidentiality of information which is obtained by the Government through questionnaires or other inquiries, but which would customarily not be released to the public by the person from whom it was obtained. This would include business sales statistics, inventories, customer lists, and manufacturing processes. It would also include information customarily subject to the doctor-patient, lawyer-client, lender-borrower, and other such privileges. Specifically it would include any commercial, technical, and financial data, submitted by an applicant or a borrower to a lending agency in connection with any loan application or loan.

Exemption No. 5 relates to "inter-agency or intra-agency memorandums or letters which would not be available by law to a private party in litigation with the agency." It was pointed out in the comments of many of the agencies that it would be impossible to have any frank discussion of legal or policy matters in writing if all such writings were to be subjected to public scrutiny. It was argued, and with merit, that efficiency of Government would be greatly hampered if, with respect to legal and policy matters, all Government agencies were prematurely forced to "operate in a fishbowl." The committee is convinced of the merits of this general proposition, but it has attempted to delimit the exception as narrowly as consistent with efficient Government operation.

Exemption No. 6 contains an exemption for "personnel and medical files, and similar files the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Such agencies as the Veterans' Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Selective Service, etc., have great quantities of files, the confidentiality of which has been maintained by agency rule but without statutory authority. There is a consensus that these files should not be opened to the public, and the committee decided upon a general exemption rather than a number of specific statutory authorizations for various agencies. It is believed that the scope of the exemption is held within bounds by the use of the limitation of "a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy."

The phrase "clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy" enunciates a policy that will involve a balancing of interests between the protection of an individual's private affairs from unnecessary public scrutiny, and the preservation of the public's right to governmental information. The application of this policy should lend itself particularly to those Government agencies where persons are required to submit vast amounts of personal data usually for limited purposes. For example, health, welfare, and selective service records are highly personal to the person involved, yet facts concerning the award of a pension or benefit should be disclosed to the public.

Exemption No. 7 deals with "investigatory files compiled for law enforcement purposes." These are the files prepared by Government agencies to prosecute law violators. Their disclosure of such files, except to the extent they are available by law to a private party, could harm the Government's case in court.

Exemption No. 8 is directed specifically to insuring the security of our financial institutions by making available only to the Government agencies responsible for the regulation or supervision of such institutions the examination, operating, or condition reports prepared by, on behalf of, or for the use of such agencies.

Description of subsection (f)

The purpose of this subsection is to make it clear beyond doubt that all materials of the Government are to be made available to the public by publication or otherwise unless explicitly allowed to be kept secret by one of the exemptions in subsection (e). Further, it is made clear that, because this section only refers to the public's right to know, it cannot, therefore, be backhandedly construed as authorizing the withholding of information from the Congress, the collective representative of the public.

Description of subsection (g)

This subsection provides a definition of the term "private party" which is not presently defined in the act being amended by this bill.

Description of subsection (h)

The 1-year period before this act goes into effect is to allow ample time for the agencies to conform their practices to the requirements of this act.

CONCLUSION

The committee feels that this bill, as amended, would establish a much-needed policy of disclosure, while balancing the necessary interest of confidentiality.

A government by secrecy benefits no one.

It injures the people it seeks to serve; it injures its own integrity and operation.

It breeds mistrust, dampens the fervor of its citizens, and mocks their loyalty.

For these reasons, the committee reports the bill with the recommendation that it be adopted, as amended.

COPYRIGHT OFFICE FEES

The bill (H.R. 2853) to amend title 17, United States Code, with relation to the fees to be charged was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 814), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 2853 is to increase the fees payable to the Copyright Office, so as to bring the cash receipts of the Office more nearly in line with its expenditures.

STATEMENT

The present statutory fees of the Copyright Office were established in 1948. As a result of the 1948 amendment of copyright fees, the income of the Office then exceeded its expenditures. Since fiscal year 1950 the ratio of fees to expenditures has dropped from 100 percent to 63 percent for fiscal year 1965. This decline has resulted in expressions of concern from the Appropriations Committees of both the Senate and the

House. On July 6, 1965, the Senate Appropriations Committee, in Senate Report No. 424, on the legislative branch appropriation bill, at page 12, declared:

"The operations of this Office result in cash receipts to the Government, although recovery from fees receipts is diminishing from year to year. The estimated percentage of fees as applied to costs for fiscal year 1966 is 62 percent as compared to 103 percent in 1949. Fees have remained the same since 1948 and, in view of rising costs, it is the committee's opinion that pending legislation raising the registration fee should be given priority consideration by the appropirate legislative committees."

S. 2472, a bill which is virtually identical to H.R. 2853, was introduced by Senator MONRONEY on August 30, 1965, and referred to this committee. No action was taken on this bill since H.R. 2853 was passed by the other body on September 7, 1965.

SPFCIFIC INCREASES IN FEES

H.R. 2853 would increase from $4 to $6 the fee for the registration of a claim to copyright in any work, including a print or label used for articles of merchandise. The fee for registration of a claim to renewal of copyright would be increased from $2 to $4.

The present fee schedule does not provide a fee for the recordation of notices of intention to use a musical composition on a phonograph record, although the recordation of a notice of use does require a fee. This legislation provides for a fee of $3 for the recordation of a notice of intention to use.

H.R. 2853 would increase the maximum price for the entire set of Catalog of Copyright Entries. Current law provides that the cost of such full set of catalogs shall not exceed $25 and permits the Register of Copyrights to set a price for individual parts of the catalog. Based upon the increases in the cost of printing, the fee for the full set of catalogs would be listed at a maximum price of $75.

Other copyright fees are raised in a smaller amount, as will be seen by reference to the following table which contains a comparison of the present and proposed fees:

Copyright Office fee schedules, 1909 to H.R. 2853

	1909	1928	1948	H.R. 2853
Entire catalog	$5.00	$10.00	$25.00	$75.00
Registration (except commercial prints and labels)	1.00	2.00	4.00	6.00
Registration (commercial prints and labels)	------	------	6.00	6.00
Registration (photographs), no certificate	.50	1.00	------	------
Renewal	.50	1.00	2.00	4.00
Additional certificate	.50	1.00	1.00	2.00
Certification	1.00	2.00	2.00	3.00
Recording assignments	1.00	2.00	3.00	5.00
Additional pages	------	------	.50	.50
Additional titles	.10	.10	.50	.50
Notice of use	.25	1.00	2.00	3.00
Notice of intention to use	------	------	------	3.00
Additional title	------	------	.50	.50
Searches (per hour)	.50	1.00	3.00	5.00
Comparing copy of assignment with Copyright Office record and certifying	1.00	2.00	------	------

INCOME RESULTS OF H.R. 2853

It is anticipated by the Copyright Office that the fee increases will result in a slight decline in the number of registrations. Allowing for such a decline, the Copyright Office estimates that the fee schedule in the bill would return approximately 80 percent of the moneys appropriated to the Office. This recovery is in line with the 75-percent recovery provided in the new Patent Office fee schedule, Public Law 89–83.

CONCLUSION

The committee believes that a reasonable percentage of the costs of the Copyright Office should be sustained by those who most directly benefit from its services. The committee is of the view that the proposed increases are reasonable and warranted.

EXTENSION OF DESIGN PATENT OF INSIGNIA OF MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF THE UNITED AMERICAN VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC.

The bill (H.R. 7888) providing for the extension of patent numbered D–119,187 was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 815), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 7888 is to renew an expired design patent, No. D–119,187, constituting the insignia of the Massachusetts Department of the United American Veterans of the United States of America, Inc., for a period of 14 years.

STATEMENT

The subject design patent was issued on February 27, 1940, for a term of 14 years. Accordingly, the patent expired on February 27, 1954. Bills to accomplish the same objective as H.R. 7888 were introduced in the 83d, 84th, and 86th Congresses, but no action was taken on them.

Section (b) of H.R. 7888 provides that no person who has manufactured the design of the patent between its expiration on February 27, 1954, and the date of enactment of the bill, shall be liable for infringement for reason of the continued manufacture and sale thereof.

CONCLUSION

The Congress has frequently enacted legislation extending the terms of design patents covering the insignia of various military, fraternal, and patriotic organizations.

On H.R. 9833 of the 88th Congress (Public Law 88–937), an act granting a renewal of patent No. D–162,975, relating to a medal of the American Legion, the Department of Commerce commented favorably on the extension of a design patent for the American Legion. This report of the Department is identical to other reports furnished by the Department on similar legislation.

APPOINTMENT OF CRIER-LAW CLERKS BY U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

The bill (H.R. 7707) to authorize the appointment of crier-law clerks by district judges was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 816), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide the statutory authority for the position of crier-law clerk to be appointed by a U.S. district judge. Accordingly, it amends the first paragraph of 28 U.S.C. 755.

STATEMENT

This bill was recommended by the Judicial Conference of the United States in a letter dated April 12, 1965, addressed to the Vice President of the United States.

Each district judge is allowed one secretary and if he is a chief judge, having five or more judges in his district, he is entitled to an assistant secretary. In addition, each district judge is entitled to a law clerk where the chief judge of the circuit has certified the need for such position and, finally each district judge is entitled to one crier-bailiff who also acts as a messenger.

For several years the district judges granted the privilege of appointing a combination court crier-law clerk in lieu of a court crier alone. That person was paid a grade GS–7 rather than a grade GS–5 salary. The salary of a GS–5 ranges from $5,000 to $6,485 per annum, and a GS–7 ranges from $6,050 to $7,850 per annum.

In 1959, as a result of testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee, the Judicial Conference concluded that it was without statutory authority to create the position of crier-law clerk. A total of 22 individuals had been appointed to such positions between 1956 and 1959. Since that time these positions have not been authorized and those that were allowed prior thereto have been phased out. Thus, this bill would give statutory authority for the appointment of a legally qualified person to the position of crier-law clerk. It would in no way alter the right of the district judge to use a court crier as he deems proper. It merely permits each district judge who wishes to do so to appoint this specially qualified individual. In each instance where it is utilized it will result in an additional per annum cost of $1,125.

The committee is of the opinion that this bill has a meritorious purpose, and accordingly recommends favorable consideration of H.R. 7707, without amendment.

CLARENCE EARLE DAVIS

The bill (H.R. 9521) for the relief of Clarence Earle Davis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 817), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the admission into the United States in a nonquota status of the alien child to be adopted by the putative father and his wife, citizens of the United States.

MR. AND MRS. EARL HARWELL HOGAN

The bill (S. 1520) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Earl Harwell Hogan was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Earl Harwell Hogan, of Pine Bluff, Arkansas, the sum of $120, in full satisfaction of all their claims against the United States for reimbursement of the cost of transportation of the privately owned automobile of their son, the late Lowell S. Hogan, specialist, United States Army, from Bremen, Germany, his last duty station, to Pine Bluff, Arkansas, the said Mr. and Mrs. Earl Harwell Hogan having transported such automobile at their own expense in reliance upon the erroneous advice of agents of the United States, who misinterpreted United States Army regulations pursuant to which such transportation was authorized to be made at the expense of the United States: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 818), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the sum of $120 to Mr. and Mrs. Earl Harwell Hogan, of Pine Bluff, Ark., in full settlement of their claims against the United States for reimbursement of the cost of transportation of the privately owned automobile of their son, the late Lowell S. Hogan, U.S. Army, from Bremen, Germany, his last duty station, to Pine Bluff, Ark., the said Mr. and Mrs. Harwell Hogan having transported such automobile at their own expense in reliance upon the erroneous advice of agents of the United States who misinterpreted U.S. Army regulations, pursuant to which such transportation was authorized to be made at the expense of the United States.

JOAQUIN U. VILLAGOMEZ

The bill (S. 2091) for the relief of Joaquin U. Villagomez was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Joaquin U. Villagomez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 819), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Joaquin U. Villagomez. The bill provides for an appropriate quota deduction and for the payment of the required visa fee.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 1218) for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co. and/or Holt Import & Export Co., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

JOSEPH J. McDEVITT

The bill (H.R. 1311) for the relief of Joseph J. McDevitt was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 821), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay Joseph J. McDevitt, of Philadelphia, Pa., $584 in full settlement of his claim for reimbursement for a claim he paid in settlement of a judgment based upon an accident involving a mail truck operated by him in the scope of his employment as an employee of the United States.

JOSEPH DURANTE

The bill (H.R. 1319) for the relief of Joseph Durante was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 822), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

LOUIS W. HANN

The bill (H.R. 1409) for the relief of Louis W. Hann was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 823), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Louis W. Hann, of Orange, N.J., the sum of $1,422.13 in full settlement of all his claims against the United States for the amount he was required to pay to the United States for transporting the excess weight of his household goods from Stuttgart, Germany, to Orange, N.J., during 1961, after being improperly separated from his position as a civilian employee of the Department of the Army.

FIRST LT. ROBERT B. GANN, AND OTHERS

The bill (H.R. 1644) for the relief of 1st Lt. Robert B. Gann, and others, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 824), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve a group of 10 Marine Corps first lieutenants from liability to repay overpayments of compensation which were made as a result of an administrative error in establishing each individual's pay entry base date due to credit of certain enlisted service which was concurrent to service as midshipman.

MISS GLORIA SEBORG

The bill (H.R. 2005) for the relief of Miss Gloria Seborg was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 825), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 22-year-old native and citizen of Canada who entered the United States for permanent residence on November 5, 1954. In August 1962, she departed to France to continue her studies. In September 1963, she returned to the United States. She has been accepted by the Peace Corps, conditioned upon her naturalization as a U.S. citizen.

CONSTANTINOS AGGANIS

The bill (H.R. 1836) for the relief of Constantinos Agganis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 826), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF BILL

The purpose of the bill is to provide for restoration of U.S. citizenship to Constantinos Agganis, who expatriated himself by voting in a foreign political election.

MRS. CONCETTA CIOFFI CARSON

The bill (H.R. 2285) for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Cioffi Carson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 827), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to waive the excluding provision of existing law relating to one who is afflicted with schizophrenic reaction, paranoid type, insanity in behalf of the wife of a U.S. citizen member of the Air Force. The bill provides for the posting of a bond as a guarantee that the beneficiary will not become a public charge, in the event she is not entitled to care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act.

FRANK SIMMS

The bill (H.R. 2557) for the relief of Frank Simms was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 828), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve Frank Simms, an employee in the Public Works Department, U.S. Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill., of liability for an overpayment of $349.80, which resulted from the fact that his hourly wage had been increased by 7 cents an hour when he was being paid "saved pay" and he was paid on that basis for a 2-year period.

MARIA ALEXANDROS SIAGRIS

The bill (H.R. 2757) for the relief of Maria Alexandros Siagris was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 829), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the admission into the United States in a nonquota status of an alien child adopted by citizens of the United States.

HWANG TAI SHIK

The bill (H.R. 3288) for the relief of Hwang Tai Shik was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 830), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the admission into the United States in a nonquota status of the alien child adopted by citizens of the United States.

MARY ANN HARTMANN

The bill (H.R. 3515) for the relief of Mary Ann Hartmann was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 831), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the admission into the United States in a nonquota status of the alien child adopted by citizens of the United States.

EMILIA MAJKA

The bill (H.R. 3669) for the relief of Emilia Majka was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 832), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to preserve nonquota status in behalf of the widow of a U.S. citizen.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE EMPLOYEES

The bill (H.R. 3770) for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Navy at the Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, Calif., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 833), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve 85 named employees of the Department of the Navy at the Pacific Missile Range at Point Mugu, Calif., of the liability to refund amounts paid to them due to administrative error in the determination of their annual salary rates in the period 1959 through 1964.

WILLIAM L. MINTON

The bill (H.R. 4078) for the relief of William L. Minton was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 834), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve William L. Minton of all liability to repay $241, the amount of his liability, to the United States for overpayments of per diem during the period August 16, 1960, to April 13, 1961, while he was serving as a member of the U.S. Navy. This bill also provides for a refund of amounts repaid or withheld because of the liability.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 4088) for the relief of Irving M. Sobin Chemical Co., Inc., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

DR. JAN ROSCISZEWSKI

The bill (H.R. 4137) for the relief of Dr. Jan Rosciszewski was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 836), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

ANGELICA ANAGNOSTOPOULOS

The bill (H.R. 4194) for the relief of Angelica Anagnostopoulos was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 837), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the admission into the United States in a nonquota status of the alien child adopted by a citizen of the United States.

ALTON G. EDWARDS

The bill (H.R. 4203) for the relief of Alton G. Edwards was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 838), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to pay Alton G. Edwards, of Orlando, Fla., $348.23 as reimbursement of the amount he paid in settlement of a judgment rendered against him based upon an accident which occurred on September 10, 1960, involving a mail truck operated by him while performing his duties as an employee of the United States.

MICHAEL HADJICHRISTOFAS

The bill (H.R. 4464) for the relief of Michael Hadjichristofas, Aphrodite Hadjichristofas, and Paniote Hadjichristofas was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 839), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the entry into the United States in a nonquota status of two alien children to be adopted by citizens of the United States. The bill also grants second preference status to the adult brother of the minor beneficiaries.

AUTHORIZE THE ADMINISTRATIVE SETTLEMENT OF TORT CLAIMS ARISING IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The bill (H.R. 5167) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the administrative settlement of tort claims arising in foreign countries, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 840), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to amend title 38 of the United States Code by adding a new section 236 granting authority to the Administrator of the Veteran's Administration to settle tort claims arising in foreign countries in connection with Veterans' Administration operations in the same manner as claims may be settled under the administrative authority provided in section 2672 of title 28, United States Code. The bill would further amend section 235 of title 38 by correcting internal references to other sections of the code where the present references have been rendered obsolete by subsequent law.

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

Subsection (a): This subsection adds a new section 236 to title 38, which extends to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs the authority, now held by several other agencies or departments, to administratively settle tort claims (subject to a $2,500 limitation) arising in foreign countries, in connection with VA activities, in the same manner as is now permissible in this country under the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U.S.C. 2672). Section 2401 of title 28 of the United States Code requires that an administrative claim under section 2672 must be presented in writing to the appropriate Federal agency within 2 years after the claim accrues. This bill would add a new section to title 38 which would grant equivalent authority for overseas cases arising from Veterans' Administration activities and specific reference is made in this section to the 2-year limitation concerning the filing of claims.

Subsection (b): This subsection is purely technical in nature and amends the analysis at the head of chapter 3 of title 38 to reflect the addition of the new section 236.

Subsection (c): This subsection clarifies the language of section 235 of title 38 to reflect the changes in statutory references brought about by the enactment of the Overseas Differentials and Allowances Act (Public Law 86-707). It makes no substantive change in the benefits and allowances now authorized to Veterans' Administration employees, but merely deletes obsolete references to repealed or superseded sections of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 and the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, and, in conformance with the general pattern of title 38, restates the current applicable authority in terms of United States Code citations. All specific references currently cited in section 235 to allowances or benefits provided to overseas employees generally by the Overseas Differentials and Allowances Act (secs. 901(1), 902, 903, and 911(9) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946), and the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, have been deleted. For purposes of clarity, a sentence has been placed in the proposed section 235 indicating that the allowances and benefits specifically cited therein supplement, but are not in lieu of, allowances and benefits that have been provided to all Government employees overseas by titles 5 and 22, United States Code.

The following table shows the conversion from the citations to the Foreign Service Act of 1946 to the current applicable reference in the United States Code:

Foreign Service Act of 1946:	*United States Code*
Sec. 901(3)	22 U.S.C. 1131.
Sec. 911 (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) and (7).	22 U.S.C. 1136 (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) and (7).
Sec. 913	22 U.S.C. 1138.
Sec. 933	22 U.S.C. 1148.
Sec. 941	22 U.S.C. 1156.

The specific references to sections in title 22 of the United States Code just referred to concern allowances and benefits of Foreign Service personnel of the State Department. These same provisions have been made applicable to Veterans' Administration personnel overseas by section 235 of title 38. In making the nonsubstantive changes proposed in this bill, it is, therefore, necessary to retain the specific reference to each of these sections of title 22. The final sentence of the section makes it clear that the grant of this authority supplements but is not in lieu of other allowances and benefits provided in titles 5 and 22. The House amendment to this section is intended to clarify the fact that other general provisions in titles 5 and 22 apply to oversea employees of the Veterans' Administration and are in no way affected by the specific references to sections of title 22 in section 235 of title 38.

Subsection (d): This subsection is a savings clause to insure the continuation of the applicable delegations by the President to the Secretary of State (Executive Order No. 10853, as amended by Executive Orders Nos. 11123 and 10903) with respect to the benefits and allowances contained in 38 U.S.C. 235, and the resulting authorizations to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs from the Secretary of State, until and unless otherwise changed.

STATEMENT

The Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, in its report on this proposed legislation, explained the facts and circumstances surrounding it, along with its favorable recommendation, as follows:

"The bill, H.R. 5167, was introduced in accordance with the recommendations contained in an executive communication transmitted to the Congress by the Veterans' Administration which recommends its enactment.

"This bill has two purposes. Its primary purpose is to authorize the administrative settlement of tort claims in foreign countries in a similar manner to that now authorized for other Government agencies. The administrative settlement of tort claims which would be extended under this bill would be limited to those claims which do not exceed $2,500. Section 2672 of title 28 of the United States Code, which is a codified restatement of a portion of the original Tort Claims Act, provides for the administrative settlement of tort claims which do not exceed $2,500 which arise from incidents subject to the jurisdictional provisions of the tort claims sections of title 28. The second purpose of the bill is to correct with no substantive change in the law the present language of section 235 of title 38 of the United States Code concerning benefits and allowances of Veterans' Administration employees at Veterans' Administration offices in foreign countries so as to accurately reflect the true legal situation concerning such benefits subsequent to the enactment of Public Law 86-707 (Overseas Differentials and Allowances Act).

"As is stated in the executive communication, the Veterans' Administration has become concerned with recent developments wherein Veterans' Administration employees abroad have been forced to personally pay damages, for injuries or property damage, as a result of an accident in connection with Veterans' Administration activities. Such a situation would be covered in the United States by the Federal Tort Claims Act which provides for the administrative settlement, by the agency, of tort claims up to $2,500. This act does not apply to claims arising in a foreign country. While an administrative settlement under such act does not preclude a suit against an employee (except as provided in Public Law 87-278 in cases of drivers of motor vehicles) it does minimize the likelihood of such an action.

"The bill, H.R. 5167, was the subject of a subcommittee hearing on March 4, 1965. At that hearing the testimony established the fact that similar authority for the settlement of claims arising as a result of actions of employees of the United States has been extended to a number of other Government agencies or departments. The Veterans' Administration, therefore, finds itself in the position where it is unable to settle claims in oversea areas which could have been settled had they arisen as the result of activities of other U.S agenices. There was, therefore, a precedent for authorizing the administrative settlement of this type of claim in the same manner as claims arising in the United States may be settled administratively under the Tort Claims Act when the claims do not exceed $2,500. The departments or agencies with the authority to settle claims in this manner in oversea areas and the provisions of law granting them authority to settle such claims are: The State Department (5 U.S.C. 170g(f); the Agency for International Development (general authority provided by their appropriation acts); the U.S. Information Agency (specific authority provided in their appropriation acts). Somewhat similar authority, although broader in scope, has been granted to the Department of Defense (10 U.S.C. 2733 and 2734).

"In the executive communication, the Veterans' Administration noted that the same considerations which led to the authorization for administrative settlement of claims just referred to apply equally in its case. The communication included this statement:

" 'We believe the reasons which motivated the Congress to grant the aforestated authority to the foregoing agencies are equally applicable to our operations. Such authority would provide a means of avoiding possible adverse reaction against the United States, within a foreign country, as a result of a situation that occurred in connection with official actions. Moreover, it is only fair that our employees overseas receive the same consideration as those in this country with respect to minimizing the likelihood of direct action against them, or harassment as a result of their Veterans' Administration activities.'

"The amendments proposed to section 235 of title 38, United States Code, are clarifying in nature and involve no substantive change in the law. The present text of such section, concerning benefits and allowances to Veterans' Administration employees abroad, currently does not accurately reflect the true legal situation concerning such benefits. This situation exists due to the fact that such section 235 has never been updated to reflect the changes brought about by the enactment of the Overseas Differentials and Allowances Act (Public Law 86-707). As a result, it contains references to certain allowances and benefits, provided by various sections of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 and the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, which have now been wholly or partially repealed or superseded by Public Law 86-707.

"At the hearing on March 4, 1965, the representative of the Veterans' Administration was questioned as to potential cost involved should the authority to settle such claims be extended to the Veterans' Administration. It is impossible to predict exactly how many claims might be filed. It is also impossible to state what percentage of such claims would be determined to involve negligence and the elements of responsibility necessary to impose liability on the Government under the Federal Tort Claims Act provisions of title 28. The communication from the Veterans' Administration states that only four successful actions occurred which resulted in judgment against its overesa employees since 1959. As has been noted, the principal benefit which would accrue for the granting of authority for such settlements would be to make it possible for the prompt and equitable settlement of meritorious claims in foreign areas. This would provide the Veterans' Administration with a means of avoiding possible adverse reaction against the United States in a foreign area as the result of damage or injury which occurred in connection with official U.S. activity in the country concerned.

"The committee agrees that there is a well-defined need for the amendments provided in this bill and recommends that it be considered favorably."

This committee agrees with the conclusions reached by the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives and it is, therefore, recommended that H.R. 5167 be favorably considered.

MARY FRANCES CRABBS

The bill (H.R. 5554) for the relief of Mary Frances Crabbs was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 841), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the admission into the United States in a nonquota status of the alien child adopted by citizens of the United States.

MARIA DEL ROSARIO DE FATIMA LOPEZ HAYES

The bill (H.R. 5457) for the relief of Maria del Rosario de Fatima Lopez Hayes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 842), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the admission to the United States in a nonquota status of the alien child adopted by a citizen of the United States.

NAM IE KIM

The bill (H.R. 5904) for the relief of Nam Ie Kim was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 843), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the admission into the United States in a nonquota status of the alien child adopted by citizens of the United States.

KIM SUN HO

The bill (H.R. 6229) for the relief of Kim Sun Ho was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 844), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the admission into the United States in a nonquota status of the alien child adopted by citizens of the United States.

CHUN SOO KIM

The bill (H.R. 6235) for the relief of Chun Soo Kim was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 845), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the admission into the United States in a nonquota status of the alien child adopted by citizens of the United States.

DR. ORHAN METIN OZMAT

The bill (H.R. 6819) for the relief of Dr. Orhan Metin Ozmat was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 846), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to provide that the beneficiary shall have complied with the requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to residence and physical presence in the United States.

THE SUCCESSORS IN INTEREST OF COOPER BLYTH AND GRACE JOHNSTON BLYTH OTHERWISE GRACE McCLOY BLYTH

The bill (H.R. 8350) for the relief of the successors in interest of Cooper Blyth and Grace Johnston Blyth otherwise Grace McCloy Blyth was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 847), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize and direct the Attorney General to return to Barclays Bank, Ltd., of London as executor under the will of Cooper Blyth, deceased, $654.73, representing the proceeds of 15 shares of capital stock of the National City Bank of New York which was vested under a vesting order dated April 26, 1948.

ROBERT G. MIKULECKY

The bill (H.R. 8457) for the relief of Robert G. Mikulecky was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 848), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay John E. Gondek $150 in full settlement of his claims against the United States and against Robert G. Mikulecky arising out of an accident which occurred in Chicago, Ill., on October 26, 1959, involving a private automobile and a Post Office Department truck operated by Mr. Mikulecky in the performance of his duties as an employee of the Government.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 8646) for the relief of Rifkin Textiles Corp. was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

RAFFAELLA ACHILLI

The bill (H.R. 9526) for the relief of Raffaella Achilli was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 850), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the admission into the United States in a nonquota status of the alien child to be adopted by U.S. citizens.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 9545) providing for the acquisition and preservation by the United States of certain items of evidence pertaining to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1848) for the relief of Mary Horalek and Eva Horalek, Blue Rapids, Kans., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2362) for the relief of Hilda Shen Tsiang, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 317) for the relief of the Swanston Equipment Co., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

M. SGT. BERNARD L. LAMOUNTAIN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 851) for the relief of M. Sgt. Bernard L. LaMountain, U.S. Air Force, retired, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 5, after the word "of" where it appears the second time, to strike out "$3,634.26" and insert "$4,067.16"; and, in line 9, after the word "through", to strike out "September 30, 1963" and insert "October 2, 1963"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Master Sergeant Bernard L. LaMountain, United States Air Force (retired), is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $4,067.16, representing the amount of overpayments of longevity pay received by the said Master Sergeant Bernard L. LaMountain (retired), for the period from October 24, 1951, through October 2, 1963, as a result of administrative error in the computation of his creditable service for pay purposes. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Bernard L. LaMountain referred to in the first section of this Act, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 855), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation, as amended, is to relieve M. Sgt. Bernard L. LaMountain, USAF, retired, of liability to the United States for $4,067.16. The amount represents overpayments resulting from administrative error in the computation of creditable service for pay purposes. The bill states that he received the overpayments from October 24, 1951, through October 2, 1963. The bill allows for credit in the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer for the amounts involved. Refund to Sergeant LaMountain is authorized for amounts repaid or withheld from him for which liability is relieved.

VALENTINA SIDOROVA PARKEVICH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1922) for the relief of Valentina Sidorova Parkevich which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 8, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and "*Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act."; and, at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "section" and insert "exemption"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (3) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Valentina Sidorova Parkevich may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act. This exemption shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 856), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to waive the excluding provision of existing law relating to one who has had one or more attacks of insanity in behalf of the mother of U.S. citizens. The bill has been amended to provide for the posting of a bond as a guarantee that the beneficiary will not become a public charge.

ELINOR A. JEAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1972) for the relief of Elinor A. Jean which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 5, after the word "issued", to strike out "a visa" and insert "an immigrant visa"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elinor A. Jean may be issued an immigrant visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of said Act: *And provided further,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 857), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to waive the excluding provision of existing law relating to one who has a mental defect in behalf of the mother of a U.S. citizen. The bill provides for the posting of a bond as a guarantee that the beneficiary will not become a public charge. The amendment is technical in nature.

MARIAN EDITH KID-STANTON SIMONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2112) for the relief of Marian Edith Kid-Stanton Simons which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 8, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act."; and, in line 11, after the word "This", to strike out "section" and insert "exemption"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 2112

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (3) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Marian Edith Kid-Stanton Simons may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act. This exemption shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 858), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to waive the excluding provision of existing law relating to one who has had one or more attacks of insanity in behalf of the wife of a U.S. veteran of our Armed Forces. The bill has been amended to provide for the posting of a bond as a guarantee that the beneficiary will not become a public charge.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 11303) to amend section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

THE INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE ACT OF 1965

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 10779) to authorize the Pharr Municipal Bridge Corp. to construct, operate, and maintain a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Pharr, Tex., which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "International Bridge Act of 1965".

SEC. 2. The consent of Congress is hereby granted to the construction, maintenance, and operation of any bridge and approaches thereto, which will connect the United States with any foreign country (hereinafter referred to as an "international bridge"), and to the collection of tolls for its use, so far as the United States has jurisdiction. Such consent shall be subject to: (1) the approval of the proper authorities in the foreign country concerned; (2) commitment by the State in which the bridge would be located to review the detailed plans and specifications for the bridge with respect to structural soundness and to inspect the bridge on completion and periodically thereafter; and (3) the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters", approved March 23, 1906 (33 U.S.C. 491–498), except for section 6 (33 U.S.C. 496), and (4) the provisions of this Act which follow hereafter.

SEC. 3. No bridge may be constructed, maintained, and operated pursuant to section 2 unless the President has first given his approval thereto. In the course of determining whether to grant such approval, the President shall secure the advice and recommendations of (1) the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, in the case of a bridge connecting the United States and Mexico, (2) the Governor of the State in which the bridge would be located, and (3) the heads of such departments and agencies of the Federal Government as he deems appropriate.

SEC. 4. The approval of the Secretary of the Army, as required by section 1 of the Act of March 23, 1906 (33 U.S.C. 491) shall only be given subsequent to the President's approval, as provided for in section 3 of this Act, and shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge is commenced within two years and completed within five years from the date of the Secretary's approval: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary may, for good cause shown, extend for a reasonable time either or both of the time limits herein provided.

SEC. 5. If tolls are charged for the use of an international bridge constructed under this Act, the following provisions shall apply, so far as the United States has jurisdiction:

(a) in the case of a bridge constructed or taken over or acquired by a private individual, company, or other private entity, tolls may be collected for a period not to exceed sixty-six years from the date of completion of such bridge, and at the end of such sixty-six years, such bridge and approaches thereto, if not previously transferred to a public agency pursuant to section 6, shall become the property of the State wherein the United States portion of such bridge is located, and no further compensation shall be deemed to be due such individual, company, or entity; or

(b) in the case of a bridge constructed or taken over or acquired by a State or States or by any municipality or other political subdivision or public agency thereof, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid therefor, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period not to exceed forty years from the date of completing or acquiring the same. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, any such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls.

An accurate record of the amount paid for acquiring the bridge and its approaches, the actual expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 6. Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to prevent the individual, corporation, or other entity to which, pursuant to this Act, authorization has been given to construct, operate, and maintain an international bridge and the approaches thereto, from selling, assigning, or transferring the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this Act to any public agency and any such successor agency is authorized to exercise the rights, powers, and privileges acquired under this section in the same manner as if such rights, powers, and privileges had been granted by this Act directly to such agency: *Provided, however*, That with respect to the collection of tolls the provisions of section 5(b) shall apply.

SEC. 7. The provisions of this Act shall apply only to international bridges the construction of which is approved under such provisions.

SEC. 8. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect, impair, or diminish any right, power, or jurisdiction of the United States over or in regard to any navigable waters or any interstate or foreign commerce.

SEC. 9. The Secretary of the Army shall, at the end of each calendar year, transmit to the Congress a report of all approvals pursuant to this Act during such year.

SEC. 10. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act to give the consent of Congress to the construction of certain international bridges."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 859), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAIN PURPOSE

The purpose of this measure, as proposed to be amended, is to give consent of Congress, subject to a number of conditions, to the construction of certain international bridges so as to make separate authorizations for individual international bridges unnecessary for the most part. In this respect, the substitute follows the philosophy of the General Bridge Act of 1946 by which Congress granted consent for the construction, maintenance, and operation of bridges and approaches thereto over the domestic navigable waters of the United States.

BACKGROUND

The General Bridge Act of 1946 specifically stated that it "shall not be construed to authorize the construction of any bridge which will connect the United States, or any territory or possession of the United States, with any foreign country." Accordingly, each individual proposal to build a bridge across waters between the United States and a foreign country has had to receive separate congressional approval. Since enactment of the General Bridge Act of 1946 almost 30 such measures have been passed by the Congress. With population expanding along the northern and southern borders of the United States, it can be expected that this demand will continue, if not increase.

This factor, together with recently developing local controversies as to the sites of proposed bridges, led the Committee on Foreign Relations to explore other means of authorizing the construction of international bridges. After extensive consultation with the executive departments primarily concerned with questions relating to such international bridges, and at the request of the committee, the language embodied in the pending substitute was submitted by the Bureau of the Budget and represents the consolidated views of the executive branch.

WHAT THE BILL DOES

The substitute consists largely of the generally applicable provisions of the individual authorizations previously enacted and the act of 1906 entitled, "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters" (33 U.S.C. 491–498).

The consent of Congress is granted in section 2 to the construction, maintenance, and operation of any bridge and approaches thereto, which will connect the United States with any foreign country, subject to (1) the approval of the proper authorities in the foreign country concerned; (2) a commitment by the State or States having jurisdiction over the bridge location to review the detailed plans and specifications for structural soundness and to inspect the bridge on completion and from time to time thereafter; and (3) the provisions of the 1906 act. Requirements (1) and (3) have been consistently a part of prior international bridge authorizations. The condition set forth in clause (2) has not previously been placed in such legislation but the committee considered it desirable because of the significant international consequences which might flow from the structural failure of an international bridge.

Section 3 of the substitute requires the prior approval of the President to the construction, maintenance, and operation of bridges. In determining whether to give such approval, the substitute provides that the President shall secure the advice and recommendations of (1) the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, in the case of a bridge leading to Mexico; (2) the Governor of the State in which the bridge would be located; and (3) the heads of such departments and agencies of the Federal Government as he deems appropriate. The Committee would expect the Secretary of State to be among those consulted.

It seems appropriate to vest the approval power in the President because the question affects foreign relations and because a large number of Federal agencies have an interest—the Bureau of Public Roads, the Corps of Engineers, the Public Health Service, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Customs Bureau, among others. The President can, of course, and probably will, delegate this authority.

Section 4 follows the pattern of the 1906 Bridge Act and provides that the approval of the Secretary of the Army shall be subsequent to that of the President and shall be null and void unless construction of the bridge is begun within 2 years and completed within 5 years from the date of the Secretary's approval. In view of the planning and construction time necessary for some large projects, the substitute includes a proviso that the Secretary may, for good cause shown, extend for a reasonable period either or both of these time limits. The equivalent time limitations in the 1906 Bridge Act are 1 and 3 years and in the individual international authorizations they have varied from that to as much as 3 and 6 years. The 3- and 5-year limit appears reasonable when combined with the discretionary extension authority given the Secretary of the Army.

Section 5 applies to tolls. In the case of a privately constructed or acquired international bridge the authority to collect tolls is limited to 66 years from the date of completion of such bridge. After that the bridge must be operated free of toll. The 66-year limitation has been contained in all international bridge authorization enacted since 1959.

The substitute provides that at the end of the 66-year period, the bridge and the approaches thereto, if not previously transferred to a public agency, shall become the property of the State in which the U.S. portion of the bridge is located, and no further compensation shall be deemed to be due to the private owners. It was the committee's belief that, inasmuch as a bridge serves the public convenience, provision should be made for its continuing operation after the private owners no longer could provide such operation and maintenance from funds collected through the tolls. The private owners would have been compensated through the privilege of building the bridge and collecting tolls for 66 years.

In the case of a publicly owned and operated international bridge, the tolls shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid therefor, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period not to exceed 40 years from the date of the completion or acquisition of the bridge.

For both publicly and privately owned bridges, the substitute further requires that an accurate record of the amount paid for acquiring the bridge and its approaches, the actual expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

The provisions relating to tolls charged for the use of a public international bridge are virtually identical to those contained in the General Bridge Act of 1946 except for the period of time set forth. In the General Bridge Act of 1946, this is set at 30 years. The longer period was recommended by the executive branch in the light of recent bridge bonding experience.

It should also be pointed out that the tolls on private bridges are subject to regulation by the Secretary of the Army under the provisions of 33 U.S.C. 494, which is incorporated in the substitute by reference.

Section 6 authorizes individuals, corporations, or other entities which, under the act, have obtained authorization to construct, operate, and maintain an international bridge and approaches to it to sell, assign, or transfer the rights, powers, and privileges conferred upon them to any public agency or international bridge authority or commission. The latter will then be authorized to exercise these rights, powers, and privileges in the same manner as if they had been granted to it directly, except for the collection of tolls where the provisions with respect to publicly owned international bridges will apply. This identical provision has been contained in almost all individual international bridge authorizations for many years.

In order to assure continued congressional surveillance over bridges authorized by this substitute, the committee provided in section 9 that the Secretary of the Army at the end of each calendar year report to the Congress on approvals made during that year.

COMMITTEE ACTION AND RECOMMENDATION

The committee agreed, on October 8, 1965, to report the substitute text favorably to the Senate. The substitute contains the exact language of S. 3074 which passed the Senate without objection on August 5, 1964. The House of Representatives amended and passed S. 3074 on the last day of the session, but the House amendments did not reach the Senate for action thereon prior to adjournment.

The committee favors this approach over the site-by-site approval of international bridges previously pursued by the Congress. The committee repeats its conclusions of last year:

"In recommending this bill to the Senate, the committee wishes to stress that there are no great departures from precedent involved. Nothing in this bill gives advance consent to compacts or agreements between States and foreign countries or subdivisions thereof for the construction of international bridges. Bridges built under such agreements would continue to be considered ad hoc by the Congress. Nor does the bill deal with toll policy for international bridge authorities or commissions because it is felt that appropriate toll provisions could best be worked out in the context of negotiating compacts or agreements to set up such authorities. The bill is naturally limited in its effect to the territory over which the United States has jurisdiction.

"The authorization contained in the bill is specific and limited and, the committee stresses, largely drawn from existing law and precedent. The committee believes that it represents a more orderly and better method for dealing with requests for permission to build international bridges than has been available heretofore. Its principal advantage is to relieve Congress of the burden of passing on a multiplicity of individual bridges."

Approval of this amendment in the nature of a substitute does not adversely affect the request of the Pharr Municipal Bridge Corp. for authority to construct a bridge. It would, however, require that this corporation and others seek authority to construct international bridges in accordance with the terms of this substitute.

CONSERVATION OF THE ANADROMOUS AND GREAT LAKES FISHERIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 23) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate with the several States a cooperative program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments on page 2, line 4, after the word "are", to strike out "primarily"; on page 5, line 8, after "(b)", to strike out "Not more than 20 per centum of all funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act may be expended in any one State" and insert "Not more than $1,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this section in any one fiscal year shall be obligated in any one State"; and, in line 13, after "Sec. 5.", to strike out "Nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting or modifying the provisions of the Act of May 11, 1938

(52 Stat. 345), as amended (16 U.S.C. 755–757)" and insert "This Act shall not be construed to affect, modify, or apply to the same area as the provisions of the Act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 345), as amended (16 U.S.C. 755–757)".

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the enactment of H.R. 23—a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate with the several States a cooperative program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish—will be an effective, constructive, and far-reaching step toward the restoration of the once fertile runs of migratory fish up the rivers and streams of New England.

The principal aim of the bill is the preservation and the restoration of those migratory fish, called anadromous fish, which spend most of their lives in salt water but when at maturity return to fresh water to spawn and complete their lifespan. Such fish include the salmon, shad, alewife, striped bass, and some varieties of trout. The bill would also apply, and this I insisted on in the committee, to efforts to conserve and develop the landlocked salmon of New Hampshire and New England, which are anadromous in nature, even though they are unable to spend their maturing years in salt water.

Under the bill, the Secretary of the Interior will join with interested States, on a 50–50 matching basis, in a program to increase the population of these types of fish through biological research, the construction of fish hatcheries, clearance of spawning areas, construction of fish ladders and other fish passage facilities, and similar activities.

The story of the Atlantic salmon well illustrates the need for this legislation. In days long since passed, the salmon runs on the rivers of New England were enormously productive, so much so that legislation was enacted making it illegal for mill operators to feed their employees salmon more than 3 days a week. The pace of industrial development choked off the salmon runs through the construction of dams which effectively blocked the rivers to migratory fish and through such other causes as the rising levels of pollution which made it ever more difficult for the fish to survive and spawn successfully.

Of course, it would have been much cheaper and better to have built the fish ladders and fish passageways when the dams were built, but our forefathers were not blessed with enough vision and foresight in this matter. But there is considerable evidence that prompt action now can still result in a major restoration of salmon runs in New England rivers through effective Federal-State-local cooperation under the program authorized in this legislation.

The New Hampshire Fish and Game Department, for instance, has determined that effective measures could result in the restoration of the Atlantic salmon in the Merrimack River in Massachusetts and New Hampshire, and that this fishery in just this one river could have an annual value to New Hampshire of $250,000 a year.

I hope the Senate will approve this measure, and that interested States, including my own State of New Hampshire, will move promptly on programs to protect and restore the runs of migratory fish that were at one time such an abundant and valuable resource in New England and other parts of the Nation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 860), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate with the several States a cooperative 5-year program, at a total cost not exceeding $25 million, for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish and the fish in the Great Lakes that ascend streams to spawn.

Anadromous fish are a very important species of food fish that begin their life in fresh water where they live for varying periods. They then migrate to salt water where they usually spend most of their lives. Finally they return to fresh water (usually the stream of their birth) at maturity to spawn, after which many die, having completed their lifespan. During their lifespan anadromous fish may migrate through interstate and international waters and as a result their management requires cooperation between the United States and foreign countries as well as between the various States and the United States.

Some fish, like the landlocked salmon of New England, are not anadromous in a literal, technical sense, because they do not spend part of their life in salt water. For reasons entirely beyond their control, they are unable to reach salt water despite the fact that they were originally descended from anadromous species. It is the committee's intention and understanding that fish in these kinds of circumstances are to be regarded as anadromous for the purpose of this legislation.

The fish of the Great Lakes, although not anadromous, have similar habits and life histories as they migrate upstream from the Great Lakes. These fish are a valuable food and sport fish resource and can be made capable of supporting a much larger commercial and recreational fishery.

Public hearings were held by your committee on S. 909, a similar bill, and all desiring to testify were given an opportunity to be heard.

WHAT THE BILL DOES: SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1 of the bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into cooperative agreements with one or more States, acting jointly or severally, and when deemed appropriate, with other non-Federal interests, for the purpose of conserving, developing, and enhancing the anadromous fishery resources of the Nation and the fish in the Great Lakes that ascend streams to spawn. The agreements entered into shall describe (1) the actions to be taken by each; (2) the benefits expected to be derived; (3) the estimated cost; (4) the share of such costs to be borne by each, provided that the Federal share of all costs, including operation and maintenance, which the Secretary annually determines to be a proper Federal cost, shall not exceed 50 percent of such costs, exclusive of any Federal land involved, and the non-Federal share may be in the form of real or personal property, as well as money; (5) the term of the agreement; (6) the terms and conditions for disposing of properties acquired by the Secretary during the term of the agreement; and (7) such other terms and conditions deemed desirable by the Secretary.

These agreements would be the basis for carrying out a joint Federal effort of conserving and developing such fishery resources of the Nation that are subject to depletion from Federal, State, and private water resource developments and from other causes or, with respect to which the United States has international commitments.

Section 1, subsection (b) would authorize the Secretary to contract with the States for the operation, management, and administration of any property acquired pursuant to this act. This subsection would have the effect of authorizing the Secretary to transfer certain Federal management functions to the States.

Section 2 would authorize the Secretary, in accordance with any agreements entered into pursuant to section 1, subsection (a), (1) to conduct investigations, engineering, and biological surveys, and research, (2) to carry out stream clearance activities, (3) to construct, install, maintain, and operate devices and structures for the improvement of feeding and spawning conditions, for fishery resources protection, and for facilitating the free migration of any fish, (4) to construct, operate, and maintain fish hatcheries, (5) to conduct studies and make recommendations regarding the development and management of any stream or body of water with respect to anadromous fishery resources and fish in the Great Lakes that ascend streams to spawn, provided that the reports and recommendations shall be transmitted to the States, the Congress, and the Federal water resources construction agencies, and provided further, that any construction of water resources projects authorized would be single-purpose dams needed solely for such fish, and such construction would be carried out by the appropriate Federal agency or by the States, with funds made available under this act, which would be subject to cost sharing and other provisions of this act, (6) to acquire lands or interests therein by purchase, lease, donation, or exchange for lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, provided the exchange involves approximately equal values, and provided further that the Secretary may accept cash or pay cash to equalize values when necessary to do so, (7) to accept donations of funds and to use such funds for acquiring or managing lands, and (8) to administer such lands and interests therein for the purposes of this act.

Further, title to acquired lands or interests therein pursuant to this act shall be the United States.

Prior to 1958, when the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act was amended, the Nation's fishery resources were not given full consideration by Federal and non-Federal water resource agencies in planning for the development and management of waters supporting such fish. Although fishery interests have been given more consideration since 1958, there still remains much to be desired. This provision would provide a means of correcting the problems that were created prior to 1958 and, in addition, would provide a means of preventing future problems from arising.

Further, one of the most important features of this legislation would be to authorize the Secretary, pursuant to cooperative agreements, to take more initiative in river basin planning, where anadromous fish are found, including the planning and construction of single-purpose dams needed solely for the conservation, protection, and enhancement of such fish.

Section 3 would provide that any activities to be performed on lands administered by other Federal agencies shall be carried out only with the prior approval of such agencies.

Section 4: subsection (a) would authorize to be appropriated until June 30, 1970, $25 million and subsection (b) would provide that not more than $1 million may be expended in any one State in any one fiscal year. Subsection (b) would have the effect of limiting total expenditures during the life of the program in any one State to $5 million.

Section 5 specifically provides that the Columbia River fishery development program would not be affected or modified by this act.

Section 6 would provide that the Secretary shall, on the basis of studies carried out pursuant to this act and section 5 of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, make recommendations to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare concerning the elimination of polluting substances found to be detrimental to fish and wildlife in interstate or navigable waters or tributaries thereof.

Further, this provision would provide that these recommendations and any enforcement measures taken by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare pursuant thereto, be designed to enhance the quality of such waters while at the same time taking into consideration other legitimate uses of such waters.

This section would be extremely helpful in placing more responsibility in the Interior Department for furnishing advice concerning the detrimental effects of pollution on fish and wildlife. At the same time, this section recognizes that the Congress has placed in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the primary responsibility for the control of water pollution.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The program that would be authorized by this legislation is an outgrowth of the highly successful Columbia River fishing development program authorized by Congress in 1938. (See appendix.)

Your committee believes a nationwide fish program is needed to fill a gap that now exists in this field. This legislation is needed by the Department of the Interior as it now is unable to carry out the cooperative conservation measures contemplated by this legislation within its existing authorities.

By the years 1976 and 2000 our population is expected to increase by 30 percent and 98 percent, respectively, over the 1960 population figures. Sport fishermen are expected to increase by 50 percent by 1976 and 150 percent by the year 2000. By 2000 the number of fishermen-days will be about three times what it was in 1960. In round figures, current trends indicate 63 million anglers will fish 1.3 billion days by the year 2000.

The coastal waters will absorb an increasing portion of the sport fishing effort. Marine waters are expected to carry 36 percent of the increased fishing pressure anticipated during the next 40 years.

Anadromous fish can contribute substantially to this increase, provided that the essential streams and estuaries are not rendered unfit for the needs of these species and that restorative measures are applied wherever feasible and justifiable.

The need is urgent for a comprehensive program that will accomplish restoration and development of anadromous fish resources in the coastal areas and streams and for other areas where fish ascend the streams to spawn. The committee is of the opinion that this program is desperately needed by the Great Lakes States in their plans to restore famous fishing streams which, from many causes, have been seriously depleted.

In our Nation, the net effect of man's activities from earliest colonial times has been to more or less drastically reduce the tremendous former abundance of many species of fish. These decreases have resulted primarily from (1) damage to habitat through pollution, siltation, channelization, and dewatering; (2) destruction of habitat through land filling and flooding by reservoirs and impoundments; and (3) creation of insurmountable, or at least formidable, obstacles to migration through dam construction. Thus, fresh water areas essential to spawning and juvenile development have been damaged, lost, or cut off from access; and estuarine areas have been eliminated and made unproductive.

Wholesale clearing of the countryside, either by logging operations or by large urban real estate developments and commercial activities, has modified areas which historically provided fish production. In the absence of effective action, growing competition for water resources may cause fish populations, especially anadromous fish populations, to decline so far that rehabilitation will not be possible.

The valuable migratory fish resources must be given a higher priority among the varied uses of the Nation's water supply.

There is a pressing need for Federal leadership in the development and execution of a comprehensive national program for the restoration and development of our anadromous fish resources and the rehabilitation of the streams of the Great Lakes. In many cases, these species pass through navigable, interstate, and international waters. The management of such resources in many cases must be discharged in accordance with interstate compacts and even international conventions. In addition, Federal responsibility extends to anadromous fish development programs in those instances where the fishing resources are depleted or threatened by water use projects constructed or licensed by Federal agencies.

Although this program is devoted to anadromous and Great Lakes fish, there could be important benefits for species which are not within these definitions, but which are also affected by water resource developments. This would be true of those marine species which spend some portion of their life cycle in the bays, estuaries, and tributary streams. The elimination or reduction of fresh water inflow to these bays and estuaries would result in a considerable change in salinities and nutrients, thus presenting an entirely different type of habitat.

The Department of the Interior is not now authorized to prepare in cooperation with the States plans for the encouragement and conservation of anadromous fish; to develop plans which would include artificial spawning channels, improvement of natural spawning habitat, fish hatcheries, removal of natural and artificial barriers to the migration of fish, and other such measures except at individual Federal water resource projects where the principal purpose of the projects may be adverse to fishery conservation, or in the Columbia River Basin; or to cope with the problems that have been created in this field as a result of the development of Federal water-resource projects prior to the 1958 amendments to the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act.

Water resource development is underway at an extremely rapid rate in the United States. It must be emphasized that the very heavy use and misuse of water throughout the Nation comprises a real threat to the maintenance of significant levels of our remaining fish populations. Impairment of water quality, depletion of streamflow, and elimination of water areas essential to one or more life stages of our anadromous species are all occurring at a rapid pace.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVAL RESERVE

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military construction, Naval Reserve (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF ACTING COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on analysis of certain aspects of bidding by both sealed bids and oral auction bids on national forest timber in the northern region—region 1—and the California region—region 5—Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, dated October 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Tribal Council of the Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, opposing the enactment of legislation to create within the original boundaries of the Bad River Reservation any part or parcel of the so-called Apostle Island National Lake Shore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, Bad River Reservation, Wis., relating to the rights of Indians under treaty and the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H.R. 10097. An act for the relief of North Counties Hydroelectric Co. (Rept. No. 865).

By Mr. HART, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H.R. 10369. An act to give the consent of Congress to the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont to enter into a compact providing for bus taxation proration and reciprocity (Rept. No. 866).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Philip E. Mangan, of Maryland, to be an Examiner in Chief, U.S. Patent Office;

John T. Curtin, of New York, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of New York;

Donald E. O'Brien, of Iowa, to be U.S. Attorney for the northern district of Iowa;

Merle M. McCurdy, of Ohio, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Ohio;

H. Moody Brickett, of Montana, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Montana;

Leonard T. Heckathorn, of South Dakota, to be U.S. marshal for the district of South Dakota;

Emilio Naranjo, of New Mexico, to be U.S. marshal for the district of New Mexico; and

Thomas W. Sorrell, of Vermont, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Vermont.

By Mr. BAYH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Frederick Landis, of Indiana, to be judge of the U.S. Customs Court.

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

One hundred and twenty-two postmasters.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2640. A bill for the relief of Dr. Guillermo Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 2641. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Charles Edward Cunningham; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2642. A bill to authorize the release of platinum from the national stockpile, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2643. A bill to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission not to approve any railroad merger or consolidation unless it conforms to a Commission approved plan for consolidation of railroads in any major region of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

TO ALLOW THE VIEWING OF THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY FILM, "ADLAI STEVENSON THE AMBASSADOR," AT THE AUDITORIUM THEATRE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. DOUGLAS) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 61); which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN, which appears under a separate heading.)

RAILROAD MERGERS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to end the piecemeal approach of the Interstate Commerce Commission to proposed railroad mergers.

The bill which I am introducing would require that merger plans of major railroads conform to a Commission-approved regional plan for railroad consolidation.

The inadequacy of the piecemeal approach is highlighted by the recent announcement of a proposed merger in the East of the Norfolk & Western system with the C. & O.-B. & O. system after the hearings had closed in the pending Pennsylvania-Central merger case. In the West the same situation has arisen in the recent announcement of a proposed merger of the Milwaukee and C. & N.W. after the close of the hearings in the proposed GN-NP-Burlington merger case.

How can the Commission consider whether the public interest will be protected and the national transportation policy promoted without considering all merger proposals for a region? How can the Commission make a sound determination of the wisdom of the GN-NP-Burlington merger proposal without considering the proposed merger of the Milwaukee and C. & N.W., and indeed, the competing applications of the C. & N.W. and the Union Pacific to take over the Rock Island?

In his 1962 transportation message to Congress, President Kennedy directed the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and Labor, and the Council of Economic advisers to form an interagency committee to develop criteria applicable to mergers in the railroad and airline industry. The report of this committee, released March 6, 1963, concluded:

> While public policy clearly relies on the initiative of private firms in proposing and implementing specific mergers, it is not inconsistent, and is indeed desirable, for the Government to develop overall guidelines pointing to the range of acceptable structures of transportation industries deemed consistent with the public interest.

Among the legislative recommendations to the Senate Commerce Committee of the Special Study Group on transportation policies, in June 1961, was:

> Conformance to an established plan would be required for approval of a consolidation of railroads in any major region of the United States.

In accordance with these recommendations, the bill which I am introducing would require the Commission to analyze carefully whether a proposed merger of major regional railroads would be within the range of an acceptable transportation structure for that region. The Commission could not approve a consolidation of major regional railroads unless it was in conformity with such a plan.

I believe that the Commission should be doing this in accordance with its responsibilities under present law. Section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act specifically requires the Commission in passing upon a proposed merger to consider the effect upon the public interest of the inclusion or exclusion of other railroads in that region. The Commission is empowered to require the inclusion of other territorial railroads in a merger as a prerequisite to approval.

The ICC has followed congressional intent in relying on the initiative of the railroad industry in developing merger proposals, but it has shirked its responsibilities in not determining whether such proposals are in accordance with an acceptable regional plan to protect the public interest.

This failure of the Commission has occurred because of its blind reliance on a case-by-case approach. The bill which I am introducing would change this by requiring the Commission to determine whether pending merger proposals are in conformance with a Commission-approved regional plan.

This bill would not halt all mergers. Those mergers which would not tend to create a monopoly or substantially lessen competition in any line of commerce could be considered forthwith by the Commission, and approved, if in the public interest. I have in mind those failing eastern railroads whose inclusion in a major system might be necessary to preserve existing service. Decisions on the pending mammoth proposals would be held in abeyance until the Commission faces up to its responsibilities, and develops regional plans in the public interest. Now that the railroad industry itself has come forward with merger proposals for two or three railroad systems in most major regions, Commission-approved plans could be readily completed. In any case, such delay as might be encountered is a small price to pay to insure that our railroad transportation industry will be shaped into systems to best provide transportation service for the generations to come.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2643) to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission not to approve any railroad merger or consolidation unless it conforms to a Commission-approved plan for consolidation of railroads in any major region of the United States, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOHN W. REYNOLDS, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, October 18, 1965, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of John W. Reynolds, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. district judge, eastern district of Wisconsin, vice Kenneth P. Grubb, retired.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

INTEREST: THE BIG TAXPAYER BURDEN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in a thoughtful and well balanced article in last night's Washington Star, Sylvia Porter points out that interest charges on the Federal debt will break all records in the coming year and will exceed $12 billion.

As Miss Porter says this is by all odds the biggest single item in the budget except for defense.

As she also contends this is not caused by Vietnam or the Great Society program—but overwhelmingly by the ability of the economy to carry this load, the taxpayer has every reason to be concerned about this burden and even more concerned about the immense interest burden which American debtors have to pay.

Private debt is far greater than the Federal Government's debt in this country. Of course, the private person or business pays higher interest rates and the total interest burden on the American people is not only far greater than ever before, it represents the most rapidly rising cost in this country and has done so for years.

The contention that these high interest rates are essential to price stability makes little sense because the rising costs of money represent inflation too.

The balance-of-payments argument—that our American capital will flow overseas unless we hike interest rates—is the most poorly documented economic myth now extant. The studies that have been made refute this contention. What is more, higher American interest rates have tended to ratchet up foreign interest rates; the result: the same differential continues between American and foreign interest rates—except at a higher level.

The tendency for American banks to shove up interest rates in recent weeks is most unfortunate for the future of economic growth in this country.

I ask unanimous consent that the Sylvia Porter article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. INTEREST BURDEN INCREASING

(By Sylvia Porter)

Yesterday the Treasury paid more than 4 percent to renew a loan for only 90 days—one of the steepest charges it has had to pay for very short-term loans in this generation.

This situation involves every taxpayer, for here is what it means.

1. Because interest rates are rising across the board, the Federal Government must pay more to borrow new money to finance the budget deficit and to renew outstanding IOU's. President Johnson's January estimate on how much of fiscal 1966 budget funds would be spent for debt interest is obsolete.

2. The likelihood is that in this fiscal year—to end next June 30—an alltime record of about $12 billion in tax money will go to pay interest on the public debt, by far the largest single item in the Federal budget outside of national defense. This will be up $600 million over fiscal 1965.

3. This ballooning expenditure will swell the 1966 budget—and this increase has nothing to do with Vietnam or any Great Society program. The reason is overwhelmingly the higher level of interest rates.

4. Interest rates are rising because: (a) an increasing demand for loans from borrowers—ranging from small installment buyers to giant corporations and public bodies—is pressing against the available supply of credit; (b) market factors of demand-supply are pushing up interest rates which, in essence, represent the price for money; (c) the Federal Reserve System is not pouring enough new credit into the money stream to offset the rate pressures entirely, because it fears that if it did so it would encourage speculative activities at a time of high prosperity and thereby feed inflationary forces.

5. While climbing rates are primarily causing the climbing interest load, the public debt—on which interest must be paid—is rising too. Last June 30 the debt was at $317.3 billion. Next June 30 it could be in the $324 billion range.

6. When measured against the growing economy, the record totals for debt and interest shrink considerably—and this is the valid way to measure the figures. Today the public debt represents less than 50 percent of the gross national product against 98 percent of GNP in 1950. Actually, $12 billion in annual interest is far easier for us to carry in 1965–66's prosperous economy than under $1 billion in annual interest was for taxpayers to carry in 1935–36's sluggish economy.

Here's the record since 1950, to put the interest totals and their relationship to Federal spending in perspective (in billions):

[Dollars in millions]

Year	Debt	Interest paid	Percent interest of Federal spending
1950	$257.4	$5.8	14.5
1951	255.2	5.6	12.7
1952	259.1	5.9	9.0
1953	266.0	6.5	8.8
1954	271.3	6.4	9.4
1955	274.4	6.4	9.9
1956	272.8	6.8	10.2
1957	270.6	7.2	10.4
1958	276.3	7.6	10.6
1959	284.7	7.6	9.4
1960	286.3	9.2	11.9
1961	289.0	9.0	10.9
1962	298.2	9.1	10.3
1963	305.9	9.9	10.6
1964	311.7	10.7	10.8
1965	317.3	11.4	11.7
1966 [1]	324.5	12.0	11.4

[1] My guess.

Source: Distributed 1965, by the Hall Syndicate, Inc. All rights reserved.

FDIC—FINE, DEPENDABLE, INFLUENTIAL, COURAGEOUS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, in this day and age it seems to be the fashion to attack the bank regulatory agencies downtown for their every move. One such agency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, has come under such attacks and, in my mind, they are completely unwarranted and irresponsible.

The growth of the American banking system and the confidence placed in it by the American public is in no small part due to the availability of Federal deposit insurance. What in the realm of banking could be more important than protection for America's depositors?

From my position as ranking Republican on the Senate's Banking and Currency Committee I have had the opportunity to watch the workings on the FDIC and its various chairmen and staff from a ringside seat for a number of years.

One seldom meets more dedicated Americans than the present Chairman, K. A. Randall, and the immediate past Chairman, Joseph W. Barr, who is currently Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. President, the feelings I have expressed here are not mine alone. I ask unanimous consent to place into the RECORD at this point a resolution which was unanimously endorsed by the members of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks assembled in Detroit, Mich., at their 64th annual convention, September 28 through October 1, 1965.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SUPERVISORS OF STATE BANKS CONCERNING FDIC

The following resolution was unanimously endorsed by the members of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks assembled in Detroit, Mich., at NASSB's 64th annual convention:

"Whereas the supervisors of State banks are of the opinion that one of the important factors which has contributed to the growth of a vital banking system in the United States has been the availability of Federal deposit insurance;

"Whereas Congress has established the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation as the agency of the U.S. Government to administer this all-important program for the protection of depositors;

"Whereas the supervisors of State banks and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation have a mutual goal in maintaining the present strength of the State banking system and the high level of service which it provides;

"Whereas in achieving this goal the supervisors of State banks and the members and staff of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation work harmoniously and closely together; and

"Whereas the supervisors of State banks have had ample occasion to have first-hand knowledge of the efficiency, thoroughness, and vigor with which the members and staff of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation perform their duties; of the examination reports of the highest quality which are issued by the Corporation; and of the willingness and availability of the members and staff of the Corporation to join with the supervisors in solving problems and reaching goals of mutual interest: Now, therefore, be it unanimously

Resolved by the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, assembled in Detroit, Mich., for its 64th annual convention, That the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Honorable K. A. Randall, and its immediate past chairman, the Honorable Joseph W. Barr, along with the dedicated staff of the Corporation, are to be highly commended for their faithful performance of the trust committed to them by Congress; for the efficient and thorough manner in which they guard the public interest; and for their cooperation with supervisors of State banks in advancing their common goal of assuring the continuance of a strong and vigorous State banking system."

COLUMBUS DAY AS A NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, yesterday, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I was involved in consideration of a supplemental appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare. Remembering that yesterday, October 12, was also Columbus Day, I could not help speculating as to whether Christopher Columbus, prior to each of his voyages, secured all of the necessary funds to set sail on each voyage, all in one sum, in the form of a single allocation from the Spanish monarchy. I suspect that deficiency requests were well known in those days, too, and that supplemental allocations were often necesary to meet unexpected costs of approved projects.

Today, the financing methods used by European royalty during the century when Columbus explored the New World—pawning of royal jewels or taxation of subjects—are only incidental to the historical value of Columbus' feats. We, in America, do well to pay homage to his courage and perseverance. In this spirit, I have again this year served as cosponsor of a Senate bill, S. 108, to recognize Columbus Day, October 12, as a national holiday. During the 88th session of Congress, I cosponsored a similar bill which was passed by the Senate but failed of House action. The Senate Judiciary Committee has not yet reported out S. 108, but it is my hope that both Houses of Congress will see fit to act favorably on this measure in time for the commemoration of Columbus Day as a U.S. national holiday in 1966.

WATER RESOURCES OF THE DELAWARE PENINSULA

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in conjunction with my distinguished colleague from Maryland, and both of the distinguished Senators from Delaware, I recently introduced S. 2287, a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a 5-year study of the water resources of the Delaware Peninsula for the purpose of determining whether fresh water supplies could meet anticipated future requirements. I have recently received a letter from Mr. Brinton Whitall, Secretary of the Delaware River Basin Commission, advising me that the commission has adopted a resolution which unanimously endorses this legislation. The resolution stresses the importance of this study to the commercial and industrial well-being of the entire Middle Atlantic region.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Whitall's letter and the text of the resolution be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION,
Trenton, N.J., September 22, 1965.

Hon. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
443D Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: The attached resolution conveys the endorsement and support of the Delaware River Basin Commission of legislation now before the Congress (S. 2287) authorizing a 5-year hydrologic study of the Delmarva Peninsula. This resolution was passed by unanimous vote of the commission on September 13, 1965.

Sincerely yours,
W. BRINTON WHITALL,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION IN RELATION TO THE WATER RESOURCES OF THE DELMARVA PENINSULA

Whereas the Delaware River Basin Compact confers upon this commission broad Federal and interstate responsibilities for the development, management, and control of the water resources of the Delaware River Basin; and

Whereas the commission recognizes that the aquifers beneath the basin portion of Delaware extend beneath the surface boundary of the basin and many also underlie the Delmarva Peninsula; and

Whereas large numbers of people as well as commercial and industrial enterprises are entirely dependent upon these underground supplies of fresh water; and

Whereas the taking of water from aquifers beyond the boundaries of the basin may influence their behavior within the basin, or vice versa; and

Whereas available information indicates that portions of the aquifers are threatened by saline water from Delaware Bay, Chesapeake Bay, and the Atlantic Ocean; and

Whereas the interrelationships among the fresh and saline water supplies and many of these aquifers are imperfectly known at the present time: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Delaware River Basin Commission:

1. The commission endorses and supports the enactment of S. 2287, a bill to authorize a 5-year hydrologic study of the Delmarva Peninsula, and urges the Congress of the United States to act favorably thereon at an early date.

2. The secretary of the commission is authorized and directed to forward a certified copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the congressional delegation of the basin, and to Members of the House and Senate Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Adopted: September 13, 1965.

EFFECT OF FOREIGN INVESTMENT CONTROLS ON THE DOMESTIC ECONOMY AND WORLD LIQUIDITY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the insertion into the RECORD of an October 12 Washington Post editorial which reiterates Senator MCCARTHY's and my position with regard to the effect on the domestic economy and world liquidity of tighter controls on foreign investment.

I am pleased that the Post editorial calls attention to the possible adverse effects of augmenting a policy which is so strict, not in its initial step, but in its multiplier effect. I call attention to the statement:

> They (the banking establishment) concede that reducing the outflow of U.S. capital inhibits growth in recipient countries.

The editorial calls upon the administration "to ask where it wants to go and whether it is traveling in the right direction." The short run obvious solution may pinch our economy and move the international community toward crisis.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 12, 1965]

DIRECT FOREIGN INVESTMENT

Since there can be a perilously thin line between voluntarism and compulsion in Federal programs, one can only hope that Commerce Secretary Connor's distaste for controls over the direct foreign investments of American enterprises will not be weakened. Some rather powerful voices, notably that of the organized bankers, have been raised in support of the contention that such controls are essential in the effort to eliminate this country's balance-of-payments deficit. But before another barrier to the free flow of money and goods is erected, its consequence for the American economy—and indeed, the world economy—should be pondered.

Direct foreign investment, in contradistinction to indirect investment, occurs when an American company or its subsidiary builds or acquires productive facilities in another country. At the end of 1964 the direct foreign investments of the United States were valued at $44.3 billion. Another $21 billion was indirectly invested in marketable securities—stocks and bonds—and in bank loans and other credits to foreigners. Thus, the grand total of foreign investments at the end of last year was $75.4 billion.

The sale of foreign securities in the money markets of this country is inhibited by a tariff known as the interest equalization tax. The extension of bank loans to foreign borrowers is limited by a quota which the Federal Reserve authorities impose. And now eyes are being turned toward direct foreign investment.

All impediments to the international migration of capital are objectionable, but a particularly strong case can be made against those affecting direct investment. Unlike many types of indirect investment—bank loans, for example—the income from direct investment tends to exceed the capital outflow. Last year the net inflow or surplus from direct foreign investment was nearly $1.4 billion, a significant plus factor in the balance of payments.

Moreover, exports are likely to be tightly tied to direct investment. It is estimated that a dollar of direct foreign investment increases U.S. exports by between 20 and 25 cents. In the case of Australia, a country whose growth rate is now largely determined by the size of the capital inflow, a dollar of direct investment probably induces a demand for as much as 50 cents in U.S. exports.

Those who speak for the establishment concede that limiting the volume of direct foreign investment will eventually, if not immediately, weaken this country's balance-of-payments position. They concede that reducing the outflow of U.S. capital inhibits growth in the recipient countries. But they insist that the restrictions are necessary evils, measures that must be adopted in order to eliminate the U.S. payments deficit and convince the Europeans that they should join in the reform of the international monetary system.

But can it be assumed that this balance-of-payments strategy is valid? Will the Western Europeans whose dissatisfaction with a dollar-gold standard is essentially political really be impressed by an economic accomplishment? If the policymakers cannot answer this question with an affirmative certitude, then they must surely ask themselves some others. Is it really necessary to risk undermining this country's competitive position in world trade? Are the alternatives so unpalatable that this country is justified in abandoning its principles by erecting new and perhaps permanent barriers to trade? And is it necessary to risk the worldwide stagnation that will follow if the savings generated by the American economy are no longer permitted to flow into areas where they nourish economic growth?

The necessity for maintaining confidence in the dollar and the pound sterling has led to an obsession with balance-of-payments tactics. But introspection about strategy must not be precluded. Before shackling direct investment with mandatory controls the administration must ask where it wants to go and whether it is traveling in the right direction.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR RUSSELL OF GEORGIA

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, when Senator RUSSELL addressed the State Kiwanis convention at Jekyll Island in Georgia recently, he was introduced by Maj. Gen. Carl T. Sutherland, one of the Nation's outstanding Reserve officers and the former president of the Reserve Officers Association.

I ask unanimous consent that General Sutherland's remarks introductory of the senior Senator from Georgia, who is chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, which pay eloquent tribute to one who has done so much for his State and Nation, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICHARD B. RUSSELL

(Address by General Sutherland)

If the late Sir Winston Churchill were here to introduce our speaker, he probably would begin, "Seldom have so many owed so much to one man."

The contributions of this man to our country and especially to Georgia, are so many and so varied that they cannot be recited in a brief introduction. He has labored so long and so effectively for our State and Nation that we are prone to take him and his accomplishments for granted. For that reason a brief résumé of his career and accomplishments is in order.

His public service began when he left the University of Georgia to enlist in the Navy in World War I. After the war he returned to Winder where he practiced law for 12 years. At 22 he was elected to the Georgia House of Representatives where he served 10 years, the last 4 as speaker, before becoming the youngest Governor in Georgia history in 1930 at age 33. During the next 2 years of the great depression he directed the State government in an austerity program that kept the State's finances sound, and spearheaded a sweeping reorganizaiton of the State government resulting in the reduction of 102 departments, bureaus, and commissions to 17 and a considerable reduction in the cost of operation. By consolidating the independently administered State supported colleges into a unified system, RUSSELL's reorganization laid the foundation for the present model university system.

At 35 he became the then youngest Member of the U.S. Senate. In this august body where seniority counts so heavily, he now is the second most senior Member, though many Members are older than he; and without doubt he is the most influential and highly respected of the 100 Members. Former President Truman has said many times, "If DICK RUSSELL had been from Indiana, or Missouri, or Kentucky, he may very well have been President of the United States."

The Senator's contributions to Georgia and the Nation have been many and great. He successfully sponsored the basic agriculture conservation programs now in effect, the rural electrification program, and the Farmers Home Administration. He is the father of the school lunch program, which provides 17 million underprivileged children, 620,000 of them Georgians, with a balanced and nutritious daily meal, probably the only decent one they receive during the day.

A strong advocate of river and water resources development, he has obtained funds to finance giant multipurpose dams and navigation projects on the Flint, Chattahoochee, Savannah, and other major rivers.

Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, he is the Senate's foremost authority on military matters and is a forceful and effective champion of a strong national defense, including a sound Reserve program. A significant consequence of his responsibilities over military matters has been to place Georgia in a strong position to participate in vital defense activities. The 15 major military posts in the State, plus the huge Lockheed aircraft plant at Marietta, provide civilian employment for 55,000 Georgians. One billion three hundred million dollars a year pour into Georgia's economy from payrolls, purchases, and contracts by military installations located throughout our State.

Because of his long service he is the ranking Democrat member of the powerful Senate Appropriations Committee, which provides money for all of the Nation's military activities, Federal agriculture programs, river development, education and health activities, highway construction, housing and community facilities projects, airports, space programs, atomic energy projects, and many other activities of the Federal Government.

Though known throughout the Nation for his many and varied interests and accomplishments, he probably is best known outside Georgia for his outspoken advocacy of States rights and his stanch defense of constitutional government.

We are grateful to Senator RUSSELL for his many contributions to Georgia, and we particularly appreciate his making special arrangements to speak to us today. I have the honor, Governor Ed, ladies, and gentlemen, to present a great Georgian, a longtime member of the Kiwanis Club of Winder, the Honorable RICHARD B. RUSSELL, senior U.S. Senator from Georgia.

OVERSEAS CARGOES FROM PORTS ON THE GREAT LAKES

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on September 10, I made a speech in the Senate deploring the unwillingness of American-flag ships to carry cargoes overseas from U.S. ports on the Great Lakes.

I urged that steps be taken to enable shippers—both the Federal Government and private concerns—to reduce costs by shipping directly from lake ports instead of having to use expensive overland transportation to east coast ports.

The lack of American bottoms to carry this traffic hurts Midwest producers—by denying them the benefits of lower shipping costs and hurts the balance-of-payments situation of the United States by too great use of foreign-flag ships.

The Maritime Administration has now issued findings and recommendations on Great Lakes foreign trade routes—which more than confirm the points I made then.

These findings include the shocking fact that only about 4 percent of overseas shipping originating in U.S. ports on the Great Lakes is being carried in American-flag vessels.

I had understood that the American flag situation was pretty bad on the lakes—but I had never imagined it was as bad as this. Only 43 out of approximately 1,000 overseas sailings in 1964 were American flag vessels. Of the 6,160,000 commercial tons, Public Law 480 and AID cargoes, and 84,811 measurement tons of defense cargoes—only about 4 percent was carried in American bottoms.

On behalf of the conference of Great Lakes Senators of whom I am chairman, I endorse the recommendations of the Maritime Administration—and urge that they be implemented at the earliest possible moment.

They should not be allowed to lie dormant as was the case with the 1961 Department of Defense study of the Great Lakes—which proved that great savings were available through the use of Great Lakes ports.

The three major recommendations of the report are:

First. Consolidation and delineation of separate Great Lakes overseas trade routes: This means recognition of the Great Lakes as a separate seacoast, no longer to be treated as a stepchild by American flag lines concerned only with shipping from east coast ports.

Second. An incentive operating subsidy for the solicitation and carriage of non-Government impelled cargo from the area: This can provide the impetus needed to attract American flag shipping to the Great Lakes.

Third. Concentration of overseas cargoes at major ports through the development of land-sea container services and feeder-type operations by barge: New technology can make a major difference in the use of the Great Lakes. This proposal seems to forecast approval of the proposed Prudential Lines operation using container ships and barges, which I support strongly.

The Conference of Great Lakes Senators has often charged that the lack of American-flag ships on the Great Lakes has increased costs to overseas shippers, especially the Federal Government.

This charge has been substantiated by the Maritime Administration in this report, which emphasizes that the Departments of Defense and Agriculture are required to transship a considerable proportion of Government cargo to east coast ports at extra expense in order to obtain the U.S.-flag overseas transportation required by law.

While the Great Lakes area has made tremendous investments to improve its facilities and deepen its harbors, the area is still being boycotted by American-flag ships. The Great Lakes area contributes in excess of 40 percent of Federal income taxes, but is not receiving a fair share of subsidized U.S. shipping.

The Great Lakes Conference of Senators intends to keep a close watch on the execution of the recommendations of this report, and will do all it can to assure that the proposed steps are taken.

A NEW CONFIDENCE IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, things are looking up in South Vietnam. We have evidence increasing daily that the Vietcong are becoming more dispirited under the pressures of American commitment to the fight there. And we have strong evidence that our very commitment has also given the South Vietnamese people, and particularly that nation's army, a needed boost of confidence and morale.

Richard Fryklund, writing in the Washington Evening Star of Tuesday, says that the new South Vietnamese self-confidence, engendered by the American ground engagements of the past summer, lifts the hopes for eventual victory in that brutal, dirty war. Psychology plays an important role in any contest, in any war, Mr. President, but in none is it more important than in pursuit of a guerrilla campaign. That is the point of Fryklund's column. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Lift for the Vietnamese Spirit

(By Richard Fryklund)

Three historic battles this summer transformer a dwindling, dispirited South Vietnamese Army into a confident fighting force.

In the long run, American military leaders feel, these battles may have made it possible for South Vietnam really to win in the far future.

Interestingly, it was the American role in these battles that worked the change. By showing what they could and would do in battle, the Americans converted the image of our side from that of a loser to a winner.

The first battle, at Duc Co, August 10, saw the first ground combat by Americans on a large scale. To the South Vietnamese—and to many Asians outside the Communist world—Duc Co showed that the United States was in fact engaged in a land war on the mainland of Asia.

The second battle, at Chu Lai, August 19, showed that the Americans could beat the Vietcong when conditions were right. And the third battle, at An Khe, September 18, showed that the Americans could still win when almost everything went wrong.

Most Americans assume that the complexion of the war changed last February when the first U.S. marines were sent to Vietnam. This was viewed in Washington as a total commitment to fight indefinitely with whatever was needed to get a favorable outcome.

But the Asians saw it differently. To them, Uncle Sam was only dipping a toe into the water.

Air support, advice, and equipment were nice, but they did not commit the United States. And the ground force which the United States managed to get ashore by mid-summer looked like a token, not even large enough to defend the American bases.

But Duc Co was different. That was an outpost well inland, not far from the Cambodian border. Elements of the American 173d Airborne Brigade and 1st Infantry Division were there in a support role, but they were there, and they were fighting.

The United States was committed to a land war.

Americans who accompanied South Vietnamese units into that battle say the knowledge that they were side by side with American infantrymen turned them into chargers.

They were aggressive and confident. They remembered what their advisers had taught them. They did things right.

The Chu Lai battle was an American show. The marines had intelligence of a Vietcong concentration; they planned an attack; they surprised the Vietcong with a land, sea, and air operation, cornered them and chewed them up.

American casualties were light, the Vietcong's very heavy.

Some academic students of guerrilla wars say they can find only one common ingredient of past successes. Many techniques are useful under a great variety of circumstances, but history shows that in order to win, you have to look like a winner.

At Chu Lai, the American side looked like a winner for the first time in Vietnam. And they have been looking that way ever since.

In their own minds, so have the South Vietnamese soldiers. An accurate scorekeeper might have tallied a few defeats this summer, but you can't tell that to the friendlies.

So in August, the United States was committed, and our side was rolling.

There was no particular thought of setbacks until September 18, when reports reached Saigon that an American battalion had blundered into a Vietcong trap and had been defeated.

Almost immediately, however, the true story became clear. Part of the 101st Airborne Division had been dropped by helicopter in the middle of an enemy battalion, but the isolated and surrounded Americans had rallied and won with professional skill and, most important, quick bomber support.

Even better for morale, the South Vietnamese were convinced that it was a North Vietnamese unit (part of the 95th Regiment of the 325th North Vietnamese Division) that was upset by the Americans at An Khe.

It may not have been a North Vietnamese unit—the intelligence is not conclusive—but it is good for morale that people think so.

If the new Vietnamese self-confidence that was generated by the American ground engagements endures, then there is hope for eventual victory.

For it is the South Vietnamese forces, not the Americans, who will have to stick it out in the long run and win.

THOMAS H. WARD—BALTIMORE CITY COUNCILMAN

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, one of the most active and articulate city councilmen in Baltimore is a young attorney, Thomas Ward. Mr. Ward has been the only elected official in the city to recognize the desperate need for mass transit facilities in the Baltimore area.

The October issue of Baltimore magazine, published by the Chamber of Commerce of Baltimore, includes an excellent article by Sunpapers reporter John Goodspeed on this dynamic young man.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Up and Comer

(By John Goodspeed)

(Note.—Tom Ward, city councilman and budding boss, could be described as a young curmudgeon; his stormy and uncertain political career started as a battle against brutes, ruffians and brahmins.)

One of the city councilmen from the Second district, Thomas Henry Ward, is occasionally called one of the up-and-coming young politicians of Baltimore. Yet his first run for public office may have been his last.

"I haven't made my mind up to run again," the 38-year-old Ward said recently. "In office you're a political football, and I don't get that much kick out of it."

For a man who doesn't enjoy kicking, Tom Ward has done quite a lot. During his 11 years in the public arena (2½ years in the council), he has:

Moved to nullify the entire East-West Expressway project, as proposed, by removing money for it from the city budget;

Denounced the overhead destination signs on the city approaches to the Jones Falls Expressway as "monstrous eyesores";

Described the pro-expressway Maryland State Roads Commission director, John B. Funk, as "an enemy of the people";

Opposed some aspects of urban renewal, principally the demolition of houses;

Described the Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Agency as "loaded with incompetents";

Tangled with the Health and Parks departments to save pigeons, trees and picturesque old concert band shells.

Ward isn't always kicking. He is positively in favor of a Baltimore subway; of increasing real estate values in Bolton Hill, the downtown residential area where he lives; of more police protection; of urban renewal for the inner harbor, and of redistricting the city so that his Second district, long controlled by white votes, would expand to include a 42-percent Negro population.

Ward is outspoken. "The disinterest of the average person in politics has resulted in brutes and ruffians having plenty of say in Government," he has written in the monthly newsletter of the Mount Royal Democratic Club (Tom Ward, president).

He founded the club in 1954 with 10 interested persons. (He prefers the old name, Mount Royal, to either of the newer names, Bolton Hill or Madison Park North/South.) His purpose was to combat the entrenched and haughty "brahmins" there. Young newcomers, many of them business and professional people, have increased the Mount Royal Democratic Club membership until its size is now "confidentially, in the high hundreds," according to its leader.

Ward is the first Bolton Hill councilman to be elected for the second district since Philander B. Briscoe, a Brahmin, served in the 1930's. Two other Mount Royal Democratic Club members hold elected office—Maryland General Assembly Delegates Julian L. Lapides and Frank J. McCourt. McCourt has parted company with Ward.

Before brutes, ruffians or even the east Baltimore political faction he opposes rejoice that Tom Ward may never run for office again, they should hear what else he said in his Linden Avenue law office:

"But I will always be active in politics. I will always stand on the corner on election day."

Ward has laid the foundation to become a political boss—one of those non-office-holding civic leaders who in Baltimore stand on the corner on election day to win votes, influence patronage, and keep an eye on their club members.

Ward is a native Baltimorean, as is his wife, the former Joyce McCartney, and their two children (soon three). He is a medium-short man with a "black Irish" look that is slightly less fierce since he shaved a remarkable mustache that stood out on television when he was sergeant at arms for the Maryland delegation at the 1960 Democratic National Convention.

He is the son of a railroad trackman who worked his way up to general supervisor of terminals for the B. & O. He was graduated from the Valley Forge Military Academy, the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service and the University of Maryland Law School.

He has worked as a farmhand, a shipyard electrician, a meatcutter, a freight trucker, and a police reporter for the Baltimore Sun (his half brother is Paul W. Ward, the Sun's United Nations correspondent).

Tom Ward says he wants to devote more time to his real estate in Baltimore (five Bolton Hill houses) and West Virginia (a partnership in 2,600 acres of timberland, with mineral rights). He will still be a "take charge" guy, though. When he was 17, he rose in a short time to be chief yard clerk at the B. & O.'s Mount Clare shops in Baltimore.

He is a natural boss. Tom Ward may be one of the up-and-coming political bosses of Baltimore.

CRITICISM OF U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM STILLED

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, we have endured a lengthy period of criticism and protest against our Government's policies in South Vietnam. But in more recent days, as William S. White has written in today's Washington Post, the criticism, though not a thing entirely of the past, has been stilled and the isolationism of the sixties is dying out, both here and among our allies abroad.

Public realization that the course of America in holding firm in southeast Asia is both necessary and right has, in short, grown. White's column makes the point that, abroad, the British Government of Prime Minister Harold Wilson has become our chief associate in quieting the critics. White's praise for the Prime Minister's achievement is noteworthy and should be heeded, Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that his column "Vietnam Support—Critics Finally Stilled" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 13, 1965]

VIETNAM SUPPORT—CRITICS FINALLY STILLED

(By William S. White)

For the first time, it can be said with confidence that the long attack upon the American policy of resisting Communist aggression in Vietnam by candid military force is clearly failing, both in this country and in Europe.

The new isolationism of the sixties—an isolationism expressed in recommendations that in one way or another we should abandon the South Vietnamese and cut and run from Asia under elegant rhetoric protesting that we were not running at all—is dying at last.

Its death at home—and a slow death it has been through 2 years of almost constant biting at American purposes—is manifest, both in what is now happening and in what is now not happening. The shrill outcries formerly heard so often from a Democratic fringe in the Senate are heard no longer, except here and there and in very minor key.

The hostile student teach-ins are not altogether a thing of the past. But apart from the fact that proresistance teach-ins are now also being organized—for example, one to be held in Washington on October 16—these academic fevers were never more than a nuisance. And they never reflected in the least way any substantial opinion in this country, any more than the little band of complaining Democratic Senators ever represented anything more than a fragment of Congress.

The mischief of the teach-ins and of the clamors of the Senate splinter was that they warmed our critic abroad, particularly in Britain, with a suggestion of togetherness—the wonderful notion that the true intellectuals in the United States at all events were not standing with a line of resistance to Communist imperialism to which three American Presidents had successively given their word.

This implication that the real brains here were against the war of resistance was, of course, always absurd. Far the greater proportion of the intellectual community was always in support of this Government. Still, it was never so strident, so skilled at self-publicity. So it was the opposition that was largely heard in Europe.

Yet, as the Johnson administration on this issue has steadily enlarged its backing at home—and spectacularly so in recent weeks, as the Harris poll has just confirmed—so has our position improved in that focal point of important foreign criticism which is England.

Indeed, the Labor Government of Harold Wilson has now become the most useful of all our associates in beating back the mixed international group—of mere beatniks, of honest semipacifists, of decent ultraliberals enchanted with the delusion that it is always possible to halt Communist incursions by mere negotiation—that had so long given the U.S. Government so much trouble.

The magnitude of Wilson's achievement at the recent Labor Party convention at Blackpool in England in destroying their case has not been appreciated here. This erstwhile ban the bomber, this man who was once the very secular Pope of the neutralist-minded men of the West, has done more than grow in stature as a Prime Minister when at last he had to confront head on the hard realities of this world. He has become a strong and courageous party leader as well.

For at Blackpool Wilson proved to even the most skeptical, point by point, historical fact by historical fact, that those who refuse an honorable peace in Vietnam are not bad old Yankees but rather Communists—and mainly Chinese Communists at that. When he had done, the howlers had no case left.

His Foreign Minister, Michael Stewart, in his current visit here has in a quieter way done much the same thing. Neither publicly nor privately has Stewart given the smallest comfort to those Americans who had hoped to elicit from him some kind of sniping at some point of the policy in Vietnam.

A Conservative government in London could not have been so helpful. For British Conservatives, like American conservatives, are suspect from the word go on any rationally hardline enterprise whatever. When authentic very-liberals like Wilson and Stewart stand with us nobody can possibly accuse them of professional Communist-baiting. Anglo-American politics works in illogical ways, sometimes, its wonders to perform.

WISCONSIN: NO. 1 IN DAIRY BY A MILE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, during the recent debate on the farm bill claims were made about the agricultural production of many States. The farm bill included some provisions which we hope will be helpful to America's dairy farmers. Certainly these dairy farmers deserve an opportunity to earn a better income.

Their efficiency has vastly increased as has their investment. Their hours of work probably exceed those in any other occupation. And yet their income continues at an insulting rate—in my State, for example, of less than 50 cents per hour.

Mr. President we will be watching the effect of the new farm bill on our farmers in Wisconsin closely; and we will be prepared to urge as hard as we know how for whatever changes may be necessary to enable these farmers to earn a fair return.

Wisconsin's stake in dairying is not just legendary. It is a big fact. Our State produces nearly half of all the cheese in America. We are way out in front in almost every dairy category.

Recently the Wisconsin Agriculturalist and Farmer printed statistics from the Wisconsin Statistical Reporting Service that document this. I ask unanimous consent that this brief explanation and table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the explanation and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM FACTS AND FIGURES—NO. 1 IN DAIRY

How Wisconsin continues to hold top place in the Nation's dairy industry is illustrated in the following table. Last year the State ranked first in milk production with nearly 19 billion pounds, first in 11 manufactured dairy products, second in 6 and third in 1 more.

During 1964, Wisconsin dairy plants produced more than a fifth of the Nation's butter and over two-fifths of the cheese. Included in cheese production were a third of the Swiss cheese made in the Nation, half the Italian and nearly half of the American cheese.

More than a third of the sweetened condensed whole milk and almost half of the sweetened condensed skim milk, bulk goods, produced in the Nation in 1964 came from Wisconsin plants. More than a fifth of the dry skim milk for human use and all of the malted milk powder was made in Wisconsin.

Wisconsin's rank in the Nation's dairy industry—1964

Product	Rank among States	Wisconsin production (pounds)	Percent of United States
Butter	2	317,307,000	22.0
Cheese:			
American	1	522,198,000	45.1
Swiss	2	38,546,000	31.6
Munster	1	21,534,000	74.7
Brick	1	15,935,000	67.6
Limburger	1	1,609,000	55.9
Italian	1	110,609,000	50.2
Blue Mold	1	12,566,000	74.6
Total cheese (excluding cottage cheese)	1	761,968,000	44.1
Condensed milk, bulk:			
Sweetened, whole	1	22,112,000	37.1
Sweetened, skim	1	26,136,000	45.1
Unsweetened, whole	3	35,542,000	10.1
Unsweetened, skim	2	93,191,000	11.4
Evaporated whole milk, unsweetened, case	6	123,297,000	6.5
Dry products:			
Whole milk	5	10,462,000	11.9
Skim milk for human use	2	468,158,000	21.5
Skim milk for animal feed	2	3,589,000	16.3
Whey	1	136,433,000	37.7
Buttermilk	2	23,937,000	26.0
Malted milk powder	1	22,369,000	100.0
Ice cream (gallons)	9	25,050,000	3.4
Milk production	1	[1]18,887,000,000	14.9

[1] Preliminary figure.

Source: Wisconsin Statistical Reporting Service.

TAX SAVING PASSED ON TO CONSUMERS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the repeal of many excise taxes by the 89th Congress was based, in part, on the belief that manufacturers and retailers would pass the savings on to the consumer. I am proud to note that the Kimball Piano Co. of Jasper, Ind., has undertaken in good faith such a course of action.

Recently, my distinguished colleague, Senator MURPHY, passed along to me a telegram from the John Peters Piano and Organ Co., lauding the "exemplary efforts" of this Hoosier company.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this telegram be printed, in part, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PASADENA, CALIF.

Senator GEORGE MURPHY,
Room 452, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

My purpose in sending this message to you is to mention the sincere efforts of the Kimball Piano Co. of Jasper, Ind., and the way they are handling the Federal excise tax repeal.

I believe that Kimball Piano Co. with Mr. Arnold Habig the company's chairman of the board and the rest of the company's staff deserve commendation for their sincere and patriotic efforts and cooperation in the way they are handling the President's release of Federal excise taxes. Their exemplary efforts deserve to be brought to the attention of all.

I believe Kimball is demonstrating great intelligence in this currently important matter.

I am hoping that it would be possible for you to call this matter regarding Kimball Piano Co., to the attention of the Indiana representatives as it is a company in our industry they can truly be very proud of.

Respectfully,
JOHN PETERS URSULESCU,
John Peters Piano and Organ Co.

ADDRESS BY ROBERT MOSES, CHAIRMAN OF TRIBOROUGH BRIDGE AND TUNNEL AUTHORITY, BEFORE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS, AT NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR, ON OCTOBER 7, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an address delivered by Robert Moses, chairman of the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority, at a dinner commemorating the occasion of the 51st Annual Convention of the American Association of State Highway Officials, at the World's Fair, New York, on October 7, 1965.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF ROBERT MOSES, CHAIRMAN OF THE TRIBOROUGH BRIDGE AND TUNNEL AUTHORITY AT A DINNER COMMEMORATING THE OCCASION OF THE 51ST ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS, FLUSHING MEADOW, OCTOBER 7, 1965

Triborough welcomes the highwaymen to the New York metropolis and the fair. Our red carpets as well as our blacktops are spread for you. Our latchstrings are out, and the keys to the city are yours. Give us your confidence, your ideas, and your criticisms too so long as they are constructive, because wisdom will not die with us, and this fair is the place to measure achievements in free competition and to crown the forerunners in our olympics of progress.

You have no doubt already been surfeited with advice. I shall try not to bore you. My task is to enlighten painlessly. One can attract attention by throwing vitriol into people's faces, but it is not a good way to sustain their interest or friendship.

There were good roads as soon as the wheel was invented, and men traveled them by chariot and on foot. The road, as a great historian remarked, has from the beginning of time been the handmaiden of civilization, and the beds of Roman roads give mute testimony today to the truth of this observation. Washington, Jefferson, and the two Adams, at the founding of our Nation, recognized that there could be no United States without the unifying influence of transcontinental roads. We can see, as we look at the maps of newly established African Republics, how impossible it is to create a nation out of remote, diverse, separate, inaccessible, unconnected fragments where distance magnifies civil, religious, racial, and military differences.

To be sure, communication routes have their sinister aspects. I read the other day in a book called Routes of Contagion that the great epidemic diseases have always spread along man's established routes of communication—caravan trails, highways, railroad lines, sealanes, airways—and so have ideas.

There can be no regional or continental highway system without Federal aid, which is indispensable where a nationwide point of view is required, and cash is needed to insure continuity and uniformity. The Bureau of Public Roads in Washington, beginning with Thomas H. MacDonald almost half a century ago, has been a model institution. It has been scrupulously honest and has religiously avoided the pitfalls of dictation, politics, and bureaucratic gobbledegook. It has not invaded States' rights, home rule, and local responsibility.

At best highway building is not an exact science, and those who get beyond good schooling, drafting, surveying, and the drudgery of the apprentice, journeyman, and craftsman, to positions of authority above if not beyond routine, must rest less on their academic laurels and trust more to judgment, wisdom, and incorruptible courage. Origin and destination surveys are well enough, and no doubt indispensable to impress the uninitiated with needs manifest to professionals, but great highways and crossings have their own inescapable logic as palpable to the uninitiated as a coming storm to a weatherman, a disease to a diagnostician, or a great talent to an artist or producer. A traffic expert, after all, is a man who can distinguish the quick and the dead. Any recognized expert is simply a man who agrees with you.

Even if we begin to realize how essential leadership, loyalty, status, and dependable support are to success, we must be reconciled to the fact that nobody can hold the sideline wiseacres to account for either their diagnoses or cures. The American Indians were smart. Their medicine man was a prophet as well as a quack. He also practiced forensic medicine, which means that even if he could not cure, he could always describe dramatically what killed you.

I am always happy in the company of professionals. I don't like 3-day planning symposia where pompous superbores put minor bores to sleep. I, like the actor at the Players who, when unexpectedly called on, can without posturing or preparation, turn up his collar, rumple his hair, change his expression, and revive an old part. It's the professional touch. A good actor needs no buskin. The professional is a man who works hard, profits by experience, and is never satisfied.

I don't like smooth, brilliant amateurs and millennial planners, characterized by postering, conceit, laziness, lofty pretensions, technical, humorless vocabularies, eau de cologne, overdeveloped critical faculties and monstrous assurance. August Heckscher III, who turns a neat phrase in his Ivory Tower, puts you boys in your place. He said recently anent the province of planning that it involves: "tempering the arrogance of the engineers * * * limiting the profits of the speculator * * * putting long-range values above the enticements of immediate gain * * * fixing of priorities and the affirming of values beyond those of the day."

The critics build nothing. They are never found by the pilgrim as he progresses on the long, rough journey from information to knowledge to wisdom. It is well for a man to be sure of himself, short of a fatuous belief in his own inspiration and infallibility. The smart man makes the most careful, detailed and wearisome, painstaking preparations for the immediate future, but heeds Ecclesiastes and leaves something to time and chance.

The general public cannot read blueprints. They go for pictures and other graphic stuff. There are of course ill-natured jibes at elaborate and expensive printed reports, spot air announcements, studious documentaries, large models and clever perspectives, but throughout the country the more alert and perceptive officials are using all the best modern technique and aiming to lend a touch of distinction to dated, dreary handouts. The expense of good publicity is in fact a very small fraction of the cost of staggeringly expensive improvements. Advertising our products needs no apology, and surely those who complain that they never know where the public dollar goes should be the last to complain.

You gentlemen face a fascinating and challenging decade in highway building and transportation, in the course of which the next and crucial Federal aid program will be decided. Right ahead of us is probably the last opportunity for progress without revolutionary disruption of property and living and government bankruptcy. I am not exaggerating. The problems of arterial building become daily more urgent and controversial, and only the most reliable industrial, official, press, and citizen support will enable the builders to keep abreast of increased motorization.

There is considerable truth in the cliché that this has become more and more an age of specialization. We look longingly for the all-around men who founded this country—native universal geniuses like Franklin and Jefferson who could both dream and do almost everything. The tendency to specialization in vast assembly line factories is something to give us road builders real concern. It leads otherwise able men to ignore and shut out everything but their own sector or piece of pie in the big economic travel circle.

This is well illustrated in Alfred P. Sloan, Jr.'s recent interesting autobiography entitled "My Years With General Motors." In this saga of the auto assembly line there is not a single reference to roads. I had quite an argument years ago with Mr. Sloan. He told me then that cars should be manufactured the year round, but that roads should be built only in depressions. Since then General Motors has fortunately taken the lead in the encouragement of continuous road building, as dramatically exemplified by the General Motors pavilion at the World's Fair.

Cooperation of local officials, urban, suburban, and exurban, on main arteries is almost impossible to attain without prolonged controversy. The suburban and exurban people of course want to get to town and home fast on the finest roads located nearby, but not too close to them. They want at the same time to be accessible and isolated. It's a neat trick if you can do it. Our danger is not from corruptible builders. It is from highwaymen and other transportation and traffic engineers who lack courage when they can't depend on support, who have no thirst for martyrdom, who shun ulcers and coronaries or, to use a different metaphor, won't stick their necks out as they await their pensions. The engineering profession has been notoriously incorruptible, but it has not always been bold and vocal in meeting politics and enlisting public opinion.

Competition for space within the metropolis becomes fiercer as demands become more insistent and resistance mobilizes. The irresistible force meets the unmovable object—rails against rubber, driver against pedestrian, airports against residences, parks against subdivisions, public beaches against piers and docks, smoke, smog, and noise against the unsullied atmosphere, thruways, expressways, and freeways for mixed traffic, representing the shortest distance between two points, as against genuine parkways restricted to passenger vehicles, representing the most attractive, if not the fastest route.

Few observers realize that building roads and regulating traffic are two very different things. Each no doubt has its own mystique. My friend Henry Barnes determines the efficiency of meter maids by weighing them. It occurs to few of these people that a little more daily, folksy commonsense, cooperation between and among the many present officials, administrators, professionals and technicians would accomplish more than exhorting miracle men and reaching for the millennium.

It is hardly necessary for me to say a word in passing for the public authorities which have been established to unite the best in government with the best in private financing. I believe in what the diplomats and U.N. lads call ad hoc agencies; that is, those created to meet specific, definite, realizable, limited objectives as distinguished from spreading themselves all over the landscape to advocate vague, foggy, noble, sublimated, and morally unassailable distant ends. Look up teleology in Webster, if you don't know Greek, and beware of the teleological magicians.

If a public agency like the Triborough Bridge & Tunnel Authority or the Port of New York Authority, without public credit, whose revenues are pledged to its bondholders, has a small surplus, political leaders immediately propose to use it to capitalize wholly extraneous improvements or to impose drastic rents which would destroy its credit and its ability to finance needed extensions.

There has recently been added to our official objectives the beautification of the American landscape. Obviously this can best be achieved through the Federal aid highway program. Spotting parks and playgrounds in cities is all very well and will no doubt improve the intimate life of congested centers, but only the most imaginative, farflung highway system can provide the continuous nationwide beauty recently announced as his policy by President Johnson. Realization of this policy depends on liberal interpretations by those in Washington and the States who must be convinced that it is their job to implement the program, instead of whittling it down in the normal course of attrition of most noble pronouncements. The billboard lobby has already shown its teeth and very effectively. Highways, like hell, are paved with good intentions.

When further Federal aid is debated and determined, many of us will be out of commission, and this therefore is our last opportunity to be heard. I have no doubt that all forms of transportation must be considered and that a balanced program for the legitimate needs of rubber, rails, air, and water is required. It is not too early for us gaffers to put in our 5 cents' worth of practical experience.

Meanwhile, bless you all. Have a good look at the fair, and safe home.

DON SHULA—COACH OF THE YEAR

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to inform my colleagues of my confidence that the Baltimore Colts of the National Football League will become league champions in 1965. They have been coached since 1963 by a dynamic and determined young man, the National Football League's Coach of the Year for 1964, Don Shula. I am proud of the Colts and proud of the fine job which Don Shula has done as he enters his third season as head coach.

The October issue of Baltimore magazine, published by the Chamber of Commerce of Baltimore, includes an interesting article on this outstanding young coach. I commend it to any of my colleagues who would dispute the Colts' determination to win the championship.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"COACH OF THE YEAR"—IN TWO SEASONS, YOUNG DON SHULA LED THE BALTIMORE COLTS TO THE BRINK OF ANOTHER WORLD CHAMPIONSHIP—THIS YEAR HE HOPES TO TAKE THEM ALL THE WAY

(By John C. Schmidt)

It took Don Shula just two seasons in his first job as head coach to take a group of dispirited "old" men and inexperienced young ones and mold them into a team strong enough to capture the National Football League's western division title. In doing so, he also earned for himself the honor of 1964 National Football League Coach of the Year.

Thus, at the age of 35, his lifelong ambition has been all but achieved. Only one thing could have made last year perfect for him—to have won the championship game in Cleveland. That will have to wait for another season, and expectancy is running high among Colt fans that it will be this one.

Shula has exceeded the hopes of even some of the team's most optimistic followers in his brief tenure as head coach. In his first season, the Colts started slowly, losing four of their first seven games, but were playing without standouts Lenny Moore for two contests and Raymond Berry and Jimmy Orr for three and five, respectively. Rookies John Mackey and Bob Vogel were just being broken in, and the position of fullback—which had been anything but solid since Alan Ameche's retirement 3 years before—was still being filled experimentally.

The coach proved himself equal to this logjam of problems, regrouping his players and sparking a stretch drive that produced five victories in six games—still without the services of Moore. The 1963 season ended with the Colts in third place in the conference with an 8 to 6 won-lost record, bettering 1962's 7 to 7, fourth place finish. A lot of fans were talking championship in 1964 even before summer training camp opened.

The season began with a disheartening and unexpected 34-to-24 loss to the Minnesota Vikings. Then, equally surprising the following Sunday Baltimore edged the powerful Green Bay Packers, 21 to 20, and, as someone observed, won the Western Conference title on the spot. "I don't think anyone was really convinced before the Packer game that we were a championship team," says Shula, "but after the game, we knew we could do it."

The Colts went on to win the next 10 games in a row—a club record—and finished the regular season solidly in first place with a 12-to-2 record. They thrived on opponents' mistakes and made few of their own. They hit a new club high in touchdowns (54) and points scored (428) and managed to avoid disabling injuries. Don's trade for linebacker Steve Stonebreaker and his use of other key personnel were vital to the team's success.

The championship game in Cleveland December 27 is something many Colt fans still do not like to talk about, as Baltimore suffered a humiliating 27-to-0 less to the Browns. Don has done a lot of thinking about that afternoon, and talks about it calmly and with no alibis. "What can you say when you get beat like that? You just accept it and try to work all the harder, try to get another opportunity to regain yourself. I wish I could pinpoint it to one thing, because then I could correct it, but I cannot. Before the game, it was very similar to the first game with the Vikings. We worked hard in the 2 weeks of practice we had before the championship, but when we got there, we did not make the plays, offensively or defensively, to get the job done.

"When we came out for the second half, it was zero to zero. The Browns were not picked to be that close, but they were, and I think that gave them the incentive. They scored 17 points in the third quarter. Then we got backed up in a corner of the stadium with the wind coming down on us and we just could not get out of that hole. I do not feel I did a good job of getting us ready—the results indicate that I did not. I do not think anyone played a super ball game for us. We made some mistakes defensively in that second half that we had not made all year long, such as letting guys come wide open to score. We just blew it from top to bottom, everybody connected with the football team."

All things considered, however, Don believes that his first 2 years as head coach of the team for which he once played have gone well. Viewing the game from the position of head coach, he says one thing he has learned is never to take anything for granted. "When you are preparing for something, you do not ever assume that the quarterback knows this or the defensive back knows that. Even though they have done it dozens of times, you have got to put them in that situation again before you can feel confident that they will do it in a game." He has also found that even with 2 years of experience behind him, he is no more relaxed about a game beforehand than he ever was. "You still get all tensed up. You are constantly afraid of having missed something, or of not having covered something thoroughly enough. I think this is a thing that stays with all coaches. I know that right up until game time, I will have the butterflies just like I used to as a player. But after the thing starts and your concentration is such that it is focused on the play out there, then you pretty much forget about everything except what you are trying to get done."

Don has made no radical changes in the 2 years. As he observes, football is an old game and coaches have been around for a long time and it's pretty hard to think of something that is completely new. "We do keep looking for ways of doing things that may be a little bit different. We realize the other teams are all watching us, and we chart ourselves to make sure we're not becoming stereotyped, that every time we get in a certain situation or formation we do a certain thing. We try to vary our plays so they can't get a type on us." Like all coaches, he spends long hours with a movie projector, analyzing and reanalyzing virtually every play the team makes, reflecting a passion for thoroughness which has marked his football career from its earliest days.

Those days were spent in Ohio, where Don was born in a small town about 30 miles east of last December's disaster. He went to Catholic grade school, and in high school, he and his five brothers and sisters all took part in sports. Don won 11 letters. "Sports was all I ever had—whatever was in season." After high school, he went on to John Carroll University in Cleveland, where he was a sociology major. He kept up a B average while participating in collegiate sports, and in his senior year was captain of the football team.

He graduated in 1950 and was offered a teaching job in a high school in Canton. He also found himself a ninth draft choice of the Cleveland Browns. "There was a decision to make then," he says. "I decided in order to have peace of mind, I had at least to try pro ball and see if I could make it." He played two seasons with the Browns, taking a master's degree in physical education at Western Reserve and doing a hitch in the National Guard at the same time.

He came to Baltimore first in a trade in 1953 when the Colts were reactivated. He was never a standout as a player, although Weeb Ewbank did once rate him as his best defensive back. Don early established himself as a perfectionist, spending hours practicing footwork on his own. It was said of him that he could run backward almost as fast as he could forward. Assistant coach Charlie Winner said what he lacked in actual ability he made up in brains.

Don was released by the Colts in 1957 as Ewbank was trying to mount strength for the first drive toward the championship. It was a case of youth versus experience, Don says, and one of the toughest things that ever happened to him. He was picked up by the Washington Redskins and finished the season there, but was coming to realize that his best playing days were probably behind him. He turned almost naturally to coaching. "It had appealed to me for a long time," he says, "Besides my own assignment, I always wanted to know what everybody else was doing. I always had an interest in the whys and hows of the game." He accepted an offer as assistant coach at the University of Virginia, stayed one season, then went to the University of Kentucky where he worked under Blanton Collier, who is now head coach of the Cleveland Browns. After a year at Kentucky, he got a call from George Wilson, coach of the Detroit Lions, who was looking for a defensive backfield coach with NFL experience, and Don found himself back in pro ball.

He was married and had a young son by this time, and moved his family to Allen Park, a Detroit suburb. On the field he was what the players called a "holler guy," whose deep voice could be heard all over the gridiron when he found occasion to chastise one of his charges. He worked in Detroit for 3 seasons, in each of which the Lions finished second.

One day toward the end of 1962, Don came home and asked his wife, Dorothy, how she would like to move to Baltimore. The Colts were looking for a new head coach, and despite his youth and relative inexperience, he thought he had a chance at it. Colt owner, Carroll Rosenbloom, considering about a dozen prospects, is said to have made up his mind on Shula on the basis of his answer to one question: did he think he was ready for a head coaching job? Don's reply: "It doesn't make any difference what I tell you about that. I'd have to prove it. That's by winning."

Don was hired in January 1963, becoming the third coach since the team returned a decade previously and ending the 9-year regime of Weeb Ewbank. Don had just turned 33 and was, by a few weeks, the second-youngest head coach in the NFL. Rosenbloom admitted that he was taking a gamble on Shula, but was sufficiently impressed with his studious approach to the game and the job he had been doing for the Lions to take the chance.

Don's forthrightness and sincerity helped him avoid what might have been a crippling pitfall. He was coming in to coach a team he had once played for. Some of the players were former teammates, and some were older than he was. "I didn't anticipate any problems, and had none," he says. "I believe it was mainly because I was always honest with them and treated them all the same." Gino Marchetti quipped that he saw no reason to worry: "Shula used to give us hell when he was just a player."

Brief though it had been up to that point, Don's coaching career had a lot of facets. "I've been brought up in the Paul Brown philosophy of coaching. It started out at John Carroll where we used to use all Brown stuff. Then I started to play with the Browns. When I came to Baltimore, I found that Ewbank was a student of Brown also. Then I got into coaching. I was under Blanton Collier, and there again it was back to the same system: organization, attention to detail, eliminate errors. This is what I've tried to do. Our practices are highly organized, for example. They're not long but we get a lot done. There's not much standing around. You just don't tolerate any mistakes. You get a guy who makes repeated errors and sooner or later he's going to beat you, and if you can't depend on him, you look for somebody else.

"Detroit is the only place I've been as a coach that's been different, and I learned a lot there from George Wilson. He was not only a fine coach but was a real great handler of men, and this helped me, to see how he handled the pros. I learned a lot from Ewbank, too. He was a fine organization man and did a good job of getting the squad prepared. And I have my own ideas about running a team—I haven't tried to copy anybody. I try to profit by my experience yet be myself, because I think if you pattern yourself after anybody, you're not natural, you're not doing the things that got you as far along as you are." Partly for this reason, Don rarely sends a play in from the bench. He says he firmly believes that the quarterback on the field is in a better position than the coach on the sidelines to estimate and analyze the opponent's defenses.

Don's dedication to the game is such that football consumes most of his waking hours. He never developed any outside business even as a player. "I've had a few opportunities, but I've never felt that I was able to do two things at one time. I just had to concentrate on one thing. I feel that football's been good to me and it's given me the opportunity to be here and I'm going to give it back everything I have, make the most of the opportunity. I'm going to either make it or break it in football."

His only regret is that the job consumes so much time that he would like to devote to his family. To the regular off-season duties a coach must perform this year was added the round of banquets and appearances that go with being Coach of the Year. There were about 60 such functions all told, an average of 3 a week between January and May. There's a danger of putting on weight, but Don has kept his down to 210, just 5 pounds more than he weighed as a player. And he'll lose those 5 pounds during the season if this year is like the past, which he attributes to being "a little more nervous."

His family now consists of five children, two boys and three girls ranging from 6 years to 2 months. They live in Campus Hills, near Towson, where they have plenty of room and a pleasant, fenced-in lawn. Don plays some golf for recreation when he can get to it, but not during the football season. "He always shines up his clubs and puts them away before training camp opens," says Dorothy, "which is typical of him. Around the house he picks up after himself. He's particular about how his clothes look and about what we call his football room in the basement, where he has his game pictures and footballs and other souvenirs. He doesn't like that room to be upset, unless it's something the children have just done. With kids, he's mellowed a little around the house. He appreciates a neat mess."

The Shulas are a religious family—Don goes to mass in Westminster every morning during training camp. He's normally eventempered, but when things go wrong, he can explode. "We had some television people up in camp this year getting some background for the 'Countdown to Kickoff' program. They had a mike on me and everything I said during practice was recorded. A lot of times I don't like everything I say to be recorded," he laughs. "They can always use it against you, especially when you have a tendency to say just what comes to your mind and not think too much about it."

As to the life expectancy of a head football coach, Don has come to be philosophical. He now has a 3-year, continuing contract, one which renews itself from year to year. "This is a little bit of security in a sense," he says. "But you've got to say that your job is determined by winning games. You can be the greatest talker or con man or what have you, but when it comes to the end of the year, they look pretty much at that record. I'm in a situation with the Colts where there's a lot of talent and you're expected to win, and it's pretty hard to explain when you don't.

If hard work and confidence in himself and the team will do the trick, Don will lead the Baltimore Colts out onto the field at Memorial Stadium on Sunday, January 2, 1966, to meet the eastern division titleholder for the championship. And if winning that game depends on wanting it, nobody stands a better chance than Don Shula.

THE PAINFUL REALITY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on Tuesday, September 14, I spoke on the floor of the Senate in opposition to the recently enacted legislation—then under debate—revising our U.S. immigration laws in the manner proposed.

I pointed out that advocates of the legislation claimed that the increase in immigration brought about by its passage would be miniscule and would amount to only a few additional thousand persons annually, but that I feared the practical results would be otherwise.

I questioned why our Nation should be the only advanced Nation in the world to develop a guilt complex concerning its immigration policies, when it has always been far more liberal than other countries in this respect. I emphasized the fact that other advanced nations, realistically and in their own national interests, are selective in dealing with immigrants—without apology. I stated that our first responsibility in matters of immigration, at this point in our national history when we are faced with numerous sociological and economic problems of mounting severity, is to the citizens of our Nation.

I called attention to the sure indications of our changing times and urged that we take cognizance of the realities of our present situation and the forecasts for our future.

In the Washington, D.C., Evening Star, of October 11, the able newspaper columnist, Mr. Eric Severeid, a widely traveled and skilled political analyst, cogently warned of the difficulties which our Nation surely faces as a result of the enactment of our new immigration law.

I ask unanimous consent to have the October 11 article by Mr. Severeid printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPENING GATES TO IMMIGRANTS

(By Eric Severeid)

Fidel Castro will be very happy to get rid of more Cubans who have relatives in the United States, and the United States will take them. The American humanitarian instinct outweighs the American sense of realpolitik which tells us that we are hereby easing one of Castro's burdens.

Not all the quarter-million or more Cuban refugees in this country have been economically assimilated, but most have, even in Miami, the social tone, variety and charm of which has been improved by their presence, not damaged.

This is not because these people are Cubans rather than Brazilians or Dominicans or Trinidadians. It is because, for the most part, these Cubans represent the aspiring, hard-working and responsible elements in the Cuban society.

It was because of them that pre-Castro Cuba enjoyed one of the highest, not one of the lowest rates of per capita income in Latin America. It is partly because of their banishment that Cuba now suffers one of the lowest rates.

Simply put, what the Cuban Communists have done is to gut the Cuban middle class, not just the small, exploiting upper class. This is profound, historical tragedy because the whole drive in Latin America must be to build middle classes by training the poor and illiterate as well as by reducing the power and holdings of the very rich.

It seems axiomatic: Without a strong middle class in those countries, that is to say, without a balance wheel which permits tolerance and orderly change, there is no escape from dictatorial rule, either by the right or by the left. In modern times, the existence of stable democracy is intertwined with the existence of a middle class.

President Johnson made his affirmative response to Castro's "offer" at the same time he signed the new immigration bill. Many statistics have been bandied about as to the past totals of foreigners admitted here and the future expectations under this bill. The most common characteristic of these figures, so easily spouted from political soapboxes, is their meaninglessness. American citizens do not understand what the picture has been and will be, and the press has not done very much to enlighten them.

The welcome to a new wave of Cubans is an example of why the official figures never stay put. The new bill puts a limit of 120,000 per year on immigration visas from the Western Hemisphere. Many thousands more enter under different kinds of visas. The new Cuban wave will drive the total that much higher.

The bill eliminates the noxious quota system of 40 years standing, under which people from northern Europe were preferred as immigrants, even though those countries do not fill their quotas, presently prosperous as they are.

In recent years, "quota immigration" stood, on paper, at 158,000 a year, which will now be increased slightly. Most people seem to think that is the total of our annual harvest of newcomers to these shores. In fact, the total of nonquota newcomers—refugees, reunited families, etc.—has been averaging far more than the number who actually come by quota.

The grand total of foreigners admitted has been running around 275,000 or more each year. Under the new bill, the grand total, by some expert estimates, will rise to somewhat near 400,000 a year.

It will now be easier for people of southern Europe, Asia, and Africa to come here, but the common notion that they have been virtually inadmissible is not quite true.

The Italian quota, for example, was only 5,600 a year, but the actual admissions from Italy have averaged over 15,000 a year for 10 years. Japan's quota was only 185, but the Japanese admitted annually have been averaging nearly 5,000 for the last 10 years.

Very few people will argue that the old quota system, based on religious and racial feelings, should have been retained. Few will argue against reuniting families or in favor of closing the door against political refugees in certain circumstances.

But responsible Americans, particularly the orthodox liberals, must now face up to certain hard, unpleasant realities and must think about them with their heads, not with their glands.

This is a basically different country from the time when immigrants were not only welcomed but required. The economic life of America in the revolution and the early 19th century was more like the life of ancient China than like the life of America today.

Farmlands no longer need filling up; they are, indeed, emptying into the vast urban centers. Our really terrible problems are urban problems and at the heart of most of them is the simple business of overcrowding. Sanitation, health, transportation, police services are at the point of breakdown in many cities. Psychological tensions have become unbearable in some cities, as we have seen in our long, hot summers.

The age of mass mess has just begun, for the population of this country will probably increase by another 30 million in the next 10 years.

It is in this light that we must now think about immigration, not in the light of old theories and emotions. To pile tragedy upon tragedy is scarcely liberal. Liberalism was an easy path when help given to one unfortunate did not injure another unfortunate.

The real, and the painful question that now has to be faced is not whether to be liberal or illiberal, but whom to be liberal to. Choices must be made. This is the sad wisdom that every older civilized country understands and acts upon because it must. History will not exempt the American civilization.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in just a matter of months now, medical care for the aged will no longer be the dream that it was almost a half-century ago. Instead it will be a reality—a reality made possible in no small part by the historic struggle of one of this country's most illustrious citizens, Josephine Roche, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

As far back as 1915 Miss Roche has highlighted, in one way or another, the health deficiencies of this Nation that needed correction. In her writings, in her speeches, and in her everyday work, she has relentlessly fought for better health and better medical care for this country.

Her earlier efforts were climaxed when she organized the Interdepartmental Committee to Coordinate Health and Welfare Activities in July 1938. As chairman of this committee she called the first National Health Conference. This conference was attended by members of the medical and related professions, by public health and public welfare officials, by workers in health and social agencies, and by representatives of labor and farm groups, and of other groups composing the general public. The conference contributed toward a better understanding of the national needs in the field of health and medical care and toward the formulation of policies that would enable the medical and other professions, private organizations, Federal, State, and local agencies and individual citizens to cooperate in efforts to meet those needs.

The following is a brief summary of the work that led to the creation of that conference:

In June 1934, subsequent to a Presidential Executive order establishing the Cabinet Committee on Economic Security and the Advisory Council on Economic Security, the President appointed her as a member of this Council. In November 1934, she was appointed by the President as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and thereupon appointed to the Technical Board on Economic Security composed of specially qualified Government officials. This Board was responsible for the review and the analysis of the vast data on national economic and social needs, the proposals for meeting these needs, and for the preparation of the Cabinet Committee's report on economic security which was submitted by this Committee to the President January 15, 1935. The President, on January 17, 1935, transmitted this report to the Congress with his message recommending legislation along the lines proposed by the Committee. This report formed the basis for the Social Security Act passed by the Congress in August 1935.

Upon passage of the Social Security Act with its far-reaching new economic and social programs involving both Federal and State administration, the President requested her to act as Chairman of the Interdepartmental Committee To Coordinate Health and Welfare Activities of the Federal Government with particular reference to Federal-State relationships in these new programs. Due to the success achieved by the Committee during its first year of functioning in developing efficient and coordinated procedures for prompt implementation of the many new provisions contained in the Social Security Act, the President formalized the Committee's status a year later by Executive order.

As Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, the U.S. Public Health Service, then a Treasury agency, was placed under her administration and she immediately made plans for a comprehensive inventory of the Nation's health needs under the immediate direction of this outstanding professional agency. The mass data and material obtained and documented throughout every State over a period of months and subjected to expert analysis and compilation is still considered major reference material in the health field, both in regard to facts obtained and procedures employed in the survey.

This national health inventory was referred to the Interdepartmental Committee's Technical Committee on Medical Care. The Technical Committee, after intensive review of the mass data and many conferences with professional and public agencies prepared and submitted to the Interdepartmental Committee for its consideration an exhaustive five-topic report on national health needs. Submission of the Technical Committee's report to the Interdepartmental Committee came in the fall of 1937, at a time when her resignation from the Treasury was imminent. Because of the importance of this Technical Committee's report and the importance of the developing work of other committees, the President asked her to continue as Chairman of the Interdepartmental Committee.

In February 1938, the Interdepartmental Committee, after careful review of the Technical Committee's report and recommendations, transmitted to the President an extensive report on the needs of the Nation's health.

The Interdepartmental Committee met in Washington, D.C. July 18, 1938.

The conference brought forth widespread interest and an urgent response throughout the country to the need for an adequate health program. The Interdepartmental Committee, therefore continued intensive work throughout the summer and fall of 1938 on the preparation of a health program which in January 1939 was sent to the President. On January 23, the President transmitted the report to the Congress with his message recommending that the report receive the careful study of the Congress.

Concurrently with the work she was carrying on with the Interdepartmental Committee during 1937 and 1938, she also was serving on the Advisory Council on Economic Security jointly appointed in May 1938 by the Senate Special Committee on Social Security—a subcommittee of a Senate Committee on Finances—and by the Social Security Board. This Committee was charged with the responsibility of studying amendments to the Social Security Act on such subjects as benefit extensions, taxes, size and use of reserve, and related matters. The final report of this Council was filed in December 1938.

Some 10 years later, when the United Mine Workers Union and the mine operators reached their historic agreement to set up a welfare and retirement fund, Miss Roche was selected to direct it. As director and trustee of the UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund since 1950, she has been able to demonstrate in a practical way what was only theory in 1938. She was able to bring to the fund the great wealth of her experience and ability in medical care, and to demonstrate that it could work.

The hospital and medical care program of the UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund has been in operation since 1948. It started with the rehabilitation of severely disabled coal miners. Her earliest concern was the challenging task of placing injured coal miners on the road to freedom from the iron imprisonment of physical disability that they had faced. What was achieved in the physical and vocational rehabilitation of those tragically disabled men constitutes a 20th century miracle. The techniques and new knowledge gained through treatment of many of the most severe cases developed new medical and rehabilitation standards which opened new horizons to recovery and hope for paraplegics everywhere and brought to the fund the American Public Health Association's Lasker Award.

In presenting the award, Miss Roche was told:

> You have brought together the warmth of compassionate hearts, the incisive planning of brilliant scientific minds and the wisdom of dedicated lives of service to create a model program of health services to coal miners and their families in the mining towns from Alabama to Alaska.
>
> Your staff of specialists has taken modern scientific medicine to the backwoods. You have brought specialist services when the patient needed them, and no drug has been too expensive if it were necessary for health and healing. No time has been too long to rehabilitate the paraplegic who had broken his back in the treacherous pits under the hills. Nor were the wives and children forgotten. Needed health services are theirs, too, for they are part of the great family who provide fuel for a nation.
>
> The bold, comprehensive medical care program you have developed has demonstrated that private physicians and organized labor can work together in harmony for the good of the patient.
>
> The medical care program of the United Mine Workers of America Welfare and Retirement Fund created and operated by you and your colleagues exemplifies the best in medicine, in social accomplishment and in social consciousness. For your great humanitarian services and for your vision and achievement the American Public Health Association is honored to present to the medical care program of the United Mine Workers of America Welfare and Retirement Fund this Albert Lasker Award.

The Lasker Award was only one of many received by the fund.

Within 12 months, after its medical care program was instituted, the fund received its first award.

In 1960 the fund's medical service was cited with the 1960 award of the Goodwill Industries of America "for its outstanding example of good will toward the handicapped in a major industry."

In 1957 the fund's medical program was recognized by the National Rehabilitation Association with an award "for the development of advanced rehabilitation programs."

Recognition of its preeminent medical service resulted, in 1954, in the presentation to the fund of a distinguished service award by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

In 1951, the fund had similarly been honored by the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped "for spurring the whole concept of real rehabilitation."

Even the 1955 Senate Committee on Welfare and Pension Plans Investigation in its final report regarding the UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund stated:

> This program is honestly and well administered; in fact, the medical program is outstanding.

When the medical program of the fund went into operation almost 18 years ago, its objective was to provide for its beneficiaries the best medical care that the medical profession and the hospitals in this country could offer. No other medical care plan in the world has ever approached the benefits provided for by the fund. The UMWA Welfare and Retirement Fund has been outstanding from the beginning and remains so today.

By keeping constantly abreast of the newest developments in medical science and techniques, Miss Roche has kept the medical program of the fund the most honored medical care program in the country.

A noted medical care expert who had occasion to review the work that the fund was doing said he "was amazed at the exacting quality, the good care, and the many services that the fund was providing for within the resources available. No amount of money could buy the care that was being rendered daily to the coal miners in this country."

The fund is in the forefront in enabling its beneficiaries to receive the benefits of the new techniques and improved methods of diagnosis and treatment that are constantly being developed.

Surgical operations performed upon the heart and blood vessels, the use of artificial kidneys, methods for the early detection of cancer, corneal transplants in the eyes, and measures for the restoration of those who have suffered a stroke are just a few examples.

The fund has utilized the services of group practice clinics already established and has encouraged the organization and operation of others. When administered properly and staffed with well-trained specialists and able general practitioners, they make a notable contribution in the prevention of illness as well as good care of the sick entrusted to them. They have the advantage of easy consultation between physicians because of the proximity of their offices, provide prompt and accurate diagnoses often in the early stages of disease, and enable the patient to recover his health with a minimum loss of time. The beneficiary is spared much time, exertion, and expense in not having to travel from one physician's office to another on the outside.

The fund has been able to develop good rapport and understanding with university medical centers which has added greatly to the quality of care received. Several new ones near the mining areas are outstanding. They have manifested a high regard for the fund and its objectives. Beneficiaries are frequently transported to distant cities for the highly specialized services available there. Recent developments have provided many of these services nearer the coal fields.

To one who has pioneered in all that is new and good in medicine it was altogether fitting that the American Labor Health Association pay her the following tribute:

> Of all those dedicated to improving the well-being of their fellow men, few can point to accomplishments which enrich the material and spiritual foundations of the many. You, Josephine Roche, are one of those rare individuals. Throughout your lifetime you have successfully challenged powerful and self-seeking interests. Your achievements are manifold. Consistent with your inspired service to mankind, you have for the past 11 years given devoted leadership to bringing the highest quality of medical care obtainable for the miners and their families. You are associated with a great program in the

United Mine Workers of America welfare and retirement fund which has created a pattern that is freeing medical services from ineffective, archaic, and traditional practices. The suffering and anguish from disease and disability and the specter of creditors have been replaced by medical security and equitable prepayment. The ill, the lame, the malnourished and the crippled no longer are ignored and neglected in the coal mining communities of our Nation.

It is the privilege of the American Labor Association to present to you this tribute in recognition of your meritorious contribution to organized labor in its struggle to provide prepaid medical group care of a high quality to all workers on the basis of their needs, yet free of individual financial harassment.

Such tributes are not easily come by. They are the result of the long and tireless effort Josephine Roche has exerted, day and often late into the night, for the past 50 years.

It, indeed, makes one wonder why our reflection on it is so belated, yet so well deserved.

CLAUDE L. CALLEGARY—MARYLAND'S VETERAN OF THE YEAR

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it is with great pride that I rise today to salute my fellow Marylander, Claude L. Callegary, of Baltimore, the national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, who has just been chosen as Maryland's Veteran of the Year.

Mr. Callegary is a prominent attorney, and has often acted as a consultant on veterans' programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article about Mr. Callegary's selection as Maryland's Veteran of the Year which appeared in the Baltimore Evening Sun on October 12.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SELF-EDUCATED LAWYER: DROPOUT AT 13, NOW VETERAN OF YEAR

(By Robert Blake)

A school dropout at the age of 13, who later returned to classes and became a successful lawyer and national commander of the disabled American Veterans, has been named Maryland's Veteran of the Year.

Claude L. Callegary was the unanimous choice of the Veterans Brotherhood Committee composed of representatives of the American Legion, DAV, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Catholic War Veterans, Jewish War Veterans and veterans of World War I.

The award is the highest one that the veterans' organizations of Maryland can bestow.

TO SUPPORT FAMILY

At the age of 13, after completing the seventh grade at Cathedral Elementary School, Mr. Callegary was forced to drop out of school completely to help support his family. He worked at the Mount Vernon Cotton Mills and then moved on, holding such jobs as a stock boy, plumber's helper and truck driver.

He entered the Army in March of 1941 and served in the Aleutian Islands during the Japanese attacks.

Mr. Callegary later served in the South Pacific and was also assigned to Biak in the Netherlands East Indies with an airborne signal unit.

PLANE CRASHED IN BIAK

While involved in the latter campaign, his plane crashed on Biak.

He was one of three survivors of the 14 men aboard the plane and was unconscious 14 days.

After hospitalization in areas that were under constant air attack, he was returned to St. Petersburg, Fla., for treatment of severe burns and other injuries.

The crash changed his entire life.

He took the Army's general education development test and, because of his extensive reading and studying since he was a "forced" dropout, he received unusually high grades.

Mr. Callegary was one of the first students admitted to the University of Maryland without having finished grade school or without having attended a high school.

After 2 years at College Park he transferred to the law school in Baltimore where after being in attendance only 2 years, he took the Maryland State Bar examination and passed it in the top ten of his class, again without benefit of grade school, high school or a college degree.

He opened his law practice in January 1950, but continued in law school to obtain his law degree in June 1950.

In the meantime, he married the former Catherine Briggs, of Oklahoma, and the couple now has six children—three girls and three boys.

JOINED BY BROTHER

Upon being admitted to the bar he began his own law practice and a year later was joined by his brother, Ray.

He has served in many civic and Bar Association activities.

In 1962, he assumed a national office with the DAV which culminated in his being elected national commander of that organization in its annual convention in New Orleans this year.

He was nominated by Senator BREWSTER, a law school classmate.

JOHNSON'S GUEST

In the course of his activities with the DAV, he has traveled the 50 States, been President Johnson's guest at the White House and at the President's Texas ranch.

He is frequently called into conference by Government leaders to discuss programs pertaining to veterans.

Despite this fame and good fortune, returning to school and becoming a lawyer are his proudest achievements.

"THE U.S. CONGRESS—A PERSONAL VIEW" BY THE HONORABLE JOSEPH W. BARR

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, recently in a speech before the American Society for Public Administration, the Honorable Joseph W. Barr, Under Secretary of the Treasury, offered perceptive comments regarding the American legislative process.

Secretary Barr's wide range of personal experience permits him to assess the Congress with an inside as well as an outside view. His remarks are informative and refreshing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his speech be prinetd in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE U.S. CONGRESS—A PERSONAL VIEW

(Remarks of the Honorable Joseph W. Barr, the Under Secretary of the Treasury, before the American Society for Public Administration, Washington, D.C., on Wednesday, September 22, 1965)

INTRODUCTION

I will confess to an unabashed admiration for the Congress and for the congressional system. The constructive, thoughtful, and vigorous record it has established this year surely calls for such expressions of admiration. Mine is offered herewith.

The Congress, as it exists and functions today, is a peculiarily American institution. There is no legislative body in any major nation today which resembles it very closely—and for that matter there has been nothing quite like it in recorded history.

Its quality of uniqueness derives from the constitutional separation of executive and legislative powers—a division which has puzzled, exasperated, and often outraged generations of scholars. Perhaps my "inside, outside" attempt today will contribute some understanding and if not understanding, at least, hopefully, sympathetic admiration.

I have one reservation to offer. I served 2 years in the Congress. While I am acutely aware that this is hardly enough time to form critical judgments, those 2 years were followed by 3 years of close work with the Congress in discharging my legislative responsibilities with the Treasury.

I. INVOLVEMENT IN THE NATION'S AFFAIRS

First of all, to a Member of Congress there is a sense of total involvement in the affairs of the United States that is paralleled only in the White House. (My reference here is to Presidential assistants with whom I have worked during the past 4 years—not to the President, who is clearly in a position of responsibility that cannot be compared with anything.) Finance, foreign policy, farm programs, commerce, conservation, roads, defense, human rights—all these facets of American policy pour through the Congress. For anyone who enjoys the broad sweep of affairs it is both an exhilarating and sobering experience.

But it also has its own drawbacks. If you have an inquiring and analytical mind, the attempt to understand all the issues presented for a vote can be maddening. I am not certain that I qualify as an analytical mind, but I do remember on one occasion trying to get Speaker Rayburn to help me through an issue that confused me. I suppose that I asked too many questions because finally Mr. Sam in exasperation said to me, "Joe, I am worried about you. You seem to have an orderly mind—and this is a disorderly body."

In the final analysis you must usually take the word of someone you trust who is expert in the area under debate and vote with him. While it would seem that this procedure can eliminate the necessity for doing any studying on the issues, still I believe that the average Congressman has a unique perspective of the totality of issues.

My views on this particular point have not changed after 4 years on the outside. Personally I have found it to be gratifying to be able to pursue the issues with which we are associated in greater depth than I ever found possible in the Congress. But now I am frequently concerned that I do not completely understand how all the issues fit together in a national perspective. The Congressman, by the very allocation of his working time, has a better opportunity to obtain a more accurate perspective.

One bit of advice suggests itself here. In making presentations to the Congress, one should keep in mind that the case being presented must not only stand on its own merits but must also make sense when it is lined up with all the other issues that are confronting the Nation. Failure to recognize this relationship gives rise to the feeling in the Congress that the Government is composed of narrow-minded and parochial experts who suffer from that dread bureaucratic disease—"tunnel vision."

II. SEPARATION OF POWERS

During my 2 years in the Congress I sometimes felt that there was an unbridgeable abyss between the Congress and the Executive. I could and did build bridges to the departments with which I was most involved because of committee assignments—Treasury, State, Defense, and to an independent agency, the Federal Reserve Board. But at that time there was no access to the White House for a freshman Congressman. I must admit that I was not disturbed by this situation. I merely assumed this was the way it had always worked, and my colleagues with much longer tenure had never seemed to have had more than a very tenuous relationship with the White House.

Two Presidents, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, with the help of one man, Larry O'Brien, changed all this. In this particular Congress there are 92 new Members, 83 of whom are in the House and 9 in the Senate. I know that everyone of them has a close relationship with Larry and his staff and at least some relationship with the President. While 72 of these new Members, 65 in the House and 7 in the Senate, are members of the President's party, I know from personal observation that the new Members of the opposite party are given the opportunity to establish a similar relation.

From the outside at least, it seems that this rather simple device of consciously building a bridge across the constitutional gulf has helped to combine the advantages of a congressional and a parliamentary system.

The effect of the O'Brien bridge has been to assure that every member has the chance to hear not only the Department's position, but the President's views on legislation he is sponsoring. The distinction may sound tenuous, but think back to my original point that the Congress usually tends to jump to a conclusion that departmental positions are narrowminded and parochial. They do not take that attitude with Presidents. Even if they disagree with a position, as politicians they are acutely aware that a President stands for election before all the people.

It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of this development involving only a handful of people in the White House and 30 or 40 in the rest of the Government. While maintaining the absolute independence of the individual Member of Congress, the O'Brien bridge has in effect opened a parliamentary dialog in a congressional system. I mean by this that the politicians—the Members and the President—are now engaged in a direct dialog as they would in a parliament.

I believe that the recent legislative record will support my thesis that a dialog between the politicians develops more understanding than the more traditional dialog between the Congress and the departments.

III. SPECIALIZATION

I have already referred to the fact that the variety of issues confronting the Congress makes it a practical necessity to rely on the judgment of Members who specialize in the particular area. As a Member I had a vague idea that the Congress was a body of generalists fragmented into areas of specialization. I was forming a dim idea that access to committee staffs and to the staffs of the departments over which one had oversight opened up extraordinary avenues for research in depth in particular areas. However, the extent and the quality of the congressional system of specialization never became fully apparent until I was on the outside looking in.

My experience on the outside has had mainly to do with taxes and finance and has involved the Ways and Means Committee and Banking and Currency Committee of the House plus the Sente Finance, Banking and Currency, and Foreign Relations Committee. I cannot speak with a background of experience on the other committees of the Congress but I can state emphatically that an administration witness before any of the committees I have named is always pressed—and pressed hard—to make a case. The members of these committees have had years of experience; they are backed up by excellent staffs; and their accumulated knowledge on almost any one of the problems that confront the Treasury is usually awe inspiring.

There is nothing that irritates me more than a somewhat recurring theme that I encounter periodicaly to the effect that the Congress is a rubber stamp. To the people who make these speeches and write these articles, I have always wanted to extend an invitation to testify on a highly technical and controversial subject before the Ways and Means Committee.

Let me give you an example. About a month ago I testified before Ways and Means on Unemployment Compensation legislation. This subject is always controversial and it is admittedly complex. However, for my own information I kept a log of the hours I spent in preparing for the testimony. I logged a total of 34 hours—usually late at night or early in the morning—preparing myself for a 3-hour session.

This may seem like supercaution, but too often I have seen intelligent, experienced witnesses demolished before these committees because they had not taken the trouble to do their homework. Just this week one of our assistant secretaries went before the Senate Finance Committee to testify for a total of 20 minutes on the Canadian auto parts legislation. This man told me that he had spent 29 hours in preparation.

I hope these illustrations will help to show why I become so irritated at the "rubber stamp" charge that is sometimes leveled at the Congress. Any reasonable man with any experience in the affairs of this Government knows better. He knows that when he takes the administration's case to the Congress—no matter what the majority his party may have—he is confronted with an independent panel of specialized experts who usually possess vastly more experience than he. Unless he is to disgrace himself, his department, and the administration, he has no alternative but to spend bone-crushing hours of preparatory homework. It is from this particular angle that the Congress looks most different from the outside than from the inside.

I have often wondered whether it was not this degree of specialization that has developed in the U.S. Congress that has made it the tough, effective legislative body that it is today. We live in a world of specialists in every phase of our lives. While the congressional system with its high degree of specialization may appear fragmented and disorderly to those who admire the symmetry of the parliamentary system, I would submit that the congressional system is peculiarly adapted to the world in which we live today.

It seems to me that this is especially true in the area of taxation. In a parliamentary system a major overhaul of a nation's tax system can usually be accomplished in a month or 2 months. In the United States, I know from experience that it usually takes at least a year and in that period of a year the legislation is debated in the committees of the House and Senate, on the floor, in the press, at most business and labor gatherings, and eventually becomes the topic of almost general conversation in the Nation.

While this can be an excruciating and harassing experience for the Treasury, it does have one enormous advantage. If your case is solid and will stand the scrutiny of the Congress, the press, and the general public—no matter how controversial it may appear at first—you will usually end up with a consensus ranging from two-thirds to three-fourths of the Nation in support of the proposal. As a result, when the legislation is finally enacted, the Nation usually both understands and supports what has been done. In any area so vital to our domestic welfare as taxation, I think this heavy consensus is crucial.

CONCLUSION

I can only conclude from my vantage point first on the inside and then on the outside, that the American Congress as it exists today is a highly effective instrument reflecting the will of the American people. And when I look further at the cooperation and understanding that has been established between the politicians at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue, I feel a profound confidence in the ability of this Nation to face up to its problems.

TOWSON STATE COLLEGE—100 YEARS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it is with great pride that I rise today to salute Towson State College in Maryland, which celebrates its centennial this year.

Authorized by the Maryland General Assembly in 1865, the school was formally opened in January 1866 as Maryland's first normal school. Located in Baltimore for 50 years, it moved to its present location in suburban Baltimore County just north of the city line, in 1915.

In 1936, the school became Towson State Teachers College. From a small, single-purpose institution, Towson State College has evolved into a multipurpose college which offers bachelor's degrees in both teacher education and in the arts and sciences. The school became Towson State College in 1963, and broadened its liberal arts programs. This past year, it served over 6,000 students. Its recently instituted graduate program is rapidly expanding.

It is my great pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues the 100th anniversary of an outstanding educational institution in the Free State of Maryland.

ADDRESS BY WENDELL BARNES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the remarks of Mr. Wendell Barnes, executive vice president of the Western Wood Products Association before the members and board of this association on September 10, 1965, in Portland, Oreg.

This association results from the joining together of the West Coast Lumberman's Association and the Western Pine Association a year ago.

Mr. Barnes served capably as the head of the Small Business Administration and is rounding out his first year as executive vice president of the Western Wood Products Association.

Because of the importance of the wood products industry, and particularly the western wood products industry, I take this opportunity to more fully acquaint people with it.

In his statement, Mr. Barnes said:

> Finally, the forest products industry will be using the new timber sales contract. We will then be able to give time to the complex maze of problems involved in access

to raw materials and, hopefully, to find ways to make reasonable returns on the processing of Federal timber.

The outlook for western lumber, our market men say is one of reserved optimism. This is their professional way of saying that the demand is on the upswing and that the pie is going to be bigger. The market-oriented western lumberman should plan to capture his share of this larger market.

The outlook is based on four indicators: First, the per capita consumption of softwood lumber reached a low in 1960. It has since climbed steadily. It has been predicted for 1966 at 177 board feet per man, woman and child. Second, population continues to grow. The gross national product reaches new highs. Lumber sales reflect the buoyant state of the economy. Third, single-family housing, our single greatest market, is making a comeback this year. This, along with the demands of multifamily housing, now in the doldrums but expected to recover, will use about 11½ billion board feet of softwood lumber in 1966. This represents an increase of better than 2 percent over 1965. I believe there will be additional orders for stepped-up military use. The new housing bill will round out the picture of increased demand for lumber. Thus, new market opportunities.

This demonstrates the vigor with which this industry is responding to opportunity.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY WENDELL B. BARNES, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, WESTERN WOOD PRODUCTS ASSOCIATION, BEFORE MEMBERS AND BOARD OF WWPA, HILTON HOTEL, PORTLAND, OREG., SEPTEMBER 10, 1965

It has been a year since we joined forces. I was aware of some of your problems then and some of your opportunities.

I have since learned a great deal about the lumber industry. I am confident that its future success is to be found in the united action of its many segments.

Your desire for cooperative action is shown by your participation in Western Wood Products Association. The talent and energy you have displayed in making WWPA succeed is greater than I could have anticipated.

You have fielded a good industry team. It has already done much. It will do more. In WWPA we have set a good example of an industry solving its own problems to the mutual benefit of all.

Rarely a day passes that we on the staff do not see a better way to serve WWPA members, or that we don't see a better answer to overcoming adversity and difficulty.

WWPA's role of aggressive and responsible leadership is being recognized at the national level. It has been accepted as the voice of technically progressive and market-oriented western lumbermen. WWPA's public image has gained, and will continue to gain, stature.

However, it would be an overstatement to say that all who questioned WWPA at the outset are now wholeheartedly behind our efforts. But our staff people, who are in daily contact with the industry throughout the country, report that respect is shown for WWPA accomplishments; moral support is given for its actions; and the need of the industry for its vigorous programs is recognized.

Many wood-using groups and the trade press also indicate in print, from time to time, that they think our committees, the board, and the staff are on the right track. These shifts in attitude tell us that WWPA is moving in the right direction. We are establishing belief in our competence, trust, goodwill among all segments of our wood-using industry.

Most of my recommendations have been given to committees through the staff. Later we will hear detailed reports of the actions of standing committees. I am impressed by the quantity and quality of voluntary industry leadership that makes these reports possible. Chairmen and committeemen give valuable direction and skilled professional help in providing WWPA members with workable answers to mutual problems. They pass on to the industry the benefits of their specialized training and long experience. They insure that the association programs provide quality service at a minimum cost to the membership.

I am also impressed by the competence of the staff, the quality and volume of their work, and their dedication to the industry. Our WWPA committees and staff together accomplished much in this past year. We now face new and challenging tasks and problems. How we go about solving them will be affected in varying degrees by your wishes regarding the size and scope of future WWPA operations.

What are some of the immediate major tasks of our committees?

Forestry: Faces a difficult job. It must provide members with authoritative answers to all phases of the new and complex timber sales contract, the new appeals procedure, and the new road easement forms. The expected change in lumber grades will result in the obsolescence of lumber price indices. It will also result in the need of revising all appraisal data based on lumber recovery under the old system. Forestry will need to engage all of the knowledgeable timber industry leadership that the association can muster in this task. It must help to develop equitable appraisal data for interim use, while the timber selling agencies compile data for the new grades based on defensible experience. Forestry must give increasing leadership to improved log-scaling policies and practices. WWPA is an acknowledged leader in this field. It is evident that continued active leadership will greatly benefit WWPA members. Forestry must also endeavor to insure that forestry-related legislation and the review of public land laws now scheduled to undergo a sweeping 3-year study will be constructive for the public and the industry.

Grading: The big job ahead, assuming that the ALS proposal for related dry and green sizes is adopted, is promptly to complete and publish the new WWPA grading rules and the technical data on the stress grades. We must then undertake a large-scale educational and promotional effort. We must familiarize industry production, grading, and sales personnel, as well as wholesalers, retailers, homebuilders, architects, engineers, and others with the new grading rules. We must also familiarize the consumers and users with the advantages provided by the new rules in the end-use of products.

We will have much to be proud of and will have many benefits to gain for our members, if this educational job is done successfully. There has been careful planning for this work. There is every likelihood of prompt and enthusiastic acceptance throughout the country of the new WWPA grading rules and of the lumber and wood products whose qualities they control.

If other grading rules differ too much from those we publish and promote, then we should take whatever steps are necessary to make it possible for WWPA's promotion efforts to benefit all of our members wherever they may be located.

Technical: Procedures for assigning strength values to clear wood of individual and grouped species were recently adopted by an ASTM subcommittee. These will be up for adoption in final form in November. This action will clear the way for issuance of accurate technical information concerning the proper use of lumber products. This will be a great scientific advance. We plan to be among the first, if not the first, to make this information available to the users of our products. Architects, engineers, builders, and specifiers will recognize and approve this advance.

Our technical committee must now develop plans and suggest priorities for future research and technical studies. There is yet much to be learned about the manufacture and use of lumber and wood products. I hope that our association will always play a leading role in the development of new technical knowledge and manufacturing techniques. I hope WWPA will continue to provide for the prompt utilization of such knowledge by our members.

Traffic: The LFVC rule is important to our members who ship the lighter weighing lumber and wood products. There has been little difficulty with authorities and railroads during the past 6 months since the rule was clarified largely as the result of our efforts. It was extended to July 1966. But the LFVC rule is now in jeopardy. Until the rule is settled again, the railroads will likely take no action on WWPA's pending request for a rate reduction. More important, this action will reopen the door for opposing factions in other regions to try and shoot down the LFVC rule in the proceeding before the ICC. Other industries are pressuring the carriers to furnish them specialized cars suitable only for one-commodity use. As this trend continues, it diminishes the total available number of all-purpose cars traditionally used to haul your wood products. Thus, it is likely that for protection of our interests our western lumber industry will have to develop and establish standards for equipment adaptable to its loading needs.

Economic services and market research: Our newest division is creating profitable management tools for WWPA members. It developed the Market Strength Index that has been appearing in Plumb Line. Skillful use of it will provide profits and avoid losses. The geographical sales analysis program has also been introduced. This program will permit any company to compare its realization on its own products from market to market. A company can also compare its own realization to the average for its region or district and then take corrective action, if needed. This analysis will provide a guide indicating where your company is doing well when compared to the industry, and in what area your company needs strengthening. It will provide both a guide and a measuring stick for the association's promotion program. It will open a mine of information for analysis by the association staff. It will give your individual company sales and marketing specialists data for use in developing market opportunities. This has not been available until now, due to our inability to separate specific facts from composite totals. Every effort is being made to finance this program through those who will use it, without any present increase in the association budget. This appears feasible. In the future, as data processing enables marketing techniques to become increasingly sophisticated, more and more companies will require this type of analysis to compete successfully.

The WWPA staff, working with the committee, has also developed a statistical code that is available to any WWPA member who now, or in the future, uses electronic data processing. Many trade associations are making costly efforts to provide such codes for their members. WWPA has such a system now ready. It will very likely be used throughout the industry and by wholesaler and retailer associations.

Safety: Faces the urgent need for making its message heard by lumbermen. It has a valuable story to be heard: nonsafe operations constitute profit leaks. How to tell this story is a prime objective of this department. It will continue to alert the membership to the introduction of restrictive legislation and its possible spread to other areas. This department must also look over the shoulder, as it were, of an ever-increasing number of Government agencies, who may have the power to initiate and to promulgate restrictive regulations and standards.

Public relations: The task here centers around the pressing need to increase the effectiveness of WWPA in correctly and rapidly translating western lumber industry communications to an ever-widening circle of specific and influential target areas. In the past year, WWPA member companies, their key personnel, allied associations, Government agencies and the local, regional and trade press have been kept informed about the western lumber industry. We believe there has been a good improvement in the quality of our communications. We have kept our members well informed. The department is now expanding its target areas to include nonmembers, forestry oriented officials, and legislators from the 12 Western States. It will continue to make specific contacts, hopefully more and more through personal acquaintance. It will inaugurate some new projects to present to the public the wholesome picture of the western lumber industry.

Advertising and promotion: Capturing new markets for western lumber is a prime assignment of this department. Its authorized level of programing determines the extent of its range. You saw the promotion presentation yesterday. Our 1965 program has been outstanding. Other lumber-oriented groups verify this. In July the Southern Lumberman editorialized that, "they (WWPA) are able, aggressive, and resourceful merchandisers." The Western Retail Lumber Dealers Association recently cited WWPA for the "excellence of its dealer materials." The executive secretary of the National Sash & Door Jobbers Association wrote that WWPA was to be congratulated for its, "merchandising kit of considerable benefit to the industry." Inevitably, an advertising and promotion program is subject to unscheduled change in the level of its operation. The program presented by the department yesterday takes this into consideration. It is realistically planned for any of three levels of budgeting. Each level is designed to put dollars into its members' cash registers through skilled and aggressive assaults on modern markets. I hope that you will not permit any loss of the momentum that you have developed in the promotion of your products. In my opinion, there is no substitute for vigorous, intelligent promotion of products of all species at the regional level in producing sales for companies of any size. I further believe that we can make our available promotion funds even more effective by coordinating our activities with other allied associations.

I have used broad brush strokes in painting for you the varied jobs cut out for the association's major department.

Now let's look ahead to where the association and our members will be at the opening of the new year 1966. There will be many changes, almost a new industry.

Assuming the new ALS sizes are adopted, and again I stress the importance of adopting them, we will then be entering a period of harmony within the industry when we should plan to move rapidly forward. This should be a time for testing and advancing new sales and distribution techniques; a time of opportunity for the lumber manufacturer who takes advantage of the marketing opportunities now developing and puts to intelligent use the economic reporting services that will become available to him.

The new WWPA grading rules will provide for the manufacture of modular lumber products which have been properly developed for wide customer appeal. There will be new and accurate technical data on the stress grades available for engineering and construction use. The new rules provide for the efficient use of the harvested log from both the manufacturing and sales standpoint. They further provide for the manufacture of lumber products of uniform nature that will give the designer, the specifier, and the builder-contractor a readily available wood building material of demonstrable performance at competitive in-place cost.

Finally, the forest products industry will be using the new timber sales contract. We will then be able to give time to the complex maze of problems involved in access to raw materials and, hopefully, to find ways to make reasonable returns on the processing of Federal timber.

The outlook for western lumber, our market men say is one of "reserved optimism." This is their professional way of saying that the demand is on the upswing and that the pie is going to be bigger. The market-oriented western lumberman should plan to capture his share of this larger market.

The outlook is based on four indicators: First, the per capita consumption of softwood lumber reached a low in 1960. It has since climbed steadily. It has been predicted for 1966 at 177 board feet per man, woman, and child. Second, population continues to grow. The GNP reaches new highs. Lumber sales reflect the buoyant state of the economy. Third, single-family housing, our single greatest market, is making a comeback this year. This, along with the demands of multifamily housing, now in the doldrums but expected to recover, will use about 11½ billion board feet of softwood lumber in 1966. This represents an increase of better than 2 percent over 1965. I believe there will be additional orders for stepped up military use. The new housing bill will round out the picture of increased demand for lumber. Thus, new market opportunities.

Finally, I will touch on budget considerations.

Insofar as this year is concerned, we anticipate being able to stay within the approved budget.

In the tentative budget for 1966, I do not feel that it is a staff responsibility to recommend an increase in either dues or spending. Unless you gentlemen authorize a change in our level of activity, we visualize a budget of slightly under $4 million which is balanced and does not change the dues rate. The 1966 budget assumes some increase in shipments and a modest increase in membership. The income on which it has been premised does not make provision for a protracted work stoppage. However, we must be realistic where reserves are concerned. In essence, the size of the 1966 budget is directly related to your considered decision as to how great a share of the future lumber markets the members of WWPA wish to capture.

This year some of our departments will inevitably exceed budgets slightly while others will remain within or be below limits. For example: In the area of grading the ALS dues are going to be higher than anticipated. WWPA revenues were also better than expected, and as a result NFPA dues are correspondingly higher. We have also incurred legal and professional costs greater than anticipated, as a direct outgrowth of putting two organizations together. They might be considered "start up" costs.

But generally the WWPA budget for 1965 is realistic and foresighted. I am certain that we will develop a sound budget for 1966. The money you invest in WWPA has provided a wide scope and an increasing volume of services. We expect to improve this job in 1966.

This past year has been a time of setting up shop. It has been a time of sharpening tools, of providing a climate of trust, confidence, and loyalty between western lumbermen everywhere. It has been a time of welding and shaping ideas, plans, programs, and goals. We can capitalize on this program and the funds that have been spent by the plans we make and by what we do in 1966.

I have shown you that we will have new lumber sizes, new grading rules, new technical data, an enlarged lumber demand, promotion acceptance and momentum for our products. All of these elements point to great market opportunities for WWPA members if we continue our drive and keep up our vigorous programs.

We do not intend to leave our future in the hands of our competitors. Our goal is success in the marketplace. As a unified industry we can make our strong voice heard at all levels of government. We can promote our lumber and wood products with all the punch of a uniform approach to marketing. I urge everyone of you here to sell this concept of a vital and united western lumber industry to your mill neighbors. Ask them to join with you in active support of WWPA. You cannot pass this neighbor-to-neighbor communication task on to the staff. Only you can do it.

Finally, let's work to bring other lumber groups closer to us. Let us invite all our western lumber and wood using groups to join with us in taking advantage of our mutual opportunities. Let us command an ever-increasing share of tomorrow's markets. Let's do it together.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

PREVENTION OF SPREAD OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the previous order, the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Madam President, last week Pope Paul VI brought an historic message to the United Nations:

> Peace—

he said:

> it is peace which must guide the destinies of peoples and of all mankind.

And, he reminded us:

> If you wish to be brothers, let the arms fall from your hands. One cannot love while holding offensive arms. Those armaments, especially those terrible arms which modern science has given you, long before they produce victims and ruins, nourish bad feelings, create nightmares, distrust and somber resolutions; they demand enormous expenditures; they obstruct projects of union and

useful collaboration; they falsify the psychology of peoples.

Pope Paul spoke as a man of God. But his words and precepts were addressed to us, the men who hold responsibility for the fate of men in the world. It is for us now to bring his principles into practice; to turn exhortation to active example; to fulfill the hopes which he has aroused in men all over the world.

No task he set before us is more important than to prevent any spread of "those terrible arms" which modern science has given us—the nuclear weapons which could, if unleashed, utterly destroy our societies—our lives— the world itself. As President Kennedy said to the United Nations 4 years ago:

> Every man, woman, and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident or miscalculation or by madness. The weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us.

And in this effort, President Johnson has set our timetable:

> The time to halt nuclear spread—

he has told us—

> is before its contagion takes root.

For the Damoclean sword of which President Kennedy spoke is really five swords—five nations now having the capacity to explode bombs and start the world toward a final holocaust. Surely this is danger enough. But at least 10, perhaps more, other nations are all in a position to develop nuclear weapons within a few years.

Three months ago, I was 1 of 18 Senators who stated on the Senate floor that preventing such further development of nuclear weapons must be "a central priority of American policy" deserving and demanding the greatest additional effort by the United States.

These 18 included Senator PASTORE, who has worked long and hard, quietly and effectively, to limit the spread of nuclear weapons; Senator ANDERSON, for many years Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, who has been a leader in all work to control the atom; and others equally concerned with the great questions of war and peace in the world: the majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD; and Senators AIKEN, CHURCH, CLARK, COOPER, GRUENING, HARRIS, HART, JAVITS, MCGEE, MCGOVERN, MOSS, PELL, PROXMIRE, and TYDINGS.

All agreed with President Kennedy's view of a world where nuclear weapons were spread among many nations—"large and small, stable and unstable, responsible, and irresponsible": that in such a world, "there would be no rest for anyone, no real security, and no chance of effective disarmament."

I then urged immediate action along the following lines:

First. That we initiate negotiations with the Soviet Union and other nations with nuclear capability, or potential, on a treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons.

Second. That we encourage the creation of formal territorial zones free of nuclear weapons.

Third. That we extend the partial test ban treaty of 1963 to underground testing.

Fourth. That we act to halt and reverse the growth of the nuclear capabilities of the United States and the Soviet Union.

Fifth. That we strengthen the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Sixth. That we attempt to lessen our own reliance on nuclear weapons as an instrument of national policy.

The United States has made specific proposals for preventing the spread of nuclear weapons. But our effort must continue and must increase. We were prepared, in 1963, to take the first step; we must now be prepared to take the second step—indeed to walk the final mile—in the long journey toward peace.

The steps we have taken in the last 4 months are important and valuable. But the purpose of my speaking today is to stress that control of the atom, preventing the spread of nuclear weapons, is a problem that will be with us—and will require our maximum attention—as far into the future as it is given to us to see; to stress that our search for solutions must go on; and to say that no matter what others do or fail to do, our responsibility and duty to act is plain.

For we were the first to discover and use the atom's secrets; our nuclear capability is still the most powerful among the nations of the earth. The greatest power brings the greatest responsibility—a responsibility, in my judgment, to engage in a total effort to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, an effort that should pervade every aspect of our foreign policy.

If we have a decision to make, we must ask ourselves: what effect will this have on the spread of nuclear weapons?

If we have an asset with which to bargain, we must ask ourselves: in what way can this asset be used to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons?

For prevention of nuclear spread is a matter of political action on a grand scale—an effort to turn the world community away from nuclear war, away from ultimate weapons as guarantors of security and prestige.

In this effort, we will be called on to use all the tools and resources at our command.

We will need to reach agreement on a treaty to prevent nuclear spread. We will need to make that treaty more than a scrap of paper—to persuade other nations that it is in their direct interest to accede to and abide by it—to abstain from nuclear weapons development.

We will need to ban nuclear weapons entirely from certain areas of the world.

We will need to extend the limited test-ban treaty to underground tests.

And we will need to enlist the help of the United Nations, and all other nations—including Communist China—in the effort to prevent nuclear catastrophe.

I

Last month, the United States presented to the Geneva Disarmament Conference a draft treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. By the draft treaty submitted by the United States, nonnuclear powers would pledge not to acquire or develop nuclear weapons. The present nuclear powers would pledge "not to transfer nuclear weapons into the national control of any nonnuclear state, either directly or indirectly through a military alliance." The nuclear powers would also pledge not to increase the "number of states and other organizations having independent power to use nuclear weapons."

This means, in essence, that the U.S. draft would hold the door open for a multilateral nuclear force including West Germany—since such a force would not place nuclear weapons within the national control of any nonnuclear state. States not now possessing nuclear weapons could, however, gain access to such weapons to a greater degree than they now possess, by participation in a multilateral force. However, the draft would pledge the nuclear powers not to increase "the number of states and other organizations having independent power to use nuclear weapons." So for a multilateral force to have the power to use nuclear weapons independent of veto by one of the present nuclear powers, one of these powers—the United States, Great Britain, or France—would, in the words of U.S. delegate William Foster, have to "turn over to the force all of its—nuclear—weapons and also give up its veto over them." In other words, the MLF would take the place of the United States, Great Britain, or France as one of the five nuclear powers. It was stated by Mr. Foster that this provision is intended not to allow creation of such independent forces now, but only to allow a future United Europe to preserve its present nuclear armament.

The Soviet Union regards such a treaty as potentially allowing Germany a degree of control over nuclear weapons which is, in the Soviet view, unacceptable. Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko stated to the United Nations that the Soviet Union is now ready to sign their own draft treaty—which seemingly would prohibit any direct West German participation in use of nuclear weapons by the NATO allies. And he seemed to reject the U.S. draft so long as it contains any opening for a multilateral nuclear force.

It is quite clear, from the Soviet draft that we have a similar objective—preventing nuclear weapons from spreading to the national control of any present nonnuclear power. This shared objective may be as important as our differences over an MLF. As our delegate William Foster said at Geneva:

> The fact that the Soviet Government can accept most of the language of the U.S. treaty concerning the obligations of nuclear and nonnuclear states to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons—

indicates that—

> it should be possible to proceed with that draft as the basis for negotiations when we meet again.

In such negotiations, we cannot rest on what we may think is a reasonable position, and wait for the Soviets to change. I think we must always bear in mind the history of the nuclear test ban treaty. Those negotiations went on for 5 long years, years of trial and tension; often the prospects for agreement were bleak indeed. Yet the United States continued to seek a basis for agreement, pressing several possible alternatives—until President Kennedy, with the brilliant assistance of Averell Harriman, at last secured Soviet assent to the limited treaty of 1963. The same pattern may well hold true with a treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons.

But if the negotiations are to be fruitful, much more than persistence will be required. All concerned nations—the United States, the Soviet Union, West Germany, and the other nations of Europe—must be prepared to rethink their positions; to make compromises; and to place an overriding priority on the prevention of nuclear proliferation. Specifically, the following steps are necessary:

First. We must seek for new answers to the problem of the military security of Western Europe. The MLF which now seems to stand between us and the Soviet Union is but one of many attempts at such a solution; it is by no means certain that it is the best solution.

Militarily, the MLF is conceived of as assuring our Western European allies that nuclear weapons would be available to prevent any blackmail by Soviet IRBM's now targeted on Western Europe. A guarantee against nuclear aggression, of course, exists in the American commitment to Europe—a guarantee evidenced by the presence of six American divisions in West Germany, including substantial forces in West Berlin.

Nevertheless, this guarantee has been questioned by France, which has insisted on building her own force de frappe, or nuclear-armed striking force. Dependence on United States or British nuclear forces is apparently regarded by General de Gaulle as vassalage to the United States—as he said on September 9:

> The subordination known as integration which is provided for by NATO and which hands our fate over to foreign authority.

French insistence on an independent deterrent, questioning the U.S. commitment in Europe, has produced uneasiness in West Germany. Some Germans, and some Americans, have been inclined toward MLF as affirmation of that commitment—a greater voice for Germany in decisions on the use of the nuclear weapons which guarantee her present status.

But General de Gaulle's reluctance to place France at the dependence of those he calls the "Anglo-Saxons" applies as well to MLF as to the present NATO structure, and agreement on such a force within NATO is not now apparent.

Indeed the MLF, whatever its merits, clearly offers no complete answer to the problem of nuclear confidence within the Alliance, and may even be a source of division between the allies. Surely we and our friends need to review with urgency the whole range of possibilities. That review should include the MLF itself, the British plan for an Atlantic nuclear force, Secretary McNamara's proposal of a select nuclear committee, and any other arrangement that could strengthen the confidence of all in the strategic security of the Alliance.

This is a task for the best brains and talent of the whole Atlantic Community. We cannot afford to fail—and I do not think that we need fail. Men capable of developing the bomb should be capable of developing effective means of controlling its use. As President Kennedy said:

> Our problems are made by man—therefore, they can be solved by man.

But military arrangements are only a part—the lesser part—of an answer to the European security problem. It was President Kennedy's hope that progress toward West European unity would lessen emphasis on armaments in general and nuclear weapons in particular. The progress he sought was of two kinds. First, it was hoped that integration of Western Europe—the process that began with Robert Schuman and Jean Monnet and the Coal and Steel Community, and advanced greatly with the creation of the Common Market—would make for a stronger Europe, an arena in which the brave, able, and industrious people of West Germany could find ample scope for the exercise of their talents and energy. The defense of this Europe, and the defense of West Germany, would be indistinguishable. In a Europe in which all the nations of NATO were closely bound as partners, there would be neither need nor room for competition by the building of national nuclear forces.

The nations of Europe must lead the way toward making this ideal a reality. It is too important and vital a goal to be abandoned.

It was the further hope that this effort in Western Europe, with the tremendous economic and security advantages that would result, would in time bring an easing of tensions with the nations of Eastern Europe, and that closer relationships between the two Europes would follow. Within a context of general relaxation, and with West Germany looking to Western Europe as her major area of action, it might be that the Soviet Union and the East German Government would relax the degree of Soviet control in, and the repressive character of, that regime. And a better and a freer life for East Germany could lead in turn to lower tensions and antagonisms between the Soviet Union and West Germany, toward less military and militant postures on both sides, and gradually toward reunification.

But all these hopes were based on greater European unity, in close cooperation with the United States and Great Britain—especially in matters of defense. And that plan of unity has received setbacks from France. For without a fully integrated defense—without mutual confidence and full trust between all the nations of the Atlantic Alliance—it is very difficult to bring West Germany into the kind of integrated community upon which President Kennedy's hopes were based.

There are steps we can and should take now to revive these hopes. We should make clear our willingness to act in any responsible fashion to reinforce our commitment to Western European security. We should couple this with assurances to France that NATO is not a vehicle for Anglo-Saxon domination of Europe. We should give a fair hearing to those who disagree with our policies and take responsible steps to meet legitimate demands or complaints; history has shown that no country has a corner on virtue. And we should urge that those who may have questioned the American commitment to Europe—for whatever reasons—should think again whether their security is truly increased by the spreading of nuclear capability in any way.

France's desire for nuclear weapons of her own, as a matter of prestige and position, is understandable, though, in my judgment, misguided. Militarily the force de frappe is only a device to insure that nuclear weapons would be used in any European conflict; its only true function is as a trigger which would compel us to use our nuclear weapons. Thus the force de frappe, in the end, rests on the very U.S. commitment which General de Gaulle professes to doubt.

France obviously feels that possession of nuclear weapons increases her military power and her prestige in the world. What everyone must realize, however, and what France must take into consideration, is that it also cannot fail but to set a dangerous example for all the other nations of Europe. The argument that De Gaulle makes for France is applicable to most of the nations of Europe. Accepting De Gaulle's argument as valid, it must inevitably lead other European nations to feel that they must develop national nuclear forces. If the policy De Gaulle has outlined is pursued by France, other countries of Europe, under different leadership than they presently enjoy, will follow suit. What is a good argument for France, and that country's strong nationalist leader De Gaulle, can well be made by some future leader of Germany who shares General de Gaulle's views of national and international affairs.

After all, Germany in the past has given to the world many leaders who have believed as strongly as De Gaulle in a strong national policy for their country. The implications of Germany following the lead of France in the matter of independent nuclear forces must be seriously considered by us all—and that includes France.

Now, the security of West Germany is directly dependent on an integrated Western defense; that of Sweden and Switzerland also depends on an effective NATO. If France at once proclaims integrated defense to be intolerable, and by her actions makes it unworkable, it is all too likely that these other nations might well feel themselves forced to develop their own nuclear forces as well. Life for us all must then be more precarious; and even France's cherished nuclear prestige would be a sharp discount. Such courses of action will hardly increase the security of France. We are entitled to ask whether France has taken these facts into account; we should make every effort to remind her that they exist.

The domino theory has had much currency in relation to southeast Asia. We must all realize that it applies more directly, in my opinion, to the development of nuclear weapons—and if these awesome dominoes fall, it is our children's future that will be crushed beneath them.

And let me say one more word about France. Let us also make every effort to overcome the difficulties between our two countries. Both of us have made mistakes; but the past is done, and the only real question before us is whether we can avoid compounding past misunderstandings, and move toward the bright future our children deserve. For the leaders of all countries must always keep in mind our responsibility to the next generation—the kind of world, if any, that we shall leave to children and those yet unborn.

Second. As we seek for alternative answers to the problem of security in Europe, the Soviet Union must do the same. They must realize that they cannot reject out of hand every proposal for West German participation in nuclear decisions by the NATO alliance. No less than NATO, the Soviets are faced with very real questions as to the future of Germany. West Germany's forbearance from nuclear armament is, after all, something to which West Germany itself must agree. The Soviets can hope for little security in the long run if they are unwilling to acknowledge reasonable demands for German security now. But if—as some reports indicate—the Soviets are willing to accept West German participation in Allied plans for nuclear defense, or in a consultative committee which makes nuclear decisions, we may yet reach agreement on a treaty.

Third. We must attempt to move toward a general European settlement. For the military confrontation which has frozen Europe since the end of World War II is in large part only a reflection of the deep political divisions in Europe—which find their center in Germany.

Twenty years after the war, Germany remains artificially divided between East and West; and the division makes progress toward controlling nuclear weapons, or any other arms control measures, far more difficult than they might otherwise be. The Soviet Union, knowing that all Germans desire reunification, fears German action to this end; the Soviets seek security in nuclear armaments, and in their denial to West Germany. The West Germans see their military inferiority as threatening, and as foreclosing any progress toward unification; any indication of German desire for greater strength makes the Soviets more uneasy still, thus leading to a circle of suspicion and distrust with which the postwar world is all too familiar.

It is plain that movement toward reunification, and a general European settlement, is necesary if we are to take major steps toward disarmament, beyond the prevention of nuclear spread which is our most immediate concern. But it is equally clear that the present state of armaments, especially nuclear armaments, limits sharply our ability to make the necessary progress. This circle of inaction we have not been able to break.

To begin movement toward a general European settlement is an item of the highest priority on our national agenda. To our allies, we should make clear our determination to actively pursue all avenues toward reunification of Germany. The leaders of the 1920's failed to reach a lasting settlement in Europe; the legacy of unsolved problems and bitterness they left to their children are in many ways with us still. It is our highest obligation to avoid repeating their failure—to leave to our children a better world than that we received from our predecessors. None of us can be satisfied to hand down the German problem, or the European problem of which it is a part, to our successors as it was handed down to us.

To the Soviet Union, and to the nations of Eastern Europe, we should make clear that the settlement we desire is one which accepts and protects their legitimate national interests—that they need not fear again the war which has visited them twice in a half century. President Johnson's policy of building bridges to Eastern Europe is a major and farsighted step in this direction; it deserves the active support and encouragement of all concerned agencies of the Government. And we must be ready to explore the further steps toward arms control which would guarantee the security interests of both sides.

But if we must move as far and as fast as possible toward a European settlement, we cannot regard a complete settlement as a precondition to preventing the spread of nuclear weapons. The dangers of nuclear spread confront us now; and even a partial European settlement will be an affair of gradual movement over many years. As the President says, "the hour is late"; now is the time we must make the maximum effort, as we did in 1963, to arrive at an agreement. For every day of delay may be the day that somewhere in the world a decision is taken to proceed with the development of nuclear weapons—a decision which may be irreversible; a decision the consequences of which will ultimately reverberate to every corner of the world, to affect the lives of all our posterity; a decision which may mark the moment of doom for our children.

All these factors must be before us as we continue negotiations on a nonproliferation treaty. In these negotiations, moreover, we must not regard the U.S. draft treaty as our final position; it is not, we should understand, a perfect treaty. But whatever criticisms may be made of it—and I think some are understandable—it nonetheless represents a sound basis for discussions, a start toward meaningful negotiations, a step toward peace. President Johnson deserves the thanks of every American for his initiative in presenting this treaty.

II

A nonproliferation treaty would be a vital contribution to our security and the peace of the world. But a treaty is not an end, only a means, to the end of preventing the spread of nuclear weapons. There are other means, and other strategies, to the same end. And they must be pursued, whether or not a formal nonproliferation agreement is reached.

There are now at least 10 countries which are in a position to develop nuclear weapons within the next few years. Each of them must balance the advantages of nuclear armament against its disadvantages in the context of its own political situation. Acquisition or development of nuclear weapons by any one of them would have a serious effect on the possibility of limiting further spread in the future. It should therefore be our immediate policy to make nuclear armament unnecessary—and to make abstention from its development as attractive as possible—for each of the nations with the capability of nuclear development.

Such a policy of country-by-country political action will clearly be necessary in the absence of a nonproliferation agreement. For the fact is that we are not so much concerned that the Soviet Union will give nuclear weapons to other countries as we are that the lack of an agreement will lead other countries, in the interests of their own security, prestige, and power, to undertake nuclear armament. This is not like the test-ban question, where Soviet disagreement and testing compelled us to resume atmospheric testing ourselves. Whatever course of action the Soviets take—or fail to take—on a nonproliferation treaty, it will still be in our deepest national interest to prevent nuclear weapons from spreading beyond their present possessors.

Moreover, the kind of country-by-country approach for which I call would be necessary even if we do reach agreement on a treaty with the Soviet Union. First, it will be necessary if we are to secure the assent of other nations to the treaty. Nations with the potential power to develop nuclear weapons capability will not be bound—unless they agree—to a treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union. And at least one nation—China—may be a potential source of nuclear capability for nations unable to develop it by themselves.

Second. This approach will be necessary to secure continued adherence to a treaty after its ratification. The draft treaty put forward by the United States expressly preserves the right of withdrawal by any party which "decides that extraordinary events related to the subject matter of the treaty have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country."

It would surely be in our interest to prevent such extraordinary events from jeopardizing the supreme national interest of any signatory. But even if a treaty were reached without such a clause it would not be a self-executing agreement. For as the history of many past agreements show, nations will break treaties—including a nonproliferation agreement—if they think that by the acquisition of nuclear weapons they may gain some advantage in power or security.

Even the conclusion of a treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, then, will still require our attention to each nation with the capacity and the desire for nuclear capability. Thus our effort to reach agreement with the Soviet Union, at Geneva and elsewhere, cannot be allowed to attract all our attention or postpone our other action. This other action, rather, must begin now.

An example of the pressures with which we must deal—and the urgency of our attention to them—can be seen in

India. Only a precarious cease-fire has halted her armed conflict with Pakistan—a continuation of nearly 20 years of struggle over Kashmir. At the same time, India is menaced by Communist China to the north—and Pakistan, our SEATO ally and a member of CENTO as well, has gone so far as to request aid in the recent conflict from all nations, including China.

India is also the nonnuclear nation closest to weapons capability. She has brilliant and well-trained scientists. She has nuclear powerplants and natural uranium reserves. She has the reprocessing facilities which are the last step in the production of weapons-grade fissionable material. And she has bombers capable of carrying an elementary nuclear device. There are powerful voices in India which would develop and use nuclear weapons to awe Pakistan into retreat on Kashmir, or to prevent humiliation by Communist China; indeed, 86 members of the Indian Parliament have formally asked Prime Minister Shastri to reconsider his opposition to developing a bomb.

In this situation, there is a special urgency to preserving the cease-fire and securing a settlement—urgency far beyond even that which would otherwise attach from the sight of American weapons being used on both sides of a dangerous conflict. For India has been the leader of the new nations, born since World War II, not alined with any of the great power blocs. India's leadership—while we do not and need not agree with it in all situations—is still oriented to democratic methods of development. Thus it furnishes to other nations an alternative model to that offered by Communist China—and it is in our interest to maintain Indian prestige.

At the same time, for India to preserve her position through the development of nuclear weapons would be a tragic blow to our hopes of containing their spread. She would be the first of the nonalined powers to develop them; and others would be only too eager to follow her lead. Moreover, the direct pressure on Pakistan, with whose aspirations for progress and development we also maintain deep sympathy, would certainly push that nation also to seek nuclear weapons—perhaps by agreement with Communist China.

There are steps we can and should take to preserve India's position in Asia—and to persuade her that nuclear armament is not to her advantage. Among these steps are:

First. The extension to India of a guarantee against aggression from a nuclear power. President Johnson has indicated the willingness of the United States to defend India against nuclear blackmail, a pledge repeated by Ambassador Goldberg before the United Nations. And Secretary Rusk's warning to Communist China was welcome. But more specific and definite steps are needed.

These should include exploration with the Soviet Union of the extension of a joint or parallel guarantee, perhaps under United Nations auspices. It will be recalled that the Soviet Union, during India's border conflict with China 2 years ago, continued to send combat aircraft to India—at the same time as the United States worked to assist the Indian air defense system.

That Soviet spirit seems to have been echoed in recent weeks, especially in Premier Kosygin's offers of mediation toward a peaceful settlement, and in Soviet cooperation with U.N. peace efforts. But we should, if we can, go further in cooperation with the Soviet Union toward a lasting settlement of the conflict and toward the prevention of India's nuclear armament.

Second. We should remind India that our greatest interest, and her best interest, is not in nuclear weapons—or indeed in great store of any weapons—but in economic development. The basis of our special relationship with India is that we are partners in a great experiment, to determine whether the few who are rich can help the many who are poor. That experiment, however, can only be hampered by costly adventures in nuclear weaponry; and this India should understand.

At the same time, we must not stint in our aid to India's peaceful economic development. Rather our aid program should be intensified. If India achieves her aim of democratic development, she will not need nuclear arms to maintain her prestige vis-a-vis Communist China; indeed, her prestige will be all the greater for not wasting needed capital in the nuclear race. If India continues to develop democratically, there will be far less internal pressure on the Government to become involved in foreign adventures. And a prosperous India will offer great attractions to her less-developed neighbors, who might otherwise be tempted to ride with the Communist tiger.

I would point out that our assistance to India should include, if she requests it, assistance for programs of family planning. The choice, after all, is hers to make, not ours. The Indian Government, believing it essential to self-sustaining growth, has inaugurated a major program of educating for family planning.

I think we should support that effort. India's sovereign decision deserves our respect and our help. Again, this is something which we should do even if the atom's secrets had never been discovered. But the direct relationship between Indian economic strength, and the temptation to develop nuclear weapons as an emotional substitute for it, lends special urgency to our action.

For there should be no mistake: there is no country, including our own, in which irresponsible elements may not seek to brandish the nuclear sword; King Henry the Fourth was not the last ruler to feel the temptation to submerge domestic quarrels in foreign wars and adventures. Indeed, the pressures of internal politics, all over the world, now pose one of the greatest dangers to nuclear stability. To denounce the U.S. efforts at Geneva as a sellout in one campaign is not more responsible than to urge that control over nuclear weapons be given to subordinate commanders in another.

But we must realize that the pressures for nuclear armament are also in part responsive to legitimate consideration of national security—as in India, the threat of a two-front confrontation with Pakistan and China. If we ask India to forgo nuclear arms, we must act to assure her security in other ways.

There are other examples of this situation, which may require other kinds of action by the United States. For example, Israel feels threatened by her larger neighbors; the continuance of her pledge not to be the first to introduce nuclear weapons into the Middle East may depend on the continued firm opposition of the United States to any aggression in that area. Sweden, by contrast, has made it clear that progress toward arms control by the Soviet Union and the United States would be most likely to prevent her nuclear armament. These countries, and many others, will require aid or assurances different in direction—but equal in scope—from that described in the Indian case; and in each case, the return we must seek is their continued abstention from nuclear weapons.

Country-by-country action to prevent nuclear weapons spread should not, of course, be restricted to nations which otherwise might acquire them. Action is also imperative as to nations with the potential to aid others to become nuclear powers. There are, for example, only a few nations with the ability to manufacture certain equipment, which is necessary to nuclear development. Until a nonproliferation treaty is concluded, and indeed after it, as well, we should seek to establish worldwide controls over the sale and use of such equipment. Nations capable of fabricating such specialized equipment should be induced to prevent its use for the development of nuclear weaponry—just as nations like the United States and Canada seek to prevent uranium which we sell from being used for such purposes under IAEA or similar safeguards.

Furthermore, every nation may be able to contribute, in a common effort, its influence with other nations—to help induce them not to acquire or develop weapons; and to otherwise help create the necessary atmosphere for lowered tensions and nuclear abstention.

For example, many nations of Eastern Europe have in recent years achieved a significant degree of independence from the Soviet Union. And as these nations have grown more independent of the Soviet Union, they have grown more receptive to American and Western European influences. Trade with the West, particularly the United States, is much desired; cultural exchanges and tourism are encouraged. And historic ties and family relationships with American citizens especially in Poland, are also significant.

The way is therefore open for us to deal, not just with the Soviet Union, but with the nations of Eastern Europe. Eastern European feelings about a European detente—an important factor in any nonproliferation negotiations—might have great weight with the Soviets. We should therefore make every effort to secure their assistance. This is especially true now, when President Johnson's policy of "building bridges" is being implemented by the sending of a trade mission; the connection between preventing the spread of nuclear weapons, peaceful relations generally, and normal commercial trade should be obvious to all.

There are other nations which might be of great assistance in such efforts; thus the nations of the Mahgreb might exercise their considerable influence against nuclear weaponry in the Middle East.

Such use of what influence and leverage we possess in all our relations with other countries may or may not be important in any instance to the prevention of nuclear spread. But these are the kind of efforts we should be making everywhere in the world to prevent nuclear weapons from spreading. We can never know the results until we make the attempt.

III

There are other areas where the United States can act to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons—and where more urgent action is now needed.

One of these, for which I called on June 23, is the creation of nuclear-free zones, areas into which the introduction of nuclear weapons by any power, even the present nuclear powers, would be prohibited.

Particular emphasis should be placed on the creation of such a zone in Latin America—which is understandably going through a period of some turmoil and disorder, as people search for a system of law and government which will guide them to progress and prosperity.

True land reform—universal education—democratic political development—these things men cry for; if necessary, men will die for them as well. In their desperate search for these things, the people of Latin America deserve our support.

To their achievement of these goals, we have made a special commitment symbolized by the Alliance for Progress. I believe we will fulfill the pledges of the Alliance.

Efforts to develop nuclear weapons by the nations of Latin America, however, could only be detrimental to the Alliance. They would absorb desperately needed investment capital. And their potential effects, in a continent which will lean toward instability for many years, are incalculable. Juan Peron, in fact, did attempt to acquire nuclear weapons, and luckily failed; now, when the atom's secrets are far easier to discover than they were 10 years ago, we must insure that no others start down that path.

Recent discussions on declaring Latin America to be such a zone have not borne fruit, perhaps because some nations are reluctant to move ahead as long as Cuba does not pledge to bar all nuclear weapons from its soil. Vice President HUMPHREY, who has been a leader in this effort at nuclear control since 1958, has stated that the United States, would welcome the declaration of a nuclear-free zone in Latin America. Those who are concerned with possible nuclear weapons in a Communist Cuba should remember how swiftly and firmly the whole hemisphere acted to remove a nuclear threat from Cuba in October of 1962; there is no doubt that the American states will continue to prevent a nuclear threat from Cuba in any case. We should therefore move to put our own house in order, to prevent a spread of nuclear weapons which cannot add to the security of any American nation. The Cuban Government should understand also that nuclear weapons on their soil made no contribution to their security in 1962, and that their absence has not affected Cuban security since that time.

The United States can do much more to facilitate agreement on this issue. We could, for example, ask the Organization of American States to call a special meeting for the purpose of making Latin America a nuclear-free zone, or to take up the matter at its regular November meeting. And we could lend considerable technical assistance to Latin discussions on ways of implementing and certifying any pact to bar nuclear weapons from the zone.

In fact, we should use every available device to maintain a Latin America free of nuclear weapons. And similar efforts, as I urged on June 23, should be pursued in Africa and the Middle East. And we should, in connection with a general European settlement, make the same kind of effort in central Europe. Thirty-four states of the Organization of African Unity have indicated their willingness to work toward a nuclear-free zone under United Nations auspices; they deserve our full support. Here as elsewhere, the most important thing now is for the United States to act, to take the initiative and pursue it; to be the foremost advocate of the case against nuclear armaments; to assist nations to meet problems that might otherwise lead them to seek nuclear solutions.

IV

If we are to prevent nuclear weapons from spreading, we must move, with the Soviet Union toward limiting our two-party arms race; many nations—among them Sweden and India—have pointed out that the smaller states find it difficult to accede to a nonproliferation agreement while the great powers continue to increase their own nuclear stockpiles. It was for this reason that I urged, in June, that we follow up President Johnson's initiative in slowing down the production of plutonium and uranium 235—to proceed toward elimination of some of the destructive capacity of the United States and the Soviet Union. And it is for this reason that President Johnson's second major initiative, for mutual conversion, by the United States and the U.S.S.R., of large amounts of weapons material to peaceful purposes, were so welcome last week.

Another area where progress may be within our grasp is in the extension of the limited nuclear test-ban treaty to underground explosions.

An important admission was made by the Soviet Union at Geneva. Heretofore, the Soviets had contended that all underground disturbances could be classified as man made or natural by seismological means alone. Former Premier Khrushchev, at various times, agreed to one, two, or three inspections annually; but he did so as a supposed political concession to the West, not admitting their necessity. But Mr. Tsarapkin admitted at Geneva that not all underground events could be identified as man made or natural seismological events at this time.

However, the U.S.S.R. voted in favor of its old position—proposed at Geneva by Egypt—that those tests not verifiable without inspection be subject to an unpoliced moratorium pending further technical progress or negotiations. Such a moratorium was stated to be unacceptable to the United States; but the way is nevertheless more clear than before to press the Soviet Union for an extension of the test ban to underground tests—with the inspection provisions which are necessary to its success. Ambassador Goldberg's United Nations speech, at the same time, recognized that progress has been made in the detection of underground disturbances and the identification of their cause. We should, therefore, also press for cooperative efforts by scientists from the United States, the Soviet Union, and other countries such as Sweden, which has already offered its assistance in this effort, to determine the types of explosions which can be prohibited without inspection, and to reach agreement on the number and kind of inspection which are needed for those explosions which cannot be identified seismologically. Our offer to open to inspection our new Montana facility for monitoring underground events is a significant step in this direction.

V

Next, I urge again that the United States explore new avenues of approach to the question of Communist China. China has expressed on many occasions—of which Minister Lin Piao's recent speech was only the latest—hostility toward us; expectation of protracted conflict with us; and interest in our destruction and humiliation.

But despite China's hostility, it may be possible to arrive at agreements—definite and limited in nature—which are in the interests of both of us.

> World peace—

as President Kennedy said in 1963—

> does not require that each man love his neighbor.

The rulers of China may be persuaded that their long-run interest, like that of the United States and all other nations, lies not in the spread of nuclear weapons but in their strict control.

We now engage in regular discussions with the Chinese Ambassador in Warsaw. But these are not the only possible means to explore possible Chinese accession to a system of nuclear control. We should, at the outset, invite the Chinese to participate in the disarmament talks at Geneva when those talks resume in January. If they accept, the negotiations will be more meaningful. If the Chinese refuse, we will have lost nothing; we will have opened another door to peace, and the Chinese will show to the world that they are not interested. I think no one, looking at United States foreign policy since 1961, will interpret our civility as a sign of weakness.

Finally, I hope that the present session of the United Nations will carry on, on an informal basis, the work of the 18-nation Geneva Conference so that negotiations in the Conference will be as fruitful as possible in January. At this U.N. session are delegates, from many nations including our own, with the full confidence of their governments. These delegates may well be able to move toward the necessary agreements. Pope Paul has set the keynote for this session; and I hope that the United States will press all other concerned nations to now make there a major contribution toward limiting nuclear arms.

CONCLUSION

These are some of the things we must do if we are to meet our responsibilities in the nuclear age. President Kennedy once said that "the events and decisions of the next 10 months may well decide the fate of man for the next 10,000 years." That is true now as it was in 1961—and it will continue to be true for the rest of man's lifetime on this planet. For us there can be no permanent solutions, no gimmicks, no neat answers—only ceaseless effort to rule ourselves by humility, not pride; by reason, not emotion; above all by a consciousness of the sacredness of human life. For the community to which we must answer is not those who elected us, nor even all those living on this planet; it is all those who have gone before so that we may sit here today, and it is all those, the young and the unborn, who wait in the womb of time to make their appearance. It is this generation that has unlocked the mystery of nature; all men must live henceforth with the power of complete self-destruction.

But this power is the power of choice—our glory and our tragedy, our failure and our hope.

"The real danger," said Pope Paul, "comes from man himself."

That danger is the hardest to avert. But it is the danger we must face.

The President has shown that the United States can and will take the initiative toward nuclear sanity and peace. I believe that we should take these further steps, and that the President will have the support of all Americans as he moves to do so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I compliment the distinguished Senator from New York on the far-ranging speech he has made, a speech on a subject which is of interest to all mankind and to all nations, both nuclear and nonnuclear—perhaps most important to the nuclear nations themselves.

It would be my hope that such countries as France, for example—which is now outside the test ban treaty agreement—would reconsider their position, and join in attempting to find a solution to the potential holocaust which threatens the entire world.

It would be my hope—and in this I am in accord with the distinguished Senator from New York—that it would be possible for Communist China to enter into negotiations or at least talks covering the control of atomic weapons. We and they have a forum in which we can meet and have been meeting for almost a decade. That is through the meetings, first, between our consuls general, the consuls general of the United States and Communist China, in Geneva, and now between the Ambassadors of our respective countries in Warsaw. I believe the total number of meetings which have occurred between the representatives of the two countries now exceeds 130, and there is no reason why a matter such as this could not be discussed there.

Some might raise the cry of "recognition of Communist China." As a matter of fact, because of these meetings, a partial degree of recognition has already been extended to China, so such talks would not change that picture one iota.

China has detonated two atomic devices. China is, or will be soon, a major nuclear power. We cannot obliterate that fact in any consideration of the problem which the Senator from New York has once again laid before the Senate today.

If my interpretation, from listening to the Senator's speech, is correct, I do not agree with him that we should pursue the idea of the MLF, or multilateral force. I believe that would be a step in the wrong direction. But I could be mistaken and, in any event, I believe the matter should be discussed. For the moment, at least, the question is in abeyance.

The Senator has stated very cogently the relationship between Germany and the Soviet Union, and the fears of the Russians toward a reunited Germany. I believe such fears are misplaced. I should like to see a reunified Germany, able to take its proper place in the affairs of Western Europe and the world.

But I have great doubts about a multilateral force, the so-called MLF. As I say, however, my doubts are open to question.

I was happy that the Senator once again, as he has on previous occasions, advocated nuclear free zones throughout the world. I was impressed with the emphasis he placed on the proposal for Latin America, which has been placed before the Latin American nations by Mexico. As is he, I am disappointed that such a nuclear free zone, which was first advocated, I believe, by former Mexican President Adolfo Lopez-Mateos, has not been established; but I hope the Mexican Government will continue to take the initiative in the matter, to the end that a nuclear free zone may be created in Latin America.

I noted that the distinguished Senator from New York made reference, on the next to the last page of his speech, to the new Montana facility. I am glad he did so. I speak not from a parochial point of view in this respect, but because of the significance of that facility, known as LASA, in my home State. It was dedicated only last night in Billings.

This advance research project agency, which I mentioned in the Senate yesterday, is of the utmost significance in the field of detecting earthquakes and underground tests. As I said yesterday:

> I am not a scientist nor am I familiar with the complex technical terminology involved, but as I understand it, this cluster of seismometers will be the most advanced yet developed. This project is an experiment in long-range detection and identification of earth tremors induced by both natural causes, such as earthquakes, and by artificial means, such as underground nuclear explosions. The LASA seismograph is expected to differentiate more accurately than existing equipment between nuclear explosions and background noise signals which result from frequent, small-scale, natural earthquakes. If LASA lives up to expectations, it could have great influence in the field of nuclear weapons control and disarmament—

Which I may say, incidentally, has been one of the hindrances between the Soviet Union and the United States in the conferences held in Geneva—

> partially dissolving the problem of on-sight inspection which has heretofore prevented negotiation of an all-inclusive nuclear test ban treaty.

Frankly, Mr. President, I am delighted and encouraged by the speech made by the distinguished Senator from New York. I only hope that he will continue in this vein, because this is not his first speech on the subject.

Somebody has to speak out. Somebody has to make these situations clear. I am delighted that, insofar as the Senator from New York is concerned, and the administration likewise, as I understand, feels the same about much of the material which the Senator has laid before the Senate today.

Again I salute the Senator. I commend him. He has done a good job on a most vital subject in the affairs of mankind.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Let me first express to the Senator from Montana my personal appreciation for the leadership he has given in this field.

So far as the multilateral force is concerned, I, too, have serious reservations about it. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has spoken out in opposition to the multilateral force. The position the Senator from Montana took as he spoke here a moment ago approximates my position. I believe the subject should be pursued, although I think it does involve great problems, and does not have wide support here. Meanwhile, because it seems more apparent day by day that a multilateral force will not be readily accepted, we should try to develop other ways to deal with the problem of West Germany's security and the basic problem of bringing other countries under some kind of nuclear control.

I agree with the Senator. I am reluctant to make another speech on the floor and say that we should abandon MLF until I am certain that every other avenue has been pursued.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has given a most explicit definition of his position. I agree with him. I, too, believe that the issue should be further explored. I have grave questions about it. My immediate position is, really, in opposition, but I have an open mind, and I am open to advice and counsel on the problem.

However, to me, it appears to be, at the moment at least, a divisive force, whereas what is needed in Western Europe is a force which will bring us all together.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I believe that the Senator has made a correct appraisal of the situation.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I had the privilege of receiving an advance copy of the Senator's speech. I took it home and read it carefully last night. I express my admiration for the speech of the Senator from New York, and commend him highly for it. In the speech, he unquestionably brings up many problems which are controversial, and many things which need to be said.

I have always felt that it is not only the executive branch of the Government that should enter into debate or make decisions. I also feel that we as Senators have a definite role to play in this field.

I know from personal experience and a long friendship with the Senator from New York how deeply and sincerely he feels about each of the points and issues in the speech he has just delivered.

I want to commend the Senator, because I believe that he has performed a very useful duty, helpful not only to all Senators but also to the public, the Government, and concerned people everywhere.

In taking on a discussion of this difficult subject, not only today, but as he has in the past, the distinguished junior Senator from New York has performed a useful public service. I take this opportunity to commend him for making such a speech, because it needs to be made. More speeches like his should be made in the future.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank my friend and my colleague the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to join the majority leader and the Senator from Connecticut in their commendation of the excellent speech which the Senator from New York has just made.

I should like to make a few specific comments on the points raised in his outstanding speech, and I hope that the Senator from New York will feel free to interrupt me at any point, if he cares to do so, in the course of my observations.

First, I refer to the first effort the Senator made in this area; namely, his speech of June 23, wherein he strongly urged the United States to press forward with a nonproliferation of nuclear weapons treaty. At that time, as the Senator has already recalled, at the conclusion of his talk I had occasion to ask whether anything significant had happened with respect to a nonproliferation treaty since it was proposed by the President on January 21, 1964. I asked the rhetorical question as to why nothing effective had happened, and I answered my own question by saying: "The answer is simple. The answer should be understood by every Senator in this body, by the press, by the general public. The answer is MLF—the multilateral nuclear force. So long as we play around with the obsolete notion of MLF, so long as we flirt with the suggestion that West Germany should be given a finger closer to the nuclear trigger than it has now, so long will the Soviet Union, in all likelihood, be unwilling to agree to a treaty which will ban the further proliferation of nuclear weapons."

I then had the temerity to state that in my judgment the MLF was as dead as a duck, anyway.

Therefore, I am delighted to observe that the Senator from New York is now publicly questioning the validity of MLF.

Yesterday, I had occasion to talk about this problem with an able member of the Conservative Party of Great Britain, who has a special competence in the area of defense. He said that in his considered opinion the MLF was a minus from a military point of view and not a plus, because it would result in the United States diverting to the MLF missiles which would otherwise be available for the Polaris submarine force and for the intercontinental ballistic missile force.

Therefore, I would go a good deal further than the Senator from New York, and the majority leader, in urging that the State Department and the President abandon MLF forthwith.

William C. Foster, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, said on his return from Geneva—and this has been reiterated elsewhere—that there is no real, practical possibility of coming to an agreement with the Russians in the foreseeable future unless we abandon MLF.

To be sure, their position may well be wrong. Perhaps they are psychopathic on the matter, but if one weighs the advantages of MLF against its disadvantages—particularly the fact that it is, I believe, without a doubt, standing in the way of a nonproliferation treaty—it is clear that the wisest course is for the State Department and the President to abandon the MLF and get to work on coming to an agreement with the Russians on a nonproliferation treaty.

Actually, except for MLF, we and the Russians are not very far apart. I point out to my friend, the Senator from New York, that West Germany is bound by treaty never to manufacture nuclear weapons. We have every right to hold West Germany to that treaty, just as we expect to be held to our own treaty commitments.

If they are not permitted by treaty to manufacture nuclear weapons, and if we do not intend to give nuclear weapons to West Germany—and we can be sure that Russia will not do so—where is West Germany going to get nuclear weapons?

Therefore, why should we hesitate any further in abandoning the MLF and moving forward with a more important objective; namely, a nuclear nonproliferation treaty?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania permit me to interrupt him at that point?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, indeed.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I recognize the problems of the MLF. I do not believe that it is merely a question—and I disagree with him in this area—of abandoning the MLF and then arriving at an agreement with the Soviet Union. I believe that it is possible to do so, but there are legitimate and responsible questions being raised in Europe, and in West Germany, as to the role they are going to play in European defense. I discussed this point in depth in my speech, because it is something which must be considered.

I attended the meeting of the NATO parliamentarians a week ago, and I observed that we have been going around the fringes of this question.

President de Gaulle makes the strong argument that they cannot rely upon the United States, that they need their own nuclear power, and need to manufacture nuclear weapons in their own country. If that argument is good for France, it will be good also for other countries in the future under different leadership.

We talk about West Germany being bound by treaty never to manufacture nuclear weapons. I went into this point in some depth with the State Department. What West Germany is prevented from doing is making nuclear weapons on their own soil.

I am looking down the road to the future. If we arrive at an agreement with the Soviet Union now, without making any effort to bring West Germany into some kind of general understanding with us, particularly with France on the other side going down another road which is opposite to ours, then we would be neglecting the aspirations of the Germans who wish to have a closer relationship with us—including perhaps the Benelux countries.

I believe that to ignore these facts may be to create a major problem a decade from now—when we have a different kind of leadership, when people then will possibly not remember the Second World War as we do today, and when the Germans at that time will not remember the Second World War, as present-day Germans do. They will feel that their responsibility is less than we feel their responsibility might be today.

I set forth in my speech several other alternatives. First, with respect to West Germany and other countries relying on Europe as a whole, rather than on the defense of any single country: France and Charles de Gaulle torpedoed that largely by saying, "You cannot depend on another country. You have to depend on your own country." That cry can be taken up by a leader of West Germany or another nation 5 or 10 years in the future. That is what concerns me—that they could go ahead and obtain their own nuclear weapons.

Mr. CLARK. I read the Senator's speech, and also listened to it.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. For which I am very grateful.

Mr. CLARK. I find nothing in it with which I am in disagreement with respect to the desire to negotiate with our Western European Allies in connection with what we are doing or will do about negotiations with the Soviet Union. But I would like to refer to something that the Senator said, both in his June 23 speech and again today, about the problem. Responsible people have said that if we do not get a nonproliferation treaty in 1 year, the "beans" will have been spilled. India is under high pressure to manufacture nuclear devices. So are other countries.

I share the admiration which the Senator from New York and so many of my colleagues have expressed for the West Germans who are peace loving, who have learned their lesson, and who wish to remain members of the civilized community of nations. But if we have to wait for the West Germans to give up MLF and agree not to manufacture or use nuclear weapons, we may run out of time. I have no doubt that if we got rid of the MLF ourselves, we could come to an agreement with the Soviet Union, which it is about ready to make if that is done. If we did, I have no doubt that Great Britain would applaud. So would the Scandinavian countries. So would Italy, and so would the Eastern European countries. So we would have a massive force behind us, and I do not think we would have any difficulty with either France or West Germany. This, of course, is a matter of opinion.

I turn now to my second point, the need for a comprehensive test ban treaty. With this I am in complete accord, but I point out that there are members of the executive and Members even within this body who disagree with respect to moving toward a comprehensive test ban treaty. Less than 2 weeks ago the able Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], speaking for the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, presented a report which, at least by implication, expressed grave doubt as to the desirability of a comprehensive test ban treaty and indicated a need for rigorous inspection as a condition for extending the partial ban now in effect.

It would be a wise thing, it seems to me, for the Foreign Relations Committee, and particularly for the consultative subcommittee on disarmament, whose chairman [Mr. GORE] is on the floor at the present time, to explore with Mr. William Foster, Secretary Rusk, and Secretary McNamara, the question of how many inspections they believe to be essential for the safety of the United States.

My opinion is that in a situation of this kind, we must be prepared to take a calculated risk. I hope that while we are offering with one hand at Geneva to enter into a comprehensive test ban treaty, we would not with the other hand disclose that we cannot enter into a comprehensive test ban treaty because of our insistence on an unduly high number of inspections which we know very well the Soviet Union would not agree to.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. There is no question that that effort should be pursued. I think it would be well to have the legislative branch of the Government look into this problem.

To summarize this speech and the last speech in one sentence, what is required is energy and commitment by the U.S. Government, by high officials in the U.S. Government and elsewhere. We have very able people in the legislative and executive branches, and we have allies who are able. If we are intelligent enough and have the initiative and scholarship and skill to develop the atom bomb, then we have the same ability to try to arrive at a solution of this problem. One of the ways which has been touched on is to bring the Secretary of Defense into this effort, who is vitally interested in the subject. Nobody is more interested. Although he is responsible for our armaments, he is also interested, as an important member of the executive branch, in controlling the spread of nuclear armament and reaching an accommodation with the Soviet Union. Let us also seek the advice of men like Mr. McGeorge Bundy, Mr. Dean Rusk, and other able officials. Then let us come up with some worthwhile proposal, so that when we look into the eyes of the next generation, we can truthfully say, "We did what we could do." It is incumbent on those of us who have a public interest and some interest in this particular subject not merely to say, "It seems that we are not able to find an answer to this problem." Let us give to it the energy and effort we are giving in southeast Asia and the war in Vietnam. Let us try to do the best we can to find some answers to this problem.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator, but I point out that there are differences and clashing opinions within the executive branch of the Government and the Senate on this matter which make arrival at a consensus difficult. I would hope that we would have the consideration both of members of the executive branch and of this body, and that we would devote our attention to the problem. I would hope that in connection with that study they would read the statement made by our Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Goldberg, on the 23d of September, which presumably some Members of the Senate have read, and will read and reread the address of the Pope at the United Nations, and that some part of that philosophy will help to beat down resistance to the conduct of these negotiations.

The third point I would like to make relates to the Senator's position with respect to Communist China, with which I am in accord. On several occasions I have called for inviting Red China to the 18-nation Disarmament Conference at Geneva. In spite of their bellicose position, perhaps this could be the crack in the door through which they might enter into a consideration of disarmament.

A good many members of the United Nations have asked that a worldwide disarmament conference be summoned to include all the nations of the world in an effort to see if something of consequence might not develop.

The position of the State Department has been that this would be a mere exercise in propaganda. Perhaps that is correct, but I am wondering if we might not make an effort to go along with other nations that believe such a conference would be useful.

I agree with the Senator from New York that the first step would be to invite Communist China to Geneva.

I would hope that the State Department would change its position substantially so that that could be done.

Does the Senator from New York agree with that?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. My fourth point is somewhat more involved. I shall state it briefly.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I regret that 3 months ago when the distinguished Senator from New York made his able and intelligent speech calling for the cessation of the proliferation of nuclear weapons I could not be present on the floor. Committee work kept me away. Similarly, today I have just returned from a House-Senate conference on the higher education bill. I have not had the privilege of hearing all of the speech, but I commend the Senator for his efforts to lessen the continued proliferation of nuclear weapons in the world.

If this program continues, with many nations developing nuclear weapons, I see no end but a nuclear holocaust.

I commend the Senator for the leadership he is showing. I believe it is in the best tradition of the Senate to develop ideas on the floor of the Senate, especially when they mean so much to the United States.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. CLARK. I will return to the fourth point that I would like to make.

It was on September 21, 1961, that President Kennedy first committed this country to general and complete disarmament under enforcible world law.

That magnificent speech at the United Nations was followed by two other equally brilliant speeches, the last of which was made at the United Nations only a short time before his tragic death. The other speech was made in Washington in June of 1963.

As a result of those speeches, an outline for a draft treaty of general and complete disarmament was tabled at Geneva by the United States. The Soviet Union also tabled such a treaty.

Discussions went on for some time. Now they have been dropped while we go around the periphery of what to me is the most important problem facing the world: Before we all blow each other up with them, how are we—the nations of the world—going to get rid of our vast arsenals of nuclear armaments and indeed, conventional weapons also?

In this regard, I was happy to see three things happen recently. At the Washington Conference on World Peace Through Law, a unanimous resolution was adopted, which committed that body of lawyers and jurists—3,000 from all over the world—to general and complete disarmament under strict international control.

Before that body, for the first time since he moved into the White House, President Johnson committed himself to general and complete disarmament under strict international control.

And finally there was the speech of Mr. Goldberg, to which I already referred, on September 23, at the United Nations, in which he reiterated in these words, the policy of the United States:

> The goal of general and complete disarmament to which we are all committed remains elusive. But it is a necessary and indispensable goal. We have to work toward it vigorously and thoughtfully and with good will and not be deterred by what must be momentary setbacks.

My view with respect to world peace and disarmament is best expressed in a phrase used by the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. John Gardner. He said, as he took over his office, that he did not intend to proceed inch by inch, but rather by barracuda bites.

I would hope that we could impress on the State Department, on the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, on the White House, and the Pentagon the critical need to proceed not inch by inch, but by barracuda bites, if we are to make meaningful progress in this important area of international affairs before it is too late.

I am sure the Senator from New York would agree with me in my general philosophy.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. The fifth point that I would like to emphasize has to do with what the Senator said in connection with a detente with the Soviet Union.

It is fashionable, not only in this body, but outside as well, to aver that those of us who constantly reiterate that the peace of the world depends on our coming to some sort of detente with probably the roughest, toughest, and meanest nation in the world, with the possible exception of Communist China, are "soft on communism."

Yet all these problems depend for solution on tough, hard negotiations with a nation whose social system is so different from ours, but whose economic and security interests are identical with ours.

I commend the Senator for having referred during his speech on several occasions to the vital necessity of arriving at some arrangement with the Soviet Union.

I do not mean giving up our shirt, or unilaterally giving way in our position. My view is that the State Department is not trying hard enough to arrive at a detente with the Soviet Union. It is not sufficiently concerned with the need to give top priority to a treaty to halt nuclear proliferation now.

I hope that as a result of this speech by the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] we might find renewed effort and zeal for the search for agreement with this other superpower with whom we must work to attain the goal of peace to which we are committed.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I could not agree more with what the Senator says. The preservation of peace or the making of any progress in these fields will require not only our action and our effort; it will require the same kind of action on the part of the Soviet Union. I believe the Soviet Union is aware of that. If we are to resolve any of these problems, we shall have to work out an accommodation with the Soviet Union.

As the Senator from Pennsylvania spoke about the only nuclear confrontation that has ever taken place in the world, the one which occurred in October 1962, I was reminded that it was not only the action of President Kennedy and the American Government that led the Soviet Union to withdraw the missiles from Cuba. We should remember that it was also the action of Mr. Khrushchev, who reached the decision to withdraw the missiles from Cuba. No matter what had been done by the United States or what action had been taken by our Government, if Khrushchev and the Soviet Union had not realized that the removal of the missiles was in their own interest and in the cause of world peace, and they were obviously interested in world peace, there might have been a nuclear exchange, and the result would have been far different. So it is important, as we attempt to solve our difficulties and problems, to keep that fact in mind.

As the Senator from Pennsylvania has pointed out, the mere fact that we make this effort to reach an accommodation, and I join the Senator in saying that we are not saying that the eastern seaboard should be given away, we should also continue to pursue the effort. It is in the interest of our own consciences that we do so.

We recall, from the book "The Guns of August," what was said by two ministers when they were talking about how the First World War started. One said to the other, "Oh, my God, if we only knew; if we only knew."

We as Senators, who have a public responsibility when something important is about to happen to the world, should not, when someone asks us the question, respond, "Oh, my God, if we only knew."

Mr. CLARK. I quite agree with the Senator from New York. While the Senator was Attorney General, he made a significant and important contribution to the solution of the Cuban crisis, which had us all scared to death for quite a while.

I should like to conclude with my sixth and last point, which I touched upon a little earlier. In particular, I should like to quote an excerpt from the speech of the Pope at the United Nations a short time ago, a speech which I had the great pleasure of hearing. I observed the Senator from New York seated a little closer to the podium than I was, but the Pope's words came through loud and clear.

> Your vocation is to make brothers, not only of some, but of all peoples. A difficult undertaking, indeed; but this it is, your most noble undertaking. Is there anyone who does not see the necessity of coming thus progressively to the establishment of a world authority, able to act efficaciously on the juridical and political levels?

That, to my mind—the creation of international institutions able to keep the peace under the rule of enforcible world law—is perhaps the most single important effort to which we should devote ourselves in our search for peace. Again, I say I am disappointed that no greater initiative has been taken thus far in this area by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and by the State Department.

I should like to refer, finally, to a comment made by the Pope a little later in his speech, when he said:

> Will the world ever succeed in changing that selfish and bellicose mentality which up to now has been interwoven in so much of its history? It is hard to foresee; but it is easy to affirm that it is toward that new history, a peaceful, truly human, history, as promised by God to men of good will, that we must resolutely march. The roads thereto are already well marked out for you; and the first is that of disarmament.

Then the Pope went on most eloquently to strike a strong blow in support of the abolition of war and the coming of disarmament.

Some may say it is easy to make rhetorical and eloquent speeches in favor of peace if one has no responsibility for protecting our national security. With this I agree. But one of the principal services that the Senator from New York has performed today, and which he performed earlier, on the 23d of June, has been to bring this high idealism down to the practical and pragmatic problems which confront us. I wish particularly to commend him for his comments in the conclusion of his speech. The Senator from New York there quoted President Kennedy to the effect that "the events and decisions of the next 10 months may well decide the fate of man for the next 10,000 years."

We now have been given a little more time. More than 10 months have passed, and we are still here. But 10 months from now, and certainly 5 years from now, if we do not move quickly, it may well be too late. As the Senator from New York said:

> For us there can be no permanent solutions, no gimmicks, no neat answers—only ceaseless effort to rule ourselves by humility, not pride; by reason, not emotion; above all by a consciousness of the sacredness of human life.

Again, I commend the Senator from New York for a most able, effective, and moving speech. I pledge to him my cooperation in helping him to secure those aims of peace for which he has spoken so courageously today.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to commend the Senator from New York again, as I did in June, not only for the substance of his speech, but for the fact that he has made it. The fact of history is that whenever the Senator from New York makes a speech, it will be listened to, not only by his colleagues, who respect him; not only by the citizens of our country, who respect him; but by all the citizens of the world, including those who are behind the Iron Curtain and the Bamboo Curtain.

The fact that the Senator from New York speaks up in an area which, whether we care to admit it or not, is vital to the survival of the human species, is in and of itself a mark of progress. It is a positive step toward a detente or a modus vivendi. We must try to get machinery going, whether inch by inch or in barracuda bites. It is vital that the other countries of the world realize that there are leaders in this counry who feel that this question is of paramount importance.

We are all aware that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency of the executive branch is greatly concerned in this area. It is impossible to be too much concerned. It is easy to say, when the United States has the role it plays today, that it has the responsibility for observing every tree and making certain that every tree, if it falls, falls in the right place or is removed in the proper manner. It is easy to say that we have the responsibility to take care of the entire forest.

In this case, the entire forest is the survival of our species and of world peace. Every time the Senator from New York speaks, I think that it is of help. It is also a sign that the responsible leadership in the U.S. Senate is undoubtedly concerned. There is undoubtedly leadership behind the Bamboo Curtain and the Iron Curtain which shares this concern.

It is easy to be governed by ignorance or emotion when it comes to talk of trying to work out a detente with Russia or of trying to work out a method of living or getting along with the Chinese Communists. It is easy for those who would ply on ignorance and emotion to gain public credence and public support. When someone stands up and says what must be said, it is of great help to those many others who feel the same way.

I believe that when the Senator from New York stands up and speaks as he did in June, and as he did today—and as I hope he will again and again in the Senate—he renders a great service to the country, to world peace, and to those of us who believe as he does. However, perhaps the others need a little help and leadership in this field.

I congratulate the Senator. I think his speech was a fine speech. I am particularly glad that he made it.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much. I appreciate his very kind remarks.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I would ask the Senator from New York to elaborate on certain parts of his speech as delivered before the U.S. Senate this morning.

I particularly direct the attention of the Senator to the third section of his speech, in which he referred to the need for a Latin American nuclear-free zone. As I understand it, the United States has today, through the Organization of American States, a number of treaties with Latin American countries.

Is the Senator from New York suggesting in his speech, as part of the efforts that are being made—and which should be made, and will be made—through the Organization of American States, the adoption of the same guarantees to any or all countries of the hemisphere which are willing to sign a nuclear-free zone treaty, to provide for those countries the same guarantees that the Senator from New York advocates in the first section of his speech with respect to India?

I believe that this does present a new and different kind of concept. It marks an area in which we might obtain a significant breakthrough.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I would be in favor of that.

I believe that, with the close relationship which exists between the United States and the Latin American countries, the Latin American countries at the OAS meeting in November, or at a specially called meeting, will be able to reach some kind of solution. This would have a great effect in Latin America and in the United States, and on the people of these countries. It would strengthen our relationships.

I believe that this would be a great impetus to the other parts of the world which are in a similar situation.

I should hope that, if Latin American countries were to do this and lead the way—and there is no reason that they should not—in working out a relationship that is satisfactory to them and to the United States, there would be no reason why that procedure should not also be followed by Africa. I believe this would be an important step forward.

I should think that if Latin America and Africa were to do this, we could expect other countries in the world to do the same. I hope that we will ultimately move in this direction in central Europe, and perhaps ultimately through all of Europe, in connection, as I say, with movement toward a satisfactory general settlement.

The Test Ban Treaty of 1963 did not solve all the problems. It did not solve these difficulties or we would not be discussing this subject today. But the treaty was a step forward.

With that kind of agreement, we will not make the problem disappear as far as Latin America is concerned, but it would be a step forward in the control of nuclear weapons. It would be an indication to the rest of the world of what Latin America is willing to do. It would be an example for other countries to follow in the future.

I believe that it would be most helpful.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, is it the feeling of the Senator from New York, based on his own personal knowledge and study, his trips to Latin America and his conversations with many of the leaders of the Latin American countries, that there is a broad sentiment in favor of a nuclear free zone treaty?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I believe there is. I believe that there will also be action on the nuclear free zone treaty by other countries around the world. I believe that would be good.

As I pointed out, and as the Senator from Massachusetts has pointed out, the great struggle which has taken place in Latin America, and which deserves our support, is in an effort to develop economic, political, and social institutions which will be in the interests of all their people.

That has frequently been lacking. There is turmoil and disorder there now. I believe that we should support an effort to bring about the needed reform. I understand that that is frequently not done smoothly, any more than it was done smoothly in the United States. However, I believe that we should support such effort while some of the turmoil and disorder is taking place.

I believe that the presence of nuclear weapons in that area of the world would be against the best interests of the people of Latin America and the people of the world. As I pointed out in my speech, it is conceivable and possible—as we observed from the effort made by Juan Peron in the Argentine some 10 years ago—that if he or a person in a similar position in one of these nations desired to do so, it would be far easier to gain access to nuclear weapons today than it was then. That is the reason why I think it is so important.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. As I understand the theme which runs throughout this speech—and the Senator can correct me if I am wrong—the Senator feels that the United States ought to be providing technical know-how, and that we ought, at every opportunity, to try to encourage a climate in which these countries might by themselves, and, if need be, with the assistance of the outside world—and, in hopefulness, in coordination with the Soviet Union, develop the nuclear free zones that the Senator from New York is suggesting. The Senator feels that the U.S. policy ought to be a live and vibrant policy and thus be a strong force for bringing these countries together so that they may make this accommodation between themselves, and that, if need be, they should be ready to make the kind of commitments suggested by the Senator from New York in the Indian situation, as well as to try to reach a harmonious situation with the Soviet Union in an effort to reach these nuclear free zones in Latin America, Africa, and the other nations.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct. I believe that we should encourage any such effort. However, unless we take the initiative and decide within the Government that this will receive top priority and that this is the most important issue which faces not only the U.S. Government but also the people of this country and all mankind, I believe that we would drift.

If such a decision is made, I believe that we can help finance such a move.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I believe, from the speech of the Senator and from his personal experience, that he feels these efforts really run parallel in many instances with the ideas, objectives, policies, and interests of the Soviet Union in following the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty that was arranged with the United States.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct. There are difficulties, and we will always have difficulties and some unpleasant times. However, I suggest that we continue to make an effort to do all we can. We can do no less.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the Senator from New York.

I join other Senators who have said that they have been enlightened by the presentation of the Senator from New York, and I commend the Senator for his fine speech today as well as for his previous speech on this matter before the Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I join enthusiastically in supporting and applauding the speech of the Senator from New York. Though I do not agree with him on every detail of his very comprehensive discussion of this matter, I endorse a great deal that he said.

I am particularly delighted to hear his stress on this Nation's responsibility. As he put it:

> The greatest power brings the greatest responsibility—a responsibility, in my judgment, to engage in a total effort to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, an effort that should pervade every aspect of our foreign policy.

That is something that leaders in this country often seem to lose sight of. I believe the last major speech on the floor of the Senate on the subject was the speech made by the same Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], in June. It was a speech which, as he pointed out in his speech today, won the approval of many Senators. But it was the last speech made on the subject, and it was made 4 months ago. Nevertheless, I believe we all agree when we reflect that there is no more important problem facing the world or facing our Nation.

The specifics that the Senator has provided are most important, when he says:

> We should make clear our willingness to act in any reasonable fashion to reinforce our commitment to Western European security. We should couple this with assurances to France that NATO is not a vehicle for Anglo-Saxon domination of Europe. We should give a fair hearing to those who disagree with our policies and take responsible steps to meet legitimate demands of complaints;

We tend to lose our sense of urgency, as our attention is diverted by such events as the India-Pakistan conflict, and that Vietnam war. Somehow we forget about the proliferation threat, because it is not a subject which has provoked headlines. There have been many meetings and many efforts to try to cope with it, but, as the Senator from New York stresses here, "the hour is late; now is the time to make the maximum effort, as we did in 1963, to arrive at an agreement, for every day of delay may be a day that somewhere in the world a decision is taken to proceed with development of nuclear weapons"; and, as the Senator says, such decisions may be irreversible.

Also I believe it is most desirable, as the Senator has contended in his colloquy with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], that we use the best brains in our Government. Our most competent personnel in the executive branch are overburdened, as competent people are always likely to be, with the many other responsibilities and concerns of the moment; and I believe it is most helpful that the Senator from New York makes a plea, as he does today, that we find somehow opportunity and time for these outstandingly capable men, Secretaries Rusk and McNamara, McGeorge Bundy, and others, to give their attention, their interest, and their top priority to this subject.

I join in the general appeal to the Senator from New York to continue coming back to this subject over and over again. He serves a most useful purpose. His voice is one of those rare voices in our country that are heard throughout the Nation and throughout the world. He is the man who has given most prominent attention to this most important subject, and I hope and plead that he will continue to direct his great abilities to the problem until we meet it and solve it.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I am happy to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. I join other Senators who have spoken here today in commending the Senator from New York for his magnificent statement on the problems of nuclear proliferation. The late Adlai Stevenson said some years ago that "the most important unfinished task of this generation is the establishment of world peace."

We took a long stride in that direction as the Senator from New York has said, following the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. Admiral Rickover, in looking back over that event, made the observation that history turned a corner in October of 1962, and that the American people have never looked quite the same at the cold war since that day.

The reason for that is that, under the leadership of the late President Kennedy, and with the cooperation of the other great powers, we took a long step in the direction of peace with the limited nuclear test ban. It seems to me quite clear that there was an informal, unofficial agreement reached among the great nuclear powers at that time, that the use of nuclear weapons was a "no-win" policy and a self-defeating policy.

As the Senator has suggested, the next step seems to be to stop the proliferation of these terrifying weapons, which can spell the end of civilization as we have known it. I commend the Senator from New York, as a fellow Senator, as a citizen, as a father, and as one interested in the peace of the world, for the fine leadership he continues to provide in this field.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Looking back to the middle of 1963, prior to the Test Ban Treaty, the matter that President Kennedy regretted most about the first 28 months of his administration was the fact that we had not arrived at any kind of understanding with the Soviet Union regarding nuclear weapons. Probably the event that gave him the greatest satisfaction was the fact that the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty had been signed in 1963. Even though it was limited, he foresaw and anticipated that in the coming years it could be further developed, and that the accommodation which had risen could come out first, from the confrontation in October 1962, and then from his speech at American University, followed by the Test Ban Treaty, that it would be followed up in 1964 and 1965 and following years by some real understanding in this very difficult field.

As I say, I do not care what progress we make, whether it be in education or poverty or housing, or even in southeast Asia in our relationships with Laos and Vietnam, or in the Middle East; if we do not find an answer to this problem, nothing else means anything. All the rest is "as sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal."

Mr. McGOVERN. If the Senator will yield further, we have felt very painfully the loss of some of the great voices for peace around the world: Dag Hammarskjold, Eleanor Roosevelt, Adlai Stevenson, President Kennedy, and Pope John XXIII—who did so much to alert the world to the imperatives of peace—and so I think everyone is especially grateful to the Senator from New York, who has a voice which is heard around the world, when he speaks out as courageously and as imaginatively as he has on this important subject.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I was interested in the many references, in the speech given by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], to the matter of the Test Ban Treaty. When President Kennedy made his conservation trip to the Northwest and the West in 1963, when he reached Billings, Mont., he mentioned for the first time the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty which had been passed by the Senate a few days previously.

On that occasion, there were at least 75,000 people in attendance at the fair grounds—this in a city which has a population of 55,000, in a State which has a population of 705,000.

When he mentioned what the Senate had done in ratifying the test ban agreement, the people applauded, the rafters shook, and the feelings of everyone were plain for all to see and hear.

Therefore, let no one underestimate the importance of this subject in the minds and hearts of the American people, and of people throughout the world.

Coincidentally, yesterday, in Billings, as I have indicated previously, the Advanced Research Projects Agency dedicated a large aperture seismic array, known as LASA.

In connection with the Test Ban Treaty, I quote from what I said yesterday:

> If LASA lives up to expectations, it could have great influence in the field of nuclear weapons control and disarmament, partially dissolving the problem of on-site inspections which has, heretofore, prevented negotiation of an all-inclusive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

Once more I extend my thanks to the Senator from New York for the foresight he has shown, for the remarks which he has made, and for the warning flags which he has waved before us.

SALUTE TO 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of October 9, there is published an editorial, entitled "The Broader Salute," prompted by the President's salute to the 89th Congress a few nights ago. The editorial categorizes the record of this session of the Congress as "one of the most remarkable legislative performances of this century." This flattering compliment, from so erudite a source, even though it may be an overstatement, will be deeply appreciated by the Members of the Senate.

I prefer, however, to underscore another comment in the editorial that "the salute which the President has addressed to Congress necessarily bounces back in very large measure to the White House." That is a most accurate comment on the President's great contribution. As the editorial points out, President Johnson has given the Nation a magnificent national leadership these past months. He has worked tirelessly, wisely, creatively, and with total dedication to the welfare of all the people. In so doing he has provided the prerequisite framework—he has fixed the sights—without which the Congress would not have been able to legislate as it has done. The President has, moreover, a profound understanding of the mutual decencies and respect, as between the executive and legislative branch which are inherent in our constitutional system. And by scrupulous regard for these considerations he has contributed immeasurably to the effective operation of the Senate.

So when the scorecards are tallied, it will be found that while the accomplishments of this Congress have, indeed, been unique and outstanding, they have been registered in and as a part of a unique and outstanding national administration and leadership.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have the editorial previously referred to printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 9, 1965]

THE BROADER SALUTE

President Johnson's salute to Congress will be widely reechoed through most of the country. Though it still has a number of important chores to finish, the 1st session of the 89th Congress has performed remarkably well. Its so-called box score is almost a solid mass of black dots, each indicating the advancement or final enactment of a bill. Certainly its record is one of the most remarkable legislative performances of this century.

This is not the moment to appraise the full work of Congress during 1965. The end of the session is not yet in sight. But it is an appropriate occasion on which to note the generally good relations between the White House and Capitol Hill and to applaud the diligent efforts which have brought the administration's legislative program for 1965 so near to completion. The present Congress has maintained a positive attitude toward its task. Petty bickering and partisan sabotage have been at a minimum. From the early months of the session Congress has buckled down to the business at hand as if its first concern were the public welfare.

Yet it is obvious that a large measure of the credit for the outcome belongs to the President himself. We surmise that every Member of Congress would acknowledge this. A highly skilled politician with many decades of experience behind him, Lyndon Johnson is at his best in lining up legislative support for measures he deems to be in the public interest. Much has been said about arm twisting and the Johnson treatment, but it boils down to the fact that the President is extraordinarily persuasive in dealing with Republican as well as Democratic legislators.

We do not think it can rightly be said that he has encroached upon the congressional prerogative of making the final decisions. He has not seized any legislative authority; he has not coerced the Congress or reduced it to the status of a rubber stamp. But he has by reason of his boundless energy and his vigorous leadership dominated the national scene. He has provided the kind of leadership, coaching, wheedling, persuading, encouraging, and prodding that is neecssary to the successful operation of our representative system. So the salute which the President has addressed to Congress necessarily bounces back in very large measure to the White House.

APOLOGY TO LADY BIRD JOHNSON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] takes the floor, I should like to make another comment, because it fits in with what he is about to do.

Mr. President, the outstanding leadership of President Lyndon B. Johnson in building a better America has been greatly supplemented by the faithful support of Mrs. Johnson. The burdens of the President are weighty and taxing. President Johnson has been fortunate in that Lady Bird Johnson has assisted him with her ability, imagination, sensitivity, and dedication. She has been a tower of strength to the President. As First Lady she has served the Nation in her own right and her own way with great dignity and distinction.

Therefore, I was most disturbed and chagrined to learn that in my own State, in Montana, there was emblazoned briefly on a roadside billboard a sign calling for the "Impeachment of Lady Bird." This action presumably was supposed to be a protest—humorous or otherwise—against Mrs. Johnson's vigorous support of the highway beautification bill, amendments to which the Senate will consider today. I do not know what this act was supposed to achieve. All that was proved was a lack of good sense and obvious bad manners on the part of those responsible for it.

It is to the credit of the proprietors of the sign company that they realized promptly that, even if intended as humor, this sign was in bad taste and they had it removed at once. Certainly the act was not in keeping with the reputation for decency and friendliness which the people of Montana have long enjoyed. Of all States, Montana has a natural affinity for Lady Bird Johnson's great efforts to safeguard the beauty of the American scene. For Montana is a treasure state, a repository of some of the greatest natural and scenic assets of the Nation, and their preservation is of real and abiding concern to every Montanan.

So I offer to Mrs. Johnson my personal apologies for this unbecoming and untypical incident and note only in extenuation that it has been promptly rectified. Moreover, I would like to extend to her an invitation to come soon and to come often to Montana where she will find not only a warm welcome but much understanding and appreciation of her sincere concern for a beautiful America.

SCENIC DEVELOPMENT AND ROAD BEAUTIFICATION OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY SYSTEMS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2084) to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I

SEC. 101. Section 131 of title 23, United States Code, is revised to read as follows:

"§ 131. Control of outdoor advertising

"(a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, and devices in areas adjacent to the Interstate System and the primary system should be controlled in order to protect the public investment in such highways, to promote the safety and recreational value of public travel, and to preserve natural beauty.

"(b) Federal-aid highway funds apportioned on or after January 1, 1968, to any State which the Secretary determines has not made provision for effective control of the erection and maintenance along the Interstate System and the primary system of outdoor advertising signs, displays, and devices which are within six hundred and sixty feet of the nearest edge of the right-of-way and visible from the main traveled way of the system, shall be reduced by amounts equal to 10 per centum of the amounts which would otherwise be apportioned to such State under section 104 of this title, until such time as such State shall provide for such effective control. Any amount which is withheld from apportionment to any State hereunder shall be reapportioned to the other States. Whenever he determines it to be in the public interest, the Secretary may suspend, for such periods as he deems necessary, the application of this subsection to a State.

"(c) Effective control means that after January 1, 1968, such signs, displays, and devices shall, pursuant to this section, be limited to (1) directional and other official signs and notices, which signs and notices shall include, but not be limited to, signs and notices pertaining to natural wonders, scenic and historical attractions, which are required or authorized by law, which shall conform to national standards hereby authorized to be promulgated by the Secretary hereunder, which standards shall contain provisions concerning the lighting, size, number, and spacing of signs, and such other requirements as may be appropriate to implement this section, (2) signs, displays, and devices advertising the sale or lease of property upon which they are located, and (3) signs, displays, and devices advertising activities conducted on the property on which they are located.

"(d) In order to promote the reasonable, orderly and effective display of outdoor advertising while remaining consistent with the purposes of this section, signs, displays, and devices whose size, lighting and spacing, consistent with customary use is to be determined by agreement between the several States and the Secretary, may be erected and maintained within six hundred and sixty feet of the nearest edge of the right-of-way within areas adjacent to the Interstate and primary systems which are zoned industrial or commercial under authority of State law, or in unzoned commercial or industrial areas as may be determined by agreement between the several States and the Secretary. The States shall have full authority under their own zoning laws to zone areas for commercial or industrial purposes, and the actions of the States in this regard will be accepted for the purposes of this Act. Nothing in this subsection shall apply to signs, displays, and devices referred to in clauses (2) and (3) of subsection (c) of this section.

"(e) Any sign, display, or device lawfully in existence along the Interstate System or the Federal-aid primary system on September 1, 1965, which does not conform to this section shall not be required to be removed until July 1, 1970. Any other sign, display, or device lawfully erected which does not conform to this section shall not be required to be removed until the end of the fifth year after it becomes nonconforming.

"(f) The Secretary shall, in consultation with the States, provide within the rights-of-way for areas at appropriate distances from interchanges on the Interstate System, on which signs, displays, and devices giving specific information in the interest of the traveling public may be erected and maintained. Such signs shall conform to national standards to be promulgated by the Secretary.

"(g) Just compensation shall be paid upon the removal of the following outdoor advertising signs, displays, and devices—

"(1) those lawfully in existence on the date of enactment of this subsection,

"(2) those lawfully on any highway made a part of the interstate or primary system on or after the date of enactment of this subsection and before January 1, 1968, and

"(3) those lawfully erected on or after January 1, 1968.

The Federal share of such compensation shall be 75 per centum. Such compensation shall be paid for the following:

"(A) The taking from the owner of such sign, display, or device of all right, title, leasehold, and interest in such sign, display, or device; and

"(B) The taking from the owner of the real property on which the sign, display, or device is located, of the right to erect and maintain such signs, displays, and devices thereon.

"(h) All public lands or reservations of the United States which are adjacent to any portion of the Interstate System and the primary system shall be controlled in accordance with the provisions of this section and the national standards promulgated by the Secretary.

"(i) In order to provide information in the specific interest of the traveling public, the State highway departments are authorized to maintain maps and to permit informational directories and advertising pamphlets to be made available at safety rest areas. Subject to the approval of the Secretary, a State may also establish information centers at safety rest areas for the purpose of informing the public of places of interest within the State and providing such other information as a State may consider desirable.

"(j) Any State highway department which has under this section as in effect on June 30, 1965, entered into an agreement with the Secretary to control the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, and devices in areas adjacent to the Interstate System shall be entitled to receive the bonus payments as set forth in the agreement, but no such State highway department shall be entitled to such payments unless the State maintains the control required under such agreement or the control required by this section, whichever control is stricter. Such payments shall be paid only from appropriations made to carry out this section. The provisions of this subsection shall not be construed to exempt any State from controlling outdoor advertising as otherwise provided in this section.

"(k) Nothing in this section shall prohibit a State from establishing standards imposing stricter limitations with respect to signs, displays, and devices on the Federal-aid highway systems than those established under this section.

"(l) Not less than sixty days before making a final determination to withhold funds from a State under subsection (b) of this section, or to do so under subsection (b) of section 136, or with respect to failing to agree as to the size, lighting, and spacing of signs, displays, and devices or as to unzoned commercial or industrial areas in which signs, displays, and devices may be erected and maintained under subsection (d) of this section, or with respect to failure to approve under subsection (g) of section 136, the Secretary shall give written notice to the State of his proposed determination and a statement of the reasons therefor, and during such period shall give the State an opportunity for a hearing on such determination. Following such hearing the Secretary shall issue a written order setting forth his final determination and shall furnish a copy of such order to the State. Within forty-five days of receipt of such order, the State may appeal such order to any United States district court for such State, and upon the filing of such appeal such order shall be stayed until final judgment has been entered on such appeal. Summons may be served at any place in the United States. The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the determination of the Secretary or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located and to the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254. If any part of an apportionment to a State is withheld by the Secretary under subsection (b) of this section or subsection (b) of section 136, the amount so withheld shall not be reapportioned to the other States as long as a suit brought by such State under this subsection is pending. Such amount shall remain available for apportionment in accordance with the final judgment and this subsection. Funds withheld from apportionment and subsequently apportioned or reapportioned under this section shall be available for expenditure for three full fiscal years after the date of such apportionment or reapportionment as the case may be.

"(m) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this section, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and not to exceed $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967. No part of the Highway Trust Fund shall be available to carry out this section."

SEC. 102. The table of sections of chapter 1 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by striking out "131. Areas adjacent to the Interstate System.", and inserting in lieu thereof "131. Control of outdoor advertising."

TITLE II

SEC. 201. Chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended to add at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 136. Control of junkyards

"(a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that the establishment and use and maintenance of junkyards in areas adjacent to the Interstate System and the primary system should be controlled in order to protect the public investment in such highways, to promote the safety and recreational value of public travel, and to preserve natural beauty.

"(b) Federal-aid highway funds apportioned on or after January 1, 1968, to any State which the Secretary determines has not made provision for effective control of the establishment and maintenance along the Interstate System and the primary system of outdoor junkyards, which are within one thousand feet of the nearest edge of the right-of-way and visible from the main traveled way of the system, shall be reduced by amounts equal to 10 per centum of the amounts which would otherwise be apportioned to such State under section 104 of this title, until such time as such State shall provide for such effective control. Any amount which is withheld from apportionment to any State hereunder shall be reapportioned to the other States. Whenever he determines it to be in the public interest, the Secretary may suspend, for such periods as he deems necessary, the application of this subsection to a State.

"(c) Effective control means that by January 1, 1968, such junkyards shall be screened by natural objects, plantings, fences, or other appropriate means so as not to be visible from the main traveled way of the system, or shall be removed from sight.

"(d) The term 'junk' shall mean old or scrap copper, brass, rope, rags, batteries, paper, trash, rubber debris, waste, or junked, dismantled, or wrecked automobiles, or parts thereof, iron, steel, and other old or scrap ferrous or nonferrous material.

"(e) The term 'automobile graveyard' shall mean any establishment or place of business which is maintained, used, or operated for storing, keeping, buying, or selling wrecked, scrapped, ruined, or dismantled motor vehicles or motor vehicle parts.

"(f) The term 'junkyard' shall mean an establishment or place of business which is maintained, operated, or used for storing, keeping, buying, or selling junk, or for the maintenance or operation of an automobile graveyard, and the term shall include garbage dumps and sanitary fills.

"(g) Notwithstanding any provision of this section, junkyards, auto graveyards, and scrap metal processing facilities may be operated within areas adjacent to the Interstate System and the primary system which are within one thousand feet of the nearest edge of the right-of-way and which are zoned industrial under authority of State law, or which are not zoned under authority of State law, but are used for industrial activities, as determined by the several States subject to approval by the Secretary.

"(h) Notwithstanding any provision of this section, any junkyard in existence on the date of enactment of this section which does not conform to the requirements of this section and which the Secretary finds as a practical matter cannot be screened, shall not be required to be removed until July 1, 1970.

"(i) The Federal share of landscaping and screening costs under this section shall be 75 per centum.

"(j) Just compensation shall be paid the owner for the relocation, removal, or disposal of the following junkyards—

"(1) those lawfully in existence on the date of enactment of this subsection,

"(2) those lawfully along any highway made a part of the interstate or primary system on or after the enactment of this subsection and before January 1, 1968, and

"(3) those lawfully established on or after January 1, 1968.

The Federal share of such compensation shall be 75 per centum.

"(k) All public lands or reservations of the United States which are adjacent to any portion of the interstate and primary systems shall be effectively controlled in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"(l) Nothing in this section shall prohibit a State from establishing standards imposing stricter limitations with respect to outdoor junkyards on the Federal-aid highway systems than those established under this section.

"(m) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and not to exceed $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967. No part of the Highway Trust Fund shall be available to carry out this section."

Sec. 202. The table of sections of chapter 1, title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"136. Control of junkyards."

TITLE III

Sec. 301. (a) Section 319 of title 23, United States Code, is revised to read as follows:

"§ 319. Landscaping and scenic enhancement

"(a) The Secretary may approve as a part of the construction of Federal-aid highways the costs of landscape and roadside development, including acquisition and development of publicly owned and controlled rest and recreation areas and sanitary and other facilities reasonably necessary to accommodate the traveling public.

"(b) An amount equivalent to 3 per centum of the funds apportioned to a State for Federal-aid highways for any fiscal year shall be allocated to that State out of funds appropriated under authority of this subsection, which shall be used for landscape and roadside development within the highway right-of-way and for acquisition of interests in and improvement of strips of land necessary for the restoration, preservation, and enhancement of scenic beauty adjacent to such highways, including acquisition and development of publicly owned and controlled rest and recreation areas and sanitary and other facilities within or adjacent to the highway right-of-way reasonably necessary to accommodate the traveling public, without being matched by the State. The Secretary may authorize exceptions from this requirement, upon application of a State and upon a showing that such amount is in excess of the needs of the State for these purposes. Any funds not used as required by this subsection shall lapse. There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed $120,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and not to exceed $120,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967. No part of the Highway Trust Fund shall be available to carry out this subsection."

(b) The table of sections of chapter 3 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by striking out

"319. Landscaping."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"319. Landscaping and scenic enhancement."

Sec. 302. In order to provide the basis for evaluating the continuing programs authorized by this Act, and to furnish the Congress with the information necessary for authorization of appropriations for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1967, the Secretary, in cooperation with the State highway departments, shall make a detailed estimate of the cost of carrying out the provisions of this Act, and a comprehensive study of the economic impact of such programs on affected individuals and commercial and industrial enterprises, the effectiveness of such programs and the public and private benefits realized thereby, and alternate or improved methods of accomplishing the objectives of this Act. The Secretary shall submit such detailed estimate and a report concerning such comprehensive study to the Congress not later than January 10, 1967.

Sec. 303. (a) Before the promulgation of standards, criteria, and rules and regulations, necessary to carry out sections 131 and 136 of title 23 of the United States Code, the Secretary of Commerce shall hold public hearings in each State for the purpose of gathering all relevant information on which to base such standards, criteria, and rules and regulations.

(b) The Secretary of Commerce shall report to Congress, not later than January 10, 1967, all standards, criteria, and rules and regulations to be applied in carrying out sections 131 and 136 of title 23 of the United States Code.

Sec. 304. There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $500,000 to enable the Secretary of Commerce to carry out his functions under section 135 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to highway safety programs.

Sec. 305. Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to authorize the use of eminent domain to acquire any dwelling (including related buildings).

TITLE IV

Sec. 401. Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to authorize private property to be taken or the reasonable and existing use restricted by such taking without just compensation as provided in this Act.

Sec. 402. In addition to any other amounts authorized by this Act and the amendments made by this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Secretary of Commerce not to exceed $5,000,000 for administrative expenses in carrying out this Act (including amendments made by this Act).

Sec. 403. This Act may be cited as the "Highway Beautification Act of 1965".

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in bringing this subject to the floor of the Senate this afternoon, I desire that the Record reflect the fact that the agreement which we requested has been entered into with the cooperation of the majority and minority leaders. It is an agreement which is understood and which was requested by the chairman of the Committee on Public Works [Mr. McNamara] and also the ranking minority member of that committee [Mr. Cooper].

Therefore, this is a matter, as I shall show later, which has been thoroughly discussed with the leadership within the Senate and within the committees. It is for this reason that we now approach final action, I trust, on this important piece of legislation.

At the outset, because of the appropriate remarks just made by the Senator from Montana with reference to the unfortunate incident in the State of Montana, which he so well represents in part, I state that the dedication, devotion, and diligence with which the President and the First Lady have approached their responsibilities in this matter reflect great credit on the White House and the executive branch of the Government.

It is recognized throughout the United States that the efforts by the President and the First Lady in the matter of beautification and scenic development of our highway system, have been activated by a sense of urgency in this problem.

Therefore, I congratulate all those, including the President and Mrs. Johnson, who have made such notable contributions to this legislation which we are now bringing to a conclusion, with the concurrence by the Senate to the provisions of the House version of the bill.

Mr. President, several months ago, President Johnson transmitted to the Congress his recommendations for a program to improve and to protect the appearance of America's highways. Following careful consideration of this subject by the Senate Committee on Public Works, and following extensive debate and discussion in the Senate, a highway beautification bill, S. 2084, was approved by the Senate last September 16. The bill which was approved by the Senate provided for an effective, fair, and reasonable program of highway beautification.

Subsequent to the Senate's passage of S. 2084, it was transmitted to the House for further action, and it is now back before the Senate for our concurrence in House amendments.

Mr. President, I have examined carefully the House approved version of S. 2084 and it seems to me that there is no major difference between S. 2084 as approved by the House and S. 2084 as previously approved by the Senate.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Roads, it was my responsibility to introduce this measure in the Senate, to conduct the hearings before our committee to report S. 2084 from committee and to serve as floor manager of the bill when it came to the Senate in mid-September. In the light of this knowledge I find the House version presents no significant departure from the bill as it was earlier passed by this body.

This opinion is shared by the able chairman of the Public Works Committee, Senator Pat McNamara, and the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, Senator John Sherman Cooper, as well as other members of the committee with whom I have discussed the matter.

I shall comment briefly on what I believe are the most significant substantive differences between the House and the Senate versions of S. 2084.

Title I of S. 2084 relates to the control of outdoor advertising along the interstate and primary highway systems. In the Senate-approved version of this bill, there was a general provision for judicial review by any State dissatisfied with the Secretary of Commerce's final action with respect to withholding funds, as provided in the bill. The House retained this important provision for judicial review, but enlarged on it by stating in more specific detail the procedural rights which would be accorded to the States. This language is found in section 131(1) of S. 2084 as passed by the House. For example, the House version states that before the Secretary makes a final determination on withholding funds from a State he shall give the State written notice at least 60 days in advance and accord to the State an opportunity for a hearing. Following the hearing and the Secretary's final determination, the State would have 45 days within which to appeal the Secretary's final determination to any U.S. district court within that State. Also, as provided in the bill previously approved by the Senate, the judgment of the district court shall be subject to review by the appropriate U.S. court of appeals and subsequently by the Supreme Court. On careful consideration of the language of the House bill covering judicial review, it is my conclusion that all of the safeguards contained in the Senate-approved bill have been retained in the House bill. There is the additional requirement in the House bill that the Secretary of Commerce accord the States an opportunity for an administrative hearing before he takes final action on withholding any funds from a State for failure to achieve control of billboards or junkyards certainly should be regarded as entirely acceptable to this body.

Another difference in language of title I is found in section 131(d) of the House approved bill, which section is comparable to section 131(e) of the Senate approved bill. The language of these two sections is quite similar, with the exception that the House approved version states that "signs, displays, and devices whose size, lighting, and spacing consistent with customary use, is to be determined by agreement between the several States and the Secretary" are authorized in commercial or industrial areas. The words "consistent with customary use" were not contained in the Senate version of S. 2084. The sponsor of this amendment explained during the course of the House debate on S. 2084 that it was his purpose to write into the statute the interpretation stated in the letter from the Secretary of Commerce to the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Roads, September 14, which appears on pages 4 and 5 of the House committee report accompanying S. 2084. The Secretary of Commerce, in his letter of September 14, states:

> It is the intention of the administration that the regulations, insofar as they are consistent with the purposes of this act, shall be helpful to the advertising industry and that, for instance, standards of size which may be adopted would be insofar as possible consistent with standard size billboards in customary use.

The Secretary of Commerce further emphasized in his letter that regulations pertaining to outdoor advertising will not be adopted without thorough consultation with the States and with reasonable provisions for public hearings and with full opportunity for private businesses to express their views.

On careful consideration of the phrase "consistent with customary use," in the House-approved bill and which was not contained in the Senate version, it is my conclusion that there should be no objection to writing into the statute the interpretation and the intention stated by the Secretary of Commerce in his letter of September 14, in the House committee report accompanying S. 2084. Certainly, it seems to me that any regulations which the Secretary adopts in agreement with the States should, consistent with the purposes of this act, be helpful to the advertising industry. Any regulations or criteria with respect to size, spacing, and lighting of outdoor advertising signs should, insofar as possible, be consistent with customary use in the industry. Therefore, I cannot perceive any valid objection to this particular language in the House approved bill.

There is additional language in the House version, in section 131(d) which is not contained in the bill approved by the Senate. This reads:

> The States shall have full authority under their own zoning laws to zone areas for commercial or industrial purposes, and the actions of the States in this regard will be accepted for the purposes of this Act.

This language states in express terms what was clearly provided in S. 2084, as approved by the Senate. That is, the matter of zoning areas for commercial or industrial purposes is left to the States. Therefore, when States or local governments act to zone areas for commercial or industrial purposes, in accordance with the States' traditional exercise of authority on zoning, those determinations will be accepted for purposes of billboard or junkyard control. This language does not, of course, mean that a State or local authority could place a label "zoned commercial or industrial" on land adjacent to the interstate and primary systems solely to permit billboards or junkyards and thereby frustrate the intent of Congress stated in section 131(a).

Thus interpreted, I know of no real objection to this clarifying language referring to the zoning powers of the States contained in the bill approved by the House.

Title II of S. 2084 deals with the control of junkyards adjacent to the interstate and primary highway systems. Notwithstanding some difference in language between the House and Senate versions of this bill, the two are identical in substance with one exception. The Senate approved bill, in section 135(i), provided that the first $1,500 of cost for screening a junkyard should be assumed by the owner of the facilities screened, and any amount in excess of $1,500 should be the Federal and State responsibility with Federal participation set at 75 percent of the amount in excess of $1,500 of the cost, and provides that "just compensation" shall be provided for screening of junkyards, on the same basis as the provision for just compensation for removal of junkyards or for the removal of billboards. The House approved bill retains the same participation by the Federal Government as did the Senate bill, that is 75 percent. It appears to have been the conclusion in the other body that it would be somewhat discriminatory and unfair to require the owner of a junkyard which had to be screened to bear the first $1,500 of such cost while not imposing a similar requirement on the owner of billboards or junkyards which had to be removed. After consideration of the position on this point adopted by the House, it is my conclusion that it has considerable merit and that the Senate should not object to this change.

Title III of S. 2084 related to landscaping and scenic enhancement. The House-approved version contains three provisions which were not in the bill as approved by the Senate. The first is found in section 319(b) to the effect that the 3-percent funds allocated to a State, on a nonmatching basis, for landscape and roadside development, may be used within the right-of-way as well as outside the right-of-way. The bill as approved by the Senate provided that these 3-percent nonmatching funds would be available only outside the right-of-way, inasmuch as landscape development within the right-of-way has for many years been treated under the Federal-aid highway statutes as a cost of construction. It is certainly possible that there can be some situations in certain States where it would be desirable for the State to be authorized to use a portion of the nonmatching funds for landscaping and scenic enhancement within the right-of-way. This would be particularly true in those situations where the full amount of the nonmatching funds, which would not come from the highway trust fund, could not appropriately and efficiently be used for scenic enhancement of strips of land outside the right-of-way. Under this language, the Secretary of Commerce will be authorized to approve expenditure of the nonmatching funds for projects within the right-of-way. These funds would, of course, be administered in the same manner as Federal-aid matching money from the highway trust fund; that is, on an individual project basis.

I do not see any reason to object to this provision with respect to authorizing the use of some of the 3-percent nonmatching funds for projects within the right-of-way.

There are two other provisions in title III of the House approved bill which were not contained in S. 2084 as approved by the Senate. These are contained in section 303(a) and section 305(a) of the House approved bill. Section 303(a) provides that before the promulgation of standards, criteria, and rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this act, the Secretary of Commerce shall hold public hearings in each State for the purpose of gathering all relevant information on which to base his conclusions.

The other provision is found in section 305 of the House approved bill, which states that nothing in this act is to authorize the use of eminent domain to acquire any dwelling. The purpose of this language, as I understand it, is to provide that a person would not be forced to vacate his dwelling, in which he actually resides, as a part of a scenic enhancement project adjacent to an interstate or primary system highway.

There might be some difference of opinion as to the full justification of these last two provisions I have described, but it is my judgment that they do not present a sufficient problem or sufficient question as to require the Senate to take issue.

Finally, I mention the differences in title IV between the Senate and House versions of this bill. The Senate version, contained in section 401, authorizes $5 million for research and development in disposition of scrap or discarded motor vehicles. This provision was deleted by the House, on the premise that it would be more appropriate to cope with this specific issue separately as a part of a comprehensive solid-waste disposal program expected to be considered next session.

The House bill does contain an authorization for administrative expenses not to exceed $5 million, for carrying out the provisions of this act. No authorization for administrative expenses was contained in the Senate-approved version. In view of the requirements in the House-approved bill that the Secretary of Commerce is required to conduct a full public hearing in each of the 50 States before promulgating any criteria, rules or regulations, pertaining either to billboards or junkyards, it is evident that a substantial administrative expense will be incurred. It is necessary that the Department of Commerce have sufficient funds to carry out this requirement for a hearing in each State, particularly in view of another provision that the Secretary of Commerce shall file a report with the Congress not later than January 10, 1967, concerning all standards, criteria, rules and regulations which he proposes for implementing the provisions of this act relating to billboard and junkyard control.

Careful consideration has been given to the House version of S. 2084 and it is my conclusion that none of the changes made by the House are of such character as to be unacceptable to the Senate.

Accordingly, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 2084.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. McNAMARA. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from West Virginia on the tremendous job he has done in handling the bill, from the beginning, when he held hearings, up to now when the bill is on the way to the White House.

The bill is one of the most complicated bills we have had before our committee this year. The patience displayed by the Senator from West Virginia was outstanding, to say the least. I believe his skillful handling of the bill finally brought it to what will be a satisfactory conclusion.

I congratulate him sincerely for his tremendous effort and ability on this complicated piece of legislation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Those words are in character for my distinguished chairman. We have worked together on this measure, and I have been guided often by his good judgment. I am gratified that in aproaching this complex problem, as we move into a more concentrated concern for esthetic values in American life, that we have had a splendid bipartisan approach to this responsibility in the Senate. We have sensed it here. We felt it in the leadership of the majority and minority parties. It is a moment when we can realize that the Congress has acted in the public interest.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Once again I commend the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, who has acted with integrity, capacity, knowledge, and understanding in guiding this most difficult bill to its present passage. Words fail me because I understand the difficulties under which he has labored. I do know about the tremendous amount of work and time that he has put in in perfecting the bill.

I congratulate him for a job well done.

Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Senate concurred in the House amendment to S. 2084.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I say to the Senator from West Virginia that his leadership on the bill is one of the finest pieces of floor leadership I have witnessed in my years in the Senate.

The bill was a difficult bill when it came to the floor of the Senate. It was made much more difficult because amendments had to be added on the floor, of which the Senator was not aware until shortly before he brought up the bill for consideration.

He did a masterful job. We are all proud of him and I extend to him my highest congratulations.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am grateful for the commendation of the Senator.

SHOWING OF FILM ENTITLED "ADLAI STEVENSON THE AMBASSADOR"

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit, for immediate consideration, a concurrent resolution, in behalf of myself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 61) was read, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 61

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States Information Agency should make appropriate arrangements to make the film prepared by it on the late Adlai Stevenson, entitled "Adlai Stevenson the Ambassador", available for viewing only at the Auditorium Theatre in the City of Chicago, Illinois, for one day only, on or about October 24, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have cleared this matter with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and with the ranking Republican member of that committee, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the recent death of Adlai Stevenson was not only a great loss to the Nation and to the world, but it was also a very deeply felt loss to my own State of Illinois. A committee of distinguished Illinois citizens, with the sponsorship of about 100 civic, religious, and fraternal organizations including the United Nations Association of the U.S.A. has organized a memorial tribute to Ambassador Stevenson to be held on October 24 in Chicago.

The memorial observance has a completely nonpartisan sponsorship and it is in no way a "benefit" or fundraising affair. Its purpose is solely to honor our distinguished State Governor, national leader, and world representative. The organizers of the observance have asked Members of the Congress for assistance in securing permission to show at this single event, and at no other, the new film entitled "Adlai Stevenson the Ambassador" produced by the U.S. Information Agency. The law properly provides, of course, that USIA films may not be shown in the United States. Specific permission must be granted by the Congress.

Knowing the deep importance to Illinois of this observance, Senator DIRKSEN and I have agreed to sponsor the necessary concurrent resolution which would, if the Congress agrees, permit this single showing in Chicago of the Stevenson film. Immediately after receiving the request of the observance committee on October 1, and with the concurrence of my colleague, I addressed an explanation of the request made of us to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the majority leader and each member of the Foreign Relations Committee. In that letter I asked if the Senators, in view of the exceptional and unforeseen circumstances, would object to immediate consideration of the required resolution. I enclosed a copy of the draft resolution and reported that two precedents for such action had already been approved by the Congress this year. These are House Concurrent

Resolution 282 and House Concurrent Resolution 426, both authorizing single showings of the USIA film of John F. Kennedy.

For the RECORD may I say that after I sent out the letters I was informed by the USIA that the title of the film in question is "Adlai Stevenson the Ambassador" not "From the Land of Lincoln—Adlai Stevenson," as I indicated in the letters.

Members of the committee have been most understanding of the circumstances of this matter, and I wish to particularly thank the chairman of the committee, Senator FULBRIGHT, the majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota and author of the ban on showings of USIA films, Senator MUNDT, for their considerateness and help.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 61) was agreed to.

CONTRIBUTION TO CERTAIN INHABITANTS OF THE RYUKYU ISLANDS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 32) to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury to persons, and for use of and damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after August 15, 1945, and before April 28, 1952, which were, on page 2, line 4, after "persons" insert "(excluding municipalities)", and on page 3, line 16, after "claim" insert "; except that no remuneration on account of such services rendered on behalf of any association of claimants by any agent or attorney (including organizations thereof) shall exceed 1 per centum of the aggregate amount so paid on the claims involved".

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, section 3 of Senate Joint Resolution 32, as passed by the Senate, provided that attorneys' fees in connection with any claim shall not exceed 5 percent of the total amount paid on such claim. The House amended this section by adding a proviso that no remuneration on account of services rendered on behalf of any association of claimants by any agent or attorney, including organizations thereof, shall exceed 1 percent of the aggregate amount paid on the claims involved.

The House of Representatives also amended Senate Joint Resolution 32 to exclude municipalities from the definition of persons who may be considered as meritorious claimants. I understand that this amendment would apply to about 38 cities and towns of various sizes which have claims totaling approximately $960,000.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 10292. An act for the relief of Hilda Shen Tsiang; and

H.J. Res. 695. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

The bill (H.R. 10292) for the relief of Hilda Shen Tsiang, was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1966

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 695, making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes.

This joint resolution extends from October 15 to Saturday, October 23, existing provisions of law, providing funds for the operation of the agencies of Government for which the regular appropriation bills for fiscal year 1966 have not yet been enacted.

All authority under this resolution expires on October 23, 1965.

There are two regular appropriation bills still awaiting final action by both Houses of Congress. One is the public works appropriation bill—and the Senate and House conferees are meeting on this bill this afternoon. The other is the agricultural appropriation bill, upon which a conference is scheduled for this afternoon.

The final bill of the session—the supplemental bill for fiscal year 1966—is expected to be considered in the House of Representatives tomorrow. The Senate Committee on Appropriations is proceeding with its hearings on the supplemental items, and will conclude these by the first of the week.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of this joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 695), which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 695) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT—AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES, ETC.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Friday, October 15, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session until Friday, October 15, 1965, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives and the President of the United States, that committees be authorized to file reports, together with any individual, additional, supplementary, or minority views if desired; and that the Vice President or President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] has been in the forefront of our ranks in defense of our State right-to-work laws. His counsel and his leadership have been invaluable.

Only yesterday the Senator from Texas took this floor to defend so ably his State and its chief executive against those opposed to Texas' right-to-work laws. On Friday, last, Senator TOWER came prepared to speak all Friday afternoon, and night if necessary, to do his part to carry the message to all across our land. Due to a most unusual parliamentary situation, as we recall, the Senate recessed without the opportunity for my distinguished colleague to speak. He dutifully awaited with eagerness his turn again this Friday, but low and behold, we have now put this matter over.

Mr. President, the Senator from Texas had prepared through diligent effort a wealth of valuable educational material upon this subject of 14(b). Much of it he will, of course, use next year if need be, but I believe we should now have recorded a statement of Senator TOWER's support of 14(b), and his support of his people in Texas. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that a speech prepared for delivery by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR TOWER

In my remarks in support of 14(b) of Taft-Hartley, I must necessarily refer to our labor unions and to our labor union movements. I wish to make clear that I favor generally unions and their efforts to bring better working conditions to their members. As a matter of fact, if I were an employee in industry, I would want the privilege of joining forces with my fellow employees in a labor union so that I might work in the interest of our common good. Most labor unions seriously endeavor to serve the interest of their members. Of this, there is no doubt. But there is, likewise, no doubt that there exists in the labor movement, just as in every other movement of comparable size, those who do not do service to the general interest of their members. Laws enacted by the Congress must be designed to minimize their impact, to regulate, and restrain their operation. These regulations, in order to be just and constitutional, must likewise apply to all unions—good as well as bad.

As I have said, if I were a laboring man in industry, I would want the privilege of joining, and I probably would join, a labor union. But I would not want to be compelled to do so. I would want the right to join if I thought it were in my interest to do so. I would also want the right to refrain from joining, or to resign my membership if I had joined, should I believe the union was failing to represent my best interests.

In the course of my remarks today in support of right to work, I will review, generally, opposition arguments to this right. These opposition arguments are clearly against the principle of the right-to-work laws of Texas and the several other States. The reason for my review, I might add, is prompted by the thoroughness with which the opposition to Texas right to work has been presented. This opposition prompts a like thoroughness in defense of the principle Texans have so wisely seen fit to adopt.

Certainly I do not wish my remarks to be interpreted in any way as being critical, personally, of any one of those so ably presenting proponent arguments.

This proposed repeal is an impelling issue. It involves the freedom, the liberty, and the dignity of the working men and women, the little people who in our Nation are least able to defend themselves. It is an issue upon which I will have more to say before this discussion ends.

Opponents of 14(b) have stated the question is simply one of whether or not a union shop should be approved uniformly in the entire country, where it meets with the employers approval as well as with the approval of a majority of the employees, and is contractually carried out.

Now that may be a question but is not the real issue before us. The real issues, and there are several, include personal freedom, the dignity of the individual, the diffusion of power within our Federal-State system, and the matter of who is better able to properly represent the people on personal issues of this nature—the State legislatures who are close to and readily accessible to the people, or the Federal Congress.

The Congress has each session for several years considered and enacted legislation designed, according to proponents, to further assure the privileges of freedom and dignity to individuals in the area of civil rights and economic opportunity. Now on this issue we find that many of those who were strong proponents of these civil rights proposals are advocating the repeal of section 14(b), which would, in effect, force many American workers either to join or pay into a privately controlled labor union. I feel a number of opponents to right to work are out of touch with the feelings and the wishes of the people back home.

As members of the Senate, we should want to protect, not destroy, the principle of diffusion of power between the Federal and State governments so carefully established by our forefathers in an effort to protect themselves and their descendants against the abuses, the miscarriage of justice, and the dangers that emanate from excessive powers in the central government they created. These founders of our Nation had experienced harsh dealings at the hands of autocratic power, and were determined through the diffusion approach to protect the American people against it. We must not destroy those safeguards.

Mr. President, the Senate should not go on record here as favoring the further concentration of power in the Central Government by increasing restrictions on the already too restricted States. We do not want, through this measure, to concentrate more power in the powerful unions that are already demonstrating their capacity to dominate the Federal Government. We do not, through this proposal, want to give unions and their leaders breadbasket control over the workingmen of America. We do not want to create a condition that could enable these union leaders to create a behind-the-scene oligarchy responsible in fact to no one, yet powerful enough to control government at all levels, and through this government vehicle the freedom and dignity of all people. These are the real issues before us today and not the technical concepts that have been presented.

Opponents of 14(b) have said its repeal, in actuality, would not force upon any group of employees the adoption of a union shop, but only where a majority of the employees are desirous of it.

With this argument, I am technically in agreement, but I have numerous reservations based on practicality. Available National Labor Relations Board records and tabulations reveal many union elections have been won by very slim majorities, some no greater than 51 percent of the working force. What about the 49 percent who opposed the union? They may wish to negotiate directly with their employer. They may wish to select other representation. Their freedom, their right to choose, is just as sacred as is that of the majority. Any student of our Government knows that great care was exercised by its creators to provide protection for the minorities, to protect their freedoms, their dignity, and their rights. This Congress has recently taken action to further implement this purpose. We should not say to minorities of whatever nature that we will protect your freedoms; that is, all except the freedom to work at your chosen skills in a plant of your choice. We should not say that you must join or pay a private organization selected to represent you by someone else, if you hope to exercise this inalienable right of earning a living for yourself and your family.

I ponder, as we all must, the high measures of disrespect shown our Government by many American citizens, especially our youth. Perhaps a large measure of this disrespect stems from action in favor of the favored few. Our Government should not change from one based upon the principle of Government "of the people, by the people, and for the people" to one based on the developing concept of Government "of the favored few, by the favored few, and for the favored few." This proposed forcing of minorities to support private organizations created by majorities certainly indicates that we are moving in that direction. We cannot expect our coming generations to respect a government that distorts personal freedom and liberty in this fashion.

The term right to work has been declared by its opponents to be a misnomer, in that right to work laws do not really give anybody the right to work. Opponents of 14(b) further contend that the repeal of the 14(b) would not destroy anyone's right to work, and that such repeal would not require one to join a union in order to secure or continue employment.

Now, I must agree with 14(b)'s opponents to the degree that the words "right to work" are perhaps a misnomer. It should be labeled, in my opinion, "freedom to work," the freedom to work without being forced to join a union or to pay tribute to a union, or to any other organization or working men with which the individual worker did not happen to agree. The freedom to secure a job on his own ability and to hold that job by virtue of his capacity to perform. Freedom to work with a measure of happiness fully realizing that his future depends entirely upon his own capacity. Freedom to work in any fashion that will give to his employer an hour's work for an hour's pay, a day of production for a day's pay, and void of being forced to slow down his operations to keep within the purposely low standards established by his imposed leaders. Freedom to move outside job classification bounds that tend to stifle the use of his talent, demonstrate his versatility, and enhance his opportunity for progress. Freedom to work as long as he satisfies his employer through honest effort. Freedom from the agony of being called upon the carpet by union leaders and told how he is to perform off his job as well as on his job. Freedom from assessments for dues and political activities in the support of candidates and issues he does not desire to support.

Freedom to select his own representation in dealing with management or freedom to represent himself. Freedom to work for a promotion without being hamstrung by arbitrarily set standards that breed mediocrity, stifle initiative, and delays, and forestalls opportunity for promotion. That is what the so-called right to work means. It is the freedom to work as rapidly or as slowly as one wishes and to go the extra mile if desired in an effort to advance. It means the freedom to choose one's employer, to secure a job, and hold that job by virtue of his own ability.

The argument that right to work does not, in fact, give anybody a true right to a job because it creates no jobs is one I agree with. Neither do unions provide jobs beyond the relatively few for those who are employed to carry forward the unions' programs. Right-to-work laws do not create jobs, neither does the National Labor Relations Act or the Taft-Hartley Act, and neither will H.R. 77.

Jobs are created by employers who invest their money in private enterprises from which they hope to secure profits from the production or the rendering of needed services. Unless they secure that production, or render a needed service for which the people are willing and able to pay, the jobs tend to dry up and people lose their jobs.

Section 14(b) opponents further say that the repeal of section 14(b) would not require that any person join a union in order to get or hold a job. With this, I am in total disagreement. Technically, a person is not required to join a union to either secure or hold a job. He is, however, required to pay tribute to that union to the extent of an initiation fee established by the union, pay dues, or contribute the equivalent of initiation fees and regular dues to the union. As a matter of practice, when an employer and the union enter into a union shop contract for all practical purposes the individual worker does have to join the union because he may not possess the knowledge or the funds to prosecute his rights under the law.

As a matter of fact, the average worker does not know what is in the law. All that he knows is what he is shown by union leaders, and conceivably by his employer, with respect to the law. Generally speaking, his knowledge is confined to the contract between the employer and the union which has been explained to him. He is made familiar with the contract, or at least that segment of the contract that requires that he be a member of the union, and possessing no knowledge of the law, he does not look beyond that.

Insofar as the practical application of this section of the act, if this bill is enacted, the man must become a member of the union, if the union wants him as a member, in order to hold his job. The union may not want him as a member if they think he might become a dissident voice in its operation, and why should they, as practical men, when he would have to pay them anyway. The contract, I remind you, was made between his employer and the union designated to represent him, but as to is contents, he had no voice.

As a matter of fact, a little research will show examples where labor unions, enjoying a monopoly in either the closed shop or the union, have destroyed jobs in years past through excessive demands supported by this monopolistic authority. They have forced industries and operations to either close their doors, curtail operations, or, as was the case in the mining industry, to force prices so high that substitutes for the material they were producing moved into their established markets. The net results have been the destruction of the jobs rather than the creation of jobs for the individuals affected.

I have no figures available to me, but conceivably they are available, in union records, that would reveal the percentage of the dues dollar that is actually utilized in the process of negotiations. It is the judgment of many that in some cases only a small percentage of the total money collected is expended for this purpose. A vast majority of the dollars thus collected in such cases may, in fact, be utilized for the purpose of furthering organization efforts of the union in plants other than the plant in which the worker is employed, and for the purpose of expanding the political activities of these union organizations. This money is controlled by the union leaders, and this individual worker, if he chooses to pay these fees without becoming a member of the union, has no opportunity whatsoever of expressing himself with respect to the activities of the union unless he becomes a member.

If he does choose to become a member, in all probability his voice carries but little more weight, as is reflected by the disturbed condition in some major unions.

There is a deep and underlying principle involved here, a principle that should be protected by this Congress, that is individual freedom. It is our job as lawmakers to protect the individual in doing what he wants to do in such matters without being subjected to the abuses and the underlying principle of not being forced to support the activities of others in their pursuit of endeavors to which he is opposed. The underlying freedom is to choose his own representation in dealing with his employer, or in the event of his work to go that extra mile in an effort to get a promotion.

This Senate, in its investigation of labor organizations, which began some several years ago and which is still continuing, has disclosed abuses in some union organizations. It has been found that such unions are active politically; that men have been forced to financially support candidates that they did not wish to support; members have been requested to pay special assessments for political purposes; and have had pressure placed upon them in order to force these political contributions. As a matter of fact, it is believed by some that unions spend far more money in political activities than is ever collected through the processes of their political arm commonly referred to as COPE. Many of the union executives and business managers of the various locals, while being paid by the unions, become active in politics and spend perhaps more of their time in political endeavors than they do in representing the workers. Yet, these workers who may disagree with these leaders, politically or on political issues, are forced to contribute their funds for the purpose of maintaining those individuals, paying their salaries and their expenses while they thus devote their time to political issues and political candidates.

As evidence of the pressures that are thus applied I need only refer to the recent press reports to the effect that some of the American labor unions have purchased computer equipment to be used in keeping tabs on their members regarding their "cooperation with the union." They keep tabs as to whether the union member pays his dues, whether he contributes to COPE, whether he pays his political assessments, or a hundred and one other pieces of information that will determine his measure of cooperation, and whether this union member is a cooperative member. That is, cooperative with the program developed by the union leaders.

The argument has been presented by right-to-work opponents that all an employee must do under a union shop agreement is to pay his proportionate share of the cost of the union in representation of its members. Section 14(b) opponents contend in addition that this is only fair, that after a union is certified as a bargaining agent, after a majority vote of the employees, the union must then by law represent all of the employees, union and nonunion alike.

I am not in agreement with such arguments. In my opinion, the contents are quite exaggerated in favor of union representation. In the first place, it is difficult for me to believe that every worker forced to pay tribute to these unions would concur in the opinion that he is benefited by the union. One could ask, what benefits? Certainly we have seen increases generally in all wages. This has been required in a competitive labor market whether a plant be unionized or nonunionized. Most assuredly in a nonunionized plant a worker is not forced to pay an initiation fee, nor forced to pay annual dues and thus permit their being deducted from his paycheck.

In all probability, the actual take-home pay of a worker in a nonunion plant would be larger than that of a worker in a union plant. There is considerable question whether these workers are really benefiting from those various negotiations carried on by union leaders.

Second, I would remind opposition proponents that because of the irritating grievance procedures and the constant harrassment emanating from some unwise labor leaders that we have examples in America of industry moving from one location to another in order to avoid these harrassing situations. When these industries move, these workers lose their jobs, be they union members or nonunion members, and they are either forced to sell their homes and move elsewhere in order to stay with that particular industry, or they are forced to seek employment in other establishments where there may or may not be demands for their skills. Many of these workers are older, beyond the age of immediate employment, and find it most difficult if not impossible to find suitable work at all. It is these groups that exhaust the funds available to them through the unemployment compensation program. Certainly we do not wish to encourage such matters.

And what of the industries that have been closed or forced to reduce their operations because of inability or lack of desire to conform to union demands? It must be of little solace indeed to the worker thus unemployed to know that he has been represented at the bargaining table by one allegedly working for his benefit. This worker most assuredly did not benefit.

The right-to-work opposition arguments just stated imply that a union is designated as the bargaining agent only after a majority of the employees have duly voted for that union to be their bargaining agent. However, under recent interpretations and decisions of the National Labor Relations Board some employers have been required to bargain with unions when no elections were held. The decisions were based on a new type of petition and authorization for NLRB election cards devised by unions where the worker authorizes the union to represent him (153 NLRB No. 120).

Workers signed these cards, possibly in their homes, maybe under pressure, and probably feeling there would be an election. They were given no opportunity of hearing the other side of the question and changing their minds. They are captives and can only escape from their captive position through the painful process of decertification. That is not a fair election. That is not a decision by secret ballot.

Many workers are therefore unable to cope with able union organizers, especially when they have not been privileged to hear the other side of the argument. A worker may refuse to sign but may become the victim of a union shop contract. He had no opportunity to express his views to his fellow workers before an election. I say that is not fairness.

Another argument in opposition to 14(b) is that the union and its officers spend much time and effort in representation of employees, both union and nonunion. Thus, say right-to-work opponents, it is only just to require all employees to pay for such time and effort.

Of course the law is clear that unions must represent those workers within the bargaining unit regardless of membership or nonmembership in the union. I feel, however, that as we consider this question we must bear in mind that this is not a burden imposed upon the labor unions through congressional action contrary to union wishes. It is a privilege that was sought by unions late in the 1930's when the National Labor Relations Act was before the Congress for consideration. The late William Green, president of the AFL at that time, and his coworkers, were the principal proponents of that section of the law. They sought and they secured the privilege of representing all workers within a bargaining train, they now call free riders, because they do not want to pay an assessed fare. The records of the committees of the Congress at that time reveal that organized labor was the principal advocate of the requirement that unions represent all employees in the bargaining unit regardless of union membership, and now they seek another privilege. They want again to use this Congress to force their will upon these people who refuse to join. They want to make them pay the fare.

In the arguments against 14(b) to which I am now referring, it is stressed rather emphatically that these nonunion members in the bargaining unit were the recipients of benefits hard won by union negotiations. Whether or not a worker benefits by union representation is a matter that only the worker himself can decide. Who in this body knows what they want? They may possess different points of view from ours. They may feel that they would have done better without representation.

It is true that a nonunion member has the right under law to call upon the representative of the union in the bargaining unit to represent him in matters of personal grievances with his employer. Conceivably this worker may prefer to express his own grievances to his employer. We have no knowledge to support the contention that union representatives work as diligently in behalf of nonunion members as they do their own members.

The records are replete with examples where unions have called strikes because of the discharge or mistreatment of union members, but I have as yet to have called to my attention any instance where unions have called strikes for the purpose of protecting nonunion members. If the impressions that I have gained are correct, we cannot in fairness say that the unions give equal representation to all members of the bargaining unit. This is a question, that should receive considerable thought before we, as members of this body, attempt to further impose upon nonunion members the obligation of supporting unions with which they disagree.

Certainly I am not criticizing unions for being more diligent in behalf of their members, perhaps they should be. However, I believe we should know and understand the true picture before taking action that would impose a burden upon the nonunion workers in the manner proposed. Right-to-work opponents have stated that one advantage of legalizing the union shop would be the corresponding uniformity of contract throughout the 50 States.

We now have a uniform Federal law. The only deviation therefrom is that in some States the people and their legislative representatives have determined to utilize the privileges granted them, by the Congress in section 14(b) to enact laws that prevent discrimination against a worker for union membership or nonunion membership. Some States have not. These laws that were enacted read in substance that no person shall be denied employment or be expelled from his job because of membership or nonmembership in a union. These laws protect the union member as well as the nonunion member. They are fair, they are impartial, and there is nothing in the Taft-Hartley law or in the Constitution of the United States that prevents any State among the 50 from enacting similar laws.

Several States have attempted to do so only to find that dominant union pressures in those States have prevented the legislature from taking this progressive action. They have gained this position of dominance in these non-right-to-work States, of which there are 31, and in some of those States have held this position of dominance for a good number of years. They have been seeking this same dominance at the national level, and the mere fact that we are considering this issue here today is indicative of the fact that they have made substantial headway.

Opponents of right to work point out that out of the employed people of America, estimated to be 75 million, only 17 million workers are now members of a union. It is then argued that those who do not wish to join a union do not lose their right to work, that a person who does not join a union, or pay union dues, has ample opportunity to seek employment elsewhere.

The important factor here is the contention, that if a man, because of some basic principle, religion, or simply for personal convictions does not wish to be a member of a union or pay tribute to a union, there is a vast number of opportunities, some 58 million, for him to secure employment outside unionized operations. Now, this sounds reasonably good until one places upon these conclusions the microscopic eye of analysis and weights the findings by the facts of life. Many of these workers who could be opposed to becoming members of a union have been working in their present position for a number of years, have developed skills for which they are receiving good wages, and have passed beyond the age of 40, an age that seemingly has become the maximum age limit for any new employment by an industrial establishment in America.

Industries have developed this basic level because of their retirement and fringe benefit programs. If the employee is to receive the full benefit thereof, he must be on the job and working by the time he is 40 years of age to provide adequate retirement. Consequently, people who are discharged for whatever reason beyond the age of 40 find it extremely difficult to secure new employment. More especially is this so if they are skilled workers in an industrial establishment that has these retirement programs, and most substantial industries do. In theory the opposition arguments appear to be correct, but these skills the workers have developed do not equip them for suitable employment in most of the other industries employing the other 58 million people. As a matter of fact, most of these other 58 million jobs are not manufacturing jobs at all, but in the service and distributive fields. As a result of these conditions, a worker beyond the age of 40 working in an industrial establishment, who has developed skills that warrant him premium pay is simply forced to go along. He is going to be forced to pay tribute to this union with which he disagrees and which he does not want to represent him. That will simply mean that he will have deducted from his weekly paycheck this tribute that we are considering imposing upon him, for a service that he does not desire to receive.

That is not fair. We should not deny this individual his freedom to continue in his employment where he has been employed satisfactorily for a great number of years. We should not subject him to these pressures. We should not force him to make contributions to an organization with which he is in disagreement in order to satisfy those who have forced this representation upon him. A majority of the people in my State, and in the Nation, are in agreement with this position.

Turning to another argument, it is said unionization in the 19 States that presently outlaw the union shop is lower than is the case in the other 31 States. If it be so, it is so for two reasons.

In the first place, in the non-right-to-work States, people are not permitted to work in union shops unless they are members of a union or pay tribute to a union. In these States that can have the union shop, there are literally thousands of workers who are members of the union because they are working in operations that have union shops and they are, therefore, forced to be members of those unions, or at least pay tribute to them. Inasmuch as they have to pay tribute to them, they find it to their advantage to become members of the union so that they may at least have the privilege of attending union meetings to see what is going on.

In the right-to-work States, these persons who do not want to be members of a union can continue peacefully in their employment without the necessity of paying tribute and, consequently, do not see any necessity of being a member of a union. So, union membership in these States is naturally lower. There is certainly nothing wrong with that.

Perhaps there is another reason. There is nothing in a right-to-work State that prevents an individual from joining a union, but it becomes incumbent upon the representatives of a union to sell that individual the idea that it is to his advantage to become a member. Just because the unions have failed in this opportunity, does not mean we can rightfully assume that it is incumbent upon us to enact legislation to bail the unions out of a situation that has developed because of their own incapacity to sell their product. We should not bring force upon those who do not wish to buy the union product.

In answer to the argument that the wage index in the right-to-work States is lower than in the non-right-to-work States, I submit that whether it is true or not true, it is somewhat immaterial. All of us know that during the course of the development of our Nation, the States which are now right-to-work States were primarily the agricultural States, the ranching States, the producers of the raw materials, and not the manufacturing States.

Manufacturing was concentrated in the East and in the North, and by virtue of this concentration of skilled laborers, naturally the wage structure was higher. In these right-to-work States it has not as yet caught up. These wages, the income of the workers, were substantially higher in these current non-right-to-work States long before there was even enacted any National Labor Relations Act, any Taft-Hartley law, or any right-to-work law. It has been historically so. The right-to-work States are making some progress toward closing this gap, and I believe that in the interest of the Nation they should be encouraged to do so. The Bureau of Economic Security of the Department of Labor reports for 1964 show that unemployment in the right-to-work States was only 4 percent while in the non-right-to-work States, it was 5 percent. The Department of Commerce reports that from August 1960 to April 1965, in right-to-work States, personal income increased 27.2 percent, while in non-right-to-work States, the increase was 25.5 percent.

Opponents of right to work frequently endeavor to deal in the field of economics, and more especially in that phase of economics that applies to income growth and expansion.

I do not have figures before me substantiating their arguments. However, I think perhaps such arguments are somewhat insignificant for the reasons pointed out in the discussion of the preceding paragraph. I would say to you, and to the Members of this Senate, that the per capita income has nothing to do with this issue here. As a matter of fact, it is somewhat of a false issue because per capita income includes the income of the rich as well as the poor.

The question we are discussing here has to do with the wage-earner and not with the number of millionaires, the billionaires, or coupon clippers that may exist and be more numerous in the older industrial and more highly developed States. Per capita income, as we all know, includes the income of every individual in the States from the richest to the poorest. So, it is not much of a criterion by which to judge the well-being of the working people in any particular State.

In some of the arguments presented against right-to-work, a point was made of comparing my State, Texas, with that good State of Illinois, because Illinois is now comparable in population. There again, population does not have much to do with income; it depends on what the people are doing.

My State, being a rather large State, a varied State, extensive in area, and sparsely populated in some sections compared against the more congested, populated State of Illinois might not be a good comparison. Let's look at some statistics. First, let me deal with this issue of per capita income.

The Texas right-to-work law was enacted in 1947, and has since remained as a statute of the State. The per capita income of the State of Illinois for the period of 1947 to 1963 increased 81.5 percent whereas in Texas during that same period, the per capita income increased 83.3 percent, or approximately 2 percent more rapidly than was the case in Illinois.

The "Statistical Abstract of the United States" reveals that Illinois had a population of 8,397,000 people in 1947, whereas the State of Texas had only 7,104,000. The population increased in both States. By 1963, according to this same Federal document, Illinois had a population of 10,182,000, or a growth of only 21.3 percent. In 1963, Texas, according to the "Statistical Abstract," had 10,323,000 or a growth in population of 45.3 percent. That is given not because of any bearing or significance on the statements here made or the issue under discussion, but primarily to get the record straight, and to point to the fact that there must be something in my State that is appealing to the people, or else our population would not have grown so rapidly.

Undoubtedly an attempt has been made to leave the impression that Texas, because of its right-to-work law, is not doing as well as the good State of Illinois, which has no right-to-work law. Cited has been the comparative industrial payrolls or the manufacturing payrolls of the two States. Again, I would like to make a comparison, and in doing so I would respectfully request that it be kept in mind that the economy of the two States differ. Inasmuch as the issue with respect to manufacturing has been raised, I want to cite a few figures in this connection. In the State of Illinois in 1947, there were 1,184,000 industrial employees on the average according to "The Statistical Abstract of the United States." By 1962, the latest available figure, this number had increased to 1,195,000, or an increase of 0.86 percent, which is less than 1 percent.

Whereas in the State of Texas in 1947, there were 297,053 manufacturing employees, while in 1962 there were 497,000 such employees, for an increase of 67.3 percent. The industrial wages paid, according to this same authority, in Illinois in 1947, were $3,585 million, and by 1962 were $7,191 million, or an increase of 100.6 percent. In the State of Texas in 1947, when the right-to-work law was enacted, manufacturing wage earners received $755 million, and this increased in 1962 to $2,667 million, or an increase of 253.4 percent. I leave the interpretation of these figures to the good judgment of the Members of the Senate as to whether or not this comparison reflects a favorable impact of right-to-work laws. While making this comparison and just for the record, the Department of Commerce figures show that personal income in Illinois increased 20.7 percent for the period 1959 to 1964, while during the same period, income increased in Texas by 27 percent.

Now, let us make a comparison of the growth between 1947 and 1962 as reported by "The Statistical Abstract of the United States." In Illinois in 1947, value added by manufacturing was $6,680 million, and by 1962 this had increased to $13,676 million, or an increase of 104.7 percent. In the State of Texas during this same period of time, value added by manufacturing increased from $1,727 million in 1947, to $6,361 million in 1962, or an increase of 268.3 percent. Again, I will leave it to the good judgment of this Senate as to which of the States has progressed most rapidly in this respect.

It occurs to me that the above figures, which I have been quoting to you previously, do not tell the true story in the fashion that it should be told, if, in fact, the question of economics has any place in this discussion at all.

The employee figures and the wage and salary figures mentioned previously apply to all workers from the top executives down to the janitors, or from the lowest paid to the highest. It seems to me that a more significant set of figures would be the production workers, those who are more amenable to unionization and from which the great body of union members come. Inasmuch as this comparison was begun, by those opposing 14(b), with respect to the States of Texas and Illinois, I shall continue it as I have said, but in this instance deal with production workers and their wages as reported by "The Statistical Abstract of the United States." This authoritative source of information reveals that in 1947, Illinois had 954,415 production workers and by 1962 this number had decreased to 837,000, or an approximate decrease of 12.2 percent. In Texas, in 1947, there were 242,000 production workers and this had increased by 1962 to 351,000, for an increase of 45 percent. So while, numerically speaking, the production workers were decreasing by 12.2 percent in Illinois, they were increasing by 45 percent in Texas. These figures certainly do not reflect an evil impact upon job opportunity by State right-to-work laws.

What about the wages of these employees? "The Statistical Abstract of the United States" unfortunately did not give the hourly wages in both years but it did provide information as to the amount of these wages which in turn could be divided by the number of workers to arrive at the annual wages. In Illinois in 1947, the total payroll of production workers was $2,627 million and by 1962 this had increased to $4,440 million which was 170 percent of the 1947 figure. In Texas, wages earned by production workers increased from $558 million in 1947 to $1,634 million in 1962, or 293 percent of the 1947 figure. Through the simple process of division, we find that these production workers' annual average earnings in Illinois in 1947 were $2,700, and I deal only in round numbers, which increased to $5,300 by 1962, for an increase of 96 percent. In Texas, the average annual earnings in 1947 approximated $2,300 and by 1962 this had increased to $4,650, for an increase of 102 percent. Thus, it is evident that Texas secured a far more rapid industrial growth.

While Illinois was having a decrease in production workers, Texas had an increase. The average earnings of those workers in Texas increased more rapidly than in Illinois, and I would remind you that Illinois has no right-to-work law, but does have the union shop. Texas has a right-to-work law and no union shop.

I have previously referred to recent decisions or actions of the National Labor Relations Board wherein that body has required employers to negotiate with unions when no elections had been held. The negotiation requirements were based entirely upon signed cards, where a majority of the workers had signed authorizing the union to represent them. As I have noted, any person knowledgeable in the field here under discussion readily appreciates that many of these workers are visited in their homes, sometimes by individuals and sometimes by committees, and are submitted to substantial pressure to sign these cards calling for elections.

The first paragraph of the card does call for an election. The second paragraph authorizes the union to represent him. I should imagine, therefore, that many of those who sign the cards do so in the belief that there will be a secret-ballot election only to be faced with the fact a short time later that the National Labor Relations Board has directed the employer to negotiate with the union and no election has been held or is to be held.

If we could assume, however, that no pressure was applied, and this is a big assumption, we as Members of this Senate should recognize the fact that on these occasions the employer has had no opportunity to present his point of view to the workers; that the workers have had no opportunity to become familiar with the disadvantages, if there are any, of being a member of the union; or the impact that the union might have upon his employer. There are many facets to such matters that have not been called to his attention at the time he signed the card. These, if presented, might cause him to change his mind and vote differently in a secret-ballot election.

Inasmuch as the National Labor Relations Board has already begun the practice of calling these elections based on this type of authorization card, there is no reason to believe that it will not be expanded and, consequently, the so-called secret elections will be less frequently used in the future than in the past.

Should we enact into law H.R. 77 repealing section 14(b) of Taft-Hartley, then those workers in plants who signed no cards and where no elections are held will become, without the opportunity of expressing their views, captive members of that union, or captive contributors to that union with no avenue of escape except through the turbulent process of decertification.

It seems to me that under these conditions and in the face of this new type of decision being made by the National Labor Relations Board that it becomes increasingly important that these so-called right-to-work laws be permitted to remain on the statute books of the States.

This NLRB practice, in my opinion, is most unwise. Under such practice, it is only through the individual worker's ability to withdraw from the union that he would have any opportunity of exerting his own beliefs and demands with respect to unionization and the operations of that union. This is a serious matter. We are dealing with the freedoms of people and we are dealing with one of man's most basic and fundamental freedoms, the freedom to work at one's vocation in the plant of one's choice where a mutually satisfactory relationship exists between the worker and the employer. We are also dealing with his, the worker, being required to pay into a labor union without having had any voice in deciding whether the plant should be unionized.

There are many answers to the contention in the opposition arguments that employees allegedly benefiting from labor union representation should contribute to the support of the union. I maintain that for a union and an employer to sign a contract forcing a third party, the worker, to contribute to a labor union may violate basic rights. Such action in effect may be said to take his property without due process. It permits two people to sign a contract that affects the third, which forces his payment of dues or contributions of his hard-earned money to the union in order to retain his job and earn for himself and his family the necessities of life.

There are many, many arguments that could be advanced on this issue. Perhaps, however, they are best summed up briefly by Judge Carter of the Nebraska Supreme Court in a decision rendered some years ago in which he said:

"If an employee is compelled to join a union against his will in order to continue his employment, he not only pays his share of the cost of the union bargaining process, but he is compelled to support many other principles, policies, programs, and activities to which he may not subscribe. Some unions support a form of life insurance which pays death benefits. Others support a welfare fund for the benefit of needy members. Some unions maintain a strike fund to protect employees while on a strike. Some establish funds to be used in the furtherance of economic and political principles in which an employee may have no confidence. In some instances, compulsory membership would compel support, financial and otherwise, of policies which an employee might deem objectionable from the standpoint of free government and the liberties of the individual under it. An employee may neither desire to benefit from such programs nor desire to contribute to their support. He may object to certain programs and activities of the union for a reason of his own and, consequently, not desire to contribute to their promulgation. To compel any employee to make involuntary contributions from his compensation for such purposes is a taking of his property without due process of law."

Another argument used by those opposing right to work is through comparison of labor unions with municipalities, an argument which, in my opinion, is grossly misused. It is inferred that the same responsibility rests upon the individual worker in an organized plant who is not supporting a union, that rests upon the individual in a municipality who may be required to pay his taxes in support of a program voted by a majority of the people of that municipality. I suggest that there is no basis at all for this argument. One is a vehicle of government created under the Constitution of the United States and of the various States of the Union, created for the purpose of maintaining order; providing public services; and serving the people of the area. It is legally an authoritative group, it is government. The same cannot be said with respect to a labor union because that is a private organization. It is not a vehicle of government; it is not a constitutional authority as is the municipality. In my opinion, it is most erroneous to offer as an argument that labor unions as such, regardless of their fine quality, should be placed on a parallel with a municipal government or, for that matter, any level of government created by the people for the purpose of governing themselves.

Our Government, as Abraham Lincoln once said, is a "government of the people, for the people, and by the people." There are provisions in the Constitution and the laws of the Nation and the States which require that the various legislative bodies, which enact laws and levy taxes, submit themselves for reelection in a democratic fashion at regular intervals. They are, therefore, accountable to the people for their acts. Union elections differ materially from this process. In many instances such elections are controlled to a large degree from the top. It takes, in some cases, a major and courageous uprising for the individual members to have any effective voice in the selection of union leadership. Admittedly, in many union constitutions there are provisions that in theory would enable its members to vote in the selection of leadership, but the union operating machinery makes this, in many cases, ineffective. The individual who is required by H.R. 77 to contribute to a union without being a member would have no such semblance of a voice.

Aside from the foregoing differences, which are adequate, there is no authority invested in any legislative group at the National, State, or local levels which enables them to require that an individual, through taxes or otherwise, make contributions toward the furtherance of the political aims and objectives of the legislative group of the administrative group then in power. It is common knowledge with respect to labor unions that many union activities are aimed toward political endeavors and programs outside the area of collective bargaining.

Right-to-work opponents have also made a comparison between compulsory unionism or compulsory contributions to unions, and so-called integrated bars in the various States of the Nation as applied to attorneys. Comparisons have also been made with respect to physicians and the requirements by some hospitals that physicians be members of their medical associations in order to practice in certain hospitals.

Taking the bar association first, I would call your attention to the fact that there are some members of the legal fraternity who do not agree with the integrated bar principle. But let's accept facts as they are, many States do have an integrated bar. In every instance, members of the legal fraternity must pass a bar examination established by the State, many of which are conducted by a special committee created by the supreme court or by some authority created by the State.

It is a professional group that is required to meet professional standards as established by the legislative body of the State. Furthermore, in those States having the integrated bar, the bar is charged by statute with the responsibility of policing the profession and, therefore, is in actuality functioning as a department of government. In my State, at least, all attorneys are officers of the court by virtue of these statutes and as such have quasi-governmental responsibility.

The medical profession is one that requires approximately 12 years of schooling and internship. A doctor is not required, insofar as I know, to be a member of the medical association. Some hospitals do require that a physician be a member of the local or county association in order to practice medicine in that particular hospital. This, however, is not law. It is the decision of the management of the hospital, a decision that they have made in order to assure that those who practice in their facility have the qualifications necessary to properly care for patients.

The professional standards required for attorneys and physicians are quite different from those required by unions because only the union leadership determines the standards that must be met by a prospective member or a member of that union. Even these standards in many instances are subject to various deviations including the union's desire for membership. So, in fact, there is no basis for the comparison that has been made.

In conclusion, it is my belief that this Congress should be concerned with protecting the individual freedoms of all mankind and among those is the freedom to work. As I have previously indicated, this session of the Congress and each preceding session for several years has spent considerable time and passed considerable legislation in an effort to guarantee more effectively the freedoms provided for under the Constitution to the citizens of America; to assure minority groups that they would have the same freedoms as would the majority. In my opinion, it ill behooves us here to enact a law that will strike at the most vital of all freedoms, the freedom to earn a living in one's chosen profession or chosen skill in a plant of his choice, where his relationship with his employer is satisfactory, without being compelled to pay monetary tribute and other support to a private organization with which he is not in agreement, and which conceivably may be of doubtful benefit to him.

Our forefathers were most careful in their efforts in establishing this Government to protect the freedoms of the individuals and minority groups and their action has proven to be wise.

As I have cited previously, according to national polls, 67 percent of the American people indicated that they are opposed to forced union membership, more specifically, opposed to outlawing the right-to-work laws by statute. With that thought in mind, it occurs to me that, if as the advocates of this opposition statement indicate, they feel that unions should be put on a parity with government, they come forth with a legislative proposal that would submit this question of forced union membership and forced contributions to unions to the voters of America. If they feel that unions are on a parity with government, then they should propose that it be treated as government and let the people affected, and all are either directly or indirectly, decide the kind of unions they want and the leadership they desire.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on this floor several days ago I spelled out the reasons why I intended to cast my vote for repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. Since we are denied a test of 14(b) on its merits this year, I would voice my hope, shared by many of my colleagues, I know, that this body will proceed to consideration of the issue early next year after we again convene.

Because my State's name has been raised repeatedly in the past week or more, Mr. President, I want today to interject just a few brief remarks to set the record straight. The so-called right-to-work law enacted in Wyoming in 1963 has been no boon to the State's economy. Nor has it been good for our unions. At the next general election following its enactment the people of Wyoming sent to Cheyenne a State house of representatives pledged to repeal the law. And, despite considerable odds, they sent to the State capitol a senate which came within one vote of also voting for repeal. Given a representative legislature, which we will have, it may be safe to predict that Wyoming, following the wishes of its people, will shed itself of the right-to-work issue no matter what we in this Chamber may do.

On union membership in the State, Mr. President, it has been said here that enactment of the right-to-work law resulted in a gain. For some unions, for some locals, this is apparently true because of what President Thomas R. Lee, of Local No. 8201, Communications Workers of America, calls "a lot of hard work on the part of our unions." Many workers, he adds, joined because they were fearful of what right-to-work might do to their rights.

However, it should be noted that the membership gains recorded between 1960 and the end of 1963, the year in which right-to-work took effect in the State, reflect increases which came before, not after, the law's passage. Further, decreases have since been recorded, so that today, I am told, membership in labor organizations affiliated with the AFL-CIO in Wyoming numbers only some 15,000. Many workers, including many active union members and officers, even, have left the State. Overall population growth in the State, according to the current resident and civilian resident population reports from the U.S. Bureau of Census, has been well below the national average, which is estimated at 8.1 percent since the 1960 census. The Wyoming growth in total resident population has been 3.1 percent, lowest of the Mountain and Pacific States.

I am among those, Mr. President, who seek to develop to its fullest the rich potential of Wyoming and her sister States. And, indeed, this Congress and the administration now in office have taken strides along this path with such programs as the Public Works and Economic Development Act. We would do well in this regard to free our States of the phony competition based on cheap labor, which is the appeal for some in right-to-work laws. And there are many other fruitful areas, where remedial steps must be taken. In Wyoming, for instance, government, industry, and labor must move to correct the State's ranking, which is 49th among the 50 States, in the field of industrial safety. There is an example of a real job to be done—a job requiring a firm governmental hand, industry's cooperation, and, I hold, a strong labor movement.

We can look at one more statistic relative to the contention that right-to-work has benefited Wyomingites. That is the per capita personal income. In Wyoming, Mr. President, we have for years been blessed with a somewhat more-than-average personal income figure. Since 1950, Wyoming slipped slightly below the national average briefly in 1955–56, then climbed back above it. But now, Mr. President, we have slipped again, and, in 1964, according to the August Survey of Current Business, the per capita personal income in Wyoming was $2,441, compared to the U.S. average of $2,566.

The moral to this may be the old saw about statistics being capable of use to prove any point, for, to be sure, those who support the right-to-work law can and do marshall their own figures. The result is a lot of sound and fury, a symptom of what I referred to here Saturday as the divisiveness created by right-to-work laws. Wyoming, to be sure, has many problems to solve in its quest for progress and development. They are problems requiring unity, not a continual contentious debate over the phony issue of right-to-work.

CLARIFICATION OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY TOWARD LATIN AMERICA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to report to the Senate on developments that have taken place in the last 2 weeks with respect to what I regard as a much-needed clarification of U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America.

The source of the confusion stems primarily from House Resolution 560 which was agreed to by the House of Representatives September 20 and which says, in its most objectionable part, that any threat of subversive domination in any member of the Organization of American States justifies a response "which could go so far as resort to armed force" by any other member. In order to make clear that I am not quoting out of context, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of House Resolution 560 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of House Resolution 560 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H. RES. 560

Whereas the American Continents, by the international communism, operating secretly and openly, directly and indirectly, threaten the sovereignty and political independence of all the Western Hemisphere nations; and

Whereas the American Continent, by the free and independent positions which they have assumed and maintained, are not subject to colonization or domination by any power; and

Whereas the intervention of international communism, directly or indirectly, however disguised, in any American state, conflicts with the established policy of the American Republics for the protection of the sovereignty of the peoples of such states and the political independence of their governments; and

Whereas such a situation extended to any portions of the Western Hemisphere is dangerous to the peace and safety of the whole of it, including the United States; and

Whereas the ninth meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs Serving as Organ of Consultation in Application of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance recognized that acts possessing characteristics of aggression and intervention carried out against one or more of the member states of the Organization of American States may be responded to in either individual or collective form, which could go as far as resort to armed force, until such time as the Organ of Consultation takes measures to guarantee the peace and security of the hemisphere: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that (1) any such subversive domination or threat of it violates the principles of the Monroe Doctrine, and of collective security as set forth in the acts and resolutions heretofore adopted by the American Republics; and

(2) In any such situation any one or more of the high contracting parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance may, in the exercise of individual or collective self-defense, which could go so far as resort to armed force, and in accordance with the declarations and principles above stated, take steps to forestall or combat intervention, domination, control, and colonization in whatever form, by the subversive forces known as international communism and its agencies in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in fairness to the House of Representatives and to the Department of State, it should be pointed out that during debate on House Resolution 560, the resolution's principal sponsor, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], entered a mild disclaimer, at the request of the State Department, that the resolution meant what it said. I quote from the remarks of the gentleman on page 24348 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 20:

> I want to point out that the Department of State generally agrees with the objectives of the proposed resolution and so stated in its testimony before the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs. In reviewing the resolution passed by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the committee report, the Department of State has informed me that it would have preferred that the last "whereas" paragraph and the second operative paragraph follow more precisely the language of paragraph V of resolution I of the Ninth Meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, * * * so as to make clear that the House does not intend to say that a mere threat of subversion, standing alone, justifies the unilateral use of armed force—to make clear that the Houes does not intend to depart from existing inter-American treaties and resolutions on the subject. The Department of State has said that the legislative history should, in any case, clearly show that it is not the intention of House Resolution 560 to depart from the policy laid out in paragraph V of resolution I.
>
> While this particular paragraph refers specifically to Cuba, the principle of self-defense has general application.
>
> I assured the Department of State that the legislative intent would be made clear in this respect and, on this basis, the Department withdrew whatever objections it might have had.

Mr. President, one may reasonably ask, if it was not the intention of the House to depart from existing inter-American treaties and resolutions, why did it do so? Questions also naturally arose as to why the Department of State was not less equivocal in its comments to the House.

In an effort to clarify the situation, the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations met at length with Under Secretary of State Thomas C. Mann on September 30. Several members of the full committee were present, as well as members of the subcommittee.

We had a full and satisfactory discussion which covered not only the questions raised by House Resolution 560 but also the substance of two resolutions which have been proposed in the Senate—Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, introduced September 2 by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and Senate Resolution 150, introduced September 29 by myself and the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. I ask unanimous consent that the texts of these two resolutions be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the texts of Senate Concurrent Resolution 56 and Senate Resolution 150 were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 56

Whereas recent events in the Dominican Republic have suggested the desirability of strengthening the inter-American system to facilitate the taking of prompt and effective multilateral action when required to maintain the peace, security, and freedom of the Americas; and

Whereas a prime objective of the Organization of American States and of the United States is to strengthen freedom in the Americas by upholding the right of the people to self-determination and by encouraging confidence in and respect for constitutional and democratic governments, and to foster conditions to insure against subversion and infiltration by the forces of international communism or ultra-rightist forces which pose a constant danger to the freedom of the people of the Americas; and

Whereas the Organization of American States and the United States are committed to accelerated economic development and social progress in the Americas, as the right road toward freedom, dignity, security, and peace for all the people of the Americas, and to prevent infiltration or subversion by Communist or ultra-rightist forces: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

1. The United States again pledges its faith in the oldest of the regional security systems established in accordance with the United Nations Charter, the collective security system of the Americas under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance and the Charter of the Organization of American States, and again pledges its efforts to preserve and strengthen free democratic institutions and to encourage and contribute to accelerated economic development and social progress in the Americas, as set forth in the Act of Bogotá of 1960 and the Charter of Punta del Este of 1961.

2. The United States, while continuing to reserve the inherent right of self-defense, consonant with its treaty obligations under the inter-American system and the United Nations Charter, joins in the determination of the member states of the Organization of American States to maintain a common defense against aggression and subversion within the Americas, including efforts to subvert free institutions by infiltration and other forms of interference in the internal affairs of any nation in the Americas.

3. The United States should seek to improve the authority and capability of the

Organization of American States to take timely action in emergencies affecting the peace and security of any nation in the Americas in accordance with the requirements of a common defense set forth in the preceding paragraph of this resolution, by standing ready to support and assist in the establishment of means to undertake peacekeeping efforts under the auspices of the Organization of American States, and by such other procedures as the President may deem appropriate, consonant with the Constitution, the inter-American system, and the United Nations Charter.

4. The United States should encourage and support collective consultation among the members of the inter-American system and with Canada with a view to refraining from the establishment of diplomatic relations with, and denying military and economic aid to, any regime brought into power in a member state by the unconstitutional overthrow of a freely elected, constitutional, democratic government ruling in accordance with its constitutional mandate, and to requiring, as a precondition to the establishment of diplomatic relations and the extension of military and economic aid, prior commitments for the restoration of constitutional government, for the holding of free elections, and for the application of human and civil rights and liberties, within a reasonable time, and a sincere dedication to accelerated economic development and social progress within the framework of personal dignity and political liberty; and should encourage and support other common efforts to strengthen constitutional, democratic, and progressive government in the Americas.

5. The United States should continue its active support of the Alliance for Progress with emphasis on self-help and mutual cooperation; economic integration of the Americas through common markets, free trade areas, or other appropriate means; the encouragement of other developed nations to maintain an appropriate level of development aid in the Americas; and the encouragement of the growth of the private enterprise system and of conditions to enhance its capability for accelerating economic development and social progress in the Americas.

S. Res. 150

Whereas the Constitution of the United States, in article II, section 2, provides for the Senate to give its advice and consent to the President with respect to treaties; and

Whereas the Senate in 1947 gave its advice and consent to ratification of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance which provides for consultation and collective action, in accordance with the constitutional processes of each of the parties, to meet threats to peace and security of the Hemisphere; and

Whereas the Senate in 1950 gave its advice and consent to ratification of the Charter of the Organization of American States which prohibits intervention by one State in the affairs of another: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate further advise the President that the foreign policy of the United States should be conducted in consonance with these and other treaty obligations which were freely entered into.

Sec. 2. It is the further sense of the Senate that the foreign policy of the United States, with respect to the Western Hemisphere, should be directed toward achievement of the following major objectives:

(a) The economic growth rates and social reforms set forth in the Alliance for Progress, as embodied in the Charter of Punta del Este, including the encouragement of the development of regional markets; and

(b) Collective defense of the hemisphere against aggression or subversion as provided in the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance and more specifically in the resolutions of the Eight and Ninth Meetings of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, dated respectively in Punta del Este, January 31, 1962, and Washington, June 26, 1964.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a result of our discussions in the Foreign Relations Committee with Secretary Mann, we reached an informal understanding that efforts would be made to draft a document which would clearly state our policy toward Latin America and on which there could be general agreement on the part of the State Department, the Foreign Relations Committee and hopefully also the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House.

These efforts have not been successful. The proposed tentative draft of the statement submitted to my subcommittee by the Department of State is completely unsatisfactory. As a consequence, matters stand precisely where they were prior to the meeting of the American Republics Subcommittee with Secretary Mann.

It has become clear to me, Mr. President, that the reason these efforts have not been successful is that the U.S. Government itself is divided over what our Latin American policy should be. To oversimplify, and thereby perhaps to exaggerate this division somewhat, it is between those who believe in an interventionist policy and those who believe in a noninterventionist policy. The division is not between the executive and legislative branches, or between the House and Senate. There are those in each branch on each side of the issue.

In these circumstances, Mr. President, there are two courses of action open to us.

On the one hand, we can attempt to paper over these differences which, in normal circumstances, are not so great as my shorthand description makes them appear. They come sharply to the surface only when crisis situations arise. This alternative would indicate a do-nothing and say-nothing course of action in the Senate, and we would drop the whole matter at this point.

On the other hand, we can thrash out these differences in public debate in the Senate and across the country. Out of such a debate, there would hopefully emerge, if not a consensus, at least a majority view. This alternative would have the short-term disadvantage of perhaps increasing the confusion which already exists concerning our Latin American policy. It would have the long-term advantage of perhaps eliminating the divisions that now bedevil us and of arriving at a rational policy solidly based in public understanding and public support—both here and in Latin America.

This latter alternative would indicate that the Committee on Foreign Relations should proceed forthwith to hearings on Senate Congressional Resolution 56 and Senate Resolution 150 with a view to reporting to the Senate a resolution which could be, in Senator Vandenberg's famous phrase, "totally debated." It seems to me that this is what is needed.

I am reluctant at the moment to pursue this course, however, for three reasons.

One is that the Congress is—we all expect—about to adjourn.

I repeat what I have said in recent days: It is unfortunate that Congress is about to adjourn. I repeat: In my judgment that Congress cannot, under any justification whatsoever, warrant adjournment sine die while American boys are fighting in South Vietnam.

In my judgment, Congress owes to the American people the responsibility of staying in session and exercising its constitutional checks upon an administration that is fighting an unconstitutional and undeclared war in South Vietnam.

But I am well aware that the views of the senior Senator from Oregon will not prevail on this subject.

Mr. President, we are about to adjourn in the not too distant future. I shall leave it to the American people to enter their judgment on the Members of Congress in respect to that adjournment.

The second reason which I point out for thinking that it is not favorable at this time to have the hearings on the two resolutions dealing with the United States-Latin American policy is that the issues involved are of such importance that they should receive the personal and thoughtful attention of the President himself, who is, after all, the only man who can decide the issues insofar as the executive branch of the Government is concerned. I do not believe the President should be called upon to do this while lying in a hospital bed and recuperating from an operation.

The third reason is that, within a few weeks—in fact, we leave on November 17 for the conference—there will convene in Rio a meeting of the OAS Foreign Ministers. It is my confident prediction that, in the best of circumstances, this will be a difficult meeting for the United States.

I believe it would be considerably less difficult if the House of Representatives had not passed House Resolution 560, and if the State Department had been less equivocal about its own position. However, that is water over the dam.

There does not remain enough time for a great debate prior to November 17. I would be less than honest if I did not say, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, that, in my judgment, it would be a mistake to go to Rio in the midst of a great debate over this issue of U.S. policies vis-a-vis Latin America in connection with whether we are going to follow an interventionist or a noninterventionist policy.

There does, however, remain time enough for the State Department to get its own house in order. I am willing at the moment to give them that time and then see what happens in Rio. We can then return to this issue in the Senate, if need be, at the next session of Congress.

I close with a plea to the State Department that we not go to Rio without announcing in advance an official statement from the State Department as to exactly what our policy is in respect to the Rio Treaty, in respect to the Organization of American States Charter, in respect to the agreement of Punta del Este, and in respect to the understanding that was reached in the Washington Conference of Foreign Ministers in 1964. We, on my committee, know that throughout Latin America there is great concern and much misunderstanding over the unfortunate resolution which was passed by the House of Representatives.

I believe it is important, before we arrive in Rio, that the State Department give at least an unequivocal statement to erase its equivocation to date and making perfectly clear that we stand foursquare on our commitments under the treaties to which I have just referred. If we do stand foursquare on those treaties, Mr. President, we will not be frightening Latin American countries into believing that, when some military junta tells the United States it believes it is about to be overthrown by a Communist coup, American marines will be forthwith on their way to Latin America.

Let me say from the floor of the Senate today that if the State Department and this administration continues the unfortunate policy that it started in the Dominican Republic, when it went beyond the use of marines to evacuate American nationals and, in effect, took sides in that revolution in Latin America, we are headed for a repudiation by one democratic government after another in Latin America. And we should be repudiated, because if the United States is going back to a policy of intervention in Latin America, the American people had better be ready to pay the price. It will be a price that will be paid in blood as well as in the loss of our standing in Latin America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial on this subject which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of October 4, 1965.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Oct. 4, 1965]

A LOT TO EXPECT

We hope a Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee under Senator MORSE will draft a restatement of American policy toward Latin America, as an answer to the ill-considered and insulting House resolution advocating unilateral intervention. Even so, the answer will be difficult to explain to aroused Latin Americans. They will be expected to understand that the House cannot speak for U.S. foreign policy, and that the Senate speaks with more authority in this field under our system of government. And they will be expected, perhaps, to forget that the State Department hardly spoke at all when the House passed its measure. This is a lot to expect, which only shows how much damage can be done to American foreign policy by a combination of willful ignorance in Congress and timidity in the State Department.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISTURBANCES AT JOB CORPS CENTERS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, recent news accounts of disturbances at Job Corps centers, however minor most of these disturbances have been, have given rise to some criticisms of the whole program which are quite unjust and unfounded.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial from the Washington Daily News of July 9 and an article from the Washington Post of August 16.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 16, 1965]

AREA JOB CORPS RECRUITS RISE TO 100 A MONTH

(By Robert Fresco)

Job Corps recruitment in the Washington area has picked up in recent weeks after a slow start, according to John Cheston, National Director of Recruitment for the Corps.

The United Planning Organization, which does all corps recruiting in the area, is now processing about 100 men a month, compared with 25 at the start of the program.

The reason for the slow start, says Cheston, is that UPO was badly organized at the outset.

But he adds that although the Job Corps had reason to complain earlier, UPO's present efforts are "the equal of any now going on in the country."

E. Stewart Forrester, head of the recruitment program for UPO, says that his group is using some effective methods not employed elsewhere.

For one thing, UPO has drawn on the idea of the recent Job Corps telecast, "It's What's Happening, Baby," by staging three rock 'n roll shows in the Washington area over the past 2 months.

Forrester estimates that the first show alone, held at Terrell Junior High School in late June, brought in nearly 100 corps applicants.

GANG LEADER SPEAKS

Recently, UPO had a former New York gang leader, now in the Job Corps, talking to youngsters in local neighborhood houses. The response was terrific, says Forrester; those talks brought in dozens of new applicants.

UPO does its recruiting from an old firehouse annex at 635 North Carolina Avenue Southeast. The place resembles a warehouse more than an office. Pipes and fixtures are exposed, and it needs painting.

Forrester says that he could have had more modern facilities, but he prefers these surroundings. "Boys coming from underprivileged backgrounds would be put off by a plush office," he says.

During an average day four or five boys come in to ask about the corps. They are interviewed by one of seven staff counselors. In the interview their education, health, and police records are determined, and they are given intelligence tests.

After the interview, the boy is sent for a medical examination, at UPO's expense. If he passes this, parental consent must then be obtained before he can be sent to a Job Corps camp.

NINETY PERCENT ACCEPTED

About 90 percent of those interviewed, says Forrester, are eventually accepted for the Job Corps. Boys with police records may be taken if the record includes no convictions on serious criminal charges.

Even those who are illiterate are usually accepted, although they are sent to rural camps for schooling before being taken back to urban camps to learn a trade.

UPO's screening process generally takes no more than 10 days, says Forrester. However, this does not mean that those processed are being sent to camp immediately.

Although 368 applicants from the Washington area have been processed, only 129 are now in camps.

The delay, says Cheston, is caused by the fact that the Job Corps still does not have enough camps to accommodate all those who have been recruited, and won't have for several months.

Meanwhile, the several hundred boys now awaiting induction into the corps may have to wait until mid-October before they are placed in camps.

[From the Washington Daily News, July 9, 1965]

BETTING ON BORN LOSERS

One of the many exciting things about the Job Corps has been the ability of its officials to criticize themselves—to admit their errors openly and to proceed without fear, taking new chances and challenges.

They are, after all, adventurers, working on problems which no one else has ever really solved. Of course there will be failures. These boys and girls have lived with failure all their lives—and pretty much accepted it. And those who have tried to help them in the past have done so with little success. Where is there to go but up?

That the Job Corps is now coming in for some outside criticism is a healthy thing. It is the proper business of taxpayers to insist that those who spend their money have respect for it—and spend it honestly and well. The danger, of course is that honest criticism will be seized upon by those who do not want the corps to succeed, who applaud its every shortcoming, and that this backlash will intimidate those who are trying to make it work.

That only 20 percent of enrollees have dropped out of the corps so far seems to us remarkable. The chances that those who have stuck with it will benefit in some way, however small, seem vastly good.

The important thing is to offer these young people what they came for—an opportunity to acquire some skill they can market when they go home. This can only be done if there is a good, solid, well-planned and well-executed program of academic and vocational training. The sooner all the camps have this, the better. However armor-plated these kids may seem, they are extremely vulnerable. Nothing kills them as quickly as boredom or a sense that those in charge do not know what to do.

Meanwhile, we believe in giving the Job Corps every chance. If it falls on its face, we expect it to pick itself up and move on. This is important work, no one expects a miracle, and, as the poet E. E. Cummings once said, "they only understand enormously which fail."

THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT OF 1965 AND THE ADMINISTRATION ON AGING

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, after years of hard work and despite obstructionist tactics of certain officials of the

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Congress passed the "Older Americans Act of 1965."

The new law creates an agency known as the Administration on Aging. That agency, headed by a Commissioner, was intended by the Congress to give high-level representation and leadership, at the Federal level, on behalf of our millions of older citizens.

The Administration on Aging was specifically established, among other reasons, as a direct result of congressional dissatisfaction with both the location and efforts of the Office of Aging in the Welfare Administration. It was crystal clear that older Americans did not want the principal agency dealing with their needs to be a welfare agency. It was, and is, equally clear that the Congress intended the new Administration on Aging to be a fresh start, with fresh approaches and fresh faces.

In this context, then, I must express my very strong disappointment and displeasure over an announcement just released over the signature of the Administration on Aging. That announcement referring to the new agency, says: "It supersedes and will expand the work of the Office of Aging." Mr. President, that statement is completely at odds with the congressional intent in establishing the Administration on Aging. We have had an Office of Aging in the Welfare Administration to deal with matters of old-age assistance. But the Administration on Aging is not merely an expansion of that function. It is intended to deal with the problems and services to the aged that have nothing to do with old-age assistance. It should not be the captive of a welfare-oriented bureaucracy. We intended the Administration on Aging to be the source of dynamic leadership and not the refuge of a group whose business is in the Welfare Administration.

I ask unanimous consent that the announcement by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCEMENT BY U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The new Administration on Aging, established when President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the Older Americans Act into law July 14, has now become operational. It supersedes and will expand the work of the Office of Aging. The administration becomes the seventh major operational agency of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Functions of the Administration on Aging, as set forth in the Older Americans Act, will be to:

Serve as a clearinghouse for information related to the problems of the aged and aging;

Assist the Secretary in matters pertaining to the problems of the aged and aging;

Administer the grants provided under the act;

Provide for research and demonstration programs in the field of aging;

Give technical assistance and consultation to States and their political subdivisions with respect to programs for the aged and aging;

Prepare, publish, and disseminate educational materials dealing with the welfare of older persons;

Gather statistics in the field of aging;

Stimulate more effective use of existing resources and available services for the aged and aging.

The Older Americans Act provides grants to States to help strengthen State agencies which have responsibility for establishing and improving programs and services for older people in their communities. The grants will be used for community planning and coordinating, demonstration projects, and training of personnel.

Also authorized are Federal grants to public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, and institutions for research, development, and professional training.

The Administration is headed by a Commissioner of Aging, appointed by the President. He serves as chairman of a 15-member Advisory Committee on Older Americans, created by the act.

For additional information on the Administration on Aging or the Older Americans Act, write to: Administration on Aging, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF JOB CORPS TRAINING SCHOOLS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, from time to time sincere and well-meaning questions have been raised about the effectiveness of Job Corps training schools, the provision for which is incorporated in the Economic Opportunity Act.

A clarifying answer to some of these questions is stated in clear terms in an editorial of September 14 in the Oregonian of Portland, whose writer visited a Job Corps camp.

Speaking of the youngsters enrolled, he wrote:

> For the first time in their lives, for some, they are in daily contact with interested adults who listen to their views and help in working out the problems that led to their becoming school dropouts. The transformation, as we observed in talking to some of them, is amazing.

The Oregonian has done a great service in reporting the procedures and goals of this program, and I know that others will be interested in the full editorial, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DROPOUTS' COMEBACK

Adults who worry about modern schools getting away from the basics might enjoy a visit to the Wolf Creek Job Corps Conservation Center in the Umpqua National Forest, as we did last week.

This Job Corps camp directed by Richard M. Pomeroy, of the U.S. Forest Service, has been receiving boys from all over the Nation in its 5 months of existence. Present enrollment is 186 and potential is 200 to 210. The boys' time is divided about equally between classroom education and job training in machinery, forest trails, campgrounds, laundry, restaurant services, etc.

About 20 percent of the youngsters, average age 17, arrive as nonreaders. Now all can read, write, and do a creditable amount of arithmetic. One youngster could recognize only his name in print when he came. He has now passed the fourth-grade status in reading. The camp has graduated 12 boys in its 5 months, some to jobs, others to urban-oriented centers in which more education and advanced job training are available.

The boys are divided into small groups both in living quarters and in classrooms, with counselors and teachers to match. For the first time in their lives, for some, they are in daily contact with interested adults who listen to their views and help in working out the problems that led to their becoming school dropouts. The transformation, as we observed in talking to some of them, is amazing. They act and talk like any other group of well-oriented boys who are beginning to see a purpose in life and are planning their futures with understanding and hope.

TILLAMOOK JOB CORPS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled, "The Tillamook Job Corps Proves Up," from the summer 1965 edition of the Department of Interior publication Our Public Lands. This article is, I believe, a most fitting tribute to the fine work that the Job Corps is doing in my home State of Oregon to give a second chance to young men who may have dropped out of school for one reason or another, but who are taking this route to complete their education.

I was privileged to participate in the opening of this camp last March 20, and I look forward with anticipation, to the next visit I can make to it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TILLAMOOK JOB CORPS PROVES UP

(By Bob Hostetter)

"I gained 26 pounds and that was just the first month." "I never knew there was so much land in the United States." "I think I'll learn to be a cook."—Recent remarks of Tillamook enrollees.

It was a bedraggled and glum looking bunch of boys that arrived at the Tillamook Job Corps Conservation Center in Oregon on February 16. They were tired from traveling, hungry, needed baths and clean clothes, and they were wary of the new world they were about to enter. But the transformation soon began.

They hailed from Kentucky, Tennessee, California, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Missouri, West Virginia, and Nebraska. Ages ranged from 16 to 21. And in size, well, it's hard to strike an average because weights change so fast. Within the first month, one boy who weighed in at 130 had gained 26 pounds.

Twenty-three corpsmen are members of a voluntary group known as the Mustang Commandos. These men make a run before breakfast each day. Leader of the runners is Eugene "Sparky" Walker, one of the center's work leaders.

Intramural sports include basketball, softball, volleyball, soccer, bowling, and table tennis. Other on-base recreational activities are weightlifting, boxing, track, shuffleboard, table games such as monopoly and checkers, cards, television, and reading. Record players provide music, but so do boys who play the guitar and harmonica.

Movies are shown at the center and corpsmen can also go to the movie theater in nearby Tillamook, a town with a population of 4,000 which is noted for its cheese, trees, and ocean breeze. It is also gaining a reputation for its friendly cooperation with the Job Corps Conservation Center.

FOUNDATION FOR HOPE

All the enrollees had dropped out of school for one reason or another—sickness, inadequate clothing, improper and insufficient food, fear of ridicule, no incentive. Irregular attendance generally worsened the situation until there just wasn't any hope of catching up.

But there is hope now. Crumbling foundations of ignorance are no basis for building knowledge, so the instructors are helping the boys find a solid footing on which to start building again. Tests were administered to determine what educational training would be appropriate for each boy. Then reading ability of all boys was tested and they were classed in nine different levels according to their abilities. Ten were practically unable to read at all. Others were at higher levels, but only five could read as well as high school seniors. By the second month, all corpsmen had advanced at least one reading level, and some had advanced two or three levels.

Each corpsman puts in at least 4 hours a week in reading, mathematics, and physical education. One group spends 4 hours each week learning how to typewrite and another group gets an extra 4 hours a week of reading instruction.

Phil Kipper, a reporter for the Wenatchee Daily World who spent a couple of days with the boys, observed, "What the youths achieve at the camp is all theirs. They don't have to face the loss of pride because they aren't competing against anyone but themselves. Instructors explain that they have given up in the past because their pride wouldn't let them fail. Now they have to break the habit of being proud of antisocial behavior."

Tom Miller, assistant director for education, points out that corpsmen must make many social and emotional adjustments before they can get into the mainstream of American life. A strenuous work program in BLM forests around Tillamook helps achieve those adjustments. Corpsmen are divided into two work groups. Each group works 3 days a week and receives educational training on the other days.

CONSERVATION WORK

Corps men are rebuilding Alder Glen recreation site, which was damaged by last winter's floods, and are also working on Dover Creek recreation site, a new picnicking and camping area for public use on BLM land. They level tent and table sites, clear brush and debris, build trails, and cut up dead trees for firewood.

In another project, Corps men have planted 2-year-old Douglas-fir tree seedlings on an area where mature timber was harvested.

Several Corps men assist BLM foresters in marking selected trees for cutting, posting timber sale boundaries, measuring and tallying snags to be felled, or cutting brush for survey lines. Other work projects are planned, including road maintenance, stream clearance for fish passage, thinning of young timber stands, and disposal of unmerchantable debris left after timber harvest.

Not all the work is in the woods; there is much fixing up to be done at the center. Originally constructed as a naval air station during World War II, buildings had to be repaired and painted before they could be occupied. Corps men are continuing the work by replacing a rotted porch, building a sidewalk, repairing windows, and installing shelves. They take their turns working in the kitchen. They do their own laundry and ironing and housekeeping chores at the dormitories.

Jim Hedger, of Newberry, Mich., commented on the variety of work to be done, when he said, "I've been doing some carpentry work. I like the work, but when I finish this job, I think I'll ask if I can work in the kitchen."

"What's the matter, aren't you getting enough to eat?" his buddy asked.

"Sure, it's just that I think I'd like to learn to be a cook," he said.

When the Tillamook Center was officially dedicated on March 20, Corps men served as ushers and guides for a crowd of 400 townspeople and other visitors. Long deprived of attention, they enjoyed talking about their hopes for the future with the dignitaries. These included Dr. Otis A. Singletary, Director of the Job Corps; Senator WAYNE MORSE; Clifton P. Lander of the Department of the Interior staff; Harold R. Hochmuth, Associate Director of the Bureau of Land Management; BLM State Director Russell E. Getty; and others.

SO MUCH LAND

Since this is the first time that many of the Corps men have been away from home, their viewpoint is broadening. One Corps man from Tennessee remarked, "I never realized there was so much land in the United States until I came to Tillamook."

John J. Scalise, himself a forester and the director of BLM's Tillamook Job Corps Conservation Center, summed up the attitude of his staff recently when on a radio program he said, "Our heritage is not reserved for the upper and middle classes. It is for all the people. We in the Job Corps program can work at a job that combines the development of natural resources and of underprivileged young men."

As a corpsman, Ray Cosio, of California looks at the Job Corps somewhat differently. In the center's newsletter, "Tillamook Tiger Tales," he wrote, "The Job Corps is something for men who are in need of help. They have a home where they live and eat and work. They have a school to learn reading and math and other things."

And other things. Among these are optimism and hope.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Friday, October 15, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 13, 1965:

THE JUDICIARY

John W. Reynolds, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin vice Kenneth P. Grubb, retired.

COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Dr. Joseph R. Smiley, of Colorado, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs for the remainder of the term expiring May 11, 1966, and until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

The following-named persons to be members of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs for terms expiring May 11, 1968, and until their successors are appointed and have qualified:

Dr. Luther H. Foster, of Alabama.

Dr. Rufus C. Harris, of Georgia.

Arnold M. Picker, of New York.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., prefaced his prayer with this verse of Scripture: Psalm 121: 2: *My help cometh from the Lord, who made heaven and earth.*

Most merciful and gracious God, we are always coming unto Thee with a great variety of needs and desires which Thou alone canst satisfy and which we know will never exceed Thy patience.

Grant that we may be one in spirit with all who are striving faithfully and courageously to make some contribution to the higher good of humanity.

May the day be brought nearer when men and nations everywhere shall be members of the kingdom of peace and brotherhood.

In all our efforts may we not become discouraged and allow our faith in Thy sustaining grace to become eclipsed by doubt and despair.

Help us to feel confident that with the aid of Thy presence no task will be too arduous, no responsibility too exacting, and no burden too heavy.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On October 5, 1965:

H.R. 4603. An act for the relief of Lt. (jg.) Harold Edward Henning, U.S. Navy;

H.R. 5842. An act to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961; and

H.R. 7090. An act for the relief of certain individuals.

On October 7, 1965:

H.R. 7969. An act to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States, and for other purposes.

On October 9, 1965:

H.R. 2091. An act relating to the establishment of concession policies in the areas administered by National Park Service, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2358. An act for the relief of Tony Boone;

H.R. 2772. An act for the relief of Ksenija Popovic;

H.R. 4750. An act to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8035. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept a donation of property in the county of Suffolk, State of New York, known as the William Floyd Estate, for addition to the Fire Island National Seashore, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8283. An act to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964;

H.R. 9417. An act to revise the boundary of Jewel Cave National Monument in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10516. An act authorizing the disposal of vegetable tannin extracts from the national stockpile;

H.R. 10714. An act to authorize the disposal of colemanite from the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 10715. An act to authorize the disposal of chemical grade chromite from the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 10748. An act to authorize the transfer of copper from the national stockpile to the Bureau of the Mint;

H.J. Res. 309. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, to increase the number of electric typewriters which may be furnished to Members by the Clerk of the House; and

H.J. Res. 330. Joint resolution to authorize the disposal of chromium metal, acid-grade fluorspar, and silicon carbide from the supplemental stockpile.

On October 10, 1965:

H.R. 728. An act to amend section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; and

H.R. 1274. An act for the relief of Mrs. Michiko Miyazaki Williams.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9811) entitled "An act to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices, and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs, and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 597. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting the need for adequate health science library services and facilities.

NINTH ANNUAL REPORT ON THE TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 305)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

This is the ninth annual report on the trade agreements program, as required by section 402(a) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

In 1964, U.S. and free world trade continued to set fresh records.

U.S. exports reached a new high of $25.6 billion, $6.9 billion more than our imports.

U.S. farm exports rose to $6.4 billion, an alltime peak.

Free world exports reached a record of $152 billion.

The major trading nations agreed to take further steps under General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to assist exports from developing countries.

The policy of two-way trade expansion and liberalization, initiated with the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 and continued by every administration since that time, has brought great benefits to this country. In general, U.S. goods have enjoyed progressively easier access to foreign markets. Low-cost, high-quality U.S. exports, sold and used in every corner of the world, have provided immediate evidence of the vitality of our free enterprise system. Our processors have gained ready access to essential raw materials, and have profited from the stimulus of keener competition. Consumers have enjoyed the wide range of choice which the world market provides.

But we have only begun. We must build on past success to achieve greater well-being for America, and for all the world's peoples. In particular, we must make every effort to assure the success of the current Geneva negotiations, known as the Kennedy round.

In this International Cooperation Year of 1965, all nations should pledge themselves to work together for the steady expansion of commerce. Continuing its steady course begun in 1934, the United States will do its part in achieving that goal.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 13, 1965.*

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the pending sugar legislation and I want to congratulate the members of the House Committee on Agriculture on their successful efforts in bringing this legislation to the House.

Mr. Speaker, I have no interest in sugar legislation other than as one Member of Congress who desires to see the best type of legislation passed to protect our consumers and at the same time to permit our sugar industry in America to continue. This industry provides livelihood for thousands of people in production, processing and transportation processes. The consumer and industrial users have a stake in this legislation, because they need to be assured of a stable sugar supply at reasonable prices.

There is no sugarcane or sugarbeet production for the refining mills, in the district of Florida that I represent so I believe that I can look at this matter objectively.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], has suggested two amendments to the pending legislation. In the one instance, he would prohibit the American lobbyists who represent the foreign sugar interests from continuing their representation. Now let me say that if the gentleman from Illinois were interested in having an investigation made of all the American nationals who represent foreign interests, I would concur with him. In fact, we have a foreign agents registration law that perhaps needs to be studied. Amendments might well be passed to this law, but why should we pick out one group of lobbyists and not subject all lobbyists who represent foreign nations from being put out of business?

It has been said that the very fact that so many of the lobbyists who represent foreign nationals in sugar legislation receive large sums of money, and the very fact that this discussion has an unsavory flavor, indicates that there is something unhealthy and improper about the activities of lobbyists for foreign sugar interests, as they might influence Congressmen. Let me say that after serving on the Committee on Agriculture for 10 years, I have never seen any evidence of unwholesome activity on the part of the lobbyists for the sugar industry of foreign countries.

Mr. Speaker, we can either plan sugar quotas through the supervision of the Committee on Agriculture or we can turn this responsibility over to the Department of State, to the Department of Agriculture and to other officials in the executive branch. I, for one, believe that it is better for the Congress to set these quotas, rather than to have them established by "striped pants diplomacy." I do not mean to be unduly critical of Government agencies, but I believe that Congress has no alternative. It must go through all the tortuous procedure, under the constant glare of publicity, of permitting interested people to come before the committee to present their case for sugar quotas. Then, as the Committee on Agriculture has done, by a formula which I think is fair, again under no veil of secrecy, come to the conclusion, as they did. I believe that in order to be fair to our own interests, it is absolutely necessary for the Committee on Agriculture, as they have done, to try to consider, in establishing sugar quotas, nations that are friendly to us, nations that will trade with us to the utmost of their capabilities, and other criteria that I believe are very fair. The fact that lobbyists representing foreign interests, and the fact that many other Americans, come before the Committee on Agriculture is, in my opinion, no reason for anyone to suspect that there is anything unsavory that is happening. Let me repeat again, it is all open and above board. So, insofar as our attitude toward American nationals who represent foreign interests is concerned, let us go all the way. If there is anything wrong in this procedure, let us amend the foreign agents registration law to the extent that it should be amended. I, for one, would be enthusiastically a supporter of a thorough evaluation of this law, and I am sure that the Committee on the Judiciary will be amenable to a careful review of this law.

Insofar as the imposition of an import tax on the sugar that comes to us from foreign nations, let me say that, in my opinion, this would have no effect whatsoever on the prices that the consumer pays here in the United States. I think such a tax would also be a slap in the face to friendly nations who are trying to be self-supporting now by trade rather than by handouts from our taxpayers. I would like to explore in detail, Mr. Speaker, if I may, the so-called world market and domestic sugar prices.

Comparisons are sometimes drawn between the price paid by domestic cane refiners for raw sugar, as quoted in New York or New Orleans, and the price for raw sugar on the so-called world market. It is implied that the world market provides some kind of worldwide price standard, and that any price higher than the world price is too high. It is also implied that everybody else in the world pays only the so-called world market price—and that only the United States pays more. The impression is left that American consumers pay more for sugar than anybody else in the world.

Such statements and implications are erroneous and unfair. Persons who make them are either, first, ignorant of the true facts about sugar markets; or, second, deliberately trying to deceive the Congress and the American public.

The facts are these:

ABOUT THE SO-CALLED WORLD MARKET

Sugar is one of the most regulated commodities in the world, everywhere in the world. Producing countries all have some kind of internal arrangements concerning production and marketing—ranging from special taxes, production subsidies, and the like, to export subsidies and Government trading corporations. Importing countries, most of them, have some kind of special arrangements with exporters to assure supplies. All these national systems affect price.

For example, there is the British Commonwealth system, under which a price is negotiated annually with producers in the Commonwealth countries for specified quantities of sugar sold in the United Kingdom. And there is the French system, with special price and quota arrangements between Metropolitan France and the nations of the French community. The Portuguese have still another system. The nations of the Communist bloc have special arrangements, some on a barter basis, for the movement of sugar among the nations of the bloc.

In addition, there are many special bilateral arrangements and deals between importers and exporters.

As a result of all these special systems and special arrangements, only a very small part of total world sugar consumption moves in international trade without restrictions of some kind. Usually only 10 to 15 percent of all the world's sugar is traded on the so-called world market. This is sugar that is homeless, that is not covered by any of the special arrangements. It is sugar that is seeking a market. Since it is a small and thin market it is extremely sensitive to changes in the world supply and demand situation. Usually there is more sugar than there is a demand for, the so-called world market is depressed. World market prices are often below the actual cost of production—which is the situation today. Producers that sell at these depressed prices can do so only because they also sell in one or more of the protected markets, where the price is higher.

ABOUT U.S. CONSUMER PRICES

A fair way to gage the reasonableness of prices paid for sugar by U.S. consumers is to compare the prices actually paid by consumers here and consumers in other individual nations around the world. Every such study in recent years has shown that U.S. consumers pay less per pound than the average of prices paid by consumers in other leading countries of the world.

For example, on January 1 of this year, retail sugar prices in a score of nations around the world averaged out to 12.2 cents a pound, while the American housewife paid only 11.6 cents a pound.

Some of the prices in other countries: Italy, 16 cents a pound; Sweden, 15; West Germany, 14.2; The Netherlands, 14; Belgium, 13.9; China, 13.4; France, 12.6; Switzerland, 11.2; the United Kingdom, 11.1; Australia, 10.2 cents a pound.

If you measure sugar prices by the amount of work-time a laborer puts in on his job in order to earn enough money to buy a pound of sugar, you find that sugar prices in the United States are the lowest in the world. This has been shown repeatedly in studies made both by the United Nations and by the National Industrial Conference Board.

Prices, import fee, and costs of production

[All data in cents per pound]

Price on October 5 of raw sugar duty paid, delivered to New York	6.85
Deductions for duty (0.625) and ocean freight	1.00
Approximate price f.o.b. for foreign sellers	5.85
F.o.b. world market price on October 5	2.20
Difference on October 5 between United States and world market prices	3.65
Recapture fee under Congressman FINDLEY's proposal (75 percent of 3.65)	2.74
Returns for foreign sellers in U.S. market after Findley fee	3.11
Recapture fee under previous recommendation of industry and government	1.00
Return to foreign sellers in U.S. market after industry-government fee proposal (50 percent with 1 cent maximum)	4.85

Data recently compiled by the Foreign Agriculture Service of USDA, by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress and information received from diplomatic sources indicate current or recent-year costs of production (in terms of U.S. cents per pound) in several foreign countries supplying the U.S. market to be as follows:

India	8.0
Dominican Republic	6.0 to 7.0
Brazil	5.3 to 5.5
Mexico	4.9 to 5.5
South Africa	5.3
British West Indies	4.9
Guatemala	4.6
El Salvador	4.5
Peru	3.9
Australia	3.5
Ecuador	2.6

Retail price of sugar for selected countries, Jan. 1, 1961–65

[U.S. cents per pound]

	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965
United States	11.9	11.6	11.8	14.1	11.6
Above United States in 1965:					
Hungary	20.2	20.2	20.2	20.2	[1] 20.2
Pakistan	17.0	14.1	15.3	17.1	18.0
Italy	15.4	15.0	14.9	15.6	16.0
Sweden	12.6	12.2	13.7	20.2	15.0
Poland	13.5	13.5	13.5	14.6	[1] 14.6
Japan	18.7	18.4	18.7	22.0	14.2
West Germany	12.9	14.0	13.9	14.1	14.0
Netherlands	11.7	12.2	13.7	13.9	14.0
Belgium	13.0	14.1	12.7	12.5	13.9
China	9.1	10.0	12.3	13.4	13.4
Yugoslavia	25.4	25.4	25.4	25.4	13.3
France	10.5	11.8	12.3	12.6	12.6
Same as United States in 1965: India	10.5	10.0	10.2	11.6	[1] 11.6
Lower than United States in 1965:					
Switzerland	9.1	8.6	8.8	12.7	11.2
United Kingdom	9.3	10.0	10.0	11.1	11.1
Australia	9.3	9.3	10.3	10.3	10.2
Canada	9.6	9.0	10.3	17.9	8.8
South Africa	6.4	6.5	7.0	7.0	7.0
Brazil	4.5	5.0	5.0	6.1	6.1
Peru	2.8	3.7	3.7	5.1	5.8
Mexico	5.5	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6
Simple average (including United States)	11.8	11.8	12.2	13.8	12.2

[1] 1965 figures not available; assumed here to be same as in 1964.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say again, that I am opposed to the two amendments suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY]. I am in favor of the sugar legislation as reported by the House Committee on Agriculture and I want to congratulate the members of that committee, who represent both of our political parties, because of the statesmanlike approach they have used in this matter. When you evaluate the character of the members of that committee, I am sure you will agree with me that their action has not been subjected to any unsavory approaches on the part of lobbyists, but rather, they have acted according to the dictates of their consciences on the basis of what they sincerely think is best for our country and for the friendly nations to whom we permit sugar quotas.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **GATHINGS**. Mr. Speaker, I concur wholeheartedly in the remarks of my colleague and friend from the State of Florida [Mr. Matthews]. For many years I have supported the sugar legislation. I have done it consistently. That legislation is based on the theory that the Congress itself sets these quotas. That system has worked well, exceedingly well. This program has done three things which are most essential to the well-being of the consuming public. No. 1, the program has increased the amount of sugar, beet and cane that our own farmers can grow in this country. No. 2, it has set quotas in such a way as to assure our friends in this hemisphere and throughout the world that we are giving them a part of our sugar business to meet the Nation's sugar requirements. Most importantly it has provided a very ample supply of sugar at reasonable prices for our housewives and industrial needs. I do hope that the House will not turn topsy-turvy this program which has worked so well and will vote down the motion to recommit this bill and then pass the legislation.

Mr. **ROGERS** of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ROGERS** of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the House to enact sugar legislation today.

The Sugar Act has operated successfully for over 30 years. It has provided a stable market for the consumer. It has served the national security by maintaining a supply of sugar for the country to use in time of emergency, that supply being provided mainly by producers located within the confines of the continental United States.

This legislation allots U.S. producers 65 percent of the American market. That remaining portion which is allotted to foreign nations would provide some measure of assistance to the economies of friendly allies. I am sure that the membership would agree that it is far better for the United States to trade with a friendly foreign nation than to call upon the taxpayers to simply give outright aid, and particularly so in the case of Latin American nations.

To pursue a policy of trade rather than aid strengthens the principle of preserving respect between nations, as well as allowing the United States to obtain something in return—a factor which is absent from so many existing foreign aid programs.

I urge that new sugar legislation be enacted to guarantee a continuing stable market of this commodity.

Mr. **HERLONG**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **ROGERS** of Florida. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **HERLONG**. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Florida and say I agree with him 100 percent.

Mr. **ROGERS** of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

FINDLEY AMENDMENTS TO THE SUGAR BILL

Mr. **HALL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HALL**. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for the Findley amendments today and against the sugar bill. I resent the gag rule and limitation on debate.

The choice before this House on a legislative issue has never been clearer: It is a choice between all the "sugar daddies," downtown, or the American housewife back home. It is a choice between the "smoke filled-sugar filled rooms," or the clean air of the open marketplace.

Have we sunk so low in our obedience to the administration, that we are willing to accept a bill, which every Member knows—whether he admits it or not—is part of the system that feeds upon payoffs, influence, and every other vice which, deservedly or not, have cast a shadow over the integrity of Congress?

I would be the first to say that the Nation's press is never always right but I also would be the first to admit that when 99 percent of the Nation's editors who have seen fit to comment upon this legislation come up with a common finding: that it reeks not from the "sweet smell of sugar" but from the "rank odor of payola," then we had better pay some heed, as true representatives.

If this bill with all its imperfections is the best we can accomplish, then surely the argument for the prerogatives of the legislative branch is a sham, and we do not deserve to be called an independent body. I do not see how any Member on this side of the aisle can support this bill in the face of its overwhelming lack of support by the American public, and I daresay that in taking such a position we will find lots of company from the other side as well.

Mr. Speaker, I hope to place in the Record today a list of all money contributed by sugar lobbyists and their agents to Members of Congress. I hope the bill will be defeated.

The House of Representatives has taken up a proposed 5-year extension of the Sugar Act, which will impose an additional burden on consumers of at least $700 million a year. One Congressman, on the House's Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from Illinois, Representative Paul Findley, has referred to this proposal as "profiteering on a grand scale." Because this legislation is such a "sugary plum" for foreign governments lucky enough to get a piece, lobbying has developed to an extraordinary level. The fees for the "services rendered"—which consist primarily of peddling influence by getting juicy quotas for countries they represent—range from $3,000 a year to $50,000 a year. A list of these lobbyists and the fees they draw was published in the Congressional Record of August 24, 1965.

Public money—and only public money—is involved. The lobbyists have one clear objective: to satisfy their "sweet tooth" by getting as much of the "sugar pie" as possible. In effect, their fees are covered by the American taxpayers and consumers, because the sugar program—which is completely under the control of the Secretary of Agriculture—makes possible the sugary premium prices for foreign countries lucky enough to get quotas. There is no other legislation which has called forth as witnesses such an impressive string of lobbyists representing foreign governments. For that matter, private attorneys representing foreign governments are unknown as witnesses before the Foreign Affairs Committee, which sets the guidelines for foreign aid programs. Imagine how ridiculous it would be for every foreign aid recipient to have an agent here in Washington lobbying to get its share of the foreign aid pie. Yet that is how our sugar program operates and how the administration proposes it continues to operate for another 5 years.

Of all the schemes to rig markets and control production—and we have them in embarrassing abundance—this one should qualify as the prototype for complexity, extent of government power, and absence of competitive conditions. It makes the Secretary of Agriculture the absolute czar of sugar. Not 1 pound can move legally without his blessing. Whether the Sugar Act produces the stable prices its supporters claim is open to question. If the American housewife were confronted with the choice between Canada-priced sugar—currently about 8 cents a pound on the grocery shelf—and U.S. priced sugar—about 11 cents a pound—she would quickly identify the Canadian item as reasonable and the U.S. item as not. But, as a practical matter, she has no choice. Currently, the world price of raw sugar is about $2 a hundredweight. The comparable U.S. price is about $5.50. The inflated U.S. price is achieved and maintained through "supply control" in charge of the Secretary of Agriculture. By controlling all marketings and imports, he forces prices to the desired artificial level, and keeps them there. The Congress specifies what countries will share in the foreign quotas, and how big a piece each will get. In practice, the Congress has no opportunity to change the decisions of the House Agriculture Committee, because the bill is not open for amendments when it comes to the floor.

There are several alternatives to the present system, which literally invites corruption. The most-needed improvement is reduction of the bill's "foreign aid" component. A quota premium worth more than the world market price of raw sugar is nonsense. One approach would be to increase the sugar tariff from its present level of 62 cents to $2. This alone would transfer over $100 million of the foreign aid gravy to the U.S. Treasury.

The Federal Trade Commission and other agencies, which are intended to protect the public interest, are powerless to act because the profiteering is not only sanctioned under the present program, but promoted and carried out by the Government itself. A revision of the present Sugar Act might raise the ire of the lobbyists, but it most surely would be welcomed by the American housewife.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on Thursday, October 7, and Friday, October 8. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on S. 2084, and "aye" on the conference report on H.R. 9811.

SUGAR LEGISLATION

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I take emphatic disagreement with and exception to the statements made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL]. I was a member of a special subcommittee consisting of four Republicans and four Democrats which worked for many days to come up with recommendations to the Committee on Agriculture involving the suggested division of foreign import quotas. Certainly it was not a smoke-filled room or a sugar-filled room in any way. There were no lobbyists present. Personally, I refused to see any foreign lobbyists at any time, with the exception of some men who came all the way from South Africa.

This bill was worked out objectively and fairly for good and sufficient reasons, and I should like to ask my colleagues to vote favorably on the sugar legislation before us today.

A GOOD SUGAR BILL

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the sugar legislation that is before us today. In spite of all the oratory that has been offered us, if you want to do something for the housewife of this country to keep the price of sugar stable, then you had better vote to continue this Sugar Act. Also, if you have a concern for a great industry in this country, both the farmers who produce sugarbeets and sugarcane as well as the processors who employ thousands of people as well as invest a great deal of money in this country, then you should support this sugar bill.

I have heard a great deal about lobbyists, and so forth. I know nothing about the situation on the foreign side, but as far as I am concerned, I know many representatives of beetgrowers in this country, some from my own district, as well as processors, and I consider them honorable men who are concerned about producing a good product for the citizens of this country, at a fair consumer price, and at a fair profit to the farmer and processors. I cannot find anything un-American about that at all.

As far as I am concerned, I am just as much interested in the consumer and the housewife as anyone else in the Congress. If you want to take a good, hard look at what has happened to sugar prices throughout the world and even in our own country, when the Sugar Act was not functioning as it should, then you will find that you have got to have a Sugar Act in order to maintain a stable price. We have had stable sugar prices in this country for many years fundamentally because we have a Sugar Act.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, pretty soon we will be back in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the sugar bill.

Mr. Speaker, vicious and irresponsible speeches have been made in the well of this House concerning this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of irresponsible statements have been made in the press which are prompted either by malice or stupidity.

Mr. Speaker, these people who have been addressing the House, and one of them this morning, are trying to shake the faith of the country in the Congress of this Nation, and in the integrity of the Members of this House who for 30 long years have approved this very program of country-by-country quotas, and it has always been approved under a closed rule.

Mr. Speaker, when some of these newcomers, who have not taken the time to even read the bill or to read the report and who know nothing on earth about what is in the bill or is contemplated, come out here with these tirades against the Committee on Agriculture, I do not have to defend the integrity of the members of the Committee on Agriculture. All of them are well known to you. But I do defend this program. It is not a farm program merely because it comes from the Committee on Agriculture. Maybe it should have been with the Committee on Ways and Means years ago. But it is not. It is in our committee and we submit it to you without apology and I urge the House to adopt it and to defeat all pending amendments.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am going to vote for the sugar bill. I think it is unfortunate though that the rule that we got on this bill provided for 4 hours of general debate and then limits the debate to 10 minutes on the two amendments that the Rules Committee permitted to be offered to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, during the general debate yesterday most of the time there were less than 100 people on the floor and sometimes as few as 50 to listen to remarks by people who knew what they were talking about. Among those I would say that the speech given by our colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS], was one of the best, and those who missed that should take time to read it before the vote on this bill today.

The next thing I want to say with regard to the allocation to foreign countries, I guess every member of our committee would have probably written a different allocation. But, after all, we had to get a bill out and I think the committee has done a much better job than the State Department could have done. I, for one, will never submit to giving this back to the State Department, because I think the people on the Agriculture Committee have far better judgment to allocate those quotas than the State Department.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, it is with some reluctance as a member of the "89th Club" that I rise, but I must do so to take exception to the observations made earlier by the eminent gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] for whose opinions and guidance I have expressed a high regard on other matters. But when the gentleman refers to "payoffs" or "payoff money," I say to my eminent colleague that I am offended by so rash a charge, and cannot go along with him.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation because I believe it is the best legislation possible for the housewives of America and for the people of America. I have seen no "foreign" agents or anyone else with the slightest talk of "payoffs." I have seen no "sugar daddies." The gentleman says that every Member of the House knows that there are "payoffs." I take exception and I resent these statements very, very much.

Mr. Speaker, as most Members know, I am not one of the favorites of the President of the United States among my colleagues of this House. But I will yield to no one in tribute and service to my President in his great leadership in protecting America, and in helping South American nations to better the lot of their people and to defend themselves from Communist aggression. This bill deals with this delicate matter, too.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RONCALIO. I, of course, am delighted to yield to the committee chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman who just delivered that tirade [Mr. HALL] did not come before the Committee on Agriculture and never showed any interest in this pending bill until it was brought to the floor of the House.

Mr. RONCALIO. I am sure the gentleman made no personal inference or meant to do so. I respect him sincerely.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, it is most important to the well-being and future of the port of Baltimore that H.R. 11135 be passed here today with the Agriculture Committee amendments. Baltimore has a vital stake in sugar legislation. Passage of this bill will assure the continuity of raw sugar supplies to the domestic cane sugar refiners and provide orderliness and stability to the U.S. sugar market for the 6 years of the law. American consumers will enjoy the benefits of secure supplies and stable, reasonable prices.

Sugar is important to the port of Baltimore. Among the commodities imported through this great port, raw sugar ranks seventh in tonnage. As many as 50 ships carrying over 500,000 tons of raw sugar move into the port in 1 year's time.

We have in Baltimore one of the Nation's largest and most modern cane sugar refineries—the plant of the American Sugar Co., located on the Patapsco River in the city of Baltimore. This plant provides direct employment for nearly 800 individuals and has an annual payroll in excess of $4,500,000.

Other segments of Baltimore's economy benefit from the import and refining of raw cane sugar. Additional thousands of workers are employed in allied industries which service, supply, and ship for this great cane sugar refinery. For example, each year almost 1¼ billion pounds of sugar products move out of American Sugar's plant by truck and rail, providing many man-hours of employment to transportation workers.

I want to stress that H.R. 11135 has the full support of the entire domestic sugar industry, including the cane sugar refiners. The measure establishes a fair division of the quotas between domestic and foreign suppliers and between cane and beet sources. Mainland producers will receive increases in their marketing allotments which will enable them to dispose of the surplus inventories in an orderly manner. An increasing proportion of our foreign supplies will be obtained from Latin American countries. All in all, the prescribed quota division and retention of price incentives for foreign suppliers to fill their quotas and to maintain additional supplies in reserve will serve the interests of all American consumers. This measure, which will run through 1971, will assure consumers of an adequate supply of sugar at reasonable prices.

I wish to add my voice to that of my colleagues who also are supporting the bill.

The amendment, however, which would restore a confiscatory import fee should be defeated. We must retain a proper incentive for foreign countries to supply us with sugar.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I feel that we have probably had altogether too much politics and personal condemnation on this question. I have no intention of condemning anyone, but I feel very strongly that the discussion so far has resulted in considering too much political expediency in connection with this sugar bill rather than getting to a discussion of the basic facts.

As the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] so ably pointed out yesterday, the people of the United States need a sugar bill. We need a program to maintain and stabilize prices in the United States. We need a sugar bill to maintain the sugar producing industry in the United States. Right now, if some new legislation is not passed there will be a half million tons of domestically produced sugar which cannot be legally sold.

We need a sugar bill to protect our consumers in the United States. Without a sugar program sugar prices will fluctuate wildly. With a sugar program the United States has enjoyed three decades of stable sugar prices—and American consumers have bought their sugar for less than the consumers of most developed countries.

We need a sugar program to sustain our refining industry along the seaboard of both coasts of the United States. Sugar refining is of vital importance to every community in which a refinery is located.

The United States of America needs this sugar bill. Without it we are going to have chaos, and everybody knows that. Without a bill domestic producers will be burdened with stock they will not be able to sell. Without a bill, consumers will be forced to pay as much as consumers in Canada and other countries.

If you adopt some of the politically attractive amendments you might as well vote against the bill itself. This bill is based on the premise that it is in our interest to pay a premium price for at least a part of our overseas sugar supply. We pay this price in order to secure stability of price. I think this decision is sound. The proposed tax takes away the very consideration on which this bill is based. You might as well vote against the bill as to vote for such an amendment.

Do not think you can succeed in covering up the real purpose with an amendment offered by the opposition to this bill. The best politics in the world, is do the thing that is good for your country, and the sugar bill is good for America. I urge you to vote for it—and to do so without any killing amendments.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, during general debate on H.R. 11135, the Sugar Act Amendments of 1965, I pointed up in a short colloquy with my colleague from Washington State [Mrs. MAY] that the sugarbeet growers in our State would suffer if this 5-year bill is not passed. Because of the importance to the economy of our State of obtaining an increase in allotments for our beet sugar farmers, I intend to support the bill as against the existing program which expires on December 31, 1966.

However, Mr. Speaker, let me make it clear I shall do so only because the alternative, as I understand, will be to continue the existing Sugar Act. The fact is, I do not advocate either of these programs. My choice here is that the new proposal is better by far for our State's beet sugar industry.

But, on the other hand, I firmly intend to support the Findley amendment, to bar from the privileged list of foreign countries permitted to sell sugar to our lush American market any foreign producers who hire Washington lobbyists. Also, I intend to support the second Findley amendment, to impose a Federal tax on imported sugar, in order to recapture part of the premium prices in excess of world prices which the United States pays for its sugar under the law.

As to the influence of the lobbyists in the case of sugar, I think it is obvious that there is something sordid and wrong. Argentina, for example, was asked to have a Washington lobbyist. She refused to do so; whereupon the 63,000 tons allocated by the Johnson administration's bill as Argentina's annual quota was cut to 21,500 tons.

Venezuela, on the other hand, paying a lobbyist $50,000 annually for 2½ years, had her recommended quota of 2,676 tons annually increased to 30,809 tons. This increase in quota, it is estimated, will be worth more than $9 million over the 5-year life of this new bill.

Nine countries with lobbyists are having quotas given them for the first time.

This sort of business has all the earmarks of influence peddling—if not worse—and I intend to vote for the amendment to stop it.

As to the validity of the arguments in favor of any legislation which is proposed to assure our country an adequate supply of sugar—and at a stable price—I have serious doubts as to whether any law is needed. Certainly, I do not approve of having the American housewife underwrite the subsidy for foreign governments, from whom we obtain 40 percent of our supply.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, as previously indicated, the tariff amendment to recapture part of the profits on imports from foreigners will likewise have my support.

Meanwhile, the old technique of ramrodding sugar legislation through Congress in the final days of the session has my continued disapproval. The grabbag system of quotas, based on huge fees to lobbyists, could well be investigated by a special bipartisan independent committee, assisted by personnel from the FBI.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous consent order of Monday, October 11, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 695) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 695

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the joint resolution of September 30, 1965 (Public Law 89–221), is hereby amended by striking out "October 15, 1965" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 23, 1965".

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution would continue the availability of funds for certain programs through Saturday of next week, October 23. We hope that by that time the Congress will have adjourned and that still another continuing resolution will not be necessary. The Committee on Appropriations this morning approved this resolution and I trust the House will unanimously adopt it and that we can get along with the business that must be done before Congress adjourns.

With respect to appropriations, there is a meeting scheduled for this afternoon of the conferees on the agriculture appropriation bill and also a meeting of the conferees on the public works appropriation bill. I confidently expect that agreement will be reached and that these two annual appropriation bills will be approved by early next week. Then there will be nothing else pending on appropriations except the supplemental appropriation bill which was reported by the committee this morning and which is scheduled to be considered by the House tomorrow.

So, Mr. Speaker, I trust the pending resolution will be agreed to.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I understand, the original proposal was to have this continuing resolution apply until the last day of this month; is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. Someone may have proposed that, but I never proposed it and I would never support it. I think it is much better to have the resolution extend to October 23, next Saturday a week.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I wholeheartedly agree with the personal decision of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I know the gentleman knows that I, and I am sure many others, would have vigorously opposed, and would have been successful I think in defeating a continuing resolution that would have gone past October 23.

Mr. MAHON. Let me say that I have favored the extension to the 23d and I know the distinguished Speaker and the distinguished majority leader favor the extension to October 23. No other date was suggested to me.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Does this indicate to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that as far as the Committee on Appropriations is concerned, October 23 is the deadline for any continuing resolution regardless of what happens in the House and in the Senate regardless adjournment sine die?

Mr. MAHON. It is our hope that this can be accomplished and so far as we now know, it will be accomplished. But, of course, we cannot foresee what may develop. But I confidently believe that an additional continuing resolution will not be required.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Would the gentleman from Texas recommend a date beyond October 23 if by chance the Congress did not adjourn sine die by that time?

Mr. MAHON. I believe that we can complete our work by October 23 and I would not want to recommend or suggest anything at this time as to anything beyond that date. I believe we can finish our work so far as appropriations are concerned. Some of these matters have been in controversy a long time between this body and the other body. What happens depends on the ultimate decision on these matters. Of course, we have the supplemental appropriation bill which is due to come up for consideration tomorrow and must go to the other body. But, of course, I cannot foresee what may develop.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. But the gentleman has no doubt that the two appropriation bills that he has mentioned will be completed by the Congress by the 23d of October?

Mr. MAHON. I have no doubt in my own mind that they will be approved prior to October 23.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. What is the gentleman's forecast as to the supplemental appropriation bill?

Mr. MAHON. I would feel that the supplemental appropriation bill will be approved early next week—by mid next week in the other body. At least I would hope so.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the pending resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this is the fifth continuing resolution we have considered. At the time the third continuing resolution was offered, I advised the House that I would oppose any further resolutions.

The last resolution came in setting a date of October 15. At that time I said I would oppose the present resolution and I do oppose it.

It seems to me that if the Congress desires to adjourn, one of the best ways in which we can accomplish that feat is to make sure that we have no more resolutions continuing appropriations and that we let the other body know that this is not going to continue.

The supplemental appropriation bill will pass the House tomorrow. Hearings have been held in the other body. They can act promptly. The Government will not suffer. But if we continue these resolutions, there can be a slowdown.

I would urge the House to oppose the resolution. Certainly if any other resolutions are submitted, I hope that they will be voted down so that we can adjourn this Congress.

Tomorrow we will consider a supplemental appropriation bill in the amount of $4.2 billion. There is not a Member in this House who has not lived at some time when the budget for the entire Nation, the year's budget, the entire cost of the operation of the Government, was less than the supplemental that we shall bring in here tomorrow. I applaud what the President has recently said, that next year we had better take a look and start to evaluate the programs we have been passing, the authorizations. I applaud the idea that we had better slow down and take a look. I think we had better take a look. If we continue these resolutions, there will be more and more estimates coming in. It is time to adjourn this Congress so that not only Members can take a look and evaluate what we have done, but so that the people of our Nation will know what we have done, too.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members speaking on this joint resolution may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and to insert pertinent matter and tables.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE IN THE CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN AREAS AFFECTED BY A MAJOR DISASTER—TO ELIMINATE INEQUITIES IN THE APPLICATION OF PUBLIC LAW 815 AND CERTAIN MILITARY BASE CLOSINGS—TO MAKE UNIFORM ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN PUBLIC LAW 874

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 9022) to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster; to eliminate inequities in the application of Public Law 815 in certain military base closings; to make uniform eligibility requirements for school districts in Public Law 874; and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill from the House of Representatives (H.R. 9022) entitled "An Act to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, Eighty-first Congress, to provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster; to eliminate inequities in the application of Public Law 815 in certain military base closings; to make uniform eligibility requirements for school districts in Public Law 874; and for other purposes", do pass with the following amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after "1950" insert "(Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress)".

Page 2, lines 7 and 8, strike out "the date of enactment of this section", and insert "August 30, 1965,".

Page 4, line 10, after "disaster." insert "In any case deemed appropriate by the Commissioner such assistance may be in the form of a repayable advance subject to such terms and conditions as he considers to be in the public interest."

Page 4, line 14, after "expend" insert "(without regard to subsections (a) and (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 665))".

Page 6, line 1, after 1950" insert "(Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress)".

Page 6, lines 10 and 11, strike out "the date of enactment of this section" and insert "August 30, 1965,".

Page 9, line 9, after "expend" insert "(without regard to subsections (a) and (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 665))".

Page 10, strike out lines 18 and 19.

Page 10, line 21, after "amended" insert "by striking out 'and paragraph (3)' in the second sentence of paragraph (2),".

Page 11, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 5. Subsection (e) of section 5 of the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress), is amended by inserting after 'waive or reduce' the following: 'the minimum number requirement or'."

Page 11, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 6. (a) Section 203(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress), as amended, is amended by inserting immediately after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

"'(5) In the case of a State agency which is directly responsible for providing, on a non-school-district basis, free public education for handicapped children (including mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, or other health impaired children who by reason thereof require special education), the maximum basic grant which that agency shall be eligible to receive under this title for any fiscal year shall be an amount equal to the Federal percentage of the average per pupil expenditure in that State multiplied by the number of such children in average daily attendance, as determined by the Commissioner, to whom that agency provided free public education in the most recent fiscal year for which satisfactory data are available. Such State agency shall use payments under this title only for programs and projects (including the acquisition of equipment and where necessary the construction of school facilities) which are designed to meet the special educational needs of such children.'

"(b) Section 206(a)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out 'which meet the requirements of that section' and by inserting in lieu thereof 'which meet the applicable requirements of that section and of section 203(a)(5)'.

"(c) Section 303(6) of such Act is amended by adding before the period at the end of the second sentence thereof ', and for purposes of title II (except sections 203(a)(2), 203(b), and 205(a)(1)) such term includes any State agency which is directly responsible for providing, on a non-school-district basis, free public education for handicapped children (including mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, or other health impaired children who by reason thereof require special education)'."

Page 11, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 7. (a) Subsection (b) of section 207 of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) The Commissioner is authorized to pay to each State amounts equal to the amounts expended by it for the proper and efficient performance of its duties under this title (including technical assistance for the measurements and evaluations required by section 205(a)(5)), except that the total of such payments in any fiscal year shall not exceed—

"'(1) one per centum of the total of the amount of the basic grants paid under this title for that year to the local educational agencies of the State, or

"'(2) $75,000, or $25,000 in the case of Puerto Rico, Wake Island, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, whichever is the greater.'

"(b) The amendment made by this section shall be effective for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1965."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PERKINS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PERKINS moves that the House concur in Senate amendments 1 through 10.

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PERKINS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PERKINS moves that the House concur in Senate amendment No. 11 with an amendment as follows: On page 3, line 14 of the Senate engrossed amendments, following the word "Commissioner," strike out "to whom that agency provided free public education" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "at schools for handicapped children operated or supported by that State agency."

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. I should like to request that the gentleman from Kentucky give a little explanation of this to the Members.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the House passed the school disaster bill, H.R. 9022, on August 30. The bill provided financial assistance by way of grants for elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by major disasters.

We also in this bill eliminated inequities in the application of Public Law 815, with respect to certain military base closings, that were brought about by the order of last November 19.

We also provided for uniform eligibility requirements for school districts under Public Law 875 by eliminating what we believed to be an inequity in the law which required a 6-percent eligibility requirement for some school districts and 3 percent for other school districts. For school districts with school populations under 35,000 it has always been 3 percent, and in those larger school districts with more than 35,000 the eligibility rate was 6 percent of federally connected children. We made that uniform by providing that the rate for all school districts should be 3 percent.

When the bill went to the Senate the effective date was the date that the bill became law. At this point Mr. Speaker let me explain the Senate amendments:

First. The effective date of the disaster provisions of H.R. 9022 as the bill passed the House of Representatives was the date of the enactment of the disaster provisions. The Senate amended the effective date of the disaster provisions so that they are effective August 30, 1965, to coincide with the date the bill passed the U.S. House of Representatives.

Second. The Senate amended section 1 of the House bill to add the following language to the authority given the Commissioner to make grants to local educational agencies for the construction or restoration of facilities damaged by major disaster:

> In any case deemed appropriate by the Commissioner such assistance may be in the form of a repayable advance subject to such terms and conditions as he considers to be in the public interest.

The addition is likely to have little or no application in most instances and should not justify a conference. Its chief application would probably relate to a school district with adequate bonding capacity and tax resources but a temporary incapacity to immediately finance a reconstruction or restoration of school facilities following a disaster due to the ordinary delays in making financial arrangements to fund this activity.

Third. The Senate added a new section 5 to the legislation which would permit the Commissioner of Education to waive or reduce the minimum number eligibility requirement of Public Law 815 thus enabling remote areas having high concentrations of federally connected children in a numerically small school district to obtain the benefits of the act.

Fourth. The Senate added a new section 7 which amends title I of Public Law 89-10 so as to provide a minimum grant to State educational agencies for the administration of that title of $75,000 or 1 percent of the total grants to the local educational agency in the State whichever is greater. The existing allowance to States for administrative costs is 1 percent which poses difficulties in those States having large numbers of districts but with relatively small grants. The total cost of this amendment is $672,551.

There are a number of reasons why this amendment should be supported: There are certain fixed costs which must be met regardless of the number of poor children involved. These fixed costs work against those States with a small entitlement, leaving little for the development of strong State leadership. A reasonable basic amount is required to insure that an adequate staff can be assembled to get the program into operation. The majority of those States receiving less than $75,000 have a disproportionately high number of school districts, thus requiring extra personnel to process the extra applications. Moreover, these States are concentrated in the sparsely populated western section of the country and this will add to the traveling expenses incurred by the State Department personnel working in the field and, at the same time, limit the number of districts with which they can work. Further, it is difficult to argue logically that Maryland with 24 school districts should receive more than $150,000 while Montana with 40 times as many school districts should receive less than one-fourth this amount for administration. In those States, receiving less than $75,000 for administration, and which have a large number of school districts, there is a need for unusually good State leadership because many of these small districts with limited staff are not equipped to design adequate plans to meet the needs of the educationally deprived. If adequate State leadership is not available, it is conceivable that many of these smaller districts will not participate in the program.

It is important to recall that the Congress also added a provision for measurement and evaluation of the program. As a result, the 1 percent is also expected to cover State technical assistance for the measurement and evaluation required by this new section. If this evaluation is to prove valuable, there will be a need for effective expenditure at the State level in the development of meaningful measures.

Fifth. The Senate added a new section to the bill which would provide grants to State educational agencies conducting special education programs for the benefit of handicapped children.

State-operated schools for the handicapped were left out of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 so that only schools for the handicapped operated on a local school district basis can now be assisted. This Senate amendment to H.R. 9022 attempts to correct that inequitable omission and offers substantial aid to the schools serving the deaf and blind and others educationally disadvantaged by reason of physical or mental defect. All States have schools for the deaf and blind or make arrangements for care of such children in other States. There are over 20,000 students in State institutions for the deaf and blind. In addition, enrollees in schools operated in other public institutions for the mentally handicapped, physically handicapped, and dependent and neglected children total approximately 30,000.

Adding State-operated schools for the handicapped as eligible educational agencies under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act would entitle such schools to financial aid at the rate of half of the State's per capita contribution for all students. While such schools are more expensive than the general public schools, such a Federal contribution would significantly assist them.

Let me insert, Mr. Speaker, at this point, an estimate of the costs of the bill as amended:

Costs of the legislation with the Senate amendments

[In thousands]

Disaster relief	$1,250
Base closing	295
Eligibility for big cities	18,600
Schools for handicapped children (with House modification $20 to $25 million)	15,000
State administration, $75,000 minimum	700
Total ($40 million)	35,845

Finally, amendments numbered 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 are technical amendments which do not affect the substantive provisions of H.R. 9022 as it passed the House August 30.

Now, Mr. Speaker, permit me to explain the House modification of one of the Senate amendments. Earlier in the session when the Congress enacted into law the Elementary and Secondary Education Act there was one category of educationally deprived children who were not covered by grants to local educational agencies for provision of special education programs designed to meet their special needs. This category of children is those children who are physically handicapped including the mentally retarded, the hard of hearing, the deaf, the speech impaired, the visually handicapped, or the extreme emotionally disturbed child who are in State institutions.

There is abundant evidence of the need for improved and strengthened educational programs for this category of children. Amendment No. 11 of the Senate engrossed amendments to H.R. 9022 adds a new paragraph to title I of Public Law 89-10 which would make eligible for basic grants State agencies directly responsible for providing, on a non-school-district basis, free public education for handicapped children—including mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, crippled, or other health impaired children—who by reason thereof require special education. The amount of the basic grant which the State agency is authorized to receive is computed upon a formula based on the average per pupil expenditure in that State multiplied by the number of such children in average daily attendance to whom the State agency provided free public education in the most recent fiscal year for which satisfactory data are available. The grant shall be used by the State agency only for programs and projects including the acquisition of equipment, and where necessary, the construction of school facilities, which are designed to meet the special educational needs of such children.

The House modification of the Senate amendment would also count handicapped children attending State supported schools as well as schools directly operated by the State agency. This modification is necessary in order to take into account the needs of handicapped children in those States who in lieu of operating State institutions provide public moneys to private institutions for the care and education of handicapped children. In some States this is considered a more efficient and economical expenditure of public funds for providing education and welfare services to such handicapped children. The cost of the proposed amendment together with the House modification is estimated to be between $20 and $25 million. The lack of precision on the estimate is based in part on the absence of census statistics in as much as these institutionalized children were not counted for census purposes in the family income statistics as a part of a family unit. They were counted for population purposes as institution residents.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that if the action we propose is taken we will be making an improvement in an already worthy piece of legislation.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9022 was overwhelmingly—304 to 37—passed by the House in August.

Recently the Senate enacted substantially the same bill including several amendments to which I want to draw House attention.

H.R. 9022 amends Public Laws 81–815 and 81–874 both dealing with Federal aid to educational facilities in areas having a high concentration of federally connected personnel.

I fully support the changes brought about by H.R. 9022 and, after close analysis of the Senate amendments, ask that the House recede to them.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York who has done considerable work on this particular amendment dealing with the handicapped in the subcommittee.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain statistical tables.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 9022.

I supported this measure when it was passed by the House on August 30, because I knew it would give great assistance to schools that have been seriously damaged by unforeseen disasters.

It was a good bill when we passed it. I believe that it has been made an even better bill by the Senate, with one exception which I wish to discuss at this time.

After we sent this bill to the Senate, it was brought to our attention that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which we enacted earlier in the session, did not include a significant group of educationally deprived children that should have been included under title I. I refer to institutionalized handicapped children—the educable mentally retarded, blind, deaf, and physically handicapped children.

I consider the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 the greatest single piece of education legislation ever enacted. However, because we had such a massive and all-inclusive measure before us, we overlooked one area of need, which in some ways, is the greatest—the handicapped children in State-supported schools.

The other body, with laudable intentions, amended our bill to cause an unfortunate oversight in this act. The Senate amendment to H.R. 9022 will fill in one hole which was left in by providing for special education for the disadvantaged. Certainly, handicapped children are disadvantaged and deprived and there is no need to labor the point.

In the act we provided that handicapped children could participate in local education agency programs for the benefit of disadvantaged children. However, since the bill operates through local or school district systems, it makes no provisions for those schools that operate statewide or regionally. Hence we have an unfortunate situation in which the institutions for the handicapped with the highest enrollment of children are outside the boundaries of the bill's benefits.

H.R. 9022 provides that schools for the handicapped which are State-supported schools, will receive project grants in the same way as local schools do now. The Senate aimed to correct this inequality by specifically providing that the enrollees in State-operated institutions be included by amendment. I might add at this point that had I been aware that all handicapped children would not receive the benefits of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, I would have offered a corrective amendment when we were considering the bill earlier this year.

Unfortunately the term "State-operated schools" would apply again to only a segment of the handicapped and not to the entire enrollment. This is for the reason that all States do not provide facilities for the handicapped under the same system.

Some States do provide State-managed and State-operated public institutions for the blind, deaf, mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, and so forth. Others, as a matter of tradition or policy, utilize institutions which are under voluntary sponsorship and receive both State support and private donations.

For example, in my own State of New York, there are no State-operated schools for deaf children. Instead the State makes a per capita distribution to six institutions enrolling 1,372 children under private auspices.

Under the Senate language, none of these children—or, in effect—no deaf child in a regional school in New York would be eligible for benefits.

In large or different degree the situation obtains in many other States.

To illustrate this I shall enter in the RECORD at this point figures I have secured from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, indicating the enrollment of handicapped children—State by State—in State-operated and nonpublic institutions:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—OFFICE OF EDUCATION, DIVISION OF PROGRAM OPERATIONS, SECTION ON EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED IN LOW-INCOME AREAS

TABLE 3.—*Number of public and nonpublic residential institutions operating school programs for the visually handicapped and number of children enrolled, by State, February 1963*

State	Institutions under public control [1]		Institutions under nonpublic control [1]	
	Number reporting school program	Number enrolled	Number reporting school program	Number enrolled
Total	42	5,813	13	1,756
Alabama	1	222	----------	----------
Alaska	----------	----------	----------	----------
Arizona	1	104	----------	----------
Arkansas	1	126	----------	----------
California	1	150	1	10
Colorado	1	77	----------	----------
Connecticut	----------	----------	1	145
Delaware	----------	----------	----------	----------
District of Columbia	----------	----------	----------	----------
Florida	1	220	----------	----------
Georgia	1	198	----------	----------
Hawaii	1	32	----------	----------
Idaho	1	39	----------	----------
Illinois	1	216	1	16
Indiana	1	209	----------	----------
Iowa	1	158	----------	----------
Kansas	1	148	1	4
Kentucky	1	142	----------	----------
Louisiana	2	242	----------	----------
Maine	----------	----------	----------	----------
Maryland	----------	----------	1	262
Massachusetts	----------	----------	2	328
Michigan	1	283	----------	----------
Minnesota	1	87	----------	----------
Mississippi	1	164	----------	----------
Missouri	1	203	----------	----------
Montana	1	30	----------	----------
Nebraska	1	82	----------	----------

See footnote at end of table.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—OFFICE OF EDUCATION, DIVISION OF PROGRAM OPERATIONS, SECTION ON EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED IN LOW-INCOME AREAS—Continued

TABLE 3.—*Number of public and nonpublic residential institutions operating school programs for the visually handicapped and number of children enrolled, by State, February 1963*—Continued

State	Institutions under public control[1]		Institutions under nonpublic control[1]	
	Number reporting school program	Number enrolled	Number reporting school program	Number enrolled
Nevada				
New Hampshire				
New Jersey			1	45
New Mexico	1	125		
New York	1	196	2	355
North Carolina	1	384		
North Dakota	1	33		
Ohio	1	196		
Oklahoma	1	108		
Oregon	1	104		
Pennsylvania			3	591
Rhode Island				
South Carolina	1	136		
South Dakota	1	73		
Tennessee	2	215		
Texas	2	269		
Utah	1	69		
Vermont				
Virginia	2	258		
Washington	1	121		
West Virginia	1	133		
Wisconsin	1	177		
Wyoming				
American Samoa				
Guam				
Puerto Rico	1	84		
Virgin Islands				

---

[1] Classification based on source of administrative control of institution, not source of financial support or licensing authority.

TABLE 4.—*Number of public and nonpublic residential institutions operating school programs for the deaf and number of children enrolled, by State, February 1963*

State	Institutions under public control[1]		Institutions under nonpublic control[1]	
	Number reporting school program	Number enrolled	Number reporting school program	Number enrolled
Total	46	12,412	29	4,631
Alabama	1	441		
Alaska				
Arizona	1	203		
Arkansas	1	286		
California	2	989		
Colorado	1	154		
Connecticut	1	144	1	378
Delaware				
District of Columbia			1	108
Florida	1	423	1	49
Georgia	1	453	1	14
Hawaii	1	89		
Idaho	1	103		
Illinois	1	436	1	34
Indiana	1	528		
Iowa	1	325		
Kansas	1	296	1	60
Kentucky	1	296		
Louisiana	2	474	1	73
Maine	1	135		
Maryland	1	228		
Massachusetts			3	460
Michigan	1	404	1	93
Minnesota	1	267		
Mississippi	1	252		
Missouri	1	320	2	262
Montana	1	70		
Nebraska	1	153		
Nevada				
New Hampshire			1	61
New Jersey	1	429		
New Mexico	1	182		
New York			6	1,372
North Carolina	2	676		
North Dakota	1	92		
Ohio	1	237	1	102
Oklahoma	1	212	1	64
Oregon	1	260		
Pennsylvania	1	134	4	1,180
Rhode Island	1	129		
South Carolina	1	242		
South Dakota	1	123		
Tennessee	1	394		
Texas	1	490		
Utah	1	200		
Vermont			1	79
Virginia	2	444		
Washington	1	293		
West Virginia	1	223		
Wisconsin	1	183	1	102
Wyoming				
American Samoa				
Guam				
Puerto Rico			1	140
Virgin Islands				

---

[1] Classification based on source of administrative control of institution, not source of financial support or licensing authority.

TABLE 5.—*Number of public and nonpublic residential institutions operating school programs for the mentally retarded and number of children enrolled, by State, February 1963*

State	Institutions under public control[1]		Institutions under nonpublic control[1]	
	Number reporting school program	Number enrolled	Number reporting school program	Number enrolled
Total	108	31,323	116	7,330
Alabama	1	184	1	16
Alaska				
Arizona	1	311	3	102
Arkansas	1	317		
California	5	1,685	17	777
Colorado	2	722	2	131
Connecticut	2	694	3	102
Delaware	1	184	1	12
District of Columbia	1	325	1	44
Florida	2	718	5	204
Georgia	1	289		
Hawaii	1	129		
Idaho	1	142		
Illinois	2	836	5	1,019
Indiana	2	338		
Iowa	2	743	1	20
Kansas	3	759		
Kentucky	1	200	1	82
Louisiana	2	219	4	369
Maine	1	221		
Maryland	1	300	1	57
Massachusetts	6	1,909	6	398
Michigan	6	1,373	7	499
Minnesota	4	908	4	117
Mississippi	1	46		
Missouri	2	330	3	247

See footnote at end of table.

TABLE 5.—*Number of public and nonpublic residential institutions operating school programs for the mentally retarded and number of children enrolled, by State, February 1963*—Continued

State	Institutions under public control [1]		Institutions under nonpublic control [1]	
	Number reporting school program	Number enrolled	Number reporting school program	Number enrolled
Montana	1	198	----	----
Nebraska	2	373	3	246
Nevada	----	----	----	----
New Hampshire	1	150	2	20
New Jersey	5	922	3	451
New Mexico	1	164	----	----
New York	7	3,614	13	459
North Carolina	3	1,100	2	50
North Dakota	1	220	----	----
Ohio	4	1,071	3	43
Oklahoma	2	285	2	85
Oregon	1	459	2	63
Pennsylvania	5	2,118	10	1,057
Rhode Island	1	549	1	10
South Carolina	2	878	----	----
South Dakota	1	150	----	----
Tennessee	2	207	1	52
Texas	5	1,927	4	124
Utah	1	204	----	----
Vermont	1	90	----	----
Virginia	2	615	2	89
Washington	3	1,044	----	----
West Virginia	1	111	----	----
Wisconsin	3	715	3	385
Wyoming	1	277	----	----
American Samoa	----	----	----	----
Guam	----	----	----	----
Puerto Rico	----	----	----	----
Virgin Islands	----	----	----	----

[1] Classification based on source of administrative control of institution, not source of financial support or licensing authority.

TABLE 6.—*Number of public hospitals for the mentally ill and private residential institutions operating school programs for emotionally disturbed children and number enrolled, by State, February 1963*

State	Public hospitals for the mentally ill [1]		Nonpublic residential institutions for emotionally disturbed children [1]	
	Number reporting school program	Number enrolled	Number reporting school program	Number enrolled
Total	111	6,187	144	9,846
Alabama	----	----	1	25
Alaska	----	----	----	----
Arizona	1	25	1	173
Arkansas	1	15	----	----
California	6	629	13	678
Colorado	1	63	2	92
Connecticut	1	82	4	256
Delaware	2	129	----	----
District of Columbia	1	28	3	105
Florida	----	----	1	42
Georgia	1	27	----	----
Hawaii	1	24	----	----
Idaho	----	----	----	----
Illinois	5	274	7	304
Indiana	5	205	2	182
Iowa	3	59	2	88
Kansas	2	114	1	49
Kentucky	1	24	2	110
Louisiana	1	36	2	106
Maine	----	----	2	13
Maryland	3	49	4	200
Massachusetts	3	162	6	279
Michigan	8	430	7	726
Minnesota	5	56	3	114
Mississippi	----	----	1	12
Missouri	5	336	5	240
Montana	1	5	1	77
Nebraska	2	57	1	87
Nevada	1	20	----	----
New Hampshire	1	10	1	33
New Jersey	7	321	3	158
New Mexico	1	32	----	----
New York	10	1,689	20	2,014
North Carolina	2	27	1	7
North Dakota	1	48	----	----
Ohio	6	291	8	440
Oklahoma	1	27	1	80
Oregon	3	63	2	159
Pennsylvania	5	204	20	2,149
Rhode Island	----	----	1	57
South Carolina	----	----	1	63
South Dakota	----	----	----	----
Tennessee	2	43	1	72
Texas	2	173	3	176
Utah	----	----	----	----
Vermont	1	18	1	20
Virginia	2	92	1	42
Washington	1	104	3	180
West Virginia	1	16	----	----
Wisconsin	5	180	6	238
Wyoming	----	----	----	----
American Samoa	----	----	----	----
Guam	----	----	----	----
Puerto Rico	----	----	----	----
Virgin Islands	----	----	----	----

[1] Does not include institutions in which a local public school system operates the school program.

TABLE 7.—*Number of public residential institutions operating a school program for emotionally disturbed or socially maladjusted children and number enrolled, by State, February 1963*

State	State training schools [1]		Other public residential institutions [1]	
	Number reporting school program	Number enrolled	Number reporting school program	Number enrolled
Total	131	30,600	23	2,083
Alabama	3	684	----	----
Alaska	1	14	----	----
Arizona	1	410	----	----
Arkansas	4	412	----	----
California	7	3,778	2	172
Colorado	2	384	----	----
Connecticut	2	376	----	----
Delaware	2	161	----	----
District of Columbia	1	586	----	----
Florida	3	1,443	----	----
Georgia	3	546	----	----
Hawaii	1	92	----	----
Idaho	1	185	----	----
Illinois	3	806	3	72
Indiana	1	341	----	----
Iowa	2	280	----	----
Kansas	2	295	1	15
Kentucky	1	353	2	155
Louisiana	3	1,171	----	----
Maine	2	275	----	----
Maryland	5	1,059	1	92
Massachusetts	4	543	3	89
Michigan	2	562	1	109
Minnesota	3	492	----	----

See footnote at end of table.

TABLE 7.—*Number of public residential institutions operating a school program for emotionally disturbed or socially maladjusted children and number enrolled, by State, February 1963*—Continued

State	State training schools [1]		Other public residential institutions [1]	
	Number reporting school program	Number enrolled	Number reporting school program	Number enrolled
Mississippi	2	484	---	---
Missouri	2	321	---	---
Montana	2	277	---	---
Nebraska	2	268	---	---
Nevada	1	140	---	---
New Hampshire	1	89	---	---
New Jersey	2	785	---	---
New Mexico	2	376	---	---
New York	7	1,834	---	---
North Carolina	6	1,517	1	130
North Dakota	1	166	---	---
Ohio	3	649	---	---
Oklahoma	2	293	---	---
Oregon	2	506	---	---
Pennsylvania	4	592	---	---
Rhode Island	2	116	---	---
South Carolina	4	715	---	---
South Dakota	1	140	---	---
Tennessee	5	1,051	---	---
Texas	4	1,996	4	202
Utah	1	300	---	---
Vermont	1	80	---	---
Virginia	4	709	---	---
Washington	2	355	1	260
West Virginia	1	178	---	---
Wisconsin	3	705	---	---
Wyoming	2	147	---	---
Federal	---	---	3	741
American Samoa	---	---	---	---
Guam	---	---	---	---
Puerto Rico	2	508	1	46
Virgin Islands	1	55	---	---

[1] Does not include institutions in which the education program is operated by a local public school system.

In order to perfect the Senate language and meet the situation in each State according to State policy therein, the Senate language is changed in our bill to provide that funds would go to both State-operated and State-supported schools. This would take care of all children who are classified as needing benefits by a State agency and are receiving such benefits in whole or in part to assist in their care and education.

H.R. 9022 amends Public Laws 874 and 815 in four significant ways:

First, it assists schools in recovering from the ravages of disaster.

Second, it eliminates inequities in eligibility requirements under the impacted areas program.

Third, it helps the schools which would be hurt by the closing of military and naval installations.

Fourth, and in my opinion most important, it will go far in providing full educational opportunities for all handicapped children.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 9022 as amended, to take one more step forward for the benefit of our American school children, helping those who need help the most.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 9022, sometimes known as the "disaster relief" bill. This bill, which previously passed the House of Representatives, has been constructively amended in the Senate.

To review action of the House on August 30, one of the purposes of the bill, which amends Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, is to provide special relief for the operation and construction of school facilities destroyed as a result of disasters such as the recent hurricane which struck our gulf coast.

As it passed the House, H.R. 9022 also corrected an inequity in Public Law 874, in the treatment of the larger school systems by requiring a 6-percent eligibility factor instead of the 3-percent eligibility factor applicable to all other school districts.

Another deals with the special burden placed on certain school districts by recent announcements of military base closings. All of these we have previously accepted.

There is, however, another very important title to Public Law 874—title II, which is really title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act passed last April. Certain imperfections or omissions in this title have become apparent in the 6 months of preparing for implementation of programs under this most important piece of legislation. The Senate has attempted to correct two glaring imperfections or omissions to title II of Public Law 874 by amendments to our bill, H.R. 9022.

One of these imperfections is the inadequate provision for meeting the costs of administering the review and approval process for programs under this title by the smaller State departments of education. This matter is corrected by providing for a minimum authorization of $75,000 for administrative expenses instead of the current 1 percent of approved program grants. Further, $25,000 is provided for the outlying territories.

Of even greater importance, however, is the Senate correction of an omission in the original law concerning benefits to handicapped children residing in State operated institutions.

The original act provides that children residing in our poverty areas were to be considered educationally disadvantaged if they were suffering from various handicaps, including mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, or crippled.

There is certainly no doubt as to the educational disadvantage which these children suffer.

The omission of the larger number of these children who are located in institutions rather than in the individual school districts was in part a problem of statistics and in part a problem of administration.

Technically, these children might be included in programs for the educationally disadvantaged by local school districts. This could be done, however, only through elaborate arrangements between the local school district of residence of the child's family and the institution or by expecting a local school district to absorb the entire burden of a State by providing programs for the children in an institution located in the school district.

This would be impossible in many cases and unjust in all particularly, because of the way census figures are collected. No payments would be made to the local school district for these children.

They simply were not counted for family income purposes since they did not reside in a basic family unit.

This amendment would correct that situation by providing a direct payment based on the children in average daily attendance in such institutions to be used for projects and programs to correct educational disadvantages. The payment would be on the same basis as to the school districts—one-half the State average educational expenditure per child for each child in average daily attendance.

The House modification of the Senate amendment on this point would include State supported as well as State operated schools to assure that handicapped children would not be omitted from educational benefits in those States which operate few or no schools but which do furnish State funds to other institutions serving handicapped children.

The payments under this amendment would go far toward improving the educational programs of these most disadvantaged of educationally disadvantaged children—the physically and mentally handicapped. We estimate that up to 85,000 children will benefit from this amendment. The cost of $20 to $25 million will be money well spent and the Nation will reap the benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I urge concurrence in the Senate amendment to H.R. 9022.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, before Secretary McNamara's base-closing announcement of November 19, 1964, the Potter County, Tex., Consolidated Common School District No. 3 had made extensive preparations to construct new facilities at Highland Park School, which is operated by the district to serve patrons at Amarillo Air Force Base and in the area surrounding the base.

The school district definitely will operate Highland Park School for several more years under conditions of heavy Federal impact, and we hope for many more years. However, present law is written in such a way that the announcement of curtailment of Federal activity is tantamount to the end of the requirement for impacted area assistance. The purpose of section 3 in H.R. 9022, adding new language to Public Law 815, is to correct this inequity. With this correction in the law, the Potter County Consolidated Common School District No. 3 and several other school districts in the country will be able to meet the obligations of Federal impact with the same degree of Federal assistance they had every reason to expect and on which their construction planning was based.

The Public Law 815 application submitted by School Superintendent H. A. Wallace for Potter County Consolidated Common School District No. 3 requested assistance totaling $35,226. Because the present law precludes assistance in providing permanent facilities to schools due to suffer loss of enrollment from the closing of Federal installations, the Potter County district was not able to receive this amount. Instead it had the option of accepting two temporary classroom trailers, to which title would have remained with the Commissioner of Education, or to accept the equivalent amount in cash as an increment toward construction of facilities to be financed in part by the local school district. Potter County chose to accept the latter option, receiving $21,000 from the Federal Government and adding its own funds to construct a $40,925 addition to the Highland Park School consisting of two classrooms and allied facilities.

I commend our colleagues' attention to the merit of section 3 in H.R. 9022, permitting the Potter County school district and others to receive assistance to the extent of their eligibility before Secretary McNamara's announcement.

Enactment of this legislation, restoring some $14,226 in Public Law 815 eligibility for the Potter County district, will enable the Federal Government to keep faith with the local taxpayers who have maintained and developed a first-class school system serving assigned military patrons as well as the permanent civilian population.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time, while the House is again considering H.R. 9022, a bill for construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster, that I bring to the attention of Members of this body the unusual and unfortunate situation which exists in one of the school districts in my State. This particular district—Box Elder County in Utah—is truly the victim of a "major disaster," but the nature of it is such that relief under H.R. 9022, as presently written, is not possible. I therefore have introduced H.R. 10776, which is now pending before the Judiciary Committee, for the purpose of granting relief to the Box Elder County School District. Because of the unusual and pressing circumstances of this particular case, however, and its relation to the subject matter of the bill now before us for consideration, I would like to place in the RECORD at this point extracts from the brief prepared by the Box Elder County School District so that the Members of the House may be informed of the difficult and perplexing problems faced by this particular school district in my State:

BRIEF OF THE BOX ELDER COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

From the inception of the law, the Box Elder County School District has been found eligible for assistance under Public Law 874. Until the school year 1959-60, this entitlement came primarily from eligible pupils whose parents were employed at Hill Air Force Base and Utah General Depot in Ogden and Intermountain School in Brigham City.

During the 1959-60 school year, Thiokol Chemical Corp. was declared federally connected to the extent that the Box Elder County School District could count pupils whose parents were employed there for 874 entitlement; however, a commingle percentage of 10 percent was to be applied to the number of pupils. This means that of the 825 pupils whose parents were employed at Thiokol, the school district could count 82.5.

Since this time the Box Elder County School District has been eligible for funds from Public Law 874 through Thiokol Chemical Corp. The commingle percentage, however, has been applied each year and has gone from a low of 9 percent in 1960-61 to a high of 16.7 percent in 1962-63. Because of the application of the commingle percentage factor, the percentage of entitlement from this source has not been too great, even though the problems which Thiokol brought to the county were almost overwhelming.

By the use of temporary portable buildings, by going into double sessions in some of the schools, by overcrowding available buildings, and by building and bonding to the limit of its ability, the Box Elder County Board of Education was able to house the rapidly growing school population.

At the end of the 1963-64 school year the last contracts were signed to provide buildings for the enlarged school population brought in by Thiokol Chemical Corp.

When school began in the fall of 1964 the district was faced with another even more perplexing problem, the school population was now dropping as rapidly as it had been rising in the past, and new frustrating problems arose in the form of too many employees for the number of pupils; empty classrooms, which were not yet paid for; budget deficits from funds paid on an average daily attendance basis and other numerous problems related to this situation. On top of all this the district received notice from the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that it would be necessary to repay to the Federal Government as an overpayment under Public Law 874, $288,819.29 received from Thiokol Chemical Corp. in privilege taxes. This amount represents the revenue received from a 4.5 mill levy in the district and approximately 10 percent of the annual operation and maintenance budget.

This privilege tax issue has been a problem to Box Elder County for years and only after two court hearings and considerable deliberation, was the decision made in the spring of 1964 that such taxes are constitutional.

The Box Elder County Board of Education is deeply concerned over this matter and although the citizens of the area are, and will be forever, grateful for the aid received under Public Law 874 over the past few years, they do protest the deduction of such funds from Public Law 874 entitlement.

1. Thiokol Chemical Corp. is a private industrial firm which utilizes some Federal property and is, therefore, subject to the privilege tax. This tax, however, is not upon the Federal Government but upon the company. Decisions handed down from the courts have consistently emphasized this fact. Thiokol Chemical Corp. is not regarded as an instrumentality of the Federal Government but as an independent contractor. The Government specifies an end product but does not interfere in the method or manner in which the company produces such product. In other words, the Federal Government simply contracts with the company and pays for the services under the terms of the contract. Thiokol pays the taxes from the profits of its business or uses the contract for figuring overhead. This, of course, is common business procedure and the fact that the Government is a second party, as the case may be, should not alter the fact that a private company is doing a private business and paying taxes from its profits. It is difficult to see that the taxes are being paid by the Federal Government and thus should be counted as an offset against other Government obligations for support of education. If, under this premise, the Government can claim an offset it would seem that likewise a private individual could claim relief from taxes for payment of goods and services he has received through similar contracts.

2. Privilege taxes paid by Thiokol Chemical Corp. to the Box Elder County are divided proportionately among local agencies including, Brigham City and Tremonton, other agencies of the county exclusive of schools and the State of Utah.

Each of the other agencies listed receive, or have received, aid from the Federal Government for operation of their services and to our knowledge there is no other case where the privilege tax is applied as a deduction against their entitlement. From our point of view it would seem that a deduction of this tax from school entitlement for Federal aid is discriminatory and should be corrected.

3. Thiokol Chemical Corp., as has been mentioned earlier, is not the only agency from which the Box Elder County School District receives entitlement for Public Law 874 funds. Other agencies in the area contribute greatly to the district's entitlement.

The portion of 874 entitlement due the Box Elder County School District is becoming less and less as the Thiokol privilege tax becomes greater. It is obvious that as employment drops at Thiokol the amount of entitlement becomes less while the tax becomes greater.

If the Thiokol owned research and development area is isolated from the Air Force plant, and this research area, it appears, is where most of the privilege tax problem originates, an even gloomier picture appears. Here, we already have deducted 85 to 90 percent of the pupils who are connected to the operation because their parents are employed there, which in itself should offset claims by the Federal Government that privilege taxes should constitute a deduction from 874 funds. When this is done the percentage of entitlement is far less than the percentage of entitlement deducted by the privilege tax.

In this light, it is apparent that money due the Box Elder County Board of Education through pupil connection to other Federal agencies will now be refunded to the government because of taxes paid by Thiokol Chemical Corp. It appears to us that if the Government can work the law in this manner it is subject to manipulation and the Federal Government, by controlling contracts and location of plants in certain areas, can divest itself of responsibility.

4. The purpose of Public Law 874 is to give aid to school districts in areas where

activities of the Federal Government place undue hardships on school systems. Since 1956 the Box Elder County School District has felt the impact of the Thiokol Chemical Corp. operation.

Employment at Thiokol mushroomed to a high of 6,100 in the 1961–62 school year and now the trend is just opposite.

During the interim between 1956 and 1962 the Box Elder County School District was greatly concerned with the school population which followed very closely the same trend as Thiokol employment.

With the school population growing so rapidly, the board of education was faced with a housing problem which is only now beginning to come under control.

The Box Elder County Board of Education has done all within its power to meet the challenge of the Thiokol influx through bonding. The money for which the district bonded was used to provide housing for pupils moving into the area, primarily because of the Thiokol operation.

To show the extent of the building operation, the district had adequate housing for 5,786 pupils in the 1959–60 school year, by 1962 there was housing for 7,553, by the beginning of 1965–66 school year our facilities will accommodate 10,485 pupils.

To provide this much new housing has been a terrific strain on the school district and now an even more perplexing problem makes itself evident. The district now has the buildings and the debts to accompany them but now the school population is not sufficient to fill them and since a large percentage of the district's money is paid by the State on an average daily attendance basis, the aid from this source is diminishing. To further complicate the matter the county assessor has estimated that the assessed valuation for the county will be approximately $2 million less this year.

Obviously the board of education is concerned when asked to refund $288,819.29 in privilege taxes, by deducting it from present and future 874 entitlement. If Public Law 874 were designed to give aid to districts in meeting problems such as those listed above it would seem very illogical that after the crisis is met the Federal Government could make such a request.

Again, the Box Elder County Board of Education expresses appreciation for moneys received under Public Law 874, for without them the district could not provide an adequate educational program for pupils in the county, and encourage a continuation of the law, however, it cannot accept, at this time, a ruling which requires it to deduct money due the district through Public Law 874 because of taxes paid by a private industry for private gain.

For the aforementioned reasons; namely:

1. The apparent inconsistency of a law which would allow the Federal Government to withhold Federal funds because of taxes paid by a private individual.

2. The discriminatory nature of a law which provides that one local governmental body should deduct tax moneys from Federal aid entitlement while others sharing the same tax remain exempt from such deductions.

3. The manipulative nature of a law which would allow the Federal Government to divest itself of all responsibility to the people through controlling contracts and location of plants in certain areas.

4. The illogical nature of a law which would exempt the Federal Government of its legal responsibility to an agency because of taxes paid to that agency by a private corporation.

The Box Elder County Board of Education requests that consideration be given this matter with the intent of declaring that the portion of Public Law 874 which makes such provisions possible be declared not in keeping with the original intent of the law and that the law be either reinterpreted or, if necessary, amended to prohibit the above-mentioned practice, and that the $288,819.29 debt now claimed by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare be set aside.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PERKINS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. PERKINS moves that the House concur in Senate amendment No. 12.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

PENDING SUGAR LEGISLATION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable controversy about the pending sugar legislation and I wanted to speculate what might be in the motion to recommit and point out that it will not be based on any political considerations.

The present Sugar Act provides that in the allocation of the Cuban reserve and the allocation of our deficits special consideration shall be given to those countries who buy our surplus commodities. I would point out this language is not in the bill we are now considering in the House. I trust the motion to recommit will have an amendment which was offered in the committee and defeated on a very close vote of 16 to 14. It is only practical that we allocate our deficits so as to give preference to those countries who buy our surpluses, whether it be wheat or cotton or tobacco, or anything else. Also I trust the motion to recommit may contain a provision that would preclude quotas to any country which either ships to or trades with or permits its ships to be used in trade with North Vietnam and certain other countries.

We should not give any country a bonus, when that country trades with our enemy.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 365]

Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Baring
Bingham
Bonner
Brock
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Culver
Diggs
Evans, Colo.
Flood
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Hardy
Hays
Hébert
Holifield
Hosmer
Lindsay
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McClory
McEwen
O'Hara, Ill.
Patman
Powell
Quie
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Saylor
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
White, Idaho
Wolff
Wyatt
Young

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MADDEN). On this rollcall 383 Members answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight to file a report on H.R. 11539.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I understand that under the parliamentary procedure those of us who are interested in the sugar bill will not be allowed to speak today because only 10 minutes will be allotted to each side.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to record my support of H.R. 11135 as reported by the Committee on Agriculture. I believe it will bring stability to the sugar economy of this country and that its provisions represent an equitable solution to the very complex problems that vexed the entire domestic sugar industry throughout the last session of Congress. Furthermore, and equally important, I believe the bill when enacted will give the consumers of the Nation adequate supplies of sugar at reasonable and stable prices—at the same time promoting the foreign trade of the United States. Foreign trade is of vital importance to the port area of Boston and to the great State of Massachusetts.

The Revere Sugar Refinery and the American Sugar Co. each have a refinery in the Boston metropolitan area. In 1964, they brought over 400,000 tons of raw sugar through the port of Boston. More than 70 ships entered and departed from the port because of these refineries. Both companies have assured me that the bill before us will insure the continuation of this commerce and hence will insure continuation of the refinery and waterfront jobs such commerce generates.

The raw sugar imported into Boston is valued at over $50 million per year and generates an estimated $25 million more in business in the area.

The two refineries provide direct employment for more than 1,000 workers and maintain an annual payroll of approximately $7,500,000.

I said earlier that this bill, and the stability to our sugar economy it promotes, will stimulate our foreign trade. Let me elaborate on that point.

Foreign trade is a two-way street. Foreign nations cannot buy from us, if they cannot sell to us. A few figures from a study made 2 years ago will illustrate the point.

In 1961, Latin American sugar producing countries, alone, purchased some $75 million worth of Massachusetts products. These exports of machinery, instruments, electrical equipment and other goods produced in my State provided an estimated 9,000 jobs and $53 million in factory wages and farm income. Thus, the refining industry benefits every part of the State of Massachusetts. It is understandable, therefore, why I have a vital and continuing interest in sugar legislation. I want to be sure that the consumers of my State, and the industry in it, get a fair shake.

Members will recall that last year the various groups, which make up the domestic sugar industry, were at loggerheads. Legislation was stimulated, which, if enacted, would have taken 750,000 tons of sugar quota annually from the cane refining industry, for transfer to the beet industry. These proposals died aborning because those of us with refineries in our States, and large consuming populations, resisted them with all the vigor at our command. Not only were such bills against the best interest of our States but against the national interest.

This year the House Agriculture Committee urged the domestic sugar industry to exercise restraint and statesmanship—urged the industry to consult with the executive departments to develop common and joint legislative recommendations to the Congress. This was done. In consequence, the domestic provisions of the bill before us today are supported by the administration and by all groups within the domestic sugar industry.

In my judgment H.R. 11135 represents an equitable solution to the very complicated problems which confronted its authors. The quotas it provides for the beet and mainland cane areas will permit those producers to dispose of their surpluses in an orderly manner, without putting any refineries out of business, which last year's proposals would have done. It is true that in the first few years of the new act—assuming this bill becomes law—the refiners of the country are giving up substantial tonnage to the beet area; however, as national sugar consumption increases, due to the annual growth in population, there will be a yearly increase of about 50,000 tons in their level of operations. Thus, by the end of the period, covered by the bill, the annual output of the refiners will be back to approximately the same ratio, when compared with the beets as they have under the present 1962 act. But I emphasize again, that I am assured no refinery will be shut down because of this bill. The jobs in our refineries, on our waterfronts—longshoremen, warehousemen, truckers, jobbers—and in our exporting industries are protected to the extent they rely on raw sugar imports for their business; and the consumer is protected.

Again I say, this is a good bill and I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for it—just as I hope they will join me in voting against the import fee amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois. I speak briefly to that amendment.

First, the sponsor's basic assumptions are extremely misleading. The gentleman from Illinois calculates the difference between the United States and world prices at $3.50 per hundredweight or $70 per ton. He then multiplies this figure by the approximately 4 million tons of sugar we obtain from foreign sources annually to come up with a yearly "quota premium" of $280 million. Then he multiplies his yearly figure of $280 million by 5 years and concludes that the so-called quota premium will amount to $1.4 billion.

These calculations are pure speculation to say the least. The gentleman operates on the false assumption that the world price of sugar, and hence the difference between that price and the U.S. price, will remain static throughout the life of a new Sugar Act. This assumption flies in the face of the very nature and entire history of the so-called world sugar market.

The world market is a very thin market. Less than 10 percent of the world's production is sold in it. That market, therefore, is subject to wild and wide fluctuations. In July 1962, for example, sugar was selling in the world market for about $2.50 per hundredweight. Seven months later the price had exceeded $6 per hundred and 10 months later the price hit $12.60—over 5 times the price which prevailed when the 1962 act passed the Congress.

Proponents of the import fee were claiming, in 1962, that the fee would raise $180 million per year for the U.S. Treasury. They, in 1962, like my friend from Illinois now, were basing their calculations on a false premise; namely, that the world price would remain static. They completely misjudged market trends. The import fee during the 2½ years it was in effect raised, not $180 million per year, but only $38 million—for the entire 2½-year period—and the experimental fee combined with the experimental global quota cost U.S. consumers over $400 million in higher sugar prices.

The $400 million figure cited is derived as follows: On page 9 of the hearings on the sugar bill the Department of Agriculture's witness stated:

> During the period from February 1963 to June 1964 the price of raw sugar, duty paid at New York, averaged 8 cents per pound. It was 1½ cents per pound above the usual price in the United States.

During the February 1963 to June 1964 period approximately 14 million tons of sugar was sold in the United States. The Department's own figures show that, during this period, the average price was 1½ cents per pound above the normal price. That converts to $30 per ton above the normal price and $30 per ton times 14 million tons produces a figure of $420 million.

The gentleman from Illinois is as wrong on his calculations today as his forerunners were in 1962. For this reason alone his proposal should be voted down.

In addition, however, the President of the United States himself eliminated the fee from the administration's proposal. Adoption of this amendment would be in direct conflict with the assurances he gave the Latin American Ambassadors on August 17 when he told them, and I quote:

> I will propose today that Congress eliminate the special import fee on sugar, so the full price of sugar will get to Latin American producers.

I restate my hope that you will join me in voting against the import fee amendment and for H.R. 11135.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, this is the second time in 29 years that finds me down here in the well on a bill that does not concern my district or the committee of which I am a member. I am down here today because I understand there is a man representing a friendly country—one of the real friends we have in South America and Latin America—Venezuela. He is representing them because they did not receive a proper quota in previous years. This same man was the assistant chief counsel for Harry Truman on the Truman Investigating Committee charged with the oversight of the spending of billions of dollars in World War II. When he got in the act profiteers stopped stealing. That is how good he is. His able work helped skyrocket Harry Truman ultimately into the Presidency of the United States, where he subsequently made a good and great President.

We are here today in regard to this sugar legislation. If I understand anything about this bill, the Congress of the United States has charge of all foreign commerce in this area, but in these proposed amendments we are asking the chairman of this committee and the Congress, if they will take the advice of the Department of Agriculture. The chairman of the committee has said in effect, "I am down here to pass this bill for the Congress and for the people." We, the people, are the boss and not the President, the Senators, or the Congressmen. If this act does not turn out all right, then the people will come into it, because they properly have control. They are the boss. However, when you put the power in the hands of some agency downtown with people who never run for public office you exclude the people from being a party to the legislation and from expressing their views. That is why I am asking you here today to follow the leadership and vote for this sugar bill.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. **SISK**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. **SISK**. Mr. Speaker, of course, we are coming to the close of the consideration of the Sugar Act extension. There has been a lot of discussion and controversy and accusations and so on. In the final analysis, though, the American housewife and the American consumer have enjoyed a stable supply of sugar at a stable price under this act. I want to commend the members of the Committee on Agriculture for the great job that they have done here. I think a lot of the criticism and a lot of the charges and the material printed in the press are wholly unwarranted. These criticisms are just totally unjustified. I hope today this House will pass this act and indicate our faith and confidence in our colleagues on that committee who, in my opinion, have done a good job. I do not agree with everything in it, but after all, all legislation is a result of compromise. In my opinion, in the long run, this legislation is in the best interests of our country.

PENDING SUGAR LEGISLATION

Mr. **ASPINALL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ASPINALL**. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 11135. I do so, at this time, as the Member of this body who represents a district which has more sugarbeet production than any other congressional district in the United States. I have closely observed the economic welfare of this industry throughout my life. For the past 17 years I have actively participated in the legislative efforts to improve, strengthen and extend the Sugar Act of 1948. The bill before us represents a major step in our continuing effort to bring stability to the domestic sugar industry—a stability that is vital to the producers, the processors, and the consumer.

I wish to recognize and commend the domestic sugar industry on two points, Mr. Speaker. First, we must not forget the response of that industry when this Nation asked for and received a rapid expansion in production to meet anticipated shortages during the early part of this decade. However, with a number of factors coming into play, the anticipated shortages evolved into a threatening surplus. We are told that mountain climbers find the descent from the summit much more arduous and dangerous than the ascent. So it was with the imperative cutback that faced the domestic sugar industry. The climb to the pinnacle of domestic sugar production was not nearly so precipitous as the trip down.

The second point of recognition that I make, Mr. Speaker, is that this economically disrupting task was faced realistically and the often-divided domestic industry reached a position of agreement. In the words of Mr. Frank Kemp, the spokesman for the domestic sugar industry, this represents "something of a miracle in legislative history." The lack of unanimity within the domestic sugar industry has long made the task of legislation one of our more difficult periodic chores. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues will join with me in hailing the unified position that is presented to us in this legislation that is before the House today.

The provisions of this bill, as proposed by the committee, carried out over the 5-year extension that is proposed, will pave the way for a return from the surplus market—for which the producers did not ask—to a more normal situation in which all segments of the industry may move forward toward a stable economic future that can expand with the needs of the Nation.

PENDING SUGAR LEGISLATION

Mr. **CALLAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CALLAN**. Mr. Speaker, we are considering complicated legislation today, but I think it can be reduced to very simple terms.

First, the sugar program has been successful. The domestic consumers under this program can be assured adequate supplies at reasonable prices.

Second, domestic producers in the United States must have this program because right now there are 1 million tons of sugar in surplus and without orderly marketing this can mean economic chaos to the whole industry.

Third, with reference to lobbyists, I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture and I have not seen a lobbyist except at our committee hearings. I have talked to members of the committee who have not been contacted by any lobbyists. The only time we have been contacted by representatives of foreign sugar interests is during the hearings.

In regard to foreign allotments, there were four members of the Republican Party and four members of the Democratic Party who made the recommendations to our committee. These members are men and women of the highest integrity. We took their recommendations, with some minor changes. The foreign allocations in this legislation were developed by this method.

Fourth, in regard to the import fees I believe an import fee has some merit. However the proposed amendment for import fees is unreasonable. The fee would amount to 1½ times the present world price of sugar or 50 percent of the price of raw sugar in the United States. The imposition of this fee would have grave international complications and I urge its rejection. The present sugar bill is for 5 years and the farm bill we just passed is for 4 years. Our committee will have an opportunity to study and improve both pieces of legislation. I urge the passage of H.R. 11135 without amendments.

THE PENDING SUGAR LEGISLATION

Mr. **HANNA**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HANNA**. Mr. Speaker, I should like to use this minute to ask the chairman of the committee a question, if I may.

Mr. Chairman, I note that the bill contains provisions for reallocation of deficits. On page 8, line 8 of the bill there is a section which provides a possibility where a quota might not be qualified, under the language of that subsection. I should like to ask the chairman this question. In the event that a deficit should result from the application of subparagraph (3) on page 8, would that deficit be reallocated in accordance with the section governing reallocation of deficits for other deficits?

Mr. **COOLEY**. The answer is "yes."

Mr. **HANNA**. I thank the gentleman.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. **COOLEY**. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 11135) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 11135, with Mr. Burke in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **CHAIRMAN**. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read the first amendment as printed in the reported bill. Without objection, the Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 5, line 6, strike out the period and quotation marks and insert "with sugar produced in such country.".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the other committee amendments be read and voted on en bloc. They are technical and clerical in nature and are not controversial.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, beginning on line 15, strike out "up to and including the amount".

Page 5, line 17, after the word "determination" insert "up to and including the amount".

Page 5, line 22, strike out "in excess of the amount" and on line 23, after the word "determination" insert "in excess of the amount".

Page 6, line 1, insert parenthesis around the figure "3".

Page 8, line 7, strike out "other than Ireland".

Page 8, line 19, change the lower case "(a)" to upper case "(A)".

Page 9, line 4, strike out "year; and" and insert "year: *Provided,* That in no event shall the quota for the Republic of the Philippines be reduced to an amount less than nine hundred and eighty thousand short tons, raw value, of sugar; and".

Page 9, line 5, change the lower case "(b)" to upper case "(B)".

Page 9, line 15, after the word "reduction" insert "under either subparagraphs (a) or (b)".

Page 10, line 2, after "Secretary," insert "and".

Page 10, line 10, strike out "(A)" and insert "(1)".

Page 10, line 13, strike out "125" and insert "115".

Page 10, line 14, strike out "(B)" and insert "(2)".

Page 10, line 16, change the comma after "July 1" to a period and strike out all of lines 17, 18, 19, and 20.

Page 13, line 12, after the word "under" insert "the foregoing provisions of".

Page 14, beginning on line 13, strike out "under this subsection," and insert "for any country listed in Section 202 (c) (3) (B),".

Page 14, line 15, after the word "countries" insert "so".

Page 14, line 15, after the word "listed" strike out "in Section 202(c) (3) (B)".

Page 20, line 4, strike out, "Belgium,".

Page 20, beginning on line 6, strike out the semicolon and "one hundred and eighty-two short tons, raw value, for Belgium;".

Page 20, beginning on line 14, change the semicolon to a period and strike out the remainder of line 14 and all of lines 15 through 24.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the amendment provided for under the rule?

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is provided for in the rule and begins on page 12 after line 14.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 12, after line 14, insert the following:

"'("h) Effective January 1, 1966, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the quota of any country shall be reduced to zero for the balance of the period covered by this Act if any authorized person appearing or working in the interest of such country in regard to sugar legislation is registered or required to be registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act; except that the quota shall not be reduced below any treaty obligation.' ";".

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, lobbying for U.S. citizens and organizations is proper, and much of it helpful.

But I have dug deep enough into the foreign sugar lobby to know that it is open to suspicion. One of these days the lid is going to blow off the sugar bowl, and when that happens I want the House of Representatives to be standing in the clear. That is why I offer this amendment.

If Chairman Cooley operated the Agriculture Committee on the same proper policies that govern the Ways and Means Committee, the foreign sugar lobby could not thrive as it does. I doubt that it would exist at all. Lobbyists can sell their services for $50,000 a year, because the Agriculture Committee gives them status, lets them testify, and this makes them look important. The system leads foreign countries to believe they have to hire a lobbyist to get a quota.

In contrast, the Ways and Means Committee has an inflexible rule that no foreign agent, no lobbyist for a foreign government can appear before it. Unfortunately Chairman Cooley does not run his committee that way.

Do foreign sugar lobbyists really peddle influence? I cite as authority Chairman Cooley, who on page 182 of the hearings credits one of these lobbyists, Arthur L. Quinn with packing enough wallop to kill an import fee proposal that would have enriched the U.S. taxpayers by $80 million a year.

Whether these lobbyists really peddle influence or not, they put doubt and suspicion over sugar legislation.

John A. O'Donnell used public office for personal profit to such an extent that in 1962 the Congress passed a law just to bar him from getting additional commissions. He was charged with deceiving Congress and the Executive, and yet he is still a prominent sugar lobbyist.

Chairman Cooley spoke yesterday of vicious insinuations. What insinuations could be more vicious than those placed against Members of Congress by Lobbyists John A. O'Donnell and Monroe Karasik, as recorded in the 1962 Senate hearings?

O'Donnell, Karasik, and others in the foreign sugar lobby make Congress look bad at home and abroad. Foreign countries are led to believe they must have to pay somebody to get a quota.

Argentina believes its quota was cut because it had no lobbyist.

Venezuela got a big quota increase, and I daresay its new $50,000-a-year lobbyist, Charles Patrick Clark, is doing his best to claim credit.

It is easily seen how this lobby makes the U.S. Congress look bad.

I have yet to discover one scrap of useful information these lobbyists provide the committee which is not readily available from official sources.

Perhaps Chairman Cooley can help.

Mr. Cooley, what useful information have you ever received from these $50,000-a-year influence peddlers that was not readily available from official sources?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois for the work he has done in this area in directing our attention to procedures and to confirm what he says, as I understand it, the Committee on Ways and Means and the procedures followed by that committee. We establish our guidelines and our procedures and get away from these personalities that unfortunately have to be indulged in. I again want to commend him.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RESNICK. Would this affect the sugar quotas in this bill? In other words, all of the foreign countries using lobbyists on this quota would virtually be thrown out?

Mr. FINDLEY. I am not sure what the gentleman means.

Mr. RESNICK. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted, therefore the countries that do use lobbyists will be thrown out?

Mr. FINDLEY. It is not retroactive. It is effective only on the date of enactment of this legislation. The countries would have ample opportunity to clear their skirts, pay off the boys, and cancel any lobbyist contracts.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Since an honest confession is good for the soul, I think it is well for all of us to acknowledge a few things in considering this amendment. We all have our likes and dislikes; we all have our pet peeves and pet projects; we are all prone to proclaim our love of motherhood and our hatred of sin. As to those who are inclined to overplay their own virtues, the English have a reply: "Forget it, because to them all their geese are swans."

Now, lobbyists do present a problem. In my judgment, however, it is as wrong to say that all lobbyists as a general rule are bad as to say that all politicians, all insurance people, or, yes, all business people, are bad.

We all know that there are hundreds of lobbyists in Washington, and if we do not acknowledge this, we are only kidding ourselves. But for my part I have an open door policy. Anyone can see me. I make it a practice to see representatives of all groups, and it is sometimes even difficult to say whether they are lobbyists in the true sense of the word.

I do know that under the Constitution people have a right to petition Congress, and in a way visits by representatives of groups constitute their way of petitioning Members of Congress. Anyway, I know I have seen and see many lobbyists, although I certainly have not seen anyone whose actions have been described by certain people on this floor. I do know also that I have not stultified myself by talking to representatives of groups of people and I am satisfied that I have not been corrupted by these conversations.

Now, we have a law on the books called the Foreign Agents Registration Act. As I pointed out yesterday, if this act needs to be amended, let us amend it; if there are loopholes in it, let us close those loopholes; and if more teeth should be added, let us add them. As a matter of fact, I have held hearings on this very subject during the year and I hope and expect to be able to report out a bill next session. I think that is the right way to cope with the problem we are talking about.

But I do not believe that the Findley approach is the right way.

What does his amendment say?

First, let me point out that all the countries who sell us our deficit sugar requirements are friendly countries. We do not buy sugar from any unfriendly country.

Now, the Findley amendment says that if any friendly country should dare to employ an American citizen—an American citizen, mind you—to represent it in connection with sugar legislation, from then on we will not buy a pound of sugar from that country.

During the debates the finger was pointed at only two or three representatives of foreign countries appearing in Washington on behalf of sugar legislation. The charge in substance is that these representatives are receiving excessive fees. But we do not know exactly how the fees are measured. Perhaps they earn their money. At least we have heard of only two or three complaints. But if it is true that excessive fees were charged in two or three cases, the amendment would penalize the friendly foreign countries whose representatives appear to have been above reproach so far as the proponents of this amendment have revealed to the general membership of the House.

Why then penalize all representatives of all friendly countries?

Why single out sugar when we know that no court would uphold such discriminatory legislation?

What about representatives of other commodities? What about representatives of manufactured goods? What about representatives of industry generally? What about representatives of labor unions?

Besides, does anyone believe for a moment that these foreign friendly sovereign powers would take it lying down? Does anyone really believe they would not retaliate against representatives of our people doing business with them. As I said yesterday, if anyone believes that he is only dreaming; that if anyone on this floor believes that I am defending anything wrong or evil or improper, he is not only dreaming but he is doing me and others who feel that the way to go about this is to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act an unkindness and an injustice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chariman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, my able colleague from the State of Illinois, Congressman PAUL FINDLEY, has achieved noteworthy success in making it possible for Members of the House to vote on the merits of two amendments to H.R. 11135, the proposed revision and 5-year extension of the Sugar Act.

The Findley amendments are sound and reasonable, and I wish at this point to express my support of them.

One of the amendments would return to the U.S. Treasury three-fourths of the profits on sugar now being received by foreign countries. The other amendment would restrict the activities of lobbyists for foreign sugar interests.

The Findley amendment for a 75 percent import fee would achieve a compromise between the 100 percent import fee sought by the late President Kennedy in 1962 and the 50-percent import fee embraced by the Johnson administration.

Foreign sugar quotas today are yielding about $200 million profit not anticipated by Congress. Under administrative ruling, earlier foreign quotas were extended through 1965, but the import fees were not. In October of 1964, the administration announced that an import fee was a necessity for new sugar legislation. On March 29, 1965, the domestic sugar industry issued recommendations for new sugar legislation, including a recommendation that a 50 percent import fee, or 1 cent a pound, whichever is lower, be adopted. Later, however, the administration changed its course, dropping the demand for an import fee. I am not sure what caused this change in policy.

The Findley amendment could return to the U.S. Treasury some $210 million annually, or $1.4 billion during the 5-year term of the proposed legislation. At present prices, the 25 percent being retained by quota countries would amount to $17.50 a ton—a substantial advantage when compared with the world sugar price of about $40 per ton.

This amendment would not force sugar prices up, it would not change the volume of imports, and it would not change U.S. sugar prices.

It would however reduce by three-fourths the pure profit on sugar now enjoyed by foreign interests. It could also reduce the tendency toward overproduction in foreign countries.

I cannot see how the Congress of the United States can do anything other than vote to establish the 75-percent import fee on sugar.

Congressman FINDLEY's other amendment would restrict the activities of lobbyists who try to influence sugar quotas for foreign governments.

Some foreign sugar lobbyists in the past have received lobbying fees based on the size of the sugar quotas obtained by their clients. Also of importance is the fact that the foreign sugar lobbyists are unable to provide information to Congress which is not readily available from official governmental sources.

This amendment would not impair the rights of U.S. citizens; it would not handicap foreign governments in presenting information to the U.S. Government; it would not prevent foreign governments and foreign sugar interests from hiring U.S. firms and individuals to deal with nonlegislative aspects of sugar problems; and it would not apply to lobbying in regard to U.S. sugar interests.

In drawing up these amendments and in calling them to the attention of the Nation, Congressman FINDLEY has performed a fine service. Drawing on his reportorial and publishing background and relying on his broad experience as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, Congressman FINDLEY has made a strong case for his amendments.

Extension of the Sugar Act without these amendments would undoubtedly be sweet news to the sugar producers in foreign countries. But it would leave a sour taste in the mouths of the people of the United States. I will support the two Findley amendments.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I listened attentively to yesterday's debate. I have reviewed some of the hearings, and have carefully read the report of the committee.

I am opposed to this bill and will vote against it. I will also support the Findley amendment barring the employment of lobbyists in connection with the allocation of these sugar quotas.

I am opposed to the means employed to allocate the sugar production quotas outside this country. This bill allots sugar production to some 30 countries. Through these quotas the sugar producers in these lucky countries will receive $280 million more than if they sold at world market prices.

I have found no objective criteria by which these quotas are assigned to the participating countries. I have searched the committee report in vain for these objective criteria. The only standards which the committee professes to have used are so general and vague as to be meaningless.

If quotas were assigned to 30 States in the United States on the same basis as they are assigned through this bill to nations abroad, a public howl of outrage and indignation would be heard across the Nation. The lack of objective standards would lead to charges that the quotas are assigned "arbitrarily," "unreasonably," and without any kind of objective measure.

After all, when the Federal Government establishes programs for the benefit of its own citizens, it must employ reasonably firm standards in distributing grants or benefits. The production of sugar within the United States is a case in point. The payments to sugar growers in the United States and the acreage restrictions themselves are based on objective criteria. Why are there no objective criteria for the granting of quotas abroad? Both the Department of Agriculture and the principal spokesman for the domestic producers urged that a formula be used to fix these overseas quotas, but the committee obviously has not elected to do so.

What should these criteria be? I will suggest a few which could provide a reasonable basis for quotas: First, the historical quota held by a country; second, the historical allocation held by a region of the world; third, the history of sugar production in a country; fourth, the proportion which a country's sugar exports bear to her other exports—in other words, her dependency upon sugar for foreign exchange earnings; fifth, the proportion of sugar exported by a country compared to its domestic consumption; sixth, the other preferential sugar markets available to a country; seventh, the character and diversity of ownership of sugar production units; eighth, the per capita income of the country; ninth, the relationship which sugar production bears to the general development needs of the country; and, tenth, the self-help measures taken by a country to improve its economy.

If a formula were adopted, the historical quota should obviously be the starting point, with only gradual, step-by-step changes made in accordance with the formula.

I suggest another possibility. Most of our quotas are assigned to the Western Hemisphere. Why not give this amount in gross to the Western Hemisphere with the allocation to be made by the OAS or some special committee having appropriate power? The same technique could be used with respect to the small amount allotted to Africa. The OAU could be invited to allocate this quota. Alternatively, the OAS and the OAU could participate with the United States jointly in arriving at these decisions.

Finally, the need for an orderly, worldwide system of marketing in sugar as well as in other commodities is becoming increasingly evident. We need to work more vigorously at improved marketing of food because food is growing in importance as population outstrips food production.

Mr. Chairman, I do not base my objection to this bill on its failure to suggest an international or regional forum to participate in these marketing decisions, desirable as that would be. My fundamental objection is based on the arbitrary assignment of quotas which are not based on some formula capable of either precise ascertainment or which give approximate guidelines.

The absence of such criteria provide a field day for foreign intervention into the decisionmaking processes of this Congress. While I ordinarily do not oppose the use of counsel to represent outside interests, whether they be foreign nations or not, in this case the circumstances lend themselves to unfortunate conclusions. We should not tolerate a system of allotments which leaves these kinds of possibilities open. For this reason I shall support the bar against lobbyists.

Mr. Chairman, this bill fixes quotas for 5 years. A rejection of this bill would permit the committee to work out standards for the assignment of this quota. In the meantime a 1-year bill which gives relief to domestic producers could be enacted.

I hope others will join in asking the committee to take a new look at the method of assigning overseas sugar quotas.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, each time that sugar legislation is considered by the Congress we hear the same old charges. In recent weeks the columns of the press and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have been filled with accounts of how the American consumer is being victimized by our national sugar program. It would seem that the more than 30 years of successful operation of the U.S. sugar program is its own defense, and that these remarks are therefore unnecessary. However, permit me to reiterate that time and again this program has been declared to be one of the most successful of all farm programs—accomplishing its aims and goals with an astonishing degree of satisfaction. It has provided a necessary commodity to the American consumer at a reasonable and remarkably stable price; it has permitted the maintenance of a healthy American sugar industry, so essential to our long-term needs; and it has permitted friendly foreign countries to participate equitably in our domestic market—fostering international trade and assuring an adequate store of sugar.

The charge is made that the act is in direct conflict with U.S. objectives in foreign trade. The fact is that the administration supports the Sugar Act; that the Departments of Agriculture and State support the Sugar Act; that the act itself, by section 411, provides for the issuance of regulations by the Secretary of Agriculture as may be required to carry out this country's obligations under the International Sugar Agreement for the regulation and marketing of sugar. The Sugar Act is in harmony with our foreign trade policy, not in opposition to its objectives.

The charge is also made that the sugar program imposes a cost of $700 million on U.S. consumers. Underlying this figure are a whole series of implicit assumptions none of which have validity:

First. The assumption is made that the entire domestic sugar industry should either sell its sugar at the present world market price of $2 a hundred pounds or quietly liquidate. A delivered price of $2 a hundred pounds for sugar is far below the cost of production in any area in the world.

Second. The assumption is made that the United States, if it chose to do so, could secure its entire supply of sugar—about 10 million tons per year—from foreign countries on the so-called world market.

Third. The assumption is made that if the United States were to attempt to buy all of its sugar on the world market the price would stay right where it is now, near $2 per hundred pounds.

Individually, each of these assumptions is demonstrably wrong. In combination they are absurd. Any effort to compute the costs of the sugar program should compare costs under realistic alternatives, not under conditions which are inherently impossible. The $700 million figure is a mere exercise in arithmetic, not an estimate at all.

What would it cost to liquidate the domestic sugar industry? What would it cost to be wholly dependent on foreign suppliers? What would our national exposure be if we had to secure all of our sugar in a market largely influenced by Communist nations? I do not know the answers to these questions, but these are the questions that would have to be faced up to if our present sugar program were to be abandoned.

The charge is made that under the sugar program large, and by implication unreasonable, payments are made to U.S. sugar producers. Wholly ignored is the fact that an excise tax on the manufacture of sugar, paid by refiners and beet processors, is an integral part of the sugar program. Since 1937 the total amount collected under this tax has exceeded cost of producer payment by $55 million. The U.S. sugar program does not represent a cost or burden to this Government, but on the contrary it returns each year substantially more than is paid out.

Finally, the charge is made that the sugar program is responsible for prices to the American homemaker which are unreasonably high. The Sugar Act accepts as its price objective a price for raw sugar directly related to the parity index determined under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. The Department of Agriculture has been generally successful in achieving this objective. The result has been that refined sugar prices, which bear a direct relationship to raw sugar prices, have regularly met the standards of fairness which are built into the concept of parity pricing.

It is no criticism of pricing fairness to point to a price in another country, whether it be Canada or elsewhere, which is lower. Canada was used as an example, however, and it may be in order to look a little at its sugar situation. Much of its sugar is being bought, at admittedly low prices, from Cuba. Is this desired for the United States? Is this the way to reduce the price of sugar in the U.S. grocery stores? Canada's whole cost structure, its wages, its per capita income, its gross national product, are at a lower level than in the United States. Is it any surprise, then, that particular commodities may have a slightly lower price in Canada than here?

An objective analysis of the facts cannot but lead to the conclusion that the Sugar Act has well served the national interest; that it has protected the interests of the United States consumers while at the same time it has helped a limited domestic sugar producing industry to survive; and that the Sugar Act should be extended as proposed in H.R. 11135.

I should like to address myself briefly to the two amendments permitted under the rule. First, that which would cancel the quota of any country which is represented by any person required to be registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] in his able presentation has pointed out that this is not a proper subject for inclusion in the Sugar Act. The activities of all persons representing foreign interests are regulated by separate statutes. If these statutes are not adequate they should be changed—but not by amending the Sugar Act.

Second, the Committee on Agriculture, by an overwhelming majority, favors the elimination of the import fee on foreign sugar. The proposed amendment, on the basis of present prices, would mean that this country would be asking friendly nations to supply sugar to this market at substantially below the cost of production in practically every instance. It could well mean that, under certain conditions, this country could not obtain the required supplies. Both the State Department and the Department of Agriculture are opposed to the inclusion of the import fee in this legislation. The President has, in accordance with a promise made to the ambassadors from member countries of the Organization of American States, recommended against the fee. And it should be remembered that a much more modest fee was under consideration when this decision was made—not the confiscatory fee provided in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

As Representative from our greatest sugar-producing State, and as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I urge the passage of the bill as reported by the committee—and the defeat of the Findley amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FINDLEY), there were—ayes 62, noes 83.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FINDLEY and Mr. CALLAN.

The Committee again divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes, 93, noes, 114.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment made in order by the rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINDLEY: On page 21, strike out lines 8 and 9 and insert in lieu thereof: "SEC. 9. Section 213 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 213. (a) As a condition for importing sugar into the continental United States pursuant to sections 202(c) and 204 of this Act, an import fee shall be paid to the United States, which fee shall be 75 per centum of the amount which the Secretary determines from time to time will approximate the amount by which a domestic price for raw sugar at a level that will fulfill the domestic price objective set forth in section 201, exceeds the prevailing world market price for raw sugar (adjusted for freight to New York, and most-favored-nation tariff). The fees provided for in this paragraph shall be imposed on a per pound, raw value, basis, and shall be applied uniformly except that the import fee imposed on any direct-consumption sugar shall be one-half of one cent per pound more than the import fee imposed on raw sugar under this paragraph. Such fees shall be paid by the person applying to the Secretary for entry and release of sugar. Such payment shall be made in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary. The Secretary shall promulgate regulations permitting any importer of sugar to apply for a quota set-aside, furnishing such security as the Secretary may require, which will fix the import fee for any sugar under his control to be imported at any time during a calendar year at the rate then in effect for such calendar year. The Secretary shall determine, from time to time, the rate of import fee and the initial such determination shall be made by October 1 in each year for the succeeding calendar year, except for the calendar year 1966, in which case such determination shall be made at the earliest practicable date.

"'(b) The funds collected as import fees by the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.'"

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, the lobbyist amendment has been disposed of, but I am reassured by the comments by the gentleman from Louisiana in regard to revision of the Foreign Agents Registration Act. The Senate sent over a bill to accomplish this objective 2 years ago, so I am hopeful now for prompt consideration.

The import fee amendment is similar to one recommended to the Congress by the domestic sugar industry on March 28. In making the recommendation the domestic sugar industry argued that it would help to curb overproduction of sugar overseas.

It has many other good features.

It would help our balance of payments. It is hard to estimate precisely what the gain to our balance of payments would be, but assuming present prices continue the gain to our balance of payments would be $210 million a year, or about $1 billion for the life of the bill.

It would help our Federal deficit by the same amount. The likelihood is that we will have another $8 billion deficit or thereabouts when the current fiscal year is out. This amendment would help to reduce the deficit and would of course be a substantial benefit to the U.S. Treasury.

This is similar to the import fee sought until very recently by the Johnson administration; similar to the one sought by the Kennedy administration; similar to the one imposed on the Dominican Republic at one time by the Eisenhower administration; and, similar to one in effect during 1962, 1963, and 1964. So Members can see it does have precedent.

At present prices sugar quotas will yield a pure profit over world prices of about $280 million a year. My amendment would put, therefore, about $210 million of this pure profit into the U.S. Treasury. It would not affect domestic sugar industries in any shape or form. It would leave ample incentive in the foreign quotas for these countries to ship to the U.S. market to the limit of their quotas. Domestic quotas and prices would not be involved at all.

My amendment would help the taxpayers and help our balance of payments, and it would hurt nobody but the profiteers.

If, as some argued yesterday, world prices would go up—and I would expect them to go up some, and I would hope they would—then the import fee would automatically go down proportionately. Under no circumstances would this import fee cause higher sugar prices in the United States.

Under the present bill, believe it or not, Dr. Duvalier, the worst tyrant in the Western Hemisphere, the ruler of Haiti, will have access to big money. The value of the premium prices he will have access to is about $2 million a year or about $10 million for the life of this act. Now, why should the consumers of America help to finance the Duvalier regime?

As presently written, plantation owners in Latin America who pay only 7 cents an hour to canefield workers would get almost as much for the sugar they sell into the U. S. market as do the Hawaiian producers whose canefield workers presently get more than $3 an hour. Compare the $3 an hour with the 7 cents an hour and you get some small idea of the tremendous profit involved in these foreign quotas and the big money in them.

There is no assurance in this bill whatever that any of this big profit would lead to higher pay for the canefield workers of Latin America. Very likely it would just make the rich that much richer.

So far as I can learn, the President has made no commitment or given no assurance on the question of the import fee. If he has, it has been completely out of sight. I cannot find any record of it. He did say that he will propose that Congress eliminate the import fee. It was no promise; no commitment. The decision was left specifically to the Congress.

Given our deficit situation and given our balance-of-payments situation and the uncertain money demands that lie ahead for us in defense, to me it is simple logic to take some of the profit out of these foreign sugar quotas and put these into the U.S. Treasury to benefit all of the American people.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY]. Mr. FINDLEY is an able and hard-working member of the committee. I have served with him on the committee and I know he brings this matter forward in good faith.

I base my opposition to the amendment primarily on two points. First, it would have a most serious impact upon our relations with many important allies and particularly our Latin American neighbors. Second, it would jeopardize, in my opinion, the American consumer's ability to receive a reliable and adequate supply of sugar year in and year out. On the first point the gentleman mentioned the recommendations made earlier in the year by the domestic sugar industry. I have in my hand a memorandum from the domestic sugar industry in which it is said that the industry does not support the amendment which would impose an import fee on sugar.

I have in my hand a letter from the State Department signed by Assistant Secretary MacArthur in which the Department says that it is opposed to the import fee contained in the Findley amendment.

I also have in my hand a letter from the Department of Agriculture signed by the Under Secretary stating that the Department of Agriculture opposes the Findley amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in a statement made by the President of the United States on the fourth anniversary of the Alliance for Progress the President indicated his opposition to this amendment because he said that he would recommend to the Congress—page 13 of this report—that the Congress eliminate the special import fee on sugar.

I have been advised by the White House this morning that the President is opposed to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask: What would the adoption of the Findley amendment do to our relations in Latin America?

First of all, it is at odds with the Charter of Punta del Este, which established as one of the bases of the Alliance for Progress the stability of prices of basic raw materials in commerce between nations.

It contradicts the principles unanimously adopted by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development in June 1964, that we would work together to stabilize prices on major exports at fair levels.

Any import fee on sugar has been protested officially by the Organization of American States. It has been protested in an official communication to the Secretary of State by the President of the Inter-American Committee of the Alliance for Progress, called the CIAP.

Following that recommendation, the President stated:

> And consistent with the CIAP recommendations I will propose this afternoon that Congress eliminate the special import fee on sugar so that the full price will go to the Latin American producers.

Such a proposal was contained in the bill which the administration sent to the Congress on that same date.

To depart from these recommendations could have disastrous effects.

Not only would the adoption of this amendment harm this Nation's diplomatic posture, it would work serious economic hardship on many of our allies and friends.

Reports of the Library of Congress and the Department of Agriculture show that the cost of producing sugar in many of the quota countries averages about 5 cents per pound. The bill before the House today provides to these countries a price of only 5.7 cents per pound.

The Findley amendment would put the United States in the unenviable position of forcing some of our supplying countries to sell us their sugar at less than the cost of production, and on the basis of present prices, for less than other major importing nations are paying.

How would the adoption of this amendment leave the United States in comparison to the other major sugar importing countries?

The United Kingdom has a sugar quota program similar to that of the United States. Its guaranteed price is 5.8 cents per pound, with no duty, a price comparable to that paid in the United States, as opposed to something like 3 cents per pound should the Findley amendment be adopted.

France has a sugar program with a price higher than the price objective in our Sugar Act.

Russia and Red China have contracts to purchase virtually the entire Cuban sugar crop at a price of approximately 6 cents per pound, which, again, is higher than our price.

Adoption of this amendment would present to all the world a devastating contrast between the treatment extended to Cuba by Russia and Red China, and the less generous treatment we would be extending to our loyal allies and neighbors.

Mr. Chairman, our primary objective, of course, is to guarantee permanent and adequate supplies of sugar to the American people at a fair price. The essence of our sugar program is to protect the American consumer against a wildly fluctuating sugar price by limiting our market to reliable suppliers who agree to meet our needs at a set and fair price.

The Findley amendment would sacrifice this time-tested program in an uncertain effort to improve our balance of payments. He says we will gain $200 million a year. But, let us look at the record. For 2½ years beginning in the middle of 1962, there was a levy on most of the sugar coming into the United States. Yet in this entire 2½-year period, the fee netted the U.S. Treasury only $40 million.

This is a matter of record. It is a clear indication that the world market price is completely unpredictable and that the figures used by the gentleman from Illinois are highly questionable. Furthermore, any effect on the balance of payments is conjectural because the earnings of the sugar supplying nations make possible imports by those countries from us.

There is also a relationship between the imposition of an import fee and the aid requirements of the Alliance for Progress programs.

Mr. Chairman, any import fee which reduces the attractiveness of the U.S. market to our suppliers weakens the dependability of the source of supplies for the American housewife. H.R. 11135 provides a comprehensive system that assures that adequate supplies shall always be available. We must not weaken that system.

On all points, I urge the defeat of the amendment.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I include the memorandums and letters to which I referred earlier in my statement:

MEMORANDUM

To: Members of the House Committee on Agriculture.
From: The Domestic Sugar Industry [1]
Subject: Import fee on sugar.
Date: September 30, 1965.

In view of conflicting reports concerning the attitude of the domestic sugar industry toward one aspect of pending sugar legislation, we consider it desirable to set forth our position.

The domestic sugar industry does not support the amendment which would impose an import fee on sugar. It vigorously supports the position of the President and the administration against an import fee.

Confusion as to the industry's position may have arisen because earlier this year it was advised by responsible officials in the administration that consistent with their announcement of October 19, 1964, there would not be administration support for sugar legislation unless such a fee were included. After much discussion the industry agreed to support an import fee of not more than 50 percent of the difference between the so-called world market and the domestic price objective of the act, with a 1-cent-per-pound ceiling.

Subsequently, the President determined that such a fee was inadvisable and announced his position to the ambassadors from the Latin American countries. On August 17, 1965, the President said: "I will propose today that Congress eliminate the special import fee on sugar, so the full price of sugar will get to the Latin American producers."

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., October 12, 1965.
Hon. CARL ALBERT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ALBERT: This administration is firmly opposed to levying a fee on imports of sugar into the United States.

A number of developing countries, especially in this hemisphere, depend on sugar exports for much of their foreign exchange. The United States is the only preferential market available to Latin American countries. The balance of their sugar moves into the world market where prices have been distressingly low all year. At present the price is 2.2 cents per pound which is also just about the average for the year to date. The dollar earnings which they realize from sugar exports to the United States materially reduce the aid requirements of many of these countries.

On August 17, at the ceremony commemorating the fourth anniversary of the Alliance for Progress, the President stated that he would propose to the Congress that Latin American producers receive the full price for sugar shipped to the United States. The bill to carry out the President's recommendations was sent to Congress on the same day.

I am attaching an excerpt from the President's statement which relates to this subject.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN A. SCHNITTKER,
Under Secretary.

---

[1] Domestic Beet Sugar Industry, Mainland Cane Sugar Industry, Hawaiian Sugar Industry, Puerto Rican Sugar Industry, U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners' Association.

EXCERPTS FROM PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT

First, we must step up our efforts to prevent disastrous changes in the prices of those basic commodities which are the lifeblood of so many of our economies. We will continue—as we did this week in London—to strengthen the operation of the coffee agreement and to search for ways to stabilize the price of cocoa.

We will try to maintain a regularly expanding market for the sugar that is produced by Latin America. And consistent with the CIAP recommendations, I will propose this afternoon that Congress eliminate the special import fee on sugar so that the full price will go to the Latin American producers.

Second, we must try to draw the economies of Latin America much closer together. The experience of Central America reaffirms that of Europe. Widened markets—the breakdown of tariff barriers—leads to increased trade and leads to more efficient production and to greater prosperity.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., October 12, 1965.

Hon. CARL ALBERT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ALBERT: The administration would strongly oppose proposals to reintroduce a fee to take away the difference between the world market price for sugar and the domestic price which we choose to pay under the provisions of the Sugar Act.

In his remarks on the fourth anniversary of the Alliance for Progress on August 17, 1965, President Johnson said that we must step up our efforts to prevent disastrous changes in the prices of those basic commodities which are the lifeblood of so many of the economies of the countries in the world. He went on to say that we will try to maintain a regularly expanding market for the sugar that is produced in Latin America, and that consistent with the CIAP recommendations he would propose that Congress eliminate the special import fee on sugar so that the full price would go to the Latin American producers.

When the import fee was first recommended in 1962, the world sugar market had still not recovered from the change in Castro Cuba's sugar policy. It was a time of great uncertainty. The Department hoped at that time that a fee might discourage overly large expansion of production in many countries who were then making their decisions as to whether to move in to fill the gap expected to result from Cuba's decreasing its sugar production. Despite the existence of the fee, many countries continued to expand their production. Prices are now extremely low and the future stability of world sugar is in doubt.

The experience of the last few years has taught us that the global quota and fee arrangements of the 1962 act have not contributed to stability of supplies for our consumers in the way our earlier, traditional system did. It is for this reason that the administration has proposed a return to the former arrangements under which all the foreign portion of our market is assigned to specific, named countries, and no import fee is levied.

Our primary objective must be to guarantee permanent and reliable supplies to the American people. The system of assigned country quotas, buttressed by the return of the quota premium when our price is above the world price, will best assure stable, predictable supplies. The presence of an import fee inevitably reduces the attractiveness of the United States as a market and therefore does not contribute toward security of supplies for the American consumer.

It should be recalled that since the beginning of our present sugar system in 1934, the foreign countries which supply our market have enjoyed the full price (less the tariff) we seek to guarantee to the American farmer. The aspirations of Latin American countries and others which serve our sugar market center around obtaining the full price for what they sell here. Since they have so long had the full price, the introduction of the fee would look to them like the withdrawal of a long established privilege which they would find difficult to understand. It would be received throughout the Western Hemisphere as a denial of what has become a vital economic and political aspiration of theirs; namely, obtaining the full price for their basic export commodities in the markets of the developing countries.

In addition, it should be mentioned that we know a great deal more now about the cost of production in many foreign countries than we did in 1962. At that time there was considerable feeling that the so-called quota premium represented a windfall to countries able to produce sugar at a cost substantially below what they obtained here. Now, as programs like the Alliance for Progress have become more effective, wage rates are generally rising. More and more of the price we pay for sugar is making a direct contribution to increased standards of living in the countries which supply sugar to the United States. In view of our concern for the economic progress of the developing countries, as evidenced by programs like the Alliance for Progress, it would be unwise to take a step which would discourage the economic development of the countries which supply us with sugar.

For these reasons the Department believes that it would be unwise to reintroduce an import fee.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the "noes" had it.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FINDLEY and Mr. CALLAN.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 95, noes 137.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. HARVEY of Indiana moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the Members, I hope to use this time as profitably as possible in explaining to them the nature of the recommital motion which I will offer later. This motion will be very similar to the one that has just been rejected, except it will set the fee at 50 percent instead of 75 percent.

I feel in my own personal rationalization of this legislation that this is a better figure. I think it is one that is more easily defended, and I think it is one that certainly the U.S. Treasury is justified in attempting to impose. I say "attempt" because, as I listened to the discussion of my good friend, the able majority leader, he set forth the reasons why the majority were in opposition to any import fee. I do not think there is any doubt, Mr. Chairman, but what this turnabout in their attitude toward an import fee, is because of the Dominican crisis. It was hoped that by dropping the import fee to appease the ruffled feathers of the Latin American countries that were aroused because of our intervention there. I think the President himself, when he originally recommended this fee, realized it was a just and equitable levy and should be incorporated in the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It is my understanding that within the last year the administration was for this precise provision in the law.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. That is right, so were the domestic sugar producers and the refining industry. It has been supported also by the last three Presidents.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Every time something comes up on the floor of this body we are told it will seriously jeopardize our international relations with our Latin American friends. This was the red herring that was used at the time the House considered the immigration bill. We had a real tought fight on that legislation at that time. We did not prevail. We attempted to put on a hemispheric limitation, but after all of those arguments the bill on immigration went over to the other body and almost within 24 hours all of those arguments, which sounded plausible on the floor of the House were undercut. They get rather threadbare with that kind of argument, but they did it. The administration was for this legislation, it was for this provision in the last year, and we should help them get it for the benefit of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I thank the gentleman.

I want to add at this point that in addition to the very cogent argument that our distinguished minority leader has presented, I want to impress upon the majority that this is in line with the principle and the philosophy of the Selden resolution which we approved not too long ago. I think that those of you who supported the Selden resolution ought to likewise support this recommital motion because they are basically alike having to do with our foreign policy and particularly with regard to our relations in the Caribbean.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I think Members of the House are entitled to know how the various U.S. beet sugar companies and their producers will fare under H.R. 11135 as compared with the present law. This comparison is as follows:

Effect of H.R. 11135 on U.S. beet sugar companies

	Market allotment			
	Present law		H.R. 11135	
	Tons	Percent of total	Tons	Tons increase
1. The Great Western Sugar Co	629,000	23.7	717,000	88,000
2. Holly Sugar Corp	442,400	16.7	505,200	62,800
3. Spreckels Sugar Co., division American Sugar Co	409,000	15.4	465,800	56,800
4. Amalgamated Sugar Co	323,300	12.2	369,000	45,700
5. American Crystal Sugar Co	286,400	10.8	326,700	40,300
6. Utah-Idaho Sugar Co.—Layton Sugar Co	272,600	10.3	311,600	39,000
7. Union Sugar, division Consolidated Foods	132,300	5.0	151,200	18,900
8. Michigan Sugar Co	83,400	3.2	96,800	13,400
9. Monitor Sugar, Division Rob. Gage Coal Co	40,300	1.5	45,400	5,100
10. Buckeye Sugars, Inc	15,300	.6	18,100	2,800
11. The National Sugar Manufacturing Co	8,000	.3	9,100	1,100
12. Empire State Sugar Co	8,000	.3	9,100	1,100
Total	2,650,000	100.0	3,025,000	375,000

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I hope we thoroughly understand what is involved here before we vote on the motion to recommit.

It so happens that I, along with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] and my good friend, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], represent some of the sugar-producing sections of my State. I have had to familiarize myself with this very complex piece of legislation.

Now let us see what is involved here. To begin with—until the rise of Castro in Cuba—about 96 percent of all the foreign requirements for sugar consumption in the United States outside of our own possessions came from Cuba.

There was therefore no allocation of any substantial amounts to the other countries in Latin America. And when all the sugar came from Cuba, there was no import fee of any kind whatsoever. As a matter of fact, when the Sugar Act was passed back in 1937, certain considerations were given to the domestic producers, both beet and cane, and the existing tariff was reduced for Cuba.

One of the sanctions against Castro, as all of you know, was that we cut off totally and completely all imports from Cuba. That meant something like 3 million tons of sugar a year had to be allocated to other countries.

Now what did we do? We attempted to allocate that tonnage to various friendly nations in Latin America. I am not prepared to argue whether or not the allocations that have been made in this proposed legislation are right or not—I do not know enough about them. But I know this. I know that if we impose this proposal which will be contained in the motion to recommit, we would be discriminating against every one of our friends in Latin America.

Now why do I say that? In the first place, there is no such thing as a world price for sugar. That is an illusion—a snare and a delusion. There is a residual price for sugar and that has to do with sugar that has no market and it brings any price that the market will bring. That price is roughly today about 3 cents a pound. But practically no sugar is sold that way. Today England pays 5.8 cents per pound for sugar and they import every pound of it. France pays 8.5 cents per pound. Russia and Red China pay 6 cents a pound for sugar. Yet here it is proposed by the minority that we pay our Latin American friends something like 3 cents a pound for sugar. The notion that that would not upset our relations with Latin America just is not correct.

The only recommendation if any——

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield.

The only time there was any indication of any import fee was when, upon the insistence of certain parties, some segments of the administration said that they would go along on 1 penny.

This is quite different from the proposal here involved today. Since that time the administration has very firmly come out against any such proposal.

Now there is one other matter that has not been mentioned here today.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. BOGGS. I do not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order. I decline to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana declines to yield. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I do not have the time to yield. The gentleman had his time and I did not try to get him to yield.

Mr. Chairman, this proposal violates GATT. There is no question about it. What would happen if we adopted this proposal? We would have to go in and renegotiate all of our tariff arrangements with all of the Latin American countries. Rather than saving the consumers any money anywhere in this country, the net effect would be that we would have to renegotiate our tariff agreements which would result in complete confusion and pandemonium. I hope all of us understand this and I hope this very destructive motion to recommit will be repudiated when it is offered.

When the facts are studied, however, it becomes clear that the imposition of the proposed import fee would be a serious error. The purpose of the import fee is to tax away from the foreign producers the difference between the U.S. price and the usually lower "world market price." At present, for example, the U.S. price is about 6.85 cents per pound, while the adjusted world price is about 3.10 cents, making a difference of about 3.75 cents per pound. If it were true that most of the world's sugar were sold at the so-called "world market price," then such an import fee proposal might make sense, because it would be clear that the United States was paying almost three times as much as the rest of the world for sugar.

In fact, however, between 80 and 90 percent of the world's sugar appears to be sold at prices approximating the U.S. price, while only 10 to 20 percent is sold at the so-called world market price. Here is the way it works. Total world production of sugar is a little more than 60 million tons per year. About three-fourths or 45 million tons of this is consumed in the country where it is produced. Virtually all of this sugar is sold under some sort of protective arrangement which yields a stable and profitable price for the producer well in excess of the world market price. Of the remaining one-quarter of world production, or about 15 million tons, which is shipped from one country to another, more than one-half—7 to 9 million tons—is sold to preferential markets like the United States, Britain, or France. Thus, out of a total world production of more than 60 million tons, only about 6 or 7 million tons is sold on the so-called world market.

In fact, the "world market" is nothing more than a residual market where the world's excess sugars are sold. Over the years most of the developed countries have learned that occasionally there are sugar shortages resulting from small crops brought about by such things as hurricanes or drought. But these developed countries are, like the United States, unwilling to reduce sugar consumption even during times of scarcity. Accordingly, they have pegged their sugar prices at a level which will insure that they have an adequate supply even during periods of world shortage. The premium price systems of the developed countries cause supplying countries to produce at least enough to meet their obligations to the premium price importing countries. Inevitably some supplying countries have excess production. For the most part, this excess production is what is sold on the world market.

It can be seen, then, that the world market is in fact a residual market. It can be compared with the various Government surplus stores around the country. For example, a tent originally costing $25 might be found in a surplus store with a price of $5. The reason for the difference in price is not that the two tents are different, but rather that the one found in the surplus store is not needed by the Government; it is in excess of known requirements; in short, it is surplus, so we sell it for whatever price we can get. The same thing can be said for most of the sugar sold on the so-called world market.

It is thus clear that just as tentmakers do not normally produce Army tents for surplus stores, so sugar producers do not normally produce sugar for the world market. Accordingly, we could not rationally take the position that the price of sugar in the world market is a profitable price for foreign producers. It is not, and the cost figures filed by foreign producers with the Agriculture Committee shows that it is not. Under these circumstances, it seems clear that we cannot responsibly impose a variable tax designed to soak up the difference between the U.S. price and the surplus store, or world market, price.

The proposal would also be a clear violation of GATT. This is virtually admitted in a letter from the State Department Legal Advisor to the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee dated December 30, 1964. This means that if the fee were imposed, we would probably have to compensate other countries by lowering our tariffs on some other items, or face retaliatory action by them against our own exports. Second, it would undoubtedly embarrass the United States in its relations with Latin American countries. Thus, for example, on August 17, 1965, the President addressed the Ambassadors of the Latin American countries on the fourth anniversary of the Alliance for Progress and said:

> We will try to maintain a regularly expanding market for the sugar that is produced by Latin America. And consistent with the CIAP recommendations, I will propose this afternoon that Congress eliminate the special import fee on sugar so that the full price will go to the Latin American producers.

After this statement by the President, it would clearly be embarrassing to impose the import fee.

It seems clear, therefore, that the import fee proposal is unwise both from an economic and good-neighbor standpoint, and should not be enacted.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word of the preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. That motion is not in order at this time.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak in favor of the preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no present time allowed under the rules. The question is on the preferential motion of the gentleman from Indiana.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the sugar bill before us is the result of extensive deliberation by the Agriculture Committee. It represents many compromises and perhaps no one will be happy with the bill in its entirety. But I have been impressed with the fact that it has the unanimous support of the many different segments of the sugar industry and the nearly unanimous support of the committee. I am convinced that it is a good bill and will assure the many consumers of sugar I represent of adequate supplies of sugar at reasonable prices.

We all know that sugar is not a luxury but a necessity. Everyone consumes it in many forms every day. Because of this, legislation designed to protect our supplies of sugar is a matter of great importance and deserves the careful attention given to it by the Committee on Agriculture. Every housewife knows the serious effects of a shortage of sugar. We must not expose the American consumer to the dangers of such a shortage and this bill is designed to assure our country of a continuing substantial supply.

The bill will also protect the livelihood of the many workers in the two cane sugar refineries in Philadelphia and in the various other associated industries such as transportation.

In 1964, more than 850,000 tons of raw sugar moved into the Port of Philadelphia on nearly 100 ships. This raw sugar moving into Philadelphia was valued at well over $100 million.

American Sugar Co. and National Sugar Co. have both played an important role in the business community of Philadelphia since the turn of the century. Their two refineries provide employment for nearly 2,000 people and maintain an annual payroll of nearly $15 million.

These two up-to-date cane sugar refineries need adequate stable supplies of raw sugar if they are to serve the many consumers, housewives, and industrial users, with the sugar they need. The bill before us would restore the stability of supplies of raw sugar we enjoyed for so many years before the unhappy experience of 1963 and 1964. The disturbances of those years came as a result of the imposition of an import fee. The committee bill before us does not provide for such a fee, but we have been put on notice that an amendment will be offered to restore that fee.

Mr. Chairman, when the import fee amendment is offered I will cast my vote against it. As recently as August 17 President Johnson spoke out against such a fee. If the proposed amendment should pass it would undercut our foreign policy as expressed by the President. I am also fearful that it would mean higher prices for the American consumer.

Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 11135 with the technical amendments proposed by the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Chairman, the roots of the sugarbeet industry are sunk deeply into the fertile soil of my district in Colorado, as they are, indeed, in the economy of the entire State. Colorado is the largest producer of beet sugar of all the States in the great Rocky Mountain region, and the second largest producer among all the States in the Union.

In my district are 2 of Colorado's 12 beet sugar mills—at Longmont and at Brighton. In fact, nearly a hundred years ago, long before there was a beet sugar industry in Colorado, some farsighted members of the Chicago-Colorado colony, a band of courageous pioneers who founded the town of Longmont, were urging that the production of sugarbeets and beet sugar would prove to be the salvation of the West.

And so you understand, Mr. Chairman, that I am keenly aware not only of the importance of the beet sugar industry of today to the West, but also of today's urgent needs of the industry. It is that awareness that prompts me, Mr. Speaker, to urge passage of H.R. 11135 because the domestic sugar industry desperately needs the domestic quota provisions of the bill.

The bill provides for some modest increase in marketing rights—on a temporary basis—for the domestic beet sugar producers. The urgent necessity for this modest increase in marketing rights, above what they would be in the present law, came about because of certain events that took place in the sugar world about 2½ years ago.

At that time, an apparent shortage of sugar in the world was having repercussions in the U.S. market, and our Government, in order to assure sugar supplies for our consumers, and help bring down prices, pleaded with the domestic sugar producers, and offered certain encouragements, to produce much greater quantities of sugar than the domestic industry had ever produced before. This, the industry did.

For example, the farmers who grow beets for the two beet sugar factories in my district produced sufficient additional sugarbeets, and the mills so expanded their operations that they produced nearly 10 million pounds more refined sugar in 1963 than in 1962. Ten million pounds of sugar is enough to care for the total sugar needs of 100,000 Americans for an entire year.

This response to the pleas of our Government was typical of the response by sugarbeet growers and the beet sugar companies throughout the West. The additional, immediate production of the beet sugar industry helped to stem the tide, and bring the 1963 sugar price situation under control. The industry was able to market part of that additional production during 1963, because all quotas were administratively increased that year to meet the emergency.

The upward surge in beet sugar production continued in 1964, encouraged by the Government's lifting of all acreage controls for that year. However, when Congress was not given an opportunity, last year, to act on sugar legislation, and provide additional marketing rights for the beet sugar industry, the industry found itself not only geared to a higher level of production, but actually producing many, many millions of pounds more sugar than it was permitted to sell.

Today the sugar silos and the sugar warehouses in my district are literally bulging with sugar that cannot be sold unless we pass this bill, and provide additional marketing rights to the beet sugar industry. And the sugarbeet harvest now is in full swing with stocks of sugar adding to the problem.

The sugarbeet growers in my district took a 10-percent cut in acreage this year, and they face a much more drastic reduction next year unless we pass this bill. Even with the temporarily increased marketing permitted by the bill, another acreage cut is probable; without a law, a cut is inevitable.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the beet sugar industry should be further penalized for having responded so well and so affirmatively to our Government's pleas for more production to meet an emergency. I urge immediate passage of H.R. 11135.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, the Findley amendments to the sugar bill now before us appear to me to be deserving of complete support.

These amendments provide: First, that sugar lobbyists—those unseen men who bargain for quotas for their customers—will be outlawed in effect; second, that the U.S. Government will collect an import fee on sugar shipped into this country, the import fee to represent the difference between the 6 cents the United States pays for sugar and the 2-cent-a-pound world price. In other words, this amendment would sop up some of the gravy of the sugar market.

I am appalled at the manner in which we too long have allowed ourselves—we, the Members of Congress—to be used in this sticky sugar mess. Too long, I feel, we have not taken the time and the trouble to really take a close look. If this be self-indictment, so be it.

But now, we have the opportunity to start correcting some of our serious oversights, and I propose to take that opportunity.

Let us look at what a sugar quota does for a country that manages to wangle it from this Congress.

A country that uses lobbyists and gets a quota, let us say, of 25,000 tons of sugar would net a premium of $2 million—a premium of $2 million extracted from the consumers of the United States. That $2 million is made up of the difference between the U.S. artificially supported price of 6 cents a pound and the world price of 2 cents a pound. That figures out to $80 a ton in premium—and $80 multiplied by 25,000 is $2 million—all gouged, not too subtly, from American consumers.

The reforms being proposed today are long overdue, and I will support them wholeheartedly in the interest, not only of the consumers, as important as they are, but also in the hope that by our actions today we can regain control over a situation that must be corrected.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, we all know that the House Agriculture Committee held extensive hearings on the sugar legislation last year and again this year. This item is one of 224 items that comes under the heading of Agriculture and it was our responsibility as members of the Agriculture Committee to report a sugar bill to the floor of the Congress before Congress adjourns. We fully realize that before Cuba was dominated by Castro that our country purchased approximately 96 percent of our sugar from that country and gave them a 2-percent incentive in order to help out the economy of that country.

Now since Cuba seems to have a communistic dictator we have been trying to divide our foreign sugar quota among as many countries that produce sugar as possible in order that we can always feel certain that we have a dependable source where we could purchase additional sugar should this country become entangled in a war or some other emergency.

Personally, I do not see how the committee could have more equally divided the sugar quotas among the countries that produce sugar even though I have always been of the opinion that some of the smaller countries that depend entirely on the production of sugar in order to keep their economy healthy possibly should have had additional quotas.

I support my chairman, Mr. COOLEY, wholeheartedly in connection with this proposed legislation and hope that the House and the Senate can take favorable action on this bill before the weekend.

I have given thorough study to each quota that was approved by the committee and the proposed quotas that was sent to us by the Department of Agriculture. I cannot see any reason why the Secretary of Agriculture would not approve this bill in its present form and the President could not sign it into law without further delay.

Again, I want to congratulate Chairman COOLEY on his outstanding work in connection with this proposed legislation.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, sugar legislation is important to the city of Philadelphia and the State of Pennsylvania. There are two large cane sugar refineries in Philadelphia providing work for thousands of employees. In 1964, more than $100 million worth of sugar moved into the port of Philadelphia.

Sugar legislation is also a complex matter affecting American agriculture, industry, and consumers. The sugar bill before us is supported by nearly all persons affected and I am happy to support the bill. I am convinced it will be good legislation for Philadelphia and the country as a whole.

I should like to take this opportunity to commend the domestic industry for its efforts in arriving at a mutually acceptable solution. I should like to point out, however, that the established domestic cane sugar refining industry has had to make extensive sacrifices to achieve the compromise. This large domestic industry has given up more than 1 million tons of sugar over the life of this bill. The loss of the right to refine and market this tremendous amount of sugar will cost the domestic cane refining industry and its workers heavily, but the sacrifice was made to permit the beet and mainland cane interests to market their surpluses grown during the past 2 years.

When the period of adjustment has passed, the delicate balance established by the act among the various parts of the sugar industry must be carefully maintained. Future beet and mainland cane surpluses must not be permitted to develop.

As I have stated, I support the bill before us together with the committee amendments. However, the amendment to reimpose confiscatory import fees should be defeated. We have seen the disastrous effects in 1963 and 1964 of tying our domestic market to the so-called world market in sugar. We must not permit our sugar market to be subjected to the wide price fluctuations of the world market again. The import fee amendment should be defeated.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to voice opposition to the Sugar Act amendments in their present form. The Congress is being asked to enact legislation that would establish an outrageous grab bag program, which has the appearance and aroma of having molded in great part by high-priced peddlers of influence. I am making specific reference to the sugar lobbyists who have been particularly active this year.

From the quota system now being offered, it appears that their labors have not been in vain. The nation-by-nation quota system has turned Uncle Sam into "Uncle Sugar" and approximately 29 sugar-producing countries have been willing to spend $357,258 in fees over the past year to retain lobbyists to make sure that Uncle Sugar does not forget them. The larger the quota received, the more pure profit gained.

At present prices, the value of the quota premium, that is, the approximate difference between the U.S. price and the world price of raw sugar, is about $3.50 per hundredweight, or $70 a ton. The current world price of sugar is about $2 a hundredweight. The same hundredweight in the U.S. market sells at about $5.50. In other words, the U.S. price is almost three times higher than what producers could get in any other world market.

Under the proposed program, about 4 million tons of sugar will be purchased under foreign quotas. The pure profit being offered amounts to $280 million a year or $1.4 billion for the 5-year term. If this is not high-priced, wide-open profiteering, I would like to know a better scheme. And of course, the entire outrageous plan is ultimately paid for by the American consumer.

We are now about to ask the American consumer to contribute his share to $50,000-a-year fees obtained by some sugar lobbyists and to the $280 million a year bonanza grabbed by those foreign countries shrewd enough to bargain for a piece of the sugar pie. One nation, Argentina, under a Department of Agriculture recommendation, was to receive a quota of 63,585 tons based on a yearly consumation rate of 9.7 million tons.

Argentina had not engaged any lobbyist to protect its recommended quota. When the bill was reported out of committee, this quota had been cut to 21,485 tons, with the remainder going to those countries who had retained lobbyists.

It seems absolutely absurd for the various agencies of the U.S. Government to devise all sorts of methods to improve our balance of payments while the Congress is being asked to increase the outflow of American dollars at the rate of $280 million a year for 5 years. Even more absurd is the granting of a quota of 10,000 short tons, raw value, of sugar for the calendar year of 1968 and each subsequent year to a country which has yet to plant its first acre.

It is more than evident to myself that the sugar lobbyists have done their work well. They collect fat fees, their clients are assured of windfall profits, the American taxpayer underwrites the cost of the program and all are left bewildered in trying to figure out how much each country receives.

This free-for-all raid on the public purse has to be curtailed and I join with my distinguished colleagues in calling for an end to this unwarranted, ill-conceived program that benefits no one save the high-living profiteers.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, it is clear that the bill before us, H.R. 11135, offers significant benefits to producers of sugar, to traders in sugar; but what benefits accrue to the vast majority of American families, who pay the annual cost?

The answer, I believe is "None."

Mr. Chairman, the 89th Congress can justly be proud of its record of achievement this year. Let us now add one more achievement: removal of subsidies to traders in sugar. Let us not, in the last few weeks of this year's session, close the books by once again enacting petty special-interest legislation, at the behest of the sugar lobby.

H.R. 11135 would continue an artificially determined, consumer-financed, inflated market price for sugar and sugar products in the United States. The inflated price will cost the American consumer at least $300 million, probably far more.

Of the almost 10 million tons of sugar we consume in this country annually, only 60 percent is grown domestically—including Puerto Rico.

Forty percent of our sugar is obtained from abroad. But in spite of the fact that we currently pay foreign producers a premium price for this sugar, a price of $6.85 per hundredweight or almost three times the current net price on the world market, the foreign producers to whom we pay this gift are under no legal obligation to fulfill the assigned quotas. So if the world price for sugar were to rise above the price set by this legislation, foreign producers could demand—and could not be refused—higher prices for their allotment. On the other hand, assuming the world price will remain, as it has, lower than the U.S. sugar price—which is the case, and has been the case the vast majority of the time—the American consumer will continue to pay a "gift tax" to foreign sugar producers. I find this particular "gift tax" indefensible.

Mr. Chairman, recognize that it is important that the world's leading nations, including this Nation, work together to assure high prices for the exportable products of the developing countries. But, Mr. Chairman, to whom abroad do we pay this particular sugar "gift tax?"

The dollars we pay go principally to the long entrenched, landowning families of Latin America, often the most reactionary elements in the political life of the subcontinent. These relatively few families, to whom we donate this gift, furthermore often do not invest their windfall in the economic arteries of their nations; instead, traditionally, they immediately send a sizable fraction of their dollar profits abroad, to a safe haven in Switzerland. Thus, the gift our American consumers make when they purchase sugar and its products, may neither substantially aid economic development in these nations, nor even necessarily help the foreign exchange problems these countries face.

We are told that the high price set for sugar by this bill is required so that the American farmer can survive in competition with foreign producers. This may very well be the case, Mr. Chairman. But let me point out some facts about U.S. sugar production that bear on this question: First, over half of the sugar produced in the United States—including Puerto Rico—is cane sugar. Cane sugar is now produced almost solely on vast, mechanized, corporate-owned land areas. Few little family farmers here. Many of the employees of the corporate farms are migrant workers, whose wages are notoriously low. Thus it is these huge sugar corporations who benefit most from the American consumer's sugar "gift tax."

Furthermore, in addition to receiving a price for their produce which is more than double the world price, American sugar producers also all receive direct subsidy payments. More particularly, the top 25 recipients of direct subsidies—receiving subsidies ranging in amount from over a million dollars to a low of $260,000—were all corporate cane sugar producers in Florida, Hawaii, Louisiana, and Puerto Rico. Why, I ask, should these particular corporations be subsidized, while others are not?

Mr. Chairman, I cannot, in good conscience, vote for this bill. I cannot vote to saddle the American consumer with a sugar "gift tax," whose proceeds enrich a few Latin American families and a few U.S. cane sugar corporations, yet help virtually no American family farms. I shall vote against H.R. 11135, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to passage of this sugar bill for the reason, among others, that it is highly sweetened for the foreigners. This is, in fact, another foreign aid bill for it gives to too many foreign countries the productive capacity of American farmers and American industry and labor.

We have heard much in the last few days of how this legislation will stabilize sugar prices to American consumers. It has all the earmarks of stabilizing these prices at high levels, just as did the so-called international coffee agreement. The consumers of this country are paying right through the nose for coffee, despite the assurance of certain Members of Congress that would not be the case. And in the opinion of this Member, U.S. consumers will continue to pay to foreign suppliers nearly three times the world price.

Why, for instance, should any sugar production quota go to the British-controlled Bahamas where sugar has never before been produced? Let the British develop the sugar industry there and let them take the sugar that is produced. Why should American consumers buy it and pay nearly three times the price of the world market?

In his excellent speech on this bill, the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. LANGEN, said in effect that midwestern sugarbeet producers and processors will get what amounts to the crumbs off this legislative table. I agree.

And there seems little doubt that this legislation has been a real sugarplum for the lobbyists who have chiseled out the lush quotas for certain foreign countries. Why has there been so much opposition to the amendment by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] who seeks only to put a bridle on these highly paid lobbyists? Why these lobbyists, anyway?

Cut it thick or thin, this is another foreign handout that is being taken out of the hides of American consumers and American producers. I refused to be a party to the sellout of our consumers in the coffee deal and I refuse to take consumers and producers to the cleaners through the process of this legislation.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the sugar bill before us today really is in the category of a fifth wheel. Who needs it? This bill is a monstrosity. It is even worse than any farm bill that I have seen presented to the Congress in the past 25 years.

Certainly, the sugar consumers of this Nation do not need it. They have been saddled with it for about 20 years now, and all that it has meant has been a much higher price for a vital food product—a higher price that has been reflected in higher prices for all the foods in which sugar is used.

The bill now before us would continue this mockery of congressional sugar control for another 5 years. I oppose its continuation in the most vigorous terms because I feel the sugar allocation scheme has resulted in nothing but higher prices to consumers.

Consumers on the eastern seaboard are now paying—as the direct result of this legislation—at least 4 cents a pound more for sugar than the world price. Sugar producers, both here and abroad, are being paid at the inflated rate of 6 cents a pound when the world price is a bit less than 2 cents.

I am well aware of the arguments made by the proponents of this legislation that sugar prices would climb to unimagined heights if we became involved in a world conflict. But, there is nothing in this legislation that would prevent such skyrocketing prices in any event.

In other words, our consumers are paying—and have been paying—an inflated price for sugar for about 20 years to protect them, supposedly, against the possibility of an emergency inflated price that probably would happen anyway.

This sugar bill has cost our consumers millions of dollars; it has placed this Congress in an untenable position; and it has turned sugar into a sticky subject, to say the least.

My vote is against this kind of legislation, or anything like it. Let us throw open this great consumer market of ours.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the necessity of my presence yesterday in California prevented my earlier participation in the debate on sugar legislation.

My purpose in arising is to clarify some points for the record and to argue for an amendment imposing a suitable import fee on foreign sugar. My points of clarification are the following:

First. Section 10 of the bill amending section 302 of the Sugar Act of 1948, contains a provision for a reservation of acreage of domestic sugarcane from the sugarcane allotment acreage for the purpose of establishing production and refining in new areas. This amendment was adopted at the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. TUNNEY] to permit the ultimate development of sugarcane production in the Imperial Valley of California for processing through an existing sugarbeet processing plant which would be further equipped to process sugarcane. This amendment was drafted in consultation with the Department of Agriculture and would permit an assignment of acreage to the Imperial Valley for such processing and marketing by the sugar processor involved although such processor is already in the beet sugar business.

Second. Under existing law the Secretary of Agriculture has authority to set quarterly quotas on the importation of foreign sugar. It is not the purpose or effect of this legislation to subtract from that authority. It was clearly demonstrated before our committee that this existing authority is needed to carry out the price stabilization feature of the Sugar Act and, therefore, this legislation does not diminish that authority.

Third. A statement was made on the floor the other day by the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] which might seem to indicate that only through the passage of this legislation would the domestic beet and can industry be permitted to market rather large supplies of refined sugar being held in storage by domestic beet and cane refiners—added sugar which was produced and refined at the specific request of the Secretary of Agriculture when there was an actual or potential shortage of foreign sugar in 1963. Such implication is not correct. If for some reason no sugar legislation is passed, such sugar could be marketed in a proper set of circumstances. I refer to the possibility that the Secretary of Agriculture could raise the estimate of the level of consumption requirements above a 9,700,000 figure. Increments above that figure could result in increasing the amount of domestic cane and beet sugar which would be marketable and the larger the increase the larger the marketing.

Finally I would express support for restoration of the authority to impose an import fee which would recapture for the Treasury part of the difference between the U.S. price and the world price.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, once again we are being asked, in the closing hours of a long congressional session, to approve a bill which has vast implications for our relations with more than a dozen countries as well as for our own domestic economy.

This, of course, is nothing new. Amendments to the Sugar Act have traditionally been called up as one of the last legislative items of a year. They are presented under rules which prohibit perfecting amendments and always with the thinly veiled threat that if they are not passed, havoc will be wreaked on the sugar market. To say the very least, this is neither a sensible nor an adequate way in which to write important legislation.

Mr. Chairman, at one time it was argued that high domestic sugar prices were necessary to guarantee a stable supply of sugar and also to provide a form of foreign aid. Today the more common argument is that high prices are necessary to protect domestic producers. Let me make it clear that I do not object to these stated reasons. Distinguished agricultural economists, as a matter of fact, have advised me that this program has worked reasonably well in several respects.

But I am concerned that after relatively little opportunity for consideration by the House, and without the opportunity for the House to exercise its will on the substance of this program, we are providing an extension—not for 1 or 2 years—but for 5 years.

Some knowledgeable people have argued that since sugar quotas have substantial significance for our relations with a number of countries they should be drawn by the administration. Others have argued that we should return to the global quota system rather than the grab-bag system of country quotas which we find in this bill today. There may even be some merit in this latter point, but whatever the system I do feel that Congress should retain ultimate jurisdiction.

But if Congress is to exercise this responsibility it must be prepared to do so in a responsible manner. This means that sugar legislation should be reported to the Congress with ample time remaining in the session for it to act wisely and thoughtfully. It means that sugar legislation should be reported under rules which will permit revisions and changes deemed appropriate by a majority of the Members of Congress. It means, in short, that Congress should be given a reasonable opportunity to exercise its proper legislative responsibilities.

The questions which have been raised about this bill make very clear, among other things, that we need to make a thorough review of our entire sugar policies. The present hodgepodge—the present collection of quotas, taxes, subsidies, and artificial prices—is certainly an inferior and inadequate substitute for a clearly thought-through program which could benefit both consumers and producers.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against this bill today as an expression of my disapproval of the way in which it has been considered and presented and in the sincere hope that Congress will make the review, that it will make the study, that it will take the long look which this whole legislative area so badly needs.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I am totally opposed to the bill, H.R. 11135, extending the Sugar Act. Numerous broad questions need to be answered in connection with this bill. The present program does not expire until the end of next year. There is no need to rush this legislation through at this time. There is plenty of time to go into the matter thoroughly next year and seek answers to those questions. The present haste is unseemly and only adds fuel to the cloud of suspicion surrounding the sugar program and the question of how quotas are allotted to the various countries.

This is a deep and complicated subject. The sugar program costs American consumers some $700 million every year. Much of this flows, in the form of subsidies, into the pockets of wealthy sugar interests overseas. It keeps up the price of sugar to the American consumer. It is carried on in the name of orderly marketing but serious questions have been raised indicating that the program may not be necessary at all to maintain markets.

There is the sordid matter of lobbying by foreign governments and allegations of huge lobbying fees paid to representatives of those governments, as well as allegations of influence peddling and political payoffs. Congress should get to the bottom of the entire sugar story before it agrees to perpetuate this program. I strongly urge that this bill be defeated and that we return to the subject next year for a thorough look.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to discuss briefly some aspects of the bill now before the House, H.R. 11135, the Sugar Act Amendments of 1965.

As you know, this legislation is presented to the Members of the House for their consideration on a virtual take-it-or-leave-it, now-or-never basis, late in the session when everyone is thinking about adjournment, and without any real opportunity to offer substantive amendments to help improve what is admittedly a most complex and far-reaching measure.

Unfortunately, this seems to be the annual ritual for congressional consideration of the sugar bill. In my opinion, however, it does little to contribute to mature or thoughtful deliberation, or to assure adequate protection for the vital interests of the American consumer. Nor does it help us promote the interests of the workers and producers in the U.S. domestic sugar industry.

Congress is asked to take this legislation on "faith" in the unerring wisdom of the majority of the Agricultural Committee, and without a genuine chance to examine, analyze, and perhaps change the bill in any meaningful way.

But I would say that "faith" is a rather poor substitute for such essential examination and analysis.

This year, serious charges have been made regarding the propriety of allowing highly paid lobbyists for foreign sugar interests to allegedly influence the drafting of this legislation.

In addition, the procedures and criteria apparently used by the committee in establishing the lucrative foreign sugar quotas has been brought into question.

Finally, there is little doubt that the foreign policy implications of the allocation of these valuable foreign quotas have not been explored as adequately as this important subject requires.

Also, I would like to know if it is true, as has been charged, that the extra "quota premium" paid annually by American consumers for our foreign sugar purchases will amount to some $280 million a year.

If this is true, and I have heard no one deny it, then, over the 5-year life of the legislation, U.S. homemakers will pay nearly $1½ billion more than the established world price for the sugar we buy abroad on the world market.

Such a ridiculous situation results from the fact that the American premium price paid to foreign suppliers—in order to artificially support the price of domestic sugar—is presently almost three times the world price.

In my opinion, this is profiteering on a grand scale, with every housewife and consumer in the country forced to pick up the tab through an increased food budget, adding unnecessarily to an already high cost of living.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BURKE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11135) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 598, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The **SPEAKER**. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the passage of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. **HARVEY** of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The **SPEAKER**. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. **HARVEY** of Indiana. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana moves to recommit the bill H.R. 11135 to the Committee on Agriculture with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Page 21, line 8, strike out lines 8 and 9 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 9. Effective January 1, 1966, section 213 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 213. (a) As a condition for importing sugar into the Continental United States pursuant to sections 202(c) and 204 of this Act, an import fee shall be paid to the United States, which fee shall be not more than 50 per centum of the amount which the Secretary determines from time to time will approximate the amount by which a domestic price for raw sugar at a level that will fulfill the domestic price objective set forth in section 201, exceeds the prevailing world market price for raw sugar (adjusted for freight to New York, and most favored nation tariff): *Provided, however,* That such import fee for raw sugar shall not exceed 1 cent per pound, raw value. The fees provided for in this paragraph shall be imposed on a per pound, raw value, basis, and shall be applied uniformly except the import fee imposed on any direct consumption sugar shall be not more than one-half of 1 cent per pound more than the import fee imposed on raw sugar under this paragraph. Such fees shall be paid by the person applying to the Secretary for entry and release of sugar. Such payment shall be made in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary. The Secretary shall promulgate regulations permitting any importer of sugar to apply for a quota set-aside, furnishing such security as the Secretary may require, which will fix the import fee for any sugar under his control to be imported at any time during a calendar year at the rate then in effect for such calendar year. The Secretary shall determine, from time to time, the rate of the import fee and the initial such determination shall be made by October 1 in each year for the succeeding calendar year, except for the calendar year 1966, in which case such determination shall be made at the earliest practicable date.

"'(b) The funds collected as import fees by the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts'."

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may inquire whether the Clerk properly read "50 per centum" or "1 cent" in the motion to recommit. I just wish to be sure I heard correctly.

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair understands the Clerk read "not more than 50 per centum."

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD**. Or a 1-cent maximum?

The **SPEAKER**. It says "not more than one-half of 1 cent."

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD**. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 160, nays 230, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 366]

YEAS—160

Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ayres
Battin
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bow
Bray
Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Callaway
Cameron
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Duncan, Tenn.
Dyal
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fogarty
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fulton, Pa.
Gibbons
Goodell
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hechler
Horton
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, N.Y.
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
Love
McCarthy
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Mackie
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
May
Meeds
Michel
Minshall
Mize
Moore
Morris
Morton
Mosher
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Pelly
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Quillen
Race
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Ryan
St Germain
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Shipley
Shriver
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Stafford
Stalbaum
Stanton
Sullivan
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Tuck
Udall
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vivian
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Weltner
Whalley
Widnall
Wydler
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—230

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Baldwin
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Beckworth
Bell
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Callan
Carey
Casey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Clevenger
Cohelan
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Hagan, Ga.
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harris
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hébert
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holland
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Landrum
Leggett
Lennon
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Mackay
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nix
O'Brien
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Poage
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Randall
Redlin
Resnick
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Satterfield
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner

Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sweeney
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Trimble
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Ullman
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Watts
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Yates

NOT VOTING—41

Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Baring
Bingham
Blatnik
Bolton
Brock
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Dwyer
Evans, Colo.
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Hardy
Hays
Holifield
Hosmer
Lindsay
Long, La.
McClory
O'Hara, Ill.
Patman
Quie
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Saylor
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Springer
Staggers
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Walker, Miss.
White, Idaho
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wyatt
Young

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Springer for, with Mr. Bingham against.

Mrs. Dwyer for, with Mr. White of Idaho against.

Mrs. Griffiths for, with Mr. Staggers against.

Mr. Walker of Mississippi for, with Mr. Toll against.

Mr. McClory for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Mr. Glenn Andrews for, with Mr. Hays against.

Until further notice:

Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Brock.

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. O'Hara of Illinois with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. Roberts with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Hardy with Mr. Quie.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Young with Mr. Smith of California.

Mr. Blatnik with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Wyatt.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Skubitz.

Mr. Wolff with Mr. Lindsay.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Baring.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 246, nays 147, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 367]

YEAS—246

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baldwin
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Betts
Boggs
Boland
Bonner
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Callan
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Clark
Colmer
Conte
Cooley
Craley
Culver
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Friedel
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffin
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harris
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holland
Horton
Hull
Hungate
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Keith
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
McDade
McFall
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Mink
Mize
Monagan
Moore
Morgan
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nix
O'Brien
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Purcell
Randall
Redlin
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
St. Onge
Scott
Selden
Senner
Shriver
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Ullman
Utt
Vigorito
Waggonner
Watson
Watts
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Younger

NAYS—147

Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Ashbrook
Berry
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Cahill
Callaway
Cameron
Carter
Chelf
Clancy
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Conable
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Duncan, Tenn.
Dyal
Erlenborn
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Findley
Fino
Fogarty
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Fulton, Pa.
Gallagher
Gibbons
Goodell
Gross
Grover
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hamilton
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hechler
Helstoski
Howard
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
King, N.Y.
Krebs
Kunkel
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McCulloch
McDowell
McEwen
McGrath
MacGregor
Mackie
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Michel
Minish
Minshall
Moeller
Moorhead
Morris
Morton
Mosher
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Ottinger
Patten
Pike
Powell
Pucinski
Quillen
Race
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Resnick
Reuss
Robison
Rodino
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Shipley
Sikes
Stalbaum
Stanton
Sullivan
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vivian
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Weltner
Whalley
Widnall
Wydler
Yates
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—39

Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Baring
Bingham
Blatnik
Brock
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Dwyer
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Hardy
Hays
Holifield
Hosmer
Lindsay
Long, La.
McClory
O'Hara, Ill.
Patman
Quie
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Saylor
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Springer
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Walker, Miss.
White, Idaho
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wyatt
Young

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Bingham for, with Mr. Roberts against.

Mr. White of Idaho for, with Mrs. Griffiths against.

Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mrs. Green of Oregon against.

Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Glenn Andrews against.

Mr. Smith of California for, with Mrs. Dwyer against.

Mr. Quie for, with Mr. McClory against.

Mr. Don H. Clausen for, Mr. Springer against.

Mr. Hosmer for, with Mr. Walker of Mississippi against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Brock.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Skubitz.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Hardy with Mr. Wyatt.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Lindsay.

Mr. O'Hara of Illinois with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.

Mr. Young with Mr. Wolff.

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Toll.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Thompson of Texas.

Mr. COHELAN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. PHILBIN and Mr. CONTE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, H.R. 11135.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 695. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 61. A concurrent resolution to allow the viewing of the U.S. Information Agency film "Adlai Stevenson the Ambassador" at the Auditorium Theater in Chicago, Ill., on or about October 24, 1965.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, last week my duties as a member of the U.S. delegation to the NATO Parliamentarians Conference in New York City precluded my participation in final consideration of several bills, on October 7 and 8. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 356, "nay" on rollcall No. 357, and "nay" on rollcall No. 359.

WATER CONSERVATION MONTH

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 671) to authorize the President to proclaim the month of November as "Water Conservation Month."

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this resolution?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution authorizes the President to issue a proclamation naming November 1965 as "Water Conservation Month." The necessity therefor, of course, comes by reason of the prolonged drought in so many places in the United States, and it was thought proper that this resolution be offered today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. Res. 671

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the month of November 1965 as "Water Conservation Month" in recognition of the importance of water conservation to the maintenance of public health and the national economy.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCulloch: After the word "November" in line 5, insert a comma and the figure "1965".

The amendment was agreed to.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill H.R. 8670, appropriation bill for the agricultural agencies, may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a conference report on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

ORGANIZATIONS PROVIDING FUNDS FOR TAX EXEMPT SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 327) to amend section 501(c)(14) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations operated to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in order that we may have an explanation of the bill I reserve the right to object, but I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, there is a difference of opinion on procedure here which I will be glad to explain for the Record. I will object to this bill being considered, and other bills that were on the calendar to be brought up by unanimous consent today. So I object.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be appropriate, this bill having been listed for a considerable period of time for consideration today, to at least know something of the background of the merits of the legislation in connection with any action that the House might take on it, or any individual might take.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. The point is, in my judgment under the circumstances existing in the Committee on Ways and Means, these matters should not be considered under unanimous consent, and in order not to prolong this I object.

Mr. Speaker, I am distressed by the developments in the Ways and Means Committee which have led me to object to these bills being considered under unanimous consent procedure.

These bills were voted out of the Ways and Means Committee with no negative votes and the chairman properly scheduled them on the whip notice to be considered under unanimous consent. However, these bills and some before them, and some still under consideration by the House Ways and Means Committee, have all been considered under the same set of circumstances referred to frequently as the consideration of Members bills.

The "Members bills" procedures followed by the Ways and Means Committee for a number of years has always bothered me greatly because no standard set of procedures or guidelines have been established to guide the Members on the merits of the bills to be considered. Essentially the procedure is for each member of the Ways and Means Committee to list with the clerk of the committee one or two or more bills he would like to have called up and considered by the committee for passage. It is generally assumed that the bills to be called up will be relatively simple and reasonably noncontroversial. The bills are called in order of seniority on the committee.

Aside from the lack of clearly established guidelines for the consideration of these bills there has grown up an unpleasantness when a Member objects to a bill called up by another Member to the extent that on one particular occasion one Member about whose bill I had expressed grave reservations stated before the committee, "Well, just wait until a bill with your name on it appears." He later apologized to me for these remarks. However, in a way, I was happy to have what had been clearly under the surface feelings out in the open. I stated that that under those circumstances I would have to object to all bills considered under the "Members bills" procedure. Not only was the procedure poor but it created a tendency to have "logrolling," whether or not actual logrolling took place or not.

After this episode which occurred last year I suggested to the chairman that we either abolish the "Members bills" procedure or establish some clear guidelines as to how the matter would be handled. Nothing definitive has been done.

Today, as we continued on the list of "Members bills" one came up which had negative reports from four of the executive departments and agencies concerned with the legislation. The issue itself was at the present time awaiting court decision. Accordingly I objected. Instead of passing on to the next bill the procedures were followed to make it clear that I was the only Member objecting. I stated if it was the purpose to make it clear that I was the oddball on the committee who objected when merit suggested an objection was in order I would have to accept this role.

I notified the chairman on the floor that under the circumstances I would have to object to the bills which were scheduled to be taken up under unanimous consent and which previously had been voted out by the committee under the "Members bills" procedure.

Some of these bills have merit. They can be taken up on the Suspension Calendar if the chairman so chooses, but I cannot any longer give even my consent by my silence to this method for considering and handling legislation.

TAX TREATMENT OF EXPROPRIATION LOSS RECOVERIES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 6319) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for treatment of the recoveries of losses arising from expropriation, intervention, or confiscation of properties by governments of foreign countries.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin has reserved the right to object. Does the gentleman from Missouri insist on his objection?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's objection prevails over the reservation of the right to object and takes the Member so reserving the right to object off his feet. Objection is heard.

SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON CERTAIN TROPICAL HARDWOODS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 7723) to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to suspend the duty on certain tropical hardwoods.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri insist on his objection now or will he permit the gentleman from Wisconsin to reserve the right to object?

Mr. CURTIS. No, Mr. Speaker, I am objecting to the request now for the reasons stated before.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri objects.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IMMUNITIES ACT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 8210) to amend the International Organizations Immunities Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills]?

Mr. CURTIS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

DUTIABLE STATUS OF WATCHES, CLOCKS, AND TIMING APPARATUS FROM INSULAR POSSESSIONS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 8436) to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the dutiable status of watches, clocks, and timing apparatus from insular possessions of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills]?

Mr. CURTIS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

RETIRED PAY OF JUDGES OF TAX COURT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 8445) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change the method of computing the retired pay of judges of the Tax Court of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills]?

Mr. CURTIS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

TAX TREATMENT OF CERTAIN AMOUNTS PAID TO CERTAIN MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES AND TO THEIR SURVIVORS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 10625) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax treatment of certain amounts paid to servicemen and survivors.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills]?

Mr. CURTIS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

TARIFF TREATMENT OF ARTICLES ASSEMBLED ABROAD OF PRODUCTS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 11216) relating to the tariff treatment of articles assembled abroad of products of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills]?

Mr. CURTIS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

TRADE STATISTICS HIDE U.S. COMPETITIVE GAP

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a great deal of hullabaloo about who discovered or found America. Perhaps Leif Ericson might have found it but Columbus discovered it, because Leif, after he found it, lost it, which reminds us of the old story of "Losers weepers, finders keepers." After Columbus discovered America, it stayed discovered.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to offer a resolution today aimed at what I believe is even more important than finding or discovering, or worrying about who discovered America; it is aimed at our starting to worry about who is going to save it.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a joint resolution that calls for a radical change in the reporting of our import statistics by the Federal departments that are responsible for the collection and publication of these statistics.

It has been known for some time that our import statistics report only the foreign value of goods imported by us, although quantities are also reported in many instances. This foreign value represents the value of the goods at the foreign point of shipment to this country. The costs of shipping to this country are not added. The result is an appreciable undervaluation of the cost of the imported goods, especially when they come from overseas, as do some 80 percent of our total imports.

Our practice differs from that of nearly all the other trading nations. The result has been a serious distortion in our trade statistics. One effect has been to make our imports look small in relation to our exports; and, of course, to show a higher surplus of exports than is justified. When our trade policy is determined by such a false representation of the facts, there can be little wonder that it should be off base.

Calculations that substantiate an average global figure of 17½ percent as representing the undervaluation of our imports have been made. This seems to be on the conservative side but even so the use of this percentage as a multiplier to bring our imports to a c.i.f. basis, that is, adding to the foreign f.o.b. value, the insurance and freight incident to shipping the imported goods to our shores, would add $3.25 billion to our 1964 import figure of $18.6 billion as reported by the Department of Commerce. This would bring the total to $21.85 billion and would cut the reported $6.9 billion export surplus for that year to $3.65 billion, or almost in half.

I shall not impose on Members by detailing the actual calculations by which these results are reached. I shall ask unanimous consent to present them at the conclusion of my remarks. They were prepared by O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, and are fully documented for anyone who wants to check the sources.

Mr. Speaker, in this matter of competitive standing of this country, we have been hiding our head in the sand too long. We have based our trade policy on the assumption that we are handsomely competitive in world markets. Our officials, including the highest, have pointed to our export surplus as evidence of a highly gratifying competitive capacity. We have assumed, for example, that Japan has been suffering a deficit in her trade with us; and this presumed fact deeply colored our policies toward her. The fact is, according to the new calculations, that we have been importing more from Japan than we have been exporting to her. The tables in the appended exhibit will show the magnitude of the distortion under which we have labored. We have in fact been importing more from Japan than we have been selling there, including extensive sales of subsidized cotton and wheat.

I will only say, without going into details, that in 1962 we actually incurred a deficit in the order of $319 million in our merchandise trade with Japan instead of a surplus of $58 million, as our official statistics show; that in 1963 our deficit was $101 million in place of a surplus of $216 million, as our official statistics would lead us to believe, and that in 1964 a deficit of $257 million replaces a supposed surplus of $139 million. The basis and source of these calculations are shown in the exhibit.

The balance in our trade with the United Kingdom shows a similar distortion. During the years of 1962–64 we ran a deficit calculated at $234 million instead of an apparent surplus of $478 million, as our official statistics show. There was an undervaluation of our imports during those 3 years from the United Kingdom averaging 22 percent. This was the amount of freight and insurance incurred by the United Kingdom in bringing our exports to her shores. The assumption is that in reporting our imports from that country on an f.o.b. basis, English port of shipment, we should add the same 22 percent in order to bring our imports on an even keel with our exports as reported by the United Kingdom. This may not be precise but it cannot contain any appreciable error.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the distortion of our import statistics should be corrected as soon as possible, so that the American people will be able to see our trade as it is, instead of falling victim to a wholly unjustified optimism derived from false reports. I do not say falsified. I say false, because our official import statistics lead to a false representation of the amount of import competition, and incidentally swell our export surplus into something that it is not.

If we go one step further and eliminate from our exports the products that we ship under AID, Public Law 480, and under governmental subsidies, the remaining 1964 surplus of $3.5 billion disappears completely. Indeed it is not a proper use of statistics to represent subsidized exports as reflecting our competitive standing in world markets.

Keep in mind that I am not talking about balance of payments. I have reference to exports and imports of merchandise, which, however, do play a major part in the balance of trade. I am interested in our comparative competitive position, and I am not saying that our wages are too high. I point out that wages in other countries with one exception are much lower and that that is the principal difficulty. Before 1958 we ran a surplus in shipping charges in overseas trade. It was a plus factor in our balance of payments. This has now dropped to a deficit position that in 1963 reached $300 million. Our merchant marine is not competitive and can operate only under subsidization. The reason is no different from the difficulty that faces a number of our leading industries, such as steel, coal, glass, textiles, and so forth. Foreign wages hand in hand with foreign productivity leave us little to stand on competitively. This situation will not improve. Our technology has become available to the other industrial nations and this fact confronts our industries with implications that will be resolved only by still more foreign investments.

Mr. Speaker, under these circumstances it seems insane to pursue the tariff-cutting program in Geneva.

I include the material previously referred to, the analysis prepared by O. R. Strackbein, at this point in the RECORD:

CONCEALMENT OF U.S. GLOBAL COMPETITIVE LAG

(By O. R. Strackbein, chairman, the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, September 15, 1965)

The international competitive position of the United States has been the subject of controversy in recent years. The predominant theme has been that this country is indeed competitive as shown by the continuing high surplus in our merchandise export-import account. In 1964 this surplus was $6.9 billion, higher than in 1963 when it was nevertheless a very comfortable $5 billion and in 1962, when it stood at $4.3 billion. There was a "healthy" growth, it was said, from year to year; and, on the face of it, that was true. Hence the easy conclusion that all was well in our foreign trade merchandise account.

Only those who are familiar with the makeup of our balance-of-payments account were in a position to question the validity of the glib assumption that an export surplus in our merchandise account automatically was cause for exuberance.

The question is of concern because the status of the U.S. competitive capacity in international trade has a vital bearing on our trade policy, among other aspects of foreign economic policy, and on the employment problem of this country.

In order to test this status several aspects of our trade balance will be examined here:

1. The makeup of the export surplus;
2. The basis of import tabulation used by this country compared to that of other countries, and the distortion caused by it;
3. The balance in receipts and payments in export and import transportation (shipping);
4. The declining share of world exports enjoyed by this country in recent years;
5. The trend in our exports and imports of manufactured products.

These five headings will be examined in the order of their appearance.

1. THE MAKEUP OF OUR EXPORT SURPLUS

As mentioned above, our export surplusages of the past 3 years have ranged from $4.3 to $6.9 billion (the 1964 surplus). The year 1964 may therefore be selected for examination because that surplus was the highest of recent years.

While this surplus does not include military aid shipments, it does include AID and Public Law 480 shipments plus the so-called "commercial" exports of wheat, wheat flour, raw cotton, rice, dairy products, etc., that, although not a part of AID or Public Law 480 shipments, were nonetheless subsidized shipments, and cannot therefore be considered as evidence of the positive competitive capacity of either our industry or agriculture.

In 1964 (fiscal year ended June 30) exports of agricultural products under Government-financed programs amounted to $913 million. Those exported with export payments but recorded as commercial sales for dollars amounted to an additional $1,380 million: wheat and wheat flour $604 million, cotton $530 million, milled rice $132 million, and smaller amounts in dairy products, tobacco, oilseeds and products, and peanuts.

The two combined, i.e., exports under "Government-financed programs" and "commercial sales for dollars" "with export payments," were $2.293 billion. (See Foreign Agricultural Trade of the United States, May 1965, U.S. Department of Agriculture, p. 7.)

Turning now to our exports of nonagricultural products, the 1964 (calendar year) exports financed by U.S. Government grants and capital were $1,407 billion. (Foreign Agricultural Trade of the United States, July 1965, U.S. Department of Agriculture, p. 8.)

If the two are combined we find that $3.7 billion of our exports agricultural and nonagricultural (the first category during the fiscal year 1963–64 and the second for the calendar year 1964), were not private commercial unsubsidized transactions, as they must be if they were to represent competitive sales. (The lack of dovetailing of the two sets of statistics, with an overlap of 6 months is not regarded as serious. If agricultural exports bulked larger in 1964 because of sales of wheat to Russia, so did total 1964 exports.)

If the $3.7 billion of exports are subtracted from the total surplus of $6.9 billion, the latter is reduced to $3.2 billion. No doubt our export surplus could be increased beyond the $6.9 billion if we elected to subsidize yet more exports.

2. THE BASIS OF IMPORT-TABULATION USED BY UNITED STATES COMPARED WITH OTHER COUNTRIES

The United States tabulates its imports on the basis of f.o.b. value, foreign port of shipment, or, in any case, without addition of insurance and shipping charges to U.S. port of entry. Nearly all other countries on the contrary, do compute their imports on the basis of cost, plus insurance and freight, or c.i.f.

The difference is appreciable. With the exception of Canada and Mexico, the costs of insurance and shipping charges range from some 15 percent to 25 percent. Of total imports some 20 percent come from these two countries. Therefore an average global percentage would need to be reduced by 20 percent in order to reflect the omission of these two countries.

Two other leading countries among our trading partners by which a test may be run are Japan and England. Each of these records its imports on a c.i.f. basis.

Our exports to Japan, of course, are the same as the Japanese imports from us. Therefore if we set down our exports to Japan over a 3-year period, such as 1962–64, and match these exports with the Japanese imports from us during the same years, the difference between the f.o.b., our port of export, and the c.i.f. value, Japanese port of entry, can be calculated. By covering 3 years the distortion caused by goods in transit in either direction at year's end and year's beginning, will be minimized. The following table will show the value of U.S. exports to Japan as computed by the United States and the value of Japanese imports from this country, as tabulated by Japan.

[Dollars in thousands]

Year	United States exports to Japan [1]	Japanese imports from United States [2]	Difference, (+) or (−) *Percent*
1962	$1,415,000	$1,809,000	+27.8
1963	1,714,000	2,077,000	+21.2
1964	1,908,000	2,336,000	+22.4
3-year total	5,037,000	6,222,000	+23.5

[1] U.S. official tabulation.

[2] As tabulated by Japan on c.i.f. basis.

From this table we see that our exports to Japan were enhanced in value an average of 23.5 percent during the 3-year period of 1962–64 as a result of Japanese tabulation of her imports on a c.i.f. basis rather than f.o.b. U.S. port of export.

According to this tabulation Japan imported $1.185 billion more from us during the 3-year period than our statistics show as U.S. exports to Japan during the 1962–64 period.

If we now examine our imports from Japan first as reported by our official import statistics and then by adding to those figures a percentage equal to the Japanese addition to our exports to them, i.e., by adding constructed shipping insurance and shipping costs, we will arrive at a proper basis for striking a trade balance between the two countries. The next table will show U.S. imports from Japan, as tabulated by the United States, together with what the values would be laid down at U.S. port of entry if the insurance and shipping charges westward were the same as eastward to Japan from the United States. The same percentages of increment or increase resulting from the calculation in the first table will be used. Thus will the cost of U.S. imports from Japan approximate the c.i.f. value, U.S. port of entry. This will place our imports on the same basis as Japanese imports from this country.

[Dollars in thousands]

Year	United States imports from Japan [1]	Same import if enhanced to c.i.f.[2]	Amount of increase *Percent*
1962	$1,357,000	$1,734,000	27.8
1963	1,498,000	1,815,000	21.2
1964	1,769,000	2,165,000	22.4
3-year total	4,624,000	5,714,000	23.5

[1] As recorded by United States on f.o.b., foreign point of exportation.

[2] By same percent as Japanese imports exceeded our exports.

If next we show United States exports to Japan as computed by United States, as already shown in the first table, and match them with United States imports from Japan on the constructed cost, insurance, and freight basis as shown in the immediately preceding table, we may strike out trade balance with Japan in the same manner as Japan and most other countries strike their trade balances:

[In thousands]

Year	United States exports to Japan	United States imports from Japan (c.i.f.)	U.S. deficit
1962	$1,415,000	$1,734,000	$319,000
1963	1,714,000	1,815,000	101,000
1964	1,908,000	2,165,000	257,000
3-year total	5,037,000	5,714,000	677,000

The next table will show the balance of trade between United States and Japan as computed by United States and disseminated as the official trade statistics by the U.S. Department of Commerce.

[In thousands]

Year	United States exports to Japan	United States imports from Japan	Apparent U.S. surplus
1962	$1,415,000	$1,357,000	$58,000
1963	1,714,000	1,498,000	216,000
1964	1,908,000	1,769,000	139,000
3-year total	5,037,000	4,624,000	413,000

Our official 3-year export surplus in our trade with Japan in the amount of $413 million is thus converted into a deficit of $677 million. The 1962 surplus of $58 million becomes a deficit of $319 million; the surplus of $216 million in 1963 becomes a deficit of $101 million, and the 1964 surplus of $139 million is changed into a deficit of $257 million.

Yet, all this time our national policy has been based on the erroneous notion that Japan, struggling as she was, was somehow unable to overcome the deficit in her trade with us. We were evidently on the face of it more competitive in the Japanese market than Japan was in the U.S. market.

If we keep in mind, further, that Japanese imports of U.S. raw cotton was highly subsidized by this country as a means of selling abroad and that the same was true of our exports of wheat and wheat flour to Japan—not indeed as a matter of foreign aid, but as a matter of being competitive in world markets—the deficit in our trade with Japan assumes even greater proportions. In 1964, for example, we exported to Japan $130 million of cotton and $110 million of wheat. (See FT 410, 1964, U.S. Exports, Department of Commerce.) These exports are recorded as commercial sales by the Department of Agriculture, and no doubt correctly so, but they were not sales that demonstrated our economic competitiveness.

Added to our constructed deficit of $257 million in our merchandise trade with Japan in 1964, the total deficit raises to $497 million so far as private commercial unsubsidized exports are concerned.

With respect to our merchandise trade with the United Kingdom the situation is quite similar. First we shall again show U.S. exports, as reported by the U.S. Department of Commerce and United Kingdom imports from us, as reported by official United Kingdom sources. We shall again use the 3-year period of 1962–64 so that the year-end and year-beginning distortions caused by goods in transit in both directions will be minimized:

[Dollars in thousands]

Year	United States exports to the United Kingdom [1]	United Kingdom imports from the United States [2]	Difference, (+) or (−) *Percent*
1962	$1,074,000	$1,333,000	+24.1
1963	1,161,000	1,395,000	+20.0
1964	1,468,000	1,790,000	+22.0
3-year total	3,703,000	4,518,000	+22.0

[1] U.S. official tabulation.

[2] As tabulated by the United Kingdom.

From this table we see that the value of the United Kingdom imports from the United States increased in value by an average of 22 percent during the 3-year period as a result of the c.i.f. tabulation base used by the United Kingdom. According to this tabulation the United Kingdom imported $815 million more from us during this period than we exported to her, f.o.b. U.S. port of export.

Next we shall examine our imports from the United Kingdom, first as reported by our official import statistics and then by adding the percentages by which the United Kingdom imports exceeded our exports (representing the cost of insurance and shipping charges). This will give us an equal base for determining export surpluses or deficits in the two-way trade. The assumption is that the charges for shipping from the United Kingdom to the United States is virtually the same as in the reverse direction. We will add to our import figures from the United Kingdom, which are f.o.b. United Kingdom, the same charges the United Kingdom adds to our exports in order to arrive at the c.i.f. basis:

[Dollars in thousands]

Year	United States imports from the United Kingdom [1]	Same imports raised to c.i.f.[2]	Amount of increase *Percent*
1962	$1,005,000	$1,247,000	24.1
1963	1,079,000	1,294,000	20.0
1964	1,141,000	1,3961000	22.0

[1] As reported by United States on f.o.b. basis, foreign point of exportation.

[2] Placed on c.i.f. basis, U.S. port of entry, by use of percentages shown in preceding table.

Next we set our exports to the United Kingdom, as computed by the United States for the same period against the calculated U.S. imports from the United Kingdom as shown in the immediately preceding table. It will then be possible to draw a balance in our trade on a roughly even basis with the United Kingdom method and that of nearly all other countries.

[In thousands]

Year	United States exports to the United Kingdom [1]	United States imports from United Kingdom, c.i.f.[2]	U.S. deficits
1962	$1,074,000	$1,247,000	$173,000
1963	1,161,000	1,294,000	133,000
1964	1,468,000	1,396,000	[3] 72,000
3-year total	3,703,000	3,937,000	234,000

[1] According to U.S. tabulation.

[2] As constructed and previously explained.

[3] Surplus.

The final table shows the apparent surplus in merchandise exports enjoyed by the United States during the years 1962–64 according to official U.S. statistics as published to the world, to Congress, and the American people:

[In thousands]

Year	United States exports to the United Kingdom [1]	United States imports from the United Kingdom [2]	Apparent surplus
1962	$1,074,000	$1,005,000	$69,000
1963	1,161,000	1,079,000	82,000
1964	1,468,000	1,141,000	327,000
3-year total	3,703,000	3,225,000	478,000

[1] Official U.S. exports (exclusive of special categories or military supplies).

[2] Official U.S. imports (Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1964, table 1129; and Overseas Business, OBR 65–20, U.S. Department of Commerce, April 1965).

Here we see an apparent 3-year surplus of $478 million converted into a deficit of $234 million. Yet, again, the world has been allowed to believe that we have been enjoying a comfortable surplus in our trade with the United Kingdom, thus demonstrating a competitive prowess we do not possess.

As in the case of Japan, among our exports to the United Kingdom are subsidized items such as cotton, wheat, and rice, much lower, however, than our exports of these items to Japan. In 1964 the total for the three products was some $60 million, and these should not be counted as demonstrating our ability to compete commercially in the United Kingdom market.

It is difficult to obtain reliable import-export statistics for purposes of measuring U.S. trade with Western European countries other than the United Kingdom, because destinations are not always known. Shipments to internal countries with no seaports are often credited to the countries where the goods are landed. Goods may then be transshipped, thus maximating exports to some countries while understanding these to other countries. Trade with Japan and the United Kingdom is not as subject to such aberrations.

The contiguity of the United States to Canada and Mexico also offers a problem in any endeavor to reach a global markup that would bring our import statistics onto a par with those of other countries. About 20 percent of our imports come from these two sources. While some shipping charges are incurred on shipments from Canada and Mexico to this country, they are small compared with those incurred from countries lying farther away. In arriving at a global factor or percentage of inflation to be applied to our total imports a reduction of 20 percent should be made to account for our imports from Canada and Mexico.

If we calculate an average of the two countries we have tabulated, i.e., a markup of 23.5 percent on our imports from Japan and 22 percent on those from the United Kingdom over the 1962–64 period, we arrive at 22.75 percent. If we subtract 20 percent from this 22.75 percent to account for Canada and Mexico, we arrive at 18.20 percent.

It would seem safe to say then that a global percentage of 17½ percent should be a fair approximation to the actual difference between the U.S. import figures and what they would be if we converted to a c.i.f. basis.

It must be kept in mind that some European countries use a lower percentage when converting their own imports from f.o.b. to c.i.f. France is reported to use 10 percent. Such lower conversion factors are justified in those instances in which most of the trade comes from near rather than far countries. For example, in 1963 of western Europe's $63.2 billion of total exports, $40.4 billion went to western Europe, or very nearly two-thirds. In the EEC countries $25.8 billion in exports of a total of $37.5 billion also went to western Europe. Therefore the conversion factors used by the European countries to convert from f.o.b. to c.i.f. do not apply to the United States. Our factors must be appreciably higher because, with the two exceptions mentioned, all other imports come from farther away. Some 80 percent of our imports come by ocean transportation, over half of it from Europe, Asia, and Africa, in 1963, thus incurring heavy shipping costs.

We may now with reasonable confidence apply a global conversion factor to our total imports.

In 1964 total imports by the United States, for consumption, were $18.6 billion. If the conversion factor of 17½ percent is used, this total will be increased by $3.25 billion, bringing the total to $21.85 billion.

Our total 1964 merchandise exports were $25.3 billion. (Survey of Current Business, U.S. Department of Commerce, July 1965, p. S–2.) Thus our export surplus would fall to $3.5 billion from $6.7 billion.

If we now bring forward the calculation that showed that of our total 1964 exports the $3.7 billion that moved under the various categories of governmental assistance, we are left with a global deficit of $200 million in our private unsubsidized commercial merchandise export account.

3. THE BALANCE IN RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS FROM SHIPPING CHARGES

It might be thought that this deficit might be overcome by the earnings of our merchant marine in carrying our trade and that of other nations.

The day of such surpluses disappeared in 1958 when it shifted from a surplus of a bare $2 million to a growing deficit. This reached $113 million in 1959 and after some zigzagging rose to $300 million in 1963. In 1950 receipts exceeded payments by $215 million; in 1955, by $202 million. (Statistical abstract of the United States, 1964, table 827.) This decline has occurred despite shipping subsidies that have grown from $133 million in 1959 to $226 million in 1963. (Ibid., table 524.)

These accumulations bring the trade deficit to some $725 million in 1963.

4. U.S. DECLINING SHARE IN WORLD EXPORT TRADE

The share of the United States in world exports has declined markedly in recent years. With two principal exceptions this shrinkage has been borne predominantly by manufactured products. Because of the high degree of subsidization in one form or another, the exports of agricultural products have expanded, thus demonstrating that our exports respond to the foreign aid and other methods by which this country pays for or helps pay for the exports. In 1955 agricultural exports were $3.2 billion; in 1964 they had doubled to $6.3 billion. In the same period imports went only from $3.9 to $4 billion.

By volume total U.S. exports rose from an index of 100 in 1958 to 126 in 1963. World exports in the same period moved from 100 to 141. Our agricultural exports rose to 165 during the same period in value.

The following table shows the extent to which exports by volume have increased more (the United Kingdom among the leading trading nations excepted) from other countries than from the United States:

Index: [1] *1958=100*

Country:	*1963*
United States	126
United Kingdom	120
Netherlands	149
Sweden	151
West Germany	156
France	162
Belg-Lux	173
Japan	198
Italy	206
Canada	133

[1] Statistical Yearbook, United Nations, 1964, p. 487 ff.

In the same period our imports went from 100 to 133 or 7 points higher than our exports.

From 1953 to 1963 the U.S. share of total world exports declined from 19.0 percent to 15.0 percent or by 20 percent. From 1958 to 1963 it declined from 18.3 percent to 15 percent or by 18.2 percent. This means that our lag began in the late 1950's.

5. TRENDS IN EXPORTS AND IMPORTS OF MANUFACTURED PRODUCTS

With respect to exports of manufactured goods the United States did less well even than with exports as a whole. The next table will show the trends in exports of manufactured goods from 1958 to 1963, where 1958=100:

Index: [1] *1958=100—Exports of manufactured goods*

Country:	*1963*
United States	117
United Kingdom	118
Netherlands	162
Sweden	163
West Germany	155
France	165
Belg-Lux	161
Japan	209
Italy	235
Canada	134

[1] Statistical Yearbook, United Nations, 1964, p. 496.

Here again the United States lagged spectacularly behind all the other leading industrial countries (except the United Kingdom) in exports of manufactured products. Whereas our total exports had increased to 126, our exports of manufactured goods rose only to 117, and both lagged far behind Europe and Japan.

If we turn to exports of manufactured products other than machinery and transport equipment (mostly automobiles), we find that the U.S. share between 1958 and 1962 declined from 19.1 percent of the world's total to 15.4 percent. Total world exports of such manufactures increased 37 percent, that of the United States, only 10.7 percent. (See Statistical Yearbook of the U.N., 1963, p. 468. The 1964 yearbook dropped this table.) In these statistics Canada was combined with the United States, but this fact could be regarded as producing only a minuscule effect.

Even though U.S. exports of chemicals increased from $1.438 billion in the 1956–60 period to $1.922 billion in 1963, our share in world chemical exports dropped by 17 percent from 1955 to 1962. (Statistical abstract of the United States, 1963 and 1964, and statistical yearbook of the U.N., 1963.)

With respect to machinery and transport equipment, the decline was from 34 percent of the world's total exports in 1955 to 26 percent in 1962, a decline of 23.5 percent. This group includes automobiles. The U.S. share has fallen sharply in the exportation of automobiles in the past decade. However, our machinery exports have prospered in recent years in response to heavy direct foreign investments.

If further evidence is needed to demonstrate the U.S. lag in international trade in manufactured goods by volume, it may be found in the trend of both our exports and imports compiled by the Bureau of International Commerce, U.S. Department of Commerce. By an index in which 1957–59=100, our exports of crude foodstuffs rose from 104 in the 1956–60 period to 158 in 1963 (prel.). This represented the upward swing of our exports of subsidized agricultural products and Public Law 480 shipments.

During the same period our exports of finished goods rose from 101 to only 113—a marked contrast. The one rose 58 percent; the other only 13 percent.

The opposite trend was visible in our imports. Crude foodstuffs rose from 98 to only 107. By contrast, imports of finished goods rose from 100 to 152. (See statistical abstract of the United States, 1964, table 1230.) Imports of semimanufactures went from 100 to 132. Crude material imports virtually stood still, moving from 99 to only 101.

If these trends are translated into employment it will be appreciated that they are very adverse to this country. Trading of unprocessed goods for finished goods as represented by the recent trend, is not productive of employment, but quite the opposite.

There can be no doubt about the unenviable status of the competitive prowess of the United States in world markets. If we examine export trends a little more closely the deplorable position of most of our manufactured products, exclusive of machinery other than automobiles, will become apparent.

Machinery exports have boomed because of our heavy investments in foreign productive facilities. In 1964 we enjoyed a favorable export balance in machinery to the extent of $4.7 billion. Exports of machinery exclusive of automotive and aircraft rose by $2.34 billion from 1959 to 1963.

The only other item showing a large surplus was in chemicals, one of $1.6 billion, a large part of which consists of raw material or semimanufactures. If these two items, in which our export surplus was $4 billion, are removed from our calculation it follows that our trade in virtually all other nonagricultural items must have left us with a higher deficit and a much greater lag in relation to world exports than might be guessed from the total balance.

According to detailed export-import statistics for 1962 (U.S. statistical abstract, 1964, tables 1222 and 1223), our exports recorded a deficit over imports with respect to a long list of broad categories. The total of this deficit was $4.6 billion. The greater part of these deficits were recorded by petroleum ($1.3 billion), nonferrous metals (copper, lead, and zinc, etc.) ($560 million) and paper and manufactures ($516 million). If subtracted from the $4.6 billion deficit, this nevertheless left $2.1 billion in our trade deficit in exports of a long list of items including rubber and manufactures, cotton, and wool manufactures, sawmill products, wood manufactures, steel mill products, beverages, and related products, leather manufactures, meat, and products, fish, and products, silk, and manufactures, toys, athletic and sporting goods, precious metals, jewelry, etc., leather, and stone, cement, and lime—all of which recorded export deficits in 1962, even by U.S. tabulations.

That the deficit has grown in recent years may be seen from a comparison with the 1956–60 period. At that time the deficit was $3.3 billion averaged over the 5-year period, compared with the $4.6 billion deficit. of 1962.

If we again eliminate the three leading deficit items; i.e., petroleum, nonferrous metals and paper and manufacturers, the 1956–60 deficit drops to $1.3 billion. It rose to $2.1 billion in 1962.

A change in statistical compilation by the Department of Commerce prevents comparison of the preceding statistics with those of 1963 and 1964. However, the excess of imports of other manufactured goods not including machinery, automobiles, petroleums and chemicals, rose from a mere $57 million deficit in 1958 to $1.68 billion in 1964. This confirms the trend. Nevertheless we went into another tariff-cutting round in 1960.

Conclusion

The foregoing analysis must lead to drastic revision of several factors that are basic to policy formation of a national trade policy.

1. The United States has been running and continues to run a deficit instead of enjoying a massive export surplus, as generally believed, in its merchandise export-import account in terms of private commercial unsubsidized exports.

2. We are in a growing deficit position in the exportation of many of our broad product classifications, other than machinery and transport equipment, foods, crude materials and minerals. In some of these we are also running a sharp deficit: petroleum and nonferrous metals.

3. Our imports have been shifting from raw materials toward finished goods and semifinished goods to the detriment of industrial employment in this country.

4. Our exports have been shifting toward agricultural products and raw materials, plus machinery in the field of. manufactured goods. Machinery exports have been stimulated by our heavy foreign investments, which in turn reflect the reaction of our industries to our noncompetitive status at home and abroad vis-a-vis foreign competition.

5. Our exports have become increasingly dependent on governmental assistance of one kind or another.

6. Further tariff reductions should be shelved until our industries regain their one-time competitive status at home and abroad.

PROGRESS OF THE DEVELOPING NATIONS

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, the sugar legislation discussed yesterday and which will be discussed today, focuses the attention of this House on the bottleneck to progress which plagues the developing nations. That bottleneck is foreign exchange. To make progress in today's world the developing nations must have foreign exchange. The major source of such exchange is from the sale of the basic commodities extracted from their land. The basic rules governing the international monetary system and the too-often ruthless marketplace to which these nations bring such basic commodities militate very strongly against the growth of foreign exchange available to the emerging, developing nations.

In the legislation which is before us today, we see an effort to bring some equity and fairness into the marketplace for one of the important basic commodities extracted from the agriculture of the underdeveloped nations. It is a step toward a break in the bottleneck to which we have alluded. It may not be perfect, but since this legislation serves other and conflicting purposes it would be unreasonable to expect anything but imperfection. I intend to support the bill. But more than this support, I intend, and I hope that my colleagues also intend, to continue to address their attention to the other market situations involving other basic commodities from these same nations. At the same time, we should support the efforts, and encourage the program of Secretary Fowler as he seeks to bring to the deliberations for international monetary reform the viewpoint and the vital interest of these emerging nations.

MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENTS

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, with the annual death toll due to motor vehicle accidents in the United States approaching 50,000 and with injuries from this cause numbering in the millions and increasing apace, it is abundantly clear that our efforts to prevent these tragedies and reverse this trend are utterly inadequate.

Safer roads are being built. Increased attention is being given to traffic law enforcement. Stiffer requirements are being adopted for the licensing of drivers. New safety features are being built into automobiles. Safety, along with safety education and driver improvement, are receiving heavy emphasis.

All of these measures, I am sure, are helpful. But they are not enough. We have our answer in the statistics that reflect the loss of life and the crippling injuries which occur every hour around the clock on our streets and highways.

There is a clear and urgent need for new approaches and new methods aimed at preventing these accidents which take such awesome tolls in human life, in health, and in economic loss. It would be presumptuous in the extreme for me to prescribe what these measures should be. However, I refuse to accept the notion that all of these accidents are unavoidable, and the resulting carnage is an inevitable price to be paid in perpetuity for the benefits of automotive transportation. A nation which has mastered supersonic flight, harnessed the atom, and explored outer space certainly must possess the capabilities needed to solve this problem. Our task is clear; we have delayed too long in seeking the solutions needed.

If ever there was a field which justified strong support and leadership by the Federal Government, this is it. For too long, now, individual and privately supported efforts aimed at reducing the traffic toll have struggled with this problem with inadequate means. These efforts are important, and of course will be continued. More recently, the Federal Government has begun to contribute, but on a scale that is modest in proportion to the gravity of the problem and the enormity of the task. Beginning now, the Federal Government should assume its proper share of the load.

It is clear that a substantial research effort is needed to learn more about the underlying causes of motor vehicle accidents. Until such knowledge is developed and validated, we are working very largely in the dark insofar as prevention is concerned.

What human failures, or momentary behavioral lapses, as the scientists put it, lead to accidents? Why do some individuals have accidents while other avoid them in what appear to be similar environments and circumstances? These are but two of the basic questions which must be answered before really effective preventive measures can be developed. These and a host of other vital questions remain unanswered now.

I am told that getting at such facts will not be easy. But then, neither was it easy to find the means for cutting the death tolls due to cancer, heart disease, and many other conditions where the results of massive research have led to massive savings of human life.

Today, great laboratories are devoted exclusively to research related to common and uncommon diseases. There are other great laboratories devoted to scientific research leading to new and improved products of all kinds. But there are no comparable staffed and equipped laboratories even in the planning stage for carrying out the research so urgently needed to find effective means for reducing the traffic toll. And this is where Federal resources and leadership are most urgently needed. Moreover, it is an area in which Federal efforts will supplement and complement the efforts of others. Finally, if the Federal Government does not assume its proper and logical role in this field, the work will not be done, and the answers so urgently needed will not be found.

I do not foresee the millenium when motor vehicle fatalities and injuries will be a thing of the past. At present, some 3 million people a year are injured in traffic accidents in this country, and 90 percent of these require medical attention. One in every four is hospitalized.

In spite of the obvious need, well organized emergency medical services simply do not exist in most parts of this country. Whether an accident victim receives efficient handling or services which are so bad as to inflict further damage depends on where his accident occurs.

Few of the ambulances called in these emergencies are based in hospitals, or are even under medical supervision. Many of them are not designed, equipped, or staffed to provide adequate care at the place of injury or during the trip to the hospital. In many States, distances traveled from the ambulance base to the hospital may exceed 100 miles.

Here is another area related to conservation of life and health in the traffic picture where Federal support and leadership are urgently needed. In view of the outstanding success of the Federal program for aid to community hospitals, is there any logical reason for delaying a comparable effort to assure the best emergency medical care possible for people who are injured in motor vehicle accidents? I feel very strongly that there is not.

Establishment of a national system of efficiently organized and professionally competent emergency medical services, with Federal backing and the customary safeguards for local initiative—such as are built into our hospital program—must be given high priority.

The question, in my mind, is not whether the Federal Government should mount a massive assault on all aspects of the problem of motor vehicle deaths and injuries, but rather when. The magnitude and complexity of the problem calls for greatly increased resources and leadership from the Federal Government. With the toll of deaths and injuries still climbing, we cannot afford a further delay.

THE COST OF CONGRESS IN SESSION

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have in hand a telegram which reached me this morning from Melvyn D. Bollman, 404 Lee Street, Muscatine, Iowa, in which he says:

> Please hurry and adjourn. I cannot afford another week of this session of Congress.

I doubt that Mr. Bollman is aware of what is in store for him, or he would have changed somewhat the wording of his telegram. He probably does not know that tomorrow we will be considering a supplemental appropriation bill for $4,214,609,610. If Mr. Bollman had known what was in store for him in the next 24 hours I am sure he would have changed his telegram to read:

> I cannot afford another day of this session of Congress.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF SCHOLARS TO PROPOUND VALUE JUDGMENTS

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Dr. John Howard, the president of Rockford College, gave a stimulating and thought-provoking speech at Convocation at Rockford College just recently.

I think it is a masterful presentation on how important it is today for scholars to propound value judgments and the important role the academic community must play in relation to the student body and society as a whole. Dr. Howard suggests that this should spring from a confident but humble recognition that the central mission of education is to elevate society, and that the educational institution cannot fulfill that role from the position of apologetic neutrality.

Mr. Speaker, his talk is timely and of particular interest because of recent happenings on campuses in various points around the Nation. I think those who would take the time to read it in full would immensely profit from it because this talk reflects the thinking of one of our Nation's academicians.

Dr. Howard's convocation address follows:

OPENING CONVOCATION ADDRESS

(By President John A. Howard, Rockford College, September 22, 1965)

One Fourth of July a bright youngster was scheduled to give a speech at the municipal holiday celebration. He had prepared and memorized an appropriate address and spent long hours rehearsing it. When the big moment came, he marched confidently to the platform and looked out at the sea of people. The circumstances were overwhelming, but he began boldly: "Washington is dead. Lincoln is dead." He could not remember what came next, so he tried it again, but the next phrase would not come. Starting a third time, he said, "Washington is dead. Lincoln is dead. And I'm not feeling very good, myself." And he sat down.

India and Pakistan are at war, and Communist China is making bellicose threats on the sidelines. The Vietnam conflict appears to be a long and costly one. The rate of increase in population is said to be even more alarming in the long run than the failure of nations to live together peacefully. Here in our own advanced society, a summer riot has left a residue of shock and fear in Los Angeles and a pall of possibility in all other cities. The thoughtful person surveying the contemporary scene may, like the youthful Fourth of July orator, find the circumstances overwhelming and not feel so good himself.

The academic community may try to hold itself apart from the fear, despair, and disorder of the times. It may, unwittingly, contribute to the turbulence, or it may overtly try to help distinguish the landmarks by which a course can be steered through present oversized dangers and alarms. From one point of view, it would seem that scholars, because they are privileged to invest substantial time in analysis, comparison, and contemplation, have a great opportunity, if not an obligation, to offer guidance to a world confused by rival claims, and to raise standards around which the frightened and the untutored could rally. Such a role, however, is not a wholly welcome opportunity in the citadel of objective thought and reserved judgment. The acts of drawing conclusions, offering advice, and pursuing public goals are perceived by many scholars as beyond the limits of their profession. The activist professor is not only suspect to some of his colleagues, but he may also be the prompt target of abuse by citizens who oppose the cause he advances. It is a hazardous business at best to engage in the battle for public attitudes, and one which, for the scholar, diverts valuable time from his principal work and may result in loss of stature or other penalties for himself or the college he serves.

However, even if in good conscience the scholar was formerly able to remain apart from troublesome public issues, that isolation for meditation may now be foreclosed to him. Oh, college personnel have in the past engaged in public controversy, but the issues grown cold, the American campus returned its attentions to its own preoccupations. Almost overnight, there has been a substantial change. Activism has become a dominant feature of college life in America. There is little profit in wishing that library and laboratory people would stick to their books and their beakers. A new set of circumstances now prevails. Unless the student and the professor recognize their new milieu and respond to it thoughtfully and constructively, the educational process may, with increasing frequency, be at the mercy of the unscrupulous demagogs and self-serving bullies who assert themselves in the midst of change and in the absence of firm and purposeful leadership.

The "Revolution at Berkeley," as it is designated in a new anthology of commentary on that California eruption, is not to be dismissed as a normal college disturbance, simply magnified to the scale of the modern university. It was the sunburst of a number of potent forces pent up in a too fragile and unfortified academic container. The many analyses of the Berkeley events deserve the most thoughtful and determined study by all who participate in higher education.

It is beyond my purpose here to try to identify or weigh the specific frustrations and tactics, deficiencies and errors which conspired to bring such confusion to one of our most highly regarded centers of learning. That must be done by those who have access to the facts of the case and can assess the attitudes of the people involved. There are, however, some conclusions to be drawn from this distance. And some lessons to be learned. One of very substantial importance pertains to the response of the general student body as it is urged by various spokesmen to take one action or another.

The self-assertion of student groups is becoming commonplace. Whether in any given instance, an undertaking will result in useful or devastating results is probably more dependent upon the wisdom of the group than upon the judgment and the motives of those who propose and lead. Serious-minded students must come to recognize that their mass actions can lay waste at least as readily as they can bring about constructive change.

I suggest three criteria by which a cause might be judged, three questions to be asked. First, is it affirmative? That man may find some satisfaction in tearing down was all too vividly demonstrated several weeks ago in the tragedy of Watts. Savagery does have its appeal. However, it takes no brains, no courage and no special talents to criticize or destroy. Since man is imperfect, his institutions, even the best of them, are imperfection compounded, and any fool can find fault with them. Negativism is the mark of a small man and a mean man.

Such an assertion is easy to make and perhaps as easy to grasp. The difficulty is that as a student begins to comprehend the scope of the problems of this world, the inequities and the injustices, he becomes understandably dissatisfied and impatient with the generations that have preceded him and with the evident failure of their methods. But before he disposes of their works and systems, he must remember that man's institutions, imperfect though they be, are the social instruments which have made possible the slow progress from isolated creatures of the wilderness to a human society of problems, yes, but also of enormous potential for human comfort and human kindness. These institutions have been slowly built by trial and error, pain, sweat, and sacrifice and should not be petulantly discarded. Room for improvement they all have, if improvement is the genuine objective.

A second basis for judging whether to take part is whether the decision is made thoughtfully or whether it is the product of emotion. Group emotions quickly intensify and what passes for a reason in the midst of shared anger, resentment, or other strong passions, too often turns up as regrettable stupidity later. No one who has not witnessed a mob can fully comprehend its inhuman acts and caprices. I was in college when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor. For some unaccountable reason the students on campus kindled a huge bonfire on the terrace of one of the dormitories and fed it with their furniture, their clothes, their books, and their class notes. It was a pagan, subhuman spectacle, spontaneous and performed by generally sensible students. It can happen.

Finally, and this is undoubtedly the most critical question, will the proposed undertaking actually serve the ends claimed for it? Everyone can respond warmly to a rallying cry of "peace," or "freedom," and consequently the rascals of the day chant the magic words even louder and more fervently than the saints. Since both goals are as difficult to attain as they are desirable, progress toward them is seldom achieved by hasty or superficial techniques. Indeed, if freedom is a condition of unrestricted opportunity which derives from mutual trust, one of the few sure consequences of the Berkeley uprising is a substantial setback in the condition from which freedom springs, mutual trust. As Leo Rosten has stated, "We must learn to meet fanaticism with courage, and idealism with great care, for we must be skeptical of what is promised, even by virtuous men, but has not been proved."

On the students' part, we must hope that as they exert their power, they will do so toward thoughtfully conceived, constructive goals. What of the faculty and administrative roles in the new circumstances? What changes must take place in what the students perceive as "The Establishment"?

First, there is a more pressing obligation than before to provide the clear channels through which students may raise questions, express dissatisfaction, propose change and, in return, hear from and interact directly with those who make policy. The people who are ultimately responsible for any organization do themselves no favor by interposing echelons of agents between themselves and their constituencies. The shape and dimensions of any substantial grievance cannot fail to be distorted when processed according to the perception and the reporting of third parties. In any argument with headquarters, students already perceiving themselves as underdogs, are confirmed in that perception when the bone of contention is carried away to a remote adversary.

A second requirement relates to the attitude of the policymakers toward students who are seeking help, clarification or redress. A cavalier reception of petitioners is one of the most effective means of escalating a minor difficulty into a full-scale battle. Vice President HUMPHREY, either misspoke or misthought when he said on August 23, "What I wish to suggest is that we in the United States have created a society in which freedom and equality are meaningful concepts—not vague abstractions. But I must also say that the right to be heard does not automatically include the right to be taken seriously. The latter depends entirely upon what is being said."

As the administration of any democratic community fails to take seriously the claims or the complaints of its people, it makes a critical error, for it has by that failure revealed that it either does not honor or else does not understand democracy, and it has added to whatever real or imagined problem existed originally an obvious injury which an unscrupulous leader can readily exploit.

This much of what is required of academic leadership is fairly obvious and can be passed over quickly. The other point I would make suggests a marked departure from general practice and needs some elaboration and defense. It is briefly that college policies ought to be the product of carefully arrived at value judgments which the institution has made consciously, is prepared to proclaim proudly, defend publicly, and alter or abandon with good grace if proven ill-founded. Since value judgments are at the other end of the scale from the dispassionate and never-ending search for truth which is the stock-in-trade of the academic institution, college and university officials may understandably place the enforcement of regulations as many steps removed as possible from the policymakers in the hope that no one will perceive a relationship between the two. In this act of camouflage, they are hoist by their own petard.

The Berkeley thing was started by an administrative decision to enforce a ban against a certain type of political activity by students. The specific infraction was the manning of a table where political action groups were making known their causes. A dean charged with enforcing such a regulation can hardly enlist enthusiastic compliance if his ammunition is restricted to the assertion that an act is against the rules. In this instance, some students suspected that the abrupt enforcement of a dormant rule was the result of pressures by the Oakland Tribune or other powerful, noncampus influences. The voicing of such suspicion helped attract many defenders of academic freedom and amalgamated the most diverse elements in an attack upon a craven administration.

Whatever the cause for the change in policy from nonenforcement to enforcement, it must have reflected some responsible authority's judgment, that is, value judgment, that it was wrong for the students to continue what they were doing. Such a judgment should not have been made unless it was explainable, defensible, and consistent with other policies that relate to the same judgment. A university through its regulations commits itself to the propriety or impropriety of certain actions and if it is unwilling to acknowledge its regulative brainchild and nurture and defend it, then perhaps students are correct in assuming that the offspring is illegitimate, sired outside the family.

The open mind is one of the fundamental necessities of a democracy, but if it is open at both ends and there is no thought process in the middle, it is no mind at all. It is simply a conduit.

If the trustees and faculties and administrators of our centers of learning persist in the belief that the sina qua non of such institutions is a collective open mind of the conduit type, then their campuses will attract growing numbers of malefactors whose purpose is to hobble and disrupt and whose harvest of destruction will increase as they discover there are no limits to what can be undertaken under banners of free speech and civil disobedience. In a recent article Dr. Buell Gallagher, president of the City College of New York, reporting on the Berkeley events, stated, "(The students) were in no mood to talk things over or to compromise. The time for action had come. They no longer respectfully requested, they demanded. And when demands were not met, they used the well-learned tactics of civil disobedience to bring the academic process to a grinding halt. 'We shall see who runs this university,' shouted the student leader, Mario Savio. Thus did the defense of rights become a naked struggle for power * * *. Abe Raskin comments: 'the reckless prodigality with which the free speech movement uses the weapon of civil disobedience raises problems no university can deal with adequately.' "

Since communism has rendered truth a relative, if not a completely meaningless word, and since civil disobedience seems to be regarded within the acceptable or even desirable range of academic conduct, it appears that colleges and universities are going to be forced to make some value judgments and establish and enforce certain limits of conduct, or face the eternal prospect of defending themselves from internal attacks by anyone with an ax to grind.

As these remarks have developed, this has been a backward entrance on stage by a character that deserves a center-stage fanfare. The change from a self-conscious institutional neutrality to a forceful, intentional partisanship should not be the result of a belated effort to improve a strategic position in dealing with fractious students. It should, instead, spring from a confident, albeit humble recognition that the central mission of education is to elevate society, and that the educational institution cannot fulfill that role from the position of apologetic neutrality.

In recent times a great deal of attention has been paid to extremism or fanaticism and the impropriety in a pluralistic society of placing any one objective above all others. Perhaps we are now seeing in the campus uprising the predictable results of the extremist attachment of the academic community to the open mind. There are, however, beginning to be some notable deviations from that rigid attachment. Professors are increasingly abandoning the dispassionate pose and moving out into the public marketplace of ideas to press the causes of their personal value judgments. Perhaps the best-known instance in which academic men are trying to influence the public mind is found in that group of professors at Michigan and elsewhere who have engaged in the teach-in movement to encourage our Government to withdraw from the Vietnam conflict. It makes no difference whether you and I agree or disagree with them, their action illustrates the point of scholars who are propounding value judgments.

Perhaps the time has come when our institutions of higher learning, faced with the necessity to protect themselves from irresponsible attacks, will have the courage to transcend mere defensive regulations and assert themselves as positive forces in the battle for men's minds. There are certain areas of commitment shared by men of good will which could be codified as institutional objectives. They might well include an insistence upon responsible behavior and upon respect for the individual, and a rejection of racial or religious discrimination. Once over the hurdle of the traditional and almost psychotic avoidance of anything that could be interpreted as a value judgment, it is possible that colleges and universities might reassert themselves in the role they once occupied of proponents of ethical and moral living.

Education is, after all, supposed to be a service to society. If the institutions of higher learning are by default, or even by active encouragement contributing to unethical and immoral behavior, it is a strange service they are performing for society.

This is a hazardous change of course to propose for higher education. The hazards lie in the choice of those human objectives to which the institution commits itself and also in the techniques by which it chooses to advance them. But any institutional move in this direction would certainly meet such internal resistance that there is little danger of precipitate action. There is an even more effective safeguard against any national thrust into mass indoctrination. That safeguard is the large number of colleges and universities and the diversity of their control. Each has its own policy board, its own faculty committees, its own executive officers. If one institution through its faculty, trustees and administration concluded that slovenliness and bad manners were not necessary to the highest intellectual endeavor and in fact were antithetical to that end, and if it declared its institutional self in behalf of such a value judgment, there is no reason to fear that all others would follow suit.

I would propose here one objective for all colleges and universities—a conscious and determined effort to prepare their students for a world which has always been and always will be beset with monumental problems and imminent dangers, but a world that has also been blessed with a sequence of heroic figures who defied pessimism and proved of themselves that man can work prodigies. Mankind has always needed its heroes and with the mechanical devices we have to apprise us immediately of the full details of every world catastrophe, we need our heroes now more than ever before. The sad part is that there are enough scholars at work to unearth the human foibles and peculiar failings of each entry in the lexicon of the great, with the result that one may suspect greatness is merely a coincidence of good luck and skillful public relations.

College students and all people, but especially college students, need a periodic encounter with the vibrant, dedicated, optimistic, magnificent accomplishers of our times, whose works and temper place them beyond any suspicion of self-serving or petty motives. There are such individuals, people who make those around them stand taller just by the power and the genuineness of their commitment. On our campus, we have experienced this confident aura in Dr. Connie Guion, Dean Myron Tribus, Gwendolyn Brooks, Walter Judd—or you write your own list.

The first 11 articles of the March issue of the Atlantic were devoted to Winston Churchill. Editor Edward Weeks began his introductory statement by saying, "Anyone who ever saw Winston Churchill in action will never forget it." And concluded, "This, then, is the Atlantic's expression of gratitude for the greatest man of our age." In the Saturday Review, Norman Cousins' editorial said in part, "Several times during the 20th century—most notably following the deaths of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Mahatma Ghandi, John F. Kennedy, Jawarharlal Nehru, Pope John XXIII—there have been worldwide demonstrations of loss deeply felt. What is most significant about the response to Churchill's death is the reflection in it of the changes he created in the people he reached. In speaking to the strength inside people, he caused that strength to come into being."

Our educational institutions are, after all, working with the future leaders of the Nation. It is not our obligation to stretch their aspirations, fortify their courage and challenge them to rise toward their own possibilities of dignity and power? And to do these things intentionally?

It would be a colossal irony if Mario Savio and his Free Speech Movement were the agents for proving to our colleges and universities that their total commitment to unhampered freedom in the search for truth is an untenable position. It would be a great service if Mario and the Free Speech Movement proved to students the necessity for responding thoughtfully to the urgings of each self-styled messiah. And it might be the dawn of a new era for the Nation if the California student leaders prompted a recognition by faculties, trustees, and administrators that they cannot conduct an educational institution without some value judgments, and therefore they might as well extend themselves and make some value judgments that will amount to something.

In closing these remarks I want to include a quotation I have used before, repeating it now both because it bears repeating and also as a tribute to the man who wrote it, Albert Schweitzer. It occurs in a volume bearing the significant title, "The Light Within Us." "The final decisions as to what the future of a society shall be depends not on how near its organization is to perfection, but on the degrees of worthiness in its individual members."

It is time we recognized that college education has a direct bearing on the worthiness of the members of our society and labored earnestly and humbly and forthrightly to add to that worthiness according to our lights.

AWARD FOR HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Illinois Optometric Association is having its annual meeting today in Chicago. The association will present three awards for outstanding service in the field of health. One will be to the optometrist of the year; one to an outstanding lay person, and a third to a distinguished public official.

Our own colleague, BILL SPRINGER, of the 22d Congressional District, has been chosen by the association to receive its distinguished public official award and I know that all of the Members of the House join me in congratulating him on being singled out for this honor.

BILL has been the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during the last year and has contributed substantially to constructive portions of much of the health legislation that has come from that committee this year. This award goes annually to only one public official in the State of Illinois. Because of the hard work which BILL SPRINGER has given to health legislation in this last year, I know that this award is well deserved and am sure that we are all pleased that the association is publicly recognizing his effort.

ACTION OF UNITED STATES IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC CRISIS

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, last April the United States sent soldiers and marines to the Dominican Republic to prevent a Communist takeover and creation of another Cuba. This action, predictably, set off sharp controversy both at home and abroad.

The argument flared again, in mid-September, in the other body, when one Senator, denouncing our actions, said:

> Our intervention in Santo Domingo shook, if it did not shatter, a confidence in the United States that had been built up over 30 years.

However, another Senator, with whose conclusions I heartily agree in this matter, defended our intervention, pointing out that it was an unavoidable necessity and went on to observe that many critics of our Dominican policy "are not pro-Communist. But they are so bemused by the Communist pretension to social revolution, that they permit their tolerance of communism to blind them to the very real danger it poses to the survival of freedom."

It seems to me that we should have learned after so many years that the Communist Party is not just another political organization which may be dealt with around a conference table. But have we learned? From a look at the situation in the Dominican Republic today, I am inclined to doubt it.

The United States is deeply involved with the political, military and economic problems of the Dominican Republic. If American troops were to be withdrawn, there is little doubt that fighting would break out again; if American aid money were not forthcoming, the economy would collapse; if American support did not bolster the present government headed by Hector Garcia Godoy, set up in September under a compromise arranged by the Organization of American States, there would be political chaos.

Our officials admit that the Dominican problem is one of the most complex ever tackled. I have grave doubts, though, that some of the actions of the Garcia Godoy administration, supported by the United States, will go very far toward solving the matter.

Garcia Godoy, with U.S. approval, has taken a firm stand against Brig. Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin, who led the fight against a Communist takeover before we intervened last April. Under conditions that can only be described as puzzling, to say the least, General Wessin has been deported from his country and he has charged the United States expelled him "with a bayonet at my back." I do not claim perfection for General Wessin, but there is certainly no honor due us for our role in throwing him out of his country.

The Dominican Government, with apparent U.S. consent, seeks to operate on the assumption that, by giving some former rebels good Government jobs, they can be rehabilitated. There are both Communist and non-Communist forces in the rebel camp, and there is always the possibility of open conflict between them. Dominican and U.S. strategy seems to be "divide and conquer" and weaken the rebel forces, which admittedly are made up of a number of splinter groups.

However, these conditions are also conducive to Communist consolidation of power among the rebels. The Communists, too, know how to divide and conquer, and they have operated on this principle for many years. Their abilities in using this strategy cannot be ignored; we would do so only at our peril. There can be no doubt about the skills available to the Communists in the Dominican Republic, either; it is known that Cuban-trained Communists are operating there and have been active since the first of the fighting.

For reasons that are obscure to me, we chose to turn our attention to the Dominican rightwing first, when it seems the most logical course would have been to move against and destroy what Communist power and influence existed there. Perhaps in so doing we have missed our chance to nullify and root out the Communists altogether.

General Wessin was described as being objectionable to the United States because "he is so rigidly anti-Communist that he creates more Communists than he destroys." To me, this is a rather dogmatic assertion to make about one aspect of a problem described as one of the most complex ever tackled. But General Wessin was of the Dominican rightwing, and it was felt so urgent to get him out of the country that he was put aboard an American Air Force plane under the supervision of five armed FBI agents and a contingent of the 82d Airborne Division.

Now, at least in theory, it is the turn of the Dominican leftwing. But is it too late, and can the divide-and-conquer tactic succeed? A non-Latin diplomat, quoted in the September 27, 1965, issue of U.S. News & World Report, had a very gloomy view of the situation:

> The Communists are stronger now than they ever have been in this country. They have come out in the open, publish their own newspaper, hold conventions, even call themselves Communist, openly. All the concessions are being made to the Communists—none to the other side. * * * Their gall is enormous. In one edition of Patria the Communists bragged in one statement that they were the power in the revolution. * * * In these months of revolution, the Communists have built up their political and military apparatus far beyond anything they ever had here before.

In the same magazine, a high-ranking Dominican military officer is quoted:

> United States * * * seems to be protecting the Communists. * * * The Communists publish their newspapers—but the anti-Communists are ordered off the air. * * * We cannot understand your Government. You send thousands to fight communism in Vietnam—but give in to the Communists here.

We may well have allowed the Dominican Communists time to gain a foothold in this strategic Caribbean island republic and, in so doing, once again seized defeat from the jaws of victory. If there is a resultant loss of American prestige over the entire situation, it will not come from the fact that we did intervene to begin with. It will come from what we did not do when we had the chance. It will come from the loss of faith in U.S. determination to keep Communist influence out of the Western Hemisphere. This faith has already been badly shaken in Latin America by our actions at the Bay of Pigs in 1961 and the continued menace of Castro Cuba, and we will only have ourselves to blame if we are faced with more Cubas and more Dominican situations in the future.

Those in charge of conducting our foreign policy, in their attempts to make friends of our enemies, have managed to compile a rather sorry record of making enemies of our friends, without noticeable success in their original endeavors. We sometimes act as if the supply of good will and respect for the United States in the world is not only inexhaustible but is also resilient enough to withstand whatever strains we choose to put upon it. Self-confidence in the conduct of a nation's foreign policy is an admirable and desirable trait, however, we can expect nothing but trouble ahead if it degenerates into self-deceit.

THE U.S. PAVILION AT THE WORLD'S FAIR

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege, along with my wife, last year, shortly after the opening of the World's Fair in New York to attend that fair, with a number of my colleagues and their families. The hospitality of the city was boundless indeed as usual. On returning to Washington after that wonderful and very fine weekend I, along with other Members of Congress, found it not necessary to criticize the World's Fair itself, for it was and is a good fair, but the U.S. pavilion at that fair. At that time I was not critical of the building itself or its architecture which is terrific but I was critical of the subject matter, the treatment, and the handling of the history of the United States as portrayed then in that pavilion. It simply missed the mark.

It was my privilege again this year, for a brief while, to visit the World's Fair. I returned to the U.S. pavilion out of curiosity and I should like to say that the U.S. Commissioner to the World's Fair, Ambassador Norman E. Winston, along with his staff, are deserving of credit, because they have gone back into the history of the United States and have caused the pavilion to be completely redone so that it in truth and in fact tells in a very creditable manner the story of the United States in its growth and in world history. I am proud of that history and the manner in which it is now presented. I am sure all real Americans are. I think credit should be given where credit is due. Ambassador Winston, our U.S. Commissioner to the fair, and his staff, are deserving of credit. They have done a good job. The fair is a good one. I could not in good conscience let this great fair come to a close this week without recognizing that what I thought was a mistake has been indeed corrected.

AMBASSADOR NORMAN N. WINSTON AND THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this brief time to commend the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] for his frankness and his fairness in regard to his visit this year to the New York World's Fair and particularly the Federal pavilion therein. There is no question in my mind that the improvement this year in the Federal exhibit was wholly due to Ambassador Norman K. Winston, the Commissioner-General, my distinguished friend, and his staff. Ambassador Winston deserves great credit for the considerable time and attention he has given to his considerable duties.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SCHOOL DENIES ADMISSION TO NEGRO NONRESIDENT

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I have previously informed the House that 22 States and the District of Columbia provide for a system of school tuition for nonresidents. At that time I mentioned that my research showed that Michigan has such a law.

On October 1, 1965, the Detroit News published an article indicating that a Georgia resident was prohibited from enrolling in a Michigan school. The school superintendent said that Michigan law forbade the admission of the 14-year-old Negro.

For the enlightenment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FARNUM] who has criticized our Mississippi law, I emphasize the fact that this incident occurred in Michigan—not in Mississippi.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the aforementioned article at this point:

[From the Detroit News, Oct. 1, 1965]

CENTER LINE BLAMES LAW FOR BAN ON NEGRO PUPIL

(By Robert M. Pavich)

The superintendent of the all-white Center Line-Warren school district said today that State school laws, not racial prejudice prevented enrollment of a 14-year-old Negro boy from Georgia who had been invited to attend school here.

The boy, Matthew Hunter, was not enrolled and has returned to Georgia.

ADVISED OF LAW

In a resolution submitted to the State house of representatives at Lansing, nine Democratic legislators have called on Center Line officials to "search their souls and conscience" because they had "denied the hospitality of the North" to the Negro boy.

Clarence E. Crothers, superintendent of the suburban district, said that when he was approached by persons who wanted to enroll the boy in Center Line High School, he advised them that State law prohibited enrolling anyone from another district unless he were in the home of relatives in the district, in a licensed boarding home, or living with legal guardians in the district.

PETITION TO COURT

Matthew Hunter, who had been invited to the North by a Warren priest who became acquainted with him during a voter registration drive in the South could not qualify.

Crothers said he was informed on September 13, the day regular classes began at Center Line High, that the couple the Negro boy was staying with, Mr. and Mrs. George Fielder, had petitioned to probate court for a ruling that would allow them to be named guardians.

REFUSED TO RULE

Crothers said, "I assumed this would be authorized, so I informed the principal of Center Line School who in turn informed his staff that the boy would be attending classes there.

"After this I heard nothing. The Fielders must have decided to send the boy home and the boy must have decided to go."

The probate court refused to rule on the petition by the Fielders, referring them instead to the State department of social welfare. That department said the matter was not in its jurisdiction.

Crothers said, "We had a colored child in our school system for nearly 2 years, from the spring of 1963 until the spring of 1965. We welcomed that child and her parents, who were involved in the local PTA.

"We have signed pledges with the Federal Government guaranteeing to enroll students without regard to race, color or creed. We have operated as such."

RIOTS IN WATTS, CALIF.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I have read many editorials arising from the rioting in Watts, Calif. One of the best is the editorial broadcast over KMPC radio and KTLA channel 5 from Hollywood as M. B. Jackson's commentary. The editorial follows:

THE SECOND CIVIL WAR

One hundred years ago the Civil War ended and with it, the bloodiest episode in our country's history. Not many realize it, but the Civil War toll in dead and wounded was greater than that in all other wars in which we have been involved put together—including World War II and the Korean war.

In the past few days, Los Angeles has witnessed and been the victim of a state of anarchy and virtual civil insurrection probably unmatched since the last one.

To deny that it was racial in character or motivation—as some have attempted to do—would be like denying that slavery was an issue in the Civil War. It erupted in a depressed heavily Negro area, and has been fought and carried on by Negro mobs and gangs consisting of young and old alike. Slavery was a secondary issue in the Civil War. The preservation of the Union was the principal one. By the same token, the racial aspect of this second one is a secondary, albeit important, issue; the preservation of the fabric of our society and our type of government is the principal one here.

The consequences of last week's rioting sounds like a catalog of major crimes: riots, pillage, arson, looting, murder, aggravated assault, armed robbery, beatings, burglary—you name it. Scenes of fire and destruction remind one of London during the Battle of Britain—and they call to my mind many vivid combat scenes during the war in the Pacific.

The extraordinary thing is that this should have happened in California. This is not the Deep South. Los Angeles has an enviable record for good race relations among its citizens, and they are justifiably proud of it. It has it's poorer sections—no large city is without them—but they are nothing compared to some of the slum areas in the large northern cities of this country—to say nothing of other large cities in the world.

Why did it happen here? What caused it? What is the answer; what is the cure?

As usual with anything as cataclysmic as this, there are no easy answers. This is a cliche in itself, I know. But many of the basic factors involved are not difficult to identify. The trouble is, however, that they are unpleasant to face, and people in positions of responsibility and leadership in the community—National and State as well as local—frequently try to sidestep them or avoid coming directly to grips with them in the terms they require.

We might start off by eliminating a few shopworn excuses that are invariably offered up when situations like this break out—and are beginning to be peddled about in this one. The first of these, and probably the most vicious, is that police brutality—that old bugaboo—is responsible for the whole mess. A few Eastern commentators have already played this tune. But it just doesn't play this time.

Los Angeles has probably the finest metropolitan police force in the country, if not the world—and I am familiar with many of them. Its record and efforts in the field of community and race relations is particularly noteworthy, and it is there on the record for anyone who is interested in facts to check. I made a point of this myself a year or so back and spoke not only with Chief Parker and several of his people, but also with several prominent members of the Negro community, including one who is now a member of the city council. At that time, complaints of police brutality were among the reasons cited by those who favored the creation of a police review board. When asked for examples of this, they invariably boiled down to complaints of "verbal brutality"—use of offensive language, or at least language offensive to Negro sensitivities. I was cited to not one example of actual physical brutality. Even this complaint was met by a special training course given to police officers who were instructed in the niceties of language to be employed when dealing with Negroes, and particularly when handling Negro suspects.

Actually, no better evidence of the lack of police brutality is furnished than the very restraint with which our law enforcement officers have conducted themselves under conditions of extreme provocation during the last week.

On the contrary, what we have seen is heroic devotion to duty of police and fire department people—outnumbered and under constant, savage attack—in their attempt to restore law and order and to defend the safety and security, Mr. and Mrs. Citizen of Los Angeles, of you and of your property. Parenthetically, I frequently wonder how it is that those who get themselves so worked up over police brutality, so-called, can feel so little apparent corresponding concern over the brutality practiced on hundreds of innocent citizens by lawless mobs in the past few days.

The second cliche which is being offered up is that the Negro is simply reacting by giving vent to long pent-up frustration; that he has been held down and mistreated too long, and the inevitable reaction is setting in. One is given the impression that this has been the result of a deliberate, almost single-minded conspiracy on the part of the white community. The utterance comes as a sort of breastbeating, a mea culpa, and it is heard from white and Negro apologists alike, who, incredibly seem to justify and excuse, in their own minds, murder, arson, assault, armed robbery, and every other crime in the book by the mere fact of social maladjustment or economic underprivilege.

Again, this one does not play, because it does not square with the facts—nor does it face them.

The opinion makers in our society today—the journalists, writers, political leaders, etc., seem to have a preoccupation with sickness, social and physical. It is all they seem to be able to write or talk about. We see little else on television and the screen; we read of hardly anything else in books, magazines and all the other media. It is hardly fashionable anymore to be healthy or normal. However, to put this point into somewhat better focus, let us consider for the moment a different type of citizen from the one we have heard so much about recently. He is the one you never hear of, and seldom hear from, but, contrary to the impression that might be gained from reading the papers, he represents the vast majority of the people in this country.

This citizen has educated himself—has taken advantage of the marvelous schools this country affords; he works for a living and supports himself and his family. He pays his taxes—and he doesn't complain too loudly over the fact that they are high and that a large part of them goes to pay the cost of maintaining programs for the relief of those who haven't gone at things the way he has. He is probably making payments on his own home, but the property taxes are getting so high that he wonders if he will be able to hang onto it. Welfare programs which soak up over half of this State's budget alone keep pushing them further and further up.

He pays his bills on time; and with what little is left over, he very likely contributes to various charities of his own choosing.

Our Mr. Citizen obeys the law. He may grumble at an occasional traffic ticket, but he has respect for the officer nevertheless. He probably uses his seat belt when he drives but, more importantly, he respects the rights of others on the highway. He supports and stays with his wife and children, and he is concerned to see that his children receive a good education, hopefully at the college level, so that they may do better in life than he has done. He probably belongs to his local PTA and very likely is a member of his community church.

The likelihood also is that he put in a weary and dangerous stint fighting for his country, and that his son may possibly be in Vietnam now, or at least available for the draft. Neither he nor his son relishes the idea, but they accept the obligation, and the son will discharge it with honor just as his father did.

This Mr. Citizen we have been talking about has a quality that is part of the root structure of our society—a sense of responsibility. He is a vital and accepted part of his community because of his contribution to it. This is the essence of his identity with it. He doesn't take or demand—he gives, contributes, in the best sense of our common Judeo-Christian tradition. As a consequence, he is respected.

It was precisely this sense of obligation, this notion of personal responsibility and this type of contribution to the community which gave rise to our Nation and gave it the character which has kept it stable and thriving for 200 years—a continuity which no nation in the Western world, with the possible exception of Great Britain, can claim.

You will notice that the Mr. Citizen I am talking about is not white, or black, or yellow, or red, because his qualities still characterize the vast majority of our countrymen, including the vast majority of our so-called minority communities—Negro, Jewish, Chinese, Japanese, Mexican, Polish, Italian, Irish, Scandanavian, or what-have-you.

These citizens contribute to their communities. And they ask only to be secure in the equal protection of the law which it is the Government's obligation to extend to them. They don't bother their neighbors; but they demand, and have a right to expect protection from injury by neighbors who would bother them.

These citizens stand out in startling contrast to those in that community which spawned the bath of fire and blood recently witnessed here: one where crime is rampant, where over 1,000 felonies have been logged in the last few months including 196 murders and other major crimes; with an illegitimacy rate of 25 percent or higher and a divorce rate of 33 percent or higher; an area containing at least 500 probationers from the commission of major crimes and a large proportion of whose population lives on relief. The lawless fringe of this same community in the Nation as a whole is responsible for over 50 percent of the crimes of violence committed in the country.

Their insurrection is indeed connected with these conditions. But to cite these conditions as the cause of what occurred here is, I think, to confuse the symptoms with the sickness.

The Negro has very legitimate grievances in certain parts of the country, and most certainly has every right to demand equal treatment under the laws of our country. He has just witnessed a massive, and historic, Federal legislative accomplishment designed to secure to him these very things in the diminishing areas where they have been denied, and to secure to him equality of opportunity in every area where he can legitimately expect it. Parenthetically, it might be noted that the principal sectors of recent Federal civil rights legislation have already been on the books as State law in California for many years.

But the demands have gone beyond this, and they have received encouragement and even incitement from various political and community figures on the local and national scene. On the fringes of the rights cause, one hears these shrill voices on every hand demanding equal this and equal that, with no corresponding note of the obligation, contribution, or responsibility which economic or social stature inevitably requires. To the lawless and irresponsible elements of the Negro community—and I emphasize again that, as with other sections of our national community, they represent a minority—these incitements and exortations amount to an invitation to lash out and take by force that which they are constantly told has been denied them and withheld from them.

They receive encouragement from all sides to disregard the law—pay no attention to it—to treat our law enforcement officers with contempt or worse. Our youth and theirs have been invited to challenge and question authority. Our police are systematically restricted further and further in the fundamental tools of law enforcement they may employ in order to maintain public safety and arrest and punish criminals.

Small wonder then that when the occasion arose on a steamy night in Watts, this lawless, irresponsible element of the Negro community decided to give it a try—and have a ball. Which is just exactly what they have been doing in these last few unbelievable days.

They have been encouraged to believe that they are only taking what is rightfully theirs and what has been wrongfully withheld from them all these years. They have been told that they are being willfully suppressed, so they're getting even.

One can see it written on their faces as they emerge from gutted stores loaded down with loot. They seem actually to be proud of what they are getting away with.

It is a tragedy for the entire community; it is a tragedy for the poor fools who are delighting in the rampage—tragic because they don't realize they are destroying the very things they want most to gain. The even greater tragedy, however, lies with the responsible members—the great majority—of the Negro community who must live and suffer with the humiliation done them by their own people, as well as the incalculable hurt this has done to their own cause.

What is the answer?

Taking first things first, the immediate answer, quite simply, is force: sufficient force to restore law and order and to fulfill government's primary obligation to insure the safety and protection of the public. Here is one situation where the obligation to the law-abiding citizen and the community must take precedence over feeling of concern for the salvation of the criminal. If this means martial law and even two or three divisions of troops, then this is the minimum that should be employed. One of the tactical problems involved in controlling the situation there is the vast area over which the disorder is spread, unlike the concentrated, tightly packed areas in New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago where earlier rioting has occurred. If saturation is needed, then it should be supplied and speedily.

Secondly, every effort should be made to assure the capture, the conviction, and punishment of those whose crimes can be identified and proved. The restoration of order will be merely temporary if those who caused it—or are disposed to emulate it—are not swiftly and surely convinced that they will wind up behind bars for their pains—instead of being fawned upon or even lionized as social misfits.

Thirdly, and most importantly, we need some basic rethinking among our own community leadership, and among the Negro community, on new approaches to the Negro's final goals. An approach with a little less "gimme" and a lot more give. An approach which emphasizes responsibility rather than privilege.

It is an approach which has worked before, and the only one which can produce lasting results. A shining example is our Japanese community, which has known discrimination, official, and unofficial, as deep, as unyielding and as vicious as any in our midst, but one which has, by its own integrity, hard work, sense of responsibility, and by the magnitude of its contribution to the community as a whole, earned a well-merited respect and an honored and accepted place in that community. Dwelling on the senselessness of the prejudice and the baseless suspicion and animosity they had to overcome in the process is a useless exercise; it is merely accentuating the negative, a mistake which the Japanese never made. The important thing and the one which should attract our attention now is how they overcame it: the positive action they took to pierce that curtain of prejudice and to shred it.

Another community in our midst that knows these truths very well is the Jewish one. They have known this problem for centuries. Their situation in our society today is the positive and eloquent evidence of how well they have learned and practiced these same truths. Their contribution to our society in every field—business, arts, sciences—is immeasurable, and this country would be poorer without them, considerably poorer.

Each of us has the right to expect equality of opportunity: the right to start out from the same starting line, to be judged on his own performance, on the merits, by the same ground rules, and to harvest the reward of patient and diligent effort, and to be secure in those fruits.

But none of us has the right to demand, of society or anyone else, that these fruits, without the commensurate effort, be handed over on a platter.

The legislation recently passed is designed to insure, to the Negro and to everyone else, precisely such equality of opportunity. And it means to say: if there have been obstacles in your path, we have done our best to remove them; now it is up to you. * * * The law does not say, and could not safely attempt to do or say, that equality of accomplishment or equality of wealth is yours, as a matter of right, and will be guaranteed to you.

But this, in effect, is precisely what many of these shrill voices are demanding, and what many of the lawless and ignorant, as a consequence, have been led to expect. They see visions of television sets and other goodies, private homes with views and two cars in each garage in sections of their own choosing, etc., now as a matter of right.

These things can be had when they are earned—and only then—as others who enjoy them have learned. To insist otherwise is to sound the death knell of our society. (Parenthetically, it is worth recalling that the funds allocated by government to relief and welfare programs and to rehabilitation projects are there to be used only because other citizens earned them and were responsible enough to pay their taxes. If the responsible are taxed to subsidize irresponsibility, society takes a downturn.)

But the important thing is that all the demands and petitions and grievances and demonstrations in the world cannot give to the Negro the thing he most wants—respect; the respect of others and, almost more important, self respect. Even though society as a whole might gladly bestow it, if only to solves the problem, it cannot be done. Respect cannot be demanded or given; it has to be earned; it has to be merited.

Here is where the basic rethinking must start, if the insanity of the last several days is not to be repeated. It must, I think, start with the Negro leaders themselves. They must say to their own people: We have fought hard for laws which will insure to us a fair shake, and we are on the threshold of a new day. Now it is up to us to make the most of the opportunity this gives us. It's time to roll up your sleeves, spit on your hands and go to work: keep your children in school; reeducate yourselves, keep your homes together; learn to know your community and learn to know its police and other peace officers—they're not bad types at all when you get to know them; they would like to help you, if you would give them a chance. And above all, don't let yourself be suckered into the temptation or the luxury of claiming that every setback or disappointment is the fault of some white man or some brutal cop. It may seem comforting to tell yourself that, but it's a phony comfort and one that will betray you. If you want decent things—good housing, good jobs, good education, then work for them—put out. The opportunities are there, but the job is up to you.

This is largely the job of the Negro leaders themselves, for such advice from the white community would probably be ill received. Dutch uncles are sometimes listened to; outsiders seldom.

But the community leadership as a whole, from the President on down, has a tremendous role to play also, in redirecting and reorienting this basic thinking. A little less negativism; a little more positive approach. A little less political emotionalism and a little more commonsense. Educational and vocational rehabilitation programs now on the boards should be given every push but with wise and sensible administration and without political coloration.

Welfare programs should be reshaped and directed toward the relief of the needy, yes. But funds should be used on an open-ended ad infinitum basis, to support only those who are permanently indigent through no fault of their own or through the consequences of some incurable handicap. For those in temporary need, relief funds should, on the contrary, be administered in such a way as to encourage rehabilitation and to stimulate and furnish incentives toward self-help, readjustment and eventual self-reliance. They should not be poured out to subsidize irresponsibility and indolence, or to perpetuate maladjustment. Subsidies can be good things, but they have an inevitable tendency to perpetuate the very problems they are designed to relieve.

Perhaps the shock of the last several days, not simply to Los Angeles and California, but to the Nation, may be great enough to produce the genesis of just such a new look. If so, and if it takes hold, we could be on the threshold of a national rebirth of sorts: a clear morning after a night of terror.

If not, however, we can expect more of the same, whether here or elsewhere, in a mounting crescendo which will continue, make no mistake about it, until these facts are faced. For as long as we continue to hear from the demagogs the tired cries of police brutality, enforced underprivilege and deprivation, just so long will the ignorant and lawless on the fringe of the Negro community continue to believe that it is not their fault. And they will continue to respond in precisely the same manner, while their decent, hard-working, law-abiding brothers suffer along with the rest of the community—perhaps even more.

As an optimist, I believe and hope that the turning point has come, and that from this point forward, responsibility and not demagoguery may once again become the fashionable and respected point of view. Let's all hope so. Thank you and good night.

COMMERCIAL POLICY AT THE CROSSROADS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the great economic importance of foreign trade to all areas of the country, in terms of individuals employed and import and export trade opportunities for industries and firms, makes the current Kennedy round of trade negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade important to all Congressmen.

In my report to the House on June 2 this year, after returning from Geneva as a congressional delegate to the negotiations, I said that I had seen indications that led me to think that we could make considerable, rapid progress in the trade talks.

Since that time two developments have tempered my optimism. The first of these developments is the European Common Market's difficulty in reaching agreement on how to finance its continued development, particularly its common agriculture program. The second is the weakness of the British economy.

But these developments have not dampened my belief that it is possible through the Kennedy round to achieve substantially our trade goals. Recent newspaper reports from Paris published in the Washington Post and Washington News on October 11 indicated that the United States is extending diplomatic feelers to determine whether non-EEC nations would accompany the United States in forming a new trade arrangement that would initially exclude the EEC. I have been assured by high administration sources that these reports are unfounded. No representative of the U.S. Government, either in Washington, Geneva, or Paris has given such indications, they state.

Nonetheless, the EEC crisis and the weakness of the British economy have made the Kennedy round slower and tougher than I had anticipated when I returned from Geneva trade talks last May.

The Common Market financing deadlock will prevent the Kennedy round from beginning actual bargaining in agriculture products other than grains. And the United States rightly cannot make any Kennedy round bargains on industrial products until we can make satisfactory agriculture bargains. This means that any substantial Kennedy round achievements will be delayed until the Common Market can put its agriculture offers on the bargaining table at Geneva. The deadlock will also affect progress on the "sector" discussions on iron and steel, pulp and paper, chemicals, textiles, and aluminum. It will slow the nontariff barriers discussions also. Antidumping talks will resume in Geneva this month, but it is not certain whether the EEC will be able to participate in them.

It may now be unrealistic to expect the British to make meaningful agricultural and industrial concessions at a time when their exports are insufficiently strong to balance their imports. For the short term the recent sterling "crisis" has been resolved. But the longer-term prospect of the British economy, faced with problems of modernization, productivity, and taxation, are not clear. Lowering trade barriers to imports in 1967 as a result of the Kennedy round could possibly worsen Britain's balance of trade, and thus again weaken confidence in the pound.

In spite of these problems, however, with good and tough bargaining, I think there is good prospect for successfully achieving many of our original Kennedy round goals at Geneva.

In charge of U.S. negotiations and the U.S. negotiating team in Geneva is Ambassador W. Michael Blumenthal, Deputy Special Representative for Trade Negotiations. Ambassador Blumenthal has a competent staff of experts in GATT negotiations and the various aspects of international trade. On his staff are advisers from the Departments of Commerce, Labor, Agriculture, and the Interior. It is upon Ambassador Blumenthal and upon his staff that the operating responsibilities of U.S. trade or commercial, policy in the Kennedy round rest.

On Thursday, September 16, 1965, Ambassador Blumenthal addressed the annual luncheon of the National Council of American Importers in New York City. The topic of his speech was "Commercial Policy at the Crossroads."

Ambassador Blumenthal traced the major problems of current U.S. commercial policy and related them to the Kennedy round of trade negotiations now in progress at Geneva. Commercial policy includes all foreign trade and commercial policy matters.

Blumenthal pointed out in his speech that successes in expanding world trade have been impressive. The average level of duty on all U.S. imports has been reduced from 59.1 percent in 1932 to less than 12 percent today, and other countries' progress "has been hardly less spectacular." Exchange controls and quantitative restrictions have been widely removed. The result has been that since 1948 world exports have tripled.

That trade expansion progress has nevertheless been uneven is demonstrated by some of the problems we face in commercial policy today, Blumenthal pointed out. To some extent these problems have become important only as a result of past success in removing so many obstructions to trade.

Five major commercial policy problems remain for urgent solution: Nontariff barriers to trade; trade in agricultural products; trade in primary commodities or raw materials; rich country trade with poor countries; and East-West trade.

All of these problems focus in varying degree on the Kennedy round of trade negotiations now taking place under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—at Geneva.

First. Major progress in removing many nontariff trade barriers can be made at the Kennedy round, if all negotiating partners will approach these problems with energy and creativity. A major area for progress is in nations' laws and procedures designed to curb dumping. Solution to this problem along the lines of my House resolution (H. Res. 405) for an international antidumping agreement, would, I believe, be very constructive.

Second. Increased trade in agriculture products has been a major United States emphasis at the Kennedy round. It should be possible to make very substantial progress in resolving many of the problems of world agricultural trade. Even without quick solution of the deadlock among the members of the European Economic Community—France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg—major progress is possible in the negotiations on grains, which are already under way. The tabling of U.S. limited agricultural offers on September 16 and the corresponding action by a large number of other GATT participants, excluding the EEC, was a wise move which will help maintain the momentum of the Kennedy round agriculture talks until the time the EEC finds itself able to join them.

Ambassador Blumenthal was right in saying in his speech:

> The question collapses to a realization and acceptance by major trading nations of these mutual benefits [from trade in farm products] through a genuinely outward-looking trade policy.

He went on to say that:

> A movement toward greater autarchy and higher protection for agriculture will inevitably have its impact on other sectors of trade as well. This danger is today the greatest single threat to our overall trade liberalization program. It requires the watchful attention and imagination of leaders in all countries to seek a basis for insuring the maintenance of expansion of agricultural trade, and to avert the consequences of a lapse into greater restriction and reduced trade for these products.

I wish to underscore and emphasize these remarks. Ambassador Blumenthal's comments should reassure U.S. citizens that agriculture trade is a most serious problem and that it is so considered by our negotiators. He seems determined to make maximum advantage of the opportunity afforded by trade negotiations to resolve these agriculture problems to the best of our ability.

Third and fourth. The problem of trade in primary products regrettably does not find a major focus for solution in the Kennedy round. Indeed, because of this, it appears to me, the new United Nations Conference on Trade and Development—UNCTAD—and its permanent body, the U.N. Trade and Development Board, have sought to assume major responsibility for problems of world commodity trade. I am concerned about this proliferation of responsibility for international trade among international organizations.

It is most certainly within the purview of the Kennedy round to attack the fourth commercial policy problem, the broader problem of rich country trade with the poor, developing nations. In this context it is possible to deal with commodity trade in the GATT negotiations. A new body of principles, titled the GATT "Chapter on Trade and Development" has been added to the general agreement in order to enable GATT trade negotiations and specifically the Kennedy round to treat the problems of increasing trade between poor and rich countries.

I hope earnestly that the Kennedy round can prove its utility to the developing nations in the coming year. The U.N. Trade and Development Board has not proven of concrete usefulness to date, in spite of two lengthy sessions. Even so, many of its proposals for change are at best of doubtful value.

It is incumbent on the United States, as the recognized leader in efforts to help the developing countries promote their own growth, to interpret the GATT "Trade and Development Chapter" and actively apply it to the developing countries' trade problems. Concomitantly, the United States must make a greater effort to convince the developing countries that their interest lies in participating actively in the GATT negotiations now, under the special rules which have been developed to apply to them. I hope that more progress can be made in this area in the future.

Fifth. The Kennedy round is also a focus for Ambassador Blumenthal's fifth major commercial policy concern: East-West trade.

Special rules of procedure under article 17 of GATT apply to trade with state trading enterprises. The inclusion of Poland and Yugoslavia, and to a limited extent, Czechoslovakia, in the current GATT trade negotiations is a possible opportunity to begin some exploration of the ways in which trade with the people in the East can be expanded on satisfactory terms.

A criterion which I think is important in deciding this issue is whether or not such trade will benefit the people of the Communist countries or whether the advantages of trade will accrue to Governments, further enabling them to perpetuate their repressive control over their populations.

PROSPECT FOR SUCCESS

The Kennedy round should not be expected to bring great changes in East-West trade patterns or in the policy decisions governing that trade. This is not a Kennedy round first objective. But the GATT negotiations can usefully explore and develop the rules under which such trade might take place.

These five broad policy areas are each very complex. The fact that they all can be taken up and some perhaps resolved in the Kennedy round is a major reason for the tremendous importance of the current round of GATT negotiations. The importance of this effort impels me to restate my hope that all elements of American society will take an active interest in the current GATT negotiations and in the broader elements of U.S. commercial policy. The collective knowledge, indeed, genius, of the society should be brought to bear on these crucial negotiations. Fullest public understanding and discussion should be sought, for the importance of these negotiations to the United States and to the world cannot be too greatly stressed.

I have suggested in earlier commentaries that the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which is the authority for our participation in the Kennedy round, will have to be replaced with new trade legislation when it expires in 1967. It will always be necessary for Congress to provide authority to the Executive to negotiate the problems of U.S. commercial policy, in whatever form they may take.

But this consideration is certainly secondary. Our first and most pressing task is to bring the Kennedy round to the most successful possible conclusion by mid-1967 in the context of the great expectations we have had and do have for it. We must bring the full weight of our intellectual resources to bear on bringing the negotiations to a successful conclusion in all of its phases.

Beyond the five commercial policy issues discussed here, we must look further to find solutions to other problems of international commercial policy. I hope it will soon be possible to begin to develop an effective international patent system and to resolve the problems presented by differing national antitrust laws.

Mr. Blumenthal's speech follows:

COMMERCIAL POLICY AT THE CROSSROADS

(Address by the Honorable W. Michael Blumenthal, Deputy Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, at the 43d annual luncheon of the National Council of American Importers, New York City, September 16, 1965)

For most of you here today, international trade is your business—and your livelihood. I therefore particularly welcome this opportunity to meet with you. For, I believe, an intimate day-to-day contact with trade and traders is the surest way of understanding what is at stake when we speak of trade liberalization, or the threat of a resurgent protectionism. International traders best realize the variety of efficiently produced commodities that commerce provides to the consumer; they best understand the degree of support our purchases abroad provide to the new and developing countries; and they are most aware of the constant exchange of knowledge and ideas that is stimulated by the exchange of products. No one is more acutely conscious of the problems between nations—nor is any other group more firmly convinced that understanding and cooperation are a necessity in our constantly shrinking world.

Today I invite you to join me in a stocktaking of our commercial policy: What have been our accomplishments? What are we doing at present? What new problems will we face tomorrow? What is the direction of trade relations in the world?

The nadir of the world's trading relations followed the shock of the great depression. Frustration and the helplessness of conventional thinking strengthened the hand of those advocating protection at any cost. And the cost, as might be expected, was a corresponding loss of export markets, and a further decline of hard-pressed export industries. The highest tariff in our history was implemented in 1930, with predictable effect: Whereas world industrial production by 1936 was 11 percent higher than the 1929 level, the volume of world trade still lagged 15 percent below the 1929 level.

The protectionist philosophy of the era could be summed up by the proverbial petition of French candlestick makers in the 19th century:

> "We are subjected to the intolerable competition of a foreign rival, who enjoys such superior facilities for the production of light that he can inundate our national market at reduced price. This rival is no other than the sun. Our petition is to pass a law shutting up all windows, openings, and fissures through which the light of the sun is used to penetrate our dwellings, to the prejudice of the profitable produce we have been enabled to bestow on the country."

If any good emerged from the "beggar-my-neighbor" commercial diplomacy of the early thirties, it was the realization that there were not only the textbook "gains" from increased trade, but also some very painful "losses" to industry and employment from a substantial decline in trade. The pioneering efforts of Cordell Hull demonstrated and convinced a hesitant nation that a liberal trade policy, aimed at reducing trade barriers to imports as well as exports, would ultimately produce the greatest gain to the greatest number of Americans.

Our commercial policy over the past three decades has been to implement just such a policy. An established body of principles, agreed to by virtually all major trading nations, under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), has enabled us to systematically reduce and eliminate a wide range of tariff and other trade barriers. The average of all dutiable U.S. imports has been lowered from a high of 59.1 percent in 1932 to 26.4 percent in 1946, and to less than 12 percent today. The reduction in the duty levels of other countries has been hardly less spectacular. And the Kennedy round negotiations in Geneva are aimed at further reductions based on a general rule of a 50-percent across-the-board cut in existing duties.

But trade liberalization has not been limited to tariff reduction: Exchange control has been virtually abolished for major industrial countries; quantitative restrictions have been relaxed or done away with; and regional free trade in the European Economic Community and the European Free Trade Association has demonstrated the gains from closer economic cooperation.

Trade, as might be expected, has increased hand in hand with the lowering of these barriers. World exports, presently over $170 billion annually, have tripled since 1948, and U.S. exports over the same period have more than doubled despite recent competition from previously war-devastated exporting nations.

We can, therefore, be proud of our past achievements. No matter how we look at it, the overall expansion of trade is impressive. If this optimism seems paradoxical when we follow the debate of discontent by the less-developed countries in the newly formed United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), or the tedious and protracted agricultural discussions in the GATT, it can be explained very simply: Our success has been very uneven. Reduction of tariffs and other direct barriers to trade have received primary attention, and active participation has generally been limited to the advanced industrial nations. It is not surprising that almost half of the total world trade is among industrial nations, while exports of the less-developed countries (LDC's) are concentrated in a relatively small number of raw materials and basic foodstuffs. Only some 6 percent of world trade is accounted for by trade of the many nonindustrial countries amongst each other.

Thus, it is our success which is revealing our weaknesses. As tariffs are progressively reduced, the restrictive effect of other nontariff barriers becomes more evident. As trade in industrial products continues to expand, the lag in trade liberalization for agricultural products is made more apparent. As the economies of industrial countries are drawn into closer harmony, the need for creating a durable and progressive trading relationship with the less-developed countries becomes more urgent.

Looking ahead to the issues that these contrasts pose, let me elaborate on five separate trade problems which will be facing us in coming years, and comment on how we might deal with them.

The first of these categories is what has come to be known as "nontariff barriers." This is a catch-all name covering direct quantitative restrictions and the numerous legal and administrative regulations which tend to discriminate against imported products. As we are discovering in the Kennedy round, all nations have some nontariff barriers which are noxious to the export interest of others. European road taxes, in general, discriminate against North American-type vehicles; licensing requirements are often excessively burdensome; and the ASP system of valuation for benzenoid chemicals, as you are probably well aware, is particularly troublesome for foreign exporters to the U.S. market. Antidumping regulations and government purchase practices are problem areas common to all trading nations but differ widely from country to country. In many cases, American procedures and regulations are more explicit than those abroad, making us in a way more vulnerable to criticism and complaint. But just because a country does not have a "Buy American Act" on the statutes does not mean that government purchasing is free from discrimination against imports. On the contrary, the principal difficulty for U.S. exporters is often the lack of any well-defined procedure or legal recourse. There is much uncertainty and no assurance against arbitrary decisions favoring domestic interests.

Nontariff barriers are in general more subtly contrived and more firmly embedded in a country's legal structure than tariff levies. They are therefore more difficult to remove, even when it is recognized to be of mutual advantage to do so. Negotiating authority often does not permit removal or reduction of nontariff barriers. A necessary balancing of concessions between countries is also difficult if not impossible to demonstrate with such varied forms of trade restrictions. Cooperation in finding solutions and demonstrable quid pro quo, however, defined, are prerequisite to real progress in reducing this type of trade barrier. It is our task in the Kennedy round and elsewhere to accomplish such balanced progress.

Another major problem area is trade in agricultural products. It is interesting that, with limited exceptions, the same GATT rules apply to both agricultural and industrial products. This is so because there is a direct connection between the two sectors in the bargaining of reductions in trade barriers. Countries such as Australia, Canada, Denmark, and New Zealand, with vital trade interests in agricultural products, would find little meaning in trade negotiations which do not consider agricultural and industrial products together. As regards the United States, about one-quarter of both our total exports and our total imports are farm products, and we have also made it clear time and again that a successful Kennedy round must include a significant widening of export markets for farm products.

Experience, however, has taught us that for many agricultural products the conditions for international trade are far more complicated than for nonagricultural products. There are domestic support programs which frequently have import restrictions tied to them. Surpluses often receive export subsidies. And the rapid advances in technology and productivity put extra pressure on governments to ease adjustment in the domestic farm sector at the expense of imports.

The cumulative effect of these circumstances has produced two significant results. First, gaps between low-cost and high-cost products have gradually widened. Barley, for example, the principal European feed grain, is marketed for roughly 90 cents per bushel in Canada versus over $2 per bushel in West Germany; poultry meat selling at 25 to 30 cents per pound in the United States is about double that price in Switzerland and the Common Market.

Second, the possibility for negotiating meaningful reduction of trade barriers and greater access for lower cost imports has been frustrated in quite a number of countries by the complex and deep-rooted nature of existing regulations. In some European countries, recent years have shown a tendency in the direction of greater rather than less restriction for trade in agricultural products. The highly publicized "chicken war" is a glaring example of this tendency.

The United States, as a highly efficient low-cost agricultural producer, has generally maintained a liberal trading policy in the agricultural sector. For over half of our farm production, we have no support program. Only six products are subject to quota restriction. We have consistently made mutual tariff reductions for agricultural products in the past, and we are willing to do it again.

The potential gains from trade are obvious and substantial for most farm products. The question collapses to a realization and acceptance by major trading nations of these mutual benefits through a genuinely outward-looking trade policy.

Failure to implement such policies, on the other hand, constitutes a real danger. A movement toward greater autarchy and higher protection for agriculture will inevitably have its impact on other sectors of trade as well. This danger is today the greatest single threat to our overall trade liberalization program. It requires the watchful attention and imagination of leaders in all countries to seek a basis for insuring the maintenance and expansion of agricultural trade, and to avert the consequences of a lapse into greater restriction and reduced trade for these products.

A third area of concern is "commodity trade"—the raw materials and basic foodstuffs which are not only essential imports for industrial countries, but are often the economic backbone of the exporting countries. Colombia, for example, depends on coffee for 70 percent of its export earnings; cocoa constitutes 60 percent of Ghana's exports; and Malaysia receives over 50 percent of its export earnings from rubber.

The vulnerability of export economies from this heavy dependence on one or two commodities is further aggravated by the highly price-sensitive world markets for these products, through resulting price instability and protracted periods of depressed prices.

The United States recognizes that wide price fluctuations or a steady downward slide of commodity prices is harmful to international trade—and especially disruptive to the development plans of many low-income countries. To avoid these tendencies, we have actively participated in certain international commodity agreements, and most recently, taken the initiative in helping to negotiate a world agreement for coffee. We have also expressed a willingness to study proposals to stabilize markets for other commodities such as cocoa, cotton, and sugar.

The commodity agreements attempted thus far have helped to stabilize prices in the short run. They have also sought to influence the longer run adjustment of supply to the general level of demand. This double-edged effect is, in fact, the key to understanding the nature of successful market stabilization: A realistic and fair range of prices can only be achieved if internal reforms on the part of producing countries are able to maintain production levels in approximate balance with demand. Continued surpluses on world markets will eventually cause any international program to fall apart. Circumstances vary greatly from one commodity to another, but structural adjustment of world production in response to the changing patterns of consumption and trade underlies all commodity problems.

A fourth problem area, which to some degree overlaps the previous ones, is trade between the rich industrial countries and the poorer less-developed countries. I have used the words "rich" and "poor" purposely because this is a key to understanding the question of development. Economic development means, to a large extent, investment—and many less-developed countries are simply too poor to generate internally the necessary capital to build an industrial base. Foreign exchange limitations are often the controlling factor in determining the importation of capital equipment and other basic needs of a developing economy, and almost 90 percent of the foreign exchange accumulated by developing countries comes from export earnings. Greater access for the exports of these countries not only provides the means for larger imports from industrial countries, but enables their economies to break out of the vicious cycle of poverty and enter into a prosperous period of self-sustained growth.

Greater access for LDC exports has been espoused by virtually all governments. The new United Nations body, UNCTAD, is testimony of this intent. The means of attaining this goal, however, have not achieved any similar measure of unanimity. The most publicized form of export stimulus for LDC's is probably the tariff preference issue. LDC's generally and some developed countries have supported, with varying degrees of enthusiasm, the proposition that tariffs should discriminate in favor of LDC's—that exports of these countries should face duties lower than the most-favored-nation (MFN) rates applying generally among the more advanced countries. The allure of this general proposition tarnishes, though, when we try to answer more specific questions. Which countries would qualify for such preferences? Will preferences distinguish between relatively "least" developed countries and other "less" developed ones? Which commodities are to be included? How long will preferences last? Will preferences necessitate other types of import restriction such as quota limitation? What will be the actual trade effect of a given set of preferences? The more these questions are discussed, the more apparent it becomes that preferences could become a serious handicap to the prosperous development of the exports of LDC's. We have yet to be convinced that any proposal for temporary tariff preferences will be more effective than our present policy of seeking maximum MFN tariff reductions for products of particular trade interest to these countries.

There is one aspect of export expansion for LDC's which I feel has not received adequate attention. This is trade promotion per se. There is a need for technical assistance in the art of salesmanship and market development. The GATT has recently established an International Trade Center in Geneva for this purpose. The great burden of responsibility in this area, however, lies with the experienced traders in developed areas—such as yourselves. It is important that you seek out efficient producers in the less-developed parts of the world, and encourage them to overcome the inertia of parochialism and make the hurdle into an export-oriented operation.

The last point I would like to raise is a problem which we are just beginning to come to grips with, namely, East-West trade.

This is an area in which our own participation has been minimal. Aside from shipments of foodstuffs to Poland under Public Law 480 and our commercial exports of grain to the Soviet Union early in 1964, the United States has normally been exporting not more than about $100 million worth of goods per year to the Soviet bloc.

Some years ago the rate of expansion in the East-West trade was high and there were expectations among many Western industries that the historic prewar volume of East-West trade might soon be fully retrieved and even exceeded. This hope has not been borne out in fact. The Soviet bloc has yet to develop a general sales capability in Western markets commensurate with its own present state of economic development.

Two fundamental reasons explain, to a large extent, the failure of East-West trade to develop in a more dynamic way. In the first place, exports from the Soviet bloc to the West consist mainly of commodities and raw materials for which supply is growing ever tighter in relation to domestic requirements within the Soviet bloc, or for which Western demand is no longer expansive. The U.S.S.R., one of the world's largest industrial nations, exports less than $15 million per year to the West in machinery and equipment.

The second reason for the difficulty in developing East-West trade lies more in the institutional field. If they are to participate normally in the world trading community, the Communist nations will have to open up their markets more effectively to Western competition, permitting freer Western access to their real buyers. They will have to permit multilateralization of their trade, in ways which they have never permitted before. To this end, they will need to find means for making their currencies acceptably convertible, and to move toward more realistic pricing and costing systems.

There are some grounds for optimism about gradual movement in this direction. The economic reforms which are being introduced in most of the Eastern European countries may well lead eventually to revisions in their approaches to international trade. The trend toward decentralization of decision-making may also cause international trade opportunities to be considered more freely and to be dealt with more effectively.

Another sign for optimism is the apparent rising interest of some Eastern European nations in the institutional structure which supports the expansion of international trade and economic relations among the free world market economies. The Soviet Union adhered this spring to the International Patent Convention. Poland has asked for a closer form of association with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. And in business relations with privately owned firms of Western Europe, the Communist countries are showing a willingness to experiment with new forms of economic association known as "joint ventures."

These signs seems to point in the direction of a more flexible approach in trade relations between East and West. This point of view has been recognized in a growing consensus of opinion in the United States as well.

For East-West trade, the rigidities of the present need not necessarily persist indefinitely into the future. Under present circumstances there is hope that, in time, a more stable basis will develop for mutually advantageous trade between East and West.

These are the challenges that are facing us in the field of commercial policy. For our part, it is necessary that these challenges be met with wisdom, determination, and a well-coordinated program for action.

Outlining these problems should also make it easier to understand what we are presently trying to accomplish. In Geneva, we are engaged in the most ambitious effort for trade liberalization ever undertaken—the Kennedy round of trade negotiations. For industrial products, we are seeking a multilateral reduction of all tariffs by 50 percent across the board, with only a bare minimum of exceptions subject to careful justification and scrutiny by other participating countries. For agricultural products, in accordance with the ministerial resolution of June 1963, our objective is "acceptable conditions of access to world markets in furtherance of a significant development and expansion of world trade. * * *" To achieve this, we have been discussing not only direct trade barriers, but all of the elements of domestic support and regulation affecting international trade. In May of this year, 12 nations exchanged proposals for an international grains agreement. And today, September 16, marks another important step forward, with the presentation in Geneva of comprehensive and specific offers for trade liberalization in the agricultural sector. We are today making the most attractive offer to reduce farm trade barriers the United States has ever tabled in 30 years of trade negotiations. Our offer is substantial in coverage and is based on the far-reaching authority contained in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

The significance of today's action is not, however, limited to the substance it gives to our stated objective for agricultural trade. The initiative taken by the United States in maintaining the agreed schedule for agricultural offers also underlines the confidence and determination we continue to have in an early and successful conclusion of these negotiations.

But the Kennedy round aims at progress in other directions as well. The difficult nontariff barrier field is being discussed multilaterally with the expectation that mutual concessions can also be achieved in this sector. Special effort has been made to give maximum tariff reductions to the exports of the developing countries. In particular, the requirements of fully reciprocal concessions have been waived in their case. Finally, certain East European nations wish to participate in the Kennedy round and we are seeking means to actively engage these countries in the negotiations.

We have had our share of frustration and delay in the Kennedy round. Success in such complex and far-reaching matters is seldom quick or easy. But we have also made substantial progress, and there is every hope that the Kennedy round will result in a significant advance toward trade liberalization. It is in the mutual interest of all of the participating countries to make the Kennedy round succeed.

However sanguine we may be, it would be overly optimistic to believe that the Kennedy round will put everything right. These negotiations are one further step along the upward path of international cooperation in trade matters. The summit has yet to be conquered. Yet, I see the Kennedy round as the critical crossroad for our commercial policy; the alternative to a genuinely successful Kennedy round would spell disillusion for many, and could well herald a new era of protectionism and inward-looking skepticism for world trade.

Looking back over the past three decades we can be justly proud of our achievements in expanding international trade to benefit all nations. Looking ahead to the next three decades, we are faced with new and equally challenging problems to surmount. We are now at the crossroads. The negotiations and decisions in the coming months will set the precedent and spirit for our future course. It is incumbent on us, both within government and without, to meet this challenge.

We may speak with pride of our past achievements but we dare not risk being complacent about the future. As in all fields of human endeavor having the right goals is not sufficient. Our goals must be pursued with vigor, wisdom, and the courage to act in the national interest.

You who are dedicated to furthering our Nation's commerce share in this challenge as you share in our Nation's achievements. All of us here today can commit ourselves to the proposition clearly put by President Johnson when he said:

"If we are to live together in peace, we must know each other better * * *. There is no better way to come to know each other than to engage in peaceful and profitable commerce together."

CONTROLS MAY BEGET MORE CONTROLS AS ADMINISTRATION'S BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROGRAM FALTERS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, for months the administration has been telling the American people that its so-called voluntary program to restrict outflows of U.S. private capital has been working successfully. It is now clear that the program is not working and that, in the words of Treasury Secretary Fowler, officials will be devoting a good deal of time and energy to the question of whether further compulsion might be needed to buttress President Johnson's program.

This is what the warnings made at the time the ill-conceived capital gains was proposed stated. The flow of capital investment to abroad would not be stemmed, only its composition would be altered. There would appear for short periods of time a lessening of flow, but this would be only the result of stopping a flow of a type in use which would soon burst out in other competing forms or in new forms designed to get around the restriction. The net result would be no lessened flow.

We warned that cutting off investment in securities, bonds and stocks, would end up in increased long-term bank loans. This happened. The net was nil. We suggested that cutting off investments in new ventures would simply give advantage to established business. This happened. We warned that restricting established businesses abroad from further investing through voluntary agreements to restrict, would simply produce flows from other sources. This, as Secretary Fowler says, is happening.

The metaphor I first applied to this ill-conceived law—a Berlin wall—has proved to be most apt. It has to be a very tight wall to keep people from fleeing to climates of greater freedom, and it must be a very tight wall to keep people's activities from fleeing to climates of greater freedom. The United States is not well versed, thank God, in building walls against freedom and I hope we never learn to be proficient in this trade.

There is only one fundamental way to keep people or people's activities at home. Keep developing the climate of freedom at home. In this we have some proficiency.

Further signs that the program is faltering include the fact that U.S. companies estimate their foreign subsidiaries are spending 30 percent more this year than last on plant and equipment. Also, the balance of payments for the quarter just ended has slipped into the red after having shown a small surplus during the second quarter of the year.

Even more alarming is the fact that our annual trade surplus during the first 8 months of 1965 has dropped to a rate of $5.2 billion after having reached a level of $6.9 billion during all of 1964. On this point, too, the administration has had full warning. We pointed out that our exports were inextricably interwoven with our foreign investments. Cut back on foreign investment and we hamper our greatest asset in our international balance of payments, our exports. This too has happened.

Instead of moving to correct one of the fundamental causes of the situation, which is the rapid rate of increase in money and credit, the administration, quite predictably, is moving toward even more investment controls. Not only are officials intensifying their "jawboning" at business, but the talk now is about how to apply the interest equalization tax or something like it to U.S. capital spending abroad. The basic alternative to this approach is a case-by-case Federal licensing of such investment operations.

And at the same time the administration is restricting the private sector it is continuing to increase the Government foreign investment program. CURTIS' corollary to Gresham's law that Government money drives out private money does not have to operate, but under the administration's policy of restricting private investment abroad and increasing Government investment it is very clear that the Curtis corollary is operating at a faster pace than ever before. Government is competing with and driving out private investment abroad. The net result is a less improvement in our balance of payments because we get meager economic return from Government capital investment vis-a-vis a very handsome return from our private capital investment. The worst feature of all is that at the same time we are exporting a form of economics alien to our society—a form wherein governmental bureaucratic decision supplants the marketplace decision. No wonder the poorer countries get poorer and more in need of help. The way to terminate welfare programs for both nations and people is to get them on their feet not make permanent welfare cases out of them.

It would seem obvious that in the long run, the administration's program of restrictions and controls not only will fail to do the job but at the time will do inestimable harm to U.S. interests as well as to the overall free world interest in an expanding and more open international economy. Under unanimous consent I place an article from the Wall Street Journal of October 1, 1965, discussing the administration's thinking on the possible need for new controls in the RECORD at this point:

OFFICIALS TO SEE IF NEW CURBS ARE NEEDED ON CAPITAL SPENDING ABROAD, FOWLER SAYS

WASHINGTON.—Treasury Secretary Fowler said the administration will try to decide soon if fresh steps are needed to curb foreign capital spending by U.S. corporations.

At a news conference at the International Monetary Fund meeting, Mr. Fowler was asked if compulsion might be needed to buttress President Johnson's program of voluntary restraints on investment abroad. In the next few weeks, he replied, officials will be devoting "a good deal of time and energy" to the question.

Giving rise to the mounting worry about the corporate-investment phase of the balance of payments is a recent Commerce Department survey showing U.S. companies estimate their foreign subsidiaries are spending 20 percent more this year than last on plant and equipment. So far, officials don't know how much of this might involve an outflow of dollars from the United States and how much might be paid from earnings and other foreign-currency funds of the subsidiaries themselves.

But they figure that any jump of that magnitude must involve some increase in dollars sent by the parent U.S. companies, thus adding to the balance-of-payments deficit. A U.S. payments deficit occurs as more dollars are acquired by foreigners than they return to the United States, and dollars that pile up in foreign central banks are increasingly being used to buy gold from the dwindling Treasury stock.

This country posted a small payments surplus in the April-May-June quarter, and the surplus of exports over imports widened in August, but authorities said preliminary indications are that the overall balance of payments slipped back into the red in the 3-month period that ended yesterday.

Mr. Fowler didn't specify what extra measures might be taken, but other authorities said they believe the first should be to intensify their "jawboning" at businessmen to voluntarily limit their foreign outlays. The outlook "would have to get worse" than it is now before any more direct control would be attempted, one key planner said.

If the more urgent cajoling doesn't prove enough, some authorities believe the administration should ask Congress for power to apply the interest equalization tax or something akin to it to U.S. capital spending abroad. The tax, which applies to most American purchases of foreign securities from foreigners, is intended to discourage borrowing here by adding 1 percentage point to the average annual interest cost. For several months Washington experts have been examining ways of imposing a comparable levy on capital spending abroad by U.S. concerns.

Those who favor the tax approach say it would interfere less with private business decisions than would the basic alternative of case-by-case Federal licensing of such investment operations. As does the present interest tax, they reason, such a method would allow any business to proceed with its plans if it feels the extra cost is worthwhile. This could have a secondary benefit, some contend, by causing businessmen to make only the most promising foreign investments, those which in the future would provide a sizable return of profits and thus help the payments situation.

The review of the voluntary program, Mr. Fowler said, will examine which elements "are satisfactory and which are not." But, because appeals to banks to hold down foreign lending are obviously successful, officials say, their concern clearly centers on corporate investment.

Evidence that the increased jawboning may already be getting under way came from Chicago, in a speech by Otto Eckstein, a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, to the National Association of Business Economists. Slower growth in some key foreign countries, Mr. Eckstein asserted, makes fresh American investment there relatively less attractive from a profit standpoint than before. He urged businesses to reevaluate the benefits of capital spending in the United States, in light of rising profit levels here this year.

At the Commerce Department, which runs the voluntary corporate program, officials privately urged that businessmen be given a longer opportunity to demonstrate that they will respond adequately. More attention, one official said, should be directed to averting strikes, such as this year's dock and maritime strikes, that hamper businessmen's ability to export. Commerce Secretary Connor, he recalled, has said each company should try to help the payments effort in its own way and increasing exports would be the best way.

The surplus of exports over imports, long the strongest plus factor in the balance-of-payments situation, has been narrowed from last year's level by the strikes. But August's figures were encouraging to Johnson administration economists.

The value of the month's exports was a seasonally adjusted $2,345,700,000, up 4 percent from July's, while imports were valued at $1,725,400,000 after seasonal adjustment, up 3 percent from the month-earlier total.

In the first eight months this year, exports ran at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of $25,520 million, up 3 percent from 1964's comparable rate. The annual rate of imports is $20,309 million, up 11 percent. The resulting trade surplus is at a $5,211 million annual rate, up from the $4,894 million rate of the first 7 months.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS FOR DISABLED WIDOWS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide social security benefits for disabled widows of insured workers, regardless of their ages. The law currently provides survivorship benefits to disabled adult children. It also provides reduced widow's benefits at age 60 and full widow's benefits at age 62. The disabled widow is in no better position to provide for herself when her husband dies than is a disabled adult child, and may be less capable of providing for herself than a widow age 60 who is under no disability.

The 1965 Report of the Advisory Council on Social Security made the following recommendation:

> The disabled widow of an insured worker, if she became disabled before her husband's death or before her youngest child become 18, or within a limited period of either of these events, should be entitled to widow's benefits regardless of her age.

My bill is in accordance with these recommendations. It would provide widow's benefits to an individual disabled at the date of her husband's death, or disabled at the time the last child of her husband in her custody attains 18 or marries. If a widow becomes disabled any time after the date of her husband's death or after the date that the last child in her custody reaches 18, my bill provides that she must have at least one quarter of coverage for each two quarters elapsing since that event. This requirement will, of course, be exclusive of any periods involving a disability freeze as described in present law.

Mr. Speaker, this relief for disabled widows is an urgent matter, and I certainly hope that the Congress will act on it expeditiously.

VIEWS CONCERNING NASA

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee in the House of Representatives, I have each year after the conclusion of the authorization hearings expressed my views concerning certain matters involved in the fiscal year budget requests presented to our committee by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. These are not necessarily matters pertaining to the budget request, but are instead observations which appear to me to be of importance in the overall NASA program.

This year I wish to make the following comments and suggestions:

First, I believe that the National Science Foundation should be given a thorough review from time to time. It has undergone no examinations since I have been in Congress for the last 3 years. I am pleased that a subcommittee of a Science and Astronautics Committee under the able chairmanship of Congressman DADDARIO is now undertaking such a review. I thoroughly approve of this action. I believe, however, that authorizations for this Foundation should be put on a 3-year basis.

Second, I am greatly bothered and have been for the past 2 years by the relationship that exists between the Jet Propulsion Laboratory and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Last year, I called on the NASA authorities to place the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in the same category as all other Government laboratories as to its management and general organization. At that time, the Ranger program was experiencing a great deal of difficulty; however, my criticism was not to any extent based on the failure and difficulties in that program. I believed then and I believe now even after the success of the latest Ranger shots that there is no logical reason to continue the unusual and unique relationship between the Jet Propulsion Laboratory and the NASA. This is especially true since I understand that the Jet Propulsion Laboratory will be given the main management functions for the voyager series of space shots which will be an important series in the future of American space programs. The Jet Propulsion Laboratory is a Government-owned research facility, but it is unique in that it is operated by the California Institute of Technology under contract. There is no other NASA installation managed in this way, and there appears to be no reason why this installation should be managed in this way. The Laboratory is spending approximately $230 million a year, and it should be made a regular NASA research facility without further delay.

The third matter I wish to direct my attention to is the so-called western operations office. This is an extension of the NASA executive offices to California. During the hearings I asked for, and have received, complete information as to the structure and operations of this office. It appears that this office is unnecessary. There is no other office like it in the NASA. It is true that there was an eastern operations office called the northeastern operations office, but this has been eliminated and merged into the new Electronics Research Center in Boston, Mass. The western office has some separate facilities but much of it consists of representatives of the NASA located on the factory grounds of major NASA contractors in California. These functions, of course, can be continued without the need for a separate entity or a separate name. The present setup discriminates against the other sections of the country.

I seriously question the need for the last two Saturn I shots. Since these shots cost almost $80 million apiece, they should have been clearly justified. In my opinion, the last two shots were unnecessary. The NASA has attempted to justify these shots by the fact that they carried into orbit a Pegasus satellite which is an open arm type of satellite which will be pierced by meteorites and relay information as to meteorite activity around the earth back to earth so that data can be collected. Originally the NASA used one of the Saturn I shots to shoot a load of sand or water into space. After this was criticized, the Pegasus satellite was developed to be launched by the Saturn test shots. However, when I questioned the need for shooting three apparently completely similar Pegasus into orbit, I was told that the orbits would be different and therefore the data collection would be different. The second Pegasus shot is in almost an exact orbit as the first Pegasus shot, and apparently the information given to me and the Science and Astronautics Committee was incorrect. I believe this question should be reviewed in great detail during the committee's hearings next year.

I believe the NASA should consider the cutting off of the collection of data from satellites now circling the earth. It is obvious that in the early days of the NASA's performance we had few satellites which were transmitting limited information. As a result, the collection of all data was undertaken which made sense at that time; however, we now have so many satellites in orbit sending so much information back to earth that its collection is an onerous task and one which is proving very expensive. We are getting diminishing returns.

I personally doubt that much of this information is of any real value and most is probably very repetitious. I think that it is time for the NASA to set up standards for transmission and data collection. The very success that they have achieved in getting satellites in orbit now means that new standards should be established to determine what information should be collected under present conditions.

The next matter is the disturbing trend I have noted in the average GS ratings that the NASA has been giving to its employees. In 1964 the average GS rating was 9.96. In 1965 it was 10.14. In 1966 it is going to be 10.16. In other words, it is constantly going forward, and I believe the NASA should examine the need for this very carefully before the 1967 fiscal year budget is presented to our committee.

Finally, I was disappointed by the manner in which the NASA informed our subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology in the matter of the 260-inch solid fueled rocket. We on our subcommittee were faced with the task of deciding whether to adopt the President's and the Bureau of the Budget's recommendations that the 260-inch rocket program be discontinued. As a result, we took much testimony and did much soul searching to determine if this program should, in fact, be canceled. We heard from many witnesses from the NASA, and we listened to them very carefully. Although much information was given to us, it now appears that one of the two contractors did not have a satisfactory product under development. It appears that this information may well have been available to the NASA at the time of our deliberations but was not available to the committee generally. It now appears that the committee was given incorrect information as to the amount of money needed to carry on this program efficiently. I believe this program should be adequately funded or dropped and expect the NASA to come in with a clear, definite presentation on the subject this year.

Once again, may I express my high regard for the general competence and dedication of the men of the NASA. They are a group of which our Nation can be justly proud.

WIRTZ' APPLE-PICKING LABOR EXPERIMENT HARD ON NEW HAMPSHIRE TOWN

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Labor's ill-advised labor experiments with the New Hampshire apple industry produced some very costly results. The usual consequences of damaged and lost crops were there but took on an uglier addition in the town of Hollis as detailed in the following article by Fred R. Beane, which appeared in a recent edition of the Manchester Union-Leader. Young rowdies recruited in Boston by the Labor Department in place of experienced hands were sent to Hollis but mostly spent their time in annoying and harassing the populace.

My friend Lewis J. Tetlow, of Hollis, wrote me that—

> You have my personal assurance that everything written in this article is true. My daughter, Sue, attends the school referred to by the writer. Tell all your colleagues our battle cry in Hollis is "Hit Wirtz where it hurts—vote Republican."

I commend the article to my colleagues as an example of what happens when big Government, remote from the people, attempts to dictate our lives and livelihoods:

ABCD TEAMS FROM BOSTON WRECK HOUSING, SPOIL FRUIT, SCARE TOWN

(By Fred E. Beane)

HOLLIS.—This small New Hampshire countryside town normally is quiet, peaceful, and industrious. Folks mind their own business, and expect all who come here to do likewise. But, today, Hollis is nervous and worried. Its people definitely are disgusted, and at the blowing off point, too.

It is all because the U.S. Department of Labor bigwigs in Washington, D.C., and in the branch offices at Boston have arbitrarily insisted that a Hollis applegrower try to pick his apples, using a miscellaneous assortment of youngsters out of Boston, out of work, and in certain cases, for sure, out of favor with the big city authorities.

The orchardist is William Lievens, of Londonderry, owner of Woodmont Orchards there, and also of Holly Hill Orchards in Hollis. The Boston youth, described locally as "off the streets of Boston," are an assembly of whites, Negroes, and Puerto Ricans, a so-called ABCD Team, ages 17 to 22.

"ABCD," it turns out, means "Action for Boston Community Betterment." It apparently is a special training and reform setup, under the Labor Department eye. In it are gathered dropouts from the schools, unemployed young men, youth who have been in home trouble, unemployed teenagers, and a few thought to be trainable for jobs and work. The hope is to reestablish their lives in traditional American industry, capable of supporting themselves, sensibly, and after training, expected to do so, under supervision.

NOT WORKED OUT

If you can believe Hollis reports, and quiet down the home folks long enough to detail them, the plan not only has not worked out in any direction, but has turned an otherwise peaceful orchard scene into bedlam and worse, and scared the native folks almost beyond description.

The ABCD boys arrived in town the day after Labor Day, and, say both orchard executives and town leaders, there hasn't been a really trouble-free day in town since. A lot of the trouble has been at the orchard harvest scene. But trouble, and of the worst order, has spilled over into the village, and reports are, even into Milford, Manchester, and possibly other towns.

Shortly in town, the Boston boys hit into a rainy day. That's one when you simply cannot pick apples. It was a question, what would they do? Here we let the Hollis chief of police, a rugged, but easygoing, and gentlemanly type of individual, describe what did happen.

Kenneth Bennett, the chief, tells a story that is backed up by Harland Muzzey, another police officer in town, by the custodian of the big Hollis grammar school, Kenneth Marvell, and by teachers, parents, and the school youngsters themselves.

LOOK FOR EXCITEMENT

Chief Bennett recalls that eight of the Boston Street boys ganged up and headed for town looking for any excitement they could find. About 1 p.m., after the Hollis school was in session, they showed up there. They circled around the school, looked at the windows, shouted at the schoolchildren, and started a scare that has continued ever since.

As the eight milled around, outside the school, the teachers became frightened and contacted the janitor. He found them around the windows yelling "smart aleck stuff" at the youngsters. Admittedly pretty upset he went out and ordered them off the school grounds, only to have three of them chase him around in a threatening manner, he told police.

The janitor made it to the telephone and contacted Officer Muzzey, and about the time he arrived, Chief Bennett had been contacted, and was on the scene, also. By this time, half the Boston gang had taken to the woods, and half were in the road, when the police ordered them out of the area.

A phone call was put into the Holly Hill Farm, demanding its manager, Aubrey Amidon, to come after his hired hands and get them out of the village. Aubrey showed up with his schoolbus. They loaded the troublemakers in, and carted them back to the barracks.

SOME REAL TOUGH

Chief Bennett reports that some of them played real tough. Some of them, he said, were downright arrogant and provocative, and seemed to be looking for trouble.

One rugged individual, says Bennett, was about as mouthy as any he's ever encountered, and he threatened him with arrest, unless he quit and left which he finally did, he says, along with all of them. Next day, reports are, the "mouthy one," without the consent of his councilor, it's said, threw his possessions into his bag and left, on foot, and has not been seen in town since.

Somewhere in the rather heated conversation, says the chief, he suggested they go back onto the farm "and pick their apples." The reply was, he recalls "Apples, hell, we're here for a good time."

Manager Amidon said the talk in the bus on the police ordered "ride out of the village" was that they planned to hang around until after school, and have ourselves a little rumble." Amidon explains that this is a grammar, and not a high school, they were fooling around, and town mothers continue to be pretty worried over dangers involved.

As the farm editor chatted with the chief about this upset and worried town, the chief was told by Farm Manager Amidon that he hoped that the few Boston boys, then left at the farm, would be "soon gone." He said there was talk of sending back the last remnants of those not already gone. The chief's remarks was "Thank goodness for that." He indicated good riddance.

DANGEROUS SITUATION

But this is only one facet of the ABCD team story, as told by those who have been close to it, day and night, and even in the middle of the night. It has been a nightmare of the worst order, they declare. But more than this, it's been a situation filled with danger, and always expected to spill over any hour of the 24.

Manager Amidon took the writer through the farm's labor barracks which, long ago, were fitted out, and which have normally housed shipped-in Canadian apple pickers brought in to handle the harvest emergency when it became apparent that the farm simply could not depend on locally recruited labor to handle this important chore.

The 20 of them, without any means of identifying who did what, says Amidon, have knocked gaping holes in 11 wall panels and kicked some others into the ceiling panels. In the process, they also made a shambles out of a well-fitted closet, intended for careful storage of their clothes and possessions.

The farm estimate for the repairment of this damage is around $150, with daily worry that damage will continue, and possibly get worse. It's a nightmare and a headache, Amidon says frankly.

ABCD MESS

But what of the apple-picking chore? It would take a whole edition to relate all the bad features of this experience, as set forth by the manager, all the while trying to be cool, calm, and collected about it all. He says there have been a few, but only a few, who have come anywhere near doing any real apple picking, or making themselves any worthwhile money. Here are a dozen or two of his complaints against what he terms "the mess" ever since the farm and the ABCD team collided September 7.

Some of the boys picked no more than nine boxes of apples in a day. Either they couldn't or they wouldn't do the work, he says. One fellow spent an afternoon riding a bike around town. Some have laid under apple trees and slept in the heat, or sang for their own amusement and the amusement of others still picking.

They were put into a young orchard of choice fruit, where two-thirds of the apples can be picked from the ground. The crop was running 12 to 15 bushels to the tree. Normally a bushel of drops under four trees would be "too many," says Amidon. The Boston boys managed to drop from one to three bushels per tree.

DAMAGED FRUIT

Apples they have picked, he complains, have included a lot of damaged fruit from bruising, stem punctures, and lost stems. More than this, he says, they have yanked off spur growth with the apples. To explain, spurs are the things on which next year's apples would be produced. Destruction of spurs in an orchard is rated an intolerable act by anyone.

These rugged youngsters, the manager said, frankly, "simply don't give a damn." He says they throw the ladders at the trees and the apples. Stop them and try to reach them, and they do it all over again.

The logical question, of course, is "then why keep them?" and the answer, only hinted at, has been fear of retaliation—fear that if they did not, then they might lose the eight Canadians allowed them, who are doing a marvelous job. They had asked for 20 Canadians, and instead, were assigned 8, with 20 Bostonians.

The ABCD boys, it happens, came to town with counselors, and after they had been given an orientation training program back in Boston, to fit them for the apple picking chore. The counselors have sent many of them back by their own decision. The gang has dwindled to some five.

Day we called, the five had been integrated into other picking crews. But the farm view was "it's no use, we are finished with them, unless we have to have them." Each boy was expected to pick at least 42 bushels of apples, which for 8 hours at $1.30 minimum, would be the minimum day's pay.

WATCH TV

On calling day, we found the Hollis farm had five Bostonians. They were having all kinds of trouble placing them. The counselors was living on the telephone, trying to get some of the topflight labor chiefs onto the scene. Two of the boys were at the barracks watching television. "Too cold to pick apples," they declared.

While all this was going on, a local worker, who works a 7 to 7 shift in a factory, came up out of the orchards. He had been 3 hours on apple picking. He had picked 24 boxes and made himself $6. He's a well-known and reliable worker. He said it was easy, and he'd be back again the next day.

So who are picking the Hollis apples? Well, there are the eight Canadians, who are from just north of Pittsburgh, this State, and have their visas. They are older men, in their sixties, wanting and needing the work. They pick some 60 to 100 boxes a day and are happy about it all. They are housed in a separate house.

Then there are some 15 to 20 pickers known as "walk-ins," "drive-ins" and "domestics" some of them oldtimers, and entirely reliable. Many do a good job. They take directions, and follow them carefully.

Occasionally there is a troublemaker. Some come and find the ladder climbing scares them. Some stay just long enough to earn the money for a bottle of whisky, says Amidon, and then away they go, as suddenly as they came.

MORE HEADACHES

We contacted the man who owns the Hollis Orchards, William "Bill" Lievens, the Londonderry man, with plenty of headaches on Woodmont Farm back home, where he does the close supervising, leaving Hollis to his manager, Amidon. He'll get his apples picked, Lievens says, but he says, also and frankly, he'll never again go through any ABCD's from Boston, or any similar experience. It would be better to give up apple growing, he insists.

He's got 40,000 bushels of apples to worry about at Hollis and 60,000 at Londonderry. The McIntosh harvest is just about ended. But there are weeks more of picking of Cortlands, Delicious and other hardier varieties.

He's got 78,000 bushels of controlled atmosphere storage at Londonderry, he explains, and 40,000 of regular cold storage, and at Hollis he also had 40,000 regular cold storage.

Bill says the ABCD team plan is a Government-sponsored project, under the Labor Department, aimed at picking up Boston's quantity of school dropouts, delinquent youngsters, and others, and training them in a rehabilitation program.

He says he was assured the boys he'd get would be those weeded out as the best of the lot, showing a desire to help themselves, and especially trained, and sent out under councilor direction. The councilors supervise the barracks and the field operations, also.

NEVER AGAIN

Lievens says that Labor promised there would be 400 of these youth available for New England, but that the number was revised down to 125, and then to 60. Then he sort of grits his teeth, and exclaims "and we got 20 of them assigned to Hollis."

He added "the project may work out on paper, but not in the apple orchard," and he concluded, "I'll never go through any such experience again.

"We wanted to send the whole lot back, but were afraid we might lose our Canadian pickers, or be held liable for full contract payments." He then concluded, "we simply have had to live through it all."

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO REAPPORTION THE U.S. SENATE

Mr. SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to reapportion the U.S. Senate on a "population-only" representational basis.

In introducing this resolution, I hope to clarify for the people of the United States the paramount issue of legislative representation on all levels of our Government.

The basis and balance of legislative representation is at the heart of our system of government. Nevertheless, too few of our people yet comprehend the far-reaching significance of the U.S. Supreme Court's reapportionment ruling in Reynolds against Sims. Nor is there a true understanding of the vast changes which will occur in our governmental system should these Court rulings continue to be implemented throughout our land.

Senator DIRKSEN has proposed a constitutional amendment which would provide the people an opportunity to make the ultimate determination regarding the basis and balance of legislative representation in their respective States. I support that proposed amendment and early this year introduced a similar constitutional amendment in the House because it is my belief that any issue so fundamental to the workings of our Government should be presented to and decided by the people themselves.

My proposed amendment to reapportion the U.S. Senate is directed toward a comprehensive understanding and determination by the American people of the entire issue of legislative representation. By extending the issue to the national level of government, I hope to provide our people the opportunity finally to resolve the entire question as to whether the "population-only" principle shall be universal and controlling in our system of government.

As is known, I am opposed to such universal application of the "population-only" principle. But unlike the opponents of the Dirksen amendment, who would prevent the people from expressing their will on this vital question of our time, I believe that our citizens should have the ultimate decision as to how far the "population-only" principle should extend.

Under Senator DIRKSEN's proposed amendment and my own amendment, the people would decide whether the "population-only" principle should be universal in our State governments. Under the amendment which I propose today the question of whether it should be applied to the entire structure of

American Government—State and Federal alike—would be taken to the country as a matter of constitutional revision.

The matter of whether the "population-only" principle should be applied to the apportionment of representation in the U.S. Senate was mentioned by the Supreme Court in the Reynolds against Sims decision. The Court said:

> The system of representation in the two Houses of the Federal Congress is one ingrained in our Constitution, as part of the law of the land. It is one conceived out of compromise and concession indispensable to the establishment of our Federal Republic. The fact that almost three-fourths of our present States were never in fact independently sovereign does not detract from our view that the so-called Federal analogy is inapplicable as a sustaining precedent for State legislative apportionments.

Thus, the Court states that the U.S. Senate was established on the basis of equal, rather than proportional representation as a matter of political expediency on the part of the Founding Fathers. If, by some miracle of the fourth dimension, the matter had been submitted to the present U.S. Supreme Court, we are led to infer that the basis for the U.S. Senate representation would be other than it is.

As a matter of historical fact, it is true that the two-members per State basis for apportioning seats in the U.S. Senate was the result of heated debate and final compromise at Independence Hall. According to the Federalist No. 62:

> The equality of representation in the Senate is another point, which, being evidently the result of compromise between the pretensions of the large and the small States, does not call for much discussion. If indeed it be right, that among a people thoroughly incorporated into one nation, every district ought to have a proportional share in the Government, and that among independent and sovereign states, bound together by a simple league, the parties, however, unequal in size, ought to have an equal share in the common councils, it does not appear to be without some reason that in a compound republic, partaking of both the National and Federal character, the Government ought to be founded on a mixture of the principles of proportional and equal representation. But it is superfluous to try, by the standard of theory, a part of the Constitution which is allowed on all hands to be the result, not of theory, but of a spirit of amity, and that mutual deference and concession which the peculiarity of our political situation rendered indispensable. A common Government, with powers equal to its objects, is called for by the voice, and still more loudly by the political situation, of America. A Government founded on principles more consonant to the wishes of the larger States, is not likely to be obtained from the smaller States. The only option, then, for the former, lies between the proposed Government and a Government still more objectionable. Under this alternative, the advice of prudence must be to embrace the lesser evil; and instead of indulging a fruitless anticipation of the possible mischiefs which may ensue, to contemplate rather the advantageous consequences which may qualify the sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, the basis of representation in the U.S. Senate, according to the Federalist, was viewed by these framers of the Constitution as a matter of prudence, a formula arrived at out of "mutual deference and concession."

In my opinion, and I believe in the opinion of the people of this country down through the years, "the advantageous consequences" which have flowed from that compromise have amply justified the position taken by the Federalist in urging ratification of the Constitution. The U.S. Senate has emerged as one of the great deliberative bodies of history, as a guide and a protector of the American system, despite the fact that it was not created on a "population-only" representational basis.

But the fact remains that—as the present U.S. Supreme Court declares—the system of representation upon which the U.S. Senate operates "is one conceived out of compromise and concession," to the extent that the "so-called Federal analogy is inapplicable as a sustaining precedent for State legislative apportionments."

The Supreme Court therefore ordered that the system of legislative representation on the State level of American government be radically altered and universally established on a "population only" basis. This change is fundamental. It calls up for review and reappraisal the entire basis upon which the American system of representational government has been operating—from the time of the Federalist down to the Supreme Court legislative apportionment decisions.

Senator Dirksen's proposed amendment and the other similar proposals reflect an understanding of the far-reaching significance of the Supreme Court reapportionment decisions. Make no mistake: the decision in Reynolds against Sims and similar reapportionment cases is not simply another innovation introduced into our constitutional system by a modern court. It is a decision which goes to the vital core of our system and which, if finally effected, will result in changes so extensive as to reconstitute the entire basis of American political, social, and economic life.

When in 1787 the Constitutional Convention first established the basis for the American system of government, the framers of our Constitution derived their powers from the people of the United States and of their respective States. The Constitution was not handed down by a group of 9 or even 90 select men as a matter of personal or collective interpretation of what they believed was good for the American people. It was drafted by the people's chosen representatives at the Convention and then submitted for ratification.

If we are to radically remold the American system which emerged from that Convention and constitutional ratification, then let the people of this country today, as did their forebears nearly two centures ago, have the controlling voice in such a change.

That, purely and simply, is what the amendment proposed by Senator Dirksen would accomplish. I would consider this resolution I am introducing today regarding reapportionment of the U.S. Senate worthwhile if it does nothing but clarify and dramatize to the American people the underlying issue involved in the current debate regarding the Dirksen proposal.

Yet there is something to be said for the idea that if the American people are to express their will on the "population-only" principle, we should resolve this issue on the Federal as well as the State level. For as George Washington wrote in April 1789:

> The election of the different branches of Congress by the freeman, either directly or indirectly is the pivot on which turns the first wheel of the government; a wheel which communicates motion to all the rest.

Our people are entitled to express their will on the question of legislative representation on all levels of government. Senator Dirksen has proposed an amendment affecting State governments. I, therefore, am proposing, with the resolution introduced today, that the American people themselves determine the manner of legislative representation of "the first wheel of government which communicates motion to all the rest."

Mr. Speaker, in reapportioning the U.S. Senate on a "population-only" basis, we would be faced with the practical necessity of dividing the Nation into senatorial districts.

Of course, it might be argued that pure and unadulterated senatorial representation on a population basis can only be effected by electing our 100 U.S. Senators on a nation-at-large basis. I believe, however, that even the most dedicated advocates of the "population-only" theory would recognize the impracticality of trying to elect the membership of our U.S. Senate in this way.

It is, therefore, necessary that some form of senatorial districting be the basis for any plan to elect U.S. Senate Members under the outline projected by the Supreme Court's ruling in Reynolds against Sims and other cases.

According to the 1960 census, the perfect norm for Senate representation by population would find each U.S. Senator representing 1,785,000 people. The senatorial districts under my proposed amendment would provide a variance from this perfect figure which would reflect representation by population far more accurately than the wider variance employed to determine representation in the House of Representatives.

U.S. Senatorial District No. 1 would be comprised of the New England States of Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut. Following the guideline set forth in Reynolds against Sims on a proportionate national population basis, these States, which now are entitled to 12 U.S. Senators, would only be entitled to 6.

New York State would of itself comprise district No. 2. The people of the Empire State would be entitled to a total of nine U.S. Senators on a "population-only" basis.

Similarly, the people of district No. 3, which would be composed of the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, would be entitled to a total of 10 U.S. Senators.

District No. 4, composed of Maryland and Delaware, would find its combined senatorial representation cut in half. This two-State district would be entitled to a total of two U.S. Senators.

The State of West Virginia of itself would constitute District No. 5, to be represented by a single U.S. Senator.

There would be no total change in U.S. Senate representation for the people of District No. 6, to be comprised of Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina. These three States, on a population basis, would be entitled to six U.S. Senators.

The States of Georgia and Florida, making up District No. 7, would be entitled to five U.S. Senators, one more than under the present system.

Of course, it should be understood that we would be electing Members of the U.S. Senate on a district rather than a State basis, in order to achieve the Supreme Court's ideal of representation on the basis of "population-only." Under this proposed plan the importance of our States in our electoral system would necessarily be of secondary importance to considerations of population. This, of course, would seem to be in accord with the U.S. Supreme Court views on the subject of "population-only" legislative representation.

While the people of District No. 7, residing in Georgia and Florida, would gain a Senator, the people of neighboring Mississippi and Alabama, District No. 8, would lose one. The Mississippi-Alabama district would be entitled to a total of three U.S. Senators.

District No. 9, based on a breakdown of population only, would be composed of the State of Tennessee alone. The Tennessee district would be entitled to two U.S. Senators, just as the State of Tennessee is at present.

Senatorial District No. 10 would be composed of Ohio, Indiana, and Kentucky, and would be entitled to 10 U.S. Senators.

The States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan would comprise District No. 11. These five States would be entitled to nine U.S. Senators.

District No. 12 would include my own State of Missouri, along with our neighboring State of Iowa. The Missouri-Iowa district would have four U.S. Senators.

Our neighboring State of Illinois would make up the 13th Senatorial District, and would be entitled to six U.S. Senators.

District No. 14 would consist of Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana. On a percentage of total population basis, these three States would be entitled to four U.S. Senators.

Texas and New Mexico would make up the 15th District, entitled to six U.S. Senators.

On a population basis there would, of course, be a drastic cutdown of Senate representation in many of our sparsely populated far western States. Therefore, District No. 16 would be composed of the States of Utah, Arizona, Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming. These 5 States, which now have a total of 10 U.S. Senators, on a population basis—as projected by the U.S. Supreme Court's recent decisions—are entitled to only 2 U.S. Senators.

Similarly, the States of Alaska, Hawaii, Washington, and Oregon, composing District No. 17, would be entitled to only three U.S. Senators.

District No. 18 would be composed of the States of California and Nevada. This district would be entitled to nine U.S. Senators.

District No. 19, composed of Nebraska and Kansas, would be entitled to two U.S. Senators.

Finally, District No. 20 would consist of the State of Colorado, which would have a single U.S. Senator.

Mr. Speaker, as I have pointed out—and as States which have been required to reapportion their legislatures have learned—there are always numerous versions of how a balanced legislative body can be achieved on a "population-only" basis. The plan which I have just projected has the merit of adhering closely to the "perfect norm" of U.S. Senate representation on a population basis. I realize that there are other approaches to this problem, but as I have pointed out, the only pure system of electing U.S. Senators on a population basis would be to choose 100 on a nation-at-large basis. Such an at-large race would totally eliminate existence of States as a basis for the selection of Senators, however.

In this case we would have to elect one-third of the U.S. Senate "nation-at-large" every 2 years. Thus, we see that the logic of the "population-only" theorists would ultimately lead to the elimination of all considerations other than population in legislative representation—including even the elimination of the status of the States themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that what I have proposed today may be startling to many—including even some advocates of the "population-only" approach to representative government, who perhaps have not fully considered the direction in which recent U.S. Supreme Court rulings have been headed.

Let me repeat that although I do not endorse the proposed U.S. Senate reapportionment plan just outlined, I do endorse the principle that the American people should have an opportunity to fully reexamine and reassess the representational system under which their Government operates. For in the last analysis, it is the American people who must finally determine whether they want to continue under our present system or change it. That is the sum and substance of the Dirksen resolution and the other resolutions which are now pending before the Congress.

I submit, therefore, that the people of our country should be given the opportunity to make these crucial decisions on a State basis under a constitutional amendment such as Senator DIRKSEN's and on a Federal level, under the proposed amendment which I have today introduced.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida who has spoken out in a very enlightened manner many times on this subject.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman and my friend from Missouri for yielding to me at this time. I want to commend the gentleman from Missouri for his very excellent presentation here before the House with reference to a very serious problem about which we share and many others of this House have shared a great deal of concern.

I believe in pointing out what would happen to the U.S. Senate should it be apportioned on a strictly one-man, one-vote basis is something that all of us should consider seriously and particularly those who advocate this philosophy of one man, one vote. If they really believe in what they are advocating, then they should come out and support some plan for the equitable distribution of the 100 U.S. Senators.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD] has been working very hard in trying to provide some way for the States to determine for themselves. We have both shared in our view in this very important matter—and not that we should tell the States how they should apportion their legislature or which formula they should adopt—by simply letting the States decide for themselves about how their legislature would be apportioned. If they want to produce the one-man, one-vote philosophy, or if they think they can better serve the wishes of the majority of that State by including factors other than solely population, they should be permitted to do so.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the gentleman from Florida and he has made a very important point. If the one man, one vote principle or the population-only principle is a valid principle, then we should be consistent and apply the population-only principle to the top level of Government as well as the local level of government. That is my purpose in introducing this amendment—to clarify and dramatize the issue for the equitable people of the United States.

Of course, there are some proponents of the one-man, one-vote principle who would definitely get hurt by a senatorial redistricting. There are some people who would be completely put out of a job much the same as State representatives and State senators. For example, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Utah, and Arizona—which States are now entitled to 2 Senators each or a total of 10 Senators on a population-only basis—would be entitled to only 2 U.S. Senators. But that is the principle of population only and if you adhere to that principle then we should be consistent and apply it on the national level.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman for what I consider to be an extremely scholarly presentation. I am intrigued by the chart or map that the gentleman has so carefully worked out.

I note from the chart that speaking of the State of Utah which now enjoys two representatives in the U.S. Senate, under the gentleman's reapportionment plan, based upon a one-man, one-vote principle, the State of Utah for about 6 years out of every 10 years would probably have no representative at all in the U.S. Senate; is that not correct? In other words, I notice that you group us with 5 other States which, of course, would be entitled to 10 as a whole.

Mr. ICHORD. That is correct. You have to divide the United States into senatorial districts, and in order to get enough population in the western part of the United States, I had to group five States together in order to reach the perfect norm.

Mr. KING of Utah. In other words, if Utah is one of five States in a group that has two Senators, this means that probably half of the time they will have no Senator at all. Is that correct?

Mr. ICHORD. Of course, offhand I do not know the most populous State in those five States, but usually people are inclined to vote for the hometown candidate. I suppose Arizona would have the greatest population and Arizona would probably elect the two U.S. Senators.

Mr. KING of Utah. That is correct, and if it is correct, the tendency to elect two Senators from the most populous States, a State like Wyoming and Montana would probably never have a U.S. Senator at all.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FUQUA. I might say in reference to the gentleman from Utah with two U.S. Senators serving the five great Western States, I am sure the Senator would represent each of those States, because I am sure he would be interested in the welfare and problems of those two States. This would be on a directly one-man, one-vote principle that has been advocated for each, and applied to all legislators.

Mr. ICHORD. I do not think the gentleman from Utah was disputing that point. District No. 16 which embraces Utah, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, and Arizona, is the largest variation on a population basis. That district would vary 8.2 percent, I believe, from the perfect norm. Under the perfect norm you would have 1 Senator for 1,785,000 people, taking the 1960 population. Of course, the population of the United States has increased since 1960.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I want to compliment my colleague from Missouri who, in his own right as a distinguished constitutional lawyer and certainly as former speaker of our house of representatives for the Missouri State Assembly, knows well what has happened under this one-person, one-vote decision of the Supreme Court in its job to determine the law of this body, and its assumption of the power to regulate and implement as well as to interpret wherein some of our counties have been split in three different directions in Missouri under the recent reapportionment of our legislative districts. So I compliment him on how beautifully he has pictorialized this situation.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. I certainly thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding and also his explanation and taking the time to bring the matter of reapportionment again to the House. I think perhaps in the closing days of Congress, I know of no other subject we should stop and consider for a few moments that is of more importance than this one. I would encourage Members who have not done so to recall that there is a discharge petition that has been filed. There has been a bipartisan steering committee in the House composed, I believe, of four Democrats and three Republican Members, which is making every effort possible to stir up some interest and enthusiasm to get the so-called Dirksen amendment or, on the House side, the Patten amendment, moving again. This should at least cause people to look at the possibility of a U.S. Senate reapportionment.

I am certain that people feel, as the gentleman from Missouri has told me, that we are simply waving a red herring, that this cannot happen, that this is ridiculous. I think the same thing was said about 20 or 30 years ago in relation to State reapportionment. As far as I am concerned, the Supreme Court decision of June 15, 1964, was completely erroneous. It was based on, I think, a theory, or at least a thought, that they had a right to amend the Constitution. The gentleman from Missouri well knows that the Court's duty is to interpret the Constitution. The duty to amend and the right to amend, of course, should be in Congress. There is no precedent otherwise, although a precedent was sought in the Court's deciding the cases of June 15, 1964.

I am happy to note that the States of Kansas and Nebraska would end up with two Senate seats. As the gentleman has pointed out, there would be a loss of two. I also note that 18 Western States would drop from 36 Senators to, I believe, 23. In other words, about half the area in the country would drop about 13 Senators.

Mr. ICHORD. Of course, the gentleman from Kansas can always say that what is good for the goose is good for the gander. If this is good on a State level, it should be good on a Federal level.

Mr. DOLE. Yes. I really think the gentleman is making an excellent presentation. Perhaps it will alert some of the people in this body and some of the people in the other body to the real problems that we face. I know it is easy, when you come from areas like I do, or the gentleman from Missouri does, to say that they are talking about this for selfish reasons. We can see what is happening in Kansas. There is no contest between the urban interests and the rural interests. I think what we want—and what everyone wants who truly understands it—is a balanced representative system with the States making their own determination rather than the U.S. Supreme Court.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his very worthwhile contribution.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. RONCALIO. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

I wish to add my commendation to that of my colleagues for the splendid presentation that the gentleman is making. I feel fortunate in having walked into the Chamber at the time I did this afternoon, although I must admit, upon looking at the gentleman's interesting chart, it is a bit of a shock to one coming from Wyoming. I see there five Western States represented by two Senators, if the projection were to be made on the basis of the gentleman's analogy of a one-man, one-vote basis.

There is in the House what we call the Patten discharge petition. My name is on that petition and has been on it since the 1st of January.

Mr. ICHORD. I commend the gentleman.

Mr. RONCALIO. I am grateful for this representation, because the U.S. Constitution guarantees the right that each State will have two Senators representing the State, therefore being some other entity or unit besides human beings.

I do not believe the problem would be before us today if each of the State legislatures had apportioned according to the State constitutions.

In Wyoming the Wyoming State Constitution directed the Founding Fathers and early lawmakers of the State to reapportion both Houses according to population every 10 years. Had that been done there would have been no problem. There would have been no necessity for the Supreme Court to legislate.

We recently reapportioned. There was a three-man panel which had to do the job last week, which should have been done every 10 years for the past 40 years.

Mr. ICHORD. The gentleman is correct. I am not defending the abuse of legislative apportionment which did exist in many States but I do submit that the Supreme Court did not interpret the Constitution, but amended it by legislative decree.

If the Supreme Court had gone far enough to say that every State shall be required to submit this to the people, to let the people make up their minds, the problem would not exist today.

Let me tell the gentleman what happened in my own State of Missouri. We have in Missouri a State senate which is based strictly on population only. We have, in the house of representatives, a mixture of population and area representation; that is, each county is guaranteed one representative and if it has a larger population it may get more than one representative.

I have no doubt that the people in my own State of Missouri, voting both in the urban areas and in the rural areas, would sustain this plan of representation overwhelmingly.

The Federal courts came into the picture and declared that both the house and the senate were not properly apportioned, so the legislature drew up a plan and submitted it to the people of Missouri, on a one-man, one-vote basis. That would comply with the Supreme Court mandate. The people of Missouri, both in rural Missouri and in urban Missouri, turned it down overwhelmingly.

Now we do not know what we are going to do. We do not know whether it is going to have to be done by the courts of Missouri or whether it will be done by the legislature. In any event it now appears that the people of Missouri will not have the final scheme of legislative apportionment submitted to them for approval.

That is my purpose in introducing this in the Congress of the United States. I wish to clarify the issue.

I say again—I have said this before—the one-man, one-vote principle should be termed the "population only" principle. I prefer the term "population only" because I think the one man, one vote is a misnomer, much like the term "right to work" in the controversy over section 14(b) is a misnomer.

If that is a valid principle, then we should apply it throughout all levels of our Government and it should be applied over in the U.S. Senate, right here in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. RONCALIO. I thank the gentleman from Missouri. May I indicate some appreciation of his problems and some sympathy. I share his concern. Naturally, we who represent the sparsely populated States will fight to the last element of our strength for anything that would preserve the rights under the Constitution, now nearly 200 years in establishment, to protect whatever representation we have left in these beloved United States.

Mr. ICHORD. Of course, it may not be necessary to change the U.S. Constitution in order to have this come about because, as the gentleman well knows, distinguished lawyer that he is, the Constitution means what the nine men on the other side of the street say it means.

Mr. RONCALIO. That is very well worded.

Mr. ICHORD. Let us look at what the Constitution of the United States says. It is true that article V reads as follows:

> *Provided*, That no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

Can the State of Wyoming be deprived of its equal suffrage without its consent?

I would point out to the gentleman that if he will look at the definition of "suffrage" in Black's legal law dictionary, he will find that "suffrage" means voting. Then, if the gentleman from Wyoming will read the decision in Reynolds against Simms, he will find that "equal" under the interpretation of the U.S. Supreme Court means "population only" "one-man, one-vote." That was the decision under the 14th amendment. "Equal protection" means "one-man, one-vote," "population-only." Do the States now have equal suffrage in the U.S. Senate? No. Not under the interpretation of the Supreme Court. They now have unequal suffrage. The States, however, consented to unequal suffrage when they adopted the 17th amendment. We have unequal voting or unequal suffrage, because under the Supreme Court's interpretation, equal suffrage or equal voting is one man, one vote. So certainly it is not beyond the realm of reason that the Supreme Court at a later date will hold that the 14th amendment supersedes article I of the Constitution and, in order to give the States equal suffrage under this interpretation, you have to come out with a plan such as I have submitted here. I am doing this by a constitutional amendment. It would require the ratification by the States, of course.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful again to the gentleman for these citations and again I respect his understanding of the subject matter. I have read the decision in point. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Are you familiar with the protestations that have recently been made on the Senate confirmation of recent appointments to the Supreme Court when asked specifically if such a thing could ever come to pass, when the prospective appointees have answered, "Impossible. I cannot envision it."

Mr. ICHORD. Yes. I am familiar with it. I noticed it in the newspapers. I think the gentleman is referring to the Honorable Abe Fortas.

Mr. RONCALIO. That is correct.

Mr. ICHORD. Who in the hearing on his nomination to the Supreme Court said that such an apportionment of the Senate would be inconceivable. Perhaps Abe Fortas went on record at that hearing before the U.S. Senate, but Abe Fortas will not be on the U.S. Supreme Court forever. Abe Fortas may not be on the Supreme Court tomorrow and after all, he is just one member. That is why I said that the Constitution means what the Supreme Court says it means.

Mr. RONCALIO. I thank the gentleman so very much again.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. VIVIAN. I am very interested to find that my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, has introduced a resolution proposing that the Constitution be amended to reapportion the U.S. Senate. I had considered introducing a similar resolution, but did not do so for a reason which I will return to in a moment. The gentleman has clearly stated that he is opposed to the very resolution he has today introduced. He states that he introduced it to bring the matter to public attention.

Each of the other speakers has commended the gentleman for introducing the resolution for this purpose. I may say that I would support such a resolution. Of course, I recognize that the chance that such a resolution would be reported to the floor is slight, but I would support it because, in spite of the views expressed here today, it is basically a wise and a needed resolution.

For while the apportionment of two Senators to each State was, doubtless, a sound and a necessary concession, at the time our forefathers were developing the consensus which would lead to the United States of America, it is, in my opinion, unfortunate that the potential for malapportionment of seats in the U.S. Senate was frozen into our Constitution. It is not logical today, and it will become an increasingly troublesome matter in the future.

For many years I lived in the State of Rhode Island which has twice the representation in the United States Senate which would be given on the basis of its population. Presently I live in the State of Michigan which has only half the representation which would be given it by the population index. Michigan has 4 percent of the population but only 2 percent of the Senators. Now, I think each Michigan resident should be represented to the same extent as each Rhode Island resident is, on a "one-man, one-vote" basis. Furthermore, I have lived in three other States in this Nation some of which were underrepresented and some overrepresented in the United States Senate. I fail to see any reason why each citizen of this Nation should not have equal representation regardless of his residence. Furthermore, as our Nation grows we will find that malapportionment of our Senate will become increasingly troublesome. It will inhibit the growth of this, the greatest democratic nation in the world.

I mentioned a moment ago that I had considered introducing a similar resolution earlier in the 89th Congress. There were several reasons for deferring this action. In the first place, as I am sure the gentleman from Missouri is aware, there is a serious constitutional question as to whether the apportionment of two Senators to every State of the Union is a part of the Federal Constitution—perhaps the only part—which is not subject to the amending procedures. The very last part of article V of the Constitution, the article dealing with amendments to that document, states, and I quote, "no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

Now the interesting point to note is that this provision is a part of the article dealing with amendments to the Constitution. The question is: Is this just like every part of the Constitution, subject to the amending procedures provided, or, because it is made a proviso of the amending procedure, are the delegates to the Constitutional Convention telling us across the years: "This is how you may amend the Constitution; but these amending procedures specifically do not apply to the apportionment of Senate seats"? I do not doubt that this is what the framers of the Constitution intended. But I suspect that we will never know how this question might be interpreted.

The reason that I have grave doubts as to whether we shall ever be afforded a test of the constitutionality of such an amendment is also the main reason which led me to defer submission of an equalized apportionment resolution. This is the virtually absolute knowledge that there are no circumstances under which such a resolution might be adopted by the other body, or, for that matter, by the legislatures of 38 States.

I considered one version of such an amendment which would guarantee life tenure to both Senators from any State which, under the provisions of the amendment, would lose one seat. But that had its own built-in disadvantages, and really did not seem to make the proposal much more palatable.

So I think we shall not see any application of the equalized representation principle, in the case of the United States Senate. And I think the gentleman from Missouri knows this is true. But I thank him for having introduced this subject into the debate of this body, and for having allowed me the opportunity to express my support for the resolution, idealistic and utopian as it may be.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the gentleman for his views, and I would point out that he is being consistent.

I wonder if some of the Senators who are pushing State legislative reapportionment and who will lose senatorial representation under "one man, one vote" will be just as consistent as is the gentleman by championing adoption of this constitutional amendment.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to inquire of the gentleman what the machinery of his resolution provides for ratification of this proposed constitutional amendment? How does the gentleman propose to have this ratified?

Mr. ICHORD. Of course, it would take the form of the usual joint resolution, passed by the House and the Senate by a two-thirds vote and then ratified by three-fourths of the legislatures of the various States. If the gentleman was going to make a point, I do not think that article V would require a unanimous ratification by the States.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. If the gentleman will permit me, I will take issue with him on that point because, if the Constitution means what it says, that no State shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate without its consent; then unless you had a unanimous ratification by all 50 States I do not see how his proposal could ever become a part of the Constitution.

Mr. ICHORD. I am glad the gentleman did use the word "unanimous." Someone earlier was speaking to this plan and was saying that the Constitution of the United States could not be amended in this respect. I am sure the gentleman from Michigan, distinguished lawyer as he is, would not deprive—and he did not deprive—the people of the United States of the right to change their form of government. That is one of the very basic principles upon which this country was founded. The gentleman can argue that it would take a unanimous vote. Personally I do not think it would take a unanimous vote of the States. Pursuing that a little further I would say to the gentleman from Michigan that most people thought that it was inconceivable that the States of the Union would be forbidden to use the Federal analogy in determining the apportionment of their State legislatures.

Let me point out to the gentleman that article 5 reads as follows—and I thought I had explained that earlier—

> *Provided*, that no State without its consent shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

Suffrage means vote—equal vote. The Supreme Court in Reynolds against Sims held that equal voting is one man, one vote.

The people do not have equal suffrage in the Senate of the United States because the ruling is one man, one vote. But people consented to have something different under amendment No. XVII, which was adopted after the original Constitution.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. The gentleman will agree, will he not, that the reference in article V to suffrage in the Senate is not to the voting of the people but to the suffrage of the State. In other words, the State shall have an equal vote in the Senate. That is what that phrase means in the Constitution.

Mr. ICHORD. That is the point.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. That each State shall have an equal vote in the Senate and the State votes in the Senate by its Senators, not by its people.

Mr. ICHORD. As the gentleman well knows, I would not fight this matter long and hard with him. I am just pointing out how the Supreme Court could even have this come into effect, the way it interprets the Constitution, without even submitting it to three-fourths of the States, let alone unanimously, which, the gentleman argues, the Constitution requires.

Personally, I believe that under the Court's interpretation we could get this adopted by a three-fourths ratification and not a unanimous ratification, because you are going to have the rules of construction running against you in that it is basic to our form of government that the people have the right to change it.

Are we going to permit the original States to write in a principle that our Government cannot be changed except by unanimous vote?

However, Mr. Speaker, I do not want or care to press that point with the gentleman because we are not in basic disagreement.

I am not in favor of this type of legislative reapportionment itself except that I am in favor of submitting this issue to the people of the United States by letting them make up their own mind. This is not a mere innovation brought into being by a modern court. This is a change which goes to the very basis of our form of government and I believe that it should be based upon a decision by the people of the United States of America. That is my position.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HUNGATE. I thank my distinguished colleague and I would like to direct his attention back to some remarks concerning Federal judicial appointments that have recently been made, including the very distinguished gentleman, Mr. Fortas, and I believe presently the other body has under consideration another distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts for appointment who has some very distinguished friends and whose law school has been referred to, although the law school of Mr. Fortas was not held against him.

On the question of judicial experience this has been raised regarding the Federal court confirmation with reference I believe to Judge Morrissey. Is the gentleman acquainted with the prior judicial experience of the members of the U.S. Supreme Court?

Mr. ICHORD. I am and I put that information into the RECORD some few months ago. I believe the present U.S. Supreme Court has, or at least before Judge Fortas went on the Bench, a total of 13 years' judicial experience distributed among nine Judges, and one Judge had 6 of those 13 years.

Mr. HUNGATE. If the gentleman will yield further, it would seem, perhaps, then would it not that the fact that prior judicial experience might not be a disqualifying factor for Judge Morrissey?

Mr. ICHORD. Personally, I do not want to get into that issue, but I would be in favor at least of having and laying down the requirement that all U.S. Supreme Court Justices do have prior judicial experience or at least some very strong substitutes for the prior judicial experience.

Mr. HUNGATE. I thank the gentleman and I would like to inquire——

Mr. ICHORD. But that—that is a matter which the Congress can take care of. I would, without a doubt, think that Congress does have the right to establish qualifications for the members of the courts.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, do I understand that in some of these States where under the one-man, one-vote population test our legislatures have to be reapportioned and have been referred to as de facto legislatures until another election can be held under the one-man, one-vote theory; is that a correct statement, as the gentleman understands it?

Mr. ICHORD. That is what I understand. The Court uses its equity powers and says the legislatures can function as de facto legislatures.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRIEDEL). The Chair will announce that the gentleman from Missouri has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. Concerning the State legislatures, and reapportioning the States without the consent of the people through a referendum vote, I was wondering, is the gentleman critical of the Founding Fathers for adopting this apportionment of the United States without a popular referendum?

Mr. ICHORD. Of course, if the gentleman had been here earlier he would have heard me quoting from the Federalist, No. 62, which set forth the history of senatorial representation. It was purely a matter of compromise. The smaller demanded two votes for each State in the Senate. But, at least, it was submitted to the various States for ratification. That is the important point.

I submit that the Supreme Court of the United States in deciding Reynolds against Simms did not interpret the Constitution of the United States, it amended it by judicial decree. I defy any Member to show me differently. I have asked this time and time again. I defy any Member of this body or any student of political history in the United States to point out to me where at any time when the 14th amendment was discussed in Congress, or when the 14th amendment was discussed in State legislatures and ratified by three-fourths of the State legislatures that any mention was made of the fact that equal protection clause of the 14th amendment means one man, one vote. I still wait for anyone to cite me any case where such a discussion was had in the Congress or in State legislatures.

Mr. Speaker, there has been some question about the effect of article V. Article V of the Constitution reads as follows:

> *Provided*, That no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

I also mentioned a while ago that Abe Fortas, at the hearing on his nomination to the Supreme Court, said that such an apportionment of the Senate would be "inconceivable."

However, only a little over a year ago most people thought it was "inconceivable" that the States of the Union would be forbidden the use of the Federal analogy in determining the apportionment of their legislatures. Then, last June, the Supreme Court, relying on the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment, held in Reynolds against Simms that both houses of a State legislature had to be apportioned on the basis of population. The majority of the Court said that trees and acres did not count, but numbers of people did, in determining whether a person had been denied an equal vote in the State legislature under the equal protection clause.

Thus, the Court interpreted the "equal protection" language of the 14th amendment as applying to voting. Black's law dictionary defines "suffrage" as voting. It would appear logical, almost mandatory, to interpret the language of article V in the light of the decision applying the 14th amendment to voting rights. If equal protection means that the voting rights of persons must be determined on a population basis, it would follow that the "equal suffrage" language actually means, not that each State has a right to two Senators, but that the consent of the States must be obtained for any apportionment of the Senate which is not based on numbers of population.

By ratifying or acquiescing in the 17th amendment, which provides two Senators for each State, the States presumably consented to an apportionment of the Senate not based on equal suffrage. However, following this reasoning, the less populous States could be deprived of their two Senators without their consent by an amendment to the Constitution under the usual amending procedure because the present Senate apportionment does not constitute equal suffrage and the only apportionment of the Senate for which the consent of all States is required to change is one based on population.

This is a logical extension of the Court's reasoning in Reynolds against Simms.

An additional reason for reaching this conclusion would be that unless the Senate was so apportioned, persons within the more populous States would be in fact denied the equal protection of the laws, as this clause has been now interpreted. This is especially true in this half of the 20th century when the Federal Government is assuming such a much greater role in the lives of all citizens and when Federal taxation and spending have grown so greatly in proportion to State taxation and spending. Certainly, the more populous States are denied their equal voice in the decisions of the Senate.

The Supreme Court has indicated that it is not adverse to applying the same standards to the Federal Government as it applies to the States. When the issue of desegregation in the schools of the District of Columbia was before the Court, it commented that although the 14th amendment applies by its terms only to the States, "it would be unthinkable that the same Constitution would impose a lesser duty on the Federal Government," and it therefore applied the proscriptions of the 14th amendment in order to desegregate schools under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government just as it had schools under the jurisdiction of State governments.

So, I submit the stage has been set for a basic shift in our entire governmental structure. Article V does not prohibit this amendment.

MOORE DEMANDS ACTION ON TARIFF COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION WITH RESPECT TO ZINC INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Friedel). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, time and again legislation is suggested here in the House and in the Congress that specifically has to do with the problems that have been created in a number of the areas of our country which have become known as depressed areas or the economically disadvantaged areas of the country.

This administration and the past administration received a great deal of widespread publicity because of the fact there was submitted to the Congress several legislative enactments which supposedly were to lend a helping hand to the Appalachian region and particularly the State of West Virginia.

I wish to take these few minutes here this afternoon to say something on behalf of the people of my State of West Virginia. I do not know that I speak for a majority of them in any sense of the word. But I certainly want this House to know that I speak my own deep sincere sentiments on the matter.

What I would like the U.S. Government to do and what I would like the President and the executive branch of the Government to do is to keep their hands off of our State. I would like to see these particular legislative enactments which are supposed to rescue us from the den of poverty, the poverty which is so widely advertised, wiped off the books and any supposedly proportionate share that would go to my State canceled out. At the same time, I would like to have the executive branch of the Government handle a few of the administrative decisions which is their responsibility in such a way that my people can keep the jobs that they have and the industries that they have and the livelihoods that they have without having to be continually sacrificed on the anvil of international political expediency to take care of the needs and the trade desires of some other nation of the world. The industries and the people of my State are hit from all parts of the world by restrictions on the flow of raw materials or by manufactured items that are imported to this country and compete, I say unfairly, with the items that are manufactured in my State.

I wish to bring to the attention of the House here today a very urgent matter which has come to my attention which is facing the zinc smelting industry in my State today. Specifically I refer to the absolute quotas that have been in effect and as they do affect the sale of zinc which is manufactured from imported zinc ore. As a result of these unfavorable zinc quotas, that is, the inability of this manufacturing facility to obtain and use zinc ore, that is, the raw material which will be refined and processed by the utilization of individuals who work in this industry, we are now confronted with the prospect of the closing down of a zinc smelting plant in my State which will cause my State to lose this manufacturing facility and create the loss of 350 jobs, badly needed jobs I might say.

I am speaking particularly concerning the Matthiessen and Hegeler zinc plant which is operated in the community of Spelter in Harrison County, W. Va.

Last Friday this company shipped its last zinc that it can ship this year under the present quota system. The company can no longer afford to stockpile zinc or continue the manufacturing of zinc slab by reason of the fact that it is a small company and cannot continue to carry vast amounts of inventory.

You may say to me, "Well, what does this have to do with the situation concerning our trade policies?"

Let me simply say this: On March 4, 1964, the President of the United States asked the Tariff Commission to review and to study the question of the establishment or the continuance of the establishment of the zinc quotas on the importation of zinc ore into this country.

On June 8, 1965, the Tariff Commission reported to the President that these restrictions on the flow of zinc ore into this country should be removed, that there was a distinct shortage of supply in this country, and that it was unnecessary for these particular quotas to continue in operation.

Now, one would think that that would settle the matter, that it would be sufficient for an executive decision. But obviously it was not. Therefore, I want the RECORD to show that the next time we consider trade legislation in this body I intend to offer an amendment to do away with the Tariff Commission entirely, because it means absolutely nothing. That body of seven men can hear, as it did in this zinc case for 15 months, the cries and the pleas and the evidence of the industries in this Nation of ours—I am speaking of here in the United States—and how they are adversely affected by any one of a number of our trade policies, and that Tariff Commission can make a unanimous finding, and under the law all they can do is simply advise the President of the United States; and the President himself has the power either simply to accept it or to turn it down.

Since June 1965, knowing full well that a number of the zinc smelting facilities in this country were reaching the point that they would have to close their manufacturing facilities down unless the absolute quotas on zinc were terminated or modified. The Executive Review Board, which is under the authority of the former Secretary of State, Christian Herter, has had within its breast, the recommendation of the Tariff Commission to remove these quotas. Four months has now passed. I am advised at this time that they are no better prepared today to tell the President whether the decision of the Tariff Commission should be accepted, or whether it should be partially put into effect, or whether the President should turn his back on it in its obvious validity, than they were the day it was submitted to them.

Mr. Speaker, this is a tragedy of the highest order. There are 350 families involved in this possible plant closing in my congressional district. I can point out that this same situation exists in a number of other like facilities throughout the United States.

Here, after 15 months of hearings by a body in the executive branch of the Government, the Tariff Commission, there has been handed down a recommendation, and somebody who is under the complete control, I suggest, of the Department of State, has held up either advising or suggesting to the President what he should do, though they have had that recommendation for over a period of 4 months, and, as I say, are not any better prepared today to make further suggestions to the President than they were on the day on which the decision was submitted to them.

It seems ironic that we tolerate in the executive branch of the Government a specialized "court of last resort," which is responsible to no one and one that pays not the slightest bit of attention to the Congress or the Tariff Commission. The Tariff Commission was constructed by the Congress of the United States, to which industries—both those adversely affected or those which seek some sort of relief from the consequences of foreign imports—can go to explain their problems. This particular Commission can sit for 5 years and give its attention to the matter on a day-to-day basis, and its recommendation or its finding has no more force and effect than the observation which my 14-year-old son might make on the subject.

I believe it is perfectly ridiculous for us in the Congress to continue to perpetuate in operation a Tariff Commission that does not have any power, that has no authority, that does not accomplish anything, however widely it may study any one of a given number of different problems affecting the jobs of people in this country or the industries that might be affected. For the Tariff Commission to see its recommendations or its work for a long period of time implemented is essential.

On the matter at hand I quote from the report of June 8 of the Tariff Commission:

> When import quotas were imposed in October 1958 domestic lead and zinc products were experiencing the consequences of a large excess of supplies over consumption requirements, burdensome producers' stocks, depressed prices, underutilization of mining and smelting facilities, reduced employment and declining profits.

And I continue:

> To a large degree, this was also the situation throughout the free world.

However, today, Mr. Speaker, we have a situation where there are no producer stocks other than the current accumulations awaiting shipment; a minimum of ore stocks are available today and prices are at the highest since 1952. Smelting capacity—and that represents the jobs that we hear about in this country of ours—are operating at a record rate and they desire to expand, and they would expand if raw materials were available and their employment would continue at very high levels as they have over the past few years.

The Tariff Commission concluded in its June 8, report that—

> Termination of the quotas would not likely have a detrimental effect on domestic lead and zinc producers unless world demand for these metals should subside substantially in relation to world supplies.

The Commission went on in its report to the President and made the observation that—

> Termination of the quotas would be followed by some increase in import supplies available to U.S. consumers. This would occur because U.S. smelters and importers—

Which are employing U.S. working men and women and are creating jobs in this country of ours—

> would doubtless enter for consumption ores and metals they now hold in bond in excess of import quotas.

I have a situation confronting me with respect to this particular plant, that if these people have to cool down these particular retorts that heat the zinc ore, they stand to lose $2½ million because when these particular facilities, which have a lining of brick, cool they crack and are worthless. This will encourage this particular facility simply to shut its doors and move out of the State of West Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that this is another example—and I am going to cite many more—where this administration and the past administration, while talking about the assistance that they have given us in the form of Federal handouts—I would say to every citizen of every other State in this Union that the people in my State do not want handouts. We would like the Government to leave us alone, leave our jobs there, and occasionally give us a helping hand from the standpoint of the problems we are experiencing because of our Nation's trade policies. The administration is slowly pressing a number of our manufacturing facilities to the wall and we will not be able to keep the jobs now available in Appalachia or in the State of West Virginia if this is continued.

It might be interesting for the House to know that in all of these grandiose schemes—and this might as well be said, too, to the rest of the country—in all of these grandiose schemes to rescue the State of West Virginia from its ostensible poverty, there has not been one real job created. That ought to stir the wrath of every individual in this country, to think that apparently billions of dollars have been spent and there has not been created one permanent job in the area to which so much attention has been given and to which the Nation has a sympathetic feeling.

I think it is high time that this administration asked its Trade Executive Review Board to transmit to it the decision of the Tariff Commission with the recommendation that the Tariff Commission recommendations on zinc imports be implemented. After all, these men are learned in their particular work. They have looked into this matter very carefully and it is their considered and deliberate opinion that import quotas on zinc should be removed and that our plants be allowed to continue to operate so that our families continue to have the opportunity to enjoy the benefit of having a father who is working 40 hours a week and bringing home a paycheck, instead of going to the department of public assistance or to some one of a half dozen administrators who are supposed to administer financial aid to the economic ills of a family, when all this man wants for his family is the right to continue to work at the job he now has and has had for a long number of years.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I certainly thank the gentleman for this statement of strength based upon perception and experience and judgment.

Most anyone who has ever worked or provided work knows that that is not Government's function but, rather, just to create the climate in which to work. Certainly, we have to protect what industries we have. The example you have cited points up the paradox of a Tariff Commission that three Presidents have not listened to and they have neither established quotas recommended by the Tariff Commission. They have not imposed a tariff and, in fact, quite to the contrary, we have eliminated jobs and indeed are killing the goose that lays the golden egg by such examples as the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1962 which has been the father of the whole thing when this Congress gave away the prerogatives of lowering tariffs by 50 percent, which brought on the Executive Herter Committee, the GATT conference, the Kennedy round, the "chicken war," and allowed the importation of glass and eliminated our watch market and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, this is a paradoxical situation that we must wrestle with. We not only are doing it, as the gentleman has so beautifully pointed out, through the Tariff Commission which is like a castrated bull—it is not worth very much, except to stand around and admire things—but we have, quite to the contrary, actually let other departments of the Cabinet trade for zinc and lead being brought into this country, and I am referring to the 1961 action of the Secretary of Agriculture wherein he traded wheat quotas with Canada out of our Commodity Credit Corporation for lead in Mexico to the tune of 100,000 tons of lead and zinc.

Mr. MOORE. That is right.

Mr. HALL. This is the kind of freewheeling on the part of our State Department and the Department of Agriculture and the lack of Presidential recognition of the Tariff Commission that is eliminating jobs as well as our surplus stockpiles of zinc and lead which as the gentleman knows, I am familiar with as a member of the Armed Services Committee, and be that military or strategic or otherwise, they are being doled out in this time of relative shortage rather than reopening the mines. Imports are continuing to be encouraged in the interest of building image rather than respect and honor, at the sacrifice of the wage earner.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly commend the gentleman for what he has so brilliantly said here today and feel that we should no longer subsidize mining while importing at the same time and trying to reduce our stockpile, all of which are inconsistent in bringing on this dilemma, simply because someone has not listened to the emasculated Tariff Commission which we continue to keep around.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the gentleman from Missouri very, very much. I know of the gentleman's long, devoted, and sincere interest in this matter. I just hope that in some way, by continuing to bring this to the attention of the House, it will at long last receive the fair consideration which it is due.

Now let me just point out the irony of all this. I just set forth in detail about the fact that a company employing 350 people in my State cannot get the raw product with which to do their work. In this very same area today there is a large sheet-glass-making facility where there are 2,000 jobs—as a matter of fact, 2,400 jobs—involved. This industry is now looking to the Tariff Commission because the President of the United States has said to the Tariff Commission, "You made a suggestion 3 years ago that there be an increase in the tariff with respect to the importation of sheet glass. We are now being told by the people in the other nations of the world that this is unfair to them."

When you analyze the matter since the adjusting of these exist in the sheet glass industry, the actual facts show that the percent of the market that the foreign importers actually control even though tariffs were increased several years ago it has increased from about 24 percent of American market to 26 percent. Yet the foreign interests are apparently so strong they can force, through our State Department and the President of the United States a demand that the Tariff Commission reopen hearings on sheet glass. The new rates have not been in effect a year and a half and yet foreign interests display their power by the fact that a review of those higher rates has now been ordered by the President.

Mr. HALL. The same thing has happened to the watch industry, and to the shoe industry.

Mr. MOORE. Absolutely. The irony of this is that here is an area of a State that is fighting on several fronts against the inequity of our current and incongruous tariff policies. I am talking about importation of manufactured sheet glass. I am talking about zinc, the raw material with which to do the job, or the smelting process. In the sheet glass industry the Federal Government is trying to do everything to encourage further importation of the manufactured item so that the American manufacturer is pressed to the wall competitively, and he cannot compete in the American marketplace when he has to pay higher wages, and when he has to help maintain the standard of living and the economics of the people who work in the sheet glass industry in this country.

Let me point out a half dozen other instances in which my State, the State that is supposed to be one of the chief beneficiaries of all this great social legislation, but never receives any of its benefits by reason of the complete inefficiency of the administration. To cite another example, it is well known to everybody in this House that the State of West Virginia is the No. 1 producer of bituminous coal in these United States. Yet we see an influx into the eastern seaboard of the United States of low-cost, waste residual fuel oil that is replacing coal as a fuel in some of the vital industries of this country to the extent that time and time again mines are forced to close down because this waste material is thrown on the energy market. And yet the administration simply refuses to control this flow of muck which completely works at odds with any good that could be accomplished under the so-called poverty programs.

Another instance, my State recently had the opportunity of getting a new petrol chemical plant, one in which there would not be a dime's worth of Federal money involved. It was a free enterprise move to the State of West Virginia. Two industries wanted to get together to construct this plant and utilize our resources and many other of the fine attributes available in our State. The thing they needed was naphtha, as the material necessary to run this particular facility. But there was an import control on naphtha. So we had to go to the administration and ask them, "would you let enough naphtha—we are talking about the raw material again—come into the country, because this is a plant that will employ a thousand people in our State, where you desire to spend thousands of Federal dollars?"

The administration said "No, we cannot take the import quotas off of naphtha." It seems utterly ridiculous to me that the people in my State are forced time and time again to be exposed to our sister States in such a way that some of them actually believe we are not interested in the problems that exist, or the humanitarian difficulties that exist among some of our citizens, when actually we are trying to solve it the best way we can, that is, by preserving the jobs and preserving the industries and trying to encourage new industries, not something financed by a Government agency, but one in which freedom of choice and the free enterprise system would create the new job opportunities. Yet this administration and the last administration has slammed the door in the face of the workers and the industries, and the people of my State, and seemingly are content to make us believe that we are the No. 1 welfare State in the Union.

I think it is just high time that the people in my State rise up and once and for all simply say to this Federal monstrosity here in Washington, just leave us alone and give us the full advantage of good and sincere administration in these many areas so that we can keep our plants operating. That is not to say that we are asking for any unfair advantage. We will compete in the marketplace if you just do not give the people in some far-off nation in the world an unfair advantage against us here in this country.

May I conclude by saying, this is indeed a pressing and serious matter. I daresay in 10 years' service in the Congress, I have not seen many industries with a guaranteed employment base of 350 which has desired so much to stay in my home State. I think it is incumbent upon me to do everything I possibly can to keep industries already located and operating in West Virginia and attempt to encourage new industries to come in.

I ask the trade advisers in the executive branch, what in the world could they discover in 4 months that the Tariff Commission has not developed and that it has not itself discussed and has not itself reviewed in 15 months? It is certainly rather amazing to me and I would suggest that what needs to be done here immediately is that the Tariff Commission's recommendation modifying the escape clause provision on lead and zinc be implemented immediately in order that this manufacturing facility in West Virginia as well as other manufacturing facilities throughout the country, and I speak certainly in behalf of others because they are also involved, will be able to continue to operate at a time when it is suggested that this Nation is enjoying its highest peak of prosperity.

I have been in contact with Mr. William M. Roth and Mr. Bernard Norwood on this matter and I expect immediate action on this very urgent problem.

For us in Harrison County, W. Va., to lose the Matthiessen & Hegeler Zinc Co. and 350 jobs at this time, and when there is such a mis- mal- and non-administration in this area by the executive it seems to me to be highly ridiculous and certainly incompetence of the highest order.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution of the Association of Industrial Development of Harrison County dealing with the difficulties of the Matthiessen & Hegeler Zinc Co.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. By unanimous consent I insert at this point in the Record the resolution unanimously adopted by the Association for Industrial Development of Harrison County, W. Va., and a letter from Mr. T. R. Ferguson dated September 23 which completely explains why the recent Tariff Commission report on the effect of modifying the escape clause tariff on lead and zinc should be implemented by either increasing the import quotas or by removing restrictions on zinc imports.

A Resolution by the Association for Industrial Development of Harrison County, W. Va.

I, George W. McQuain, secretary of Association for Industrial Development of Harrison County, a corporation, hereby certify that at a special meeting of the board of directors of said corporation, duly called and held at the Stonewall Jackson Hotel, in the city of Clarksburg, Harrison County, W. Va., on the 8th day of October 1965, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas on August 19, 1965, representatives of Association for Industrial Development of Harrison County joined with representatives of the Chamber of Commerce of Clarksburg, W. Va., and others in a resolution requesting some relief for Matthiessen & Hegeler Zinc Co. from the unfavorable quotas on the sale of zinc from imported zinc ore;

"Whereas the quotas are still in effect and as a result thereof the Meadowbrook plant of Matthiessen & Hegeler Zinc Co. today shipped the last zinc it can ship this year under the present quota system, and the company will stockpile zinc until the first of November, but if some relief is not had by the first of November of this year, the company will be compelled to stop production at its Meadowbrook plant, for by the first of November it will have stockpiled approximately $1 million worth of zinc, which is all it can afford to stockpile;

"Whereas the Meadowbrook plant of Matthiessen & Hegeler Zinc Co. was today compelled to cancel all orders it had for delivery of zinc next week and will have to cancel orders for later deliveries if some relief as to quotas is not had;

"Whereas if the Meadowbrook plant of Matthiessen & Hegeler Zinc Co. stops production, about 350 employees will be thrown out of work and, if the plant is actually compelled to shut down, there is small likelihood that it will ever open, and Harrison County will thereby lose one of its most important and valuable industries;

"Whereas the 350 employees who will be thrown out of work by stopping production at the Meadowbrook plant cannot be absorbed by any other industry or industries in Harrison County, and these employees, practically all of whom are residents of Harrison County, will be compelled to seek employment elsewhere; and

"Whereas the closing of said Meadowbrook plant will cause great hardship to the employees and their families and will have a serious adverse effect on the economy of Harrison County and the city of Clarksburg: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of directors of the Association for Industrial Development of Harrison County, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, urged to take prompt action in removing the present quotas on zinc in accordance with the recommendations of the Tariff Commission in its report on this important subject; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, Senator Mike Mansfield, Senator Everett M. Dirksen, Gov. Christian Herter and his Trade Expansion Committee, Gov. Hulett Smith of the State of West Virginia, all members of the West Virginia congressional delegation, and to the heads of such U.S. Government departments as may have a recommendation to make to the President on zinc import or zinc quotas."

Given under my hand and the seal of the corporation, this the 8th day of October 1965.

George W. McQuain,
Secretary.

September 23, 1965.

Hon. Arch A. Moore, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Moore: We know that you have already taken up with the President the question of removal of the existing import quotas on zinc concentrate as the Tariff Commission has so recommended. Our workers, the union, and our company all deeply appreciate the fine attention you have given to this matter which is so vital to us. That which was a serious situation when we visted with you in Washington several weeks ago has now developed into a critical situation. I am now contacting the officials of our union requesting a meeting to work out plans to shut down our plant. Approximately 300 workers are involved.

As we explained to you in Washington, the existing quotas on a quarterly basis do not provide us with enough concentrate with which to smelt metal. Fortunately, we have had reserves which we have been using. Those reserves are being exhausted at this time. The new quarter commences on October 1; and, of course, we will obtain a small amount of ore as our share for that quarter. It will last us only a few weeks.

If we should shut down our smelting plant, we may never be able to reopen it. Here are the facts: We have 20 retorts each with a value of approximately $125,000. As you may be aware, these retorts are very large, are made of a firebrick and carborundum and are used for smelting the ore. If we shut down completely and this brick gets cold, it will crack and be worthless, constituting a loss of approximately $2,500,000. If this should occur, we would not expect to reopen. If we are forced to close down, we would attempt to dead fire the retorts for a while, hoping for Presidential action, but even this would cause us much damage, perhaps a million dollars, even for a limited shutdown.

If we should close down there is also a very practical reason why we could probably not reopen and again offer employment to these approximately 300 people. This is because we must sell our metal in competition with other smelters who own their own mines and are able to obtain ore to operate their smelting plants from their own mines. These smelters are not located in West Virginia.

Our customers would take the position that if we are not able to supply them with metal, other smelters will supply them; and should they once terminate buying from us and shift to other smelters who own their own mines, obviously they would not return to us. This attitude is understandable.

In an effort to do everything to prevent our having to stop operations, we have imported in bond a reasonable quantity of ore so that when the quota is lifted, we could proceed immediately without delay, providing the closing down which we are now preparing for has not taken place.

In West Virginia so many industries have been in vital need of minimum import protection and yet the administration has taken a hard stand against protecting American industry. In this instance, we have just the opposite situation, the case of a commodity in critically short supply, the Tariff Commission having recommended the elimination of the quota many weeks ago; and yet the President has not acted to allow us to obtain a supply of ore with which to operate our plant.

We are hopeful you will be able to get the President to act immediately. It is very critical. We are grateful for your efforts.

Sincerely,
Matthiessen & Hegeler Zinc Co.
T. R. Ferguson, *Plant Manager.*

CLEVELAND COMMENDS CONGRESSMAN ICHORD FOR DRAMATIZING NEED FOR DIRKSEN AMENDMENT

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Ichord] for the dramatic manner he has devised to call public attention to the illogical aspects of the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote ruling. The logical extension of this ruling is the proposition, which the gentleman has put forward, that the Constitution should be amended to reapportion the U.S. Senate on this basis. Under such a plan, the 6 New England States would have their representation cut from 12 to 6 U.S. Senators. I hope this observation will have special meaning for those New England Senators who saw fit to vote against the Dirksen amendment when it came up for a vote earlier this year.

But, if we are to apply the philosophy of the Supreme Court with the even hand of justice, which is the world-renowned hallmark of our free Government, the gentleman's proposal is a logical one. Of course, I do not support such an idea any more than I believe he does, but the gentleman should be congratulated for adopting this novel means of focusing public attention on this serious problem.

CLEVELAND BILL EXPLAINED

I know the gentleman, like myself, is a sponsor of legislation under which the States could, if they chose, select the membership of one house of their legislatures on the basis of factors other than population alone. My bill would allow States to do this only where the citizens approved in a statewide referendum. My bill, similar to the Dirksen bill, is permissive only. It would not require States to reapportion their legislatures on any other basis than population. It would, however, leave the matter to the people and give them an option which they do not now have.

WARREN ONCE IN FAVOR

The reasons for doing this have never been expressed better than they were stated by Chief Justice Warren when he was Governor of California which reads in part:

> They (the 58 counties) are far more important in the life of our State than their population bears to the entire population of the State. In this respect they are comparable to some of the less populous but important States of the Union.
>
> It is for this reason that I have never been in favor of restricting their representation on our State Senate to a strictly population basis.
>
> It is the same reason that the Founding Fathers of our country gave balanced representation to the States of the Union—equal representation in one house and proportionate representation based upon population in the other.

I believe such an approach is essential for the protection of minority rights. My bill, and the others like it, would give minorities a means for defending themselves, at least where the majority of voters in a statewide referendum approved. Without such a provision, State governments, operating under the one-man, one-vote concept—which can never be achieved in fact—will lose their formal power to protect minority rights. All power will go to great voting blocs, often dominated by city political machines. Up-country interests can be overridden by the tide of metropolitan numbers.

MINORITY PROTECTED

Unless the Dirksen amendment is approved, the treasured concept of minority representation in this country will be all but abolished. Only the U.S. Senate will remain to embody the principle. I know the gentleman from Missouri offers his amendment facetiously and as a device to point out the dangerous absurdities of the one-man, one-vote ruling but it is in line with the philosophic movement put in train by the Supreme Court decision. There are some I fear who would take it seriously and it may not be long before it is proposed in earnest.

Let us act soon, Mr. Speaker, to provide a means by which the States may protect themselves and the country from the dangerous impact of this ill-considered ruling.

CONSULAR TREATY WITH THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions in the past month I have discussed the premature and perfunctory approval by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of the consular treaty with the Soviet Union. I am pleased that this committee of the other body has withheld action in bringing the matter to the floor for at least this session of Congress.

A very timely and penetrating analysis of the consular treaty is contained in an article by Columnist Harry E. Dembkowski of the Polish American which I ask leave to insert in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has indicated that he will reopen hearings when Congress reconvenes and permit opponents to express their opinion. I am most hopeful that this treaty will not be ramrodded through the Senate and that a full discussion of its potential problems for us is held at this time. Views such as those expressed by Mr. Dembkowski deserve to receive full public scrutiny.

[From the Polish American, Sept. 25, 1965]

CONSULAR TREATY: ANOTHER DUBIOUS "PEACE" OFFERING

(By Harry E. Dembkowski)

On June 1, 1964, the United States and the Soviet Union signed a Consular Convention in Moscow. This was a treaty calling for the establishment of Soviet consulates in several American cities and, in return, of American consulates in several cities of the Soviet Union.

Eleven days later the treaty was submitted to the U.S. Senate for ratification with President Johnson explaining, "It is hoped that this treaty will be a step forward in developing understanding between the two countries which is so important in continuing the struggle for peace" and that it is "a significant step in our continuing efforts to increase contacts and understanding."

At the same time, by a curious coincidence, the Soviet regime was saying substantially the same thing. And everyone concerned thought that senatorial confirmation would be quick and easy.

But opposition soon arose. Senator DIRKSEN, for instance, called the treaty an unprecedented concession to the Soviet Union. Incoming mail, especially from the Midwest and West, where two of the expected three Soviet consulates would be established, revealed wide disapproval of the pact.

It was an election year and—in a gesture of political chicanery—the Democratic high command ordered the entire matter shoved under the rug until the new Congress convened in 1965.

Unfortunately this blackout action was successful since its opponents, especially Senator Goldwater, failed to make a campaign issue out of it, and a national discussion of the treaty's merits failed to take place.

By July of this year the administration felt free to act. A hearing on the treaty was scheduled by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which is headed by that noted "realist," Senator FULBRIGHT, as a preliminary before Senate ratification sometime next year. But the only witnesses heard were Secretary of State Rusk and his legal adviser—hardly to be considered impartial witnesses—and no one else was permitted to testify.

In controversial matters of this sort it is usually the practice to allow various experts and interested parties the right to testify and offer their views. But, as in the presidential campaign, an open discussion of the issue was muffled. (FULBRIGHT, who controlled the hearings and prevented anyone else from testifying, must have forgotten some words he spoke last year in his famous address on "Old Myths and New Realities": "If we are to disabuse ourselves of old myths and to act wisely and creatively upon the new realities of our time, we must think and talk about our problems with perfect freedom.)"

And there the matter now rests.

The treaty, as already indicated, calls for the establishment of consular relations with the Soviet Union. This in itself would not be unusual or too objectionable since the United States maintains consular relations with many, including some Communist, nations.

Nor would it be anything new. In 1934 we established a consulate in Vladivostok while Moscow opened up consulates in New York and San Francisco. After the war we received permission to open one in Leningrad, but never did. For by then Russian hostility was growing and, after the notorious Oksana Kasenkine affair in New York in 1948, they broke off all consular relations.

Why, then, should we oppose the present consular treaty which seeks—in the words of its supporters—to "normalize" relations between the United States and the U.S.S.R.? Because the treaty contains a number of pitfalls, as will be pointed out in some detail next week, that bode ill for this Nation.

Thus far the proponents of the treaty have failed to clearly spell out to the American people exactly what the treaty contains. Perhaps because they realize that if its contents became widely known, criticism would mount and eventually defeat it. They insist that the treaty is desirable in the name of peace. But "peace" is a handy catch phrase used to excuse whatever concessions are offered to the foe. Enough—far too many—concessions have already been given to that foe.

THE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER IS IN TROUBLE WITH THE LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRIEDEL). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, although primarily of local interest, an incident here in Washington last September 8 points up current complexities in law enforcement which are of national importance.

In violation of District of Columbia law, which prohibits ball games of any kind in the streets and alleys of the city, four youths were detained by two District policemen for playing football in an alley. Scores of persons marched on the stationhouse to complain, and the policemen were later chastised for using bad judgment. The incident assumed greater proportions today when it was reported that a group of Washington businessmen had begun mobilizing support for the two policemen.

Despite its minor nature, the above-cited case involves factors not appreciated by the average citizen. How real and complex are some of the obstacles which confront law officials today was excellently outlined by Mr. Dwight J. Dalbey, special agent of the FBI legal research desk, in a speech which later appeared in the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin of July 1965.

The theme of Mr. Dalbey's remarks contends that the law enforcement officer is in trouble with the law. In addition to legal confusion reaching as far as U.S. Supreme Court inconsistencies, public apathy and the necessity for an increase in police personnel and funds were cited as contributing causes.

Numerous and sometimes superficial panaceas have been offered regarding the issue of crime in our Nation. For a responsible and instructive treatment of the subject, I recommend Mr. Dalbey's fine presentation, "Taking Inventory."

[From the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, July 1965]

TAKING INVENTORY

(By Dwight J. Dalbey, Special Agent, Federal Bureau of Investigation)

(NOTE.—The law enforcement officer is in trouble with the law. Why? Special Agent Dalbey, FBI Legal Research Desk, gives some of the answers to this puzzling question in a speech he presented recently at the graduation exercises of the Southwestern Police Academy, Dallas, Tex., and at the 33d annual conference of the Missouri Peace Officers Association, St. Louis, Mo.)

In the social corporation which we call law enforcement, a comprehensive inventory taking is long overdue. In a comparatively few years this Nation has changed from a principally agrarian society in which criminal offenses where the simple, age-old crimes common to all mankind to a highly urbanized society in which the old crimes persist with new twists and new offenses seem to thrive like bacteria in a laboratory culture.

We have improved our transportation so remarkably that a criminal can leap the continent by air in less time than his predecessor could leave the county by horse and buggy. We have built a communications system so complete that an astute criminal can direct and commit criminal offenses through a network of telephones from coast to coast and border to border.

We have transformed ourselves from a society in which some constitutional rights often were ignored or overlooked to one in which they all are universally insisted upon. We have replaced the frontier law enforcement officer, whose power was measured largely by the bulge in his biceps and the speed of his six-gun, with an organization man who carries a manual of administrative regulations under one arm and a lawbook under the other. The individual now has more power against the police, and the police have less power against the individual.

As stated by the chief judge of a Federal circuit court of appeals: "The two distinct trends in the criminal law during the last 40 years have been to strengthen the rights of the individual and to restrict the powers of the police."[1] Yet the stockholders in this corporation—the citizens at large—have taken little notice of those changes and their effect on the security of each of them in his life, liberty, and property. They do not see the conditions which are sapping the strength of law enforcement.

The obvious proof of our need to take inventory is the expanding volume and intensity of crime, a problem on which Director J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI has endeavored to focus public attention for years. Crime has unquestionably reached the proportions of a public menace in some areas and is threatening in many others. Preliminary figures for 1964 show that crime in the United States increased 13 percent over the same period in 1963. The volume of crime has grown almost constantly for approximately two decades. That fact is not necessarily serious in itself. We must expect a growing population to generate a rising volume of crime. But the volume of crime does not stand alone. It is the rate of increase in crime that is alarming. Since 1958 crime has increased five times faster than population growth. Not only are there more murders, robberies, burglaries, and larcenies than ever before, there are more of each of these crimes and all others per 1,000 inhabitants. In at least the statistical sense, each inhabitant is in greater personal danger from crime than ever before. Public security against crime has hit a new low for our time.

But the cold statistics on crime are inadequate to demonstrate the magnitude of the problem. They do not graphically portray the human tragedy of crime. The cold statistics do not spill the blood of the murder victim before the public eye, nor echo his screams of terror in the quiet halls of justice. They do not express the fears with which many of our people must now live—the fear of the bus driver that he will be beaten and robbed at the end of the line; the fear of the cabdriver that he will be shot in the back for his night's receipts; and the fear of the woman necessarily abroad that she will be attacked either by day or by night. Yet these crimes and others equally vicious have occurred with frightening frequency in at least some of our larger urban areas.

The cold statistics on crime do not reveal disabling injury, financial loss, or a citizen's voluntary curtailment of his own freedom of movement lest he be victimized in the exercise of it. Yet these are the ultimate facts in the menacing growth of crime, and the end result to many a victim is that his allegedly unalienable right to life, liberty, and property becomes a hollow mockery.

An inventory will readily disclose specific facts to show some of our fellow citizens live in constant danger of criminal molestation and violence. In a large eastern city, the newspapers of recent years, and particularly those of recent months, have stated that taxicab drivers are so fearful of robbery that they are reluctant to drive at night; that narcotics addicts, sexual perverts, and other undesirables are driving the citizens from the public parks, and that widespread vandalism is costing public and private concerns millions of dollars annually.

In several large residential areas of modest income, where there are as many as 1,800 apartments in many tall buildings, so many of those who live there have been robbed, raped, mugged, beaten to death, or victimized in other crimes that the men of the families residing there have set up systems of voluntary patrols to guard those buildings during the late evening and night hours.

Violence in the streets, the corridors, and the elevators has thus brought back to some areas of that city a system of citizen police which was discarded a century and a quarter ago with the establishment of the first official police forces. One newspaper stated that "of the many problems disrupting the present and threatening the future of this city, none is more critical than this growing concern and fear over the increase of fear and violence in the streets, the elevators, and the parks."

Nor is that one city unique; other large cities suffer from burgeoning crime. In a different city the newspapers of recent months reported that in two separate sections of the city, alarmed citizens have banded together to set up vigilance and warning systems to protect their people and their homes against criminal attack. "At times," a newspaper reported, "the attitude of the homeowners * * * appeared to be that of a frontier posse."

In that same city, during the month of December 1964, merchants with firearms shot five thugs attempting to rob them in their stores. This was said to be something of a record in the city and reminiscent of the do-it-yourself law enforcement of the vigilantes of the early frontier.

A newspaper in a third large city stated editorially in February 1965 that "Law-abiding citizens here are getting fed up with invasions of their homes by burglars and stickup men. It was bad enough when sneak thieves were breaking into houses and ransacking them for valuables. A new and worse pattern seems to be taking shape; the crooks break into an empty dwelling, wait for the householders to come home, crack their skulls with the butt end of a pistol, and make off with their jewelry."

President Lewis F. Powell, Jr., of the American Bar Association said recently that "When we have reached a situation—as we have in certain areas—where law-abiding citizens are unsafe in their homes and are denied the privilege of using the public streets and parks for fear of their personal safety, we are approaching paralysis in the first duty of government at all levels."[2] And as you are all aware, the President of the United States has shown his concern with this problem.

DEFECTIVE RATIONALIZATION

There are those who seek to rationalize the risk of crime by stating that some crime is inevitable in a free society in which police powers necessarily are limited and that the citizen must assume this hazard. But this easy rationalization has obvious defects. It places no upper limits on the hazard of crime which the citizen must assume in a era of rising crime trends. Moreover, it falsely assumes that the citizen living in some quiet suburb shares the risk of crime equally with those who live in the poorer and more densely populated sections of the central city.

The victims of the criminal are predominantly the poor and those of modest income.[3] It is the weak and inarticulate, forced by economic circumstance to live and work in the areas of greatest danger, who bear the greatest human burden of crime. This is an inequity which cannot fairly be rationalized and which no citizen of this Nation, however safe he may be in his own home, should be willing to tolerate.

---

[1] Judge J. Edward Lumbard, "The Administration of Criminal Justice," American Bar Association Journal, September 1963.

[2] United Press International, Jan. 29, 1965.

[3] New York Times, Feb. 19, 1965.

It would not be amiss at this point to speculate a moment on the future. Within a few years, the city planning experts say, three-quarters of the American people will live in a fairly small number of metropolitan areas, fewer than 200. Nearly 40 percent of the population will live in or close by three monster supercities—one spreading from Boston, Mass., to Norfolk, Va., another from Milwaukee to Detroit or Cleveland, and a third from San Francisco to San Diego.[4] If crime already thrives like a malignant virus in many streets of the metropolis today, what proportions will it assume when those streets stretch out for hundreds of miles?

An inventory of law enforcement will show that the employee of this social corporation—the law enforcement officer—is in trouble with the law. He is in trouble with the law because in many important respects he does not know what the law requires of him. The law often is confused and uncertain, failing to clearly mark out the powers which the officer may exercise and the restrictions upon those powers. This was true in the days of Wyatt Earp and the frontier sheriff, but the official acts of those officers were not required to pass the microscopic legal analysis of the official acts of police officers today.

Now, unlike then, a man arrested for a crime has a right to demand a lawyer from the moment of arrest,[5] and you may be sure that the lawyer will minutely examine the officer's work for any legal flaws which may exist. It is his duty to do so. Now, unlike then, the principal legal questions concerning arrest, search, and interrogation in State cases are questions of Federal constitutional law.[6] And those questions may be raised by the defendant through every level of the State courts and then to the Federal courts and to the Supreme Court of the United States. The legal problems of today's officer make those of the frontier marshal and sheriff look like child's play.

LEGAL CONFUSION

Yet this gaping defect in the law—the uncertainty of the powers which it gives and denies to the officers—goes largely unrecognized and unadmitted, even by those who should know better. When an officer investigating a case of some notoriety makes an arrest on information which the courts later find to be insufficient to meet the Federal constitutional standard of probable cause for arrest, or a search is found by the courts to be unreasonable, the critics have a field day. They say, as one said recently in a letter to a national publication, "Why don't our law enforcement officers simply begin to observe the law and to confine their searches and seizures to those which do not violate constitutional guarantees?"

Let the Supreme Court of the United States answer that question. Mr. Justice Frankfurter said the decisions of the Supreme Court itself on what is a reasonable search incidental to lawful arrest "cannot be satisfactorily reconciled" with each other.[7] Chief Justice Vinson said the law of search and seizure is "replete with perplexities."[8] Mr. Justice Black said it is a matter of "uncertainty."[9] Mr. Justice Clark said it is a "quagmire."[10] Mr. Justice Jackson spoke of the law of search and seizure as a subject on which "This Court and its members have been * * * inconstant and inconsistent."[11]

Or let the senior judge of a U.S. circuit court of appeals answer the question why officers don't "simply begin to observe the law." In the words of the judge: "Police officers need to know their powers to question, detain, and arrest, but Federal law and the laws of all the States on these questions are in great confusion. * * * Reliable guides are usually unavailable, so that no one can say with any certainty what powers the police officer has until the particular case is decided by the courts."[12]

Another Federal circuit judge said a year ago: "I must concede that some of the rules laid down by the lawgivers—including judges—are so ambiguous that even a judge, were he the watchman on the firing line, would not always know precisely what to do to avoid breaking the laws which govern the police. Moreover, they reflect an astounding naiveté concerning the realities and risks involved in searches and arrests."[13] Or, as the judge of the supreme court of a large State said last year: "In the interest of effective law enforcement, law-enforcing officials and the courts of this State must be clearly advised of what is and what is not permissible search and seizure."[14] When the judges themselves find the law confused and uncertain, how is it humanly possible for the police officer to "simply begin to observe the law"?

The uncertainty of the law springs from many sources, and some of it must remain so long as men disagree on what is right and what is wrong. But much of it can be removed by legislation updating our criminal codes, some of them over a century old, to fit modern crime conditions and modern concepts of basic constitutional rights. A few States already have made such a revision.

Some may shrug off the uncertainty of the law as a police problem only—a worry to be left to the police administrators. But it is more than that; it is a problem for the citizen who expects protection against crime. Uncertainty in the law leads to the discouragement and demoralization of police officers, hesitancy in making even those arrests which the law would allow, and, consequently, greater freedom of action for the criminal.

The officer is in trouble with the law because so much knowledge is expected of him and so little training is given to him. It is not an exaggeration to say that the law enforcement officer is now required to be a constitutional lawyer in some areas of the criminal law, particularly those covering arrest and search.

Due to circumstances beyond the control of anyone, many arrests and searches, if not most, must be made on an emergency basis. There is no time for asking a judge or magistrate to determine the existence of probable cause for arrest, or the limitations of a reasonable search. The officer must decide these questions for himself, and in the proverbial split second. Yet these are questions on which the judges themselves disagree frequently, and the *Mapp* decision in 1961 made them questions of Federal constitutional law which can be appealed all the way to the Supreme Court of the United States. But who instructs the officer in these areas of the Federal constitutional law, to say nothing of State law? Who teaches him what the courts, the public, and the critics require him to know? The FBI has done so for many years under a program of police cooperation inaugurated by Director Hoover long ago, but police training still labors under severe handicaps.

TRAINING NEEDED

The vast majority of law enforcement officers have no police academy or other facilities suitable for instruction, and no money in the police budget to provide for systematic and extended training in the law by the instructors available. This Nation can afford many law schools for training judges, prosecutors, and defense lawyers, and it does afford free legal counsel to an indigent defendant. It surely can also afford the facilities and finances which would permit instructors trained in both the law and police work to teach the law to officers who must make judgments of constitutional law and do so in a moment's time and under the pressure of personal danger.

Like uncertainty in the law, inadequate police training in the law is more than a police problem. Inadequate training in the law leads to cases bungled that might have been won, and bungled cases turn more criminals loose on the streets.

The law enforcement officer is in trouble with the law because the law leaves him too little room for honest mistakes in judgment, particularly on the question of probable cause for arrest and the limits of a reasonable search. The law admits the known fact that reasonable men will differ widely on these questions. The justices and the judges of the highest courts and the appeals courts of both the Federal and the State Governments often split 5–4 and 3–2 or 2–1 on these questions. Some differences of opinion are inevitable. Probable cause for arrest and the limitations on a reasonable search are questions of degree, and as Mr. Justice Holmes once said: "* * * when you realize that you are dealing with a matter of degree, you must realize that reasonable men may differ widely as to the place where the line should fall."[15]

When dealing with these matters of degree—probable cause for arrest and reasonableness of a search—it is inevitable that officers of the law, like the judges and justices of the courts, will sometimes make honest mistakes. Not many years ago the law recognized this fact and permitted the officer some latitude for error.

In 1949 Mr. Justice Rutledge, speaking for the Supreme Court of the United States in a decision on probable cause for arrest, said that "Because many situations which confront officers in the course of executing their duties are more or less ambiguous, room must be allowed for some mistakes on their part."[16] But this rule has been changed.

Today the law allows the officer no room for error. If an officer makes an arrest without probable cause or an unreasonable search, he has violated a Federal constitutional right of the person aggrieved by that arrest or search, and the person aggrieved may sue the officer personally for damages in Federal court regardless of any remedy which he may have in State court.[17] This has been the law since 1961. Although a few lower Federal courts are attempting to modify the severity of this rule,[18] the threat of personal suit for damages for an error of law still hangs like a sword suspended over the head of every police officer.[19]

This constant vulnerability of the officer to civil suit for damages leaves him no room for error. In this misfortune the officer is unique. Out of all the vast hierarchy of officials who can and do make honest mistakes of judgment on probable cause for arrest and the reasonableness of a search—the judges, the prosecutors, the magistrates, and the police officers—it is the police officers and the police officers alone who can be sued for damages for that mistake. Yet the police officer is the official to whom the law is most uncertain, to whom the least training in the law is given, and the only one who must make his decision with speed and under pressure.

---

[4] American Directions: A Forecast, Harper's, February 1965.

[5] *Escobedo* v. *Illinois*, 378 U.S. 478 (1964).

[6] *Mapp* v. *Ohio*, 367 U.S. 643 (1961); *Beck* v. *Ohio*, 379 U.S. 89 (1964); *Escobedo* v. *Illinois*, *supra*.

[7] *Abel* v. *U.S.*, 362 U.S. 217 (1960).

[8] *Trupiano* v. *U.S.*, 334 U.S. 699 (1948).

[9] *U.S.* v. *Rabinowitz*, 339 US. 56 (1950).

[10] *Chapman* v. *U.S.*, 365 U.S. 610 (1961).

[11] *Irvine* v. *California*, 347 U.S. 128 (1954).

[12] Judge Lumbard, *supra*.

[13] Judge Warren E. Burger, Court of Appeals, District of Columbia Circuit, lecture at the American University, Washington, D.C., Apr. 17, 1964.

[14] Justice Harry F. Kelly, *Michigan* v. *Bannan*, 125 N.W. 2d 875 (1964), cert. denied Jan. 18, 1965.

[15] *Schlesinger* v. *Wisconsin*, 270 U.S. 230 (1925).

[16] *Brinegar* v. *U.S.*, 338 U.S. 160 (1949).

[17] *Monroe* v. *Pape*, 365 U.S. 167 (1961).

[18] *Bowens* v. *Knazze*, 237 F. Supp. 826 (1965).

[19] LaFave, "Arrest, The Decision To Take a Suspect Into Custody," American Bar Foundation, Administration of Criminal Justice Series; Little, Brown & Co., 1965, pp. 46, 74, 86, 87.

It is true that some law enforcement officers are protected against this danger. The State of New York, for example, has a statute which provides that the State and its governmental subdivisions must assume the normal risk of illegal arrest, as well as other mistakes made by officers, and will pay the judgment assessed against the officer in the civil suit for damages.[20] But the officers in most of the other States are not protected.

The public danger from this condition was expressed by a Federal judge when he said: "We are rapidly reaching the point where a law enforcement officer will be afraid to carry out his authority for fear that he might have to answer in a civil suit for damages. This is a sorry state of affairs, and I for one will not subscribe to it."[21] Another authority put it this way, "If an officer resolves all doubts [on arrest and search] in favor of his own pocketbook, the public interest in effective law enforcement is sure to suffer."[22]

HEAVY DEMANDS

An inventory will show that law enforcement is in trouble because it is chronically undermanned. The thin blue line of police officers has been stretched too thin. Police departments in major cities have been operating at less than authorized strength and are unable to recruit enough men to fill the gap. This is not because there are not enough men in a nation of over 180 million, nor because there is not enough money to pay them in a society so notoriously affluent as ours. The blunt fact is that there are not enough qualified young men willing to take the job under the pay and conditions offered.

We expect of a police officer the wisdom of Solomon in understanding the law, the strength of Samson in arresting a criminal, the gentleness of St. Francis of Assissi in repelling a riot, the patience of Job in dealing with each of us, and the moral purity of Caesar's wife in a nation whose public and private morals in areas outside police work are sometimes open to legitimate question. But we are willing to pay this officer a wage which often is less than that paid to many other employees, public and private, of whom much less is required. We are entitled to make heavy demands upon a law enforcement officer, but he is entitled to be paid accordingly.

An inventory will disclose that law enforcement is in trouble because of widespread public apathy to crime. There is no doubt of the existence of this condition; the metropolitan newspapers record it with distressing frequency. As a California newspaper said editorially, "In the United States, too many bystanders are looking on with enthusiastic apathy and rich, warm indifference as thugs and gunmen rob and beat up old ladies, young girls, and anyone else they choose."[23]

Apathy to the plight of the victim takes many forms—refusal to assist a person being attacked, refusal to be a witness in court, and refusal to notify the police of a crime committed. One year ago a woman who managed a bar in a large city was walking home in a residential area at 3 a.m. when she was attacked by a knifer. Her assailant stabbed her and retreated, then stabbed her and retreated again. The attack lasted more than half an hour and covered 150 feet as the victim dragged herself along the sidewalk. Not until she was dead did anyone call the police, who arrived in 2 minutes and established by subsequent investigation that 38 men and women witnessed some part or other of the attack.

In another city about a month ago, a gang of eight teenagers seized a 16-year-old girl and dragged her screaming and struggling down the subway tracks. Six men stood near one end of the subway platform and did nothing. And in still another city, police officers on two different occasions, needing physical help in making arrests, called to bystanders for assistance, but the bystanders only laughed. As one newspaper said editorially, "One of the most distressing aspects of modern crime and lawlessness is the widening split it seems to be producing between policemen and a part of the public."[24]

In another incident 20 bus riders sat on a bus while a crowd of rampaging young hoodlums smashed eight windows, threw seats into the street, and raced through the bus ripping out advertising cards, and not a one of those riders would give his name and address to the police officer who discovered the crime being committed.

PUBLIC APATHY

The causes of public apathy to crime are difficult to establish. Some of it may be due to cowardice, a weakening of the national moral fiber. Some of it may spring from acceptance of the perverted creed that a citizen who stands up to assist the police is naive, if not a fool, or it may spring from laws and court decisions which create a financial risk in being a good Samaritan. Some of it may be due to an Orwellian dehumanization of the individual in the metropolis jammed with its millions of inhabitants, a dehumanization that will be most pronounced among the innocent victims of crime, for they, unlike the defendant, all too often do not live to see their day in court. And some of the apathy may be due to a comparatively new phenomenon in this Nation, an economic stratification of urban society which may lead to an ever-widening gulf between the powerful and articulate and the weak and inarticulate, both geographically and socially. But whatever its origins, this widespread public apathy to crime must surely be one of the principal causes of crime.

And is it not odd that in an era in which society is increasingly spending its money, its intelligence, and its energies to throw greater constitutional, statutory, and procedural protection around the defendant accused of crime, and particularly the indigent defendant, we have permitted the uninhibited growth of a crime trend which increasingly victimizes the innocent law-abiding citizen who is the human foundation of all law and order? The indigent defendant accused of crime has found his spokesmen, and they have broadened his rights in many ways. Who now is willing to speak out for the law-abiding citizen who asks only for protection against crime and the opportunity of enjoying his constitutional right to life, liberty, and property?

A quickening of the social conscience of this Nation would provide the major weapons necessary to bring crime under control.

The powerful and the articulate in our society would assume their full role as the protectors of the poor and the weak who are victimized by crime. They would demand and approve the expenditures for police manpower, police pay, and police equipment necessary to guarantee police patrols adequate to protect the innocent in the high-crime areas. They would urge and approve the legislation necessary to clarify the criminal law and the police training necessary to familiarize the officers with the powers which the law gives them.

They would provide the officer with financial protection against his honest mistakes of judgment on questions of constitutional law, so that he may act courageously and rid the streets of those whom the formulas of the law say should be placed under arrest. They would willingly take their turns on juries in criminal cases and testify when called as witnesses. They would require of the law a continuing awareness of the fact that the victim of tomorrow's crime committed by the recidivist set free today is neither a faceless anonymity nor a dehumanized statistic, that he is flesh and blood, and that his constitutional rights to life, liberty, and property are the equal of those of the defendant who stands in visibly human form before the bar of justice.

In short, a Nation aroused can reduce crime to its irreducible minimum and protect those who cry out for protection now more than ever before in modern times. But a Nation that is apathetic can destroy the rights of the law abiding, and ultimately itself.

"SHOWDOWN AT SEA"

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the speech given by Vice Adm. John S. McCain, Jr., on October 12 at a luncheon session of the 54th annual conclave of the American Association of Port Authorities, being held this week in Norfolk I believe will be of very great interest to the Members. In view of this I think it warrants being printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

SHOWDOWN AT SEA

(By Vice Adm. John S. McCain, Jr., U.S. Navy)

Since World War II there have been a number of showdowns with the Communists. Many—the Lebanon crisis, the Formosa crisis—were showdowns at sea.

The first major showdown between the Communists and the United States during what we have come to call the "missile age" took place at sea. This was the showdown between the United States and Soviet Union during the Cuban missile crisis of October 1962. It was a showdown at sea because there was no other method of getting missiles into Cuba except by ship.

This Cuban crisis was the first time that America had faced Russia, without third parties such as satellite countries involved. It was an omen of things to come that this confrontation took place on the high seas.

A more recent crisis at sea took place just last September in the Gulf of Tonkin—in the international waters off North Vietnam. U.S. vessels were attacked by hostile craft from North Vietnam. We met the attack with swift but measured response—not only against the hostile craft but also against the bases from which they came. This demonstrated our clear determination to exercise our right to help our ships in international waters.

---

[20] *Snyder* v. *State*, 38 Misc. 2d 488 (1963).

[21] Judge Thomas D. Quinn, *Craig* v. *Cox*, 171 A. 2d 259 (1961).

[22] Davis, "Officers' Tort Liability," 55 Mich. Law Rev. 201 (1956).

[23] Richmond (Calif.) Independent, Feb. 15, 1965.

[24] The Evening Bulletin, Philadelphia, Aug. 4, 1964.

In referring to our seapower during the Cuban crisis, the late President Kennedy made the observation that "Events of October 1962 indicated, as they had all through history, that control of the seas can mean security, control of the seas can mean peace, control of the seas can mean victory. The United States must control the seas if it is to protect our security."

Following World War II, the late Sir Winston Churchill had this to say of another crisis: "Regardless of all else that was happening the Battle of the Atlantic was the dominating factor all through the war, and we viewed its changing fortunes from day to day with hope and apprehension."

These quotes from two great statesmen point up the continuing importance of these oceans in the past, present, and future.

SECURITY RELIES ON STRENGTH ACROSS THE BOARD

There are three basic points that I would like to make on the subject of seapower.

First, we are involved in what I call a total "wet war" with the Soviet Union. This not only includes the naval aspects of the oceans but also the merchant marine, oceanography and fishing industry.

Second, with any further expansion the Communists must move into those areas which are directly influenced by seapower.

And third, the most profound change in the history of warfare has been the extended inland reach from mobile bases at sea. With the addition in September 1964 of the 2,875-mile range Polaris ballistic missile, no spot on earth is beyond range of attack from the seas.

But as a prelude and as a foundation I want to emphasize that this Nation today needs all four services and strengths. This means a strong Army and Air Force and a strong Navy and Marine Corps.

Furthermore, wars are still brought to a successful conclusion by a man with a gun on his shoulder taking over a spot with all his attendant heavy equipment which can only be gotten there by ship. There is no scientific innovation on the horizon that foreshadows the slightest change in this simple little statement of fact.

THREE-QUARTERS OF THE EARTH'S SURFACE IS WATER

Three-quarters of the earth's surface is water. Consequently, it just stands to reason that three-quarters of the earth's surface is going to have a predominating influence on the future of the human race.

The oceans will play a growing role in the defense of the free world in the future. Some people would like to see the United States take a decreasing interest in world affairs and withdraw to our "Island America." But we are inextricably tied to the nations of the free world for our own mutual benefits and we are directly involved in the defense of 60 of them through either direct treaty or military assistance agreements.

The British used the oceans to unite their great Commonwealth and to do so they maintained tremendous strength in seapower. Today we must also use the oceans in the interest of this great oceanic confederation of nations of the free world if we are to resist the massive onslaught of communism which seeks to rule the world.

Almost three-quarters of the earth's surface is free real estate to use in the defense of the free world. The oceans are the best way our national policy can be projected from our own "Island America" without the possibility of international political problems.

If we were to control the seas in wartime, then the Communists would be confined to a limited area of the world. If they gain control of these oceans, then the reverse becomes true.

SEAPOWER'S NEW FOUR-OCEAN CHALLENGE

Future hostilities may require any one of a variety of responses. One is the projection of the combat-ready marine ashore any place where circumstances may dictate. Because of the geographic, political and economic factors we are faced with a four-ocean challenge. This new four-ocean challenge not only includes the North Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, but it also includes the Arctic Ocean to the north, and to the southeast there is a brand new strategic ocean area which I have been referring to as the Afro-Asian Ocean, comprising the broad reaches of the South Atlantic and the Indian Oceans.

DISTANT COMMITMENTS REQUIRE FORCE MOBILITY

Longer distances and new conditions put a new emphasis on mobility. From the standpoint of distances, most trouble spots are thousands of miles from the United States. Furthermore, they tend to be in areas in which we have few fixed bases from which to project military power. The primary method by which we are going to get there is by sea.

The Communists are skilled at devising solutions to meet new conditions. One is the leapfrogging technique by which they move to many widely separated areas of the world thousands of miles from their own borders, in their effort to move toward world domination. The importance of mobility is increasing because of these factors.

There are three types of mobility which we derive from these oceans.

First, is geographic mobility. The oceans are a vast highway and we can range from place to place at will.

Second, is political mobility. When you use the international waters you do not become involved with problems of national sovereignty.

Third, the oceans give us tactical mobility. Our seaborne striking force can be concentrated as a unit or dispersed in many task groups.

These mobile bases have many capabilities. The aircraft carriers, in effect, are self-sufficient mobile airfields. Mobile strategic missile bases are in the form of Polaris submarines. Our amphibious forces are mobile troop bases and staging areas. All ships have an extensive communications capability but we are now building communications ships which can replace an entire communications station on land. One, the communications relay ship U.S.S. *Annapolis*, is already on station with the fleet. Repair ships provide all the facilities for upkeep and maintenance. This entire complex is supported by tankers and supply ships which give our mobile bases sustained staying power.

Every type of military power can be projected from mobile bases at sea—airpower, gunpower, manpower and missile power.

THE PATTERN OF COLD WAR CRISES

A few years ago the areas of cold war crises tended to conform with a pattern bordering the Sino-Soviet bloc. These crises included the Korean war, the Formosa crisis, the South Vietnam evacuation, the crisis at the northern border of India, and the Berlin crisis. All these trouble spots tended to conform with and were in the proximity of the borders of the Sino-Soviet bloc.

World trouble spots now take form in a new type shooting crisis which extends more than halfway across the world. Of particular interest is the entire Afro-Asian area, the free world's most critical trouble spot at the moment.

On VJ Day, political control over this Afro-Asian area was held mainly by five nations—Great Britain, France, Holland, Belgium and Portugal. Most of the problems that arose were settled in five European capitals. Today there are over 40 new nations in this section of the world which complicates the political picture. In Africa alone there are 37 sovereign nations.

As I have previously pointed out, the Communists are particularly interested in these new nations which are sometimes called the underdeveloped countries—both politically and economically.

One sure politico-military means we have of getting at the trouble areas is by sea.

THE COMMUNIST METHOD IN MADNESS

Obviously there is a method to the madness of these trouble spots. The critical strategic areas involved reveal a pattern and a plan.

All four bottlenecks of world sea trade lie in areas of political unrest and uncertainty—the Panama Canal, Straits of Gibraltar, Suez Canal and Red Sea, and the Straits of Malacca.

It becomes increasingly apparent that these strategic bottlenecks of seapower have received close attention from the Communists.

But they haven't lost sight of the "big picture" either. Their overall strategy places equal importance on the merchant marine aspect of seapower.

Of primary interest to them is the fact that there are more than 9,000 merchant ships steaming in the sea lanes of the world every day. Many of these ships are carrying vital raw materials to the United States. If these merchant ships don't get through with their important cargoes, we would be hampered in our efforts to build satellites, B-52's, B-58's, nuclear-powered submarines, automobiles, radios and many other things that depend on the import of strategic raw materials from overseas. I might add that we would also have to do without coffee, something many of us couldn't stand.

In time of war these merchant ships assume a very important role. In the Korean war 99 percent of everything going into Korea was delivered by ship.

Yet, our own U.S. merchant fleet is in a state of serious decline. American-flag merchant ships carry only about 5 percent of our overseas trade. In other words, we are dependent upon ships of other nations to carry 95 percent of our commerce.

We have less than 550 active merchant ships flying the U.S. flag engaged in overseas trade, and this fleet is declining by about 4 percent each year. Compare this to the several thousand ships we had at the end of World War II.

We are presently building about 50 new merchant ships of all sizes. On the other hand, the Soviet Union is building 441 new ships. By 1970 the Soviets will be constructing 670 new merchant ships.

Unless the trend changes the Soviet Union is expected to overtake us in the field of merchant shipping in the next year or two.

ANOTHER VIEW FROM THE KREMLIN

Looking at the world from another viewpoint: For the past 15 years the Communists have been seeking to expand to the east and west. In the first few years after World War II the Communists expanded rapidly. They absorbed the so-called satellite nations of Eastern Europe by simply marching in. In the Far East they seized the mainland of China and its 700 million inhabitants.

As a result, the nations of the free world have determined that any aggression means war. When the strategist in the Kremlin looks to the west, he sees Europe as a peninsula surrounded on three sides by water. He knows that with any movement into Europe on his part, he is faced with our fixed base structure in that section of the world in the person of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries as well as the 6th Fleet with its amphibious capabilities and embarked marines. In addition, it is possible to deploy other units of the defense establishment from the east coast of the United States by sea to bolster the defenses of Europe.

If the Communists move to the east they immediately encounter our fixed base structure in that section of the world, together with the 7th Fleet and its amphibious capability with embarked marines, which right now is operating with other forces off South Vietnam. Also there is the possibility of deployment of the 1st Fleet and other units of the Defense Establishment from the west coast of the United States.

If they try to move to the north they encounter the unfavorable climatic and geographic conditions in the polar icecap.

This leaves only one direction for Red China and Soviet Russia to move—to the south.

Unless restrained, it may be their intention is to do just that. The determination of free people in these sections of the world to resist communism in the face of great hardship and danger is worthy of note.

LEAPFROGGING—A TREACHEROUS COMMUNIST GAME

In order to fulfill their ambition of world domination the Communists are leapfrogging to new areas. Both Red China and Russia are active in Africa, and we know what the situation is in Cuba. The pressure in southeast Asia is constant and unrelenting. And, the pattern shows, they are moving into those geographic areas that come directly under the influence of seapower.

Cuba has become the classic example. Considering Cuba from a strategic standpoint and in line with the philosophy of Adm. Alfred T. Mahan, the great champion of American seapower, this Caribbean Island is within reach of the north and south trade routes between North and South America.

So I repeat—any further expansion on the part of the Sino-Soviet bloc will mean that they have to move into those areas that come directly under the influence brought to bear from the seas.

We saw this proven in the Korean war when we turned their flanks by the Inchon landing. Our naval striking forces also projected mobile airpower and gunpower on the enemy's flanks. When I was the executive officer of the cruiser *Saint Paul* we continually bombarded their lines by steaming up the coastline. Had we not controlled the seas around Korea, and not been able to use our cruisers and carriers and amphibious force, the outcome of that conflict would have been more difficult to achieve.

This same principle applies to the southeast Asian peninsula, the Indian peninsula, the isthmus which connects Africa and Asia and to the European peninsula. In short, the Communists would be faced with all the disadvantages of peninsula warfare without control of the sea surrounding those peninsulas.

One of the significant advantages in the proper military use of these oceans is that there is an infinite number of locations in which we can place our mobile bases around the periphery of the Sino-Soviet bloc. Moscow and Peiping are more than aware of this capability.

THE SUBMARINE THREAT TO SEAPOWER

Let us examine this world situation from still another viewpoint. World War I was a one-ocean war and rotated around the North Atlantic. The Kaiser's U-boat campaign came within an inch of licking us because of the importance of the lowly freighter and its strategic cargoes for the prosecution of the war.

World War II was a two-ocean war involving both the North Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. Hitler began World War II with 57 submarines and came dangerously close to cutting the Allied supply lines.

Today the most critical potential military threat to our vital ocean routes is the huge Soviet submarine fleet, because the Soviet Union has over 400 submarines. Over 25 of these are nuclear powered and of the most modern design.

The real significance of this tremendous number rests in the recognition by the men in the Kremlin of our dependence upon the ocean lanes of communication for the survival of the free world. The Soviet submarine fleet has been built specifically to establish a capability of driving a steel wedge down the Atlantic Ocean, cutting the lifeline between Europe and America. If this should happen it would split the Western Alliance and pose a grave danger to both sides of the Atlantic.

During the Cuban crisis many Soviet long-range submarines were sent to the Caribbean area. In fact our antisubmarine warfare forces persistently tracked these submarines and some eventually were forced to come to the surface to recharge batteries and make repairs.

The Soviets also have missile-firing submarines. At present these are not comparable to our Polaris submarines since they can only carry a few short-range missiles and must come to the surface in order to fire them. But the Russians are presumably hard at work perfecting a long-range underwater missile similar to our Polaris system. Recent Russian claims at great progress in this area cannot be completely disregarded as propaganda. We must attribute to their technological skills the same potential for eventually developing this sophisticated weapons' system as well. Our answer must be an effective antisubmarine warfare capability.

Antisubmarine warfare requires a combination of forces to do the job. Aircraft, surface ships, and submarines are all members of the ASW team. Our ASW forces are built around aircraft carriers which supply fixed wing aircraft and helicopters for patrol and detection. The carrier-based aircraft are supplemented by long range land based patrol planes.

Destroyers now carry new weapons such as the remote controlled drone helicopter, DASH. Submarines can seek out and destroy enemy submarines in their own environment. The primary mission of our attack submarines is ASW. With the recent development of the antisubmarine rocket, ASROC, this killer submarine concept is becoming an extremely reliable thing.

There are many facets of antisubmarine warfare. The problem goes far beyond the simple detection and destruction of attacking enemy submarines. In the first place, if war should come, we would attack enemy submarines at every available opportunity—in the shipyards, alongside the docks while fitting out, in the training areas, while enroute to the target area, in the target area, and on their way back home again.

Also, the Soviets suffer in the deployment of their subs from the discontinuity of their coastline. Their submarines can only be deployed from four basic areas—from the White Sea through the Skagerrak and the Kattegat, from the Black Sea through the Dardanelles and the Straits of Gibraltar, and from the Pacific coast of the Soviet Union through narrow waters between Korea, Japan, and the Kurile Islands. In wartime, we could easily mine many of these narrow waters and also deploy our hunter-killer submarines to lie in wait for the egress of the Soviet submarines.

TODAY THERE ARE FOUR OCEANS

These developments and considerations lead to an obvious conclusion—today our ocean challenges have grown from two to four.

Ocean number one now includes the Mediterranean as well as the North Atlantic and western approaches to Europe. This is the NATO arc of responsibility.

Ocean number two includes the Pacific approaches to the Asian continent and extends all the way from the Bering Strait to the Straits of Malacca.

Ocean number three takes in the great northern reaches of the Arctic Ocean which for the first time in the history of man can be exploited by seapower because of the advent of the nuclear-powered submarine. This was forcefully demonstrated in August 1962 when two of our nuclear subs, the U.S.S. *Sea Dragon* and the U.S.S. *Skate* rendezvoused at the North Pole.

Last winter the Soviet Union announced that one of their nuclear-powered submarines had also surfaced at the North Pole. In any future conflict this could easily become a vast silent battleground between opposing submarines.

Ocean number four is the Afro-Asian Ocean and extends from New Guinea across the Southern shores of Asia and around Africa. This is a brandnew area of importance.

UNITED STATES LOOKS SEAWARD FOR SOLUTIONS

The fact that the United States is no longer self-contained adds to the seriousness of this challenge. We are forced to go outside our continental limits for strategic raw materials. Just to mention a few: Over 50 percent of our cobalt and 50 percent of the free world's copper comes from Africa. Some of our tin comes from the Far East.

Science and technology are now looking seaward for a solution. As the population of the world increases and our resources on land diminish we must look to the oceans for food, fresh water, raw materials, and power. Mankind has always derived food from the oceans in the form of fish. We are now investigating the possibilities of extracting other life-giving elements which are abundant beneath the surface of the seas.

The Japanese are the leaders in this exploration and are now making palatable dishes from such things as seaweed and algae. U.S. scientists are also studying algae-based foods that can be grown and eaten during a long space voyage.

Fresh water supply is becoming a serious problem in certain areas of the United States and will become even more serious in the years to come. Several distilling plants for making fresh water from salt water are already in operation in this country and elsewhere. Witness the highly successful desalinization plant that was recently put into operation at our naval base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, for example. The complete plant, installed in less than 150 days, now provides the base with its entire water needs—two and a quarter million gallons a day.

We have the know-how, but the cost is prohibitive. Recent technological developments in the peaceful use of atomic energy may help, but an accelerated effort in this field is a must.

Our resources in some raw materials are rapidly giving out. The oceans are a vast storehouse of raw materials. For instance, rocklike nodules of practically pure raw materials have been photographed on the ocean bottom. They range across the entire spectrum from zinc to manganese. All that remains is for science to devise economical methods to unlock the door to this storehouse.

ALL ASPECTS OF SEAPOWER AFFECT OUR NATIONAL INTERESTS

From a geopolitical as well as from a military standpoint we have a profound interest in every section of the world. Consequently the importance of the merchant marine to the future of the United States will increase in the years to come.

More than 70,000 miles of vital ocean routes unite the free world and bring together its vast resources. These ocean routes are as fundamental to our own survival as eating, breathing, and sleeping are to the human body. They must remain open.

IVAN HAS GONE TO SEA

Ivan too has gone to sea in the interest of Soviet goals because the Russians recognize fully the importance of the oceans to the achievement of Communist ambitions.

Soviet seapower is modern and it is growing. The Soviets have the second largest navy in the world. They have more than 20 cruisers, 160 destroyers, and as mentioned before, 400 submarines. Most of her ships have been built since World War II.

One ship of particular interest is the Komar class guided missile PT boat. Some of these patrol boats have been given to Cuba and Indonesia. Some of Russia's cruisers are equipped with surface-to-air missiles and several Red destroyers are armed with surface-to-surface missiles.

Communist China has also embarked on a massive buildup of her naval strength.

There is no doubt that these Communist navies are growing with the object of challenging the U.S. supremacy at sea. The Soviet Union now understands the value of seapower and has come to realize that the Atlantic bridge is a vital link of allied strategy.

The Soviet merchant marine is growing by leaps and bounds. She recognizes the importance of the simple, seemingly innocuous looking merchant ship with its vital cargo.

The U.S.S.R., unlike the United States, is almost self-sufficient in raw materials. Yet they have one of the most modern merchant fleets in the world and it is growing rapidly. They have over 1,200 merchant ships today and the signs are that they intend to more than double this fleet by 1970. In 5 years they could have the world's largest and most modern merchant marine. This is in contrast to only 581 merchant ships in Russia in 1954. By 1966 the Soviets will surpass us in ships.

Further, there is a very fine line of distinction between the peaceful uses of a merchant ship and its wartime uses. In fact this line is nearly indistinguishable because the passenger ship, for example, lends itself to warlike transportation of troops. In the Cuban crisis, it was merchant shipping that took the missiles into Cuba and others that took them out.

In the fishing industry, Soviet Russia has invaded every major fishing ground throughout the world and she will soon surpass Japan, if she hasn't already, as the No. 1 industrial fishing country in the world. In that connection, Russia has had trawlers operating in close to both of our coasts. Often, these trawlers are equipped with more electronic equipment than one would normally attribute to just fishing.

Soviet Russia has more than 100 oceanographic survey vessels working worldwide. It is apparent that she has in mind not only the future military uses of the ocean depths but also their economic potential, including mining the ocean bottoms for raw materials.

The fact is that we have just scratched the surface in the exploration of the ocean depths. The *Thresher* tragedy in 1963 clearly illustrated that we probably know less about the ocean depths than we do about space.

We have begun to make breakthroughs, however, and one of them has been with the bathyscaphe *Trieste*. The *Trieste* descended to the deepest spot in the oceans, a depth of over 6 miles in the Marianas Trench, in 1960. This trip was just as spectacular from a scientific point of view as the more widely publicized orbiting of the earth.

U.S. FLEETS ARE DEPLOYED AND READY

At present we can boast of the greatest Navy in the world to meet this challenge. Our U.S. fleets are deployed worldwide—the 1st Fleet in the Pacific, the 2d Fleet in the Western Altantic and the Caribbean, the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean and the 7th Fleet in the Western Pacific, where right now it is in the South China Sea. These forces can anticipate trouble and often their timely arrival in an area of tension is enough to deter actual conflict.

MILITARY MIGHT CAN BE PROJECTED FROM THE SEA

Fortunately, our mobile sea bases can perform an important military function. There is no form of military power that we cannot project from our mobile bases at sea. We can project airpower from our mobile airfields, the carrier. We can project missile power from surface ships and submarines; gunpower from surface ships; and the combat-ready marine with his heavy equipment from our amphibious forces.

For these reasons the Navy and Marine Corps are a basic instrument in the execution of a policy of graduated deterrence.

Seapower is ideally suited to execute a defense policy of graduated deterrence. Seaborne striking forces can apply any degree of military power required.

For an example of a show of force without firing a shot take the Cuban crisis; for putting men ashore to prevent trouble as well as handle it, we had the Lebanon crisis; for air strikes deep inland look at Vietnam; and if necessary we could engage in any size war with aircraft operating from mobile airfields and the FBM submarines deployed with Polaris missiles.

Today the Navy and Marine Corps have more jobs to do than ever before.

First is the projection of airpower deep inland from carriers. Then there is submarine warfare, and antisubmarine warfare.

Another function is in space. The Navy is in space in many areas, but the best known is its Polaris missile program. Polaris missiles are launched from nuclear powered submarines in the submerged condition. The Polaris has been called "an intercontinental ballistic missile in a hole—and the hole moves."

THE NAVY-MARINE CORPS TEAM

One of the most important functions of our Navy is the projection of the combat-ready marine ashore. This involves the Navy-Marine Corps team which is unique in history because of its mobility and the fact that it can engage in all forms of warfare—land, sea, and air. Furthermore, there is a basic maxim of warfare which the Navy-Marine Corps team adheres to: That is, never separate the fighting man from his equipment.

This team, too, is able to fight at any end of the warfare spectrum.

At one end of the spectrum is the "show of the flag." The bluejackets and marines are outstanding ambassadors of good will. When these boys go ashore in the ports of our friends and allies their outstanding conduct inspires in that country a confidence in us to support them in time of trouble. Our ships can also show the flag in areas where the people have never before come in contact with Americans.

And, as I have pointed out previously, we can continue up the spectrum to putting marines ashore to handle trouble, to fight any type of war.

While I am on the subject of our marines and sailors, I must say that everything I have discussed to this point comes to nothing if the bluejacket and enlisted marine does not do his job. And even in this modern age, these boys must be led properly if they are to perform satisfactorily.

This then brings us to a consideration of leadership; possibly the most complicated yet essential subject in military as well as civilian life. Leadership is the supreme achievement of a successful man. And the secret of good leadership is found in the Holy Bible—"Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

SUMMARY

In summary, our free use of the seas will play an ever increasing role in the world situation of the future. It is of primary significance that the Communists, who occupy the world's greatest single land mass, should show so much interest in the sea. You might compare the Soviet Union to a magician. While the world focuses its attention on the right hand which is up in the air or in space, the left hand is carrying out an equally important part of the trick and is in the oceanic pocket.

We have had our first major showdowns at sea and we accomplished our national objectives. Recent world events may forecast more showdowns. The next one could come at any time and thousands of miles from the United States.

We must be prepared to meet it promptly and win. This can be accomplished through strong seapower.

CORPORATE MANAGEMENT INTERLOCKS ACT

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a bill, the Corporate Management Interlocks Act, to amend the prohibitions of the Clayton Act against interlocking directorates. This bill results from an extensive study made by the staff of the Antitrust Subcommittee during the 88th Congress.

On March 12, 1965, the Antitrust Subcommittee published a 270-page staff report, entitled "Interlocks in Corporate Management." This staff report contains a comprehensive study of the legislation relative to corporate management interlocks that has been enacted since the Clayton Act in 1914. It also contains an analysis of the cases that have arisen under all of these statutes. In addition, the staff study contains a vast amount of detailed information on the current structure of interlocking relationships among a representative sample of our major corporations.

The bill that I introduce today follows the model bill suggested in the staff report as an appropriate basis for further study and hearings. In its report, the staff found that there is a scarcity of evidence to show how current corporate management interlocks in operation affect specific business transactions. A model bill that would eliminate, from an analytical viewpoint, known defects in existing law, and which would proceed from a consistent governmentwide policy, was suggested as a basis for going forward in this important antitrust field.

The model bill would serve as a basis for further consideration and hearings, so that the results that reasonably may be anticipated from specific amendments to existing law may be thoroughly probed.

The need for legislation at this time to deal with the problems that exist in the statutory framework that deals with interlocking corporate management relationships is underscored by the following conclusions from the staff report:

> Notwithstanding the assertions that the Clayton Act, in its interlocking directorate provisions, embodied the legislation that had been requested by the President, it has proved to be too restricted in scope to be effective. Section 8, in its coverage of industrial and commercial companies, is restricted to directors and, hence, fails to include all those members of management whose interlocks would have the same effects as those of directors. The provisions relative to banks apply only to horizontal interlocks and do not prohibit ties with the corporations that do business with banks. Industrial and commercial corporations are not prohibited to have indirect rather than direct links, nor are they prohibited from interlocking with suppliers or customers who are not competitors.
>
> In any event, limitations on the scope of its prohibitions, and the easy avoidance of section 8's express restrictions has resulted in a failure of enforcement even as to those interlocks where there is a practical certainty that competition is adversely affected.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The ancillary legislation and the implementing regulations that have been developed to reinforce the Clayton Act's interlocking directorate prohibitions are as much a patchwork as sections 8 and 10 of the Clayton Act itself. From industry to industry and from agency to agency the types of interlocking relationships sought to be controlled, the persons subject to the laws' prohibitions, the tests to be applied for an administrative approval, the penalties imposed on violators, and the administrative philosophies are discrepant as frequently as similar. This condition does not result from a piecemeal application of a coordinated policy. The differences in the statutes and the regulations that have been reviewed cannot readily be identified with an effort to adapt a dominant overall policy against common corporate managements to the particular supervisory requirements of the regulated industries. On the contrary, the differences in the statutes and regulations are more rationally subject to the conclusion that they represent a series of tentative precautionary forays into situations where ultimate goals were not always clearly perceived.
>
> In operation, the body of Federal legislation has not effectively prevented interlocks in corporate managements in the fields it covers.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The regulatory bodies, whose enabling statutes authorized enforcement of prohibitions against interlocks, tended to slump into a pattern where approval generally was granted to industry applications for otherwise prohibited interlocks. Over the years the tendency for a regulatory body to become identified with the industry problems in which it is immersed has manifested itself, insofar as the problem of interlocking managements are concerned, in sympathy for the industry viewpoint. In relation to the multitude of other problems that the regulatory bodies daily confront, the problems of interlocks in corporate management apparently have not been considered to be of major significance.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The staff's analysis of the interlocking management relationships involved in the 74-company sample selected for study shows that the high frequency of management links that generated passage of the Clayton Act, and which was found to continue to exist in the numerous investigations and studies that had been conducted since 1914, has persisted with no perceptible lessening until 1962. It is clear, notwithstanding all legislation to the contrary, that widespread interlocks among corporate managements in 1914 were, and have continued to be, a characteristic of the way American business operates. It is a factual feature of U.S. corporate organization.
>
> In its survey of the industrial and commercial, banking, and insurance categories in the 74-company sample selected for analysis, the staff found that the total of 1,449 directorship positions were available on December 31, 1962. These directorships were filled by 1,206 individuals, 182 of whom had multiple links that accounted for 425 directorships in the 74 companies. These 1,206 directors, plus the 274 officers of the 74 companies that were involved in management ties with other companies, participated in 3,180 management interlocks with industrial-commercial companies, 865 management connections with banks and other financial institutions, 456 management positions in insurance companies, and 105 interlocks with other business organizations. All told, the 1,480 directors and officers of the 74-company sample had 4,428 common management connections in other corporations.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Such a model bill should give effect to the following considerations:
>
> (a) The Government should have a unified and consistent policy with respect to interlocked corporate managements that applies to all types of business in interstate commerce.
>
> (b) This policy should have as an objective enlargement of the corporate managerial base.
>
> (c) Inherent conflicts between the private interests of the individual and the corporation he serves, and conflicts in the corporate interests which he serves as a fiduciary, should be eliminated.
>
> (d) Relationships that reasonably would impair the vigor of competition should be avoided.
>
> (e) Defects in, and omissions from, coverage of present law should be eliminated.
>
> In application of these policies, the model bill should be designed to accomplish the following:
>
> 1. Prohibit any person, directly or indirectly, at the same time, from being a director, officer, or employee with management functions, or having a representative or nominee for such purpose, in any two or more corporations, any one of which has capital, surplus, and undivided profits aggregating more than $1 million;
>
> 2. This prohibition would apply to the corporation or corporations, and to the representatives or nominees, involved;
>
> 3. The prohibition would be operative if any one of the corporations involved were in interstate commerce;
>
> 4. The prohibition would apply to all classes of corporations and to all types of business that otherwise met the jurisdictional requirements;
>
> 5. The prohibition would apply to horizontal interlocks between actual or potential competitors, and to vertical interlocks between actual or potential customers, suppliers, and sources of credit or capital;
>
> 6. The prohibition would not apply to subsidiaries or related companies, or persons, that owned 50 percent or more of the voting capital stock of the corporations involved;
>
> 7. The prohibition would not apply if specific approval were granted by the Department of Justice; and
>
> 8. The prohibition would take precedence over any other provision of existing law.

Mr. Speaker, the provisions of the model bill are as follows:

H.R. 11572

A bill to amend section 8 of the Clayton Act to prohibit certain corporate management interlocking relationships, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Corporate Management Interlocks Act."

SEC. 2. Section 8 of the Act entitled "An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (Clayton Act, 38 Stat. 732, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 19 (1964)), is amended as follows:

"SEC. 8. (a) It shall be unlawful, unless specific approval for such relationship has been granted by the Attorney General of the United States, upon due showing in the form and manner prescribed by the Attorney General, that such relationship in consideration of all relevant factors accords to the maximum extent practicable with the objectives of the antitrust laws—

"(1) for any natural person who is a director, officer, or employee with management functions, of any person engaged in commerce at the same time to hold the position of director, officer, or employee with management functions, or to have a representative or nominee who represents such person as a director, officer, or employee with management functions, in any other person (a) who is an actual or potential competitor, or (b) who is an actual or potential customer, or supplier, or source of credit or capital, or (c) whose principal business in purpose or in fact is the holding of stock in, or control of, any other person in commerce;

"(2) for any person engaged in commerce knowingly to have a director, officer, or employee with management functions who, at the same time, holds the position of director, officer, or employee with management functions, or who has a representative or nominee who represents such person as a director, officer, or employee with management functions, in any other person (a) who is an actual or potential competitor, or (b) who is an actual or potential customer, or supplier, or source of credit or capital, or (c) whose principal business in purpose or in fact is the holding of stock in, or control of, any other person in commerce;

"(3) for any person to be a representative or nominee of any person who is a director, officer, or employee with management functions of any person engaged in commerce so that such director, officer, or employee with management functions may hold the position of director, officer, or employee with management functions, in any other person (a) who is an actual or potential competitor, or (b) who is an actual or potential customer, or supplier, or source of credit or capital, or (c) whose principal business in purpose or in fact is the holding of stock in, or control of, any other person in commerce.

"(b) The provisions of this section shall apply (1) if any one of the persons involved in an interlocking relationship shall have capital, surplus, and undivided profits aggregating more than $1,000,000, and (2) if any one of the persons involved in an interlocking relationship is engaged in commerce; provided, however, the provisions of this section shall not profit any interlocking relationship when one of the persons involved directly or indirectly lawfully owns more than 50 per centum of the voting stock of the other or others, or where 50 per centum or more of the voting stock of each of the persons involved in an interlocking relationship is directly or indirectly lawfully owned by the same person.

"(c) To the extent that any provision of the Federal laws listed herein, and any regulations promulgated thereunder, are inconsistent with the provisions of this section, the provisions of this section 8 shall take precedence and shall be controlling:

"(1) Clayton Act, section 10; 15 U.S.C. 20 (1964);

"(2) Panama Canal Act, as amended; 49 U.S.C. 5(14), 5(15), 5(16) (1964);

"(3) Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, sections 1(3)(b), 5(4), 20a(12); 49 U.S.C. 1(3)(b), 5(4), 20(a)(12) (1964);

"(4) Banking Act of 1933, as amended, section 32; 12 U.S.C. 78 (1964);

"(5) Communications Act of 1934, as amended; section 212; 47 U.S.C. 212 (1964);

"(6) Federal Power Act of 1935, as amended; section 305(b); 16 U.S.C. 825(d) (1964);

"(7) Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, as amended; section 17(c); 15 U.S.C. 79q(c) (1964);

"(8) Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended; section 10; 15 U.S.C. 80a–10 (1964);

"(9) Federal Aviation Act, as amended; section 409; 49 U.S.C. 1379 (1964);

"(10) Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended; section 8; 27 U.S.C. 208 (1964);

"(11) McCarran-Ferguson Insurance Antitrust Moratorium Act, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 1011–1015 (1964).

"(d) Any person who willfully violates this section 8, or any regulation promulgated thereunder, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $50,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or both, in the discretion of the court."

SEC. 3. The provisions of this Act shall be effective on and after twenty-four months after the date of enactment.

ALLOWING WAIVERS OF CERTAIN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the bill I introduce today is done so with regret—regret that the strong intent of this Congress to provide increased benefits to those covered by social security has not had the results it should have had in many cases.

It has come to my attention that many of our veterans who are receiving disability pensions, as well as social security benefits, have had their veterans pensions decreased by amounts tripling the increased benefits provided for in the amendments to the Social Security Act we recently approved.

I could cite many examples, but I believe that one will suffice. A Rhode Island veteran who was receiving $75 per month in veterans' benefits has had that monthly stipend decreased to $43 per month because his social security benefits were increased by $7.10 per month.

This is but one example of many in my State alone and I know that throughout the country there must be many more who are affected in this same manner. I know that it was not my intent to decrease anyone's income when I voted for the Social Security Amendments of 1965—in fact, it was my high hope, and I believe it was likewise with the majority of my colleagues, that all of our social security recipients would benefit from the increase we approved for them. To have our good intentions boomerang in such a manner is particularly distasteful to me and I hope that my colleagues will see fit to adopt this measure I introduce today with little or no delay. In this way, we can speedily correct what may seem a minor injustice, but no injustices were contemplated when we approved these changes in the social security law and certainly innocent people should not suffer because of an oversight in the provisions of the amendments.

DENTAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include a speech which I delivered at the National Conference on Dental Research and Education, Washington, D.C., on October 6, 1965:

THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN MEDICAL-DENTAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION

(Speech by the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, Member of Congress from Rhode Island)

Thank you, Dr. Hine. Before beginning my talk, I want to offer you my best wishes for your coming year as President of the American Dental Association. The dentists of the Nation have often furnished strong leadership in the health field and I'm sure they will continue to do so during your tenure in office.

Let me say, too, that I think this meeting takes place at a most appropriate time. The 1st session of the 89th Congress, now drawing to a close, has made remarkable progress in health research and health education. Combining what has already been passed with what can be reasonably anticipated, I think the title we have been given, "The Health Congress," has been fairly earned.

A number of us here in this room have spent a lot of hours over the years persuading Congress to be realistic both in appraising the health needs of the Nation and in allocating enough money to meet those needs. We've had setbacks during this time but the accomplishments of the past 2 years compensate quite adequately for any previous disappointments.

Strong support for health research dates back more than 2 years, of course, but this isn't true of support of professional education. In this, Congress tended to lag, to hold back. But now we are moving on both these fronts and I, for one, am most hopeful that we will intensify our progress in coming years.

The topic I am to address myself to this morning is "The Role of the Federal Government in Medical-Dental Research and Education." I have only one quarrel with the title. It is, scientifically speaking, 8.3 percent ambiguous. The word "role" has two possible meanings: a factual recitation of what the Federal Government has been doing or a qualitative judgment as to whether it has been doing too little, just enough or too much. I'm going to pay some attention to both these interpretations but I imagine you would agree that the latter is the more significant of the two.

In looking at what the Government has, in fact, been doing, I'm sorry we don't have an exobiologist to lead the discussion. Exobiology—if you haven't noticed it—is a new discipline defined as being the study of life on other planets. I call it a new discipline advisedly since some scientists deny its existence, saying no one has yet demonstrated that it has any real subject matter. It seems to me unduly harsh, if not un-American, to say that a man shouldn't talk just because he hasn't anything to talk about and so I'm going to ignore that particular criticism.

In fact, I'm going to go even further. When I suggest that we could use an exobiologist, I mean one from some other planet. He could help us, perhaps, to see this country in an objective manner, with fresh eyes, without the prejudices we all inescapably acquire through the years.

Looked at in this way, the United States is a nation of some 190 million people accounting for an annual gross national product of about $650 billion and a total labor force of some 75 million men and women. Though we enjoy a median family income of nearly $7,000, other available statistics tell us that one out of every five families is impoverished; that is, has an annual family income of less than $3,000. A considerable number of us, 77 million, are either less than 21 or more than 65, ages during which special health needs are evident.

As a nation, we have, in the past 5 years, become acutely conscious of the extent to which poverty, hunger and disease dwell among us and of what they cost not only in terms of productive capacity but, more importantly, in terms of human anguish and misery. As a nation, we are generally agreed that our health goal is threefold: to prevent as much disease as possible; to control and cure that which we can't prevent and, third, to have a supply of highly qualified health personnel adequate enough that services are accessible to everyone in need. Finally, we live in a society that agrees that health is not just a precious heritage or a pragmatic prerequisite, but a human right. And we acknowledge that both the public and the private sectors of our Nation have a role to play in establishing that right, though there are differences among us as to the nature of each sector's role.

In pursuing these goals we spent, in 1964, about $35 billion on health services, which amounts to 6 percent of the gross national product. Nearly 3 million people, or 4 percent of the total labor force, were engaged either in providing these health services or supporting the provision of them.

Most of that $35 billion represents payment from a member of the public to a member of the health professions in exchange for personal health service within the private practice system. About 5 percent of it, or some $1.8 billion, was spent on health related research. Since 1947, the Nation has spent some $12 billion for health related research. Since 1950, health related research and development has gone from being one-tenth of 1 percent of the gross national product to being one-quarter of 1 percent.

Of the $1.8 billion spent in 1965 for health related research, 25 percent came from private industry; 15 percent came from private philanthropy, voluntary health agencies and miscellaneous sources, and the remaining 60 percent came from the Federal Government. The Federal share is, by and large, funneled through the National Institutes of Health.

In fiscal 1964, NIH distributed some $757 million just in grants and awards. Of the 50 States, New York received the largest single share, $123 million, and Wyoming and Nevada received the smallest, $300,000 each. The top five States taken together—New York, California, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and Illinois—received nearly half of the total amount.

Quite recently, it is worth noting, President Johnson spoke about this disproportion in distribution and directed that efforts be undertaken to explore its significance. I don't need to tell you that this question has been a vexing one for some time; many of you can testify to this personally. There is no question that it needs to be explored and NIH and other agencies should soon be giving it a thorough and unbiased examination. As they do so, however, two things should be clear.

First, whatever the disproportion may mean, it does not necessarily mean that institutions receiving large amounts of money have used them unwisely or could have carried out the projects they had in hand with less funds. Secondly, in extending substantial assistance to those institutions that are now ready to begin mounting a serious program of research, we don't have to assume that the money being given them has to be taken from the amounts now allocated to others.

And that last statement leads us directly into general questions that must be posed before we talk about the specific role of the Federal Government in this area. The questions are these: Are we, as a nation, spending too much in health research and education? Is it unreasonable to talk, as I just have, implicitly, of increasing our financial commitment?

Anyone who would answer these questions affirmatively must then have serious reservations about the current role of the Federal Government.

By way of giving you my answer to them, let me restate some of the statistics already quoted:

We are a nation of 190 million people with an annual gross national product of $650 billion. Many of us are either under 21 or over 65 and consequently have some special health needs. About 20 percent of us have incomes that are generally agreed to be less than is necessary for fully adequate lives.

Of our gross national product, about one-quarter of 1 percent is spent on health-related research, about one-quarter of 1 percent is all that we spend to search out the causes of disease and find ways to overcome it.

I don't think that is too much, and when I say this, I believe I am making the understatement of the century. A much more serious and appropriate question is whether it is enough. I am personally inclined to think that we can do more and that we should be doing more. When I say that we could reasonably be spending four times as much as we are, many of you might think I have finally taken leave of my senses. But let me make that same statement in another way: It would not be inappropriate for the Nation to devote 1 percent of its gross national product to health-related research. Put this way, I don't think the statement sounds so outlandish.

In any case, the area of concern, the area worth talking about here is in the direction of whether we are doing enough, not whether we are doing too much.

Having put this forward as a premise, let me then ask whether the proportionate role of the Federal Government is what it should be.

In considering this, the first thing to be done is to counter the current disposition on the part of many people to talk of the Nation as "us" and of the Federal Government as "them," as if the Federal Government were something entirely apart from and alien to the country. This is, flatly, nonsense. The legislative branch of the Federal Government is headed by men and women who must, every 2 years, present themselves to the electorate to be rehired or fired. Much the same is true of the executive branch. The President, every 4 years, must come before the people personally to have his mandate extended or ended. Every 2 years he goes before the people, in a very real if not personal sense, when the congressional elections are held. The Federal Government, then, is as much a part of the Nation as, say, the automobile industry, and has as sure a finger on the public pulse as does, say, the television business.

Perhaps this sounds to you as if I'm belaboring the obvious. Frankly, I hope it does because that would mean you are free of this prevalent disease of Federal allergy. Now, there are two types of Federal allergy. One is the Birch syndrome and the main symptom is foaming at the mouth when the word "government" is even mentioned. I'm not concerned with that type here. The other one, with which I am concerned, affects people who think in favor of Federal action but don't like to say so out loud. When the chips are down, they mumble. They tend to apologize for favoring Federal action, to talk around the issue, apparently wanting to mask their support. I see no reason to be so shy. The Federal Government springs from the people and is part of the people. Its resources are the people's resources and they ought to be taken into account when we talk about solving problems that afflict the people. To favor Federal action in some area or other is nothing more than saying it is sometimes necessary for all our people to act together at one time and with one purpose.

There can be no clearer application of this than in health-related research. I have never seen a study claiming that the people of Georgia are immune from oral cancer or that the people of New Hampshire have no arthritis or that heart attacks are unknown in Kansas.

Albert Sabin happened to do most of the laboratory work on his oral vaccine against polio in Cincinnati. A good deal of the testing of the vaccine took place in Russia. But I don't recall anyone saying it wouldn't work in South Dakota or Tennessee. Most of the work related to the transmissability of caries has taken place in Maryland, but if a vaccine results, I think it safe to assume that every State in the Nation will use it.

All of which argues toward the conclusion, inescapable in my opinion, that the Federal Government has a strong and positive role to play in health-related research. I have never been backward about saying this frequently and clearly.

This does not mean, of course, that the role of the Federal Government in health research and education is without rules or boundaries. There are stringent rules and whatever abstract worries there may be about the Government abiding by them, I have not yet heard of concrete incidents in health that would lead me to believe the Government isn't doing so.

The traditional division of labor has been that the universities and institutions of the Nation supply the ideas and the workers. The Federal Government, for its part, supplies the coordination to block duplication to the degree possible, reviews applications to see that high national standards are kept in force and, finally, supplies much of the money. There are exceptions, but this is the way most of our research work is being carried out.

The burden of this arrangement, it seems to me, lies most heavily on the schools, not the Government. Ideas are harder to come by than dollars are. You can't buy into being that combination of imagination, insight and industry that leads to research breakthroughs: you have to develop a man who shows promise, give him room to work and have faith in him.

I am well aware of the fact, incidentally, that some dental deans feel that they have done all of those things and then, because there are not enough dental research funds available, the worthwhile applications of these men have been lengthily postponed or even turned back. It would be less than candid for me to pretend that there is an easy or imminent solution to this problem. We are, however, making progress.

This year I was happy to help in allocating to the National Institute of Dental Research a greater sum of money than the original budget called for. NIDR, in fact, received a greater percentage increase in the regular appropriations bill for this fiscal year than did the average NIH institute. True, we may not yet be at the level required to fund all of the many, high-quality research applications being generated today in dentistry. But we have come a long way. In terms of the possible, I hope to be able to continue to help you move ahead. At the same time, you must persevere in providing the flow of ideas that will put pressure on us and make ever more clear the necessity for a higher level of support.

Thus far we have been talking specifically about health-related research. Some of what I have said applies with equal validity to education but let me spend a moment or two talking specifically about that aspect of our discussion.

Enactment of the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act in September of 1963, during President Kennedy's administration, established a new kind of relationship between the Federal Government and the health professions schools. For many years before that time, I and a number of others were pointing out as vigorously as we could that the Government had a definite responsibility to assist the schools that were providing the Nation with its health manpower. Both the American Dental Association and the American Association of Dental Schools have a long, positive record in support of this.

Congress was slow to act, it must be admitted, but the impending manpower shortage finally became clear enough, and critical enough, that it did so. In the 2 years since enactment, 12 dental schools have received construction funds. Of these, one is an entirely new school, nine are engaged in major expansion and replacement and two are involved in less major renovation. Taken together, these projects will increase the number of first-year dental student places by 372. It is my understanding that 12 other applications are presently under consideration which, if approved, would add 325 to 375 more first-year places. The situation in medicine is somewhat the same, with 18 schools having received funds by August of 1965 and some 321 new first-year places being projected by these funds.

Because, as I have said, it took some time for Congress to see the necessity for this program, it is understandable that there is a backlog of demand and the funds allocated during the first 3 years of the program were quickly committed. The 89th Congress has addressed itself to the problem of extending the act for another 3 years and, indeed, the House has already passed such a bill.

The House bill, based on one I was happy to introduce early in this session, does more than merely extend the present law. It expands it in two meaningful ways:

First of all, it provides scholarships to talented but needy dental and medical students, thus supplementing the loan funds already available under the original law.

Second, it inaugurates for the first time a category of grants to medical and dental schools, among others, to assist those schools in improving the quality of education they are able to offer. Approximately $200 million will be able for this purpose during the next 4 years. In the final House version of the bill, an amendment was added to this section tying these grants to enrollment increases. It seems to me an unwise provision and one that runs counter to the basic purpose of the section. Hopefully, there will be a chance before this session of Congress ends to eliminate the amendment by way of a House-Senate conference. Even if this can't be done until later, however, this new grant authority remains extraordinarily valuable in two ways: it establishes the principle of the Federal Government's cooperative responsibility for this vital aspect of our national life and, second, it appropriates a respectable sum of money to underwrite this responsibility. And it does so, I might add, while not encroaching on the school's authority in matters pertaining to the educational process itself.

Another bill I have had the pleasure of sponsoring in this session of Congress might appropriately be mentioned here. It is directed toward improving dissemination of information in the health field. It calls for Federal assistance in rehabilitating existing health science libraries and constructing new ones. It calls for assistance in research and training for library sciences in the health area and for supporting nonprofit, biomedical publications. A version of the measure, called the Health Sciences Library Assistance Act, has passed the Senate under the sponsorship of Senator LISTER HILL and the House will be acting on it, favorably I believe, in the near future.

We have come a long way, then, in the past few years in bringing the Federal Government to a fuller acceptance of what it should be doing in the health field. In all that we have done, it should be noted we have worked in the direction of Federal support for something or Federal assistance of something; we have not been talking about Federal direction of anything.

This is as it should be. It is the type of responsibility that the Federal Government is structurally able to undertake and discharge competently, just as the schools of the Nation are in a position to discharge their share of the responsibility with regard to providing the scholarly environment within which men can think and work and find the answers we are looking for.

And, of course, finding answers is the paramount purpose of all this work. We want knowledge not to contemplate but to use, to use to alleviate pain, to eliminate sickness, to make it possible for all of our fellow citizens to have a healthy, productive life.

I know of no nobler work. We have come a long way down the road toward achieving these goals. It is yet too early to tell, but I think it entirely probable that future generations, looking back on the sixties, may see that this was a time of revolution: peaceful, domestic revolution against poverty, against disease, against ignorance. Few generations have had the opportunity given to us to move so swiftly and progressively. This is an important and exciting time in which to live.

Dentistry is in the mainstream of this movement. The purpose of this conference, as I see it, is to assess what has been done and fix priorities for what remains. I suppose, in what I have said, I have implied a list of priorities that are persuasive to me.

I have also, I hope, communicated to you my conviction that the role the Federal Government has played has been an entirely satisfactory one in terms of the tasks to be shared and that the pattern of partnership that has been formed between the Federal Government and the schools and research institutions of the Nation is a valid pattern and one that will continue to bear fruit for many years to come.

MR. JOHNSON'S INITIATIVE

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, when people want to leave their homeland and seek asylum elsewhere, the reason for their unhappiness is not lost on world public opinion.

Whatever Castro's original intentions may have been, the Latin American Times, of October 5, 1965, has noted, President Johnson's prompt response to permit "those in Cuba who seek freedom" to come to these shores has taken the initiative away from Castro.

Now, says the newspaper, President Johnson's affirmative response "has placed the Cuban government in an awkward situation." The editorial in its entirety will be of general interest. It follows:

CALLING CASTRO'S BLUFF

With his usual flair for the dramatic, Fidel Castro last week pulled yet another diplomatic rabbit from his frayed sleeve. The occasion was a celebration of the fourth anniversary of Cuba's National Committees for the Defense of the Revolution (CDR), and Castro's gambit was a sudden offer to allow a mass exodus of antigovernment Cubans to the United States.

Whatever Castro's original intentions may have been, President Johnson's prompt response to the Cuban premier and his decision to permit "those in Cuba who seek freedom" to make "an orderly entry into the United States" has taken the initiative away from his Caribbean adversary. With characteristic vigor, the President has now put Castro on the defensive.

Prior to the President's announcement on Sunday, U.S. officials and other observers of Caribbean affairs felt that there were two major reasons behind Castro's offer.

One was the Cuban premier's desire to put the United States on the spot. Since Castro seized power in 1959 more than a quarter of a million Cubans have fled to this country, and it is estimated that the United States has spent more than $200 million resettling them.

The State Department has estimated that in addition to those now in the United States, 70,000 more Cubans—many of them relatives of the earlier refugees—are eager to come to this country. They and any others who may accept Castro's offer to leave Cuba would have to be absorbed by the United States.

And despite conflicting opinions among Cuban exile groups as to the motives behind Castro's offer, most of them agreed that the proposal posed a touchy question for the United States. Although wary of the plan, they generally agreed that Washington's refusal to go along with, or at least consider it, might create resentment among the many exiles who want to get their relatives out of Cuba.

The other major reason was to relieve pressures in Cuba. With ever-increasing shortages of consumer goods and food rationing, rumors of civilian discontent and anxiety have been filtering out of Cuba for some time now, and it is felt that Castro may have decided that a mass exodus of sick and elderly Cubans will improve the situation.

Indeed, this latter motive was stressed by Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida, who said the offer was intended to hide "the ruinous state of Cuba's agricultural condition. We know that eggs are rationed and that fresh milk is only given to small children."

Other comments on Castro's offer were equally caustic. His sister, Juanita Castro, said in Miami that "It is a demagogic trick." She also warned that her brother would probably turn the list of applicants over to the Ministry of the Interior for their arrest.

On the other hand, Cuban exile leader Luis Conte Aguero said that the proposal "seems to be the start of a new campaign to achieve coexistence with the United States."

In view of these and other conflicting theories, the State Department reacted correctly with caution and reserve. At a press conference, a State Department spokesman said that if the Cuban Premier were serious about assisting Cuban refugees in getting to the United States, he should make his proposal through diplomatic channels.

Castro reacted to this statement by expanding his original offer. He announced in Havana that the Cuban Government "is willing to offer two daily planes so that those citizens who wish to join relatives in the United States or simply live there may depart in an absolutely free manner."

A NEW LABOR STANDARD: THE ANNUAL PAID VACATION

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act in a new and important way.

My bill will provide that each employee, covered under that act, receives 3 weeks of annual vacation, with pay, for each full year of regular employment. Its purpose is to add a new labor standard—the annual 3-week paid vacation—to our long-established labor standards—the 40-hour week and the 8-hour day.

So far as I can ascertain, Mr. Speaker, no such legislation—providing annual paid vacations to American workers—has been introduced in this House in recent years. Yet there is a widespread and growing interest in the question to which my bill relates—"the manner in which Americans are to receive the benefits of the added leisure time resulting from the rapidly increasing productivity of our economy."

As our economy's technology has progressed and as our labor and capital equipment have become more and more productive, workers have had opportunities to take the rewards of increased productivity in the form of higher wages, or shorter working hours, or some combination of both. Historically, a combination of the two benefits has been the preferred choice. As a result, the real earnings of American workers have risen greatly over the years, while working hours have been falling.

There is every reason to believe, Mr. Speaker, that Americans will continue to prefer to take the gains of increased productivity in the form of a combination of higher income and greater leisure time. Accordingly, careful consideration should be given to all—not just one or two—of the major options available to us with respect to a reduction in working hours.

Up to now, our attention has been rather narrowly focused on only one option—the shorter workweek. Those who have advocated legislation designed to give more leisure to American workers have confined themselves almost exclusively to one formula—a cut in the standard workweek, from 40 hours to 35 or 32 hours.

I, of course, am among those in the Congress who have most strongly argued that the standard 40-hour week now needs a downward revision, particularly in view of the dramatic labor-displacing impact of automation. In fact, I have introduced legislation, for quite a few years, to establish a 32-hour week. Between June and December of 1963, the Select Subcommittee on Labor, under my chairmanship, held what I believe to be the most extensive congressional hearings in our history on the question of establishing a shorter workweek along with the possibility of increasing the rate for overtime.

But, Mr. Speaker, I recognize there are other ways in which the leisure of American workers can be increased, in addition to cutting hours of the workweek. One of the most obvious, and attractive, of these other options is the reduction of annual working hours—by granting workers substantial paid annual vacations.

By introducing this bill to provide annual vacations under the Fair Labor Standards Act, I am seeking to give the shorter workyear its rightful place among the various possibilities now being studied for reductions in hours of work. Certainly this proposal to lengthen the average annual paid vacation and to extend the benefit of an annual vacation to millions of workers not now enjoying it deserves to receive full and thorough attention from the Congress.

There is no doubt in my mind that we will—and in the not distant future—take the long-delayed step of enacting legislation designed to bring hours of work down below the national standard established 27 years ago by the passage of the Fair Labor Standards Act. In framing such legislation, we should not be shortsighted. Instead, we should diligently and imaginatively seek that form, or combination of forms, of reduction in working hours which will be most appropriate for a society with continually rising aspirations for the well-being of its people.

I wish to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that a required paid annual vacation of 3 weeks, for all full-time annual workers covered under the Fair Labor Standards Act, can be advocated as a complementary proposal to accompany the proposal for a shorter workweek. The provision of an annual vacation to each American worker is an obviously desirable social goal, whether the standard workweek be set at 40 hours, 35 hours, or less. A cutback in the number of hours of work per day—or per week—cannot really substitute for a vacation—since only the vacation gives the worker an extended, continuous period of time free from work obligations.

Moreover, the satisfaction received by a worker and his family cannot be mechanically measured by merely counting the total number of hours of additional leisure time which the worker may gain from new labor standards legislation. The increase in satisfaction will also be greatly affected by the way in which those additional hours are distributed. The case for a required annual vacation, therefore, would still remain strongly persuasive if the present 40-hour workweek should be lowered by amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Of course, one major purpose of this proposal, for an annual paid vacation, is to encourage additional employment by reducing—on an annual basis—the average hours of work per employee. Basically, this the same purpose that has motivated the proposals for a reduction in the standard workweek and for an increase in the overtime premium rate.

But a second purpose—and, over the long run, probably the more important—is to provide an annual paid vacation to millions of additional Americans; to lengthen the standard period of vacation sufficiently to enable a greatly increased number of workers and their families to enjoy much broader opportunities for visits to resorts and national parks, and other forms of recreation, especially those involving travel.

These extended travel and recreational opportunities are becoming increasingly important to the American people, as the continuing rise in income levels enables more and more families to enjoy the vacation trips which were once the privilege of a small minority.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we can make a very significant contribution not only toward the creation of additional jobs, but also toward a very meaningful enhancement of the enjoyment of life for millions of American families by establishing a new labor standard of a required annual 3-week paid vacation. I hope that the proposal embodied in my bill will be given strong consideration by the Congress, as it takes up the question of amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act.

LEST WE FORGET

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, for those of us who remember the anguish and travail of World War II, and the reasons for which we fought and died, the following article in the Antidefamation League bulletin for September is must reading.

In light of the resurgence of German nationalism and other problems in Europe this report is important to us to keep us from becoming smug and complacent about the possibility of a reoccurence of the same events that preceded and took place during World War II.

Our country needs to know what the true picture is as we continue in our involvement and confrontation with Europe.

The article follows:

Are Europe's Jews in Danger—Synagogues Burned, Cemeteries Desecrated, Neo-Nazi Conspiracies Uncovered—What and Who Is Behind the Rash of Anti-Semitic Incidents?

(Note.—This article is based on the reports and analyses of Jack Baker, director of ADL's department of foreign research. He is currently in Europe on a study mission.)

In Bamberg, Germany, swastikas and anti-Jewish slogans were smeared on a granite memorial for a Nazi-destroyed synagogue a few hours before it was to be unveiled. Forty-eight hours later, American tourists visiting the city's ancient Jewish cemetery discovered that vandals had desecrated 23 gravestones with 3-foot high swastikas, the lightning insignia of Hitler's SS guard, and such taunts as "6 million Jews were too few."

In England, a synagogue at Brondesbury, a London suburb, was destroyed by arson; gasoline and bomb attacks were made on other Jewish houses of worship, and threats of attack were made against still more.

In Stockholm, Sweden, newspaper reporters exposed a neo-Nazi plot to overthrow the government and liquidate the country's most prominent Jews.

The disturbing incidents took place within the past 4 months. They were reported around the world under such headlines as "New Nazi Terror," "More Synagogues Attacked," and "Swedish Nazis." Is the spate of European anti-Semitism a sign of a powerful, organized conspiracy, or a nuisance phenomenon that can be ignored? An examination of recent anti-Semitic incidents shows neither appraisal to be accurate.

These things happened in Germany since the Bamberg cemetery desecration on June 15:

In Bamberg, vandals painted a swastika and anti-Semitic sloagns on one of the city's statues; yellow paint, the color of the Star of David Jews were forced to wear by the Nazis, was smeared on the local Jewish cultural center; "To the gallows with the Jew accomplice, Erhard," and the SS motto "Our honor is faithfulness," were two of the Nazi slogans painted on a statue near the sports arena; anti-Jewish stickers were pasted on buildings; paint was spilled on a synagogue memorial; swastika, Sieg Heil, and the letters "SS" were painted on the walls of a U.S. Army munitions depot; yellow paint was sprayed on the sign of a textile concern owned by a leader of the Jewish community; a placard with anti-Jewish slogans was attached to a bridge over an autobahn 22 miles from the city.

In Neuss, "We will march further" and "Heil Hitler" was painted on the sidewalk in front of a Jewish monument; in Coblenz, a memorial on the site of a former Jewish cemetery was desecrated; in Weissenthurm, plantings at the Jewish cemetery were uprooted.

In Heilbronn, swastikas were found on walls and buildings; in Kappeln, a Nazi flag was flown at a public school; in Bonn, swastikas were painted on suburban houses and cars.

In Munich, swastikas and the words "Jews get out" were chalked on walls, sidewalks, and advertisting posters; in Erpting, five tombstones in the Jewish cemetery were desecrated; in Burchhausen-Vilsen, swastikas were daubed on streets.

That the majority of the incidents took place in Bamberg is perhaps ironic since this was the city where Hitler was greeted with a shower of eggs and tomatoes when he visited it prior to his seizure of power. But although Bamberg citizens have been described as having been opposed to Hitler, the city is in the Province of Franconia, which was Julius Streicher's territory, and of a once thriving Jewish community, only 70 Jews remain.

After World War II, the area became a center for extreme nationalist activities carried on by such groups as the Deutscher Block, which is politically inconsequential today but was, in the early fifties, part of the neo-Fascist European Liaison Group. The latter now operates under the name of European New Order and is the most militant racist anti-Semitic organization in Europe.

Bamberg was also the headquarters for the International Viking Movement, headed by 26-year-old Wolfgang Kirchstein, the editor of a small hate sheet who cooperates with George Rockwell's American Nazi Party, with Dan Burrows, neo-Nazi editor of the Free American, published in New York, and with this country's National States Rights Party. Kirchstein was indicted early this year for disseminating anti-Semitic literature (a punishable crime under German law), and was sent to prison.

To what extent the rantings of a Kirchstein triggered the Bamberg vandalism is hard to determine. The 20-year-old unemployed dental technician arrested for desecrating the synagogue memorial is the son of a former SS officer. No link between him and Kirchstein has been found.

A Protestant weekly newspaper, Christ and Welt, defended the city of Bamberg after pointing out that "the impression of new anti-Semitism has not been eradicated either by the establishment of city wardens, the demonstrative laying of wreaths on the Jewish cemetery, protest rallies, or condolence lists." Declaring that "as far as foreign countries are concerned, Bamberg has become synonymous with a revival of the German past," the newspaper said the city does not deserve "such an unpleasant reputation."

And, indeed, the incidents in Bamberg horrified its residents. Embarrassed officials, fearful that the memorial desecration would touch off a worldwide epidemic of anti-Semitic acts like the one after the 1959 Christmas Eve defacing of the Cologne synagogue, had the stone scrubbed clean and tried to keep the affair quiet. When it was followed by the cemetery desecrations, Bamberg citizens, who are mostly Roman Catholic, reacted with anger, sadness and shame. Their youth laid wreaths inscribed "Forgive us, brothers" at the violated headstones. City flags were flown at half mast. Townspeople were summoned by the bells of Bamberg's cathedral to an "atonement rally" in the marketplace. Braving a rainstorm to attend, 5,000 heard the appeal by the lord mayor: "I beg our Jewish citizens not to blame all Bamberg." In addition, police and civilians were marshaled to guard the property of the city's Jews.

An analysis, prepared by the Federal Department of Interior, of all anti-Jewish activities in West Germany during the past 5 years showed that—

"Daubing of public buildings, etc., with swastikas and anti-Semitic slogans constitutes about one-third of anti-Semitic acts. Others include threats and insults to Jewish citizens; illegal poster and leaflet campaigns; the desecration of cemeteries; and public disturbances.

"Daubing activities are a seasonal phenomenon, prevalent between April and October.

"Daubing activities accelerate whenever a case is dealt with in detail by the mass media, or when certain critical situations are discussed at great length over a period of time, as for example, the Eichmann trial; the deterioration of relations between the German Federal Republic and the Arab States; the establishment of diplomatic relations with Israel; the extension of the statute of limitations for Nazi crimes."

In England, Jewish defense committees have been formed to stop the rash of attacks on synagogues, mostly in the London area. More than 20 have been set afire. At the Ilford synagogue, for example, flammable liquid was poured on the building; the blaze blew out the windows and damaged the floor and woodwork. Scrawled on the walls were the slogans "Heil Hitler," and "We shall free Britain from Jewish control."

In Southgate, also a London suburb, where gasoline was poured through a synagogue window, the rabbi attributed the fire to the work of the so-called Ku Klux Klan or some similar element.

During the past 10 years some 800,000 "colored" workers and their families have arrived in England from the West Indies, India, and Pakistan. Sociopolitical problems stemming from the situation have been used by racist groups to stir hatred against the newcomers and at the same time, against Jews—whom they hold responsible for "mongrelization of the British race." A newly formed English Ku Klux Klan is reported to have chapters in London, Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool, and Leicester—and ties with U.S. Klan leader Robert Shelton.

But at the inaugural meeting last June of the Birmingham Klan, only 16 people showed up—described by a reporter as being young, wearing "sideboards," "shades" (sunglasses), and wearing black leather jackets. Almost all were former supporters of Colin Jordan, the British "Fuehrer" who, together with Rockwell, operates the so-called World Union of National Socialists. According to the reporter, talk at the meeting centered around "mongrelizing the British race," "the silent black invasion," "the Jewish financiers," and a hoped for visit from the American Klan's Grand Wizard Shelton—a remote possibility since the British Home Secretary won't let him into the country.

Although the Jewish community is concerned about the attacks, most Jewish leaders are careful not to exaggerate the incidents. The London Jewish Chronicle also took this stand:

"Recent attacks on synagogues are bound to give rise to concern in the community but it is important to maintain a sense of proportion. So far, there is ample evidence to show that these activities are the work of a small number of crackpots; it takes only a few to undertake daubing or vandalism. Anyone who tries to magnify these incidents into a wave of anti-Semitism is doing a disservice to the community."

Sweden, for many years, has been an important center of neo-Nazi activities. The European Social Movement, a conglomeration of Swedish, German, French and Italian, neo-Nazis and fascists, was formed there in 1951.

The Nordic Reich Party has a "Fuehrer" in Sweden and one in Norway. Last April, "Nordisk Kamp," organ of the Swedish branch, had a cover picture of Hitler and an editorial proclaiming that "In the end Adolf Hitler will win World War II."

Einar Alberg, founder of the Swedish Anti-Jewish Fighting League, has been frequently prosecuted by the Swedish Government but continues to distribute anti-Semitic leaflets in several languages.

Despite this background, the tale of the plot to overthrow the Swedish Government and liquidate the nation's Jews, reads like a satire on international intrigue.

The Stockholm Expressen exposed the story, after receiving a tip from a Swedish Jew who had infiltrated a secret right-wing group. After 2 months of sleuthing, Expressen reporters had a long, complicated story about a strutting would-be Fuehrer named Bjorn Lundahl, links to Arab plotters, hidden arms, and plans to kill leading Swedish Jews "by drug injections," with their bodies to be disposed of in an incinerator plant outside Stockholm.

Lundahl, head of the C. E. Carlberg Foundation, a neo-Nazi front, had a Klan membership card signed by Imperial Wizard Sherman Miller of Waco, Tex. According to the card, Lundahl had been appointed "Grand Dragon of the Aryan Knights in the Realm of Sweden"—a figment of Miller's imagination. The Texas Klan leader, who died several years ago, supplied hate literature to racists and anti-Semites around the world.

Working by flashlight in the downtown Stockholm headquarters of the neo-Nazi group, the Expressen reporters photographed documents, anti-Semitic tracts, Nazi flags, busts of Hitler, and a cache of weapons and ammunition. One of the documents was a pledge signed by Lundahl promising to "help Egypt with a Swedish army of 5,000 infantrymen, completely equipped, against Israel." Lundahl, who had had numerous meetings with Kamel Hamed, former first secretary of the Egyptian Embassy in Stockholm, also pledged that "after seizing power in Sweden, we will confiscate Jewish property, arrest all enemies of the Egyptians, prohibit Jewish immigration to Israel and solve the Jewish problem with Egyptian assistance."

About to break their story, but worried that Lundahl might be wise to them, the reporters had a phony message delivered to him which sent the Fuehrer on a wild goose chase to a town near the Finnish border where, the message said, Cairo agents would meet him. While he was away, the reporters handed in their story and the Expressen notified police. Lundahl has been arrested and charged with "armed threat against lawful order," an offense that could jail him for 10 years.

Stockholm newspapers praised the Expressen and the police for "a fine capture," voiced concern about Sweden's image abroad, and consternation about the link to the United Arab Republic. One paper, in an editorial entitled "A Handful of Madmen," said:

"The whole matter is unpleasant—partly because it has gone on for such a long time, partly because 20 years after Hitler, there are those who dream about a return to Nazism.

"However, there is reason to look coldly on the matter, for what it is in reality is just visionary delusions of a little group of misguided and idiotic people who are no danger to Swedish democracy. The cleanest animal can be struck with a few lice in his fur—and it is important that the vermin be checked and, if possible, removed. In fact, this is what the whole matter amounts to."

To those who can never forget another "handful of madmen" the fact that activities of European neo-Nazi groups do seem to be expressions of irrational impulse rather than planned, well-organized action, is nevertheless a shattering reminder that fanatic hatemongers still exist, and still try to inject others with their poison.

The situation was perhaps best summed up in the July edition of Deutschland-Berichte:

"Those who allege that anti-Semitism is dead are either liars or fools. Anti-Semitism is a sociopsychological phenomenon which exists just as obviously as disease or criminal tendencies. * * * The swastika neurosis can be dealt with effectively. The more dangerous and concealed cancer of anti-Semitism must be cured with the therapy of intellectual conviction and psychological persuasion."

WAKE UP, AMERICA, OUR MERCHANT SHIPBUILDING IS SINKING

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to a matter that gives me great concern; that is, the continuing national policy to deemphasize the importance of our

American shipbuilding industry and to adopt a new build-abroad philosophy which, in my opinion, is completely destructive of our national interests.

Mr. Speaker, I predict that if this national policy of shipbuilding is put into effect, it will ultimately lead to the destruction of an already crippled U.S.-flag shipping industry.

My comments on this matter follow:

WAKE UP, AMERICA, OUR MERCHANT SHIPBUILDING IS SINKING

Today I sound a warning concerning the continuing national policy to deemphasize the importance of American shipbuilding and to adopt a new build-abroad philosophy which is completely destructive of the merchant shipbuilding interests in this country. I predict that if this national policy is put into effect, it will ultimately lead to the destruction of the U.S.-flag shipping.

Ever since coming to Washington as a Member of the 89th Congress, I have been repeatedly alarmed by the national tendency to give preferential patronage to foreign-flag shippers, particularly as it affects shipments under the Department of Commerce programs, and under Public Law 480, the Food for Peace Act. On top of this, reports have recently been received that the Department of Commerce recommends the elimination of passenger ships under the American flag and approves widespread construction of ships in foreign shipyards, the ultimate effect of which would finish off our own American shipbuilding industry and our American-flag shipping. I am convinced that there is a very studied effort being conducted here in Washington to secure the repeal of our cargo preference laws, which would give the Departments of our Federal Government unrestricted ability to patronize without restraint, foreign-flag vessels. I do not believe this to be in the interest of the U.S. shipbuilding industry, and I would predict this ultimately would adversely affect our economy and undermine the national security.

At times when the national defense was imperiled, it has cost America many billions of dollars to build vessels capable of meeting our cargo space requirements. In a time of national emergency, the United States of America would be completely at the disposal of foreign-flag merchant marine vessels to provide our military sea transportation service. Yet, despite the experience we have had in two World Wars and the Korean conflict, the United States of America has apparently not yet learned the lessons of the past and has permitted Government policy on our American shipping fleet for national defense to deteriorate.

I recoil with disgust at the announced intention of the Maritime Administration of the United States to promote the idea of building U.S.-flag vessels in foreign shipyards at a time when the U.S. shipyards are closing down one by one. Our Defense Department is exploring the possibility of having $50 million worth of noncombatant vessels built abroad, and the Interior Department is seeking Federal authority or approval to have fishing trawlers built in Communist Poland.

The phasing out of our American shipyards seriously destroys our Nation's maritime shipbuilding capacity and seriously reduces our ability to preserve essential skills and crafts. What is needed in 1965 is the same conviction and leadership as was demonstrated by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Hugo Black, Joseph P. Kennedy, and Emory Land, who in 1936 pushed a Merchant Marine Act through a reluctant Congress. Today, not only is our national security involved in this issue, but also the security of the free world.

FEDERAL VIOLENT CRIMES COMPENSATION COMMISSION

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, in the past several years, the entire problem of criminal justice has become subject to widespread reevaluation. Recent Supreme Court decisions, and controversy over these decisions, have quickened the tone of debates in which the rights of criminals, the procedures for just application of criminal statutes, and remedies for outdated legal practices have all undergone careful scrutiny.

At the same time, of course, there has been widespread concern about the growing national crime rate, and increased violence in many of our cities. So there is a mood of introspection and joint inquiry among those interested and committed to the prevention of crime and the proper execution of enlightened criminal justice.

A valuable addition to this debate was made, I believe, when Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas, introduced legislation dealing with the very unusual problem of compensation for victims of violent crimes. On June 17 of this year, Senator YARBOROUGH announced his sponsorship of a bill designed to establish a Federal Violent Crimes Compensation Commission. I am today submitting such legislation to the House of Representatives in the hope that it may be acted favorably upon by the Congress, and that it will stimulate debate on a neglected topic in criminal justice.

The question we should raise is quite simple: Have we overlooked the victims of crimes in our concern with finding equitable and effective policies dealing with the criminal?

The injustice of the present system can be very directly demonstrated. A worker disabled as a result of an industrial accident, for example, can often receive thousands of dollars of compensation, even if his negligence was partly responsible for the accident. Yet an innocent citizen, suddenly set upon violently for purposes of robbery or senseless brutality, is without any compensation for injuries caused by circumstances entirely outside his control. What sort of future do such victims face? Without adequate compensation, they must pay for extensive medical and hospital treatment. Their families may often bear added financial burdens in the absence of wages. The lives of these victims may be permanently blemished, all without any recourse to minimal compensation.

The idea that victims of certain crimes be eligible for some sort of compensation has a long history in the Western tradition of jurisprudence. Ancient penal codes in Babylon, Israel, Greece, Rome, and Anglo-Saxon England required that the criminal in one way or another reimburse the victim with money or property. Colonial Connecticut and Massachusetts also had procedures for such compensation. But the frequent inability of criminals to reimburse victims has always proved the major obstacle to a systematic program of compensation.

It is time that the modern social welfare state take up its responsibilities in this area. Since the modern state takes as its responsibility the protection of its citizenry and prosecution of criminals, it is fitting that it offer compensation to victims of criminal violence. Great Britain and New Zealand have already made steps in this direction. We should do likewise.

Our entire legal and criminal code now rejects the anarchy of eye for eye, tooth for tooth formulations of law enforcement. Punishment of the criminal rests in the hands of the State. We judge that the victim, or that a self-styled group of citizen vigilantes, has neither the right nor the resources to decide the fate of criminals. These same principles ought to apply in the difficult problem of compensating victims.

Recently, former Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg argued that the victim of a crime of violence "has been denied the protection of the laws in a very real sense, and society should assume some responsibility for making him whole." There is no program, procedure or mechanism for such action, however necessary we may acknowledge it to be. While we have adopted a more modern and enlightened system to deal with criminals, our procedures for reimbursing the innocent victims of crimes of violence are medieval.

I am today introducing a bill designed to establish a Federal Violent Crimes Compensation Commission which would consider the claims of victims of criminal violence. The Commission would be empowered to examine the cases of such victims, to determine the right and degree of compensation. It would be composed of three men, chosen by the President on the basis of experience and concern for problems of criminal justice. Upon determination of just claim, the Commission would set a figure for compensation not to exceed $25,000. This determination would be considered final.

As of now, it is only possible to make this legislation applicable to areas of the country subject to Federal jurisdiction; in other words, the District of Columbia, and special maritime or territorial jurisdictions of the United States. In no way will this legislation impinge upon the jurisdictions and rights of the States. On the other hand, passage of such a bill for Federal jurisdictions would, I hope, have strong effect upon the States, encouraging them to adopt similar plans. Already the State of California has established a program for compensation of the victims of violent crimes.

It is altogether proper that modern criminal law be vigilant in the defense of the rights of accused and convicted criminals. In no way is this an improper emphasis. I suggest, however, that the same principles which commit us to criminal justice also oblige that we seek to meet the just claims of victims of violent crimes.

The establishment of a Federal Violent Crimes Compensation Commission represents a major innovation in our legal institutions. It nevertheless would be an outstanding contribution to the machinery of social and legal welfare.

TRIBUTE TO JACK O'BRIEN

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, Jack O'Brien was a humanitarian, a man of great social conscience, an outstanding labor leader in our Nation, and a man I was proud to call my friend.

His death brought to a close a full and rewarding career.

Roy Siemiller, international president of the Machinists, described Jack O'Brien as a man who "possessed unique understanding of the political processes of America, boundless energy, phenomenal capacity for accomplishment, and passionate commitment to democratic principles."

He served his State government in Montana, worked for a period of time in private industry, and worked in Federal service with the Office of Price Administration, coming to Washington as chief of field operations of OPA's information department.

For the past 12 years, he had worked tirelessly as the national coordinator of the Machinist Nonpartisan Political League. He worked closely with President Siemiller to develop the Machinists union into one of the Nation's most potent liberal forces in the political arena.

Jack O'Brien had a keen interest in the political process and acted as director of the late Senator Estes Kefauver's bid for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1952.

I am sure that the Members of the House join me in expressing our most sincere sympathy to his widow, Mrs. Ruth Vick O'Brien at this time of great personal sorrow.

TWENTY-EIGHT YEARS IN THE EVOLUTION OF FEDERAL AID FOR HEALTH FACILITIES AND PROFESSIONAL MANPOWER

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the approval of the President's proposal for the establishment of regional medical centers for the diagnosis and treatment of heart disease, cancer, and strokes and the approval of the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act amendments of 1965 represent major advances toward our goal of training a sufficient number of professional personnel and making available comprehensive treatment facilities to meet the health needs of the Nation.

The first of these measures will make the best modern medical care available to a greater number of people than ever before. It will also provide for advanced training for physicians in the diagnosis, care, and prevention of these three major diseases. The second, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act amendments, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor, not only extends but considerably broadens the original act of 1963 by providing for Federal grants to help meet the operating costs of professional schools and for scholarships as well as student loans. It will also encourage more physicians to practice in rural areas by allowing up to 50 percent forgiveness of student loans in such cases.

These acts are a source of real satisfaction to me because they embody provisions which I sponsored long ago and because they will help meet serious health facility and manpower needs which I recognized more than 20 years ago. I would like to chronicle briefly the history of this legislation to aid the health professions and to supply health facilities in which I have been so closely involved.

First. In 1937 every Member of the Senate joined in sponsoring legislation to establish the National Cancer Institute. This bill, which became Public Law 244 of the 75th Congress, not only established the first of the National Institutes of Health but also provided for the encouragement of cancer research and authorized grants-in-aid to medical schools and other institutions for training, instruction, and fellowships in cancer diagnosis and treatment.

Second. In 1939 Senator Wagner, of New York, introduced before the 76th Congress his first comprehensive national health bill which provided for aid to the States for more adequate public health and maternal and child health services; for construction and maintenance of needed hospitals and health centers; for disability insurance; and for the training of health personnel. This bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Education and Labor on which I served, and hearings were held by a subcommittee chaired by Senator Murray. A favorable report was issued but no action was taken by the Senate.

Third. The 78th Congress, in recognition of the Armed Forces' acute need for nurses, in 1943 approved the Bolton bill, which provided for grants to institutions for tuition fees and maintenance expenses of student nurses and graduate nurses undergoing retraining. I am proud to have been a member of the committee which handled this bill on the Senate side for it was of vital importance in meeting our nursing manpower needs during World War II.

Fourth. In 1943 the Senate authorized under Senate Resolution 74, which I sponsored, the establishment of a Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor to investigate the educational and physical fitness of the civilian population as related to national defense and problems of reconversion to peace after World War II. This resolution calling for a study of the health conditions of the people of our Nation was prompted primarily by the disclosure that the selective service had rejected some 40 percent of all selectees due to mental and/or physical impairments.

The Wartime Health and Education Subcommittee was composed of seven Senators appointed by the chairman of the full committee, the late Honorable James E. Murray, of Montana. It was my honor to serve as chairman of the subcommittee during the 3 years of its existence.

The Wartime Health and Education Subcommittee is perhaps best remembered for its investigations of the medical needs of veterans and especially for its work in connection with a national health insurance program. The subcommittee was also vitally concerned, however, over manpower shortages in the health professions and the scarcity of hospitals and other treatment facilities. In fact, the third of its six interim reports dealt extensively with the problems of distribution of physicians and medical facilities and with the need for Federal aid to medical students. The report pointed out that financial barriers which face many prospective students could be overcome by more adequate scholarships or by loan funds. The subcommittee specifically recommended that "Federal scholarships or loans be made available to assist qualified students desiring medical or dental education; that increased enrollment of women in medical and dental schools, and premedical and predental courses, be encouraged in every way possible."

The subcommittee also recognized that in order to maintain our Nation's high quality of medical education and to meet the increasing demand for advanced training, graduate teaching facilities and staffs would have to be expanded. The subcommittee's immediate concern was for the medical officers of the Army and Navy who would be returning and demanding refresher and advanced courses to compensate for the accelerated pace of their undergraduate work and the shortened internships and residencies many of them experienced because of the war effort. The members realized, however, that not only these physicians but increasing numbers of future years would require advanced training. The subcommittee stated, therefore, that it believed that the expansion of both medical schools and teaching facilities in hospitals and medical centers would be necessary.

Another important finding of the subcommittee was that not only did shortages of doctors, dentists, nurses, and other medical personnel exist but that the shortages were much more marked in some communities than in others.

The subcommittee reported, for example, that in 1944 Massachusetts had about three times as many active physicians in proportion to population as did South Carolina. Similar disproportions were found to exist between other States and between local areas within the same State. The subcommittee pointed out that although the burden of illness in rural areas was the same as or greater than in urban centers, the shortage of doctors in rural areas was growing steadily worse. From its poll of young Army and Navy doctors the subcommittee concluded that this trend would continue unless positive incentives such as good professional surroundings, including modern hospital facilities, could be provided in rural areas.

The subcommittee devoted a great deal of study to the problem of health facilities—how many were needed, where they were needed, and what form they should take. The subcommittee was the first congressional group, I believe, to advocate the medical center idea. We realized that many hospitals were nothing more than places to care for the seriously ill, and we felt that modern programs of hospital construction should have as their aim the provision of a more inclusive type of hospital service which coordinated preventive, diagnostic, and therapeutic programs. The subcommittee report stated:

> The medical center brings together doctors' offices, diagnostic and laboratory equipment, hospital beds, and preventive work. It furthers group practice by physicians, surgeons, and dentists; encourages experimentation and research; and stimulates dissemination and exchange of medical knowledge.
>
> The principle of combining the preventive, diagnostic, and curative services of medicine into a single functional unit, here called the medical center, has been advantageously applied on a large scale in certain great university centers. It is also applicable, however, to the smaller scale needs of rural communities throughout the Nation. The establishment of a network of "outpost clinics," to use the phrase of a representative of the American Medical Association, the creation of "diagnostic centers," as urged by the Surgeon General of the Navy, and the "expansion of the present functions of the hospital," advocated by the spokesman of the American Hospital Association, appear to be expressions of the same basic aim—the provision of facilities suited to the practice of modern, scientific medicine.

The subcommittee recommended the development of a network of health facilities including neighborhood or community health centers, rural hospitals, larger district hospitals and, finally, base hospitals which would serve as the hubs of the major medical service areas. The base hospital was to be a teaching hospital, staffed with experts in the various medical and surgical specialties, equipped for complete diagnostic services, and designed to conduct extensive postgraduate work and research. The subcommittee envisioned that the benefits of the research carried on in the base hospital would be passed on to the smaller units in the network and that there would be constant back-and-forth referral of patients and diagnostic information, as well as interchange of personnel, between the large center and the smaller institutions. In summary, the subcommittee said:

> With such graded networks * * * covering the entire country, facilities would be available through which every person, regardless of where he lived, might receive (a) immediate diagnosis and care for the common, relatively simple ailments and (b) easy access when necessary to the more complicated types of medical service.
>
> The development of such a network of medical centers would constitute a great step toward the goal of providing high quality of medical service everywhere in the Nation.

In discussing additional health facilities requirements, the subcommittee's third interim report, which was issued in January, 1945, cited statistics prepared by the U.S. Public Health Service showing a need for 100,000 new general hospital beds, 94,000 new mental hospital beds, and 44,000 new tuberculosis beds. An additional 179,000 beds in those categories were found to be situated in hospitals that were obsolete and needed to be replaced. The subcommittee pointed out that in view of the scope of the problem, careful planning and coordination would be necessary in order to avoid costly mistakes. The subcommittee recommended that in order to permit local initiative and control, State programs should be drawn up by State health planning commissions in cooperation with local authorities. The subcommittee, stated, however, that the cost of an adequate health facilities program could not be borne by the States and localities alone and that Federal grants-in-aid to the States on the basis of need would be essential. It specifically recommended:

> That Federal grants-in-aid to States be authorized now to assist in postwar construction of hospitals, medical centers, and health centers, in accordance with integrated State plans approved by the U.S. Public Health Service.

The subcommittee emphasized, moreover, that not only were the quantity and quality of medical facilities important but likewise the distribution of those facilities. The report noted that the high quality of American medicine at its best was very high but that, unfortunately, American medicine at its best reached only a relatively small part of the population. As a result, large numbers of people suffered from cancer, tuberculosis, and other serious diseases which were not diagnosed until they reached advanced stages. The subcommittee stated the reasons for the failure of medicine to apply more widely the known diagnostic and preventive techniques were many and complex. It found, however, that one very important reason was the lack of physical facilities and equipment in many parts of the country. For example, although the national ratio of hospital beds was 3.4 per 1,000 population in the years before the war, the ratios in such States as Mississippi and Alabama were less than half that. According to a report of the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, 40 percent of the Nation's counties, with an aggregate population of more than 15 million, had no registered hospitals. Many other counties had very inadequate facilities. For these reasons, the subcommittee urged that priorities be established in connection with the proposed hospital construction program.

Finally, in addition to its recommendations relating to health manpower and to general health facilities, the subcommittee made certain suggestions concerning mental health facilities. In discussing the health needs of veterans, it stated that existing psychiatric clinics were altogether inadequate to meet the needs of the returning men and that considerable expansion of such clinical services should be undertaken. The subcommittee also felt that the acute shortage of trained psychiatric personnel made it imperative that such expansion should be accomplished within the framework of general community medical services. The report further stated:

> From a longer range point of view, the establishment of child guidance clinics in all communities is urgently neded to prevent early social maladjustments. Such a step would pay tremendous dividends in decreased crime, delinquency, and costs of institutionalizing the mentally ill.

Fifth. In 1945 Senators Wagner and Murray, the ranking members, respectively, of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Education and Labor, introduced S. 1606, a bill to provide for a national health program as outlined in a special message from President Truman to Congress in November of that year. This bill included not only a program of health insurance but also a program of grants-in-aid for medical education. The Surgeon General would have been authorized to make grants to nonprofit institutions for projects which showed promise of making valuable contributions to the education or training of persons in the field of medicine, dentistry, nursing, and other related hospital and laboratory occupations. The bill further specified that during the first 5 years the Surgeon General and Advisory Council were to give preference to projects to aid servicemen seeking postgraduate education as medical or dental practitioners or training for administration of personal health, rehabilitation, and related services. Twenty-five million dollars was authorized for the first 2 years of such a program.

Extensive hearings were held on this bill by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor in 1946. The third interim report of the Wartime Health and Education Subcommittee was incorporated in the record of the hearings, and I, along with the U.S. Surgeon General and numerous spokesmen for the medical schools and the medical professions testified as to the need for aid to medical education. No action was taken on the bill, however.

Sixth. In 1946 Senators Murray and MORSE and I introduced S. 2499, a bill to provide Federal aid to the States for higher education, including fellowships to students in graduate and professional schools such as medicine and dentistry.

This bill was referred to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, but no action was taken on it.

Seventh. The 79th Congress in July 1946 approved the National Mental Health Act. It was my privilege to bring this bill to the Senate floor and to head the Senate conferees who met with a delegation from the House to work out the final details of the bill. This act established the National Institute of Mental Health and provided for research and training relating to psychiatric disorders. It was hoped that with continued research and the training of sufficient personnel we would be able to develop more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of mental illnesses.

Eighth. One of the most important health bills ever approved by Congress, the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, or the Hill-Burton Act, as it is better known, was also passed in 1946. This act amended the Public Health Service Act to provide for grants to the States for surveying their hospitals and public health centers and for planning and constructing such facilities. I am happy to say that the bill incorporated many of the recommendations made by the Wartime Health and Education Subcommittee concerning equitable distribution of facilities and adequate planning as well as control at the local and State levels. As a result of this legislation many communities which would have otherwise lacked health facilities now offer modern, comprehensive services.

Some idea of the scope of this program can be obtained from the following figures. From July 1, 1947, when the program first went into operation through May 31, 1965, a total of 7,750 projects have been approved. Nearly 330,000 new inpatient beds have been provided, plus more than 2,200 other health facilities. The total cost of these projects has been $7.3 billion, of which the Federal share was $2.3 billion. Annual appropriations for the Hill-Burton program have grown over the same period from $75 to $220 million.

Ninth. In the 80th Congress Senator Taft introduced S. 1455, a bill to provide grants to graduate schools of public health for training and construction, and Senator Thomas, of Utah, introduced S. 2588, a similar bill to aid medical, dental, nursing, and public health, education. No action was taken on either of these bills.

Tenth. In 1947 I joined Senators Murray, Taft, AIKEN, and MORSE in introducing S. 176, a bill to establish a National Institute of Dental Research, to conduct research, and to provide training programs for students and graduates in the field of dentistry. This bill passed the Senate and a similar bill introduced on the House side became the National Dental Research Act the following year.

The need for improved dental services throughout the Nation was very clear to me as a result of the studies of the Wartime Health and Safety Subcommittee in 1943, 1944, and 1945. One of our findings had been that a great many of the men classified as IV-F in World War II were rejected because of major dental defects. Moreover, a report of the National Youth Administration showed that 85 percent of all the young people examined needed dental services. Many of these impairments were both painful and disfiguring; most, however, could be corrected with sufficient personnel as revealed by the Army's effort to rehabilitate some 1 million inductees with serious dental defects. With these facts in mind, I was pleased to join in sponsoring the National Institute of Dental Research legislation, and I am still very proud of my association with it.

Eleventh. In 1948 Bridges, Ives, Murray, and I introduced S. 2215, a bill to establish the National Heart Institute, to support research, to provide training for doctors in diseases of the heart and circulation and to aid the States in developing programs for the control of cardiovascular diseases. This bill was reported favorably by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and subsequently became Public Law 655 of the 80th Congress.

Twelfth. Also in the 80th Congress two bills providing for a national health program, including aid to the health professions, were introduced. The first of these was S. 545 sponsored by Senators Taft, Smith, Ball, and Donnell. The other was S. 1320 sponsored by Senators Wagner and Murray and myself. This bill, like S. 1606 of the preceding Congress, provided for a program of national health insurance and for grants-in-aid to medical and other health professions' schools. It also provided for expansion of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act and for grants to the States for public health services.

The Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee held extensive hearings on these two bills. Although the primary focus, of course, was upon the need for a compulsory health insurance program, testimony on the underlying need for more professional personnel to supply such services was also received. As I developed in my examination of Dr. Parran, the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, in order to provide the vast amount of medical care contemplated by S. 1320 it would be necessary both to upbuild local health services and to provide substantial aid to medical education in order to produce the required manpower.

Thirteenth. Since no further action was taken after the hearings on S. 1320 in 1947, Senators Wagner and Murray and I again introduced this legislation as S. 5 in the 81st Congress. Again no action was taken.

Fourteenth. Later the same year, 1949, Senators Thomas of Utah, Wagner, Murray, and I, and four others introduced S. 1679, the National Health Insurance and Public Health Act. At about the same time Senators Taft, Smith of New Jersey, and Donnell introduced the National Health Act. Although these bills differed as to the method of providing health services, both included programs to aid medical education. The bill for which I was a sponsor provided for grants to schools of medicine, dentistry, nursing, sanitary engineering, dental hygiene, hospital administration, and public health for scholarships and for construction. In order to encourage the professional schools to expand their capacities, payments of $150 to $350 per student up to average past enrollment figures were authorized; beyond that level, payments of $800 to $2,400 could be made.

The bill also provided for an increased medical research effort; for extension of the Hill-Burton program, and for guaranteed minimum gross incomes, operating expenses, and moving costs and noninterest loans for facilities for physicians who would settle in rural areas. It also included provisions for a prepaid personal health insurance plan to be paid for by people in proportion to their income.

The bill supported by Senator Taft had as its purpose the centralizing of the health functions of the Federal Government under a National Health Agency. It also provided funds for State surveys of the need for medical, hospital, and dental services. It authorized funds for school health services and for an expanded hospital construction program. Finally, it also provided funds to assist health professions' schools, including financial incentive to the schools to expand their enrollments.

The Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee held hearings on these bills, and I testified on both the Hill-Burton amendments and on the provisions for expanded local health services. I urged that Hill-Burton funds be doubled from the current level of $75 million annually to $150 million and that the Federal share be made more flexible to take into account the financial ability of the various States. I also proposed that the list of eligible hospital projects be expanded to include group practice facilities for both medicine and dentistry and facilities operated by cooperative or other nonprofit corporations or associations.

In connection with the need for local health services I called attention to the fact that more than 30,000 vacancies existed for nurses, dentists, sanitation engineers, health educators, and other public health personnel. Moreover, many of the people in these fields were inadequately trained and needed additional academic work. As I pointed out to the committee, the problem was one of providing an incentive to young people to study for a public health profession. I believed that this could be done by offering scholarship and construction assistance to the appropriate schools.

The Labor and Public Welfare Committee released four volumes of hearings on the National Health Act and the National Health Insurance and Public Health Act of 1949, but no further action was taken on these proposals.

Fifteenth. In March, 1949, I introduced S. 1453, a bill to provide scholarships and construction assistance to schools of medicine, dentistry, nursing, osteopathy, dental hygiene, and public health. I was joined in sponsoring this bill by 12 other Senators. Hearings on this bill were held in connection with those on the Taft and Wagner-Murray bills previously discussed. This bill was considered separately, however, and was reported favorably by the committee. It was my pleasure to submit the report on this bill to the Senate and to witness its passage by the Senate in September 1949.

Unfortunately, however, the House failed to take action upon my bill.

Mr. Speaker, today, 28 years after the National Cancer Institute Act which provided the first Federal training program in the field of medicine we have a great array of such programs. The National Institute of Health now comprises nine separate institutes, each with a training grant program. In 1956 Congress established other traineeships for nurses and public health personnel and in 1963 finally approved legislation granting construction and student loan assistance to the various health professions. Then in 1964 the Nurse Training Act was signed, giving construction funds, project grants, and loan funds to collegiate, diploma, and associate degree schools of nursing I am particularly pleased that this act included as a major provision the project grant program which I supported in two nursing education bills which I introduced in the 88th Congress. Finally, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act Amendments of 1965, of which I am cosponsor, will provide scholarships as well as loans to students in the fields of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and optometry, will assist schools with their operating expenses, and will encourage practitioners to settle in rural areas.

In the broad area of health facilities we have seen the steady expansion of the Hill-Burton program. The Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 provided a most valuable program to supplement the Hill-Burton efforts with regard to facilities for the mentally ill. I am proud to have been a cosponsor of both the act and the 1965 amendments to it which should further encourage the rapid transition to community-based services by helping provide the necessary professional and technical personnel. And, finally, the approval this year of a program of regional centers for the diagnosis and treatment of heart disease, cancer, and stroke promises to be another significant step toward making the best of American medicine available to all the people of our country.

The accomplishments of the 89th Congress in the field of health have been truly remarkable, and we can all take pride in this record. Those of us who have been closely involved in the evolution of Federal health programs over the years, however, have a special cause for satisfaction as we see our early recommendations finally bearing fruit. We now look forward confidently to a rich harvest of services, facilities, and manpower to meet the health needs of the Nation.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. **KIRWIN** submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 9220) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FARNUM, for Thursday, October 14, 1965, on account of official business in district.

Mr. RANDALL, for Thursday, October 14, 1965, on account of official business in district—address to the REA annual convention.

Mr. STRATTON, for Thursday, October 14, 1965, until Tuesday, October 19, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MOORE, for 30 minutes, today.

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore added, was granted to:

Mr. FASCELL, for 30 minutes, on Thursday, October 14, 1965.

Mr. O'KONSKI (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON), for 30 minutes, October 20; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MINSHALL.

Mr. ALBERT the remarks he made in connection with consideration of the sugar bill in the Committee of the Whole and to include certain letters and memoranda.

Mr. LATTA to include a table with his remarks made today in the Committee of the Whole.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BOW.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. **BURLESON**, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a Joint Resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3141. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6852. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 97 million pounds of abaca from the national stockpile;

H.R. 7743. An act to establish a system of loan insurance and a supplementary system of direct loans, to assist students to attend postsecondary business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools;

H.R. 7919. An act to provide for the establishment of the Roger Williams National Memorial in the city of Providence, R.I., and for other purposes;

H.R. 9811. An act to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 695. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 14, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV,

1672. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded on various claims, pursuant to the provisions of section 21 of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t), was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 695. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Report on conflicts between the Federal research programs and the Nation's goals for higher education; without amendment (Rept. No. 1158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Report on procurement of a cryogenic cooling system for fighter aircraft; without amendment (Rept. No. 1159). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 1735. An act relating to the use by the Secretary of the Interior of land at La Jolla, Calif., donated by the University of California for a marine biological research laboratory, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1160). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 10722. A bill to authorize the payment of an allowance of not to exceed $10 per day to employees assigned to duty at the Nevada Test Site of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 1161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 11588. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1162). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KIRWAN: Committee of conference. H.R. 9220. An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1163). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Alabama: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 11539. A bill to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane; without amendment (Rept. No. 1164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 11571. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide benefits for certain disabled widows without regard to their age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 11572. A bill to amend section 8 of the Clayton Act to prohibit certain corporate management interlocking relationships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 11573. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to reduce the rate of duty on spirometers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 11574. A bill to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 11575. A bill to require certain containers of salt of foreign origin to be marked with the name of the country of origin; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11576. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to permit third-class mailings of sample ballots and other election materials by registrars of voters within a State to be handled in the mails as first-class mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 11577. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide covered employees with entitlement to paid vacations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 11578. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 7-percent increase in all annuities and pensions payable thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 11579. A bill to provide for a comprehensive, long-range, and coordinated national program in oceanography, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 11580. A bill to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 11581. A bill to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 11582. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for a pension of $100 per month for widows of men awarded a Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 11583. A bill to provide for the compensation of persons injured by certain criminal acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 11584. A bill to provide for the establishment in Zanesville, Ohio, of a Zane Grey Memorial Museum; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 11585. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide that certain social security benefits may be waived and not counted as income under that section; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11586. A bill to establish a system for the sharing of certain Federal tax receipts with the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11587. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction from gross income for contributions and gifts to civic organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 11588. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 695. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DENT:

H.J. Res. 696. Joint resolution to require that reports on imports into the United States include the landed value of articles imported, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.J. Res. 697. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to apportionate the Senate of the United States upon the basis of population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.J. Res. 698. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.J. Res. 699. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H. Con. Res. 520. Concurrent resolution providing for showing the film "Adlai Stevenson: The Ambassador"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YATES:

H. Con. Res. 521. Concurrent resolution providing for showing the film "Adlai Stevenson: The Ambassador"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 11589. A bill to permit the vessel *Gone Fishin IV* to be documented for use in the fisheries and coastwise trade; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 11590. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jacinta Llorens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 11591. A bill for the relief of Mario and Maria Titone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 11592. A bill for the relief of Theodora Papadopalis Ivanov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 11593. A bill for the relief of Ng Hung Shing (also known as Ng See Pan); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 11594. A bill for the relief of Deirdre Mason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 11595. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jae Hyung Choi and his wife, Dr. Ock Jin Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 11596. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lui Kwong-Sung Ng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11597. A bill for the relief of Epa A. Onate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

H.R. 7315

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1965

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, curators and directors of museums throughout the United States, and there are more than 5,000 museums in our cities and towns, are watching anxiously during these closing days of the session for action on H.R. 7315, a bill that would authorize the Smithsonian Institution to undertake a program of research, training, and publications which would improve and strengthen their institutions.

Known as the National Museum Act of 1965, an identical bill already has passed the Senate without opposition.

I am told that a number of Members of Congress are receiving telephone calls and telegrams regarding the bill from people back home who are interested in or supporting local museums. These expressions of support for H.R. 7315 are the outgrowth of recent conferences under the direction of the American Association of Museums. Resolutions supporting H.R. 7315 have been adopted by representatives of the following States at their regional museum conferences: Il-

linois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, Wisconsin, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland, Delaware, Idaho, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, Washington, Oregon, Nevada, California, Hawaii, and Alaska.

For the convenience of many Members who are receiving these messages, I include the text of the bill at the end of these remarks:

H.R. 7315

A bill relating to the National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution

Whereas the museums of the Nation constitute cultural and educational institutions of great importance to the Nation's progress; and

Whereas national recognition is necessary to insure that museum resources for preserving and interpreting the Nation's heritage may be more fully utilized in the enrichment of public life in the individual community: Now, therefore,

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Museum Act of 1965".

SEC. 2. The Director of the National Museum under the direction of the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution shall—

(1) cooperate with museums and their professional organizations in a continuing study of museum problems and opportunities, both in the United States and abroad;

(2) prepare and carry out programs for training career employees in museum practices in cooperation with museums and their professional organizations, wheresoever these may best be conducted;

(3) prepare and distribute significant museum publications;

(4) perform research on, and otherwise contribute to, the development of museum techniques;

(5) cooperate with departments and agencies of the Government of the United States operating, assisting, or otherwise concerned with museums; and

(6) shall report annually to the Congress on progress in these activities.

SEC. 3. The first paragraph under the heading "National Museum" contained in the Act of July 7, 1884 (23 Stat. 214; 20 U.S.C. 65), is amended by deleting the following sentence: "And the Director of the National Museum is hereby directed to report annually to the Congress the progress of the museum during the year and its present condition.".

William E. Minshall Reports on the 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1965

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 89th Congress is nearing adjournment after 9 months in session.

In this time, more than 11,700 bills were introduced in the House of Representatives, nearly 500 of which were passed. The House also acted on some 70 Senate measures. In all, more than 250 pieces of legislation will have been signed into law by the President by the time this session ends.

This Congress established a new high in number of House rollcalls, a total of nearly 400, surpassing the previous record of 307 called during the 2d session of the 81st Congress, which ran from January 3, 1950 to January 2, 1951. During my 11 years in Congress I have answered nearly 2,500 rollcalls for an attendance record of over 90 percent.

This Congress also voted more money than any since 1944 and the session's appropriations reached more than $118 billion.

Mere statistics, however, do not accurately represent the long hours spent in committee work. It is in committee that the major portion of actual legislating is accomplished. Bills are painstakingly studied, analyzed, discussed, often amended.

My Appropriations Committee assignments include a massive amount of detail and work. As a member of two of the most important subcommittees in the entire Congress—Department of Defense Appropriations and Independent Offices Appropriations—I take an initial role in reviewing more than half the entire Federal expenditure—more than $64 billion in fiscal 1966.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

My Defense Subcommittee assignment is one I have held for the last 7 years. Always an important post, my duties have assumed an even more critical responsibility as the war in Vietnam is intensified. The Defense Subcommittee is charged with initial review of the administration's military requests and we spend long hours daily, over a period of months, taking top-secret testimony from the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The Defense budget for fiscal 1966 totals $46.9 billion, which includes a last-minute request for $1.7 billion as token payment on increased costs in Vietnam. In addition last spring we approved $700 million in supplemental money for military action in the Far East. The President is expected to ask for as much as $14 billion more shortly after January 1 to cover costs now being incurred there.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

After 2 years' membership on the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee, the House leadership last January asked me to accept appointment as second ranking minority member of the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee, which supervises more than $14 billion in public spending. Combined with my Defense assignment, this totals action on more than $64 billion of the entire budget. I am one of only two House Members charged with examination and review responsibility for such a large portion of total Government spending.

The trend toward bigger foreign aid spending has been reversed and much of the credit for cutting out waste and mismanagement is due to the Foreign Operations Subcommittee. Much as I regretted leaving it, I felt I could better serve the Nation and the 23d District on the Independent Offices Subcommittee, which oversees the budgets of 22 Federal agencies which spend vast sums of public money and which have a day-in, day-out impact on the lives of all Cleveland citizens.

Agencies which fall under the purview of my new subcommittee are the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which spends more than $5 billion yearly; NASA Council; Civil Defense; Civil Aeronautics Board; Civil Service Commission; Federal Aviation Agency; Federal Communications Commission; Federal Home Loan Bank Board; Federal Power Commission; Federal Trade Commission; General Accounting Office; General Services Administration; Housing and Home Finance Agency; Interstate Commerce Commission; National Capital Housing Authority; National Science Foundation; Office of Emergency Planning; Office of Science and Technology; Renegotiation Board, Securities and Exchange Commission; Selective Service System, and Veterans' Administration.

I have an intense interest in both of my subcommittee assignments and feel that fulfilling them is one of my most important services as a Representative in the Congress. This interest and the tremendous time it consumes does not preclude my concern in other areas of legislation, of course.

MINSHALL LEGISLATION

During this session I have introduced a number of bills and resolutions, several of which were incorporated in legislation which became law. Among them are the following:

H.R. 4266, to repeal the 10-percent excise tax on communications. Full repeal of tax on telegrams will be effective January 1, 1966; reduction of telephone taxes to 3 percent, January 1, 1966, with full repeal on January 1, 1969.

H.R. 4504, to repeal the excise tax on admission to cabarets, motion picture and legitimate theaters. Full repeal, noon, December 31, 1965.

H.R. 5048, to repeal the excise tax on club dues, initiation fees, and lifetime memberships. Full repeal, January 1, 1966.

H.R. 7337, to designate Vietnam as a combat zone to permit U.S. military Federal income tax exemption. Accomplished by Presidential proclamation.

H.R. 7532, to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on passenger automobiles and trucks. Passenger automobiles reduced to 7 percent on June 22, to 6 percent January 1, 1966, and thereafter reduced yearly until it reaches 1 percent on January 1, 1969.

H.R. 9670, to provide free mailing privileges for first-class letter mail sent by U.S. Armed Forces in Vietnam.

A wide variety of new laws were placed on the Federal books during 1965. Many of them will have a profound impact on the lives of present and future Americans.

My report on the legislative action of the 1st session of the 89th Congress follows:

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Unanimous support was given to passage of the $46.9 billion defense bill. We minority members of the Defense Subcommittee protested piecemeal funding of the war effort in Vietnam as not in the best interests of this Nation's security. Subsequent action by the White House has underscored our position and we have been alerted to expect a supplemental defense appropriation request from the President early in January, possibly asking for as much as $14 billion to pay current costs in Vietnam.

Nearly $2 billion was approved for military construction at domestic and foreign installations, and more than $114 million for Coast Guard procurement. The Atomic Energy Commission was authorized $2.5 billion for construction, operations, and equipment, including $704 million for weapons and $2.5 million for the merchant ship reactor program.

Federal penalties were enacted for assassination, kidnaping, or assault of a President or Vice President of the United States. Destruction or mutilation of draft cards was designated a Federal offense.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The foreign aid bill amounts to $3.9 billion, slightly over $270 million more than last year. A $1 million authorization was granted for construction of a new U.S. Embassy in Saigon, Vietnam.

National origins quotas on immigration were abolished effective July 1, 1968. Congress fixed an annual limit of 170,000 from all former quota countries. First preference, not to exceed 20 percent of the total, will be given to unmarried sons and daughters of U.S. citizens; second, 20 percent, spouses, and unmarried children of aliens admitted for permanent residence; third, 10 percent, qualified immigrants who are members of the professions, sciences or arts; fourth, 10 percent, married sons and daughters; fifth, 24 percent, brothers and sisters of citizens; sixth, 10 percent, capable skilled or unskilled workers in job areas where labor shortages exist, and seventh, 6 percent, conditional entries.

A 3-year extension, and an annual authorization of $30 million, was granted to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, for operations and research. The Peace Corps was authorized $115 million for the next year, including $500,000 for research.

U.S. quota in the International Monetary Fund was raised from $4.1 billion to $5.1 billion, and U.S. participation, to the extent of $250 million annually, was authorized in an increase in the Inter-American Development Bank's Fund for Special Operations.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

Congress removed $4.6 billion wartime-imposed excise taxes. Effective July 1, excises were removed from furs, luggage, jewelry, leather goods, radio and television sets, cameras, household appliances, musical instruments, records, and sporting goods. Taxes on general admissions and cabarets will be ended December 31, 1965. A gradual reduction in the 10-percent automobile tax will see it reduced to 1 percent by January 1, 1969. Taxes will be removed completely from telegraph communications and cut to 3 percent on telephones on January 1, 1966. Telephone excises will be eliminated entirely on January 1, 1969.

Requirement of 25-percent gold reserves against Federal Reserve deposits was repealed. Silver was eliminated from dime and quarter coinage, cut from 90 to 40 percent in half dollars.

"Temporary" increase in the national debt this year amounted to $4 billion, raising it from $324 to $328 billion. This is the seventh increase since January 1961.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Congress amended the Social Security Act to provide hospitalization for persons 65 and over, effective July 1, 1966, and optional medical care insurance at $3 per month, matched by the Government. Eligibility rules for social security payments were liberalized and benefits increased by 7 percent. Social security taxes and income rate bases were increased to cover the new costs of the program.

Congress approved $1.3 billion aid to elementary and secondary public school systems; a $5.5 billion, 5-year program of aid to higher education, and 25 percent Federal contribution toward scholarships for exceptionally needy students under the National Defense Education Act. A 5-year extension was given to the program of mass immunization against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, and measles.

Authorization was given a 4-year, $7 billion housing program, which, for the first time, includes rent subsidies. Subsequent House action eliminated all funds for the rent program other than a limited amount for administrative costs in drawing up new regulations. As in the past, the housing bill included FHA, urban renewal, housing for the aged, college housing, 60,000 new units of public housing per year, $800 million annually in matching grants to communities for water and sewer facilities.

Office of Economic Opportunity antipoverty programs, which include VISTA and the Job Corps, were authorized $1.65 billion for the next year. The Juvenile Delinquency Act was extended 2 years, with $6.5 million approved for fiscal 1966 and $10 million for 1967.

Aid to Appalachia was authorized in the amount of $1.1 billion for 1966 and the Manpower Development and Training Act was extended for 3 years, with a first-year authorization of $454 million. More than $3 billion was granted for a 4-year public works program in economically depressed areas to develop industries and create jobs.

Congress attached stiff new penalties and controls on illegal sales and distribution of depressant and stimulant drugs. Cigarette manufacturers were told to label their products, "Cigarette smoking may be harmful to your health."

The highway beautification bill, to promote control of outdoor advertising signs and junkyards near Federal highways, was cleared by both House and Senate.

GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

To enforce the right to vote, under the 15th amendment to the Constitution, Congress authorized appointment of Federal voting registrars in areas where discrimination prevails; barred literacy and other tests, directed U.S. court suits to invalidate poll taxes and fixed penalties for threats, intimidation and violence.

A constitutional amendment was adopted to fix conditions and procedures for succession of the Vice President to the Presidency in the event of the Chief Executive's disability and for filling the vacancy in the Vice-Presidency. The measure must be ratified by the States.

A Federal pay bill, granting a raise of 3.6 percent to postal and civil service workers, was approved after the House eliminated a provision which would have increased the salaries of Members of Congress.

Congress created a Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development to coordinate programs in that area.

THE 23D DISTRICT, OHIO

It is an honor to represent the nearly half-million residents of the 23d District, one of the most highly informed and articulate congressional districts in the entire Nation. I take particular pride in the fact that these citizens have awarded me their confidence and support during the 11 years I have served them in the U.S. House of Representatives.

As a Representative of this outstanding district, I make every effort to keep well informed of the views of my constituents through personal contact, frequent newsletters and occasional opinion polls. When the session adjourns early enough in the fall, I take a traveling office to the 23d District to make myself available for personal office conferences in various communities.

In addition to my Washington, D.C., office, I maintain a full-time office at 525 Federal Building in Cleveland for the greater convenience of my constituents. I am always ready to provide counsel or assistance for residents of the 23d District who are involved in the increasingly complex problems of Federal Government.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of the Scriptures: Ephesians 3: 16: *That He would grant you to be strengthened with might by His spirit in the inner man.*

Almighty and ever-gracious God, strengthen us daily with Thy presence and power as we seek to build a finer social order in which all the barriers which divide and separate the members of the human family shall be bridged by the spirit of cooperation and good will.

Grant that we may courageously champion every noble cause and fearlessly denounce everything that is wrong and that violates the rights of man and hinders his freedom.

May the righteousness and justice of God find a voice and a response in all our plans and proposals, our deliberations and decisions.

Show us how we may legislate for the good and welfare of all men everywhere and may the stern demands and difficulties which we encounter never cause us to live neutrally and negatively nor hopelessly.

In every humanitarian effort and enterprise show us how to labor together as friends and partners.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1311. An act for the relief of Joseph J. McDevitt;

H.R. 1319. An act for the relief of Joseph Durante;

H.R. 1409. An act for the relief of Louis W. Hann;

H.R. 1644. An act for the relief of 1st Lt. Robert B. Gann and others;

H.R. 1836. An act for the relief of Constantinos Agganis;

H.R. 2005. An act for the relief of Miss Gloria Seborg;

H.R. 2285. An act for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Cioffi Carson;

H.R. 2557. An act for the relief of Frank Simms;

H.R. 2757. An act for the relief of Maria Alexandros Siagris;

H.R. 2853. An act to amend title 17, United States Code, with relation to the fees to be charged;

H.R. 3288. An act for the relief of Hwang Tai Shik;

H.R. 3515. An act for the relief of Mary Ann Hartmann;

H.R. 3669. An act for the relief of Emilia Majka;

H.R. 3770. An act for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Navy at the Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, Calif.;

H.R. 4078. An act for the relief of William L. Minton;

H.R. 4137. An act for the relief of Dr. Jan Rosciszewski;

H.R. 4194. An act for the relief of Angelica Anagnostopoulos;

H.R. 4203. An act for the relief of Alton G. Edwards;

H.R. 4464. An act for the relief of Michael Hadjichristofas, Aphrodite Hadjichristofas, and Paniote Hadjichristofas;

H.R. 5167. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the administrative settlement of tort claims arising in foreign countries, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5457. An act for the relief of Maria del Rosario de Fatima Lopez Hayes;

H.R. 5554. An act for the relief of Mary Frances Crabbs;

H.R. 5904. An act for the relief of Nam Ie Kim;

H.R. 6229. An act for the relief of Kim Sun Ho;

H.R. 6235. An act for the relief of Chun Soo Kim;

H.R. 6819. An act for the relief of Dr. Orhan Metin Ozmat;

H.R. 7707. An act to authorize the appointment of crier-law clerks by district judges;

H.R. 7888. An act providing for the extension of patent No. D–119,187;

H.R. 8350. An act for the relief of the successors in interest of Cooper Blyth and Grace Johnston Blyth otherwise Grace McCloy Blyth;

H.R. 8457. An act for the relief of Robert G. Mikulecky;

H.R. 9521. An act for the relief of Clarence Earle Davis; and

H.R. 9526. An act for the relief of Raffaella Achilli.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 23. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate with the several States a cooperative program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10779. An act to authorize the Pharr Municipal Bridge Corp. to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Pharr, Tex.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S.J. Res. 32. Joint resolution to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury to persons, and for use of and damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after August 15, 1945, and before April 28, 1952.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 851. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Bernard L. LaMountain, U.S. Air Force (retired);

S. 1160. An act to amend section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act, chapter 324, of the act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 238), to clarify and protect the right of the public to information, and for other purposes;

S. 1520. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Earl Harwell Hogan;

S. 1922. An act for the relief of Valentina Sidorova Parkevich;

S. 1972. An act for the relief of Elinor A. Jean;

S. 2091. An act for the relief of Joaquin U. Villagomez; and

S. 2112. An act for the relief of Marian Edith Kid-Stanton Simons.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have until midnight Saturday, the 16th of October, to file a report on the bill H.R. 9424.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9220) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1163)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9220) "making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 18.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 5, 12, 14, and 22; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$25,435,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "993,279,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$16,537,000'; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$84,942,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$14,232,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$12,847,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$405,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$48,011,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,483,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,121,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$243,995,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$59,347,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 11, 16, and 17.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
JOE L. EVINS,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
GEORGE MAHON,
JOHN J. RHODES,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
HOWARD W. ROBISON (except on amendment No. 4),
FRANK T. BOW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
LISTER HILL (except on amendment No. 21),
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
ALAN BIBLE,
PAT MCNAMARA,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9220) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments; namely:

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2: Insert the language "and the Interoceanic Canal Commission," in the preamble of the bill as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (CIVIL)

Department of the Army

Corps of Engineers (Civil)

General investigations

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $25,435,000 instead of $24,100,000 as proposed by the House and $26,720,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes $356,000 for navigation studies; $372,000 for flood control studies; $30,000 for beach erosion cooperative studies; $51,000 for the Connecticut River Basin study; $61,000 for the North Atlantic region water shortage study; $40,000 for the Charlotte County hurricane protection study; $100,000 for coastal engineering research and development; $75,000 for civil works investigations; and restoration of $250,000 of the general House reduction due to slippage. The increase provided over the House bill for navigation, flood control, and beach erosion studies shall be allocated to the following projects:

ALABAMA	
(N) Dog and Fowl River, Alabama	$10,000
ALASKA	
(FC) Bethel, Kuskokwin R.	7,000
(N) Humboldt Harbor-Sand Point	7,000
(N) Metlakatla Harbor	6,000
ARKANSAS	
(FC) Terre Noire Creek	10,000
CALIFORNIA	
(N) Coast of northern California	$10,000
(N) Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor	[1] 25,000
(FC) Navato Creek and tributaries	15,000
COLORADO	
(FC) Arkansas River above John Martin Dam	67,000
(FC) South Platte River	50,000
FLORIDA	
(BE) Brevard County	[1] 10,000
(FC) Econlockhatchee River (central and southern Florida)	15,000
(N) Gulf Intracoastal Waterway-Carrabelle-St. Marks River	20,000
GEORGIA	
(N) Apalachicola 308 Rpt., Georgia and Florida	[1] 10,000
(FC) Weracoba Creek	10,000
HAWAII	
(FC) Kailua - Kaneohe - Kahaluu area	20,000
(N) Port Allen Harbor	20,000
ILLINOIS	
(N) Mississippi River (21-foot channel), Ill., Mo., Iowa, Wis., and Minn	15,000
INDIANA	
(FC) Mount Vernon	10,000
IOWA	
(FC) Boyer River	5,000
KANSAS	
(FC) Arkansas River (Great Bend, Kans., to John Martin)	[1] 40,000
KENTUCKY	
(FC) Covington-Rosedale area	8,000
LOUISIANA	
(N) Calcasieu River and Pass, Devil's Elbow, Lake Charles	10,000
(N) Mississippi River at Venice	5,000
(N) St. Bernard Parish	10,000
(FC) St. Bernard Parish	10,000
MAINE	
(N) Frenchboro Harbor	6,000
(FC) Kennebec River (southern coastal area of Maine)	10,000
MARYLAND	
(N) Elk River	10,000
MASSACHUSETTS	
(FC) Charles River	30,000
MICHIGAN	
(N) Black River, Port Huron	5,000
(N) Manistique Harbor	15,000
(N) Monroe Harbor	10,000
(FC) Southeast Michigan	30,000
MISSOURI	
(FC) Blue River, Kansas City, Mo., and Kans	[1] 5,000
MONTANA	
(FC) Flathead and Clark Fork	20,000
NEW HAMPSHIRE	
(N) Portsmouth Harbor-Great Bay-Piscatagua River	15,000
NEW YORK	
(N) Niagara River	40,000
NORTH CAROLINA	
(BE) Fort Fisher	20,000
(FC) Northeast Cape Fear River	[1] 10,000
(N) Pamlico River	[1] 10,000
OHIO	
(N) Lake Erie coast, Michigan and Ohio	[1][2] 8,000
OREGON	
(N) Siletz River, bar and entrance	5,000
(N) Umpqua River	4,000

PENNSYLVANIA

(N)	Delaware River, Philadelphia to Trenton, channel dimensions, Pennsylvania and New Jersey	$10,000

TENNESSEE

(FC)	Harpeth River	10,000
(N)	Memphis Harbor	20,000

VIRGINIA

(N)	Chincoteague Inlet	$15,000
(N)	York River, between Yorktown and West Point, Va	15,000

WASHINGTON

(N)	Anacortes Harbor	10,000

[1] Increase in House bill figure.

[2] To include start on Put-In-Bay study.

Construction, general

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $993,279,000 instead of $973,736,000 as proposed by the House and $1,009,099,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds appropriated under this heading are to be allocated as shown in the following tabulation:

Construction, general, fiscal year 1966

	Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1966		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Alabama:				
(N)	Alabama River channel improvement		$140,000		$140,000
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(N)	Claiborne lock and dam	$3,000,000		$3,000,000	
(N)	Holt lock and dam	4,000,000		4,000,000	
(MP)	Jones Bluff lock and dam			1,600,000	
(MP)	Millers Ferry lock and dam	14,000,000		14,000,000	
(N)	Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss				75,000
	Tombigbee River and tributaries, Alabama and Mississippi. (See Mississippi.)				
	West Point Dam, Ala. and Ga. (See Georgia.)				
	Alaska:				
(N)	Anchorage Harbor (1958 act)			400,000	
(FC)	Skagway (deferred)		5,000		5,000
(MP)	Snettisham power project		800,000		800,000
	Arizona:				
(FC)	Alamo Reservoir	2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC)	Painted Rock Reservoir	270,000		270,000	
(FC)	Pinal Creek		37,000		37,000
(FC)	Tucson diversion channel	1,031,000		1,030,000	
	Arkansas:				
(N)	Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma:				
	(*a*) Bank stabilization and channel rectification	14,700,000		14,700,000	
	(*b*) Navigation locks and dams	79,000,000		79,000,000	
(MP)	Beaver Reservoir	1,150,000		1,150,000	
(MP)	Dardanelle lock and dam	1,700,000		1,700,000	
(MP)	Degray Reservoir	9,400,000		9,400,000	
(FC)	DeQueen Reservoir			1,000,000	
(FC)	Dierks Reservoir		136,000		136,000
(FC)	Garland City			200,000	
(FC)	Gillham Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(FC)	Maniece Bayou, upstream extension	220,000		220,000	
(FC)	Millwood Reservoir	3,752,000		3,752,000	
(MP)	Narrows Dam, addition of 3d power unit	550,000		550,000	
(N)	Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La	8,000,000		8,000,000	
(MP)	Ozark lock and dam	9,000,000		9,000,000	
(FC)	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex	200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Water Valley Reservoir				150,000
	California:				
(FC)	Alameda Creek, Del Valle Dam	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(FC)	Bear Creek	1,380,000		1,380,000	
(FC)	Buchanan Reservoir		250,000		250,000
(FC)	Corte Madera Creek		180,000	800,000	
(N)	Dana Point Harbor			1,000,000	
(BE)	Doheny Beach State Park (reimbursement)	142,000		142,000	
(FC)	Dry Creek (Warm Springs) Reservoir and channel improvement		933,000		933,000
(N)	Half Moon Bay and Harbor	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Hidden Reservoir		400,000		400,000
(FC)	Los Angeles County drainage area	9,500,000		9,500,000	
(FC)	Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries	1,500,000		1,500,000	
	Nartis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev. (See Nevada.)				
(FC)	Merced River Reservoirs (New Exchequer Dam)	6,150,000		6,150,000	
(FC)	Mojave River Reservoir (West Fork)		500,000		500,000
(N)	Monterey Harbor		90,000		90,000
(FC)	Mormon Slough		75,000		75,000
(MP)	New Melones Reservoir		1,000,000	1,500,000	
(N)	Noyo River and Harbor (mooring basin)				45,000
(N)	Oakland Harbor	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Oroville Reservoir	14,840,000		12,830,000	
(N)	Port San Luis				80,000
(FC)	Redwood Creek	400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries	700,000		700,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River bank protection	3,450,000		3,450,000	
(BE)	Santa Cruz County (reimbursement)	130,000		130,000	
(FC)	Santa Paula Creek				75,000
(BE)	Surfside-Sunset and Newport Beach (reimbursement)	1,367,000		1,367,000	
(FC)	Walnut Creek	3,000,000		3,000,000	
	Colorado:				
(FC)	Chatfield Reservoir		300,000		300,000
(FC)	Trinidad Reservoir	1,043,000		1,043,000	
	Connecticut:				
(FC)	Ansonia-Derby		352,000		352,000
(FC)	Black Rock Reservoir	400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Colebrook River Reservoir	3,200,000		3,200,000	
(FC)	Hop Brook Reservoir	2,100,000		2,100,000	
(FC)	Mystic		60,000		60,000
(FC)	New London Barrier		170,000		170,000
(FC)	Stamford	2,300,000		2,300,000	
(FC)	Sucker Brook Reservoir	300,000		300,000	
(FC)	West Thompson Reservoir	1,065,000		1,065,000	

Construction, general, fiscal year 1966—Continued

	Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1966		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Delaware:				
	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.)				
(N)	Inland Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay (Chesapeake and Delaware Canal), pt. II, Delaware and Maryland	$16,400,000		$16,400,000	
	Florida:				
(N)	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(N)	Apalachicola River channel improvement	350,000		350,000	
(N)	Canaveral Harbor	400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Central and southern Florida	13,000,000		14,000,000	
(N)	Cross Florida barge canal	10,000,000		10,000,000	
(FC)	Four River Basins		$130,000	880,000	
(N)	Intracoastal Waterway:				
	Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River	1,200,000		1,200,000	
(N)	Key West Harbor		52,000		$52,000
(BE)	Palm Beach County, Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet (reimbursement)	10,000		10,000	
(N)	Palm Beach Harbor	600,000		600,000	
(N)	Tampa Harbor, Ybor Channel	950,000		950,000	
	Georgia:				
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(MP)	Carters Dam	10,000,000		10,000,000	
(MP)	Lazer Creek Dam				300,000
(MP)	Spewrell Bluff Dam		150,000		150,000
(MP)	West Point Reservoir, Ala. and Ga	1,000,000		1,000,000	
	Hawaii:				
(N)	Hilo Harbor		230,000		230,000
(N)	Honolulu Harbor				75,000
(N)	Kawaihae Harbor				100,000
(FC)	Kawainui Swamp	610,000		610,000	
	Idaho:				
(FC)	Blackfoot Reservoir		44,000		44,000
(MP)	Dworshak (Bruces Eddy) Reservoir	11,000,000		11,000,000	
(FC)	Heise-Roberts extension	100,000		100,000	
(FC)	Portneuf River and Marsh Creek	400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Ririe Reservoir		300,000		300,000
	Illinois:				
(BA)	Calumet River, bridges	2,500,000		2,500,000	
(N)	Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind.:				
	(*a*) 27-foot depth in river channel and Lake Calumet (1962 act)	3,500,000		3,500,000	
	(*b*) 29-foot approach channel, 28-foot outer harbor (1960 act)	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Carlyle Reservoir	7,000,000		7,000,000	
(R)	Chicago Harbor (breakwater)	355,000		355,000	
(N)	Chicago Harbor (1962 act)	600,000		600,000	
(FC)	Columbia Drainage and Levee District No. 3		45,000		45,000
(FC)	East St. Louis and vicinity	1,371,000		1,371,000	
(FC)	England Pond levee		22,000	100,000	
(FC)	Harrisonville and Ivy Landing Drainage and Levee District				50,000
(FC)	Henderson County Drainage District No. 1	400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Henderson County Drainage District No. 2	300,000		300,000	
(N)	Horse Island and Crescent Bridge (Mississippi River), Illinois and Iowa	300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Hunt Drainage District and Lima Lake Drainage District	100,000		100,000	
(N)	Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modification, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana	6,500,000		6,500,000	
(FC)	Indian Grave Drainage District	100,000		100,000	
	Island levee, Illinois and Indiana. (See Indiana.)				
(N)	Kaskaskia River (navigation)			1,500,000	
(FC)	Lincoln Reservoir				100,000
(N)	Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.:				
	(*a*) Regulating works	1,500,000		2,500,000	
	(*b*) Chain of Rocks	391,000		391,000	
(N)	Mound City lock and dam, Illinois and Kentucky		160,000		160,000
(FC)	Mount Carmel	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	New Athens	600,000		600,000	
(FC)	Oakley Reservoir		300,000		300,000
(FC)	Prairie DuPont Levee and Sanitary District		43,000		43,000
(FC)	Rend Lake Reservoir	3,752,000		3,752,000	
(FC)	Rochester and McClearys Bluff levee	600,000		600,000	
(FC)	Rock Island		75,000		75,000
(FC)	Russell and Allison levee (deferred)		25,000		25,000
(FC)	Saline River and tributaries		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Shelbyville Reservoir	5,000,000		5,000,000	
(N)	Smithland (Dog Island) lock and dam, Illinois and Kentucky				150,000
(FC)	Sny Island Levee and Drainage District	1,100,000		1,100,000	
(FC)	South Quincy Drainage and Levee District	100,000		100,000	
(FC)	Subdistrict No. 1 of Drainage Union No. 1 and Bay Island Levee and Drainage District	657,000		657,000	
(FC)	The Sny Basin	815,000		815,000	
(FC)	Tri-Pond levee	350,000		350,000	
	Indiana:				
(FC)	Aurora (deferred)		30,000		30,000
(FC)	Brookville Reservoir	1,730,000		1,730,000	
	Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)				
(N)	Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	14,400,000		14,400,000	
(FC)	Evansville	1,460,000		1,460,000	
(FC)	Grandview (deferred)		15,000		15,000
(FC)	Greenfield Bayou levee				50,000
(FC)	Huntington Reservoir	4,600,000		4,600,000	
	Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modification, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana. (See Illinois.)				
(FC)	Indianapolis (Warfleigh section) (deferred)				70,000
(FC)	Lafayette Reservoir				150,000
(FC)	Levee unit 5, Wabash River	1,600,000		1,600,000	
(FC)	Mississinewa Reservoir	7,300,000		7,300,000	
(N)	Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	4,000,000		4,000,000	
(FC)	Orleans (deferred)		10,000		10,000
(FC)	Patoka Reservoir				125,000
FC)	Salamonie Reservoir	6,200,000		6,200,000	
N)	Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	6,200,000		6,200,000	

Construction, general, fiscal year 1966—Continued

	Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1966		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Iowa:				
(FC)	Coralville Reservoir, Mehaffey Bridge	$628,000	-----	$628,000	-----
(FC)	Des Moines	350,000	-----	350,000	-----
(FC)	Dubuque	-----	$150,000	-----	$150,000
(FC)	Green Bay Levee and Drainage District No. 2	835,000	-----	835,000	-----
(FC)	Guttenberg	-----	70,000	-----	70,000
	Horse Island and Crescent Bridge, Mississippi River, Ill., and Iowa. (See Illinois.)				
(FC)	Indian Creek Dam	300,000	-----	300,000	-----
(FC)	Iowa River Flint Creek Levee District No. 16	200,000	-----	200,000	-----
(FC)	Marshalltown	-----	-----	-----	50,000
(FC)	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska	2,500,000	-----	2,700,000	-----
(N)	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska:				
	(*a*) Sioux City, Iowa, to Omaha, Nebr	2,900,000	-----	3,500,000	-----
	(*b*) Omaha, Nebr., to Kansas City	4,200,000	-----	4,800,000	-----
	(*c*) Kansas City to the mouth	2,300,000	-----	2,300,000	-----
(FC)	Rathbun Reservoir	6,000,000	-----	6,000,000	-----
(FC)	Red Rock Reservoir	15,000,000	-----	15,000,000	-----
(FC)	Saylorville Reservoir	3,500,000	-----	3,500,000	-----
	Kansas:				
(FC)	Atchison	400,000	-----	400,000	-----
(FC)	Big Hill Reservoir	-----	131,000	-----	131,000
(FC)	Clinton Reservoir	-----	400,000	-----	400,000
(FC)	Cow Creek, Hutchison	-----	50,000	-----	50,000
(FC)	Elk City Reservoir	3,862,000	-----	3,862,000	-----
(FC)	Fort Scott Reservoir	-----	200,000	-----	200,000
(FC)	Grove Reservoir	-----	75,000	-----	75,000
(FC)	Hillsdale Reservoir (deferred)	-----	-----	-----	10,000
(FC)	Kansas City, Kans. (1962 modification)	-----	200,000	-----	200,000
(FC)	Lawrence	1,200,000	-----	1,200,000	-----
(FC)	Marion Reservoir	5,000,000	-----	5,000,000	-----
(FC)	Marysville	902,000	-----	902,000	-----
(FC)	Melvern Reservoir	-----	-----	750,000	-----
(FC)	Merriam	200,000	-----	200,000	-----
(FC)	Milford Reservoir	6,500,000	-----	6,500,000	-----
	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
(FC)	Osawatomie	200,000	-----	200,000	-----
(FC)	Perry Reservoir	13,000,000	-----	13,000,000	-----
(FC)	Topeka	2,500,000	-----	2,500,000	-----
	Kentucky:				
(MP)	Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn	9,000,000	-----	9,000,000	-----
(FC)	Booneville Reservoir	-----	150,000	-----	150,000
	Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)				
(FC)	Carr Fork Reservoir	2,220,000	-----	2,200,000	-----
(FC)	Cave Run Reservoir	3,000,000	-----	3,000,000	-----
(FC)	Eagle Creek Reservoir	-----	100,000	-----	100,000
(FC)	Fishtrap Reservoir	5,500,000	-----	5,500,000	-----
(FC)	Frankfort, North Frankfort area	100,000	-----	100,000	-----
(FC)	Grayson Reservoir	6,950,000	-----	6,950,000	-----
(FC)	Green River Reservoir	5,600,000	-----	5,600,000	-----
(MP)	Laurel River Reservoir	2,000,000	-----	2,000,000	-----
(FC)	Ludlow-Bromley (deferred)	-----	20,000	-----	20,000
	Mound City lock and dam, Illinois and Kentucky. (See Illinois.)				
	Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)				
(FC)	Red River Reservoir	-----	105,000	-----	105,000
	Smithland lock and dam, Illinois and Kentucky. (See Illinois.)				
(FC)	Sturgis	170,000	-----	170,000	-----
	Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)				
	Louisiana:				
(N)	Aquatic plant control, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas	1,000,000	-----	1,000,000	-----
(N)	Bayou Lafourche and Lafourche Jump Waterway	400,000	-----	400,000	-----
(BA)	Berwick Bay Bridge	500,000	-----	500,000	-----
(N)	Caddo Lake Dam	-----	-----	-----	85,000
(N)	Calcasieu River and Pass	4,500,000	-----	4,500,000	-----
(N)	Calcasieu River, salt water barrier	1,000,000	-----	1,000,000	-----
(FC)	Campti Clarence area	500,000	-----	1,234,000	-----
(FC)	East Point levee	-----	-----	300,000	-----
(N)	Freshwater Bayou	1,000,000	-----	1,000,000	-----
(FC)	Lake Pontchartrain	-----	-----	-----	450,000
(N)	Mississippi River, Gulf Outlet	7,000,000	-----	7,000,000	-----
(FC)	New Orleans to Venice hurricane protection (1962 act)	200,000	-----	200,000	-----
	Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. (See Arkansas.)				
	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)				
(N)	Red River navigation and bank stabilization	-----	-----	-----	50,000
	Maine:				
(N)	Portland Harbor, 45-foot channel	1,200,000	-----	1,200,000	-----
	Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H. (See New Hampshire.)				
	Maryland:				
(N)	Baltimore Harbor and Channels	3,600,000	-----	3,600,000	-----
(FC)	Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va	-----	450,000	-----	450,000
	Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md. (C. & D. Canal), pt. II. (See Delaware.)				
	Massachusetts:				
(N)	Boston Harbor, Chelsea River	1,135,000	-----	1,135,000	-----
(B)	Cape Cod Canal, Bourne Bridge	232,000	-----	232,000	-----
(FC)	Conant Brook Reservoir	1,125,000	-----	1,125,000	-----
(N)	Marblehead Harbor	-----	-----	350,000	-----
(FC)	New Bedford-Fairhaven and Acushnet Barrier	852,000	-----	852,000	-----
(N)	Plymouth Harbor	300,000	-----	300,000	-----
(N)	Provincetown Harbor (restudy)	-----	-----	-----	20,000
(FC)	Three Rivers	305,000	-----	305,000	-----
(FC)	Westfield	500,000	-----	500,000	-----

Construction, general, fiscal year 1966—Continued

	Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1966		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Michigan:				
(R)	Charlevoix Harbor (piers and revetments)	$600,000		$600,000	
(N)	Great Lakes connecting channels	800,000		800,000	
(FC)	Kalamazoo River		$50,000		$50,000
(N)	Leland Harbor	200,000		200,000	
(R)	Manistee Harbor (pier and revetment)	315,000		315,000	
(R)	Marquette Harbor	370,000		370,000	
(R)	Muskegon Harbor (breakwaters, piers, and revetments)	600,000		600,000	
(N)	New Buffalo Harbor		20,000	200,000	
(N)	New Poe lock, St. Marys River	10,000,000		10,000,000	
(N)	Point Lookout Harbor				55,000
(FC)	River Rouge	700,000		700,000	
(FC)	Saginaw River (flood control)	1,200,000		1,200,000	
(N)	Saginaw River (navigation)	400,000		400,000	
(N)	Saginaw River (1965 act)			440,000	
	Minnesota:				
(FC)	Bigstone Lake-Whetstone River, Minn. and S. Dak				100,000
(FC)	Mankato and North Mankato		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Rushford	400,000		400,000	
(FC)	St. Paul and South St. Paul	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(FC)	Warroad River and Bull Dog Creek				98,000
(FC)	Winona	600,000		600,000	
	Mississippi:				
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(FC)	Jackson and East Jackson	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Okatibbee Creek Reservoir	2,400,000		2,400,000	
(FC)	Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss. (See Alabama.)				
(FC)	Tombigbee River and tributaries, Alabama and Mississippi	400,000		400,000	
	Missouri:				
(FC)	Chariton River	1,100,000		1,500,000	
(MP)	Joanna Reservoir			1,000,000	
(MP)	Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir	7,000,000		8,500,000	
(FC)	Meramec Park Reservoir		600,000		600,000
	Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo. (See Illinois.)				
	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
(FC)	St. Louis	10,000,000		10,000,000	
(MP)	Stockton Reservoir	10,500,000		10,500,000	
	Montana:				
(FC)	Great Falls		150,000		150,000
(MP)	Libby Reservoir	7,500,000		7,500,000	
	Nebraska:				
(FC)	Gering Valley	1,800,000		1,800,000	
(FC)	Little Papillion Creek	700,000		700,000	
	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
(FC)	Norfolk	1,300,000		1,300,000	
(FC)	Salt Creek and tributaries	2,000,000		2,000,000	
	Nevada:				
(FC)	Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev		100,000		131,000
	New Hampshire:				
(N)	Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H	2,000,000		2,000,000	
	New Jersey:				
(BE)	Atlantic City (reimbursement)	200,000		200,000	
(N)	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (anchorages), Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania	4,000,000		4,000,000	
(FC)	Elizabeth River				75,000
(R)	New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway, Point Pleasant Canal	400,000		400,000	
	New York and New Jersey Channels, Kill Van Kull entrance, New York and New Jersey. (See New York.)				
(FC)	Raritan and Sandy Hook Bays	900,000		900,000	
(MP)	Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa., N.J., and N.Y		1,000,000		1,000,000
	New Mexico:				
(FC)	Alamogordo diversion channel	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Albuquerque	3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC)	Cochiti Reservoir	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Galisteo Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(FC)	Rio Grande Floodway, Espanola Valley unit		60,000		60,000
	New York:				
	Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y. (See Pennsylvania.)				
(BE)	Fire Island Inlet to Jones Inlet (1962 act)		225,000		225,000
(FC)	Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway	400,000		400,000	
(N)	Great Sodus Bay Harbor		29,000		29.000
(N)	Hudson River, New York City to Albany	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(N)	Irondequoit Bay Harbor				50,000
(FC)	Ithaca, Cayuga Inlet	200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Lackawanna	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Lake Chautauqua and Chadakoin River		75,000		75,000
(N)	Little Neck Bay	200,000		200,000	
(R)	Little Sodus Bay (piers)	51,0000		510.000	
(N)	New York-New Jersey Channels, Kill Van Kull entrance, New York and New Jersey			300,000	
(FC)	Nichols		30,000		30,000
(FC)	North Ellenville		80,000		80,000
(N)	Oswego Harbor (1962 act)	690,000		690,000	
(FC)	Rosendale	150,000		150,000	
(FC)	Salamanca			200,000	
(FC)	Staten Island, Fort Wadsworth to Arthur Kill				100,000
	Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa., N.J., and N.Y. (See New Jersey.)				
	North Carolina:				
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(FC)	Falls Reservoir				100,000
(N)	Masonboro Inlet jetties	772,000		772,000	
(FC)	New Hope Reservoir		515,000		515,000
(N)	Rollinson Channel	250,000		250,000	
(N)	Wilmington Harbor, 38- and 40-foot depth (1962 act)	400,000		1,400,000	
	North Dakota:				
(FC)	Bowman Haley Reservoir	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Missouri River, Garrison Dam to Oahe Reservoir	800,000		800.000	
	Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See South Dakota.)				

Construction, general, fiscal year 1966—Continued

	Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1966		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Ohio:				
(FC)	Alum Creek Reservoir		$150,000		$200,000
(N)	Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	$9,600,000		$9,600,000	
(FC)	Big Darby Creek Reservoir	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Buck Creek Reservoir	1,650,000		1,650,000	
(FC)	Caesar Creek Reservoir		156,000		156,000
(N)	Cleveland Harbor: Bridge replacement, widening Cuyahoga and Old Rivers (1958 act)	300,000		300,000	
(N)	Conneaut Harbor	2,900,000		2,900,000	
(FC)	Deer Creek Reservoir	2,000,000		2,500,000	
(FC)	East Fork Reservoir		131,000		131,000
(FC)	Fremont		160,000		160,000
(N)	Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Lorain Harbor	2,300,000		2,300,000	
(FC)	Mill Creek Reservoir, Scioto River Basin				175,000
(N)	Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	10,500,000		10,500,000	
(FC)	Salt Creek Reservoir		120,000		120,000
	Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa. (See Pennsylvania.)				
(FC)	West Branch Reservoir, Mahoning River	2,147,000		2,147,000	
(FC)	Youngstown, Crab Creek	300,000		300,000	
	Oklahoma:				
	Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)				
(MP)	Broken Bow Reservoir	7,500,000		7,500,000	
(FC)	Copan Reservoir		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Hugo Reservoir		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Kaw Reservoir		164,000	664,000	
(MP)	Keystone Reservoir	5,500,000		5,500,000	
(FC)	Lukfata Reservoir		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Optima Reservoir			750,000	
(FC)	Pine Creek Reservoir	2,900,000		2,900,000	
(MP)	Robert S. Kerr (Short Mountain) lock and dam	18,100,000		18,100,000	
(FC)	Skiatook Reservoir		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Waurika Reservoir		75,000		75,000
(N)	Webbers Falls lock and dam	8,300,000		8,300,000	
	Oregon:				
(FC)	Applegate Reservoir		250,000		250,000
(FC)	Blue River Reservoir	8,000,000		8,000,000	
(FC)	Cascadia Reservoir		62,000		62,000
(N)	Columbia River and lower Willamette River, 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington	4,300,000		4,300,000	
(N)	Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington		75,000		75,000
(R)	Columbia River at the mouth (south jetty), Oregon and Washington	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Elk Creek Reservoir		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Fall Creek Reservoir	5,000,000		5,000,000	
(FC)	Gate Creek Reservoir		60,000		60,000
(MP)	Green Peter Reservoir	21,400,000		21,400,000	
(MP)	John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	75,000,000		75,000,000	
(FC)	John Day River		10,000		10,000
(MP)	Lost Creek Reservoir		550,000		550,000
(FC)	Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington	800,000		800,000	
(N)	Port Orford				20,000
(R)	Rogue River (north jetty)	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Scappoose Drainage District		20,000		20,000
(FC)	Shelton Ditch		100,000		100,000
(N)	Siuslaw River and Bar		20,000		20,000
(MP)	The Dalles lock and dam, Oregon and Washington (additional power units)		500,000		500,000
(R)	Tillamook Bay and Harbor	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Willamette River Basin bank protection	800,000		800,000	
(N)	Yaquina Bay and Harbor	4,000,000		4,000,000	
	Pennsylvania:				
(FC)	Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y.	15,900,000		15,900,000	
(FC)	Aylesworth Creek Reservoir		80,000		80,000
(FC)	Beltzville Reservoir	1,400,000		1,400,000	
(FC)	Blanchard Reservoir	4,000,000		4,000,000	
(FC)	Blue Marsh Reservoir		300,000		300,000
(FC)	Chartiers Creek				100,000
(FC)	Curwensville Reservoir	2,263,000		2,263,000	
(N)	Dam 4, Monongahela River	5,000,000		5,000,000	
	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.)				
(FC)	Elkland	259,000		259,000	
(N)	Erie Harbor (1962 Mod.)	300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Latrobe	1,300,000		1,300,000	
(N)	Maxwell locks and dam, Monongahela River	1,918,000		1,918,000	
(FC)	Muddy Creek Reservoir		50,000		50,000
	Prompton Reservoir (modification)		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Raystown Reservoir		560,000		560,000
(FC)	Scranton	300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa.	6,100,000		6,100,000	
(FC)	Tioga Hammond Reservoir		400,000		500,000
	Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa., N.J., and N.Y. (See New Jersey.)				
	Trexler Reservoir		200,000		200,000
(EC)	Turtle Creek	3,500,000		3,500,000	
(FC)	Union City Reservoir	400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Woodcock Creek Reservoir		120,000		120,000
	Rhode Island:				
(FC)	Fox Point Barrier	1,440,000		1,440,000	
(FC)	Lower Woonsocket	2,400,000		2,400,000	
(FC)	Narragansett pier, hurricane barrier	100,000		100,000	
(FC)	Point Judith, hurricane barrier		160,000		160,000
(N)	Providence River and Harbor				150,000
	South Carolina:				
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
	South Dakota:				
(MP)	Big Bend Dam-Lake Sharpe	7,000,000		7,000,000	
(FC)	Big Stone Lake-Whetstone River, Minn. and S. Dak. (See Minnesota.)				
(FC)	Cottonwood Springs Reservoir				85,000
(MP)	Fort Randall Dam-Lake Francis Case	2,497,000		2,497,000	
(MP)	Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak.	5,700,000		5,700,000	
	Tennessee:				
	Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn. (See Kentucky.)				
(MP)	Cordell Hull lock and dam	8,000,000		8,000,000	
(MP)	J. Percy Priest Reservoir	15,000,000		15,500,000	
(BA)	Woodland Street Bridge, Nashville, Tenn.	224,000		224,000	

Construction, general, fiscal year 1966—Continued

	Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1966		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Texas:				
(FC)	Abilene channel improvement				$150,000
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(FC)	Bardwell Reservoir	$3,687,000		$3,687,000	
(R)	Brazos Island Harbor (jetties)	250,000		250,000	
(N)	Brazos Island Harbor, widen channel (1960 act)		$90,000		90,000
(FC)	Buffalo Bayou and tributaries	3,800,000		3,800,000	
(FC)	Cooper Reservoir and Channels (Sulphur River)			750,000	
(FC)	Fort Worth Floodway, Clear Fork extension	250,000		250,000	
(FC)	Fort Worth Floodway, West Fork extension	700,000		700,000	
(FC)	Freeport and vicinity	400,000		400,000	
(R)	Galveston Harbor (jetties)	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(N)	Galveston Harbor and Channel, 36-foot project			800,000	
(N)	Galveston Harbor and Channel, 40-foot project	3,300,000		3,300,000	
(N)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway: Channel to Palacios			800,000	
(N)	Houston ship channel (40-foot project)	2,200,000		2,200,000	
(FC)	Lake Kemp Reservoir		290,000		290,000
(FC)	Lavon Reservoir modification and channel improvement		230,000		230,000
(N)	Matagorda ship channel, 36- and 38-foot channels	2,831,000		2,831,000	
(FC)	Pat Mayse Reservoir	5,500,000		5,500,000	
(R)	Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (jetties)	1,600,000		1,600,000	
(FC)	Port Arthur and vicinity (hurricane flood protection)	750,000		750,000	
	Red River levee and bank stabilization, below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)				
(N)	Sabine-Neches Waterway, 40 feet and channel to Echo	2,700,000		2,700,000	
(MP)	Sam Rayburn (McGee Bend) Dam	3,773,000		3,773,000	
(FC)	San Antonio Channel	1,100,000		1,100,000	
(FC)	San Gabriel River tributary to Brazos River		500,000		500,000
(FC)	Somerville Reservoir	6,500,000		6,500,000	
(FC)	Stillhouse Hollow Dam	4,000,000		4,000,000	
(FC)	Texas City, hurricane protection	4,100,000		4,100,000	
(N)	Texas City Channel 40-foot project	750,000		750,000	
(FC)	Vince and Little Vince Bayous	500,000		500,000	
(N)	Wallisville Reservoir, Trinity River			1,200,000	
	Vermont:				
(FC)	Bennington (deferred)		15,000		15,000
(FC)	Gaysville Dam (deferred)		30,000		30,000
	Virginia:				
(FC)	Gathright Reservoir		300,000		300,000
(N)	Hampton Roads			3,000,000	
(FC)	John W. Flannagan (Pound) Reservoir	2,625,000		2,625,000	
(N)	Lynnhaven Inlet and Bay	970,000		970,000	
(FC)	North Fork of Pound Reservoir	1,058,000		1,058,000	
(BE)	Virginia Beach (reimbursement)	75,000		75,000	
	Washington:				
(R)	Chief Joseph Dam (Stilling Basin)	600,000		600,000	
(FC)	Colfax	720,000		720,000	
	Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
	Columbia River and lower Willamette River 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
(R)	Grays Harbor and Chehalis River (south jetty)	2,000,000		2,000,000	
	John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
(FC)	Kalama River south area		50,000		50,000
(N)	Kingston Harbor	405,000		405,000	
(MP)	Little Goose lock and dam	14,000,000		14,000,000	
	Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
(MP)	Lower Granite lock and dam	14,000,000		14,000,000	
(MP)	Lower Monumental lock and dam	47,000,000		47,000,000	
(FC)	Skagit River, Avon bypass		30,000		30,000
(N)	Tacoma Harbor	700,000		700,000	
	The Dalles lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
(FC)	Wahkiakum Diking District No. 4		15,000		15,000
(FC)	Washougal area	727,000		727,000	
(FC)	Wynoochee River Reservoir		500,000		500,000
	West Virginia:				
(FC)	Beach Fork Reservoir		180,000		180,000
	Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
	Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va. (See Maryland.)				
(FC)	Buckhannon	650,000		650,000	
(FC)	East Lynn Reservoir	4,100,000		4,100,000	
	Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
(FC)	Justice Reservoir		418,000		418,000
(N)	Opekiska lock and dam	3,000,000		3,000,000	
	Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
(FC)	Summersville Reservoir	2,939,000		2,939,000	
	Wisconsin:				
(FC)	Eau Galle River, Spring Valley	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(N)	Green Bay Harbor (1962 act)	350,000		350,100	
(R)	Kewaunee Harbor (south pier)	470,000		470,000	
(FC)	La Farge Reservoir and Channel improvement, Kickapoo River		300,000		300,000
(N)	Milwaukee Harbor (1962 act)	1,400,000		1,400,000	
(R)	Milwaukee Harbor (breakwater)	200,000		200,000	
(N)	Saxon Harbor	220,000		220,000	
	Wyoming:				
(FC)	Sheridan	400,000		400,000	
	Miscellaneous:				
(FC)	Emergency bank protection	250,000		250,000	
(FC)	Small projects for flood control and related purposes not requiring specific legislation (sec. 205)	6,000,000		6,500,000	
(FC)	Snagging and clearing	500,000		500,000	
(N)	Small navigation projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to $200,000 (sec. 107)	1,500,000		1,750,000	
(BE)	Small beach erosion control projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to $400,000 (sec. 103)	500,000		500,000	
	Recreation facilities, completed projects	5,000,000		5,175,000	
	Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)	500,000		500,000	
(R)	Minor rehabilitation projects (costing up to $400,000)	500,000		500,000	
	Employees compensation	231,000		231,000	
	Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages	−80,075,000		−90,075,000	
	Grand total, construction, general	952,948,000	20,715,000	970,381,000	22,896,000
		(973,663,000)		993,279,000	

Flood control, hurricane and shore protection emergencies

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $12,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $7,000,000 as proposed by the House.

General expenses

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $16,537,000 instead of $16,481,000 as proposed by the House and $16,662,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill is for the Office, Chief of Engineers.

Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $84,942,500 instead of $80,060,000 as proposed by the House and $89,825,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill consists of the following: Mississippi River Levees, $400,000; Channel improvements, $1,382,500; St. Francis Basin, $300,000; Lower Red River, $400,000; Atchafalaya Basin, $2,000,000; and Maintenance, $500,000. The total amount allowed also includes $20,000 for initial planning of an adequate crossing of the Sardis Reservoir at Teckville, Mississippi, and reflects a decrease of $100,000 in the House bill amount for the Boeuf and Tensas Rivers.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

General Investigations

Amendments Nos. 8 and 9: Appropriates $14,232,000 instead of $12,873,000 as proposed by the House and $15,127,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: evaporation reduction research, $175,000; North Coast project, California, $125,000; Southern California Coastal area, $100,000; Delta Division, Central Valley project, $50,000; reconnaissance investigation of the Retrop project, Oklahoma, $15,000; reconnaissance investigation of water potential in San Juan County, Utah, $20,000; reconnaissance survey of the Upper Klamath River Basin, Oregon, $25,000; to coordinate a study of Oregon's north coast rivers with current Corps of Engineers Survey, $25,000; feasibility study of the Okanogan unit, Chief Joseph project, Washington, $44,000; planning in the Arkansas River Basin, $30,000; and atmospheric water resources research program, $750,000. None of the latter increase is to be used for application of existing weather modification methods for the actual production of water.

Amendment No. 10: Provides for transfer of $405,000 of the general investigations appropriation to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service instead of $370,000 as proposed by the House and $440,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Construction and Rehabilitation

Within available funds the conferees agree to the following items in addition to those carried in the House bill: initiation of construction to improve water supply and efficiency of the irrigation system, Eden project, Wyoming, $500,000; North Dakota pumping division, Missouri River Basin survey, $40,000; reconnaissance study, St. Vrain unit, Colorado, $55,000; acceleration of preconstruction planning, Oahe unit, South Dakota, $79,000 including $35,000 for feasibility study of Mitchell section; preconstruction planning, Garrison diversion unit, north and South Dakota, $450,000; and continuing preconstruction work on the Nebraska Mid-State project, $150,000.

Amendment No. 11: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment inserting language authorizing the use of not to exceed $450,000 of available funds, on a reimbursable basis, to replace the Paradise Valley Diversion Dam on the Milk River, Montana, and related facilities destroyed by flood in June, 1965.

Loan Program

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $13,495,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $13,087,000 as proposed by the House. The increase over the House bill is for a loan to the Kays Creek Irrigation Company, Utah, for construction of a water distribution system.

Upper Colorado River Storage Project

Amendments No. 13, 14, and 15: Appropriate $48,011,500 instead of $46,865,000 as proposed by the House and $48,471,500 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes: $163,000 to meet an operating deficit at the Page, Arizona, Accommodation School; $590,000 to continue construction of the Jones Hole National Fish Hatchery, Utah; and $393,500 for completion and operation of the Delta National Fish Hatchery, Colorado.

Amendment No. 16: Reported in technical disagreement.

General Administrative Expenses

The conferees recommend that the Bureau of Reclamation be allowed 300 positions in Grades GS-14 and above to permit it to meet its minimum requirements for executive direction but urge that every effort be made to hold employment in these grades as low as absolute need and efficiency will permit.

Bonneville Power Administration

Construction

Amendment No. 17: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the language provision inserted by the Senate with an amendment providing that the Bonneville Power Administration shall not supply power directly, or indirectly through any preference customer, to any phosphorous electric furnace plant in southern Idaho, Utah, or Wyoming.

Amendment No. 18: Deletes language provision inserted by the Senate providing that the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration shall cancel contract numbered 14-03-44107, with the Monsanto Company. The contract was canceled by the Department of the Interior on August 23, 1965.

TITLE III—ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Operating expenses

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $2,121,900,000 instead of $2,117,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,132,800,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: $1,000,000 for the Superheat project and $1,000,000 for the Fast Breeder reactor program under the Civilian Power program; $1,000,000 for Satellite and small power sources—SNAP 50 program; $900,000 for the Civilian application of isotopes; and $1,000,000 for changes in selected resources. The conferees agree that the Atomic Energy Commission should have flexibility in applying the reduction made in the Special nuclear materials program.

Plant and capital equipment

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $243,995,000 instead of $237,995,000 as proposed by the House and $244,245,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes $4,800,000 for an electron linear accelerator, Oak Ridge National Laboratory and $1,200,000 for architect-engineer work for the Los Alamos meson physics facility.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Tennessee Valley Authority

Payment to Tennessee Valley Authority Fund

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $59,347,000 instead of $59,847,000 as proposed by the House and $58,952,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount allowed deletes the $5,775,000 added by the Senate to initiate construction of Tellico Dam and restores items deleted from the House bill by the Senate as follows: $100,000 for study of pollution control on the Tennessee River to review the possible adverse effect of Tellico Dam on pollution in the Little Tennessee River; $500,000 to expedite purchase of lands in connection with the Land Between-the-Lakes project; and $5,570,000 to initiate construction of the Tims Ford project on the Elk River, Tennessee.

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Office of the Administrator

Administrative expenses, public works acceleration

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $500,000 as proposed by the Senate for closing out the work performed by the Community Facilities Administration under the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962 instead of $400,000 as proposed by the House.

Interoceanic Canal Commission

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $7,000,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $7,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
JOE L. EVINS,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
GEORGE MAHON,
JOHN J. RHODES,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
HOWARD W. ROBISON (except amendment No. 4),
FRANK T. BOW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. KIRWAN (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, the conference total is $4,292,866,500. This is $176,150,000 below the 1965 appropriations and $94,749,500 below the budget estimates.

The conference total is $51,230,000 over the House bill and $34,722,500 under the Senate bill. However, the Senate bill included budget amendments totaling $13,811,000 not considered by the House. So on a comparable basis, the conference figure represents about a 50-50 split between the two bills.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following table in further explanation of the report:

SUMMARY TABLE

Public Works appropriation bill, 1966

Item	Appropriations, 1965	Budget estimate, 1966 (as amended)	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						Appropriations, 1965	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL									
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY									
CEMETERIAL EXPENSES									
Salaries and expenses	[1] $15,164,000	$13,739,000	$13,739,000	$13,739,000	$13,739,000	−$1,425,000			
CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL									
General investigations	[2] 24,194,000	[3] 24,677,000	[3] 24,100,000	26,720,000	25,435,000	+1,241,000	+$758,000	+$1,335,000	−$1,285,000
Construction, general	[4] 956,956,200	[5] 973,663,000	[5] 973,736,000	1,009,099,000	993,279,000	+36,322,800	+19,616,000	+19,543,000	−15,820,000
Operation and maintenance, general	[6] 162,423,000	[7] 175,762,000	175,762,000	175,762,000	175,762,000	+13,339,000			
Flood control, hurricane, and shore protection emergencies	[8] 14,150,000	[9] 12,000,000	7,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	−2,150,000		+5,000,000	
General expenses	16,163,000	16,662,000	16,481,000	16,662,000	16,537,000	+374,000	−125,000	+56,000	−125,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries	77,862,000	77,060,000	80,060,000	89,825,000	84,942,500	+7,080,500	+7,882,500	+4,882,500	−4,882,500
Total, rivers and harbors and flood control	1,251,748,200	1,279,824,000	1,277,139,000	1,330,068,000	1,307,955,500	+56,207,300	+28,131,500	+10,816,500	−22,112,500
THE PANAMA CANAL									
Canal Zone Government:									
Operating expenses	29,960,000	31,211,000	31,000,000	31,000,000	31,000,000	+1,040,000	−211,000		
Capital outlay	4,821,000	9,557,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	+4,179,000	−557,000		
Panama Canal Company: Limitation on general administrative expenses	(10,847,000)	(11,169,000)	(11,000,000)	(11,000,000)	(11,000,000)	(+153,000)	(−169,000)		
Total, the Panama Canal	34,781,000	40,768,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	+5,219,000	−768,000		
Total, title I	1,301,693,200	1,334,331,000	1,330,878,000	1,383,807,000	1,361,694,500	+60,001,300	+27,363,500	+30,816,500	−22,112,500
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR									
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION									
General investigations	11,404,000	11,520,000	12,873,000	15,127,000	14,232,000	+2,828,000	+2,712,000	+1,359,000	−895,000
Construction and rehabilitation	185,616,500	[10] 200,650,000	196,661,500	196,661,500	196,661,500	+11,045,000	−3,988,500		
Operation and maintenance	[11] 39,844,200	40,915,000	41,305,000	41,305,000	41,305,000	+1,460,800	+390,000		
Indefinite appropriation of receipts	(4,537,000)	(4,920,000)	(4,920,000)	(4,920,000)	(4,920,000)	(+383,000)			
Loan program	12,307,000	14,995,000	13,087,000	13,495,000	13,495,000	+1,881,000	−1,500,000	+408,000	
Emergency fund	1,000,000					−1,000,000			
Upper Colorado River Basin fund	62,300,000	48,865,000	46,865,000	48,471,500	48,011,500	−14,288,500	−853,500	+1,146,500	−460,000
General administrative expenses	[11] 10,774,800	10,938,000	10,775,000	10,775,000	10,775,000	+200	−163,000		
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	323,246,500	327,883,000	321,566,500	325,835,000	324,480,000	+1,233,500	−3,403,000	+2,913,500	−1,355,000
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION									
Construction	87,420,000	[12] 98,450,000	97,777,000	97,777,000	97,777,000	+10,357,000	−673,000		
Operation and maintenance	15,260,000	16,015,000	15,988,000	15,988,000	15,988,000	+728,000	−27,000		
Total, Bonneville Power Administration	102,680,000	114,465,000	113,765,000	113,765,000	113,765,000	+11,085,000	−700,000		
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION									
Operation and maintenance	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000				
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION									
Construction	2,610,000	4,500,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	−910,000	−2,800,000		
Operation and maintenance	1,680,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	+120,000			
Continuing fund (indefinite appropriation of receipts)	(4,500,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	(−500,000)			
Total, Southwestern Power Administration	4,290,000	6,300,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	−790,000	−2,800,000		
Total, definite appropriations	431,216,500	449,648,000	439,831,500	444,100,000	442,745,000	+11,528,500	−6,903,000	+2,913,500	−1,355,000
Total, indefinite appropriations	9,037,000	8,920,000	8,920,000	8,920,000	8,920,000	−117,000			
Total, title II	440,253,500	458,568,000	448,751,500	453,020,000	451,665,000	+11,411,500	−6,903,000	+2,913,500	−1,355,000

TITLE III—ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION								
Operating expenses	2,261,573,000	2,231,000,000	2,117,000,000	2,132,800,000	2,121,900,000	−139,673,000	−109,100,000	+4,900,000	−10,900,000
Indefinite appropriation of receipts	(50,046,000)	(46,625,000)	(46,625,000)	(46,625,000)	(46,625,000)	(−3,421,000)			
Plant and capital equipment	363,000,000	250,000,000	237,995,000	244,245,000	243,995,000	−119,005,000	−6,005,000	+6,000,000	−250,000
Total, Atomic Energy Commission	2,624,573,000	2,481,000,000	2,354,995,000	2,377,045,000	2,365,895,000	−258,678,000	−115,105,000	+10,900,000	−11,150,000
Total, definite appropriation	2,624,573,000	2,481,000,000	2,354,995,000	2,377,045,000	2,365,895,000	−258,678,000	−115,105,000	+10,900,000	−11,150,000
Total, indefinite appropriation	50,046,000	46,625,000	46,625,000	46,625,000	46,625,000	−3,421,000			
Total, title III	2,674,619,000	2,527,625,000	2,401,620,000	2,423,670,000	2,412,520,000	−262,099,000	−115,105,000	+10,900,000	−11,150,000
TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES									
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation:									
Limitation on administrative expenses	(470,000)	(490,000)	(490,000)	(490,000)	(490,000)	(+20,000)			
Tennessee Valley Authority	47,915,000	58,952,000	59,847,000	58,952,000	59,347,000	+11,432,000	+395,000	−500,000	+395,000
Delaware River Basin Commission:									
Salaries and expenses	44,000	44,000	44,000	44,000	44,000				
Contribution to the Delaware River Basin Commission	92,000	96,000	96,000	96,000	96,000	+4,000			
Total, Delaware River Basin Commission	136,000	140,000	140,000	140,000	140,000	+4,000			
Housing and Home Finance Agency—Office of the Administrator:									
Administrative expenses, public works acceleration		500,000	400,000	500,000	500,000	+500,000		+100,000	
Funds appropriated to the President:									
Public works acceleration	4,000,000					−4,000,000			
Interoceanic Canal Commission:									
Salaries and expenses	[13] 400,000	[14] 7,500,000		7,500,000	7,000,000	+6,600,000	−500,000	+7,000,000	−500,000
Total, title IV	52,451,000	67,092,000	60,387,000	67,092,000	66,987,000	+14,536,000	−105,000	+6,600,000	−105,000
Grand totals:									
Total, definite appropriations	4,409,933,700	4,332,071,000	4,186,091,500	4,272,044,000	4,237,321,500	−172,612,200	−94,749,500	+51,230,000	−34,722,500
Total, indefinite appropriations	59,083,000	55,545,000	55,545,000	55,545,000	55,545,000	−3,538,000			
Grand total, all titles	4,469,016,700	4,387,616,000	4,241,636,500	4,327,589,000	4,292,866,500	−176,150,200	−94,749,500	+51,230,000	−34,722,500

---

[1] Includes $1,770,000, exclusive of pay act costs, appropriated in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965.

[2] Includes $2,000,000 appropriated for the Appalachia program in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965.

[3] Includes $350,000 submitted in H. Doc. 111, and $121,000 submitted in H. Doc. 200; $157,000 submitted in S. Doc. 41, not considered by the House; and $61,000 in S. Doc. 48, not considered by the House.

[4] Includes $2,860,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965, and $14,153,000 appropriated for the Appalachia program in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965.

[5] Includes $2,850,000 submitted in H. Doc. 111, and a decrease of $18,495,000 submitted in H. Doc. 200; a decrease of $157,000 submitted in S. Doc. 41, not considered by the House; and $1,250,000 in S. Doc. 48, not considered by the House.

[6] Includes $1,735,000 for west coast floods, exclusive of pay act costs, appropriated in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965.

[7] Includes $1,000,000 submitted in H. Doc. 111, and $1,900,000 submitted in H. Doc. 200.

[8] Includes $10,000,000 appropriated for west coast floods and other emergency requirements in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965.

[9] Includes $7,000,000 submitted in H. Doc. 111, and $5,000,000 submitted in S. Doc. 41, not considered by the House.

[10] Includes $5,200,000 submitted in H. Doc. 134, and $12,000,000 submitted in H. Doc. 200.

[11] Reflects transfer of $374,800 from "Operation and maintenance" to "General administrative expenses" due to pay increases, Public Law 89-16, Apr. 30, 1965.

[12] Reflects request in H. Doc. 154 to use $1,000,000 of available funds to initiate planning for a high voltage transmission line into southern Idaho.

[13] Appropriated in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965.

[14] Submitted in S. Doc. 37 and not considered by the House.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure this conference report will be overwhelmingly approved, and that all Members agree on the outstanding job which has been done by the House conferees, led by the able gentleman from Ohio, our beloved MIKE KIRWAN.

Once again the House Committee on Appropriations has moved responsibly and effectively to advance the cause of water resource development—to provide for the needs of our expanding population in this critical resource requirement.

More than any other program of our Government, this program is designed to provide a solid foundation for economic growth and development.

With approval of this report, we provide for America's future, and for generations yet unborn.

I congratulate the distinguished committee on its outstanding legislative achievement.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, though I intend to support this conference report on the public works appropriation bill for 1965, it may be noted that I reserved—as one of the conferees on the part of the House—on amendment No. 4, and that deserves at least this brief explanation.

Though I do have some tentative reservations about some of the numerous other projects included under the general heading of "General construction"—the total cost of which now approaches $1 billion—my specific reservation has to do with the action taken by the conferees from the other body, on their own motion, to recede on the item of $60,000 that the other body had inserted in this bill to resume planning on what is known as the Davenport Center flood-control project on the north branch of the Susquehanna River above the Binghamton, N.Y., area.

This particular project—and several others like it—has been long stalled in Congress because of continuing local opposition in the upstream areas where the projects would be built, if they ever are to be built.

Mr. Speaker, it makes no sense to me whatsoever—with all the interest that has developed in water-resource problems of the Northeast and in the development of our Nation's river basins—that this Congress would not even approve the allocation of $60,000 to the Corps of Engineers to permit it to revise its original plans for this project in order to make them conform to the present multipurpose concept for such projects, following which our committee and the Congress could make an intelligent determination as to whether or not this project should go forward to construction.

Title I of this year's omnibus flood control bill, as we will recall, provides for a Corps of Engineers' study of the Northeast with emphasis on the possibilities of transfer of water from one river basin to another in order to meet the ultimate needs of our sprawling metropolitan areas. In my judgment, and in the present judgment of the corps as I understand it, the Davenport center project is exactly the kind of facility that would fit into any such overall plan. In my further judgment, the Davenport center project is also badly needed, now, not only for its original flood-control purposes, but for water retention purposes in order to augment the stream flowage of the Susquehanna—which reached a record low in the recent drought during normal summer months now that so many growing communities along the river are directly or indirectly drawing water from it.

And, equally important, this project not only offers an important water supply source for the municipal and industrial purposes of the larger communities in that area, but also has an attractive potential for development for recreational uses in the county in which it would be located, which county, incidentally, is in the Appalachia portion of south-central New York.

Mr. Speaker, the only opposition to this project comes from those who live in the proposed construction area who naturally enough do not want to lose their homes or farms, and from those others who are concerned about the temporary loss of local tax base that construction of the project might entail in that upstream community. I respect that opposition because I understand it, just as I understand and respect the position taken by my colleagues here who have articulated that opposition.

But Mr. Speaker, that opposition has grown into something that is considerably less than objective and it ignores the basic maxim that decisions such as this must be based—as this one eventually will be—on the principle of the greatest good for the greatest number.

It has also been frequently argued by the opponents, Mr. Speaker, that no such project in the Susquehanna River Basin should go forward even in the planning stage so long as the corps is conducting a comprehensive review—as it is—of the entire river basin.

That study, it is true, will not be completed yet for perhaps 2 or 3 more years. However, the Interstate Advisory Committee on the Susquehanna River Basin—under whose guidance as a coordinating body that corps study is being conducted—has recently issued a preliminary informational report in which, on page 13 thereof, we find this paragraph:

> For present purposes, the Interstate Advisory Committee considers that the term "comprehensive study" denotes the collection of data of many kinds, which then becomes the raw material from which alternative plans may be formulated. There is, however, no reason why planning should not be started when enough survey data have been collected to make planning or partial planning feasible.

Mr. Speaker, the corps has repeatedly assured me that this is exactly the situation, now, with respect to the resumption of planning on the Davenport Center project.

When the other body moved to reverse itself on this item in conference, there was nothing further that I could do about it. But, Mr. Speaker, I must express the hope that our committee will take another and more favorable look at this project when Congress reconvenes in January.

The Davenport Center project is needed, and the long-standing deadlock that has stalled it must now be broken.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, for a long time the Oak Ridge operations of the Atomic Energy Commission have needed an electron linear accelerator. We were greatly encouraged when the Senate Appropriations Committee recommended $4,800,000 for such an accelerator to be built at Oak Ridge.

Today we have a chance to boost the future of nuclear power in the United States by giving our approval for the construction of the facility at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

Our Nation's nuclear power ultimately depends on breeder reactors. The experts tell us that "at the present time predictions of the performance, safety, and economics of these reactors are uncertain because of the lack of precise neutron cross-section information."

This electron linear accelerator could provide the best neutron source for cross-section measurements. As I pointed out in earlier statements, foreign laboratories already have such facilities. Certainly our Atomic Energy Commission needs something of comparable performance.

It is not only that we need to keep up with other countries in this great scientific field, but we have a definite lack in our atomic energy program.

The Oak Ridge National Laboratory is certainly the most appropriate location for the linear accelerator. Because it is a "national" laboratory, it brings together top scientists, engineers, and technicians in this field. We can expect best results from these experts by making available to them the best facilities, the most powerful equipment, to conduct difficult nuclear measurements.

Another fact that should not be overlooked is that such an accelerator at Oak Ridge National Laboratory would be of great value to the many graduate student programs in the South. Students of nuclear energy from throughout the country could well benefit from the experiments and work done at Oak Ridge.

An accelerator of this type is not available in the southern United States. Certainly, its operation at Oak Ridge would be a great boost to this area as well as to our entire atomic energy program. We have the staff. We have a great need for the accelerator. I urge my colleagues to approve this proposed construction at Oak Ridge as approved by the joint Senate-House conference on public works.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Senate amendment No. 11: On page 12, line 24, insert: "*Provided further*, That not to exceed $450,000 shall be available for replacement of the Paradise Valley Diversion Dam on the Milk River project, Montana, with facilities to serve the lands of the Paradise Valley Irrigation District, to be repaid in full under terms and conditions satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 16: Page 14, line 24, insert the following: "*: Provided further*, That $163,000 of the funds herein appropriated for the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund shall be available for operation of the Page, Arizona, Accommodation School, and to be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 17: Page 19, line 21, insert the following: "*: Provided*, That the Bonneville Power Administration shall not supply power, directly or indirectly, to any phosphorous electric furnace plant in southern Idaho, Utah, or Wyoming."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following: "*: Provided*, That the Bonneville Power Administration shall not supply power directly, or indirectly through any preference customer, to any phosphorous electric furnace plant in southern Idaho, Utah, or Wyoming".

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the conference report and the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter and a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the subject of the conference report just adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations have until 6 o'clock p.m. Friday to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Six p.m.?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Six p.m.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Six p.m. when?

The SPEAKER. Friday, tomorrow.

Mr. GROSS. Tomorrow?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION OF CONFEREE ON THE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter of resignation of a conferee:

OCTOBER 14, 1965.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives,
H 206 Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith ask that you accept my resignation as a member of the conference committee on H.R. 8310—the Vocational Rehabilitation Act amendments.

Sincerely,

JOHN H. DENT.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints to the committee of conference, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS].

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the appointment by the Speaker.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 368]

Abbitt
Adair
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Ashley
Baring
Bingham
Bonner
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Clawson, Del
Craley
Dawson
Delaney
Dwyer
Farnsley
Farnum
Findley
Ford, Gerald R.
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Gathings
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Halleck
Hardy
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hébert
Holifield
Hosmer
Johnson, Pa.
Keogh
Latta
Lindsay
Long, La.
McClory
Martin, Nebr.
Mize
Morton
Murray
O'Hara, Ill.
Powell
Randall
Reifel
Reuss
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Roudebush
Saylor
Senner
Shriver
Sickles
Sisk
Skubitz
Stratton
Talcott
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Walker, Miss.
Watson
White, Idaho
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Young

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 360 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11588) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited not to exceed 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 11588, with Mr. HARRIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is the final appropriation bill of this session and I am sure we are all pleased that it is except for action on the agricultural appropriation conference report, which will come next week, and of course final action on this supplemental bill, the appropriation business of the session is concluded.

Custom and tradition are strong in congressional procedures and practices. The name of this bill is a good example. The closing appropriation bill of the session is always called a supplemental bill, but it is somewhat of a misnomer to call this bill a supplemental bill. It does include some supplementals, but about 80 percent of the $4,214,000,000 total represents the regular continuation funding of some large programs that, except for lack of timely legislative authorization or other special circumstance, would have been—should have been in the regular annual bill and not in this closing bill.

SUMMARY OF PENDING SUPPLEMENTAL BILL

I would like to take a moment to call the roll of the major items in the bill with the hope of putting the matter in some better perspective. I shall not undertake to go into the details. The report of the committee contains explanations of the variety of appropriations in the bill. And members of the Committee on Appropriations will, of course, cooperate with the membership in an effort to be helpful with respect to what the bill actually contains. I commend the report to your attention.

Calling the roll of the major items, I would first mention the antipoverty program: $1,500,000,000 of the bill total is for continuation of the antipoverty program which was launched last year. This is considerably below the recently enacted authorization, but it is the same amount as requested in the appropriation budget for the program.

A sum almost as great in magnitude relates to urban renewal, another going program. We have in this bill $1,400,000,000 for urban renewal. We were able to close the backdoor spending approach on this program in the regular bill for fiscal 1966—the independent offices bill—and as a part of that decision we agreed to fund the program a year in advance so that local authorities would have some basis for planning their participation. The bill includes $675,000,000 for fiscal 1966 and $700,000,000 for fiscal 1967. Next year it will not be necessary to fund more than a 1-year requirement for the program.

The measure before us also contains $332,000,000 for the Economic Development Act. That, as you know, is new in name but actually old in substance, since it contains features of the former Appalachia aid, accelerated public works, and area redevelopment programs.

These three items, then, account for about 80 percent of the funds in this bill.

Another 10 percent of the funds provided in this bill come in three rather large items:

The sum of $140,000,000 is included in the bill for the development of a civil supersonic aircraft. This is a program in which there has been great national interest. We have already considerably funded the beginning phases of the project. This would continue the project at the level urged by the President and his advisers.

The sum of $220,000,000 in this bill is for grants to States for public assistance, in explicit and unavoidable response to additional authorization in the Social Security Amendments Act of 1965. There is no practical discretion left to us at this stage in regard to this item. It is on a matching formula set out in the basic legislation.

The sum of $76,000,000 is for additional Small Business Administration loans, ascribed in large measure to demands occasioned by disruptions and disasters caused by such things as Hurricane Betsy a few weeks ago.

Another program funded in this bill, in the amount of $100,000,000, is a program for water and sewer facility grants based on newly enacted provisions in this year's general housing legislation. I think this program is widely endorsed by a great majority of the House and the American people.

So, Mr. Chairman, this handful of items to which I have made reference, encompasses 90 percent of the funds in this bill. But there is a wide variety of additional appropriation items which are reflected and explained in the committee report. They appropriate some $444,000,000.

I do not know for certain, but perhaps supplemental budget requests—perhaps of the order of $400,000,000—may go directly to the other body for consideration in connection with this bill. We were aware of this likelihood; we had to close our hearings some days ago in order to get this bill to the House today. We would expect that some of those funds would be added to this supplemental bill in the other body.

APPROPRIATIONS SUMMARY OF THE SESSION

As I indicated, the appropriations business of the House is concluded except for clearing the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill next week, and of course the final disposition of the supplemental bill now before us.

I think that Members of the House would be interested in some speculation as to just what the aggregates, moneywise, may be in this session of the Congress.

Many Members have spoken in glowing terms of what Congress has done for the people of the Nation. We have talked about the great work which is in the offing by way of clearing up the pollution in the air and fighting the water pollution problem, which is very great.

We have talked about the beauties which may result by reason of the legislation involving highway beautification. We have talked about many advances in social security, in medicare, and the billions of dollars we have authorized for education. These programs enjoy varying degrees of popularity. Of course, as individual Members we voted for some of them and we voted against some of them. But as a Congress, we have passed a great amount of legislation which will probably bring about a conclusion by the historians that this was one of the most significant Congresses in the history of the Nation. I do not believe there is much doubt about that.

But we have not spent long hours talking about the cost of these programs. They are very expensive. They cost money. We cannot have our cake and eat it, too. We have to pay for these programs and the people we represent are the people who will have to pay. As taxpayers, we will join with them in financing these programs.

I would estimate the total of the appropriations at this session of Congress, when all bills have cleared conference, to be in the area of $106,600,000,000 to which must be added, for a good picture of this situation, the so-called permanent appropriations, which would be, tentatively, some $12,300,000,000, which recur automatically without annual action by Congress. Interest on the national debt is the largest of the so-called permanent appropriations. That would bring the aggregate total for this session, in appropriations, to between $118 to $119 billion, according to my reckoning. This breaks down about like this:

1. For the fiscal year 1965, but during this session, though that fiscal year ended on June 30 last, $4,527,000,000. Some of that was for the war in Vietnam and for other purposes.

2. For the fiscal year 1966, we have appropriated during the current session, or I estimate we will appropriate, including the permanents, about $113,525,000,000.

3. Then in advance funding for fiscal 1967, we have provided, or I estimate we will provide, about $926,000,000. This would cover some prefinancing of the urban renewal program, to which I made reference, and similar prefinancing of grants for airport aid and mass transit aid.

The rough total which I would estimate by way of funds made available during this session of the Congress would, on this basis, aggregate roughly $118,978,000,000. This would compare with approximately $106,000,000,000 in last year's session. So, Members can see that Congress has made a great leap upward in appropriations during this session.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What does the gentleman estimate the revenues will be to meet the spending of $118 or $119 billion in the next fiscal year?

Mr. MAHON. I would leave to the Committee on Ways and Means and others the most accurate prognostication as to revenues. Usually the prognostication as to revenues is somewhat in error, for many reasons. Often, the estimate is on the high side rather than on the low side. But when we say this Congress is appropriating at this session for expenditure in 1966 and future years, about $119 billion there is no room for much doubt about these figures.

Of course, the expectation is that we are going to continue in the red—the budget will be in deficit—in the current fiscal year 1966. No one knows how much this may be. I hope we are moving toward a balanced budget. We should be.

The economy is thriving. The Nation has never before been in such a sustained period of prosperity. The future certainly is bright in many ways. I do not imply that all spending is bad spending, that big appropriation totals are inherently bad. If we do not undertake spending on the local, State and National levels—and even on the home level—we will not achieve the things which are required, the necessities for government and for our private lives.

But the main object, in my judgment, is that we ought to try to keep the figures as low as reasonably possible. And we ought to undertake to pay our own way—a policy which I have always advocated but which is not as popular in the country generally as it once was. But it is still popular with me.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman agree that we will very likely, in view of the figures he has set forth, see a widening of the gap between income and outgo?

Mr. MAHON. I would doubt we will see a widening of the gap. I believe probably there will be some closing of the gap. Certainly we hope so.

In elaboration, I would add that the budget received in January estimated that for the fiscal year 1965, which closed on June 30, last, there would be a deficit of some $6.3 billion. The actual deficit was much smaller. It was down to about

$3.5 billion. Revenues were up and expenditures were down. And we might add that this was somewhat below fiscal 1964 when we had an $8.2 billion deficit.

The original fiscal 1966 budget, received from the President in January, projected a deficit of $5.3 billion based on expenditures of $99.7 billion—the widely known figure just under the $100 billion mark—and revenues of $94.4 billion. I believe the revenue outlook has improved somewhat since then; in June, the Treasury put out an estimate of $95.4 billion, but the uncertainties of war and the unknowns of congressional action on appropriations have precluded further public projections of expenditures in fiscal 1966, except that I think it may be generally conceded they will probably rise over the earlier estimate.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will permit another question, there is a rumor going about that when this bill goes to the other body there are some 20 or 21, perhaps two dozen, items to be added by the other body. Does the gentleman have any idea how much the bill will be increased by the other body?

Mr. MAHON. Yes. I would say it is more than a rumor that there will be additional funds added. I would estimate that additional amount might be in the range of $300,000,000 or $400,000,000, as I tried to indicate a few moments ago.

We had to have a cutoff date in the House in order to bring this bill to the floor and move toward an adjournment.

Mr. GROSS. So what we are actually looking at is a supplemental appropriation bill running somewhere between $4.5 billion and $5 billion?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is probably correct, as near as I know the probabilities.

Mr. Chairman, I was about to make reference to James A. Garfield, formerly a Member of the House and chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who once said that "War overturns all ordinary calculations." I quote him in order to say that the war in Vietnam has overturned the calculations which many of us, including the Executive, made as to spending for this fiscal year, which will end next June 30.

The original Treasury estimate of spending—not appropriations—was, as I indicated, $99.7 billion for fiscal 1966. I do not know what the official Executive revision of that figure will show, but I say to the House that the psychological $100 billion expenditure barrier has, in my judgment, gone aglimmer. I feel certain that it will be punctured. This we regret, but I believe it fair to say that war has been the upsetting circumstance. There are no limitations to the necessities of defense and security because there is no second place in the contest for survival.

But aside from the upsetting factors of war, the President is holding the line in keeping with his budget calculations and with his promises. Just recently, a supplemental budget estimate message contained this passage:

> Excluding supplementals and budget amendments to finance our efforts in Vietnam, the amounts requested herein when added to the amounts previously requested will not increase the total new obligational authority proposed in the 1966 budget.

Mr. Chairman, I think this would generally cover the overall parameters of the bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The chairman of the committee has set forth the figure of between $118 billion and $119 billion, I believe, as representing the prospective total of appropriations of this session of Congress. If I recall correctly, at the beginning of the year those estimates were $106.4 billion for fiscal 1966 and $6 billion for estimated supplementals, making a total of $112.4 billion. I wonder if the chairman, either now or through an insertion, could pinpoint for us the areas that have accounted for this additional increment between the $112.4 billion and the $118 billion to $119 billion which have been appropriated in this session of Congress.

Mr. MAHON. I would say to the gentleman that at the end of the session when we do know what the appropriations have actually been, I shall undertake to make a summary statement which is usually done by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. However, as an immediate response, I will say that "new obligational authority" is a budget term, and is not quite the same as "appropriations" although with a few exceptions it is synonymous. The largest single difference is the Post Office. The budget tabulates only the net postal deficit, whereas we count as appropriations the gross amount of the appropriations. The other principal differences are the matter of cash appropriations to liquidate prior contract authority; reappropriations; and loan authorizations. I would reread what I read a few minutes ago—from a very recent Executive budget communication to the House:

> Excluding supplementals and budget amendments to finance our efforts in Vietnam, the amount requested herein—

That is, in the budget requests—

> when added to the amounts previously requested will not increase the total new obligational authority proposed in the 1966 budget.

That is the statement very recently from the President's Director of the Budget.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Are you saying, then, that the entire additional $6 billion represents increased authorization to finance the military effort in Vietnam and related expenditures? Is that what that amounts to? And these figures were not included in the $112.4 billion that was submitted to us in January?

Mr. MAHON. What I am saying is that except for the Vietnam situation, the budget totals for obligational authority are within the original total limits. Of course, the Congress is below the budget because we have cut it, the House has cut the appropriation requests about $2,559,000,000 this session. That is the House. The final totals for the Congress will of course be different.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE APPROPRIATION BILLS 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Mr. Chairman, supplementing my earlier remarks, and under leave granted, I include a table summarizing the appropriation bills to this date, including in the House totals today's supplemental bill, and in the final totals the public works bill cleared earlier today:

Summary of totals of the appropriation bills, 89th Congress, 1st session, to Oct. 14, 1965

(NOTE.—Treasury loan authorizations, roughly approximating $900,000,000, are not in this summary. Nor are undetermined "backdoor" appropriations. Nor are permanent appropriations not requiring action in the session, roughly approximating $12,300,000,000.)

	All figures are rounded amounts		
	Bills for fiscal 1965	Bills for fiscal 1966	Bills for the session
A. House actions:			
1. Budget requests for appropriations considered	$4,668,000,000	$100,794,000,000	$105,462,000,000
2. Amounts in bills passed by House	4,418,000,000	98,485,000,000	102,903 000,000
3. Reduction below corresponding budget requests	−250,000,000	−2,309,000,000	−2,559,000,000
B. Senate actions:			
1. Budget requests for appropriations considered	4,723,000,000	99,254,000,000	103,977,000,000
2. Amounts in bills passed by Senate	4,558,000,000	98,487,000,000	103,045,000,000
3. Above House amounts in these bills	+140,000,000	[1] +4,217,000,000	[1] +4,357,000,000
4. Reduction below corresponding budget requests	−165,000,000	−767,000,000	−932,000,000
NOTE.—All bills except final supplemental are included—precise budget requests unknown.			
C. Final actions:			
1. Budget requests for all bills cleared conference	4,722,000,000	93,472,000,000	98,194,000,000
2. Final amounts approved	4,528,000,000	[2] 91,525,000,000	[2] 96,053,000,000
3. Comparisons—			
a. With corresponding budget requests	−194,000,000	−1,947,000,000	−2,141,000,000
b. With corresponding fiscal 1965 amounts		+227,000,000	
c. With bills of the last session			+(3)
NOTE.—2 bills for fiscal 1966 not included (involving budget requests: Agriculture, $5,782,000,000; and final supplemental, $4,364,000,000 plus unknown amounts to be submitted direct to Senate.			

---

[1] Includes 2 unusually large budget items not considered originally in the House: $1,700,000,000 on the Defense bill and $1,035,000,000 on the Treasury bill (this latter item being classified as a supplement to fiscal 1965 rather than a fiscal 1966 appropriation).

[2] Include $201,000,000 for fiscal 1967 (grants for airports and mass transportation).

[3] Undeterminable until the last bill is enacted.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, since this is the last appropriation bill of this session, before addressing myself to the bill I should like to acknowledge, on behalf of myself and the minority, the courtesies that have been extended to us by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. Mahon] and the other members of the majority and their courtesies to the minority. It is a very pleasant task to serve on the Committee on Appropriations. We find that we work well together on both sides of the aisle. We are not always in agreement. I am not in agreement on this bill, but nevertheless we do work well together, and I am sure that this is the spirit that will prevail from now on.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I will be glad to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAHON. I want to thank the gentleman for his very generous statement. I want to say that, in my opinion, the gentleman from Ohio has provided magnificent leadership as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. It has been a much better session and we have done a better job as a result of the good work of the gentleman from Ohio and his colleagues on that side of the aisle.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his statement.

Mr. Chairman, we have spent 9 months of 1965 laying the groundwork of what our President calls the Great Society. We have enacted into law a score or more of new Federal programs intended to give something for nothing to just about everyone in the country. Today we are asked to make a downpayment on these programs. Most of the more than $4 billion in the supplemental appropriation bill is requested to fund portions of the pedernales panacea, and this is only the beginning.

No one knows how many billions will be spent before we are through with these programs. The Congress has been on a wild spending spree in L.B.J.'s general store, trying to buy health and happiness and wisdom for all of our people. Some of us have asked to see the price tag, but the majority did not hear. Some of us have asked what the interest and carrying charges might be, but the majority ignored the question. And so I cannot tell you today exactly how much all of us in our capacity as taxpayers are going to pay to give some of us the good things that are provided in these new programs. I do have some estimates, however.

This supplemental appropriation bill provides $4,214,609,610 to initiate 35 new Federal activities.

We have not provided funds for many other new activities authorized in this session of the Congress.

We are appropriating today only about 10 percent of the total initial authorization of the Great Society legislation of 1965. This is only a small beginning.

As signs of inflationary pressures develop in various sections of the economy, I grow increasingly concerned about the effect of this spending spree.

I am increasingly concerned about our ability to finance all of these new programs while carrying on an increasingly costly military effort in southeast Asia.

And I am increasingly concerned about the reputation of this House, for certainly we have not shown a sense of responsibility for the fiscal soundness of our Federal Government in our mad haste to carry out the mandates of the Great Society.

I am introducing legislation today that will, if enacted, eliminate much of the uncertainty that we have experienced this year concerning the cost of new proposals. The first is a House resolution which would require each legislative committee to include in its report on any new or expanded Federal activity an estimate of the cost of that activity for each of the first 5 fiscal years it is to be in effect. The second would require the same information with regard to each proposal for new legislation in the budget. These resolutions were introduced in the 88th Congress by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith]. Had they been accepted in the 88th Congress, we would know better where we are and where we are headed today, and we might have been able to whittle down or avoid entirely some of the vast expenditures to which we have been committed by the new legislation enacted this year.

During the heyday of the New Deal, the Fair Deal, and the New Frontier, all of us became acquainted with the technique of issuing lists of programs the President at that time considered to be must legislation. That meant only that the President desired the enactment of a bill or several bills during a session of Congress, and sometimes he got his must legislation, sometimes not. Under the Great Society the term has a different meaning. Now it refers to legislation that must be passed on a certain day, or must be accepted by one body without change in order to avoid a conference, and until a week or so ago the majority seemed never to question the wisdom of obedience to these demands.

The principal change made in many of the new programs was to increase the amounts of money the President sought to have authorized. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations put in the Record a few weeks ago a list of new programs illustrating that the amounts authorized for most of them were greater than the generous amounts requested by the executive branch. His words of caution and restraint went unheeded. Today we begin to pay the piper.

For example, we are asked to appropriate $222 million additional for grants to the States for public assistance as a result of improvements in that program authorized this year. And we are told that this will not be sufficient. There is likely to be another supplemental request early in the next session. Furthermore, the testimony of departmental officials is that we cannot expect any reduction, only an increase, in the cost of these programs because they claim that two people are standing in line waiting to get on the rolls for every one whose improved circumstances take him off.

We are authorizing $125,212,000 to administer the recent amendments to the social security program, including health care. They will need 8,300 new employees and a new $3 million building in Baltimore to get this program off the ground.

There is $6 million in contract authorization for the rent subsidy program. The agency had asked for $30 million of which $850,000 was for first year administrative expenses with expected disbursements of $900,000. Instead, the disbursements are limited to $180,000 in this fiscal year. But this is a deceptively small beginning for a program that can last for 40 years and may cost upward of $6 billion. This bill includes other relatively small downpayments on housing programs that will ultimately cost hundreds of millions of dollars.

Testimony in these hearings shows that we are now spending over $3 billion annually for automatic data processing. Some of the more sophisticated systems have monthly rentals of $80,000 to $100,000. This is not a new, but it most certainly is a growing program and one that must be carefully reviewed.

The bill contains another $1½ billion for the poverty program, making a total of $2,084,396,000 available for expenditure in this fiscal year.

The cost per person for the various poverty programs is startling. For instance, the cost per enrollee in the Job Corps conservation centers is given as $4,536.48. In other male centers it is $4,419.78 and in the women's centers $4,536.45.

This assumes that each enrollee stays 9 months. The average cost of establishing a conservation center is $3,300 per man.

VISTA, Volunteers in Service to America, is costing about $7,000 per volunteer.

The bill also includes funds to get underway the new program in the Arts and Humanities. Here, again, the committee has wisely trimmed the amounts requested, but as in the rental program, this is only a temporary saving for you may be certain that the heat will be on for more money next year. It is interesting to note that the National Council on Arts is taking interest in the plight of poor artists whose studios are being destroyed when the urban renewal programs move into the tenement districts to replace old buildings. The Council is considering a request that new low-cost housing projects include studio apartments for those displaced artists, one argument being that the presence of an artist in a penthouse would diversify the population of such projects. I suggest there might be more pressing requirements for the hard-pressed taxpayers' dollar.

Perhaps these will serve as quarters for the Job Corps boys who graduate with honors from the woodworking course, also referred to in these hearings.

We could go on and on with staggering figures and unusual examples of how we are spending our resources, but surely this should be enough to give everyone reason for sober reflection on the fiscal problem we have created here this year.

I think it should add weight to the suggestions of the majority leader of the other body. You will recall that he has urged a pause in the enactment of new legislation. He has suggested that the next session might be devoted to review of the new legislation enacted this year, pointing out that:

> It is hardly possible to set in legislative motion so many new Federal approaches to the Nation's problems, as we have done in recent years, without leaving a number of gaps and any number of rough edges, overextensions, and overlaps.

I cannot conceive of any gaps. It seems to me we have many, many overextensions, overlays, and rough edges. It could not be otherwise when legislation that usually requires long hearings and discussion is enacted in a matter of hours. In fact, the amendment of the Education Act within 2 months to correct a major error is proof of the dangers inherent in hastening the legislative process.

The Senator's statement has struck a responsive chord throughout the country, indicating that there is an undercurrent of uneasiness about the speed with which new legislative programs have been enacted and the probable cost of extending Federal activity into so many new areas. Under unanimous consent I include with my remarks at this point editorials from the Wall Street Journal and the Chicago Daily News on this subject:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, Oct. 6, 1965]

The Piper's Fee

It was the Democrat's own Senate leader, Mike Mansfield, of Montana, who called last week for a pause in the hurtling momentum of the Great Society's proliferating program.

"It is hardly possible," said Mansfield with grim understatement, "to set in legislative motion so many new Federal approaches to the Nation's problems, as we have done in recent years, without leaving a number of gaps and any number of rough edges, overextensions and overlaps."

All of this is true, and the area where warning signals are most conspicuous is the U.S. economy. Prices everywhere are straining against the leash as the billions pour into the new Federal programs. Steel and automobiles appear to be holding the line fairly well, but food prices—which affect everyone—are beginning to yield to the pressures. A recent Republican brochure cited, for example, that the price of bacon has risen 114 percent in the last year; round steak is up 70 percent; frying chickens are up 56 percent, and so on.

The source of the pressure is not hard to find. The Daily News Washington Bureau documentary on the Great Society last week cited an estimate by a U.S. Chamber of Commerce statistician that 25 items in the legislative program will cost $13.5 billion. President Johnson's January figure of $99.7 billion has long since gone by the boards. Current spending is at the rate of $104 billion a year, and more billions will be added before the year ends.

This is, of course, the road to inflation, and it would be well to utilize Mansfield's proposed pause to reflect who pays the price of inflation. Everybody does, but especially the little fellow. Rising prices take an ever-bigger bite out of everybody's paycheck, but the people least able to afford it get hit with the biggest percentage increase in living costs.

Here is a campaign issue that is being laid in the lap of the Republican Party—the party of fiscal moderation and sound currency—and as yet the GOP has done little about it except to nibble around the edges.

"No leading Republican personality," our Washington bureau reports, "has yet taken it upon himself to give a single speech in which he has analyzed the Great Society program as a whole." It is time the party as a whole turned to this constructive task. The GOP has many internal differences, but one target where it should find absolute unanimity is the Johnson administration's shoveling out billions.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 4, 1965]

Pause for Digestion?

Consolidation—need to digest—time for a pause; unusual words like that are being heard in Washington these days. In part they reflect a probably well-justified suspicion that a lot of voters think the legislative activity has been too hectic. It would be a healthy thing if the relatively temperate mood were to last.

The President himself, as Mr. Otten reported in this newspaper the other day, is cautioning various task forces that 1965's rash of legislation should be digested slowly and carefully next year, that programs should not be accelerated too quickly or more money spent than can be spent intelligently, that care should be taken not to create swollen, floundering buearucracies.

At the same time a liberal Democratic Representative, quoted in the National Observer, writes the President (and indirectly his constituents): "We must take time to work out the most efficient administration of these programs * * *. It is my hope * * * that we may look forward to a more deliberate pace of legislation in the 2d session of the 89th Congress."

Whether much time for stocktaking will be found is nonetheless doubtful, especially since the second session will be subject to election-year pressures. Moreover, Mr. Johnson and his advisers may decide, after all, to submit "bold new programs" next year. Officials are working on such, though no one knows when they may emerge as legislative proposals.

Still, even a little caution is welcome; it is urgently needed for precisely the kind of reasons the President suggests.

To look at an aspect of the cost question first, the Senate Republican policy committee has just assembled some interesting estimates of authorizations for appropriations which show their first-year cost contrasted with future costs. This list represents a mere sprinkling of Federal activity. It comprises 50 bits of legislation, selected partly for their variety, and does not include such spending giants as the Agriculture Department and the bulk of Defense Department projects.

Here are a few of the examples: The estimated first-year authorization for housing, rent subsidies, and urban development is given as $935 million; the cumulative amount in 4 years, $7.4 billion. Regional medical centers, first year $50 million, in 4 years $650 million. Federal aid to higher education, first year $672 million, in 5 years $4.7 billion.

Apart from their substantial size, these and other examples exhibit the built-in growth of Federal programs; that is, the cumulative amounts exceed the sum of the first-year costs multiplied by the number of years. Naturally no account can be taken of further expansions Congress may decree next year or later.

It is indeed a political truism that once these programs get launched they tend to enlarge, and almost never is there retrenchment or discontinuation. Given that powerful momentum, plus increased military spending, and the prospect is for bigger budget deficits instead of the smaller ones the President has hoped for. If so, it would help propel the inflationary forces already developing.

Many in Government, to be sure, regard unlimited spending, deficits, and inflation as nothing to worry about. Yet we don't see how any official could fail to sense the danger the President sees of chaotic and self-defeating administration of numerous new programs piled atop all the old and expanding ones.

The plain truth is that the Federal Government is now so intimately involved in so many matters, great and small, that it would tax the talents of the wisest administrators to run it all in a half-way intelligent fashion. There is not that much wisdom in Washington, and the problem is aggravated by the fact that the Government has plunged into many areas where its competence is at best highly questionable.

We happen to believe the present session of Congress has been far too busy for the Nation's good. A pause for digestion would not be a solution, but it might help. Whatever is the upshot next year, President Johnson has at least set forth some of the risks of continuing at the same frantic pace.

I have extracted a few interesting items from the hearings, illustrative of the problems I have mentioned, and will include them with my remarks as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Griffin, Assistant Administrator, General Services Administration, testified that the Federal Government's annual bill for automatic data processing now exceeds $3 billion. Two thousand one hundred and eighty-eight computers are now in place in the Federal Government. He said:

> The computers are designed to operate three shifts a day. The Government's usage falls far short of this. During fiscal year 1964 an average of 640,000 hours of computer time was unused monthly. Some of the more sophisticated systems have monthly rentals of $80,000 to $100,000. An unused hour of computer time can cost as much as $500. The Comptroller General over the weekend, I think, on Friday, issued a report in which his estimate of the unused time and the recapturable time is $500 million. GSA's estimate was short of that. We conservatively estimate that there is $300 million annually of unused time which can be captured. In addition to this the Government also spends annually $23 million for machine time on commercial computers while this time on Government computers goes unused. This appropriation will enable us, along with more far-reaching accomplishments, to considerably cut into that $23 million of machine time which we are now leasing commercially.

He said the President on March 4 sent to Congress a report on the need for improved management of automatic data processing equipment in Government. I agree. It certainly needs improved management.

People sometimes forget the far-reaching activities of General Services Administration. The following was in their justification for $3,510,000 for operating expenses, Federal Supply Service:

> This supplemental appropriation contains the requirements for additional expenses in the supply distribution, procurement, quality control, and administrative operations activities. All expenses are directly related to the increased volume of stores stock sales and nonstores direct delivery purchases for

> the Department of Defense in connection with the increased military aid to Vietnam and the general buildup of U.S. military forces.
>
> Based on U.S. Army estimates of additional requirements for GSA-managed items contained on their support lists and buildup lists, and preliminary estimates of Navy and Air Force requirements, there will be an unanticipated increase of $26 million in stores stock sales. In addition the general administrative items furnished to DOD by GSA such as group 81—packaging and packing supplies—not included in the lists amount to an additional $15.4 million based on Army and GSA estimates. Based on the same sources, estimates of additional requirements for nonstores items will total $10.8 million. These increases, which will raise the stores stock sales for fiscal year 1966 to $416.4 million and the total volume of stores and nonstores buying to $787.3 million, are considered the minimum effect of the increased military requirements on the volumes which can be handled within 1966 funds currently available.

Mr. Griffin said they have firm information from the military services showing an initial additional requirement for troop support of $26 million, plus general administrative items for the military services of $15.4 million—an 11-percent increase.

HHFA

During consideration of the rent supplement program by FHA, it was testified there would be an expected expenditure of $900 thousand. Mr. Jonas asked:

> This means you plan to dispense $900,000 during the year, and you want $850,000 for administrative expenses?

Mr. Weaver—

> Yes, sir, because we are building up a program which will have a long-term lead, and which will result in much greater expenditures later. It is a $30 million program we have, sir, not a $900,000 program.

Later on Mr. Evins said:

> Doctor, as now authorized this program could go up to $6 billion over the 40 years if we gave you all the money you could expend.

Mr. Evins also said:

> Most of these programs are for a year or 2 years or 3 or 5 years, but these will be contracts for 40 years.

Mr. Weaver agreed the amount will go up but would not agree it would go up that much.

In a long statement on their cost reduction program, page 327, is an indication PHA will use one appraiser instead of two to appraise tentative sites of low-rent housing projects. I wonder if that will save money. With two appraisers, the chances are doubled that the appraisal might be realistic and not an overestimate.

PILOT PROJECTS IN JOB CORPS CAMPS

> The staff, in cooperation with the Office of Economic Opportunity, started three tentative pilot projects in three representative Job Corps camps throughout the country. A men's urban center, two conservation centers, and one women's camp were chosen as typical of Job Corps operations throughout the country.
>
> While it was felt that vocational training of artists through the Job Corps programs was not desirable at the present time for either agency, it was agreed that cultural activities should become a part of the general program of the training centers, since one of the aims of the Job Corps is to adjust enrollees to a fuller life. These activities will be recreational in nature, making use of the cultural resources of the areas concerned.
>
> Further studies are being carried out to ascertain the feasibility of developing fundable proposals at all levels of the poverty program, including Head Start and the community action program.

I think some of the local Federal Government buildings still contain examples of art produced under the WPA. If the results are as bad as some were, I hope they will not be as permanent.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS

The following appears on page 543 in a statement on "Activities of the National Council on the Arts from September 3, 1964 through June 30, 1965":

LOW-COST ARTISTS' HOUSING

> It has been pointed out that under urban renewal programs which replace inadequate and substandard housing, many buildings which serve not only as homes, but also as studios for artists are being destroyed. Since artists are seldom well enough off to maintain both a home and a studio, their working-living quarters are, therefore, being destroyed, and no provisions made under present construction plans for their replacement. It has been suggested that under URA, FHA, and other HHFA programs, provision should be made for low-cost housing (which would mean studios) for artists.
>
> It has been further pointed out that the building of low-cost studio-type units on the top levels of urban apartment projects would—
>
> Diversify the population of such projects, which is often narrowly restricted;
>
> Provide needed working quarters for artists, as well as homes;
>
> Assist in breaking the monotony of what are frequently monotonous skylines;
>
> Another suggestion is the conversion of large homes, obsolete schools, and loft buildings to artists' quarters, rather than destroying these buildings * * *.
>
> Meetings have been held with the HHFA to investigate the problem, but as yet no detailed plan has been proposed for its solution. The staff are, however, investigating the provisions of the various Federal housing programs, under which it might be possible to demonstrate that the housing of artists in living-working quarters is as feasible as it is necessary.
>
> The remodeling of a loft building as a pilot project may be undertaken to demonstrate the feasibility of such a program.

One would think that the new housing law—$8.2 billion—must have something in it for every needy person—including artists. Amazing that a pilot project is necessary to prove a loft building can be remodeled.

TREASURY—BUREAU OF THE MINT

> Public Law 89-81, approved July 23, 1965, authorizes the production of new subsidiary coins, of an alloy consisting of 75 percent copper and 25 percent nickel clad on a core of pure copper for the 10- and 25-cent coins, and an alloy consisting of 80 percent silver and 20 percent copper clad on a core of an alloy consisting of approximately 21.5 percent silver and 78.5 percent copper for the 50-cent piece. The act also increases the amount authorized to be appropriated to $45 million. This change in alloys, coupled with an apparent change in the demand pattern for coins, requires a substantially larger production capacity in the new Philadelphia Mint. It is now planned to construct a mint with an immediate capacity of 2 billion coins per shift per year, or 4 billion coins annually on a two-shift basis, which will include additional space and process equipment for the cladding operation.

In fine print, inserted in the record, page 455:

> It is estimated that the seigniorage from the additional coins that will be produced from this supplemental will be from $750 to $800 million in the fiscal year 1966. We had previously estimated $113 million would be derived from seigniorage in 1966 based on the program in the President's budget. Thus, a total of about $900 million is estimated for 1966.

This means that Public Law 89-81 will result in additional receipts in the general fund of the Treasury of about or almost $1 billion in 1966.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] has consumed a total of 12 minutes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas, pointed out as far as the revenue aspects are concerned, the Committee on Ways and Means had the best estimates. Which, of course, is true because that is our business. Government revenues tend to be underestimated in times of economic expansion, so in the past few years our revenues, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon] correctly states, have been underestimated. However, let me warn that in periods of contraction the tendency is to overestimate our revenues. We have already adjusted our revenue estimates in this year upward by about $1.5 billion. It is also our business, when the expenditures exceed the revenues that we anticipate, to figure out how much additional bonds we are going to have to market and what are the economic consequences.

In this appropriation process in the Congress, there are really three steps. We are all familiar with them, but just to go over them, there is the authorization bill—the authority—to go to the Committee on Appropriations. Of course, these are the larger figures.

Then there is the appropriation process itself which we are engaged in right now.

But the third and often the neglected area, the one that the Committee on Ways and Means has to zero in on, is the expenditure side. Because the President actually has the authority to spend over $200 billion from the accumulated carryover balances plus the new power to spend that this particular Congress has granted.

The President said he was only going to spend $99.7 billion this fiscal year even though he had requested $106.4 billion additional power to spend for the fiscal year. Incidentally, we have given him about $106 billion and this would add another $4 billion plus. So there is $110 billion additional power to spend, but I am happy to say that the

President not only is adhering to the $99.7 billion figure for expenditures that he gave us in January but he actually is spending at below the $98 billion level.

Incidentally, when the President asked for the debt ceiling increase earlier this year, he originally asked for $329 billion based on the expenditure level of $99.7 billion. In the wisdom of the Congress we only gave him $328 billion, which was on the assumption that his expenditures should be only $98.7 billion. I again point out to the credit of the administration that they have been holding below those figures.

Incidentally, I will supply for the RECORD the expenditure levels for the months of July and August and the projected expenditure levels which indicate these levels at this figure.

But here is the dangerous thing, and here is what I would like to see the Committee on Appropriations do. At the same time that these expenditure levels were held and are being held now for fiscal year 1966 to the $98 billion level, and for the fiscal year 1965 just ended June 30 with the expenditures being held to the $97 billion level, and the previous fiscal year 1964, a cutback from the expenditure levels that the Kennedy administration had projected were held at $97.4 billion—the Congress each time has been busting the $100 billion mark in additional power to spend granted to the President.

So we see an interesting increase in the carryover balances to spend, going back to the fiscal year 1963, an $80 billion carryover; and then the next fiscal year 1964, an $87 billion carryover and for this fiscal year just ended a carryover of $95 billion and a projected carryover this fiscal year in the budget submitted this January, a carryover of $101 billion; and with this additional $4 billion in this supplemental appropriation bill, the carryover will be close to $105 billion, or the figure may increase to $110 billion carryover depending on what else is done in supplemental appropriations next January.

Now this is power to spend that the President received. Except for the debt ceiling he can can exercise this full power to the tune of $200 billion right away, but he has not done so; which has led me to make the remark, When is the real Lyndon Johnson going to stand up, the President who has been holding the expenditures, the actual outflow of cash, to those levels to which policy I happen to adhere to and believe is good fiscal judgment? Or the President who continually asks the Congress to give him more power to spend when he is not using all of this power and actually freezing funds—and I am glad he is—the President who is telling the departments to cut back in their expendture levels.

But the Appropriations Committee ought to zero in on these carryover balances and have a few rescission bills come up before the Congress and cut back on these powers the President has not been using. By doing this the Congress can have a better understanding and be more effective in establishing our fiscal policies. This would guard against putting too much of a burden on the Ways and Means Committee in holding the debt ceiling.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. In referring to spending, the gentleman has mentioned the figure of slightly under $100 billion. I think the RECORD should show that he is talking about the administrative budget and not the actual spending, because actual spending is above $120 billion.

Mr. CURTIS. The actual spending is $150 billion, if you want to figure it from an economic angle, because that would include two major items. One item the gentleman has mentioned. It includes the trust funds, such as social security, highways, and so on, which would kick us up to about $130 billion expenditure.

Then, in addition, there are these exchanges which go on in the Post Office, Government corporations, and other places where actually cash passes out of Government hands and is collected in other kinds of revenue.

So the total economic impact of the Federal Government expenditure is about $150 billion.

The administrative budget to which I am referring, of course, relates to the appropriation process in which we are engaged. The $4 billion bill before the House relates to the administrative budget, the power of Congress to grant or not to grant additional spending power to the President. It is the expenditures of appropriations, enacted under the administrative budget which has been held below the $100 billion figure.

I would like briefly to refer to two key things. We need to balance this budget and we need to balance it badly, especially because of our international balance-of-payments situation, which is still unsolved and is weakening the United States in international affairs daily. The longer we put this off, the more dangerous it becomes.

Second, do not think that we are escaping this in our daily lives. The Consumer Price Index increased by 2 percent in only 1 year. Multiply 2 percent by the $550 billion consumer spending power, and we see we have taken $11 billion out of the purchasing power of our people. That hits those people least able to adjust themselves to it.

It is perfectly true that in our society the debtor gains from inflation. The Federal Government is the biggest debtor and so the biggest gainer. But let me say this. Those of our smaller income groups in our society who depend upon consumer credit, and therefore are debtors, are debtors on short-term credit. They find that the lender increases interest rates depending on the amount of anticipated inflation. The lender must do this. That is why in Brazil, where inflation is very heavy, interest rates are 30 percent in terms of months, not years, because what the lenders have to recoup is the depreciation of the value of the dollar as well as to charge for the use of the dollars that are being lent. This is one of the causes of the increased interest rates, and there is no way of avoiding it. This hurts the lowest income groups in our society.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of our committee pointed out earlier in his discussion on this bill, we cannot keep passing authorizing legislation without coming to the day of reckoning, and this is one of those days. This $4.2 billion supplemental appropriation bill is merely a starter to fund many of these programs that have whisked through this Congress so hurriedly in this session. There are a number of us on the Committee on Appropriations who are not carte blanche opposed to everything embodied in this bill, but we do have some reservations about some of the money and some of the programs that are being funded.

I shall confine my remarks today to just a few of these.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Shriver has had many great and grand things to say about the poverty program. He has enumerated before the Democratic national platform committee in 1964 the goals this program would ultimately achieve.

He has said:

> Other people say, I am sure you have heard it, that the poor shall always be with us but President Johnson does not believe that and the Congress of the United States does not believe that and the American people do not believe it.

I need not remind Members of this House that the first man who ever said it, a man of a good deal more insight and foresight than either President Johnson or Mr. Shriver, was Jesus Christ, as reported in three Gospels of the Bible. As I have revealed recently, the administration is now attempting to rewrite the history textbooks, but I did not think they would go so far as to try to rewrite the Bible.

No one in this world or the next seems to know exactly how much it is going to cost the American taxpayer to see that there are no poor in this country. Mr. Shriver has started off this year requesting $1.5 billion. From all the testimony in the RECORD, this is a minuscule drop in the bucket compared to what it will eventually cost to achieve the projected goals.

Mr. Shriver has said the poverty bill will mean "nearly a million boys between 16 and 22 now standing on street corners can get work" and "millions of young women" will learn how to run a household "as well as get the training in order to hold a job." Last year of this 2 million boys and girls the Job Corps was capable of handling only 10,000 enrollees in 48 Job Corps centers at a cost of $183 million. This coming year it is estimated that the capacity of Job Corps centers will increase to 50,000 young people at the cost of $235 million. Just how many millions will it cost to take care of all the poverty-stricken young people?

Mr. Shriver has said:

> Eleven million adults will get a chance to read, to write, and to count well enough to hold down a decent job.

I agree that this is a wonderful goal. However, the fact remains that it will cost $42 million just to take care of approximately 105,000 participants in the adult literacy program in this fiscal year, which means, of course, that $42 million is only 1 percent of the total required to carry out this goal—see table 1:

TABLE 1.—*Demands for Office of Economic Opportunity-delegated programs*

	1965 fiscal year, actual	1966 fiscal year, estimated
Neighborhood Youth Corps:		
Number of youths sponsors sought to include	383,000	485,000
Enrollment	278,000	280,000
Estimated unfilled demand	105,000	205,000
Rural loans:		
Loan applicants	31,551	70,000
Loans approved	10,984	15,500
Estimated unfilled demand	20,567	54,500
Co-op loans:		
Loan applicants	341	1,000
Loans approved	82	350
Estimated unfilled demand	259	650
Small business loans:		
Loan applicants	1,500	30,000
Loans approved	155	3,000
Estimated unfilled demand	1,345	27,000
Adult basic education:		
Number of people seeking to enroll	93,000	250,000
Enrollment	43,000	105,000
Estimated unfilled demand	50,000	145,000
Work experience:		
Number of participants included in all projects submitted for approval	106,500	126,000
Enrollment	88,700	109,000
Estimated unfilled demand	17,800	17,000
Work study:		
Number of applicants	80,000	125,000
Enrollment	80,000	125,000
No estimated unfilled demand	0	0

Mr. Chairman, it is a cruel hoax to approach the war on poverty without any true concept of what it will actually cost the American taxpayer. During the hearings Mr. Shriver told our committee that in the next 5 years the total cost would probably be over $10 billion, or an average of over $2 billion a year. He would not even venture a rough guess as to what the average cost would be over the next 10 years. If as Mr. Shriver has said, this program were to turn relief receivers into taxpayers, I am certain that most Americans would want us to vigorously proceed, but it is a hoax to lure them into believing that by paying $15,000, $20,000, $25,000 salaries to short-time and often part-time administrators will accomplish this goal.

The local administration costs of community action programs will come to between $35 and $40 million in fiscal 1966.

This includes $9.9 million for an additional 349 people, or an average of better than $20,000 per person.

In the Head Start program last year the Federal share came to $82.7 million as compared to $11.9 million from the local communities. This is only a little higher than 12 percent local contribution.

During the hearings Mr. Shriver pointed out that only 15 percent of the children participating in a Head Start program could come from groups other than those that are poverty-stricken, and yet in information I requested concerning the Bureau County Head Start program, he said that only 33 of the 144 children enrolled were from families with annual incomes of $3,000 or less. Of the 144 children, 37 were from families receiving aid to dependent children benefits.

So in other words better than 50 percent of the children in this project from families are well above the arbitrary poverty line of $3,000 of family income.

OEO spent $712,000 on postage this past year. CAP accounted for $130,000. Of this $130,000 it is estimated that Head Start used between $87,000 and $98,000. A sizable portion of this was for air mail postage. I understand that 12-inch stacks of mimeographed letters were being air mailed clear across the country. Now I realize that this program has benefited many children, but if we are really serious about this poverty war we must operate it efficiently.

Let us not forget the old English proverb that "Haste makes waste."

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that we cannot recount here the entire operation of the Office of Economic Opportunity, but let me touch on just a few facets at random.

Mr. Chairman we are told by the administration that 35 percent of the people living in rural areas are poor people; 33 percent of all Head Start grant amounts went to rural areas—8 percent of all program development and conduct and administration grant amounts went to rural areas. Overall, 26 percent of all title II funds were granted in rural areas.

The first 2-year average costs per Job Corps enrollee came to about $6,000, although I should say in all fairness that this includes the beginning capital costs. If the capital costs figure is amortized over a 5- or 10-year period this average enrollee cost still is above $4,500 per year.

In the Job Corps Center in St. Petersburg meals are fixed by professional cooks. Under no circumstances are enrollees required to prepare their own meals. They may, if they wish, volunteer to do so. This is at one of those women Job Corps camps were, according to Mr. Shriver, tomorrow's mothers will learn how to run a household.

The OEO is planning to spend $600,000 for VISTA recruitment and community relations in 1966 in order to bring the program level from 1,000 to 4,000 volunteers. They are going to require the services of more than 100 national and local organizations to assist in recruitment. The average costs for these volunteers last year came to $7,000 per volunteer on the job. The way OEO figures it, however, the annual direct cost of a volunteer is figured at $3,350.

Mr. Chairman, this budget includes $88,000 for the development of programs for the aged poor. The administration is still working on a foster-grandparent program and on the training of elderly as home health aids. No one has yet ventured a guess on the cost of this in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I must call your attention that there is money here to provide mobile legal services for the poor that will eventually be a $20 million program. This program I suspect is supposed to parallel the rural library service or something like that. I tell you there is no end to the dreamer's machinations in this poverty war.

Mr. Shriver claims that he cannot possible foresee the need for a supplemental in 1966. Perhaps we should point out that this is probably due to the fact that he has a $550 million carryover from this past year—see table 2:

TABLE 2.—*Economic opportunity program level*

[In thousands of dollars]

	1965 obligations (1)	1965 expenditures (2)	1965 unliquidated obligations (3)	1966 President's budget (4)	Total of cols. (3) and (4)
Title I:					
(*a*) Job Corps	182,974	34,854	148,120	235,000	383,120
(*b*) Work-training program	132,100	50,679	81,421	255,000	336,421
(*c*) Work-study program	55,077	32,422	22,655	60,000	82,655
Total, title I	370,151	117,955	252,196	550,000	802,196
Title II:					
(*a*) Community action program	237,157	56,773	180,384	685,000	865,384
(*b*) Adult basic education	4,448	3,410	1,038	30,000	31,038
Total, title II	241,605	60,183	181,422	715,000	896,422
Title III:					
(*a*) Migrant agricultural employee program	14,945	634	14,311	20,000	34,311
(*b*) Rural areas program	25,680	21,409	4,271	35,000	39,271
Total, title III	40,625	22,043	18,852	55,000	73,582
Title V: Work experience program	111,988	20,619	91,369	150,000	241,369
Title VI:					
(*a*) VISTA	3,030	620	2,410	17,500	19,910
(*b*) General direction and administration	6,417	2,231	4,186	12,500	16,686
Total, title VI	9,447	2,851	6,596	30,000	36,596
Total, all titles	773,816	223,651	550,165	1,500,000	2,050,165

The Office of Economic Opportunity in 1965 was allowed a total of 3,965 personnel. In this budget proposal for 1966 increases this amount to 7,038 people. A breakdown on this follows:

TABLE 3.—*Personnel staffing data, by program*

	Fiscal year 1965 allowance	Fiscal year 1966 proposed
Job Corps program:		
Office of Economic Opportunity	345	467
Department of Agriculture	1,170	2,222
Department of Interior	1,040	1,959
Community action program	301	650
Director VISTA management	504	955
Work training	605	785
Work study		
Rural areas		
Work experience		
Adult basic education		
Total	3,965	7,038

Mr. Chairman, in closing these brief remarks I would call your particular attention in the following table to the 8,295 additional employees requested to just get medicare and the attendant amendments to the Social Security Act underway. This is just a starter. And all told look at the total number of 12,078 additional Federal employees provided for in this table:

TABLE 4.—*New positions, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and Office of Economic Opportunity, fiscal year 1966*

	Requested positions	Allowed positions
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE		
Food and Drug Administration: Salaries and expenses	269	269
Office of Education: Educational improvement of the handicapped	----------	----------
Public Health Service:		
Chronic diseases and health of the aged	6	6
Communicable disease activities	----------	----------
Community health practice and research	175	175
National Institute of Mental Health	20	20
Social Security Administration: Limitation on salaries and expenses	8,295	8,295
Welfare Administration:		
Grants to States for public assistance	----------	----------
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Family Services	150	100
Grants for maternal and child welfare	----------	----------
Salaries and expenses:		
Children's Bureau	35	35
Office of Commissioner	23	11
General administration and other:		
Salaries and expenses:		
Office of Secretary	36	18
Office of Field Administration (trust funds)	36	36
Office of General Counsel	50	40
Total, Department of Health Education, and Welfare	9,095	9,005
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT		
Office of Economic Opportunity	3,073	3,073
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and Office of Economic Opportunity	12,168	12,078

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I will be glad to yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. I think you are quite correct in pointing out that we will very likely be spending the figures Mr. Shriver indicated of $10 billion or more over the next 5 years. Does my colleague have any concept of what we are spending annually in welfare payments by Federal, State, city, and private agencies to ameliorate poverty but reducing none of the basic causes of it?

Mr. MICHEL. You know, years ago the arguments they gave us were that if you attacked this or that problem with this or that program, you will be sure to cut down appreciably the payments of assistance grants. In this year the expenditures for Federal grants for public assistance to the States are higher than they have been in the history of this country. This year we are appropriating $3.5 billion in Federal grants to the States. So the argument that enactment of this and that program to fight poverty will reduce the requirement for public assistance grants just does not work out that way because every time they keep coming back for more.

Mr. SCHEUER. We are spending nationally over $100 billion a year on various types of welfare assistance. Certainly the poverty program in 8 months of its history cannot be expected to justify itself now. In a year from now the situation may be a lot different.

Mr. MICHEL. I will not dispute the gentleman's point, but I think we should be honest and forthright with the people and not delude them by telling them that through the appropriation of a couple of billion dollars this year we will wipe out poverty for we know that it will take years for the trickle-down theory to actually get down to the poverty stricken poor folks.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED].

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to give the Members a word of explanation about one item in the bill which shows as a reduction. I refer to the request for supplemental funds of $41.5 million that was made by the Post Office Department which has been disallowed in the bill.

As the Members of the Committee know, the operations branch of the Post Office Department receives a lump sum appropriation of some $4.3 billion. Under the law they are required to divide this lump sump into four quarterly allocations. This was done this year. However, when the Department got into the actual problem of delivering the mails in the first quarter, there was an unprecedented increase in volume, much above what the committee and the Department had estimated the increase would be, which has placed the Department in the position of running about $10.5 million short on its allocation for the first quarter.

When it became apparent that it would not be possible for additional funds under a supplemental to be made available to the Department in the first quarter and upon the insistence of the subcommittee, the Department went to the Bureau of the Budget and was able to prevail upon them to permit a transfer of money from the fourth quarter allocation in order to meet the needs of the first quarter.

This same action may have to be taken again in the second quarter.

The reason we have put this off—and what I want to tell the Members of the Committee is, that this is not a reduction. It is only a delay, because the Department must have not only this money but some additional money before it can complete this fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, some legislative actions are now pending which, if enacted into law—and the indications are they will be—will make some very heavy impact upon the budget of the Department.

Now, in January or early in the next session when this matter comes up again, we will have then available at least 6 months of experience so we can get a much more accurate picture of what the volume increase is going to be and we hope to know then a lot more about what the impact on their budget as the result of congressional legislative action is going to be.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted the members of the Committee to be assured that the Department will be able to meet its obligations until further action can be taken and that the mails will be delivered; that when this matter comes back, instead of being $41 million, if all of the actions now pending and which have been passed by this House become law, you are going to be talking about a lot more money than this.

So, Mr. Chairman, I did not want there to be any misunderstanding about this particular item in the bill because it is the best method through which we can give the House a better opportunity to make a better decision on the matter at that time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Is the Post Office Department going to be charged for this student summer work program? I notice in the report you devote quite a little attention to that program.

Mr. STEED. The Post Office Department used the funds for that work last summer that they would have used in any event, because in the hiring of people to fill vacation time jobs they have that fund available all the time and that is what they used for the student work program last summer. Actually, the Department was able to take advantage of it and it actually saved money by doing so.

There was some criticism about the way they went about doing it which we have covered in the report. However, dollarwise, it made no impact on their budget except it actually had the effect of saving some money.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, my friend is not saying that these youngsters picked up here, there, and everywhere, some of whom never saw the inside of a post office before, were better qualified than the regular employees and temporary employees in the post offices in this country?

Mr. STEED. I think the gentleman will have to agree that most of these people acquitted themselves very well.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROBISON].

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, even at the risk of beating a horse that may already be dead, I would like to say just a few more words about the summer employment program indulged in by the Post Office Department this year.

The subject is covered, in some detail, in the report on this supplemental appropriation bill—as you will note if you will turn to page 51 thereof—and while the committee has indicated its less-than-total pleasure with the manner in which this particular operation was carried out, I would have to say that, all in all, the Department has gotten off the spot on this pretty easily.

Let us take a look at what happened. As you will find out from the hearings—if you are interested enough to look—there has always been a summertime employment program by the Post Office Department. Last year—1964, that is—the Department hired some 1,500 temporary summer employees, many, if not most of whom, were students. And this was about par for a normal summer.

This year, however, when a directive came down from the White House to the effect that it was the President's desire to find summer employment for as many young people aged 16 through 21 as possible, the Department managed to find and to hire some 8,600 summertime employees, which is surely a remarkable increase in just 1 year.

Sort of as an afterthought, word was finally sent out by the Postmaster General that these hundreds of new employees were supposed to be deserving youngsters who needed jobs or—to quote from a more specific departmental memorandum—were to come from the ranks of "economically and educationally disadvantaged youth."

But it would appear, Mr. Chairman, that there was never any real effort on the part of the Department, or those responsible for this program, to properly screen the many hundreds of job applicants who were dredged up, some 3,400 of which evidently came through recommendations submitted by those more fortunate Members of Congress who were permitted to get in on the act.

As all of us well know, a veil of secrecy has since been drawn around this whole affair, and I do not suppose it would do any good to again try to pierce that veil although the mere fact that it was put there indicates, at least to me and perhaps to you, that the Department, in the end, was not as proud, actually, of this program as the outgoing Postmaster General and others who have come to his defense would have you believe.

It may be easy for the Vice President to say, as he was reported having said in an article in the Baltimore Sun on September 19, that he was "unimpressed" by Republican complaints that some of the youngsters who got these jobs came from well-to-do families because, in the words of the Vice President, a summer job can be a valuable experience for any youngster, provided he earns his pay and is not a shirker. And so it can.

But it is not so easy to shrug off such criticism as this on September 9 from the editor of the Evening Star—here in Washington—to the effect that:

> The Post Office Department has flagrantly undercut a portion of the antipoverty program which had a great deal of merit, and its explanation, issued a few days ago, to the effect that it had misinterpreted the President's desire simply doesn't hold water.

Now, I am not suggesting that these youngsters did not earn their pay from the Post Office Department this past summer—probably most of them did—and undoubtedly many of them were helped through the summer months and even, perhaps, a few of them were thus encouraged to go back to school this fall.

But the point is, Mr. Chairman, that the mail service—for whatever variety of reasons—is not the service it ought to be. Each of us gets enough letters from irate constituents every week complaining about the mail service to convince us of that fact. And I, personally, just do not think that service was improved very much by this kind of a crash program to bring in hundreds of untrained, unscreened, temporary summer employees—probably far more than were actually needed or could properly be used—just because somebody, somewhere, saw in this the opportunity to spread around a little patronage where it might do some doubtful good.

The outgoing Postmaster General said he could not tell us exactly what kind of a program his successor might run along these lines next summer. Whatever it is, I would hope that the new Postmaster General—when we get him—will have profited by this year's experience, and will not repeat it.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I am glad the gentleman brought this up, because I find that the statement of the Postmaster General in the report is not too accurate. It says that the Postmaster General testified that the program had no relation to the antipoverty program. It is true that antipoverty funds were not used.

However, I might quote from a newspaper account in the Minneapolis Tribune on June 16 which quotes the Vice President as saying, "The primary emphasis should be on hiring disadvantaged youth."

The President when he announced this program said:

> These opportunities will be given so far as practical to boys and girls because of economic and educational disadvantages.

Now the emphasis as laid out in the press that everybody read about is that these were to be poor kids who would not go on to school unless they received a summer job. I had information from people working in the post office in Milwaukee, Wis., that they were dropped from the payroll. Widows, who were temporary employees and who had children who were trying to go on to college, lost their post office jobs and were replaced by summer youth. It seems to me this is inconsistent with the purposes of the program. The President announced the program as an adjunct to the poverty program and it is hardly fulfilling his proposals when poor widows are fired and the children of wealthy politicians are hired. I think the most important thing now is not the fact that there might be this same kind of hiring next year because the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Macy, indicated he is not going to let this happen again, after issuing the cease and desist order in July.

You can see by the announcement of Christmas hiring that they are going to use the merit basis for hiring then. But the most important thing is secrecy in Government where the Postmaster General refused to submit the names of summer employees to the Members of Congress as to whom they were hiring in the Post Office Department and where the House itself by a vote of 186 to 180 refused to ask him to submit these names. Now some of us have had to use a long drawn out process trying to secure these names from the local post offices and the regional offices themselves and some Members are running into difficulty there trying to secure the names as quickly as they would like. We have five regional offices reports now. It will take some time before they convey all the information. I think this kind of secrecy in Government makes the entire country suspicious of the hiring of the Post Office Department when it refuses to divulge these names and this House has been a party to this abuse of the people's right to know.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POOL. I would like to ask the gentleman this question. Did the gentleman go to any of these post offices to see these boys working?

Mr. ROBISON. No, I did not happen to have any boys to visit.

Mr. POOL. Well I did, and I will tell you one thing. Those boys did a tremendous job. They picked up those sacks of mail and kept moving around for 8 or 10 hours a day. They did a lot of manual work there. It is good for these boys. They are young fellows who did a good job and I want to take up for them a little bit. I was interested enough to go there and see what was being done. I would suggest that the gentleman should have done what I did before making this speech about these boys who did a good job and I am going to stand up and defend them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder how heavy the sacks were that the girls carried around who were working at these jobs this summer? Could the gentleman give us a report on that? I want to commend the gentlemen from New York for discussing this subject, which badly needs some light thrown on it. I would point out in the State of Iowa we have had an unusual experience with this make-work program. One Iowa post office put on some of these employees. The local daily newspaper ascertained and printed the names despite the curtain of secrecy raised by the Post Office Department. The St. Louis regional office of the Post Office Department promptly sent an inspector to Iowa to find out how the newspaper had obtained the names of the employees. It has taken much time and effort to pierce the wall of secrecy that was thrown up to protect the hiring of sons and daughters and other members of the families of Members of Congress as well as other Government officials.

That is why the veil of secrecy went on and was kept on to the extent of trying to persecute those who sought to know what was going on in their government.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. The Post Office Department brought this on themselves. If they had merely submitted the list of names and let the Members of the Congress and the press find out who they were, this would not have flared up. We are not criticizing these boys and the job they did. We are not criticizing disadvantaged youth. The Post Office used patronage to fill summer jobs, wealthy politician's sons received them but, so far as I could find out, the Post Office Department was the only Department to use patronage. They then cloaked the whole thing in a veil of secrecy so that no one would know what the Post Office Department was doing with the money of the taxpayers whom we represent.

Mr. ROBISON. The gentleman is exactly correct. I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of our committee has explained fully the broad scope of this bill. We recognize that there are 12 titles in the bill. It carries an appropriation of more than $4 billion—$4.2 billion.

The Independent Offices Subcommittee on Appropriations which considered a major portion of this bill, considered estimates of more than $1,771 million in our portion of this bill. I thought that an explanation of some of the programs embraced in this section would be of interest to the Members.

We are recommending the appropriation of $1,738,552,500, which represents a reduction of $32,736,500 from the budget estimates.

Under programs of the Civil Service Commission, we are recommending $200,000 for additional national security checks, mostly for civilian employees that are planned to replace military personnel to be called into the Vietnam conflict. They would replace the military personnel by civilian personnel, and the civilians would have to be checked out for security reasons.

The committee has also provided $2 million of about $3 million requested by the Civil Service Commission to implement the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The Congress has already passed this new legislation. Registrars have been sent into three of the States. Originally they were in about 14 counties. Just before coming to the floor, we secured information from the Commission that registrars have registered to date about 50,000 under the Voting Rights Registration Act in 20 counties. So funds for implementing this program must be provided. To date some of the registrars have been borrowed from other agencies of the Government.

We are recommending the funding, as pointed out by the committee chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] of $140 million for the supersonic transport. This is the third phase of research for that program. We recognize that this project has a top priority. The Federal Aviation Administrator has been appointed and his nomination has been confirmed. This is one of the vital projects of this agency at the present time. General McKee, the new Administrator, is dedicated to getting this program going in the national interest.

We know that the French and the British are building the Concorde supersonic plane. Our supersonic transport is to be built by private industry, and the Government working together. It will be the largest, the fastest, and the biggest commercial type of aircraft ever built.

The goal, of course, is to build a safe aircraft for passengers, one which will be superior to any other aircraft, economically profitable, and able to operate efficiently. I might point out that the goals are in sight.

It is estimated that when the plane is certificated, potential sales for the aircraft will be $10 to $20 billion. It is estimated that from 400 to 800 aircraft of this type will be purchased. To date some 96 position reservations have been made by domestic and foreign air carriers to buy this plane when built. The Congress has appropriated $91 million to date on research. Most of this has been used for contracts with two airplane manufacturers and the two engine manufacturers. At the end of this, further research over the next 18 months it is expected that one airframe and one engine will be selected and a supersonic transport will be built.

There has been considerable comment about private financing for this program. It is believed that before this research is completed the Congress can look into whether private financing is feasible. There has been a proposal that some sort of a satellite corporation be formed and that it might sell bonds to finance such a program. At the present time the Government is financing 75 percent of the research and the industry has been contributing 25 percent.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did the committee in any way go into the McNamara's infamous award of the TFX contract, at $400 million more than the bid of a competing company? Does that figure in this program the gentleman is talking about?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. We went into the supersonic transport aspect of the program thoroughly. We were unanimous in our opinion that America must go forward. There were originally six contractors. Now there are only four contractors. The contracts have been let and we feel that we should continue to fund this research program.

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about the TFX contract.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. This contract dealt largely with matters of appropriations for national defense. The supersonic transport contract is concerned with commercial aviation.

Mr. GROSS. That TFX plane does not figure in this contract?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. It does not.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The Secretary of Defense is a member of the committee on this matter, as well as the Federal Aviation Commissioner.

The committee also recommends funding construction of an FBI Academy at Quantico, Va., for FBI and other law enforcement officers. We are providing funds only for design and site preparation for this project at this time. There is great need for this facility and we felt that the FBI Academy should be built as soon as possible. This will go forward.

Mr. Chairman, we believe this is a good bill. It is an important bill. It has been carefully considered. Some of the funding requests have been denied. This is a supplemental bill, and we can consider other requests when the Congress reconvenes in January.

We believe the items that have been recommended are necessary and that the bill should be passed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. With respect to an academy, the State of Florida wants the Federal Government to help finance a law enforcement academy. I wonder if any member of the subcommittee could tell me whether any Federal funds are included in this bill in support of the Florida academy?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. There are no funds for that project in the independent offices section of the bill. They do train a limited number of police officers at the FBI Academy at Quantico. They are invited there for this purpose.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that. I am talking about the effort to get the Federal Government to subsidize the academy now being operated, I believe, by the State of Florida.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. That is not funded in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, first let me say that we on the Independent Offices Subcommittee have missed our distinguished chairman the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] who has been away on account of illness. I should like to report to the House and the Committee today that his successor has carried on admirably. We have enjoyed the opportunity of working under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS]. I know that he and all the other subcommittee members join me in extending greetings and all good wishes to our absent chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to confine my remarks to that section of the bill which came under the jurisdiction of the Independent Offices Subcommittee. I do not believe it is necessary to run through the individual items contained in this section of the bill.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the distinguished chairman of the full committee, discussed some of those items, and the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] made some further comments about some of the items contained in that section of the bill. With respect to the supersonic aircraft, I think the House might be interested to know that while we are providing in this bill $140 million for continued research by airframe and engine manufacturers, we have already spent $91 million on this supersonic aircraft. It was related to the committee by General McKee and his associates at FAA that the only thing we have received for that $91 million is a design. That is a pretty expensive design, but money has already been spent. The question arises as to whether we are going to wash $91 million down the drain or put up the additional money which will be required to complete the research work on that phase of the program. This supersonic aircraft is an item of the highest priority in the administration, and the committee provided the full amount of money requested in order to go forward with the necessary research.

I would like to say with respect to several of the items in this section of the bill that I personally believe they should have gone over until next year when we will be considering the regular bill. Many of these items are not in the nature of an emergency and it has always been my concept that a supplemental bill should be approved to take care of important developments that occur between regular appropriation bills. I think this can be illustrated by one new program that is sought to be funded and which is partially funded in this bill. This is the rent supplement program which was inaugurated in the last housing bill, the Housing Act of 1965. That provides, as you know, for the Federal Government through the Federal Housing Administration to supplement rent of families unable to occupy the kind of housing that the administration feels they should enjoy. When we heard the testimony on the rent supplement bill we noticed that the Administrator is undertaking to lay down some very broad and far-reaching guidelines. I would like to read two sentences from the justifications from page B-12 of the hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. JONAS. It was stated there, and I quote:

> The housing owner will be urged to make every effort during his renting period to take in tenants with as wide as possible a range of economic and social characteristics.

I quote further:

> It is believed that such economic and social diversity will reduce management problems and expenses and also contribute to the social and economic upgrading of tenants of relatively low income and social achievement.

It would appear from this and also from the regulations that have now been promulgated, but which became available only a few days ago and which have not yet been received for distribution or circulation, that this program is going to be administered in a way to bring about or assist in integrating residential areas along economic and social lines.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that information was available to the Committee on Banking and Currency when the act was approved in that committee. It certainly was not available to us in the hearings, but I point it out today for the information of those who are present so that they can make their own determination as to whether that is calculated to be the sort of thing in which the Federal Government should become involved.

I also find from these new regulations that are now out that it will become possible for the Federal Government to pay 70 percent of the rent. Nowhere in the regulations are specific income limits set out. But with a little research it develops that families will be eligible for rent supplements even if they have assets up to $25,000.

It now becomes clear for the first time that rent supplements can constitute up to 70 percent of the total rental. It further appears that the 25 percent of income will be calculated after deducting allowable deductions. The regulations do not in any way spell out how much these allowable deductions might add up to in various sections of the country.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to one other thing. These new regulations fix bedroom standards under which a family consisting of six persons should receive rent supplements in order to occupy a four-bedroom house or apartment.

Just think of it—a family of six may be entitled to a house with four bedrooms; a family of four persons would be eligible for a house with three bedrooms.

It also provides that in no case is it contemplated that any member of a family would ever have to sleep in the living room. That will do away with the folding beds. The people who are manufacturing folding beds or day beds or couches that fold down and make up into sleeping quarters should be on guard.

Mr. Chairman, these regulations are so startling in some of their aspects that I believe it would be well for our committee to have another opportunity to consider this entire program before it is inaugurated and put into operation.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just wanted to advise him and to advise the other members of the Committee as well that when the time is appropriate I shall offer an amendment to strike out that portion of the supplemental appropriation bill of 1966 pertaining to the rent supplement program. I believe the gentleman has enumerated many of the reasons.

It seems to me that the reason that stands out first and foremost, and of which the Members of the House should be mindful, is the same reason that motivated the House to pass the Stephens amendment limiting this program to low income groups eligible for public housing. The Stephens amendment which limited the supplement program to low-income groups is essentially the reason this legislation was able to pass the House.

It seems to me when you have an eligibility for tenancy where the tenants may have up to $25,000 in assets, we are going a long way from helping the poor people of America or helping the low-income people as this legislation was intended. I hope to have more to say when I offer the amendment that I do intend to offer.

Mr. JONAS. I understood the gentleman from Michigan had such an amendment, and would propose it. Am I correct in assuming in doing so you are not especially attacking the program itself, but you think the regulations ought to be studied and reviewed and analyzed before beginning the program?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I may say to the Members of the House that I am always willing to abide by the will of the House. I think the House has spoken that it wants the rent supplement program, and I am willing to abide by that. My amendment would not kill the rent supplement program. I would say that the most it would be would be to delay it for a matter of a few months until we can revise the regulations that have been put out so that they may conform to the intent of the House.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Will not the effect of the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Michigan be to actually kill the next supplemental program? Why should not the gentleman from Michigan take steps to correct the regulations, if that is what he finds objectionable? The actual elimination of funds does not correct the regulations at all, it wipes out the entire program itself.

Mr. JONAS. May I say in reply to the gentleman from Illinois—the gentleman from Michigan can speak for himself—that the elimination of the $6 million and the $180,000 in this bill would not kill the program. It would simply defer beginning the program until we can study these regulations.

Mr. YATES. It would at least mortally wound it.

Mr. JONAS. It would simply defer starting until next year. We do not have any authority to write these regulations. They are written downtown. We did not even get a copy of them until we asked for them. We cannot change the regulations, we can only work our will with respect to the matter of funding, that is all.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I would point out to the gentleman from Illinois that my amendment specifically would not kill the program. The reason I say that is because I specifically leave in the bill the money provided on page 9, line 6, for the administration of this program, so that the Housing and Home Finance Agency can go on and do more planning. I do not know of any other means in an appropriation bill where this House can make changes in administrative regulations. I do not think we have that authority.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the Members of the Committee here today to two other brandnew programs that I think need real consideration. We are beginning in this bill to provide money to municipalities in the United States to enforce their housing codes and we are also putting up money in grants to municipalities to pay the interest on debts assumed or incurred in purchasing land for future use.

Now we are doing many fine things in the housing field, but it seems to me we are going far afield when we ask the Federal Government to spend the taxpayers' money, money that is collected from taxpayers all over the United States, to help X city or Y city to enforce its housing code.

If cities in the United States cannot enforce their own housing codes, I think we have gone a long way down the road toward providing all of the services and essentials that are required by municipalities to operate their own affairs. I think that is something that deserves the serious consideration of all Members.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment my colleagues of the Appropriations Committee for the work they have done with this bill. They have gone over it with a fine-tooth comb; they have assessed the possibilities and the impossibilities; they have saved the taxpayers of this Nation millions of dollars.

It is for that reason, Mr. Chairman, that I offer no amendments to the bill at this time. The committee has done a painstaking job and so have the subcommittees. They deserve praise.

I would, however, like to have the House examine for one moment the cut made in the funds requested by the Public Housing Administration. This year the House gave the Public Housing Administration a new tool to use in caring for those without decent, safe and sanitary housing—that was the right to use private accommodations, voluntarily offered, for public housing tenants.

This brought the private enterprise system and its considerable resources into the public housing picture. It made privately owned, privately operated housing, housing that pays full taxes, housing that would be certified as decent, safe, and sanitary, available for use under the public housing program. Unlike the rent supplement program, it provided for the use of housing that would be available immediately—"instant housing" if you please.

I think there should be some earmarking of funds for this program. Were that done, I would even advocate an increase in the amount of authorization in order that the Public Housing Administration be put on notice that it should not neglect this program which has the support of a wide spectrum spanning the entire housing field. This program will help in the States, in the cities, in the towns, in rural areas. It should not be nibbled to death by a lack of administrative funds as originally proposed.

This type of housing program was suggested by the minority and was accepted practically in its entirety by the majority at the time of the passage of the Housing bill. This program emphasizes local controls and economy. Its costs will be lower per unit than those of the conventional public housing program, much lower than the costs entailed in the rent supplement program. Called the rent certificate program, it deserves a trial of its own. It is my hope that when the House next considers this bill that it will give the rent certificate idea some chance for success.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I support the motion to eliminate the $6 million appropriation for rent subsidies contained in this bill.

I have just had an opportunity to study the instructions and regulations of the Housing and Home Finance Agency in setting forth the rules for administering the rent subsidy program. Mr. Chairman, it is clear that this program was misrepresented by its sponsors when it was before Congress and it is still being misrepresented. I will not vote to spend the taxpayers' money for a program which most of them would oppose if they knew the truth about it. We should hold up this $6 million until the administration and the sponsors of this bill come before Congress and tell us exactly what the bill will do and what they vision as the goal of the legislation.

When the rent subsidy program came before the House it was passed by the votes of southern Democrats. I think the time has come to call a spade a spade. Did they know what they were voting for? If they did not and were misled by the sponsors of the bill, are they now willing to spend $6 million of their constituents' money on a program that was passed under false pretenses?

When the rent subsidy program was before Congress some of us said the purpose of the bill was to force integration of better class neighborhoods. This was denied by the sponsors. In my own State of Alabama, the junior Senator whose name is on the bill in the other body, said this was not true and he is still telling the people of Alabama this is not true.

Let me read from a Federal Housing Administration letter, MF Letter No. 63 to all insuring office directors and multifamily housing representatives under date of September 28, 1965:

> Important criteria with regard to approval of a rent supplement project will include full consideration of its contribution to assisting in integrating income groups and furthering the legal requirements and objectives of equal opportunity in housing.

That is in the regulations, in the instructions to those housing officials who will be spending this $6 million, and they are told the first consideration of the rent subsidy program is integrating economic groups and furthering the objectives of equal opportunity in housing. Under this implementation of the program, private homeownership in America is doomed because a man cannot protect the value of his property nor the desirability of his neighborhood. Every neighborhood in America will be opened up to public housing, and I challenge anyone to deny that is the purpose of this instruction from the administering agency of the rent subsidy program.

Another falsification that was an important part in getting the rent subsidy program through Congress was that rent subsidy projects could not be owned by organizations, but would have to be entirely private enterprise and that no single family dwellings could be financed under the program. That statement is still being made to the people of Alabama by the junior Senator from my State, one of the leading proponents of this program.

Let me read from the same MF Letter No. 63 from the Federal Housing Administration, date of September 28, 1965:

> Eligible projects can be owned by private nonprofit, limited distribution, or cooperative mortgagors, and many consist of five or more single-family detached, row, walkup, or other type of multifamily units.

There can be no doubt what that statement says in the plainest of English. Any nonprofit organization may develop a housing project under the rent subsidy program and that includes such nonprofit organizations as the NAACP, SNICK, church organizations, fraternal organizations, civic clubs. The civil rights groups have made no secret of the fact that they intend to use the law to integrate American neighborhoods. I am not arguing now about whether it is right or wrong to use a Federal program to help the poor for the purpose of bringing about social changes, but I do say that the sponsors of the legislation were not honest when they sold this program to Congress and because of their dishonesty we should not now reward them with the funds to put their schemes into action.

They said, and they are still saying, a single-family unit cannot be financed under the rent subsidy program and yet in these regulations it states they can be financed just as long as there are five single-family units in a project.

Mr. Speaker, homeownership is the keystone of the American system. It is the dream, the desired goal of practically all Americans to own your own home in a neighborhood you have carefully chosen among the kind of people you want to raise your family. Now the American people are going to have that basic right taken away from them and the Federal Housing Administration is going to decide the makeup of a neighborhood. A Washington bureaucrat is going to pick your neighbor, and if his choice is too poor to be able to afford to live in your neighborhood, or too indolent to want to strive to better his economic condition, then the Federal Government will take your tax money to pay his rent so he can live next door to you.

This is wrong. It is immoral. It is reckless. No man will have the desired initiative to struggle to build a home when it will be impossible for him to have any control over the kind of neighborhood which will surround his home.

I am convinced we should take this rent subsidy money, this $6 million request out of this bill and hold up any funds until we are sure that proper rules and regulations for carrying out the purpose of the bill Congress passed have been formulated. I will vote to eliminate this rent subsidy request from the supplemental bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Passman].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is always in order to correct the record and clear up any possible misunderstanding.

On September 8, 1965, it was my privilege to report the foreign assistance appropriation bill for fiscal year 1966. During the debate on the bill, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] said, and I quote from page 23184 of the Record of September 8:

> Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether a research contract will be necessary to get the information that I desire. When I spoke on the bill earlier today, I neglected to ask the gentleman from Louisiana what he could tell the House about a situation in Thailand involving an individual who handled a lot of foreign-aid funds. I understand that a huge estate was left by a general over there who had 40 or 50 wives. I wonder if it will be necessary to employ some contract outfit to find out about that situation, or can the gentleman from Louisiana enlighten us?

Then I said, and the Record reads as follows:

> From a financial standpoint, a man with 50 wives would in all probability have to neglect some of them. There have been many rumors as to the wealth of the former Prime Minister to which the gentleman refers. I understand that it was once set at $139 million; then scaled down to about $60 million, and then down to about $35 million. It was finally brought down to $19 million. If sufficient time is given, they might be able to prove that Thailand owes the late Prime Minister's estate some money.

My statement was intended to indicate a complete coverup for the activities of the late Prime Minister who evidently had, in some way or another, become very wealthy. This individual administered the funds of Thailand and also funds that we gave them under the foreign aid bill. I thought I was supporting and also thanking the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], who has made many very valuable contributions not only in the handling of the foreign aid appropriation bill but also on many other bills.

Then I continued, as the Record for that day reads:

> Seriously, there is no way to determine the number of wives that the gentleman had, because I understand that he guarded one with great care. I do not know about the other 49, if there were that many.
>
> I represent the majority of the committee, and not necessarily my personal views. Those have not changed very much since I last reported the bill 2 years ago.

I certainly intended my remarks to be complimentary of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa for bringing to the attention of the House something that had happened in Thailand and of which I had some knowledge.

The value of the estate of the late Prime Minister has ranged from a high of $139 million down to a low of $640,000, and with various figures in between.

The wide range of figures and the fact that each valuation was a little lower than the previous estimate seemed to justify a little humor and also to indicate very clearly what could happen if we gave them sufficient time, and that is that we could possibly end up owing the estate money.

My remarks were meant as a compliment to the gentleman from Iowa for bringing this matter to the attention of the House and certainly were not intended in any way to be a criticism of my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, who I consider to be a very able Member of the House. I hope this explanation—and if the gentleman wants to interpret it as an apology, that is all right with me—is sufficient to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, in order to receive his accolade, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the statement made by the gentleman from Louisiana. I think the reading of the previous record would indicate that we might be owing this general something. This is the point that I thought ought to be cleared up. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. It was only to indicate that given sufficient time, even a $119 million estate can disappear into zero. That is the thought I tried to convey at that time. I hope the record shows that I properly conveyed it at this time.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I am sure he is correct that $119 million can disappear in a few seconds in the foreign giveaway program with no questions asked and no answers given.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested to hear the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. Mahon] start the discussion of this huge supplemental appropriation bill this afternoon, by stripping away the pretense of any future talk of $100 billion administrative budgets. According to the gentleman from Texas, $100 billion administrative budgets for this Government have gone where the woodbine twineth and the whangdoodle whangeth.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I wish to point out that I did not use that phraseology. I said they had gone a-glimmer.

Mr. GROSS. They had gone a-glimmer all right. We are now headed for an administrative budget of $118 or $119 billion each year, but, of course, we are far beyond that in terms of spending. It will be nearer $136 billion in terms of the actual spending budget spending and when trust fund spending is taken into account.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. For the purpose of the record, I have the daily statement of the Treasury of October 8. During the first 100 days of this current fiscal year we have spent $384 million per day, $16 million per hour, and $266,000 per minute; and that is substantially higher than the rate of spending last year. So the trend and the curve is up in spending, as is established by those figures.

Mr. GROSS. So the Great Society is rapidly putting the taxpayers on cloud nine. I doubt that many of them really know what is happening. Today we are dealing with a bill providing an appropriation of $4.2 billion which, by the admission of those who are proponents of the Great Society, will come back to the House in a few days with somewhere between $4.5 and $5 billion in it by way of supplementals added by the Senate. The taxpayers should understand this bill, in a large measure, adds to the regular appropriation bills previously approved in this same session of Congress.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. For the record, I should like to point out that during the first 100 days of the last fiscal year, this Government spent $245,000 a minute and that has now gone up in 1 year to $266,000 per minute.

Mr. GROSS. I see my friend, the capable and genial gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] on the floor. I again recall his words when he brought the tax reduction bill to the floor. He said, in effect, that we cannot go down two roads. If we reduced taxes, he said, we must cut spending. Instead of that, and despite the huge cut in income taxes, we have taken the wrong road. We have not cut spending. It is out of hand, and this bill is evidence that we are heading for disaster.

But I really rose to ask a few questions about the bill. Particularly would I like to learn something about the Cuban refugee program on which we are now embarking.

I hope some member of the subcommittee can give me some information on that, but before I go into it I shall be glad to again yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I should like to point out that while the appropriations budget this session may be in the area of $118 billion or $119 billion, this does not mean that the actual spending will be at that level this year or next year.

I should like to make reference to the fact that in the budget last January it was estimated that the deficit for the fiscal year 1965, which ended June 30, would be $6.3 billion. That was the estimate of January. There has been such a spectacular improvement in the economy that the actual deficit, instead of being $6.3 billion, was $3.5 billion on June 30, which I believe is a very encouraging situation.

The indications some time ago were that the estimated deficit for the current fiscal year, 1966, would perhaps be below the figure which had been estimated earlier in January. The estimated deficit at that time was about $4.3 billion as against $5.3 billion in the original January budget. But as I said before, war overturns ordinary calculations. Vietnam will affect the situation. I am hopeful. The President is undertaking to hold the line.

Mr. GROSS. I would say to the gentleman, from what I have heard, that is about like a man who drowns in 6 feet of water instead of 10 feet of water.

Let me say to the gentleman that I cannot possibly agree with him about all this alleged prosperity we are wallowing in, when at the same time we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars and will be spending billions of dollars on poverty in this country, at the same time plunging deeper in debt with every passing day. Two and two just do not add to four.

What we have been doing in this country is eating T-bone steaks on hamburger incomes, and the gentleman knows it. It is about time we got around to balancing the budget and paying something on the Federal debt, instead of passing it on to your children and mine and to all the children of all the parents of this country. It is a responsibility we ought to face up to today.

Mr. MAHON. Since the gentleman addressed his remarks to me, I should like to say that certainly I, along with I believe a great majority of the Members, want to achieve a balanced budget as quickly as possible, and some of the actions we are taking certainly move in that direction.

Mr. GROSS. I do not see much indication of it, on the basis of some of the votes I have seen here on a lot of issues in this Great Society session of Congress.

Mr. MAHON. The budget of the President has been reduced by the Congress, and it seems to me some considerable restraint has been exercised by the Congress in these appropriation bills.

Mr. GROSS. We do not need to go over all of this. The gentleman knows that the budget figures are the asking price. That is, as I said in previous sessions of Congress, like the old horse trader asking $100 for an old, spavined, sway-backed horse when he knows he cannot get more than $15 or $20 for it.

Mr. MAHON. But this country is not at all comparable to a spavined, sway-backed horse. This country is strong in more ways than one. We have our deficiencies, but this country is worth spending money on and working for.

Mr. GROSS. Of course it is a great country and I want to save it from bankruptcy, financially and morally. At the same time, you know, we are allegedly poverty stricken, despite all this astronomical spending.

I should like to get back to this refugee program, and try to find out on what basis we are bringing thousands of Cubans into this country. I should like to know if the hearings on this bill developed any information as to why Castro is turning loose 45,000 people. Can anybody help me on this? Unfortunately, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs did not promptly call a meeting to explore this subject. I regret to say that the committee of which I am a member has made no move to find out what this is all about.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. We will tell the gentleman what we can.

This happened on the spur of the moment. Castro said, on September 28, he had changed his policy and if they did not want to stay in Cuba we could have them. Of course the President immediately accepted the challenge and said that we would accept them, as we have in the past.

They will be properly screened. I thought it was a very good thing. I am certainly pleased that the committee supported the subcommittee recommendation and approved the entire amount, because the cost is fixed for processing each Cuban.

That is if they need $12.6 million to spend. I think it is a good thing psychologically and otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PASSMAN. Did I answer your question entirely satisfactorily, Mr. GROSS?

Mr. GROSS. I am afraid not, up to this point. What I would like to know is by what authority in law are we bringing to this country 45,000 Cuban refugees? Do we just reach out and take 45,000 people from Cuba?

Mr. PASSMAN. Of course, it is only an estimate. We do not know how many we will process. I think you have all of the adequate legislation to be able to provide this appropriation. Otherwise I am sure the gentleman from Iowa would make a point of order against it.

Mr. GROSS. Wait a minute, my friend. I am not talking about the ability to appropriate the money. In this bill you have appropriated $12.6 million ostensibly to bring in 45,000 Cuban refugees. What authority is there in law even to bring them in?

Mr. PASSMAN. First, let me say the gentleman is on the committee which, in all probability, provided the law. There has never been any fixed number of Cuban refugees. Can you tell us about any fixed number you have had in previous legislation?

Mr. GROSS. I think the gentleman will find that the Committee on the Judiciary handles immigration laws and not the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The Committee on Foreign Affairs ought to be interested in this from the standpoint of why does Fidel Castro want to get rid of 45,000 people.

Mr. PASSMAN. I hope in the end we can find this out, but may I refer the gentleman to Public Law 87-510. That is your authority for the appropriation that we are asking for today, which comes out of the Committee on the Judiciary and deals with refugees. This is a general authorization that has been in effect for many years.

Mr. GROSS. But on what basis are passports issued to bring these people in? On what basis are they admitted?

Mr. PASSMAN. We are dealing with a refugee program and not just a question of bringing in one immigrant. If you will refer to the law that I just referred you to, I think you will find ample authority there for bringing the refugees in. Certainly I want to thank the gentleman for believing that I have all of this information that I can give off the top of my head. About all that I can do is keep up with the appropriations. Certainly, if we did not have the basic legislation which would permit this to be done, then you would make a point of order against it.

Mr. GROSS. Do the immigration laws provide that we can take in overnight or in a period of days some 45,000 people? Do we have immigration laws which permit us to do that?

Mr. PASSMAN. There is absolutely no quota fixed on the number of political refugees that you may bring into the country. If you will refer to the law, and I do not know whether I voted for or against it, but in this particular instance I am glad that we do have a law and that Mr. Castro knows we are certainly willing to take these people in, because they are good people. I think this is a pretty good bargain that we are getting.

Mr. GROSS. I do not think we will get very far prolonging this discussion, because apparently neither one of us knows the law. However, tell me this: Did your hearings develop any information on the part of any of those who sponsor this Cuban refugee program as to why Castro wants to get rid of 45,000 people?

Mr. PASSMAN. You will not be able to get that information overnight. We do know that Fidel Castro said "these people are not sympathetic to our philosophy. You can have them." To me that indicated they were good people. The experience we have had with Cuban refugees so far has been very, very good. They come to this country and are willing to adapt themselves to our standards and look for jobs. Most of them have gotten jobs and are working and supporting themselves. This money is not to extend support to them but mainly to process these people as they come in.

Mr. GROSS. We are supposed to have a problem of poverty and unemployment in this country, will the gentleman not agree?

Mr. PASSMAN. I do not know of any person who could not get a job if he is willing to work for it. I have lived through several depressions and have always been able to find employment.

Mr. GROSS. Why are we admitting these people when we are spending the kind of money we are on poverty, $1.5 billion as contained in this bill?

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Louisiana I do not believe voted for the poverty program. I know I do not, any more than the gentleman from Iowa did. Do not make me get started on that. Let us stay on the subject of refugees.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, that is part and parcel of it.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why we are permitting 45,000 people to come to the United States in a period of a comparatively few days to compound the alleged unemployment and poverty. These people are coming in with nothing more than the clothing on their backs. They are coming here and are leaving everything they have in Cuba.

Mr. PASSMAN. It is a part of our foreign policy, and the gentleman from Iowa may have supported the legislation. I do not know.

The Refugee Act has been on the statute books for a long, long time. We have not fixed the number at 45,000. They may bring in 500,000, I do not know; but in the event that many should attempt to come in I am sure we will have another look at it.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. How are these people screened? Does the gentleman from Iowa know how they are screened?

Mr. GROSS. That is a good question. I do not know how they are screened. Who is responsible for the screening?

Mr. Chairman, there are many, many unanswered questions concerning this bill. It ought to be debated for a far greater period of time. The so-called poverty spending in this bill involves at least $1.5 billion. This, alone, deserves the closest scrutiny but the bill will be rushed through as is usual with a supplemental appropriation near the close of a session of Congress.

The great difference is that in my time in Congress I cannot recall a supplemental appropriation bill approaching the magnitude of this one.

I say again that additions to the regular appropriations in the magnitude of those contained in this bill constitute a blueprint to financial disaster for this Nation. I have no alternative but to vote against this bill on final passage although I know that some—a comparatively minor amount—of the money to be made available is merited.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], or whomever asked the question as to how these refugees are screened, that the program officials will use the same system which they have used in the past in the screening of the 200,000 refugees that have already entered the United States. The services of the FBI and the Immigration and Naturalization Service are used.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] asked that question.

Mr. PASSMAN. I will repeat for the benefit of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] that it will be the same process that has been used since we have been permitting the refugees to come into the United States. That process involves several Federal agencies, including the FBI. Of course—and I am sure the gentleman would like to hear this—as I know we have not found any objection to the present method of handling the admittance of these Cuban refugees. We do not know of any Communist agent that has come into the United States from Cuba since we have had this program for assistance to Cuban refugees. They will use the same admittance procedures with these new refugees as they have with the 200,000 Cuban refugees that have been brought into this country in the past.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes, I am glad to yield.

Mr. GROSS. Is there no other country in the world that can take some of these people, some of these refugees? Must we take all of them and thereby compound the so-called poverty problems of this country, already costing hundreds of millions of dollars?

Mr. PASSMAN. I personally know that many of them are going to other countries. Some of the refugees which have entered the United States have entered this country after going to Mexico, Spain, and other countries.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, the Congress of the United States threatens to become as well-known for its building projects as for its lawmaking. Unfortunately, I believe the mark of our reputation for the former is more one of notoriety than of renown. And, today, tucked away in a dim corner of this omnibus appropriations bill, is a request for funds that has all the earmarks of becoming fodder for the grist mills of the gossips who managed to parlay the Rayburn building into the world's best known office building—if not its eighth wonder.

The supplemental request from the Bureau of the Mint for the construction of new mint facilities in Philadelphia in chapter 10 of this bill, if approved here today, will certainly add a new dimension to the definition of boondoggle and, as such, come back to haunt this Chamber again and again. I will say I hope that I am privileged to be around for the next few years if the appropriation request is approved. These funds should not be appropriated today. I am telling you so now and I will be telling you I told you so then.

We have plans on the drawing board for a production facility with a $37,700,000 price tag that no private businessman in the country would approve for construction as a part of his plant. Now is the time to take a closer look—before construction gets underway and we are irrevocably committed to a planned facility whose obsolescence is as certain as our growing old worrying about it if it is built.

The supplemental request of chapter 10 of this bill more than doubles the cost of constructing and equipping the proposed new mint. It is a request that shows a lack of foresight, a lack of planning, a failure of confidence in the proposal—but a dogged determination to rush on, lemming-like into the sea, before someone can come up with a better way to accomplish the same purpose.

Back in 1963, the Congress authorized the construction and equipping of new mint facilities and the appropriation of funds through fiscal year 1973 for such purposes. Appropriations have since been approved of $16,500,000 for a new mint, to be located in Philadelphia.

Today, we are requested to approve a supplemental appropriation for this Philadelphia facility of $21,200,000—a 122-percent increase in the total cost of the mint.

Is the increased cost a result of a lack of foresight?

The justification cites the Coinage Act of 1965, establishing a new system of coinage of differing metal content, as greatly responsible for the cost increase due to a required larger production capacity. Yet, the new coinage alloy is the outgrowth of an intensive Treasury Department study that was begun in the same year, 1963. The bureaucratic complex seems to have achieved such uncontrolled proportions that within one department, new mint facilities for the production of traditional coinage were being planned while, at the same time, research was being conducted to find an alloy for a new coinage system that would render much of the equipment as well as the planned physical structure out of date and inadequate.

The collision course was, however, set, and was maintained throughout the 2 intervening years. As a result, we have before us today a supplemental request reflecting a cost for the Philadelphia Mint that is more than double the amount originally appropriated for that facility. The area of the building has been increased by 60 percent; the construction costs for the building have increased by 136 percent; and, the cost per square foot for construction is up 50 percent—all since 1963.

Is the increased cost a result of a lack of planning?

If there was a lack of planning in 1963, by all indications we should be overplanned now. The cost estimate for architectural and engineering plans in 1963 was $500,000; it is now $1,800,000. However, the plans resulting from this expenditure, increased by 260 percent, hardly seem to be of a value commensurate with their cost.

A site has been selected and cleared of all buildings in an urban renewal area of Philadelphia. When the land is turned over to the Bureau of the Mint, the city will receive $2 million for it. This is one cost item that shows no increase over its cost in 1963. Perhaps, there is a very good reason for that. In the intervening years, as plans and costs for construction and equipping of this facility have spiraled up and up, the margin of adequacy of this particular piece of land has plunged so drastically that it is now sorely inadequate.

Today, when every industrial construction or modernization program is characterized by one-level buildings, and even before the first ceremonial shovel of dirt is turned in Philadelphia, it is admitted that there is no room for lateral expansion of the proposed new mint facilities. If, as has happened within the past 2 years, increased production is required to meet the demands made for coins, we will have to build vertically in Philadelphia—up or down.

Already, a part of the 50-percent increase in square-foot construction costs is attributed to site restrictions and the need to place offices and other service facilities on upper floors or in basements.

A classic example of the art of understatement was heard during hearings on this supplemental request by those of us sitting on the Treasury-Post Office Appropriations Subcommittee—the site was described for us as "somewhat restricted—we cannot expand laterally."

Could there be any greater indictment of the site chosen for the construction of the Philadelphia Mint than the astounding fact—in this age of auto-choked cities with inadequate parking—that there will be a total of 25 parking spaces for a facility employing 700 persons?

And, let me ask each one of you if you would give the go-ahead to the plans of the Treasury Department after hearing this bit of testimony? We were told that the increased costs were attributable in part to the production requirements for the new coinage system. Presently, there are several different cladding operations being utilized by private industry to provide the clad stock material for the new coins, but the planners indicated that they had not yet decided which process will be installed in the laterally unexpandable Philadelphia Mint. Must we hold our breath and hope for one that operates vertically—up and down rather than to and fro?

I have seen this cladding operation from which the stock material for the cupro-nickel clad copper coins—our new dimes and quarters—is obtained. I was privileged to be a guest at the metals and controls plant in Attleboro, Mass., with my good friend and colleague, the fine gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]. What we saw in Attleboro was an extremely efficient and workable process. But, it was a cumbersome operation requiring a vast lateral area for the processing line and equipment.

The description of equipment going in and out of windows at the old Philadelphia Mint was always an amusing example in our committee hearings for the necessity of constructing a new mint. However, I fail to see any humor in the possibility that such means will have to be employed in the new mint—even before the ground has been broken.

Are the planners and the Treasury officials confident that the proposal for which they have testified before our committee will fulfill the existing production facility gap?

Faced with the prospect of only being able to go up for future expansion, I would like to be able to look ahead for more than a few years before I start looking up. I would like to be assured that we will get a reasonable amount of use from this $40 million edifice in its presently proposed design. Yet, if we resorted to three shifts a day, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week—an operating schedule we are presently forced to employ and which we are building a new mint to get away from—we could produce approximately 12 billion coins a year. That includes the production capacity of the Denver Mint and has been estimated to be a sufficient number of coins for perhaps the next 10 years. We should be planning now for the next 25 or even 50 years.

I do not like this whole idea.

We have an inadequate site—poorly selected and not suited for our purpose.

We have plans on the drawing board for a Treasury Department facility that will not be ready for use for 3 years—but is outmoded and antiquated today.

Are we going to take those plans from the drawing board and put them in three-dimensional reality with our stamp of approval on them by voting in favor of this supplemental request?

It should be measured in terms of an expenditure which can confidently be endorsed by the Members of this body and satisfactorily approved by the millions of sidewalk superintendents across the country—the taxpayers that will foot the bill.

I urge you to vote against this $21,300,000 supplemental appropriation for construction of mint facilities.

In closing, let me state I have no objection to building the new mint in Philadelphia. I do object to the present site in Philadelphia because it is inadequate for our needs.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, the report which accompanies this bill is of particular value because of the data provided on operations of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Experience in the Second Congressional District of Oklahoma strongly supports the committee report on the achievements of the Neighborhood Youth Corps and Project Head Start, which together have accounted for nearly 75 percent of direct program benefits under the 1964 act.

I agree wholeheartedly with the committee that a period of 10 months is a very short time in which to evaluate a program of this magnitude, and I also agree that phenomenal results have been attained in this short period—especially in Head Start and the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

It is easy to criticize and to find faults in any major governmental undertaking. This is particularly true when the governmental program is directed at such tremendous problems as are involved in the Economic Opportunity Act.

The committee, while undoubtedly well aware of the program's well-advertised failures and mistakes in some areas, has wisely decided to provide funds to continue its broad operations, while calling for "a firmer foundation for the program in future years."

I support the committee bill and urge its approval.

Mr. Chairman, an added reason of high priority for support of this supplemental appropriation bill is that it provides funds to activate the Economic Development Administration.

I regret that the committee has not provided the full administration request, particularly as it applies to regional economic planning, and hope the other body will make up the difference and permit this vital program to move forward on schedule.

The Ozarks regional development program is awaiting these funds to get moving, and I hope there will be no further delay in establishment of this great undertaking.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, the supplemental appropriations bill under consideration today carries a high price tag of over $4 billion. There are many requests for funds which are well-considered and deserve approval; but there are a number of areas where economies should be made.

Today I want to declare my support again of this Nation's efforts to join with industry in the development of a supersonic transport for the 1970's. This appropriations bill includes $140 million for the phase two development program being conducted under direction of the Federal Aviation Agency. A total of $220 million will be required for this 18-month development phase.

Since 1961 the Congress has appropriated $91 million for this vital program. However, we are still approximately 15 months away from a go or no-go decision.

Meanwhile, the French and British have widened their lead time over the United States in the development of the Concorde supersonic transport. Aviation Week and Space Technology magazine on July 12, 1965, reporting from

Geneva, discussed the stretchout of the supersonic transport program by the United States, stating:

> U.S. decision to stay in the supersonic transport race has added new impetus to the Anglo-French Concorde project, but deferral of construction of U.S. prototypes has convinced airline officials in Europe that the time gap between the two programs continues to widen.

The article also pointed to French elation over the U.S. decision stating:

> European industry is now persuaded that the U.S. program will eventually materialize, but the deferral of prototype work has elated French industry and government officials and has provided strong encouragement over sales prospects of the Concorde.
>
> Opinions over the final outcome of the race—and the French are firmly convinced that a race is on—vary widely. The general feeling is that the Concorde will hit its certification target date of 1971 and that a U.S. airplane will not be in the air before 1975.

While there is a tendency to downgrade the technical quality and marketability of a Russian supersonic transport, nevertheless the United States also trails the Soviet Union in supersonic transport development.

I certainly recognize the complexities of such a development program. There are many problems which must be resolved. Apparently we have been approaching this program with timidity.

It is difficult to understand the administration's stretchout of the development phase in view of the market potential outlined by the administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

We are told there is a market potential among commercial airlines for 400 to 800 aircraft. The national impact of the production program based on such potential would be approximately $10 to $20 billion over a 20-year period. Approximately 60 percent of the production effort will be distributed among approximately 10,000 subcontractors, suppliers and vendors in some 40 States.

The FAA administrator has reported that nearly $10 million in deposits have been received for 96 delivery positions based on a delivery deposit of $100,000 per aircraft ordered.

A study made by the Stanford Research Institute revealed that it will cost America $2¼ billion in lost revenues if we decide not to build the supersonic transport. It will yield a profit of $2¾ billion if we do.

Beyond the financial benefits, we must remember the free world continues to look for leadership in the field of Aviation to the United States.

In his testimony before the Appropriations subcommittee, General McKee said that this 18-month development phase would not preclude action on the part of the Government to speed this program up. I believe it is important that every effort be made to do so.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to comment on one item in this bill of which I strongly disapprove, namely, the item on page 22 of the bill, in chapter VII, legislative branch, which would appropriate $300,000 for an extension of the west front of the Capitol.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we would be making a very serious mistake, both historically and esthetically, to spend any money at all in furtherance of the present plans and proposals of the Architect of the Capitol regarding the west front.

You can say what you like about the earlier decision to extend the east front. I was not in the House when that decision was made. But at least there was some merit to moving the east front out to balance the overhanging dome. And we were short of office space when the extension was authorized.

But neither argument, Mr. Chairman, applies in the case of the west front. The balance along the west front is perfect. The proposal of the Architect would completely disrupt that balance and destroy a view of the Capitol that has been familiar for over 150 years. Besides that, we certainly have no need of additional office space, some 4½ acres of it. We have all we need and more now in the three office buildings. While space in the Capitol might be more convenient it certainly does not warrant destroying the character and balance of this important and historic building.

But most of all, Mr. Chairman, I oppose this extension because if it goes through it means that the last remaining exterior facade of the original Capitol Building, dating back to 1800, will be forever covered from view. We ought to preserve our historic shrines and buildings, not cover them up with garish imitations. This country went to great expense to preserve the original walls of the White House when reconstruction was undertaken in 1948. I believe we should do no less in the case of the U.S. Capitol, seat of the world's greatest deliberative body.

Oh I will be told that the present sandstone walls are crumbling. Of course they are. I have seen them. They need to be shored up and strengthened. And I have seen the engineering report which says that the only way you can save these walls is to cover them up. But, Mr. Chairman, engineering reports are like lawyers' briefs. You can get them to prove either side you want. You get what you pay for. I just do not believe that this great Nation, so technically advanced that we can orbit 2 men for 8 days in space, cannot find it possible to preserve the west front of the Capitol without destroying its historic integrity.

Mr. Chairman, I am aware the committee report indicates this $300,000 is only for preliminary studies, that we must still approve the final plans and appropriate the construction money. Nevertheless the cat is out of the bag. The plan is plainly indicated. The time to stop it is now, not 2 years hence.

I wish, Mr. Chairman, that I had the eloquence of the poet Oliver Wendell Holmes who with his pen saved that great American ship that lies tied up and still commissioned in Boston Harbor, the U.S.S. *Constitution, "Old Ironsides."*

> Aye, tear her tattered ensign down.
> Long has it waved on high,
> And many an eye has danced to see
> That banner in the sky.

Holmes saved *"Old Ironsides"* from destruction and death with those historic lines. We here in this House could write even more eloquent poetry today by defeating this appropriation and making it crystal clear that no one, not even the Architect of the Capitol, shall tear down the walls of the historic U.S. Capitol which have proudly proclaimed our liberty for 165 years.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, with exceptions, I support this bill. I have reservations, for example, about the foundation for the arts and the supersonic transport and have voted against them in the past. The Congress has spoken, however, and I cannot vote against the bill because of these two items.

It was unfortunate that administration requests for appropriations for the Rural Water and Sanitation Facilities Act and the Water Quality Act were not before the Committee in time to include them in this supplemental appropriation. Rather than delay acting on supplemental appropriations, and to expedite the business of the House, today's bill was reported with no provision for funds for these very important programs. However, it is my understanding that such requests will be made to the Senate Appropriations Committee in time for inclusion in their bill. I am confident that there will be no problem in accepting such an inclusion.

I note that today's bill provides only one-half of the sum authorized in title VII of the Housing Act for basic water and sewer facilities. I hope that this is not a precedent, and that the requests made to the Senate Appropriations Committee are for the entire authorization; $150 million for the Water Quality Act, and $50 million for the Rural Sanitation Act. There is absolutely no excuse, under any circumstances, to tolerate the further pollution of our rivers and streams for lack of adequate sewage facilities. This is one problem where we know the need, the solution, and the deplorable consequences of our failure to act.

The administration should have requested and the Congress should appropriate, regardless of the absence of such a request, the full authorized amounts for waste disposal and water facilities.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the budget estimates that were considered by the subcommittee on the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies were practically all the direct result of legislation that has recently been enacted. In ll instances this legislation passed the House by large majorities. In several instances the requests are below the amounts authorized to be appropriated. In view of these facts and in view of the important nature of these programs the committee has made very few cuts and the cuts which have been made are relatively small.

The first item included in this chapter is $2,727,000 to enable the Food and Drug Administration to carry out the Drug Abuse Control Amendments of 1965. This is the full amount requested. The abuse of drugs used for nonmedical purposes has become a major health and social problem. It has spread and intensified during the past decade and there has been increasing involvement of criminal organization. This legislation establishes controls for the depressant and stimulant drugs—the so-called pep pills and sleeping pills. It also provides better controls concerning counterfeit drugs which have increasingly become a problem in the drug industry.

For the Office of Education the bill includes the full amount of the request for $4 million authorized by Public Law 89-105 for additional research and demonstration activities aimed at improving the programs for the education of handicapped children in this country. $2 million was appropriated for this purpose in the Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill for 1966, however, the need for research in this area has been so great that this program has committed all but $500,000 of the $2 million just to support research which was begun prior to this year. Thus, this additional $4 million will provide the funds desperately needed for new research projects. Ten percent or more of the children in our schools have physical, intellectual, social, or communications handicaps of such severity that present educational procedures are not adequate to prepare them to assume their proper places in today's society. This inability to cope with the handicapped 10 percent of the school population also damages the schools effectiveness with the rest of their students. The additional funds will be used to support projects in all areas of the handicapped.

The appropriation of these funds represents the very serious determination of Congress that effective programs be developed and implemented for the benefit of handicapped children. But money alone will not suffice to bring about the new ideas and new programs so desperately needed right now. The effective use of these funds and the future of handicapped children will depend upon the way the funds are managed by the Office of Education. The Office of Education must determine the educational needs of handicapped children and invest the funds accordingly. Because of this need for a systematic determination of priorities and for sensitive and intelligent management of these funds, I firmly believe that a single unit within the Office of Education should be designated as the one to manage the funds and that such funds do not become a part of a common pool to be drawn from at random by a variety of units.

The bill includes funds for several extremely important activities in the Public Health Service. The committee has approved the full amount in each instance. The first of this group is $2,835,000 for chronic diseases and health of the aged, of which $2,750,000 is for grants to States. This appropriation is needed to carry out new authority, for assisting State programs for combating mental retardation, contained in the Social Security Amendments of 1965. Previous legislation and appropriations have provided funds for planning mental retardation facilities and services that are so desperately needed in practically every State in the Nation. This small amount of funds contained in the bill is to assist the States in implementing the plans drawn up under the previous program.

The next item in the bill under the Public Health Service is $8 million for the community immunization program carried out by the Communicable Disease Center. This request was included in the original President's budget submitted to Congress in January but was disallowed at that time since authorization for the program had expired. This authorization has since been extended. Since the committee took technical credit for an $8 million reduction in the budget in connection with the regular Labor-HEW appropriation bill, this amount is shown in the report table as an increase in connection with this bill. Actually the new authorization is for $11 million, and some members of the committee felt that more than the amount carried in the bill should be appropriated. However, no revision was made in the original budget request and the full amount of that request was approved by the committee. The main purpose of this appropriation is to carry out the revised authority which adds measles to the diseases for which vaccination assistance can be given. Measles is the most infectious of the childhood diseases, attacking about 4 million children each year, leading to many serious complications, and causing about 500 deaths. Fortunately, we now have vaccines to prevent the disease, but unfortunately, the extent of utilization is quite low. Under this program grants will be made to States and communities to assist them in conducting comprehensive immunization programs against this disease, and will continue the old program against polio, diphtheria, whoopingcough, and tetanus.

The bill carries an item of $3 million under "Community health practice and research" which was also carried in the President's budget submitted last January and denied because of the expiration of authority for the migrant health project grant program. The authorization for this program has since been extended and expanded to provide an authorization of $7 million. As in the immediately preceding item there are some who feel that the full authorization should be provided, however, the budget has not been revised and the full amount of the budget is contained in the bill. Also, as with respect to the previous item, the committee took credit for a reduction in the budget in connection with the regular annual bill so this is shown as a plus in the committee's report on this bill.

There are also two other items in connection with "Community health practice and research," which are directly connected with the Social Security Amendments of 1965. The first is $9 million for formula grants to States for an accelerated program of developing home health services. Beneficiaries under the Social Security Amendments of 1965 will be entitled to 100 home health visits in any calendar year after a period of care in a hospital or extended care facility. It is a sad commentary on our Nation's health services, but it is a fact, that the availability of such home services is exceedingly limited in almost all communities and is totally lacking in many. I am not sure that $9 million is going to be sufficient to make a real start in correcting this problem but there is real hope that, with the cooperation of the States and communities, significant progress can be made. Our committee will certainly make a careful reevaluation of this program when we act on the next annual appropriation bill.

The last item under "Community health practice and research" is $2,100,000 which is a transfer from the social security trust funds to provide for the administrative expenses necessary for the Public Health Service to carry out its responsibilities related to the professional health aspects of the program of health insurance for the aged.

The last Public Health Service item is an appropriation of $19,700,000 to the National Institutes of Mental Health to carry out the new authorization for Federal assistance in staffing mental health centers. The Mental Health Centers Act has been widely hailed as providing for the greatest advance in the treatment of mental diseases of any program yet devised. While this act has served as a stimulus toward establishment of a nationwide community based program of services for the mentally ill, it quickly became obvious that the majority of the Nation's communities, and especially the less affluent communities, would have to have help in financing the initial staffing of the new centers while local financing was being arranged to support continuing operations. The important legislation authorizing this Federal assistance passed the House by unanimous vote.

There are several items in the bill for the Social Security Administration and the Welfare Administration all of which were authorized by the Social Security Amendments of 1965 or are for the necessary costs of administering these new programs. These have been so thoroughly discussed in connection with the authorizing legislation that was passed this session of Congress that I will not go into them in detail. I would like to point out, however, that the amount carried for "Grants for maternal and child welfare" is another item where the authorization exceeds the amount of the request. The request was for $25 million which is the amount contained in the bill. This will provide $15 million to initiate a new and very much needed program of project grants to provide health screening, diagnosis, preventive and treatment services for children, particularly in areas with a concentration of low-income families. It also provides a $5 million increase for the grant program for maternal and child health services, and $5 million for the grant program for services for crippled children. These were all authorized by the Social Security Amendments of 1965 and, in addition, a $5 million increase for the grant program for child welfare services was so authorized. I personally cannot understand why there was no request for the additional $5 million for welfare services since there is such an obvious need for at least this additional amount.

One of the items reduced somewhat by the committee was the request for $326,000 for the Office of the Secretary. There is no doubt that the considerable amount of recently enacted legislation, adding new programs and expanding old programs of the Department, has added substantially to the responsibilities and workload of the Office of the Secretary. For fiscal year 1965, appropriations provided for 101 positions in his immediate office. In recognition of the additional workload, Congress provided for 12 additional positions in the Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act for 1966. The supplemental request was for an additional 36 positions. In view of the fact that 12 positions had already been allowed in connection with the regular bill the committee felt that an additional 18 would be sufficient to permit the Secretary to adequately discharge his responsibilities.

The increase provides eight additional positions for the Assistant Secretary for health and medical affairs. In this broad field involving some 40 appropriation items and a vast array of activities, there has been a substantial amount of new legislation during the last year. The other 10 additional positions were allowed to establish a new Assistant Secretary, and provide the necessary staff, to be available to carry out responsibilities in any areas where the Secretary determined staff assistance was most needed. The committee denied the request for an Assistant Secretary for special programs and staff. A similar request was contained in the President's budget submitted in January and was denied by Congress in connection with the Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill for 1966. The committee also denied the request for a new assistant to the Secretary for water pollution and staff. A new organization is to be established in the Department to administer the water pollution program. A majority of the committee felt that the establishment of a new Assistant Secretary for the same purpose should at least be postponed until more is known regarding the details of the organization to be established to administer the program. There was also some feeling that it is unwise to establish assistant secretaries for individual programs such as this. It could be opening Pandora's box and inviting the supporters of a great many individual programs, that such supporters would consider just as important as water pollution, to insist on assistant secretaries to lend equal stature to their programs.

Mr. Chairman, the last item in this chapter is also by far the largest. The bill includes $1½ billion, the amount of the request, for the economic opportunity program. While this is a very large sum, it is certainly conservative. Both the House and the Senate passed authorization bills in excess of this amount. It is $285 million less than the authorization finally enacted, and is $400 million less than the amount that this House passed just a few months ago. Compared to the potential of the program in 1966 as measured by the estimated demand from the States and communities, even the authorization is conservative and the amount carried in the bill is short by at least $500 million

As the committee report states, this agency has shown a remarkable ability to get a complex, multifaceted program moving expeditiously and in an efficient manner. The committee report goes on to point out that just in the first 10 months of this program 1.3 million poor persons directly benefited. When you consider that the families of these persons also benefited in most cases, the total of people benefited directly and indirectly will approach 5 million.

The almost 400 pages of hearings on this program are full of specific examples of benefits derived from the many programs and subprograms this agency administers. A few examples—the committee was told that the average enrollee in the conservation camps gains 15 pounds during the first month of training. In the short time that the conservation centers have been in existence, enrollees have spent 1,821 man-hours in firefighting and building firebreaks; they built 250 family units for picnicking and camping; they laid 1,280 yards of pipe and tile lines; put up 640 signs; built 2,000 yards of diversion ditches; built and maintained administrative facilities, including 809 equipment and supply storehouses, 80 service and repair shops, and so on. As a result of counseling efforts and special programs worked out cooperatively with the schools, 300 of the 1,200 out-of-school neighborhood youth corp enrollees in Cleveland are expecting to return to school this fall. The Salt Lake City neighborhood youth corp director reports that between 30 and 40 percent of the dropouts in that out-of-school program are returning to school. A sample of the medical examinations given Head Start children shows that dental referrals were made for 56 percent of the children, 5 percent had been exposed to tuberculosis, 3 percent had hearing problems, 4 percent had visual problems, and 1 percent of the children had speech defects. Formal requests have been received for more than 6,500 VISTA volunteers in excess of those that have already been placed. This is just a sampling of the many examples of accomplishment and successes in connection with this program.

Mr. Chairman, the Office of Economic Opportunity has been maligned in newspapers, magazines, and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. During the course of our hearings many of the specific instances involved in these newspaper and magazine stories and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD were brought up for discussion. In all but one instance these stories proved to be completely erroneous or so distorted and exaggerated as to constitute untruths. Satisfactory explanations were given for every one of them except an instance brought to the committee's attention by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] involving the use of small purchase orders to contract for personal services of individuals. When it was confirmed that this procedure had been followed in the one instance, Director Shriver immediately agreed that this was a very poor practice and assured the committee that it would be discontinued. He also had a complete search made of the OEO's records and advised the committee that this procedure had been utilized for similar purposes in 10 instances, totaling $20,000. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this comes about as close to a perfect record as any program of this size in the Federal Government could come. For an agency to undergo the searching questions which were raised in our hearings and come up with about one three-hundred-and-fiftieth of 1 percent of their funds having been spent in a doubtful manner is about as good as it is humanly possible to get.

Mr. Chairman, I have discussed here some very worthwhile programs that greatly benefit either directly or indirectly all of the people of our Nation. In closing, I ask the indulgence of this body to speak briefly about a somewhat personal matter. As chairman of the subcommittee that handles appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and the antipoverty program, I am continually frustrated and embarrassed by the fact that my own State of Rhode Island does not take advantage of these programs as it should. Frankly it is one of the more backward States in the Nation in this regard. I am not going into great detail at this time, but I would like to have in the RECORD at least one good example that will only take 2 or 3 minutes of the Members' time.

During the past 3 years, this Congress has brought about a revolution in the area of mental health and mental retardation. The Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 is a landmark in the history of our humane national concern for those afflicted with these maladies. But the Congress found it was not enough to provide all the impetus that was needed; thus, this year we added amendments to the act to allow for staffing assistance for mental health centers and we authorized even greater expenditures than had originally been planned for mental retardation.

I personally take great pride in the fact that as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee of the House of Representatives I participated in the actions of the 88th and 89th Congresses to enact these laws to provide funds that will stimulate the construction of mental health centers and mental retardation facilities.

As you know, this legislation was designed as a stimulus. We in Congress had no intention of supplanting local or State programs with Federal programs. We left the next step up to each State itself. Federal funds were available, but they provided only enough to interest communities and States in attempting to find additional methods of financing.

The act, and its amendments, require that State plans for the use of alloted funds be prepared, opening the way for individual communities to develop their own local plans for participation in the program. And, as I see it, this is true cooperation between the Federal Government and the States.

It is, therefore, with a great deal of sadness that I have observed the slowness with which the Governor of my own State of Rhode Island has moved to avail us of this Federal assistance. Our citizens have suffered from a lack of leadership in a field where dynamic leadership is vital.

In the area of mental health, for example, our Governor's comprehensive State mental health plan recommends a permanent Governor's council on mental health with full-time professional and clerical staff. The plan also emphasizes the distinctive features of the State: its small geographic size and the comparatively easy geographical accessibility to mental health services developed within our State.

Because of these features, Rhode Island is in a position to establish specialized units providing centralized services for the entire State, while continuing the support of basic mental health services required by the Federal program under local mental health boards.

But comprehensive planning in Rhode Island has not yet led to a practical plan of action for participation in the Federal program for community mental health center construction. And I must confess that it is a mystery to me why Rhode Island has not been in the forefront of this movement nationally.

Already, seven States have submitted center plans that have been approved; four others are pending. These States with approved plans include the two with the largest populations—California and New York. If these two, with their immensely complex problems and their broad geographic variations, can act to take advantage of Federal assistance in the center construction program—so too can Rhode Island.

Specific recommendations regarding sources, methods and levels of financing a mental health program are lacking altogether in the Rhode Island comprehensive plan. These must be provided, and soon, by the responsible State officials.

The comprehensive plan also recommends the development of a model mental health law for Rhode Island to be submitted to the general assembly at its 1966 session. This must be done; Rhode Island cannot continue to lag behind the 25 States that have already enacted such legislation.

An extensive program for expanding mental health facilities in Rhode Island has been recommended by the Governor's council on mental health in a report that also called for the establishment of several new institutions. The council said an estimated 86,000 persons in the State were in need of some form of psychiatric care in 1960, and that number could increase to 94,200 by 1970. Last year, approximately 32,800 persons were treated in Rhode Island.

It is just unbelievable that Rhode Island is dragging its feet in this area.

Although the council did not give a specific estimate of the cost of the expanded program, it said that treatment for Rhode Islanders would cost a great deal of money. The council also recommended public subsidies for some patients referred to private psychiatrists.

Costly or not, the council's goals are clearly reasonable—these goals are urgent. Failure to provide care can result in more profound, more intractable illness. Each year of delay in providing such services produces its own harvest of despair, and makes recovery and rehabilitation more difficult and expensive.

In my duties as a Member of the Congress I have sought on many occasions to promote national programs built on the sound principle that mental health is public health, and thus must include both preventive and rehabilitative resources to reduce the burden of disability which individuals and communities must suffer. I urge attention to this principle upon the officials of my own State.

In the area of mental retardation, the situation is somewhat better although here too the lack of leadership in finding the financial ways and means for an active program is handicapping local efforts.

Rhode Island has submitted its mental retardation facilities plan to the Public Health Service, and in this plan 13 facilities are projected for the State, based on a division of the State into four regions.

Region No. 1 includes Providence, Cranston, and East Providence. For this region there are five facilities planned to serve the retarded, with two facilities in Providence, two in Cranston, and one in East Providence.

Region No. 2, which includes Burrillville, Pawtucket, and Woonsocket, has planned three facilities. Burrillville already has facilities, and two would be added in Pawtucket, and one in Woonsocket.

In region No. 3, including Exeter, Warwick, and Westerly, three new facilities are planned, with one for Warwick, and two for Westerly. Exeter already has some facilities.

Region No. 4 includes only Newport, where two facilities are planned.

Mr. Chairman, our State officials have been guilty of sins of omission—they have not pushed ahead to take advantage of the opportunity available to them.

In Rhode Island, I cannot understand this attitude. It seems to me that one of the qualities needed for true leadership is the ability to recognize opportunity when it arises. Federal assistance in mental health and mental retardation programs provides an opportunity for those of our citizens who have suffered without the help they deserve.

I, for one, would like to see the qualities of leadership put on display in my home State.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to several items in this bill. I am not going to take time to discuss them all but there is one quite confused situation, that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] touched on briefly, that I think should be discussed in more detail.

For fiscal year 1965, appropriations available to the immediate office of the Secretary supported a total of 101 positions. In the regular Labor-HEW appropriation bill for 1966, Congress allowed an additional 12 positions. The supplemental request was to add still another 36 positions, as follows:

First. To increase from 8 to 16 the number of positions for the Assistant Secretary for Health and Medical Affairs.

Second. Ten additional positions to establish a third assistant secretary and staff.

Third. Ten additional positions to establish an assistant secretary for special programs and staff.

Fourth. Eight positions to establish a new assistant to the Secretary for Water Pollution and staff.

The hearings were very vague when it came to any details concerning the request. The witnesses also were unable to explain why the President's budget submitted in January contained a request for five positions for a new assistant secretary for special programs and staff; then, after this was turned down in connection with the regular bill, it was resubmitted in the supplemental, but for 10 positions rather than 5.

During the hearings on the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] asked:

> Do you think water pollution is more important than your farflung education and training programs?

After which the following colloquy took place:

> Mr. Cohen. Are you talking about the Office of Education or are you talking about Manpower Development and Training?
>
> Mr. Fogarty. No, an assistant secretary.
>
> Mr. Cohen. I think there is a lot of merit to that.

Mr. Chairman, it appears that they were so anxious that this was not to be used as an argument against an Assistant Secretary for Water Pollution that, within days after the hearings, the Secretary announced that he was establishing a new position of Assistant Secretary for Education. I am glad that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] confined his comparison to just water pollution and education. If he had asked if they consider water pollution to be more important than education, vocational rehabilitation, air pollution, mental retardation, alcoholism, and a few others, we might have a dozen or 15 new Assistant Secretaries by this time.

The bill includes the requested increase for the Assistant Secretary for Health and Medical Affairs, and the requested increase for the third Assistant Secretary. Now I would like to quote what the justifications to the House committee said about the duties of the third Assistant Secretary:

> The third Assistant Secretary is expected to perform those special functions which are assigned to him by the Secretary. The Secretary wishes to have an Assistant Secretary to whom he can make special assignments such as evaluation of particular program areas, assisting the Secretary with special White House matters, including White House conferences, and numerous other unanticipated responsibilities which are constantly being placed on the Secretary and

> for which the Secretary needs a small staff headed by a top-level official.

They convinced a majority of the committee that 10 additional positions were needed for these purposes and the funds were included in the bill. Now I have just received a copy of the justifications that went to the Senate for the third Assistant Secretary. These read as follows:

> The third Assistant Secretary will advise the Secretary on educational policy matters which are best handled at the Department level. He will review and coordinate intradepartmental policies affecting fellowships, student loans and related matters to insure Departmentwide consistency. He will have responsibility for the educational television program and DHEW responsibilities in the manpower development and training program, including liaison with the Department of Labor. He will act as liaison with other Federal agencies and institutions of higher learning to improve consistency of approach to educational policy.

The Department has a relatively new Secretary who obviously has not had time to make a thorough study of the needs of his office. Since the President's budget was submitted, the Department has completely changed its mind regarding the needs for an Assistant Secretary for special programs. Just since the House held hearings on this supplemental, they have completely changed their minds on the functions to be performed by the third Assistant Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is safe to assume that they will have changed their mind about other things in connection with the Office of the Secretary by the time these funds could be appropriated. It appears to me that the only reasonable thing to do is to postpone making any additional appropriations to the Office of the Secretary and reconsider this matter in January when we have something firmer to act upon. After all, the regular Labor-HEW appropriation bill gives the Secretary an increase of over 10 percent in the number of positions above those available for fiscal year 1965 and I am sure the Department would not be crippled by delaying further increases for just a very few months.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supplemental appropriations (this Act may be cited as the "Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966") for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, namely:

CHAPTER I

Department of Agriculture

Soil Conservation Service

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

RENT SUPPLEMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Chairman, a few months ago when the housing bill was under consideration, I opposed the rent supplement program because it was the most controversial part of the entire bill.

The main reason for my objection was that this program—a social planner's dream disguised in housing terminology—would give the Housing Administrator a blank check to federalize American residential patterns and subsidize forced economic integration. This is what we were afraid of—and we were right. That is what the Housing Administrator is trying to do.

I am sorry to say that the Administrator admits his objective. He is not concerned with helping poor people to find housing. He is after so-called economic integration. He says so right in his instructions to local FHA office directors. In a letter of September 28, numbered NF letter 63, the Administrator states that criteria for approval of a rent supplement project "will include full consideration of its contribution to assisting in integrating economic groups." He stands condemned out of his own mouth as a man up to no good.

This program has been full of deceit. It was initially called an experiment, yet it was to be given $8 billion over a 40-year period. Some experiment.

If you will recall, when the Administrator realized that this program was doomed to defeat, there was a sudden retreat—the program was watered down and a compromise was offered to save it. It passed the House on a 208-to-202 vote.

So instead of asking for $50 million for this year, the compromise asked for only $30 million. Of course, this was still too much.

I am glad to see that the distinguished Committee on Appropriations has slashed the rent supplement appropriation from $30 to $6 million. I can understand the reluctance of the committee to completely eliminate appropriations for this worthless program, but they have made their feelings perfectly clear by almost doing so. Now it is our turn.

We ought to make our feelings perfectly clear by throwing out the last $6 million appropriation for this study in trickery. The rent supplement program is not worth a penny.

I say this because this program is an insult to the Congress. We warned the Members of this House that this program was a Trojan horse. We said that it would be as full of abuses as a swiss cheese is full of holes. We said this, and some of you did not believe us. We knew that the regulations would be chock full of the loopholes that the Administrator needs for his forced economic integration. We told you, and we were right.

The regulations are out now. They just came out recently. The Administrator held them up for a while until the Appropriations Committee had finished its hearings. The Administrator has no more respect for the committees of the Congress than he has for the Congress itself. He delayed issuing his rent supplement regulations until 20 days after the Appropriations Committee hearings. You have heard about these regulations already. They make a mockery of the rent supplement program.

Let me mention the worst regulations. First, rent supplements can be used to pay up to 70 percent of a tenant's rent. This degree of subsidy is gross paternalism. Secondly, a family may qualify for rent subsidies even though it has assets of as much as $25,000. Those of you who thought that this program is for the poor are wrong. Nobody concerned with the poor would implement a regulation like this.

Another bad regulation allows a family with four children to collect payments for a four-bedroom apartment. What percentage of our American families with four children have four-bedroom housing? This is not equity—this is trickery and luxury.

As I said, the Appropriations Committee was not allowed to know about these regulations while their hearings were going on. The Housing Administrator has pulled every trick he knows to keep his program from being blasted on its merits.

From start to finish, this program has been an insult to the Congress and its committees, and the guiding hand behind these insults has been the Housing Administrator. Some of you may remember the special Banking and Currency Committee print that was written downtown to attack the committee minority as liars for minority report statements which have turned out to be true.

Rarely in congressional history has one man downtown sought so often to pull so much wool over the eyes of so many as the Housing Administrator.

I am sorry that this infamous rent supplement program is in the lawbooks, but if it has to be on the books, I urge you to have it there without 1 red cent of appropriations.

When the rent supplement survived a recommittal vote by a bare six votes, it did so under false pretenses. Many Members supporting it had been convinced that possible abuses would not occur. They were wrong. I hope they know it. I hope they know that the Housing Administrator tried to make suckers out of them. This is their chance to redeem themselves. This is their chance to vote right on rent supplements. This is everybody's chance to vote to tell the Housing Administrator that he cannot bamboozle the Congress of the United States and get away with it.

Some here may say that $6 million is chickenfeed, and that we ought to let the rent supplement program starve to death in peace. This would be a mistake. This $6 million is not $6 million at all. It is $6 million worth of commitment to run 40 years, and that is just about a quarter of a billion dollars, and once the contracts are made this year for $6 million, we are stuck for 40 years.

Nor do I think it is a question of respecting the $6 million figure the committee set. The committee had not seen the regulations. Besides, I think they had the goods on the rent supplement. I think that they would have liked to knock it out completely, but they left that up to us. A vote to knock out the remaining $6 million is a vote for the honor and integrity of this House—and it is also a vote for commonsense.

I urge your support of the motion to strike out this $6 million for the rent subsidy program.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take a few minutes to say that I am very pleased the Appropriations Committee has unanimously decided to grant $12 million in additional funds to the USIA for stepping up and increasing their informational activities in Vietnam, Thailand, and southeast Asia generally. I am sure we agree that although military victories are important, we really will win or lose in southeast Asia depending upon whether we can compete for the minds of the uncommitted people of the world.

The totalitarian nations for years have recognized the uses of propaganda. We have been a little slow in doing likewise, but we must counter the totalitarian claims, misstatements, and falsehoods. If we do this, if we tell our story in a convincing way, we will be well on the way to a political victory.

I commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], who is always zealous for the rights of the taxpayers but who is never found wanting when money is needed to tell the American story to the people of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER II

District of Columbia

Federal Funds

Loans to District of Columbia

For an additional amount for "Loans to District of Columbia", $2,000,000, to be advanced to the general fund.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to this particular paragraph, which also relates to the final paragraph on page 3 of the bill. The two portions of the amendment are completely related, and I ask unanimous consent that the two portions of the amendment may be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should like to know what the second portion relates to. I understood the gentleman to refer to page 3. Does the gentleman mean page 12?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. No. The final paragraph of page 3. The first paragraph of page 3, I say to the chairman of the committee, relates to a loan to the District of Columbia in order to provide the funds set forth by appropriation in the final paragraph on page 3.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF WISCONSIN

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: On page 3, line 6, strike out "2,000,000" and insert "250,000".

On Page 3 line 20 strike out "2,000,000" and insert "250,000".

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this may seem a rather insignificant amendment, when we are dealing with a bill amounting to $4.2 billion, but I submit in all sincerity that there is a great deal more involved here than the $1,750,000 which would be reduced in this appropriation if this amendment is adopted.

The $6 million appropriation is contained in two chapters of this bill, to complete the planning and to begin the construction of the subway for the District of Columbia. The estimates which we had in the way of overall costs for this project before our committee amounted to $431 million, but even though we had verbal assurances from some of the people who came before us I believe it is a fair statement to say that every member of the subcommittee had a very distinct uneasiness and misgivings that we were talking about a lot more money than $431 million. A member of the Legislative Committee on the District of Columbia who came before us in a rather unusual appearance expressed his concern and his misgivings that we were dealing with a substantial amount of money, of which the Appropriations Committee was not being made aware.

I think we are all aware that the soil conditions here in the District of Columbia are not what they might be back in Iowa or up in New York or Pennsylvania. This city was originally built on rather soft foundations. We ran into unusual conditions in connection with the construction of the Rayburn Building because no one had bothered there, either, to find out what the difficult conditions would be under which construction is carried out here in the District of Columbia. Here we are undertaking to dig a 13.1-mile tunnel underground. I submit that the fair and proper thing for this Congress to do is to spend a total of three-quarters of a million dollars, a quarter of a million dollars in this portion of the bill and half a million dollars in the portion relating to the Department of the Interior, to complete the necessary soil investigations and surveys so that when we come back here in January and consider this matter afresh in the 1967 appropriation bill we will have that information available to us. It does not do us much good if we have already given the original $9 million, as the budget contemplated, or the $6 million involved in this bill, and then find out that we are going to spend a great deal more money than the $431 million we are talking about, because the foot will be firmly entrenched in the door then, and the funds for construction will have been initiated. I think the wise thing to do, and it will not result in any unreasonable or unfair delay in the construction of this project, is to get the complete information with respect to the soil conditions where this subway is to be built, and to complete the job of soil investigations and surveys which the money would provide under the amendment which I have offered. Then we will have a much better idea as to whether we are talking about $431 million or $750 million in order to build a subway here in the District of Columbia.

I think it is commonsense to have all of the facts available that this Congress can provide before we commit ourselves to the construction of a project which will run us into a lot of money. So, as I said, while this particular amendment would only reduce this bill by $1¾ million, I think it can give us the information we need so that we can tell in the future whether we want to commit ourselves to this project. In my opinion, we do not have sufficient information in order to provide the initial construction funds which will irrevocably commit us to the construction of a subway here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in August of this year Congress passed the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965. This act authorized the agency to design, engineer, and construct a rapid transit system here in the city of Washington. The act further provided that the rapid transit system would cost a total of $431 million. Of that amount $100 million was to be paid by the Federal Government; $50 million was to be paid by the District of Columbia in borrowed funds from the Treasury and $281 million to be received from the issuance of bonds. This made a total of $431 million. Now, for a period of several years here in our Capital City not only the Democratic administration and the Democratic leaders of the District of Columbia but also the Republican leaders and the Board of Trade and all of those interested in the Capital City have requested time after time that we have a rapid transit system constructed in our capital system. For a number of years we had some controversy about the highway and the rapid transit system. At all times, as chairman of the subcommittee on the budget for the District of Columbia, I have said that here in our Capital City there is a place for both rapid transit and also our highway program. Now, Mr. Chairman, we are down to this point where in this bill we request $5,679,000 to start a rapid transit system.

Mr. Chairman, the amount comes from two subcommittees, the subcommittee chaired by my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], the Subcommittee on Interior, which was called upon for $6 million. The exact amount was $5,679,000, since the difference of $321,000 has heretofore been appropriated. The District of Columbia Budget Subcommittee was called upon for $3 million, this $3 million to be borrowed from the Treasury.

After carefully considering the testimony as presented to our Subcommittee on the District of Columbia Budget we decided that for the balance of fiscal year 1966 the sum of $2 million could be used, instead of the amount requested of $3 million. We made a reduction of $1 million.

The Subcommittee on Interior made a reduction of $2 million. That, Mr. Chairman, makes a total in this bill of

$5,679,000 to start the rapid transit system underway during the balance of this fiscal year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say this to the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. I, for one, do not believe that the rapid transit system can be completed for the sum of $431 million. I do not believe that it will be completed in 7 years, and that the bonds will be retired out of the fare box. But I want the Members of the Committee to know that this bill was passed in August authorizing the rapid transit system without a rollcall vote—a unanimous decision of the House., At this time we ask the Members of this Committee to sustain the Committee on the District of Columbia Budget and approve the amount contained in the bill of $5,679,000 in order to get this system underway.

The rapid transit system will contain 24.9 miles of line. The amount of $50 million will be borrowed by the District of Columbia over a period of years to meet its share of the total cost of the rapid transit system. The first $2 million will be borrowed from the Treasury, and will pay interest on this amount at the rate of about 4⅛ percent. Over a period of 30 years, this will be repaid to the Treasury. The $100 million will be paid by the Federal Government. Again I would like to say that I have my doubts that the fare box will retire the bonds.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, in presenting this matter to the Subcommittee on Interior, as my good friend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] will no doubt point out to the members of the Committee, Mr. McCarter, the Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency, on page 574 of the hearings, very clearly stated that all down through the years a study had been made of the soil and that testing had been completed at a total cost of $118,000, and that they had carefully considered this matter. Further, they would consider this again and again as the transit system proceeded under contract.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], a member of our committee and one of the able Members of the House, would simply slow down and bring to a halt the beginning of the rapid transit system for the city of Washington. This must not be done.

Mr. Chairman, we must appropriate the full amount that the committee approved of $5,679,000 and get the rapid transit system underway now.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment is defeated.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] has pointed out, this appropriation was reviewed by two Appropriation Committees, the District of Columbia, and Interior.

The District Committee recommended $2 million, and Interior recommended $4 million. I certainly would object to this amendment because it proposes only to cut the funds furnished by the District. It would reduce the District's share from $2 million to $250,000.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I do not think the gentleman should be concerned about that, because I have an amendment at the desk to cut the amount of the Interior Department.

Mr. DENTON. Let us consider the merits of the matter. Regardless of how we may have felt about the necessity for building a rapid transit system, no matter how we felt about the method of financing, Congress by an overwhelming majority decided in favor of a rapid transit system in the District of Columbia.

Occasionally the Committee on Appropriations of the House has been criticized for legislating. To deny this appropriation and not appropriate any money could be construed as a form of legislation, and that is not within the spirit of the law.

I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin we should have complete knowledge of the facts involved, and we do not have that yet.

Information on soil content is something we need very badly. This is one area where the agency has done considerable work and study. The Commission employed an engineering firm which collected soil information from the District Highway Commission, the General Services Administration and other local government bodies. They also drilled some 116 sampling holes. It is extremely important to have the contents of the soil analyzed. That will represent a total cost of $1.6 million.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] said he did not think the transit system could be built for $431 million. Mr. McCarter says it can. A great many engineering experts agree with him. We have these conflicting views because we do not have engineering data on all details at this time.

This bill provides a million dollars for preliminary plans to determine where the line is going, design and specifications of the stations et cetera. Practically all the funds in the bill is for engineering, design and planning. There have not been sufficient surveys on passenger load and fare income. There has been no independent traffic survey for this item. Funds are included in this bill for such a survey. All things considered, I think this appropriation is at a reasonable level to accomplish the necessary planning. I think we have reduced the appropriation to the minimum, but it provides what we should have to carry out necessary planning.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The gentleman does recall, does he not, that in the request that came before our two subcommittees from the Bureau of the Budget, there was a request for $600,000 to complete the soil investigation and soil survey and analysis.

Mr. DENTON. The total cost will be $1.6 million.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Do you not think it is necessary to have these surveys and soil analysis before we commit ourselves on this?

Mr. DENTON. This is just the start of the project. I agree with you on that. But they have done considerable work on soil analysis and soil surveys and will do more as they progress. In conclusion, if this amendment is approved we will just be delaying the project and it will cost considerably more because costs will undoubtedly increase with any delay on this project.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I wish to express opposition to the proposed amendment to cut this figure for the transit system. Already $118,000 has been spent on 116 borings to establish the feasibility of this project. All the engineers who have been engaged in this project and some of the best in the world have done work on such a system in Toronto, Cleveland, Chicago, Philadelphia, San Francisco, and Montreal.

Earlier in the debate the work of the firm of Dames & Moore, of New York—one of the best in the world—their soils study indicate feasibility of this system.

Reference has been made to the fact that $600,000 has been asked for additional borings. That is true. But not borings to establish the feasibility. That has already been established. The additional borings that are requested are borings to determine engineering design. For example, you may find in block 10 a certain soil condition. You may find down the street in the next block a different condition. The purpose of additional borings for which the $600,000 is to be used is to complete the plan for engineering design for construction.

The design phase is the next step and in this figure you have requests for money for detailed specifications for this work. You have money in it for easements. You have money in it for the final contract design—$3 million on the basis of these designs contracts will be let.

I might point out, we have gone through this on our committee time and time again and, as has been pointed out, three different Presidents have requested that we proceed on some kind of a transit system in our Nation's Capital—my Capital and your Capital. We have on the floor of this House passed a bill to do exactly that. Here is our opportunity to make allocation of funds which has been very carefully gone over in the committee. I think the appropriation committee has very wisely proceeded with care and caution as to the amount. I know in our District of Columbia Committee, there were those of us who had some fear that perhaps the dollar figure might go higher. Perhaps it will. But we are convinced that the engineering is of the best and we are convinced that the present management of the system is of the best.

We believe we have done everything we need to do to see to it that our dollars are wisely spent and that our Nation's Capital will be given a transit system that we believe they will need in the future.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman feel there is enough reasonable doubt about the accuracy of the overall cost estimates in view of the uncertain conditions of the foundations and the soil conditions here in the District of Columbia which has been demonstrated time and time again that we ought to get all of the available information relating to these soil investigations and surveys before we commit ourselves for one dime before we do anything about the engineering design or for construction costs?

Mr. NELSEN. I would not agree with the gentleman. If I were of the opinion that the gentleman seems to be, that all the facts have not been put together, which I think they have been.

The $118,000 that has been spent has been spent to secure 116 borings. The feasibility of the project has been arrived at by engineers who have wide experience in this field. The $600,000 that is referred to is not for borings to establish feasibility but borings to establish engineering design.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Which would give us a much better estimate of how much money we are talking about.

Mr. NELSEN. No, that will make no difference.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I take this time only to advise the Members that we will dispose of this matter today, including the vote. When the bill was moved forward from Friday to Thursday, it was announced that it would be disposed of today, including the vote. After we vote we will ask to go over until Monday. I make this announcement only because so many Members have been inquiring as to whether the vote would go over until a later date.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin) there were—ayes, 20, noes, 76.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Welfare Administration

Assistance to refugees in the United States

For an additional amount for "Assistance to refugees in the United States", $12,600,000.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I am today requesting the appropriate committees of the Congress to interest and concern themselves in the pending negotiations between the United States and the Castro government with regard to the entry of refugees into the United States, and to hold hearings as may be necessary.

The Federal Government has the clear responsibility to insure that the burden and the privilege of accommodating thousands of Cuban refugees from Communist tyranny is shared by all America.

For the Federal Government to pay for the costs of transportation, housing, food, clothing, education, health, and other matters has been generally recognized. The administration and the Congress have and will, I am sure, continue to provide the necessary funds.

The distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, and the members of his subcommittee have, and I am sure will continue, to be fair, reasonable, and generous in their allocation of Federal funds for the care of Cuban refugees.

However, the burden is more than financial. The principal burden is the ability of any one community to take to its heart and absorb into its economic life more thousands of those who flee tyranny.

The whole world knows of the truly outstanding manner in which the people of Greater Miami have met the problem of the influx of hundreds of thousands of Cuban refugees heretofore admitted. There is perhaps no finer chapter in the history of humanitarianism. But it is unrealistic and unwise to stretch any further the generosity and the humanity of the people of Greater Miami by assuming or expecting that the community is prepared and willing now to be the terminal settlement point for hundreds of thousands more of Cuban refugees.

Because important national policy is involved the appropriate committees of Congress should concern themselves with the specifics of the negotiations now taking place.

I am of the opinion that any agreement for entry should, among other things, be surrounded by or contain certain basic limitations and safeguards.

First. Entry of refugees should be sharply limited. First priority should be to reunite immediate families; and second priority to release political prisoners. The best estimates of these priorities means that from 30,000 to 50,000 people will be involved. Beyond this we should not now go.

Second. Miami should be only an entry and processing center. Staging and relocation centers should be opened in other areas of the country.

Third. The U.S. Government should at all times be in control of the transportation means. We all fully sympathize with the anxious members of the divided Cuban families, but they are endangering themselves and violating the laws and policies of this country if they follow Castro's advice and resort to the use of small boats to rescue their loved ones from Cuba. The U.S. Government cannot allow the breakdown of law and order to serve the propaganda purposes of the Castro Communist government.

Fourth. We should be satisfied that we have and will maintain the necessary personnel and equipment in the south Florida area to safeguard the security of the United States.

Fifth. The United States must have the final determination on who is admitted to the United States. If the United States is not to screen and process people in Cuba, then debarkation lists must be certified by a recognized and reliable international authority on consultation with the United States.

Sixth. On arrival, the United States must have prompt security screening processes and right of return to Cuba of anyone considered inimical to the security of the United States.

Seventh. The rate of entry of Cuban refugees into the United States should not exceed the rate of relocation.

Eighth. Finally, no agreement should include any terms or conditions which in any way could be interpreted as an agreement on the part of the United States that we are relaxing our position against Castro and his government or which will in any way permit him to propagandize his image as humane, and his government as one of the inter-American family of respectable nations.

We must make it clear that our act is purely humanitarian; that Florida and the United States are not to become a dumping ground for those whom Castro considers undesirable; that our position towards Castro Cuba has not changed; that Castro and the Communist government of Cuba are both incompatible with the spirit and intent of the democratic and freedom-loving people of the inter-American system; and that our policies are and will continue to be the restoration of the government of Cuba to those who want, believe in, fight and die for freedom and democratic institutions.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he is satisfied with the appropriation provided for this program?

Mr. FASCELL. In the supplemental appropriation bill, yes. I am grateful to the Appropriations Committee for including the full amount of the item.

I have further said that with respect to past appropriations, with minor exceptions we have never had any problem with respect to the funding of the program.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is addressing his remarks to other committee hearings on the subject?

Mr. FASCELL. I am addressing my remarks to the overall problem, not only the funding but also the policy involved on the Cuban refugees.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FASCELL. I am delighted to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I have not been present all of the time, and I wonder whether any study has been made as to the possible reason for all this generosity on the part of Mr. Castro?

Mr. FASCELL. I am sure there have been executive studies. I am addressing myself to the responsibility of Congress on this subject.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thought it was the responsibility of Congress to find out why.

Mr. FASCELL. I agree with the gentlewoman, and this is to what my remarks are addressed.

Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that the appropriate committees having the responsibility will immediately react to do that which the Congress has the responsibility to do.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the gentleman is correct in saying that the proper committees of the Congress will look into this situation. I find it hard to understand that it was only about 3 years ago we spent some $60 million to buy Cubans out of Cuba. Now Castro wants to give us some 45,000 Cubans. This whole thing is difficult for me to understand. However, I do agree with the gentleman that the proper committees of the Congress ought to get into this and ought to do it before this session of Congress adjourns. They should ascertain what is going on that prompts this exodus from Cuba. Why does Castro now suddenly decide to turn loose 45,000 people?

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for his observation. Of course, I concur that the whole policy question is a matter in which the Congress ought to interest itself. I have talked to the chairman of the appropriate subcommittees who are interested in this problem and are proceeding to concern themselves with it.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GURNEY. I commend the gentleman on his statement and the points he made in it. I certainly subscribe wholeheartedly that the proper committees in the Congress look into this. I also hope while they do this investigating that these committees will also find out why the administration all of a sudden has to perpetrate this kind of a crisis on the district of the gentleman standing in the well as well as on the entire State of Florida and indeed the Nation. I have talked to many others in this Congress as well as those outside of this Congress who are of the opinion that this action was ill advised and I might say indeed irresponsible. I would sincerely hope the committees of the Congress would examine this aspect of it also.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for his observation. He is certainly entitled to his opinion. I would not want to associate myself with the remarks he has made that the decision to allow entry is irresponsible and injudicious. I say it is a policy question both for the administration and for the Congress. The administration made its position clear on this subject, and I simply point out at this point that before the matter is definitely concluded the responsible committee of the Congress ought to have their say.

Mr. GURNEY. May I say that indeed I did not intend to embarrass the gentleman in the well by my own remarks. All I meant to say was many people in the Congress feel this way and many people outside, too.

Mr. FASCELL. I realize that the gentleman did not direct his remarks at me, and I appreciate it.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleague from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] in the question of the refugees coming expressing considerable concern about from Cuba to the United States as a result of Castro's most recent proposal and the President's indicated interest in considering such a proposal as he announced at the Statue of Liberty in New York, where I had the privilege of being in attendance, when he signed the immigration bill.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is quite obvious that no one knows, according to the hearing record, exactly what the eventual cost or the present cost of this program will be, partially because no one knows exactly how many refugees are going to be permitted to come into this country, although the figure of 45,000 is used in the hearings.

I think it is quite obvious that no one knows because the negotiations presently underway indirectly, supposedly through the Swiss Embassy, have not been finalized and apparently the suggestions of the United States have not been accepted, according to the most recent morning Washington Post newspaper article that I have in hand of October 14 in which the article clearly indicates the United States has suggested that second preference should go to political prisoners, the second group of immigrant refugees from Cuba should be political prisoners, the first group being close relatives of those refugees already in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it Castro has not commented or agreed to that second category preference. Supposedly he has agreed to the first category to some extent.

But, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this whole thing is fraught with danger. I agree with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] wholeheartedly that the Congress of the United States should get into the picture now and not after decisions are made and not at the time the treaty is ready to be ratified, not at the time that all the deals with Cuba have been made and our own function and that of the other body relating to confirmation and so forth is to rubber-stamping what has already been agreed to. I believe that is part of the point which the gentleman from Florida was trying to make, that we ought to have an opportunity in our committees and in the House and Senate to give consideration to the entire problem before the decisions are made. This thing is fraught with danger. We should not kid ourselves that Castro did this for the sake of the refugees. He did not do this for the sake of uniting broken families. He did this for propaganda reasons—for the sake of helping his Communist regime in Cuba and to strengthen himself in this hemisphere and to strengthen his hand all over the world. We should know that Castro has no humanitarian motivation in this matter, in my opinion, regardless of what the United States does in reacting.

Mr. Chairman, I admit that he is trying to get us in a box just as he had us in a box relating to the prisoner deal which our country agreed to. It appears that it is all right to trade in flesh, but there has been an announced policy of the administration not to trade in anything else. Does that make sense?

Mr. Chairman, there are so many unanswered questions relating to this at this time when we are being asked to give a blank money check to carry out unknown policies. How are we going to keep Communist supporters and Castro supporters and Communist sympathizers out of the United States? If they get to the United States, and have not been screened in Cuba before they leave, and they are known to be members of the Communist Party and supporters of Castro how do we get rid of these and other undesirables? What can we do with them when they get here? They are here. Can you put them in jail? They have not done anything, any act, in this country as yet to permit this, have they? They are here. How are we going to get rid of them?

Do the members of this Committee think that any other Latin American country is going to accept them? No. Do you think that Castro is going to accept them back if they want to come back? No. Who makes the selection as to who will come? Castro.

Mr. Chairman, that is the basic problem as I see it.

Does anyone believe he is going to send any outstanding citizens of Cuba to the United States? No. Who is he going to send? Logically the people who he feels he cannot trust and who if there is ever going to be freedom on the island of Cuba ought to stay there and try to get rid of him and win back their freedom.

Mr. Chairman, who else is he going to send? Possibly elderly people, and there is some discussion of it in the RECORD, but no answers, elderly people, maybe, some of them on welfare and in hospitals, and many of them sick. They are certainly not going to be able to screen them out when the family over here says they want them over here and if they come within the first preference category.

Mr. Chairman, who is going to pay the bill, and how much is it going to be?

I think the Committee will admit and I will ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], is not the figure of $12.6 million in the bill just the beginning of the cost in that we have already appropriated some $207 million according to the hearings relating to refugees presently in this country? Is not this just the beginning figure?

Mr. BOW. I think the gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAMER

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER: Page 4, line 14, strike out the period and insert: "*Provided*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be used for incurring any obligation under this chapter until adequate screening processes are established to make every reasonable effort to prevent members of the Communist Party or supporters of the Communist conspiracy from leaving Cuba for the United States."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the gentleman from Texas and the committee would accept this amendment, because I think this would answer some of the serious questions that are being asked throughout the Nation with regard to this proposal, and that is: How do we make certain that these people coming in are not going to end up by doing the bidding of Communist Castro, or some of them, and the Communist Party?

What are we going to do to screen the people before they leave Cuba? That is, what I was asking in my remarks for an adequate system. I do not want anyone to think that I am suggesting that the United States should do anything that could be interpreted as indirectly recognizing Castro. Of course, that is one of the troubling aspects of this proposal and our reaction to it. By acknowledging Castro authority, by negotiating even indirectly with him, is tacitly recognizing now his government, something which we have said we do not want to do. Are we not in this matter in fact giving a high status to him as head of a government of this hemisphere, a status in which we are acknowledging him, and further, we are announcing practically on a daily basis what the negotiations are in effect, saying, "Okay, Mr. Castro, we cannot sit down with you directly, but we can indirectly negotiate with you, point by point, through the Swiss Embassy," which is the import of the statement contained in the press today. Castro agreed with the United States relating to relatives. He has not said, and I refer to Castro, that he will agree with the United States through the Swiss Embassy relating to the question of political prisoners.

There is no doubt in my mind that Castro is the one who is going to get the benefit out of this. He is getting the propaganda benefit, in that he says he is supposedly the humanitarian, he is supposedly the one who wants families joined together. But the risk we can avoid is basically keeping Castro's Communist supporters out of this country. Perhaps he wants to infiltrate the Cuban communities throughout the United States, the 270,000 of them, a good portion of which are in the Miami and Florida area. I am concerned about this as a Representative from the State of Florida. There are some 12,000 on the west coast of Florida.

I want to make certain that the people who come in here are legitimate relatives, not supporters of the Castro regime, and not intent on accomplishing their subversive objectives, the objectives of the Communist supporters.

If this amendment is not agreed to, then the end result could be these people come in and if we find out they are Communist supporters, they are here in this country. We do not weed them out before they get here. They are here. What are you going to do with them? Can you put them in jail? Can you put them in a camp? What are you going to do with them, hold them indefinitely? They are here. So I think the crux of the matter is to make sure they never get here, and the purpose of my amendment is to make certain that through the Swiss Embassy, through the Red Cross, not the U.S. Government, these people are screened in advance, and that none of the Communist supporters will come to the United States.

I hope the committee will accept the amendment, because I think it is necessary if this program is going to be palatable to the people of this Nation.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order this legislation provides additional duties.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to find out the purpose of the gentleman rising.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Louisiana rise?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that on the basis of Public Law 87-510 it would require additional duties to carry out this amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, this is a limitation on an appropriation of a customary type, part of which is intentionally limited to that extent. These duties being proposed are duties which, in my opinion, would have to be accomplished in any event in order to prevent the spread of the Communist Party in this country and to carry out fully the Alien and Sedition Act which is presently the law.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HARRIS). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Florida proposes an amendment that has for its purpose at the outset to provide a limitation on the use of the funds that would be appropriated. However, the amendment further provides that until adequate screening processes are established to make a reasonable effort to prevent members of the Communist Party and supporters of the Communist conspiracy from leaving Cuba and entering the United States. In the opinion of the Chair, this does impose extra and new duties on someone in order to carry out that purpose, and it would be legislation.

Therefore, the point of order is sustained.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks at this point, may I make further reference to the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] to the paragraph appropriating funds for the Cuban refugee program. I am in complete sympathy with the purpose of the amendment. I do regard it as subject to a point of order and unnecessary as a part of the pending bill.

I am advised that the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, the agency responsible for security clearance of all Cuban refugees entering the United States, already is doing and will continue to do what the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] proposes to accomplish.

I requested the Immigration and Naturalization Service to furnish me the steps involved in the screening of Cuban refugees for security reasons and have just received the following statement this afternoon:

> 1. Prior to departure from Cuba to the United States, identity of refugee will be checked against U.S. Government indices to see if derogatory information is contained concerning individual. Similar checks will be made by State Department of similar Visa Office records.
>
> 2. Where no derogatory information appears, primary selection will be confirmed and refugee will be examined comprehensively by immigration officer.
>
> 3. Upon arrival in United States, refugee will again be examined by immigration inspector to determine eligibility for admission under U.S. laws.
>
> 4. Refugee will be fingerprinted and photographed and detailed biographical data taken. These will be furnished to U.S. intelligence agencies for possible further identification in relation to any derogatory information. In event possible suspicion, matter will be referred to appropriate Government agencies for further interrogation. In any case where even remote doubt of eligibility exists for admission, refugee will be held in detention pending final determination.

So, Mr. Chairman, the amendment seems to me wholly unnecessary.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Housing and Home Finance Agency
rent supplement program

For rent supplements authorized by section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, $180,000: *Provided*, That the maximum payments in any fiscal year for rent supplements required by all contracts which may be entered into under such section shall not exceed $6,000,000: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authority shall be used for incurring any obligation in connection with any dwelling unit or project which is not either part of a workable program for community improvement meeting the requirements of section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1451(c)), or which is without local official approval for participation in this program.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that lines 22 through 24 on page 5 are legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAHON. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, this is strictly a limitation on an appropriation bill and we do not believe it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, with due respect to my distinguished chairman on the committee, the language in line 22 is applicable to "any fiscal year" for rent supplements. The word "any" makes it permanent legislation and legislation that is not only a part of this appropriation bill.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the act itself provides in title I, section 101, as follows:

> The aggregate amount of the contracts to make such payments shall not exceed amounts approved in appropriation acts—

It leaves it to the Committee on Appropriations and the appropriation acts to set the amounts.

Then it goes on and says:

> and payments pursuant to such contracts shall not exceed $30,000,000 per annum prior to July 1, 1966, which maximum dollar amount shall be increased by $35,000,000 on July 1, 1966, by $40,000,000 on July 1, 1967, and by $45,000,000 on July 1, 1968.

So the language itself in the act leaves it to the Committee on Appropriations to set the amounts with a ceiling set for each year.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard further on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I point out that the language which my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Tennessee just read, uses the words "appropriation acts," the plural, Mr. Chairman, and it is the obvious intention of that language that if there is to be a limitation it will be in each appropriation act rather than permitting a provision to be made which would be binding in all acts in the future.

I suggest, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that it is legislation not contemplated by the basic authorization law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Illinois raises the point of order against the language on page 5 beginning with line 22, through line 24. It is the opinion of the Chair that the language is merely a limitation on the appropriation and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order against the language on page 6, lines 6 and 7, which read as follows: "or which is without local official approval for participation in this program."

The purpose of this language, as very clearly set forth on page 13 of the report, is to limit the use of funds under the rent supplementary program to projects which are "either part of a workable program or which have been officially approved by the local community concerned."

Mr. Chairman, these issues were the subject of discussion and, indeed, proposed amendments at the time the housing bill was debated and considered earlier this year. The amendments which sought to accomplish the same objective were rejected. I, therefore, submit that this item represents legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the whole context of the Housing Act is to put more emphasis on workable programs within a community. This "workable program" concept is written throughout the Housing Act. It should apply to the rent supplement program. The report states—

> The committee has included language in the bill limiting the use of funds under this program to those projects which are either part of a workable program, or which have been officially approved by the local community concerned.

That ties in the rent supplement program to the workable community program, which is written throughout the entire Housing Authority Act.

If the gentleman insists upon his point of order, I would move to strike the whole section.

Mr. ASHLEY. The gentleman may do so. In further support of my point of order, I would say that it may well be that the workable program concept is a well established concept and should be written into the basic statute, but not by the Appropriations Committee. It should have been done at the time the bill was before us earlier this year; it can be done next year when a bill is before us for renewal.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, we think that control and use of the funds can be written into the bill, and it has been written into the act. The appropriation can limit the use of the funds. We think it is a limitation on the expenditure of an appropriation.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. REUSS. I make a point of order to some of the language mentioned by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY], but specifically to all language on page 5, line 25, through page 6, line 7. I am not quite clear that the gentleman from Ohio included all of that in his point of order, but I wish to do so. I should like to be heard briefly in support of that broader point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Ohio makes a point of order against the language on pages 6, lines 6 and 7. The gentleman from Wisconsin raises a point of order against the entire proviso beginning on page 5, line 25, through line 7 on page 6.

The Chair has had occasion to analyze the provisions of this paragraph, and on hearing the gentlemen on their points of order and the committee in opposition to it, the Chair feels that the proviso is negative in character. It does not impose any additional duties on the Administration, that is, the proviso, and therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on my point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already ruled on the point of order, and has overruled the point of order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARVEY OF MICHIGAN

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. HARVEY of Michigan: On page 5, strike out line 19 and all that follows through page 6, line 7.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is quite simple. It would strike out of the supplemental appropriation for 1966 that portion of the bill on pages 5 and 6 which pertains to the rent supplement program. This is a relatively small amount, $6,180,000.

I wish to make clear now that my motive is not to kill the program. I admit that what my amendment would do, very simply, is to delay the administration of this program. The effect would not be to kill, but rather to delay the administration of this program for a few months, until next year, until we can get the regulations, to which I intend to refer, rewritten.

To those who would say this would kill the program, I point out page 9, line 6, where there is left in the sum of $170,000 specifically for the administration of the rent supplement program, under section 101, so that the Housing and Home Finance Agency would have the money to proceed and to continue to make regulations.

I had not intended to speak on this subject again this year for, very frankly, I believed the question of rent supplements was fully debated over a period of 3 days during the month of June It was a good debate. It was a fair debate. The proponents of the rent supplement program won by a vote of 208 to 202, as Members will recall.

I will not bore the Committee now with the merits or lack of merits of the rent supplement program. I should like to take a few minutes to direct attention to the manner in which the Housing and Home Finance Agency seeks to administer or to carry out this particular program.

The Independent Offices Subcommittee held hearings on this matter on September 8. It is unfortunate that the hearings were held before the regulations themselves were published on September 28 by the Federal Housing Administration, because the regulations are significant both for what they do not say and for what they do say as well.

Let me call attention to a couple of things they do not say. For example, they do not yet tell us what the mortgage limitation upon these rent supplement apartments would be. They do not indicate any limit upon the mortgage to be placed upon these particular units, so we do not know yet what sort of units will be built.

We do have a couple of clues from these regulations. We do know, for example, that a family of six persons—a husband, a wife and four children—is to be entitled to a four-bedroom apartment.

I would point out to you by comparison it is rather interesting to note in the 1960 census less than 16 percent of all Americans live in houses or apartments with 4 bedrooms. Another thing that the regulations still do not do is this: They do not tell us the exact income limits by area of persons who wish to apply under this rent supplement program. So we still have to rely on the limits which presently exist. Look at the testimony of Mrs. McGuire in the hearings. I would point out to you again on page 237 of the hearings of the housing subcommittee last year where Mrs. McGuire, the Public Housing Administrator, had this to say when questioned by the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER]. Mrs. DWYER asked:

> What is the present highest income being serviced in the housing program today?

The answer of Mrs. McGuire was:

> The present top for admittance of a four-person family with many exemptions is $8,100.

One thing which has already been mentioned that these regulations do provide, and I want to say a word about it, is that as much as 70 percent of the tenants' rent under the rent supplement program can be paid by the Federal Government. Now, I can well recall when we set forth in the minority views just that; and we were told "that will never happen."

Mr. Chairman, probably most important insofar as these regulations are concerned and which give us some clue as to what is intended here, is the provision insofar as tenant eligibility is concerned this provision provides that a person can be eligible to receive rent supplements with assets of as much as three times the amount of the annual income limit if elderly or handicapped and two times the amount of the annual income limit for any other person. Just bear in mind Mrs. McGuire's figure which was the net figure I gave you a few minutes ago of $8,100. You can readily see from that under these regulations, which are set forth on page 4 thereof, paragraph I, that a person with assets in excess of $25,000 can still be eligible for benefits under this particular program. This does not include, as I said, all income. It is net income. It does not include income which goes, for example, to pay for a continuing illness or income of the person which is nonrecurring. It does not include other forms of deductions, because under the Public Housing Administration's rules and regulations, they consider only net income after deducting these other things. So you are actually talking about a person in the area of New York City, for example, who may be earning not $8,100 but may well be earning $10,000 or $11,000 and have these moneys deducted and still be eligible for the rent supplements or subsidies. Now, what does this mean? It means that in addition to their salary in excess of $8,100 they can have $24,000 in cash, stocks, or bonds of any kind whatsoever and still be eligible for this help from the Federal Government. I say that because I just want to take a minute of your time to refresh your memory as to how we got started in this. You will recall when the administration first submitted the program that it was directed at moderate income people.

Dr. Weaver is one of the most honest witnesses I have ever heard. He said very honestly that this program will not work for low-income groups, and he said it in no uncertain terms and left no doubt about it whatsoever. Let me say that I think it would be conceded by every Member of the House the way the housing bill and this particular rent supplement program were passed in this House by the enactment of the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. STEPHENS] which supposedly restricted aid under this program to those in the low-income groups—those in the low-income groups. Let me say that was the pretense under which this program was passed. However, what do we have here? Do we have a program restricted to the low-income groups? No; we have a program which is restricted to persons with as much as $25,000 in cash. In other words, you could own, let us say, General Motors stock in the amount of 220 shares. Today it is selling at $108 a share. You could own more than 220 shares of that stock. The dividend last year was $4.55 a share, and it is a cinch that it will be $5 a share this year. You could own more than 220 shares and collect your dividends and have that money and still be eligible to receive help with which to pay your rent from Uncle Sam.

Mr. Chairman, let us bring it a little bit closer home with another example. Let us take for example the Potomac Electric Power stock because that is something that even supplies the electricity for the Capitol itself here. You could own more than 1,000 shares of Potomac Electric stock at $22 a share and you could collect a dividend of 80 cents a share and still you could collect the rent supplement under this particular program and under these regulations which the Housing and Home Finance Agency has asked us to proceed under as far as the administration of this program is concerned.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I find it very difficult to believe that this is a program for the low-income group, the program for the poor people of America, that it was purported to be when it was passed.

I find it very difficult to believe that this agency is trying to make it such, but rather, they are trying to make it a program of the moderate-income group as it originally started.

I urge the adoption of my amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Housing and Urban Affairs Act was passed in August of this year and was signed into law on August 10. We also know that we have created a Department of Urban and Housing Affairs which is a Cabinet-level Department. We now have an agency with Cabinet-level status.

Mr. Chairman, this program is to be administered by the Federal Housing Administration. This program was authorized in the new basic Housing Act and the sum of $150 million was authorized for the first year for the rent supplement program. The Bureau of the Budget recommended $30 million for the first year. We passed this law with a $150 million authorization. The Budget, as I stated, recommended $30 million, and our committee has proposed only a very modest start of $6 million this first year. They recommended $900,000 for payments. We have cut this figure to $180,000 for the first year. So we have proposed a very minimum start for the program.

Mr. Chairman, the funds here proposed will not represent a galloping program. It is, I repeat, a very minimum program.

The decision on this issue has been made. The House has voted on this matter, as well as the Senate, and the President of the United States has signed it into law. We cannot go up the hill one day and down the hill the next.

Mr. Chairman, authority is given in the basic act for the making of contracts to private builders and private contractors.

This was done for the purpose of bringing private enterprise into the housing program. It is tied in with the low-income and public housing program under the Public Housing Act.

Mr. Chairman, here is what the law provides. This rent supplement will only go under the law to those who are eligible—those who are physically handicapped, those who have been displaced by governmental action, those who live in substandard housing or those who have been removed by some natural disaster such as the hurricane that occurred down in Louisiana recently. So it is tied down under law, to the low-income groups, the handicapped, those who are disabled or have been displaced by the Government and those who have been affected by a natural disaster.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Would the gentleman agree with me that anyone in those four groups could still have assets up to the sum of $25,000 and receive the rent supplement?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. No, I do not agree with the gentleman. This is not my understanding of the situation. Our committee has been advised otherwise. I disagree with the gentleman on that point. Members of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices have not all been in full sympathy with this particular program. Probably many of us share some of the reservations and same views as the gentleman from Michigan, but the law has been passed and the committee is attempting to fund it properly.

Mr. Chairman, according to the testimony before our committee the highest income groups eligible would be in the city of New York. A survey would be made of the large metropolitan areas and New York is the highest. Second is Chicago. Cleveland is third. Those eligible with the highest income would be slightly over $5,000 in New York City. It would be somewhat in excess of $4,800 in Chicago and other cities.

According to the information provided our committee, only those who have low incomes, like those eligible for public housing, are eligible for rent subsidy.

The highest income level eligible in Washington, D.C., is $4,100. These are the top limitations on income given to us by officials of the agency.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Would the gentleman point out where in the regulations these income limits are set?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I have read some of the regulations just issued which are being circulated here and I think it is unfortunate that some of these provisions in the regulations have been promulgated. The regulations should not have been issued until after the funds were provided.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. The gentleman will agree these income limits are not contained in the regulations; is that correct?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. These are the figures that they gave us before our committee. A $150 million authorization has been passed and we are only providing $6 million in this bill to implement the first stage of the program.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. But they are not in the regulations themselves.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the pending amendment, and ask that it be defeated.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when this measure was first proposed in the legislative bill I was very much opposed to it. I am still opposed to the proposition. I think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY] is to be commended for offering this amendment here today. He has made a most persuasive argument and since he was so limited in time to present his case I will yield to him for further comment.

I should point out, Mr. Chairman that these regulations we have been referring to were not available, as I understand it, to the subcommittee, at the time they held their interrogations. It is quite possible, however, had those rules been available at the time there might have been a better job of probing of the matter.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am most happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan at this time, for he was so limited in time to present his case fully.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to make this clear. The question we have before us right now is whether the Congress of the United States is going to have this program run in accordance with the bill that passed the House or whether the Housing and Home Finance Agency is going to run it in accordance with their wishes.

The Congress of the United States decided in accordance with the Stephens amendment that this was going to be a program for the low-income people of America. They have made this program one for the rich people of America. How many in this Chamber have net assets in excess of $24,000? I refer you in the regulations to page 4, section (i). You show me where in those regulations you cannot own assets three times the net income entitling you to this program.

I refer you to Mrs. McGuire's testimony, the Public Housing Commissioner, page 237, where she said the net income is $8,100. We are talking about people with $24,000 in net assets. These are the people we are supposed to be giving help to under the program. That was not the intent of the Congress. The intent of the Congress was to help the low-income people of America.

One other point: If you do not think this is a program for the big builders of America, and the big contractors, you look on page 203 of the Independent Offices Subcommittee hearings. Look at Dr. Weaver's testimony where he is talking about these converted units, where apartments have been built, they are partially occupied, and the big builders and owners are trying to get in under this program. Dr. Weaver says "they are lining up at the door. We have correspondence from practically every eligible owner who wants to get into the program."

They want to get into the program because they are big builders, they cannot rent the apartment buildings for going rents, and they want to lower the rents. I assure you this is a big contractor's program.

I want to emphasize one other point. The amendment does not kill this bill at all.

I leave in the funds for the Housing and Home Financing Agency to go on and administer this program. I truly hope within the next 2 or 3 months they will come back with a set of regulations corresponding with the Stephens amendment which was enacted and passed the House, and with the conference report as well.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. In reference to the regulation, the statement that the gentleman from Illinois made is correct. The subcommittee did not have the benefit of these regulations when we marked up the bill. The regulations only became available after September 28.

I helped to work out this section of the bill in the committee. We felt we had done a good job in slowing the program down and reducing the request from $30 million to $6 million. But I do not believe we would have done it so quickly or at least without more argument if we had had these regulations before us. The purpose of the amendment is to eliminate this title until we can have an opportunity to study these regulations and find out what the administration plans to do. We can do that in the regular bill that will be under consideration early next year.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, one often hesitates to use the word "socialism." The word is often loosely used and gives rise to a good deal of controversy sometimes. Yet, I was very interested to read a couple of weeks ago in the Saturday Evening Post column of Stewart Alsop, in his regular Affairs of the State, where he comments on some of the Great Society programs, and naming them, including the direct Federal housing subsidy.

He goes on to say that the passage of any one of them would have been accompanied by an enormous ruckus a few years ago.

Then he says this, and mind you I am quoting Stewart Alsop and not a Republican over here—

> The Johnson housing bill can, in fact, quite fairly be described as Socialist.

As a matter of fact, all of us know that we have read newspaper comments at home in just this same language and I think it is worthy of note by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out first my high regard for the gentleman from Michigan. He is a very knowledgeable member of our Subcommittee on Housing and one for whom I have a great deal of respect.

But, Mr. Chairman, I wonder how long one can beat a dead horse? The gentleman from Michigan has been beating this dead horse since the first mention of this rent supplement program. He had his opportunity on the floor when we debated the bill on the floor of the House. Today he still whips the same immovable horse.

I think, ladies and gentlemen, what we should do here today is to commend this committee for reporting the bill out which would make a start on this vital program.

The committee found that the appropriation of $30 million was more than adequate. Exercising their will, the committee decided to cut the $30 million down to $6 million. Very frankly, I deplore such a great cut. I think we ought to have the $30 million. But I accept the will of the committee and certainly I do not ask for any temporary delay for further study. Because temporary situations, as I have learned down here, are the most permanent situations. If we delay this program for further study, it will probably be the year 2,000 before we have the opportunity to help these thousands of people who are waiting for decent, safe and sanitary housing.

This is all that this does. As to this bugaboo of $25,000 in assets. Now, gentlemen, you are conversant with these relief situations. The public housing applicants are investigated thoroughly and in the most minute detail.

When they come up with any assets they are asked to liquidate them and to use that money before they become eligible for public housing.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I am sure that the Committee would agree with the Appropriations Committee that this program should be confined to those in the low-income category and the physically handicapped, as set out in the statute. The Agency is prescribing a regulation which goes beyond this. We will investigate the matter and see that it is done.

Mr. BARRETT. I am glad the Chairman brings the point before the House, because the gentleman from Michigan—and, of course, I do not agree with him, as much as I love him—fails to indicate that the Housing Agency must report back to the Congress. It must first report to the President of the United States 1 year after the establishment of this program and then report to the Congress of the United States. That would give us an opportunity to reevaluate the program.

But, gentlemen, today we need this type of program, not as a substitute for public housing, but to supplement public housing.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHLEY. I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, for a most eloquent statement. I think it is perfectly clear that the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Illinois are unalterably opposed to the rent supplement program in any form and despite any regulations. They made that clear during the hearings before the subcommittee, they made it clear during the hearings before the full committee, and they made it clear on the floor of the House.

The gentleman from Michigan has also been misinformed. First, the regulations are merely tentative and are by no means final. Second, the statistics he cites on assets are far-fetched "horror" cases and would never actually occur.

In any case the Appropriations Committee and our Banking Committee can see to it that the final regulations are in accord with congressional intent. The truth of the matter is that the gentleman from Michigan is making one last effort to kill the bill on whatever pretext.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me, since my name has been used by him?

Mr. BARRETT. The gentleman from Michigan failed to yield to me but I would be glad to yield to him.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I did not have the time to yield at the time, but I am always happy to yield when I can.

Mr. BARRETT. I need no apologies. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I merely wish to say to the gentleman that I like to think of myself as a good loser. Earlier in my remarks I said that this program passed by a vote of 208 to 202. I think that is far from being a dead horse at this point. But I also said I would abide by the will of the House, and I hoped that such a rent supplement program would be carried out.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The Subcommittee on Independent Offices gave very careful consideration to this particular item in this supplemental bill.

The House some weeks ago, after extended discussion and debate on the rent subsidy feature of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, the House voted for it. We believe that we have a responsibility, as an appropriations subcommittee, to provide the funds to implement that program.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency came in with a supplemental request for $30 million for fiscal year 1966. That amount was cut to $6 million. The Housing Agency asked for immediate cash in the amount of $900,000. This bill provides $180,000. It would seem that this committee has used good judgment.

It has indicated to the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Federal Housing Administration, which will run this program, that we wanted them to proceed slowly. That is precisely what the effect of the cut, which the subcommittee made, will produce.

Many questions have been raised with reference to the income of individuals who will be eligible under the rent supplement program. If one looks at the FHA form No. 2500, which is included in the regulations established by the FHA for eligibility for rent supplements, the questions that are asked of those are full and detailed.

I would hope—and I am sure all who are interested in this program would hope—that the FHA would not permit people with the size of assets that have been indicated in this debate to come under the rent supplement program.

Today we are writing legislative history on this, as to those who will be eligible for this program. I would hope the FHA would not approve any application for a rent supplement, when the assets of the applicant involved are more than $25,000 or even close to that figure. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the committee that the possible asset figure of $25,000 referred by the gentleman from Michigan comes from stretching the language of the regulation on page 4 of the regulations. Let me also point out that—and I emphasize this—only elderly or handicapped families may not have assets in excess of three times the annual income limit for low rent housing.

Those who oppose this program here today have opposed public housing for a long period of time. The same people who oppose public housing oppose this program. We have been up the hill once, Mr. Chairman. I hope we can stick by our guns and stick by the results of the vote accomplished here a few weeks ago.

I hope that the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan will not prevail.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. I want to point out that despite the protestations of the sponsor of the amendment, the gentleman from Michigan, if we should strike out of the bill, by adopting his amendment, this language, there would be nothing in the bill under which the supplement program could get underway. The basic law is not self-executing. Without this appropriation in this bill nothing could be done.

I have just reread the gentleman's amendment, and it would strike out the entire appropriation, which would leave nothing with which to get the program underway.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I should like to clarify that point. Frankly, I could have asked to strike the language on page 9, line 6, which specifically sets forth the administrative expenses for this agency to administer section 101, the rent supplement program. That is $170,000. I did not ask to strike that, because I believe that they should be permitted to have this money and to continue.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. It has been the practice of the Independent Offices Subcommittee, when amendments have been accepted striking out basic appropriations, to delete as well the administrative expenses; is that not true?

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. YATES. As a matter of fact, if the gentleman's point were valid, there would be nothing for this agency to do, because no funds would be left to carry out the program.

Mr. BOLAND. So far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, I would say that the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan would absolutely kill this program this fiscal year. I am also fearful that its adoption might kill the program forever.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time after the Committee rises and we go back into the House, I shall ask permission to include as a part of my remarks as much of the regulations dated September 28, 1965, as I shall have been able to obtain by that time.

Federal Housing Administration

Series and Series No.: MF Letter No. 63.
Control No.: F–1052.
Date: September 28, 1965.
To: All insuring office directors and multifamily housing representatives.
Subject: Rent supplement program.

I. INTRODUCTION

Title I of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 approved August 10, 1965, authorizes the HHFA Administrator to make payments to project owners to supplement the rentals eligible families can afford to pay. Important criteria with regard to approval of a rent supplement project will include full consideration of its contribution to assisting in integrating income groups and furthering the legal requirements and objectives of equal opportunity in housing.

The amount of the rent supplement payable for a family is the difference between the rental for the dwelling unit and one-fourth of the tenant's income, provided that the payment may not be less than 5 percent nor more than 70 percent of the unit rental. Under the basic rent supplement program, projects will be insured by FHA under section 221(d)(3) at market interest rates. Tenants other than those eligible for rent supplements may occupy units in the project. There will be no income limits for occupancy in these market rate projects, but tenants must meet certain income and other criteria to be eligible for rent supplements. Eligible projects can be owned by private nonprofit, limited distribution, or cooperative mortgagors, and may consist of five or more single family detached, row, walk-up, or other type of multifamily units. Projects may either be new or major rehabilitation. Rehabilitation must result in the creation of standard units in a structure previously containing primarily substandard living accommodations or involve rehabilitation amounting to at least one-half of the mortgage amount.

In addition to the basic program, the law provides for experimental programs under which up to 5 percent of the funds appropriated may be used in 221(d)(3) below market interest rate projects and another 5 percent may be used in FHA section 231 and CFA (Community Facilities Administration) section 202 housing for the elderly projects. The mortgagor of a section 231 project must be a private nonprofit organization. A section 202 project mortgagor may be a private nonprofit or cooperative housing corporation or a public body or agency.

The program will not be operative until Congress appropriates funds. In the meantime, insuring offices should become familiar with these instructions and may have preliminary discussions with prospective sponsors.

General information regarding the rent supplement program is set forth below.

II. ELIGIBLE PROJECTS

A. Basic program: Section 221(d)(3) market interest rate projects with private nonprofit, limited distribution, or cooperative housing corporation mortgages for which the loans are insured after August 19, 1965.

B. Experimental program: Not to exceed 5 percent of the appropriated rent supplement funds may be used in section 221(d)(3) below market interest rate projects with private nonprofit, limited distribution, or cooperative housing corporation mortgagors for which commitments to insure the loans are issued after August 10, 1965.

In addition to future proposals, upon request of the mortgagor and mortgagee, any currently proposed below market interest rate project which has been neither initially endorsed nor construction started may be considered for acceptance under the below market experimental rent supplement program. Partial reprocessing of these cases by underwriting will be required to determine the change in operation and management costs. Also, the other rent supplement eligibility requirements must be met.

C. Experimental program (sections 202 and 231: Not to exceed 5 percent of the appropriate rent supplement funds may be used in FHA section 231 and CFA section 202 housing for the elderly projects. To be eligible for consideration under the rent supplement program, a section 231 project must have a private nonprofit mortgagor, it must be finally endorsed and approved for rent supplements after August 10, 1965.

A section 202 project mortgagor may be a private nonprofit or cooperative housing corporation or a public body or agency and may have been financed prior to August 10. Rent supplement payments may be made for no more than 20 percent of the dwelling units in any project financed under section 202 on or before August 10, 1965, or finally endorsed for mortgage insurance under section 231 pursuant to a commitment issued on or before August 10, 1965. For section 202 projects, FHA will be concerned only with the rent supplement provisions. Underwriting processing for this program is performed by CFA.

Note I: With respect to any proposal involving an experimental project under B or C above, after completion of the preapplication review and before questioning a reservation of funds, the Director will forward the experimental proposal to the multifamily representative. The representative will review the proposal and forward the file with his recommendations to the Assistant Commissoner for Multifamily Housing.

The Assistant Commissioner for Multifamily Housing will review and return the case to the Director with his recommendations with a copy to the representative.

Note II: An application may be accepted for a proposed section 221(d)(3) below market interest rate rent supplement project only if the project is to be located within a community having a workable program certification in effect. A workable program certification is not required for a section 221(d)(3) market rate rent supplement project, unless the project is to be located in a community where there has been a workable program for community improvement at a time a contract for a loan or capital grant was entered into, or a contract for annual contribution or capital grant was entered into pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937.

III. DEFINITIONS AND EXPLANATIONS OF TERMS

A. Private nonprofit mortgagor means a corporation or association organized for purposes other than the making of profit or gain for itself or persons identified therewith and which the Commissioner finds is in no manner controlled by nor under the direction of persons or firms seeking to derive profit or gain therefrom. Such a mortgagor shall be regulated or supervised under Federal or State laws or by political subdivisions of States or agencies thereof, or the Commissioner, as to rents, charges, and methods of operations.

B. Limited distribution mortgagor means a corporation restricted as to distribution of income by the laws of the State of its incorporation (or by the Commissioner) or a trust, partnership, association, individual, or other entity restricted by law or by the Commissioner as to distribution of income, and regulated as to rents, charges, rate of return, and methods of operation.

C. Cooperative mortgagor means a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation approved by the Commissioner which is regulated or restricted by law or by the Commissioner as to rents or sales, charges, rate of return, and methods of operation.

D. Qualified tenant means an individual or family that has been determined:

1. To have assets and income below the maximum amounts established by HHFA for occupancy eligibility, and

2. To be one of the following:

(a) A person or family displaced by governmental action.

(b) Who is 62 years of age or whose spouse is 62 years of age or older.

(c) Who is physically handicapped or whose spouse is handicapped.

(d) Occupying substandard housing.

(e) Disaster victims in an area designated as disaster area by SBA since April 1, 1965, whose dwelling has been extensively damaged or destroyed.

("Qualified tenant" includes a member of a cooperative who satisfies the foregoing requirements and who, on sale of his membership, will not be reimbursed for any equity increment accumulated through rent supplement payments.)

E. Family means two or more persons related by blood, marriage or operation of law who occupy the same unit.

F. Handicapped person means a person who has a physical impairment which is expected to be of long-continued and indefinite duration, substantially impedes his ability to live independently and is of such a nature that his ability to live independently could be improved by more suitable housing conditions.

G. Substandard housing means a unit of housing that is dilapidated or lacks one or more of the following plumbing facilities:

1. Hot and cold piped water inside the structure.

2. Usable flush toilet inside the structure for the exclusive use of the occupants of the unit.

3. Usable bathtub or shower inside the structure for the exclusive use of the occupants of the unit.

H. Dilapidated housing unit: A dilapidated housing unit is one that does not provide safe and adequate shelter, and in its present condition endangers the health, safety, or well-being of the occupants. Such a housing unit has one or more critical defects, or has a combination of intermediate defects in sufficient number or extent to require considerable repair or rebuilding, or is of inadequate original construction. The defects are either so critical or so widespread that the structure should be extensively repaired, rebuilt, or torn down.

Critical defects include: Holes, open cracks, or rotted, loose or missing material (clapboard siding, shingles, bricks, concrete, tile, plaster or floorboards) over a large area of the foundation, outside walls, roof, chimney, or inside walls, floors, or ceilings; substantial sagging of floors, walls, or roof; and extensive damage by storm, fire, or flood.

To be classified as dilapidated on the basis of intermediate defects, a housing unit must have such defects in sufficient number or extent that it no longer provides safe and adequate shelter.

Inadequate original construction includes: Shacks, huts, or tents; structures with makeshift walls or roofs, or built of packing boxes, scrap lumber or tin; structures lacking foundations (walls rest directly on the ground); structures with dirt floors; and cellars, barns, garages, or other places not originally intended for living quarters and inadequately converted to such quarters.

I. Asset limitation for tenant eligibility: A check on assets will be made for families, or single individuals, who are otherwise eligible for rent supplements.

An elderly or handicapped family (or single individual) may not have net assets in excess of three times the annual income limit established for the dwelling unit having the number of bedrooms that would be required by that family (or individual).

For a family (or single individual) other than an elderly or handicapped family or individual, net assets may not exceed two times the annual income limit established for the dwelling unit having the number of bedrooms that would be required by that family.

Net assets are defined as the excess of assets over liabilities. Assets in turn are defined to include cash on hand, savings and checking account balances, bonds, stocks, and other liquid assets, and value of real estate, automobiles, etc., but not including such personal assets as furniture, clothing, etc. Liabilities include amounts owing on charge or installment accounts, notes payable, real estate mortgages, etc.

It will not be necessary to list or check the assets of welfare families since welfare agencies have already checked the assets of these families.

J. Family income means the amount of the income of the family serves two important purposes under the rent supplement program. Gross family income is used to determine income eligibility of the family; that is, whether such income is less than the maximum income limit established for the applicable size of unit. Also, except for welfare recipients for whom the rental charge shall not be less than the rental allowance provided by the welfare agency, family income after deductions is used to determine the amount of rent to be paid by the tenant; namely, 25 percent of such income.

The following paragraphs define family income for these purposes. Income of families as used herein will also apply to income of individuals. The income to be reported is the annual income for the previous 12-month period.

Gross family income

Gross family income means all the income of all the members of the family occupying the unit, from any source whatsoever, before any deductions for Federal, State, or local income taxes. Gross family income shall include but is not limited to the following:

1. Compensation for personal services, such as wages and salaries, part-time wages, overtime pay, commissions, fees, tips, bonuses, cash value of any compensation in kind (such as meals), and allowances for carfare.

2. Net income from the operation of a business or profession.

3. Interest, dividends, and net income from real or personal property.

4. Amounts received from annuities, periodic payments derived from insurance policies, retirement income, pensions, periodic benefits for disability or death, and other similar types of periodic receipts.

5. Periodic payments such as unemployment and disability compensation including military or veterans' disability, social security benefits, workmen's compensation and dismissal wages.

6. Cash relief (welfare) receipts and the value of determinable relief allowances in kind, including rental allowances.

7. Periodic and determinable allowances, such as alimony and regular contributions or gifts.

8. All regular pay, special payments, and allowances recived by a member of the armed services who is the head of the family, whether or not he is living in the dwelling, or by any other member of the armed services who is living in the dwelling.

Family income after deductions

The following deductions from gross family income shall be allowed:

1. Not to exceed $300 of income earned per annum by each working member of the family less than 18 years of age.

2. Annual expense for disability or continuing illness.

3. A reduction from total income is permitted for unusual income which will not be forthcoming during the current 12-month period. This is intended to provide a more meaningful appraisal of current income. Such a reduction may include discontinuance of all or part of overtime pay, loss of income due to departure of secondary wage earner or minor, unemployment compensation which does not occur regularly, etc.

K. Household means all of the persons who live in one living unit.

L. Rent Supplement Contract means the contract between the housing owner and the HHFA Administrator pursuant to which rent supplement funds will be allocated for and paid to the project owner. The contract terms may not exceed 40 years or the term of the mortgage, whichever is less. The rent supplement payment for any unit may not be less than 5 nor more than 70 percent of the unit rental.

M. Occupancy standards: Consistent with established public housing standards in assigning accommodations to eligible families, project owners are responsible for not creating or continuing unnecessarily overcrowded living conditions. Likewise, owners are responsible for not assigning more space to eligible families than is needed under reasonable standards.

Generally, dwellings are to be so assigned that (1) except possibly in the case of infants and very young children, it will not be necessary for persons of opposite sex, other than husband and wife, to occupy the same bedroom; (2) dwellings also should be so assigned as not to require use of the living room for sleeping purposes, except in the case of efficiency units occupied by one person; and (3) in applying the following limits, every member of the family regardless of age is to be considered as a person. These principles result in the following standards:

Number of bedrooms	Number of persons	
	Minimum	Maximum
0	1	1
1	1	2
2	2	4
3	4	6
4	6	8

IV. ELIGIBILITY OF SPONSORS

Because the rent supplement program will require that the owning organization deal with tenants in the lower economic and social level with all of the added management responsibilities this can involve, and because they will be required to handle and account for direct Federal rent supplement payments, FHA must give the most careful consideration to the qualifications of prospective sponsors and housing owners. FHA not only will see that sponsors not equipped for housing ownership under the rent supplement program are screened out before they have spent unnecessary time and effort on a hopeless venture, but also will see that interested sponsors with a potential for successful low income housing ownership are given the guidance and assistance necessary to the realization of that success. They will be given advice and assistance in remedying such deficiencies in organization, continuity, representation, or capacity which they may have.

For any prospective sponsor and project owner under the rent supplement program, it will be necessary to examine carefully the character, integrity, and motivation of the organization as well as its continuity, its knowledge, or ability to secure the knowledge of housing finance and construction necessary to develop a project, its capacity to provide competent management of the project, as well as its understanding of the extensive and continuing responsibilities it is undertaking in providing housing for low income families and individuals. Good will and good intentions are not enough to assure a successful project. These qualities must be accompanied by willingness and capacity to stick with the project over the long term and to perform the services to the tenants and to the project which are essential.

V. ALLOCATIONS, INCOME CEILINGS, MARKET DATA

A major portion of the operating responsibility for the rent supplement program has been delegated to FHA by the HHFA Administrator. However, HHFA will retain responsibility for regional and local allocations of rent supplement funds, establishment of income ceilings in each locality for tenant eligibility, and for estimating the aggregate need for low-income housing in each locality.

It will be some time before complete market information is available and income ceilings have been established for all areas. Until such time, HHFA and FHA will utilize available data and will proceed as follows: When a sponsor who appears to be qualified expresses serious interest in developing a rent supplement project, the FHA Director through the Multifamily Representative will notify the HHFA Regional Administrator that the project is under review, request him to establish income ceilings for the area in which the proposed project will be located, and to furnish any market information which may be available on low-income families relating to the area. A copy of each request will be sent to the Assistant Administrator (Program Policy) Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C. In addition, FHA will utilize or develop its own market information on probable demand, as needed.

VI. FHA EVALUATION OF RENT SUPPLEMENT PROPOSALS

Based on the income ceilings for rent supplement tenant eligibility and low income market information supplied by the HHFA Regional Administrator, the insuring office director will proceed with the preapplication review of the proposal. This will include a tentative determination with respect to the acceptability of the sponsorship, and the usual preapplication analysis and determination.

Early in preapplication review, the Director will proceed to obtain a final determination on the eligibility of the prospective sponsor and project owner, as well as the prospective site in terms of the open occupancy site selection criteria indicated below. If the mortgagor will be a private nonprofit organization, the regular nonprofit clearance procedure will be followed. For any other type of mortgagor, the office Director will submit a complete report and his recommendations regarding the sponsor and mortgagor entities to the Multifamily Representative. The representative will evaluate the report under the rent supplement eligibility requirements and will forward the file with his comments and recommendations to the Assistant Commissioner for Multifamily Housing. The Assistant Commissioner will advise the office director, in writing, with copy to the representative, regarding the sponsor-mortgagor eligibility.

If the proposal involves a section 221(d)(3) below market interest rate project, under the rent supplement experimental provisions, the regular procedure will be followed to obtain an allocation of below market interest rate funds.

The market data and information received from the Regional Administrator will contain estimates of the overall community need and demand for very low rent housing, distribution of eligible families by income and size, and the number of families eligible for rent supplements by reason of each of the five eligibility requirements. The low rent housing need estimated by HHFA may be met not only by the rent supplement program, but also by new and leased public housing. Section 202 Housing for the Elderly administered by CFA, and, to an extent, by section 221(d)(3) below market interest rate housing. The Regional Administrator will maintain a record of housing made available by the various programs and adjust or update community market estimates as needed. It is, therefore, necessary for insuring offices to keep the Regional Administrator fully informed of the status of rent suplement proposals being considered. The Regional Administrator will also keep FHA informed of developments that would affect the low rent housing market. However, the insuring office must also be alert to local public housing planning and other sources of housing that might preempt a portion of the immediate market. The insuring office will develop locally additional data needed to estimate the market absorption capacity. The Director must consider that the existence of eligible tenants is not synonymous with market need and demand. Adequate data are necessary for proper project planning and for advising sponsors, but early implementation of the program must not be unnecessarily delayed. The Director must also consider what portion of the overall market of the community a single project in a given location can be expected to properly serve. It would ordinarily not be reasonable to presume that one project or one location could properly serve the demand of the entire low income market in a sizable community.

The production of housing for the rent supplement program below the maximum cost indicated by the mortgage limits should be encouraged. However, planning must follow the principles of good design practice and avoid features that will contribute to premature obsolescence. The objective is to provide substantial, well designed, livable housing without luxury features. Due to the maintenance and management problems often inherent in housing for low income tenants, sponsors must be encouraged to specify materials that will contribute to lower maintenance cost and to design for ease of management.

At the conclusion of preapplication review, but prior to the issuance of Format Letter B, the Director will request a reservation of rent supplement funds in a specific amount for the proposed project. The request will be made by submitting an original and four copies of FHA Form 2502 to the Multifamily Representative. The Representative will forward the original and three copies to the Regional Administrator, and one copy to the Assistant Administrator (Program Policy) Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C. After completion, the Regional Administrator will return the original and two copies to the Representative. The Representative will retain one copy and will forward the other copy to the Assistant Commissioner for Multifamily Housing. The original will be returned to the Director.

When and if an allocation of rent supplement funds for the particular project is received from the HHFA Regional Administrator, through the Multifamily Representative, the Director will complete his preapplication review and notify the sponsor that an allocation of rent supplement funds has been made at the same time he indicates the willingness of FHA to receive a formal application for mortgage insurance for the project. (Note, the procedure described above for determining low income market and justifying rent supplement allocations will be followed in the early stages of the program. As HHFA is able to conduct studies of low markets in various localities, it will be able to establish income eligibility ceilings in advance of applications from sponsors and will be able to supply definitive information on the aggregate market for low income eligibles and the distribution of incomes among those eligibles. When this happens, it will require less FHA study and justification of aggregate low income need. It will not, however, affect the necessity for FHA to make its own determination of the effective demand for a particular project under review and, based on this, to calculate and request the required rent supplement allocation.)

VII. SECTION 202 PROGRAM

Any section 202 mortgagor who wishes to have his project included under the rent supplement program is to file his request with the HHFA Regional Administrator. If the Regional Administrator concurs, he will forward the mortgagor's request and his own recommendation to the Director. With the recommendation, the Regional Administrator will forward information such as the date the project was financed, the term of the direct loan on the project, the recommended duration of the contract, the maximum rental rate for each living unit, the income ceilings for rent supplement eligibility, any information available regarding distribution of family income among the eligibles, and detailed estimates of rent supplement payments required.

When the information has been analyzed, the Director will forward a report and recommendation to the Multifamily Representative. The Representative will forward the file with his recommendation to the Assistant Commissioner for Multifamily Housing. The Assistant Commissioner will confer with the Community Facilities Administration and will issue notice of decision with respect to acceptance of the project, and if appropriate, the amount and terms of the rent supplement contract.

VIII. MAXIMUM MORTGAGE LIMITS

As an initial consideration, the mortgage limits established by FHA for rent supplement projects will not exceed those established for the same area for section 221(d)(3) below market projects. Special per living unit mortgage limits will be issued. These limits will apply to all FHA insured rent supplement projects in an area regardless of the section of the act, the mortgage interest rate, or the type of construction.

Directors will be furnished mortgage limits for all communities for which data are already available. If mortgage limits are needed for other areas, the instructions in 72436 of the FHA manual for the example walk-up project must be followed.

IX. THE RENT SUPPLEMENT CONTRACT

The FHA insuring office will be responsible for negotiating rent-supplement contracts with sponsors on all projects which are eligible for rent-supplement payments, including elderly projects financed under section 202.

For FHA insured projects, FHA's agreement to pay rent supplements will be incorporated into the commitment by attaching to the commitment a completed but unexecuted form of rent supplement contract. The commitment will provide that the contract will be executed prior to initial closing or start of construction if the project is to be insured upon completion. This rent supplement contract provides for adjustment at the end of a prescribed rent-up period to reflect actual rent supplement requirements.

The amount of the initial rent supplement contract will be based on the estimated occupancy pattern developed by the insuring office for the specific project. The sponsor is to be encouraged to achieve a pattern of occupancy and tenant income as close as possible to that on which the original allocation was based. If the amount of the initial or adjusted contract will be in excess of the amount of the HHFA preliminary reservation for the project, the Director will submit a report through the Multifamily Representative to the Regional Administrator substantiating a request for an increase in funds reservation. In no case may a contract be executed or adjusted to an amount in excess of that authorized by HHFA.

The original and three copies of all contracts are to be sent to the Representative. The Representative will forward the original to the Assistant Commissioner-Comptroller and will retain one copy and will forward one copy each to the Regional Administrator and to the FHA Assistant Commissioner for Multifamily Housing.

The rent supplement contract will provide that payment of rent supplements on behalf of eligible tenants will be made monthly to the housing owner or his designee by FHA in accordance with terms of the contract. The total payments due on behalf of each eligible tenant will be requested by voucher initiated by the housing owner and sent to the FHA, in accordance with Comptroller Letter No. 309. The amount of the payment due on behalf of each tenant will be the difference between the unit rental as determined by FHA and 25 percent of the tenant's gross family income less allowable deductions, but in no case will the payment be less than 5 percent nor more than 70 percent of the approved rental for the unit.

The contract will require periodic recertification by FHA of tenant incomes (at the termination of lease periods but not less than once every 2 years) and corresponding adjustment in payments to be made to the project owner. It will also cover recertification of income in tenant hardship cases, determination of fair market rent, and other statutory or regulatory provisions needed to protect the interests of the HHFA Administrator. Tenants 62 years of age or older are exempt from the standard recertification of income requirement. There will be special recertification requirements applicable to all tenants who have their rent supplement payments increased under the hardship provisions.

X. DETERMINATION OF TENANT ELIGIBILITY

Applicants for rent supplements in a project will furnish information on the combined income of all members of the household, together with a statement of assets and liabilities, and other information bearing on eligibility. An "Application for Tenant Eligibility" form will be used for this purpose.

The housing owner or his manager will assist the tenant in completing an original and three copies of the application form. One copy should be retained by the housing owner or manager. The original and two copies are to be forwarded to the Director.

Acting under authority delegated by the Administrator, FHA will certify the eligibility of the applicant as well as the amount of rent supplement to which he is entitled. The original of the application form will then be returned to the owner or manager, one of the two copies will be retained by the insuring office for reference in checking rent supplement vouchers, and the second copy will be sent to the FHA statistics section, Washington, D.C., after receipt of the first voucher. (See Comptroller Letter No. 309, items 4 and 5.)

Disclosure of significant assets will require eligibility determination pursuant to the provisions set forth in paragraph III.I.

Tenant eligibility claimed by reason of occupancy of substandard housing or where housing has been destroyed or severally damaged by natural disasters will require physical examination of the housing unless adequate proof is provided from an authorized agency regarding the physical condition of such housing. The director will make arrangements for inspection by other agencies as appropriate. Usually the LPA's will perform this function in connection with tenants coming from existing or proposed urban renewal areas, the LHA (local housing authority) in connection with tenants coming from public housing, or by building inspection departments in connection with persons from areas with code enforcement. In instances where these functions are performed by these agencies there will be no charge. Where they are not performed by these agencies, the director will have the necessary property inspection performed by FHA employees. The definitions of substandard and dilapidated housing are set forth in paragraphs III.G and III.H and on Form No. 2501.

XI. LEASE-OPTION UNDER THE RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

The statute authorizes rent supplement payments on behalf of selected tenants occupying rental units under a lease with an option to purchase. This provision can be used only by projects planned for the purpose and with individual units capable of separation from the project operation. Eligible projects will generally consist of townhouse, row type, semidetached or detached structures initially financed under Section 221(d)(3) market rate.

Sponsors of this type of project should anticipate conversion of all living units to owner-occupancy during the early part of the project mortgage term.

Tenants will be selected on the basis of their potential for increasing income and eventual homeownership capability. Prospective tenants will be reviewed by FHA using criteria and procedures paralleling current FHA mortgage credit practice. Selected tenants will occupy their units on a rental basis, paying as their portion of the fair market rent, 25 percent of their monthly applicable income. The balance of the fair market rent will come from the rent supplement. The tenant, however, will be permitted to contribute additional sums from his own resources to be placed in an escrow account in his name by the housing owner. When the tenant has accumulated the required cash investment for purchase, his income has increased sufficiently to qualify for ownership, and if his other credit characteristics are acceptable, his unit will be eligible for release from the project mortgage. His purchase may be financed in the usual manner, the most probable way being under an FHA Section 221(d)(2) insured mortgage.

If a tenant is unwilling to exercise his option to purchase within a reasonable period of time after reaching an income level that permits full payment of housing expenses, he will lose the lease and the unit will be made available to another eligible lease-option tenant. If he is unable to exercise his option to purchase, he will be considered for an extension. The sponsorship will be expected to offer guidance and financial advisory services to tenants for the purpose of encouraging them to establish a good credit record, properly manage family finances, and bettering their financial position.

Any proposals under these provisions should be forwarded to the Multifamily Representative for procedural instructions at the earliest preapplication stage.

XII. REHABILITATION PROJECTS

Rent supplements will be available to rehabilitation projects as well as to new construction. However, to be eligible, the rehabilitation work must result in the production of standard units in a project currently containing primarily substandard living units or account for at least one-half of the mortgage amount. The rent supplement program will not be used to revive existing projects of standard living units in financial difficulty.

XIII. MIXED RENT SUPPLEMENT AND BELOW MARKET PROJECTS

In order to achieve a mixing of low and moderate income levels, proposals will be encouraged which combine projects receiving rent supplement payments with projects receiving the benefits of a 3 percent below market interest rate.

Separate structures and separate mortgages will be required, but the structures may be on adjoining sites and may share common facilities. Each project would own an undivided interest in the common facilities, which may include the kinds of nondwelling facilities normally provided in a section 221(d)(3) below market interest rate project.

Any proposals under these provisions should be forwarded to the Multifamily Representative for procedural instructions at the earliest preapplication stage.

XIV. PROJECT MANAGEMENT

The management of rent supplement projects will involve some responsibilities not encountered in the typical project. Also, there will be extra duties such as assisting and guiding applicants in preparing applications for rent supplements and in the periodic recertification of tenant incomes which will require counseling at the time of initial application and subsequently as family size and/or incomes change. With a view to assuring that proper provision is made for project management, FHA will retain authority for the prior approval of any proposed management plan or contract. Therefore, the commitment must contain a special condition providing that:

"Thirty (30) days prior to initial endorsement (start of construction for insurance upon completion cases), a copy of the proposed management plan or contract together with a résumé of the background and experience of the management agent shall be submitted for evaluation and approval by FHA."

XV. AMORTIZATION OF MORTGAGE

The level annuity monthly payment plan set forth on FHA Form 3010–3 is to be used for the section 221(d)(3) market rate and section 231 rent supplement projects. For any section 221(d)(3) below market interest rate project, Form 3010–5 A, B, C, D, or E is to be used as appropriate.

XVI. PROJECT NUMBERING REQUIREMENT

In order to identify those projects approved for rent supplements, the suffix letters "SUP" (for supplement) will be added to the prescribed section 221 or section 231 project number. The foregoing is applicable to all applications processed under the rent supplement program, to converted commitments, and to section 231 projects not finally endorsed for insurance.

XVII. REQUIRED NOTICE IF PLANS FOR PROPOSED RENT SUPPLEMENT PROJECT CANCELED

In the event plans for any proposed rent supplement project are canceled after funds have been reserved, the Director must issue notice in writing to the multifamily representative. The representative will notify the Regional Administrator in writing, with one copy to the Assistant Commissioner for Multifamily Housing and one copy to the Assistant Administrator (Program Policy), Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C., so that the reservation will be canceled.

XVIII. LANDLORD-TENANT RELATIONSHIP

In administration of the rent supplement program, no effort will be made to interfere with the normal landlord-tenant relationship. Landlords will be free to reject applications from prospective tenants or to accept them, conditioned only on FHA's certification of their eligibility if they require rent supplement payments and subject to the FHA policy prohibiting discrimination in the selection of tenants on the basis of race, color, or creed. Landlords will also be free to evict tenants for violation of lease provisions or for other reasonable causes.

XIX. SPECIALLY DESIGNED PROJECTS FOR ELDERLY

Rent supplement projects which are specially designed for the elderly may be insured under section 221(d)(3) at market interest rates. Some units in housing for the elderly projects may be designed for occupancy by the physically handicapped, depending upon the local market demand and interest of a sponsor. Such a project shall be designed to meet the FHA housing for the elderly minimum property standards.

The unit rental on which the amount of rent supplement is based shall be defined as including shelter rent with utilities but excluding meals and special services or personal care.

XX. WELFARE TENANTS

The amount of rent to be paid by an applicant who is receiving welfare assistance shall not be less than the rental allowance which is provided by the welfare agency.

XXI. FOUNDERS' FEES

Owners of projects under section 231 requiring founders' fees will not be eligible for rent supplement payments and owners of section 221(d)(3) projects will not be permitted to require founders' fees.

Mr. Chairman, there is also a Comptroller letter consisting of two printed pages and two standard forms; an underwriting letter consisting of four pages; and three additional FHA forms; Proposed Amendments to the HHFA and FHA Regulations Implementing Rent Supplement Provisions of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 consisting of five pages and a rent supplement contract consisting of four pages.

These are in printed form and while they are quite interesting, they should now be readily available for anyone who requests the same.

Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to feel that the action of the administrator, in his unwillingness to readily make available the contents of these regulations, is a breach of faith with the House of Representatives. I am informed that several Members of the House have made an effort to obtain these, and I have reason to believe that if they had been readily available this amendment might not have some of the support which it now has.

I do not believe that agency officials should conceal from Members of Congress, on any pretext, any regulations or any documents which have been printed.

There is reason to believe that these elusive regulations may go further than the language of the act approved August 10, 1965, and that they may go further than the authority of the Administrator under any section of any housing act. The copy of the regulations which I have seen is unmistakably dated September 28, 1965. They are ready for distribution. I know of no reason why they should not be readily available, upon request, to any Member of Congress.

As I have been able to interpret those meager portions of the proposed regulations dated September 28, 1965, but which to my knowledge have not been made generally available as of today, October 14, 1965, I feel that this House owes it to itself and to the integrity of the House of Representatives to at least defer action on this until we have had an opportunity to determine whether or not the proposed regulations go further than the language of the amendment to the housing bill which was offered by my colleague from Georgia [Mr. STEPHENS] when the housing bill was under consideration in the House.

In the debate on this amendment which has preceded my remarks, there has been a difference of opinion between the author of the amendment and the chairman of the subcommittee as to the maximum income and property ownership for a person designated as eligible to receive a rent subsidy or rent supplement under the provisions of Title I of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

The integrity of both of these men is unquestioned, and there is a valid basis for the differences in opinion held by the two Members. From what I know of the law, and from what little I have been able to see and read of the regulations, I am unable to determine which gentleman is correct and which amount is correct. The probable answer is that neither the law nor regulation is clear now, and it will ultimately be decided by subsequent administrative action rather than by law. At such later date the figure given by the author of the amendment might then be too low and the figure given by the chairman of the subcommittee might be too high. The fact is, that no one knows with certainty what maximum figures the administrator will select. The law is silent and the regulations are not clear.

Contrary to the comments of some who have said that this would kill this program, I do not think so. If it is indeed a good program, as many of my colleagues feel it is, then it can be fully implemented and can become a part of the national housing policy of the United States.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. Of course I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I asked the gentleman to yield in order that I may reinforce what the gentleman from Michigan said. There is $170,000 in this bill untouched by his amendment, for administrative expenses for the Federal Housing Administration to continue to study this program and get its ducks in a row, so to speak, so that it can come back to our committee in January with a new bill. We will then consider or reconsider any request made by the administration. There is no brief for anyone to say that this amendment will permanently kill the program, because that is not true.

Mr. FLYNT. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina and I agree with him in his observation.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us what this $170,000 for administrative expenses can be used for if you do not appropriate the money for the program. What are they going to administer and do with the money if you do not give them the money to get this program underway?

Mr. FLYNT. I will yield to the gentleman himself to answer his own question. The question is self-answering. The purpose of the $170,000 is to adequately prepare a set of rules and regulations so that the Congress of the United States will know what it is appropriating money for.

Mr. MULTER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FLYNT. Certainly I yield.

Mr. MULTER. I am sure the gentleman does not seriously contend that any agency can justify spending $170,000 to write a simple set of regulations.

Mr. FLYNT. I may say this: I do not think they could justify their action in doing it, but I have seen administrative agencies use a great deal more than that and accomplish a great deal less.

Mr. MULTER. If the gentleman will yield for one further point, do I understand the gentleman is suggesting to strike this out at this point from this bill and then go to conference? If you strike it out, what is there to go to conference about?

Mr. FLYNT. I will say this in reply to the gentleman from New York: If the regulations had been available to the subcommittee which considered and held hearings on this portion of the bill, this amendment might very well not even be before us today. When it takes an operation almost the equivalent of pulling impacted wisdom teeth to get possession of a simple set of regulations which have been written and printed for at least 3 weeks, then I think the House of Representatives is entitled to take a look at such regulations before we proceed further with funding the program.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I wonder if we could agree to a limitation of time on this matter. The amendment has been debated, and we have to conclude the action of this bill. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we vote on this amendment after the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GROSS. Just one minute. Could I have a minute or two?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we limit debate on this amendment to 8 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment as one of those five which helped carry this bill when it was before the House when it was first approved. At that time I supported the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. STEPHENS], which specifically pointed out that no one would be eligible for rent subsidy unless they were eligible for public housing. I felt at that time that anyone who is eligible for public housing should be eligible for the rent subsidy.

Mr. Chairman, I thought I was supporting the private sector and getting away from public housing per se.

I now find that these perpetuating regulations do not do what I thought the law intended to be done and what I thought we were voting for in this House at the time it was passed.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a vote to kill the rent subsidy, because as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY] pointed out, there are going to be adequate funds in the bill to bring out an adequate set of regulations that we can all understand. In voting for it today we are voting either against the bill that we passed or for a set of regulations. I believe this House in all honesty deserves the opportunity to wait until such time as they can bring out regulations that we can understand.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. Of course I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Is not the gentleman doing this? Is it not one thing to insist upon the law being observed and another thing to cut out all funds needed to implement this program?

Mr. JENNINGS. I would say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that is true and if they were cutting out all funds in this bill I would take a second thought on it. But the gentleman's amendment is not designed to cut out all of the funds. He is leaving $170,000 in the bill for the administration of the program.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield further——

Mr. JENNINGS. We will be back here in 3 months——

Mr. ALBERT. What good would it do to have funds for administration if there is nothing to administer?

Mr. JENNINGS. What good would it do to have all this money, $150 million, if we did not know whether the law was going to prevail or the regulations put out by the Administrator are going to prevail?

Mr. Chairman, I say this is something that we can wait on and should wait on.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. The point is that we are in agreement in some respects. We have made the legislative history that unless an applicant for this kind of supplement can qualify for public housing, they cannot qualify for this kind of housing.

Mr. JENNINGS. I appreciate the gentleman agreeing with me, and if he does agree with me he will vote to support the amendment and wait until we come back the first of the year and we will know what we are voting on. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] for 3 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARVEY of Michigan), there were—ayes 99, noes 95.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. EVINS of Tennessee and Mr. HARVEY of Michigan.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 111, noes 104.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Grants to aid advance acquisition of land

For grants authorized by section 704 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, $5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONAS

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONAS: On page 6, strike out lines 12 through 15.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Urban Renewal Administration

For additional amounts for "Urban renewal administration", to remain available until expended, $675,520,000 for the fiscal year 1966, including not to exceed $520,000 for administrative expenses during such year, and $725,000,000 for grants for the fiscal year 1967: *Provided,* That funds available for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year shall be available in connection with grants provided for in this paragraph: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $1,500,000 of the amount provided for each fiscal year in this paragraph for grants shall be available for rehabilitation grants pursuant to Sec. 115 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, and not to exceed $75,000,000 shall be available for code enforcement grants pursuant to Sec. 117 of such Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONAS

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONAS: On page 7, line 15, strike out the word "and" and all that follows through line 17, and insert: "*Provided further,* That no part of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used for code enforcement grants pursuant to Sec. 117 of such Act."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction, rail rapid transit system

For expenses necessary to design, engineer, construct, and equip a rail rapid transit system, as authorized by the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965, including acquisition of rights of way, land and interests therein, $3,679,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That, in addition, $320,551 previously appropriated to the National Capital Transportation Agency for "Land acquisition and construction" shall be merged with this appropriation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF WISCONSIN

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: On page 12, line 12, strike out "$3,679,000" and insert "$500,000".

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this is a companion to the amendment which I offered earlier.

The $6 million in the bill for initiating the subway in the District of Columbia is divided into two parts. My purpose in the companion amendments I offered was to reduce the total funds to $750,000 to be used for soil investigations and surveys.

I feel, as I said earlier, Mr. Chairman, that we need the information to be furnished by such complete soil studies, before committing ourselves to construction funds.

The mood of this Committee is obviously not favorable to reduction of these funds, so I shall not further belabor my point.

I predict this subway will cost much in excess of $431 million, and that the same conditions which greatly increased the cost of so many other structures here will be found to account for a major portion of that increased cost.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, this is the same question that we considered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] to the part of the appropriation bill dealing with the departments of the District of Columbia. The question was fully discussed then. The amendment was voted down. I do not think I need to discuss it any further.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, adoption of this amendment would kill the rapid transit system. I hope that the amendment is rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Office of Education

Arts and humanities educational activities

For carrying out sections 12 and 13 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, $1,000,000.

National Foundation of the Arts and the Humanities

Salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, including functions under Public Law 88-579, to remain available until expended, $5,700,000, of which $5,000,000 shall be available for carrying out sections 5(c) and 7(c) of the Act: *Provided,* That, in addition, there is appropriated for the purposes of section 11(b) of the Act, an amount equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests and devises of money, and other property received by the Endowments, during the current fiscal year, under the provisions of section 10(a)(2) of the Act, but not to exceed $2,000,000 for the Endowment for the Arts, and $3,000,000 for the Endowment for the Humanities.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask a question of some Member of the Committee regarding this arts, culture and humanities business. I see that it is off to a flying start. The bill was passed only a short time ago, and the money is now going through. Did the subcommittee question Mr. Roger Stevens, the head of this arts and culture business, on the possibility of a conflict of interest?

Mr. DENTON. The Interior Subcommittee discussed the question of possible conflict of interests, in our hearings on the arts and humanities.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman ascertain whether it was true or not that Mr. Stevens has an interest in 100 plays?

Mr. DENTON. There was no evidence of a conflict of interest. It was felt that the arts and humanities had to get men of ability, experts on the councils.

There are special inserts in the record covering the subject of conflict of interest with regard to Roger Stevens beginning on page 50 and continuing through page 55.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Stevens resigned from the National Symphony Orchestra to avoid an accusation, as I understand it, of a conflict of interest. I do not think there is any question but what he has an interest in a number of plays. Moreover, on the day after he appeared before your subcommittee, the New York Herald Tribune carried a statement from Stevens saying that he would not divest himself of other interests.

I believe the record is quite plain that there is very strong possibility of conflict of interest with respect to this gentleman. I would hope that the committee would take a further look at this situation.

Mr. DENTON. There are three or four pages in the record on that. I ask the gentleman to turn to the hearings, where there are three or four pages on that. I believe we are able to say this is a man of ability, who is taking this position. Mr. Stevens is a man of independent wealth. He does not need to make money in that manner. He has taken a great deal of interest in the Arts and Humanities Foundation. He has done a great deal of work for the Government without any pay whatsoever. I believe we are extremely fortunate in having a man like him in this position.

I am not worried a bit about him using this position for his own gain in any way, shape or form.

Mr. GROSS. I say to the gentleman it is not a question of his intent or what he has been. It is a question of what he is going to do in the future and in the Federal office which will distribute millions of dollars. This art and culture program is going to run into a lot of money, and will have many facets and ramifications. We here today are asked to appropriate the money to make it possible, if there is a conflict of interest, for him to feather his own nest in the future. We should know whether he will divest himself of all interests in conflict with his office and duties.

Mr. DENTON. I believe the man is honest. I believe we are fortunate to have him in this position. He has done yeoman service for the Government in this respect in the past. I know nothing to make us question that in any way.

Let me read a portion of the record in this regard:

> Mr. Denton. Undoubtedly some of the members on the Council will have interests in various projects related to the arts. This could eventually involve a conflict of interest. What are your plans on regulations to avoid this sort of thing?
>
> Mr. Stevens. Needless to say, to have the quality of people serving on the Council that is necessary, they will, as you say, have a familiarity with the arts. The Council is composed of members from all parts of the country and of various interests in the 13 categories of the arts, and no one would want to jeopardize the objects and purposes of the law.
>
> Besides, they are subject to the recently announced code of ethics promulgated by the Civil Service Commission which takes care of all conflict of interests.

Mr. GROSS. That is very fine, but the code of ethics does not mean very much around here, I fear, when someone wants to violate it. I would suggest that the gentleman not place very much reliance on a code of ethics.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bureau of the Public Debt

Administering the public debt

For an additional amount for "Administering the public debt", $1,000,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question as to when we can expect to see the funny money that has been authorized by Congress. I assume some of the appropriation in this title would go for the new sandwich-type funny money. I simply cannot wait to get a few of those coins.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman for that.

Mr. STEED. It just happens that I was reading in the paper today an announcement by the Department of the Treasury where they say the production of these new-type coins has now advanced ahead of schedule to the point where 25-cent pieces will be distributed during the Christmas holiday season. That is the only information I have as to the time they will start circulating.

Mr. GROSS. What a blessing that will be this Christmas to get 25-cent pieces worth a quarter of a cent. That ought to make for a real fine Christmas celebration. This is one of the ways by which we roll in prosperity?

Mr. STEED. All I can tell the gentleman is that Congress passed a law requiring a change in the type of metal that we use in making coins. Those of us concerned with the operation of the mint are doing our best to carry out the mandate of Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Is this one of the reasons why the Bureau of the Public Debt's fund for administration has to be increased with a supplemental appropriation?

Mr. STEED. No. The item on the public debt has to do with fees paid to banks throughout the country who transact business for the Treasury Department such as cashing bonds or selling bonds and that sort of thing.

Mr. GROSS. To help float the debt that we are piling up while we are so prosperous. Is that right?

Mr. STEED. That plus a number of other services. The volume of business that has been transacted this year was more than they estimated, and it requires this amount to meet those obligations.

Mr. GROSS. The Great Society has a record to be real proud of. They are going to bring the funny money on the market at Christmastime and increase the expenditure for the Bureau of the Public Debt so that they will be properly prepared to take care of the increase in the debt. The year 1965 A.D. ought to go down as a red-letter year—a year when this Nation wallows in prosperity and yet poverty increases. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEED. If the gentleman will yield, I think I can assure the gentleman we will do our very best to try to produce a sufficient quantity of the very best quality of this type coin.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Harris, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11588) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken and on a division (demanded by Mr. Harvey of Michigan) there were—ayes 84, noes 95.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 185, nays 162, answered "present" 2, not voting 83, as follows:

[Roll No. 369]

YEAS—185

Abernethy
Addabbo
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baldwin
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bonner
Bow
Brooks
Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burleson
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Everett
Fallon
Fisher
Flynt
Foley
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Gettys
Goodell
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Hansen, Idaho
Harris
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karth
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kunkel
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
McCarthy
McCulloch
McEwen
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matthews
May
Michel
Mills
Minshall
Moeller
Moore
Morris
Morse
Mosher
Murray
Nelsen
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pelly
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Purcell
Quie
Reid, Ill.
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Selden
Sikes

Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stubblefield
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Utt
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
Whalley
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Younger

NAYS—162

Adams
Albert
Annunzio
Ashley
Bandstra
Barrett
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cameron
Carey
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conyers
Corman
Craley
Daniels
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Farbstein
Farnsley
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Fogarty
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hechler
Helstoski
Hicks
Holland
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Leggett
Long, Md.
Love
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Perkins
Philbin
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Race
Redlin
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Schisler
Secrest
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Staggers
Sullivan
Sweeney
Thompson, N.J.
Trimble
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Scheuer
Van Deerlin

NOT VOTING—83

Abbitt
Adair
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Arends
Baring
Bingham
Bray
Brock
Burton, Utah
Celler
Clancy
Clark
Clawson, Del
Conable
Curtis
Daddario
Dawson
Delaney
Duncan, Oreg.
Farnum
Findley
Fino
Ford, Gerald R.
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gathings
Gilligan
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Halleck
Hardy
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Johnson, Pa.
Keogh
Kornegay
Laird
Lindsay
Long, La.
McClory
McDade
Martin, Nebr.
Mize
Morton
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Pepper
Quillen
Randall
Reifel
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Saylor
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Skubitz
Stephens
Stratton
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Walker, Miss.
Watson
Weltner
White, Idaho
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Wydler
Young

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Kornegay for, with Mr. Delaney against.

Mr. Rogers of Texas for, with Mr. Toll against.

Mr. Roberts for, with Mr. Gilligan against.

Mr. Fuqua for, with Mr. Lindsay against.

Mr. Brock for, with Mr. Horton against.

Mr. Conable for, with Mr. Duncan of Oregon against.

Mr. Clancy for, with Mr. Farnum against.

Mr. Van Deerlin for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Pepper against.

Mr. Watson for, with Mr. Tenzer against.

Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Baring against.

Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Laird for, with Mr. Daddario against.

Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Garmatz against.

Mrs. Green of Oregon for, with Mrs. Griffiths against.

Mr. Willis for, with Mr. O'Hara of Illinois against.

Mr. George W. Andrews for, with Mr. Anderson of Tennessee against.

Mr. Abbitt for, with Mr. Clark against.

Mr. Hardy for, with Mr. O'Brien against.

Mr. Fino for, with Mr. Randall against.

Mr. Gerald R. Ford for, with Mr. Stratton against.

Mr. Roudebush for, with Mr. Hays against.

Mr. Bray for, with Mr. Dawson against.

Mr. Harvey of Indiana for, with Mr. White of Idaho against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Weltner with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Burton of Utah.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Quillen.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. McDade.

Mr. Young with Mr. Findley.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.

Mr. Gathings with Mr. Wydler.

Mr. MURRAY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOW. I am opposed to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bow moves to recommit the bill H.R. 11588 to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 242, nays 100, answered "present" 1, not voting 89, as follows:

[Roll No. 370]

YEAS—242

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Baldwin
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Casey
Chelf
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Culver
Curtin
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
de la Garza
Dent
Denton
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harris
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hébert
Hechler
Helstoski
Hicks
Holland
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Krebs
Landrum
Leggett
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Race
Redlin
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Steed
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Todd
Trimble
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Walker, N. Mex.
Watts
Whalley
White, Tex.
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Zablocki

NAYS—100

Abernethy
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Glenn
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Ayres
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bonner
Bow

Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burleson
Byrnes, Wis.
Callaway
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Collier
Colmer
Cooley
Cramer
Cunningham
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Duncan, Tenn.
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Fisher
Fountain
Gettys
Goodell
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Haley
Hall
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Hutchinson
Jonas
Kunkel
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McMillan
MacGregor
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Matthews
May
Michel
Mills
Minshall
Mosher
Murray
Nelsen
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pelly
Poff
Pool
Quie
Reid, Ill.
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rogers, Fla.
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Scott
Selden
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stanton
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Waggonner
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Younger

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Diggs

NOT VOTING—89

Abbitt
Adair
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Arends
Baring
Bingham
Bray
Brock
Burton, Utah
Celler
Clancy
Clark
Clawson, Del
Conable
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Dawson
Delaney
Duncan, Oreg.
Ellsworth
Farnum
Findley
Fino
Ford, Gerald R.
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gathings
Gilligan
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Gurney
Halleck
Hardy
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Herlong
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Johnson, Pa.
Keogh
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Laird
Lindsay
Long, La.
McClory
McDade
Martin, Nebr.
Mize
Morton
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Pepper
Purcell
Quillen
Randall
Reifel
Resnick
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Saylor
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Skubitz
Stephens
Stratton
Talcott
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Watson
Weltner
White, Idaho
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Wydler
Young

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Adair against.

Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. Bray against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Watson against.

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Roberts against.

Mr. Horton for, with Mr. Fuqua against.

Mr. Bingham for, with Mr. Rogers of Texas against.

Mr. Clancy for, with Mr. Kornegay against.

Mr. Daddario for, with Mr. Arends against.

Mr. McDade for, with Mr. Brock against.

Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Walker of Mississippi against.

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Harvey of Indiana against.

Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Bob Wilson against.

Mr. Lindsay for, with Mr. Roudebush against.

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Laird against.

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee for, with Mr. Hosmer against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Wydler against.

Mr. Tenzer for, with Mr. Talcott against.

Mr. White of Idaho for, with Mr. Quillen against.

Mr. Gilligan for, with Mr. McClory against.

Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Findley against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Shriver.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Weltner with Mr. Mize.

Mr. Stephens with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Young with Mr. Burton of Utah.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Dawson with Mr. Fino.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Randall.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Duncan of Oregon.

Mr. Senner with Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. Stratton.

Mr. O'Hara of Illinois with Mr. Gathings.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Conable.

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Dague.

Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Reifel.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Skubitz.

Mr. Hardy with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Pepper with Mr. Wyatt.

Mr. Farnum with Mr. Purcell.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Resnick.

Messrs. ASHMORE and GLENN ANDREWS changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 18

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to ask the distinguished majority leader about the program for the balance of the week and for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BOW. I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Ohio, we have completed the legislative program, except for minor unanimous-consent matters, for this week. It will be my purpose after announcing the program to ask to go over until Monday.

The program for next week is as follows: Monday is Consent Calendar day. There are seven suspensions:

H.R. 6568, tariff treatment of copra, palmnuts, and palmnut kernels, and the oils crushed therefrom;

H.R. 11539, Southeast Hurricane Disaster Relief Act of 1965;

H.R. 9424, endangered species;

S. 1758, providing for the right of persons to be represented in matters before Federal agencies;

H.R. 10722, per diem allowance for Nevada Test Site employees;

S. 2150, to discontinue certain reports; and

S. 1004, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

These may not necessarily be taken up in the order in which they have been announced.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day. For Wednesday and the balance of the week the only original legislation we have scheduled are eight unanimous-consent bills from the Committee on Ways and Means which were scheduled this week and are printed on the whip notices and in the RECORD for this week.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the numbers of these bills may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The eight unanimous-consent bills from the Committee on Ways and Means are as follows:

H.R. 327, exempting from taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations operated to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations;

H.R. 7723, suspension of duty, certain tropical hardwoods;

H.R. 8210, amending the International Organizations Immunities Act;

H.R. 8436, dutiable status of watches, clocks, and so forth, from insular possessions of the United States;

H.R. 8445, retired pay, tax court judges;

H.R. 11216, tariff treatment of articles assembled abroad;

H.R. 10626, tax treatment of certain amounts paid to certain members and former members of uniformed services and to their survivors; and

H.R. 6319, tax treatment of expropriation loss recoveries.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, this announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that further program may be announced later and conference reports may be brought up at any time. We do expect and we will have, of course, next week important conference reports and Members should govern themselves accordingly. We will do the best we can to keep Members informed of changes in or additions to the program next week, looking, we hope, toward the final disposition of the legislative business for the session.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 18

Mr. ALBERT. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourns to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rules may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COOPERATIVE PROGRAM FOR CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND ENHANCEMENT OF ANADROMOUS FISH

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 23) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate with the several States a cooperative program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 4, strike out "primarily".

Page 5, strike out lines 8, 9, and 10, and insert:

"(b) Not more than $1,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this section in any one fiscal year shall be obligated in any one State."

Page 5, strike out lines 11, 12, and 13, and insert:

"SEC. 5. This Act shall not be construed to affect, modify, or apply to the same area as the provisions of the Act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 345), as amended (16 U.S.C. 755–757)."

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I believe it would be well if the distinguished gentleman from Michigan would indicate that this is the bill as it passed the House, with three minor amendments, and perhaps the gentleman would be willing to explain the nature of the amendment put in by the Senate.

I believe on our side we feel these amendments make a better bill. This has been cleared with the minority leader and has our approval.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I would be happy to comply with the gentleman's request.

Mr. Speaker, I would like again to commend my good friend, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY], for his very great help and his interest in this fine piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the first amendment authorized by the Senate is perhaps the most important of the three, although all three are in the nature of technical amendments.

This amendment limits the amount which may be received by any particular State in one year to the sum of $1 million, although allowing, as does the House bill, any State to receive the sum of $5 million over the life of the program which is 5 years in length.

Mr. Speaker, the other two amendments are really technical amendments. The second amendment simply says that the bill does not apply to the area to which the Columbia River salmon program had applied, but it says it in a little different way than the House language did. It appears to be technically, perhaps, a little better than the House language and I think it should be acceptable to the House.

Mr. Speaker, the other amendment is a very small item, striking the word "primarily" on page 2, line 4, of the House bill. I have to be frank with my colleagues in the House and say that I really cannot answer exactly what the purpose of this amendment is, but in the interest of expediting this legislation it would be well to accept the Senate amendment. Since this last amendment does very little, if anything as I can see it, I think it should be approved.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation and wish to join in commending both the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] for advancing this most important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this is important legislation to those of us who live on the west coast and around the Great Lakes area and we are indebted to these gentlemen for their leadership.

In addition to this, of course, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Senate now has offered its position and we are concurring therein, it will then permit the States themselves to move forward in enhancing a very valuable resource of this Nation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN] for his fine work and his interest in this matter and thank him again for his fine comments.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO ALLOW THE VIEWING OF THE U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY FILM "ADLAI STEVENSON THE AMBASSADOR"

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 61) to allow the viewing of the U.S. Information Agency film "Adlai Stevenson the Ambassador" at the Auditorium Theater in Chicago, Ill., on or about October 24, 1965.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT OF 1937

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2092) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit marketing orders applicable to celery, sweet corn, limes, or avocados to provide for paid advertising.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 2092

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the proviso at the end of section 8c(6)(I) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937) (7 U.S.C. 608c(6)(I)) is amended by inserting a comma and the following: "celery, sweet corn, limes, or avocados" immediately after "applicable to cherries."

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DE LA GARZA: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 2092, and insert the provisions of H.R. 10206, as passed by the House.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DE LA GARZA: Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1937 to permit marketing orders applicable to various fruits and vegetables to provide for paid advertising."

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OGO–II

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to inform the House of the successful launching this morning of this Nation's second Orbiting Geophysical Observatory—OGO–II. The launch was from the western test range, Vandenberg AFB, Calif., into a polar orbit, and the spacecraft is turning in a nominal performance.

This is a most important scientific satellite. The public notice given our manned space flights sometimes tend to obscure the very great unmanned scientific achievements that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration keeps accumulating. This spacecraft carries 20 different scientific experiments, which were contributed by 11 American universities, 1 foreign university—University of Paris—2 NASA field centers, and 2 other Government agencies.

One of the objectives of OGO–II is the global mapping of the geomagnetic field as part of the United States commitment to the International Year of the Quiet Sun. The overall mission, to which all the experiments are geared, is to concentrate on near-earth space phenomena. The final earth stabilization and experiment turn-on are planned for later today.

OGO is a very strange-looking craft. Its mosquito-like appearance is the result of deployed booms, antennas, attitude control jets and solar panels attached to its rectangular, box-shaped main body. It is one of the most advanced unmanned satellites ever developed. As chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics I congratulate NASA on OGO's progress so far, and offer my best wishes for successful completion of the mission.

THE TELEPHONE HATE NETWORK

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, many recent reports have called attention to the increasing use of slanderous recorded telephone messages which abuse many respected organizations and individuals. Targets of these messages, sponsored I understand by an outfit called Let Freedom Ring, have included the Peace Corps, the National Council of Churches, civil rights organizations, and most recently the National Congress of Parents and Teachers. Dial 444–2213 in Denver, it is reported, and you can hear a voice tell you that the PTA is a leftwing organization which is promoting a "complete federalization of the schools in the Russian manner." The recording lets us know that members of the PTA are "sheep to be shorn by the Socialist or pro-Communist PTA national leadership." Such is the style and substance of Let Freedom Ring.

The nature and focus of this program has recently been documented in an enlightened article by Mr. Lawrence Peirez for the bulletin of the Antidefamation League of B'nai B'rith. I include this article in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The use of this slanderous device is growing rapidly. There are presently reports of telephone recordings of this nature in six States. The Let Freedom Ring organization, with its strong connection to the John Birch Society, is making strong moves to extend its influence and exposure. Its distorted use of half-truth and innuendo is confusing many of our citizens who are unaware of the background and sponsorship of these messages.

Something must be done about this extremist idiocy whose means of public discourse are libel, slander, and distortion.

For some time, I have been investigating remedies for bringing these telephone messages under some sort of control and clarification. I am convinced that we must act to offset the dangerous impact of these recordings on confused citizens, and to insulate the slandered institutions from the bitter results of these blind attacks.

I am today submitting legislation designed to require disclosure of the source and sponsor of these messages in the actual text of the telephone recordings. My bill will make unlawful the transmission over a telephone system of any recorded message not identifying the subscriber through whose phone such a message was transmitted. Telephone companies would be under responsibility to secure the name of the sponsor of all recorded telephone messages. Moreover, the telephone companies would be required to maintain on file both the identification of these subscribers and the actual transcript of the message. These would be available for public scrutiny. Violations of these provisions would be punished by a fine of up to $10,000 or imprisonment not to exceed 1 year, or both.

Let me say that I am aware of the complicated legal context in which such action is to be considered. The recent Supreme Court decisions in *New York Times* v. *Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254 (1954) and *Garrison* v. *Louisiana*, 379 U.S. 64 (1964) make it clear that the interest of society in unrestricted debate and discussion of public matters outweighs the offended party's need for self-protection. The Court rules that only if such attacks were made with "actual malice," defined as knowledge of the attacks' falsity, could an action for defamation be maintained. I share the Court's commitment in these decisions, as I do the judgment that "actual malice" would require determinations largely incapable of noncontroversial definition. We are not about to seek a way to censorship. Clearly we must do all in our power to protect and stimulate public discussion of public matters, regardless of any displeasure over the substance of some of that discussion.

My bill, however, does not involve criminal libel legislation. It attempts to serve the principle of open public discourse as well as the protection of parties under slanderous attack.

By requiring that the actual sponsor of such messages be so designated in the text of their message, my bill serves the same function as the provision that paid political announcements on radio and television carry an identification of their sponsorship and origin. The disclosure requirement furthers the goals of enlightened discourse by helping the citizenry evaluate the merits of these messages through knowledge of their source. It likewise protects the attacked party from the dangerous inferences that these messages may have responsible or respectable origin.

Such a disclosure requirement, finally, is well within the Congress commerce power. The Federal Communications Commission is likewise charged by 47 U.S.C. 201 with regulating the industry in the public interest. I am anxious that this legislation be passed at the earliest date. These phone recordings must be brought under proper democratic control in the interest of healthy public discourse and protection of responsible institutions from vicious slander.

Mr. Peirez' article follows:

THE TELEPHONE HATE NETWORK

(By Lawrence Peirez)

(NOTE.—This article is based on a report of the Antidefamation League's Fact Finding Committee of which Mr. Peirez is chairman.)

The most unique voice of the radical right movement is quiet, recorded, and available at any hour of the day or night. To hear it, and the 90-second sermon of fear it calls a patriotic message, people in some 30 or more cities throughout the country have only to pick up their phones and dial an unlisted, but well-publicized number.

The name of the propaganda operation is Let Freedom Ring. It is the creation of William C. Douglass, a Sarasota, Fla., physician who is active in behalf of many rightwing causes, and is a member of the John Birch Society.

According to Dr. Douglass, Let Freedom Ring is a nonprofit organization established to disseminate "anti-Communist, anti-Socialist, pro-American broadcasts via a telephone tape recording."

What it actually broadcasts is the radical right line—a Communist conspiracy lurks behind the fight for civil rights, the United Nations, the Supreme Court, the State Department, the last three Presidents of the United States, the press, and even such groups as the National Council of Churches, the American Civil Liberities Union, and the Antidefamation League.

Included among LFR messages:

"America will soon be in a position of hopeless military inferiority to the beasts of Russia because of deliberate disarmament by traitors in the Johnson administration.

"At the forefront in this vicious campaign against American patriots are the Communist press and the Antidefamation League. * * *

"Another factor ignored by the press is that the Communist-lining National Council of Churches is openly promoting bloodshed through armed revolution by Negroes. * * *"

"It's likely that those three civil rights workers in Mississippi were kidnaped and murdered by their own kind to drum up sympathy for their cause."

Earlier messages attacked the Kennedy administration:

"How long will the American people put up with treason right in the White House itself? How long before the American people demand the impeachment of John F. Kennedy?"

"The Civil Rights Act will * * * turn America into a Fascist state practically overnight. * * * No business; no church; no club, public or private, would be free of the evil smell of BOBBY KENNEDY's marshals and spies."

Let Freedom Ring operates out of a Sarasota post office number. After less than 3 years in business, its network includes major cities across the Nation and a dozen additional franchise applications are pending.

Callers hear a new message each week, supplied by Dr. Douglass to local outlets which pay $24 for the first year of the service and $12 thereafter. The messages are recorded on tape and play automatically—through Bell Telephone automatic announcement service equipment—to anyone who dials the advertised number. The equipment is rented from the telephone company at a cost varying from $20 to $45 monthly. All arrangements are made and paid for by the local Let Freedom Ring subscriber.

Much Let Freedom Ring material follows the Birch line. It is therefore not surprising that the operation has been recommended by Robert Welch, founder of the John Birch Society, as a worthwhile interest for society members. And although the "Birch line" is discernible in much of its material, LFR has, on occasion, used items more closely related to those found in the tracts of far-out paramilitary groups.

There was this one for example:

"At the University of Michigan a plan is being developed for the systematic house-to-house search of the entire United States for arms of any kind. The search is to be made by the U.S. Army by blocking off five States at a time, beginning in the western part of the country. The entire civilian population is to be disarmed by the end of 1965."

The story so incensed Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, that he asked the Defense Department to establish the truth as a matter of public record. He then inserted the reply in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"This charge is absurd, completely false, and reflects the hallucinations of an aberrated mind."

JAVITS added a note: that the story appeared to have been taken bodily from an issue of On Target, official publication of the Minutemen organization.

The reception room of Douglass' professional offices features stacks of rightwing propaganda materials—reading matter for waiting patients. These include the latest issues of American Opinion and the Dan Smoot report, and flyers advertising the Christian Crusade radio program of Dr. Billy James Hargis. At one time the doctor was warned to stop distributing such literature to patients at the local hospital.

A political activist, Douglass is a member of the advisory board of the Conservative Society of America, the political crusade headed by Kent and Phoebe Courtney of New Orleans. He was one of the featured speakers at the recent "Congress of Conservatives" held in Chicago to lay the foundation for a national rightwing party. The doctor is leading efforts to form a third political party in Florida which would offer a slate of candidates in the 1966 State elections and become the Florida unit of an eventual national party.

The slant and novelty of the Let Freedom Ring operation seems to have had a natural appeal for people in the John Birch Society who use the service as a tool for propaganda and recruitment. The operations of the two organizations have been connected at many stations along the LFR network.

Let Freedom Ring scripts have recommended Robert Welch's American Opinion magazine as well as his book, "The Politician." In the Birch Society's Bulletin of March 1965, Welch wrote that Let Freedom Ring "has been catching on quite well, spreading gradually, and transmitting some very worthwhile messages." He added that Dr. Douglass "will welcome your inquiry."

In Decatur, Ill., the LFR outlet is sponsored by Freedom House, a rightwing bookstore run by members of the Birch Society.

In Philadelphia, callers are told to send money to a post office box for printed copies of the weekly messages. According to a story in the Philadelphia Inquirer, the box was rented by a Birch Society section leader. A check mailed to the outlet as a contribution was endorsed by the local Birch Society American Opinion Bookstore.

In California, the Los Angeles Times reported that the funds for the local LFR phone operation were "donated by a Birch chapter in North Hollywood."

In Miami, the box number of the LFR station was listed under the name of the John Birch Society.

In Summit, N.J., the LFR address was that of the American Opinion Bookstore there. The actual telephone equipment stands in the finished basement of Dr. Foster G. Ruhl, an active local John Bircher.

In Canoga Park, Calif., use of an LFR tape was halted by officials of the Pacific Telephone Co. after many complaints. The American Opinion Bookshop (which ran Canoga Park's LFR operation) was represented in conversations with the telephone company by John Rousselot, national public relations director of the John Birch Society.

There is no doubt that Let Freedom Ring services the radical right, from its small-time ax grinders to its largest national membership organization, the John Birch Society. Its broadcasts, scheduled at the caller's convenience, have a personal and therefore more persuasive impact. The telephone message is a quick exhortation affording the caller no chance for rereading or analysis. This allows the use of some of the bluntest propaganda scare tactics. On May 23, 1965, for example, Dr. Douglass' script read in part:

"Under the provisions of the Civil Rights Act, a convicted rapist applying for a job in a girls' school could file suit against the school if they requested a picture with his application."

Although such messages plant seeds of confusion and fear, the local LFR sponsor, unlike most other publishers and broadcasters, is protected by anonymity. The LFR number, though widely publicized, is technically an unlisted one, its holder, nameless—as are the unidentified voices on Let Freedom Ring tapes.

The question of responsibility nettles many who are concerned about the use of a public communications medium for the spreading of fear and mistrust. Can nothing be done? The position of the telephone company was stated by the Bell Telephone Co. of Pennsylvania in a letter to the Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations:

"1. It is the duty of the telephone company to furnish services and facilities to anyone who will use the service in a lawful manner. * * * The Pennsylvania Supreme Court has made it clear that public utilities are not censors. * * *

"2. Automatic announcement service is a regular telephone service which is available to any customer. * * * A user of automatic announcement service determines for himself the content of the messages handled by the service.

"3. Regardless of its views on the contents of recorded messages, the telephone company is prohibited from interfering with the lawful exercise of a customer's right of free speech."

Bell System officials have pointed out that public utilities are prohibited under Federal statutes from discriminating—offering preferential service or withholding service at will—and are forbidden to censor or even to monitor private calls. The telephone company may intervene in the case of messages which violate criminal laws (e.g., bookmaking operations or obscene calls) when requested to do so by police agencies.

Various courts have held that the company may act when it has reasonable cause to believe that the telephone is being used for illegal purposes, even without a specific police request. The difficulty is in proving an illegal purpose. In the present case, it would have to be proved that the Let Freedom Ring tape constitutes criminal libel. Telephone officials, mindful that to establish criminal libel it must be shown that the tape has a tendency to create a breach of the peace, and aware that the courts extend the broadcast protection to freedom of speech, are reluctant to take action unless assured by law enforcement agencies of the probability of criminal libel.

One suggestion that has been offered is to extend the Federal Communications Commission's regulations in regard to radio and television broadcasting to the telephone system. Such standards, thoroughly tested and upheld in the courts, provide for a certain degree of Federal control under license requirements to insure that the licensee will serve the public convenience, interest, and necessity.

Bell Telephone maintains that phone messages reach only those persons who wish to hear them, thus limiting the public nature of Let Freedom Ring and negating the argument that the broadcasts can create a general breach of the peace. But no one is forced to listen to radio or TV broadcasts either. The fact is that wide publicity and advertising of Let Freedom Ring phone numbers have given the operation's anonymous broadcasters a greater daily audience in some cities than many radio news broadcasts.

Dr. Douglass is confident that LFR "cannot be stopped" and that it will become one of the major rightwing influences within the next 2 years.

"You will be amazed at the influence that you have on public opinion almost immediately," he declares in his prospectus. "Last year we were given credit for having killed the UNICEF Christmas card drive locally—an accomplishment of which we are very proud."

But if the doctor is proud, others are indignant at the LFR technique, called by Senator JAVITS a "pushbutton approach to mass libel."

Last year, in the Senate, JAVITS warned that Let Freedom Ring was "a nationwide organization not run by professionals but by enthusiastic amateurs and apparently inaugurated and dedicated to bringing hate and fear within the reach of all."

The usually conservative California Federation of Republican Women, in a resolution asking the FBI to look into the "origin, sponsorship, and objectives of this vicious activity," called Let Freedom Ring's messages "false and treacherous propaganda."

WCAU, an important Philadelphia radio station, asked "all decent people" to renounce LFR messages which "are feeding the fires of race hatred and possible violence."

Let Freedom Ring continues—but so too does the search for means consistent with American constitutional freedoms to end the spreading of hatred by anonymous voices of dissension.

NATIONAL NEWSPAPER WEEK

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the newspapers of our country during this week designated as National Newspaper Week. Mr. Speaker, I might point out that on the final day of this week, the 16th, we pay particular honor to newspaper carrier boys; and right here in the Washington area on a cold winter morning there is no one I appreciate more than the newspaper boy who brings me the paper.

National Newspaper Week began in 1939 "To encourage public understanding of newspapers and their service to the Nation." Their slogan this year is "Newspapers Make a Big Difference in Peoples Lives."

Mr. Speaker, there are today in the United States 1,763 daily newspapers. Weeklies early this year numbered 8,061. Each week 100 million Americans read about people and events in their hometown weeklies alone.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper that we honor all of those who make possible the finest newspapers in the world right here in the United States. Our newspapers are devoted and dedicated to the cause of preserving freedom and all that it stands for, not only freedom of press, but freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and the great free enterprise system which has made our Nation the most powerful Nation on earth.

Newspapers of our country support our great institutions. The most persistent defenders and supporters of our churches, schools, and libraries are the newspapers of our land.

I turn to our newspapers, the dailies and weeklies, constantly for geography, history, information, and understanding. The newspapers have taken the lead in promoting culture, music, and the arts. It has been my experience as a Representative in the Congress that the newspapers have offered me inspiration and encouragement during critical and trying periods when we seek to solve national and international problems. The newspapers support us when we reject radical solutions to problems and when we deplore hatred, intolerance, and violence.

Mr. Speaker, I have no fear for the future of our country or for the free world as long as our newspapers are free and independent.

Mr. Speaker, it might be well for us to constantly remember the words of the accredited founder of National Newspaper Week, John B. Long, when he said:

> Newspapers are never free from those who would seek to enslave them.

FIRST HALF OF THE 89TH CONGRESS—PLUS AND MINUS

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, next week a weary Congress closes the door on the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

Some call it a recordbreaking Congress and so it has been.

There are many pluses—to be sure, such as an economy stimulating tax cut, voting rights legislation, immigration reform and others, but the minus side is there, too—and it will take time for Americans generally to see the picture.

It has been an unusual session in many regards.

Far-reaching legislation has been passed in every conceivable area of Government.

New Federal programs have been created—programs which no legislator would have given a chance 4 years ago.

Revolutionary new and very liberal concepts pervade much of these programs which try to do so much for so many.

This Congress has drastically altered the traditional relationship between the Federal Government and the separate States. It has blindly cast aside its responsibilities, disrupting the check and balance of separation of powers by abdicating to a demanding President. It has heavily committed future revenues in massive spending schemes which guarantee dangerous inflationary spirals in coming years.

And the most amazing historical political paradox is that the majority party, the Democratic Party in Congress, has turned out to be the party of negation. The Democratic Party, its ranks sprinkled with liberal libertarians, has persistently thwarted open debate and free discussion.

The minority party, the Republican Party, in this Congress has been positive—constantly prodding the majority to improve and clean up hastily drawn and ill-conceived legislation.

Time and again, better alternative programs were proposed by the minority and rejected out of hand by the majority.

Time and again the majority imposed gag rule by restricting time during debate and in some instances, reducing to the absurdity of allotting only 30 seconds per Member for debate.

Time and again amendments even procedural or perfecting amendments were barred by the majority.

Thus did the Republican Party accentuate the positive.

Thus did the Democratic Party in supine obeisance to the White House negate the traditional dutiful deliberations of the House of Representatives.

There is in operation a committee on legislative oversight. It is really a committee on legislative hindsight—a cleanup committee.

As a result of the haste of the President and his congressional lieutenants to have all America, indeed, all the world, taste the elixir of the Great Society and glory in its clean air, clean water, free education, free medicine, free culture, free rent, and highway beauty, the entire Congress will spend a good deal of the next session as one big committee on legislative oversight.

CONVOCATION ADDRESS BY BRIG. GEN. DAVID SARNOFF

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, October 12, Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff was a special guest and speaker at a convocation held at Hendricks College, Conway, Ark., at which time he delivered a magnificent speech. I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include therewith the splendid remarks made by General Sarnoff on this occasion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SUGAR

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that the nearer the knife is to the bone, the greater the bleeding, we in this House yesterday passed the so-called sugar bill, but today the Under Secretary of Agriculture says in leading off before the Committee on Finance of the U.S. Senate that "the basic bill fails to allocate quotas to foreign countries on any objective basis."

Mr. Speaker, that is a quotation.

He says further that our passed bill differs from the administration recommendation in three main respects according to U.P.I. release No. 82 of today:

> The House-passed bill does not allocate quotas to foreign countries on a performance basis, or, in fact, on any objective basis.
>
> The House-passed bill seriously weakens provisions which are necessary to stabilize sugar prices and promote an orderly market.
>
> The House bill includes special consideration provisions with respect to both the allotment of mainland sugarcane and sugarbeet crop acreages.

He is urging the Senate to completely clean up the House bill and adopt the original bill. I certainly hope that he will not undertake to write the bill himself or to make the allocations but that his testimony will result in tabling the bill for 1965, in hope that 1966 will bring saner minds and cooler brows.

Mr. Speaker I here insert the entire release under prior authority granted by unanimous consent:

> WASHINGTON.—The administration said today a House-passed sugar bill fails to allocate quotas to foreign countries "on any objective basis."
>
> The statement was made by John A. Schnittker, Under Secretary of Agriculture, in urging the Senate Finance Committee to substitute an administration proposal for the House bill.
>
> The sugar bill, which would be effective through 1971, would continue a program under which the Government controls all sugar marketing in the United States through a system of quotas for domestic and foreign producing areas.
>
> Schnittker was the first witness in the Finance Committee hearings on the bill, which was passed by the House yesterday. A list of more than 30 witnesses was cut down to 19 in an effort to complete the hearings today.
>
> But chances of swift approval were somewhat clouded. Several Senators were prepared to offer alternatives to the bill and extensive questioning kept Schnittker in the witness chair throughout the morning.
>
> He said the House bill differed from the administration recommendations in three main respcts:
>
> "The House-passed bill does not allocate quotas to foreign countries on a performance basis, or, in fact, on any objective basis.

"The House-passed bill seriously weakens provisions which are necessary to stabilize sugar prices and promote an orderly market.

"The House bill includes special consideration provisions with respect to both the allotment of mainland sugarcane and sugarbeet crop acreages."

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I said I "hoped" to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the political contributions of the sugar lobbyists or their agents, as they might relate to the end product of their efforts which the House voted upon yesterday. All will note that I did not and would not in deference to comity. The nearer the scalpel to the bone the greater the bleeding.

I stressed the word "hope" because the lobbyists who were the subject of much of yesterday's discussion have not revealed much over the years. A partial list is in the previous day's RECORD. It seemed to me that if the public could not be advised of such contributions until now, at least it might be healthy for the House to consider the bill with the possibility, the hope, that such information might be forthcoming.

With several hundred thousand dollars in foreign funds supporting the efforts to get preferential sugar quotas, it taxes the imagination to suppose that none of these funds have found their way into political campaigns as part of the overhead.

Since none of the lobbyists have rushed forward to indicate the scope of their political activity, I suppose this must remain an eternal mystery.

Perhaps some enterprising reporter can do better. But until such time, the matter of the sugar money and how it spills into politics, apparently is destined to fade away, just like those little sugar cubes that dissolve in a cup of coffee.

Mr. Speaker, let us get to work and save the Nation from too much Central Government. I repeat, "the nearer the bone, the greater the bleeding."

NATIONWIDE, ORGANIZED ANTI-VIETNAM DEMONSTRATIONS SCHEDULED FOR OCTOBER 15 AND 16

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1965, I spoke to the House on the "Communist Campaign To Oust the United States From Vietnam." On July 24, 1965, I delivered the main address before the annual convention of the Virginia Department of the American Legion at Roanoke, Va., entitled "Communist Attempts to Undermine U.S. Policy in Vietnam." This was inserted in the RECORD by Congressman GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB on July 29, 1965.

Today I wish to make my third and final speech of this session on this most important subject "Nationwide, Organized Anti-Vietnam Demonstrations Scheduled for October 15 and 16."

As we reach the final days of our session, I would like to draw to the attention of my distinguished colleagues some rapidly developing events on our college campuses and elsewhere relative to the Vietnam situation. I think you, and other Americans, will be interested in knowing the cunning, skill, and diabolical purposes of those who seek to vilify this Nation and undermine her policies of preserving freedom.

Last spring our campuses were swept by a giant conflagration of protest. Rallies, demonstrations, and teach-ins were common occurrences. Almost like magic, we heard epithets such as "aggressor," "warmonger," and "imperialist" used to denounce this Nation. Students vied with each other to find new ways of heaping scorn on American policies. Last Easter a student march on Washington was held in which some 15,000 persons protested. Many citizens were shocked by the vehemence and bitterness of many of the students and faculty members.

I want it to be absolutely clear that there are many citizens in this country, including students and teachers, who, for their own personal reasons, disagree with our policy in Vietnam. These persons are not by any stretch of the imagination Communists or even sympathetic with the Communist position. We must be extremely careful not to label all opposition to America's foreign policy as Communist. This would be wrong. I have emphasized this point many times in the past.

However, on the other hand, we must not overlook the sinister role which the Communist Party and its allies are playing in this situation, especially on college campuses. Just to view these demonstrations as "children's fun" or the pranks of an adolescent minority, without realizing what role they play in Communist strategy, is to take lightly our obligations of citizenship.

The position of the Communist Party has been one of unremitting hostility to American participation in the Vietnam hostilities. The party wants us to withdraw our troops and stop military aid to the South Vietnamese Government. In other words, it seeks a complete Vietcong victory.

As far back as March 1964, for example, the party's national headquarters in New York City sent a directive entitled "The United States and South Vietnam Developments" to all its districts. Party members were urged to send telegrams of protest to President Johnson, to place advertisements in newspapers throughout the country, to organize protest meetings and picket lines and to enlist the support of non-Communist groups.

Since that date, the party's pressure has been relentless and unceasing. After President Johnson ordered air bombardment of North Vietnam military targets, the party voice became more strident. Communist leaders worked frantically to encourage rallies, demonstrations, and teach-ins. Key leaders such as Arnold Johnson—the party's top public relations man—and Michael Zagarell—National Youth Director—participated in the Easter March on Washington. From the party's point of view, the Vietnam student protest movement had become an effective tactic to promote its own subversive aims.

A key factor in the party's strategy, of course, was the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs, its front group for young people. Founded in June 1964, this group became active on many campuses during the last academic year and participated in many of the student demonstrations. In Berkeley, Calif., Bettina Aptheker, daughter of Herbert Aptheker, well-known Communist, was one of the most outspoken of DuBois leaders.

In June came the summer recess. But the party and its associated groups were not inactive. As Members of this House, you will recall, for example, the demonstrations held here on Capitol Hill last August by the so-called assembly of unrepresented people. On October 15 and 16, we are to witness the first major nationwide organized anti-Vietnam demonstration of the new academic year—what has been billed as "International Days of Protest." On these days massive civil disobedience is being planned, with demonstrations, parades, and rallies throughout the country. According to advance announcements, this is to be a shot heard around the world, designed to ridicule this Nation and its Vietnam policy.

Let us look a little more closely at this so-called international days of protest. Though some will want us to believe that this project is spontaneous and comes from the hearts of the students, actually it has been carefully and devilishly planned by those who would rejoice in our defeat.

The Vietnam Day Committee—VDC—was the original sponsor of the idea of an international days of protest. This group had its origin in demonstrations last May at the University of California at Berkeley.

What is the Vietnam Day Committee? Actually, it is a type of holding company consisting of representatives of groups which for some time have been firing the smudge pots of hatred, venom, and distrust against American policy in Vietnam. In the VDC we find such assorted types as the Progressive Labor Party, well known for its pro-Red Chinese sentiments, and its youth front, the May 2 movement. Who else, we might ask, would want a Vietcong victory more? This vociferous and dangerous splinter group represents the hand of Mao Tse-tung inside our country.

In addition, there is SNCC, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, one of the most militant of the civil rights groups, the Trotskyite Socialist Workers Party and its youth front, the Young Socialist Alliance.

Still another group is the Students for a Democratic Society. This group is a militant Socialist-oriented youth group which preaches an anarchist-nihilist program of derisive mocking of American institutions and values. The SDS incidentally was the prime sponsor of the Easter march on Washington and reportedly has some 2,000 members in 80 chapters.

Early in September, the SDS held a national council meeting at Bloomington, Ind., attended by some 100 delegates. Discussion focused, among other things, on what steps could be taken to encourage young men to avoid military service. The national council eventually adopted a program of legal tactics relative to avoiding the draft, but much of the debate centered on support for illegal acts. Draft registrants, for example, are to be counseled to pressure their draft boards for exemption on the basis of conscientious objector beliefs. SDS hopes to secure the services of outside people, such as ministers and attorneys, to counsel young men in carrying out these tactics. In addition, SDS hopes, if possible, to file lawsuits against draft board actions and organize protest demonstrations. The whole purpose is to harass military recruitment.

Of course, as could be expected, the Vietnam Day Committee has felt the touch of Communist influence. DuBois Clubs members are actively participating in the VDC. In July, for example, the VDC was one of the sponsors of a rally and march at the Universty of California at Berkeley. Among the speakers were Mario Savio, well-known leader of the university's free speech movement last spring, and Bettina Aptheker. Seldom has a young person—Bettina Aptheker—been more active in behalf of party causes. This young woman has been highly trained, disciplined, and taught by her father to carry on the work of promoting the interests of the Soviet Union in this country. In this father-daughter combination we see what fanaticism the Marxist-Leninist ideology can produce.

The Vietnam Day Committee was the driving force behind the recent widely publicized incidents of trying to stop troop trains proceeding to the Oakland Army Terminal in Oakland, Calif. This shows the extent to which these fanatics will go to jeopardize our national security and inflame others to support their cause. They believe in direct action, being virtual guerrillas inside the United States for the Vietcong.

Leading up to the international days of protest we have witnessed the outbreak in various areas of the country of what might be called preliminary brush fires—designed to build up enthusiasm for the October demonstration and to serve, as it were, as fire drills for the real thing.

Some dozen students and faculty members from Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa., picketed an industrial firm, the Hamilton Watch Co., Lancaster, on September 27, 28, and 29. Known as the Lancaster Committee for Negotiated Peace in Vietnam, this group was protesting the company's manufacture of war material. Early last month students at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore passed out leaflets at Fort Holabird, Md., protesting U.S. action in Vietnam. The New Haven-Yale Committee for Peace in Vietnam and a group by the name of "End the Draft" held a demonstration in September in New Haven, Conn.

At Arizona State University, the Philosophy Club is planning to hold a public meeting on the university campus to discuss the Vietnam situation on October 15. The Students for a Democratic Society chapter at the University of Illinois plans to picket the University of Illinois Armory on October 14–16 as a protest against American intervention. In Austin, Tex., the University of Texas SDS chapter plans a cruel and gruesome project. It will sponsor a "death march," with participants wearing death masks. A hearse and coffin will be in the line of march, with the coffin bearing a child depicting a dead Vietnamese baby.

Important direction for this massive demonstration of civil disobedience and protest is coming from the National Coordinating Committee to End the War in Vietnam with headquarters in Madison, Wis. This again is a holding type group and among its chief participants is the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs.

The Communist Party is overjoyed with the international days of protest. Party leaders are working feverishly to help prepare the mass demonstrations. From the party's point of view, these demonstrations will greatly aid its agitation and propaganda programs. National party headquarters, for example, has sent all party districts a list of slogans to be used in the campaign to end the war in Vietnam. Sample slogans include such phrases as "Withdraw all U.S. troops," "Halt all acts of torture," "End gas and chemical warfare."

What are these student rebellions leading to? What does the future hold?

These are serious questions which should concern my colleagues.

Last spring Prof. Eugene D. Genovese, of Rutgers University, was quoted as saying that he welcomed a Vietcong victory. A few days ago a press item noted that Staughton Lynd, professor of history at Yale, and James Mellen, a history instructor at Drew University, agreed with Professor Genovese. Here we have high-ranking intellectuals, in contact with youthful minds, pouring out a poison which seeks the defeat of this Nation. If ever professors were failing their students, here are prime examples.

It is my observation that the so-called new left, involving a combination of Communists—both Russian and Chinese styles—Trotskyites, and Socialist-oriented groups, such as the Students for a Democratic Society, represents a grave threat to our American way of life. Through civil disobedience tactics, they seek to disrupt the law, the peace of the community and the integrity of our colleges as institutions of learning. Some are virtually anarchist in spirit. They display a cruelly defeatist, negative, and antitype attitude. Their chief aim is not to improve weaknesses in our society or offer new avenues of democratic approach. Instead, they castigate, indict, and defame our values. These students are quick to denounce the barbaric actions of American troops, but say absolutely nothing about Vietcong atrocities. They are victims of a double vision—of self-righteous indignation about our cause and a complete willingness to overlook the evil of Communist aggression and inhumanity.

Let me illustrate, for example, the brazenness of communism on the university campus. Big posters were recently displayed on the University of California campus at Berkeley openly advertising classes in Marxism-Leninism. Here is the exact wording of one of them:

> Register for classes in Marxism-Leninism taught by revolutionaries, Thursday, September 23, 142 Dwinelle, 7:30 p.m.

The poster was signed "Campus Progressive Labor"—the pro-Red Chinese organization. Here was a class in Marxism-Leninism being held in a university building.

The Communist hand is becoming more clear. It simply is amazing how in the past few years Communist groups in this country have grown in self-confidence. We find DuBois Clubs openly involved, even seeking publicity for their actions. Their great hope is that communism will "go respectable," that Americans will accept it as a legitimate part of our democratic tradition. Nothing could be more disastrous.

The Communist Party will be the chief beneficiary from the international days of protest.

In recent days there have been indications that the sponsoring groups will not actually go as far in overt civil disobedience as they originally proclaimed—that is, trying to interfere with arms shipments or encourage the destruction of draft cards. But the danger remains that their inflammatory and volatile speeches may fall on the ears of some students who might be goaded into foolish and unlawful actions.

I call upon my colleagues not to be misguided, not to view the international days of protest as something spontaneous, as the genuine outpouring of the sentiments of innocent students. Instead, these days have been skillfully planned by people who do not love our Nation—by people who wish nothing more than to destroy America.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I refrained from voting on rollcall 369 because, under rule 8 of the House I felt that I might have a personal interest in the legislation.

I therefore answered "present" instead of casting a vote.

THE NATIONAL DAY OF THE MALAGASY REPUBLIC

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, on October 14, 1958 the Malagasy Republic was proclaimed as an autonomous state within the French community. On this occasion I wish to extend best wishes to this friendly nation. The Malagasy Republic comprises the island of Madagascar and its dependencies.

The achievements of the Malagasy Republic are impressive. I should like to focus on her educational progress. In 1960, 50 percent of the Malagasy children attended elementary school. Because the government has placed a high priority on education, the nation is now approaching 75 percent attendance. Secondary education is also expanding rapidly. There are now 16 apprenticeship centers and 3 large institutions for technical training. The University of Madagascar, founded in July of 1964, includes a school of engineering, a medical school, a school of agricultural sciences and an institute of social promotion, among others. In 1960 a National School of Administration was established.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to congratulate the Malagasy Republic on her national day.

THE RENT SUBSIDY PROGRAM

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to deplore the action of the House in scuttling the rent subsidy program. This was one of the real hopes of the Great Society program, and it must not be permitted to die in the rush for adjournment. I certainly hope the other body will insist on the full appropriation for the rent subsidy program and that it will appear in the conference report which comes back to the House.

I urge the President and the leadership of the House and Senate to keep Congress in session until the full funds are appropriated for this program, if it takes until Christmas, or January 1. The ill-housed people who are living in the slums of the great cities of this country have been cruelly treated by the action of the House this afternoon. This must be reversed—this must be reversed if the Democratic Party is going to be able truly to point with pride to the record of the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

POLITICAL SCIENTIST JAMES MELLEN

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in the October 8, 1965, issue of Time magazine I find the following paragraph:

> Admittedly, some intellectuals who reject President Johnson's foreign policy would also deplore his capitalism. For example, Political Scientist James Mellen of New Jersey's Drew University admitted at a teach-in last week that he is "a professed Marxist" and would like to see the Communists win in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I checked up on this Mr. Mellen and found that he received a graduate fellowship at the University of Iowa in 1961 under title IV of the National Defense Education Act. It was a 3-year award in international relations and comparative government.

He received $2,000 the first year, $2,200 the second and $2,400 for the third, or a grand total of $6,600 from the U.S. Government.

To qualify for this grant Mellen had to sign a loyalty oath.

Mr. Speaker, the American taxpayers must be thrilled that their tax dollars went to a professed Marxist who wants the Communists to win in Vietnam. How many more characters like Mellen have received similar grants? Should not the Justice Department prosecute a man who signs a loyalty oath but who admits that he is a Marxist?

RESIGNATION FROM THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

> CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
> HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
> *Washington, D.C., September 20, 1965.*
> The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
> *Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,*
> *The Capitol, Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MR. SPEAKER: With regret, I find it necessary to resign my membership to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.
>
> It was a great deal of pleasure serving with this distinguished group, which is and has done such constructive work for the Congress and the Nation.
>
> With kind personal regards, I am,
> Sincerely yours,
> HARLEY O. STAGGERS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

DE GAULLE'S UNANSWERED CHALLENGE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, are President de Gaulle's complaints of American domination in NATO justified?

Many Americans will be astonished to learn that throughout NATO's entire 16 years U.S. officers have always held the two supreme command posts. Of the 10 principal subordinate commands, French officers have never held more than 1. United Kingdom officers have always held six and United States the remaining three. Officers of Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark, Norway, Luxembourg, West Germany, Italy, Portugal, Canada, Turkey, and Greece have never held a principal command position and do not now. Iceland, the other member of NATO, has no national military force.

On September 9 De Gaulle warned that France will "end the subordination which is described as integration"—at the very latest—when the North Atlantic Treaty reaches its 20th year in 1969.

This has been widely presented in the United States as a rejection of any Atlantic integration, although the French President stressed that his objection was to the present form of integration which to him means the "subordination" of his country.

France has repeatedly stated that the present command structure is not acceptable. In fact, these complaints were first voiced before De Gaulle's return to power. Today, the complaint comes principally from France. Tomorrow it may be from Germany, Britain, or others.

We should ask ourselves how we would feel if the situation were reversed, with U.S. officers never permitted to hold more than one lonely subordinate command post in the entire structure.

De Gaulle is aware of course that the relative power of members is usually reflected in the structure of any alliance or league. In the United Nations, for example, certain countries have privileged status on the Security Council. In NATO only the United States, Britain, and France are represented on the standing group.

But clearly he warned this practice has been carried to excess in NATO, and to the disadvantage of France. We can note that the practice has also worked to the disadvantage of other European allies. Germany, Italy, the Low Countries, and others—all have valid claims to proper representation in NATO's command structure.

The charge was serious and deserved immediate, courteous, and sympathetic attention.

It should have been dealt with affirmatively. Instead the administration prepared only for retreat.

President Johnson recently said of NATO:

> We must maintain its strength and we must continually update it to serve the common aspirations of us all.

But the only action his administration has taken is negative—preparations in anticipation of French withdrawal.

This totally negative response tends to strengthen French complaints and more than cancels out the affirmative words. It directly contradicts the partnership spirit of NATO. If pursued, it will tend to give substance to De Gaulle's charge of U.S. domination. And, perhaps most dangerous of all, it unwittingly plays into the hands of the long-term scheme, often attributed to De Gaulle, to establish French dominance over Western Europe, in substitution for what De Gaulle calls Anglo-Saxon hegemony.

Some observers attribute De Gaulle's words and actions to a desire to wreck NATO. This conclusion is guesswork. The important question today is what the United States will do: ignore the challenge and pursue our present passive and uncreative course, talking affirmatively but acting negatively? Or, take forward action to meet legitimate complaints?

The latter course is the wise one. It might bring to the surface and clarify De Gaulle's true intentions. It would provide our other NATO allies the opportunity to establish their rightful position within NATO, without having to submit to the exclusive dominance of one man or nation. Certainly, it would make NATO stronger no matter which way France ultimately turns.

WHAT DE GAULLE REALLY SAID

De Gaulle's charge must not be brushed aside, or even left for tomorrow. It touches our national security at its most critical point, its very heart. It comes from our oldest ally, a nation that could not possibly be more strategically located from the standpoint of alliance organization, force deployment, logistics, and geography.

Former President Eisenhower, in commenting on De Gaulle's latest warning, stressed France's strategic importance. Without France, he said, NATO would be in a "difficult" military position. Much the same, of course, could be said for a number of NATO nations.

Indeed NATO without France, or without Germany or the Low Countries, for example, would be as crippled as the United States would be if shorn of our central area, the Midwestern States.

If the United States continues to respond to De Gaulle's charges only by planning NATO retreat, it does so at grave hazard to our security.

FUNDAMENTAL QUESTIONS

The French President has raised several fundamental questions. To what extent does the United States dominate this structure? To what extent are other nations subordinate? To what extent are the military forces of NATO really integrated?

Here are the facts—drawn from NATO Handbook, 12th edition, May 1965, published by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Information Service, the NATO Military Command and Organization charts, April 1965 issue, published by the NATO standing group—on forces that are assigned and therefore under NATO command.

Germany's entire forces are fully assigned, but the other member nations have assigned only part of their forces.

Additional forces—some of them substantial—are earmarked by some allies for automatic assignment in the event of war. In peacetime these are operated and trained only by national commands.

None of the strategic nuclear weapons or principal strategic forces of any ally is either assigned or earmarked to NATO. They are completely under national control and presumably would remain so in time of war.

The recent report that De Gaulle wants NATO military bases on French soil commanded by Frenchmen has been interpreted in some quarters as "excessive nationalism." But what is the situation in other nations? No bases under foreign or NATO command are located in our country. No NATO forces of a foreign nationality are presently stationed in Canada, Norway, Denmark, Belgium, or Luxembourg. In addition, both Norway and Denmark prohibit the stationing of foreign troops or the placement of nuclear weapons within their territory.

Who really controls the central command structure of NATO? The top authority is extremely complex with a 14-member Military Committee and a 3-member executive agency called the Standing Group. Both are permanently located in Washington.

The Military Committee consists of officers named by the military chiefs of the NATO nations. According to the official NATO Handbook, it has "effective powers of decision."

The Standing Group, which is in continuous session, consists of the American, British, and French members of the Military Committee. According to the handbook, this Group "is the superior body responsible for the highest strategic guidance . . . (and) to which the NATO commanders are responsible."

As a practical matter, the authority of the Standing Group and Military Committee is limited.

Critical analysis shows that the real military authority in the Alliance resides in the U.S. President.

This is because the basic power of the Alliance depends on U.S. nuclear weapons, all of which are under the exclusive authority of the American President.

Restrictive United States and British-Canadian policies have effectively blocked other NATO nations from participation in NATO nuclear matters. This has not kept France from developing its own nuclear weapons, but has kept French nuclear power from being coordinated with that of the United States and Britain.

This unfortunate nuclear "caste" system considerably diminishes the status of the French representative on the Standing Group.

Who holds the principal NATO command posts?

The strategic area covered by the North Atlantic Treaty is divided among two supreme commands, Allied Command, Europe, and Allied Command, Atlantic, and a third but less important one, Allied Command, Channel.

Of the three, only Allied Command, Europe, headed by the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe—SACEUR—has substantial forces assigned to it and therefore is actually integrated. This command covers the area extending from the North Cape of Norway to the Mediterranean and from the Atlantic to the eastern border of Turkey—excluding the United Kingdom, the defense of which does not fall under the responsibility of any one NATO command; and Portugal, which is covered by the Atlantic command.

Although SACEUR is theoretically subordinate to the Standing Group, he has the right of direct access to the Chiefs of Staff of any of the NATO members and in certain instances to the Defense Ministers and heads of state. All NATO members, except Iceland, maintain a National Military Representative at SHAPE, which is SACEUR's headquarters in Paris.

By informal arrangement, SACEUR has always been a U.S. officer, currently Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer. He has a principal deputy and three special deputies, one each for air, naval, and nuclear affairs.

His principal deputy has always been a British officer, currently Marshal Sir Thomas G. Pike. His air deputy has always been an American officer—currently Gen. Robert M. Lee. The naval deputy was a French officer until 1961 but since then has been a British officer—currently, Rear Adm. R. C. P. Wainwright. The nuclear deputy, recently created, is a Belgian officer—Lt. Gen. F. V. P. van Rolleghem.

Five subordinate commands are directly responsible to SACEUR: First, Northern Europe, always commanded by a British officer, currently Gen. Robert Bray; second, Central Europe, always commanded by a French officer, currently Gen. Jean A. E. Crepin; third, Southern Europe, always commanded by a U.S. officer, currently Adm. Charles D. Griffin; fourth, Mediterranean, always commanded by a British officer, currently Adm. Sir John G. Hamilton; and fifth, United Kingdom Air Defense Region, always commanded by a British officer, currently Air Marshall Sir Douglas Morris.

The Atlantic command has no assigned forces—only forces earmarked for assignment in wartime. It extends from the North Pole to the Tropic of Cancer, and from the North American coastal waters to those of Africa and Europe—including Portugal, but not the English Channel, and British Isles.

Its supreme commander—SACLANT—has always been a U.S. officer—currently Adm. Thomas H. Moorer. His deputy has always been a British officer—currently Vice Adm. I. W. T. Beloe.

Five subordinate commands are directly responsible to SACLANT: First, Western Atlantic, always commanded by a U.S. officer, currently Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, who is also SACLANT; second, Eastern Atlantic, always commanded by a British officer, currently Adm. Sir Thomas E. Madden; third, Striking Fleet, Atlantic, always commanded by a U.S. officer, currently Vice Adm. Klever S. Masterson; fourth, Submarine Atlantic, always commanded by a U.S. officer, currently Vice Adm. V. L. Lowrance; and, fifth, Iberian Atlantic, not yet activated.

In 1961, France proposed the creation of a subordinate Atlantic command which would have merged the Iberian area with the Western Mediterranean Command and requested it be placed under a French commander. The proposal was not accepted. In 1964, the French Government announced that its Atlantic naval forces which had been earmarked for NATO were no longer so designated.

The Channel Command covers the English Channel and southern North Sea. Its Commander-in-Chief has always been a British officer and is currently Adm. Sir Wilfrid Woods. His Maritime Air Advisor has always been a British officer and is currently Air Marshall P. D. Holder.

The total activated NATO commanders and top deputies are thus divided—7 United States, 8 United Kingdom, 1 French, and 1 Belgium. Since the United States seven include both of the two supreme commanders, SACEUR and SACLANT, and since two of Britain's eight are deputies, with relatively little power, it will be readily observed that the U.S. has always dominated the command structure of NATO with the British always second, the French a low third—and with no principal position whatever to the other nations.

To summarize:

To what extent are the military forces of NATO integrated?

None of the strategic nuclear weapons is integrated. None is even earmarked for NATO command in wartime.

None of the tactical nuclear weapons is actually integrated. Even those assigned to NATO forces can be used only on specific authority of the U.S. President.

No naval forces are integrated.

Only SACEUR commands NATO forces which can properly be called integrated.

To what extent does the United States dominate the NATO military command structure?

Because of the importance of U.S. nuclear weapons, the U.S. dominates the top NATO military authority, the three-member Standing Group and its parent group, the Military Committee.

U.S. officers hold the two top field command positions—SACEUR and SACLANT—and always have.

U.S. officers hold three of the four principal subordinate commands under SACLANT, and one of the five under SACEUR—and always have.

A U.S. officer—SACEUR—has the supreme command of the only NATO forces which can be called integrated.

To what extent are France and other allies subordinate?

A French officer holds only one of the five subordinate commands of Allied Command, Europe, and his command of this is even qualified in a vital respect. The tactical nuclear weapons assigned to this command are actually controlled by "subordinate" U.S. officers whose authority for their use comes by a U.S. chain of command which begins with the U.S. President and completely bypasses the French officer.

With the exception of Britain, all other nations are even more subordinate than France.

NATO is a far cry from the integrated, militarily-efficient structure many believe it to be. Calling it integrated does not make it so.

Germany is the only member of the Alliance whose military forces are fully integrated.

The command structure itself is so dependent on U.S. decisions that it could not possibly function in a crisis except as an appendage of the U.S. Department of Defense.

This arrangement was probably inevitable when NATO was formed in 1949. Then the nations of Europe, struggling to rebuild from the rubble of war, necessarily looked to the United States for both leadership and aid.

Now all of these proud nations deserve a more important role in NATO. One of them—France—is plainly demanding changes.

Prompt action is needed to keep NATO from falling apart.

The NATO facts-of-life must be faced squarely, and chief among them is that the United States does indeed dominate the military structure.

In my opinion, it does so to an unnecessary degree.

The United States could make several substantial improvements on its own initiative.

They are:

First. Authorize full exchange of nuclear military information among all three members of the Standing Group—the United States, Britain, and France. This would end an unfortunate caste system. France is a nuclear power, and therefore the provisions of the U.S. Atomic Energy Act should be no bar to full exchange of information within the Standing Group.

Second. Yield some of the U.S. command positions in NATO to make possible a more reasonable division of them among officers of other nations. Former President Eisenhower recently suggested that a French officer be named SACEUR.

Certainly the key positions should be more fairly distributed—perhaps rotated—thus creating a command structure that reflects a greater degree of partnership.

Third. Withdraw the U.S. veto over tactical nuclear weapons assigned to NATO. The line of authority over all assigned weapons and other forces must be clear, without lateral interference.

These reforms should be brought about at the earliest possible date.

They would give long-needed substance to our repeated avowals that we do not wish to dominate.

Although modest compared with what needs to be done to strengthen the Atlantic Community, they would revitalize the spirit of partnership that has always been the NATO ideal, upgrade and make more efficient the NATO military command and hopefully lead to a greater force integration and less complaint about U.S. domination.

These basic reforms are needed, whether France stays in the alliance or not.

Regardless of what his intentions may be, the French President has rendered a service in focusing attention on weaknesses in NATO. Real integration of at least a portion of NATO's impressive military might is urgently needed.

The problems afflicting the Atlantic Community of course are not limited to military affairs. They involve trade, monetary, and worldwide policy matters, too.

But military improvements might be the key to other broader successes.

Prompt U.S. action to improve NATO's military command could help tremendously in creating an atmosphere in which these other urgent problems of the Atlantic Community can be solved.

The President of the United States holds the key. Instead of preparing only for retreat, he can open the door which opens forward, a door leading into a structure in which this great community of nations can live, work, and act in close harmony and unity of purpose.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE TAKES THE INITIATIVE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to insert at this point in the RECORD, a tribute to the Mead Corp. of my hometown, Kingsport, Tenn. The Mead Corp., established in 1846, has served the Kingsport area for over 45 years. Recently, it put into operation a waste treatment plant which will help eliminate pollution of the Holston River. I think that this new plant is a striking example of the interest and efforts of private enterprise in our Nation's well-being, and I feel that the Mead Corp. deserves the appreciation of all of us for their acceptance of community responsibility.

I would like to pay special tribute to Mr. V. K. Shannon, Mead's division manager, for the outstanding contribution that he has made to the progress of Mead, to the community, and to the entire area.

A congratulatory editorial was presented by Mr. Walter Crockett on WCYB-TV in Bristol, Va.-Tenn., on September 29, 1965, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD:

MEAD CORP. PROTECTS A RIVER

Our warm commendation and congratulations go to the Mead Corp.'s Kingsport division. Today, Mead put into operation a new half-million-dollar waste treatment plant which will almost fully eliminate pollution of the Holston River.

As Mead Division Manager V. K. Shannon, said:

"Investment for waste treatment facilities cannot be compared to investments in pulp and papermaking equipment because it will produce no economic returns. It is an expenditure made because we recognize our responsibilities for stream improvements in the area."

Actually, Mead's concentration on stream improvement goes back several years when concentration was on recovery of valuable fiber, filler, and chemicals used in the process of manufacture. It included recovery furnaces, and installations permitting the reuse of water. These permit the saving of 8 million gallons of water per day.

Several years ago the Olin Mathieson Corp., at Saltville, Va., spent a great sum to control its waste into the North Fork of Holston River.

Other industries in our region have stepped forward with waste control and antipollution programs.

These industries are dependent on water, and they—far better than the public—know the full necessity of a national program to protect our water resources in every way—from the watershed to the control of flow in streams.

Mead Corp., at Kingsport, is one of the most substantial industries in our area.

From a mill which produced 55 tons of pulp daily when it began operation in 1917, it has grown into the second largest manufacturing facility in the Mead national organization—with a Kingsport daily pulp production of 240 tons.

Moreover, there is now under construction a multi-million-dollar modernization and expansion program at Kingsport which includes additional finishing facilities and replacement of old equipment.

In the beginning of Mead at Kingsport it employed 80 people. Employment jumped to 556 by 1937, and in 1964 the 1,125 employees of the Kingsport division earned $8,802,000.

Last year, Mead at Kingsport spent over $1,800,000 for pulpwood from regional suppliers. Its tax, freight and coal bill in 1964 amounted to another $5,800,000.

The Mead Corp. is 1 of the 10 largest paper and paperboard companies in the Nation, and 1 of the most diversified in the industry with a total employment of 17,000 people and sales exceeding one-half billion dollars.

We welcome new industry to our area, but we get a special exhilration from the expansion of our established plants. An even greater source of satisfaction is their happy relationship with employees * * * the pride and sense of responsibility which these industrial families have in their communities.

Mead's Kingsport division today gave another example of that sense of community responsibility, and for its long past record and the present, Mead has the admiration, respect, and cooperation of the people in our region.

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY—A THREAT TO AMERICAN FREEDOM

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Dwyer] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, there is a reluctance in politics and among politicians to "rock the boat," to engage in unnecesary controversy, to offend organized groups or blocs or special interests.

This is often an understandable reluctance—for in our two-party political and governmental system, the emphasis within each party must be on agreement, not disagreement; on those things which unify and bring people together, rather than on what may be divisive.

Nevertheless, there are times when keeping quiet ceases to be a matter of prudence and becomes cowardly and self-defeating. When the words or deeds of certain organizations begin to threaten the stability of our political system or sow the seeds of distrust in our basic political institutions or corrupt the rationality and reasonableness of political debate, then silence becomes irresponsible and dangerous. Caution is no longer a virtue when it encourages doubt or ambiguity about such basic issues of political integrity.

Such an issue, I believe, has been posed by the extremist activities of radical rightwing groups in America of which the John Birch Society is the most notorious. And so the time to speak up is now—not because the danger to the Nation is immediate but because it will become so if responsible political leaders fail to expose and oppose the danger in time. We have, I hope, learned our lesson from the Nazi experience in prewar Germany and from Communist attempts at infiltration here and abroad.

In its organization and operations, the John Birch Society violates many of the basic principles of our free society. It functions as a secret organization. Its policies and activities are dictated from above and it operates under the completely authoritarian direction of its president, Robert Welch. It denies the right to disagree, to engage in open and responsible debate. It attacks our free institutions—our Government, our press, our churches, our schools. It charges our national leaders—including such men as former President Eisenhower and the late Secretary of State Dulles—with being conscious agents of the Communist conspiracy. It indicts the entire Nation with the allegation that 60 to 80 percent of the country is now under Communist control. It deals in political subversion, attempting to undermine political parties, local school boards and governing bodies. It seeks its objectives through harassment and intimidation of public officials, through character assassination, the spreading of unfounded accusations, the creation of fear and suspicion. It is blind, arbitrary, wrong—and determined.

It is also close to home, to the home of every one of us. It has the money, organization and influence to penetrate all sections of America. In my own State of New Jersey—surely one of the country's most enlightened—it has grown, according to its president, from 3 to 100 chapters with the help of paid organizers. It is active in my own congressional district spreading its message of hate and fear.

It is not enough, as some have naively suggested, to say that Robert Welch must go as the society's president and to invite its members into an established political party. For the people who join the John Birch Society and remain as members accept its doctrine, share in its intrigue, and follow its direction. It is not enough to dismiss the organization as simply a fringe group, as the hypercautious would have us do, for Birchites are to the body politic what a sickness is to the body physical.

The responsibility of opposing the John Birch Society rests most heavily on the Republican Party and its leaders, for the avowed and active purpose of the group is to infiltrate our party, depose its leaders, take over its machinery, and refashion the party in the society's ugly image. While there is every evidence that as many Democrats as Republicans belong to the John Birch Society, our party is the target and we must be alert to the threat.

I welcome, therefore—as the huge majority of decent Republicans must also welcome—the strong statements of Republican leaders like Congressman Ford and Senators Dirksen and Morton—who likened the society to the Ku Klux Klan and the Communist Party—that there is no place in the Republican Party for the John Birch Society or for those who follow its policies. The outspoken condemnation of the society and its policies by such leading conservatives as William Buckley and the National Review is also a source of gratification.

There must be no doubt in anyone's mind about the attitude of Republicans toward Birchites. There is, of course, plenty of room in both parties for genuine conservatives who have made a constructive contribution to American politics, just as there is for responsive liberals. But the John Birch Society is not conservative—it is radical, it is reactionary, it is destructive. Nor is the society political—it is essentially clandestine and opposed to the free and open process of decisionmaking that is vital to politics and government.

In the final analysis, however, the success or failure of the John Birch Society depends on the American people. While it is the obligation of political leaders to expose the danger and—within their jurisdictions—to oppose the threat—it is the people in their sovereign wisdom who must make the decision. And the decision will be made a million times and in a million ways, at district and precinct political meetings, at local elections, in individual responses to Birchite threats and propaganda, in attendance and participation at church, school, and other organizational activities.

A small but well-organized and disciplined force can make a lot of trouble, Mr. Speaker. But an informed public, which will fight for its freedom, keep its head, and listen to the lessons of history, will not be subverted.

ILLINOIS OPTOMETRIC ASSOCIATION RECOGNIZES CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM L. SPRINGER AS DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC OFFICIAL OF THE YEAR

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Illinois Optometric Association, at its annual meeting in Chicago, presented three awards for outstanding service in the field of health. In recognizing Congressman William L. Springer, of the 22d District of Illinois, as its distinguished public official of the year, the following commendation was presented by Dr. J. A. Potter, president of the association:

The past 3 years have seen a dramatic upsurge in vital health legislation in the Congress. The entire field of health endeavor has been touched in some way by the far-reaching programs guided through the Congress during this time. The Honorable WILLIAM L. SPRINGER of the 22d District of Illinois has been in the forefront of this crusade from the beginning. As ranking minority member of the powerful Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and especially as a member of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare, he has been in a position to influence and guide these important measures along their legislative path to approval and implementation. It is hard to imagine the importance and breadth of these measures and it is difficult to detail and explain his continuing contribution to their evolution.

Health legislation has touched many areas of our lives as professional people and as citizens interested in the health of the Nation. From the immunization of tiny children in every hamlet the program reaches to the building of huge research facilities in our great universities. From the construction of hospitals in your community and mine it reaches to the concentrated assault upon those dread killers—heart disease, stroke, and cancer.

The interest and the work of WILLIAM L. SPRINGER in better health facilities for our citizenry is not a sometime thing, nor is it a zeal lately acquired. It goes back into what might be called the dim beginnings of our now dynamic health programs. The Hill-Burton hospital construction program has had not only his support, but his unflagging effort to better and further it. Years ago he made a detailed study of our medical schools and their problems and he has worked toward the day when a program such as that now embodied in the Medical Educational Assistance Act could be perfected.

The Federal Government has been active in the field of hospital construction and public health assistance to the States for some years now. The massive grants for medical research through the National Institutes of Health are well known and universally applauded. But, more recent and perhaps even more important are the new provisions of law which look to upgrading and expanding the healing arts. We find new concepts of care and new educational opportunities for those who would minister to our health needs. For example, we have a Nurse Training Act, passed by the 88th Congress to increase the numbers and the quality of our nurses through grants to build schools and to help those in being, as well as give some financial support to those who would become nurses. We can thank Congressman SPRINGER for his fine efforts in developing this legislation.

Also, in the 88th Congress we saw for the first time the acceptance of the principle of community mental health care. Facilities at the local level for diagnosis and treatment of mental disorders and also mental retardation were for the first time possible. Now, in this Congress, Mr. SPRINGER was coauthor of the bill which provided for financial assistance to community health centers for adequate staffing.

Medical education was also the subject of a bill introduced by Congressman SPRINGER. It provides for increased assistance in the form of grants to build schools, including those teaching optometry. But more significant and probably more indicative of the attitude and nature of the gentleman from Illinois, it provided for assistance grants to those schools to make possible the necessary upgrading in the quality of instruction and curriculum. It recognized the fact that many qualified and highly desirable students make no attempt to enter the health professions because of finances and it provided for scholarship assistance in proper cases. These are milestones which the health professions and the public may well note now. They will undoubtedly prove to be the important developments in health progress in our time.

On a somewhat different front Mr. SPRINGER has fought successfully for a new approach to combat drug abuse, the increase of which has loomed as a direct and immediate danger to our young people. A bill to make it more difficult to distribute illegal "pep pills" and "goof balls," more properly known as amphetamines and barbiturates, obtained his fighting support amid the welter of objection from affected interests. It is now law and due in great measure to his efforts. As a sequel to this legislation, Mr. SPRINGER has introduced and is now actively promoting a series of bills to provide a new era in the legal and medical treatment of those who succumb to the horrors of drug abuse.

All this indicates that our honoree, WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, is a pioneer spirit in the field of medical legislation. With well directed foresight he sponsors and supports the sound and meaningful measures to promote health programs at all levels, while yet cherishing that which is good and right about the American system of bringing medical care and health assistance to our population. We commend him for his efforts. While we are not unmindful that these efforts have benefited the profession of optometry, it is for the far greater good and broader effort far beycnd our own field of endeavor that we salute him.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure all our fellow Members wish to join me in commending our distinguished colleague, BILL SPRINGER, of Illinois, for his outstanding leadership in the House during his long tenure of service. The commendation which he received from the Illinois Optometric Association merely solidifies the respect with which we hold BILL SPRINGER.

INTRODUCE BILL TO ESTABLISH BIPARTISAN COMMISSION TO STUDY WORLD FOOD NEEDS, POPULATION TRENDS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the world crisis caused by a lack of food is not really felt in the United States of America. But a serious crisis, nevertheless, exists in many parts of the world. And all indications are that it promises to get worse before it gets better.

With my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN], I am introducing today a bill to establish a bipartisan commission which would be charged with the responsibility of studying the questions of world food needs, population trends, agricultural potenial, and coordination of U.S. foreign assistance programs.

The exploding populations of the world are finding it difficult to survive today. Tomorrow, when these populations have doubled and tripled, difficulty may be turned into impossibility. The U.S. know-how in agricultural production, therefore, can be a real humanitarian force and also a keen political instrument.

I hope and trust that there will be broad bipartisan support for this bill.

REPUBLICAN PARTY CONCERNED ABOUT THE PRESENT WORLD FOOD AND POPULATION SITUATION

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party is vitally concerned about the present world food and population situation, and the frightening projections of what promises to be worldwide famine on a mammoth scale.

Clearly, the United States has not only a moral obligation, but also some very practical interests in making sure the world can feed its people.

If we as a nation plan wisely our response to this world problem, an opportunity could be provided for American agriculture to fully realize its potential.

Because of these concerns, and because of our belief that careful planning in this area is an absolute necessity, the House Republican Task Force on Agriculture is recommending that the Congress take a major legislative step toward determining the future U.S. role in the approaching food crisis.

Today, I join with members of the Agriculture Task Force and many other Republican Members of Congress in introducing this joint resolution proposed by the task force "to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends."

Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish the RECORD to include the complete Agriculture Task Force statement regarding this proposal.

STATEMENT BY THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE ON AGRICULTURE, OCTOBER 14, 1965

The House Republican Task Force on Agriculture recommends the establishment of a bipartisan U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to evaluate present and future food needs of the United States and of the world. This Commission would recommend ways and means by which the total complex of American agriculture might be coordinated and implemented toward the end of helping to meet these needs.

CHALLENGE AND OPPORTUNITY

The impending world food crisis presents this Nation with both a challenge and an opportunity—a challenge for us to assume the leadership required to meet a world problem of possible epic proportions, and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

a potential opportunity for American agriculture to achieve a new economic vitality and income stability.

Although this complex world food and population problem has long been foreseen, only recently has it begun to receive the greater public attention it so urgently requires. Unfortunately, however, much of this attention remains entirely superficial in character, limiting itself to loud announcements that there is a problem, and that we "ought to do something about it."

CAREFUL PLANNING

It is imperative that U.S. response to this major world problem be well-considered and carefully planned. There is sufficient evidence to raise serious questions whether past U.S. agricultural assistance and giveaway programs have not sometimes brought more harm than good both to the recipient countries and to U.S. farmers. We must not rush blindly into a gigantic "feed the hungry world" project which would accomplish just the opposite of its objective by magnifying old mistakes and compounding past failures.

FARM OPPORTUNITY

Although we are presented with a potential opportunity for American agriculture, it is an opportunity for good or ill. Hastily planned and executed programs could further endanger the precarious economic position of the U.S. farmer.

On the other hand, effective and sound planning can sow the seed for a new health and vitality for American agriculture—for expanded markets and income, and a brighter future potential. Current problems of inadequate farm income, prices and markets must be of major consideration in any programs this Nation may devise to meet world food needs.

DETERMINE GOALS

It is obvious, then, that our first requirement in planning to meet this tremendous challenge and opportunity must be the bringing together of the best minds in the field to grapple with the basic questions concerning these world problems of population and food, and to emerge with some sound recommendations as to goals and courses of action open to this Nation.

The U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission would be made up of the broadest possible membership. Of the 18 proposed Commission members, 4 would be chosen from the House of Representatives and 4 from the Senate. Of the remaining 10 to be appointed by the President, 1 each would come from the Departments of State and Agriculture, and 8 from outside the Federal Government, to be representative of various farm organizations, private agricultural trade, U.S. land-grant and State colleges and universities, and other agricultural organizations.

COORDINATE AND RECOMMEND

It would be the responsibility of the proposed Commission to make a sound and detailed analysis of the world food and population problem, to draw some conclusions from this analysis, and finally to make recommendations as to what role the United States can play in helping to solve these problems—that is, what our objectives should be and how our resources could be utilized.

In addition to this, as the Commission's study moves along, and the many problem areas in our present policies and programs of foreign agricultural assistance begin to receive some clarification, the Commission would be responsible for calling attention to these problems. It would be authorized to make specific recommendations to the President and the Congress for the correction and improvement of these programs.

FIFTEEN-POINT STUDY

We as a nation are presently faced with a large number of unanswered questions regarding this world food and population problem—questions which must be answered if the United States is to assume a useful and productive role in helping to find satisfactory solutions to these world problems.

The agriculture task force legislation outlines a 15-point study program for the proposed Commission, including many of the major questions which must be answered. The Commission study would include:

1. An examination of present and projected world food needs, related to present and projected world food supply and population levels. We need more explicit, detailed information as to what is actually happening in terms of food production and population expansion in individual countries of the food-deficit and food-surplus areas, thereby providing an adequate basis for U.S. decisions about using American resources to help meet future world food needs.
2. An evaluation of the internal agricultural complexes of food-deficit countries to determine the causes of their inability to meet domestic food needs.
3. A determination of the extent to which U.S. domestic agricultural production could be utilized to meet U.S. domestic needs, necessary reserves, and help meet world food needs as well.
4. An appraisal of the effects which such action could be expected to have on U.S. agriculture and total economy, and the probable effects of such action on the economies of other countries of the world.
5. A study of the total domestic and foreign dollar market potential for U.S. agriculture.
6. An examination of the influence that agricultural commodities stored in U.S. bins has on world prices for these commodities.
7. A study of the effects U.S. shipping rates have on the sale of agricultural commodities abroad.
8. An analysis of the results of past operations under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, with particular reference to agricultural production and utilization in recipient countries, effects on U.S. agricultural exports for dollars, and the projected development and operation of such programs in the future.
9. An exploration of the possibilities for more effective use of the excess foreign currencies which have accumulated under past Public Law 480 programs.
10. A study of the effectiveness of past and present U.S. agricultural aid and economic development assistance to foreign countries, with particular reference to its effects on recipient countries, the degree of coordination among participating U.S. agencies, and other related factors.
11. A determination of the extent to which duplication and overlapping of programs exists among U.S. agencies involved in these foreign assistance activities.
12. An exploration of alternative ways of financing possible U.S. programs designed to help meet world food needs.
13. An analysis of the manifold technical, mechanical, diplomatic, bureaucratic, political and other barriers to present and future U.S. programs designed to assist food-deficit areas of the world.
14. A review of the potential of other food-surplus countries of the world for assistance in meeting world food needs, and a study of methods for coordinating such assistance.
15. An investigation of any other areas which the Commission may find pertinent and related to United States and world food problems.

The object, then, of such a commission is vividly clear. And there is every reason to hope that such a commission could very well prove to be a catalytic agent that would not only help to bring food to the hungry mouths of the world, but also stability and a new vitality to American agriculture.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, although over one-third of the Republican Members of the House have at this time either introduced this legislation or gone on record in support of it, many others have not yet had the opportunity to express their interest. In view of this, a list of supporters of this legislation will be provided for the RECORD at a later date.

THE CREATIVE ROLE OF PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, congressional investigations and Treasury Department review of tax treatment of U.S. privately endowed foundations have naturally been of concern to these organizations.

The Rockefeller Foundation has responded to this public examination in an article titled "Private Philanthropy in a Changing World," a discussion of the role of foundations and the public interest, published in December 1964.

The Rockefeller Foundation has taken the position that:

> It is easy to resent * * * scrutiny—even to dismiss it as unnecessary. But criticism, if objective and if informed, is good for us who work to serve the public and, in any case, we must expect it.

The Rockefeller Foundation welcomed the Treasury Department's review of private foundations' tax exemptions, in the hope that a program of more frequent and searching audits of foundation tax returns should go far to deter misconduct and to expose it when it occurs. It reminded that under the law as it now stands a foundation is not entitled to tax exemption unless it is operated exclusively for authorized tax-exempt purposes. It said:

> The possibility that foundations are being used by individuals and groups not to advance the public welfare, but to serve private interests, is most serious and deserves careful and objective consideration.

Within this context of public responsibility and accountability, however, the Rockefeller Foundation has forcefully stated the need and the case for ample freedom of action for foundations. I wish to emphasize this need. For, even though, in 1961, all U.S. private foundations disbursed only about one penny of every welfare dollar spent, it has been money of the most important kind. As a generality, foundations pick and choose among the vast reservoir of projects, to select those which they are best able to take up fruitfully. Their object is often to give "seed" money to worthwhile though embryonic effort, to provide the catalyst for a group of projects which in combination could contribute much more to the society than separately. Foundations must be free to pick and choose, to invest their scarce dollars in the projects that will bring the greatest possible social return.

As Maimonides recommended, private foundations should seek to perfect the highest form of charity: to search for the root causes of human ills and to seek to eliminate them, rather than to ameliorate their mere symptoms.

Many government-financed and conceived programs simply supplant private efforts. They have not sought to seek reforms at the roots of society's needs. Such government spending often conforms to the Curtis corollary to Gresham's law—which is that bad money drives out good—that government money used uncreatively and injudiciously drives out private money and private effort.

Certainly one judicious and creative use of government funds is, in implementing government programs, to use private organizations wherever possible and desirable, rather than to establish government bureaucracies. There is evidence that U.S. private foundations have contributed creatively in this way to our betterment as a society. I would warn, however, of the corruptive effects of government programs if they can so undermine a private organization's independence as to sway honest judgments and research.

I include the article entitled "Private Philanthropy in a Changing World" in the RECORD at this point:

PRIVATE PHILANTHROPY IN A CHANGING WORLD

FOUNDATIONS AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Philanthropic foundations are once again under government scrutiny. Two congressional inquiries into the operations of tax-exempt foundations were held in the last decade; a third inquiry, under the leadership of Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, has been in progress for many months.

The general attitude of the Rockefeller Foundation toward these investigations is that which was expressed by one of its trustees in a recent speech: "It is easy to resent such scrutiny—even to dismiss it as unnecessary. But criticism, if objective and if informed, is good for us who work to serve the public and, in any case, we must expect it. In a free society—in a changing society—every franchise is to be continually rearned."

There has been evidence, in connection with the current study, that certain foundations are being used by individuals and groups not to advance the public welfare, but to serve private interests. Such a possibility is most serious and deserves careful and objective consideration by public representatives.

In appraising the performance of our foundations, however—and especially in contemplating the possibility of restrictive measures—it is well that we remind ourselves of the nature of this uniquely American institution and of what the people of the United States have received from it in the past and have a right to expect from it in the future.

The foundation as we know it came into its own in the first decade of this century, when a few men of great wealth who were also men of vision and compassion saw that their wealth had grown far beyond their own needs, and could be turned to the welfare of mankind. It should be recalled that this highly civilized idea took form before there were any income or estate taxes at all. Men like John D. Rockefeller and Andrew Carnegie were here concerned with the condition of mankind, not with the avoidance of tax payments. As a result, Carnegie organizations built thousands of free libraries and pioneered retirement benefits for teachers. The Rockefeller Foundation established the pattern of modern public health practices and conducted worldwide campaigns against mass diseases and hunger; today both the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corp. continue in the forefront of private effort for public benefit. There can be little doubt that this same impulse guided the formation of subsequent philathropies, even though many important ones were formed after the income tax legislation of 1913. Among these have been the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, with its great contributions to the fields of medicine, nursing, rural health and nutrition, and to American education generally; the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, which for almost 40 years has provided fellowships to young scholars, scientists, writers, and artists; the Julius Rosenwald Fund, which has helped education in the rural South and has worked to improve race relations; the Twentieth Century Fund, with its major contributions to economic and social research; the Milbank Memorial Fund, long active in public health, especially population research and nutrition; the Russell Sage Foundation, a prime mover in the professionalization of welfare and philanthropic activities; the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, active in medicine, mathematics, and the physical and social sciences; the great worldwide activities of the Ford Foundation, concentrated especially on improvements within America's educational systems, and economic and social progress abroad; and many others.

The achievements of America's tax-exempt foundations, reaching back collectively more than a half century, have established beyond any doubt the soundness of the idea that private wealth can be expended effectively for the public welfare through programs which are privately conceived and administered.

A second and complementary idea has also been confirmed: the public interest is well served if incentives to the establishment of these philanthropies include tax exemptions for such organizations as well as tax reductions for their contributors. As the number of privately endowed foundations has risen over the decades of this century, so have private programs devoted to public advancement. And as time has passed, these programs have become increasingly effective.

At the same time, it is clear that in our time of rapid social change, philanthropies must be prepared to meet the changing requirements of society. There must be constant sensitivity in our foundations to the problems of contemporary society. And there must be internal standards of performance so that the effectiveness of foundation programs is always at its highest.

Equally important, there must be public guarantees that the privilege of tax exemption is not abused by anyone who would exploit the foundation idea for private ends. Should any part of this extraordinary instrument for social progress fall into the hands of cynics who would use it for self-serving purposes, the instrument itself is jeopardized.

The Rockefeller Foundation has welcomed the Treasury Department's recently concluded study of private foundations; its recommendations deserve careful consideration. Furthermore, by revising the information-return forms filed by foundations so as to call for fuller disclosure with respect to foundation operations and by starting a program of more frequent and searching audits of these returns, the Treasury has taken steps which should go far to deter misconduct and to expose it when it occurs. For it seems to be often forgotten that under the law as it now stands a foundation is not entitled to tax exemption unless it is operated exclusively for authorized tax-exempt purposes. Most of the conduct which has come under attack in the current investigation fails to measure up to this standard.

Stricter enforcement of the present law may remove or reduce the need for stricter laws. If additional legislative controls are to be considered to protect the public interest, we urge the lawmakers not to overlook the even greater public interest in maintaining rather than restricting the independence of the vast majority of foundations which seek only to advance the general welfare, and in encouraging rather than stifling the philanthropic impulse to which we owe so much.

The fact is that much remains to be done by the privately endowed, general-purpose foundation. And this ingenious social instrument must not be unnecessarily inhibited as it seeks to apply its unique resources to human need.

It is true that our private foundations represent only a small fraction of the massive welfare resources of the American people and their Government. In the year 1961, for example, all the privately endowed foundations in the country disbursed only about 1 penny of every welfare dollar spent in this country. But we have learned that this comparatively tiny fraction of the total American welfare expenditure has an effectiveness which is greatly disproportionate to its size. The philanthropic dollar which is spent by the experienced and imaginative private servants of the public interest who are working in the foundations can trigger great movements forward in the interest of mankind.

But if they are to perform this vital function of catalyst in human progress, foundations plainly need the understanding and the support of the society they aim to serve. They must have the flexibility of broadly framed charters which enable them to move promptly to the seizure of opportunities across the whole range of human need. They must be able to risk failure against the possibility of opening new vistas of success. They must not be limited in size, for here as with other institutions of social action there is need for the large as well as for the small. They must retain the freedom to move geographically to the point of need—including to places abroad. We have learned, perhaps bitterly, that attending to human problems in a land we hardly know today can spare the tragedy of greatly magnified problems touching us closely tomorrow.

And just as a founder should not be denied the right to determine the amount of his endowment, so also he should not be denied the right to endow with longevity. The gradual evolution of the foundation as a tool of progress during this century has resulted in the accumulation of a totally new reserve of experience devoted to the service of mankind. But this has taken time. The techniques of organized philanthropy are today far more sophisticated and effective than those of a half century ago, and they are far less so than they will be a half century from now. If the life of the Rockefeller Foundation had been limited at the outset and if its mission had been restricted to an attack on epidemic diseases, as an example, progress would have been made, but not progress enough. Mankind would have lost the incalculable benefits of the foundation's programs in aid to education, agricultural development, population stabilization, and assistance to the arts, among many others.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

THE SUMMIT OF CHARITY'S GOLDEN LADDER

Americans, perhaps more than any other people, have cherished the right to contribute their resources and energies for the benefit of others as they see fit: philanthropy has clearly become an indispensable part of our society. As our Nation has grown and prospered and as our society has become more complex, we have enlarged the dimensions of our giving and improved the organization of our philanthropies. Every citizen has the right to give according to his own inclinations to causes in which he believes.

This outpouring of private resources for the public good has resulted in many and varied philanthropic and charitable organizations, until today they are a critically important force—but in terms of total unmet need still a modest one—on the human scene. Some have questioned this proliferation of private organizations and agencies. A few have gone so far as to suggest that all such funds should be channeled through Government agencies. There is little logic in this position and certainly no real understanding of the meaning of giving. The public verdict has been repeatedly rendered by the millions of citizens who through their contributions regularly share their resources with others. It is their money and after bearing their share of the cost of Government, they have both the moral and legal right to respond as they choose.

Many of our most distinguished citizens enthusiastically serve on the boards of philanthropic and charitable institutions and work zealously in their behalf. The late Herbert Hoover, who was throughout his life active in humanitarian causes, paid tribute to private philanthropy when he said:

> "The essence of our self-government lies in the self-government outside political government. The fabric of American life is woven around our tens of thousands of voluntary associations and charitable institutions. That is the very nature of American life. If these voluntary activities were to be absorbed by government agencies, this civilization would be over. Something neither free nor noble would take its place."

Charity, and philanthropy assume many forms. All may be well motivated but there are definite gradations of effectiveness and even of merit. Long ago, Maimonides, the 12th century Jewish philosopher, defined eight degrees of charity. His eighth degree was in effect a statement of the principle of private philanthropy: that the highest and most meritorious form of charity is to anticipate it by preventing the need for it, so that our fellow man would not be forced to the dreadful alternative of asking for it. This Maimonides called the summit of charity's golden ladder.

In modern terms, Maimonides' summit is reached by searching for the root causes of human ills and seeking to eliminate them rather than to ameliorate their symptoms. This is intelligent philanthropy, and many feel that it has reached its fullest expression in the modern private foundation.

Private foundations have sought for decades to encourage individual scholarship; to facilitate communication among educators, scholars, scientists, leaders in government, and others with key responsibilities; to support basic research and its application; to aid education in a variety of ways; to promote more adequate support for the social sciences and humanities as areas of great import; to help remove root causes of disease, hunger, and malnutrition; and in many other ways to advance the welfare of mankind. Often they were among the pioneers in these fields.

It is not suggested that the modern achievements of private philanthropic enterprise should be credited solely to foundations. Although there is no doubt that the senior members of the foundation field and their distinguished younger colleagues have major accomplishments to their credit, it must be remembered that the most important function of foundations is to point the way and to establish guidelines.

To fulfill this function a foundation must establish its program. It is the responsibility of the board of trustees to define the areas in which a foundation will function and, in turn, the responsibility of its executive officers to structure its programs. It is the officers—men of professional training, competence, and experience—who continually face the sensitive task of determining which projects show greatest promise of benefiting humanity; who shoulder the responsibility of selecting from among many proposals of great merit those few to which available funds may be applied.

Unhappily, many meritorious proposals must be declined as falling outside the limits of a foundation's objectives. This is often as difficult to communicate as is the fact that foundation grants must be entrepreneurial in the sense that they should help initiate and develop projects which can realistically be expected to become self-supporting, or to receive public support by reason of demonstrated merit. To give a little help to as many people as possible would be kind, comforting, and perhaps popular, as would general support of worthy projects long after startup needs had been met. But neither would meet the purpose for which private foundations exist.

A consortium of effort

Long ago, when it became evident that neither the church nor private philanthropies could meet the many needs of a growing population, municipal, State, and Federal agencies began to take increasing responsibility for its welfare. This was a slow process; the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was established only in 1953; the National Science Foundation, modeled after private foundations, was founded in 1950 and the National Institutes of Health officially established only in 1948.

Far from resisting the relatively recent introduction of Government resources and programs, vastly greater than those of private agencies, foundations have foreseen and encouraged such transfer of responsibility. Foundations are aware, as their record clearly shows, that their groundbreaking work and pilot projects can be fully meaningful and become widely beneficial only if their values are recognized and their procedures adopted and extended by public agencies. And foundations are also aware that a program adopted by a public agency will free foundation funds for a new venture which, if successful, will itself be so adopted someday.

Today a number of foundations cooperate with governmental and international agencies here and abroad in operating programs affecting the well-being of people in many nations where basic needs in food supply, health, and education are still acute. This consortium of effort, often involving United Nations agencies, international development banks, the U.S. Agency for International Development, local institutions of research and education, and private foundations, has made possible more rapid progress than any single agency, working alone, could achieve.

FOUNDATIONS AND THE FUTURE

There are still many trails yet unblazed—new vistas for constructive giving. We live in an age of seemingly overwhelming problems—the products of the past in newer, larger, and more complex form. Few if any have burst upon an unsuspecting world; rather, they have become impossible to ignore.

Other than total war, the greatest threat we face is the impact of unrestrained population increase upon the world's resources and social structure. Hindsight tells us that efforts to improve sanitation, disease control, food production, and the like should from the beginning have been carried on with an awareness of their impact on population increase and in conjunction with measures toward its stabilization. Although there is the valid excuse that public apathy, and antagonism arising from religious or ethical scruples, have inhibited such action, we realize today that the greater wisdom would have been to begin the battle of population stabilization long ago.

Today, even though apathy and opposition are diminishing and despite a great deal of expressed concern, progress almost everywhere is still too slow to avert the danger of suffocation by numbers.

Some priavte foundations have accepted the challenge and are doing all in their power to work toward the stabilization of population. Because of the nature and sensitivity of the problem, foundations are in a special position to give support on several fronts, including demographic research, studies on the physiology of reproduction, and direct action projects where the need is greatest. They can also promote intensive discussion and social and economic research focused on the problems of population and their solution.

As we work toward population stabilization, we must continue our efforts to combat hunger, disease, and ignorance which condemn so many millions to degradation and misery and tax a multitude of others for their support. Here again private philanthropy can and does work toward the establishment and development of sound programs, adaptable to local conditions and resources, which in combination with efforts to stabilize population offer hope for a brighter future for all.

The stagnating effect of educational disadvantage is clearer today than ever before. Newer nations and resurgent ancient states are painfully aware how difficult an obstacle they face in the lack of people trained for the many forms of leadership and responsibility essential to national progress. The need is so critical and vast that massive and coordinated effort is required to achieve even a moderate advance. Foundations have been among the first to recognize this and to act, and today private and public organizations, working together, are making encouraging progress.

In this country, despite great achievements on many fronts, we have still to solve grave current problems and to overcome some earlier failures. Most critical is the struggle for equal rights and opportunity. In this area, some foundations have a long, if not exclusive, record of concern and action; but gains made over the years have been slow and inadequate. Private philanthropy would seem by definition to have a stake in helping to resolve longstanding inequalities in imaginative and significant ways.

The quality of our society is a matter of interest to all. Even today, support from private sources for the performing arts and for outstandingly creative people is hard to come by. Yet it is from these sources that we can expect stimulating contributions to the tone and substance of our times. Furthermore there is substantial evidence that, given the opportunity, large numbers of citizens, especially young people, would like to have greater experience in the creative and performing arts as participants or spectators. This is a fertile field for experimentation and assistance, and one in which the interest and involvement of a number of foundations are growing.

There are innumerable other ways and fields in which private foundations can contribute to the well-being of mankind. A few examples might include further research in the new needs of education; greater encouragement of the humanities; economic research and its present application to disadvantaged nations; confrontation of the problems of the arid lands of the world, which are coming under greater population pressure; participation in basic studies of water resources; aid to research on the increasingly critical problem of air and water pollution; efforts to reduce or eliminate certain epidemic diseases of domestic animals in the interest of increased protein production; continuing studies and progress in the area of human nutrition; greater effort to understand and utilize marine, brackish-, and fresh-water resources for sustained food supplies. Other subjects which lend themselves to study under the auspices of private philanthropy are: international relations; modern diplomacy; political and constitutional institutions of underdeveloped areas; economic and political history; the causes of war, and methods of disarmament; and the behavioral sciences as they relate to current social ills.

There are many more; no single foundation can tackle more than a few. But fortunately the number and diversity of foundations' program interests enable them to range widely, particularly in areas in which other support is hard to come by. Characterized by imagination, flexibility, and the willingness to pioneer and venture in good cause, foundations are destined to serve the objectives of free society in ever-growing dimensions.

CAPITAL GAINS TAX AT DEATH

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have felt that an objective study should be made of the gestative period required for an idea which has been conceived to become law. This, of course, is meaningless to those who adhere to the Olympian theory that laws spring full grown and fully armed like Minerva from the head of Jove.

For some time I have been aware that something was stirring in the Treasury sector of the Jovian brain to basically alter the taxation of capital gains by taxing them at death. I have felt that a complete reconsideration of the tax treatment of capital gains was very necessary. At the same time I have felt that the great economic and social damage we are experiencing from our present system shows up in what is called locked-in investment, largely resulting from post-World War II inflation and our failure to adjust our tax laws to it and in the tax advantage that larger estates have over smaller estates whose assets consist primarily of the ownership of the business the decedent had started and built during his lifetime.

Far from posing a further burden on the successful business entrepreneur to the advantage of the vested interests with greater liquidity we should be adjusting our taxation of capital gains to encourage and assist the intrepreneur. The path for vested wealth needs no further smoothing at the entrepreneur's expense. A recent article prepared by René A. Wormser appearing in the September 1965 American Bar Journal discusses these basic taxation, economic, and social problems in a most competent way. I am having it reproduced at this point in the RECORD:

THE CASE AGAINST A CAPITAL GAINS TAX AT DEATH

(Rumblings from Washington indicate that the Treasury Department may be reviving a proposal made during the Kennedy administration—that a capital gains tax be assessed at death. Believing that this would be a calamitous and confiscatory turn of events, Mr. Wormser marshals the case against this tax imposition and suggests that the capital gains tax itself be overhauled.)

(By René A. Wormser)

During the administration of President Kennedy the proposal was made that a capital gains tax be assessed at death, but this was rejected by Congress. It is reported that the Treasury again is studying this proposal and may decide to offer it once more to Congress. In commenting on the introduction of bills by Representatives EUGENE J. KEOGH and HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI to raise the $60,000 estate tax exemption to $120,000, the "Tax Report" in the July 7 Wall Street Journal said: "Treasury men acknowledge that domestic estate taxation is due for an overhaul, but they've warned any liberalization should be linked to tougher income taxation of capital gains at death."

I present this summary of most of the arguments against the proposal in the hope that it may help persuade readers that the adoption of the proposal would be most unfortunate.

The proponents of the change allege that the present rule, which gives a stepped-up basis to property held unto death, affords a loophole, one particularly favorable to the rich. Some proponents justify their position with a false comparison. They point out that in the case of a gift the cost basis of the donor is passed on, while in the case of a transfer by death the cost basis of the decedent is obliterated. Insofar as they propose that a capital gains tax be imposed automatically at death, their analogical reasoning is false because no such tax is imposed upon the making of a gift.

Realizing this fault in the analogy, other proponents urge that while there should be no automatic capital gain imposition at death, the decedent's cost basis should be carried over so that, if property that came from an estate is sold, the decedent's cost basis should be applied to determine whether a taxable profit has been reaped. This variety of the proposal is as impractical and punitive as the first.

Some seem to believe that, if there are two ways in which to do something and one results in a lesser tax impact than the other, the first constitutes a loophole which should be plugged. This approach is blind to the fact that our tax system sometimes consciously makes one way of doing a thing more tax-economical than another. To accuse Congress of having created a loophole by having treated gifts more benignly than testamentary transfers seems rather absurd, but if there is any loophole in the respective treatment of the two methods of transfer, it is not in the taxation of testamentary transfers but in the preferred treatment of gifts.

Congress has knowingly established gift tax rates lower than estate tax rates and has granted generous gift tax exemptions. To put it in reverse, Congress has made it far more costly to transfer property by will than by gift. There is another operative discrimination in favor of transfers by gift. In contrast to the operation of the gift tax, the estate tax is in part a tax on a tax. That is, the estate tax is levied on the taxable estate and paid out of the same fund, so that the beneficiaries do not get the full amount of the transfer (as they do in the case of a gift) but only the amount of the transfer after the estate tax itself has been deducted from it.

It is difficult, therefore, to find logic in the claim that one who holds property unto death (whether to get a stepped-up basis for his property or for any other reason) gets away with a something—i.e., passes through a loophole. Leaving property by will is indeed costly.

LOOPHOLE HUNTERS CAUSE COMPLEXITY AND UNSOUNDNESS

Much of the unfortunate tinkering that has produced an Internal Revenue Code enormously complex and in many respects unsound has been prompted by critics who have sought out what they thought to be loopholes, instead of asking for reform based on sound and coordinated principles. They are at it again—this time finding a loophole where there isn't any. True, the testator has the stepped-up basis advantage which the donor of property has not, but the donor has substantial advantages which the testator has not. Moreover, if we were to legislate to plug this alleged loophole, catastrophic practical and sociological results would follow on the error.

A large proportion of estates of men of the middle economic class consists overwhelmingly of stock in enterprises of their own creation, for today it is generally only in corporate form that substantial fortunes can be accumulated. When these men die leaving proportionately little in liquid assets, the problem of producing enough liquidity to pay debts, administration expenses and death taxes, to say nothing of some cash for the family, can be extremely difficult.

If stock held by an estate is traded actively, either on an exchange or over the counter, the liquidating part of it may be comparatively easy—though it is not always so. On the other hand, if the stock is not traded actively, the liquidity problem can result in economic and social tragedy. In the case of the very rich, stock in their enterprises is usually actively traded and a liquidation market is available. So the estate liquidity problem strikes hardest at the proprietors of smaller enterprises, the stock of which is all too frequently found to be in a frozen or frigid condition in an estate.

In the middle-sized and small estates, there is often no solution for the liquidity problem other than a sale of a controlling interest or of all of the stock of the corporation involved. It is not always easy to find a buyer even on this basis. There is, moreover, the collateral, unhappy result of making it impossible to preserve a family enterprise for the family—a result that certainly should not be encouraged by government. There is already a highly undesirable tendency of small businesses to be absorbed by great ones, prompted by the very problem of estate liquidity. To add to the present burden of producing sufficient liquidity the necessity of further liquidation in order to pay a capital gain tax would be oppressive indeed. It would result virtually in an increase in the already heavy death taxes, by whatever name one called the new imposition. And it would accelerate the trend toward mergers and acquisitions.

Nor would the second variety of the proposal (that the cost basis of the decedent be passed on to the recipient) make any sense. If this variety were applied so that only recipients from the estate took over the decedent's cost basis and sales made by the estate itself were given the advantage of a stepped-up basis, a lovely loophole would truly appear. The estate could sell all of its stock and take advantage of the stepped-up basis. So, to plug the real loophole thus produced, the rule that the decedent's basis must be used would have to extend to both

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

types of sales—those by a recipient and those by the estate itself. So, as the estate would have to liquidate substantially and perhaps sell all of its holdings in order to solve its liquidity problem, the second form of the proposal would operate as harshly as the first.

WOULD SECTION 303 BE AVAILABLE?

Whatever the problems of the estate whose decedent held control of an enterprise, consider the added problem of the estate holding only a minority stock interest. Who would buy this minority interest in a small or middle-sized, untraded company? And if there is no purchaser available, how is the estate to liquidate enough to pay its obligations? In some few cases section 303 of the Internal Revenue Code might be available—if the corporate finances permitted, and if the majority stockholders were gracious and if section 303 were amended to permit redemption for capital gains tax purposes. In most instances, section 303 would be unavailable, I suppose, then, that the executors would have to sell the stock at auction. I point out again that it is the smaller and middle-sized estates which would be most injured by the additional necessity of liquidating to pay a capital gains tax at death.

PROBLEMS WITH SECURITIES LAWS

The Federal securities laws are highly desirable. However, they sometimes create difficult problems for an estate to solve, problems that would be increased in severity by the proposed capital gains tax imposition. Take the case of a minority stockholder whose executors are deemed under Securities and Exchange Commission rules to be part of a control group. The executors cannot sell the decedent's stock without a registration, except in a so-called private sale, which is made extremely difficult by the requirement that the purchaser agree to hold the stock for investment and not resell it. Yet the executors cannot register—it is the company which must register, and the executors may not be able to compel the company to do so. For any number of reasons, the company's management may consider a registration not to be in the best interests of the company and the other stockholders, and it will refuse to register the stock. What then, re the liquidation problem? Should this problem be made more difficult by adding to the liquidity needs of the estate?

SPECULATOR FAVORED OVER INVESTOR

The proposal would not only be punitive to the proprietor or part owner of an enterprise, it would be unfair also to the ordinary investor, for it would discriminate against him in favor of the speculator. The speculator is likely to leave securities that have a comparatively high cost basis because recently purchased. The true investor, in contrast, is likely to leave securities that he has held a long time and, therefore, have a low-cost basis. It is true, of course, that the speculator will have paid capital gains taxes on the gains resulting from his successive sales. However, this does not justify imposing a higher tax at death on the investor. If a speculator and an investor die with estates of the same size, the taxes imposed at death under the proposal would be higher in the case of the investor than in the case of the speculator. Is this a socially desirable result?

WHAT WOULD THE STATES DO?

One must keep in mind also that estates are burdened not only with Federal estate taxes but also with State impositions at death. When these are superimposed on the net Federal tax, adding a further tax burden on the estate by the imposition of the proposed capital gain tax at death would be tragic indeed. The result could be virtual confiscation in many instances. Moreover, can we be sure that the States would recognize the capital gain tax at death as a debt of the decedent? Whatever the Internal Revenue Code may call it, a State might deem this tax to be the equivalent of an additional death tax and, therefore, allow no debt deduction. Indeed, it would seem to me that the States would have to take this position in self-defense. If they did not, then their own tax take would be reduced. I should think, therefore, that the State governments would rise up against the proposal, and if it were enacted, they would be likely to institute a capital-gain-at-death tax of their own to make up the loss in State tax receipts. This new State imposition, piled on top of the Federal, would punish the taxpayer nobly.

HOW TO DRAFT THE STATUTE?

One can think of many problems that would have to be met in trying to draft a statute to cover the proposal. Consider just this one. Suppose a considerable part of the estate is to go to charity. It might be a specific bequest of items of property; it might be a general legacy; it might be a trust remainder interest; it might be an income or annuity interest for a term. Gifts to charity are not burdened with capital gains tax. Would capital gains taxes be imposed on specific assets bequeathed to charity, assets liquidated in order to provide a cash legacy or assets included in a trust in which a charity had an interest? How on earth would a statute be drawn to produce an equitable result covering the many and varied types of charitable benefaction by will?

One might anticipate that, if a bill on the proposal were to be drafted in a fashion calculated to do equity (which it could not do in any event), it would have to state the new rule and then append exceptions, exceptions to those exceptions, and exceptions to the exceptions to the exceptions.

Would the capital gain tax at death be applied to all varieties of property a sale of which during life would bring on a capital gain tax? Would not exceptions to some types of property have to be made? How about homes? And personal effects that may have risen in value since their purchase? And how about property taxed to the estate though not part of the probate estate? This property can become taxable in the estate without any volitional act by the decedent. Would not considerable deference have to be given to the proposition that while a man who sells property or gives it away during life does so voluntarily, he does not usually die voluntarily? Yes, I can see exceptions to exceptions to exceptions, and the addition of a great many pages to an already overburdened and confusing Internal Revenue Code. I can also anticipate years of litigation, interspersed with regulations and rulings issued, reversed and reissued.

What rage there would be in the community property States if no attempt were made to give special relief to their residents. It could be decided arbitrarily by the draftsman of the bill that no community property exceptions should be granted even to those States where the wife is vested with half the community—this would be on the theory that she always owned half the family property. But the realistic fact in most cases is that the husband has created the family estate by his energies and his savings, very often chiefly in the form of a single enterprise.

Thus whatever the basic soundness of the community property system may be, it carries with it a severe burden on the husband. He is required, when his wife dies before him, to disgorge half his wealth (which may be half his enterprise) and to find means to pay Federal and State death taxes on that half. This would happen, I emphasize, not on his death but on the prior death of his wife. Would it be equitable to force him, in addition to produce the funds with which to pay a capital gain tax on his wife's share of the community? No amount of reasoning based on the (admittedly true) proposition that his wife's estate is separate from his and consists of her vested interest in half the community can soften the severity of the problem that faces so many business proprietors in community property States, a problem which the proposal would make tragically more difficult to solve.

ADMINISTRATION HAS PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES

There would be many practical difficulties in the administration of the proposal. One is that it is so often impossible to trace the cost basis of securities held by a decedent for many years. In my own office there is an estate in which it would be utterly impossible to trace the cost basis for a long list of securities. The decedent's records are uninformative; they do not even give clues as to the origin of these securities.

A further complication might be met in instances in which shares had been received by the decedent by gift from a donor who, in turn, received them by gift from a previous donor who himself had received them by gift from an earlier donor. As the cost basis of the original, antecedent donor would be the decedent's cost basis and, therefore, that of the estate, tracing the cost basis could become an impossible job.

In the case of a gift, the donor will either be able to trace the cost basis of his property or be willing to take the chance of selling without being able to establish it clearly. The decedent, on the other hand, does not make the transfer decision—death makes it for him—and his executors or heirs may not have the information at hand to enable them to trace the cost basis.

ESTATE TAXATION RISES THROUGH INFLATION

The Federal estate tax is already extremely burdensome, not merely because of its applicable rates but also because of its interaction with inflation. Any fixed, progressive rate system of taxation becomes unfair in a period of inflation. We have long been in an inflationary period, and there is every indication that it will continue. Thus, there is an automatic increase yearly in the estate tax. As the aggregate value of an estate rises through inflation, it reaches higher percentage tax brackets in the progressive scale, i.e., the percentage tax take increases. To add an additional tax imposition at death to the burden of that increase would make no sense, except as a desire to destroy wealth.

The annual increase in taxation through inflation could be corrected by an annual recognition by Congress that inflation exists and interacts with sliding-scale tax systems, but there is little hope of this action by our legislators, who seem to close their eyes to the impact of inflation. One might hope, however, that they recognize the inflationary decimation of capital in considering the proposal in question. It would add another element of confiscation to that already imposed by the squeeze of the progressive scale tax systems and inflation. For the capital gain tax itself is partly confiscatory. Insofar as it taxes as a "profit" what is really an increase in mere dollar value through a reflection of inflation, it confiscates capital.

See how this, again, punishes the investor who holds property for long periods of time and how it favors the speculator. Because of inflation, the longer property is held the greater is the confiscatory impact of the capital gain tax. Property purchased 25 years ago should now be worth more than double its cost merely by the operation of inflation. If a capital gains tax is imposed on a sale of that property, more than one eighth of the capital would be confiscated. To apply this form of confiscation through a capital gains tax imposed at death would be truly outrageous.

WHY NOT STUDY CAPITAL GAINS TAX ITSELF?

Instead of studying how to plug a nonexisting loophole in the taxation of capital gains, the Tresaury Department might undertake a realistic study of the capital gain tax itself. There are many who believe that the tax is basically unsound, particularly in the light of the unwillingness of successive administrations and Congresses to curb inflation and the prospect that this governmental attitude will not change. If, however, the principle of taxing capital gains is to persist, can we not make better sense as to its application?

One defect in the present system is that we denote the tax by only one holding period. Profit on the disposition of property held for less than 6 months is subject to ordinary income tax, while if held for 6 months or more, it is treated as long-term capital gain and given the benefit of a 25-percent tax ceiling. Another defect is that the ceiling is constant at 25 percent no matter how long the property may have been held.

Perhaps many gains now taxed as long term should be taxed in full with ordinary income tax. The holding period of 6 months permits profits on comparatively rapid trading to get the advantage of long-term treatment. On the other hand, is is logical that gains on the disposition of property held for say, 40 years should be taxed on the same basis as property held for 6 months, or 1 year or 2 years?

It has been suggested that the holding period should be extended to a year, so that the profit on any disposition made within that period would result in ordinary income tax. It has been suggested further that there should be successive holding periods, each carrying with it a different tax ceiling on a declining scale. The following table illustrates this kind of system. It is presented not in an attempt to determine proper holding periods or proper maximum rates of tax but merely to illustrate a system that could be designed:

Maximum tax ceiling

Holding period:	*Percent*
1 year but less than 3 years	25
3 years but less than 5 years	20
5 years but less than 10 years	15
10 years and more	10

Several desirable results would follow this change. First, the true investor would be treated more equitably. Second, the impact of inflation would not operate as harshly as now. Finally, the Treasury probably would increase its tax take substantially: more sales would be taxed with ordinary income tax and more long-term sales would be made as the rates would be lower.

Would the proponents of the capital gain tax at death insist on their measure even after the adoption of the system described above? I feel sure that they would abandon their proposal for, if it also were adopted, an estate would have to be given the benefit of the longest holding period—this on the undeniable ground that it is death and not the decedent who selects his holding period. So, if the longest holding period resulted in a low tax, the alleged loophole would dwindle into innocuous triviality.

IMPORTANT CHANGES IN THE SOVIET ECONOMY: COMMUNISM'S "NEW ECONOMICS"

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the recent statement of Soviet Premier Kosygin on new Soviet economic methods to promote productivity makes official a trend in Soviet thinking that has been maturing for several years. It is important that we understand the real nature of these changes and the effects they are having. This infusion of some of the proven aspects of capitalism may be a much more efficient—and powerful—Soviet economy.

Essentially the new economics now being experimented with is a limited introduction of the profit motive into the Soviet planned economic system. But we should not be deluded by the new Soviet economics into thinking that the Communist nations may be embracing capitalism. They are not. They are simply moving from red to a rosy pink.

These new economic ideas are known as Libermanism, because they were originally formulated by Dr. Yevsei Liberman, a teacher at the Kharkov Engineering and Economics Institute. Libermanism allows greater freedom to plant managers in supplying their outlets. It institutes a "profitability rate" which would replace fulfillment of predetermined quotas as the main determinant of the size of bonuses to be awarded the plant and its workers. The profitability rate is defined as the total profit of the firm in relation to its stock of fixed and working capital.

Plant managers under Libermanism operate within targets set by the Soviet central planning organization, the Gosplan, but are free to decide for themselves such matters as how many workers to hire, what wages to pay, what capital investment to undertake, and whether to use new productive techniques.

Libermanism was instituted on a pilot basis in the Soviet Union beginning in mid-1964. The initial experiment, which used two large apparel manufacturers, is considered successful. During the present year the incentives plan will be extended to 400 shoe and clothing enterprises.

Experience with the new economics has also shown that the new profitability criteria and production determination techniques cannot successfully be limited to manufacturers of consumer goods alone. Logic demands that their suppliers in turn be allowed to determine production not on the basis of a plan handed down by the Gosplan, but on the basis of orders from manufacturers, just as manufacturers under Libermanism are able to plan their production according to the orders received from the sales organizations. Logically, there can be no end to the process of changeover to the new system. This has led one commentator, Victor Zorza in the New Republic, to say that the present compromise system cannot long last in its present form. It of course, leads to a marketplace economy where the individual consumer casts his ballot to collectively register economic judgments in place of economic decisions being reached through the political bureaucratic process.

IMPACT OF THE NEW SOVIET ECONOMICS

The new economics has already had deep effects. It is spreading to the satellite countries. As a demonstration that the Soviet economy is not a successfully functioning model for their growth, the new economics has further disillusioned those in other countries who have progressively become disenamoured of the Soviet system. In this sense the results of the new system may be beneficial in promoting greater independence from the Soviet Union among its former satellites.

The new Soviet economics may also have the favorable effect of increasing the freedom of the individual in Communist society. Potentially the new system allows far greater freedom for individual decision and for competition. The plant manager, now finding himself free and encouraged to make independent decisions affecting his plant's work force and productivity, may find it difficult to stop thinking for himself outside of his place of work. As the idea that individuals can make their own decisions grows throughout Soviet society, a genuine liberation of the scope for human initiative could occur.

NOT CAPITALISM BUT NEAR-CAPITALISM

It is very seldom considered in public discussions of the Soviet new economics that the essential elements of the Communist economic system have not been modified. One key to Soviet economics and philosophy is that the means of production shall be owned by all the people, in the person of the state. Ownership of plants and factories and stores is thus the accurate guide to whether a final liberalization has taken place. This fundamental change has not occurred. In fact, implicit in Libermanism is that the Gosplan and industry-by-industry planning organizations will still have final control over industries and over prices.

Libermanism is simply a pragmatic response to a problem that has long plagued the Soviet economy—inefficiency. It is a way to achieve Soviet economic, and thus political, goals faster. The Soviet philosophy of state ownership and the concept of the place of the individual in society has not fundamentally changed at all. However, what has been doctrine has now been reduced to mere strongly held theory and so is subject to debate.

USES OF NEW SOVIET STRENGTH—GUNS OR BUTTER?

In another way, implicit in the above, the new economics and the faster growth it implies could be a disturbing development.

Any marked new Soviet strength will simply increase Soviet ability to pursue throughout the world its goals—which remain opposed to our own. Soviet capacity to afford belligerency will be strongly increased.

On the other hand, it can be argued that rapid economic growth resulting in marked improvement in the material conditions of life for individuals could result in diminishing and mellowing Soviet will to pursue its aims through force. Thus we may have a chance to test the well-known theory that a satisfied materialistic society with a great deal to lose from wars is reluctant to begin them.

We will need to watch the changes that take place in the Soviet and satellite economies under Libermanism to see what they mean for our policy, on balance, when the favorable aspects are weighed against the unfavorable.

Explanations of the new Soviet economics can be found in two articles: "Communism Makes Some Changes" in the April 1965 issue of the Morgan Guaranty Survey, and "Communism's New Economics," by Ernest Conine in the June 1965 issue of the Harvard Business Review. Under unanimous consent I include these in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Morgan Guaranty Survey, April 1965]

COMMUNISM MAKES SOME CHANGES

The Soviet Union, as even the severest critics of the state-managed economy acknowledge, has made prodigious industrial strides in the past three decades. Soviet planners have achieved a formidable industrial complex second only to that of the United States, capable of supporting sophisticated undertakings in space and military weaponry.

What Soviet planners so far haven't been able to do with anything like comparable success is to cope with a much subtler kind of problem that has appeared as the economy has moved toward relative maturity. In particular, efficiency in production, as distinct from production itself, is proving an elusive goal. Throughout the Soviet economy, as the almost constant grumblings of Kremlin officials attest, plant operations tend to be slipshod, and materials and labor are used up with little thought of minimizing costs. The result is a heavy yield of shoddy goods and a total volume of output that is far below what it otherwise might be.

Numerous problems also plague Soviet retailing. Putting up a steel mill, planners have been finding out, is a relatively simple task compared with placing in stores the style and color of hat or dress that the increasingly choosy Russian woman is likely to want. Miscalculation has abounded, producing choice ridicule by Soviet cartoonists and rank impatience in officialdom.

The failures have been so glaring as to generate lively and surprisingly open debate within the Soviet Union during recent years, affording outsiders an unaccustomed view of the workings of the Russian economy. One outcome of the intramural argument has been a remarkable flirtation with Western ways of business operation. In selected areas of the economy, traditional planning techniques are being discarded. In their place Government is installing methods that afford managers broad leeway to run their enterprises in response to the signals of the marketplace. Most striking of all, over the strenuous objections of old-line Communists, profit incentives are being introduced. Supporters of the changes are even invoking a slogan that translates more or less into "what's good for business is also good for the country."

Experimentation along these lines, which began modestly last year, currently is blossoming to sizable proportions. Some 400 shoe and clothing manufacturers are being cut loose from central planning. No longer required to make what a master economic blueprint dictates, they are now to produce what the market demands. Rewards to managers and workers in these enterprises no longer will depend mainly on producing a stipulated quantity of goods, but will also reflect market success and profits earned.

All of this contrasts radically with the elaborate procedures of central planning which have characterized the Soviet economy and which still hold sway over most segments of the country's economic life. Typically, the plant manager is told from above—in almost unbelievable detail—what to do, and how and when to do it.

To be sure, at the very beginning of each annual planning go-around, the plant manager does have a chance to express his views as to what his operating blueprint for the coming year ought to look like. But rarely do his ideas prevail intact in the elaborate process of refinement which ensues. He must first of all argue them out with regional planning officials, who generally suspect that he has deliberately understated production possibilities (bonuses, after all, depend on the fulfillment of assigned quotas), while at the same time overstating his need for materials, equipment, and manpower.

Once the haggling between a manager and regional officials has produced tentative operating projections, they move upward through additional layers of the planning bureaucracy, undergoing continuous change intended to coordinate them with estimates of other enterprises. Ultimately, they reach the top planning body, U.S.S.R. Gosplan in Moscow. This agency synthesizes as best it can the schedules of all Soviet enterprises and, in consultation with the Soviet Union's highest officials, produces a master plan for the total economy. This is then piped back down the line. In the descent, subordinate planning groups again review the individual enterprise schedules, adjusting some one way and some another to achieve detail consistent with Moscow's overall goals. Finally, the factory manager receives his assignments for the year and usually finds that they differ considerably from his original proposals. He learns not only what he is expected to produce, but where he must buy supplies, when and where to sell his output, and what prices to pay and charge. He is told, additionally, how many workers he may hire, what wages to pay, and what capital projects to undertake.

Seldom, however, do things go according to plan. The manager is likely to find the document out of date, both because it is based on past performance and because it was 6 months in the making. Not uncommonly the quotas assigned are too large in relation to materials allocated. Frequently instructions fail to mesh with the plans of suppliers, who as a result either do not deliver on time or else ship goods with the wrong specification. This can interrupt output, endangering the fulfillment of annual quotas.

THE JOB OF THE TOLKACH

Faced with such difficulties, the Soviet executive often is driven to extralegal devices. One common practice is the use of the tolkach. Carried on the enterprise's payroll under some camouflaging title, the tolkach is actually a "fixer" who roams among suppliers, spending entertainment funds liberally and sometimes paying bribes to pry loose needed materials. At times the Communist hierarchy profesess to be grossly scandalized at such goings on, but actually there is typically a tendency to look the other way in recognition of the safety valve function the tolkach performs.

Preoccupation with the fulfillment of production quotas has other unhappy consequences. Perversely, it puts a premium on sloppy work. A factory manager has met his target when he has produced the required number of astrakhans. Whether the hats find buyers, or fall down on customers' ears, isn't his concern. A manager is also likely to try to find ways to get around instructions to begin manufacturing new products or to change production techniques, since he is anxious to avoid the slowdowns that such innovations entail. Production quotas, moreover, sometimes have the effect of holding the annual output of a factory below its full potential, despite the bonuses paid for exceeding quotas. This occurs because the manager knows that high output this year is likely to be followed by a sizable jump in the next target assigned him.

Criticism of planning failures has been commonplace in the Soviet Union for at least a decade. Typically, however, it was not the system which was called into question, but rather individual plant managers and planning bureaucrats. Premier Khrushchev frequently voiced displeasure with the bureaucracy, once exploding when plan officials stymied programs he wanted in chemicals and other materials, concentrating instead on steel: "Some officials have put on steel blinkers; they do everything as they were taught in their day. A material appears which is superior to steel and is cheaper but they keep on shouting 'steel, steel.' " Premier Khrushchev's impatience led to repeated shakeups in the Soviet planning apparatus during his tenure, without, however, producing conspicuously better results.

Criticism of the system as such is a much more recent development, dating back a few years at the most. It became possible only in the more advanced stages of the post-Stalin thaw. Not before the beginning of the 1960's did academicians and other commentators shed doctrinal shibboleths and begin to write about economic problems freshly and boldly.

HOW IT STARTED

The pathbreaking effort to come to grips with the deficiencies of Soviet planning was made by Dr. Yevsei G. Liberman, a teacher at the Kharkov Engineering and Economics Institute, a school where many Soviet managers are trained. Addressing a study group at the Soviet Academy of Sciences in April 1962, Professor Liberman put forth a number of suggestions for enlarging the operating freedom of plant managers. He also made the novel proposal that an enterprise's profitability rate replace quota fulfillment as the main determinant of the size of the bonuses to be awarded the firm and its workers. Subsequently invited to elaborate on his ideas in a Pravda article, Dr. Liberman did so in September 1962. Ever since, a spirited debate has raged between Professor Liberman's supporters and critics, and "Libermanism" has become a byword of Soviet dialog.

Arguing that managers have a much better knowledge of plant capabilities than do outsiders, Professor Liberman suggested that far fewer specific instructions be handed down from central authorities. While proposing that Gosplan retain authority to set targets for the volume and composition of production, and for destination and date of delivery, he recommended that managers be left free to decide for themselves such matters as how many workers to hire, what wages to pay, what capital investment to undertake, and what new productive techniques to introduce. By Western standards, of course, the continued setting of production quotas and production makeup by Gosplan is still severely restrictive. Actually Dr. Liberman appeared to be hinting at the desirability of more general acceptance by the central authorities of production plans as originally proposed at the plant level. To have made that point explicitly, however, probably would have been to tweak traditional doctrine too vigorously.

Under the Liberman plan, an enterprise would still have to fulfill production quotas to be eligible for bonuses, but the size of the bonus fund would be determined solely by the firm's profitability rate, defined as the total profit of the firm in relation to its stock of fixed and working capital. Managers thus would have a compelling incentive to use inputs of labor and materials as efficiently as possible and also would be discouraged from requesting more capital than is actually needed, a commonplace tendency.

The precise size of a firm's bonus would be determined by its profitability rate measured against a "profitability norm." Norms would be worked out for each branch of industry on the basis of past performance. Once established, each would remain constant for a number of years in order to provide the plant manager with the assurance of not being penalized with a higher norm should he do unusually well in a particular year. To stimulate innovation, norms would be varied in accordance with the number of new products that a firm was trying to introduce, in recognition of the fact that product change usually involves temporary cost increases. To discourage output of poor quality, Professor Liberman proposed that only goods actually sold be allowed to figure in profit calculations. The value of merchandise rejected by customers or remaining unsold in warehouses would be omitted from revenues.

BLESSING FROM ON HIGH

The elevation of profit to such exalted status had the predictable result of bringing sharp reaction from many Soviet traditionalists. Adoption of the Liberman scheme, they charged, would bring on an "anarchy of production" and scatter through the Soviet economy the seeds of capitalism.

But there was favorable reaction as well—and enough of it from influential quarters to provide an early indication that Professor Liberman wasn't going to be punished for deviationist heresy. Prominent economists, including the late Vasily S. Nemchinov, then head of the Soviet Academy's Learned Council for Problems of Planning and Production, came promptly to Dr. Liberman's defense. Indeed, only 2 weeks after the Pravda article appeared, the Council itself went on record backing "the Kharkov people's initiative and [recommending] the expansion of experiments along these lines . . ." Some supporters—Dr. Nemchinov being one of them—even ventured into sensitive areas that Professor Liberman had gingerly sidestepped, proposing that prices be permitted to fluctuate more freely and that plant managers be given broad leeway to negotiate terms with suppliers and customers.

In November 1962 Premier Khrushchev entered the discussion. Speaking before the Central Committee of the Communist Party, he called for sympathetic study of Professor Liberman's proposals, asserted that profit at the enterprise level carried great significance as an efficiency index, and specifically proposed a tryout of the new ideas in selected plants and industries. To legitimatize this thrust, Premier Khrushchev reminded the delegates of Lenin's counsel that Communists "be able if necessary to learn from the capitalists, to adopt whatever they have that is sensible and advantageous."

Preparations for the first experiment took more than a year, but when the launching occurred—in mid-1964—it became clear that a more ambitious course had been charted than even Professor Liberman had envisioned. Two garment makers, Bolshevichka in Moscow and Mayak in Gorky, were entirely relieved of centrally planned production goals and told to set their own, based on orders from retail outlets. In line with Dr. Liberman's principal recommendation, the managers of both firms were told that bonuses would depend on the fulfillment of contractual obligations and the achieved rate of profitability.

Representatives from Bolshevichka and Mayak immediately began negotiating with retailers as to the quantity, quality, style, and color of clothing to be delivered. Then, with orders on hand, plant managers drew up plans for output and wrote contracts with suppliers.

The firms had their ups and downs with the unusual procedures. Bolshevichka found itself squeezed because it was not permitted to raise prices enough to compensate for the cost increases entailed by the better finishes and roomier cuts it introduced in its line. Mayak found that its suppliers—whose output was still determined by plan—were not meeting delivery promises. The Glukhov Cotton Combine, for instance, delivered fabrics for children's raincoats in only 4 colors instead of the 12 ordered. As a result, Mayak could not fill orders from a number of stores.

Despite such difficulties, both clothing makers fared better under the system than they had previously. Quality improved, and profits and bonuses rose. Store managers also were pleased because they could order merchandise their customers wanted.

Premier Khrushchev's successors have been sufficiently impressed to sanction a broadening of the experiment. In 1965 some 400 shoe and clothing enterprises will switch to the new market-oriented arrangements, some starting this month. In addition, suppliers of cloth and leather are also being included in the experiment, apparently in response to the unsatisfactory delivery experience encountered by both Mayak and Bolshevichka. All told, by the end of this year 25 percent of clothing factories, 28 percent of shoe plants, 18 percent of textile mills, and 30 percent of leather manufacturers will be shifted to the sales and profit criteria.

That, moreover, is not likely to prove the full extent of the shift, judging from the manner in which Premier Kosygin has committed himself to the spirit of Libermanism. "It is necessary," he declared last December, "to wage a resolute struggle against those who represent didactic management of the national economy, who substitute arrogant instructions for real, businesslike management * * *. We shall take the path of planning on the basis of orders from customers not only in the consumer goods industries but in other branches of the economy as well."

EASTERN EUROPE, TOO

Communist willingness to experiment with Western business techniques is not limited to the Soviet Union. In Eastern Europe, where economic strain and planning failures have been considerably more serious, the winds of change are strong. Conditions vary greatly from country to country, but in one degree or another all the satellite economies are plagued with problems of inefficiency and low quality.

These difficulties have produced widespread disillusionment, especially in the ranks of the younger Communists. For many Eastern Europeans the Soviet Union has ceased to be a reliable model of success, and Soviet-style planning techniques in particular have come to be sharply criticized. The example of Yugoslavia's successful defiance of Moscow encouraged this; so did the whole process of "de-Stalinization," which destroyed the notion of Soviet infallibility in interpreting Marxist doctrine. Additionally, Red China's challenge to Soviet leadership in the Communist world has emboldened Eastern Europeans increasingly in recent years to question Soviet ways of doing things.

Most of the satellites have begun to move toward market-type innovations. The boldest steps are scheduled in Czechoslovakia and East Germany, where sweeping reductions are intended in the power of planning officials. Over a wider segment of these economies than in the Soviet Union, business enterprises are to be left free to decide what products to produce and how to produce them, with bonuses to depend not on filling production quotas but on the volume of profit earned. The Czechs and East Germans, moreover, are going further than the Soviets with respect to pricing. They intend to let prices reflect conditions of supply and demand more accurately than they have in the past. East Germany, indeed, already has made major price adjustments in a program begun a year ago.

Elsewhere in east European countries, similar possibilities are being actively discussed, but policy lines have not firmed. Poland has started to employ profit incentives experimentally, resurrecting an effort that actually began in 1956 but withered away in doctrinal debate. The Bulgarians, in their experiments with profit incentives, are focusing on the need for reducing price distortions caused by subsidies, as well as for encouraging enterprises to use capital more prudently. Their most unorthodox innovation to date has been the imposition of an explicit interest charge on capital supplied to enterprises by the state, a step also taken by the Hungarians. Only Albania and Rumania, among east European countries, remain untouched by the new wave.

One of the dividends that satellite countries hope to reap from an upgrading of their economic performance is increased trade with the West. Handicapped in meeting world industrial standards, east Europeans have been forced to carry on most of their trade among themselves and with the Soviet Union—a pattern established in the early postwar years when Russia was seeking to make the bloc economically self-sufficient.

HOW FAR WILL IT GO?

Neither in Russia nor in the other bloc countries is it possible to foresee where this experimentation will ultimately lead. Strong economic pressures argue for basic and lasting change in the cumbersome apparatus of planning, but these pressures seem destined to encounter powerful forces of resistance. The fate of Poland's earlier reform endeavor testifies to the likelihood of determined opposition by the planning bureaucracy. So does experience in Yugoslavia, where central planners have effectively recaptured much of the power that slipped from their hands when Marshal Tito launched a decentralization of that country's economy.

Even more basically, the new direction in Communist economics is clouded by an inner contradiction. The proponents of change want to use the guidance which market forces can offer, but allegiance to doctrine makes them reluctant to have the state forgo its role of arbiter in deciding what production is socially desirable. Professor Liberman can call with one voice for broad managerial freedom and with another for determination by Gosplan of the volume and composition of production.

The further change goes, the more pointed the contradictions will become. Last year's pilot undertaking in the Soviet Union with Bolshevichka and Mayak drew attention to the need for gerater flexibility in pricing and also to the desirability of including in the venture not just producers of finished goods but their suppliers as well. This year's broadened program is likely to show that the suppliers' suppliers ought to be brought in. Actually, the process of adaptation has no logical place to stop.

The introduction of market concepts has implications for human resources as well as for material. Soviet workers and managerial personnel have enjoyed considerable job mobility since the end of the Stalin regime. High turnover rates, in fact, present serious operating difficulties. These will almost certainly be compounded as Soviet enterprises cut loose from planning and get the opportunity to pay bonuses on the basis of profit performance. Successful plants will tend to attract workers, drawing them away from plants still tied to other bonus systems. This will create further pressure for extension of the experiment, unless the Soviet Government reintroduces stringent limitations on the freedom of workers to move from job to job.

Such possibilities show that the Soviet Union and other bloc countries are embarking on a course that could in time effect profound changes in the Communist way of life.

As yet, however, the implications haven't been squarely faced by the political leaders and indeed probably haven't been fully perceived. Mr. Max Frankel of the New York Times reported last January that a Czech economist had told him: "I do not think our politicians realize yet that the reform they have reluctantly accepted can succeed only if it turns into a revolution that will sweep away the faiths of a lifetime."

As realization sets in, resistance to reform is likely to harden. It can hardly escape the governments of the Communist countries that by surrendering even partial control of the economy they will also be giving up a significant part of their political leverage.

This raises the question: why have the Communist states admitted the entering wedge? Perhaps the answer lies in economic pressures even greater than those which are apparent from the outside, and in a greater political need to satisfy public impatience for the good things of life. This in turn makes it at least conceivable that the inefficiencies of centralized planning almost certain to multiply as the Communist economies grow in size and complexity, will compel an increasing tolerance of ideas and methods essentially alien to the Marxist tradition.

While the natural inclination in the West is to hope for such a development, the consequences for East-West relationships wouldn't necessarily be all favorable. Profit-oriented Communist economies would very likely experience more rapid increases in national wealth than are now the case. They might settle down to enjoy it and might also take advantage of their enhanced ability to expand trade with the West. They might, on the other hand, be emboldened to new belligerence. This is but one of the many imponderables that make the changes in communism important and intriguing.

[From the Harvard Business Review, May–June 1965]

COMMUNISM'S NEW ECONOMICS LEANS TOWARD SUCH HERESIES AS THE PROFIT MOTIVE AND CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

(By Ernest Conine)

If a Marxist Rip Van Winkle arose today from even 5 years of sleep and looked at the Communist world around him, he would doubt the evidence of his own senses—

The Soviet Union is trying a new system of economic planning which is based, of all things, on the profit motive—and the odd notion that factories should produce to satisfy their customers.

In Poland the regime decided early this year to go into business with Krupp, West Germany's impeccably "capitalist" industrial giant. Under an agreement negotiated in January, Krupp would provide equipment and know-how; the Communist government would supply the real estate and labor. They would split the profits from sales on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

A group of American businessmen returned from a Moscow visit with the impression that Premier Alexei Kosygin might welcome under certain conditions similar U.S. joint ventures in the Soviet Union.

Yugoslavia is encouraging establishment of privately owned bars and inns to serve foreign tourists along the beautiful Adriatic seacoast. Marshal Tito himself holds that strikes are not a crime against the state—if such "work stoppages" are directed against the excesses of factory managers, and not against the regime.

The Hungarian Chamber of Commerce says, "It is urgently necessary that well-trained experts should pursue advertising careers" so that advertisements aimed at promoting export sales will be more effective.

As these examples suggest, the passion for economic betterment is a strong factor in the waves of change which are now sweeping over the Moscow-alined portion of the Communist world.

The reforms in the structure and management of Communist economies will, generally speaking, increase their abilities and desires to trade with the West. Thus they are of significance to anyone contemplating business in those countries.

In fact, if the Soviet Union and its East European allies ever evolve into a semblance of parliamentary democracy—truly at peace with the West—their peoples will owe a debt of gratitude to the reform-minded economists who helped light the way.

Thus far, despite some liberalization, Western-style freedoms are no more than a gleam in the eyes of the hopeful. Poland, once the freest of all the Communist regimes, is now pressing a new campaign against the Catholic Church, reducing contacts of its citizens with foreigners, and further restricting the free expression of its writers. Rumania, while carrying on an encouraging flirtation with the West, remains a tightly controlled police state. The Soviet citizen, while allowed more liberties and consumer goods than before, lives in an atmosphere which seems repressive even to visiting Communists.

To appreciate the potential effects of the changes now taking place, it is necessary to look at what went before.

COMMAND ECONOMY

Russian communism, as conceived by Lenin and carried on in its essentials by his successors, was first of all a system for seizing power, and then for maintaining it, in a nation which occupies 8.5 million square miles, or one-seventh of the earth's land surface.

The command economy which is now under broad attack was a natural part of the pyramidic structure that sought to concentrate all power in the hands of a few men at the top.

Rapid industrialization

In its essentials the centralized planning system was born more than three decades ago when the Soviet Union was a backward land whose leaders were determined to marshal the nation's resources, and regiment its people, for the most rapid industrialization possible.

Huge investments were essential. Since the industrial base was small, and availability of foreign capital very limited, capital was generated by holding down consumption—that is, by keeping factory wages and farm prices at an appallingly low level over a sustained period.

As a result, the Soviet Union's rate of gross investment usually has run about 25 to 30 percent of gross national product, compared with about 20 percent in the United States. Further, investment has been mainly concentrated in heavy industry, with agriculture and consumer goods industries getting the crumbs from the table. Even with heavy industry, the Kremlin's allocation of resources has favored the "leading sectors" of the economy—those singled out for their importance to the state's industrial and military power. Under Stalin, the priority areas were electric power, steel, and machine building. Khrushchev broadened the list to include petroleum, natural gas, and chemicals.

The central planners assigned production targets on the basis of national goals and the estimated ability of the economy to meet them. At the factory level, managers were told what to produce and in what quantity. They had little or no voice in the setting of prices, which often bore no relationship to costs or other economic factors. Generally, the managers could not choose their own suppliers. And they could not make independent decisions on whether to modernize their plants. All these matters were handled by administrative orders from the planning bureaucracy.

This is essentially the system of economic management which Stalin imposed on Eastern Europe after World War II and Khrushchev inherited when he came to power a decade ago.

The example of Russia, and later China, offers convincing proof that a backward country can industrialize with impressive speed if it will force its citizens to do what no people have ever done voluntarily: endure grinding poverty and regimentation in order to maintain a high investment rate.

Built-in defects

The Soviet Union is easily the world's second-ranking industrial power today. In recent years, however, the Kremlin has been jolted by a slowing growth rate into realizing that the command system of economic planning has built-in defects which render it obsolete in the mature economy which the U.S.S.R. now has.

The first problem of the planners is the sheer size of the present-day Soviet economy. There are 200,000 industrial establishments producing some 20 million different items. Obviously, the central planners cannot even attempt to cope with them all. Gosplan in Moscow plans the output of 18,000 key items only one-tenth of 1 percent of the total. A crazy quilt of subordinate and supplementary planning agencies, several layers thick, concerns itself with most of the rest.

It has been suggested, not entirely in jest, that the volume of planning work will increase 36-fold by 1980 unless the system is changed, and every adult in the Russian population will be employed in the planning apparatus.

Thus the regime has been unable to maintain the iron grip over the economy which it wants.

Industrial managers are rewarded for their production volume, not excuses. When supply shortages occur and a halt in production is threatened, the Soviet executive knows that legal channels will be too slow. So he sends out tolkachi, or expediters, to obtain the needed materials outside normal channels—by bribery if necessary.

The Soviet "command economy" probably would not work at all without the flexibility introduced by these gray market transactions. But they encourage corruption and erode the power of the planners to allocate resources according to national priorities.

SERIOUS DISTORTIONS

Most serious of all are the distortions created by the system of "material incentives," and by the closely related absence of feedback from customer to producer.

Material incentives

Factory managers and workers receive bonuses above their base pay when production targets are exceeded. These targets normally are expressed in tons or units of production, with unintended results.

When orders are given in units of weight, managers find it easiest to meet the plan by making goods unnecessarily heavy. Aircraft designer O. K. Antonov, in a series of Izvestia articles which began on November 22, 1961, told how a Leningrad paper plant made its product as thick as possible, with a resulting waste per machine equivalent to 3 million square meters of paper annually. The humor magazine Krokodil carried a cartoon showing a nail factory which overfulfilled its target by producing one huge nail the size of the plant.

If the planners expressed the target in square meters of paper or in number of nails, however, the opposite distortion would occur: the factories would turn out paper that was too thin, and nails in small sizes only.

With incentives keyed to volume of production, the emphasis is on quantity at the expense of quality. Soviet press reports indicate that repair of existing machine tools occupies 3.5 times as many people as are employed in machine tool production. At any given time, 40 percent of all motor-driven vehicles in the Soviet Union are idle awaiting repairs.

Frequently, the incentives actively encourage waste and inefficiency. Mining installations have been known to add barren rock to ore in order to get credit for increased production. Antonov told of a ball bearing plant which could double the working life of its product—but didn't, through fear that demand would be cut in half, and the income of everyone at the factory reduced.

The Soviet incentive system creates a resistance to technological innovation, too. Managers are hesitant to shut down production lines for retooling, or installation of new equipment, because the downtime would mean lost bonuses. Production of high-speed oil drills was delayed for years for this reason.

In the West, customer reaction acts as a healthy corrective. The buyers may switch to another supplier, or at least return faulty goods, thus punishing the errant producer in his pocketbook. Alternatively, the shoddy producer might lose out to foreign competition.

Historically, however, feedback has been totally missing in the Soviet system. The customer faced a monopoly situation where he had no meaningful choice of suppliers. In the sellers' market which perpetually existed, faulty merchandise was better than none, and accordingly was rarely refused. Even when goods were completely unusable, incomes of workers and managers at the guilty plants were unaffected.

Because of the overall attempt at autarky, foreign trade has been too small to act as a stimulant to quality of domestic production.

Growth slowdown

All these failings have existed in varying degrees throughout the Soviet era. But there is no evidence that the Kremlin leadership considered any radical solutions until it dawned on them that the highly vaunted economic growth was slowing.

The declining industrial growth rate is reflected in these official figures from the U.S.S.R. Central Statistical Administration:

	Percent
1959	11.0
1960	10.0
1961	9.2
1962	9.5
1963	8.5
1964	7.1

Since the 1963 agricultural failures are not included in the above figures, the drop in Russia's overall economic growth rate would be even greater. This makes it likely that the Soviet Union's GNP is now growing more slowly than ours, if a common methodology were used.

The slowdown came as the Soviets were facing serious strains on their resources as a result of the competing demands of defense, space exploration, heavy industry, foreign aid, and the rising expectations of Soviet consumers.

Surpluses and scarcities

Planning failures were most shockingly evident in the consumer goods field, where unsold surpluses existed side by side with unbelievable scarcities.

Pravda reported, on October 27, 1963, that in many towns it "is possible to buy only 100- or 150-watt electric light bulbs. It is not the first year that smaller wattage bulbs have not been on sale * * * the factories are producing only high power bulbs." Other items in short supply, at one time or another, include razor blades, kitchen utensils, and pillows.

Clothing supplies meanwhile have at least reached the point where the people will not buy obviously worthless items. During the first half of 1963, 65 percent of all the footwear received at the Volvograd wholesale base was rejected outright. At one factory 95 percent of men's overcoats were returned by the trading network, and another produced nothing but rejects for 4 months.

Surplus stocks of unsold shoes alone reached a value of 3 billion rubles ($3.3 billion).

Khrushchev tinkered with incentives, and reorganized the management of industry several times without really changing it. And, finally, capital investments in consumer industries were stepped up. In fact, for the first time, the scheduled growth rate for light industry is higher than for heavy industry in several of the Soviet republics.

However, the regime can only go so far in that direction, and in the "chemicalization" of agriculture started by Khrushchev, without cutting into funds available for defense and space.

The evidence is strong, therefore, that the Kremlin leaders finally turned to basic reform of the planning system in an almost desperate effort to stretch out available resources without sacrificing the big-power ambitions of the Soviet elite.

REFORM MOVEMENT

On September 9, 1962, the Communist Party newspaper Pravda caused a sensation by publishing an article by Prof. Yevsei G. Liberman of the Kharkov Engineering and Economics Institute.

Liberman proposals

He suggested that the central planners continue to set targets for volume and assortment of production, and for delivery dates. Most other decisions—such as the number of workers to be hired, wages paid, and production techniques to be employed—would be made by the plant managers, said Lioerman.

Incentive premiums, for both managers and workers, would be tied to profits because "the higher the profits, the greater the incentive," and "what is good for society should be good for each factory." The enterprise would not be paid for unsalable or rejected goods. With shoddy production thus reducing profits, there would be an incentive for quality.

Speculation that Pravda would not have published the Liberman proposals without high-level support was borne out 2 months later when Khrushchev personally endorsed some of the ideas, and called for experiments to test them in practice. A public debate—unprecedented in the Soviet Union for a matter of such gravity—thereupon ensued in the Soviet press.

The movement toward a Communist-style market economy has come to be known as "Libermanism." In fact, however, the Kharkov professor's proposals proved cautious compared with some of those that later poured onto the pages of Pravda and Kommunist.

Followup suggestions

Khrushchev himself had observed that "without a correct solution of the problem of price fixing and without scientifically based prices, it is impossible to remove many of the serious defects in the planning of production. * * *" Many other contributors to the debate made the same point, in terms the Soviet leader may not have foreseen.

I. S. Malyshev, first deputy chief of the Central Statistical Administration, called for abandonment of the system whereby prices often are set to accomplish political objectives. Another official suggested free buying and selling of consumer goods in surplus supply.

In May 1964, respected academician V. Nemchinov joined the fray with a direct attack on the command economy as Stalin understood it. He called for an end to the multiplicity of directives which smothered managers, and he proposed that an element of competition be introduced by having factories submit tenders to Gosplan specifying quality and delivery dates for goods to be produced. Gosplan would allot contracts to the factories making the most attractive offers, and these then would have broad freedom to manage their own affairs. Prices for the most important items would be fixed. But factories could refuse contracts where the price was too low—a concept which, if accepted, would put unprecedented limits on Gosplan's authority.

Another venerated academician, automation expert Victor Trapeznikov, followed with a suggestion that the old administrative planning methods be replaced by financial levers of control, including variable taxes, fines, and a system of incentives tied to profits, plus a "flexible system of prices."

Where Trapeznikov merely advocated a more flexible system of administered prices still set by the planners, an official of the Moscow Automobile Factory proposed that prices between factories and trade networks be fixed by mutual agreement—in other words, determined by the market.

Initial steps

Experiments had been quietly underway since shortly after Liberman's 1962 article to test his ideas in practice. But it was not until May 1964 that evidence came that the regime had really made the momentous decision to abandon the command system of management in at least a part of the economy—and that the reforms would go beyond pure Libermanism. The Bolshevichka and Mayak clothing factories, in Moscow and Gorky, were allowed to conduct a well-publicized experiment, which Liberman described in a letter published in the London Economist:

"Total volume of output * * * is fixed in money terms by the central plan on the basis of an analysis of such factors as increase of population, purchasing power and the share of income that goes to buy clothes, and raw material resources. The plan does not fix exactly what styles or sizes of clothes the factories are to put out. These are stipulated in contracts between shops and factories. Prices are specified in the contracts on the basis of average prices fixed by Government price lists, but taking into consideration the newness of the item, its attractiveness, convenience, packaging and so on."

Liberman added that "the success of a factory's work is judged, first, by how well its wares sell and, second, by the profit level."

On October 20, 1964, only a week after the fall of Khrushchev, the Kremlin announced that principles developed in the Bolshevichka-Mayak experiments would be extended by mid-1965 to one-third of all the footwear and clothing factories in the country.

Premier Kosygin, assumed to have been an influential supporter of Libermanism all along, has made it clear he intends to pursue the matter. He told the Supreme Soviet in December 1964 that "there is an urgent need to compile plans for the production of consumer goods on the basis of orders from customers, taking into account the establishment of direct ties between industrial enterprises and trade organizations."

During the lengthy debate over Liberman's proposals, there was disagreement as to whether they should be applied to heavy as well as light industry. But Kosygin noted that "we shall take the path of planning on the basis of orders from customers not only in the consumer goods industries but in other branches of the economy as well." Experiments are reported underway in the coal mining and engineering industries.

REVISIONIST OPPOSITION

Will this revolution in Communist economic management survive the inevitable counterattacks from conservative planners and others with a vested interest in the centralized system? If so, can the regime's effective control over the allocation of resources survive? Will decentralization in economic decisionmaking be followed by decentralization in political decisionmaking?

Critics' ammunition

The answers to such questions are of major significance to the western businessman engaged in trade with the Soviet bloc, or planning to engage in trade, and are of even more vital concern to Government policymakers who hope to encourage liberalization within the bloc.

Certainly, there will be opposition to the reforms.

New York Times correspondent Theodore Shabad reported from Moscow in October 1964 that the Soviet Finance Ministry was opposing Libermanism on grounds it smacked of capitalism and in practice led to higher costs. The same month, a Pravda article complained that the planning bureaucracy in Lvov was obstructing the adjustment of clothing production plans to consumer demand. More of the same kind of rearguard action can be expected.

Liberman has argued that the reforms actually strengthened central planning, because the new approach "frees the planning bodies of detailed control, permitting them to concentrate on planning technological progress and scientific research."

The regime obviously hopes so. But problems suggest themselves.

First, it is hard to see how profitability can be a reliable criterion of performance unless it is based on prices which reflect economic reality. It remains to be seen how well the Soviet price reforms meet this need. If costs are to be the major factor—assuming they can be accurately determined—it seems that widely varying prices for the same items will result, because some factories have better access than others to skilled labor and raw materials. Nor can the interplay of supply and demand give the final answer in cases where monopoly or near monopoly exists.

Whatever prices are adopted, some factories will prove unprofitable. If they are subsidized, the whole objective of the planning reforms is undermined. But if the market is really allowed to rule and these enterprises are closed, the regime must deal with the inevitable disruptions which will follow: unemployment and, at least temporarily, loss of production and loss of investment. Nothing in a Soviet bureaucrat's experience prepares him for such a thing.

Thus the internal critics are not likely to lack ammunition for their counterattacks.

SATELLITE PROGRAMS

Hints as to what is at stake in the Soviet Union can be gleaned from an examination of events in Eastern Europe, where all the erstwhile satellites, except Albania and Rumania, are busily installing a "socialist market economy," or at least talking about it.

Their experience indicates that relaxation of centralized economic controls, accompanied as it is by denunciation of centralized authority, does indeed create an atmosphere conducive to liberalization in the cultural and political fields. But it also carries the lesson that resistance develops, and, in the end, the older generation of party leadership will not willingly surrender its ultimate powers of dictatorship.

Historical cycle

The first revisionist was Tito's Yugoslavia, which was expelled from the Soviet fold over 15 years ago and committed such heresies as returning 80 percent of agriculture to private ownership, accepting foreign aid from the West, and granting considerable autonomy in economic decisionmaking to factory level workers' councils elected by the workers. The regime has relied mostly on financial and tax levers, plus influence exercised through the Communist Party and the trade unions, to maintain central direction of the economy.

Poland seemed set to follow the Titoist example in 1956 when Wladyslaw Gomulka faced down Khrushchev and asserted Poland's right to its own "road to socialism." Farms were decollectivized and, amidst talk of interest rates and profitability, a start was made toward decentralization of planning for industry. But the latter experiment was dropped when Gomulka felt secure enough to throw liberalization into reverse.

A similar fate befell premature decentralization in Czechoslovakia in 1958.

Several factors combined to bring the question of planning reform to the fore once again in the last 2 years.

Time and the "de-Stalinization" encouraged by Khrushchev in Eastern Europe swept out the more dogmatic dictators, except in Czechoslovakia and East Germany, and brought a new spirit of experimentation even to those two countries. As a result of the split with Peiping, which flared into the open in late 1961 and 1962, Moscow once again recognized Yugoslavia as a bona fide Communist country—thus legitimatizing discussion of the Yugoslav heresies in planning. Finally, the command system of economic management repeated the same cycle in Eastern Europe as in Russia itself: impressive economic growth, accompanied by distortions which ultimately threatened stagnation.

Decentralized approaches

A Polish economist told me, during a 1964 visit to Warsaw, that Liberman's "ideas were not new to us. But their publication created an easier atmosphere for our own proposals." While the Poles led in the discussion phase for a time, it is East Germany and Czechoslovakia which have undertaken the most all-embracing reforms announced thus far.

They have launched similar programs to decentralize economic planning and substitute the indirect levers of price and credit policies for detailed central directives. Investments must be paid for mostly out of the enterprises' own funds in order to discourage waste of capital goods. Credit will be available under conditions fixed by the State, thus giving the central planners a lever for regulating the relative growth of different industries and areas. The State will continue to make direct investments for high-priority major projects.

To a great extent, the Czech and East German programs appear to parallel the Soviet reform movement. But their commitment to apply the reforms to heavy as well as light industry seems stronger, and, where Moscow has treaded gingerly on the subject of interest rates, East Germany plans to adopt a system of "capital levies" within 2 years.

Unlike the Soviets, the Czechs frankly recognize that, if the new system is to work, the old style industrial managers who have little qualification beyond a party card and a loud voice will have to be weeded out.

Observing that a third of the enterprise managers have only elementary schooling, an article in Kulturny Zivot on January 16, 1965, claimed the State could save "hundreds of millions" merely by dismissing managers guilty of "favoritism, intrigues, intimidation * * * and creating an atmosphere of fear and overcautiousness." Calling for development of better trained and more flexible managers, the author said "creative thinking cannot simply be commanded." This is a more revolutionary concept than it sounds to uninitiated western ears.

Trade attitudes

The most striking difference between the Soviet Union and its ex-satellites lies in their attitudes toward trade with the West—and in the enthusiasm of the latter to embrace new forms of interbloc cooperation.

In Stalin's day, the Soviet Union aimed at making the Communist bloc basically self-sufficient. Bloc members produced largely for their own collective needs. Western goods and equipment were bought when Russian industry could not produce what was needed, or the planners forgot to make proper provision.

Under Khrushchev, the same mentality prevailed through most of his reign, except that more emphasis was put on overcoming Russia's lag in technology. Then, only weeks before his ouster, he made the first overt attack on autarky, on the grounds that it "is harmful in economics, and it is especially pernicious to science and technology * * *. No country, not even the most advanced, can hope to move forward quickly if it does not skillfully use the world's scientific achievements." Kosygin went further, in a December 1964 speech, and offered to channel investment funds into Soviet export industries during the new 5-year plan starting in 1966—if the West will sign long-term contracts, including generous credits.

Tito's success

Whether this constitutes a genuine recognition of the international division of labor or not, there is no evidence that the Soviets even contemplate the kind of hospitality to things Western which is occurring in Eastern Europe.

Again, Belgrade led the way. After suffering excommunication from Moscow in the late 1940's, Yugoslavia turned by necessity to the West for industrial supplies and equipment, as well as consumer goods. To pay for these imports, Tito turned his Adriatic seacoast into another Riviera for Western tourists, and he gladly accepted credits and foreign aid from the capitalists.

Today, less than a third of Yugoslavia's foreign trade is conducted with other Communist countries.

Tito was also the first Red leader to recognize that unemployment can occur under communism, and to act accordingly. On November 1, 1963, Belgrade announced a formal program allowing unemployed Yugoslavs to contract bracero style for jobs in Western countries.

The marshal also pioneered the partnership concept of doing business with the West. To take one example, Yugosalvia assembles Italian Fiat cars under license and exports them to Soviet bloc countries as Red flag 750 models.

The lesson of Tito's success has not been lost.

Other developments

Virtually every Soviet bloc country is now conducting a trade drive of its own—unlike the Russians, in consumer as well as capital goods. All seek the most-favored-nation treatment from the United States that is so far enjoyed only by Poland and Yugoslavia. They fret about the rising external tariff wall which threatens to exclude them from the European Economic Community. To alleviate political objections to trade, both East Germany and Rumania have released thousands of their political prisoners.

In their scramble for hard currency, the regimes of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and even Rumania and Bulgaria have virtually dismantled the Iron Curtain for travelers from the West. (But not for their own people.)

Czechoslovakia is trying to sell its licenses abroad. Hungary has joined with an Austrian firm to expand two electric powerplants in India. Poland is sending unemployed coal miners to Belgium and northern France, which have labor shortages. The Warsaw regime also has negotiated a precedent-breaking agreement: West Germany's Krupp will provide management and equipment for factories in Poland, which will gain by the jobs generated and the export possibilities opened.

Today, commerce with the West accounts for an increasing share of East European countries' foreign trade. They expect that, by providing the material basis for upgrading the quality of production, Western equipment will improve the export potential of their own output.

In Czechoslovakia, Western goods will be used as a quality standard. Planners are enjoined not to approve proposed investments until they have determined that the facilities will compare well with similar developments abroad. Also, when prices of domestic goods go too far above world market levels, foreign products may be imported to discourage high-cost production. If executed in practice, this would mark an unprecedented withdrawal from protectionism by a Communist country.

CONTROLLED LIBERALIZATION

All in all, the movement of events behind the Iron Curtain is encouraging to those who like to think that communism will evolve into a parliamentary socialism not too different from that espoused by the Labor Parties of Western Europe.

How realistic is this hope?

Cautious optimism

Actually, it is a very long shot. But the experience of Yugoslavia, and the infectious influence that Titoism has within the bloc, suggests that it isn't wholly naive, despite equally plain evidence that the present-day leaders will not willingly preside over the liquidation of the Communist Party's essential dictatorship.

Ever since the Yugoslav economy was decentralized more than 15 years ago, there has been a tug-of-war between those who insist that efficiency demands even more freedom and those who insist the party is endangered by the reforms already made.

The reformers were especially outspoken in the long debate preceding the Eighth Party Congress in Belgrade in December 1964. Interestingly enough, some of the most radical ideas came from Edvard Kardelj, chief party ideologist and one of two potential successors to Tito.

Kardelj, in a speech in February 1964, called for members of the Parliament to stop rubberstamping proposals by the regime, and to require full explanations. He also suggested that the Communist Party's role is to guide, rather than to command, the masses. Specifically, he said the party should not be a "monopolistic force which decrees what is correct and what is wrong," but rather a "force which fights within the broad masses—influencing their consciousness."

On April 20, 1964, an article in Borba, the party organ, claimed that increasingly there will not be a party line which Yugoslav journalists must follow—that, instead, individual editorial boards will formulate their own "ideological-political line." (It is extremely doubtful this will happen in practice.)

Some professors went so far as to suggest that the party should begin "withering away" along with the state.

Party conservatism

Unfortunately, virtually all these ideas are opposed by Aleksandar Rankovic, the ex-policeman and hard-liner who is even more likely to succeed Tito. He was reportedly behind the cultural crackdown which began in the fall of 1963 and included the closing of the cultural journal Perspektiv. The editor of Perspektiv was accused of advocating the "restoration of bourgeois multiparty democracy," as well as publishing stories which insulted Yugoslavia's "socialist reality."

The December party congress, when it came, disappointed both the conservatives and the reformists.

On the one hand, it adopted new statutes which reaffirmed the leading role of the Communist Party and the continuing necessity for discipline. And, while calling for "freer market relations" and ordering reduction of central control over investments, the new steps toward economic decentralization fell short of what the "liberals" wanted.

However, the new statutes did provide that more party business would be conducted in public and less behind closed doors. In another setback for the conservatives, the Yugoslav Parliament in late January 1965 exhibited an unprecedented spirit of independence. Over the objections in several cases of the Federal Executive Council, which represents the regime, the deputies added 54 amendments to the 1965 economic plan.

Thus the reformist movement, while under fire, has not been cowed.

The retrogression in Poland, mentioned earlier, tends to bear out the Yugoslav lesson that the Communist apparatus will allow liberalization up to a point—then react to protect its interests when they are really threatened.

It will not be surprising to see the kind of conservative Communist reaction which is now visible in Poland and Yugoslavia show up later among the more recent converts to the "market economy."

Certainly, there is no sign of the slightest possibility that private ownership of production will ever exist again in the Soviet bloc, except in agriculture.

CONCLUSION

The ferment among the Communist countries is reason for long-range optimism.

In Yugoslavia at least, even the critics no longer suggest a return to the absurdities of Stalinist-style central planning. The voices of liberalization have not been squelched in Poland, though they are under pressure from the neo-Stalinists. In both countries, the younger, better educated men who will someday take over leadership favor a society which is more open, and flexible, than the one which exists. They are convinced, in the words of a Croatian Communist leader, that economic problems cannot be solved when freedom is granted "only in little spoonfuls."

Hopefully, such sentiments will prove as contagious in Russia as they already have been in Eastern Europe.

When the Communist Party of two countries, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, is forced to defend its right to dictate policy, that in itself represents progress.

Western-style democracy is nowhere in sight, and there is no guarantee that the current evolution will continue. But time and the continuing search for economic efficiency are on the side of liberalization.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE RULE OF LAW: A SIGNIFICANT ADDRESS BY THE PORTUGUESE FOREIGN MINISTER

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of October 11, Dr. Alberto Franco Nogueira, the Foreign Minister of Portugal, delivered a speech before the General Assembly of the United Nations which was a noteworthy exercise in clear and simple logic. It merits the attention of all those interested in the fate of the United Nations.

Although Portugal has perhaps had more cause to resent its treatment at the United Nations than almost any other member, the Portuguese Foreign Minister in this speech showed more and deeper concern for that organization than many members who most loudly proclaim their faith while irresponsibly trying to subvert it to serve their own ends.

Dr. Nogueira's principal theme was the vital importance to the United Nations of observing the rules of law. His warning was clear that if temporary political considerations take precedence over the rule of law, disaster lies ahead for the United Nations.

The Foreign Minister's discussion of the peacekeeping function of the organization, his analysis of the sources of power in this area, and how the great and small nations could be variously affected, is one of the clearest and most intelligent expositions on this subject I have ever read.

Dr. Nogueira's address follows:

SPEECH BY MR. FRANCO NOGUEIRA, FOREIGN MINISTER OF PORTUGAL, BEFORE THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, ON OCTOBER 11, 1965

Mr. President, I have very great pleasure in joining all those who have congratulated you upon your election to the Presidency of 20th session of the General Assembly. The choice of your name is a well-deserved tribute to your high personal qualities, both as a scholar and as a statesman, and it is also a fitting tribute to your great country with which, I am very happy to say, my country shares many traditions and many common values of a moral and spiritual nature. Please accept, Mr. President, the warm congratulations of my delegation.

Sir, as a starting basis for this general debate we have, as a fundamental document, the introduction to the annual report which the Secretary-General has drawn up for our benefit and which places before the Assembly a comprehensive picture of the work of the Organization during the past year. We should not underestimate the importance of such a document. As I studied it, there came to my mind past reports of the Secretary-General, and I particularly remember the annual report of 1962. Then the Secretary-General wrote that the Organization had failed to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom, and that the rate of development had fallen far short of meeting the needs and demands of peoples; and the Secretary-General, also in 1962, pointed out that the United Nations had failed to help in finding a solution to the very crucial problem of disarmament. As a result of all this, the Secretary-General spoke in 1962 of "a crisis of confidence" in the United Nations.

Now, Mr. President, what do we find in the annual report for 1965 now before us? The Secretary-General refers to past facts which have damaged "the effectiveness and dignity of the United Nations." He stresses "the deterioration in the international situation generally, which have made an adverse impact in the field of disarmament," as a result of which "no substantial progress has been achieved" and "the high hopes engendered by the agreements reached in 1963 have been greatly diminished." Then the Secretary-General turns to economic problems, and writes: "Yet here, too, a disturbing shadow has been cast, in the form of a worsening of the relative economic position of the developing countries" and again the Secretary-General underlines that "despite the progress made in the organizational and administrative field, however, the year has not fulfilled the hopes generated in developing countries by the agreements reached in Geneva." And so, Mr. President, it seems to me that in such matters of paramount and decisive importance as disarmament and economic development of the underdeveloped countries no progress or very little progress has been achieved by the various powers, and we find the Secretary-General, as it is his duty, expressing precisely the same preoccupations in 1962 and in 1965. There should be no wonder, Mr. President, that there is an increasing awareness of a deep and general serious crisis of the diminishing confidence of the whole frustrated world.

For this, we could find many reasons. In the view of my delegation, however, the most important reason stems from the fact that the charter is not being respected and implemented. When we consistently ignore the law for a long time, or when we amend it through unconstitutional procedures, then we are actually killing it, and I fear that this is precisely what it is being done to the charter, as a result of decisions taken against the charter by simple majority vote in order to meet the desires of occasional majorities. But there are other reasons for the crisis and frustration of the United Nations. We should stress, in the first place, that the countries which, within the Assembly, formulate or initiate policies and support decisions in regard to some concrete problems are not those which have to pay the political price for the implementation of such policies and decisions and also are not those which have the means to carry them out; and therefore there is a tremendous and widening gap between the fine points scored in the Assembly and the hard realities of life throughout the world. And then, Mr. President, we should also emphasize another important factor: and that is that the political forces which seem and do rule the Assembly and command its decisions are not the real forces in the world; and the fact that this has been lost sight of has resulted in an accumulation of resolutions which the political forces of the Assembly—that is the majority—have voted and approved but which have been ignored and filed away by the real world forces; and when this happens for a long time, as it has happened, it only brings about a loss of prestige, of effectiveness, and of respect.

But I referred to violations of the charter and this brings me back to the annual report of the Secretary-General, particularly to that passage where he himself points out the need to respect legality not only in the United Nations but in the specialized and technical agencies and in all international organizations as well. The Secretary-General writes: "I must add that it is the feeling of the executive heads of all the organizations that a precondition for the continued success of economic, social, and cultural cooperation on an international plane is the preservation to the greatest possible extent of the essentially technical character of such action. I have previously had occasion to observe that it would be a matter for regret on the part of the entire international community if important meetings dealing with these questions, and depending for their success on the vital element of international cooperation, were to fail to yield solid results because of the introduction of highly contentious political issues into discussion and deliberations." And the Secretary-General goes on: "the admitted difficulty of drawing a clear line between what is political and what is not must not be allowed to distract the member states from their specific duty to respect the charter, the conventions and the constitutional procedures of the agency concerned and from their general obligation to safeguard, in the common interest, the future of international order itself."

These weighty words of the Secretary-General, Mr. President, are very important words indeed. They outline in a forceful and vivid way the whole picture of international cooperation and its very structure. And the Secretary-General tells us in substance that either there is the rule of law respected by all—or else international cooperation ceases to be at all possible. But in recent years, and in an increasingly louder fashion, the rule of law within international organizations and specialized agencies has been treated with utter contempt. Political issues, purely political issues have replaced and prevented the constructive debate and solution of scientific, economic or technical problems. I am not suggesting that political issues should not be discussed; but they have their proper forum, which is this assembly, or a regional political organization. But for sometime, Mr. President, one cannot discuss international cooperation on education, or labor conditions, or telecommunications, or fisheries, or meteorological problems, or airways, or in fact anything, without first debating purely political issues for endless days. My country has been a very special target, and a victim of such a disruptive behavior. In fact there has been no meeting of any specialized agency without political debate of and political attacks on certain Portuguese policies. And many times it takes on a ridiculous nature. Recently, in UNESCO, an African delegation, although acknowledging that Portugual is a full member of that agency, asked that the Portuguese delegation should be denied the office space which is allocated to every delegation; and in the International Agency for Civil Aviation another delegation requested, and was supported by a majority vote, that Portuguese airlines should be considered as nonexisting and Portuguese planes should be considered as nonflying. It may seem very easy, Mr. President, and it may seem inocuous and harmless to indulge in attacks against Portugal in the specialized agencies, and to ask for its condemnation, and to ask for its expulsion—in utter disregard of the law and of the basic charter of the various international organizations.

It may seem of no consequence at all. But I remind all those who think along those lines, that if once you violate the law, then you are bound to violate it at other times; and that if you accept the violation of the law when it affects one country, then there is nothing preventing future violations in respect of other countries; and that if you reject a country because you do not agree with certain of its policies, then tomorrow you may be rejecting other countries, and that is the end of international cooperation, and of the diversity which characterizes the international community. There would be no security in international life. Today Portugal is the one which is under attack; but tomorrow capitalist countries may be asking for the expulsion of socialist countries; republics may not like to cooperate with monarchic states; and what seems now to be a very harmless attitude, because it is merely directed against Portugal, may very well backfire and turn against the very countries which now feel very happy in indulging in such a procedure. I therefore fully subscribe to the advice of the Secretary-General, and appeal to all concerned to cease violating international laws and conventions, and to bring some more constructive contribution to the community of nations and to this Organization.

However, Mr. President, this is just an aspect of one serious problem: the breakdown of international law and order. As a matter of fact, during the past few years a new legality has been or is in the process of being created; a new conception of law has been brought to international affairs; and a new legal structure has been ruling the life or at least some aspects of the life of the community of nations. The interesting point is that such a new notion of international lawfulness works in one direction only, for one purpose only, and for the benefit of some only. We have two sets of countries in the international community: some are allowed anything they please, with any justification which may occur to them; other countries are not allowed anything, and they cannot even do what the first ones can. And it does not seem valid to argue in favor of the legitimacy of the actions as a result of the legitimacy of the purposes: because the purposes are themselves an outcome of lawlessness; and besides, such an attitude would amount to saying that it becomes right what is backed or supported by might. In other words, that would be the destruction of the rule of law.

But the breakdown of international law and order and the problems of international immorality and double standard have found in recent weeks a glaring manifestation. I have in mind the conflict between Pakistan and India, to which the Secretary-General refers in his annual report, and which has been debated in the Security Council for the past few weeks. As the Secretary-General points out, the conflict "broke out between India and Pakistan over the longstanding problem of Kashmir."

The conflict is long standing indeed, Mr. President, and it is also a part of the drive of the Indian Government to secure political unity in the subcontinent of India. Already on October 18, 1962, speaking before this Assembly, I stated: "The Indian aggression against Kashmir, a territory which rightfully belongs to Pakistan, is a further step of the drive I am referring to." I said this 3 years ago, and it seems that I was being only too accurate. Because my country, Mr. President, has direct experience of Indian aggression. The grab of Goa, against the will of its population and carried out through military aggression, was just a first step. Other steps will follow if Indian imperialism is not checked in time. Indian aggression against Pakistan is just another example which should be taken by this organization as a further lesson. But important as these aspects are, there are other points which were brought out by Indian aggression against Pakistan and which have implications of a general nature and which do have a bearing on other situations. With your permission, Mr. President, I shall undermine only a few examples. Apart from invading Pakistan territory, which is not under dispute, the Indian Government also invaded that part of Kashmir which is administered by its legal owner. And what was the justification which the Indian Government put forward to excuse its action? The Prime Minister of India said that the bases where infiltrators were coming from had to be attacked and destroyed.

So, Mr. President, the Prime Minister of India is on record as stating that it is legitimate to attack and destroy bases in foreign territories if they are used by people who seek to infiltrate themselves into neighboring territory. My delegation takes very good note of this, and hopes that the Prime Minister of India is not claiming a special prerogative but that he is setting forth a doctrine of which all governments can avail themselves under similar circumstances. Then the Prime Minister of India, in referring to peacekeeping activities of the United Nations, has categorically stated that his Government would never allow any international force to be sent to Kashmir to supervise and insure the ceasefire because India would never tolerate foreign soldiers on Indian soil. Now, Mr. President, has the Prime Minister of India already forgotten that not very long ago India was an enthusiastic supporter of the sending of international armies to foreign countries? Has the Prime Minister of India already forgotten that his own country sent a very large contingent to the Republic of Congo-Léopoldville? Congolese soil is certainly foreign soil insofar as India is concerned; but that does not matter: for the New Delhi government, India soil seems to be superior and more important than that of others. Be it as it may, we take good note that the Indian Government is now against the stationing of foreign soldiers on other people's soils. But as a result of this question of Kashmir, the Indian Prime Minister has made other very interesting points.

Dealing with the suggestion that there should be a plebiscite in Kashmir (as decided by the United Nations 15 years ago), the Indian Prime Minister said that such a suggestion is unacceptable. He seems to have forgot that India has in due time accepted the idea, and now he states that it is a dangerous idea to hold plebiscites at the request of outsiders, and that in any case Kashmir was part of India because it was so provided in the Indian Constitution. We have here, Mr. President, two points of the utmost importance: First, foreign countries or outside organizations cannot request that a plebiscite should be held in a territory which is part of another nation; second, integration of a territory by a constitutional provision or clause of a territory by a constitutional provision or clause is considered to be legitimate and final, and should be so accepted by all. My delegation again, takes good note of this, and hopes that the Indian Government will agree that its doctrine is valid for all and that other governments are entitled to apply it. But the Prime Minister of India also dealt with the question of the self-determination of the people of Kashmir. And then the Prime Minister stated that self-determination is brought about by participation of the people in general elections, in accordance with internal law, and that when people participate in general elections such people have achieved self-determination. In view of the position taken in the past by India in respect of self-determination, this new political posture of the Indian Government is bound to have wide and far-reaching repercussions. Let us see, Mr. President, whether the Indian Government from now on will dare ask for the implementation of other and different criteria when other governments are involved.

I mentioned it above, and the Foreign Minister of Pakistan also referred to Goa as a glaring example of naked Indian aggression: the world wishes to conceal and tries to forget a dark chapter of recent history. But the people of Goa are every day reminded of that chapter, because for them it is an ordeal, and in their painful plight they appeal to the world to save them. They are human beings, Mr. President, but this seems to be of no consequence and of no importance to the great councils of the world like this Assembly. And what is the situation today inside Goa? Unemployment is rampant; there is a general shortage of goods; corruption is deep in administration; poverty and misery are widespread; and movements are being launched in India to destroy the individuality of Goa. On August 26, 1954, speaking before Parliament, the then Prime Minister of India said in respect of Goa: "The special circumstances of cultural, social and lingual relations and the sense of a territorial group which history has created will be respected." Back in 1954, therefore, the then Prime Minister of India recognized the special personality and individuality of Goa, which has no connection with India. We now see how these promises are being fulfilled.

India tries to present itself as the "liberator" of Goa, assuming that role before the world. But only a few weeks ago, as reported in the Times of India, the courts of India ruled that the action of the Indian Government could not be considered as liberation, but that Goa was now Indian by right of conquest. By right of conquest, Mr. President.

The shock and dismay of the Goan population are deeper every day before the perspective of their utter destruction. I will leave it to the Assembly to judge whether Goa has been liberated or has been placed under foreign tyranny. All those who have looked into the problem have no doubts on the feelings of the people of Goa—and although they do not dare yet to speak up, they do know that the Goans have not been liberated but enslaved. If this Assembly is truly concerned with human rights, individual freedom and the welfare of peoples, then a serious investigation should be made of the conditions in that territory, so as to expose before the world a crying situation.

Mr. President, in the course of this debate, and in the Secretary-General's report references were made to the various aspects of what is usually called the peacekeeping functions of this Organization. It seems, Mr. President, that there are many delegations which appear to be very keen on this subject and support almost any kind of proposals empowering the United Nations to conduct such activities. Of course, Mr. President, my delegation along with all or most other delegations believes peace is essential and should be preserved if mankind is to survive and make progress. It is a deep-felt need of men everywhere. But in considering the peacekeeping activities or possibilities or powers which some of us would like to entrust to the Organization, one must be very careful, and we should consider the various implications of any decisions which this Assembly may take on the matter. First of all, and as to financing such peacekeeping activities, my delegation is very happy to note that article 19 of the charter was not called into operation: because such matters are clearly outside its scope, and article 19 certainly has no bearing on the problem. And then, Mr. President, there are other and very important considerations. Some seem to believe that a peacekeeping force should be established, and act as a kind of fire brigade to put down conflicts as and where they might arise.

Now, sir, we all know that there are many types of conflicts or of wars. There are the classical or conventional wars; there are the so-called liberation wars; and there is a type of warfare which works through subversion, infiltration, and attacks across borders or sometimes inside countries. Is the peacekeeping force to be used in all the above circumstances? If not, in respect of what type of warfare are we going to use the peacekeeping force? And if there is to be some discrimination and choice, who decides what? And then, Mr. President, one should also be very careful so as to avoid putting the aggressor and the victim in the same category and under the same treatment. This has been a tendency that is increasing in recent years. It goes under the name of political solution. That means that someone is able to start aggression or to try to solve a problem through military means; then there is a reaction from someone else in self-defense; and there we at once have a general outcry for a political solution which means peace under terms dictated by the opponents. But there is still a more serious consideration connected with or arising from such peacekeeping activities. No force, established on a more or less permanent basis or hastily gathered at random, can be used against the great powers, even if they start an aggression: because the great powers have the military means to resist such a force, and if such a force should be backed by the force of another great power, that would simply mean general war. On the other hand, such force, if applied against a small power or a group of small powers, could operate only with the agreement or the consent of a great power or of a group of great powers. Presumably, Mr. President, the great powers would not give their agreement or consent unless the peacekeeping forces are used in accordance with or in furtherance of their own policies and national aspirations. That means that small powers become mere pawns in the game of the great ones. But when we come to such a situation, then the peacekeeping force becomes useless and unnecessary.

We have a very recent example of this. The war between India and Pakistan was stopped, at least for the time being, and a cease-fire was imposed without any intervention of any international peacekeeping force. Why? I leave it to the Assembly to find the right answer; but agreement to that effect among some great powers was certainly not an indifferent factor; and I think we should be more modest and above all more realistic before we herald the cease-fire on Kashmir as a triumph for the Organization and a victory for the small powers, because both have had nothing to do with such a success. Finally, Mr. President, one has to be very careful as to in what areas may the peacekeeping forces intervene. Certainly not in national territories; certainly not to replace national forces; certainly not to carry out any duties or assume any functions which only belong to the local sovereign state; and when they are used along international borders, then a prior condition should be the consent of the neighboring countries involved. Because nothing should prevent or in any way limit the right of self-defense in respect of national borders against any aggression, be it a classical military operation, or be it a subversive infiltration, starting from foreign bases in contiguous territories and disguised under the name of wars of liberation. We have ourselves been the victims of such infiltrations which find support in foreign soil and in foreign bases, where they are organized and receive all sorts of help. We shall defend ourselves, and my Government is happy to see that the doctrine of self-defense in such circumstances, including the right to destroy and eliminate those foreign bases located in foreign territories, is gaining widespread acceptance among the community of nations. Certainly this is not the privilege of some: it is a doctrine valid for all.

Mr. President, I am ending my remarks. In the course of this debate my country has been subjected to accusations and criticism in connection with our national policy. The accusations are unfounded; the criticism is baseless; and what is presented as facts has been either imagined or distorted. But my delegation does not wish to take more of the time of the Assembly and I therefore shall refrain from replying to those accusations; and in any case they do not deserve our attention. My delegation believes that we should dedicate ourselves to higher preoccupations, and try to solve the real problems of mankind. Disarmament with proper safeguards and underdevelopment are among them. But we cannot make substantial progress if we go on ignoring the law. We all agree that we should strive for world peace. We all agree that we should strive for the welfare of peoples and for better international cooperation. Insofar as we are concerned, I can state that my country is ready to do its utmost for such purpose. We are ready to cooperate with all countries but more specially, as it is only natural, with those with which we have more affinity and common traditions and with those with which we have common borders in Africa. We stretch out our hand and again we offer our full cooperation to them. If we cannot agree, at least for the time being, on some political problems, nothing should prevent us from a close cooperation in every other field, like transportation, communications, economic matters and trade, technical assistance, common development and exploitation of natural resources for the common good. We hope that our neighbors in Africa will increasingly realize the usefulness of such a cooperation in both directions, and the benefits to be derived therefrom, and that they will also realize that anything solid and lasting can only be built through sincere and full cooperation; nothing is achieved through sterile hostility and violence. But, Mr. President, peace is essential; and there is no world peace without world law. Slogans and double standards are not a substitute; they only raise confusion and misery. We cannot buy peace with lawlessness; such a policy would not succeed and mankind may have the misfortune of being led into a world war by an Organization meant to defend world peace. It is a duty for all to try to prevent the United Nations from becoming the betrayed Organization.

FEDERAL REVENUES SHOULD BE CHANNELED BACK TO STATES

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to channel a percentage of Federal revenues back to the States—with no strings attached. Under the formula of this bill about $2.5 billion would be returned annually to the States under present conditions, and the amount would grow as the tax base grows.

In this complex era there are tremendous demands on all levels of government. As the Federal Government's responsibilities grow in defense, in foreign affairs, and in space exploration it is vital that our State governments equip themselves to more vigorously tackle the complex problems of community health, modern education, and general welfare. If the State governments default then there will be an increasing flow of money and power into the already overburdened bureaucracy in Washington.

Kansas, under Republican leadership, has been a model of what a State government should be. Former Governor FRANK CARLSON, now a U.S. Senator, initiated a dynamic mental health program which has been emulated in progressive States all across the Union. Our present Governor William Avery's dramatic programs for education, highway building and industrial growth are geared to the needs of the present and the challenges of the future. I believe an observer of the national political scene, James M. Perry, hit the nail on the head recently when he wrote:

> The Republicans in this State (Kansas) represent a solid tradition. They are honest, industrious, and almost always alert to the basic desires of the electorate. They are prudent but not penurious; conservative but not reactionary.

Mr. Speaker, if the vitality and strength of our States is to be maintained and increased, more money will have to be available for State treasuries. As the Federal Government expanded it utilized tax sources which were then closed to the States. It is only right that the Federal Government return a portion of this money for use as the State sees fit. The formula of my bill, also introduced by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] in the other body, would give Kansas, for example, about $24.5 million extra a year with which to work—without dictation from the Federal Government as to how the money would be spent. These increased funds, on a nationwide basis, would increase the ability of every State to deal effectively with social problems, and decrease the necessity for Federal action in those areas.

I hope the Congress will give immediate attention to this legislation next session.

LOS ANGELES RIOTS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. REINECKE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said recently about the tragically destructive riots of this past summer in Los Angeles. There have been charges and countercharges leveled from all directions, and from all parts of the country. Some of the discussion has been very useful in helping concerned citizens to find the root causes of this terrible civil disorder. Other parts of the dialog have been unfortunately disruptive and inflammatory.

Among the hundreds of items which have crossed my desk pertaining to the Watts riots, the following statement seems worthy of special recognition. Nowhere else, Mr. Speaker, have I seen this document reprinted, and I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD.

The statement was made by the mayor of Los Angeles, the Honorable Samuel W. Yorty, who is well known to Members of this body. This statement should be read hand in hand with an excellent editorial entitled "The Second Civil War," by M. B. Jackson. That editorial was introduced into the RECORD yesterday at page 26915 by our distinguished colleague from California [Mr. YOUNGER]. In the interest of economy, I shall not attempt to have Mr. Jackson's astute observations reprinted here. I do, however, commend the commentary to my colleagues.

Mayor Yorty's statement is especially significant, and I hope all Members will take time to study the thoughts of the man upon whose shoulders so much responsibility rests.

The mayor's excellent statement follows:

STATEMENT BY MAYOR YORTY, AUGUST 16, 1965

Respect for the rights of others is the cornerstone of democracy. This requires respect for law. It also requires respect for those charged with the duty of enforcing the laws; of maintaining order; and controlling those criminal and irresponsible elements who can only be restrained by physical force.

Practically all of our 2,700,000 citizens willingly obey the laws and respect the rights of their fellow citizens. Otherwise, our 5,091 police officers could not begin to cope with our law enforcement problems. Every citizen should remember that the first defender of his rights, the defender of the safety of his person and his property is the one he calls when his rights are threatened—the police officer. The police officers who defend us deserve, and must have, our gratitude, support, and understanding. It is well to understand that our constitutional right to be secure in our person and property is translated into reality in the first instance by the policeman who stands guard over our city. Anyone who deliberately attempts to undermine faith in our Los Angeles Police Department is attacking the very structure of our free society and jeopardizing our safety.

For some time there has existed a worldwide subversive campaign to stigmatize all police as "brutal." The cry of "police brutality" has been shouted in cities all over the world by Communists, dupes, and demagogs irrespective of the facts. Such a campaign has been vigorously pushed here in Los Angeles. In fact, the "big lie" technique has been used to such an extent that some unthinking people have been misled by the incessant repetition of the lie. Criminal elements have seized upon the false charge to try to excuse their lawlessness. These criminal elements seek to put the blame on the police for their own wanton attacks on the persons and property of their neighbors. These criminal elements hate the police who restrain them and protect us from them to the best of their ability.

Of course, all policemen are not public relations specialists. They do the best they can under trying circumstances. They are forced to deal with dangerous criminals and recently they have been forced to do this under such restraints that they can hardly even protect themselves from attack or command respect and obedience from lawless elements.

Last Wednesday night far more policemen were injured by mobs than mob members by policemen. Their restraint was remarkable when one considers the dangerous situations they faced, and the fact that by resorting to their arms they could have protected themselves.

Certainly Negroes in the South have been deprived of their rights and deprived of justice, but this provides no excuse for the criminal elements who terrorized their own people and indiscriminately and wantonly attacked citizens of our city.

Race relations in this city have received a staggering blow. It is hard for me to believe that this happened here. The number of Negroes involved was large, but only a small percentage of the Negro population of our city. Almost all of our Negro citizens are saddened, shocked, and ashamed of what has happened. We must give them our understanding and assurance of our good will and respect. We cannot permit a criminal element to destroy the exemplary race relations which must continue to exist in our city. I hope our responsible Negro citizens will be emboldened to help us suppress the criminal element which has done so much to besmirch our city and that the reckless charges of "police brutality" be repudiated by all of our citizens. Surely now all can clearly see how dependent we are for our safety upon our courageous policemen and firemen.

Now that the carnival of carnage has subsided, I hope those "looters" who were carried away by events will voluntarily return the property they stole. They can return it through their churches and other institutions. Those who do not return the stolen property should remember that so long as they keep it, they must know in their hearts that they have made thieves of themselves. They may escape justice, but they cannot escape the haunting knowledge of their misdeeds.

Law and order will be reestablished in this city, and order will be maintained by as much force as is necessary. No problems existing here or allegations of "police brutality" can excuse the attacks of criminal elements upon the people of this city.

SHARE FEDERAL TAX REVENUES WITH THE STATES

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide for the sharing of certain Federal tax revenues with the States. In my judgment, this bill would do much to lighten the enormous burden that has been placed on State and local governments in recent decades.

The strain of more people demanding more services has pushed State and local tax bases to the limit. In my own State of Massachusetts this problem has had a particularly severe impact on property tax rates which have skyrocketed and made industrial growth and the provision of adequate services at the local level extremely difficult.

When we look at the figures, we gain a greater appreciation of the magnitude of the problem. In the decade which ended in 1963, school age population increased by 40 percent, while the population as a whole grew by only 19 percent. At the other end of the scale, the number of people 65 or over increased by 35 percent. This situation meant a great burden on citizens during their most productive years—to the detriment of their own planning for future security, and their ability to provide proper education for their children.

All of this population growth and mobility has taken place on an essential fixed tax base. Property tax increases have provided 46 percent of increased local revenue, but another 32 percent has come from consumer taxes of one sort or another.

Most of the States, and now many of our major cities have imposed sales taxes, hotel and motel taxes, and other revenue raising devices which in the short run may help meet immediate needs, but in the long run can only hurt their competitive position in the economy.

Despite the increase in Federal grant-in-aid programs, these funds have provided only 16 percent of the additional $35 billion in State and local revenues between 1953 and 1963. The remaining 84 percent came from increased taxes—and increased State and local indebtedness.

Clearly this is not a healthy situation. And we still cannot see the end to the number of problems that will continue to face us in the decades ahead. We have only scratched the surface in dealing with problems of air and water pollution, the application of modern technology to civilian problems, the care and prevention of physical and mental illness, the development of schools of quality and imagination, the provision of adequate recreation facilities, the prevention of crime, and juvenile delinquency.

We must not wait until these problems become so acute that we are forced to substitute a crash program for long-term planning. We must develop the means by which to anticipate these needs and provide for them now.

When we look at the traditional economic tools available to policymakers, we find that for one reason or another all of them are inappropriate to the present circumstances. Federal tax reduction to enable the States to increase their own taxes is of dubious value. Only a small amount of funds released through tax reduction would end up as State and local revenue.

Tax credits or the relinquishment of certain Federal taxes to the States have serious difficulties. In the first place, the funds would end up in the States from which the bulk of Federal revenues originate, thus perpetuating the economic imbalance that already exists between many of our States. In the second place many States, those which do not have income taxes for example, would not benefit at all. The proposal to share revenue from a particular tax between the Federal and State Governments also suffers from the fact that areas of revenue do not always correspond to areas of need. In addition, the repeal of a number of Federal excise taxes this year reduces the opportunity for the use of this technique.

Of course, specific Federal grants to States and localities are already in widespread use, but there are a number of problems which do not lend themselves to this method. Furthermore, the administrative burdens and necessary Federal controls can be burdensome.

We must find a method that will honor the principle that the best government is the government closest to the people and assist the States in solving urgent problems.

I believe that this legislation reaches this middle ground. It provides for a trust fund of 1 percent of the national aggregate taxable income. Present estimates indicate that this would amount to $2.5 billion and expand with the tax base.

This money would be available to the States for health, education, and welfare purposes. It could not be used for highways, debt service, general administrative expenses, disaster relief, or State payments in lieu of real property taxes.

The fund would be distributed to the States as follows: 80 percent of the total would go to the States in proportion with their tax effort, as compared with the average national tax effort, and their population. Tax effort is measured by dividing total State revenues by the total individual income for the State. The remaining 20 percent would go to the 13 States with the lowest per capita income according to population. No State could receive more than 12 percent of the total fund.

The Governors and the Secretary of the Treasury would be required to provide detailed audits to the Congress. Furthermore, the State would be required to distribute the funds to local communities according to the proportion of previous distributions. Failure of a State to comply with the limited conditions outlined in the act would result in cancellation of the State's future payments and allocation of the State's funds to the other States.

This formula assures flexibility without flabbiness and State responsibility without unwarranted Federal restrictions. In my judgment, this is one of the most creative things we can do to insure the economic health and effective responsibility of State and local government. The Republican Governors endorsed such a proposal last summer and I am proud to assist in giving it concrete expression today.

Of course, we cannot give this idea proper analysis in the few days that remain in this session, but I think it should receive top priority when we reconvene in January.

LAWS, THEN WHAT NEXT?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, Raymond Moley has an excellent column in the October 11, 1965, issue of Newsweek. It is refreshing once in a while to see someone give a little concern about the direction in which we are heading. Anyone who has any concern at all about the future of our country should read this article.

It is particularly noteworthy on this day when the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations tells us that we are over the hump on the $100 billion budget figure. This next year will see a budget reaching $120 billion which is almost 50 percent more than when the Democrat administration took office 5 short years ago. Where are we headed? Mr. Moley gives us a good indication.

PERSPECTIVE—LAWS, THEN WHAT NEXT?

(By Raymond Moley)

At the rate Lyndon B. Johnson is going in exacting what he wants from Congress, he will not only outstrip his predecessors but rival such famous lawgivers as Hammurabi, Moses, Justinian I, and Napoleon. Of these, I select Justinian as a warning to our energetic President. For while Justinian became immortal because of his promotion of the great Corpus Iuris, he made an unholy mess of his job as an administrator. James Bryce tells us that Justinian was so extravagant that he stirred up revolts throughout the empire because of his fiscal exactions through taxes and confiscations. "His changes were all in the direction of greater centralization * * * in some cases limiting the powers and appropriating the funds of the municipalities." Lavish sums were required to buy off the barbarians and for his wars. And his bureaucracy was not only wasteful but corrupt.

It is relatively easy for a President possessed of such political power as L.B.J. to jam a great volume of laws through Congress. The real test comes when the new projects are administered. We already have a portent of what is to come in confusion, waste, and the political use of the antipoverty program. Preparations for medicare are meeting serious problems. And the education program finds great overlapping with State and local operations, but there is overcentralization in Washington.

EFFICIENCY ISN'T NEWS

The President is already asking subordinates to think up new programs for 1966. His appetite for new Government enterprises at home and abroad seems to be boundless. But the digestive apparatus of his bureaucracy is suffering internal pains and retchings. Competent administrators to organize new agencies are scarce. But, as in the Shriver case, when L.B.J. finds no one for the new program, he spreads the energies and ingenuity of one administrator over two jobs.

Good and efficient administration is a prosaic job. Headlines in that department are made only when something goes wrong. The President is demanding that all good news should be announced by the White House. But one can imagine the President's unhappiness when some bureau head provides such items as the firing of 200 employees or the cutting down of a benefit. Only the invention of some new program rates a Johnsonian homily on the nightly television show.

Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD has called for a moratorium on new projects. He says: "We have passed a lot of major bills at this session, some of them very hastily, and they stand in extreme need of a going-over for loopholes, rough corners and particularly for an assessment of current and ultimate cost * * * [there is need to] evaluate the degree of efficiency with which they are being administered by the executive." That task alone would occupy Congress throughout the entire year 1966. But the President is the one who is responsible for seeing that the new programs are properly manned and competently administered. This sort of labor will yield little political appeal—and 1966 is an election year. Only by making sure that the benefits so joyfully announced will actually reach the prospective beneficiaries will the many promises come true.

ENACTING GOOD INTENTIONS

What we have had this year is only the enactment into law of the good intentions of the President and his friends in Congress. Very few Members of Congress had the slightest idea how these beneficial gestures were going to be realized. They merely voted for the bills and dumped the job of management upon an already overburdened bureaucracy. In many cases that bureaucracy had and has no idea how the beautifully phrased purposes of these measures could be realized. In such cases the administrators make a great fuss of hiring new people, setting up complicated charts and making sure that the appropriation will be spent.

Good intentions alone will never create a great society. I have on an earlier occasion cited the comment of Santayana (which he applied to William James' pragmatism): "Love is very penetrating, but it penetrates to possibilities rather than to fact." Often the broad highway paved with legislative good intentions ends in an administrative swamp.

WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SHRIVER HAS WARLORDS APLENTY: BUT WHAT ABOUT THE POOR?

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Monadnock Ledger, an outstanding weekly newspaper published in Jaffery, N.H., commented with great insight on the war on poverty. The editorial was generated by the appearance last month in New Hampshire of Sargent Shriver and aids who, to judge from this and other press commentary, left a strangely disquieting impression on many people in my State.

I voted against the poverty program both in the last Congress and in this one not because I do not believe the Federal Government has a solemn obligation in this area, nor because some of the programs included in this voluminous legislation are not worthy by themselves. I voted against it because I feared that what is in fact happening in the program would be the consequence.

NOT REACHING THE POOR

This program is not reaching the poor, at least not in any way proportionate to the huge sums and energies that are being devoted to it. Like a river which flows into the desert and disappears in the sand, antipoverty funds are flowing into the country but are being consumed in the limitless sands of politics, local, State, and Federal. As to the poor, they are being led to put trust in false promises.

The war on poverty is many faceted. It will be won, as every major social problem in American history has been overcome, through education, through jobs, through enlightened Government at every level helping a willing and able people to pursue their own chosen ends.

POLITICS TOO LARGE A FACTOR

This battle against poverty can never be won solely by placing vast sums and authority at the disposal of a few politically appointed officials who may grant or withhold them at their pleasure. As we are seeing, and as we have seen since the inception of this program, it is entirely too political. The poverty war, its underlying philosophy and its, now obvious though predictable, shortcomings will be the subject of much further discussion in the months ahead.

Although I opposed the program in the form in which it was presented to the Congress, I am deeply concerned by the problems it seeks to alleviate and I am anxious that we salvage all the good we possibly can from the experience we have had with it.

I offer the editorial from the Ledger at this point in the RECORD and also, by way of illustrating the extent to which blatant politics has been allowed to dominate the program, I offer a chilling article from a recent issue of the Wall Street Journal. I earnestly commend them to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the Monadnock Ledger]

TAKES ALL KINDS

Sargent Shriver's jaunty war on poverty and mankind's weary war on poverty are horses of a different color.

We betray the earth's poor if we confuse them.

The dapper Director of America's Office of Economic Opportunity was absolutely right when he said at Durham last Thursday afternoon that his immaculate war, like mankind's grimy war, and the ugly war in Vietnam are all part of the same great cosmic struggle.

America need not choose between guns and butter he said, because "It's all one war and we're all in it."

But war has always been a panoply.

One man's chance to die in the mud is another man's opportunity to get fat in the Quartermaster Corps. There are foot soldiers and there are profiteers. There are those who follow orders and those who see to it they get promoted.

Shriver's warlords, as you may have noticed, are in charge of logistics. They are back at headquarters where the medals are kept.

We got a good look at them in full dress uniform last Thursday afternoon at Snively Arena in Durham, when New Hampshire's Office of Economic Opportunity stood at attention for the general.

Shriver came here, supposedly, to talk strategy with 300 delegates to the Northern New England Governors' Conference on Community Action. But somehow something happened. It turned out he talked politics to the faculty and the student body of the University of New Hampshire.

Oh, you think it is unfair to holler "politics"?

Why, then, was the event scheduled at Snively Arena, which is bigger than a football field?

All 300 delegates to the Conference on Community Action could have gotten lost in one corner of the gaping auditorium, and Governor King and Senator MCINTYRE along with them.

They were not there to fight a war. They were there to stay elected. And make no mistake about it. The address was political, complete with a snide reference to Senator Goldwater, who is no longer a candidate and in no way the issue. The press conference afterward was as partisan as they come.

The tragedy is that Shriver was right about the war on poverty. It is global. It is everywhere.

But in his address last Thursday he gave not the slightest inkling he understands how desperately the war needs to be won.

Poverty is not a category. It does not begin and end at $3,000 a year. It is not even essentially a matter of dollars, although economics plays a part in the syndrome.

It is a question of relationship. It is a sickness of the spirit that sets in when one part of the human family lives off the blood of another.

Poverty is progressive, like gangrene, and unless we cure it in the world we will never come to grips with that other galloping ghost: the population explosion.

The poor people of the world, you see, are the ones who are growing by leaps and bounds. It is their protest. The meek will inherit the earth, and find their rightful place on the planet, or they will push us all relentlessly off it.

They must be fed, of course, but the war on poverty will not end with the whole human race gathered around a trough. The poor will keep pushing until they stand free and in dignity. That is the other half of America's political dialog.

And that's why it was so chilling to watch Shriver's warlords pass in review last Thursday.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

POLITICAL IMPRINT ON YOUTH CORPS

(By Jerry Landauer)

CARLINVILLE, ILL.—When Sargent Shriver's antipoverty program descended on southern

Illinois one Friday afternoon, certain townsfolk in Macoupin County could hardly contain their joy. "I thought it was too good to be true for a thing like that just to drop on us," recalls Walter Vesper, a Democratic ward leader who makes his living checking eggs and produce for the State department of agriculture.

In Staunton, Mr. Vesper and several more Democratic colleagues unhesitatingly enlisted as local lieutenants in the national antipoverty crusade. With an efficiency that big city machines might envy, the small-town politicians worked the phones that weekend. By 9 o'clock Monday morning more than a score of young men and women aged 16 to 21 were lined up outside the city clerk's office and by late afternoon close to 40 had signed up for the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

"Not one Republican family around here knew anything about it until after the kids were enrolled," says Roy France, former mayor and voluntary suprevisor of the Staunton NYC project who later quit in disgust. "I'd say probably not more than five kids were really poor. While the wealthy kids were working, many who didn't have decent clothes to go to town in came to me crying. It was a rotten, corrupt political deal."

Here at the county seat the joy generated by the NYC matched the cheers it received in Staunton. Skipping church in Sunday, Carlinville's five Democratic precinct leaders gathered around the council table in city hall to deliberate. In meetings convened for 10 a.m., 2 p.m., 5:30 p.m., and 8 p.m. the leaders lined up enrollees. "By Sunday night we had 27 boys and 10 girls," Mayor Howard Heinz recalls.

Lanky Mayor Heinz, a furniture dealer, hadn't even been aware that Macoupin County would participate in the Youth Corps part of the poverty program until an emissary appeared in his store at 5 p.m. the previous Friday to tell him. "It was a purely Federal expenditure going down the hatch anyway, so I took it," the mayor explains.

"The kids were supposed to start work Monday morning. I asked, 'How can we organize this thing so fast?' and this fellow said not to worry. That had been taken care of, he told me." Next day Carlinville's Democratic chief called to suggest the Sunday meetings.

GUIDELINES NOT CONSULTED

But though Carlinville's Democrats organized the Corps without help from county or State welfare agencies (the county public aid director wasn't even asked to provide a list of potential enrollees) and without consulting Washington's selection guidelines, the youth project rolled along fairly well for a time.

The youngsters helped stack books at the library, supervised children in the park, cleaned up parts of the city cemetery, pulled grass from sidewalk cracks, and cut away underbrush near the lake. They were paid $40 for a 32-hour week.

Some problems did crop up. One boy who terrorized other brush cutters with a machete-like knife had to be removed for psychiatric examination. John Dunn, veteran Democratic leader of the third ward, tried to fire a second boy whose parents he believed might be Republicans.

Nonetheless, many townsfolk say that, to some extent, at least, Washington's goal of providing useful work experience for needy kids was met. Naturally, Democratic politicians lead what chorus of praise is heard for the Corps' accomplishments.

"These kids did things that have never been done in this town before," asserts Robert (Sonny) Albertine, one of the five precinct leaders who attended the Sunday selection sessions. Mr. Albertine, who draws $748 monthly as chief plumber at the statehouse in Springfield, a post to which he was appointed by the secretary of state, particularly resents complaints that his 17-year-old stepson was among the youths who found work in the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

"He comes from a broken home, don't he?" Sonny demands. "Believe me, that kid came home from work with blisters on his hands. Anyway, to the victors go the spoils; you know what I mean?"

A VOLLEY OF PROTEST LETTERS

The appearance of the stepson's name on the list of recruits published by one of the town's two weekly newspapers was among the events that inflamed the critics. Others wondered how a girl member of the corps could afford to drive to her playground-supervisor job in a sporty red convertible (a gift from her grandfather). Charles F. Wolf, a bacteriologist, began firing off a volley of protest letters to Washington; there the Labor Department operates the NYC under Sargent Shriver's generalship.

Mr. Wolf's complaints drew a rather prompt response. Sargent Shriver's headquarters dispatched an inspector, and within a few days 83 corpsmen in the county were dropped as ineligible. But that still left Macoupin holding 186 of the 900 jobs filled in all Illinois beyond Chicago. "We don't fool around down here," brags county Democratic leader Edgar Fuess, recalling that of the first 600 jobs Macoupin hogged half. Mr. Fuess is on the State payroll as a truck weight checker.

Spokesmen for the Illinois Farmers Union, the statewide project sponsor, say politics infiltrated the Youth Corps as a byproduct of well-intentioned haste to get it going. "The thing did get away from us," concedes Ray Watson, Farmers Union president. "But as soon as we found something wrong we got cracking."

Critics, however, pointing to the Farmers Union's close ties with Illinois Democrats, question the wisdom of delegating responsibility for any part of the antipoverty program to organizations which are necessarily involved in local or State politics.

Democratic boss Fuess, for example, is a Farmers Union member. He readily concedes that the group's county president asked him to help organize the Youth Corps. "Naturally I helped all I could."

Right now the local Democrats are waiting hopefully for more Federal money to finance a followup project of part-time work for youngsters who otherwise couldn't stay in school. Few politicos who greeted the Youth Corps with signup pencils poised, seem chastened.

"There was only one mistake in the whole business," concludes Carlinville's Sonny Albertine. "That was when Washington paid attention to a bunch of gripers."

THE CITIZEN'S VOICE—A VITAL LEGISLATIVE INGREDIENT

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the voice of the citizen is still a vital ingredient in the formulation of new laws. This point is very well expressed in a recent editorial from the Keene Sentinel, an outstanding newspaper in my district. As an example it uses my bill to provide humane care for laboratory animals. This legislation was drafted in response to public demand expressed to me by hundreds of individuals in letters and conversations and by many newspapers. Continued demand from the public resulted in public hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I am confident that continued public concern will produce good legislation and want to take this opportunity to express my thanks once again to all those who have given and are still giving their invaluable support to this worthy cause. I offer the Sentinel's editorial at this point for the RECORD.

[From the Keene (N.H.) Evening Sentinel, Oct. 5, 1965]

THE CITIZEN'S VOICE

Private citizens, like small city newspapers, sometimes wonder whether their opinions count. When important issues are being debated in the Nation's Capital, citizens in New Hampshire's Second District often wonder whether their views, expressed in letters to their Congressman, really make any difference.

There is evidence that they sometimes do.

A case in point has been area support of legislation introduced by Representative JAMES C. CLEVELAND, providing for humane treatment of animals used in scientific research.

In May and again in mid-August supporters of the legislation were urged to express their views in letters to CLEVELAND. They did, and, according to CLEVELAND, it helped.

Hearings on the animal-research legislation finally were held last week. In his testimony before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, CLEVELAND said, "I am particularly gratified by these hearings, which I have urged for months, sustained in my efforts by important newspapers and countless concerned citizens of good will."

Regarding the legislation, he said, "Everyone recognizes the need to test radically new surgical procedures, for instance, on animals before they are tried on humans, but once the validity of a procedure is established, or the nonvalidity, for that matter, it seems to me wrong, wasteful, and wicked to repeat the test over and over again. My bill would certainly help prevent this from happening, at least in research financed wholly or in part with Federal funds. At the same time, the legislation recognizes the necessity of using animals in teaching and, under the conditions set by the bill, would permit repetition of procedures for purposes of instruction."

CLEVELAND also listed the six principal elements in his bill which he said he considers essential to an effective law:

1. Unannounced inspection by qualified, full-time inspectors with access to animal quarters, laboratories, and records of animal use.
2. Individal licensing by governmental authority of all scientists desiring to use live vertebrate animals with the right to remove licenses from those who violate the standards of humane treatment.
3. Pain-curbing provisions.
4. Humane care and housing.
5. Student work, as distinct from research conducted by licensed scientists, must be painless.
6. Records that include a brief statement of what is to be done to the animals and why, identification of the animals and their eventual disposition; and the requirement for an annual report.

These are not unreasonable regulations and they would not in any way hamper legitimate research. As CLEVELAND said in his testimony, those who wish to put an end to all animal experimentation would not favor his legislation. But the bill would go far toward causing the amount of experimental work to be held to the minimum actually needed, and toward minimizing the suffering experienced by animals before, during and after experiments.

Humanitarians in the Cheshire County area who have supported Cleveland's bill in letters to the Congressman and letters to newspapers can rest assured that their support has been pertinent.

In closing his testimony last week, Cleveland placed in the Congressional Record editorials from the Christian Science Monitor and the Keene Evening Sentinel, along with selected letters from private citizens, all supporting the legislation.

MINORITY STAFFING FOR CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on February 19 of last year I addressed this House on the subject of minority staffing needs on our committees. At that time only about 60 of the approximately 500 professional staff members employed by the committees of the House were permitted to the minority.

More than a year has passed since I last called attention to this problem. The total number of committee employees, according to the latest lists published in the Congressional Record on August 11, 1965, has risen to more than 630. Yet, so far as I can determine, the number of such employees assigned to the minority still remains near the 60 mark.

Mr. Speaker, Lord Acton wrote almost a hundred years ago:

> Power tends to corrupt; absolute power corrupts absolutely.

Our form of government is dedicated to the proposition that power must be checked and balanced, that no element in our political system should be permitted to reign unbound. Although political parties were not provided for in our Constitution, they inevitably arose out of the circumstances of the Nation's political life and, in accordance with the spirit of the American system, took their place in the counterbalancing process. One of the vital functions of our parties, as of our governmental organs, is to see to it that absolute power not be permitted to coagulate.

Unfortunately and, at least in my opinion, mistakenly, the American electorate last November chose to bloat the already large majority in Congress. Today, the ruling party bestrides the Federal Government like a colossus. It controls both Houses of Congress and all the committees of Congress and all the staffs of those committees. It controls the Presidency and the vast informational and technical resources of the executive departments and agencies.

What role is there for the minority party under these circumstances? How can it best serve the best interests of the country? Obviously, the function of the minority is to oppose, to criticize, to present viable alternatives. This presentation of responsible choices to the public is not just theoretically desirable; it is a practical necessity. An unresponsive minority robs the Nation of a vital control over the actions of the Government. To the extent that the minority party is ineffective, by so much is democratic government weakened.

We live in a perilously complex world. The late President Kennedy, comparing the problems that confronted legislators of the last century with those we must face today, pointed up with acute precision the profound changes that have overtaken us. A century ago, a legislator had only to familiarize himself with perhaps half a dozen issues, and he could face his responsibilities with confidence. The conscientious legislator of our day is confronted by literally scores of complex national and international issues. He must take stands on Cuba, on water pollution, on Vietnam, on civil rights, on the poverty program, on disarmament, on labor relations. He must keep reasonably abreast of such problems as automation, the space program, farm income, consumer prices, and the India-Pakistan rivalry.

No Representative can possibly become expert on all the subjects he ought to keep up with, and, in addition, carry out the many other aspects of his job. He needs help—expert, technical, knowledgeable help. And he most especially needs assistance in those areas for which he has a special responsibility, the subjects under the jurisdiction of the committees on which he serves.

For the majority party members, it is difficult enough, but they at least have at their disposal the loyalty of the committee staffs and the vast resources of the executive branch. The minority, on the other hand, is faced with a desperate need for reliable, confidential aid, the kind that will help it develop those responsible alternatives so vital in a working democracy.

If the minority is to offer constructive alternatives, it must have adequate help in researching policy problems. The figures I have cited as to the pitifully small number of minority committee staff members is prima facie evidence that this resource is lacking. As I warned last February, the problem is acute at this moment, but it will become even more acute with every year that passes as the Nation's problems become more and more complex the necessity for sound alternatives becomes crucial.

Can the majority party really justify a situation in which a committee that deals with as many vital areas of our economy as does the Committee on Banking and Currency permits the minority some 4 staff members out of a total of 59? One of our great watchdog committees, the Committee on Government Operations, charged with the vital duty of overseeing the operation of our vast bureaucracy, deigns to offer the minority a pittance of 3 staff people, reserving some 53 for the majority.

Mr. Speaker, the majority has every right to try to perpetuate itself in office by every legitimate means. But surely the majority also has the duty of playing the game according to fair rules. Surely the present majority must realize that one day our roles may be reversed. This is not merely a question of comity to today's minority but to all future minorities as well.

My party has suggested a number of formulas to relieve the present inequitable situation. The individual merits of any one of them may be arguable, but the principle on which they are based is not.

I have noted with great satisfaction the very large number of Members who have asked the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress to recommend more equitable minority staffing. The responses of many Joint Committee members, both Democrats and Republicans, have been distinctly sympathetic. It is my hope that the Joint Committee will ask Congress to bring much needed reform to this area of its operations.

Ultimately, however, the responsibility will remain with the majority party. We have every indication that the public is favorably disposed toward our cause. It remains only for those who presently hold the power to realize that the Nation's best interests, and therefore the majority's best interest, will be served by permitting the minority a fair share of committee staff assistance.

NINTH SON OF JOHN AND ROSE RODGERS IN SERVICE OF COUNTRY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in this day and age we hear a great deal about those who do not want to serve their country in the Armed Forces. A pitiful spectacle was presented a few weeks ago when pictures showed scores of young men and women lined up to get married to avoid the draft. Beatniks on the west coast talk of burning their draft cards and protest our military involvement in Vietnam. While these people are not representative of the great body of patriotic Americans they receive an undue amount of publicity.

Recently when I had the opportunity to spend an afternoon with our fighting men in Vietnam this was one of the recurring questions: "Do the teach-ins and the Lippman columns represent the thinking of America?" In Coshocton, Ohio, we recently had an example which is the unheralded side of the American character. The ninth son of Mr. and Mrs. John C. Rodgers entered the Army last month. Six sons currently are serving in the Armed Forces and one son died while in service.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the John Rodgers family is a much better example of Americanism than the student protestors to our military policy and those who shirk their duty and evade the draft. I heartily commend the entire family and I want to place in the Record at this point an article from the Coshocton Tribune on September 26, 1965:

Ninth Son of John and Rose Rodgers in Service

Otis Cary Rodgers, who entered the Army September 8, this year, is the ninth son of Mr. and Mrs. John C. Rodgers, 1322 South Sixth Street, to serve in the Armed Forces of the United States. Six of the boys are currently serving in the Armed Forces, at least two of whom are career men, and there are two more who are still in high school and won't be eligible for a few years.

One of the sons died while in the Armed Forces and two others served out their enlistments and did not reenlist.

The first of the family to enter the military service was John Edward who entered the Navy August 1, 1945. Two weeks later the war with Japan ended on his birthday, August 14, and there was a lot of celebration at the boot camp. John Edward wisecracked to his shipmates that he had not expected them to celebrate his birthday quite so enthusiastically.

Henry Edmund, second of the boys to join up, is still in the Air Force, making a career of it. He has been in for 13 years and is currently serving in Germany. His wife and children will join him there in December.

William Daniel, now in his second enlistment in the Air Force, may make a career of it. His family is with him in England.

Norman Eugene entered the Army in June 1959 and died in February 1960, in Aberdeen, Md., where he was serving as an Army medic.

Lonnie, a veteran of the Air Force is now out, married and living in Delaware.

Nathaniel (Sonny) entered the Army in December 1963, and is now serving as a pharmacist at Walter Reed Hospital, Washington, D.C.

Delbert entered the Army October 30, 1963, and is now a bookkeeper in the 561st Engineering Detachment in Germany.

Clyde Thomas is an Army medic in France. He entered the armed service October 1, 1964.

Two sons, Gary, 18, and Richard Allen, 16, are still in high school.

Only one son has not been in the service. Leon Robert was married before he became eligible for the draft. He and his family live at 1002 Orchard Street.

Mr. and Mrs. Rodgers, John and Rose to their friends, also have three daughters.

One daughter, Mary Alice Bankes, is married and works as a beautician in Columbus. Another, Helen, attends Coshocton High School, and a third, Carolyn, 11, is in the sixth grade.

A total of 18 children have been born to John and Rose Rodgers, and 14 survive. Three babies died in infancy.

REPORT ON 1ST SESSION, 89TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, we are now about to adjourn the 1st session of the 89th Congress. Under the leadership of Speaker McCORMACK and with the cooperation of President Johnson, this Congress has kept faith with the American people. In the presidential and congressional campaigns of 1964, our party presented a platform to the American people, setting out a progressive legislative program to improve our Nation's economy, education, health, employment, and agriculture. We passed effective legislation to protect voting rights for all citizens and equitable population apportionment.

We elevated the problems of our Nation's cities to Cabinet status. Seventy percent of our population now live in urban areas. These millions will have equal representation in our National Government along with agriculture and other important segments of our economy.

We legislated for slum clearance, housing, and for continued curbing of Communist aggression in addition to solving many additional problems connected with the largest business on earth—the Government of the United States.

The above programs received the endorsement of the American people last November by an unprecedented majority of over 16 million voters. We have kept the faith. We have followed through on our promises to the people. Some of our opponents criticized this session as being a "rubberstamp Congress." It has been exactly the opposite. I can include myself with approximately 125 Members who have been fighting for these progressive legislative measures for many sessions before the advent of the Kennedy-Johnson victories. The American voters, in November 1964, defeated a number of Congressmen who endorsed the Goldwater reactionary leadership. Many progressive, forward-looking Members were elected. President Johnson has cooperated and fought, shoulder to shoulder, with the legislative branch to bring about the enactment of all planks of the Democratic Party's platform.

When the second session convenes in January, I am confident that any legislation pending at the time of adjournment will be disposed of successfully before the final days of adjournment next year.

AID TO EDUCATION

The record of this session in passing seven major bills pertaining to the education of our youth is unprecedented in the history of this or any other nation. In the future years, millions of American children from the elementary grades to high school and college can, if qualified, secure a finished education regardless of the handicap of short funds or the financial condition of their parents. Any youth with industry and desire for educational advancement can take advantage of legislation passed by this Congress and signed by President Johnson. This great educational expansion gives opportunity to American youth who wish to become doctors, nurses, or participate in scientific education in this atomic age of scientific progress. Time and space do not permit me to give all the details of the wide scope and complex provisions contained in the seven educational bills passed by this Congress.

MEDICAL CARE AND SOCIAL SECURITY EXPANSION

For many sessions of Congress I have joined with a minority of other Members to enact legislation for medical and hospital care plus expanding social security benefits for the elderly citizens of our Nation. This year we have succeeded in passing a comprehensive medicare bill, which will be financed mainly through social security, covering hospital, doctor bills, and other benefits. Detailed directions concerning same can be obtained by writing to your nearest social security office. This Congress, in addition, took congressional action on the construction of new rehabilitation and treatment centers for the mentally ill and retarded. In addition, on August 5, the President signed a bill extending through June 30, 1968, Federal assistance for mass immunization of preschool children against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, and measles. This Federal aid consists of purchasing the vaccine and paying for an educational campaign to get parents to bring in the children, while States and local agencies pay other costs of the immunization.

Two months ago the President also signed a law extending for 3 years and expanding authority to make matching grants, totaling $280 million, to institutions and organizations for constucting, renovating, and equipping health-research facilities.

IMMIGRATION

The recently passed immigration legislation would abolish the bigoted 41-year-old "national origins" provisions of our immigration laws. This new bill will equitably distribute immigration quotas to all nations without prejudice as to nationality, race, or religion. After World War I, an isolation-minded Congress enacted immigration regulations wherein a few countries in northern Europe were extended superliberal immigration quotas, while other nations less favored were restricted with unreasonable limited quotas.

Our migrant population will not be increased by the passage of this bill. We provide for a fair and equitable distribution of the quota allotments to all nations. The bill places a limit of annual immigration at 170,000, inclusive of 10,200 refugees. A maximum of 20,000 will be allotted to any one country. To this number may be added the wives, children, and parents of the U.S citizens. In that latter category there were about 35,000 last year. This bill prevents the permanent separation of families. In many cases the families have remained divided for indefinite periods during these 41 years that we have had the national-origins theory of immigration.

The State, Labor, and Justice Departments are authorized to exercise rigid control over immigrant applications under this new bill. No one can be admitted for citizenship unless the Secretary of Labor issues an individual certificate that there will be no displacement of an American worker from his job. There will be no adverse effect on working conditions, or American labor in general.

EXCISE TAX CUT

Although the President asked for a reduction of $3.5 billion in excise taxes to help spur the economy, Congress sent him—and he signed on June 21—a measure reducing them by $4.6 billion. Most of these taxes were enacted and levied in World War II and the Korean War. Here is the partial schedule of reductions: jewelry, watches, furs, cosmetics, toilet preparations, luggage, handbags, business machines, sporting goods, phonographs, records, musical instruments, cameras, film, radios, televisions, pens, mechanical pencils, refrigerators, coin-operated amusement devices, bowling alleys, general admissions—theaters, athletic events—and cabaret bills.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

VOTING RIGHTS

On August 6, President Johnson signed a bill aimed at enforcing voting rights guaranteed by the 15th constitutional amendment. It was the second major civil rights law enacted in 2 years.

Federal registrars, or examiners, can be—and are being—sent to any State or political subdivision that on November 4, 1964, had a registration or voter participation of less than 50 percent of the voting-age population, and that used a literacy test or other device in qualifying voters.

ONE MAN, ONE VOTE

I am opposed to legislation in Congress or State legislatures that will give political bosses or special interest groups who are sponsoring amendments to our Constitution the right to overturn the one-man, one-vote rule of legislative apportionment. They would ignore population or people as the yardstick to determine legislative districts.

The Revolutionary War and Civil War were fought for constitutional liberty and to preserve the Bill of Rights. These liberties are being threatened today by those who would legislate inequality in the Nation's legislative halls. The yardstick to determine a county, district, or community's representation in our Congress or State legislatures should not be measured by acres, geography, or livestock.

MANPOWER TRAINING

Renewed and expanded authority for Federal job retraining programs began July 1. The bill was approved by President Johnson on April 26. The aim of this law is mainly to help jobless workers because of mechanical or technological change. It was expanded to provide for teaching and training unemployed and other applicants.

This measure authorizes training for service and craft jobs, and eases requirements for unemployed people's relocation expenses. Experimental, demonstration, and pilot projects are established to show new methods of meeting problems of long-term unemployment. This program is much needed for underprivileged youth, displaced older workers, the handicapped, and members of minority groups. Training payments may now be paid for 104 weeks, twice as long as previously allowed.

The goal in 1962 had been to train 400,000 jobless workers in the succeeding 3 years. More than 320,000 trainees have been accepted in the program.

AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

This session of Congress has finally passed legislation which will eventually result in the termination of the inexcusable polluting of our lakes, rivers, and streams throughout the Nation. Legislation has also been enacted wherein the Government is taking advantage of the scientific progress made in solving the air pollution problem. Although science has not completely mastered the method for 100-percent purification of both air and water, the time is not far off when the pollution menace to health and recreation will be as obsolete as the kerosene lamp. It is impossible for local communities to successfully solve the complete problem of air and water pollution. Some major industries, even today, are totally ignoring scientific discoveries regarding pollution and industrial waste. It is necessary that our Federal Government be constantly alert to eliminate the inexcusable pollution of our fresh air and waters in order to protect our national health.

PUBLIC BUYING POWER

Older folks who suffered through the depression in the early 1930's fully realize that the major cause of unemployment, business failures, farm bankruptcy, and public distress was the drying up of the Nation's buying power in the 1920 period. When millions of people are working at low wages or part time, markets for manufactured products, food, and other necessities soon diminish.

During that depression, internal Communist agitators in our industrial centers had a fertile field in which to spread dissension and promote riots among the discontented.

I recall the great legislative program enacted in order to restore employment, aid industry, and reestablish buying power which started under President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and has continued to expand with slight interruption, down to the present day. During this session of Congress we enacted other programs to plug loopholes in certain distressed areas over the Nation for the purpose of taking people off relief and restoring spotty unemployment which will eventually make taxpayers out of tax consumers. This program will curb poverty, expand education, establish business, industry, and build highways, in subnormal or backward areas. When this program is fully established, it will provide more work, not only in these depressed areas, but it will bring a demand for steel, lumber, brick, oil, and hundreds of other commodities manufactured in our Calumet region of Indiana.

JOINT COMMITTEE OF HOUSE AND SENATE

The Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress was authorized in this session. Senator **MIKE MONRONEY**, of Oklahoma, was appointed cochairman from the Senate and I from the House of Representatives. Our joint committee has held 41 hearings during the past 7 months. Testimony has been given by many Members of Congress, university professors, and leaders of business, industry, labor, and other groups. Contrary to popular opinion, there has been a surprising interest in congressional reform as evidenced by the fact that almost 20 percent of the total membership of the House and Senate has testified. We have received a great many suggestions relating to all aspects of congressional organization such as selection of committee chairmen, various housekeeping functions, campaign finance, and similar items. A few reforms seem to stand out. First, there has been considerable interest in lengthening the term of Members of the House of Representatives. Many witnesses, both in and outside of Congress, suggested that our committee recommend a 4-year term for Members of the House. When a Congressman takes office in January, he must start campaigning almost immediately for his next primary election only 15 months away. A vast majority of city, county, State, and National offices have been extended to 4-year terms or longer. Instead of a constant campaign for reelection, Congressmen should have more time to study and evaluate legislation. A congressional election every 2 years is also a huge burden on the pocketbook of the average congressional candidate.

We have had considerable testimony concerning how the Congress should review and evaluate the budget proposals of the executive branch. Evidence has been presented that indicates the machinery of Congress for purposes of analyzing and evaluating billion-dollar budget requests is outmoded and obsolete. Our committee and staff have a tremendous and important task ahead and, hopefully, we can make recommendations that will improve the efficiency of the Congress and bring about savings of tax dollars to the American people.

NATIONAL SOLVENCY

Critics continue to talk about the size of our national debt. They fail to mention in their pessimistic propaganda that our economy—or gross national product—has been advancing and improving over the last 20 years. In 1946 our gross national product was approximately $202 billion. Today, in 1965, our gross national product at the termination of this year will be approximately $660 billion. They also fail to mention that our national debt in 1946 was $270 billion and today, in 1965, it is approximately $318 billion. In other words, our national debt in 20 years has increased $48 billion while our gross national product, or our economy generally, has increased approximately $460 billion. This increase of gross national product means billions more in taxes coming into the Federal, State, and local treasuries. So when your neighbor talks about our Nation's fiscal policy "going to the dogs" you might quote figures of our great business, industrial, and employment expansion during the last 20 years. If any of our Lake County citizens wish a U.S. Treasury breakdown of our national debt as compared to our gross national product for each year over the last 20 years, I would be glad to mail the same.

LEGISLATION ENACTED

In this session of Congress, 255 public laws and resolutions have been enacted and signed by the President, and 130 private laws and resolutions.

In submitting this legislative report to the citizens of my congressional district, I am continuing a service which I have always followed after the adjournment of each session of Congress.

We will reconvene for the 2d session of the 89th Congress in January. I hope that my 1966 report will contain favorable news on the present unfinished legislative business and successful decisions on any new domestic and international problems which confront our Nation.

MEDICARE: THE CHALLENGE TO HOSPITALS

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. **FOGARTY**] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include a speech which I delivered at the dedication of cornerstone laying ceremony, Mercy Hospital, North Smithfield, R.I., October 10, 1965:

MEDICARE: THE CHALLENGE TO HOSPITALS

(Address by Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY, dedication at cornerstone laying ceremony, Mercy Hospital, North Smithfield, R.I., October 10, 1965)

This fine new hospital building for which we today lay the cornerstone promises to carry on and expand the mission implied in its name—the bestowal of mercy.

A dictionary definition of "mercy" is "compassion to victims of misfortune." In its more than a decade of service, the staff of Mercy Hospital has performed many acts of compassion to aid victims of many kinds of misfortune.

Mercy Hospital has been uniquely equipped for this purpose, for it has been able to provide many services that other hospitals—even those of larger size—do not provide.

For instance, only 25 percent of non-Federal short-term hospitals have a radioisotope facility such as Mercy's. Only about one-half of such hospitals have pathology laboratories and pharmacies such as those of Mercy.

And now, with a new location and expanded size, Mercy Hospital will enter into an even greater decade of service—service not only to the people of the immediate surrounding community, but to those of more remote areas of northern Rhode Island, and to neighboring Massachusetts as well.

For Mercy Hospital is no longer a short-term, 30-bed facility. It now boasts a hundred beds, 50 of which are to be reserved for the treatment of long-term patients—and these, I can assure, will not be wanting.

Under provisions of the Social Security Act of 1965—an act whose provisions I long supported and fought for in the Congress—elderly citizens who previously could not afford even the minimum of needed hospital and medical care will now, with Government assistance, be able to receive full and adequate medical treatment.

Under provisions of the bill, persons aged 65 and over will be eligible for 60 days of hospital care, after payment of a small deductible charge. An additional 30 days of care can be obtained at a cost to the patient of only $10 a day.

All regular hospital services are included under the act with the exception of those provided by hospital-based specialists. Outpatient diagnostic services are covered in amount equal to 80 percent of total costs less a small deductible.

These benefits, plus those available under an inexpensive voluntary medical insurance program, will for the first time offer to all elderly persons, the proper medical care they need and deserve.

Yet, as wonderful as these benefits are, the program will not function without posing some significant challenges.

Specifically, I refer to the challenge to our Nation's hospitals—a challenge to expand facilities now and "tool up" for the increased demands that will be placed on their bed capacities, their facilities, and their services.

Medicare, as well as other new Federal medical programs, will challenge communities with small or inadequate hospital facilities to plan new or expanded ones.

I am proud that here in northern Rhode Island such a challenge has been met. With its new capacity for long-term patients, Mercy Hospital stands ready for what the future will bring—I am sure that with its excellent administration and the support of the community it will meet the challenge to expand again if the future demands continued growth.

As many of you here today well know, it is not easy to get a hospital built. Just as the medicare program resulted from years of debate and planning by those of us in Congress who are directly concerned with the Nation's health—so the administrators of Mercy Hospital struggled against great odds to obtain the modern facility we stand before today.

The hospital was not eligible to expand its original facilities under the regular Hill-Burton hospital construction program because the State health department did not rate the Woonsocket area one of high priority. Further the old building did not meet the fire safety standards specified as a requirement for meeting Hill-Burton standards.

However, with the passage of the accelerated public works program in 1962, funds were made available to support hospital construction without regard to a local priority rating. The program, in addition to helping increase the Nation's health resources, also was designed to provide immediate useful work for the unemployed in labor surplus areas.

I have followed the progress of Mercy Hospital in its efforts to obtain Federal aid—first for the construction of expanded facilities, and then for the construction of a brand new building. However, because of the rigid fair standards of the Hill-Burton Act, in which I firmly believe, I did not attempt to interfere in any way with the decisions of the local advisory council.

It is then to the credit of Joseph O'Donnel and the others who worked diligently with him to obtain funds locally and who did not desist in efforts to obtain Federal assistance, that the Mercy Hospital project did receive approval in July 1963 for a grant under the accelerated public works program. I am happy to say that the Federal Government was able to provide about 43 percent of the total cost of construction.

Yet, as proud as all of us Rhode Islanders can be of Mercy Hospital, we Americans are going to need more of them—not just in Rhode Island, but in every State in this Nation.

There are about 19 million elder Americans who will soon be eligible to receive benefits under the medical care program. Right now, people over 65, while constituting only 9 percent of the total population, occupy about 27 percent of the Nation's hospital beds. There is an immediate need for 150,000 more beds in general hospitals and 450,000 more beds in mental hospitals.

What are we going to do to meet this tremendous demand? The greatest single source of financial aid for the construction of hospitals is still the Hill-Burton program. In the nearly two decades of its operation, over 7,300 projects have been approved of which over 6,000 have been completed and in operation with others under construction or in the planning stage. These projects will provide over 313,000 inpatient beds and over 2,000 health facilities. Under its assistance nearly one-third of the States have met present hospital bed needs.

During the last 18 years, in Rhode Island alone, over $55 million has been pledged for 50 projects for hospital and other health facility construction under the Hill-Burton Act. Of this, the Federal contribution will amount to nearly $10 million. Over 1,500 beds, in addition to new laboratories and service and training facilities will be provided under the program. Some of the funds were also used to replace or modernize existing facilities.

Last year the Hill-Burton Act's expiring provisions were renewed for 5 more years extending aid for the construction of hospitals, public health centers, diagnostic and treatment centers, hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, rehabilitation facilities, and nursing homes. The new amendments also allowed for the modernization of certain existing facilities. Sums ranging from $150 million for fiscal year 1965 through $180 million for the final 2 years were authorized.

But programs such as Hill-Burton alone will not do the needed job. Federal funds are not the entire answer to future financial needs. There is much that hospitals can do to reduce the spiraling of hospital costs that has occurred in recent years. Wise planning to reduce costs will not only conserve funds that can be later used for expansion and modernization, but will also aid in providing streamlined, more efficient hospital care.

According to the American Hospital Association, the average cost to hospitals per patient day rose 7 percent last year. The major contribution to this increase, which is but part of a 20-year trend, is the rising hospital payroll.

Recent technical advances in medical care have also contributed to rising hospital costs, both in the expense of the facilities and equipment they require, and in the higher salaries of the skilled specialists who must administer them.

I do not mean to suggest that hospital salaries should be cut. Far from it. Historically, the pay scales of hospital employees have been considerably below those of other workers. I am glad to see that wages and salaries are gradually being adjusted upward to bring the levels where they belong.

But increasing hospital costs are also certainly influenced by inefficient administrative practices, poor hospital design planning, and unnecessary hospital admissions.

To reduce costs in administrative practices, hospitals will have to learn to apply the methods of industry and business to the solution of hospital problems. I might as an outsider suggest such things as making use of electronic data processing for such functions as inventory control, scheduling of appointments for outpatients, predicting the demand for services and supplies, and automated cost accounting.

Another way to economize may be found in the delegation of certain professional functions to other personnel—physician to nurse and technician; nurse to ward manager and aid.

Here the idea would not simply be to lower the level at which a service is delivered to the patient, which would simply increase the size of the payroll for technicians and aids. The ultimate goal is to reduce the ratio of employees to patients.

Hospitals would also do well to establish better working relationships with and make better use of nursing homes, rehabilitation units, and halfway houses for recuperating patients. In these facilities the costs are one-third that of hospital care. And well they should be. There, it is possible for many of the ambulatory patients—as a part of their return to normal activities—to do a number of chores. This includes care of their own room—from mirror tidying up to making their own beds. Now it is possible that some may not wish to gainfully occupy their time and at the same time hasten their recovery. Perhaps those people should check in at a first-class hotel and see their physician daily. It would undoubtedly be cheaper than paying the costs of the full range of general hospital services.

In planning for new hospitals, fewer 25- and 50-bed facilities should be built, and more buildings like the new Mercy Hospital—with 100, or even 200 beds—should be constructed to serve rural and suburban areas.

In designing hospitals, facilities that complement each other—such as surgery, pathology, and recovery—should be placed together. Fullest possible use should be made

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of hospital space for hospital functions. Centralized service facilities—food, drugs, supplies, waste disposal, linen supply—avoid waste and duplication of equipment, space, and personnel.

The physician must do his part in planning to reduce hospital costs. He should meet the needs of his patient as fully as possible in his own office or hospital outpatient department and admit as bed patients only those who require in-hospital care.

A second challenge which medicare presents is one to our manpower resources in the health fields. Here again, however, the challenge is being met. The Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, which I helped sponsor in Washington, has already substantially contributed to increased enrollments in schools of medicine, dentistry, public health, nursing, pharmacy, and optometry.

Yet, more must be done in this line to meet future needs—to provide the 56,000 doctors we will need by 1975, the 15,000 dentists by 1980, and to meet other projected shortages in the other health professions.

I am pleased that a bill renewing and expanding the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act has already passed the House. The approved bill, which I was also privileged to help sponsor, includes for the first time provisions for scholarships—a measure for which I have long cited the need—to medical, dental, osteopathic, and optometry students. These scholarships would enable highly qualified, but financially needy, young men and women to embark on essential careers in these vital health professions, unhampered by financial worries. The amendments also extend the loan provisions of the act to pharmacy and podiatry students and provide funds for the direct operation of medical schools.

I am confident that the Senate will soon see fit to bring these provisions into effect.

Therefore, with Federal, State, and local cooperation and with the increased efforts of medical schools to improve educational programs and provide scholarships, I am confident that the challenges posed by medicare and our growing population will be met.

And let us not forget that the problems we may encounter are far overridden by the benefits that will accrue. For medicare is but the largest of several major health programs that this session of Congress—the "medical care" Congress—has approved.

In my quarter century as a Representative of this great State, I have never been so impressed by the record of a Congress in health legislation as I have with this 89th Congress.

I have never witnessed a session so clearly set on bettering the Nation's health and welfare as this current session.

What fruits will be borne from these great measures? We can only speculate. But it is certain that we are at last fully launched into one of man's greatest conquests against his most ancient enemy: disease. It is one conquest in which we will surely not fail. Its leaders will be tomorrow's heroes; its triumphs will be tomorrow's salvation.

MALAGASY'S INDEPENDENCE PAY

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I am happy to extend the congratulations and well wishes of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States to President Tsiranana, His Excellency Louis Rakotomalala, Ambassador to the United States from the Malagasy Republic, and to the people of Malagasy on the fifth anniversary of their independence.

The Malagasy Republic comprises the island of Madagascar and its five island dependencies. Situated in the Indian Ocean, 250 miles across the Mozambique Channel from the southeast coast of Africa, Madagascar is the fourth largest island in the world. It is 995 miles long and 360 miles wide and is 228,000 square miles in area, slightly smaller than Texas. Its people are of southwest Pacific origin.

The population of 5.8 million, which is growing at the rate of 2.5 percent annually, is divided among 18 major tribes. The largest of these tribes is the Merina, numbering about 1.2 million. They are prominent in government service and in business and are the most highly educated in Madagascar.

Madagascar was sighted in the 1500's by Diego Dias, a Portuguese captain whose ship had become separated from a fleet bound for India. Before then, as early as the seventh century, Arab settlements had been established on the northwest and southeast coasts of the island. In the latter part of the 17th century the French attempted to colonize the southeast coast but met with ill fortune at the hands of the neighboring tribes and were forced to settle for trading bases on the east coast during most of the next century. For the half century prior to 1824, Madagascar was a favorite haunt of sea pirates, including John Avery, Captain Mission, and William Kidd. The pirates even formed a short-lived republic named "Libertalia" and it was an American buccaneer vessel which introduced Malagasy rice to North Carolina.

In addition to association with piracy, U.S. relations with Madagascar date back at least to the early 18th century. An American trader named Marks—or Max—resided at Majunga on the west coast of the island around 1830–31, conducting a considerable trade in Malagasy skins, woods, honey, pitch, and salt fish against imports of American textiles, glass, and other manufactured articles. It was probably the same Marks who in 1874 presented Queen Ranavalona II a gift of the first pane glass known on the island. A commercial convention was concluded between the two countries in 1867, and a treaty of peace, friendship, and commerce in 1881.

Beginning in the last decade of the 18th century the Merina rulers succeeded in exploiting the mutually competitive interests of Britain, France, and other European and American powers. King Radama concluded a treaty with the British Governor of Mauritius and received British arms, uniforms, and military training for the Merina forces. British influence remained strong for several decades. In 1885 the British Crown accepted the imposition of a French protectorate over Madagascar as part of an overall definition of spheres of influence in the area. Absolute French control was established by military force in 1895–96.

After the fall of France in Second World War Madagascar was administered at first by the Vichy Government. It was, however, occupied by British troops in 1942 to preclude seizure of the strategically placed island by the Japanese. The Free French received it from Great Britain in 1943. The French established reformed institutions in 1957 and Madagascar was conducted peacefully toward independence. In 1958 the results of a referendum created the Malagasy Republic within the French community. Full sovereignty was attained on June 26, 1960, with the transfer by France of the powers it had exercised over foreign affairs and defense.

The Malagasy Republic was proclaimed on October 14, 1958, as an autonomous state within the French community. A constitution was adopted by the Constituent Assembly on April 28, 1959. The first President of the Republic, Philibert Tsiranana, was elected on May 1, 1959, by a Congress of the National Assembly and the Senate, and on June 26, 1960, independence was proclaimed in Tananarive. The President's term of office is 7 years and he is assisted by a Council of Ministers.

Madagascar's economy is principally agricultural. The main crops are rice, manioc, coffee, vanilla, cloves, and tobacco. Graphite, mica, and other minerals are also found on the island.

Malagasy's foreign trade is oriented principally toward France and the European Common Market. However, the United States is Madagascar's second best customer, purchasing roughly 15 percent of her exports, but our share of her imports is insignificant—under 3 percent. U.S. aid is modest and is concentrated in those fields where it is felt that U.S. techniques and skills can make the most contribution.

The Malagasy government is a strong supporter of the West and is staunchly anti-Communist. It maintains close economic and cultural ties with France, which provides important funds for development and specialists for many technical positions in the government. It is a member of the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

Under agreement with the Malagasy government, the National Aeronautic Space Agency has built a space tracking station in Madagascar which is important to the American space program. Through information and cultural programs the United States has sought to provide the Malagasy government and people with a greater understanding of the United States.

THE NATIONAL DAY OF THE MALAGASY REPUBLIC

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FARNUM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, this is the anniversary of the day in 1958 when the Malagasy Republic became an autonomous member of the French Community. In 1960 it became fully independent. Anthropological studies have made it possible to establish the fact that the people of the island of Madagascar are related to the people of Indonesia, in custom and belief as well as language. The unification of the country, which had been initiated by the Merina kings, was completed under the regime of General Gallieni in the early part of the 20th century.

The Social Democratic Party, under the leadership of President Philibert Tsiranana, is now the dominant political organization in the Malagasy Republic. As the governing party it has emphasized economic and social development, to be achieved partly through close ties with France.

The increasing participation of the Malagasy Republic in international affairs is evidenced by her membership in the United Nations and her association with the European Common Market. In 1961 the Malagasy Republic joined with 11 French-speaking African countries in establishing an Afro-Malagasy Organization for Economic Cooperation.

I am confident that all Members of this honorable body wish to see the Malagasy Republic achieve her goals in cooperation with other developing nations and I am personally happy that we have been able to provide this important nation with economic aid.

I am happy today to extend greetings on the National Day of the Malagasy Republic to President Philibert Tsiranana, Minister of Foreign Affairs Albert Sylla, and Ambassador to the United States and the United Nations Louis Rakotomalala.

THE 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the old folks sometimes used an expression which ran about like this: "Today we have got to pile up what we did this week." The phrase had more meaning than appears at casual glance. It was a way of asking a whole complex of questions. "Did we do a good job?" "Did we accomplish what we intended?" "Has what we have done worked out as well as expected?" Some ideas look promising in the planning stage, but fail to justify promises, you know. In short, the expression indicated a broad and critical appraisal.

The time has come to pile up what Congress has done during the past 9 months. The record of the first session is just about written. Writers and commentators on the political scene are already busy compiling summaries and passing judgment. It is the turn of Congressmen themselves to do the same—for their own benefit, or for the benefit of their constituents. It must be hoped that the average citizen will read a number of appraisals in order to get a variety of opinions.

On the matter of quantity of legislation passed by this session of Congress, there is only one opinion. An extremely large number of proposals has been approved by both Houses, and is now public law. Further, it is agreed that the new legislation will affect economic and social life to an unusual degree. The 89th Congress has made a heavy mark on its own time and on future times.

Also, for the first time in a number of years, the Congress has not been obsessed with a single anxious concern. The legislation considered has ranged over every possible matter subject to congressional action. Foreign, domestic, economic, social, political—everything has been scrutinized. Matters long neglected have come to the attention of the lawmakers, and many of them have been handled in a manner which seemed appropriate at the time.

As to the quality of legislation, there may be a difference of opinion. Someone has said:

> Whoever is always right and always sure of himself—whether it be nation, institution or person—has been deserted by his angels. The outline of truth, as we are able to know it, comes not from the courage of aloofness but from the courage of contact—the prolonged rub of opposites.

History emerges from the test of time and experience. No single appraisal, or all of them blended into one, can carry the stamp of final truth.

But there is this to be said about the quality of 1965 legislation. The Members of the 89th Congress were fresh from the polling places. The voice of the people was reasonably clear. That voice was condensed into legislation, as is fitting in a form of government such as ours.

In an age of science, mathematics speaks in a language seldom disputed. By October 14, Congress had been in session 169 days. The average length of session was 4 hours and 40 minutes. As the daylight hours wane, the session tends to lengthen. A typical entry in the RECORD reads:

> Accordingly (at 5 o'clock 58 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow.

This is less than half a day's work for a Congressman. His committee, or committees, take up a large fraction of his morning hours.

In the current session of the 89th Congress, the House alone was presented with a total of 13,200 bills, resolutions and other measures requiring consideration and action. The Senate added some 2,500 more, some of which finally came to the House. After committee consideration, 1,010 were reported back to the House. Of these, 960 got a majority vote in the House, 528 of them being what are known as public bills. But of this number, only 237 survived the hurdles of House and Senate passage and Presidential approval. Thus is the golden grain of legislation winnowed from the chaff of legislative proposals. Only one proposal in 60 became law in this session. No reckless acceptance of every suggestion here.

The screen which separates the legislative wheat from the chaff is the committee. The other half of a Congressman's day is spent in his committee room. Here he listens to long hours of testimony for and against bills which have been referred to his committee. On the basis of evidence adduced, he decides to support the bill or oppose it, to accept it as is or subject it to amendment. Seldom does a bill come to the House floor without alteration. This is where the integrity, the ability, and the skill of the Congressman shows itself. We say a "good bill" is hammered out by evidence, by discussion, and by argument, "the prolonged rub of opposites."

The two committees on which I am privileged to serve were in session nearly as long as the House itself. The proportion of bills considered to laws enacted followed the House pattern. This session the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee dealt with a large number of measures having unusual effect on daily life. Some of these will be singled out later.

A Congressman has another, a third, "half day" of work. Callers arrive. Many are social calls, and a Congressman is happy to welcome citizens to their Capital City. Others have public business to transact, and legislative offices are designed to serve them. Groups of sightseers throng Washington, especially schoolchildren. Our young people have the right to a few hours of their Congressman's time and attention. It is they who will soon fall heir to the majesty and power wielded by a democratic government, and they should come into contact with its workings at an early age. An estimate of the total number of callers at my office during the session would run to at least 4,000.

Finally, there are meetings with officials of the executive branch. There are telephone calls, incoming and outgoing, without number. There are letters to read and write. A conscientious Congressman could use a longer day.

A recent official compilation lists 93 pieces of approved legislation which are classed as "major." Appropriation measures, which are always major, number 13 more. From this list, a limited number, of special interest to the people of the State of West Virginia and the Second District, are selected for comment. They are grouped in convenient categories.

National defense, which has for so long absorbed the attention of Congress and the Nation, has received a full share of precautionary consideration. Seven authorization bills, in distinction from appropriations, provide $15.4 billion for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and research and development; $5.18 billion for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, with special emphasis on solid-fuel rockets and nuclear solid-powered systems for spaceships; $2.55 billion for the Atomic Energy Commission; $114.2 million for the Coast Guard; $1.78 billion for military construction at foreign and domestic installations; construction of 17 new Coast

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Guard vessels. The total of these authorization measures is $25.7242 billion. Current defense appropriations—as distinguished from authorizations—total $48.644 billion, in comparison with $48.323 billion in 1964.

Other defense measures prohibit mutilation or destruction of draft cards; place the kidnaping, assault or assassination of the President or Vice President under Federal law; authorizes the Secret Service to make arrests without warrant for offenses committed in their presence.

No less than 15 pieces of major legislation deal with international affairs. A few of them: foreign aid authorization, $3.36 billion—1965 appropriation, $3.66 billion; change of quota system for immigrants; extension of control on exports of scarce or strategic materials to 1969; limits to $100, retail value, duty-free goods brought back by returning visitors from foreign countries; authorizes $115 million for the Peace Corps, probably our most profitable operation abroad for the money spent.

Probably no part of the work of the 89th Congress has been more fruitful than its efforts to stimulate the national economy. The measures that have been put on the statute books affect directly and positively the individual citizen.

First of all, we note the long-awaited excise tax cut. Results have been immediate and impressive in a fantastic leap in the gross national products figure and in the decline of unemployment. Other measures of major interest to our area: Establishment of Appalachian Regional Commission, with $1.1 billion authorization to initiate various types of programs to revive economy and improve skills and health of the Appalachian area; authorizing increase to $3 billion of Federal aid for Interstate and Defense Highway System; increases to $461 million the limit on lending power of the Small Business Investment Corporation; provides aid for communities hit by floods and tornadoes; clarifies Interstate Commerce Commission's control over truck transportation.

In the area of health, education, and welfare, preventive measures share the spotlight with vast promotional projects. On the preventive side, the 89th Congress has established control over the indiscriminate distribution of depressant and stimulant drugs. Results of the use of these drugs on moral attitudes, on criminal tendencies, especially in the case of youth, can hardly be overstated. Also, cigarettes are required to carry a statement that they may be hazardous to health. Again, authorization is provided for Federal grants for mass immunization against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, and measles. Still more, a small authorization makes a beginning of the attack on crime from the Federal level. In all of these, it has been my privilege to have an active part.

On the positive side, the most conspicuous and the most controversial measure has been amendment of the Social Security Act. A limited program of medical care for the aged is the controversial part. But the amendment further extends the benefits of social security to groups not previously covered. Almost equally experimental is the authorization of $1.3 billion in Federal aid for elementary and secondary schools. The Higher Education Act of 1965 authorizes a 5-year, $5.5 billion program for various higher education activities. Another act authorizes more than half a billion dollars over a 7-year period for the establishment of community health centers and for research in the teaching of handicapped and retarded children.

The category of governmental reorganization received attention in the form of 17 major bills and resolutions. Few of these have a direct bearing on the individual citizen. Several of the resolutions provide for a regrouping of various agencies, councils, and administrative officials with the view of achieving greater simplicity. One important resolution submits to the States a proposed constitutional amendment providing for presidential succession.

As usual, and properly so, agriculture required extensive consideration. While West Virginia is not primarily an agricultural State, several bills in this field are of interest to West Virginians. One sets up a Water Resource Council to coordinate planning for maximum use of water resources. Another fixes uniform policies on recreation facilities, fish, and wildlife in multipurpose water-resource projects. Another authorizes nearly a billion dollars for flood control and navigation improvement in a number of river basins. Still another is designed to control water pollution. The severe drought which struck the northeast part of the Nation this year led to an act providing for continued research in the desalination of sea water.

The 89th Congress has been at particular pains to strengthen and extend existing legislation affecting servicemen and veterans. A 10.4 percent basic pay increase for officers and enlisted members of the uniformed armed services was provided, as was a $10,000 life insurance policy for those on active duty. For veterans, a fund was established to reopen national life insurance policies on loan from VA and to be repaid out of premiums; increased allowances under the War Orphans Education Assistance Act were granted; increased allowances were given disabled veterans pursuing vocational rehabilitation courses.

Two projects from whose acceptance I derive peculiar satisfaction are the so-called Spruce Knob project and the Rowlesburg Dam. In my opinion, they will do more to stimulate industrial and commercial development and to improve the lot of West Virginians than anything which has as yet been done. The Spruce Knob project will open up an isolated area of the State, with all its immense resources. The Rowlesburg Dam will provide abundant electric power for industrial expansion in the Monongahela Valley. They are the beginnings, and the essentials, to progress.

A general verdict on the accomplishments of the 89th Congress must be reached in the light of the times and conditions in which it worked. The wheel of change is spinning at an accelerating rate. It has carried us far from the obsessions and fears of just a few years ago. Another world war is possible, but it seems improbable, given our preparation for it if it comes and our determination to avoid it if honorably possible. There is need for a vast number of things, but we have shown an amazing ability to supply what we need, whether it is money or personal skill. The United States is demonstrably and visibly rich and powerful, and our enemies agree with our friends that this is so. But the Great Society is minded to be even more conspicuously determined to be farsighted and benevolent, as the appreciative populace from one end of the land to the other agree. In the words of Mark Twain about the ocean: "Boys, she's a success."

In this session, the Congress of the United States has finally caught up to the 20th century. It is already casting a speculative eye on the 21st century. It is an honor to have been a part of its machinery.

ADDRESS BY HON. HENRY H. FOWLER, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, BEFORE THE AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION, OCTOBER 5, 1965

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues a very important address of the Honorable Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury, before the annual convention of the American Bankers Association meeting in Chicago on October 5, 1965.

Secretary Fowler's remarks constitute what might be called a position paper, stating the primary facets of our economic and fiscal policies.

The address follows:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE HENRY H. FOWLER, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, BEFORE THE AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION ANNUAL CONVENTION, CHICAGO, ILL., OCTOBER 5, 1965

It is a particular pleasure to appear before this organization, for it gives me the opportunity to pay public tribute to the banking industry for all it has done during the past year to help the Treasury and the Nation in so many ways.

You have been an invaluable source of strength and support during the past year of coin shortages and the need for authorization of new subsidiary coinage materials. Consultations with your industry led to the development of our program to double the production of coins. Last fall your association sponsored a series of radio and television announcements urging the public to put idle coins in circulation. The combined effect of these programs was to avert what otherwise might have been a coin crisis last fall.

This year your association has given strong support to our program for changing our subsidiary coinage materials. During the current fiscal year, as you know, we will be producing these new coins by the billions and will continue to do so until coin shortages have become no more than a distant memory.

Nor can I let this occasion pass without citing the invaluable service that the bankers of America perform for the Treasury and for the country through their efforts on behalf of U.S. savings bonds. I cannot emphasize too strongly how vital those efforts are to sound Government financing and management of our public debt.

More important even than these notable contributions to our Nation's welfare has been the splendid performance of our banks and other financial institutions in response to the President's call for voluntary curbs on capital outflows abroad to which I shall refer later.

Having thus cited but a few of the important services you have rendered to the Treasury and the country, I am indeed happy to note some good progress on a matter of concern both to the legislative and executive branches of the National Government and the banking industry—the matter of bank mergers. As Attorney General Katzenbach made clear in a recent letter to Chairman PATMAN of the House Banking and Currency Committee, there is now a substantial meeting of minds between the Attorney General, the bank regulatory agencies, and the Secretary of the Treasury on the two central aspects of antitrust policy which have been of growing concern to the industry and those responsible for its regulation in the public interest. Without going into the details of this consensus—which are clearly outlined in the Attorney General's letter and have been well reported in the press—may I simply express my hope that this development will lead to a speedy resolution of the issues in a way that will both protect the legitimate interests of the Government and meet the legitimate needs of the banks.

Last week, on a far larger stage, there was another meeting of the minds that—while preliminary and far from total—may help to assure a new era of free world economic progress and prosperity which could equal or surpass even the unexampled accomplishments of the past two decades.

For last week the Ministers and Central Bank Governors of the Group of Ten leading industrials nations formally instructed their deputies to enter intensive negotiations to locate areas of basic underlying agreement—and I quote from the communique issued by the group—"on improvements needed in the international monetary system, including arrangements for the future creation of reserve assets, as and when needed, so as to permit adequate provision for the reserve needs of the world economy." The deputies were further instructed to report in the spring of next year "on the progress of their deliberations and the scope of agreement that they have found."

Nor would these discussions be limited solely to the deputies of the group—but would also include representatives of the Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, of the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development, the Bank for International Settlements, and of the Swiss National Bank.

So this important task of formal preparation was set in motion for evolving arrangements in the free world monetary system to meet the needs of a fast growing world economy without a continued increasingly dangerous dependence on major U.S. deficits in its balance of payments—and on the schedule we publicly suggested last summer; namely, "at the time of the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund this September."

The Ministers and Deputies of the group also agreed that, once these negotiations have established a base for agreement on essential points, they must move to a "broader consideration of the questions that affect the world economy as a whole." They recognized, in short, that after the 10 leading nations had established some common ground for agreement—and before any final significant intergovernmental arrangements are entered into—negotiations must be expanded to include a second phase, designed to encompass the views and interests and problems of the other 93 member countries of the International Monetary Fund, as reflected by their representatives among the 20 executive directors of that organization. The United States had insisted upon this second stage of negotiations because of our conviction that all countries have a vital interest in a system of exchange of national currencies and the regulations and conditions which govern its working.

In thus moving efforts toward world monetary reform from the level of technical discussion onto the plane of high policy negotiations and in offering an avenue for the inclusion of representatives of the smaller nations in these negotiations, this formal accord among the group of 10 nations and the similar undertakings by the Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund represent the full achievement of all that the United States hoped would be accomplished at last week's meeting of the International Monetary Fund and World Bank.

These procedural arrangements provide an adequate and appropriate pattern of careful preparation for a significant international monetary conference in the form of a special meeting of the Governors of the International Monetary Fund or some other suitable forum, provided, of course, that a sufficient degree of substantive accord can be reached in advance.

No one who followed the developments at the meeting last week—or took part in them as I did—can help but be heartened about the prospects for eventual world monetary reform of a meaningful and workable kind. There are, to be sure, differences not only about the nature of future reform but about the need for reform. These differences are real, and some of them are deep. But they are not insurmountable.

There are those, after all, who as little as 3 months ago held out little hope for the degree of accord that we achieved at last week's meeting—a degree of accord that I wish neither to exaggerate nor to diminish.

What I wish to suggest, therefore, is that while we are well on the way toward real world monetary reform—we still have a long way to go, we still have ahead of us many more months of hard and tough negotiations. We must be prepared, as those negotiations proceed, to weather moments of uncertainty and doubt—moments, even, when prospects for a final resolution of difficulties and disagreements may seem to grow bleaker, instead of brighter—moments that must inevitably occur as we move deeper and deeper into the specific details of agreement and national interests become more and more involved.

At this early stage in our movement toward world monetary reform it is neither advisable nor appropriate for me either to take a position on or to discuss publicly any of the substantive proposals or possible proposals for monetary reform. The course of wisdom at this time is to be firm in principle and in purpose, but flexible in approach.

On this occasion, therefore, I would like simply to place the forthcoming negotiations into proper perspective by reviewing briefly some of the background of these negotiations as well as some of the problems and prospects, objectives and strategies, that may unfold as negotiations proceed.

May I begin simply by stressing the fact—familiar to all of you—that the high level negotiations that will shortly begin do not represent any sudden turn of events, any unexpected change in the international weather. They are but the logical outcome—not only of recent events—but of the patient, painstaking preparation that has been going on for several years.

The major countries long ago agreed that there were two basic elements in international liquidity: the reserves of gold and reserve currencies and the ready availability of credit facilities for countries in need of temporary assistance.

And we have augmented international liquidity over recent years by enlarging the credit resources of the International Monetary Fund. In 1961, as you know, the Group of Ten major industrial nations negotiated with the International Monetary Fund a so-called General Arrangements to Borrow. Under the Arrangements, the 10 nations agreed to lend the IMF up to $6 billion should this be necessary "to forestall or cope with an impairment of the international monetary system." The Arrangements were activated last December and again last May to furnish part of a $2.4 billion drawing from the IMF by the United Kingdom.

At the meeting last week the Ministers and Governors of the Group of Ten agreed to renew the Arrangements for 4 more years—with the suggestion that the Arrangements be reviewed for possible adaptation in October of 1968 or later in the light of further experience with them.

There has also been agreement on a 25-percent general increase in IMF quotas—along with special increases for some 16 countries—that will raise total aggregate quotas from $15 billion to around $21 billion.

At the same time that international credit facilities have thus been expanded, there have been underway the exhaustive technical studies essential to opening up the possibilities of enlarging international liquidity through some new form of reserve asset.

Moreover, informal international monetary cooperation has served to give an added degree of stability to the system. For example, I was extremely pleased that during the course of my recent visit to Western Europe for bilateral discussions of procedures for negotiating long-range international monetary reforms, we were able to participate in and help effect a concrete measure of cooperation between monetary authorities to deal constructively with a more immediate and pressing problem affecting the stability of the existing international monetary system—confidence in the British pound, one of the two reserve currencies.

I refer to the action announced September 10 by the Bank of England, in which 10 nations, including the United States, joined in new arrangements to strengthen the pound. It should be emphasized that this action comes on the heels of encouraging indications that Great Britain is moving toward a balance in its international payments and is undertaking a more effective long-term national program to stabilize costs and prices that will put it in a stronger competitive position in world markets. Hence, the main purpose of the new arrangements is to exploit this strengthening situation and reinforce these developments. The prompt action of the 10 cooperating countries demonstrated once again the strength and flexibility of the existing international monetary system and the willingness of the major industrial countries to work together for the common good.

I mention these facts simply to demonstrate that on the financial front, the free World has not been sitting on its hands over recent years—that instead it has been moving surely and steadily toward the negotiations we are now about to enter. It is, in fact, this record of thorough and thoughtful accomplishment—of a wise willingness to prepare for future contingencies before they occur—that must serve as one of our

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

firmest grounds for confidence in the successful outcome of the forthcoming negotiations.

These negotiations do not issue forth from any unanimous view that there is any urgent, pressing shortage of world liquidity—or even that there will be such a shortage in the near future. They stem, instead, from common agreement, that when and if additional liquidity is needed, there must already be in readiness some new orderly mechanism for creating that liquidity.

Why, some will ask? What was the matter with the existing mechanism?

The answers to these questions go to the very heart of the matter.

The problem stems from the fact that the large deficits in the U.S. balance of international payments, which for nearly 20 years have served as the existing mechanism for providing a major portion of the free world's liquidity, must come to an end. The United States—the President, the Congress, and informed financial authorities around the world all are agreed—must move its balance of payments into equilibrium and keep it there. It must do so to preserve the integrity of the dollar at home and abroad, so that dollars—over $27 billion of them held in the official reserves of the world's central banks and in private commercial banks as a transaction currency—can continue to function as an essential part of the world's monetary system. It must do so to arrest further drains in U.S. reserves. That erosion cannot go on indefinitely. It must be, and is being, stopped now.

That the world must know, and that the world expects because it, too, requires that the dollar be as good as gold.

The long period of large U.S. deficits has come to an end. If growth is to continue and trade is to expand, we must provide an effective and adequate substitute for the creation of additional reserves, when needed. Newly mined gold that finds its way into the monetary system will not be enough in the future any more than it has been in the past.

The U.S. balance-of-payments deficits have supplied about three-quarters of the new official reserves accumulated by the central banks or other nations since the end of 1958. Reserves deriving from the U.S. deficits grew in two forms—dollar balances held as such, and dollars acquired and converted into gold. The latter development, of course, resulted in a substantial decline in U.S. reserves. We estimate that as of the end of 1964 more than a quarter of the official reserves of the remainder of the free world were held in the form of dollars.

Clearly, as the existing mechanism for creating additional liquidity—U.S. deficits—is closed down in order to protect and maintain the liquidity that exists in the world's holdings of dollars, some substitute must be devised.

All nations in the free world are committed to a policy of dynamic growth in a dynamic world economy. This means growing international trade and economic development. If this expansion is to occur it is reasonable to expect that the free world, including the United States, will, in the course of time, face growing needs for monetary reserves.

These are the considerations that led your Government to take the initiative in suggesting that it is now time to negotiate new international monetary arrangements to enable the free world to deal in season with future demands upon its monetary system.

In entering these negotiations, as I said last week, the United States is wedded to no specific plan. We have no need to preen our national pride—very possibly at the price of imperilling the prospects of successful negotiations—by seeking to press or impose upon others a plan labeled "Made in USA." We will, as I have many times emphasized, carefully consider and fairly weigh the proposals of all other nations.

Our own strategy, our own acceptance, and presentation of proposals, will be determined by the time and by the circumstances—guided always by our paramount goal of seeking ample improvement in world monetary arrangements of a kind that is thoroughly compatible with our national interests.

In the meantime, there is no more important task before the United States than to achieve and to maintain equilibrium in its balance of payments.

Since the announcement of President Johnson's balance-of-payments program on February 10, our position has improved markedly—in no small measure because of the magnificent response by our financial institutions to the President's call for voluntary curbs on our capital outflow.

In the second quarter of this year, we experienced—on the basis of regular transactions—a surplus of $119 million, seasonally adjusted, compared with deficits of $780 million in the first quarter, and $1,551 million in the fourth quarter of 1964.

No one, I am sure, imagines that by showing a modest surplus for 3 months we have in any sense solved our balance-of-payments problem. For one thing, figures for so short a period inevitably present a distorted reflection—whether favorable or unfavorable—of particular transactions. And, on balance, we believe the second quarter figures present a more flattering picture of our progress than events really warrant.

It is far more prudent—and realistic—to look at the combined results of the first and second quarters of this calendar year. During the first half of 1965, we had a deficit of $661 million—about $1.3 billion at annual rates—which represents a marked improvement over the $2,144 million deficit—$4,288 million at annual rates—recorded for the second half of 1964.

These results tell us that we are headed in the right direction—but we yet have far to go before we arrive at our goal of sustained and lasting equilibrium.

I was very pleased to learn this week that our voluntary program aimed at dampening the outflow of dollars from U.S. banks to foreign holders is continuing to show very good results. In the 5 months April through August the banks have reduced their dollar placements abroad by $500 million.

Without this reduction, our balance-of-payments position would be worse by that same amount. With this reduction, our balance-of-payments position is that much better than it would otherwise be. So this program is helping the country in very real and measurable terms to achieve the great national objective of bringing our international accounts into balance. The Nation's banks, and the Federal Reserve System which is managing this part of the program for voluntary restraint of foreign investment, are certainly to be congratulated. They should, and I know they will, keep up this good work.

I am sure also that we are going to see good results from the part of the program aimed at achieving savings in the international transactions of nonfinancial businesses through their own voluntary efforts. The reports so far show a continued high level of foreign investment by these companies. But this reflects, in part at least, the fact that the companies doing business abroad already had commitments when our program went into effect that they could not ignore or substantially change.

They have given evidence of their support of the program by bringing home some $575 million of funds that they had on deposit abroad and substantially increasing foreign borrowings. We are taking a new look at this picture as we review again our overall balance-of-payments position. In appraising the result, we will, of course, consider what, if any, new measures of a voluntary character should be taken, including the possibility of a guidelines program, to achieve further improvement in the year ahead.

And let there be no mistake: we must have nothing less than sustained and lasting equilibrium. We must have nothing less, not only for the sake of our own international reserve position and the continued strength and soundness of the dollar as an international reserve and key currency, but to insure the successful outcome of the forthcoming negotiations on world monetary reform.

For there are those who are still skeptical of our desire and determination to bring our international accounts into lasting equilibrium. To falter or flag in that effort during the coming months of negotiation would not only seriously sap our negotiating strength, but would seriously damage the prospects for any early and fruitful end to those negotiations.

We cannot afford to let that happen—and we will not.

President Johnson made that very clear in his address to the Bank and Fund meeting last week. I quote:

"* * * the United States has taken firm action to arrest the dollar drain. Should further action be necessary in the future, such action will be taken.

"I want to be very clear about this. We must, in our own interest and in the interest of those who rely on the dollar as a reserve currency, maintain our payments in equilibrium. This we will do."

All America, therefore, has not only a stake in the successful outcome of the forthcoming monetary negotiations, but a very real share in insuring this outcome.

I have no doubt that we will more than rise to the challenge.

I have no doubt also that one of our greatest assets in meeting that challenge will be the continued strength, stability and soundness of our domestic economy.

Only the night before last, I talked with our President on this subject which is one of those nearest and dearest to his heart.

We reviewed what had happened to our economy during his nearly 2 years in office, a time during which:

A business expansion already thought mature at 33 months of age in November 1963, has continued to its current record length of 56 months, the longest peacetime economic expansion we have known;

A total of 3.6 million nonfarm jobs have been created from November 1963 through August 1965, with official unemployment rates being reduced from 5.8 percent to 4.5 percent;

Personal income, in which we all share, has increased in the same period from $474.7 billion to $531.6 billion or 12 percent;

Business profits after taxes, despite an increase of $9.4 billion or 38.5 percent from the first quarter of 1961 to the fourth quarter of 1963 have continued to rise by an additional $10.6 billion, or 31.4 percent;

Bank profits have moved to their greatest peaks in history, increasing 6 percent between 1963 and 1964, and may register another rise when 1965 figures are available.

We also discussed the favorable prospects for maintaining this forward momentum because of the fact that the current expansion up to date has remained remarkably well balanced and free from inflationary distortions.

The President then put a question to me and I believe it went this way: "Why won't people stop, look, and listen, and count three before taking steps that would change the favorable mix of economic policy that has characterized this balanced expansion?"

Without answering the President's question, let me say that this administration continues to believe that the stability of long-term interest rates is an important factor in the economic environment which has given us the greatest and best balanced period of domestic prosperity in our history. Of course, I recognize that new facts may at any time call for a reexamination of a policy mix, but may I venture my own feeling that there is a tendency today in the money markets to jump to conclusions instead of acting on the basis of hard facts.

For us in the Treasury it seems that the money markets are basing many of their forecasts and their fears of inflation on exaggerated ideas about an economic boom which would add a bubble on the steady trend line of expansion. The economic outlook is bright but there is no evidence as yet that justifies any assumption that the expansion is going through the roof.

In recent years, the economy has shown remarkable ability to move forward smoothly and to take the bumps in the road in stride. There have been bumps in particular areas, and there will be some in the period ahead. We must be alert to them and ready to counter them in order to maintain our progress. At the same time, the bumpier aspects of the outlooks today have a bright side in assuring us that there is no serious threat of overexuberance in the economy.

One bumpy spot for the rest of this year and opening months of 1966 is the runoff of steel inventories. It will not throw us for a loss, but it will shave our gains in industrial production and our manufacturing employment. Housing has been a bumpy area for a year and a half. The latest movement of housing starts has been downward, and while we see no likelihood of a persistent decline, we cannot count on the homebuilding industry to contribute to our advance in the months ahead. The forthcoming January rise in payroll taxes which was once inaccurately but widely viewed as a roadblock to our expansion is now seen in better perspective not as a serious threat to our forward movement, but a stabilizing factor for a time. It will be accompanied by our second stage of excise tax reduction, and we will be experiencing the effect of a rise in defense expenditures within this fiscal year.

In the past 2 years the pluses and minuses have added up into a generally smooth and well-paced expansion of $10 billion a quarter in our gross national product. The pluses and minuses that are in prospect do not suggest a marked deviation from that pattern—either upward or downward.

In making our budget decisions for fiscal 1967, we will treat our needs for defense expenditures as the No. 1 priority. The exact size of those needs will shape up in the next few months. On present prospects, they dim the hopes for new tax reduction in fiscal 1967, and they may squeeze the scheduling and size of some of the President's valuable civilian programs. Our defense needs are certainly not welcome, but they become a specter to our economy only when their likely size is greatly exaggerated. If I thought defense was going to add $10 to $15 billion to our fiscal 1967 budget, I'd be back in my office right now considering proposals for tax increases to pay for it. As you see, I'm here with you instead. I expect us to incorporate our defense spending into a sound fiscal 1967 budget which still is carefully and finely tuned to the needs of the economy.

In short, the outlook on both the domestic and international fronts is for continued progress—progress, to be sure, that must continue to be earned by forging ahead with the flexible, balanced policies in both the public and private sectors that have brought us our present unprecedented prosperity.

POOR PUT TO WORK TO HELP THE POOR

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, two recent articles, one in the Des Moines Register and the other in the Wall Street Journal, have pointed out the growing success of the Job Corps. Because there has been irresponsible criticism of this program and because some of my colleagues have questioned the effectiveness of the Job Corps, I wish to insert these articles in the RECORD. This will make these expressions more readily noted.

I feel certain that, as the administrators of this program have more time to work out the kinks that occur in any new venture, it will, along with Operation Head Start, prove to be one of the most creative and effective projects undertaken by this administration.

The articles follow:

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, Oct. 3, 1965]

POOR PUT TO WORK TO HELP THE POOR

(By Mark R. Arnold in the National Observer)

Local community-action agencies across the country have recruited 15,000 slum residents—people whose knowledge of poverty is firsthand.

Fresh from the welfare rolls or the ranks of the unemployed, they are whisked through quickie training courses, put on salaries of $4,000 to $5,000 a year, and sent back to the slums.

Some social workers see a potential threat in the prospect of untrained workers performing tasks they spent years preparing for. Many school boards are resisting pressure to let subprofessionals into the classrooms. The major professional organizations have met with Sargent Shriver, Director of the antipoverty program, to seek assurances they will not be bypassed.

So far, however, Shriver's lieutenants have encountered less resistance than they anticipated. They stress that neighborhood workers can free the professional from routine chores—recordkeeping in hospitals, lunchroom supervision in schools—that prevent him from making full-time use of his training

They argue, too, that the work of the neighborhood workers can help bridge the gap between the demand and supply of trained health aids, teachers, and social workers. Antipoverty officials estimate that 10,000 vacancies for social workers exist in the Nation.

But criticism could grow in the next few months. The number of subprofessionals will rise to 66,000 by mid-1966.

Obviously, no one intends that amateurs should try their hand at treating mental or physical disorders, or tackle other sensitive problems requiring a high degree of specialization. But Washington suspects there are many jobs traditionally held down by professionals at which neighborhood workers can excel.

Use of subprofessionals will test the validity of standards that professionals set up as qualifications for entry into their ranks. Some critics contend these standards are artificially high, and serve only to deny needed services to the poor.

PITTSBURGH'S EXAMPLE

Under a $95,000 contract with the Pittsburgh, Pa., Mayor's Commitee on Human Resources—the local antipoverty agency—the board of public assistance has taken 30 mothers off relief and trained them to teach cooking, sanitation, and other skills to needy mothers in the home. The board's usual qualification for such work is a college degree in home economics.

Pittsburgh's Board of Education is using antipoverty funds to hire 167 subprofessionals to work with regular teachers in the classrooms. The usual qualification for teachers: A college degree with 18 hours of education courses.

Lawyers will break new ground in the next few weeks by hiring subprofessionals to set up interviews, gather information, and interview parties in welfare, credit, and housing disputes.

The county health department has hired 56 subprofessionals to interview welfare families needing health care, to comfort the sick, to identify basic illness, and to staff mobile clinics.

Mrs. Audrey Glenn, 31, the mother of three, is a case worker. A high school dropout, she was a welfare recipient for 7 years before being plucked from the relief rolls by the mayor's committee. After 3 weeks of training, she was sent back to the slums of the city's Hill District, where she grew up, to help her neighbors.

Mrs. Glenn sees her role as part counselor, part real estate agent (she finds housing for people), part taxi driver to take people who need help to the hospital, and part traffic cop to direct them to available services.

David G. Hill, Pittsburgh's 32-year-old community action director, comments, "The biggest problem when you're dealing with the poor is one of communication. They don't read the papers. They don't get the message on TV. They're suspicious of outsiders. These subprofessionals are our connecting link."

Often, antipoverty warriors insist, traditional welfare programs have ignored people who needed their services most. Hill's agency is trying to entice welfare services—from Salvation Army to public assistance and Traveler's Aid—to reexamine their programs.

Mrs. Glenn describes her efforts to help one couple: "When the daughter came home from the hospital (with her second child) I went to visit her. She and the children's father have a two-room apartment that's horrible, and it costs them $60 a month. He's making $40 a week as a dishwasher. His mother had been on welfare. He's a high school graduate and bright enough to be in college, but no one ever took an interest in him.

"Now that he's about to be drafted, he could be deferred since he has a family to support. But he can't prove he's got to support his family to the draft board unless he produces a marriage license or a notarized statement saying they're his children.

"I want to get married, but he doesn't have the $15 for a blood test, which you need to get married. I'm trying to get walfare to lend him the money for the blood test, but they're dragging their feet."

RESISTING NEW IDEAS

Hill concedes that some of the agencies resist new ideas. But he believes the threat of cutting off an agency's antipoverty subsidy will prove a powerful incentive to reform.

Some enthusiastic supporters of the neighborhood worker program wonder how long the formerly impoverished can maintain identification with the poor, the key to their usefulness. Asks Aaron Schmais, Shriver's watchdog on local community action employment of subprofessionals: "When you take a poor person and pay him $4,000 or $5,000 a year, does he represent the interests of the poor anymore?"

Despite these problems, Washington is so hopeful that planners are studying ways of using subprofessionals to open up vast new fields of employment. Besides working in human services, Schmais says, the subprofessionals could be used in such fields as conservation, air pollution and urban renewal.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 5, 1965]

Graduates begin to flow from the Job Corps. The employment hunt is stepped up.

The emerging stream of trainees will build to nearly 1,000 a month by the year's end, to 3,000 a month by next March. The 318 graduates to date have all been placed. Nearly half get jobs; the rest return to school or enter the armed services. Federal men aim for a 60-percent job placement rate eventually; other job training programs and the military forces would take most of the rest.

A business-labor team probes hotel, motel, and restaurant trade groups to help open jobs in advance. Similar teams are planned for the retail and electronics industries. Job Corps graduates' skills will be heavily concentrated in service lines.

Antipoverty officials mull expanding the Corps' enrollment to 80,000 or more from the present 60,000 goal if the jobfinding efforts hit expectations.

VETERANS PENSIONS

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the problem of veterans pensions is a nagging one from year to year, Congress to Congress. Numerous bills are introduced each year to correct one inequity or another, and Congress enacts major legislation every 2 or 3 years in an attempt to modernize the law. The trouble is that the law can never be modernized and it will always be unfair and inadequate because it is based on an archaic and unjust assumption. That assumption is this: Any pension given by the Government to a veteran, his widow, children, or other dependents, is a gratuity and an act of charity.

As a result of this assumption, which permeates the entire body of veterans legislation, pensions are often reduced and cut off. Also, as a result of this assumption, the decisions of the VA Administrator are final and nonappealable to the courts. I know of no other instance in private industry or government service where a pension is not a pension but a gratuity to be given or taken back at the whimsy of civil servants. In business, when a pension is earned, a property right vests in it, and it belongs to the owner. It cannot be tampered with because it has been earned through faithful service over a long period of years. The same is true with government pensions; for example, railroad retirement. Only in the area of veterans pensions is the pension not a pension.

As I understand it, the present philosophy dates from the American Revolution when, after the war, widows appealed to Congress for relief. At that time Congress handled each claim on a case-by-case basis as there was no body of general law on the subject. In each case, whenever Congress approved a claim it did so on the basis of extending a gratuity or subsidy to the individual. When general legislation was finally enacted the same philosophy was incorporated into the law. This example of early Americana has survived into the present. We thus have an almost 200-year-old antique cluttering up the statute books.

This obsolescence can be corrected by a major revision of the law, completely changing the philosophy of veterans pensions. This can be done with a finding by Congress that it is the policy of the United States that veterans pensions earned through long and faithful military service, or by reason of death or disability, shall vest as a right, not a gratuity, in the veteran, his widow, children or other dependents. The rest of the law would then have to be reworked in order to truly modernize and update it.

THE SPECTER OF OVER-REGULATION

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of this great body the following speech by the outstanding Administrator of National Banks, the Honorable James J. Saxon:

THE SPECTER OF OVER-REGULATION

(Remarks of James J. Saxon, the Administrator of National Banks)

The banking industry this year has reached new heights of achievement by all the standards we use to measure its performance. There abounds—as never before—a healthy spirit of initiative and enterprise. Banks have become ever more aggressive competitors, and they are setting ever higher standards for others in the financial community to follow. The growing and changing needs of our advancing economy are being met more efficiently and more effectively. New facilities, provided through additional charters, branches, and mergers, have enabled banks to move with their customers and to respond to the demands that have appeared at new locations. Banks are offering to the public many new services which formerly were available only from nonbank financial institutions, thus heightening the competition.

Throughout the world of finance, a new energizing force is clearly evident. Communities everywhere in the Nation are enjoying the benefits of these new endeavors.

Despite these notable achievements of the banking industry, some criticisms have recently been leveled against present banking policies and practices. These criticisms have come only from a very few, and not from the consumers of banking services whose convenience and needs the banking industry is designed to serve. Nevertheless, they should be of concern because they have already spawned legislative proposals that would fundamentally alter the present relationship between the Government and the banking industry.

In determining the proper relationship between the Government and any industry, the basic choice is whether to rely principally on government, or principally on private enterprise, to safeguard the public interest. The more the opportunity is narrowed for private enterprise to function in an industry, the greater will be the necessity to rely upon governmental controls. The more administrative procedures are complicated and encumbered in any regulated industry such as banking, the less effective will be the operation of the industry in meeting public demands—and the greater will be the need to supplant private initiative with ever more rigorous public controls. There is, in my view, a genuine danger that if we reverse the policies of the past several years—in which we have endeavored to enlarge the scope for private initative in banking—we may unknowingly drift down the road toward rate regulation and compulsory conditions of service, like those applied to the public utility industries such as transport, power, and communications.

The entire spirit of a regulated industry, and its performance in serving consumer demands, are critically affected by the functioning of the regulatory authorities. If the maximum safe reliance is to be placed upon private enterprise in banking, the decisions of the banking agencies must be prompt and definitive. Delays and uncertainties in regulatory procedures breed indifference and suffocate enterprise, and they provoke disrespect for government. They reward mediocrity and penalize initiative and imagination—and they have a deadly influence on performance. Where private initiative and enterprise wither and atrophy, public demands remain unsatisfied and the costs of products and services mount. Existing competitive positions are favored over emerging consumer needs, and the public must look elsewhere for protection. This sets the stage for direct intervention by Government to fix prices and require the performance of service.

In the title of this address, I have described these dangers as "The Specter of Over-Regulation." They are truly that. There are no considerations of the public interest which demand that the banking industry should become mired in the quicksand of bureaucratic control. The opposite course should be chosen. In keeping with the philosophy of our private enterprise system, the aim should be to rely on private initiative in the banking industry as fully as is prudent, and to impose governmental controls only where they are clearly required to safeguard the public interest. This has been our guiding principle throughout the past 4 years, and I believe that the recent performance of the banking industry amply vindicates the course we have taken.

A LOOK AHEAD

If we are to preserve the full safe role of private initiative in banking, there are continuing tasks ahead both for the regulatory authorities and for the banking industry. Public acceptance of this principle hinges critically upon bank performance in meeting consumer demands. The most essential factor in bank performance is the spirit of initiative and innovation—the alertness to existing requirements, the sensitivity to future opportunities, and the enterprise to undertake new ventures. For this spirit to flourish in a regulated industry such as banking, it must be nourished and sustained. It is the responsibility of the regulatory authorities to welcome and encourage new initiative which will serve public demands, to see that new proposals are promptly and carefully examined, and that unambiguous decisions are quickly reached, so that enterprise will not be discouraged nor falter. It is the responsibility of the banking industry to seek its full potential for public service through a constant search for new markets and new opportunities. Only if all this is done can the banking industry be safeguarded from needless public controls, and its future performance assured.

All of us here today know that the banking industry cannot perform its functions effectively under outdated rules and regulations, or hampering policies and procedures. We know that for many years the banking industry was not able to keep pace with the broadening opportunities of our rapidly advancing economy. Bank regulatory policies had remained virtually unchanged for three decades, in the face of cataclysmic changes in the economy. A vast potential for new initiative lay dormant in the banking industry for many years. This great competitive force has now been released, and we see today, in countless ways, the results which can be achieved by a live, aggressive banking industry.

We must never again allow so many years to pass without a review of bank regulatory policies. Indeed, this is a never-ending task—and one which properly calls for a cooperative endeavor between the regulatory authorities and the banking industry. All wisdom does not lie in Washington. What is needed is a continuing joint effort to keep bank regulatory policies abreast of the Nation's needs—on the one hand, averting excessively constrictive public controls and, on the other hand, providing the necessary safeguards for the viability of the banking system.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON BANKING POLICIES AND PRACTICES

To assist in this continuing review of regulatory policies, I am today appointing a National Advisory Committee on Banking Policies and Practices. Membership in the Committee shall rotate, so as to provide the broadest range of advice over the years, and to afford the greatest number of bankers an opportunity to participate in this vital effort to develop and constantly sustain enlightened public policies for banking.

To complement the efforts of the National Advisory Committee, we shall also establish, in each of the 14 national bank regions, an Advisory Committee to the Regional Comptroller.

Finally, we shall once again ask national banks throughout the country to join in this endeavor, as they did so splendidly 3½ years ago, by giving us the benefit of their practical experience in suggesting further measures for improvement of the national banking system, both now and in the future.

The objective appraisal that we seek through these new measures is indispensable in the fashioning of a banking system that is continuously and sensitively adapted to the Nation's needs. We are certain that the national banks and the Advisory Committees will be frank in expressing their thoughts and in making their recommendations. On our part, we assure you that we shall give the most careful and prompt consideration to the proposals we receive.

A great opportunity confronts us in this cooperative endeavor to bring the thinking of the banking community to bear on the many matters of national concern in which the banking industry is vitally involved. The future progress of the entire economy will be critically affected by the policies of Government toward banking. We ask you to join with us in shaping these policies that are so essential to the Nation's welfare.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was not present in the House to respond to the rollcalls listed below. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall No. 356: "Nay."
Rollcall No. 357: "Nay."
Rollcall No. 359: "Nay."
Rollcall No. 363: "Yea."

MAJ. GEN. DON R. OSTRANDER

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. VIVIAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the last day of active duty in the U.S. Air Force for Maj. Gen. Don R. Ostrander, commander of the Air Force's Office of Aerospace Research, which has its headquarters here in Washington. General Ostrander has rendered exceptionally distinctive service to the U.S. Army, the U.S. Air Force, and his country for the past 28 years, and has earned a place of high esteem in the eyes of all who know him.

I am certain that the other Members of the House join me in recognizing General Ostrander's meritorious career, and wishing him equal success in the future.

A native of Stockbridge, Mich., and, I might add a summer cottage neighbor of mine, General Ostrander was graduated from the U.S. Military Academy in 1937. First serving as an aviation ordnance officer in the United States, he was assigned to the 8th Air Force Interceptor Command in England as armament and ordnance officer at the height of World War II, in May 1942, and he served there until July 1944. Typical of his ability and devotion to duty, General Ostrander—while in England—helped modify the famous P–38 fighter aircraft to accommodate a bombardier with a Norden bombsight, and he personally flew as bombardier on the initial test missions over battle areas in Europe.

General Ostrander later was assigned to the Army Air Force Tactical Air Command, before attending the Command and General Staff School, and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. Shortly thereafter, he embarked on his career as an Air Force manager of science and engineering activities.

After spending some time in the armament laboratory and in the Engineering Division of the Air Materiel Command, General Ostrander, in 1951, became Deputy Commander of the 6540th Test Wing at Holloman Air Force Base, N. Mex. In 1952, when Holloman was redesignated the Holloman Air Development Center, he became the first commander of that center. He held subsequent responsible positions with the Air Research and Development Command before being appointed Assistant for Guided Missiles Production with the NATO International Staff in Paris. General Ostrander was then elevated to the position of Deputy Director of Advanced Research Projects Agency, Office of the Secretary of Defense. From late 1959 to August 1961, he was Director of the Office of Launch Vehicles, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and then Vice Commander of the Ballistic Systems Division, Air Force Systems Command.

In October 1962, General Ostrander became commander of the Office of Aerospace Research. As commander, General Ostrander has had the responsibility for monitoring research programs being conducted in widespread laboratories in the United States, as well as the support rendered by the command's foreign elements in Brussels, Belgium; Fort Churchill, Canada; and Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. The general's command also monitors research done for the Air Force through contracts and grants to colleges, universities, and private firms throughout the United States and abroad.

Because basic research produces the necessary seedlings for every technological advancement that follows—and the United States has realized scores of these advancements in all fields of endeavor—the value of General Ostrander's dedicated and productive service is readily apparent. The industrial and military strength of the United States has been greatly enhanced by his managerial efforts. It is with great distinction that he retires from active duty, leaving a record of devotion to country which is an inspiration to every American.

SPREAD OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call to the attention of my colleagues a speech made in the other body yesterday by the distinguished Senator from New York, the Honorable ROBERT KENNEDY. Senator KENNEDY has taken the lead in the Congress in calling attention to the great problems raised for all mankind by the spread of nuclear weapons. Yet his speech went far beyond the simple expression of this problem to present, in a most farsighted and comprehensive way, almost a summary of the major problems facing the nations of the world in achieving humanity's greatest goal, a just and lasting peace.

The Senator called for new answers to the problem of the military security of Western Europe, recognizing that our proposed MLF may not be the answer, and that the foundations of NATO are crumbling with the insistence of France on going her own way.

He called for new moves toward a general European settlement, freeing us from the military confrontation which

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

has existed there for 20 years, and including in that settlement steps for the reunification of Germany.

He discussed, in far-reaching terms, the problem of India and Pakistan, and the need to provide an increased program of economic assistance and guarantees of security to these countries.

He called for the creation of nuclear-free zones around the world, laying special emphasis on the situation in Latin America.

He urged an extension of the present test ban treaty to include underground testing.

He urged again "that the United States explore new avenues of approach to the question of Communist China," including at the outset inviting the Chinese to participate in the disarmament talks in Geneva when these talks reconvene in January.

And he said, in conclusion:

> For us there can be no permanent solutions, no gimmicks, no neat answers—only ceaseless effort to rule ourselves by humility, not pride; by reason, not emotion; above all by a consciousness of the sacredness of human life. For the community to which we must answer is not those who elected us, not even all those living on this planet; it is all those who have gone before so that we may sit here today, and it is all these, the young and the unborn, who wait in the womb of time to make their appearance.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself completely with these eloquent words, and with the proposals contained in this landmark speech. The American people should be heartened to know that in the Halls of Congress statesmen still speak in words worthy of our great past, words which will, I am sure, echo down the corridors of the future as one of the finest statements of our time.

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES OF CONGRESS

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, at the end of each session, I summarize the activities of the Congress for that year, reprint them at my expense and mail them to the constituents I am privileged to represent. While I cannot possibly include every bill, I do try to include those of widespread interest or importance in central Iowa. The rules under which the House of Representatives operates were changed enough at the beginning of the session so that some bills which had been blocked by parliamentary maneuvers in previous years came to a vote this year. Of course, there was also some change in the membership as a result of the election last November. As a result of these and other factors, the volume of general legislation passed was greater than it has ever been in any previous year in history.

The President has said that the administration will not urge much new legislation next year and the attitude the Congress has reflected the past few weeks indicates the Congress is going to digest and oversee the implementation of what has been passed for a year or two before passing very many more important bills. Some bills have passed either the Senate or the House of Representatives, but the summary I will make includes only those bills which have passed both Houses and have been signed by the President.

MEDICAL AND HEALTH

Public Law 89–97 provides; first, a basic hospitalization program under social security for persons 65 and over effective July 1, 1966, under which they can go to any accredited hospital of their own choice instead of the county hospital; second, an optional medical care insurance program at $3 a month matched by the Federal Government to cover physicians' fees and various other services; third, a 7-percent increase in social security cash benefits; and fourth, expands and increases payments under Federal assistance programs for dependent children, blind and disabled. It will be financed partly by an increase in social security taxes and partly from the general fund.

The tax contribution by Iowans to pay for the provisions of the bill in 1966 will be about $30 million, and benefits to Iowans will be about $53 million. Since it will not be fully implemented the first 6 months of 1966, benefits in later years will total much more than $53 million.

Public Law 89–74 regulates the production, purchase, and sale of depressant and stimulant drugs.

Public Law 89–105 authorizes grants to community mental health centers for professional and technical personnel, and to train teachers, construct facilities, and perform research for handicapped and retarded children.

Public Law 89–115 is 3-year extension of a matching grant program for construction of health research facilities with an authorization of $280 million.

Public Law 89–239 establishes regional medical research centers and clinics to fight heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major diseases.

Public Law 89–234 establishes a national policy and standards for the prevention of and control of water pollution and provides aid to communities to help them prevent filth from being dumped into streams.

Public Law 89–272 initiates a research program to find better ways for cities to dispose of trash and garbage and provides that new cars and trucks after September 1, 1967, must have exhaust devices which will limit the exhaust fumes enough so they will not endanger the health of people.

Public Law 89– extends program for construction of facilities and loans to students to increase the number of physicians, dentists, osteopaths, optometrists, pharmacists, podiatrists, and nurses.

EDUCATION

Public Law 89–182 supports State centers which act as an extension service to small businesses to help bring new scientific information to them. Iowa State University at Ames has one of only three of these established thus far.

Public Law 89– increases grants to colleges to pay part of the cost of new classrooms and expands student loan program.

Public Law 89–10 authorizes Federal aid to local school districts mainly for special education courses to be distributed on basis of number of children from low-income families. Next year Boone County should receive about $156,488; Polk, $1,083,221; Story, $142,220, and Webster, $192,388. Iowa should receive $21 million and our share of the cost is about $11 million.

Public Law 89–209 provides the first real attempt to recognize the importance of general education programs in an era which has previously had a heavy emphasis upon space and atomic science.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Public Law 89–110 abolishes many literacy requirements and restrictive voting practices; authorizes appointment of Federal registrars in areas where it is found that discrimination against voting exists, and prohibits requiring payment of head tax as a prerequisite to voting.

FARM

Public Law 89–237 increases the money available to production credit associations to loan to farmers who are considered good risks but cannot borrow enough for seed, and so forth, at a private bank.

Public Law 89–240 provides aid and loans to nonprofit groups or co-ops who want to establish water and sewer systems in areas too rural to qualify under other legislation.

Public Law 89– extends the feed grains program now in effect and most other farm programs through 1969. It continues my amendment to include average yields of recent years in calculating yield bases. This has meant more than $20 million to Iowa farmers already because our yields were lower in the base years of 1959 and 1960 compared to some other States which used fertilizer more extensively at that time.

Public Law 89– extends sugar act under which we enter into contracts with processors both in the United States and other countries to deliver our sugar needs at a guaranteed stable price and to give us a priority on enough of the supply to meet our demand.

LABOR

Public Law 89–212 amends the Railroad Retirement Act by eliminating provision which reduced annuities of spouses of retired employees who were eligible for social security.

Public 89–216 provides that a bond fully protecting union funds against loss due to fraud and dishonesty is sufficient and eliminates requirement of Landrum-Griffin Act for excessive coverage which was requiring unnecessary premium payments.

Public Law 89–15 extends the Manpower Development Training program 3 years to June 30, 1969. This program provides training for the unemployed and partially employed persons whose jobs are in jeopardy due to automation. Contains an amendment I sponsored to make low-income farmers eligible so they can train while still farming units too small to produce a good income. A pilot training program under this provision has now been started in Iowa.

SAYLORVILLE AND RED ROCK DAMS

Earth moving is now underway on the Saylorville Dam near Camp Dodge and the final stage of the Red Rock construction has begun. Necessary appropriations were again secured to advance these at the maximum rate the engineers can efficiently operate next year.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Public Law 89– authorizes Appropriations Committee to consider necessary annual appropriations for water resource projects. Includes Skunk River Reservoir near Ames and $600,000 additional Federal contribution toward Des Moines flood control levees which will also be used for a riverside road.

Public Law 89–119 authorizes establishment of a Herbert Hoover National Memorial Site at West Branch, Iowa.

Public Law 89–4 authorizes extra funds for roads, to seed wornout cropland to grass and to develop the economy of the depressed 11-State Appalachian region.

Public Law 89–136 provides grants and loans for public works, and other projects intended to redevelop chronically depressed areas and to encourage regional economic development planning.

Public Law 89–80 provides $11.5 million annually to States for coordinated planning of water resources development.

Public Law 89–72 provides a program to include recreation, fish and wildlife benefits in flood control, reclamation, hydroelectric or multipurpose water projects.

SMALL BUSINESS

Public Law 89–59 amends the Small Business Act to provide long-term loans for businesses which were victims of floods and tornadoes in Iowa and elsewhere.

Public Law 89–78 increases SBA's loan funds for small business investment companies and State and local development companies.

HIGHWAYS

Public Law 89–139 provides for a $100 million increase in the amount authorized for the Interstate Highway System for 1967. Iowa will receive a total of about $36 million for our interstate program and $20 million for other roads next year. It is hoped that with the increase, presently planned interstate mileage can be completed in 5 years.

Public Law 89– provides that States will lose considerable Federal highway funds unless they eliminate most billboards on primary roads. Our interstate roads were already covered under another act and an agreement authorized by the 1965 Iowa Legislature.

TAXES

Public Law 89–44 reduces Federal excise taxes by $4.6 billion. Includes a provision I introduced so farmers can claim their gasoline tax refunds as a credit on their income tax returns instead of having to wait until later and file a separate claim.

DEFENSE

Public Law 89–171 authorized funds for foreign economic and military aid for 1966. Amount slightly less than last year.

Public Law 89–27 authorized $30 million annually for 1966–68 for arms control and disarmament research and negotiations.

Public Law 89–134 authorized $115 million for Peace Corps for 1966.

Public Law 89–214 provides group life insurance for members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones.

Appropriations for defense hardware and to pay for past wars continue to be about 80 percent of the budget. Although equipment is more complicated each year and costs more per unit, the cost reduction program, base closings and elimination of some of the duplication is holding the overall cost of defense about the same.

MISCELLANEOUS

Public Law 89–81 reduces the silver content requirement. Coins have contained so much silver that people hoarded and melted them and caused a shortage. Appropriations were also made to build a new modern mint to increase the coin supply.

Public Law 89–117 expands and extends current housing and urban renewal programs including FHA guarantees used so extensively in Iowa.

Public Law 89–236 abolishes the system of using the last country of residence to determine who can become a citizen and substitutes giving preference to those with close relatives in the United States and with a skill or professional ability that is in short supply here.

Public Law 89–174 establishes a Cabinet-level department to merge and assume the functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and several constituent agencies.

Public Law 89–141 makes it a Federal crime to assassinate, kidnap, or assault the President, President-elect, Vice President, Vice-President-elect, and other officers next in order of succession.

Senate Joint Resolution 1 cleared for State approval a constitutional amendment permitting the Vice President to become Acting President if the President is disabled and provides for filling vacancies in the office of Vice President.

Public Law 89–73 establishes an Administration on Aging to provide information and services to the States relative to developing programs for the aged.

BUDGET

Our Federal Government income increases at about $4 or $5 billion per year without changing tax rates. This is because we have an increasing population and higher incomes and profits upon which taxes are paid.

Automation, educational progress, and so forth, will continue to cause higher production and higher incomes per person. Population increases are also expected to continue; therefore, Government income should continue to increase unless there is a recession.

I believe the policy has pretty well been established now to distribute part of the increased Federal Government income to local governments and to use some for tax reduction. Of course, an increase in international conflicts could change this.

Congress still spends most of its time working through money requests, and since I am one of the Appropriations Committee members, I spend a large share of my time helping decide which requests to approve. Sometimes we add a few items, but it is usually a matter of either approving, eliminating or changing requests. Appropriations are the maximum amount that can be spent, but under executive orders designed to reduce actual expenditures, current actual expenditures are running less than $98 billion per year. The appropriations recap—or maximum that can be spent—for the fiscal year 1966 is as follows:

Total budget requests	$103,083,378,055
Total authorized by Congress	101,522,219,794
Total reduction by Congress	1,561,158,261

Appropriation bills, 89th Cong., 1st sess.

Title	Budget requests	Amount as passed (House)	Amount as passed (Senate)	Amount enacted
Agriculture, 1965 supplemental	$1,742,209,000	$1,600,000,000	$1,600,000,000	$1,600,000,000
District of Columbia	389,346,800	356,300,500	364,350,347	360,228,500
Interior	1,270,129,500	1,200,090,300	1,246,752,770	1,212,739,070
Treasury	1,219,400,000	1,272,252,000	1,304,014,000	1,291,239,000
Post Office	5,383,000,000	5,313,400,000	5,340,850,000	5,324,400,000
Executive Office of President	15,805,000	15,752,000	15,805,000	15,805,000
Independent agencies	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
2d supplemental, 1965	2,226,456,933	2,118,033,083	2,257,869,415	2,227,563,977
Defense supplemental, 1965	700,000,000	700,000,000	700,000,000	700,000,000
Labor	588,144,000	537,460,000	557,607,500	547,607,000
Related agencies	36,867,000	36,825,000	36,825,000	36,825,000
Health, Education, Welfare	7,652,014,000	7,323,020,000	7,411,940,000	7,410,170,000
Independent offices	14,566,023,000	14,109,908,000	14,253,364,000	14,246,167,800
Agriculture [1]	5,815,134,000	5,717,832,000	6,711,908,800	6,210,000,000
State	404,210,000	388,202,000	390,125,000	389,602,000
USIA	173,249,100	171,871,000	171,617,000	171,617,000
Justice	373,834,000	370,819,000	370,919,000	370,869,000
Judiciary	76,616,500	81,111,900	80,693,900	80,693,900
Commerce	937,030,000	889,522,000	851,122,900	856,851,250
Related agencies	191,547,000	184,164,000	187,734,000	184,814,000
Legislative	204,872,222	150,589,107	190,840,167	189,993,297
Defense	46,948,844,000	46,888,244,000	46,877,063,000	46,887,163,000
Public works	4,373,805,000	4,241,636,500	4,327,589,000	4,292,866,500
Military construction	2,049,000,000	1,755,495,000	1,759,504,000	1,756,635,000
Labor—HEW supplemental, 1966	1,553,918,000	1,223,181,500	1,407,181,500	1,223,181,500
Foreign aid	4,188,923,000	4,001,453,000	3,857,188,000	3,932,188,000
Total [2]	103,083,378,055	100,650,161,890	102,275,864,299	101,522,219,794

---

[1] Estimated and includes several hundred million dollars for CCC that will not be spent this year.

[2] Does not include last-minute supplementals for the newly passed education and other bills.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

FOREIGN AID TO GREECE

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, on October 1, this House debated a motion to cut off foreign aid to Greece on the premise that Greek ships are carrying the sinews of war to North Vietnam. At that time, the majority leader, the distinguished Member from Oklahoma, pointed out that this movement of ships flying the Greek flag is not an action by the Government or the people of Greece but of private shippers of other lands who have chartered ships registered in Greece, and are carrying cargoes which never touched Greek soil. He wisely counseled that such matters be left to the discretion of the President.

The motion did not pass, and I reopen the topic today only to offer further information which I have received on good authority, from the Greek Government. Of the ships seen flying the Greek flag in North Vietnamese ports in July and August, as referred to on October 1, not one was a Greek-flag line vessel or controlled by a Greek shipper. Every vessel was privately owned and under legal and irrevocable charter to shippers in other countries, entirely beyond the Greek Government's jurisdiction. I am sure it is well known that shipowners have access to registration in numerous countries, Liberia and Panama being among the more popular. Once a ship is legally chartered, neither its owner nor the country of its registration have control over its movements.

Contrary to being responsible for shipping war materiel to North Vietnam, the Kingdom of Greece has an admirable record of supporting the U.S. policy in matters such as these. There is no Greek-flag line as such, either Government operated or Government subsidized as is the case with U.S. shipping. The vessels owned and operated, not chartered, by Greek private owners belong to three general groups, all of which voluntarily entered into a mutual pledge of abstinence from shipping to Red China long ago. They entered into a similar voluntary pledge against traffic with Cuba even before the United States made its request for quarantine, and that same pledge exists with respect to North Vietnam. Even the members of the Greek Maritime Union voluntarily voted such a pledge. In the past 2 years, two separate royal decrees from the Crown of Greece have applauded, endorsed and called for continued compliance with these attitudes which were assumed voluntarily by active Greek shippers.

I offer these facts in support of the wisdom of the House in abstaining from such action as depriving the Greek Government the support of foreign aid on the premise advanced October 1. Certainly the purpose and mission of the United States in North Vietnam is to defeat communism, not to punish stanch allies and members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

During that debate, I spoke in favor of continued aid to Greece, suggesting the condition of its present government as a reason, and applying the word "shaky." I will say that the aforementioned reasons are more meaningful, and that the word "shaky" may not properly apply to the present government of Greece. While it is true that this government, formed on September 18, won its vote of confidence from the Greek Parliament by a margin of only four votes, I am now convinced that this in itself is not an evidence of "shakiness." I would now revise a description of this government to such terms, perhaps, as "tenuous but tenacious." I have been reminded that the United States' strongest and most loyal ally in postwar Europe, West Germany, elected her greatest leader of this century, Konrad Adenauer, to the Chancellorship by exactly one vote in the Reichstag—and that vote was Konrad Adenauer's own. Yet we have never found West Germany shaky, nor Chancellor Adenauer either, in his many years of leadership.

The strength and stability of a government rightly depends on the quality of the men who head it. The quality of the Greek government headed by Prime Minister Stefanos Stefanopoulous and Deputy Prime Minister Elias Tsirimokos was demonstrated in an address by the latter, who is also acting Foreign Minister, before the United Nations General Assembly on Tuesday, October 12. Referring to the many problems and conflicts between peoples and nations over boundaries and jurisdictions which trouble countries the world over today, Mr. Tsirimokos made this statement as to the policy of his government:

> I would like to stress that for Greece there is no other way to settle a difference than by peaceful means.

And he said further:

> Greece intends to remain in line with the principles governing the United Nations and to respect its decisions.

Mr. Speaker, those are not the sentiments of a weak or shaky country or government, but are worthy of a stanch friend and ally of the United States and an equally stanch member of NATO. I include in the body of the RECORD this address by Deputy Prime Minister Elias Tsirimokos:

ADDRESS BY THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF GREECE, MR. ELIAS TSIRIMOKOS, TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1965

Mr. President, the Greek delegation wishes to associate itself with the well-deserved praise and congratulations addressed to Mr. Fanfani on his election to the Presidency of this Assembly. The Greek Government is deeply gratified to see this high office entrusted to an eminent statesman from a country with which Greece is bound by so many ties. May I extend to our President the best wishes of the Greek Government and delegation for his speedy recovery.

I also wish to pay tribute to the President of the 19th session, His Excellency, Mr. Quaison-Sackey, whose patient efforts contributed so much to overcoming the constitutional crisis of our Organization.

Finally, I would like to welcome the new members of our family, Gambia, Singapore, and the Maldive Islands. Their admission marks another step toward the aim of universality of the United Nations.

After the frustrations of the 19th Assembly, our Organization managed to avoid an obstacle on which it almost foundered. But having escaped shipwreck, we should not allow ourselves to be carried adrift. After all, we only achieved an accommodation and not a solution. The principles about which the crisis arose must be redefined and reaffirmed, for they are fundamental and cannot be ignored without damage to the efficiency and prestige of the United Nations.

More than anything, the ability to undertake peacekeeping operations, is what distinguishes our Organization from its predecessor and makes the decisive difference between an impotent body, doomed to failure, and an effective organization in which an anguished humanity can put its hopes.

The question of peacekeeping operations and their financing may now be approached in a less alarming atmosphere but with an undiminished sense of urgency. Two points are already agreed upon; namely, that assessment on developing countries should be reduced and that the responsibility of the permanent members of the Security Council for the preservation of peace implies special obligations with regard to the financial burden. The general acceptance of these two points and the expectation of voluntary contributions, render possible a variety of formulas. However, in our eagerness for an agreement, we could not deviate too far from the basic principle of solidary financial responsibility of all members for the activities of the Organization, without jeopardizing the very foundations of our charter.

Greece, who always put its trust in the United Nations and resorted to its procedures whenever she was involved in a dispute, reaffirmed this trust by making to the United Nations force in Cyprus the highest financial contribution of all member states, considering her resources and her rate of assessment for the ordinary budget. That notwithstanding and in spite of current financial difficulties, Greece was among the first countries to pledge a voluntary contribution toward bringing the Organization to solvency.

The ratification of the charter amendments within the time limit prescribed by the resolution of the 18th Assembly is an auspicious development. It demonstrates on the part of the Great Powers a unanimous recognition of new present political realities. At the same time, the enlargement of the Security Council makes it more representive of the whole membership and should render more easily acceptable its predominant role in matters of peacekeeping and their financial aspects.

Similarly, the enlargement of the Economic and Social Council will enable it to discharge with renewed vigor a task whose importance is in no way diminished by the creation of UNCTAD.

The United Nations have not neglected their duty prescribed by the charter to promote and encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms. The universal declaration of 1948 has been the historical milestone on this road. From then on we toil to give human rights a legal and contractual form, which alone can insure their observance. In spite of inevitable delays we feel entitled to hope that an agreement will be reached on implementation clauses and that our efforts will soon be rewarded by the adoption of final texts of human rights covenants, which in itself should go a long way toward insuring the respect of these rights. It is high time to make such progress.

While it is natural that any conflict or risk of conflagration calls for the United Nations immediate attention, there is another problem, longstanding but no less urgent for that, to which we are called upon to dedicate sustained efforts. Disarmament cannot wait for the settlement of all disputes. It is true that in an atmosphere of relative calm, progress on disarmament is easier to achieve. But it is no less that any agreement on a collateral measure greatly contributes to the lessening of international tensions.

A resolution adopted here this summer by the Disarmament Committee clearly indicated that, in spite of the joint declaration on the principles of general and complete disarmament agreed upon 4 years ago, at the present stage the best chances of progress lie in the field of collateral measures, specifically on the question of underground explosions and nondissemination of nuclear weapons.

The Geneva Committee had little time to carry out the mandate contained in this resolution. It would therefore be useful if the Committee resumed its work at the earliest, with the encouragement and guidelines to be provided by this Assembly. We do not underestimate the difficulties it will have to face and will subscribe to any measure capable of promoting its task.

Having attained independence at the cost of a long and bloody war and fought in each generation to defend it, the Greeks, can understand the impatience of non-self-governed peoples better than anyone.

The task awaiting newly liberated peoples would be much easier if the resources now wasted to contain emancipation movements were used to better and mutual advantage in order to help the new states.

But if decolonization is nearing completion, the struggle toward a standard of living, education, and health compatible with human dignity is only beginning.

A developing country may receive assistance from a single country, which will then often appear to seek a predominant influence. Help may be granted by two countries or more, and then a struggle for influence is hard to avoid. Or help can be granted within the framework of international cooperation, and this is the form which we advocate unhesitatingly. Our preference is not dictated by political considerations alone. Direct assistance is but temporary and auxiliary. What developing countries need above all is a consolidation of commodity markets. Only by relying on its own resources can a nation hope to attain a real equality in its international relations.

Since the depression of the thirties, countries exporting basic commodities have made scant progress in establishing control over the sales of their products, while industrial countries have had more success in limiting the fluctuations of their economies.

Although the 19th General Assembly had a limited scope, it managed as its main achievement to adopt the resolution 1995 (XIX) institutionalizing the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. This new permanent organ of the General Assembly has recently begun functioning and is of major importance to the common task of economic and social development.

But we are aware that there is no wonder cure for underdevelopment, only collective and simultaneous efforts in the economic, commercial, social, technical, and cultural fields. The importance and complexity of matters within the ambit of the Conference and the variety of tasks to be undertaken is shown by the program of meetings for the remaining months of this year.

Developed nations should expand their role in the common task. For, as stated by the Secretary General and by ECOSOC, the results of the first half of the U.N. development decade fall short of solving the more pressing problems. In fact, these problems become more acute. But we trust the international organizations, and especially UNCTAD, to pave the way for the necessary political decisions.

Mr. President, the question of economic development is closely linked to the demographic problems, the study of which received a new stimulus when it was raised in the 16th General Assembly, 4 years ago. The study of the political, social, moral, and technical aspects of this problem will long continue. Meanwhile, the statistical projections which have been computed by new scientific methods and instruments enable the countries, where the rise of population growth is particularly high and where the need for raising the standard of living is pressing, to evaluate, as from now, the incidences of demographic pressures on their long-term development plans. It is incumbent on each country, each government, freely to choose, according to its own social structure, the policy it will adopt. The role of the United Nations and of their most developed members should consist in providing the developing countries, if they choose to ask for it, the assistance they may require, either for a more advanced study of their particular problems or for the implementation of a specific program. To be able to do so, the competent organs of our organizations must be endowed, as soon as possible, with adequate means.

However important peacetime problems and however useful one's assistance in solving them, let us remember that a specific if modest duty rests upon each of us for the maintenance and consolidation of peace. We must not only contribute to regional agreements, but also cultivate good relations with the greatest number of nations, beginning with immediate neighbors—and prevent the outbreak of local conflicts which might endanger peace. In this respect my country has ceaselessly striven to improve its relations with all nations, especially its neighbors, both those contiguous and those with whom our common border is the Mediterranean. In the Balkans, Greece was able to achieve a friendly climate with the collaboration of other countries of the area. With Yugoslavia, Greece has had for a long time close relations. Those with Rumania have much developed. Recently, relations with Bulgaria show substantial progress. In this connection Greece cannot but deeply deplore the deterioration, of the last 2 years in its relations with the Republic of Turkey, her neighbor and ally.

This deterioration is caused less by the question of Cyprus itself than by the reprisals resorted to by Turkey against innocents.

These deplorable initiatives, began with the arbitrary expulsions of dozens of Greek citizens, longtime residents of Turkey. The deportations became massive after Turkey, under a futile pretext, denounced the Greco-Turkish Treaty of Commerce, Navigation, and Establishment. Thousands of Greek citizens are being banished from the place where their homes have been for many generations. These measures and vexations of every kind caused, through anguish and intimidation, the exodus of thousands of other Greeks who were Turkish citizens and not liable to legal deportation. Under the slightest pretext, Greeks in Turkey are exposed to chicanery, intimidation, boycott. Police and law courts fail to protect them against wrongdoers. Teachers in minority schools are under constant threats and often removed from their posts. On the islands of Imbros and Tenedos, whose population has remained overwhelmingly Greek, Greek schools were closed in spite of the special status of the island; farmland and town property has been extensively expropriated under various arbitrary pretexts, with the sole purpose of despoiling the Greeks and altering the ethnic character of the population.

The Ecumenical Patriarchate established in Constantinople for 17 centuries and its venerable Head did not escape persecution.

The plant of the Patriarchate for printing religious publications of the Supreme See of the Orthodox Church has been sequestrated. The Patriarchal Orphanage has been closed. Two bishops have been deprived of their Turkish citizenship and expelled. A priest, defrocked and excommunicated 40 years ago, and his sons, ordained by himself, and who claim to represent a so-called Turkish Orthodox Church, dared with the encouragement of Turkish authorities to substitute themselves to the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Under the tolerant eye of the Turkish police, they have seized two important churches of the Istanbul diocese on the strength of abusive title deeds obtained through the complaisance of public authorities. Meanwhile, the See of the Ecumenical Patriarchate is put under police guard; all callers must identify themselves and explain the purpose of their visit; His Holiness the Patriarch was warned not to communicate with other churches in the exercise of his ecumenical apostolate. This persecution is accompanied by a vitriolic press campaign. Everything Greek or Orthodox is presented as a peril for Turkey.

The climate of tension is maintained by border incidents and frequent violations of Greek airspace which cannot be explained by navigational errors.

Under such provocations, which are so many violations of the spirit and often the letter of the treaty of Lausanne—cornerstone of Greco-Turkish relations—the Hellenic Government retained its composure. It confined itself to making representations in Ankara and bringing regularly the facts to the attention of the Security Council. In a spirit of moderation Greece refrained till now from countermeasures against Turks residing on her territory. This, however, instead of restraining the leaders of Ankara, seems to have convinced them that they can persecute with impunity the Greeks of Turkey. We are faced with an absurd situation in which Turkey multiplies hostile actions against Greece, puts forward preposterous demands and at the same time affects a desire to pursue talks to facilitate the solution of the Cyprus question.

I deeply regret that before examining this question, I had to denounce the aforementioned facts to the world conscience which you represent. These facts by themselves deserve your attention. They do it even more because the question of Cyprus, which is before you suffers from them, since any peaceful solution which we pursue presupposes a general detente between the interested countries.

I was struck by the fact that my distinguished colleague, the Foreign Minister of Turkey, insisted on the need for a dialog between Turkey and Greece. I would not question his sincerity; but those who in his country order anti-Greek measures would be better advised to further good intentions by an appropriate behavior. Before proceeding, I would like to stress that for Greece there is no other way to settle a difference than peaceful means; that is, discussions. It is essential for the interested parties to know who discusses with whom and about what. This means that one should always seek out for each case, the "valid interlocutor," and debate with him the points on which it would be possible to reach an understanding.

Another fact which struck me in the address of my colleague, is his almost total silence on the results of the U.N. action in Cyprus. It is true that he has expressed his country's thanks to the powers which have contributed to the setting up of UNFYCYP. I wish, for my part to express

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the gratitude of Greece to all these countries. But the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Turkey omitted even to mention the mediator, Mr. Galo Plaza, although the latter was appointed by our Secretary General, in pursuance of a Security Council resolution, in order to submit a report as complete and objective as possible.

Greece wishes to pay tribute to the whole U.N. action in this matter, to our Secretary General who once again proved himself so highly worthy of this office and so conscious of the mission of our Organization, as well as to the mediator, Mr. Plaza, whose efforts were commensurate to the seriousness of the problem.

No doubt observations can be made on the report of any mediator, whatever its merits. Eventual errors might be spotted; but to reject the whole report, as Turkey has done, and to go as far as to blame the person of the mediator amounts to an attack against the very principle of mediation. Mediation is one of the most effective means the United Nations may use in a conflict such as the one under consideration.

The distinguished Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom has even proposed the setting up of a standing group of mediators. I will not go into this proposal. I mention it only to show the extent to which mediation seems appropriate to the aims of the U.N. It is obviously the duty of every one to respect such an effort and not to treat it with contempt.

As far as Greece is concerned, she has endeavored to comply with all the decisions of the organs of the United States. Wishing to prove her respect for these decisions, she accepted, in the spirit of the mediator's recommendations, to open discussions with Turkey on the basis of U.N. principles.

I do not have to analyze Mr. Plaza's report. It is in your hands. Nor do I have to substitute myself to my colleague of Cyprus who will doubtless present the point of view of his country. I shall briefly describe the attitude of the Greek Government, stressing that most of our statements and arguments are borne out by the report of the mediator who very conscientiously has set out the real facts and in so doing may have failed to please everybody.

1. We believe there is no need to touch upon the principle of the validity of treaties. This principle has always existed, which did not save a great many treaties from a slow or a sudden death. As for the constitutional regime erected on the Treaties of Zurich and London, Mr. Plaza observes that it was a "constitutional oddity."

The eminent equatorian statesman uses here the moderate language of a mediator. In fact it was a legal monster who like most monsters could not survive for long.

My colleague Mr. Ishik says that in principle he is not against the revision of these treaties. Whether we say that these treaties are defunct or, that they must be revised we recognize that a new reality has emerged and must be faced.

2. To speak of two communities instead of a majority and a minority, does not alter the fact that there is in Cyprus a large Greek majority and a small Turkish minority. The fact takes on another aspect when one speaks of partition or coadministration of the island. For there is only a minority scattered over the whole territory of the country and not confined to any one area. As for the coadministration, it would only be a way to revive the monster, the absurd system whereby the minority can defeat the will of the majority, may I submit to the assembly that if such peculiar notions of constitutional or international law were to prevail one would have to accept the idea of completely changing the map of the world and the constitutions of a great many countries, since almost everywhere there are minorities which could demand either the partition of these countries or their coadministration. Mankind has long struggled for the recognition of minority rights. If the Turkish thesis were adopted we would enter a new historic era: that of the struggle for majority rights.

3. On the other hand, I wish to proclaim that we definitely favor the granting of every possible guarantee of the rights of the Turkish minority in Cyprus. This should raise no problem since the people of Cyprus are ready to accept even international guarantees of minority rights. In this connection I am sure that you will have noted with satisfaction a document just circulated. I refer to the Declaration of the President of the Republic of Cyprus on the rights which he recognizes and wishes to see guaranteed to the Turkish minority.

4. I come now to another thesis of the Greek Government. A great deal is being said with much solicitude about the independence of the Republic of Cyprus. Some allude to annexionist tendencies which are allegedly entertained by Greece. My country has never had, has not, and cannot have expansionist tendencies. The liberation of its territory has been accomplished through long struggles over a hundred and twenty years. Greece could not now become an expansionist country. Nor could she accept under any pretext that Cyprus be reduced to a curtailed independence. There cannot be two kinds of sovereign states. Those who fully enjoy all attributes of independence and those who do not. The Republic of Cyprus is entitled to an unfettered independence, like any other free and sovereign state.

I believe that I have proved that Greece intends to remain in line with the principles governing the United Nations and to respect its decisions. She will do so to the end. For this reason she wishes to express her satisfaction because the Secretary General of our organization in the introduction to his annual report stresses his intention to pursue the mediation effort in the spirit of the Security Council resolution of March 4, 1964, and that his hope that the countries concerned will meet together in the search of a peaceful solution of the Cyprus problem.

We accept this conclusion as it stands. As for the discussions recommended under this resolution, we would like to make the following point: Having placed this problem upon the basis of the principles of the United Nations, its decision, the spirit of the resolution of the Security Council and the mediation it decided upon, we have set the framework of our future action. As concerns Turkey in particular, Greece considers herself as an "interlocuteur valable" to the extent Greek-Turkish relations in general and aspects of the Cyprus question connected with these relations are involved.

But inasmuch as the question of independence and the future of the Republic of Cyprus is concerned, Greece does not claim the right to make decisions against the will or without the knowledge of the people of Cyprus. The Cypriots alone have the right to make decisions concerning their own fate. No equitable and lasting solution is possible without the consent of the Cypriot people.

In stating this basic truth, in further proclaiming her will to continue her contribution toward every mediation effort and to comply with the recommendations of the United Nations organs, Greece is conscious of serving the cause of a people that wants to be free, the cause of Greek-Turkish relations, the cause of peace in the eastern Mediterranean as well as the cause of the United Nations.

This is the reason why Greece considers herself entitled to address an appeal to the effect that the General Assembly make a necessary move in order to bring closer the moment of a peaceful solution. This solution should not be unduly delayed, because the crisis of Cyprus and certain actions by the Government of Turkey have repeatedly endangered the peace that the United Nations have the mission to preserve.

Thank you, Mr. President.

ASTRONAUTS OF THE FUTURE

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to call to the attention of the House a letter I received from a constituent, Mr. Ben Zajac, who lives in my hometown of Utica, Mich.

In his letter, Mr. Zajac expresses the hopes of himself and nine of his colleagues to volunteer for our space program. It is clear from his letter, Mr. Speaker, that he and his friends are eager to go—to the moon and beyond—if need be.

I have taken the liberty of forwarding the letter to the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Mr. James E. Webb. With enthusiasm such as that conveyed by Mr. Zajac's letter, I am confident the number of astronaut volunteers for America's space program will be more than adequate to meet our needs.

Mr. Zajac—perhaps I should say young Mr. Zajac—and his friends range in age from 10 to 10½ and in weight from 63 to 94 pounds. With up and coming astronauts such as these youngsters, I would say our space program is in great shape.

Mr. Speaker, I include the letter I received from 10-year-old Ben Zajac at this point in the RECORD along with the table giving the age and weight of the 10 volunteer spacemen:

DEAR SIR: Will you please mention in the House that 11-year-olds would like to join the space program? We are ready for training. By the time we are ready, it will be time for the Apollo shot. Then we should be ready. If it should go through, please contact me but if it does not go through, contact me anyway.

List of boys who want to join on back.

Truly yours,

BEN ZAJAC.

	Weight	*Age*
Ben Zajac	85	10
Lawrence Zenber	94	10
Tim Tshirhart	65	10
Kenneth Zapczynski	70	10
Tom Van Ryckeghem	65	10
James Reckling	80	10
David Ameloot	70	10
Gary Hildebrandt	72	10½
William La Ponse	63	10
David Massey	90	10½

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT'S POSITION ON FENCING POLICY ON PUBLIC GRAZING LANDS BOTH ENCOURAGING AND DISTURBING

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous mater.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on September 30, 1965, I introduced H.R. 11359, a bill to prohibit the erection of fences which will impede the movement of wildlife on public lands used for grazing and other puropses.

I pointed out at that time that miles of fences have been strung across public lands by the holders of grazing licenses and permits to save themselves the costs of hiring shepherds and range hands.

At the same time I warned that the fences on public lands in Wyoming and other Western States prevent the free movement of antelope and other wildlife and prevent them from ranging for food and water they need to survive.

I introduced H.R. 11359 because I was concerned that this fencing policy threatened existing antlope herds. I showed pictures of antelope hung up on fences which had either died of starvation or from injuries suffered in their run-in with the fences.

Since introducing the bill, I have asked the Bureau of Land Management for detailed information on fencing on public lands in Wyoming.

I am both disturbed and encouraged by BLM's report of October 9, 1965, "Position Statement on Woven Wire Fencing on the Public Lands in Wyoming."

I am disturbed because the report shows that 6,144 miles of fences have been constructed on public lands in Wyoming. This total includes 4,804 miles of barbed wire fences and 1,340 miles of woven wire fences.

Most of the fencing has been constructed since 1950 and virtually all of it was put up for the benefit of sheep and cattle interests who are allowed to graze their herds on our public domain.

Although the report does not state who paid for this fencing, I have been told that some of it has been erected by the BLM at Government expense. I have not learned yet precisely how much fencing was paid for by the Government, but I have been assured by the BLM that less than 10 percent of it was. Even 10 percent of this total adds up to about 614 miles of fence, which seems like a large amount.

The report also indicates that only 87 cattleguards, which permit passage of antelope, have been installed. This comes out to about 1 cattleguard for every 70 miles of fence—hardly an adequate number.

The report correctly points out that the Congress has directed the BLM to "manage lands to be retained in public ownership for various multiple uses, including livestock production, wildlife habitat, recreation, and timber production."

But I am disturbed that so much of the emphasis of the BLM's program, according to its own report, is directed to only one facet of its congressional charge, mainly, on livestock production.

The report points out that the population of the antelope has doubled in the past 10 years during the period when most of the fencing was erected, and concludes therefore that fencing must be beneficial to antelope.

This, I submit, just does not follow. The fact is that other factors, such as development of new water sources, predator control programs and improved range conditions were obviously responsible for growth of antelope herds. And while fencing might be responsible for improving range conditions by cutting down on overgrazing by cattle and sheep, I cannot believe that fences are needed to prevent overuse by antelope.

On the positive side, I am encouraged that after using the first dozen pages to justify the present fencing policy, the report begins facing up to the serious problems the present fencing policy has brought about and makes a series of positive recommendations. I quote from page 13 of the report:

> As a solution to the present situation, it would appear that the livestock user must face and accept the following factors in his use of the public lands:
>
> 1. Existing fences may have to be modified through lowering of overall height and inclusion of various wildlife crossing devices in fence lines.
> 2. More access points may have to be provided in public lands fences, gates, or cattle guards, for recreation use.
> 3. More adequate posting of public lands fences and access points as open to the public use will have to be achieved.
> 4. Reasonable and adequate amounts of public forage for wildlife use within licensed areas must be reserved.
> 5. Full recognition and planning for suitable wildlife numbers on public range must be realized.
> 6. The responsibility and possible inconvenience in seeing that gates, and such other wildlife devices as lay-down panels, are open at the proper times to facilitate wildlife movement, must be accepted.
> 7. A degree of interference with livestock operations must be expected through fuller use of the public lands for recreation use.
> 8. Stricter compliance with regulations and terms of licenses and permits must be achieved.

These recommendations, if implemented, will solve some of the problems that have grown up through the years as a result of the mistaken emphasis the BLM has placed on the role of cattle and sheep raising on public lands to the detriment of wildlife and recreational uses of the land.

Indeed, the BLM has carried this emphasis so far that the cattle and sheep raisers who have grazing permits have come to regard this public land as their own.

These commercial growers are, naturally enough, more concerned with profit than with the welfare of the antelope and other wildlife. Nor are they concerned with public access or use of the public lands.

In some cases the licensees have posted public lands with no trespassing and no hunting signs. They have even put up fences without bothering to obtain authorization from the BLM.

I have been told that one grower with a grazing permit even charged hunters a $5 fee to hunt on public land.

The Casper, Wyo., chapter of the Izaak Walton League, in a recent publication, reported that the Diamond Ring Ranch, the largest in Wyoming, erected 30 miles of fence without authorization from the BLM. At last report, the fence was still standing, although the violation had been reported.

The Casper chapter also made this observation in the September issue of the Wyoming Wildlife Federation Newsletter:

> There is another problem in this area leased by the Diamond Ring Ranch. It is the problem of "No Trespassing" signs. It is illegal for a rancher who leases the public land to erect such signs which keep the public off its own land.
>
> Most casual visitors such as hunters, fishermen, artifact and rock hounds, hikers and others who do not know exactly which land is private deeded land, and which is public leased land.
>
> As a result, many signs are erected and maintained which effectively keep such people off the land. Some ranchers go so far as to order these individuals off the public land, claiming it to be private.

Until the BLM makes the determination that the Congress meant what it said in directing that multiple uses includes not only livestock production, but also wildlife habitat and recreation and timber production, this mistaken attitude of "ownership" by licensees will continue.

The present fencing policy is clearly an important issue to many groups, judging by the reaction I received after introducing H.R. 11359. Wildlife and conservation groups and sports enthusiasts have approved the bill and sheep and cattle men have generally condemned it.

To give the flavor of public response, here are portions of both pro and con letters:

> CORA, WYO.
>
> DEAR SIR: We wish the cattle and sheep to continue using public land, but it should be managed so that game can use it also. And the general public should be permitted to roam their own land, without fear of trespass. We have here in the West the last great frontier.
>
> Yours very sincerely,
>
> CARROLL R. NOBLE,
> *Noble's Angus Ranch.*

> RAWLINS, WYO.
>
> DEAR SIR: The Carbon County Conservation Club would like to thank you again for submitting a bill to Congress to outlaw any fence on the public domain that will hinder the migration of wildlife.
>
> I am enclosing a clipping from the Rocky Mountain News of October 4, 1965, in which the Diamond Ring Ranch has invited you for a visit to their ranches at their expense.
>
> We hope that if you accept their invitation, that you will not be misled by a glossing over of the facts by the personnel of the ranch.
>
> The Diamond Ring Ranches did advertise for hunters on their ranches, after they had removed the "No Trespass" signs that they had posted.
>
> I returned from Casper on September 29, 1965, and noticed several signs, "No Trespassing, Diamond Ring Ranch."
>
> These signs appeared new, but I cannot say if they were on private or public land. But I believe that there is public land in that area.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> KARL D. VOGELGESANG,
> *Secretary.*

CASPER, WYO.

DEAR SIR: It pleases me no end to know that someone in our legislative bodies does care about the wanton invasion of public lands and the destruction of our wildlife.

This does not belong to the people of Wyoming, but to all Americans and while the sheep ranchers may have problems, they are being subsidized by the Government, and in addition they mean to not only fence public lands but to control all access to it also. This is even better than having a deed to it.

All people interested in wildlife and the preservation of public parks and public rights should be on your side.

Very truly yours,

Dr. HENRY M. BIGELOW.

HOT SPRINGS, S. DAK.

DEAR SIR: You are right about your bill in regard to fencing public land. I would like to tell you a few truths about that as I lived in a sheep wagon years ago and I saw Wyoming go from a good place to live unto this present feudal system.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. ETHEL FURRER.

DEAR HENRY: May I commend you most sincerely for introducing on behalf of our affiliate, the Wyoming Wildlife Federation, a bill to abolish sheep-tight fences on public domain lands.

We are very hopeful that some consideration can be obtained for the welfare of the antelope, which is almost entirely dependent upon the public lands of Wyoming for its well being.

The National Wildlife Federation has recently had discussions with officials of the Bureau of Land Management on this problem and we are hopeful that a good many of the present problems may be resolved by administrative directive.

Your continued interest and action on important natural resource measures are sincerely appreciated.

Kindest personal regards,

THOMAS L. KIMBALL,
Executive Director, National Wildlife Federation.

BUFFALO, WYO.

MR. REUSS: We really got a good laugh last night at the thought of an antelope impaled on a barbed-wire fence. Pray, did you ever try getting impaled on barbed-wire? I've gotten my Levi's caught on it a few times, but impaled? Really, Mr. REUSS.

As for the pile of bleached antelope bones at the foot of woven-wire fence, was he perhaps shot by some hunter from back east and left to die because the big white hunter wanted bigger pronghorns to take home?

Have you any idea how easily an antelope's hair pulls out of his hide? Easier than pulling grass out of the ground, by far. Now if his hair doesn't tangle in the barbs, how does he get caught in barb-wire?

He's not like a horse who will walk into it in the dark. And most barb-wire fences are topped with woven wire so he can't get caught going over. Most antelope will go under or around a fence, but if he has to, he will go over.

Please mind your own confounded business. You're meddling in affairs of which you have absolutely no knowledge.

PRISCILLA SHERMAN.

MILES, MONT.

REPRESENTATIVE REUSS: Trying to be a practical man who runs a sheep business in southeastern Montana, I cannot conceive of a recreational sport impeding newer methods of an industry so essential to the western United States.

We both can live together. We must.

The article using your thoughts of game become intangled in sheep-tight fences is just about a fantasy, experience tells me.

Sincerely,

JOHN MCRAE.

TEN SLEEP, WYO.

DEAR MR. REUSS: I would like to take issue with a recent quotation of yours which I am enclosing in this letter.

First of all, just why are you so concerned with Wyoming and its wildlife population? Doesn't Wisconsin have enough to keep you busy?

Secondly, and I feel this is the more important, we feel that the livelihood of several thousand people in Wyoming is a far more fundamental issue than that of preserving a playground for antelope and deer.

We feel that the economics of this is an important issue. Isn't it more necessary to provide a living and to provide the production of wool and sheep than to worry about some antelope?

Please don't misunderstand me. I am not completely inhumane about enough feed for the antelope and deer. We love to see them romp around the countryside too. However, how many have you actually seen impaled in fences?

Bear in mind that it is truly lovely to have wildlife abound in our western ranges. Bear in mind it is also truly lovely to have good business practices emyployed by those in the sheep industry.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. HAL WOOSLEY,
W-Diamond Ranch, Inc.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Would be more than glad to have you as my expense-paid guest for a tour of the Diamond Ring Ranch and other areas to view first hand the antelope-fence controversy.

Best for all if you come soon during the hunting season.

Wire plans, arranged for your convenience, to 400 East 15th Street, Casper, Wyo.

Sincerely,

HERMAN WERNER,
President, Diamond Ring Ranch.

Mr. Speaker, I airmailed this reply to Mr. Werner:

DEAR MR. WERNER: Thanks very much for the kind offer in your telegram to let me view first hand the antelope-fence controversy as your guest on the Diamond Ring Ranch.

Unfortunately, my legislative duties will not permit me to visit Wyoming at this time.

You can be sure that I will drop in to discuss this matter with you if I do get an opportunity to visit Wyoming after the session ends.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS.

Since I had been invited earlier to visit Wyoming by Mr. Noble, the cattleman who supports my bill, I hope I will be able to take advantage of these offers to hear both sides of the controversy at the end of this session.

I decided to insert these letters because they reflect the views of persons on both sides of this issue. I am interested in all of the letters, both for and against my bill. But it seemed to me that most of those who opposed the bill, did so not so much out of public interest as out of self-interest.

What some of these sheep and cattle raisers who lease these public lands for grazing have forgotten is that this is not only their land, it is mine and yours. They have forgotten that the unique Wyoming pronghorn belongs to all of us here in the United States. The fate of the antelope on public lands should not be determined by private sheep and cattle interests in Wyoming. It is rather a problem for all in this country to ponder.

Although I appreciate the BLM's modification of fencing policy as outlined in its October 9 position paper, I feel it is still necessary for the Congress to clearly delineate its position regarding fencing on public grazing lands.

My bill would prohibit fencing which the Secretary of Interior determined would impede the movement of wildlife and would provide for the removal of such fences and the revocation of grazing permits, if the Secretary feels such a penalty is warranted.

The bill would not be unduly restrictive to the Secretary. At the same time, it would insure that public lands on which grazing is permitted would indeed be retained in public ownership for multiple uses. This is what Congress has directed in the past.

There is room on the range for all interested users—the rancher, the hunter, the hiker, the scientist, and the outdoor enthusiast. And certainly we must not allow any one of the users to change the characteristics of the range so that the antelope and other wildlife which abound there are threatened.

CASIMIR PULASKI, A GREAT POLISH FREEDOM FIGHTER

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, 186 years ago, a great Polish freedom fighter died for a great cause—the freedom of the American colonies from foreign domination.

Casimir Pulaski, a nobleman and army officer driven into exile, came to America as a volunteer to serve in the Continental Army in 1777. He fought with distinction at the battle of Brandywine. He organized and commanded his own cavalry and infantry corps, Pulaski's Legion, which fought with great courage and stamina. He was with the ragged American Army during the hard and cruel winter at Valley Forge, and died a hero's death leading a cavalry charge at the siege of Savannah on October 11, 1779.

Casimir Pulaski was a fighter for freedom in his native Poland before he gave his life for American independence. His name has been synonymous with freedom. Few men have shown greater dedication to the cause of liberty or have sacrificed more in its service than this valiant Polish officer.

Although he died fighting for America's freedom, he was at the same time fighting for Poland's freedom, and indeed for man's freedom everywhere.

It is important that on this anniversary of Casimir Pulaski's death we remember the close ties that have existed between Poles and Americans because of their mutual respect for each other. Through the years, they have stood steadfast for the cause of liberty.

The courage and idealism shown by this Polish patriot rekindles our great admiration for the Polish people, and reinforces our faith that they will be victorious in restoring freedom in their homeland.

SUPPORT IS GROWING FOR SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY'S CHALLENGE TO HALT NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, since the time mankind first inhabited this planet by His divine will, there has been and ever will be a world of change, diversity, contrast, and contradiction. Abundant and frightening examples of frictions and differences between peoples and among nations exist in world history which have contributed to nothing but the useless destruction of man, bird, and beast.

The development of nuclear weapons and their proliferation among several of the major world powers in this century have created such destructive forces which now pose a shuddering menace to all life on this planet. Differences inflamed by highly charged emotions which could spread to power confrontations and nuclear conflict must be adjusted to the mutual agreement of all the parties concerned. Nothing can be achieved by straying off the path of seeking peace and harmony for one that promises emptiness through useless discord and conflict.

I highly endorse and join in the strong challenge set forth yesterday on the floor of the Senate by Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, of New York, who called for "political action on a grand scale" to halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons. In his incisive speech, Senator KENNEDY pointed out that the risks of proliferation of nuclear weapons must concern all countries, particularly the nuclear powers, whether they are Communist or not.

As a cosponsor of the legislation proposed by the late President John F. Kennedy in 1961 to create the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, I have subsequently voted for expanded appropriations and authority which would enable this Agency to develop technical and political experts who would constantly devote their efforts toward effectively diminishing the dangerous spread of nuclear arms.

More than 20 years ago, a destructive war ended and victors and vanquished alike pondered in great sadness their mindless wisdom as their lands laid ravaged, their resources spent, and millions of their youth slain. The United States must take the lead in searching and achieving international peace, a peace free from external coercion and nuclear intimidation.

There is no substitute for peace which must guide the destiny of men and nations. Peace for all men, peace among men and among nations is our desire and objective.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KORNEGAY (at the request of Mr. HENDERSON), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa, for October 18 and 19, on account of official business.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the week of October 11, 1965, on account of official business.

Mr. ASPINALL, for balance of 1st session, 89th Congress, after October 15, 1965, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MADDEN, for 40 minutes, on October 20 and 21.

Mr. VANIK, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday next; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. HALL), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. HALL), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDOWELL (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA), for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. COLLIER.

Mr. PIKE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MAHON to revise and extend his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include certain tabulations.

Mr. BOW to include extraneous matter in his remarks made on the supplemental appropriation bill today.

Mr. FLYNT the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole during consideration of the bill H.R. 11588, and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HALL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho

Mr. PELLY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois.

Mr. FUQUA.

Mr. STEPHENS.

Mr. CULVER.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 851. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Bernard L. LaMountain, U.S. Air Force (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1160. An act to amend section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act, chapter 324, of the act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 238), to clarify and protect the right of the public to information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 1520. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Earl Harwell Hogan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1922. An act for the relief of Valentina Sidorova Parkevich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1972. An act for the relief of Elinor A. Jean; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2091. An act for the relief of Joaquin U. Villagomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2112. An act for the relief of Marian Edith Kid-Stanton Simons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 61. A concurrent resolution to allow the viewing of the U.S. Information Agency film "Adlai Stevenson, the Ambassador" at the Auditorium Theater in Chicago, Ill., on or about October 24, 1965, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. 597. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting the need for adequate medical library services facilities; and

S.J. Res. 32. Joint resolution to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury to persons, and for use of and damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after August 15, 1945, and before April 28, 1952.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until Monday, October 18, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1673. A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, Department of the Army, transmitting report on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment, for the quarter ending September 30, 1965, pursuant to subsection 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1674. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting report of foreign excess property disposed of during fiscal year 1965, pursuant to section 404(d) of Public Law 81–152; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1675. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting the annual report of tort claims paid during fiscal year 1965, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2673; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Review of market promotion activity of foreign agricultural service, 20th report; without amendment (Rept. No. 1165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. S. 1004. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and nonpersonal services by executive agencies, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 606. Resolution opposing the granting of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 1167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAGUE:

H.R. 11598. A bill to provide that the fee increases prescribed by Public Law 89–83 shall not be effective in any case wherein the application was filed prior to the effective date of that act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 11599. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act so as to permit injured employees entitled to receive medical services under such act to utilize the services of optometrists; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 11600. A bill to establish a system for the sharing of certain Federal tax receipts with the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 11601. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide that certain social security benefits may be waived and not counted as income under that section; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 11602. A bill to create a National Military Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 11603. A bill to establish a system for the sharing of certain Federal tax receipts with the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 11604. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to prevent loss of veteran pension benefits as a result of increases in social security benefit payments under the Social Security Amendments of 1965; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 11605. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to make unlawful the transmission over a telephone system of any recorded message which does not identify the subscriber through whose telephone such message was transmitted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 11606. A bill to aid in the development of a coordinated system of passenger transportation for the northeastern corridor; to create a Northeastern Corridor Transportation Commission; to authorize negotiation to create an interstate agency; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 11607. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 11608. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation to veterans who incur total deafness or blindness in combination with service-connected total blindness or deafness, respectively, to reflect the greater disability than resulting from their service-connected disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11609. A bill to liberalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to automobiles for disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 11610. A bill to provide for the establishment of an adequate labor supply of agricultural workers for producers of perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 11611. A bill to provide for the establishment of an adequate labor supply of agricultural workers for producers of perishable agricultural commodities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLEVENGER:

H.R. 11612. A bill to provide for certain payments to be made with respect to property acquired by the Secretary of Agriculture for national forest purposes in Gogebic County, Mich., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R.11613. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to prohibit the performance of certain charter operations unless authorized by the Civil Aeronautics Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R.11614. A bill to provide a program of Federal assistance to elementary schools throughout the Nation to improve educational opportunities through provision for the services of child development specialists and to provide a program of Federal assistance for the training of such elementary school personnel in the institutions of higher education, and for other educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOW:

H.J. Res. 700. Joint resolution amending section 201(a) of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 701. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim November 13 of each year as "National Dental Assistants Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.J. Res. 702. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the District of Columbia shall be considered as a part of the State of Maryland for the purposes of representation in both Houses of the Congress and the appointment of electors of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.J. Res. 703. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.J. Res. 704. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.J. Res. 705. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.J. Res. 706. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.J. Res. 707. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.J. Res. 708. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 709. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.J. Res. 710. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating

Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.J. Res. 711. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 712. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.J. Res. 713. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.J. Res. 714. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H.J. Res. 715. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H.J. Res. 716. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.J. Res. 717. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.J. Res. 718. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.J. Res. 719. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.J. Res. 720. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.J. Res. 721. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.J. Res. 722. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.J. Res. 723. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 724. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.J. Res. 725. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H.J. Res. 726. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.J. Res. 727. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.J. Res. 728. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McEWEN:

H.J. Res. 729. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.J. Res. 730. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARTIN of Alabama:

H.J. Res. 731. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.J. Res. 732. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.J. Res. 733. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.J. Res. 734. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.J. Res. 735. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.J. Res. 736. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.J. Res. 737. Joint Resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.J. Res. 738. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.J. Res. 739. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.J. Res. 740. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 741. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.J. Res. 742. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.J. Res. 743. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.J. Res. 744. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STANTON:

H.J. Res. 745. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.J. Res. 746. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.J. Res. 747. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALKER of Mississippi:

H.J. Res. 748. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.J. Res. 749. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.J. Res. 750. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BATES:

H.J. Res. 751. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.J. Res. 752. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.J. Res. 753. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 754. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DON CLAUSEN:

H.J. Res. 755. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.J. Res. 756 Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.J. Res. 757. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.J. Res. 758. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H.J. Res. 759. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POFF:

H.J. Res. 760. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.J. Res. 761. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 762. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOW:

H. Res. 607. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEE:

H. Res. 608. Resolution to authorize printing as a House document the "Chronology of the History of the United States of America" and providing for additional copies; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 609. Resolution to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by House Resolution 94; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 11615. A bill for the relief of Gaspare Impeduglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11616. A bill for the relief of George Sembrakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 11617. A bill for the relief of Jun Becky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 11618. A bill for the relief of Miss Guiseppina Vannucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 11619. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the former owner thereof; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 11620. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carmela Mancuso and her daughter, Filippa Mancuso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI (by request):

H.R. 11621. A bill for the relief of Francesco Ragusa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 11622. A bill for the relief of Andrea Caporrimo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 11623. A bill for the relief of Sophia Panagiotis Iosifidou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF (by request):

H.R. 11624. A bill for the relief of Floris Maud Walker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Rampart Dam, Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the House proceeding on October 12, our colleague, the gentleman from Washington, Mr. TOM PELLY, expressed his opposition to the proposed Rampart Dam in Alaska. saying he has always believed "that one should not destroy something if the destruction is wanton and unnecessary." Though I agree with my distinguished colleague in opposing pointless destruction of anything, I strongly dissent from his characterization of Rampart Dam as a proposal for wanton destruction and as an unnecessary project.

I also disagree with Mr. PELLY that the time is right—as I will explain in a moment—for him to draw final conclusions regarding the Rampart project.

Although the gentleman is correct in saying that the Fish and Wildlife Service expressed its opposition to Rampart, he did not point out that the Fish and Wildlife Service proposed a program to mitigate any losses of fish and wildlife that might occur incident to the construction of Rampart. He also failed to point out that in 1963 the Department of Interior reported the fact that near Bureau of Reclamation projects there had developed an unexpected increase of wildlife.

Our colleague also failed to mention, in his overall evaluation of the Rampart project, that the Fish and Wildlife Service was alone in recommending against Rampart while the other agencies of the Department of Interior were strongly recommending construction. Upon the release of the Department of Interior's massive field study in February of this year the New York Times reported that the study concluded that there is a definite market in sight for the power that would be generated by the Rampart project, and noted:

> Although the study does not commit the Federal Government to any position on the dam, the overall analysis of the voluminous report is optimistic.

What is the Federal Government's position on Rampart Dam? We will know by the end of the year. At that time a special task force appointed by Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall will report its analysis and evaluation of the field study. It is for this reason that I think the time is not right for the gentleman from Washington or others to weigh the merits of the proposed Rampart project or to prejudge and condemn the project on the basis of emotional opposition.

Since the gentleman's evaluation is one sided, in that he cites only the report of the Fish and Wildlife Service, and premature, in that the Interior Department's evaluation of its massive field study is not yet completed, I am hopeful that my colleagues will not be prejudiced by his views, but will follow the doctrine of highest and best use when the time comes.

The New York Times reported that "the overall analysis of the Department of Interior's voluminous report is optimistic."

Happy Birthday, Ike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1965

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, today we are happy to join all America in paying tribute to President Dwight D. Eisenhower on his 75th birthday. Our tribute to Ike is indeed genuine. Today Americans continue to turn to him for his wealth of knowledge, comprehension of our current problems, and advice—which is regularly sought by our current President.

General Eisenhower's policy of waging peace and prosperity with all its resulting success, can be easily seen by examining his 8 years as President of the United States.

In celebration of his birthday, all Americans should heed his timely warnings and halt the deterioration of our Nation's moral fiber. We can all learn from Ike's outstanding life in public service and dedication to the country he believes in and loves. Also, we can look forward to continued service from this American patriot and the opportunities of pledging ourselves to the high ideals for which he stands.

National School Lunch Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the week of October 10–16 has been proclaimed by President Johnson as National School Lunch Week, and I feel it is appropriate that we in the House of Representatives pause and reflect for a few moments on the great importance of the school lunch program. President Johnson's purpose in designating a week as National School Lunch Week was "to increase public understanding and awareness of the significance of the national school lunch program to the child, to the home, to the farm, to industry and to the Nation."

The national school lunch program, which is now in its 19th year, provides over 18 million lunches per day to more than 70,000 schools participating in the program. The primary purpose of this program, which is operated by local school boards and local citizens, is to improve the health and education of schoolchildren through nutritionally adequate and educationally sound, nonprofit school food service programs.

The national school lunch program plays a very significant role in the total educational program of the school. Educators have long been cognizant of the fact that the learning process must take into account the whole child. Not just the child's mind, but the physical, as well as mental, well-being of the student must be considered. It is difficult for an undernourished student to concentrate on his studies. In addition to contributing to the health of the student, well balanced and nutritious meals at lunch teach good eating habits.

The national school lunch program is becoming a major factor in the national economy and in local economies. Thousands of school food service operations are carried on outside the actual Federal program. On a national basis, school food services are one of the largest single consumers of surplus foods which have already been purchased by the Federal Government under price support programs. However, these federally supplied foods total less than 15 percent of the total used in schools each year. The remaining 85 percent is purchased locally and privately which benefits the local economy and contributes to the financial stability of the community.

Thus, it is obvious that the national school lunch program is an increasingly significant factor in our economy, and it is fitting that we take note of this importance during National School Lunch Week.

Senate-House Conference on the Public Works Appropriation Bill Fails To Include $300,000 for Fremont Dam of the Lower Teton Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, Idaho has fared well in the public works appropriation bill for 1966 as agreed to in conference between the House and Senate, and which passed the House today. Included was $11,844,000 for five important projects in my State, four of which are in the Second Congressional District. These projects, and the amounts appropriated for them, are: Dworshak—Bruces Eddy—Reservoir, $11 million; Portneuf River and Marsh Creek, $400,000; Ririe Reservoir, $300,000; Heise-Roberts extension, $100,000; and Blackfoot Reservoir, $44,000. Funds for the Ririe and Blackfoot Reservoirs are for planning, while the rest are for construction.

However, Mr. Speaker, I must say I was naturally disappointed that the Senate-House conference on the public works appropriation bill, in its wisdom, did not include the $300,000 provided in the Senate version of the bill for the Fremont Dam of the lower Teton project. It is a good project, and one I believe to be of vital necessity to the residents of the area.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure Members of the House are aware of the great rampart of mountains—sometimes called the American Alps—which lie south of Yellowstone National Park, and along the Idaho-Wyoming border. These towering peaks of glacier-filled crevices, and of breathtaking beauty, are called the Tetons and form a major part of Teton National Park.

It was in the shadow of the rising sun under this majestic vertebrae of Mother Earth that I was born and reared.

Flowing out of these high places are crystal clear but swift and turbulent streams. Coursing through deep canyons the waters from the fast-melting snow in the spring emerge and flow out upon the broad, flat valleys below, inundating everything in their path. Later in the year, as the heat of summer reaches its peak, the snowpack recedes to a point where little melting occurs, and the streams slow to a trickle. Thirsty crops are too frequently left to wither in a land of little rain. These conditions have worsened as times have changed and as the area has become more highly developed.

Lands that can provide abundant yield year after year remain irregular and unpredictable and economic conditions have worsened for some 30 years.

The proposed Teton Dam is primarily and initially designed to provide supplementary water and to control spring flooding.

In House Report No. 1715, 88th Congress, 2d session, accompanying H.R. 2337, a bill to authorize this dam we find:

> This is a multipurpose development designed to make maximum use of the available water resources in the area. The construction and operation of this proposed project would provide irrigation service to 151,400 acres of irrigable land. About 114,400 acres are in a highly successful irrigated agricultural area and would receive a supplemental water supply. The other 37,000 acres which are presently dryland farmed would receive a full water supply. The project would also provide substantial flood protection to a highly developed area in the Upper Snake River Basin, which has suffered severe damage from floods in recent years; make available about 75 million kilowatt-hours of electric energy annually for project pumping and for disposal through the Federal Columbia River power system; and, in addition, would provide new recreational opportunities in the area.
>
> For the past 30 years, water users as well as businessmen in the Fremont-Madison Irrigation District, an area which is subject to both drought and floods, have been urging the construction of a dam and reservoir on the Teton River. At the present time, there are only two small reservoirs for water storage in the area, and the water which is impounded is subject to prior downstream rights. The canals which serve the Fremont-Madison Irrigation District lose their natural flow early in the irrigation season resulting in late season water shortages. A supplemental water supply for the existing irrigated land in the district is the greatest need in the area. This area is completely dependent upon agriculture, and the frequent crop losses due to drought conditions have a serious adverse impact which is felt not only by the local economy but throughout the entire State.
>
> The new land which would be brought into irrigated production would be a great asset to this area, strengthening and firming up the economy and providing for diversified crops on lands presently devoted to dryland grains.
>
> This same area, for which firm water supply is so badly needed, is also subject to serious flooding. Floods and drought conditions in the same year are not uncommon. The spring floods in many years cause inundation of farmlands, homes, and areas of improvements, as well as threaten the life and health of humans and livestock. Substantial economic losses have occurred. The seriousness of an alternate drought and flood cycle was vividly illustrated in 1961 and 1962. During the summer of 1961, Fremont and Madison Counties were declared a drought emergency area. In February 1962 extremely high runoff caused record floods in Henry's Fork and Teton River valleys and the Snake River plain. Thus, within 6 months, the same area was declared a drought area and a flood disaster area. Destructive floods occurred in the area just a few weeks before the committee held hearings on this legislation in June. The committee was impressed with the extent of damage indicated by photographs furnished during the hearings. A large percentage of the floodflows that have been so damaging are contributed by the Teton River, and storage space in the proposed Fremont Reservoir would provide substantial protection against future floods.
>
> Electric energy that would be made available would be an additional valuable asset that is needed to meet the ever-expanding power requirements.
>
> At the present time, recreation facilities in the area are taxed to the limit. The recreational opportunities that would be made available by construction of this project in the form of boating, camping, fishing, etc., would help meet the increased demand.

Mr. Speaker, support of this project has been completely bipartisan. The first bill on it was introduced by the late Senator Henry Dworshak in the 87th Congress. It was later reintroduced and cosponsored by Senators FRANK CHURCH and LEN B. JORDAN in the 88th Congress on the Senate side, and by my predecessor, Representative Ralph Harding, on the House side. It currently has the wholehearted support of the entire Idaho congressional delegation.

Twice the Idaho State Legislature has memorialized the Congress in its support. Following is the text of Senate Joint Memorial No. 5, Idaho State Legislature, 38th session, in such support:

> SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 5
>
> Joint memorial to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, and the Honorable President of the United States
>
> We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 38th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:
>
> Whereas the 88th Congress of the United States of America, by an act approved September 7, 1964, entitled Teton Basin Reclamation Project, Idaho, and known as Public Law 88–583, 78 Stat. 925, authorized to be appropriated for the construction of the Fremont Dam and other facilities of the lower division of the Teton Basin Federal reclamation project the sum of $52 million plus or minus justifiable amounts for ordinary fluctuations in construction costs and for operation and maintenance costs; and
>
> Whereas said project received the overwhelming support of Congress and all persons in the affected areas, of both political faiths, as being necessary and within the public interest to arrest the flooding waters of the Teton River and its tributaries by the construction of a dam and reservoir to use the impounded water, most of which in high runoff periods in the past has gone rushing down through the lower valleys eroding valuable farmlands and damaging and destroying homes and other properties; for the irrigation of arid and semiarid lands, the devel-

opment of river power opportunities, the providing for recreation facilities, and the conservation of fish and wildlife: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the senate and house of representatives concurring), That the Congress and its respective committees and subcommittees and the President of the United States in this session of Congress be respectfully petitioned to give the very earliest consideration, approval, and authorization to the making of the appropriation of the funds necessary to commence construction of the Fremont Dam, reservoir, and other facilities of the Teton Basin reclamation project, Idado; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives and the President of the United States of America, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

This senate joint memorial was adopted by the senate on the 28th day of January 1965.

W. E. DREVLOW,
President of the Senate.

This senate joint memorial was adopted by the house of representatives on the 1st day of February 1965.

PETE T. CENARRUSA,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within Senate Joint Memorial No. 5 originated in the senate during the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

ARTHUR WILSON,
Secretary of the Senate.

There is no controversy over this project within the State of Idaho. It has won wide public acceptance, both among those who would use the water made available by it, and among nonusers. Following is the text of a resolution adopted at the annual meeting of Water District No. 36, Idaho Falls, on March 1, 1965, in support of the Fremont Dam.

Whereas, the 88th Congress of the United States of America approved and passed September 7, 1964, an act entitled "Teton Basin Reclamation Project, Idaho" and known as Public Law 88–583; 78 Stat. 925, and

Whereas, funds were not appropriated at that time for the construction of the project, and

Whereas, said project has received the overwhelming support of Congress and all persons in the affected areas, of both political parties, as being necessary and within the public interest: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the waterusers of Water District No. 36 at their annual meeting in Idaho Falls, Idaho, on March 1, 1965, That the Congress of the United States in this session, make the necessary appropriation of funds for the early construction of the Fremont Dam, reservoir and other facilities of the Teton Basin reclamation project, Idaho: be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this meeting be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to immediately forward certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

I have pointed up the fact that this project has had complete bipartisan support. I would also like to point up the fact that the Department of the Interior repeatedly has stated that politics has no place in its consideration of projects—that projects are approved or disapproved solely on their merits.

As an example of this approach by the Department, I include at this point a copy of a letter I received some time ago from Commissioner Floyd E. Dominy, Bureau of Reclamation.

U.S. DEPARTMENT,
OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D.C., May 11, 1965.

Hon. GEORGE V. HANSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HANSEN: In your letter of April 26, 1965, you presented several questions regarding the Teton Basin project and asked that we furnish you the answers.

The questions and answers are as follows:

1. "Is there a need for this project to be started at an early date?"

A highly successful diversified agriculture has developed in the existing Fremont-Madison Irrigation District. The primary cash crop is potatoes which are grown in rotation with hay, feed grains, and pasture to support an extensive livestock industry. However, the area is subject to annual shortages of irrigation water in the late summer months which restricts crop production. Occasionally the shortages are very severe. The area also is frequently flooded by spring runoff which causes severe flood damage to land and improvements both in the project area and in the highly developed upper Snake River area immediately downstream. The seriousness of this alternating flooding and drought is illustrated by the fact that in the summer of 1961 the project area was declared a drought disaster area. During the following February the extremely high runoff caused severe flooding in the valley and the Snake River plain which resulted in the area being declared a flood disaster area. Multipurpose storage is urgently needed to control the damaging floodflows and conserve the water for irrigation purposes.

2. "If funds were available, how soon could advance planning be started?"

Advance planning could be started within about 2 weeks after funds became available for that purpose.

3. "Could an engineering field study of the area be started within 90 days?"

Yes. See answer to question 2.

4. "Could access roads, test well drilling, and hydrological land surveys be started without delay?"

The first priority of advance planning is the hydrologic studies and the ground water exploration including a test and observation well drilling program. This work could be started without delay. The next priority is the foundation drilling at the damsite. This work could be undertaken as soon as contractual arrangements could be completed for the drilling. The present roads are adequate for access for advance planning purposes with a minimum amount of repair and improvement. Additional access roads would be required for construction purposes but this would be done as part of the construction program.

5. "Would it be feasible to begin appraisal rights-of-way acquisition?"

Rights-of-way appraisal is not a critical or major item, and in an orderly sequence of work would be delayed until late in the first year or early in the second year of advance planning.

6. "Are the local irrigators willing to assume the repayment costs?"

The Lower Teton Division is to be constructed in two stages. The initial stage will consist of Fremont Dam, reservoir, and powerplant, together with the facilities to provide a supplemental water supply for the land now being irrigated in the Fremont-Madison Irrigation District. The second stage will consist of facilities to develop irrigation on 37,000 acres now being dry-farmed in the Rexburg Bench area. The second stage will require further study and water exchange arrangements to firm up the water supply. Construction of those facilities is to be deferred until the details have been worked out and a feasibility report has been submitted to the Congress.

Discussions with the water users of the initial stage regarding details of the repayment arrangement have not been initiated pending the availability of advance planning funds. However, the water users participated in the congressional hearings and strongly supported early authorization and construction of the project. No difficulty is anticipated in completing the necessary repayment arrangements for the initial stage.

7. "Are there any disagreements in Idaho concerning the project?"

There are no disagreements in Idaho concerning the construction of the initial stage.

8. "Is there controversy between the State of Idaho and the State of Wyoming on this project?"

There is no controversy between the States of Idaho and Wyoming.

9. "Are the farmers in the area prepared to negotiate on a contract repayment schedule?"

The farmers in the Fremont-Madison Irrigation District are strongly supporting early start of construction, and as indicated in answer to question 6, no difficulty is anticipated in obtaining a satisfactory irrigation repayment contract.

10. "Has the first phase of contract negotiations been worked out with the local irrigation districts?"

As indicated in answer to question 6, discussions with the prospective water users regarding the details of the repayment contract have not been initiated although the plan of development and the requirements for repayment under reclamation law have been discussed with them on a number of occasions.

11. "How much money do you estimate would be required to begin advance planning?"

Funds in the amount of $300,000 would be used during the initial year for advance planning studies. The funds would be used for foundation exploration, field surveys, ground water exploration including a test and observation well drilling program, hydrologic and land classification studies, right-of-way appraisals, and contract negotiations.

12. "Could you use as little as $50,000 to start work with the water users to prepare for contract negotiations?"

As little as $50,000 could be used the first year, although the work that could be accomplished with that amount would be limited and start of construction of necessity would be delayed.

Your interest in the Teton Basin project is appreciated. If we can be of further assistance, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

FLOYD E. DOMINY,
Commissioner.

I would like to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, Commissioner Dominy's answer to the first question I had asked—particularly the sentences which read:

> The seriousness of this alternating flooding and drought is illustrated by the fact that in the summer of 1961 the project area was declared a drought disaster area. During the following February the extremely high runoff caused severe flooding in the valley and the Snake River plain which resulted in the area being declared a flood disaster area.

This point is further emphasized by the statement, contained in House Report No. 1715 that: "Thus, within 6 months, the same area was declared a drought area and a flood disaster area."

In recent testimony before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Mr. Kenneth Holum, Assistant Secretary for Water and Power, Department of the Interior, stated that cost-benefit ratio is not the only index upon which the Department bases its recommendations. He said in part:

> It is an important index, but it is not the only index that ought to be considered.

Other factors, Mr. Speaker, surely should be the economic condition of the project area and the effect an immediate or a delayed start would have upon it. The recurring floods and droughts have had severe adverse effect on the economy of the area—to the extent that it has, in the past, been forced to call upon the Federal Government for aid under various Federal programs in addition to the relief frequently sought as a disaster area.

Mr. Speaker, this project has been divided into two parts because of the urgency of the initial phase. Secretary Holum, in a letter to the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, dated March 11, 1964, stated:

> Problems associated with negotiating exchanges to firm up the water supply for irrigation of Rexburg Bench lands and adjusting operations to accommodate that development may take some time to solve, and they should not be allowed to impede developments for which there is an immediate present need.

All of the above, Mr. Speaker, I believe makes an extremely strong case for an early construction start on the Fremont Dam. It is wanted, it is needed, and it will easily pay for itself in 50 years.

Congressman Pike Reports on 1st Session, 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1965

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity for the 5th consecutive year to make this annual report to my constituents of the First Congressional District of New York on the activities of the Congress in general, and of their Congressman in particular, during the 1st session of the 89th Congress of the United States of America.

Never, ever will the cry be raised that this has been a do-nothing Congress. Its greatest detractors will have to admit that this Congress has done more this year than any Congress in the history of our Nation. There is a possibility that the cry will be raised that this has been a "do-too-much Congress", but in general I believe the people of our district will approve most of what this Congress has done.

First of all, what sort of district do we have? It remains probably the fastest growing area on the east coast of the United States of America. In the 1960 census the First Congressional District, which comprises all of Suffolk County except the towns of Huntington and Babylon, contained a population of 398,254 people. By May of 1964 the Bureau of the Census had already certified to me that our district exceeded 500,000 people, and the latest estimate put out by the Long Island Lighting Co.—a very reliable source—shows that our population now exceeds 550,000, so it is a very rapidly growing area.

It is an essentially prosperous area. We have survived remarkably well the cutback of defense employment at the Republic Aviation plant largely because of an equally great increase in defense employment at the Grumman Aircraft & Engineering Corp. We remain far too much tied economically to the mercurial defense industries, and there are bound to be other crises in the future, particularly in the case of those manufacturers who fail to diversify their production. As a district, however, we are widely and healthily diversified, ranging from large defense manufacturers to the farms of the east end of Long Island. Our recreation business continues to grow, and our potential for additional business in this field was never greater. We have rural, suburban, and relatively urban living. Our greatest problem continues to be that of planning for the future in such a manner that we can preserve the way of life which has made eastern Long Island so attractive that tens of thousands of people move in each year to take advantage of it.

The 89th Congress met on January 4, 1965, and its first vote—that of the election of the Speaker—showed the heavily Democratic makeup of the Congress resulting from the landslide by which President Johnson carried the country in November 1964. The vote was 289 for the Democratic candidate, Speaker McCORMACK; 139 for the new Republican minority leader, GERALD R. FORD. From that start on the first day of the session major bills have been considered in committee, debated on the floor, and passed at a rate never exceeded by any Congress.

The first major controversial issue of the year came on the new $840 million program of Federal aid to the Appalachian area, which was passed on March 3, 1965. During the same month a new program for Federal controls over the manufacture and sale of barbiturates and amphetamines was passed; a new Federal program of aid to elementary and secondary schools was passed; a new Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was established, and a new program for the joint development by Federal and State governments of water resources was enacted.

April saw the extension of the Manpower Development and Training Act, and on April 8, after roughly 20 years of debate and controversy, the House of Representatives passed the bill providing hospital care for the elderly through the social security program, and a voluntary health insurance program by the lopsided vote of 313 to 115. The same bill also provided broadened coverage and increased payments for the recipients of social security. April also saw the passage of a constitutional amendment providing for succession in cases of Presidential disability and the passage of a Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Throughout the year the most ominous note was the undercurrent of national concern over the war in Vietnam. In the early months of 1965 the situation was deteriorating on the military front, and the government at Saigon was increasingly shaky. Americans were confronted with a choice of letting that small nation, which had been fighting first the Japanese, then the French, and then the Vietcong for an entire generation, fall to the Communists, or to bolster it with vastly increased American aid on three fronts—military aid, economic aid, and American military manpower. The decision was made to increase American aid dramatically, and on May 5 the House of Representatives, by a vote of 408 to 7, passed a bill providing an additional $700 million for American military operations in southeast Asia. At this time, the situation in that area, while still dangerous and deadly, is substantially improved.

During the same month we passed our annual authorization bill for the procurement of aircraft, missiles and ships to the extent of over $15 billion, and authorized over $5 billion for the operations of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and $2½ billion for the operations of the Atomic Energy Commission. May was the month of large authorizations—in addition to the three above-mentioned we authorized over $3 billion for foreign aid for fiscal 1966, and almost $6 billion for the operations of the Department of Agriculture. May was also the month in which the House passed a bill providing for further construction of health research facilities, and for additional funds to the Public Health Service to carry on its programs of research, involving such diseases as cancer and heart.

In June a long-sought program reducing or eliminating Federal excise taxes on hundreds of items as common as ladies' cosmetics and handbags, watches, jewelry and luggage was happily passed by the House of Representatives. June also saw the creation of a new Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the passage of our largest appropriation bill of the year—$45 billion out of an annual budget of approximately $100 billion to operate the Department of Defense during fiscal 1966.

In June we also passed legislation extending the program previously administered by the Area Redevelopment Act, and passed the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, a highly controversial measure which for the first time included a program of Federal rent subsidies, which the New York Daily News, in a reference toward medicare, referred to as renticare.

Five days after the Fourth of July we passed the Voting Rights Act of 1965, banning poll taxes in an effort to end the last discrimination against the right of any citizen to vote.

Feeling brave, we passed a bill requiring that cigarette packages be labeled to inform the uninformed that their contents might be hazardous to health; and listening to the outraged cries of the tobacco people, we postponed its effective date until July 1, 1969. We took note of the silver shortage by providing for new dimes and quarters to be made without silver, and we took note of the shortage of pay in our military by providing an average 10.6 percent pay increase for our men in uniform. We authorized almost $2 billion for an expanded antipoverty program, and toward the end of the month the House passed another controversial measure, voting to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

In August we authorized $3 billion of aid to the States for the Interstate Highway System, and a $3.25 billion program for public works in economically depressed areas. In the same month we passed an agriculture bill providing a 4-year program of price supports for wheat, cotton, wool, dairy and feed grains, and passed a major measure liberalizing the immigration laws of the United States of America.

Early in the year the majority leader in the Senate, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, had predicted confidently but optimistically that Congress would be adjourned by Labor Day. Labor Day and the entire month of September, however, saw Congress still grinding out major legislation at a tremendous pace. During that month we extended for 3 years the program of Federal aid for training nurses and students in Public Health fields. We authorized the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a $90 million research project for high-speed ground transportation which may some day be of tremendous value to the bumper-to-bumper club on western Long Island's highways. We established a Water Pollution Control Administration and increased Federal aid for the construction of municipal sewage treatment plants. We passed our annual public works bill to the extent of $1,743,228,000 and passed a new measure giving to the Farmers Home Administration the authority to develop water supply and sewage disposal systems in rural areas. We went through agonies on the question of whether to grant home rule to the District of Columbia, and wound up passing a bill which said "maybe." We ended the month of September in another display of raw courage by voting to increase the compensation of all Federal employees, after first voting to eliminate Congressmen.

October found us still hard at it. We amended the Public Health Service Act in order to provide grants for the establishment of medical library services and facilities. We passed a bill providing for the beautification of highways constructed with Federal funds by eliminating billboards and screening or eliminating junkyards within certain distances of such highways. We will hopefully wind up the session in the near future after passing the act establishing quotas for the import of sugar into the United States.

It has been a fantastically busy year for Congress. We have had as of this date 367 rollcalls. Of these 193 were votes, and 174 simply quorums. I missed eight votes and nine quorum calls. While this constitutes a slippage in my attendance record, it is still substantially better than average, and I believe that the absences were justified. It has been a busy year for your Representative, also. Six out of eight missed votes and eight out of the nine missed quorum calls came in the month of June, when I was designated chairman of a four-man special subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee to visit the fighting areas in Vietnam. The two other missed votes came when Mrs. Pike was in the hospital, and the other missed quorum call came when the Advisory Committee for the Fire Island National Seashore was being sworn in.

The trip to Vietnam took us more than halfway around the world. We traveled 2,150 miles within Vietnam alone, visiting all of the major combat areas and American installations. On our return we filed a classified report which I like to think has been read by a few people. We must have done something right, for in August the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, assigned to me the responsibility of heading up a new subcommittee to investigate the adequacy of the air support which has been provided for our ground troops in Vietnam. This special subcommittee consists of nine Members of Congress, and has held hearings over the past month. We have heard witnesses ranging from the enlisted men who have served on the ground in Vietnam and who have called for air support, through the pilots who provided it, through the military and Department of Defense planners who have been developing our tactics for the present and are developing our plans for the future, and we wound up with a four-star Air Force general who has overall responsibility for the Air Force in this important field. All of our hearings were held behind closed doors. I can only say that they were so interesting I wish I could discuss them.

The Special Investigating Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, of which I am the second ranking member, conducted several investigations and held several hearings this year—the most noteworthy of which involved the Aerospace Corp. of Los Angeles, Calif. Our report on the waste of taxpayers' money incurred by the practices of this corporation received national coverage including articles in both Time and Newsweek magazines and an editorial in the New York Times, and has already resulted in many changes in the operations of the corporation which will save the taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars. This Special Investigating Subcommittee has now been assigned the job of checking on the quantity and quality of our inventory stockpile of military goods at bases both within the United States and all around the world. This will involve a trip around the world some time during the period after Congress adjourns, and I will not pretend that this will be a duty unmixed with pleasure. I concede that I am looking forward to it.

During the Easter recess, I had the privilege of being designated as a representative of the U.S. Congress at a meeting of the Interparliamentary Union which was held in Dublin, Ireland, and Doris and I joined the representatives and the wives of the representatives of the legislative bodies of some 70 different nations—both from the Western World and from the Communist world.

On the personal legislative front we were successful in having passed a bill to supplement last year's Fire Island National Seashore. The bill which I sponsored this year provided for the addition of the 611-acre William Floyd Estate to the Fire Island National Seashore. The owners of the estate had generously agreed to donate it to the Federal Government retaining a 25-year lease of the property and the bill authorizing this expansion of the Fire Island National Seashore was introduced on May 10, cleared subcommittee, full committee, House, Senate, and was signed by the President almost as soon as he came out of the ether on October 9.

The Federal Government's program of erosion control on the south shore of Long Island is proceeding on schedule. More than $5 million has been appropriated for this project. More than $6 million has been made available for the purchase of land on Fire Island and for the development of the National Seashore Park and dredging operations funded by the Federal Government have been conducted on both the north and south shores of Long Island.

The above constitute the more newsworthy activities in which our office was engaged this year. The less newsworthy but perhaps more important activities of our office continued to be the handling of as many as 200 individual letters and phone calls each day from the more than half million residents of our district. My staff of five full-time secretaries and two part-time assistants was kept busy trying to help thousands of individuals whose problems ranged from the simple job of procuring a Government publication to the extremely complicated one of trying to cut through redtape in order to help get a serviceman home from overseas for a visit with a dying parent. We presently have 24 young men from the First Congressional District attending West Point, Annapolis, the Air Force Academy, and the Merchant Marine Academy, and we have already commenced the processing of approximately 100 applications from young men in our district who wish to compete for appointment to the academies next year.

In all of the daily cases involving problems of immigration, student loans, delayed mails, social security benefits, veterans' pensions, and income tax refunds, I have been greatly aided by and I am deeply indebted to a dedicated and hardworking staff whose ingenuity sometimes exceeds my own, and a wife and three children who have not only learned not to act surprised on those rare occasions when father comes home, but who have also become quite expert at keeping complicated telephone messages straight.

We have tried to keep in close touch with our district through weekly radio broadcasts over eight radio stations and a weekly newspaper column mailed to every newspaper in the district, and we are grateful to those radio stations which have broadcast our reports and to those newspapers which have printed the column as a public service. We have stopped worrying about those hardy few papers which even after 5 years find the prospect of carrying a weekly column by a Democratic Congressman too dangerously subversive to contemplate. Both broadcasts and columns will be discontinued when Congress adjourns.

While I have generally supported the program of President Johnson, there have been frequent occasions, such as the $840 million Appalachia bill, the $5.7 billion agriculture appropriation to finance farm subsidies, the $8.2 billion housing and rent subsidy program, the extension of the Area Redevelopment Agency, and the $3.25 billion program for expanding the Area Redevelopment and Emergency Public Works programs, when I felt that we had gone too far in new programs and voted "no."

A more complete voting record on the major issues of the 1st session of the 89th Congress follows:

Date	Issue	Vote
1965		
Jan. 4	Election of Speaker. (McCormack 289; Ford 139.)	McCormack.
Jan. 4	Direct Speaker to seat Mississippi Congressmen-elect. (Yea 276, nay 149.)	Nay.
Jan. 4	Adopt new House rules. (Yea 224, nay 202.)	Yea.
Jan. 26	Recommit supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1965 for Department of Agriculture, with instructions to report back with amendment prohibiting agricultural exports to United Arab Republic. (Yea 204, nay 177.)	Yea.
Feb. 9	Eliminate requirement Federal Reserve maintain gold certificate reserves of not less than 25 percent of deposits. (Yea 300, nay 82.)	Yea.
Feb. 17	Extend Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, 1966–68. (Yea 302, nay 63.)	Yea.
Feb. 25	Authorize $370,000 for investigation expense, House Un-American Activities Committee. (Yea 360, nay 29.)	Yea.
Mar. 3	Authorize $840,000,000 to aid Appalachia. (Yea 257, nay 165.)	Nay.
Mar. 10	Establish Federal controls over manufacture and sale barbiturates and amphetamines. (Yea 402, nay 0.)	Yea.
Mar. 26	Improve educational quality Nation's elementary and secondary schools. (Yea 263, nay 153.)	Yea.
Mar. 31	Establish Administration on Aging in Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to help older persons through grants to States. (Yea 396, nay 1.)	Yea.
Mar. 31	Provide assistance to States to develop Federal-State water resources development programs. (Yea 383, nay 0.)	Yea.
Apr. 1	Extend Manpower Development and Training Act 2 more years. (Yea 395, nay 0.)	Yea.
Apr. 5	Provide for return of obscene mail matter through U.S. postal service. (Yea 360, nay 21.)	Yea.
Apr. 8	Provide hospital care for the aging under social security, and voluntary health insurance program. (Yea 313, nay 115.)	Yea.
Apr. 13	Amend constitution providing for succession in cases of Presidential disability. (Yea 368, nay 29.)	Yea.
Apr. 14	Authorize $50,000 to House Un-American Activities Committee for investigation of Ku Klux Klan. (Yea 313, nay 43.)	Yea.
Apr. 27	Authorize increase in U.S. quota in International Monetary Fund. (Yea 301, nay 88.)	Yea.
Apr. 28	Establish Federal Water Pollution Control Act to abate pollution and create municipal sewage treatment works. (Yea 396, nay 0.)	Yea.
May 3	Extend health service programs for migrant workers and communities. (Yea 347, nay 0.)	Yea.
May 4	Authorize assistance in initial cost of professional and technical personnel for community mental health centers. (Yea 389, nay 0.)	Yea.
May 5	Provide additional $700,000,000 for American military operations in southeast Asia. (Yea 408, Nay 7.)	Yea.
May 5	Authorize $15,303,400,000 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and ships for the military services. (Yea 396, nay 0.)	Yea.
May 6	Authorize $5,183,844,850 for National Aeronautics and Space Administration program. (Yea 389, nay 11.)	Yea.
May 10	Provide further construction of health research facilities and research funds to Public Health Service. (Yea 334, nay 4.)	Yea.
May 20	Authorize $2,555,521,000 for Atomic Energy Commission. (Yea 352, nay 1.)	Yea.
May 25	Authorize $3,367,670,000 for foreign aid in fiscal 1966. (Yea 249, nay 148.)	Yea.
May 26	Appropriate $5,717,832,000 for Department of Agriculture. (Yea 354, nay 41.)	Nay.
June 1	Amend Federal Coal Mine Safety Act to provide further for prevention of accidents in coal mines. (Yea 336, nay 42.)	Yea.
June 2	Reduce Federal excise taxes over next 3 years, resulting in their elimination by 1969. (Yea 401, nay 6.)	Yea.
June 8	Extend Export Control Act to June 30, 1969. (Yea 388, nay 1.)	Yea.
June 9	Increase public debt limit to $328,000,000,000 through June 30, 1966. (Yea 229, nay 165.)	Yea.
June 9	Permit USIA to show film about President Kennedy through educational and commercial media. (Yea 311, nay 75.)	Yea.
June 23	Appropriate $45,188,244,000 to Department of Defense for fiscal 1966. (Yea 407, nay 0.)	Yea.
June 24	Extend Area Redevelopment Act for 2 months. (Yea 224, nay 167.)	Nay.
June 28	Provide rent supplements for moderate income family housing; extend urban renewal. (Yea 245, nay 169.)	Nay.
July 9	Voting Rights Act of 1965; ban on use of poll taxes. (Yea 333, nay 85.)	Yea.
July 13	Require cigarette packages be labeled hazardous to health. (Yea 286, nay 103.)	Yea.
July 14	Provide for minting of dimes and quarters without silver; half dollars 40 percent silver. (Yea 255, nay 151.)	Yea.
July 20	Provide average 10.6 percent pay increase for the military. (Yea 410, nay 0.)	Yea.
July 22	Authorize $1,900,000,000 for antipoverty program. (Yea 245, nay 158.)	Paired for.
July 26	Adopt open rule for floor consideration of sec. 14(b) of Taft-Hartley Act. (Yea 248, nay 171.)	Yea.
July 28	Repeal sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act permitting State right-to-work laws. (Yea 221, nay 203.)	Yea.
Aug. 2	Authorize apportionment of $3,000,000,000 to States in fiscal 1967 for Interstate Highway System. (Yea 314, nay 11.)	Yea.
Aug. 2	Provide Federal support for training programs for local law enforcement personnel. (Yea 326, nay 0.)	Yea.
Aug. 3	Increase pensions for retired Federal employees and their survivors. (Yea 396, nay 0.)	Yea.
Aug. 4	Authorize U.S. agreement to changes in charters of International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Finance Corporation. (Yea 331, nay 54.)	Yea.
Aug. 5	Extend Interest Equalization Tax Extension Act of 1965 to July 31, 1967, and broaden coverage to include purchases by Americans of foreign bonds. (Yea 274, nay 97.)	Yea.
Aug. 10	Amend Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951 making it crime to knowingly destroy or mutilate draft card. (Yea 393, nay 1.)	Yea.
Aug. 12	Establish 5-year, $3,250,000,000 program of grants and loans for public works to aid economically depressed areas. (Yea 246, nay 138.)	Nay.
Aug. 16	Suspend duty on certain forms of nickel until July 1, 1967; authorize President to grant extension of duty-free treatment beyond that date. (Yea 298, nay 48.)	Yea.
Aug. 16	Establish Federal Boxing Commission with broad powers over professional boxing. (Yea 346, nay 4.)	Yea.
Aug. 19	Establish wheat, cotton, wool, dairy, and feed grain price supports. (Yea 221, nay 172.)	Nay.
Aug. 24	Recommit bill to appropriate $1,223,181,500 supplemental funds for manpower training, elementary and secondary education activities, recruitment of agricultural workers, heart disease, cancer, and stroke programs. (Yea 139, nay 263.)	Nay.
Aug. 25	Eliminate national origins quota system and set new general priorities for admission of immigrants to the United States. (Yea 318, nay 95.)	Yea.
Aug. 26	Authorize 5-year program of assistance to institutions of higher education and students in attendance. (Yea 368, nay 22.)	Yea.
Aug. 30	Authorize Federal aid to public elementary and secondary schools affected by major disaster. (Yea, 305, nay 37.)	Yea.
Aug. 31	Authorize President to remove tariff duties on Canadian automobiles and parts. (Yea 280, nay 113.)	Yea.
Sept. 1	Extend for 3 years Federal grants for construction of teaching facilities for training health personnel and loans for students in specified health fields. (Yea 340, nay 47.)	Yea.
Sept. 2	Authorize Secretary of Commerce to conduct $90,000,000 research project in high-speed ground transportation. (Yea 317, nay 24.)	Yea.
Sept. 7	Authorize $1,780,062,000 for construction at military bases at home and abroad. (Yea 347, nay 0.)	Yea.
Sept. 7	Raise compensation payments to veterans with service-connected disabilities. (Yea 348, nay 0.)	Yea.
Sept. 7	Authorize $1,500,000 for President's Commission on Law Enforcement. (Yea 339, nay 0.)	Yea.
Sept. 8	Appropriate $3,285,000,000 for foreign assistance and $716,453,000 for related programs. (Yea 239, nay 143.)	Yea.
Sept. 15	Recommit bill establishing a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. (Yea 128, nay 251.) (Later passed by voice vote.)	Nay.
Sept. 17	Adopt resolution dismissing challenge to 1964 election by Mississippi Freedom Party. (Yea 228, nay 143.)	Yea.
Sept. 20	Authorize $10,000 life insurance program for members of armed services on active duty. (Yea 362, nay 0.)	Yea.
Sept. 20	Adopt resolution expressing sense of House that any 1 or more Western Hemisphere countries could take steps to forestall or combat Communist intervention in any American state in Western Hemisphere. (Yea 312, nay 52.)	Yea.
Sept. 21	Establish Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works. (Yea 381, nay 0.)	Yea.
Sept. 22	Authorize construction of public works, erosion control, maintenance of rivers and harbors. (Yea 207, nay 185.)	Yea.
Sept. 23	Amend Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 by providing new program of $55,000,000 annually in grants to develop water supply and sewage disposal in rural areas. (Yea 326, nay 10.)	Yea.
Sept. 24	Control air pollution and authorize $92,500,000 from 1966–69 for research in disposal of solid wastes. (Yea 294, nay 4.)	Yea.
Sept. 27	Discharge Rules Committee from further consideration of home rule for the District of Columbia. (Yea 213, nay 183.)	Nay.
Sep. 29	Adopt Sisk substitute to home rule bill providing for election of a Charter Board and referendum by residents. (Yea 227, nay 174.)	Yea.
Sep. 30	Amend bill providing salary increase of Federal employees, to exclude pay increase to Members of Congress. (Yea 238, nay 140.)	Yea.
Sep. 30	Authorize salary increase for Federal employees. (Yea 370, nay 7.)	Yea.
Oct. 1	Amend conference report on foreign aid, to prohibit aid to nations involved in commerce with North Vietnam. (Yea 164, nay 174.)	Yea.
Oct. 1	Amend Public Health Service Act to provide grants for adequate medical library services and facilities. (Yea 296, nay 3.)	Yea.
Oct. 7	Highway Beautification Act of 1965. (Yea 245, nay 138.)	Yea.
Oct. 13	Establish sugar quotas for domestic and foreign producers. (Yea 246, nay 147.)	Nay.

Johnson Administration Favors Building Ships in Foreign Yards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the last appropriation bill has passed the House and adjournment is at hand. In the language and provisions of these bills, the Representatives of the people, as provided in the Constitution, have worked their will and have specified how and where the taxpayers' money will be spent.

However, the bureaucrats in the agencies and departments of Government have ways of thwarting the will of Congress. One of these is to withhold information until Congress is not in session and then, without legislative provisions to the contrary, the executive branch can do what it wants.

As an example, today—the very day after the House acted on its final appropriation bill—the word is out—the Department of Defense is firming up its plan to award a $150 million procurement order to England for naval support-type vessels. According to the Associated Press, a program has been approved by the Johnson administration for initial procurement from British shipyards of $46 million, including four seagoing minesweepers costing $19 million and five tugs to cost $8.2 million. Later, a contract will be let for 12 merchant-type ships, for cargo transport.

Mr. Speaker, it is beyond me why the administration favors building ships abroad when we know our shipyards and skilled workers are needed for national security.

Yet, it is apparent that a policy is being followed to reduce U.S. shipyards to a mere nucleus. Only the other day, a Department of Commerce official came up with a recommendation to cut our domestic shipbuilding program and eliminate 20,000 jobs.

In the Puget Sound area in the State of Washington, we have one Government yard at Bremerton that has demonstrated its ability to compete costwise with any other shipyard in the country and meet time schedules with the highest quality of work. Filler jobs of the type being contracted to England are absolutely essential to this Bremerton yard, if costs are to be held down and a balanced workload maintained.

As for private shipyards, in Seattle—not to mention smaller yards in other communities in the area—we have demonstrated on a competitive basis that we can obtain naval contracts and in this connection, recently, large sums have been invested in increased facilities. In the Seattle-Bremerton area, the finest ships in the world are built.

Previously, Mr. Speaker, I protested secret negotiations with the British to build ships abroad. Now that Congress has appropriated the money and is going home, the word is let out.

Mr. Speaker, America's shipyards and her great pool of skilled workers have always built the finest ships in the world. What justification is there to depend on foreign countries for naval and commercial needs? How much money do we save when American workmen must draw unemployment benefits?

As I did before, I protest this unwise and unnecessary policy of closing down 18 shipyards in the United States, throwing Americans out of work, and giving the work to England—which already has a stepped-up shipbuilding program of her own.

Business Should Develop Flying Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1965

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, in order to bring a topic of importance to the attention of the Members of this body, I would like to take the liberty of inserting into the Record the remarks I recently made to the convention in Los Angeles of the National Business Aviation Association. The subject of my speech—a private, flying peace corps—is a topic that should interest all those who are concerned with strengthening America's position in the emerging nations of the world.

Hopefully, our way of life can become a model for the developing countries. But, we must be able to demonstrate the American way to foreign peoples. And what better way is there to accomplish this goal than to have the citizens of another country meet with private individuals from the United States on a person-to-person basis?

I can think of no more effective method—and to support my beliefs I have long been advocating a greater effort to implement this policy. One important way to do so is to interest the Nation's flying businessmen in such a concept. If those qualified pilots who serve in America's overseas businesses will support and assist the private Peace Corps theory, the increased mobility through flying will greatly enhance the effectiveness of the private citizens' groups that are already serving our Nation in foreign countries and perhaps attract more groups and businesses into the field.

I am frank to say that I was very pleased with the reception my speech received from such a knowledgeable group of business aviation leaders and felt that I should bring my remarks to the attention of interested Members:

BUSINESS SHOULD DEVELOP FLYING PEACE CORPS

(By Congressman Don H. Clausen, before the National Business Aviation Association, Ambassador Hotel, Los Angeles, October 12, 1965).

The invitation to address this great aviation organization here in my home State of California is indeed very much appreciated. When Bill Lawton called, my first question was, "What phase of aviation do you want me to discuss?" Bill replied, "Don, just tell 'em what's on your mind and how Congress looks at business aviation. But don't speak for more than 20 to 25 minutes." That's like putting a muzzle on a bulldog. As you all know too well, a Congressman is just "gettin' airborne" in that length of time.

First of all, I would like to take a moment to recognize the splendid safety record of business aviation. As a former fixed base operator, I know the value of training, discipline and professionalism in aviation. Business flying success stems from the application of these points to aircraft operations.

It is for these reasons that Maj. Gen. Joe Caldera, Flight Safety Foundation president, wrote recently, "A careful analysis of general aviation accident statistics has resulted in a startling conclusion—business aviation pilots are 900 times safer than the average private pilot. This fact is supported by figures which show private pilots are averaging 39 accidents per 100,000 flying hours, while business aviation pilots average less than 0.04 accidents per 100,000 hours of flying." We, in the Congress, salute you for this extraordinary display of professionalism in our beloved art of flying.

While I plan to comment further on what the Congress sees in business aviation, I think it might be appropriate at this time to suggest that you in business aviation would be well advised to take a good look at the Congress. For years, many of you have approached Capitol Hill in support of, or in opposition to, pending legislation affecting aviation. You probably spent hours "indoctrinating" and, in some cases, "brainwashing" a Congressman who had never flown.

If you think that situation still exists—you're in for a real surprise. One of the most refreshing facts of political life in Washington is the growing number of Congressmen and Senators who are flyers and are familiar with all phases of civil aviation. John Bell Williams, Bo Callaway, Pete Dominick, Dick Ichord, Bob Stafford, John Davis, Bob Duncan, Mo Udall, Howard Cannon, Hastings Keith, Teno Roncalio, Al Quie, Burt Talcott, Jim Broyhill, Don Rumsfeld, Lud Ashley, and myself—are but a few of our flying Congressmen. The Congressional Flying Club was formed to further extend the realm of flight to Congressmen and their staff personnel.

Recognition of this new element reached its climax during the flight service station crisis, when the general aviation community appeared in Washington to oppose the FAA directive to close 42 stations. As Bill Lawton said, "We didn't have to explain the problem—we found Congressmen who understood the situation as well as we did. This was a real breath of fresh air." Of course, you realize this can be a two-edged sword. There will be no room for camouflage or smoke screens as you approach the Congress in the future with your requests.

We all agree that aviation will benefit greatly with this improved understanding; I further believe that general aviation will receive a more balanced recognition because all of these Congressmen are active participants in the general aviation category.

In discusing aviation problems with the FAA, it becomes increasingly apparent that they appreciate the opportunity to present their objectives and programs to an informed Congress. Dave Thomas, the head of civil aviation, is highly regarded and respected by all of us privileged to work with him. His recent letter to Chairman Oren Harris, of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committe, advising that "extensive consolidations of flight service stations would not be undertaken at this time," was very well received.

Bob Reynolds, the very capable, genial judge from Texas (who succeeded Bill

Schulte as head of General Aviation), and I have spent many hours discusing the navigation and communications requirements of business and general aviation throughout the country.

With business taking to the air to stay competitive, it becomes increasingly mandatory that we in Government provide the latest in Nav-aids to increase safety and additionally to improve the schedule reliability for all airway users. For a long time I have argued for more flexible criteria in the establishment of navigation and communications facilities. I feel strongly that we need to increase the number of terminal VOR's, ILS's, and direction finders, in addition to the "educated-eye-balls" of the qualified flight service station operator.

Just prior to his leaving the FAA, Jeeb Halaby (for whom I have the highest regard) and I were having one of our frequent discussions relating to all phases of aviation. On this occasion, we were concentrating on the Nation's Capital and the increased traffic at Dulles and Friendship, but more specifically, the increased commuter and general aviation traffic at National Airport. I offered two suggestions to Jeeb: (1) activate Bolling Field for general aviation, at least until such time as a permanent general aviation access could be provided; (2) consider building new general aviation airstrips at carefully selected sites contiguous to the circumferential highway (beltway) that encircles Washington, D.C.

With this integrated transportation complex contemplated for the Nation's Capital, I would hope we can look forward to an extension of this concept throughout the country, particularly in communities located near our great Interstate Highway System. Close coordination in land-use planning between the FAA, the Bureau of Public Roads, the State Division of Highways, and local airport sponsors could save substantial sums of money and greatly improve the business aviation access to communities.

With the maximum in Nav and landing aids, we can expect a more reliable completion of schedule for business aviation and the very obvious expansion of business. The broad flexibility, utility, and diversification of business aircraft, with the steady growth in turbo-powered and pure jet, suggests no limit to the growth potential.

The American population, and certainly American business, is more flexible and mobile than at any time in the history of civilization. Those who fail to understand business aviation do not realize that productivity increase is essential to business growth. Transportation and communication for modern business is essential to achieve this productivity.

Our expanding aviation industry is not without competition from abroad. Our electronics and other supporting industries also reflect international competition. This competition, combined with the high productivity of all American business, means aviation is playing an increasingly significant role in our balance of trade.

Before discussing the international benefits of general aviation, I would like to touch briefly on its relation to my favorite subject—aviation education.

As we look to the future, aviation education is the key to our success. The rapidly changing international situation will require a maximum acceptance and implementation of creative ideas, as we adopt the inevitable changes in our foreign policy—policies that will reflect the more trade, less aid philosophy.

Our young people must be prepared to participate in the diversified use of aircraft contemplated for the future—from rotary wing and slow-flight utility aircraft to supersonic and space vehicles. The opportunities are unlimited.

One need only read the daily newspapers or listen to television to determine the rapidly expanding demands for an aviation-oriented population. The domestic use of commercial and general aviation type aircraft, agricultural planes, all phases of military aviation, the supersonic, the newly created airmobile divisions in Vietnam to combat the guerrilla warfare techniques of the elusive Vietcong, the latest in space vehicle developments and interplanetary explorations—dramatically point to a maximum American commitment, as we seek advancement of our aviation and space technology.

For many years, I have advocated the inclusion of aviation education and flight training as part of our vocational education programs in the schools of America. In my hometown of Crescent City, Calif., working with educators, we established such a program over 15 years ago. We saw what could be done to motivate young men and women to improve their education, as well as pursue a career in aviation or supplement other careers with the mobility of aviation.

I am of the view that a broader exposure to aviation education at the earliest possible age would pay great dividends in later years. Your elected representatives in Government are dependent upon an informed public opinion for direction. Many of the aviation advances we seek will not be forthcoming unless John Q. Citizen is aviation oriented.

In addition to textbooks, I would like to see an inexpensive flight simulator developed for placement and use in the grade school classrooms of the country. A more sophisticated simulator could be made available to the high school and college level student. For those students that demonstrate an average-to-above aptitude, the next step would be flight training in aircraft or gliders.

With the increasing demands and opportunities for aviation-oriented men and women, it seems only logical that this foundation in aviation education would serve many purposes in our rapidly changing domestic and international society.

If your great organization (NBAA) feels inclined to endorse this program, we would welcome any suggestions or assistance to put it into practice.

Returning now to the international benefits of business aviation—frankly, I feel that aviation can and will open up new countries just as canals, railroads, and highways opened our Nation to the development of commerce. Many emerging nations will go directly from the oxcart to the turbine and jet age. Those businessmen who understand the utilitarian value of aviation will undoubtedly do better in the newer nations than the earthbound entrepreneurs.

However, just as I stressed the great importance of providing adequate communications and navigation aids here in the States, it will become increasingly important to have similar aids throughout the Western Hemisphere and, ultimately, the entire world.

I am sure that many of you in this room are familiar with the expanding international role of American business. Few people, however, realize the extent of the technical cooperation and other aid rendered to foreign nations by private organizations. For decades, American business concerns have been helping less developed countries advance economically. Housing has been provided, disease controlled, local people trained to use modern machinery, and other steps taken to permit increased industrialization. Most of this activity has occurred without fanfare or publicity.

Essentially, there are four groups from which private foreign aid programs may spring: (1) private investment, (2) foundations, (3) religious groups, and (4) voluntary agencies. Many organizations within these groups have been quietly carrying on the type of activity proposed for our much-publicized Peace Corps.

This brings us to the challenge of our time—a challenge that you in the business aircraft community are best equipped to accept. The world needs an expansion of the Private Flying Peace Corps concept. In 1963, during the Peace Corps debate, I said—and I quote: "In addition to current programs, I want to recommend vigorously that the leaders of our private enterprise system recognize a new responsibility of providing for our security. They must take the lead in projecting an ideological offensive truly representative of our private enterprise system—it is they who are the most qualified to lead."

In September of this year, Roger Blough, chairman of the board of United States Steel, was quoted in a headline, "Blough Urges Business To Head Peace Quest." He told a conference of international industrial leaders that mutual economic interest could be the most effective bond for peace. The cornerstone of such a bond, he said, would be the multination corporations that have extended their operations and their plants beyond their home borders.

Gentlemen, who is better equipped to formulate and expand the private flying peace corps concept? This is the challenge that you must accept. Again, it is you who are the most qualified to lead.

In George Haddaway's June issue of Flight magazine, he carried a magnificent article, "Miracle in the Desert," which told of how Sister Therese, the flying nun, and Brother Mike Stimac of the United Missionary Air Training and Transport operation in Kenya, were carrying out medical missionary work in one of the world's most remote and neglected areas. Since 1955, I have been privileged to work with, on a limited basis, the Seventh-day Adventist International Missionary program. Currently, they are expanding their aviation operations throughout the world. Their flight training center at Pacific Union College in my district not only trains medical missionaries to fly, but will ultimately develop "flying teams" of dedicated missionary volunteers equipped to assist their foreign brethren in the fields of agriculture, medicine, education, theology, et cetera. This, again, can be appropriately identified as a flying private peace corps. There are many other programs established by other denominations, carrying out this concept without fanfare and publicity.

Many in this room, I am sure, share my concern for the problems throughout the world. With each passing day, a new crisis unfolds. While we evaluate our overall foreign policy, I can only conclude that the foreign policy of the future must include a declaration of national policy to "win the cold war" and a program to carry us to victory. I am firmly convinced that we must develop an effective economic, technological, and psychological offense—in addition to the maintenance of a superior military defense posture.

We shudder at the thought of a nuclear war in terms of human and economic waste. The avoidance of a nuclear showdown requires us to seek other ways in which to prevail in the face of communism. To paraphrase the expert on communism, Clausewitz, "A cold war is but an extension of a hot war by other means." Therefore, we, too, must develop "other means," which take a variety of forms, to counter this new threat to our security.

When they say, "Which way America?" I am convinced the business aviation community will provide the leadership in developing these "other means" that put to use the most advanced tools available in the fields of communication and transportation.

You in business aviation are uniquely qualified to lead this airborne peace offensive.

As flyers, we can expedite the export of American knowledge and know-how by simply demonstrating to others throughout the world that which we have applied successfully at home. As Americans, we can help other Nations provide opportunities based on freedom, dignity, and justice for all mankind.

Let's put "wings on Americanism."

Tree Capital of the South, Taylor County, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1965

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in announcing to the Congress of the United States, a proclamation by the Honorable Haydon Burns, Governor of Florida, proclaiming Taylor County, Fla., as the "Tree Capital of the South."

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the tremendous importance of timber and its related industries to the economy of this Nation; in fact it is one of the five major industries of the United States.

It is hard to visualize, as we see an individual tree, that this one item is a basic cornerstone of the economy of this Nation. The landowner is the first in a long line of Americans who derive all or part of their incomes from timber.

The multitude of wood products and lumber runs into the thousands.

It is therefore with justifiable pride that I join with Governor Burns in asserting our claim that Taylor County, an area which I am privileged to represent in the Congress, is the "Tree Capital of the South."

This afternoon on the steps of the capitol of Florida, Governor Burns took a branding iron to affix his signature to a proclamation which had been inscribed on a huge cross section of a cypress tree. It reads:

> Whereas official forest statistics prove Taylor County, Fla., throughout history has been a world leader in tree production, and now leads the South in wood harvested and leads the South in reforestation, I hereby proclaim Taylor County, Fla., the Tree Capital of the South.

This is no idle boast.

As far back as the 1700's, Taylor County began harvesting its vast acreages of virgin timber. Through the years this harvesting accelerated, as Taylor County is situated in the heartland of America's virgin timber.

Harvesting hit a peak in the early part of this century with the construction of the largest cypress sawmill in the world, the Burton Swartz Co., still in operation as the Lee-Tidewater Cypress Co., and the huge Brooks-Scanlon sawmill, which was to become the largest sawmill ever to operate east of the Mississippi.

The sawmill town of Carbur sprang up, and was the largest sawmill town in the world.

When these early timber companies cut out the virgin forests, many believed Taylor County would dwindle away, but forward thinking men began reforestation even as the last vestiges of the virgin stands were cut away. Their efforts have borne fruit.

Our area is noted for its rapid rate of growth of timber and just over a decade ago, Buckeye Cellulose Corp. established its huge plant near Perry, and today after five major expansions, is one of the three largest dissolving pulp producers in America.

Lee-Tidewater Cypress Co. is today expanding into a completely new plant, and employs hundreds of people.

Cooperation between the pulp and timber industry has brought a resurgence of the lumber industry in the county, and today five major mills are operating there.

Taylor County has nearly a billion board feet of standing timber; and wood harvesting in the county last year exceeded 340,000 cords of wood. Looking to the future, Taylor County has been the leading tree planting county in our State, having planted over 87 million seedlings since 1928, with thousands of acres reforested with direct seeding.

This past year alone, Taylor County planted 6⅓ million seedlings.

Taylor County has more tree farm acreage than any other county in the State; in fact, one of every 12 tree farm acres in Florida is located in Taylor County.

This is the basis for our claim.

Each year, Perry is the site for a great pine tree festival which pays tribute to the second largest industry in our State—timber—producing a billion dollars in income annually.

I take pride in being able to present just a portion of the story of Taylor County to the Congress. Men looking to the future, where we will need an ever increasing amount of wood for a growing Nation, are scientifically conserving this priceless natural resource in the Taylor County area.

I pay tribute to them and salute the people of Perry and Taylor County, and join with them in making claim to the title that Taylor County is truly the "Tree Capital of the South."

Culver Salutes Collins Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1965

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, we in the Second District of Iowa are extremely proud of the achievements of the Collins Radio Co. In the space field, for example, Collins has participated as the principal communications supplier for all manned space programs to date, and, in fact, every American voice which we have heard transmitted from our space vehicles has been on Collins equipment.

Of perhaps equal significance to the American people, however, are the recently announced figures indicating the remarkable success of the company's cost reduction program. The serious efforts devoted to this objective throughout the entire organization have resulted in a net cost reduction of over $10 million in fiscal year 1965, nearly double the figure for fiscal year 1964.

Beyond the managerial capability and operational efficiency which this substantial reduction clearly illustrates, the figure most importantly represents a similar cost savings to the company's governmental and commercial customers. As a tribute to these outstanding efforts, the Collins program has been cited for particular recognition by James E. Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the company has received the personal commendation of President Lyndon Johnson.

The success of these endeavors is dependent upon both the initiative and leadership of management and the interest and full participation of all the firm's employees. This aggressive program and its proud results are one more notable reason why Collins Radio has risen to a position of leadership in the electronics industry.

I am extremely pleased to call these worthy accomplishments to the attention of my colleagues, and I know they join with me in support of these continued efforts by the Collins Radio Co. to promote greater efficiency and economy in production, to insure maximum value to its customers, and to contribute positively to our Nation's industrial strength.

Blue Key Honor Fraternity Address of Senator Richard B. Russell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1965

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues the fine remarks made by Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL at the homecoming banquet of the Blue Key Honor Fraternity at the University of Georgia, in Athens, on Friday, October 8. The occasion was organized by Tucker Dorsey, general chairman of the banquet committee, and Franklin Freeman, president of Blue Key Honor Fraternity:

REMARKS OF SENATOR RICHARD B. RUSSELL, OF GEORGIA, BEFORE BLUE KEY HONOR FRATERNITY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, ATHENS, OCTOBER 8, 1965

Athens in autumn must evoke moments of nostalgia for all of us who love the university and who look back upon our days here as among the happiest of our lives.

Even before the days of discotheques and the time when everyone is go-go or trying to get where the action is, life around the arch was not too hard to take. The Charleston of yesteryear may have given way to the frug and the watusi, but we still thrill at the toll of the chapel bell and at the rending of a Georgia yell. Isn't it pleasant to contemplate that this fall we have good reason to expect the chapel bell to be tolled much more often than it has in the last decade?

I can tell you as one Bulldog rooter that for the past three Saturdays the bell has been heard all the way to Washington—last Saturday in particular. There are, I am sure, quite a few public officials in Georgia tonight who are glad that Vince Dooly is not running for office.

As undergraduates, many of us indulged in Walter Mitty-like vignettes of the future in which we were the central figure in a triumphant return to the scene of our student pranks. Each of us might have a different definition of a triumphant return, but I assure you, it is highly pleasing to me to return tonight under the auspices of Blue Key, a fraternity that emphasizes service and progress.

Campus organizations come and go, leaders change, and forms of student activity are altered. But as long as I have known anything about Georgia, Blue Key's reputation and contributions have been outstanding. I am flattered by your invitation and honored by your award.

I have always held a deep and abiding interest for the university—my alma mater—and for all other institutions of higher learning throughout Georgia.

It is an article of my faith that the destiny of our beloved State—the hopes and dreams for a beckoning tomorrow—lie largely in the hands of our colleges and universities. For it is these citadels of learning that bear the challenging responsibility for molding and developing Georgia's greatest resource—our young men and women.

In looking back on my tenure as Governor of Georgia, I believe the most enduring accomplishment of my administration was the reorganization of the then autonomous State colleges into a unified university system under the board of regents. This reorganization laid the foundation for what I truly believe stands today as one of the foremost university systems in the Nation.

During my years in the Senate, I have continued to labor and to fight for the cause of higher education in Georgia. I am extremely proud of the Federal research projects and facilities that I have been able to help channel to this and other campuses over the State. These research efforts serve both to augment our existing academic assets and to open the doors to new opportunities to all our people.

I must say, however, that I share the feeling that has been expressed by Dr. Aderhold and others that the South has not participated to the extent it should in Federally financed university research. There are a number of reasons advanced to try to explain this, but none of them are satisfactory to me. I believe that it not only is right and just but in the national interest for the South to share fully and fairly in the research pie.

I can assure this audience—and I can assure those in Washington who determine the disposition of the research money—that I will overlook no opportunity to advance Georgia's interest in this regard as vigorously as I know how.

The session of Congress now drawing to a close undoubtedly will become famous—or perhaps infamous to some—for many acts of commission or omission. But I believe in the judgment of history the passage of the Higher Education Act will rank as the most significant college-aid legislation to come from Congress in the last century.

My vote for this bill gave me as much pride and satisfaction as any I have cast in a long time. The bill as passed by the Senate authorized almost 7,000 college scholarships for deserving Georgia students during the first year alone. The number undoubtedly will be increased in subsequent years. In addition, the bill would establish a new program to guarantee college loans to many other students.

The scholarships and the guaranteed loans this legislation provides will carry us further toward the objective of having a student's intellect and ability—not the income of his parents—become the test of college admission.

There are a number of other features of the bill that provide employment opportunities for students, improve library and other plant facilities, and create teaching fellowships to further postgraduate study. All told, Georgia stands to receive a minimum of $12 million the first year if the bill becomes law—which I believe it will.

Even without this most recent assist to college education, you have only to compare registration figures and to observe expanding classroom and dormitory facilities at Athens and elsewhere to know that in quantity, at least, much has been accomplished.

It is not an exaggeration to state that in the 1970's a bachelor's degree will be no more distinguishing than a high school diploma was in the 1930's. I would express a word of caution to those who might look upon a college education as merely a prerequisite to employment and a multiplier of lifetime earnings. For in filling jobs or in making promotions in the future, the choice for employers more and more will be among many college graduates, instead of between a college graduate and a high school graduate.

This brings me to one of the points I hope to make in these brief comments.

There is, of course, a fundamental difference between education and training. We need plenty of both; the price of our attempts to encourage young people to aspire to a college education may be the creation of a false impression that those who make their living in the trades or providing services are barred from a full, productive and happy life. Here, I think we might profit from a healthy dose of the pride that our friends in Europe feel in pursuing the same vocation their forefathers have followed for generations.

I believe there is a good deal more to education than spending 4 years in class and in having a good memory at examination time.

Discipline and training contribute to education, to be sure. But the essence of education in its true sense is the stimulation of creative mental activity—the kind that applies the experience of other civilizations in seeking new answers and novel solutions to today's complex problems. In a sense, the mark of a truly educated man should be as much an analytical attitude and an inquiring state of mind as a dexterity to apply a discipline uncritically.

The size of today's student bodies immensely complicates the problem of real teaching. My observations are those of only an interested layman, not a professional educator. But I fear we have not yet found the means for identifying, adequately recognizing, and paying those really skilled in teaching. Until we do, many of the most competent teachers will, for reasons of economic necessity, continue to be lost to research, consulting, publishing, administration, and other more remunerative pursuits.

Having dwelt for perhaps too long on weighty imponderables, may I turn for a moment to another consequence of mass higher education.

The traditional, and we hope, vanishing worry over whether the money is available to finance a college education is being succeeded by a concern over whether a person can gain admission to the college of his choice or, indeed, to any college.

Young students and their parents necessarily become preoccupied with grades, transcripts, aptitude results, and college board tests.

Even after admission academic pressures persist. I do not wish to be misunderstood on this point and I fear that my comments might easily be misconstrued, but I strongly feel that going to college should be fun and I earnestly hope that those of you enrolled here today may look back upon your undergraduate days with as much pleasure as graduates of earlier days.

I feel confident that this is true and I am equally confident that when you graduate you will have had the benefit of a much richer educational experience than has been afforded in the past.

Within the last year we have observed on many campuses defiance and demonstrations. The causes of this student anarchy have been attributed to many factors, including the loss of personal identification in large student bodies and a reaction to the academic pressures I mentioned earlier.

It is essential that students retain a status as human beings and not become a program card for a computer of the type we are warned not to fold, spindle, or mutilate. That, of course, is one of those objectives that it is easier to recognize than to achieve.

I am sure Bill Tate continues to have a few problems now and then, but I am extremely proud that there have been no reported insurrections in Athens. This is a tribute to the university officials, to the quality of our students, to the parents of these students, and to such responsible campus organizations as Blue Key.

I thank you again for your invitation and for the pleasure of being with you tonight.

Frank S. Sowa's 50 Years of Service to Community and Humanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in 1915 Frank S. Sowa began teaching naturalization classes and for half a century he has been a vital force in helping men and women to prepare for and enter into the richness of American citizenship. It was timely and fitting that a great banquet honoring his 50 years of unselfish service to his fellow man, his community, and his church should have been held at Steve's Hall, 13200 South Baltimore Avenue, Chicago, at the time when we in the Congress were putting the finishing touches on the new immigration and naturalization law. Our country owes much to men and women like Professor and Mrs. Sowa, who during the many long years have kept lighted the lamps of our democracy.

On display at this memorable testimonial dinner was a scrapbook 1 foot thick with clippings on the countless accomplishments of this remarkable man in civic, social, religious, educational, naturalization, and philanthropic work.

Mr. Speaker, I think it will be of interest to my colleagues and certainly of inspirational value to know how completely their fellow Americans residing in the district I have the honor to represent respect and do honor to one who has served them in the spirit of self-abrogation, and for the betterment of all in the community.

Professor Sowa resides with his wife at 13412 South Brandon Avenue, Chicago. They have two daughters, Frances G., an assistant State's attorney for Cook County, and Bernadine P., secretary in the county treasurer's office.

The day of the banquet the Sowa family, parents and daughters, attended the noon mass at St. Florian's Church, where the Reverend Father Chester Konsowski, who performed the marriage 29 years ago, is still active in the ministry of the parish.

Mrs. Catherine Dienes, director of the Polish National Alliance of America, was the mistress of ceremonies. Turning to the guest of honor at one time she asked:

> Is there anything needed for the community and humanity that you did not attend to?

Then added:

> In all my life I have not yet met your equal.

Father Kuntz of St. Florian's Parish of Hegewisch delivered the invocation and speakers included State Senator Daniel Dougherty, Representative Henry Lenard, Alderman Lupo, Mayor Blackburn of Burnham, and James Panagas, president of the Hegewisch Chamber of Commerce. Messages were received from President and Mrs. Johnson, Governor Kerner, Mayor Daley, Senator DOUGLAS, Judge Augustine Bowe, Dr. Shephn Lisowski, secretary of the Polish-American Organization of Illinois, Frank A. Drilling, grand knight of General Pulaski Council, Knights of Columbus, Francis J. Kapera, commander of the Polish Legion of American Veterans in Illinois, and many others.

Accordionist Walter Lenckos and Drummer Gene Bokowy furnished excellent music.

Prof. Frank S. Sowa attended Henry Clay School, St. Florian's Elementary School of Hegewisch, St. Victor's College, and Chicago Law School. He holds the degrees of bachelor of law, master of law, doctor of civil law, and doctor of international law.

On August 1, 1933, when Mr. Sowa was appointed registrar of the seminar department, Dr. Amabel A. Anderson, president of the board of Chicago Law School, appointed Mr. Sowa as an instructor to teach the following: radio law, movie law, automobile law, aviation law, patent and copyright law, the development of Roman and Hebrew law, insurance law, international law, traffic law, and other extremely interesting and instructive subjects as indicated on page 17 of the Chicago Law School Bulletin, graduate classes, 1933–34, 14 East Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. He accepted and conducted classes.

He still retains the letter dated June 3, 1915, from Flora V. Renaud, principal of Henry Clay Elementary School, acknowledging the fact that Mr. Sowa had opened classes on June 2, 1915, as per the request of the president of the Chicago Board of Education, Jacob Lorb, and the superintendent of schools, John D. Shoop, and was teaching the elder people and the parents of the school children, reading, writing, and language. He continued to teach these classes during the evening until June 2, 1925. He also has a copy of a letter written by him on July 22, 1919, reporting to the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization on the completion of the first evening classes started by request of the Bureau on December 2, 1918. From that date on, Mr. Sowa has taught naturalization in many places, including the Chicago Law School.

Mr. Sowa currently is: President, Federation of Lodges of Hegewisch and Calumet Regions; chairman, Hegewisch Committee, Council 34, Polish National Alliance; teacher of reading, writing, naturalization for over 55 years, and presently chairman, swimming pool committee, Hegewisch Chamber of Commerce; chairman, library committee, Hegewisch Chamber of Commerce; chairman, education committee, Hegewisch Chamber of Commerce; chairman, welfare and industrial committee of Hegewisch Chamber of Commerce; chairman, Wolf Lake Committee, Hegewisch Chamber of Commerce; deputy in the claim department of Cook County Treasurer's Office; chairman, executive committee, Club Limanowa; alternate director of Chicago Polish Home Association; president, Sowa Realty Co.; fire insurance broker; real estate broker; member, St. Adalbert Lodge, No. 272, Polish Roman Catholic Union; member, Sons of Liberty Lodge, No. 624, Polish National Alliance; member, General Pulaski Council, No. 3323, Knights of Columbus; chairman, conference for recreation center.

His past services include: President and treasurer, South Suburban Currency Exchange, Inc.; president, Hegewisch Chamber of Commerce; president, Calumet Airport Association; manager, Wood Cabinet Shop and Invalid Chair Department, Betz Co. of Hammond, Ind.; chairman, Draft Board 93, Second World War; secretary to Master Mechanic Lake, Pressed Steel Car Co. in charge of 11 departments, First World War; coremaker, Pressed Steel Car Co., 1917; minute clerk to judge in chancery law, jury and nonjury cases of superior court for over 25 years; registrar, seminar department, Chicago Law School; member, Chicago Airport Commission; member, South Side Traffic Commission; adjuster, St. Florian Building & Loan Association, 1928; assistant treasurer, Illinois Savings & Loan Association; chairman, Hegewisch Recreation Committee, 1938, by mayoral appointment; adjuster, Peden, Kahn & Murphy law firm; Hegewisch chairman, Red Cross, three times; subchairman, executive committee, Century of Progress World's Fair, 1933; assistant to chief clerk, psychopathic hospital; water tester, 79th Street water filtration plant.

What he has accomplished: Mr. Sowa has spearheaded or been connected with, as chairman or member of the committee, which accomplished the following improvements: Mann Park fieldhouse, 1934; Chicago Vocational School; all South Chicago high schools; opening of streets of South Chicago, 87th, 100th, 103d, et cetera, Streets; lecturer and promoter, Calumet Harbor; obtained South Chicago library, with Mrs. Mary Campbell of the South Chicago Committee Center.

Obtained Hedgewisch branch of Chicago public library; extended buses to 130th Street and Exchange; obtained street lights for Avalon Trails; Wolf Lake Beach established through contributions of the members of the Hegewisch Chamber of Commerce; Liberty ship construction at 130th Street bridge and Calumet River; saved Wolf Lake; Hegewisch streets repaved at no cost to taxpayers; also cement sidewalks, no charge to public (1931); obtained 600 jobs on WPA for Hegewisch residents; lights and ice-skating shelter in Mann Park; and hundreds of other improvements throughout the Calumet district.

Mr. Speaker, this is the man and this the partial story of his accomplishments. I repeat what I said at the beginning of these remarks: Our country owes much to such men as Frank S. Sowa.

U.S. Frigate "Constellation"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1965

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on September 29, I introduced H.R. 11329. My bill would make a national shrine of the U.S. frigate *Constellation*, now berthed in Baltimore Harbor. This ship served the Navy with distinction from its launching in 1797 until the end of the Civil War. It has the longest record of total service of any U.S. warship. In 1953 it was rescued from oblivion by a group of Baltimore citizens who began its restoration. In view of the *Constellation's* great record of service, and the unique place it holds in the history of the U.S. Navy, I believe that the U.S. Government should complete their work by officially making the ship a national shrine. I am proud to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the long proud history of this U.S. frigate, made and launched in Baltimore:

U.S. FRIGATE "CONSTELLATION"

At the close of the Revolutionary War in 1782 our new Nation disbanded its Armed Forces, and America enjoyed a growing prosperity based on foreign trade. Our merchant ships carried the flag of the United States across the seven seas, but without men of war to protect them they were defenseless. The corsairs of the Barbary States of north Africa began to attack our ships and hold American seamen for ransom. By 1794 over 100 American sailors had been held in prisons of the Barbary States. In 1794 Congress passed a bill authorizing the construction of six frigates to protect American rights and property, and President George Washington signed it into law.

Work on the six frigates began but only three were finished in time to see immediate action. They were: *Constellation* of 36 guns and *United States* and *Constitution* of 44 guns each. *Constellation* was built by David Stodder in Baltimore, Md., and launched September 7, 1797. She sailed June 26, 1798, the first to put to sea of the original three ships built for the U.S. Navy.

By the time *Constellation* was on the high seas a peace treaty had been signed with the Barbary States. However, French privateers and men-of-war were now attacking our ships, particularly in the West Indies. Capt. Thomas Truxtun, who had commanded several American ships during the Revolution was given command of *Constellation* and ordered to the Caribbean. Truxtun was a hard driving but fair and highly capable officer. He put his new ship in fighting trim and drilled his crew until they were an efficient fighting team. When the ship arrived on station in January 1799 they were ready and eager to meet the enemy.

At noon on February 9, 1799, a sail was sighted off the island of Nevis, and *Constellation* closed, with crew at battle stations. The ship was the Frigate *L'Insurgente*, one of the finest and fastest of the French fleet. In just over 1 hour from the time of the first broadside, *Constellation* had battered her opponent into helpless surrender. This was the first important U.S. Navy victory over an enemy man-of-war on the high seas. Captain Truxtun and *Constellation* were toasted from one end of the land to the other. This decisive victory raised the morale of the American people and gave them a new sense of pride and purpose.

In February 1800, 1 year after the victory over *L'Insurgente, Constellation,* and Truxtun won America's second great naval victory. This battle also took place in the West Indies against a larger ship of the French Fleet, *La Vengeance*. The savage battle raged for some 5 hours, with *Constellation,* now mounting 38 guns, matching and outshooting the 52 guns of *La Vengeance*. The French ship finally escaped into the night, brutally beaten and barely afloat.

Constellation's victories over *L'Insurgente* and *La Vengeance* served notice to the world that the United States would defend her honor and freedom at all costs. Earlier, on June 18, 1798, just 8 days before *Constellation* had put to sea for the first time, Congressman Harper had proposed his now famous toast, "Millions for defense—not 1 cent for tribute." *Constellation* had given meaning and substance to those words.

While the victories of Truxtun and *Constellation* were most important, yet together they made another, even greater, contribution to the infant U.S. Navy. This was the system of conduct, discipline, gunnery, signals, and naval operations put into effect by Truxtun while in command of *Constellation*. His system set a pattern of success and efficiency that is the basis of U.S. naval procedure to this day. Some measure of Truxtun's true stature as a naval genius may be understood by the fact that a majority of the officers who achieved distinction in the U.S. Navy for the next 30 years had served under Truxtun, many of them on *Constellation*.

By 1800, Truxtun had left his beloved ship, but Truxtun discipline and Truxtun tradition had started *Constellation* on one of the great sagas of the sea. A part of that saga was the legendary speed of *Constellation* which earned her the name "Yankee Race Horse." Truxtun attributed much of this great speed to Stodder's design which introduced the sharp bow lines into warship architecture. These lines were later to be one of the distinguishing characteristics of the famous Baltimore Clippers.

Alexander Murray of Chestertown, Md., succeeded Truxtun in command of *Constellation*. Captain Murray sailed to the Mediterranean in the spring of 1802, joining the American squadron in a war which sought to eliminate depredations on American merchant ships and seamen by warships of the Barbary States. *Constellation* assisted in the blockade of Tripoli, where she sank two gunboats and put an Arab cavalry contingent to rout, protected American merchant shipping from Barbary cruisers throughout the Mediterranean, and evacuated Marines and diplomats from Derne at the conclusion of the victorious and remarkable fleet-shore operations which culminated in peace terms with all the Barbary powers by August 1805.

Returning home in November 1805, *Constellation* was in ordinary at Washington until the outbreak of the War of 1812, at which time she was dispatched to Hampton Roads, Va. There, blockaded by an imposing British Fleet, *Constellation* stationed herself between the enemy and an American fort on Craney Island, where she thwarted every British attempt to destroy her and the fort. Her armed boats twice detected and spread the alarm to foil British Fleet boat expeditions; and, on June 22, 1813, her batteries, together with gunfire from Craney Island, sank three British Fleet boats. Of the 700-man invasion force, 90 were killed or wounded and 43 others taken prisoner before the British turned back.

The Treaty of Ghent was ratified in December 1814, bringing our second war with England to a close as *Constellation* faced renewal of naval action against the Barbary States, which had taken advantage of the conflict to renew piratical attacks against American shipping. In the Mediterranean squadron of Stephen Decatur she joined four other ships in the capture of the 48-gun Algerian frigate *Mashuda* in June 1815, then took part in demonstrations of U.S. Navy strength which enabled Decatur to extract treaties of peace with Algiers, Tunis, and Tripoli. *Constellation* remained to enforce these treaties until late 1817.

Constellation protected the rights of American seamen off South America from 1819–1821, and was instrumental in establishing the favorable trade relations in that quarter before entering the Pacific to guard American merchantmen from belligerents during the revolt of Peru against Spanish rule. After helping drive the last of the pirates from the Caribbean Sea in 1825–26, she carried our new ministers to England and France in 1831. *Constellation* then joined the Mediterranean squadron for nearly 4 years duty that included the enforcement of indemnity payments for pervious depredation against merchantmen by piratical ships of Naples. In October 1835 she sailed for the Gulf of Mexico to assist in crushing the Seminole Indian uprising in Florida, landing shore parties to relieve Army garrisons and sending her boats on amphibious expeditions. She then cruised with the West Indian squadron until 1838, serving much of this time as flagship of Commodore Alexander J. Dallas.

The decade of the 1840's saw *Constellation* circumnavigate the globe. Sailing from Boston on December 9, 1840, she proceeded to Rio de Janeiro to serve on Brazil Station until February 1841, when she became flagship to Commodore Lawrence Kearney appointed to command the East Indian Squadron. Already a revered symbol of American naval greatness, *Consellation* now added bright new laurels. She left Rio on March 8 for her new station where she watched over American interests during the Opium War and maintained great vigilance and activity along the Malayan and China coasts as far as the Philippines, to prevent the smuggling of opium by ships under the U.S. maritime flag. As flagship of the East Indian Squadron, *Constellation* became the first U.S. ship-of-war to enter the inland waters of China on April 13, 1842, when she passed both bars of the Canton River and anchored at Whampoa among the merchant ships. Learning of a commercial treaty between China and Great Britain, Commodore Kearny, with great diplomatic skill, urged upon the Chinese Government the granting of equal privileges to American citizens. His success in *Constellation* opened Chinese ports to American shipping and led to our first commercial treaty with China in 1845.

The team of Kearny and *Constellation* wrote another significant chapter of American history while returning home through Pacific waters. Leaving China on May 22, 1843, they arrived at Oahu on July 6 to learn that King Kamehameha III had made a provisional cession of the Sandwich (Hawaiian) Islands to the Captain of the British warship H.M.S. Caryfoot. A strong protest by Commodore Kearny to the King and subsequent British disavowal of the impeading annexation restored the Hawaiian Islands to native rule. (A little more than a century later these Islands became the 50th State of the Union and *Constellation* was still afloat to welcome the event. The Islands had been annexed by the United States on July 7, 1898, and established as a territory on June 14, 1900) *Constellation* embarked Commodore T. ap Catesby Jones at Valpariso, thence by way of Callao, the Straights of Magellan and Rio de Janeiro to Norfolk, where she terminated her world cruise on April 30, 1844. She had been absent from the United States 3 years, 4 months, and 22 days and had sailed, by log, 58,000 miles in 492 days at sea.

Mr. Speaker, from 1845 to 1852 *Constellation* was in ordinary at Norfolk, Va. From 1853 to 1855, the ship was rebuilt, an operation which included the addition of 12 feet to her length and changed her rate to a 22-gun sloop of war.

She left Norfolk in August 1855 to serve with the Mediterranean Squadron and returned in June 1858, having logged 29,227 miles. After guarding American merchantmen from unlawful search in waters off Cuba, she was decommissioned in August 1858.

The split between North and South widened until a clash seemed inevitable. One of the main issues was the abolition of slavery. It was this issue that brought *Constellation* into the conflict.

Placed back in service in June 1859, she became flagship of the African Squadron to assist in breaking up the slave trade. In the following three years she made prizes of three slave ships and liberated nearly a thousand slaves, who were transported to freedom in Monrovia. The Civil War brought her home in September 1861, but she was soon dispatched to the Mediterranean, where she watched over Union merchant ships, guarding them from possible attack by Confederate cruisers and helping in the blockade of Raphael Semme's Confederate raider *Sumter* at Gibraltar. She returned to Hampton Roads by way of the Gulf Coast Blockading Squadron in May 1864, then began a new career as receiving and training ship, taking time out now and again for special missions.

The Civil War ended the era of billowing canvas and wooden ships as the steamship came into its own. The thrilling sight of a cloud of canvas skimming the horizon became just a memory as more and more wooden hulks of once proud ships were permitted to rot on the beach. These is no place for sentiment in naval records, but it must have been great respect and admiration that saved *Constellation* from the fate of other sailing ships of the time.

In 1871, the Navy returned the old veteran to active duty as a training ship at the Naval Academy. During the peaceful, happy years of her duty at Annapolis many of America's future admirals trained on her ancient decks. Twenty years passed on training duty before *Constellation* resumed her diplomatic mission. Most important during this period was the part she played in transporting food to the starving people of Ireland during the terrible famine of 1880. Thus to millions of people, both at home and abroad, the U.S. frigate *Constellation* had come to represent the United States of America in war and peace.

In 1894, *Constellation* went to Newport, R.I., on training duty once again. In 1914, she returned to Baltimore, to take part in the Star-Spangled Banner Centennial Celebration and, in 1926, cruised to Philadelphia to attend the Sesquicentennial Celebration of American Independence.

In the dark days of 1940, the memory of *Constellation's* glory was dimmed by the clouds of war in Europe. She lay berthed at Newport, neglected and almost forgotten. In those crucial early days of World War II, German submarines roamed the Atlantic in wolf packs like the Barbary Pirates of old. One of the men who knew and loved *Constellation* recalled that the American Navy's record of freedom and valor on the high seas started with this great ship. Perhaps the American people could again draw on those same resources of determination and bravery in this new hour of trial. That man who remembered was President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. In a dramatic revival of naval tradition, President Roosevelt ordered the 143-year-old ship *Constellation* back into commission as flagship of the U.S. Atlantic Fleet.

The record of America's grand old champion of freedom is astounding. No other ship has amassed such a continuous record of participation in so many historic and significant events over so great a period of time. Even in its present condition, this historic old ship inspires every visitor with the majesty and meaning of our past. Future generations will draw the same sense of strength, dignity and determination from the *Constellation* as did our forefathers. As an official national historic shrine, the U.S. frigate *Constellation* is an eloquent symbol of American liberty.

She must be preserved.

IN THE NAME OF FREEDOM—RESTORATION PROGRAM

In 1953, it appeared that the U.S. frigate *Constellation*, then berthed in Boston, would be completely destroyed by the cumulative ravages of time coupled with a lack of Federal funds to preserve the old ship.

The members of the Star-Spangled Banner Flag House Association of Baltimore, a patriotic, nonprofit organization determined to protect and preserve this invaluable relic of the fight for freedom on the high seas. The Flag House Association secured title to the ship from the U.S. Navy; then these patriotic citizens, by immediate and vigorous action, brought *Constellation* home to Baltimore in 1955.

The Flag House Association then took the second step in the plan to preserve *Constellation* for future generations. This was the establishment of the *Constellation* restoration committee for the purpose of planning the restoration and raising the necessary funds.

From 1955 to the present, funds have been raised principally through the sale of souvenir coins and outright gifts. These limited funds have been used for general care, hull maintenance and essential interior repairs. The current national fund raising campaign is expected to provide the funds required to complete the ship.

This final restoration effort will be undertaken in six stages.

First, primary hull repairs; second, secondary hull repairs; third, masts, spars, riggings; fourth, interior restoration; fifth, fittings and detail, and sixth, dock facilities.

Complete restoration will allow the U.S. frigate *Constellation* to travel to various ports in the United States and thus be made accessible to thousands of American schoolchildren. This grand old champion will then complete her final and greatest mission—bringing the true meaning of the American heritage of freedom to the people she has served so long and so well.

U.S. FRIGATE "CONSTELLATION"

The first warship built for the U.S. Navy to get to sea.

The first ship of the U.S. Navy to defeat an enemy man-of-war on the high seas.

The first American warship to enter the inland waters of China.

The first U.S. Navy signal book, prepared by Captain Truxtun, was used on board *Constellation*.

The longest record of total service of any U.S. warship.

The only major American warship still in existence that saw action in the Civil War.

The only sailing ship in U.S. history to ever serve as flagship of the U.S. Atlantic Fleet.

The first U.S. Navy regulations, written by Captain Truxtun for *Constellation*, are the basis of present day naval regulations.

The U.S. frigate *Constellation* is the oldest ship in the world continuously afloat.

Chester W. Nimitz, fleet admiral, U.S. Navy, national chairman, *Constellation* Restoration Committee:

> The U.S. frigate *Constellation* is perhaps the most important link that the U.S. Navy and the American people have with our early historic efforts to preserve our liberty. Your help is needed now to restore this great defender of freedom to her rightful position as a proud symbol of American determination to preserve justice and maintain independence. It is important to restore *Constellation* so that future generations of Americans may be inspired to the same great deeds of valor and bravery as those men who served and died on her decks.

Arleigh A. Burke, admiral U.S. Navy, retired, national vice chairman, *Constellation* Restoration Committee:

> President Franklin D. Roosevelt once called the U.S. frigate *Constellation* "a ship of destiny." That this great ship has accomplished so much and survived so long does seem a miracle. Part of the greatness of this magnificent old man-of-war may lie in the fact that her accomplishments in peace equal those of war. Her diplomatic missions and peacetime activity in the protection of the people of Hawaii, relieving the famine stricken in Ireland and ceaseless vigilance on the high seas are reasons enough for restoration. Every American can feel proud of this opportunity to help restore the U.S. frigate *Constellation*, America's "ship of destiny."

SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in a disturbing and baffling world, filled with sights that sadden and problems that perplex, may our outlook be brightened and our hearts be strengthened by the realization that ours is also a time of splendid challenge, radiant with promise, as we stand at the portals of beckoning tomorrows.

May the crashing of outworn things that are falling to the earth not hide from our eyes the dawning glory of a new era struggling to birth.

We give thanks with humble, yet kindling hearts, that ours is the high privilege to live—and to give—in such a time. If this faltering flesh of ours, hemmed by foes, should fear and tremble, keep us firm and steadfast as we put on the whole armor of faith, and hope, and love.

Thus, may we play our full part as Thy faithful servants in history's crowning hour.

And Thine shall be the kingdom, and the power, and the glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, October 13, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of October 13, 1965, the following message from the House of Representatives was received by the Secretary of the Senate on October 14, 1965:

That the House agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9220) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence

Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 11 and 16 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17 to the bill, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had concurred in the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 through 10, inclusive, and 12 to the bill (H.R. 9022) to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster; to eliminate inequities in the application of Public Law 815 in certain military base closings; to make uniform eligibility requirements for school districts in Public Law 874, and for other purposes, and that the House concurred in the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 11135. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; and

H.J. Res. 671. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the month of November as "Water Conservation Month."

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 597. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting the need for adequate medical library services facilities;

H.R. 3141. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that Act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6852. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 97 million pounds of abaca from the national stockpile;

H.R. 7743. An act to establish a system of loan insurance and a supplementary system of direct loans, to assist students to attend post-secondary business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools;

H.R. 7919. An act to provide for the establishment of the Roger Williams National Memorial in the city of Providence, R.I., and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 32. Joint resolution to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury to persons, and for use of and damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after August 15, 1945, and before April 28, 1952.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 11135. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

H.J. Res. 671. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the month of November as "Water Conservation Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of October 13, 1965, the following reports of committees were submitted:

On October 13, 1965:

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration without amendment:

H.R. 9495. An act to increase the appropriation authorization for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 867);

H.J. Res. 597. Joint resolution providing for the erection of a memorial to the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the father of rocketry (Rept. No. 868);

S. Res. 151. Resolution to print additional copies of a report entitled "Legislation Authorizing Appropriations and Establishing Revolving Funds (as of March 1965)" (Rept. No. 869); and

S. Res. 152. Resolution to investigate criminal laws and procedures (Rept. No. 870).

On October 14, 1965:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

H.J. Res. 397. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the United States to transfer from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency title to certain real property in said District (Rept. No. 871).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

H.R. 5217. An act to permit the vessel *Little Nancy* to be documented for use in the coastwise trade (Rept. No. 872); and

H.R. 10198. An act to amend the requirements relating to lumber under the Shipping Act, 1916 (Rept. No. 873).

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

H.R. 11420. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide certain mailing privileges with respect to members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 874).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that Mr. DANIELS had been appointed a manager on the part of the House at the conference of the two Houses on the disagreeing votes to the bill (H.R. 8310) to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes, vice Mr. DENT excused.

The message announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2092) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit marketing orders applicable to celery, sweet corn, limes, or avocados to provide for paid advertising, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 23) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate with the several States a cooperative program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 11588) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 11588) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES, FILE REPORTS, AND SIGN BILLS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment following today's session until Monday, October 18, 1965, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives and the President of the United States, that committees be authorized to file reports, together with any individual, additional, supplementary, or minority views, if desired; and that the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 805, and that it and the next two measures on the calendar be considered in sequence.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I will not object—the junior Senator from Wyoming has no objection to the unanimous-consent request that the Senate proceed to consider this legislation. However, he feels it appropriate to direct to the attention of Senators the fact that this is one of four bills now on the Senate

Calendar, each of which would waive the statute of limitations insofar as it relates to controversies involving payment of customs duties.

These bills are H.R. 1218, for the relief of T. W. Holt Co.—Calendar No. 805; H.R. 4088, for the relief of Irving M. Sobin Chemical Co.—Calendar No. 820; H.R. 8646, for the relief of Rifkin Textiles Corp.—Calendar No. 834; and S. 317, for the relief of the Swanston Equipment Co.—Calendar No. 839.

The Republican calendar committee is in full agreement with the position of the Treasury Department that finality should attach to the actions of the Bureau of Customs, its appraisers and collectors, subject of course to proper judicial review, and that any appeal or protest must be made within the time limits prescribed by the statute of limitations. The passage of a single private bill on this subject is in itself precedential and discriminatory. Here, four bills are involved, each of which has its own peculiar and what some believe to be extenuating facts. Too much emphasis cannot be placed upon the danger that is implicit in the erosion of the basic law by the passage of such bills, no matter how compelling the equities. However, the Republican committee on the calendar in these instances defers to the judgment of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary which, it is understood, has given most careful consideration to each of the bills in question.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

T. W. HOLT & CO.

The bill (H.R. 1218) for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co. and/or Holt Import & Export Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 820), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> PURPOSE
>
> The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay T. W. Holt & Co., also known as the Holt Import & Export Co., $8,478.19 in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for repayment of excessive customs duties erroneously collected by the Bureau of Customs on canned meats imports from Argentina. The canned meats imports concerned were imported between December 8, 1948, and July 3, 1950, and the customs duties were liquidated between January 9, 1951, and January 6, 1953.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to pay the claimant $8,478.19 to satisfy its claim against the United States for repayment of excessive customs duties erroneously collected by the Bureau of Customs on canned meat imports from Argentina. The imports took place between December 8, 1948, and July 3, 1950, and the customs duties were liquidated between January 9, 1951, and January 6, 1953.

After the merchandise covered by the entries in question had been appraised, the U.S. Customs Court, in International Commercial Co., Inc., and Armour & Co. against United States, ruled on April 4, 1951, that certain charges included by customs in the valuation of other importations of Argentine canned meats were nondutiable. This decision was sustained on appeal in reappraisement, on May 15, 1952.

In justifying relief the committee report states the committee's awareness that claimant is in disagreement with the Treasury Department on the fact of whether a request was made for the withholding of the appraisements here concerned. In a hearing on the bill conducted March 7, 1962, the attorney for claimant quoted from a letter from claimant company, dated November 2, 1961, as follows:

> I would also like to refresh your memory on these entries in that I went to Washington and showed Mr. Roy that the appraisers had been advised not to liquidate these specific entries as values had not been established. Mr. Roy pointed out to me appraisers could liquidate any entry as they deemed that values were OK and it was my contention that this might be true except that they had been specifically advised that values had not been established on these items. Naturally, if we had known that the entries in this second group had been liquidated, we would have included them in our original bill.

The "original bill" referred to in the quotation was a bill which passed in the 86th Congress for the relief of the same claimant—Private Law 86–239. At the March 7, 1962, hearing the attorney quoted from the same letter for the purpose of demonstrating that the officers of the claimant company were under the impression that the entries listed in the earlier legislation had not been liquidated and therefore were not included in the original bill, as introduced. However, the entries in both of the bills were liquidated prior to the establishment of evaluation.

The committee report then goes on as follows:

> In the light of previous action taken regarding similar entries and the subsequent determination by the U.S. Customs Court regarding this category of merchandise, it is recommended that the bill be considered favorably.

In opposing relief, the Treasury Department directs attention to the International Commercial Co. case above mentioned, in which the U.S. Customs Court ruled that certain charges included by customs in the valuation of importations of Argentine canned meats were nondutiable. The Treasury Department opposes any application of that decision "retroactively by private bill to values which long since were determined and became final by operation of law."

The Treasury Department calls attention to the facts that the U.S. Customs Court decision came after the appraisements of the meat products in question had been made in accordance with the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, that no request was received for the withholding of such appraisements, and no objection was made to the appraisements at the time and on the basis on which they were made. Its report states:

> The importer has asserted an understanding that it was necessary in order to obtain the release of the merchandise to give entered values based on free-on-board prices in Argentina, including the charges which were later declared nondutiable charges by the courts. However, no provision of law or regulation prevented the importer from entering the merchandise at values the importer considered proper or from excluding any charge which the importer considered not a part of the values under section 402(d) of the act, as amended.
>
> The appraisements at the export values, including certain charges levied in Argentina, determined by the appraisers of merchandise under the law were not appealed by the importer under section 501 of the Tariff Act, as amended. Consequently, the appraised values were correctly applied in the liquidation of the entries in question and duties were collected on that basis.

IRVING M. SOBIN CHEMICAL CO., INC.

The bill (H.R. 4088) for the relief of Irving M. Sobin Chemical Co., Inc., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 835), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> PURPOSE
>
> The purpose of the bill is to pay to Irving M. Sobin Chemical Co., Inc., of Boston, Mass., the sum of $11,216.02 in settlement of its claims against the United States for repayment of customs duties collected by the Bureau of Customs on imported sodium perborate entered by or for the account of the said Irving M. Sobin Chemical Co., Inc., between September 15, 1954, and June 20, 1961, entries of which were liquidated between June 27, 1956, and December 8, 1961; and to provide that the collectors of customs at the various ports of entry shall waive the collection of unpaid assessments of liquidated increased duties, totaling $3,216.19, due from the Irving M. Sobin Chemical Co., Inc., provided that the Irving M. Sobin Chemical Co., Inc., shall abandon its protests before the U.S. Customs Court claiming relief from assessments and duties totaling $3,604.90.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to pay claimant $11,216.02 in settlement of its claims for repayment of customs duties collected on imported sodium perborate entered by or for the account of claimant between September 15, 1954, and June 20, 1961, entries of which were liquidated between June 27, 1956, and December 8, 1961; and to provide that the collectors of customs at the various ports of entry waived the collection of unpaid assessments of liquidated increased duties, totaling $3,216.19; provided that claimant abandon its protests claiming relief from assessments and duties totaling $3,604.90.

Claimant bases its requests for relief on the decision in United States against Philipp Brothers Chemicals, Inc., by the U.S. Customs Court, on June 13, 1961, which held that there was no "foreign value" for certain sodium perborate exported from Germany and therefore that the proper basis for appraisement was "export value" determined by bargaining between the manufacturer and the purchaser. The imports of sodium perborate involved in this bill were appraised at unit values based on "foreign value," and not upon the basis of value approved in the Philipp Brothers case. The appraisal at "foreign value" had the effect of advancing the value of the sodium perborate over the entered value. The importer was given notices of this action. No appeals to reappraisement were filed, except as to port of Charleston entries Nos. 1479, 1665, and 2754. Appraisements for the other entries became final.

Liquidations at the higher, final appraised values were concluded with respect to all the entries except the three Charleston entries. Following this, increased duties, over and above the estimated duties deposited on entry, became payable. Protests against the liquidations were filed as to many of the entries. These were denied by the collectors of customs. Several applications by claimant for administrative relief against the increased assessments were also denied. Eighteen of the denied protests, together with the entries, were forwarded to the U.S. Customs Court, as were the timely appeals to reappraisement filed for the Charleston entries above referred to. These are all currently pending before the court.

The legislation would grant relief to claimant upon all of the appraisements, including the 18 which were denied and which could not be considered by the Customs Court because timely protest was not made.

The Department opposes the bill insofar as it applies to remaining entries since the importer failed to take advantage of his administrative remedies and the liquidations became final by operation of law. To grant relief would discriminate against other importers who may be similarly situated and undermine the principle of statutory limitations of time within which appeals to reappraisement against decisions of appraisers of merchandise and protests against decisions of collectors of customs must be filed.

It is essential, states the Treasury Department report, that finality attach to the actions of appraisers and collectors subject, of course, to proper judicial review, and that any appeal or protests should be made within the time limits prescribed by statute. In this case, an importer was predicating its claim on circumstances which took place after final determinations had been made with respect to its entries. This was highly undesirable.

Witnesses in behalf of claimant appearing at a subcommittee hearing of the House Committee on the Judiciary explained their failure to file protests was based on the assumption that since the importations involved in the Philipp Brothers case concern sodium perborate produced by another West German company, the decision would not have any effect upon claimants. At the hearing, witnesses stated this was erroneous and the claimant company learned that the sodium perborate manufactured by Kali-Chemie, a producer other than that which supplied Philipp Brothers in West Germany, was affected by the Philipp Brothers case. By the time claimant realized the latter case would govern appraisement of its importations, the time had expired for protesting the advanced values based on "foreign value," with the exception of 12 entries.

The committee report justifies relief on the ground that the Philipp Brothers case settled a difficult question concerning the value of importations of sodium perborate. In that case the court found that prices for sales of sodium perborate sold in Western Germany were determined by bargaining between manufacturer and purchaser, but that as of the time of the exportations involved in that case similar merchandise was not freely offered for sale to all purchasers for home consumption in West Germany. The court concluded there was no "foreign value," within the meaning of section 402(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, for such merchandise; and that the basis for the determination of the value was "export value" as defined in section 402(d) of that act.

There remained 100 entries which were appraised at the higher figure and not in accordance with the decision of the Philipp Brothers case. The committee justifies relief on the ground that "under the particular circumstances of the case, Sobin Chemical Co. should be granted similar treatment—to that in the Philipp Brothers case. Due to the passage of time this can only be established by legislative action."

The Treasury Department opposes the bill on the ground that it is premature with respect to those entries which are the subject of pending litigation wherein timely appeals or protests have been filed.

RIFKIN TEXTILES CORP.

The bill (H.R. 8646) for the relief of Rifkin Textiles Corp. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 849), explaining the purpose of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to waive the statute of limitations to permit the reliquidation of 10 customs entries on behalf of Rifkin Textiles Corp., of New York.

Mr. **SIMPSON**. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to waive the statute of limitations to permit the reliquidation of 10 customs entries on behalf of claimant.

In 1961 and 1962 claimant was importing woven wool fabrics from Italy for sale to the American dress industry. This fabric had a braid sewn along one edge for the full length of the piece. At the time of their importation the Bureau of Customs contended these goods were classifiable as woven wool cloth and therefore dutiable under the Tariff Act at 37½ cents per pound and 60 percent ad valorem.

On the other hand, claimant contended the goods were classifiable as woven woolen fabrics "in part braid" which were dutiable under another section of the Tariff Act at 42 percent ad valorem. This was a vital distinction because there was a difference of 40 cents per yard in the duties.

At the time the controversy arose and prior to May 2, 1962, the collector of customs classified the goods as "woven woolen fabrics, in part braid" and duties were paid by the importer at the lower rate of 42½ percent.

On May 2, 1962 after hearings had been conducted in Washington, D.C., the Commissioner of Customs ruled these importations were dutiable at the higher rate. The ruling was made applicable only to goods entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse after May 25, 1962. A timely protest was filed against the liquidations of a number of entries at the higher rate. This protest was rejected by the Bureau of Customs and was taken to the U.S. Customs Court. On December 18, 1962 the court held that the goods were "woven woolen fabrics, in part braid." This was the manner in which the importer had contended they should have been classified from the outset. The court therefore sustained the protests and the collector of customs at the port of New York was directed to reliquidate the entries which had been protested.

Following the decision the Department of Justice advised the attorney for the claimant that it did not intend to appeal from the judgment. The next day the attorney wrote the collector advising him of the decision of the court and of the fact that he had been advised that the Government would not appeal. In the same letter, the attorney requested that the entries which were the subject matter of the protest be reliquidated in line with the court's decision at the lower rate.

While the litigation was pending and before the December 18, 1962, decision, the Commissioner of Customs ordered a suspension as of December 14, 1962, of all liquidations by the collector of customs. At that time there were a number of importations of the same type of fabric which were not involved in the litigation and which were awaiting liquidations by the collector.

The 10 entries which were specified in this bill were not covered by the protests which were sustained by the court.

The committee, which justifies relief on the ground that the Treasury Department opposes relief solely on the technical ground of the statute of limitations, calls attention to the fact that late in December 1962 the attorney for claimant and its president personally inquired of the collector of customs in New York City, as to what, if anything, should be done in relation to the importations liquidated at the higher rate, but not yet protested. The collector replied that he had requested a ruling from the Commissioner of Customs as to whether the U.S. Customs Court decision would be taken to govern all importations of a like character or would be limited to the entries specifically included in the litigation.

The importer was advised that no action of any kind had to be taken by the importer and was given to understand that when the collector was given formal notice that the Government did not intend to appeal, that he would immediately proceed to reliquidate all of the entries and that all of the other protested items would be disposed of accordingly.

The collector sent his letter of inquiry to the Commissioner of Customs on December 31, 1962, which was long before the 60-day statute of limitations on the 10 entries would expire. When, on February 12, 1963, the Commissioner replied to the collector's letter, the authority to reliquidate was limited specifically to those liquidations which had not become final. The report stresses that it took 43 days to get the instructions to proceed, although the liquidations covered by the bill were not final when the collector originally requested instructions. The committee report states that the facts establish a firm basis for the equitable relief provided in the bill.

The Treasury Department opposes relief, stating, among other things, that enactment of the proposed legislation would grant to a single importer more favorable treatment than is accorded others in similar circumstances, and it would undermine the principle of statutory limitation of time within which protests against decisions of the collector must be filed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 9545) providing for the acquisition and preservation by the United States of certain items of evidence pertaining to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1848) for the relief of Mary Horalek and Eva Horalek, Blue Rapids, Kans., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

HILDA SHEN TSIANG

The bill (S. 2362) for the relief of Hilda Shen Tsiang, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate indefinitely postpone the bill S. 2362, which was reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee and placed on the Senate Calendar, in view of the fact that the bill H.R. 10292, for the relief of the same beneficiary, has been received and placed on the Senate Calendar. The language of the two bills is identical.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 853 (H.R. 10292).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10292) for the relief of Hilda Shen Tsiang.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 853), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Hilda Shen Tsiang. The bill provides for an appropriate quota deduction and for the payment of the required visa fee. The bill has been amended at the beneficiary's request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 847, and that it and the succeeding bills be considered in sequence.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VETERANS COMPENSATION INCREASES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 168) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with amendments, on page 3, line 9, after "Section 315", to strike out "(a)"; on page 6, after line 8, to strike out:

SEC. 4. (a) Section 415(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) If there is only one parent who has not remarried, dependency and indemnity compensation shall be paid to him at a monthly rate equal to the amount under column II of the following table opposite his total income shown in column I:

“Column I		Column II
Total annual income		
More than— but	Equal to or less than—	
	$1,000	$83.
$1,000	$1,250	$66.
$1,250	$1,500	$50.
$1,500	$1,750	$33.
$1,750	$2,000	$17.
$2,000	------	No amount payable.”

"(2) If there is only one parent who has remarried and is living with his spouse, dependency and indemnity compensation shall be paid to him under either the table in subsection (b)(1) or the table in subsection (d), whichever rate is the greater. In such a case of remarriage the total combined annual income of the parent and his spouse shall be counted in determining the monthly rate of dependency and indemnity compensation under the designated tables."

(b) The table in section 415(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to appear as follows:

“Column I		Column II
Total annual income		
More than— but	Equal to or less than—	
	$1,000	$55.
$1,000	$1,250	$44.
$1,250	$1,500	$33.
$1,500	$1,750	$22.
$1,750	$2,000	$11.
$2,000	------	No amount payable.”

(c) The table in section 415(d) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to appear as follows:

“Column I		Column II
Total combined annual income		
More than— but	Equal to or less than—	
	$1,500	$55.
$1,500	$1,850	$44.
$1,850	$2,200	$33.
$2,200	$2,550	$22.
$2,550	$3,000	$11.
$3,000	------	No amount payable.”

On page 8, at the beginning of line 1, to change the section number from "5" to "4"; after line 3, to strike out:

SEC. 6. Section 106 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) Each person who has incurred a disability as a result of an injury or disease described in subsection (b) shall be entitled to the same rights, privileges, and benefits under the Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387–391), as a person described in section 2(1) of such Act."

At the beginning of line 12, to change the section number from "7" to "5"; in line 19, after the word "area", to strike out "and shall, during his tenure in such position, be accorded by the Secretary of State the diplomatic designation of Attaché"; after line 21, to strike out:

SEC. 8. (a) Chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"§ 4116. Defense of certain malpractice and negligence suits

"(a) The remedy by suit against the United States as provided by section 1346(b) of title 28 for damages for personal injury, including death, allegedly arising from malpractice or negligence of a physician, dentist, or nurse in furnishing medical care or treatment while in the exercise of his duties in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, shall hereafter be exclusive of any other civil action or proceeding by reason of the same subject matter against such physician, dentist, or nurse (or his estate) whose act or omission gave rise to such claim.

"(b) The Attorney General shall defend any civil action or proceeding brought in any court against any physician, dentist, or nurse (or his estate) of the Department of Medicine and Surgery for any such damage or injury. The physician, dentist, or nurse against whom such civil action or proceeding is brought shall deliver within such time after date of service or knowledge of service as determined by the Attorney General, all process served upon him or an attested true copy thereof to his immediate superior or to whomever was designated by the Administrator to receive such papers and such person shall promptly furnish copies of the pleading and process therein to the United States attorney for the district embracing the place wherein the proceeding is brought, to the Attorney General, and to the Administrator.

"(c) Upon a certification by the Attorney General that the defendant physician, dentist, or nurse was acting in the scope of his employment in the Department of Medicine and Surgery at the time of the incident out of which the suit arose, any such civil action or proceeding commenced in a State court shall be removed without bond at any time before trial by the Attorney General to the district court of the United States for the district and division embracing the place wherein it is pending and the proceeding deemed a tort action brought against the United States under the provisions of title 28 and all references thereto. Should a United States district court determine on a hearing on a motion to remand held before a trial on the merits that the case so removed is one in which a remedy by suit within the meaning of subsection (a) of this section is not available against the United States, the case shall be remanded to the State court.

"(d) The Attorney General may compromise or settle any claim asserted in such civil action or proceeding in the manner provided in section 2677 of title 28, and with the same effect."

(b) The analysis of such chapter 73 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"4116. Defense of certain malpractice and negligence suits."

(c) Section 4116 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) of this section shall take effect on the first day of the calendar month which first occurs more than one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act, and shall apply only to an act or omission occuring before such date with respect to which no suit or civil action has been commenced.

On page 11, after line 9, to strike out:

SEC. 9. (a) Subsection (c) of section 5033 of title 38, United States Code, is hereby repealed.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 6. (a) Subsection (c) of section 5033 and paragraph (3) of section 5035(b) of title 38, United States Code, are hereby repealed; and paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 5035(b) of such title are hereby redesignated as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively.

After line 19, to strike out:

SEC. 10. (a) Section 5001(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by redesignating paragraph (2) thereof as paragraph (3) and by inserting immediately after paragraph (1) thereof the following:

"(2) The Administrator, subject to the approval of the President, is authorized to establish and operate not less than one hundred and twenty-five thousand hospital beds in facilities over which the Administrator has direct and exclusive jurisdiction for the care and treatment of eligible veterans who are tuberculosis, neuropsychiatric, medical, and surgical cases."

(b) Paragraph (3) of such section (as redesignated by subsection (a) of this section) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The nursing beds authorized by this paragraph shall be in addition to the hospital beds provided for in paragraph (2) of this subsection."

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 7. Section 503 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(a)" after "503", and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, in the case of any individual—

"(1) who, for the month in which the Social Security Amendments of 1965 was enacted, was entitled to a monthly insurance benefit under section 202 or 223 of the Social Security Act, and

"(2) who, for such month, was entitled to pension under the provisions of this chapter, or under the first sentence of section 9(b) of the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959, there shall not be counted, in determining the annual income of such individual, any increase in benefits under such sections of the Social Security Act which resulted from the enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1965."

On page 13, at the beginning of line 5, to change the section number from "11" to "8"; and, in line 6, after the numeral "3", to strike out "4, and 5" and insert "and 4".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 861), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The primary purpose of the bill is to provide increases, averaging about 10 percent, in the rates of service-connected disability compensation payable to wartime and peacetime veterans, including a 10-percent increase in the additional allowances payable where the veteran is 50 percent or more disabled and has a wife, child, or dependent parents. The bill also liberalizes the definition of the term "child" for the purpose of veterans' benefit laws and increases the additional allowance payable to a veteran 50 percent or more disabled where he has a child or children pursuing a course of instruction at an educational institution. Further, the bill would authorize certain higher statutory awards to service-connected totally blinded veterans where their blindness is associated with various degrees of deafness. Finally, the bill, as amended, would remove the 40-year age requirement for the special Medal of Honor pension of $100 a month.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

Section 4 of the bill as passed by the House proposes certain changes in the income levels used for determining entitlement of parents to dependency and indemnity compensation. The committee was advised that the Veterans' Administration has presently under examination the question of adequacy of income limitations, exclusions, and rates generally for beneficiaries under the dependency and indemnity compensation program. Accordingly, pending development of the details of any justifiable liberalization of this program, the committee has deleted section 4 in accordance with the Veterans' Administration's recommendation that the limited action provided by that section be deferred at this time.

Section 6 of the House bill proposed to confer certain veterans' preference status to certain persons who are disabled on their way to induction or other military service. This is, of course, a subject within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Pursuant to the following request from the chairman of that committee, section 6 has been deleted:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE
AND CIVIL SERVICE,
September 14, 1965.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of September 10, 1965, concerning H.R. 168.

As you know, a bill containing similar language, H.R. 3413, is pending before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. These bills would entitle any person who is injured while en route to enrollment in the Armed Forces to veterans' preference. The Veterans' Preference Act now applies only to former members of the Armed Forces who have been honorably discharged after military service in designated zones of danger or conflict during peacetime.

Enactment of this legislation would result in persons who have never actually served in the Armed Forces receiving employment preference, while those who have actually served, but not in a zone of danger or conflict, will not receive preference. It would accord such disabled persons 10-point preference while those nondisabled veterans who served in a zone of danger or conflict would receive only 5-point preference.

In its report to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the Civil Service Commission recommended against enactment. No official reports have been received by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee on H.R. 3413, and no action is scheduled on the bill at this time.

Unless evidence is brought to the committee's attention indicating good reason for its enactment, I do not think it would be in the best interest of the Federal service to act favorably on the bill.

I appreciate your seeking my advice in this matter.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
Chairman.

Section 7 of the House bill (now section 5 of the committee-amended bill) proposes to broaden the authority and functions of a Veterans' Administration office in Europe and as passed by the House provided that the head of such office, during his tenure in such position, shall be accorded by the Secretary of State the diplomatic designation of attaché. The Department of State advised the committee that it was opposed to this section, particularly with respect to the undesirable precedent for a statutory mandate dealing with a diplomatic designation. The committee appreciates the principle involved in the Department's position: on the other hand, in view of the broad scope and range of the activities for which such office head is responsible, it is believed that such a designation should have been accorded by the Department long ago. Upon the firm assurance made to the committee by the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations that prompt administrative action will be taken to accord such diplomatic designation, the committee has deleted the objectionable language from section 5.

Sections 8 and 10, dealing with the medical program of the Veterans' Administration fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. In accordance with the following request of the chairman, Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, these sections have been deleted in order to afford his subcommittee an opportunity to give them further study and consideration:

U.S. SENATE,
October 8, 1965.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The following remarks are submitted in response to your request of September 9, 1965, for the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs in regard to three sections of H.R. 168, a bill now pending before the Committee on Finance.

Upon consideration of section 8(a), section 9 (a) and (b), and section 10 of H.R. 168, I submit the following recommendations to the Committee on Finance:

1. Section 8(a): This section adds a new section 4116 to chapter 78, title 38, United States Code, Department of Medicine and Surgery, to provide protection to physicians, dentists, and nurses in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, in the event of malpractice suit brought about them. In effect, the Attorney General would defend any civil action brought against a physician, dentist, or nurse arising out of his employment. If successful, this would end the matter. If the Government should lose the case and a claim be approved by the courts in favor of the plaintiff, the Government would bear the cost of meeting the claim. This provision is modeled after the so-called Driver's Liability Act, Public Law 87-258.

Since the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs has received no statement of position or report on this section of the bill from the several interested departments and agencies and since this amendment appears further to be of a controversial character it is my recommendation that this section be stricken from the bill as it is reported by the Committee on Finance. Such action by your committee will enable the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs to consider the section carefully in the future and reap the benefit which comes from a hearing of the views of all interested parties.

2. Section 9 (a) and (b): Section 9(a) repeals subsection 5033(c) of chapter 73, title 38, United States Code, relating to authorizations of appropriations for State home facilities for furnishing nursing home care, which prohibited any one State from receiving more than 10 percent of the annual maximum $5 million appropriation. Section 9(b) also amends subsection 5034(1), chapter 73, title 38, United States Code, increasing the formula for the allocation of such nursing care construction funds from one-half to one and one-half beds per thousand war veteran population in the case of any State.

This amendment is a noncontroversial one and I believe that it will tend to encourage the States to participate in this program in a more acceptable and uniform manner. If section 9 (a) and (b) is included within the bill as reported by your committee the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs can exercise its proper oversight functions in order to firmly ascertain whether in fact this amendment serves to stimulate a greater interest by the States in the construction of nursing home facilities for veterans. Upon this basis I recommend that the Committee on Finance include section 9 (a) and (b) within the bill as it is reported to the Senate.

It has been brought to my attention that section 9(a) of the bill is in need of a minor technical amendment. Section 9(a) repeals subsection (c) of section 5033 of chapter 73, title 38, United States Code, which subsection prohibits any one State from receiving more than 10 percent of the annual maximum $5 million appropriation. This 10 percent restriction appears again in paragraph (3) of section 5035(b) of title 38, United States Code. The purpose of the technical amendment which I propose and include herewith is to repeal paragraph (3) of section 5035(b) in accordance with the full intent of section 9(a) of H.R. 168. I therefore also recommend that the Committee on Finance amend section 9(a), H.R. 168 with this technical amendment, which I attach herewith.

3. Section 10(a): This section amends section 5001, chapter 81, title 38, United States Code, "Hospital and Domiciliary Facilities," to provide that the Administrator, subject to the approval of the President, is authorized to establish and operate not less than 125,000 hospital beds in facilities over which the Administrator has direct and exclusive jurisdiction for the care and treatment of eligible veterans who are tuberculosis, neuropsychiatric, medical, and surgical cases, and the nursing homes authorized by paragraph (3) shall be in addition to the hospital beds provided for in paragraph (2).

Because of the exact and apparently mandatory language utilized within this proposed amendment it is of a highly controversial character. Upon this basis it is my recommendation that this section be stricken from the bill as it is reported by the Committee on Finance. Such action by your committee will enable the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs to consider the section carefully and at length in the future and reap the benefit which comes from a hearing of the views of all interested parties.

I wish to extend to the Committee on Finance and to its distinguished chairman, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, my sincere appreciation for the consideration shown in promptly submitting these three sections of H.R. 168 to the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs. It is my hope that our committees may continue their productive joint efforts in behalf of those most worthy citizens—the veterans of America.

Sincerely,

RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs.

A new section (now sec. 7) has been added to the bill by the committee. This section provides that the increases under the Social Security Amendments of 1965 (Public Law 89-97) shall not be counted in determining the annual income of persons entitled to both pension and social security benefits for the month in which that act was enacted. This provision will prevent the untoward loss or reduction of pension which would otherwise result from the social security increase. The proposal will not affect the pensioner's right to have 10 percent of the major remaining portion of his social security excluded in the pension income determination.

Minor perfecting technical amendments have been made in section 2 and the former section 9 (now sec. 6).

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation for the prompt action of the Committee on Finance in reporting H.R. 168 and to congratulate this body for its favorable consideration of this most significant measure. H.R. 168 as passed by the Senate provides a well-deserved increase in the basic rates of monthly compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities. The increase of approximately 10 percent in the rates of service-connected disability compensation payable to wartime and peacetime veterans, including the 10-percent increase in the additional allowances payable where the veteran is 50-percent or more disabled and has a wife, child, or dependent parent, is long overdue. The last cost-of-living increase in compensation rates was in 1962, while the most recent increase in dependency allowances occurred in 1957. It is high time that the Congress provided for an overall average increase in compensation rates which adequately offsets the 2.5-percent advance in the cost of living since 1962 and the 10.3-percent jump in that same cost since 1957.

The bill reported to the Senate provides increases in compensation payments for all percentage ratings of disability from 10 through 100 percent.

Furthermore, the more seriously disabled veterans who suffer from multiple amputations or loss of use of more than one extremity or blindness will receive an increase in their statutory award. In the final analysis, nearly 2 million service-disabled veterans will share in monthly compensation increases ranging from $1 for a 10-percent disability to $50 for a 100-percent disability.

An approximate 10-percent increase in the allowances for dependents payable to veterans who are at least 50 percent disabled, is also provided by this measure. This allowance, which was last raised in 1957, is usually paid on behalf of a child up to the time that that child reaches the age of 18 years. If the child is attending school the allowance is continued until he reaches 21 years of age. Section 2 of H.R. 168 extends the age limit to 23 years of age for a child who is attending school. At the same time, this section increases the monthly payment on behalf of the school child to $40 in the case of a totally disabled veteran, with proportionate increases for disabilities rated at 50 through 90 percent. This provision provides a needed stimulus to keep the children of seriously disabled veterans in school and off of the dangerously expanding dropout lists and unemployment rolls.

Mr. President, as the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs I have had a keen interest and concern in the progress of this compensation legislation. The increases in compensation rates provided in H.R. 168 are necessary, they are just, and they are fair. It is with great pride that I support this bill which in reality offers but a compensatory pittance to those dedicated Americans who have bartered their health and their economic well-being so that freedom might be preserved for future generations.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to support H.R. 168, which calls for a much needed increase in the rates of service-connected disability compensation payable to wartime and peacetime veterans. The rising cost of living has placed a severe burden on many of our veterans who are dependent upon their disability compensation for their livelihood. This increase would be very helpful to our disabled veterans and will assist them in meeting their increased financial obligations.

I want to particularly commend the members of the Senate Finance Committee for amending this bill to include a section which provides that the increase under the Social Security Amendments of 1965 shall not be counted in determining the annual income of persons entitled to both veterans' disability pensions and social security bnefits for the month in which that act was enacted. This new section 7 will prevent the loss or reduction of benefits which would otherwise result from the 7-percent increase in social security benefits provided by Congress this year. I have received much mail from veterans in South Carolina relating the difficulties which have arisen and the loss of money which has resulted because of the social security increase. This has worked an extreme hardship on many individuals, and I am pleased to support this provision which provides some remedy to this inequity.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the third reading and passage of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to correct a technical error in the bill. Earlier in the session section 315 of title 38, United States Code, was amended by repealing subsection (b) of that section so that such section no longer has a subsection (a). This amendment would merely strike from section 2(b) an incorrect reference to subsection (a) of section 315 of title 38.

Mr. President, regarding the deletion of section 5 of H.R. 168, reported by the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], with amendments, on October 11, 1965, I ask unanimous consent that a statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The deletion of section 5 and the consequent renumbering of the remainder of the sections of H.R. 168 has been recommended by the Bureau of the Budget in its letter of October 6, 1965, to Senator BYRD, chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance.

Section 5, as reported out of the committee, provides that "the Administrator shall establish and maintain an office in Europe at such location as he deems appropriate."

The executive branch position was that the mandatory cast to this section would conflict with the foreign relations responsibilities of the President and the Secretary of State. Among other things, this language would ignore the need for Federal agencies generally to coordinate in the establishment of offices or engaging in their official activities in foreign countries. Such coordination is equally desirable regarding foreign policy as well as balance-of-payment considerations. The section also would be in conflict with the President's delegation to the American Ambassador of comprehensive responsibility for the conduct of all U.S. Government activities in the country concerned.

I am informed that the deletion of this section is agreeable to the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration and to the chairman of the House Committee on Veteran's Affairs. I am also informed that this deletion would be acceptable in conference. I therefore urge that the Senate agree to the deletion of section 5 from H.R. 168 and to the consequent renumbering of sections 6 through 8 as sections 5 through 7, respectively.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 5, after the word "section", to strike out "315(a)(1)" and insert "315(1)".

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AUTHORIZING THE DISPOSAL OF GRAPHITE, QUARTZ CRYSTALS, AND LUMP STEATITE TALC FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE OR THE SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE, OR BOTH

The bill (H.R. 11096) to authorize the disposal of graphite, quartz crystals, and lump steatite talc from the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 862), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would grant congressional approval for the disposal of (a) 16,586 short tons of Malagasy crystalline graphite and 2,009 short tons of crystalline graphite other than that of the Malagasy type, (b) 4,388,522 pounds of stockpile grade quartz crystals and 467,816 pounds of nonstockpile grade quartz crystals, and (c) 1,049 short tons of lump steatite talc now held in the national and supplemental stockpiles; and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period ordinarily required before disposals from the national or the supplemental stockpile can be started.

EXPLANATION

Why congressional action required

Under existing law congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile except when the proposed disposal is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of graphite, quartz crystals, and lump steatite talc is based on determinations that the quantities of these materials in the national and the supplemental stockpiles are excess to stockpile requirements and not because the materials are obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, congressional approval is required for the disposal.

Why disposals are proposed

The current stockpile objective for Malagasy type graphite is 18,000 short tons and the current stockpile objective for crystalline graphite of other than the Malagasy type is 2,800 short tons. The quantity of the Malagasy type graphite in the national and supplemental stockpiles is 16,586 tons more than the objective. The quantity of crystalline graphite of other than the Malagasy type in the national stockpile is 4,809 short tons, or 2,009 short tons more than the current objective of 2,800 short tons.

The current stockpile objective for quartz crystals is 650,000 pounds. The quantity of quartz crystals in the national and supplemental stockpiles is 5,702,365 pounds, or 5,052,365 pounds more than the objective. A part of the inventory has been previously authorized for disposal.

The current stockpile objective for lump steatite talc is 200 short tons. The inventory of 1,249 short tons is 1,049 short tons more than the objective.

This bill would authorize the disposal of the quantities of these materials that are surplus to stockpile objectives.

Graphite

Stockpile grade Malagasy graphite is used principally in the manufacture of crucibles for use in nonferrous metallurgy, and may also be used in lubricants and packing. The crystalline graphite from countries other than Ceylon and Malagasy is used principally in lubricants and packing, and may also be used in brake linings and oilless bearings.

The high-grade graphite contained in the Government's stockpile is produced principally in Ceylon and the Malagasy Republic. Small quantities of graphite are produced domestically.

U.S. consumption of all types and grades of natural graphite was about 40,880 short tons in 1963. Total consumption of strategic-grade graphite in the United States in 1963 was 6,951 short tons, and is expected to maintain present levels.

Prior disposals of graphite from the Government's stockpiles have had little, if any, impact on the market. In 1960, 430 short tons of domestic crystalline were released from the Defense Production Act inventory. In 1961 and 1962, a total of 1,968 short tons of mixed, nonstockpile grade graphite was released from the national stockpile.

A sales expectancy of about 500 short tons per year for the Malagasy crystalline type, and 120 short tons per year for other than Ceylon and Malagasy, crystalline, is anticipated. These quantities are subject to adjustment in subsequent years if market conditions warrant.

The disposal program will be subject to continuous scrutiny throughout the year, and the Administrator of General Services will consult with other agencies at any time he considers such consultation is advisable or at any time consultation is requested by other responsible agencies.

Quartz crystals

The quartz crystals proposed for disposal were acquired for the stockpile by direct purchases, transfers from other agencies, and through the barter program.

By reason of their piezoelectric properties, quartz crystals serve as devices for converting mechanical force to electrical charges and vice versa, and consequently find wide application in electrical and electronic fields. Because of their light transmitting properties, they are also used in making prisms, wedges, lenses, and other parts for various types of optical instruments.

The world's largest supplier of natural quartz crystals is Brazil, from which the United States in recent years has received virtually all of its imported natural crystals. The Malagasy Republic and Peru also mine small quantities and export most of their output. There is no U.S. production.

Annual U.S. imports (excluding stockpile accessions) for the 6-year period 1958–63, averaged about 461,000 pounds of electronic grade quartz crystals. Apparent annual consumption in the United States during the same period averaged about 284,000 pounds.

Since World War II, the U.S. Army Signal Corps, in cooperation with industry, has sponsored a comprehensive synthetic quartz crystals program. By 1958, the technical and commercial success of quartz synthesis was assured. Eventually, it is expected that U.S.

imports from Brazil will be increasingly curtailed by the growing use of synthetic quartz.

Prior disposals of quartz crystals from the Government's stockpiles have had little, if any, impact on the market. (In 1960 and 1961, a total of 7,625,082 pieces of semimanufactured quartz crystals was sold. Also in 1960, a total of 17,667 pounds of nonstockpile grade crystals was sold. The current program for 500,000 pounds of nonstockpile grade crystals began in August of 1961, and is still underway. As of December 31, 1964, 303,973 pounds were sold.)

It is proposed to dispose of the total excess over a period of approximately 25 to 30 years. The annual sales rate for the first year will be approximately 100,000 pounds, subject to adjustment in subsequent years if market conditions warrant.

The disposal program will be subject to continuous scrutiny throughout the year and the Administrator of General Services will consult with other agencies at any time he considers such consultation is advisable or at any time consultation is requested by other responsible agencies.

Lump steatite talc

Talc, a hydrous silicate of magnesium, is a smooth, soft, chemically inert mineral. When pure, it has a high fusion point and high dielectric strength. Common varieties of talc are used for cosmetics, inert fillers for various chermical compounds, ceramics, and paints. A more pure, dense variety, known as steatite, is used in the electronics industry. One form occurs in lumps and blocks, which are easily sawed, cut, or punched into shapes for electron vacuum tubes and insulators for use in electronic circuits, especially circuits in ultrahigh frequency electronic transmitting equipment. The finished spacers and insulators, when baked, become very hard and permit extremely close tolerances.

Italy and India are the only two countries producing block steatite talc in commercial quantities. Italian block talc, which is not suitable for ultrahigh frequency applications, is not stockpiled and, therefore, is not involved in this proposed release.

In India separate statistics are not reported for strategic grade and other grades of talc. Therefore, Indian production of stockpile grade talc is not known. However, Indian production of stockpile grade block and lump steatite talc for 1963 was estimated at 50 short tons. U.S. imports derived from Indian production of block and lump steatite talc averaged about 33 short tons per year over the 1958–62 period. U.S. imports for 1963 were 16 short tons.

U.S. consumption of all grades of block and lump (steatite) talc has averaged about 42 short tons per year over the 1958–62 period. U.S. consumption in 1963 was estimated at 60 short tons.

At the present rate of consumption, the surplus of 1,049 short tons of block and lump talc could fulfill the needs of the entire U.S. industry for the next 20 years.

The starting disposal rate will be 5 to 10 short tons annually. This rate may be accelerated to the extent that the Government is able to channel some material into markets not competitive with electronic block talc uses, and not disruptive to the U.S. markets supplied by foreign sources.

The disposal program will be subject to continuous scrutiny throughout the year and the Administrator of General Services will consult with other agencies at any time he considers such consultation is advisable or at any time consultation is requested by other responsible agencies.

FINANCIAL INFORMATION

The acquisition cost of the materials that would be disposed of under the authority of this bill was $64,865,700. The best estimate of the current market value of these materials is $82,500,000. The disposal of these materials will be accomplished over a period of several years and hence it is impossible to know what the market will be throughout the disposal period.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 1582) to remove a restriction on certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of California, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 8126) to amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law, provide broader coverage, improved standards of minimum wage and overtime compensation protection, and improved means of enforcement, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

NORTH COUNTIES HYDRO-ELECTRIC CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 10097) for the relief of North Counties Hydro-Electric Co. which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the word "for", to strike out "past and future".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 865), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to pay the North Counties Hydro-Electric Co. of Illinois $187,058 as the amount found by the Court of Claims in full satisfaction of its claims against the United States for damages and losses suffered as the result of the construction of a dam on the Illinois River at Starved Rock near Ottawa, Ill., in accordance with the opinion of the Court of Claims in congressional case No. 2–59, decided on April 16, 1965.

CONSENT TO ENTRY OF CONNECTICUT, RHODE ISLAND, AND VERMONT INTO BUS TAXATION PRORATION COMPACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 10369) to give the consent of Congress to the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont, to enter into a compact providing for bus taxation proration and reciprocity which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont to enter into a compact providing for bus taxation proration and reciprocity substantially in the form of the compact set forth in title II, section 201, of Public Law 89–11, approved April 14, 1965 (79 Stat. 60)." and insert "That the consent of Congress is given to the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont to become parties to title II of the Compact on Taxation of Motor Fuels Consumed by Interstate Buses and to the Agreement relating to Bus Taxation Proration and Reciprocity as consented to by the Congress in the Act of April 14, 1965 (79 Stat. 60)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act to give the consent of Congress to the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont to become parties to title II of the Compact on Taxation of Motor Fuels Consumed by Interstate Buses and the Agreement relating to Bus Taxation Proration and Reciprocity."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 866), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation, as amended, is to grant the consent to Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont to join in title II of that certain compact on taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and the agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity.

STATEMENT

The information contained in the House report on H.R. 10369 relates the justification for this legislation in the following manner:

"By title II, section 201, of Public Law 89–11, approved April 14, 1965, Congress gave its consent to the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and New York, to enter into a certain compact providing for bus taxation proration and reciprocity, and by section 203 Congress directed the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into it.

"Under this compact, parties agree to prorate bus registration fees so that any owner of a fleet of buses may register the buses of that fleet in any compacting State by paying to that State total registration fees in an amount equal to that obtained by applying the proportion of in-State fleet miles divided by total fleet miles, to the total fees that would otherwise be required for regular registration of all the vehicles in the compacting State.

"Public Law 89–11 requires the prior consent of Congress to the entry of additional States into the compact.

"As appears from the attached copies of State legislative enactments identically adopting the compact in question, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont have taken the necessary State action to join in the same. The committee knows no reason why these States should not participate in the compact. H.R. 10369 contains the usual reservation of congressional power to alter, amend, or repeal the consent granted."

The committee, in its original consideration of the bill which resulted in Public Law

89-11, was aware of the merits of that compact. It appears that the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont have found that the tax propration and reciprocity features of title II of that compact are to their advantage and have passed enabling legislation to allow each of them to become a party to the compact. Those public enactments of the States involved are attached hereto and made a part hereof.

The committee is in agreement with this legislation, as amended, and recommends it to the favorable consideration of the Senate.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 9495) to increase the appropriation authorization for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Commission, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

MEMORIAL TO THE LATE DR. ROBERT H. GODDARD, THE FATHER OF ROCKETRY

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 597) for the erection of a memorial to the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the father of rocketry, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 868—explaining the purposes of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF THE JOINT RESOLUTION

House Joint Resolution 597 would direct the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to erect in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts an appropriate memorial to the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, former professor of physics at Clark University in Worcester, Mass., and the father of rocketry. The memorial would be in the form of a sculpture in bronze or other enduring metal and would symbolize the scientist's role as the pioneer of the space age. It would be located on the Clark University campus in Worcester, Mass., on the site donated by the Clark trustees adjacent to the Robert Hutchings Goddard Library. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration would request the advice and comment of the Commission of Fine Arts and consult with Clark University trustees with respect to the design and setting of the memorial. The memorial would give appropriate recognition to the pioneering efforts of the late Dr. Goddard in his country's achievements in rocketry and supersonic flight. There would be authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary, not to exceed $150,000 to carry out the purposes of the joint resolution.

HOUSE ACTION

The Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives held a hearing on House Joint Resolution 597 on September 7, 1965, at which it heard testimony and received statements from a number of Members of Congress, Federal agency spokesmen, and private-institution representatives. The committee reported the measure favorably with an amendment limiting the appropriation authorization for the memorial to $150,000. The joint resolution as amended was passed by the House of Representatives on September 20, 1965.

A pertinent excerpt from the report of the Committee on Science and Astronautics to accompany House Joint Resolution 597 (H. Rept. 961, 89th Cong.) is as follows:

Dr. Robert H. Goddard, who is to be honored by the memorial, is the father of modern rocket propulsion. Born on October 5, 1882, he was a physicist of great insight who also had a unique genius for invention. Although his speculations and experiments were often ridiculed and his genius largely unappreciated in his own day, the flight of Goddard's first liquid-fuel rocket in 1926 is now generally considered to be a feat as epochal in history as that of the Wright brothers at Kitty Hawk. Eighteen years after his first successful demonstration, many of his basic concepts and technical designs came to worldwide notice in the German V-2 ballistic missiles. The advent of intercontinental missiles, earth satellites, and spacecraft was not only based upon that to which Robert H. Goddard devoted his creative talents but also open up a new era in the accelerating impact of science and technology upon the affairs of mankind. The greater part of Dr. Goddard's life was devoted to his work on rockets and rocket apparatus; and although the labor of this scholarly, modest man was appreciated by experts, it went largely unrecognized until the recent dawn of what is now called the space age.

The joint resolution further provides that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall request the advice and comment of the Commission of Fine Arts (an independent agency of the Federal Government) and shall consult with Clark University trustees with respect to the design and setting of the memorial.

It has been claimed that numerous honors have already been paid to the late Dr. Goddard for his achievements. These include the naming of a major installation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the issuance of a memorial postage stamp, the designation by the President of March 16, 1965, as "Goddard Day," and other similar tributes. However, it should be noted that these tributes are either temporary or operational in nature and that there does not exist today any permanent national memorial in the nature of a work of art in commemoration of this distinguished individual.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to express my great satisfaction that the Senate has passed House Joint Resolution 597. This joint resolution authorizes the erection of a memorial to the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the father of rocketry. Because of Dr. Goddard's close association with that university, I feel it is particularly appropriate that the memorial will be located on the Clark University campus.

Although scorned by many of his countrymen, Dr. Goddard nonetheless pursued his pioneering research on rocket flight. In 1926, he became the first man to launch a liquid fuel rocket. Because of his foresight, brilliance, and conviction, Dr. Goddard made discoveries for which our current missile technology is still indebted. It is most fitting that our country honor this outstanding man.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT OF COMPILATION ENTITLED "LEGISLATION AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS AND ESTABLISHING REVOLVING FUNDS"

The resolution (S. Res. 151) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the compilation entitled "Legislation Authorizing Appropriations and Establishing Revolving Funds" was considered and agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 869), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 151 would authorize the printing as a Senate document of the committee print entitled "Legislation Authorizing Appropriations and Establishing Revolving Funds (as of March 1965)," compiled by the Bureau of the Budget at the request of the Committee on Government Operations, from information furnished by various departments and agencies, and further would authorize the printing of 5,000 additional copies of such documents for the use of that committee.

The printing cost estimate, supplied by the Public Printer, is as follows:

Printing cost estimate

To print as a document (1,500) copies)	$653.00
5,000 additional copies, at $146 per thousand	730.00
Total estimated cost, S. Res. 151	1,383.00

STUDY OF CRIMINAL LAWS AND PROCEDURES

Resolution (S. Res. 152) to study criminal laws and procedures was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of criminal laws and procedures.

SEC 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from October 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $30,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 870—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 152 would authorize through January 31, 1966, the expenditure of not to exceed $30,000 by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting through its Special Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of criminal laws and procedures. The special subcommittee would study certain anticrime bills, including one dealing with the so-called *Mallory* rule, which are presently pending before the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar for the moment, except for one bill which the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service wishes to have called up at this time.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 844 (H.R. 11303).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11303) to amend section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act as amended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, H.R. 11303 would amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to extend the benefits of the recent retirement annuity increase bill, Public Law 89-205, to those Federal employees whose annuities commence after December 1, 1965, but not later than December 31, 1965.

The primary purpose of this bill is to retain the services of many experienced and efficient postal employees who otherwise will retire before the very heavy mail volume period at Christmas time. Under the provisions of the recent retirement act, any Federal employee who retires on an immediate annuity before December 1, will receive the annuity increases. Those who retire after December 1, will not receive any benefit under the bill. A great many Federal employees plan to retire before the bill becomes effective. In the postal service, it is estimated that normal retirement figures will multiply three or fourfold. The Department believes that as many as 20,000 employees will retire before the effective date of the bill so that they can receive its benefits. Unfortunately, those contemplating retirement are the most experienced employees. Veteran letter carriers, supervisors, foremen, postmasters, postal service officers, and even regional directors with 30 or more years of service who are now eligible for immediate retirement plan to retire before December. If 20,000 experienced and capable postal employees retire before December, they will necessarily be replaced by junior employees—in some cases brand new employees—who do not yet possess adequate skill and knowledge of their postal duties. The public, which relies on efficient Christmas-time delivery, will suffer.

To avoid this problem, the Post Office Department has requested that the benefits enacted in Public Law 89–205 be extended so that any Federal employee who retires prior to December 31, 1965, will be considered, for retirement purposes, to have retired prior to December 1, 1965. Those already on the retirement rolls will receive their annuity increases on time. Those who wish, for whatever reason, to retire before December, may do so. But those who wish to stay on can do so without losing the benefits of the retirement increase which Congress has passed. The postal service and other Government agencies will retain the benefit of their service during the Christmas season, and the American people will have the benefit of their greater postal skills during the Christmas period.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has not been able to estimate accurately the cost of this bill, but it is more than probable that any cost resulting from enactment of H.R. 11303 will be more than made up by the utilization of experienced personnel in key positions in the postal field service during the Christmas season, as well as in other Federal agencies.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], who is very much interested in this matter, has cleared it?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill (S. 2572) will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 790), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill will extend the benefits of the recently enacted increases in civil service retirement annuities to any person whose annuity commences not later than December 31, 1965.

JUSTIFICATION

H.R. 8469, the 1965 annuity increase bill, established its effective date as the first day of the third month following enactment. In order to provide increases for all annuitants presently on the rolls before Christmas, President Johnson signed the bill on September 28, 1965. The effective date of the bill is therefore December 1, 1965. Any annuity presently being paid, or any annuity which commences not later than December 1, 1965, shall be increased by 1.5 percent plus the amount of increase in the Consumer Price Index from the end of the year 1962 until the date of enactment. The latest report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows an increase of 4.6 percent since 1962, thus producing a 6.1 percent increase payable from the retirement fund. In addition, Public Law 87–793, the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, provided a 2-percent increase for all annuities commencing in 1965. Thus the employee who retires prior to December 1, 1965, is entitled to an 8.1 percent increase in his retirement annuity. The employee retiring after December 1 will receive only the 2-percent increase enacted in 1962.

Evidence indicates that many Federal employees are considering retirement before December in order to receive the benefits of the annuity increase. In the Post Office Department, it is estimated that as many as 20,000 employees will retire early. Unfortunately, the timing of the annuity increase is not advantageous. The postal service experiences its greatest activity during the month of December. The American public relies heavily on the efficient and speedy delivery of Christmas cards, letters. and packages. If 20,000 employees retire prior to the Christmas season, they will necessarily be replaced by less experienced or completely unexperienced employees. Postions of substantial responsibility. including postal supervisors, experienced or completely unexperienced employees. Positions of substantial responsibility, including postal supervisors, experienced clerks and carriers, postmasters, regional officers, and even some regional directors, will be replaced by other employees who are not familiar with the duties and responsibilities of the new position. The postal service and hence the American people will suffer any delays in mail service which result from this significant changeover in manpower.

To avoid this problem, the committee, upon recommendation of the Post Office Department and with the approval of administration officials, has given favorable consideration to legislation authorizing the extension of the effective date of the annuity increase to December 31, 1965. In this way any postal or other Federal employee who chooses to remain on duty during the busy Christmas season may do so without losing the benefits of the retirement annuity increase. The present bill does not require any employee to remain in service; it merely encourages such employees to remain at their posts until the Christmas season is over.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

VISIT OF MAARTEN BOLLE, NETHERLANDS NEWSMAN, TO MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, recently, Montana played host to one of the best known and ablest foreign newsmen in Washington, Maarten C. Bolle, of the Netherlands.

Maarten Bolle is an old friend to many of us in the Senate. In September, he and his wife visited Yellowstone National Park and nearby Montana.

The Bolles were given a sampling of the gregarious and good-natured Montanans. They also discovered a "bit of

Holland" in several small communities near Bozeman where the first Dutch migrants settled 71 years ago.

Their visit to Montana was a success in part because of Fred J. Martin, publisher of the Park County News in Livingston. Fred published a most interesting feature story on the visit of Mr. and Mrs. Bolle, and I am looking forward to Maarten Bolle's journalistic observations after his visit to the Treasure State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the article which was published in the September 16 issue of the Park County News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Outstanding Foreign Correspondent to United States, Maarten Bolle, Netherlands, Local Visitor, Telephones Broadcast About Yellowstone Park

Do we Americans have a duty to be informed as to what's going on in this world?

Are we spinning our wheels on inconsequential problems, instead of realizing the implications?

Should we substitute a false security for faith? Weaken our pride by doubletalk? Condone immorality and dishonesty? Are we inclined to reach to government aid from every level—local, State, and Federal—and at the same time preach against it?

Despite the dangers and causes of major concern that the above questions contain, there's plenty of room for optimism. Let's hope that you readers, particularly the civics class at the Lincoln Junior High in Livingston, can get from this just a wee bit of the mental stimulation that came our way as a result of a chance to visit Friday and Saturday with one of the world's most famous journalists, Maarten C. Bolle, and his wife from Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

To give an idea of the speed of communications these days, Mr. and Mrs. Bolle were visiting with Superintendent John S. McLaughlin of Yellowstone National Park Friday afternoon and gave him a surprise by telling him that a telephoned radio report from Yellowstone to Amsterdam, via New York, about the wonders of Yellowstone already had been heard that day by more than 3 million people in the Netherlands and perhaps a like number in Belgium.

Guides on their trip through Yellowstone included Jim Godbolt, administrative assistant to the superintendent, and George D. Marler, NPS geologist and one of the world's recognized authorities on geysers.

Mr. Bolle, who has been in Washington for more than 10 years and is one of the deans of foreign newspapermen assigned to Washington, recently won the University of California top award for foreign correspondents to the United States. The award is the equivalent of the Pulitzer prizes to American newspapermen, one of which was won this year by Mel Ruder, editor-publisher of the Hungry Horse News, Columbia Falls, for his reporting of the northwest Montana flood in 1964.

The Bolles were induced to include Yellowstone Park and Montana in their vacation schedule at the urging of Senator Mike Mansfield and our chance to visit them resulted from a telephone call from Peggy DeMichele, the Senator's administrative assistant, saying they would like to meet Montanans of all shades of political conviction. Mayor Willard Fraser, of Billings, and the writer drove them to Livingston from Mammoth Friday afternoon.

Fortunately, the Montana Municipal League convention in Livingston was timely thanks to Mayor George Ommundsen and Al Klinger, league secretary. The Bolles had the opportunity to meet and hear Gov. Tim Babcock, as well as to visit with and meet most of the visiting mayors, aldermen, and city officers at the convention on Friday evening during the social hour and banquet and on Saturday morning at the mayors' prayer breakfast. They also had the opportunity to visit briefly with Con Douma and members of his family, who are native Americans but of Dutch descent.

Maarten Bolle, as a result of his newspaper career, is a keen observer, knows how to probe for information, has great respect for another's convictions, is a keen student of current history, devours a newspaper, and seemingly never tires.

But, both he and his wife were surprised delightfully to discover a genuine American "bit of Holland" in the Churchill and Amsterdam communities northwest of Bozeman and south of Manhattan. First migrants from the Netherlands came 71 years ago in 1894, and today the Christian Reformed churches have a membership of 480 families. In the schools, also operated by the church, there are 150 in the high school and 300 in the elementary school at Amsterdam.

Thanks to the suggestion of Mayor Harry Morrow of Bozeman, Harry Droge, a prominent member of the Netherlanders' community and an outstanding Montanan, Saturday morning took the visitors on a quick tour of the "Dutch Valley." Droge, who served as chairman of the Gallatin County Board of Commissioners for many years and in many other capacities, came to Gallatin County more than 60 years ago and subsequently was followed by his parents, six brothers and his sister. He and his wife, a member of another oldtime family that had emigrated from Holland, have six daughters and a son, who with their families all reside in the area and operate dairy farms. The daughters and the son also married spouses of Dutch descent.

The Hollanders are proud of their farms, their homes, their irrigation systems, their dairy and beef cattle, hogs and other livestock. Collectively, they testify to their faith by the four churches they support, two at Churchill, one at Bozeman, and one at Gallatin Gateway and to their concern for education by the modern high school and elementary school, privately supported, at Churchill.

But, as Harry Droge reiterated again and again, the Hollanders are proud of their heritage, but equally as proud of their American citizenship. They, he declared, are grateful for the opportunities which they found in the United States and in Montana and want to protect that heritage for the next and future generations. Like other Americans, they grumble about taxes and trends, but they meet their obligations.

In Montana "The Big Sky Country," there's lots of room—only 4.1 persons for each of 147,138 square miles (4.6 in Park County's 2,631 and 8.7 in Gallatin's 2,540 square miles). In contrast, the Netherlands has 760 persons in each one of the 15,800 square miles, of which 40 percent is given to pasture, 30 percent to farming, 7 percent to forests and 3 percent to horticulture. Of the land 90 percent is in holdings of fewer than 50 acres and more than 50 percent of fewer than 10 acres (World Almanac).

When we stop to think of how Netherlanders, Belgians, Danes, Swedes, Norwegians and Swiss have maintained their faith, pride and integrity, although threatened, invaded and practically left in tatters and with their property confiscated or destroyed, cannot we take a lesson from them? These people, together with the English, Irish, French, German, Spanish, Italian, Greek, and other God-fearing peoples surely are our best hope for enduring friendships and fair treatment.

Yet, we best recognize that "If 1,000 were in the world" (taken from Our Church Times), of this number 560 are living in Asia (and the ratio is increasing day by day), 91 in Africa, 70 in the U.S.S.R. and 50 in South America.

Maarten Bolle has promised to write a column for the Park County News on his impressions of Montana. Likewise, he's promised to send us a translation of his column on President Lyndon B. Johnson, shortly after he took office following the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. This column was one which the judges who studied the writings of more than 238 foreign correspondents in the United States considered was one of the most outstanding journalism stories they had read and it was one of the reasons for Bolle's selection for the award as the outstanding foreign correspondent covering the United States. Bolle's quest for news frequently takes him to Canada, Mexico, Central America and to South America. He served in London prior to his Washington assignment.

He plans to visit in Salt Lake City, Barstow, Calif., Los Angeles, El Paso, Houston, New Orleans and other cities on the current trip. Stories will include a visit to a Texas cattle ranch, an oil well being drilled off the coast of Louisiana—he doesn't believe in sitting at his desk in Washington and depending on the wire service for his news.

Bolle majored in English in college. He speaks English fluently, as well as French, German, and several other languages. He has great respect for Senator Mike Mansfield and declared that Mansfield's integrity had won him the respect from all newspaper correspondents, as well as his colleagues, regardless of party affiliation.

Mrs. Bolle, a librarian, is on the staff of a private law research library in Washington, D.C. The Bolles have a married daughter in the Netherlands, two sons, and seven grandchildren. Their two sons have become American citizens. One is a professor of mathematics at Brown University and the other is on the staff of McCall publications.

Mr. and Mrs. Bolle declared that Senator Mansfield expressed surprise they had not previously visited Montana, but prophesied that "they had saved Montana, the best, until the last." They agreed and already are making plans for another visit in 1967, when they plan a vacation trip to Canada.

But, the dividend from their current visit will be the sparks of interest that will be lit up in the Netherlands, particularly by the relatives and acquaintances of Montanans still living there.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ROBERTSON OF VIRGINIA ON HIS BIRTHDAY

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, one of our most distinguished colleagues, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson] recently celebrated his birthday. I wish to express belated congratulations to a true statesman and one who is admired for his forthrightness, his unyielding loyalty to his country, and to the good people of Virginia whom he has represented in the Congress for 33 years, first in the House of Representatives, having been elected to the 73d Congress on November 8, 1932, and later elected to the Senate on November 5, 1946. Having represented his constituency so ably, he has been returned to the Senate on three successive occasions and I have no doubt that he will again be returned to this body by a mandate of the people of Virginia next year.

Having had the pleasure to serve the good people of Florida in part in the Senate since 1946, I have been closely alined with my distinguished colleague on many occasions. Our philosophy and aims follow similar paths. Parenthetically, I might add that Senator ROBERTSON served in World War I, as did the Senator from Florida.

The continued reelection of WILLIS ROBERTSON is indicative of the high esteem the people of Virginia hold for him.

Mr. President, those who knew WILLIS ROBERTSON prior to his election to the Congress also hold him in high esteem, be they Virginians or be they in one of the other 49 States.

I recently received a letter from Mr. Max Fleischer of the St. Petersburg Isaak Walton League, who knows of the fine work that WILLIS ROBERTSON accomplished when he was Commissioner of Game and Inland Fisheries in the Commonwealth of Virginia in the late twenties and early thirties.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this splendid letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 13, 1965.

Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HOLLAND: I wish to applaud the gracious tribute to the Honorable A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, U.S. Senator from Virginia, on the occasion of his 78th birthday anniversary and his championship of conservation, by his senatorial colleagues on October 7, 1965.

On behalf of Virginia members of the Association of Izaak Walton League Chapters of Virginia, I desire to express high regard for Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON's service to the Old Dominion during the 1920's and 1930's when the Senator served as the commissioner of game and inland fisheries under Gov. HARRY FLOOD BYRD.

Commissioner ROBERTSON was the architect of statewide organization of Izaak Walton League chapters which were brought under cover of the Association of Izaak Walton League chapters of Virginia. Under Commissioner ROBERTSON's leadership it was my privilege to aid in the promotion of the organization program, becoming the first president of the State association in 1931.

Commissioner ROBERTSON is remembered for his matchless courage, imagination, determination, and humility.

Best of all, he is remembered for his statesmanship and his knack for motivating others. He often gave orders but preferred to inspire people by his own example.

The organization of Izaak Walton League chapters brought an enlightened prospective to the people concerning the active conservation of natural resources.

To this fine Virginia gentleman it was a spiritual thrill, not just to shoot one more quail or catch one more fish, but to insure and provide for a sportsman regard for wild life and its environment.

To Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, God bless and keep you, sir, for many more years of distinguished service.

MAX FLEISCHER.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1966, FOR THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH AND EXECUTIVE BRANCH (S. Doc. No. 63)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1966, in the amount of $188,600,000, for the legislative branch and various departments and agencies of the executive branch (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, 1966, TO PAY CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS RENDERED AGAINST THE UNITED STATES (S. Doc. No. 64)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims and judgments rendered against the United States, in the amount of $5,377,742 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. HART, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H.R. 3349. An act for the relief of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force (Rept. No. 892).

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 1781. An act to amend section 113(a) of title 28, United States Code, to provide that Federal District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina shall be held at Clinton (Rept. No. 891).

By Mr. ERVIN (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H.R. 2571. An act for the relief of Ralph S. DeSocio, Jr. (Rept. No. 884).

By Mr. ERVIN (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 1393. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Eduvigis Aran Heffernan (Rept. No. 889);

H.R. 2578. An act for the relief of Maxie L. Rupert (Rept. No. 888);

H.R. 2762. An act for the relief of Manlio Massimiliani (Rept. No. 887);

H.R. 2906. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lily Ning Sheehan (Rept. No. 886);

H.R. 3079. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eleni Bacola Ciacco, M.D. (Rept. No. 885);

H.R. 3905. An act for the relief of Bibi Daljeet Kaur (Rept. No. 875);

H.R. 5006. An act for the relief of Diosdado F. Almazan (Rept. No. 876);

H.R. 6312. An act for the relief of Mario Menna (Rept. No. 890);

H.R. 6655. An act for the relief of Pieter Cornelis Metzelaar (Rept. No. 877);

H.R. 6720. An act for the relief of Ping-Kwan Fong (Rept. No. 879);

H.R. 7282. An act for the relief of Richard D. Walsh (Rept. No. 878);

H.R. 7357. An act for the relief of Dr. Felipe V. Lavapies (Rept. No. 880);

H.R. 7453. An act for the relief of Margaret Elizabeth and Frederick Henry Todd (Rept. No. 882);

H.R. 8135. An act for the relief of Jennifer Rebecca Siegal (Rept. No. 881); and

H.R. 10256. An act for the relief of James D. W. Blyth, his wife, Jean Mary Blyth, and their daughter, Penelope Jean Blyth (Rept. No. 883).

REPORT ENTITLED "JUVENILE DELINQUENCY"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 893)

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report entitled "Juvenile Delinquency," pursuant to Senate Resolution 274, 88th Congress, 2d session, and Senate Resolution 52, 89th Congress, 1st session, and ask that it be printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO INVESTIGATE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. DODD, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 154) providing additional funds to investigate juvenile delinquency, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 52, Eighty-ninth Congress, agreed to February 8, 1965 (authorizing an investigation of Juvenile Delinquency), is hereby amended on page 3, line 1, by striking out "$220,000.00" and inserting in lieu thereof "$240,000.00".

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HART, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 63) providing additional copies of hearings on antitrust and monopoly, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary two thousand additional copies of volume 2 and volume 3 of the hearings held by its Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly during the Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, on economic concentration.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 2644. A bill to provide for the establishment of cooperative outdoor recreation research and training centers; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BAYH:

S. 2645. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Kanellos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 2646. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the millennium of the Polish nation in the calendar year 1966; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. BOGGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2647. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mario Guillermo Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 2648. A bill for the relief of Demetrios G. Daskalas, his wife, Athena Daskalas, and their daughter Eugenia Daskalas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2649. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to permit payment of survivor annuities to the widows and widowers of certain annuitants who remarry subsequent to retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2650. A bill for the relief of Dr. Karim Rashad; and

S. 2651. A bill for the relief of Pedro Navarro Hermosilla; Jose Maria Ibarra; Pedro Sanz; Eugenio Gonzalex Oyague; Valentin Gonzalez Descosio; Carlos Pena Moreno; Severiano Garcia Gamo; Jose Ruso Capel; Jose Gomez; Francisco Lobo Fernanz; and Dionisio Garcia Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2652. A bill relating to the applicability of the 3 percent interest rate for loans to provide housing for the elderly or handicapped under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. TYDINGS when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 2653. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Sabine Pass Battlefield Area National Monument in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2654. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide more favorable income tax treatment for gain derived by individuals from the sale or exchange of capital assets held for more than 2 years; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. TOWER when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. HART:

S. 2655. A bill to provide for certain payments to be made with respect to property acquired by the Secretary of Agriculture for national forest purposes in Gogebic County, Mich., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 2656. A bill to permit members of the Armed Forces to accumulate more than 60 days of leave under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 2657. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Alcoholism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. MCGEE):

S. 2658. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to study and investigate problems relating to the export of beef from the United States and to consider ways and means of increasing the export of beef from the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BOGGS:

S.J. Res. 117. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation for the commemoration and observance of the millennium of the Polish Nation in the calendar year 1966; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BOGGS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON COLD WAR GI EDUCATION BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 62) to authorize the printing of additional copies of the hearings held by the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs during the 89th Congress, 1st session, on S. 9, the cold war GI education bill, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. CON. RES. 62

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare two thousand additional copies of the hearings held by its Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs during the Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, on S. 9, a bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY

Mr. HART, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 63) providing additional copies of hearings on antitrust and monopoly, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HART, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

RESOLUTION

ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO INVESTIGATE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. DODD, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 154) providing additional funds to investigate juvenile delinquency, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. DODD, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

TO EXTEND THE LOWER INTEREST RATE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to extend the coverage of the lower interest rate provided in the 1965 act for construction of housing for the elderly.

The session of Congress which is presently drawing to a close will be long remembered for its record of creative humanitarian legislation. Not the least of its achievements is the recognition of the needs of our elderly citizens. Medicare, extension of social security benefits, the establishment of regional medical centers, each of these measures recognizes the right of every American to live his twilight years in peace and dignity.

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 included another item in recognition of the needs of the older American. In this act, the result of so much painstaking care and patient effort on the part of the Housing Subcommittee, under the leadership of the able and distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the program of direct loans to build housing for the elderly has been made applicable to many more of our older citizens, by lowering the interest rate applicable to such loans. However, as that act is construed by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the lower interest rate will apply only to new projects for which a commitment had not been made prior to the date of enactment of the 1965 Housing Act.

The bill which I introduce today would make the lower interest rate applicable to projects for which a commitment has already been made, but which had not begun construction on the date of enactment of the 1965 act. Thus the bill would allow additional projects of housing for the elderly to secure a lower interest rate, and thus to charge lower rents to their tenants, who are very often less than affluent.

In view of the worthwhile purpose of this bill, it is my hope that it will receive prompt consideration by the Housing Subcommittee and the Banking and Currency Committee, which have in the past been so solicitous of the needs of all of our citizens for adequate housing at reasonable rates.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2652) relating to the applicability of the 3-percent interest rate for loans to provide housing for the elderly or handicapped under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ESTABLISHMENT OF SABINE PASS BATTLEFIELD AREA NATIONAL MONUMENT, TEX.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I wish to introduce today a bill to provide for the establishment of a national monument at the site of the famous Civil War battle of Sabine Pass in Jefferson County, Tex.

Mr. President, the actions which took place at Sabine Pass, several miles from the Gulf of Mexico, in August and September of 1863 are well known to scholars of the American Civil War. It was at Sabine Pass, an outlet from Sabine Lake into the gulf, that one of the decisive battles of the Civil War occurred. There, Federal forces were repulsed and prevented from invading the southeastern part of the State of Texas.

This battle was one of a very few battles of the Civil War fought on Texas soil.

On September 8, 1863, Lt. Dick Dowling and his force of 44 officers and men routed many hundreds of Federal troops who attempted to land at Sabine City.

I would like briefly to recount for the Senate the military background of this heroic battle and call to its attention the brave acts of this small band of dedicated Texans.

For diplomatic purposes aimed at preventing European complications, the commanders of the Federal armies decided, in August of 1863 that the Federal flag should be raised somewhere in Texas as soon as possible.

General Banks, the Union commander in New Orleans, instructed General Franklin to land his forces a few miles below Sabine City, a settlement on the Sabine Pass, and to proceed upon the Confederate works commanding the pass and, if practicable, to seize Beaumont. Instead Franklin decided to have his gunboats make a direct attack upon the works.

Early in the forenoon of the 8th of September, 1863, Franklin's four gunboats opened fire on Dowling and his 44 men who were in the groundworks at Sabine Pass. The fire was immediately returned and at the conclusion of the battle, Dowling and his handful of men had inflicted heavy casualties on Franklin's troops, who were under the command of a Lieutenant Crocker. Dowling's 44 men managed to take over 200 prisoners. Not one of the Texans was even hurt.

It is at the scene of this engagement, where many heroic men on both sides of the lines fought for the things they believed in, that I propose we establish a national monument and recreation area.

I support fully the observation of the people of Jefferson County that the battleground stands in need of recognition commensurate with the significance of the event.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2653) to provide for the establishment of the Sabine Pass Battlefield Area National Monument in the State of Texas, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for more favorable income tax treatment for gain derived by individuals from the sale or exchange of capital assets held for more than 2 years.

Under present law, capital gains and losses are divided into two general categories: short- and long-term capital gains and losses. The former are gains and losses on assets held for not more than 6 months and the latter are gains or losses on assets held for long periods of time. Net short-term gains in excess of net long-term losses are taxed as ordinary income. In the case of net long-term gains in excess of net short-term losses, present tax treatment applicable to individuals provides that such gains be included in the taxpayers ordinary income and then reduced by a 50-percent deduction, or alternatively, the entire gain is omitted from the taxpayers' ordinary income base and a flat 25-percent tax must be paid with respect to this gain.

Mr. President, I certainly do not profess to be any sort of tax expert. Nor do I feel this bill should not or could not be substantially improved. It is the idea or thought that I am interested in presenting now.

I would further point out that I have been advised by those who are experts that legislation of this nature is worthy of most serious consideration.

Mr. President, the Treasury Department has indicated it felt it would end up getting more money if present capital gains provisions were liberalized, at least in a several year period following such change in the law. And there is indeed no certainty that Treasury would not get more money for all time. It is my opinion, and that of others much more knowledgeable in the field of taxation than myself, that a reduction in the present capital gains rate would result in the loosening up of a great many sales which had not heretofore been made, and thus stimulate the loosening up of profits which are now unrealized.

Mr. President, in my opinion, the present law has been a great restraint on development of capital and assets, which would have in turn, of course, led to additional job and other economic opportunities.

In essence, Mr. President, I am of the opinion my proposal presented here would be a stimulus to both individual investment and to the economy as a whole.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2654) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide more favorable income tax treatment for gain derived by individuals from the sale or exchange of capital assets held for more than 2 years, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PAYMENTS FOR CERTAIN PROPERTY ACQUIRED BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE IN GOGEBIC COUNTY, MICHIGAN

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the land in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan known as Sylvania is a magnificent tract of about 18,000 acres in Gogebic County. It is a scenic complex of timberland and lakes. It is an undeveloped area with high recreational opportunities which have not been available to the public.

Funds for the purchase of this beautiful tract as a part of the Ottawa National Forest have been made available to the Forest Service from the land and water conservation fund. Acquisition of Sylvania and subsequent development by the Forest Service will attract hundreds of thousands of visitors annually. It will surely bring substantial economic benefits to northern Michigan as well as provide an outdoor recreation area of outstanding beauty for the Nation.

Acquisition and development of Sylvania by the Forest Service will give local people an opportunity to provide supporting services, facilities, and supplies to the inflow of visitors. The buildup of this inflow and accompanying economic benefits to the local people will be gradual. Its ultimate level is predictable. But predictions sometimes deal with unknowns and this concerns the local authorities.

At the present time Sylvania pays over $30,000 annually in local taxes, shared by Gogebic County, Watersmeet Township, and Watersmeet School District. This is a substantial part of the tax revenue of these local governments. Gogebic is a rural county. The population is low. Resources that produced employment in the past are depleted. The area is one of excessive unemployment. The county, township, and school district cannot absorb the shock of losing this much of their tax revenue.

Unlike many other acquisitions for park and recreation purposes where the acquisition comes over a period of years, and the impact on the local tax rolls is not as severe, at Sylvania the purchase will be made at one time, and the total tax loss will be substantial in the first year. It is for this reason it would seem especially justified for the Congress to take special action here.

The local officials support the idea of Sylvania being acquired and developed by the Forest Service if offsetting relief is provided for the tax loss. They look hopefully to development of tourism to the area. On August 25, Representative CLEVENGER and I introduced legislation which would have provided transitional type payments to temporarily offset the tax loss to the local governments. After that bill was examined by the local officials, they asked that a different approach be taken. We met with local representatives and their concern has merit.

A new bill along the lines of their alternate proposal will be offered for introduction following my remarks today. Representative CLEVENGER is introducing an identical bill in the House.

The new bill provides for payment annually of three-fourths of 1 percent of the value of the tract. This payment will be distributed to, and used by, the county, the township, and the school district in the same manner as are other taxes. The payments will be adjusted for each 5-year period to reflect the current market value by applying the index of the statewide average value of farm real estate as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The cost to the Federal Government under the new bill will not exceed and will probably be less than the costs would have been under the former bill. The reason for this is that, since the payments under S. 2456 were transitional in character, payment of the full 25 percent of national forest receipts would have continued to be made. The new bill, in this respect, is similar to the 1948 act that applies to the boundary waters canoe area in the Superior National Forest in Minnesota. That act also provides for the payment annually to the counties of three-fourths of 1 percent of the value of the Federal land. Like it, the new bill provides that payments of 25 percent of receipts will no longer be made with respect to Sylvania.

According to projections made by the Forest Service the annual receipts from Sylvania within 10 to 15 years will reach a level where 25 percent would more than balance out the payments under the new bill.

A significant feature of the new bill is the review to be made within the third 5-year period. This will give us all a sound look at how it is working. In the meantime the local authorities will be given the protection they so badly need.

Mr. President, Sylvania is available now to provide its wonderful benefits to present and future generations. It is the kind of area that will make reality out of the dreams of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. The opportunity to acquire Sylvania will not remain long. If it is not embraced now, it will be lost forever. I hope the bill will be enacted with utmost speed.

I introduce the bill, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2655) to provide for certain payments to be made with respect to property acquired by the Secretary of Agriculture for national forest purposes in Gogebic County, Mich., and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CREATION OF A FEDERAL COMMISSION ON ALCOHOLISM

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, at this time I introduce a bill to create a Federal Commission on Alcoholism.

The Federal Government has generally been behind many of the States in recognizing that alcoholism is an illness and a serious public health problem. There is comparatively very little concerted, coordinated effort put forth at the Federal level to gather and share information and to conduct research regarding this illness.

Many thousands of alcoholics have been rehabilitated and brought back from the lowest point of their lives into the mainstream of our society. This has been made possible only through the efforts of sincerely dedicated volunteer groups and through the diligence of professional persons in State or local agencies.

In Utah, we long ago recognized that alcoholism is a chronic disease which can be normalized. The Utah State Legislature, in a farsighted move, created the Utah State Board on Alcoholism in 1949. This board cooperates with the Utah Alcoholism Foundation and it is affiliated with the North American Association of Alcoholism programs and the National Council on Alcoholism.

The board of directors of the State-level organization serves without compensation. Board members devote many, many hours each year to serving those less fortunate individuals who are suffering from alcoholism.

There are many other agencies which volunteer their staffs, time, and private funds in the quest for a State which will be free from alcoholism. Utah has enjoyed particular success in her endeavors in this field. In 1957, it was determined that Utah's alcoholism rate was 3,080 per 100,000 population. By last year, this rate had been cut back severely. Utah now has only 1,988 alcoholics per 100,000 population, and the State has increased its population by some 200,000 between 1957 and 1964.

While much of our effort is aimed at treatment and rehabilitation, we do not neglect the value of a preventive program aimed at schoolchildren and the general public. The foundation has found that in Utah, through the use of printed materials, motion pictures, lectures, and discussions, the teenager can be reached and can indeed get the important message that excessive consumption of alcoholic beverages at any point in life can be personally disastrous.

Mr. President, the bill which I introduce today provides that a Federal Commission on Alcoholism shall be established. The duties of the Commission will, generally, be to study and conduct much-needed research into the problems of alcoholism, including methods and facilities available for the care, custody, treatment, employment, and rehabilitation of alcoholics.

The bill further provides that the Federal Commission on Alcoholism shall make grants to the States to combat the growing problem of alcoholism.

There is a great need for the Federal Government to interpose with its resources in this critical social and medical problem. At the present, in the United States, I am informed that while this Nation allocated $380 per year per patient to treat those suffering with tuberculosis, we spend only $0.16 per year per patient to treat and rehabilitate an alcoholic. The Federal and State Governments collect more than $4 billion annually on alcoholic beverages, but we do not spend a slight fraction of that amount on treatment.

I am sure that additional research which can be financed by the Federal Commission will be very helpful to the States in their separate programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill remain on the table for the next 5 days so that additional sponsors might join me.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will remain at the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 2657) to establish a Federal Commission on Alcoholism, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Moss (for himself and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOSS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am in the process of drinking this glass of water, which is the strongest liquid I ever drink. May I have the honor to join in the bill, in view of the fact that I have been trying to end the Senate saloon here in the Capitol reception room?

Mr. MOSS. I am delighted to have the senior Senator from Oregon as a cosponsor of the bill. I recognize the continuing efforts he has made in this field. I am sure his cosponsorship will add greatly to the bill.

CREATION OF A U.S. BEEF EXPORTS COMMISSION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], I introduce a bill for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent that the bill and Senator MONTOYA's statement concerning it be printed in the RECORD and that the bill be held at the desk through October 20 for additional sponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement by the Senator from New Mexico will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The bill (S. 2658) to provide for the establishment of a Commission to study and investigate problems relating to the export of beef from the United States and to consider ways and means of increasing the export of beef from the United States, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for Mr. MONTOYA and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2658

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Beef Exports Commission Act".

SEC. 2. There is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government a commission to be known as the United States Beef Exports Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

SEC. 3. The Commission shall be composed of five members to be appointed by the President as follows:

(1) one from the Department of Agriculture;

(2) one from the Department of Commerce;

(3) two from the beef industry; and

(4) one private citizen who represents no special interest, but whose background and experience qualifies him for service on the Commission.

SEC. 4. (a) The President shall designate one of the members of the Commission to serve as Chairman.

(b) Vacancies in the Commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointments were made.

(c) Three members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 5. Members of the Commission from private life shall not receive compensation for service on the Commission, and members of the Commission from the departments and agencies of the government (including commissions and boards) shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the departments and agencies, but all members shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission may, in carrying out its duties under this Act, sit and act at such times and places, hold such hearings, take such testimony, administer such oaths, procure such printing and binding, and make such expenditures as the Commission deems advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission.

(b) The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of a staff director and such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949. The Commission may also procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $75 for individuals.

(c) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality of the Federal Government information for the purposes of this Act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information directly to the Commission upon request made by the Chairman of the Commission.

Sec. 7. (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission to make a continuing study and investigation of any and all matters relating to the exporting of beef (including beef on the hoof) from the United States with a view to increasing such exports. In carrying out such study and investigation the Commission shall give special consideration to—

(1) the need for and the desirability of readjusting the inland freight rates in the United States in order that the high cost of shipping beef from the point of production to the point of embarkation might be reduced;

(2) means of eliminating the disparities which exist in ocean freight rates and which are discriminatory against United States exporters;

(3) how the owners and operators of United States vessels might be encouraged to provide modern refrigerated space in both new and existing vessels;

(4) how the owners and operators of United States vessels might be encouraged to provide more facilities for shipping beef on the hoof;

(5) means of eliminating unnecessary or unreasonable restrictions that have been or may hereafter be imposed by foreign countries on beef exported from the United States;

(6) programs which might be undertaken to increase beef exports from the United States, including advertising programs, consumer education programs, trade fairs, programs to promote personal contacts with people in foreign markets, and programs to increase the information available on trade sources in foreign countries; and

(7) the collection and dissemination of all technical advancements and marketing information which might assist domestic producers and shippers of beef in acquiring and retaining their fair share of the world beef market.

(b) The Commission shall submit a written report to the President annually setting forth in detail the results of its study and investigation under this Act and shall make such recommendations as it deems appropriate, including recommendations for the enactment of legislation. The President shall transmit a copy of each such report to the Congress.

Sec. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The statement by Senator Montoya, presented by Mr. Morse, is as follows:

Statement by Senator Montoya on a Bill To Create a U.S. Beef Exports Commission

Mr. Montoya. Mr. President, coming as I do from a major beef-producing State, I have watched with great interest and with growing concern the various efforts being made by this country to develop the beef export market.

Twice this year, I have made statements to the Senate concerning the beef export problem, and have participated in the continuing investigation of this matter which has been conducted by the Small Business Committee under the able leadership of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman].

More and more, I have become convinced that one of our biggest problems is the fragmentation of our approach. There are a number of programs underway in the Department of Agriculture, in the Department of Commerce, the Department of State, and perhaps in other agencies, designed to improve our beef export position.

The Federal Maritime Commission is looking into one of the most serious aspects of the question, discriminatory ocean freight rates. The American Meat Institute and other trade organizations are active in various phases of export promotion.

But there is no central, guiding hand in all this activity, and there are, I am sure, a number of areas which are being ignored or overlooked simply because there is no one or no agency taking an overall view of the problem of increasing beef exports.

That is why, Mr. President, I am introducing a bill which would establish a U.S. Beef Exports Commission.

This Commission, composed of industry, Government, and public members, would act as a central overseer and would serve as an information channel and bridge among all the public and private organizations which are working in the field.

I would propose that this Commission have the widest possible powers, to enable it to make whatever investigations and take whatever steps it deems necessary to encourage and expand a trade which can be of immense benefit to American agriculture and to the American economy as a whole.

COMMEMORATION AND OBSERVANCE OF MILLENNIUM OF POLAND AS A CHRISTIAN NATION

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill and a joint resolution to commemorate and observe the millennium of Poland as a Christian nation in the year 1966.

One of these measures, a joint resolution, Mr. President, would authorize the President of the United States to issue a proclamation commemorating this event and call upon the people of the United States to observe such millennium with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The second is a bill, Mr. President, which would authorize and direct the Postmaster General to issue a commemorative stamp in observance of this occasion.

The celebration of Poland's millennium of Christianity will be an occasion for our country to emphasize our links with Poland, to demonstrate our cultural heritage and give to the people of Poland hope and courage toward attaining greatly deserved freedom from oppression.

I would certainly hope that these proposals will receive favorable consideration and that this country will join with the people of Poland in this celebration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of these measures be printed at this point in my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill and joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and joint resolution will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2646) to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the millennium of the Polish nation in the calendar year 1966, introduced by Mr. Boggs, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2646

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue, during the calendar year 1966, a special series of postage stamps, of such appropriate design and denomination as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the occasion in the calendar year 1966 of the millennium of the origin of Poland as a Christian nation.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 117) to authorize the President to issue a proclamation for the commemoration and observance of the millennium of the Polish nation in the calendar year 1966, introduced by Mr. Boggs, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S.J. Res. 117

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation (1) commemorating the occasion of the millennium of the origin of Poland as a Christian nation, which event will be celebrated by the people of Poland throughout the calendar year 1966, and (2) calling upon the people of the United States to observe such millennium with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENT AND EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF SUGAR ACT OF 1948—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 473

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], an amendment to the bill (H.R. 11135) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and ask that it be printed under the rule.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 473) was referred to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators Moss, Nelson, Hartke, Gruening, Bartlett, Bayh, Randolph, Hart, Tydings, and Monroney be added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2548) to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit the transmission of certain matter which defames or reflects injuriously upon racial or religious groups.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 15, 1965, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 597. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting the need for adequate medical library services facilities; and

S.J. Res. 32. Joint resolution to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury to persons, and for use of and damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after August 15, 1945, and before April 28, 1952.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations, beginning with New Reports—Department of Justice.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Tom Lilley, of West Virginia, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations of the executive calendar will be stated.

NEW REPORTS—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of Justice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. PATENT OFFICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Philip E. Mangan, of Maryland, to be an examiner in chief, U.S. Patent Office.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the postmaster nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion by Mr. MANSFIELD, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9220) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Oct. 13, 1965, p. 26951, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the conference report was signed by all of the Senate conferees, although the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] signed except as to amendment No. 21 which relates to the appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The reason for that was that the House failed to appropriate funds for the Tellico Dam for which there was a budget estimate. Instead, they recommended funds for the Tims Ford project for which there was no budget estimate. The Senate deleted the funds for Tims Ford and included the budget estimate for the Tellico project. My good friend, the senior Senator from Alabama, as chairman of the special panel handling TVA matters, put up a very strong fight to maintain the Senate position, but the House was adamant. Since the House was rather generous on other matters, the Senate conferees reluctantly receded. I know that the Senator feels very strongly on this matter and that is the reason he signed except for amendment No. 21.

All legislation is the result of compromise. I believe that the Senate conferees did unusually well in upholding the position of the Senate. The conference report provides $4,292,866,500, which is $34,722,500 below the amount approved by the Senate; $51,230,000 above the House; $94,749,500 below the budget; and $176,150,200 below the appropriation for fiscal year 1965.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a summary table explaining the action of the conferees on the various items in the bill.

There being no objection, the summary table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary table

Item (1)	Budget estimate, 1966 (as amended) (2)	House allowance (3)	Senate allowance (4)	Conference allowance (5)
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL				
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY				
CEMETERIAL EXPENSES				
Salaries and expenses	$13,739,000	$13,739,000	$13,739,000	$13,739,000
CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL				
General investigations	[1] 24,677,000	24,100,000	26,720,000	25,435,000
Construction, general	[2] 973,663,000	973,736,000	1,009,099,000	993,279,000
Operation and maintenance, general	175,762,000	175,762,000	175,762,000	175,762,000
Flood control, hurricane, and shore protection emergencies	12,000,000	7,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
General expenses	16,662,000	16,481,000	16,662,000	16,537,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries	77,060,000	80,060,000	89,825,000	84,942,500
Total, rivers and harbors and flood control	1,279,824,000	1,277,139,000	1,330,068,000	1,307,955,500

See footnotes at end of table.

Summary table—Continued

Item (1)	Budget estimate, 1966 (as amended) (2)	House allowance (3)	Senate allowance (4)	Conference allowance (5)
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL—Continued				
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued				
THE PANAMA CANAL				
Canal Zone Government:				
Operating expenses	$31,211,000	$31,000,000	$31,000,000	$31,000,000
Capital outlay	9,557,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
Panama Canal Company: Limitation on general administrative expenses	(11,169,000)	(11,000,000)	(11,000,000)	(11,000,000)
Total, the Panama Canal	40,768,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000
Total, title I	1,334,331,000	1,330,878,000	1,383,807,000	1,361,694,500
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION				
General investigations	11,520,000	12,873,000	15,127,000	14,232,000
Construction and rehabilitation	200,650,000	196,661,500	196,661,500	196,661,500
Operation and maintenance	40,915,000	41,305,000	41,305,000	41,305,000
Indefinite appropriation of receipts	(4,920,000)	(4,920,000)	(4,920,000)	(4,920,000)
Loan program	14,995,000	13,087,000	13,495,000	13,495,000
Upper Colorado River Basin fund	48,865,000	46,865,000	48,471,500	48,011,500
General administrative expenses	10,938,000	10,775,000	10,775,000	10,775,000
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	327,883,000	321,566,500	325,835,000	324,480,000
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION				
Construction	98,450,000	97,777,000	97,777,000	97,777,000
Operation and maintenance	16,015,000	15,988,000	15,988,000	15,988,000
Total, Bonneville Power Administration	114,465,000	113,765,000	113,765,000	113,765,000
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION				
Operation and maintenance	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION				
Construction	4,500,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
Operation and maintenance	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
Continuing fund (indefinite appropriation of receipts)	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)
Total, Southwestern Power Administration	6,300,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Total, definite appropriations	449,648,000	439,831,500	444,100,000	442,745,000
Total, Indefinite appropriations	8,920,000	8,920,000	8,920,000	8,920,000
Total, title II	458,568,000	448,751,500	453,020,000	451,665,000
TITLE III—ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION				
Operating expenses	2,231,000,000	2,117,000,000	2,132,800,000	2,121,900,000
Indefinite appropriation of receipts	(46,625,000)	(46,625,000)	(46,625,000)	(46,625,000)
Plant and capital equipment	250,000,000	237,995,000	244,245,000	243,995,000
Total, Atomic Energy Commission	2,481,000,000	2,354,995,000	2,377,045,000	2,365,895,000
Total, definite appropriation	2,481,000,000	2,354,995,000	2,377,045,000	2,365,895,000
Total, indefinite appropriation	46,625,000	46,625,000	46,625,000	46,625,000
Total, title III	2,527,625,000	2,401,620,000	2,423,670,000	2,412,520,000
TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES				
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation: Limitation on administrative expenses	(490,000)	(490,000)	(490,000)	(490,000)
Tennessee Valley Authority	58,952,000	59,847,000	58,952,000	59,347,000
Delaware River Basin Commission:				
Salaries and expenses	44,000	44,000	44,000	44,000
Contribution to the Delaware River Basin Commission	96,000	96,000	96,000	96,000
Total, Delaware River Basin Commission	140,000	140,000	140,000	140,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency—Office of the Administrator:				
Administrative expenses, public works acceleration	500,000	400,000	500,000	500,000
Interoceanic Canal Commission: Salaries and expenses	7,500,000	----------	7,500,000	7,000,000
Total, title IV	67,092,000	60,387,000	67,092,000	66,987,000
Grand totals:				
Total, definite appropriations	4,332,071,000	4,186,091,500	4,272,044,000	4,237,321,500
Total, indefinite appropriations	55,545,000	55,545,000	55,545,000	55,545,000
Grand total, all titles	4,387,616,000	4,241,636,500	4,327,589,000	4,292,866,500

---

[1] Includes $350,000 submitted in H. Doc. 111, and $121,000 submitted in H. Doc. 200; $157,000 submitted in S. Doc. 41, not considered by the House; and $61,000 in S. Doc. 48, not considered by the House.

[2] Includes $2,850,000 submitted in H. Doc. 111, and a decrease of $18,495,000 submitted in H. Doc. 200; a decrease of $157,000 submitted in S. Doc. 41, not considered by the House; and $1,250,000 in S. Doc. 48, not considered by the House.

TITLE I—CORPS OF ENGINEERS, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, for general investigations of the Corps of Engineers, the bill provides $25,435,000, which is $1,285,000 below the amount approved by the Senate; $1,335,000 above the amount allowed by the House; $758,000 above the budget; and $1,241,000 above the appropriation for 1965.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a tabluation showing the details of the amount allowed for this item.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

General investigations, operation and maintenance, and general expenses, fiscal year 1966

Item (1)	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1966 (2)	House allowance (3)	Senate allowance (4)	Conference allowance (5)
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS				
1. Surveys:				
(*a*) Navigation studies	$2,535,000	$2,851,000	$3,527,000	$3,207,000
(*b*) Flood control studies	7,073,000	7,351,000	7,723,000	7,723,000
(*c*) Beach erosion cooperative studies	388,000	438,000	498,000	468,000
General reduction due to slippage	−195,000	−1,195,000	−195,000	−945,000
Subtotal, navigation, flood control, and beach erosion studies	9,801,000	9,445,000	11,553,000	10,453,000
(*d*) Comprehensive basin studies:				
(1) Big Black River, Miss	87,000	87,000	87,000	87,000
(2) Big Muddy River, Ill	154,000	154,000	154,000	154,000
(3) Columbia North Pacific region	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000
(4) Connecticut River Basin, Conn., Mass., Vt., and N.H	514,000	514,000	565,000	565,000
(5) Genessee River Basin, N.Y. and Pa	154,000	154,000	154,000	154,000
(6) Grand River Basin, Mich	256,000	256,000	256,000	256,000
(7) Kanawha River, W. Va., Va., and N.C	410,000	410,000	410,000	410,000
(8) Missouri River Basin	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
(9) North Atlantic region	61,000	--------	61,000	61,000
(10) Ohio River Basin review	330,000	330,000	330,000	330,000
(11) Pascagoula River Basin, Miss	230,000	230,000	230,000	230,000
(12) Pearl River Basin, Miss	230,000	230,000	230,000	230,000
(13) Puget Sound Area, Washington	410,000	410,000	410,000	410,000
(14) Red River below Denison Dam, La., Ark., Okla., and Tex	460,000	460,000	460,000	460,000
(15) Sabine River, Tex	145,000	145,000	145,000	145,000
(16) St. John River Basin, Maine	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
(17) Susquehanna River Basin, N.Y., Pa., and Md	565,000	565,000	565,000	565,000
(18) Upper Mississippi River Basin	515,000	515,000	515,000	515,000
(19) Wabash River, Ind. and Ill	565,000	565,000	565,000	565,000
(20) White River Basin, Ark. and Mo	360,000	360,000	360,000	360,000
(21) Willamette River Basin, Oreg	480,000	480,000	480,000	480,000
(*e*) Special studies:				
(1) Coordination studies with other agencies (Public Law 566, Public Law 984, etc.)	260,000	260,000	260,000	260,000
(2) Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway, N.Y	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
(3) Jersey Meadows, N.Y. and N.J	360,000	360,000	360,000	360,000
(4) Lake Erie-Ontario Waterway, N.Y	100,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
(5) Texas coast	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
(6) Water levels at Great Lakes	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000
(7) Charlotte County hurricane protection	--------	--------	40,000	40,000
Subtotal, surveys	17,612,000	17,395,000	19,655,000	18,555,000
2. Collection and study of basic data:				
(*a*) Stream gaging (U.S. Geological Survey)	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
(*b*) Precipitation studies (U.S. Weather Bureau)	550,000	550,000	550,000	550,000
(*c*) Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)	310,000	310,000	310,000	310,000
(*d*) International water studies	85,000	85,000	85,000	85,000
(*e*) Flood plain studies	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Subtotal, collection and study of basic data	2,245,000	2,245,000	2,245,000	2,245,000
3. Research and development:				
(*a*) Coastal engineering research and development	1,100,000	1,000,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
(*b*) Hydrologic studies	190,000	190,000	190,000	190,000
(*c*) Civil works investigations	1,800,000	1,650,000	1,800,000	1,725,000
(*d*) Mississippi Basin model:				
(1) Mississippi River comprehensive study	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000
(2) Maintenance	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000
(*e*) Nuclear explosives studies for civil construction	1,310,000	1,200,000	1,310,000	1,200,000
Subtotal, research and development	4,820,000	4,460,000	4,820,000	4,635,000
Total, general investigations	24,677,000	24,100,000	26,720,000	25,435,000
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL				
1. Navigation:				
(*a*) Channels and harbors	89,691,000	89,691,000	89,691,000	89,691,000
(*b*) Locks, dams, and canals	32,201,000	32,201,000	32,201,000	32,201,000
2. Flood control:				
(*a*) Reservoirs	14,393,000	14,393,000	14,393,000	14,393,000
(*b*) Channel improvements, inspections, and miscellaneous maintenance	1,270,000	1,270,000	1,270,000	1,270,000
3. Multiple-purpose projects including power	31,804,000	31,804,000	31,804,000	31,804,000
4. Protection of navigation	6,328,000	6,328,000	6,328,000	6,328,000
5. Niagara remedial works	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
Total, operation and maintenance, general	175,762,000	175,762,000	175,762,000	175,762,000
GENERAL EXPENSES				
1. Executive direction and management:				
(*a*) Office, Chief of Engineers	5,756,000	5,700,000	5,756,000	5,756,000
(*b*) Division offices	8,700,000	8,575,000	8,700,000	8,575,000
Subtotal, executive direction and management	14,456,000	14,275,000	14,456.000	14,331,000
2. River and Harbor Board	707,000	707,000	707,000	707,000
3. U.S. Army Coastal Engineering Research Center	186,000	186,000	186,000	186,000
4. Commercial statistics	1,130,000	1,130,000	1,130,000	1,130,000
5. Special investigations	183,000	183,000	183,000	183,000
Total, general expense	16,662,000	16,481,000	16,662,000	16,537,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, for construction, general, the conference bill provides $993,279,000, which is $15,820,000 below the amount approved by the Senate; $19,543,000 above the House; and $36,322,800 above the 1965 appropriation.

Generally speaking, the House sent us a good bill this year. As I stated earlier when the bill was before the Senate, the House added 21 unbudgeted items, which upon review by the Senate committee proved to be desirable projects, and the committee recommended their inclusion in the bill. The Senate concurred in that recommendation.

The House added seven new planning starts, which were subsequently approved by the Senate. The Senate added 32 new planning starts, of which 20 were in the omnibus authorization bill as passed by the Senate, and the House approved 16 of these planning items for projects in the omnibus authorization bill.

The House added 14 new construction starts involving a future commitment of $343,912,000. These projects were accepted by the Senate. The Senate added 14 additional construction starts. The House accepted 10 of the new starts added by the Senate having a future commitment of $223,346,000. The budget provided for 37 new starts having a future commitment of $527,258,000. Thus, the conference bill provides for 61 new construction starts involving a future commitment of $1,984,516,000, which is just a little over 1 year's work at the current rate of appropriations.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a tabulation showing the details of the amount allowed for this item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Construction, general, fiscal year 1966

	Construction, general, State and project (1)	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1966		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
		Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
	Alabama:								
(N)	Alabama River channel improvement		$140,000		$140,000		$140,000		$140,000
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(N)	Claiborne lock and dam	$3,000,000		$3,000,000		$3,000,000		$3,000,000	
(N)	Holt lock and dam	4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000	
(MP)	Jones Bluff lock and dam			1,600,000		1,600,000		1,600,000	
(MP)	Millers Ferry lock and dam	14,000,000		14,000,000		14,000,000		14,000,000	
(N)	Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss						75,000		75,000
	Tombigbee River and tributaries, Alabama, and Mississippi. (See Mississippi.)								
	West Point Dam, Ala. and Ga. (See Georgia.)								
	Alaska:								
(N)	Anchorage Harbor (1958 act)					400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Skagway (deferred)		5,000		5,000		5,000		5,000
(MP)	Snettisham power project		800,000		800,000	250,000	800,000		800,000
	Arizona:								
(FC)	Alamo Reservoir	2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC)	Painted Rock Reservoir	270,000		270,000		270,000		270,000	
(FC)	Pinal Creek		37,000		37,000		37,000		37,000
(FC)	Tucson diversion channel	1,031,000		1,031,000		1,031,000		1,031,000	
	Arkansas:								
(N)	Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma:								
	(a) Bank stabilization and channel rectification	14,700,000		14,700,000		14,700,000		14,700,000	
	(b) Navigation locks and dams	79,000,000		79,000,000		79,000,000		79,000,000	
(MP)	Beaver Reservoir	1,150,000		1,150,000		1,150,000		1,150,000	
(MP)	Dardanelle lock and dam	1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000	
(MP)	Degray Reservoir	9,400,000		9,400,000		9,400,000		9,400,000	
(FC)	DeQueen Reservoir			1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Dierks Reservoir		136,000		136,000		136,000		136,000
(FC)	Garland City					200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Gillham Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
(FC)	Maniece Bayou, upstream extension	220,000		220,000		220,000		220,000	
(FC)	Millwood Reservoir	3,752,000		3,752,000		3,752,000		3,752,000	
(MP)	Narrows Dam, addition of 3d power unit	550,000		550,000		550,000		550,000	
(N)	Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La	8,000,000		8,000,000		8,000,000		8,000,000	
(MP)	Ozark lock and dam	9,000,000		9,000,000		9,000,000		9,000,000	
(FC)	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Water Valley Reservoir						150,000		150,000
	California:								
(FC)	Alamada Creek, Del Valle Dam	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
(FC)	Bear Creek	1,380,000		1,380,000		1,380,000		1,380,000	
(N)	Bodega Bay Harbor (not authorized)						64,000		
(FC)	Buchanan Reservoir		250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000
(FC)	Corte Madera Creek		180,000	800,000		800,000		800,000	
(N)	Dana Point Harbor			1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(BE)	Doheny Beach State Park (reimbursement)	142,000		142,000		142,000		142,000	
(FC)	Dry Creek (Warm Springs) Reservoir and channel improvement		933,000		933,000		933,000		933,000
(N)	Half Moon Bay and Harbor	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Hidden Reservoir		400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000
(FC)	Los Angeles County drainage area	9,500,000		9,500,000		9,500,000		9,500,000	
(FC)	Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
	Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev. (See Nevada.)								
(FC)	Merced River Reservoirs (New Exchequer Dam)	6,150,000		6,150,000		6,150,000		6,150,000	
(FC)	Majave River Reservoir (West Fork)		500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000
(N)	Monterey Harbor		90,000		90,000		90,000		90,000
(FC)	Mormon Slough		75,000		75,000		75,000		75,000
(MP)	New Melones Reservoir		1,000,000	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(N)	Noyo River and Harbor (mooring basin)						45,000		45,000
(N)	Oakland Harbor	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Oroville Reservoir	14,840,000		12,830,000		14,840,000		12,830,000	
(N)	Port San Luis (not authorized)						80,000		80,000
(FC)	Redwood Creek	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River bank protection	3,450,000		3,450,000		3,450,000		3,450,000	
(BE)	Santa Cruz County (reimbursement)	130,000		130,000		130,000		130,000	
(FC)	Santa Paula Creek				75,000		75,000		75,000
(BE)	Surfside-Sunset and Newport Beach (reimbursement)	1,367,000		1,367,000		1,367,000		1,367,000	
(FC)	Walnut Creek	3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
	Colorado:								
(FC)	Chatfield Reservoir		300,000				300,000		300,000
(FC)	Trinidad Reservoir	1,043,000		1,500,000		1,043,000		1,043,000	
	Connecticut:								
(FC)	Ansonia-Derby		352,000		352,000		352,000		352,000
(FC)	Black Rock Reservoir	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Colebrook River Reservoir	3,200,000		3,200,000		3,200,000		3,200,000	
(FC)	Hop Brook Reservoir	2,100,000		2,100,000		2,100,000		2,100,000	
(FC)	Mystic		60,000		60,000		60,000		60,000
(FC)	New London Barrier		170,000		170,000		170,000		170,000
(FC)	Stamford	2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000	
(FC)	Sucker Brook Reservoir	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC)	West Thompson Reservoir	1,065,000		1,065,000		1,065,000		1,065,000	

Construction, general, fiscal year 1966—Continued

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1966		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
(1)	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
Delaware:								
Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.)								
(N) Inland Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay (Chesapeake and Delaware Canal) pt. II, Delaware and Maryland	$16,400,000		$16,400,000		$16,400,000		$16,400,000	
Florida:								
(N) Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(N) Apalachicola River channel improvement	350,000		350,000		350,000		350,000	
(N) Canaveral Harbor	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC) Central and southern Florida	13,000,000		13,000,000		14,000,000		14,000,000	
(N) Cross Florida Barge Canal	10,000,000		10,000,000		10,000,000		10,000,000	
(FC) Four River Basins		$130,000		$130,000	750,000	$130,000	880,000	
(N) Intracoastal Waterway: Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River	1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000	
(N) Key West Harbor		52,000		52,000		52,000		$52,000
(BE) Palm Beach County, Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet (reimbursement)	10,000		10,000		10,000		10,000	
(N) Palm Beach Harbor	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
(N) Tampa Harbor, Ybor Channel	950,000		950,000		950,000		950,000	
Georgia:								
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(MP) Carters Dam	10,000,000		10,000,000		10,000,000		10,000,000	
(MP) Lazer Creek Dam (not authorized)						300,000		300,000
(MP) Spewrell Bluff Dam		150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(MP) West Point Reservoir, Ala. and Ga	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
Hawaii:								
(N) Hilo Harbor		230,000		230,000		230,000		230,000
(N) Honolulu Harbor (not authorized)						75,000		75,000
(N) Kawaihae Harbor (not authorized)						100,000		100,000
(FC) Kawainui Swamp	610,000		610,000		610,000		610,000	
(BE) Waikiki Beach (not authorized)						56,000		
Idaho:								
(FC) Blackfoot Reservoir		44,000		44,000		44,000		44,000
(MP) Dworshak (Bruces Eddy) Reservoir	11,000,000		11,000,000		11,000,000		11,000,000	
(FC) Heise-Roberts extension	100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000	
(FC) Portneuf River and Marsh Creek	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC) Ririe Reservoir		300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000
Illinois:								
(BA) Calumet River, bridges	2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
(N) Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind.:								
(a) 27-foot depth in river channel and Lake Calumet (1962 act)	3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000	
(b) 29-foot approach channel, 28-foot outer harbor (1960 act)	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC) Carlyle Reservoir	7,000,000		7,000,000		7,000,000		7,000,000	
(R) Chicago Harbor (breakwater)	355,000		355,000		335,000		335,000	
(N) Chicago Harbor (1962 act)	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
(FC) Columbia Drainage and Levee Districts No. 3		45,000		45,000		45,000		45,000
(FC) East St. Louis and vicinity	1,371,000		1,371,000		1,371,000		1,371,000	
(FC) England Pond levee		22,000	100,000		100,000		100,000	
(FC) Harrisonville and Ivy Landing Drainage and Levee District				50,000		50,000		50,000
(FC) Henderson County Drainage District No. 1	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC) Henderson County Drainage District No. 2	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(N) Horse Island and Crescent Bridge (Mississippi River), Illinois and Iowa	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC) Hunt Drainage District and Lima Lake Drainage District	100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000	
(N) Illinois Waterway Calumet-Sag modification, part I, Illinois and Indiana	6,500,000		6,500,000		6,500,000		6,500,000	
(FC) Indian Grave Drainage District	100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000	
Island levee, Illinois and Indiana. (See Indiana.)								
(N) Kaskaskia River (navigation)			1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC) Levee District 23, between Cowden and Vandalia, Kaskaskia River (inactive)						25,000		
(FC) Lincoln Reservoir (not authorized)						100,000		100,000
(N) Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.:								
(a) Regulating works	1,500,000		1,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
(b) Chain of Rocks	391,000		391,000		391,000		391,000	
(N) Mound City lock and dam, Illinois and Kentucky		160,000		160,000		160,000		160,000
(FC) Mount Carmel	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC) New Athens	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
(FC) Oakley Reservoir		300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000
(FC) Prairie du Pont Levee and Sanitary District		43,000		43,000		43,000		43,000
(FC) Rend Lake Reservoir	3,752,000		3,752,000		3,752,000		3,752,000	
(FC) Rochester and McClearys Bluff levee	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
(FC) Rock Island		75,000		75,000		75,000		75,000
(FC) Russell and Allison levee (deferred)		25,000		25,000		25,000		25,000
(FC) Saline River and tributaries		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC) Shelbyville Reservoir	5,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000	
(N) Smithland (Dog Island) lock and dam, Illinois and Kentucky (not authorized)						150,000		150,000
(FC) Sny Island Levee and Drainage District	1,100,000		1,100,000		1,100,000		1,100,000	
(FC) South Quincy Drainage and Levee District	100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000	
(FC) Subdistrict No. 1 of Drainage Union No. 1 and Bay Island Levee and Drainage District	657,000		657,000		657,000		657,000	
(FC) The Sny Basin	815,000		815,000		815,000		815,000	
(FC) Tri-Pond levee	350,000		350,000		350,000		350,000	
Indiana:								
(FC) Aurora (deferred)		30,000		30,000		30,000		30,000
(FC) Brookville Reservoir	1,730,000		1,730,000		1,730,000		1,730,000	
Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)								
(N) Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	14,400,000		14,400,000		14,400,000		14,400,000	
(FC) Evansville	1,460,000		1,460,000		1,460,000		1,460,000	
(FC) Grandview (deferred)		15,000		15,000		15,000		15,000
(FC) Greenfield Bayou levee						50,000		50,000

Construction, general, fiscal year 1966—Continued

	Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1966		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
		Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
	(1)								
	Indiana—Continued								
(FC)	Huntington Reservoir	$4,600,000		$4,600,000		$4,600,000		$4,600,000	
	Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modification, part I, Illinois and Indiana. (See Illinois.)								
(FC)	Indianapolis (Warfleigh section) (deferred)				$70,000		$70,000		$70,000
(FC)	Island levee, Indiana and Illinois					50,000			
(FC)	Lafayette Reservoir (not authorized)						150,000		150,000
(FC)	Levee unit 5, Wabash River	1,600,000		1,600,000		1,600,000		1,600,000	
(FC)	Mississinewa Reservoir	7,300,000		7,300,000		7,300,000		7,300,000	
(N)	Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000	
(FC)	Orleans (deferred)		$10,000		10,000		10,000		10,000
(FC)	Patoka Reservoir (not authorized)						125,000		125,000
(FC)	Salamonie Reservoir	6,200,000		6,200,000		6,200,000		6,200,000	
(N)	Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	6,200,000		6,200,000		6,200,000		6,200,000	
	Iowa:								
(FC)	Coralville Reservoir, Mehaffey Bridge	628,000		628,000		628,000		628,000	
(FC)	Des Moines	350,000		350,000		350,000		350,000	
(FC)	Dubuque		150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Green Bay Levee and Drainage District No. 2	835,000		835,000		835,000		835,000	
(FC)	Guttenberg		70,000		70,000		70,000		70,000
	Horse Island and Crescent Bridge, Mississippi River, Ill. and Iowa. (See Illinois.)								
(FC)	Indian Creek Dam	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Iowa River Flint Creek Levee District No. 16	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Marshalltown (not authorized)						50,000		50,000
(FC)	Missouri River agricultural levess, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska	2,500,000		2,500,000		2,700,000		2,700,000	
(N)	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska:								
	(a) Sioux City, Iowa, to Omaha, Nebr	2,900,000		2,900,000		3,500,000		3,500,000	
	(b) Omaha, Nebr., to Kansas City	4,200,000		4,200,000		4,800,000		4,800,000	
	(c) Kansas City to the mouth	2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000	
(FC)	Rathbun Reservoir	6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000	
(FC)	Red Rock Reservoir	15,000,000		15,000,000		15,000,000		15,000,000	
(FC)	Saylorville Reservoir	3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000	
	Kansas:								
(FC)	Atchison	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Big Hill Reservoir		131,000		131,000		131,000		131,000
(FC)	Clinton Reservoir		400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000
(FC)	Cow Creek, Hutchinson		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Elk City Reservoir	3,862,000		3,862,000		3,862,000		3,862,000	
(FC)	Fort Scott Reservoir		200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Grove Reservoir		75,000		75,000		75,000		75,000
(FC)	Hillsdale Reservoir (deferred)						10,000		10,000
(FC)	Kansas City, Kans. (1962 modification)		200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Lawrence	1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000	
(FC)	Marion Reservoir	5,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,0000	
(FC)	Marysville	902,000		902,000		902,000		902,000	
(FC)	Melvern Reservoir					750,000		750,000	
(FC)	Merriam	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Milford Reservoir	6,500,000		6,500,000		6,500,000		6,500,000	
	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
(FC)	Osawatomie	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Perry Reservoir	13,000,000		13,000,000		13,000,000		13,000,000	
(FC)	Topeka	2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
	Kentucky:								
(MP)	Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn	9,000,000		9,000,000		9,000,000		9,000,000	
(FC)	Booneville Reservoir		150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
	Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)								
(FC)	Carr Fork Reservoir	2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000	
(FC)	Cave Run Reservoir	3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC)	Eagle Creek Reservoir		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Fishtrap Reservoir	5,500,000		5,500,000		5,500,000		5,500,000	
(FC)	Frankfort, North Frankfort area	100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000	
(FC)	Grayson Reservoir	6,950,000		6,950,000		6,950,000		6,950,000	
(FC)	Green River Reservoir	5,600,000		5,600,000		5,600,000		5,600,000	
(MP)	Laurel River Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
(FC)	Ludlow-Bromley (deferred)		20,000		20,000		20,000		20,000
	Mound City lock and dam, Illinois and Kentucky. (See Illinois.)								
	Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)								
(FC)	Red River Reservoir		105,000		105,000		105,000		105,000
	Smithland lock and dam, Illinois and Kentucky (not authorized). (See Illinois.)								
(FC)	Sturgis	170,000		170,000		710,000		170,000	
	Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)								
	Louisiana:								
(N)	Aquatic plant control, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Bayou Lafourche and Lafourche Jump Waterway	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(BA)	Berwick Bay Bridge	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(N)	Caddo Lake Dam (not authorized)						85,000		85,000
(N)	Calcasieu River and Pass	4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000	
(N)	Calcasieu River, saltwater barrier	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Campti Clarence area	500,000		500,000		1,234,000		1,234,000	
(FC)	East Point levee					300,000		300,000	
(N)	Freshwater Bayou	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Lake Pontchartrain (not authorized)						450,000		450,000
(N)	Mississippi River, Gulf Outlet	7,000,000		70,00,000		7,000,000		7,000,000	
(FC)	New Orleans to Venice hurricane protection (1962 act)	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
	Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. (See Arkansas.)								
	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)								
(N)	Red River navigation and bank stabilization						50,000		50,000

Construction, general, fiscal year 1966—Continued

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1966		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
(1)								
Maine:								
(N) Portland Harbor, 45-foot channel	$1,200,000	----------	$1,200,000	----------	$1,200,000	----------	$1,200,000	----------
Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H. (See New Hampshire.)								
Maryland:								
(N) Baltimore Harbor and Channels	3,600,000	----------	3,600,000	----------	3,600,000	----------	3,600,000	----------
(FC) Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va	----------	$450,000	----------	$450,000	----------	$450,000	----------	$450,000
Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md. (C. & D. Canal), pt. II. (See Delaware.)								
Massachusetts:								
(N) Boston Harbor, Chelsea River	1,135,000	----------	1,135,000	----------	1,135,000	----------	1,135,000	----------
(R) Cape Cod Canal, Bourne Bridge	232,000	----------	232,000	----------	232,000	----------	232,000	----------
(FC) Conant Brook Reservoir	1,125,000	----------	1,125,000	----------	1,125,000	----------	1,125,000	----------
(N) Marblehead Harbor	----------	----------	350,000	----------	350,000	----------	350,000	----------
(FC) New Bedford-Fairhaven and Acushnet Barrier	852,000	----------	852,000	----------	852,000	----------	852,000	----------
(N) Plymouth Harbor	300,000	----------	300,000	----------	300,000	----------	300,000	----------
(N) Provincetown Harbor	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	20,000	----------	20,000
(FC) Three Rivers	305,000	----------	305,000	----------	305,000	----------	305,000	----------
(FC) Westfield	500,000	----------	500,000	----------	500,000	----------	500,000	----------
Michigan:								
(N) Bayport Harbor (sec. 107 project)	(1)	----------	(1)	----------	(1)	----------	(1)	----------
(R) Charlevoix Harbor (piers and revetments)	600,000	----------	600,000	----------	600,000	----------	600,000	----------
(N) Great Lakes connecting channels	800,000	----------	800,000	----------	800,000	----------	800,000	----------
(FC) Kalamazoo River	----------	50,000	----------	50,000	----------	50,000	----------	50,000
(N) Leland Harbor	200,000	----------	200,000	----------	200,000	----------	200,000	----------
(R) Manistee Harbor (pier and revetment)	315,000	----------	315,000	----------	315,000	----------	315,000	----------
(R) Marquette Harbor	370,000	----------	370,000	----------	370,000	----------	370,000	----------
(R) Muskegon Harbor (breakwaters, piers, and revetments)	600,000	----------	600,000	----------	600,000	----------	600,000	----------
(N) New Buffalo Harbor	----------	20,000	200,000	----------	200,000	----------	200,000	----------
(N) New Poe lock, St. Marys River	10,000,000	----------	10,000,000	----------	10,000,000	----------	10,000,000	----------
(N) Point Lookout Harbor	----------	----------	----------	55,000	----------	55,000	----------	55,000
(FC) River Rouge	700,000	----------	700,000	----------	700,000	----------	700,000	----------
(FC) Saginaw River (flood control)	1,200,000	----------	1,200,000	----------	1,200,000	----------	1,200,000	----------
(N) Saginaw River (navigation)	400,000	----------	400,000	----------	400,000	----------	400,000	----------
(N) Saginaw River (not authorized)	----------	----------	----------	----------	440,000	----------	440,000	----------
Minnesota:								
(FC) Bigstone Lake-Whetstone River, Minn. and S. Dak. (not authorized)	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	100,000	----------	100,000
(FC) Mankato and North Mankato	----------	100,000	----------	100,000	----------	100,000	----------	100,000
(FC) Rushford	400,000	----------	400,000	----------	400,000	----------	400,000	----------
(FC) St. Paul and South St. Paul	2,000,000	----------	2,000,000	----------	2,000,000	----------	2,000,000	----------
(FC) Warroad River and Bull Dog Creek	----------	----------	----------	98,000	----------	98,000	----------	98,000
(FC) Winona	600,000	----------	600,000	----------	600,000	----------	6,00000	----------
Mississippi:								
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(FC) Jackson and East Jackson	1,500,000	----------	1,500,000	----------	1,500,000	----------	1,500,000	----------
(FC) Okatibbee Creek Reservoir	2,400,000	----------	2,400,000	----------	2,400,000	----------	2,400,000	----------
(FC) Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss. (See Alabama.)								
(FC) Tombigbee River and tributaries, Alabama and Mississippi	400,000	----------	400,000	----------	400,000	----------	400,000	----------
Missouri:								
(FC) Chariton River	1,100,000	----------	1,100,000	----------	1,500,000	----------	1,500,000	----------
(MP) Joanna Reservoir	----------	----------	1,000,000	----------	1,000,000	----------	1,000,000	----------
(MP) Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir	7,000,000	----------	7,000,000	----------	10,000,000	----------	8,500,000	----------
(FC) Meramec Park Reservoir	----------	600,000	----------	600,000	----------	600,000	----------	600,000
Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo. (See Illinois.)								
Missouri River agriculture levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
(FC) St. Louis	10,000,000	----------	10,000,000	----------	10,000,000	----------	10,000,000	----------
(MP) Stockton Reservoir	10,500,000	----------	10,500,000	----------	10,500,000	----------	10,500,000	----------
Montana:								
(FC) Great Falls	----------	150,000	----------	150,000	----------	150,000	----------	150,000
(MP) Libby Reservoir	7,500,000	----------	7,500,000	----------	7,500,000	----------	7,500,000	----------
Nebraska:								
(FC) Gering Valley	1,800,000	----------	1,800,000	----------	1,800,000	----------	1,800,000	----------
(FC) Little Papillion Creek	700,000	----------	700,000	----------	700,000	----------	700,000	----------
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
(FC) Norfolk	1,300,000	----------	1,300,000	----------	1,300,000	----------	1,300,000	----------
(FC) Salt Creek and tributaries	2,000,000	----------	2,000,000	----------	2,000,000	----------	2,000,000	----------
Nevada:								
(FC) Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev	----------	100,000	----------	100,000	----------	131,000	----------	131,000
New Hampshire:								
(N) Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H.	2,000,000	----------	2,000,000	----------	2,000,000	----------	2,000,000	----------
New Jersey:								
(BE) Atlantic City (reimbursement)	200,000	----------	200,000	----------	200,000	----------	200,000	----------
(N) Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (anchorages), Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania	4,000,000	----------	4,000,000	----------	4,000,000	----------	4,000,000	----------
(FC) Elizabeth River (not authorized)	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	75,000	----------	75,000
(R) New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway, Point Pleasant Canal	400,000	----------	400,000	----------	400,000	----------	400,000	----------
New York and New Jersey Channels, Kill Van Kull entrance, New York and New Jersey (not authorized). (See New York.)								
(FC) Raritan and Sandy Hook Bays	900,000	----------	900,000	----------	900,000	----------	900,000	----------
(MP) Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa., N.J., and N.Y	----------	1,000,000	----------	600,000	----------	1,000,000	----------	1,000,000
New Mexico:								
(FC) Alamogordo diversion channel	500,000	----------	500,000	----------	500,000	----------	500,000	----------
(FC) Albuquerque	3,000,000	----------	3,000,000	----------	3,000,000	----------	3,000,000	----------
(FC) Cochiti Reservoir	1,500,000	----------	1,500,000	----------	1,500,000	----------	1,500,000	----------
(FC) Galisteo Reservoir	2,000,000	----------	2,000,000	----------	2,000,000	----------	2,000,000	----------
(FC) Las Cruces	----------	----------	----------	----------	500,000	----------	----------	----------
(FC) Rio Grande Floodway, Espanola Valley unit	----------	60,000	----------	60,000	----------	60,000	----------	60,000

See footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1966—Continued

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1966		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
(1)	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
New York:								
Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y. (See Pennsylvania.)								
(FC) Davenport Center Reservoir						$60,000		
(BE) Fire Island Inlet to Jones Inlet (1962 act)		$225,000		$225,000		225,000		$225,000
(FC) Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point	$1,000,000		$1,000,000		$1,000,000		$1,000,000	
(R) Glen Cove Breakwater (minor rehabilitation)	[2] (125,000)		[2] (125,000)		[2] (125,000)		[2] (125,000)	
(N) Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(N) Great Sodus Bay Harbor		29,000		29,000		29,000		29,000
(N) Hudson River, New York City to Albany	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
(N) Irondequoit Bay Harbor				50,000		50,000		50,000
(FC) Ithaca, Cayuga Inlet	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
(FC) Lackawanna	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC) Lake Chautauqua and Chadakoin River		75,000		75,000		75,000		75,000
(N) Little Neck Bay	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
(R) Little Sodus Bay (piers)	510,000		510,000		510,000		510,000	
(N) New York-New Jersey Channels, Kill Van Kull entrance, New York and New Jersey (not authorized)					300,000		300,000	
(FC) Nichols		30,000		30,000		30,000		30,000
(FC) North Ellenville		80,000		80,000		80,000		80,000
(N) Oswego Harbor (1962 act)	690,000		690,000		690,000		690,000	
(FC) Rosendale	150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000	
(FC) Salamanca			200,000		200,000		200,000	
(FC) Staten Island, Fort Wadsworth to Arthur Kill (not authorized)						100,000		100,000
Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa., N.J., and N.Y. (See New Jersey.)								
North Carolina:								
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(FC) Falls Reservoir (not authorized)						100,000		100,000
(N) Masonboro Inlet jetties	772,000		772,000		772,000		772,000	
(FC) New Hope Reservoir		515,000		515,000	485,000	515,000		515,000
(N) Rollinson Channel	250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000	
(N) Wilmington Harbor, 38- and 40-foot depth (1962 act)	400,000		1,400,000		1,400,000		1,400,000	
North Dakota:								
(FC) Bowman Heley Reservoir	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC) Missouri River, Garrison Dam to Oahe Reservoir	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See South Dakota.)								
Ohio:								
(FC) Alum Creek Reservoir		150,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(N) Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	9,600,000		9,600,000		9,600,000		9,600,000	
(FC) Big Darby Creek Reservoir	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC) Buck Creek Reservoir	1,650,000		1,650,000		1,650,000		1,650,000	
(FC) Caesar Creek Reservoir		156,000		156,000		156,000		156,000
(N) Cleveland Harbor: Bridge replacement, widening Cuyahoga and Old Rivers (1958 act)	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(N) Conneaut Harbor	2,900,000		2,900,000		2,900,000		2,900,000	
(FC) Deer Creek Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC) East Fork Reservoir		131,000		131,000		131,000		131,000
(FC) Fremont		160,000		160,000		160,000		160,000
(N) Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N) Lorain Harbor	2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000	
(FC) Mill Creek Reservoir, Scioto River Basin				175,000		175,000		175,000
(N) Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	10,500,000		10,500,000		10,500,000		10,500,000	
(FC) Salt Creek Reservoir		120,000		120,000		120,000		120,000
Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa. (See Pennsylvania.)								
(FC) West Branch Reservoir, Mahoning River	2,147,000		2,147,000		2,147,000		2,147,000	
(FC) Youngstown, Crab Creek	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
Oklahoma:								
Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)								
(MP) Broken Bow Reservoir	7,500,000		7,500,000		7,500,000		7,500,000	
(FC) Candy Reservoir						40,000		
(FC) Copan Reservoir		200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(FC) Hugo Reservoir		200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(FC) Kaw Reservoir		164,000		164,000	500,000	164,000	664,000	
(MP) Keystone Reservoir	5,500,000		5,500,000		5,500,000		5,500,000	
(FC) Lukfata Reservoir		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC) Optima Reservoir					750,000		750,000	
(FC) Pine Creek Reservoir	2,900,000		2,900,000		2,900,000		2,900,000	
(MP) Robert S. Kerr (Short Mountain) lock and dam	18,100,000		18,100,000		18,100,000		18,100,000	
(FC) Skiatook Reservoir		200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(FC) Waurika Reservoir		75,000		75,000		75,000		75,000
(N) Webbers Falls lock and dam	8,300,000		8,300,000		8,300,000		8,300,000	
Oregon:								
(FC) Applegate Reservoir		250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000
(FC) Blue River Reservoir	8,000,000		8,000,000		8,000,000		8,000,000	
(FC) Cascadia Reservoir		62,000		62,000		62,000		62,000
(N) Chetco River (not authorized)						30,000		
(N) Columbia River and lower Willamette River, 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington	4,300,000		4,300,000		4,300,000		4,300,000	
(N) Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington		75,000		75,000		75,000		75,000
(R) Columbia River at the mouth (south jetty), Oregon and Washington	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC) Elk Creek Reservoir		150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(FC) Fall Creek Reservoir	5,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000	
(FC) Gate Creek Reservoir		60,000		60,000		60,000		60,000
(MP) Green Peter Reservoir	21,400,000		21,400,000		21,400,000		21,400,000	
(MP) John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	75,000,000		75,000,000		75,000,000		75,000,000	
(FC) John Day River		10,000		10,000		10,000		10,000
(MP) Lost Creek Reservoir		550,000		550,000		550,000		550,000
(FC) Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
(FC) McKenzie River, Walterville (Public Law 685, small flood control)	(1)		(1)		(1)		(1)	

See footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1966—Continued

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1966		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
(1)	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
Oregon—Continued								
(N) Port Orford (not authorized)						$20,000		$20,000
(R) Rogue River (north jetty)	$500,000		$500,000		$500,000		$500,000	
(FC) Scappoose Drainage District		$20,000		$20,000		20,000		20,000
(FC) Shelton Ditch		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(N) Siuslaw River and Bar		20,000		20,000		20,000		20,000
(MP) The Dalles lock and dam, Oregon and Washington (additional power units)		500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000
(R) Tillamook Bay and Harbor	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC) Willamette River Basin bank protection	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
(N) Yaquina Bay and Harbor	4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000	
Pennsylvania:								
(FC) Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y	15,900,000		15,900,000		15,900,000		15,900,000	
(FC) Aylesworth Creek Reservoir		80,000		80,000		80,000		80,000
(FC) Beltzville Reservoir	1,400,000		1,000,000		1,400,000		1,400,000	
(FC) Blanchard Reservoir	4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000	
(FC) Blue Marsh Reservoir		300,000		200,000		300,000		300,000
(FC) Chartiers Creek (not authorized)						100,000		100,000
(FC) Curwensville Reservoir	2,263,000		2,263,000		2,263,000		2,263,000	
(N) Dam 4, Monongahela River	5,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000	
Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.)								
(FC) Elkland	259,000		259,000		259,000		259,000	
(N) Erie Harbor (1962 Mod.)	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC) Latrobe	1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000	
(N) Maxwell locks and dam, Monongahela River	1,918,000		1,918,000		1,918,000		1,918,000	
(FC) Muddy Creek Reservoir		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
Prompton Reservoir (modification)		150,000				150,000		150,000
(FC) Raystown Reservoir		560,000		560,000		560,000		560,000
(FC) Scranton	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC) Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa	6,100,000		6,100,000		6,100,000		6,100,000	
(FC) Tioga Hammond Reservoir		400,000		500,000		500,000		500,000
Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa., N.J., and N.Y. (See New Jersey.)								
Trexler Reservoir		200,000				200,000		200,000
(FC) Turtle Creek	3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000	
(FC) Union City Reservoir	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC) Woodcock Creek Reservoir		120,000		120,000		120,000		120,000
Rhode Island:								
(FC) Fox Point Barrier	1,440,000		1,440,000		1,440,000		1,440,000	
(FC) Lower Woonsocket	2,400,000		2,400,000		2,400,000		2,400,000	
(FC) Narragansett pier, hurricane barrier	100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000	
(FC) Point Judith, hurricane barrier		160,000		160,000		160,000		160,000
(N) Providence River and Harbor (not authorized)						150,000		150,000
South Carolina:								
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
South Dakota:								
(MP) Big Bend Dam-Lake Sharpe	7,000,000		7,000,000		7,000,000		7,000,000	
(FC) Big Stone Lake-Whetstone River, Minn. and S. Dak. (not authorized). (See Minnesota.)								
(FC) Cottonwood Springs Reservoir						85,000		85,000
(MP) Fort Randall Dam-Lake Francis Case	2,497,000		2,497,000		2,497,000		2,497,000	
(MP) Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak	5,700,000		5,700,000		5,700,000		5,700,000	
Tennessee:								
Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn. (See Kentucky.)								
(MP) Cordell Hull lock and dam	8,000,000		8,000,000		8,000,000		8,000,000	
(MP) J. Percy Priest Reservoir	15,000,000		15,500,000		15,500,000		15,500,000	
(BA) Woodland Street Bridge, Nashville, Tenn	224,000		224,000		224,000		224,000	
Texas:								
(FC) Abilene channel improvement						150,000		150,000
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(FC) Bardwell Reservoir	3,687,000		3,687,000		3,687,000		3,687,000	
(R) Brazos Island Harbor (jetties)	250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000	
(N) Brazos Island Harbor, widen channel (1960 act)		90,000		90,000		90,000		90,000
(FC) Buffalo Bayou and tributaries	3,800,000		3,800,000		3,800,000		3,800,000	
(FC) Cooper Reservoir and Channels (Sulphur River)			750,000		750,000		750,000	
(FC) Fort Worth Floodway, Clear Fork extension	250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000	
(FC) Fort Worth Floodway, West Fork extension	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
(FC) Freeport and vicinity	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(R) Galveston Harbor (jetties)	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(N) Galveston Harbor and Channel, 36-foot project			800,000		800,000		800,000	
(N) Galveston Harbor and Channel, 40-foot project	3,300,000		3,300,000		3,300,000		3,300,000	
(N) Gulf Intracoastal Waterway: Channel to Palacios					800,000		800,000	
(N) Houston ship channel (40-foot project)	2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000	
(FC) Lake Kemp Reservoir		290,000		290,000		290,000		290,000
(FC) Lavon Reservoir modification and channel improvement		230,000		230,000		230,000		230,000
(N) Matagorda ship channel, 36- and 38-foot channels	2,831,000		2,831,000		2,831,000		2,831,000	
(FC) Pat Mayse Reservoir	5,500,000		5,500,000		5,500,000		5,500,000	
(R) Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (jetties)	1,600,000		1,600,000		1,600,000		1,600,000	
(FC) Port Arthur and vicinity (hurricane flood protection)	750,000		750,000		750,000		750,000	
Red River levees and bank stabilization, below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)								
(N) Sabine-Neches Waterway 40 feet and channel to Echo	2,700,000		2,700,000		2,700,000		2,700,000	
(MP) Sam Rayburn (McGee Bend) Dam	3,773,000		3,773,000		3,773,000		3,773,000	
(FC) San Antonio Channel	1,100,000		1,100,000		1,100,000		1,100,000	
(FC) San Gabriel River tributary to Brazos River		500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000
(FC) Somerville Reservoir	6,500,000		6,500,000		6,500,000		6,500,000	
(FC) Stillhouse Hollow Dam	4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000	
(FC) Texas City, hurricane protection	4,100,000		4,100,000		4,100,000		4,100,000	
(N) Texas City Channel 40-foot project	750,000		750,000		750,000		750,000	
(FC) Vince and Little Vince Bayous	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(N) Wallisville Reservoir, Trinity River			1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000	
Vermont:								
(FC) Bennington (deferred)		15,000		15,000		15,000		15,000
(FC) Gaysville Dam (deferred)		30,000		30,000		30,000		30,000
Virginia:								
(FC) Gathright Reservoir		300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000
(N) Hampton Roads (not authorized)					3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC) John W. Flannagan (Pound) Reservoir	2,625,000		2,625,000		2,625,000		2,625,000	
(N) Lynnhaven Inlet and Bay	970,000		970,000		970,000		970,000	
(FC) North Fork of Pound Reservoir	1,058,000		1,058,000		1,058,000		1,058,000	
(BE) Virginia Beach (reimbursement)	75,000		75,000		75,000		75,000	

Construction, general, fiscal year 1966—Continued

Construction, general, State and project (1)	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1966		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
Washington:								
(R) Chief Joseph Dam (Stilling Basin)	$600,000		$600,000		$600,000		$600,000	
(FC) Colfax	720,000		720,000		720,000		720,000	
Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
Columbia River and lower Willamette River, 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
(R) Grays Harbor and Chehalis River (south jetty)	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
(FC) Kalama River south area		$50,000		$50,000		$50,000		$50,000
(N) Kingston Harbor	405,000		405,000		405,000		405,000	
(MP) Little Goose lock and dam	14,000,000		14,000,000		14,000,000		14,000,000	
Lower Columbia River bank protection. Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
(MP) Lower Granite lock and dam	14,000,000		14,000,000		14,000,000		14,000,000	
(MP) Lower Monumental lock and dam	47,000,000		47,000,000		47,000,000		47,000,000	
(FC) Skagit River, Avon bypass		30,000		30,000		30,000		30,000
(N) Tacoma Harbor	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
The Dalles lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
(FC) Wahkiakum Diking District No. 4		15,000		15,000		15,000		15,000
(FC) Washougal area	727,000		727,000		727,000		727,000	
(FC) Wynoochee River Reservoir		500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000
West Virginia:								
(FC) Beach Fork Reservoir		180,000		180,000		180,000		180,000
Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va. (See Maryland.)								
(FC) Buckhannon	650,000		650,000		650,000		650,000	
(FC) East Lynn Reservoir	4,100,000		4,100,000		4,100,000		4,100,000	
Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
(FC) Justice Reservoir		418,000		418,000		418,000		418,000
(N) Opekiska lock and dam	3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
(FC) Summersville Reservoir	2,939,000		2,939,000		2,939,000		2,939,000	
Wisconsin:								
(FC) Eau Galle River, Spring Valley	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
(N) Green Bay Harbor (1962 act)	350,000		350,000		350,000		350,000	
(R) Kewaunee Harbor (south pier)	470,000		470,000		470,000		470,000	
(FC) La Farge Reservoir and Channel improvement, Kickapoo River		300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000
(N) Milwaukee Harbor (1962 act)	1,400,000		1,400,000		1,400,000		1,400,000	
(R) Milwaukee Harbor (breakwater)	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
(N) Saxon Harbor	220,000		220,000		220,000		220,000	
Wyoming:								
(FC) Sheridan	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
Miscellaneous:								
(FC) Emergency bank protection	250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000	
(FC) Small projects for flood control and related purposes not requiring specific legislation (sec. 205)	6,000,000		6,000,000		7,000,000		6,500,000	
(FC) Snagging and clearing	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(N) Small navigation projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to $200,000 (sec. 107)	1,500,000		1,500,000		2,000,000		1,750,000	
(BE) Small beach erosion control projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to $400,000 (sec. 103)	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Recreation facilities, completed projects	5,000,000		5,175,000		5,175,000		5,175,000	
Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(R) Minor rehabilitation projects (costing up to $400,000)	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Employees compensation	231,000		231,000		231,000		231,000	
Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages	−80,075,000		−90,075,000		−80,075,000		−90,075,000	
Grand total, construction. general	952,948,000	20,715,000	954,670,000	19,066,000	985,632,000	23,467,000		
	(973,663,000)		(973,736,000)		(1,009,099,000)			

---

[1] Project included in tentative allocation of funds for fiscal year 1966.

[2] Included in budget request under minor rehabilitation.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, for Mississippi River and tributaries, the conference report provides $84,942,500, which is $4,882,500 below the amount approved by the Senate; $7,882,500 above the budget; and $7,080,500 above the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1965.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a tabulation explaining the action of the conferees on the appropriation for flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, fiscal year 1966

Project (1)	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1966 (2)	House allowance (3)	Senate allowance (4)	Conference allowance (5)
1. General investigations:				
(a) Examinations and surveys	$149,000	$209,000	$209,000	$209,000
(b) Collection and study of basic data	101,000	101,000	101,000	101,000
Subtotal, general investigations	250,000	310,000	310,000	310,000
2. Construction and planning:				
Mississippi River levees	3,635,000	3,635,000	4,500,000	4,035,000
Channel improvement	26,200,000	26,700,000	30,000,000	28,082,500
Memphis Harbor	900,000	900,000	900,000	900,000
Old River control	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
St. Francis Basin	3,700,000	4,200,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
West Tennessee tributaries	725,000	965,000	965,000	965,000
Lower Arkansas	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Tensas Basin:				
Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, etc	475,000	800,000	700,000	700,000
Red River backwater	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000

Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, fiscal year 1966—Continued

Project (1)	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1966 (2)	House allowance (3)	Senate allowance (4)	Conference allowance (5)
2. Construction and planning—Continued				
Yazoo Basin:				
Sardis Reservoir	$70,000	$70,000	$70,000	$70,000
Enid Reservoir	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000
Arkabutla Reservoir	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000
Grenada Reservoir	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000
Greenwood	215,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
Upper auxiliary channels		50,000	50,000	50,000
Main stem	450,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
Tributaries	885,000	950,000	950,000	950,000
Big Sunflower River, etc	325,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
Yazoo backwater	1,950,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
Lower Red River			400,000	400,000
Atchafalaya Basin	9,000,000	9,000,000	13,000,000	11,000,000
Subtotal, construction and planning	51,710,000	54,350,000	63,115,000	58,732,500
Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages	−1,600,000	−1,600,000	−1,600,000	−1,600,000
Total, construction and planning	50,110,000	52,750,000	61,515,000	57,132,500
3. Maintenance	26,700,000	27,000,000	28,000,000	27,500,000
Grand total	77,060,000	80,060,000	89,825,000	84,942,500

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, with respect to title II—Bureau of Reclamation, Construction and Rehabilitation, the conference bill provides $196,661,500, the amount allowed by the House for this item. The conference amount is $3,988,500 below the budget and $447,385 above the appropriation for 1965.

Although the amount is identical, there are some program changes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a tabulation showing the action of the conferees on this item.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
Advance planning	$300,000	$300,000	$600,000	$300,000
Eklutna project, Alaska	1,170,000	1,170,000	1,170,000	1,170,000
Delivery of water to Mexico	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
Colorado River front and levee system, Arizona-California	4,432,000	4,432,000	4,432,000	4,432,000
Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie, Arizona-California-Nevada	26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000
Parker-Davis project, Arizona-California-Nevada	847,500	847,500	847,500	847,500
Central Valley project, California	79,240,000	79,140,000	79,140,000	79,140,000
Denver office building, Colorado	2,965,000	2,965,000	2,965,000	2,965,000
Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado	10,030,000	10,030,000	10,030,000	10,030,000
Mann Creek project, Idaho	1,817,000	1,817,000	1,817,000	1,817,000
Washoe project, Nevada-California	562,000	562,000	562,000	562,000
Arbuckle project, Oklahoma	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
Baker project, upper division, Oregon	2,550,000	2,550,000	2,550,000	2,550,000
Crooked River project extension, Oregon	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000
Rogue River Basin project, Talent division, Agate Dam and Reservoir, Oreg	900,000	900,000	900,000	900,000
Canadian River project, Texas	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000
Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Mercedes division, Texas	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
Dixie project, Utah	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Weber Basin project, Utah	4,129,000	4,129,000	4,129,000	4,129,000
Chief Joseph Dam project, Okanogan-Similkameen division, Oroville-Tonasket unit, Washington	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Columbia Basin project, Washington	6,800,000	9,300,000	9,300,000	9,300,000
Spokane Valley project, Washington	2,860,000	2,860,000	2,860,000	2,860,000
Drainage and minor construction	1,091,000	1,091,000	2,041,000	2,041,000
Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects	935,000	3,660,000	3,660,000	3,660,000
Subtotal	173,178,500	178,303,500	179,553,500	179,253,500
Missouri River Basin project:				
Ainsworth unit, Nebraska	2,380,000	2,380,000	2,380,000	2,380,000
Almena unit, Kansas	200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
Farwell unit, Nebraska	1,720,000	1,720,000	1,720,000	1,720,000
Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska	440,000	440,000	440,000	440,000
Glen Elder unit, Kansas	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000
Transmission division	9,094,000	9,094,000	9,094,000	9,094,000
Yellowtail unit, Montana-Wyoming	10,500,000	10,500,000	10,500,000	10,500,000
Drainage and minor construction	1,017,335	1,017,335	1,017,335	1,017,335
Investigations	2,704,000	2,704,000	3,657,000	3,478,000
Subtotal, Missouri River Basin project	45,055,335	46,055,335	47,008,335	46,829,335
Other Department of the Interior agencies	3,583,000	3,469,500	3,469,500	3,469,500
Total, Missouri River Basin project	48,638,335	49,524,835	50,477,835	50,298,835
Subtotal, construction and rehabilitation	221,816,835	227,828,335	230,031,335	229,552,335
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays	−21,166,835	−31,166,835	−33,369,835	−32,890,835
Total, construction and rehabilitation	200,650,000	196,661,500	196,661,500	196,661,500

TITLE III—ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as to title III, very little change was made by the conferees. As Senators know, that title deals with the Atomic Energy Commission.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a table showing the details of the amount agreed to by the conferees for operating expenses of the Atomic Energy Commission.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Operating expenses

Program	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate committee recommendation	Conference allowance
Raw materials program	$212,770,000	$210,000,000	$210,000,000	$210,000,000
Special nuclear materials program	378,625,000	376,000,000	376,000,000	376,000,000
Weapons program	705,400,000	702,400,000	702,400,000	702,400,000
Reactor development program:				
Civilian power reactors	71,800,000	67,300,000	70,300,000	69,300,000
Cooperative power reactor demonstration program	33,800,000	33,800,000	33,800,000	33,800,000
Euratom	5,900,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
Merchant ship reactors	1,400,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Army power reactors	4,800,000	2,700,000	4,800,000	2,700,000
Naval propulsion reactors	96,550,000	96,550,000	96,550,000	96,550,000
Rocket propulsion reactors	84,100,000	84,100,000	84,100,000	84,100,000
Satellite and small power sources	70,500,000	52,500,000	54,500,000	53,500,000
General reactor technology	58,900,000	58,000,000	58,000,000	58,000,000

Operating expenses—Continued

Program	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate committee recommendation	Conference allowance
Reactor development program—Continued				
Advanced systems research and development	$32,500,000	$29,300,000	$29,300,000	$29,300,000
Nuclear safety	35,450,000	34,450,000	34,450,000	34,450,000
Operational services	4,750,000	4,750,000	4,750,000	4,750,000
Total, reactor development program	500,450,000	471,450,000	478,550,000	474,450,000
Physical research program	239,000,000	236,000,000	239,000,000	236,000,000
Biology and medicine program	85,000,000	83,000,000	83,000,000	83,000,000
Training, education, and information program	16,850,000	15,780,000	15,780,000	15,780,000
Civilian applications of—				
Isotopes	12,800,000	11,000,000	12,800,000	11,900,000
Nuclear explosives	17,875,000	15,375,000	15,375,000	15,375,000
Communities	8,927,000	8,927,000	8,927,000	8,927,000
Program direction and administration	81,500,000	81,500,000	81,500,000	81,500,000
Security investigations	6,300,000	5,700,000	5,700,000	5,700,000
Cost of work for others	8,100,000	8,100,000	8,100,000	8,100,000
Total, accrued program costs	2,273,597,000	2,225,232,000	2,237,132,000	2,229,132,000
Change in selected resources	40,475,000	21,977,000	25,877,000	22,977,000
Gross obligations	2,314,072,000	2,247,209,000	2,263,009,000	2,252,109,000
Revenues applied	−46,625,000	−46,625,000	−46,625,000	−46,625,000
Net obligations	2,267,447,000	2,200,584,000	2,216,384,000	2,205,484,000
Unobligated balance, start of year	−36,447,000	−83,584,000	−83,584,000	−83,584,000
Appropriation	2,231,000,000	2,117,000,000	2,132,800,000	2,121,900,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the conference amount of $243,995,000 includes the Senate increase of $4,800,000 for the electron linear accelerator at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory and $1,200,000 for architect-engineer work for the Los Alamos meson physics facility. The Senate receded from its amendment of $250,000 for equipment for radioisotope and separations technology.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Title IV provides funds for the TVA, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Delaware River Basin Commission, administrative expenses for the accelerated public works program and for the Interoceanic Canal Commission.

I have already submitted to the Senate the table indicating exactly what was done as to each agency in that title.

Mr. President, I now move the adoption of the conference report.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 9220, which was read as follows:

In the House of Representatives, U.S.,
October 14, 1965.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 11 and 16 to the bill (H.R. 9220) entitled "An Act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes," and concur therein.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed, insert: "*Provided,* That the Bonneville Power Administration shall not supply power directly, or indirectly through any preference customer, to any phosphorous electric furnace plant in southern Idaho, Utah, or Wyoming".

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate amendment No. 17.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate amendment No. 17.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President——

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair recognizes the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. Is the Senate now operating under the 3-minute limitation in the morning hour?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** It is, but if the Senator wishes to bring up a privileged matter, the Chair will recognize him to do so.

Mr. STENNIS. I have a statement to make on another matter.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Mississippi.

ORGANIZED CAMPAIGN TO ENCOURAGE AND INSTRUCT YOUNG AMERICANS TO AVOID THE DRAFT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, several nights this week the Walter Cronkite CBS television network news program has carried a series of short films, or excerpts, which described an organized campaign to encourage and instruct young Americans to avoid the draft. It also described and presented interviews direct from some of the schools of instruction being conducted to teach young American men ways of evading service to their country. In addition, and more seriously, it showed the leaders of this organized effort are attempting to spread the philosophy that every American has the right to refuse to fight in any war or military action that he does not personally approve.

The leaders of this effort are encouraging a revolt against the military draft and are not only pledging not to serve themselves, but are asking that others join them in this shameful, and I think unlawful conspiracy to avoid military service.

There is talk now of a nationwide protest during which individuals will march in cities coast to coast so as to dramatize their disapproval and condemnation of our policy in Vietnam.

There are other reports that workshops are being held by the Students for a Democratic Society to devise ways to disrupt the necessary and normal operation of the draft system. It is reported that this organization has published a newsletter which has been sent to college campuses, in which there is listed a set of instructions on how to file as a conscientious objector. The purpose of this action, according to the report, is to jam the draft boards and to cause the Government to spend thousands of dollars in investigations and paperwork.

I am convinced such an action as described by CBS and in other reports is a Federal offense, punishable by fine or imprisonment.

I am sure the Columbia Broadcasting System presented this matter in good faith to call public attention to this deplorable and shameful activity on the part of those who have no regard for duty, honor, or their country. Regretfully, however, the individuals who are promoting this campaign thrive on publicity. The publicity of a nationwide television documentary gives them great encouragement and stimulation to continue their unwarranted and disgraceful campaign. The network took this film to Vietnam and showed it to a group of our men who are risking their lives there for their country in an active and hot war that is now our first line of defense.

These men who are on that battleline ought to hear more often from us that, under the circumstances of the case, regardless of how we might have gotten in there, we are in, that is the battleline, they are our boys, and they are our first line of defense until it is settled in a satisfactory manner, instead of having this kind of vehement protest and this kind of publicity that is trying to undermine the Selective Service System and its operations. Although it is a question of judgment, I think it is the gravest kind of misjudgment to be taking this publicity to our men who are over there and who are baring their breasts to the enemy.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **STENNIS**. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 2 additional minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **STENNIS**. Mr. President, I was greatly impressed with the immediate response of these men, as I saw it on television. They came out with a firm declaration of their sense of duty to the flag and to their country.

But this is bound to plant ideas in their minds and lessen their morale, and they will have a lessening of morale over there, if they have second thoughts over what we are permitting to go on here and advertising under such unfavorable circumstances.

As I have said, I am sure the network acted in good faith, but I question the judgment of the network officials who arranged for these films to be shown to our men in Vietnam while they are daily facing the enemy. It must have had the effect of undermining their morale. It must have been discouraging to them to know that there are in America people who are attempting to avoid military service. It must have given great satisfaction to those conducting this campaign to have their protests shown to Americans on battlefields.

I regret the necessity of my speaking on the floor of the Senate and thus giving further recognition and publicity to this movement to avoid public service. Now that it has come into the open and has been given nationwide publicity, I think it is imperative for the executive department through the Department of Justice or whatever agencies have jurisdiction, to immediately move to jerk this movement up by the roots and grind it to bits before it has the opportunity to spread further and to be nourished by further publicity.

AUTHORIZATION FOR LOAN OF NAVAL VESSELS TO FRIENDLY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7812) to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. **STENNIS**. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. **Russell** of Georgia, Mr. **Byrd** of Virginia, Mr. **Stennis**, Mr. **Symington**, Mr. **Saltonstall**, and Mrs. **Smith** conferees on the part of the Senate.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there further morning business?

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

On request of Mr. **Monroney**, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

TRADE IS BETTER THAN WAR

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, a successful businessman once said that a good deal is one which is good for both parties.

Businessmen in this country frequently ask each other, "How can we work together for mutual benefit?"

On the international scene, if countries can get together and trade for mutual benefit, perhaps they will be able to avoid mutual destruction.

Good commerce can mean a "good deal" to both sides.

I call attention of my colleagues to a recent editorial in the Scranton, Pa., Times. It discussed this country's first commercial trade mission to Poland and Rumania. These two so-called satellite countries, like Yugoslavia, have demonstrated increasing independence of Moscow.

Trade agreements will not only help American business and industry but also improve relations and develop better understanding. The editorial, which I ask to be inserted in the Record, states that the United States has "little to lose and much to gain" if the mission is successful.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Scranton, Pa., Times be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Times, Sept. 27 1965]

Trade With Communists

Almost from the beginning of the cold war the United States has sought to encourage Soviet satellite nations to try to achieve some degree of independence from Russia. Yugoslavia, with President Tito proclaiming his faith in communism but not exactly the Kremlin brand, was a model in this American experiment. Whether the effort has paid off to our benefit is a question that will be argued on both sides.

Now President Johnson has set out to woo two Soviet bloc states. This country's first commercial trade mission left recently for trade conferences with Communist leaders of Poland and Rumania. These two satellite nations have been demonstrating some independence of Moscow in recent months.

The President is said to feel that trade agreements will not only help American business and industry but that they will improve relations and develop a better understanding between the Communist countries and the United States. On the economic side, such agreements would mean American competition with the Western European nations now selling their goods to Poland and Rumania. Members of the mission when they return will acquaint American business groups with the possibilities for East European trade, citing both the obstacles and advantages. All things considered, it would appear that the United States has little to lose and much to gain if the mission is successful.

DESALTING OF WATER

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, scarcely a country in the world today is without a water problem of one kind or another.

The United States is working on desalting processes with many nations of the world. The possibilities for cooperation should be best, however, between two close neighbors—Mexico and the United States.

We were all heartened to hear that joint studies are being undertaken by Mexico and the United States aimed at eventual construction of a great nuclear water desalting plant.

It will serve the arid border regions of the Southwest: Sonora and Baha on the Mexican side and Arizona and California on the U.S. side.

A recent Philadelphia Inquirer editorial said:

> The administration should be congratulated for aligning itself with Mexico in a project with so much promise of mutual benefit and betterment for all mankind.

Because the editorial will be of general interest, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Oct. 5, 1965]

United States-Mexican Nuclear Water Plant

Over the years the United States and Mexico have devoted much energy and possibly millions of words to negotiations concerning water—sometimes with amicable results and often with neither party fully satisfied by the outcome. Now comes an agreement between the two nations which both sides ought to find completely acceptable.

We refer to the joint studies to be undertaken by Mexico and the United States aimed at eventual construction of a great nuclear water desalting plant to serve the arid border regions of the Southwest: Sonora and Baha on the Mexican side; Arizona and California on the U.S. side.

News of the project—announced at the opening of the first international symposium on water desalinization in Washington, D.C.—should impress delegates from many countries and guarantee they will take home an inspiring story of international cooperation.

The United States is working on desalinization with other nations. But the possibilities for international cooperation should be best of all between two close American neighbors with a mutual water shortage problem to solve.

There are many water experts who scoff at the economic feasibility of desalting seawater. But the long run facts argue powerfully against their doubts. More than four-fifths of the earth's surface is covered with water—of which 97 percent is too salty for human use. The tiny fraction of usable water, moreover, is being constantly and increasingly contaminated by the expanding civilization that depends upon it.

Desalinization—with other water purifying improvements—seems the most reasonable hope for satisfying future water requirements.

The administration should be congratulated for alining itself with Mexico in a project with so much promise of mutual benefit and betterment for all mankind.

NEW YORK TIMES EDITORIALS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, for about 3 weeks in September the New York Times was unable to publish, and, therefore, the excellent editorials which appear from time to time in that fine paper were not available to the general public.

I was particularly interested in obtaining copies of these editorials which appeared in the international edition.

Two of them deal with matters germane to the subjects discussed by the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy] in his excellent speech on Wednesday on the need to move forward with respect to greater international cooperation in the area of peace and disarmament.

I ask unanimous consent that the two editorials from the New York Times entitled "The Pope's Message," and "U Thant's Proposals," which deal with the problem of peacekeeping, be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, international edition, Oct. 6, 1965]

The Pope's Message

The address of Pope Paul VI to the United Nations General Assembly, the high point of his brief, historic trip to the United States, was a powerful and moving reminder to the nations of the world of the first principles and basic interests they hold in common.

The world has become a single city; the task now is to make it a single community. The General Assembly in which every nation, great and small, weak and powerful, has equal stature and an equal vote represents the first step toward the fulfillment of this task. The Assembly, as the Pope said, confers "an honored international citizenship" when it admits a country to membership. Only from a recognition of the integrity and rights of each national political community can grow the mutual respect needed as the basis of a single world community.

The Pope urged the United Nations to strive for universality. This implicit endorsement of the admission of Communist China and of other states now outside the international system was the closest he came to direct comment on immediate political issues. Even more significant, however, was his clearcut endorsement of "a world authority, able to act efficaciously on the juridical and political levels."

These words ought to strike home to many Americans, both within and without his church, who have mouthed hostile slogans about the United Nations and have scoffed at the ideals of universal brotherhood and international cooperation for which it stands.

Pope Paul stressed the common interest that all peoples have in the age of nuclear weapons in the preservation of today's peace, no matter how fragile, and in the attainment of a stable peace founded on justice. He rebuked the pride that impels nations to place their own opinions and interests above the common interest of peace. Imploring the nations to disarm before catastrophe overtakes them, he repeated the plea which he made in Bombay last December that every nation divert part of its arms expenditures to a fund to assist the economic development of the poorer countries.

In only one important particular do we dissent from the Pope's remarks. His allusion to birth control as irrational seems to us an unnecessarily narrow, old-fashioned interpretation of natural law doctrine on this issue at a time when the world's people, including many of his fellow Catholics, had been looking to him to provide a new, more constructive lead on the population question.

The address in its main arguments, however, remains a compelling document. It happily mingles old wisdom and fresh moral urgency. "As you will remember," the Pope declared, "we are very ancient, we here represent a long history, we here celebrate the epilogue of a wearying pilgrimage in search of a conversation with the entire world, ever since the command was given to us: Go and bring the good news to all peoples."

His own speech does much to advance that universal conversation on the most imperative theme—peace.

[From the New York Times, international edition, Sept. 23, 1965]

U Thant's Proposals

In his report to the 20th General Assembly of the United Nations, Secretary General Thant argues that military conflicts in Asia and the impasse over disarmament prove the "imperative need" to give Peiping a seat and to make U.N. membership universal.

Meanwhile, he believes, the admission of observers from such countries as Communist China and North Vietnam would be useful in exposing these countries "to the views of the rest of mankind."

Those views may be of small interest to Peiping at this time, as its aggressive behavior in the India-Pakistan conflict demonstrates. But Peiping's contemptuous—and contemptible—attitude does not lessen the desirability of an invitation to the Chinese Communists to come to the U.N.

This week's Security Council negotiations on an India-Pakistan cease-fire reveal once again how unreal is the theory that the Nationalist Government in Taiwan alone represents 700 million Chinese. Because of Russian hostility, the Chinese Nationalists representative was not permitted even to participate in preparing the Security Council resolution on this matter of vital concern to Asia and the world. Inevitably, he was excluded as unacceptable to the Soviet Union.

The fact is that the Nationalist Chinese on the island of Formosa no more represent mainland China than the Communist government of the mainland represents the island of Formosa. Both, as we have long urged, ought to be in the United Nations under one form or another of a two-China policy—even though both oppose such an idea at the present time.

In his report, the Secretary General also had some pertinent comments on the Vietnam war, which has "cruelly set back" the thaw in East-West relations, he said. His considerable personal efforts through quiet diplomacy to stop the fighting and start discussions have failed so far. But he remains convinced, as we do, that there is no military solution, that "total victory or total defeat," is out of the question for either side and that negotiations with "major concessions" by all sides is the only way out.

Nothing in Mr. Thant's report is more important than his insistence that the U.N. peacemaking machinery is as much in need of improvement as its peacekeeping methods. The India-Pakistan conflict shows the danger of leaving longstanding problems without a solution in the hope that a cease-fire, a U.N. peacekeeping mission, and the passage of time will resolve them. There is a need for more vigorous methods of seeking peaceful settlement of disputes—before as well as after armed clashes take place—through good offices, negotiation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, and other techniques. Britain has proposed a study to develop such machinery and the Assembly would do well to approve this resolution promptly.

ATLANTIC NUCLEAR FORCE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the New York Times of October 6, 1965, entitled "Atlantic Nuclear Force" a subject which both Senator Kennedy and I discussed yesterday, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Atlantic Nuclear Force

Now that the West German elections are over, the project for an Atlantic nuclear force, shelved by President Johnson last December, is being dusted off again. The reappraisal that lies ahead is likely to be agonizing.

Under Secretary of State George W. Ball has indicated that a new round of talks will begin with the coming visits to Washington of British Foreign Secretary Michael Stewart and German Chancellor Ludwig Erhard. The problem, he said, "cannot be swept under the rug."

The immediate difficulty is that the three nations most directly concerned—the United States, Britain and West Germany—have varying ideas of what kind of a force should be created. And President Johnson wants the British and West Germans to reach agreement first. But with President de Gaulle vehemently opposed to the scheme, Chancellor Erhard is urging a strong American lead. Without it, he argues, a Bonn-London agreement will be difficult to achieve.

The need for Anglo-German-American agreement is increased by the deadlock with the Soviet Union on a nuclear nonproliferation treaty. Moscow claims an allied force would give West Germany control of nuclear weapons. The United States insists, on the contrary, that proliferation of national nuclear forces would be headed off by giving Europe a voice in its own nuclear defense through a collective force. This debate inevitably will remain a "dialog of the deaf" as long as neither side knows what kind of collective force is being discussed.

The lack of an agreed project also prevents discussion with General de Gaulle. The French President has threatened to break up NATO if the American project for a multilateral force of Polaris missile ships is adopted. But soon after that project was shelved last December, he indicated that France would withdraw from NATO in 1969 anyway, unless existing collective commands were dismantled as well. The confrontation with Paris that lies ahead will find Washington, London, and Bonn at a severe disadvantage unless they agree first among themselves what kind of NATO they want.

The efforts to achieve agreement last year were broken off abruptly by President Johnson without prior consultation with America's friends in Europe—ostensibly to await elections in West Germany that would permit Bonn and London to take the lead. In the 10 months that have passed since then, the need has mounted for a collective answer to the nuclear problem within NATO—whatever the compromise between the American and German proposals for a new force and the British insistence that the solution be based mainly on existing weapons.

The periphereal crises that increasingly absorb White House attention will seem like

pleasant pastimes in a few months unless the President soon comes to grips with this critical issue and related problems of European and Atlantic unity.

IMPENDING RETIREMENT OF HON. T. WHITFIELD DAVIDSON, U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Honorable T. Whitfield Davidson, U.S. district judge for the northern district of Texas, has announced his impending retirement after almost 30 years of distinguished service to the Federal judiciary and 89 years of service to his countrymen as teacher, lawyer, author, and judge, and as a living example of an unshakeable faith in the fundamental virtues which are the bedrock of our Nation.

Born on a wilderness farm in Harrison County in east Texas in 1876 to hardworking God-fearing parents whose everyday necessities depended on their self-reliance in those Reconstruction days, he studied by the light of the wood fire at the family hearth and then taught the children of his neighbors in the community schools while he studied law. He received his license as a lawyer in 1903, thereafter taking specialized law studies at Columbia University and the University of Chicago. He became a distinguished practicing attorney at Marshall in east Texas where the people in 1905 made him an alderman of the city and where he served also as city attorney. In 1920, he was sent to the Texas Senate and 2 years later he became Lieutenant Governor of the State of Texas. He was appointed U.S. district judge for the northern district of Texas in 1936 and has served in that capacity with the greatest distinction to the present time.

During all of these years Judge Davidson has personified the finest traits of character. He lives the creed "Do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly before God." He has maintained the dignity of the high office he has held tempered with kindness. He has inspired all who have known him with his scrupulous respect for honesty and for the virtue of honest toil, with the deepest reverence for our Constitution and for those whose wisdom and labors and sacrifices have given us the American heritage; and with an unwavering faith in the Almighty.

In the thousands of cases over which Judge Davidson has presided during the past three decades, his decisions and opinions have continuously reflected a wisdom not only of the law but also of the basic justice of the cause, and a jealous respect not only for the rights of society but also for the obligations of the independent judiciary and the limitations of jurisdiction and power of the Federal Government as granted by the people in the Constitution.

Though honored in so many walks of life, Judge Davidson has never lost his love of the land. He has found the time to preserve and develop his beloved Woodfire Ranch on which he was born to the end that he might additionally further serve his fellow citizens by giving its 3,000 acres of experimental grasses, native timbers, and fat cattle to the public through a foundation he has, in his great generosity, created to combine and retain the beauty which was placed there by nature with the accumulated agricultural knowledge of man.

He has combined his abiding respect and love of parents with this love of the land, of our Constitution, and of the faith of our fathers by building a chapel in the woods of Woodfire Ranch dedicated to the memory of his beloved mother and where a religious service is held each spring in the faith of our fathers and another each fall to remind all of the priceless heritage of our Constitution.

A man of great faith, he has taught the men's class of his church for many years.

He has likewise found the time to write, having authored a book on elementary law, having published an analysis of the Aaron Burr trial, and having written a book entitled "The Bible and History of Christian Civilization," and having recently published a work entitled "Wisdom of George Washington."

Of such men as this distinguished jurist, men of wisdom, fearlessness, faith, and service, has America been hewn and shaped and preserved.

It is both fitting and necessary that their examples be observed in order that these things shall not pass.

WHY THE ADMINISTRATION SUGAR BILL IS THE BETTER BILL FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the domestic cane and beet sugar industries will not supply the approximately 10 million tons of sugar the United States will consume this year.

Under the terms of an industry-Government agreement, arrived at this summer, a ceiling of 3,025,000 tons annually has been placed on mainland beet sugar marketings; and one of 1,100,000 tons annually on mainland cane. Both agreements were for 5 years.

No new cane or beet sugar growers will be admitted to the U.S. domestic sugar industry.

No new beet sugar mills will be built for half a decade.

Any farmer who has never grown, but who desires to grow sugarbeets instead of corn or soybeans, will now have to wait at least 5 years, because the U.S. sugar industry—refineries, processors, and producers—have all agreed to certain annual production ceilings.

Even if Congress now refuses to ratify this agreement, there is little reason to believe that the domestic industry, with the influence around of the major refineries, is in a position to build new mills in new production areas.

Until 1970 at the least, therefore, it looks as if American sugar suppliers will be assigned to the following sources: Domestic beet sugar, 30 percent; mainland cane sugar, 11 percent; Hawaii, 11.1 percent; Puerto Rico, 11.4 percent; Virgin Islands, 0.0015 percent; Philippines, 11 percent; and other foreign sources, 25.35 percent.

Actual deliveries are bound to deviate from these assigned percentages because in recent years Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands have been producing some 1,900,000 tons per year instead of their assigned 2,260,000 tons. Realistically, therefore, we will probably be importing about 40 percent—or some 4 million tons—of our total sugar requirements from the Philippines and other foreign exporters.

And it is with respect to this 40 percent that I present these few remarks today.

Four million tons of sugar is a lot of sugar; and when it is bought at American refinery prices, it is also a lot of dollars—almost $450 million. This is the amount of dollars—or gold—which will leave the United States and be placed abroad, primarily in foreign central banks, every 12 months for 5 years.

Is it not important, therefore, for us to consider carefully where we purchase these 4 million tons so that we assure American consumers a steady inflow of sugar, but do not burden ourselves with a steady outflow of gold.

If these dollar purchases of sugar are to be allocated by statutory quotas to specific countries, one of the primary criteria in selecting each country should be: How many dollars will the country in question spend for U.S. goods and services in return? Otherwise, if we are not prudent, we will be building into our imports—by act of Congress—a further serious imbalance with respect to our already serious balance-of-payments problem.

The administration took this problem into account when they formulated their 1965 sugar bill proposal. After allocating 1,050,000 tons to the Philippines in accordance with our treaty with that country, each foreign applicant was measured primarily on the factual answers to the following questions:

Are you an established and reliable sugar-exporting country?

Did you supply sugar to the United States during the worldwide sugar shortage of 1963 and 1964, in accordance with your capacity to supply and your existing U.S. quota?

Are you a good customer for U.S. goods and services?

These are three fundamental criteria which give the current sugar quota recommendations of the administration a sound foundation, one which should not be taken lightly by the Congress.

Nevertheless, we are now presented with a bill—H.R. 11135—to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948. This latter bill completely ignores the recommendations of the administration.

I have the utmost respect for the distinguished committee which drafted this bill, but it is clear that if we are to allocate sugar imports on sound criteria, the quotas proposed by the administration serve the needs and purposes of the people of the United States far better than do the quotas in H.R. 11135.

As but one example, the administration would give market preference to Western Hemisphere countries, but distribute the quotas within the hemisphere so as to give in turn special consideration, first, to countries which made a real effort to supply the United States during the worldwide sugar shortage; and second, countries which buy more goods and services from the United States than the United States buys from them.

H.R. 11135, however, reshuffled the quotas for Western Hemisphere exporters as recommended by the administration. In doing so, the bill provides more for 14 countries and less for 6 countries. Of the 14 which obtain increases, 6 have a balance-of-trade picture unfavorable to the United States—including 2 which have a most unfavorable balance: $148 million in one case, and $360 million in the other.

Of the six countries which get less than the administration's recommendation, five have a balance-of-trade picture favorable to the United States—the sixth is the Dominican Republic; and two of the countries whose quotas were reduced—Mexico and Argentina—have trade balances very favorable to the United States: $419 million and $150 million—in dollar trade—respectively.

Nor does H.R. 11135 confine its quota reshuffling to the Western Hemisphere countries. The bill provides lower quotas—totaling some 160,000 tons less than those recommended by the administration—for 12 countries outside the Western Hemisphere; and at the same time adds some 20,000 tons for a new supplier, a country which has never sold a pound of sugar to the United States before—Thailand.

These 12 countries whose quotas were reduced so drastically have historically bought more goods and services from the United States than we have bought from them, individually and collectively. One is Australia, a nation which buys 2½ times as much from the United States as we buy from them—and, as we know, Australia is fighting side by side with us in Vietnam.

Furthermore, 10 of these 12 countries outside the Western Hemisphere supplied sugar to us far in excess of their statutory quota commitments during the shortage of 1963 and 1964. But H.R. 11135 would give them the dubious reward of drastically reduced quotas.

Frankly, I am at a total loss as to how these quotas in H.R. 11135 were determined. They are not based on performance, or a country's proved ability to supply; and emphatically they are not based on trade balances, because certain countries which are already draining off the gold that is becoming ever more important to the security and prosperity of the United States have nevertheless been given larger quotas than the administration recommended, while countries which are buying more from the United States than we buy from them are given lesser quotas.

Mr. President, it is clear this bill—H.R. 11135—should be corrected. I believe, in all fairness, that the Senate should substitute the administration's recommended quotas for the quotas provided by the other body, because the administration quotas are well reasoned and based on sound criteria. The administration has carefully weighed the influence this legislation will have on sugar supplies, and our relations with other countries, and the impact on our balance of payments.

We will all agree that one of the first objectives is to protect the American housewife from sugar rationing and high-priced sugar. This the administration bill accomplishes by dispersing our sources of supply among many reliable sugar exporting countries, so that, if and when supplies from one supplier are interrupted by subversion, sabotage, or invasion of a particular country—there will be other suppliers to fill the breach and keep sugar flowing to the United States.

Another objective is to rely on those suppliers who have proved, under emergency conditions, that they would make a special effort to supply the U.S. market. This objective is met by the administration bill, which bases quotas on past performance when exporters could have made far more money by selling to markets other than the United States.

H.R. 11135, however, lends no weight to performance during these shortage years.

A third objective should be to buy sugar from countries which have historically bought and are now buying more goods and services from us than we buy from them. This the administration bill does. This H.R. 11135 does not.

Therefore, Mr. President, based on the foregoing facts, I respectfully urge my colleagues to substitute the administration bill for H.R. 11135, and to insist in conference on the Senate position.

HIGH RISK AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, for the past year, and on behalf of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary, our able colleague, the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], has been investigating the high risk automobile insurance industry.

In a speech this week before a joint meeting of insurance agents and executives at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., Senator DODD discussed some of the facts he has developed during his investigations and hearings he held earlier this year.

So that as many people as possible may have an opportunity to read some of the startling evidence of abuses and faulty regulatory practices that have been uncovered by Senator DODD, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD his incisive speech entitled "The Role of the Federal Government and the States in Insurance Regulation—Cooperation or Collision Course?" In speaking out, Senator DODD is making another of his many great contributions to the public good.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND THE STATES IN INSURANCE REGULATION—COOPERATION OR COLLISION COURSE?

(Remarks of Senator THOMAS J. DODD at the joint convention of the National Association of Casualty & Surety Agents and the National Association of Casualty & Surety Executives, October 4, 1965, White Sulphur Springs, Va.)

I take great pleasure in addressing you this morning on the subject of the Federal role in the regulation of the insurance industry. No topic is more timely for this group of insurance agents and executives than the question of how to protect the integrity and reputation of the insurance industry with a minimum of Government intervention. For some deeply disturbing questions have arisen in recent years about how effective the present system of State insurance regulatory practices is in protecting the public interest.

I want to talk to you this morning about these questions regarding the effectiveness of State regulation of insurance. I want to talk to you about the future of insurance regulation and the role of the Federal Government in it.

Rousseau said that "government originated in the attempt to find a form of association that defends and protects the person and property of each with the common force of all." In democratic government, we consent to a common power superior to our own to articulate minimum rules for the conduct of society which are enforcible without resort to individual violence.

One of the powers which the American people have consented from the early years of our Republic to give their Government is the power to make reasonable regulations for the conduct of commercial affairs.

One of the central purposes sought through Government regulation of insurance has always been to make sure that those who deal in insurance so conduct their operations that the promises they make can be fairly, quickly, and fully performed upon occurrence of the event insured against. A policy of insurance which is unenforcible is no insurance at all.

It is an obligation of effective government to see, by inspection and regulation, that those in whom the American people put their trust against financial disaster remain at all times fully prepared to fulfill their promises.

That the Federal Government has plenary regulatory authority over the interstate aspects of the insurance industry has not been a matter of dispute since the Supreme Court's decision in the case of *Southeastern Underwriters* v. *The United States* in 1944.

But in recognition of the sincerity of the industry's self-policing activity, and also in an attempt to encourage the States to establish an effective insurance regulatory framework, Congress has refrained from exercising this plenary regulatory authority.

Thus, a year after the Southeastern Underwriters decision, Congress enacted the McCarran-Ferguson Act, which left primary insurance regulatory responsibility to the States.

The clear authority of the Federal Government to preempt State insurance regulation—and the Federal decision not to—remain the law today. Nonetheless, Congress has retained an active interest in the protection of the insurance industry's public trust through appropriate and effective State regulation, if possible, and through Federal regulation, if necessary.

In 1958, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary decided to make an extensive study of the insurance industry to determine whether or not State insurance regulation had lived up to the expectations which had led Congress to refrain from Federal regulation 13 years earlier. For the last 4 years I have been in charge of that study. I was delighted to accept that assignment from the subcommittee chairman because, coming from Connecticut, frequently called the "insurance center of the world," it has been my privilege to work frequently during my career in public life with many of you fine men and women of the insurance industry.

I have a keen appreciation for the prosperity the insurance industry has generated, not only in my own State, but also throughout the entire country. By providing protection, assurance, and capital to individuals, industry, and government, as well as by providing employment for more than a million people and a stable and a fruitful investment for many others, the insurance industry makes a truly unique and essential contribution to the American economy.

Indeed, the very enormity and importance of insurance in modern American life emphasizes the critical need to maintain the highest standard of integrity within the insurance industry. It also requires maintenance of the highest degree of public confidence in that industry.

The insurance industry itself has traditionally recognized its grave responsibilities to merit and to maintain the public trust. I am pleased to be able to report to you today that throughout my associations with the insurance industry, I have found a consistent high, scrupulous devotion among virtually all insurance people to their traditional and essential public trust.

However, I regret to report that the investigations I have conducted have recently uncovered a serious failure on the part of State regulatory bodies and the insurance industry itself to protect the public from the depredations of fly-by-night, fraudulent, and inexperienced insurance operations.

I am talking about some companies dealing in high risk automobile insurance. As you know, high risk automobile insurance companies insure the 5 million American motorists who, for one reason or another, find themselves unable to buy insurance in the regular insurance market. These motorists must place themselves in assigned risk pools or do business with a company selling high risk insurance.

There are, of course, many high risk insurance companies which are sound, well run, and honest. But gravely disquieting reports of high risk auto insurance failures which left policyholders and claimants without adequate protection and, in many cases, without any protection at all, began reaching my committee about a year ago.

We learned that some 50 companies in 45 States writing high risk insurance had failed during the past 6 years. Our analysis of these reports clearly indicated the need for a long, hard look at abuse of the public and irregular practices in high risk insurance operations.

The failure of these 50 companies left hundreds of thousands of policyholders without insurance and tens of thousands of claimants without indemnity for millions of dollars in claims. Thirty-two of these insolvent companies alone left 400,000 policyholders without insurance. They left almost $80 million in outstanding claims, but only about $8 million in assets to satisfy them, after the administrative costs of the insolvency receiverships are deducted.

Even if outstanding claims in these cases are overvalued by 60 percent, policyholders and claimants stand to receive only 25 cents on the dollar.

This is a shocking and intolerable situation. But some of the individual company stories are even more appalling. One insolvent company left 10,000 policyholders without insurance. It left $2½ million worth of outstanding claims, and only $4,100 in assets to satisfy them.

A second company left 32,000 policyholders without insurance, more than $2 million in claims, and only $400,000 in assets.

One company collected over $5 million in premiums in 9 months, but, at the time of the receivership proceeding 6 months later, left 15,000 policyholders without insurance, $5 million in outstanding claims, and only $352,000 in assets.

Just last month a company placed in receivership left 120,000 policyholders, $2½ million in outstanding claims, and only about a million dollars worth of assets.

These are only a few typical examples of what we have found in our preliminary tabulation of the damage done the public and the insurance industry itself by fraudulent and inept insurance operations. We have only recently begun compiling the statistics on the other half of the high risk insolvencies since 1960.

Neither you in the insurance industry nor we in the Government can tolerate these regular, indeed frequent, situations in which an insolvency leaves thousands of policyholders and the public without protection and where claimants and creditors stand to lose millions of dollars in unpaid claims.

What are the practical causes of these failures, these frauds, these intolerable impositions on the public welfare, these ruinations of policyholders and claimants?

Our investigation disclosed clear evidence that incompetent and careless management practices led to the downfall of at least 23 of these 50 high risk companies. Flagrant abuse and outright fraud by company management caused an additional 20 of the 50 companies to fail. Many of these involuntary insolvencies could have been prevented by adequate State regulation. The causes we discovered during our investigation for more than 80 percent of these failures were equally discoverable by State regulatory authorities had they been alert and had their regulatory procedures been adequate and effective. In some of these high risk company failures we found appropriation of company funds to personal use. In others we found falsification and manipulation of company assets and securities.

We found cases of grossly excessive fees and commissions paid under management contracts and retrospective commission agreements with agencies controlled by the same principals who controlled the company. We discovered juggling of loss reserves, and highly improper claims practices. We found fictitious reinsurance arrangements. We uncovered inaccurate and generally inadequate books and records. We discovered poor underwriting practices. We found overexpansion of premiums written in relation to capital and surplus.

If these gross deviations from sound and honest practice were discoverable after these companies went under, why couldn't the State regulatory authorities discover them in time to avoid the fantastic loss to the public and damage to the insurance industry such practices caused?

The fact is that, in the high-risk field at least, insurance departments have frequently not acted effectively to discover abuses and to remedy those which have been discovered.

Many insurance departments have failed to detect gross underestimation of loss reserves and accumulations of vast numbers of claims by some insurers. Many departments have permitted too high a ratio of premiums written to policyholders' surplus, and have failed to uncover fictitious reinsurance arrangements. Many insurance departments seem to be too preoccupied with technical rate and form matters to effectively supervise fringe insurance operations.

Most States lack adequate standards and qualified personnel to measure the sufficiency of loss reserves. Financial manipulations, such as the siphoning of premium dollars from high risk insurers and their agencies, too frequently receive inadequate attention and have, in many cases, led to insolvency.

There are wide gaps in communication and cooperation among the States in regulating high risk insurers. You in the industry and we in the Government cannot tolerate these conditions. American policyholders are entitled to the best protection possible. They have a right to expect it, they will demand it, and I intend to see that they will get it.

No segment of the insurance industry and no regulatory body can bury its head in its own work, ostrichlike, and expect these pernicious abuses of the public trust to disappear. These scandalous swindles impair public confidence not only in automobile insurance, but in all insurance, and in the trustworthiness of Government as well.

I do not intend to be a party either to the deterioration of public confidence in Government or to the abuse of the public trust. If State regulation proves inadequate to the task of protecting the public, how long can the Federal Government be expected to stay its hand?

Because I believe in and support State regulation of the insurance industry, I am doing all I can to encourage the reforms that must be made if State regulation is to persevere. I have urged the State insurance commissioners, through their national association, to take a number of specific steps to make State insurance regulation more effective and to bring the epidemic of high risk fraud and failure under control.

I have urged the insurance commissioners to strengthen examination processes, specifically by making more frequent, more thorough, and more surprise examinations.

I have encouraged them to recruit competent examiners and to compensate them adequately.

I have told them to examine far more closely the underwriting and reserve activities of every company operating in the States.

I have asked them to devote special attention to reinsurance arrangements, especially, "fronting" arrangements and the so-called "surplus aid contract" used to hide a company's true financial condition.

I have urged them to review existing minimum capital and surplus requirements for the formation of new companies.

I have suggested that they determine whether relationships between policyholders' surplus and premium volume should be established by statute.

I am encouraged that a number of insurance commissioners have already told me that they intend to act upon these recommendations.

I am also encouraged that the National Association of Insurance Commissioners is forming a special committee to address the problem of the gaps in communication and cooperation among the insurance commissioners of the several States.

But we have barely begun to combat the problem of inadequate State regulation of insurance. We need not only new tactics, but also new weapons to protect the public interest.

State insolvency discovery process and conservation and rehabilitation procedures must be improved and strengthened.

Present methods for assuring the solvency of insurance companies must be closely scrutinized and radically revised if that is found necessary to protect the public.

And new and imaginative approaches to alleviate an insolvency's drastic consequences to innocent policyholders and claimants should be devised and carefully studied.

At the same time, we must avoid courses which would restrict competition or impose unnecessary controls on well-managed companies.

These steps to strengthen State regulation may require substantial increases in the budgets of many States for insurance regulatory programs and practices. The funds for adequate insurance regulation are readily available in the form of revenues from insurance premium taxes.

The percentage of insurance-generated State taxes devoted to State insurance regulation has declined from 4.2 percent of all such taxes in 1960 to 4.07 percent today, according to the best available figures. The remaining 95 percent of such taxes go into State treasuries, because too many States view premium taxes primarily as a source of State revenue rather than as a source of funds for adequate and effective State regulation of insurance.

This decline in the percentage of insurance-generated State taxes devoted to insurance regulation has been matched by the increase in high risk auto insurance outlawry over the same period. If adequate supervision of insurance practices by the States requires a greater allocation of insurance taxes to regulatory activities, then that price must be paid if the need for Federal action is to be averted.

But the moving oar for preservation of the integrity of State insurance regulation is in the hands of the industry and the State commissioners. The commissioners will need your suggestions and your cooperation in securing higher budgets and better regulation and legislation. You must work together to secure the public interest. The people of this country have placed their trust in the insurance industry. You are dedicated to safeguarding that trust. I am confident you will spare no energy in creating imaginative and effective answers to the problems of State insurance regulation.

I look forward to working with you in a continued spirit of harmony and cooperation to protect the American people.

NATIONAL PATRIOTIC EDUCATION WEEK

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am delighted to bring to the Senate's attention a reminder from the Auburn Society of the Children of the American Revolution that October 12–19 is National Patriotic Education Week. The CAR's interest in this week stems from one of its main objectives: to love, uphold, and extend the principles of American liberty and patriotism. This is another example of the many fine programs which the National Society of the Children of the American Revolution, with the active participation of our Auburn, Ala., chapter, sponsors.

This year, the year of the 750th anniversary of the signing of the Magna Carta, the CAR is calling our attention to the influence of that great charter of English liberties upon our own Bill of Rights and our other freedom documents.

Thomas Jefferson believed, "Enlighten the people generally, and tyranny and oppressions of body and mind will vanish like evil spirits at the dawn of day." I know he would applaud the Children of the American Revolution's endeavors to make the American people aware of our great heritage and our responsibility to preserve the liberties we all cherish. I want to add my own personal praise of the CAR's efforts, and I urge everyone to remember, practice, and observe October 12–19, Patriotic Education Week.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8310) to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment and agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HILL, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. PELL, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. MURPHY conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish that some Senator would take the chair so that the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland can make his speech and the Senate can get on with its business and get away at a reasonable hour.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee will graciously contribute his time to the Chair so that the distinguished Senator from Maryland can make a most important speech.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As always, the Senator from Tennessee is self-sacrificing.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

IMPROVEMENT OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy which the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee extended to the junior Senator from Maryland in relieving him of his responsibility in the chair.

Mr. President, our Federal judiciary is undoubtedly one of the most important and indispensable institutions that our society has produced. I am sure that every Member of the Senate shares my appreciation of the vital role that the judicial branch of our Government plays in the perpetuation of those ideas which motivated the formation of the Union, which have guided this Nation throughout its almost two centuries of existence, and which, in a broader sense, are the hope we hold for the future. We shall continue to look, as we have in the past, to the courts for the vindication of individual rights, and for the dispassionate and reasoned application of the law to the end that disputes between citizen and citizen, between citizen and government may be settled peacefully and justly.

Yet while our judicial system has served us well and promises to continue to do so we must continually strive to remove whatever imperfections come to light—not acting casually or hastily, but after studied deliberation and close inspection, and with the nicest sense of judgment. The Congress has the principal responsibility for insuring that the Federal judiciary continues to be all that it should be—indeed all that it must be if we are to remain the Great Society that we are today. For it is Congress, not the judiciary itself, that is charged with the establishment and maintenance of the judicial power of these United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for an additional 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I reassure the Members of the Senate that their Committee on the Judiciary—and, more particularly, the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of that committee—is mindful of its responsibilities and is cognizant of a number of problems within our judiciary that have troubled bench and bar. The Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, of which I am chairman, intends to take an active interest in these problems in the months ahead and will welcome the advice and counsel that any Member of the Senate can give with respect to its efforts. The subcommittee will also need the best advice of the judiciary, of the bar associations and the various legal institutes and foundations, of law schools, and of the profession itself. In the hope that word of the subcommittee's activities will reach the ears of those who will not only aid us in the endeavors already planned, but alert us to additional problems deserving our attention, Mr. President, I should like to outline the problem areas with which the subcommittee will concern itself over the future months. We approach these problems in the spirit of calculated inquisitiveness, for at present, in many instances, we know only that a problem exists, and not what the best solution is.

THE U.S. COMMISSIONER SYSTEM

The first area of concern to the subcommittee, Mr. President, is the U.S. commissioner system, on which we have already commenced to hold hearings. In a real sense the U.S. commissioners constitute the "front line" of Federal justice. They are charged with duties of great import in the administration of Federal criminal law. Yet almost without exception those familiar with the system are of the opinion that it is not equal to the task we call upon it to perform.

We depend upon the U.S. commissioners to exercise reasoned judgment in determining whether or not a warrant should be issued for a person's arrest or for the search of his home. When an individual is arrested and charged with committing a crime against the United States, we depend upon the commissioner before whom the accused is brought, to inform that individual of his constitutional rights to remain silent, to have the aid of counsel in the preparation of his defense, and to have a determination made whether there is probable cause to believe a crime has been committed and that he is the offender. If the accused is indigent, we depend upon the commissioner to see that counsel is provided for him. Indeed, the determination of indigency itself is left to the commissioner—and this in many cases is far from an easy matter to ascertain. We often depend upon the U.S. commissioner to hold the preliminary hearings in order to determine whether there is probable cause for the accused to be held pending action by a grand jury. If probable cause is found, we rely upon the commissioner to set the conditions of the accused's release pending further judicial action. Many of our U.S. commissioners are empowered to act as magistrates, and render judgment in cases involving petty offenses against the United States. These are functions of great importance not only to the individual, involving as they do his liberty, his property, and his constitutional rights, but also to the United States and to society, as they constitute integral steps in the process of Federal law enforcement.

Mr. President, the first individual in the Federal judicial system that a criminally accused person meets is the U.S. commissioner. That meeting is his initial impression of Federal justice.

Yet, Mr. President, despite the importance of the role played by the commissioner in the administration of Federal justice, the most cursory examination discloses that the commissioner system is in many respects an archaic relic of times past, ill-suited to meet the needs of our present-day judicial system. If the commissioner system today is less than it should be—less than it must be—the fault, Mr. President, lies not with the many U.S. commissioners, most of whom are dedicated, conscientious servants of the law, but with ourselves, for it is we who are charged with the responsibility for seeing that our judicial house is in good order. Legal scholars have referred to the U.S. commissioner as the "forgotten man" in the Federal judicial structure, and I believe there is a good measure of truth in this charge. It has been almost 70 years since the Congress established the present arrangement, and it is now time to reexamine the commissioner system to see that it is functioning properly and fostering the efficient administration of justice.

In its investigation, the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery intends to look anew at the method whereby commissioners are appointed, and at the qualifications which they should have for appointment. Presently, commissioners are appointed by each Federal district court, in such number as that district court deems advisable. They serve for terms of 4 years. There are no minimum standards or qualifications established by either the Congress or any judicial body, and while the preference for lawyers as commissioners has often been expressed, some 30 percent of the over 700 U.S. commissioners in the country today are not members of the bar. One's first impression, Mr. President, is that it is certainly less than a happy situation that a person who has not been admitted to the bar—and who, therefore, has no trial experience, and probably little if any familiarity with the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure or with the rules of evidence—should be permitted to discharge responsibilities that call for the exercise of trained legal judgment. The decisions that commissioners must routinely make often involve some of the most difficult points of constitutional law, which the best lawyers and judges are hard pressed to apply correctly. Moreover, in dealing with petty offenses, the commissioner sits in place of the U.S. district court, dispensing Federal justice in accordance with Federal law, with the power to impose substantial fines and sentences of imprisonment. Such functions might better be entrusted to persons trained in the law. I should hope that our investigation of the commissioner system will enable us to determine whether it is feasible to establish minimum qualifications for commissioners.

Perhaps one of the principal reasons, Mr. President, that personnel with higher qualifications are not generally obtainable to serve as U.S. commissioners is that their compensation is often inadequate. Under present law, commissioners are remunerated on the basis of set fees for services rendered in their official capacity. A commissioner may receive somewhere between $2 and $14 for conducting a preliminary hearing, even though proper preparation for such a proceeding may involve untold hours of work and the exercise of sophisticated legal judgment. And often a commissioner may receive no compensation at all for this preparation, as when a grand jury indictment intervenes before a scheduled preliminary hearing can be held. A commissioner receives only $6 for the issuance of a search warrant, the preparation for which may be quite substantial, and but $4 for the issuance of a warrant of arrest. While I was U.S. attorney, in a very technical case involving mail fraud in an international scheme of insurance, we spent 5 months trying the case on the mail fraud, but we spent 3 months before that on the subject of whether or not a search warrant was properly issued. The testimony before the U.S. district court on the search warrant was, indeed, more difficult and more sophisticated than the testimony in the court action itself. Yet a U.S. commissioner receives only $6 for issuing a search warrant, which can and in many instances does require the most sophisticated legal study and the best judgment, to determine whether or not the search warrant should be issued.

Yet, Mr. President, that is not the whole story, for there is a statutory maximum of $10,500 which a commissioner may earn in any single year. Thus, some commissioners in our more populous urban areas, who are so beseiged with business that fees totaling the statutory maximum are collected during the first 3 or 4 months of the year, perform their duties for the remainder of the year without additional compensation. Moreover, Mr. President, in such cases the commissioner does not really net $10,500 a year, for under present law there is no provision whereby he is reimbursed for any of the expenses—which are rightly those of the Federal Government—that he incurs in the performance of his duties. Apart from a handful of commissioners for whom special provision is made. For instance, commissioners do not receive any allowance for clerical assistance, for stamps, or for telephone and telegraph expenses. One U.S. commissioner who testified before our committee stated that his telephone bill amounted to $40 or $50 a month. He receives no remuneration for that; he pays it out of his own pocket. That is not right.

The result of this scheme of inadequate compensation is that most commissioners find it necessary to supplement income derived from the performance of their duties with income from other sources. Many commissioners also practice law; some are referees in bankruptcy; still others are gasoline station attendants and chicken farmers. But, Mr. President, this situation points out another problem. At present there is no announced standard or any customary practice that establishes either legally or ethically what a commissioner may do in addition to his official duties, and often commissioners are engaged in outside activities which at best are not entirely consonant with the commissioner's office, and at worst present a direct conflict of interest.

It may be that the fee system of compensation should be abolished altogether, and commissioners should receive a straight salary as do Federal referees in bankruptcy. It may be that the schedule of salaries for commissioners should be on a sliding scale, depending on the number of hours worked and the caseload of the individual jurisdiction. But the present system of compensation makes no sense, in the world in which we live today.

And there are other grave problems that inhere in the present fee system. As early as 1927 in the case of *Tumey* v. *Ohio*, 273, U.S. 510, Mr. Chief Justice Taft, speaking for a unanimous Supreme Court, laid down the principle that a criminal proceeding held before a judicial officer having a direct, personal, substantial interest in the outcome of the proceeding constitutes a denial of due process of law under the Federal Constitution.

There are several aspects of the present fee system that pose serious constitutional questions under the rule of Tumey against Ohio. To take but one example, when a Federal agent applies for an arrest warrant from a U.S. commissioner, it is only in the event that the commissioner issues the warrant that he is paid the $4 fee. If he determines that there is no probable cause for the arrest, he does not receive any fee at all. While most commissioners are undoubtedly upright, dedicated men, there is an opportunity here for the judgment of a less than scrupulous commissioner to be affected by consideration of whether he is going to receive a fee and be compensated for his time. There might be an inclination to issue the arrest warrant as a matter of course, knowing that at the preliminary hearing stage the determination of probable cause could be reversed and the arrested person set free with no resulting prosecution against him. Thus two fees—one for the warrant and one for the hearing—are obtained instead of possibly none.

I do not believe that that sort of conflict should be put in the face of the U.S. Commissioner. In that situation, harm has been done to the accused's reputation, because he has been arrested and he has been brought before a U.S. Commissioner on a charge, to say nothing of the inconvenience caused him and the disrespect he has likely acquired for the Federal judiciary and the law.

Surely this method of compensation must be reexamined, Mr. President, for even if such potential conflicts of interest do not rise to the magnitude of constitutional infirmity, at the very least this aspect of the fee system is less than good policy dictates, is less than sound judicial administration demands.

Mr. President, our subcommittee's examination of the Commissioner system will also give close consideration to the role the Commissioner plays in the issuance of process. The issuance of arrest and search warrants cannot be regarded as the performance of a mere technical formality; a U.S. Commissioner may be the only judicial officer in a position to insure that individual rights are not disregarded by overzealous prosecutors. Yet, Mr. President, it appears that in many instances the action of the Commissioner in issuing a warrant may be little more than a rubber stamp of the application made by the complaining officer. The reasons for this are not altogether clear. I hope that the subcommittee's investigation will shed more light on this aspect of the Commissioner's function.

Another failing of the present system is a lack of uniformity in the practices and procedures employed by commissioners in the performance of their duties. For example, Mr. President, it is almost beyond belief to me that the question whether a commissioner may issue a warrant based either solely or in part on hearsay evidence has not been resolved either by the courts or by administrative practice.

The result is that if the U.S. commissioner sits in the State of South Dakota, he may determine, when a person is brought in for a preliminary hearing, that he can waive hearsay evidence to find probable cause, as is done before a Federal grand jury; or, if he is in North Dakota, he may decide that he is going to adhere to the rules of evidence and will not permit hearsay evidence.

The Supreme Court has expressly left this question open in *Giordenello* v. *United States*, 357 U.S. 480, 485 (1958), and the commissioners are themselves divided over this issue. Many commissioners admit hearsay evidence; many do not. Such divergency of practice should be eliminated, for the standards of Federal justice should be uniform throughout the country. The manual for U.S. commissioners, issued by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts presumably for the purpose of providing guidelines for the performance of the commissioners' official duties, was last revised in 1948. Anyone who is familiar with the decisions of the Supreme Court in the criminal procedure area will testify that much has changed in the intervening period. Even in 1948 the manual was scarcely an adequate tool to assure the uniform practices that are desirable, for its ambiguities were legion, and its omissions were many.

Perhaps the most important aspect of the subcommittee's inquiry into the Commissioner system, Mr. President, will be a studied consideration of the function of the preliminary hearing, and the role the Commissioner plays in the holding of these hearings. In many respects, our present law in this area is but a relic of an earlier day when grand juries met infrequently—perhaps only once a year. The purpose of the preliminary examination was to prevent an accused from being held in custody for the several months between the arrest and the meeting of the grand jury without a prompt determination that the detention was at least prima facie warranted. The preliminary hearing thus served a real purpose, for it provided the only protection an accused had against unjust incarceration pending the convocation of the grand jury.

Now, however, in many judicial districts, such as the Southern District of New York, a Federal grand jury sits continually, and often in such districts it is the practice of the U.S. attorney's office to have an indictment returned before the Commissioner has an opportunity to hold a preliminary hearing.

This procedure varies, but that was the case when I was U.S. attorney for the district of Maryland. In other districts, U.S. attorneys will not take a case before a grand jury until after the preliminary hearing.

I do not mean to intimate that there is necessarily anything wrong with this practice. I merely point out that in large measure the preliminary hearing today serves no useful purpose. It can even become an annoying burden to the commissioner, who may prepare for such a hearing only to find at the 11th hour that the hearing has been preempted by a grand jury indictment.

To the extent that the preliminary hearing no longer serves any useful purpose, it should be either eliminated or revitalized so that it once again is a worthwhile component of the Federal judicial process. It may be, for example, that the preliminary hearing could be used to advantage not only to determine probable cause, but also to determine the legality of searches and seizures, the existence of probable cause for arrest, the legitimacy of arrest warrants that have issued, et cetera—in short, to determine the legality of all process that has issued up to the time of the hearing. Such a hearing could even be held after the grand jury has returned an indictment. Or, alternatively, the preliminary hearing might be utilized to give the accused a measure of criminal discovery; some maintain that because criminal discovery better enables the accused to prepare his defense it strengthens our adversary system and consequently elevates the standard of justice dispensed by the Federal courts. This is not a new concept, Mr. President, as I am informed that in a good many of our States—particularly those west of the Mississippi River—the preliminary hearing, given as a matter of right, generally in lieu of indictment, allows an accused to obtain some familiarity with the evidence against him.

Those of us who have watched the "Perry Mason" show know that he generally wins his cases at the preliminary hearing.

At the Federal level, of course, an accused is constitutionally entitled to grand jury indictment in felony cases, but the Supreme Court has held that grand jury indictment may be waived. It might, therefore, be feasible to establish by statute a right to a preliminary hearing on condition that the accused waive grand jury indictment.

I do not at this point endorse any of these specific proposals, Mr. President. I do think, however, that they merit serious consideration by our subcommittee in its forthcoming investigation.

There is also an opportunity to utilize the U.S. commissioner system to relieve our Federal dockets of some of the congestion that now plagues them. Federal district courts annually hear over 2,000 petty offense cases. A petty offense is presently defined in the United States Code as one punishable by not more than 6 months' imprisonment, a fine of $500, or both. Similar breaches of State law are generally heard by police and magistrate courts, but existing Federal law makes no provision for a Federal magistracy that could perform the equivalent function, although certain U.S. commissioners, who have been specially designated by the Federal district court of the district in which they sit, have jurisdiction to try and sentence persons committing petty offenses within Federal enclaves.

It has been suggested that there is no sound reason why U.S. commissioners should not be given trial jurisdiction over all Federal petty offenses, no matter where committed, and that the definition of petty offenses be broadened to include offenses punishable by up to a year's imprisonment, or a fine of up to $1,000, or both.

Of course, under the Constitution, an accused is entitled to a jury trial before a judge who has life tenure in accordance with the provisions of article III. But the fact is, Mr. President, that most persons accused of petty infractions against the United States far prefer to have the case against them tried immediately by a commissioner rather than by a district court, with the great delay and the likelihood of publicity that a trial in the district court entails. It has been the experience of most commissioners having petty-offense jurisdiction that well over 90 percent of petty offenders brought before them consent to trial by the commissioner rather than insist upon trial before the district court. And out of the many petty-offense cases currently disposed of by commissioners, only a handful are appealed to the district court. There is little to suggest that this pattern would change were the contours of the petty-offense jurisdiction expanded as suggested.

Once again, Mr. President, I do not necessarily advocate this alteration, for the subcommittee has not yet had the chance to give the proposal close study. But I do point out that perhaps there is an opportunity here to relieve materially the congestion in the Federal courts at the same time one dispenses a quicker and consequently better brand of Federal justice. Some students of this problem have suggested that these changes would remove close to 25 percent of the caseload in some of our more crowded district courts. If such an opportunity does exist, we should not fail to explore it.

FITNESS OF FEDERAL JUDGES

Mr. President, the second major area which our subcommittee plans to explore in great depth is that of judicial qualifications and disqualifications of U.S. Federal judges. A judicial system is as good only as the men who staff it. Although the general caliber of the Federal judiciary is extremely high, it sometimes seems that this has occurred not because of the system of selection of Federal judges, but in spite of it. And the importance of an adequate system of judicial selection becomes particularly clear when one is confronted with those uncommon cases in which a Federal judge is unable to do his job properly. At this point, one discovers that by far the easiest way to remove an unqualified judge is not to have appointed him in the first place.

On the whole, the President and the Senate have done quite well in the appointment of Federal judges, and they have been ably assisted by the Justice Department and the organized bar. But mistakes have been made, and when controversy arises over a potential nominee, too often the battle rages in the darkness of inadequate information. The decision is ultimately that of the President and the Senate, but it may be that they need more assistance in order to insure the selection of the best possible candidates. Therefore, the subcommittee will look into the possibility of establishing an additional independent body, within the Government, which would assist the President and the Senate in the selection of judges, by obtaining relevant information from outside sources and impartially evaluating and recommending candidates.

We must also remember, Mr. President, that no system of judicial selection, no matter how intelligently designed and administered, can be infallible. There must be an effective method of removing a judge if, once in office, he turns out to be unfit by reason of physical or mental incapacity, inefficiency or corruption. I do not mean to suggest that such situations are common or widespread in our Federal judicial system. But the fact is that they have existed and continue to exist. Even a very few unfit judges constitute a serious impediment to the efficient administration of justice. The vast majority of Federal judges, who are honest and conscientious, are very much concerned lest the few unfit judges spoil the public image of the Federal judiciary and impair public confidence in the administration of Federal law. They are willing to police the judicial system themselves if we will only give them the proper machinery for so doing.

The framers of the Constitution, wisely believing in the importance of an independent judiciary free from partisan pressure, provided that Federal judges shall hold office "during good behavior." Historically, the only method for removing a corrupt Federal judge has been impeachment, a cumbersome process in which the House of Representatives serves in effect as a grand jury, and this body, the Senate, serves as the court to determine the merit of the charges brought by the House. An impeachment and trial, properly conducted, can absorb several weeks of valuable legislative time and requires members of the Senate to go over hundreds of pages of testimony and exhibits in order to reach their decision. In view of this, it is not surprising that there have been only eight impeachments of Federal judges in the history of the United States, and that only four of these resulted in convictions. There is widespread feeling that the impeachment remedy is inadequate, and that some method which would allow the judiciary to police itself would be both more effective and perhaps more consistent with the principle of an independent judicial branch.

This proposal, however, raises serious constitutional questions, because some scholars believe that impeachment was intended to be the exclusive method of removing Federal judges. Our subcommittee plans to explore this area fully, in order to determine what can be done either to supplement or to streamline the impeachment process.

However, improving the impeachment process, Mr. President, would not solve all our problems, because we should remember that impeachment was intended to deal only with the problem of the judge who has committed "high crimes and misdemeanors," and not with the judge who, though honest, is unable to perform his functions properly because of mental or physical incapacity. The latter problem is separate from, though related to, the problem of the corrupt judge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TYDINGS. This relationship may perhaps best be illustrated by the tragic situation that existed in one of the courts of appeals in the 1930's, when a corrupt judge was selling decisions written by him for an elderly colleague who was practically deaf and practically blind. Even under ordinary circumstances, a judge whose impaired faculties no longer permit him to carry his full load of court work is a serious burden on judicial resources, particularly at a time when dockets are so crowded and requests are so regularly made for the appointment of additional judges in many districts and circuits. Of course, an elderly or disabled judge may retire voluntarily, and, in most cases, he will continue to receive the salary of his office. But experience has shown that some judges refuse to retire voluntarily, even though they are no longer able to do their job properly. The history of the Supreme Court shows a number of situations in which the Justices were forced to undertake the unpleasant task of asking a colleague to retire in order to make room for a younger and more alert individual.

The only provision for relieving a court of the burden of a disabled judge who refuses to retire voluntarily is one which permits the President to appoint an additional judge to in effect take the place of the disabled judge. This can be done only if, after receiving a certificate of disability signed by a majority of the judicial council of the circuit in which the judge sits, the President finds that the judge in question is in fact permanently incapacitated. The incapacitated judge retains his office, and, upon his death or retirement, the vacancy is not filled. This provision indicates a potentially useful approach, in that it is a reasonably expeditious way of making sure there are enough fit judges in a given circuit or district to deal with the load of judicial business. But some people have questioned its constitutionality, and in any event its scope is rather narrow, and judges have been understandably reluctant to initiate action against a colleague.

What is needed at this point, Mr. President, is a broad study of all the causes for which it may be desirable to remove a judge from office. Perhaps different causes necessarily require different methods of removal, but we should draw on our past experience in the Federal system and on the experience of the several States, in order to determine whether this is so.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the most serious shortcoming at present is that there is no single body which can receive and investigate complaints against Federal judges. This means that such complaints come to a variety of offices, already overworked and lacking the staff and expertise to make a fair evaluation, and, of course, without any power to take appropriate action. As a result, charges are bandied about in the press on the basis of incomplete information. This is unfortunate for judges, the judicial system and the public. Not only should the public have an opportunity to have legitimate complaints considered, but a judge should have an opportunity before a proper tribunal to clear himself from unfounded charges, and the judiciary should not unnecessarily suffer the disrespect that unfounded charges often produce.

Therefore, one possibility which our subcommittee intends to consider very seriously is the establishment of an independent commission to deal with judicial fitness at all stages from nomination through removal, with jurisdiction to receive complaints, investigate cases, and make recommendations to the appropriate decisionmaking authorities. The existence of such a body might go far to improve judicial performance, to eliminate irresponsible and unfounded charges against the judiciary, and consequently to raise the stature of the Federal courts in the eyes of the public.

Mr. President, the problem of the unfit judge is a serious challenge to our judicial system. Adequate solutions will not be easy to find. But I believe it is an area that will reward the type of exhaustive study our subcommittee is prepared to undertake, and I am hopeful that at the conclusion of our inquiry we will be able to produce helpful legislation in this field.

ADDITIONAL PROBLEMS OF CONCERN TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE

There are numerous other problem areas, Mr. President, that I intend to have the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery look into in some detail over the future months. In brief scope, I would like to let the Members of the Congress, the bench, and the bar know what they are.

First, there is an apparent need for consolidation of the correctional functions of the Federal judicial system. At present our Federal probation and parole systems are fragmented in their operation, without any central direction, coordination, or supervision. The various probation officers, the Bureau of Prisons, and the Department of Justice's Parole Board perform, independently, functions that are by nature vitally related. There is a good case, I believe, that can be made for better coordinating our correctional services, but the exact nature and form that any consolidation should take must be explored.

Next, there is much uncertainty concerning Federal habeas corpus procedures and the statutory postconviction remedy afforded by section 2255 of title 28 of the United States Code. Then there is the matter of bail reform and the related problem of preventive detention. The Senate has just passed the omnibus bail reform bill of 1965, S. 1357, which is a studied effort to meet the problems posed by our presently outdated Federal bail system. The related problem of preventive detention is, Mr. President, a most difficult one. It has become evident that one of the major problems in the war against crime is that posed by persons who, already accused of one crime, are free on bail pending trial. Experience has shown that, in many instances, such persons commit additional offenses during the pretrial period. Whether anything can be done in this area in light of evident constitutional problems posed by the prospect of detention before conviction is unclear, yet it is imperative that we undertake a full-scale study of the problem.

There are many who think that, if preventive detention procedures are attended by adequate guarantees of an expedited trial, and if procedural due process is afforded the accused who is "preventively detained," such an approach can be squared with the constitutional right to trial by jury and the presumption of innocence. If so, society may be spared much agony that otherwise might occur. Our subcommittee together with Senator ERVIN's Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, has already announced hearings on the preventive detention problem.

Mr. President, the subcommittee is also aware that the "fair trial-free press" problem is becoming more acute as every year passes. Supreme Court decisions, the most recent of which was *Estes v. Texas,* 381 U.S. 532 (1965), decided only last term, make clear that the right of the individual to a fair trial must be preserved and that some accommodation must be reached between the legitimate interests of the news media and the right of a defendant to a trial free from the effect of prejudicial publicity.

Numerous problems surround the selection of Federal jury panels. There are many ambiguities in the current system, and rules and procedures vary widely from district to district. Increased supervision of the jury selection process should be exercised by the district judge, and close scrutiny should be given to this process to determine whether it provides adequate assurance that Federal juries will be impartially and fairly selected. Without such assurance the quality of Federal justice will be less than it must be.

Next, the subcommittee would like to look into the present method of choosing chief judges for the circuits and districts. The selection is currently based solely on seniority, and the chief judge automatically loses his position as chief judge on reaching the age of 70 whether he chooses to retire as judge or not. It has been suggested that since the chief judge has certain important administrative duties, the selection should be made on the basis of merit and special qualifications, rather than seniority.

One of the most important areas which our subcommittee intends to study is the jurisdiction of the Federal courts, particularly the jurisdiction based upon diversity of citizenship. Federal courts throughout the country have been faced in recent years with an ever-increasing caseload, and some judges and lawyers have come to the conclusion that the only way to accomplish a substantial reduction of this tremendous caseload is to curtail or even eliminate the diversity jurisdiction. A committee of the American Law Institute, under the direction of Prof. Richard Field of the Harvard Law School, has been studying the diversity jurisdiction problem for the past several years, and it is anticipated that the results of that study and the recommendations of the institute will soon be available. At that time, I hope that our subcommittee will be prepared to undertake the very large task of evaluating the desirability of legislation to amend the diversity jurisdiction.

A related problem is the very heavy caseload of the Supreme Court. Although the Supreme Court has the power to limit the number of cases it takes up through the denial of writs of certiorari, in some situations it is faced with direct appeals from decisions of the district courts—cases that, unlike the normal case, do not pass through an intermediate stage at the level of the Court of Appeals. In one of these areas, that of antitrust under the Expediting Act, it has been suggested that the direct appeal be eliminated and that the traditional role of the Court of Appeals be reinstated. Our subcommittee will look into this problem.

In addition, the subcommittee also hopes to give continuing attention to proposals for changes in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. In the past, when the Supreme Court of the United States has laid before the Congress proposals for changes in the rules, these proposals have perhaps received less attention from the Congress than should have been given. Since these rules provide the basic procedural framework for the administration of Federal justice, the Congress has a responsibility to examine the proposed changes with care before permitting them to become effective.

In recent weeks, our subcommittee has been involved in several matters affecting the Court of Claims. There was, first, the proposal to add two new judges to the Court of Claims, and to permit the Court of Claims to sit in panels as well as en banc, which our subcommittee reported favorably and which passed the Senate last month.

Second, the subcommittee has been concerned with the problem of the congressional reference cases—private relief bills submitted to the Congress involving complicated questions of fact which, in the past, had been referred to the Court of Claims for advisory opinions.

The Court of Claims is now unwilling to render such advisory opinions to the Congress, being of the opinion that this function is inconsistent with the court's status as an article III tribunal. Together with Representative CELLER's Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, and the Office of Legal Counsel of the Department of Justice, the subcommittee has been trying to work out another method of dealing with these cases. I hope that we will be able to announce a workable solution in the very near future.

The boundaries of the several judicial circuits, Mr. President, were drawn many years ago, and now the volume of judicial business varies materially from circuit to circuit. Of course, additional judges have been added to particular circuits as their caseloads have increased. But there is some feeling that there may be a point beyond which a circuit has too many judges to be manageable, and that, therefore, the geographical boundaries of the circuits should be redrawn to prevent this from happening. Also, there are several circuits where the geographical area encompassed is great, and where the distances between litigant and courthouse can be immense. The geographical boundaries of the circuits is a problem within the mandate of the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, and I expect that in the not too distant future we will examine and evaluate the arguments for and against retaining the status quo.

The problem of pretrial, prearraignment procedures, which will play an important part in our study of the U.S. commissioner system, may also be the subject of an independent inquiry of its own. The proper way to protect the rights of suspected persons, without depriving law enforcement authorities of adequate means of apprehending criminals, is a subject of great controversy and great importance.

The efficiency of the Federal courts is at times impaired by the fact that litigants are forced to try their case in a district which may not be the most convenient for the parties and witnesses. A provision of the Judicial Code, section 1404(a) of title 28, providing for discretionary transfer from one district to another under certain circumstances, was interpreted rather narrowly by the Supreme Court in the case of *Hoffman* v. *Blaski*, 363 U.S. 335, decided in 1960. The suggestion has been made that judicial efficiency would be increased if this provision for transfer were broadened to cover a greater number of cases. This is an area which I think our subcommittee might usefully explore.

Finally, Mr. President, I would like to mention several other problems with which we hope to deal at some time in the near future: possible reform of present law prescribing the method of the service of process with respect to actions in Federal courts; creation of a special aviation jurisdiction akin to the present maritime jurisdiction, pursuant to a multilateral convention to which the United States is a party; a study of the savings clause problem in the admiralty jurisdiction—that is, whether *The Tungus*, 358 U.S. 588 (1959), should be overruled by statute; criminal discovery; the problem of senior judges; additional staff for courts, judges, and U.S. attorneys; the problem of appellate review of sentences.

Obviously, Mr. President, not all of the many areas I have alluded to are of equal importance, nor are they in equal need of study and reform. Nor do I suggest that this list exhausts the problems in the Federal judicial system that merit thorough scrutiny by the subcommittee.

I have taken the liberty of discussing these topics at perhaps excessive length for the purpose of alerting the Members of Congress, the bench, and the legal profession, to the type of matter that the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery will be studying over the coming months. I want to reiterate at this time that we will welcome any advice and counsel—including suggestions for additional areas that need attention—that we may receive from our colleagues in the Congress, from members of the Federal judiciary and from the bar at large. I urge everyone who is interested in improving and maintaining the health of the Federal judicial system to assist us in this important enterprise.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I have listened to much of the Senator's speech, and I shall read it in tomorrow's RECORD with great interest, but I wish to say at this time that we are fortunate to have the Senator from Maryland as chairman of a subcommittee that will be reviewing the whole subject of how the judicial process of criminal justice functions. We are fortunate because of the Senator's experience as a U.S. attorney. We are fortunate because of his keen interest in this subject and his being a student of it. We are also fortunate that the Senator has made this one of the major subjects of his interest in the Senate.

I serve on the Committee on the District of Columbia with the Senator from Maryland, and I know of his great interest in the whole question of law enforcement problems. I want to associate myself with his objectives. The points he has made in his speech which I have heard are deserving not only of being discussed, but of having a determination by the Senate with regard to a legislative program as a result of his conduct of a review of this subject.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. I join my colleague, the Senator from Oregon in commending the Senator from Maryland. Although I have heard some of the speech, I intend to read the Senator's speech with greater care; but I know what he is talking about. I am in support of his chief objective. The Senator from Maryland has already become an outstanding Member of this body. His accomplishments in many fields are great. This particular subject is illustrative of the kind of work he does. I compliment him.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Connecticut and the distinguished Senator from Oregon for their kind comments. I hope they and other Senators will lend assistance in this effort, because we need all the help we can get.

THE SOVIET CONSULAR CONVENTION, THE RUMANIAN RUBBER DEAL, AND THE QUESTION OF EXTREMISM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, before the session draws to a close, there are some further observations that I would like to make on the question of the Soviet consular convention and the question of trade with the satellite countries.

I link these two questions together because the charge has been made by some that the John Birch Society and other extremist groupings are somehow responsible both for the mounting opposition within the country to the ratification of the consular convention with the Soviet Union and for the cancellation of the Goodyear Rubber contract to build a synthetic rubber plant for the Rumanian Communist government.

I feel that these charges are most regrettable because they carry with them the unescapable implication that in some manner those who oppose ratification of the consular convention have been reached or influenced by the John Birchers or other extremists.

I assume that Congress has received a fair amount of mail opposing ratification of the consular convention because my own office has received a substantial amount of mail on this subject.

I also assume that the John Birch Society has had something to do with these communications because the society has been urging its adherents to write and has been putting out some rather fancy claims about the number of letters they have written.

Every Member of Congress welcomes mail from his constituents because it helps him to make up his mind on important issues. But it is not very difficult to detect an organized letter writing campaign. This is a knack, indeed, which most Members develop during their freshman year in Congress. I am therefore convinced that every Member of the Senate, whether he supported or opposed the consular convention, was aware of the origin of the John Birch campaign and did not attach much weight to these many identically worded or similarly worded communications.

Despite the inflated estimates put out by the John Birch Society about their ability to influence Congress, I am absolutely certain that the John Birch Society has about as much influence in the Halls of Congress as the Ku Klux Klan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that I may continue for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, as a personal note, I might again remind my colleagues that the John Birch Society in a recent bulletin assailed me as—and I quote their words directly—"By far the most persistent, continuous, aggressive, and damaging, enemy the society has had in the U.S. Senate."

THE REASONS AGAINST THE CONSULAR CONVENTION

I opposed the consular convention not so much because of any mail I may have received urging my opposition, but for the simple reason that I considered the convention morally wrong, politically mistaken, and potentially disastrous in its consequences.

To the argument that the convention was not very different from the consular conventions we had concluded with other countries, I replied that the other countries with whom we have such conventions are not committed to our destruction and are not engaged in worldwide subversive activities against the free world.

To the argument that the convention would improve communications between our two countries, I replied that it would do no such thing, because it is not the business of consulates to communicate or to negotiate.

And to those who argued that such an exchange of consulates would further the process of mutual understanding, I replied that the establishment of a series of Soviet consulates on American soil would inevitably fan American suspicion because of the incurable addiction of Soviet diplomats for espionage.

I want to make it clear that I do not believe that the security of our country stands or falls on the establishment of a few Soviet consulates in our major cities.

I have no doubt that the Soviets would use these consulates primarily for purposes of espionage.

But the evidence indicates that the espionage apparatus already maintained by the Soviets in this country is the most massive ever maintained by one country in the territory of another.

I, therefore, doubt that the establishment of a few consulates would enhance the overall effectiveness of the Soviet espionage apparatus by a factor of more than 5 or 10 percent.

The threat posed to our own security by the establishment of a few Soviet consulates would be of limited and manageable propositions. But it would pose a threat of a far greater magnitude to the security of the Americas.

So far, the countries of Latin America, while recognizing the Soviet Union, do not have consular conventions with it.

The acceptance of Soviet consulates in our own country would, I am convinced, inevitably lead to a proliferation of Soviet consulates throughout the troubled countries of Latin America. In these countries, the chief functions of the Communist diplomatic establishments is not espionage; it is, as more than one Latin American government has discovered, the direct support of subversion.

Given the increasingly precarious political situation throughout the Americas, we must shun like the plague any diplomatic innovation which will enhance the Communist capability for subversion.

For all of these reasons, I am convinced that we need Soviet consulates in this hemisphere approximately as much as we need a hole in the head.

It troubles me to have to oppose the administration on the ratification of an agreement which it has negotiated.

But conscience demands that I take a stand against a measure which, I am convinced, can produce no conceivable good, but will instead spawn a host of evil consequences.

In a statement on the floor last week, I pointed out that, in the heat of debate, all of us are prone to make exaggerated statements which we later regret.

It is my earnest hope that in the continuing debate on the consular convention, we will be able to discuss the matter on its merits and to avoid charges of procommunism on the one side and of "John Birch influence" on the other side.

There has already been far too much of this.

THE QUESTION OF TRADE WITH COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

The press of Tuesday, October 12, reported that six major U.S. cigarette manufacturers have defied threats of a consumers' boycott aimed at ending their imports of tobacco from Communist Yugoslavia. It also reported that the cigarette firms have received letters from the administration warning that yielding to pressure groups that threaten economic reprisals for carrying out lawful trade "is to encourage capricious interference with the vital processes of our constitutional government."

Now, there are three basic positions on trade with Communist countries.

There are those who believe in unlimited trade.

There are those who believe in no trade at all.

And there is an in-between category which is not opposed to all trade but which holds that major concessions on trade, especially in the sphere of heavy industrial or strategic goods, should be accompanied by political concessions from the other side.

I have always considered myself a member of this third category. I have no serious objection to the purchase of tobacco or furs or other such commodities from the Communist countries, nor do I seriously object to the sale of certain consumer goods to them. But when it comes to selling them heavy industrial equipment or entire factories or to selling them massive quantities of wheat with which to offset their grave food deficiency, I think it is the height of folly, as I have said on many previous occasions, not to exact certain elementary political concessions in return for the favor we are doing them.

But however we may feel about trade with the Communist countries, I do not think that we can properly take the stand that citizens groups should be discouraged from expressing their viewpoint if it conflicts with Administration policy or that citizens are not within their rights when they organize to boycott goods coming from certain countries.

I recall that in the thirties there was no national prohibition on trade with Nazi Germany. But there was a very active and very successful citizens' movement to boycott Nazi Germany, which operated with complete toleration. Of this movement, I might say incidentally, I counted myself a supporter.

THE RUMANIAN RUBBER DEAL

In his statement on July 25, 1965, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee sharply criticized the Goodyear Rubber Co. for refusing to build a synthetic rubber plant for the Rumanian Communist government.

He rebuked the Firestone Rubber Co. for consenting to build the plant and then reversing its decision because of an adverse public opinion reaction. And he described the Young Americans for Freedom, the organization chiefly responsible for publicizing the rubber deal, as an "extremist," vigilante group.

The question raised by the senior Senator from Arkansas in this case involved more than a determination of the propriety of decisions taken by two American business firms.

I hope that I have misread the Senator's intent, but it seemed to me that his remarks carried the strong inference that the question of developing trade with the Communist-ruled states of Europe is no longer open to controversy.

Actually, as the President's Special Committee on U.S. Trade Relations With East European Countries pointed out in sumarizing the case for and against such an expansion, "there are persuasive elements" in the arguments on each side.

"No one policy is wholly right or wholly wrong," said the committee, "and any course chosen has its own risks."

And just as it would be wrong to take the stand that all those who favor increased trade with the Communist countries are pro-Communist or "soft on communism," it is completely contrary to the facts to suggest that those who oppose such expansion are rightwing extremists whose activities merit investigation.

Even within the liberal political community there are sharply divergent views on the advisability of increased East-West trade.

The executive council of the AFL–CIO has come out strongly against expanded trade with the Communist countries.

In addition, liberal scholars of national reputation, like Dr. Hans Morgenthau and Dr. Zbigniew Brzeszinski, have taken the stand that any expansion of East-West trade should be made conditional on political concessions from the Communist side.

Finally, in addition to myself, the senior Senator from Illinois, the senior Senator from Wisconsin, and the senior Senator from Kentucky, have all warned against an unconditional expansion of East-West trade.

The President's special committee made this point:

> The committee does not believe that many U.S. firms would be interested in selling their most advanced technology. They bargain hard for satisfactory terms for such technology as they are willing to sell. These practices would hold all the more for trade with Communist countries.

Further on the report pointed out that:

> The President should use his authority to permit the sale of nonstrategic technology in support of U.S. trade negotiations with individual Communist countries. The decision to permit the sale is a Government decision to be made on foreign policy grounds. The decision to sell and the terms of sale of such machinery and equipment should be left to the individual U.S. business firms.

This view is restated in recommendation 12 of the committee:

> Trade with Communist countries should not be subsidized, nor should it receive official encouragement. The U.S. Government should decide the permitted scope of the trade in terms of security considerations. Within these limits, the amount of trade that takes place should be left to the U.S. business and the U.S. consumer to decide.

These views were agreed upon and released last May by the very distinguished panel of business and community leaders who make up the Special Committee, under the chairmanship of J. Irwin Miller. Mr. Euguene R. Black and Mr. Crawford H. Greenewalt were among its members.

Judged in the light of these wise ground rules, the actions of both the Goodyear Co. and the Firestone Co. in refusing to sell a synthetic rubber plant to Rumania was unchallengeably proper.

The case against the unconditional expansion of East-West trade was clearly stated in the March 1, 1965, statement of the AFL–CIO executive council. Let me quote what they said:

> 1. The Communist governments are seeking expanded trade with and long-term credits from Western democracies in order to overcome their economic plight.
>
> 2. The record shows that, in seeking expanded economic relations with the West, Communist governments have been motivated primarily by a desire to strengthen their economic system and totalitarian rule rather than by serious concern for speeding the improvement of the living conditions of the people.
>
> 3. There is no reason for American businessmen to join in a mad scramble for trade with Communist countries.
>
> 4. There is no foundation to the myth that the expansion of Western trade will promote the liberalization of any Communist government or encourage the separation of the satellites from the U.S.S.R.

The real problem in expanding East-West trade is not that of the normal exchange of goods.

As was pointed out by the President's Special Committee:

> Foreign exchange rather than present U.S. export controls, is the major limitation on the potential for this trade.

According to the Special Committee, the Eastern European regimes saw in trade with the West a means of hastening economic growth and meeting planned goals. They were interested mostly in advanced technology.

At this time and over the near future, these countries are unlikely to increase substantially their sales in the United States or their convertible foreign exchange holdings earned from trading with Western Europe.

The President's Special Committee said that it is up to the Communist regimes to create conditions which would make possible serious long-term growth in United States-Eastern Europe trade.

Let me quote again from their report:

> They would have to be prepared to invest in new export industries, to learn new marketing methods, to build dealer and service organizations abroad, and to develop relations of confidence with U.S. business firms. Such positive actions move a country to participate in the world economy and to abide by generally accepted international practices. They are intimately related to a nation's world outlook and are evolutionary in nature.

THE SITUATION IN RUMANIA

The real question to be asked is whether the several ostensible gestures of independence on the part of the Rumanian regime are secondary phenomena or whether they have basic significance, whether they are stratagems intended to encourage Western trade and Western credits, or whether they are true indications of a resolve to participate in the world of commerce, and, in the words of the Miller committee, to display an intensified concern "with internal standards of living, rather than with external adventures."

It is true that there are many commentators who are convinced that Rumania has moved very far along the road to independence from Soviet control.

On the other hand, there are some expert observers on Eastern Europe who question the validity of certain actions that have been construed as manifestations of independence.

In addition, the Rumanian Government itself has, in recent months, taken a number of actions which hardly square with the thesis that Rumanian communism is developing into a special breed that should not be identified with Soviet communism.

Let me set forth here certain facts about Rumanian communism and the Rumanian Communist government which, in my opinion, deserve more serious consideration than they have been given in determining our policy toward Rumania.

First. On July 19, 1965, at the Fourth Communist Party Congress, Nicolae Ceansescu, the Secretary General of the Rumanian Communist Party "spent almost 3 minutes denouncing imperialist aggression in Vietnam" according to a report of David Binder, in the New York Times for July 21, 1965.

Next day, said Mr. Binder, the head of state, State Council President Chivu Stoica, "inserted a vitriolic attack on the U.S. Vietnam policy into a discourse on electric power development. His implication was that an increase in Rumanian power production would hearten the anti-imperialist forces."

There is also the fact, recently confirmed by the New York Times, that, ever since the suppression of the Greek-Communist insurrection, the Greek Communist Party has continud its subversive operations directed by headquarters in Rumanian territory, and supported by Communist broadcasts in the Greek language also originating in Rumanian territory. In a very direct sense, therefore, the Communist government of Rumania bears a heavy share of responsibility for the recent disorders that have been plaguing Greece.

At the same congress the previous decision to send material help to North Vietnam was reaffirmed.

Second. While Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria are experimenting with less rigid planning methods and Poland and Hungary are actively studying similar changes, Nicolae Ceansescu, the Rumanian Communist leader, defiantly announced that decentralization of State authority "was not Rumania's way of doing things."

Third. The economic policy of the Rumanian Communist Party remains faithful to its Stalinist prototype. The stress is still on "a system geared more for military power than for human welfare"—report by the President's special committee.

Fourth. Agricultural collectivization was completed over the past 3 years against Moscow's advice. Even within the so-called socialized sector of agriculture, which constitutes more than 90 percent of the land, the State farms get 40 percent of the investment funds although they hold only 15 percent of the land.

The individual lot which the peasant is permitted to till is barely one-half acre—the smallest in any European Communist country. On this the peasant manages to produce one-third of the national vegetable output, close to 50 percent of beef, pork, and dairy products, and 80 percent of the poultry and eggs.

The peasants make up 71.7 percent of the population but get only 28.3 percent of the national revenue.

Fifth. The average salary of the industrial worker is $63 per month. Of this, close to 70 percent goes for food. It takes a skilled worker 1 week of work to earn the price of a pair of shoes and 10 hours to pay for a pound of meat.

Sixth. It is noteworthy that even in the 1956–58 period, when in response to the Hungarian revolution, the stress was temporarily transferred in all Eastern European countries to the output of consumer goods, Rumania did not follow suit.

Seventh. Much has been said about the Western orientation of Rumanian foreign trade. The years since 1959 have witnessed a substantial growth in trade between the Soviet Union and the Eastern European satellites on the one hand and the Western nations on the other hand.

In the case of Rumania, Western European credits have made a marked contribution to the overall expansion of trade with the West. For example, Rumanian imports in 1961 and 1962, exceeded exports by $106.6 million. The indications are that the bulk of this was made up of Western credits.

Eighth. Soviet economic exploitation through overcharged Soviet exports and underpriced imports from the captive area seems to continue unabated. It has been estimated that in 1962 Rumania lost $161.8 million in this way, and the figure for 1963, the last year for which official Soviet foreign trade statistics are available, is slightly higher.

As long as this form of exploitation continues—and there is no evidence that the practice has been discontinued—credits to Rumania indirectly subsidize the Soviet Union.

These are but a few facts in support of the contention that a policy of unconditional Western credits—short- or long-term—would enable the European Communist governments to forego those reforms in the structure and operation of their economy which are called for if they are to overcome the serious problems they are now confronted with.

Left to their own devices these regimes would be compelled by necessity to drop some of their politically motivated economic policies, such as collectivization of agriculture or rigid and centralized planning in industry.

This would result not only in more attention to the people's welfare but also in a dispersal of power.

This would be a salutary political development because a government which is more responsive to the needs of the people and whose powers are less concentrated is, to that degree, less prone to engage in subversive or aggressive adventures in its foreign policies.

I have taken the trouble to set forth the facts in some detail because I think that the facts are sufficient to make it possible for completely reasonable citizens to take a stand against the proposed sale of a synthetic rubber plant to the Rumanian Government and against other similar measures which would serve to enhance the overall industrial capacity of the Communist bloc.

I have many differences on questions of domestic policy with the Young Americans for Freedom. But they were acting completely within their rights as citizens in opposing the Firestone rubber deal and in bringing pressure to bear on the Firestone Co. in support of their views.

We have accorded every freedom of action to critics of our Vietnam policy, because this is the American tradition.

It is my hope that those who may disagree with the administration in other areas will not, in future, be denigrated as vigilantes, but will instead be granted the same freedom of criticism and the same liberty of action that we grant the critics of administration policy in Vietnam.

THE ANTI-VIETNAM PROTEST MOVEMENT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I have sent to the offices of every Senator a copy of a study entitled "The Anti-Vietnam Agitation and the Teach-in Movement." This study was prepared, at my request, by the staff of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security.

The study points out that:

> The great majority of those who have participated in anti-Vietnam demonstrations and in teach-ins are loyal Americans who differ with administration policy in Vietnam for a variety of reasons, ranging from purely strategic considerations to pacifism.

On the other hand, the study points to the conclusion that:

> The control of the anti-Vietnam movement has clearly passed from the hands of the moderate elements who may have controlled it at one time, into the hands of Communists and extremist elements who are openly sympathetic to the Vietcong and openly hostile to the United States, and who call for massive civil disobedience, including the burning of draft cards and the stopping of troop trains. This is particularly true of the national Vietnam protest movement scheduled for October 15–16.

I have been asked what evidence there is that the anti-Vietnam agitation and the teach-in movement have been infiltrated and are being manipulated by the Communists. There are a number of facts, all of them contained in the study, which, taken together, would, I believe, convince any reasonable person that this is so.

The mere fact that these demonstrations are being organized on a worldwide basis is, in my opinion, a complete giveaway. Pacifists and liberals do not maintain a worldwide apparatus. Only the Communists have a worldwide apparatus capable of inspiring or contriving simultaneous demonstrations in many countries.

Second, there is the fact that confidential American Communist Party directives to their members, which are reproduced in our study, instruct them to get into the movement and even target the organizations to be infiltrated.

Third, there is the fact that Moscow broadcasts have openly boasted that the Communists in every country are marching in the forefront of the anti-Vietnam protest movement.

Fourth, there is the fact that a number of longtime Communists have played and are playing a prominent role in the work of organizing these protest demonstrations.

The Communists are smart enough to have respected citizens heading up movements they support and appearing on their platform. But if you look closely, the hands of the real organizers become apparent.

For example, in May 1960, the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy organized a mass rally at Madison Square Garden. The members of this committee are all eminently respectable citizens. So were the speakers at the mass rally. But it turned out that the actual organizer of this rally was one, Henry Abrams, a veteran member of the Communist Party. The same Henry Abrams, I note, is listed as the No. 1 staff member in charge of organizing the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade tomorrow. I have here an ad from the Trotskyite Communist newspaper, the Militant, in which Abrams' name is listed, and which appeals to all Trotskyites and radicals to turn out.

The subcommittee study at many points identifies known Communist participants and people with long and persistent records of association with Communist-front causes, who are playing a prominent role in the present anti-Vietnam agitation.

I hope that all of my colleagues will find the time to study this publication, because I believe it will give them a new insight into what is taking place this weekend in some 80 cities around the country.

PAGEANT MAGAZINE CALLS FOR COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in the November issue of Pageant magazine, on pages 4 and 5, Gerald A. Bartell, publisher of Pageant magazine has written a "letter from the publisher," in which he calls for increased consideration of the futures of our cold war veterans.

Under the title of this editorial "So That These Brave Men Will Not Have Fought In Vain," the editor truly says with reference to the cold war GI bill:

> It is not charity; it is morality. It is good sense economically and socially. It proved its value in two postwar periods. It is one of the few national counterpoints in the recurring madness of war.

In this article, he states that it is essential that we support the cold war GI bill (S. 9) as well as other legislation for these veterans.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial entitled "So That These Brave Men Will Not Have Fought In Vain," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SO THAT THESE BRAVE MEN WILL NOT HAVE FOUGHT IN VAIN

Amid the unceasing ideological soul searching that our Vietnam intervention has occasioned, we request a moment to plead for the GI.

We are sending him, in increasing numbers, to dismal duty. Surely a Saturday night in Saigon can be a world of excitement to a callow 20-year-old soldier—if he spends it on a date with a sloe-eyed oriental girl. The landscapes of southeast Asia and the seascapes of the South China Sea must be of absorbing interest to almost any young American male, and educational indeed. Becoming acquainted with the Vietnamese people offers a maturing experience.

But our fighting men are not sent to Vietnam for such worthwhile adventures. They know why they go and what may be expected of them. So do we. And it is time to look to the welfare of the GI upon whom we impose a heavy burden. I suggest that he deserves some of the Great Society treatment to which we have properly dedicated ourselves.

We therefore direct the attention of our citizens and lawmakers to the need for new legislative action that will give our servicemen overseas in that unfortunate land of slaughter, squalor, and misery—in a meager quid pro quo for their contribution to what is announced as our national purpose—the benefits accorded veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict.

As this issue of Pageant was going to press, Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE, Democrat, of Georgia, introduced a bill (S. 2127) that offers a free $10,000 GI insurance policy to each combat area fighting man. At a 1-day hearing before the Senate Finance Committee the bill was approved for consideration of the full Senate.

If, by the time this letter is in print, S. 2127 is not a law, it is because the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs refuses to go along with what it regards as a superficial, patchwork approach to a problem that demands a complete program, of which GI insurance is only one component.

Certainly a form of the Talmadge bill, which provides an equivalent of national service life insurance, is essential. But we must also undertake such programs as a generous mustering-out allowance to assist in the adjustment from military to civilian life, college or training school education underwritten by the Government, and low-interest loans.

If you are startled that our men in Vietnam are not covered by these basic benefits, you may be subject to a brace of surprises arising from the ticklish technical position of this war. Officially, the conflict in Vietnam is not regarded as an American war. Our troops are engaged in a massive assist to the South Vietnamese. Korea, you may recall, was designated by President Harry Truman as a police action. But even without the legalities, the men involved in that encounter were given essentially the same benefits as participants in World War II.

We are told that any special consideration granted servicemen stationed in Vietnam must then be granted to all others on cold war duty. But must this be so? The President has the power to declare a state of national emergency when flood, fire, or other disaster overtakes an area. In like manner he is able to declare a state of emergency upon serious threat to national security. This declaration should be sufficient, if specifically spelled out, to engender wartime welfare benefits to troops engaged in the designated action. To help our GI's now, such a Presidential proclamation should be made immediately.

It is also essential that we support long-range legislation proposed by Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas, author of the cold-war GI bill for which he has fought for 6 years. Senator YARBOROUGH is incensed at the unfairness of penalizing those engaged in military service. He told Pageant that "only 40 percent of draft-eligible men ever serve in uniform, and we need to put them on an equal footing with the 60 percent whose opportunity to further their education and careers are not interrupted by military duty."

Perhaps the most terrifying thought a soldier experiences is that of uncertainty, the unknown. He's not usually afraid of being shot at, for it's always someone else who is killed. But he does fear the unknown. We all do.

An orderly procedure of assists and encouragements to the soldiers who must do the Government's most hazardous work is important and appreciated. It tends to lift morale.

It is not charity; it is morality. It is good sense economically and socially. It proved its value in two postwar periods. It is one of the few rational counterpoints in the recurring madness of war.

GERALD A. BARTELL.

TEXAS AND PERU: AN ALLIANCE THAT HAS PROGRESSED

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President: Last night I was privileged to attend a reception at the Peruvian Embassy hosted by the charming Ambassador and Mrs. Celso Pastor, on the occasion of the opening of a National Gallery exhibition of a fabulous treasure of Peruvian gold. Some of these articles are several thousand years old, some being the product of craftsmen of former peoples of Peru before the birth of Christ.

Many of these treasures have never been outside Peru before, and this outstanding exhibit projects the friendly relations which have existed between the United States and Peru.

I am especially interested in this exhibit, because Texas and Peru are official partners in the Alliance for Progress, and during our brief time as partners, many projects have been undertaken and successfully completed.

One example of what was done is described in the Dallas Morning News of July 31, 1965, under the title "One Hundred and Ninety-seven Dollars Admits Village to 20th Century," which outlines how Texans sent road equipment to Peru and with that equipment the village of Navan built a road which gave access to the 20th century and communication with the outside world.

There was an article in the Washington Post on October 3, 1965, describing the wonderful cultural exhibit from Peru on display at the National Gallery in Washington, a treasury of gold ornaments, gold jewelry, gold plates, gold goblets, and gold chalices, and many other gold things going back thousands of years, and also this photographic exhibit.

It was my privilege to visit Peru in 1962. Its ancient history and great culture makes it an honored leader in the Western Hemisphere.

To illustrate the success of the Texas-Peru Alliance of Progress, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Dallas Morning News of July 31, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD, along with an article from the Washington Post of October 3, 1965, describing the wonderful cultural exhibit from Peru on display at the National Gallery in Washington.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, July 31, 1965]

SATURDAY SHOWCASE—$197 ADMITS VILLAGE TO 20TH CENTURY

(By Carlos Conde)

LIMA, PERU.—For more than 200 years the mainstream of life bypassed the people who lived in the mountain village of Navan. There was no road from their town to the main highway. It was only 6 miles distant, but to them it might as well have been a world away.

The only way to get down the mountain was a steep rocky mule path that was impassable at certain times of the year. Many lived and died in Navan without ever leaving it. They wove their own clothes and grew their own food. Only two people in the village could read and write.

Finally the town leaders decided to build a usable road.

They didn't want a lot of money or fancy engineering plans. They just wanted tools to do the job themselves. But picks cost about $5. They needed about two dozen of them and the same number of shovels. That would take $200. A villager didn't earn half that much in a year. How would they ever get that much money?

They asked the Peruvian Government for help. Navan, a town of 2,500 people, was small and insignificant. Few Peruvians even knew it existed. It was natural, therefore, for their request to get buried and lost in bureaucratic files.

Two years went by. The townspeople began to search elsewhere. Someone told them of a "gringo" group that might help them. They traced the group to the U.S. Agency for International Development in Lima. It was a bunch of Texans who called themselves "The Texas Partners of the Alliance." The Texas Partners bought the tools for them and the Navan citizens went to work.

Last May they finished the job. A truck loaded with potatoes chugged up the narrow, lumpy road to commemorate the event. Church bells rang, people cheered and dogs barked. For Navan it was the greatest day in its history.

Trucks now travel up and down the road to buy and sell products. Two government teachers have started reading and writing classes in the village. The Navan folks occasionally hit the road for a holiday in the nearby towns.

These people had never heard of "Texans" before. But they'll never forget them. They call Texans the "padrinos," or godfathers of their road.

And all it cost was $197.

The Texas Partners of the Alliance have been doing a lot of similar people-to-people diplomacy since the organization was founded in San Antonio in March 1964.

And they have proven most vividly that it doesn't take a lavish budget. Since 1964, they have spent a total of $5,397 on projects such as the Navan road construction. The U.S. Government has given $310,500,000 in aid in Peru.

Chairman of the Texas Partners is Edward Marcus of Dallas. In Peru, the program is coordinated by a Lima corporation attorney, Carlos Boza, through the U.S. AID offices,

The creed of the Texans is "Ayudense que nosotros los ayudaremos." It means, "We will help those who help themselves."

The Texas Partners was formed at the request of the U.S. State Department to give a personal touch to the Alliance for Progress program. Twenty-four States are engaged in similar programs in other South American countries.

The purpose of the Texas Partners is threefold: To initiate self-help projects for the Peruvians; to stimulate cultural exchange; and to encourage small investments.

Participating in the program are Texas civic clubs, high school organizations, labor unions, and business and professional groups.

"This type of partnership helps to assure the people of South America of our concern for their struggle to rise above poverty," said Banks Miller, Jr., the executive secretary of the Texas Partners. "It aims to give a sense of movement of the Alliance in the slums and the rural areas where help is most needed.

"Most important, it can buy time until the institutions building economic development programs of the Alliance can make themselves felt at the grassroots level."

Boza thinks the pocket-change aid program is turning out to be more effective than some of the multi-million-dollar projects undertaken by the U.S. Government.

"A $5 pick has more impact than a $5 million dam," Boza said. "Few participate directly in a $5 million structure. It's like a gift with very little intrinsic value. Peruvians are leery of a gift. They think a gift has hidden strings. But they understand the gesture of a pick."

"Texans have not made this an old-clothes program," Boza said. "They have helped us without making us feel like beggars and taking away our dignity as human beings."

The Texas Partners are moving at a faster pace than first expected. They have participated in 32 projects and have spent $5,397.11. They still need $1,075.51 for seven pending projects such as libraries, rooftops for schools, handtools, and kerosene lamps.

The partners are still developing their cultural and investment sections. In August, a Texas concert pianist will perform in Lima under the auspices of the partners. Delegations of Texans have made several trips to Peru to investigate investment possibilities.

Self-help projects are screened and recommended through AID offices in Lima and then forwarded to the partners office in Austin. The project is then assigned to a Texas civic club or school organization which raises the money.

The $197 for the Navan project was raised by the Texas AFL–CIO. The Women's Democratic Club of Texas gave $125 for a gas generator. Edward Marcus gave $250 and Levelland High School gave $115 to a bridge project. Five Pan American Student Forum Clubs from Wichita Falls gave $213 to a jungle tribe for chicken wire. Sunset High School of Dallas' PASF Club gave two dye pots to an artisans' center in a mountain village. The PASF Club of Travis High School in Austin raised $75 for tools for the Picha tribe in the Amazon.

"This program is proving very effective, but it still needs some tightening up," said

John O'Donnell, the AID officer in charge of the partners program. "We need to streamline things. There is too much of a gap between the time the project is approved and the time they get the money. We also need to keep the Texans better informed on how their projects turn out."

Carlos Boza said Texans might be happy to hear what the people of Navan did with their tools after they finished their road.

"They held a ceremony and presented the tools to a neighboring town 2 miles away that had no road. Now their neighbors are building a road to connect with Navan."

All This Glitter Really Is Gold—1800-Year-Old Treasures Are Here From Peru

A fabulous treasure of gold, some of it 1800 years old, has been sent by the Government of Peru to Washington to be exhibited this month at the National Gallery of Art.

A glimpse inside the thick-walled vault where the treasure is presently stored produces some of the excitement of an archeologist's discovery. Tables all around the narrow room are crowded with golden objects—not today's heavy, polished gold, but a quite different kind, gleaming dully and most often beaten to an exquisite thinness.

The treasure is both unsalable and irreplaceable, valued beyond any price by Peru.

In the centuries before Columbus, before the Incas even, when Europe was still in the dark ages, the highly civilized Peruvian Indians made and used these golden ornaments—ceremonial necklaces, huge earrings, wide belts, crowns, nose jewels, bowls and vases, death masks, tiny figures of people and animals.

From October 15 through November 28, the treasures will be on display, mounted on black velvet and dramatically lighted, in the central second-floor rotunda of the Gallery. It will be only the second time in the Gallery's history that an exhibit has been shown there.

Many of the golden treasures have never been outside Peru before, and they have never been exhibited together. Seven different museums, including the Peruvian National Museum of Anthropology and Archeology, have loaned them for a U.S. tour. After leaving here, they will be shown in Dallas, Cleveland, New York, Seattle, and Kansas City.

The most ancient of the ornaments, only recently discovered, belong to the Vicus culture of the first century A.D. Four later civilizations are also included in the exhibit, ending with the Incas.

One of the Inca kings, Atahualpa, was captured by the Spanish conquistador Pizarro, and offered his captor three rooms full of gold and silver for his freedom.

Students of history will remember that the Spaniard took the ransom but killed the king anyway, hoping to get his hands on even more treasure. This tragic story has been made into a play, which will soon open in New York, perhaps during the time that the Peruvian gold is displayed there.

This and most of the other loot seized by the conquistadors was melted down, since it had commercial and currency value for the Spaniards, though the Indians valued it only for its ornamental beauty.

Because of the practice of melting, few of the Indian treasures that were transported to Europe remain, and even the Peruvian supply of them is limited, many of them having been discovered through excavations in modern times.

President and Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson and Peruvian President Fernando Belalunde are honorary patrons for the epic exhibit at the National Gallery.

On Tuesday, another Peruvian cultural exhibit will be opened at the National Collection of Fine Arts in the Museum of Natural History, with Ambassador and Mrs. Pastor acting as hosts to an invited group. This is a photographic exhibit called "The World of Peru," depicting the art, archeology, geography, and industry of the country.

In January, at about the same time as the gold treasures will be in Dallas, the photographs will be exhibited at the University of Texas in Austin, where Lynda Bird Johnson is a student.

Interestingly enough, not only is Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson a graduate of the university, but so is President Belaunde, and there begins a whole series of links between the United States and Peru.

Texas and Peru are official partners in the Alliance for Progress, and Peruvian cities have a number of sister cities in this country. Cleveland, Ohio, for example, is linked to Lima, and Flint, Mich., is a sister to Trujillo, Peru.

So, the Peruvian Embassy is inviting to the opening parties for the cultural exhibits not only the usual Washington official and cultural society, but also the Congressmen and Senators of the related States and the mayors of the sister cities.

An embassy official explained, "We want to project cultural diplomacy to all regions of the United States to emphasize the common cultural and human values between our people."

The Peruvian program is based on the conviction that these intangible values are essential to the technological and economic relationships of the Alliance for Progress.

Two other cultural exhibits from Peru have already appeared here during the past year: the colonial paintings of the Cusco School, which were displayed at the Pan-American Union, and the children's embroidery from Chijnaya, near Lake Titicaoa, which was shown at the State Department.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF 1ST SESSION OF 89TH CONGRESS—A TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, 1 week ago today, our President underwent surgery at the National Naval Medical Center in Bethesda. The prayers of all of us, indeed, of all the free world, went with him and remain with him.

Our anxiety and concern of those we represent in all 50 States have moved us to follow the progress and recuperation of this superlative leader whom we admire and love. We shall—all of us—continue to follow with sincere and warm interest his progress toward the complete healing we wish him in the days ahead as we wind up our own labors in this 1st session, 89th Congress.

The monumental social legislation of the 89th Congress is a tribute to Lyndon Johnson. Already, President Johnson is destined for his mark in history as one of the greatest Presidents—for his own record and his part in ours. He is at once our adviser and guide while inspiring confidence in Government, a superb administrator and brilliant executive. He is a builder of cooperation, earning the admiration of all the free world.

This is not to minimize the role of any one of the 535 Members of Congress. Each of us can point with pride at the total accomplishment of this session and look ahead toward the next with assurance we shall continue to make an even greater record in the next session.

As we put together far-reaching laws and achievements, we did not in this body always agree with one another nor, in every detail, with the President. Yet, regardless of the pressure of the task or the complexity of the problem, regardless of the storms raging throughout the world, our business was disposed of without rancor and bitterness and with dispatch.

Whenever we were counseled by the President, whether we agreed in detail or in general or not at all, it was with fondness and good nature that we accepted the advice. For all of us felt the deep pride that one of us—our former majority leader—was in the White House, and we knew he was doing an outstanding job with his awesome responsibilities.

In any event, this is a good time to take stock—and to look ahead.

We have, for the first time in the recorded history of mankind, committed organized society to the proposition that the poor, the undereducated, the hungry, the ill-housed, the deprived recipients of charity and relief are not self-perpetuating in the fabric of our Nation. Whether we are able to achieve the Great Society or not, the greatness is in the fact that we have made a beginning on an idea—conceived by the President and carried out by the Congress.

We have, for the first time in our own history as a nation, installed a medical program that will assure that every American will have proper care in his old age as a matter of right.

We have begun the tremendous task of cleaning up our lakes and streams and keeping them clean.

We have begun a program of assistance for our schools from first grade through university that will enable more Americans to attain the fullness of their own capacity.

The President himself dramatized these monumental achievements.

Will we ever forget his signing of the education bill in the presence of his own teacher? Who among us could forget the trip to Independence, Mo., for the signing of medicare?

And we will not forget the leader of the free world standing at the foot of the Statue of Liberty telling the whole world we mean what we say on the inscription at that shrine.

Indeed, the ideas, the inspiration, the guidance and the help for these milestones often came from our former colleague.

There is little remaining undone in the program which we and the President have set as our goal for this session. Only a few recommendations remain before us or are due to come before us.

Whether we agree in every detail is again not important. Let us, however, work with diligence and dispatch to complete favorable action on the President's remaining recommendations. And let this become our own get-well gift to him.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana for his beautiful tribute to the President of the United States, a fellow Texan, who is the first citizen of Texas ever to have the honor to serve as President.

I commend the Senator from Indiana for his concise narration and enumeration of the great accomplishments of the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank the Senator from Texas.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FIREARMS ACT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I would like to place in the Record today, for the information of my colleagues, a brief résumé of some of the thoughtful and responsible support which has been given to S. 1592, the amendment I have proposed to the Federal Firearms Act.

The bill, as you know, was developed over a period of more than 4 years by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee with the cooperation and aid of industry, Government agencies, law enforcement officials, sportsmen and others.

It would place a reasonable control over the now wide-open traffic in firearms to criminals, addicts, mental patients, and others who by law should not have them.

In that sense it would merely plug the loophole existing in the present law which allows a felon from one State to travel to another State and purchase a gun, without fear of effective prosecution. And in the same manner, it would prevent the felon from making the illegal purchase via the mail order route.

Senate bill 1592, which is sought by President Johnson as an essential part of his war on crime program, would also clamp strict controls on the importation of millions of foreign military surplus armaments, including bazookas, antitank guns, mortars, bombs, and grenades.

These surplus weapons are now being gobbled up on the American market by criminals, juveniles, and extremists such as paramilitary groups and others who would presume to defend the shores of this Nation with popguns, as it were, when we are invaded by a nuclear power.

There has been opposition to this legislation, and by that I mean an intensive, well financed, and powerful lobby working night and day to see that it is never adopted.

This lobby has distorted the facts, confused the issue, in some cases lied outright to attain its end, the defeat of reasonable firearms legislation. And what is more disturbing, this hard-core lobby represents only a small minority of the American people, the vast majority of whom want reasonable laws such as this and have repeatedly said so. The public would feel more secure in the knowledge that firearms are difficult to come by for the murderer, the holdup artist, the addict, the mental patient, and the assassin.

This matter has been given serious thought by a number of responsible organizations. Among them are the American Bar Association, the International Associations of Chiefs of Police, and the Connecticut Bar Association.

Each of these groups, after lengthy consideration, unanimously adopted a resolution asking that S. 1592 be made a part of our statutes because of its importance to crime control.

I want to publicly thank the leadership of each of these organizations, along with each member, for doing what he believed right in the face of criticism that has been all too frequently both withering and unreasoned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions adopted unanimously by the American Bar Association and the International Association of Chiefs of Police and the letter informing me of the Connecticut Bar's decision be printed in the Record, so that my colleagues may share in their thoughts and deliberations.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

American Bar Association Section of Criminal Law

RECOMMENDATION

Be it resolved, That the American Bar Association support the enactment of S. 1592, 89th Congress, a bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act, or similar Federal legislation.

Be it further resolved, That the section of criminal law be authorized to present the views of the American Bar Association on such legislation to the appropriate committees of Congress.

REPORT

Federal action directed at the control of firearms originated, for modern purposes of criminal control, in the National Firearms Act of June 26, 1934, which is now set out in sections 5801–5862 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. This act, passed in reaction to the gang wars of the prohibition era and the postprohibition crimewaves, was directed at preventing criminals from obtaining firearms, such as machineguns, cane guns, sawed-off shotguns, silencers, and similar weapons, which were particularly suitable for criminal use. The act provides for special licensing taxes on importers, manufacturers, dealers, and pawnbrokers dealing in such arms, imposes heavy transfer taxes on the transfer of such arms, requires the registration of such arms upon transfer, and the registration of persons possessing such arms. Although written as a revenue measure, it was clearly intended to control the criminal commerce in firearms of a criminal character and provided penalties of up to 5 years' imprisonment.

The Federal Firearms Act of June 30, 1938, 15 United States Code sections 901–909, was designed to suppress crime by regulating the traffic in firearms and ammunition, and applied to all firearms. Its legislative history shows particular concern with "roaming racketeers and predatory criminals who know no State lines—a situation beyond the power of control by local authorities to such an extent as to constitute a national menace." *United States* v. *Platt,* 31 F. Supp. 788, 790 (S.D. Tex. 1940); see hearings on H.R. 9066 before House Committee on Ways and Means, 73d Congress, 2d session (1934). The act requires a dealer to obtain a Federal dealer's license by filing an application with the Internal Revenue Service and paying a fee of $1. However, because of the simplicity of this requirement and of the other recordkeeping required by the law, this act has been called a "mail-order operation" in itself. Hearings before the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 88th Congress, 1st session, part 14, at 3209 (1963).

The assassination of President John F. Kennedy on November 22, 1963, with a rifle reported to have been purchased by the accused assassin through the mails, brought public and congressional scrutiny to bear on the availability of firearms in the United States through mail orders and other uncontrolled channels of distribution. However, consideration of this problem had preceded that tragic event; concern with juvenile crime in which the use of mail-order weapons was an increasing factor led to hearings by the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary during early 1963, and legislation directed at the types of weapons used by juvenile criminals was introduced in August 1963 by Chairman Dodd and other members of the subcommittee. The assassination brought the introduction of numerous other bills, the expansion of the Dodd bill, and greater concern about this problem.

S. 1975, 88th Congress, 1st session, was introduced on August 2, 1963, by Senator Dodd for himself and other members of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, but this proposal was not enacted. Other legislation proposing varying techniques for controlling the interstate shipment of firearms was introduced in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. In addition, resolutions were introduced in the House of Representatives authorizing an investigation of the sale of firearms in interstate and foreign commerce.

On March 22, 1965, Senator Dodd introduced S. 1592, a bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act. A copy of this bill is attached. Basically, the proposed legislation is designed to accomplish the following:

First: It would prohibit the shipment of firearms in interstate commerce, except between federally licensed manufacturers, dealers, and importers. This provision would have the effect of prohibiting the so-called mail-order traffic in firearms to unlicensed persons. It would leave to each State the responsibility and authority for controlling the sale and disposition of firearms within its borders. There are several important exceptions to this general prohibition against interstate shipment. Sportsmen could continue to take their shotguns or rifles across State lines. Pistols could be carried in interstate commerce but only for a lawful purpose and only in conformity with State laws. Further, firearms could be shipped to a licensee for service and return to the sender. However, a nonlicensee could no longer buy weapons from out-of-State mail-order dealers. Sales would be made by retail dealers and would thus be subject to recordkeeping requirements. These records would then have new meaning; they would not be rendered futile by an unrecorded flow of mail-order guns.

Second: Licensed retail dealers would be required to limit sales of handguns to residents of their State who are 21 years of age or older; they would be prohibited from selling any firearm to a person under the age of 18. In accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, licensed dealers would be required to ascertain the identity and place of residence of a purchaser. Further, it would be unlawful for a dealer to sell a firearm to any person when he knows or has reasonable cause to believe that such person is under indictment for or has been convicted of a felony, or is a fugitive from justice. These provisions of the proposed legislation do not address themselves to the question of permits to possess or to use firearms, leaving it to the States and local communities to decide what they need and want in that regard. Thus, for example, while the bill limits the sale of shotguns and rifles to persons who are at least 18 years of age, it does not preclude such persons from using guns if such use is permitted by State or local law.

Third: The bill would raise the annual license fees for a dealer from the present token of $1 to $100. It would also establish a license fee of $250 for a pawnbroker who deals in firearms. Specific standards are established under which an application for a license shall be disapproved, after notice and opportunity for a hearing. The purpose of this provision of the proposed legislation is to limit the issuance of licenses to bona fide dealers. Under existing law, anyone other than a felon can, upon the mere allegation that he is a dealer and the payment of a fee of $1, demand and obtain a license. According to the Secretary of the Treasury, some 50,000 or 60,000 people have done this, some of them merely to put themselves in a position to obtain personal guns at wholesale. There would be nothing to prevent them from obtaining licenses in order to ship or receive concealable weapons through the mails, or to circumvent State or local requirements.

Fourth: The bill would permit the Secretary of the Treasury to curb the flow into the United States of surplus military weapons and other firearms not suitable for sporting purposes. However, weapons imported for science, research, or military training, or as antiques and curios, could be allowed.

Fifth: The importation and interstate shipment of large caliber weapons, such as bazookas and antitank guns, and other destructive devices would be brought under effective Federal control.

The Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Senate Judiciary Committee has been holding hearings on S. 1592, commencing shortly after the introduction of this legislation. The testimony of witnesses appearing before the subcommittee has generally favored enactment of the legislation, particularly the testimony of witnesses who are concerned with any facet of law enforcement. The principal objections to the legislation seemed to stem from the National Rifle Association and its members. The position of the NRA was commented upon by Attorney General Katzenbach in a statement to the subcommittee on May 19, 1965, excerpts of which appear below:

* * * * *

"This measure is not intended to curtail the ownership of guns among those legally entitled to own them. It is not intended to deprive people of guns used either for sport or for self-protection. It is not intended to force regulation on unwilling States.

"The purpose of this measure is simple: It is merely, to help the States protect themselves against the unchecked flood of mail-order weapons to residents whose purposes might not be responsible, or even lawful. S. 1592 would provide such assistance to the extent that the States and the people of the States want it.

* * * * *

"There is demonstrable need for regulation of the interstate mail-order sale of guns. This bill is a response to that need. It was carefully drafted; it is receiving detailed attention from this subcommittee.

"But, nevertheless, S. 1592 now has itself become a target—for the verbal fire of the National Rifle Association and others who represent hunters and sporting shooters. These opponents feel their views most deeply, as is evident from the bitterness and volume of their opposition. It is no secret to any Member of Congress that the NRA sent out a mailing of 700,000 letters to its membership urging a barrage of mail to Senators and Congressmen.

"There is no question that the views of the NRA should be heard and given full weight. There is no question that so many people with an interest in gun legislation should have every opportunity to express it. But those views also need to be evaluated and thus I would like now to turn to analysis of the opposition arguments.

"It has been suggested, for example, by Franklin Orth, executive vice president of the NRA, that S. 1592 gives the Secretary of the Treasury 'unlimited power to surround all sales of guns by dealers with arbitrary and burdensome regulations and restrictions.'

"I fear this is an exaggeration flowing from the heat of opposition. The Secretary's regulations must be reasonable. I should think that the reasonableness of the regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Treasury under the existing provisions of the Federal Firearms Act would contradict the assumption of burdensome regulations.

"Further, the Administrative Procedure Act assures all interested parties of an opportunity to be heard before the issuance of substantive rules and regulations. The NRA and other gun interests have, in the past, taken full advantage of this opportunity and clearly could do so in the future. And still further, the regulations are subject to review and reversal by the courts and by Congress should they be felt arbitrary and capricious.

"It has also been suggested that S. 1592 requires anyone engaged in the manufacture of ammunition to pay $1,000 for a manufacturer's license. The bill does not do so. It does not cover shotgun ammunition at all, and the license fee for manufacturers of other types of ammunition is $500.

"It is true that anyone selling rifle ammunition, even .22 caliber, would be compelled to have a $100 dealer license. Why shouldn't he? He is dealing in ammunition for a lethal weapon. The many dealers in ammunition who also sell firearms would not, however, be required to pay an additional ammunition fee. Nor is there anything in the legislation that would, as has been stated, require a club engaged in reloading for its members to obtain a manufacturer's license.

"A further specific objection raised against this measure is that it would forbid a dealer to sell to a nonresident of his State. The objection is stated in a misleading way. The bill does forbid such sales of handguns, but it specifically excepts weapons like rifles and shotguns most commonly used by sportsmen and least commonly used by criminals.

"A similar objection is made on the grounds that the measure would prohibit all mail-order sales of firearms to individuals. While this is an accurate description of the measure with respect to interstate and foreign commerce, the bill would not foreclose now allowable shipments within a State. Any control of such commerce is left to the States.

"One last comment on the specific NRA objections, as expressed in the letter sent to its membership. The letter described this measure as one which conceivably could lead to the elimination of the private ownership of all guns. I am compelled to say that this is not conceivable. I am compelled to say that there is only one word which can serve in reply to such a fear—'preposterous.'

* * * * *

"More generally, I really cannot understand why the legislation we are talking about should seem a threat at all to sportsmen, hunters, farmers, and others who have a productive or necessary or enjoyable interest in the use of rifles, shotguns, or sporting handguns. Nothing that we propose here could intelligently be construed as impairing the employment they derive from shooting.

"This legislation would, indeed, make some changes in the distribution of firearms. It would, indeed, by outlawing mail-order sales of firearms between States, bring about changes in the commercial firearms world. It would, indeed, challenge interests which have thrived on the present state of unregulated chaos. But such a challenge is tragically overdue.

* * * * *

"Which is more significant, the right not to be slightly inconvenienced in the purchase of a firearm, or the right not to be terrorized, robbed, wounded, or killed?

"As the chief law enforcement officer of the United States, I come before you today to ask you to supply the only conceivable answer to that question. I come, with all the urgency at my command, to ask the subcommittee to report this measure favorably and to ask the Congress to enact it without delay."

Two further objections have been made to the proposed legislation. The first that it is unconstitutional, and the second is that, even if enacted, the criminal will still get guns by the simple process of stealing them or buying them from a "gun bootlegger."

With respect to the constitutional issue, both the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General of the United States have affirmed that the bill was carefully drafted to insure its constitutionality. It is the view of the section of criminal law that there is no merit to an objection to the legislation on constitutional grounds. The vast body of authority under the commerce clause supports Federal control of the distribution of firearms by means of interstate commerce. Further, it seems clear that the right to bear arms protected by the second amendment relates only to the maintenance of the militia; that amendment does not prevent the reasonable regulation of interstate commerce in firearms in the interest of public safety. It should be noted that the legislation does not apply to agencies and departments of Federal, State, and local governments.

With respect to the second objection, viz, that, even if the legislation is enacted, it will not prevent the criminal from obtaining a gun, the statement made by the Secretary of the Treasury to the subcommittee is illuminating. Excerpts follow:

"Mr. Chairman, I am happy to appear before your committee in association with my colleague, the Attorney General, and other representatives of the administration in support of S. 1592 to amend the Federal Firearms Act, because I feel that enactment of this piece of legislation is of great importance to the welfare of this country and its citizens.

"S. 1592 is designed to implement the recommendations which the President set forth with respect to firearms control in his message to the Congress of March 8, 1965, relating to law enforcement and the administration of justice.

"The President, in that message, described crime as 'a malignant enemy in America's midst' of such extent and seriousness that the problem is now one 'of great national concern.' The President also stated, and I quote from his message, 'The time has come now, to check that growth, to contain its spread, and to reduce its toll of lives and property.'

"As an integral part of the war against the spread of lawlessness, the President urged the enactment of more effective firearms control legislation, and cited as a significant factor in the rise of violent crime in the United States 'the ease with which any person can acquire firearms.'

"The President recognized the necessity for State and local action, as well as Federal action, in this area and he urged 'the Governors of our States and mayors and other local public officials to review their existing legislation in this critical field with a view to keeping lethal weapons out of the wrong hands.' However, the President also clearly recognized in his message that effective State and local regulation of firearms is not feasible unless we strengthen at the Federal level controls over the importation of firearms and over the interstate shipment of firearms. The President advised that he was proposing draft legislation to accomplish these aims, and stated, and I quote, 'I recommend this legislation to the Congress as a sensible use of Federal authority to assist local authorities in coping with an undeniable menace to law and order and to the lives of innocent people.'

"Anyone who reads the papers today or hears the news on radio and television cannot help but be appalled at the extent of crime and lawlessness in this country and at the extent of the loss of lives through the use of weapons in the hands not only of criminals but also juveniles, the mentally sick, and other irresponsible people. Every day the lives of decent American citizens, our greatest national asset, are being snuffed out through the misuse and abuse of firearms by persons who should not have access to them.

* * * * *

"What the bill does is to institute Federal controls in areas where the Federal Government can and should operate, and where the State governments cannot, the areas of interstate and foreign commerce. Under our Federal constitutional system, the responsibility for maintaining public health and safety is left to the State governments under their police powers. Basically, it is the province of the State governments to determine the conditions under which their citizens may acquire and use firearms. I certainly hope that in those States where there is not now adequate regulation of the acquisition of firearms, steps will soon be taken to institute controls complementing the steps taken in this bill in order to deal effectively with this serious menace.

"Since a bureau of my Department is responsible for the administration of the Firearms Act, I am particularly anxious that the changes proposed in the bill with respect to the issuance of licenses to manufacture, import, and deal in firearms be adopted. Under existing law, anyone other than a felon can, upon the mere allegation that he is a dealer and payment of a fee of $1, demand and obtain a license. Some 50,000 or 60,000 people have done this, some of them merely to put themselves in a position to obtain personal guns at wholesale. The situation is wide open for the obtaining of licenses by irresponsible elements, thus facilitating the acquisition of these weapons by criminals and other undesirables. The bill before you, by increasing license fees and imposing standards for obtaining licenses, will go a long way toward rectifying this situation.

"One misconception about this bill which has been widely publicized is that it will make it possible for the Federal Government to institute such regulations and restrictions as will create great difficulties for law-abiding citizens in acquiring, owning, or using firearms for sporting purposes. This is absolutely not so. Sportsmen will continue to be able to obtain rifles and shotguns from licensed dealers and manufacturers subject only to the requirements of their respective State laws. Indeed, they can travel to another State and purchase a rifle or shotgun from a licensed dealer there and bring it home with them without interference. Only two minor inconveniences may occur for the sportsmen of this country. They will not be able to travel to another State and purchase a pistol or concealable weapon, and they will not be able to obtain a direct shipment from another State of any type of firearm. On this latter point, the inconvenience is more apparent than real because the large mail-order houses have outlets in most of the States and the bill will permit mail-order shipments to individual citizens from these outlets.

"These minor inconveniences have been found to be necessary in order to make it possible for the States to regulate effectively the acquisition and possession of firearms. Obviously, State authorities cannot control the acquisition and possession of firearms if they have no way of knowing or ascertaining what firearms are coming in to their States through the mails or, in the case of concealable weapons, by personally being carried across State lines.

* * * * *

"Today, the people of the United States are living under the most ideal conditions which have ever existed for any peoples anywhere on earth. Yet much of this is threatened by the spreading cancer of crime and juvenile delinquency. It is absolutely essential that steps such as those proposed in this bill be taken to bring under control one of the main elements in the spread of this cancer, the indiscriminate acquisition of weapons of destruction. In concluding my statement, may I say that the Department's experience with the existing Federal Firearms Act has resulted in a feeling of frustration since the controls provided by it are so obviously inadequate in the ways that I have indicated. In drafting S. 1592 we have had in mind these inadequacies and now have, we believe, a bill which, when enacted, will provide effective controls without jeopardizing or interfering with the freedom of law-abiding citizens to own firearms for legitimate purposes. I strongly support the enactment of S. 1592."

For a number of years, the section of criminal law has considered that the loose and ineffective controls on the sale of firearms, particularly handguns, has been a contributing factor to the increasing crime rate. At the midyear meeting of the American Bar Association in February 1964, the section recommended to the house of delegates that action should be taken by the association "to draft a uniform State firearms statute and appropriate Federal legislation." During the annual meeting in August 1964, the section presented a program on the subject, "The What, When, and Why of Gun Legislation." Distinguished speakers, including a law enforcement officer, a judge, a private citizen, and representatives of the National Rifle Association explored the subject in depth and detail. Although no formal action of the section followed this panel program, it was clear that the sentiment of the large majority of the members attending the session favored more effective firearms controls.

In summary, in determining whether the American Bar Association should support the enactment of S. 1592, or similar Federal legislation, the following specific questions and answers should be considered:

First: Does the relatively free interstate traffic of firearms contribute materially to the increasing crime rate in the United States? Answer: The available evidence indicates clearly that a considerable number of crimes are committed by persons who have been able to acquire firearms easily, particularly handguns.

Second: Is it within the constitutional power of the Federal Government to establish controls on the interstate movement of firearms? Answer: No lengthy legal brief is necessary to show that the Federal Government under the commerce clause is empowered to establish reasonable controls upon the interstate movement of firearms.

Third: If the States and local governments enacted stringent controls on the purchase, possession, and use of firearms, would it be necessary or desirable for the Federal Government to legislate in this area? Answer: Although stringent State and local control of firearms would assist materially in reducing the possession and use of firearms for unlawful purposes, State and local controls cannot be effective unless the Federal Government prevents the relatively free and unimpeded flow of firearms into the several States through the channels of interstate commerce.

Fourth: Are the controls contained in S. 1592 reasonable? Answer: Few persons will interpose reasonable objections to the purpose or to the major provisions of S. 1592. Reasonable men might differ as to the necessity for certain of the specific provisions. For example, it can be argued that the provisions which preclude a licensed retail dealer from selling rifles and shotguns to persons under the age of 18, or from selling handguns to persons under the age of 21, are an unwarranted usurpation of the power of the States and local governments to decide who may possess and use firearms. However, almost everyone would agree that these restrictions are reasonable if firearms are to be kept out of the hands of irresponsible juveniles. Further, it is clear that the control of such sales, even though local in nature, can best be established by Federal insistence, through licensing procedures, that dealers adhere to fixed standards in all of the States. Otherwise, it would be difficult to prevent a juvenile from purchasing a firearm in a State where the sale is permitted, and carrying it to a State where such a sale is prohibited.

The council of the section of criminal law is of the opinion that S. 1592 represents a reasonable and desirable step forward in law enforcement. Although this legislation will cause minor inconvenience to the law-abiding citizen who desires to buy a gun, it will not prevent him from acquiring one. This minor inconvenience is the price that must be paid if the Federal Government is to do its part to assist the States in maintaining effective control over firearms.

For the above reasons, the section of criminal law, acting through its council in accordance with section 6, article VI, of its bylaws, recommends that the American Bar Association support the enactment of S. 1592, or similar Federal legislation.

KENNETH J. HODSON,
Chairman.

RESOLUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE AT CONVENTION ASSEMBLED IN MIAMI, FLA., OCTOBER 7, 1965

Whereas there is in the United States a widespread traffic in firearms moving in or otherwise affecting interstate or foreign commerce, and the existing Federal controls over such traffic do not adequately enable the States to control the firearms traffic within their own borders through the exercise of their police power;

And recognizing that the ease with which any person can acquire firearms (including criminals, juveniles without the knowledge or consent of their parents or guardians, narcotics addicts, mental defectives, armed groups who would supplant the functions of duly constituted public authorities, and others whose possession of firearms is similarly contrary to the public interest) is a significant factor in the prevalence of lawlessness and violent crime in the United States;

That the possession and use of firearms by those engaged in crime and lawless activities aids in the carrying out of such activities and greatly magnifies the tragic and serious consequences thereof;

That the acquisition on a mail order basis of firearms by nonlicensed individuals, from a place other than their State of residence, has materially tended to thwart the effectiveness of State laws and regulations, and local ordinances;

That the sale or other disposition of concealable weapons by importers, manufacturers, and dealers holding Federal licenses, to nonresidents of the State in which the licensee's place of business is located, has tended to make ineffective the laws, regulations, and ordinances in the several States and local jurisdictions regarding such firearms;

That the United States has become the dumping ground of the castoff surplus military weapons of other nations, and that such weapons, and the large volume of relatively inexpensive pistols and revolvers (largely worthless for sporting purposes), imported into the United States in recent years, have contributed greatly to lawlessness and to the Nation's law enforcement problems;

That there is a causal relationship between the easy availability of firearms and juvenile and youthful criminal behavior, and that firearms have been widely sold by federally licensed importers and dealers to emotionally immature, or thrill-bent juveniles and minors prone to criminal behavior;

That the lack of adequate Federal control over interstate and foreign commerce in highly destructive weapons (such as bazookas, mortars, antitank guns, etc., and destructive devices such as explosive or incendiary grenades, bombs, missiles, etc.) has allowed such weapons and devices to fall into the hands of lawless persons, including armed groups who would supplant lawful authority, thus creating a problem of national concern;

That the existing licensing system under the Federal Firearms Act does not provide adequate license fees or proper standards for the denial of licenses, and that this has led to licenses being issued to persons not reasonably entitled thereto, thus distorting the purposes of the licensing system:

Be it resolved, That the International Association of Chiefs of Police urges the Congress of the United States to enact S. 1592, 89th Congress, or similar legislation which would amend the Federal Firearms Act to prohibit, in connection with commercial transactions in firearms, the shipment of firearms in interstate or foreign commerce except between federally licensed manufacturers, importers, and dealers; to restrict the sale of handguns to the residents of the State where purchased; to limit the unrestricted volume of imported surplus military and nonsporting weapons; to prohibit sales by federally licensed dealers of shotguns and rifles to persons under 18 years of age, and of all other types of firearms to persons under 21 years of age; to control commerce in large caliber weapons and other highly destructive military-type devices; and to provide adequate licensing standards to assure that Federal licenses to manufacture, import or deal in firearms will be issued only to responsible citizens bona fidely engaged in the business licensed.

CONNECTICUT BAR ASSOCIATION,
Hartford, Conn., October 1, 1965.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: At its meeting on September 20, 1965, the council, which is the governing body of the Connecticut Bar Association, voted its approval of Senate bill S. 1592, which was introduced by you and other Senators in the present session. We are writing a letter to all of the Connecticut Representatives and to Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, asking that they support this measure when it comes up for a vote in the Congress.

We hope that you achieve success with this important piece of legislation.

Sincerely,

BERNARD H. TRAGER,
President.

MONETARY REFORM AND THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on International Finance, I have learned that monetary reform and the balance-of-payments situation are, in themselves, complicated.

If you add to their inherent complexities the intricate relationships among the Common Market countries, you arrive at a puzzling and difficult picture of economics in the Western World.

If we are to achieve a favorable balance-of-payments position, and if we are to maintain our economic vitality and leadership, we must come to grips with the problems of the Common Market.

These problems cast a long shadow over the Kennedy round of tariff talks, the desire to liberalize world trade, and the hope for international monetary reform.

The economic stability and prosperity of the Western World will depend on the course of the Common Market.

The September issue of the Morgan Guaranty Survey, published by the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., of New York, carries an article, entitled "The Nature of the Common Market Crisis," which analyzes the problems within the Common Market.

I commend this article to my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATURE OF THE COMMON MARKET'S CRISIS

President De Gaulle's press conference of September 9 did not in itself create a crisis in the development of the European Economic Community. Nor did the crisis start, as so many reports would have it, with the French decision last June to walk out of the Common Market negotiations in Brussels. The actual causes, rather, go back to fundamental problems and conflicts inherent in the idea of community that were only partially perceived, and certainly not adequately dealt with, at the time the Rome Treaty, EEC's basic document, was written.

What General De Gaulle has now done with acute precision is to spell out the problems and define the conflicts. Despite the dismay his action has stirred, it could well have the outcome of ultimately putting relations among the six on more certain and less troublesome footing.

EEC's crisis has less to do with the particulars of economic policy than with the fundamental issues of constitutional form and the lodgment of ultimate power. What is involved most crucially is the Community's momentum toward becoming a political entity above its member nations. This, declared General De Gaulle, is unacceptable to France because it threatens French sovereignty.

He might have noted that it likewise threatens the sovereignty of each of the five other members, and might have asked—since rhetorical questions are not out of place in his press conferences—whether any or all of them were more ready than France to sign and seal the substantial surrender of autonomy which the erection of a supranational authority would demand. The general was issuing, in other words, not so much an ultimatum as an invitation to his fellow heads of state in EEC to think through one more time the conditions on which the economies of their countries are to be harmonized.

All this was no more than realists in the Common Market had reason to expect. Where the French leader jolted even the realists was in his strong implication that the Rome treaty must be rewritten. France, he indicated, would require removal of "basic errors" and "ambiguities" from the treaty before it would be willing to go any further with the work of harmonization.

That work has been at a virtual standstill since last June 30, when French Foreign Minister Couve de Murville abruptly ended a session of EEC's Council of Ministers that was laboring to reach agreement on the knotty issue of the Common Market's financing arrangements for agriculture. On the basis of a previous understanding among the Six, those arrangements—involving member country payments into and receipts from the Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund—were to have been worked out by June 30. The failure of the Council to meet the deadline, said the French, was the reason for their walkout.

Important as agricultural matters are to France and its farmers, and anxious as the French were to reach an agreement, close observers of Common Market affairs tended at the time to doubt the completeness of that explanation. Negotiations beyond deadlines, it was pointed out, have become commonplace for EEC. Moreover, sharp though the farm differences were, it seemed clear to most that the possibilities of compromise had not been exhausted, nor even fully explored, and that in time a solution would have been found.

As President de Gaulle's statements have now made clear, it seems far more likely that even in June, France had decided that the time had come to face the crucial issue of supranational trend. In fact, with the effective veto power of individual member countries over major decisions scheduled by the Community's timetable to end next January 1, there exists widespread conviction that General de Gaulle might well have been forced to create a critical issue sometime this year if one had not presented itself. "Sooner or later," he declared, "the crisis was inevitable." With the transition to majority voting getting near, "sooner" presumably seemed better.

In any event, the end of June would have ushered in a period of enforced repose for the Community. The vacation period was on hand, and looming beyond that were the complications of the German national election in September and the French one in December. The French, meanwhile, could proceed with reasonable confidence that delay in fixing the terms of EEC's agricultural financing wouldn't necessarily mean that any less money would ultimately flow to France, since in practice there is a timelag of many months in disbursements. Nor should it have distressed the French Government that postponing agricultural agreement meant further loss of time for the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations. Paris right along has been distinctly cool toward U.S. determination to get EEC to lower its farm import barriers.

At the center of the controversy, quite obviously, is the gut issue of how much political federalism the Community is to have, if any. Is the absolute sovereignty of each of the Six to remain untouched, or is the Common Market to evolve in the direction of political federation, with its institutions (its executive body and its parliament in partcular) wielding political authority which is independent of that possessed by the individual member countries?

The latter course was clearly in the minds of some of the Community's original sponsors and was the chief reason for the enthusiasm with which the U.S. Government supported EEC from the start. It is precisely the concept which President de Gaulle is now challenging. "Nothing," he declared on September 9, "which is important at present in the organization, and later in the operation of the Common Market of the Six, should be decided and, even more, applied, except by the responsible public authorities in the six states; that is, the governments controlled by the parliaments."

While perhaps not so explicitly stated before, this has long been President de Gaulle's view. It has, moreover, numerous other adherents in Europe, a fact which tends to be underappreciated but which is vitally important in trying to assess the probable outcome of EEC's present crisis. There is rather wide agreement, actually, that few countries of Europe, big or small, have reached a stage where they are psychologically ready to abide by majority votes on economic issues other than the most trifling.

AGRICULTURE AND MUCH MORE

Although the squabble over agricultural financing is clearly of subordinate importance in the present controversy, its details and its chronology help illuminate what the fight is really all about. The origin of the trouble traces back to 1962, when as a condition for agreeing to further industrial tariff cuts, the French insisted that a start be made on a common agricultural policy. Among other things, agreement was reached at that time on a formula under which member countries would make payments into and withdraw money from an Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund. The formula penalized farm imports from nonmember countries, the intent being to encourage and subsidize agricultural production within EEC.

This arrangement covered only a 3-year period. Thereafter, a new formula, to be worked out no later than June 30, 1965, was to cover the remainder of EEC's transition period, which runs through 1969. In December 1964, anticipating the approaching deadline, the Council of Ministers instructed the Community's nine-man executive Commission to draw up and submit proposals for continuing the Fund's operations. The Commission also was asked to investigate how receipts from EEC's common external tariff, scheduled to go into effect July 1, 1967, might be used to replace payments to the Community's budget from national treasuries. It was from this latter request that the whirlwind blew.

STRETCHING THE MANDATE

In carrying out its assignment, the Commission made the fateful decision to construe its mandate in exceptionally broad terms. Besides providing a new formula for operating the Agricultural Fund, it proposed eventual transfer to the Community's coffers of all proceeds flowing from the common external tariff. Although provision was made for the redistribution to national governments of revenues in excess of normal Community needs, one very significant consequence of this arrangement would have been to make budgetary discipline over the Commission by member countries far more difficult.

Predictably, this was a highly controversial recommendation, since even previously the executive body's budgets had been a source of considerable friction. Still more sensitive was the Commission's suggestion that the EEC parliament in Strasbourg—an institution that draws no real power from the Rome treaty—assume partial authority over the Community's budget—and thus, in effect, the potential for materially influencing Common Market affairs.

The Commission's recommendations, formally submitted to the Council on April 1 of this year, triggered immediate opposition from the French. They angrily protested the coupling, in an omnibus package, of nonfarm proposals with those relating to agricultural financing, emphasizing that only for the latter, and for nothing else, was there a June 30 deadline.

The French thought they perceived the Commission's stategy, and they found it offensive. They believed the Brussels group was counting on France to swallow a measure of distasteful integration because of its special interest (as EEC's most important agricultural nation) in getting the details of farm financing settled. Reportedly, the implied suggestion that France might compromise its sovereignty for financial considerations was particularly infuriating to President de Gaulle.

Despite the strong protest from Paris, the Commission—in what is now regarded as a serious miscalculation of its strength—proceeded to try to line up support for its package. In May it sought and won the backing of the Strasbourg Parliament for its proposals, a tactic which could only add to the displeasure which the French already felt.

Since there is no public record of debate within the Council of Ministers, the precise position taken on the package by each of the Community's members other than France is not known with certainty. The Dutch, who consistently have been the most federally minded among the Six, unquestionably provided the Commission's strongest support; beyond that, generalizations are risky. Italy, hardest hit of all by the financing formulas applicable from 1962 to 1965, seems to have been principally preoccupied with winning concessions on the matter of contributions to the Agricultural Fund.

The dialog between France and Germany on the Commission's proposals presents, in retrospect, something of a puzzle. On the basis of conversations between the French and German Under Secretaries of State, the French toward the end of June were operating on the assumption that they had reached satisfactory agreement with Bonn on essentials. Then, on June 30, the deadline date, the German Bundestag passed a resolution supporting the Strasbourg Parliament's desire for budgetary power. This abruptly altered the complexion of the Council's deliberations, again giving primacy to the supranational issue, which had been tending to recede into the background. Probably the Bundestag's action, more than any other single event, was what prompted Couve de Murville to break off discussion at 2 a.m. on July 1.

Had agricultural financing alone been the issue, it seems highly improbable that any such outcome would have occurred. Italy and France, it is true, differed quite sharply on the length of the period for which financing arrangements were to be set. Germany, moreover, had introduced some complicated economic requests during the Council sessions of June 28 and 29. But there had been considerable progress, and just before the Bundestag's move the general expectation of close observers of the Brussels negotiations was that a way of compromising differences on financing would be found—perhaps not by the midnight deadline on the 30th but probably with only a short extension.

A settlement covering agricultural financing alone would have been strongly displeasing to the Dutch, whose legislature had instructed its Government not to agree to a plan for farm financing which did not allow for a strengthening of the powers of the Strasbourg Parliament. But the prevailing belief was that even that problem might have been circumvented by the Council through some mildly worded declaration of eventual intent to consider changes in Parliament's status. Conceivably the Dutch might have balked at such a maneuver, but a position of intransigency would have been difficult for them to maintain had the other five members come to agreement.

But the Bundestag's unexpected vote of support for the parliament's budgetary powers seemed to convince the French that the issue of supranationalism would have to be dealt with decisively before Community integration went any further. "Now we know," President de Gaulle declared September 9, "heaven knows that we know—that there is a different concept of a European federation in which * * * the countries would lose their national personalities * * *. The combination—premeditated or not—of the supranational demands of the Brussels Commission, of the support that several delegations declared themselves ready to give them and finally of the fact that some of our partners at the last moment went back on what they had previously accepted, forced us to bring the negotiations to a close."

The issue, then, focuses on the constitutional form the Community is to have and on the location of power within the organizational structure. President de Gaulle is calling for agreement among the Six on the precise limits of the Commission's and the parliament's authority. He clearly is no longer content to rely on anything like a "gentlemen's agreement" that the vote of a majority will not be used to ride roughshod over a dissenting nation's will. Agricultural financing, despite its great importance to France, is secondary, and that is undoubtedly why the French chose to stay away from the July meeting of the Council even though the Commission by that time had belatedly drafted a new set of proposals restricted in essence to agricultural matters.

WHAT FUTURE FOR EEC?

All sorts of difficulties attend any effort to anticipate when and how resolution will come. The relevant considerations range all the way from purely personal animosities among the individuals involved to profoundly different philosophies of political organization. The only thing that can be said with reasonable safety is that the end of the crisis is at least some months off. The new German Government needs time both to get itself organized and to assess the French demands. The French, meanwhile, are nearing the start of their own election campaign. Thus, the chances are that a resumption of EEC negotiations will be delayed, with no hard bargaining likely for the rest of the year.

Eventually, however, France can be rather sure of getting its Common Market partners to focus on the question of revising the Rome Treaty. Waiting may prove all that is necessary. The agreement reached last April to merge the executive apparatuses of EEC, the European Coal and Steel Community, and Euratom contemplates the writing of a new document unifying the three existing treaties. This would afford France an opportunity to make proposals for eliminating the supranational features of the Rome Treaty which it dislikes.

Since last April's agreement calls for creation of a single executive Commission for the unified Community, the merger when it takes effect should provide some element of a fresh start in relationships between the Commission and the Council of Ministers. Some students of EEC's recent difficulties attach high causal weight to French dissatisfaction with present Commission personnel; with or without new faces, the mere event of unification will give the Commission a chance to get off on a new, more amicable footing with the Council.

In a confrontation as confused and ramified as the present one, anything is possible, including even EEC's eventual disintegration. The chances, however, of such an extreme outcome still seem small. A solid alinement against France on the issue of supranationalism, which conceivably could wreck the Community, is unlikely. Moreover, all EEC members, including France, seem convinced that the Common Market has had a lot to do with their prosperity.

Political scientists are busy noodling over the question of how reduced power for the Commission would affect EEC's future development. The prevalent theoretical preference for strong executive leadership inclines most observers to the view that any weakening of the Commission would make further progress toward economic harmonization more difficult. If the Commission's job is that of a catalyst, this line of reasoning goes, it can function effectively only if it has freedom to take venturesome initiatives, to propose boldly. This year's experience, however, casts some question on that basically plausible analysis. If it had not been for the

Commission's boldness last spring, there might not have been a midyear explosion, and agricultural harmonization might now be much further along.

BAD NEWS FOR GATT

In Washington, concern over the Common Market deadlock centers on the harm it does to the Kennedy round tariff negotiations in Geneva. EEC's wrangle prevented it from putting forward the agricultural proposals that were supposed to have been submitted on September 16, and there would appear no prospect that this failure will be remedied anytime this year. This could mean a serious loss of negotiating time, since Congress insisted when granting authority for the Geneva negotiations that cuts in industrial tariffs be made conditional on a lowering of EEC's agricultural barriers.

With U.S. bargaining authority running to mid-1967, there will still be leeway for constructive negotiations if EEC can resolve its troubles by early 1966 and then go speedily ahead with the submission of tariff proposals for farm products. If the crisis is not settled rather early in 1966, however, the outlook for a satisfactory outcome of the Kennedy round would dim, because the farm negotiations are bound to be troublesome and lengthy. This, in turn could have a pronounced impact for a long time to come on world trade liberalization, since the prevailing judgment in Washington is that it will be a long while before another reciprocal trade measure is voted if the high hopes attached to the 1962 act come to nothing.

HOLY WEEK AND THE CIVIL RIGHTS DEMONSTRATIONS AT THE CHURCHES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a number of people from across the country have called my attention to an outstanding sermon delivered by Dr. Robert Strong, minister of the Trinity Presbyterian Church in Montgomery, Ala., on April 11, 1965. This sermon is entitled "Holy Week and the Civil Rights Demonstrations at the Churches."

This sermon has been reprinted and widely distributed across the country, but has not thus far been made available to the Members of Congress to read and to consider. In order that this might be done, I ask unanimous consent to have this sermon by Dr. Strong, who is one of the most eloquent and dedicated ministers in this country, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOLY WEEK AND THE CIVIL RIGHTS DEMONSTRATIONS AT THE CHURCHES

Today is Palm Sunday. In our quiet Presbyterian way we also observe the Christian year. At Christmas we lay tremendous emphasis upon the advent of our Lord and on His virgin birth. Now we are thinking of His triumphal entry into Jerusalem. Throughout the week we shall turn our thoughts again and again to the things He did during the week of His passion, and on Good Friday we shall linger over the climactic events on Calvary where our Saviour bore our sins in His own body on the tree and saved us from eternal death. Next Sunday we shall exult in the great victory He won over the grave and rejoice in the truth that because He lives we shall live also. We always observe Pentecost and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. In the fall comes Reformation Sunday when we take account of the rediscovery of the Bible and particularly of the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ alone. These are most helpful emphases that the seasons bring round.

Let us return now to consider Palm Sunday and events in Holy Week. In His triumphal entry our Lord presented Himself as the fulfillment of the prophecy of Zechariah who said, "Rejoice, O daughter of Zion, thy King cometh unto thee riding upon an ass. He is meek and He has salvation." On Monday of Passion Week occurred an event that suggests a crisis with which our Montgomery churches are now being confronted. Because it is uppermost in the minds of all church members and certainly in the minds of our people I turn attention to contemporary happenings to consider them in the light of what our Lord did on the Monday before He suffered for us on the cross. I was only to have made just before the announcements a brief statement of the policy of Trinity Church with regard to the civil rights demonstrations that are occurring at many churches in our city. I have decided in view of developments in the past week to devote a major part of the sermon time to a treatment of the situation in which we are involved.

QUALIFYING THE WITNESS

I am going to try to say something about the civil rights problem in the United States, in the South, and in Montgomery. Perhaps I am being very bold to try to do such a thing. Here I am a northerner speaking in a southern context. Born in Chicago, Ill., I went through the Chicago school system, being graduated from Morgan Park High School. Our family moved at that time to California. There I attended the University at Berkeley. When we moved back to southern California I went to UCLA, from which I have my bachelor's degree, then to the University of Southern California, where I received the M.A. and Th. M. degrees. I went east to the seminary of my choice, Westminster in Philadelphia, for my Th. B. degree. My doctorate was earned at Temple University. So all my education was in northern schools. And my first pastorate was in the North; for 16½ years I served a congregation in a suburb of Philadelphia. May I even dare to mention that both my grandfathers wore the blue in the tremendous struggle which only this past week we remembered in the centennial observance of the surrender at Appomattox. Likely I may be believed when I claim to have no prejudice based on skin color.

I am a northerner but also I am a southerner. To me it has always seemed a strange providence that brought me south. I had, I think, an interesting preparation for the change, a very wide reading in American history, particularly in the Civil War period. Douglas Southall Freeman's great works on Lee and on Lee's lieutenants and many other books about Lee and Jackson as well as Grant and Sherman were a part of that preparation. As I have often said, when I think about Civil War days my blood moves a little faster. That dreadful period of internecine conflict when the ratio of casualties to the number of men engaged was the highest of any war in history was a tremendous period in the life of our Nation.

In 1949 came a call to the First Presbyterian Church of Augusta, Ga. A whole new life began for our family. It is a shock in certain ways for a northerner to come south. I do not only speak of the climate. It was in mid-September when we moved, and the weather was so hot we just about perished, for our blood was still thick, I guess. I really am speaking about customs. I remember my feeling of amazement when in the waiting room of the railroad station I saw a rail running through the middle of it to separate the whites and the Negroes. I was shaken when I saw two identical water fountains in stores with their racial labeling. At once I became aware of the problem which is segregation.

At First Presbyterian Church this was not too great a problem. Often we had Negroes in attendance. They would come to see the minister they had listened to on the radio. Once when the Fort Gordon Choir was with us a Negro was among them; at the social period afterward our young ladies served him as readily as any other member of the choir. I was told that until 15 years before there had been Negro members of the church, the last remnants of slave families which in large numbers had belonged to that historic church where, by the way, our denomination held its first general assembly.

Now I have lived in the South for 15½ years. I have been close to the situation and have studied it with attentiveness. I shall offer some comments about the history of the problem in order to lead up to the discussion of what our own church now faces.

ORIGIN OF SEGREGATION

As I read the story of early times, and as I see life in the South, I come more and more to the conclusion that one cannot possibly understand the South unless he has lived here for a period of years. The observer must become aware of the psychology of the South, a psychology which is in part the result of the tremendous historical developments that have been seen in the past 150 years.

First of all reference must be made to slavery. To work the plantations in the South the black man was needed, or it was thought that plantations could not be managed without his labor. The Yankee trader went over to the west coast of Africa and bought from African chiefs those members of the tribe the chief would sell or the captives his tribe had taken in their wars and raids upon neighboring tribes. It should be understood that the black headmen of Africa were just as responsible as the white trader for the slave trade. It was black turning against black as truly as white exploiting black that we had the monstrous iniquity of the slave trade.

The Civil War came in all its inevitability. Who said that wars don't decide anything? They certainly do. The Civil War decided that this country would be a united nation whatever anybody wished. That is a settled fact upon which there has been no possible debate since 1865. It was decided that slavery would never any longer characterize the social pattern of America. But how ridiculous it was to suppose that the psychology of the Southern slave society would quickly vanish. The master-slave attitude was the perhaps unfortunate legacy of the decades of the slave era.

Then came the Reconstruction period. At bayonet point legislatures were elected and put into the State capitols that included large numbers of Negroes who were completely unable to legislate, who were the pawns of the northern masters, who in their arrogance and incompetence outraged white southerners. Foolish laws were passed. Bond issues were voted whose proceeds went to enrich many a northern politician and carpetbagger; heavy debts were saddled upon the Southern States, not for generations to be paid off. A desperate poverty prevailed in the Southern States. A great resentment lay in the hearts of southern citizens and a determination arose never to allow such a state of affairs to recur.

In this psychology is to be found the origin of the concept of white supremacy. The phrase has obvious reference to a political role. When in the Hayes-Tilden standoff in the election of 1876 a compromise behind the scenes was reached, it gave the election to the Republican candidate Hayes, though Tilden had actually won the election, and it was agreed that the northern troops would be withdrawn and the Southern States would resume internal autonomy. Immediately they asserted and since they have maintained white legislative and executive supremacy. You have told me that the effect of that period of history has been a continuing factor in the conditioning of the psychology of the South. I am convinced that this is true.

The relationship between the races is complicated, of course, by the fact that here as nowhere else in America exists the problem of the near equality of numbers of the races.

The article which appeared in last week's Saturday Evening Post written by a southern Baptist minister entitled "Integration Could Destroy Rural Mississippi" is one that everybody in the United States ought to read. It sets forth the racial problem as it is faced in many parts of the South. Granted that it is a description of the problem in its most aggravated form. Still it sets forth a line of reasoning which needs to be taken into account, one which I have used myself in seeking to interpret the southern situation when challenged in the North and other places to which I have traveled for an explanation of the southern attitude. However you will explain it, however you may be inclined to condemn it, however you may be willing to assess blame for it, an enormous gap exists between the white population and most of our southern Negroes. To ask for instant integration of these populations is absolutely unreasonable. It is an absolutely unworkable idea. The cultural gap, the moral gap, the educational gap, the psychological gap, the hygienic gap are real. The bridging of this gap will be a long, slow process; the effort to accomplish this is just as much the responsibility of the Negro leadership and those in the upper level of life in the Negro community as it is that of the white leadership and citizenry.

THE ENLIGHTENED SOUTHERN ATTITUDE

This is not to evade the point that many of you have made to me again and again that the southern white population deserves a heavy portion of blame. You have told me that the education of the Negroes has been neglected. You have confessed that only the pressure of threatened or actual judicial action and of Federal legislation has prompted the remarkable school building programs and the improvement of the educational system across the South for the Negro folk. Travel in Mississippi and in Alabama and you will be amazed at the beautiful, modern schools that have in these last 15 years been erected for the Negro young people. You have told me and deplored it and deplored the fact of it that there has been a terrible discrimination in many counties in the South about registering Negroes for voting. They have been differently handled from the whites all too often. Many of you have said to me that it absolutely must no longer be that discriminatory tests be imposed upon the Negro when he comes to register, but that he must be treated just exactly like a white person who seeks the right of franchise. You are saying in my hearing that justice must be done throughout the South. The man who is qualified to vote must be allowed to register and to cast an unintimidated ballot.

Several times I have said from this pulpit that the attitude that generally prevails in the South among its white population during these times of tension is greatly to be admired. The civil rights bill of 1964 was resented. Its encroachment upon States rights was denounced; but when it became law, the white southern population with such grace as they could muster bowed to it because it was national legislation. They didn't like it. They had to swallow very hard. But they accepted it peaceably with very few exceptions. This is to the wonderful credit of Alabama and other Southern States. It demonstrates the fact that the white southern population is pervaded by a law-abiding spirit.

Many of you have told me how embarrassing it has been to you to see the way in which recent developments in the race problem have been mishandled. You have deplored the confrontation at the end of the Pettus Bridge. You have told me that you thought it never should have been left up to a mere major of State troopers, but should have been handled in a way that showed statesmanship and an awareness that the whole Nation was watching. The terrible national impression of Alabama that was born when the television cameras exposed the violence of the troopers against the Negro marchers will probably not be erased in our lifetime. This did not have to be. If only sound planning and good judgment had prevailed.

You have told me that you deplore the bombings and all the other acts of violence. You are repelled by them. They disgust and shame you as a part of the region that is blamed out of all reasonableness when these things occur. When similar events happen in other places of the country without this clear racial connotation, they are quickly forgotten. And even when they happen in a racial setting and far exceed in their turmoil and gravity anything that happens in the South, still they are soon forgotten. Nothing like the significance that is attached to a southern incident follows upon such events as the dreadful riots in the northern cities during the summer of 1964.

Here we are now in a time in which the law has been passed and the courts have upheld it to the requiring of enormous social changes. These changes are being accepted in the South. We know that they have to be accepted. Our schools are being integrated, and so are public facilities. What about the situation in the churches? Is such a policy as is in effect at Trinity Church putting us in a position of rebellion? Are we being maneuvered into a position that is unchristian? Let me try to prepare for an answer to these questions by telling the story of racial demonstrations that have occurred outside Trinity Church.

THE DEMONSTRATIONS AT TRINITY CHURCH

Last Sunday, April 4, appeared at our church doors six Negro young people, three boys, three girls. They were met by a few of our officers at the church steps. Our spokesman could not have been better chosen; he was Deacon Winton Blount. Mr. Blount explained to the young people that they had arrived so late for the service that they could not help disturb it if they went in. He said that this late arrival made it all the more obvious that their intention in coming to Trinity Church was not really to worship. He explained the policy of the church that our officers were not willing to permit it to become an arena for sociological causes. The young people turned away.

This incident and the national publicity that was given to it involved us as church officers in an immediate consideration of our position. It was apparent that some felt the problem should be handled in one way and some in another. On Tuesday night a very well attended joint meeting of the section and of the Diaconate was held to discuss this pressing matter. I will say to you that you may be proud indeed of your officers. Not one of them lost his temper. I have heard of church meetings on this issue in this city where there were some highly excitable moments. Not one of your officers was intemperate in the way in which he spoke. Every single one of them who took the floor spoke thoughtfully and with restraint. It was obvious that although at times they disagreed with each other they all had one overriding concern, namely, the good of Trinity Presbyterian Church. The discussion went on for over 2 hours. Then the Diaconate withdrew to leave the session to act. It is the session's responsibility to make policy. It cannot evade the responsibility. It cannot pass along to the shoulders of the Diaconate to bear with the session jointly this responsibility. The law of the church is that these sorts of decisions have to be made by the session. The session has always sought to work in closest harmony with the Diaconate. It welcomes the opinions of the deacons. This is why a joint meeting was held. But in the end the session must enunciate the policy. The session modified somewhat the policy that had been previously decided upon.

Before I outline our policy position let me say a word or two about the attitude of Trinity Presbyterian Church toward our Negro friends. There never had been the slightest sense of tension about Negroes in this church until 1954 and the Supreme Court decision about school integration. To this day there is no real opposition to their presence in our church. At weddings and funerals they are found constantly in attendance; the feeling is that this is normal and natural and right. You have told me that they would be welcome at worship if it were genuinely the case that their motive in coming was a desire to seek the Lord. This is the way it has to be, for, as I pointed out at the joint meeting of the Boards the other night, the Book of Church Order of our denomination will be amended at the 1965 general assembly to make it specific that nobody is to be refused admission to worship on the basis of his class or his color. This will be the law of the denomination, and it will have to be obeyed or a congregation will stand in a position of defiance. Trinity Church will never desire to be in defiance of the constitution of the denomination. When the constitution speaks, unless by some strange quirk it has become out of harmony with the Word of God, elders', deacons', members' feelings must yield to the authority of the constitution of the denomination.

TRINITY CHURCH POLICY

The session recognizes the foregoing fact and seeks to approach the issue of handling church demonstrators in a way that is not at odds with the constitution in what will be its new form. There is clearly an answer to the question. The point is that civil rights demonstrators constitute a separate case. No present or imminent rule of the denomination has any application to them. At the beginning of the joint meeting I had suggested that it might be expedient simply to admit the demonstrators in the expectation that this would get the matter over with quickly. It was not the feeling of the meeting that this result would be achieved as hoped, and I must admit that the experience of one of our neighboring churches seems to bear out the contention that was made to this effect.

The session decided to stand upon the principle that sociological demonstrators are not sincere in their protestation that they have come to worship and that therefore they are not welcome at Trinity Church. The session is not willing to see this church sanctuary or church plant made an arena of sociological demonstrations or an outsider's means to the end of furthering merely social causes. The session has instructed the deacons to confront people who obviously come for that purpose and to tell them that they are not welcome.

The deacons are to make this position clear by use of Holy Scripture. Twice in His ministry our Lord Jesus Christ entered the temple of God and saw it defiled. He cleansed it, even on one occasion making it whip and by it driving out the moneychangers and those who were selling sacrificial animals within the precincts of God's house. The second time He did this was on the Monday of Holy Week. You see now how I came to give the particular title it bears to this address. When our Lord drove the profaners of the temple away, He quoted the prophet Isaiah from the 56th chapter saying, "It is not written, for my house shall be called of all nations a house of prayer? but ye have made it a den of thieves." That verse in the Gospel of Mark is often used out of context, as though our Lord said, "My house shall be made a house of prayer for all people." That is bad interpretation. What our Lord said was, "My house shall be for all people a house of prayer." His emphasis was on the sacredness of the precincts of worship, that the temple is a place for prayer and not for moneymaking. It is obvious that the motive of sincerity enters into the proper approach to God's house, whether it is the temple in Jerusalem as in those days, or a sanctuary of Jesus Christ as in these days.

The reasoning of the boards of our church, particularly of the session, is that in the context of the present time those who approach the sanctuary with placards or as groups of Negroes or as mixed groups of Negroes and whites are in actual fact sociological demonstrators. There is evidence that in some instances these sorts of groups have been paid to do this kind of work, so that not only is there an obvious insincerity but on occasion an element of commercialism appears. On the basis of the Scriptural application of the Holy Week incident in the temple the officers of the church judge that it is proper to say to sociological demonstrators, "You are not welcome."

Instructions have been given to those who are charged with meeting the public at the doors, when the necessity arises to state these things carefully and courteously and to have no physical contact with the demonstrators. If the demonstrators refuse to be dissuaded and insist on rudely entering or on brushing by the deacons, they are not to offer physical resistance. The congregation must understand the necessity of this. No physical contact is to occur, and, if it becomes necessary, the congregation must endure what amounts to an invasion for the sake of the preservation of the peace and order of this house of worship.

AFTERMATH

The further events of the past week have been highly interesting and I know you would like to hear about them. On Wednesday a group came to picket the church and to exhibit their signs. I was informed of this and came down from the manse to talk to them, but only the television people were here when I arrived. Their news reporter and I had a lengthy conversation. I pointed out to him that the news media had wronged the South by a distorted report of the recent racial events. I told him how shocked I was when on national television Mr. Liuzzo was shown in his grief at the terrible crime of the murder of his wife, a crime which a hundred and fifty thousand people who had behaved themselves perfectly during the march from Selma to Montgomery and during the rally in front of the capitol groaned over. I denounced the way in which the interview with Mr. Liuzzo included his saying that he held Governor Wallace 100 percent responsible for the death of his wife. This was totally outrageous for television to release because it was so obviously inflammatory and plainly unjust. It was all too typical of the often irresponsible way the news media has treated the South. The reporter asked me if I would be willing to be interviewed by ABC and I agreed. The next day a camera was set up in the backyard of the manse and for 10 or 15 minutes I was questioned for sound movie reproduction. That night over national television the network carried two brief excerpts of the interview. My effort was to set matters in what I thought was a proper focus and to support the fine statement that Mr. Blount had given to the press about our Sunday visitation. You should see some of the crank letters I have received about the broadcast.

One Friday another group of demonstrators carrying signs appeared at the church. I was informed of it and that their leader desired to talk to me. I came to the church and first spoke to the demonstrators. There they were, all high school youngsters except the leaders, youngsters obviously playing hookey from school. I said to them, "What church do you belong to?" One by one they answered that they were Baptists. (It looks as though all southern Negroes must be Baptists.) I said, "So now you want to become Presbyterians, do you?" "Yes, sir," they replied, and then they beat me to the punch as one said, "And we believe in predestination." "Well," I said, "you are right about that. Do you also believe in infant baptism?" They were a bit nonplussed concerning this theological point. They showed me their hand-drawn signs. It was a pleasant exchange we had on the corner of Hull and Felder.

Then I went into our assistant minister, Mr. Settle's, office where their leader was waiting to confer with me. He is a man of 45 from Edenton, N.C., good looking, well set up, intelligent though not highly educated, a World War II veteran. He represented himself to be Martin Luther King's lieutenant for the Montgomery program of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. I suppose that if anybody speaks for the Negroes in these demonstrations he does. We had a long conversation. I dealt with the allegation that 11 o'clock on Sunday morning is the most segregated hour in America, pointing out that it was because of Negro desire. After the Civil War the Negroes wanted their own churches and in many cases the white Christians helped them to finance their new buildings. Separate worship is because of the Negro desire to have their own churches, to worship in their own way, to run their own church business. This was their right but it certainly explains why the former method of white and Negro worshiping together has now for many decades not been the case.

I had some things to say to him about Martin Luther King. I am frank to say that Martin Luther King is a religious hypocrite. He took Baptist ordination vows, but he does not believe time-honored Baptist doctrine. In an interview seen all over the Nation in the National Observer, Dr. King went on record as not believing the doctrines of the virgin birth of Christ, the deity of Christ, the substitutionary atonement of Christ, the literal resurrection of Christ, and other cardinal points. It should be plain to all that he is using the churches in the interest of a sociological movement. I have pointed out also that his numerous connections with Communists and his membership in many subversive front groups make him in still another way an unworthy and unsafe leader.

His representative in Montgomery professes to be a member of the Church of God in Christ, which is a fundamentalist sect. I do not mean to imply that if you are interested in a social cause you must make sure that all involved in it with you are in doctrinal agreement with you. But I do maintain that the religious overtones of the civil rights demonstrations should never deceive Bible-believing people. To join in with these demonstrations that are under the guidance of Martin Luther King is to be engaged in the most serious kind of religious compromise. We are completely at a loss to account for the hospitality that is shown to Dr. King at many conservative religious meetings. I cannot be persuaded that it is right to cooperate with him or with the organization which he heads.

After dealing with the great incident of the cleansing of the temple, I moved on with the Negro leader to the account in the Books of Acts, concerning Ananias and Sapphira. You remember what happened. In the early church they loved each other so devotedly that each said that he held his property only to benefit the other. Some (and it was all perfectly voluntary) sold their property and brought the money to the apostles to be distributed to the needy. Ananias and Sapphira wanted to get credit for this kind of generosity. They sold a piece of land, but they didn't bring in all the money they received for it. The Holy Spirit revealed the fact to Peter. He said to them that while they had their property it was their own. They could do with it as they wished but that, claiming to bring in the whole price when in fact they were only bringing in part, they were guilty of lying to the Holy Ghost. For this hypocrisy the couple paid with their lives. God struck them dead. I said to our Negro friend, "Now that incident shows what God thinks of hypocrisy. It is a good thing for you and it is a good thing for me and it is a good thing for every Christian that the Lord didn't keep on dealing with hypocrites in the church in that way, or we would all be struck dead pretty quickly, for there is some hypocrisy in every one of us. The death of Ananias and Sapphira was like a signpost raised at the beginning of the course of church history to say: 'God hates hypocrisy. This is what hypocrisy ought to receive—death. The church must be pure. See to it, every Christian, that you shun hypocrisy'."

Then I said to the man from Edenton, "I really do think that you demonstrators at churches are hypocrites. I will dare in all kindness but with firmness to state that conviction. You do not really come to worship. You protest that you do, but you do protest too much. I am convinced that your motive is sociological. You want to use the church to advance social causes. This is a form of hypocrisy. You should think about this with utmost seriousness. I do regard your souls as being at stake. For a man who persists in hypocrisy shows that he is not a Christian at all." I tried to say this with both pleasantness and firmness. He received it in the spirit I had tried to manifest and replied with a smile, "We had better stop our conversation or you will convert me." I did not convert him, of course. He is still leading these church demonstrations.

Perhaps we may now expect to live in a state of siege. One thing we do not want is internal dissension. There are congregations in this city that had tense board meetings and congregational meetings over this issue. Some of them have been internally divided. We grieve about this, for what happens at other churches affects us. We are all one in Christ Jesus. Christians of whatever denomination, or whatever color for that matter, are one in Christ Jesus. Our stand for the purity of worship does not mean that we forget that for an instant. As the Lord's table is to be guarded, so that none approaches it who does not understand what it means, who does not examine his heart to see that he is pentinent and trusting; so the House of the Lord is to be protected. Whatever the cost in terms of adverse publicity or misunderstanding, the officers are firmly minded to protect our services from being disturbed by those who would exploit them for a selfish purpose.

We have only good will for our Negro friends. We want to see them receive just treatment. We insist that if you employ Negroes in the yard or in the house and pay them more than $50 a quarter, you must pay the social security tax or you are guilty of the sin of cheating and defrauding. We insist that Negroes are to be respected as persons and accorded their proper dignity. We maintain that qualified Negroes have as much a right to be registered to vote as any white person. Counties where this right has been denied must change their procedure. Negroes who have been paid a lower wage than the white man doing no better work at the same kind of job should receive the same pay as the white man.

It does not follow that Negroes or white people either who approach the house of worship are automatically to be admitted. In the present context Negro groups coming to the doors of our church or mixed groups coming to the doors of our church are practically certain to be demonstrators. The policy of the Session has to be applied and explained to them.

In these tense days there will be differences of opinion on how to handle the problem with which we are dealing. Some churches are going to lose members because they feel that they must protest about their own particular church's stand. That is a great pity. There ought to be a recognition on the part of everyone that his church is trying to do the best it can according to the understanding it has of the Christian religion in relation to present circumstance. This may well be one of the problems that take wisdom that is more than human. Our policy is one of principle, our officers insist. It cannot be denied that expediency may become a necessity. Who knows whether a shift or a change or a modification in the policy may prove advisable? In a sense we have to play this thing by ear. We are not our Lord, infallible in judgment. We are not our Lord, infallible in decision. We try to learn from His example and from the way He handled things. But we are not possessed of His wisdom fully. As a congregation we should feel called to have confidence in our officers with the honor of Christ and the love of His church the highest sentiment of all. We must seek peace within our walls and pursue it.

THE NEED OF UNITY

As was said in the joint meeting of the boards, Trinity Church enjoys a simply wonderful spirit of unity. Here is a big church, the largest Presbyterian Church in Alabama, but it has no factions or cliques. Here is a church with a minister, I think I may say, who does not try to run things, although he seeks to exercise leadership. Here is a church that has a great work in progress, for example, giving more than $70,000 to benevolence causes annually. We want to maintain this unity and peace and devotion to the first mission of Christ's people, which is winning lost souls to Him and building up Christians in their faith. So I say to you all, be faithful to the services and activities of this church despite such things as the demonstrations. Be unafraid, be confident, be as one as we go ahead here concentrating on the true business of the church. It is perhaps hard to obey the Scripture where it says that we are to attend upon the things of the Lord without distraction. There is much distraction in a day like this. Everybody is talking about it. No conversation proceeds very far without turning to this subject. Try not to let it upset you if you can. Try not to become emotionally wrought up or involved if you can avoid this.

Today is Palm Sunday and we have entered upon Passion Week. Day by day think much about our Lord, the King. Remember that He will work out His plan. Think much about our Lord, the Prophet, and read the words He spoke in Passion Week as they are recorded in the four gospels. Think much about our Lord, the Priest, who on that Friday gave Himself once for all a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and reconcile us to God. Let your devotion build that it might climax on Easter when we shall jubilantly remember, testify to, and glory in our Lord's resurrection from the grave. Let us set our affections increasingly on things above, not on things of earth. Let us seek to have the mind of Christ.

Let us pray: Our gracious Saviour, we adore Thee. We thank Thee for Thy great love to us that caused Thee to condescend to join us men in our condition, to endure the scoffing and rejection of men, to go to the cross to save us by dying in our place, the sacrifice that divine justice required so that divine love might in harmony with the necessity of the being of God extend mercy and pardon to sinners. We thank Thee for our pardon. We covet for many others that they may know a like pardon. Bless the Gospel cause here in Montgomery and throughout the earth among all peoples. We ask it for our Lord Jesus' sake who died for us and rose again from the dead and is alive forevermore. Amen.

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM OF GROWING BENEFIT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, this fourth annual observance of National School Lunch Week, October 10–16, is again a chance for reflection on the Federal, State, and community teamwork venture which now provides wholesome lunches to 18 million of the Nation's 50 million children at school.

At an average cost of 28 cents a lunch, including about 10 percent served at reduced or no cost to needy children, the national school lunch program makes available a lunch providing one-third to one-half of daily food needs. Now in its 19th year, the program has shown continuous expansion. Last year some 35 percent of the Nation's elementary and secondary students participated.

In recent years this has been the largest single food service operation in the Nation, representing over 10 percent of the total U.S. food sold through food service outlets.

Thus, the program has carried out the dual purpose of the Congress in passage of the act in 1946, "to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other food."

With Federal support of about 20 percent, the total food bill last year came to over $950 million. About $700 million of that amount was spent by schools in their local markets.

In Missouri, we are particularly proud of the job that has been done in this program under the direction of Mr. Earl M. Langkop, director of School Food Services, Missouri State Department of Education, and with the cooperation of school officials, including food supervisors, and thousands of parent organizations. Mr. Langkop has been a leader in this field not only in Missouri but nationally. On several occasions his suggestions have been helpful to committees of the Congress and to the Department of Agriculture in improving the administration and quality of the program.

For this reason, I ask unanimous consent for insertion in the RECORD at this point of the statement by Mr. Langkop reporting our State's participation in this very worthwhile program.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSOURI SCHOOLS OBSERVE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH WEEK

The 1965–66 school term will mark the 19th year that schools across the Nation have been serving students nutritionally balanced noonday lunches with the help of the national school lunch program. In recognition of the creative work that went into developing this program, the week of October 10–16 has been proclaimed "National School Lunch Week" by the President. The theme of the week is "School Lunch Serves Child Health."

More than 2,500 schools in Missouri will serve lunches to approximately 500,000 elementary and secondary school students this year.

Hubert Wheeler, Commissioner of Education, said the activities will be designed to promote better public understanding and awareness of the true purpose of the program as well as the significance of the school lunch program to the child, to the home, to our agricultural community, to industry, and to the State and Nation.

The National School Lunch Act of 1946 was enacted, "as a measure of national security, to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other foods." The act is administered nationally by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in cooperation with State and local school officials.

The lunch program provides children with an opportunity to enjoy a completely balanced lunch for an average payment of 28 cents. The type A lunch, which was developed to supply the nutritional needs of the school age child, actually costs about 50 cents. Cash reimbursement, under the act, accounts for about 3.8 cents per lunch. Another 8 cents is contributed from Government storage stocks when the schools take advantage of and make full use of the foods donated from agricultural price support and surplus removal operations and supplemental Government purchases.

Observance of School Lunch Week provides an opportunity to pay tribute to the local school officials, teachers, food service managers and cooks, and other interested citizens whose interest, guidance, and hard work makes the program possible. The lunch program is a unique cooperative endeavor by Federal, State, and local people, and it has been expanded each year to a point where it is now recognized as the largest, single food service operation in our country according to Commissioner Wheeler.

Last year, the total food bill for this nationwide program came to over $950 million. This amount was required for the serving of 3 billion lunches under the national school lunch program. Of that total almost three-fourths, about $700 million, was spent by schools in their local markets. Inasmuch as nearly 80 percent of the foods used are purchased locally, school lunches contribute significantly to the State's economy. During the 1964–65 school year, over $41 million was spent in this State for food, labor, and other services, and equipment for the State's school lunches. The program was financed as follows: Children's payment for lunches, 56 percent; State and local contributions, 14 percent; donated commodities, 18 percent; national school lunch program reimbursement, 7 percent; and special milk program reimbursement, 5 percent.

Anyone who attempts to stay on a food budget may wonder how the schools can serve nutritious lunches at the price they do. A part of the answer lies in the national school lunch program and tax financed purchases of mandatory price support commodities held in storage by the Federal Commodity Credit Corporation as well as commodities purchased under surplus removal authority of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The school lunch program provides a valuable and very logical outlet for those foods in surplus supply that are purchased with tax moneys under agricultural price support and surplus removal activities. Such use of the surplus foods not only provides benefits in improving diets, food habits, and nutritional well-being of our schoolchildren but also serves to reduce the number of tax dollars that go into storage costs on Government holdings.

Three basic requirements for schools participating in the program are that the lunch program must be operated on a nonprofit basis, the menus follow the basic type A pattern, which has been developed by the National Research Council to provide from one-third to one-half of a child's daily nutritional requirements, and that free or reduced price lunches be provided for children who are determined by local school officials to be unable to pay the full price.

During the past school year, participating Missouri schools served 77,916,381 such lunches of which 3,552,936 were served free or at reduced cost to needy children according to Commissioner Wheeler.

To meet type A requirements the lunch must contain one-half pint of whole milk; 2 ounces of a protein-rich food; a three-fourths cup serving of two or more vegetables or fruits or both; a serving of enriched or whole grain bread or roll; and a serving of butter or fortified margarine.

SCHOOL FOOD SERVICES: HIGHLIGHTS AND PROGRESS DURING THE 1964–65 SCHOOL YEAR

There were 3,014 Missouri schools, representing 2,432 public and 582 private and parochial schools, participating in the distribution of Federal food service aid during the 1964–65 school year.

The 1,036,230 Missouri schoolchildren had access to some type of food service in their schools through 2,082 lunchrooms with a total of 1,966 preparation centers.

Average daily participation in the type A lunch program increased to 464,478 during the past year. This represents 43 percent of the total elementary and secondary school age children in our schools.

During the year 77,916,381 nutritionally balanced type A lunches were served, of which 3,552,936 were served free or at reduced price to needy children. This was an all-time high and exceeded the previous year by 3,731,990.

A total of 135,676,260 one-half pints of milk were consumed in our schools during the year. This represents a decrease of about 18 million from the previous year perhaps because of a health and dental ruling on chocolate milk, offering in some schools of other competing beverages, plus the requirement that we discount all claims as a means of living within the limited funds.

Every public high school district in Missouri is now participating in one or more of the three types of food service aid extended through the State Department of Education.

Of 680 train carloads of donated commodities, having an estimated wholesale value of $7,728,065.20, were accepted and distributed to eligible recipient schools and institutions during the past year.

School lunches represented a $41 million industry in our State during the past year.

Food cost alone amounted to $26,987,693.92 of which $20 million was spent in local markets.

Over $11 million was paid in salaries to local people employed in the preparing and serving of lunches to the children.

About $4 million was spent at the local level for such items as utilities, commercial transportation, food service equipment, commercial cold storage, etc.

The program was financed as follows during the 1964–65 school year: Child payments, 56 percent; Federal aid, 30 percent; local funds, 14 percent.

Federal tax funds distributed to our schools through the State Department of Education during the year were as follows:

School lunch cash reimbursement	$2,945,823.00
Special milk cash reimbursement	2,153,720.78
Wholesale value of Commodities	7,382,432.85
Total assistance	12,481,976.63

SENATE STAFF MAN, BEN STONG, GETS CONSERVATION AWARD

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, during the session of Congress now coming to a close, one of our professional staff people has received an unusual honor which I think should be recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I know that a goodly number of my colleagues, whom he has consulted and assisted on agricultural and resources matters, will agree with me that the award was merited and are as pleased by his recognition as I am.

I speak of Ben Stong, who served on the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, under the chairmanships of James E. Murray and CLINTON P. ANDERSON, and who is now legislative assistant to Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN of South Dakota.

Ben was presented one of the American Motors Co. awards for exceptional service to the cause of conservation. He had been nominated by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, former chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, with whom Ben had served, and by Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall. Stong was selected for the award by 10 outstanding conservationists who name recipients for the honor.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the citation which accompanied Ben's award be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION

Because for a number of years he has worked quietly but energetically and effectively on behalf of vital conservation legislation.

Because in nominating him for this award, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall wrote:

"The wilderness bill would not be law today if it were not for the role that Ben Stong played. From 1957 when the first bill was introduced up until the moment the President signed the bill on September 3, 1964, Ben worked with skill and patience to resolve the numerous conflicts and to achieve a workable compromise between views which at the outset were miles apart. Mr. Stong played an outstanding role in the shaping and enactment of the land and water conservation fund. All of the legislation recently enacted dealing with the Cape Cod, Point Reyes, Padre Island, Canyonlands, and the Ozark Rivers, Parks and Recreation Areas were helped on the road to enactment by Ben Stong's expertise. The water resource legislation, both S. 2 and S. 111, * * * was in large measure a product of this man's understanding of the immensity of our water requirements."

Because in recommending him for this award, Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON wrote:

"I know of no person in government service who has more diligently labored in behalf of the conservation of America's natural resources than Ben Stong. On many occasions, when major legislation in behalf of the public good was in jeopardy, Ben was in the forefront of the forces working to clear the way for enactment. The water resources research bill, the wilderness preservation systems bill, and a number of other acts which will benefit our Nation for generations to come, are on the statute books in significant part because of the energy and determination of Ben Stong. Long hours never deterred him from pursuing the goal of essential conservation legislation. Even when other duties required his attention, Ben always could find a few minutes or a few hours to be on hand when the going got rough. He is the kind of staff man on whom Members of Congress depend. He has that rare quality so highly regarded by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, 'a passion for anonymity.' He is richly deserving of the award."

Because he so perfectly exemplifies the kind of American this program was intended to honor, whose contributions to conservation reflect at once a deep personal devotion to the values and ideal of conservation and a willingness to work without public acclaim or recognition.

And finally, because he is past president of the Falls Church Garden Club, former officer of the Potomac Chrysanthemum Society and a sweepstakes winner at the Falls Church, Va., the Bethesda-Chevy Chase, Md., and National Capitol Dahlia Shows in recent years.

Therefore it is the honor and privilege of the American Motors Corp., to present 1 of 10 nonprofessional awards for 1964 to Benton Stong.

MILSON C. RAVER AND THE MARYLAND STATE TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I rise today to salute both a man and an organization. The man is Milson C. Raver, and the organization is the Maryland State Teachers Association. The association is in the process of celebrating its centennial year. Mr. Raver has completed 20 years as the association's executive secretary.

Dedicated to public service and to a higher standard of education for the young people of Maryland, Milson Raver is today one of the most experienced executive secretaries of teachers' groups in the country. Under his leadership, the Maryland State Teachers Association has grown to more than 26,000 members and represents today 80 percent of the professional staff of the Maryland public school system.

Mr. President, on Thursday, October 14, the Baltimore Sun carried an excellent article about the Maryland State Teachers Association and Mr. Raver's work.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be inserted in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STRONG VOICE FOR MARYLAND'S PUBLIC EDUCATION

(By Lowell E. Sunderland)

A Prince Georges County high school principal will bang a gavel on the rostrum of the Civic Center stage at 2 p.m. today and call to order the 98th Annual Convention of the Maryland State Teachers Association.

In the audience before Ralph L. Angel, association president and Suitland High School principal, will be some 10,000 teachers and school administrators representing more than 80 percent of the professional staff of the Maryland public school system.

The meeting today will mark the Maryland State Teachers Association's centennial. The group was founded 100 years ago in December 1865, with a listed membership of 98 teachers and administrators.

MISSED ONLY WAR YEARS

Sixty persons attended the first convention the following year at Baltimore's Western Female High School. Since then the group has met every year but two, 1943 and

1944, when wartime restrictions on travel prevented the convention.

The association has chosen as a slogan for this year's convention "A Century of Conflict, Change, and Challenge," suitable indeed for an organization which now claims 26,450 members and has made its weight increasingly felt in the legislative halls of Annapolis.

This is an organization which sputtered and spun in indecisiveness and ineffectuality for the first half of its existence and came into its own as the strong voice of public education in Maryland only 20 years ago.

Dr. Benjamin P. Ebersole, who is on a year's sabbatical leave from his position as curriculum specialist in the Baltimore County public school system, wrote in a doctoral dissertation on the history of the Maryland State Teachers Association that in the first 30 years of its existence it was by no stretch of the imagination a "power in the land," as some had claimed.

DID INTRODUCE SOME ISSUES

"It did introduce and keep some educational issues alive. It directed the attention of the teachers, and occasionally of the public, to education problems."

The early history of the group gave no hint that one day it would be drumming for greater political awareness and individual political action by its members; or that it would vigorously oppose the 1949 Ober law, which dealt with sedition and subversive activities; or that it would take steps to defend teachers' rights in court.

Those early days found the association worried more about such things as whether history classes should include the "ultimate realities of Scriptural history."

There are those who would disagree, but the association's prime function today is representing its membership politically and supporting educational legislation in general, not just increased salaries for teachers.

To this end, the association has become one of the most vocal, and most respected lobbyist organizations during not only the weeks when the general assembly meets but during the entire year.

It is a big job, a complex job and one which probably few of the Maryland State Teachers Association's own members fully understand. It is a job which Milson C. Raver, the groups' executive secretary since 1944, humorously describes rhetorically: "Did you ever try to sell a battleship? That's about what we do each year, with educational programs running into the millions of dollars. And sometimes it is as hard as trying to sell a battleship."

ON VERGE OF COLLAPSE IN 1903

The first rumblings of what was in store politically for the association came in 1903, when membership had dropped below 100 persons and the organization was on the brink of collapsing.

This was a time, Dr. Ebersole wrote in his thorough and searching history of the association, that the average wage for county teachers in Maryland was $270 a year, or as one educator of the day wryly said, "about the same remuneration being paid to street-cleaners in Baltimore City."

It was at this time the superintendent of Allegany County schools, A. C. Willison, called a spade a spade and charged the State's educational leaders with timidity. He said that educators should not beg for, but demand money.

He said the issue was in the hands of the voters, and that school officials should not be fooled by those who said politics and schools didn't mix.

EFFECTIVE TONGUE LASHING

Dr. Ebersole recorded the Allegany County superintendent as saying that if there were any man on the ballot who did not believe a teacher was worth more than from $125 to $290 a month "you wrong yourself if you don't get out and fight against him."

"I don't believe any community or section or county of the State would put up a man who is so dense, so blind, so narrow, so ignonant, as to oppose this question."

The acid of his tongue lashing took effect and led 2 years later to the passage of the first State aid bill for education, pumping for the first time State money into the counties for teachers' salaries and materials.

The MSTA was off and running. It was the start which had been needed for years.

The Maryland State Teacher Association remained a somewhat quiet organization in the 1920's. One of the drawbacks was the annual meeting, held during the summer and usually at one of the resorts in the State, like Ocean City or Braddock Heights. It was decided in 1921 that Baltimore would be the scene of the annual meeting, around Thanksgiving. From that point on membership grew, again slowly, but steadily.

By 1944, half the teachers and administrators in the State belonged and the Teachers Association took the major step toward becoming an effectual modern organization.

It hired an executive secretary, rented office space and for the first time became a full-time professional body. It was definitely not a move in which it led the Nation. Maryland was one of the last six States to get a full-time teachers' group, even though it had been one of the first to actually organize such a group.

A MAN WITH EXPERIENCE

The man hired was Mr. Raver, public relations man and instructor of physics and geology at Western Maryland College. This is Mr. Raver's 20th anniversary with the MSTA and he finds himself one of the most experienced executive secretaries of teachers' groups in the country.

Under his direction the association has shaken the description of its first 30 years—years when it had "little crusading zeal," according to Dr. Ebersole's dissertation.

There may well still be little crusading zeal in the organization today, but there is unquestionably knowledgeable, persistent and professional zeal, matters on which the association now prides itself.

The MSTA points with pride, for instance, to the fact that it desegregated its membership before the Supreme Court decision of 1954. The legal move was made in 1951 when the association dropped the word "white" from its bylaws, but the practical move came earlier.

NO PLACE TO EAT TOGETHER

Mr. Raver recalls how it came about: "The Negro teachers' group and the MSTA had been meeting for several years and putting out a handbook for Maryland teachers. We found there was no place to eat together, when we went out of town we had to stay apart, and we finally figured that since we were in the same business we ought to get together and forget this silliness."

The 24 teachers' groups were a bit slower, however, in dropping racial bars. The total integration was finally achieved in June of this year when Talbot and Somerset Counties merged their separate groups.

By the time this year's MSTA convention ends Saturday, some 20,000 members will have made an appearance at one or more of the general business sessions, departmental meetings and events.

Many will drop by the MSTA's permanent office at the corner of Charles and Mulberry Streets, where 19 full-time employees now carry on the $500,000 annual business of a group which started 100 years ago with 98 individuals and an annual budget of less than $100. The Maryland State Teachers Association has come a long way.

THE SOUTHERN CATTLE INDUSTRY AS A BASIS FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AT HOME AND PROFITS ABROAD

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, for about a year and a half, the Small Business Committee, of which I am chairman, has been inquiring into ways of reducing the economic barriers and expanding the exports of the U.S. beef and beef products.

This is natural, in view of the committee's longstanding interest in profit possibilities for small business in international trade, and in assuring adequate adjustments against the impact of imports. During the past 15 years, the Small Business Committee has made many contributions in this area through hearings, reports, and recommendations. Many of these recommendations, such as export insurance, mobile trade fairs, and an intercabinet export expansion council, have become part of the law.

It is known that 94 percent of U.S. manufacturers are small businesses, and it is likely that our comparable percentage of farmers and cattlemen in this country are also small, family, and independent businesses. It is true, also, that nearly all of livestock feeders, and more than two-thirds of the meat packing companies in the country are small and local businesses. So are many other small enterprises associated with the beef industry as suppliers of goods and services.

The committee is thus interested in doing what it can to open up the rapidly growing foreign markets for products of the beef industry, rather than letting these opportunities pass, uncontested, to other producing nations.

In this effort, the committee is not unmindful of the opportunities for our beef industry in domestic markets. On the contrary, advances in these two areas go hand in hand.

The nine-State region of the Southern United States presents a classic example of how growth of the cattle industry improves earnings and economic development on all levels—local, State, regional, and international.

Figures supplied to me by the U.S. Department of Agriculture indicate the presence of an annual beef deficit in the South, that is in our own backyard, of perhaps $400 million of beef. In addition, there is, perhaps, another $300 million a year deficit in pork products. In a single area abroad, the European Common Market, there will be a beef deficit estimated at between one-quarter and one-third of a billion dollars a year by 1970, as I reported to the Senate on September 30.

Another measure of potential demand is the per capita consumption. For beef, nationally, it is over 100 pounds per year. However, the individual consumption in the South is about two-thirds of this, and the European percentage is only about one-half. Both, however, are in a position to grow rapidly.

As the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] and I pointed out to the Senate in May of this year, the experts have become aware of these possibilities and have predicted a boom in livestock production for the South of major proportions. The Kiplinger Agricultural Letter of April 23, 1965, estimated that about 1 billion pounds of beef and 1.3 billion pounds of pork are imported into the South each year, and that it was reasonable to suppose that the southern beef and livestock industry might be able to mobilize in order to profitably service the markets in these States.

The importance of farming and livestock production to States such as Alabama at the present time is shown by statistics gathered by the U.S. Commerce Department on personal income.

These figures show that in 1962, 1963, and 1964, farmers' proprietary income in Alabama, that is, income to persons owning their farm businesses, increased by 18.39 percent. This rise was greater than the increases registered for all wages and salaries—16.75 percent—or manufacturing income—15.95 percent—and is almost double the increase in nonfarm proprietary business income—9.41 percent.

It thus appears that agriculture is a highly dynamic force, and perhaps, the most dynamic element in the economic development of my State at the present time.

However, a further analysis of the available information shows that the beef industry has not been sharing in these increases in farm prosperity.

For many years following 1940, Alabama's beef cattle industry enjoyed an admirable development. From an infant operation of $7½ million in cash sales, it grew to about $90 million in sales in 1963.

However, the farm income State estimates for 1963 and 1964 report that Alabama cattle industry sales have actually declined almost 16 percent during the past 3 years. The figures are as follows:

Alabama sales of cattle and calves

1962	$90,339,000
1963	85,761,000
1964	75,911,000
Total decline	14,428,000
Percentage decline (percent)	15.97

During these 3 years, the beef industry's share of Alabama agricultural income was reduced from 16.4 to 12.5 percent.

It is difficult for me to understand this situation, which seems contrary to the many trends which I have described.

Southern States such as Alabama have always possessed the natural advantages of extensive pasturelands, abundant and excellent water supplies, and a climate which is favorable to the raising of livestock. Alabama and the South have an unequaled system of rivers for transportation and channels to blue water through ports such as Mobile, which are favorable launching sites for export efforts.

However, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] and I have been emphasizing to the Senate, there have been artificial barriers that have prevented our cattle industry from achieving its potential. Prominent among these barriers are foreign and domestic freight rates. During the past 9 months, there have been several developments in these rate structures which may be of great significance.

Since the Small Business Committee hearings in February, ocean freight charges on beef were reduced 20 to 25 percent and air freight charges came down an average of 25 to 30 percent. In a further action in September, the ship lines have undertaken not to return ocean freight rates to their previous high levels, in order to allow American exporters to continue their efforts to penetrate and compete in foreign markets.

In addition, there have been reductions in domestic freight rates on feed grains, as a result of a recent decision by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Southern Railway had asked the ICC to permit lower rates in connection with the use of their "Big John" freight cars. These cars are made from aluminum and have a capacity of 100 tons, which is double the amount held by the previous cars. We are told that new freight rates will result in savings up to 60 percent on the grains needed to grow cattle and other livestock.

It may be that the falling of these freight rate barriers may be what is needed to set off the expansion that has been predicted.

Mr. D. W. Brosnan, president of the Southern Railway System, has remarked that livestock production, made less costly by the new lower grain rates, will "take off like a rocket."

Our hopes and our activities are being encouraged by some of the concrete figures on new livestock feeding and processing installations which are springing up throughout the station. These new starts or expansions have numbered 171 since May of 1963.

My own State of Alabama with 32 such installations is the second fastest growing State in the South in this field. During this period, there have been seven new cattle feed lots, six new hog feed lots, eight new feed mill elevators, and six expansions of elevators, as well as five expansions of processing of packing plants. These operations account for about 19 percent of the new activities in the South, second only to the State of North Carolina.

In the meantime, my Small Business Committee will continue to explore other outstanding economic and political barriers to the beef trade, and will seek to identify areas where these obstacles can be reduced or eliminated. An interim report which the committee will shortly file with the Senate will discuss this in detail.

The southern cattle industry can thus plan for expansion.

It has a stable and growing market at home and is capable of absorbing a major share of expansion for some time to come. Beyond this, there are untapped export markets abroad to provide new opportunities, challenges, and sources of profit.

The importance of this combination was emphasized in the February hearings of the Small Business Committee in which various experts talked about the superior productive platform possessed by the U.S. cattle industry. The significance of this term is twofold.

First. Our industry has the know-how, efficiency, advanced equipment, traditional ability to trade, which make for success.

Second. It means that with our larger overall production, we require a much smaller percentage increase in our domestic production to meet the demands of growing markets. For a smaller nation, a very considerable percentage increase would be required. A strong domestic industry is thus the greatest factor in overcoming the barriers and establishing an orderly export trade.

The possibilities of exporting were shown in February of this year, where 1,873 Alabama cattle sailed from Mobile to Italy aboard the SS *Salamat*. This was the largest shipment of live animals ever to leave the United States. The American Consul General in Genoa cabled the Agriculture Department that several cattle experts stated that the cattle "were unquestionably the best Italy had imported from the United States." I believe that these words of praise—"unquestionably the best"—by the experts of the European beef industry confirms the fact that the quality of Alabama cattle and beef is unsurpassed and would, I feel, make an apt slogan for our Alabama and U.S. beef industries.

The interest of all of our people, particularly in States such as Alabama, thus come together over the development of the cattle and livestock industry.

Authorities such as Charles Schuman, the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and Jay Taylor, the chairman of the 1964 beef mission to Europe, have agreed that small farmers, as well as large ones, can have a part of the market in both live cattle and dressed beef, whether it is marketed domestically or exported.

Not only will the farmers benefit, but industry and their communities in general will share in this activity. More mills and packing plants must be built and expanded, equipment must be bought and installed. Banking, insurance and other services will have to be performed.

Housewives and their families will benefit from the availability of a variety of meats in ample quantities at reasonable costs. Transportation facilities, including railroads, trucks, and water carriers, will be hauling more traffic, and port workers will be needed to load and unload it.

The growth of the Southern livestock industry—as a platform to supply both local and foreign demand for meat products—would give the South a might engine of overall economic development. A World Bank publication said in 1960:

> In the long run, the expansion of exports is one of the most effective of all stimuli to economic development, and the rising incomes which it brings provide the best incentive for the growth of local industries. In other words, economic development takes place most easily in the context of rising international trade.

These are the visions which I believe are shared by the Senator from Georgia

[Mr. Talmadge], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] and myself. These are the causes for which we are working, and to which our efforts will continue to be devoted.

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS AS A KEY FACTOR IN LOCATING PLANTS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, in a recent issue, the Wall Street Journal reported that a good local school system is a major factor in selecting new plant sites by some of the Nation's largest companies.

Quality schools are needed to attract and hold professional men, such as scientists and engineers, and their families. Another reason why companies scrutinize a local school system carefully is that they expect to draw their work force largely from its graduates.

As a result, the Journal article points out:

> Communities that want to attract and hold industry are learning that one way to do it is to improve schools. Put another way, communities with serious school problems are finding them to be a major handicap in attracting new industry.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be included at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wall Streeet Journal, Sept. 23, 1965]

School Scrutiny: Good Educational Systems a Key Factor in Locating Plants

(By George Melloan)

Not long ago, Rumrill Co., Inc., an advertising agency based on the outskirts of Rochester, N.Y., invited a young man from another city to come up and talk about hiring on as an account executive.

"The first thing his wife did when she got here was to go around and find out what the local schools were like," recalls Charles N. Gleason, Rumrill's senior vice president and treasurer. With some cursory investigation itself, Rumrill learned that school systems in two nearby suburbs do indeed have excellent reputations. So, adding a touch of ad agency license, it included the line "watch your kids grow up in one of the finest school systems in the Nation" in a subsequent "writer wanted" ad in Advertising Age.

Rumrill has discovered, says Mr. Gleason, that in this day of fierce student competition one of the most important factors—perhaps the most important—in a family head's decision to take a new job in a new town is the quality of the local school system. "Parents are anxious that their children be in a school system that will afford them a good chance of getting into college," says the Rumrill officer. "They didn't worry so much about that a few years ago."

Rumrill is by no means unique in its discovery. Some of the nation's largest companies have become so much aware of their key employees' concern about local school conditions that they go to great lengths, to measure school quality and make it a major factor in selecting new plant sites. A few are making strong efforts to improve schools in towns where they already have plants.

INFLUENCING AN IMPROVEMENT

As a result, communities that want to attract and hold industry are learning that one way to do it is to improve schools. Put another way, communities with serious school problems are finding them to be a major handicap in attracting new industry. The upshot is that, both directly and indirectly, corporations are influencing an improvement in local public schools.

Roger L. Yaseen, vice president of Fantus Factory Locating Service, a consulting firm that helps companies decide where to put a plant, says he has been amazed by the sharp rise in importance of schools in plant site selection. "You would think there would be more interest in operating economies than in the local schools and that obligations to the stockholders would take precedence over the needs of company executives," says he, "but prevailing school conditions has become one of the primary factors in site selection."

General Electric Co., Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. and Celanese Corp. of America are but a few of the major corporations that now scan schools carefully before selecting a town as a site for a plant. "It becomes increasingly important where large numbers of professional people, such as scientists and engineers, have to be attracted to the plant from other parts of the country," says Lee J. Guittar, manager of community and government services at GE.

Included on a sizable list of school features that GE studies in a prospective plant town are whether the system has a good long-range plan for providing necessary facilities, how well it pays its teachers, the ratio of pupils to teachers, relations between teachers and the community, the educational background of teachers, the quality, and breadth of school curricula and the percentage of graduates who enter college.

Celanese applies a simpler test but also puts strong emphasis on local school quality. According to Richard R. M. McGhee, who is the company's director of engineering and has major responsibility for plant site selection, Celanese relies heavily on results of the standard college board examinations administered by the College Entrance Examination Board to high school students who want to enter college.

Another requirement which in engineering parlance has become a go-no-go factor in Celanese site selections is the presence of an institution of higher learning (junior college at least) within easy range of the town, says Mr. McGhee. "There are all sorts of places that look like good sites in the boondocks of such States as Louisiana," he says. "They have water, sulphur, gas—everything we need. But you can't get anyone to go there to work."

Another important reason why companies scrutinize a local school system carefully is that they expect to draw their work force largely from its graduates. "When we put a plant in a town we do so on the assumption that we will be there forever," says C. P. Pesek, vice president in charge of engineering and staff manufacturing at Minnesota Mining. "You can't possibly expect to provide the training yourself that a good school system should provide for your employees."

Corporate concern over school quality is beginning to be felt by those who have direct responsibility for schools. This has been noticed, for instance, by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), a school accrediting agency which has been pushing for higher standards in southern schools. Recognition of the potential impact on a community's plant attracting capabilities has become an important force for improvement when a school system is in danger of losing accreditation, says Jerry Miller, assistant to the director of the association.

There can be little doubt, for instance, that concern over attracting industry has spurred community leaders in Duval County, Fla. (Jacksonville) in efforts to repair a reputation damaged when accreditation was withdrawn from 15 county high schools last December. Harry G. Kincaid, a Jacksonville attorney who has been one of the leaders in the reaccreditation effort, says, "We were getting industry at a pretty good clip. Now it has dwindled to practically nothing."

In some communities, companies that are already major employers (and, not incidentally, major taxpayers) have taken a strong hand in trying to bring about heavier spending for schools. Such is the case in Louisville, Ky., which had been in danger of becoming the next major city to lose accreditation from the tough-minded SACS. One of the leaders in attempts to bring about better tax support for schools in Louisville and surrounding Jefferson County is GE, which has its huge appliance park factory complex in Louisville.

GE's Louisville management and some 200 of its local employees worked actively last fall to obtain passage of a tax referendum that would have provided a new financing for schools. The referendum failed. This fall, efforts to head off loss of accreditation—which would have been primarily due to underfinancing—shifted to the Kentucky State Legislature, which has just passed a bill to provide emergency financing for Louisville and Jefferson County schools. The bill's success was partly due to lobbying by some major Louisville companies.

PAPER COMPANY'S HELP

The International Paper Co. Foundation has budgeted $385,000 in the current year for aid to 26 school systems that educate the children of employees in International Paper Co. plants around the Nation. The figure is double that budgeted 10 years ago when the program started. The money is used to provide advanced training for teachers and to finance a program that the schools themselves devise.

One of the schools aided, the Choppee school at Georgetown, S.C., not long ago became the first consolidated school in South Carolina to receive accreditation, according to Richard C. Millett, vice president of the foundation. Among other things, Choppee has cut its dropout rate to 3 percent, extremely low for a predominantly Negro school, and has installed language laboratories and other facilities that are not common in rural Southern schools.

Corning Glass Works Foundation helps high school teachers, in the 18 towns where Corning Glass Works has plants, attend summer school to advance their knowledge of the subjects they teach.

Of course, there still are business interests in some communities that oppose tax increases often needed for school improvement. Junius Eddy, director of public information for the National Committee for Support of the Public Schools (which in turn draws a good deal of its support from industry) notes that real estate interests in some cities still lead campaigns against school spending. But, says Mr. Eddy, "even they are beginning to see the light."

Despite the remaining holdouts, though, more businesses are coming to agree with Robert A. Will, manager of location surveys for the Austin Co., a large engineering firm which offers site selection advice. A good local school system is a "top requisite" for employees' families and therefore of a plant site, he says. "A company cannot afford to overlook the influence of this factor on retaining and recruiting key employees."

NOMINATION OF TOM LILLEY TO BE A MEMBER OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have today reported from the Banking and Currency Committee the nomination of Mr. Tom Lilley to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

The committee held a hearing on Mr. Lilley's nomination at which he appeared and testified. The committee was very favorably impressed with Mr. Lilley's qualifications for the position.

Two questions arose. Mr. Lilley was nominated as a resident of West Virginia. He was personally presented to the committee by Senator RANDOLPH, though nominated as a Republican, and his nomination was approved by the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. At the hearing it developed that Mr. Lilley, though a native of West Virginia, has lived for some years in Michigan. Accordingly, the committee felt it appropriate to consult the Senators from Michigan for their views on the matter, and we have now received letters from them. I ask unanimous consent that their letters may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

In addition, Mr. Lilley is resigning as vice president of the Ford Motor Co., in charge of the Canadian overseas group. Mr. Lilley has advised the committee of his financial arrangements with the Ford Motor Co., and an extensive excerpt from his letter to me on this subject is set forth in the hearing.

In order to complete the record on this point, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from a letter to Mr. Lilley by Henry Ford II be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. Also, I should add that, under the trust which Mr. Lilley is creating to handle his securities, the deed of trust will provide that the trustee is to inform Mr. Linder, the President of the Export-Import Bank, of all changes in investments, and Mr. Linder will undertake the responsibility of seeing that Mr. Lilley does not vote on matters relating to companies in which he has a financial interest.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
October 12, 1965.

Chairman A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman of Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, 5300 Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your recent letter regarding Mr. Tom Lilley who has been nominated to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank.

I understand Mr. Lilley is well qualified for this position, and I certainly have no objections to his confirmation.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

PAT McNAMARA,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., October 12, 1965.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, 5300 New Senate Office Building.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The President has nominated for Export-Import Bank Board membership, Tom Lilley. For many years I have known Mr. Lilley who for some 16 years has been a resident of Michigan.

Based upon that long acquaintanceship, I have every confidence that he would serve with distinction and effectiveness and welcome the opportunity, by this informal note, to express to you and the committee my unreserved endorsement of his nomination.

Sincerely,

PHILIP A. HART.

FORD MOTOR CO.,
Dearborn, Mich., October 13, 1965.

Mr. TOM LILLEY,
Ann Arbor, Mich.

DEAR TOM: In connection with your nomination as a Director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, I am writing to furnish you with a statement of your rights under the supplemental compensation plan.

You have unpaid installments of awards made to you for the years 1962, 1963, and 1964 under the supplemental compensation plan. As you know, awards under that plan generally are payable in four equal annual installments. One-fourth of the award is paid in the year next succeeding that for which the award is made and the balance is payable in equal installments on January 10 of each of the next 3 years, subject to fulfillment of the earning out conditions of the plan.

A summary of the installments thus payable to you is shown in the following table:

* * * * *

The right to receive payment of any installment of an award to you will accrue under the plan only if from the time of termination of your employment until December 31 of the year preceding that in which the installment is payable, you earn out the installment by fulfilling two conditions, essentially as follows:

1. By refraining from certain competitive activities, as set forth in the plan.
2. By making yourself available, upon request, at reasonable times and upon a reasonable basis, to consult with, supply information to, and otherwise cooperate with the company or any subsidiary thereof with respect to any matter that was handled by you or under your supervision while in the employ of the company or any subsidiary thereof.

In view of your nomination as a Director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, the Salary and Supplemental Compensation Committee (which, as you know, consists entirely of nonemployee directors, ineligible for awards), at a meeting held today, considered the question of the effect of service in that capacity upon both of the earning-out conditions. The committee unanimously determined, and so interpreted the supplemental compensation plan, that (1) service by you as a Director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington would not result in nonfulfillment of the condition relating to competitive activity applicable to unpaid installments of any supplemental compensation award to you and (2) it would not be reasonable for the company to request of you any of the services contemplated by the consultation and cooperation condition during the period of your service in that capacity, and, accordingly, that neither your activities in that capacity nor your failure to comply with the consultation and cooperation condition provisions would result in nonfulfillment of such conditions.

In view of this determination, you will not be called upon by the company for any of the services referred to in the consultation and cooperation condition.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY FORD.

MORALE IN VIETNAM AND AT HOME

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, there is no 40-hour workweek or double time pay for our men in Vietnam. They work around the clock; sleep in hot and humid foxholes; are plagued with tropical diseases and snipers' bullets, while engaged in an effort to arrest and stamp out the world's greatest and most destructive disease—communism.

They fully realize that they must forgo the freedoms and comforts of home; they understand that they face death at every turn in the steaming, disease-infested jungle; they understand that they are being furnished with the best available under the circumstances to provide for their protection and comfort—but what they cannot understand is the lack of united moral support from the citizenry back home.

Mr. President, these are some of the thoughts of Pfc. Donald A. Gibson expressed in an extremely well-written and thought-provoking letter to me.

I ask unanimous consent that Private First Class Gibson's letter be printed at this point in the RECORD, and I hope that members of these anti-Vietnam groups read it. The finger of shame is pointed at them.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 3, 1965.

Senator FRANK LAUSCHE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LAUSCHE: Today, as I read the September 29 issue of Army Times, I came across a news brief which stated: "Senator FRANK LAUSCHE, Democrat of Ohio, says he has heard reports that peaceniks plan to stage a big sit-down in California next month in hopes of obstructing the movement of U.S. troops to Vietnam. The article went on to say, "He mentioned the rumor as he announced that seven Senators have decided to cosponsor his bill to make obstruction of troop or military material movements a Federal crime worth up to 10 years in prison."

After reading this short, and seemingly unimportant news item, I had to stop for a moment and reflect on some of the developments that have occurred in the United States in these past weeks and months.

Recently a captain in the Air Force, who after much soul searching, decided he should extend his tour of duty in Vietnam because he believed so much in the cause of the Vietnamese people in the Republic of Vietnam. This man felt he had not the right to neglect "his duty" as an American. Shortly thereafter, this man lost his life in action while on a routine flight.

During a period of time when I am sure his wife was overwhelmed with grief, having to look forward to a bleak future and the responsibility of raising their children alone, this woman received numerous phone calls, letters, and messages from people far and near. These people threatened, accused, teased, and harassed this woman because her husband, "had no business" in Vietnam, and because he "mettled."

Can any person ask more from a man than to give his life for a cause in which he believes so deeply? Is there anyone who could possibly expect more than for a man to offer his life, and the consequences of losing it? I for one have only the highest admiration for pilots who would set themselves up as a target for Vietcong bullets, which every single man in every aircraft in Vietnam does, regardless of his mission.

Also, in the recent past, some 3,000 persons in Berkeley, Calif., staged a stirring demonstration in protest to the U.S. policy in Vietnam. And, elsewhere across the country groups large and small have found fault with those men in Vietnam who risk their lives every day in that war torn country.

To be sure, Senator LAUSCHE, these people have the right to express their feelings and opinions. The heritage which was bought for them with their father's and grandfather's blood gives them the privilege to tell the people of the world whatever they believe. They can stand on the highest hill and shout in their highest voice and no one will stop them. In the United States, freedom of speech and freedom of the press is of the most cherished of all freedoms.

Throughout the history of our country we Americans have had to prove our right to be free. Too many times our country has had to fight for what it stands for, for what it believes in. Today in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, the United States once again has had to stand up and fight to prove to those who would have things differently that the United States stands for the cause of freedom. Not only for ourselves, but also for the millions and millions of other freedom-loving people of the world. New or old, the countries of the world look toward the United States as their one guarantee of freedom.

Senator LAUSCHE, it saddens me to see so few individuals make so much noise about our presence in Vietnam. It is a necessary evil however, that such a minority can add so much fuel to the fire of the Communist propaganda that would lead all people to believe the United States is indeed an imperialist, warmongering nation directing aggression against the people of North Vietnam and against the will of the people at home.

These so-called peaceniks with their beatle haircuts, sideburns, black leather jackets, shades, and all their other trademarks, and the Ivy-leaguers who apparently have nothing better to do than have demonstrations and sit-ins, ought to take a moment and try to understand what these men in Vietnam are fighting for. An examination of the most basic and fundamental issues at stake should merit a more mature and civic-minded attitude.

In a recent interview, Walter Cronkite, well-known news analyst for CBS talked with General Westmoreland, commander, U.S. Forces, Republic of Vietnam. In reply to Cronkite's question, "What can we do to help our troops?" General Westmoreland replied, "Let us know if we have the people's support."

Such news as that which happened to his widow when an Air Force pilot gave his life doing his duty; thousands of people in Berkeley, Calif. staging demonstrations against our cause in Vietnam; more thousands marching on Washington and demanding to see the President; and the hundreds of other demonstrations and sit-ins all across the country, many of which never even reach the ears of our men in Vietnam, have a demoralizing effect on our men in that country to say the least.

There is not one single man in Vietnam today that is looking for any medals. No one is seeking fame or fortune. Each man knows there is a tremendous job to be done and he is there to do his own small part in contributing to its successful completion. These men are not asking for any special privileges, nor are they receiving them. Our men in Vietnam today are suffering many hardships and inconveniences not unlike those that were experienced by our fighting men in the Second World War and Korean conflict.

Many thousands of men live with only the barest of essentials. Many live in foxholes, must diet on C-rations, and it's a chore to get a shower and shave. Thousands of men are on the job 16, 18, 24 hours straight. All must brave the heat, and also the diseases which run rampant throughout the country. dysentery, flu viruses, malaria are everyday things. Not to mention the constant, ever-present threat of a mortar round landing in their lap, a grenade tossed their way, or a single bullet aimed at them.

The long hours, hard work, and sweat, the jungle, heat, disease, inconveniences, and all the hardship entailed in fighting this war, all these can be tolerated. But, the lack of moral support, indifference, even a complete disregard of the situation by some, cannot and should not be tolerated by these men who day in and day out risk their lives to fight the spread of a greater and far more deadly disease—communism.

Because of these convictions Senator LAUSCHE, I support your efforts in obtaining the passage of the bill you have introduced to the Senate. I sincerely wish for you and your constituents a speedy passage of this bill, and the swift execution of it being signed into law.

To those who would stand up and curse the cause for which the United States fights in Vietnam, to those who would find fault with the men themselves who fight in Vietnam, and to those who would find fault with anything and everything, I for one would give my life for their right to do so.

In fact, Mr. Senator, having approximately 5½ months left in the Army, with at least 5 more months of that time left in my present tour of duty in Vietnam, I may very well have the opportunity to do just that.

Thanking you for your consideration of my letter, this Clevelander remains

Very truly yours,

DONALD A. GIBSON,
Pfc., U.S. 52595183.

NEW PANAMA CANAL TREATY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the New Haven Register carried an interesting editorial recently, to the effect that the United States has shown its greatness of character with its willingness to negotiate a new treaty involving the Panama Canal.

This decision to negotiate should improve our image in the Latin American states, where Fidel Castro and other communistic influences are so busy trying to undermine us.

> A nation or individual must be truly big in character to make fair decisions when sheer force of power or influence could easily dictate unfair or oppressive action—

The Register editorial said.

The editorial will be of general interest, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Haven (Conn.) Register, Sept. 27, 1965]

WE SHOW OUR GREATNESS IN PANAMA DECISION

A nation or individual must be truly big in character to make fair decisions when sheer force of power or influence could easily dictate unfair or oppressive action. The United States has shown the world the greatness of its character in its willingness to negotiate a new treaty involving the Panama Canal.

The United States has a population approaching 200 million and is the world's richest nation. The Republic of Panama has a population of about 1,250,000 and is economically depressed.

When Panama demanded a new treaty covering the canal, another nation might have used its military and other powers to trample the isthmus nation. The United States is too big in principle to take violent action against a tiny country. It agreed to negotiate.

While the terms of a new pact are not in writing, the United States has agreed to give Panama a share in management and profits. We will also recognize Panama's sovereignty over the Canal Zone, including the canal, leased to the United States.

It may be said that we are looking ahead to the construction of another canal in the narrow strip of land linking North and South America and friendly relations with Panama will make such a project possible. Certainly the general terms announced by President Johnson will make lease and other terms easier to reach. There is both good business and good international diplomacy, as well as a large degree of fairness, in our agreement to scrap the canal treaty dictated by us some 62 years ago.

The decision to negotiate should improve our image in all of Latin America, where Fidel Castro and other communistic influences are trying to undermine us. We have long preached that we will not use our power or influence in any form to take advantage of a neighbor or any friendly nation. We have proved our position many times. We have both proved and improved it in Panama.

SUPPORT GROWS FOR THE CHILDREN'S ASPIRIN AMENDMENT OF 1965

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, support is rapidly growing for S. 2404, the children's aspirin amendment of 1965, which I introduced on August 12 of this year.

The purpose of this bill is to prevent the all too frequent loss of children's lives which occurs through self-administered overdoses of baby aspirin. The legislation which I have introduced would require that baby aspirin be packaged in containers of not more than 25 tablets.

I am most hopeful that the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee will hold hearings on this bill early in 1966.

I have received many letters endorsing the children's aspirin amendment, from distinguished members of the medical profession as well as concerned parents. Articles in newspapers, magazines, and medical journals evidence the great interest in this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that several of these articles, as well as extracts from some of the many letters which I have received on this subject, may be printed at this point in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted at the annual convention of the New Jersey Pharmaceutical Association be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 16, 1965]

SENATOR MCGOVERN URGES CONTROLS ON SALE OF ASPIRIN FOR CHILDREN

(By Jean R. Hailey)

The danger of youngsters getting hold of too many children's aspirin tablets was brought home sharply to Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, recently.

As he explained to the Senate, the young son of his nextdoor neighbor nearly lost his life because of swallowing a bottle of children's aspirin.

And the daughter of a staff assistant created a bad scare when she was found with 9 or 10 aspirin tablets in her mouth.

So on Friday, McGOVERN introduced a bill that would limit the content of "baby aspirin" bottles to 25. The standard bottle, he noted, contains 50 tablets, a lethal dosage for a 30-pound child.

ONE HUNDRED FIFTY DEATHS A YEAR

In remarks carried in the Congressional Record, Senator McGovern pointed out that self-administered overdoses of baby aspirin cause more than 150 deaths a year in children under 5.

"In almost every case," he said, "the young child finds the bottle of aspirin accidentally and eats all of the sweet, fruit-flavored tablets."

He cited a frightening case of the 3½-year-old daughter of a member of this staff who had taken aspirin from a bottle but was caught in time. Owen J. Donley, his administrative assistant, said yesterday it was his daughter. She swallowed only one or two of the pills before she was caught.

CHILD NEARLY DIED

Senator McGovern, who lives at 3214 Coquelin Terrace, Chevy Chase, Md., also cited the near death of the son of his neighbor, Col. William H. Crosby, who is director of the Department of Medicine at Walter Reed Army Institute of Research.

If the standard aspirin bottle were to contain only 25 tablets instead of 50, a child might eat all the tablets without serious danger, he told the Senate.

Another bill, which would ban candy aspirin from interstate commerce, was introduced in the House last January by Representative Leonor K. Sullivan, Democrat, of Missouri.

[From the Journal of the American Medical Association, Aug. 30, 1965]

Children's Aspirin

Senator George McGovern, Democrat, of South Dakota, introduced a bill to require that aspirin for children be packaged in bottles of no more than 25 tablets.

In a Senate speech, McGovern said:

"At the present time, the standard bottle of baby aspirin contains 50 tablets. Each tablet contains 75 milligrams of aspirin. Thus, the total dosage in the bottle is 3.75 grams which is more than a lethal amount for a 30-pound child.

"However, if the standard bottle were to contain 25 tablets instead of 50, as my bill provides, the child might eat all the tablets without serious danger. According to the Food and Drug Administration, legislation is necessary to achieve this result. Passage of this legislation could mean the difference between life and death for more than 150 small children each year. I am hopeful that the Congress will not fail to act.

"During the past year, I have received suggestions and support for this idea from pediatricians throughout the country. I am especially indebted to Col. William H. Crosby, U.S. Army Medical Corps, of the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, who first interested me in the seriousness of the problem. Colonel Crosby's own young son nearly lost his life because of swallowing a bottle of baby aspirins.

"I have received numerous letters from parents whose children's health has been impaired by the ingestion of baby aspirin.

"Mr. President, it seems to me that a simple requirement could save many lives each year and prevent the unbearable heartache of the families involved. I urge the Senate to act in order that hundreds of young children might live."

Aspirin Packaging Quantity: Ten Years Later

(Note.—The following editorial prepared for Clinical Pediatrics by Dr. J. M. Arena.)

South Dakota's Senator George McGovern, on August 12, 1965, introduced the children's aspirin amendment, to safeguard the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to authorize a limitation on the total quantity of aspirin (25) permissible in containers of aspirin intended for children.

On February 14, 1965, in Washington, D.C., a meeting of a medical advisory panel on the accidental ingestion and misuse of salicylate preparations by children was held. All important officials of the aspirin industry were represented. Much of the discussion that took place that day was in regard to packaging quantity. Physician members of the panel asked for a limit of 25 tablets, but this was voted down as being very uneconomical by the aspirin representatives, since the cost of 25 would be approximately the same as for 50 tablets. They were sustained by the Food and Drug Administration at this time.

But now it is 10 years later, and the magnitude of the problem is 10 times greater in spite of considerable publicity, labeling, safety closures, etc. In 1955, for example, 72 children under 5 years of age died from aspirin and salicylate poisoning. There were 140 or twice as many deaths in 1963. The annual incidence of aspirin ingestion in this age group is over 20 percent of all reported cases to the National Clearinghouse for Poison Control Centers in Washington—it was 23 percent in 1964. No one is more familiar with this problem than the pediatrician. Limiting packaging aspirin to 25, 75 milligrams (1¼ grain) tablets, may cost the public a few pennies more, and may inconvenience the producers, yet saving a hundred or more small children is more important.

Support this amendment by writing your Senator today. Interest your patients and local organizations in the importance of this type of legislation for it is already 10 years late.

Resolution 1 of the New Jersey Pharmaceutical Association, 1965 Annual Convention, June 27–July 1, 1965

Whereas hundreds of children die annually from overdosage of children's aspirin and thousands more become ill therefrom; and

Whereas the lethal dose times 50 for children is generally in excess of 31 grains, or the approximate amount of aspirin contained in 25 of such tablets; and

Whereas many of these deaths and illnesses could be prevented by packaging of children's aspirin in quantities of 25 each and each sealed with an aluminum disk seal so as to prevent access by children; and

Whereas the sale of the 25's in multiple packages so that the unit sale could still remain at 50 tablets is possible with no economic injury to the manufacturer: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New Jersey Pharmaceutical Association recommend to all children's aspirin producers that they take such steps as to reduce the quantity of such drug available in one pack to no more than 25 tablets; and be it further

Resolved, That the New Jersey Pharmaceutical Association urge all of its members to sell children's aspirin tablets only in packages which contain 25 or less tablets per pack unit; and be it further

Resolved, That the New Jersey Pharmaceutical Association submit the substance of this resolution to the American Pharmaceutical Association for its consideration at the next convention thereof.

Extracts From Letters on S. 2404

October 5, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: It is with real relief that we have learned of your concern for our children as evidenced by your bill, S. 2404. Surely it is time that warnings be given regarding the dangers of aspirin.

Mr. and Mrs. Elvin Noel.
San Diego, Calif.

October 4, 1965.

Dear Senator McGovern: I wish to congratulate you on your introduction of the bill to require children's aspirin to be packaged in bottles of only 25 tablets. Your insight and diligent efforts in this area will be appreciated by mothers in all of our 50 States.

Since our 2-year-old dragged a full hamper down a carpeted hall, stood on it to reach the aspirin on the top shelf of a linen closet, and bit the top off, we have always purchased the small-sized bottle.

Mrs. Kenney M. Marenge.
Rochester, N.Y.

August 16, 1965.

Senator George McGovern,
U.S. Senate.

My Dear Senator: I shall back you a hundred percent on this type of legislation.

Jay M. Arena, M.D.,
Director, Duke Poison Control Center.
Durham, N.C.

August 23, 1965.

Dear Senator McGovern: I believe that your proposed amendment is a good one, and I am glad to give it support.

M. M. Wintrobe, M.D.,
Head Department of Internal Medicine, University of Utah Medical Center.
Salt Lake City, Utah.

August 19, 1965.

Dear Senator McGovern: May I offer you my personal support for your bill to limit the total quantity of aspirin sold for children to be 75 milligrams or less. This bill should reduce not only the deaths but also the morbidity in those who do not die.

Yours is a fine bill. I shall be pleased to ask our organization for support at its annual meeting on October 26, 1965, should you care for a formal consideration by our organization.

Harry B. Shirkey, M.D.,
President, American Association of Poison Control Centers, Birmingham, Ala.

August 19, 1965.

Dear Senator McGovern: Establishment of a limit for the aggregate number of tablets available in a standard bottle of infant aspirin would go a long way to minimizing the toxic and often lethal effects occurring in infants following accidental ingestion of aspirin.

Again, my very best wishes for a thoughtful and important piece of legislation.

Sumner J. Yaffe, M.D.,
Associate Professor of Pediatrics, State University of New York at Buffalo.
Buffalo, N.Y.

August 19, 1965.

Dear Senator McGovern: The American Parents Committee is appreciatively aware of your efforts in behalf of child health and safety, through the introduction of your bill on children's aspirin.

Mrs. Barbara D. McGarry,
Executive Director, The American Parents Committee, Inc.
Washington, D.C.

September 24, 1965.

Hon. George McGovern,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Sir: I have discussed your remarks on the children's aspirin amendment of 1965 with the departmental faculty. On the whole we think this is a good amendment and would support it.

Roger W. Sevy, M.D., Ph. D.,
Chairman, Department of Pharmacology, Temple University Health Science Center.
Philadelphia, Pa.

September 18, 1965.

Senator George McGovern.

Dear Senator: I certainly agree with you that accidental ingestion of aspirin by children is a serious cause of both morbidity and death and, in my opinion your amendment should be enacted.

N. R. Whitney, M.D.

Rapid City, S. Dak.

September 20, 1965.

Dear Senator McGovern: I am practicing with three other pediatricians in a rather busy pediatric clinic, and I am greatly concerned over the number of cases of aspirin poisoning that we encounter monthly.

I am happy to see that you are introducing a bill in an attempt to curb this negligence. I feel a bill like this is long overdue and should be acted upon as soon as possible.

F. Allen Mershen, M.D.

Houston, Tex.

August 19, 1965.

Dear Mr. McGovern: Poisoning problems in children have been one of my special interests for years, and your bill presents a simple means of combating a major part of the problem.

W. F. Stanage, M.D.,
Yankton Clinic.

Yankton, S. Dak.

August 18, 1965.

Senator George McGovern.

Dear Senator: It is wonderful to know that at least one person in Washington is interested in the lives of children and the curb on baby aspirins has been needed for many months.

Like so many mothers, I just had an experience with the baby aspirin a week ago. My 3-year-old son ate 49 which is just one less than a full bottle and the commotion, scare, and the damage it did both to the child and us was horrible. Had the bottle contained just half that many as you have introduced, there would have been no damage or if any it would have been slight.

Mrs. Pherbia Stephens.

North Judson, Ind.

August 15, 1965.

Dear Senator McGovern: Your suggestion about the aspirin for children is so simple and ingenious, it suddenly strikes one, "Well, of course, why has nobody thought of that before."

My hat is off to you, sir.

Mr. E. Harlan Whitehead.

Lawrenceville, N.J.

August 17, 1965.

Dear Senator McGovern: This act provides a practical solution to a problem of great significance to public health. I believe that passage and enforcement of the bill will substantially decrease the number of accidental deaths from aspirin in children and that it could serve as a model for enactment of legislation to reduce accidental poisoning from various other dangerous drugs and economic poisons.

Kenneth P. DuBois,
University of Chicago Toxicity Laboratory.

Chicago, Ill.

August 27, 1965.

Dear Senator McGovern: Congratulations on your excellent amendment.

I support your amendment without reservation.

J. Edmund Bradley, M.D.,
Professor and Head Department of Pediatrics, University of Maryland.

Baltimore, Md.

September 20, 1965.

Dear Senator McGovern: The Winnebago County Department of Public Health would like to go on record for endorsing the bill S. 2404.

Individuals connected with accidental poisoning investigation are well aware of the need for this bill.

Robert H. Anderson, M.D.,
Acting Health Officer, Winnebago County Department of Public Health.

Rockford, Ill.

September 3, 1965.

Dear Senator McGovern: Each year a number of children needlessly die from consuming an overdose of fruit-flavored baby aspirin. The bill which you have introduced would require manufacturers to dispense no more than 25 tablets in each bottle and as you well know, this would be less than a fatal dose. I pray for the passage of your bill.

I thoroughly agree with every word that you said before the Senate on August 12, 1965.

Samuel C. Southard, M.D.,
Chairman, Committee on Accident Prevention, American Academy of Pediatrics.

Ventnor, City, N.J.

September 2, 1965.

Dear Senator McGovern: While I cannot state what comment will be made by our Department, it is my personal view that this bill is a step in the right direction toward reducing the injuries to and deaths of children from accidental consumption of aspirin.

A. J. Lehman, M.D.,
Chief, Division of Pharmacology, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Washington, D.C.

Baltimore, Md.,
August 31, 1965.

Dear Senator McGovern: I would hope that my comments might be used for the record, if this is at all appropriate, because I heartily endorse the legislation which you are suggesting.

We have recently had almost an epidemic of aspirin poisoning in one of our associated hospitals. So frequent has poisoning become that we refer to the night emergency clinic at this hospital as the aspirin clinic.

The only solution that seems reasonable to us is to reduce the number of aspirin tablets in each bottle. The attempts to make a foolproof cap have left much to be desired. The cap is readily removed by the child by the use of his teeth while an adult may have some difficulty removing it with his hands. We have suggested locally that the only way to avoid poisoning would be for flavored aspirin to be packaged in small units so that the whole unit could be consumed without serious toxicity.

I sincerely hope that your amendment will be favorably acted on by the Congress. It may seem to be a minor matter to have the number of tablets in a bottle reduced, but this minor action could literally save as many lives as very expensive Government research programs already approved by the Congress.

Robert E. Cooke, M.D.,
Given Foundation, Professor of Pediatrics, The Johns Hopkins University.

OUR PRECIOUS SHORELINES

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the public has become aroused about the urgent necessity for setting aside some of our irreplaceable outdoor resources to meet our rapidly expanding recreational needs.

President Johnson is taking the lead in awakening our people about this matter. In signing the bill to create an Assateague Island National Seashore, the President pointed out that our waters, our lakeshores, and our seashores are "rare and very precious possessions."

The Milwaukee Journal, which has long championed the cause of conservation, praised the President for these timely remarks in a recent editorial. The Journal pointed out that the same issue is at stake in the long fight to preserve some of the Indiana dunes along Lake Michigan as a recreational resource for the millions of people crowded into that area of Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan.

I ask unanimous consent that the Milwaukee Journal editorial of October 1, 1965, be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Precious Possessions

"What the good Lord once gave in greatest abundance have now become rare and very precious possessions," President Johnson said the other day. "Clear water, warm sandy beaches are a nation's real treasure. For the rest of this century, the shoreline within reach of the major cities of this country just must be preserved and must be maintained primarily for the recreation of our people."

He spoke before signing a bill to make a seashore national park of Assateague Island, a superb sandy sweep of the Maryland and Virginia coastline.

The President might have been describing a bill to rescue from almost inevitable obliteration 10 miles of sandy beach and thousands of acres of towering dunes in Indiana, along the south shore of Lake Michigan. For 8 years now, legislation has been knocking about in Congress to make it a national lakeshore park. The latest effort again has cleared the Senate. Again it is meeting roadblocks in the House.

The Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Park lies within 100 miles of nearly 10 million people. "An unusual complex of exceptional sand dunes, numerous marshes, swamps and bogs, a greatly diversified flora and fauna and an attractive white sand beach," the Senate Interior Committee calls it. Dunes, like miniature mountain ranges, rise to heights of 200 feet. They shelter more than 1,000 different species of flowering plants and ferns.

These indeed are "rare and very precious possessions."

SUMMER INTERNS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, last month the distinguishd Senator from New Jersey, Harrison A. Williams, Jr., joined by several other Senators introduced a resolution—Senate Resolution 139—to provide funds for each Senator to hire three "student congressional interns." It is my great pleasure to be a cosponsor of that measure.

While I have been in the Senate but a short time, my one summer here was aided immeasurably by having had in my office 11 summer interns. They were wonderful young people, who assisted my staff with projects which might not otherwise have been attempted and which certainly were of service to my constituents.

Forsaking a summer of sun, fun, and play, these young people were exposed to the complexities of a Senate office and were able to participate in a great many phases of the work.

Let me tell you a little about each of them:

Jeffrey Blum and Jerry Lipsch are both sophomores at the University of Chicago. They are former officers of the United Nations Youth of Maryland and were active participants in the Baltimore tutorial project, an organization which tutors young Negro students in junior high and high school subjects.

Lila Boyce, a junior at Vassar College, and an honor scholar who was graduated from Garrison Forest School in Baltimore, has been an active participant in the Baltimore United Appeal.

Betsy Crone, a political science major in her junior year at Chatham College in Pittsburgh, is a native of Baltimore.

Marilen Grosjean is a graduate of Wellesley College, where she was a student government leader.

David Heppel, a freshman this fall at Connecticut Wesleyan, was treasurer of the senior class at Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School in Montgomery County and was active in student government.

Charles Herz, a graduate of Princeton University, is presently studying in his second year at Yale Law School, where he is an outstanding student.

Leslie Kohn, a graduate of the Park School in Baltimore, is a junior political science major at Knox College in Galesburg, Ill., where this year she is chairman of a freshman-sophomore dormitory.

Robert Livernash is a senior at the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, where he serves on the editorial board of the student newspaper.

Patricia Nichols, after 1 year at Keuka College in the State of New York, has transferred to George Washington University to become more actively involved in her political science major.

Jon Small is a magna cum laude graduate of Brown University, and is now in his second year at Harvard Law School.

Mr. President, these young people are the leaders of tomorrow. Each of them is of the highest caliber. Most are student leaders on their campuses. Their experiences here have given them a real and meaningful insight into the workings of their government.

Those of us engaged in government strive constantly to stimulate the interest of our young citizens in our chosen field. This is one way in which we can offer to them an opportunity for experience in government before they make their choice.

Mr. President, a summer internship program is definitely a worthwhile one. I believe that it must be continued and expanded.

SOMETHING FOR SOMETHING

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, leaders of our country and of the United Nations should be alert to recent attempts to "outfox" them by Red Chief Janos Kadar under a guise "to normalize U.S. relations."

Henry J. Taylor writes ably on this subject in his column "Something for Something" in the Washington Daily News of October 6, 1965.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Taylor's column be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOMETHING FOR SOMETHING

(By Henry J. Taylor)

I herewith deliver on a midnight promise made in Budapest to eight agonized anti-Communist leaders of the Hungarian underground. They speak for all who pound at closed gates and bathe the barbed wire in tears.

These freedom fighters want desperately to inform the American people and to enlist the interest of Secretary of State Dean Rusk and the United Nation's U Thant.

They note the current propaganda pitch in our press by Red Chief Janos Kadar "to normalize U.S. relations."

They note, fully reported in the Red government's media, similar insistences by some Americans.

And they know, as I wrote from Budapest, that when it comes to deeds and not propaganda to get our money and loans, Kadar has not given the slightest indication of a reform to American Chargé d'Affaires Elim O'Shaughnessy.

The eight agonized Hungarian heroes call on Kadar for deeds, not words, if his claims are to deserve any consideration.

His Government deported to Siberia more than 75,000 freedom fighters who survived the revolt. Among these were 7,000 girls, 14 to 18. They are still in Siberia; their letters to their parents still asking for help.

No one knows what has happened to 13,000 of the other 68,000 deportees. The Budapest freedom fighters estimated to me that about 50,000 still are living. And locally 463 without the slightest criminal record remain in the central prison in Budapest.

Will the Government release these persecuted humans?

Among those seized were 152 youths not executed because of their age. Of these, 144 were hanged in the central prison yard, one by one, each on his or her 18th birthday. Eight received commuted sentences of 10 to 15 years.

One of these minors is named Bela Uvacsek. His mother, Mrs. Helen Dorosy, lives in California. She asked Secretary Rusk to intervene and Mr. O'Shaughnessy succeeded in obtaining a Budapest lawyer for the boy. Kadar has rejected the clemency petition.

Dr. Tibor Pakh is a Budapest intellectual. In 1960 he addressed an entreaty for general clemency to the United Nations. He was arrested. Kadar offered to release Dr. Pakh if he would retract his appeal. The brave scholar refused. The Government is still trying to bend Dr. Pakh under a 15-year sentence and he remains at this moment in solitary confinement in central prison.

Political prisoners in Hungary must pay for their own food in jail. Dr. Pakh is on what is called the "fourth ration." This limits payments to 60 forints a month, a fact verified by Dr. Bela Fabian, the distinguished chairman of the Federation of Hungarian Former Political Prisoners in our country. The 60 forints limit is a starvation diet.

Will Kadar release Dr. Pakh?

The agonized Hungarians urge these challenging quid pro quos before the Red government's campaign to soften us up gains further momentum.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PHILIP VINCENT CARDON

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post pays tribute editorially to the late Philip Vincent Cardon, a native of my State of Utah who was a resident of the District of Columbia at the time of his death.

Dr. Cardon rose from very humble beginnings in Utah to world leadership in food and agriculture. Despite his great eminence and accomplishment, he remained a humble, thoughtful, and friendly man. His wife Leah has been his lifelong companion and contributed immeasurably to the successes of Dr. Cardon.

They are parents of three brilliant children, each of whom is now making a contribution to the communities in which each resides. It should be pointed out that their daughter, Lucybeth, is the First Lady of the State of Utah, as the wife of Gov. Calvin L. Rampton.

Although we mourn the passing of Dr. Cardon, we take satisfaction in the great good that he has left behind.

I ask unanimous consent to include the editorial in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILIP VINCENT CARDON

In the death of Dr. Philip Vincent Cardon the world has lost one of the foremost architects of the agricultural revolution. Though his work was primarily in the United States, where he became Chief of the Agricultural Research Administration of the Department of Agriculture, his influence was felt in many lands. In 1943 he helped to create the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization, and for 2 years in the middle 1950's he was Director General of this dynamic venture in the modernization of farming. Since then he has enriched the knowledge and improved the technical skills of many lands as a consultant.

Although he worked quietly as a dedicated technician, Dr. Cardon was in the forefront of the great movement that is changing the face of agriculture. Willard W. Cochrane in his new book, "The City Man's Guide to the Farm Problem," notes that the average farmworker in the country was feeding and clothing 10.7 persons in 1940. By 1963, 1 American farmer was providing for 30.7 consumers. Mr. Cochrane remarks that, as a result of the sweeping technological transformation of agriculture, the food bill of the average consumer in the United States is less, relative to his income, than at any earlier time or any other place in the world.

This astounding progress in the management and conservation of land and in the production of food is, of course, the work of many men. Among them Dr. Cardon holds an eminent place. Not only was he an able teacher and administrator and a research worker of broad vision; his humanitarianism and diplomatic skill made him also an especially effective channel for the dissemination of modern agricultural techniques to other countries.

Thousands of Washingtonians will also remember Dr. Cardon as the creator of one of the most attractive azalea gardens in the city. Within his neighborhood and among his friends he conducted a beautification program of his own for at least two decades. In many parts of the world he will be remembered as one who has contributed much to the amenities of living.

PROJECT HEAD START

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, recently television station WTOP in Washington carried an interesting account of a new program here in Washington for the day care of underprivileged children. I understand it is related to Project Head Start under the Great Society's poverty program. It is being financed by the Office of Economic Opportunity—OEO—through the United Planning Organization in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Harold Walker, of the WTOP news staff, interviewed three people at the Sargent Memorial Church concerning this new program. He came up with some interesting facts and observations which, I feel, are well worth the consideration of my colleagues.

First of all, Miss Joan Lynch, director of the day-care center visited by the newsman, conceded most frankly that, and I quote, "we certainly do a sort of babysitting job."

Further in his interview the reporter talked with Mr. Sidney Mensch, president of the District of Columbia Child Care Association. He discovered that the proposed string of day-care centers in Washington will do this babysitting job for a total of 450 children, all of them below kindergarten age. For this program, OEO has given a grant of $635,000.

Those are interesting figures. They are going to care for 450 children—and it is going to cost $635,000. It did not take long with a pencil and paper to figure it will cost $1,411.11 per child per year; $1,400 a child seemed just a little high to me, so I had a complete check made of the figures involved. I have learned that they are accurate.

I understand from the budget people of the District of Columbia Board of Education that you can educate a child in the District of Columbia public school system for $498.21 a year based on the average daily attendance rate. That means it costs nearly three times as much to provide a babysitter for preschool-age children as it does to educate that child once he gets into school.

I have been reading a lot in the newspapers here recently about the poor quality of the education provided District children, so I thought perhaps Washington's figure was pretty low—perhaps far below the national standards. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare compiles educational statistics, and they show that Washington's costs are actually about $14 a year above the national level which is set at $484 per pupil based on average daily attendance.

So, no matter how you slice it, the cost to babysit a youngster in the District still is about three times the amount it costs to educate that same child once he gets into school.

Mr. President, I realize further comparisons may be somewhat burdensome but I did do a little further checking. I have learned that the cost of this babysitting operation in Washington far outstrips the cost of sending a young man or woman to many colleges for a year.

To be completely fair on this comparison, I checked on the average per student costs at the four principal private colleges in the District of Columbia and on Maryland University. Again, the comparison between the babysitting fees and tuition charges for higher education is interesting.

At Georgetown University, the average tuition charge, I am told, is $1,350, or $61 less than the babysitting fees.

American University and George Washington each charge an average tuition fee of $1,330, or $81 less than it costs to hire these babysitters.

Catholic University's average tuition charge is $1,250—or $161 less than the babysitting operation costs.

As for Maryland, a State-supported institution, the fee for resident students is $346, or less than a fourth of the babysitting costs, and the nonresident tuition charge is just a little over one-half that babysitting cost, or $746.

Mr. President, I am as convinced as any man in this Nation that every American child is born with the right of an equal opportunity with every other child in America. Further, I am convinced that no child has that opportunity guaranteed, unless there is available a sound education for every child in America.

It does seem to me, however, that programs such as these are a travesty on this basic principle of our Republic. Someone other than the children is reaping the benefits.

Mr. President, I was appalled when I was advised that $635,000 was to be spent from the poverty program funds to train only 450 children. Disbelieving these figures, I had them checked thoroughly as I have outlined.

There is no doubt that they are correct. Apparently they are to be used for what amounts to a continuation of Project Head Start this summer, which is to assist preschool children of deprived families.

This $635,000 allocation has been made to be used for 450 children in the District of Columbia and two counties, one in Maryland and one in Virginia.

I cannot help but suppose that these counties must be chosen from Prince Georges or Montgomery in Maryland and Arlington or Fairfax in Virginia, among the wealthiest counties in this Nation.

I understand also that 90 children will be supported by these funds in each of 5 day-care centers. I have been advised that this $1,411.11 per child is to be used for "day-care centers" rather than Project Head Start. In this case, this amounts to a distinction without a difference. It seems that great effort will produce no real difference between the two programs.

The objectives of such a program may be fully justified but it strikes me, Mr. President, that this shocking expenditure for day-care centers should provoke, if nothing else, a thorough and complete examination into the conduct of this and other phases of the poverty program.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, we have heard much impassioned talk in recent days about the thousands—or even millions—of workers who would be forced into union membership by the repeal of section 14(b), and about the thousands of employers who would be compelled to sign union shop contracts.

This talk has continued in the face of the simple truth—that the repeal of section 14(b) will not, in itself, create a single new union shop agreement.

It will still be up to the workers to decide whether or not they want a union shop; and it will still be up to the employer to decide whether or not he will agree to it.

This is precisely the case today in the 31 States which do not have so-called right-to-work laws; and by now, every newspaper reader should know it.

I call attention, Mr. President, to the settlement, last weekend, of the Newspaper Guild's strike at the New York Times. This was a strike in a city where the labor movement is large and powerful. This was a strike that had the support of all the other unions, both at the Times and throughout the city. This was a strike that closed the paper. This was a strike in which one of the union's objectives was a union shop contract.

But what do we find in the terms of settlement?

We find that the new contract between the Times and the Guild does not include a union shop for editorial employees.

I am not discussing the merits of the case. I simply point out that an effective strike, backed by a powerful labor movement, in a city with a pronounced prounion policy, did not succeed in winning a union shop from an employer who did not believe it should apply to a group of his employees.

This proves again what we who favor the repeal of 14(b) have pointed out many times:

The repeal of 14(b) will mean less compulsion, not more compulsion. It will permit workers and employers to agree on what degree of union security is appropriate for their establishment. It will do away with the compulsory open shop; it will not create a compulsory union shop.

The New York Times has proved the point.

BIPARTISAN SUPPORT FOR EXPANDED WAR AGAINST HUNGER

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I rise to commend the House of Representatives Republican task force on agriculture for a statement released yesterday on the opportunity for America to expand her efforts at home and abroad to meet the increasing food crisis.

The task force, headed by Representative ODIN LANGEN, of Minnesota, opens its statement with a description of the "challenge and opportunity" presented to the United States. The members say:

> The impending world food crisis presents this Nation with both a challenge and an opportunity—a challenge for us to assume the leadership required to meet a world food problem of possible epic proportions, and a potential opportunity for American agriculture to achieve a new economic vitality and income stability.

Although this complex world food and population problem has long been foreseen, only recently has it begun to receive the greater public attention it so urgently requires.

The great strength of Public Law 480—the legislative base of our food-for-peace program which I was privileged to direct under the late President Kennedy—is that it has enjoyed from the beginning strong bipartisan support. That is as it should be. Hunger knows no political lines and the war against hunger must be fought on a united bipartisan front. This is the best way to strengthen our own agricultural economy and to use our productivity as a more effective instrument for humanity and peace. So I warmly support the general concepts of the House Republican task force report on the world food problem. The statement cautions against rushing blindly into a "feed the hungry world" effort without planning. The specific recommendation is a bipartisan study commission with a January 2, 1967 deadline to report.

I personally believe that we can and should move ahead with a world food program without a year's delay. I do not believe there is need for another year devoted entirely to preliminary study. The beginnings will necessarily be modest in comparison to the total need. My own proposal, S. 2157, contemplates a gradual, 6-year buildup because of obstacles in distribution and efficient use which must be overcome. I agree we cannot feed the hungry world tomorrow but we can take some new steps in 1966. I believe the task force will find that there is a great deal of information, dating back to the Eisenhower administration, on existing and prospective world food needs and U.S. procedures to meet them which justifies a start next year. Additionally, by the first of next year we will have a further report from a task force of Government experts on the situation.

The really significant feature of the task force statement is the basic policy position which the group has taken. They recognize the world food problem as a U.S. concern, "a challenge to assume world leadership and a potential opportunity for American agriculture to achieve a new economic vitality and income stability." This is welcome advance which I sincerely hope will be adopted as the party's position on production of food for assistance programs. I congratulate the Republican task force on the fundamental policy position they have taken.

This has been my own thesis in repeated statements as a Member of the House of Representatives, 1957–61, during my years as food-for-peace director, 1961–62, and as a Member of the U.S. Senate since 1963. In a 1964 book, "War Against Want," in two major speeches in the Senate explaining and urging enactment of S. 2157, my international food and nutrition bill, and in many articles and addresses to private groups I have urged our Nation to seize this great opportunity to serve mankind and the cause of peace, and to restore agricultural prosperity in the United States.

As a believer in the two-party system, I welcome the position announced today by the House Republican task force on agriculture as basically a very constructive document. It is encouraging to note that many of the most distinguished Members of the House have introduced resolutions based on that report.

I had intended, Mr. President, to ask permission to insert the House Republican task force report in the RECORD. However, it appears at page 27017 of the RECORD of the House proceedings yesterday, October 14, 1965. I recommend it to all those interested in the world food problem and the health of American agriculture.

THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS AND EXPORTS BY SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, for the past 15 years, the Nation has experienced consistent deficits in its balance of payments. Secretary of Commerce Connor last month addressed himself to the situation as follows:

> In every instance I have described the problem in such terms as "serious," "urgent," and "critical," and I have called its solution absolutely vital to the national welfare.

Statistics compiled by the Department of Commerce confirm that, with the exception of 1957 when the Suez crisis resulted in extraordinary export activity, our international accounts have shown a deficit in every year since 1950. I ask unanimous consent that a tabulation reflecting this data be included in my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. balance of payments on regular types of transactions (seasonally adjusted)

[In millions of dollars]

1949	+175
1950	[1] −3,580
1951	−305
1952	−1,046
1953	−2,152
1954	−1,550
1955	−1,445
1956	−935
1957	+520
1958	−3,529
1959	−4,178
1960	−3,918
1961	−3,071
1962	−3,605
1963	−3,287
1964	−3,106
1965 (first quarter)	−780
1965 (second quarter)	+119

[1] Minus sign indicates deficit.

Source: Survey of Current Business, June 1965, p. 12 (for 1960–64); September 1965, p. 13 (for 1965). Other data from Office of Business Economics, Balance of Payments Division, U.S. Department of Commerce.

As a result, there have been a number of extraordinary governmental measures touching upon purchases by tourists and movements of capital, as well as the operations of our business and financial corporations. As illustrated by a payments surplus for the second quarter of this year, these programs have had tangible results.

However, as the authorities have noted, improvements stemming from voluntary restraints must be regarded as temporary. The London Economist of September 4 notes that a large part of the initial success of our programs reflects nonrecurring adjustments. The Economist gives this description of the measures adopted by the financial community which made possible the good second-quarter report:

> Virtually everyone has toed the line. The banks for their part, have responded even more dramatically. During April–June, the banks actually clawed back some $300 million to New York. As a group the 150-odd banks reported to the Fed had whittled down their outstanding loans to foreigners to well below the ceiling set by official guidelines.

It seems to me that the financial sacrifices of our banks are deserving of recognition and commendation. It seems also that it is important to place our greatest emphasis on solutions which are in full accord with the economic interest of our banking and commercial establishments.

The avenue which seems most natural in this regard is the expansion of exports. I believe it is widely accepted both here and abroad that our commercial export surplus is the rock upon which our international position is founded.

The small business segment of our economy has a special interest in the potential for export expansion and the ability of our country to export. The Small Business Administration advises me that about 94 percent of all manufacturers are small business. This would place their number at a figure approaching 300,000. Further, U.S. industry is reputed to be the most technologically advanced and efficient in the world. Yet, it has been noted that only a tiny fraction of our businesses have ever entered the export trade.

For more than 6 years now, the Select Committee on Small Business has been actively concerned with matching the export potential of smaller businesses in the country with the opportunities of expanding foreign markets.

During the past several months we have seen signs that the overall posture of our country in the export field is not all that it could be. On June 12, the London Economist voiced the suspicion of some bankers and businessmen that:

> The administration's ceiling on foreign loans which banks may make is killing the goose that lays the golden egg, even though finances for export are given priority.

A week later, on June 18, the Wall Street Journal reported that "prime"—or minimum—lending rates on business loans to finance exports were under pressure, and the money centers were turning to an unpublicized policy of "selectively" charging more interest on some loans, or upon renewals of loans.

On August 2, the Journal of Commerce described developments which, it was believed, decreased the capacity of small- and medium-sized firms to finance their export sales, as follows:

> Some export loans which under normal circumstances would go through are being refused with regret and some of the smaller business corporations have to face a certain amount of discrimination in favor of larger ones.

The Journal of Commerce article emphasized that the banks were attempting to lean over backward in considering small business credits, but that they told the newspaper frankly:

> When the money pool is limited, rationing takes place and the best credits win.

On September 3, another report by the Wall Street Journal indicated that "corporation holdings of foreign notes have quadrupled since 1959." What are the implications of this development for small business?

Further questions arise as to the consequences of our Government policies relative to direct investment upon small business exports. Trends in this area were discussed by several recent articles in the Washington Post.

An article in the Wall Street Journal of September 8 describes some of the efforts that private industry and Government are making to assist small business in the export field. As I have pointed out to the Senate on several occasions during this session, a great deal of thought is being devoted to export and balance-of-payments problems in Congress and throughout Government and industry.

Despite all of this work, however, it appears from other recently published reports that growth of imports is exceeding that of exports for the United States this year by a margin that appears to be rather significant. The Secretary of Commerce stated on September 23, that, for the first 7 months of this year, exports were only 1½ percent above the 1964 figure, while imports were up 12 percent. It appears also that the U.S. share of certain important export markets may be shrinking rather than growing.

Accordingly, I have asked the staff of the Senate Small Business Committee to broaden the committee's current inquiry in the export field to embrace the adequacy of export programs, particularly as to credit and financial policies. I have directed the staff to explore the relationship of these matters to exporters and potential exporters of the small business community. In doing so, it is not my purpose to duplicate the extensive and continuing studies undertaken by the Joint Economic Committee and the International Payments Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, under the leadership of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE]. As the ranking member of each of these bodies, I am aware of the excellent organization, thorough articulation, and consistent quality of these inquiries. I am also aware of the many thoughtful analyses of balance-of-payments problems brought to the floor of the Senate by Members of this body.

Our committee must be concerned, principally, with the welfare of the small businessman, and in the practical effects of our payments problems and policies upon the smaller manufacturer who is attempting to export his products. The studies to which I have referred constitute fine background, which may enable our committee to bring the small business questions into clearer focus in this complex and difficult field.

In the course of our endeavor, the committee will be able to assess the current information as to the important area of the balance-of-payments problem that is within its special jurisdiction. It may thus be able to determine whether the committee is in a position to make a contribution toward identifying and attempting to resolve some of the problems faced by our smaller and medium-sized concerns as a part of the national export effort.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that articles to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD following my remarks for the information of all who are interested in this vital area.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Economist, Sept. 4, 1965]

AMERICA'S PAYMENTS—VOLUNTEERS, UNDER PROTEST

The man who once ran Britain's own statutory exchange control remarked drily last week that to administer their voluntary restraints the Americans have a bigger bureaucracy than he ever had. No doubt they do: and no doubt they are correspondingly more effective. President Johnson's program already involves the getting of progress reports from more than 150 banks, nearly 400 financial intermediaries and some 600 large corporations. The job must eat heavily into the time and personnel of already hard-pressed departments in Washington and New York. The point is that it has not been effort wasted. The first hard data flowing in show that the growth in the foreign loans and investments of America's bank and other financial institutions was slashed back during the first half of 1965 to an annual rate of less than $500 million, from a record of $3,500 million last year. Businessmen for their part have been quick to pull back at least their liquid funds. And so, in April-June, America chalked up its first real balance-of-payments surplus for 8 long years. Tired officials were delighted with these results—if too battle wise to count on a repeat performance over the months ahead. The volunteers themselves have begun to feel that they have done their bit.

Businessmen have been hinting gently but firmly that they cannot be expected to contribute very much more. Programs hammered out long before the President's bombshell earlier this year committed American corporations to a very large increase in their direct investment abroad this year. Admittedly since then some 40 firms have canceled or postponed investment projects. But this contribution—little over $100 million—amounts to a flea bite. The latest official survey in May-June showed that the American business community still plans to bump up its spending on plant and equipment abroad this year by 20 percent to a whopping $7.3 billion. Companies have promised to do what they can to raise more of the needed finance abroad. But their forays into overseas capital markets to date have been, not surprisingly perhaps, very cautious; plans to borrow in Western Europe so far total a modest $300 million. And heavier calls on the earnings of overseas affiliates can only be at the expense of remittances.

If the corporations are sticking on these basic bread and butter issues, they have been quick to comply with the President's request to pull their liquid funds out of foreign money markets—despite temptation and ample opportunity to cheat. During the first quarter of the year alone American companies repatriated $240 million in short-term financial assets. And this inflow continued, if at a somewhat reduced pace, during April-June. By now, however, it may have ended.

The financial community has had less freedom of maneuver. There have been complaints—after all American banks had only begun to get in on the tricky but lucrative business of international finance. But virtually everyone has toed the line. The financial intermediaries (institutions like insurance companies), which last year increased their credits and investments abroad by $1 billion, held their expansion over the first 6 months of this year to less than $150 million. (One of the incidental products of the new regime in America is the information that the foreign assets of these institutions are very nearly as large as those of the banks.)

The banks, for their part, have responded even more dramatically—prodded not only by detailed guidelines from the watchful Federal Reserve but also the extension of the interest equalization tax to the banks' term loans. During April-June the banks actually clawed back some $300 million to New York. Some banks, for all that, remained "overlent," but only by small amounts. As a group the 150-odd banks reporting to the Fed had whittled down their outstanding loans to foreigners by June to well below the ceiling set by the official guidelines.

What it all amounts to is that a very large part of the spectacular initial success of the President's program reflected once-and-for-all adjustments. Of this American officials are all too painfully aware. The belated if ingenious discovery by American bankers and businessmen of the argument that President Johnson's restraints are stripping the world of liquidity is cutting very little ice. Admittedly, far and away the most important bite of the program has been on flows of short-term capital across America's northern border and across the Atlantic. Identified withdrawals of short-term funds by American banks, business corporations and financial intermediaries from Canada and Europe over the first half of the year totaled over $600 million—and most of it occurred after March. The impact on the Euro-dollar market of this sudden switchback was immediate and obvious to all at the time: a sudden spectacular hardening of interest rates. It has been further documented since by data showing a $300 million drop in the dollar liabilities of London banks during April-June. But the point is, as Mr. Fowler has said flatly, the brunt is over. Rates on Euro-dollars deposits have come back down very close to the levels prevailing early this year—not, *pace* Mr. Fowler, because British and Canadian banks have "refilled the pool by withdrawals of funds from American banks" but because more continental dollars (including a good number from the Bundesbank) have now come into the market.

[From the Economist, June 12, 1965]

EXPORTS IN THE BALANCE

Critics of the Export-Import Bank, which provides financing and credit insurance for firms selling abroad, won several concessions last week. From now on such insurance will cover 90 percent, not 85 percent, of the credit extended; exporters will have to bear only 10 percent of the risk. The bank is also loosening its special restrictions on countries which are considered to be poor credit risks, giving exporters a chance to increase their sales if they themselves will assume more of those risks. The administration is not very hopeful that more liberal financing will do much to narrow the gap in the balance of international payments. Recently representatives of the aircraft, railway equipment, and construction industries testified at congressional hearings that government financial aids to exports were not competitive with those of other countries. But Mr. Connor, the Secretary of Commerce, and Mr. Linder, President of the Export-Import Bank, are skeptical;

the latter thinks that the "hundreds of millions of exports being lost" would mostly have gone to countries which would have had great difficulty in paying for them.

Until the April figures are in, it will not be possible to tell whether most of the damage done to exports by the dock strike in January and February are being made good. Imports suffered less and figures for the first quarter make dismal reading: the trade surplus sank to a seasonally adjusted $963 million, compared with almost twice that in the first and last quarters of 1964. America's immense trade surplus—$7 billion last year—is the rock on which attempts to right the balance of international payments must be built. Yet the official expectation is that exports will grow by only about 4 percent in 1965 while imports continue to rise twice as fast. Banks and businessmen are beginning to voice their suspicion that the administration's ceiling on foreign loans which banks may make is killing the goose that lays the golden eggs even though, in theory, finance for export is given priority.

Another prong of the drive to cut the international deficit is plainly not working as it was intended to. Tourism cost the United States $1.6 billion, on balance, last year. But in spite of strengthened appeals to "Discover America" more travelers than ever are heading abroad—some, apparently, in the fear of a clampdown to come. Moreover, the House of Representatives has just rejected the administration's proposed cut in the duty-free goods which a tourist may bring back, though the $100-worth permitted must now reflect retail, not wholesale, prices. But of this only 1 quart, not a gallon, may be whisky. This unkind cut originated with a Representative of the Bourbon State and there is no doubt that if the administration wished (as it does not) to right the balance of payments by restricting imports it would have strong support from many Members of Congress who are backing bills for precisely this purpose. The President, himself a drinker of Scotch whisky, has, however, required the serving of American wines at official functions though not, so far, at the sensitive Embassy in Paris.

[From the Wall Street Journal,
June 18, 1965]

Interest Rates Rising on Business Loans at New York Banks; Credit Being Rationed

(By Lee Silberman)

Lake Placid, N.Y.—Major banks in the New York City metropolitan area, in more and more cases, are quietly boosting their interest charges on some business loans, sharply restricting the amount of loans to established customers and, in some instances, rejecting entirely loan requests that they might have granted just a few months ago.

This was disclosed by a panel of bankers at the 69th annual convention of the New York State Bankers Association in the Lake Placid Club. The bankers, representing institutions from all over the State, talked freely about banking and economic conditions with the understanding that neither they nor their banks would be named.

Many banks, the officials said have begun actively to ration credit in the wake of continuing heavy demand for loans and recent steps by the Federal Reserve System to keep a somewhat tighter rein on bank credit.

POLITICAL FACTORS NOTED

The bankers also said they were emphasizing rationing measures instead of the more traditional approach of raising their general lending rates because of political factors. This referred to developments last November when some larger banks outside New York raised the prime, or minimum, lending charge on business loans to 4¾ percent from 4½ percent but quickly rescinded the increase under prodding by the White House.

Panel members described economic conditions in their geographic areas and in New York State in glowing terms and said they didn't see any especially worrisome clouds marring the national economic outlook.

"Recently we've seen business activity in the country level off a bit from the unusually high rate in the first quarter, but this slowing is a welcome development," said one panelist.

This banker, an officer of a large New York City institution, said, "Pressures on the banks for funds have been very great and show no signs of slackening." As a consequence, he stated, banks have been cutting down on the size of loans requested by national corporations and refusing to grant funds to businesses that haven't regularly maintained deposit accounts at the banks. Many larger banks, he added, are also shying away entirely from financing real estate ventures and speculative projects.

LOANS ROSE IN WEEK

The growing demand for loans was reflected in figures issued yesterday by the New York Federal Reserve Bank. These figures showed that commercial and industrial loans at 14 major New York City banks spurted $538 million in the week ended Wednesday, lifting the increase since year-end to $1,740 million. A year ago, such loans had fallen $382 million. The Wednesday total of such loans outstanding was $15,599 million, the reserve bank said. It attributed the latest week's increase largely to borrowing to meet Tuesday's quarterly corporate-tax installments.

Panelists also made these other points: The President's program for banks to curb voluntarily foreign loans to help check the Nation's balance-of-payments deficit will noticeably reduce the Nation's export surplus this year.

They don't believe the level of consumer debt is too high. "The rising volume of consumer credit doesn't appear to be out of line with growing personal income," a banker said.

After the abortive attempt late last November by several banks, including Citizens & Southern National Bank of Atlanta and First National Bank of Boston, to boost the prime rate, many larger banks in New York, Chicago, and other money centers turned to an unpublicized policy of selectively charging more interest on some loans. The higher charge, an increase usually of from one-fourth to one-half percentage point, is usually imposed at the time the borrower renews a loan.

The prime rate, technically the fee the banks charge for loans to their biggest borrowers with the best credit rating, has been at 4¼ percent since the fall of 1960, its longest period of stability since the war. Most other bank-lending charges are scaled upward from the prime rate.

UPWARD MOVEMENT SEEN

Members of the New York State Bankers Association panel noted that although the prime rate has gone unchanged, a number of other bank interest rates have moved upward recently. Last March, for example, many larger banks boosted their charges on "broker" loans, secured by stocks as collateral, to 4¾ percent from 4½ percent. Many banks in turn lately have been paying more interest for savings represented by certificates of deposit—receipts for deposits left for a specified period.

"What we're likely to see for some time is interest rates grinding slowly upward," said the New York City banker. But he indicated it was unlikely banks would again soon try to raise the prime rate, because of White House interest in keeping general lending rates from going higher.

Several panel members said that as a result they expected the percentage of deposits their banks have out on loan to rise above already high loan-to-deposit ratios.

One panelist, who heads a large banking organization in the State, said its loan-to-deposit ratio at the end of May was 65 percent. "Only a few years ago we thought 60 percent was awfully high but now banks aren't particularly concerned if the ratio goes to 70 percent," he said.

The ratio of loans to deposits is frequently regarded as a measure of a bank's liquidity, but several panelists stressed that a high ratio nowadays isn't a source of concern because banks have come to rely increasingly on selling certificates of deposit to obtain funds. A number of banks recently have also been obtaining funds through the sale of long-term capital notes, it was noted.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce,
Aug. 2, 1965]

Heading for Showdown?—Foreign Credit Curbs Stir Dissatisfaction

Swelling currents of dissatisfaction and disquiet over two phases of the U.S. foreign credit restraint program promise to come up for detailed consideration next week at a high administration level. The two phases are increasing difficulties for U.S. export financing and the effects of the restraint policy upon less developed nations.

Evidence is likely to be submitted to the administration that the 105-percent overall ceiling on bank and nonbank lending and investing abroad is making U.S. export financing more difficult and more expensive and that there is a big referral of credits to the Export-Import Bank, a Government institution exempt from the credit restraint rules.

Meanwhile, the split between the Government and private segments of the economy on the desirability of exempting export finance from restraint ceilings has deepened, as has also the split within the Government on the same issue.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce,
Aug. 2, 1965]

Export Financing

(By Ed Tyng)

Differences in opinion on credit restraint policy as applied to foreign financing which have long existed in the Government itself and between Government and the private segment of the economy seem likely to come nearer to decision next week at a meeting of President Johnson's Cabinet Committee on the Balance of Payments.

At that meeting the issue of whether export financing should be divorced from the foreign lending restraint program may come out in the open and certainly will be debated. For the plain truth of the matter is that under the foreign credit restraint program, U.S. export financing has suffered despite its supposed preferential rank. How much it has suffered is still a moot matter, and figures may be laid before the Cabinet Committee next week on this phase of the program.

WHAT'S GOING ON

During the past week Daniel Goldy, the export expansion coordinator, has been gumshoeing around among the larger banks, without apparently calling any formal meetings, presumably gathering evidence to submit next week as to how the credit restraint program has affected U.S. exports, which in turn have a vital influence upon the U.S. payments position.

Mr. Goldy is reputedly leader of the Government faction which favors greater liberation for export finance, even if it can be had only through exemption of such financing from the 105-percent ceiling. Banks and nonbank financing organizations under the ceiling are supposed to keep their total foreign lending and investing at 105 percent of December 31, 1964, levels.

The Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board take a dim view of exempting export financing credits and they still hold the upper hand, so it is said, in administration policy along this line.

The Federal Reserve Board view seems to be that U.S. exports can't expand more than 5 percent this year and therefore should be covered by the 105-percent ceiling. Also it is felt, as Gov. J. L. Robertson of the Reserve Board, said in his Cleveland speech June 9, that to make export credits available without limit would invite foreigners to couch all of their appeals for funds in terms of export credits, thereby making the 105-percent ceiling meaningless.

This latter idea is scouted by the larger banks, who say that foreigners would not seek to gain dollars by subterfuge, especially if they were compelled to sign affidavits stating the use of the money borrowed.

The Treasury is said to have ideas paralleling those of the Reserve Board.

Meanwhile a careful check in some of the larger banks by this newspaper discloses that some export loans which under normal circumstances would go through are being refused with regret and that some of the smaller business corporations have to face a certain amount of discrimination in favor of larger ones—their loans are regarded as unassured of payout in some cases while the credit behind the large ones is unquestioned.

However, large corporations have problems because their needs are great.

This is despite the efforts of the banks to lean over backwards in considering small corporations' credits. But, as one bank said frankly, when the money pool is limited, rationing takes place, and the best credits win.

If it were not for this automatic preference for the no-risk over the riskier there would be no "prime rate" charged by banks to their best borrowers: everybody would get charged the same rate.

A corollary of the limited supply of money available under the ceiling for foreign financing is that more loans than ever before are being shifted to the Government-operated Export-Import Bank, which is exempt from the restraint program.

Ever since the foreign lending restraint program began in February there has been criticism of the exemption of the Export-Import Bank. This, many bankers say, merely shifts to the Government credits which should be made by private banks and makes the Export-Import Bank a factor in keeping the U.S. payments position unbalanced over the long run. In recent months, because of unusual capital inflows, the program has given evidences of achieving results, though these may not be lasting.

Other effects of the restraint program which injure exporters as well as others are tightening interest rates. Interest rates are being boosted on loans that are granted, on the old-established principle that when the money available in a given pool is scant, more is charged for it.

For future financing within the guidelines banks are often charging—as they always have to some extent—commitment fees of up to one-half of 1 percent for standing by with assured credit which may not be used until 3 months to more than a year hence. And some banks are asking for higher compensating balances or interest free deposits made in consideration of granting a loan.

Normally, compensating balances range from 10 to 20 percent of a loan. This is an indirect way of charging more interest. With recourse loans naturally are favored over without recourse credits. Offshore financing for third countries under the guidelines has become largely a dead letter.

Whether all this eventually is going to hurt U.S. exports enough and therefore our balance of payments position is something the future will indicate. Some New York bankers take the view that United States May exports were disappointing and that credit restrictions may have played a part in it. If the export situation shows signs of being hurt the Government may change its mind and export finance exemption from ceilings may win out.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, Aug. 2, 1965]

Needy Land Plight

(By Stanley Wilson)

Washington, June 14.—The financial plight of less developed countries is beginning to be watched by the United States with deepening attention, though the remedies the United States is in a position to extend unilaterally are very limited, indeed.

For weeks, there have been warnings from nonofficial sources that the balance-of-payments correctives adopted by the United States and the United Kingdom were going to hurt less developed countries.

HIT BY LOW PRICES

They are already losing foreign exchange from lower prices for their staple products, such as cocoa and coffee.

For months, World Bank and International Monetary Fund officials have been warning that less developed countries are carrying a burden of debt repayment that is fast becoming dangerous.

Suppliers' credits for imports of 5 or 10 years' duration, extended too liberally, are at the root of much of the debt repayment problem. Europe has been the source for most of such credits in the past. Stung by competition, this country's Export-Import Bank has just brought its policies in line.

India, at the moment, epitomizes the problem. It has temporarily exhausted its resources for borrowing foreign exchange. India badly needs capital investment to provide import substitution and export earnings.

It was decided a few days ago at a meeting of the interagency Cabinet committee on the balance of payments to use a speech being delivered today, at the Indian Investment Center in New York, as a platform for a definitive policy statement on U.S. private investment in LDC's.

In the text of the speech, in New York, Commerce Assistant Secretary Andrew Brimmer told business that a letter will soon go out from the Commerce Department to the nearly 600 major firms in the corporation program for the balance of payments.

OUTLAY CURB SOUGHT

The letter will remind them that "there is no intention to improve our own balance-of-payments position at the expense of the emerging nations," though the Government hopes at the same time that such investments will be financed as much as possible by restraining capital outlays in developed countries.

Sources here predict this message will also be mailed to the 3,000 smaller companies which were asked to help out in a Commerce Department letter June 4.

Meanwhile, as an inducement to make less developed country investment—which Mr. Brimmer admitted in his talk brings "only a very small payout" in income repatriated to the United States, within a week or two the administration will send Congress a bill asking for a 30-percent credit against U.S. tax on such outlays.

The only thing now holding back this development is negotiation to have it dignified by a special message from the White House—which Congress presumably would heed.

Mr. Brimmer said today that "most recent data" since the voluntary payments program began indicate that less developed countries are getting "priority treatment."

Others say this is true enough as it stands. But, particularly as regard bank credits, less developed countries are getting a priority share of a very small outflow, compared to a smaller part of a much bigger outflow last year.

If so, the change may not have been altogether to the advantage of less developed countries.

According to some reports, banks may be affecting adversely corporation investment in less developed countries, by reluctance to take on financing for such outlays.

BIG BANKS ABOVE CEILINGS

For a time there was the further problem, that big international operating corporations were in the habit of doing their banking business with a few big banks and these were already way over their voluntary-program, foreign-credit ceiling when the program started February 10.

Small banks were not above their ceilings, but the big corporations were not used to dealing with them. This problem may now be lessening as the big banks work down their load of foreign commitments.

All in all, the Brimmer speech indicated, the role of U.S. private capital in less developed countries needs badly to be stepped up.

The alternative of public foreign aid, so far as this country is concerned, is in a phase of retrenchment.

The Senate vote on the administration's $3.24 billion foreign aid package, after today's debate, promised to lead uneventfully to final passage.

But this peaceful victory (marred a little by Senator Wayne Morse's objections) seems to be directly related to the administration's understanding that Congress has wearied of foreign aid and wants it cut down to the barest minimum.

COLLECTIVE EFFORT

In a few years' time, presumably, a collective effort may ease the credit problems of less developed countries after the richer countries have worked out new international-payments liquidity measures.

Today, former Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon, accepting an honorary degree at Middlebury University, in Vermont, urged the developed countries to give priority to their efforts to strengthen the international monetary system. Action was needed, he said, to avoid a slowdown in the growth of developing countries.

[From a New York paper, Aug. 11, 1965]

World Trade Growth Slowing

Washington, August 10.—World trade growth began slowing down in early 1965, with the U.S. share of the total starting to slip again, the Commerce Department has reported.

The Department said that the United States gave ground to other world suppliers in 30 of 38 leading trading nations during the last 12 months on which data is available.

The U.S. share of the import market of such countries as West Germany, Japan, Italy, Switzerland, Belgium, Austria, Mexico, Argentina, and India declined during the 12 months since spring last year, the Commerce survey showed.

SOME GAINS

The U.S. share rose in Britain, France, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Yugoslavia, Brazil, and Malaysia.

The report added, however, that the United States during the latest 12 months scored export increases in terms of absolute value in 23 of the 38 countries, with declines registered in only 8. The most notable increases in terms of percentage occurred in Australia and Britain. Since January, Commerce said, the United States has maintained its share of the British import market despite the maritime strike here and a 1-percent drop in total British takings.

The Department reported that overall imports of several major countries—Italy, Brazil, Korea, Malaysia, and Turkey—had fallen significantly since spring last year. Most of the declines were laid to tight credit policies. The rate of import growth meanwhile slowed in other countries, including Japan, Canada, and most European Common Market members.

IMPORT RISES

But total imports rose substantially in Australia, West Germany, Portugal, Taiwan, and Iran, according to the report.

Commerce said that reserves of most developed nations were higher on March 31 than a year earlier, with Sweden's holdings climbing the fastest of any industrialized nation. Sharp gains of over $900 million each were reported for France and Italy. Norway, Denmark, and Spain also were singled as having bolstered their reserves considerably.

Foreign exchange holdings of most countries in Africa and the Far East were reported down, but those of many Latin American nations increased.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 3, 1965]

Expanding Exports—Manufacturers Boost Foreign Sales by Easing Restrictions on Credit—Company Holdings of Foreign Notes Quadruple Since 1959; Insurance Helps Cut Risks—Working With Three Sets of Books

(By Roger W. Benedict)

U.S. exporters, long timid about selling on credit to foreign buyers, are increasingly being forced to reverse course.

The pressure is coming, not surprisingly, from astute marketers in other free world countries who are intent on expanding volume outside their borders and are finding credit is an almost irresistible sales lure.

"Credit is becoming as important to making an export sale as the price of the product," asserts Matthew Provenzano, credit manager of Jefferson Chemical Co. in Houston. He reports his company is extending more export credit and granting longer terms to meet competition. Altogether, he estimates Jefferson's export accounts receivable in the past 3 years have risen 21 percent faster than the growth in total foreign sales.

At the beginning of this year, American companies (other than financial institutions) held $2.7 billion of short-term paper from foreigners, more than 4 times the $593 million they held 5 years before. Only slightly smaller gains were recorded in export credit by banks. The credit increase far outstrips the growth in export shipments themselves, which climbed a much smaller 55 percent during the same 5-year period.

ROLE IN PAYMENTS DEFICIT

The rising use of credit has helped spur a rapid growth in exports, a strong plus in the Nation's efforts to reduce a persistent balance-of-payments deficit. With this in mind, the Federal Reserve Board granted such credit top priority when early this year it called for voluntary restrictions on foreign lending by U.S. banks. The restrictions are aimed at holding foreign loans to no more than 5 percent above the total on last December 31.

Nonetheless these restrictions—plus the crippling effects of the now-ended dock and ship strikes—may well slow the growth in export credit this year, but exporters say any slowdown is certain to be temporary. They argue the use of credit is so essential to overseas selling that it's bound to grow.

To get around the restrictions, in fact, many companies are beginning to fall back on their own working capital to finance foreign sales rather than turning to banks for such financing. "We carry our own paper on export sales and I think this is true of most big companies these days," says Louis Candee, credit consultant for Witco Chemical Co. in New York City. "We don't expect the Government's voluntary restrictions to slow the export credit trend. We're certainly not going to lose export business because of inability to extend longer terms. We'll find ways to do it and others should be able to do the same."

BILLING ON OPEN ACCOUNT

What's more, U.S. exporters are increasingly selling and billing foreign customers directly on open acount, the same as they do with nearly all domestic buyers. On such selling, the goods or services are simply charged to the customer's account for payment at some future date. Its use in overseas transactions is in marked contrast to the traditional practice of requiring confirmed and irrevocable letters of credit, under which the customer's foreign bank and the exporter's U.S. bank assume the risks and guarantee payment. These letters of credit are more secure ways of doing business but they are costly, time-consuming, and irksome to many foreign customers.

"Until a year ago, we were only selling open account overseas to our own distributors," reports Kenneth H. Knox, credit manager for Tektronix, Inc., Beaverton, Oreg., manufacturer of electronic test instruments. "Now we're selling nearly half our export volume that way, and it's working out well. It has definitely gained us new customers, particularly in Latin America where the cost of money is often the difference between a customer buying or not buying."

Extension of longer credit terms and assumption of more direct credit, of course, requires a sharp increase in the amount of credit checking U.S. firms must do overseas and many are finding the field has its own special hazards. "In West Germany, companies keep one set of books for the Government, another for their banker, and still a third for themselves," reports one New York banker. Adds the president of a small leather goods company: "When we checked up on a potential customer in Nigeria who was ordering $3,000 worth of leather on credit, we found his assets totaled just $25." The credit manager of a Houston manufacturing company says ruefully, "One of our Latin American customers paid our bill to his bank on time, but the bank went bankrupt."

BAD DEBT LOSSES ARE LOW

Despite such problems, bad debt losses in foreign countries remain remarkably low. J. Stewart Gillies, director of the Foreign Credit Interchange Bureau, New York, which collects overdue debts for 1,500 U.S. exporters, says, "Our volume of uncollected bills never runs over $1.5 million, and for most U.S. companies foreign credit losses are infinitesimal."

On top of worrying about the customer's credit status, exporters must also ponder the political and economic stability of the country in which a customer is located.

"Nine times out of ten, foreign customers are willing to comply with terms of an export transaction, but getting your money out of some countries can be a problem," says Leo E. Kucera, general credit manager for Consolidated Foods Corp., Chicago. "Restrictive currency regulations, changes in exchange rates and internal political troubles can raise havoc."

But U.S. exporters are getting some important protection against such adverse developments from an insurance program set up 3 years ago. Provided jointly by the Government's Export-Import Bank and by the Foreign Credit Insurance Association, a voluntary group of more than 70 stock and mutual insurance companies, the program covers exporters on up to 85 percent of their loss from any commercial risk and up to 95 percent on losses from political cause such as expropriation.

About 3,100 companies currently are insuring export loans with the FCIA, double the 1,549 at the start of last year, and insurance in force has climbed to more than $1.5 billion from $660 million during that time, says Henry Sheehy, the association's president. He predicts 10,000 companies will be participating by 1970.

This Government backing is helping U.S. exporters better compete against West German and British firms that have had such coverage for many years, but Mr. Sheehy says U.S. companies still aren't making enough use of export credit. "U.S. companies had it so good so long in foreign markets, they are just beginning to realize the need for credit terms in foreign trade," he asserts.

Certainly most companies who have relaxed credit restrictions on foreign selling seem enthusiastic about the results. George E. Gaba, credit manager of J. P. Stevens & Co., New York textile maker, says that since it began making open account sales to foreigners in 1963, it has had no credit losses on the transactions. "We now sell on open account in Scandinavia, Germany, France, and Israel and we're lengthening terms in other countries," he says. "For instance, we're giving up to 120 days in Italy now, compared with payment on delivery a few years ago."

But the remarkably low ratio of losses in foreign selling doesn't mean U.S. companies haven't experienced some credit headaches, particularly in sales to Latin America. Notes an Atlanta banker: "You just have to expect a normally higher rate of delinquency on paper outstanding in Latin America, because companies down there are continually short of working capital, and are also slow to collect their own receivables. So they just take a free ride on the exporter's capital as long as possible."

Insisting on prompt payment isn't always the solution. Filing of a formal protest for slow payment is considered in many countries to be the equivalent of an involuntary bankruptcy proceeding, and almost certainly would cost the exporter a customer. Some exporters try to speed payments by charging interest for late payment, but this has hazards, too.

"Charging interest on overdue export drafts is just an invitation to foreign buyers to delay payment still longer," says Sylvester F. Majestic, vice president of Chemical Bank New York Trust Co. "After all, 6 percent is darn cheap interest in most foreign countries. We don't like drafts going behind due dates and insist on prompt payment."

Perhaps the greatest roadblock to extension of more export credit in many countries is the fact that foreign governments often insist on letter-of-credit transactions to better control currency and trade.

"We could treble our sales of commercial aircraft overseas except for restrictions foreign countries place on use of credit due to their dollar shortage problems," reports Frank A. Boettger, senior vice president of Cessna Aircraft Co., Wichita. "The less-developed countries that could most use airplanes, due to lack of roads and railways usually bar use of credit, and that greatly reduces the number of potential buyers."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 8, 1965]

Little Guys and Trade Export-Managing Firms Help Small Businesses Gain Markets Abroad—Companies Handle 5 Percent of Total U.S. Sales Overseas, Find Some Unexpected Buyers—Button-Down Shirts for Paris

(By Frank Morgan)

El Monte, Calif.—Inquiries from potential customers overseas used to pile up on Charles Wade's desk and eventually wind up in the wastebasket. "I never bothered to answer them," says the president of CHD, Inc., a maker of swimming pool equipment.

"They were a nuisance, and some were written in a language I couldn't even read."

Today Mr. Wade claims to be the largest exporter of such swimming pool items as filters, lamps and heaters. Foreign letters barely arrive before they are whisked over to Meridian Enterprises, Inc., in nearby Los Angeles. Meridian serves as CHD's foreign sales department and last year sold more than $250,000 of CHD products overseas, 25 percent of the pool equipment maker's total 1964 sales.

Meridian is one of a rapidly growing breed of concerns, called combination export managers or CEMs, which are carving a niche for themselves in world trade by exporting products made by small companies like CHD. Experts on foreign trade estimate there are between 600 and 1,000 CEM's in the nation handling 5 percent of total exports, or $1.2 billion last year, and perhaps 10 percent of the finished and semimanufactured goods which are their specialties. CEM's are concentrated in coastal trade centers, but are starting to spread to Midwest manufacturing areas.

POTENTIAL IS BIG

Trade experts say there is plenty of room for growth in U.S. exports, particularly among the smaller companies CEM's serve. Some 315,000 manufacturers are turning out products which probably could be sold in foreign markets, but only 5 percent of them have ever sent a shipment overseas, according to Government estimates. Most of the 15,000 U.S. companies which export goods are big concerns with their own overseas offices, distributors and sales staffs. "I think a lot more companies would export if they knew how," says Daniel L. Goldy, President Johnson's national export expansion coordinator.

Uncle Sam's desire to increase U.S. exports as an antidote to the Nation's adverse balance of payments is producing enthusiastic backing for the CEM's from both the Commerce and State Departments. And the rising effluence of many foreign countries is whetting their appetites for American goods and making it easier for them to pay for U.S. products. As a result, many CEM's are prospering. Overseas Operations, Inc., Los Angeles, says its sales have doubled since 1960, rising to about $1.2 million. Ad. Auriema, Inc., New York, says its sales have jumped to $6 million from $4 million in the past 5 years. Meridian, which started with $12,000 in sales in 1960, had a $500,000 volume last year and expects to hit $1 million this year.

To get a small businessman into the growing overseas market, a CEM offers him specialized knowledge he lacks and hasn't the time or money to acquire. CEM staffers often speak several languages. They keep abreast of new or expanding markets for thousands of U.S.-made goods and offer expert advice on economics and customs of some 120 diverse overseas markets. They also closely follow shifts in import laws and changes in tariffs or duties to help clients match or beat prices of goods made locally. Most CEM's represent anywhere from two to 100 clients.

HOW CEM'S WORK

Meridian's dealings with CHD, one of its 20 client companies, are typical of a combination export manager at work. To send a recent $8,000 shipment of swimming pool filters to a customer in Johannesburg, South Africa, all CHD had to do was set the shipment of 100 filters on its own loading dock in El Monte, and let Meridian take it from there. A truck hired by Meridian picked up the filters at the dock and hauled them to New Orleans since no ships were leaving Los Angeles immediately for South Africa. A New Orleans freight forwarder handled crating, insurance, documentation and loading of the shipment to Meridian's specifications.

The CEM paid all transportation and handling costs. It paid CHD cash, less Meridian's usual 15 to 20 percent discount, for the filters. CHD figures this discount about equals its own cost of selling the equipment in this country, so it makes the same profit on overseas deliveries that it does on its own sales to U.S. customers. Mr. Wade finds the combination export manager's cash payment to CHD especially attractive because it eliminates collection problems. "There's no financial risk to me at all," he says enthusiastically. CHD received its money for the pool filters about the time the ship sailed from New Orleans. Meridian received its money a short time later, through a Johannesburg bank.

As painless as they claim to make exporting, many CEM's say their big problem still is convincing a small manufacturer he has a place in foreign trade. "The U.S. businessman tangles with many more problems and complexities selling in his own territory than overseas, but mention foreign trade and he gets a mental block, thinking it's too complicated or too costly for him," says a West Coast export specialist.

SUCCESS IN SHIRTS

Often a CEM must search the Nation to find a seller to match up with an eager foreign buyer. Jane Taylor International, a Los Angeles CEM, learned last year from its Paris distributor that European men like a particular style of shirt with button-down collars. It took 2 weeks for Burton Taylor, vice president, to track down the company that makes that style, Creighton Shirtmakers, Inc., in Reidsville, N.C. Since then the company has shipped 12,000 of its shirts to Europe. "I had no idea I'd ever get into the export business." says Stan Tanger, Creighton's president. "But now I'm shooting to export 10 percent of this year's output."

Western Microwave Laboratories, Inc., Santa Clara, Calif., hadn't considered entering overseas markets until it was approached by the New York Advertising Auriema firm. But in the 2 years it has been exporting, orders from abroad accounted for 8 to 10 percent of its total sales. "We're looking for this to grow to 20 percent or more this year," says Hal Tenney, vice president, marketing. Export sales cost the company "a little more" than domestic sales, but Mr. Tenney considers the CEM's fee a bargain. He says it would cost his firm "considerably more" to handle its own exports.

Besides their specific foreign orders, CEM's spend a good deal of time overseas doing a variety of broader chores for U.S. companies. They advertise and promote a client's goods, display its products at trade fairs, and act in the client's name, even using the company letterhead for correspondence. CEM's also arrange licensing, subassembly or joint-venture agreements where exporting isn't feasible.

From their vantage point on the foreign scene, the CEM's attempt to fend off competition from locally made goods. To avoid head-on collisions, they seek to specialize in products the local country isn't making, such as air conditioning and refrigeration equipment, selected luxury items, and certain kinds of tools, household goods, electronic components and clothing.

CEM's sometimes make financing arrangements for the foreign concern or distributor that wants to buy from a U.S. company. Credit risks in selling abroad are worrisome, the CEM's concede, but aren't prohibitive. The Foreign Credit Insurance Association (FCIA), composed of several insurance companies and backed by the Federal Export-Import Bank, offers both short- and long-term insurance covering up to 85 percent of a foreign sales contract. The bank also makes medium-term guarantees to other banks financing exporters. "If a customer can't be insured under FCIA regulations, we won't export to him," says H. D. Sheldon, president of the New York export managing firm that bears his name. "But there are few markets that are closed."

Because of the diversity of the products they handle and the independence of their operations, combination export managers didn't form a trade association until early this year. At the Commerce Department's urging, CEM groups have been set up recently in 10 major cities to provide central agencies where small companies can get information about exports.

The Government is playing an increasingly active role in promoting use of CEM's. A manufacturer need only indicate to the Commerce Department that he may be interested in selling abroad to be inundated with brochures, invitations to seminars and visitors representing the Government and CEM's. In the first half of this year, the Commerce Department's 42 regional offices held 685 export seminars for 24,800 businessmen who weren't then exporting, and last year its field office personnel made 15,800 visits to manufacturers to talk exporting.

The Department last year channeled 68,000 trade leads to companies from the Agency for International Development (AID) and U.S. embassy commercial attachés. It also sponsors regional export expansion councils in which 1,200 businessmen volunteers called on more than 9,000 potential exporters during the past 17 months. The State Department recently sent detailed instructions explaining ways to promote wider use of combination export managers to all U.S. diplomatic and consular posts except those in Communist countries.

All this new interest in exports has had a few unfavorable side effects. Established CEM's and some international bankers say unqualified persons who call themselves CEM's or agents, but lack the knowledge, financing and overseas contacts to be successful, have been drawn into the business by the increased emphasis on foreign trade. Many "export schools" also have opened recently in major port cities. They teach "textbook trade" and little about the day-to-day complications of selling abroad, trade experts complain.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce Sept. 20, 1965]

Import Rise During Fall Indicated—Credit Letter Survey Points Toward Boost Over Total in 1964

(By Emma M. Doran)

Imports this fall may be expected to continue to run ahead of the 1964 movement, as they have in the aggregate so far this year.

This expectation is based on surveys of the import letter of credit experience of the leading New York City banks during the past 3 months (June-August).

Last month was a rather quiet one with the combined dollar volume of import credits established by the surveyed banks dipping slightly below that for July. But, August is the month in which vacations, notably in Europe, are concentrated so the dip from July probably is not significant insofar as the underlying import trend is concerned.

GAIN OVER LAST YEAR

The comparison of August activity with that of the corresponding 1964 month, moreover, again shows a considerable gain. Six of the banks checked by the Journal of Commerce reported that the dollar value of import credits issued last month was higher than in August 1965 and in four instances the increase was substantial. The other three banks doing less business experienced only slight dips in two cases.

Thus, the August survey as well as those for July and June came up with aggregate dollar volumes considerably larger than in the corresponding 1964 month. Assuming a 3-month time lag—which is probably a less accurate assumption at this time of year than at others—the 3-month letter of credit showing points to an import movement in the 3 fall months higher than in 1964.

Insofar as the time elapsing between establishment of credit and receipt of merchandise is concerned, this varies widely with the product concerned, the country of supply and other factors. But, by and large 3 months or somewhat less seems a reasonably good average. On the other hand, around this time much so-called Thanksgiving and Christmas merchandise is paid for under letters of credit taken out early in the year.

This provides an added reason for anticipating that imports this fall will show a good gain over 1964.

Conversely, the maritime strike that held up some U.S.-flag ships from mid-June until early this month might be expected to have some delayed impact on September imports. But, in view of the very sharp rise in customs duties collected at the port of New York in August when foreign carrier activity increased, the strike effect on import volume may well be fairly minimal.

The dollar values of general imports for 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, and for January–July 1965, as computed by the U.S. Department of Commerce, without seasonal adjustment, follow:

1961

January	1, 149. 7
February	1, 067. 2
March	1, 255. 2
April	1, 063. 0
May	1, 222. 9
June	1, 232. 0
July	1, 285. 3
August	1, 251. 8
September	1, 197. 1
October	1, 363. 5
November	1, 342. 2
December	1, 294. 9

1962

January	1, 367. 6
February	1, 222. 7
March	1, 380. 8
April	1, 333. 5
May	1, 453. 1
June	1, 348. 7
July	1, 333. 6
August	1, 356. 8
September	1, 341. 5
October	1, 442. 1
November	1, 449. 2
December	1, 359. 4

1963

January	1, 116. 2
February	1, 385. 4
March	1, 462. 5
April	1, 454. 4
May	1, 458. 9
June	1, 355. 9
July	1, 502. 1
August	1, 459. 7
September	1, 398. 7
October	1, 592. 2
November	1, 425. 3
December	1, 530. 5

1964

January	1, 444. 5
February	1, 336. 8
March	1, 590. 2
April	1, 560. 6
May	1, 455. 7
June	1, 593. 7
July	1, 610. 7
August	1, 491. 0
September	1, 561. 8
October	1, 613. 0
November	1, 671. 7
December [1]	1, 755. 0

1965

January	1, 112. 9
February	1, 463. 6
March	2, 040. 2
April	1, 854. 9
May	1, 724. 1
June	1, 906. 9
July	1, 632. 9

[1] December total may have been swelled by shipments expedited in anticipation of the dock strike that eventually broke out on Jan. 11, after which date receipts were held down. The high March total reflected the continuing above-normal import activity in the port which began after strike ended and may also have included goods entered through customs but not actually removed from ships or piers.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, Sept. 24, 1965]

CONNOR VOICES PAYMENTS FEARS—STRESSES SERIOUSNESS OF PROBLEM

Concern over two aspects of the U.S. balance of payments was expressed here yesterday by Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor in addressing the second annual Business Outlook Conference of the National Industrial Conference Board in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel.

The Secretary voiced the fervent hope that foreign financing would be found for heavy overseas outlays by U.S. companies and also appealed for help to correct the perilous cut in our trade surplus.

The U.S. official who devoted the bulk of his remarks to the national economy and the paramount inmportance to balanced growth, took the occasion early in his speech to discuss balance also in this country's international transactions.

Asserting that the balance-of-payments program is by no means lagging, he nevertheless emphasized that the problem continues one that merits designations stronger than "urgent" and "critical," if one could think up such terms.

He then proceeded to tick off progress by corporations. In the first half, this included:

1. Repatriation of more than $400 million of short-term funds by nonfinancial firms.

2. A 13-percent rise in income brought home in second quarter by 380 concerns whose experience has been tabulated over figure for first quarter, for a total of $675 million.

3. Restraint on capital outflows for direct investment in participating companies show a decline of $224 million from the first to the second quarter, a drop of about 30 percent from the very high level in January–March.

4. Raising of about $400 million funds abroad for financing of overseas investments by reporting companies (this includes expanison of bank loans as well as the flotation of securities in the public market).

Then after observing that the benefits of restraint on long-term investment will not become fully apparent until later on since many companies had projects in an advanced stage, he said, "at the same time, I must state frankly that the present estimate of a 20-percent increase in 1965 in capital expenditures abroad for plants and equipment has given us a slight chill.

"We fervently hope that U.S. corporations will succeed in financing that hefty expansion abroad, particularly in Western Europe, because otherwise the capital net outflow for direct investments again will be dangerously high."

EXPORT EXPANSION

Turning to export expansion on which many companies have been relying to improve their balance-of-payments ledgers, the Secretary noted that unfortunately the export trade was not increasing its contribution to the balance of payments. Strikes and the slower pace of economic expansion in Europe have affected exports, he observed. But, he declared that the showing so far only makes more urgent than ever our need to step up exports in the remaining months of this year and on into next year.

We especially need to boost exports in order to offset the substantial rise in our imports, he said, noting that in the first 7 months exports were only 1½ percent above the corresponding 1964 aggregate, while imports were up 12 percent. Terming this a perilous cut in our trade surplus, he asserted it must not continue.

Mr. Connor then outlined what the Government was doing to try to step up the export drive, stating that this "is our No. 1 priority" and saying that he hopes it is close to the top of the list for every businessman in the Nation who is concerned with exports.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 26, 1965]

VOLUNTARY RESTRAINTS FAIL TO CUT OVERSEAS INVESTMENT

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

An unpublished White House report discloses that President Johnson's voluntary balance-of-payments program for businessmen is producing disappointing results.

The key to the program is business cooperation and the report makes it evident that businessmen are not giving Mr. Johnson the support that he asked.

Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor submitted the report. The findings are a black eye for the Cabinet officer since he urged Johnson to rely on a voluntary effort.

The Chief Executive requested business cooperation as part of an emergency balance-of-payments program that he laid before the country last February. He asked businessmen to cut their net dollar outflows to foreign countries by 15 percent this year but the report indicates that they did a few relatively painless things and are not following through by making necesary but more difficult sacrifices.

There is a marked contrast between the meager results that the business program is yielding and the extremely impressive results that are being produced by a parallel voluntary program that the Federal Reserve System is running for the Nation's banks.

A separate White House report on the banking effort reveals that the commercial banks have slashed their foreign loans to an amount that is smaller than the total last December 31 and now are a solid $600 million below the recommended 1965 target volume.

One quick, easy contribution that corporations made was to pull back close to $450 million of short-term funds that they had invested overseas to obtain higher interest rates.

But the business export drive is lagging very badly. Exports are running only 1½ percent ahead of last year.

Most disappointing of all, in the Administration's view, has been the corporate direct investment performance.

American companies invested $1.7 billion in foreign facilities during the first 6 months of this year. The half-year total is only $700 million less than the $2.4 billion that U.S. firms invested overseas in all of 1964—before the voluntary program began.

The step-up in the corporate overseas investment rate has left administration officials blinking in astonishment—and in rage.

Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury Paul A Volcker hinted at the jaundiced view that the administration is beginning to take of the corporate effort in a New York speech Thursday.

He praised the banks for their "full and continuing cooperation in the President's program."

But of the corporations the best he could muster was a dry comment that "there would appear to be a sizable potential for further savings" in direct investment and "a clear potential for increased exports."

Volcker acknowledged that it takes time to change corporate investment planning and Connor, in a separate New York speech, publicly gave a group of businessmen the same apologetic explanation that he has been making privately to the White House.

"Let me say that we recognize that the benefits of restraint on longer term investments will not become fully apparent until later this year and early next year," the Cabinet officer said. "This is due largely to the fact that many companies already had projects in such advanced stages of development that they could not be cut back."

Connor mentioned a Commerce Department prediction that corporate overseas capital expenditures will go up 20 percent this year and said the prospect "has given us a slight chill."

But other officials commented that the situation is worse than Connor's 20 percent figure indicates.

Pointing to the $1.7 billion that companies sent overseas in the first 6 months, they allowed that it will be remarkable if the upsurge in corporate direct investment does not come closer to 50 percent this year than to Connor's still uncomfortably higher 20 percent.

"Corporation cooperation on direct investments is terrible."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 3, 1965]

Economic Impact—Voluntary Curbs on Foreign Investment Restudied

(By Hobert Rowen)

Behind closed doors in the White House, Treasury, and Commerce Department, there is a critical evaluation of American economic policy under way.

The problem is this: one key part of President Johnson's voluntary program to curb our balance-of-payments deficit has failed to get off the ground. American businessmen, instead of cutting back their direct investments abroad, are buying new plants or other enterprises (and adding to what they already own) on a hand-over-fist basis.

One reason this is happening is that tax cuts in the last few years have provided a bonanza for American corporations. In effect, American businesmen are so well-heeled that a good share of undistributed profits has had no place to go, except abroad. (This side-effect of tax cuts will be studied early next year by the Joint Economic Committee.)

Here is the scorecard on direct capital investment abroad: in the first 6 months of this year, it zoomed to a full $2 billion. For all of 1964, the total was only $2.4 billion.

Even if Commerce Secretary John T. Connor—L.B.J.'s main ambassador to the business community—succeeds in talking his old friends into slowing down the mad pace, it's easy to see that the final 1965 total can be something like 50 percent greater than 1964.

That would feed a big minus into the balance-of-payments totals.

Thus, the hush-hush reexamination of policy now going on is directed to the question: Is the voluntary program worth keeping, or should L.B.J. turn to direct controls on private capital investment abroad?

The latter course would be fiercely resisted by American businessmen, who don't care much for even the "voluntary" pressure they're under. They turned thumbs down, for example, on Connor's proposal earlier this year that they notify the Government in advance of overseas projects costing $10 million or more.

Yet another disappointment in the picture is the serious decline in our export surplus. "We know now," says a top-ranking man, "that our reliance on the export program was overdone. Businessmen have tried to boost exports, but the real decisions are made by those who do the buying."

Most of our good customers in Europe are suffering from various degrees of economic slow-down. But the boom continues apace here. Hence, in the first several months this year, imports into the United States rose by 12 percent, while exports gained only 1½ percent.

The Johnson Administration has known all along that it had milked most of the benefits easily achievable through the voluntary program during the second quarter, when we had a small surplus. It's been aware that there would be a modest deficit for the final 6 months of 1965.

But officials can see things turning much worse if exports don't do better. Connor says flatly that would be "perilous." And if capital investment runs along at the present pace, watch out.

The last thing L.B.J. wants right now is a reversal of our balance-of-payments fortunes when we are making a grandstand effort to convince hard-bitten Europeans that we can get to and achieve "equilibrium." All of the talk about monetary reform is hitched to the idea that the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit will be eliminated—or at least, reduced to a trickle.

The President is thus face to face with a potentially embarrassing problem. Obviously, he doesn't want to impose direct controls on overseas investment. "That would raise hell with the consensus he is so proud of," an administration man confesses.

But he may have to do what he probably should have done before—ask U.S. businessmen to set a specific target for reduction in their investment programs. The very successful program relating to bank credit by the way, is keyed to a specific loan reduction goal.

Whatever Johnson does, it won't add to his popularity. He may even have to reconsider proposals to curb tourist travel and spending abroad. And tourists also vote in large numbers.

A NEW ATTACK ON OUR CAPITOL

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, for some reason, which I am at a loss to understand, the Architect of the Capitol is planning to commit the Congress not only to the investment of millions of dollars in a so-called shoring up of the west front of the Capitol, but to an extension of the west front which, in my opinion, the Congress has never authorized.

Some Members of the Senate may recall how bitterly I fought the 32½-foot extension of the east front—an expense to the taxpayers which was not justified, and which altered the historic appearance of our Capitol.

I express the earnest hope that we will not permit the Architect of the Capitol to lead us into the same blunder on the west front. If the walls of the west front need shoring up, they can be shored up, but that does not mean that they should be extended and the entire appearance of the Capitol changed.

I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD, the attached statement of the American Institute of Architects concerning the proposal to extend the west front of the National Capitol.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Statement of the American Institute of Architects Concerning the Proposal To Extend the West Front of the National Capitol, October 13, 1965

The American Institute of Architects, now in its 109th year, is a professional association composed of over 17,000 corporate members and 5,000 associate members, representing leading practitioners, and teachers of architecture in all States of the Union.

The institute believes that the Capitol of the United States is a vitally important symbol of our Nation's Government. As such, it should be preserved. If reconstruction is structurally necessary it should be carried out in strict accordance with the present design.

If the Capitol continues to expand it will rapidly lose all resemblance to the original building. The American Institute of Architects believes that it should be a permanent policy of the Congress that the exterior of the Capitol is to remain unchanged.

Today, the west front contains the last remaining external vestiges of the Capitol as it was originally designed and built. It is the only important link with the beginnings of the building. If the west front of the Capitol is extended, we will have buried the last of those walls that date from the early years of the Republic, and will have obscured a part of our history that can never be restored.

APPRECIATION FOR BEAUTY AND CLEANLINESS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, with age comes appreciation. This is no less true with countries than with people. In the United States, which is still a relatively young country, our people are learning to appreciate our greatest gifts.

We are becoming more interested in such basic goals as cleaning up our rivers, purifying the air in cities, and preserving the natural loveliness of our landscapes.

In a recent editorial the Fort Wayne, Ind., Journal-Gazette in commenting on this newly developed sense of appreciation, commented that "Times are changing and taste is improving."

I ask consent that this editorial on an important subject be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) Journal-Gazette, Sept. 28, 1965]

Beauty and Cleanliness

America is very properly becoming increasingly interested in such things as beautification of herself, antipollution of streams and rivers and lakes, anti-air pollution and conservation in general.

Our country is a relatively young one.

In its development we have sometimes been wasteful of its resources and careless of its appearance.

Times are changing and taste is improving.

The national movement, headed by Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, should grow on the local level.

Every city and rural community could be much cleaner and more beautiful than it is.

Fort Wayne already has done much along the line of beautification through the years.

There is still much which can be done here at home.

FEDERAL ACTION IN SCHOOL CASE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a recent article by Mr. Arthur Krock of the New York Times, "Highhanded Federal Action in School Case," was reported in the Wheeling, W. Va., News-Register, and is an excellent presentation of the facts regarding the recent action by the U.S. Office of Education in the Chicago, Ill., public school funds matter.

On June 19, 1964, I spoke on the floor of the Senate in regard to the civil rights bill then under debate. Among other remarks, I stated my apprehension that the legislation would impose entirely too much power in Federal officials not elected to office by the people and warned against what I anticipated might well become instances of Federal powers of coercion and compulsion arbitrarily used.

This would appear to be a clear example of just such action. I would hope that the American public may not witness many others.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article by Mr. KROCK printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—HIGHHANDED FEDERAL ACTION IN SCHOOL CASE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON.—Overall Federal control of local public school education through the power to grant or withhold the financial support of the Central Government was inherent in two measures legislated by Congress and enacted into law in 1964 and 1965—the Civil Rights and the Education Acts. But it required the arbitrary and extra-legal exercise of that power in Chicago by Washington's bureaucracy to verify this potential of the legislation which its opponents charged and its sponsors denied.

The bureaucracy's highhanded cutoff of $30 million of Federal aid to the Chicago public schools was reversed after the Democratic boss of Chicago, Mayor Daley, carried the widespread protest it aroused in the city to the highest level of the Democratic administration in Washington. But since the ruling was a typical product of the meeting of the bureaucratic and academic minds that is prevalent in the Federal Government, and since the legislation invites the abuse of power to which it was subjected in the Chicago case, it is likely to be only the first of many. That is, unless Congress makes the full investigation which indignant Members of Congress from Illinois are urging, or President Johnson cracks down hard on the U.S. Office of Education, or both.

The root of the episode is that the Federal Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel, cut off the $30 million on the representation of a civil rights pressure group in Chicago, that de facto racial segregation in the public school system is a deliberate policy of Benjamin C. Willis, the superintendent of schools. Announcing that "preliminary investigation * * * indicates evidence in certain instances of noncompliance with the Civil Rights Act and the regulations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare," Keppel took his summary action. But despite an accompanying statement that the inquiry was continuing, Keppel closed his door to demands that he produce specifications to support his prejudgment of the facts, and has produced none.

Moreover, title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, that Keppel invoked for his action, provides that withholding of Federal aid to local education must follow "express findings on the record, after opportunity of hearing." It also provides that 30 days must first elapse, during which the appropriate committees of Congress for withholding may, if they choose, review "a full written report" by the Federal agency of its grounds for withholding.

But Keppel's cutoff of the $30 million might have prevailed, even in these circumstances of flagrant transgression which were exposed in the city protest whose press spokesman was the Chicago Tribune, if Mayor Daley had not brought the political counterpressure of his Democratic organization to bear on the White House. So that the affair is a warning to Congress and to all administrators of local education in the United States to set up safeguards against the mood of arbitrary and extra-legal control thus revealed in the U.S. Office of Education and the HEW Department, both administered by academic doctrinaires.

This correspondent is indebted to James Yuenger of the Tribune, whose reports of the controversy have been a model of objectivity in newswriting, for the following background:

1. The total public school enrollment in Chicago is about 600,000, of which 53 percent is Negro. They live in "two oblong areas extending south and west from the Loop. Superintendent Willis has concentrated new school construction in these areas (at a cost of many millions of dollars) on the premise that schools must be built where the children are." As a consequence of unusual neighborhood patterns, approximately 35 percent of the elementary schools are more than 90 percent Negro, about 35 percent are 90 percent or more white. The remainder are considered integrated, as having a much smaller percentage of either of these racial groups.

2. The complaint which sufficed Keppel to make his ruling on what is "indicated" but without anything approaching conclusive evidence, is that the school district boundaries in Chicago have been gerrymandered by Willis to effect de facto segregation. He is accused of using this device in a "Machiavellian attempt to 'perpetuate the Negro ghettos'." Another complaint is that the superintendent and the city school board ignored recommendations of administrative changes which two University of Chicago professors recommended. But both professors Hauser, a sociologist, and Havighurst, an educator, have said publicly that, if all their recommendations were carried out, there would be little immediate change in the school racial proportions because of longstanding neighborhood residential patterns.

3. The complainants, whose sparkplug is Albert A. Raby, a former grade school teacher, have good grounds for their conclusion that Willis' attitude toward them is hostile, reflecting a view that they are "outsiders nosing into his business." They also have been fully justified in protests against his act in allowing the use of the Washburne Trade School for union apprentices by the unions which discriminate racially in their apprenticeship programs. In consequence, the pupils at the Washburne School are almost all white.

These are among the main points in the memorandum. In sum, however, it seems clear that the objective of the desegregation pressure groups in Chicago and of Keppel's ruling, is to abolish neighborhood residential patterns by Federal force, and meanwhile to eliminate the school racial proportions they effect by shipping pupils wholesale from the areas they live in. As for the ruling itself, it bears the familiar marks of a Federal agency's overture for more legislation to administer—in this instance legislation which will equip the HEW and the U.S. Office of Education with power to terminate de facto school segregation, regardless of whether it is deliberately contrived or is an inevitable incident of the desire of the American people to school their children in the areas they live in.

If this is to be made unconstitutional, that is the function of Congress as reviewed by the Supreme Court, not of the U.S. Office of Education by usurping control of the purse, whose contents are supplied by the Nation's taxpayers.

FREE PRESS AND QUESTIONS LEFT UNANSWERED BY THIS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, three front page articles, side by side in today's Washington Post, attest to the role a free press can play in focusing a glaring spotlight on questions left unanswered by this administration.

The first deals with the involvement in an estate case of the law firm of David Bress, the nominee for U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia.

The second article casts additional doubt on the qualifications of Francis X. Morrissey, the nominee for a Federal judgeship in Boston.

The third is the mysterious case of a film that is not—a film put together by certain Federal agencies, with narration by a well-known movie actor, for showing at a special White House Salute to Congress reception, a reception that almost did not come off, and when it did, lacked the star attraction.

Each reflects an area—a facet—of our political system which always disturbs the public and which causes the public to view this system with a certain amount of suspicion.

When Mr. Bress was initially nominated as U.S. attorney, I raised the question that since he had represented Bobby Baker's Serv-U Corp., a possible conflict of interest could exist because Baker is currently under Federal grand jury investigation.

Now the air is full of charges that Mr. Bress' law firm may have mishandled an estate case in which the validity of certain stock certificates is in question.

Since additional questions of such nature have come to the public attention, this is only the more reason why Mr. Bress' nomination should be held up. It demonstrates the undesirability of rushing through the Judiciary Committee such a nomination.

The case needs a full public airing.

There are now second thoughts as to the confirmation of Mr. Morrissey as a Federal judge in Boston. The questions center around his place of residence during certain critical months of a year in which he ran for the State Legislature in Massachusetts. Was he a resident of the State for a full year as required, or was he in Georgia?

This brings up the area of whether records were misrepresented and adds fuel to the fire of whether Mr. Morrissey has the qualifications for a Federal judgeship.

Unless these questions are satisfactorily answered, there should be no Senate confirmation of this nominee.

The case of the mysterious film allegedly extolling the accomplishments of the 89th Congress—for showing at the White House Salute to Congress—raises the pertinent question of who is to foot the bill for it. I have no doubt that the taxpayer is going to be the one who is going to be stuck, and he, his children, and grandchildren are already stuck with the bill for the most expensive session of Congress in peacetime history.

The fact that the administration is denying the existence of the film, even though there is ample evidence that such a film was made, does not make its acceptability any greater.

I ask unanimous consent that the three articles, entitled "Power Play Stalls Bress Nomination," "Residency During '34 in Question," and "Film on Fighting 89th: Great, but Never Shown," be placed in the Record; also an editorial from the October 12 issue of the Des Moines Register entitled: "Degrading the Federal Judiciary."

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 15, 1965]

Power Play Stalls Bress Nomination—Opponents Charge Mishandling in Estate Case

The nomination of David G. Bress to be U.S. attorney for Washington has become ensnared in a bizarre power play.

An effort to block his confirmation has been made through circulation of charges that the prominent attorney mishandled an estate a decade ago.

Flowing through subterranean channels, the charges reached members of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Last Tuesday, a subcommittee of the full committee held a closed-door hearing intended to get to the bottom of the allegations. Bress denied the allegations, and the committee did not withdraw the approval previously given Bress.

The hearing was unusual. It was held 4 days after the full committee had acted favorably on the Bress nomination. And it was held in such secrecy that other committee members were startled to hear of it last night.

DELAY REQUESTED

Because the hearing failed to satisfy all of Bress' critics, certain unidentified Senators who want to speak on the matter asked that Senate action on confirmation—which had been scheduled for today—be delayed. The matter is expected to be put over until Monday or later.

The 56-year-old lawyer, nominated by the President last August 25, now finds himself caught in twin pincers—between Republicans and Democrats with obvious stakes in the matter, and between two wings of the Democratic Party, Mr. Johnson's and Senator Robert F. Kennedy's.

The New York Senator and his allies—and, before Bress entered the picture, Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach—are believed to have favored William W. Greenhalgh of Potomac, Md., a candidate who was initially cleared for the nomination.

Greenhalgh's supporters believe that Greenhalgh, director of Georgetown University's Legal Intern program, was scratched because he was too close to Kennedy. Abe Fortas, intimate adviser to the President, who is now a Justice of the Supreme Court, then recommended that Bress be substituted.

The first opposition to Bress' nomination in the Senate developed in mid-September with two Senate speeches, one by Senator Jack Miller, Republican, of Iowa, the second by Senator John J. Williams, Republican, of Delaware.

Both zeroed in on Bress' representation, in a breach-of-contract case, of the Serv-U Corp., which was controlled by Robert G. Baker, former secretary to the Senate majority and the subject of a grand jury investigation here.

CONFLICT CHARGE DENIED

Miller said the appointment could involve a conflict of interest—a possibility immediately denied by Bress.

Williams said the nomination "can only be interpreted as a continuation of the efforts to protect Bobby Baker."

Six days later, Bress told the Senate Judiciary Committee that "I did not know" Baker at the time he (Bress) represented Serv-U.

Katzenbach testified that the Justice Department—not the U.S. Attorney's Office—is handling the Baker case.

CONFIRMATION BLOCKED

At the time, it was thought that objections to Bress' nomination were solved, but Williams said later that he had more to say.

On October 5, he blocked confirmation of Bress by objecting to a request for unanimous consent promising information.

In recent days, material about Bress and the decade-old estate case began surfacing after being circulated quietly on Capitol Hill and elsewhere.

When asked about these reports last night, the Justice Department issued this statement:

"In the course of the routine character investigation of Mr. Bress, the Department learned of allegations regarding an estate matter handled by his law firm 10 years ago."

"This matter was looked into carefully and the undisputed evidence is that while there does not appear to have been any impropriety in the stock matter in question, in any event Mr. Bress was not involved."

The same point—that Bress was not involved in any impropriety, if there was any—was made by Bress himself, by a former associate involved in the case in question, Albert Philipson, and by the lawyer for the adversary party in the case, Bruce G. Sundlun.

This is the background as developed yesterday through checks of available records and interviews with principals:

During Tuesday's hearings before the Senate Judiciary subcommittee on the Bress nomination, Sundlun, a Washington attorney, was questioned about the case, which involved a contested will, dating to January 1955.

At that time Bress' firm was representing the estate of Melvin A. Viner, the president of Arcade-Sunshine Co., a large laundry and valet service.

Viner died on January 8, 1958. A month later, his widow, Jeanne, contended in probate court that a management-survivorship agreement entered into in 1949 by her husband and his two brothers, both partners in the company, was invalid.

MALE HEIRS FAVORED

The agreement provided that only male heirs of any of the brothers could inherit stock in Arcade-Sunshine. If there were no male heirs, it said the company would repurchase the stock at one-half its book value. Mrs. Viner claimed this provision unfairly treated her and her children.

Sundlun represented Mrs. Viner. A settlement was finally arranged in late 1956, after the brothers had filed a civil suit to resolve the validity of the 1949 survivorship agreement.

During a deposition on the civil suit on December 5, 1955, Sundlun pointedly raised doubts as to the genuineness of a series of stock certificates dated from 1951 on. This was the only outstanding stock at the time and his client held none of it.

As an officer of the company, Bress was called to answer questions about the stock issue, but no contention was ever made that he knew of the stock issue, and it was never proved that the stock issue was not authentic.

IMPLICATIONS REVIEWED

Sundlun said he went to the U.S. Attorney's office about a year after settlement of Viner case to discuss possible criminal implications in the matter. He stressed he did not go seeking prosecution but merely wanted "to discuss the situation" at the request of his client, Jeanne Viner.

He said he talked only with John C. Conliff, chief of the criminal division.

For his part, Conliff said he took up the matter with U.S. Attorney Oliver Gasch and his first assistant, Edward P. Troxell. All three agreed there was no evidence warranting prosecution, he said.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 15, 1965]

Residency During 1934 in Question—Boston Newspaper Files on State Candidacy

(By John P. MacKenzie)

Where did Francis X. Morrissey reside during the first 3 months of 1934?

This became the critical question last night in the fight over Morrissey's nomination to the Federal bench in Boston, as two versions of his whereabouts unfolded.

One version came from Morrissey's own sworn testimony this week before a Senate subcommittee. Morrissey testified that he stayed in Georgia, intending to settle there and practice law for 6 months after September 9, 1933, when he was admitted to the Georgia bar.

A flatly contradictory version is disclosed by records on file in the Massachusetts statehouse in Boston. They show that Morrissey ran for the State legislature in September 1934. To be eligible for the legislature under the State constitution, he would have had to be a resident of his Charlestown district for the full calendar year 1935.

Called at his Boston home for comment late last night, Morrissey was said to be asleep and could not be disturbed.

The statehouse records, which were uncovered by the Boston Globe, showed that Morrissey was one of 16 candidates in the State primary of September 20, 1934, for the house of representatives. He placed 12th, with 420 votes, and did not qualify for the final election.

Morrissey ran in ward 2 in the district of his birth, the records showed.

The nominee's Senate testimony came as Morrissey was under fire for listing himself as a Georgia resident in his September 1933, application for the Georgia bar. Under questioning, Morrissey testified under oath that he considered himself a good-faith Georgia resident.

The trip to Georgia came under the scrutiny of a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Tuesday after witnesses from the American Bar Association raised it as a mark against his fitness for the bench. They charged that Morrissey received a "quickie" law degree from an Athens, Ga., "diploma mill" for the occasion, after flunking the Massachusetts bar examination and dropping out of a Boston law school.

Morrissey denied any impropriety in the Georgia venture and stressed that he had never tried to use his Georgia credentials to gain back-door admission to the Massachusetts bar under reciprocity arrangements.

RETURNS TO BOSTON

The nominee, now a 55-year-old municipal judge in Boston, testified that the Georgia trip was the product of immaturity and "bad advice." He said he stayed in the State for 6 months, unsuccessfully looking for legal cases, before giving up and returning to Boston.

That was in his public testimony. In testimony at a closed hearing on Wedesday, according to a summary given newsmen by

Minority Leader Everett M. Dirksen, Morrissey slightly modified the time element. Dirksen quoted the witness as saying it "seemed like 6 months."

Morrissey also testified, both publicly and in executive session, that he studied law in Athens, Ga., for 3 months—from June to September, 1933—before seeking admission to the State and Federal courts in Georgia.

DEMANDS DETAILS

But the nominee could not remember details demanded by Dirksen including the size of his law school, whether it had a large or small library, or how the faculty of the now-defunct Southern Law School handled his bar application papers.

According to Boston legal sources, the Georgia certificates would have been useless as a ticket to the Massachusetts bar. Under State law and Massachusetts court rules, all applicants from out-of-State bars who had earlier flunked the Massachusetts bar examination were routinely rejected by Massachusetts bar examiners. A new Massachusetts bar examination was required.

By coincidence, the issue of Morrissey's residence came to light as another riddle of his admission to the bar was becoming more involved.

The precise manner in which Morrissey could qualify for practice in Georgia was brought up—but not cleared up—in Wednesday's executive session.

PROVISIONS READ

Dirksen read Morrissey the provisions of a Georgia law, enacted 6 months before Morrissey applied for admission there, designed to crack down on "diploma mill" operations.

The law, dated March 1, 1933, eliminated the practice of admitting bar candidates "on diploma" without taking Georgia's bar test. The new law had a "grandfather clause" that lawyers in Atlanta and Athens say was designed to help students who had begun law study under the old ground rules.

This clause exempted from the bar test requirement "those students of law who are now pursuing the study of law and have completed at least 1 year" of law study as of July 1, 1933.

Apparently this clause could not have applied to Morrissey, who had broken off his studies at Boston's Suffolk Law School in January 1932, after failing four courses. He was turned down by the Massachusetts bar examiners in June 1932.

ADMITTED TO COURTS

Nevertheless, Morrissey was admitted to the Georgia trial and appellate courts, the Federal court in Atlanta, and the U.S. 5th Circuit Court of Appeals on September 7, 8, and 9, 1933.

One Morrissey supporter speculated that the Georgia law might have been construed liberally to allow credit for continuing law study at both the Boston and Athens schools. Clarification of the whole matter was thwarted by Morrissey's failure of memory.

Ultimately Morrissey did graduate from Suffolk Law School and went on to receive a master of laws degree. He was admitted to the Massachusetts bar in 1944 after failing the exam a second time in 1943.

Morrissey is best known in Boston as a faithful political servant of the Kennedy family.

When the late President Kennedy was a Congressman and for part of his tenure as a Senator, Morrissey did political errands as secretary in the Boston office. He escorted Edward M. Kennedy around the State before the 1962 Democratic primary in which Kennedy won the Senate nomination and the Senator gave a strong speech in his behalf on Tuesday.

The American and Boston Bar Associations contend that Morrissey is unqualified for the prestigious district court job. The State bar association and other legal figures disagree.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 15, 1965]

White House: What Movie?—Film on Fighting 89th: Great, but Never Shown

(By Ward Just)

It was to be a cinematic celebration of the 89th Congress, a Presidential valentine in simulated cinemascope. One working title was, "The Fighting 89th—The Congress That Wouldn't Wait." Instead, it may well be the greatest story never told.

Accounts vary, and doors were slammed all over Washington when a reporter attempted to assemble the full story, but it appears that the White House approved the making of a film on the greatness of the 89th Congress for showing at the special Salute to Congress reception last Thursday night in the State Department auditorium.

That was the night the House rebelled against the highway beautification bill and the President was obliged to report to the Bethesda Naval Hospital. The bill was not approved until after he had retired. The reception was abbreviated and the movie was never shown. Despite repeated probings, its whereabouts remain unrevealed.

White House sources said last night that there "never was any plan to show any film at the congressional reception." The spokesman added that the White House "didn't know of any such film."

But other voices in other rooms in Washington told a different story.

The producer of the 17-minute spectacle was John Naisbitt, an aid to John W. Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. An ABC producer, John Lynch, was called in as the top creative consultant. Bernard Asbell, the best-selling author ("When FDR Died"), wrote the script. The narrator was no less a figure than Gregory Peck, the movie star.

According to a dispatch from a Knight newspapers correspondent, Federal departments and agencies were instructed to supply "storyboard" ideas and movie clips to illustrate how national problems have been solved by the fighting 89th.

For example, the Commerce Department donated film footage on economic development and scenic roads. The Agriculture Department supplied film clips of the national farms and forests.

Peck told the story of the 89th and on the 30-foot screen behind him the film clips dramatized his words. "You talk about medicare and then you show people with casts on their legs, that sort of thing," explained an administration official yesterday.

According to one account, the film comes to a climax with scenes of a peaceful and bountiful America, motion pictures of great national parks, city skyscrapers, rocks and rills. In the background, the Mormon Tabernacle Choir sings "America, the Beautiful."

Yesterday there was a certain confusion as to who assumed responsibility for the film. Officials at HEW and its Office of Education (which reportedly donated a room in which the filmmakers worked) referred reporters to the White House. Naisbett was unavailable for comment.

One outside consultant protested that he could give no information unless it was cleared by the proper authorities. "The whole thing was secret, you know," he said.

There was no information on who paid for the film or its cost. One consultant said he expected a "consultancy fee" but had received no check. Since the film was not shown, there was one suggestion that it be kept on ice and used as a model for a film on the 90th Congress.

[From the Des Moines Register, Oct. 12, 1965]

Degrading the Federal Judiciary

The appointment by President Johnson of Municipal Judge Francis X. Morrissey of Boston to a Federal judgeship is opposed by the American Bar Association, the Boston Bar Association and the chief judge of the court on which Morrissey would sit, Charles Wyzanski. One organization which formerly opposed the appointment, the Massachusetts Bar Association, has reversed itself, its board voting to support the appointment.

Morrissey is a longtime political family servitor to Joseph P. Kennedy and other Kennedys, including Edward M. Kennedy, the Massachusetts Senator, who recommended Morrissey's appointment. The naming of Morrissey also had been urged on President John F. Kennedy, but he failed to respond.

The political circumstances of this appointment do not create much confidence in Morrissey's ability to handle the job. He has had a good deal of municipal court experience since he was first mentioned for promotion, but it is significant that Judge Wyzanski bases his objections on reports that Morrissey still "has neither * * * familiarity with the law nor the industry to learn it." Boston Bar Association, made up of lawyers from Morrissey's home community, should know Morrissey's municipal court record best, but its executive council recently reaffirmed its opposition, 13 to 9.

The president of the Massachusetts Bar Association, which did reverse itself and come out for Morrissey, pointed out that judicial appointments are usually political.

"With that being the case for so many years, it would be unfair to make Judge Morrissey a martyr," he said.

Judge Morrissey's supporters seem to favor him principally on the grounds that he is entitled to the position on the basis of long political service. His opponents argue that judges should be appointed for their judicial ability, not for their political backing.

The issue here is whether Federal judgeships should be political plums. There is no denying they have been much of the time in the past. It is a system which degrades the Federal judiciary and should be eliminated. Unless the appointment is withdrawn, defeated or justified it will serve only as another bad political precedent.

CRUSADE AGAINST CRIME

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, if America has big problems, we also have a great resource of brainpower. It is important that our best minds be set to solving some of our biggest problems—such as our crime wave.

Noting that "crime is always bad news," the Phoenixville, Pa., Republican said that:

> Lyndon Johnson is not one to sit back philosophically and shake his head at bad news. He wants something done.

The newspaper praised the President for the new Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, noting that the task before them is "awesomely difficult," but that "few tasks are as important."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Phoenixville (Pa.) Republican, Sept. 27, 1965]

Crime Crusade

Lyndon Johnson makes great demands on those who serve him, but few have been given a greater challenge than his new Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. The President simply asked this 18-member Commission to give him "a blueprint for effective action to banish crime."

The President's crime crusade is typically Johnsonian, rivaling in scope and difficulty his campaigns against poverty, discrimination, disease, and ignorance. It is, in fact, interrelated with all of these.

Lyndon Johnson is not one to sit back philosophically and shake his head at bad news. He wants something done.

Crime is always bad news. It continues to increase each year, and just when it seems to be leveling off in the cities, as it has this year, it flares out of control in the suburbs and among American youth.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation recently reported that more than one-third of all serious crimes solved by police were committed by persons under 18. In the first 6 months of 1965, while the crime rate went up only minutely in cities, it rose 9 percent in the suburbs. Suburban robberies alone increased 17 percent over 1964.

Last week, when the commission met in Washington, the President asked for answers to several questions:

Why is it that juvenile delinquency knows no economic or educational boundaries?

Why is drug addiction spreading among youth?

Why do one-third of all parolees revert to crime?

Why does organized crime continue to expand?

Why does one man commit a crime while his neighbor, in the same surroundings and circumstances, does not?

In his charge to the commission, the President did not dwell on organized crime. The more critical problem seems to be the waves of unorganized, random, individual crime—the assaults, often without purpose; the senseless and dangerous armed robberies; the inexplicable sex offenses; the burglaries and larcenies, the contagion of narcotics addiction.

The President appointed a strong chairman—Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach. The commission was given 18 months to make studies and conduct hearings. The President asked specifically for recommendations on how better to recruit and train law enforcement officers, how to improve anticrime techniques, how to do a better job of rehabilitating offenders, how to promote greater respect for the law and the officers who enforce it.

The task is awesomely difficult. Few tasks are as important.

THE GREAT SOCIETY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, two of the most able political reporters in the Nation, James McCartney and Charles Nicodemus, have written a remarkable series of articles on the meaning of the Great Society. They have tried in this series of articles for the Chicago Daily News to answer the question, What does the Great Society mean to the individual American as well as to the Nation as a whole? The series includes a final article by a third and distinguished Daily News reporter, Peter Lisagor.

The result of their research is excellent and the best popular description I have seen on this matter, though, of course, I do not mean to indicate my endorsement of all of their judgments. The McCartney-Nicodemus series should be widely read, and I am sure that Members of the Congress who have not seen it will appreciate having it made available to them.

I ask unanimous consent that these articles from the Chicago Daily News issues of September 25 through October 1, 1965, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News, Sept. 25, 1965]

(The 89th Congress has poured out landmark legislation at a rate unequaled in crisis-free times. The new laws touch on every facet of American life. Daily News reporters set out to learn what the Great Society will mean to you. Here is the first of their reports.)

(By James McCartney and Charles Nicodemus)

WASHINGTON.—To 7-year-old Johnny Smith the Great Society means he'll be able to hear again.

To 70-year-old Peter Jones, who fell and broke his hip, it means the payment of all but $219 of $2,074.50 in medical bills.

To Lester Peabody, a Negro in Mississippi, it means he'll vote next year, the first in his family to do so.

To Pamela Clark, 19, it means another year in college, when otherwise she may have had to quit for lack of money.

To Roger Brown, a Chicago father of two, it means the Government will pay $15 a month of the rent for his $95-a-month apartment.

To Lucille Green it means a new geography book at school.

To Buster Black it means a pair of shoes to wear to school, to a better equipped classroom, with a better trained teacher.

To Mrs. Black it means a new park down the street from home where she can walk the baby.

To Chester Rich, a corporation lawyer, it means the preservation of the lake on which he sails his sailboat, with more and bigger fish.

The air over that lake, in 5 years, should be purer, perhaps prolonging his life.

To Mrs. Rich it means a more pleasant trip to the country club, along a highway uncluttered by billboards.

To Charles Schultz, who quit school 2 years ago, it means a natty blue coat with gray slacks as his uniform in a Job Corps camp, learning to read, write, and train for a welder's job.

Your life will be different

Whoever you are, wherever you live, whatever you do—President Johnson's drive to build what he has chosen to call the Great Society will mean your life will be different—whether you like it or not.

But as yet, few Americans—and even many of the top administrators who helped the President plan the program—know how much different.

When Mr. Johnson stood before Congress on January 8 to outline his program not even he realized how far the Congress would go—and how fast.

Richard Goodwin, one of his top aids in planning the program, says the administration thought it might take 4 years to enact the entire package. Most of it has been approved in far less than a year.

Prof. George Galloway, one of the Nation's top experts on Congress, says the 89th Congress has proven more productive than any other in the last quarter of a century.

What Will It Mean to You?

But what exactly will it mean; what will its impact be on American life? What will the Great Society mean to you?

In many cases the answers can be supplied in terms of checks for so many dollars—or of specific programs designed to solve specific problems.

But President Johnson also has gone further. He has sought to define new goals for the Nation, particularly in improving what he has called the quality of life.

Goodwin says the Great Society program consists of two basic parts.

First are programs that continue in the traditional patterns of the New and Fair Deal. These are programs like medicare, housing, aid to Appalachia, parts of the education bill and the antipoverty program. Goodwin says they are designed "to assimilate all people of the United States into the mainstream of American life."

The second objective—improving the quality of life—runs through many parts of the Johnson program. It is possibly the greatest intellectual innovation of the administration.

It is based on the theory that money and material wealth—long the basic goal of most Americans—aren't everything.

As Goodwin has put it: "We went swiftly and hopefully ahead assuming that if we built and grew rich we could create the conditions of a full life. We were wrong."

The natural beauty program is one outgrowth of this attempt to refocus governmental efforts, but only one.

Many parts of the education bill seek to improve the quality of education for all. Attempts to solve air and water pollution problems fall, in administration minds, in a similar category.

"Nobody, whatever his income, can shut himself off from pollution of the air and water," says Goodwin.

The cost and the financing

Although billions will be spent, there is no evidence of a dramatic increase in the national debt.

It will cost somewhere between $10 and $15 billion—but taxes are not being raised, nor is a substantial increase in the national debt anticipated.

It is being financed largely out of the prosperity of the times.

Considering the amount of money being spent, it will not add vastly to the size of the Federal bureaucracy—at least proportionally.

The number of Federal employees is expected to rise by about 1 percent—a totel of roughly 25,000 new civilian employees above the present 2,500,000.

It is not a completely cohesive, neatly balanced, easily charted program.

As one top official puts it: "Nobody sat down 3 years ago and said: 'Let's think up a program to solve our problems.'"

There is no place you can go in Washington, or anywhere else, to ask: What will the Great Society do?

Officials often define the program differently. Nobody can say just what belongs "in"—and what is "out."

But it is now moving out of the Halls of Congress, over the Presidents' desk, and out across the country, item by item, bill by bill.

Here are some of the major ways it may touch your life in the years to come:

YOUR EDUCATION—NEW SCHOOLS BILLS ARE DESIGNED TO GIVE CHILDREN OF THE POOR A BETTER BREAK

Lucille Green and Buster Black, both 9, live in a slum neighborhood. Most of their playmates come from families with annual incomes of less than $2,000. U.S. Office of Education officials believe that they haven't been getting a fair break at their school.

The new education act is designed to help them—and perhaps as many as 5 million others like them—in the slums, or half-slums of the Nation.

Lucille may get a new geography book and Buster, new shoes. But they also may find any number of other changes at school.

Their teachers may get special training—or they may get more teachers and teacher's helpers.

Classes could be set up on Saturday morning to enrich their programs. Special classes could be held to help them with languages—even with English.

Or they might be offered financial assistance. Some money could go into improving their school, its laboratories, kitchens or cafeterias.

The school might buy a TV set or a radio, musical recordings or recordings of poems. A summer school might be set up. Field trips could be planned to museums, concerts, plays. A bookmobile might stop in front of their homes.

Special funds have been provided to try to improve their libraries—or perhaps to give them a school library. Another special program could be set up to establish an education center for special instruction in science, languages, music or the arts.

For the first time, somebody may be assigned to act as their guidance counselors—to help plan their futures.

What the educators call material centers could be established to furnish modern instructional equipment and materials to their school. Their teacher might some day be able to call the local center, ask for a packet of materials for a subject at a particular grade level and get books, films, slides, or demonstration materials the next day.

Almost all of these programs would have to be developed and planned by local and State school authorities. Both public and parochial school students could benefit from many of the programs.

Almost half of the States have already submitted plans for some of their school districts. Some communities are ready to move as soon as November 1—soon after President Johnson is expected to sign the education bill.

In Houston, a plan to benefit 27,000 children has been developed by 25 cooperating schools. Specialists in guidance, visiting teachers, nurses, and psychologists would be furnished to the schools. The program would emphasize teaching reading skills.

In Columbus, Ohio, a plan calls for a new teacher for every four children to enrich the language arts. Extra teachers would be provided for tutoring and after-school help.

In Broward County, Fla., a mobile reading laboratory is ready to roll by November 15—to serve 7,000 children.

In New York City, some schools have developed a program for study centers after school where work could be done on reading and remedial reading as well as arithmetic. The centers would be opened 3 days a week from 3 to 5 p.m.

In Detroit, a million-dollar program has been approved for a program designed to help teach children in racially mixed schools how to live together better.

Educated adults

When President Johnson first discussed his concept of the Great Society at Ann Arbor, Mich., on May 22, 1964, he said that 8 million adult Americans have not finished 5 years of school.

"Nearly 20 million have not finished 8 years of school," he said, "nearly 54 million—more than one-fourth of the population—have not finished high school."

The massive impact of the new $1.3 billion education bill is expected to slash these figures by about 10 percent in the areas of the Nation which will receive most of the money.

Some Government experts believe, however, that the legislations' greatest impact will be in showing school districts not receiving money what can be done. Says one: "When middle-class citizens see what can be done in slum areas, they are going to want programs of their own."

HELP FOR THE ELDERLY—CHECKS ARE MAILED IN MASSIVE DOSES

A few days ago checks began to be mailed in massive quantities to social security beneficiaries receiving an across-the-board, 7-percent pay hike.

These first checks were for retroactive portions of the increase, covering the months from January through August. John Jones, an average retired worker, received a check for $48.

Beginning in October, the rate increase will apply to his regular monthly social security check. If his check was $74—it will become $80 a month. Rates of benefits differ for widows, aged couples, and those in other social security categories.

Some problems are arising from the voted benefit increase, however. Nearly half of those in the Nation who receive public assistance because of their advanced years also receive social security benefits.

Some States deduct

Public assistance benefits are paid through States. Some States are deducting the amount of the 7-percent social security increase from the public assistance benefits paid in their States.

James Smith, 80, may get no increase in his total income at all as a result. His money from social security may go up—but the money from public assistance in his State may go down by the same amount.

Congress made provisions to try to avoid this, but not all States have taken advantage of the provisions.

Not long ago Maude Peterson, 60, of El Centro, Calif., received a check for $94.40 as her share of the Great Society program. She became eligible for a widow's benefit under a new amendment to the law. Earlier a widow had to be 62 to qualify.

Another beneficiary of changes in the law was Abe Lee Midkiff, 75, of Conway, W. Va. He began getting a monthly check for $35. Earlier he had not qualified for social security because he had not worked long enough during his productive years.

Student gets benefits

Joyce E. Roberts, 19, a student at Southern Illinois University, is also getting a social security check—which is enabling her to continue studying at the university.

One social security amendment permits surviving children of men who earned social security benefits to receive Federal aid until they are 22 years old—providing they stay in school.

YOUR HEALTH—LEGISLATORS ENACT MORE MEANINGFUL INSURANCE PROGRAM FOR JOHN Q. PATIENT

Peter Jones, 70, falls and breaks his hip. He is taken to the hospital by an ambulance. An operation is required. While in the hospital he develops pneumonia.

Here is what social security experts believe would happen involving Jones' medical bills under the new medicare program, approved by Congress this year, if he were fully enrolled.

In that case he would have hospital insurance as well as supplementary medical insurance, a voluntary program for doctor bills.

BREAKDOWN OF BILLS

All of his bills would total $2,074.50, the experts compute. These would include fees for 19 days in the hospital, at a rate of $26.50 a day.

They would also include bills for such items as other hospital supplies and services, services of a surgeon and an assistant surgeon, an anesthesiologist, X-rays, and bills for a doctor calling at the hospital.

The experts also have computed the cost of care in a nursing home—for 14 days—and 10 visits to a therapist in the hospital as well as some other services.

Hospital insurance would cover $1,363.50 of the total bill. The biggest items would be $503.50 for room and board in the hospital—and $556 for other hospital supplies and services.

Supplemental insurance under the legislation, they say, would cover $492 of the bill. The big item here would be a surgeon's fee of $320.

The patient himself—Peter Jones—would have to pay $219 out of his own pocket.

ANOTHER EXAMPLE

In another theoretical example the experts computed what might happen to an elderly woman who required two operations for cancer of the upper gastrointestinal tract. She also would have the supplemental insurance program.

They computed that the two programs would cover $5,421 out of total bills of $6,688. That is 81 percent. The woman herself would have to pay $1,267.

It has been estimated that 19 million elderly citizens will qualify for the basic hospital insurance plan by July 1, 1966. Somewhere between 15,200,000 and 18 million are expected to qualify for the voluntary supplemental plan.

A MASSIVE BATTLE

A middle-aged man has a heart attack. The most crucial period is the first few minutes, and then the first few days.

Advanced research has shown that a machine called a "pacemaker" can play an important role in monitoring the heart's activity in the crucial first days.

It might detect a change in the rhythm of the heart that would alert a medical team to take corrective action before it was too late.

But few hospitals have pacemakers, and few have medical teams trained to work with them. Yet preliminary evidence has suggested that the mortality rate from heart attacks might be lowered by 15 percent if both were commonly available.

A plan to start regional medical programs designed to provide this kind of highly specialized facility—as well as many other kinds—is included in the Great Society program.

Although original plans have been modified, 25 regional programs are expected to be in operation around the country in 3 years.

Others will concentrate on providing the latest techniques for treating cancer and strokes, which with heart attacks, are the Nation's most common killers.

The idea is to provide the latest in medical knowledge and research, along with training for local doctors, close to where people live.

"SPECIAL" CHILDREN

Johnny Smith, 7, may be able to learn to hear again.

He comes from a slum family and has never known a doctor. Last year he started the first grade and was a slow learner. Teachers had him examined. They found the reason for his problem; defective hearing.

His parents were told, but they couldn't afford a doctor and didn't know how important the hearing problem could be. Johnny got further and further behind. Soon he showed signs of becoming a problem child.

One of the social security amendments adopted this year is for children like Johnny—1 of 1,500,000 with hearing problems.

A special health project could pay the bills for corrective surgery, outpatient care in a hospital or clinic, even a hearing aid if necessary.

Linda Jones, 5, might also get help. She is blind in her right eye—with a defect sometimes called lazy eye.

It could have been prevented, but now it is too late. She can, however, be taught to adjust to her handicap.

CLOSE SCRUTINY

Your child may become a problem in school—fight his teachers and cause trouble among his classmates. Or, your wife or husband may become depressed. A man becomes overly nervous from his work. A woman has problems adjusting to changes of life.

A national network of mental health centers, first proposed under the Kennedy administration, appears close to final approval.

You would be able to go to a center in your community and seek diagnosis of a mental problem and perhaps short-term hospitalization.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Sept. 25, 1965]

THE GREAT SOCIETY

President Johnson first described his vision of a Great Society, and first used the term, in a speech on May 22, 1965, at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor.

Though few recognized it at the time, the speech proved to be the cornerstone of much that was to come. Here are some of the key phrases from that speech:

"In your time we have the opportunity to move not only toward the rich society and the powerful society but upward to the Great Society.

"The Great Society rests on abundance and liberty for all. It demands an end to poverty and racial injustice, to which we are totally committed in our time. But that is just the beginning.

"The Great Society is a place where every child can find knowledge to enrich his mind and to enlarge his talents. It is a place where leisure is a welcome chance to build and reflect, not a feared cause of boredom and restlessness.

"It is a place where the city of man serves not only the needs of the body and the demands of commerce, but the desire for beauty and the hunger for community.

"It is a place where man can renew contact with nature. It is a place which honors creation for its own sake and for what it adds to the understanding of the race. It is a place where men are more concerned with the quality of their goals than the quantity of their goods.

"But most of all the Great Society is not a safe harbor, a resting place, a final objective, a finished work. It is a challenge constantly renewed, beckoning us toward a destiny where the meaning of our lives matches the marvelous products of our labors."

[From the Chicago Daily News, Sept. 27, 1965]

A REVOLUTION IN THE MAKING—LET'S TOUR GREAT SOCIETY'S FUTURE CITY

(By Charles Nicodemus and James McCarthy)

BIG CITY, U.S.A.—Come tour with us through the American city of the Great Society—compliments of the prodigious 89th Congress.

Come see a revolution in the making—blight replaced by flowered beauty; the cries of crime quieted; dark, fouled air turned clear and fresh; racial minorities flexing new political muscles, and young eyes, once squinting from poverty, now brushed wide with their first glimmering of knowledge and hope.

But it might be best to wear a pair of doubt-tinted glasses on this tour.

Laws to build this kind of city have been passed—are on the books. None can say for sure that they will all work out according to plan.

But it's a city that Lyndon Johnson is devoting his boundless energy to molding—marshaling all his political craft and the vast resources of the Federal Government.

It is the President's obsession, his dream. Regardless of his ultimate success or failure, parts of that vision are already near reality, because the 89th Congress, now in its final legislative spasms, has been all-productive.

Come what may tomorrow, there will now be revolutionary new rent subsidies for the poor; grassy parks in place of crumbling warehouses; Negroes crowding up to ballot boxes, and scenic highways empty of billboards.

There will be public housing families living in scattered, rented apartments—away from the oppression of giant projects; there will be new, immigrant faces shining among families long separated but now united; there will be federally financed dormitories at those new colleges springing up in cities; pioneering neighborhood centers for health and recreation, new water and sewer systems.

Let's trek through a city of 250,000—it could be any one of dozens—girdled by burgeoning suburbs rich and poor, astride an interstate river.

Driving in through one lower middleclass suburban area, we pass a new sewage treatment plant, center of the village's new sewer system.

It was built with a new 50–50 community facilities grant—a $200-million-a-year program.

Uncle Sam makes sure the effluent it pipes into the river is nonpollutant. That is part of the Federal drive to clean up interstate waterways, for better drinking, more recreation.

Notice that open tract on the left we're passing now, just at the city limits. A developer swung the maximum $10 million low-cost Federal loan, to help finance a new approved subdivision.

He is going to bring in middle-income housing—to help break up the inner city ghettos.

That's Sam Kalb's bungalow over there, just beyond it. Sam lost his job when an Army base closed. So the FHA has given him up to a year's grace on his mortgage payments.

And notice his brother Joe's house down the block. The Defense Department bought that house from Joe when he got transferred after the shutdown, and couldn't sell it for a fair price. The FHA will sell it, now.

See that new low-rise and garden apartment complex back there? It was specially built to qualify for rent-subsidy tenants.

The Government's set to furnish $150 million in the next 4 years to help pay rent in decent housing for some 300,000 families of the poor.

One is Roger Brown, a 37-year-old shipping clerk with two children. He earns $3,840 a year—about $75 a week. His apartment rent in the project runs $90 a month, but he only pays $75—one quarter of his salary.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency makes up the rest: $15 a month.

As Roger's salary goes up, Uncle Sam's contribution will go down. But unlike a public housing family with a rising income, he can stay there as long as he wants.

Roger got into this project because he lived in a rat-ridden tenement. He'd also have been eligible if he'd been physically handicapped; recently ousted by some Federal project, elderly, or the victim of a hurricane, flood, or some other natural disaster.

Of course, his income couldn't top the maximum earnings permitted for public housing residents in his area—$4,600 in Chicago, for example.

That older 80-unit down the block had 12 vacancies.

The local public housing people have leased eight of them and used them for public housing families. Others like that are scattered all over the city. They are mixed right in with rich and poor, black and white, old and young.

That old high-rise apartment two blocks down was bought outright by the housing authority. It is using it for 50 more families. It's a year-old program, but new laws changed the amortization formula to make purchases like that more attractive.

Both programs have cut the long waiting lists for public housing vacancies.

Now we're about a mile from downtown. This is an urban renewal area, where blight has gotten so bad it's taking civic surgery to cut it away.

Those new public housing units you see going up over there—they're a bit roomier and better built than the older ones. The Government has boosted the maximum per unit cost permitted from $2,000 to $2,400. And they've expanded the program to put up 60,000 units a year.

That's Sam Caldwell's house over there, a garbage truck worker. Makes less than $3,000 a year. He's fixing up his porch, putting on new windows, doing plumbing work on the side.

His place was substandard. But he got a $1,500 Federal grant to bring it up to snuff. It's cheaper, than condemning the land, moving Sam out and putting up another building.

Besides, it helps save the neighborhood—the friendships, the security, the traditions, the cohesion that go with it.

Those men in business suits with flashlights, poking around behind Sam's house? A city health inspection team.

Ten percent of the $2.9 billion earmarked for urban renewal grants has to go to finance code enforcement projects like that—crackdowns on zoning, health, and building codes.

They are all part of a "save it, don't raze it," approach.

Sam's neighbor, in that two-story stucco, earns too much to get an outright grant. So he got a low-interest rehabilitation loan for his place. They just cut the interest rate to 3 percent.

Down a few blocks in the adjoining section, outside the urban renewal area, you'll find more inspection teams. They're financed by a code enforcement grant for "deteriorating areas."

They want to nip blight in that part of town before it gets to the renewal stage.

Across the street there, that's one of those new neighborhood health and recreation centers—put up with a 50-50 community facilities grant. They're new.

The Government's got an antipoverty office in there—a community action program.

There are family guidance counselors upstairs, a job placement setup, and birth control information. Downstairs, a prenatal care station and a medical-dental inspection clinic. They've got a gym, rumpus room, and a Project Head Start classroom for teaching preschoolers in the basement.

There are already 1,063 CAP's revving up across the country—mostly in rundown areas like this, no two of them alike. That's a $196,368,862 gamble by the Government that you can help the poor earn and learn with a big dose of cash and patience.

There used to be an old, falling-down warehouse where the center is now. City razed it with a grant for destroying unsafe structures.

That little park next door used to be an auto junkyard.

The city got a 50-percent grant to buy it, clear it, put in grass, sidewalks, benches and lights.

It was the first time that kind of Federal "open space" money has been available to buy built-up property like that. It used to be just for vacant land for parks, like they've been buying around the edge of the city.

And how about the parkway down the middle of that old avenue they're widening?

Uncle Sam helped with all those parkway trees—and that new kind of street lighting. Urban beautification money did it—just like all the new trees and flowers they're putting out in that bigger park up ahead.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Sept. 28, 1965]

Jobs, Parks—Even Cleaner Air and Water—Great Society Blueprint: Something for Everybody

(By Charles Nicodemus and James McCartney)

Washington.—In Shreveport, La., the father of a child taking part in an antipoverty project complained that his son had learned to eat off a table "with spoons and forks."

He told the project director the child was no longer content to sit on the floor and eat with his hands "like the rest of the family."

The child in Shreveport is only one of millions of Americans whose lives are being rebuilt as a part of President Johnson's Great Society program.

The child was taking part in an antipoverty campaign called Project Head Start.

But the Great Society program, as enacted in large part by the 89th Congress, is more than an attack on poverty.

It is also designed to be an attack on some of the problems of affluence—like surpluses of leisure, with no place to go, or too many autos.

The Great Society is interested in more than people's pocketbooks. It is also interested in their pleasures. In all its vastness, it is touching lives and changing them, and often changing the countryside as well.

It is providing funds to build training camps for the jobless as well as camping grounds for the middle class; industrial plants for depressed areas as well as floral plantings for bleak avenues.

There is a strong emphasis on building parks, tearing down billboards, saving lakes for boating and swimming, and even improving the quality of the air we breathe.

In Newark, N.J., LaFayette M. Gaines, Jr., quit high school—thinking life would be easy. But he found it tough and competitive, with poor pay for the uneducated.

Last February he enrolled in one of the Great Society's neighborhood Youth Corps programs and began training to be a fireman's trainee in a boiler room. Recently he was offered a job by the Borden Milk Co. at $156 a week.

Along the Atlantic coastline in Maryland and Virginia, for 33 miles, work is underway on a national park on Assateague Island.

Before long a family from Pennsylvania or Maryland, Virginia or North Carolina, will be able to drive to the park in less than a day.

It was the last undeveloped coastline between Massachusetts and North Carolina and it lies within a day's drive of a fifth of the Nation's population—40 million people. The park has been sought for 30 years. A bill to create it was passed this year.

In West Virginia, in the heart of the 11-State region called Appalachia, a young man is planning to go to a new vocational school to learn a trade.

Millions have been made available to build vocational schools—in an area where the unemployment rate runs 50 percent higher than in the rest of the country.

In southern Illinois, Oklahoma, in Arkansas—in areas bypassed in the development of an affluent society—new boards are meeting, new committees are forming, new blueprints are being drawn to plan economic revival.

A laborer hopes to have a new job in a new plant as a result. So do many of his neighbors.

There are 27 million Americans living in areas that have been called distressed—and now have new hope.

Elsewhere, in the country, billboards will come down, junkyards will be screened—and autos will begin to carry devices to purify their exhausts.

In summary, these are some of the ways the $10 billion to $15 billion Great Society program is touching lives across the land.

As much as any single program, the antipoverty drive has been a keystone. It was fully funded for the first time this year with appropriations doubled.

Its operations already reach into every facet of the problems in American life.

In Edcouch, Tex., Jose Rangel, 20, quit school in the seventh grade. He survived by doing odd jobs at vegetable farms and packing plants.

He joined the poverty program's Jobs Corps, stayed in for 6 months, and is now making $2.50 an hour as a welder with the Freuhauf Trailer Co. in Chicago.

The Job Corps hopes to lift boys and girls from their home environment, often desperately poor, and teach them how to get and hold jobs.

By January 1, 95 centers will be set up to train 35,000 youths. Eighty of them will be small conservation camps. Eight will be urban centers and seven will be centers for girls.

In Fredonia, Ky., Edward Gill, 44, a father of nine, borrowed $2,500 that was offered as part of a rural antipoverty program.

He bought livestock and equipment for his farm. He used the rest of the loan to buy tools for a farm equipment repair shop he opened and that is now making money.

In Washington, D.C., Fate Lucas, a paraplegic, applied for a small business loan. He got $8,000 and used it to expand his "notions" sales from $5-a-day gross into a $100-a-day operation housed in a corner store.

Project Head Start is widely considered to be the most spectacularly successful of all the antipoverty programs.

Its basic objective at the beginning was to help 100,000 preschool children who were culturally deprived by conditions in the slums.

But the goal has mushroomed, along with the program. Now plans are to enroll 1 million children of poverty within the next 2 years.

The largest share of the money going into the antipoverty programs is going into what are called community action programs developed on the local level.

Nellie Carol, 33, a mother of six, gets family planning counseling in Corpus Christi, Tex.

Carl Schurzle, who has been unemployed for 9 months, is studying woodworking in a job placement program in New Haven, Conn.

Campbell Jones, 42, is taking a nighttime remedial reading course in Baltimore.

In Appalachia, the battle to solve problems of poverty aren't part of the formal antipoverty program—they're part of the Appalachia program, with its own special financing.

There the basic problem is to create jobs—and the hope is that opening up the region with new roads will bring in new industries that will create new jobs.

In all, $840 million has been provided to build 1,000 miles of local access roads and 2,350 miles of what are called development roads.

But the program also includes plans for better health facilities, help to farmers and new fish and wildlife projects.

Beyond problems of jobs and income are problems common to all, rich or poor—the quality of the water and the air, the beauty of the countryside.

Thus far the Great Society programs in these areas have represented beginnings rather than major breakthroughs.

You may expect to have cleaner water in lakes and rivers under interstate control, as a result of a pollution control bill.

Provisions have been made to establish Federal standards of cleanliness and stronger enforcement procedures.

But no one believes that this year's legislation is enough to solve the Nation's water pollution problems.

In air pollution, new regulations require new autos to be equipped with mechanisms to limit the amount of pollutants permissible. Used cars are not affected.

In the years to come, as more and more new cars come onto the highways, air should be cleaner—at least for a few years.

But by 1980 the number of new cars is expected to bring the country back to the point in air pollution from autos where it is now.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Sept. 29, 1965]

And Who Will Carry the Financial Burden

(By James McCartney)

Washington.—Who pays for the Great Society?

How is it that the Government can conceive and execute a program estimated to cost between $10 and $15 billion a year—and not hike taxes?

Let there be no question about it. You are paying for the Great Society, or will pay for it—as taxpayers pay for all government.

But top Johnson administration economists explain that you're not paying for it in quite the same way as you may have paid for Government spending programs in the past.

In a sense, according to Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, you're paying for the Great Society program in tax cuts that you're not getting.

Ackley explains it, in laymen's terms, in this way:

President Johnson has been able to present his Great Society program—and a program to finance it—largely because the economy has been in a state of vigorous expansion.

"If we didn't have a vigorously expanding economy," he says, "we would find it difficult to do all the things we are doing.

"It is the expansion that has made it possible to think of these things."

In general terms. Ackley says, the Nation's total economic output—its gross national product—now seems to be growing, roughly, at a rate of $30 to $40 billion a year.

"In a sense," says Ackley, "we're taking a quarter of that growth and putting it into the Great Society program."

If it wasn't put into this program it would obviously be available for other things, he says.

"In the absence of the program, you could conceivably have a tax cut for the same amount."

The goose that is laying the golden egg, however, in the eyes of Ackley and other administration economists, is unquestionably the growing economy.

While not pretending to understand all of the factors that have gone into making it so vigorous, administration economists clearly feel that what they call "progressive economic" policies of the Kennedy-Johnson years have been a key. They cite income and excise tax cuts as examples.

In essence, they believe that "progressive" thinking in economics, common in academic circles for many years, has finally found its way into Government and is influencing Government policy.

It is sometimes called the "new economics."

"The new economics of fiscal policy," Ackley has said, "insists that the great power of the Federal Government to effect total demand can and should be consciously used.

"It should be used deliberately to keep the gross national product growing steadily, at a level close to our full potential output, rather than used randomly and hence often in a destabilizing way."

Ackley believes it is possible, for the Nation to continue to have substantial increases in the budget—and to enjoy tax cuts—at least up until 1970.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Sept. 29, 1965]

The Great Society, From Cradle to Grave—Saga of "Federal Man" and His Lifetime U.S. Benefits

(By Charles Nicodemus)

WASHINGTON.—Ever wonder just how much Uncle Sam could help you out in life if you both really tried?

Here's one answer in the fictional birth-to-death saga of a gent we'll call Simon Poor. He is what we might label a Federal man. He gets U.S. aid whenever he can.

From his cradle to the tomb, he's entwined with his National Government.

That broadening Federal role in our lives was accelerated significantly this year by the 89th Congress and its spate of Great Society legislation.

Federal man not only can get such things as counseling on subjects from business to brides, aid for his children's education, or help with his water's chlorination. He can also be housed and dehoused; insured and inured; medicated, census-rated, smoke-abated and integrated.

We start at city general hospital. Simon's mother to be has just entered the hospital largely built with Hill-Burton Federal grants. That nurse pushing her wheelchair toward the maternity ward was trained under a federally supported program.

The doctor who thwacks Simon's backside at birth has federally financed degrees.

Simon's mother, a charity patient, had used the hospital's federally financed maternal and child welfare clinic since the third month of pregnancy. She'll be back there for postnatal care, too.

From the moment her baby breathes his first, medical research financed in bulk by Uncle Sam, starts fighting to keep him alive.

That vital PKU test, for instance, given shortly after birth, discloses that chemical imbalances in the baby's system might render him retarded. Federal research perfected the test—and the diet that can now correct the deficiency.

So starts Simon's life.

Simon's father dies in an industrial accident a short time later, and social security, aid to the dependent children, and food stamp programs support the family.

The next year, the wrecker's swinging ball razes Simon's tenement, as urban renewal bites into his slum.

Pocketing a Federal relocation payment, Simon and mother move to an FHA-financed project in the new rent-subsidy program.

For a third birthday present, Simon's mother tells him about the Federal antipoverty program.

Soon, Simon is parked at a community action program day-care center in a federally financed neighborhood health and recreation center while his mother soaks up:

Home management counseling, on how to cook better food for Simon, and keep herself and her house presentable.

Training for a job as a practical nurse, through an antipoverty work experience program.

Uncle Sam's present on Simon's fourth birthday is the first of a long line of educational benefits that Simon may savor for some 20 years.

As a starter, he is brought up to the level of his more privileged peers in the antipoverty campaign's Project Head Start.

Then there are preschool medical and dental checkups at that neighborhood center. His cavities are filled, his lisp corrected and he gets new shoes for the walk to school.

When he trots into kindergarten the following year, it's in a new school wing built with federally impacted aid funds. And from there on, the benefits fly:

There's teaching help from the Teacher
 Corps,
School lunch programs, milk and more:
Movies, maps and globes galore,
Library books as ne'er before;
Counselors, psychiatrists,
Nurses and podiatrists.
Remedial reading, guidance tests,
To see what course of study's best;
Research work and language lab.
Picking up the growing tab:
The newest Federal school aid bill,
One billion-two, put in the till.

After 8 more years in elementary school, it becomes obvious to Simon that somebody up there likes him—"up there" being in Washington, D.C.

He finds high school more of the same, with vocational training; counseling to back his will to stick in school; science equipment and mental health screening.

As always, there is an antipoverty program to help out: a part-time job with the Neighborhood Youth Corps, sprucing up local parks.

Come graduation, Simon hops one rung up the antipoverty ladder: He enlists for a 2-year stint at a Job Corps camp where he learns to handle heavy construction equipment.

That takes him to age 20, when Uncle Sam—for a change—says: "Ask not what your country can do for you but what you can do for your country." At this point he is drafted.

In 2 years, Simon Poor emerges with corporal's stripes and another lien on the Federal Treasury: veterans' benefits.

Thanks to some Army extension courses, Simon thinks he is now ready to tackle college.

A federally aided community college gets him the first year. Then he enrolls at State U, where he finds a student union, dormitory, library, observatory, labs and classrooms and cafe, all financed by the United States.

As for tuition and expenses, there is help to be had from the GI bill; low-interest loans under the National Defense Education Act, a Federal scholarship—which he can not quite swing—and another antipoverty program, a summer job under college work-study.

But he becomes a college dropout and a married man.

From his neighborhood center, he then gets counseling on courtship, marriage, and birth control.

The latter, however, proves deficient, because Simon is soon writing for that ever-popular Federal pamphlet: "Raising Your Child."

Lacking a job, Simon Poor heads for the land of opportunity: Appalachia. He figures any place Uncle Sam is spending $1 billion extra a year cannot be all bad.

There, with a new company set up under the Regional Development Act, he lands a job as a heavy equipment operator, helping build the millions of dollars worth of federally aided roads mapped out in the Appalachia program.

Before too long:

His local bank fails. But why worry? There is Federal deposit insurance.

His union president runs off with the local's treasury—but he is bonded under Federal law.

A tornado hits his rented house. But it is fixed up fast with a Federal disaster loan.

Then, trouble hits.

Simon's bulldozer runs over his foot, necessitating amputation. Good-by, job. But Simon's still cheery:

After all, there's always workman's compensation; unemployment compensation; Federal rehabilitation; treatment by VA, and help from the Manpower Development and Training Act, which Simon uses to become an electrician.

Soon, he's working as a civilian electrician at a nearby Army base.

He buys a home with a VA loan, and gets another from FHA to expand it.

The home's on a new subdivision, financed by the maximum HHFA $10 million loan. And it's in a new suburb that has just built a sewer and water system with a community facilities grant.

This idyll is interrupted by the Secretary of Defense, who orders the Army base closed. This leaves Simon with no job, no mortgage payments, and a heart attack. At this, his wife has a nervous breakdown.

But all's well.

For him, there's the regional center on heart disease, cancer and stroke. For her, there's the community mental health clinic.

And for the mortgages, there's a 1-year grace period if you're tossed out of work by a base shutdown.

With time growing short now. Simon presses on to leave no Federal benefit unsampled.

He retires and collects social security.

He vacations in national parks; breathes less polluted air; swims in depolluted water; drives in cars with seat belts and exhaust-fume suppressors along billboard-free highways constructed with Federal funds; sees plays and paintings sponsored by the Federal Arts Commission.

His fatal mistake was to watch night TV
Hoping on hope that the old FCC
Had finally given the people a break.
But what he saw was more
Than weak hearts can take.

His final expenses are paid by the VA, hers mostly by medicare.

Then both are buried in Federal land:
Arlington Cemetery, near at hand
To Washington, D.C., their capital where
There's always perpetual care.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Sept. 30, 1965]

Has Government Gone Too Far, Too Fast?—What Critics Say About the Great Society

(By Charles Nicodemus and James McCartney)

WASHINGTON.—Critics of President Johnson's Great Society say it is costing too much—and isn't worth the price.

They say it is leading the country on the pathway to inflation—and perhaps to ruin.

They say it is concentrating authority in the Federal Government and destroying local government and initiative.

They are deeply disturbed by potential problems in "maladministration" of the vast program.

But they are even more disturbed by the eventual cost—which they say may run many billions more than the Johnson administration has so much as hinted.

These are just some of the criticisms of the vast Great Society program approved by Congress over the last 8½ months.

If there is a single thread to the worries of most critics, it is that the Government has gone too far—too fast.

This fear has been phrased eloquently by Senator Minority Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, who said:

"I suppose everybody who went to grade school must have heard the stories of Chicken Little and about the sky falling in. That is what bothers me.

"We have been racing these programs through the Senate and through Congress, and the question is: When does the sky fall in?"

Former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, considered a leading Republican presidential possibility for 1968 by the pollsters, has said much the same thing in a different way. Said Nixon:

"The very things Johnson is being praised so highly for now are going to become his failures in time.

"The programs he is pushing hold out a lot of promises, but when they are not fulfilled—and a great many of them won't be—the reaction will set in."

Nixon predicted flatly that President Johnson's domestic program—the Great Society program—will cost him the election in 1968.

The most common fear of the Great Society program expressed in Republican literature and speeches is the fear of inflation.

"Inflation has begun to roll," said the former GOP national chairman, Senator Thruston B. Morton, of Kentucky.

"It already is seen in rising living costs which shrink wages and pensions. Retired persons dependent upon their social security benefits have seen the recent increases in their pensions wiped out before the bill granting them was signed.

"Tax cuts designed to help the middle-to-lower income brackets have been swallowed and bigger tax burdens are on the way."

In speech after speech other Republican orators are sounding the same theme. The Republican National Committee has put out a brochure entitled "Those Startling Food Prices."

It contains a chart that lists the cost of frying chickens as having risen 56 percent in the last year; porterhouse steaks, 56.8 percent; bacon, 114 percent; chuck roast, 73 percent; pork chop, 62 percent, and round steak, 70 percent.

"The sad truth is that those who suffer most from inflation are people in the low-income brackets," the brochure says.

"Ironically, at the very time the Johnson administration is pursuing its much-advertised war on poverty, it also is generating inflation pressures which—in the long run—may take far more from the poor man than they will ever receive."

Senator Jack Miller, Republican, of Iowa, cited figures recently in an attempt to show that many pensioners have less buying power now than they had in 1958 and 1954—in spite of the Great Society's 7 percent increase in social security benefits.

He said a person who has paid into the social security fund since 1940 on an annual salary base of $3,000 has $9.90 less purchasing power with the increased benefits than would have been provided by the lower pensions of 1954.

The loss in purchasing power compared with 1958, he said, is $9.19.

Republicans are particularly incensed at the cost of the Great Society program—which they say the administration has never publicly acknowledged.

A U.S. Chamber of Commerce statistician has computed that the first year cost of 25 items in the Great Society program will be $13.5 billion.

The price will continue to go up year by year, however, the statistician says, and the cumulative price in the next several years—as best it can be computed—will be about $75 billion.

One problem the statisticians have is that no one is quite sure what bills should be included in computing the cost of the Great Society.

Senate Republicans have included 50 items in computations they have made and reported that the cost of the program in the next several years will be $112 billion.

"Federal spending has been rising at an unprecedented rate," says Senator Milton R. Young, Republican, of North Dakota. "This increased spending includes funds for a broad range of Great Society programs, many of which are going to increase in cost year by year.

"The end result of this fiscal policy must be of deep concern to everyone. If expenditures continue to soar, we can expect only one of two results in the future—the restoration of any old taxes and perhaps even some new ones, or a badly unbalanced budget with inevitable runaway inflation."

Another issue that concerns many critics—even one leading liberal Democrat—is the way the Johnson administration has pushed the program through Congress.

The liberal Democrat is Representative Edith Green of Oregon, who said after passage of the administration's education bill:

"Today it seems to me we have in the House a determined effort to silence those who are in disagreement."

Representative Charles Goodell, Republican, of New York, said the education bill should be renamed as "the Railroad Act of 1965"—because it was railroaded through the House.

He said that of 29 Republican amendments to the bill only 4 were debated—for 5 minutes each—and 14 were given no debate.

"No opportunity was given to explain them," Goodell said.

Republicans say many of their efforts to change Great Society proposals in both the House and the Senate have aimed essentially at preventing further centralization of power in Washington.

They lost almost every time—including a campaign to permit Governors to veto poverty projects in their States. They also lost on drives to permit States, rather than the Federal Government, to set standards for water pollution and billboards.

One of the phenomena of the last 8½ months has been the absence of deep-searching criticism that such a program probably should have in a democratic society.

No leading Republic personality has taken it upon himself to give a single speech in which he has analyzed the Great Society program as a whole.

Major party figures, like former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Nixon, 1964 presidential aspirant Barry Goldwater, Gov. George Romney of Michigan, and Gov. William Scranton of Pennsylvania, have refrained from attempts to take on this job.

Some of them have had a disparaging comment or two about the Great Society, but none has sought to make a detailed criticism.

The Republican National Committee has also shied away from this job, as have the new GOP leaders in the House—and the old Republican leaders in the Senate.

One of the results has often been a free ride—essentially—for much of the Great Society program. Often largely unknown Congressmen and Senators have had to carry the ball for the opposition in the House and Senate.

They have attacked specific programs—while refraining from an overall attack on the Great Society concept in all its sweeping scope.

Thus, some of the attacks on specific programs have been more biting and detailed than attacks on the Great Society program as a whole. No better example can be furnished than the attacks on the antipoverty program.

This program has proven to be one of the most popular targets of all for Republican orators and critics.

A House GOP leader, Representative Albert Quie of Minnesota, has called the antipoverty program an "administrative mess" and said: "They are not helping the poor."

Representative Peter Frelinghuysen Jr. of New Jersey, the head of a GOP study task force, says it has been "an administrative shambles * * * a war without strategy, waged mostly by generals."

Senator Dirksen, famed as an orator, reserved for the antipoverty bill one of his classic performances. He gave a little dance on the Senate floor to ridicule a program teaching choreography.

In his impassioned closing remarks he said the program was "the very acme of waste and extravagance, and unorganization and disorganization * * * colossal disgrace, and in some cases, an absolute fraud upon the taxpayers of this country."

AND OTHER COMMENTS

Washington.—Here is what some of the major critics of President Johnson's Great Society have said:

Barry Goldwater, 1964 Republican presidential candidate: "There are two distinguishing marks of the so-called Great Society. First, it preaches a free-ticket philosophy in which recipients of Federal handouts are urged to believe that they are getting something for nothing. Second, its high-sounding programs are not so much designed to accomplish results as they are designed to capture results at the polls."

William F. Buckley, Jr., conservative editor of National Review: "The quality of life has heretofore depended on the quality of the human beings who gave tone to that life, and they were its priests and poets, not its bureaucrats."

Gov. George Romney, of Michigan: "The collection of programs which are called the Great Society, by themselves, can never reach their lofty goals. They are based on a partial and inadequate conception of the society they seek to build, and of the forces that must do the building."

Gov. William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania: "The Democratic Party has not moved on from the sterile approaches which for 30 years have failed to solve our pressing national problems."

Representative Gerald Ford, House Republican leader from Michigan: "There appears to be no certainy in the Great Society except debt and taxes."

[From the Chicago Daily News, Oct. 1, 1965]

JOHNSON'S GREAT SOCIETY TRYING TO MERIT THE NAME

(By Peter Lisagor)

Washington.—The Great Society can be praised or deprecated with almost equal facility because its legislative mandate embraces, in a sense, history that hasn't happened yet.

It is so tentative and vaguely defined in practical terms that it manages in one swoop to magnify the fears of its critics and the hopes of its supporters.

None can vouchsafe at this stage whether it is welfarism rampant or a progressive approach to preserve the dignity and individuality of the American people in a society transformed by population growth, technology and changing attitudes.

Any generality about it seems equally assailable.

Not even its progenitors inside the administration have a clear view of how a great deal of the legislation passed by the 89th Congress will translate into working programs.

Chicago Daily News Reporters James McCartney and Charles Nicodemus talked with scores of key Government officials in a painstaking effort to sort out the specifics contained in the mass of new measures that poured from this Congress.

They found no central sources to help them and were compelled to piece together a meaningful mosaic out of scrambled bits of legislation. They were thus not surprised when they were told by many of those they interviewed, "We'll be interested to see how you come out."

One of the chief theoreticians of the Great Society, Richard N. Goodwin, a former Presidential speechwriter now enjoying the contemplative life at Wesleyan College in Middletown, Conn., has said that it is not "a grand scheme or master plan." That, in fact, may be its main defect.

Planning may have been a sinful concept in New Deal days. But today even big business has accepted the necessity of avoiding the slides, turns, and pitfalls of unplanned economic activity. So Goodwin may have exposed a flaw in the administration program that will make it vulnerable to a well-executed, and planned, Republican siege.

Thus far, the Republicans have failed to mount an effective opposition to either the theory or the design of the Great Society. They have been unable to articulate a persuasive case against its objectives.

They have chosen to fight it piecemeal, and the lines on which they have stood often have followed the old demarcation of welfarism versus individualism, big central government versus local control.

If the public opinion polls mean anything, the people seem unimpressed by arguments that had emotional impact before the society acquired such a high degree of affluence.

Some critics of the program confidently believe the case against it will make itself, so to speak, that its greatest barrier may be the bureaucracy it promotes. It can, in this judgment, only strangle in the red tape it will generate.

It is true that many of its features require new Federal-State and Federal-city relationships, on which the bureaucracy feeds. But President Johnson, whose memory of the makeshift agencies of the depression years remains vivid, has already begun to warn his lieutenants against this kind of Federal undergrowth.

Despite its propaganda output, the glowing rhetoric that accompanies and distends each measure as the President lays his signature to it, there is little new in the entire package. It swept the shelves clean of remnants from the New Deal and a few fresh articles from the New Frontier.

Its innovations are scarce—rent subsidies for low-income families, educational clinics to modernize curriculums and stimulate new teaching techniques, health research.

The contention that it is a campaign to improve "the quality of our lives" is unsubstantiated. The arts and humanities have been boosted, it is true, and the countryside may be somewhat beautified in the war on litterbugs.

But the big nonmilitary money will continue to be spent on familiar programs—space, social security, housing, Federal pay raises, vocational rehabilitation. The aid-to-education outlays will be vastly greater, as will spending for medicare, two programs that went on the books for the first time in a major way but cut no new furrows.

Whatever else the Great Society might do to rectify what Goodwin calls "the social failures," it has yet to excite or capture the fancy and enthusiasm of many Americans, particularly the students and intellectuals.

This absence of esprit troubles administration officials.

They realize students seem to prefer dissent to consent and tend to equate the President's cherished concentration with conformity and conventionalism.

Improvement in housing conditions and educational facilities, health, and hospital assistance to the elderly, antipoverty measures, and all the other laws appear to these affluent and jaded citizens as the necessary works perhaps of an ordinary society, but not a great one.

As the Great Society unfolds, it conceivably may offer everything but inspiration and challenge. It is not improbable these will be the next goals of the Johnson administration if current programs work out satisfactorily.

DEMONSTRATION PROTESTS AGAINST VIETNAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, demonstrations protesting U.S. participation in the war in Vietnam have today been launched in various areas throughout the country for continuance in a planned pattern throughout the weekend.

In Oakland, Calif., the members of the Vietnam Day Committee—the organization spawned, in part, by the radical student element at the University of California, at Berkeley, have announced their intentions of undertaking general operations to halt troop movements at the U.S. Army Terminal at Oakland, possibly invading the docks in massive numbers, using small boats for encirclement, blocking the railway tracks, and dropping leaflets by air. A sleep-in has been threatened, and a 7½-mile torchlight parade has been scheduled for Saturday evening—despite refusal of a police permit for such activity—as reported by the press.

Hearing of these well-organized, highly publicized plans will remind American citizens of past events at the Oakland Army terminal when demonstrators attempted to actually physically haul troops away from military transports departing for Asia, and when demonstrators stood on railway tracks in the area to prevent train movements.

Affiliated with this radical group—the Vietnam Day Committee—in "invasion" plans on the Oakland Terminal, again according to reliable press reports, are elements of the Dubois Clubs—named for the former Negro educator turned Communist who later died in Ghana after reportedly renouncing communism—members of the Harry Bridges' Longshoremen Union, and neighborhood civil rights groups, possibly totaling 5,000 in all.

Another demonstration is planned for New York City on Saturday, October 16, by an ad hoc committee, and it is stated that this demonstration will include 15,000 marchers down Fifth Avenue with a rally to follow in Central Park.

In Baltimore, Md., also on Saturday, 200 students and faculty members of Johns Hopkins University, Morgan State College, and Goucher College will picket Secretary of State Dean Rusk when he speaks at Johns Hopkins University. Additionally, if plans materialize as have been announced, here in Washington, D.C., an organization headed by the so-called Washington Area Committee to End War in Vietnam will picket the Army Recruiting Station at Seventh and E Streets NW., in the afternoon of October 16.

These are but some of 100 American cities and college campuses which may expect to witness demonstrations this weekend, these masterminders confidently state.

Mr. President, I am appalled at the manner in which students and citizens of the United States are apparently being led or duped by persons whose plans and actions are not only hostile to the better interests of our Nation but are also deliberately aimed toward a goal that smacks of anarchy. Extremists and agitators are combining in areas throughout the country to discredit the foreign policy of our Nation and to mock the efforts of those worthy American citizens serving under enemy fire in support of our Nation's security.

The study by the Senate Judiciary Internal Security Subcommittee, issued just this week, makes plain the fact that control of the anti-Vietnam agitations, teach-in movements, and varied demonstrations so allied, has clearly passed from the hands of the moderate elements who may have controlled these at one time, into the hands of Communists and extremist elements who are openly sympathetic to the Vietcong and openly hostile to the United States. The firm conclusion drawn by this Senate committee from the evidence secured is that this is particularly true of the national Vietnam protest movement scheduled for today and tomorrow, October 15-16.

Those persons—students, marchers, pickets—who participate in the demonstrations this weekend should make no mistake about what they are doing. They are being used by their country's enemies to damage this Nation which nurtured them, and the watching American public will make its judgment between the merits of their actions and those of our American fighting men in Vietnam whose efforts they are dishonoring and endangering.

In my humble judgment, the actions announced for this weekend fall little short of being treasonous and will give succor, comfort, and encouragement to the Vietcong guerrillas with whom American fighting men are locked in mortal combat in the jungles, swamps, and rice paddies of Vietnam.

From the beginning, I have looked with disapproval upon those demonstrations in which the laws of States and communities were violated. I foresaw the time when every disgruntled group would take its problems into the streets. I feel that the cup "now runneth over," and the wind which was sown is now becoming the whirlwind. Communist elements which apparently have had a part, to a degree, in the demonstrations that have increasingly occurred in all areas of this country during the past 2 years, are now obviously becoming more bold; and I feel that the time has come when action must be taken to meet this threat to our Republic, to our people, and to our way of life.

I daresay that if the American marine, begrimed and weary from hacking his way through the jungles of Vietnam in seeking out guerrilla strongholds, had an opportunity to address a group of the demonstrators on Saturday, he could make explicit his revulsion of those who, under the guise of using the due processes of free speech, attempt to limit the support which he is due from those whose security he is risking his life to protect.

I ask, "In what manner is any person being helpful to an American soldier in combat in Vietnam when he, or she, attempts to interfere with the shipment of supplies and reinforcements which at any time may make the difference between life and death for him, and which are essential to the successful accomplishment of his military tasks?"

Such actions are alien to our American traditions—yet an announcement distributed by the Vietnam Day Committee openly called for supporters to "stop the troop train." Organizations such as that are a threat to the structure of our American society, and they should be fully exposed for what they really are, so that the American public may clearly understand that these protest movements, and these advocates of civil disobedience, have deeper purposes than those which they profess in cloaking their activities.

CIVIL WAR SIDELIGHT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, Civil War "buffs" will doubtlessly find the October 12, Beckley, W. Va., Post-Herald, column by the Reverend Shirley Donnelly of much merit, in view of the light which it casts on the emotional climate of the war-torn years of the War Between the States.

The Reverend Mr. Donnelly is a man of wide and versatile interests, and I have always felt fortunate to have his friendship, having once taught a Sunday morning Bible class at the Crab Orchard Baptist Church, in Crab Orchard, W. Va., with the encouragement which he, as pastor of that church, gave to me as a member of his congregation undertaking for the first time serious responsibility as a layman of the church.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article, "David S. Creigh Was Greenbrier Martyr," printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAVID S. CREIGH WAS GREENBRIER MARTYR

(By Shirley Donnelly)

Mrs. Merritt Lowry, John Merritt Waddell, and Miss Trove Kittinger—three of the grandchildren of the late O. W. Kittinger and Rachel Wright Kittinger—live at Alderson.

O. W. Kittinger was the last survivor of those who attended the military commission trial of David S. Creigh (May 1, 1809, to June 11, 1864), "the Greenbrier martyr." The father of O. W. Kittinger was George W. Kittinger. The two men, along with George L. Knapp and S. S. Hern, were permitted to attend the Creigh trial.

After Creigh was condemned to be hanged and turned over to 20 Yankee cavalrymen to march him away on foot to await his execution, Creigh told all those present goodby. The last one the 55-year-old condemned man spoke to on that occasion was O. W. Kittinger, then just a small boy.

Events which led to the trial were like this:

Creigh and his family were living in the large brick mansion a couple of miles from Lewisburg on the way to the Davis-Stuart School. It is the high, white-columned house now owned and occupied by the Boones.

At that time—the fall of 1863 when the Lynchburg campaign was about to be launched by the Federal armies—Gen. George Crook, who was in command of the 2d Infantry Division, occupied the Lewisburg area. The Federal units were planning to move on Lynchburg from the West.

On, or about, November 8, while Creigh was away from his home, a blue-uniformed man, with bridle in hand and drunk, entered the Creigh home. He began to pillage the place and insulted Creigh's daughter who was sick in bed with a fever. After flaunting some of the girl's clothing in the faces of the girl and her mother, the Yankee started to break open a trunk that was in the room.

It was at this point that Creigh returned. The Yankee drew his pistol. Mrs. Creigh grabbed the arm of the drunken soldier and thus prevented her husband's being killed as the gun discharged. Creigh caught the man by the collar and threw him out of the room.

In the upper hall they scuffled and the Yankee was shot and killed. It was charged that Creigh killed the man with a derringer pistol which he had. O. W. Kittinger always contended that the Yankee was killed as he fired his own service gun. Bullets recovered much later from the body were those of the type fired in a derringer. For the killing, Creigh was tried and hanged.

After the soldier was killed, the body was covered with straw and dropped into a dry well on the Creigh estate. There it remained until the drought of 1936 when it was examined and pictures taken of the things found among the remains. Julian Cobb of Ronceverte took the pictures, including the two derringer bullets which he later sent to me.

A slave divulged the news of the slaying to military authorities some time after the trouble occurred. This led to Creigh's arrest. Shortly before Cyrus Creigh, the oldest son of David Creigh, died, he gave the facts about the case to O. W. Kittinger.

Creigh was marched on foot to Staunton, Va., a hundred miles away. General Hunter approved the verdict of the military court and set June 10, 1864, as the date for the hanging. On that date Crigh was at Brownsburg, Rockbridge County, Va., imprisoned in a Negro slave cabin under heavy guard.

It appears that Creigh was not executed until sunrise on June 11, 1864. They hanged him at Bellview on the limb of a tree. After the sentence was carried out the body was cut down and buried in a blanket on the spot.

Six days later a coffin was secured and the body was taken to the graveyard of New Providence Church in Rockbridge County. On July 28, 1864, Creigh's remains were disinterred a second time and brought back to Lewisburg.

On July 31, a mile-long funeral cortege wound its way to the old stone church where Rev. J. C. Barr conducted the funeral service, using as his subject "The Christian Martyr." The tombstone states:

"Sacred to the memory of David Creigh. Died as a martyr in defense of his rights and in the performance of his duties as a husband and father. Born May 1, 1808, and yielded to his unjust fate June 11, 1864, near Brownsburg, Va." The grave is 30 steps east of the rear of the historic meetinghouse at Lewisburg.

O. W. Kittinger said, "I shall never forget how this good man looked when he came down to tell us all goodbye. He was very much agitated and great beads of perspiration stood out on every feature of his face. I was the last one he spoke to in Greenbrier."

SALUTE TO AMERICA'S NEWSPAPERS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the week of October 10–16 has been designated as National Newspaper Week. I wish to salute our Nation's newspapers and the great service which they render to the citizens of this free Republic.

The Williamson, W. Va., Daily News of October 11, presented an editorial in observance of this special week which I feel states, most effectively, the special worth of newspapers in our American way of life.

The editor takes cognizance of the desire of the American public for dispassionate reporting and expressions of opinions grounded in accuracy and informed with integrity and courage. I feel that this is a clear expression of the true mission of any high caliber newspaper and should at all times represent the goal of responsible news publications. To report news in a biased and slanted fashion, with facts chosen to fit into a preconceived editorial, or managerial, policy, neither serves the best interests of American citizenry nor of the newspaper fraternity itself.

A newspaper, as an instrument of the power of the press and a practitioner of the right of free speech, has the privilege to speak openly and without censorship, but it also has a responsibility to speak accurately and with integrity.

I ask unanimous consent to have the Williamson Daily News article, "Newspapers: Lights of Liberty," printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWSPAPERS: LIGHTS OF LIBERTY

Editor and Publisher Yearbook reports that as of September 30, 1964, the 1,763 daily newspapers in the United States has a combined circulation of 60,412,266.

This is the highest circulation in history and a 2.5 percent increase over 1963.

Sunday papers numbered 561 with a circulation of 48,383,076. This is also a gain over 1963, up by 11 papers and a million and a half circulation.

All of which information is apropos of observing that the week of October 10–16 is National Newspaper Week.

These figures add up to a lot of newspapers. There can never be too many of them in a free land, however, for the quality of freedom depends in great measure on the news reporting, news analysis and news editorializing performed by an unfettered and competitive press.

The figures add up to a lot of readers, too, especially when we add some 8,000 weeklies with a circulation of more than 24 million. The circulation numbers overlap, of course; they include people who subscribe to more than one paper.

On the other hand, they do not include millions of others who are not counted in the paid circulation but who see and read and are otherwise exposed to newspapers.

It is safe to say that the individual in America today who does not read at least some part of some newspaper regularly is a pretty rare bird indeed.

Whenever any newspaper, large or small, goes out of business or is shut down by a strike, it is if a light were turned off in the community it served.

No other communications medium fills so many and so varied needs of modern life—from want ads to advice columns, from society notes to vital statistics, from comics to sermons.

Not all of these are secondary to a newspaper's reason for existence—of being a newspaper. Yet in this day of almost instantaneous electronic dissemination of major news events, even this category has undergone fundamental change.

People look to their newspaper not just for headlines or spot news but the news behind the news. They want background, explanation, analysis to help them relate today's complex news to yesterday's and to enable them to understand tomorrow's news when it happens.

They want not only dispassionate reporting; they want opinion on all sides of every issue—opinion that is grounded in accuracy and informed with integrity and courage.

A newspaper is a light in its community and its country. That is why totalitarian governments, which prosper in human darkness, must gag them. That is why freedom of the press was the first to be cataloged in the Bill of Rights of the Constitution.

America has many such lights. Happily, the number is growing, despite the deaths of some and the merger of others. Each one of them contributes to the brilliance of the larger light of liberty.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, is the Senate still in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). The Senate is still in the morning hour.

Mr. MORSE. Unless there is further morning business, I ask that morning business be concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE IN CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN AREAS AFFECTED BY A MAJOR DISASTER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 9022.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives that the House concur in the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 through 10, inclusive, and 12 to the bill (H.R. 9022) entitled "An Act to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster; to eliminate inequities in the application of Public Law 815 in certain military base closings; to make uniform eligibility requirements for school districts in Public Law 874; and for other purposes."

Resolved, That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, with an amendment, as follows: On page 3, line 14 of the Senate engrossed amendments following the word "Commissioner," strike out "to whom that agency provided free public education" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "at schools for handicapped children operated or supported by that State agency."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this matter has been cleared with the majority and minority membership of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. On behalf of the committee, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11.

The motion was agreed to.

LABOR POLICIES OF THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my attention was invited a few moments ago to a speech made in the Senate on October 12, beginning at page 26705, by my good friend the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower]. The speech purports to answer the criticism that I made in the Senate on October 11 concerning the labor policies of the State of Texas and of the Governor of Texas vis-a-vis the position of the Governor of Texas on section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The Senator from Texas seems to be laboring under a misapprehension.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Will the distinguished Senator from Oregon please designate the Senator from Texas to whom he is referring?

Mr. MORSE. Let the record be perfectly clear that I am referring to the Republican Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower].

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I make that reference to the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] with the greatest respect and the utmost courtesy and good will. I find the junior Senator from Texas to be incorrect on point after point that he makes in his supposed rebuttal to my speech.

I have not had an opportunity to return to my office since reading the speech of the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower]. Next week, however, I shall reply in greater detail to his speech. I now incorporate by reference, though, every charge that I made in my speech on last Monday, in which I referred to the labor policies of the State of Texas and of its present Governor.

The junior Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] says that he thinks I am very much mistaken in regard to wages paid in textile mills in Texas. He may have a point of distinction. The mills I talked about are garment mills. To me, a garment mill is a textile mill. But apparently the junior Senator from Texas has another definition for textile mills.

I am talking about garment mills along the border, in which shocking substandard wages are being paid, but which, of course, are permissible under the right-to-work law of Texas.

Since 1947, when I led the fight in this body against the Taft-Hartley bill, and particularly called attention to the dangers of so-called right-to-work laws, I have said many times, that such laws would lead to just the kind of unsavory labor conditions that exist in garment mills in the State of Texas.

Next, my good friend from Texas [Mr. Tower] denies that trucks leave Texas every morning for Mexico, where they are loaded with Mexicans who are brought back into Texas for their daily work. He denies that Mexican workers are exploited in Texas garment mills and in other Texas industries at wages far below the legal minimum wage. Next week I shall provide my good friend from Texas with an accounting of some of the wages paid in Texas, wages as low as $12, $13, and $14 a week. If that is not exploitation, I want the junior Senator from Texas to give me his definition of "exploitation."

The low wages that are paid are so important a matter of international concern that at the interparliamentary meeting of delegates of the U.S. Congress and delegates from the Mexican Congress, held in Mexico City earlier this year, the frightful labor conditions that exist in Texas and other border States were the subject of an official discussion among the parliamentarians of the two countries.

The Mexican parliamentarians left no room for doubt. They believed that the parilamentarians from the United States—of whom I was one, and the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] was another—should come back to the United States, look into this situation, and do something about it.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, I have tried to do something about it. Our committee held an executive session some months ago, in which session we had before the committee representatives of labor, or attachés, and representatives of the U.S. Government. These representatives talked to us at some length about the very problem which I discussed the other day, which concerned the abuses that have arisen under the section 14(b) or the right-to-work provisions of the Taft-Hartley law, in terms of this exploitation by Texas of Mexicans who are brought into Texas every morning and taken out of Texas every night, and exploited during the day by Texas employers who pay them wages far below the standard wage.

Mr. President, I am very glad to join issue with my friend, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], in regard to the matter and we will let the facts speak for themselves.

I received the following telegram from H. S. "Hank" Brown, president, and Roy R. Evans, secretary-treasurer of the Texas AFL-CIO:

> Bravo. Bravo. Your statement about Connally being notorious in his attitude toward decent wages printed in the Dallas Morning News today. The industries involved primarily in the truck hauling are garment and agricultural involving from 50,000 to 100,000 Mexican aliens daily who are picked up on the U.S. side. Texans are hauled like cattle across State lines by the thousands to work in other States with the assistance of the Texas Employment Commission and the Texas Bureau of Labor Statistics. Thanks again.

Mr. President, I have been advised that a part of the truck-hauling technique is to have the trucks meet the Mexicans midway on an international bridge and load them up on the bridge, or meet them on the Texas side of the bridge and load them into the trucks, and move them to low-paying exploiting Texas plants, or move them out into the country in order to undercut the wages and the livelihood of potential American agricultural workers. In some instances, even as this telegram from the president and the secretary-treasurer of the AFL–CIO union points out, they are moved across State lines.

Many Americans, probably most Americans, have never recognized the constitutional law issue that is involved in the 14(b) issue. The jurisdiction of the Federal Government in the matter of industrial relations involving labor-management relationship stems 100 percent from the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution. Without the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution, the Federal Government would have no jurisdiction in respect to labor relations.

Mr. President, I led the fight in the Senate to defeat the unfortunate Taft-Hartley law back in 1947. If a small group of Democrats had stayed in the United States, rather than duck out to Europe, we would have sustained President Truman's veto. My understanding with President Truman was that I would hold the floor over that long weekend to give the Democrats who had fled to Europe an opportunity to come back and vote to uphold the President's hand.

We did not expect any help from the other side of the aisle. Their antilabor bias has been well known for a long time.

These Democrats did not come back, and we lost the vote to sustain the President's veto by the number of Democrats who were then in Europe. Many of my Democratic colleagues do not like to hear me say that. However, if I have not demonstrated in my 20 years in the Senate that I never let partisanship interfere with my presentation of facts, I have not demonstrated anything.

The Republicans have to assume their full share of the responsibility for this shocking antilabor law known as the Taft-Hartley law that has produced and is producing the unfortunate and unfavorable labor conditions which exist, particularly in the South. The veto was not sustained at that time primarily because of the failure of those on the Democratic side of the aisle to live up to their clear responsibilities in 1947. However, be that as it may, Congress delegated to the States, as it has the power to do, a limited authority over interstate commerce.

That limited authority is set forth in the right-to-work law. It provides that a State shall have the right to pass a law to outlaw the union shop. There is nothing illegal about a union shop in the absence of a right-to-work law. The union shop exists in 31 States. It exists in my own State.

When we outlaw the union shop, we take away from employers, as well as unions, a precious constitutional right, the right of freedom of contract under which an employer and a union can voluntarily, without any coercion—enter into an agreement in which the employer says, "For the considerations afforded by the contract, I wish to hire all the men in my plant from your union hall." That is a pretty precious freedom, the freedom of contract.

When Congress delegated congressional control over interstate commerce to this limited extent in regard to these right-to-work laws, it followed a course of action of discriminating, in my judgment, against those who want to exercise the precious right of freedom of contract.

I opposed such action then and I oppose it now because it has led to many abuses. Because of the passage of the right-to-work laws, we turned these workers over to the jurisdiction and the control of State laws. That is what has happened under the right-to-work law. That is the reason when Texas is able to get by with the kind of exploitation of which I am complaining in low-standard plants and in areas in which workers are taken out to do agricultural work, as pointed out by the telegram I have received from the president and the secretary and treasurer of the AFL–CIO union.

I have had other experience with this problem. I was appointed by President Kennedy and later by President Johnson to try to help settle the very costly east coast and gulf strike in 1962 and 1964. We were able to reach agreement in States in which the right-to-work laws did not exist. However, the interesting fact is that our trouble—and it cost the American people hundreds of millions of dollars before the strike was settled—was in the right-to-work States along the gulf, which States are accustomed to exploit Negro longshoremen as well as white longshoremen.

We were finally able, with the cooperation of farseeing industrial statesmen among the shipowners of America, to obtain application of the agreement that we had worked out around the coast and into the Gulf States.

There is no question that, on the basis of my experience in working in the settling of disputes, right-to-work laws give rise to many abuses. One of the abuses that I mentioned the other day is the unfair competitive advantage which the law gives to low-paying employers and employers who do not believe in high labor standards. Thus, employers in the non-right-to-work States, such as the employers in my own State, in large numbers are protesting the section 14(b) provision of the Taft-Hartley law.

Take the lumber industry of my State, placed at a competitive disadvantage by the low standard lumber areas of the South in which the right-to-work laws prevail, making it possible that workers will be subjected to just the type of abuses and exploitation that I protested the other day when I spoke on the practice that exists in Texas. I did not want the weekend to pass without some comment upon the speech of the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER].

Mr. President, I turn now to another subject.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is with great reluctance that I must register vigorous dissent to an address by the Honorable Thomas C. Mann, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, which he delivered before the annual meeting of the Inter-American Press Association at San Diego on October 12, 1965.

I can appreciate the vigor of his efforts to repair our relations with Latin America because the forthcoming meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the American Republics in Rio on November 17 will undoubtedly be a painful occasion for the American delegation. We are going to have to justify policies which for the first time since President Roosevelt's good neighbor policy have put marines in Latin America. We must seek to explain the most unfortunate resolution adopted by the other body—a resolution which has excited the almost unanimous opposition of our friends to the South because they see it as a unilateral declaration by the United States that we will intervene when and where we see fit.

I hasten to applaud the statement of Secretary Mann in which he says:

> I believe unilateral intervention by one American state in the internal political affairs of another is not only proscribed in the OAS Charter, but that nonintervention is a keystone of the structure of the inter-American system.

It is unfortunate that Secretary Mann did not stop there. I could have endorsed his position fully. However, he then proceeded to set up a series of straw men, and then knock them down one by one.

For example he describes as interventionists those who desire to "support political parties of the non-Communist left." And continues:

> With all respect, this thesis is justified by the same rhetoric that was used to justify our unilateral interventions in the past.

But he then proceeds to describe events in the Dominican Republic which culminated with more than 20,000 American troops there as something that was neither unilateral, nor intervention.

An interesting dictionary he must use. A remarkable set of definitions he must rely upon.

Mr. President, the only justification, under international law, for a single marine ever being in the Dominican Republic, notwithstanding the shocking record of the United States this year in the Dominican Republic, was to bring out American nationals and the nationals of any other country who might want to join our nationals in coming out. That is not intervention.

But let the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD speak for itself. From this desk, that very afternoon, when the tickers outside this door started announcing the sending of American marines into the Dominican Republic, the senior Senator from Oregon took to the floor of the Senate and warned the administration that although it had a right, under international law, to go in for the limited purpose of bringing out American nationals and evacuating them, it was without right to involve itself in the revolution. But we did involve ourselves, and all the denial of the White House and all the alibiing of the Secretary of State and the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Mann, cannot change those ugly facts.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Unfortunately I did not have the opportunity of hearing the beginning of the Senator's speech.

Mr. MORSE. It just started.

Mr. CLARK. Although he was kind enough to tell me he was going to make it. But I take it the Senator has read the speech made by Under Secretary Mann on the west coast a few days ago.

Mr. MORSE. That is what I am replying to. I shall ask to have it printed in the RECORD when I finish.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator share my view that that speech adds little, if any, clarification of our Latin American policy?

Mr. MORSE. It clarifies nothing, but confuses much.

Mr. CLARK. Is it the Senator's view, as it is mine and that of the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT], that our intervention in the Dominican Republic, once we got past the stage of sending in a battalion or two of marines to protect American rights and aid in the evacuation of Americans and other nationals whose lives may have been in jeopardy, was in complete violation of our treaty commitments?

Mr. MORSE. Complete violation of Rio, complete violation of the Organization of American States Charter, complete violation of Punta del Este, complete violation of Bogota, and complete violation of our understanding at the Foreign Ministers' Conference in Washington, D.C., in 1964.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator, as a valued member of the Foreign Relations Committee, participated in the investigation which the committee made of our activities in the Dominican Republic, and will recall that Mr. Mann appeared on several occasions before the committee.

Is the Senator's recollection of that testimony and of the conclusions which were drawn from that testimony by Chairman FULBRIGHT and by myself to the effect that that testimony and those conclusions were considerably at variance with the statements made by Mr. Mann in his speech on the west coast?

Mr. MORSE. Irreconcilably so. As the Senator knows, at those hearings on the United States-Dominican Republic fiasco, the administration witnesses—I give my description of them—fell flat on their faces. I think that is the most charitable descriptive term I could use.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator agree that the future of our policy in Latin America, insofar as the success of the Alliance for Progress is concerned, tends to be jeopardized as long as we take the position toward unilateral intervention which was expressed in the Selden resolution in the House of Representatives, to which I think it is clear the State Department made no adequate objection?

Mr. MORSE. I quite agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania. The burden of my argument today, and of much of my speech, is that the Alliance for Progress program is doomed if the United States does not clarify its policy in regard to intervention and military aid to Latin America.

As the Senator knows, I sought, when the foreign aid bill was before the Senate a few weeks ago, to have military aid to Latin America cut back.

What we are doing by our military aid is building up military oligarchies in various parts of Latin America that, by their very nature, are irreconcilable with the spirit of freedom, thus causing a great deal of misunderstanding among our friends in Latin America and, in my judgment, raising a question about our motivations in regard to the whole Alliance for Progress program, which is basically, as the Senator knows, that envisioned by John Fitzgerald Kennedy; namely, a program calling for the exportation to Latin America of economic freedom and not military power.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is chairman of the consultative subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations for Latin America, and he has traveled extensively in Latin America. He has many friends in that area. I am sure he corresponds from time to time with influential persons in Latin America. The statement was made about 2 days ago by a high official in the State Department that on a recent trip through Latin America, during the course of which he visited seven countries, he found no single individual who was critical of our activities in the Dominican Republic.

I wonder if the Senator's experience would bear out that statement?

Mr. MORSE. I know about the statement and I know about the person concerned. Let me say that I am aghast at the incompetency of his observation and report.

Mr. CLARK. Is it the view of the Senator from Oregon that our activities in the Dominican Republic were well described by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee as overreacting to a situation where it would have been well to be considerably more cautious, and that the almost necessary effect of that overreaction was to damage our position in many Latin American countries, including those not under the control of what I would call "gorillas," but rather under the control of freely elected democratic governments?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is completely correct. Many inexcusable mistakes have been made by the administration in the Dominican Republic. It did not even keep Adlai Stevenson advised of developments in that country. Once again he came in after the fact. Once again the Ambassador to the United Nations was put in the position of having to alibi and rationalize on unsound American policy. He was in the same position in regard to the Dominican Republic that he was left in in regard to the Bay of Pigs. Adlai Stevenson was never told the truth in advance about the Bay of Pigs.

Mr. President, we shall have to do something about the State Department not keeping out top officials, who do not happen to be sitting at the State Department level, advised of what is going on in advance.

They are always brought in for the post mortems. They are always brought in after the blunders have been made.

I have reason to believe that the situation is being changed under the administration of Ambassador Goldberg. I certainly wish him well. I have great confidence in him.

Mr. CLARK. I share the Senator's confidence, and I thank him for permitting me to intervene at this point.

Mr. MORSE. I said to Ambassador Goldberg, before he went to New York:

> I hope one thing you will insist on will be to be kept advised before the fact and not after the fact in regard to the policies of the United States.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania very much.

In effect, Secretary Mann is saying that this sort of unilateral intervention is all right if it is done by the United States, because we know what is right and what is good.

The trouble with the United States, in the view of many persons, is that we suffer from grandiose delusions as to our monopolistic control of the determination of what is right and good. We allegedly have a special insight into the Communist threat and can distinguish between Communists and reformers.

In the Dominican Republic, they have the count up to 78, of the top number of Communists they found in the revolution; but further investigation disclosed that many of them were teenagers, which raised a great deal of question as to the definition of what a Communist was in respect to those people.

Of course, every time we have a disturbance and struggle for freedom in any part of the underdeveloped areas of the world, the Communists will try to make themselves a part of it. They always seek to spread their vicious propaganda and influence during times of intense trouble.

But, Mr. President, the contention of the State Department that the revolution was Communist-controlled was never substantiated by the State Department before our committee.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] was quite right in making clear that the State Department completely failed in its burden of proof in regard to our hearings. The trouble is that several persons in the State Department, and in the Pentagon as well, are always ready and willing to try to alibi the blunders, not so much the blunders but the intentionally devised wrong foreign policy and military policy of this Republic, with the great scarecrow that "The Communists are going to get you if you don't watch out." This is always good for a lot of votes. It is always good for getting support in Washington for a policy that never should have been adopted in the first place.

I am constrained to remark that so far as I am concerned, I was on the Senate floor opposing what Castro stood for while the Department of State was still hopeful that he was an overeducated reformer but democratically inclined.

They should have recognized from the beginning, by the procedures the tyrant

Castro put into practice in Cuba immediately after the takeover of dictatorial power, that all that had happened in Cuba was the substitution for one kind of dictator, Fascist dictator Batista, for another kind of dictator, Communist dictator Castro.

What bothers me most about Secretary Mann's speech is its overtone of righteousness. One must read the whole speech to get that flavor, but it is there.

For example, he states at one point after describing events in the Dominican Republic: "The facts which I have outlined are undisputed," yet among those "facts" is the statement that "our Embassy—in Santo Domingo—was informed by police authorities that they could no longer be responsible for the protection of American lives."

What Secretary Mann and Secretary of State Rusk have failed to tell the American people is that our Ambassador to the Dominican Republic had urged the police authorities to make such a request so that American assistance could be justified and could be obtained to thwart the rebels. That is the kind of collusion which existed between the American Ambassador to the Dominican Republic and the military junta which had imposed tyranny upon the Dominican people who were rising up in revolution against the junta and also against American aid to that junta.

At that moment, Washington—when our Ambassador was seeking to get the police authorities to ask him to ask our Government to send in the Marines to give so-called protection to American nationals and to evacuate them—was not about to intervene on the public ground of a fear of a Communist takeover, but we were ready to intervene to save American lives—not one of which had been lost prior to our landing the Marines.

The record which was made before the Foreign Relations Committee makes that additional fact crystal clear.

At another point and referring to a subsequent point of time, the Secretary stated:

> All those in our Government who had full access to official information were convinced that the landing of additional troops was necessary in view of the clear and present danger of the forcible seizure of power by the Communists.

There is an interesting shift in the position taken in that sentence from the preceding sentence.

But I would only point out that these adjectives "full" and "official" are qualifications. I suspect that those who had "full" access were limited in number and judgment, and that "official information" was the information which those few chose to believe.

Time has not permitted a more careful analysis of the address of the Under Secretary. But I believe time will prove the dangers of his analysis not only of events in the Dominican Republic but of his broad ranging comment on East-West relations generally.

I would only note that 2 years ago a prestige poll in the Dominican Republic showed that admiration for the United States and its policies was at an all time high—higher, as I recall, than in any other Latin American country.

Today, I suspect that our prestige there is at an all time low. I think that it is already becoming apparent that the next election campaign in the Dominican Republic will turn into an anti-American binge and that the victor will be the candidate who can demand with the most vigor the withdrawal of our forces and who can pin the interventionist label on the United States.

Our relations with Latin America have, I very much fear, came to a low state unequaled since the early 1930's.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks on this subject the speech released by the State Department, delivered by the Under Secretary, Hon. Thomas C. Mann, before the annual meeting of the Inter-American Press Association at San Diego, Calif., Tuesday, October 12, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have one further point. In my judgment, the speech at Los Angeles of Under Secretary Mann does not clarify in the slightest the confusion that exists in one Latin American country after another at the present hour as to just what American policy is in regard to unilateral intervention.

The United States cannot justify retaining discretion to determine whether or not we are going to intervene in Latin America because some government says to us, "We are about to be taken over by Communists."

We must beat communism in Latin America, but we shall never beat communism by a unilateral military intervention policy. We shall make Communists by the hundreds of thousands throughout Latin America. Instead of making governments more secure, we will jeopardize more governments, because on one point Latin Americans will rally, the masses of the people will rally, and that is in opposition to American intervention.

Our policy should be and must become a policy that when there is a charge or a feeling that some government is in jeopardy from a Communist coup, and it appeals to us because its security is about to be threatened, the whole purpose of the treaties I have alluded to in this speech requires the calling of a joint consultation.

Is that what we are afraid of? Is that why there are some who seem to favor unilateral action on the part of the United States, and is this country the only one to decide whether a country is about to be overthrown by a Communist coup, or is in danger of an overthrow by a military coup if it is a democratic government? If the State Department says that, it is guilty of hypocrisy, for our record of recognizing military juntas in Latin America is a record of shocking hypocrisy.

The greatest mistake my President made since coming into office was the recognition of the military junta more than a year ago in the Dominican Republic. There were a few of us at the time who strenuously and earnestly urged him not to make that mistake. There were a few of us who at the time warned him and the Secretary of State that if they followed that course of action they were headed for serious trouble in the Dominican Republic.

It was clear to many of us that the recognition of this tyrannical military junta that the Johnson administration recognized in the Dominican Republic was bound to lead to a revolution in the Dominican Republic.

That is not the only place where revolutions are going to occur in the years immediately ahead in Latin America if we continue to give support to the foisting of a military oligarchy upon the masses of people.

The State Department must face up to a few hypotheticals that I would give to them.

Suppose conditions should worsen in Bolivia, now ruled by a military junta. Suppose groups of people in Bolivia should rise up to overthrow that military junta. Suppose that military junta should make a plea to the United States for military assistance and intervention. Are we going in, Mr. Rusk and Mr. Mann? Yes or no? There had better be an answer before we get to Rio on November 17, 1965.

I use the following as a hypothetical only: Take the hypothetical in regard to Bolivia and apply it to a considerable number of other Latin American countries. In case they ask the United States to come in with marines because a group of military tyrants say that they are about to be overthrown by Communists, are we going in, Mr. Rusk and Mr. Mann? Yes, or no? Get ready to give the Rio conference the answer, because in my judgment the question will be put squarely to us at Rio. At Rio there will be no sidestepping or ducking the issue as Mr. Mann did in his Los Angeles speech in respect to the unfortunate resolution passed by the House of Representatives.

EXHIBIT 1

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE THOMAS C. MANN, UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR ECONOMIC AFFAIRS, BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE INTER-AMERICAN PRESS ASSOCIATION AT SAN DIEGO, CALIF., OCTOBER 12, 1965

It is a pleasure for me to meet here in California with so many distinguished representatives of the press of the hemisphere. I hope to have the opportunity of meeting those whom I have known only by name. To greet old friends and acquaintances and to refresh old memories is always a rewarding experience.

In selecting a subject of current interest, I have chosen to speak about some of the issues that have arisen in the Dominican crisis principally because it seems to me that there are certain misconceptions that ought to be corrected.

I should like to make it clear that my remarks today are not in answer to any particular commentary on our policies. There has been a great deal of comment both here and abroad. My simple purpose is to clarify a number of misconceptions.

I

It has been suggested that nonintervention is thought by some to be an obsolete doctrine.

I know of no Washington officials who think this way. On the contrary, I believe unilateral intervention by one American state in the internal political affairs of another is not only proscribed in the OAS Charter, but that nonintervention is a keystone of the structure of the inter-American system. American States have a treaty as well as a sovereign right to choose their political, social and economic systems free of all outside interference.

If we start from this point, it is not difficult to identify two distinct areas of confusion:

The first confusion comes from those who say, however obliquely, that it is necessary unilaterally to intervene—"support" is the word most often used—in favor of political parties of the non-Communist left.

With all respect, this thesis is justified by the same rhetoric that was used to justify our unilateral interventions in the past.

But this thesis overlooks the fact that countries want to solve their internal political problems in their own way. Latin Americans do not want a paternalistic United States deciding which particular political faction should rule their countries. They do not want the United States to launch itself again on what one scholar described as a "civilizing mission" no matter how good its intentions are.

This explains why, in the case of the Dominican Republic we refrained, during the first days of violence, from supporting the outgoing government or supporting either of the factions contending for power.

It explains why we and others thought it best to work for a cease-fire and to encourage the rival Dominican factions to meet together and agree on a Dominican solution to a Dominican problem. It explains why, to use a phrase of international law, we offered our good offices rather than attempting to preside over a meeting for the purpose of proposing political solutions with a "made in U.S.A." label on them.

The second area of confusion concerns the response which an American state, or the Organization of American States as a whole, can make to intervention. When, in other words, a Communist state has intervened in the internal affairs of an American state by training, directing, financing, and organizing indigenous Communist elements to take control of the government of an American state by force and violence, should other American states be powerless to lend assistance? Are Communists free to intervene while democratic states are powerless to frustrate that intervention?

This is not so much a question of intervention as it is of whether weak and fragile states should be helped to maintain their independence when they are under attack by subversive elements responding to direction from abroad.

Surely we have learned from the October 1962 missile crisis that the establishment of Communist military bases in this hemisphere threaten the security of every American state. Surely we have learned that political control of an American state by Communists is but the prelude for use of that country as a base for further aggressions.

A number of juridical questions deserve consideration—not in an atmosphere of crisis, demanding an immediate decision, but in an atmosphere of calmness and objectivity. As illustrative of the kind of questions that ought to be considered, I pose these two:

What distinctions ought to be made, on the one hand, between subversive activities which do not constitute an immediate danger to an American state and, on the other, those which, because of their intensity and external direction, do constitute a danger to the peace and security of the country and the hemisphere?

Second, assuming that, as I have suggested certain subversive activities do constitute a threat to the peace and security of the hemisphere, what response is permitted within the framework of the inter-American system?

I do not offer precise answers to these questions at this time. I only wish to say that the problem of Communist subversion in the hemisphere is a real one. It should not be brushed aside on a false assumption that American states are prohibited by inter-American law from dealing with it.

II

I turn now to a political question: How seriously should we regard Communist subversion in this hemisphere?

I will not take your time to remind you of the expansionist history of the Communist countries in recent years in Eastern Europe and in Asia. The history and the tactics used are well known.

Only last month the Defense Minister of Communist China, in what was described as a major doctrinal article, stated that the United States, which he considered the principal obstacle to Communist domination of the world, must be defeated "piece by piece" in "peoples' wars" in Africa, Asia and Latin America. This doctrine is the same as Lenin's. But the Minister's candor in reminding us of Mao's dictum that "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun" is revealing. Quoting Mao, he states:

"The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war is the central task and the highest form of revolution. This Marxist-Leninist principle of revolution holds good universally for China and for all other countries."

The so-called peoples' wars or wars of national liberation are the tactic used in cases where the direct employment of military force is not feasible. Less than a year ago Communist parties from the hemisphere met in Havana and pledged to each other an increase in their coordinated efforts to subvert free institutions in this hemisphere.

It is difficult to understand the precise reasons why some appear to be less concerned than others about attempts to expand, by force and violence, areas of Communist domination in this hemisphere.

One point of view I have heard expressed as late as 2 years ago is that the Castro revolution should be looked at sympathetically because "it has done so much for the Cuban people." "Please keep an open mind about the Castro revolution" is a phrase I have heard. I do not believe this view is held by any U.S. Government official, appointed or elected. But it still has a few articulate and influential proponents. If this were U.S. policy, only dictatorships of the right would be opposed, not Communist dictatorships of the left.

A second school of thought says in substance that the way to preserve freedom in this hemisphere is to achieve rapidly a higher level of social justice, economic progress and political democracy. I know of no one in the Government of the United States who does not have a deep and sincere conviction that the goals of the Alliance for Progress should be achieved as rapidly as possible. We support the Alliance goals not because there are Communists in the world but because the goals are right and good and because they are consistent with our national and hemispheric traditions and ideals.

As President Johnson said in August of this year:

"In my Nation, like yours, we are still struggling to find justice for all of our people. And because we are fortunate in abundance, we feel that morality requires that we must also try to help others who seek it for their own people too."

The issue is not whether we should pursue the Alliance programs. The issue is not whether faster progress under the Alliance will make it more difficult for subversive elements to achieve their purpose. The issue is whether those programs, by themselves and standing alone, can be expected to frustrate Communist subversion by force and terror.

This recalls to mind a story I read somewhere several years ago. A young man went alone into the jungle in search of a tiger. When he found a tiger he began to explain in great detail and with considerable persuasiveness why peace between tigerkind and mankind was desirable. To prove his good faith he had come without arms—— The young man's statement of good will ended here at midsentence. At this point in the monolog the tiger ate the man.

In my experience the men who have contributed most to social, economic, and political reform in this hemisphere are men who have understood that the Communist danger is not met by good works alone.

Another theory points out that the new generations in Eastern Europe want greater freedom to express themselves and a higher standard of living. Decentralization; profit incentives; greater autonomy for light industrial plants and farms; quality rather than quantity goals—all these and other topics of debate suggest a movement away from the old Marxist practices. Historic rivalries between Russia and China are stressed. The suggestion is made that the Soviet Union will, in its own interest, inevitably draw closer to Western Europe.

I suppose everyone welcomes certain liberal trends in Eastern Europe. However limited in scope they may be—and they are limited—they represent a step in the right direction. I suppose everyone would welcome a decision by the Soviet Union to abandon the idea of world revolution by force, a decision to leave others alone, a decision to put its enormous weight on the side of those who hope for a truly pacific relationship between the Communist and the free parts of the world.

We ought to welcome liberalizing thought and action in Eastern Europe. We ought to seek ways, compatible with our own security interests and those of the free world, gradually to find a basis for a truly pacific relationship with Eastern Europe.

But it is wrong to present as a current reality that which is now only a hope for the future. All Communists still openly proclaim their belief in a world revolution achieved by force. They are still supporting subversion in the Western Hemisphere. It would be difficult indeed to convince those who have lived recently for long periods in Latin America that Communists are not working harder than ever to export the "revolution of the Sierra Maestra to the Andes."

Lastly, there is the thesis that we tend to overestimate the ability of the Communists to subvert free governments.

As near as I can discover, this particular theory comes down to this: A number of Western European and Latin American governments have been able to stand up against subversive elements; therefore it is to be assumed that all developing nations will be able to do likewise. All that is needed is more faith in democracy.

It is true that today there are a number of states in Europe and the developing areas of the world which have achieved the kind of maturity and tradition which gives them a large degree of security. But it is equally true that other states are vulnerable simply because they have not yet been able to modernize their societies and to acquire the maturity, broad popular support, the disciplines and the traditions which are elements of national unity and strength.

It is to these weaker, more fragile societies that Communist subversive efforts will be directed in the future. One has only to look around the world today to see that great differences exist between areas and between states in terms of their vulnerability to demagoguery and to the use of force exercised by a disciplined minority. It is folly to assume that the experience of one nation or one culture is even a good indicator of what will happen in an entirely different situation.

What we can be certain of is that the greatest danger to freedom and to peace will come when the free world is confused, uncertain, divided and weak—when expansionistic communism comes to believe that new aggressions can be committed without risk.

In addition to these generalities there are a number of misconceptions about particular U.S. actions in the recent Dominican crisis.

III

One misconception is that danger to American lives was more a pretext than a reason for U.S. action.

This is demonstrably incorrect.

Violence in the Dominican Republic began on April 24, 1965. By April 25–26 there had been a breakdown in the maintenance of order in the capital city. Planes of the Dominican Air Force were strafing and bombing the national palace and other points. Artillery fire between the rebel and antirebel forces was being exchanged in the eastern part of the city. Armed rebel bands roamed the streets looking for anyone who was suspected of being unsympathetic to their cause. The police were special targets and suffered heavy casualties; for all practical purposes the police force disintegrated and police protection broke down completely. Radio and telephone stations in Santo Domingo were in the hands of rebel groups.

The first important decision made in Washington was to evacuate, through the Port of Haina, all those who wished to leave.

American tourists, unable to leave the capital by commercial transportation, had requested evacuation. On April 27 a group of about 1,000 people of various nationalities, mostly women and children, gathered at and near the Hotel Embajador which had been designated as the assembly point for evacuation. The American Embassy asked for and received promises of safe conduct from both the rebel and antirebel groups so that they could be moved from the assembly point by road to Haina, 7 miles to the west.

While the evacuees were being processed, an armed group appeared at the hotel and engaged in indiscriminate firing both in the hotel itself and on the grounds nearby, endangering the lives of many people. Only by good fortune was the first evacuation successfully carried out through Haina on April 27 without loss of life.

On the following day, April 28, another large crowd gathered at the Hotel Embajador desiring evacuation. By this time, the road to Haina was under sniper fire; our Embassy was informed by police authorities that they could no longer be responsible for the protection of American lives.

Meanwhile, the rebel government had dissolved with many of its members, including Molina Urena, seeking asylum. There were no constituted authorities on the rebel side. There were, in fact, no constituted authorities of any kind in the city at this time and for several days thereafter. Total anarchy prevailed.

The second major decision was to order that some 500 marines be landed for the purpose of protecting Americans and making possible the continuation of the evacuation process by helicopter.

This small number of marines established a small perimeter around the Hotel Embajador area. This permitted helicopters to land and take off and gave protection to those assembled for evacuation.

The evacuation of the second group was begun as night came on the 28th. Several hundred more were evacuated then. Around 5,000 persons of many nationalities were evacuated during the crisis.

While the evacuation by helicopter was taking place, the U.S. Embassy and Chancery were under steady sniper fire, endangering the lives of Americans there. A small group of marines was sent from the Hotel Embajador area to the U.S. Embassy in order to reinforce the Marine guard there.

The facts which I have outlined are undisputed. Whatever may have been the requests or desires or recommendations of others, the action taken by Washington in the evening of April 28 had as its purpose the protection and evacuation of unarmed civilians.

We did not consider it necessary to wait until innocent civilians had been killed in order to prove to the most skeptical that lives were in danger. Had we done this we should have been derelict in our duty to our citizens. These facts are also obviously relevant to the assertions that we should have left those desiring evacuation on the beach until the complex machinery of the OAS was able to function.

IV

It is charged that the administration assumed from the beginning that the revolution was Communist dominated and that it should therefore be opposed by military force.

This assertion is incorrect for the simple reason that when the second decision (to evacuate by helicopter) was taken it was still our hope that U.S. troops could be withdrawn as soon as the evacuation was completed. There was a sound basis for this on the 28th.

But with each passing day hope had been diminishing that the non-Communist elements on the rebel side would either reach a cease-fire agreement with the bulk of the armed forces opposing them or bring the armed civilians and paramilitary on the rebel side under effective control. By the evening of April 29 it became clear that the armed forces at San Isidro would be nothing but observers. General Wessin, for reasons best known to him, elected not to support General Montas' column which was split up as it entered the city from the west, and, after some initial success, disintegrated. As it turned out, Wessin never did move his forces into the city.

Whereas on the evening of the 28th it appeared that order might be restored by the Dominicans themselves, by the evening of the 29th the reverse appeared to be the case. Rebel bands, still without any visible cohesion except among the Communist components, were roaming at will into the city, carrying violence with them. There could be no assurance that order could even be maintained in the balance of the country.

The United States Government had, of course, long since been aware of, and concerned about, the growth of Communist influence in the Dominican Republic. This concern grew when large quantities of arms were turned over to civilians and distributed by known and identified leaders of Communist parties to their partisans in the early days of the crisis. But there is a very important distinction to be made between concern and a decision to use armed force.

Thus, it was not until the evening of the 29th that a decision had to be made on whether the Communist elements in the rebel camp presented a clear and imminent peril to the freedom of the Dominican nation.

I do not know what the U.S. Government might have decided that evening had we not then been engaged in evacuation operations—had not the lives of innocent people been in danger. Perhaps, under other circumstances, we might have awaited developments for a while longer. Certainly we should have welcomed time to permit the OAS which, by this time was working on the problem, to take effective action.

But these were not the facts and this was not the situation. We were already engaged in evacuating our citizens and civilians of many other nationalities.

Thousands remained to be evacuated. We did not wish to abandon them by withdrawing our men and helicopters from the small perimeter on the western edge of the town. We did not wish to abandon those in our Embassy under fire and other nationals without either protection or means of leaving the island.

Against this background the third important decision was taken in the evening of April 29. In form it was to reinforce the small number holding the perimeter near the beach and to land troops at the San Isidro airport a few miles east of the capital.

The saving of lives continued to be an objective. But from this third decision (to land additional troops) flowed a number of actions in the following days.

First, the small perimeter around the hotel was expanded into an international safety zone, a safe haven for all those who wished to repair to it. This was done both for humanitarian reasons and in response to requests for protection from a number of embassies which had come under small arms fire from snipers.

Second, a line of communication, a corridor, was established between the troops in San Isidro area and the troops in the international safety zone. This corridor had the effect of interposing troops between the two contending armed factions The interposition prevented a bloodbath that otherwise would have occurred eventually. It prevented a widening of the civil war. It helped to stabilize the countryside. It opened the way for a political settlement under the auspices of the OAS.

Much of the confusion concerning these events derives from attempts to lift official statements out of their time context. Statements made in one phase of the crisis were compared with statements made in another phase. These confusions have not been helpful to the American States in their efforts to find solutions to delicate and difficult problems.

V

The degree of Communist influence in the rebel movement has been especially questioned.

It will not be possible, in this short speech, to tell the complete story of the degree of Communist influence and strength in the rebel movement. The facts we already have would fill a volume. Each passing day brings additional facts to light. The danger will soon become apparent even to the most skeptical. In a very real sense the danger still exists.

All those in our Government who had full access to official information were convinced that the landing of additional troops was necessary in view of the clear and present danger of the forcible seizure of power by the Communists. The evidence we have indicates that at that stage the paramilitary forces under the control of known Communists exceeded in military strength the forces controlled by the non-Communist elements within the rebel movement. Equally important is the fact that these non-Communist elements were working hand in glove with the Communists.

The strength of the Communist component of the rebel side must be measured not only by its men and arms and its superior discipline but by the weakness, the divisions, and the lack of leadership within the rebel movement. It needs to be measured in light of the fact that the Communists were operating in a total political vacuum during the early days of the crisis.

There were no moderate forces on either the rebel or antirebel side with the will and the capacity to offer effective resistance to them. Indeed, from the dissolution of the Molina Urena regime on April 27 until Colonel Caamano formed his regime on May 3 there was no identifiable leadership on the rebel side other than that of the Communists.

VI

Next, it is said that the United States overlooked the fact that reform movements are likely to attract Communist support; that the United States failed to perceive that if it is automatically to oppose any reform movement that Communists adhere to, it is likely to end up opposing every reform movement and, in the process, make itself a prisoner of reactionaries.

This theory assumes that an alliance between the Communists and the non-Communists left in a popular front is an act of nature. This is really not different in essence from the Marxian theory that Communists are in the vanguard of all truly revolutionary movements.

In Western Europe, this theory has been proved false. By and large, Communists have failed to seize power there because European reformers were their most determined and effective opponents. In contrast, non-Communist revolutionaries in Eastern Europe and elsewhere have formed popular fronts with Communists.

The needs to distinguish between a reform movement allied with the Communists and a movement dedicated to reform in freedom should be emphasized over and over again. Indeed, it is precisely the failure to make this distinction—the tendency of some to lump all "reformers" together and to evaluate them solely on the basis of their rhetoric—that causes a great deal of the confusion.

Many of you will recall de Tocqueville's conclusions about the causes of the Reign of Terror which detracted from the real achievement of the French Revolution:

"When we closely study the French Revolution we find that it was conducted in precisely the same spirit as that which gave rise to so many books expounding theories of government in the abstract. Our revolutionaries had the same fondness for broad generalizations, cut-and-dried legislative systems, and a pedantic symmetry; the same contempt for hard facts; the same taste for reshaping institutions on novel, ingenious, original lines; the same desire to reconstruct the entire constitution according to the rules of logic and a preconceived system instead of trying to rectify its faulty parts. The result was nothing short of disastrous; for what is a merit in the writer may well be a vice in the statesman and the very qualities which go to make great literature can lead to catastrophic revolutions.

"Even the politicians' phraseology was borrowed largely from the books they read; it was cluttered up with abstract words, gaudy flowers of speech, sonorous cliches, and literary turns of phrase."

Popular fronts do not have as their principal objective the noble purpose of democratic reform. Their principal objective is political power. They are often formed by those who want the Communist vote in order to get elected to office. Sometimes they are formed because the help of disciplined Communists is needed to overthrow a government. They are sometimes formed by politicians already in power to buy their peace. The rationale I have heard is a revealing one: "I know they are dangerous. But I can control them." Sometimes this estimate proves to be correct. More often it does not.

As President Kennedy said in his address at the Free University of Berlin on June 26, 1963: "As I said this morning, I am not impressed by the opportunities open to popular fronts throughout the world. I do not believe that any Democrat can successfully ride that tiger."

But the point I wish to make is that Communist participation is not necessary in order to carry out reforms. There are several governments I can think of which are not allied with Communists and which are doing a pretty good job of reform. I am not conscious that this great country of ours has, in cooperating with these and other countries, become a prisoner of any group.

Moreover, popular fronts serve Communist ends. Communists gain from them a respectability they do not deserve. They use this respectability to infiltrate their partisans into the educational system, organized worker and farm groups, the mass media and, of course, the government itself. In participating in popular fronts, politicians usually have in mind a short-term, personal, political, selfish gain. On the other hand, Communists are content to work today in order to prepare for tomorrow.

We do not really have to choose between reaction and leftist extremism. There is a large and growing number of people in Latin America dedicated to rapid and far-reaching reform. New political movements, organized on an institutional rather than a personalized base, give promise of organizing and leading those who so desperately want to build modern societies. The Latin American military contain in their ranks many able and dedicated men who do not deserve to be smeared with the brush that ought to be reserved for the few. The church is providing leadership in many areas of social progress. Many of the younger men from all sectors of society are conscious of the need for change and are helping to promote it. Organized labor is growing in strength and could be a powerful influence for progress.

VII

It is also said that our country is not much in sympathy with revolution and that our Revolution of 1776 was not much of an upheaval compared to the Russian and other revolutions.

Perhaps these words are to be interpreted as suggesting that in our revolution the violence was confined largely to the battlefields, and that, consequently, it cannot be compared with the number of civilians killed under the guillotine or with the millions who disappeared in the familiar Communist purges. If so, I fail to see why violence itself should be considered a desirable end.

If, on the other hand, it is intended to say that the basic values of political and economic freedom, which were the principal motive force of the Revolution of 1776, are inferior to others, then there are differences in opinion which are indeed significant.

Our political, economic and social systems have produced a greater degree of individual freedom, a more even-handed, impartial administration of law, higher levels of income, a more equitable distribution of an ever-rising national product, more equality of opportunity, more religious freedom, a greater appreciation of the value of the spirit and of the dignity of man, than has been heretofore achieved by any nation in history.

Our revolution did not start and end in 1776. It is a continuing phenomenon. The frontiers of opportunity, of knowledge, of health, of social justice and economic and political progress in our land are being expanded still further in President Johnson's program for the Great Society.

Certainly if one compares the achievements of our system with that of others, we have no need to be apologetic or defensive. On the contrary, we can take great pride in our accomplishments and in our determination for even greater improvement in the future.

VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I made a speech the other day from the floor of the Senate in which I said that the Senate and the House of Representatives are going to adjourn in spite of my protest in regard to adjourning sine die while our Americans boys are dying in South Vietnam. This is a course of action which, in my judgment, cannot be justified by any Member of Congress. When the motion for sine die resolution is before the Senate, the senior Senator from Oregon will go on record in opposition to the resolution.

In my judgment, we cannot justify adjourning Congress so long as American boys are being killed in an unconstitutional war in South Vietnam. People have a right to have the Congress in session to maintain a check upon the executive branch of government.

Congress had better start checking, in spite of all the interpretations being given under so-called polls. I am like so many with whom I have talked; I am still waiting to meet the first person who has been polled; but somebody must be polled.

The reliance of this administration upon polls is an act of whistling by graveyards. The sad thing is that it is filling the graveyard, by the unnecessary killing in South Vietnam, not only of Americans, but of Asians.

I am at work on a speech entitled "The Crucifixion of the Teachings of Christ in South Vietnam." I am always interested in Christians trying to rationalize, on moral grounds, this unconstitutional, illegal war in South Vietnam.

But, Mr. President, come next January, if the State Department does not clarify its position in regard to military intervention in Latin America, this chairman will conduct hearings for whatever length of time is necessary to make the record replete with the facts with regard to what our clear national law obligation is under the treaties to which I have referred.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record an article by Mr. Emil Mazey, international secretary-treasurer, United Auto Workers, entitled "South Vietnam Leaders No Better Than Reds—L.B.J. Backed Military Dictator in Dominica."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH VIET LEADERS NO BETTER THAN REDS—L.B.J. BACKED MILITARY DICTATOR IN DOMINICA

(By Emil Mazey, International Secretary-Treasurer, United Auto Workers)

Some of the problems that currently face the people of our world today are the aftermath of struggles for independence on the part of colonial peoples. The difficulty in South Vietnam today is a typical example of what I have reference to.

The people of Vietnam sought their independence from French domination and finally defeated the French in 1954. The 1954 struggle was terminated by the signing of the Geneva Conference accord which among other things, accepted the sound principle of self-determination and stipulated that free elections would be held in 1956 to reunite the country.

The present civil war in South Vietnam began in 1956 when President Diem, with the concurrence of the Eisenhower administration, refused to hold elections.

The reasoning of Diem and the reasoning of the Eisenhower administration was that elections would result in the Communists winning control of the government.

This violation of the Geneva Conference accords is responsible for the civil war and conflict taking place in South Vietnam today.

President Lyndon Johnson inherited a war which, I am sure, he doesn't want. President Johnson has repeatedly stated that we are in Vietnam to maintain freedom, liberty and democracy and the right of the South Vietnam to choose their own political path.

I disagree completely with President Johnson on this evaluation. There is no democracy in South Vietnam. There is no freedom in South Vietnam. There is no liberty in South Vietnam.

There is no representative government in South Vietnam. The people have not chosen their national leaders or their regional leaders.

There is no free trade union movement in South Vietnam.

In my opinion, the war in Vietnam is being fought to bolster and maintain an oppressive military dictatorship. The war is not being fought to extend freedom and democracy. The government of South Vietnam does not have the confidence of the people and is totally and completely unstable.

We have seen the perpetual circus in Saigon in one clique of military leaders fighting to replace another military clique for political control of Vietnam.

This game of musical chairs to see who is going to control South Vietnam, apparently has the blessing and full financial support of our Government because we have endorsed and embraced each new punk dictator who has gained power.

President Johnson is very thin-skinned about any criticism of his policy of South Vietnam.

He has discouraged free discussion of his policies and has attempted to justify his policies on the ground that he and his advisers have information not available to the average citizen, and therefore, we must have faith in his judgment and blindly follow and endorse his policies.

Constructve criticism is equated with treason—those who oppose escalating the war are called appeasers—citizens calling for a negotiated peace have been charged with being soft on communism.

Despite the fact that we have a large military force and a large body of CIA agents in South Vietnam, every time a military coup takes place, spokesmen for our Government announced they were surprised by the overthrow of one regime by another.

If our Government truly understood what was happening in Vietnam, I suggest we would not be surprised by developments there.

I believe that the President of the United States is making a serious mistake in escalating the war in South Vietnam by the attacks on North Vietnam. This policy is really the Goldwater policy and has the full support of the leadership of the Republican Party.

I suggest that President Johnson not take too much comfort in the support he is receiving from Goldwater and DIRKSEN because in 1966 and 1968, the South Vietnam war will become the major political issue and will be referred to as the Johnson war by the Republicans currently urging and egging President Johnson on to escalate the war.

I do not believe the struggle in South Vietnam can be won by negative anticommunism. It should be obvious to everyone that the South Vietnamese people have no confidence in their government because two-thirds of South Vietnam is already under the control of the Vietcong.

Frankly, the South Vietnamese have not been given anything to fight for. Fighting to maintain the status quo is not good enough.

The South Vietnamese find little difference between Communist dictatorship or a military dictatorship over their country. I confess I see no difference between Communist dictatorship and a military dictatorship.

The people of South Vietnam look upon American forces as a replacement to the French forces they kicked out in 1954.

The people in South Vietnam must be given an effective alternative to communism or to a military dictatorship.

I suggest that the alternative ought to be a democratic government chosen by the people with a program of land reform and other reforms that can raise the living standards and improve the security of the people.

I know that there are no easy answers to resolve the Vietnamese problem. Among the possible answers are the following:

1. We ought to seek the implementation of the 1954 Geneva Conference accords. The nations that brought about the agreement in Vietnam originally ought to be called into session to seek a solution to the present problem.

2. We ought to consider giving the United Nations an opportunity of solving the Vietnam crisis. Placing Vietnam under U.N. trusteeship for a period of time and subsequently implementing the Geneva Conference accord of 1954, may be one way to solve this dilemma. I believe the recent statements of President Johnson to the effect that he is willing to have unconditional talks to bring about a negotiated solution to the Vietnamese problem, is good. However, I believe that the President is making a mistake in trying to bring about these negotiations through the escalation of the war.

I believe that our Government needs to reevaluate our entire foreign policy position. It should be clear to all of us that our Government cannot unilaterally act as a world police force and cannot by itself solve the many problems that the years of colonialism on the part of Great Britain, France, and Belgium created.

Our Government seems to favor military dictatorship to democracy. I am alarmed and sickened at the quickness in which President Johnson moved 30,000 marines into the Dominican Republic to bolster and maintain a military dictatorship that came into power by overthrowing the only freely elected government in the Dominican Republic in the past 30 years.

Our Government gave quick recognition to the military dictatorship which replaced the democratically elected government in the Dominican Republic in 1963.

In 1965, when the democratic forces attempted to overthrow the military dictatorship, our Government finds itself on the side of the military dictatorship again. Some 30 years ago, United States marines moved into the Dominican Republic and placed Trujillo, the military dictator, in power. We must raise our voices in protest to see that history doesn't repeat itself.

I want to commend Senator WAYNE MORSE for having the courage and the intestinal fortitude to criticize our Government on foreign policy and on other matters when he believes the Government to be wrong. I believe that the best way to support President Johnson is not to rubber stamp his every act. but to oppose him constructively when we believe that his policies are in error.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, he is not the only labor leader who has diverted from the propaganda line of most of the labor leaders of this country who are purportedly in support of war in Vietnam.

I am glad that there are some labor leaders who recognize the moral principles involved in connection with the uncalled-for war in South Vietnam; who recognize that to take the position of the senior Senator from Oregon does not mean that we get out of South Vietnam, but that we follow an international law procedure course of action that will bring others in through the United Nations.

I am glad also that there are labor leaders who recognize that no weight can be given to rationalizing our unfortunate course of action in South Vietnam by what is called the economic benefits to certain industries in this country connected with the war effort.

I am glad that we have labor leaders such as Emil Mazie, who is willing to stand up and be counted, even though the line of the American labor movement today, unfortunately, is to support our outlawry in South Vietnam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there also be printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch entitled "Facts in the Far East."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTS IN THE FAR EAST

A general review of tensions in Asia now seems likely to feature the current session of the United Nations General Assembly, and it is long overdue. The Assembly has agreed to debate the question of seating Communist China. Vietnam has been brought into the picture by U.S. Ambassador Goldberg and by Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko.

There is in reality no way to separate one Asian problem from another. There will be no permanent peace in Vietnam without the concurrence of China. The presence of China broods over the Indian-Pakistani quarrel. Until the U.N. comes to grips with the reality of China, discussion of Asian problems is bound to appear peripheral.

This being so, it was disappointing that Mr. Goldberg, in his speech to the Assembly, should have reiterated doctrinaire U.S. antagonism to the mainland regime; particularly that he should have associated North Vietnam and China in criticizing those who allegedly do not "leave their neighbors alone." The relationship between Peiping and Hanoi is a subtle one and a more constructive statement would have been directed toward identifying the components.

The United States can make a case of course, for opposing the admission of China. It has a treaty with the Chiang Kai-shek regime on Formosa, which holds one of the five permanent Security Council seats. China has acted in a belligerent fashion toward all the major nations. It has shown no desire to become a U.N. member.

But much of this is beside the point. The point is not whether China is truculent, or whether it wants admission, but whether the peace of the world would be more secure with China in the U.N. or outside of it. In other words, the point is not whether China would be gratified by "shooting its way" into the U.N., but whether the 117 nations would benefit by its presence.

In this connection there is merit in a sort of interim proposal by Secretary General U Thant that China be represented at U.N. headquarters. He told the Assembly: "I have no doubt that the true interest of peace would be better served if nonmember states were to be encouraged to maintain observers at United Nations headquarters so that they may be in a position to sense the currents and crosscurrents of world opinion which are so uniquely concentrated in the organization."

The problem is urgent. The Vietnam war cries for settlement; so does the quarrel between India and Pakistan. These countries are on China's border. China is developing an atomic capability; can there be any profitable conference on nuclear controls, or any viable agreement, without its participation? Also, suppose China led a move to form a rival international organization? Indonesia, which has withdrawn from the U.N. has made such a suggestion.

A thoroughgoing debate in the U.N. would ventilate this whole situation, and would, we hope, lead to fresh approaches to the complex problems of Asia.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is a great editorial from a great newspaper. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, from the beginning of our unfortunate course of action in South Vietnam, from the very beginning of the United States starting its violation of the Geneva accords back in 1954, from the very beginning of our setting up of our tyrannical puppet in South Vietnam, Dien, and one puppet after another, as one after another fell from grace in South Vietnam, has carried on a courageous editorial policy of constructive criticism against foreign policy of the United States, vis-a-vis South Vietnam.

Not very often is such courage commended in periods of hysteria in this country—and we are in a period of hysteria. I commend the editors of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch not only for this editorial, but also for the many preceding editorials they have published seeking to warn the American people that our foreign policy in southeast Asia will eventually cause us to lose all support in southeast Asia. No matter how many years are required, we shall eventually be driven out of Asia. The lesson we have to learn has already been learned by the French, the Dutch, the Belgians, and the British.

The tyrants whom we are supporting in South Vietnam have never provided an hour of freedom in South Vietnam since they have taken over power; yet they have been backed, financed, and militarized by the United States. I know from reading recent news dispatches that those puppets of ours are now trying to tell us that we must not give consideration to any negotiated settlement of the war. Of course, we are doing most of the fighting now. We have already demonstrated that the Vietnamese army and military establishment of 500,000 to 750,000 cannot whip the hard core Vietcong military establishment of between 35,000 and 60,000. It is necessary for the United States to go on in and do the job for the South Vietnamese. We can do the job. We can do every military engagement. The Vietcong cannot begin to meet American force. The Vietcong lack firepower and materiel; the Vietcong have no air force.

I have said many times that all we are doing, now that we have gone into Vietnam with our military might, is to shoot fish in a barrel, for the Vietcong can best be described in that war as shooting fish in a barrel.

It is impossible for the Vietcong to resist the military power of our great country. That is what we should expect. You and I, Mr. President, have not sat here for years, voting billions of dollars for the defense of this country, without knowing that the United States has the military might to mop up and wipe out any force such as the Vietcong.

But that will not win the peace. That will only win the war—if we want to call it winning a war. What we are doing in Vietnam will leave a heritage of hatred and revenge against the United States that will last for hundreds of years.

Also, it will do something to our national morality. Do not tell me that there is no cause-to-effect relationship between the lack of morality of our foreign policy and the moral attitudes of the young people of this country. That is why I am working on my speech, "The Crucifixion of the Teachings of Christ in South Vietnam." I believe that our professed religious beliefs should not be kept off the floor of the Senate, but should influence the action of this body.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter entitled "Legalized Murder," written by Dr. E. J. Fagan, Masonic Building, McMinnville, Oreg., and published in the Portland Oregonian.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGALIZED MURDER

To the EDITOR:

Now that big business, the oil companies, airplanes, steel, and Du Pont as well as others have taken over the Johnson administration lock, stock and barrel, we can expect the Vietnam war to continue for months or perhaps years and anyone like our own Senator MORSE or Gov. Mark Hatfield who speaks against such murder can be expected to be slapped down by our leading newspapers.

The Johnson administration wants war and that's what they are going to get, because it's big business and keeps big operations going and a new batch of American millionaires will be hatched before it's over with. That's why war is now so popular.

I would not feel right if I didn't speak out against legalized murder by this or any other country and to my way of thinking both Governor Hatfield and Senator MORSE are 100 percent right in opposing the President's escalation of war in Vietnam. I feel sure that there are enough people on the mainland of Asia to look after any and all problems that may arise in that part of the world without intervention of another continent. Minding our own business, I think, is never a bad policy. Let's try it as a nation and see if results won't be fruitful.

DR. E. J. FAGAN.

MCMINNVILLE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter entitled "We Have Failed," written by Peter S. Buck, of Portland, Oreg., and published in the Portland Oregonian. The letter deals with our outlawry in southeast Asia.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE HAVE FAILED

To the EDITOR:

I do not sympathize with the Oregonian's fear that Senator MORSE is "weakening the unity of purpose the President and the majority of Americans wish to convey to the aggressors." It is not the function of a critic to create unity behind the policies being criticized; if the majority of Americans wish to unite behind the President, then they can do so, but they have no business requiring that dissenters also fall into line so that the impression of solidarity may be made more perfect.

On the issue of Vietnam, I see no virtue in applauding the President for pressing with greater intensity a policy that is not working. We have bombed in the north for months and have steadily increased our military power in Vietnam with the result that the war has gone just as steadily against us. We have supported the transitory regimes that have passed through Saigon and have got, for our troubles, a general there who tells a British newspaper he finds something to admire in Hitler. We have stood firm in Vietnam, but the opposition has simply gone around our war, seeking and finding support among African and Asian nations disenchanted with American policy.

As I understand the history of American involvement in Vietnam, our original intervention was based on the assumption that we could attain our limited objectives with an equally limited effort. This premise has proved false as the effort required has grown out of all proportion to the goals. I think it time that we admit that our undertaking in Vietnam has failed and that, by choosing to intervene in the first place, we are at least partly the creators of our own difficulties. Our position in Asia will not be irrevocably damaged by Vietnam unless, by following futile policy to its bitter conclusion, we show that we are determined to have it that way. Perhaps Senator MORSE's proposals will have no greater success, but I do not see how they can have less.

PETER S. BUCK.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter entitled "Impossible Situation," written by Eunice E. Wise, of Portland, and published in the Portland Oregonian. The letter criticizes our policies in South Vietnam.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPOSSIBLE SITUATION

To the EDITOR:

Your editorial of August 5 entitled, "Now, Impeachment?" reveals that what the whole world has long dreaded and feared has come to pass; that is, "war by miscalculation." And American experts have made the miscalculations.

The $700 million appropriated in May is already spent. Another $700 million plus $1 billion is the minimum thought necessary to carry the "buildup" to January 1. After that nobody knows how much the cost will be.

But the money miscalculation is nothing compared with the seriousness of the manpower miscalculation.

Experts maintain that for success in that kind of war, there must be a ratio of 10 Americans to 1 guerrilla. This is an impossible situation to cope with even if the war lasted 40 years and family planning was banned "for the duration." For there are already more than a billion Communists in the world and less than 200 million Americans counting every man, woman, and child.

It would seem that the time has come for nations to "learn war no more."

EUNICE E. WISE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter entitled "Gross Insult," written by Jane Erickson, of Lake Oswego, Oreg., and published in the Portland Oregonian.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Gross Insult

To the Editor:

Anent your recent editorial "Now, Impeachment?" when the lust for war has fastened itself upon the land, the word "peace" becomes a dirty word and scathing denunciation is heaped upon those who espouse it. Carried to the ultimate, incarceration in concentration camps, and, in some cases, the firing squad, is their reward. If there are any doubts, how many saw, recently, on CBS television, the spectacle of several hundred doctors, lawyers, teachers, etc., who were brought from their jail cells in Saigon to face a row of men sitting in judgment upon them? Their crime: taking part in a peace demonstration urging negotiation looking to a settlement of the war, the very same aim to which our President is supposed to give favor. Undoubtedly their sentences, when rendered, will be further incarceration and, if the great Hitler-worshiping General Ky's wishes are carried out, death by the firing squad.

One wonders how long it will be before the same insanity prevails in our own country. Certainly that condition is aided by those who foment hatred against their fellow citizens whom they scornfully designate as "peaceniks," although among such are many good citizens, including our leading scientists, historians, educators, religionists, and many others.

Such a demeaning appellation and, further, likening our interest in reaching a peaceful solution in Vietnam to an "attraction like flies to a dead fish," is a gross insult to many readers of the Oregonian and is unworthy editorial comment in a newspaper of the usual high caliber of the Oregonian.

Jane Erickson.

Lake Oswego.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a letter entitled "Minimal Respect," written by William H. Halewood, of Portland, and published in the Portland Oregonian. The letter expresses Mr. Halewood's views concerning the war in Vietnam.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Minimal Respect

To the Editor:

Several readers of the Oregonian have registered dismay, in these columns, at the primitiveness of the attitudes expressed in Oregonian editorials having to do with the war in Vietnam. They may now complain of primitive manners as well.

The abusive dismissal of Senator Morse and his audience as "flies drawn to a dead fish," "peaceniks," etc., is beneath the level of civilized discourse. It would seem a modest and easily satisfied requirement of an editorial writer that he approach an issue with the minimum respect necessary to understand it and that he be capable of rational argument.

William H. Halewood.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a letter entitled "Man Who Thinks," written by Mrs. Lloyd Johnson, of Milwaukie, Oreg., and published in the Portland Oregonian.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Man Who Thinks

To the Editor:

Contrary to the views expressed in your editorial of August 5, "Now, Impeachment?" those interested in the peace of the world are not necessarily fanatical, nor do they deserve the ridiculous label "peacenik."

Ours is a war-weary generation. We cannot see that wars accomplish their supposed purpose. Thousands have sacrificed fathers, husbands, sons, and other loved ones to these insatiable monsters. The thought of again sending loved ones into the grinding teeth of a huge war machine is more than grave.

The people of this country are already taxed nearly to the breaking point. If only a portion of the staggering bill presented annually to the American people could be diverted to the spreading of the cause of the Prince of Peace, soon this old world would be a far better place and we need not learn war any more. Haven't we tried the way of death long enough? Why not try the way of life?

As for your attack on Wayne Morse: If we had a few more rabble-rouser leaders with the courage of their convictions such as Mr. Morse demonstrates again and again perhaps there would be less apathy among the people. As long as men in high places allow themselves to be swept along with the current instead of standing up for what they believe or know to be right, the "What's the use?" attitude of the masses will remain. The people of Oregon must feel the need of a man who thinks for himself or they would not return Mr. Morse to the Senate time after time.

Mrs. Lloyd Johnson.

Milwaukee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a letter entitled "Shameless Involvement," written by Peter A. Griffin, of Salem, Oreg., and published in the Portland Oregonian.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Shameless Involvement

To the Editor:

In your August 5 editorial criticizing Senator Morse, you characteristically display more spleen than reason. While the use of facile epithets such as "peaceniks," "fanatical spokesman," and "rabble-rousing demagoguery" may enable you better to manipulate public opinion, they add nothing to what should be a serious national debate on a very grave issue.

The clear implication of your editorial is that Senator Morse himself advocates impeachment despite a story in the same edition of the Oregonian presenting Senator Morse's denial of this very contention. Your own moral bankruptcy blinds you to the fact that there are still Americans of sufficient conscience to be outraged at and protest the wanton and indiscriminate brutalities and devastation visited upon the populace of North and South Vietnam by our former advisers. Moreover, those of us who do feel that President Johnson has grossly overstepped all admissible legal and moral bounds in our shameless involvement in Vietnam are neither isolationists nor are words put in our mouths by Senator Morse, although we all welcome his courage, concern and support.

Peter A. Griffin.

Salem.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last summer, I said on the floor of the Senate that only by a military occupation of South Vietnam by the United States could the Vietcong be stopped from taking over the country. We are now in the process of doing that. We are making this an American war. We are doing it on the theory that we are faced with another Munich in southeast Asia, and that the lessons of history teach us that it is better to fight a small war when aggression first begins than to wait until it has gathered steam, when opposing it will mean a third world war.

The very fact that defenders of administration policy put the war in these terms is indicative of its understanding that the American people do not want war, and that the rest of the world does not want war. Increasingly, your military activities are presented, not as an end in themselves, but as the means of preserving peace. With each fresh arrival of more troops, with each new fleet unit, and with each buildup in the size and activity of the Strategic Air Command, we hear that it is all in the name of peace.

When the bombing of North Vietnam commenced in the first week of February, this was not the case. But between the first week in February and the first week in April, when President Johnson went to Johns Hopkins University to talk for the first time about negotiations, it had become evident that the American people were not satisfied with a purely military policy toward southeast Asia. So it is vital to our policy to determine how much our military activity is contributing to a peaceful settlement.

Some obvious questions come quickly to mind. Who is the aggressor in Vietnam that is to be compared to Hitler's Germany? We say we are bombing North Vietnam to make her more amenable to negotiating; but our Secretary of State maintains that we are going to make Red China leave her neighbors alone. His speech of October 5 to the United Press International Editors and Publishers Conference, referred to China as the major threat to world peace, although Red China has not a man fighting in Vietnam, and has made available very little material support to the Vietcong.

Are we to consider, then, that North Vietnam, whom we are bombing around the clock, is the aggressor who must be stopped now, or are we to consider China, who is not physically involved in the current war at all, as the aggressor?

Another possibility is that communism per se is what the Secretary of State really has in mind. But are the objectives of Communist Ho Chi Minh the same as the objectives of Communist Mao Tse-tung? The Secretary of State is the first man who will tell us that the communism of the Soviet Union, Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and China are all differentiated by their national interests and must not be lumped together by American policy. In fact, it is the policy of the administration to foment the breakup of the Communist bloc by dealing with each country in it as a totally different entity from its neighbors, and to encourage each of them to loosen its ties with the other.

Is this a sound policy for Eastern Europe only? Or are not the same nationalisms that make the Communist bloc of Eastern Europe vulnerable to be found equally in Asia?

Traditionally, there has been little to join the former French colony of Indochina to China. Historically, there has been animosity between them. In fact, we are not using Chiang Kai-shek's Chinese soldiers from Taiwan in large part because they are regarded as unacceptable allies to the people of South Vietnam. There are other reasons, too, but that is one of them. Yet the same historic animosities also prevail north of the 17th parallel. The inhabitants of North Vietnam have the same historic reasons for not wishing to be drawn too closely to mainland China.

We have capitalized on these historic attitudes in the case of the Balkans vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. We have flown in the face of them in the case of North Vietnam and Red China.

We have compelled North Vietnam to seek allies wherever she can find them. We say she is in a different category and we are bombing her because she has transgressed against the Geneva Accords of 1954. But we are not a party to them, nor is South Vietnam, and our transgressions against the same accords are a matter of record with the International Control Commission, which found North Vietnam had violated them. The International Control Commission was created by the Geneva accords to investigate complaints of violations. In its first published report in 1957, it found North Vietnam had violated them, and that South Vietnam had violated them through its military aid program from the United States. That was in 1957. In 1955, we had endorsed the refusal of South Vietnam to proceed with elections throughout the whole of Vietnam, elections specifically provided for in the accords.

So the issue of who first violated the Geneva accords is scarcely one that the United States can stand on as justification for our policy. We never mention our violations when we claim that North Vietnam began infiltrating assistance into the south in 1959. We had already sent in thousands of soldiers.

Nor is there any reason to assume that the United States has any sanction to enforce an agreement to which we are not a signatory. I do not know of any of the Munich analogies that maintain the United States should, alone, have sent troops to Czechoslovakia to fight the Germans in 1938. Oh, no; it is said that the free world should have united against Hitler to stop his aggression. But there is no free world unity in South Vietnam. It is strictly a GI operation, financed by Uncle Sam. The other flags represented in Vietnam represent, as I have said before, little more than flagpoles. We have symbols, some of them sent only under very great diplomatic pressure from the United States. But we have very little tangible help for carrying out our policy in Vietnam.

The Munich analogy breaks down at several places for the reason that we are not concerned so much with what happens to other countries in Asia as we are with our concept of our own American security interests.

We believe that the string of American bases and American-supported countries along the western shores of the Pacific would be threatened by the loss of South Vietnam. That is why we are fighting there. That is why we have exalted an exchange of letters between President Eisenhower and the late unlamented President Diem of Vietnam into a sacred national promise that pretends President Diem never promised us anything. President Eisenhower upset some of our officials when he said recently that the agreement with Diem went no further than a pledge of goods—foreign aid—not direct military support. But all that was hushed up when a further expression of support for our present policy was elicited from President Eisenhower, irrespective of what was in his letter.

It is the effort to maintain an American-oriented government in South Vietnam that is the reason for our war effort there. We see it as a vital link in the containment policy toward Communist China. This containment runs from South Korea, to Japan, to Okinawa, to Taiwan, the Philippines, South Vietnam, Thailand, India, and Pakistan.

PROSPECTS FOR PEACE THROUGH WAR

One of the criticism leveled at those of us who have opposed the war in Vietnam is that we have no alternative that will get the American Army out and still guarantee that the Communists will not take over.

That is quite true. We have no guaranteed alternative. But neither does the administration have any plan for getting the United States out without having the Communists take over. So far, their plan calls only for an indefinite U.S. occupation of South Vietnam to prevent the Vietcong from taking it over whereas we propose a procedure of seeking to bring many other nations in, not to make war, but to keep the peace, just as the United States keeps the peace on the Gaza Strip and in Cyprus, just as the United Nations moved in the other day to take over jurisdiction between Pakistan and India, and just as the United Nations moved into the Congo and moved the Russian military forces that had already started to infiltrate the Congo out of the Congo. That is our program and our recommendation.

The very best that can be expected from administration policy is that the other side will not escalate the war further than we choose to escalate it. Yet the longer the war drags on, the more likelihood there is that China or the Soviet Union will find that their national security interests require them to play a further role in the war. The bickering and border warfare over Kashmir dragged on for 18 years and it finally erupted into outright war. The Vietnam war could well be the same smoldering brushfire that can ignite much of the world. The administration has no plans and no means for ending it, only for continuing it. And it has no guarantee that Red China will not come in; it has no guarantee that the Soviet Union will not aid North Vietnam on a truly massive scale that could lead us into a confrontation with the Soviet Union.

There is no question but that the overwhelming military power of the United States can prevent South Vietnam from falling to the Vietcong. But we have already proved that we cannot win a guerrilla war through our South Vietnamese proxies. We can only cope with guerrilla war by making it a conventional war, fought with the Strategic Air Command and the latest word in airborne, mobile operations by our professional Army.

The men who call themselves a government in Saigon are anxious that there not be any negotiations, and have protested the American offer to negotiate unconditionally. That is to be expected. General Ky and his associates have no claim to power or authority other than through the American war effort. If the American war effort in South Vietnam disappeared tomorrow, General Ky would disappear, too, with all of his tyrannical military associates. We created them, we support them, and maintain them in office. And we do it to keep South Vietnam in the war.

If the war were ended, these military flunkies, and their political cohorts, would lose their reason for existence. So they will do what they can to keep the war going and to keep American military power on their scene.

I am greatly disappointed that the administration has not taken issue publicly with South Vietnam's stated objections to negotiations.

It is very discouraging. I say to President Johnson and to the Ambassador: "You are going to find out that you cannot reconcile General Ky's pronouncements in opposition to negotiations with your promises that you are going to do everything you can to bring about negotiations."

President Johnson should put the puppet in his place in South Vietnam. The objections stated by these puppets were stated publicly, as a rebuke to the American position that we are willing to undertake negotiations unconditionally. These people in Saigon should not be permitted to speak for the United States on this matter. If they become the tail that wags the dog, the American people can expect to continue fighting their war for them forever, beside supporting them with a million dollars worth of goods every day.

President Johnson said during the election campaign of 1964 that to send large American forces into Vietnam would be to fight a war that Asians should be fighting for themselves. That is what he has now done. The question is whether we are going to do their fighting for them on their terms or on ours, and the President has the obligation to make clear to the American people that it is our Government that decides when we fight and when we negotiate, not General Ky.

IS CONTAINMENT OF CHINA U.S. OBJECTIVE?

A few minutes ago I spoke of containment of China as the basis for our policy in Vietnam. This, too, is a slogan that needs analysis. Will what worked with the Soviet Union automatically work with China, and are the condtiions that made the first a reasonable possibility present in Asia?

The most serious difference is the absence of the large and potentially strong nations of Asia from our containment network. Japan permits us to use her territory for bases; and her government gives verbal support to the American war in Vietnam. But her public opinion is overwhelmingly against it. India has never subscribed to our containment theory, despite her own ominous troubles with China, and Pakistan has decamped entirely from her once-close association with the West.

Indonesia, with her population of 100 million and her immense natural resources, is a complete question mark, except in one respect, and that is that her bitter experiences with Dutch colonialism have left her highly anti-West.

So instead of drawing into our network the major non-Communist powers of Asia, as we did in Europe, we have with us only small countries, largely dependent upon American aid for their military establishments, and not even all of those. Burma opted out of the American scheme of things in 1958 and is totally neutral.

Cambodia invited the entire American official community to leave in 1963, and to take U.S. aid with them. Mayor Lee, of Singapore, long counted on as a pro-West ally in Malaysia, now presides over an independent country and has found it expedient to dig back 4 years ago to find the means of insulting the United States.

Malaysia was once one of the dominoes we were supposed to be protecting by fighting in Vietnam. It has now collapsed from its own internal impossibilities, and the most dynamic leader in it has seen fit to cast his lot with anti-Americanism.

It certainly should not be lost on the American people that Mayor Lee, of Singapore, surely a non-Communist, has taken this tack at the very moment when our administration is telling us that our military activities in Asia are the only thing that will convince the nations and people of Asia we mean to stay. Proving to everyone that we will not be evicted by force is supposed to bolster confidence in us. But Mayor Lee is an Asian politician, and he obviously knows where his future lies. His statements that even if the British leave the Singapore bases the Americans will never be allowed in are aimed at his own population and at the nations of Asia with whom Singapore must live and deal as an independent country.

If there was ever an Asiatic strawman, that is one, Mr. President. Great Britain is not likely to leave her bases in the foreseeable future, and the United States has no intention of taking over British responsibilities in Singapore. But this is typical of Communist propaganda. They feed that kind of rot, and they are able to get by with it, because of the intense hatred of most Asians for Americans.

When are we going to learn that? When are we going to learn that Asians do not think as well of us as we think of ourselves? When are we going to learn that Asians suspect us, do not trust us, and take note of our repeated examples of stark hypocrisy in American foreign policy?

There is no Britain, or France, or Germany, or Italy, or Scandinavia to help us encircle Communist China. Call on them, and see how much help will be forthcoming.

They have no intention of reinvolving themselves in Asia. They were beaten once. Western Europe's day in Asia is finished, and they know it. But there are no counterparts among the Asian countries, either. There is in Asia no common cement of fear of communism and a common religious and ethnic background which made possible the unified Western response to the threat of Communism from the Soviet Union.

Indeed, the only common thread in Asian politics is that of anti-Western nationalism. It vastly exceeds fear of communism, in part because the Communists of Asia are indigenous. Whatever their dogmas, they are not white, and they are not white foreigners. This is the great weakness in the American design for Asia. It assumes that our leadership will automatically be accepted as it was in Europe, when the fact is that no white leadership is acceptable any more in Asia.

This is why we are reduced to Thailand, the Philippines, South Korea, and South Vietnam in our search for support. Each is small and totally dependent upon the U.S. Treasury for the maintenance of its defense establishment. These countries are not allies. They are dependencies. They have nothing to offer from their own resources to a common cause or a common struggle.

They are no foundation upon which Asia can develop free from communism. All they do is furnish the United States the real estate for stationing American military forces. You will not hear any Washington policymakers, who prescribe our military commitment in Vietnam as the way to save all of Asia, comment on the failure of the large Asian powers to support us, on the rejection of American aid and bases by Burma and Cambodia, on the violent anti-Americanism of Indonesia, on the breakup of the Malaysian Federation, or on the anti-Americanism of Singapore. Those facts do not fit in with the theory, so they go unmentioned.

McNamara and Bundy cannot reconcile that fact with their propaganda. These facts go unmentioned.

The most that is said about these facts is that the United States has the duty to act as policeman in Asia. But it is entirely a self-appointed duty. The net result of our present operation will be, again in the best of possible results, another American enclave on the Asian Continent like South Korea, supported at a cost of half a billion a year and defended only by the continued presence of 50,000 U.S. troops even after the fighting has stopped, after we have killed the fish in the barrel, after we have leveled their industrial complexes, and after we have created a reservoir of bitter hatred for the United States for years to come.

The more dependent these few governments are upon us, the more vulnerable they become to local opposition, and if they are truly important to us, we must intervene with our military power to salvage the geography they occupy.

This is a vicious circle the Chinese have avoided. Other than border wars, they have not sent a soldier outside their country; they give little economic or military support to any government. They rely upon propaganda, and they can do it because they are sounding an immensely popular and effective note which can be picked up and used by local agitators to great advantage. In all respects, it is China that is the paper tiger in Asia. She talks big but does nothing, even to help the Vietcong. Yet her power and influence in Asia are growing simply because she has the advantage of being a large chunk of Asia, of being kin to millions of Chinese scattered throughout neighboring countries, and of being opposed by Americans who give every appearance of sacrificing indifferent Asians for our own purposes.

In my opinion, the power and influence of China in Asia will grow, no matter what the United States does. China has lived as an international outlaw, and she has yet to come to terms with the existence of her neighbors. But the United States has yet to come to terms with the fact that China is no longer the China of Chiang Kai-shek. Any junta is recognized in Latin America so long as it controls its territory; but in China we spin theories about respect for human rights that we do not think of applying elsewhere in the world.

It is as hard for many Americans to think of a strong and independent China as it was for Winston Churchill to break up the British Empire. Our Department of State reflects this ingrained attitude when it speaks of making Red China "leave her neighbors alone."

Secretary Rusk has played this cracked record so frequently that at long last I believe the American people recognize that he should have something else to follow it up. That is why millions more Americans are beginning to ask, "Mr. Secretary, when are you going to lay the issue formally and officially before the United Nations, as the commitment of the United States when it signed that charter calls for?"

Let me say to the Secretary of State that we are not going to answer it by saying that all that needs to be done is for China to leave its neighbors alone. Around the world, the Secretary of State is now being asked the question, "Mr. Secretary, when are you going to start living up to your country's charter and treaty commitments?"

Yet we freely invaded the Dominican Republic when we thought our self-interest was at stake, and we did not consider that anyone else had a right to "make the United States leave her Caribbean neighbors alone." The expectation that a great power will dominate her weaker neighbors is not an expectation we are willing to accord to China. But China is there. We cannot wishfully think China off the face of the earth. It is new, it is Communist, and it is expanding its contacts with other nations whether the United States approves or not.

This is not to say that Communist China is not a virulent force in Asian affairs, or that it does not try to exert leadership for Communists in North Vietnam and elsewhere. But it is operating in the midst of nations newly entered upon the trials of nationhood, to whom communism is a more remote evil than the colonialism which they have experienced, and certain only that never again will they allow themselves to fall under the dominion of foreign powers.

In this respect, China has a great deal in common with them, and it is a common cause we are making it easy for her to exploit by our unilateral action.

It was not my privilege, day before yesterday, to hear the statesmanlike speech on foreign policy delivered by the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]. As that speech was being given, I was involved in difficult conferences on the higher education bill, with which we had been wrestling for a good many days in conference with the House. At the time the Kennedy speech was being delivered, it was necessary for me to confer with executive officials of the Government and to obtain their advice as to how they thought we should proceed further in trying to arrive at an acceptable compromise with the House on the higher education bill.

I heard all about the Senator's speech when I got back, and I read it the next morning. I tried to reach him by telephone, but he had gone to New York, so I left a message in his office that he be notified that I completely agreed with his speech and wished to associate myself with its premises.

That does not mean that the Senator from New York or I take the position that Red China be recognized in the United Nations. It does mean, however, that we should take our heads out of the sand as a nation and recognize that China has become a great power in Asia and that she must be dealt with. There are those who believe that she should be dealt with by destroying her militarily. I have protested that warhawk philosophy for more than 2 years, and I shall continue to speak out against it, because we could not endanger the ultimate security of the United States more than to follow such an insane course of action. Mr. President, in my judgment, those who hold that point of view are madmen.

The conclusion of the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] is quite right when he suggests that China must be dealt with in regard to nuclear control. Perhaps we cannot deal with her. We can never deal with her if we follow the policies of the State Department.

I have said many times, and now repeat, that I am not in favor of voting Red China into the United Nations until we can obtain some arrangements with her, through the United Nations, in regard to the issues, to determine whether she can be counted upon to follow the obligations which a signatory to that charter would create. That is why, as one of our country's delegates to the United Nations in 1960, I voted against seating Red China, and would do so tomorrow.

However, our Government is failing, in my opinion, to exercise leadership, both diplomatically and through the United Nations, to try to get the United Nations to adopt procedures which will lead to an attempt, at least, to have the United Nations negotiate with Red China in respect to such problems as the Senator from New York raised the other day, and as I have been raising in my frequent speeches in the Senate week after week for more than 2 years.

CONTAINMENT OF CHINA IS A TASK OF THE ENTIRE WORLD

In my opinion, there is a much more applicable lesson to be learned, not only from Munich but from the whole of World War II. The final monument of that war was the recognition that maintaining world peace is a task for the entire community of nations. The victory was a victory not only of the United States nor of Russia, but of a great many countries acting in concert. If the war was to have been prevented, it could only have been prevented by all of the west acting together.

It was the appreciation of that lesson that caused the founding of the United Nations. Peace cannot be maintained by any self-appointed policeman, and indeed, it was Hitler's contention, too, that he was saving Europe from the evils of communism. The possibility of the United States leading an allied cause in Asia is hopeless. If we fight there, we will fight alone, and against many more countries than just China.

The one thing we have not tried yet is the United Nations. It is to that body that the community of nations has entrusted the authority to wage war in the name of peace.

Every minute we conduct our war in Vietnam, we are doing it in violation of our signature on the United Nations Charter, a solemn treaty which, I submit, is a far higher test of our national honor than a letter from one former President to another former President. We stand today in violation of those provisions which require us, as a party to a dispute and as a signatory to the charter, to lay that dispute before the Security Council of the United Nations.

We do not have to propose a solution. But until we have asked the Security Council to meet to consider the threat to the peace in Vietnam, we will remain in violation of the charter. So long as we fail to do that, we convict ourselves of seeking only the ends of American nationalism in southeast Asia, for a nation that rejects the application of the United Nations Charter to a breach of the peace to which we are party, displays much more of the truth than references to a commitment to South Vietnam can ever cover up.

Last week, the world saw a reigning Pope come to the New World for the first time in the 500-year history of the New World. He came to plead for peace, for the maintenance of peace, for no more war.

He did not come before the American Congress to make that plea, nor to the White House. He did not come to the Pentagon and beg the Joint Chiefs of Staff to keep the peace of the world. He did not ask America to act as the policemen of Asia or anywhere else. In fact, he did not come to Washington, D.C., at all.

He came to the United Nations. He called his message "a solemn moral ratification of this lofty institution," and he likened the universality of the United Nations to the universality of the Catholic episcopate.

> The peoples of the earth—

He said—

> turn to the United Nations as the last hope of concord and peace * * *. You give sanction to the great principle that the relations between peoples should be regulated by reason, by justice, by law, by negotiation; not by force, nor by violence, not by war, not by fear or by deceit.
>
> You exist and operate to unite the nations, to bind states together. You are an association. You are a bridge between peoples. You are a network of relations between states. We would almost say that your chief characteristic is a reflection, as it were, in the temporal field, of what our Catholic Church aspires to be in the spiritual field: unique and universal.
>
> In the ideological construction of mankind, there is on the natural level nothing superior to this. Your vocation is to make brothers not only of some but of all peoples, a difficult undertaking, indeed; but this it is, your most noble undertaking.

With words largely interpreted as referring to China, Pope Paul said:

> Strive to bring back among you any who have separated themselves, and study the right method of uniting to your pact of brotherhood, in honor and loyalty, those who do not yet share in it.
>
> Act so that those still outside will desire and merit the confidence of all; and then be generous in granting such confidence.

In his most memorable utterance he told us:

> No more war, war never again. Peace, it is peace which must guide the destinies of peoples and of all mankind * * *. Gratitude and glory to you for the conflicts which you have prevented or have brought to an end. The results of your efforts in recent days in favor of peace, even if not yet proved decisive, are such as to deserve that we, presuming to interpret the sentiments of the world, express to you both praise and thanks.
>
> Gentlemen, you have performed, and you continue to perform, a great work; the education of mankind in the ways of peace. The U.N. is the great school where that education is imparted * * *. Everyone taking his place here becomes a pupil and also a teacher in the art of building peace.

The same papers that carried these words of Pope Paul carried the news that American soldiers in Vietnam now number 140,000. To whom was Pope Paul speaking? Of whom was he speaking?

Our policy in Vietnam has been one of ending a war by pounding one side into the ground with the Strategic Air Command and thousands of American soldiers. But it shows no signs of bringing peace. Its advocates have no idea just how peace may emerge from this, except that they expected the other side to seek negotiations long before this, and they have not.

I do not know whether the United Nations could provide a peace that would prevent the Communists from taking over all of Vietnam. But it must be given a chance to try. The alternative is perpetual war in Asia that will carry the threat of bigger war as long as it continues.

I say today, as I have said in the past, that we have neither the manpower nor the economic resources to police Asia.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of these remarks a wise analysis of our outlook in Vietnam as written by Walter Lippmann in his column which appeared in the Washington Post on September 30. In it, he points out the inconclusiveness of our military occupation of South Vietnam, and raises the same question I have raised in these remarks here and in speeches throughout the country in recent days, which is to ask how the administration and its Pentagon architects of Vietnam policy plan to achieve peace in Vietnam by making war?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Lippmann uses the figure of speech in this column, referring to our policy, as a policy of punching water.

I care not what the descriptive terms; it is the status of posture in South Vietnam that concerns me. I would like to change the status from warmaking to peacekeeping. I would like to change our image from an ugly one of hypocrisy, outlawry, illegality, from one of substituting the jungle law of the claw, for our professed ideal of supporting the rule of law. That is my plea. I make it over and over.

I shall continue to make it over and over and from coast to coast, so long as my country does not declare war, so long as many Americans, and many Senators and Representatives do not live up to their constitutional trusts, oaths, and obligations.

I repeat that every Senator who votes to give to the President the power to make war without a declaration of war violates his oath of office, for he swore to uphold the Constitution. The Constitution vests no power in the President to make war in the absence of a declaration of war, except for that short interval of time that it takes the President to come to a joint session of Congress and recommend a declaration of war in a war message. The Congress then decides whether or not they shall vote in favor of that declaration.

If the President should come up tomorrow with a such proposed declaration, I would vote against it, for, in my judgment, the United States cannot justify making war in Asia or declaring war in Asia until it first exhausts its treaty obligations.

We stand in open, wanton, and deliberate violation of our treaty obligation. We are writing a shameful chapter in American history by our course of action in Asia.

I know that if war is declared it will become my clear patriotic duty as a U.S. Senator to do everything I can to successfully prosecute that war and help to get it over with as quickly as possible, and at the same time to do everything I can to try to convince the leadership of my Government to get back inside the framework of international law.

I made this long speech today because tomorrow in various parts of the country various groups of varied political complexion are going to protest America's involvement in war in Vietnam.

I certainly do not endorse all the views and the conduct that may be taken by some of those groups. Neither do I endorse the McCarthyism of the superpatriots and shocking rightists in this country who are already charging those who tomorrow will protest outlawry of the United States in Asia as being traitors.

Short of a declaration of war what is needed in this country is the protests of millions of Americans against the policy of their Government in Asia.

What is needed in America, short of a declaration of war, is the tramp, tramp, tramp of marching feet in the communities of America, by the thousands of communities, of free people protesting; nonviolent demonstrations against the course of action of the United States in violation of both the Constitution and our treaty obligations.

Mr. President, there are those who would silence those of us who are there to protest the outlawry of our Government. There are those, even found in this body, who believe some sort of censorship ought to be placed on free men who practice their freedom by protesting the inexcusable foreign policy of the Johnson administration.

I thank my God that there are in this country thousands of people who will be heard from tomorrow and in the weeks and months ahead and who will not be cowed into submission by the intolerant bigots of America who believe that because our country is on an illegal course of action, we must support its illegality. I shall never do that so long as I believe there is any hope of getting my country to change its course of action, get back into the framework of international law, and stand for the substitution of the rule of law for its jungle law in South Vietnam.

If the unhappy hour arrives when Congress passes a declaration of war, the senior Senator from Oregon will say to the American people that we must support our constitutional system, because our freedom is dependent upon its implementation. But our freedom is not dependent upon the implementation of unconstitutionalism, and this administration is following an unconstitutional course, short of a declaration of war in southeast Asia.

So I shall be back next week, and I shall speak again and again and again for peace. I shall continue to plead until there is a declaration of war. I shall continue to plead that my country change its course of action. I again call upon my President and upon the Secretary of State to send forthwith to Ambassador Goldberg, at the United Nations, a formal request that he submit the necessary formal resolution to the Security Council calling upon the Council to take full and complete jurisdiction over the threat to the peace of the world in South Vietnam. If that resolution is vetoed, I shall then call upon my President and the Secretary of State and the American Ambassador to the United Nations to proceed under the procedures of the charter in respect to the authority of the General Assembly of the United Nations. I prefer that course to a continuation of the unnecessary killing, bombing, and warmaking in South Vietnam.

I again suggest to Senators and to members of the executive branch of the Government that over the weekend they reread the messages of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt. I have said before in the Senate that I hoped Senators would read the great war message that Woodrow Wilson delivered in April 1917, before a joint session of Congress, in which he set forth that great principle of constitutional law for which, for 2 years, the senior Senator from Oregon has been pleading in the Senate. President Wilson said that he was without constitutional authority to make war in the absence of a declaration of war; and because of that undeniable constitutional restriction upon the President of the United States, he came before a joint session of Congress and recommended a declaration of war against the German Imperial Government, setting forth his reasons therefor.

I would also have Senators read the great war message of Franklin Roosevelt following Pearl Harbor, when he, too, recognized that he was without authority to make war in the absence of a declaration of war. If Senators will read that great war message, as well as the message of Woodrow Wilson, perhaps they will reflect a little longer than they reflected in August 1964, and reflected again this year, when the President submitted to Congress his so-called $700 million appropriation bill for the war in South Vietnam, although at the time he sent it he told Congress and the world that he did not need the money because he had the power to transfer funds without the bill. He said he was using the bill as a vehicle for determining whether or not Congress would stand behind the resolution of August, 1964. Congress voted the funds; and when it did, every Member of Congress who voted for the bill stated that he voted confidence in the President to make war in South Vietnam, outside the Constitution, and, in my opinion, violated his oath of office.

In view of the fact that Congress will undoubtedly, mistakenly, adjourn sine die by the end of next week, I hope that the American people will exercise their precious right of freedom during the time that Congress is not in session and will make clear to the Members of Congress that foreign policy does not belong to Congress or to the President, but belongs to the American people. I hope that the American people will, during the adjournment of Congress, make perfectly clear to the Members of Congress that they expect them to return in January and exercise the great power that is vested in them to seek to get this country to lay the whole issue of South Vietnam before the United Nations for determination, if the President in the meantime does not come to that conclusion on his own initiative.

Exhibit 1

Stalemate in Vietnam

(By Walter Lippmann)

The success of the American buildup in South Vietnam has been very considerable when we measure it by what so many informed people feared last June. The Vietcong has not been able to smash the Saigonese army, to cut the country in half, and in this military disaster to bring about the overthrow of the government in Saigon. There is reason to think that the size and power of the American forces has discouraged or prevented the Vietcong from mounting big enough battles to win a victory over the Saigonese.

Yet, things have not come out as the administration spokesmen hoped they would. They allowed themselves to think that a demonstration of our ability to build up a great American force which could not be defeated would compel or persuade the Vietcong and Hanoi to agree to a negotiated settlement. Quite the contrary has happened. The position of the Vietcong and Hanoi today is even harder than it was last spring.

Why? Why, as we have put more and more of the best troops we have into South Vietnam, as we have escalated the violence of our attacks, have our adversaries become ever more scornful of our proposals to negotiate?

My own belief is that they are convinced that, while the Americans cannot be defeated, the Americans cannot win the war on the ground. This, however, is where the war has to be won, in the villages of South Vietnam, and that is where the struggle will in the end be decided. The essential fact, which is beginning to seep through the dispatches of some of the American correspondents, is that while the Americans can seize almost any place they choose to attack, the Vietcong will almost surely come back once the Americans leave.

The war in Vietnam is like punching a tub full of water. We can make a hole with our powerful fist wherever we punch the water. But once we pull back our hand, possibly to punch another hole in the water, the first hole disappears. In theory, the Saigonese army ought to fill the hole, ought to occupy and pacify the places we seize. But the Saigonese army is not able to do this because it is too small and too war-weary.

It is too small because the villages, which are the reservoir of available manpower, are for the most part Vietcong in their sympathies or are terrorized by the Vietcong. The Saigonese army is too disillusioned and has too little morale to occupy territory which the Americans have seized. What remains of the Saigonese army has little enthusiasm for the revolving politicians in Saigon.

There are some Republican politicians who think that this mess can be disentangled or ended by bombing the industrial, and therefore populated, centers of Hanoi and Haiphong. The President, fortunately, has resisted the temptation to make the war a total war, and thus to make it a general Asian war.

In any event, our adversaries in the Vietcong and in Hanoi show no signs of being intimidated by the possibility of total war. The Vietcong in the south are already receiving the full treatment of total war by our area bombing, and the North Vietnamese do not value their material possessions, which are few, nor even their lives, which are short and unhappy, as do the people of a country who have much to lose and much to live for.

Our adversaries, moreover, have time to wait, time to retreat, to hide, and to live to fight another day. So we shall be forced to face the fact that in order to win the war in South Vietnam we shall have to occupy South Vietnam with American troops. A few months ago Mr. Hanson Baldwin, the military correspondent of the New York Times, called for a million men for Vietnam. It sounded fantastic at the time in the light of what President Johnson was saying about not wanting a wider war. But it is beginning to look very much as if Mr. Baldwin had made an informed and realistic estimate of what a military solution would require.

The situation has become so tangled that no clear and decisive solution is for the present conceivable. The President is no nearer the negotiated settlement which he has hoped to bring about. Nor, as a matter of fact, is the administration truly resolved to negotiate in a sense that it is prepared, even in its private thinking, to make the concessions that any successful negotiation is bound to call for.

Failing the prospect of a settlement, the President has managed to obtain the assent of most of the country to the kind of war we are fighting—a sporadic, low-grade war carried on chiefly by a professional American army. There is no immediate prospect of big battles with big casualties because the Vietcong, so it would seem, have withdrawn into guerrilla warfare. Against the kind of force we have in Vietnam, guerrilla warfare cannot win a victory. But neither can the guerrillas be defeated decisively and put out of business.

If we cannot or will not escalate the war until we have an enormous army which can occupy the country, our best course is to dig in along the coast and begin to discuss with the Vietnamese politicians the formation of a government in Saigon which can negotiate a truce in the civil war. This course will not please the majority of the President's current advisers. But with all due respect to them, how do they propose to win this war, specifically, what size of American army are they prepared to draft and put into Indochina? For the war is not going to be won by punching the water.

SWANSTON EQUIPMENT CO.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 839, S. 317.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 317) for the relief of the Swanston Equipment Co.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments in line 6, after the word "of", where it appears the second time, to strike out "$40,377.19" and insert "$21,376"; and, in line 8, after the word "as", to strike out "excise taxes and"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Swanston Equipment Company, of Fargo, North Dakota, the sum of $21,376, representing the sum of the amounts such company was erroneously required to pay as customs duties in connection with the importation from Canada by it of certain farm machinery and equipment (including farm hoists) during the period beginning October 6, 1956, and ending with the close of May 14, 1959.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 854), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to pay to the claimant the sum of $21,376, the amount of customs duties paid in connection with the importation of certain farm machinery and equipment.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill, as amended, is to pay the claimant $21,376, representing customs duties paid in connection with importation of certain hydraulic truck hoists and parts thereof from Canada.

During the period beginning in April 1956 and ending in June 1959, claimant imported and sold to dealers in the United States farm conversion truck hoists for installation on ordinary 1½-ton trucks used by farmers. Such hoists operated to raise the front end of the truck wagon box so that the load could be dumped out at the tailgate.

Early in 1959 a special agent of the Internal Revenue Service discovered that the quarterly excise tax returns for the periods ending June 30, 1956, through June 30, 1959, had not been filed and the excise tax imposed by the Internal Revenue Code on the hoists sold during those periods had not been paid. The taxpayer sought a ruling that the hoists were not taxable because, first, they were mounted on trucks used only for agricultural purposes; and second, they were exempt from excise taxes because they were subject to the import tariff. The Internal Revenue Service rejected these arguments as being contrary to the Internal Revenue Code and ruled that the hoists were taxable. Claimant then was heard in the appellate division on the ground that the customs duties were improperly collected and as such should be allowed as offset against the excise tax liability on the basis of the doctrine of equitable recoupment. This claim was overruled on the grounds that, first, a requirement for free entry as an agricultural implement is that the implement must be chiefly used throughout the United States for agricultural purposes; and second, available evidence did not establish that these hydraulic hoists were chiefly used in the United States for agricultural purposes.

On June 23, 1963, the taxpayer made an offer in compromise of the excise tax liability, including penalty and interest. Included with the offer in compromise was a check for $7,961.75, which was tendered conditional upon acceptance of the offer.

During the conferences concerning this offer in compromise, the president of the claimant company stated he had relied upon the advice of an employee of the Small Business Administration, that the hoists were not subject to excise tax if customs duties had been paid on the hoists. On August 30, 1963, the offer in compromise was rejected by the Internal Revenue Service and on October 22, 1963, the check for $7,961.75 was applied against the taxpayer's account.

Later, the Government agreed to concede the 25 percent late filing penalty, amounting to $4,752.80, and this was abated. On December 5, 1963, the taxpayer paid $7,000 which brought the total amount of tax and interest paid to date to $21,542.26 and reduced the outstanding liability to $2,008.96.

The report of the committee, in justifying relief, cites the contents of a letter dated September 13, 1960, from the Small Business Adminsitration, over the signature of Ernest W. Reisner, chief production and assistance division, as follows:

> In reply to your inquiry of September 8, 1960, farm machinery and equipment, including farm hoists, for on-farm use enters the United States from Canada duty free. This does not include, however, food and dairy processing machinery and equipment, nor does it include industrial hoists and materials handling equipment.
>
> Further information on the latter may be obtained from the U.S. Tariff Commission, Washington, D.C.
>
> Import statistics on a number of classes of farm machinery and equipment entering the United States from Canada can be obtained from the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Washington, D.C. Farm hoists are basketed with miscellaneous farm machinery and equipment, and cannot be segregated for statistical purposes.

On the basis of this letter it was contended that claimant understood in the trade that hoists for "on-farm use" were exempt; that no one in the Government made any representation in regard to the excise taxes due and that had claimant known there were both duty and excise taxes due on these farm hoists the purchases would never have been made. The report recommends reimbursement to the claimant for the amount of the customs duties which he paid "after reporting the equipment in reliance upon information from an agency of the Government which led him to believe that the equipment was duty-free."

The Treasury Department strongly opposes the bill. It states that the only specific evidence in the record of a communication to claimant from the Small Business Administration is a letter, dated September 13, 1960, which was long after the hoists were imported. The various reasons given by claimant for failing to pay the excise tax indicate that claimant was aware of the excise tax and relied upon incompetent advice as to the application of the tax. In 1956 the Internal Revenue Service published "Tax Guide for Small Business," which described this excise tax on automotive parts and accessories. There was no indication that claimant sought advice on this matter from the Internal Revenue Service nor from any other competent tax counsel, notwithstanding that its sales of hoists apparently amounted to almost $250,000 during the years in question. The records available to the Treasury Department indicate that at no time had the claimant contended it was not aware of the 8-percent excise tax on automotive parts. If claimant had disagreed with the classification of the hoists, it could have availed itself of established judicial remedies to contest the determination. Claimant did not do so, and the statutory period of limitations has now expired on any such claim. There was no evidence in this case of any extraordinary extenuating circumstances. Granting such relief in this case would discriminate against other similarly situated taxpayers and would create an undesirable precedent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, in accordance with the previous order, until Monday, October 18, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, October 15, 1965:

Department of Justice

Frederick Landis, of Indiana, to be judge of the U.S. Customs Court.

H. Moody Brickett, of Montana, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Montana for the term of 4 years.

Merle M. McCurdy, of Ohio, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Ohio for the term of 4 years.

Donald E. O'Brien, of Iowa, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Iowa for the term of 4 years.

John T. Curtin, of New York, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of New York for the term of 4 years.

Emilio Naranjo, of New Mexico, to be U.S. marshal for the district of New Mexico for the term of 4 years.

Thomas W. Sorrell, of Vermont, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Vermont for the term of 4 years.

Leonard T. Heckathorn, of South Dakota, to be U.S. marshal for the district of South Dakota for the term of 4 years.

U.S. Patent Office

Philip E. Mangan, of Maryland, to be an Examiner in Chief, U.S. Patent Office.

Postmasters

ALABAMA

Clara D. Turner, Butler.
Gordon B. Roden, Pisgah.

ALASKA

Herbert Apassingok, Sr., Gambell.

ARIZONA

Homer L. Fancher, Bullhead City.
Frances A. Johnson, Parker.

ARKANSAS

Blount Hohn, Diaz.
Douglas Stroud, Huntsville.
Irlowain E. Roepe, Lakeview.
Clark Walker, Springdale.

CALIFORNIA

Dorothy M. Collis, Brentwood.
Maynard Green, Covina.
Howard C. Denton, Los Altos.
Theodore F. Locicero, Monterey.
Norman J. Pope, New Almaden.
Ellen C. Cothran, Westmoreland.

COLORADO

Roy G. Larson, Arvada.
Vernon J. Dix, Haxtun.

CONNECTICUT

Vincent P. Nolan, Southington.
Donald L. Cummings, Vernon.

GEORGIA

Woodrow W. Gay, Cordele.
James A. Howard, Jr., Dearing.

ILLINOIS

Malvin W. Ditzler, Davis.
William C. Thompson, Edwards.
Francis C. Shanahan, Midlothian.
Gerald D. Earlenbaugh, Pearl City.

INDIANA

Roberta L. Harlan, Bringhurst.
John D. Wade, Jonesboro.

IOWA

Coline L. Morisky, Fostoria.
Wilfred L. Cline, Menlo.
Gerald F. Siebels, Minden.
Delbert W. DeHaan, Orange City.
Clarence L. Busch, Persia.

KENTUCKY

Franklin A. Orndorff, Adairville.
Dallas L. Crace, Campbellsville.
Mildred J. Jackson, Mayking.
Newell M. Hargett, Maysville.

LOUISIANA

Theodore H. Bolton, Anacoco.
Raymond C. Couvillion, Melville.

MAINE

Beatrice N. Bagley, Grand Lake Stream.
Wesley G. Oliver, Nobleboro.
Chester W. Curtis, Richmond.

MARYLAND

Charles C. Gray, Deale.
Nona E. Geisler, Woodstock.

MASSACHUSETTS

Frieland C. Peltier, Oxford.
William F. Griffin, Rutland.

MICHIGAN

Leonard E. Amidon, Interlochen.
James R. Budak, Lakeside.
Calvin P. Leach, Le Roy.
Mark C. Dilts, Mesick.

MINNESOTA

Edward S. Walters, Willow River.
Armin R. Steinhaus, Winthrop.

MISSOURI

John Rowlett, Jr., Maitland.
Gerald E. Fielder, Winfield.

NEBRASKA

Theodore I. Larsen, Exeter.
Veronica E. Walsh, Ulysses.

NEVADA

Lester E. Mills, Logandale.

NEW JERSEY

Virginia A. Korbobo, Bloomsbury.
Thomas E. Buckley, Roseland.

NEW YORK

Francis E. Gilhooly, Alexander.
John B. Goodwin, East Rochester.
Evelyn F. Kurtz, Henderson Harbor.
John L. Ingalls, Hornell.
Florence Robinson, Lawrence.
Henry A. Walter, Loch Sheldrake.
John J. Bridgeford, Rensselaer.
Mary E. Cawley, Witherbee.

NORTH CAROLINA

Raymond G. Gaylor, Ayden.
William E. Twiford, Kill Devil Hills.
Gerald B. Gibson, Pine Hall.
Billy V. Overman, Rockwell.

NORTH DAKOTA

Edward A. Seel, Rugby.

OHIO

Henry C. Waggoner, Amsterdam.
Harry R. Kimball, Jr., Green Springs.
Carl J. Burkhart, Leavittsburg.
Willard C. Geis, Massillon.
Thomas W. Feldman, Minster.
Robert D. Maidlow, Prospect.
William P. Moran, Roseville.

OKLAHOMA

Charles M. McCurdy, Tupelo.

OREGON

George A. Hansen, Halfway.
William C. Green, Oregon City.

PENNSYLVANIA

Chester P. Tracewski, Eynon.
Joseph A. Ferace, Greensburg.
Mary C. Klingel, La Plume.
Edward D. Oliver, Montrose.
Leonard H. Stackhouse, Muncy Valley.
Henry A. Springer, New Stanton.
Albert L. Wessner, Pine Grove.
Doris I. M. Moyer, Virginville.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Walter A. Clark, Vance.
Stanmore T. McClain, Williston.

SOUTH DAKOTA

LaVerne V. Johannesen, Erwin.
James W. Preston, Hermosa.

TENNESSEE

Lyle P. Varnell, Adamsville.
Robert M. Sams, Dandridge.
Harold A. Hutcheson, Soddy.
Grover B. Tucker, Tracy City.

TEXAS

Narvie L. Caperton, Cameron.
Edison Monroe, Eustace.
Sidney L. Gustafson, Gonzales.
Ruby F. Henderson, Groesbeck.
Nina F. Ruby, Pollok.

UTAH

David F. Parrish, Centerville.
Garr B. Ashby, Holden.
Michael D. Pavich, Midvale.
Pete L. Bruno, Price.
Ernest R. Farnsworth, Santaquin.
David C. Weeks, Smithfield.

VIRGINIA

Richard E. Durham, Millboro.

WASHINGTON

Charles S. Shepard, Cheney.

WEST VIRGINIA

William S. Penn, Jr., Bluefield.
Charles H. Gillilan, Jr., Frankford.

WISCONSIN

Robert J. Kane, Cassville.
William Ihrig, Jr., Centuria.
Clarence E. Sandberg, Clear Lake.
Donald E. Peters, Juneau.
Julia M. Binning, Kansasville.
Robert F. Hartsworm, King.
Silas J. Paul, Montfort.
Richard H. Vollmer, Mukwonago.
Carl S. Nordin, Siren.
John P. Seckar, Vandyne.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., prefaced his prayer with these words of Scripture: Psalm 85: 8: *I will hear what God the Lord will say unto us for He will speak peace unto His people.*

Almighty God, who art always speaking unto us through Thy Holy Word, may this verse of sacred Scripture, with its message of peace and loving kindness, of comfort and assurance, be unto us a revealing light and a sustaining power during all the hours of this new day.

We rejoice that Thy Word is a lamp unto our feet and its entrance giveth light to our path.

Grant that the meditations of our hearts may daily be tempered and disciplined by the spirit of charity and sympathy, of tolerance and cooperation, as we seek to solve the difficult problems of human relationships.

May Thy Word illumine our spiritual insight and bring it into harmony with a great faith and enable us to meet each day with courage and fidelity.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Journal of the preceding session.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the Journal be read in full.

The Clerk read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 14, 1965.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Journal of Thursday, October 14, 1965, as read, will stand approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1218. An act for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co. and/or Holt Import & Export Co.;

H.R. 4088. An act for the relief of Irving M. Sobin Chemical Co., Inc.;

H.R. 8646. An act for the relief of Rifkin Textiles Corp.;

H.R. 10292. An act for the relief of Hilda Shen Tsiang;

H.R. 11096. An act to authorize the disposal of graphite, quartz crystals, and lump steatite talc from the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both;

H.R. 11303. An act to amend section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended; and

H.J. Res. 597. Joint resolution providing for the erection of a memorial to the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the father of rocketry.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 168. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10097. An act for the relief of North Counties Hydro-Electric Co.; and

H.R. 10369. An act to give the consent of Congress to the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont to enter into a compact providing for bus taxation proration and reciprocity.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9220) entitled "An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes," and concurred in House amendment to Senate amendment No. 17.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the House amendment to the Senate amendment No. L1 to the bill H.R. 9022, an act to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster; to eliminate inequities in the application of Public Law 815 in certain military base closings; to make uniform eligibility requirements for school districts in Public Law 874; and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2084. An act to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 7812) entitled "An act to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mrs. SMITH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 8310) entitled "An act to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. PELL, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. MURPHY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 317. An act for the relief of the Swanston Equipment Co.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. EDWIN W. EDWARDS, be permitted to take the oath of office today. His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 371]

Abbitt
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Aspinall
Bell
Berry
Blatnik
Bolling
Bonner
Brock
Cahill
Callaway
Casey
Celler
Cleveland
Clevenger
Conable
Conyers
Culver
Davis, Ga.
Dickinson
Diggs
Donohue
Dow
Duncan, Oreg.
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Evins, Tenn.
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford, Gerald R.
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gathings
Goodell
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Halleck
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Henderson
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Jennings
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Laird
Latta
Lindsay
Long, Md.
Love
McDowell
McEwen
Mackay
Madden
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mills
Mize
Monagan
Morton
Mosher
Murphy, N.Y.
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Philbin
Pickle
Poage
Pool
Powell
Purcell
Quillen
Reifel
Resnick
Reuss
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Schisler
Sisk
Smith, N.Y.
Stephens
Stratton
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tunney
Vivian
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Weltner
Whitten
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wyatt
Young

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 314 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

RIVERS AND HARBORS ACT OF 1965

Mr. JONES of Alabama submitted a conference report on the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be printed.

BUS TAXATION PRORATION AND RECIPROCITY

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10369) to give the consent of Congress to the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont, to enter into a compact providing for bus taxation proration and reciprocity, with amendments of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 to 8, inclusive, and insert "That the consent of Congress is given to the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont to become parties to title II of the Compact on Taxation of Motor Fuels Consumed by Interstate Buses and to the Agreement relating to Bus Taxation Proration and Reciprocity as consented to by the Congress in the Act of April 14, 1965 (79 Stat. 60)."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to give the consent of Congress to the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont to become parties to title II of the Compact on Taxation of Motor Fuels Consumed by Interstate Buses and the Agreement relating to Bus Taxation Proration and Reciprocity."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to commend the gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the subcommittee that approved this bill as it came to the House. I wish the gentleman would explain the impact of this amendment on the House version of the legislation.

Mr. WILLIS. I am glad to explain the amendment to the gentleman who is the author of the bill.

The amendment is a technical amendment and an unimportant amendment so far as the merits of the legislation are concerned. It simply substitutes the words "to become parties to" in place of the words "to enter into" a compact, and so on.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, obviously the amendment as explained by the gentleman from Louisiana does not affect the basic purposes of the legislation as it passed the House and, therefore, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING DISPOSAL OF 124,200,000 POUNDS OF NICKEL FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10305) to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 124,200,000 pounds of nickel from the national stockpile, with amendments of the Senate thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and without objection appoints the following conferees: Messrs. RIVERS of South Carolina, PHILBIN, BENNETT, ARENDS, and GUBSER.

AUTHORIZING RELEASE OF ZINC FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE OR SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 9047) to authorize the release of certain quantities of zinc from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both, with amendments of the Senate thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and without objection appoints the following conferees: Messrs. RIVERS of South Carolina, PHILBIN, BENNETT, ARENDS, and GUBSER.

WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT—WORK PLANS—COMMUNICATION FROM COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication which was read and which, together with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., October 14, 1965.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture today considered the work plans transmitted to you by executive communication and referred to this committee and unanimously approved each of such plans. The work plans involved are:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION NUMBER, WATERSHED, AND STATE

No. 1532, 89th Congress, Back Swamp, N.C.

No. 1422, 89th Congress, Big Slough, Fla.

No. 1532, 89th Congress, Blue Eye Creek, Ala.

No. 1603, 89th Congress, Chocolate, Little Chocolate, and Lynn Bayou, Tex.

No. 1532, 89th Congress, Escondido Creek, Tex.

No. 1603, 89th Congress, Frogville, Okla.

No. 1532, 89th Congress, Little Delaware-Mission Creeks, Kans.

No. 1532, 89th Congress, Lower Bayou Teche, La.

No. 1532, 89th Congress, Margaret Creek, Ohio.

No. 1532, 89th Congress, Mill Creek, Ind.

No. 2534, 87th Congress, Mill Creek, Tenn.

No. 2534, 87th Congress, Mosquito of Harrison, Iowa.

No. 1633, 89th Congress, Plain Honey Creek, Wis.

No. 1532, 89th Congress, Revolon, Calif.

No. 1603, 89th Congress, Swan Quarter, N.C.

No. 1532, 89th Congress, Turkey Creek, Kans.

No. 1422, 89th Congress, Upper Big Nemaha, Nebr.

No. 1532, 89th Congress, Williams Creek, Tex.

No. 1603, 89th Congress, Zeigler Creek, Nebr.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT, AS AMENDED — COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 13, 1965.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Public Works has approved the work plans transmitted to you which were referred to this committee. The work plans involved are:

STATE WATERSHED, EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION NUMBER, AND COMMITTEE APPROVAL

Louisiana, Bayou Boeuf, No. 1612, October 13, 1965.

Pennsylvania, Mauch Chunk Creek, No. 1612, October 13, 1965.

Pennsylvania, Middle Creek, No. 1612, October 13, 1965.

Pennsylvania, Oil Creek, No. 1612, October 13, 1965.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. FALLON,
Member of Congress,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

CONSTRUCTION OF POST OFFICE AND FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING AT DENTON, TEX.—COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 14, 1965.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House, the Capitol, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives on October 13, 1965, approved a prospectus for the construction of the following building, which prospectus was transmitted to this committee from the General Services Administration:

Texas, Denton, Post Office and Federal Office Building.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. FALLON,
Member of Congress,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—CONFERENCE REPORT ON HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 9567, the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The House is not in order and we could not hear the request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky asked unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the Higher Education Act.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

TRANSFER FIVE COUNTIES TO WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8317) to amend section 116 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the U.S. District Court for the eastern and western districts of Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire if this will involve an additional Federal judgeship.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. This does not in any manner involve an additional judgeship or any expense whatsoever.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Colorado advise the House as to the basic necessity of this reallocation of countries of Oklahoma into judicial districts?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman, this is for the convenience of litigants and witnesses. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], I am sure, can answer any other details the gentleman may have in mind.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman if he wishes to furnish additional information.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have a statement which I intend to insert in the RECORD. I might say that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN] and I support this legislation, as does the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], whose district also is represented.

Mr. HALL. Whose districts are involved in this legislation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The districts involved are those of Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. JARMAN, and mine. The bill moves five counties from Mr. JARMAN's district and my district, which are presently in Mr. EDMONDSON's district, to the Oklahoma City district. This is simply a matter of geographic convenience to accommodate all parties concerned.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman explain why the views of the Department of Justice are not printed in the report?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, in response to the question of the gentleman from Missouri, the Department of Justice always yields to the Judicial Conference that makes these recommendations. I am sure the gentleman understands how the Judicial Conference is composed.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman from Missouri knows about the Judicial Conferences, yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman asked about the Justice Department and its views. The report contains a letter from the Deputy Attorney General and if the gentleman has no objection I shall be glad to read that letter.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman would just insert the letter in the RECORD.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I have just referred, addressed to the gentleman from New York, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and dated August 10, 1965, as it relates to H.R. 8317, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

AUGUST 10, 1965.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Justice on H.R. 8317, a bill to amend section 116 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the U.S. district court for the eastern and western districts of Oklahoma.

The bill would amend section 116 of title 28, United States Code, by providing that the counties of Garvin, Grady, McClain, and Stephens, which are presently in the eastern district of Oklahoma, shall be transferred to the western district of Oklahoma. It would also provide that Chickasha and Pauls Valley, which are now places of holding court for the eastern district of Oklahoma, shall be places of holding court for the western district of Oklahoma.

Inasmuch as this legislation is of primary concern to the judiciary, the Department of Justice defers to the Judicial Conference of the United States concerning its enactment.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

RAMSEY CLARK,
Deputy Attorney General.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN], or the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], whether the local attorneys and residents concur in this reallocation of counties?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; they do.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to hear that this regrouping of judicial districts in Oklahoma will not require an additional Federal judge. I get the impression these days we have too many Federal judges in some places, at least in the State of Massachusetts, where there has been a vacancy since 1961, and where the attempt is now being made to fill the vacancy with an unqualified candidate. I am pleased to know that there is a surplusage and that we will not be called upon in the near future to create any more Federal judgeships.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is correct. Nothing in this bill creates a Federal judge.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, with the assurance of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] that there will be no cost involved, and no additional Federal judge's office established, and on the basis of the reassurance given by the gentleman from Oklahoma and the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 8317

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first sentence of section 116(b) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out (1) "Garvin, Grady,", (2) "McClain,", and (3) "Stephens,".

(b) The second sentence of section 116(b) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out (1) "Chickasha," and (2) "Pauls Valley,".

(c) The first sentence of section 116(c) of title 28, United States Code, is amended (1) by inserting "Garvin, Grady," immediately after "Garfield,", (2) by inserting "McClain," immediately after "Logan,", and (3) by inserting "Stephens," immediately after "Roger Mills,".

(d) The second sentence of section 116(c) of title 28, United States Code, is amended (1) by inserting "Chickasha," immediately before "Enid", and (2) by inserting "Pauls Valley," immediately after "Oklahoma City,".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the sixtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike the language on page 1, line 3, through line 7 on page 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That (a) section 116(b) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) The Eastern District comprises the counties of Adair, Atoka, Bryan, Carter, Cherokee, Choctaw, Coal, Haskell, Hughes, Johnston, Latimer, Le Flore, Love, McCurtain, McIntosh, Marshall, Murray, Muskogee, Okfuskee, Okmulgee, Pittsburg, Pontotoc, Pushmataha, Seminole, Sequoyah, and Wagoner.

"'Court for the Eastern District shall be held at Ada, Ardmore, Durant, Hugo, Moskogee, Okmulgee, Poteau and S. McAlester.'

"(b) Section 116(c) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) The Western District comprises the counties of Alfalfa, Beaver, Beckham, Blaine, Caddo, Canadian, Cimarron, Cleveland, Comanche, Cotton, Custer, Dewey, Ellis, Garfield, Garvin, Grady, Grant, Greer, Harmon, Harper, Jackson, Jefferson, Kay, Kingfisher, Kiowa, Lincoln, Logan, McClain, Major, Noble, Oklahoma, Payne, Pottawatomie, Roger Mills, Stephens, Texas, Tillman, Washita, Woods, and Woodward.

"'Court for the Western District shall be held at Chickasha, Enid, Guthrie, Lawton, Mangum, Oklahoma City, Pauls Valley, Ponca City, Shawnee, and Woodward.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, enactment of this legislation is important to three counties in the Sixth Congressional District of Oklahoma and has been requested by members of the bar in Grady, Stephens, and Jefferson Counties.

This bill, introduced by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN], would transfer five counties from the eastern to the western district of Oklahoma. The legislation affects two counties in the Fifth Congressional District. I introduced a similar bill, H.R. 8624, at the request of the Honorable Alfred P. Murrah, chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 10th district, and members of the bar of the three counties.

Early in the session I received petitions signed by members of the bar in Grady, Stephens, and Jefferson Counties asking that legislation be introduced to transfer these three counties from the eastern to the western judicial district. I understand that there has been agitation for this realinement for more than 30 years but the members of the bar and others interested simply have never been able to quite agree upon it until recently.

As stated in the committee report, the basic purpose of this transfer is for the convenience of the litigants and their attorneys in the five counties in question. Currently, all the the filing is done is Muskogee and involves substantial travel and expense, but these costs will be lessened by the transfer to Oklahoma City.

It is my understanding that the reason the five counties were attached to the eastern district at the beginning was because they were a part of the old Indian Territory which formed the boundary between the eastern and western districts of Oklahoma when the Federal courts were organized at statehood in 1907.

Under the pending legislation, Oklahoma City would become the court town for these counties, instead of Muskogee, and, of course, Oklahoma City is far more convenient and accessible.

There now are five Federal district judges in the western district. One judge resides in the eastern district. Two of the judges residing in the western district also are judges in the northern and eastern districts. But inasmuch as they live in Oklahoma City, which is easily accessible to the counties south of Oklahoma City, it is my understanding that much of the litigation originating in the counties affected by this legislation is tried in Oklahoma City by agreement.

I thank the Committee on the Judiciary for its prompt attention to our problem and I hope the legislation will be enacted at this session.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PLACING STATUE OF THE LATE SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 46) to authorize placing temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol the statue of the late Senator Dennis Chavez.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have one simple question: Is it true, as according to the customs of the Capitol, that this will not exceed the allocation per State of two statues in the rotunda?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That is right. This will be the first statue from New Mexico.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 46

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Senator Dennis Chavez Statuary Hall Commission is hereby authorized to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico, and to hold ceremonies in the rotunda on said occasion, and the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make the necessary arrangements therefor.

The Senate Concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACCEPTANCE OF STATUE OF LATE SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 47) to authorize the acceptance by Congress of the statue of the late Senator Dennis Chavez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 47

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the statue of the late Dennis Chavez, presented by the State of New Mexico, is accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of Congress be tendered to the State for the contribution of the statue of one of its most eminent citizens, illustrious for his historic renown and distinguished civic services; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the Governor of New Mexico.

Passed the Senate September 10 (legislative day, September 8), 1965.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINT, PRESENTATION OF STATUE OF LATE SENATOR CHAVEZ

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 48) to print as a Senate document the proceedings of the presentation, dedication, and acceptance by Congress of the statue of the late Senator Dennis Chavez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 48

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the proceedings at the presentation, dedication, and acceptance of the statue of Dennis Chavez, to be presented by the State of New Mexico in the rotunda of the Capitol, together with appropriate illustrations and other pertinent matter, shall be printed as a Senate document. The copy for such Senate document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed five thousand additional copies of such Senate document, which shall be bound in such style as the Joint Committee on Printing shall direct, and of which one hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate and two thousand eight hundred copies shall be for the use of the Members of the Senate from the State of New Mexico, and five hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and one thousand six hundred copies shall be for the use of the Members of the House of Representatives from the State of New Mexico.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTRICAL AND MECHANICAL OFFICE EQUIPMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11267) to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove certain limitations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the RECORD show, if possible, if there are any proposals pending to increase the aggregate amount which may be expended for the equipment involved?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I believe I might throw some light on that question. I do not know of any pending legislation or resolutions for that purpose. Actually, the necessity for that has been lessened due to the fact that some weeks ago the House adopted a resolution authorizing the purchase of an automatic typewriter which would not come out of the electrical equipment fund.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would say that as far as the chairman of that particular subcommittee is concerned, there would certainly be no necessity for any increase in it.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman indicate as to whether or not there is any authority to use this type of equipment in our district offices?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, there is no additional authority granted through the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it there are certain districts where the GSA has a pool and it is possible for Members of Congress to obtain typewriters and other equipment; whereas, in other areas that is not the case.

I believe, perhaps, the committee might well consider this question as to whether some of the Members are unable to obtain sufficient equipment for their needs.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation and I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11267

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (d) of the first section of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the Clerk of the House of Representatives to furnish certain electrical or mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives", approved March 25, 1953 (2 U.S.C. 112a(d)), is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAN ANTONIO 250TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATIVE MEDALS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7526) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of San Antonio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 7526

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall strike and furnish for the Hemis-Fair Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation"), a not-for-profit organization for the celebration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the San Antonio community, national medals in commemoration of such anniversary.

SEC. 2. Such medals shall be of such sizes, materials, and designs, and shall be so inscribed, as the corporation may determine with the approval of the Secretary.

SEC. 3. Not more than one hundred thousand of such medals may be produced. Production shall be in such quantities, not less than two thousand, as may be ordered by the corporation, but no work may be commenced on any order unless the Secretary has received security satisfactory to him for the payment of the cost of the production of such order. Such cost shall include labor, material, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, as determined by the Secretary. No medals may be produced pursuant to this Act after December 31, 1968.

SEC. 4. Upon receipt of payment for such medals in the amount of the cost thereof as determined pursuant to section 3, the Secretary shall deliver the medals as the corporation may request.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which is a technical amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GONZALEZ: On page 1, beginning on line 4, after the words "furnish for the", strike out "Hemis-Fair Corporation" and insert "San Antonio Fair, Incorporated."

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word. May I inquire of the gentleman proposing the amendment on the original bill H.R. 7526, if indeed this is for the HemisFair celebration in San Antonio by an act that was passed by this body wherein we authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to strike a medal at no cost to the United States?

Mr. GONZALEZ. It authorizes the San Antonio Fair, Inc., which is the corporate entity responsible for the liability and undertaking the cost necessary to strike the medal, which is also sponsoring the HemisFair to coincide with the commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of San Antonio.

Mr. HALL. This is a corporate body that is putting on what we voted for as the HemisFair in recent weeks in this body.

Mr. GONZALEZ. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. What is the purpose of the commemorative medallion, Mr. Speaker? Is it just one of these medallions that would commemorate the 250th anniversary of the founding of the city of San Antonio after migration to the north through El Paso del Norte?

Mr. GONZALEZ. That is correct. The gentleman is correct, it commemorates the 250th anniversary of the founding of the first settlement in that area.

Mr. HALL. Are these medals to be sold, or presented, or given away, or will there be some reimbursement by this corporation for this authorization?

Mr. GONZALEZ. As I understand it, the corporation undertakes the complete cost the Treasury assumes in striking the medal. They will be limited as to the number they can strike. The corporation in its wisdom can either sell or obtain through the disposition of these medals what I would consider the bare net cost.

Mr. HALL. It will be a self-liquidating proposition, it does not come out of the $125,000 of Federal funds advanced by this body?

Mr. GONZALEZ. There would be nothing connected with Federal funds. It would mean that the corporation undertakes the liability for reimbursing the Treasury for any cost that might accrue for striking the medals.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ST. AUGUSTINE QUADRICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 516) to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the Saint Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), to provide that eight members of such Commission shall be appointed by the President, to provide that such Commission shall not terminate prior to December 31, 1966, and to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of such joint resolution.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 516

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subsection (a) of the first section of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the Saint Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, and for other purposes", approved August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), is amended by striking "eleven" and inserting in lieu thereof "thirteen".

(b) Paragraph (4) of subsection (a) of such section is amended by striking "Six" and inserting in lieu thereof "Eight".

SEC. 2. Section 4(b) of such joint resolution is amended by inserting, immediately after "Congress" in the last sentence thereof, the following: "except that in no event shall the Commission terminate prior to December 31, 1966".

SEC. 3. Such joint resolution is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution, but in no event shall the sums hereby authorized to be appropriated exceed a total of $25,000."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to establish the Saint Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, and for other purposes', approved August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), to provide that eight members of such Commission shall be appointed by the President, and that such Commission may continue in existence until December 31, 1966."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, lines 6 through 9, strike out all of section 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. Section 4(b) of such joint resolution is amended by inserting, immediately after 'Congress' in the last sentence thereof, the following: ', except that the Commission may continue in existence until December 31, 1966."

On page 2, strike out lines 10 through 15.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An Act to amend the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to establish the Saint Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, and for other purposes,' approved August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), to provide that eight members of such Commission shall be appointed by the President, and that such Commission may continue in existence until December 31, 1966."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPLAY OF THE FLAG AT LEXINGTON, MASS.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5493) to provide that the flag of the United States of America may be flown for 24 hours of each day in Lexington, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I simply want to point out to the House that this is one of two bills involving the flying of our emblem, our national colors, in two places, perhaps deserving, today. At the present time this is authorized by the Congress in only five different spots—the U.S. Capitol, the White House, Fort McHenry, Betsy Ross' home, and the U.S. Marine Iwo Jima Memorial—in the United States of America. We should carefully consider, and I have no opposition to this particular bill because the colors are lighted during the hours from sundown to sunup; and I think it is a deserving situation, where the Minute Men first withstood the British on the commons—or on the green—at Lexington in Massachusetts—but I think we should give serious consideration to these requirements and, secondly, to realize that we are opening up a floodgate of precedent.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5493

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled, That, notwithstanding any rule or custom pertaining to the display of the flag of the United States of America as set forth in the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America", approved June 22, 1942 (36 U.S.C. 171–178), the flag of the United States of America may be flown for twenty-four hours of each day on the green of the town of Lexington, Massachusetts. The flag may not be flown pursuant to the authority contained in this Act during the hours from sunset to sunrise unless it is illuminated.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL PARKINSON WEEK

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 571) to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning October 25 in each year as National Parkinson Week.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas more than one and one half million people are afflicted with Parkinson's disease; and

Whereas the National Parkinson Foundation has been established to promote research concerning and to assist persons afflicted by Parkinson's disease; and

Whereas many persons have dedicated themselves to diagnosing, treating, and rehabilitating persons afflicted by Parkinson's disease and to research into the cause or causes of such disease and a cure for it; and

Whereas the Nation's first Parkinson Rehabilitation, Diagnostic, and Research Institute was established at Miami, Florida, in 1962: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation designating the week beginning October 25 of each year as National Parkinson Week and inviting the Governors of the several States to issue similar proclamations. It is requested that such proclamation invite the medical profession, the press, and all agencies and individuals interested in a national program for the control of Parkinson's disease to unite during such week in public dedication to such a program and in a concerted effort to impress upon the people of the United States the necessity for such a program.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning October 25, 1965, as National Parkinson Week."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, strike all "Whereas" clauses.

On page 2, line 5, after "25", strike "of each year" and in lieu thereof insert ", 1965,".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor, I rise to join my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], in supporting this most significant resolution, in high hope that the declaration of a National Parkinson Week will bring Parkinson's disease to the concern and sympathetic attention of the American people.

Parkinsonism is a devastating disease, numbing mind and soul as well as body. Neither cause nor cure is known, and therapy serves only to retard the progress of deterioration. Hope for the million and a half Americans afflicted with Parkinson's must lie mainly in research and, therefore, in public education.

The last few years have witnessed substantial progress in public concern and governmental support. Particularly outstanding efforts are being made by the National Parkinson Foundation, a private organization which coordinates and sponsors research, operates an outpatient unit in Miami for treatment and rehabilitation and is building a 100-bed inpatient facility for intensive care of Parkinson victims.

The foundation is headed by Mrs. Jeanne Levey, a valiant woman who found through her own husband's affliction the strength and courage and urgent need to work for the many thousands suffering similarly. Always the thrust of her effort is the same: to reach more and more people, to convey the necessity, to rouse concern, to enlist support. Thousands of Americans have found hope and encouragement from her dedication and her untiring and unselfish efforts. I am sure that all present here today in this great body join in commending Mrs. Jeanne Levey and her coworkers for their outstanding humanitarian work.

Surely we can aid such efforts. As we have learned in the past, successful and rapid attack on disease depends heavily on public understanding and involvement. I believe the declaration of a National Parkinson Week would be a great stimulus to such active participation. Press, radio, the medical profession, interested agencies, and individuals would unite during the week in a special and concentrated campaign to educate the people of the United States about Parkinson's disease. And this, in turn, will lead to demand for, and support of, research into the cause and effective treatment of this dread disease.

As you may know, my own urgency in the matter rises from personal experience: I have seen the ravages of Parkinsonism in my family.

I urge your support of this resolution. There is much to be gained.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning October 25, 1965, as National Parkinson Week."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPLAY OF THE FLAG AT THE GRAVE OF CAPT. WILLIAM DRIVER

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 12) to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day at the grave of Capt. William Driver in Nashville, Tenn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is there any reason why in view of today's Consent Calendar No. 221 permitting the flag to fly 24 hours a day over the green in Lexington, Mass., providing it is lighted from sundown to sunup, that the same provision is not made on this bill, Calendar No. 223, House Joint Resolution 12?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman must recognize that the bill does not authorize the appropriation of any funds. We have stated in the report that this should be illuminated between the hours from sunset to sunrise. As I say, that is set forth in the report. My understanding is that the expense in connection therewith will be borne by the American Legion of Nashville. It was introduced in a different form and we did not want to change it or amend it, but we have the assurance that is what will be done.

Mr. HALL. Will not the gentleman agree with me that it would be much better to put this in the authorizing legislation, if indeed we are to allow additional flying of the colors 24 hours a day?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. To have it in the authorizing legislation perhaps would be a better method. However, I do not contemplate that an organization like the American Legion will not carry out our understanding as set forth in the report.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in view of this I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution be passed over temporarily until such an amendment can be drawn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL]?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATES OF CITIZENSHIP IN THE CANAL ZONE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3993) to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to interrogate one of the chief sponsors responsible for this bill. I see the gentleman from Ohio is on his feet and I want to ask the gentleman this question. In sponsoring this bill today, are you taking into consideration the announced new proposed treaty with Panama that would cancel our lease on the Panama Canal Zone and which would, in effect, nullify the purposes of this bill?

Mr. FEIGHAN. This bill was approved before the announcement of that agreement. This is a bill which would permit the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone because the Canal Zone is not included within the definition of the United States. The only reason for this legislation is a matter of convenience for those in the Canal Zone who are U.S. citizens or who may be U.S. citizens and eliminates the necessity for them to leave the Canal Zone to go to the United States to accept their certificate of citizenship.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylavnia. Mr. Speaker, I have a further question. I notice that for purposes of taking the oath of citizenship, the bill considers and designates the Panama Canal Zone as a part of the United States. In view of the very sensitive relationship that we have with Panama at the present time, does the gentleman from Ohio think that it would be wise to have the Panama Canal Zone declared a part of the United States for this purpose?

Mr. FEIGHAN. That would be done for this specific purpose only; that is, jurisdiction to issue certificates of citizenship.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Has the bill been cleared with the State Department and with the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House?

Mr. FEIGHAN. It has been considered by the Department of Justice and, I understand, the State Department.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. In view of the negotiations going on with Panama—and do not let anyone think that I am in favor of giving away the Panama Canal—does the gentleman think that the President will sign this bill if it is laid on his desk, in view of the negotiations that are being conducted with Panama?

Mr. FEIGHAN. As I said before, this bill was approved before the negotiations, or the results thereof, were made public. The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Attorney General to issue in the Canal Zone certificates of citizenship to all classes of U.S. citizens specified in section 341 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. It would do nothing more than that. It would be a matter of convenience to those who are eligible U.S. citizens.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to ask the gentleman from Ohio why the other body refused, as late as 1962, to pass this bill?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I cannot give any reason for their not passing it, except probably they have been pressed for time and it has been delayed. I see no reason why, if the other body had time to consider this measure, they would not approve it. I see nothing wrong with it. It would merely be a convenience to persons who are eligible to be citizens of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. According to your report, this same bill was passed by the House in April 1962. The interval of time between then and now certainly has given the other body ample opportunity to take some favorable action on the bill if it so desired.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I cannot speak for the other body at all.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. If a treaty is made by which we give away the Panama Canal Zone, then, of course, the proposed legislation would be void. I said, "If." I hope the "if" in my question is a big one. The Canal Zone Company has been pressing for years for this legislation in the interest of American citizens who have children born in the Canal Zone and who had to go to a great deal of trouble to certify and get birth certificates. The bill would provide a convenience for the people of the United States who live in the Canal Zone.

As I have said, if the Canal Zone is done away with, then, of course, the measure would be voided.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentlewoman from Missouri could give us a clue as to why the other body has not acted. I now find that the other body refused to act on this bill as late as last year. So, in 1962, 1963, and 1964, the other body has refused to do anything about this legislation as previously passed by the House.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. To answer the gentleman's question, I think it is just lack of interest in the other body.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, in view of the purposes of the bill, it would be a deterrent to giving away the Panama Canal, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BURT COUNTY BRIDGE COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5026) to authorize the Burt County Bridge Commission, a public body politic and corporate in the county of Burt and State of Nebraska, to refund the outstanding revenue bonds of said Burt County Bridge Commission heretofore issued to finance the cost of the construction of a bridge, together with the necessary approaches and appurtenances therefor, from a point located in the city of Decatur, Burt County, Nebraska, across the Missouri River to a point located in Monona County, Iowa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5026

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Burt County Bridge Commission, a public body politic and corporate in the county of Burt and State of Nebraska, be, and is hereby, authorized to refund the outstanding revenue bonds of said Burt County Bridge Commission heretofore issued to finance the cost of the construction of a bridge, together with the necessary approaches and appurtenances therefor, from a point located in the city of Decatur, Burt County, Nebraska, across the Missouri River to a point located in Monona County, Iowa.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon said Burt County Bridge Commission all such authority, rights, and powers as are necessary or required to enable said Burt County Bridge Commission to issue its refunding revenue bonds for the purpose of refunding and refinancing said outstanding revenue bonds, including the payment of reasonable financing costs and expenses in connection with such refunding and refinancing.

SEC. 3. The said Burt County Bridge Commission is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of tolls so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of the Army under the authority contained in the General Bridge Act of 1946, enacted August 2, 1946.

SEC. 4. In fixing the rates of tolls to be charged for the use of such bridge, the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating said bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize said refunding revenue bonds, including interest at a rate not to exceed 6 per centum per annum and reasonable financing costs and expenses, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed fifty years from the date of issuance of said refunding revenue bonds. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the cost of such refunding and refinancing, the cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating said bridge and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, strike out lines 7 through 14, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon said Burt County Bridge Commission, all such authority, rights and powers as are necessary or required to enable said Burt County Bridge Commission to issue its refunding revenue obligations for the purpose of refunding and refinancing said outstanding revenue bonds, including the payment of reasonable financing costs and expenses in connection with such refunding and refinancing. Said obligations are, in order of priority, as follows: Two thousand series A bonds of par value of $500 each, total value of $1,000,000, bearing interest at 4 per centum per annum, due August 1, 1985, and redeemable at 100 per centum of par value and accrued interest on any interest payment date; two thousand non-interest-bearing notes in the amount of $375 each, total value of $750,000, due not later than August 1, 2004; and two thousand series B bonds of par value of $500 each, total value of $1,000,000, bearing no interest, and principal due not later than August 1, 2004."

Page 2, strike out line 21 and all that follows down through and including line 12 on page 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 4. In fixing the rates of tolls to be charged for the use of such bridge, the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating said bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize said refunding revenue obligations. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, but in any event not later than August 1, 2004, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the cost of such refunding and refinancing, the cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating said bridge and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested. The Commission shall provide the Secretary of Commerce with a copy of its semiannual audit report, which shall be subject to review by the Secretary, and who, if he deems necessary, may undertaken on-site audits of the Commission's records at no expense to the Commission."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

USE OF LAND AT LA JOLLA, CALIF., FOR A MARINE BIOLOGICAL RESEARCH LABORATORY

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 1735) relating to the use by the Secretary of the Interior of land at La Jolla, Calif., donated by the University of California for a marine biological research laboratory, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman who asked unanimous consent would explain the bill. I do not have a copy available, though I hasten to add that the gentleman has discussed it with me.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. LENNON. I am delighted to explain the bill.

The purpose of the bill is to implement an agreement with the University of California, made by the Secretary of the Interior, under which the United States acquired title to 2.4 acres of land for the construction of a Fishery-Oceanography Center.

In 1962 the University of California conveyed this land to the Department of Interior, more particularly to the Bureau of Fisheries. At that time an effort was made to put a reversionary clause in. That was not acceptable to the Department of Justice; and then consideration was given to a 99-year lease. Again, that was not acceptable; so there was an agreement between the Secretary of the Interior and the regents of the University of California, to the effect that if the property were conveyed—and it was conveyed to the Federal Government for this purpose—the Congress would be called upon to enact legislation which would permit the Secretary of the Interior to reconvey the property to the regents of the University of California if and when the property was used for a purpose different from the purpose for which it was originally deeded to the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman would stipulate, then, that this is merely a "reverter clause" to the original donor to the U.S. Government?

Mr. LENNON. In substance it will authorize the Secretary to reconvey the property to the University of California, only when the property is no longer used for the purposes for which it was deeded to the Federal Government.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I note in the report, as the gentleman has stated, that the university insisted originally upon this reversionary clause, but dropped its insistence apparently for the reason that it wanted the laboratory more than it wanted a reversionary clause at that time.

Now we are confronted with an after-the-fact call to do something which should have been done, it seems to me, during the process of originally awarding the laboratory on land held by the university.

I am not going to object to consideration of this bill at this time, but in the future, it seems to me, we should insist that demands of this type be carried out or that the Government locate its laboratories in other places.

Mr. LENNON. I can appreciate the concern of the gentleman from Iowa, but I believe it should be made crystal clear for the RECORD that the Department of the Interior in the first instance contacted the regents of the University of California because of their desire to locate a marine laboratory in this particular area. As a matter of fact, the hearing record will reflect that the University of California was solicited by the Secretary of the Interior for land on the campus.

The University of California, through its board of regents, was quite acceptable to the idea of deeding the property to the Federal Government with a reversionary clause, but the Department of Justice intervened and said it would not accept it under those conditions. Then the question of a 99-year lease was considered, and that was not acceptable, either. So the full import of this legislation, sir, is that the Secretary of the Interior and the regents of the university then agreed to go ahead with the transaction with the understanding that Congress would enact legislation that would give the Secretary of the Interior the legal authority to reconvey the property at some subsequent or future date, which I frankly do not believe will happen, in the event that the property is not used for the specific purposes for which it was deeded.

Mr. GROSS. What I am saying to my friend from North Carolina is that here today we are called upon to do something, it seems to me, that ought to have been worked out in the first instance. That is my criticism.

Mr. LENNON. I agree. As the chairman of the subcommittee, that is exactly the position I took. It is water over the dam, now, though, and has to be done in this way.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1735

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to carry out the understanding between the Secretary of the Interior and the Regents of the University of California when the latter donated approximately two and four-tenths acres of land situated on the San Diego Campus of the University of California, for establishment thereon by the United States of a marine biological research laboratory, and in recognition of the restriction in the deed conveying the land to the United States which requires the land "to be used exclusively for research on the living resources of the sea or their environment; or for purposes compatible with activities of the * * * Scripps Institution of Oceanography (situated on said Campus) or for any other purpose expressly approved by the Grantor", the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to reconvey to the Regents of the University of California, or their successors, title to the donated land and the improvements constructed or placed thereon:

(a) Whenever he determines that the land and improvements are not in his judgment needed by the United States for the limited uses permitted by the deed, such determination to be made after receiving the views of other Federal agencies regarding their possible use of the land consistent with the limitations in the deed; or

(b) Whenever the United States ceases to use the land and improvements for more than two years exclusively for such limited uses.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TARIFF TREATMENT—COPRA, PALM NUTS, PALM-NUT KERNELS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6568) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for alteration of the duties on importation of copra, palm nuts, and palm-nut kernels and the oils crushed therefrom, with the amendments as reported in the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 6568

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the article description preceding item 175.09, and items 175.09 through 175.12, inclusive, of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) are amended to read as follows:

“

	Copra:		
175.09	Entered during the effective period of special proclamation issued pursuant to headnote 1 of this part, or entered after July 3, 1974	Free	Free
175.10	Entered on or before July 3, 1974, when no such special proclamation is in effect	1.25¢ per lb.	1.25¢ per lb.
175.11	If product of the Philippines or of the Trust Territory	Free	
175.12	If produced elsewhere than in the Philippines or the Trust Territory wholly of materials the growth or production thereof	Free	Free

”

(b) Such Schedules are amended by striking out items 175.27 and 175.30 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

“

175.28	Palm-nut kernels and palm nuts	Free	Free

”

(c) The article description preceding item 176.04, and items 176.04 through 176.13, inclusive, of such schedules are amended to read as follows:

“

	Coconut oil:		
176.04	Entered during the effective period of special prolcamation issued pursuant to headnote 1 of this part, or entered after July 3, 1974	1¢ per lb.	2¢ per lb.
	If product of the Philippines or of the Trust Territory:		
176.05	If Philippine article within tariff-rate quota (see headnote 2 of this subpart), or if Trust Territory article, entered on or before July 3, 1974	Free	
176.06	Other	1¢ per lb.	
	Entered on or before July 3, 1964, when no special proclamation issued pursuant to headnote 1 is in effect:		
176.07	Crude	3¢ per lb.	4¢ per lb.
	If product of the Philippines or of the Trust Territory:		
176.08	If Philippine article within tariff-rate quota (see headnote 2 of this subpart), or if Trust Territory article	Free	
176.09	Other	1¢ per lb.	
176.10	If produced elsewhere than in the Philippines or the Trust Territory wholly from materials the growth or production thereof	1¢ per lb.	2¢ per lb.
176.11	Other than crude	1¢ per lb.	2¢ per lb.
	If product of the Philippines or of the Trust Territory:		
176.12	If Philippine article within tariff-rate quota (see headnote 2 of this subpart), or if Trust Territory article	Free	
176.13	Other	1¢ per lb.	

”.

(d) Such Schedules are amended by striking out the article description preceding item 176.32 and all that follows through item 176.36 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

“

	Palm-kernel oil:		
176.32	Rendered unfit for use as food	Free	Free
176.33	Other	0.5¢ per lb.	1¢ per lb.
176.34	Palm oil	Free	Free

”,

(e)(1) Items 465.05 and 465.15 of such Schedules are amended—

(A) by striking out "4.5¢ per lb." each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "3¢ per lb."; and

(B) by striking out "7.5¢ per lb." each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "6¢ per lb.".

(2) Items 465.25, 465.35, 465.45, 465.65, 490.24, 490.48, and 490.73 of such Schedules are amended by striking out "3¢ per lb. +" each place it appears.

(3) Items 465.55 and 490.92 of such Schedules are amended by striking out "1.5¢ per lb. +" each place it appears.

(f)(1) Headnote 3 for schedule 1, part 14 of such Schedules is amended by striking out ", palm-kernel nuts and palm nuts, and a 3-cent part of each of the rates of duty in subpart B on coconut oil, palm-kernel oil and palm oil".

(2) Headnote 2 for schedule 4, part 8, subpart A of such Schedules is repealed.

(3) Schedule 4, part 13, subpart A of such Schedules is amended by striking out "Subpart A headnote:" and by striking out headnote 1.

(g) The article description preceding item 903.30 and all that follows through item 930.65, the article descriptions preceding item 907.70 and all that follows through item 907.77, and the article description preceding item 907.85 and all that follows through item 907.88 of such Schedules are repealed.

SEC. 2. (a) The headnotes for schedule 1, part 14, subpart B of such Schedules are amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (c) and (d) of headnote 2 as subparagraphs (d) and (e), respectively;

(2) by striking out subparagraph (b) of headnote 2 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) 160,000 tons during calendar year 1965,

"(c) during calendar years 1966 through 1967—

"(i) if a proclamation has been issued pursuant to headnote 3 of this subpart, 160,000 tons, or

"(ii) if such a proclamation has not been issued, 120,000 tons,"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new headnote:

"3. If, before May 1, 1966, the President determines that for the calendar years 1966 through 1967 the Republic of the Philippines has waived its rights with respect to copra under paragraph 5 of article IV of the revised trade agreement between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines, he shall so proclaim."

(b) The appendix to such Schedules is amended by inserting after item 903.21 the following new item:

"903.25	Copra provided for in item 175.10, if a proclamation has been issued pursuant to headnote 3 of part 14B of schedule 1	Free	1.25¢ per lb.	On or before 12/31/67"

SEC. 3. (a) The amendments and repeals made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) (1) The amendments made by paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 2(a) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after January 1, 1965. Upon request therefor filed with the collector of customs concerned on or before the 120th day after the date of the enactment of this Act, the entry or withdrawal of any such article—

(A) which was made after December 31, 1964, and on or before the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(B) the liquidation of which has been made without regard to such amendments, shall, if necessary to give effect to such amendments and notwithstanding section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or any other provision of law, be reliquidated and appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

(2) The amendment made by section 2(b) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after December 31, 1965.

The **SPEAKER**. Is a second demanded?

Mr. **BYRNES** of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. **KEOGH**. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I hope it will not be deemed inappropriate for me to note, in view of some of the proceedings that went on earlier in the day, that it is rather fortuitous that the first bill on which there is any debate today is a bill concerning oil, coconut oil, a very soothing oil. I hope that it will soothe the tempers of the House. However, beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I hasten to add I trust that it will not be so soothing that it might impair the relatively quick adjournment of this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the pending bill does three things; it repeals permanently the 3 cents processing tax on coconut oil, which tax has been suspended by temporary action since 1957.

Second, it increases for the years 1965, 1966, and 1967, the duty-free quota of Philippine coconut oil from 120,000 to 160,000 tons.

Third, and quite importantly, it conditions the increase of the quotas duty free for 1966 and 1967 upon the waiver by the Philippine Republic of their existing 1¼-cent preference on copra.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, I think meets with the virtual approval of all those who might directly or indirectly be concerned. It certainly meets with the approval of the U.S. importers and goes far to meeting all of the objections of the domestic crushers. It is of untold, proven, and inestimable value to the consumers of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to review in more detail the background and provisions of the bill:

Coconut oil was subject to a regular duty imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930, and in 1934 was made subject to a domestic processing tax. Copra was free of regular duty, but became subject to a proportionate processing tax in 1934. In 1957 the processing taxes were suspended for a temporary period, and this suspension was periodically extended by legislation. The processing taxes were assimilated into the new tariff schedules and consolidated with the regular duties, where applicable, effective August 31, 1963. In so doing, however, recognition was given to the suspension of the processing taxes in the appendix of the tariff schedules by providing for the suspension of that portion of the duties on coconut oil and copra that reflected the former processing taxes. Because of an obligation in the Philippine-United States trade agreement, a duty of 1.25 cents per pound remains applicable to non-Philippine copra so long as adequate supplies of Philippine copra or coconut oil are readily available for processing in the United States.

H.R. 6568, in its original form, provided for the repeal—permanent removal—of the processing taxes which have been under suspension since 1957. There was no opposition to this proposal from any source, and section 1 of H.R. 6568, as reported by your committee, would accomplish this purpose.

Under the Philippine-United States trade agreement, Philippine coconut oil has been the subject of progressively declining duty-free quotas and will remain so until 1974. Overquota imports are subject to duty at 1 cent per pound. H.R. 6568, in its original form, provided for the repeal of the 1-cent-per-pound duty on overquota Philippine coconut oil. It was claimed that with the declining duty-free quotas the 1-cent duty operated as a deterrent to the importation of adequate supplies of coconut oil which is used mainly in the United States in the manufacture of inedible products, such as soaps and detergents. The duty, it was urged, will have the effect of causing domestic producers of soaps and detergents to shift to synthetic substitutes, which, in turn, would deflect Philippine oil to European and other markets where it is used largely in edible products and thus compete with U.S. vegetable oils in those markets. On the other hand, U.S. copra crushers contended that the 1-cent duty on overquota oil was their only protection from destruction of their copra-crushing operations so long as they had to pay 1.25 cents per pound duty on non-Philippine copra imports.

Taking all factors into account, including that of the difficulties imposed by the Philippines on access of U.S. fats, oils and oilseeds in their market, the bill developed in the committee provides, in this regard, as follows:

The tariff quotas for Philippine coconut oil would be increased from 120,000 to 160,000 long tons for 1965, 1966, and 1967, provided that the increase for 1966 and 1967 would not be effective unless the President, before May 1, 1966, proclaims that the Philippine Republic has released the United States for the 2 years 1966 and 1967 from its obligation to maintain the duty of 1.25 cents per pound on non-Philippine copra. If this proclamation is issued, the quotas will be increased for the 2 years, as provided in the bill, and the duty on copra will be suspended for those 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, I believe that the various domestic interests are agreeable to the provisions of the bill as reported, and the Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in recommending enactment of the bill.

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **KEOGH**. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. **GROSS**. If this bill is approved by everyone why is there not some indication of that in the report? There is not a single letter or communication from any agency or department of Government stating a position with reference to this legislation.

Mr. **KEOGH**. Mr. Speaker, I can say to the gentleman that the reports of all the departments of the Government interested in this legislation were favorable. Those reports were on the original bill. They reported in person to the committee their approval of the committee bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEOGH. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, those reports will be found in the public hearings. I realize this does not make them a part of the RECORD itself, but, as the gentleman says, they were favorable and they are available to the Members.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEOGH. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr GROSS. As I understand this legislation it would cut the tariff on coconut oil imports into the United States; is that correct?

Mr. KEOGH. That is correct; it would increase the duty-free quota for 3 years, conditionally.

Mr. GROSS. I note on page 5 of the report that the Philippine Congress last year passed legislation lowering by 50 percent duties levied on U.S. soybeans, but that legislation was vetoed by the President of the Philippines. What kind of reciprocity is it when we provide under the terms of this legislation to accept more imports of coconut oil and they refuse to extend us reciprocity in our export of soybeans to that country?

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, as always, raises a very cogent point. I would say to him that our committee went carefully into this matter and we decided that it would not be fitting on our part to attempt to guess why an autonomous legislative body in a friendly, allied country does certain things, no more, we hope, than some of them would attempt on occasion to guess why we here do certain things.

But I will say to the gentleman that your committee—and this report, incidentally, is unanimous out of our committee—that your committee has conditioned the continuance of the duty-free quota on their not only waiving their existing and longtime preference on copra, but as I am sure the gentleman has noted, the report invites the attention of the executive branch, in dealing with this problem, to go into all the others.

But I will say to the gentleman that in my opinion it would be unwise for us, with respect to the Philippine Islands, to make any more narrow, or to narrow to any further extent, the conditions except those that are laid down in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, what did the committee hearings develop with respect to the supply of domestic edible fats and oils situation in this country?

Mr. KEOGH. That clearly the best interests of the edible fats and oils produced in this country and sold worldwide are far better protected in the manner which your committee has reported in the pending bill than attempting, as I am sure the gentleman is always opposed to, any futile effort to do it piecemeal, to do it narrowly, and to do it with respect to the Philippine Islands where the problem is nonexistent.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I come from an agricultural area, and I am wondering——

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of that.

Mr. GROSS. I am wondering, as I look at this legislation, what the situation of edible fats and oils is within this country. Are we now going to bring in more coconut oil to load on what may be a domestic surplus of edible fats and oils?

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman, coming as he does from and speaking in behalf of a great agricultural section of this country, knows very well that the use to which coconut oil is put primarily in this country, is not at all competitive with that of edible fats and oils.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Wait a minute.

Mr. KEOGH. But, for the most part this coconut oil goes into the making of detergents and the unavailability of any supply would force the domestic detergent manufacturers into the manufacture of synthetic detergents, with the creation of further collateral problems with which the gentleman from Iowa is fully familiar.

Mr. GROSS. As the gentleman, my good friend from New York, very well knows, detergents, soap, and so forth, can be made and are made from inedible oil in this country. We have a lot of inedible oil as a byproduct of our livestock industry.

Mr. KEOGH. Precisely; and it has been so testified to. But the trend of the domestic detergent industry is in two directions. They use coconut oil when available and they go to synthetics when it is not available. There is no gainsaying that.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill deals with two separate taxes or duty applicable with respect to the importation and processing of coconut oil. Practically all of our coconut oil is either imported from the Philippines, or is produced in the United States from copra which has been imported from the Philippines.

In the Revenue Act of 1934, coconut oil was subjected to a processing tax of 3 cents per pound if processed from a product of a U.S. possession or the Philippines, and 5 cents per pound if processed from other sources. Since 1957, we have suspended this processing tax.

The Philippine Trade Act of 1946 provided for the favorable differential in the processing tax as applied to the Philippines. By agreement with the Philippines, the United States undertook an obligation to maintain this 2-cent-per-pound preferable differential in the processing tax between Philippine coconut oil and non-Philippine coconut oil. As applied to the copra, this differential works out to 1.25 cents per pound of copra to be processed.

In addition to the processing taxes, the Tariff Act of 1930 imposed a 2-cent-per-pound duty on the importation of coconut oil and a 1-cent-per-pound duty on palm-kernel oil fit for human consumption. Pursuant to GATT, it was reduced to 1 cent, effective January 1948.

Originally, the processing taxes were designed to protect domestic vegetable oils in a use of the production of edible products such as margarine. The use of coconut oil for such products became economically impractical because of a price differential. Accordingly, coconut oils are used almost wholly for the production of soaps, detergents, and the like. No coconut oil is used for edible purposes in the United States, except where used as a film on certain bakery products.

While the processing tax has been suspended, the regular duty of 1 cent per pound has been in effect with respect to imports of Philippine coconut oil within specified quotas since 1948. The quota which could be brought in from the Philippines duty free was scaled to decline from 200,000 tons initially to 160,000 tons by 1962 and 120,000 tons by 1965, and thereafter in stages to be completely eliminated by 1974. Thus, the amount of coconut oil which could be brought in free of duty from the Philippines was declining, while at the same time the U.S. demand for coconut oil to be used in the production of soaps and detergents was increasing. This year the duty free quota was filled within the first 6 months of the calendar year. This meant that all coconut oil imported from the Philippines after June 1965, came in at a duty rate of 1 cent per pound. The users of coconut oil asked that the duty be eliminated, or the quotas increased since there was no domestic production of copra.

There were a few domestic crushers of copra who opposed any increase in the quota, or elimination of the duty, unless we also removed the discriminatory duty that applied to non-Philippine copra imports of 1.25 cents per pound. These domestic crushers stated that so long as that duty remained in effect, they did not have access to any non-Philippine copra, and with the elimination of the duty on imports of oil from the Philippines, could not compete with copra crushed in the Philippines.

The bill seeks to provide an equitable adjustment both with respect to the preference granted to the Philippines and with respect to the duty imposed on non-Philippine copra.

First, the bill increases the quota-free imports of coconut oil from the Philippines to 160,000 long tons. This will correspond with the quota in effect for the calendar years 1962–64.

Second, the quota of 160,000 long tons will be effective for the years 1966 and 1967 only if the Philippine Republic agrees to release the United States from any obligation to maintain a duty of 1.25 cents per pound of non-Philippine copra. In other words, if the Philippines wishes to have the advantage of a higher duty-free quota, the Philippines must agree in turn to permit the U.S. domestic crushers to buy copra from outside the Philippines without paying a discriminatory duty of 1.25 cents per pound.

While the bill does not provide an ultimate solution to the problem insofar as it relates to the problem of protecting the interest of domestic crushers of copra without unreasonably penalizing domestic users of coconut oil, we believe that the quotas provided for in the bill, accompanied by a waiver of the discriminatory duty on non-Philippine copra, will provide benefits for all concerned by 1968, we will have a much better idea of what a permanent solution should be.

The bill also provides for the repeal of the processing taxes which have been suspended since 1957. These suspensions have become pretty much automatic, and there is no objection from any source to this section of the bill. Our only problem arose in attempting to satisfy the domestic users of coconut oil who objected to the payment of a duty on Philippine oil required in excess of the duty-free quotas, and the interest of a few domestic crushers who rightly contended that they could hardly stay in business if coconut oil was admitted duty free, that they could not buy copra—the raw material—without the payment of a duty.

I also believe it should be said at this point that as far as the competition is concerned between coconut oil and domestic edible oils, while that used to be a problem some number of years ago and that is why in the first instance a processing tax was imposed, we have suspended this processing tax for a number of years simply because there is not the competitive situation existing today that used to exist some 10 years ago. So that really is not the issue any more.

What we are trying to do here through the passage of this bill is to maintain, in a sense, the status quo as far as the importation or the payment of duty is concerned on coconut oil coming from the Philippines and get something in return for our copra processors in this country: namely, a relaxation of the preference which in effect means that you can only purchase copra from the Philippines. We made the implementation of this legislation depend on whether the Philippines agrees to waive the preference which they now enjoy in the sale of copra to this country.

Also, we have suggested in our report to the department involved—and you will note it referred to on page 5 of the committee report, that we hope the executive branch in consulting with the Government of the Philippines will also discuss with them the attitude on the part of the Philippines today which we think is unreasonable and which restricts our edible oils going into the Philippine Islands. It is our hope that by acting in this way they in return will reciprocate; not only insofar as their attitude toward copra is concerned, but that they will also yield in their restrictive attitude toward the exportation of other oils from this country to the Philippines.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Yes, surely.

Mr. GROSS. We are taking a tangible action here today in the House to lower the tariff.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. For 1 year; and we point out that as far as next year's increase in quota is concerned, it shall not go into effect unless the Philippines provide this waiver to which I have referred. So this is not a completely self-operating piece of legislation.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I am glad to hear that it is limited and that it is limited to 1 year. But, again, we get this story of "we hope the Philippines" or we hope someone else in some foreign country will do something.

Some of us are going to die in despair around here in this business of hoping that they are going to be reciprocal in their approach to us.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think if the gentleman will study the report and will study the hearings he will discover that this bill is more for the benefit of this country and the domestic consumers than it is for the Philippines.

The situation we find is that the Philippines is today the exclusive source for copra. Because they are the exclusive source we seek a mechanism to make them at least move in the direction of easing the situation as reflected by their attitude toward some products that are exported from this country to the Philippines. But whether they agree or not, I think this legislation would be good legislation without this condition simply because the fundamental benefit is going to be for our people.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I am glad to see our legislative body keeping its finger on this, as well as keeping the Reciprocal Trade Act that you have just so well explained as a basis for our negotiations.

Can the gentleman tell me why this amendment that further amends the Tariff Act of 1931 is needed in addition to the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act of 1962 which authorizes the President to reduce all tariffs up to 50 percent?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. It arises out of the fact we have a special agreement that was entered into with the Philippines, I think first in 1946, and then was revised in 1959, that gives special privileges. It gives preferential treatment to the Philippines in connection with a number of items, including coconut oil and copra. We have agreed, for instance, they will always have a 2-cent-per-pound tariff differential in their favor. We cannot import coconut oil from any other country unless we charge them 2 cents more per pound in duty than we charge the Philippines. That is what we ask them to waive.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman is saying this is not embraced by the Reciprocal Trade Agreement.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. This is a special agreement. We have an understanding with GATT that recognizes such agreements that we have with the Philippines, entered into as a step in their independence.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on copra, palm nuts, and palm-nut kernels, and the oils crushed therefore, and for other purposes."

SOUTHEAST HURRICANE DISASTER RELIEF ACT OF 1965

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 11539) to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby recognizes that the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi suffered extensive property loss and damage as a result of Hurricane Betsy in 1965 (including, but not limited to, loss and damage from flood, high waters, and wind-driven waters caused by such hurricane) and that there is a need for special measures designed to aid and accelerate these States in their efforts to provide for the reconstruction of highways and public works projects, and to otherwise rehabilitate these devastated areas.

Sec. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, trailers provided as a result of Hurricane Betsy as temporary housing under clause (d) of section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes", approved September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855b), may be sold directly to the persons who are the occupants thereof at prices that are fair and equitable.

Sec. 3. In the administration of the disaster loan program under section 7(b)(1) of the Small Business Act, as amended (15 U.S.C. 636(b)), in the case of property loss or damage in the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi resulting from Hurricane Betsy, the Small Business Administration, to the extent such loss or damage is not compensated for by insurance or otherwise, (1) shall at the borrower's option on that part of any loan in excess of $500, (A) cancel up to $1,800 of the loan, or (B) waive interest due on the loan in a total amount of not more than $1,800 over a period not to exceed three years; and (2) may lend to a privately owned school, college, or university without regard to whether the required financial assistance is otherwise available from private sources, and may waive interest payments and defer principal payments on such a loan for the first three years of the term of the loan.

Sec. 4. In the administration of the emergency loan program under subtitle C of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1961–67), in the case of property loss or damage in the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi, resulting from flood, high waters, or wind-driven water or uninsurable crop loss, caused by Hurricane Betsy, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, to the extent such loss or damage is not compensated for by insurance or otherwise, at the borrower's option on that part of any loan in excess of $500, (1) cancel up to $1,800 of the loan, or (2) waive interest due on the loan in a total amount of not more than $1,800 over a period not to exceed three years without regard to whether the required financial assistance is otherwise available from private sources.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall undertake an immediate study of alternative programs which could be established to help provide financial assistance to those suffering property losses in flood and other natural disasters, including alternative methods of Federal disaster insurance, as well as the existing flood insurance program, and shall report his findings and recommendations to the President for submission to the Congress not later than nine months after the appropriation of funds for this study, except that the findings and recommendations on earthquake insurance shall be reported to the President for submission to the Congress not later than three years after the appropriation of funds for this study.

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $70,000,000 to carry out this Act, and such sums shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 7. This Act, other than sections 5 and 6, shall not be in effect after January 1, 1967, except with respect to payment of expenditures for obligations and commitments entered into under this Act on or before such date.

SEC. 8. This Act may be cited as the "Southeast Hurricane Disaster Relief Act of 1965".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to appear on this floor today as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works, and report to this body that the legislation which is being considered at this moment is needed and necessary legislation. It comes into being as a direct result of a trip taken to the State of Louisiana recently by the Subcommittee on Flood Control. We visited the devastated areas of New Orleans and Baton Rouge and held public hearings. We heard testimony from Federal, State, and local officials and private individuals as to the magnitude of Hurricane Betsy.

It appears that in the terms of the numbers of people affected and in the terms of monetary loss the damages caused to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi by this hurricane of September 1965, may be greater than any of the previous natural disasters.

H.R. 11539, the legislation we consider today we believe will go a long way toward restoring the area to its full scale vitality. I point out that it operates within the framework of existing law and will provide, to those individuals who suffered damage by this disaster, relief for housing, property loss, and crop damage. It will as well, by acting again within the framework of existing law, go a long way to help replace the damaged schools in the area. The legislation authorizes some $70 million for the purposes of the bill which in essense would waive at the borrower's option up to $1,800 of a loan issued by the Small Business Administration if the loan is in excess of $500 to begin with or would allow interest to be waived on such loan for a period of 3 years but once again not in excess of $1,800.

In the case of the farmers who are affected by this legislation as well as stockmen and oyster planters in the affected areas the Farmers Home Administration will be allowed to give additional assistance to these people and as in the case of the Small Business Administration where a loan is in excess of $500 cancel up to $1,800 of such loan or waive the interest due on the loan up to $1,800 over a period of three years all without regard to whether required financial assistance is otherwise available from private sources.

Mr. Speaker, may I say between January and September of this year the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works has taken six separate trips to various disaster stricken areas of our country from the Pacific coast to the Gulf of Mexico. We believe these trips have been effective not only as a physiological stimulus to the people whom we visited in the areas and where we held hearings but have as well provided concrete results in the increased authorizations for existing projects, and definite legislation as in the case of Louisiana, Mississippi, and Florida which we consider today

In the States of Louisiana, Florida, and Mississippi between 800,000 and 1 million people were affected by the hurricane. Over 1,500 homes were destroyed and more than 150,000 homes were damaged.

There were 2,000 trailers damaged or destroyed and 1,400 farm buildings and 2,600 small businesses.

It is obvious that these people must receive all the help possible. I pay great tribute today to the various Federal agencies which immediately moved into these areas and did so much for the regions that were affected. However, I believe that legislation such as H.R. 11539 is needed and is necessary. I trust this body will pass this legislation today.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I should like to commend the gentleman and all of his colleagues on the Public Works Committee, including the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] the ranking Republican member of the committee.

I should like especially to commend the Members on both sides of the aisle who took time off on a busy weekend and gave up their whole weekend to go to Louisiana and take testimony on the damage done in Florida, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

I should also like to commend the gentleman from Alabama and the members of the Committee on Public Works on the breadth of the proposed legislation. As the gentleman from Indiana knows, hearings have been conducted by the gentleman's committee on the need for general legislation.

I think what the gentleman is trying to do is to take care of the situation in the manner in which we took care of the situation in Alaska, the Northwest, and elsewhere where disasters have recently occurred, and at the same time anticipate the passage of a general bill in the future, and also you are taking a real look at the need for flood and earthquake insurance. I commend the gentleman and everyone associated with him.

This bill is vitally important to the States affected and will bring measurable relief to a great many people.

Mr. Speaker, the recent Hurricane Betsy which struck Florida, Mississippi, and my State of Louisiana, was the worst natural disaster ever to strike the North American Continent, in terms of property losses. Many millions in insurable losses were suffered by homeowners, farmers, small businessmen, and by colleges and universities in south Louisiana, the area which received the most severe blow from Hurricane Betsy.

The Southeast Hurricane Disaster Relief Act, which we are considering in the House today, is a most important piece of legislation to the stricken people of my State, and those of Florida and Mississippi, many of whom suffered almost irreparable losses from Betsy's wrath. This legislation will bring sorely needed financial assistance in those areas where existing law does not provide adequate relief. Homeowners, farmers, fishermen, small businessmen, and private schools, colleges and universities, will be able to obtain more financial aid than is now available on their property losses by flood, high waters, and wind-driven waters. In cases, where their property losses from flooding, high waters, and wind-driven waters exceeds $500, the homeowners, farmers, and small businessmen will be able to obtain a "forgiveness" up to a maximum of $1,800, from the Small Business Administration, or from the Farmers Home Administration, or they will have an option to waive the interest due on a loan of up to a maximum of $1,800, and to have more liberal repayment terms.

Schools, colleges, and universities, privately owned or religiously supported, will be able to get SBA loans without regard to whether the needed financial aid can be obtained from private commercial sources. These institutions, many of which sustained severe damages from the hurricane, also will be able to waive interest payments and defer principal payments on such loans for the first 3 years of the term of the loans.

This legislation also will permit those citizens who are living in Government-owner trailers, like those being provided to people at Grand Isle, to buy these trailers at fair and equitable prices.

In addition, the bill also provides for a comprehensive study of the whole field of Federal disaster assistance and relief, including various methods for offering Federal disaster insurance such as the existing Flood Insurance Act enacted by Congress in 1956.

From this thorough study, a report on findings and recommendations will be made to the President—with the end result that such special legislation for each individual major disaster may not be necessary in the future.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is the result of a fully cooperative effort between the legislative and the executive branch. It is the product of many good minds, and it has the support of the administration and of the Bureau of the Budget. It is vitally needed for the stricken people of Louisiana, Florida, and Mississippi, because with Hurricane Betsy, the destruction was so widespread—the misery and suffering so great—and the property losses so extensive—that existing law for these citizens and for private schools and colleges is not adequate.

There are so many people who deserve thanks for their cooperation and their help in bringing this legislation to the attention of Congress for its action. My distinguished colleague from Alabama, Mr. BOB JONES, who heads the Public Works Subcommittee on Flood Control, has really been the leader in drafting and presenting this legislation. His genuine concern for the people of my State, and of Florida and Mississippi, is most heartening. He directed the conduct of thorough hearings in New Orleans and Baton Rouge before this legislation was drafted. He gathered the necessary testimony and facts to emphasize the need for this legislation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

The problems that were presented in this disaster were unique from all the rest we considered. For that reason, I believe all members of the committee have been very skillful in drafting the relief that would be responsive to the despair of the people of that area.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. MORRISON. I wish to commend the gentleman for the outstanding and very diligent and wonderful work that he has done on this legislation. As I heard my distinguished colleague from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] say, the amount of time and sacrifice that you and the other members of the committee put forth in going to Louisiana was a most outstanding and unselfish job. No chairman or members of this committee have ever worked any harder, and the results today, in passing this emergency and needed legislation is truly a masterpiece of work. I certainly wish to thank the gentleman and to say that I think that this has certainly been a very outstanding job and one that is most appreciated.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT].

Mr. HÉBERT. I wish to join with my colleagues in their expression of gratitude to the gentleman from Alabama and his colleagues on the committee who visited Louisiana and held on-the-spot hearings.

This legislation is perhaps some of the most important that has come before this body in many years. I believe the thanks of the Nation go to the gentleman from Alabama, as well as the thanks of those of us who come from Louisiana, who are immediately affected, and of the people of Mississippi and Florida.

This is emergency legislation of the moment, but carried in the bill is a more important item relating to future legislation which will be based upon this type of legislation. It is to be hoped that in the future, under the splendid leadership of the gentleman from Alabama, if ever a hurricane, tornado, earthquake or flood should occur in another section of this Nation, the people of that area will not be compelled to wait for emergency legislation. In the future they will know immediately.

In this particular instance, as has been pointed out, under the law the Government could do no more than it did. It did a magnificent job. It did a splendid job. But now we need this additional emergency legislation, which I hope will be a pattern for the future, for permanent legislation.

Again I express the thanks of the people of Louisiana in my district, who probably were struck harder than any other section of the Nation, to the gentleman from Alabama, and his committee.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with everything that has been said, and I commend the gentleman from Alabama and his colleagues on the committee, as well as the members of his staff.

This is a good bill. It will bring deserved relief. I appreciate the bipartisan spirit which has brought it to the floor.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I assure the gentleman that it has been a bipartisan spirit. The Members on the left of us have been as diligent, as earnest, and as devoted to the cause as any Member of the majority.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN.]

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Alabama. I believe I speak for all of the wonderful people of the great State of Louisiana, especially those of the Fifth Congressional District, when I say thank you very, very much for moving into action and getting this needed legislation passed during the present session of the Congress. It is especially pleasing to me to see the Congress give the same consideration to Americans that we have been extending to many foreign nations, and that is interest-free money, in fact, the right of cancellation of loans as well as outright grants. To do as much for our own people is not more than should be expected.

Many of my fellow Louisianians have lost their life's savings, and without a helping hand from their Government, and for that matter, their neighbors and organizations that are in position to help, they would never be able to become sufficiently rehabilitated to pick up the loose ends and try to replace that which has been lost.

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in their support of H.R. 11539, a bill which will provide assistance to the States of Louisiana, Florida, and Mississippi, for assistance in the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent Hurricane Betsy.

I have just been confirmed by the House of Representatives as a Member from the Seventh District of Louisiana, and I consider it a privilege to have as my first duty the opportunity to join in the views of my colleagues and to vote for this bill, which will do much to mitigate the tremendous losses caused by Hurricane Betsy with which you are all familiar.

From what I understand, the damage caused by Hurricane Betsy is the worst of record in the United States. Betsy's September 1965 smash of the Gulf Coast was one of the most destructive in all history. Even experienced disaster workers were appalled more and more every day as storm victims continued to register for long term recovery help in rebuilding their lives and homes.

When it is realized that approximately 1 million persons were adversely affected by the hurricane, some conception can be gained of the magnitude of the disaster. The only other natural catastrophe that equals this devastation was the 1937 Ohio-Mississippi River flood, which forced over a million persons from their homes.

In the case of Betsy, over 1,500 homes were destroyed and more than 150,000 damaged. In addition, there were 2,000 trailers that were damaged or destroyed, as well as 1,400 hundred farm buildings and 2,600 small businesses.

I join with my colleagues in complimenting the members of the Public Works Committee in taking immediate action. A special subcommittee of the full committee was sent to the area to inspect the damage and to meet with Federal, State and local officials. The subcommittee held hearings on September 25 and 26, 1965, in New Orleans and Baton Rouge, to determine what the Federal Government and Congress could do to provide additional relief to the area affected by Hurricane Betsy.

On October 13, 1965, the Committee on Public Works held hearings on H.R. 11539, and related bills, in Washington, and testimony was received from Members of Congress and representatives of the executive branch of the Government.

The bill has been ably described by the chairman of the subcommittee, ROBERT E. JONES, of Alabama, and I shall not repeat the provisions of the bill. However, it does provide for assistance in the way of cancellation of a portion of loans or waivers of interest, in addition to other financial aid. It is my opinion that it is a forward step in providing for assistance by the United States to the residents of an area so severely devastated, and one of the most far-reaching steps it has been my fortune to experience in the workings of the Federal Government. I am tremendously impressed by this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this bill will receive favorable action by the House.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Waggonner].

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my personal appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. Fallon; to the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. Jones of Alabama; and indeed to the entire committee for the consideration they have given to those who have suffered so much because of Hurricane Betsy. The people of Louisiana appreciate what you are doing I assure you.

I express the hope that from this legislation will come new recommendations or legislation which will be long standing and corrective in nature, and will assist others, as time goes by, who find themselves in similar conditions. Perhaps from this will come flood control insurance which will be meaningful.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Long] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11539, a bill to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi, for damages caused by the unforgettable Hurricane Betsy.

Hurricane disaster has been frequent to the people of Louisiana, as well as to other Gulf States. Because of such frequency, and consequential damage to life and property, it is entirely appropriate that the Congress of the United States act to provide assistance to the people of Louisiana, Florida, and Mississippi in their time of emergency need.

The unprecedented and unequaled extent of financial loss caused by Hurricane Betsy sustains and cogently advances the idea that individuals alone cannot shoulder the loss inflicted upon them by the elements. It is, therefore, the duty of this Congress to enact appropriate legislation to bridge the gap in the rebuilding of affected areas. This bill will provide that assistance and I strongly urge its final passage.

I am extremely grateful to the Honorable Robert E. Jones of Alabama, and his Subcommittee on Flood Control for their visit to Louisiana; and to Chairman Fallon of the Public Works Committee, my colleagues from Louisiana, and other Members of this body, who have worked so hard to develop H.R. 11539.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the gulf shore States have suffered severely at the hands of hurricanes many times in the past as have all of the littoral Atlantic States. However, this past September, Louisiana and nearby Mississippi suffered the worst blow of all time when Hurricane Betsy struck after having hit Florida where it caused severe damages.

Damages in Florida have been estimated at over $100 million, and that in Louisiana and adjoining Mississippi has been estimated variously from $1 to $2 billion, and many precious lives were lost.

Under Public Law 875 many Federal agencies rushed in with food, temporary shelter, clothing, undertaking protective and preventive health measures, repair crews for roads, communications utilities, and levees.

Countless lives were saved and much good has been accomplished, but, as in the past, there is the inevitable aftermath which leaves thousands still homeless, without jobs and saddled with debts for property which has been destroyed or damaged so as to require extensive costly repair. Many businesses have been wiped out—resulting in unemployment for many and bankruptcy for the owners and operators. Numerous communities still lack functioning public facilities, schools, churches, and other institutions remain closed or were destroyed.

Assistance under Public Law 875 is unable to cope with a disaster of the caliber attained by Hurricane Betsy.

H.R. 11539, which is identical to my bill, H.R. 11574, is directed toward mending this situation.

Trailers brought in to house victims are still needed. Construction of permanent housing in the ordinary sense will require years to replace the homes wrecked by Betsy. The bill would authorize the sale of these trailers to the present occupants at a fair price.

The bill would assist small business to assume activities and again give useful employment by permitting cancellation of part of existing Small Business Administration loans, or waiving interest payments for a period. This would in many cases enable small shops and service establishments and the like to resume a useful life, serving the community by meeting their needs and by giving employment.

Provision is made for loans on generous terms to private educational institutions which suffered grievously at the hands of Hurricane Betsy. These three States have a high proportion of such institutions and many now have limited resources.

Inevitably much agricultural loss is suffered in a disaster of this type. Entire crops were destroyed leaving farmers with no income, but in many instances saddled with debts incurred for purchase of seed and fertilizer, and for labor. This bill would provide relief for these unfortunates so that they may resume activities.

The act would also direct the Housing and Urban Development Department to undertake a long-needed restudy of the overall problem of disaster relief to develop a program of insurance against property loss which might serve to avert the necessity for extensive specialized legislation such as is embodied in H.R. 11539. Americans are willing to stand on their own two feet even after suffering at the hands of mother nature if only given a helping hand.

H.R. 11539 will, by utilization of the $70 million it would authorize, extend this helping hand so that the people of three States who have suffered a crippling blow may once again become productive citizens.

On behalf of the people of the congressional district I represent I express my deep appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Jones], chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control and the distinguished chairman, Mr. Fallon, of Maryland, and the ranking minority member, Mr. Cramer, of Florida, and all members of the subcommittee and the full Committee on Public Works for their prompt response and action to and for the distress and the needs of the people who have been seriously damaged and inconvenienced.

Mr. Speaker, I urge unanimous approval of this legislation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper.]

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in the highest commendation to the able gentleman from Alabama who is now in the well and who was the chairman of the subcommittee handling this legislation and also particularly commend our distinguished colleague from Florida [Mr. Cramer], the ranking minority member of that great Committee on Public Works, for the promptness and thoroughness with which this splendid committee has investigated and responded to the needs of the people in these three States who have been the victims of this hurricane. I especially wish to commend the committee for their farsightedness in including section 5 which lays the groundwork for the hope that we will be able to enact in the next session of this Congress legislation of far-reaching importance that will meet these situations as they arise and meet them adequately as they come along, without the Congress having to deal with each case individually. I think it is a very significant piece of legislation. For my people and myself I wish to commend the able gentleman and his colleagues for the great work they have done.

Hurricane Betsy struck a vicious blow to the people in the heavily populated south Florida area. In Dade County alone, the county manager of our metropolitan county government has estimated the damage to private property totaled $111,284,500 and the additional damage to public property $5,103,000.

Much of this damage was water damage for which the victims of the hurricane cannot obtain compensation under existing insurance policies. These losses must be sustained by the individual homeowner and the small businessman, unless a compassionate Federal Government sees fits to help these homeowners and businessmen, to compensate them for losses against which they can obtain no other protection, to extend to them the heartfelt sympathy of the American people to those who have suffered, through no fault of their own, a serious misfortune.

The provisions of this bill, which I have cosponsored, would permit the Small Business Administration to recognize the individual hardships of those who obtain SBA disaster loans by waiving part of the interest due on the loan or by canceling part of the loan in excess of the first $500. This will give a greater flexibility to the administration of the present disaster loan program and relieve to a greater degree the hardship imposed by these property losses.

I am happy to be a sponsor of this legislation with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida, Representative DANTE FASCELL, also from Dade County, and with the distinguished Members of the Louisiana and Mississippi delegations in this body.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I commend him for bringing this particular piece of legislation to the floor of the House. I hope it will pass unanimously. I am especially grateful to the gentleman for undertaking hearings on the omnibus disaster legislation. Many of us who have lived through one of these disasters, as we have in my district, know that there is a need for a complete overhaul of the existing acts which presently are on the statute books. There have been over 40 disasters declared as such since January 1964 in the United States. There are presently some 30 of these still existing as disaster areas. I would hope that this would point up to the House the need for an overhaul of our disaster legislation so that it would not be necessary for us to come to the House each time we have a natural disaster. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes, and I now yield to my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, as one of the cosponsors of this legislation, I desire to associate myself with the remarks made by those who have preceded me in the discussion of this bill. Hurricane Betsy was one of the most erratic and damaging of all the hurricanes which have visited their wrath upon the coastal lines of the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi. It even exceeded the damage wrought by the 1947 hurricane which caused much damage to my own beautiful coast of Mississippi. Betsy, after an erratic course in both the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico, was aimed directly at the Mississippi gulf coast. Fortunately for my people, its course again was changed and its full fury hit the city of New Orleans and the adjoining areas of Louisiana. Even so, my own area along the Mississippi coast did not escape unscathed. Much damage was done to that area. While the damage there was not comparable to the New Orleans area some 50 miles to the west, the damage was nevertheless substantial. The seawalls constructed at a cost to the taxpayers of the Mississippi coast were substantially damaged. The fishing industry which means so much to the economy of that section also suffered substantial damage. Likewise, many private homes and property felt the fury with resultant damage of this hurricane.

The purpose of the bill, Mr. Speaker, is to assist the people and the local governments of these three States to rehabilitate themselves and assist in the recovery from the losses substained in this severe storm. This is a humanitarian effort which I am sure will receive the support of the people of all of the States of the Union and, therefore, I am glad to have a small part in relieving the suffering and the losses incurred by this hurricane.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am particularly cognizant of the impact of a great natural catastrophe because of my memory of the Alaskan earthquake. I am proud to be on the full Committee on Public Works and worked very closely with the subcommittee in drafting this legislation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, may I say that the gentleman from Alaska gave us valuable information based on the experience he has had with such things in Alaska. He was quite helpful in the draftsmanship of this legislation.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. I thank the gentleman, and I rise in full support of this legislation.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I concur in the remarks, generally, of the gentleman from Alabama, my distinguished colleague, who has held many conferences with many of the department heads in the executive branch of the Government, trying to get together a bill that makes sense, that the House will accept, that will do some real, substantial good, and that will give some needed help to the people in the areas affected.

Hurricane Betsy was one of the most devastating hurricanes in recent history. The estimated damage of that hurricane is $2.5 billion, the largest portion of which, in excess of $2 billion, was in the State of Louisiana; about one-quarter billion dollars in the State of Mississippi; and about $119 million in the State of Florida.

We knew that legislation was contemplated, after the damage took place. We knew that the Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act of 1965 had been acted upon in this session of Congress, and we realized further that the relief contained therein, being partially regional in character, did not provide adequate relief for the rest of the Nation and, in this instance, to the States of Mississippi, Louisiana, and Florida.

Discussions started about the type of legislation that would be proper at this late date in the session. Could we possibly get to the consideration of general legislation relating to disaster relief throughout the Nation? I wholeheartedly subscribe to the basic thesis, as I am sure the gentleman from Alabama and other members of the committee do, that this is a subject that must be treated as soon as possible on a nationwide basis. For that reason the committee last week started hearings on this subject matter.

This bill does bring within the existing program the present administrative agencies, and requires no new administrative agencies, no additional personnel except, perhaps, for study purposes, as to what the permanent solution should be. It is within the framework of what I believe at this late date should be done by our committee, taking the existing programs and thoroughly exploring the possibilities with the executive agencies as to what could be done at this late hour that would give immediate relief to those persons who suffered from this terrible disaster.

This is one of the toughest bills we have gotten into. It is one of the toughest problems that we have to meet. I say unequivocally, so far as this Member is concerned, that it will be my intention and it appears to be the intention of the majority likewise, to take this matter up in detail, with continuing hearings early next year and studying the matter during the recess period. We all realize the importance of treating the problem of any future disasters that may strike any community, because the people of these communities in this Nation should know what relief is available and what relief should be made available through State and local communities, as well as through the Federal Government.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is the intent and will be the intent of the committee, to address itself to that problem and to make suitable studies of the legislative requirements to meet these hazardous circumstances once they arise. I can assure the gentleman from Florida that it will not go without attention.

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman that back in 1928 when I had just gone to Florida we had one of the worst storms in the history of this Nation. It almost knocked our roof off; it was almost blown off. I know what it is to go through one of these terrible storms. So I am not unsympathetic to the problem involved so far as Florida is concerned.

In Florida we suffered an estimated damage of $119,060,000 of which $9,100,000 was public property damage. Under the present law, passed in 1950 and amended subsequently, only $1,546,000 is eligible for Federal assistance. Under the present program, Public Law 875, which I think is one of the best indications of the situation, only $1,500,000 out of nearly $120 million is eligible for Federal assistance. The severity of the situation even in the State of Florida is demonstrated by the Red Cross reports which indicate that there were thousands of homes that were either destroyed or suffered major and minor damage. One hundred and ninety-three trailers were destroyed and 955 were damaged. A total of over 5,000 families suffered some loss as a result of the disaster.

It is estimated that there will be 50,000 claims by the insurance industry which will be filed resulting in payments of between $25 and $28 million.

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, let me say that there is nothing in this legislation nor is it intended to discourage in any way, but rather to encourage the private property owners to insure against losses which are insurable; as a matter of fact insurable losses—not only insured losses, but insurable losses, meaning nonwater damage risks and that those insurable losses are not covered by this legislation. I believe it is important to note that only uninsurable losses are specifically spelled out in section 4.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Jones] whether or not my understanding is correct, having helped draft the legislation, that it is the intention of the committee that section 3 likewise should cover as a matter of administrative procedure uninsurable losses?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is exactly correct. Most of section 4 items were in the sugarcane operation and therefore they were covered under the existing law at 80 percent. Therefore, the gentleman from Florida in writing up the provisions to which he has just referred did not think it was necessary to write it into section 4.

Mr. CRAMER. I am glad the gentleman concurs, because I personally was of the opinion that we ought to write it into section 3 the same as we wrote it in section 4, that loss or damage from flood, high waters, or wind-driven water or uninsurable crop loss would be subject to the provisions of this bill.

But, it is understood, I hope, in the debate that that is what is intended in section 3 as well as under the Small Business Administration disaster relief program.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, when the gentleman wrote that provision into section 3 it was my understanding that since the uninsurable losses occurred under the existing law, in section 4 it would not be necessary and so the gentleman from Florida has stated what was intended to be arrived at through the language of the bill.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman from Alabama and I hope in administering the program it will be so administered.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama—and then I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross]—relating to a needs test. As the legislation is drafted, there is under the present program of the Small Business Administration disaster relief, under the consolidated Farmers Home Administration disaster relief, the ASCA disaster relief, and there is written into those laws, or in the alternative by administrative action, a needs test so that those persons who have an economic need can qualify. In other words, millionaires cannot get the $1,800 benefit either in waived interest or waived principal? Does the gentleman from Alabama agree with that statement?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I not only agree to that but I would expect that there will be a continuation of the needs test as contained in existing law, with those exceptions that are waived in titles III and IV. So I believe we could not neglect in the administration of this act some type of needs test or examination.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman on that point.

Of course, the gentleman and I concurred in the paragraph on page 3 relating to where in administering the act someone who makes the request for the full $1,800, either waiver of an existing loan or $1,800 payoff in interest or principal on a new loan, that the administration will have discretion to determine not only and how come or whether the act should be approved, but certainly whether the full $1,800 should be granted.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, not only that but the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, along with the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, gave assurances to the committee that once they received a loan of approximately $2,300, they would, of course, look with careful examination at that proposal.

Mr. CRAMER. In other words, $2,300 is the most favorable consideration a person could have, meaning $1,800 over the initial $500 minimum?

In other words, if you made application for $2,300 you might get the maximum of $1,800 in waivers, and thus only be liable for $500. I hope that will be looked at with serious reservation because it is a maximum benefit situation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I regret to note that this is the second consecutive bill that comes before the House this afternoon accompanied by a report which gives no indication of any departmental or agency views. While I do not mean to say I am bound by agency and departmental views, I think it is well to have them, and I regret again this bill is accompanied by a report which gives no indication that any agency or department is interested in the legislation.

Mr. CRAMER. I may say that the testimony of the agencies is contained in the hearings. Generally the agencies favor this kind of legislation. I will say to the gentleman further, so far as I am concerned, this House can consider itself fortunate that the price tag brought before this House on a $2.5 billion loss situation is only $70 million. It was estimated in view of the lateness of the hour and in view of inability to get departmental and agency suggestions it would end up with a price tag double that. I may say to the gentleman that the gentleman in the well is one who unequivocally told the executive branch of the Government he would not support new programs at this time, and new administrations of those programs and, secondly, would not support substantial direct grants to provide property owners compensation for loss of real and personal property, which was the proposal initially under discussion.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman for the position he took in that respect.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. With reference to section 5, which has to do with a study of insurance, this philosophy was supported in S. 408, presented before the Senate. Senate 408 is substantially the same as the bill that I filed in April of this year providing for a study comparable to that which has been authorized in this legislation. I would like to say to the House that the nature and extent of this recent disaster is unique only because our memories are short. I can recall one day while serving at a place called Indianola Beach, when a flood and hurricane came in and overcame an entire railroad train. I can recall in 1938 we had a hurricane up in Connecticut in which over 3,000 people lost their lives. This is as expensive as others we have had in the past, and I cannot overlook the loss of human life that was suffered in those days in 1938.

Mr. CRAMER. Perhaps the gentleman misconstrues what the committee intends by that language. It means when the amount of property damaged and involved is of such proportions it deserves consideration by separate legislation.

Mr. KEITH. I agree that it does deserve attention. In the absence of a national policy it deserves special attention.

Mr. CRAMER. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. KEITH. Section 5 will provide a national policy that will make some of these things unnecessary because in other years hundreds of miles of railroad and other roads, and housing, were involved, many lives were lost, as we all remember. I strongly support section 5, which was passed in effect by the Senate, and which was before us on our calendar 3 weeks ago today.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to join in the commendations of others for the gentleman in the well and the chairman of the subcommittee. For those who have been hit in areas throughout the country during disasters, certainly it behooves all of us to support this legislation wholeheartedly.

I am particularly interested in section 5 of the act which had been included in this bill. The balance of the legislation certainly will be of immeasurable relief in Florida, Louisiana, and the Mississippi sections of our country. It certainly is regrettable that this great Committee on Public Works, which is normally recognized for its work to build America and its great resources, has had to spend so much of its time and effort in rebuilding many sections of America that have been so hard hit by disasters this year.

It is to the credit of this committee, the House and the entire Federal system of government that we can develop legislation that will provide assistance to people and property damaged beyond their ability to recover through normal means.

Mr. CRAMER. In closing I would just like to make this comment.

Section 5 I think is one of the most valuable aspects of the legislation. No. 1, the 1956 insurance act has not been implemented. They have a study that has been begun on what can be done to implement it. It appears that this actually is the long-range answer to the problem. How can these people who cannot get insurance today at reasonable rates to protect themselves against these inordinate risks and who do not have insurance available if a disaster strikes, get protection without direct appropriations from the Federal Government to cover these disasters?

I am confident that some program can be evolved. Also, of course, section 5 includes a general study relating to all available programs and all programs that might be recommended in addition to hurricane insurance. I am confident we can come up with a workable, sound and substantial contribution in this field next year. After all, we need something to be left for next year to be acted on anyway.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH].

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out for the benefit of my colleagues in the House that there is a decided role that the private insurance industry can play in meeting the problem that we are dealing with here today, and that is primarily in the field of hurricane insurance. We can buy insurance against windstorms. But we cannot buy insurance against abnormal high tides, and that is where our real problem comes up. We are not concerned with hurricanes as such. There are reasonable rates for that readily available, but we are concerned with the abnormal high tides accompanying these disastrous hurricanes. Practically the only place that you can get insurance against high tides is with Lloyds of London, but the premiums are prohibitive.

We are going to have a cooperative effort, I am sure, as a result of this study which will be made by the Federal Government. The State and local governments and private industry in general and the insurance industry in particular will know what their responsibilities are. I trust the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development will approach this constructively and when the report is rendered in 9 months time we will have some legislation that we can enact in the next session of the Congress.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, and to congratulate the committee on bringing this measure to us for action. Florida is grateful for the generous and needed provisions of this bill. I wish to stress, Mr. Speaker, the need for the studies here authorized to lay the basis for a broad program of insurance for the future. I worked for the 1956 measure which was intended to accomplish this same objective; and I sincerely hope that the new studies will reveal a practical method of prompt relief, preferably on an insurance basis.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to support H.R. 11539, the Southeastern Hurricane Disaster Relief Act of 1965.

This legislation is certainly necessary for the victims of Hurricane Betsy in Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi.

I wish, however, to take this opportunity to speak out very strongly on behalf of favorable action by Congress at the earliest possible time on omnibus disaster relief legislation.

The omnibus disaster relief bill, S. 1861, has already been passed by the Senate on a voice vote on July 22, 1965. I have introduced an omnibus disaster relief bill, as have my colleagues, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH] and other Members of the House.

This omnibus bill provides relief for the unfortunate victims of natural disasters like the devastating series of tornadoes which swept through northern Indiana last Palm Sunday and left death and destruction in their wake. The loss to my district alone, with 54 dead, 242 injured, and property damage in the millions, was catastrophic. Hardest hit was the little unincorporated community of Dunlap, near Elkhart, where the desolation in some places was total and the individual suffering was and remains beyond total measurement or relief.

Three days after the holocaust, President Johnson, my colleagues Senators VANCE HARTKE and BIRCH BAYH, Indiana Governor Roger Branigan, Buford Ellington, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, and I visited the stricken area. The crippling effects of the storm were overwhelming. The evidence of personal and community tragedy, on all sides, stunned and moved us all.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to support Federal action for the victims of Hurricane Betsy in the Southeastern States but I speak as well for those who have suffered from disasters in other parts of the United States during recent months and I also speak for the victims of tomorrow's natural disasters.

Can we possibly be satisfied with piecemeal and after-the-fact legislation each time natural disaster strikes? The omnibus bill which several of us have introduced authorizes Federal agencies to provide a number of forms of immediate and long-term assistance when natural disaster strikes.

Mr. Speaker, I hope very much that if it is not possible for Congress to act during this session on omnibus disaster relief legislation, we shall do so as early as possible in the second session.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is needed to assist local and State governments in Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi, and the estimated million citizens adversely affected by Hurricane Betsy, in the long road of rebuilding their homes, businesses, and public facilities. In his report to the President on the activities of the Weather Bureau during the hurricane, the Secretary of Commerce indicated Betsy was the most erratic and destructive hurricane of this century. Much damage was prevented by both the Weather Bureau and the Coast Guard, through their warning and rescue operations, but the destruction in many areas reached unbelievable proportions. Certainly the Federal Government must be in a position to grant special consideration to those who suffered losses from this natural disaster. This legislation seeks to implement existing programs, and reduce some of the restrictions not contemplated in circumstances of this sort. In urging adoption of H.R. 11539, prudence and commonsense are also urged, so that those in actual need are able to secure help, and those who may seek to take advantage of the situation although suffering no hurricane damage are prevented from doing so. Our experiences in this year of destructive weather may serve as the emphasis for more study of the role of the Federal Government in disasters, so that emergency situations can be better met with machinery set up for this purpose, rather than for the necessity of special legislation for each succeeding event of weather on the rampage.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). The question is, Shall the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 11539?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PROTECTION OF ENDANGERED SPECIES OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9424) to provide for the conservation, protection, and propagation of native species of fish and wildlife, including migratory birds, that are threatened with extinction; to consolidate the authorities relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of the National Wildlife Refuge System; and for other purposes, with amendments as printed in the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 9424

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Congress finds and declares that one of the unfortunate consequences of economic growth in the United States has been the extermination of some native species of fish and wildlife; that serious losses in other species of native wild animals with educational, historical, recreational, and scientific value have occurred and are occurring; and that the United States has an obligation pursuant to international agreements, such as the Migratory Bird Treaties and the Inter-American Treaty on Nature Protection and Wildlife Preservation, 1940, with Canada and Mexico and other countries to conserve and protect, where practicable, the various species of native fish and wildlife, including game and nongame migratory birds, that are threatened with extinction. The purposes of this Act are to provide a program for the conservation, protection, restoration, and propagation of selected species of native fish and wildlife, including migratory birds, that are threatened with extinction, and to consolidate, restate, and modify the present authorities relating to administration by the Secretary of the Interior of the National Wildlife Refuge System.

(b) A species or subspecies of native fish and wildlife shall be regarded as threatened with extinction whenever the Secretary of the Interior finds, after consultation with the States, that its existence is endangered because its habitat is threatened with destruction, drastic modification, or severe curtailment, or because of overexploitation, disease, predation, or because of other factors, and that its survival requires assistance.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall utilize the land acquisition and other authorities of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act, as amended, the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended, and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to carry out a program in the United States of conserving, protecting, restoring, and propagating selected species of native fish and wildlife that are threatened with extinction.

(b) In addition to the land acquisition authorities in such Acts, the Secretary is hereby authorized to acquire by purchase, donation, or otherwise, lands or interests therein needed to carry out the purpose of this Act relating to the conservation, protection, restoration, and propagation of selected species of native fish that are threatened with extinction.

(c) Funds made available pursuant to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897) may be used for the purpose of acquiring lands, waters, or interests therein pursuant to this section that are needed for the purpose of conserving, protecting, restoring, and propagating selected species of native fish and wildlife, including migratory birds, that are threatened with extinction.

(d) The Secretary shall review other programs administered by him and, to the extent practicable, utilize such programs in furtherance of the purpose of this Act. The Secretary shall also encourage other Federal agencies to utilize, where practicable, their authorities in furtherance of the purpose of this Act.

SEC. 3. In carrying out the program authorized by this Act, the Secretary shall cooperate to the maximum extent practicable with the several States, and he may enter into agreements with the States for the administration and management of any area established under this program for the conservation, protection, restoration, and propagation of threatened species of native fish and wildlife. Any revenues derived from the administration of such areas under these agreements will continue to be subject to the provisions of section 401 of the Act of June 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 383), as amended (16 U.S.C. 715s).

SEC. 4. (a) For the purpose of consolidating the authorities relating to the various categories of areas that are administered by the Secretary of the Interior for the conservation of fish and wildlife, including species that are threatened with extinction, all lands, waters, and interests therein administered by the Secretary as wildlife refuges, areas for the protection and conservation of fish and wildlife that are threatened with extinction, wildlife ranges, game ranges, wildlife management areas, or waterfowl production areas are hereby designated as the "National Wildlife Refuge System" (referred to herein as the "System"), which shall be subject to the provisions of this section. Nothing contained in this Act shall restrict the authority of the Secretary to modify or revoke public land withdrawals affecting lands in the System as presently constituted, or as it may be constituted, whenever he determines that such action is consistent with the public interest.

(b) In administering the System, the Secretary is authorized—

(1) to enter into contracts with any person or public or private agency through negotiation for the provision of public accommodations.

(2) to accept donations of funds and to use such funds to acquire or manage lands or interests therein, and

(3) to acquire lands or interests therein by exchange (a) for acquired lands or public lands under his jurisdiction which he finds suitable for disposition, or (b) for the right to remove, in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, products from the acquired or public lands within the System: *Provided,* That the lands or interests therein so exchanged shall involve approximately equal values, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further,* That the Secretary may accept cash from, or pay cash to, the grantor in an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged.

(c) No person shall knowingly disturb, injure, cut, burn, remove, destroy, or possess any real or personal property of the United States, including natural growth, in any area of the System; or take or possess any fish, bird, mammal, or other wild vertebrate or invertebrate animals or part or nest or egg thereof within any such area; or enter, use, or otherwise occupy any such area for any purpose; unless such activities are performed by persons authorized to manage such area, or unless such activities are permitted either under subsection (d) of this section or by express provision of the law, proclamation, Executive order, or public land order establishing the area, or amendment thereof: *Provided,* the United States mining and mineral leasing laws shall continue to apply to any lands within the System to the same extent they apply prior to the effective date of this Act unless subsequently withdrawn under other authority of law. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the Secretary to control or regulate hunting or fishing of resident fish and wildlife, including endangered species thereof, on lands not within the System. The regulations permitting hunting and fishing of resident fish and wildlife within the System shall be, to the extent practicable, consistent with State fish and wildlife laws and regulations.

(d) The Secretary is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to—

(1) permit the use of any area within the System for any purpose, including but not limited to hunting, fishing, public recreation and accommodations, and access whenever he determines that such uses are compatible with the major purposes for which such areas were established: *Provided,* That not to exceed 40 per centum at any one time of any area that has been, or hereafter may be acquired, reserved, or set apart as an inviolate sanctuary for migratory birds, under any law, proclamation, Executive order, or public land order may be administered by the Secretary as an area within which the taking of migratory game birds may be permitted under such regulations as he may prescribe; and

(2) permit the use of, or grant easements in, over, across, upon, through, or under any areas within the System for purposes such as but not necessarily limited to, powerlines, telephone lines, canals, ditches, pipelines, and roads, including the construction, operation, and maintenance thereof, whenever he determines that such uses are compatible with the purposes for which these areas are established.

(e) Any person who violates or fails to comply with any of the provisions of this Act or any regulations issued thereunder shall be fined not more than $500 or be imprisoned not more than six months, or both.

(f) Any person authorized by the Secretary of the Interior to enforce the provisions of this Act or any regulations issued thereunder, may, without a warrant, arrest any person violating this Act or regulations in his presence or view, and may execute any warrant or other process issued by an officer or court of competent jurisdiction to enforce the provisions of this Act or regulations, and may with a search warrant search for and seize any property, fish, bird, mammal, or other wild vertebrate or invertebrate animals or part or nest or egg thereof, taken or possessed in violation of this Act or the regulations issued thereunder. Any property, fish, bird, mammal, or other wild vertebrate or invertebrate animals or part or egg thereof seized with or without a search warrant shall be held by such person or by a United States marshal, and upon conviction, shall be forfeited to the United States and disposed of by the court.

(g) Regulations applicable to areas of the System that are in effect on the date of enactment of this Act shall continue in effect until modified or rescinded.

(h) Nothing in this section shall be construed to amend, repeal, or otherwise modify the provision of the Act of September 28, 1962 (76 Stat. 653; 16 U.S.C. 460K—460K–4) which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to administer the areas within the System for public recreation. The provisions of this section relating to recreation shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of said Act.

SEC. 5. (a) The term "person" as used in this Act means any individual, partnership, corporation, or association.

(b) The terms "take" or "taking" or "taken" as used in this Act mean to pursue, hunt, shoot, capture, collect, kill, or attempt to pursue, hunt, shoot, capture, collect, or kill.

(c) The terms "State" and the "United States" as used in this Act mean the several States of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

SEC. 6. Section 4(b) of the Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451), as amended (16 U.S.C. 718d(b)), is further amended by changing the colon after the word "areas" to a period and striking the provisos, which relate to hunting at certain wildlife refuges and which are now covered by section 4 of this Act.

SEC. 7. (a) Sections 4 and 12 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (45 Stat. 1222), as amended (16 U.S.C. 715c and 715k), are further amended by deleting the word "game" wherever it appears.

(b) Section 10 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (45 Stat. 1224), as amended (16 U.S.C. 715i), which relates to the administration of certain wildlife refuges, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. (a) Areas of lands, waters, or interests therein acquired or reserved pursuant to this Act shall, unless otherwise provided by law, be administered by the Secretary of the Interior under rules and regulations prescribed by him to conserve and protect migratory birds in accordance with treaty obligations with Mexico and Canada, and other species of wildlife found thereon, including species that are threatened with extinction, and to restore or develop adequate wildlife habitat.

"(b) In administering such areas, the Secretary is authorized to manage timber, range, and agricultural crops; to manage other species of animals, including but not limited to fenced range animals, with the objectives of perpetuating, distributing, and utilizing the resources; and to enter into agreements with public and private agencies."

(c) Section 11 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (45 Stat. 1224) (16 U.S.C. 715j) is amended by striking the period at the end thereof and adding the following: "(39 Stat. 1702) and the treaty between the United States and the United Mexican States for the protection of migratory birds and game mammals concluded February 7, 1936 (50 Stat. 1311)."

(d) Sections 13 and 14 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (45 Stat. 1225), as amended (16 U.S.C. 715l and 715m), which provide for the enforcement of said Act and for penalties for violations thereof and which are covered by section 4 of this Act, are repealed.

SEC. 8. (a) Sections 302 and 303 of title III of the Act of June 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 382), as amended (16 U.S.C. 715d–1 and 715d–2), which authorize exchanges at wildlife refuges and which are covered by section 4 of this Act, are repealed.

(b) The last sentence of section 401(a) of the Act of June 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 383), as amended (16 U.S.C. 715s), is amended by inserting after the term "wildlife refuges", the following: "lands acquired or reserved for the protection and conservation of fish and wildlife that are threatened with extinction,".

SEC. 9. The first clause in section 1 of the Act of September 28, 1962 (76 Stat. 653), is amended by deleting the words "national wildlife refuges, game ranges," and inserting therein "areas within the National Wildlife Refuge System,".

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. **PELLY**. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. **DINGELL**. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege and honor for me to explain to the Members of the House, H.R. 9424.

This legislation was introduced by our former beloved colleague, the immediate past chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the late T. Ashton Thompson. The bill was introduced on June 23 of this year and probably was the last one introduced by T. A. before his tragic death on the weekend of July 4. This is one of the most important pieces of legislation that has been considered by the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation for many Congresses and I think it most appropriate that the House pay tribute to a truly faithful public servant, the late T. A. Thompson, by passing H.R. 9424 in his honor as a living memorial.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most unfortunate results of economic growth in the United States over the years has been the extermination of some 24 birds and 12 mammals native to the United States and Puerto Rico. These animals are gone forever from the face of the earth and soon will be joined by some 35 kinds of mammals and 30 to 40 birds unless special conservation efforts to acquire and maintain sufficient habitat for them are initiated.

This legislation would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to initiate and carry out a comprehensive program to conserve, protect, restore, and propagate selected species of native fish and wildlife, including migratory birds, that are threatened with extinction. In carrying out the program, the Secretary would be directed to use existing broad authorities under the Migratory Bird Conservation Act, the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, for among other things, as research, studies, and land acquisitions. In addition, new land acquisitions would be authorized and the bill would consolidate and in some cases expand the authorities of the Secretary relating to the management and administration of the national wildlife refuge system as a means toward affording protection to fish and wildlife in all areas of the system. The legislation would also afford some protection to all species of fish and wildlife.

Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation has studied the problem of vanishing fish and wildlife for many Congresses but we sincerely believe that H.R. 9424 would provide that needed protection and assistance which will preserve such species for future generations.

This legislation came down to the committee in the form of an executive communication from the Interior Department, its importance warranted the testimony of Secretary Udall at the hearings, it has the endorsement of all the other departments reporting on the legislation, and the unanimous support of all national and international fish and wildlife conservation organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend the passage of H.R. 9424.

As I had assured the distinguished chairman of the Interior Committee, I insert into the RECORD two letters from me to him. These letters make it clear it is not the intent of the committee to amend, alter, or otherwise affect the land and water conservation fund by this legislation.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 24, 1965.
Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: This is a formal acknowledgement of your letter of July 14 to the Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER regarding H.R. 9424.

As I advised you in regard to that letter, the language to which you referred at page 3, line 14, regarding the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, is simply enunciative of the language already included in that statute and provides no new authority to the Secretary of the Interior, nor does it in any way amend, change, or alter the provisions of that statute.

This point was attested to in the hearings by witnesses on behalf of the Department of the Interior who stated this same point and, when published, I am sure you will find that the hearings buttress this statement to your full satisfaction.

I would be derelict in my defense of jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation if I did not point out that legislation dealing with the refuge system for fish and wildlife is properly a matter of concern to that subcommittee, and under the rules of the Congress is given to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which the subcommittee is a duly constituted part.

While I am anxious always to be cooperative and helpful whenever possible, I do wish you to know that it is my responsibility as acting chairman of that subcommittee, to preserve the jurisdiction of the subcommittee and to protect as fully as I am able, in cooperation with our distinguished chairman, the jurisdiction of the full committee.

With warm good wishes.
Sincerely,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 27, 1965.
Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: Thank you very much for your letter on H.R. 9424 dated September 20, 1965, regarding the provisions of that legislation in subsection 2(c) dealing with Land and Water Conservation Fund Act moneys being made available for acquisition of land for preservation of species of fish or wildlife threatened with extinction.

This matter was discussed at considerable length in the subcommittee, both in the open public hearings and in the executive session, and it was the attitude and intention of the Department of the Interior, which drafted the legislation, and the members of the subcommittee, including myself, that this is simply annunciative of the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act and it adds nor detracts nothing from the provisions thereof. A notation to this effect will appear in the report of the committee and, of course, I will be happy to make similar comments on the floor at the time this matter is resolved.

I am happy to learn of your views in our subsequent telephone conversation that this meets with your approval.

With warm good wishes,
Sincerely,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress.

Mr. **DINGELL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include two letters.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. **PELLY**. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in urging favorable consideration of H.R. 9424. This bill was introduced by the late Honorable T. A. Thompson, a former distinguished member of our committee and former chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation.

The purpose of H.R. 9424 is to provide an overall program for the conservation, protection, and propagation of native species of fish and wildlife which are threatened with extinction.

It is unfortunate, but true, that the economic growth of our country has been at the expense of exterminating some wildlife. The U.S. Department of Interior has advised that since the settlement of the 50 States, some 24 birds and 12 mammals native to the United States and Puerto Rico have become extinct. These animals are gone forever from the face of the earth. Unless remedial action, such as proposed in H.R. 9424, is taken now, another 35 kinds of mammals and 30 to 40 birds face a similar fate of extinction.

True, in the past we have made special efforts to save specified species which have been threatened with extinction. But, this former approach carries with it the weakness of ineffective and piecemeal remedies. What is now required is a coordinated program providing for special conservation efforts to protect all such endangered species. H.R. 9424 provides the vehicle to attain this commendable goal.

In conclusion, I should like to bring to your attention a portion of one of the recommendations on endangered wildlife of the First World Conference on National Parks held in Seattle in 1962. That Conference noted, and I quote, that:

> Any species so threatened which is not accorded such official sanctuary proclaims the failure of the Government concerned to recognize its responsibility to future generations of mankind.

It is my firm and personal belief that the United States now has such a responsibility. It is a responsibility which can be discharged through the legislation which is now before you for consideration, H.R. 9424. Accordingly, I strongly urge that H.R. 9424 be considered favorably and passed by the House.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished acting chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, in memory of a beloved friend and colleague, T. A. Thompson, of Louisiana, I consider it an honor to recommend passage of H.R. 9424.

I had the pleasure of serving with T. A. as fellow members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries during the past 13 years. His term as chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation produced an outstanding record of important legislation considered and enacted. Unquestionably, the most important piece of legislation to come before the subcommittee in many years has been H.R. 9424, introduced by T. A. only a few days before his tragic death. As a memorial to a truly faithful public servant, I think it very fitting that H.R. 9424 be passed in his honor.

Mr. Speaker, over the years some 24 birds and 12 mammals native to the United States and Puerto Rico have disappeared from the face of our earth. There are a number of other rare and endangered native fish and wildlife which will become extinct in the not too distant future unless sufficient habitat is soon acquired. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has considered the problem of species threatened with extinction many times before and has passed special legislation to save such species as the key deer, fur seal, sea otter, and many others. H.R. 9424 would eliminate this need to come to the Congress each time a species of fish and wildlife is threatened.

The main purpose of this legislation would be to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to initiate and carry out a program designed to conserve, protect, restore, and propagate selected species of endangered fish and wildlife.

In addition, the bill would afford protection to migratory birds which would assist us in meeting our international commitments to Canada and Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend the passage of this vitally important legislation.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH].

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in tribute to the late T. A. Thompson, the original sponsor of this legislation, and I commend our subcommittee chairman, Mr. DINGELL, who is doing such an outstanding job in his efforts to fill the shoes of Mr. Thompson in this respect.

As a Representative of Cape Cod, Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket, I have had firsthand knowledge of the problem which faces our Nation's wildlife. For example, the last heath hen died early in this century down on Martha's Vineyard. This was a game bird which furnished food for the tables of our early settlers.

I believe the legislation goes a long way toward resisting and reversing the trend which has decimated so much of our wonderful wildlife.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend my good friend from Washington [Mr. PELLY], and also my good friend from Massachusetts, for their help on this bill, and indeed all the members of the subcommittee and the committee.

I yield at this time to my good friend the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding to me.

I commend the gentleman for the excellent job he has done in such a short time since he has taken over the work of our late beloved colleague, Mr. Thompson of Louisiana.

To establish a legislative history, I should like to pose a question to the gentleman from Michigan.

Do the provisions of H.R. 9424 include the nene goose of Hawaii?

Mr. DINGELL. I refer the gentleman to page 2, line 16, subsection (b) and the language which follows, wherein the Secretary can designate. The language is:

> A species or subspecies of native fish and wildlife shall be regarded as threatened with extinction whenever the Secretary of the Interior finds, after consultation with the States, that its existence is endangered because its habitat is threatened with destruction, drastic modification, or severe curtailment, or because of overexploitation, disease, predation, or because of other factors, and that its survival requires assistance.

It is my interpretation of the language, as I am sure it would be the interpretation of the subcommittee and of the House, that that language would cover the nene goose of Hawaii to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. As the gentleman knows, the nene is the official State bird of Hawaii, and indeed one of the world's most beautiful and distinguished looking species. Unfortunately, it is one of the world's rarest and most endangered species. Its preservation is truly a matter of interest not only to the State of Hawaii but also to the entire Nation. For this reason I introduced a bill, H.R. 505, on January 4 of this year, and appeared before the gentleman's subcommittee to testify in support of my bill. It is my understanding that my bill has been incorporated into the bill now before us, and the purpose of my bill is fully covered by the measure under consideration. The program provided by the bill raises the hope that the nene will become another conservation achievement in which all Americans can take pride. Mr. Speaker, I urge a favorable vote on H.R. 9424.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield at this time 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a Congressman from the South Bronx, a densely populated urban area, in support of this bill.

I say to my colleague from Massachusetts that I have spent many happy childhood and adult hours on the beaches of Martha's Vineyard, on the sandy windswept dunes of Menemsha Pond and King's Beach, and I rejoice in the imminent passage of this legislation.

I rejoice not only for my colleague for the preservation of the glorious wildlife and eerie beauty of his rural district but also, as a Member representing a densely populated New York City district, I rejoice for urban America, as well.

The advent of the airplane and the omnipresent automobile have largely eliminated space and time in our society. And the increase in our per family spending money and in our vacation periods, as well as in the proliferating automobile population and the ever-spreading network of concrete ribbons crisscrossing our lands, pose the question: Where shall we go in our family car for the breath of pure natural beauty which refreshes the body and rekindles the spirit?

For too long we have ravaged and despoiled our great wildlife heritage and the pristine open spaces, golden plains, verdant valleys, marshland oases, majestic coastlands.

A reversal of this shameful lack of national program and national purpose is long overdue.

So, on behalf of urban America, speaking for the great majority of Americans—the city dwellers across the land who will enjoy the national heritage you are preserving and enhancing—may I be so bold as to rise in enthusiastic support of this bill and commend all of you who have worked so long and hard in bringing it to fruition.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. Don H. Clausen].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 9424, a bill to conserve, protect, and propagate the native species of fish and wildlife that are threatened with extinction.

It is particularly fitting that we pass this bill as a final tribute to its author, our former colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Thompson. Having served with T.A. on the Public Works Committee, I observed the exceptional abilities of this fine gentleman and heard him express a concern and interest in the conservation objectives contained in this bill. I am pleased to add my support to the bill and ask that the bill be passed unanimously.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 9424 to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to carry out in the United States a comprehensive program for the conservation and protection of species of birds and animals that are threatened with extinction.

This program is urgently needed. Nearly 100 species of birds and animals native to the United States will be wiped out unless a major effort is made. This legislation provides the Secretary with expanded authority to acquire the wildlife habitats and do the research necessary to save threatened native wildlife and migratory birds within our borders. It specifically allows use of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act to purchase land for this purpose.

High praise is due the Interior Department for submitting this legislation to Congress, and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries for bringing it before us today.

Enactment of this legislation will constitute a welcome declaration by the United States of the importance of saving threatened species. However, passage of H.R. 9424 is only one of the steps I hope Congress will promptly take.

WILDLIFE IS THREATENED THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

It is not only in North America that many species are facing extermination. Indeed the threat to the world's wildlife is even more acute in Africa, Asia, and Latin America—and in the world's oceans.

Even now man is in the process of wiping out the world's largest animal—the blue whale, as well as the rhinoceros, the orangutan, the leopard, and more than 250 other species.

Many of the animals that are now doomed unless something is done have present or potential economic value. Many of them are of scientific, medical, or educational importance.

All of them belong to the web of life with which we tamper at our hazard. And all of them have a claim to survival based on esthetic and ethical considerations.

Wherever they may live, these irreplaceable creatures belong, in a broader sense, to all men. Mankind as a whole will be the loser if these animals go the way of the dodo and the passenger pigeon and the 200 other species that man has senselessly destroyed.

We must do more than conserve the species within this country under the excellent legislation before us today.

We should also take the initiative in cooperative conservation action on a worldwide basis to save the threatened species and the habitats that are indispensable to their survival before it is too late.

As it is now, a number of largely private organizations manned by able and dedicated conservationists are fighting an uneven battle to save the world's threatened wildlife. But the task is beyond the resources available to them.

WORLD GOVERNMENTS MUST TAKE A LARGER ROLE IN INTERNATIONAL CONSERVATION

I have long felt that the world's governments must play a much greater role in world conservation of wildlife.

Governments control conservation programs within their own borders. They control the export and import of animals and animal products. The governments of the developed nations have the technical experts, the experience, and the modest funds needed to assist in creating effective conservation programs in the developing countries and, moreover, to do it in a way that will further the economic development of these emerging nations.

Accordingly on June 15, 1965, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 440, calling on the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of State to take all necessary steps to convene an intergovernmental conference on the conservation of wildlife under the sponsorship of the United Nations. The distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] sponsored an identical resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 52, in the other body.

I had in mind a conference attended not merely by conservationists and technicians but by Government leaders on the ministerial and Cabinet level who need to learn and understand the need for worldwide conservation efforts and who are in a position to take the needed governmental actions.

EMINENT CONSERVATIONISTS HAVE PREPARED AN AGENDA

On September 30, and October 1, a special meeting was held in London under the sponsorship of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources—IUCN—the International Council for Bird Preservation, the Fauna Preservation Society, and the World Wildlife Fund to consider such a conference and to prepare an agenda.

More than 50 of the world's leading conservationists attended this meeting. Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall was represented by Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife, Dr. Stanley Cain, accompanied by Samuel E. Jorgensen, Chief of the Foreign Activities of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. My legislative assistant, Everard Munsey, also attended the meeting.

The meeting was chaired by Peter Scott, chairman of the Survival Service Commission of the IUCN and chairman of the World Wildlife Fund, who is one of the dynamos of the world conservation movement.

Assisting in the conduct of the meeting were Dr. Dillon Ripley, president of the International Council for Bird Preservation and Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution; Dr. Francois Bourliere of France, president of the IUCN; and Captain C. R. S. Pitman of the United Kingdom, vice president of the Fauna Preservation Society.

The conservationists strongly backed the idea of holding a world intergovernmental conference under United Nations sponsorship. An agenda was drawn up emphasizing the practical advantages to be derived from wildlife conservation and the steps that can be taken to achieve these benefits.

The emphasis on practicality stemmed from the realization that it is often useless to talk conservation to hungry, aspiring people intent on the economic development of their country, unless conservation can be shown to be of economic benefit by providing foreign earnings from a sustained supply of wild animal products, by providing the basis of a tourist industry, or by providing food through programs of wildlife management and game cropping.

FOUR MAJOR CONSERVATION ACTIONS ARE PLANNED

The agenda is aimed at culminating in an action program under which the nations participating in the conference will step up their efforts to conserve wildlife through such steps by their goverments as:

First. Participation in international treaties and conventions to control trade in wildlife and wildlife products.

Second. Preparation of model conservation laws and provision of assistance in enforcement and administration for countries seeking to improve their domestic conservation programs.

Third. Provision of technical assistance and added financial aid to assist developing nations to benefit from the economic potential of their wildlife resources and to preserve their threatened species.

Fourth. Participation in specific international programs to preserve certain threatened species.

In addition, it was hoped that the aid of governments could be enlisted in enhancing public understanding of conservation through education and in combating fashions—such as the fad for leopard skin coats—and traditions—such as the belief that powdered rhino horn is a sex stimulant—which lead to the destruction of wildlife.

Working under such an agenda with its focus on governmental action and specific goals, an international conference on world wildlife could be of vast importance.

Happily, Assistant Secretary Cain indicated that Secretary Udall is very much in favor of such a conference and that the United States might well be able to be host.

The conservationists are continuing to work to prepare the details of the various items of the agenda. Efforts will be made to bring the developing countries into the planning process.

I would hope and urge that Congress play a part in bringing this proposed conference to reality by passing House Concurrent Resolution 440. The passage of this expression of the sense of Congress would give a powerful impetus to efforts to bring about a conference with the broad participation of high-level Government officials needed at this critical time for the world's wildlife.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the measure to provide against the extinction of rare living species of wildlife. For many years I have been deeply interested in efforts of this type and have from time to time introduced legislation in this field. What God has carefully created, we should surely protect. In so doing we serve ourselves and future generations, as we fulfill what I believe to be an obligation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 9424.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RIGHT TO BE REPRESENTED IN MATTERS BEFORE AGENCIES

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1758) to provide for the right of persons to be represented in matters before Federal agencies, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1758

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That—

(a) Any person who is a member in good standing of the bar of the highest court of any State, possession, territory, Commonwealth, or the District of Columbia may represent others before any agency upon filing with the agency a written declaration that he is currently qualified as provided by this subsection and is authorized to represent the particular party in whose behalf he acts.

(b) Any person who is duly qualified to practice as a certified public accountant in any State, possession, territory, Commonwealth, or the District of Columbia may represent others before the Internal Revenue Service of the Treasury Department upon filing with that agency a written declaration that he is currently qualified as provided by this subsection and is authorized to represent the particular party in whose behalf he acts.

(c) Nothing herein shall be construed (i) to grant or deny to any person who is not qualified as provided by subsection (a) or (b) the right to appear or represent others before any agency or in any agency proceeding; (ii) to authorize or limit the discipline, including disbarment, of persons who appear in a representative capacity before any agency; (iii) to authorize any person who is a former officer or employee of an agency to represent others before an agency where such representation is prohibited by statute or regulation; or (iv) to prevent an agency from requiring a power of attorney as a condition to the settlement of any controversy involving the payment of money.

(d) This section shall not be applicable to practice before the Patent Office with respect to patent matters which shall continue to be covered by chapter 3 (sections 31 to 33) of title 35 of the United States Code.

SEC. 2. When any participant in any matter before an agency is represented by a person qualified pursuant to subsection (a) or (b) of section 1, any notice or other written communication required or permitted to be given to such participant in such matter shall be given to such representative in addition to any other service specifically required by statute. If a participant is represented by more than one such qualified representative, service upon any one of such representatives shall be sufficient.

SEC. 3. As used in this Act, "agency" shall have the same meaning as it does in section 2(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act, as amended (60 Stat. 237, as amended).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). Is a second demanded?

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This measure is designed to abolish special agency requirements imposed on attorneys in good standing who appear for persons in matters before Federal agencies.

The bill provides that an attorney who is a member in good standing of the bar of the highest court of his State may represent persons before a Federal agency upon filing a declaration that he is so qualified and that he represents the person for whom he acts.

Second, the bill provides that a certified public accountant who is duly qualified to practice in any State may represent persons before the Internal Revenue Service of the Treasury Department.

However, the bill does not cover practice before the Patent Office in patent matters. This is because the committee is convinced that attorneys are not necessarily qualified by their legal education alone to prepare patent applications and draft specifications and claims. This is why the committee has amended the Senate bill.

The background is that in past years many Federal agencies required application to the agency before attorneys would be deemed acceptable as practitioners. In 1957 the Department of Justice recommended that all agencies discontinue the practice. Most have done so. Today few retain it.

Only two agencies object to discontinuing: the Treasury and the Patent Office.

The Treasury Department's rules and regulations governing the right of attorneys to represent others before its Internal Revenue Service have the purpose of disclosing whether or not the applicant is a person of good moral character. The Treasury assumes that attorneys at law as well as certified public accountants are professionally qualified for tax practice and no further qualifications are imposed on members of these professions with respect to skill, knowledge, or ability. In order to be issued a "Treasury card" for admission to practice an applicant must submit himself to an involved admissions procedure. Applications are made pursuant to Treasury Department Circular No. 230, containing 70 provisions with which the applicant is required to familiarize himself. He must also affirm that he will conduct himself in accordance with the laws, regulations, and rules of the agency. The purpose of the application is to enable agency investigation of the applicant's background to determine whether he is a person of good character and reputation. A director of practice and staff have responsibility for this work. Appeal from an adverse decision lies to the Secretary of the Treasury. The committee knows of no other Federal agency that imposes a comparable burden on professionally qualified prospective practitioners to establish their moral fitness to practice.

The bill would abolish this practice. The committee believes that there is a presumption that members in good standing of the professions of the law and certified public accountancy are of good moral character, and that surveillance by State bar associations and State associations of certified public accountants will sufficiently insure the integrity of practice by such persons before the Internal Revenue Service. The cumbersome admission procedures of the Internal Revenue Service seem unwarranted in their impact on duly qualified attorneys and certified public accountants.

The qualifications imposed by the Patent Office for eligibility to represent persons in patent matters are not directed to moral fitness but to professional competence. The essence of the Patent Office position is that a legal education does not qualify a person to perform the technical and specialized work involved in the preparation of patent applications and their claims and specifications. Accordingly, an examination procedure has been established and an engineering degree or substantial equivalent is normally needed for eligibility to take the examination. The Patent Office informed the committee that past experience in admitting attorneys without further eligibility requirement had been unsatisfactory. The committee found merit in the contention of the Patent Office that attorneys are not necessarily qualified by their legal education to prepare adequate patent applications, including the drafting of specifications and claims. The committee accordingly recommends that the operations of the Patent Office with respect to patent matters be exempted from the provisions of section 1. Practice in trademark matters, however, would be subject to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the amended bill does not affect the right of persons other than attorneys—or other than certified public accountants before the Treasury—to appear for or represent persons before agencies.

It does not affect the power of agencies to discipline persons who appear before them.

It does not authorize any conflict of interest.

It does not prevent agencies from requiring powers of attorney as a condition to the settlement of matters involving the payment of money.

Agencies would, however, be required to give notices to representatives qualified under the bill.

This legislation is vigorously supported by the American Bar Association and the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants whose letters are attached to the report.

Mr. Speaker, I urge enactment of S. 1758, as amended.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, this is not a lawyer's bill. This is not a certified public accountant's bill. This is not a Government agency bill. This is a private citizen bill.

As the Federal Government grows bigger and bigger, as its laws get more and more complex, and as it touches more and more the lives of more and more citizens, it becomes more and more important that the citizen's rights in any dispute he may have with his Government should be accorded the first priority.

The first protection he must be assured is his right to select his own representative to speak for him. That right he does not fully enjoy today. Some governmental agencies have assumed a power never delegated specifically by statute. They have undertaken to decide who is qualified and who is not qualified to represent his fellow citizens in proceedings before them. At least one agency maintains a staff of 18 and spends over $300,000 per year for this purpose. But the cost involved is not the significant thing. What is significant is that the government, which is a party in interest, substitutes its judgment for the judgment of the client in testing the competence of his counsel. In so doing, some of the agencies, not satisfied with professional competence alone, presume to judge moral fitness as well.

This bill intends to return to the citizen to whom it belongs the right to exercise his own judgment in choosing his own representative. It provides simply that any person who is a member in good standing of the bar of the highest court in any State will be eligible to represent those who employ him before any Federal agency. All he has to do is to file a written declaration that he is currently qualified and is authorized by the citizen to represent him. So far as the Internal Revenue Service is concerned, the same authorization is made to any person who has been qualified under the laws of his State to practice as a certified public accountant.

The provisions of this legislation do not extend to practice before the Patent Office. Such practice is already covered by chapter 3 of title 35 of the United States Code. Because the practice of patent law ordinarily involves a need for specialized education and training, such practice must be treated in a special way.

It is important to emphasize that nothing in this bill in any way changes the nature or enlarges the scope of the service that will be performed by certified public accountants in the practice of accountancy before the Internal Revenue Service. The American Institute of Certified Public Accountants has registered its full endorsement of this legislation and has indicated repeatedly that it has no desire to practice law or otherwise to trespass upon the proper domain of other professions.

While this bill would allow an attorney to practice before Federal agencies upon his own assertion, any misrepresentation would subject him not only to disbarment, but to penalties for false statements under the criminal section of the United States Code, 18 U.S.C. 1001.

The bill in no way modifies the authority of agencies to discipline persons before them, to prescribe qualifications for nonattorneys, or to prevent former employees from representing persons appearing before them in order to avoid conflicts of interest. Furthermore, the bill would in no way prevent an agency from requiring a power of attorney as a condition to the settlement of controversies involving the payment of money.

The legislation also has the unequivocal endorsement of the American Bar Association, most individual State bar associations, and the Department of Justice. With such a broad consensus, the 89th Congress should move promptly to lay this troublesome issue at rest and to restore to the citizen his unfettered right to choose those who represent him in disputes with Federal agencies.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1758 which would authorize lawyers to practice before Federal agencies without special admission to agency bars. The measure now under consideration is almost identical to H.R. 8207 which I introduced in the 88th Congress.

S. 1758 provides for the right of a person to be represented by counsel of his choice. This right is now recognized by most Federal agencies, but it should be extended to all agencies. Since some agencies still impose such requirements, a citizen's right to be represented by an attorney of his choice is thus impaired.

I can see no reason why this right of the citizen should not be respected, particularly inasmuch as the attorney has already been determined to be qualified to represent others in his State. By such recognition and licensing of the attorney, the State deems the individual qualified to handle before its courts or tribunals matters similar to those which come before any Federal agency. Why, then, should admission and control of practice be duplicated at the Federal level through a maze of conflicting, multiple regulations of various agencies?

The passage of this bill will do away with these cumbersome admission requirements, thereby recognizing the right of persons and concerns to be represented by counsel of their own choice. This would directly benefit the client whose legal problems in Washington could then be handled by his local attorney.

I have long advocated the simplification and clarification of our administrative procedures. I believe this bill is a step in the right direction. The principles of this legislation have been approved by the American Bar Association and I am sure will be supported by lawyers throughout the country.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker I want to express my full support for S. 1758, the bill providing for the right of persons to be represented in matters before Federal agencies.

It is gratifying that this bill is coming before us for approval in view of the fact that a substantial number of Members of this body and of the other body have introduced similar legislation. My bill, for example, is H.R. 8433, introduced May 25, 1965.

It is unreasonable that competent lawyers in good standing with State bar associations should be required to undergo time-consuming and sometimes expensive procedures to meet the requirements of Federal agencies.

Members in good standing of the professions of the law, as judged by the continuing surveillance of State bar associations, should be presumed to be competent and of good moral character for practice with regard to Federal agencies.

The Committee on the Judiciary has recommended an exception in the case of operations of the Patent Office with respect to patent matters but not with respect to trademark matters. The decision is that attorneys are not necessarily qualified by their legal education to prepare adequate patent applications.

But in the case of the Internal Revenue Service and other Federal agencies attorneys as judged competent in their States should be allowed to practice in order that citizens have maximum opportunity to defend themselves.

By the same token, certified public accountants who have passed all the proper tests in their own States should be competent to appear before the Internal Revenue Service without being further qualified.

The objectives of this legislation are objectives on which we all can agree. I look forward to its enactment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1758, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PER DIEM ALLOWANCE FOR NEVADA TEST SITE EMPLOYEES

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 10722) to authorize the payment of an allowance of not to exceed $10 per day to employees assigned to duty at the Nevada test site of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 10722

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide authority for the payment of certain amounts to offset certain expenses of Federal employees assigned to duty on the California offshore islands, and for other purposes", approved August 31, 1964 (78 Stat. 745; 5 U.S.C. 70c), is amended by inserting after the word "islands" the words "or at the United States Atomic Energy Commission Nevada Test Site, including the Nuclear Rocket Development Station,".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 10722 will provide an allowance to about 100 employees of the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Public Health Service who must travel unusually long distances from their homes to their work stations at the Nevada Test Site. As all Members know, this is the continental location where our nuclear devices are developed and tested. It is of the utmost importance to our security and to our role in future exploration in space that this work proceed as rapidly and as efficiently as possible.

There are about 7,000 private contract employees on the site who already receive from their employers the allowances we propose here for the relatively small number of Federal civil servants.

The situation is this: There are no residence quarters on or anywhere near the work station of the employees of the test site suitable for family living. The only accommodations on the site are some barrack-type dwellings owned by the Government used primarily for overnight needs of an emergency nature. Most of the test site personnel, both contractor and Government, live in or near Las Vegas, which is a distance of 66.6 miles from Camp Mercury, and 92.3 miles from the Nuclear Rocket Development Station. The distance is even longer from the areas where underground testing is conducted. These people must travel these distances by car or bus twice each day. Travel time to and from work averages about 4 hours per day. Many of us, of course, are well acquainted with the trials and tribulations of suburban and big city commuting but there can be no comparison with the problems here.

The bill provides an allowance as a form of extra compensation for the unusual circumstances of employment at the test site. AEC and NASA both have been losing scientists, engineers, and technicians because of what seems to them to be a form of discrimination in compensation between the contractor personnel and the Government personnel. Under the circumstances it seemed to be inequitable to the Committee and this bill was supported unanimously.

Legislation is needed because present law does not permit any compensation for travel to and from work stations. We had a similar situation last year involving Navy installations on the California offshore islands. The Congress met that problem with remedial legislation. The present bill is an amendment to that legislation Public Law 88-538.

This bill will provide a ceiling of $10 per day on the allowance but the Bureau of the Budget and the agencies involved expect it to range from $5 to $7.50, comparable to payments made by the private contractors. The total annual cost of the legislation should not exceed $170,000.

The Bureau of the Budget also has informed us that they know of no other comparable situation in the United States where such allowances are needed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has said that under this legislation, if enacted, the Government may pay up to $10 but that it is expected they will pay somewhere between $5 and $7.50 per day for this purpose.

If they go to $10 then they will have set a precedent for private contractors who of course are 100 percent Government contractors in this case; is that not correct?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. That is obviously correct. The private contractors that pay this added compensation are cost-plus contractors.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I understand that. But if $10 is paid they practically force the private contractors to come up to $10, do they not?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. If that were the case, the gentleman is correct. However, the representatives of the Bureau of the Budget have testified, and it appears in both the report and the hearings, indicating that the private contractors are paying on an average of $5 to $7.50. It is the intent of the agencies who appeared before the committee and the Bureau of the Budget to merely meet the level the private contractors have set for individuals which is somewhere between $5 and $7.50. They have not indicated any intention or desire or willingness to go to the $10 figure but, rather than come back this year or next year or the year after for a ceiling which may eventually be necessary, they felt this was the best approach.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I would assume that these contractors are working under cost-plus contracts and perhaps some of them are fixed-fee contractors, but at least cost-plus contracts. Therefore, any increase on the part of the private employer will be paid for by the taxpayers of this country. I am not opposed to it—the travel cost of Government employees—but I would hope whatever it is they will keep them comparable and I would hope that the figure of somewhere between $5 and $7.50 will be ample.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I thank the gentleman and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING].

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 10722, a bill to amend Public Law 88-538. This bill would provide authority for the payment of an allowance to employees of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and other Government agencies who are duty stationed at the remote areas of the Atomic Energy Commission's Nevada test site, including the Nuclear Rocket Development Station.

As you know, I have a real personal interest in this matter, as I have introduced similar legislation pending in another committee. I cannot emphasize enough the importance of this legislation to the people involved; namely, the Government employees at the Nevada test site.

Nuclear devices are not being tested in Nevada by accident; it is by design.

When our nuclear program began it was necessary for our scientists to locate a remote and isolated area where nuclear testing could be conducted in privacy and in safety. Particularly, safety as applied to the general public.

Southern Nevada fulfilled these requirements.

Today, there are two important programs going forth in southern Nevada, one is the underground testing of nuclear weapons and the other is the development of the nuclear-powered engine for space flight.

I have personally visited the Nevada test site and the nuclear rocket development stations on numerous occasions and believe me, gentlemen, they are remote isolated areas in the dry uninhabited regions of of southern Nevada.

Traditionally, contractor and laboratory personnel have been compensated for inconvenience and time associated with their employment there. As programs have increased and stabilized it became essential in the name of sound management and economy that Government personnel be assigned to permanent duty at these two testing locations.

Las Vegas, Nev., is the nearest established community suitable for family living for the professional, scientific, and other employees of the Government who work at the test site. Therefore, most employees who are duty stationed at the Nevada test site are required to commute long distances from their home to the remote work locations. The distances from the Clark County courthouse in Las Vegas to the test site are 66.6 miles to Camp Mercury which is at the entrance of the test site, and it is 95 miles to the Nuclear Rocket Development Station at Jackass Flats, and even longer mileage to certain remote areas where underground weapons testing is conducted. Because of the lack of adequate living facilities closer to the locations of duty, most employees presently have no alternative but to spend up to 4 hours per day traveling to and from work, depending upon the particular duty station involved. This combination of commuting time and distances without reasonable alternatives creates a highly unusual situation that most other employees of the Government do not normally face in going to and from work. Complicating this situation for Government employees is the fact that the employees of private contractors working at the site, side by side with Government employees, are receiving an allowance of from $5 to $7.50 to offset the inconveniences, hardships, and expenses associated with travel to and from their homes and duty at the remote work locations. To attract and retain competent employees an allowance for such a work situation is deemed necessary.

The almost unique circumstances at the Nevada Test Site have created substantial hardships and inequities for the employees, and problems for the Government agencies involved in carrying out the vital activities at this location. The long hours employees are forced to spend away from home each day because of the lengthy commuting time required, coupled with the absence of any commuting allowance, has created problems in recruiting and retaining professional, technical, and clerical employees.

This legislation that we are considering here today, H.R. 10772, is in my opinion justifiable and long overdue.

Mr. HOLIFIELD recognized the problem in Nevada during hearings on the Navy's offshore legislation—(Public Law 88–538)—a little more than 1 year ago. The Atomic Energy Commission has recognized this problem for a similar period of time.

The number of Government employees permanently stationed at the site is small, presently consisting of approximately 100 employees of the Atomic Energy Commission, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Public Health Service. Although the bill will permit a maximum of $10 per day it is expected that the allowances will range from $5 to $7.50 as is being paid by Government contractors to their own personnel there. The total cost of this legislation for fiscal year 1966 is estimated at $172,000.

The bill has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and regulations governing these payments will be prepared by the Bureau of the Budget, which has been delegated by the President.

I urge passage of H.R. 10277 to correct this inequity between Government and contractor employees and to compensate faithful employees for the inconvenience and additional expense associated with their jobs.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York has very ably explained this legislation. In the hearings before our subcommittee there was no opposition to this bill. The unusual circumstances under which these employees work were explained.

I think a little explanation on the maximum allowance of $10 is possibly in order. It was explained that from time to time the worksite on the test area may be at some remote location. Ordinarily the employees may work at a particular worksite which is 65 or 70 or 80 miles from their place of residence. At other times they may work at remote areas on the testing ground which might be considerably farther. So the allowance may vary according to the place on the testing grounds where the employees are employed from time to time.

As has already been explained, there is good precedent for this legislation in a bill that was passed last year for the California offshore islands. I believe the report has received unanimous support from the committee, including agencies whose reports are printed with the report accompanying the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Are these employees presently transported by bus, or by some form of mass transportation, or do they drive their own cars, or is it a combination of both?

Mr. ERLENBORN. It is a combination of both. It was explained that there is bus transportation made available to these employees, but some elect to drive their own private vehicles. It was also explained that at times it is necessary for them to stay on the testing site overnight. There are accommodations available to them out there; however, they must pay the cost of these accommodations. In other words, they must rent a room.

Mr. GROSS. The $10 might be considered in the nature of a combination both for quarters and transportation?

Mr. ERLENBORN. That is correct. The $10 limitation would be applicable to the combination of the cost and the extra time involved, as well as the use of their private automobiles if they so select; and it represents the cost of accommodations if they stay overnight at the worksite.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). The question is, will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 10722.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

DISCONTINUANCE OF CERTAIN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2150) to discontinue or modify certain reporting requirements of law.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following reporting requirements, which relate to the submission of certain reports to Congress or other Government authority, are hereby repealed, as follows:

REPORTS UNDER EACH EXECUTIVE AGENCY

(1) The annual report to Congress of the administrative adjustment of tort claims of $2,500 or less, stating the name of each claimant, the amount claimed, the amount awarded, and a brief description of the claim (28 U.S.C. 2673).

REPORTS UNDER TWO OR MORE EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

(2) The semiannual report to the Congress of purchases and contracts with respect to experimental, developmental, or research work with the name of each contractor, the amount of the contract, and description of the work required (63 Stat. 393; 41 U.S.C. 252(c)).

(3) The quarterly reports to Congress by the Department of the Treasury, Housing and Home Finance Agency, General Services Administration, and the annual report to the President and to Congress by the Small Business Administration of progress in liquidating the assets and winding up the affairs of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as required by section 106(b) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act (67 Stat. 231; 15 U.S.C. 609, note), by Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957, and by Public Law 87–305, section 5(a) (75 Stat. 666; 15 U.S.C. 639(a)).

REPORTS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

(4) The annual report to Congress of activities relating to the Puerto Rico hurricane relief loans (45 Stat. 1067; 70 Stat. 525).

(5) The report of the estimates of national farm housing needs and of progress made toward meeting such needs (63 Stat. 435; 42 U.S.C. 1476(b)).

REPORTS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

(6) The quarterly report of contracts entered into, proposed contracts, and general progress with respect to aviation war risk insurance activities (72 Stat. 805; 49 U.S.C. 1539).

(7) The quarterly report of contracts entered into, proposed contracts, and general progress with respect to war risk insurance activities under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (64 Stat. 776; 46 U.S.C. 1291).

(8) The annual report of the names of contractors and subcontractors for scientific equipment used for communication and navigation and of the names of persons entering into contracts or other arrangements by the terms of which the United States undertakes to pay only for national-defense features, together with the applicable contracts and amounts (49 Stat. 1998; 46 U.S.C. 1155(b)).

(9) The annual report covering each case and the reasons therefor in which an exception is made to the prohibition against payment of an operating-differential subsidy for the operation of a vessel beyond its economic life (49 Stat. 2003; 46 U.S.C. 1175(b)).

REPORTS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

(10) The annual report to Congress by the Secretary of the Navy of all vessels used for experimental purposes which have been stricken from the Naval Vessel Register (10 U.S.C. 7306(b)).

(11) The requirement that the Secretary of the Navy shall communicate to Congress all or a portion of the annual report submitted to the Secretary by the Naval Sea Cadet Corps with respect to its proceedings and activities (76 Stat. 534).

(12) The requirement that the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury, as the case may be, shall report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives the details of the proposed participation by members of the Armed Forces under his jurisdiction in international amateur sports competition (10 U.S.C. 717(b)).

REPORTS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

(13) The annual report to the appropriate committees of Congress on the use of the separate fund created for the promotion of the free flow of domestically produced fishery products (68 Stat. 376; 15 U.S.C. 713c-3(f)).

(14) The annual report to the Congress giving detailed information with respect to the establishment of fish restoration and management projects and expenditures therefor (64 Stat. 434; 16 U.S.C. 777j).

REPORTS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

(15) The annual report of the Secretary of Labor to Congress of the administration of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act including a detailed statement of receipts and expenditures from the funds established by the Act (14 Stat. 444; 33 U.S.C. 943).

(16) The annual report to Congress by the Secretary of Labor of the work of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation including a detailed statement of appropriations and expenditures and a detailed statement showing receipts of and expenditures from the employees' compensation fund (39 Stat. 749; 5 U.S.C. 784).

REPORTS UNDER THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(17) The inclusion in the annual report of operations of the postal savings system of the names of post offices receiving deposits, the number of depositors in each and the amount on deposit (39 U.S.C. 5205).

(18) The inclusion in the annual report to the President by the Postmaster General of activities with respect to the Postal Modernization Fund (39 U.S.C. 2332).

REPORTS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

(19) The report to the Congress by the President with respect to operations under the Lend-Lease Act (55 Stat. 32; 22 U.S.C. 414(b)).

(20) The report to the Congress by the President not less than once each year on the activities of the International Atomic Energy Agency and on the participation of the United States therein (71 Stat. 453; 22 U.S.C. 2022).

(21) The annual report to Congress by the National Commission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation and the Secretary of State of the receipts and expenditures of funds and bequests received and disbursed in connection with the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (72 Stat. 273; 22 U.S.C. 287q).

(22) The annual report by the Secretary of State to the Congress and to the President on the condition of the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund and of estimates of appropriations necessary to continue the system in effect (60 Stat. 1024; 22 U.S.C. 1102).

REPORT UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY

(23) The annual report to Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury on the financial condition of the Postal Modernization Fund (39 U.S.C. 2234).

REPORT UNDER THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

SEC. 2. The following reporting requirements, which relate to the submission of certain reports to Congress or other Government authority, are hereby modified as follows:

(1) From quarterly to annual submission to Congress by the Secretary of Commerce of a report with respect to all activities or transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 50; 50 U.S.C. App. 1746).

(2) Beginning January 1, 1967, from semiannual to annual submission to the President and to Congress by the Secretary of Commerce of a report with respect to activities under the International Travel Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 130; 22 U.S.C. 2125).

(3) From quarterly to annual submission to Congress by the Secretary of the Air Force of a report of the number of officers in the executive part of the Department of the Air Force and the justification therefor (10 U.S.C. 8031(c)).

(4) From quarterly to semiannual submission to the Senate and the House of Representatives by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of a report with respect to personal property donations to State surplus property agencies and real property disposals to public health and educational institutions (66 Stat. 593; 40 U.S.C. 484(o)).

(5) From semiannual submission through the President to annual submission to Congress by the Secretary of the Interior of a report of the operations of programs to stimulate exploration for minerals within the United States, its territories and possessions together with recommendations regarding the need for such programs (72 Stat. 701; 30 U.S.C. 645).

(6) Beginning January 1, 1967, from semiannual to annual submission to the Congress by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States of a report concerning its operations under the War Claims Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1246; 50 U.S.C. App. 2008).

(7) From semiannual to annual submission to the Congress by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States of a report concerning its operations under the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 (64 Stat. 13; 22 U.S.C. 1622(c)).

(8) From semiannual to annual submission to the Congress by the President of a report of each transaction entered into by any agency of the United States Government pursuant to section 302 or 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, together with the basis for determining the probable ultimate net cost to the United State thereunder (64 Stat. 789; 74 Stat. 282; 50 U.S.C. App. 2094(b)).

(9) From semiannual to annual submission to the Congress by the Export-Import Bank of Washington of a report concerning its operations under the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 529; 12 U.S.C. 635g).

(10) From quarterly to annual submission to the Congress by the Attorney General of a report concerning certain voluntary agreements and programs pursuant to section 708(e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 818, as amended; 50 U.S.C. App. 2158).

(11) From quarterly to annual submission to the Congress by the Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission of a report pursuant to section 710(b)(7) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 819, as amended; 50 U.S.C. App. 2160).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will authorize the elimination of certain reports that various departments and agencies of the Federal Government are required by statute to make to Congress at periodic intervals and to change the frequency of certain other reports which are to be continued.

Over the years, numerous bills enacted by the Congress have properly required the preparation and submission of reports on a wide variety of programs so that the Congress can be kept informed on developments of importance, thereby enabling it to effectively carry out its constitutional function. From time to time these reports have been reviewed to determine if they still carry out the purposes intended and if they have been rendered unneeded by later developments. In 1954 and in 1958 a number of reports were eliminated by the Congress after such reviews by the Bureau of the Budget and the House and Senate Committees on Government Operations. Seven years having elapsed, a further review has been made and the pending bill has resulted.

Sixty-five reports were originally recommended for elimination by the Bureau of the Budget. Twenty of these were dropped from the original list by the Senate and we had for consideration 45 reports listed for elimination in the Senate bill. The frequency of submission of 11 other reports was also altered in the Senate bill—in most instances from quarterly or semiannual submissions to annual submissions. The chairman of the Committee on Government Operations then addressed a letter to the chairmen of each committee of the House inquiring whether or not the chairmen desired any of the listed reports to be retained. Whenever any chairman in response to this letter indicated that his committee desired any of the reports in the Senate bill continued, those reports were deleted from the bill. Subsequently, the ranking minority members of each committee were contacted by a member of the Government Operations Committee minority. We believe, therefore, the committee has checked with every logical source on this matter. Additional deletions were made by the committee itself on the basis of recommendations by its own members.

The committee's consideration of the Senate bill has resulted in the removal of a total of 22 reports from the Senate bill and 2 changes in dates in those reports whose frequency is being altered.

Twenty-three reports remain in the pending bill and the committee, believing that a consensus exists that these are no longer required, recommends that they be eliminated. This will be accomplished by the passage of this bill as amended.

The committee submits this bill as an economy measure, though as the bill is amended the savings will be greatly reduced from those estimated by the Bureau of the Budget accompanying its original recommendation. Officials of the Bureau of the Budget estimated a saving each year of $100,000 if all of the 65 reports they listed were dropped.

On the other hand, we wish to make clear that this committee does not favor curtailing information which should be available to the Congress and only supports this measure because it appears that the listed reports have lost their usefulness. The committee thoroughly endorses the expression of one of its members [Mr. Rumsfeld] "that this bill is not intended to permit or authorize the withholding of any of the information that will hereafter be exempted from the report, but simply is to avoid duplication and to avoid the necessity of an affirmative act on the part of the agency."

The amendments proposed remove from the bill reports which the committee feels should be continued; change the enumeration of the items in the bill; and modify the dates in two of the items in section 2.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I want to join with the gentleman in stating approval of this legislation. However, I do not want the House ever to discontinue reports that are essential to our right to know and our ability to know what is going on in Government.

I would say to the gentleman, I have only one criticism and that is that the report does not contain the views of the Comptroller General who I am sure is vitally interested in reports from all agencies. I could wish this report contained his views on the specific reports that are to be dropped or minimized under the terms of this legislation.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New York for his excellent description of this bill. I also want to commend the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson] on the way that this bill was handled in the subcommittee and in the full committee. As was explained, before the bill was considered by the subcommittee, each chairman of a standing committee of the House was contacted by the committee for his feeling as to the elimination of any of these reports. In every instance when a committee chairman expressed a desire to have a report continued, that report was eliminated from this bill so that the report would be continued.

At the time of the hearing, it was suggested that the ranking minority member of each committee should also likewise be contacted. Through the generosity of the chairman of the subcommittee and the full committee [Mr. Dawson], time was given for us to make such a contact, and the ranking minority member of each of the House committees was contacted and their views were likewise taken into consideration.

At the hearing of the full committee on this bill, additional sections were deleted at the request of Members.

I call to the attention of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], who I know is interested in the subject, that at my request, on page 2 of the bill, lines 13 through 18, we struck the section which would eliminate reports as to the number of grants for scientific research—the dollar amounts—in institutions in equipment purchased with such funds invested. I think he, I, and other Members of the House have enjoyed reading this report about some of the interesting scientific experiments that are conducted with these research funds. At my request, that provision was stricken from the bill, and so we shall continue to receive those reports.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentleman for his interest in that respect. We certainly need to continue to scrutinize at every opportunity the awarding of research contracts, because this has become a multibillion dollar annual bill to the Federal Government. It needs to be scrutinized very carefully.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I thank the gentleman from Iowa. I also wish to commend the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rumsfeld] who suggested and contacted the committee about language which was adopted and made a part of the legislative history of this bill, making clear that it is not our intention by the passage of the bill in any way to make it more difficult for Members of the Congress or the general public to obtain information from any agency of the Government. We are only trying to save money by eliminating duplication and unnecessary reports, but in no way are we trying to make it more difficult for anyone to obtain information that they desire.

I believe that this bill should receive the unanimous support of the Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 2150 with amendments.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, TO MAKE TITLE III THEREOF DIRECTLY APPLICABLE TO PROCUREMENT OF PROPERTY AND SERVICES BY EXECUTIVE AGENCIES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1004) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and nonpersonal services by executive agencies, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1004

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 302 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 302. (a) Executive agencies shall make purchases and contracts for property and services in accordance with the provisions of this title and implementing regulations of the Administrator; but this title does not apply—

"(1) to the Department of Defense, the Coast Guard, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; or

"(2) when this title is made inapplicable pursuant to section 602(d) of this Act or any other law, but when this title is made inapplicable by any such provision of law sections 3709 and 3710 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5 and 8), shall be applicable in the absence of authority conferred by statute to procure without advertising or without regard to said section 3709."

Sec. 2. Subsection (c) of section 302 of said Act is amended by revising paragraph (15) to read:

"(15) otherwise authorized by law, except that section 304 shall apply to purchases and contracts made without advertising under this paragraph."

Sec. 3. The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 307 of said Act is amended by inserting immediately after "section," the following: "and except as provided in section 205(d) with respect to the Administrator,".

Sec. 4. Subsection (b) of section 307 of said Act is amended by striking out the second sentence thereof.

Sec. 5. Section 310 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 310. Sections 3709, 3710, and 3735 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5, 8, and 13), shall not apply to the procurement of property or services made by an executive agency pursuant to this title. Any provision of law which authorizes an executive agency (other than an executive agency which is exempted from the provisions of this title by section 302(a) of this Act), to procure any property or services without advertising or without regard to said section 3709 shall be construed to authorize the procurement of such property or services pursuant to section 302(c)(15) of this Act without regard to the advertising requirements of sections 302(c) and 303 of this Act."

Sec. 6. Subsection (d) of section 602 of said Act is amended as follows:

(a) By striking out the semicolon at the end of paragraph (15) and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and the leasing and acquisition of real property, as authorized by law;".

(b) By striking out the word "or" where it appears at the end of paragraph (18).

(c) By striking out the period at the end of paragraph (19), and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or".

(d) By adding at the end of that subsection the following new paragraph:

"(20) The Secretary of the Interior with respect to procurement for program operations under the Bonneville Project Act of 1937 (50 Stat. 731), as amended."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and services by executive agencies, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Reid] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, there are three separate and distinct statutory procurement procedures within the Federal Government. First, we have the procedures in the Armed Services Procurement Act applicable to the Defense Department, NASA, and the Coast Guard. Second, we have the procedure provided in title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, applicable to procurement by the General Services Administration. And, third, we have the antiquated procedure set forth in Revised Statute 3709 which dates back to the 1860's, generally applicable to the other civil agencies of government.

At the time Congress enacted the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, the modern code of procurement procedures provided in title III of that act was not extended to the various civil agencies. However, in 1958, the act was amended making it permissive for the civil agencies to utilize this modern code of procurement in lieu of Revised Statute 3709 by delegation of the Administrator of GSA.

The primary purpose of this act is to funnel civilian agency procurement, with certain statutory exceptions, directly through title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act rather than the 100-year-old provisions in Revised Statute 3709.

Title III requires that purchases and contracts for property and services shall be made by advertising except in certain situations enumerated in considerable detail in section 302(c). Requirements for advertising for bids, opening of the bids, and notice of the award are spelled out. Also, the agencies are prohibited under title III from using cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost contracts and cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts in which the fee exceeds 10 percent of the estimated cost with a few exceptions. Comparable safeguards are not provided in Revised Statute 3709.

The Bureau of the Budget and the various civil agencies involved approve of this legislation. Essentially, this statute replaces an obsolete procurement code no longer needed by the agencies. The bill, which has been approved by the Senate, thus clarifies existing procurement requirements and permits the development of more uniform procurement regulations.

The committee amendments are technical in nature. Evaluation of the language of the Senate-approved bill suggested the possibility that the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, as amended by this legislation, could be interpreted so as to exclude procurement of personal services from the safeguards provided in the act. The Government Operations Committee amended the bill to avoid this consequence.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, S. 1004 was reported unanimously by the subcommittee and by the Committee on Government Operations. Its primary purpose is to make the modern code of procurement procedures contained in title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, directly applicable by statute to executive agencies of the Government not now so covered, except the Department of Defense, the Coast Guard, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and agencies otherwise excluded by law.

At the present time, use of this modern code by executive agencies is entirely on a permissive, delegated basis. A common statutory code of procurement authority will enhance the development of uniform procurement practices for the benefit of both the Government and the businessmen contracting with the Government.

Mr. Speaker, the present title III is directly applicable only to procurement practices of the General Services Administration, the civilian agency primarily responsible for property procurement. The Administrator of GSA has discretionary authority to delegate the use of title III procedures to other executive agencies, but this bill would make it explicit that title III should pertain.

Similar procedures have already been made applicable by the Congress in the Armed Services Procurement Act to procurement by the Department of Defense, the Coast Guard, and NASA.

Executive agencies not now covered by title III procedures or the Armed Services Procurement Act are required to follow the directives set forth in a statute dating back to 1861. This is a very limited provision, requiring only formal advertising for procurement and permitting four situations in which contracts may be negotiated.

Title III contains several additional safeguards and directives which protect both the Government's interest and the procurement official; specifically, a more detailed enumeration of the situation in which contracts may be negotiated as well as the spelling out of the requirements for advertising of bids, opening of bids, and notice of the award.

Agencies are prohibited from using a cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost contract and a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract in which the fee exceeds 10 percent of the estimated cost. All negotiated contracts under title III must contain a provision permitting the Controller General to examine the books of the contractor for 3 years after final payment.

I believe that S. 1004 is desirable. It will result in uniform procurement safeguards and practices, and it will promote the efficient operation of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BROOKS. I am delighted to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I note that the report carries a letter from the Comptroller General, in support of the legislation.

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Earlier this afternon I criticized the fact that other bills dealing with revisions of policy in the operation of the Federal Government contained no views of the Comptroller General.

At this time I wish to commend the committee for having obtained the views of the Comptroller General in respect to a policy matter which I am sure is of vital interest to the Comptroller General.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for his usual objective analysis of reports and constructive help on legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Harris). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 1004 as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An Act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and services by executive agencies, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WONDERFUL YEAR FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, now that the first session of the 89th Congress is about to adjourn, I would like to commend you and my colleagues for a job well done. In all my years of service in the Congress of the United States, I can truthfully say I have never witnessed a more productive session.

As Representatives of the people of this wonderful Nation, it is our duty to care for them and to protect them. The legislative proposals that have been passed by the House this year will benefit every man, woman, and child in the city of Philadelphia now and in the future.

During this session of the Congress—month after month—bills have been introduced and passed by the House to improve our Great Society.

For the elderly, this session has provided increased social security benefits; more and better housing; and a fine medical care program.

For our children, we have provided additional educational facilities as well as programs to financially assist worthy students through college.

For the unemployed, programs like the Peace Corps, the Job Corps, and on-the-job training have been enacted.

For our men and women serving in the armed services, bills have been passed by the House to grant them basic pay increases and life insurance coverage.

For our Federal employees, the House of Representatives has approved legislation to grant a much needed pay raise.

For the Federal retirees, the House has approved a bill to grant them increased monthly benefits, which are sorely needed to meet the present high cost of living.

To stimulate and improve the national economy, the House reduced certain excise taxes in order that you and I—the consumer—may save money.

In addition and of national importance, public works programs have been established to help distressed communities and provide jobs for the unemployed. A law has been placed on the statute books to provide funds for our small businessmen in order that they may continue to compete with big business. Federal moneys have been provided for finer and safer highways, which will create additional jobs.

Water and air pollution control programs have been approved. Our immigration system has been updated and revised. Those entitled to vote have been guaranteed this right. An effective drug control act is now law. Today we have a Commission on the Arts and Humanities.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a wonderful year for the American people. We have shown by our deed and our laws that our first concern is for our people and our Nation.

DEMONSTRATIONS AGAINST VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. **WOLFF.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **WOLFF.** Mr. Speaker, the past weekend saw demonstrations against American participation in the Vietnam conflict. There were speeches, picketing of draft boards—even burning of draftcards. I will not attempt to ascertain the causes of these demonstrations, but I would like to read a letter from Capt. Robert Ainsworth, a young Army officer serving in Vietnam. It gives some answers to those who question our presence there:

July 6, 1965.

The Reverend Harvey Lord,
Bozrah Center Congregational Church,
Fitchville, Conn.

Dear Reverend Lord: I have just finished reading your letter in the July 5 issue of Newsweek magazine. It was particularly disturbing to me because I felt that as a man of God you, above all, should know the facts before using your title in publicly expressing your views. I am sure you do not realize the impact that a man in your position has on the morale of those who daily risk their lives in the belief that their efforts here are in keeping with the Christian principles of brotherly love and respect for the dignity of man. Your rhetoric as exemplified by the statement "It is a tragedy that the embattled farmers of 1965 are being attacked and bombed by the descendants of the embattled farmers of 1776," was quite clever, but I hope that before you preach your next sermon or write your next article, you will consider some of the pertinent facts about just one of the many advisory teams in this country; one small group of the "decendants of the embattled farmers of 1776."

Our five-man team lives and works in the district of Hoc Mon (similar to a county in the United States), an area approximately 120 square kilometers, and located some 25 kilometers northwest of Saigon. There are more than 120,000 inhabitants living in the 12 villages and 59 hamlets of the Hoc Mon district. The primary source of income is derived from agriculture, and these people could certainly be considered as the "embattled farmers of 1965." About 30 percent of the total population are Catholics, most of whom are refugees who left their homes and belongings in 1954 and fled to the south.

Except for our small team, there are no American units in the area. The security of our district lies in the hands of a group of 800 volunteers from the villages, who are known as Popular Forces, and are organized into "self-defense" units scattered throughout the district. In the past, these men worked the fields during the day and manned watch posts at night. Now, because of the Vietcong pressure, they work full-time as security forces while their families work the fields. Their pay is pitiful, their living standards austere, but they never complain. Their courage and sacrifice in trying to maintain those things which we take for granted are an inspiration, to say the least.

But what of those poor unfortunate souls whom you seem to classify with the "embattled farmers of 1965," the Vietcong? In our area there are no Vietcong units as such. This is primarily because they have received no support from the populace. However, just across the canal from our district in a heavily vegetated area, there is a band of Vietcong, about 300 men strong. We have recently received reports that a larger force from North Vietnam has joined forces with this unit. I have seen that face before in my own country—the face of misguided youth enjoying the thrill of a "Robin Hood existence," the hoodlums of the streets raised in an atmosphere of poverty and despair, the men who have decided that working in a rice paddy is drudgery, or that group of disenchanted men who simply feel that communism is the only way of life and is to be attained at all costs. It is pure folly to pretend that these men are actively engaged in any vocation other than subversion. In the past 30 days some of their "farming" activities included kidnapping five youths fishing for frogs along the canal; throwing a grenade in a marketplace, wounding three people; infiltrating a village on the outer perimeter and executing the young brother of one of the popular forces, and setting off two mines in a residential area, injuring several persons. They are neither selective nor charitable in choosing their victims. A good example you must have read about was the detonating of two mines in a waterfront playground next to My Canh Restaurant in Saigon recently, killing 42 persons of all nationalities and ages.

Last week our popular forces captured 21 suspects who had infiltrated into one of the hamlets during the night. There was no doubt that they were not paying a social call, but they had been careful to hide their weapons, probably burying them in a nearby field. They had to be released for lack of evidence; released to fight another day. Frustrating? Yes, but that's the rule book we are trying to follow, and must follow if we are to win.

I only wish that you could walk through the villages, talk to these people, and get to know them as I do, day after day. I believe that certain facts would become immediately apparent. First, you would be amazed at how knowledgeable and perceptive they are as to their present situation, what they are fighting for and what the Americans are trying to do here. Second, you would find that the American soldier is received with an appreciation unmatched anywhere in the world, including our own country. I am not referring to just the village chiefs and school teachers. I am talking about the man in the rice paddy, walking behind his oxen. Third, you would see that, contrary to all of the publicity that our news media gives to the "glamor" of the battlefield, the majority of our efforts here are expended in civic action programs. This is not to sell our military role short, for without security and an area free of enemy combat units, the civic action program is not possible. Security is a prerequisite for area improvement, but I would say that 80 percent of our teams' efforts are taken up in this program. We have supervised the building of 39 new schools in the past year; rural electrification is expanding; numerous road and bridge projects have been completed, with more in the planning stages, and 12 medical-aid stations have been established. These are but few of the many projects being paid for by the U.S. taxpayer.

I would be the first to admit that there are many seemingly convincing arguments opposing our presence in Vietnam, to wit: "This is a civil war to be fought to its ultimate conclusion by the Vietnamese without our interference"; "We can never win a land war in Asia"; "We are killing helpless women and children", or "Life is meaningless to these people and it's not worth the sacrifice of one American life." How easy it would be to follow these lines of reasoning, to go home to our loved ones and to say "to hell with this place." But, would this be a realistic solution to our problem? Would things improve? I am convinced that not 5 percent of the 120,000 people in our district would be willing to live under communism. Certainly, the Catholics wouldn't. I am equally convinced that without our assistance they could not last 2 months against an enemy supported from the north who would gobble up the villages one by one until there was nothing left. What would be the solution for these people? Should we repartition the partition established in the Geneva Convention of 1954? Should we tell everyone who wishes to live in a democracy to move south of Saigon and then in a few years, as bands of Vietcong resume their subversion and terrorism, repartition again, and then again, until those millions of people who don't wish to live under communism have been pushed into the sea?

And how would you suggest that we inform these people who believe in us and look to us for assistance in this struggle? Should I go to the village fathers and tell them that I am very sorry but the Americans have decided that "we are the true aggressors in this local war; that we have discovered that every time we send planes to the North to bomb the bridges and roads that are used to bring men, ammunition, and weapons used to attack their villages that we risk the chance of killing and maiming innocent victims; that we have discovered that every time our armed helicopters are called to assist one of their beseiged villages, we end up killing the attacking 'farmers'; that we have found that we are taking unfair advantage of the Vietcong's lack of sophisticated weaponry; that we are gunning down in cold blood an ill-equipped, underfed guerrilla foot soldier with our sleek, push button supersonic jets when he is attacking their village with an outmoded Russian gun, and that we have determined that this is not in keeping with the American tradition of fairplay and good sportsmanship"?

In conclusion, I would say that our ancestors might be quite proud of our efforts here in Vietnam, and perhaps even prouder of the true "embattled farmers of 1965" in their fight for freedom. It is a discouraging war and the closer you get to it, the more you realize what a senseless and tragic lesson in futility war can be as an attempt to solve man's problems. I only hope that the strength of our convictions and our determination to see this war to a just conclusion will convince our adversaries that they have selected the wrong course of action. This, in turn, might direct them toward the conference table, our only hope for peace in Vietnam.

I would entreat a gracious and loving God in His infinite wisdom to impart a sense of prudence and rational thinking to all those in positions of responsibility and authority. Without the support of those we respect and believe in, our cause here is meaningless and futile. I also ask your prayers for those who carry out our country's policies, whether you agree with those policies or not. It is not exactly enjoyable to be the man with the finger on the trigger or on the bombsight, but we cannot falter before the challenge that faces us, we cannot turn our back on choosing between right and wrong, and we cannot avoid our obligation to our fellow man.

I realize that this letter is a one-sided opinion of one man, and I would welcome hearing from you or anyone else on the subject. If you would be interested, I would be more than willing to ask some of our Vietnamese friends to write to you and express their views.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. AINSWORTH.

DEMONSTRATIONS AGAINST OUR POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues I have been extremely disturbed and disgusted by the demonstrations staged over the past several days to protest our policy in Vietnam.

I was even more disturbed to learn from press reports that the nationwide series of demonstrations this weekend was planned and coordinated by an organization based in my own State of Wisconsin at Madison, our capital.

The right of free speech and free assembly is basic to our system and these students and others are certainly free to express their views on this subject. With this freedom, however, comes the responsibility of knowing the true facts on Vietnam and of realizing the consequences of their action.

Already the Chinese Communists and the Communist press in China, North Vietnam, and other areas are pointing to these demonstrations as an indication of widespread American dissatisfaction with U.S. policy. Nothing could be further from the truth.

We all know that these demonstrators are a vocal but small minority of our people. Unfortunately, however, this fact may not be apparent to the rest of the world.

The effects of these demonstrations can only be a hardening of the Communist line on a negotiated settlement in Vietnam. Therefore, the demonstrations are self-defeating for they postpone the day when a peaceful settlement can be reached. Beyond that they condemn the United States to extended involvement in Vietnam with subsequent loss of American lives. It should be clear by now that those who really want peace in Vietnam are supporting the policies of President Johnson. The harmful effects of these demonstrations have been vividly pointed out in an article by James Reston in the New York Times of Sunday, October 17. In order to bring this fine statement to the attention of my colleagues I insert it in the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

WASHINGTON: THE STUPIDITY OF INTELLIGENCE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, October 16.—It is not easy, but let us assume that all the student demonstrators against the war in Vietnam are everything they say they are: sincerely for an honorable peace; troubled by the bombing of the civil population of both North and South Vietnam; genuinely afraid that we may be trapped into a hopeless war with China; and worried about the power of the President and the Pentagon and the pugnacious bawling patriotism of many influential men in the Congress.

A case can be made for it. In a world of accidents and nuclear weapons and damn fools, even a dreaming pacifist has to be answered. And men who want peace, defy the Government, and demonstrate for the support of the Congress, are not only within their rights but must be heard.

THE PARADOX

The trouble is that they are inadverently working against all the things they want, and creating all the things they fear the most. They are not promoting peace but postponing it. They are not persuading the President or the Congress to end the war, but deceiving Ho Chi Minh and General Giap into prolonging it. They are not proving the superior wisdom of the university community but unfortunately bringing it into serious question.

When President Johnson was stubbornly refusing to define his war aims in Vietnam, and rejecting all thought of a negotiated settlement, the student objectors had a point, and many of us here in the Washington press corps and the Washington political community supported them, but they are now out of date. They are making news, but they are not making sense.

HEART OF THE PROBLEM

The problem of peace now lies not in Washington but in Hanoi, and probably the most reliable source of information in the Western World about what is going on there is the Canadian representative on the Vietnam International Control Commission, Blair Seaborn.

He flies regularly to the North Vietnamese capital with the Polish and Indian members of that Commission, and he is personally in favor of an honorable negotiated peace in Vietnam. He is a cultivated man and a professional diplomat. He knows all the mistakes we have made, probably in more detail than all the professors in all the teach-ins in all the universities of this country. What he finds in Hanoi, however, is a total misconception of American policy, and, particularly, a powerful conviction among Communist officials there that the antiwar demonstrations and editorials in the United States will force the American Government to give up the fight.

Not even the conscientious objectors on the picket lines in this country really believe that they have the power or the support to bring about any such result, but Hanoi apparently believes it and for an interesting reason.

Ho Chi Minh and the other Communist leaders in Hanoi remember that they defeated the French in Vietnam between 1950 and 1953 at least partly because of opposition to the Vietnam war inside France. The Communists won the propaganda battle in Paris before they won the military battle at Dienbienphu.

COUNTING ON PROTEST

Now they think they see the same surge of protest working against the Government in Washington, no matter what Mr. Seaborn says to the contrary. They have not been able to challenge American air, naval, or even ground power effectively since midsummer in South Vietnam, but they apparently still have the hope that the demonstrations against the Johnson administration in the United States will in the end give them the victory they cannot achieve on the battlefield.

So the Communists reject the negotiations the demonstrators in the United States want. They reject the negotiations the American Government has offered, and the demonstrators are protesting, not against the Nation that is continuing the war but against their own country that is offering to make peace.

Not surprisingly, this is creating an ugly situation here in Washington. Instead of winning allies in the Congress to change the Johnson policy, the demonstrators are encouraging the very war psychology they denounce.

WRONG OBJECTIVES

Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, is now demanding that the administration pull up the antidraft movement by the roots and grind it to bits.

Honest conscientious objectors are being confused with unconscientious objectors, hangers-on, intellectual graduate school draft dodgers and rent-a-crown boobs who will demonstrate for or against anything. And the universities and the Government's policy are being hurt in the process.

So there are now all kinds of investigations going on or being planned to find out who and what are behind all these demonstrations on the campuses. It is a paradoxical situation, for it is working not for intelligent objective analysis of the problem, which the university community of the Nation is supposed to represent; not for peace, which the demonstrators are demanding; but in both cases for precisely the opposite.

THE WATTS MANIFESTO

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, with penetrating insight, Bayard Rustin has written an account of the rioting in the Watts section of Los Angeles. Everyone concerned with the meaning of this explosion will find his article revealing, informative, and moving. It is not a chronology of events. It is, rather, a documentary of emotion and reaction. It could be written only by one who has both a deep understanding of the currents of feeling which generated the rioting and the ability to translate this into articulate thought.

For these reasons I urge that this article be read by my collegues and by everyone who seeks to understand the relationship between what happened in Watts and what is happening in civil rights across America. "The Watts Manifesto" by Bayard Rustin follows:

[From the New America, Sept. 17, 1965]

THE WATTS "MANIFESTO"

(By Bayard Rustin)

After Dr. King and I went to the Watts area to work with community people to find a creative solution to the conflict and to present demands to the public officials, many sympathetic and troubled white people asked me why Negroes, at a time when they are achieving freedom, would revolt. But to raise such a question in innocence is almost to answer it.

Too many Americans still do not understand what it means to be a Negro in the United States—not one of the narrow strata of middle class Negroes but what it means to be an "average" Negro. I am talking about the millions of Negroes earning less than what is considered necessary by the U.S. Government to stay above the poverty line, jobless or facing possible joblessness, and stuck at the very bottom of the economic ladder.

According to the State of California, over 30 percent of the Negroes in Watts are unemployed. Michael Harrington, author of "The Other America," puts the figure at closer to 42 percent, because Government figures do not include the thousands who have stopped looking for work after months of fruitless search and those who work part time or only intermittently. For the Negro of Watts and other black ghettos across the land conditions have not improved, they find unemployment deepening and quality integrated schools far from realization.

These are the cold facts behind the flaming ruins in Watts. They remain so even after so many other things have changed as a result of the civil rights revolution. The historic Supreme Court decisions have brought more justice before the law to Negroes particularly in the South. President Johnson has spoken out as no President has ever spoken in our history in his Howard University speech and "We Shall Overcome" address on the eve of the march on Selma, Ala. But the new civil rights legislation passed by Congress, except for the FEPC section of the 1965 civil rights bill, which did not go into operation until this July, did not have any effect on the North. Even the antipoverty program and the social welfare measures, while ameliorating some of the misery, have not yet frontally attacked the basic economic problems.

NOT UNDERSTOOD

What these economic facts mean in human terms is still not understood because they are not experienced by the observer. How else would it be possible that a writer as knowledgeable and perceptive as Walter Lippmann, after pondering the implications of the Watts riots and acknowledging America's failure "to make free men of the great mass of the descendants of the emancipated slaves" could conclude:

"The young rioters are very close to being past saving, and we have to face the grim question of how they can be induced to remain quiet while the necessary reforms for the benefit of other Negroes are worked out in the slow process of political democracy * * *."

The riots themselves refute Lippmann's conclusions.

One of the first lessons of Watts is that Negro ghetto youths cannot be "induced to remain quiet." When I talked to young people in Watts many of them referred to their "manifesto." I asked a young girl what they meant by the "manifesto." Who wrote it? She said, "We wrote it." When I asked to see a copy she burst into laughter and said, "Daddy, we're not talking about nothing you write, we're talking about the blood. We're talking about the fires. That's our manifesto. Now, you write something, you don't know who's to read it. But, baby, all over the world they know about our manifesto cause we wrote it in blood."

Another young boy said to me, "What we are trying to teach those white folks is to render to Caesar what is his, but give us what's ours."

If we can't read their "manifesto" in the burnt buildings and the smashed store windows in Watts, if things don't change, these young people were saying they would do it again. They wanted more than anything to be heard, to be recognized, to be listened to. At a meeting that Dr. King and I attended, a young man got up and said, "Dr. King we're happy, you've come, but you're not what we really want to hear. You go tell the Governor and the mayor to come down here and hear our grievances, and tell the goddamned chief of police we want to talk to him and tell them what's been happening down here." But too many people are still not listening.

DIGNITY

A second point is that these desperate youth cannot be bought off with the dole. They want jobs, decent houses and, above all, dignity. A dramatic illustration of their great hunger for pride and dignity occurred when the city authorities brought food into Watts. Many food stores had been destroyed and others remained closed. There was nowhere to buy food and many residents who had been kept away from work did not have any money even should food have been available for purchase.

But when the relief groups came in and started throwing bread and other food off trucks to the crowds in the street, the people refused to pick the food up. They said, "Man, don't treat us like that, we don't want your goddamn food." Hungry men, some of whom had not eaten for days, refused the food.

When the authorities turned the distribution over to more sensitive community volunteers, the people took the food. But they still refused to take the milk unless it came out of glasses, bottles, or cartons. They would not take it out of cans. They refused to take bread and other staples that were not properly wrapped.

And all this reveals to me that there is something far greater than hunger and that is the hunger for dignity. And when that basic human desire for dignity is frustrated, when hopes are smashed as they have been for the masses of Negroes, their desires are channeled into a destructive direction.

A young boy, who had been involved in a number of situations of arson, told me that he enjoyed it. "You mean you enjoyed seeing buildings going up in fire?" I asked. "I did," he replied, "because it gave me a feeling of being powerful, of being somebody. And if I can't go downtown and be a man, at least up here I can set something on fire." These youths, blocked from asserting their manhood in constructive ways, turn to violence. And this is a society in which violence has come to be related to manhood.

Mr. Lippmann should recognize that these young people cannot be bought off with relief checks or bread lines. This generation of ghetto youth will not accept being consigned to the American scrap heap as past generations have been. They have peered over the ghetto wall, they watch television and they have observed America's affluence. They want what most other young Americans have—a decent life, and an opportunity to better their existence—things that all America's children deserve.

HOPES

The families of these young people came to Watts seeking these opportunities. Over half of the inhabitants of Watts have come from the South over the past 25 years. The attraction was not the relief doles as some would have it. They came to California mainly during the Second and Korean wars, seeking jobs in the burgeoning defense industry and an expanding economy. They are still pouring into Watts as more Negroes are being displaced in Southern agriculture by machines. Like the European immigrants they were fleeing from misery and oppression. They came with many of the same kinds of hopes and illusions about "the gold in the pay envelopes."

But the difference is that today unskilled and uneducated hands are no longer needed to tend automated production. Their hopes were dashed. They hear speeches about the new opportunities opening up for Negroes but there are no jobs to fulfill their expectations. The result is resentment and bitterness.

TURN TO NATIONALISM

When no aid seemed forthcoming from outside the ghettoes to help them to constructively and creatively tear down the walls that imprison them, they tried to burn them down. Feeling alone and unwanted they are turning to black nationalism.

I don't mean that they join the Muslims of Black Nationalists, only a small number do this. They develop a kind of nationalistic pride. They cannot identify with America, because this conception only emphasizes the lowliness of their position as compared to other Americans. Many of them identify psychologically with the new African nations where black men are assuming the positions of leadership and dignity that have been denied Negro Americans. Thus their skin color becomes transformed into a badge of honor rather than one of shame.

Is it so surprising that people deprived of the economic and social necessities for dignity find that the only things they have to take pride in, are the color of their skin and their hatred? It is a similar phenomenon to what occurs in the thinking of the whites in Mississippi. But this is a sicker form of race pride because it can only be maintained through constant acts of oppression. The "poor white trash" also turn to violence—they have for more than a century—to maintain a feeling of worth and dignity. And I saw this craving for dignity, for nationalistic pride among the youth and adults in Watts in a much stronger form than I ever saw before. As a response to the hostility and indifference they felt from the white world, the black people of Watts grew closer together. It was common to see children, young people, and often adults, exchange a new kind of greeting: one puts his thumb over his little finger, holds out the three middle fingers, and says "brother."

Paradoxically the communal bonds had grown stronger during and after the riots. The strangeness and loneliness which are the experience of those who have newly entered the northern ghettoes from the South, gave way to a feeling of community and relatedness. Many responded to this much more than to the violence. The fraternity of combatants—that is one of the few admirable qualities of war.

Ironically for all those who advocate that Negroes should band together like other national groups—the Italians, Jews, and Irish—for self-help programs, this was precisely what happened. But the organizations and programs were much more extreme because the problems were more extreme.

In Watts these relationships were developed on a class basis perhaps even more than on a racial basis. This is natural because the problem of the Negro in America is one of class as well as race. The majority of Negroes, together with the white poor—separate but equal—make up what Gunnar Myrdal has so aptly called, the American "underclass."

During the riots there was almost as much hatred and bitterness toward the Negro middle class "who had made it" as toward the whites. An illustration of this occurred at a meeting held shortly after the riots. It was proposed that all the community and civil rights leaders join together to present their demands to the authorities. This was refused by those local leaders—block and gang leaders, heads of nationalist sects and the others most closely related to the poor. In private they said if they joined with the civil rights groups, churchmen, and middle-class community leaders they would be rejected by their people and replaced by extremists.

Here the civil rights movement is faced with profound difficulties. Divisions are growing wider in the Negro community as new opportunities open up to the middle class as a result of progress in social integration but the great masses of Negroes remain economically segregrated and impoverished.

The civil rights movement must develop an effective economic program that responds to this problem in order to bridge the gulf emerging between the Negro leadership at the grass roots and the national level. The major civil rights organizations, from SNCC to the Urban League, have not moved fast enough toward developing and pressing for necessary programs although stronger efforts are now being made in this direction. And too often, also, the grass-roots leadership has offered only nationalistic slogans to solve complicated economic and social problems.

But, essentially this is not the fault of the Negro leadership. Negro poverty and unemployment is built into our present economic structure. It will require a major national effort to redirect and transform our economic and political institutions to resolve the basic conflict.

In this kind of a situation, one should think carefully before concluding, as Mr. Lippman does, about how "the young rioters are close to being past saving." This kind of attitude in itself could be considered an "incitment to riot" by those being cast out of our society, by those who in fact have never been given the opportunity to enter it.

In one sense the criminals in the Negro community can be compared to the youth who rioted—but certainly not in the way the chief of police made this comparison. Springing from the poor, the uneducated, and the unskilled, many of the criminal types are among those most able at surviving the harsh rigors of the ghetto. Neither the Negro criminals nor the rioting youth are simple phenomena to be dealt with or dismissed easily.

The response to Government training and job programs is amazing. Many more young Negroes turned up to apply for these OEO projects than the openings provided for. If American society cannot offer a decent and humane solution to the awesome problems of the Negro youth then it is our society that is hopeless and not these young people.

COMMUNITY INVOLVED

It should be clear that what we are dealing with here is the problems of the entire Negro community, not just the criminal elements, delinquent adolescents, and the hopelessly disintegrated. The riots were a warning and an appeal, not from the narrow section of the Watts community, but from the masses of Negroes.

I could not count heads but reports I have received and my experiences with the people leads me to believe that a large percentage of the people living in the Watts area participated. Most of them did not themselves loot and burn but they were on the streets at one time or other. The idea that most of the people caught up in the rioting were criminals, as Chief Parker would have it, is belied even by the type of looting that took place. Most of the people involved were stealing things they thought they would never otherwise have, and a great number of touching stories can be told of this. There was a husband and wife, both over 60, carrying a couch about 8 blocks to their home. They got so tired with this enormous couch that they just plopped down in the middle of the street and rested on the couch until they could carry it further. These were hardly criminal types—they were people caught in a kind of carnival atmosphere of stealing.

A large number of people were arrested trying to match up furniture. One of them was a woman who had gone out with her children to get a kitchen set. But when she got home she added up and discovered that they needed another chair in order to feed the whole family around the table. They went back to get the additional chair and they all got arrested. There was an amusing, tragically amusing, side to the manner in which people who are not used to theft can get caught up in a mob situation where these things are going on. And the greatest number of arrests were for looting, not arson or shooting.

As a person who deplores violence I want to say something that may sound shocking if it is not carefully understood. The violence in the Watts area was a relatively healthy reaction to the situation. The conditions in the Negro ghetto generate enormous amounts of violence, but heretofore it has almost always been Negroes who have suffered from that violence and were its victims.

Frustrated black men beat up their women and abused their children, they knifed other black men in barroom brawls. The number of murders last year in Watts was extraordinarily high. It is well known that the police care little and do little about the violence Negroes inflict on each other. But this time Negro violence was expressed outwardly toward hated objects, belonging to the white world. Psychologists would say this was a healthier expression of anger than the usual self-destruction. Even so, more Negroes than whites were killed.

But in a sense, Negroes were willing to pay this price. In some families Negro men who had participated in the riots were treated with awe and respect by the wives and children. They were no longer the passive victims of the ghetto, to be either pitied or hated, often both, by their families. Now they were—if even for a moment—men who had asserted themselves through action. A jobless young man of eighteen who already had a number of common law marriages and six children by different women, told me that the first time he felt like a man was when he saw the building he set on fire, burn to the ground.

Family counseling and psychotherapy can't solve the Negro family problem. These can only help in some cases and under certain conditions. But without a program that provides jobs at decent wages counseling and therapy are impotent. It should be clear that we can't solve the Negro family problem without solving the unemployment problem.

I have described the feelings and attitudes of the people who rioted—the nationalism, the anger, the class and economic nature of the problem. All of these factors were reflected in the events. Now I want to describe the riots. The events almost speak for themselves and they refute two theories presented about the riots. The riots were neither a plot nor a totally irrational outburst of madness, although there were many irrational aspects.

While a ghetto riot doesn't have a head it does roll on with a kind of logic. Violence was not indiscriminate in Watts. Where Negro storekeepers put up signs, "I am a poor working Negro trying to make a business," they were not touched. Where a sign said "blood brother" the mobs passed it by. Even where there were white-owned businesses which had given the community people a break—allowed them credit or purchases on time, even at relatively high prices—some stores were spared. But where merchants were known to be gougers they were looted and destroyed.

That the direction the rioters took was not entirely antisocial is demonstrated by their treatment of the liquor stores. All the liquor stores were broken into and burned. But I was told by a number of reliable observers that many more bottles of liquor were destroyed than were stolen to be drunk. I think this happened because although on one hand the people needed liquor to make their lives bearable, they revolted against the idea that they have to live on it. I think they demonstrated a kind of logic by which people turn against the things that destroy them.

No simple-minded conclusions that the riots were instigated by "malcontents or subversives" fit the facts. From information I got from trusted observers and participants, and from my own personal experience during the Harlem riots, the two events follow a similar pattern.

First, both were spontaneous, sparked by an incident involving the police. Second, as the situation began to get out of hand the police became frightened and used excessive violence. More people joined the rioters and then criminal gangs took over, looted and encouraged others to loot, sometimes justifying the action with civil rights and nationalistic arguments. And lastly, some political elements tried to take advantage of the situation by making themselves visible through leaflets and speeches to the crowds.

Of course there was much that was irrational in the riots. But the irrationality of people forced by society to live in insane conditions is far different from the irrationality of the police chief and mayor of Los Angeles. They denounced the Negro leadership, and refused to meet with them early enough. It was the mayor who acted irresponsibly by contributing to blocking the poverty program. He had attempted to control it to strengthen his own political machine by excluding other political factions and representatives from the Negro community. As a result, Los Angeles was one of the few cities in the United States that had no poverty program, and this made the situation even more desperate.

The mayor and the chief of police, by their statements and actions before and during the riots, put the community leaders in an untenable position, limiting their influence over the rioters and preventing them from turning the violence into constructive protest action. The rioters' response to the appeals of the Negro leadership was that only one thing could affect the mayor and the police chief—violence. And I must say that Parker and Yorty are themselves convincing arguments that the people on the street were right. But, as I pointed out earlier, the situation was one in which, even if these public officials had been angels, it is doubtful that violence could have been wholly averted.

HARLEM AND WATTS COMPARED

During the Harlem riots we urged rioters to stop the violence and organize nonviolent protest, but we met with very slight success. This is understandable, because when we tell them to go home, they feel we are asking them to accept the conditions of their lives. Dr. King and I were not surprised when we were booed in Watts.

The situation in Watts was more difficult than in Harlem for a number of reasons. Time had passed and the situation for the ghetto Negro had not improved. A number of gangs existed whose activities, though mainly petty crime and violence, had begun to develop a nationalistic strain. The fact that Dick Gregory was shot when he tried to calm the crowd was an indication that the situation had gotten worse.

I have witnessed a number of riots and there is another important difference between past riots and the explosion in Watts. Almost all of these other riots turned back toward some programmatic aspect of the civil rights struggle.

I remember the Harlem riot in 1942 which started out as a protest against the OPA's not watching and controlling prices in Harlem. It ended with the destruction of A. Philip Randolph's march on the Washington office. The crowd was saying, "Randolph, why don't you march?" A short time before. Mr. Randolph had planned to march unless President Roosevelt established a Fair Employment Practices Commission. Roosevelt gave in to the pressure and the march was called off. But the Negro community wanted to go further.

The situation subsequently improved. At the time war production was expanding rapidly and there were soon jobs for Negroes in the full employment war economy. Today the job situation is much worse, and while there were still programmatic aspects to the riots in Watts recently, and in Harlem last summer, the ideological basis this time was predominantly nationalistic and narrow in its implications. The rioters were saying, "You white folks won't help us and we black people in the ghetto will have to do it ourselves. If we can't have what you have we're going to destroy what you have. We are going to turn this country upside down." There was a stronger element of despair than ever before.

The heightened aspirations and expectations inspired by the civil rights revolution have not been fulfilled for the masses of Negroes. And as a result, not only was the extent of violence and destruction greater than in Harlem last summer but the psychological attitude of the rioters was different. In Harlem the youths and adults on the streets screamed at the police, "You want to kill a nigger? kill me." But in Watts, the cry of the crowd was "burn baby, burn."

TAX SHARING

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, tax sharing between Federal and local governmental units was suggested in 1961 as a means of meeting the increasing needs of State and local governments by the then Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Prof. Walter Heller. More recently, it was the subject of a study by a special task force headed by Dr. Joseph Peckman, director of economics at the Brookings Institution. The details of this study have not yet been released. The principle of tax sharing has recently been endorsed by a number of Governors at their conference. In my opinion, this proposal has a great deal of merit and should be considered by the Congress in its next session. It has much to recommend it:

Those of us who are familiar with millage battles at home know how hard it is to raise the funds needed for our local school systems and how the millage is never voted until 2 or 3 years after the crisis has occurred. We know of the person living on a fixed income or annuity whose increased property tax comes out of their food allowance and who justifiably complains that property taxes can go no higher. We know of the businessman who may be taxed 5 percent on his inventory, even though he may be in a business, such as food sales, in which he realizes a profit of only 1 or 2 percent on his inventory. We know of the farmer who doesn't buy a machine he needs or cannot store his grain on his farm because the property tax is too high. We know that property taxes, which provide 37 percent of the State and local revenues, cannot substantially be increased.

In States such as my own, the sales tax is already at its upper limit, and might even appropriately be reduced on certain necessities of life. In addition, a variety of other taxes—business activities, nuisance and intangibles provide a hodgepodge of revenues which cannot be expanded without driving business into other States. City and State income taxes, if in existence, cannot readily be extended without tending to drive businesses and citizens into other cities and States where these taxes do not exist.

One of the communities in my district, at this very moment, is deciding on whether or not to impose a city income tax. This city has a problem shared by many of this Nation's smaller and larger communities alike—it is a core city, surrounded by residential and light industrial city and township governments. The core city is expected to provide most of the needs of the entire metropolitan area, with only a portion of the metropolitan tax base within its borders. In addition, it is being asked to provide social and welfare services which benefit the surrounding communities, without their substantial financial involvement.

Some say a city income tax appears to provide a means of securing the needed revenue—but will it, in fact, do so? If a city income tax is imposed, will industry settle and expand within the city or instead move outside the city—either near or far away—to avoid the tax? Certainly the presence of the tax will tend to keep out potential new industries. Will industries already in the city prefer discontinuing their operations by shifting them to other plants in other parts of the country? Certainly they must seriously consider doing so, for if they are selling in competitive markets, without Government subsidies, they cannot absorb the city income tax increases if their competitors in other cities do not have the same increases imposed on them.

This city, like many others in our land, must face the hard decision: whether to impose a new tax to increase revenue to pay for needed services and thereby take the substantial risk of driving industries and citizens away or to neglect the needs of the community and leave taxes at their present levels. Both courses of action are, in a very real sense, self-defeating. There is no obviously preferable course.

In short, local units of government are going to have a hard time expanding their sources of revenue. Although tax revision and reform may be undertaken by the more courageous State legislatures, it will not necessarily entail a needed expansion in State revenues, because States and their tax structure still remain in competition with each other.

It is also obvious that the needs of State and local governments will grow rapidly. During the period 1953 to 1963, State and local governments increased their expenditures by 132 percent. Their expenditure on education increased by 155 percent to a total of $24 billion. Their expenditures on public welfare, and on health and hospitals doubled. It is expected that State and local expenditures must rise at a rate of at least 7 percent a year if they are to satisfy local needs.

If we make the bold assertion that State and local revenues from existing taxes grow as fast as the national product—5 percent per year—there will still be a gap of 2 percent between their revenue and their expenditures. This will be of a magnitude of $2 to $3 billion per year by 1970.

If we look ahead, then, the options are clear: States and local governments will have to increase the types of taxes which are already at their upper limit; or they will have to receive Federal grants in aid for specific programs; or they will fail to meet service needs of their communities; or they will have to receive a share of Federal tax revenues. Of all these options, the last is clearly the most acceptable.

It is estimated by a number of students on the subject that Federal tax revenues will continue to grow at a rate of $4 to $7 billion per year. In the absence of an armed conflict—which will severely tighten our belts—we can anticipate the possibility of further tax reductions, further increases in Federal nondefense programs, and/or a reallocation of some of this growing Federal revenue to the States and communities. I would favor a combination of tax reduction and of tax sharing with the local units of government.

I am, accordingly, introducing today a bill which provides a mechanism of sharing Federal tax revenues with the States and local units of government. In many respects, this bill is similar to S. 2619, introduced on October 11 by Senators JAVITS and HARTKE and to H.R. 11535 in the House introduced by Representative REID of New York. But it is dissimilar in that it shares tax revenues with the States without tying strings on fund use. Whereas the Senate bill says that the funds must be used only for purposes of health, education, and welfare, I prefer to allow the local governmental units to use the funds in any manner they desire, except highway construction. I see no wisdom in telling a State, county, city, or village, that they need to spend money on this activity and not that. In fact, they need to spend money on all the activities for which they are held accountable, in the best judgment of their citizens. And I respect the judgment of these citizens, as well as differences of opinion which may exist from one community to another. If we in Congress see other needs—transportation, education, recreation, or conservation—which cannot be met by State action, we can make use of existing programs of grants in aid.

My bill, like the Senate proposal, limits revenue sharing to Federal personal income tax receipts, since these are among the least volatile of Federal revenues.

My bill distributes this shared Federal tax on the basis of a State's population. It makes no provision for adjusting the allocation up or down on the basis of the State's per capita income or its own effort to raise revenues. If we wish to redistribute income further than my bill would do it, I believe we should use the technique of grants-in-aid, so that we know just what we are doing and how much it is costing. There is enough hidden redistribution going on right now.

I believe this approach is consistent with the proposition that our citizens are best able to determine their needs for themselves, and that governmental decisions should be as decentralized as possible. It accepts the traditional belief that the needs of our citizens for health and education and comfort can best be met at the local level. It will arrest the tendency to transfer some of these responsibilities to the Federal Government just because the local governments do not have funds to provide for them.

Although my bill is merely an early proposal, I hope to discuss its ideas, merits, and imperfections with my constituents during the recess, and to make further contributions to this dialog when Congress reconvenes in January.

The problem is pressing, the need is great. I believe the Congress has a responsibility to seriously consider this and other proposals right away. Our State and local governments are now facing a severe crisis. They are facing demands in the present—particularly with regard to water and air pollution, overcrowded and substandard schools, insufficient recreation facilities, and even inadequate health care. But their sources of revenue are years out of date and available taxes have been pushed about as high as they can go.

I believe the bill will help strengthen the capacity of local governments to serve their citizens more effectively and more responsibly.

RED COMMUNISTS INSTIGATE PEACE DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the peace demonstrations and riots over the weekend were instigated and prepared by the Communist leaders of the worldwide Communist demonstrations against our Vietnam policy.

It is incredible that some students and professors in this country would join hands with the ruthless, bloody Vietcong aggressor in South Vietnam in timing and coordinating these anti-American demonstrations. We are at war against the Red aggressor in South Vietnam. Our Armed Forces are actively engaged in a death struggle to preserve freedom. Demonstrations in the United States are designed to weaken our military position and undermine the morale of our people. These demonstrations are an attack upon this country no less than the Communist attacks upon our men by the aggressor in South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Congress to launch an immediate and thorough investigation of these peace demonstrations and teach-ins. Their sinister objectives should be exposed. These demonstrations have duped and hoodwinked some innocent people. These demonstrations have by design and false propaganda enlisted the support of some well-meaning people. We should expose now the connection between these demonstrations in our country and the worldwide demonstrations called by the Communists to force a withdrawal from South Vietnam. These demonstrations are carefully designed with the ending of the monsoon season in the hope of preventing a complete free world victory in southeast Asia. These demonstrations are a frantic, desperate Communist effort to slow down progress being made by our Armed Forces in South Vietnam.

THE TEACHER CORPS PROGRAM

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the Higher Education Act of 1965 is one of the most important elements of the legislative program of the 89th Congress. It contains a brilliant new concept by which master teachers and apprentices will be subsidized by the Federal Government and sent to those local areas most in need of teachers.

This concept, formally entitled the National Teacher Corps, is now under fire by a small minority of my colleagues who claim that it injects an element of Federal influence into local school administration. I do not see the truth or logic in this.

The Teacher Corps members would be assigned at the request of local school authorities and would serve under local control. The teachers would be paid according to the prevailing local salaries. They would teach whatever subjects the employing school assigned them to teach. They would be hired, paid, administered and, if necessary, fired by local authorities.

The need for more teachers is well-known. Last year, nearly 400,000 of our children went to school for less than a full school day because there simply were not enough teachers to go around. There are now nearly 50 million youngsters in our public and nonpublic elementary and secondary schools. The average teacher-pupil ratio in elementary schools is 28 to 1. In some schools it is as much as 40 to 1. Thus, far too many children are denied the benefits of close contact with the teacher; the individual needs, and talents of these children go unnoticed; the needs unmet; the talents undeveloped.

President Harry S. Truman had a sign on his desk when he was in the White House, which read: "The buck stops here." Hundreds of thousands of our children are carrying similar signs: "The buck stopped here." And they will carry that blight—educational impoverishment—for the rest of their lives.

Last month, when schools opened across the country, there was a need for about 250,000 new teachers. This need was not met. Only about 100,000 teachers were recruited. Thus, the children of this Nation were denied the educational opportunities to which they are entitled, by the laws of the land, by our traditions, and by our frequently mouthed commitment to the principle of a first class education for every American child.

Worse, the children from the families with the lowest incomes were the ones who were hardest hit. If we ever hope to carry out successfully our declared war on poverty we will have to eject these children from their subgroup status and break the cycle of poverty which has choked off the hopes, aspirations, and capabilities of the poor for generations.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge that we pass the Higher Education Act of 1965 and leave intact the provision for the National Teachers Corps. It will be a major step in tackling the problems of substandard educational opportunity for the poor which must be solved if we ever are to remove the national stigma of the one-fifth of America who live in poverty.

A trenchant and perceptive analysis of the poverty problem by Joseph Kraft appears in today's Washington Post, and will, I am sure, be of great interest to my colleagues:

IN THE MIDST OF PLENTY

(By Joseph Kraft)

Glowing as they may seem, the latest economic statistics actually express a condition of poverty in the midst of plenty—maybe, even, of growing poverty in the midst of growing plenty. At a minimum, they reinforce the proposition that there are two nearly separate economies in the United States.

One is the economy of affluence, which includes the great majority of Americans. They are well trained, hold stable jobs, and enjoy good health, good housing, and normal family life. They benefit from Government efforts to expand the economy through such measures as the recent tax cuts. Their fortunes rise with every increase in the gross national product.

The other is the economy of poverty. It includes millions of Americans who have sidetracked from the central path of national growth, usually either by reason of color, or because they live in rural backwaters. Inadequately trained, they have trouble finding and holding jobs. In consequence, they have low incomes, poor health, and slum housing. They do not benefit much from measures to expand the economy because, so far at least, these measures have tended to stimulate demand for skills they do not have. While the gross national product has been rising, they have been passing on poverty from generation unto generation.

A finely etched statistical profile of the two Americas can be found in the figures, just now being released, for the third quarter of this year. During the past 3 months, the gross national product jumped by $11 billion to reach a record annual rate of $677 billion. The jump exceeded by more than 20 percent the projections of the Council of Economic Advisers. It expressed an annual growth rate of about 5 percent—double the rate of the Eisenhower years.

What is more, the growth has been balanced. It has affected virtually all sectors of the economy. It has not been accompanied by any rise in wholesale prices. And in general, wage rates have held about even with increases in productivity.

On the employment side, the growth is fully reflected in the figures for white people. During the last quarter the rate of unemployment for white persons averaged 4 percent—the lowest quarterly figure reached since the third quarter of 1957. In July, and again in September, the figure dipped slightly below the 4 percent mark. Unemployment among white teenagers, also on the downgrade, dropped from 12.9 percent in June to 11.4 percent in September.

But nonwhite unemployment in the past quarter actually showed a rise—up from 8 to 8.3 percent. While white unemployment decreased in the months of July and September, nonwhite unemployment rose in each of these months. And the reason it seems to have dropped in August is the employment of some 100,000 teenagers in the Neighborhood Youth Corps of the poverty program.

In September, with that summer program ending, nonwhite teenage unemployment rose by 7 points to 27.5 percent. More than a quarter of the nonwhite teenagers on the job market, in other words, are unemployed. Poverty's next generation is already in sight.

This is not to say that no progress has been made. Total unemployment has dropped from 6 to 4.4 percent in the past 5 years. A million persons newly entering the job market each year have been absorbed. And the poverty program has been launched with special programs for meeting the problems of the poor that are beyond the reach of general economic growth.

Still, the next 5 years will see 1.5 million workers entering the job market annually. While some features of the poverty program, for example the Neighborhood Youth Corps, are largely palliatives, others, for example the effort to provide initiative and confidence through preschool training, cannot possibly pay off for years to come.

In the meantime, it is evident that something more must be done if the end of poverty amidst plenty is to be accomplished. Rosy as things look, there remains a need to raise even higher the rate of growth and cut, even more rapidly, the rate of unemployment.

THE NEW FIFTH COLUMN—THE 5–A MARCHERS

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, over the past weekend, in several regions of the country, we witnessed a deplorable spectacle of the new fifth column in America.

I say this column is more than deplorable—it is despicable. Until I find a better name for this column, I shall refer to it as the "5–A Vanguard." This vanguard would aid and abet anyone against America.

In this case the 5–A marchers have chosen to march on the side of aggression—the Communist aggression against the free people of Vietnam who simply seek to enjoy the same kind of freedom we have in America. We intend to give the South Vietnamese a chance for that freedom. That is why we are on their side assisting them against the forces of infiltration and enslavement.

I have defended individual freedom on any and every occasion whenever I felt obliged to speak out upon it. More than that, I served as an infantryman in World War II against the most heinous and destructive threat to freedom we had known up to that time. We had a fifth column then which caused the fall of Europe. Can we now fail to deal with this 5–A column which roams the streets of America.

The 5–A column is not truly a free movement. It is not a positive nor constructive movement.

The Vice President of the United States indicated over this weekend that it is not a movement indigenous to the communities in which it is seen. He stated that there are indications that it is being controlled from without.

As a controlled movement, I would question that it is entitled to the protection that it has thus far enjoyed from civil authority.

As a controlled movement, I believe it merits the thorough and complete investigation by the Congress in order that we may fully explore the control mechanism, we must expose plans and objectives of those who pull the strings of the puppets from New York to Berkeley, all of whom sing the same ragged tune and shout the same hateful slogans.

I have no respect for the card-carrying Communist and I have even less respect for the placard-carrying marcher who seeks to help the Communists.

While investigations of this kind take time to get underway and because this type of organization has a serpentine proclivity for crawling back into the crevices from which it arose, the process will be tedious. In the meantime my concern is not for these unwashed and unwanted people. My concern is for the 125,000 members of the Armed Forces who are defending freedom in Vietnam and who have every right to ask of us:

"What are you Americans back home doing about these whelps who are yapping at the heels of the defenders of freedom?"

This much we can do and do right away:

On November 11 we will mark Veterans Day to pay homage to all the fighting men and women of today and yesterday who never had any doubt about their obligation and responsibility in the defense of freedom. Neither has there ever been any doubt that communism—especially militant, aggressive communism—threatens that freedom and deserves no comfort or consideration in our land.

On that day I feel it would be fitting and appropriate if all veterans' organizations, and, indeed, all Americans who can and want to do so were to join in massive marches and parades in every region of our land in the support of our course in Vietnam and around the world in the defense of freedom.

I am today calling upon the heads of all our national veterans' organizations to join in such a massive march in the support of our policy of assisting the free people of Vietnam. I believe the servicemen and servicewomen who are putting their lives on the line across the world from our safe and secure homeland have a right to expect no less from us.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, has just returned from Vietnam and has stated that the morale of our men and women in that area has been shaken by such demonstrations and for this reason I urge that veterans, and all Americans, march for Vietnam on November 11 under the free and positive auspices of our veterans' organizations so that the 5–A demonstrations will recede into ridiculous insignificance by comparison.

In my years in Congress I have never felt more called upon to deliver a flag-waving speech. I believe the time has come not only to wave the flag but to wash from the toes of America this case of athlete's foot on the march which pretends to be part of the contagion of freedom but is in reality no more than the bacteria of enslavement to aggression.

THE USO AND MR. EUGENE JELESNIK

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to two great American institutions: the USO and Mr. Eugene Jelesnik, of Salt Lake City, Utah.

The one, the USO, we are all familiar with, though we may have temporarily forgotten that this great organization, which did so much to provide relaxation and entertainment for members of the armed services during World War II and the Korean conflict, is still in business. The role of the USO today in making more bearable the job of the cold war GI's is just as important as it was 20 years ago, and I commend this great institution. America must give it wholehearted support.

The second institution I also commend today, my friend Gene Jelesnik. His life of service embodies the best tradition of the USO. This great American, who came with his mother to the United States when he was 11 years of age, left New York just recently with a troupe of entertainers bound for the USO circuit in Europe and north Africa. This will be Gene's second USO tour of this area, his first having taken place over 20 years ago.

Though the present tour means some financial sacrifice for Gene, he feels that his whole career as an entertainer and entrepreneur should constitute an expression of gratitude for his American citizenship.

When Eugene Jelesnik left Salt Lake City 2 weeks ago to put together the show he will be directing abroad, the Deseret News of September 27 took note of the fact in a short article:

Jelesnik Invited on USO Tour

Eugene Jelesnik, conductor of the Salt Lake philharmonic orchestra, talent scout and violinist, has been invited by the USO to entertain U.S. servicemen on a tour into Spain, Morocco, North Africa, Italy, Germany, and France.

Mr. Jelesnik will be manager of a troupe of performers who will rehearse for a week in New York beginning October 9, then go by jet to Spain. The tour will last 4½ months.

In addition to Mr. Jelesnik, who will entertain with his Amati violin, members of the troupe will include Barbara Stalzle, acrobatic tap dancer from Denver, Colo.; Meri Kayne, singer-guitarist; Sammy King, ventriloquist, and Thomas Cheles and Charles Burgess, who perform on the electric bass and piano.

The tour will be a return engagement for Mr. Jelesnik, who entertained on the Fox Hole Circuit in the Mediterranean theater of operations during World War II. He played in the front lines of Italy before 56,640 soldiers. For this he received the Civilian Service Ribbon award from the War Department.

With his variety artists he also traveled 35,000 miles to entertain U.S. soldiers in Korea, Japan, Philippine Islands, Okinawa, Guam, and Hawaii. He received a Silver Medal citation for this tour.

Mr. Jelesnik originated the Salt Lake City pops concerts, pays annual visits to entertain shutins and the blind, has brought many star attractions to the community, and presents local talent on a television show.

He also has composed several musical numbers, including the "J. F. K. March," which was dedicated to the late President and played for him in Salt Lake City just 2 months before the assassination.

Gov. Calvin L. Rampton, in giving the Salt Lake artist a sendoff on his tour, dubbed him the Utah ambassador to the Armed Forces, and extended his greetings to all Utah servicemen abroad.

ELLEN BROWNING SCRIPPS

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, 130 years ago today, in a dingy house on a grimy street in London, a baby girl was born, unknown but to her family and the doctor. Ninety-six years later that girl died in far-off sunny California, mourned by hundreds of thousands. Because she had lived, the world was a better place. Because of her existence, hundreds lived who would otherwise have died, and thousands more lived in health who would otherwise have existed in pain and misery.

She was Ellen Browning Scripps, whose contributions throughout her lifetime to her fellow man are immeasurable.

The fortunate possessor of a large fortune acquired by tireless industry in the newspaper field, Ellen Scripps utilized that fortune to make happier and fuller the lives of others. She moved to California in 1890, and our State is marked with monuments to her generosity. The Scripps Institution of Oceanography, Scripps Clinic and Research Hospital, the La Jolla public playground and community center, Torrey Pines State Park and the children's pool are but an infinitesimal part of her contributions to her community and to the people of every generation. Benefactions to churches, charities, and individuals are without number, and through them she has had a lasting and beneficial effect on the lives of thousands.

On this, her birthday, these thousands pay tribute to her memory. I join with them in this tribute.

STUDENT DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, the embarrassing spectacle of student demonstrations we witnessed this weekend does not represent the prevailing thinking of our college campuses.

These young people are actually working against all the things they want, as James Reston so ably put it in the New York Times yesterday. They are in no way influencing the President or the Congress with their outbursts.

This weekend in Memphis, the presidents of the student bodies of the three largest colleges pledged to support the Government's policies in Vietnam and to protest the so-called peace demonstrations. They were joined in their statement by the president of the Memphis AFL–CIO Labor Council and the president of the junior chamber of commerce.

Under unanimous consent, I would like to place in the Record at this point a news item from the Commercial Appeal and call attention to Mr. Reston's column, already inserted in the Record by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Zablocki]:

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, Oct. 16, 1965]

Students Join Jaycees, Labor To Support United States

Student leaders of Memphis' three largest colleges joined with civic and labor groups yesterday to pledge support of the Government's policies in Vietnam and to protest so-called peace demonstrations elsewhere in the country.

A joint statement declared:

"We feel, as representatives of our respective groups and as concerned American citizens, that it is our privilege and duty to take a stand in support of our Government's position in the Vietnam crisis.

"While we do not profess to be experts * * * we do recognize that our Government must take firm stands in some instances for the sake of freedom in the world.

"Constant appeasement can only lead to war and surrender to our country's enemies. We believe the various irresponsible demonstrations being held in other sections of our country * * * are in no way representative of the youth and workers of our country."

The statement was signed by John Houseal, president of the Student Government Association at Memphis State University; Roderick Diggs, Jr., president of the student council at LeMoyne College; Bill Allen, president of the student body at Southwestern; Thomas E. Powell, president of the Memphis AFL–CIO Labor Council; and Ed Pulliam, regional vice president of the Tennessee Junior Chamber of Commerce.

LOST GOALS IN AFRICA

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, a very provocative and thoughtful article entitled "Lost Goals in Africa" has been published in the magazine Foreign Affairs for October 1965. Its author, Mr. Arnold Rivkin of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has been a profound student of developments in the Dark Continent for many years. His viewpoint deserves careful consideration. The article follows:

Lost Goals in Africa

(By Arnold Rivkin)

U.S. policy in Africa has lost much of its credibility for a large part of the African continent. We have held out hope for more than we have, in the event, been able or willing to deliver. Often the promise of brave words was extravagant and unwise; but what is noticed is that it has not been matched by congruent acts. We have seemed to say one thing and do another. For example, to most of Africa the unqualified and warmly welcomed pronouncement of the

U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs—"The United States stands for self-determination in Africa"—appears to have been disregarded, even repudiated, in practice, with respect to what in African eyes is the acid test of our bona fides, the white redoubts in southern Africa. Again, in promising major and growing American aid for a decade of development we declared it to be "a primary necessity, opportunity and responsibility of the United States" to help make "a historic demonstration that economic growth and political democracy can go hand in hand" in building "free, stable, and self-reliant countries." This hope has now been substantially dissipated by the evolution of the U.S. aid syndrome in Africa—initial good intentions, objective standards, policies of rewarding merit, yielding to the pressures of the moment, the putting out of fires, the special concern for bad boys, problem children, and the crisis prone, the needs of containment, the special interest of allies, the U.S. dollar drain, etc.

So too, our promise of uncritical support for African aspirations and goals—as if all of Africa shared the same set of aspirations and goals: "What we want for Africa," said the Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, "is what the Africans want for themselves." Its naivete was exposed when it came up against the shattering realities of African diversity and division in the renewed Congo crisis. The inability of the Organization of African Unity to cope with the crisis only served to emphasize the lack of agreement in Africa on aspirations and goals. The aftermath of the Congolese rescue operation in November 1964 brought this message home to the United States. One part of Africa responded with what Ambassador Stevenson called an unprecedented torrent of abuse, verbal violence, hatred and malign accusations against the United States. Another part silently acquiesced or openly approved the Belgian-American action.

There is a prevalent feeling among Africans that after a brief encounter the United States has lost interest and is having second thoughts about Africa. Have we and are we?

Africa more than any other area of the world was to assume a new importance under the Kennedy Administration; Africa was to be a new frontier for U.S. foreign policy. This was the promise of the President's unprecedented action in choosing for his very first appointment to the State Department a prominent political personality to be the Assistant Secretary dealing with African affairs, and of the accompanying announcement that in his administration the new post would be second to none in importance. This initial promise was quickly reinforced.

First, the United States repudiated its apparent acquiescence to the Portuguese position that its African territories are constitutionally integral parts of Portugal, and substituted a policy looking toward self-determination for Angola. Ambassador Stevenson's warm support of the resolution calling for a U.N. investigation of conditions in Angola moved the Liberian representative on the Security Council to declare that Stevenson's words would reverberate throughout Africa.

Then the President, in his first foreign-aid message to Congress, called for a new aid agency, with a mandate to mobilize United States and other free world resources for a decade of development in the underdeveloped southern half of the globe. Significantly, from the point of view of Africa's new importance, within months of his message and before Congress could enact new legislation, President Kennedy dispatched a special mission to Nigeria to study its economy and its new development plan to determine the country's eligibility for a long-term U.S. aid commitment under the new criteria—long-term planning, absorptive capacity, selp-help and social justice. The Nigerian mission, the first anywhere in the world under the new criteria, was soon followed by another to Tunisia. Two unprecedented long-term commitments resulted: $225 million for Nigeria's 6-year plan and $180 million for Tunisia's 3-year plan.

The revolution of rising expectations generated in Africa by these new departures in American policy was relatively shortlived. Early in 1963, the Chairman of the State Department's Advisory Council on African Affairs wrote: "By 1962 numerous African leaders who had welcomed Assistant Secretary Williams' visit in 1961 as a portent of great things to come were beginning to wonder whether the New Frontier was all public relations and no real help."[1]

Disillusion followed disappointment when the administration seemed to contradict its dramatic new policy—self-determination for the people of Angola—by continuing to supply arms to Portugal. Similar feelings were aroused when the administration seemed to hold back from applying its publicly stated policy of self-determination in Africa to the Republic of South Africa, even though the circumstances were different and even though it did eventually support a voluntary prohibition on shipment of arms to South Africa. Disillusion also resulted from the apparent acceptance by the administration of the finding of the President's committee on U.S. foreign aid, the Clay Committee, that, notwithstanding our proclaimed policy of support for the revolutionary transformation underway in Africa from colonial dependency to national independence, Africa was an area of primary interest for the outgoing colonial powers and not for the United States. The Nigerian Ambassador to the United Nations, concerned about the implications of the Committee's finding for his own country and for Africa generally, hurried to Washington seeking assurances that Africa was indeed still a new frontier in U.S. foreign policy. He received assurance only that the administration would continue honoring its pledge of support for Nigeria's 6-year plan; nothing more could be said about future aid.

Nothing has since occurred under the Johnson administration to reverse the downward spiral of African importance in American policy. In Washington, Africa now has the lowest priority of any area. This has always been more or less State Department practice in making foreign policy decisions; now it has become a matter of national policy.

II

Africa has come to be an area of residual interest for the United States. It is not merely that former colonial powers are recognized as having the primary Western interest and responsibility; in principle, this may be a quite defensible position. But in practice the principle has been pushed to extremes. It has meant that the interest of the United States comes into play only as "the court of last resort," when there are no acceptable alternatives available. Thus, it is only where the decolonization process has gone wrong, as in the cases of the Congo (Leopoldville) and Guinea, or where there have been special situations, such as those arising out of the abrupt liquidation of Italy's African empire, or where there has been no colonial relationship, as in Liberia and Ethiopia, or where the needs were obviously beyond the capacity of the outgoing colonial power, as in Nigeria—it is only then that the United States has stepped in to play a major role. As circumstances have permitted, we have encouraged the former colonial power to remain or to come back into the picture.

In short, with the exceptions of Nigeria and Tunisia, where independent assessments of their importance and potential for development were made, the United States has allowed the quirks of history and the policies of other Western powers to impose a crazy quilt of special relations in Africa. As a matter of chance, some of these may coincide with a sound U.S. policy for Africa; others seem highly dubious. The incongruity of our position in Africa has been heightened by our attenuated relations with the many other African states which, not being "special cases," are not thrust into the orbit of active U.S. interest.

In the remaining colonial territories, inevitably and quite naturally, the United States has deferred to the colonial powers, the United Kingdom, and Portugal. The problem, however, has become one of limits. At what juncture do these territories of free world nations become a matter of direct concern, even responsibility, for the leading free world nation? American policy has been equivocal.

In State Department practice as well as policy, the notion of residual interest operates. For the most part, major decisions of African policy are determined, not in the African Bureau of the State Department, but in the European Bureau and, insofar as the United Arab Republic is concerned, in the Near Eastern and South Asian Bureau. Certainly this is true of U.S. policy toward Portuguese Africa and Rhodesia. But more surprising, policies toward independent African States are also shaped in the European Bureau. The sensitivities of President de Gaulle, as judged by the European Bureau, rather than an independent assessment of the U.S. national interest in various French-speaking countries, is likely to be the decisive factor. Thus, for some 3 years the United States severely limited its relationship with Guinea, even though Guinea had broken with France in achieving its independence. Notwithstanding the existence of the very situation which should have triggered active U.S. interest in Guinea, our respect for French primacy and De Gaulle's wishes prevented our taking action. Only after Guinea withdrew from the tightening Soviet embrace in 1962 did we take an active interest there, partly because the containment policy demanded that we take preemptive action to forestall the elements in the Parti Démocratique de Guinée which were seeking a rapprochement with the Soviet Union or an expanding relationship with Communist China, and partly because De Gaulle had relented enough in his attitude toward Guinea to allow the United States to enter the scene.

The policy of containment of the Soviet Union and Communist China is indeed a principal reason for retaining even a residual interest in Africa, so as to avoid the possibility of a "dangerous vacuum" where a colonial power has failed to make a reasonable accommodation with a former colony. The desire to deny, in very different circumstances, the Congo, Guinea, and Somalia to Soviet or Communist Chinese hegemony has certainly been a prime consideration in our policy toward these three countries. Similarly, fear that failure of the colonial power to take adequate steps to void crisis situations which the Communist powers could exploit has influenced us to go as far as we have in our policies toward Rhodesia and Portuguese Africa.

As with any policy depending on the actions of others, the United States has found itself on the horns of more than one dilemma. For example, the policy of residual interest has thrust the United States into support of Ethiopia, and the policies of residual interest and containment into support of Somalia, while the two states are engaged in an undeclared but nonetheless violent war. Similarly, the policy of containment has led us to provide large-scale agricultural commodity assistance to the United Arab Republic, and the policies of residual interest and containment have led to our principal commitment in Africa, support of the Congo—where the United Arab Republic has long been engaged in attempting to overthrow the central government by one means or another. I cite these cases not because our action in either of them was necessarily wrong, but to underscore the difficulties of relying too much on the policies of third countries in determining our own.

---

[1] Vernon McKay, "Africa in World Politics." New York: Harper and Row, 1963, p. 360.

The expansion of the policy of containment by word and action in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic has far-reaching implications for Africa. Thus, Castroite Cuba's role in the Zanzibar revolution of January 1964 not only illustrates the varied character of the Communist drive to export revolution to Africa, but also suggests the scope of the "containment" that may be required in Africa. So, too, the abortive but nearly successful Communist attempt in the Sudan to capture control of the revolution which ousted the Abboud military government. If the tougher policies we have been following elsewhere mean that we cannot accept a Communist takeover in Africa either, then we can hardly afford to avoid involvement until the last moment. By an act of self-abnegation, we cannot remain aloof from Africa, except as determined by the actions of other powers, and at the same time be on call to put out fires on a continent where political instability is endemic.

Our unwillingness to take more initiative in Africa is all the more remarkable because it is the one area of the world in which the United States has more freedom of action and fewer constraints on its foreign policymaking than in any other. The administration seems to have accepted as applicable to Africa the Kennan-Lippmann thesis on the limitations of U.S. capacity to influence the direction of affairs in distant areas of the world. Yet, remote as it is from Communist China and the Soviet Union, Africa does not present the geopolitical difficulties we find in dealing with crises in southeast Asia, the Middle East and Eastern Europe. We are not limited by regional (and related bilateral) military alliances comparable to NATO, CENTRO, SEATO, ANZUS and the OAS defense systems. In Africa, also, we should be comparatively free from pressures arising out of commercial interests; Africa accounts for less than 5 percent of our total foreign trade and investment.

One result of our policy of self-abnegation is that the desire of the newly independent states to widen their relations and dilute the influence of their former colonial masters is being ignored, and the conditions for their continuing dependency are being nurtured. This promotes the image of neo-colonialism and African stooge governments ripe for national liberation, as propagated by Communist China and radical nationalist African states such as Ghana. The fewer alternatives the new states are offered to diversify their political and economic relations within the free world, the more they are forced either to preserve old patterns of dependency or to "swing to the left" into Communist orbits. Our experience in Latin America provides some apposite lessons on what can happen when an outworn relationship is persisted in too long.

In conflict with our traditional policies, we are also contributing to the resurrection of the outmoded concept of great-power spheres. Walter Lippmann advanced the view that the French interest in Gabon is comparable to the vital interest hegemony which he concedes to Communist China in southeast Asia and to the United States in Latin America. Interestingly enough, President de Gaulle, while apparently accepting the idea of French and Communist Chinese spheres of influence, does not, judging from his tour of South America and his condemnation of U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic, seem to accept our sphere in Latin America.

Our overall attitude toward Africa has also limited our relationship with many of the African states whose foreign policies have most often coincided with our own, particularly on the recurring Congo crisis, but also on other issues of special importance to us, such as the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. Ever since France's recognition of Communist China, a number of French-speaking African states (Congo-Brazzaville, Dahomey, Senegal, the Central African Republic and Mauritania), which we have recognized as remaining in the French sphere of influence, have also been reversing their position on that issue. Now with half the population of India, Africa has almost one-third of the membership of the United Nations. Reasonable or not, this means that Africa can significantly influence the balance of world political power. In fact, the U.N. vote, which for the last several years has pivoted on the ballots of the African states, will probably go against us this year or next if this new French-inspired trend continues. Only Communist China's ineptitude so far in her relations with the new African states has stemmed the turning tide.

III

What could be done to restore the promise and the credibility of U.S. policy in Africa? The point of departure must be to do away with the principal causes for past contradictions and inconsistencies. First, the United States should abandon the policy of having a merely residual interest in Africa and recognize that with 36 independent states (excluding South Africa) in existence and another 3 or 4 in the offing, the continent can no longer be viewed as of only derivative interest to the United States. We should make it clear that we have a coherent African policy, and not simply improvised positions deriving from our NATO relationships and our cold war involvement.

This means that we must cease to pose African policy questions in terms of a dilemma: pleasing African states or pleasing our NATO allies. Each must be considered, but neither exclusively or even preponderantly. Our NATO allies are no more homogeneous in their policies and interests than the the African states. On a few issues, however, such as independence for the Portuguese territories, there is a consensus among African states. Because the issues on which Africans agree are so few, those issues take on added importance. The question then becomes one of means. If in keeping with our policy of self-determination for Africa we think it right to support steps in that direction in Portuguese Africa, how can we take effective steps with the least damaging effects for Portugal and NATO? Certainly, several of our NATO allies have time and again taken positions and followed policies in conflict with our own with respect to Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Vietnam, Communist China, the test-ban treaty, trade with the Soviet bloc, etc., without the United States pulling the NATO house down. So too, in Africa, we have long supported self-determination for African colonies without the United Kingdom, France, or Belgium tearing the alliance apart. Portugal may react differently. That would seem to be the risk we must run—but it is certainly a lesser one than compromising our policy of support for self-determination and alienating much of Africa. In any event, NATO's present disarray, centering as it does on France, is so basic that, although any further dissention in the alliance would be undesirable, the disaffection of Portugal would hardly seem crucial to the alliance's future.

Third, the United States must recognize that on a continent ripe for revolution in the judgment of the world's leading practitioner, the policy of active containment is neither appropriate nor feasible. Intervention of the type practiced in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic to forestall Communist-inspired wars of national liberation is obviously out of the question. Yet this is what the containment policy suggests, if France, the United Kingdom or Belgium should falter in their determination or capacity to preclude Soviet or Communist Chinese penetration and takeovers. Our posture in the Congo has not been too far removed from active intervention, and if the situation should deteriorate again, what then?

Africa now has a momentum of its own in world affairs which cannot be disregarded. Withdrawal and then sudden thrust by the United States in response to one crisis or another has all the disadvantages of both policies. Our sudden bursts of energy to counter Communist initiatives simply distort our basic interest in the development of the African states themselves by exaggerating cold-war considerations. They also put in question the credibility of our oftstated interest in the development of politically independent and economically viable states, free to determine their own external policies.

Thus, it is to the positive aspects of policy that we must address ourselves. How can we help the new states to consolidate their independence? This is the best sort of containment and, as a practical matter, the only sort conceivable for most of Africa.

For all new African countries, the achievement of formal international sovereignty is but the beginning of their travail. They all have to build states, nations, market economies, and modern societies. In the words of the Assistant AID Administrator for Africa: "The newly independent countries of Africa are today at a critical stage of development. The courses of action taken now by the United States may profoundly influence their political, economic, and social structures for generations to come. It is clearly in our interest to seize the opportunity to help the relatively new and emerging nations of Africa to develop along constructive lines."[2] The alternative is unacceptable—endemic instability, bush-league arms races, brush-fire wars, Latin American-style militarism, despotism, declining living standards and an ever greater gulf between the developed Western and the underdeveloped African states.

In the broad political arena, we should reassert the basic U.S. interest in the emergence and development of stable and viable independent states in all of Africa, and affirm our intention to help in the process. The United States must also redeem its unqualified pledge of support for self-determination in Africa, making it clear that we do not draw a line at the Zambezi or Limpopo Rivers so as to exclude from this pledge the white-dominated areas in southern Africa. Failure to find an orderly and peaceful route to independence for the remaining colonial territories in Africa, and the inevitably ensuing violence, would be—in fact already is being—attributed to U.S. policy, or lack of it.

Finally, the most intractable problem of all—the Republic of South Africa. Here, a determined white government, with the considerable economic and military resources of a rapidly developing country, has committed itself to a policy which despite its rationale of separate development for Africans does in fact deny the nonwhite majority the right of self-determination. The United States can rescind its pledge of support for self-determination as inapplicable in the context of an already independent country. Lenin's ambivalence on the nationality question, favoring self-determination in Russia and elsewhere in Europe but denying its applicability once a socialist government comes to power, offers a precedent. Such a tactic on the part of the United States would be viewed as skeptically in Africa as Lenin's reversal is in the United States.

---

[2] E. C. Hutchinson, "U.S. Economic Aid to Africa, 1960–64," in "Africa Report," December 1964, p. 8.

Having condemned apartheid and voluntarily imposed a ban on arms shipments to South Africa, the United States has accepted the need to bring pressure to bear to induce South Africa to change its policy. The basic decision of principle having been taken, what remains is to find that combination of persuasion, inducement, and coercion which would be both effective and acceptable. This will not be an easy or quick task. An opportunity for action may be offered by the World Court in the case now before it, where South Africa is charged with violation of its League of Nations mandate over South West Africa in applying apartheid to the mandated territory. In the event of an adverse ruling, South Africa may be confronted with the dilemma of accepting the decision, with all that would entail for the practice of apartheid in South Africa itself, or defying the Court and laying a new basis for the U.N. to assume jurisdiction and take action. This would leave the United States and other Western countries with considerably less discretion about what their response should be to African pressures for applying sanctions.

Another problem of concern to the United States is the mounting overt and covert flow of arms, munitions, and military missions to Africa—for national armed forces as well as for "liberation forces." Means must be found to achieve "preventive disarmament" in Africa, not only to increase its internal security but to avoid the increasing diversion of local resources from development to military purposes. In practice, much of the flow of arms for "liberation forces" has been diverted to other destinations and other ends. The recent incidents in Kenya involving Chinese Communist arms are illustrative. On two occasions large shipments of arms theoretically destined for Congolese and Mozambique rebel forces were transshipped from Tanzania and found hidden or intercepted in suspicious circumstances in western Kenya. These discoveries carried the unmistakable implication of a threat by disaffected internal factions to overthrow the Kenyan government with outside support. As a result of Kenya's suspicion that her two partners in the East African common market, Tanzania and Uganda, were involved in such a plot, the prospects of maintaining the common market and expanding it into an East African federation, something which the United States greatly favors, is vastly diminished. In another case, the Sudans' willingness to serve as a corridor for Communist arms shipments to rebel forces in neighboring countries came to a sudden halt because too many shipments were falling into the hands of disaffected Sudanese elements, particularly in the rebellious southern provinces.

The increased flow of arms for national forces also presents a danger. Soviet support of a substantial buildup of Somali armed forces has had a direct impact on the two neighboring states with which Somalia has intermittently been warring—Ethiopia, which receives its arms primarily from the United States, and Kenya, which receives its arms primarily from the United Kingdom. Raising the capacity of the three states to make war can only enlarge the already dangerous threat to African peace, drag in cold war issues and divert scarce resources of three of the poorest African states.

Would not Africa be a good place to start arms control and disarmament agreements? It took 6 years for the military regime in the Sudan to be replaced, and then only by extraconstitutional means. The aftermath has been disorder, violence, and political instability reminiscent of the very situation that General Abboud set out to erase with his military coup in 1958. Does Africa have to repeat the Latin American pattern of successive military coups to effect political change?

It seems clear by now that the independent African states are not going to be in a position to liberate by force of arms the Republic of South Africa or Mozambique and Angola. It is also apparent that the Western Powers cannot supply even limited kinds of arms to South Africa and Portugal which would not be useful for internal repressive purposes. Simple realism suggests the need for an explicit moratorium on arms for Africa and the effective policing of it by agreement with the African states. Failure to come to grips with this critical issue makes nonsense of so much external economic aid, which in practice is either directly or indirectly diverted to military ends. Unnecessary arms expenditure also undercuts whatever added political stability might be hoped for as a result of economic development. Moreover, in the context of Africa-wide arms control, a total ban on arms and munitions to South Africa and Portugal would become more acceptable. In view of African insistence on declaring the continent a denuclearized zone and urging disarmament on the major powers, it would seem appropriate for the African states themselves to initiate steps toward achieving a moratorium on arms shipments to Africa, and by doing so to lend credence to their other disarmament policies. This would put pressure on the Western Powers to agree and considerable leverage could then be brought to bear on the Communist powers.

Whatever relevancy schemes for peacekeeping by small nations or regional organizations may have in some areas of the world, it seems clear that in this decade such proposals are largely irrelevant for Africa. Individual African states do not have the capacity in being and it seems of doubtful wisdom deliberately to create it. In any event, whenever the question has arisen, the African States have been unable to agree on the desirability of creating a regional peacekeeping force. Some fear it would mean interference in their internal affairs; others that it would mean support of the status quo and the preclusion of change; and still others that it would mean domination by larger or more aggressive states. And so far, African States have preferred to look elsewhere than to one another for assistance in putting down rebellions—in east Africa, to the United Kingdom, and, in French-speaking Africa, to France.

The Organization of African Unity is structurally incapable of playing such a role at present or in the foreseeable future. With its members deeply divided on fundamental principles, such as the sanctity of inherited boundaries and non-interference in one another's internal affairs, the organization has not been in a position to play any military role at all. In the Congo affair, ever since the withdrawal of the U.N. forces, the OAU has not only been unable to carry out a peacekeeping role; it has also been unable to prevent its minority faction of radical nationalist States and their sometime associates from providing active support and bases for rebel groups. Equally, the OAU has been unable to face up to the problems of guerrilla warfare in the southern Sudan, the Watusi refugees and émigrés and their periodic incursions into Rwanda, the continuing quarrels and intermittent violence between Dahomey and Niger, Ghana and Upper Volta, Ghana and Togo, Somalia and Ethiopia, Somalia and Kenya, etc. To wish upon the OAU tasks it is not yet ready to assume is merely to impair further its limited effectiveness. Our expectations for it have been unrealistic—as we should have known from our experience with peacekeeping in Latin America.

IV

In the economic field no less than in the political arena we must do away with the incongruities which have characterized our economic assistance programs in Africa if these are to play a consistent and effective role in support of U.S. policies. At the outset, we need to reassess the size and composition of our economic assistance to Africa. As the continent receiving the smallest segment of our aid (less than 10 percent), Africa deserves more if we are to give credence to our policy of support for African development. A higher proportion of aid for economic development (as opposed to political purposes) needs to be coupled with a renewed attempt to apply the Kennedy aid concepts, including the conscious provision and programing of technical assistance so as to enlarge the capacity of the African States to absorb external aid effectively.

We should also renew our attempts to achieve the mobilization and coordination of aid to Africa from the free world, to make such aid more effective, increase its availability and improve the terms on which it is made available. Free-world aid to Africa, having reached a plateau, has in the last 2 years actually started to decline. Our own economic aid (excluding surplus food) reflects this downward trend. The appropriation requested by the President for the fiscal year 1966 is almost $100 million less than was obligated in 1962, the high water mark of U.S. aid to Africa.

The decline has set in just as Africa has begun to move forward and to increase its capacity to absorb capital. There are signs, too, of growing African interest in rationalizing and coordinating the flow of external aid. At the meeting of the Economic Commission for Africa late in 1964, Mr. Robert Gardiner, the executive secretary, called for "a Marshall plan, Colombo plan, or Alliance for Progress" for Africa, and suggested the possibility of the founding of an African Council for Economic Cooperation. The new African Development Bank, which came into operation this year with a nominal capitalization of $250 million, will also undoubtedly be seeking outside resources. In view of our contributions to the Inter-American Development Bank and our proffered offers to the proposed Asian Development Bank, it is difficult to see how we can refrain from making significant contributions to the African Development Bank.

It would be in the interest of both the United States and Europe if the heavy dependence of their respective "client states" in Latin America and Africa could be progressively diversified and shared. Then, a change in the relationship to a former colonial power would not be felt as a wrenching divorce but as a tolerable if regrettable separation.

We also need to rationalize our aid programs and to adhere to objective criteria, thus eliminating the anomalies which make us seem to reward the troublemakers and take friends for granted. If aid is to flow to the United Arab Republic, Algeria, Guinea and others in the form of surplus agricultural commodities, supporting assistance and emergency aid—without reference to their economic performance and heavy allocation of resources to nondevelopment purposes—then provision should be made to compensate the states deserving of aid by objective economic standards, and to reward, or at any rate not discriminate against, those which are pro-Western in their nonalinement rather than pro-Soviet or pro-Communist Chinese.

From the receiving country's point of view, all American aid, regardless of the particular pocket it comes from, has the effect of enlarging that country's total resources. If a country needs food, it makes little difference whether it receives food or "development dollars" which enable it to buy food—

or, if in budgetary straits, it receives supporting assistance or development dollars. It can always shift its resources around as economic (and political) conditions require. Africans have not been slow to grasp this point. Nigeria, which is frequently cited by American officials as the largest African recipient of U.S. economic aid, has felt compelled to point out that, measured in either aggregate or per capita terms, any number of African countries have received greater assistance if contributions emanating from all U.S. aid pockets are taken into account.

Ghana, Guinea, Mali, Algeria, and the United Arab Republic, all radical nationalist states whose economic performance leaves much to be desired and who are prone to allocate resources to nonproductive prestige purposes and questionable foreign adventures, have each received disproportionately more economic aid than Nigeria, the country we have singled out as one of the two most deserving African countries under the Kennedy economic development criteria. During U.S. fiscal years 1960–64, Ghana, Algeria, and the United Arab Republic, with populations of 7.4, 10.8, and 28.7 million respectively, each received as much or more U.S. economic aid (without regard for which U.S. aid pocket it came from) than Nigeria, whose population of 55.5 million is larger than the combined population of the three. During the same period, Guinea and Mali, with a combined population of 8 million, received about one-half as much economic assistance as Nigeria. In addition, such special cases as Morocco, Ethiopia, Liberia and the Congo, with a combined population considerably smaller than Nigeria's, have each received as much or more U.S. economic aid (to say nothing of military) than Nigeria. Yet none of these states has been singled out by the United States as specially deserving of "development" aid.

The United Arab Republic has received its large share of our economic assistance to Africa in the face of the U.S. Government's own judgment that that country "has followed a number of political policies which are not to our liking and contrary to our interests": for example, diverting its resources to aid the Congolese rebels, maintaining 50,000 troops in Yemen, conducting campaigns to coerce Libya into ousting the U.S. air base, and evidencing hostility toward Tunisia for proposing negotiations in the Arab-Israeli dispute.

In contrast, the 13 original members of the Common Organization of African and Malagasy States (OCAM), which have on the whole been most vigorous in their support of the OAU principle of noninterference and most articulate in condemning external interference in their internal affairs by Ghana "and other states," have received considerably less economic aid than the five most interventionist states. Indeed, since 1960, Ghana alone has received more U.S. aid than the combined total going to all 13 OCAM states. Guinea has received more during this period than the combined total going to the two most important OCAM states, the Ivory Coast, and Senegal. And almost as if to add insult to injury, the United States over the last 2 years has withdrawn its aid missions from the OCAM states and administers aid to them, such as it is, from Washington.

In sum, then, the United States must redress the imbalance in its foreign policies by refocusing its view of American interests in Africa, not by downgrading our traditional interest in Europe or by denying the reality of the cold war, but rather by upgrading the importance of Africa, formulating policies responsive to African realities, and striking a reasonable balance among our multiple national interests. The United States also needs to rationalize its political and economic policies in Africa, to make them consistent and credible and thus responsive to our national interest in the development of stable and viable African states.

STUDENT TESTING PROGRAM PROPOSED BY THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have obtained unanimous consent to have printed in the daily Record a letter from a constituent, together with an editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Memphis, Tenn., Commercial Appeal, disapproving some of the student testing program proposed by the Federal Government's Office of Education.

Just to impress some people with the "stuff" that is going on, just imagine, Mr. Speaker, the confusion which would be created in the mind of an immature youngster—or most adults, for that matter—if he were faced with the problem of answering the question with a "yes" or "no":

> Which is worse, spitting on the Bible or spitting on the American flag?

How would you, Mr. Speaker, answer with a "yes" or "no" the question:

> Which is more important, taking the oath of allegiance to the United States or joining a church?

BANK MERGER BILL HEARINGS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I had to adjourn a meeting of the House Banking and Currency Committee for lack of a quorum. The meeting was called at the request of three members of the committee to consider bank merger legislation. The failure of a quorum on the committee is a sample of the waning support for this type of legislation.

The proponents of the bank merger bill have made many claims of a majority. However, this morning, not even a majority of the committee was present.

I firmly believe that members of this committee and the public are becoming more aware of the far-reaching and extreme nature of these bills. I am convinced that only a distinct minority of this committee and the public want to do anything to weaken antitrust laws as they relate to the banks. I believe only a minority favors special retroactive excuses for antitrust law violations.

Great pressure has been brought to bear on Congress to pass this legislation. This pressure and lobbying campaign should be thoroughly investigated. We have in the committee records, cases where lobbyists failed to register in compliance with the lobbying laws. The American Bankers Association, the biggest lobbyist in this campaign, completely defies the lobbying laws and does not even register with the Clerk of the House.

I know that many bitter words have been exchanged over this legislation in recent weeks. I hope that the wounds will heal and that this committee can move forward on more productive and more needed legislation.

In the press, there has been much talk of majorities and minorities. I would like to emphasize that throughout the consideration of these bills, a majority of the Democrats have stuck together. All 11 Republicans have consistently voted together as a bloc against the majority of the Democrats. The Republicans have picked up just enough Democratic votes to keep the issue in doubt.

However, I am happy that my own vote has been cast consistently with the majority of the Democrats. In most cases, this has been a 2-to-1 majority on the Democratic side. On most votes, only 6 or 7 of the committee's 22 Democrats have joined the Republican minority.

By its tactics, this Republican-led group has prevented the committee from carefully considering legitimate bank merger bills. The Domestic Finance Subcommittee worked long and hard on legislation to deal with these proposals. As the subcommittee neared completion of its work, Representatives Ashley and Moorhead, and the Republican members of the committee introduced entirely new bills. They insisted that their measures be considered and that the subcommittee's work be tossed out. We have had no hearings on this Ashley-Moorhead bill. It would have been a shameful thing for this committee to have reported to the floor of the House such far-reaching legislation without hearing a single witness. This is not normal procedure, and so long as I am chairman, I will attempt to stop such high-handed tactics.

If these Members had followed committee procedures, I believe it would have been possible to have had a reasonable bill on the floor this session. Their attitude and tactics prevented this.

Throughout the consideration of these bills, I have insisted on full and open hearings. I again call for full and open hearings.

I suggest that the House Banking and Currency Committee meet while the Congress is out of session for the purpose of holding complete hearings on the new proposals that have been proposed to deal with bank mergers. I believe such hearings will require about 3 weeks of steady work by the committee.

The Ashley-Moorhead bill creates an entirely new set of problems for the so-called bank supervisory agencies. The bill also virtually eliminates the Justice Department role in controlling mergers and concentration of power in the banking industry.

Therefore, I suggest that the committee call Attorney General, Nicholas deB. Katzenbach; Comptroller of the Currency, James J. Saxon; Federal Deposit

Insurance Corporation Chairman, K. A. Randall; and all members of the Federal Reserve Board. I suggest that all members of the Federal Reserve be called because of a severe division of opinion on bank mergers within that agency. At least three members of the Federal Reserve Board have appeared before the Domestic Finance Subcommittee and testified against retroactive exemptions from antitrust laws. The chairman of the Federal Reserve, William McChesney Martin, fully endorsed the idea of giving the big banks freedom from antitrust laws including those already prosecuted.

No impartial observer could claim that the House Banking and Currency Committee yet has all the facts on this legislation. This is a major step, and the committee simply must have all the facts before it acts. To do otherwise would be highly irresponsible.

The hearings before the Domestic Finance Subcommittee have revealed part of the tremendous pressure and lobbying campaign carried on to pass this legislation. I know that all my colleagues here realize that this pressure has been some of the heaviest in the history of the Congress. We have found cases where lobbyists have not complied with the registration laws. Therefore, as part of the hearings on these new bills, I strongly urge that the committee conduct a full investigation into the lobbying activities. These activities bear on this legislation and they must be brought out into the open.

SERVICEMEN'S LOAN FUNDS ON THE WAY TO RIGHTFUL OWNERS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, some 6 weeks ago I addressed this body concerning funds of unlocated servicemen that were on deposit at Suburban Trust Co., a Hyattsville, Md., commercial bank.

At that time, more than $86,000 was on deposit at the bank belonging to more than 1,000 servicemen. The funds were deposited in the bank for the purpose of repaying loans from Federal Services Finance Corp., but for several reasons the funds were not turned over to the finance company nor were they returned to the servicemen.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that through the efforts of the Domestic Finance Subcommittee, the Department of Defense, and the bank more than 600 of those servicemen have been located and nearly $30,000 has been returned to them.

The subcommittee is continuing its investigation of the practices which led to this withholding of funds from servicemen, but it is gratifying to know that our investigation has already begun to bear fruit.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD FLIP-FLOPS ON VITAL CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST QUESTION OF COMMERCIAL BANKS OPERATING SECURITIES BUSINESS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1933 the Congress, shocked by disclosure of a long, sorry record of abuses, fraud, and outright thievery, passed a law separating commercial and investment banking. The law was framed to apply to the prevailing custom of bank-affiliated securities operations controlled through interlocking management. Congress has wisely retained this statutory safeguard against conflicts of interest and unfair competition with nonbank businesses.

Only recently the Federal Reserve Board, which has the responsibility to administer this prohibition against affiliations between banking and securities dealings, testified strongly before the Banking and Currency Committee against a proposal to expand the securities operations of banks. I refer to H.R. 7539, which would alter the very narrow authority of banks to underwrite Federal, State, and local general obligation bonds.

Just recently, First National City Bank, New York, has taken steps to enter the mutual fund business in competition with the independents. At present no other member bank is engaging in this business. The First National City Bank has an application pending before the Securities and Exchange Commission for an exemption from the conflict-of-interest prohibitions contained in section 10 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as a prelude to a full-scale commercial operation, separate and distinct from investment management in their trust department.

Now all this is not too surprising, Mr. Speaker, except for one factor that stands out like a sore thumb. In an opinion to First National City Bank kept secret by the Federal Reserve for over 6 months, the agency concluded that section 32 of the Banking Act would not prohibit the bank from engaging in the business of issuing securities. The Federal Reserve bases this finding on the ground that the fund is part and parcel of the bank and thus no interlocking management prohibited by section 32 is found to exist. Since the securities operation will be carried out by the bank itself and not by an affiliate, then everything is A-OK—no violation of the law, the Board argues.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this decision by the Federal Reserve Board ranks along with many of Comptroller Saxon's astounding rulings as an outstanding example of the perversion of clear, legislative intent of the Congress in order to please a $14 billion Wall Street institution. What the Board is saying, Mr. Speaker, is that under their tortured and twisted interpretation of the law—12 U.S.C. 377—First National City Bank can engage in directly a securities operation they cannot engage in indirectly.

This is a lot of bureaucratic nonsense, absolute rubbish, and I can foresee a full investigation of this matter unless the agencies can reasonably show a legal basis for the green light to First National City Bank. If the agencies succeed in accommodating this important client, then next January would be none too soon for hearings on legislation to plug this glaring loophole in our laws.

NOTED BANKER OPPOSES BANK MERGER BILL

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Paul Jones, a successful Glenview, Ill., banker and businessman, in a letter to all members of the House Banking and Currency Committee dated October 4, strongly opposed legislation forgiving past bank mergers and tying the hands of the Department of Justice concerning future bank mergers.

The thrust of Mr. Jones' earnest plea is that big banks created by merger forget the needs of the small businessman when tight money periods come. The big banks squeeze out the little man to serve the credit needs of the large corporations only. He states that during 1959 he was barely able to survive the lack of bank financing and that some other small companies were squeezed out completely.

Mr. Jones also admits a distrust of the bank supervisory agencies in stemming the bank merger tide and that there is no substitute for the Federal courts to make the final decision. He closes by saying, and I quote:

> Let the banking supervisory agencies regulate in those areas in which they are well equipped to regulate. But if competition is to be preserved and the public interest protected, do not give them the authority to permit banks to merge.

Due to Republican-led pressures, the subcommittee was forced to cut off public hearings on these vital bills, and many excellent witnesses—such as Mr. Jones, a dedicated free enterpriser—were not permitted to appear in person before the subcommittee.

Mr. Jones' letter and statement follow:

CUMMINS-AMERICAN CORP.,
Glenview, Ill., October 4, 1965.

To Members of the House Banking and Currency Committee.

GENTLEMEN: I have been active in the finance business for 43 years. Throughout those years in that business I have borrowed money from banks, both large and small, in many States. For the last 5 years I have had the major investment in and have been the chief executive officer of a small bank in one of the Chicago suburbs.

I have followed the progress of S. 1698 in the newspapers and trade papers. It has seemed to me that the reasons why S. 1698 should be defeated have been obscured by emotional arguments advanced by its proponents. The proponents insist that banks which have merged with the approval of one of the regulatory agencies will have difficulty unscrambling, that it is unfair to make them unscramble after the merger was approved by the regulatory agency, and that the solution is to pass legislation which vests the sole authority to approve or disapprove bank mergers in the agencies which already approved their merger.

Those banks are in no position to complain. They knew the risks they were taking when they merged. Moreover, their plight is not as bad as they make it out to be. Unscrambling a bank merger poses less of a problem than unscrambling most mergers does. But even if the merged banks were in a position to complain, that does not warrant passing legislation which is ill-advised and which will adversely affect the public for years to come.

I have set out the reasons why I believe S. 1698 should be defeated in a short statement enclosed.

S. 1698 vests the sole authority to permit or prohibit bank mergers in persons who are not able by reason of their orientation to view the effect of bank mergers on competition impartially.

It invites the acceptance of bank mergers at the expense of competition in the banking industry instead of demanding that the management of banks in economic trouble be improved and competition preserved.

Those who will suffer the most from S. 1698 are small businesses and individuals.

I hope you will give the enclosed statement your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL JONES,
President.

S. 1698 SHOULD BE DEFEATED AND THE BANK MERGER ACT OF 1960 REPEALED

The Bank Merger Act of 1960 vested authority in the Comptroller of Currency as to national banks, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System as to State banks, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation as to insured banks which are not members of the Federal Reserve System to prohibit bank mergers. It directed them to consider, in determining whether or not to permit a bank merger, (1) the financial history and condition of each of the banks involved, (2) the adequacy of its capital structure, (3) its future earnings prospects, (4) the general character of its management, (5) the convenience and needs of the community to be served, (6) whether or not its corporate powers are consistent with the purposes of the Federal banking laws, and (7) the effect of the transaction on competition, and directed them not to permit the merger unless they found it to be in the public interest.

S. 1698 goes one step further. It does what the Supreme Court held in *United States* v. *Philadelphia National Bank*, and *United States* v. *First National Bank & Trust Co. of Lexington* that the Bank Merger Act of 1960 did not do. It vests the sole authority to approve or prohibit bank mergers in the three Federal regulatory agencies, and exempts an approved merger from the operation of the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act.

S. 1698 is special privilege legislation. In vesting in the banking supervisory agencies the sole authority to permit or prohibit bank mergers, it affords to banks a privilege which is not accorded to most other American businesses. The mergers of most other American businesses are subject to review by the Federal courts.

There is no justification for granting banks such a special privilege, for treating banks differently than other American businesses. The granting of that special privilege cannot be justified on the theory that the men who are in charge of the three Federal regulatory agencies are better qualified than Federal judges to pass upon bank mergers. In fact, if the public interest is to be served, they are less qualified to do so.

The background, experience, and orientation of those men are attuned to the interests of the banks whose mergers they are asked to evaluate. For example, the Comptroller of the Currency, Mr. James Saxon (who approved the First National Bank & Trust Co. of Lexington merger, after receiving adverse reports from the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Attorney General), was on the legal staff of the First National Bank of Chicago and before that was on the legal staff of the American Bankers Association. Mr. Randall, the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, was formerly President of a bank in Provo, Utah. Many of the members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System are oriented to the banks through many years of service in the Federal Reserve System, the stock of which is owned by the banks which are members of it. In contrast, the background, experience and orientation of Federal judges is typically attuned to the interests of the public as a whole, rather than a particular segment of the business community.

The tenure of office of those in charge of the three regulatory agencies is normally short. At the expiration of their terms of office, they can be expected to seek employment from the banking industry whose mergers they are empowered to approve or disapprove. In contrast, Federal judges are appointed for life and need not consider the effect of their decisions upon their future employment prospects.

The American Bankers Association is controlled by the giant banks of this country. Naturally, it has endorsed S. 1698. (In contrast, the Independent Bankers Association, which reflects the views of the small banks in the United States, adopted a resolution at the last annual meeting of its members in opposition to S. 1698.) In doing so, it has argued that the "control of bank mergers should be in the hands of the appropriate banking supervisory agencies" because these agencies are "equipped with the special knowledge necessary to regulate intelligently the American Banking System." This is to suggest that Federal judges do not have enough knowledge or intelligence to determine whether or not a bank merger violates the Sherman Act or Clayton Act, although their knowledge and intelligence is adequate to make the same determination as to mergers of other businesses. It is to suggest that only those who are drawn from the banking fraternity have sufficient knowledge and intelligence to pass upon bank mergers.

No doubt all industries would like men drawn from their own ranks to have the sole power to review their mergers. No doubt, too, foxes would like all chicken coops entrusted to their care.

Nor does the fact that the Bank Merger Act of 1960 directs the banking supervisory agencies to consider six factors in addition to the effect of a bank merger on competition justify affording banks the special privilege of having their mergers beyond the jurisdiction of the Federal courts to consider.

Instead of promoting and protecting competition within the banking industry, consideration of the six additional factors tends to invite a lessening of competition.

Referring to the first four of those factors as set out above, if the financial history and condition of one of the banks is only fair or even bad, then its capital structure will be impaired, and its future earnings prospects dim. The cause of this condition will more often than not be that the general character of its management is not good.

The Bank Merger Act of 1960 lists these considerations in advance of the effect of the transaction on competition and does not say that the banking supervisory agencies shall prohibit a bank merger which tends to substantially lessen competition or is in restraint of trade irrespective of whether the financial condition of one of the banks is bad, its capital structure impaired, its future earnings prospect dim and its management weak. The Bank Merger Act, thus, invites as a solution to such a bank's predicament, one which lessens competition—the merger of the bank with one which is economically strong. It does not insist that at least an attempt be made to achieve a solution which would preserve competition—the bringing in of new management to revitalize the bank.

Nor does the fact that banks are otherwise subject to supervision and regulation under the Federal banking laws justify affording banks the special privilege of having their mergers beyond the jurisdiction of the Federal courts to consider. Many of those regulations restrain competition rather than promote it. If competition in the banking industry is to be protected and preserved, and if the public interest is to be served, the sole authority to permit or prohibit bank mergers should not be vested in agencies whose regulations tend to restrain competition.

Among the regulations of the banking supervisory agencies which restrain competition are these: (a) The power of banks to compete in the loan market is restrained by regulations requiring them to maintain a substantial amount of their assets in cash, short-term Government bonds and Government bills; (b) banks are restrained from competing for risk investments by regulations limiting the ratio of risk assets to capital; (c) regulations increasing the amount of capital required to enter the banking business limit competition within the banking industry; in fact, any time one of the agencies exercises its power to deny a bank charter, it limits competition within the industry.

It stands to reason that S. 1698, by divesting the Federal courts of jurisdiction to consider bank mergers under the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act and by vesting the sole authority to permit or prohibit bank mergers in the regulatory agencies, will increase the number of bank mergers that are ultimately condoned. Under the Bank Merger Act of 1960 as construed by the U.S. Supreme Court, bank mergers could be prohibited by the regulatory agencies or by Federal courts. S. 1698 in eliminating the possibility of the prohibition of bank mergers by the Federal courts will certainly increase the number of bank mergers that are ultimately approved.

Small companies and individuals will be the ones who will suffer from this. Bank mergers create bigger banks. In a tight money market, the bigger banks will prefer their large corporate customers to their small business and individual customers.

During the tight money market of 1959, I learned, as a borrowing officer of substantial amounts for a small automobile sales finance company, that big banks had granted unsolicited lines of credit to large corporations prior to 1959 in order to attract their accounts. When the tight money market arrived, these corporations began, for the first time, to use their lines of credit. I was warned by bank officers that we might get squeezed out to make room for the large corporations. I was able to hold on to our credit by the skin of my teeth, but only after taking the regular rise in interest costs which occurred at that time and an additional cost of 25 percent penalty. Some other small companies were squeezed out completely. During this same period, we had much less trouble from small banks. Small banks have no choice, they must, in but exceptional cases, do business with smaller companies and people.

Every bank merger eliminates at least one bank from the banking industry. Every time that a bank is eliminated the public has one less bank to which it can present a loan request. This does not affect large corporations, but for smaller businesses and individuals, it may mean the difference between obtaining a loan on the one hand and going under on the other hand.

S. 1698 should be defeated.

Congress should not, however, stop there. It should also repeal the Bank Merger Act of 1960.

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, the sponsor of S. 1698, has stated: "The decisions of the Supreme Court in the Philadelphia and Lexington cases imposed on bank mergers the strict standards of section 7 of the Clayton Act and what apparently have become the equally strict standards of the Sherman Act. Clearly, these decisions have changed the situation on which the Bank Merger Act was based. If these cases had been decided before 1959, the Bank Merger Act would have been considered unnecessary."

Now that those cases have been decided, the Bank Merger Act of 1960 is as unnecessary today as it would have been in 1960 had those cases been decided before 1959.

Bank mergers should be measured by the same standards that mergers in other industries are measured by. It should be left to the Justice Department to determine initially whether a bank merger violates the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act and, upon the institution of suit by the Justice Department, to enjoin a bank merger or to divest banks which have already merged, it should be left to the Federal courts to decide whether the merger should be permitted or prohibited. Let the banking supervisory agencies regulate in those areas in which they are well equipped to regulate. But if competition is to be preserved and the public interest protected, do not give them the authority to permit banks to merge.

WATER CONSERVATION

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, in our land of abundance, it seems strange that customers in New York restaurants are not served water unless they ask for it.

This brings home to all of us, however, the need for conservation of our natural resources.

We are now taking two important steps: we are going to clean up this Nation's polluted streams, and we are going to make desalting feasible.

A recent article in the Sharon, Pa., Herald, hails these advances and notes the President's admonition that "aggressive conservation measures" are needed and must be taken. Because the editorial will be of general interest, I insert it in the RECORD:

WATER CONSERVATION EFFORTS: WASHINGTON TAKES A HAND

> The hearings on Hudson River pollution which opened Tuesday emphasize the increasingly active role of the Federal Government in water policy. U.S. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John W. Gardner in announcing the hearings called the fouling of the Hudson "a shocking example of the destruction of resources that are vital to the health and welfare of our people." The U.S. Public Health Service said that the river now carries pollution from the equivalent of 10 million people.
>
> The Federal Government's growing water role is largely a matter of lack of local responsibility and inability of States and localities to settle their differences over water use. By historical accident, great river systems of the continental United States are boundaries between various States, between the United States and Mexico, and in part between the United States and Canada. These rivers are thus subject to Federal jurisdiction, in whole or in part, under the commerce clause of the Constitution.
>
> The Potomac River Basin, for example, runs into four States. Federal, State, and local officials are now working together toward a plan for rescuing the river from pollution and siltation. The planners, incidentally, oppose major reservoirs proposed by the Army Engineers, but encourage development of a network of small headwater impoundments.
>
> The recent drought may prove to be not an unmixed disaster. For one thing, it gave urgency to the search for a cheap way to desalt water. Congress completed action last month on a bill to enlarge and extend the saline water program through fiscal 1972. President Johnson at the same time told Federal officials concerned with the research to proceed "as if you knew that you were going to run out of drinking water in the next 6 months."
>
> The drought also made cooperation among States, localities, and the Federal Government more urgent. Congress took a modest step recently toward formulating a national water policy. The Water Resources Planning Act of 1965, approved by the President in July, gave statutory authority to the existing ad hoc water resources council created by President Kennedy 4 years ago.
>
> President Johnson has outlined an emergency water program for the New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and Pennsylvania area. This effort will not provide a permanent solution to the problems of the Delaware and Hudson basins, of course; to succeed at all it must be accompanied, the President said, by "aggressive conservation measures."

VIETNAM: THE DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the demonstrations against the war in Vietnam which were held in several cities across our country this last weekend, including my own district in California, have generated feelings ranging from fervent support to outright hostility. They have stirred many comments and raised many questions. But let us take a minute to put the issue in perspective.

The right of protest, dissent, and free speech is, of course, a tradition of our society and a guarantee of our Constitution. Of no less importance is our traditional respect for and our reliance on a system of law and order. It seems almost needless to say, but perhaps it bears repeating at this time, that both have contributed to make our country what it is today; that neither can be compromised at the expense of the other; that both must be respected and sustained.

The war in Vietnam is most certainly a vital national issue. It both deserves and demands public thought and comment. But if this comment and participation is to be constructive it must be conducted in a lawful and a responsible manner. The very values of our form of government and our way of life require no less.

In commenting on the demonstrations, the Washington Post quite correctly stated this morning:

> That small minority can be and ought to be allowed to exercise all the liberties of free assembly and free speech that it needs to make its case known; and it ought to be denied only such means of publicizing its point of view as genuinely conflict with military security and public safety.

But, the terrible irony of the demonstrations this last week is, as the distinguished columnist and associate editor of the New York Times—Mr. James Reston—pointed out yesterday:

> They (the demonstrators) are inadvertently working against all the things they want, and creating all the things they most fear. They are not promoting peace but postponing it. They are not persuading the President or the Congress to end the war, but deceiving Ho Chi Minh and General Giap into prolonging it.

The awful paradox, as Mr. Reston goes on, is that—

> The Communists reject the negotiations the demonstrators in the United States want. They reject the negotiations the American Government has offered, and the demonstrators are protesting, not against the nation that is continuing the war but against their own country that is offering to make peace.

Or as the Washington Post stated it:

> If the demonstrations did little mischief and caused little misunderstanding in this country they may have done quite a bit of mischief abroad. * * * The demonstrators may have revived the hopes and prolonged the resistance of the Vietcong.

For the record is quite clear that Hanoi and the Vietcong, despite the American military buildup which has blunted their long-expected monsoon offensive and despite a very recent and intensive 10-week diplomatic effort on our part, have evidenced no interest at all in reducing the fighting or coming to the conference table.

Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Reston's thoughtful article along with the Washington Post's timely comment for the careful consideration of our colleagues and all other concerned Americans.

I would also like to take this opportunity once again to state my belief that the United States measured response is the only reasonable alternative to Communist aggression and terror and subversion in Vietnam. I would like to state my strong and continued support for negotiations which can end the war and insure the people of South Vietnam self-determination under United Nations guarantees at the earliest possible time. And I would like to urge, despite the Communist's continued intransigence and the apparent turning of the military tide, that we continue to mount the diplomatic offensive which is absolutely essential if peace is to be secured, independent choice guaranteed and the great task of building and rebuilding begun.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 17, 1965]

WASHINGTON: THE STUPIDITY OF INTELLIGENCE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, October 16.—It is not easy, but let us assume that all the student demonstrators against the war in Vietnam are everything they say they are: sincerely for an honorable peace; troubled by the bombing of the civil population of both North and South Vietnam; genuinely afraid that we may be trapped into a hopeless war with China; and worried about the power of the President and the Pentagon and the pugnacious bawling patriotism of many influential men in the Congress.

A case can be made for it. In a world of accidents and nuclear weapons and damn fools, even a dreaming pacifist has to be answered. And men who want peace, defy the Government, and demonstrate for the support of the Congress, are not only within their rights but must be heard.

THE PARADOX

The trouble is that they are inadvertently working against all the things they want, and creating all the things they fear the most. They are not promoting peace but postponing it. They are not persuading the President or the Congress to end the war, but deceiving Ho Chi Minh and General Giap into prolonging it. They are not proving the superior wisdom of the university community but unfortunately bringing it into serious question.

When President Johnson was stubbornly refusing to define his war aims in Vietnam, and rejecting all thought of a negotiated settlement, the student objectors had a point, and many of us here in the Washington press corps and the Washington political community supported them, but they are now out of date. They are making news, but they are not making sense.

HEART OF THE PROBLEM

The problem of peace now lies not in Washington but in Hanoi, and probably the most reliable source of information in the Western world about what is going on there is the Canadian representative on the Vietnam International Control Commission, Blair Seaborn.

He flies regularly to the North Vietnamese capital with the Polish and Indian members of that commission, and he is personally in favor of an honorable negotiated peace in Vietnam. He is a cultivated man and a professional diplomat. He knows all the mistakes we have made, probably in more detail than all the professors in all the teach-ins in all the universities of this country. What he finds in Hanoi, however, is a total misconception of American policy, and, particularly, a powerful conviction among Communist officials there that the antiwar demonstrations and editorials in the United States will force the American Government to give up the fight.

Not even the conscientious objectors on the picket lines in this country really believe that they have the power or the support to bring about any such result, but Hanoi apparently believes it and for an interesting reason.

Ho Chi Minh and the other Communist leaders in Hanoi remember that they defeated the French in Vietnam between 1950 and 1953 at least partly because of opposition to the Vietnam war inside France. The Communists won the propaganda battle in Paris before they won the military battle at Dienbienphu.

COUNTING ON PROTEST

Now they think they see the same surge of protest working against the Government in Washington, no matter what Mr. Seaborn says to the contrary. They have not been able to challenge American air, naval, or even ground power effectively since midsummer in South Vietnam, but they apparently still have the hope that the demonstrations against the Johnson administration in the United States will in the end give them the victory they cannot achieve on the battlefield.

So the Communists reject the negotiations the demonstrators in the United States want. They reject the negotiations the American Government has offered, and the demonstrators are protesting, not against the nation that is continuing the war but against their own country that is offering to make peace.

Not surprisingly, this is creating an ugly situation here in Washington. Instead of winning allies in the Congress to change the Johnson policy, the demonstrators are encouraging the very war psychology they denounce.

WRONG OBJECTIVES

Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, is now demanding that the administration pull up the antidraft movement "by the roots and grind it to bits."

Honest conscientious objectors are being confused with unconscientious objectors, hangers-on, intellectual graduate school draft-dodgers, and rent-a-crown boobs who will demonstrate for or against anything. And the universities and the Government's policy are being hurt in the process.

So there are now all kinds of investigations going on or being planned to find out who and what are behind all these demonstrations on the campuses. It is a paradoxical situation, for it is working not for intelligent objective analysis of the problem, which the university community of the Nation is supposed to represent, not for peace, which the demonstrators are demanding, but in both cases for precisely the opposite.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 18, 1965]

THE DEMONSTRATORS

The meaning of the demonstrations against the war in Vietnam will be understood in this country. The pressure groups mobilized by the National Coordinating Committee To End the War in Victnam are familiar here. All the expected elements were included, from Communists whose purpose is to destroy this country to earnest pacifists motivated by patriotic impulses.

The demonstrations revealed what the polls have long shown, that the determined popular opposition to the policy of the Government of the United States in South Vietnam has diminished to that irreducible dissenting minimum inevitable in a democratic society. That small minority can be and ought to be allowed to exercise all the liberties of free assembly and free speech that it needs to make its case known; and it ought to be denied only such means of publicizing its point of view as genuinely conflict with military security and public safety. The police, in most cities, seem to have dealt with the demonstrators and spectators with commendable restraint and patience and success. It is gratifying to know that we live in a country where the smallest minorities are free to disclose sentiments against the policies of the Government.

If the demonstrations did little mischief and caused little misunderstanding in this country they may have done quite a bit of mischief abroad. The National Liberation Front, for many long months, has been counting on public opinion in the United States to accomplish what it has been unable to achieve by armed force. Its officials have been sustained by the belief that American public opinion will do for them what French public opinion did for the Vietminh. They are bound to see the straggling marchers, the ineffectual protest meetings, and the feeble demonstrations through prisms made out of their own narrow and restricted experience. They imagine that the United States is governed by a ruling elite or clique ruling as precariously as did Diem or the colonial puppets of France. And they fancy that such a government can be toppled by a handful of pickets and marchers.

So the demonstrators may have revived the hopes and prolonged the resistance of the Vietcong. The Communists who marched on Saturday, of course, will be delighted to have this happen. But it must be confusing to the liberals and real pacifists who sincerely desire the end of the war to realize that demonstrations such as theirs are the chief hope of the National Liberation Front for prolonging the war. It probably will take a few more months of fighting than it otherwise would have taken to bring the NLF to the conference table. This cannot be what most of the unsophisticated young people wish to accomplish.

VIETNAM PROTESTS

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I was interested to read in the paper this morning that President Johnson's pastor, the Reverend Dr. George R. Davis, in his sermon yesterday, strongly criticized Saturday's demonstrations in protest to the United States helping defend South Vietnam.

I am sure that most Americans, although they must defend the right of petition and peaceful assembly, will agree with Dr. Davis, or will at least consider these demonstrators as doing a great disservice to the cause of freedom. Meanwhile, as Dr. Davis pointed out, to uphold democracy, some free Nation has got to stand—as he said—at the ramparts.

Speaking as a Republican who supports the administration's policy, I abhor war—as does everyone else—but right now, we must put freedom first. I think that military assistance to South Vietnam is the shortest way and the best hope of lasting world peace.

THE COMMUNISTS GAIN: FREEDOM LOSES IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC—ANOTHER LAOS IN THE MAKING?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, many Latin American editors meeting in San Diego apparently confirmed what I have been saying for some time about the results of the United States yielding to Communist demands after military intervention in the Dominican Republic, that is, that the strength of the Communists is greater now that it was prior to our intervention.

I quote from the following article contained in the Washington Post of October 18, 1965, written by Robert H. Estabrook:

> Many (Latin American editors) believe that the danger of Communist domination in the Dominican Republic is greater today than at the time of the American intervention last April.

Likewise, the editors apparently also "are not very enthusiastic about social reform as a means of coping with it—Communist subversion—throughout Latin America."

This is an amazing exposé of the shortcomings of our Alliance for Progress program.

It appears obvious that our entire Latin American policies need a thorough review and a complete shakeup. Likewise, it is obvious that our intervention in the Dominican Republic has been a complete failure based upon the announced purpose of the intervention, that is, to stop a Communist takeover. The result instead has been that the Communists have a voice in the government, that the anti-Communist military leaders have been forced out of the country as a part of a secret deal, that the strong anti-Communist press has not been permitted to start publication, although a pro-Communist paper "Patria" is flourishing, and equally reprehensibly former President Juan Bosch has returned triumphantly to the country. Also the pro-Communists have apparently organized as Murder Incorporated as evidenced by the killing of Angel Severo Cabral, one of the outstanding conservative leaders. The Communists and the rebels are also trying to take over the university.

Is a Latin American Laos in the making as the result of our policies?

I insert the articles which I would suggest that all Members of Congress heed:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 18, 1965]

Tension Up Again After Dominican Rightist's Slaying

(By Clyde Sanger, Manchester Guardian)

Santo Domingo, October 17.—Just when many people here were welcoming a significant relaxation after 6 months of strife, the murder of a leading rightwing politician has filled the Dominican situation with new tension.

Angel Severo Cabral, killed yesterday, was secretary general of the National Civic Union, whose candidate ran a poor second to Juan Bosch in the December 1962 presidential elections. Severo Cabral became Minister of the Interior when Bosch was overthrown 2 years ago and some people had recently spoken of him as a possible presidential candidate in the elections due next summer.

Relaxation had come with the rebel agreement to move the 1,400 troops which had held the 500-acre downtown section of this city in Bosch's name since the revolution began in April.

On Thursday these forces moved into a suburban barracks ready to be reintegrated into their old units. The next day the barricades were removed in the divided city and soldiers of the inter-American peace force—now reduced to 10.200 men—were being withdrawn to less conspicuous positions.

Ironically Severo Cabral's murder was a result of this unfreezing of the situation. On Friday his 26-year-old daughter visited the family apartment downtown to see what had happened to the furniture during the 6 months the area had been cut off. She found a revolutionary living there who said he had been given the furniture by orders of Montes Arache, a rebel military leader.

Yesterday against the pleading of the rest of the family Severo Cabral went there to claim his property. An ugly quarrel began, aggravated by a large crowd which swarmed over from a week-long hunger strike demonstration against a peanut oil manufacturer in the main square.

When Severo Cabral decided to leave by a back alley he was shot in the shoulder by a machinegunner. While lying wounded in the back of a van, which was to have taken him to a hospital, he was killed by another man with a pistol. His daughter, who twice threw herself over his body to shield him, was slightly wounded, as was his wife.

(Cabral was buried in a brief service at Santo Domingo's national cemetery, according to news dispatches. Dominican authorities were reported to have ordered the arrest of persons believed implicated in the assassination of Cabral, a distant relative of deposed triumvirate President Donald Reid Cabral.)

(Cabral followers burned a jeep belonging to Radio Santo Domingo and shouted "down with communism." Meanwhile, the headquarters of another radio station, Radio Cristal, was machinegunned from a passing car, presumably by rightwing sympathizers, according to the dispatches.)

The fear of reprisals hangs heavy here today. There may even be danger to the life of Juan Bosch, who returned from exile 3 weeks ago and has been working in a small downtown office guarded by "constitutionalist" supporters.

Another incident that has raised tension is the struggle for control of the semiautonomous University of Santo Domingo. During the heated days of the revolution some professors combined with most of the students to repudiate the university council and occupy the university site in the name of the revolution.

In attempting a comeback, the legal rector called a council meeting last weekend but it failed to gather a quorum. On Thursday, he announced he was charging the revolutionary group before the public prosecutor with usurpation of functions and illegal occupation.

Yesterday, at a second gathering of his council his supporters claimed there was the necessary 60 percent quorum while his opponents denied it. The building where the council met was patrolled by armed vigilante groups of rightwing support.

The provisional government of Hector Garcia Godoy, although in general sympathy with Bosch's constitutionality movement, has been tacitly supporting the old group at the university against the majority of the students.

Yesterday's council meeting could spark off action by students against Garcia Godoy's government. Until now the 5,000 students have been quietly attending classes. The campus is widely decorated with anti-American placards. What may restrain action is realization that rightwing tempers are also rising after the murder of Severo Cabral.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 18, 1965]

Editors See Latin Red Problem

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

San Diego.—Latin American editors view Communist subversion as the biggest problem in the Western Hemisphere, but they are not very enthusiastic about social reform as a means of coping with it.

Many also believe that the danger of Communist domination in the Republican Republic is greater today than at the time of the American intervention last April.

These are the principal conclusions invited by the meeting of the Inter-American Press Association just completed here. Some 190 editors from North and South America were among the 400 participants.

EFFECTS OF U.S. POLICY

Talks with editors of many nationalities also lead to several other conclusions about the effect of American policy:

There is a consensus that the Dominican intervention was necessary to forestall another Cuba, although some are critical of the method and others blame the United States for not finishing the job.

There is a general feeling that the recent critical speech by Senator J. William Fulbright, Democrat, of Arkansas, raised unnecessary questions and had a mischievous effect because of his position as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. One Panamanian, however, commented that "Fulbright agreed with me."

Opinion is sharply divided about the Selden resolution passed by the House of Representatives, which appeared to sanction unilateral military intervention to deal with Communist subversion. Some think that the effect of the resolution was exaggerated. Individual editors from Argentina, Honduras, and Mexico reported no special concern in their localities. But the resolution caused impassioned reactions in Chile, Colombia, Panama, and Peru, among other places.

VIEWS ON DOMINICAN ACTION

With respect to the Dominican intervention, one Ecuadoran editor remarked that many of the complaints could have been avoided "if President Johnson had just picked up the telephone and told a couple of Latin American Presidents what he was doing and why. He would not even have needed to ask them. Or he could have done the same thing by calling in a few ambassadors."

Others, however, feel that the United States has been too apologetic and should not have stopped short. They shrug off Latin American criticism as often motivated by domestic political concerns, noting the tendency of some officials to talk one way in private and another in public.

Dominican editors in particular complained that the Communists had used the truce period to consolidate forces and train saboteurs. Three newspapers closed by the rebels last April—El Caribe, Listin Diario, and Prensa Libre—have not yet been enabled to reopen under the provisional government although an overtly Communist organ, Patria, is flourishing.

Whether the preoccupation with Communist subversion rather than with reform is representative of general public opinion in Latin America is open to question.

CONSERVATIVE EDITORS

The IAPA includes such respected figures as Alberto Gainza Paz, editor and publisher of La Prensa of Buenos Aires which was closed by Peron, and Pedro Beltran, editor and publisher of La Prensa of Lima and former Prime Minister of Peru.

Nevertheless, Latin American editors who attended such conferences tend to be a pretty conservative lot. They vigorously applaud a speech by retired American Ambassador Ellis O. Briggs denouncing the emphasis on tax and land reform in the original concept of the Alliance for Progress as revolutionary and dangerous.

Some, however, may have been shy about expressing dissent. "If the man in the street gets the idea that the only people interested in helping him with his problems are the Communists," said one editor privately, "he will want to take their aid and Communist influence will be enhanced."

AGRICULTURAL NEED SEEN

A slightly different slant also came from Roberto Campos, Brazil's energetic Minister of Planning, who contended that "Fidelismo" has lost some of its menace. The great challenge to the Alliance for Progress, he asserted, is to improve agricultural productivity, to absorb rural masses becoming urbanized into national political life, and to supplement economic aid with trade opportunities including higher prices for primary products.

But a tough speech by Under Secretary of State Thomas Mann was right in line with fears of Communist subversion. Mann also was applauded, although a few found him defensive or "not simpatico." The extraordinary lengths to which he went to reply to Fulbright attested how really nettled the administration was by the criticisms, including those from sectors of the American press.

In effect, Mann denied that American policy on nonintervention has changed or that there is such a thing as the Johnson Doctrine. But he left dangling how the problem of subversion is to be countered speedily by collective means.

DANGER OF SUBVERSION

More emphatically, he insisted that the danger of subversion is real in "fragile" societies, and that any cooperation with the Communists is perilous. He quoted from President Kennedy to this effect.

What Mann really seemed to be saying is that reliance on reform through the democratic left is a mere slogan and is not enough to avoid subversion. The hemisphere must look for leadership to strong anti-Communists such as former President Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela or to new forces emerging from the military, the church, and organized labor.

How well such an essentially ideological prescription will capture public imagination is another question. At any rate it did not satisfy a Texas guest who described himself as a cousin of Mann and who provided one of the few notes of levity by charging that both his cousin and Campos had their speeches written for them.

HOUSE MUST STAND FIRM AGAINST DICKEY-LINCOLN SCHOOL PROJECT

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it seems as though a Federal power project has more lives than an alley cat. Our colleagues in the House clearly expressed themselves on September 22 by voting 207 to 185 to approve the amendment by my distinguished colleague and friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] providing for a brief respite so that the Secretary of the Army might make a survey of the St. John River in Maine separate and apart from the Passamaquoddy project. This seemed reasonable to most of us because of the hasty and poorly conceived proposal which had been perpetuated upon the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior.

Now we see the sad spectacle of the proponents of this questionable project attempting to run roughshod over the will of the House of Representatives in the conference report on S. 2300 and force this first step toward Passamaquoddy down our collective throats. To accomplish that end, those proponents have been running around admitting that several of our votes will have to be switched. The Assistant Interior Secretary Kenneth Holum told a dinner group last Saturday night that the Interior Department is "determined to see the Dickey hydroelectric power project on the St. John River become a reality." He said that he believed that some votes have been switched in the House.

Mr. Speaker, let us assure the Assistant Secretary that it is not up to the Department of the Interior to be determined but rather it is up to the Congress to determine whether a project will become a reality.

Several other proponents of this project attempted to tell some of us that the Dickey-Lincoln School project has been thoroughly studied; and, therefore, it is unnecessary to delay its approval any longer. Such a flagrant misuse of the truth I have not seen in my many years as a Member of this body. And, I might say, I am used to the Department of the Interior bending the truth because of my service on the Interior Committee. The Secretary of the Interior admitted during the testimony before the Public Works Committee that the Department of the Interior had not even discussed the possibility of marketing power from this project with any utility in New England. The whole benefit-cost ratio hangs or falls on the ability of the nonexistent power marketing agency in New England to sell this block of power at the allocated price. This issue, obviously, needs more study.

Various witnesses before the committee question the data used by the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers on the study of alternative methods of generation. These data, obviously, need more study.

The combined electric companies of New England have an alternative proposal to supply the power needs of that region more cheaply and more efficiently than the Federal proposal. The companies' proposal was not given sufficient serious consideration. This proposition, obviously, needs more study.

The Secretary of the Interior, in his report to the Congress, said the Passamaquoddy project, which has been studied for half a century, needs more study. Therefore, it is much more reasonable to take the position that the hastily dissected appendage of Passamaquoddy, known as the Dickey-Lincoln School obviously, needs more study.

A recent issue of the magazine, Electric Light and Power, carried a very interesting article on this project. The title of this article is "Federal Power Casts Its Dark Shadow Over New England." So that each of our colleagues may have an opportunity to read this interesting statement, I am incorporating it in my remarks at this point:

> If the proposed Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric project in northern Maine is rammed through Congress, then the love-thirsty, benevolent and politically saturated Great Society leadership in Washington will have planted a seed calculated to sprout deep Federal intrusion into the local affairs of New England and probably additional Eastern States.
>
> The Dickey project is perhaps less needed and more vulnerable to sound economic criticism than any Federal hydro project ever proposed, with the obvious exception of its lately sidetracked twin, the Passamaquoddy tidal project. So the fact that a project as potentially wasteful of the people's money as Dickey should become the vehicle for getting the Federal power foot in the New England door clearly attests to the administration's appraisal of its arm-twisting power in Congress.
>
> Easy justification for pushing Dickey, it might be added, was handed the administration in the form of unwary prodding by New England politicians, particularly those from Maine. In their persistent fretting that it was the Northeast's turn to get a Federal resource development project, these clamor boys tripped over the pitifully shortsighted view that Federal deficit spending for a development such as Dickey would somehow boost the area's economy.
>
> A bit of background is needed to put Dickey in correct perspective. What study and planning the project underwent was in connection with Passamaquoddy, where its prime purpose originally was to provide pumping power to the Federal project. In conformity with established procedure, Interior Department last year submitted a report on the dual Quoddy-Dickey project to the affected Federal agencies and States for comment. Critical comments from agencies still displaying some professional integrity caved the roof in on Quoddy.
>
> But extension of the Government's power realm and (coincidentally) New England's cry for a big Federal project were not to be denied. Deftly unhitched from Quoddy, Dickey was plunked on the President's desk last July by Interior Secretary Stewart Udall, with a recommendation for independent development. No detailed studies had been made of the project to operate as a single unit, and no report on the revised proposal had been sent to affected Federal agencies and States for comment, as required by law. Yet the President immediately approved Mr. Udall's recommendation and submitted Dickey, appropriately blessed, to Congress. There it was tacked onto the already well-advanced omnibus rivers and harbors bill and was whisked through the Senate without even a hearing.
>
> During a subsequent hearing before the House Public Works Committee, however, New England power company witnesses undressed Dickey for those who wanted to see. It was shown that this $300-million, 794-megawatt development on the St. John River in the northern wilds of Maine would be an outright power project, with power accounting for nearly 98 percent of its benefits. It was shown, too, that Dickey power will not be low-cost power because if the project is kept within even the most liberal payout schedule, its output must bring a price higher than power produced by investor utilities in the area.
>
> These New England utilities, incidentally, estimated they will achieve rate reductions of at least 30 percent by 1980 through current and future development of atomic power and pumped storage. Moreover, the companies' plans call for addition by 1969 of modern low-cost thermal plant, conventional and nuclear, which will provide an increase in generating capacity of more than 40 percent and will materially lower power costs in the area. Thus, it was shown that Dickey would be obsolete long before the earliest operational date (1971).
>
> An astounding line of testimony came from Interior witnesses, who admitted that no power marketing plans for the project had been developed, and that the possibility of the sale of the power had not been discussed with any utility people in New England. Nor had any plan been drawn up for the location of transmission lines. Strange pro-

cedure, indeed, considering that some 90 percent of the power would have to be marketed outside of Maine.

What should have been a clinching factor against Dickey was the offer by a group of New England utilities to furnish a far cheaper alternative. This would be a combination nuclear-power pumped storage development estimated to cost approximately $71 million including transmission facilities, compared with Dickey's $300 million price tag. Annual cost of producing power at the alternate facility would be approximately 27 percent less, including taxes, and nearly 50 percent less, excluding taxes, than the estimated annual cost for Dickey.

Another dismal facet of Dickey's economic image is that the project would get the usual substantial, taxpayer-borne interest subsidy and would contribute nothing in the way of national or regional taxes.

If Dickey required the approval of some expert and objective licensing authority, it doubtless wouldn't have a shadow of a chance. But, authorization by a body ruled largely by politics, not statesmanship, is quite another thing. The project was included in the rivers and harbors bill reported favorably last month, on a close vote, by the House Public Works Committee. Prompt approval is expected, provided logrolling legislation does not get snarled up in the Rules Committee.

Construction of Dickey would be a first step toward almost endless possibilities for Federal power activity in the East. Certain to be formed would be a Northeastern Power Administration to take over the so-called marketing. (And if the power couldn't be peddled at cost, it would in all likelihood go for less than cost, as has been the case at Bonneville.) The full import of such a setup shows clearly in the light of Interior's intention to launch a study of an EHV grid for New England, looking to the possibility of tying in with other area power systems and maybe Canadian systems. Interior's plan also includes continued study and possible redesign of Quoddy to give further consideration to the project's economic benefits "associated with recreation, economic development, and elimination of poverty in the region."

It is no secret, either, that Interior is interested in pumped storage in New England and has far more than a passing interest in the power that may be brought down from Labrador's Churchill Falls.

Should the Government get a solid power foothold in this yet unfederalized area, it would not be beyond reason to expect that its tie-ins eventually would extend from New England to the Tennessee Valley Authority and beyond. And it's a safe bet that somewhere in the process the taxpayer will be shoved between the proverbial irresistible force and immovable object.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the question of the Dickey-Lincoln School project will be before this body again tomorrow in the conference report on S. 2300. At that time, it is my sincere hope that the Members of the House of Representatives will again stand firm in their resolve that the project must be further studied. It seems to me to be in rather poor legislative taste to have Members of the other body, where this project was not even considered in open hearing nor discussed in open debate before its approval, attempt to force their will on the Members of this body, where, after thorough discussion in open hearings, and extended debate on the floor of this Chamber, the decision was made that further study was required. We must stand firm.

THE 129TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF ELLEN BROWNING SCRIPPS

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that today is the 129th anniversary of the birth of Ellen Browning Scripps. Mrs. Scripps was born in London, England, and came to this country early in life. She was associated with the Detroit Tribune, the Detroit News, and was one of the founders of the Cleveland Penny Press. Miss Scripps was an outstanding newspaperwoman and her column, "Miss Ellen's Miscellany" was the beginning of what is now known as newspaper features.

She and her brother, Edward Willis Scripps, amassed a great fortune in the newspaper field and, in 1890, Miss Scripps moved to southern California and established her home, in 1897, in La Jolla, Calif. At that time, she was 61 years of age and she dedicated the rest of her life to philanthropy.

Many of the institutions which she founded and endowed are of international reputation. Among these are the La Jolla Scripps Metabolic Clinic, the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, the Scripps Clinic and Research Foundation, and the Scripps Memorial Hospital. Other public contributions included the Torrey Pines State Park, the La Jolla Public Playground and Community Center, the La Jolla Woman's Club House, the children's pool, Scripps Field, the tower and carillon, and the La Jolla Public Library. She also established the Bishop's School.

Here let me interject a personal note. The Bishop's School is always referred to as the Bishop's School for Girls. One of my nieces attended this school. When I came to Washington, D.C., in 1953, one of my first acquaintances was Congressman FRANK T. Bow, of Ohio. He knew that I came from southern California and he said, "I attended the Bishop's School," and I replied, "FRANK, that is a school for girls. How did you get in?" He informed me that, when he was a boy, the Bishop's School was coeducational and he was a student. When it changed from coeducational to a girl's school, I do not know.

The city of San Diego, of which La Jolla is a part, did, by resolution, designate today as "Ellen Browning Scripps Day" in recognition of her outstanding philanthropy, which included much more than I have narrated above. I know of no other woman in history who has contributed so much of herself or of her substance to the betterment of mankind.

Miss Scripps died in La Jolla on August 3, 1932, at the age of 96 years. Her name will long live in the memory of man, and especially in the memory of La Jollans. I am happy to join in the tribute to her.

THE XB–70A HITS MACH 3

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, history was made last week at Edwards Air Force Base in California. The world's most advanced aircraft, the XB–70A, made its 17th flight, and in the process compiled some staggering statistics.

With a gross weight of over 500,000 pounds, the XB–70A climbed to an altitude of 70,000 feet— and attained a speed of mach 3, or three times the speed of sound. In this 1 hour and 47 minute-flight, which began last Thursday, October 14, 1965, at 12:07 p.m., e.d.s.t., the huge XB–70A research plane was piloted by North American Aviation Chief Pilot Alvin S. White and Col. Joseph Cotton, chief XB–70 project pilot for the U.S. Air Force.

Last Thursday's flight was the first time that this magnificent aircraft attained its designed cruise speed of over 2,000 miles per hour, and this achievement is of great significance in aviation, for it is this same cruise speed that our supersonic transports will someday attain.

About 70 percent of the XB–70A, which was built by North American Aviation, is made of stainless steel honeycomb—the first time such a form of steel has ever been used. The entire forward section of the craft is made of titanium, a metal which can withstand temperatures much higher than those which can be tolerated by aluminum. Featured in the airplane are the most sophisticated hydraulic and electrical systems ever devised—an electrical system that can withstand temperatures of 600° and the first 4,000-pound-per-square-inch hydraulic system. The cabin environmental system will allow the crew to fly in the comfort of 70° and 8,000-foot cabin pressure, even though the actual altitude is about 70,000 feet and the skin temperature of the aircraft is above 630°.

Mr. Speaker, this plane has been flying for exactly 1 year, and the officials and employees of North American Aviation, Inc., are to be congratulated for this remarkable contribution to America's future. The research data gathered is the most significant information applicable to the U.S. supersonic transport program which is so vital to our Nation.

The pilots of this aircraft, and all of those who have worked on the important XB–70 program, deserve the praise of a Nation which is grateful for the contributions these people have made toward the advancement of aeronautical science.

In view of the remarkable achievements of the XB–70A, it seems incredible that this aircraft will not go into production. Two of these planes have been built, but the Secretary of Defense has not seen fit to put this aircraft into use, and it was only after a long, hard struggle that authority was given for the construction of these two experimental models. The more this aircraft flies, the more conquests it makes—and the more Secretary McNamara's decision seems unexplainable.

THEY ARE NOT ALL "PEACENIKS"

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the whistles could be heard from New York to California this past weekend as police tried to keep protesting "peaceniks" in line and prevent riots. It is getting to be a weekend thing to do—staging demonstrations and marches against our involvement in Vietnam's struggle with the Communists.

Whether you live in the big city, in a small town, or even out in the wide open country, you are never far from a lively demonstration. There is no admission charge. All one has to do to join the crowd is to abuse some of the great privileges he has as an American citizen.

As thousands of would-be rioters waged protests in the streets and public squares of our Nation, a quiet dignified group of over 700 young students in Knoxville, Tenn., were also speaking their opinions and backing their Government. They are for freedom. They are against communism. They respect and love their country. They are proud to say: "I am an American." They are not just followers of the crowd. They are not just "out for kicks." They realize the sorrows of families who have members serving in Vietnam. They are supporting these soldiers. They themselves are willing to fight for freedom and against hunger and communism or any other threat to happy and productive lives for all.

There is a great contrast here—between those protesting our service in Vietnam and those who speak out in favor of our fight against communism. I would like to point to specific incidents to show you this vast difference between these two groups of our young society. I think the thousands who marched throughout our Nation, from east to west, in protest of our policy in Vietnam should be ashamed of their actions. But, I am very proud of the young people, their teachers, and ministers who, in dignified ceremony, paid respect to our Nation and thanked the brave men who are making great sacrifices in Vietnam.

The students at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville, led by their student president and other campus leaders, let their fellow citizens know that they were for peace and behind their Nation's efforts in Vietnam. Their ceremony was quiet, reverent, dignified, patriotic. This large student gathering on October 14 opened with a solemn pledge of allegiance to the flag as Old Glory unfurled from many directions, displayed by proud Army and Air Force color guards.

The students' leader, David White, president of the student government association, introduced the program:

> This is a memorial to our men who have been killed and others who are serving there for each of us.

After short talks and prayers, the University of Tennessee students and many University of Tennessee administrators stood in hushed silence for meditation as the sound of taps was heard across the campus.

The University of Tennessee vote of confidence for the U.S. fight against Communist aggressors was echoed by other groups this weekend. Perhaps the one drawing the largest representation was the reverse teach-in held in our Nation's Capital. Six University of Tennessee students joined college students from throughout the country for a peaceful program in support of the war against the Vietcong.

Let us look at some other scenes of this past weekend. For example, in New York, our largest, most bustling city, an estimated 10,000 marchers protesting U.S. policy in Vietnam swept down famous Fifth Avenue. Unapproving and irritated lookers-on threw red paint at the demonstrators, and even tried to attack them. In Berkeley, Calif., scene of repeated demonstrations, a march was staged. Broken up just as it reached the Oakland city limits, it already had resulted in injury to several of the participants who engaged in scuffles with nondemonstrators, and one police officer was carried away with a broken leg.

But wherever they marched—New York, California, or even in Trafalgar Square, London—the demonstrators met opposition from Americans who are supporting their Nation and who are not afraid to say so. Above the roar of the crowds can be heard such disturbed shouts as "back our troops in Vietnam, you traitors."

Americans have always stood by their Nation through bad times as well as the good times. There has always been thankfulness for our great heritage and for our many freedoms. It is encouraging now to know that the loud, protesting youth are in the minority. They make a lot of noise and they cause a lot of damage to persons and property, but what they say and do cannot override the patriotism of proud Americans.

I am a proud American, happy to represent such dignified young people as those who attend the University of Tennessee. Their demonstration in Knoxville will not win our struggle in Vietnam, but multiply it a few times, and it will be a tremendous boost to our Nation's policy and most of all to the brave Americans who are serving there for each of us.

VACATION OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the special order previously granted to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CROPLAND RESTORATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, not long ago a Washington newsletter described a "new policy on agriculture" being quietly developed, the scope of which would include: first, the gradual abolishment of production controls; second, the encouragement of greater production; and, third, a vast food bank for the underfed.

I think all would agree that our so-called omnibus farm bill finally approved by the Congress a few days ago will not achieve any of these ends, but that bill does include a title and provision, which, if properly expanded and modified, can bring us closer to the goal of a workable farm policy that will not only benefit the farmer but the consumer human beings throughout the world who depend on him—that farmer—for their food and fiber.

One of the titles of the omnibus farm bill entitled "cropland adjustment" calls for conversion of so-called unneeded cropland to vegetative cover, water storage facilities, or other soil, water, wildlife, or forest conserving uses with a peak participation of 40 million acres envisioned by 1970. The only word with which I strongly disagree is the word "unneeded." In view of the so-called population explosion, we will not only desperately need this acreage; we will need to convert much of it from marginal land to highly productive land, land capable of producing an abundant quantity of food and fiber at reasonable prices and of high nutritive value to consumers, and above all with a fair return for the farmer. This is important domestically if we are to continue to survive. It is paramount internationally if we are to continue the Public Law 480 program and others and be our brother's keepers around the world.

Towards the general principle of constructive farm legislation I have introduced H.R. 7184, whose dominant theme is not cropland adjustment but, rather, cropland restoration. If the small farmer is given the chance to increase the fertility of his low, inefficient acres through a second market for soil restoration, he is at once placed on the same level with the large commercial farm. In addition, he has the advantage of lower labor costs and bargaining power at a level which will keep him in business. Large commercial farms may also take advantage of this second market, but their costs of labor, management, and capital will perhaps be higher. There is an additional advantage, Mr. Speaker. The farmer will have multiple options at the time the Government assayer comes around to review the cover crop and cut a swath and measure the value he will assign to the farmer for a short ton of coverage crop plowed under each year. He may plow it under, and accept the estimated base of $25 per ton from a grateful Government for a restorative practice. He may say, "No, I will use it for the fertility of my own soil" and benefit therefrom in a second crop this year. He may say, "No, I will plow it under for next year." Or, finally, he may harvest it for a seed crop, which will itself be invaluable in this expanded program. And different cover crops could be used in different areas of the Nation. But suffice it to say on a voluntary basis, on carefully analyzed scientific surveys made to date, over 60 million acres would immediately be placed in this cropland restoration.

Now, we cannot and should not stop a trend to more efficiency, but the Federal Government can and should protect a resource, our soil, which is literally "our margin of life," that is being mined on about a 7-to-1 ratio of essential replacements.

The bill I submitted offers an incentive for doing it on a voluntary basis, in place of force; steadily increasing population will justify the effort either now or later, and later would be at a much greater cost. All land-grant colleges of agriculture already know, and have proof positive, that the productive capacity of the soil will go down as more plant food is taken from it than has been returned, even in fertilizers. We have in the past and are now using 3 to 7 times, as I have stated above, as much soil plant food as we are returning in fertilizers, manures, legumes, and other restoratives.

In addition, the soil body, which is our Nation's basic natural resource, is washing away in silt down the rivers, into the gulfs, into the oceans. Thus more fertility is lost. Thirty years of work by the Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture conservation practices, Public Law 566, and other agencies, helpful as they have been, is still a long way from being nationally implemented by all.

Government programs have rewarded farmers for growing more from less acres, by fixing prices above the consumer demand and thus creating surpluses. This is the opposite of soil conservation. It is soil destruction, subsidized by consumer taxes.

In a sound soil restoration program, the same tax money rewards farmers for returning fertility at a minimum-wage level, that gives the consumer a chance to influence the price of agricultural products. And all through this treatise today I hope you will realize that we are trying to raise the productive income of the farmer, establish a farmer-urban relationship and still protect the consumer in the metropolitan areas. Both bids—government or consumer—encourage the use of more soil plant food, because it is profitable for the farmer to return less than he takes.

In H.R. 7184, the Government bids against the consumer for "land use." His use of land, necessary and vital though it is, is also destructive in the sense that it removes nutrients from the soil and converts them into food and fiber for consumption by the consumer. In a true cropland restoration program, the Government bids for restoring the soil, so that a balance will result; that is restoration versus destruction.

The needs of the present generation are weighed in the marketplace against the needs of succeeding generations. The market price which the Government sets for soil restoration for future generations competes against the market price which the present generation is willing to offer for farm production. Thus, we would have a constant soil bank of marginal land being restored to active duty, and a constant bank of good soil being used for present production needs. Contrariwise the present system produces surpluses and related expense on the taxpayers. Our plan automatically eliminates them.

When the Government bid is made at the land-use level, as it is in the second market described in this bill, the values of abundance, better quality, and local economic adjustment can be included for the consumer—something that cannot be accomplished by present legislation.

I submit that it takes no concept of, and gives no recourse to the consumer in the omnibus bill.

My bill reaches down into the land which is in dire trouble, which the plow, the rubber-tired tractor and the hybrids, under man's control have exploited and which acres only the farmer can find and control on the basis of his local costs and markets.

If, indeed, a new agricultural policy is to be developed, as the editorial I referred to in the beginning states and as, indeed, I believe it must, then a cropland restoration program, offering a second market to lower the marginal farmer's cost of production, must be considered.

Such a program must protect our potential to produce, must give the farmer a chance to adjust his costs against the price the Government will pay, and give the family farm a chance to compete in the restoration of land, with the corporation and others looking for income tax relief.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the favorable consideration of this principle, under any Member's name, in the next session of the 89th Congress.

THE ADOPTION OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1965

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 18 of this year I introduced a bill called the Adoption Opportunity Act. Its purpose is to allow a taxpayer who adopts a child to deduct from his gross income the medical, legal, and other expenses incurred in the adoption process.

I sponsored this legislation in the belief that some tax relief is due those couples who choose to adopt a child. Under present law adoption expenses are not deductible.

It is my belief that the situation should be remedied for two principal reasons: First, adoptive parents should, in justice, be given tax treatment at least equal to natural parents who are allowed a deduction on all medical expenses involved in having a baby that are not covered by medical insurance.

Second, the deduction would have the social benefit of encouraging adoptions. Today the number of adoptions is only barely keeping pace with the large number of children available. Many public and private social services report they must carry on active recruitment programs to make sure that the number of applicants do not lag.

Often, it seems, the most desirable adoptive couples are those for whom the extraordinary expenses of an adoption are prohibitive. Young and establishing a household, they may have many other financial obligations. A tax deduction for their expenses might mean the difference between being able to take a child and not being able to.

After introducing this bill, I sent it and my introductory remarks to several hundred public and private adoption and child service agencies, asking for comments.

The response to this proposal, Mr. Speaker, has been truly overwhelming. From all across the United States letters have poured into my office expressing support of the Adoption Opportunity Act, H.R. 8258.

At this point I request permission to include excerpts from some of these letters at the end of my remarks. Coming as they do from persons intimately connected with placing children for adoption, these letters speak more eloquently than ever I could about the need for new legislation allowing a tax deduction for adoption expenses.

Although the letters which I have received on the Adoption Opportunity Act have been favorable almost without exception, some contained suggestions for changes and improvements in the wording of the proposal.

The most common suggestion was that the words "social agency fees" or similar language be added to the definition of adoption expenses in the legislation. Although it seems clear that the bill now would cover such costs, I believe there should be no room for doubt. Therefore, it is my intention to suggest this amendment when the House Ways and Means Committee considers the bill.

Should hearings not be held in the near future, I plan to revise the proposal to reflect this and other suggested changes that have been made to me by persons interested in, and directly connected with, the adoption of children.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I want to reemphasize the need for early passage of the Adoption Opportunity Act. It will go far toward bringing fair tax treatment to adoptive parents and fostering still more adoptions.

At this point, I insert excerpts from letters which I have received on this proposal, and earnestly request the attention of my colleagues to them:

I would hope that the House Ways and Means Committee would give favorable consideration to this piece of legislation when it seeks to amend the Internal Revenue Code.

As license officer for all of the private child-placement and adoption agencies in the District of Columbia, I am well aware of the great need to encourage couples to adopt and also of the financial burden upon them of the necessary expenses incurred. Therefore, it seems to me that your bill would give great and justifiable assistance to couples seeking to provide a home for infants and children in need of adoptive placement.

Mrs. Elizabeth J. Alexander,
License Officer, District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare.

You may be assured that this Office is in favor of your bill and that we will support its passage in any possible way.

Mr. Nicholas Stevenson,
Graham, Stevenson & Griffith.

Chicago.

The members of my staff and myself, as well as a number of the members of my board, are pleased to see the introduction of this particular piece of legislation. * * *

It is already difficult enough to compete with the apparent [sic] unlimited resources available to (public) child welfare service. If, however, our fee were tax deductible, it would make it possible for a larger number of people to continue to use our service. While we are convinced that many people find this a preferable service, we must also face the fact that the cost differential between our own fee and the lack of a fee in most public agencies tends to create a problem for us. * * *

May I * * * state that we are impressed wtih the intent and purpose of your bill for the very reasons that you give as its basis.

Mr. James J. Mallon,
Director, the Children's Bureau of Indianapolis.

I agree that adoptive parents should be given the same consideration as natural parents.

Mary M. Wagner,
Acting Director, Division of Child Welfare Services, Montana Department of Public Welfare.

We believe that the idea is a very commendable one, and the statement which you made in support of it expresses a philosophy and a purpose with which we are very much in accord.

We * * * believe with you that people who adopt children should be able to deduct from taxable income the expenses connected with adoption.

Mr. Frank Newgent,
Director, Division for Children and Youth, Wisconsin Department of Public Welfare.

The philosophy upon which your proposal is based seems sound, and from the point of view of the needs of children available for adoption, I think the publicizing of this legislation would attract the attention of additional adoptive applicants.

Mr. Robert M. Myers,
Executive Secretary, Children's Aid and Family Service, Northampton, Mass.

We do agree in principle that fees for adoption service should be made deductible by amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. * * *

I would like to see (the bill) discussed in our local papers. It merits more publicity. * * *

Most of our local agencies are in great need of more adoptive homes. The ratio of adoptive applicants is declining. Active recruitment programs are needed. Publicity about your bill, and about adoption services, may be a great help in our recruitment efforts.

The Reverend Eldred B. Lesniewski,
Assistant Director, Milwaukee Archdiocese, Catholic Social Services.

We believe that your bill is very sound. There is a sizable expense involved in an adoption and we would believe that this should encourage people to adopt who have small incomes.

Esther Lazarus,
Director, Department of Public Welfare, Baltimore, Md.

We have reviewed (the Adoption Opportunity Act and statement upon introduction) carefully. We believe your points in favor of the act [sic] are sound and that adopting parents should be allowed the tax deductions you propose.

We hope the Congress will see fit to enact this legislation.

Mrs. Alice R. Smith,
Chief, District of Columbia Child Welfare Division.

Your introduction and work for the passage of the Adoption Opportunity Act * * * is appreciated by this Department.

The legal and other expenses involved are deterrents to some couples within the lower economic gorup. * * *

The enactment of H.R. 8258 would be helpful in meeting the problem of an increasing number of children needing adoption.

Mr. Roy S. Nicks,
Commissioner, Tennessee Department of Public Welfare.

As the director of an adoption agency, I wish to commend you for your interest in this matter and the action you are taking. We have felt that there should be an opportunity for persons who adopt children to be allowed tax deductions for the expenses of the adoption.

Mr. Charles B. Olds,
Executive Director, Children's Home Society of Minnesota.

We are very much pleased that your bill gives consideration, for income tax purposes, to adoptive parents for expenses connected with adoptions.

Mr. Roger Gorham,
President, Child and Family Services, Portland, Maine.

Thank you very much for introducing the Adoption Opportunity Act. The many thousands of parents who are adopting children every year in this country would welcome the appropriate tax relief provided in the act.

Mr. C. Rollin Zane,
Executive Director, Children's Services of Connecticut.

I am personally in favor of this bill * * *

We find, as you point out, that adopting parents feel discriminated against in not being allowed tax deductions for the expenses of adoption. They further point out that natural parents can secure insurance to meet medical costs. We have found some couples failing to apply for a second child because of the expense. Tax deductions would help, especially with the young couples who face a promising future but are still in the process of buying homes and furnishings.

Mr. Rollo A. Barnes,
Executive Director, Family and Children's Service of Lancaster County, Pa.

May I commend you on your support of such legislation as those of us who have had considerable experience in the field of adoptive practice have advocated such legislation for years.

In my experience I would concur * * * that adoptive parents should be given at least equal tax treatment as natural parents. My experience includes 25 years of adoptive work in three different States. I feel strongly that by not giving equal tax treatment to adoptive parents we treat the adoptive child differently than we do the natural child. There should be no differential treatment of children, regardless of whether they are natural or adopted.

Tax relief to adoptive applicants would not only encourage all adoptive applicants but would be particularly helpful to agencies in recruitment of the hard-to-place child. In this category are children of mixed racial background, physically handicapped, and Negroes.

Mr. Robert I. Beers,
Executive Director, The New England Home for Little Wanderers, Boston, Mass.

We are very much in favor of your proposal and wish you success.

Mrs. Laurence A. Janney,
Executive Director, Adoption Service of Westchester, Inc., White Plains, N.Y.

We think the bill an excellent idea and hope that it will be enacted.

Mr. Frank M. Craft,
Florida State Welfare Director.

The legislation is timely and indeed overdue. As you stated in your speech, it will correct an injustice which is now done to adoptive parents and will encourage adoptions, something which is very necessary at this time.

As it stands now, it is a sound and comprehensive proposal.

Mr. George M. Pikser,
Executive Director, Jewish Social Service Agency and Jewish Foster Home, Washington, D.C.

I believe this particular measure is long overdue to afford equitable treatment to adoptive parents as well as to stimulate the number of people who might apply to adopt children. In a number of localities of which Florida is a prime example, it is becoming increasingly more difficult for sufficient homes to be found for the increasing numbers of children coming to agencies for adoption placement.

We greatly appreciate your interest in this problem and your concern for the children and families who would be affected.

Mr. Wesley W. Jenkins,
Executive Director, Family and Children's Service, St. Petersburg, Fla.

I appreciate your efforts to help adoptive couples secure a more equalized financial status with natural parents as far as income tax is concerned. One big factor we often forget is that adoptive parents, in addition to the expenses they must bear in order to adopt a child, have frequently spent several thousands of dollars for personal medical care in attempting to have children of their own.

The need for good adoptive parents is so great that we must find ways of encouraging childless couples to take on the responsibilities of adopting a child. I feel that your bill is one good way of encouraging these couples.

Mr. Perry J. Gangloff,
Executive Director, the Family and Children's Society of Broome County, Inc., Binghamton, N.Y.

We want to thank you for your interest in this matter. We are always grateful to learn of any legislative action that pertains to our work and the services offered by this agency.

Mr. Leonard R. Jagels,
Executive Secretary, Catholic Social Services of Oakland County, Mich.

We feel the Adoption Opportunity Act very timely for the many reasons you so ably pointed out in your speech to the House.

We have great respect for your interest in the welfare of children and it is our sincere hope that you will be successful in your effort to get this bill passed.

Mr. Raleigh C. Hobson,
Director, State Department of Public Welfare, Maryland.

I am in complete agreement with your proposed legislation to allow adoptive couples to deduct expenses associated with adoption.

Mr. Renald J. Nagelkirk,
Executive Director, D. A. Blodgett Homes for Children, Grand Rapids, Mich.

Your suggestion regarding legislation to provide tax exemption for adoptive parents is timely, fair, and, above all, very, very helpful. You don't know how much pressure is being brought to bear upon adoption agencies on the part of adoptive parents who go through a great deal of expenses in giving a homeless child a home—why not treat an adoptive child as it is being legally treated: like a natural child, after adoption procedures are concluded?

Thank you again. Good luck, and if there is anything that we can do to encourage and support you further, let us know.

Mr. Alfred M. Neumann, J.D.,
Executive Director, Jewish Family and Children's Service of Denver, Colo.

As a child welfare agency, involved in placing children for adoption, we would certainly give our support to your bill. In light of the recent national decrease in adoptive applicants and increase of children available for adoption, a bill intending to encourage adoptions seems most timely.

Marjorie Connors,
Assistant Supervisor, Adoption Service Department, Children's Aid and Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, Buffalo, N.Y.

As a professional social worker who has had considerable experience in the area of adoptions, I concur with your bill and also the remarks which were entered into the Congressional Record. I wish to thank you for the concern you have shown by introduction of this bill.

Mr. Lowell A. Grottveit.
Madison, Wis.

I heartily endorse the Adoption Opportunity Act, H.R. 8258, and sincerely hope that the bill will have no trouble in becoming legislation.

Adoption expenses can be considerable, and I admit that adoptive couples have had no tax break on the amount they have had to pay. More important, however, I feel that this bill will serve as an incentive to other people to apply as adoptive couples. As you perhaps know, the trend throughout the country is a decrease in the number of adoptive couples, while the number of available children is going up. While the financial consideration has not been the only one which has been limiting the number of adoptive couples, I feel being given this opportunity to deduct adoptive expenses will make more and more couples available to us. For this reason, I am in favor of the bill and hope for its passage.

Mr. Joseph W. Granata,
Chief and Family Service of Springfield, Inc., Springfield, Mass.

We who work closely with adoptions appreciate and strongly back the aims of the Adoption Opportunity Act.

If we can do anything to further its passage, we will be ready to do so.

Mrs. Mary Lou Wing,
Adoption Supervisor, Child and Family Services, Knoxville, Tenn.

Thank you for the information about your bill. It certainly makes good sense to me. Let me know of anything that might be of help to you.

Mr. William L. Galbraith,
Executive Director, Child and Family Services, Knoxville, Tenn.

Your legislation, H.R. 8258, has my wholehearted support.

As a board member of the Lutheran Welfare Services of Wisconsin and Upper Michigan, serving in the capacity of secretary, treasurer, and now vice president of this worthy organization involved in the placement of children for adoption the writer is fully aware of the importance of receiving support to encourage passage of this bill, which is sorely needed to remove any barriers for adoption as there is a shortage of homes now for these children.

You are commended for your efforts in the introduction of the bill and hope it will be adopted.

Mr. R. L. Siebert,
President, Milwaukee Electric Tool Corp., Milwaukee, Wis.

Your reasoning for support of this measure is, in our opinion, quite sound, and it is my opinion that H.R. 8258 is highly desirable. I am glad indeed that you have proposed it.

Mr. Callman Rawley,
Executive Director, Jewish Family and Children's Service of Minneapolis, Minn.

I am strongly in favor of such legislation.

Mr. Zablocki is correct in stating that there is a lag in adoption applications. At the present time the five adoption agencies of the La Crosse area are conducting a joint publicity campaign to interest new applicants.

In our area we are placing white children only. In the southeastern part of the State, whenever children of mixed race must be placed, a serious problem exists.

Tax relief will not solve the problem, but it will be one factor that can help relieve some of the difficulties that can arise from financial pressures.

Mr. Zablocki is to be congratulated on his insight in introducing this legislation.

Mr. Gregory Speltz,
Administrative Assistant, Catholic Social Service, Inc., La Crosse, Wis.

I am very pleased to learn that you have introduced H.R. 8258. The measure appears to me to be drawn with great care and I want you to know that Lutheran Welfare will take whatever action it can to rouse support for this fine measure.

Again, may I commend you for your social concern and farsightedness in preparing and introducing this significant legislation.

Rev. Benjamin A. Gjenvick,
Executive Director, Lutheran Welfare Services of Wisconsin and Upper Michigan, Milwaukee, Wis.

As an agency which places over 250 children a year for adoption, Louise Wise Services knows that such legislation as you propose is needed to cover a gap in the present law and that it would provide for a fair and equitable allowance to adoptive families for expenses incurred by them.

Mr. Shad Polier.
New York, N.Y.

We would like to express ourselves in favor of such legislation as would provide recognition to adoptive parents and some consideration for the financial burdens they assume.

Bernard G. and Mary A. Starks.
Madison, Wis.

I think your recommendation of a tax deduction for expenses related to adoption would be a particular boon to those couples whose incomes are somewhat limited but who otherwise are fine adoptive prospects.

While the voluntary agencies do not ordinarily turn down good adoptive prospects simply because they might be unable to pay the fee, the exemption would encourage families with limited income to consider this means of increasing their family.

Mr. John Kelleher,
Executive Secretary, the Catholic Service League of Akron, Ohio.

The Children's Home Society is very much interested in your bill, the Adoption Opportunity Act.

The society wishes to be on record as in favor of the bill. I shall write to our representatives in the Congress and give them our recommendation of it.

Mr. Richard H. Catlett,
President, Children's Home Society of Virginia, Richmond, Va.

Our agency is quite interested in your proposed Adoption Opportunity Act, H.R. 8258. We frequently have inquiries from adoptive applicants regarding whether or not the adoption fee is tax deductible. We would favor giving tax relief to these families.

We will be following the progress of your bill with interest.

Miss Joyce Greathouse,
Casework Supervisor, Children's Aid Society of Jefferson County, Birmingham, Ala.

Certainly there are some real values in this proposal.

Mr. George P. Spartz,
Director, Division of Public Welfare, State of Alaska.

Your introduction of H.R. 8258 was so splendid that we are reprinting it in full, in our "National Adoptalk," for our membership and for the 500 agencies on our mailing list.

Mr. Arthur Glickman,
President, National Council of Adoptive Parents Organizations, Teaneck, N.J.

The National Council of Adoptive Parents Organizations shares your views 100 percent concerning the Adoption Opportunity Act of 1965. Your speech introducing bill H.R. 8258 explains the conditions most accurately. Our legislative representative, Niha Savitz, will be in Washington June 6. She will call you. Will work to support bill.

Mr. Athur Glickman,
President, National Council of Adoptive Parents Organizations.

I believe that this is an area which needs remedying in the manner in which you propose. The need for adoptive homes is increasing every year because of the numbers of children who need this kind of permanent planning. Because of medical advances in infertility problems some couples who previously were not able to be helped medically to produce a family naturally are now becoming fertile and these advances while helpful to the individual couples compound the problem of finding adequate adoptive applicants for every child.

Any step in the direction of your bill would seem to help to encourage some families who might otherwise not feel financially able to adopt a child.

Mr. Robert G. Hintz,
Casework Supervisor, Catholic Welfare Bureau, Madison, Wis.

As a child welfare agency active in adoption we are greatly interested in this bill. Your comments in the Congressional Record indicate considerable research in this matter. I want to commend your concern for the adoptive parents and children.

Certainly it is not good for children to grow up in an institution or a series of foster homes. The interests of good citizenship will be better served through adoption, to say nothing of the children's welfare and the happiness of the adoptive parents.

Pastor Mentor Kujath,
Associate Director of Public Relations, Lutheran Children's Friend Society of Wisconsin, Wauwatosa, Wis.

My wife and I have recently adopted a baby daughter through Lutheran Welfare Agency. As I am sure you are aware, most agencies charge a fee for the adoption service which is based on the income of the adoptive parents. I was amazed to discover that at the present time no part of this fee is deductible on either the Federal or State tax return. I am, therefore, obviously pleased to hear of your interest in legislation in this area.

Mr. Larry J. Eggers.
Beloit, Wis.

I read with great interest your introduction of the Adoption Opportunity Act of 1965. Having recently adopted a child in the District of Columbia, and having paid an $880 fee, I hope that other Members of the House of Representatives will agree with your well-reasoned statement which appeared in the Congressional Record on May 18, 1965.

Your efforts to afford tax relief to adoptive parents will be applauded by many Americans.

Mr. Robert C. Zimmer.
Washington, D.C.

We feel that the Adoption Opportunity Act would help some of our low-income families who are financially able to carry the care of the child but find some of the initial costs difficult to handle. Sometimes these costs prevent a family who otherwise would give a child love and security and share their name with them from adopting a child.

Miss M. Beatrice Pryor,
Director, Wicomico County Welfare Board, Salisbury, Md.

Children's Home Society of California is very much interested in H.R. 8258 and believes that it will be very helpful. We hope, therefore, that it will receive favorable consideration by Congress.

Mr. Clyde Getz,
Executive Director, Children's Home Society of California, Los Angeles, Calif.

My clinical experience has given me an insight that makes it most difficult to tolerate programs that continue to keep children in group care that could use family care. I think that your explanation is excellent and that your bill, H.R. 8258, is entirely fair and warranted. I want to congratulate you on your insight, your courage, and your interest in the welfare of children. Unfortunately the general public does not know enough about the subject, and until we have your kind of leadership, many children will continue to be deprived of having their four basic needs met—physical, educational, emotional, and spiritual.

Thank you again for your interest and concern in the adoption program.

Mrs. Ruby Lee Piester,
Executive Director, the Edna Gladney Home, Fort Worth, Tex.

Although this matter has not been acted upon by our board of managers, I want to assure you of my personal support of this bill. I think it is sound in every respect and provides a tax deduction to which our adoptive parents are certainly entitled.

Mr. Clark L. Mock,
Executive Director, Family and Children's Society, Baltimore, Md.

The board of trustees of the Children's Home Society of Washington is very much in sympathy with the purposes of H.R. 8258, the Adoption Opportunity Act of 1965. We commend and thank you for taking the initiative to introduce this bill in the Congress.

Today with the growing numbers of children needing adoption and a relative undersupply of prospective adopters, the lack of an allowable tax deduction has two effects: (1) It deters many good families of modest means from adopting a child, and (2) it sends others to nonfee charging public agencies where the total cost of the social service must then be met from Federal, State, and local tax funds.

The present inequities, which your bill and our suggestions are designed to correct, are a serious deterrent to the movement of children needing adoption into good homes of modest means.

Mr. Andy Hess,
President, Board of Trustees, Children's Home Society of Washington, Seattle, Wash.

I wish to congratulate you upon H.R. 8258 itself and upon your accompanying remarks.

I am delighted by your efforts to encourage adoption through licensed child-placing agencies, believing this method to be the one offering greatest protection to the child, to his natural parents, and to his adoptive parents.

Miss Jean Grigg,
Casework Supervisor, the Lutheran Inner Mission Society, Washington, D.C.

It is possible that your proposed legislation could provide some benefit to prospective adoptive parents who have sufficient income to adequately provide for a child, but who are not able to easily pay all the costs involved in adopting a child that arise within the period of time necessary to complete the adoption process.

For these reasons we feel that your proposed legislation could benefit this group of people.

Mr. G. Thomas Riti,
Chief, New Jersey Department of Institutions and Agencies, Bureau of Children's Services, Trenton, N.J.

We are pleased to note that this equitable revision of the Internal Revenue Code is being proposed. We as an agency feel your proposal has much merit, and that your reasons for introducing it are sound. You have our full support in your efforts.

I would disagree, however, with your statement that "adoptions are currently keeping pace with the number of children available," at least as far as private agencies are concerned. Many agencies have experienced a decline in recent years in the number of couples seeking adoption, while at the same time the number of children needing adoptive homes has been steadily increasing. The situation in many places throughout the country has become acute, although in North Dakota we are just beginning to feel the pinch. This, of course, only makes your proposal more valid and needed.

Mr. John A. Rex,
Chief Social Workers, Adoption Unit, Lutheran Welfare Society of North Dakota, Fargo, N. Dak.

We were pleased with the proposal of providing tax relief for adoptive parents.

We certainly wish to support the principle of providing tax relief for adoptive parents.

Miss Mary C. Daly,
Director, Department of Children, Catholic Charities of St. Louis, Mo.

Your comments at its introduction were quite eloquent in providing justification for the bill's consideration.

We heartily support your bill. We believe it would be of great benefit, not only in providing more equitable treatment for adoptive parents, but also in encouraging adoption for many children who need permanent homes. It would, we believe, particularly encourage adoption by families in the middle- and low-income levels and by minority families. Adoptive homes are particularly needed for children of minority background.

We believe quite strongly that adoption should be encouraged and we believe your bill would be a great step forward in encouraging adoption now and in the future.

Miss Lucile Kennedy,
Chief, Family and Children Division, Department of Social Welfare, Sacramento, Calif.

I would like to heartily endorse the provisions contained in the Adoption Opportunity Act, H.R. 8258.

Bernice Erwin,
Senior Case Workers, Lake Bluff, Ill., Children's Home.

The purpose of this letter is to thank you for introduction of H.R. 8258, the Adoption Opportunity Act, and to express our wholehearted support thereof.

I am attaching a copy of a letter which we have written to each of the California Congressmen.

I will appreciate it if you will keep me posted regarding the progress of this bill.

Best regards.

Mr. Donald H. Fibush,
President, California Association of Adoption Agencies, Lafayette, Calif.

I am very much for the bill to help adoptive parents today, as many cannot go into adoption because of expenses. The Volunteers of America did not have a reimbursement until 1950, and since 1958 our maximum amount of reimbursement is $725, plus $150 legal expenses.

We want to commend you for your thoughtful and timely bill. This bill would enable more young couples to become parents without feeling the financial "pressure" so much. Their potential is often great, but they just have not had time to become financially secure.

Since there is a need for more fine couples to adopt children today, they need much encouragement and help in regard to finances. We have tried our best not to increase the reimbursement during the past few years for the best interest of having more qualified couples.

Lt. Col. Rachel Sparks,
Executive Director, the Volunteers of America, Fort Worth, Tex.

The president of our organization, who is an attorney, and I have reviewed the bill and believe that it has much merit. We hope that the bill has a successful passage through committees and will be favorably acted upon by the Congress.

Miss Harriet L. Tynes,
Executive Director, the Children's Home Society of North Carolina, Greensboro, N.C.

I am writing in support of H.R. 8258. I have noted with interest and approval the speech which you addressed to the House of Representatives on May 18, 1965.

Rev. J. Francis Stafford,
Associate Director, Archdiocese of Baltimore Catholic Center, Baltimore, Md., Associated Catholic Charities.

Child and Family Service of Syracuse and Onondaga County has long been advocating permitting adoptive parents to take a tax deduction for the expenses involved in the adoption procedure.

I am writing on behalf of the board and staff of this agency to let you know we appreciate and support your efforts to provide tax relief for our adoptive parents.

Mr. Lionel C. Lane,
Executive Director, the Child and Family Service of Syracuse and Onondaga County, Syracuse, N.Y.

HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION PRESSURE

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, a very discerning column by James J. Kilpatrick titled "Highway Bill Leaves Resentments" I believe deserves being called to the attention of the Congress because it highlights the travesty which occurred on Thursday, October 7, 1965, when the House was forced to be in session from 11:00 a.m., October 7, 1965, until 12:51 a.m. on October 8.

I particularly call attention to the last paragraph which says:

> All this could have been avoided if the deliberative process had been left to do its patient work, but this has not been a Congress of patience and deliberation. This has been a Congress of the bullwhip and the bulldozer; and those who were bullied along on the night of October 7 will nurse a long memory of a "present" they gave unwisely in the form of a hasty highway bill.

So far as this Member is concerned, there is certainly no resentment on my part although it became obvious that under the pressures existing on Thursday it was not possible to get fair and adequate consideration of the needed amendments. The pressure asserted was wholly unjustified for many reasons, including the fact that the billboards and junkyards do not have to be moved or screened until 1970. Any program that is to be effective 5 years in the future hardly needs emergency consideration nor should it be subjected to such pressure tactics that results in many amendments being considered without any discussion.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Oct. 15, 1965]

Highway Bill Leaves Resentments

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The Johnson administration reached a new peak of arrogance in the House of Representatives on the evening of Thursday, October 7. Tempers have cooled since then, and Members have gone on to other matters; all animosities within 660 feet of the Capital have been screened and prettied up; but no man should mistake the bitterness left behind.

For the record, the chronology began on Wednesday, October 6, when the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 came up briefly in the House. Maryland's George H. Fallon, chairman of Public Works, advised his colleagues of the schedule "On tomorrow," he said, "this body will begin to consider the bill." That was the way the Republican leaders understood it, too. The bill itself presented some serious questions; a number of major amendments deserved consideration. Thus the House would convene at 11, go as far as it reasonably could go by late afternoon on Thursday, and then vote on Friday.

So Thursday's debate began. About 2 o'clock the word came down. The President did not want the House merely to begin to consider the bill. He wanted the bill passed. Mrs. Johnson was to be hostess that evening at a gala dinner. As chief patron of the beautification bill, she would be grateful for a chance to announce its enactment. As for the President, he was to enter the hospital Friday morning; and he would be grateful too.

Johnson's proconsuls in the House cranked up their juggernaut and set the machine in motion. In the degrading spectacle that followed, Democrats trotted down the aisle in a dozen teller votes. They stumbled and shuffled through their paces, so many dutiful sheep, and the Republican amendments fell in windrows. At one point in the travesty, the House voted 121 to 84 to allow but 8 minutes of debate on 5 separate amendments.

Finally, a little after midnight, the bloody work was done. James C. Wright, Jr., of Fort Worth, speaking for the committee, pleaded with his colleagues to reject a motion to recommit.

"We ask all of you," he said, "to accept the will of the House, and present the bill tonight as a deserved present to a great President and a magnificent First Lady."

So the present was passed and packaged up and tied in a pretty bow, 245 to 138; and at 12:51 a.m., the House adjourned.

If the bill were a carefully drafted bill, prudently weighed in committee, perhaps the Republican rebellion could be brushed aside as no more than the petulance of a resentful minority. But the debate, such as it was, made it evident that the bill suffers from serious flaws.

As Senator Harry Byrd, Democrat of Virginia, pointed out in the other body, the bill is woefully underfinanced. No one really knows what it may cost, in State and Federal funds, to compensate landowners, sign owners, and junkyard owners for the property and rights to be condemned. Everyone does know, however, that $40 million a year is the merest token authorization.

No one knows, either, what effect the bill may have in those States that presumably must amend their constitutions to meet the bill's requirements. Some profound legal questions are presented under the law of police power and the law of eminent domain. Such States as California, Washington, Oregon, and Missouri could lose millions in Federal highway aid if they fail to revise their basic laws by January 1968.

Actually, no one imagines that this will happen. The act that was passed in such haste will be amended at leisure. In the end, a great many billboards doubtless will come down, and a number of eyesores will disappear. In the process of this compulsory beautification, the lawyers will be singing like larks and small businessmen along the primary highways will be crying for relief.

All this could have been avoided if the deliberative process had been left to do its patient work, but this has not been a Congress of patience and deliberation. This has been a Congress of the bullwhip and the bulldozer; and those who were bullied along on the night of October 7 will nurse a long memory of a "present" they gave unwisely in the form of a hasty highway bill.

SOUTHEAST DISASTER RELIEF BILLS, H.R. 11539 AND H.R. 11540; FLORIDA DAMAGES

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have just been furnished, pursuant to my request on H.R. 11539 and H.R. 11540, the latter of which I introduced to give consideration to devastating damage by Hurricane Betsy in Florida, Mississippi, and Louisiana, specific information on Florida damage.

I requested more specific figures on damage in Florida. The Office of Emergency Planning—Buford Ellington, Director—has provided such information, which I place in the Record.

The bill which I introduced provides for some relief in addition to the relief already obtained under Public Law 81-875.

This relief is in the form of authorizing the sale of trailers that have been made available for occupancy by damage sufferers, which is the customary procedure to take care of persons who are forced out of their homes by a natural disaster. The bill for the first time provides that the occupants and those who were damaged are permitted to purchase such trailers. Likewise, some $1,800 in forgiveness on SBA disaster relief loans is provided in the bill. The bills before Congress provide for an immediate study of all possible relief for natural disasters that should be made available through State, local, and Federal programs, as well as the possibility of activating existing hurricane insurance acts. It appears that some 6,404 families are eligible for relief under this bill according to this report. The bill covers uninsured claims. There have been some 50,000 claims for insurance payments ranging from $25 to $28 million.

This disaster again points up the need for general legislation relating to disasters, which is now under consideration by the Public Works Committee and which I hope will be acted upon early next session.

Executive Office of
the President,
Office of Emergency Planning,
Washington, D.C., October 14, 1965.

Hon. William C. Cramer,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Cramer: In accordance with your request at yesterday's hearing on H.R. 11539, enclosed for the record is a summary of Hurricane Betsy damages in Florida. When we review the transcript, we will insert it in the proper place.

Sincerely,

Buford Ellington,
Director.

Enclosure.

Estimate of eligible damage, Florida

County	Debris clearance	Protective health and sanitation measures	Streets, roads and bridges	Dikes, levees, drainage facilities	Public buildings	Public utilities	Total
Broward	$150,000	$10,000	$128,000	$50,000	$28,000	$95,000	$461,000
Collier			1,000	4,000			5,000
Dade	254,000	50,000	142,000	10,000	75,000	195,000	726,000
Glades			2,000	10,000			12,000
Hendry			3,000	15,000			18,000
Lee			1,000	3,000			4,000
Martin		16,000					16,000
Monroe	40,000	80,000	50,000	5,000	20,000	80,000	275,000
Palm Beach	2,000	18,000					20,000
St. Lucie		9,000					9,000
Total	446,000	183,000	327,000	97,000	123,000	370,000	1,546,000

Hurricane Betsy, Florida

"Major disaster" declared September 4, 1965.

Summary of damage:

Public property damage	$9,100,000
Private property damage	102,460,000
Agricultural damage	7,500,000
Total	109,960,000
Total damage	119,060,000
Estimate of eligible work (Public Law 81–875)	1,546,000

A breakdown of the work, by county and category, is attached.

The Red Cross reports that 27 homes were destroyed, 355 suffered major damage and 3,901 minor damage. In addition, 193 trailers were destroyed and 955 were damaged. A total of 6,404 families suffered some loss as a result of this disaster.

Florida State officials have estimated 25 percent wind damage and 75 percent water damage as result of Hurricane Betsy.

The insurance industry has estimated about 50,000 claims, with insurance payments of from $25 to $28 million.

ELLEN BROWNING SCRIPPS

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, on October 18 the many San Diegans, Californians, and others will give observance to the memory of one of this Nation's foremost historic figures, Ellen Browning Scripps. She was one of our most brilliant and generous early residents of San Diego, whose drive and generosity created many prominent philanthropies. Of the public facilities she is responsible for organizing, one of the most outstanding is the famed Scripps Institution of Oceanography. Her foresight in realizing that such a facility was needed in order to make America internationally prominent in ocean sciences is particularly worthy of mention because of its establishment at the turn of the century.

It is significant that the city of San Diego is officially proclaiming October 18, the birthdate of this fabulous lady, as Ellen Browning Scripps Day and I ask permission to include their proclamation as a portion of my remarks.

PROCLAMATION BY THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Whereas on October 18, 129 years ago, Ellen Browning Scripps was born in modest circumstances in London, England; and

Whereas her unusual intelligence, character, and energy resulted in the founding of a successful newspaper empire; and

Whereas she became one of San Diego's most illustrious early residents and through her constant efforts and talents, she established great and enduring philanthropies, not only for the benefit of her adopted city of San Diego, but for the entire Nation; and

Whereas many of our city's most valued public facilities such as the Scripps Institution of Oceanography; the Scripps Metabolic Clinic, now the Scripps Clinic and Research Foundation; the Scripps Memorial Hospital; the Torrey Pines State Park and the Bishop's School, as well as public playgrounds, community centers, the children's pool, the zoological garden and research laboratory in Balboa Park and many many more still serve the interests of our people; and

Whereas the Ellen Browning Scripps Foundation continues her philanthropies for the enduring benefit of citizens of the far future:

Now, therefore, I, Frank Curran, the 28th mayor of the city of San Diego, do hereby proclaim Monday, October 18, 1965, to be "Ellen Browning Scripps Day" in San Diego in recognition of her good works and do urge our citizenry to take note of her remarkable career and participate in this observance of the 129th anniversary of her birth.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand, this 18th day of October 1965, and have caused the seal to be affixed hereto:

[SEAL] FRANK CURRAN,
Mayor.

WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT AND THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GROVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Watershed Development of the Committee on Public Works, I have had the privilege this session to participate in the approval of 30 watershed projects which were transmitted to the Congress and referred to the committee for appropriate action.

The Congress has heard much about water resource development problems in this Nation during the past years, and the Congress has acted substantially on meeting these water resource development problems this session. The Congress has enacted the Water Resource Planning Act of 1965 and the Water Quality Act of 1965. The omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill is now awaiting the signature of the President. With the enactment of these three pieces of legislation, Congress has expressed the need for water supply, water purity, and waterway development.

In addition to the action of the Congress, the President called a White House conference on the water supply problems of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware this summer. As a member of this body from the State of New York, I am vitally interested in the development of water resources in the East, and I will watch with interest the developments which result from this White House conference and programs launched pursuant to its recommendations.

In an attempt to act on major water resource programs, however, the Congress should not lose sight of the many smaller programs, not the least of which is the small watershed protection and flood prevention program established under Public Law 566, 83d Congress, known as the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954. When this law was enacted, it was expressed that the sense of Congress was that the Federal Government should cooperate with States and their political subdivisions, soil or water conservation districts, flood prevention or control districts, and other local public agencies for the purpose of preventing erosion, floodwater, and sediment damages in the watersheds of the rivers and streams of the United States and of furthering the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water and thereby of preserving and protecting the Nation's land and water resources.

The small watershed program, administered by the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture, has moved forward considerably since 1954. Since the enactment of Public Law 550, 149 watershed projects have been approved by the Committee on Public Works of this body, and 272 watershed projects have been approved by the Committee on Agriculture of this body. The law establishes that the watershed project is to go to the Committee on Public Works, if the plan involves any single structure of more than 4,000 acre-feet of total capacity. The approval of these 421 watershed projects and the subsequent construction on many of them have aided greatly in preventing floods where they begin—in the upper reaches of the streams and tributaries.

A nationwide program of construction of small watershed dams to retard the flow of water in the tributaries, rather than trying to prevent floods exclusively with the larger dams on the main rivers, will do much to prevent disastrous floods. The soil conservation benefits of stopping floodwaters in the upper reaches of the streams goes without comment, for everyone knows the effect of rushing water on land.

The officials of the Department of Agriculture have been most cooperative in working with the committee. Their dedication to the watershed program is obvious every time they appear before the committee.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I include a list of the watershed projects, with appropriate information pertaining to Federal costs and the drainage area encompassed in each watershed project approved, which were favorably acted upon by the Committee on Public Works during this session:

State	Project	Drainage area (acres)	Federal cost
Alabama	Ketchepedrakee Creek	35, 110	$882, 740
Indiana	Twin Rush Creek	28, 099	1, 234, 620
Iowa	Badger Creek (supplement)		212, 965
Do	Walter's Creek	31, 560	1, 074, 920
Georgia and Alabama	Little Tallapoosa River	133, 218	3, 725, 322
Oklahoma	Uncle John Creek	99, 584	1, 822, 313
Tennessee	Wilson Spring Creek	40, 040	733, 523
Texas	Attoyac Bayou	213, 440	4, 142, 822
Do	Castleman Creek	29, 850	816, 148
Do	Donahoe Creek	98, 285	1, 362, 609
Arkansas	Cooper Creek	40, 128	1, 274, 008
Maine	Limestone Stream	31, 542	791, 349
Mississippi	Long Creek	40, 306	1, 181, 041
Mississippi and Tennessee	Tuscumbia River	223, 146	4, 710, 602
Missouri	Grindstone-Lost-Muddy Creek	209, 100	2, 744, 306
North Carolina and Virginia	Stewarts Creek-Lovills Creek	72, 000	1, 519, 200
Oklahoma	Upper Elk Creek	248, 340	3, 386, 105
Utah	Ferron	191, 000	3, 892, 100
Delaware and Maryland	Upper Choptank River	57, 000	3, 045, 300
Indiana	Little Raccoon Creek	98, 306	2, 521, 448
Kansas	Timber Creek	101, 700	3, 489, 300
Minnesota	Tamarac River	234, 700	1, 177, 486
Oklahoma	Quapaw Creek	98, 560	3, 364, 699
Do	Rock Creek	37, 997	1, 224, 703
Texas	Duck Creek	133, 120	1, 810, 207
Virginia	Cherrystone	29, 400	581, 145
Louisiana	Bayou Boeuf	187, 974	3, 235, 327
Pennsylvania	Mauch Chunk Creek	5, 790	444, 067
Do	Middle Creek	84, 096	2, 076, 135
Do	Oil Creek	112, 000	2, 241, 580
Total		2, 945, 381	61, 174, 090

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Watershed Development has been most active in insuring the continuation of a comprehensive small watershed program, and I commend him for his attention and dedication to improving the water resources of this Nation.

The Committee on Public Works has shown itself to be most responsive to the water resource needs of our Nation during this session. The committee has acted on the Water Quality Act of 1965, the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act of 1965, and a number of other legislative items, but the committee's attention to small water resource programs is indeed commendable also.

SOME THOUGHTS ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY REFORM

Mr. **BROYHILL** of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CURTIS**. Mr. Speaker, after hearing discussion from all elements of the political and economic spectra about the need for international monetary reform, it is refreshing to encounter a clear, comprehensive, unemotional exposition of the subject. Dr. Roy L. Reierson, senior vice president and chief economist of the Bankers Trust Co. of New York, delivered a speech last June which surveys the subject of international monetary reform from all sides, considering the present international monetary system, the role of the dollar and various proposals for reform. He comes to the conclusion that there is cause for concern but not for panic; that any changes in the present system will be gradual, and that the dollar will continue to play a large role in the world's monetary affairs.

I commend this article to the attention of all those interested in the future of the international monetary system and the dollar and ask unanimous consent that Dr. Reierson's speech be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

SOME THOUGHTS ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY REFORM

(Address by Dr. Roy L. Reierson, senior vice president and chief economist, Bankers Trust Co., New York, delivered at the Stonier Graduate School of Banking, the American Bankers Association, June 23, 1965)

The international monetary situation has in recent years become a matter of growing concern to Government officials and academicians as well as to bankers, businessmen and investors not only in the United States but also abroad. There is widespread agreement that the present system has various deficiencies, but reform proposals range from unrealistically futuristic plans to the equally extreme espousal of a return to the practices of bygone days. At the same time, some observers fear that the present system may already be laboring under tensions greater than can long be endured and visualize the world engulfed in a monetary crisis reminiscent of the 1930's.

The international monetary machinery is admittedly complex and delicate; a case can be made for alarm as well as for reassurance. If one attempt to maintain perspective, to sort out the basic forces that determine the system's viability, and to appraise both its strengths and its weaknesses, one arrives at three general conclusions. The first is that the system is functioning better than is credited by its more vehement critics; there is cause for solicitude but not for panic. The second is that major reform is not in sight now and perhaps for years ahead; changes may be expected as a result of the gradual evolution which is continuously underway, but the system of the foreseeable future is unlikely to be radically different from that of today. This leads to the third conclusion—that the dollar will continue to play a leading role in the world's monetary affairs and that the American balance-of-payments position necessarily provides the key to the future of the international money-and-credit system as a whole. If these conclusions are neither novel nor spectacular, it is hoped that they have the redeeming virtue of being more consistent with underlying realities and prospects.

THE PRESENT SYSTEM

For the past 20 years, the monetary system has served the world far better than could have been anticipated at Bretton Woods in 1944, when the blueprint of the postwar payments structure was formulated. Under this system, the major industrial nations overseas have rebuilt their war-torn economies, stabilized their domestic currencies, and generally registered impressive economic gains. International trade and finance has been reconstituted and strengthened. Moreover, all of this was achieved much sooner than could reasonably have been foreseen at the end of World War II.

To be sure, there have been stresses and strains. Since 1958, when currency convertibility throughout continental Western Europe was substantially restored, a few currencies have encountered strong, and in some cases, repeated adverse pressures—sterling in 1961 and again recently, the Canadian dollar in 1962, and the Italian lira in 1964—and even the U.S. dollar has been pressured on occasion. However, these developments were attributable to the balance-of-payments problems of the individual countries rather than to shortcomings of the international monetary system as such.

More surprising than that such problems have occurred is that they have been met as rapidly and as effectively as was actually the case. Cooperation among the monetary authorities has over the years reached new peaks of smoothness and efficacy, individual countries have found that they could rely upon the system for prompt action to deal with emergencies, and the system as a whole has weathered occasional squalls without serious jeopardy. These accomplishments are in striking contrast to monetary developments in the two decades after World War I; they should not be taken lightly.

International monetary reserves

A cardinal feature of the present system, and one which has been under some attack, is that the monetary reserves of the member countries of the international financial community as a whole include not only some $41 billion of gold but also about $24 billion of national currencies, principally U.S. dollars and to a lesser extent pounds sterling and other currencies. In addition, each country has "automatic" drawing rights upon the International Monetary Fund; the unused portions of these rights, aggregating about $4 billion, are counted as part of the available reserves.

The distribution of gold and currency, however, is by no means even. The two reserve currency countries—the United States and the United Kingdom—hold over 90 percent of their owned reserves in gold, as does Switzerland. Among other major industrial countries, the percentage of gold varies from almost 80 percent for France to less than 20 percent for Sweden and Japan, with the bulk of the remainder consisting of short-term dollar balances, such as bank deposits, Treasury bills and other liquid paper. The industrially less developed countries as a rule hold relatively small amounts in bullion and prefer to keep greater proportions of their usually limited reserves in interest-bearing dollar or sterling balances.

Over the years, there has been a gradual but substantial shift of monetary reserves internationally. Since the start of 1958 alone, the United States has lost some $7 billion of its gold reserves to the rest of the world; except for the United Kingdom, all other major industrial countries as a group, on the other hand, have about doubled their reserves, having increased their holdings both of gold and of foreign exchange. The additions to the latter have consisted largely of U.S. dollars.

Fixed parities

As media for making international payments, monetary reserves provide the means for holding exchange rates at the fixed parities upon which the present monetary system is founded. Member nations of the IMF are committed to keep the quotations of their currencies in the foreign exchange markets within a narrow range of par; as a country's currency moves into excessive supply or demand in the world's markets, the monetary authorities maintain its parity against other currencies through sales or purchases of gold or convertible exchange.

The parity of each currency is usually expressed either in terms of gold—for the U.S. dollar, at $35 an ounce—or in terms of the U.S. dollar as a currency tied to gold; for the Canadian dollar, for example, parity is expressed as United States $.92½. The U.S. dollar is in turn held at its stated gold value by the legal commitment of the U.S. Treasury to buy gold from, and to sell gold to, foreign official agencies for monetary purposes at the fixed price of $35 an ounce, plus or minus a slight charge.

This commitment to maintain stable exchange relationships is an essential feature of the existing monetary order. Within regional blocs, such as the Common Market, it is an obvious prerequisite to the progress of economic integration; more widely, the existence of fixed exchange parities among leading currencies is basic to the efficient conduct of international trade and investment. Since 1958, adjustments of exchange parities among the leading financial countries have been few and relatively minor—an upward revaluation of the German mark and the Dutch guilder by 5 percent, and a devaluation of the Canadian dollar by about 10 percent in connection with that country's abandonment of a floating exchange rate in favor of a fixed parity.

International cooperation

Another salient feature of today's monetary system is the highly developed degree of international cooperation among the monetary authorities of the leading countries. This cooperation has been of signal importance in strengthening the system's ability to withstand pressure and to come to the aid of individual countries in trouble. Moreover, cooperation has tended to become closer in recent years and has added several innovations to established monetary practices; it has been reflected not only in the expansion of the lending resources of the IMF, but also in the founding in 1961 of the Paris Club—a group of major financial powers which have agreed to make resources available for the support of currencies that come under pressure, and which have worked together in various ways to stabilize the system.

The leading central banks in recent years have repeatedly operated in the foreign exchange markets to protect a temporarily weak currency against speculative attack. Moreover, to moderate potentially unsettling fluctuations in the foreign exchange markets, "swap" arrangements have been introduced whereby central banks extend credits to each other in order to obtain the short-term use of foreign currencies in the marketplace; the United States has been the heaviest user of these facilities, although several other countries have also benefited from these arrangements from time to time.

On the other hand, the United States has on several occasions contributed massive credits, together with others, to bolster the Canadian dollar, the Italian lira and, recently, the British pound. Another facet of international cooperation, finally, is the gold pool, under which the participating central banks seek to maintain orderly conditions in the London gold market and to reduce the drain on gold reserves by jointly providing bullion if needed and sharing equitably in any net gold offerings that may become available.

Cooperation on day-to-day problems has by no means inhibited differences on policy matters, and it would be presumptuous to take international cooperation for granted under any and all conditions. Yet the fact that assistance has never been denied and that the cooperative techniques employed have proven effective does highlight the common interest of all leading member nations in preserving the stability of the international money and credit system.

Position of the dollar

It is evident that the key role of the U.S. dollar runs like a red thread through the fabric of the international monetary community. It is the dollar which, second only to gold, serves the rest of the world as a source of monetary reserves and international liquidity; it is the dollar which provides the common denominator in maintaining stable exchange rates and which is widely utilized in support of other major currencies in times of stress. Over and above its role in official reserves and settlements, the dollar is widely employed in international commercial and financial transactions; huge amounts of dollars are held also by foreign bankers, trading firms, and other for working purposes or as liquid resources. Indeed, the great bulk of the world's trade is denominated in dollars and to a lesser degree in sterling, including trade to which neither the United States nor the United Kingdom is a party.

This overriding role of the dollar in the world's financial affairs is not fortuitous nor is it a matter of official decision. Rather, it is the natural and inevitable result of the succession of the United States to the dominant position once held by Britain in world trade and finance. As the world's largest trader, the United States provides a ready market in which foreigners may exchange merchandise for currency and convert currency into goods; likewise, the size of the American money and capital markets permits foreigners to raise or invest funds in larger amounts and with greater ease than elsewhere. A final consideration is that the United States is committed and able to maintain the convertibility of dollars into gold for international monetary purposes.

Quest for reform

This structure of the world's monetary society assuredly falls short of technical perfection. As is true of every credit edifice built upon fractional reserves, the present system is vulnerable to crises of confidence, especially if the dollar or the pound come under attack. Also, the provision of international liquidity by the payments deficits of the reserve currency countries is not necessarily in harmony with the actual growth in the world's needs for such liquidity. The quest for improvement has been virtually continuous, and the system itself has been altered, strengthened and expanded in gradual fashion over the years.

Criticism, however, has become more searching in recent years. The chronic deficits in the U.S. balance of payments, coupled with the recurring weakness of sterling, have created growing doubts as to whether the key currencies can continue to perform their present functions. Also, the point has been made that the reserve currency status of the dollar has been abused in that the United States has acquired profitable long-term investments abroad by the expedient of increasing its short-term indebtedness to foreigners. At the same time, the dollar is so clearly the keystone of the present system that it seems virtually impossible, as a practical matter, to deal effectively with accruing international monetary problems until the American balance-of-payments situation is solidly and convincingly redressed. Thus, paradoxically, the long weakness of the U.S. balance of payments has been both an incentive and at the same time an impediment to major change in the international monetary system.

TOP PRIORITY: THE DOLLAR

The problems of today's international monetary system are largely synonymous with the problems besetting the U.S. balance of payments. The international liquidity position of the United States—the size of the monetary gold reserve relative to the amount of foreign short-term claims—has been deteriorating steadily over the years, and the monetary authorities abroad have long been critical of the continuously rising short-term dollar debt being pumped into foreign hands by our chronic payments deficit. Until relatively recently, this criticism was generally muted, and the central bankers overseas continued to hold a rising volume of dollar balances in their reserves. Within the past 12 months, however, the climate has changed.

Major central banks have become less inclined to continue financing the chain of American deficits by adding further to their dollar holdings; they are converting dollars into gold on a more aggressive scale than in the past. These gold losses must be expected to continue for some time independently of any near-term improvement in the American balance of payments, but if the improvement turns out to be substantial and sustainable, withdrawals of gold are less likely to assume either the proportions or the persistence that would jeopardize the stability of the system at large.

Basic considerations

For a long time, there has been a tendency to belittle the urgency of the dollar problem by referring to a host of extenuating circumstances indicative of the dollar's underlying strength. Included here is the favorable U.S. position on merchandise exports and on services, as well as the large net surplus on total current account, which consistently and materially exceeds the outflow of dollars under the Government's military and economic programs. It is also emphasized that the American payments deficits and gold losses have been accompanied by the substantial growth of American income-producing investment abroad, thus strengthening the balance of payments in the long run. Finally, it is contended that the conventional measurement of our payments deficit overstates the magnitude of the problem; the proposal has been made to exclude from the deficit increases in American short-term indebtedness to other than foreign official agencies.

These lines of reasoning assuredly have some validity. They support the point that the dollar is not overvalued in world trade and finance, and that the United States has strong resources in the world economy. However, they are irrelevant to the present problem, which is that the total outflow of dollars from all sources has exceeded the total inflow by an intolerably wide margin, that this has diminished the country's liquidity, and that the volume of short-term dollars in foreign hands, for the time being at least, exceeds even the large amounts that are ordinarily required to finance international transactions. In fact, were it not for the function of the dollar as an international reserve currency, foreign central banks would long since have begun converting dollars into gold and the United States would have had to face up to its balance-of-payments problem far earlier.

Some policy implications

Since strong corrective pressures have so long been held in abeyance as a result of the dollar's unique status in the world's money and credit system, the United States has been able for the past 5 years to pursue expansionary credit policies which have been inconsistent with the large and recurring payments deficits. Money rates were raised in 1963 and again in 1964 for balance-of-payments reasons, but the Federal Reserve has nevertheless continued to provide reserves to the banks in amounts that have permitted a record growth of bank credit. This ready availability of financing in turn has certainly encouraged and facilitated the large outflow of funds which brought the dollar to the brink of crisis a few months ago. No country other than the United States could for so long have withstood this combination of huge balance-of-payments deficits and aggressive credit expansion without becoming embroiled in serious trouble internationally. Now, however, even the United States has had to take action.

In February of this year, yet another program was introduced to bring the American balance of payments back into equilibrium. In large part, it reemphasized goals and approaches which had repeatedly been set forth on other occasions, such as the need to hold wages and prices in line, to expand exports, to restrain American tourist spending abroad, and to curb the dollar drain posed by the Government's foreign aid programs. One important new feature, however, was to discourage American banks, institutional investors, and business corporations from lending and investing abroad. This was achieved not through resort to credit policy but through a call for voluntary restraint which appears to be producing results; bank lending to foreigners has been slowed drastically, many business concerns are reportedly conserving dollars by financing their overseas operations in foreign markets, and—very importantly—corporate balances abroad are being repatriated. Nevertheless, even with this cooperation, another substantial payments deficit is in prospect for 1965 as a whole.

A continuing problem

The voluntary restraint program is providing temporary relief; since a reduction of the capital outflow from the magnitude that prevailed around the turn of the year was imperative, this result deserves recognition. It is not, however, a cure for the basic problem.

The benefit to the payments position from the return flow of American-held working balances is of a nonrecurring nature and will presumably exhaust itself well before the end of this year. Consequently, as the year wears on, it is likely that net current receipts on trade and services, including net investment income, will again fall short of capital exports and the foreign exchange costs of the Government's military and economic outlays abroad. In that event, complete elimination of the payments deficit in the following year, as held forth by the administration, may once more turn out to be a premature hope; by the same token also, there may be little possibility of abandoning or substantially relaxing the voluntary restraint program in 1966.

Moreover, there are some doubts as to how long the new balance-of-payments program will remain effective. Some observers, harking back to the record of previous voluntary efforts in the field of credit restraint, believe that cooperation in the curtailment of lending and investing abroad will gradually diminish; others believe that the efficacy of this effort will decline as competitive pressures and operating problems compel the administration to countenance exceptions and generally display greater flexibility in its policies.

For other phases of the administration's program, prospects are even more dubious; recent wage and price rises at home do not augur well for the maintenance of the unusually large foreign trade surplus of 1964, and American tourist spending abroad this year is almost certain to set another record. Moreover, public spending abroad—i.e., military and economic aid—is still burdening the balance of payments by close to $3 billion a year, which is an amount substantially equal to our recent annual payments deficits; unless steps are taken to reduce this large gap, the time bought by the voluntary restraint program may expire with the basic problem still unsolved.

Whether in such an event the administration would turn to credit policy to strengthen the American payments situation, introduce additional fiscal or other devices to discourage capital outflows, broaden the base and intensify the pressures of the present voluntary restraint program, or place other curbs upon the use of dollars abroad, is quite conjectural. Much would presumably depend upon the economic climate in the United States and upon conditions in Europe. However, the recent pressure upon the dollar and the continuing losses of gold have apparently had the beneficial result of alerting the administration to the serious nature of the balance-of-payments situation and of hardening the determination of the responsible officials finally to bring the problem under control.

WORLD CRISIS AHEAD?

As if to illustrate the complexities of international monetary affairs, the fact that the United States, after many years, is apparently making at least some effective inroads upon its payments deficit has caused some observers to fear that the Western World now faces the danger of a serious credit crisis. Underlying this fear, however, are two diametrically opposite lines of reasoning.

One view argues that the international liquidity position of the United States has deteriorated beyond repair, that the American payments position cannot be corrected, and that the world hence stands on the edge of a confidence crisis which will lead to a widespread rush into gold, a depletion of the American gold stock, suspension of the dollar's convertibility into gold, and a general devaluation of currencies against gold; this might either spark a general inflation or, if the world should abandon the present gold exchange standard and return to gold as the sole medium of monetary reserves and international settlement, it might actually have widespread deflationary repercussions.

The second point of view is that the American effort to eliminate its payments deficit will be substantially successful; that ending the outflow of dollars will lead to a shortage of international liquidity and a retardation of economic activity abroad; and that the result will be to engulf the world in a wave of deflation and depression. Both positions appear highly extreme.

Specter of a dollar collapse

Confidence is indeed a crucial and at the same time a delicate ingredient in the monetary and credit structure; a collapse of confidence is a risk of which all monetary authorities, but especially those of the reserve currency countries, must remain continuously aware. However, the danger to the dollar from this source would seem to have not increased but diminished in the recent past.

The present balance-of-payments program of the United States indicates that the administration is earnest in its determination to restore equilibrium to its international accounts. There are legitimate questions whether the present program will suffice, but there is little doubt that further measures will be taken if the efforts currently underway fall short of their target.

Given a reasonable degree of equilibrium in the American balance-of-payments situation, a continuation of a moderate gold outflow may be viewed with some equanimity. It would be misleading to suggest that the recent acquisitions of gold especially by European countries are wholly independent of the dollar problem, but it would also be an exaggeration to claim that these actions have been motivated entirely by distrust of the dollar and a selfish desire to strengthen national reserve assets even at the risk of precipitating international catastrophe.

By and large, current shifts in the distribution of monetary gold may be regarded as yet another stage in the long postwar reconstruction of international monetary society. Whereas European monetary reserves at first were replenished largely by increased holdings of American dollars, at present there seems to be a general desire to build gold holdings to a larger proportion of total monetary reserve assets than heretofore. This redistribution of gold among leading countries may well reduce further the share of the world's monetary gold being held by the United States and increase the share of others. However, this need not curtail the role of the dollar as an international currency; to interpret this development as evidence of the repudiation of the dollar as a reserve asset is hardly consistent with the current and prospective realities of the world economy.

Risking a liquidity crisis

Equally unrealistic is the assumption that recent measures of the United States to remedy its payments imbalance may set off a worldwide deflation either by contributing to a shortage of international liquidity or by sharply curtailing the availability of dollar credits from American banks and other lenders and investors. The leading central bankers unanimously agree that international liquidity is completely adequate to meet current and foreseeable needs. Furthermore, the fear of a liquidity or credit shortage being triggered by the United States is effectively rebutted both by the specifics of the American program and by the financial resources available to other major countries.

The heaviest impact of the American balance-of-payments program is presumably being felt now, while short-term funds are being repatriated from foreign financial markets. It has been suggested that this may create a shortage of Euro-dollars and work special hardships upon Canada, the United Kingdom, and Japan, all of which are important borrowers in the Euro-dollar market. Canada, however, is receiving special consideration designed to prevent the American program from impairing the Canadian reserve position; the present problem is to keep Canadian borrowings in the United States from reaching levels that would further add to Canada's official holdings of gold and foreign exchange. Also, withdrawals of American funds from the Canadian market can probably be offset in large measure by reductions of Canadian credits to the United States.

Japan is also receiving favored treatment under the program, while the United Kingdom has access to a $750 million "swap" arrangement with the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, which could be utilized if Euro-dollar withdrawals should become troublesome. Actually, informed opinion is that the volume of Euro-dollars in the market has not decreased appreciably since the start of the American program; funds withdrawn by American firms have evidently been largely replaced by deposits on the part of foreign central banks.

Moreover, American commercial bank credit to foreigners will certainly increase this year at least by the 5 percent permitted under the program, particularly in view of the large commitments still outstanding. Other American financial institutions will likewise continue to expand their foreign investment portfolio to some extent. Finally, despite the program, the amount of direct foreign investment by American business in 1965 is expected to equal or exceed that of last year.

Looking further ahead, even if the American balance of payments is brought into equilibrium—an event not in sight this year and which may still be difficult to achieve in 1966—total dollars in foreign hands are unlikely to decline. However, should the supply come to be regarded as inadequate to meet private financing requirements abroad, this still need not create a problem, since the major industrial countries can meet these requirements from the dollar holdings of their central banks or through sales of gold to the United States. The conversion of foreign dollar balances into gold in recent years has already withdrawn a far larger amount of dollars from the world supply than is likely to be withheld as a result of the American program.

Some countries that have been relying heavily upon American credit to finance their rapid economic development may, it is true, find American funds less readily available, but since the developing countries are receiving favored treatment, the impact is likely to be limited. Finally, in the major industrial countries, credit requirements formerly satisfied by borrowings from American banks can be met by increased lending by local commercial banks, albeit at a higher interest cost to the borrower. In sum, a shortage of credit or of financial resources for the world at large is highly improbable not only today but for an indefinite time ahead.

MOVING TOWARD REFORM

While concern over a breakdown of the international monetary machinery seems greatly overstated, it is nevertheless symptomatic of the uneasiness with which present international monetary arrangements are viewed in many quarters. This will certainly spur the discussion of change and reform which already has gathered considerable momentum in recent years.

Variety of proposals

One set of proposals, identified largely with the French point of view, would abandon the system of reserve currencies and would restore gold, or currency units based on gold, as the exclusive medium of international reserves and settlements. Presumably this would be accompanied by a substantial increase in the monetary gold price.

A second major line of thinking, represented by the U.S. point of view, advocates improving and extending the present system under which gold and national currencies are held as monetary reserves, with arrangements to supplement owned reserves in case of need by borrowing either from an international agency or from other countries. British opinion apparently would favor an international institution equipping reserve currencies with a gold guarantee in order to make them more acceptable to central banks, which would ease the task of financing protracted payments deficits on the part of the United Kingdom and the United States. The Continental European nations, as creditors, would, on the other hand, generally prefer a system limiting the proportion of reserves held in dollars and sterling, thus placing more effective pressures upon the reserve currency countries to eliminate their payments deficits with reasonable dispatch. Beyond this, there are proposals for the development of some new international reserve medium that would either supplement or supplant the reserve currencies presently in use.

Primarily in academic circles, plans have been launched which reflect the general criticism of the present arrangement under which the amount of international monetary reserves depends essentially upon the payments positions of the reserve currency countries. To remedy this situation, it has been proposed that an international institution, somewhat akin to a central bank, be established with the power to create reserve assets in amounts consistent with the liquidity needs of world trade and finance. Still others, again mainly academicians, would abolish the system of fixed parities in favor of flexible exchange rates. Finally, there are some who would increase or decrease the price of gold by a regular amount each year, or who would have the United States continue to sell gold at its present price but reserve the right to reduce its buying price. Seldom has so much diverse and contradictory advice been offered by so many experts.

Areas of consensus

Although many advocates of these various plans argue their case plausibly and persuasively, a practical obstacle is that the international monetary system cannot be "reformed" unilaterally by one or a small group of countries, including the United States. Rather, any significant changes need to be negotiated and agreed upon by all major members of the world's monetary society; at present, the monetary authorities of the countries directly concerned agree on relatively few fundamental issues.

There is agreement, for instance, that gold will continue as a monetary reserve and as the final medium for settling international accounts. There is also agreement that international liquidity in the form of monetary reserves is adequate for the present and for the foreseeable future; this rules out the need for an increase in the price of gold as a means of increasing monetary reserves and international liquidity. In fact, there is wide concurrence that a change in the price of gold by the United States or by other leading countries would be a source of serious disturbance to the system as a whole and would be a most inappropriate way to meet future needs for international monetary reserves. By the same token, the principle of fixed exchange rates is accepted as a basic premise, and the leading countries accept the responsibility to hold fluctuations in the exchange value of their currencies within the narrow limits set by the IMF.

Beyond these fundamentals, however, views as to the features of the monetary system of the future differ widely among the major industrial countries. These differences reflect essentially the conflicting interests of creditor and debtor countries; they underscore the conclusion that until the reserve currency countries, and especially the United States, solidly redress their payments situation, proposals for international monetary reform must remain largely academic.

The problem of equilibrium

The crucial and at the same time most troublesome prerequisite to progress in the international monetary sphere, therefore, is to reconcile the conflicting interests of those major countries which have been running sizable balance-of-payments surpluses with those—essentially Great Britain and the United States—which persistently have run large deficits. The monetary authorities are in substantial agreement that both forms of disequilibrium are undesirable: deficits, because they lead to losses of monetary reserves, a decline in the liquidity of the deficit country, and pressures on the country's currency in the exchange markets—surpluses, because they result in the accumulation of monetary reserves which sooner or later provoke inflationary tendencies.

In both cases, appropriate corrective action may clash with domestic policy goals. The deficit countries may be reluctant to apply fiscal and monetary restraint because of the fear that these actions may inhibit economic growth and expansion; the surplus countries may be equally opposed to liberalizing their import policies, increasing their foreign spending or investing, or permitting the price-raising influence of growing liquidity to run its course. It is not surprising, therefore, that the problem of reconciling the conflicting interests of surplus and deficit countries is the greatest obstacle to international monetary reform.

Nevertheless, this problem must be faced. Neither the present system nor any that may evolve in the future can operate successfully if the leading nations run large chronic payments surpluses or deficits, and no reallocation of reserve currency functions or rearrangement of international credit facilities can relieve for long the individual countries of the discipline of their balance of payments. Those who believe that international monetary reform, possibly including the creation of a new reserve unit, will enable the United States or the United Kingdom, for example, indefinitely to incur large payments deficits will be seriously disappointed. On the contrary, to the degree that currencies other than the dollar and sterling gain in use as monetary reserves, the ability of the present key currency countries to finance continuing payments deficits will be correspondingly reduced.

A look at the future

The foregoing suggests that the leading industrial nations cannot reasonably be expected to reach agreement on monetary reform until the currently large gap between the payments deficits of both Britain and the United States—but especially the latter—and the surpluses of the major continental countries is closed, or at least greatly narrowed. And until substantial agreement is reached, there is little prospect of real progress toward monetary reform.

For some time to come, therefore, the Western World will continue to live under the present system, with some gradual changes but without any drastic or radical revisions. This means that the gold price will remain at $35 an ounce, that monetary reserves will be held largely in gold, and that dollars and sterling will continue to provide the bulk of the reserve currencies. Moreover, the leading industrial powers, if only in their own self-interest, may be expected to continue whatever cooperative arrangements are required to moderate the reserve losses of Britain and the United States and to provide substantial support if a member currency is beset by adversity.

Meanwhile, efforts will surely be continued to make the present system stronger and more efficient. Official studies to this end are presently underway, with most of the major financial countries taking part; the debates and the conclusions may help not only to deal with immediate problems but also to widen the areas of agreement and thus build a foundation for broader reforms.

Eventually, conditions may become appropriate for the creation of a new international reserve medium, supplementing gold, dollars and other national currencies. However, the amounts of such a new reserve unit that will be issued will in all probability be held within fairly stringent limits; it would be unrealistic to expect that countries with payments deficits will be granted access to additional reserves except under terms and conditions designed to insure that the borrowers remain under effective pressure to regain equilibrium in their international accounts. In fact, if the adjustment mechanism can be improved so that large and persistent payments disequilibria can be avoided, the system should be able to function with considerably smaller reserves than today.

Farther beyond the horizon may lie a time when the leading nations will be prepared to adopt a common monetary policy, possibly determined by a supranational organization. This, however, is still in the distant future. It presupposes a world of considerably closer economic integration than has so far developed or seems in prospect.

For today and for years to come, the principles governing international monetary arrangements will in all probability be not too dissimilar from those under which the world is presently conducting its international trade and investment. Monetary problems will not be resolved by spectacular innovations or panaceas. On the contrary, it is becoming increasingly necessary for countries to pursue domestic policies designed to preserve the stability of their national currencies and to maintain substantial balance-of-payments equilibrium within the existing framework of international monetary arrangements.

DESCRIPTION OF RIOTS IN WATTS, CALIFORNIA

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, much has been written about the riots in Watts, California, but recently I received a letter from a very close personal friend of mine, Mr. E. G. Bickel, of Davis, Calif., who happened to be in Watts during part of the riots.

Mr. Bickel wrote me the following letter, which gives a very vivid description of exactly what he saw and actually what occurred. His letter follows:

DAVIS, CALIF.

Hon. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ARTHUR: Beyond its real significance, the Watts riot is perhaps being magnified by the press into an ugly and distorted image of what Time magazine, for example, terms "The Plight of the American Negro." In common with others, I think that this is being done with slanted inflammatory and inaccurate reporting.

We all know, of course, that quite a bit of our journalism has become increasingly sensational, shading the real behind the fanciful for headline effect. But how many of us will realize that such distortion of the news concerning upheavals such as Watts is, in effect, incitement to further national disgrace?

I don't know of an honest journalist in the old or indeed the new school today who doesn't look with contempt on some of the highly colored reporting and editing that is inaccurate and in the case of the Watts disaster, largely lurid and untrue.

I was in Watts during the riot, and I myself saw the havoc and the drunken turmoil. And I talked to the Guardsmen and the police officers who saw much more of it than I did.

From this firsthand knowledge, I think I can say with conviction that the word pictures and the factual narratives of many of the newspapers, and in particular Time magazine, was misleading if not actually false.

Deeply disturbed by what I saw that involved my beloved colored people so cheerful, kindly and thoughtful in my own home when I was young, I wrote an angry protest to the offending article in Time. Perhaps because of its worldwide circulation and what I conceive to be its duty to regard its dissemination of the news such as the Watts tragedy as a self-imposed public trust to use extreme care to see that it was true and factual.

Of course, I expected no response and there was none. Except, perhaps, the followup article in the issue of September 24 titled, "Los Angeles—The Far Country." This article had the same slant, calculated or not, to foment a rebellious spirit in the type of Negro who was at the core of the Watts riots.

Knowing you for so many years as I have, and your warmth and deep concern for the public welfare, I'm going to quote for you from a letter I wrote to Time magazine in the heat of my resentment at the tenor of their lead article in the issue of August 27.

Probably in it a legislator at your level serving the public for so many years, as you have, can find some small peephole for perspective on what has now become a sort of national scandal or so-termed in the press.

Anyway, I will quote from my letter as follows:

"I was present in Watts during the rioting, and finally escorted out of it by one of Chief Parker's police officers, not 'cops.' On this journey we saw no sidewalks buried with huge shards of glass and chunks of concrete that filled the air at the riot's height. Nor did we see the glint of sunlight on thousands of brass cartridge casings that gave the eerie look of an abandoned battlefield.

"Or do we believe that, as you say, the 'after image' of these drunken riots, which they were, 'haunted all Americans save in the unilluminated corners of its own big cities,' where it certainly should have. And also filled those same corners with remorse for what was largely a teenage drunken orgy, aided by young adults, who all made their homeland a sorry and distorted spectacle before the world.

"Your report goes on to say the week of these riots had brought the United States almost everywhere else proud success, mentioning our farmlands where crops are ripening. Why didn't you add—and also rotting because no pickers and other labor was available for these farmers who were watching their crops go to ruin? Farmers who want to know what type of political conniving has enabled our Honorable Secretary Wirtz to exclude the conscientious and hard working braceros from Mexico, and not replaced them with equally hard working and conscientious unemployed Negroes? This is the Honorable Mr. Wirtz who has himself photographed with burly Negroes carrying placards purporting to solicit farmers for work formerly done by these honest braceros until they were excluded.

"We read further in your article of 'scenarios of violence' in the ghetto's rubbled streets. Sometime have your reporter cruise around Watts in the shade of the palms, and along streets lined largely with well cropped lawns, and neat and adequate small bungalows that most Russians would cherish and beautify. If this area is a ghetto in the normal sense of the term, then your reporter who described it thus might as accurately be described as an ape.

"If American Negroes, who were once respected and gentle 'Uncle Toms' if you will, but beloved colored people in my own home and time, are now so degraded that this drunken and murderous orgy by a hard core of lawless punks gives them a feeling of potency and has developed in them a sense of pride in drawing world attention to a largely fancied plight, it's long odds that they'll never earn their way to equality with law-abiding whites, or indeed with our law-abiding Japanese, Chinese, Filipinos, Mexicans, and others. These honorable citizens earned their share of equality on merit alone, and by their devotion to the principles universally admired. We maintain that all good American citizens won their equality that way.

"You go on to record a statement that these rioters, the majority of whom were drunk on stolen liquor, are on the brink of hopelessness, and just had a temper tantrum to get whitey. And to burn, baby, burn. Even including the President, 'who had better be white and black, or he can burn, too.'

"To give your space, which with your great circulation should be a voluntary public trust, to such hipster hogwash, is in itself an incitement to further violence by the lower elements of an emotional people who are fascinated by their own frightening image, verbal or otherwise. To quote, or give credence, specious or otherwise, in your mag or your sister mag, Life, to the outbursts of such oafs, smacks of a shoddy and venal kind of journalism which has the old dollar sign between the lines, instead of the public interest.

"You end your article with what you say is a statement by a Negro laborer, 'I don't want anyone to give me anything. All I want is a job.' If, by remote chance he should, send him the attached headline appeal by the Dixon Tribune. It begs for workers on our 'boundless farm lands' where record crops are rotting on the ground. He can make around $50 a day if he's honest and will work like the conscientious braceros. The rioting, drunken punks can make at least $2.30 an hour if they'll work. But maybe it's easier to be on relief. Or pillage and steal. Or loiter on street corners and insult passing white women, even rape them.

"You describe Chief Parker, of the Los Angeles police, asserting derisively that he is a 'crusty cop' who is often accused of 'shooting from the lip.' This flippancy in what should be a factual report of a real tragedy is certainly not in good taste, or spirit. If Chief Parker's comments were as impolitic as yours, his truthful description about those drunken rioters being like monkeys in a zoo would have taken on some silly hipster hyperbole such as your man uses. And if he said 'We are on the top and they are on the bottom,' as you report, we feel he spoke the truth, and with the courage to handle for our protection the murderous attacks of such drunken riffraff.

"I have read your publication since it was first published, I believe, in the early twenties. I am now ashamed of you.

"E. G. BICKEL."

RELEASE BY PROFESSOR UPGREN, "UNITED STATES TO GO BUST NOVEMBER 18, 1970"

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently by unanimous consent to insert my own remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter, I inserted excerpts from a speech delivered to the California Commonwealth Club by Prof. Arthur R.

Upgren, director of the bureau of economic studies at Macalester College in St. Paul, Minn.

I now have a release by Professor Upgren dated May 9, 1959, together with a release dated July 24, 1965, in which I am sure those who are interested in the financial affairs of our Government, and especially of our banks, will be most interested. These two releases follow:

"United States To Go Bust November 18, 1970"—Arthur Upgreen Sets the Alarm for 10:30 A.M.

(By Arthur Upgren)

Star editorial page readers are certainly entitled to know the methods of economic forecasters—like myself—who foist their predictions on the public. Having done this twice in the past and now being prepared to make a third forecast, I probably should make a statement of methods.

My first forecast, concerning the end of the boom, was given in a talk in Minneapolis in September 1957. I predicted the end of the boom for October 7, 1957, at 2:30 p.m. By just how many hours my prediction was in error I leave to editorial page readers to judge. In retrospect, the prediction seems pretty good.

That estimate was made on the basis of one single, but extremely important fact. For the quarter starting October 1, 1957, the expenditures of American business for new plant and equipment started their speedy 1957–58 recession decline.

After having ascended for a year and three-quarters by $9 billion, these outlays, so important to the upward trend of the business cycle, now started a year's rapid descent. The total decline was $8 billion in a year.

My date of October 7 allowed a week for the news to spread. That's why the decline came October 7, 1 week after the bad news was released.

My second prediction was made more in advance, in the winter of 1957–58. It was that business would turn up with great force on July 21, 1958, at 8 a.m. This prediction proved to be so good that the Federal Reserve Board's research department had to recalculate later (and in an upward direction) its index of industrial production for July 1958 to match the accuracy of my prediction.

I had taken into account the fact that most heavy industries in the United States take massive vacations the first 3 weeks in July. So, of course, business would turn up on July 21 which opened the third week of the month after these massive vacations.

These past predictions were of a short-term character and quickly fulfilled. My new prediction is of a much longer run character, but it is of very much greater importance:

The United States will be ripe for a real end of the boom and, therefore, for a big bust. The date for this bust I now fix at November 18, 1970, at 10:30 a.m.

The hour of 10:30 a.m. is selected because that is the time of day when all checks are presented by banks to each other for payment and the bank clearings take place. So watch the Federal Reserve bank at the corner of Fifth and Marquette on November 18, 1970 for a lot of excitement.

The excitement, of course, will concern the checks going into the bank, not the impregnable fortress Federal Reserve bank of Minneapolis. Its walls won't fall down on that date, even though, like a modern Joshua, I blow doom on my horn.

November is picked because our serious crises always come in November, the past normal month for crises (except for that of March 1933). One November economic bust that of 1907, was so bad and left the country so short of money that a Boston department store bought the receipts of the Harvard-Yale football game that year so that they could advertise: "We give you change."

The year 1970 is picked for a very specific reason. Our supply of money—currency and bank deposits—must grow about 5 percent a year. Today our financial system is 53 percent liquid. In 1929, in contrast, just before the great bust of that year, our financial structure was only 23 percent liquid. Then came trouble and financial collapse.

Now the growth of our whole money system in the next 11 years will be such that financial liquidity on November 18, 1970, will again be reduced to 23 percent. Even the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) is concerned because in its annual report for 1957 (pp. 65–66) it says:

"There is nc question that the present deposit insurance fund would be entirely inadequate should, for example, a situation similar to that of 1930–33 recur."

They then ask:

"To what extent can we expect a situation such as that of 1930–33 to recur? Certainly, we can conceive of the possibility of a severe economic downturn accompanied by large numbers of bank failures. Neither the public confidence engendered by the existence of Federal deposit insurance nor the improvements in banking and bank supervising would be sufficient to prevent these failures which would be a consequence of economic dislocations of a fundamental nature.

"However, because the Federal Government is committed, under the Employment Act of 1946, to follow policies which will stimulate full employment, and in view of the knowledge and authority now possessed by various agencies of the Federal Government, it is reasonable to assume that we will be able to avoid prolongation of a serious depression."

There you have it. Even the FDIC says it can't stem the tide, so we see why the trouble will come and, of course, I have the date worked out for you—November 18, 1970, 10:30 a.m. But sell your stocks about 1968.

Now it will not do to end on this morbid note. What can we say that will be good?

Well, first we have given the country 11 years notice of a serious problem—the maintenance of proper levels of liquidity for our banks. Then we can add that our banks in our upper Midwest are more liquid than in the country as a whole, so we are going to do better.

Next, we can hope the country will do something in response to our warning, though the six deep financial collapses we had from 1873 to 1933 do not encourage us. But, we are doing better.

Then finally, to close on a note of levity, many of us by 1970 shall be retired to Florida and we must leave a few economic problems for handling in later issues of the Minneapolis Star.

A Solution for Future Financial Crises

(By Dr. Arthur R. Upgren, Frederic R. Bigelow, professor of economics and director of the bureau of economic studies at Macalester College, St. Paul)

When the United States devalued the dollar and increased the price of gold from $20.67 an ounce to $35 an ounce early in 1934, we thereafter attracted such a large amount of gold to our country that our monetary and banking gold reserves increased from $4 billion in 1934 to almost $24 billion 10 years later, in 1944. There has been no parallel to this large increase in monetary reserves in gold in the world's financial history over the centuries since A.D. 1500.

Monetary reserves were thus greatly enlarged. No inflation whatever was produced, inasmuch as gold by the 1930's was no longer in circulation as money but merely reposed in our central banks as reserves. Banking reserves, of course, became very excessive.

With our entry into World War II in 1941, however, and with large arms spending prior thereto, we ran very large deficits in the Federal budget. In fact, only about 46 percent of the cost of the war was financed out of taxes.

As a result, the Treasury took the easy course of financing a large share of its huge deficit at the commercial banks. This greatly enlarged their liquidity. They bought $100 billion of U.S. securities. Consequently, the total volume of money and usable bank credit in the United States doubled.

TABLE 1.—*The liquidity of all banks in the United States, 1929–45 and 1945–65*

[In billions of dollars]

	June 30, 1929	Dec. 31, 1939	Dec. 31, 1945
LIQUIDITY GOES UP			
Cash and reserves	6.3	23.3	35.3
U.S. Governments	5.5	19.4	101.3
Loans and other securities	41.1	22.2	39.0
Liquidity ratio (percent)	23	63	83
	1929	1939	1945
Total deposits	53.9	68.2	165.6

NOTE.—The "liquidity ratio" is what bankers say it is; namely, the ratio of all cash and reserves plus all U.S. securities to total deposits

The major part of our money supply is the bank deposits which are created and, of course, enlarged by the acquiring of assets by the commercial banks, particularly by acquiring the $100 billion of additional U.S. Government securities acquired by the commercial banks in the course of World War II.

As table 1 shows, bank liquidity was hugely increased from 1929 to 1945.

In the table, the large increase in the cash and reserves of the commercial banking system is accounted for mostly by the huge inflow of gold. Since 1952 we have lost $11 billion of gold. As we have lost this gold, the Federal Reserve banks have acquired equally large amounts of U.S. Government securities. They purchase these securities to enlarge the reserves of the member banks held at the Federal Reserve banks so that there would be no serious shrinkage in the ability of the banks to continue to expand loans and deposits. Of course, then bank liquidity falls.

Bank liquidity is what bankers say it is; namely, the sum of cash and all reserves, plus U.S. Government securities to total deposit liabilities. This liquidity ratio in 1929 was 23 percent, and thereafter we had a complete financial breakdown. In fact, this level of 23 percent has imminently preceded past financial crises, such as the panic of 1873 and other serious financial difficulties in the United States.

With the remarkable record of the commercial banks since the end of the war in expanding their loans from $39 billion at the end of 1945 to $270 billion recently in 1965, we have seen bank liquidity constantly fall. As a result of the great expansion in deposits by this expansion of loans, the bank liquidity ratio in April 1965 had fallen to 33.3 percent.

Table 2 reveals this decline in liquidity which followed the $230 billion expansion in bank loans for 1945–65.

TABLE 2

[In billions of dollars]

	Dec.31, 1945	Dec.31, 1955	Apr. 28, 1965
LIQUIDITY GOES DOWN			
Cash and reserves	35	50	52
U.S. Governments	101	67	64
Loans and other securities	39	111	270
Liquidity ratio (percent)	83	52	33.3
	1945	1955	1965
Total deposits	166	221	348

As banks continue to lend, as they necessarily must if we are to maintain an expanding money supply for an expanding economy, more loans are made and liquidity is reduced. It is the projection of this rate of reduction in bank liquidity by about 2 percentage points a year which brings us to the prediction of financial difficulties about 1970. Bank liquidity then will be 23 percent. We have always had financial crises as that low level (for the United States) is reached.

Can we find a solution for these difficulties? In the United States prior to 1914 with establishment of the Federal Reserve System in that year, our ability to meet demands at home and abroad depended upon the surplus gold reserves of the banks, primarily the famous "surplus gold reserves of the New York City clearinghouse banks."

In 1907, the panic occurred because these surplus reserves were entirely wiped out and financial stringency resulted producing the panic of 1907.

This led to intense study in the United States of methods whereby we could stop these panics. We spent 3 years of serious study and brought forth the Federal Reserve Act, passed December 23, 1913.

Now the gold reserves of the commercial banks were to be pooled in the 12 Federal Reserve banks. That pool would then be used to stifle any incipient panic. However, though it is not at all widely recognized, the central banks failed us in 1933 with the closing of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. A central bank the world over is defined as a "court of last resort for money." Here we see that a central bank is to provide currency without letup not just when the sun is shining in business generally, but when there are bad times. The closing of the Federal Reserve banks and the issuance at about that time of the emergency currency approved by Congress both contributed to the difficulties we had of having a fully maintained money supply. The supply shrank by about 25 percent.

We tried a new approach. It was necessary because the Federal Reserve Banks themselves, at one time, had about 7,500 member banks and the country had over 20,000 State banks which were not members of the Federal Reserve System. It is obvious in retrospect that the Federal Reserve Banks could hardly be expected "to save" these banks with which it had no visible connection.

So we produced the Federal deposit insurance program in the early 1930's. In brief, this guarantees bank deposits up to stated amounts (now $10,000). The reserves of the FDIC are extremely small in relation to the liabilities it has assumed. So, in its annual report for 1957 (pp. 65–67) the FDIC has this to say about future financial difficulties:

"There is no question that the present deposit insurance fund would be entirely inadequate should, for example, a situation similar to that of 1930–33 recur.

"To what extent can we expect a situation such as that of 1930–33 to recur? Certainly, we can conceive of the possibility of a severe economic downturn accompanied by large numbers of bank failures. Neither the public confidence engendered by the existence of Federal deposit insurance nor the improvements in banking and bank supervising would be sufficient to prevent these failures which would be a consequence of economic dislocations of a fundamental nature.

"However, because the Federal Government is committed, under the Employment Act of 1946, to follow policies which will stimulate full employment, and in view of the knowledge and authority now possessed by various agencies of the Federal Government, it is reasonable to assume that we will be able to avoid prolongation of a serious depression."

A solution might be found along the following lines:

Let all the Federal Reserve notes issued by the Federal Reserve Banks be taken over and be issued by the U.S. Treasury as U.S. notes. (The Treasury is liable on these Federal Reserve notes anyway, so this would be no momentous change.) As the Federal Reserve Banks are relieved for their liability on their books for $38 billion of Federal Reserve notes, they could return all gold certificates to the Federal Treasury and then return sufficient U.S. securities owned to balance the accounts. (The national debt would be reduced by about $25 billion.)

This would leave the Federal Reserve banks with assets consisting primarily of U.S. securities and in very small amount of rediscounts or borrowings by member banks. Against these two assets the Federal Reserve bank would hold member bank deposits or reserves.

The functions of the Federal Reserve banks would now be limited to the open market purchase and sale of U.S. Government securities as they wish to increase or decrease the reserves of the member banks in order that there should be proper monetary control for the single purpose of avoiding inflation and deflation and supply an adequate growth in the Nations money supply—chiefly bank deposits.

The U.S. Treasury now would own its gold stock free and clear of a reliability upon gold certificates. It would have issued additional U.S. notes to supersede the $36 billion of Federal Reserve notes now retired. If we wish, the 25 percent gold requirement against U.S. notes could continue, as we now have the requirement against the Federal Reserve notes.

The remainder of the solution is extraordinarily simple. The U.S. Treasury would issue U.S. notes against any properly authenticated check on any insured bank in the United States. In this way there could be no banking collapse, no money panic, nor what is the more serious problem: "a collapse of the money supply." It was this collapse which caused a loss in the great depression of the 1930's of at least $200 billion. Were there to be any future recession of similar relative magnitude, such a recession could cause future losses which would be measured by figures ranging from $500 billion to $1 trillion.

We are all aware of the good intentions of all authorities to avoid these difficulties, but the means to do so should be prepared in advance, not patched up in a time of great trouble.

As the Treasury might then cash any bank check, thus carrying out before any damage is done the guarantee of the FDIC, it could clear the check. If the bank upon which the check is drawn could make payment, that would be clearing in the normal manner. If the bank, however, was in difficulty, the Treasury could take a subordinated deposit at the bank to be cleared up when the financial crisis had passed.

While the proposed solution sounds radical, indeed, it is all implicit in the present Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation arrangements for guaranteeing bank deposits. However, the important point is that bank deposits created out of the process of making loans are the Nation's money supply. That money supply cannot be reduced without injury to the economy.

If the collapse of the money supply is to be avoided, some risks must be taken to avoid the immensely greater risk of another one of the financial crises and collapses which have occurred so many times in our Nation's history and which would cost vastly more, at least 50 to 100 times the possible loss under the plan herein proposed.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it quite clear that if acute illness in my immediate family had not prevented me from being present last Thursday, I would have voted against the Harvey amendment. I am a strong supporter of the rent supplement program and voted for it when the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 was adopted earlier this year. I hope that the damage done by the adoption of this amendment will be repaired this week.

BITTER REACTIONS AS THE RESULT OF PASSAGE OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 560

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the recent passage of House Resolution 560 has, as some of us expected, set off bitter reactions among our Latin American friends. I think it is misleading to speak of "irreparable damage." The Latin Americans, by now, are accustomed and even resigned to such unexpected behavior from their North American ally. But it is not impossible, I think, that with imagination and effort this country can counteract some of the hostility which followed the passage of the resolution.

I think it should be clear that some very major intellectual house cleaning will be necessary if we are to reinforce our reputation and, by so doing, inject optimism and energy into the presently demoralized inter-American system.

I am quite aware that the principles and procedures of the inter-American alliance are in need of reevaluation and improvement. As is the case with NATO, the conditions in which this collective security system now operates, are fundamentally altered from those in which that system was conceived and established.

I share with many of my colleagues—including, let me say, those who voted for House Resolution 560—a sense of frustration with the current mechanics of the inter-American alliance. I find no reason to believe, however, that the problems we all feel exist can be resolved by a compulsive flexing of American muscle.

We must learn to distinguished between problems caused by the structural inadequacies of the alliance, and those brought about by more complicated but equally important psychological factors. I suggest outright that until we make some progress in changing the tone of our alliance, we can have no hope for finding necessary improvement in the machinery of that alliance. The former is an absolute prerequisite for the latter. As of now, I believe the current mood of Western Hemisphere relations is one of suspicion, uncertainty, and pronounced nervousness. The inter-American system presently has a very bad case of the jitters. The condition is complex and its causes multiple.

At root, our predicament stems first from deep confusion over Latin American policy in the executive branch, and second from our failure to generate a spirit of open inquiry both here and in the Western Hemisphere. Strictly speaking, we are bound to the principles of the Rio Treaty, the charter of the OAS, and the Alliance for Progress. We are on record as continuing to accept the principle of nonintervention. And the United States, it appears, still intends to promote the idealistic goals of the Alliance for Progress, however tarnished and distant those goals.

Yet the ideals, treaties, and procedures to which we are committed are themselves in need of reexamination. And one cannot establish a consensus and a mood of common enterprise if the foundation for that unanimity is in disrepair. This, it seems to me, is the background for the current demoralization of the Western Hemisphere alliance.

Let me be more specific. Our policy for Latin America is usually stated quite simply: We favor self-determination, democracy, and social progress, and, in that cause, seek to oppose and repel threats to those goals caused by the Communists. On the face of it, this formulation seems wholesome and coherent. In fact, however, its two elements, the good neighbor policy and the demands of the cold war, are far more harmonious in theory than in practice. As many students of Latin American affairs point out, this perspective can often be one of dual vision.

Thus, while an anti-Communist policy would seem to reinforce good neighbor considerations, it can often undercut them. Anyone who doubts the reality of the Communist threat in Latin America is a fool. Yet our own attitude toward communism is different from that of many Latin Americans. We are seen as fighting a global cold war. They want no part of this particular crusade. They regard Communists as fellow Latin Americans with one view of how to run a government. We see them as agents of an undifferentiated global conspiracy. They often believe Communists can be contained within their system. We usually want to refuse Communists such membership, in fear of their powers to subvert and capture the system.

Now these may appear to be marginal differences, matters of stress and emphasis. But in a mood of uncertainty, matters of stress and emphasis harden into distinct positions, and result in very tenacious prejudices and suspicions. So the basis of our Latin American diplomacy can be schizophrenic, and that condition can be more or less pronounced at different points in history.

It simply is insufficient to argue that our goals always correspond to those of Latin America. This is a correspondence to satisfy theoreticians not politicians. In the final consideration, most Latin Americans appear to believe that we are more concerned with being anti-Communists than we are with being good neighbors. But whatever the truth, it does no good to explain repeatedly that both roles serve and reinforce one another. In practice, they often seem to conflict. And if the Latin Americans believe they conflict, then we have to deal rationally with that belief; we have to take it for what it is.

Our first efforts, therefore, have to be in response to the tone and mood of the Alliance and must treat with attention Latin American evaluations of our mutual problems. The sort of action I am talking about is neither very tangible nor very visible. But it is important for just these reasons. How do diplomats behave at meetings with Latin American officials? How much careful attention is given to Latin America at high level foreign policy meetings? How free do Latin American policy planners feel to discuss new and exciting ideas among themselves and with Latin America colleagues? What is the underlying tone of American speeches? And how does the Executive relate to congressional activity? The question, in short, is how to project a diplomacy which communicates a spirit of humility and open-mindedness.

One way not to do this, if you are the Congress, is to pass resolutions like House Resolution 560. One way not to do this, if you are the Executive, is to allow such resolutions to be passed.

I am today submitting a resolution to reaffirm this country's commitment to the procedures of the OAS charter and the Rio Treaty. From one perspective, this is unnecessary. But from another focus, one which emphasizes the need for a new atmosphere of inter-American relations, such a resolution serves an important function. As long as Congress is going to express itself in this area, we ought to seek means to support our friends and communicate our willingness to hear and respect their needs.

In my resolution, I urge that this country "encourage meetings of the Organization of American States to explore means to improve the authority and machinery of the inter-American system for any such collective consultation and action." We have to explore the basis of our commitments, and the procedures for implementing them. We have to reexamine with some honesty the whole complicated problem of intervention. It does no good to issue invocations to the principles of nonintervention or anticommunism. We have to sit down and find out what these principles mean for 1965 and the future.

But let me suggest that these conversations will have little chance of yielding success if they are conducted in the present mood of suspicion and hostility. The principal task for the next several months must be to clear the atmosphere to open some windows and some minds, and to shake some hands instead of our fists. It will be unlikely, for example, that our interest in a permanent OAS peacekeeping force will gain any respect unless we can convince people beforehand that we really and honestly want such a force to be multilateral in the composition of its command as well as in its personnel. And to convince them of that, we have to make our word appear trustworthy and dependable.

Until our basic approach to Latin American diplomacy is purified, its substance will remain ambiguous. Until we demonstrate an openmindedness to all new proposals, such proposals will not flourish. For the early successes of the good neighbor policy and the Alliance for Progress, after all, were measured largely by how they sounded and felt to Latin Americans. Our promises excited our allies in short because the spirit in which they were presented was legitimate and authentic.

I submit that the authenticity of our goals in Latin America is currently subject to wide skepticism. It is time that we awake to this skepticism with behavior which is patient and flexible rather than peevish and proud. Communists in Latin America are unfortunately going to be with us for some time. The problems of subversion and intervention are desperately complex. But we have to demonstrate our willingness to hear and respect whatever positions Latin Americans themselves wish to take on communism in their hemisphere. This is called repect for self-determination. It is also smart politics.

U.S. CAPITOL

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, thousands of visitors walk through our Capitol Building daily during the peak of the tourist season. I say "walk through" because, under existing circumstances, they are encouraged to do little else. The problem, as I see it, is lack of adequate interpretive facilities.

It is true that the Capitol guides provide a useful—and necessary—service. But, it is also true that their basic concern is with the building itself, not what we as individual legislators do here or what the function of our institution is in the American system. At the same time, most of us do assist visitors as best we can in the hope that they will better understand—and appreciate—what is involved in the business of making laws. But here again we can only scratch the surface; there is a limit to what we and our office staffs can do without jeopardizing our capability to fulfill the other responsibilities that we have.

So I have been extremely pleased in recent weeks to see the increasing interest expressed by my colleagues of both parties and in both Houses of Congress in the establishment of a visitors center on Capitol Hill. And it is in this context that I want to bring Members' attention to a proposal by the American Political Science Association, which hopes to set up and operate such a facility.

Mr. Speaker, as most of my colleagues know, this organization has had a good deal of experience with the Congress, in conducting a wide range of public service programs over the past dozen years. Operating on a strictly bipartisan basis, the association currently is sponsor of the following activities involving congressional operations:

Congressional fellowship program: Begun in 1953, this program enables young journalists, political scientists, and Federal executives to spend a year as staff assistants to Members of Congress, providing participants with a better understanding of the legislative process.

Distinguished Service Awards: For each Congress, the association presents an award to an outstanding Democrat and Republican in both the U.S. Senate and House.

Congressional staff fellowship program: The association each year awards a number of 6-month and 1-year fellowships for university study and research to selected House and Senate office and congressional committee staff members. Carried out in consultation with a bipartisan House-Senate advisory committee, the purpose of this program—financed by a grant from the Ford Foundation—is to improve the knowledge and skills of administrators and researchers, encouraging thereby the further development of a permanent and highly professional staff system.

School for freshman Congressmen: In January 1963, the association was cosponsor, with a bipartisan group of eight Members of the House, of a weeklong series of meetings designed to introduce congressional newcomers to the workings of the House of Representatives. A similar program was held under association auspices in January 1965. For this program, the association prepared a 225-page supplementary text, entitled "An Introduction to Legislative Service."

Legislative operations roundtables for executives: Seminars in legislative operations are arranged on a continuing basis by the association—at the request of the Civil Service Commission—for Federal career executives. Sessions of these legislative operations seminars are conducted by political scientists, Members of Congress, and executive branch staff members.

Congressional study project: The association is undertaking a comprehensive study of the problems of congressional organization and operation. Completion of the research and publication of the results are expected soon.

Study of campaign debate broadcasts: The association's Commission on Presidential Campaign Debates made a study of procedures and format for future television and radio debates between presidential candidates. The report incorporates, among others, the views of many Members of Congress.

Senate youth program: The U.S. Senate youth program each year introduces about 100 outstanding high school student leaders—2 from each State and the District of Columbia—to the workings of their National Government. Student participants are selected by State superintendents of education across the land and are brought to Washington, D.C., for a week of internship and study without cost to the taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, the association is proposing to operate a Capitol Hill Visitor's Center—without cost to the taxpayer—with funds from a private foundation. Under unanimous consent I place their proposal at this point in the Record, and I commend it to your attention:

American Political Science Association Proposal for a Visitor's Capitol Hill Orientation Program

I. PROPOSAL

To take advantage of a unique educational opportunity; to contribute to public knowledge about the role of Congress in the American system; and to evaluate the potential of tourism in Washington, D.C., for general public affairs education, the American Political Science Association proposes to:

Establish a visitors orientation center, open to the public free of charge, on Capitol Hill.

Develop a lecture and film program explaining the workings of the U.S. Congress and the significance of this institution in our democracy.

Design a system for testing the effectiveness of such programs in expanding knowledge about the legislative process, government, politics and public affairs generally.

II. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Millions of visitors are attracted to the Nation's Capital each year, and their number appears to be increasing steadily. Today, it is estimated that over 20 million—including roughly 1 million high school students in various educational programs—travel to Washington, D.C., annually. By 1970, the number of visitors annually is expected to reach 25 million and by 1980 over 35 million are expected each year. The average stay for visitors is 3 days, and there is no doubt that most are interested in observing governmental operations while in the city. Indeed, the pressure on facilities in the Capitol Building itself presents a serious problem during the peak tour season (hallways become too congested with slow-moving tourists—and the House and Senate cafeterias become too crowded—for use by harried congressional employees).

Despite the educational potential of tourism, however, little has been done to interpret for visitors the various kinds of governmental activities that they observe. There is no central visitor's center (such as that at Williamsburg), nor has provision been made for lectures, exhibits, or films describing governmental structure or processes. Guided tours are available in some agencies and buildings, including the Capitol, but these are limited to description of physical surroundings with only passing attention to historical highlights. No systematic effort has been made—either publicly or privately—to develop and conduct a program that includes a general introduction to the workings of the National Government or to the role of any of its component parts. Finally, the few supplementary textual materials available on a free or nominal cost basis are totally inadequate.

The consequences of this situation extend beyond failure to realize the educational potential of tourism in Washington. Without adequate interpretive materials and program techniques, casual observation of Congress, for example, has a high potential for the creation of misunderstandings. (Senate and House gallery visitors customarily leave the Chamber confused—if not irritated—at the apparent inattention of the few Members who have "bothered" to attend.)

Such misunderstandings, which have implications for civic education and the viability of representative institutions, could be anticipated—and avoided—in the development of an appropriate interpretive program. The American Political Science Association has wide experience in organizing and conducting programs in civic education. The association also has special competence in the general field of congressional operations and organization, and is currently conducting numerous public affairs and public service programs relating to Congress.

It is within this context that the association proposes a series of projects designed to interpret the workings of Congress—and to explain the role of this institution in the American system—for visitors to the Nation's Capital.

III. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

The association will establish a Capitol Hill Visitor's Center, will develop and conduct its educational program and will produce supplementary textual and film materials. While overall administrative support will be provided by the association, the program will be carried out in cooperation with a bipartisan Congressional Advisory Committee, headed by the Vice President of the United States. Operation of the center will be the responsibility of a full-time director chosen by the executive director of the association.

It is anticipated that educational programs will include lectures and short talks by Members of Congress, by representatives of the executive branch, by political scientists and other experts in the field of congressional operations. The association will conduct a national competition to select up to 10 advanced political science graduate students—who have demonstrated an interest in the study of Congress—to assist the center's director in conducting and in evaluating the program on a continuing basis. Generally, the center will operate from mid-June to Labor Day; additional schedules may prove desirable during the spring vacation period.

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE FOGARTY AT DEDICATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH MEDICAL CENTER

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like

to include a speech which I delivered at the dedication of the University of Utah Medical Center, October 16, 1965:

TOMORROW'S MEDICINE IN THE INTERMOUNTAIN WEST

(By Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.)

President Fletcher, Dean Castleton, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, we meet here in Kingsbury Hall this afternoon in the shadow of the Wasatch Mountains not only to dedicate a new medical center at this university but to inaugurate a new era in intermountain medicine.

Sometimes we can see the outline of history as it unfolds, and today is such an occasion. The past is present, here—the University of Utah is the oldest State university west of the Missouri River—and I read with interest in your college bulletin that its founders were of New England heritage and cherished ambitions for the incorporation of higher learning in their newly founded community. But the University of Utah College of Medicine is one of the youngest medical colleges in the United States—and perhaps this is the reason that it so gladly embraces the future. For the future is present, here, too—in the blending of the teaching hospital with the colleges of medicine and nursing, and in this medical school's extraordinary participation and leadership in community affairs throughout the State.

As the only college of medicine between Denver and the Pacific coast between Canada and Mexico, the University of Utah has risen to meet the demands of an entire geographic region. In this sense—in pioneering in regional medicine—the University of Utah is already in the future. It is setting an example from which the rest of the country can profit. In this area you are, I think, one jump ahead of the Congress.

During my 24 years in Congress I have seen historic moments in health legislation come and go. Sometimes they were capitalized upon, sometimes they were missed. But never have so many forces combined to such advantage for improving the health of our people as have combined this year to make the 89th Congress the "medical care Congress."

Note that I did not say the medicare Congress. Proper medical care for the aged is an important aspect of the comprehensive medical care we must provide for our citizens. But it is only one aspect of a much broader problem with which the Congress has been concerned and that is to insure that the results achieved by our magnificent national research effort over the past 15 years and more, will pay off in the saving of lives, in preventing disease and disabilities, and in diminishing human suffering.

Since I became chairman of the House subcommittee concerned with medical research and health-related matters in 1949, I have taken every opportunity to urge my colleagues in Congress to establish and maintain a national medical research effort that is second to none.

I am well aware that we do not yet have all the answers we are seeking about the causes of the major chronic diseases—heart disease, cancer, mental illness, and the neurological and metabolic diseases. I am well aware that we must continue—and continue to accelerate—our efforts to gain a better understanding of disease. But the time is now also ripe for giving greater attention to the equally urgent problem of applying the research results that have already been achieved.

This was the intent of the 89th Congress in voting overwhelmingly for a measure to intensify the battle against heart disease, cancer, and stroke. That measure was drafted in response to the report of a Presidential Commission, under the chairmanship of Dr. Michael DeBakey, which said that "Every available fact points to the same conclusion: the toll of heart disease, cancer, and stroke can be sharply reduced—now, in this Nation, at this time."

This historymaking report pointed out, among other things, that:

Two-thirds of all Americans now living will fall victim to cancer, heart disease or stroke;

Forty-eight million American citizens will contract cancer;

Nearly 15 million people suffer from heart disease and this, together with strokes, accounts for more than half of the deaths in the United States each year.

The report went on to emphasize that these tragic figures can be sharply reduced if we only apply existing knowledge to the fullest possible extent. For example:

Most forms of congenital heart defects can now be corrected;

Many strokes can be foreseen and prevented;

Deaths from some forms of cancer, such as cancer of the cervix and uterus, can be virtually eliminated and the chances are greatly improved for the cure of cancer in other accessible sites.

These things can be done—now—without waiting for further research results.

The principal feature of this new legislation is that it provides funds—$340 million over the next 3 years—with which the Federal Government will encourage and assist the establishment of regional cooperative arrangements among medical schools, research institutions and hospitals designed to forge a closer link between the centers of scientific and academic medicine, on the one hand, and community health services, on the other.

I have no doubt that your institution has plans—which I would be very interested in hearing—for the implementation of such a regional medical center—a center which will be a pilot project for tomorrow's medicine.

This forthright new program will not interfere with present patterns of patient care and professional practice but it is nonetheless a revolutionary piece of legislation. It holds enormous promise for advancing the quality of medical service available to the people of this country. It marks, I believe, the beginning of a big new step forward in accelerating the pace of progress in medical service to match the pace of medical science.

The support by the Government of a nationwide network of centers to combat heart disease, cancer, and stroke will unquestionably add a new dimension to the Government's role in the support of the medical sciences.

But I want to make it abundantly clear that this is not a radical departure from traditional support of research by the Federal Government. It has never been the intent of Congress to build up in this country the greatest medical research organization in the world just for the sake of research. The National Institutes of Health, through which the Federal Government provides most of its support for medical research, have a clear mandate to conduct and support research—and I quote—"relating to the cause, diagnosis, treatment, control, and prevention of physical and mental diseases and impairments of man." Research results which are found in the laboratory but which never reach a patient are of interest to science, but not to humanity.

The problem before us today is to bridge the gap between the laboratory and the patient—and in doing this it is important to remember that we are expanding an effort long underway—and in which the Government has a vital role—to improve the health of the American people.

The implementation of this dramatic piece of legislation demands your most imaginative and foresighted cooperation. There is no Federal blueprint for this program and it is not intended that there should be one. The pattern of grants-in-aid already so well established and so successful in the support of medical research will also be followed in this new program. Grants will be made in response to local initiative, to facilitate local planning, and to assist local execution of the plans.

The most important element in this program—as it has been in Federal support of research, hospital construction, and numerous other programs—is cooperation. The purpose—and, I am happy to say, the effect—of these programs has been to stimulate and assist local activity. The medical center we are dedicating today is an excellent example of this type of cooperation. The Federal Government, by contributing half the cost, has played a significant part in making this center possible. But we can all be proud that you not only supplied the initiative for this progressive development but that the other half of the funds came from non-Federal sources. The university itself and private contributors—in equal measure—combined to match the Federal grant-in-aid.

Those last two words are important. We have fallen into the slovenly habit of talking about Federal grants. Let us remember that they are properly called grants-in-aid. The full phrase conveys a significant attribute of these programs of which we should not lose sight. The role of the Federal Government is to aid, to assist, to stimulate activities that are in the total national interest but for which responsibility and direction must remain with those who will actually conduct them.

The glowing success of our national medical research effort is due in no small measure to the faithful adherence of the National Institutes of Health to this fundamental principle in the relationship between the Federal Government and the biomedical community.

There is no doubt in anyone's mind that the NIH will administer the new medical centers program as ably as it has administered its many other pioneering research and health programs.

It is natural to think of NIH in connection with the University of Utah. I recall that it was a study in muscular dystrophy at this college of medicine that led to the first extramural project to be sponsored by the NIH. It was an unusual combination of circumstances that made this Utah community ideal for the study of hereditary diseases such as muscular dystrophy.

Your special laboratory for the study of hereditary and metabolic disorders was organized for that project, and I note that the laboratory is still productive. You should take great pride in the record of accomplishments of this laboratory. It was this laboratory that first demonstrated that the effect of PKU—one of the diseases which cause mental retardation in children—is reversible through dietary measures. This laboratory also first discovered that muscular dystrophy includes many diseases—that it is not just one disease—and the laboratory's investigators were among the first to discover a test for detecting the gene for traits of so-called childhood dystrophy in women who are not crippled by the disease but can pass it on to their children.

I recall another early NIH project here—concerned with epilepsy—and which has been successful over the years. Under the leadership of Dr. Louis Goodman, this project has led to a better understanding of the mechanism of action of drugs against epileptic seizures, and I am told that he is currently studying the brain and its functions to increase our understanding of the effect of drugs on that vital organ.

Dr. Goodman's role in the discovery of the effectiveness of nitrogen mustard against one type of cancer brought him early recognition, and he and his coworkers are credited with the innovation of the treatment of cancer with drugs—with the result that thousands of cancer patients are living longer lives.

The tangible and intangible benefits to be derived by any medical school from the pursuit of research are not only well appreciated here, but have seldom been stated so well as by Dean Castleton in the college of medicine bulletin. Research, he said, enlarges the faculty for classroom teaching in all aspects of modern medicine; increases the worldwide contacts of the faculty; provides student participation in research; and makes possible significant contributions to the advancement of medical knowledge.

The completion of this new medical center now makes it possible to house in one building—at least for the present—the research laboratories, college classrooms, and the teaching hospital. This center—plus the newly reorganized veterans' hospital nearby—provides undergraduate and graduate medical students with the most up-to-date medical teaching facilities.

The stage is now set for an even finer blending of medical research, teaching, and service, here at the University of Utah College of Medicine. This is in keeping with the stated goal of the college—to enable students to become efficient, independent, self-teaching physicians, with the ability and desire to keep abreast of advances in scientific medicine during the years following graduation.

I am particularly impressed with the activities of the division of postgraduate medical education. It is a noteworthy pioneering venture in coordinating the activities of the college of medicine with the various medical and scientific organizations in the whole intermountain area in an effort to provide opportunities for continuing medical education for the practicing physician.

I am impressed by the visits which your faculty members make to practicing physicians in distant, rural communities to help them keep up-to-date without leaving their busy practices. I am interested in the development of your medical TV clinics for practicing physicians—which other medical schools have adopted—and your two-way radio communications system between the University of Utah College of Medicine and hospitals throughout the State.

This is the sort of progressive thinking—the sort of imaginative new development—that we must have at the State and local levels throughout this Nation if we are to provide more and better health care for our people.

Providing more and better health care is, in a sense, an important new frontier. We have not done very well in making the best that medical science has to offer available to all our people, in all parts of the country. There is too long a time lag before the results of research are applied in medical practice throughout the Nation. Too often the quality of medical service available to a patient depends on where he lives—or on how much he can afford to pay.

The amount and effectiveness of the help that a patient receives should be solely dependent on the state of the art—not on the State in which he happens to live.

This will not be an easy goal to achieve and we shall have to face—and overcome—some tough problems.

You have probably seen some of the newspaper and magazine articles that have appeared all across the country worrying about the impact of medicare on our limited health resources. One of the most forceful of these pieces appeared in a national mass circulation magazine which said that medicare was being launched into a shambles. Now, it is not news to most of us that there is a serious shortage of hospitals and of health professional personnel of all kinds in this country. But instead of wringing our hands, we should roll up our sleeves and do more about it. Denying people medical care because we are short of facilities and personnel is not an acceptable solution.

Those of you in university circles—as well as those of us in Congress who are concerned with health legislation—are keenly aware that even to maintain our present inadequate ratio of physicians to population, we shall need 346,000 physicians by 1975. We have less than 290,000 today. Even with the Federal aid possible under current law, we can only increase the number of physicians produced annually from 7,500 to about 9,000 by 1975. At the end of the projected 10-year buildup, the annual shortage will still be 2,000 physicians. We shall be short about 15,000 dentists by 1980. There are fewer public health physicians in this country than there were 15 years ago. To provide for the national deficit in pharmacists and optometrists, the current number of graduates will have to be doubled, just to maintain current ratios. An so on with the other health fields.

This is a continuing problem—and one that some of us in Congress have been wrestling with for the past decade. We have had some success in dealing with it, too.

In the same month that the Congress passed the legislation for the regional medical programs for heart disease, cancer and stroke, it also passed the Health Professions Educational Assistance Amendments of 1965 to augment our manpower sources. As many of you know, this act will provide funds for a 4-year program of basic and special improvement grants to schools of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, and optometry to enable these schools to increase the scope and quality of their teaching programs. This measure also extends student loan funds and—for the first time—provides a 4-year program from which scholarships up to $2,500 a year may be awarded to students of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and optometry.

I am confident that this Nation can meet the increasing demands on the part of our citizens for a greater share in the benefits of the most up-to-date medical care. That is their right. I am confident that we can enlarge the base on which such an expansion of services must rest. We have had nearly two decades of progress under the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act—which has assisted in the construction of nearly 5,700 health facilities in this country. We have had nearly 10 years experience with the Health Research Facilities Construction Act, which has played a major part in giving us a national medical research establishment that is second to none.

It is time—it is past time—that we take a comparable initiative in making the best in diagnostic and treatment services available to all of our people. We are making a start with a program aimed at the three diseases that are now the leading cause of death. It is the aim of the regional plan to bring the latest medical advances to every American everywhere, including those living in small towns, farm areas, the poorer sections of cities.

Thomas Jefferson said long ago that "The care of human life and happiness is the first and only legitimate object of good government." Our Government, through cooperative action with the medical community and our academic institutions, has gone a long way to lay a solid foundation for the continuous advancement of the medical sciences which are fundamental to the care of human life and happiness. We must now match this effort with programs for the continuous advancement of medical services—not only in terms of quality but of availability.

That is the major task now before us. That is the task to which this new medical center will help you to address yourselves. You can be proud of the spirited way in which you are rising to today's challenge and I salute you for it.

A PROVEN SUCCESS

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, we will have before us the Conference Report on H.R. 9567, the Higher Education bill. I rise in support of the Teacher Corps, a new provision added to the bill in the other body.

The first book of Ecclesiastes tells us that "There is no new thing under the sun." To hear some of my colleagues talk about the National Teacher Corps, I would have to say they are forgetful of their Bible.

They certainly are not mindful of what has been going on in education either. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because the idea behind the Teacher Corps is not experimental nor is it revolutionary. It is a respectable idea that has been put to good use for many years by local schools and cooperating universities around the Nation. We are indebted to Senator EDWARD KENNEDY of Massachusetts and his colleagues for including the Corps in the higher education bill. What we are discussing today is Federal recognition and assistance to a program that has had great meaning and has given great service to our schools. And yet a few of our colleagues here in the House seem frightened and threatened.

I would like very much to reassure them that the Teachers Corps idea, in particular its teacher intern provisions, are not experimental but tried and tested and found to be of great value.

The teacher intern idea dates back to 1895 when Brown University first tried it with the help of the schools of Providence, R.I. Since that time, 70 years ago, a growing number of colleges and universities have adopted the idea for their own teacher training programs.

Here are but a few: The University of Pittsburgh, Michigan State University, the University of California at four of its major campuses, Yale, Harvard, Berea College, the University of Chicago, Temple University, the University of Wisconsin, and Wesleyan University.

Educators from these and other colleges and universities have stated that, although their intern programs are successful both for the school children and the interns, that they can do no more without considerable financial help. All these schools have backed the idea of a Teacher Corps.

Three years ago a national survey was made and it turned up the interesting fact that 180 teacher-intern programs—similar to the one we are discussing today—were being conducted in public schools with the help of colleges and universities.

They are carrying on these programs with their own funds, often at some sacrifice for other programs—but they do this because they get something out of the program that is truly priceless—a fine teacher, a teacher who will stay in the profession and remain dedicated to the advancement of education and the development of our youth.

Experience, they say, is the best teacher. These schools, across the country, have had experience with the very kind of thing we are talking about. And they recommend it. They recommend it highly.

One final point, Mr. Speaker, on this matter of experience. We know that 14 percent of first-year teachers—that is, 14 of every 100 college graduates who begin their teaching careers—drop out of the teaching profession before going into their second year on the job.

But a second year makes all the difference. The teacher dropout rate then plunges downward and the retention rate climbs comfortably. And this brings me back to a prime provision of the Teacher Corps as proposed in title V of the Higher Education Act.

Under this title, the Corps teacher would agree to serve for 2 years. In other words, we would be able to carry the beginning teacher over the hurdle of that first year.

We have every reason to believe that such a new teacher would then remain in the teaching profession, be a credit to it, and give to our children the kind of creative dedication they urgently need.

There are many reasons for supporting the Teacher Corps. But what interests me is the unfounded fear on the part of a few colleagues here that this program, for all its acknowledged merits, as some kind of risky experiment. It is not an experiment. It is already a success. It has been tried and verified and used and adopted by schools and colleges and universities great and small across America.

We here will lend our support to an approach to education that is needed and has been proven.

"There is no new thing under the sun," and there is no new thing under discussion now. Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members of the House to join me in ratifying a proven success.

THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION AS A POTENTIAL RESOURCE FOR HEALTH SERVICE MANPOWER TRAINING

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's most important goals is the protection of the health of its people. In support of this purpose we now have a vast store of information and experience. Through the medium of research, we have access to infinite sources of additional knowledge which will one day complete and perfect our efforts. We can be proud, indeed, of the position of world leadership which our Nation holds in the valuable human services of medical care and their essential supporting operations of medical research and medical education.

These gains have been made by dedicated men and women who have planned carefully and worked diligently to construct the social, economic, legal, and scientific complex upon which our health service professions are established. There is nothing fortuitous about the progress we have made thus far. In these highly technical and keenly competitive fields we can leave nothing to chance or contingency. We must plan to the very limits of intelligent foresight, and we must provide the tangible resources that will assure success.

The record which the Congress has established in the medical field has not been equaled. The actions which the 89th Congress has taken are tremendous and with this advance goes the demand for more facilities and a greatly increased need for medical and related personnel.

To name but a few of these measures, this year:

Public Law 89–105, which authorizes assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for community mental health services.

Public Law 89–109, which provides additional money for community health services;

Public Law 89–115 for the construction of health research facilities;

Public Law 89–239, the Heart Disease, Cancer and Stroke Amendments of 1965;

H.R. 3141, which is likely to become law before this session adjourns and which has as its purpose the improvement of the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants for such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students and to further provide for student loans and aid in the construction of teaching facilities in such schools, and schools for other health professions; and

H.R. 3142, which seeks to provide adequate medical library services and facilities.

The effects of the medicare law effective next July have yet to be actually determined. From all indications, its impact on our entire medical and hospital system will be of the greatest proportions.

Yet, it seems to me that in all of this, the medical and hospital facilities of the Veterans' Administration, the largest unit in the Federal field in the care of patients, are being ignored or at best not being utilized in the most productive fashion. This situation should not be permitted to continue. Any system which hospitalizes over 112,000 each day, and which is affiliated with 78 medical schools, has a ringside seat, to say the least, in any question involving medical care. It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that the Veterans' Administration should not be on the sidelines in the medical training and education program, but should be one of the most active participants. It is for that reason that I have today introduced this bill, which I will include as a part of my remarks at the end thereof.

We are faced with a serious situation, which demands positive and aggressive action. Here, the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration can make a real and lasting contribution. It is uniquely qualified to do so.

THE HEALTH SERVICE MANPOWER NEED

To maintain our present ratio of 140 physicians for every 100,000 persons, 330,000 physicians will be needed by 1975. This will require the annual production of 11,000 medical school graduates, 3,600 more than the 1959 total. Present estimates indicate that by 1975 our annual graduation rate will be only 9,185. To bridge the gap between essential medical manpower and our present rate of supply, we have relied heavily on the importation of physicians from other countries.

In dentistry there has been a decline in the ratio of active non-Federal dentists for every 1,000 civilians from 49.9 in 1950 to 44.9 in 1963.

The Surgeon General's Consulting Group on Nursing estimated in 1963 a need for 850,000 practicing professional nurses by 1970. This compares to a national supply of 550,000 in 1962, of whom 117,000 were working only part time. To achieve the objective would require the graduation of 100,000 nurses annually by 1969. This year there will be approximately 32,200 graduates of U.S. Schools of Nursing, or a net addition to our national nurse supply of only 10,000, since 23,000 can be expected to leave the profession within the year.

Our national supply of physical therapists is 10,000, as compared to an estimated current need for 15,000. Many of these people, too, work only part time. In occupational therapy the prospects are even less bright. There are at present 7,500 qualified occupational therapists in the country, less than half of whom are professionally active. The national need is estimated at 12,000 with 4,000 new graduates needed annually. The current graduation rate is 400.

There are 38,000 registered medical technologists, of whom only 28,000 work full time. An additional 25,000 are needed. There is a similar shortage of radiological technicians.

Because of the large percentage of persons over 65 who have suffered strokes and who need speech rehabilitation, there is a great need for therapists specializing in speech training. It is estimated that not more than 250 trained persons provide speech rehabilitation for aphasic patients on a full-time basis. More than twice this number is needed to meet the current demand.

To fill existing vacancies, the country needs 15,000 more qualified social workers at the master's degree level. There are now 6,600 students in 56 graduate schools of social work; 2,700 graduate annually.

The American Hospital Association reported last week that 1,887,000 persons were employed in hospitals in 1964. This represents 133 hospital staff members for every 100 patients, as compared to 73 in 1946.

The President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke said:

> We must expand the basic resources and facilities for educating and training health personnel. We must develop increased opportunities for education and training leading to careers in the health occupations.

A valuable partial solution to these and other problems may lie in the decision to bring into full use the already existing capacity for health service manpower training in the Veterans' Administration. The magnitude of the existing Veterans' Administration program is shown by the table which follows:

Training program	Number of affiliated medical schools, colleges, and/or universities	Number of trainees	Cost of program fiscal year 1966	Consultant funds
1. Medical residency (noncareer)	78	4,800	$17,723,000	[1] $2,000,000
2. Medical school students (primarily clinical clerkship)	78	9,000	(2)	(3)
3. Dental residents (noncareer)	16	45	237,600	(3)
4. Dental school students	6	400	(3)	(3)
5. Social work	63	520	1,104,840	(3)
6. Psychology	68	810	3,340,800	275,000
7. Pharmacy residents	14	21	91,476	5,000
8. P.M. & R. therapies	133	1,090	241,920	(3)
9. Blind rehabilitation	2	58	(3)	(3)
10. Audiology and speech pathology	31	110	553,248	(3)
11. Hospital administration residency program	4	8	66,073	(3)
12. Hospital librarian	16	16	86,400	(3)
13. Dietetic residents and interns	8	13	29,740	(3)
14. X-ray technician	3	20	(3)	(3)
15. Dental hygienist and dental assistant	15	115	(3)	(3)
16. Medical technology	11	80	105,840	(3)
17. Nurse anesthetist and inhalation therapist	2	25	(3)	(3)
18. Nursing:				
(*a*) Basic collegiate schools of nursing	67	4,570	[4] 294,057	(3)
(*b*) Junior colleges	20			
(*c*) Diploma schools	51			
(*d*) Graduate	21			

[1] Estimated at 25 percent of time of consultants at total projected cost of approximately $8,000,000 for consultants in VA hospitals in fiscal year 1966.

[2] An undetermined cost is engendered for quarters and food for clinical clerks.

[3] Not available.

[4] An undetermined cost is engendered for quarters, subsistence, and laundry for student nurses in some hospitals

THE HOSPITAL AS THE NATURAL AND ESSENTIAL LOCALE FOR HEALTH SERVICE TRAINING

In the health service field, the general colleges and universities are a valuable and often essential asset, but in themselves universities are usually not complete health service training facilities. The role of the hospital as the essential and proper setting for much of the training in this field has emerged and become preeminent in recent years. The kind of training that was done in classrooms with blackboards, charts, and other inanimate tools of education has quite largely given way to the actual clinical setting in which the trainee is exposed very early to real life situations of patient care and to close associations with the many other technical disciplines that form the patient-care team. The superiority of this approach to medical and ancillary training is now so widely accepted that teaching hospitals find themselves functioning as a kind of multidisciplinary college. In their staffing and architectural facilities, many are quite incompletely prepared for this new role.

THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION TRAINING RECORD

For almost 20 years, hospitals of the Veterans' Administration have been offering hospital-based educational experience in collaboration with most of the Nation's medical schools—78 of the 86 accredited schools—and more than 200 colleges and universities. The success and productivity of this partnership between an agency of the Government and the non-Federal system of higher education has won the confidence and praise of educators, scientists, and political leaders throughout the world.

Although the training record of the Veterans' Administration has been spectacular in its quality, the quantitative output has been severely limited. The Veterans' Administration has no legal mandate to engage broadly in the training of health service personnel. Except for the physician and dental programs, funds and physical facilities have been provided only in support of limited training activities directly related to the agency mission and scaled to agency recruitment needs. Despite the fact that the Veterans' Administration is one of the Nation's largest employers of health service manpower, the agency has never been charged with responsibility or vested with the clear authority to replace its own usage, much less to make a positive contribution to the total health service manpower needs of the Nation. Despite these restrictions the Veterans' Administration hospital system contributes each to the training of more than 15,000 health service personnel in more than 25 different employment categories.

THE POTENTIAL OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION IN TRAINING

The important point here is this. In no training category are the staff and teaching resources of the Veterans' Administration system used to full capacity, and in all but two or three categories the number of trainees is scarcely more than a token of the total training potential. In a hospital system authorized to operate 125,000 beds, with more than 5 percent of the Nation's medical manpower, and with established working relationships in hundreds of universities and medical schools, the potential training capacity is truly enormous.

It is difficult to know exactly what it would cost to expand the entire spectrum of the Veterans' Administration's capacity to train health service manpower, or just how rapidly this can be accomplished. It is obvious, however, that the cost can be only a fraction of that which would be incurred if we are forced to create an entirely new resource to accomplish this training. It is clear, also, that much less time will be lost if we expand and build on existing plants and functioning organizations.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The experience gained during 20 years of voluntary cooperation between Veterans' Administration medical programs and institutions of higher learning clearly indicates what can and should be done at this point. Only minor changes are needed to create the legal environment which will encourage and support the health service training programs of the Veterans' Administration, and give them dignity and proper recognition, and initiate a period of renewed growth and vigor.

My proposal, therefore, is a simple one. First, it would amend section 4101 of title 38, United States Code, which describes the general functions of the Veterans' Administration, Department of Medicine and Surgery. It would add the function of training and education of health service personnel to the already established functions of a complete medical and hospital service—patient care—and medical research. This action is in full consonance with the basic intent of the law and strengthens its logic by giving recognition to the widely accepted proposition that patient care, first and foremost, and then research and education in medicine are interdependent and essentially inseparable activities.

Second, it would amend section 4112 of title 38, United States Code, which deals with medical advisory groups. Here it would broaden the original concept of advisory liaison between the Veterans' Administration and the academic medical community. In addition to the Special Medical Advisory Group—composed of distinguished physicians from across the country—which meets in Washington once every 3 months, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs would be empowered to establish local advisory bodies at the individual hospitals where education and training activities exist or can profitably be developed. These advisory bodies would include personnel of the Veterans' Administration and of the medical center or other entity which has agreed to cooperate in the training programs.

The deans' committees which were informally established by administrative policy memorandum have been very largely responsible for the high quality of medical care that has characterized the Veterans' Administration hospital system since World War II. The function of these committees, however, has been limited to the physician training programs and has served as a mechanism of liaison with medical schools only. The advisory bodies proposed in this amendment would provide supervision for the training of all types of health service personnel to be extended from all elements of a university medical center complex. Thus, the Veterans' Administration training programs can be related to schools of nursing, schools of social work service, university departments of psychology, and so on through a single advisory body. Despite the great success of the deans' committee mechanism, it is generally agreed among medical educators and hospital administrators that a broader and more formalized structure must be set up if we are to realize the full potential of the Veterans' Administration in the training of health service manpower. The local advisory bodies will also serve to maintain a high degree of decentralization which is so essential to experimentation and creativity in the pursuit of education.

I plan to submit this proposal to the Bureau of the Budget, the Veterans' Administration, and the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Defense, with the request that reports and suggestions be placed on an expedited basis. In addition, Mr. Speaker, I plan to submit this bill to medical, academic, and scientific groups for the benefit of their advice and suggestions.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 11631

A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to clarify the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the training and education of health service personnel

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4101 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately before the first sentence and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) In order to more effectively carry out the functions imposed on the Department of Medicine and Surgery by subsection (a) of this section, the Administrator, acting in cooperation with schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and nursing; other institutions of higher education; medical centers; hospitals; and such other public or nonprofit agencies, institutions, or organizations as the Administrator deems appropriate, shall carry out a program of training and education of health service personnel."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 4112 of title 38, United States Code, is amended (1) by amending the subheading thereof to read "§ 4112. ADVISORY BODIES", (2) by inserting "(a)" immediately before the first sentence thereof, and (3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) In each case where the Administrator has a contract or agreement with any school, institution of higher learning, medical center, hospital, or other public or nonprofit agency, institution, or organization, for the training or education of health service personnel, he shall establish an advisory committee. Such advisory committee shall advise the Administrator and the Chief Medical Director with respect to policy matters arising in connection with, and the operation of, the program with respect to which it was appointed. Members of each such advisory committee shall be appointed by the Administrator and shall include personnel of the Veterans' Administration, and of the entity with which the Administrator has entered into such contract or agreement. The number of members and terms of members of each advisory committee shall be prescribed by the Administrator."

(b) The analysis of chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "Medical Advisory Group" and inserting in lieu thereof "Advisory bodies".

A SENSE OF MISSION

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Teacher Corps.

The brightest, most modern classroom in the country—the best stocked, most highly automated library in the country—as desirable and as fine as these may be—they can never take the place of a dedicated, highly motivated teacher who understands the needs of children, especially the children of poverty.

Only through education can we salvage the lives of these children, Mr. Speaker, and there are 10 million of them in the Nation today. Ten million. Yes, only through education, through fine teachers, can these millions of children be rescued.

We need new teachers who will get special training in the problems that surround poverty—teachers with what President Johnson has called "a sense of mission."

The Teacher Corps will provide such teacher interns with that "sense of mission." I have no doubt of this. It is clear in the record of the hearings held on the proposal. It is clear in the excellent presentation made to us by the conference committee. It can be, Mr. Speaker, a reality.

Underlying every effort to make the Corps a reality is the sure knowledge that it will work. I have no doubts on that score.

Study after study has shown how effective a teacher can be if he is especially trained to work with disadvantaged children. Study after study has shown that special training programs for teachers in low-income areas produces better students who become better adults and better citizens.

But the time for making studies, for evaluating studies, for analyzing studies, and then for making more studies has past. Now is the time to make use of those studies throughout the Nation.

For this is not a radical new program that is being offered to us today. Brown University, one of our finest institutions of higher learning, has had a teacher intern program going since 1895. It has produced teachers of excellence who have served not only in the proud State of Rhode Island but in over half the States of the Nation as well. Wisconsin, Michigan, Harvard, the University of Pittsburgh, the University of California—four of its many campuses—all of these plus many others have been operating teacher intern programs with local schools for many years.

Outside of his own family, a child's teacher is the most important person in his life. An understanding and inspired teacher can influence a child's outlook on life and his whole future.

The Teacher Corps will attract the most talented and dedicated young people graduating from our colleges and universities. They will seize this opportunity for service where they are so critically needed.

When the Teacher Corps is in operation, we will have narrowed a large gap that has handicapped thousands of our children for many years and impeded American progress generally.

Teaching teams set up through the Teacher Corps would go to a school district upon a request from that district itself.

The program is designed to provide for maximum flexibility in making assignments for Corps teachers with special qualifications needed in any particular area. Each local school district will itself control the assignments of the individual teachers within the school system, transfers within the system, the subjects taught by the members of the Corps, and the term and continuance of the Corps member within the school system.

In our society, the Nation's teachers are extremely important people, for we are dedicated to the goal that each child shall have quality in education and full opportunities to reach the top of his abilities, in whatever direction they incline. We seek the best teachers we can develop and the highest possible quality in education for all of our children.

As President Johnson said in his message to this House on July 17:

> The National Teacher Corps draws on that spirit of dedication of Americans which has been demonstrated time and again in peace and war, by young and old, at home and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, we are facing today an issue of dedication, of quality in education, of great need by thousands of school districts under terrible pressures, and above all, the issue of 10 million children who are waiting for our help.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues will join with me in their wholehearted support for this proposed Teacher Corps contained within the Higher Education Act of 1965.

NATIONALIZATION OR GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF INDUSTRIES OR SERVICES OR SKILLS

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a resolution passed October 8, 1965, by the Mas-

sachusetts State Labor Council, AFL-CIO:

RESOLUTION NATIONALIZATION OR GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF INDUSTRIES OR SERVICES OR SKILLS

Whereas the nationalization of industries is an abhorrent to a free enterprise system as we enjoy in these United States; and

Whereas AFL-CIO unions detest the act of government taking over or the threat of taking over our rights as independent working men and women and citizens as we sometimes experience during incipient or actual strike action; and

Whereas we, in the AFL-CIO, abhor compulsions that infringe on our American rights, whether it be compulsory arbitration or other compulsions flowing from rules of regimentation by Government departments; and

Whereas there is no known AFL-CIO union on record as favoring the nationalization of their own specific union or industry; and

Whereas representatives of specific International and Local Unions are elected because they have become more expert concerning matters in their particular industry; therefore, nationalization or governmentalization of industries should not be an AFL-CIO aim unless the advocate's own industry in nationalized first; and

Whereas nationalization of an industry would place such workers under governmental aegis with restrictions on free and open political action as we understand it under COPE because of the restrictions of the Hatch Act; and

Whereas we in the AFL-CIO advocate that our Government not make available cheap clothing, steel, shoes, tools, and all other products of labor by glutting this country with foreign made products which is cheaper because of cheaper wages or standards of these workers; and

Whereas our education under the union label and services program teach us that we should combat cheap goods and services that are a result of cheap labor and low working conditions of nonunion shops in companies and industries; and

Whereas nationalization of industries, particularly electric utilities, rarely make provisions in these laws for unionism through collective bargaining provisions which is the main reason for our own existence as unions; and

Whereas the record shows that barely 3 percent of all electric utilities under government are organized into the legitimate AFL-CIO; and

Whereas the record also shows that whether the electric utility is municipally owned, a public power district or otherwise controlled by government, collective bargaining has been denied and local unions destroyed or prevented; and

Whereas the rates of pay and other working conditions, on the whole, are far inferior and lower than those that bona fide AFL-CIO unions have negotiated; and

Whereas the philosophy of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley is repealed in more than 92 percent of the contracts between AFL-CIO unions and private utilities in permissible States and even in the so-called right-to-work States, AFL-CIO unions have clauses to provide for union security in the event of the repeal of this obnoxious section as opposed to the factual denial of unions, whatsoever, in 97 percent of the so-called public power companies; and

Whereas the AFL-CIO affiliated unions in the private utilities have never advocated that other AFL-CIO affiliates be placed under nationalization conditions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this eighth constitutional convention of the Massachusetts State Labor Council, AFL-CIO, go on record of supporting the free enterprise system and its principles as practiced in the United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That we oppose the nationalization or government control of any industry where union-represented companies can and will meet the needs of the country or community adequately.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for the week of October 18, 1965, on account of official business.

Mr. CALLAWAY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for an indefinite period on account of travel outside the United States on official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ZABLOCKI, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BRADEMAS, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANNUNZIO) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. CAREY, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. COHELAN, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. O'KONSKI.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. ELLSWORTH.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANNUNZIO) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KEOGH.

Mr. BURKE.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 317. An act for the relief of the Swanston Equipment Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1311. An act for the relief of Joseph J. McDevitt;

H.R. 1319. An act for the relief of Joseph Durante;

H.R. 1409. An act for the relief of Louis W. Hann;

H.R. 1644. An act for the relief of 1st Lt. Robert B. Gann, and others;

H.R. 1836. An act for the relief of Constantinos Agganis;

H.R. 2005. An act for the relief of Miss Gloria Seborg;

H.R. 2285. An act for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Cioffi;

H.R. 2557. An act for the relief of Frank Simms;

H.R. 2757. An act for the relief of Maria Alexandros Siagris;

H.R. 2853. An act to amend title 17, United States Code, with relation to the fees to be charged;

H.R. 3288. An act for the relief of Hwang Tai Shik;

H.R. 3515. An act for the relief of Mary Ann Hartmann;

H.R. 3669. An act for the relief of Emilia Majka;

H.R. 3770. An act for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Navy at the Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, Calif.;

H.R. 4078. An act for the relief of William L. Minton;

H.R. 4137. An act for the relief of Dr. Jan Rosciszewski;

H.R. 4194. An act for the relief of Angelica Anagnostopoulos;

H.R. 4203. An act for the relief of Alton G. Edwards;

H.R. 4464. An act for the relief of Michael Hadjichristofas, Aphrodite Hadjichristofas, and Paniote Hadjichristofas;

H.R. 5167. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the administrative settlement of tort claims arising in foreign countries, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5457. An act for the relief of Maria del Rosario de Fatima Lopez Hayes;

H.R. 5554. An act for the relief of Mary Frances Crabbs;

H.R. 5904. An act for the relief of Nam Ie Kim;

H.R. 6229. An act for the relief of Kim Sun Ho;

H.R. 6235. An act for the relief of Chun Soo Kim;

H.R. 6819. An act for the relief of Dr. Orhan Metin;

H.R. 7707. An act to authorize the appointment of crier-law clerks by district judges;

H.R. 7888. An act providing for the extension of patent No. D-119,187;

H.R. 8350. An act for the relief of the successors in interest of Cooper Blyth and Grace Johnston Blyth otherwise Grace McCloy Blyth;

H.R. 8457. An act for the relief of Robert G. Mikulecky;

H.R. 9220. An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Delaware River Basin Commission, and the Interoceanic Canal Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9521. An act for the relief of Clarence Earle Davis; and

H.R. 9526. An act for the relief of Raffaella Achilli.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On October 14, 1965:

H.J. Res. 695. An act making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes;

On October 15, 1965:

H.R. 3141. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6852. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 97 million pounds of abaca from the national stockpile;

H.R. 7743. An act to establish a system of loan insurance and a supplementary system of direct loans, to assist students to attend post-secondary business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools; and

H.R. 7919. An act to provide for the establishment of the Roger Williams National Memorial in the city of Providence, R.I., and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 19, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1676. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Commerce for "Salaries and expenses, Coast and Geodetic Survey," for fiscal year 1966, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriations, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1677. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal, pursuant to 63 Stat. 377; to the Committee on House Administration.

1678. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the popular election of the Governor of Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1679. A letter from the Treasurer, American Historical Association, Washington, D.C., transmitting a copy of the audit report for the fiscal year ended August 31, 1965, pursuant to Public Law 88-504; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1680. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved, according the beneficiaries of such petitions first-preference classification, pursuant to section 204(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of October 14, 1965, the following bills were reported October 15, 1965:

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 9424. A bill to provide for the conservation, protection, and propagation of native species of fish and wildlife, including migratory birds, that are threatened with extinction; to consolidate the authorities relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of the National Wildlife Refuge System; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. S. 2150. An act to discontinue or modify certain reporting requirements of law; with amendment (Rept. No. 1169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted October 18, 1965]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JONES of Alabama: Committee of Conference. S. 2300. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1170). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 11625. A bill to prevent vessels built or rebuilt outside the United States or documented under foreign registry from carrying cargoes restricted to vessels of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 11626. A bill to amend section 1498 (a) of title 28, United States Code, relating to actions for compensation for the use or manufacture by or for the United States of a patented invention during the term of the patent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11627. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 11628. A bill to provide for U.S. participation and leadership in an international effort to end malnutrition and human want, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 11629. A bill to amend section 66 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 11630. A bill to provide certain rights for employees of the Panama Canal Company and Canal Zone Government; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 11631. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to clarify the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the training and education of health service personnel; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 11632. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code with respect to the termination of pension of certain veterans being furnished hospital treatment or institutional or domiciliary care by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TODD:

H.R. 11633. A bill to establish a system for the sharing of certain Federal tax receipts with the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.J. Res. 763. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in which June 14 occurs as National Flag Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 764. Joint resolution to provide for the construction of a velodrome in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOSHER:

H.J. Res. 765. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.J. Res. 766. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.J. Res. 767. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim National Ski Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.J. Res. 768. Joint resolution to establish an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.J. Res. 769. Joint resolution to establish an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.J. Res. 770. Joint resolution to establish an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H. Con. Res. 522. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to collective action and joint consultation in response to threats to the integrity and self-determination of any member of the inter-American system; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Con. Res. 523. Concurrent resolution to establish an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 610. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct certain studies and investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII:

372. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, transmitting a copy of Senate Joint Resolution O as passed on October 5, 1965, relative to ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to Presidential succession, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 11634. A bill for the relief of Nadira Saied Murad Khatchadurian and Najdat Sarkis Khatchadurian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 11635. A bill for the relief of Morad Hekmat-Panah, his wife, Houran Shenassa Hekmat-Panah, and their minor son, Soheil Hekmat-Panah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 11636. A bill to provide for the free entry of one double focusing mass spectrometer for the use of Ohio State University; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 11637. A bill for the relief of Jadwiga Cieciuch Korszun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 11638. A bill for the relief of Francesco Lombardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11639. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Zamparelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 11640. A bill for the relief of Dr. Juan Antonio Dumois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 11641. A bill for the relief of Gloria Esmina Clarke and Aston Fitzgerald Clarke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 11642. A bill for the relief of Ladislao Toth and Tsuzsanne Patkos de Toth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 11643. A bill for the relief of Bok Sin Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 11644. A bill for the relief of Dr. Leonardo D. Exconde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 11645. A bill for the relief of Miss Hortensia Vargas Reyna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 11646. A bill for the relief of Georgios F. Filinis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11647. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Matarangas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

280. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mariana Island District Legislature, sixth regular session, Saipan, Mariana Islands, relative to the political status of the inhabitants of the Mariana Island district; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

281. Also, petition of the County Board of Supervisors, Orange County, Calif., relative to distribution of the alcoholic beverage tax revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. DONALD RUSSELL, a Senator from the State of South Carolina.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we thank Thee for the new day bathed in the tinted glories of the autumntide, for the mystic beauty of lights and shadows, weaving patterns of splendor across the templed hills.

Through it all, and in the laughter and tears of our fellow pilgrims, and in our own souls, tune our hearts to hear Thy voice that we may know we are not alone but that Thou walkest with us both in the sunshine and in the shadows.

Grant us vistas of the strength that waits to be added to our weakness for the great enterprise of world brotherhood committed to our hands. So gird the lives of Thy servants here in the ministry of public affairs that they may make decisions greatly, walk always on the high levels of noble purpose, and with kindling sympathies as wide as human needs help to heal the open sores of this stricken world.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1965.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. DONALD RUSSELL, a Senator from the State of South Carolina, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 15, 1965, was dispensed with.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of Friday, October 15, 1965, the following reports of a committee were submitted on October 16, 1965:

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 1317. An act to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer which was imported during May 1963 for the use of Stanford University, Stanford, Calif. (Rept. No. 896);

H.R. 1386. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Pomona College (Rept. No. 897);

H.R. 2565. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of the University of Chicago (Rept. No. 898);

H.R. 3126. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the University of Washington (Rept. No. 899);

H.R. 4832. An act to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer for the use of St. Louis University (Rept. No. 901);

H.R. 6666. An act to provide for the free entry of a 90-centimeter split-pole magnetic spectrograph system with orange-peel internal conversion spectrometer attached for the use of the University of Pittsburgh (Rept. No. 902);

H.R. 6906. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer and one split-pole spectrograph for the use of the University of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y. (Rept. No. 903);

H.R. 7608. An act to provide for the free entry of one automatic steady state distribution machine for the use of the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla. (Rept. No. 904);

H.R. 8232. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer-gas chromatograph for the use of Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Okla. (Rept. No. 905);

H.R. 8272. An act to provide for the free entry of an isotope separator for the use of Princeton University, Princeton, N.J. (Rept. No. 906);

H.R. 9351. An act to provide for the free entry of one shadomaster measuring projector for the use of the University of South Dakota (Rept. No. 907);

H.R. 9587. An act to provide for the free entry of a Craig countercurrent distribution apparatus for the use of Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo. (Rept. No. 894); and

H.R. 9588. An act to provide for the free entry of an electrically driven rotating chair for the use of the Louisiana State University Medical Center, New Orleans, La. (Rept. No. 895).

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 9903. An act to provide for the free entry of one multigap magnetic spectrograph for the use of Yale University (Rept. No. 900).

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States, submitting a nomination, was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, to consider the nomination on the Executive Calendar under the heading "New Report."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of William K. Thomas, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Ohio, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Francis X. Morrissey, of Massachusetts, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Massachusetts.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Tom Lilley, of West Virginia, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance and the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Judiciary Committee were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES, FILE REPORTS, AND SIGN BILLS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment following today's session until Tuesday, October 19, 1965, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and the House of Representatives; and that committees be authorized to file reports, together with any individual, additional, supplementary, or minority views, if desired; and that the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1966, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE (S. DOC. NO. 65)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, in the amount of $277,600,000, for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 2303. An act for the relief of Ernest J. Carlin (Rept. No. 908).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 2659. A bill to provide for the free entry of one double-focusing mass spectrometer for the use of Ohio State University; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 2660. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aki Sato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 2661. A bill for the relief of Jack Baer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 2662. A bill to mobilize and utilize the scientific and engineering manpower of the Nation to employ systems analysis and systems engineering to help to fully employ the Nation's manpower resources to solve national problems; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. NELSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

A SPACE AGE TRAJECTORY TO THE GREAT SOCIETY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, why cannot the same specialist who can figure out a way to put a man in space figure out a way to keep him out of jail?

Why cannot the engineers who can move a rocket to Mars figure out a way to move people through our cities and across the country without the horrors of modern traffic and the concrete desert of our highway system?

Why cannot the scientists who can cleanse instruments to spend germ-free years in space devise a method to end the present pollution of air and water here on earth?

Why cannot highly trained manpower, which can calculate a way to transmit pictures for millions of miles in space, also show us a way to transmit enough simple information to keep track of our criminals?

Why cannot we use computers to deal with the down-to-earth special problems of modern America?

The answer is we can— if we have the wit to apply our scientific know-how to the analysis and solution of social problems with the same creativity we have applied it to space problems.

The purpose of the proposed Scientific Manpower Utilization Act of 1965 is to test new ways to use the scientific manpower and know-how of the space age to solve a great variety of social problems.

This bill authorizes the Secretary of Labor to contract directly with private firms, universities, or nonprofit institution, and with States or groups of States. They would undertake studies of the use of systems analysis and systems engineering for a broad range of local and national problems. A 5-year program totaling $25 million per year is suggested in this proposal.

This bill is an attempt to build creativity upon the successful first step work undertaken by the State of California.

A little over 6 months ago, Gov. Pat Brown, of California, decided to see if space engineers, and private space firms, could apply their know-how to a number of social problems faced by the State.

Approximately $400,000 was set aside for four research contracts. These were first-stage contracts, feasibility studies. They were surface-scratching efforts to test a new idea.

Four space companies, and four teams of space engineers, were asked to look at the problems of crime, pollution, information control, and transportation in the State.

They were asked to be broad gaged in their approach. The question was: Can we take a scientific look at each of these problems in a new way, as a system of subproblems, as an integrated whole, and thereby devise new, overall, integrated approaches to their solution?

Can we put the State in a laboratory and the problem in a computer?

Another question was stressed: Can we estimate the cost of various possible approaches—or mixes of approaches—and use computers to figure out the most efficient and economical way to do a job? In other words, can we get some idea of the cost-effectiveness of a variety of social programs?

The results of the first stage are now in. They are a success. California has proved that the concept of using space engineering on these problems is a feasible one. These preliminary studies reveal truly exciting possibilities for solving incredibly difficult social problems. I think Governor Brown's idea is the most creative idea in many years. We must now follow up the initial demonstration studies with full-blown experimental research. This means testing several projects to see how various proposals now sketched by the computers will actually work in practice.

This is one of the major purposes of this bill. Another is to try to find new uses for a great national resource: our highly trained scientific and technical manpower.

Let me give you one example of what just one California study showed.

We know that space engineers have designed a system to get information to and from space capsules. They even got us photographs from Mars. California asked whether they could not use the same techniques to help government get more accurate information right here on earth.

Our earthbound information problem is huge. In this 1 State, 23 county departments report information regularly to some 28 State departments. They submit almost 600 different kinds of reports. In 1 year, 1 county will typically transmit nearly 10,000 separate reports.

Today we are still using horse and buggy techniques to handle this vast amount of information. In California alone there are already 75 miles of State and local government filing cabinets which store information—in a more or less efficient way. By 1990 there will be 354 miles of filing cabinets unless something is done.

By 1974 the documents stored could pave a paper trail to the Moon and back—and anyone who knows typical office procedures knows that finding the one needed piece of paper in a filing cabinet may well be as difficult as getting it back from the Moon.

All this need not be. Scientists today can put the information collected at city, county, State and even Federal levels, into computers. With a flick of a button the precise information desired can be pulled back out of the computer. It can even be done by remote control as telephone wires connect one city to another and computers "talk to each other."

This is not only an efficient way to store and process information; it is economical, for one computer can eliminate thousands of filing cabinets, millions of pieces of paper, hundreds of file clerks, and scores of frustrated executives who never seem to be able to get the right information at the right time.

Another California study has showed that these same computers can provide the information necessary to effectively deal with crime and juvenile delinquency.

The basic work of this study was completed before the tragedy of the Watts riots in Los Angeles. The study showed, with amazing pinpoint accuracy, that this clearly defined block-by-block area within the city was a dangerous and unstable spot. The study showed that there was every reason to expect trouble—and it showed precisely where that trouble might occur.

It is estimated that the Watts riots resulted in at least $50 million in direct losses, and another $50 million in indirect costs. Had we understood the meaning of this study beforehand, we might have been able to apply the principle of an ounce of prevention.

As this example indicates, one feature of the computer, systems-analysis approach, is a scientific attempt to pinpoint the dimensions of a problem with high accuracy.

In Watts there was five menacing indicators that pointed out the troubles: Low family income; Negro population concentrations of more than 75 percent—with little integration; living conditions with more than 10,000 people per square mile; extremely high school dropout rates; and a high arrest rate—100 or more per 1,000 in the age group 10–17; 25 or more arrests per 1,000 total population.

Using the proper criteria to identify the problem is only the first step. The second step is to find the answer—or more important—to find the right combination of answers, at the lowest cost.

One way to fight crime is to put a criminal in jail for life. This will keep him from committing a further crime, but it is extremely costly. It costs a great deal of money to keep a man in jail for a year.

Another way to prevent crime is to take each first offender, and instead of putting him in jail at his first offense, spend substantial amounts of money for counseling, job training, psychiatric care, to try to help him onto the right track for a productive, noncriminal life. This may cost more at first, but if it means society would not have to pay to keep the man in jail for the rest of his life, the initial cost may be cheap in the long run.

Our first response to juvenile crime is often to call the police; it is not obvious that we might perhaps be better advised to call the employment and counseling service.

The first California studies indicate that it might even be wise to look to other parts of the social system if we really want the cheapest, most efficient way to reduce crime. It may well be that a new welfare system, and new poverty programs, dollar for dollar, could do more to reduce crime than could bigger and better prisons.

The studies do not attempt to offer a pat solution to crime. We have none. What is suggested is that we must look at a great variety of problems, seemingly distantly related, to see if pulling on one strand of the tangle here may untie a knot elsewhere.

This is one way to describe systems analysis. What we are really trying to do is figure out in great detail what that ounce of prevention idea is really about.

We want to find out if an ounce of counseling, psychiatric care, and job training, at the outset of a juvenile delinquent's crime career will, in fact, prevent a pound of robbery and theft later on.

We want to see if 3 ounces of new probation counseling will prevent 5 pounds of crime.

In fact, we want to know precisely how many ounces of each possible approach to prevention will produce the most pounds of cure.

And we want to know the cost: We want to know—throughout the whole system—what is the most economical and effective way to deal with this problem, and what is the cheapest mix of solutions we should adopt.

To do this we must build a miniature world—a mathematical model of the real one—inside a computer, and test various solutions on this world instead of on the real one. This is the systems approach, and the cost-effectiveness method.

It is the same method used by Secretary of Defense McNamara to work out the best mix of weapons for our national arsenal; and the same method used by space engineers to work out the best mix of techniques for trips to the moon.

Another California study showed the value of systems engineering for quite a different problem. Today Federal, State, and local governments are spending hundreds of millions of dollars on research and engineering to solve problems of air and water pollution. But there are no research and planning studies of the interrelationship of these problems. There is no attempt to achieve a total solution through a comprehensive and integrated system of waste management.

We can take some of the microscopic solids out of industrial smoke to reduce smog, but if we dump those solids into a river or lake we have converted an air pollution problem into a water pollution problem.

What is needed is a study of an overall scientific system for waste management, taking into account the interrelationships of geographic regions and the effect of industry and urban areas on air, ground, and water pollution. Such a system is every bit as complicated as a Gemini flight and it would involve the same disciplines of biology, physiology, mathematics, physics, engineering, and others. Bringing together all of these disciplines and applying them to solving a problem is systems engineering.

The California studies suggested that in the future sewage system construction could be integrated with the construction of roadways. Tubeways would consist of traffic roadways and rapid transit systems above, on, or just below the surface. Electrical power and communication lines would be located near or under the road surface. Below this network would be water lines, sewer lines, treated waste water lines, gas lines, and perhaps, gasoline and chemical lines. By handling all of these problems at one time in an integrated way, huge sums could be saved.

Another idea is that municipal solid waste are not expected to be collected in the household, carried to trash cans, and carted to the street for collection, as at present. With a general high standard of living, homeowners are expected to insist on a more advanced solid waste handling system. This might be to provide all households and industries with grinders which could grind solid wastes fine enough to be effectively handled in the sewer system.

Or, the homemaker might deposit any solid waste into a wall inlet in each room and never be troubled with it again. Solid wastes from each room and garden wastes from outdoor inlets would be collected in a container beneath or beside the home. One idea would be an underground conveyor belt that transports the waste out to and under the street and deposits it on a central underground belt running beneath the center of the street.

Some homesite processing of liquid waste may be desirable. A homesite liquid waste processor and compactor could function as a primary treatment device for extracting solids from the liquid wastes before being broken down—the stabilized solids could be combined under the house with the solid refuse.

Perhaps instead of using tin cans, our solid waste disposal problem could be solved by using plastic combustible containers which present a minimal disposal problem.

But these are only a few of the many possible ideas arising out of systems analysis. Instead of looking at the narrow question of how to dispose of our present deluge of tin cans, the systems analyst looks at the broadest possible question, asking himself why we do not do away with tin cans altogether.

For waste management, for crime, for data—in short for almost any complicated problem facing the Nation, the secret is that no one facet of a problem can be isolated from the broader problem. All sides of any problem must be looked at together—as one system.

That is the purpose of this bill. We hope to build upon California's successful experience. Because of the brilliant work and leadership of Governor Brown, we know the basic idea is feasible. Now we need to do further research to test which specific approaches, and which specific solutions will work best. We need to move beyond feasibility studies to demonstration research tests.

Both the social problems we are dealing with and the men we are asking to deal with them are matters of concern to all of us. For this reason the bill provides that the actual studies are to be conducted in the various regions of the country where the problems require urgent attention, and where the talent to do the job exists. The results of any one study are to be made available to all States with similar problems.

Perhaps one of the most exciting aspects of this approach is that we will take maximum advantage of our highly trained manpower just as our best private firms are doing.

The leaders in this field are the space firms which have paved the way in California. They have developed the techniques of systems analysis and engineering. And they have the commitment to national objectives which is so important to the success of this proposal.

The aircraft-missile industrial complex alone employs more scientists and engineers on research and development than the combined total of chemical, drug, petroleum, motor vehicle, rubber, and machinery industries.

These figures show not only that the aerospace industry has a huge portion of the scientific manpower in America today, but also that we have committed this tremendous national resource to activities which are not directly related to the solution of our Nation's social problems.

It would be highly in the national interest to begin devoting a portion of the talents and brains of our defense and space industries to other national goals of a Great Society. This would require no diminution in either our defense or space commitments. We can do both—we can have guns and butter; we can have a moon shot and a national plan for the abatement of pollution; a polaris project is not incompatible with a new and scientific attack on the terrors of crime. Moreover, the California studies have shown that private firms can help us achieve this objective since many companies in other industries have developed a systems engineering capability.

In fact, this capability and brainpower already available throughout the Nation is a great secret weapon. It is a scientific weapon of demonstrated power, and a resource which represents a huge national investment.

Our task is to recognize that we have the scientific know-how, and the men, to solve almost any problem facing this society. Once we understand this, I am confident we will choose to use the resource; we will choose to set our highly trained manpower loose not only on space probes but on down-to-earth problems; we will choose to use systems analysis, computers, and every modern resource available to us in the quest for progress.

If we do that, we will have launched ourselves on a space age trajectory to the Great Society.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a copy of the bill, and various materials relating to it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and material will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2662) to mobilize and utilize the scientific and engineering manpower of the Nation to employ systems analysis and systems engineering to help to fully employ the Nation's manpower resources to solve national problems, introduced by Mr. Nelson (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Scientific Manpower Utilization Act of 1965".

Sec. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to facilitate and encourage the utilization of the scientific, engineering, and technical resources of the Nation in meeting urgent problems facing the Nation or localities within the Nation, by promoting the application of systems analysis and systems engineering approaches to such problems. The problems referred to in the preceding sentence include, but are not limited to, problems in the area of education, unemployment, welfare, crime, juvenile delinquency, air pollution, housing, transportation, and waste disposal.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of Labor (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall carry out the purposes of this Act by—

(1) making appropriate grants to States, and

(2) by entering into appropriate arrangements (whether through grants or contracts, or through other agreements) with universities or other public or private institutions or organizations,

for the purpose of causing the systems analysis and systems engineering approaches to be applied to National or local problems of types which the Secretary, by regulations, designates as being within the purview of this Act.

Sec. 4. (a) Any grant made under section 3 to a State shall be used only for the purpose for which the grant was made, and may be used by the State for such purpose directly, or through the State's entering into appropriate arrangements for the carrying out of such purpose (whether through grants or contracts, or through other agreements) with universities or other public or private institutions or organizations.

(b) No grant under this Act shall be made to a State unless the Secretary finds that—

(1) the knowledge and experience expected to be gained from the employment of such grant would have substantial relevance to problems within the purview of this Act which exist in other States;

(2) the State has presented a plan setting forth in detail the purposes for and manner in which such grant is to be used, together with the objectives expected to be achieved from the use of such grants;

(3) the State has designated an officer or agency of the State who has responsibility and authority for the administration of the program in which such grant is to be employed; and

(4) the State agrees fully to make available to the Federal Government and to other States (and political subdivisions thereof) data and information regarding the employment of such grant and the findings and results stemming therefrom.

(c) These shall not be granted to any State under this Act amounts the aggregate of which exceed 20 per centum of the aggregate of the amounts which have been appropriated to carry out this Act at the time amounts are granted to such State hereunder.

(d) Two or more States may combine to apply for one or more grants jointly to carry out the purposes of this Act with respect to one or more of the problems which they have in common and which are within the purview of this Act, and in any such case, the provisions of subsection (b) shall be deemed to require the submission of a joint plan for the utilization of the grant and the designation of one or more officers or agencies having responsibility and authority to carry out the joint plan. Each State participating in such a joint plan shall be deemed, for purposes of subsection (c), to have received an amount equal to the amount produced by dividing the amount of the grant received to carry out such plan by the number of States participating in such plan.

Sec. 5. The Secretary, in awarding grants to States and in entering into arrangements with universities or other public or private institutions or organizations, shall follow procedures established by him for the purpose of assuring that the grants or other expenditures made to carry out the purposes of this Act will be equitably distributed among the various major geographic regions of the Nation.

Sec. 6. For the purpose of making the grants and entering into the other arrangements provided under section 3 of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, not more than $125,000,000.

The material presented by Mr. Nelson is as follows:

What Aerospace Sees on the Ground—Four Major Companies, Using Systems Analysis, Draw Up Long-Range Programs for California To Cope With the Problems of Crime, Pollution, Transportation, and Data Communication

The broad problems of urbanization—slums, crime, traffic, poverty, pollution—are getting tougher every day for planners at all levels of government. Frequently, the problems have defied conventional approaches.

That's one reason why the State of California offered last November to buy from private industry special studies on four of the State's thornier problems—crime, control of wastes and pollution, the handling of information, and transportation. The idea was to find whether the latest problem-solving techniques of private companies could be brought to bear effectively on the persistent sociological woes of the cities.

As an added consideration, Gov. Edmund G. Brown hoped the aerospace companies, so important to the State's economy, would pick up the challenge and, perhaps in the process find areas of diversification that could head off unemployment if their industry were to decline.

BIG ENTRY

More than 50 companies, mostly from aerospace, jumped into the competition, though the four $100,000 contracts, offered to the winners were unlikely to cover the costs of the study. Even if there had been profits in sight, contracts of that size would have had little lure for companies of the size of the eventual winners: Aerojet-General Corp., Space-General Corp., Lockheed Missiles & Space Co., and North American Aviation, Inc.

The aerospace companies were attracted by the chance to prove that they could handle broad, nontechnical studies for the Government.

Here's a list of the subjects covered, winning companies and some of their recommendations:

The prevention and control of crime and delinquency: Here Space-General urged that the $600 million a year the State is spending on crime prevention be redistributed to bring heavier weight to bear on the more serious crimes. The State, Space-General found, spends only an average $3,700 to pursue each burglar, while it puts out $16,900 to track the average forger in the course of his career.

The study also urged closer attention to the crime-prone age group of 14–29.

The management of wastes: Aerojet-General urged that in the future all aspects of waste and pollution be lumped as a single problem, instead of being tackled separately as, say, garbage disposal, sewerage, industrial pollution. With a unified approach, the report said, society could ultimately convert wastes into usable products, while creating the desired conditions in air, water, and soil.

Statewide information: Lockheed Missiles & Space similarly saw the unified attack as the best one for the handling of information. Its analysts urged that all areas of government, down to the smallest municipality, be covered by an information network that would expand and integrate the existing equipment for data processing. A central index of all data was recommended.

Statewide transportation in the space age: Experts at North American Aviation peered 35 years into the future to find that a synthesis of existing transportation methods with the most far-out projects now being dreamed of would best provide the answer to moving people, merchandise, and raw materials.

The contracts were awarded 6 months ago, and the final reports are just beginning to reach Governor Brown. Already, State officials are calling the studies "unqualified successes," though there are still some critics in the wings muttering "boondoggle."

Generally, it's felt that the studies will make interesting reading for everyone involved in urban problems. But the companies themselves claim that the greatest significance of the reports is that they proved that well-managed systems analysis or systems engineering can be brought to bear quickly and effectively on nontechnical problems.

SYSTEMS ANALYSIS

In each of the studies, the company used some form of systems analysis—the mathematical and engineering techniques with which they have been handling the complexities of space.

In essence, systems analysis assumes that even the most complex problem is really a series of interrelated but definable pieces. The trick is to define all the pieces, establish the links between them, and then bring in specialists to attack each area. Generally, the experts work in teams, leaning heavily on mathematical models, computers, and science in their efforts to reduce everything to numbers.

The task force approach has been widely used since World War II on large weapons systems, and private industry has been using groups drawn from many fields in their private "think tanks." In California, each of the companies set up a many faceted team, mainly drawn from its own supply of scientists, mathematicians, computer experts, and engineers. Where there were no in-house experts—in such fields as criminology, demography, and sociology—help was sought from universities, nonprofit research centers, and assorted Government agencies.

GROUPS

Typically, on each team, about a dozen specialists would be reporting to their coordinator at a given period, but rarely with the same men working together each week. The broad, complex nature of the studies called for maximum use of technical expertise. Thus small teams of two or three specialists in, say, biochemistry or physics could move in and out of the study group as needed.

It was a fairly costly procedure. Each of the companies figures that it used up about 10,000 man-hours, and spent between $200,000 and $300,000—far more than the $100,000 paid by the State. The high cost was inherent, in the level of training required. For example, North American had six Ph. D.'s in its group of specialists studying transportation.

Right at the start, the State set up its own teams to monitor the progress of each company study. For the technical side, it hired experts from the nonprofit System Development Corp. Each monitoring team was reenforced by State experts, notably from the finance department in its monthly meetings with the industry teams. The monitors had three basic functions:

Preventing duplication of effort by the industry researchers.

Avoiding conflict with other State programs.

Making sure that all existing relevant data was available to the teams.

With fields so broad and complex, each aerospace company had a tough job of coordinating its own research. Thus Space-General quickly bumped into a problem of semantics, for the jargons of mathematicians and space engineers proved sadly opaque to criminologists and sociologists—and vice versa. Discussions of interfaces and feedback loops were as baffling as the talk about reference groups and the culturally deprived.

SATISFACTION

Despite some outside talk of less than perfect efficiency, the contract winners feel that they were ideally suited to tackle fields of such extreme complexity. Says Dr. Ernest R. Roberts, who headed the Aerojet pollution study: "We are operating on the very frontiers of technology in every field, and so we can predict where much of this technology is going. This is quite a bit different from pure extrapolation of present figures."

Roberts argues that what gives the aerospace companies their edge in this sort of problem solving is "the broad spectrum of inhouse technological capabilities." His team included economists, meteorologists, thermodynamicists, chemical engineers, and a physician.

Most management consultants deny that the aerospace industry has anything special on the analytical ball. They argue that the necessary experts can always be hired and that the real trick is to know just what talents are needed for each particular problem.

WHAT'S NEXT?

Governor Brown, enthusiastic over the report, is already angling for Federal funds to continue the research. And the companies, having taken their preliminary loss, are waiting hopefuly for bigger—and more profitable—contracts to turn up.

They got some encouragement this week when Senator GAYLORD NELSON, Democrat, of Wisconsin, said he was planning a bill next year to provide Federal funds for research in the sociological problems of the cities. His measure will call specifically for private industry to handle the systems analysis.

Even without Federal help, California will probably carry through Lockheed's information proposals, since the problem is local and the plan probably not too costly. And the State is likely to take some steps toward the 3-year, $10 billion pollution design proposal made by Aerojet. In the other two areas—crime and transportation—the State is unlikely to get beyond the master plan stage, unless it gets Federal help.

PRESS CONFERENCE CALLED BY GOV. EDMUND G. BROWN, HELD AT CONFERENCE ROOM 7, BILTMORE HOTEL, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., SEPTEMBER 16, 1965.

Governor BROWN. Ladies and gentlemen, earlier this year I asked the California aerospace industry to tell us whether the system engineering methods that are winning our race in space could be used to help us win some of our social problems here on earth.

We asked them to start with four areas: Crime, transportation, data collection, and the management of the disposal of waste.

The problem of waste management is probably less dramatic than some of the others at first glance, but if we don't learn to deal with smog and water pollution, if we don't find better ways to dispose of garbage and sewage as our population continues to explode—and we will have double the number here in 35 short years—we cannot possibly hope to preserve the quality of California's environment.

Today the report of waste management is ready for release, and I have with me a number of the executives of the Aerojet-General Corp., who will describe to you the report in detail.

Now, this is the second of the four studies we have commissioned to be turned over to the State. Like the first, this one says that system engineering can help us solve the problem of waste management. As a matter of fact, the report says the techniques which were developed to conquer space offer the only logical way to tackle this problem.

Now, as I have said before, these reports represent one of the most exciting breakthroughs in government in this generation. They respresent an entirely new approach to problems that have plagued men for years. They represent a partnership between government and industry.

I might tell you that I spoke with the President, Lyndon Johnson, about all four of these studies on the telephone last Sunday, and he had no comments or anything to say, but I feel confident that he is very interested in following through. He hasn't been briefed on any of these yet—some of the people in the White House have, but he has not. I am hoping that we will have an opportunity to present them personally to him, possibly on one of his trips to the West.

I can tell you that with the filing of these four reports, that I intend to do everything that I possibly can as Governor to follow up the first steps, and this is all these are. These are just the first steps in the programs. I intend to try to follow through in the State of California, nationally, private industry, government, local people, to see that we are able to follow through on these programs in the immediate months ahead.

Now, it gives me great pleasure to present Mr. Wayne Mullane, the vice president of

Aerojet-General, who will introduce his team and take over the presentation to you people of the press.

Mr. MULLANE. Thank you.

Governor Brown and members of the press——

Governor BROWN. Maybe you better move over. Let's move over. This is waste management.

A VOICE. Governor, it seems impossible that President Johnson didn't have some comment on that. Is that literally true?

Governor BROWN. Not literally.

Mr. MULLANE. It is indeed a genuine pleasure for us to have the opportunity to participate in such an exciting and important venture as this pioneering program by the State of California to use the talents and capabilities of the space industry in solving pressing civic problems.

We in the aerospace industry strongly believe that we can make a substantial contribution because of our background in new technology and in tackling complex problems.

As a measure of our company's faith in this approach, we have invested more dollars in this study on the California waste problems than the amount of money that was presented to us by the State of California.

I believe that there is a tremendously significant message in our report. Yet, it is a deceptively simple message, too.

It is this: We must plan now and begin to act now if we are to head off intolerable problems and conditions 10 to 20 years hence.

Today, we are constantly reminded of the inadequacy of our waste-handling system by the presence of burning, irritating smog.

But if we wish to avoid the situation in which water pollution and land pollution will get us to be as annoyed as the smog, we have to take action today.

For example, the extensive quantitative analysis we ran indicate there will be a threefold to fourfold increase in liquid and solid wastes generated in California in the next 25 years. Certainly, these facts command our attention to the problem now.

At the present, our society attacks air pollution, rubbish disposal, sewage and other forms of waste as separate problems. Yes, they have strong interrelationships.

It is the stock in trade of the aerospace industry to undertake massive problems with many complex interrelated elements and develop the cheapest and best overall solutions.

It is this approach that we have proposed here.

All in all, making this study has been a rewarding experience. We have been humbled by the magnitude of the problem, but we are certain we can contribute importantly to the solution.

The aerospace industry is attuned to find the best solution to the problems at the lowest cost. We are not tied by tradition or capital investment to any particular system of waste disposal. We don't have built-in biases. Therefore, we can evaluate and analyze all potential elements and make impartial recommendations for the best solution.

Because of the great significance that we have attached to this job, we have assigned one of our top technical minds, Dr. Ernest R. Roberts, who is our vice president for development of the corporation. He has provided the corporate supervision of the project. He is very well versed in the systems approach to problems and has added a great contribution to our work. He will tell you in detail about the report.

Dr. Roberts.

Dr. ROBERTS. Thank you, Wayne.

Governor Brown, ladies and gentlemen of the press, it is indeed a privilege to have this opportunity to acquaint you with the results of our study. To tell our story in a nutshell, I would like first to define the subject of the most important element of our study, namely, waste. Then, I would like to give you a feel of how the problem manifests itself. I would like to show you the quantities of waste, what we will have to cope with in the next 25, 30 years, acquaint you with what systems approach could do to this problem, what it entails, what would be the cost savings and potential cost implication of such an approach, and finally, I would like just to shortly state recommendations for our next step, what we feel should be undertaken without delay.

Let me first, right away, address ourself——

Governor BROWN. Pardon me. I don't think you have introduced the other members of the team. Don't you think we should do that?

Dr. ROBERTS. I certainly would. As a matter of fact, they are the members who did the job first.

I would like to introduce Dr. Dwight Culver; he is our manager of our life science division. This is the division in which this study is being pursued. I think it might be pertinent to say that while Aerojet-General is in the space industry, we have had in the several past years actual activities which are pertinent to waste management, waste management in, a much more, let's say, enclosed system, such as a space cabin; and these kinds of activities and studies were pursued also in the life science division.

The product manager of the study was Dr.—not Dr., but Mr. Tom Jackson—I promoted him just to a doctor; I think he deserves the degree. He knows enough for it. I am sorry for my omission.

Governor BROWN. Right.

Dr. ROBERTS. As I say, I would like to start by making clear right away at the outset what we mean by "waste."

Waste is rubbish, garbage, sewage, any kind of a farm or industrial waste or smoke or smog. And, simply, waste is any material, gentlemen, regardless of its aggregate form, which, when it is discarded might become a liability to our public or to our society.

Now, why do we have a problem?

Simply, we have a problem because we have never in the past designed a waste management system which would have been designed to take in account or take care of the waste products of a very fast-growing State like California, fast growing in population, in industrialization and in opulence.

I think this statement is more than substantiated by the fact that we have smog in Los Angeles, we have the open dumps in the San Francisco Bay, we had an incident of contaminated drinking water in Riverside, we have a serious problem of pollution of the Lake Tahoe, and we have piles of refuse practically everywhere around the State.

Now, in addition to the esthetic, the beauty, the impact on health, the waste has also very serious potential impact on our economy.

Right now today we have in California farms where we cannot grow crops except if they are resistant to salt in a way, or to salt content. We have the problem of adequately drained or irrigated lands, but literally our biggest eyesore, which is attesting to the inadequacy of this waste management problem is our smog problem.

I have here a map which shows the State of California, and I indicate here with various colors the regions which are affected today by smog. The yellow little areas are the regions where we have eye irritation occurring as a result of smog. The green are the regions where we have crop damage, plant damage; and the total shaded area is the region where we are having effective impairment of our visibility because of smog.

This is representing by 70,000 square miles, that is about 45 percent, I think, of California; but this is the region where we have 95 percent of our total population.

Similar maps we could design and show which would indicate to you the problem of water pollution and soil pollution.

Gentlemen, this is how the problem manifests itself today. Is it going to be worse or better in the future? And in order to try to give a reasonably authentic answer to this, we have made substantial amounts of computations, calculations, utilizing computers, being in the industry which utilizes computers, to predict the quantities of waste what we will have to anticipate to occur in the next few decades, and we find that if we make our realistic predictions on the basis of population growth, industrial growth, and changing characteristics of the refuse, let's say, composition, we find that in 1990 the percentage growth of our industrial liquid waste production far outstrips that of the percentage growth of the population.

The same way with the solid refuse production, which is approximately twice that of the increase in our population.

As you note here that in the next 25 years the predictions are that our population in the State will double, but the increase of solid refuse production is more than 3½-fold.

Now, the total quantities of solid and liquid waste give you a feel of the increased problem of waste management.

Unfortunately, we don't have such a simple index which would be adequately indicating to you the problem involved in the gaseous waste management. There is a total quantity of gaseous emission, but this is not an adequate indicator of the smog problem; there we have a very complex series of chemical reactions which create this. As you know, smog is a photochemical reaction which occurs when certain percentages, when certain ratios of various gaseous wastes are available for such a reaction under certain extraneous facts and influences; for example, inversion layer, wind velocity, exposure to sunlight, or temperature, pressure, and so on. But in our report, of course, while we didn't present it here with a single line, because it wouldn't have an adequate meaning, in our report we have presented the various gaseous waste emissions and indicated their anticipated growth in the next few decades, and we come to the conclusion—and it should perhaps suffice here to say—that in spite of the devices what we are today envisioning for our automobile exhausts, if we don't do additional clever, preventive measures, we are going to experience in the 1990's a worse smog situation than we have today.

The research and development necessary in this area is more than indicated.

Now, in order to give you a specific, or a few specific numbers rather than just percentages, I prepared another chart, which might ring the bell, perhaps, more effectively.

We have presented here four different types of waste: Sewage, industrial liquids, municipal refuse, agricultural solids. We indicated in these four areas the quantities which we assess to be today in 1965, and what we estimate is going to happen to that type of waste in 1990.

As you may note, sewage, from 3.3 billion, will increase to 6.2 billion tons per year; industrial liquids from 830 million, or 0.83 billion, will rise to 2.5 billion. Municipal refuse, from 12 to 40 million tons per year, and agricultural solids from 13 to 22 million per year.

Now, it might interest you also that the cost of coping just with today's quantities of waste amounts to about $300 million per year; and if we were just to use the extension of the present techniques, just the techniques what we are employing today, how inadequate they may be, we estimate that the 1990 cost to amount to approximately $1 billion per year. And yet, in spite of this tremendous amount of money, the environment that we live in would continue to deteriorate.

Now, in light of this, I am sure you all will agree that a new look at this problem of waste management is more than justified.

Now, at present we have many separate State and local authorities regulating, collecting and disposing different types of waste. No organization is charged today with the responsibility of studying and managing all aspects of this very complex problem.

We feel, gentlemen, that California needs a system responsible not only for the collection and dumping of waste, but which will truly manage waste in a way which assures us the desired environment. And on that latter part of the sentence, I would like to put the emphasis, because if we wish to put that in an engineering language, we would say that the waste management system which should be designed must be one which is capable to perform to specific output requirements. And this is just like with any weapons system.

Indeed, when you look closer, you find that there is a lot of resemblance; and this is not the only similarity between the two systems.

Practically for every step in the development of a weapons system there is a corresponding step in the development of the waste management system. Now, I certainly don't want to take the time to go into each and every step now, but I would like to call your attention to this one, which is the environmental quality goals. Now, this simply means—a fancy name which simply means to establish standards which would tell us how much pollutants, contaminants do we wish to tolerate in the air, in the liquids, in the soil, and so on.

These are easy statements to make; these are very difficult answers to give. It takes a lot of research and development to come up with very intelligent standards, because you have to keep in mind that the standards that are established will govern the total cost, or will influence tremendously the total cost of the system.

Now, without having established criteria to which the system must be designed to, and against which its performance and effectiveness can be evaluated, no profitable use can be made of the system analysis or system engineering.

For the purpose of our study, we have to make a lot of assumptions. We did so in order to come up with some tentative conclusions.

We have defined a waste management system in terms of its major activities, as it is shown in this one, this slide, or this chart, and we show these activities in a block diagram fashion, which is very accepted in our industry.

The functions to be performed are named, the collection, the transportation, the processing, the disposal, reclamation, dilution or reaction with the environment; and you note we indicate with the arrows the flow of the material. This dotted line indicates the monitoring necessity of the system. We want to know at the end whether we get out of it is what we wish to get out of it, so that we can adjust the system to do exactly what we wish to accomplish.

Now, the task of the system analysis is to evaluate all these operations and to analyze the interrelationships among these functions.

This is done in order to arrive at the most advantageous compromise in each of these operations, to accomplish the most efficient operation of the total system.

And, again, in our jargon we call that the process of optimization.

As you may note, we start the system with the collection, but I am sure you will agree to it with me that no judicious waste management can be exercised without continuously evaluating the waste prevention possibilities and methods.

I wish to emphasize "continuously," because the state of art of technology, which is changing so rapidly, is probably at any given time the most significant only factor—I mean, single factor to determine the balance between prevention and processing, or waste processing.

The best example is today perhaps the fact that we are forced to utilize prevention in case of the automobile exhaust, because we don't have a suitable technology which could economically collect the exhaust products after it is really parted from the automobile.

Now, this is not to be construed that in 20 or 30 years perhaps we will not be smart enough to do it, but if you wish to put that in a proper perspective, I would say that we need a technology similar to that that was accomplished in the solid state physics when we introduced the transistor to replace the vacuum tube.

It is a real massive process. What we need to get it runs over here to a collector.

Now, because of the ease of transforming from one aggregate state to another one, we cannot afford the luxury to look up these three types of waste, solid, liquid and gas independently. They are actually one system, a part of one system, and they have to be handled simultaneously and concurrently. This waste system diagram does not imply a size which should be pursued, or what the size of the system would be. On the other hand, I am sure you realize that in the attainable efficiency of the waste management system is going to play a significant part. Fundamentally, one could conceive of a waste management system which would be so small that it could be contained entirely within each separate home or other source of waste generation. At the other end of the spectrum, I am sure you would agree we would be able to design a system which would serve the entire Nation or continent, and it is unlikely, I think, that either extreme would represent the most efficient choice. It is also apparent that the artificial boundaries which are primarily those representing municipal boundaries would not be the most efficient choice for a waste management system.

Now, we did not reach the point in our study where we could tell what is the optimum system for the waste management which we wish to establish. It is much too complex a problem to come to this conclusion today, but we certainly can say that the waste management system's size will be affected by the meteorological, hydrographic, and topographic conditions which are prevailing in the area which it serves. With this in mind, and this management, let's say, considerations in mind, we have proposed to consider seven regions which closely approximate, I think, the watershed in California, but they are not exactly identical. As I understand there is now an acceptable verbiage which says "problem shed" and that might probably be a problem shed topography, and we show here these several regions which are picked so that each region's characteristics would be either identical or complementary in the sense that it would facilitate our integrating the waste management system as an agent. Each region from each other, of course, both in purpose and in any other way, are different.

Now, before we would decide really what the boundaries of the regions should be, a lot of additional studies should be performed so that our decision should not be arbitrary. Now, having given you a feel of what the waste management system looks like, what it would be composed of, and how we would like to take the maximum advantage of Mother Nature in integrating this system, I would like to give you just a few words about the cost implication.

In order to make a cost comparison between different waste management systems, we must appraise the total cost associated with the system. Now, this means, gentlemen, the direct cost, which is actually the cost and maintenance of the system per se, and the indirect costs, which are the damages that society suffers as a result of the ineffective operation of the system.

Now, this chart shows such comparison between three systems. The very first one is a mere expansion of our present system, you may call it that way, to cope with the increased quantities of waste. We show that the direct cost, which is shown as a blue color, is approximately a billion dollars per year. The indirect costs, which are the damages which are going to accrue as a result of the inequity of this system, amounted to about $6 billion per year. So, the total cost of the system is $7 billion, and I am sure that that estimate is extremely conservative, simply because there are a lot of damages where we can't quantitize. We don't know how to put it into the calculation.

When you have a very bad eye irritation, your efficiency perhaps in doing your job decreases. How much it costs, how much its value, I don't know. And there are a lot of annoyances which have certainly a cost value, but we don't have a dollar figure to put on it.

Now, the next system that we show here, we label as a state of art system. This simply means that we could already today undertake the design of a system which would create substantially better environment than what we have today without any necessity of breakthroughs, R. & D.'s, or any other activity, except just design and put in operation. This would naturally mean that we would have to increase substantially our waste processing activity, and as a result of the direct costs, since you are using the present technology, would go substantially up. As a matter of fact, it would double, but because we would substantially decrease the damages to our society, indirect cost would decrease. So, therefore, the total cost is still substantially less than the one that we have today.

The real logical and intelligent approach to the problem, in our opinion, would be to undertake concentrated effort to come up with improved technology and utilize this improved technology to serve this purpose, namely, our waste management purpose. If we could do so, then, we would have an invention here, a so-called development system where the actual total direct cost would be the same that we are paying for the system today, but the efficiency of the system would be substantially enhanced, and, therefore, the total cost, which includes the indirect cost, would be approximately half of the system that we are going to have, unless we do something drastic about it.

These three cost comparisons are obviously very approximate, and they have a value only to show you the relative magnitude, because a lot of assumption must be made in order to do such cost comparison.

Now, in order to accomplish, for example, a task which would end up as an advanced system, we would undertake a program which would take a total duration of approximately 10 years. Very simply facing it, it is similar to any complex weapons system or space system which we undertake today or what we would plan to undertake in the future. What we recommend right now is that we should initiate, without delay, the very first phase of this program, which is the conceptual phase. And the scope of this phase we would not only define the requirement, we would not only evaluate the number of different conceptual designs, we would prepare a preliminary development plan which would give us a much better understanding of what has to be undertaken to reach the final objective of the 10-year study, and we would actually test in hardware some of the more sophisticated new advanced concepts in some part of the system to see whether or not we, let's say, just have a patient paper or whether we have, indeed, a very usable hardware. This is our recommendation, because we feel if we act on this today, we have the capability of saving billions, literally billions of dollars in the coming decade.

So, in conclusion, gentlemen, I would like to say that having laid the groundwork for utilizing system engineering, we are convinced that an efficient waste management system, indeed, can be developed, which will not only economically dispose of the waste, but which would help to preserve plant, animal, mineral, and marine resources.

As Mr. Mullane mentioned to you, that it was a challenging study, and I certainly agree with it, and we were very much and are very much impressed by the complexity of the problem, but we are also convinced that the use of the system approach, however complex the problem may be, we will solve our problem, and we can, but we heartily recommend that we should undertake such a problem.

Thank you very much.

Governor Brown. That was quite an explanation. I hope you fellows took notes on everything. It was really pretty good.

Did you prepare a release?

Dr. Roberts. Yes, we did. We felt it is better if the accent is not printed.

A Voice. Governor Brown——

Governor Brown. Yes.

A Voice. What is the status Tuesday of the other reports?

Governor Brown. I think we are going to get the one on data processing.

Where is Hal Wald? Is he here? Jack Burby?

A Voice. Coming in, Governor.

Governor Brown. What is the status of the other two reports, the one on transportation and the one on data?

Mr. Burby. The one on data will be next Thursday, the 23d, at Sunnyvale.

Governor Brown. That is Lockheed?

Mr. Burby. Lockheed. And the North American on transportation is the 30th out at Idlewild at their plant.

Governor Brown. Where?

Mr. Burby. Not Idlewild; Inglewood.

Governor Brown. Inglewood. I wondered if I hadn't heard of a place in California. There is an Idlewild here, too, but it is up in mountains outside of Palm Springs. Might be a good place to release it.

A Voice. Governor Brown, I am interested in the impact of these studies at the national level.

Do you feel that the problems which inspired these studies are sufficiently important to be in a new department of Government—perhaps urban affairs?

Governor Brown. I really hadn't gone that far. I am thinking in terms of California. It looks to me like we are going to have to have a department of waste disposal to coordinate all of these things—not immediately, but in the immediate future. I think it would be well to take this up with the Department of Urban Affairs, because this is, to some extent, a problem of the movement from the country to the urban areas. I think a lot of this waste disposal is a problem, and its multiplying effect is due to people moving to the cities.

A Voice. Governor Brown, how will you follow through on this Aerojet report?

Governor Brown. What is your recommendation for the next step?

Dr. Roberts. We would recommend to undertake the conceptual study phase, which is a 2½-, 3-year program, Governor, which would give us, as I say, a blueprint of action to actually develop and to institute the system in California.

Governor Brown. This would cost about $10 million for a 3-year program, and I am hoping that we can get some planning money from the Federal Government to follow through on this, because California is really the best place to make this study because of our growth problems and because of the fact that geographically California is locked in by mountains on all sides and the border of Mexico on the other and the Pacific Ocean. This would be a fine place to do this, to follow through on this 3-year conceptual study, but it really will affect the whole United States. All of the system studies will have a profound effect upon living, environment, and government in the United States in the next 35 years.

So, it is a national program, even though we have undertaken the initial studies. It is a national problem, and I am hoping that we will be able to convince Washington that they should make the studies in California, follow through on this, but I do hope that they will aid us financially, because we have other problems in California that are obvious to everybody; the problem of education and roads and highways and schools and crime and mental illness that we are taking care of. And for these studies, I am hoping, we will be able to get aid from Washington.

A Voice. Governor Brown, has anybody made a study of the political difficulties? For instance, are you going to disregard counties and municipalities? Is that going to be hard to persuade people?

Governor Brown. Let the doctor answer that for himself.

Dr. Roberts. The only way how I can answer it is that we obviously were aware at the very outset that we don't face here a pure technical problem; that we have political, civil, and many other considerations that we have to take into account. We addressed ourselves to this problem, and we find that we can put these considerations as constraints in our optimization and system analysis.

A Voice. As what?

Dr. Roberts. Constraints.

Governor Brown. Constraints.

Dr. Roberts. Similarly like we have constraints in our weapons or space system. The constraints then permit you the optimization and will give you tradeoffs which tell you what considerable political hampering does do or what you have to do to reduce it, and gives you a play where you can, in fact, really show what it means.

A Voice. In other words, you consider it?

Dr. Roberts. Yes.

Governor Brown. Yes. They have considered it, and you will observe that in one of their diagrams, one of their charts, they have set up regions. Now, they haven't been fully studied, and this is only tentative. This is not a recommendation, but they have studied it.

You notice in our air pollution districts that we are moving beyond municipal lines and county lines. There are areas that we have to consider, and some of the old governmental-political lines will have to go out the window on these things, because waste management is not confined to 1 of the 74 or 75 cities here in Los Angeles County. It moves across all of these lines.

As a matter of fact, it moves across the county. Now, water, you have got your Metropolitan Water District here in Los Angeles wherein the development of water they had to move beyond the county of Los Angeles, and this is what is going to have to happen in waste disposal, too, in my opinion.

A Voice. Thank you.

Governor Brown. We are talking now in long-range terms. We are not talking about next year. We are talking until 1990 in most of these.

Dr. Roberts. That is correct.

Governor Brown. When you think of a water project, for example, which is a good example, you start it in 1959. You get it through the legislature. It really won't be completed for 12 years. So, you put this thing ahead 12 years from the start, and we haven't started. That brings it up to 1977, which seems an awful long time away to me right now. I hardly anticipate I will be Governor then. You can't ever tell, though, according to these recent polls.

A Voice. Governor Brown, could you briefly comment on the special report on crime?

Governor Brown. Well, we had a press conference on that in Sacramento last week, and I don't want to get off the subject here. These people are all here on waste disposal, and I would rather not comment on that here today.

Any further questions?

Well, thank you very, very much, gentlemen, and I hope you will all watch with great interest the steps.

I have sent two other members of my staff back to Washington. They spent a week back there last week in all of these various departments where these studies will have some effect, and we don't intend to drop this. We intend to move it at the State level, the National level, and maybe even internationally.

Thank you very, very much. That was a wonderful job that you did.

Dr. Roberts. Thank you, sir.

Governor Brown. Even with the accent.

Dr. Roberts. It was a privilege to be here with you.

(Whereupon, at 3 p.m., the press conference was adjourned.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH AN ATLANTIC UNION DELEGATION

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, in behalf of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], and myself, a resolution to establish an Atlantic Union delegation.

Resolutions of this type are not new to the Congress. The first Atlantic Union resolution was introduced in 1949 by the late Senator Estes Kefauver, sponsored by a bipartisan group of 20 Senators. Similar resolutions were introduced in 1951, 1955, 1958, and 1959. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations held hearings on this proposal in 1950 and again in 1955. In 1960 the committee reported favorably on a somewhat modified resolution to create a U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO, and this was approved by the Congress and signed by President Eisenhower.

The Commission was authorized to participate in a convention to explore greater Atlantic unity. In January 1962, the Atlantic Convention was held in Paris with citizen delegates from all the NATO countries except Portugal. Unfortunately, the Convention took but limited action, although it approved a general statement, the Declaration of Paris, and recommended that the NATO governments establish a special governmental commission to draw up plans within the 2 years for the creation of a true Atlantic Community.

Many circumstances contributed to the fact that the Paris Convention was not more effective. Today, there is a deeper recognition of the urgency of action. We are moving into the final years of the binding character of the treaty.

In 1969, any party will be free to withdraw. Further, it is apparent that the alliance is in serious difficulties. Fundamental questions about its future and survival are openly debated.

President de Gaulle has stated that France is determined to end the "subordination called integration." Are there any areas in which we can achieve integration without one or more nations believing that they are subordinated? In a broad sense, that is the question which faced the 13 states in 1787, states varying greatly in size, population, and economic strength.

The North Atlantic Treaty since 1949 has been effective in helping its signatory nations "to safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law."

It is time now to ask whether the organization brought into being by the treaty shall decline, shall be continued as an essentially defensive military alliance, or be the basis for continuing common efforts more mutual security and development through a Federal union.

The emphasis under the treaty has been on cooperative military efforts. This was the primary incentive for the establishment of NATO, but the purpose of the treaty was broader. The parties, under article 2, pledged that "they will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them."

Since 1949, conditions have changed and the need for international cooperation has increased. The achievements of science and technology have created new challenges in politics which demand a response. There is a need to consider adjustments and develop new institutions between nations with a common commitment to the "principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law."

In the practical order, it is necessary to consider specific problems. We have special commissions and agencies and procedures to study and formulate policy on a wide variety of international problems: disarmament, trade, monetary policy. There is danger that this fragmentation so limits our vision that each problem is examined in isolation and resolved by limited action which can be fitted into existing structures.

I believe that delegates from the NATO countries should meet to discuss the possibilities of securing agreement on a federal union. Among the areas which demand attention are defense, trade, and international finance. Any action, of course, must be gradual and include the development of interim institutions.

The resolution we introduce today provides for the establishment of an Atlantic Union delegation of 18 citizens, half of whom shall be named by the Congress and half by the President. The delegation will be authorized to organize and participate in a convention made up of similar delegations from NATO allies who will join to explore the possibilities of developing their present alliance into a federal union and of establishing the democratic institutions necessary to achieve this goal.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The Concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 64) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. Con. Res. 64

Whereas—

1. In 1969 any party may withdraw from the North Atlantic Treaty, which was ratified in 1949 as a first rather than a last step toward unity;

2. Since 1949 revolutionizing scientific, technological and other advance has outstripped it and made practical union of these allies imperative for prosperity, peace and freedom;

3. The fragmentation of the world in new nations, now when the strongest democracies cannot live alone, also requires them to build the pilot plant needed to spread liberty and union both by example, and by admitting to their Union other nations desiring this and able to uphold its principles;

4. They need but unite effectively their gold and other resources behind a common currency now to assure their citizens, and the developing nations, enduring monetary stability and liquidity, and prevent their disunion from ending, as in 1931, in dictator-serving crash;

5. Our Original States, when beset by disunion's dangers under their confederation, sent delegates to the 1787 Convention, which traced their troubles to their confederal structure and invented Federal Union, which has enduringly safeguarded member States from domination by one another, equitably apportioned among their sovereign citizens voting power on common concerns—and the benefits and burdens of union—assured each State of independent government of State affairs, met other challenges facing the Atlantic allies now, and not merely worked but proved that free peoples can thus work wonders;

6. Distant though NATO's transformation into a federation of the free may seem, these allies can greatly speed it now by officially declaring that federal union, within the framework of the United Nations, is their eventual goal, setting a timetable—as we did for our moon traget—and providing democratic means for achieving the transition in safe time: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That—

1. The Congress hereby creates an Atlantic union delegation, composed of eighteen eminent citizens, and authorized to organize and participate in a convention made up of similar delegations from such NATO allies as desire to join in this enterprise, to explore the possibility of agreement on:

(a) A declaration that the eventual goal of their peoples is to transform their present alliance into a federal union;

(b) A tentative timetable for the transition to this goal; and

(c) Democratic institutions to expedite the necessary stages and achieve the objective in time to save their citizens from another war, depression, or other manmade catastrophe, and let them enjoy, as soon as possible, the greater freedom and higher moral and material blessings which federation has brought to the free in the past;

2. The conventions' recommendations shall be submitted to the Congress for action by constitutional procedure;

3. Not more than half of the delegation's members shall be from one political party, and all shall be citizens of high stature and wide influence, representing together a broad range of experience in the various major challenges facing this undertaking, and so conscious of its importance and urgency as to be willing to give it personally the necessary priority and time, in the spirit of 1787 which one member of that Convention thus expressed: "Inconvenient" as it was "to remain absent from his private affairs, he would bury his bones" in Philadelphia, if need be to unite the free;

4. Eight of the delegation shall be named by the Congress and eight by the President of the United States, and all shall be as free from official instructions and as free to speak and vote individually as were the drafters of the United States Constitution;

5. The Congress hereby requests former Presidents Harry S. Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower to serve as cochairmen of the delegation.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of October 5, 1965, the names of Mr. Case, Mr. Clark, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Ribicoff, and Mr. Saltonstall were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2599) to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide for additional technological research, introduced by Mr. Tydings on October 5, 1965.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JAMES L. WATSON, OF NEW YORK, TO BE JUDGE OF THE U.S. CUSTOMS COURT

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled on the nomination of James L. Watson, of New York, to be judge of the U.S. Customs Court, for Wednesday, October 20, 1965, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

At the indicated time and place, persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick] as chairman, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], and the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits].

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 1311. An act for the relief of Joseph J. McDevitt;

H.R. 1319. An act for the relief of Joseph Durante;

H.R. 1409. An act for the relief of Louis W. Hann;

H.R. 1644. An act for the relief of 1st Lt. Robert B. Gann and others;

H.R. 1836. An act for the relief of Constantinos Agganis;

H.R. 2005. An act for the relief of Miss Gloria Seborg;

H.R. 2285. An act for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Cioffi Carson;

H.R. 2557. An act for the relief of Frank Simms;

H.R. 2757. An act for the relief of Maria Alexandros Siagris;

H.R. 2853. An act to amend title 17, United States Code, with relation to the fees to be charged;

H.R. 3288. An act for the relief of Hwang Tai Shik;

H.R. 3515. An act for the relief of Mary Ann Hartmann;

H.R. 3669. An act for the relief of Emilia Majka;

H.R. 3770. An act for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Navy at the Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, Calif.;

H.R. 4078. An act for the relief of William L. Minton;

H.R. 4137. An act for the relief of Dr. Jan Rosciszewski;

H.R. 4194. An act for the relief of Angelica Anagnostopoulos;

H.R. 4203. An act for the relief of Alton G. Edwards;

H.R. 4464. An act for the relief of Michael Hadjichristofas, Aphrodite Hadjichristofas, and Paniote Hadjichristofas;

H.R. 5167. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the administrative settlement of tort claims arising in foreign countries, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5457. An act for the relief of Maria del Rosario de Fatima Lopez Hayes;

H.R. 5554. An act for the relief of Mary Frances Crabbs;

H.R. 5904. An act for the relief of Nam Ie Kim;

H.R. 6229. An act for the relief of Kim Sun Ho;

H.R. 6235. An act for the relief of Chun Soo Kim;

H.R. 6819. An act for the relief of Dr. Orhan Metin Ozmat;

H.R. 7707. An act to authorize the appointment of crier-law clerks by district judges;

H.R. 7888. An act providing for the extension of patent No. D–119,187;

H.R. 8350. An act for the relief of the successors in interest of Cooper Blyth and Grace Johnston Blyth otherwise Grace McCloy Blyth;

H.R. 8457. An act for the relief of Robert G. Mikulecky;

H.R. 9220. An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, and Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Delaware River Basin Commission, and the Interoceanic Canal Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9521. An act for the relief of Clarence Earl Davis; and

H.R. 9526. An act for the relief of Raffaella Achilli.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

Address delivered by the Hon. Wright Patman to the Veterans of World War I and the Senior Citizens Day Celebration at the Texas State Fair in Dallas, Tex., on October 13, 1965.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow, Tuesday, October 19, 1965.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF CERTAIN MEASURES ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of certain measures on the calendar. beginning with Calendar No. 858, and that the items on the calendar be considered in sequence.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first bill.

TRANSFERRING CERTAIN LAND IN SOUTHWEST WASHINGTON TO THE REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 397) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the United States to transfer from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency title to certain real property in said district was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 871), explaining the purposes of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSES OF THE RESOLUTION

The purposes of this joint resolution are:

1. To authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to transfer to the Redevelopment Land Agency, the bare legal title now held by the U.S. Government to certain properties located in the Southwest section of Washington, which were authorized for use by various railroads by the Union Station Acts, although legal title remained in the United States,

2. To grant to the Redevelopment Land Agency authority to transfer to the District of Columbia government its right, title, and interest in certain sites within the Southwest section of Washington, formerly occupied by those railroads, which now form part of the land within the District of Columbia highway system. For such transfer the Commissioners are authorized to pay the Agency the sum of $82,896.

Essentially, this resolution clears title to certain lands in Southwest Washington.

BACKGROUND OF LEGISLATION

Pursuant to acts of Congress approved on February 12, 1901 (31 Stat. 767), and on February 28, 1903 (32 Stat. 909), referred to as the "Union Station Acts," certain public streets in Southwest Washington were closed and abandoned, and perpetual use of these areas was granted to the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co., the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., and the Terminal Co. Title to these lands, however, remained in the United States. This grant was made to these railroads by the Congress and consideration for the exchange and transfer to the United States of certain land in the District then owned by the railroads.

The areas of land involved in this use-grant to the railroads are comprised of six parcels which together contain 272,237.60 square feet of land, and are located in squares 268, 299, 386, S–463, 537, and N–583.

For many years, these lands were used by the railroads for such purposes as switch tracks, freight warehouses, loading platforms, open air storage, truckloading areas, produce stalls, etc. During this time, also, the railroads paid taxes on this land to the District of Columbia.

The urban renewal plan for Southwest project area C, approved by the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners on November 30, 1956, requires that the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency acquire these parcels and sell or lease them to private enterprise for the development of commercial facilities in accordance with the plan. Accordingly, during the period from 1958 through 1962, the Redevelopment Land Agency purchased the rights and interests of the railroad companies in these parcels. The purchase price, which totaled $1,521,635, was based upon the opinions of disinterested appraisers with whom the Agency contracted for appraisal services.

In view of the value of the land which the railroads had transferred to the United States in consideration for the right to use the parcels in question, and of the taxes the railroads had paid on these parcels over the years, it was the opinion of the appraisers that the value of the railroads' rights and interests in these parcels was equivalent to the value of the land had the fee simple title been in the railroads. In fact, the Redevelopment Land Agency also purchased some adjacent lands owned in fee simple by the railroads for the same price per square foot paid for the rights and interests in the land referred to above.

At the time of purchase of the rights and interests of the railroads, the Agency believed that, pursuant to the Street Readjustment Act of 1932,the District Commissioners could transfer to the Agency title to the land in the closed streets owned by the United States. On January 7, 1960, the Commissioners entered an order transferring to the Agency fee simple title to part of the areas involved; i.e., former 13th Street, 13½ Street, and E Street SW., all in square 299. On the strength of this street-closing plat and Commissioners' Order No. 60–9, the Agency has paid real estate taxes to the District since the effective date of the order transferring that land.

Following discussions between representatives of the Agency and of the District government, including the Corporation Counsel's Office, doubt was expressed as to the authority of the Commissioners, under the Street Readjustment Act, to transfer to the Agency title to the properties in which the railroads had rights and interests pursuant to the acts of Congress referred to above. In the absence of a solution to this problem, the Agency in a letter dated August 27, 1963, requested the opinion of the Attorney General as to the proper method of effecting transfer to the Agency of title to the properties. On October 22, 1963, the Assistant Attorney General, Lands Division, Department of Justice, advised the Executive Director of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency that "the General Services Administration, through the Administrator, may assume control of the Government's interest in the real estate as surplus property * * * and dispose of it under the provisions of the Surplus Property Act." The letter stated that if this procedure could not be followed, "it may be necessary for Congress to specifically authorize some department or agency to take control of and convey the interest of the United States * * *."

In a letter dated April 3, 1964, the General Counsel of the General Services Administration concluded "that the Congress has retained to itself the authority to take any further action with respect to the vacated streets."

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The authority which would be granted by the enactment of House Joint Resolution 397 is needed, therefore, to facilitate the ultimate disposition by the Redevelopment Land Agency of these parcels of land to developers who will construct necessary parking facilities, office space, and retail facilities in project area C, by perfecting the Agency's title to the land.

The land referred to in section 3 of this joint resolution, comprising those parts of former streets in square 299 presently being used by the District government as part of the right-of-way for the Southwest Expressway, is one of the parcels referred to earlier in this report. Thus, by the provisions of sections 1 and 2, the Redevelopment Land Agency would acquire valid title to this land, which the language of section 3 would permit the Agency then to sell to the District of Columbia. The authorized price of $82,896 represents the amount paid by the Agency to the railroads for their rights and interests therein.

The Subcommittee on Business and Commerce held public hearings on this resolution on August 19, 1965, and received testimony from the Redevelopment Land Agency and the Assistant Engineering Commissioner for the District of Columbia. There was no opposition expressed to the resolution. The committee is informed that the District of Columbia Commissioners, the Department of Justice, and the Bureau of the Budget have concurred in approval of this proposed legislation. Accordingly, your committee recommends that this resolution do pass.

DOCUMENTATION OF THE VESSEL "LITTLE NANCY"

The bill (H.R. 5217) to permit the vessel *Little Nancy* to be documented for use in the coastwise trade was announced as next in order.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Over, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I withdraw the call of the calendar.

ANTIDRAFT MOVEMENT DISGRACEFUL AND DANGEROUS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, every decent American will applaud today's announcement by the Department of Justice that a national investigation of groups behind the antidraft movement is now underway. The Department informed me this morning that its investigation will include those contemptible groups agitating in California. Well it should. Over the weekend in Berkeley, a dirty little sheet has been distributed which is entitled "Brief Notes on the Ways and Means of Beating and Defeating the Draft." In recent days people have thrown themselves on railroad tracks in my State in an attempt to prevent passage of troop trains and railroad cars carrying military supplies to the docks for transshipment to southeast Asia. A few contemptible youths have publicly torn up their draft cards in great glee. In my State, the head of the California Democratic Council has enthusiastically praised those who have destroyed their draft cards. Governor Brown, head of the Democratic Party in my State, to his credit, has asked this person to resign, though he has been defended by the State president of the Young Democrats who notes that that organization has "gone on record advocating a shift in our Vietnam policy."

Attorney General Katzenbach has stated "there are some Communists involved" in this leftwing movement. Its ranks are replete with so-called conscientious objectors, beatniks, and those who in varying degrees oppose the southeast Asian policy of our Government.

Mr. President, I am a devoted believer in the right of constitutional free speech and of the constitutional right of any citizen to petition his Government, but what I have described here is far beyond the pale of reasonable or rational constitutional discussion or petition. Indeed, what has gone on sows the seeds of treason.

This is an American problem and both our American political parties share a feeling of revulsion and a demand that the laws of this Nation, including the Selective Service Act, be respected and enforced.

The radical left in all its facets, gleefully infiltrated by Communists, undermines respect and faith in our American Government. What a shocking paradox it is that the radical right, and all its self-styled superpatriotic leaders, simultaneously alleges that our American Government is 60 to 80 percent dominated by Communists. Both extremes are a menace to this land. Thank God, they represent a very small percentage of the fine, decent, patriotic citizens of our country. Recently in Oakland, Calif., a group was formed under the name of Responsible Citizens Aroused. They held a rally over the weekend to counteract the activities of the so-called Vietnam Committee. I sent a telegram to them. I ask consent that a copy of my telegram to that group of fellow citizens and its statement on this general subject issued on Constitution Day be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 13, 1965.

ALEXANDER GRENDON,
Donner Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.:

Regret that Senate schedule prevents me from joining you and members of Responsible Citizens Aroused as you gather together on October 16 to reaffirm your faith in the principles of this Republic and to oppose irresponsible and dangerous actions by a few in our country who object to America's role in securing the cause of freedom in southeast Asia. Please express my best wishes to those who have gathered with you on this occasion. I believe that the overwhelming majority of Americans, regardless of party, support the President of the United States as he attempts to secure peace in that troubled part of the world through the use of American strength and the offer of American compassion.

Regards,

THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator.

STATEMENT OF RCA—RESPONSIBLE CITIZENS AROUSED

Today, September 14, is Constitution Day. It is on this occasion that we remember the principles our country was founded upon and the men who have made it great.

But today we also mark with some degree of chagrin that there exists an element in our immediate community which openly challenges the basic framework of not only the community, but the Nation as a whole. This element, currently known as the Vietnam Day Committee, will, in 30 days, stage an organized riot for the purpose of amplifying their position. We would wonder how some of the defenders of our Constitution, such as Sergeant York, Nathan Hale, General MacArthur, and John F. Kennedy, would feel when reflecting upon the Vietnam Day Committee this Constitution Day of 1965.

Responsible Citizens Aroused believes in the principles of constitutional democracy upon which our Government is based.

RCA supports the President's role in the conduct of foreign affairs.

RCA believes in, trusts, and has faith in the discretion, dignity, and virtue of all American people.

RCA is a group of young, bay area people who intend to unite vocal support for our country and its principles and display to the community, the United States as a whole, and the world, that the bay area is populated by responsible Americans. RCA asks for other like-minded citizens to join this effort.

Let us make our position clear:

We are not objecting to picketing and peaceful demonstrations. As a matter of fact, picketing is an old tradition in America. We abhor war and desire a just peace. It is the U.S. leaders who are requesting negotiations. You hear no requests for negotiations from Peiping. We do not, however, subscribe to a policy of peace at the price of the freedom of the South Vietnamese.

The Vietnam Day Committee does not represent the feelings of Americans. Its actions have insulted the integrity of the American people. Its members have called the President of our country a "fascist" and a "dictator." They have called the former U.S. Ambassador to Vietnam a "murderer" and demanded he "stand trial" for his actions before five of their members. They have given the name of bay area cities and institutions a black eye all over the world.

We believe that the bay area community has been insulted long enough. It is now time for patriotic, responsible citizens to stand up in active support of their country and in opposition to the Vietnam Day Committee.

1. We call for pledges to attend a patriotic program on October 16 at a location to be announced, while the Vietnam Day Committee is "attacking" the Oakland Army Terminal. Major speakers are now being invited to address this program.
2. RCA calls for the public, Republicans and Democrats alike, to write their Representatives and Senators expressing support of our Government and the President.
3. RCA calls for contributions to provide advertising for the program and transportation for the speakers.

Contact: Responsible Citizens Aroused, 5350 College Avenue, Oakland, Calif., 655–8601.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to my able friend, the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have noted with growing concern the demonstrations which have been taking place throughout the Republic.

I believe in the right of assembly. I believe in the right of free speech. I believe in the right of petition. But I also believe in the law, and I believe in the law whether I personally agree with it or not.

I have been shocked at pictures showing some of the demonstrators using cigarette lighters to burn their draft cards. That is against the law. Within the past month Congress has made it against the law. I have been shocked to read that there are certain schools of thought—certain groups, that is—which are telling young folks how to avoid the draft; how, through the use of drugs, to place themselves in such a condition that the examining authorities would not find them eligible; how some of them have feigned mental illness, how some of them have posed as homosexuals, and how some of them have used other devious means to bring about a situation which I think is a discredit and a disgrace to this country in which we live.

We have only one country, Mr. President. I would hope that those who carry on these demonstrations would recognize that as citizens of this country, they have a responsibility, and that they should act with maturity. What is happening, in effect, is to undermine what the President of the United States is trying to do, as he has said time and time again, to bring about a negotiated settlement of the situation in Vietnam. What these people have done is furnish fodder to Hanoi, to Peiping, and to the Vietcong. What they have done has been a disservice to this country.

There are many of us who have questions on our minds about Vietnam. Not the least among them is the President himself, who has tried through every possible avenue he could think of to bring this matter to an honorable conclusion.

What is happening on the part of demonstrators, who show a sense of utter irresponsibility and lack of respect, who openly flout obeying the law, is to place this country in a position which is unbecoming a republic of stature and dignity.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, with all other Senators, I swell with great pride in listening to a great American, MIKE MANSFIELD, a great leader of his political party, in the splendid comments he has just made.

The vicious, venomous, and vile leaders of this infamous movement who attempt to influence young people of this country to evade the draft by fraud and chicanery is an ugly page in the history of the Nation.

Let the whole world clearly understand that the overwhelming majority of the people of the United States, now almost 200 million strong, stand for law and order, stand for orderly processes, and support the foreign policy of the Government of the United States, when our country faces danger, particularly as my able friend the Senator from Montana has just indicated, when the Chief Executive of this country is confronted with an honorable commitment to the free people of South Vietnam.

I am exceedingly proud that the Senator from Montana has commented as he has.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. I compliment my colleague, the Senator from California, as well as the great majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and associate myself with them in their remarks today.

I have been one of those who supported the President of the United States from scratch on the issue of Vietnam. Unfortunately, this issue is not being presented as fairly as it should be—this is true not only in the slums of our cities, where people are easily worked on, but also in our universities and colleges.

Thank God for the indication that the great majority of the students of America in its colleges and universities are seeking to do the right thing and are beginning to make themselves heard on this very important question.

It is high time that the Senate took under consideration as a major part of its business the points which the Senator from California has just made.

I am only one Senator, but I am sure the Senator from California will agree with me that the Senate should pass a bill to punish, by fine or imprisonment, those who would seek to delay military personnel or military materiel. Such a bill is now pending in committee. I believe that before Congress adjourns, it should make sure that such a bill is enacted into law. There is so much to be said for its enactment, and so much more to be taken into consideration, that we should make it a major item of our business immediately, to punish those who would do a disservice to our land, to our military forces, and to all those who seek so assiduously to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Vietnam.

I thank the Senator from California for yielding to me.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my able colleague, the Senator from Wyoming, very much. I associate myself with his remarks with respect to new legislation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, mention has been made concerning the pending bill, which would make it a crime for any person willfully, intentionally, and physically to interfere with the movement of troops, military equipment, or property. That bill was introduced by me. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is one of its cosponsors. I invite the Senator from California to become one at this time.

Mr. KUCHEL. I shall be very glad to be a cosponsor. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The present occupant of the chair, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], is also a cosponsor.

However, I wish to say to the representatives of the Departments of Defense and Justice that I cannot understand why they have not filed an appraisal of the bill with the Committee on the Judiciary.

When I first presented the bill, I made a study—through the experts—to determine whether there was any statute now on the books making it a crime to interfere with the movement of troops. The investigation disclosed that there was not.

For 1 month I have been in contact with both the Departments of Justice and Defense, begging them to file a report; but no report has yet been filed.

The Committee on the Judiciary is prepared to act immediately. It wishes to send the bill to the floor of the Senate. It is waiting for the appraisal of the merits of the bill from the two Departments. I just do not understand the reason for the delay.

This morning, Mr. Katzenbach stated that the Department of Justice would investigate what happened throughout the Nation over the weekend.

With due respect to the heavy burden which the Attorney General carries, I wish he would take a look at the bill and report to the Committee on the Judiciary whether or not he feels it should be enacted into law. I expect that the Department of Defense likewise will make a determination whether it will or will not support such a bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. As one of the many Senators who have joined the Senator from Ohio in the introduction of his bill making it a crime to interfere with and obstruct the movement of either Army personnel or materiel, I certainly join him in expressing the view that the Departments affected will render a prompt decision, recommendation, and opinion on the matter, because I believe that nothing will suffice so well as to enact a criminal statute dealing with this pressing problem.

I support the position completely.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, of course, I enthusiastically support the views expressed by the majority leader and the minority whip, concerning interference with the draft. Any violation of the law that strikes so deeply at our security as a Nation must be prosecuted vigorously and swiftly. I support the views of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] which he expressed so vigorously on the floor of the Senate the other day, that this calculated program to defeat the draft must be yanked out by the roots.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, we are discussing the demonstrations that took place last week that we believe to be harmful to the security of our country. More and more of these events will be happening unless we dig out the perpetrators and leaders of the operations. Between the 10th day of June and the 28th, at Ringwood, N.J., about 40 miles from New York, there was assembled a seminar led by Communist leaders of the United States. Between 75 and 80 students of universities were present. They were paid expenses incurred in going to and coming from the seminar. They were paid up to $50 a week while operating in this particular field.

While they were at that seminar, they were prohibited from making any telephone calls to the outside world. They were forbidden to write letters. They were there to learn the Communist technique of inciting disorder and creating demonstrations.

It is estimated that the seminar in the neighborhood of Ringwood, N.J., cost $100,000. The 75 to 80 students who were present left the seminar and moved back to their respective communities to carry out the teachings which were given them at that Communist operation.

The point I am trying to make, is that, substantially, these demonstrations are the product of Communist leadership. Countless innocent, uninformed youth of the country are participating in them, not knowing that they are following the flag of the Reds and bowing to the voices of the Communists dictating how they shall create disorder and bring the United States into disrespect.

Mr. President, by unanimous consent, may I have 3 additional minutes?

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. The meeting which I am describing as having taken place at Ringwood, N.J., took place between June 10 and June 28. What I have said is corroborated without question. This matter has been on my mind for the last 2 weeks, and I have been checking to ascertain whether the report is true or not.

Now I go to another matter. On September 11, 1965, at McMillin Theater at Columbia University in New York City there assembled the first panel of the First Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars in the United States. They originally were supposed to meet at Rutgers University. However, when word got out that these Socialist scholars were to meet at Rutgers University, indignation flashed into the mind of a candidate for the Governor of New Jersey, State Senator Wayne Dumont, Jr. He called for the removal of the scholars on socialism. When he did, the decision was made to transfer the meeting from Rutgers University. Mr. Wayne Dumont, Jr., the man who raised the complaint, called for the removal of Prof. Eugene D. Genovese because of the latter's remarks at the Rutger's teach-in on Vietnam on last April 23, when Dr. Genovese said:

> I am a Marxist and a Socialist. Therefore, unlike most of my distinguished colleagues here this morning, I do not fear or regret the impending Vietcong victory in Vietnam. I welcome it.

In other words, this scholar on socialism stated that he did not regret the impending victory of the Vietcong in South Vietnam; he welcomed it. The meeting was held in Columbia University on September 11, 1965, and various scholars of the Socialist philosophy were present.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 3 additional minutes.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. Speakers were among others, Paul M. Sweezey, Connor Cruise O'Brien, Said Shah, Staughton Lynd, and Herbert Aptheker. One of them was a person who spoke about the riots in California, mentioned a moment ago by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. He addressed the last meeting. He repeated the words that were so often spoken at Watts, Calif.: "Burn baby, burn"—meaning, burn down the buildings and the property and the houses in making protest against what is going on.

Mr. President, we cannot stand idly by with reference to this matter. The youth who are serving our country in South Vietnam are complaining about what we are tolerating back home. They are not complaining about the requirement to stand by their country. Every one of them is responding willingly. There was in my office this morning a Lieutenant Kapelka. Perhaps he is in the gallery now. He received his notice to report to Vietnam. He said:

> I am glad to go, but do something about stopping these disorders which are breaking down the morale within our country.

Whatever steps we take within the framework of the Constitution cannot be too severe in handling this problem.

Long-whiskered beatniks, dirty in clothes, worn down, seemingly, by a willingness to look like a beatnik, are the ones who are in the vanguard.

They are not entitled to our respect. In my judgment most of them are the antithesis of what a real patriot is. They do not have the backbone or courage to stand up for their country. They want to go into some hiding place completely devoid of the attributes and character of genuine true-blooded Americans. They are interfering with the lives of genuine American citizens, and with the security of our Nation.

I will in the next few days introduce a bill making it a Federal felony for a person to induce or influence a military person or a prospective draftee not to respond to the call of duty.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there further morning business?

Mr. **RUSSELL** of Georgia. Mr. President——

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. **RUSSELL** of Georgia. Mr. President, I regret that I have not heard all the statements made this morning on this subject, but I cannot let this occasion pass without expressing my own profound contempt for these demonstrations, and my sickness of soul at the weakening of the body politic and the patriotism and spiritual life of this Nation that these demonstrations indicate.

Mr. President, on previous occasions I have said on the floor of the Senate that the fact that people in high places had encouraged campaigns of civil disobedience throughout this land in other cases would bring home at other times under other conditions campaigns of civil disobedience that would be much more far reaching and dangerous than those they had encouraged.

One sure effect of these campaigns and demonstrations, will be to prolong the war in Vietnam. The prolongation of the war will certainly increase the casualty lists of American boys who are being sent there to support this country and its flag. Every protest will cause the Communists to believe they can win if they hold on a little longer.

The time has passed now to discuss the wisdom of our entrance into Vietnam. Many of us have varied opinions on that score. I was one of those who opposed our involvement in that conflict. But we are committed there now. Our flag is committed, our national honor is committed, our prestige is committed, and our whole power for the maintenance of world peace and avoidance of a nuclear war is laid squarely on the line in Vietnam today.

As for the young men taking part in these demonstrations, some of them are pathetic because they are being misled by wily agitators. These boys do not know what they are doing.

Some of them are digging their own graves, because when they encourage Ho Chi Minh to extend and prolong this war, many of them will be caught up in the military draft. Some of them will be trained and sent to Vietnam. Many of them will not come back.

Either that or they will wind up behind the bars and finally receive a dishonorable discharge. They will go through life dishonored and die unsung. They will have failed in the first duty of man—to defend his homeland—and in this case the greatest way of life ever known.

Mr. President, I would that there were some way to reach and punish those who encourage and incite these young people.

On yesterday afternoon I paid a visit to Walter Reed Hospital where I had an opportunity to talk to seven or eight battle casualties of the Vietcong who had been flown back to this country. Without exception, the first thing that each of these men mentioned was these demonstrations. They asked what Congress proposed to do about them. There is a great feeling of bitterness on the part of men who have been out there on foreign soil that American citizens without let or hindrance, and without vigorous condemnation from the press and other media of communication, are permitted to take steps that will slow down the war and inspire the hopes of eventual victory in the mind of Ho Chi Minh.

He has stated again and again that the American people do not have the patience to carry to a successful conclusion the kind of war he intends to fight there. These demonstrations will lead him to believe that impatience with the war, and war weariness, on which he so strongly depends, is already being manifested in this country.

It takes but a handful of people in a demonstration of this kind to generate the opinion overseas that there is a great mass of similar thought, because this is one of the few countries on earth where there can be public demonstrations of this kind against a fixed policy of the Government.

We pay a terrible price sometimes for the freedom to demonstrate in this country, and we pay too great a price when it amounts to a conspiracy to injure the U.S. fighting man 10,000 miles away.

I hope that all of those in positions of power—all of those who encouraged these other demonstrations—will now come out and say this one is aiding a foreign enemy and that we must find a means to deal with it.

It is sad, indeed, to think that so many foolish, misled young people who will themselves be caught up in the draft may pay the penalty of their lives because their demonstrations have encouraged Ho Chi Minh and the Chinese to think that if they will just hold on a while longer, just carry on the war for a few more months or years, the American people will eventually weary of it and pull out.

We cannot leave now, Mr. President. If we do, we will leave behind in that country, where this dirty war is being fought, in the jungles and rice paddles—if we tuck tail and run now—the heritage of greatness, freedom, and courage that has marked this country since its birth.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the spectacle of young men, willing to perjure themselves to avoid the draft and willing to let the world know that they do not support other young Americans arrayed in battle in Vietnam in the cause of freedom, is enough to make any person loyal to his country weep.

Ascribing the blame to Communist influence or to leaders of pacifist causes is a subterfuge which does not come to grips with the real issue and does not place the blame where it belongs; namely, on the wailing, quailing, protesting young men themselves.

Where in the name of conscience is their sense of history?

They can indulge in this counterfeit undertaking because this is a free land. But it is a free land because other young men long before them faced up to their duty to make it so and keep it so.

Perhaps they have forgotten that men fought at Valley Forge under ghastly conditions for 22 cents a day or perhaps they are so cynical and cowardly as not to care.

Perhaps they have forgotten that the signers of the Declaration of Independence were hounded to their graves, and perhaps they do not care.

Perhaps they have forgotten that two generations ago, millions of young Americans went to the corners of the earth to resist autocracy and that thousands of them did not return alive.

Perhaps they have forgotten that 17 million were in uniform a generation ago to defend the cause of freedom against dictators.

It is high time they begin to rethink their history and what it cost to give them the lush benefits of a free country.

Shakespeare was right. He said:

> Cowards die many times before their death.
> The valiant never taste of death but once.

What a tragic future lies ahead for such craven souls.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services and of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, I should like to add my word on the subject of the young people who hold meetings and teach-ins and who try to find ways to dodge the draft and avoid military service.

I feel certain that every Senator has had the experience I have had of having to write the parents of young boys who have been killed in Vietnam. They are difficult letters to write. I know something of how those parents feel because Mrs. Saltonstall and I lost a son in World War II.

When, after writing a letter to bereaved parents of servicemen killed in action, I read about the fact that young men and women in various parts of the country—and especially in my own city of Boston where they paraded last Saturday and held a meeting on Boston Common—when I read that young people are organizing against American policy and refusing to meet their service obligations, I am shocked.

As the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, put it so well in New York recently before the Conference of NATO Parliamentarians, it is because we believe so much in the integrity of our country's word that we are giving assistance to the Vietnamese. We have stated that we will help them to maintain their freedom and to maintain their own way of life as they wish to do.

Therefore when we hear, read, and see pictures of these demonstrations we are shocked to think that the participants have no knowledge or understanding of the problem that exists or of what our country is doing to try to solve it. None of us want American lives to be lost. We all want a peaceful world.

I hope that the words that are expressed in this body today will have some effect on the professors and others who are teaching these young people as well as on the leaders of this campaign who are stimulating the young people to act as they have been acting. I hope that the heads of institutions which permit these activities to take place will, while they safeguard freedom of speech, also promote patriotism.

We know the situation in Vietnam is a serious one, to which our Government is giving a great deal of attention and thought. It is taking what it believes to be are the right steps. Some boys will not return from Vietnam. The boys who are there, who are suffering and are exposed to danger, are those who deserve our support—not those who are trying to avoid their duty to their country.

I commend Senators who have spoken on this subject this morning. I am proud and honored to join with them.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I had not intended to speak today, for the reason that at 4 o'clock on Sunday morning I returned from a 19-day visit to southeast Asia. Because of the time differential of 12 hours between Vietnam and Washington, I thought I would rather get my feet on the ground before I made a report to the Senate of my observations there. I desire, of course, to be exceedingly careful and to go over my notes, so that I will not disclose, in the Senate or outside the Senate, any top secret or classified matter that came to my attention. However, I feel that I should mention one or two incidents at this time.

I was assigned to the visit by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, of which I am a member. The junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], and I, as members of that committee, went first to Korea as guests of the Government of Korea and at the expense of the Government of Korea. The Korean Government requested that this great Nation be represented at their Armed Services Day, when they said goodby to a fine, lean, well-trained division of Koreans—ROK's, as they are called—who were sent to Vietnam to aid in the struggle against Communist aggression. We were present at the departure of 22,000 young men, highly trained soldiers, of Korea.

By the way, on my return trip, when I stopped briefly at Clark Air Force Base Hospital in the Philippine Islands, two of the ROK soldiers who had been in Vietnam were already casualties and were being treated in the hospital.

Today I merely wish to speak briefly pertaining to the subject discussed earlier. In the course of the days—and they were hard, long days, extending from early in the morning until night, while in every part of Vietnam, and then in every part of Thailand—I spoke with and shook hands with almost 200 Ohio boys who are serving there in our Armed Forces.

When I asked each of those boys, "Have you any problem?" The answer was practically unanimous: "No, no problem; no problem, sir." Perhaps 2 of almost 200 boys had some problem or grievance, and as one who has served as a private in our Armed Forces, and later as an officer, I could only think that they were liabilities of Uncle Sam from the moment they were inducted into the armed services.

The morale of our soldiers in southeast Asia is of the highest. They have no problems.

I am sure that they are not interested whatever in what the extremists do in this country, and that it has no effect on them.

Recently, in Vietnam, in a tent in a receiving hospital for the armed services, with the temperature around 100 degrees, I saw seven women nurses who were assigned to that hospital. Three of them were there at the time, assigned to work around the clock. In going around and shaking hands with the wounded, I was told, "There is an Ohioan here." Right at the end, I came across a young man, John Hart, of Cuyahoga County, who lived in the neighborhood where I lived some 15 years ago. He is a fine athletic young man. His right leg was amputated below the knee. I talked with him and said: "I am going to talk with your parents when I return to Washington. I shall call them in Cleveland."

He and I talked briefly. When I was leaving the hospital shortly after—and this is something that made me feel very good—the head nurse said: "Senator, I want you to know that that young man was feeling very despondent. His best friend had been killed and he was feeling very low because of losing part of his right leg. When you spoke to him and told him that modern medical science had done miracles and would continue to do miracles, and that, while perhaps he will not be able to play football, he will certainly be able to bowl and enjoy certain other activities, I believe that you helped him greatly. I was fearful about him. However, after you finished, I no longer have any feeling of fear."

Shortly after that, at Clark Air Base Hospital in the Philippine Islands, I learned that this young man had already been sent to Walter Reed Hospital. I have an appointment to see him tonight. That is the story of merely one young man who nearly gave his life for his country.

While I was at that hospital, another soldier died. Others were very cheerful and said, "We are just wounded and will be back in combat soon."

The practice is that if they are seriously and permanently disabled, they are sent back to their homes as soon as possible. If they are slightly injured, then, while the extremists are denouncing the fighting, they are sent back to their units, and they continue to fight. As the chairman of our committee stated, it is too late to say that we should not have gone there in 1954, because we are now there, and we have every reason to be proud of the conduct of our soldiers there.

I assure my colleagues that the morale of our soldiers in Vietnam is not being disturbed in the least by what a few extremists in this country may be saying or doing.

AMERICAN VIETNAM PROTESTERS PROLONG VIETNAM WAR

Mr. **PROXMIRE.** Mr. President, if the Bill of Rights—the very heart of this democracy of ours—is to mean something, the right to protest must be preserved, even when that protest contradicts what most of us regard as our country's clear interest.

The right of protest is feeble and empty if it must confine itself to matters that concern us little, or on which the Nation's vital interests are not touched.

It is only when the protest offends us and seems to strike at our country's deepest purposes that the meaning of our Bill of Rights—the right to disagree and protest in this democracy—is really tested.

Thus, Mr. President, while I vehemently disagree with the protests against our Vietnam policy, while I am convinced that they are woefully in error, and while I am convinced that they do our cause in Vietnam a grievous disservice, nevertheless where they are lawful and nonviolent, they are in accordance with the essence of our free democracy—the Bill of Rights.

Mr. President in an article published in the New York Times this morning, James Reston points out that one of the supreme ironies of recent years is that these protesters are inadvertently working against all the things they want, and are creating all the things they fear the most.

They are not promoting peace, because if there is any hope remaining in the hearts of the Vietcong and their leaders in Hanoi and Peiping, it is the distant wish that somehow the American people disapprove the Vietnam war and will make their disapproval felt, reverse our Vietnam policies and call our troops home.

It is this wish—this gross misreading of the attitude of the American people—which more than anything else is keeping the war going, in spite of our immense power superiority and our solid military victories. It is this which is preventing peace.

And what is fostering the wish that keeps war going but the protests of the so-called peace marchers themselves?

As Reston says, they are not persuading the President or the Congress, but deceiving Ho Chi Minh and General Giap into prolonging it.

Mr. President, the President of the United States has clearly and carefully spoken his desire for peace and negotiations, not once, but many times. This country's leaders want peace, and any protester who can read must in his heart know that.

If these peace marchers want peace, the best contribution they can make is to address their plea to the Communists. Let the Communists know that this country is ready to negotiate and that this country will keep on a massive military pressure until they negotiate; but let the Communists know that even the peace groups in this country now recognize that if peace is to be had in southeast Asia, it will never come from an American surrender, but from a Communist recognition of the reality of military power and a Communist recognition of the absolute determination of this country to pay whatever price is necessary to keep our commitment to South Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred by James Reston in today's New York Times be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON: THE STUPIDITY OF INTELLIGENCE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, October 16.—It is not easy, but let us assume that all the student demonstrators against the war in Vietnam are everything they say they are: sincerely for an honorable peace; troubled by the bombing of the civil population of both North and South Vietnam; genuinely afraid that we may be trapped into a hopeless war with China; and worried about the power of the President and the Pentagon and the pugnacious bawling patriotism of many influential men in the Congress.

A case can be made for it. In a world of accidents and nuclear weapons and damn fools, even a dreaming pacifist has to be answered. And men who want peace, defy the Government, and demonstrate for the support of the Congress, are not only within their rights but must be heard.

THE PARADOX

The trouble is that they are inadvertently working against all the things they want, and creating all the things they fear the most. They are not promoting peace but postponing it. They are not persuading the President or the Congress to end the war, but deceiving Ho Chi Minh and General Giap into prolonging it. They are not proving the superior wisdom of the university community but unfortunately bringing it into serious question.

When President Johnson was stubbornly refusing to define his war aims in Vietnam, and rejecting all thought of a negotiated settlement, the student objectors had a point, and many of us here in the Washington press corps and the Washington political community supported them, but they are now out of date. They are making news, but they are not making sense.

HEART OF THE PROBLEM

The problem of peace now lies not in Washington but in Hanoi, and probably the most reliable source of information in the Western World about what is going on there is the Canadian representative on the Vietnam International Control Commission, Blair Seaborn.

He flies regularly to the North Vietnamese capital with the Polish and Indian members of that Commission, and he is personally in favor of an honorable negotiated peace in Vietnam. He is a cultivated man and a professional diplomat. He knows all the mistakes we have made, probably in more detail than all the professors in all the teach-ins in all the universities of this country. What he finds in Hanoi, however, is a total misconception of American policy, and, particularly, a powerful conviction among Communist officials there that the antiwar demonstrations and editorials in the United States will force the American Government to give up the fight.

Not even the conscientious objectors on the picket lines in this country really believe that they have the power or the support to bring about any such result, but Hanoi apparently believes it and for an interesting reason.

Ho Chi Minh and the other Communist leaders in Hanoi remember that they defeated the French in Vietnam between 1950 and 1953 at least partly because of opposition to the Vietnam war inside France. The Communists won the propaganda battle in Paris before they won the military battle at Dienbienphu.

COUNTING ON PROTEST

Now they think they see the same surge of protest working against the Government in Washington, no matter what Mr. Seaborn says to the contrary. They have not been able to challenge American air, naval, or even ground power effectively since midsummer in South Vietnam, but they apparently still have the hope that the demonstrations against the Johnson administration in the United States will, in the end, give them the victory they cannot achieve on the battlefield.

So the Communists reject the negotiations the demonstrators in the United States want. They reject the negotiations the American Government has offered, and the demonstrators are protesting, not against the nation that is continuing the war but against their own country that is offering to make peace.

Not surprisingly, this is creating an ugly situation here in Washington. Instead of winning allies in the Congress to change the Johnson policy, the demonstrators are encouraging the very war psychology they denounce.

WRONG OBJECTIVES

Senator STENNIS of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, is now demanding that the administration pull up the antidraft movement "by the roots and grind it to bits."

Honest conscientious objectors are being confused with unconscientious objectors, hangers-on, intellectual graduate school draft dodgers and rent-a-crown boobs who will demonstrate for or against anything. And the universities and the Government's policy are being hurt in the process.

So there are now all kinds of investigations going on or being planned to find out who and what are behind all these demonstrations on the campuses. It is a paradoxical situation, for it is working not for intelligent objective analysis of the problem, which the university community of the Nation is supposed to represent, not for peace, which the demonstrators are demanding, but in both cases for precisely the opposite.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT OF 1937

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2092) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit marketing orders applicable to celery, sweet corn, limes, or avocados to provide for paid advertising, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

> That the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, is further amended as follows:
>
> (a) Section 2(3) is amended by inserting "such container and pack requirements provided in section 8(c)(6)(H)", immediately after "establish and maintain".
>
> (c) The proviso at the end of section 8c(6)(I) is amended by inserting: ", carrots, citrus fruits, onions, Tokay grapes, fresh pears, dates, plums, nectarines, celery, sweet corn, limes, or avocados" immediately after "applicable to cherries".
>
> And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit marketing orders applicable to various fruits and vegetables to provide for paid advertising."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, S. 2092, was passed by the Senate some time ago. It went over to the House and was amended by the House. That amendment is contained in the message from the House.

I shall ask that the House amendment be concurred in as amended by an amendment which I send to the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> On page 1, line 11, after "lines," insert "olives, pecans,".

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, S. 2092, as passed by the Senate, would permit marketing orders applicable to celery, sweet corn, limes, or avocados to include provisions for paid advertising.

This bill was introduced by me at the request of the Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association. It covers products which are produced in Florida, as elsewhere, and simply refers to marketing agreements.

The House amendment extends the Senate provision to the following additional fruits and vegetables: carrots, citrus fruits, onions, Tokay grapes, fresh pears, dates, plums, and nectarines. The House amendment also authorizes the container and pack requirements of marketing orders to be effective when the price of the commodity is above parity. The present law does not permit that except when the price is below parity.

The amendment I am offering to the House amendment would add olives and pecans to the commodities covered by the bill.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] requested, on behalf of pecan producers of his State and elsewhere, that that commodity be added. The distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] requested on behalf of the olive producers in his State that that commodity also be added to this bill.

The Department of Agriculture has advised informally that it has no objection to the inclusion of olives and pecans in the bill, and so far as we have been able to determine there is no objection in the House. The bill merely provides authority which may be used if the Secretary finds that it will be useful, and if the producers approve it by at least two-thirds in number or volume in a referendum.

At the time of reporting S. 2092, the committee gave some consideration to a proposal of the National Milk Producers Federation that milk be added to the commodities covered by the bill. At that time the committee felt that marketing orders for milk are substantially different from marketing orders applicable to other commodities and the inclusion of advertising authority for milk would therefore present a somewhat different situation than for other commodities. In fact, the form of the bill would have to be completely changed since marketing research and development projects are not now authorized for milk. There is sentiment on the part of some members of our committee for the extension of this authority to milk. In addition to writing to the committee just prior to the time the committee reported S. 2092, the National Milk Producers Federation offered testimony at page 1139 of the committee's hearings on the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, suggesting a draft bill to provide such authority for milk. I do not, however, suggest that milk be added at this time. Milk marketing orders do differ substantially from those for fruits and vegetables, and I do believe that a separate bill should be introduced for milk by the sponsors of such a proposal, so that the views of all interested persons could be obtained and the committee could have the advantage of their testimony.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate more than a moment.

My able friend, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], has once again indicated his dedication to American agriculture and his ability to bring about a successful solution to the problem.

I thank the Senator on behalf of the olive agriculture industry in my State for accepting its position which will be included in this rather excellent piece of legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter to my able friend, the senior Senator from Florida, may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> OCTOBER 4, 1965.
>
> Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
> *Chairman, Subcommittee on Agriculture Production, Marketing and Stabilization of Prices, Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR SPESSARD: I enclose a copy of the letter from Congressman HARLAN HAGEN, of California, with reference to H.R. 10206 now before your committee. He notes that this legislation permits certain specified commodities which are under Federal marketing orders to expend money for advertising and promotion. He states that he understands the olive industry would like to have olives included in the list of stipulated commodities which could take advantage of this provision. I wonder if it would be possible to include canned olives in this legislation when it is reported from your committee? If you feel testimony is needed from the olive industry on this, I would be glad to contact Mr. R. W. Henderson to whom Congressman HAGEN refers.
>
> With kindest regards.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> THOMAS H. KUCHEL.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I thank my able friend, the senior Senator from Florida, for the service that he has rendered to American agriculture.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments, as amended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] to the House amendments.

The amendment to the House amendments was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now recurs on concurring in the House amendments as amended.

The amendments of the House, as amended, were concurred in.

THE GI BILL: AN INVESTMENT, NOT A COST

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, 20 years ago this fall, the veterans of the Second World War began to enroll in the educational institutions of this country under the GI bill. Although many people had doubts about the success of this bill, there has been no better proof in our history of education being an investment, not merely a cost.

In the September issue of American Education magazine, a publication begun this year by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dr. John R. Emens, president of Ball State Teachers College in Muncie, Ind., has written an article entitled, "Education Begets Education." In this article, Dr. Emens describes the vast contributions to this Nation which have come from the World War II GI bill. There is no reason to doubt that similar great and lasting benefits to the Nation will come from the cold war GI bill which this body passed this year by a vote of more than 4 to 1, but which now seems to be bottled up in the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Dr. Emens described what happened under the GI bill of World War II when the colleges first opened their doors to veterans in the fall of 1945. He said:

> Twenty years ago this fall the first veterans of the Second World War began to enroll in the Nation's educational institutions. They were the beneficiaries of one of the most remarkable acts of faith in America's history—the GI bill of rights. Two decades have passed. Today thousands of the estimated 1,445,000 students beginning college are the children of those former members of the Armed Forces, many of whom were the first of their family lines who had the opportunity of a higher education.
>
> This is, therefore, the anniversary of a precedent-setting moment in our country. An act of Congress was to change the lives of millions of Americans and directly influence the decisions of their children.
>
> It is now clear to all that education begets education. Many of the parents of today's

college freshmen would have been unable to go to college without the GI bill. Many young men and women would not be pursuing studies beyond high school now if their veteran parents had returned from the war to a choiceless land.

Mr. President, that is all we are leaving these veterans of the cold war, a choiceless land. They come back, after having lost an average of 2½ years' time. The 60 percent who did not serve have gone ahead with their civilian life, their education, their jobs, their seniority——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I have an extension of 3 minutes' time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. And yet, with the experience of World War II and the Korean conflict bill, these men offer their lives in Vietnam and other places, and many lose them, and many of those who come back have injuries to their psyches, to their minds, to their spirits, but we say to them, "You are cast out, you have no chance to go to school."

I say it is time for the administration, now that we have 200,000 men in Vietnam, to call on that House committee to unblock that bill and let us pass it this week. I am confident that it would pass the House by a vote of 4 to 1, as it passed the Senate by a vote of 4 to 1.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article by Dr. Emens be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION BEGETS EDUCATION: THE GI BILL 20 YEARS LATER

(By John R. Emens)

Twenty years ago this fall the first veterans of the Second World War began to enroll in the Nation's educational institutions. They were the beneficiaries of one of the most remarkable acts of faith in America's history—the GI bill of rights. Two decades have passed. Today thousands of the estimated 1,445,000 students beginning college are the children of those former members of the Armed Forces, many of whom were the first of their family lines who had the opportunity of a higher education.

This is, therefore, the anniversary of a precedent-setting moment in our country. An act of Congress was to change the lives of millions of Americans and directly influence the decisions of their children. It is now clear to all that education begets education. Many of the parents of today's college freshmen would have been unable to go to college without the GI bill. Many young men and women would not be pursuing studies beyond high school now if their veteran parents had returned from the war to a choiceless land.

The GI bill, with the choices for betterment it provided, was signed by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt on June 22, 1944, 16 days after the Normandy invasion. It was, in every sense, an expression of faith in ultimate victory: although the struggle was far from over, the United States had made plans for its veterans. This, as we look back, was a most fortunate time to make a major investment in the future, and this venture proved that education is an investment, not merely a cost, as was recorded in the report of President Truman's Commission on Higher Education in 1947.

There were some who feared that veterans would have a permanent itch in their trigger fingers. They agreed with the ominous forecast of a sociologist who said that Mussolini and Hitler got much of their strength from veterans and warned that "veterans have written many a bloody page of history, and those pages have stood forever as a record of their days of anger." There were other gloomy predictions: one prominent educator said that veterans "would turn the Nation's campuses into intellectual hobo jungles."

Rejecting such prophecies, the Congress affirmed its faith in the quality of our young people by passing the GI bill without a dissenting voice.

The veterans who took advantage of the education and training section of the GI bill were, by and large, superior students; they strove toward excellence with singleminded determination. Some had been college students for whom military service was an interruption; when they returned as veterans they were even more successful academically. Others were new students, who, as one educator observed, "brought an intentness of purpose to the classroom that brooked few fraternity pranks." The undergraduate campus was soon to have, as another educator said, "a graduate school atmosphere."

Known officially as the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, the GI bill was designed to give back to a generation of young people something of what it had had to sacrifice during the war years. For the war that had meant death and physical pain to many had also left the less visible wounds of lost time and economic dislocation, spiritual anguish, and uncertainty.

The veterans needed not a dole or a monetary reward but an opportunity to find lost paths, and the GI bill gave them that opportunity. Under the provisions of that bill veterans could get such benefits as guaranteed home and business loans, unemployment compensation, help in finding jobs, and an education.

Victory brought demobilization: the number of returning veterans reached a million a month. The average World War II veteran had been away from civilian life 2½ years, and no one expected him to adapt easily to the cadence of normal life. He faced an uncertain economy, which many experts felt would stagger under the double blow of retooling for peace and satisfying the hunger for jobs. One economist predicted that 8 million veterans—half the number of all the Americans who went into uniform—would be jobless during reconversion.

It was a time of delicate balance. On one side were the ingredients of economic disaster; on the other, the GI bill and the same spirit which had won the war.

Many prophets turned out to have very faulty vision indeed: 7,800,000 veterans took some form of training under the GI bill. By the time the last of the veterans had finished their studies, the Nation was richer by 450,000 engineers; 360,000 teachers; 288,000 metalworkers; as many doctors, dentists, nurses, and scientists as the population of Alaska; enough mechanics, electricians, construction workers, lawyers, businessmen, and executives to populate four cities the size of Indianapolis. According to Senator VANCE HARTKE, of Indiana, for example, fully 5 percent of the population of his State studied under the GI bill.

Pete Wheeler, director of the Georgia Department of Veterans Service, has said that those who would have been unable to get an education without the GI bill "fully appreciate the value of what they have received and will insist on their children putting forth the effort to become educated." Mr. Wheeler recalled the expression used at the turn of the century to justify a woman's education: "Educate a girl and you educate a family." The expression might be revised to read: "Educate the parents and you educate the next generation."

This fact is borne out by the findings of the Bureau of the Census (Current Population Reports, series P-20). Young people whose fathers are college graduates are far more likely to continue their studies after high school than those who fathers never had that opportunity. In October 1960 about 62 percent of men aged 20 to 24 whose fathers had completed college were already following in their footsteps. By contrast, 28 percent of men in the same age group whose fathers had completed high school but did not attend college were enrolled in a college. The figure for the young men whose fathers were not high school graudates is even more revealing: only 12 percent had continued their formal education beyond high school.

The direct relationship between the parents' and the children's education shown by those statistics does not end there: only 4 percent of the children whose fathers went to college did not finish high school. On the other hand, 44 percent of the children whose fathers did not complete a high school education failed to receive a high school diploma.

The many letters received by the Office of Education during the preparation of this article add warmth to these statistics.

There is Fritz M. Fossdal, of Lombard, Ill., "All of my education," he explains, "was sponsored by the GI bill. My stepdaughter expects to receive her degree from Northern Illinois University in January 1966. My next eldest daughter is already making plans to continue her education after graduation from high school."

There is Herbert J. Edelman, Brooklyn N.Y. "Only God knows what would have become of me," he writes, "if it had not been for the GI bill. My studies were a factor in my daughter's decision to further her education; she begins college this fall." And there is Robert Matthews, Siletz, Oreg., a high school teacher who studied under the GI bill, and whose son, Kirk William, is now a freshman at Lewis and Clark College, where he was born on January 1, 1947.

And there is Ismael Vega from Puerto Rico, who is perhaps typical of the men who would have been lost to education without training under the GI bill. "In January 1946," he writes, "I was a young veteran with only an eighth-grade education and little hope for the future. The education program of the GI bill of rights was my refuge. It opened many avenues to a good and useful life for me. Today I am the superintendent of schools in Aguada, Puerto Rico, a town of 23,000 people."

There are many more such stories in the archives of American life today. They come from homes where the spark of education has not only brightened lives but improved the economic standing of the family.

According to the Director of the U.S. Employment Service, veterans enjoy an average annual income of $5,100 compared with $3,200 for nonveterans; their unemployment rate in a recent representative year was half that of nonveterans.

With higher incomes, GI bill beneficiaries are also inevitably paying higher taxes. Estimates based on Census and Internal Revenue data show that income added by GI bill training produces tax payments of about $1 billion a year to the U.S. Treasury and that this amount will increase as the incomes of veterans continue to pull ahead of those of nonveterans. This means that the $14 billion cost of the educational provisions of the GI bill has already been well repaid to the Nation. That education is one of the soundest economic investments can therefore be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the most skeptical critic.

But there were other effects as well: the GI bill challenged social stratification. It reopened society's clogged channels. Large numbers of veterans who before the war had been in relatively low-paid occupations moved upward to much higher paying jobs and to the professions.

As a result of the opportunity offered by the GI bill, the ratio between college enrollment and the college-age population nearly doubled between 1941 and 1940. A college education, formerly too often available only to the well to do, now entered the "lifespace" of youth from other strata of the population. Certainly this program, available to all veterans and administered by the Veterans' Administration without discrimination, opened many avenues to the socially and economically underprivileged, particularly to the Negro veteran.

The GI bill did not, however, include any bar against discrimination by participating universities and colleges. Notwithstanding the enlightenment shown by the Congress when it passed this historic wartime legislation, the Nation still lacked the understanding that would have demanded a civil rights clause in the GI bill. It is interesting to speculate on the progress our generation would have seen had it been otherwise. Perhaps the social revolution we are now experiencing would have occurred 20 years earlier, and—since veterans alone would have been affected—without the degree of rancor we have witnessed.

The GI bill did much to insure, however, that modern America would maintain the belief of the Founding Fathers that the only kind of aristocracy for which we have room is "an aristocracy of achievement arising out of a democracy of opportunity."

The field of education itself was to become one of the major beneficiaries of the law. Statistics clearly reflect that the largest group of veterans who needed the GI bill were future teachers. About one-third of them later reported that they could not have finished their education without the help of the GI bill.

Now a new generation of Americans—many of them sons and daughters of veterans—are taking their first steps in higher education. All of them, in some respects, will become the future educators of the Nation. Whether they become teachers, scientists, or businessmen, they will be educators. For as the rich attainments of the GI bill have shown, education begets education.

We need merely reflect upon the accuracy of the 1947 prophecy of the report of the President's Commission on Education:

"Education is an investment, not a cost. It is an investment in free men. It is an investment in social welfare, better living standards, better health, and less crime. It is an investment in higher production, increased income, and greater efficiency in agriculture, industry, and government. It is an investment in a bulwark against garbled information, half-truths, and untruths; against ignorance and intolerance. It is an investment in human talent, better human relationships, democracy, and peace."

VICTIM OF CRIME IS THE FORGOTTEN MAN

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on June 17, 1965, I introduced S. 2155, a bill to compensate the innocent victims of crime. Since that time, several Members of the House of Representatives have introduced a companion bill to compensate an innocent victim of criminal acts.

On Friday, October 1, Chet Huntley, of NBC News delivered a succinct, brief perspective on this bill which traces the history of the theory of compensation of the victims of crime. Because of the information contained in that telecast, I ask unanimous consent that the script of Chet Huntley's perspective be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the script was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERSPECTIVE

(By Chet Huntley)

The victim of crime is frequently the forgotten man. Modern society has gone on the premise that if the criminal were punished, crime would be so reduced, that society might take comfort in there being so few victims of the criminal. But it hasn't worked out that way. There are more victims of crime today than ever before and jurists and lawmakers in this country and abroad are saying it is time we do something about it.

More on this in a moment after this message from NAVL.

(Commercial.)

A bill was introduced in Congress last June 17 by Senator YARBOROUGH, of Texas, which would establish a Federal Violent Crimes Compensation Commission to aid victims of 14 specified crimes. This proposed Commission, true, would operate only in areas where the Federal Government exercises general police power—the District of Columbia and the special maritime and territorial jurisdictions of the United States. However, Senator YARBOROUGH said it was his hope that the States would follow the Federal example and establish their own commissions.

One State has already adopted the program. California is the first State in the Nation to give limited compensation to the victims of crime. New Zealand and Great Britain initiated crime compensation programs last year. New Zealand paid out $4,888 in the first 18 months of the program; Britain paid out $232,235, in 11 months.

The concept of compensating the victims of crime is not new. It is almost as old as law itself. The penal codes of ancient Babylon, Israel, Greece, and Rome all required the criminal to compensate the victim with a sum of money or property. Compensable offenses ranged from robbery and burglary to libel, slander, assault, and murder. Compensation for crime reached its zenith in Anglo-Saxon England. The seventh century documents from the Kentish laws of King Ethelbert include a list of payments for a variety of crimes. The amount of compensation to be paid in each case was carefully graded. A murderer might have to pay 100 shillings to the victims dependents, but restitution was limited to 20 shillings if the assailant succeeded only in smashing his victim's shinbone.

In the eighth century, two things occurred. The Christian concepts of sin and penance were absorbed into penal law and punishment replaced compensation as expiation for crime. Also, the kings and the feudal lords began to demand a share, or all, of the money formerly given to the victim by the offender.

But now it is suggested that society has somehow failed to protect the victim of the criminal and therefore society should pay.

MEDICAL CARE SERVICES OF OTHER COUNTRIES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, during the debate on medicare, it was frequently remarked how far behind most of the other countries of the world the United States was in providing medical care to its citizens. To give an accurate picture of the state of medical care services provided by most of the countries of the world, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Medical Care Protection Under Social Security Schemes" appearing in the June 1964 International Labour Review, on pages 570 through 585, published by the International Labour Organization, of which the United States, along with 110 other countries, is a member, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICAL CARE PROTECTION UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY SCHEMES: A STATISTICAL STUDY OF SELECTED COUNTRIES

The present study is the second [1] in a series undertaken by the International Labor Office to give effect to the recommendations by various committees held under the auspices of the ILO to extend the activities of the Office in the field of social security statistics.[2] Although, like its predecessor, it is also in the nature of a pilot study based only on information available at the ILO, it is hoped that it will usefully complement the first study and throw further light on this aspect of social security statistics.

Medical care systems may be compared from many different points of view; it is therefore necessary to clarify at the outset the types of comparisons envisaged in this study. It should be emphasized that no qualitative assessment of schemes is attempted. Medical care schemes are only assessed quantitatively, from the point of view of coverage or scope of protection, expressed in terms of the number of individuals effectively covered under the schemes. This fact should be borne well in mind when making comparisons between countries.

The contingency dealt with in the study is "condition requiring medical care in general." Medical care provided under employment injury schemes is not taken into account, although such schemes usually provide for the necessary medical care in respect of employment injury victims.

After an initial general discussion of the types of social security medical care schemes, the scope of the study and the statistical data which have been compiled, the study goes on to describe certain specific national systems; here the statistical measures of the scope of protection are also quoted and commented upon. The absolute figures on the number of persons covered, which are of some interest in themselves, as well as the series of statistical measures of the scope of protection, are given in the appendix.

TYPES OF MEDICAL CARE SCHEMES

Different countries have adopted different approaches to the provision of medical care under social security schemes. However, the various systems fall into one or other of the following four categories.

---

[1] The first, entitled "Old Age Protection Under Social Security Schemes," was published in International Labour Review, vol. 82, No. 6, Dec. 1960, pp. 542–571.

[2] Special mention may be made of: (1) a resolution adopted by the Ninth International Conference of Labor Statisticians (Geneva, April–May 1957) requesting the Office to "compile statistical information from various countries on * * * scope and level of protection"; (2) the report of the meeting of the ILO. Committee of Social Security Experts (Geneva, January–February 1959) in which the Office was asked to "compile and publish information on the scope of protection"; and (3) the report of the Actuarial Subcommittee of the Committee of Social Security Experts (Geneva, October, 1960), which recommended that "the ILO should initiate the systematic collection, general analysis and periodic publication of social security statistics * * * coordinated with the activities it is already performing in the field of social security statistics."

National health services

Under the national health service type of program the entire population, or practically the entire population, is entitled to free medical care as of right, i.e., without having to satisfy any special qualifying conditions except the condition of residence; and the whole expenditure, or at least a major part of it, is borne by the State.

Social insurance schemes

Under this system, insured persons (and often their dependents) are entitled to medical care, among other benefits; but the award of benefit, as well as its duration, may be dependent upon whether certain qualifying conditions are satisfied by the individual concerned or by his or her breadwinner. Further, such schemes are usually financed on a bipartite or tripartite basis—insured persons, employers, and sometimes the State, contributing directly or indirectly. Most social insurance schemes are limited to employees[3] only, though a few extend their coverage to self-employed persons also. Insurance may be made compulsory for certain classes of persons and voluntary for others; sometimes it is voluntary for self-employed persons or employees earning above a certain maximum. Pensioners are covered under most of these schemes.[4] Many schemes extend their coverage also to some, or all, dependents of insured persons.

Employer liability programs

In many developing countries there is a provision in the Labor Code requiring at least the larger employers to make provision for a certain measure of medical care for their employees, and sometimes for employees' dependants also. Some employers take the initiative and provide some medical care for their employees even if they are not obliged to do so by the law. In some of these countries the government provides free medical care for certain classes of employees, for example for governmental or semigovernmental employees.

Public medical care services

Finally, most countries provide for some medical care for the population, under the general health services. The state itself, or other public authorities like municipalities, set up clinics or hospitals where medical care facilities are available to the public. Free treatment, however, is often limited to the indigent, other users of the public medical care services having to bear part or all of the cost of treatment. These public medical care services usually act as a second line of defense, serving those not covered by other organized medical care schemes of the social insurance or the employer liability type.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The aim of the study is to present as complete a picture as possible of the scope of medical care protection available under social security schemes in selected countries. In its inquiries on the cost of social security[5] the Office, instead of formulating a definition of what constitutes social security, has found it convenient to enumerate certain criteria and to include in its inquiries only such schemes as meet them. These criteria are as follows:

"1. The objective of the system must be to grant curative or preventive medical care, or to maintain income in cases of involuntary loss of earnings or of an important part of earnings, or to grant supplementary incomes to persons having family responsibilities.

"2. The system must have been set up by legislation which attributes specified individual rights to, or imposes specified obligations on, a public, semipublic or autonomous body.

"3. The system should be administered by a public, semipublic or autonomous body."

The present study, however, does not cover public medical care schemes under which free medical care is available to the indigent, although these schemes meet the criteria above. The chief difficulty in covering such schemes is the problem of defining and estimating persons who are potentially eligible for benefits. Nevertheless, it must be recognized that the public medical care services may be the main, or even the only, form of medical care protection available to the population in many developing countries.

On the other hand, the employer liability type of medical care scheme clearly does not meet the criteria used in the ILO inquiries on the cost of social security; but the fact remains that in many developing countries such schemes established under the provisions of the Labor Code may play a very important part. It is not easy, however, to compile accurate data on such schemes by reference only to material available at the ILO. Nevertheless, whenever it is known that such a scheme exists, reference has been made to it and, if possible, an attempt has been made to present some data relating to the scheme, so that it may be possible to have a better appreciation of the scope of medical care protection in the country concerned. In the cases of India and Turkey it has been possible to give some indication of the coverage under such schemes. As the information available is limited, it has not been possible to insure that all such schemes are covered in all the countries considered. The data on the number of persons protected should therefore be considered as minimum figures setting a lower limit to the number of persons to whom medical care protection is available, especially in the case of developing countries.

DATA COMPILED

In the statistical treatment of the scope of protection under medical care schemes, it is possible to consider three different measures:

(a) Total number of persons protected (i.e., including dependents, pensioners, etc.) as a percentage of total population.

(b) Number of economically active persons protected (i.e., excluding dependents and pensioners) as a percentage of total economically active population.

(c) Number of employees protected as a percentage of total number of employees.

The first measure would give the overall picture of protection in the country, but it raises two difficulties. Firstly, it is usually the case that statistics on dependents are less accurate than statistics on insured persons,[6] so that by including dependents the error in the computed measure is increased. Secondly, bringing dependents into the picture makes international comparisons more difficult because there are wide differences among schemes as regards the relative extent and duration of medical care provided to dependents as compared with what is available to insured persons. These difficulties are obviated in measure (b), where dependents are completely excluded. Measure (c) is proposed because it is the class of employees that is usually the first to be covered by social security schemes and is very often, as mentioned earlier, the only class covered. As the necessary analysis of the global statistics is not available in sufficient detail in many cases, it has often been impossible to compute all the three relative measures described above.

Wherever possible, figures have been given for a number of years running in order to illustrate the trend. The periods covered, however, do not coincide for the different countries; this is necessarily one of the limitations of a study for which such data as were available had to be drawn from many different sources.

In certain cases, when the relative measures were computed, values exceeding 100 percent were obtained. This may be attributed to the fact that the figures compared were drawn from two different sources, e.g., a census or estimate of the protected population on the one hand and a census or estimate of the total population or the labor force on the other. In such cases it has been assumed that the true value of the relative measure in question is 100 percent and this is the value shown in the tables.

The date in the year to which the data on the insured population and the like refer has been indicated wherever it has been explicitly stated in the original source, and comparisons have been made against total population, etc., relating to the same date. In cases where the time reference of the data on the insured population is not known, comparisons have been made against the midyear population estimates. This procedure might give a slightly misleading picture if, for instance, the figures on the insured population, etc., related to December 31 of the year. But the timelag between the two dates can only be half a year at the most, and the effect of this lag may not be very serious except perhaps in the case of fairly new schemes which are in the stage of implementation.

In order to facilitate comparisons, the countries covered[7] have been presented in three different groups: (1) countries with national health service schemes; (2) countries with social insurance schemes of fairly wide coverage; i.e., schemes where the present coverage may be estimated to be at least 50 percent of the total population; and (3) other countries with social insurance schemes of limited coverage.[8]

SELECTED COUNTRIES WITH NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE SCHEMES

Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the U.S.S.R. are countries where the population is entitled to practically free medical care, as of right, without having to satisfy any special qualifying conditions. In Bulgaria, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the U.S.S.R. the whole resident population is covered.

In Czechoslovakia free medical care is available to all persons except self-employed persons and their dependents; however, all children under the age of 15 are entirely covered, and free maternity care is available to all women. At present it is estimated that about 95 percent of the population of Czechoslovakia is covered by the national health service and is entitled to free medical care. Even the remaining 5 percent is entitled to some measure of free medical care; e.g., preventive examination, treatment of contagious diseases, etc., but has to bear part of the cost of other medical care.[9]

---

[3] The term "employees" is used here to denote both wage earners and salaried employees.

[4] See "Medical Care for Pension Beneficiaries," in International Labour Review, vol. 83, No. 3, March 1961, pp. 273–286.

[5] See ILO: "The Cost of Social Security," 1949–57 (Geneva, 1961), p. 2.

[6] In some cases the number of dependants is only roughly estimated, for example by applying a proportion to the estimated number of insured persons. Sometimes the data on dependants are clearly underestimated; the figures refer only to those who are "registered" with the administration and not to all dependants potentially eligible for benefits.

[7] As stated above, the data compiled have been drawn solely from published sources available at the ILO. The following analyses may not, therefore, correspond exactly to the situation in certain countries, and the Office would welcome comments on the data presented.

[8] Absolute figures on the number of persons covered as well as the series of statistical measures of the scope of protection are given in the appendix, except in the case of the first group, where total or virtually total protection may be assumed.

SELECTED COUNTRIES WITH SOCIAL INSURANCE SCHEMES OF FAIRLY WIDE COVERAGE

Austria

Austria has a general social insurance medical care scheme which covers employees, apprentices, homeworkers, and unemployed persons receiving unemployment benefit. Pensioners are also covered by the scheme. Dependents are covered but receive reduced medical benefit.

Special schemes are in operation for the following categories: civil servants and railway employees, self-employed persons, and employees of local authorities.

Coverage under all the above schemes in 1960 was about 71 percent of the total population. In 1961 the schemes covered about 75 percent of the economically active population and very nearly 100 percent of employees.

Belgium

In Belgium there is a a general scheme covering employees, who are required to enroll with a mutual benefit society or with the public auxiliary fund. There are special systems for miners, seamen, and railwaymen. Pensioners are also covered, as are also dependents of insured persons and of pensioners; dependents are entitled to the same standard of medical care as insured persons.

There is provision for voluntary insurance of self-employed and nonemployed persons and certain other categories like public officials, domestic servants, etc.

About 73 percent of the total population, or 75 percent of the economically active population, was covered in 1960.

Chile

Chile has a social insurance program for medical care, which includes wage earners, urban self-employed persons whose earnings do not exceed a certain limit, pensioners, and salaried employees in public and private employment.

There are special schemes for railroad employees, bank employees, seamen, port workers, and other groups. Wives of insured men are entitled to the same medical care as insured women; as regards children, until they attain the age of 2 they are eligible for complete medical care, but between the ages of 2 and 15 they receive reduced care.

The total coverage for medical care may be estimated to be 74 percent of the economically active population in 1960.

Denmark, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden

The medical care system in Denmark, which is based on social insurance principles, may be described as semivoluntary. It is organized on the basis of sickness benefit societies, and membership in these societies is of two types: active and passive. Passive membership is compulsory for all resident adults who are not active members (optional for juveniles between 14 and 21 years) and is available on the payment of a nominal annual premium. Active membership is voluntary but is a condition for eligibility for benefits; thus, practically all insured persons are active members.

In Iceland, Norway and Sweden too, the medical care schemes are based on social insurance, and membership is compulsory for all resident adults. In Iceland invalids maintained by public assistance are exempt from compulsory insurance.

Children under specified ages[10] are treated as dependents and are eligible for medical care under the title of their parents' insurance.

The coverage under the schemes in 1960, in terms of the total population of the respective country, was as follows: Denmark, 90 percent; Iceland, 94 percent; Norway and Sweden, 100 percent.

The scope of protection obtaining in these countries therefore approaches that found in countries with national health service schemes.

France

In France there is a general and compulsory scheme covering all nonagricultural employees, and special schemes for the following groups: agricultural employees, agricultural self-employed,[11] miners, railway employees, public employees, seamen, students, etc. Medical benefit is available to pensioners; dependents of insured persons are also covered and are eligible for the same medical benefits as insured persons.

The scope of protection in 1960 was about 66 percent of the total population. The bulk of the self-employed and nonemployed persons who are not covered by the schemes should account for the remaining 34 percent.

About 68 percent of the civilian labor force and very nearly 100 percent of civilian employees were covered in the same year.

Germany (Federal Republic)

There is a general scheme covering all employees; salaried employees are covered compulsorily subject to an income limit of 7,920 marks a year; i.e., those earning salaries above this limit are excluded from compulsory insurance but may insure themselves voluntarily. Certain categories of nonagricultural own-account workers are also insured, subject to the same income limit as above, and pensioners are covered. Public officials have an employer liability type of scheme, the State refunding to them a part of their expenses on medical care.

Dependents of insured persons are covered and get the same medical benefits as insured persons.

In 1960 about 80 percent of the economically active population was insured; the corresponding figure for 1951 was about 74 per cent.[12]

Italy

The general scheme applies to employees and pensioners. Special schemes exist for seamen, journalists, public employes, self-employed artisans, and self-employed farmers. All insurance is compulsory; there is no provision for voluntary insurance.

Dependants of insured persons are entitled to the same medical care as insured persons, with minor exceptions.

About 79 percent of the total population appears to have been protected in 1960, as against 60 percent in 1955, reflecting the extension of medical care to more and more workers, in particular to self-employed persons. The proportion of employees protected has remained fairly constant around 90 percent over the same period.

Japan

Japan has two principal schemes for medical care, and several smaller schemes covering special groups. The health insurance scheme covers employes of firms with five or more regular employees. It also covers dependants of insured persons for the benefit and provides them the same standard of medical care.

The national health insurance scheme covers compulsorily all residents who are not under another health insurance program.

There are special schemes for day laborers, seamen, public employees, teachers, and public utility employees.

The scope of protection under these several schemes increased from about 74 percent of the total population in 1957 to about 98 percent in 1961.

Luxembourg

There is a general scheme which applies to employees (both private and public) and self-employed artisans. Special schemes exist for railway workers and self-employed persons. Pensioners are also covered.

Dependants of insured persons are covered but receive reduced medical benefit.

The scope of protection was 83 percent of total population in 1960, the corresponding figure for 1955 being 74 percent; the increase is clearly due to the inclusion of self-employed persons in 1958. It appears that about 76 percent of the economically active population and 100 percent of employees were covered in 1960.

Netherlands

There is a general scheme which covers employees earning not more than 9,700 guilders a year. Voluntary coverage is available to other persons and to pensioners, subject again to an income limit. Special schemes exist for miners, railway workers, and public employees.

Dependents are covered and are entitled to the same medical benefits as insured persons.

The scope of protection was about 75 percent of the total population in 1960.

Switzerland

Medical care is provided through a mixed compulsory and voluntary social insurance system. The system is organized on the basis of approved social insurance funds, and the conditions governing compulsory insurance vary from canton to canton. In some cantons insurance is compulsory for all residents; in others only for residents in certain cities. Again, some cantons cover compulsorily only those earning below a specified limit, while others cover all residents irrespective of income. In some cantons all foreign workers are compulsorily covered, and in one all agricultural workers are covered.

Family members have to join a medical care fund individually in order to be covered.

The scope of protection in terms of total population increased from about 56 percent in 1951 to about 73 percent in 1960.

Yugoslavia

Yugoslavia has a medical care scheme based on social insurance principles. The coverage of the scheme extends to the following categories: employees, apprentices, students, members of certain liberal professions, elected officials and pensioners, as well as a large part of the farming population.

Dependants of insured persons are covered and receive the same standard of medical benefit.

The scope of protection increased from 28 percent of the total population in 1952 to 49 percent around 1960. Since 1960 the scope of protection has most likely attained a higher level with the introduction of a special health service for agricultural producers.

SELECTED COUNTRIES WITH SOCIAL INSURANCE SCHEMES OF LIMITED COVERAGE

Burma

A general social insurance scheme providing medical care, among other benefits, was introduced in 1954. It now applies to all persons employed in industrial or commercial establishments employing 10 or more workers; railways under the Union of Burma Railway Board; ports; mines; oilfields; stevedoring establishments; and the Social Security Board. Permanent public servants are excluded from coverage. The scheme does not provide any medical care to dependants of insured persons.

---

[9] See Zdenek Stich: La Santé publique tchécoslovaque (Prague, Ministère de la santé publique de la République Socialiste Tchécoslovaque, 1963).

[10] Under 15 years in Denmark, under 16 in Iceland and Sweden, and under 18 but earning less than 1,000 crowns a year in Norway.

[11] This scheme was set up in 1961.

[12] These figures, however, do not take account of the public officials' scheme.

The scheme is being implemented in stages in different parts of the country. It is now effective in the capital and in some of the bigger towns.

In 1962 the scheme covered about 1 percent of the total population.

China (Taiwan)

There are two distinct social insurance schemes in operation in China (Taiwan).

The labor insurance scheme covers employees in industrial firms, mines, and plantations, with 10 or more employees; public utility employees; fishermen; self-employed persons; and sugarcane farmers, on the basis of a contract with the corresponding employers' organization. This scheme, however, provides only in-patient treatment in hospitals.

The Government employees' scheme applies to officials of both the Central and the Provincial Governments. Under this scheme both in- and out-patient treatment are provided to insured persons.

The coverage under the schemes increased from 4 percent of the total population in 1956 to 7 percent in 1961. In terms of the economically active population, the coverage increased from 13 to 22 percent over the same period.

Costa Rica

Medical care is provided under a social insurance scheme which applies to employees earning less than 1,000 colóns a month. The scheme applies in certain regions and is being gradually extended to others.

Dependents of insured persons are covered and are entitled to the same standard of medical care as insured persons. Pensioners and their dependents are also covered.

The scope of protection appears to have grown from about 13 percent of the total population in 1955 to about 18 percent in 1961. In terms of the economically active population, the scope of protection increased only slightly during the same period, from 25 percent in 1955 to 27 percent in 1961.

Dominican Republic

The medical care scheme in the Dominican Republic applies to employees in industry, commerce, and agriculture; wage earners in public employment; homeworkers; and small frontier farmers. Pensioners are also covered. Voluntary coverage is available to independent workers, small businessmen, etc.

Salaried employees earning over 46 pesos a week, domestic servants, and family workers are excluded.

Dependents of insured persons are not covered, except that wives of insured persons are entitled to maternity care.

About 9 percent of the total population was protected in 1959.

El Salvador

Employees in industry, commerce, and Government employment are covered by the social insurance medical care scheme. However, the following categories are excluded from coverage: employees in firms with less than five workers; those earning over 500 colóns a month; and agricultural, domestic, and casual employees.

Wives of insured persons receive maternity care but no other medical care benefit is available to dependents of insured persons.

About 2 percent of the total population, 5 percent of the economically active population, or 7 percent of employees appear to have been covered around 1960.

India

The employees' state insurance scheme, introduced in 1952, applies to employees in industrial firms with 20 or more workers, excluding those earning over Rs400 a month. The scheme is being implemented in stages in different industrial centers of the country.

Initially only insured persons were eligible to receive medical care; since 1959 medical care has been extended to dependents wherever feasible.

The employees' state insurance scheme accounted in 1961 for only about 1 percent of the total population. In the same year the number of economically active insured persons constituted 1 percent of the total economically active population. However, there are a few other schemes for special groups of employees, on which some information is available at the ILO. These are:

1. The contributory health service scheme for Central Government employees in New Delhi; based on the insurance principle, this provides benefits comparable to those under the employees' state insurance scheme, and covers about 450,000 persons,[13] inclusive of dependents of insured persons.

2. The railway health service covers railway employees and their dependents, numbering about 5.5 million.[14] The Indian railways, as employers, bear the cost of the scheme.

3. The Plantation Labor Act provides for a measure of medical care, under an employer liability system, to specified categories of workers in rubber, tea, coffee, and cinchona plantations. It covers about 0.8 million workers.

4. The coal, mica, and iron mines' labor welfare funds, which are financed out of a cess levied specifically for the purpose, provide for the medical care of these miners, among other welfare benefits. The total number of persons employed in coal, mica, and iron mines was about 0.48 million in 1960.[15]

The 4 schemes mentioned above account for about 7.2 million persons. If these are added to the employees' state insurance scheme figures, it would appear that about 3 percent of the total population was covered in 1961.

Considering that the coverage under the employees' state insurance scheme has more than doubled since 1961, it may be assumed that the present coverage under all the schemes should be in the neighborhood of 4 percent of the total population.

Mexico [16]

The general medical care scheme in Mexico is based on social insurance principles and covers the following categories: employees, members of productive cooperative societies; apprentices; workers for the state; workers in undertakings of a family nature; homeworkers; agricultural workers; domestic workers; and casual and temporary workers. The scheme is being applied gradually by region and by type of gainful activity. It also covers pensioners as well as dependents of insured persons, who are eligible for the same standard of medical care.

The scheme, which covered only 4 percent of the economically active population in 1950, was being applied to over 10 percent of the economically active in 1960. The coverage in 1961 was probably much higher, considering the rather rapid increase in the number of insured persons from 1960 to 1961. In terms of the total population the coverage may be estimated to have been 10 percent in 1960.

In addition to the above general scheme there are special medical care schemes for public employees and railwaymen. Thus, from the point of view of the present study, the above figures should be regarded as slightly underestimating the scope of medical care protection as a whole.

Nicaragua

The social insurance system covers employees in industry, commerce and public employment. Coverage is being gradually extended to different areas and categories of workers. At present the scheme is operative in Managua urban area only.

Wives of insured males receive maternity care, but are not elegible for other medical care; the children under 2 years of age of insured persons are, however, provided with complete medical care.

About 3 percent of the total population was covered in 1961 compared with only 1 percent in 1957.

Panama

The following categories are covered by the social insurance system: employees of private employers in specified urban districts; public employees throughout the country; and pensioners. Voluntary coverage is open to other employees and self-employed persons, as also to dependents.

About 7 percent of the population was covered in 1961.

Turkey

The first compulsory and contributory sickness insurance scheme in Turkey was put into force in 1951. At the outset only persons employed in undertakings employing 10 or more people were covered by the scheme, but in 1952 establishments employing 4 or more persons in cities with populations of 50,000 or more were brought within the scope of the scheme. Agricultural employees, seasonal workers and family workers are not covered. Dependents of insured persons are not entitled to medical care; wives of insured men, however, are entitled to a measure of maternity care. The scheme covered in 1960 about 4 percent of the economically active population, or 20 percent of employees.

To complete the picture, mention must be made of the following special schemes, which are in fact older than the general scheme mentioned above, but are not based on insurance principles:

1. The schemes covering railway workers and employees of military ordnance factories. The number of workers covered was about 13,000 in 1959.[17]

2. The noncontributory scheme for public officials, which covered about 250,000 persons in 1959.[18]

Considering all three schemes together, it would appear that about 6 percent of the economically active population or 29 percent of all employees was covered in 1959.

Venezuela

The social insurance scheme covers employees in industry and commerce, subject to an income limit, as well as their dependants. Coverage is gradually being extended to different parts of the country.

The scope of protection in 1960 was 10 percent of the total population, 11 percent of the economically active population or 18 percent of employees.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

As mentioned earlier, this is only in the nature of a pilot study and any conclusions drawn from it can only be of limited validity. Nevertheless, the following observation may be made.

---

[13] Government of India, Ministry of Health: "Report of the Health Survey and Planning Committee" (New Delhi, August 1959–October 1961), vol. 1, p. 131.

[14] Ibid., p. 115.

[15] Central Statistical Organization, Department of Statistics, Government of India: "Statistical Abstract of the Indian Union, 1962" (New Delhi, 1962).

[16] For details see "Medical Care Benefits in Mexico," in International Labour Review, vol. 88, No. 2, August 1963, pp. 157–179.

[17] Mustafa Ertem: "Sickness Insurance in Turkey", in Bulletin of the ISSA (Geneva), June–July 1959.

[18] Ibid.

It is seen that the scope of protection measured in terms of total population varies considerably in the countries covered. While almost the whole population is protected under most national health services and in some countries with social insurance schemes, and at least 50 percent are covered in many other countries with social insurance schemes, the countries with limited social insurance schemes included in the study have a coverage ranging from as low as 1 percent to 18 percent of the total population.

In interpreting these figures it should, in particular, be recalled that public medical care services, which assume considerably greater importance in countries with social insurance schemes of limited coverage, have been excluded from the study. Another point worth recalling is that the figures on scope of protection in respect of these countries should be regarded as minimum rather than as absolute figures, in view of the possibility that employer liability schemes may not have been completely covered in the study.

It should also be noted that the schemes in some of the developing countries covered in the study are fairly young and are in the process of gradual implementation. The eventual coverage under these schemes when they are fully implemented would probably be much higher than at present.

Many of these social insurance schemes of limited coverage either exclude dependents or cover them partially, so that if the scope of protection were to be expressed in terms of the economically active population, higher percentages of coverage would probably be obtained. Lack of data has made it impossible to compute this additional relative measure for many of these countries, but China (Taiwan), Costa Rica, and El Salvador clearly illustrate this point.

Again, most of these schemes cover, in the main, employees, and the structure of the labor force in developing countries is such that the proportion of employees in the economically active population is relatively low. Hence, if the scope of protection were to be expressed in terms of employees, still higher percentages of coverage would most likely be obtained. This is illustrated by the cases of Turkey and Venezuela.

ACQUISITION AND PRESERVATION BY THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ITEMS OF EVIDENCE PERTAINING TO THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 836, H.R. 9545.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9545) providing for the acquisition and preservation by the United States of certain items of evidence pertaining to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that no hearings were held on this bill in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The House Judiciary Committee refused and denied an opportunity to Mr. King, the purchaser of the weapons, to appear before that committee. It is my belief that the matter needs more careful study than it has been given. At this time, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a statement from Mr. King, who bought the weapons, which is very revealing, and I think from the letter it will be understood why he was aggrieved at the thought that he was not able to appear before the House committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN J. KING BEFORE THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE REGARDING H.R. 9545, UNION CALENDAR NO. 366

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am John J. King, the present owner of the rifle and pistol used to such tragic purpose by Lee Harvey Oswald in Dallas on November 22, 1963. I wish to express my thanks to your chairman and to all of you for having granted me the privilege of appearing before you in opposition to H.R. 9545, a bill relating to the preservation of evidence pertaining to the assassination of President Kennedy—a privilege once promised me but subsequently denied by the House subcommittee to which it was referred.

H.R. 9545, while it appears to be a routine bill, is really a most extraordinary piece of proposed legislation; one which merits a most careful analysis and consideration by this distinguished committee.

First, inasmuch as it is a clear and unmistakable effort on the part of the Federal Government to override the statutory provisions of the State of Texas, and to assume unto itself certain powers properly and historically vested in the State, this bill poses a serious challenge to States rights in all areas. If enacted, it would invite further Federal transgression into this important field.

Second, by seeking to take full advantage of honest emotions, this bill would extend the right of eminent domain to personal property, and thereby establish a most dangerous precedent and a basic threat to the future security of all personal property rights. If enacted, it would invite future confiscatory legislation directed at personal property of whatever nature, selected at the whim of the executive branch.

Third, it is unusually nonspecific. It does not identify the items which it seeks to condemn, nor does it define the ultimate disposition of these items. In short, it grants carte blanche to the Attorney General for selection and to the Administrator of General Services for disposition of the unidentified items with which it is concerned. Accordingly, if enacted, it would significantly accelerate the relentless shift of authority from the legislative to the executive branch.

Fourth, it is an attempt retroactively to correct, at the expense of private citizens, certain past executive oversights. House Report No. 813, which accompanies this bill, includes a letter from the Attorney General to the Speaker of the House to the effect that, prior to the completion of its work, the Warren Commission requested the Justice Department to take the necessary steps to provide for Federal retention of certain items of evidence. This is substantiated by a letter from J. Lee Rankin to the Acting Attorney General written on leftover Warren Commission stationery, dated a month and a half after the Warren Commission had completed its work according to its own letter to the President. This bill was requested by the Justice Department over 7 months after the receipt of Mr. Rankin's letter.

H.R. 9545 and its accompanying report No. 813 claim as its public purpose the preservation of items of evidence in order to substantiate the conclusions arrived at by the Warren Commission. Public pronouncements by spokesmen of the Justice Department have suggested the possibility of a future reexamination of the evidence. The weapons with which I am personally concerned have been subjected to every known relevant test and analysis by impeccably qualified experts. The conclusions reached by the Warren Commission on the basis of the testimony of these experts have been widely read and fully accepted—except by a miniscule fringe of irresponsible and unqualified critics. No further tests or analyses are needed. None have been made to my knowledge on previous Presidential assassination weapons. Sulfur casts have already been made of the rifle chamber. They can easily be made of the revolver chambers and of the bores of both weapons. Bolt face impressions can be made of the rifle and breachplate impressions can be made of the revolver. These things, combined with the various cartridge cases and related bullets are all that the Government would ever need for any future ballistic reexamination. Further, no request has ever been made of me or of the Oswald estate regarding our attitudes toward the gift, loan, or sale to the Government of any of our property for which it may feel a subsequent need. For myself, I would of course be more than willing to allow Federal authorities to examine the weapons from time to time and to conduct further tests on them should the need therefor be truly felt, provided, of course, that adequate assurances were made that the weapons be not further mutilated, or altered, or displayed publicly.

The Attorney General's aforementioned letter to the Speaker alludes to the fact that allegations and theories contrary to the conclusions of the Warren Commission feed on secrecy and uncertainty—and I certainly agree with this. It is, however, of interest to me that the present governmental custody of the assassination rifle has been characterized by the utmost secrecy. The FBI refused so responsible a journal as Life magazine to even photograph it.

It is perhaps here in order to observe that, of the three previous presidential assassination weapons (1) the revolver which killed President McKinley—was acquired by private interests; while (2) the derringer which killed President Lincoln and the revolver which killed President Garfield—were taken over by the Federal Government since those two assassinations occurred in the District of Columbia and were hence subject to Federal jurisdiction. Only two of these three historic weapons survive—the privately owned McKinley assassination revolver and the federally owned Lincoln assassination derringer. History thus accords private custody twice as good a record of preservation as it accords governmental custody.

During the discussion on the floor of the House—it cannot properly be called a debate since only the pro side participated—some consideration was given (as it most certainly should have been) to the eventual cost to the taxpayer of this bill. The figure of $10,000 was bandied about as an approximate value of the two weapons with which I am personally concerned. These two weapons are unquestionably the two most carefully documented and most valuable in the world today. From a collector's point of view, they are to the field of firearms what the Mona Lisa is to the field of painting, what La Pieta is to the field of sculpture, and what the Hope diamond is to the field of gems. In short, they are invaluable. Discounting their exhibition value throughout the free world—which in itself is almost incalculable—they are worth greatly in excess of a million dollars. Coupled with the value of the weapons themselves, consideration must also be given to the value of some of the other items concerned, principally owned, insofar as I know, by the Oswald estate. For example, a measure of the value of the original manuscripts of Oswald's 2-page farewell note, of his 12-page historic diary, and of his 17-page undelivered speech may be gleaned from the fact that a miscellaneous Oswald letter—an item considered of so little importance by the Warren Commission that it did not even attempt to retain it—brought $3,000 at a recent auction. It would appear from this that the Oswald papers alone have a value of something over $100,000. If the proposed legislation is passed and its constitutionality confirmed, the constitutional guarantee of just compensation will result in an expenditure of a staggering amount of taxpayers' dollars for the acquisition of materials for which the Government honestly has no further conceivable need.

Finally, this proposed legislation is in the nature of a private bill, specifically designed to reverse the inevitable outcome of a civil action now properly before a U.S. district court. This bill was proposed by the defendant in that action after the complaint had been properly filed, and the bill's pendency before the Congress has been relied upon by the defendant in seeking repeated delays in filing his response. It is noteworthy that defendant's counsel was privileged to appear before the House subcommittee in support of this bill, and that plaintiff's counsel was not privileged to appear in opposition thereto. In other words, you are here concerned with a clear attempt on the part of a defendant, a member of the executive branch, to shift the venue in a civil action from the U.S. district court in which it was properly brought by the plaintiff, a private citizen, to the very Halls of Congress. To my view, this is an outrageous attempt to circumvent the operation of—yes, even a direct insult to—the system of checks and balances between the three branches of our Government. The late President Kennedy himself said: "Our Constitution wisely assigns both joint and separate roles to each branch of the Government; and a President and a Congress who hold each other in mutual respect will neither permit nor attempt any trespass."

In conclusion, H.R. 9545 constitutes an insipient threat to States rights, to personal property rights, and to our system of checks and balances. It represents a totally unjustified waste of the taxpayers' money. It should not be enacted.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 851), explaining the purpose of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize the acquisition and preservation by the United States of certain items of evidence pertaining to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

H.R. 9545 would authorize the Attorney General to designate, by publication in the Federal Register, which items considered by the President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy are required by the national interest to be acquired and preserved by the United States (secs. 1 and 2(a)). All right, title, and interest to these items would vest in the United States upon publication of the Attorney General's determination in the Federal Register (sec. 2(b)). Authority to effect such acquisition would expire 1 year after the date of enactment of this legislation (sec. 2(c)).

Under the bill, claims for just compensation must be filed within 1 year of the date of publication of the Attorney General's designation. The bill grants concurrent jurisdiction to the Court of Claims and the U.S. district courts over claims for just compensation hereunder and provides that a claimant filing in the Federal district court may request a trial by jury (sec. 3).

All items acquired pursuant to the bill are to be placed under the jurisdiction of the Administrator of General Services and preserved in accordance with rules and regulations which he may prescribe (sec. 4).

The bill provides that all items acquired by the United States hereunder shall be deemed personal property within the meaning of provisions penalizing removal or mutilation and theft, sections 2071 and 2112, title 18, United States Code (sec. 5). The bill authorizes such appropriation as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act (sec. 6).

STATEMENT

In the course of its investigation of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, the President's Commission on the assassination acquired a large number of items of physical evidence pertaining to the assassination and related events. The most important of these belonged to Lee Harvey Oswald and his wife. The Commission recommended that a substantial number of these items of evidence, particularly those relating to the actual assassination of the President and the murder of Patrolman J. D. Tippit, should remain in the possession of the Government. In furtherance of this objective, the Attorney General requested the introduction of the present measure.

These items include the assassination weapon, the revolver involved in the murder of Officer Tippit, among many other exhibits. The working papers, investigation reports, and transcripts of the Commission have been transmitted to the National Archives. The items of physical evidence are being retained in the custody of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The committee is persuaded that the national interest requires that the Attorney General shall be in a position to determine that any of these critical exhibits, which were considered by the Presidents' Commission, shall be permanently retained by the United States. The committee concurs in the view expressed by the Attorney General that in years ahead allegations and theories, concerning President Kennedy's assassination may abound. To eliminate questions and doubts the physical evidence should be securely preserved. A failure to do so could lead to loss, destruction, or alteration of vital evidence and in time might serve to encourage irresponsible rumors undermining public confidence in the work of the President's Commission.

The authority conferred by this legislation authorizing the acquisition and preservation of certain items of evidence considered by the President's Commission is vital in the national interest. One private party has already filed suit against the Attorney General of the United States for possession of the assassination weapon and the .38 caliber revolver involved in the death of Police Officer Tippit, claiming to have purchased all right, title, and interest in these items from Mrs. Marina N. Oswald. The Government has not yet responded to the complaint. The effect of this legislation would be to deny the plaintiff possession of these items but would afford due process of law by providing a procedure for recovering just compensation by permitting the claimant his day in court to litigate his asserted rights.

The committee believes that the need for this legislation is manifest and in the public interest, and accordingly, recommends favorable consideration of H.R. 9545, without amendment.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 854, H.R. 9495; Calendar No. 859, H.R. 5217; and the two succeeding bills.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TO INCREASE THE APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZATION FOR THE FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The bill (H.R. 9495) to increase the appropriation authorization for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Commission, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 867), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSES OF H.R. 9495

H.R. 9495 would increase the expenditure authorization for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission from $25,000 to $125,000 and would extend indefinitely the time for the Commission to select and report to the President and to the Congress on another design for a permanent memorial to former President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

BACKGROUND

The Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission was established by Public Law 372 of the 84th Congress, approved August 11, 1955, for the purpose of considering and formulating plans for the design, construction, and location of a permanent memorial to Frankin Delano Roosevelt, in the District of Columbia or its immediate environs. In an interim report to Congress on January 2, 1959, the Commission recommended—

(a) That the portion of West Potomac Park, in the District of Columbia, which lies between Independence Avenue and the inlet bridge be reserved as a site for the proposed memorial; and

(b) That the Commission be authorized to conduct a national competition, with appropriate prizes, to determine a suitable design for the proposed memorial.

The agreement of Congress to the recommended site and the proposed competition was expressed in Public Law 86–214, approved September 1, 1959. That law also stipulated that the proposed memorial should be "harmonious as to location, design, and land use with the Washington Monument, the Jefferson Memorial, and the Lincoln Memorial," and that the Commission should avail itself of the assistance and advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, of the National Capital Planning Commission, and of the National Park Service. There was authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $150,000 to carry out the provisions of that public law.

The competition was organized and held in 1960, 574 architects and sculptors participating. A jury of architectural authorities awarded first prize ($50,000) to Pedersen and Tilney of New York, for their design consisting of eight monumental steles or tablets grouped in a cluster. The winning design was approved by the Memorial Commission, with the inclusion of a statue or bas-relief of former President Roosevelt, and duly reported to the President and to the Congress, although it lacked the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts.

Although it is customary for designs for memorials in Washington to evoke some controversy, the recommended memorial to former President Roosevelt was welcomed with such unusual criticism that the Congress decided to seek a modification in the design. Public Law 87–842, approved October 18, 1962, returned the matter to the Commission and instructed it to report back, with the concurrence of the Commission of Fine Arts, either (a) a modification of the Pedersen-Tilney design, (b) another design from among those submitted in the competition, or, (c) a plan for a living memorial, such as a stadium, an educational institution, information center, memorial park, etc. An appropriation authorization of $25,000 was included in that law.

The present bill, H.R. 9495, would amend Public Law 87–842 in two respects. It would remove the provision that the Commission should report on another design by June 30, 1963, and would increase the appropriation authorization for the Commission by $100,000, from $25,000 to $125,000.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISION

A financial statement submitted by the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission is as follows:

"On August 1, 1965, the Commission had a balance of $203.07 from the $25,000 authorized by 76 Stat. 1079, 87th Congress, and received by the Commission on May 25, 1963. This amount will be completely expended by August 12, 1965. These funds have been used for the operating expenses of the Commission over the past 2 years, and to prepare the modified winning design for presentation to the Commission of Fine Arts.

"The Commission requests the following funds for its operation over an approximate 2-year period:

"Personal services (including salary of Administrative Secretary)	$15,500
Telephone and communication expenses	600
Supplies and materials (including stationery, stamps, etc.)	1,000
Expenses of Commission members (travel, miscellaneous)	1,500
Other services	1,400
Total	20,000

"The Commission feels justified in requesting $80,000 in order that funds would be available to proceed with a plan. To consider any adequate plan for the development of our present site into a park for President Roosevelt, properly landscaped and terraced with a statue of the President—or for any other development of the site that may be suggested—the Commission will have to have a careful architectural plan developed before going to the Commission of Fine Arts. A substantial fee would be required to obtain the services of a first-rate architect, as there are few who do this kind of work."

DOCUMENTATION OF THE VESSEL "LITTLE NANCY"

The bill (H.R. 5217) to permit the vessel *Little Nancy* to be documented for use in the coastwise trade was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Presient, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 872), explaining the purpose of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to restore coastwise privileges to the 35-foot sport fishing vessel *Little Nancy.*

BACKGROUND OF LEGISLATION

The bill was introduced in the House of Representatives on February 18 and hearings were held on the bill by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee on July 14, 1965. Favorable reports were received from the Departments of Commerce and Interior. No opposition was expressed to the legislation. The bill passed the House on October 5, 1965.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The *Little Nancy* was built in the United States in 1952 and sold to a Bahamian citizen in 1963. In connection with the sale, a second American citizen took a note for the amount of the purchase price of the vessel from the purchaser. The purchaser was unsuccessful in having the vessel transferred to Bahamian registry and after operating the vessel for 2 years surrendered possession to the noteholder. By reason of the fact that the vessel was sold to a noncitizen, it lost its coastwise privileges although in fact never registered as a British vessel. The present owner, who advanced the money for the transaction, seeks by this legislation to have the coastwise privileges restored.

COST OF LEGISLATION

The enactment of H.R. 5217 would involve no additional cost to the Federal Government.

TARIFF FILING REQUIREMENTS FOR HARDWOOD LUMBER

The bill (H.R. 10198) to amend the requirements relating to lumber under the Shipping Act, 1916, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 873), explaining the purpose of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to restore the tariff filing requirements with respect to ocean shipments of hardwood lumber.

BACKGROUND OF LEGISLATION

The legislation was introduced at the request of the hardwood lumber industry. The House passed the bill on October 5, 1965, without opposition. The legislation is supported by the Department of Commerce and the Federal Maritime Commission.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Shipping Act of 1916 requires every common carrier by water in foreign commerce to file with the Federal Maritime Commission rates for transportation on all cargo except bulk cargo and lumber. The exclusion of lumber from tariff filing requirements was added by Public Law 88–103 enacted in August of 1963 primarily to permit the softwood lumber industry to compete with Canadian lumber exporters. During the past 2 years the hardwood lumber industry has felt that this exemption from tariff filing requirements on all shipments of lumber was detrimental to their interests in stable ocean transportation rates to Europe although the exemption nevertheless benefited the softwood lumber industry in meeting its primary competitor, Canada.

This bill will amend the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended in 1963, to limit the term "lumber" under the exemption to softwood lumber and thereby reinstate the previous requirement for the filing of tariffs on the movement of hardwood lumber. No opposition has been expressed to this legislation.

COST OF LEGISLATION

The enactment of H.R. 10198 would involve no additional cost to the Federal Government.

MAILING PRIVILEGES FOR THE ARMED FORCES

The bill (H.R. 11420) to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide certain mailing privileges with respect to members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 874), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSES

H.R. 11420 will accomplish four purposes:

1. Provide free airmail service for first-class letter mail, including cards, for members of the Armed Forces in an overseas combat area, as designated by the President, or hospitalized as a result of such service. This privilege would be extended on a reciprocal basis to certain military personnel of friendly foreign nations.

2. Provide for the reimbursement by the Department of Defense for the loss of revenue incurred by the Post Office Department as a result of this concession.

3. Establish an air parcel post zone rate for the distance between the U.S. mailing or delivery point and San Francisco or New York, whichever city serves the military post office involved. Present law requires the rate for the eighth zone for such air parcel regardless of the distance involved.

4. Provide that parcels not exceeding 5 pounds in weight and 60 inches in length and girth combined sent by or addressed to members of the Armed Forces at or in care of post offices in overseas combat areas be transported by air on a space available basis between the point of embarkation and the overseas post office. The mailer of such a parcel will pay the regular domestic surface parcel post rate.

JUSTIFICATION

Free mailing privileges were extended to U.S. servicemen during World War II (act of Mar. 27, 1942, ch. 199, 56 Stat. 181, as amended (59 Stat. 542)) and the Korean conflict (act of July 12, 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 891)). Precedent for the extension of free mailing privileges to foreign personnel is contained in the act of February 14, 1929 (ch. 203, 39 U.S.C. 4168), which grants members of the diplomatic corps of the countries of the Pan American Postal Union stationed in the United States free use of the U.S. domestic mail service on a reciprocal basis.

The Military Pay Act of 1965, Public Law 89–132, approved August 21, 1965, enacted provisions (10 U.S.C. 1040) which authorize any first-class mail matter sent by a member of the Armed Forces from Vietnam or any other overseas combat area to be transmitted in the mails without postage. Section 1040 will be repealed by section 3 of the bill.

The committee believes that the provisions of this bill with respect to free letter mailing privileges are preferable to those in 10 U.S.C. 1040 because (1) the free mailing privileges are specifically defined as applying to letter mail, including postal cards and post cards, and (2) provision is included for reimbursement by the Department of Defense for the loss of revenue incurred by the Post Office Department as a result of this special concession to assist a Defense activity. It need only be pointed out that first-class mail under 10 U.S.C. 1040 could include any item up to 70 pounds, whereas it is intended by this legislation to extend the free privilege only to letter mail.

The second important feature of this legislation relates to parcels mailed by or to a member of the Armed Forces. It will correct a great injustice now imposed in connection with the rate on air parcel post having an Army, Air Force, or fleet post office address. This legislation will establish air parcel post rates to and from overseas military post offices commensurate with the air service which the Post Office Department actually provides.

The legislation also provides a means of speeding up the delivery of certain parcels mailed to or by servicemen at Army, Air Force, or fleet post offices in overseas combat areas, as designated by the President. The air transportation would be on a space available basis on U.S.-flag carriers at rates approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board for space available parcel service which shall not exceed the minimum rates charged for the airlift of military cargo on scheduled airline service.

COST

The cost of the first section of the bill, relating to mailing of first-class letter mail at no cost to members of the Armed Forces in combat areas, is estimated to be $1.45 million annually. The cost of overocean transportation by air under section 2 of the legislation for parcels between the port of embarkation and the overseas combat area is estimated to be $6 million annually.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

HOPE FOR REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT EARLY NEXT YEAR

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, when the Senate reconvenes in January, one of the first items of legislative business should be the proposal to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. I am hopeful that every effort will be made to bring this issue to a vote. In the 18 years of its existence, it has been the cause of continued turmoil and unrest in virtually every State in the Union. In many of the 19 States where section 14(b) has led to laws forbidding union shop contracts, there has been a suffocation of union strength and a stifling of economic growth. I strongly favor repeal of section 14(b) as I regard this as an obnoxious section of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Free trade unions are vital to the welfare and growth of our Nation. They stand for mankind's loftiest aspirations. Through their unions, working men and women have won hard-earned victories, the fruits of which will continue to be reaped by generations yet unborn.

The facts, are, if any Americans should be and are enthusiastic over the American way of life and the American free enterprise system, it is members of labor unions.

Under our system, they have won for themselves a full life with the highest standard of living anywhere and a fair share of their own production. American workers and American labor unions are the envy of workingmen and workingwomen the world over. They rear their families on the right side of the railroad tracks and they walk with dignity and love of country.

In order to protect adequately the interests of American working men and women, their unions must have the right to negotiate union shop contracts. A union is in an industrial plant because a majority of the workers voted for a union. Our Federal laws provide that unions must afford every worker whether a union member or not with the same gains, benefits, grievance procedure, and protection that all other workers receive. Section 14(b) permits individual States to enact so-called right-to-work laws which permit some workers to derive all the benefits of union membership with none of the responsibilities of membership. This is equivalent to passing a law which states that all citizens are entitled to police and fire protection, to educational opportunities and to all other services provided by government, but anyone who does not wish to pay his taxes does not have to. The right-to-work laws force unions to carry freeloaders.

In reality, they are union-busting laws. Since passage of the Wagner Act, the cornerstone of Federal labor law has been encouragement of labor organizing and of free collective bargaining. Under this Federal encouragement, trade unions have grown and have helped build a strong economy and an unparalleled standard of living. Right-to-work laws stand as a constant threat to the continued growth and welfare of trade unions, and to the continued expansion of our economy.

These laws are bad. They plant government squarely at the bargaining table and interfere with orderly free collective bargaining. They penalize employers by creating instability and uncertainty in the work force. They penalize employees by weakening the unions that represent them. They protect neither rights nor jobs. They are simply a smokescreen for union busting.

Even the title "right-to-work" is a phony one. Right-to-work laws do not guarantee anyone a job. They do not create any new jobs. They hold out no hope for the unemployed, nor can they protect any worker facing layoff from his job. They promote no positive right, and have nothing to do with work.

Many of those who support right-to-work laws and oppose the repeal of section 14(b) have no concern whatever for the rights of union members or for the welfare of American working men and women. They are never heard calling for higher wages. They never speak out for greater job protection or security. They opposed Federal aid to education and hospital and medical care for the elderly and other beneficent legislation for the welfare of all Americans. It is only when they are urging the adoption of right-to-work laws or retention of section 14(b) that they show any interest whatever in the problems of American workers.

Then, we hear loud cries of anguish from all sorts of committees, each claiming to seek freedom from the captive union member chained to his union against his will. Their concern for union members is as phony as the right-to-work laws they advocate. Their real interest is in weakening the labor union movement, and in establishing a cheap labor force.

Though other factors are unquestionably involved, the fact is that in States with so-called right-to-work laws labor standards are lower. These States lag behind free collective bargaining States in economic growth and in per capita income. Their workmen's compensation laws are weaker, and other laws protecting workers are less effective. In this space age, economic factors do not recognize State boundary lines. The result is a drag on the entire economy of the Nation.

For example, when Georgia enacted an open shop law in 1947, per capita income in the State was $432 behind the national average. By 1961, it was $614 behind the national average, a drop of $182. This fact prompted the Atlanta Constitution to observe at that time:

> Georgia's right-to-work law may be crippling the State's economic progress.

Similarly, South Dakota's average per capita income was only $84 below the national average in 1947. After years of experience under right-to-work, it had plummeted to $388 below the national average.

Georgia and South Dakota are not unique among right-to-work States. To the contrary, they are typical.

In human terms, people in right-to-work States have a lower standard of living. They do not receive as much for their work. They cannot buy as much. Their job conditions are poorer, and their job security shakier. What is worse, their prospects for improvement are dimmer, and their children's future less promising.

Despite the misleading title, right-to-work laws are not meant to help working people or to guarantee anyone a right to a job. The one objective of these laws is to hamper trade unions and limit their effectiveness.

American working men and women do not need the right-to-work law, so-called, but they do need the right to unify. They need this not only to protect their own interests but also because only by unification can labor or management have assurance that agreements made between them will always be honored. Repeal of section 14(b) will aid in preparing the groundwork for improved relations between labor and industry. Production depends equally on both. There is a mutuality of interest. Labor and capital are truly partners in production.

Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act hinders that partnership, is unfair to both labor and management and has a deterrent effect on our entire economy. It has accomplished no purpose worth the bitterness and controversy it has stirred up among our citizens. It should be repealed and forgotten, unwept, unhonored, and unsung.

THE NEED FOR AN OFFICE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, despite the recent enactment of a law creating a new Cabinet-level agency, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, there remains a real need for an Office of Community Development, situated in the Executive Offices of the President, to coordinate and rationalize the proliferating governmental programs designed to deal with the problems of our metropolitan and urban areas. This was the main idea in a speech by Gov. Robert E. Smylie, of Idaho, at the convention of the International Association of City Managers, Montreal, Canada, on September 21, 1965. Governor Smylie, who is chairman of the Republican Governors Association of the United States, is an outstanding chief executive whose views on intergovernmental relations, as they relate to the problems of our metropolitan areas, merit serious consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that Governor Smylie's excellent speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL-STATE INVOLVEMENT IN METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS IN THE UNITED STATES

As a Governor, I find it a particular pleasure and privilege to speak to an assemblage of municipal officers.

Although I realize that your group has rather widespread international membership, most of my remarks will be addressed to intergovernmental relations in the United States.

I suppose that in a gathering such as this I leave myself open to a charge of gross parochialism by so limiting my talk, and I can only reply in answer to such an accusation that I am most comfortable discussing a topic that I know something about.

Let us concede at the outset that you do not need a primer course in urban affairs. You deal with the problems. You are the workshop.

You already are aware that approximately 125 million Americans and nearly 80 percent of our productive capacity are now located within our 212 metropolitan areas. You already know that within 25 years these urban areas will increase by another 100 million people.

You need no proof that there are multiplying problems of city core decline and haphazard suburban growth, and I can spare you further statistics.

With this phenomenal urban growth, the problems of society—education, employment, housing, transportation, crime, air and water pollution, discrimination, open spaces, and all the rest—have become increasingly complex.

There is no escaping the fact that governments at all levels in our Federal system have assumed increased responsibilities in relation to metropolitan affairs. Competition for industry between the States and a wide variety of other factors have presented State and local governments with an increasingly difficult job in raising the revenues they need to meet their problems—problems which are increasing in magnitude and which frequently cross local and even State boundaries.

Yet, is there a city manager here who would say that the States and localities do not have the primary responsibility for meeting these problems? The American system has made the responsibility yours. Who can deal better with the problems than those who know them best?

Each of us at the other levels of government needs to help provide you with the sinews it takes to get the job done. And it is not merely bigness, or just money, or only slogans which are going to do it. You know that, too.

As a Governor, I am conscious of the role which we must play in helping you solve urban and suburban problems. I am conscious, too, of our limitations, even as you are conscious of yours.

Perhaps the greatest concern we feel is with the appropriateness of the role of the Federal Government in the solution of urban problems, indeed, with the role of the Federal Government in solving human problems in general.

One extreme says that the Federal Government has no role at all, and the other extreme says that this is an exclusive Federal problem and the States and localities have no role. Most of us reject both extremes.

The extreme which perhaps concerns us most, because it seems to be growing more vocal, says that State and local governments have abrogated their responsibilities and should be bypassed in the world of tomorrow. They make the case that at the State and local level, we have not taken the lead in solving some of these human problems and we are, therefore, incompetent.

There is no understanding of the tremendous lack of financial capacity under which States and localities labor. We might facetiously suggest to these critics of State and local government that, perhaps, we would show more leadership at the State and local level if the State and local governments could have all of the revenue from the Federal corporate and personal income tax.

State and local governments would then be in a position of making grants-in-aid to the Federal Government, provided, of course, that the Federal Government would meet certain standards established by the State and local governments.

We would, of course, be willing, in turn, to surrender to the Federal Government our less lucrative State and local tax sources.

None of us would, of course, advocate such policies except in a humorous vein, but it does illustrate the very grave problems of finance that we have in the local government field and it does indicate to anyone who will listen that we, at the State and local government level, will very strongly support proposals which we now understand to be under active consideration, to turn back some revenues to the State and local governments on a nonearmarked basis.

Perhaps this single move would do more to revitalize State and local government and to install new confidence in our capacity to solve problems than any other development.

We fear that even these measures, however, will not still the critics of State and local government. These people always delight in pointing out, for example, that in the typical urban area, we have a whole welter of cities, counties, townships, school districts, special service districts, and other local units of government, and that it is impossible for us to function.

The implication, of course, is that the Federal Government is superbly well-organized and they do not have the problems of fragmentation.

I would suggest to these critics, then that they make a little analysis and they will find, for example, that some 30 Federal agencies have some role in providing financial assistance, technical aid or planning assistance in the area of recreation alone. I believe that they will discover that there are some 50 Federal agencies that are providing planning assistance of one type or another.

Again, we are not suggesting that there is one effective way to organize the Federal Government to decrease this fragmentation, but we are suggesting that the Federal Government does not have a much better record in this regard than we do at the State and local level.

We also hear, and I think quite properly, that we are less effective at the local level because there is city and county rivalry in areas where it is not constructive. We plead guilty, and we are doing everything we can to decrease this tension. However, we would also point out that if you think you have really seen interagency rivalry at the local level, you ought to examine the rivalry between the various Federal agencies in Washington over who is to administer new programs.

We also hear our critics say that those at the city and county level have inadequate governmental machinery. We plead guilty, but, again, is the Federal Government doing much better? We hear, for example, that every one of our counties should have a planning agency and we certainly agree, but where is the Federal planning agency? Where is the Federal long-range capital improvement program? Where do we go to find out what the Federal Government plans to do in the way of capital construction in the next 5 years?

Again, the point is not to downgrade the Federal Government, but to see these problems in perspective and to find ways to correct our common weaknesses.

The creation of a new Department of Urban Affairs—now a fact—is the latest step and an obviously important one, in nailing down the primacy of the Federal interest in your affairs. Simply elevating the Housing and Home Finance Agency to Cabinet status will not, I submit, solve very many, if any, of your problems.

For even with the Cabinet Department of Urban Affairs now a reality, the need for an effective office in the White House to coordinate the proliferating activities of the Federal Government as they affect urban and suburban areas is a necessity. We do need—and badly—an Office of Community Development in the Executive Office of the President.

Here is why it is necessary. By ignoring some 60 other Federal programs concerned with metropolitan problems and elevating HHFA to Cabinet rank, a Department of Urban Affairs cannot hope to achieve coordination, efficiency, or economy. Urban problems cut across departmental lines and as urban life grows increasingly complex, more and more of the problems can be expected to cut across these lines.

The necessary coordination can be achieved without any drastic increase in Federal control, and without any significant increase in the burgeoning bureaucracy, by an Office of Community Development in the White House.

To understand why just changing the status of HHFA won't do the job, let's look at the relationships of some Federal programs today. Take the Federal Bureau of Public Roads, under the Commerce Department and the HHFA, for example. Under the President's plan, the activities of public roads will not be brought into the new Department. Highway planners, as you all know, have great concern for traffic needs. On the other hand, local housing agencies have as their objective the avoidance of new slums and the replacement of existing ones.

Clash for space, as each seeks to accomplish its own task, is often inevitable. The Federal Government, through two separate agencies—the Bureau of Public Roads and HHFA—provides funds for each, in cooperation with the States and localities.

But these objectives can and do clash And, in some urban places in America, it can raise cain with the dream of America the beautiful.

By way of example, in one urban Eastern area, some of the most far-reaching urban renewal projects in the Nation are underway. The Federal Government has committed hundreds of millions of dollars to carry out more than a dozen projects in this area.

But in the same densely populated urban complex, an interstate highway is planned. It is sorely needed to break a traffic stranglehold which is delaying economic and social progress throughout the region. It would be built with Interstate Highway funds, 90 percent supplied by the Federal Government. The highway would pass through or near a number of urban redevelopment areas. This causes local officials to insist that, in order to avoid construction of a Chinese wall through the communities, the freeway should be built below existing surface level.

This, the Federal Bureau of Public Roads refused to do. According to the Bureau, it would cost the highway trust fund an additional $5 million. Arguing the local case for a depressed freeway, officials pointed to the obvious evidence of dilapidated residential and commercial areas alongside an elevated railroad structure which is located only a half-mile from the site of the proposed freeway. Here, they said was proof positive that an elevated structure can depress property values and help create new slums.

Only an ingenious financial solution arrived at by State highway officials in cooperation with city officials saved the day and permitted the freeway to be built at a lower level.

This is an absurd situation. The Federal Government, through HHFA, would be paying out of one pocket for urban redevelopment at 20 times the cost of depressing the highway through these urban renewal areas.

Clearly, these Federal programs are in conflict. Two Federal pocketbooks are involved, one, the loan and grant fund of the Urban Renewal Administration and the other the highway trust fund of the Bureau of Public Roads. Because the immediate decision involved highway design, the Bureau of Public Roads was the tail which wagged the urban dog.

Clearly, this situation will not be helped one iota by elevating HHFA to the same status as the Department of Commerce, in which the Bureau of Public Roads is housed. Rather, a referee is needed in this dispute between urban redevelopment priorities and highway location and design. A White House office manned by persons with extensive experience in State and local problems would seem to be a more appropriate umpire.

There are other problems, too, in the urban scheme of things, with regard to the relative place of highways and rapid transit plans.

Some months back, the White House released a technical report prepared by a group of experts which suggested, in part, that more express buses, operating in reserved traffic lanes, might be mass transit's answer to the growing problem of traffic jams that tend to strangle our metropolitan areas. Conceivably, the Mass Transportation Act now on the books, will yield not nearly as much an increase in rail passenger facilities as it will a significant increase in express buses on our highways.

There is clearly no objection to locating mass transit programs under the Housing and Home Finance Agency. But a significant increase in the number of buses on the streets would quite obviously affect what another agency of Government is trying to do to combat air pollution. And this is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Today, these activities of the Federal Government are administratively unrelated. Nor would they be related under the proposal submitted by the President and approved by Congress to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Beyond this, duplication and waste would inevitably follow if mass transit plans are centered in the new Department while another Federal agency, the Department of Commerce, continues to guide, finance, and control the construction of urban and suburban roads.

We cannot divide responsibility and expect sound decisions for the most efficient use of the taxpayers' dollars in meeting overall community needs.

Nor will the new Federal Department help you in your efforts to wage a war on poverty. For the new Department created in part to establish a more direct line between Washington and the cities will do absolutely nothing, per se, to make you partners in the administration of local antipoverty programs.

Beyond that, how many of you have seriously considered how you are going to find your increased share of funds—a 40-percent increase—required by law if the poverty program is to continue beyond August 20, 1966?

The program calls for Federal assistance for the development, conduct, and administration of community action programs up to 90 percent of costs for the 2-year period ending August 20, 1966, or 50 percent thereafter.

Local governing bodies, to say nothing of city managers, are generally bypassed by the direct contact between poverty officials in Washington and local action groups, but where will the pressures go for continuation of the program with 40 percent less Federal participation?

Why, the pressures are just as liable to end on the desk of the city managers—and you know it. You are going to be hounded by a public acclimated to the program. But you will be asked to find the money for a program in which you have participated not at all.

Now, the purpose of my comments has not been to detract one iota from the important role the Federal Government can, and must, play in solving metropolitan problems; rather, I hope that I have left with you today a healthy skepticism regarding the Federal Government's ability to offer instant solutions to perennial metropolitan problems.

The same administrative hurdles that have impeded solution of these problems by State and local officials are merely multiplied by the current trend of Federal intervention.

Instead of a proliferation of agencies at the Federal, State, and local levels with overlapping jurisdictions and built-in self-interests, can't we begin to talk about inter-jurisdictional planning agencies that will benefit from the knowledge, finances, and energies of all three levels of government as they seek common solutions to problems that are indeed the common property of us all regardless of where we live.

If an Office of Community Development in the White House could be designed to accomplish this goal, I feel we would be taking a real step in the proper direction.

WEARY OF ALL DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, for those of us who support the administration's policy in South Vietnam, it is heartening to know that not all the opponents of that policy believe in public demonstrations or pro-Communist protests.

The Wheeling, W. Va., News-Register recently has voiced opposition to the administration's policy on South Vietnam, but an editorial which appeared in the Sunday, October 17, 1965, edition voices stronger criticism to protest demonstrations.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered printed, as follows:

WEARY OF ALL DEMONSTRATIONS

Regardless of one's personal views on U.S. involvement in the Vietnam war, there can be no condoning the type of protest demonstrations being staged around the country.

To tell the truth we are sick and tired of all demonstrations, marches, riots, and disorders and we believe the majority of Americans are weary of the same. By now it should be clear that even the most sincere and honest of these protests sooner or later become the vehicles for infiltration by pro-Communist agitators, wild-eyed beatniks, and ordinary law breakers.

On Friday the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee released a study to support what it termed the Communist infiltration and exploitation of the teach-in movement on U.S. policy in Vietnam.

The report read, "A substantial Communist infiltration (of the teach-in movement) is demonstrable, a much more substantial infiltration is probable, and there has been a tragic blurring of the distinction between the position of those who oppose our involvement in Vietnam on pacifist or idealist or strategic or other grounds, and those who oppose our involvement in the war because they are Communists or pro-Communists."

Simply because a movement of this nature is sponsored by an institution of higher learning does not mean that it is free of Communist taint or exploitation by extremists and even hoodlums. Many a worthwhile cause has been terribly damaged because of such infiltration and Americans are becoming increasingly disgusted with such mob tactics.

There is nothing wrong with speaking out in disagreement with Government policies, but there is no need to resort to mass rallies in the streets, sit-in demonstrations and disorderly conduct which disturbs the peace and welfare of the country.

Already we have spawned such shocking episodes as seeing young Americans tearing up their draft cards and rebelling against military service. Unfortunately, the protest movements set an example for our younger people and in a way many of these efforts directly involve the youth.

What must be remembered is that half of today's world population is under 18 years of age. By next year half of the U.S. population will be under 25. Youth therefore is a potentially explosive force, which unless channeled into productive paths, can lead in the future to upheaval and rioting for the mere thrill of rioting. If there is no way left in our Nation to register a dissenting opinion, other than through civil disobedience and mob tactics, then we are in a sad way indeed.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF ELLEN BROWNING SCRIPPS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like my colleagues to note that today is the anniversary of the birth of Ellen Browning Scripps, one of the most intelligent and selfless ladies our country has known. I want to take this occasion to express the pride and gratitude with which the people of Illinois remember Miss Scripps, for her belief in the power and glory of education, a belief which she supported by inestimable philanthropies.

Ellen Browning Scripps was born in London on October 18, 1836. Her family moved to the United States while she was still a child, and she spent her girlhood in Rushville, Ill. She attended public schools in Rushville, and taught school herself after graduation from high school, in order to finance her tuition at Knox College in Galesburg, Ill. After graduation from Knox College, in 1859, Miss Scripps taught until 1866, when she joined her brother in Detroit to work for the Detroit Tribune. The next move was to Cleveland and then, finally, to California where she lived for the rest of her life. Thanks to Miss Scripps, the San Diego area is generously endowed with university and hospital facilities, libraries and community centers. All of this amply illustrates her attention to environment and education as crucial concerns of a community.

The people of Rushville, Ill., are indebted to Ellen Browning Scripps for a community building and a park. Such gifts are infinitely greater than the cost of construction. They represent an inexhaustible investment in the well-being of the town and of many generations of its people. I can think of no finer memorial to a noble and generous lady.

TALKING SENSE ABOUT CUBA

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, not too many days ago Cuban Premier Fidel Castro announced that he would permit a number of his countrymen to leave for the United States. It can be assumed that Castro apparently counted on using the people he betrayed as pawns in a propaganda game. However, on October 3, President Johnson announced the United States would offer sanctuary to the Cubans, in line with our traditional humanitarian policies. This entry must be handled on an orderly basis. I am sure that Castro, realizing the United States will require clear ground rules, is now hesitating.

Certainly a continuation of the Dunkirk-style evacuation cannot be allowed. Greater Miami, which has already demonstrated its compassion by absorbing many thousands of Cuban exiles, understandably does not know what to expect. South Floridians and the Nation should get some answers and the United States should spell out its requirements.

The Miami Herald has commented on the subject with cogency and restraint. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled, "Clear Up the Refugee Muddle" be inserted in the body of the Record at this point of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Clear Up the Refugee Muddle

The promise of Fidel Castro to let his betrayed people go has given the United States an unparalleled opportunity.

Properly handled, the bearded dictator's abject failure will be demonstrated for all the world to see and communism will be given a setback in this hemisphere from which it can never rebound.

Bungled, it will give Castro a sharp propaganda weapon to tighten his control over a nation whose economy is rotting.

The misadventures of two groups of impatient exiles who tried to rescue friends and relatives show how easily the situation could be bungled.

One group engaged in a shoot-out with Cuban coastal guards. One exile was wounded, one guard reportedly killed. The incident gives Castro a made-to-order excuse to slam the door shut again whenever this suits his purpose.

Another group embarked in a stolen boat and while in Cuba was used for anti-American propaganda. The Havana radio quoted them as complaining about conditions in the United States, which had given them refuge.

These things must not be allowed to continue.

Ten days after Fidel Castro announced all Cubans were free to leave the country, no U.S. official has yet spoken out firmly and clearly to lay down ground rules for an orderly movement.

South Florida's huge exile population doesn't know what to expect. Many, therefore, try to make the best deal they can to get their people out of Cuba. This is an invitation to disaster.

Greater Miami doesn't know what to expect—whether we face a chaotic future or whether the Federal agencies intend to keep their promise to relocate the incoming tide and reduce some of the exile burden we already have.

Some authority must spell this out and make clear also that U.S. laws and regulations must be observed by exiles and American citizens alike.

This is no time to appeal to Fidel Castro to act like a reasonable person. He knows now his offhand speech was an incredible mistake for his cause and could depopulate his country.

His interest is in trying to rectify his error.

The interest of the United States is to show that, given the opportunity, the people of Cuba choose freedom. This would be the end for Fidel.

He is on the hook and the United States has the initiative. If we allow the situation to drift until he can squirm off, the hopes of the Cuban people will be dashed and their eventual freedom postponed again.

Let the proper officials speak up now and the U.S. position be made unmistakable.

THE EQUAL TIME ABSURDITY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, an important question which I hope Congress can consider next year is whether to amend or eliminate section 315 of the Federal Communications Act. I am pleased that the National Conference on Broadcasting and Election Campaigns, held recently in Washington under the auspices of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee, Inc., dealt with this issue. As the author of S. 1287, a bill to amend section 315 of the Federal Communications Act, I am keenly interested in the matter of the equal time on the air for candidates for public office.

An excellent editorial identifying the shortcomings of section 315 as it is presently written, appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer of October 8, 1965.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows.

The Equal Time Absurdity

Section 315 of the Federal Communications Act requires broadcasters to give candidates for public office equal time on the air. This means that a station which wants to give major candidates an hour of free time to present their views or engage in debate must give equal time in comparable time slots to all the other minority candidates.

In concept, this regulation appears democratic and noble enough in purpose. In practice, it can prove unfair and absurd, as can be plainly witnessed today during the mayorality campaign in New York.

There are two major party candidates for the office: John V. Lindsay, who holds both the Republican and Liberal nominations, and Abraham D. Beame, the Democratic nominee. Running also are five minority party candidates. The best known of these is the Conservatives' William F. Buckley, Jr. Others are the nominees of the United Taxpayers' Party, Socialist Workers Party, the Socialist Labor Party, and even something called the Losers' Party.

Should the broadcasting stations in New York plan coverage of the two or three important candidates, outside of the regular newscasts exempt from the law, they would have to clutter up their schedules, and the air, with equal coverage of all the other candidates, no matter how obscure and how remote their chances of election.

Because of the expense involved, the scheduling difficulties, and public indifference to the views of most of the minority candidates, the stations have naturally gone slow in extra coverage of the top candidates.

The stations are frustrated, the campaign loses a sparkle it might otherwise be given, and the public loses out. The equal-time provision has become an added incentive to anonymous characters and political crackpots to run for office for the sake of personal publicity. They know that if one candidate receives free air time, they, too, must obtain it.

The practical answer lies in modification of the FCC provision so as to bar absurdities as well as discrimination. Pennsylvania's Senator Hugh Scott is sponsor of a bill which would make the equal time regulation apply only to parties which received 10 percent of the vote in the preceding election. This would seem to be a reasonable compromise, but the Scott bill lies in the bottom of the bin in a Senate committee. The debacle in New York provides a good reason for resurrecting it.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, October 11, 1965, marked the 100th anniversary of the founding of the George Washington University Law School. Today, as the 15th oldest law school in the United States, it ranks sixth in enrollment.

To honor this institution and its distinguished alumni, many of whom have served and are currently serving in Congress, our Federal Courts and throughout the Government and Armed Forces, a special convocation was held on Tuesday, October 12, 1965, at which Associate Justice William Joseph Brennan, Jr., of the Supreme Court of the United States, received the honorary degree of doctor of laws, and delivered the address of the evening.

Being an alumnus of the George Washington University Law School, and a former member of the law school faculty, I wish to make available to my colleagues in the Congress and to those who read the Congressional Record, Justice Brennan's remarks on this occasion.

I ask that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

(Address by William J. Brennan, Jr., Associate Justice, U.S. Supreme Court)

At the outset, let me express my deep appreciation for the honor tendered me of admission to the degree of doctor of laws of this distinguished university. It is a distinction that I shall always cherish. And it gives me the greatest pleasure to join in the law school's centennial celebration. The occasion marks the completion of a century of devoted service by the law school to the profession and to the Nation. But this centennial is not merely an occasion for looking back on the evolution of this law school and congratulating all those responsible for its solid success. It is also an occasion for charting the future, as witnessed by the fact that today we are celebrating both an anniversary and a birth—the construction of the new library. And you have chosen, most appropriately, to further commemorate your proud record through a conference addressed to the problems of educating those who will practice law for and before the government. We may all draw satisfaction from this forward-looking zeal on the part of those who are charged with the heavy responsibility of educating our young people to the law.

To be unique is usually the result of accident; to take advantage of that uniqueness requires sensitivity and perception. The late Mr. Justice Jackson was among your trustees who revealed this sensitivity and perception. He and his fellow trustees realized that the very location of this law school in the Capital presented a unique challenge and an equally unique promise. The promise lay in the resources peculiarly available to the law school, those derived from its proximity to the Nation's tribunals, its administrative agencies, and myriad governmental departments. The challenge lay in the law school's major responsibility for educating those who serve in government, or serve those who deal with it.

No other law school finds as many students drawn from government service, and as many who turn to it.

The result has been the National Law Center. The next hundred years of this law school's history have merged with the development of that institution, which already is meeting with imagination and awareness many of the challenges of modern legal education. The tremendous volume of published law material makes specialization in the study and practice of law almost inescapable. Increasingly, law schools are developing areas of specialization, like undergraduate colleges, as part of their standard curriculum. Nowhere is the mountain of statutes, cases, and administrative decisions more evident than in the field of public law. The need for an institution to tackle this burgeoning growth is tremendous. It must be shifted, compacted, organized, and made available to students and the profession. The law center serves this vital need. It not only enriches the law school's conventional curriculum with the spirit of scholarly achievement and the spirit of the organized bar, but is a workshop where scholars, practitioners, and judges can be assembled; where seminars can be held; research directed; and serious consideration given to the future of public law. Its output can be scholarly and objective, a welcome supplement to the haphazard competition between litigants whose conflicting self-interests frequently provide the force that directs our law. Through the center, the entire profession can participate in the growth of the law as professionals obligated to the public, not merely as the advocates of special interests.

My main point tonight is that answering the challenge of proliferation and specialization of law is not enough. The law center, and the law school, would be failures if all they taught were technical understanding of our complex new relationships with government and of the bodies which administer them. To stop with technical competence is to contribute to our profession's already dangerous myopia. The principal gift a law school can and must bestow is an understanding of the law as a living process, responsive and responsible to changing human needs.

Thankfully, the day when such recognition was denied is passing away. Increasingly, the shift is to justice and away from finespun technicalities and abstract rules. The vogue for positivism in jurisprudence—the obsession with what the law is, which leaves no room for choice between equally acceptable alternatives—gave way first to the concept of sociological jurisprudence, primarily under Roscoe Pound's onslaughts begun over half a century ago. But sociological jurisprudence, too, had a defect: which it "shifted the emphasis away from positivism * * * it did so at the expense of reality by substituting the abstract idea of society for the actuality of the individual human beings who constitute society in fact." It was succeeded by the "new realism" and today we move further still. To quote a recent ABA report,[1] "The new trend is not back to an exaggerated individualism, which had been corrected in part by the notion of a sociological jurisprudence. Neither is it reaffirmation of the 'jurisprudence of interests,' which was a positivistic effort to spell out in jurisprudential terms the property and power priorities of society. The new jurisprudence constitutes, rather, a recognition of human beings as the most distinctive and important feature of the universe which confronts our senses, and of the function of law as the historic means of guaranteeing that preeminence. * * * The new jurisprudence, as a whole, may be summarized as tending to explore specific, and familiar, situations from a new viewpoint. In a scientific age it asks, in effect, what is the nature of man, and what is the nature of the universe with which he is confronted.

"Why is a human being important; what gives him dignity; what limits his freedom to do whatever he likes; what are his essential needs; whence comes his sense of injustice?"

Because it focuses on public law, the law center should be especially concerned with the preservation of human dignity and freedom when man deals with government. When this law school was founded, freedom and dignity found meaningful protection in the institution of real property. In a society still largely agricultural, a piece of land provided men with the means of economic independence, the necessary precondition of political independence and expression. Not surprisingly, property relationships formed the heart of legal practice, and lawyers and judges tended to think stable property relationships the highest aim of the law.

The days when common-law property relationships dominated legal practice are past. To a growing extent, economic existence now depends on less certain relationships with government—licenses, employment, contracts, unemployment benefits, welfare, and the like. Government participation in the economic existence of individuals and groups is pervasive and deep. Administrative matters and other dealings with the government are at the epicenter of the exploding law. We turn to government and to the law for controls which would never have been expected or tolerated a century ago, when a man's answer to economic oppression or difficulty was to move 200 miles west.

We are accustomed to thinking that government participation in the creation of wealth—whether through licenses, contracts, or welfare programs—should not be hampered by property-like notions, that the government should be free to set conditions on which it will give or withhold these benefits if the public interest is to be served. As Prof. Charles Reich, of Yale Law School, has cogently observed,[2] however, such conditions were once imposed on property, too. He argues that, "Regulation of property [was] limited, not because society had no interest in property, but because it was in the interest of society that property be free. Once property is seen not as a natural right but as a construction designed to serve certain functions, then its origin ceases to be decisive in determining how much regulation should be imposed. * * * The real issue is how it functions and how it should function."[3]

Professor Reich concludes that "[I]t is time to reconsider the theories under which new forms of wealth are regulated, and by which governmental power over them is measured." "Above all," he says, "the time has come for us to remember what the framers of the Constitution knew so well—that 'a power over a man's subsistence amounts to a power over his will.' * * * If the individual is to survive in a collective society, he must have protection against its ruthless pressures. There must be sanctuaries or enclaves where no majority can reach. To shelter the solitary human spirit does not merely make possible the fulfillment of individuals; it also gives society the power to change, to grow, and to regenerate, and hence to endure. These were the objects which property sought to achieve, and can no longer achieve. The challenge of the future will be to construct * * * institutions and laws to carry on this work."[4]

One may well disagree with the particulars of Professor Reich's argument, but I am in full agreement with his conclusion. If free government is to endure, those who govern must recognize human dignity and accept whatever limitations on their power are necessary to preserve that dignity and the air of freedom which is our proudest heritage. Such recognition will not come from merely a technical understanding of the organs of government, or the new forms of wealth they administer. It requires something different, something deeper—a perspective which comes from personal confrontation with the wellsprings of our society. For a school which trains so many who will either serve in government or deal with it, teaching that perspective is the great challenge of the years that lie ahead.

The particulars of meeting that challenge are, I hope, something that will be much discussed at your forthcoming conference, and by your faculty. It might be appropriate, however, for one who speaks from a nonacademic vantage point to throw down the gauntlet of a few ideas of his own.

My first suggestion, relating to the undergraduate curriculum, is that you join the growing number of law schools turning with increasing vigor to the urgent and welcome task of training lawyers to meet the problems of the poor in both civil and criminal matters. Such programs help make legal protections as meaningful for the poor as are the legal obligations the poor are accustomed to have enforced against them. In accomplishing this goal, teachers and their students bring home the dignity of the individual and the evenhandedness of the rule of law to all. Your school, with its special interests, could take a special responsibility in this vital area, by concentrating on the legal relationships and interactions between government and the poor.

---

[1] ABA Section of International and Comparative Law, report of committee on new trends in comparative jurisprudence and legal philosophy (Rooney, chairman), Aug. 10, 1964.

[2] "The New Property, 73 Yale L. J. 734 (1964).

[3] Id., at 779.

[4] Id., at 787.

For example, most persons who require welfare aid or have a claim to unemployment compensation stand alone when they appear before the agencies charged with administering these programs. Too often, these agencies are accustomed to the callousness of paternalism. Before the recent growth of neighborhood legal services, little thought was given to providing representation before these agencies, or to the nature of the benefits they dispense. Even now, these services are overwhelmed with requests for help, and have difficulty extending the representation they planned to offer. The law school would perform a substantial service to the community and its students if it took a hand in this task.

One means of accomplishing this end would be by an enlargement of the student program of voluntary legal assistance. Most law schools, including this one, have programs in which students volunteer their services in the preparation of cases for trial or appeal. A usual shortcoming of such programs, however, lies in their almost exclusive concern with rendering assistance in the judicial forum; the horizon must be enlarged to include assistance in the administrative forum, whether it be a formal administrative proceeding or a day-to-day confrontation with government officers. As I stressed earlier, this type of interaction is coming to have a greater significance in the life of the ordinary citizen. Thus, the need for such assistance becomes more and more imperative. The ordinary citizen must be assisted in detecting and protesting against arbitrary action by government officers, especially when it is camouflaged in bureaucratic complexity, as is so often the case. The responsibility for rendering such assistance must be shouldered by lawyers. But the unfortunate fact of life is that those most needing legal assistance are those least able to pay for it. Part of the solution to this problem lies in government supported legal services; the remainder lies in volunteer work, for which the law student can be called upon.

I think this law school could be a pioneer in establishing such a program of legal assistance in the administrative forum, which would serve as a model for law schools throughout the country. Such an enlargement of the legal aid programs would be a natural outgrowth of this school's special concern with public law; and the location of the law school in the Nation's Capital, with its proximity to the administrative agencies, affords an unparalled opportunity to develop such a program. It would have a tremendous educational impact, especially for the students at this law school, who so often have served government or plan for a career in government. The attorney-client relationship, with its special nuances and difficulties, would become less of an abstraction to the student and he could relate to a sector of the population whose special needs can rarely be effectively communicated in a classroom.

We all know that claims to be made before agencies are apt to be won or lost at the level of the first bureaucrat. That's the point where the law student could be of great help to the claimant. And it is not a one-way street. The student-lawyer's observance of the administrative process in microcosm would be serviceable to him in the practice before agencies which is becoming so large a part of the lawyer's life. Such a program could as easily be included as a course much like those you presently offer in trial and patent practice. The student could combine a study of the theory of the programs, viewed through the statutes and legislative proceedings which established them, with a study of their practical functioning. He should see both the administrative and the claimant perspective; perhaps he could engage in supervised practice on both sides of the fence. Learning what a program is about, seeing whether those ends are being accomplished, thinking how they might be attained—this would seem to me a supreme experience in legal education, especially if it resulted, as I think it must, in a greater recognition of the place of human dignity.

I also want to suggest that the law school should not stop with merely setting students upon their way. Insights may grow dim under the pressures of daily routine. The law school should aggressively seek the chance to renew them through its graduate and extension programs. Far too often a private lawyer's vision is restricted by a ruthless pursuit of his client's individual interest, while the government lawyer overzealously seeks to promote his conception of the public interest. They talk at cross purposes; they are unable to understand the other's problems; each overstates his case; and resort is had to less than scrupulous techniques. The result is often outrageous: settlement through negotiation is made impossible; the courts and agencies find themselves unable to rely on either side; the integrity of the law is drawn in question; and there is no concern for the best interests of the public. Although this problem has been long recognized, I think the time has come for law schools, especially this law school, to make some contribution in this area.

Here, too, the standard equipment of the postgraduate curriculum, seminars, conferences, night courses, and the like, can play an important role. But I wonder if something more isn't called for. Lawyers should be exposed to the other side, not only through academic interaction, but also through participation as advocates. Private law firms already recognize the advantages of practicing sabbaticals, through leaves of absence for government practice and the like. Cannot the government do as well? Those who participate in welfare programs would gain much, it seems to me, from spending some time as an advocate for the poor; a lawyer for an agency distributing research contracts would gain new insight into the effects of his actions on scientists and others who depend on such contracts if he had the experience of helping scientists to obtain them. To be sure there are problems involved—but they are problems private firms have been able to conquer. The government has no less ability to do so. And consider what it would gain. Lawyer exchange programs, like international student exchange programs, could significantly contribute to establishing and maintaining the understanding and broader perspective I deem so essential. This law school, with its location and contacts in government and private practice, is ideally suited to begin and coordinate such an endeavor.

I do not want to spend so much time delving into detail that we lose sight of the goal—maintaining the law's focus on human dignity in an era of ever-increasing legal complexity and governmental regulation. Finding the way is the great challenge you face in the coming century. I am sure your efforts will mirror the success the law school has already achieved in the century just past.

It is a pleasure to have participated in this ceremony. As we commemorate both the century past, and the vigorous future represented by the new library building, I am reminded of an old oriental proverb: "If you want to plan for a year, plant rice; if you want to plan for 10 years, plant a tree; if you want to plan for life, educate a man."

Your president and board of trustees, the donors who are making the new library possible, and your faculty are carrying on the great work of those who preceded them, planning for life and for the lives of generations to come. I congratulate all of you and wish you continued happiness and success.

EPISCOPAL CHURCH DENOUNCES INJUSTICE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Right Reverend John E. Hines, presiding bishop of the Episcopal Church, of which I am a member, deserves the praise of all concerned citizens for his eloquent and forthright statement of October 4 in which he deplored the travesty of justice which took place in a courtroom in Hayneville, Ala. Declaring that civil rights murders may have to be made Federal capital offenses, Bishop Hines expresses the view that a more appropriate remedy in the long run for what has transpired in the courts of Hayneville and other communities is "the mounting of a jury selection process which reduces to an absolute minimum the cultural and emotional pressures in localized areas."

> Even the most intensive campaign for voter registration will founder—

Bishop Hines points out—

> if potential voters, looking ahead, are able to discern only the wreckage of their hopes for justice on the jagged rocks of bias and discrimination.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Bishop Hines' statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE RIGHT REVEREND JOHN E. HINES, PRESIDING BISHOP OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES, ON THE ACQUITTAL OF THOMAS COLEMAN IN HAYNESVILLE, ALA., ON SEPTEMBER 30, 1965

Seminarian Jonathan Daniels and his fellow civil rights worker, the Reverend Richard F. Morrisroe, were gunned down by Deputy Sheriff Thomas Coleman on August 20. It was not the "shot heard round the world," even though its reverberations have not lessened; but the verdict rendered by the jury on September 30 in Haynesville was heard around the world.

What it said about the likelihood of minorities securing evenhanded justice in some parts of this country should jar the conscience of all men who still believe in the concept of justice in this land of hope.

It is simply inconceivable to intimate acquaintances of both young men that Jonathan Daniels flashed a knife or that Father Morrisroe was armed. Alabama's own attorney general branded testimony that they were armed as perjury. The studied care with which the defense assassinated the character of a man already dead rightfully angers fairminded men everywhere. Fortunately, Jonathan Daniels' integrity survives such despicable action.

A more pervasive question is whether or not the jury system, as it is now administered in the State of Alabama (and some other areas), if allowed to perpetuate itself without radical reform, will deal a blow as lethal as Coleman's shotgun blast to the common man's hope for justice. The horror of the Coleman case may bring cries for swift

Federal intervention, legislative and otherwise, by which capital crimes connected with civil rights be made Federal offenses.

Such may indeed be a viable strategy for more equitable justice, but more germane and safer in the long run would be the mounting of a jury selection process which reduces to an absolute minimum the cultural and emotional pressures in localized areas. The end result would be a jury genuinely representative of all the people over whom it holds such powers of judgment. As basic as is the right to vote, the right to a jury trial by a man's peers antedates it in the long struggle for responsible freedom. Even the most intensive campaign for voter registration will founder if potential voters, looking ahead, are able to discern only the wreckage of their hopes for justice on the jagged rocks of bias and discrimination. The Philadelphia Inquirer's editorial comment is pertinent—"the ancient form of trial by a jury of his peers cannot function if the peers in effect admit they would have committed the same senseless criminal act as the defendent if they had had the opportunity."

The acquittal of Thomas Coleman, which is surely a travesty of justice, is not the price we must pay for the jury system. Rather it is the fearful price extracted from society for the administration of the system by people whose prejudices lead them to sacrifice justice upon the altar of their irrational fears.

The life of Jonathan Daniels is no more and no less valuable than that of any other man in the sight of God. But the cause in which he offered it is a cause dear to everyone who breathes the air of free men. Because of this free men must not permit the devastating verdict of the Haynesville 12 to be the final word of injustice in Alabama or anywhere else.

DEFENSE AGAINST CRIME

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on October 14, I spoke to a luncheon meeting of the Junior Bar Section of the District of Columbia Bar Association, and stated my belief that recent decisions on cases in Federal courts, involving police interrogation, arrest and detention, and search and seizure, have greatly weakened society's ability to deal effectively with criminal elements.

I pointed out that steps should be taken to reverse this trend, so that the threat of punishment of the guilty will be no idle threat, for the guilty man upon whom the court fails to impose punishment is encouraged to commit further crimes. I ask unanimous consent to have the speech printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

THE CRIMINAL COURTS AND SOCIETY'S DEFENSE AGAINST CRIME

Ladies and gentlemen, you have doubtlessly noted that one of the most constantly recurring items in your daily newspapers are the latest crime statistics. These are reported for the Nation as a whole and for the District of Columbia, our Nation's Federal City.

Recently, the FBI released its 1964 report on crime in the United States. The statistics showed, throughout our Nation more than 2,600,000 serious crimes were reported during 1964, a 13-percent rise over 1963. No one knows how many less serious offenses went unreported.

Since 1958, crime in the United States has increased six times faster than our population growth. More than 1,100,000 burglaries were reported in 1964. More than 300 robberies occurred each day during that year, of which 57 percent were armed robberies and 43 percent were of the strong-arm type.

What was the role of the District of Columbia, the Nation's Capital, in this panorama of crime? The crime rate in the District has risen, significantly and steadily, during all of the years of the 1960's, to a recent high point where, again according to the latest FBI statistics, serious crime in the District has now increased 15 percent for the first 6 months of 1965 as compared to the last 6 months of 1964. These are not just figures taken from a Government report, to be glanced at and thrown aside as of only faint interest. They sound the tocsin of war. A war between criminals and society. This is a war, gentlemen. Make no mistake about it. It is a war which the criminal element is slowly but surely winning. The Federal Bureau of Investigation "Crime Clock" for 1964, shows that a serious crime was committed in the United States every 5 minutes during that entire year, a murder, forcible rape or assault to kill every 2½ minutes, an aggravated assault every 3 minutes, a robbery every 5 minutes, and a burglary every 28 seconds.

Lest it be thought that criminal law enforcement is a local matter and that it is not of immediate concern to the Federal Government, your attention is invited to the U.S. News & World Report of August 23, 1965, which carries an article entitled "Alarmed Capital Fights Violent Crime—Even the Halls of Government Are Invaded by Washington's Growing Army of Criminals." It points out that "a police report issued August 11 showed 2,844 crimes in the District of Columbia in July—92 crimes in every 24-hour period—making July the 38th consecutive month in which crime rates rose. The biggest increases were in rapes, robberies and aggravated assaults." The article shows that the criminal elements have become so bold that now "in most Federal offices, special precautions are taken to protect workers, especially women, on duty at night or in isolated areas. In the year ended June 30, 1965, official reports showed 69 crimes at Government buildings, including assaults, vandalism incidents, other types of violence, plus 10 gambling cases. The count the year before: 49 crimes, 12 gambling cases. Not reported, hundred of lesser incidents, including petty thefts." To bring this appalling situation even closer to home, I would remind you that women in our own offices have been assaulted in the streets around the Capitol. Now the area is patrolled by armed guards and police dogs after 5 p.m. and according to the article women are escorted to their cars after dark if they ask for protection and many of them do.

Even more shocking, of the 92,869 offenders processed for fingerprint identification by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, 76 percent were repeaters. This works out to about 70,528. And "for the criminal repeaters, those with two or more arrests, the average criminal career was 10 years during which period they averaged five arrests for different criminal acts." Of this group, about 51 percent had been granted leniency in the form of probation, suspended sentence, parole and conditional release.

I reminded you that your daily newspapers carry constantly recurring reports on crime statistics. What do the editors of these newspapers have to say about these facts which they continue to bring to public attention?

At the annual meeting of the Associated Press member editors, in Buffalo, N.Y., last month, Mr. George Beebe, the association president, urged the Nation's newspapers to become "crime fighters" and root out corruption in law enforcement. He hit hard at the criminal menace growing in the United States, and pointed out that crime has been flourishing in major cities across the Nation and "thieves and racketeers continue to practice their nefarious trades while lenient judges and clever criminal lawyers keep them free on appeal after appeal after appeal."

And what is the general reaction of the American public to this situation? On September 24, the Gallup poll reported: "As newspapers and magazines continue to report increases in both the number and the rate of serious crimes in this country, there has been a sharp increase in the number of people who think courts deal too leniently with criminals."

The crime situation has become so bad that the President of the United States sent a special message to Congress on "Crime, Its Prevalence and Measures of Prevention," in which he said, "Crime will not wait while we pull it up by the roots. We must arrest and reverse the trend toward lawlessness. This active combat against crime calls for a fair and efficient system of law enforcement to deal with those who break our laws. It means giving new priority to the methods and institutions of law enforcement." He then pointed out three areas where such priorities are needed—the police, the courts, and the correctional agencies. He indicated that he would appoint a Presidential Crime Commission to devise ways and means of increasing Federal law enforcement efforts, assisting local law enforcement, and to make a comprehensive and penetrating analysis of the nature of crime in modern America.

Undoubtedly, all of these measures are urgently needed. Unquestionably, more and better police, improved correctional agencies and more courts and judges are absolutely essential. All of this laudable effort may come to naught, however, if the courts fail to recognize and enforce the rights of society to be secure against the lawless and criminal elements. The President appears to have recognized this when he said in his message that "there is misunderstanding at times between law enforcement officers and some courts. We need to think less, however, about taking sides in such controversies and more about our common objective: law enforcement which is both fair and effective. We are not prepared in our democratic system to pay for improved law enforcement by unreasonable limitations on the individual protections which ennoble our system. Yet there is the undoubted necessity that society be protected from the criminal and that the rights of society be recognized along with the rights of the individual." While crime rates increase, acquittals by the courts have also increased. "Acquittals and dismissals of adult offenders for the serious crimes amounted to 26 percent of the total adults charged compared to 24 percent in 1963."

The "Uniform Crime Reports of 1964" state that "the restrictive court decisions affecting police prevention and enforcement activity have influenced, at least in part, the downward trend in [police] clearances and the increases in acquittals and dismissals." These facts, when brought into juxtaposition would seem to indicate that the courts, through decisions, have greatly weakened society's ability to deal with criminal elements. For the courts to be lenient, to suspend sentences, and to acquit on mere technicalities, releasing the criminal to further prey upon society, seems the height of folly.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has warned: "We mollycoddle youthful criminals and release unreformed hoodlums to prey anew on society. The bleeding hearts, particularly among the judiciary, are so concerned for criminals that they become indifferent to the rights of law-abiding citizens. We must have judges with courage and a high sense of their duty to protect the public and to adequately penalize criminals if we are to stop the spread of serious and dangerous crimes against society. We must adopt a most realistic attitude toward this critical problem. We have tried the lenient approach and it has failed."

Although the public attention is centered in the Mallory rule, wiretapping, Gideon, and the right to counsel, and others which I will deal with in due course, at the outset, let me point out that these are merely a few of the areas in which judicial casuistry has turned criminals loose to prey upon law-abiding citizens. For example, John Barker Waite, in an article in the Hastings Law Journal, points out a number of cases in various jurisdictions in the area of criminal attempts. I will comment upon only one of these cases.

"Miller on Criminal Law" defines a criminal attempt as consisting "of an act done by the accused with a specific intent to commit a particular crime by means apparently reasonably adapted to the accomplishment of that end and under circumstances which make its accomplishment apparently possible; which act goes beyond mere preparation and carries the project forward within dangerous proximity of the criminal end sought to be attained, but which nevertheless falls short of consummation of the intended crime."

In *People* v. *Rizzo*, 246 N.Y. 334 (1927), Professor Waite comments that, "Charles Rizzo knew where to lay the finger on a paymaster who would be easy making for a stickup. Tony Dorio could get an automobile; Tom Milo and John Tomasello had pistols. They combined assets and went after the money. But Rizzo's timing was off. Rao, the paymaster, had already been to the first place they looked; he had not reached the second. They went to the bank where he got his money but he had left. While they were looking for Rao elsewhere, the police, suspicious of their actions, picked them up. In due course they were indicted and convicted of attempted robbery. Dorio, Milo, and Tomasello took their medicine and went to Sing Sing; Rizzo's attorney appealed. The appellate division sustained the conviction. The court of appeals reversed it."

"That court began its opinion: 'The police of the city of New York did excellent work in this case by preventing the commission of a serious crime.' Then the court set Rizzo free. He had intended to commit the crime, the court said, and would have done so had he been able. But up to the point of arrest he had not yet attempted a crime."

"Of Rizzo's companions Judge Crane added: 'Two of these men were guilty of carrying concealed weapons, pistols, contrary to law * * * Two of them, John Tomasello and Thomas Milo, had also been previously convicted, which may have had something to do with their neglect to appeal. However, the law would fail in its purpose if it permitted these three men, whoever or whatever they are, to serve a sentence for a crime which the courts subsequently found and declared had not been committed. We therefore suggest to the district attorney of Bronx County that he bring the case of these three men to the attention of the Governor to be dealt with as to him seems proper in the light of this opinion.'

"Accordingly those three also were given their freedom."

Professor Waite subsequently comments on this case (Hastings Law Journal): "As to Rizzo and his pals there would seem no possible question of their demonstrated social menace. To be sure, in the course of his exempting opinion Judge Crane after basing his decision casuistically upon precedents does say: 'The law must be practical and therefore considers those acts only as tending to the commission of the crime which are so near to its accomplishment that in all reasonable probability the crime itself would have been committed but for the interference.' (Rizzo case, p. 337.)

"Then with not unprecedented judicial illogic he holds that Rizzo's acts were not indicative that the crime would have been committed; in complete disregard of his own opening sentence, 'The police of the city of New York did excellent work in this case by preventing the commission of a serious crime.'" Professor Waite, in his article notes a number of cases in the area of criminal attempt, including attempts to commit crimes of violence, in which the courts have turned obvious criminals loose to prey further on society. In another article entitled "Why Do Our Courts Protect Criminals?" American Mercury, he notes additional cases. While the cases noted by Professor Waite are examples of State court judicial casuistry in just one area, it would not seem unreasonable to say that there are other areas in which State courts engage in such practices. Overly protecting the criminal is not common to State courts alone. Some of the recent decisions of the Federal courts, particularly of the Supreme Court, also appear to disregard the right of society to be secure.

Since the extension in 1925 by the U.S. Supreme Court of a part of the 1st amendment of the U.S. Constitution to the States via the 14th amendment in *Gitlow* v. *New York*, 268 U.S. 652 (see also *Cantwell* v. *Connecticut*, 310 U.S. 296 (1940) that Court has continued to apply more and more of the Federal Bill of Rights to State court decisions. For more than a century and a quarter prior to that decision it had been thought that the Federal Bill of Rights applied only to the Federal Government. Without entering into a discussion of the wisdom of this change and assuming that such a change is both wise and desirable, it should also be pointed out that the Court has gone about enforcing this change by opinions in criminal cases promulgating technical rules of legal procedure. The result has been in the field of criminal justice that more and more criminals have been given their freedom on the basis of legal technicalities—popularly referred to as the "exclusionary rule"—without regard to their obvious guilt. The rule may be briefly stated as one excluding evidence from being received at the trial of a case which had been obtained through violation of an constitutional right of the accused. In *Mapp* v. *Ohio*, 367 U.S. 643 (1961), Miss Mapp had been tried and convicted of having in her possession certain lewd and lascivious books, pictures and photographs in violation of paragraph 2905.34 of Ohio's Revised Code. On appeal the Ohio Supreme Court found that her conviction was valid under Ohio law though based upon evidence obtained during an unlawful search of her home. The U.S. Supreme Court, on the basis of enforcing the fourth amendment, applied the exclusionary rule and Miss Mapp went free regardless of the fact that she was obviously guilty of the offense with which she had been charged. Further, the Court extended the application of the rule in fourth amendment cases to all of the States.

The case that has caused more comment and concern than any other is that of *Mallory* v. *U.S.* 354 U.S. 449 (1957) which occurred in the District of Columbia. Mallory confessed to having raped a woman in the basement of an apartment house. He was arrested and questioned by the police for about 3 hours, broken up into several periods including the taking of a lie detector test, after which he confessed. He was convicted on the basis of this confession in the lower courts. The U.S. Supreme Court, however, threw his confession out because rule 5(a) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, 327 U.S. 821, requires that arrested persons shall be taken before a magistrate without unnecessary delay. The Court said in part that "Provisions related to rule 5(a) contemplate a procedure that allows arresting officers little more leeway than the interval between arrest and the ordinary administrative steps required to bring a suspect before the nearest available magistrate." The guilt or innocence of Mallory was not examined by the Court, only the police delay.

This same Mallory, following his release from custody, attacked another female and was subsequently again arrested and sentenced to 60 days in jail. Later on, a State court gave him a long term for burglary and for assault on a housewife.

The outcry of law enforcement officials against this decision has been long and bitter. Ex-District of Columbia Police Chief Robert Murray said "the restrictions imposed by this decision had made it practically impossible to obtain convictions of criminals in many serious cases where neither scientific evidence nor eyewitness identification is available" ("Crime in the District of Columbia"—Joint hearings before the District of Columbia Committees of Congress; 88th Cong., 1st sess.).

Col. Stanley R. Schrotel, chief, Cincinnati Police Department said that "the Mallory rule is beginning to be felt in Ohio cities and towns ('we are beginning to get the brunt of it'), and it is proving to be a very serious obstacle to effective police work." (Hearings before the Senate District of Columbia Committee, on Mallory and Durham rules, investigative arrests and amendments to the criminal statutes of District of Columbia, 88th Cong., 1st sess.)

O. W. Wilson, superintendent of police, Chicago, Ill., said "the Mallory rule arbitrarily excludes the truth on the peculiar theory that by doing so, the Court can punish the police for what the Court considers to be a violation of the rights of the accused. But it is society that is being punished, not the police. The only beneficiary is the criminal. As a consequence, crime is overwhelming our society."

While no one advocates third degree methods, it would seem fundamental that the police should be permitted 2 or 3 hours at least, in which to question a suspect. It frequently happens that, although at the time of arrest circumstances point to the arrested individual as the guilty party, he will voluntarily furnish information clearing himself as an innocent party and thereby prevent the police from charging the wrong person. Of course suspects should not be and are not under any compulsion to answer any questions. The police, however, can only act upon the circumstances known to them. If the suspect is actually innocent and voluntarily furnishes additional information which they can check out, he can then be freed from the necessity of formally answering a charge of crime. The tendency of the Mallory decision is to prevent all questioning by the police, even reasonable and proper questioning. Closely akin to Mallory in its effect on law enforcement is the development of the right to counsel under the sixth amendment in the *Gideon, Massiah,* and *Escabedo* cases.

Before *Gideon* v. *Wainwright*, 372 U.S. 335 (1963) the right to counsel at the trial of a case in State courts was governed by State law. State practice varied widely among the

States. In Federal cases, the absolute right to counsel, unless the defendant had intelligently and freely waived the right, had been made clear in *Johnson* v. *Zerbst,* 304 U.S. 458 (1938). With *Gideon,* the U.S. Supreme Court made it clear that in both State and Federal cases defendants were, under the sixth amendment to the U.S. Constitution, entitled to be represented by counsel at the trial of their cases. If the defendant was too poor to pay for a lawyer, the Court, Federal, or State, would have to appoint one for him. No one can quarrel with this. It was a good decision. Since *Gideon,* however, the Supreme Court has gone much further.

In *Massiah* v. *U.S.,* 377 U.S. 201 (1964), a seaman was convicted of transporting narcotics. He was indicted, retained an attorney and was free on bail. During the bail period, in investigating the crime further, narcotics agents arranged to hide a radio transmitter in his codefendant's car. Without knowledge of the situation the seaman, Massiah, made incriminating statements while talking with the codefendant. The Supreme Court held that these statements, elicited from Massiah in the absence of his lawyer, violated his right to counsel under the sixth amendment and could not be used against him. This seems an unreasonable extension of the right to counsel. Mr. Justice White in dissenting from the Court's opinion said: "Undoubtedly, the evidence excluded in this case would not have been available but for the conduct of Colson in cooperation with Agent Murphy, but is it this kind of conduct which should be forbidden to those charged with law enforcement? It is one thing to establish safeguards against procedures fraught with the potentiality of coercion and to outlaw 'easy but self-defeating ways in which brutality is substituted for brains as an instrument of crime detection.' *McNabb* v. *United States,* 318 U.S. 332, 344. But here there was no substitution of brutality for brains, no inherent danger of police coercion justifying the prophylactic effect of another exclusionary rule. Massiah was not being interrogated in a police station, was not surrounded by numerous officers or questioned in relays, and was not forbidden access to others. Law enforcement may have the elements of a contest about it, but it is not a game. *McGuire* v. *United States,* 273 U.S. 95, 99. Massiah and those like him receive ample protection from the long line of precedents in this Court holding that confessions may not be introduced unless they are voluntary. In making these determinations the courts must consider the absence of counsel as one of several factors by which voluntariness is to be judged. See *House* v. *Mayo,* 324 U.S. 42, 45–46; *Payne* v. *Arkansas,* 356 U.S. 560, 567; *Cicenia* v. *Laqay, supra,* at 509. This is a wiser rule than the automatic rule announced by the Court, which requires courts and juries to disregard voluntary admissions which they might well find to be the best possible evidence in discharging their responsibility for ascertaining truth."

Finally, in *Escobedo* v. *Illinois,* 378 U.S. 478 (1964), the Court extended the sixth amendment's right to counsel back, even before the initiation of judicial proceedings, to the area of police interrogation. The facts were that Escobedo was arrested without a warrant in connection with the shooting of his brother-in-law. His lawyer secured his release. A number of days later, after another suspect made statements incriminating Escobedo, he was again arrested and taken to the police headquarters. While under police interrogation his requests to see his lawyer were refused. Meanwhile his lawyer, who had arrived at the headquarters also made repeated requests to see him which were also refused. Under police questioning Escobedo made incriminating statements which were used against him at his trial where he was convicted. The U.S. Supreme Court reversed his conviction by the State courts, holding that police refusal to honor his request to consult his lawyer during the course of police questioning constitutes a denial of his right to counsel under the 6th amendment as extended to the States through the 14th amendment. Mr. Justice White again dissenting said:

"By abandoning the voluntary-involuntary test for admissibility of confessions, the Court seems driven by the notion that it is uncivilized law enforcement to use an accused's own admissions against him at his trial. It attempts to find a home for this new and nebulous rule of due process by attaching it to the right to counsel guaranteed in the Federal system by the 6th amendment and binding upon the States by virtue of the due process guarantee of the 14th amendment. *Gideon* v. *Wainwright, supra.* The right to counsel now not only entitles the accused to counsel's advice and aid in preparing for trial but stands as an impenetrable barrier to any interrogation once the accused has become a suspect. From that very moment apparently his right to counsel attaches, a rule wholly unworkable and impossible to administer unless police cars are equipped with public defenders and undercover agents and police informants have defense counsel at their side. I would not abandon the Court's prior cases defining with some care and analysis the circumstances requiring the presence or aid of counsel and substitute the amorphous and wholly unworkable principle that counsel is constitutionally required whenever he would or could be helpful.

* * * * *

"The Court may be concerned with a narrower matter: the unknowing defendant who responds to police questioning because he mistakenly believes that he must and that his admission will not be used against him. But this worry hardly calls for the broadside the Court has now fired. The failure to inform an accused that he need not answer and that his answers may be used against him is very relevant indeed to whether the disclosures are compelled. Cases in this Court, to say the least, have never placed a premium on ignorance of constitutional rights. If an accused is told he must answer and does not know better, it would be very doubtful that the resulting admissions could be used against him. When the accused has not been informed of his rights at all the Court characteristically and properly looks very closely at the surrounding circumstances. See *Ward* v. *Texas,* 316 U.S. 547; *Haley* v. *Ohio,* 332 U.S. 596; *Payne* v. *Arkansas,* 356 U.S. 560. I would continue to do so. But in this case Danny Escobedo knew full well that he did not have to answer and knew full well that his lawyer had advised him not to answer.

"I do not suggest for a moment that law enforcement will be destroyed by the rule announced today. The need for peace and order is too insistent for that. But it will be crippled and its task made a great deal more difficult, all in my opinion, for unsound, unstated reasons, which can find no home in any of the provisions of the Constitution."

Perhaps I have gone into too much detail in reciting these cases to you. It is not my purpose to reargue them nor to bore you with the recitation of further cases, though many are available. They do, however, illustrate my point, that the courts, by their decisions, have greatly weakened society's ability to deal effectively with the criminal elements. Every time the courts turn loose an individual charged with crime on technical grounds such as these, they shirk their responsibility. Every time the courts fail to determine the probative value of the evidence offered and free the defendant on a technical rule of exclusion, the innocent man forever after bears a stigma of guilt among his fellows. He got off on a technicality. He beat the rap. On the other hand, the guilty man upon whom the court has failed to impose punishment is encouraged to commit further crimes. It can be argued that the psychological effect of this on the individual in just a few cases is relatively unimportant in the law enforcement picture nationwide. This, in ordinary circumstances, is probably true, but as I pointed out at the beginning of my remarks, circumstances on a nationwide basis are not now ordinary. The criminal elements appear to be making war upon society. That war has been brought to the very doors of government. When the courts, through judicial casuistry, fail to punish obvious lawbreakers or when the U.S. Supreme Court uses its decisions to promulgate administrative rules for the guidance of law enforcement agencies, without regard to the guilt or innocence of the defendant, they swing the balance which should be maintained between individual rights and the rights of society, against the rights of law-abiding citizens.

We appear to be in an era when respect for law and order has largely broken down. Society must defend itself from lawlessness. The use of punishment for the commission of crime is as old as the history of the criminal law. The guilty must be punished. Most of the judge-made law has favored the wrongdoer rather than sought to control him. To permit escape from punishment on technicalities, is to create indifference to the threat of punishment. In order to counter this indifference, society, and this includes the courts, must make sure that the threat of punishment of the guilty is no idle threat. Further, the stigma attached to punishment of unacceptable criminal conduct will tend to induce respect for law and order among all of us including the criminal elements.

One legal authority has said, "The stamping of an act the commission of which the State will prosecute with unrelenting severity, immediately rouses the feeling that the act is unsuitable, inadmissible, disreputable, contrary to duty * * *. Thus general prevention operates rather quietly, slowly and penetratingly, making the consciousness of right sharper, intensifying the general feeling of right and wrong" (Aschaffenburg, "Crime and Its Repression" (1913).) An able British jurist has written, "The sentence of the law is to the moral sentiment of the public what a seal is to hot wax. (It) constitutes the moral or popular sanction of that part of morality which is also sanctioned by the criminal law." (Sir James Stephen, 2 "History of the Criminal Law of England" (1883).)

I conclude my remarks by quoting the concluding paragraph of Professor Waite's article in the Hastings Law Journal, supra, with respect to the value of punishment as a deterrent to crime: "Because of this value of punishment as an open and notorious stigmatization of what is socially intolerable, every judicial refusal to impose a punishment merited by the facts inevitably suggests judicial tolerance of the activity. It may be tolerance of the crime as compared with some minor official misconduct, as when relevant and material evidence is rejected, or tolerance of it over departure from conventional rule, as in the cases here discussed. But on any basis of comparative tolerability, a judicial exemption from deserved punishment weakens the subconscious public sense of intolerance for the act. A single decision of this sort may wreak more deterioration in the factors of individual abstention from crime than thousands of offenses unpunished because the offenders are unknown. Thus every judge who sets casuistry above merited penalty must accept individual responsibility to an appreciable extent for the country's burden of crime."

Thank you for the privilege of letting me express some of my convictions on this very vital matter.

THE IMPORTANCE OF INTERNATIONAL SEMINARS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the principle of improving world relations through the exchange of knowledge and experience is one to which I am sure most of the Members of this body subscribe. Nevertheless, I believe that it is important to keep underscoring this truth whenever possible by pointing to special examples of successful intellectual interchanges.

South Dakota State University at Brookings, S. Dak., has twice hosted international seminars and conferences on particular problems shared by many nations of the world. The first, in 1962, was on problems of soil and water conservation, and this summer a second Conference, bringing together word extension leaders was held.

These extension leaders found that the problems each faced were common to nearly every other area of the world—that people were pretty much alike and that the experiences of a Latin American country, for instance, could be helpful to an African nation or a country in southeast Asia.

Mr. John L. Pates, the extension news editor, at South Dakota State University, has summed up the success of the Conference very well in an article he has written for the November issue of Extension Service Review. I presume that through special efforts of local or national extension officials this will reach most of those people who participated in the Conference. I think it is too bad that there is no publication which can reach extension leaders and workers in every country so that future articles of this kind can have general distribution. This was one of the recommendations of the Conference—that some media for the exchange of information, on a continuing basis, be established. The participants will continue to work on solving that problem.

Mr. President, I ask permission that Mr. Pates' article "Guiding Principles Featured at International Extension Conference," be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FEATURED AT INTERNATIONAL EXTENSION CONFERENCE

(By John L. Pates)

"Much of the universal hope for worldwide peaceful social and economic progress lies in extension education * * * for what people do for themselves when they put knowledge to work is what makes a strong and prosperous economy and a great and growing nation."—Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Washington, D.C., welcoming speech to the participants of the International Conference of Extension Leaders, July 22, 1965.

Cultural differences between countries which dictate varying educational methods, but a united concern for helping people farm and live better, characterized discussions at the International Conference of Extension Leaders at the South Dakota State University in early August.

Seventy-five agricultural and extension leaders from 43 countries spent a solid 2 weeks at South Dakota State University, Brookings, sharing principles of informal adult and youth education. After July orientation sessions in Washington, D.C., they traveled to Brookings via Ohio and Indiana where they observed county extension workers in action. On their way back to Washington after the 2-week seminar they visited Iowa State University, viewed extension work with low-income groups in St. Louis, Mo., and studied rural resource development work in Paintsville, Ky.

Djaffar Rassi, former Director of Extension in Iran, summed up the feelings of many participants saying, "Education principles are the most important foreign aid the United States can offer."

South Dakota Extension Director John T. Stone, general chairman of the conference, outlines major objectives of the seminar:

"The first was to provide those with extension-type education leadership responsibilities in various countries an opportunity to get together and become personally acquainted. A second objective was to identify, describe, and define basic educational, operational, and organizational principles which may have universal application for the administration of extension programs anywhere in the world."

Throughout the conference discussion leaders as well as participants were quick to point out the wisdom of sticking to guiding principles rather than trying to transplant specific techniques from one country and its culture to problems of another.

Discussions revealed some of the real problems which face these education pioneers.

These problems are well expressed in the seminar youth committee report.

"The major resource of every country is its people. So long as this resource remains underdeveloped, all other resources of the nation must be less fully utilized. Inadequate education, low levels of nutrition, poor health and sanitation, disease, and other problems continue to plague the people of every nation. All countries must continue to search for ways to help every citizen reach his highest potential. Extension can and must serve these needs through rural youth programs."

The report went on to point out that the educational work of worldwide extension through rural youth programs such as 4-H, 4-C, and 4-S is a major means of supplementing the efforts of schools and other developmental agencies in preparing young people for responsibility in a complex, changing world.

Similar needs were faced realistically by the home economists. Granting that principles in education are important, the ladies discussed roadblocks to carrying out educational programs with women. They wrestled with questions such as the need for research to determine problems that exist and the need for training and education to develop strong, efficient leadership.

Recognizing the cost involved, the group recommended that countries continue or at least begin simple studies and evaluations on which to base programs. These may develop and evenutally culminate into real research projects in different home economics areas and can help determine the best teaching methods. So important is research to the furtherance of good home economics programing it was recommended that this topic be the focal point of any future international conference dealing with the "home" aspect of extension work.

Dr. Stone said a third objective was to develop some proceedings from this conference that would "help facilitate a continuing exchange of ideas and pertinent information among extension leaders."

Such a report is being made. It includes a brief status report of extension programs in many participating countries; it will list major educational programs and objectives; it will include charts to help interested countries set up an organizational procedure; it will list titles and job descriptions of key extension leaders, and it will include some common professional terms used in different countries.

In his talk Dr. Stone suggested that such a summary might include recommendations for improving the effectiveness of agricultural, home economics, and youth extension programs throughout the world.

The conference participants recommended the establishment of a worldwide extension organization. The sectional report of extension administrators suggests that such an organization would accomplish three primary goals: it would promote and improve the exchange of ideas, experiences, techniques, methods, and assistance in the fields of extension work. It would help strengthen and advance professional qualifications of extension workers throughout the world. It would help develop a greater concept of extension work as a scientific profession. The administrators appointed a committee comprised of one representative from each of the five continents represented to study the formation of such an association. Members include Carlos Arroyo B., Costa Rica; Djaffar Rassi, Iran; Karl G. Kruse, Netherlands; Ahmed El/Amin Abdel Rahman, Sudan; and Albert S. Bacon (assistant to the FES Administrator) of the United States. Dr. Stone was elected executive secretary.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand adjourned until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 19, 1965, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate October 18, 1965:

THE JUDICIARY

William K. Thomas, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Ohio, vice Paul Jones, deceased.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate October 18, 1965:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Tom Lilley, of West Virginia, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

U.S.-Flag Lines Adrift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 18, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Representative JOHN M. MURPHY, of New York, at the annual convention of the Association of Water Transportation Accounting Officials at Hershey, Pa., on October 15, 1965. It is the good fortune of the Congress to have among the New York delegation one like Representative MURPHY who brings to his assignment on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee a fulsome background and experience in the shipping problems of New York and the country and who has been most diligent in the discharge of his duties.

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN M. MURPHY, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW YORK, AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF WATER TRANSPORTATION ACCOUNTING OFFICIALS AT HERSHEY, PA., ON OCT. 15, 1965

Ladies and gentlemen, I am indeed happy to be with you here today. You couldn't have chosen a more delightful place to hold your annual convention. In fact, this community and the surrounding countryside are so attractive and pleasant that it is somewhat difficult to bring one's self down to the serious business of discussing our drifting maritime policy.

At the time I commenced preparation of these remarks, rumors were circulating that the interagency maritime task force on maritime policy, under the chairmanship of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, was about to release a new shipping program which would introduce drastic changes to all existing policy and authority. Soon the press carried stories which seemed to confirm the rumors. Then came official denials. Then came reproduction in the New York Journal of Commerce on September 28 of the full text of the alleged position paper of the task force. Then more official denials. And finally, on October 7, the rumors and the stories were confirmed with the official release and presentation to the Maritime Advisory Committee of a document, entitled "The Merchant Marine in National Defense and Trade: A Policy and a Program."

Release of the long-awaited policy and program, however, did little, if anything, to clarify the picture.

In a reportedly stormy session, the Maritime Advisory Committee, composed of a cross section of all elements of our maritime industry in both labor and management, unanimously adopted a resolution not to accept the task force report, on the grounds that it was contrary to the existing statement of policy contained in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936; contrary to the directive of the President establishing the Maritime Advisory Committee; contrary to the policy adopted by the Committee; and contrary to the statements made by the Secretary of Commerce last May.

Most interesting was the fact that even before the Under Secretary of Commerce started to explain the report, the Secretary of Labor, a member of the task force, announced his disagreement with much of the contents of the report. With this background it will most certainly be interesting to review the President's transportation message to the Congress early next year.

Knowing the interest and involvement which all of you have with regard to the American merchant marine and our shipping policies, I am sure you are familiar with press accounts of the proposed new policy and program.

Among other things, radical changes are proposed in this construction and operating subsidy systems, relating the amounts of merchant marine subsidies solely to national emergency needs for military and urgent civilian shipping. The task force states that adequate Government aid would be provided to insure these national emergency needs but "aid systems would be restructured and funds reprogramed to obtain the maximum capacity per dollar input." In simpler terms, the objective is "more bang for the buck"—and fewer bucks. It is conservatively estimated that by 1975 the gross national product could exceed $880 billion and by 1985 could reach $1¼ trillion. By the clever use of mirrors, the report attempts to show that by 1985 with an annual Federal outlay of approximately $387 million—$29 million less than under present conditions—we can have a merchant marine carrying double the present volume of U.S. foreign commerce. To do this it is proposed that—

Construction and operating subsidy aid would be made available to the bulk carrier segment of the industry.

Cargo preference in all its aspects would be phased out—ultimately eliminated.

Seagoing employment would be reduced by as much as 20,000 jobs, to a level somewhat more than one-half of the present 47,000 jobs.

Passenger shipping would be phased out over the next 10 years or so.

Commercial shipbuilding would be supported up to about the present level upon the joint determination of the Secretaries of Defense and Commerce as to shipbuilding capacity required to meet national security needs. Beyond that, any operator in the offshore bulk or liner trades may build abroad and still be eligible for operating subsidy. Domestic operators may also build abroad without loss of any coastwise privileges.

Operating differential subsidy should be paid on an incentive basis calculated on a percentage of gross revenues, except that no operating differential subsidy will be paid to liners with regard to Government-sponsored cargoes.

The trade route system would be either eliminated or vastly modified.

Though the report contains many fine words to assure the belief that the proposal will lead to less Government participation and interference in shipping than at present, the fine print shows that the heavy hand of big brother will be felt at every turn. There seem to be numerous situations in which Government aid can be summarily reduced or withdrawn. For example, it states the MARAD "Should have authority to decide whether a subsidized operator's participation in a conference, pool and or other agreement inimical to the objection of the subsidy, to require the operator to withdraw from such agreements or lose subsidy."

The report is one big package of controversy and seems to have been prepared in total ignorance or disregard of existing policies and statutory authority. As one shipping official put it—some of the suggestions seem to be in the nature of "burning the house down to get at a leaky roof". I am told that the report was prepared with virtually no consultation or advice from practical shipping people.

I, for one, am glad to see this report brought into the open. Whether one agrees with it or not, it clearly delineates certain areas in which our maritime policy needs reaffirmation or strengthening. By having been formally presented by the Task Force, it defines issues more clearly than the various preceding studies that have come forth with frequency in the postwar years. Now we have something we can sink our teeth into.

Because of the official status of the report, the Congress has a clear and immediate responsibility to review and analyze it in the greatest detail. I anticipate that congressional committee staffs will initiate such analysis during the remaining months of this session and that congressional scrutiny through comprehensive hearings will begin early in the next session. We should, and I feel sure that we will, give the authors of the proposed changed program and policy every opportunity to explain and justify the details of their recommendations.

By the same token, it behooves all segments of our maritime industry to apply their own careful and objective scrutiny to every word in this report so that we in Congress may have the benefit of your views.

While I must confess that the full text of the report has not been available long enough for me to have studied it in fine detail, I can readily see where adoption of some of the recommendations will require the particular attention of you gentlemen in the accounting field. It looks as if there would be a greatly increased proliferation of accounts due to the differing treatments that would be given to the subsidization or nonsubsidization of various types of cargo. As another example, the problem of determining parity for bulk carriers on a worldwide basis will certainly present a challenge.

Before closing, I want to take this opportunity to announce that I intend to join with others who have already done so to introduce legislation which would return the guidance and administration of our maritime policy to independent status. Events over the past 4 years have convinced me that a maritime administration buried deep in the realm of a large department devoted primarily to other things has not been satisfactory. Nor has the creation of a variety of special non-Government advisory committees and interdepartmental committees and task forces permitted the development and exercise of responsible leadership by the agency created for that purpose.

The John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 18, 1965

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in the last several weeks, you may have noticed that every national leader in the Republican Party has denounced and repudiated the John Birch Society.

I am sure that most people know what my own views on the extremist John Birch Society are. But because we have, in Kansas, a substantial number of acknowledged members of the Birch Society, plus a large number of people who think and talk and act like Birch Society members, I want to make my own position crystal clear.

My position is that those people have no place in the Republican Party. For that matter, they have no place in Kansas politics, and no place in American politics. They have no program for the Republican Party, they have no program for Kansas, and they have no program for the United States of America. Their major program is fear and hate.

Now, some people have said they know some good people who are members of the Birch Society. Good people? If they are good people, they had better get as far away from the Birch Society and from extremists who think and talk and act like Birchers, as they can. The Birch Society stands for the proposition that Dwight Eisenhower was an agent of the Communist conspiracy; that John Foster Dulles was a Communist involved in treason against America; that America today is 60 to 80 percent Communist controlled and influenced, and they are still putting out the same kinds of stuff. For example, these people—these Birch members and people who act like Birchers—are now helping to foist on the public the book, "None Dare Call It Treason." This is an extremist Birch-type warning of an imminent Communist takeover in the United States, and it ends up by urging its readers to join the Birch Society.

To sum up, because of the substantial Birch membership and Birch-type activity in Kansas, I want to make my position crystal clear. There is no place in the Republican Party either for Birch Society members or for people who act like Birchers. There is no place for these people anywhere in Kansas politics or in American politics. These people have no program for the Republican Party, no program for Kansas, and no program for the United States of America. Their major program is hate and fear; and I, for one, will always be glad to stand up and be counted against hate and fear.

Two and a Half Billion Dollars Gambled on Foreign Lotteries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, for the past few weeks, I have brought to the attention of the Members of this Congress a report on gross receipts and net incomes from government-run lotteries around the world. These nations have wisely discovered that lotteries can make gambling moneys work for rather than against the people. In all of these countries, the gambling spirit of its people is legally recognized and capitalized on by its governments.

Unfortunately, we, in the United States, stand virtually alone among the nations of the world in our hypocrisy in refusing to recognize and accept the wisdom and advantages of a national lottery.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for our taxpayers to understand our Government's sanctimonious attitude about gambling when we know that gambling in this country is a $100 billion a year tax-free monopoly which is and continues to be the chief source of revenue to the underworld crime syndicates.

If we had a Government-run lottery, like our Latin American, European, and Asian allies do with near unanimity, we would satisfy the American thirst to gamble while at the same time making the flow of billions of dollars now siphoned off by the underworld work instead for public welfare. I think we could expect an American lottery to bring in gross receipts of $10 billion or so, with commensurate profits.

In 1964, the 84 foreign countries, listed below, took in gross receipts of almost $2½ billion from its legally operated government lotteries. The total income to the governments came to over $850 million which was used for hospitals, schools, housing, welfare, charity, science, medicare, public developments, and other worthwhile projects.

Mr. Speaker, is it not time that we showed similar wisdom and courage in this country? Is it not time that we remove the blinders and recognized the obvious—that the urge to gamble is a universal human trait that should be regulated and controlled for our own welfare and benefit?

Why can we not profit from the lucrative experience of these 84 foreign countries? I am waiting for us to have the guts to face up to the fiscal facts of life and capitalize on the normal gambling spirit of our American people. I think we ought to profit nationally from the example of the State of New Hampshire, which has already started to enjoy the fiscal advantages of a government-run lottery.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to list below the 84 foreign countries which recognize and accept the fact that gambling is a fact of life and should be made to work for the public good rather than against it:

Country	Gross receipts	Net income	Purpose used
1. Argentina	$37,712,000	$17,164,000	Public works and medical programs.
2. Australia	99,575,000	29,923,000	Hospitals, welfare, and Sydney Opera House.
3. Austria	20,600,000	7,100,000	General purposes.
4. Belgium	21,400,000	7,820,000	Social welfare programs.
5. Bolivia [1]	789,355	347,146	Red Cross, public health, and welfare.
6. Brazil	30,604,000	1,803,000	Public service projects, schools, hospitals, and housing.
7. British Honduras	3,500,000	90,000	Charities.
8. Bulgaria [2]	--------	--------	
9. Burma	5,235,000	2,094,000	Central Treasury.
10. Cambodia	27,400,000	20,200,000	National budget.
11. Cameroon	272,000	126,000	Schools, hospitals.
12. Ceylon	1,393,000	610,000	Economic development.
13. Chile	13,500,000	2,407,000	Colleges, public health, and hospitals.
14. Colombia	40,000,000	4,000,000	Homes for the poor and aged, and charity.
15. Costa Rica	11,056,000	3,602,000	Hospitals and mental institutions.
16. Cyprus	1,190,000	620,000	Development.
17. Czechoslovakia	4,436,000	1,919,000	Hospitals, sports, and culture.
18. Denmark	8,235,000	617,000	General fund.
19. Dominican Republic.[3]	12,258,000	2,589,887	Social betterment and public works.
20. Ecuador	4,282,000	1,307,000	Social assistance hospitals.
21. El Salvador	23,020,000	3,500,000	Welfare services.
22. England [4]	245,000,000	143,000,000	Central government expenses.
23. Ethiopia	1,440,000	202,000	Welfare purposes.
24. Finland	6,311,000	2,165,000	Science and fine arts, opera.
25. France	139,000,000	44,000,000	General purposes.
26. Gabon	50,000	25,000	Red Cross, youth.
27. Germany	545,000,000	182,000,000	Youth, sports activities and health.
28. Ghana	3,000,000	1,500,000	General fund.
29. Gibraltar	$1,967,000	$450,000	General revenue and social services.
30. Greece	31,618,000	7,007,000	Welfare agencies.
31. Guatemala	2,486,000	613,000	National theater, arts, and culture.
32. Haiti	2,416,000	1,039,000	Education, social welfare, and assistance.
33. Honduras	19,869,000	2,109,000	Schools, hospitals, and health centers.
34. Hong Kong	1,750,000	700,000	Social welfare.
35. Hungary	48,500,000	19,700,000	General revenue.
36. Iceland [5]	960,000	310,000	Housing for elderly and research.
37. India [6]	5,400,000	4,200,000	General revenue.
38. Indonesia	750,000	450,000	Hospitals, students, and orphanages.
39. Iran	19,100,000	6,950,000	Hospitals and schools.
40. Iraq	956,000	460,000	Hospitals, welfare.
41. Ireland	43,460,000	10,580,000	Hospitals.
42. Israel	26,700,000	8,000,000	Hospitals and schools.
43. Italy [7]	97,450,000	52,565,600	Hospitals, orphanages, and education.
44. Jamaica	714,000	103,000	Hospitals.
45. Japan	14,014,000	5,183,000	Public works, schools, and hospitals.
46. Jordan [8]	54,000	3,000	Hospitals, junior clubs.
47. Laos [9]	--------	--------	
48. Lebanon	4,300,000	1,100,000	Schools and development.
49. Libya	1,200,000	370,000	Poor.
50. Luxembourg [10]	1,562,300	624,920	Charity, welfare, and medicare.
51. Malaysia	16,530,000	4,000,000	Rural development program.
52. Malta	1,271,000	193,000	General purposes.
53. Mexico [11]	60,000,000	11,200,000	Health and welfare.
54. Morocco	2,410,000	600,000	Treasury.
55. Netherlands	10,228,000	1,000,000	General revenue.
56. New Zealand	11,025,000	2,690,000	Aged, welfare, research, medicine.
57. Nicaragua	5,078,000	858,000	Hospitals and social programs.

See footnotes at end of table.

Country	Gross receipts	Net income	Purpose used
58. Nigeria	$393,000	$128,000	Medical services and development programs.
59. Norway	18,900,000	5,860,000	General funds.
60. Panama	47,171,000	8,089,000	Hospitals and public assistance.
61. Pakistan [12]	7,289,909	6,404,031	General development projects.
62. Paraguay	748,000	158,000	Child care and public health.
63. Peru	4,000,000	672,000	Hospital and medical care.
64. Philippines	14,000,000	6,000,000	Hospitals, Red Cross, Boy and Girl Scouts.
65. Poland	3,932,000	933,143	Housing and culture.
66. Portugal	21,347,000	6,998,000	Public assistance.
67. Puerto Rico	60,000,000	11,989,000	Public improvements.
68. Republic of China	5,850,000	2,633,000	General purposes.
69. Republic of Congo	8,000	888	
70. Rumania [13]	----------	----------	50 percent of income used for sports.
71. Russia [14]	113,220,000	56,610,000	Unknown.
72. Sierra Leone	676,000	219,000	Development programs.
73. Southern Rhodesia	$4,580,000	$745,000	
74. Spain	164,900,000	50,000,000	Red Cross and general budget.
75. Sweden	61,084,000	33,978,000	Culture and artistic purposes.
76. Switzerland	11,000,000	3,000,000	Public building and transportation.
77. Syria	1,250,000	450,000	Damascus International Fair.
78. Thailand	38,460,000	10,384,000	General revenue.
79. Turkey	9,400,000	4,300,000	General treasury.
80. Uganda [15]	714,000	678,000	5-year plan.
81. Uruguay	14,924,000	4,952,000	General purposes.
82. Venezuela	18,524,000	1,665,000	Social welfare.
83. Vietnam	26,000,000	9,000,000	Housing and agriculture centers.
84. Yugolsavia	10,189,000	1,509,000	Veterans, deaf, and blind, Red Cross.
Total	2,264,596,000	850,305,000	

---

[1] Bolivia: 1963 figures only available.
[2] Bulgaria: Figures not available.
[3] Dominican Republic: 1963 figures only available.
[4] England: Premium bond savings lottery.
[5] Iceland: 1963 figures only available.
[6] India: Price bond lottery.
[7] Italy: 1963 figures only available.
[8] Jordan: 1963 figures only available.
[9] Laos: Laotian lottery interrupted by coup d'etat.
[10] Luxembourg: 1963 figures only available.
[11] Mexico: 1963 figures only available.
[12] Pakistan: Prize bond lottery, 1963 figures.
[13] Rumania: Figures not available.
[14] Russia: 1963 figures only available.
[15] Uganda: Prize bond lottery.

Congressman Wright Patman Speaks at Veterans of World War I and Senior Citizens Day Celebration at Texas State Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 18, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, Representative of the First Congressional District of Texas, has distinguished himself as a friend of the veteran in his service for 19 consecutive terms in the House of Representatives. As the author of the bonus bill for the veterans of World War I, and in his long service he has continued a long fight for the welfare of our veterans and the senior citizens of this Nation.

It is only fitting that this great Congressman was chosen to speak at the State Fair of Texas on the Veterans of World War I and Senior Citizens Day celebration, as he has been a constant supporter of adequate legislation for these groups.

Congressman PATMAN was the first Congressman to introduce the World War II GI bill of rights in the House and he was the author of the Veterans Emergency Housing Act of 1946. Now, Congressman PATMAN is a leading supporter for the cold war GI bill which is now pending in the House after passing the Senate earlier this session. Congressman PATMAN is an outstanding, devoted Congressman who has brought great benefits to the people of Texas and this Nation in his 36 years as a Congressman.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the State Fair of Texas which is held this year from October 9 through October 24. This annual fair is the largest single celebration in Texas and leads the Nation in annual attendance at State fairs. Founded in 1886, the fair occupies more than 200 acres of ground in Dallas, Tex., and has outstanding historical, educational, and amusement facilities which are attended by more than 2½ million people each year.

I invite all of my colleagues to come to visit this outstanding exhibit in my home State and view its remarkable exhibition.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech which Congressman PATMAN delivered at the State Fair of Texas be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE WRIGHT PATMAN TO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I AND SENIOR CITIZENS DAY CELEBRATION, TEXAS STATE FAIR, DALLAS, TEX., OCTOBER 13, 1965

It is fitting that the State Fair of Texas set aside a day to honor World War I veterans and senior citizens.

Texas has always contributed heavily to the Nation's Armed Forces. In World War I, some of the finest fighting units were dominated by personnel from the Lone Star State.

Today, the State of Texas has more than 1 million veterans of all wars living within its borders. At least 91,000 are veterans of World War I. When the Nation called, Texans have been ready.

I am happy to see so many of my old comrades out here at the State fair today. You are justifiably proud of your contributions at a time of maximum peril and maximum need for your country. Many of you and your families paid a heavy price, but the world survived because of the sacrifices of you and your fellow countrymen.

All of us who fought in World War I thought we were engaged in a war to end war. Unfortunately, this was not the case. Since that time we have seen World War II, the Korean conflict, and many other smaller engagements involving American servicemen throughout the world.

Most of this century, we have been in war or on the verge of war.

Today, American fighting men once again are scattered around the globe. In Vietnam, thousands of U.S. soldiers and marines are engaged in combat. Many are dying and many are being wounded. It is a tough, bloody, hard war.

None of us in Congress and no one in the Johnson administration wants to see these casualty lists grow. Certainly we are not in this war by choice. But, do we really have any choice?

We have a solemn commitment in South Vietnam and I believe the great majority of this country wants us to keep that commitment. As veterans of a world war, you know well the folly of weakness, retreat, or surrender. If we abandon South Vietnam, what is next? Where do we draw the line?

President Johnson's resolute stand in Vietnam, has, I believe, strengthened the chances for a meaningful peace around the world. His firm position has let the Communist world know that he means business. It has lessened the chances of miscalculation.

At the same time that the President has taken concrete military action, he has consistently held out the offer to negotiate. But the Communists do not want peace, they want domination of all of southeast Asia.

Let me assure you that President Johnson is a man of peace. As a decorated veteran of World War II, President Johnson knows the heartbreak and destruction of war firsthand. His efforts in the foreign field are directed toward preventing a catastrophic third world war. I sincerely hope that you veterans, as individuals and through your organizations, will support the President's efforts in the foreign relations field and give support to his moves for meaningful and lasting world peace.

Until we do have lasting understandings, we must face the prospect of many American young men serving in the country's Armed Forces. The Vietnam war already has required large numbers and the needs seem certain to mount in coming months. I hope that the country will see that this new group of veterans receives benefits comparable to those accorded men who served in some of our most recent conflicts. Today's military man, it must be said truthfully, serves under conditions much better than those which you experienced in the First World War. Many of you served throughout World War I for just about $1 a day. And out of that dollar came allotments, insurance, and incidental expenses.

All of you know the tremendous opposition we faced after the war when we attempted to adjust this situation. That was the famous fight for adjusted service certificates, which eventually became known under the popular title of "soldier's bonus."

I sincerely hope that our current crop of veterans will not have to go through such a fight for the benefits they have rightfully earned. But, frankly, I am very proud of the fight that I made for this World War I soldier's bonus. As you know—and some of you fought right along beside me in this battle—we had to overcome the big banker's friend, Andrew Mellon, and the vetoes of two Presidents before we got justice on this issue.

Today, I fear too few people remember the machinations of the Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew Mellon, and the banks and their near success in turning the soldier's bonus into a banker's bonus. Mellon falsified the state of the U.S. Treasury to lead the country to believe that it could not pay the face value of these adjusted service certificates. Convincing the country that it faced a Treasury deficit, Mellon gained approval of a plan to make the certificates payable in 1945. In the meantime, under the Mellon plan, you veterans could borrow small sums on the certificates from banks. On the average certificate's face value of $1,000, this meant that the veteran could borrow maybe as much as $250 from banks at interest rates ranging from 6 to 10 percent. By the time the certificates would have become payable in 1945, their value would have been eaten up by interest charges.

When I first took the oath of office as Congressman from the First District of Texas in 1929, I moved to correct this situation and introduced legislation to make these certificates payable at face value. I remember that many of you came to Washington in support of this legislation. I recall that cold January in 1931 when thousands of veterans marched up Pennsylvania Avenue to the Capitol steps and presented me with petitions circulated in every congressional district of the country. I immediately circulated these to the Congressmen and Senators on Capitol Hill and I am convinced this did much to help pass the legislation.

Originally, of course, we had to take a compromise plan, which gave the veterans a 50-percent loan on their certificates. But, finally, in 1936, we gained final victory and some 3 million veterans started receiving more than $2 billion in payments for their Adjusted Service Certificates. This not only helped provide equity to the veterans who had fought for their country in World War I, but it gave a big and much-needed boost to the general economy.

Mellon and his big banker friends were really the obstacles to this legislation. Actually, the big bankers don't change much. If you will notice, they still oppose just about every piece of worthwhile legislation for the people. But they are not at all timid about coming to Congress and asking for favors for their banks, particularly the big banks. As many of you remember, on January 6, 1932, I rose on the floor of the House of Representatives and asked that Secretary of the Treasury Mellon be impeached. I charged that he unlawfully refunded, as Secretary of the Treasury, billions of dollars in income tax payments to himself and to Mellon Companies. I also charged that he owned bank stock in violation of the Code of Laws of the United States. My resolution also contained the charge that Mellon was engaged in the manufacture and sale of distilled whiskey in violation of the law at a time when the Secretary of the Treasury was charged with the enforcement of the prohibition statutes. While we were still holding hearings on the impeachment, Mellon resigned as Secretary and President Hoover hurriedly sent him out of the country as Ambassador to Great Britain. I am convinced that the impeachment would have been upheld if Mellon had remained in the country to face the charges.

Since that struggle with Mellon and the bankers on the bonus bill, veterans' legislation has come easier. I am proud of the fact that I was the first Congressman to introduce the World War II veterans' benefit bill which became the GI bill of rights. I was also happy to author the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946 which expedited the production and allocation of material for housing purposes in the immediate postwar era. As you recall, in 1944, when we enacted the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, we provided for a program of 100 percent guaranteed home loans for war-time veterans. That act resulted in more than 6 million home loans to war-time veterans and has been a major source of financing with the growth of our housing industry.

But today there are nearly 2½ million peacetime veterans for whom no special housing terms are available, as well as some 13 million war veterans who have not used their GI housing privileges. A large proportion of these veterans still need better homes.

These represent a large segment of our younger population who have devoted part of their younger life to serving the defense of their country. And today, even peacetime service is, as we all know, vital to the maintenance of our national defense and the peace of the world.

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1964 gives special consideration to the needs of these younger people when they reenter the peacetime world to build careers and establish homes. It makes available to all veterans, except those who have already obtained GI home loans, 100 percent FHA-insured home loans on homes valued up to $15,000, with a 10-percent downpayment on the value of the home between $15,000 and $20.000, and a 15-percent downpayment on the portion of the value in excess of $20,000—up to $30,000.

This will open the way to good homes for a large number of veterans early in their peacetime life, without the need for waiting to save up substantial downpayments. It will add measurably to the volume of new housing that is built for the people's needs.

Housing, of course, is but one segment of the programs for veterans. With our increasing commitment in Vietnam, I think it is important that the Congress review the various programs and make certain that this new group of veterans is not left out in the cold.

My Texas colleague over in the Senate, RALPH YARBOROUGH, has led a commendable fight to extend the GI bill of rights to the cold war veterans. I believe this is good legislation and I hope the Congress will see fit to act favorably on it in the near future.

Veteran's legislation is good business for the entire country. First and foremost, is the fact that it does compensate the individual veteran for the years that he loses from his education and his field of work. While we have made some adjustments in pay scales, it is still a fact that most servicemen suffer a substantial financial loss while they are in the Armed Forces. This, of course, is in addition to the disruption of their lives and the obvious hazards which such service involves.

Completely aside from the individual veteran, the soldier's bonus, the GI bill of rights, the housing program, and other similar measures have meant much to the general economy. These programs have put billions of dollars into the economy at the consumers' level. The educational programs under the GI bill of rights have enriched the country greatly. Thousands of Texans have gone to college under this program. Today, these college-educated veterans' earning power has been increased many times. As a result, the additional income taxes which they pay have already more than paid for the program.

This is true of the other veterans programs. All of them are repaying the country many times over.

However, the stimulation which these programs provide the economy can be lost if we all do not keep a careful watch on other areas. I am particularly concerned about the monetary policies and their effect on the availability of money and credit. If we allow runaway interest rates, then programs such as these measures for veterans can be, in effect, wiped out or vetoed.

Of course, our monetary policies have a tremendous effect on everyone. That is why the conduct of the banking industry is of such importance to every citizen of this country.

As chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, I am deeply concerned about the slipshod manner in which so much of this industry is supervised. Frankly, I believe there is great laxity in the so-called bank supervisory agencies. I do not think these agencies are doing their job of protecting the public. I include in this, the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Comptroller of the Currency.

When I talk about the banks, I do not mean to indict every bank and every banker. I firmly support the idea that banks must make a profit in our system. I recognize that there are many, many good banks and conscientious bank executives. But these facts do not alter my concern over the domination of the banking industry by a handful of huge banks. These big banks actually work to the detriment of other financial institutions as well as the rest of the economy.

The whole country, I believe, is appalled by the revelations of infiltration of banks by criminal elements. This infiltration is extremely serious for bank depositors, stockholders, FDIC insurance, and the general public. As you know, our Domestic Finance Subcommittee investigated this area earlier this year. This included a look at the Crown Savings Bank of Newport News, Va., which was closed a year ago. Our investigation showed clearly that over $2 million of this bank's funds were used to finance and facilitate loan sharking, gambling, numbers rackets, fraudulent money order sales, and passing of forged securities. This activity was carried on all down the east coast from New York to Georgia.

This bank's situation is serious enough in itself, but such activities apparently exist in some other banks. During his appearance before our committee, Chairman K. A. Randall of the FDIC, admitted that at the present time, FDIC has 199 banks on its problem list with aggregate deposits of $1.829 billion.

I am also appalled by the apparent cooperation of many banks with loan-shark operations. In investigating the Federal Services Finance Corporation—a loan operation specializing in fast-shuffle deals with military personnel—we discovered that nearly 100 commercial banks had been providing this finance company with substantial lines of credit.

Now these things must be stopped and the Federal banking agencies simply are not doing the job. I do not accuse these officials with wrong-doing or impugn their motives. But, I do say that the decisions of these agencies invariably carry the appearance of a rubberstamp for the positions of the banks. Seldom is the public interest taken into consideration.

The Congress should move now to bring reform to the banking agencies and to include safeguards for the public. First, I think all of these agencies should come to Congress for appropriations annually. This provides an annual review of their activity—or lack of activity. Under present conditions, all three are financed outside of the public domain. The FDIC and the Comptroller of the Currency are financed by funds provided by the banks they supervise. This is like having the television networks finance the Federal Communications Commission or the airlines, the Federal Aviation Agency. This is terrible public policy and the Congress should correct this now. Every taint of banker domination should be removed from these agencies.

Now the Federal Reserve Board, of course, claims to be independent of everyone, the public, the Congress, and the President. They get their funds through interest from Government bonds they hold. They are not audited by any Government agency and they do not have to come to Congress for a dime.

Just how bad this situation has become is plainly illustrated by some recent hearings by the Banking and Currency Committee. The committee had been holding hearings on H.R. 7601, providing for cancellation of $30 billion of U.S. bonds held by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York for the Federal Open Market Committee. The total open market portfolio is now $38.5 billion, on which the taxpayers are required to pay almost $1.5 billion a year in interest.

In his testimony at the hearing, William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, admitted that the Federal Reserve had paid for these bonds once with the money and credit of the United States and that they would have to be paid again when due. This is similar to a situation where a houseowner paid off his mortgage and was then required to continue paying interest on it, and then pay it off again when the maturity date comes around. It would be illegal and absurd in the case of an individual, but that is exactly what the Government is required to do under our present banking structure.

William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve, is openly defiant about his ability to ignore public policy. He recently told me in a Joint Economic Committee hearing that "the Federal Reserve Board has the authority to act independently of the President" even "despite the President."

Of course, the problem of the Federal Reserve System is of much greater magnitude than the other two agencies. The Federal Reserve, through its Open Market Committee determines the Nation's supply of money and the interest rates. It has, in effect, near life and death control over economic policy.

In recent months, the Federal Reserve Board, led by its Chairman, has been tightening up on the supply of money, and forcing interest rates up.

The Federal Reserve Board's efforts to reconstruct their tight money line flies in the face of repeated statements by this administration in favor of plentiful credit at reasonable interest. Mr. Martin chooses to ignore these policies.

Once again, we have a prime example of the folly of allowing our monetary policy to be controlled largely by the bankers in disregard of a public policy as enunciated by the President and the Congress.

Through the years, tight money and rising interest rates have cost the American consumer billions of dollars. Tight money and high interest rates serve no useful public purpose. They have been a serious drag on the growth of the country, an out-and-out waste.

For an 11-year period from 1953 to 1963 inclusive, rising interest rates imposed an excess interest cost of $15.7 billion upon the Federal budget; $2.3 billion upon States and localities; and $32.1 billion upon all private borrowers. And the figures keep on growing.

Tight money hurts every housewife who buys a washing machine, every farmer who buys a tractor, every homeowner. Every taxpayer has paid his share of the rising interest costs on the national debt.

So long as the Federal Reserve System remains under banker domination and beyond the reach of executive and legislative control, our welfare is imperiled. In my view, the most important economic and governmental problem facing the Nation today is the need for immediate rehabilitation of the Federal Reserve System, so that it is again subject to the will of the people, acting through their elected representatives.

If the big bankers are able to have their way they will continue to encourage monetary policies that will produce larger and larger public debt and higher and higher interest rates. If they have their way, our national debt will be $600 billion in 15 years, which, at a 6-percent rate of interest, will cost the taxpayers $36 billion a year. This would mean that so much of Federal revenues would be required for debt-carrying charges that insufficient funds, if any at all, would be available for veteran's programs, social welfare, housing, community health, and the many other services needed by our people.

Monetary policy is the public's business and it should not be controlled absolutely by a handful of bureaucrats operating independently of everyone but the big bankers.

You veterans of World War I got a real sampling of the bankers' attitudes when they opposed payment of your Adjusted Service Certificates. You won that fight over great odds.

Now, today, I would like to call on you to lead another fight to gain a permanent reform of our monetary system so that it is responsive to the will and the needs of the people. If we do not gain this reform, then many of our past victories in behalf of the American veteran will be wasted.

Tribute to the Late Oscar A. Eklund, of the Veterans' Administration, a Native of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1965

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Oscar A. Eklund, a native of Wisconsin, who served his country in our Armed Forces and later in the construction of veterans hospitals, is being buried today in Arlington Cemetery.

When Oscar Eklund died on October 12, the Government of these United States, and the Veterans' Administration in particular, lost a most capable and respected man. Mr. Eklund was well liked by all with whom he came in contact and I doubt if he had an enemy in the world. He was firm but fair in his dealings with contractors and insisted that the Government receive a workmanlike job on the Veterans' Administration hospital construction projects he supervised. His loss will be keenly felt by the Veterans' Administration Office of Construction, as well as by his many personal friends. Among those who will miss him are his pets, and the racoons, birds, and other wildlife he used to feed around his house in nearby Maryland.

Mr. Eklund was extremely fond of fishing. He was incapacitated by a heart attack about 10 weeks ago and after 4 weeks in the hospital seemed to be making a satisfactory recovery and was anxious to return to work. However, his physician thought that he should wait a little longer before assuming the heavy responsibilities of his position, in which he supervised the construction of half of the new veterans hospitals being constructed throughout the country. Mr. Eklund went to Nags Head, N.C., to indulge in his favorite sport and, apparently, dropped dead while fishing on a causeway over the water near Nags Head.

Mr. Eklund was born in Tomahawk, Wis., March 8, 1899. He graduated from the public schools there and then attended the University of Wisconsin Engineering School. He served as an enlisted man with the Infantry during World War I and received an honorable discharge December 15, 1918. From then until 1922, he was associated with his father in the family business of general contracting. He served as construction foreman and superintendent for Seims Helmars & Schaffner, general contractors for St. Paul, Minn., on heavy construction work of dams and powerhouses in the Wisconsin-Minnesota area.

In 1926, he moved to Washington, D.C., and was a construction foreman for various general contractors erecting office buildings and other large structures. He accepted the position of general superintendent for the Sears Roebuck Home Construction Division, remaining there until 1932, when he entered into partnership with James Doyle. The firm of Doyle & Eklund handled all types of building construction, conducted a real estate department, engaged in rental and financing of property. In 1942, he entered the U.S. Government as project engineer and contracting officer with the Federal Public Housing Authority. During this period, he was responsible for the construction of housing projects in Quantico, Va.; Middle River, Md.; Beltsville, Md.; Oceanside, Calif.; and Fallbrook, Calif.

On January 8, 1946, he transferred to the Veterans' Administration where he conducted studies for the acquisition of real estate properties to serve as sites for Veterans' Administration hospitals, regional offices, and so forth. In May 1950, Mr. Eklund was assigned to the construction service of the Veterans' Administration where he served as personal liaison between central office and the various projects in the field. In this capacity, he was responsible for aiding and guiding the resident engineers in the construction of projects totaling $25 million.

From April of 1954 to the end of 1956, he served as the engineer member of the Veterans' Administration Contract Appeals Board, which acts on appeals from contractors arising out of their contracts for the construction of Veterans' Administration hospitals.

In early 1957, he transferred to construction service, where he served as chief of one of the two project management divisions until his death. In this capacity, he was responsible for the management of construction contracts which, at times, totaled approximately $100 million.

Fittingly enough, the largest of the construction projects of which Mr. Eklund had overall charge was the new

1,264-bed Veterans' Administration hospital at Wood, in his and my own State of Wisconsin. This magnificent and completely air conditioned new hospital costing over $28 million, was virtually complete at the time of Mr. Eklund's death. Typical of other large projects constructed under Mr. Eklund's general supervision are the 800-bed, $15 million Veterans' Administration hospital at Cleveland, Ohio, which was completed a year or so ago, and the 480-bed, $10 million Veterans' Administration hospital now under construction at Gainesville, Fla.

Mr. Eklund was highly regarded by all in the Veterans' Administration office of construction and successfully completed many difficult assignments. It will be a long time before anyone else can amass the experience and develop the ability which Mr. Eklund had. Truly, our Nation has lost one of her most capable and dedicated public servants.

Remarks on Dedicating the John F. Kennedy School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1965

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be the main speaker at the formal dedication exercises of the newly constructed John F. Kennedy School in Canton, Mass.

I wish to include here my remarks on that occasion, as well as a copy of the program.

Special mention should be made of Mrs. Virginia Chase Earle, resident of Sharon, Mass., who so beautifully executed the portrait of our late and beloved President, John F. Kennedy, which was unveiled at the dedication.

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE JAMES A. BURKE ON DEDICATING THE JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL

Today you of the forward looking community of Canton have done me the great honor of asking me to participate in the dedication of a living monument to the memory of a great American and a great President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Yes, I say a living monument, because that is really what this fine new school, the John F. Kennedy School, is. For, by honoring this educational institution with his name, the John F. Kennedy School becomes a true and living tribute to a man who valued, perhaps above all, the spirit of learning and the hope of education.

In fact, of all the moving things we might say about education in dedicating the John F. Kennedy School this afternoon, probably none could be more meaningful than those said on the subject of learning by John Kennedy himself. For, his words, as well as his ideas, about education were deeply eloquent.

At this time I think it is particularly appropriate to share some of his thoughts about learning with you. In his education message to Congress in 1963 he said, and I quote:

"Education is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress. Nothing has contributed more to the enlargement of this Nation's strength and opportunities than our traditional system of free, universal elementary and secondary education, coupled with widespread availability of college education."

In the years since these words were spoken, we in the Congress as all Americans, have continued to be inspired by President Kennedy's deep commitment to education. And we, as you in Canton who built this new elementary school, have been stimulated to work hard to strengthen and improve American learning.

Our efforts on behalf of the education of America's children and youth may not at first seem as concrete and immediate as the building of this impressive school before us. But, I think that if you look with me just a little further at what we in your National Government have done recently, you will see that these accomplishments also promise to do a great deal for American education and to help schools like the John F. Kennedy School all over the country.

What I am talking about is the major achievement your Congress won this year when it passed a massive new program to help American elementary and secondary learning, the well-publicized Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

This well-thought out and carefully planned education legislation is something that John Kennedy would have been proud of. I know that we in Congress who passed it, certainly are; for, it promises to strengthen our elementary and secondary education in a number of critical areas of educational concern today.

Consider, for instance, the approximate $1 billion that is to go for the first year of operation for the education of the children of our poor. As you all know, we are working very hard at the national level to find ways to help our disadvantaged youth to break the desperate cycle of poverty and deprivation in which so many of them seem so hopelessly caught, as their fathers before them have been. We think that education is one of the key answers to breaking this cycle. So it is, that we have granted these generous funds to help school districts all over the country give educationally underprivileged pupils the special education and educational services they need if they are to truly conquer their serious socioeconomic and cultural barriers to learning.

It may interest you to know that Massachusetts alone is due to receive approximately $16,705,086 for this purpose for the first year of the program's operation. There is no doubt that these funds will help our heavily burdened local school districts to give our State's disadvantaged pupils the extra help they need to become successes in life.

The education of more advantaged students, such as probably many of the fortunate children who will go to John F. Kennedy School, will also benefit substantially from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. For other parts of the act grant funds to improve the educational quality in all schools, regardless to the economic level of their students.

Money will be given to help grade schools and high schools improve their schools' library resources and to acquire textbooks and other instructional materials. This means, for instance, that your children in John F. Kennedy School may have more up-to-date textbooks, fine audiovisual equipment, or have access to an enriched school library in coming years.

Then funds are to be given to help schools establish supplementary educational centers and services such as special instruction in the arts and sciences and in advanced academic courses, guidance and counseling services, remedial instruction, and other such things—all of which are found in our very best schools. This might mean that at John F. Kennedy School your children will benefit from an expanded guidance program or others of these services—and thereby have richer educational opportunities than they might otherwise.

Finally, generous support is granted in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to further educational research in America and to strengthen our State departments of education so they can improve their services to our local schools. Both these sources of help will mean that America's boys and girls will have available to them an increasingly higher quality education.

I think now, that even with this brief description, you can see how your Federal Government is working hand in hand with local and State agencies to bolster American education. Your hard work has resulted in the building of an excellent new learning laboratory—the John F. Kennedy School. And our work, we hope, has resulted in an educational aid program and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, that will help make the education that your children receive at this school—and in schools all over the country—the best that our great Nation has to offer.

In closing, I would urge that you continue your magnificent and energetic efforts on behalf of education in Canton, because this beautiful structure does represent the concern of the citizens of Canton and its civil officials for the mental and physical development of our youth as well as the sacrifice, labor, and love parents devoted to the welfare of their children. For as much support as we, your Federal Government, may give, we never lose sight of the fact that the heart of the progress of American education rests with you in local communities all over the country. With your spirit of dedication to fostering learning in your community there will be no doubt that the John F. Kennedy School will grow into the excellent elementary school for which it has the potential.

Then will the inspiration of John F. Kennedy be fulfilled, and generations of your children will meet the world as the wisely intelligent and well-educated citizens that we would have wanted—and we all earnestly desire them to be.

DEDICATION EXERCISES OF THE JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL, AT CANTON, MASS., SUNDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1965

("For God and for Country")

THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS WHO HAVE CONTRIBUTED EFFORT, TALENT, AND UNLIMITED TIME IN MAKING THIS SCHOOL A REALITY

Frederick J. McCabe, chairman; William H. Galvin, secretary; Charles T. Brooks, William A. Flanagan, Daniel T. Galvin, Duncan J. Gillis, Jr., Robert P. Holland, Edward J. Lynch, M. Ruth Ruane, Leo J. Thornton, MacLaren H. MacGregor, John F. Morgan, Leonard P. Graham, Frank Davenport.

THE BOARD OF SELECTMEN

William A. Flanagan, chairman; Harold J. Fitzgerald, secretary; Leonard P. Graham, member.

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE

Daniel T. Galvin, chairman; Margaret Brayton, Ph. D., secretary; Albert D'Attanasio, Thomas J. Lane, Edward J. Lynch, William H. Kelleher, John F. Morgan, Leonard F. O'Brien, M. Ruth Ruane.

PERMANENT SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE, CANTON, MASS.

William H. Galvin, Daniel T. Galvin, M. Ruth Ruane, Frederick J. McCabe, William A. Flanagan.

Edward J. Lynch, Walter R. Hearn, Ake Goransson, Leo J. Thornton, Charles T. Brooks, Duncan J. Gillis, Jr.

Due to unavoidable absence the picture of vice chairman Robert P. Holland is not shown.

PRESENTATION BY THE PERMANENT SCHOOL BUILDING COMMITTEE OF THE JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL TO THE TOWN OF CANTON, OCTOBER 17, 1965

Bandology: Ostering; the Canton bands, John J. Judge, leader.

Greetings: Frederick J. McCabe.

Unfurling the Stars and Stripes: Color Guards, American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars; Cmdr. Gus Brown and Cmdr. Ralph O'Neill, Alan Powell, C.H.S., 1966; Noel Bosanquet, C.H.S., 1966.

Invocation: Rev. William A. Morgan, St. John's Church.

Address: Hon. William A. Flanagn, chairman, board of selectmen.

Carnival for Trumpets: Kin yon.

Introduction of invited and distinguished guests.

Finale from water music: Handel.

Prayer for the Nation: Rabbi Howard K. Kummer, Temple Beth Abraham.

Introduction: Members of the school building and school committees.

Address: Daniel T. Galvin, chairman, school committee.

Patriotic fantasy: Cohan.

Prayer for children: Rev. Douglas M. MacIntosh, United Church of Christ.

Oration: Congressman JAMES A. BURKE.

Unveiling: Portrait of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, painted by Virginia Chase Earle of Sharon.

New Colonial: Hall.

Announcements.

Benediction: Rev. Thomas Eifert, St. James Lutheran Church.

Chester: Billings, Charles T. Brooks, presiding.

Color Guards: Edward J. Beatty Post 24 American Legion, Canton Post 3163 Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Music: Canton High School Band—Canton American Legion Band (footnote to American History) William Billings, author of the music to which the Continental troops marched and sang in the American War for Independence was a native of our town and is recognized as the first American composer. The signer, Roger Sherman; the artisan, Revere; the engineer, Gridley; and the tunesmith, Billings—Canton citizens who played a significant role in the birth of our Nation.

Refreshments: Mrs. Marie Holland, dietitian, the cafeteria ladies and the parent teachers association.

THE FACULTY

Alice Lindner, room 1, special class.
Joan Sullivan, room 2, special class.
Cynthia Cornish, room 3, grade 1.
Virginia McGagh, room 4, grade 1.
Ann Resca, room 5, grade 2.
Marie Reilly, room 6, grade 1.
Helen Martis, room 7, grade 2.
Lorraine Reneghan, room 8, grade 2.
Marilyn Scipione, room 9, grade 3.
Patricia Neumann, room 10, grade 3.
Marion Feeney, room 11, grade 3.
Ann O'Malley, room 12, grade 4.
Marjorie Bennett, room 13, grade 4.
Elaine Patsos, room 14, grade 4.
James Lynch, room 16, grade 5.
Jean Sturdy, room 17, grade 5.
Paul Merchant, room 18, grade 5.
Ann Cameron, room 19, grade 5.
Ann Turnbull, room 20, grade 5.
Brenda Herman, room 21, grade 6.
John Coakley, room 22, grade 6.
Edwina Cahill, room 23, grade 6.
Joan Biberthaler, room 24, grade 6.
Marilyn Pinkham, room 25, grade 6.

HEALTH OFFICE

Nelson D. Batchelder, M.D., Mildred M. Gillis, R.N.

THE INDIVIDUALS WHO PLANNED AND BUILT THE SCHOOL

Architects: Thomas F. McDonough, F.A.I.A. (Deceased). Ake G. Goransson, A.I.A. associate of Kilham, Hopkins, Greeley and Brodie.

General Contractor: James S. Kelliher, Inc. of Qunicy.

Clerk of the work: Walter R. Hearn of Randolph.

Description

The first floor area is 34,670 square feet and the second floor is 21,075 square feet for a total area of 55,745 square feet.

Construction

Concrete foundations, concrete first floor on compacted gravel. Outside walls are 12-inch-thick masonry; 4-inch face brick or limestone facing and 8-inch thick cinderblock walls. Inside partitions are made of cinderblocks. Glazed structural facing tiles are used in all corridors, stair halls, toilets, kitchen areas. The second floor is concrete beams and slab construction. Walls on the second floor are similar to first-floor walls. Roofs are constructed of steel joists and light-weight concrete over metal roof decking. Roofs are covered with built-up roofing with pitch to roof drains.

Floors in general are asphalt tile in corridors and classrooms, terrazzo in all toilet areas, and wood in activities rooms and cafetorium platform. Walls are painted cinderblocks or exposed glazed structural facing tiles in classrooms and corridors and wood finish in lobby, activities room walls have a padded dado. Cafetorium has 15 folding in-wall tables and benches. Ceilings in general are made of acoustical plaster on metal lath or hard smooth plaster in storage areas, kitchen areas. The ceiling in the activities room is exposed steel joints.

A typical classroom has a 32-foot-long by 4-foot-high chalkboard, about 15-foot-long tackboard, 11-foot-long counter with sink, 16-foot to 23-foot cupboard space along windows, freestanding teachers' storage and closet and one L-shaped wardrobe unit.

All equipment in kitchen is stainless steel.

Building is heated by hot water radiators, unit heaters, unit ventilators and convectors. Boilers are oil fired. Complete air exchanges are provided as required by the department of public safety. Electric light in general is by fluorescent type lighting fixtures. Fire alarm, sound system and TV systems are provided.

Large outside paved play areas and parking areas are provided. One little league size and one Babe Ruth size baseball field, two enclosed tennis courts and two outside practice basketball courts are included.

First floor contains

Nine regular classrooms, two special classrooms, kitchen area, cafetorium—cafeteria-auditorium—auditorium platform, administration area—health, principal, general office—conference room, library areas, activities room, teachers' room, boiler room electric room, lobby, coat room, corridors, stairhalls, storage rooms, custodians service areas, covered canopies, toilet facilities.

Second floor contains

Thirteen regular classrooms, one remedial reading classroom, toilet facilities, storage areas, custodian service areas, corridors, stairhalls, and so forth.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

In the name of Canton, the permanent school building committee expresses its sincere appreciation to all who have so generously aided it in accomplishing its work.

FREDERICK J. MCCABE,
Chairman.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1965

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of all men, we bow in this hallowed Chamber with a sense of solemn gladness, that so much has been given to us.

We stand within these walls in the remembrance of lives greatly lived whose record is our heritage.

Sensitize our hearts, we pray, in deepened gratitude, as we think of those who here strove for truth, and when they found it, spoke it without fear or favor, for those who could not see evil without crying out against it; for those who in their own hearts felt the pain of injustice done to others; for all those who condemned oppression and fought for liberty.

In the midst of today's continuing struggle, between the true and the false, between love and hatred, grant us by Thy grace new fortitude and reinforcement for the times in which we live until by patience, persistence, and enduring courage we become sufficient for the tasks committed to our hands, until at last we finish our course, having kept the faith.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, October 18, 1965, was dispensed with.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of October 18, 1965,

The following reports of committees were submitted on October 18, 1965:

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment:

H.R. 11135. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended (Rept. No. 909).

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with amendments:

H.R. 10281. An act to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 910).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10369) to give the consent of Congress to the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont to enter into a compact providing for bus taxation proration and reciprocity.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9047) to authorize the release of certain quantities of zinc from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Rivers of South Carolina, Mr. Philbin, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Arends, and Mr. Gubser were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10305) to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 124,200,000 pounds of nickel from the national stockpile; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Rivers of South Carolina, Mr. Philbin, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Arends, and Mr. Gubser were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 11539. An act to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane; and

H.J. Res. 571. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning October 25, 1965, as National Parkinson Week.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 11539) to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 862, and the following measures in sequence.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first bill.

BIBI DALJEET KAUR

The bill (H.R. 3905) for the relief of Bibi Daljeet Kaur was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 875), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the admission into the United States in a nonquota status of the alien child adopted by citizens of the United States.

DIOSDADO F. ALMAZAN

The bill (H.R. 5006) for the relief of Diosdado F. Almazan was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 876), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to provide for restoration of U.S. citizenship in behalf of Diosdado F. Almazan.

PIETER CORNELIS METZELAAR

The bill (H.R. 6655) for the relief of Pieter Cornelis Metzelaar was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 877), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable Pieter Cornelis Metzelaar to file a petition for naturalization notwithstanding the fact that the continuity of his residence was broken.

RICHARD D. WALSH

The bill (H.R. 7282) for the relief of Richard D. Walsh was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 878), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve Mr. Richard D. Walsh of all liability to the United States in the amount of $137.10, representing the amount of an allotment which was paid on his behalf for the month of November 1961, while he was on active duty in the Army, for which no corresponding deduction was made from his pay. The bill provides for a refund of amounts repaid or withheld because of liability.

PING-KWAN FONG

The bill (H.R. 6720) for the relief of Ping-Kwan Fong was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 879), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence to Ping-Kwan Fong as of September 24, 1947, the date on which he entered as a nonimmigrant. The bill does not provide for the deduction of a quota number or for the payment of the visa fee, inasmuch as the beneficiary has been lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

DR. FELIPE V. LAVAPIES

The bill (H.R. 7357) for the relief of Dr. Felipe V. Lavapies was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 880), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Dr. Felipe V. Lavapies. The bill provides for an appropriate quota deduction and for the payment of the required visa fee. The bill would further permit the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

JENNIFER REBECCA SIEGEL

The bill (H.R. 8135) for the relief of Jennifer Rebecca Siegel was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 881), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the admission to the United States in a nonquota status of the alien child adopted by citizens of the United States.

MARGARET ELIZABETH AND FREDERICK HENRY TODD

The bill (H.R. 7453) for the relief of Margaret Elizabeth and Frederick Henry Todd was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 882), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable Margaret Elizabeth and Frederick Henry Todd to file petitions for naturalization.

JAMES D. W. BLYTH AND OTHERS

The bill (H.R. 10256) for the relief of James D. W. Blyth, his wife, and daughter was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 883), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to provide that James D. W. Blyth, his wife, Jean Mary Blyth, and their daughter, Penelope Jean Blyth, may file petitions for naturalization.

RALPH S. DeSOCIO, JR.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 2571) for the relief of Ralph S. DeSocio, Jr. which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 8, after the word "amounts", to insert "to be".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 884), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay Ralph S. DeSocio, Jr., of Pine City, N.Y., $1,500 in full settlement of his claims for reimbursement of the amounts paid in settlement of judgments secured against him in a State court as the result of a motor vehicle collision between a privately owned vehicle and a U.S. post office truck operated by him. Payment would be made under the provisions of the bill on condition that the amount received would be paid in full satisfaction of the judgments referred to in the bill.

MRS. ELENI BACOLA CIACCO

The bill (H.R. 3079) for the relief of Mrs. Eleni Bacola Ciacco, M.D., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 885), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Mrs. Eleni Bacola Ciacco, M.D., as of December 19, 1957, the date on which she entered the United States in a nonimmigrant status. The bill does not provide for the deduction of a quota number or for the payment of a visa fee inasmuch as the beneficiary has been lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

MRS. LILY NING SHEEHAN

The bill (H.R. 2906) for the relief of Mrs. Lily Ning Sheehan was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 886), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to preserve nonquota status in behalf of the widow of a citizen of the United States.

MANLIO MASSIMILIANI

The bill (H.R. 2762) for the relief of Manlio Massimiliani was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 887), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to provide for restoration of U.S. citizenship to Manlio Massimiliani, a former U.S. citizen who expatriated himself by voting in a foreign political election.

MAXIE L. RUPERT

The bill (H.R. 2578) for the relief of Maxie L. Rupert was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 888), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve Maxie L. Rupert, of Battle Creek, Mich., of all liability to the United States in the amount of $1,344, the amount of overpayment of salary between December 10, 1962, and June 23, 1963, resulting from a promotion in violation of section 1310(c) of the act of November 1, 1951 (5 U.S.C. 43 note), which occurred when an appropriate waiver of time and grade limitation was not made when he took a new position in connection with a move from Dayton, Ohio, to Battle Creek, Mich.

The bill also authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Maxie L. Rupert an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of his liability to the United States.

MRS. MARIA EDUVIGIS ARAN HEFFERNAN

The bill (H.R. 1393) for the relief of Mrs. Maria Eduvigis Aran Heffernan was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 889), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to preserve nonquota status in behalf of the widow of a U.S. citizen, to which status she would be entitled were it not for the death of her U.S. citizen husband.

MARIO MENNA

The bill (H.R. 6312) for the relief of Mario Menna was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 890), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable Mario Menna to qualify for nonquota status under the provisions of section 1 of the act of October 24, 1962.

TERM OF FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT AT CLINTON, N.C.

The bill (H.R. 1781) to amend section 113(a) of title 28, U.S.C., to provide that Federal district court for the eastern district of North Carolina shall be held at Clinton was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 891), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to provide that the U.S. district court is authorized to hold a term of court at Clinton in the eastern district of North Carolina. Accordingly, it amends paragraph 2 of section 113(a), title 28, United States Code.

STATEMENT

The Judicial Conference of the United States recommends enactment of this legislation. The judicial council of the fourth circuit has recommended favorable consideration of this proposal. The Department of Justice defers to the views of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

At the present time the court for the eastern district of North Carolina is held at Elizabeth City, Fayetteville, New Bern, Raleigh, Washington, Wilmington, and Wilson.

Clinton is the county seat of Sampson County—the largest inland area of the 100 counties of North Carolina. It is approximately 70 miles long and 35 miles wide.

The committee has been informed that the county courthouse at Clinton will be made available at no cost to the Federal Government for approximately 37 weeks a year. This will include all facilities such as a law library and courtroom facilities. The chief judge of the eastern district of North Carolina resides in Clinton and the United States provides him with office facilities there. Moreover, it is his official duty station. In addition, the Clinton jail is one approved for the detention of Federal prisoners. Clinton is part of the Fayetteville division, which division has a substantial amount of work, but there are no Federal court facilities located in that division. The Federal court has been sitting in the State courthouse at Fayetteville, but that facility is only available for approximately 2 weeks out of the year which is insufficient time to take care of the workload.

The designation of Clinton as a place for holding court will entail no expenses whatever upon the Federal Government.

The Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives finds that the designation of Clinton as a place of holding court will facilitate the hearing and disposition of cases and will be of convenience not only to the court, its officials, but also to counsel and litigants, in that there will be a reduction in travel and per diem allowances.

After a review of all of the foregoing and the attached recommendations, the committee is in agreement with the action of the House of Representatives and recommends that the bill, H.R. 1781, be considered favorably.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 3349) for the relief of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

CRAIG COUNTERCURRENT DISTRIBUTION APPARATUS FOR COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

The bill (H.R. 9587) to provide for the free entry of a Craig countercurrent distribution apparatus for the use of Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 894), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 9587 is to allow Colorado State University to import free of duty a scientific instrument for its own use.

GENERAL STATEMENT

H.R. 9587 would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty a Craig countercurrent distribution apparatus (and its accompanying parts and equipment) for the use of Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo.

The apparatus covered by the bill is a research type of chemical extraction apparatus used in endocrine research. It was entered for consumption at customs port of Denver, Colo., February 1963, under consumption entry No. 1136.

Your committee is advised that no comparable machine made in the United States is available. The Department of Commerce has stated with respect to this bill:

"It is our understanding that the Craig countercurrent distribution instrument is a research type of chemical extraction apparatus to be used in endocrine research by the Colorado State University. The Department also understands that the Craig instrument has certain characteristics which are not present in other types of chemical extraction apparatus and which are essential to the research purposes of the university.

"As a result of our investigation, this Department is of the opinion that at the time Colorado State University determined its requirements and specifications for the Craig type of extraction apparatus no instrument of equivalent scientific value was available from domestic sources."

In the circumstances the Committee on Finance, like the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature, and recommends its enactment.

ELECTRICALLY DRIVEN ROTATING CHAIR FOR LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER

The bill (H.R. 9588) to provide for the free entry of an electrically driven rotating chair for the use of the Louisiana State University Medical Center, New Orleans, La., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 895), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 9588 is to allow the Louisiana State University Medical Center to import free of duty a scientific instrument for its own use.

GENERAL STATEMENT

H.R. 9588 as reported would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty an electrically driven rotating chair (and its accompanying control unit and other equipment) for the use of the Louisiana State University Medical Center, New Orleans, La., and provides for the reliquidation of the customs entry and appropriate refund of duty in the event that liquidation of the entry has become final and duty paid.

The chair covered by the bill is known in the trade as "the Stille rotating chair RS-3." Your committee is informed that it is used for clinical practice, laboratory research, and for vestibular examination.

Your committee is advised that no comparable article produced in the United States is available. The Department of Commerce has stated with respect to this bill:

"The Department is advised that the rotating chair required by the medical center is a highly specialized piece of equipment used in medical research and diagnosis with respect to lesions of the inner ear and to disturbances of the sense of equilibrium. We are further advised that it is essential to the medical center's purposes that the chair meet certain technical requirements. These requirements include electric drive, rapid switching from a chosen acceleration value (positive or negative) to exact zero acceleration at a constant angular velocity, rapid and smooth-braking action, and distortion-free transmission of electrical signals from the revolving chair to measuring or recording instruments.

"It is the understanding of this Department that at the time the Louisiana State Medical Center decided to purchase such equipment, the medical center invited seven domestic hospital supply firms to submit bids on the required equipment. All seven of these firms failed to submit bids. A. B. Stille-Werner, of Stockholm, Sweden, was the only manufacturer willing to offer an electrically driven rotating chair meeting the required technical specifications.

"As a result of our investigation, this Department is of the opinion that at the time the medical center determined its requirements for an electrically driven rotating chair, no equipment of equivalent scientific value was available from domestic sources of this equipment."

In the circumstances, the Committee on Finance, like the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature, and recommends its enactment.

MASS SPECTROMETER FOR USE OF STANFORD UNIVERSITY

The bill (H.R. 1317) to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer which was imported during May 1963, for the use of Stanford University, Stanford, Calif., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 896), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 1317 is to allow Stanford University, Stanford, Calif., to import free of duty a scientific instrument for its own use.

GENERAL STATEMENT

H.R. 1317 would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty a mass spectrometer for the use of Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.

A mass spectrometer is a device used by chemists and chemical engineers to provide chemical analyses, measurements, and other research features. They are ordinarily built to specifications to meet particular requirements of the user. In the use of a mass spectrometer, the material to be studied is subjected to an ionizing process after which the ions formed are physically separated according to mass by electromagnetic means so that a mass spectrum is produced.

The instrument covered by the bill was entered at San Francisco, Calif., in May 1963, under Consumption Entry No. 3970.

Your committee is advised that no comparable instrument made in the United States is available. The Department of Commerce has stated with respect to this bill:

"After careful investigation, the Department feels that at the time Stanford University determined its requirements and specifications for a mass spectrometer, no instrument of equivalent scientific value was available from domestic producers. This instrument is a CH-4 mass spectrometer manufactured by Atlas-Werke, Bremen, West Germany. It is understood that Stanford University requested bids from the four possible domestic sources for mass spectrometers. Only one domestic manufacturer offered an instrument and it was admittedly inferior to the Atlas CH-4 with respect to resolution."

In the circumstances, the Committee on Finance, like the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature and recommends its enactment.

MASS SPECTROMETER FOR POMONA COLLEGE

The bill (H.R. 1386) to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Pomona College was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 897), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 1386 is to allow Pomona College, Claremont, Calif., to import free of duty a scientific instrument for its own use.

GENERAL STATEMENT

H.R. 1386 would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty a mass spectrometer for the use of Pomona College, Claremont, Calif.

A mass spectrometer is a device used by chemists and chemical engineers to provide chemical analyses, measurements, and other research features. They are ordinarily built to specifications to meet particular requirements of the user. In the use of a mass spectrometer, the material to be studied is subjected to an ionizing process after which the ions formed are physically separated according to mass by electromagnetic means so that a mass spectrum is produced.

The instrument covered by the bill was entered at Los Angeles, Calif., in January 1965 under consumption entry No. 246066.

Your committee is advised that no comparable instrument made in the United States is available. The Department of Commerce has stated with respect to this bill:

"After careful investigation, the Department is of the opinion that at the time Pomona College determined its requirements and specifications for a mass spectrometer, no instrument of equivalent scientific value was available from domestic producers of this instrument.

"The imported instrument is superior to domestically produced mass spectrometers in capacity, resolution, and versatility. It will permit the study of molecules of greater molecular weight with a higher degree of identification, and it will allow conversion to different fields of investigation without additional instrumentation."

In the circumstances, the Committee on Finance, like the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature and recommends its enactment.

MASS SPECTROMETER FOR UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The bill (H.R. 2565) to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of the University of Chicago was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 898), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 2565 is to allow the University of Chicago to import free of duty a scientific instrument for its own use.

GENERAL STATEMENT

H.R. 2565 would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty a mass spectrometer for the use of the University of Chicago.

A mass spectrometer is a device used by chemists and chemical engineers to provide chemical analyses measurements and other research features. They are ordinarily built to specifications to meet particular requirements of the user. In the use of a mass spectrometer, the material to be studied is subjected to an ionizing process after which the ions are formed are physically separated according to mass by electromagnetic means so that a mass spectrum is produced.

Your committee is advised that no comparable instrument made in the United States is available. The Department of Commerce has stated with respect to this bill:

"After careful investigation, the Department is of the opinion that at the time the University of Chicago determined its requirements and specifications for a mass spectrometer, no instrument of equivalent scientific value was available from domestic producers of this instrument.

"The University of Chicago requires an instrument that is uniquely suited to both chemical research and the training of graduate students in chemistry. The imported instrument selected by the university has certain significant features that are not obtainable in domestically manufactured mass spectrometers. These features include: electrical measurement of mass by comparing voltages necessary to focus 2 ion beams; electrical measurement of mass with a precision of less than 1 part in 100,000 and with an accuracy of at least 5 parts in 1 million; and provisions for instantaneous observations of the spectrum on an oscilloscope."

In the circumstances, the Committee on Finance, like the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature and recommends its enactment.

MASS SPECTROMETER FOR UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

The bill (H.R. 3126) to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the University of Washington was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 899), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 3126 is to allow the University of Washington to import free of duty a scientific instrument for its own use.

GENERAL STATEMENT

H.R. 3126 would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty a mass spectrometer for the use of the University of Washington.

A mass spectrometer is a device used by chemists and chemical engineers to provide chemical analyses, measurements, and other research features. They are ordinarily built to specifications to meet particular requirements of the user. In the use of a mass spectrometer, the material to be studied is subjected to an ionizing process after which the ions formed are physically separated according to mass by electromagnetic means so that a mass spectrum is produced.

Your committee is advised that no comparable instrument made in the United States is available. The Department of Commerce has stated with respect to this bill:

"After careful consideration, the Department is of the opinion that at the time the University of Washington determined its requirements and specifications for a mass spectrometer, no instrument of equivalent scientific value was available from domestic producers of this instrument.

"The University of Washington requires a mass spectrometer for conducting basic research in environmental health under varying working conditions. Of the two domestic manufacturers of this instrument, only one manufacturer's instrument was considered suitable for the required research. A comparison between the domestic instrument and the imported instrument selected by the university indicates that the imported instrument is superior with respect to resolution, scanning speed, sensitivity, and focusing. These four characteristics are essential to conducting research in environmental health."

In the circumstances, the Committee on Finance, like the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature and recommends its enactment.

SCIENTIFIC INSTRUMENTS FOR CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 9903) to provide for the free entry of one multigap magnetic spectograph for the use of Yale University which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one multigap magnetic spectograph and one MS-9 mass spectrometer (including in each case all accompanying equipment, parts, accessories, and appurtenances) for the use of Yale University.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one digital polarimeter for the use of Smith College.

(c) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one photomicroscope (including all accompanying equipment, parts, accessories, and appurtenances) for the use of the Utah State Training School.

(d) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one Weissenberg rheogoniometer for the use of the Catholic University of America.

Sec. 2. If the liquidation of the entry of any article described in the first section of this Act has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to provide for the free entry of certain scientific instruments for the use of certain universities."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 900), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF HOUSE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 9903, as passed by the House, is to allow Yale University to import free of duty a scientific instrument for its own use.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The Committee on Finance amended the House bill to provide for free importation of one MS-9 mass spectrometer for the use of Yale University, one digital polarimeter for the use of Smith College, one photomicroscope for the use of the Utah State Training School, American Fork, Utah, and one Weissenberg rheogoniometer for the use of the Catholic University of America.

GENERAL EXPLANATION OF HOUSE BILL

H.R. 9903 would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty a multigap magnetic spectograph for the use of Yale University.

Your committee is advised that no comparable instrument made in the United States is available. The Department of Commerce has stated with respect to this bill.

"The Department is of the opinion that at the time Yale University determined its requirements and specifications for a spectrograph, no instrument of equivalent scientific value was available from domestic manufacturers.

"The multigap magnetic spectrograph is a highly specialized, device for use in atomic energy research. The instrument must be made to order according to performance specifications, which are determined by the needs of the particular purpose for which the device is to be used.

"It is the understanding of this Department that the Nuclear Structure Laboratory at Yale University invited bids from seven domestic manufacturers, none of whom responded with an offer to construct the instrument. Only two authentic bids were received from abroad."

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the third reading and passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], I offer an amendment, which has been approved by the Committee on Finance, which reported the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, after line 15, insert the following new subsection:

> (e) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one double focusing mass spectrometer (including all accompanying equipment, parts, accessories, and appurtenances) for the use of Ohio State University.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read a third time and passed.

MASS SPECTROMETER FOR ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY

The bill (H.R. 4832) to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer for the use of St. Louis University was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 901, explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 4832 is to allow St. Louis University to import free of duty a scientific instrument for its own use.

GENERAL STATEMENT

H.R. 4832 would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty a mass spectrometer for the use of St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

A mass spectrometer is a device used by chemists and chemical engineers to provide chemical analyses, measurements, and other research features. They are ordinarily built to specifications to meet particular requirements of the user. In the use of a mass spectrometer, the material to be studied is subjected to an ionizing process after which the ions formed are physically separated according to mass by electromagnetic means so that a mass spectrum is produced.

Your committee is advised that no comparable instrument made in the United States is available. The Department of Commerce has stated with respect to this bill:

After careful consideration, the Department is of the opinion that at the time St. Louis University determined its requirements and specifications for a mass spectrometer, no instrument of equivalent scientific value was available from domestic producers of this instrument.

The instrument purchased by St. Louis University is a noncommercial device, which was designed by Dr. R. Ryhage of Sweden, and is being produced in that country according to Dr. Ryhage's specifications. This is a highly specialized instrument, designed for biochemical research, which combines the functions of a mass spectrometer and a gas chromatograph in a single integrated apparatus. No counterpart of the Ryhage design is available from domestic sources.

In the circumstances, your Committee on Finance, like the Committee on Ways and Means of the House is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature and recommends its enactment.

SPLIT POLE MAGNETIC SPECTROGRAPH SYSTEM FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

The bill (H.R. 6666) to provide for the free entry of a 90-centimeter split pole magnetic spectrograph system with orangepeel internal conversion spectrometer attached for the use of the University of Pittsburgh was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 902), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 6666 is to allow the University of Pittsburgh to import free of duty a scientific instrument for its own use.

GENERAL STATEMENT

H.R. 6666 would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty a 90-centimeter split pole magnetic spectrograph system with orangepeel internal conversion spectrometer attached for the use of the University of Pittsburgh.

Your committee is advised that no comparable instrument made in the United States is available. The Department of Commerce has stated with respect to this bill, H.R. 6666 and similar bills ordered favorably reported at the same time (H.R. 6906 and H.R. 8272) as follows:

"It is the understanding of this Department that the instruments required by the universities are essentially specialized beta-ray spectroscopic devices used in nuclear energy research. At the time of purchase, instruments having the required characteristics of high concentration and convertibility essential to devices used in nuclear energy research could not be obtained from domestic sources.

"After careful investigation the Department feels that at the time the universities determined their requirements and specifications for the beta-ray spectroscopic devices no instruments of equivalent scientific value were available from domestic sources."

In the circumstances of the Committee on Finance, like the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature and unanimously recommends its enactment.

MASS SPECTROMETER AND SPLIT POLE SPECTROGRAPH FOR UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER

The bill (H.R. 6906) to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer and one split pole spectrograph for the use of the University of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 903), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 6906 is to allow the University of Rochester to import free of duty two scientific instruments for its own use.

GENERAL STATEMENT

H.R. 6906 would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty a mass spectrometer and a split pole spectrograph for the use of the University of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y.

A mass spectrometer is a device used by chemists and chemical engineers to provide chemical analyses, measurements, and other research features. It is ordinarily built to specifications to meet particular requirements of the user. In the use of a mass spectrometer, the material to be studied is subjected to an ionizing process after which the ions formed are physically separated according to mass by electromagnetic means so that a mass spectrum is produced.

A split pole spectrograph is a specialized device used in nuclear energy research.

Your committee is advised that no comparable instruments made in the United States are available. The Department of Commerce has stated with respect to this bill, H.R. 6906 and similar bills ordered favorably reported at the same time (H.R. 6666 and H.R. 8272) as follows:

"It is the understanding of this Department that the instruments required by the universities are essentially specialized beta-ray spectroscopic devices used in nuclear energy research. At the time of purchase, instruments having the required characteristics of high concentration and convertibility essential to devices used in nuclear energy research could not be obtained from domestic sources.

"After careful investigation the Department feels that at the time the universities determined their requirements and specifications for the beta-ray spectroscopic devices no instruments of equivalent scientific value were available from domestic sources."

In the circumstances, the Committee on Finance, like the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature and recommends its enactment.

AUTOMATIC STEADY STATE DISTRIBUTION MACHINE FOR UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

The bill (H.R. 7608) to provide for the free entry of one automatic steady state distribution machine for the use of the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 904), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 7608 is to allow the University of Oklahoma to import free of duty a scientific instrument for its own use.

GENERAL STATEMENT

H.R. 7608 would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty one automatic steady state distribution machine for the use of the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla., and provides for reliquidation of the customs entry and appropriate refund of duty in the event that liquidation of the entry has become final and duty paid.

The machine for which free entry is provided for by the bill was manufactured in England and purchased by the university with the aid of a matching fund grant from the National Science Foundation. The machine separates, extracts, and concentrates chemical compounds out of complex mixtures. It can be used for analysis in determining exceedingly low amounts of impurities as well as for isolation and purification of mixtures. The machine was imported through the port of New York and was covered by New York consumption entry No. 844735 made in November 1964.

Your committee is advised that no comparable machine in terms of capacity, automaticity, or efficiency is made in the United States. The Department of Commerce has stated with respect to this bill:

"After careful consideration, the Department is of the opinion that at the time the University of Oklahoma determined its requirements and specifications for an automatic steady state distribution machine, no instrument of equivalent scientific value was available from domestic producers of this instrument.

"The device purchased by the university is used in basic research on chemical solvents and is designed to separate various elements from chemical solutes. The instrument is manufactured by the British firm of Quickfit & Quarta Co., Ltd. and is completely automatic and enables the operator to program up to 100 cycles.

"Further it lends itself to variable programing from large quantities of solvents to very minute traces. The device is extremely sensitive to all loads and under all operating conditions. No counterpart to the British design is available from domestic sources."

In the circumstances the Committee on Finance, like the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature, and recommends its enactment.

MASS SPECTROMETER-GAS CHROMATOGRAPH FOR OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

The bill (H.R. 8232) to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer-gas chromatograph for the use of Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Okla., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 905), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 8232 is to allow Oklahoma State University to import free of duty a scientific instrument for its own use.

GENERAL STATEMENT

H.R. 8232 would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty a mass spectrometer-gas chromatograph for the use of Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Okla.

Your committee is advised that no comparable instrument made in the United States is available. The Department of Commerce has stated with respect to this bill:

"The instrument purchased by Oklahoma State University is a noncommercial device, which was designed by Dr. R. Ryhage, of Sweden, and is being produced in that country according to Dr. Ryhage's specifications. This is a highly specialized instrument, designed for biochemical research, which combines the function of a mass spectrometer and a gas chromatograph in a single integrated apparatus. No counterpart of the Ryhage design is available from domestic sources."

In the circumstances, the Committee on Finance, like the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature and recommends its enactment.

ISOTOPE SEPARATOR FOR PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

The bill (H.R. 8272) to provide for the free entry of an isotope separator for the use of Princeton University, Princeton, N.J., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 906), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 8272 is to allow Princeton University to import free of duty a scientific instrument for its own use.

GENERAL STATEMENT

H.R. 8272 would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty an isotope separator for the use of Princeton University, Princeton, N.J., during June 1964, under New York consumption entry 1062984, and related articles imported at the same port in June 1964 under consumption entry 1074614.

Your committee is advised that no comparable instrument made in the United States is available. The Department of Commerce has stated with respect to H.R. 8272 and similar bills ordered favorably reported at the same time (H.R. 6666 and H.R. 6906):

"It is the understanding of this Department that the instruments required by the universities are essentially specialized beta-ray spectroscopic devices used in nuclear energy research. At the time of purchase, instruments having the required characteristics of high concentration and convertibility essential to devices used in nuclear energy research could not be obtained from domestic sources.

"After careful investigation the Department feels that at the time the universities determined their requirements and specifications for the beta-ray spectroscopic devices no instruments of equivalent scientific value were available from domestic sources."

In the circumstances, the Committee on Finance, like the Committee on Ways and Means of the House is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature and recommends its enactment.

SHADOMASTER MEASURING PROJECTOR FOR UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH DAKOTA

The bill (H.R. 9351) to provide for the free entry of one shadomaster measuring projector for the use of the University of South Dakota was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 907), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 9351 is to allow the University of South Dakota to import free of duty a scientific instrument for its own use.

GENERAL STATEMENT

H.R. 9351 as reported would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty one Shadomaster measuring projector (and its accompanying parts and equipment) for the use of the University of South Dakota, and provides for the reliquidation of the customs entry and appropriate refund of duty in the event that the liquidation of the entry has become final and duty paid.

The machine for which free entry is provided for by the bill is to be used by the Department of Geology of the University of South Dakota to project and to measure thin sections of rocks and minerals.

Your committee is advised that no comparable machine made in the United States is available. The Department of Commerce has stated with respect to this bill:

"The term 'Shadomaster' is a trademark for an optical measuring projector made by Watson, Manasty & Co., Ltd., Middlesex, England. This type of projector is used in meteorological work where precise, consistent, and fine measurements are required. A comparison of the specifications of the Shadomaster with the specifications of similar instruments manufactured in the United States indicates that the domestic products are not of equivalent scientific value. Both the foreign and domestic instruments provide the same degree of linear accuracy. However, the scope of the Shadomaster is much greater in terms of making angular readings, measuring diameters, and magnification than the domestic products. These characteristics are considered significant in the use of such instruments.

"After careful consideration, the Department is of the opinion that at the time the University of South Dakota determined its requirements and specifications for an optical measuring projector, no instrument of equivalent scientific value was available from domestic producers of this instrument."

In the circumstances the Committee on Finance, like the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature, and recommend its enactment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that completes the call of the calendar.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Public Works and the Employment and Manpower Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to violate the order limiting statements during routine morning business to 3 minutes, and to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator is granted.

VIETNAM: LEAKS FROM ANONYMOUS OFFICIAL SOURCES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, stories attributed to unnamed "U.S. officials" have been appearing in the press, to the effect that the war in Vietnam does not necessarily have to end in a negotiated settlement. The unnamed officials want to be sure, apparently, that the public understands that there is an alternative to negotiations. What these officials suggest, as the alternative, amounts to a total military solution, with the Vietcong being driven into a state of nonexistence.

This thesis is valid as a basis for college discussion. It is valid as a subject for consideration in the classified recesses of the executive branch of the Government. It is not valid, however, as a "leak" from anonymous official sources, leaving the strong impression that the policy of seeking negotiations is all but abandoned and we are about to adopt a new one. Indeed, one newspaper carried a banner headline on the basis of this leak: "U.S. Now Sees Vietnam Victory by Force of Arms." The impression left by the story is clear: It is that the doctrine of "unconditional negotiations" is about to be replaced by the doctrine of unconditional triumph as official policy. Whether that is accurate or not, is beside the point. Whether it is a practical possibility is beside the point.

The point is that official United States policy on Vietnam, as enunciated time and again by the President, is and remains one of seeking an honorable negotiated end to the conflict as quickly as possible. The President's policy—and it is the only official policy of this Government—is not to prove the theoretical possibility that a war of attrition without negotiation can end in a triumph in 1, 5, 10, or 15 years.

The point is, too, that it is not college students or professors without responsibility for official policy who are advancing this concept; it is not the press or political leaders out of office and without official responsibilities; it is not the Representatives or Senators, who have independent constitutional responsibilities, who are discussing this alternative policy. Rather, it is anonymous "U.S. officials" who can have no responsibilities except official responsibilities in these matters; it is U.S. officials who are not privileged to speak on policy outside of the walls of the executive branch except as they express the official policy of the United States as enunciated by the President and under his direction, and with his approval. For them to speak otherwise, even anonymously, is to imply strongly that the President of the United States so thinks.

Now, it is true that these official sources were at pains to make it clear that they support the President's policy of seeking an end to the Vietnamese conflict by negotiations, even as they advance an alternative approach of a solution by attrition. Well, if they are supporting the President's policy, why do they insist upon remaining unnamed? Why, then, do they hesitate to attach their names to that which they are discussing with the press?

Indeed, who are these official but unnamed sources? As one Senator, I would like to know in order to estimate the significance of the story, in order to know what to tell my constituents when they inquire as to the Nation's policies respecting Vietnam. Are these officials in the White House? Are they in the Defense Department? The State Department? The CIA? Or are they scattered throughout the executive branch? Is it the head of a department who advances this new concept of Vietnamese policy? Or is it a chairwarmer at a southeast Asia desk somewhere or a guard at the front door of the Pentagon or the State Department?

Whoever they may be, one thing is certain about these unnamed official sources. They are most irresponsible sources, in a situation in which the utmost of responsibility is vital, and I use the word vital, rarely and most advisedly. Here, we have almost 150,000 men in Vietnam; the number is going up steadily and the end is not yet in sight. The President has made it clear, not once but a dozen times, that he seeks an end to the Vietnamese conflict through negotiations, and that negotiations as soon as possible are in the interest of this Nation and of all concerned. That is his policy; that is U.S. official policy—period.

In these circumstances, for an unnamed official source to engage in an idle discussion—if that is what it was—of an alternative policy of triumph by attrition, is, to say the least, a breach of trust. With the President in the hospital it is, indeed, an inexcusable breach of trust.

So I would say to these anonymous officials: You are appointed officials of this Government. Your function is not to speculate to the press on the President's policy. Much less is it your function to advance publicly alternatives to his policies, even under the anonymous cloak of "official sources." Your function is to advise the President and carry out, in good faith, foreign policies which he makes in accord with constitutional processes. Any other course, particularly in the critical Vietnamese situation, is an invitation to a lengthening of the casualty lists, to the most serious difficulties and division at home and to disaster in our relations with the rest of the world.

That ought to be understood without the saying by every appointed official of the Government. The recent rash of anonymous official speculation on Vietnam, however, makes it clear that it needs to be said.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, nine excerpts from the President's statement to the press on July 28, 1965, articles and editorials on this subject.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

1

Second, once the Communists know, as we know, that a violent solution is impossible, then a peaceful solution is inevitable. We are ready now, as we have always been, to move from the battlefield to the conference table.

I have stated publicly and many times, again and again, America's willingness to begin unconditional discussions with any Government at any place at any time.

Fifteen efforts have been made to start these discussions, with the help of 40 nations throughout the world. But there has been no answer. But we are going to continue to persist, if persist we must, until death and desolation have led to the same conference table where others could now join us at a much smaller cost.

* * * * *

2

I have spoken many times of our objectives in Vietnam. So has the Government of South Vietnam. Hanoi has set forth its own proposals. We are ready to discuss their proposals and our proposals and any proposals of any Government whose people may be affected, for we fear the meeting room no more than we fear the battlefield. And in this pursuit we welcome, and we ask for the concern and the assistance of any nation and all nations.

* * * * *

3

And if the United Nations and its officials or any one of its 114 members can by deed or word, private initiative or public action, bring us nearer an honorable peace, then they will have the support and gratitude of the United States of America.

* * * * *

4

I've directed Ambassador Goldberg to go to New York today and to present immediately to Secretary General U Thant a letter from me requesting that all the resources and the energy and the immense prestige of the United Nations be employed to find ways to halt aggression and to bring peace in Vietnam.

* * * * *

5

But we insist and we will always insist that the people of South Vietnam shall have the right of choice, the right to shape their own destiny in free elections in the South or throughout all Vietnam under international supervision, and they shall not have any Government imposed upon them by force and terror so long as we can prevent it.

* * * * *

6

As I just said, I hope that every member of the United Nations that has any idea or any plan, any program, any suggestion, that they will not let them go unexplored.

* * * * *

7

And as I have said so many times, if anyone questions our good faith and will ask us to meet them to try to reason this matter out, they will find us at the appointed place, the appointed time and the proper chair.

* * * * *

8

A. I have made very clear in my San Francisco speech my hope that the Secretary General under his wise leadership would explore every possibility that might lead to a solution of this matter. In my letter to the Secretary General this morning which Ambassador Goldberg will deliver later in the day, I reiterate my hopes and my desires and I urge upon him that he—if he agrees—that he undertake new efforts in this direction.

Ambassador Goldberg understands the challenge. We spent the weekend talking about the potentialities and the possibilities, our hopes and our dreams, and I believe that we will have an able advocate and a searching negotiator who, I would hope, could someday find success.

* * * * *

9

A. We have stated time and time again that we would negotiate with any Government, any time, any place. The Vietcong would have no difficulty in being represented and having their views presented if Hanoi for a moment decides that she wants to cease aggression, and I would not think that would be an insurmountable problem at all. I think that could be worked out.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Oct. 17, 1965]

STRATEGY CHANGE IN VIETNAM—BELIEF GROWING THAT LARGE-SCALE U.S. EFFORT MAY SUCCEED SOON

(By Richard Dudman)

WASHINGTON, October 16.—The outlines of a new strategy in Vietnam are emerging as the influx of massive American military strength begins to take effect.

In its simplest terms, the new strategy calls for the use of large amounts of American men and guns to win a military victory in the south.

Some spectacular successes have changed the official atmosphere from the pessimism of 6 months ago, when the American effort faced imminent military defeat, to a growing conviction that the back of the insurgency can be broken in the foreseeable future, possibly within months.

Even the failures have helped promote the emerging strategy. The lesson many planners drew this week, when 2,000 Vietcong slipped out of a trap sprung by combined American and South Vietnamese forces, was: Secrecy is better kept when the Americans go it alone.

The successes have strengthened the position of the so-called war hawks—those who never had much use for "special warfare" and counterinsurgency techniques, who wanted to bomb North Vietnam or even China years ago, who have regretted President Lyndon B. Johnson's offers to negotiate, and who believe that peace talks now would lead to a neutralist South Vietnam instead of the anti-Communist bastion they see as a possibility.

The "relatively benign policy of counterinsurgency" must be put aside for the time being, in the words of a policy paper being circulated at high levels in the administration.

As reliance on armed force increases, less is heard about the winning of the hearts and minds of the population.

Officials no longer are reluctant to talk about American use of napalm, tear gas, and crop-destroying aerial sprays. Six months ago, if they were discussed at all it was to emphasize how little they were being used.

Despite efforts to avoid injuring civilians in the fight against the Vietcong, women and children and old men are inevitably among the victims of a war fought increasingly with heavy bombs and artillery.

A new defense of this strategy is being heard in Washington. Critics are being assured that surveys of civilian populations subjected to air attacks show that they blame the war in general for their suffering rather than the particular nation that is doing the bombing.

One student of civilian behavior, arguing in support of the enlarged war in Vietnam, contends that the rape of a single Vietnamese woman by an American soldier causes far more resentment against the United States than does the destruction of an entire village.

Less is heard, too, about a negotiated settlement. When the outlook was black, the administration was nagging potential gobetweens in Communist and neutralist countries to try to persuade North Vietnam to come to the conference table.

Now that the military situation appears brighter, officials are emphasizing that negotiation with the Communists is not the only likely solution.

Officials pointed out this week that the problem could also be solved by an unannounced slowing down of North Vietnamese assistance and Vietcong activity in the south.

The outcome thus need not follow the pattern of the Indochina war or the Algerian revolution, with their formal peace talks between the insurgents and the French. Instead, it could follow the examples of Greece and the Philippines after World War II, when both nations successfully resisted Communist-led insurgencies.

In Greece, the officials pointed out, the Communists simply were worn down and eventually retreated into Bulgaria. The implication was that the Communist-led forces in South Vietnam might be worn down eventually and caused to retreat into North Vietnam.

President Johnson has by no means bought the entire hard line. He has not accepted the formula attributed to the new Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, William F. Raborn, Jr.—"a Rotterdam policy in the north and a Dominican policy in the south." Raborn is said to have explained that this meant saturation bombing of Hanoi and sending into South Vietnam five times as many troops as seemed necessary.

Bombers attacking the north have kept clear of the Hanoi area, where there would be a chance of direct military confrontation with the Soviet Union. Russian-built missiles, which are concentrated around the North Vietnamese capital, have shot down five American planes in the last 4 months.

The American troop buildup has reached 145,000 and is expected to reach 200,000 eventually. Some military leaders speak of a million-man American force, but others scoff at that figure. American troops in the Korean war numbered about 250,000.

A measure of the buildup is the weekly casualty figure. Fifty-eight Americans were killed in action in Vietnam last week. Total American casualties rose to 806 hostile deaths, 309 nonhostile deaths, 4,259 wounded in action, 76 missing in action, and 21 detained by the enemy.

Strategists generally avoid the term "victory," although in recent weeks that is clearly what some of them have had in mind.

They base their present optimism on the apparent ability of the increased manpower and firepower to defeat the Vietcong any time the Reds stand still for a fight in regimental or division strength. The war had been going in the direction of big-unit engagements, and the South Vietnamese Army was in serious trouble until bolstered by American combat troops.

The immediate task, therefore, is to pound and kill and harry the Vietcong's main force until it gives up or, more likely, breaks up into small guerrilla bands to continue the fighting without affording a good target.

Once the Vietcong have been forced to return to guerrilla warfare, it is thought here, the insurgency will be close to defeat. The shift will mean breaking up elaborate supply lines for weapons and supplies, going back to using homemade or captured American arms, and, worst of all, admitting to the Vietcong rank-and-file that there will not be a quick victory after all.

The strategy paper mentioned earlier says that there are three possible outcomes from the American point of view—defeat, a stalemate, or victory. It says that a stalemate would be the hardest to achieve. The implication is that victory should be the goal.

One policymaker who holds that view makes the further point that victory is possible once the United States has forced the Vietcong to return to guerrilla warfare.

He reasons that guerrilla wars invariably are won or lost, that they never end in a draw. A ceasefire would mean that the Vietcong would promptly lose all the gray areas, the territory where it can operate but cannot make a permanent stand. The reason, he says, is that the Vietnamese Army would use a ceasefire to clean out any guerrillas remaining in such areas.

Those who see the new strategy in these terms contend that progress cannot be measured merely in enemy casualties. They call an operation a success even if it results in few Vietcong bodies, because the objective is not so much to kill the enemy as to harass him and prove to him that his war is unprofitable.

They insist also that the bombing of North Vietnam is hurting the Hanoi regime seriously and must be continued with no letup.

This analysis rests on some broad assumptions, which may or may not stand up.

It assumes that the Vietcong lack the resiliency to return to guerrilla warfare and go on effectively with the kind of fighting that took the British 10 years to suppress in Malaya.

It assumes also that American power—planes crisscrossing the country and bombs pounding guerrilla hiding places—can make a country almost as big as Missouri an impossible place to operate.

On the political side, it assumes that the government of Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky, the chief of the Vietnamese air force, represents a new breed of leaders, able at last to inspire the people with a revolutionary spirit that will unify them in the fight.

Finally, this analysis assumes that favorable results will come very soon. President Johnson would find it embarrassing to go to the country seeking reelection in 1968 with a stalemated war still on his hands, and the ever-larger conflict could well be an issue in the congressional elections next year.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Oct. 15, 1965]

United States Now Sees Vietnam Victory by Force of Arms—Troops Pull Back After Offensives—Draft Call Rises—Washington Suggests a Negotiated Truce Is Not Only Solution—Military Defeat of Vietcong Similar to That Suffered by Reds in Greece Is Pictured—Rebel Area Reportedly Neutralized

TOYKO, October 14.—Chen Yi, Red China's Foreign Minister, has declared his country will not seek a compromise with the United States and will struggle until America is defeated.

"China with her 650 million people has the courage to run risks in order to thoroughly defeat U.S. imperialism," he said, "to seek compromise with U.S. imperialism instead of opposing it would be to end up as shamefully as the Chiang Kai-shek [of Nationalist China] reactionaries and the Khrushchev revisionists."

POLICY

(By Albert Sehlstedt, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, October 14.—U.S. officials said today that a solution to the Vietnam situation could come about not only through negotiations but also by a gradual reduction of Communist guerrilla aggression.

This observation suggested that the combined military strength of the United States, South Vietnam, and their allies could reduce the power of the Vietcong to a level of ineffectiveness.

Officials pointed out that there had been some discussion in the press which left an impression that negotiation with the Communists would be the only likely solution to the Vietnam problem.

SIMILAR SITUATIONS RECALLED

Today, these officials said it was important to keep in mind that there was another way to solve the problem, which would come about by a reduction in the efforts of the Vietcong to subvert South Vietnam.

Such was the case in Greece and the Philippines after World War II when both nations successfully resisted Communist insurgents' efforts to seize control.

In Greece, for example, the Communists were simply worn down and eventually retreated into Bulgaria.

So, too, it was implied today, the Communist guerrillas in South Vietnam might be worn down eventually and retreat into North Vietnam or other parts of Asia controlled by the Reds.

NEGOTIATIONS STILL SOUGHT

However, officials here emphasized that the United States is still anxious to negotiate in Vietnam and is not leaning toward a more militant approach to a solution of the southeast Asian affair.

These officials also made it clear that the United States is in a much better position to negotiate than it had been in the past.

American strength in South Vietnam has reached 145,000, the draft is being greatly increased at home and selected National Guard and Reserve units totaling 150,000 men are being brought to an increased state of readiness.

Furthermore, the expected monsoon offensive of the Vietcong has been blunted this summer. It had been feared that the guerrillas, taking advantage of bad flying weather for American aircraft, would mount large-scale attacks against South Vietnamese and American defenses.

While the failure of this expected offensive is encouraging, U.S. officials made it clear that the defeat of the guerrilla force, numbering perhaps 230,000 men, is far from achievement.

Pacification of the countryside is the objective, and no extensive area of South Vietnam under Vietcong control has yet been pacified.

Pacification is defined as putting a powerful allied force in a Vietcong area for that length of time that would be required to reinstitute the economy of the region, and assure the safety of the people to such a degree that the military units could then move out.

That kind of operation is not only ambitious but requires cooperation with other elements of the Government to build up the faith of the people in the Saigon regime to the extent that those people believe the Government is capable of protecting them against the Vietcong.

Such a result is not achieved in a day or a week.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 17, 1965]

The World: Vietnam Balance Sheet

Optimism has always been more prevalent—and far more popular—than pessimism among the American community in Vietnam. Yet there have been many signs that the long-range trend of the war against the Communists has been inexorably unfavorable and that short-term, present trends should be viewed within that context.

In 1962, for example, the regular "hard core" Vietcong guerrilla force was estimated at about 18,000 men. Today it is estimated at about 75,000 men.

In April of 1963 American generals were saying that the war would be won within a year, and by late summer Defense Secretary Robert McNamara said that all American troops could be withdrawn by the end of 1965.

In early 1964 the Americans chose to make populous Longan Province, just south of Saigon, a model or test case of anti-Communist pacification methods. The program has since been shelved and the Vietcong are still strong in Longan. Pacification is what one American calls the "nasty, gutty business" of securing a territory from which the Vietcong are dislodged and making sure they do not filter back as strong as ever.

The present military trends, on the other hand, are unquestionably favorable. Between December of last year and June of this year the Vietcong had staged at least a dozen regimental-sized attacks. But with the arrival of more and more American troops, and improved morale and performance of South Vietnamese forces, the Vietcong have become much more cautious and have seldom massed in regiments.

U.S. strength in South Vietnam now is nearly 145,000 men (an increase of 115,000 since President Johnson first made his "unconditional discussions" offer last April) and is expected to jump to 200,000 by the end of the year. As part of its general buildup of the Armed Forces as a consequence of the Vietnam commitment, the Defense Department last week ordered a military draft call of 45,224 men for December, the biggest quota since the Korean war.

The technology and skill of American air power have neutralized most Vietnamese Government mistakes and penalized most Vietcong attempts at aggressive action.

However, in recent weeks there have also been a few disturbing factors. In one 4-day period the Vietcong staged three ambushes of American units, and while all three were small affairs and while the Americans generally reacted well, the guerrillas showed that this favorite trick against South Vietnamese troops could work against Americans, too.

Three weeks ago the Vietcong did mass in regimental size in Binhdinh Province, in central South Vietnam, and began a battle which has raged off and on ever since. Perhaps as many as five battalions of crack troops came out to fight despite the threat of air power and huge allied task forces.

The difficulties of pinning down the Vietcong were evident in the Binhdinh operations last week. For 5 days 8,000 Americans and at least 4,000 Government troops—described as the biggest United States-Vietnamese ground assault force of the war—pursued a large Vietcong unit and a regular North Vietnamese Army regiment said to be in Suaica Valley. But by the time the allied force swept through the area the North Vietnamese were nowhere to be seen and most of the Vietcong had slipped into the hills. Only a small number of guerrillas were reported killed.

Assessments of how badly the Vietcong have been hurt in recent years depend on how literally casualty estimates issued by officials in Saigon are taken. Though there is little doubt that the Vietcong have suffered serious losses, a senior and well-informed source said, "We think they have been able to reconstitute most of those losses within South Vietnam"—that is, through new recruitment and conscription rather than primarily through mass infiltration of new units of the North Vietnamese regular army.

An optimistic appraisal by an expert is that it will take at least a year of continued American military initiatives before the Vietcong will be hurt enough to allow a "real" rural pacification program to begin, and that such a program will take at least 2 years before its succeeds.

Accordingly, while recent political trends have been favorable, they are so only in a relative, limited sense. Prime Minister Nguyen Cao Ky, the 35-year-old commander of the air force, has increasingly impressed Americna officials with his ability, candor, and intellectual honesty. There is no sign of distintegration in the present military government.

As for prospects for a negotiated settlement, nothing in the present situation offers much realistic hope. One student of North Vietnam commented that the revolutionary heroes of the Hanoi regime remain stubbornly convinced that the methods and principles which defeated the French in Indochina will again prevail.

This view seemed to be borne out by the negative results of Washington's intensive 10-week diplomatic effort to draw the Communists to the conference table. Hanoi was reported last week to have shown no interest whatsoever in third-party soundings to the effect that the Johnson administration was interested in a tacit or explicit agreement to reduce the fighting. The administration was said to be virtually resigned to failure of the peace offensive, and many officials in Washington now believe a long and costly military campaign is necessary before diplomats can try again.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 15, 1965]

THE LONG ROAD

The only limited success won by the American-South Vietnamese attempt to trap a large body of Communist elite troops contains a hard but probably needed lesson. The fact that most of the North Vietnamese force was able to slip away from so formidable and elaborate a trap is a reminder that no early and decisive military victory can be expected.

True, the situation in Vietnam is gratifyingly better today than most observers thought possible 6 months ago. The monsoon season passed without the dreaded Vietcong victory and a South Vietnamese defeat. Indeed, the inflow of American military strength helped reverse the trend of war so strikingly that the monsoon season actually turned into a period of unusually heavy Communist losses.

It is apparent, however, that, although improved, the situation is still far from ideal. The jungles, paddies, swamps, and fields of South Vietnam swarm with tough, dedicated, ably trained guerrillas. Some of these operate in small groups of a half-dozen or so. Others exist in battalion and perhaps even regimental strength. They are supported by a network of local sympathizers and spies who provide them with eyes everywhere.

Thus, to date, little more has been achieved than to blunt the Vietcong-North Vietnamese effort to move from guerrilla to open warfare. The Communist guerrilla potential remains high. So, to a considerable degree, the situation is merely back to where it was a few years ago.

It may not, of course, stay there. American military might is so stupendous—even when utilized under such difficult conditions as jungle warfare—that it is difficult to believe that it will not be able to overbear any conceivable resistance.

Yet, even at best, such a military victory would be a long and costly task. And it is well for the American people to realize this fact. The United States can take satisfaction that it has well begun the hard task of helping save a small and doughty ally from Communist aggression. But in this sentence the operative word is begun.

Perhaps the greatest hope still resides in the possibility that both North Vietnam and the Vietcong will slowly but surely be brought to see that victory cannot be theirs. If the road before Washington and Saigon is still long and hard, it is even more so before both Hanoi and the Vietcong. It is because of this that Washington should be indefatigable in offering peace and in encouraging the United Nations to seek means of bringing all concerned to the negotiation table.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I commend the majority leader for his very forceful statement condemning the practice of persons making vital statements concerning the Nation and asking that they be referred to as "unidentified" or "unnamed" officials. There is no more sinister method of poisoning the minds of citizens than the technique of "it is officially reported" but the official involved is not willing to be named.

I commend the Senator for speaking out on this subject. It is idle for me to say that the time is at hand when we should begin to worry about the security of our country, if ever it was necessary, and to speak the truth and allow the public to know who the persons are making these condemnations so that the people can evaluate the reliability or the credibility of the officials to whom the statements are attributed.

I am sure that there is not a single Member of the Senate who has not been through the ordeal of being referred to by unidentified sources.

What kind of proof is that? Yet, that is the kind of material which is being fed to the people of the Nation. We must not tolerate it any longer.

Yesterday, I pointed out that there was in my office a Lieutenant Kapelka who was summoned to go to South Vietnam. There he sat, in front of me, approximately 28 years old. He said, "I have no hesitation in going to Vietnam. I am prepared to go, but I cannot stand the denunciations and the demonstrations which are endangering the lives of our soldiers and sailors in southeast Asia."

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] made a statement that these beatniks and demonstrators, many of them innocently led by skillful Communists, do not know what they are doing. They are probably putting a noose around their own necks. Certainly they are endangering the lives of our men in southeast Asia who will have to engage in protracted fighting because the North Vietnamese, the Red Chinese and the Russians will feel, "We have them on the run. Demonstrations are occurring in Washington, Chicago, Los Angeles, and Berkeley, which means that they do not have the will to defend their Nation."

Of course, that is exactly what it means.

I again congratulate the Senator from Montana on the fine leadership he has displayed yesterday and today on this subject.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that he signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

On Monday, October 18, 1965:

H.R. 5457. An act for the relief of Maria del Rosario de Fatima Lopez Hayes;

H.R. 5554. An act for the relief of Mary Frances Crabbs;

H.R. 5904. An act for the relief of Nam Ie Kim;

H.R. 6229. An act for the relief of Kim Sun Ho;

H.R. 6235. An act for the relief of Chun Soo Kim;

H.R. 6819. An act for the relief of Dr. Orhan Metin Ozmat;

H.R. 7707. An act to authorize the appointment of crier-law clerks by district judges;

H.R. 7888. An act providing for the extension of patent No. D–119,187;

H.R. 8350. An act for the relief of the successors in interest of Cooper Blyth and Grace Johnston Blyth otherwise Grace McCloy Blyth;

H.R. 8457. An act for the relief of Robert G. Mikulecky;

H.R. 9220. An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, and Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Delaware River Basin Commission, and the Interoceanic Canal Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9521. An act for the relief of Clarence Earl Davis.

On Tuesday, October 19, 1965:

H.R. 1311. An act for the relief of Joseph J. McDevitt;

H.R. 1319. An act for the relief of Joseph Durante;

H.R. 1409. An act for the relief of Louis W. Hann;

H.R. 1644. An act for the relief of 1st Lt. Robert B. Gann and others;

H.R. 1836. An act for the relief of Constantinos Agganis;

H.R. 2005. An act for the relief of Miss Gloria Seborg;

H.R. 2285. An act for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Cioffi Carson;

H.R. 2557. An act for the relief of Frank Simms;

H.R. 2757. An act for the relief of Maria Alexandros Siagris;

H.R. 2853. An act to amend title 17, United States Code, with relation to the fees to be charged;

H.R. 3288. An act for the relief of Hwang Tai Shik;

H.R. 3515. An act for the relief of Mary Ann Hartmann;

H.R. 3669. An act for the relief of Emilia Majka;

H.R. 3770. An act for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Navy at the Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, Calif.;

H.R. 4078. An act for the relief of William L. Minton;

H.R. 4137. An act for the relief of Dr. Jan Rosciszewski;

H.R. 4194. An act for the relief of Angelica Anagnostopoulos;

H.R. 4203. An act for the relief of Alton G. Edwards;

H.R. 4464. An act for the relief of Michael Hadjichristofas, Aphrodite Hadjichristofas, and Paniote Hadjichristofas;

H.R. 5167. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the administrative settlement of tort claims arising in foreign countries, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9526. An act for the relief of Raffaella Achilli.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to Senate Resolution 145, the Chair appoints the following Senators as members of a delegation to attend parliamentary conferences at Tokyo and New Delhi, to be held from November 24 to December 21: WAYNE MORSE, Chairman; FRANK J. LAUSCHE; FRANK CHURCH; QUENTIN N. BURDICK; ALAN BIBLE; B. EVERETT JORDAN; WINSTON L. PROUTY; and PETER H. DOMINICK.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Commerce for "Salaries and expenses, Coast and Geodetic Survey," for the fiscal year 1966, had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON FINAL SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF CERTAIN INDIANS

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the final settlement of the claims of certain Indians, which (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS OF EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, Department of the Army, reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment, for the quarter ended September 30, 1965; to the Committee on Armed Services.

DEDUCTION OF CERTAIN COSTS FROM RENTAL COLLECTIONS ON PROPERTY ACQUIRED UNDER VETERANS' LOAN PROGRAMS

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to permit deduction by brokers of certain costs and expenses from rental collections on properties acquired under the veterans' loan programs (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the disposal of foreign excess property, during fiscal year 1965; to the Committee on Government Operations.

ELECTION OF GOVERNOR OF GUAM

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the popular election of the Governor of Guam, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON FINAL SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF CERTAIN INDIANS

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the final settlement of the claims of certain Indians (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Agency, during fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON VISA PETITIONS APPROVED ACCORDING FIRST PREFERENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports concerning visa petitions approved according the beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification to certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONVENTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, conventions and recommendations adopted by the International Labor Conference, at Geneva, on July 8, 1964 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executve Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

S. 2471. A bill to improve and clarify certain laws of the Coast Guard (Rept. No. 911).

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 11588. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 912).

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of August 1965. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, AUGUST 1965 AND JULY 1965, AND PAY, JULY 1965 AND JUNE 1965

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for August 1965 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In August numbered	In July numbered	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In July was—	In June was—	Increase (+) or decrease(−)
Total [1] [2]	2,549,985	2,542,590	+7,395	$1,494,442	$1,465,274	+$29,168
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,494,732	1,497,003	−2,271	885,557	852,231	+33,326
Department of Defense	1,055,253	1,045,587	+9,666	608,885	613,043	−4,158
Inside the United States	2,388,115	2,386,976	+1,139			
Outside the United States	161,870	155,614	+6,256			
Industrial employment	559,414	556,450	+2,964			
Foreign nationals	129,588	130,119	−531	26,678	25,798	+880

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.
[2] Includes employment under the President's Youth Opportunity Campaign.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during August 1965, and comparison with July 1965, and pay for July 1965, and comparison with June 1965*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	August	July	Increase	Decrease	July	June	Increase	Decrease
Executive Departments (except Defense):								
Agriculture	115,062	117,481		2,419	$65,447	$62,233	$3,214	
Commerce	34,421	33,824	597		24,292	23,662	630	
Health, Education, and Welfare	90,514	90,311	203		52,461	51,198	1,263	
Interior	71,108	71,664		556	45,087	43,307	1,780	
Justice	33,299	33,452		153	24,524	24,465	59	
Labor	9,405	9,562		157	6,857	6,789	68	
Post Office	610,146	605,721	4,425		323,468	311,190	12,278	
State [1] [2]	40,986	40,975	11		24,497	25,608		$1,111
Treasury	90,090	90,884		794	65,446	54,424	11,022	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during August 1965, and comparison with July 1965, and pay for July 1965, and comparison with June 1965*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	August	July	Increase	Decrease	July	June	Increase	Decrease
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	319	328		9	$268	$257	$11	
Bureau of the Budget	533	548		15	558	528	30	
Council of Economic Advisers	44	58		14	50	47	3	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	71	71			43	54		$11
National Aeronautics and Space Council	26	27		1	34	34		
National Council on the Arts	3	3			14	4	10	
National Security Council	39	39			38	38		
Office of Economic Opportunity	1,362	1,338	24		1,063	1,314		251
Office of Emergency Planning	372	388		16	365	363	2	
Office of Science and Technology	129	55	74		42	51		9
Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations	27	27			32	30	2	
President's Committee on Consumer Interests	14	18		4	13	11	2	
President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing	11	12		1	10	10		
President's Council on Equal Opportunity	22	23		1	17	15	2	
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	25	25			24	24		
American Battle Monuments Commission	456	444	12		95	90	5	
Appalachian Regional Commission	8	7	1		19	14	5	
Atomic Energy Commission	7,354	7,430		76	6,502	6,377	125	
Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission	1	1			(3)	(3)		
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	676	672	4		499	486	13	
Civil Aeronautics Board	825	839		14	767	758	9	
Civil Service Commission	3,808	3,786	22		2,731	2,753		22
Civil War Centennial Commission	3	3			2	[4] 6		4
Commission of Fine Arts	4	6		2	5	5		
Commission on Civil Rights	114	116		2	76	74	2	
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2			3	3		
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	79	56	23		37	8	29	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	304	309		5	249	242	7	
Farm Credit Administration	234	233	1		198	190	8	
Federal Aviation Agency	45,131	45,332		201	37,338	36,108	1,230	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	6	1		5	6		1
Federal Communications Commission	1,541	1,550		9	1,225	1,226		1
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,527	1,555		28	1,079	1,049	30	
Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska	3	3			5	5		
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,269	1,302		33	997	988	9	
Federal Maritime Commission	252	249	3		217	216	1	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	422	422			427	438		11
Federal Power Commission	1,141	1,179		38	946	935	11	
Federal Radiation Council	4	4			5	5		
Federal Trade Commission	1,165	1,158	7		973	970	3	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	177	182		5	128	114	14	
General Accounting Office	4,266	4,283		17	3,257	3,199	58	
General Services Administration	36,385	36,471		86	20,059	19,809	250	
Government Printing Office	7,411	7,392	19		5,231	5,062	169	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,780	13,820		40	9,753	9,770		17
Indian Claims Commission	19	19			23	23		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,399	2,423		24	1,930	1,920	10	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	34,795	35,224		429	29,113	28,736	377	
National Capital Housing Authority	433	425	8		217	223		6
National Capital Planning Commission	60	64		4	53	53		
National Capital Transportation Agency	33	32	1		33	31	2	
National Commission on Food Marketing	67	63	4		53	45	8	
National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress	20	22		2	13	9	4	
National Gallery of Art	359	384		25	186	150	36	
National Labor Relations Board	2,255	2,275		20	1,807	1,780	27	
National Mediation Board	125	141		16	127	132		5
National Science Foundation	1,099	1,116		17	811	839		28
Panama Canal	14,922	14,941		19	8,532	5,870	2,662	
President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy	3	3			2	1	1	
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	57	60		3	45	46		1
President's Review Committee for Development Planning in Alaska				1	1	1		
Public Land Law Review Commission [5]	5		5					
Railroad Retirement Board	1,742	1,753		11	1,149	1,146	3	
Renegotiation Board	183	185		2	185	182	3	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	166	163	3		119	112	7	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,394	1,428		34	1,150	1,062	88	
Selective Service System	7,891	7,652	239		2,679	2,668	11	
Small Business Administration	3,756	3,787		31	2,764	2,744	20	
Smithsonian Institution	1,938	2,029		91	1,148	1,104	44	
Soldiers' Home	1,126	1,122	4		427	377	50	
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	26			29	30		1
Tariff Commission	289	298		9	245	237	8	
Tax Court of the United States	152	155		3	151	149	2	
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,207	17,076	131		11,644	11,319	325	
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	173	179		6	172	168	4	
United States Information Agency	11,743	11,717	26		5,282	6,833		1,551
United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico	25	28		3	20	18	2	
Veterans' Administration	163,870	166,543		2,673	87,958	87,623	335	
Virgin Islands Corporation	22	22			11	38		27
Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission	1	1			(3)	(3)		
Total excluding Department of Defense	1,494,732	1,497,003	5,848	8,119	885,557	852,231	36,383	3,057
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			2,271				33,326	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,329	2,327	2		2,230	2,219	11	
Department of the Army	[6] 374,742	370,939	3,803		208,521	213,577		5,056
Department of the Navy	[6] 337,871	336,634	1,237		[7] 207,104	204,913	2,191	
Department of the Air Force	[6] 296,230	295,819	411		168,120	[4] 167,929	191	
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,084	2,104		20	1,167	1,174		7
Defense Communications Agency	989	983	6		794	776	18	
Defense Contract Audit Agency	143	92	51		51		51	
Defense Intelligence Agency	2,923	2,904	19		1,927	1,697	230	
Defense Supply Agency	[6] 37,423	33,272	4,160		18,636	[4] 20,408		1,772
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	40	40			41	41		
Interdepartmental activities	10	9	1		7	6	1	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during August 1965, and comparison with July 1965, and pay for July 1965, and comparison with June 1965*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	August	July	Increase	Decrease	July	June	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued								
International military activities	60	59	1		$52	$52		
Armed Forces information and education activities	400	405		5	235	251		$16
Total, Department of Defense	1,055,253	1,045,587	9,691	25	608,885	613,043	$2,693	6,851
Net change, Department of Defense			9,666				4,158	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [8] [9] [10]	2,549,985	2,542,590	15,539	8,144	1,494,442	1,465,274	39,076	9,908
Net increase, including Department of Defense			7,395				29,168	

---

[1] August figure includes 14,867 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 14,895 in July and their pay. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The August figure includes 3,851 of these trust fund employees, and the July figure includes 3,916.

[2] August figure includes 1,222 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 1,233 in July and their pay.

[3] Less than $500.

[4] Revised on basis of later information.

[5] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 88-606.

[6] In August 3,669 employees were transferred to the Defense Supply Agency as follows: 1,363 from the Department of the Army, 906 from the Department of the Navy, and 1,400 from the Department of the Air Force.

[7] Subject to revision.

[8] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

[9] Includes employment under the President's Youth Opportunity Campaign.

[10] Includes employment in the Job Corps by Federal agencies under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-452), as follows:

Agency	August	July	Change
Agriculture Department	1,388	1,253	+135
Interior Department	1,126	938	+188
Total	2,514	2,191	+323

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during August 1965, and comparison with July 1965*

Department or agency	August	July	Increase	Decrease
Executive Departments (except Defense):				
Agriculture	113,747	116,190		2,443
Commerce	33,796	33,206	590	
Health, Education, and Welfare	89,800	89,592	208	
Interior	70,485	71,034		549
Justice	32,889	33,045		156
Labor	9,345	9,495		150
Post Office	608,505	604,082	4,423	
State [1] [2]	11,747	11,795		48
Treasury	89,215	90,161		946
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	319	328		9
Bureau of the Budget	533	548		15
Council of Economic Advisers	44	58		14
Executive Mansion and Grounds	71	71		
National Aeronautics and Space Council	26	27		1
National Council on the Arts	3	3		
National Security Council	39	39		
Office of Economic Opportunity	1,362	1,338	24	
Office of Emergency Planning	372	388		16
Office of Science and Technology	129	55	74	
Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations	27	27		
President's Committee on Consumer Interests	14	18		4
President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing	11	12		1
President's Council on Equal Opportunity	22	23		1
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	25	25		
American Battle Monuments Commission	7	7		
Appalachian Regional Commission	8	7	1	
Atomic Energy Commission	7,316	7,392		76
Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission	1	1		
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	676	672	4	
Civil Aeronautics Board	825	839		14
Civil Service Commission	3,805	3,783	22	
Civil War Centennial Commission	3	3		
Commission of Fine Arts	4	6		2
Commission on Civil Rights	114	116		2
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2		
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	79	56	23	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	304	309		5
Farm Credit Administration	234	233	1	
Federal Aviation Agency	44,096	44,286		190
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	6	1	
Federal Communications Commission	1,535	1,545		10
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,525	1,553		28
Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska	3	3		
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,269	1,302		33
Federal Maritime Commission	252	249	3	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	422	422		
Federal Power Commission	1,141	1,179		38
Federal Radiation Council	4	4		
Federal Trade Commission	1,165	1,158	7	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	167	172		5
General Accounting Office	4,231	4,230	1	
General Services Administration	36,355	35,441		86
Government Printing Office	7,411	7,392	19	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,568	13,608		40
Indian Claims Commission	19	19		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,399	2,423		24
Independent agencies—Continued				
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	34,778	35,208		430
National Capital Housing Authority	433	425	8	
National Capital Planning Commission	60	64		4
National Capital Transportation Agency	33	32	1	
National Commission on Food Marketing	67	63	4	
National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress	20	22		2
National Gallery of Art	359	384		25
National Labor Relations Board	2,222	2,241		19
National Mediation Board	125	141		16
National Science Foundation	1,095	1,112		17
Panama Canal	156	157		1
President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy	3	3		
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	57	60		3
President's Review Committee for Development Planning in Alaska		1		1
Public Land Law Review Commission [3]	5		5	
Railroad Retirement Board	1,742	1,753		11
Renegotiation Board	183	185		2
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	166	163	3	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,394	1,428		34
Selective Service System	7,726	7,484	239	
Small Business Administration	3,683	3,714		31
Smithsonian Institution	1,913	2,009		96
Soldiers' Home	1,126	1,122	4	
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	26		
Tariff Commission	289	298		9
Tax Court of the United States	152	155		3
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,202	17,071	131	
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	173	179		6
United States Information Agency	3,549	3,526	23	
United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico	20	23		3
Veterans' Administration	162,923	165,589		2,666
Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission	1	1		
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,433,154	1,435,620	5,819	8,285
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			2,466	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,258	2,257	1	
Department of the Army	[4] 324,753	324,872		119
Department of the Navy	[4] 313,454	312,708	746	
Department of the Air Force	[4] 271,230	272,468		1,238
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,084	2,104		20
Defense Communications Agency	935	930	5	
Defense Contract Audit Agency	143	92	51	
Defense Intelligence Agency	2,200	2,177	23	
Defense Supply Agency	[4] 37,421	33,261	4,160	
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	40	40		
Interdepartmental activities	10	9	1	
International military activities	33	33		
Armed Forces information and education activities	500	405		5
Total, Department of Defense	954,961	951,356	4,987	1,382
Net increase, Department of Defense			3,605	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,388,115	2,386,976	10,806	9,667
Net increase, including Department of Defense			1,639	

---

[1] August figure includes 3,365 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 3,341 in July.

[2] August figure includes 805 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 829 in July.

[3] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 88-606.

[4] In August 3,669 employees were transferred to the Defense Supply Agency as follows: 1,363 from the Department of the Army, 906 from the Department of the Navy and 1,400 from the Department of the Air Force.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during August 1965, and comparison with July 1965*

Department or agency	August	July	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Defense):				
Agriculture	1,315	1,291	24	
Commerce	625	618	7	
Health, Education, and Welfare	714	719		5
Interior	623	630		7
Justice	410	407	3	
Labor	60	67		7
Post Office	1,641	1,639	2	
State [1] [2]	29,239	29,180	59	
Treasury	875	723	152	
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	449	437	12	
Atomic Energy Commission	38	38		
Civil Service Commission	3	3		
Federal Aviation Agency	1,035	1,046		11
Federal Communications Commission	6	5	1	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2		
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	10	10		
General Accounting Office	35	53		18
General Services Administration	30	30		
Housing and Home Finance Agency	212	212		
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	17	16	1	
National Labor Relations Board	33	34		1
National Science Foundation	4	4		
Panama Canal	14,766	14,784		18
Selective Service System	165	165		
Small Business Administration	73	73		
Smithsonian Institution	25	20	5	
Independent agencies—Continued				
Tennessee Valley Authority	5	5		
United States Information Agency	8,194	8,191	3	
United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico	5	5		
Veterans' Administration	947	954		7
Virgin Islands Corporation	22	22		
Total, excluding Department of Defense	61,578	61,383	269	74
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			195	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	71	70	1	
Department of the Army	49,989	46,067	3,922	
Department of the Navy	24,417	23,926	491	
Department of the Air Force	25,000	23,351	1,649	
Defense Communications Agency	54	53	1	
Defense Intelligence Agency	723	727		4
Defense Supply Agency	11	11		
International military activities	27	26	1	
Total, Department of Defense	100,292	94,231	6,065	4
Net increase, Department of Defense			6,061	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	161,870	155,614	6,334	78
Net increase, including Department of Defense			6,256	

[1] August figure includes 11,502 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 11,554 in July. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The August figure includes 3,851 of these trust fund employees and the July figure includes 3,916.

[2] August figure includes 417 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 404 in July.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during August 1965, and comparison with July 1965*

Department or agency	August	July	Increase	Decrease
Executive Departments (except Defense):				
Agriculture	3,669	3,739		70
Commerce	6,162	6,195		33
Interior	10,115	10,193		78
Post Office	281	280	1	
Treasury	5,696	5,622	74	
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	273	278		5
Federal Aviation Agency	2,568	2,571		3
General Services Administration	2,346	2,321	25	
Government Printing Office	7,411	7,392	19	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	34,795	35,224		429
Panama Canal	7,014	7,066		52
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	161	162		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,753	13,562	191	
Virgin Islands Corporation	22	22		
Total, excluding Department of Defense	94,266	94,627	310	671
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			361	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 138,165	[2] 135,934	2,231	
Outside the United States	[1] 4,525	[2] 4,464	61	
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	191,074	189,597	1,477	
Outside the United States	1,689	1,675	14	
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	126,910	127,433		523
Outside the United States	1,154	1,157		3
Defense Supply Agency:				
Inside the United States	1,631	1,563	68	
Total, Department of Defense	465,148	461,823	3,851	526
Net increase, Department of Defense			3,325	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	559,414	556,450	4,161	1,197
Net increase, including Department of Defense			2,964	

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under United States agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of August 1965, and comparison with July 1965*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	August	July	August	July	August	July	August	July
Crete	76	76					76	76
England	1,952	1,960	107	112	103	100	1,742	1,748
France	14,607	14,837	11,386	11,543	16	8	3,205	3,286
Germany	65,048	65,249	54,952	55,147	79	77	10,017	10,025
Greece	315	313			37	37	278	276
Japan	41,174	41,284	13,921	14,011	12,264	12,272	14,989	15,001
Korea	5,460	5,444	5,460	5,444				
Morocco	541	577			541	577		
Netherlands	52	51					52	51
Trinidad	363	328			363	328		
Total	129,588	130,119	85,826	86,257	13,403	13,399	30,359	30.463

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of August totaling 2,549,985. This was a net increase of 7,395, as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of July.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1966, which began July 1, 1965, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July	2,542,590	34,471	
August	2,549,985	7,395	

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of August was 1,494,732, a decrease of 2,271 as compared with the July total of 1,497,003. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in August was 1,055,253 an increase of 9,666 as compared with 1,045,587, in July.

Civilian agencies reporting the largest decreases were Veterans' Administration with 2,673, Agriculture Department with 2,419, Treasury Department with 794 and Interior Department with 556. The largest increases were reported by Post Office Department with 4,425 and Commerce Department with 597.

In the Department of Defense the largest increases in civilian employment were reported by the Defense Supply Agency with

4,160, Department of the Army with 3,803, and the Department of the Navy with 1,237.

Total employment inside the United States in August was 2,388,115, an increase of 1,139 as compared with July. Total employment outside the United States in August was 161,870, an increase of 6,256 as compared with July. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in August totaled 559,414, an increase of 2,964.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,549,985 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 129,588 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during August who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in July was 130,119.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal stockpile inventories as of July 1965. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES, JULY 1965

INTRODUCTION

This is the 68th in a series of monthly reports on Federal stockpile inventories. It is for the month of July 1965.

The report is compiled from official data on quantities and cost value of commodities in these stockpiles submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Interior, and the General Services Administration.

The cost value of materials in inventories covered in this report, as of July 1, 1965, totaled $12,499,852,557 and as of July 31, 1965 they totaled $12,484,049,766, a net decrease of $15,802,791 during the month.

Different units of measure make it impossible to summarize the quantities of commodities and materials which are shown in tables 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, but the cost values figures are summarized by major category, as follows:

Summary of cost value of stockpile inventories by major category

Major category	Beginning of month, July 1, 1965	End of month, July 31, 1965	Net change during month
Strategic and critical materials:			
National stockpile [1]	$5,394,590,500	$5,381,649,100	−$12,941,400
Defense Production Act	1,379,897,200	1,378,486,100	−1,411,100
Supplemental—barter	1,408,532,958	1,408,912,794	+379,836
Total, strategic and critical materials [1]	8,183,020,658	8,169,047,994	−13,972,664
Agricultural commodities:			
Price support inventory	3,886,498,469	3,882,142,478	−4,355,991
Inventory transferred from national stockpile [1]	53,644,649	53,010,325	−634,324
Total, agricultural commodities [1]	3,940,143,118	3,935,152,803	−4,990,315
Civil defense supplies and equipment:			
Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense	7,589,235	7,606,908	+17,673
Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	201,015,990	200,322,102	−693,888
Total, civil defense supplies and equipment	208,605,225	207,929,010	−676,215
Machine tools:			
Defense Production Act	45,300	45,300	
National Industrial Reserve Act	90,250,400	90,534,200	+283,800
Total, machine tools	90,295,700	90,579,500	+283,800
Helium	77,787,856	81,340,459	+3,552,603
Total, all inventories	12,499,852,557	12,484,049,766	−15,802,791

[1] Cotton inventory valued at $128,409,100 withdrawn from the national stockpile and transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation for disposal, pursuant to Public Law 87-548, during August 1962.

Detailed tables in this report show each commodity, by the major categories summarized above, in terms of quantity and cost value as of the beginning and end of the month. Net change figures reflect acquisitions, disposals, and accounting and other adjustments during the month.

The cost value figures represent generally the original acquisition cost of the commodities delivered to permanent storage locations, together with certain packaging, processing, upgrading, et cetera, costs as carried in agency inventory accounts. Quantities are stated in the designated stockpile unit of measure.

Appendix A to this report, beginning on page 19, includes program descriptions and statutory citations pertinent to each stockpile inventory within the major categories.

The stockpile inventories covered by the report are tabulated in detail as follows:

Table 1: Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), July 1965 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month).

Table 2: Agricultural commodities inventories, July 1965 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 3: Civil defense supplies and equipment inventories, July 1965 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 4: Machine tools inventories, July 1965 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 5: Helium inventories, July 1965 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

New stockpile objectives

The Office of Emergency Planning is in the process of establishing new stockpile objectives for strategic and critical materials. Table 1 of this report reflects the new objectives established between May 1963 and June 1965, based on essential needs in the event of a "conventional war emergency."

Appendix B, beginning on page 22, contains excerpts from Office of Emergency Planning statements setting forth the new policy and current studies with respect to objectives for strategic and critical materials required for "conventional war emergency" and "nuclear war emergency."

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), July 1965 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, July 1, 1965	End of month, July 31, 1965	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, July 1, 1965	End of month, July 31, 1965	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Aluminum, metal:									
National stockpile	$487,680,600	$487,680,600		Short ton	1,128,988	1,128,988			
Defense Production Act	388,866,900	388,606,500	−$260,400	do	771,375	770,857	−518		
Total	876,547,500	876,287,100	−260,400	do	1,900,363	1,899,845	−518	450,000	1,449,845
Aluminum oxide, abrasive grain:									
Supplemental—barter	15,717,600	15,717,600		Short dry ton	50,905	50,905		(2)	50,905
Aluminium oxide, fused, crude:									
National stockpile	21,735,100	21,735,100		Short ton	200,093	200,093			
Supplemental—barter	22,747,400	22,747,400		do	178,266	178,266			
Total	44,482,500	44,482,500		do	378,359	378,359		160,000	218,359

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), July 1965 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, July 1, 1965	End of month, July 31, 1965	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, July 1, 1965	End of month, July 31, 1965	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Antimony:									
National stockpile	$18,983,600	$18,983,600		Short ton	28,143	28,143			
Supplemental—barter	13,551,300	13,551,300		do	22,704	22,704			
Total	32,534,900	32,534,900		do	50,847	50,847		25,500	25,347
Asbestos, amosite:									
National stockpile	2,637,600	2,637,600		do	11,705	11,705			
Supplemental—barter	10,867,817	10,867,817		do	43,465	43,465			
Total	13,505,417	13,505,417		do	55,170	55,170		40,000	15,170
Asbestos, chrysotile:									
National stockpile	3,356,200	3,356,200		do	6,224	6,224			
Defense Production Act	2,102,600	2,102,600		do	2,348	2,348			
Supplemental—barter	4,990,054	4,990,054		do	7,576	7,576			
Total	10,448,854	10,448,854		do	16,148	16,148		13,700	2,448
Asbestos, crocidolite:									
National stockpile	701,900	701,900		Short dry ton	1,567	1,567			
Supplemental—barter	11,383,750	11,383,750		do	43,830	43,830			
Total	12,085,650	12,085,650		do	45,397	45,397		(2)	45,397
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type:									
National stockpile	13,925,000	13,925,000		Long dry ton	879,740	879,740			
Defense Production Act	18,168,000	18,168,000		do	1,370,077	1,370,077			
Supplemental—barter	99,284,926	99,471,647	+$186,721	do	6,485,816	6,496,309	+10,493		
Total	131,377,926	131,564,647	+186,721	do	8,735,633	8,746,126	+10,493	5,000,000	3,746,126
Bauxite, metal grade, Surinam type:									
National stockpile	78,552,500	78,552,500		do	4,962,706	4,962,706			
Supplemental—barter	45,197,400	45,197,400		do	2,927,260	2,927,260			
Total	123,749,900	123,749,900		do	7,889,966	7,889,966		5,300,000	2,589,966
Bauxite, refractory grade:									
National stockpile	11,347,800	11,347,800		Long calcined ton.	299,279	299,279		173,000	126,279
Beryl:									
National stockpile	9,768,400	9,768,400		Short ton	23,230	23,230			
Defense Production Act	1,425,600	1,425,600		do	2,542	2,542			
Supplemental—barter	23,056,400	23,056,400		do	12,275	12,275			
Total	34,250,400	34,250,400		do	38,047	38,047		28,000	10,047
Beryllium metal:									
Supplemental—barter	18,703,500	18,703,500		do	153	153		(2)	153
Bismuth:									
National stockpile	2,673,400	2,674,300		Pound	1,342,402	1,432,402			
Defense Production Act	52,400	52,400		do	22,901	22,901			
Supplemental—barter	5,536,700	5,536,700		do	2,506,493	2,506,493			
Total	8,263,400	8,263,400		do	3,871,796	3,871,796		3,600,000	271,796
Cadmium:									
National stockpile	15,148,200	15,148,200		do	7,699,481	7,699,481			
Supplemental—barter	12,326,600	12,326,600		do	7,448,388	7,448,388			
Total	27,474,800	27,474,800		do	15,147,869	15,147,869		5,100,000	10,047,869
Castor oil:									
National stockpile	44,459,500	44,536,500	−13,000	do	175,089,127	175,037,087	−52,040	22,000,000	153,037,087
Celestite:									
National stockpile	1,412,300	1,412,300		Short ton	29,017	29,017			
Supplemental—barter	952,300	952,300		do	21,927	21,927			
Total	2,364,600	2,364,600		do	50,944	50,944		10,300	40,644
Chromite, chemical grade:									
National stockpile	12,288,000	12,288,000		Short dry ton	559,452	559,452			
Supplemental—barter	21,993,100	21,993,100		do	699,644	699,644			
Total	34,281,100	34,281,100		do	1,259,096	1,259,096		600,000	659,096
Chromite, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	263,178,200	263,178,200		do	3,755,878	3,755,878			
Defense Production Act	35,879,900	35,879,900		do	985,656	985,646			
Supplemental—barter	227,430,000	227,430,000		do	1,562,641	1,562,641			
Total	526,488,100	526,488,100		do	6,304,165	6,340,165		2,970,000	3,334,165
Chromite, refractory grade:									
National stockpile	25,149,300	25,149,300		do	1,047,159	1,047,159			
Supplemental—barter	5,039,000	5,039,000		do	179,775	179,775			
Total	30,188,300	30,188,300		do	1,226,934	1,226,934		1,425,000	(3)
Cobalt:									
National stockpile	169,228,500	169,228,500		Pound	76,068,768	76,068,768			
Defense Production Act	52,075,300	52,075,300		do	25,066,651	25,066,651			
Supplemental—barter	2,169,000	2,169,000		do	1,065,398	1,065,398			
Total	223,472,800	223,472,800		do	102,200,817	102,200,817		42,000,000	60,200,817

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), July 1965 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, July 1, 1965	End of month, July 31, 1965	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, July 1, 1965	End of month, July 31, 1965	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Coconut oil:									
National stockpile	$985,700	$844,300	−$141,400	Pound	6,517,409	5,582,129	−935,280	(²)	5,582,12
Colemanite:									
Supplemental—barter	2,636,400	2,636,400		Long dry ton	67,636	67,636		(²)	67,636
Columbium:									
National stockpile	25,050,600	25,050,600		Pound	7,392,832	7,392,832			
Defense Production Act	50,238,900	50,238,900		do	7,966,335	7,966,335			
Supplemental—barter	799,100	799,100		do	371,419	371,419			
Total	76,088,600	76,088,600		do	15,730,586	15,730,586		1,176,000	14,554,586
Copper:									
National stockpile	497,949,900	492,525,100	−5,424,800	Short ton	946,631	934,316	−12,315		
Defense Production Act	24,462,100	23,718,400	−743,700	do	43,284	42,089	−1,195		
Supplemental—barter	8,252,100	8,252,100		do	12,382	12,382			
Total	530,664,100	524,495,600	−6,168,500	do	1,002,297	988,787	−13,510	775,000	213,787
Cordage fibers, abaca:									
National stockpile	37,034,700	37,034,700		Pound	146,931,913	146,931,913		50,000,000	96,931,9
Cordage fibers, sisal:									
National stockpile	41,682,300	41,667,400	−14,900	do	308,196,551	308,086,501	−110,050	200,000,000	108,086,501
Corundum:									
National stockpile	393,100	393,100		Short ton	2,008	2,008		2,500	(³)
Cryolite:									
Defense Production Act	3,205,400	3,182,400	−23,000	do	11,608	11,525	−83	(²)	11,525
Diamond dies:									
National stockpile	626,000	626,000		Piece	19,988	19,988		25,000	(³)
Diamond, industrial, crushing bort:									
National stockpile	61,601,800	61,601,800		Carat	31,162,127	31,162,127			
Supplemental—barter	15,800,500	15,800,500		do	5,550,579	5,550,579			
Total	77,402,300	77,402,300		do	36,712,706	36,712,706		24,700,000	12,012,706
Diamond, industrial, stones:									
National stockpile	100,533,900	100,533,900		do	9,268,736	9,268,736			
Supplemental—barter	186,392,500	186,392,500		do	15,430,039	15,430,039			
Total	286,926,400	286,926,400		do	24,698,775	24,698,775		16,500,000	8,198,775
Diamond tools:									
National stockpile	1,015,400	1,015,400		Piece	64,178	64,178		(²)	64,178
Feathers and down:									
National stockpile	29,408,800	29,043,500	−365,300	Pound	7,098,323	7,010,181	−88,142	3,000,000	4,010,181
Fluorspar, acid grade:									
National stockpile	26,167,500	26,167,500		Short dry ton	463,049	463,049			
Defense Production Act	1,394,400	1,394,400		do	19,700	19,700			
Supplemental—barter	16,099,200	16,099,200		do	323,232	323,232			
Total	43,661,100	43,661,100		do	805,981	805,981		540,000	265,981
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	17,332,400	17,332,400		do	369,443	369,443			
Supplemental—barter	18,940,500	18,940,500		do	480,800	480,800			
Total	36,272,900	36,272,900		do	850,243	850,243		850,000	243
Graphite, natural, Ceylon, amorphous lump:									
National stockpile	937,900	937,900		do	4,455	4,455			
Supplemental—barter	341,200	341,200		do	1,428	1,428			
Total	1,279,100	1,279,100		do	5,883	5,883		5,500	383
Graphite, natural, Malagasy, crystalline:									
National stockpile	6,732,800	6,732,800		do	32,678	32,678			
Supplemental—barter	232,500	232,500		do	1,908	1,908			
Total	6,965,300	6,965,300		do	34,586	34,586		18,000	16,586
Graphite, natural, other crystalline:									
National stockpile	1,894,400	1,894,400		do	5,481	5,481		2,800	2,681
Hyoscine:									
National stockpile	30,800	30,800		Ounce	2,108	2,108		(²)	2,108
Iodine:									
National stockpile	4,082,000	4,082,000		Pound	2,956,713	2,956,713			
Supplemental—barter	1,415,600	1,415,600		do	1,333,512	1,333,512			
Total	5,497,600	5,497,600		do	4,290,225	4,290,225		8,000,000	(³)
Iridium:									
National stockpile	2,525,800	2,525,800		Troy ounce	13,937	13,937		17,000	(³)
Jewel bearings:									
National stockpile	4,755,800	4,755,800		Piece	52,977,515	52,977,515		57,500,000	(³)
Kyanite-mullite:									
National stockpile	658,900	658,900		Short dry ton	7,621	7,621		4,800	2,821

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), July 1965 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, July 1, 1965	End of month, July 31, 1965	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, July 1, 1965	End of month, July 31, 1965	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Lead:									
National stockpile	$300,877,700	$300,816,300	−$61,400	Short ton	989,554	989,283	−271		
Supplemental—barter	76,313,000	76,313,000		do	319,273	319,273			
Total	377,190,700	377,129,300	−61,400	do	1,308,827	1,308,556	−271	0	1,308,556
Magnesium:									
National stockpile	123,480,100	123,430,500	−49,600	do	170,064	169,996	−68	145,000	24,996
Manganese, battery grade, natural ore:									
National stockpile	21,025,500	21,025,500		Short dry ton	144,485	144,485			
Supplemental—barter	14,121,400	14,121,400		do	142,245	142,245			
Total	35,146,900	35,146,900		do	286,730	286,730		80,000	206,730
Manganese, battery grade, synthetic dioxide:									
National stockpile	3,095,500	3,095,500		do	21,272	21,272			
Defense Production Act	2,524,700	2,524,700		do	3,779	3,779			
Total	5,620,200	5,620,200		do	25,051	25,051		6,700	18,351
Manganese, chemical grade, type A:									
National stockpile	2,133,300	2,133,300		do	29,307	29,307			
Supplemental—barter	7,922,100	7,922,100		do	117,607	117,607			
Total	10,055,400	10,055,400		do	146,914	146,914		68,500	78,414
Manganese, chemical grade, type B:									
National stockpile	132,600	132,600		do	1,822	1,822			
Supplemental—barter	6,669,800	6,669,800		do	99,016	99,016			
Total	6,802,400	6,802,400		do	100,838	100,838		64,000	36,838
Manganese, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	248,240,900	248,240,900		do	5,852,191	5,852,191			
Defense Production Act	172,122,100	172,122,100		do	2,980,257	2,980,257			
Supplemental—barter	273,785,426	274,034,041	+248,615	do	4,074,228	4,077,366	+3,138		
Total	694,148,426	694,397,041	+248,615	do	12,906,676	12,909,814	+3,138	7,900,000	5,009,814
Mercury:									
National stockpile	33,080,100	33,080,100		Flask	184,365	184,365			
Supplemental—barter	3,446,200	3,446,200		do	16,000	16,000			
Total	36,526,300	36,526,300		do	200,365	200,365		200,000	365
Mica, muscovite block:									
National stockpile	27,112,900	27,112,900		Pound	11,402,381	11,402,381			
Defense Production Act	40,689,700	40,689,700		do	6,432,576	6,432,576			
Supplemental—barter	6,720,685	6,720,685		do	1,960,710	1,960,711	+1		
Total	74,523,285	74,523,285			19,795,667	19,795,668	+1	6,000,000	13,795,668
Mica, muscovite film:									
National stockpile	9,058,100	9,058,100		do	1,719,183	1,719,183			
Defense Production Act	633,300	633,300		do	102,681	102,681			
Supplemental—barter	1,062,700	1,062,700		do	116,556	116,556			
Total	10,754,100	10,754,100		do	1,938,420	1,938,420		2,000,000	(3)
Mica, muscovite splittings:									
National stockpile	40,598,300	40,598,300		do	40,040,169	40,040,169			
Supplemental—barter	6,225,800	6,225,800		do	4,826,257	4,826,257			
Total	46,824,100	46,824,100		do	44,866,426	44,866,426		22,200,000	22,666,426
Mica, phlogopite block:									
National stockpile	303,600	303,600		do	223,239	223,239		17,000	206,239
Mica, phlogopite splittings:									
National stockpile	2,580,500	2,580,500		do	3,079,062	3,079,062			
Supplemental—barter	2,501,800	2,501,800		do	1,986,902	1,986,902			
Total	5,082,300	5,082,300		do	5,065,964	5,065,964		1,300,000	3,765,964
Molybdenum:									
National stockpile	71,563,400	71,563,400		do	69,034,253	69,034,253		68,000,000	1,034,253
Nickel:									
National stockpile	181,488,100	181,445,800	−42,300	Short ton	166,400	166,334	−66		
Defense Production Act	82,487,800	82,103,800	−384,000	do	44,660	44,010	−650		
Total	263,975,900	263,549,600	−426,300	do	211,060	210,344	−716	50,000	160,344
Opium:									
National stockpile	13,661,700	13,661,700		Pound	196,364	196,364		141,280	55,084
Palladium:									
National stockpile	23,224,600	23,224,600		Troy ounce	222,963	222,963			
Supplemental—barter	16,194,700	16,194,700		do	673,124	673,124			
Total	39,419,300	39,419,300		do	896,087	896,087		1,300,000	(3)
Palm oil:									
National stockpile	661,400	661,400		Pound	3,697,425	3,697,425		(2)	3,697,425
Platinum:									
National stockpile	35,734,300	35,734,300		Troy ounce	450,033	450,033		450,000	33
Pyrethrum:									
National stockpile	415,600	415,600		Pound	67,044	67,044		25,000	42,044

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), July 1965 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, July 1, 1965	End of month, July 31, 1965	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, July 1, 1965	End of month, July 31, 1965	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Quartz crystals:									
National stockpile	$66,934,100	$66,934,100		Pound	5,412,630	5,412,630			
Supplemental—barter	3,519,200	3,519,200		do	232,352	232,352			
Total	70,453,300	70,453,300		do	5,644,982	5,644,982		650,000	4,994,982
Quinidine:									
National stockpile	1,846,000	1,846,000		Ounce	1,600,428	1,600,428		2,000,000	(3)
Quinine:									
National stockpile	2,617,200	2,617,200		do	4,138,089	4,138,089		4,130,000	8,089
Rare earths:									
National stockpile	7,134,900	7,134,900		Short dry ton	9,969	9,969			
Supplemental—barter	5,830,900	5,830,900		do	5,810	5,810			
Total	12,965,800	12,965,800		do	15,779	15,779		3,000	12,779
Rare earths residue:									
Defense Production Act	653,900	653,900		Pound	6,048,619	6,048,619		(2)	6,048,619
Rhodium:									
National stockpile	78,200	78,200		Troy ounce	618	618		(3)	618
Rubber:									
National stockpile	612,576,700	609,517,100	−$3,059,600	Long ton	792,226	788,268	−3,958	130,000	658,268
Ruthenium:									
Supplemental—barter	559,500	559,500		Troy ounce	15,001	15,001		(2)	15,001
Rutile:									
National stockpile	2,070,100	2,070,100		Short dry ton	18,599	18,599			
Defense Production Act	2,725,100	2,725,100		do	17,385	17,385			
Supplemental—barter	1,061,300	1,061,300		do	11,632	11,632			
Total	5,856,500	5,856,500		do	47,616	47,616		51,000	(3)
Sapphire and ruby:									
National stockpile	190,000	190,000		Carat	16,308,797	16,308,797		18,000,000	(3)
Selenium:									
National stockpile	757,100	757,000		Pound	97,100	97,100			
Supplemental—barter	1,662,200	1,662,200		do	306,602	306,602			
Total	2,419,300	2,419,300		do	403,702	403,702		475,000	(3)
Shellac:									
National stockpile	8,003,800	7,987,500	−16,300	do	15,964,001	15,931,471	−31,530	8,300,000	7,631,471
Silicon carbide, crude:									
National stockpile	11,394,500	11,394,500		Short ton	64,697	64,697			
Supplemental—barter	26,803,600	26,803,600		do	131,805	131,805			
Total	38,198,100	38,198,100		do	196,502	196,502		30,000	166,502
Silk noils and waste:									
National stockpile	1,232,100	1,232,100		Pound	979,924	979,924		(2)	979,924
Silk, raw:									
National stockpile	486,600	486,600		do	113,515	113,515		(3)	113,515
Silver:									
National stockpile				Troy ounce				165,000,000	(3)
Sperm oil:									
National stockpile	4,775,200	4,775,200		Pound	23,441,061	23,481,738	+40,677	23,400,000	81,738
Talc, steatite block and lump:									
National stockpile	494,800	488,300	−6,500	Short ton	1,269	1,252	−17	200	1,052
Talc, steatite ground:									
National stockpile	231,200	231,200		do	3,901	3,901		(3)	3,901
Tantalum:									
National stockpile	12,771,300	12,771,300		Pound	3,170,028	3,170,028			
Defense Production Act	9,734,400	9,734,400		do	1,536,023	1,536,023			
Supplemental—barter	21,100	21,100		do	8,032	8,032			
Total	22,526,800	22,526,800		do	4,714,083	4,714,083		3,400,000	1,314,083
Thorium:									
Supplemental—barter	17,991,700	17,991,700		do	3,965,461	3,965,461		500,000	3,465,461
Thorium residue:									
Defense Production Act	42,000	42,000		do	848,354	848,354		(2)	848,354
Tin:									
National stockpile	690,843,600	688,694,900	−2,148,700	Long ton	284,213	283,244	−969		
Supplemental—barter	16,404,000	16,404,000		do	7,505	7,505			
Total	707,247,600	705,098,900	−2,148,700	do	291,718	290,749	−969	200,000	90,749
Titanium sponge:									
Defense Production Act	175,876,100	175,876,100		Short ton	22,339	22,339			
Supplemental—barter	32,097,700	32,097,700		do	9,021	9,021			
Total	207,973,800	207,973,800		do	31,360	31,360		20,500	10,860
Tungsten:									
National stockpile	369,126,700	369,126,700		Pound	120,035,951	120,035,951			
Defense Production Act	314,536,600	314,536,600		do	77,111,909	77,119,801	+7,892		
Supplemental—barter	18,651,400	18,651,400		do	5,805,426	5,805,426			
Total	702,314,700	702,314,700		do	202,953,286	202,961,178	+7,892	44,000,000	158,961,178

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), July 1965 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, July 1, 1965	End of month, July 31, 1965	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, July 1, 1965	End of month, July 31, 1965	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Vanadium:									
National stockpile	$31,567,900	$31,567,900		Short ton	7,865	7,865		1,400	6,465
Vegetable tannin extract, chestnut:									
National stockpile	9,476,800	9,404,400	−$72,400	Long ton	33,966	33,708	−258	15,000	18,708
Vegetable tannin extract, quebracho:									
National stockpile	48,858,500	48,855,000	−3,500	do	197,465	197,465		86,000	111,465
Vegetable tannin extract, wattle:									
National stockpile	9,826,900	9,826,900		do	38,962	38,962		15,000	23,962
Zinc:									
National stockpile	318,287,500	316,765,800	−1,521,700	Short ton	1,102,600	1,098,411	−4,189		
Supplemental—barter	77,110,300	77,054,800	−55,500	do	313,811	313,585	−226		
Total	395,397,800	393,820,600	−1,577,200	do	1,416,411	1,411,996	−4,415	0	1,411,996
Zirconium ore, baddeleyite:									
National stockpile	709,800	709,800		Short dry ton	16,514	16,514		(2)	16,514
Zirconium ore, zircon:									
National stockpile	113,300	113,300		do	1,920	1,920		(2)	1,920
Total:									
National stockpile	5,394,590,500	5,381,649,100	−12,941,400						
Defense Production Act	1,379,897,200	1,378,486,100	−1,411,100						
Supplemental—barter	1,408,532,958	1,408,912,794	+379,836						
Total, strategic and critical materials	8,183,020,658	8,169,047,994	−13,972,664						

---

[1] Stockpile objectives for strategic and critical materials are determined pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h). The Office of Emergency Planning is currently in the process of revising stockpile objectives. (See app. B, p. 22.)

[2] No present objective.

[3] Not in excess of stockpile objective.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the General Services Administration and the Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 2.—*Agricultural commodities inventories, July 1965 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, July 1, 1965	End of month, July 31, 1965	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, July 1, 1965	End of month, July 31, 1965	Net change during month
Price-support inventory:							
Basic commodities:							
Corn	$594,737,418	$590,198,051	−$4,539,367	Bushel	482,973,888	479,359,018	−3,614,870
Corn products	233,515	233,515		Pound	6,359,000	6,359,000	
Cotton, extra-long staple	26,157,805	26,081,320	−76,485	Bale	99,300	99,008	−292
Cotton, upland	1,096,858,466	1,083,176,184	−13,682,282	do	6,639,909	6,556,868	−83,041
Peanuts, shelled	6,996,064	6,801,197	−194,867	Pound	43,194,888	42,124,918	−1,069,970
Rice, milled	2,376	111,206	+108,830	Hundredweight	210	12,415	+12,205
Rice, rough	6,777,827	5,364,084	−1,413,743	do	1,311,955	1,040,889	−271,066
Wheat	1,296,654,891	1,289,922,729	−6,732,162	Bushel	646,309,505	643,128,697	−3,180,808
Wheat, rolled	23,740	23,740		Pound	424,012	424,012	
Wheat flour	35,497	35,409	−88	do	682,048	682,048	
Bulgur	86,167	86,167		do	1,455,000	1,455,000	
Total, basic commodities	3,028,563,766	3,002,033,602	−26,530,164				
Designated nonbasic commodities:							
Barley	16,608,826	17,094,064	+485,238	Bushel	19,542,119	20,088,528	+546,409
Grain sorghum	648,026,051	646,988,283	−1,037,768	do	564,302,246	563,269,850	−1,032,396
Mixed feed	231,216	231,216		Hundredweight	108,450	108,450	
Milk and butterfat:							
Butter	93,522,345	97,700,398	+4,178,053	Pound	158,990,918	166,007,100	+7,016,182
Butter oil	1,230,420	1,230,420		do	1,592,184	1,592,184	
Cheese	793,122	1,839,104	+1,045,982	do	2,088,565	4,833,244	+2,744,679
Milk, dried	41,286,175	44,216,526	+2,930,351	do	282,620,291	302,664,991	+20,044,700
Oats	25,368,124	26,898,019	+1,529,895	Bushel	42,218,163	44,729,195	+2,511,032
Rye	6,351,059	6,986,605	+635,546	do	5,922,030	6,534,476	+612,446
Tung oil	3,524,164	3,524,952	+788	Pound	14,716,426	14,718,989	+2,563
Total, designated nonbasic commodities	836,941,502	846,709,587	+9,768,085				
Other nonbasic commodities:							
Beans, dry, edible	3,584,951	4,316,968	+732,017	Hundredweight	476,348	578,379	+102,031
Flaxseed	7,254,121	17,539,813	+10,285,692	Bushel	2,448,827	5,887,508	+3,438,681
Linseed oil	9,494,350	9,494,350		Pound	80,000,000	80,000,000	
Soybeans	5,981	5,848	−133	Bushel	2,492	2,435	−57
Vegetable oil products	653,798	2,042,319	+1,388,512	Pound	3,417,914	10,867,528	+7,449,614
Total, other nonbasic commodities	20,993,201	33,399,289	+12,406,088				
Total, price support inventory	3,886,498,469	3,882,142,478	−4,355,991				
Inventory transferred from national stockpile: [1]							
Cotton, Egyptian	32,162,297	31,653,716	−508,581	Bale	38,070	37,468	−602
Cotton, American-Egyptian	21,482,352	21,356,609	−125,743	do	42,711	42,461	−250
Total, inventory transferred from national stockpile	53,644,649	53,010,325	−634,324	do	80,781	79,929	−852
Total, agricultural commodities	3,940,143,118	3,935,152,803	−4,990,315				

---

[1] Transferred from General Services Administration pursuant to Public Law 85–96 and Public Law 87–548. (See app. —, p. —.)

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 3.—*Civil defense supplies and equipment inventories, July 1965 (showing by item net changes during the mon of mhs in tercostt value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, July 1, 1965	End of month, July 31, 1965	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, July 1, 1965	End of month, July 31, 1965	Net change during month
Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense:							
Engineering equipment (engine generators, pumps, chlorinators, purifiers, pipe, and fittings)	$7,291,629	$7,291,231	−$398	10 mile units	45	45	
Chemical and biological equipment	297,606	315,677	+18,071	(1)			
Total	7,589,235	7,606,908	+17,673				
Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:							
Medical bulk stocks, and associated items at PHS emergency medical supply depots[2]	117,014,249	112,943,097	−4,071,152	(1)			
Medical bulk stock at manufacturer locations	4,853,399	4,799,054	−54,345	(1)			
Packaged disaster hospitals[3]	72,734,217	73,055,387	+321,170	Each	2,444	2,485	+41
Supply additions for packaged disaster hospitals	6,414,125	9,524,564	+3,110,439	(1)			
Total	201,015,990	200,322,102	−693,888				
Total, civil defense supplies and equipment	208,605,225	207,929,010	−676,215				

[1] Composite group of many different items.

[2] Reported as "Medical bulk stocks and associated items at civil defense mobilization warehouses," prior to June 1965.

[3] Reported as "Civil defense emergency hospitals," prior to February 1965.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of Defense and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 4.—*Machine tools inventories, July 1965 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, July 1, 1965	End of month, July 31, 1965	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, July 1, 1965	End of month, July 31, 1965	Net change during month
Defense Production Act:							
On loan	$45,300	$45,300		Tool	7	7	
National Industrial Reserve Act:							
In storage	7[illegible],154,900	75,992,400	−$162,500	do	6,683	6,639	−44
On lease	27,500	27,500		do	1	1	
On loan to other agencies	14,900	14,900		do	3	3	
On loan to school programs	14,053,100	14,499,400	+446,300	do	3,333	3,433	+100
Total	90,250,400	90,534,200	+283,800	do	10,020	10,076	+56
Total, machine tools	90,295,700	90,579,500	+283,800	do	10,027	10,083	+56

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the General Services Administration.

TABLE 5.—*Helium inventories, July 1965 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, July 1, 1965	End of month, July 31, 1965	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, July 1, 1965	End of month, July 31, 1965	Net change during month
Helium:							
Stored above ground	$83,981	$103,704	+$19,723	Cubic foot	7,200,000	9,600,000	+2,400,000
Stored under ground	77,703,875	81,236,755	+3,532,880	do	7,199,600,000	7,498,800,000	+299,200,000
Total, helium	77.787.856	81,340,459	+3,552,603	do	7,206,800,000	7,508,400,000	+301,600,000

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of the Interior.

APPENDIX A

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS AND STATUTORY CITATIONS

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

National stockpile

The Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) provides for the establishment and maintenance of a national stockpile of strategic and critical materials. The General Services Administration is responsible for making purchases of strategic and critical materials and providing for their storage, security, and maintenance. These functions are performed in accordance with directives issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. The act also provides for the transfer from other Government agencies of strategic and critical materials which are excess to the needs of such other agencies and are required to meet the stockpile objectives established by OEP. In addition, the General Services Administration is responsible for disposing of those strategic and critical materials which OEP determines to be no longer needed for stockpile purposes.

General policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling are contained in DMO V–7, issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning and published in the Federal Register of December 19, 1959 (24 F.R. 10309). Portions of this order relate also to Defense Production Act inventories.

Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) an Executive Order 10480, as amended, the General Services Administration is authorized to make purchases of or commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other materials, for Government use or resale, in order to expand productive capacity and supply, and also to store the materials acquired as a result of such purchases or commitments. Such functions are carried out in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

Supplemental—barter

As a result of a delegation of authority from OEP (32A C.F.R., ch. I, DMO V–4) the General Services Administration is responsible for the maintenance and storage of materials placed in the supplemental stockpile. Section 206 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1856) provides that strategic and other materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural products, unless acquired for the national stockpile or for other purposes, shall be transferred to the supplemental stockpile established by section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). In addition to the materials which have been or may be so acquired, the materials obtained under the programs established pursuant to the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalium Production and Purchase Act of 1956 (50 U.S.C. App. 2191–2195), which terminated December 31, 1958, have been transferred to the supplemental stockpile, as authorized by the provisions of said production and purchase act.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The price-support program

Price-support operations are carried out under the charter powers (15 U.S.C. 714) of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, in conformity with the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421), the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1741), which includes the National Wool Act of 1954, the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1442), the Agricultural Act of 1958, and with respect to certain types of tobacco, in conformity with the act of July 28, 1945, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1312). Under the Agricultural Act of 1949, price support is mandatory for the basic commodities—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—and specific nonbasic commodities; namely, tung nuts, honey, milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat. Under the Agricultural Act of 1958, as producers of corn voted in favor of the new price-support program for corn authorized by that act, price support is mandatory for barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums. Price support for wool and mohair is mandatory under the National Wool Act of 1954, through the marketing year ending March 31, 1966. Price support for other nonbasic agricultural commodities is discretionary except that, whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported, the price of the other must be supported at such level as the Secretary determines will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market. This program may also include operations to remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities for the purpose of stabilizing prices at levels not in excess of permissible price-support levels.

Price support is made available through loans, purchase agreements, purchases, and other operations and, in the case of wool and mohair, through incentive payments based on marketings. The producers' commodities serve as collateral for price-support loans. With limited exceptions, price-support loans are nonrecourse and the Corporation looks only to the pledged or mortgaged collateral for satisfaction of the loan. Purchase agreements generally are available during the same period that loans are available. By signing a purchase agreement, a producer receives an option to sell to the Corporation any quantity of the commodity which he may elect within the maximum specified in the agreement.

The major effect on budgetary expenditures is represented by the disbursements for price-support loans. The largest part of the commodity acquisitions under the program result from the forfeiting of commodities pledged as loan collateral for which the expenditures occurred at the time of making the loan, rather than at the time of acquiring the commodities.

Dispositions of commodities acquired by the Corporation in its price-support operations are made in compliance with sections 202, 407, and 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and other applicable legislation, particularly the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1691), title I of the Agricultural Act of 1954, title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the Agricultural Act of 1958, the act of August 19, 1958, in the case of cornmeal and wheat flour, and the act of September 21, 1959, with regard to sales of livestock feed in emergency areas.

Inventory transferred from national stockpile

This inventory, all cotton, was transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation at no cost from the national stockpile pursuant to Public Law 85–96 and Public Law 87–548. The proceeds from sales, less costs incurred by CCC, are covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts; therefore, such proceeds and costs are not recorded in the operating accounts. The cost value as shown for this cotton has been computed on the basis of average per bale cost of each type of cotton when purchased by CCC for the national stockpile.

CIVIL DEFENSE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

Civil defense stockpile

The Department of Defense conducts this stockpiling program pursuant to section 201 (h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as amended. The program is designed to provide some of the most essential materials to minimize the effects upon the civilian population which would be caused by an attack upon the United States. Supplies and equipment normally unavailable, or lacking in quantity needed to cope with such conditions, are stockpiled at strategic locations in a nationwide warehouse system consisting of general storage facilities.

Civil defense medical stockpile

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare conducts the stockpiling program for medical supplies and equipment pursuant to section 201(h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as delegated by the President following the intent of Reorganization Plan No. 1, of 1958. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare plans and directs the procurement, storage, maintenance, inspection, survey, distribution, and utilization of essential supplies and equipment for emergency health services. The medical stockpile includes a program designed to preposition assembled emergency hospitals and other medical supplies and equipment into communities throughout the Nation.

MACHINE TOOLS

Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, the General Services Administration has acquired machine tools in furtherance of expansion of productive capacity, in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

National industrial equipment reserve

Under general policies established and directives issued by the Secretary of Defense, the General Services Administration is responsible for care, maintenance, utilization, transfer, leasing, lending to nonprofit schools, disposal, transportation, repair, restoration, and renovation of national industrial reserve equipment transferred to GSA under the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451–462).

HELIUM

The helium conservation program is conducted by the Department of the Interior pursuant to the Helium Act, approved September 13, 1960 (Public Law 86–777; 74 Stat. 918; 50 U.S.C. 167) and subsequent appropriations acts which have established fiscal limitations and provided borrowing authority for the program. Among other things, the Helium Act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to produce helium in Government plants, to acquire helium from private plants, to sell helium to meet current demands, and to store for future use helium that is so produced or acquired in excess of that required to meet current demands. Sales of helium by the Secretary of the Interior shall be at prices established by him which shall be adequate to liquidate the costs of the program within 25 years, except that this period may be extended by the Secretary for not more than 10 years for funds borrowed for purposes other than the acquisition and construction of helium plants and facilities.

This report covers helium that is produced in Government plants and acquired from private plants. Helium in excess of current demands is stored in the Cliffside gasfield near Amarillo, Tex. The unit of measure is cubic foot at 14.7 pounds per square inch absolute pressure and 70° F.

APPENDIX B

NEW STOCKPILE OBJECTIVES

The Office of Emergency Planning is in the process of establishing new objectives for strategic and critical materials. Table 1 of this report reflects the new objectives established between May 1963 and June 1965 for 80 materials (including 3 removed from stockpile list), based on essential needs in the event of a "conventional war emergency." The new objective for each material has been noted in the reports, beginning with June 1963, for the months in which the respective objectives were established.

The following excerpts from OEP statements dated July 11 and 19, 1963, February 28, 1964, March 6, 13, 20, and 27, 1964, April 3 and 10, 1964, and June 3 and 8, 1965, set forth the new policy with respect to the objectives for strategic and critical materials:

"The Office of Emergency Planning is now conducting supply-requirements studies for all stockpile materials which will reflect current military, industrial, and other essential needs in the event of a conventional war emergency. On the basis of recently completed supply-requirements studies for the foregoing materials, the new stockpile objectives were established with the advice and assistance of the Interdepartmental Materials Advisory Committee, a group chaired by the Office of Emergency Planning and composed of representatives of the Departments of State, Defense, the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, and the General Services Administration, the Agency for International Development, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Small Business Administration participate as observers.

"These new objectives reflect a new policy to establish a single objective for each stockpile material. They have been determined on the basis of criteria heretofore used in establishing maximum objectives, and reflect the approximate calculated emergency deficits for the materials for conventional war and do not have any arbitrary adjustments for possible increased requirements for other types of emergency.

"Heretofore, there was a 'basic objective' and a 'maximum objective' for each material. The basic objectives assumed some continued reliance on foreign sources of supply in an emergency. The former maximum objectives completely discounted foreign sources of supply beyond North America and comparable accessible areas.

"Previously, maximum objectives could not be less than 6 months' normal usage of the material by industry in the United States in periods of active demand. The 6-month rule has been eliminated in establishing the new calculated conventional war objectives.

"The Office of Emergency Planning also announced that the present Defense Mobilization Order V–7, dealing with general policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling, was now being revised to reflect these new policies. When finally prepared and approved, the new order will be published in the Federal Register.

"New conventional war objectives for the remaining stockpile materials are being developed as rapidly as new supply-requirements data become available. They will be released as they are approved.

"The Office of Emergency Planning is also making studies to determine stockpile needs to meet the requirements of general nuclear war and reconstruction. Stockpile objectives for nuclear war have not previously been developed. Some commodity objectives may be higher and others may be lower than the objectives established for conventional war.

"After the nuclear war supply-requirements studies are completed, stockpile objectives will be based upon calculated deficits for either conventional war or nuclear war, whichever need is larger.

"The Office of Emergency Planning stressed that any long-range disposal programs undertaken prior to the development of objectives based on nuclear war assumptions would provide against disposing of quantities which might be needed to meet essential requirements in the event of nuclear attack. While the disposal of surplus materials can produce many problems which have not heretofore arisen, every effort will be made to see that the interest of producers, processors, and consumers, and the international interests of the United States are carefully considered, both in the development and carrying out of disposal programs. Before decisions are made regarding the adoption of a long-range disposal program for a particular item in the stockpile, there will be appropriate consultations with industry in order to obtain the advice of interested parties."

The OEP statement of April 17, 1964, contained the following excerpts:

"Today's action completes supply-requirements studies for all stockpile materials based on current military, industrial, and other essential needs in the event of a conventional war emergency. Objectives for 79 materials in the stockpile were established with the advice and assistance of the Interdepartmental Materials Advisory Committee, a group chaired by OEP and composed of representatives of the Departments of State, Defense, the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, and the General Services Administration, the Agency for International Development, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Small Business Administration participate as observers.

"These new objectives reflect a new policy which accords with the recommendation of the Executive Stockpile Committee to establish a single objective for each material in the national stockpile. These new objectives will be reviewed and revised as necessary each year. Because military requirements and estimated emergency supplies of stockpile materials are constantly shifting, the supply-requirements balance for any material that is now or may become important to defense must be kept under continuing surveillance. Supply-requirements studies of the conventional war needs of approximately 20 other strategic and critical materials, which do not have stockpile objectives, are underway and are expected to be completed in the next few weeks. At the same time, studies on supply requirements for nuclear war are going forward. No definite date for completion of these studies has been established as yet.

"OEP stressed that long-range programs for disposal of identified surpluses would take into account the interests of producers, processors, and consumers, as well as the international interests of the United States. Appropriate consultation with industry will precede all decisions for the adoption of every disposal program and the advice of interested parties will be sought."

The OEP statement of June 3, 1965, contained the following excerpts:

"Buford Ellington, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, today established a stockpile objective for silver of 165 million fine troy ounces.

"Mr. Ellington noted that silver had not previously been stockpiled. He said the new objective came out of recent studies by OEP, in consultation with other defense agencies, which showed that available supplies of silver would fall short of essential needs in an emergency. Supplies of silver in recent years have failed to satisfy peacetime requirements and the metal is finding increased and more varied use throughout industry. To meet this demand, industry has increased its purchases from the Treasury.

"Industrial and military applications of silver have grown substantially and now exceed its traditional use for silverware and jewelry. The metal has many properties which make it useful for industrial products. It is an excellent conductor of heat and electricity; it resists corrosion and is readily reshaped and molded. Certain silver salts are sensitive to light. Silver is used principally in the manufacture of photographic film and sensitized paper, in brazing alloys and solders for jet aircraft, space vehicles, automobiles, and a number of other durable goods, in a variety of electrical equipment and in electroplating. Other civilian and military items in which silver is used are silver-zinc batteries, dental and surgical equipment, plates, and mirrors.

"More recently silver has played an important role in the U.S. missile program. Nozzle throats exposed to the searing heat of fast-burning fuel are now protected by tungsten rings impregnated with silver."

The OEP statement of June 8, 1965, contained the following excerpts:

"Buford Ellington, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, today announced new stockpile objectives for cordage fibers. The new conventional war objectives established June 7, 1965, are:

"[In pounds]

	New objective	Old objective
Cordage fiber, abaca	50,000,000	100,000,000
Cordage fiber, sisal	200,000,000	300,000,000

"As of March 31, 1965, there were 146,932,241 pounds of abaca cordage fiber in the national stockpile and 308,700,592 pounds of sisal cordage fiber.

"Today's action is based on supply-requirement studies of current military, industrial, and other essential needs in a conventional war emergency.

"Mr. Ellington stressed that long-range programs for disposal of identified surpluses would take into account the interests of producers, processors, and consumers, as well as the international interests of the United States.

"Cordage fibers are used extensively for twine, cargo-lifting cables, guy ropes, and other heavy yarns. Other uses include upholstery and padding and reinforcement for paper and plastics. The decrease in objectives for the two fibers is due to the increased use of adequate synthetics and declining military requirements."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The cost value of Federal stockpile inventories as of July 31, 1965, totaled $12,484,049,766. This was a net decrease of $15,802,791, as compared with the July 1 total of $12,499,852,557. Net changes during the month are summarized by major category as follows:

Major category	Cost value, July 1965	
	Net change during month	Total, end of month
Strategic and critical materials	—$13,972,664	$8,169,047,994
Agricultural commodities	—4,990,315	3,935,152,803
Civil defense supplies and equipment	—676,215	207,929,010
Machine tools	+283,800	90,579,500
Helium	+3,552,603	81,340,459
Total	—15,802,791	12,484,049,766

These figures are from the July 1965 report on Federal stockpile inventories compiled from official agency data by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, showing detail with respect to quantity and cost value of each commodity in the inventories covered.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

So-called strategic and critical materials are stored by the Government in (1) the national stockpile, (2) the Defense Production Act inventory, and (3) the supplemental-barter stockpile.

Overall, there are now 95 materials in the strategic and critical inventories. Stockpile objectives—in terms of volume—are presently fixed for 77 of these 95 materials. Of the 77 materials having stockpile objectives, 64 were stockpiled in excess of their objectives as of July 31, 1965.

Increases in cost value were reported in 2 of the materials stockpiled in all strategic and critical inventories, decreases were reported in 17 materials, and 76 materials remained unchanged during July.

National stockpile

The cost value of materials in the national stockpile as of July 31, 1965, totaled $5,381,649,100. This was a net decrease of $12,941,400 during the month. The largest decreases were $5,424,800 in copper, $3,059,600 in rubber and $2,148,700 in tin.

Defense Production Act inventory

The cost value of materials in the Defense Production Act inventory as of July 31, 1965, totaled $1,378,486,100. This was a net decrease of $1,411,100. The largest decreases were in copper and nickel.

Supplemental barter

The cost value of materials in the supplemental-barter stockpile as of July 31, 1965, totaled $1,408,912,794. This was a net increase of $379,836. The increases were in bauxite and manganese.

OTHER STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Among the other categories of stockpiled materials covered by the report, the largest is $3.9 billion in agricultural commodities. Major decreases in agricultural commodities during July were reported for cotton, wheat, and corn, partially offset by increases in flaxseed and milk and butterfat.

Inventories of civil defense supplies and equipment showed a net decrease; the machine tools inventories showed a net increase; and the helium inventories showed a net increase during July.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2663. A bill for the relief of Dinesh Kumar Poddar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 2664. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Thermutis Campbell and her son, Michael Anthony Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 2665. A bill for the relief of Fuad Boulous Shunnarah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2666. A bill to clarify and otherwise improve chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, relating to the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2667. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; and

S. 2668. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to authorize the chartering for certain passenger cruise service of vessels operating under subsidy; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2669. A bill to establish safety standards for motor vehicle tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2670. A bill to approve a contract negotiated with the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1, Texas, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 2671. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in order to exempt employees employed in the shelling of shellfish from the minimum wage provisions of such act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. THURMOND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. MONDALE, and Mrs. NEUBERGER):

S. 2672. A bill to provide full and fair disclosure of the nature of interests in real estate subdivisions sold through the mails and instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce, and to prevent frauds in the sale thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself and Mr. PELL):

S.J. Res. 118. Joint resolution to provide for the construction of a velodrome in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SIMPSON:

S.J. Res. 119. Joint resolution authorizing the Hungarian Freedom Fighters' Federation to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. SIMPSON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A STUDY ENTITLED "THE ANTI-VIETNAM AGITATION AND THE TEACH-IN MOVEMENT"

Mr. DODD submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 65); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. CON. RES. 65

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the pamphlet entitled "The Anti-Vietnam Agitation and the Teach-In Movement", prepared for the use of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, be printed as a Senate Document.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed ten thousand additional copies of such Senate document for the use of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

CLARIFICATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF STATUTES AFFECTING VA DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to clarify and otherwise improve chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, relating to the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes. As the title indicates, the purpose of this legislation is to accomplish a number of perfecting changes in the law governing the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration, which, within the Veterans' Administration, administers the hospital and medical care program for veterans.

Many of the proposed amendments concern improvements in terminology, or are mere clarifications in language to reflect current conditions or circumstances. Some of the amendments proposed would, however, involve substantive changes in the law which experience has demonstrated to be desirable.

Except for the proposed authority in section 9, to pay the expenses of part-time and temporary full-time physicians, dentists, and nurses while attending professional meetings, there would be no additional expenditure of public funds resulting from the enactment of the proposed legislation. The cost of section 9 would be minimal.

The bill would also amend section 5004 of title 38, United States Code, to provide express statutory authority for the Veterans' Administration to establish, operate, and maintain parking facilities in conjunction with the hospitals and domiciliaries it operates. Basic authority for the operation of such facilities exists, but in general terms. The proposed amendment would spell out this authority and also specifically authorize the collection of reasonable fees, under certain circumstances, from employees, visitors, and others using the facilities, as well as providing certain operational refinements.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2666) to clarify and otherwise improve chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, relating to the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2666

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4101 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4101. Functions of Department

"There shall be in the Veterans' Administration a Department of Medicine and Surgery under a Chief Medical Director. The functions of the Department of Medicine and Surgery shall be those necessary for a complete medical and hospital service, including medical research and education directly related to such service as prescribed by the Administrator pursuant to this chapter and other statutory authority."

SEC. 2. Section 4102 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting "Medical Service, Dental Service, Nursing Service, and Auxiliary Service" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "a Medical Service, a Dental Service, a Nursing Service, and such other professional and auxiliary services as the Administrator may find to be necessary to carry out the functions of the Department."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 4103(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting "five", immediately preceding "Assistant Chief Medical Directors," in the first sentence of paragraph (3) thereof, and substituting therefor, "six".

(b) Such section 4103 is further amended by amending subsection (b) thereof to read as follows:

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section—

"(1) any appointment under this section shall be for a period of four years, with reappointment permissible for successive like periods,

"(2) any such appointment or reappointment may be extended by the Administrator for a period not in excess of three years, and

"(3) any person so appointed or reappointed shall be subject to removal by the Administrator for cause."

SEC. 4. Section 4104 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting "(2) Managers, pharmacists" and inserting in lieu thereof "(2) Pharmacists", and by deleting "pathologists," in subparagraph (2).

SEC. 5. Section 4105 of title 38, United States Code, is amended as follows:

"§ 4105. Qualifications of appointees

"(a) Any person to be eligible for appointment to the following positions in the Department of Medicine and Surgery must have the requisite qualifications:

"(1) Physician—

"hold the degree of doctor of medicine or of doctor of osteopathy from a college or university approved by the Administrator, have completed an internship satisfactory to the Administrator, and be licensed to practice medicine, surgery, or osteopathy in a State;

"(2) Dentist—

"hold the degree of doctor of dental surgery or dental medicine from a college or university approved by the Administrator, and be licensed to practice dentistry in a State;

"(3) Nurse—

"have successfully completed a full course of nursing in a recognized school of nursing, approved by the Administrator, and be registered as a graduate nurse in a State;

"(4) Director of a hospital, domiciliary, center or outpatient clinic—

"have such business and administrative experience and qualifications as the Administrator shall prescribe;

"(5) Optometrist—

"be licensed to practice optometry in a State;

"(6) Pharmacist—

"hold the degree of bachelor of science in pharmacy, or the equivalent, from a school of pharmacy approved by the Administrator, and be registered as a pharmacist in a State;

"(7) Physical therapists, occupational therapists, dietitians, and other employees shall have such scientific or technical qualifications as the Administrator shall prescribe.

"(b) Except as provided in section 4114 of this title, no person may be appointed in the Department of Medicine and Surgery as a physician, dentist, or nurse unless he is a citizen of the United States."

Sec. 6. Section 4106 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by—

(a) deleting the words "Automatic promotions" in the second sentence of subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof the word "Advancement", and

(b) adding at the end thereof the following new subsection (e):

"(e) In accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator, the grade level and salary of a physician, dentist, or nurse changed from a level of assignment where the grade level is based on both the nature of the assignment and personal qualifications, may be adjusted to the grade and salary otherwise appropriate."

Sec. 7(a). Section 4107 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) deleting "or the position of clinic director at an outpatient clinic," in the second sentence of paragraph (2) of subsection (b), and

(2) adding at the end thereof the following new subsection (c):

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the per annum salary rate of each individual serving as a director of a hospital, domiciliary, or center who is not a physician shall not be less than the salary rate which he would receive under this section if his service as a director of a hospital, domiciliary, or center had been service as a physician in the director grade. The position of the director of a hospital, domiciliary, or center shall not be subject to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949 as amended."

(b) Any physician or dentist in the executive grade on the date of enactment of this Act by virtue of his holding the position of clinic director at an outpatient clinic may be continued in such grade so long as he continues to hold the same position, notwithstanding the amendment made in section 4107(b) of title 38, United States Code, by section 7(a) of this Act.

Sec. 8. Section 4111 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting "(a)" in the first line and subsection (b) in its entirety.

Sec. 9. Section 4112 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting "conduct regular calendar quarterly meetings." in the second sentence thereof, and substituting therefor, "meet on a regular basis as prescribed by the Administrator.".

Sec. 10. Section 4113 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting "and paragraph (1) of section 4104" and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraph (1) of section 4104 and physicians, dentists, and nurses appointed on a temporary full-time or part-time basis under section 4114".

Sec. 11. (a) Section 4114 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting the words "or part-time" in paragraph (a)(1)(A) and inserting in lieu thereof ", part-time, or without compensation".

(b) Such section 4114 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The Chief Medical Director may waive for the purpose of appointments under this section the requirements of section 4105(a) of this title that the licensure of a physician or dentist, or the registration of a nurse must be in a 'State', if—

"(1) in the case of a physician, he is to be used on a research or an academic post or where there is no direct responsibility for the care of patients; or

"(2) in any case, where the individual is to serve in a country other than the United States and his licensure or registration is in the country in which he is to serve."

(c) The catchline of such section 4114 is amended to read "Temporary full-time, part-time, and without compensation appointments; residencies or internships".

(d) The analysis at the head of chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting:

"4114. Temporary and part-time appointments; residencies and internships."

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"4114. Temporary full-time, part-time, and without compensation appointments; residencies or internships."

Sec. 12. (a) Section 5004 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 5004. Garages and parking facilities

"(a) The Administrator may construct and maintain on reservations of Veterans' Administration hospitals and domiciliaries, garages for the accommodation of privately-owned automobiles of employees of such hospitals and domiciliaries. Employees using such garages shall make such reimbursement therefor as the Administrator may deem reasonable.

"(b)(1) The Administrator may establish, operate, and maintain, in conjunction with Veterans' Administration hospitals and domiciliaries, parking facilities for the accommodation of privately owned vehicles of Federal employees, and vehicles of visitors and other individuals having business at such hospitals and domiciliaries.

"(2) The Administrator may establish and collect (or provide for the collection of) fees, for the use of the parking facilities, authorized by subsection (b)(1) of this section, at such rate or rates which he determines would (A) at least amortize the cost of lands acquired after enactment of this section, (B) amortize cost of improvements and recover cost of maintenance and operations, and (C) be reasonable under the particular circumstances.

"(3) The Administrator may contract, by lease or otherwise, with responsible persons, firms or corporations, for the operation of such parking facilities, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, and without regard to the laws concerning advertising for competitive bids.

"(c) Money received from the use of the garages and from the parking facilities operations authorized by this section, may be credited to the applicable appropriation charged with the cost of operating and maintaining these facilities. Any amount not needed for the maintenance, operation and repair of these facilities shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

(b) The table of sections, appearing at the beginning of chapter 81 of such title 38, is amended by deleting therefrom:

"5004. Garages on hospital and domiciliary reservations."

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"5004. Garages and parking facilities."

ESTABLISHMENT OF AN INDEPENDENT FEDERAL MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in recent weeks a number of proposals have been advanced, and some subsequently withdrawn, with the announced purpose of assisting and promoting the U.S. merchant marine. I do not care at this time to comment on all the proposals that have been made by Government officials and committees and by several associations representing maritime labor and management. It is rather clear that this adventure of initiating proposals and new ideas has not come to an end. The President of the United States has promised a new maritime policy and a special subcommittee of the President's Maritime Advisory Committee is now busy at work on additional maritime proposals.

I have no panacea to suggest to the Advisory Committee, but I do believe that it will be necessary for those who make further recommendations to realize the importance of including a meaningful program of assistance and modernization for our domestic merchant fleet and our American shipyards.

The desperate condition of the domestic trade has been fully documented in Senate Commerce Committee hearings, yet this essential segment, which in the past has involved a fleet larger than that in our foreign trade, has been admittedly and by design ignored in Government studies made to date. The problem of the U.S. coastal, Great Lakes, and offshore trades to Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and Alaska represents to me one of the most serious facing our American merchant marine. It can no longer be ignored.

Neither can our shipyards and essential American suppliers to shipyards be ignored. The Government spends over a billion and one-half dollars annually in private American shipyards and American private operators in the foreign and domestic trade spend annually another quarter of a billion dollars. Therefore, I believe it should be obvious that the improvement and modernization of our shipbuilding capability offers possibilities for competitive improvement and cost reduction to the Government and industry as significant as the modernization of our merchant fleet.

Much could be advanced for improving the competitive position of both our domestic fleet and American shipyards which have, by tradition and for good reason, been considered an essential element of the American merchant marine. It seems to me that nothing has been advanced so far that recognizes these facts.

It is my hope that what emerges from this lineup of proposals next year is a constructive and progressive administration program, not one of retrenchment. The Senate Commerce Committee will be ready for serious and constructive consideration of this program and other maritime legislation early next session. I expect it to be the first order of business.

In order to have all significant maritime proposals before the committee for consideration, I introduce by request for appropriate reference a bill to establish an independent Federal Maritime Administration. I certainly share the concern that has been expressed by the proponents of this legislation over the administration of our maritime laws. I do not suggest that this proposal is an answer to all our maritime problems but I do think that it is a bill that should be seriously considered by the committee early next year.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement prepared in support of this bill by the AFL-CIO Maritime Committee be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF LEGISLATION BY AFL-CIO MARITIME COMMITTEE

The purpose of the bill is to establish an independent Federal Maritime Administration. The failure of the present Maritime Administration to administer properly the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, is the primary reason that the enactment of this legislation is essential.

There was more than one reason for the creation of the 1936 Merchant Marine Act. First of all, our merchant marine had declined to where it was not adequate "to carry the greater portion of its (our) commerce and serve as a naval or military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency. * * *"

The indirect subsidies provided in the 1928 act has not done the job intended and their administration was associated with many abuses and malpractices.

In his message to Congress in 1936 on a merchant marine, President Roosevelt put it as follows:

"I present to the Congress the question of whether or not the United States should have an adequate merchant marine.

"To me there are three reasons for answering this question in the affirmative. The first is that in time of peace, subsidies granted by other nations, shipping combines, and other restrictive or rebating methods may well be used to the detriment of American shippers. The maintenance of fair competition alone calls for American-flag ships of sufficient tonnage to carry a reasonable portion of our foreign commerce.

"Second, in the event of a major war in which the United States is not involved, our commerce, in the absence of an adequate American merchant marine, might find itself seriously crippled because of its inability to secure bottoms for neutral peaceful foreign trade.

"Third, in the event of a war in which the United States itself might be engaged, American flagships are obviously needed not only for naval auxiliaries but also for the maintenance of reasonable and necessary commercial intercourse with other nations. We should remember lessons learned in the last war."

These reasons for a merchant marine are as sound today as they were 30 years ago. The only difference between now and then is that our merchant marine is in worse condition now than it was in 1936 and getting even worse.

The 1936 act states that we shall have a merchant marine and then it provides means such as operating and construction subsidies and preferences for U.S.-flag ships to make the declared policy a reality. The value of the subsidy provided for in the 1936 act is amply demonstrated by the fact that in the trade in which they participate, the subsidized lines carry over 30 percent of the trade. This is contrasted with the overall participation of less than 10 percent.

Over the years, because the act has not been positively administered, it has been necessary for Congress to enact further legislation such as Cargo Preference that is nothing more than piecemeal help to do what the 1936 act was intended to do.

Beginning with 1937, we have had 15 Chairmen or Administrators and 2 reorganizations of the Maritime Commission. In spite of all of these efforts, little attention has been given to administering the 1936 act. Dedication to our Nation's maritime policy is a prerequisite of our maritime laws. This dedication has apparently been missing. This may not be the sole fault of any one individual. There is no question but that the merchant marine does not get the attention necessary because it is under the Department of Commerce, an agency with many broad and varied projects, most of which because of size or objective are not conducive to the promotion and development of a merchant marine.

We have now reached the point where the Administrator is spending more time in advocating departures from the act, some diametrically opposing the stated objectives, than in administering the act.

The 1936 act is still basically sound and if administered as intended it will accomplish the stated objectives. This is not to say that some changes are not necessary. Some changes in the act will be necessary. For example, the act should be amended to preclude any assistance of any type to shipowners that own and/or operate foreign-flag ships.

While we may not be wedded to every word in this proposed legislation, we nevertheless believe that its basic purpose, an independent Maritime Administration, is necessary.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I want to emphasize that the Senate Committee on Commerce early next session will make a full review of all maritime problems and policies. This review will include plans for a nuclear merchant fleet. The United States now has the lead with the *Savannah*, but we cannot be static. Suggestions for new vessels have ranged from icebreakers to conventional cargo vessels to cargo submarines. The expense of nuclear-powered ship construction requires the establishment of detailed and imaginative priorities and plans.

It is my earnest hope that the few months we have before the next session will bring forth a consensus on the future of a stronger American merchant marine, and not contaminate the atmosphere with further dissension and acrimony. Otherwise, nothing constructive can be expected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2667) to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

CHARTER FOR CERTAIN PASSENGER CRUISE SERVICE OF VESSELS OPERATING UNDER SUBSIDY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, a bill, for appropriate reference, to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 in order to authorize the chartering for certain passenger cruise service of vessels operating under subsidy. Introduction was requested by the Committee of American Steamship Lines.

It has long been recognized that there is a continuing need for an American-flag passenger ship fleet. However, in order to combat the inroads of foreign flag competition, it has become necessary to utilize our existing fleet in a more efficient manner.

This bill is intended to permit the chartering of vessels in subsidized service by one subsidized line to another, for use by the latter on its trade route. Such legislation will vary from the present law so as to permit a subsidized operator to charter its passenger ships to another subsidized operator with regular passenger service, rather than operating those vessels in the cruise trade itself.

This cross chartering will allow the company most familiar with the trade route to administer the service through its established agents, and to integrate the ships with its normal marketing and advertising plans. It would also assure the line owning the vessel the most effective use of the ship during the "off season" period, without the necessity of engaging in a trade with which it is not familiar. It will also preclude the undertaking of advertising and other expenses which substantially exceed those required by the existing operators.

The benefits of cross chartering now exist, by special legislation, for cruise service of the Caribbean. Several years ago, in recognition of the need to better utilize American-flag passenger ships, we enacted legislation which would permit U.S.-flag operators to engage in the cruise service of the Caribbean. This legislation enabled east coast passenger line operators to provide cruises to the Caribbean on vessels which were not required for the regular passenger service during the slow season. As a result of this earlier legislation, the loss generally incurred by the subsidized lines as a consequence of the lay-ups of unused passenger ships was reduced through utilization in the cruise trade.

The present bill will permit all lines to maximize their service potential by employing other available passenger ships.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2668) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to authorize the chartering for certain passenger cruise service of vessels operating under subsidy, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

TIRE SAFETY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, during the past several months, the Commerce Committee has held extensive hearings on automobile tire safety and grading. In particular, the committee has had before it S. 1643, introduced by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], which would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to establish and enforce minimum safety standards and a uniform grading system for tires.

Following the close of the committee hearings, the staff of the committee, under my direction, prepared a revised bill taking into consideration the data and testimony developed during the hearings.

So that the public and the affected industries may have the opportunity to consider the committee draft, I now introduce for appropriate reference, the proposed "Tire Safety Act of 1966," and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, together with a brief summary, be printed at the close of my remarks.

Our committee was told that automobile accidents cost this Nation over 2 million casualties and an economic loss of $8,100 million each year. The causes of these accidents range from driver error to mechanical failure to the inexplicable.

Tires are a critical and complex part of the automobile. Control of the automobile, of course, depends on tire contact with the road. For each tire, this contact is approximately the size of a human foot, yet four tires must support and control 1 or 2 tons of automobile at 60, 70, or 80 miles an hour.

Last year approximately 42.5 million original equipment tires, 87 million new replacement tires, and 35 million retreaded tires were put into use on the Nation's highways. The committee received significant numbers of letters detailing consumer difficulties with tires. The hearings and letters have documented a situation where an unusual number of tires appear to be wearing out or failing at low mileage, where consumer and dealer confusion abounds, and where no comprehensive basic standards exist.

There is a startling lack of information and agreement by the experts in most of the problem areas. A research and development program is sorely needed to develop comprehensive minimum safety standards.

There are neither performance nor grading standards, which means that there is virtually no satisfactory way to compare the qualities of the more than 940 tire names on the market. Tire labeling has become less and less meaningful because such basic terms as "ply rating" and size designation are only approximations. The only load standards previously available for use in selecting original equipment tires have been approximations based on load figures which were considerably lower than the designed capacity of the automobiles. Present load standards represent an upward revision of the old figures, but no upgrading in the tire themselves.

The tire and automobile industries are deeply—and properly—concerned with safety. Today's tires are incomparably superior to tires of even a few years ago. Two facts remain, however; there is a lack of comprehensive tire standards and automobile accidents constitute a national catastrophe.

It is necessary that action be taken to minimize tire failure as a cause of accidents and to maximize tire performance as a positive safety factor. This bill provides for the immediate adoption of the minimum tire safety standards promulgated by the Executive Committee of the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission, a State compact organization with a membership totaling 44 States. The bill also authorizes a 5-year research and development program to develop more comprehensive safety standards, retreading standards, and a grading system for tires. The Secretary of Commerce is given the primary responsibility for the administration of the program.

The need for this legislation is becoming greater by the day. By 1975, it is estimated that 20 percent of the Nation's traffic will move over the new Interstate Highway System. These highways will allow automobiles to travel at very high speeds for long periods of time. Standards are needed to insure that the tire in use will be safe under present driving conditions as well as under the new conditions presented by the Interstate Highway System.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2669) to establish safety standards for motor vehicle tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2669

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Tire Safety Act of 1966".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "interstate commerce" includes commerce between one State, territory, possesssion, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and another State, territory, possession, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(b) The term "motor vehicle" means passenger cars and station wagons used on the highways except those regulated under clauses (1), (2), and (3) of section 204(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 304(a)(1)-(3)).

(c) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce.

MINIMUM SAFETY STANDARDS FOR TIRES

SEC. 3. In order that motor vehicle accidents caused by tire failure can be kept to a minimum, the Secretary shall establish and publish, as interim minimum safety standards, in the Federal Register the tire safety standards substantially as prescribed in Regulation V-1 by the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission, an interstate agency established pursuant to the joint resolution of the Congress relating to highway traffic safety approved August 20, 1958, as the initial minimum safety standards for motor vehicle tires.

IMPROVING STANDARDS

SEC. 4. (a) Two years after the effective date of this Act and thereafter as he deems necessary the Secretary shall review and revise to the extent necessary the minimum safety standards prescribed pursuant to section 3. Such revised standards shall be published in the Federal Register and shall become effective on the date specified in the regulations.

(b) In such revised minimum standards the Secretary shall prescribe the maximum permissible loads for each motor vehicle tire, and the application of such maximum permissible load standards.

(c) In order to carry out this section, the Secretary—

(1) is authorized to conduct a research and development program to improve minimum new tire safety standards;

(2) is authorized to conduct a research and development program to develop minimum safety standards for retreaded motor vehicle tires;

(3) shall consult with tire manufacturers, and other interested industries, technical organizations, State, local, and interstate agencies concerned with tire safety, and tire users; and

(4) shall take into consideration such factors as size, load carrying ability, and its relation to the type of expected use, skid resistance, blowout resistance, resistance to curb striking and pothole or bump damage, cornering ability, rim resistance, and such other factors as he deems relevant.

DEVELOPMENT OF PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR GRADING TIRES

SEC. 5. In order that the consumer may make an informed choice in the purchase of motor vehicle tires, the Secretary is authorized and directed to develop a uniform grading system for motor vehicle tires. The Secretary shall make recommendations to the Congress with respect to the implementation of such a uniform grading system by January 31, 1971.

PROHIBITED ACTS

SEC. 6. The following acts and the causing thereof are prohibited:

(a) the manufacture for sale, the sale, or the offering for sale, in interstate commerce, or the importation into the United States, or the introduction, delivery for introduction, or transportation, in interstate commerce, or for the purpose of sale, or delivery after sale, in interstate commerce, of any motor vehicle tire manufactured on or after the date this section takes effect unless in compliance with the standards prescribed by the Secretary pursuant to sections 3 and 4 of this Act;

(b) the sale, or the offering for sale, in interstate commerce, or the importation into the United States, or the introduction, delivery for introduction, or transportation, in interstate commerce, or for the purpose of sale, or delivery after sale, in interstate commerce, of any new motor vehicle equipped with tires not in compliance with the standards established by the Secretary pursuant to section 4(b) of this Act;

(c) the failure to permit entry or inspection as authorized by section 10 of this Act.

SEIZURE

SEC. 7. (a) Any motor vehicle tire that has been manufactured or introduced into commerce in violation of section 6(a) of this Act shall be liable to be proceeded against while in interstate commerce or at any time thereafter, on libel of information and condemned in any district court in the United States within the jurisdiction of which the tire is found: *Provided,* That this section shall not apply to a tire intended for export to any foreign country if it is labeled on the outside of the shipping package to show that it is intended for export, and is so exported.

(b) Such tire shall be liable to seizure by process pursuant to the libel, and the procedure in cases under this section shall conform, as nearly as may be, to the procedure in admiralty; except that on demand of either party any issue of fact joined in any such case shall be tried by jury. When libel for condemnation proceedings under this section, involving the same claimant, are pending in two or more jurisdictions, such pending proceedings, upon application of the United States or the claimant seasonably made to the court of one such jurisdiction, shall be consolidated for trial by order of such court, and tried in (1) any district selected by the applicant where one of such proceedings is pending; or (2) a district agreed upon by stipulation between the parties. If no order for consolidation is so made within a reasonable time, the United States or the claimant may apply to the court of one such jurisdiction, and such court (after giving the other party, the claimant, or the United States attorney for such district, reasonable notice and opportunity to be heard) shall by order, unless good cause to the contrary is shown, specify a district of reasonable proximity to the claimant's principal place of business, in which all such pending proceedings shall be consolidated for trial and tried. Such order of consolidation shall not apply so as to require the removal of any case the date for trial of which has been fixed. The court granting such order shall give prompt notification thereof to the other courts having jurisdiction of the case covered thereby.

(c) Any tire condemned under this section shall, after entry of the decree, be disposed of by destruction or sale as the court may, in accordance with the provisions of this section, direct and the proceeds thereof, if sold, less the legal costs and charges, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States; but such tire shall not be sold under such decree contrary to the provisions of this Act or the laws of the jurisdiction in which sold: *Provided*, That, after entry of the decree and upon the payment of the costs of such proceedings and the execution of a good and sufficient bond conditioned that such tire shall not be sold or disposed of contrary to the provisions of this Act or the laws of any State or territory in which sold, the court may by order direct that such tire be delivered to the owner thereof to be destroyed or brought into compliance with the provisions of this Act under the supervision of an officer or employee duly designated by the Secretary, and the expenses of such supervision shall be paid by the person obtaining release of the tire under bond.

(d) When a decree of condemnation is entered against the tire, court costs and fees, and storage and other proper expenses, shall be awarded against the person, if any, intervening as claimant of the tire.

(e) In the case of removal for trial of any case as provided by subsection (b) of this section—

(1) the clerk of the court from which removal is made shall promptly transmit to the court in which the case is to be tried all records in the case necessary in order that such court may exercise jurisdiction;

(2) the court to which such case is removed shall have the powers and be subject to the duties, for purposes of such case, which the court from which removal was made would have had, or to which such court would have been subject, if such case had not been removed.

INJUNCTION; CRIMINAL CONTEMPT

SEC. 8. (a) The United States district courts and the United States courts of the territories shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown and subject to the provisions of rule 65 (a) and (b) of the Federal Rules of Civil procedure, to restrain violations of this Act.

(b) In any proceeding for criminal contempt for violation of an injunction or restraining order issued under this section, which violation also constitutes a violation of this Act, trial shall be by the court or, upon demand of the accused, by a jury. Such trial shall be conducted in accordance with the practice and procedure applicable in the case of proceedings subject to the provisions of rule 42(b) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

SUBPENAS

SEC. 9. In all libel or injunction proceedings for the enforcement, or to restrain violations, of this Act subpenas for witnesses who are required to attend a court of the United States in any district may run into any other district in any such proceeding.

TESTING AND INSPECTION

SEC. 10. (a) The Secretary is authorized to conduct such testing and inspection as he deems necessary for the enforcement of this Act.

(b) For purposes of this section, officers and employees designated by the Secretary, upon presenting appropriate credentials and a written notice to the owner, operator, or agent in charge, are authorized to enter, at reasonable times, any factory, warehouse, or other business establishment or premises where motor vehicle tires are manufactured or held prior to their sale or delivery to the ultimate consumer, or are being worked on after such sale or delivery, or where new motor vehicles are assembled or held prior to their sale or delivery to the ultimate consumer and to make a reasonable inspection of such tires or such motor vehicles to determine compliance with the provisions of this Act and regulations prescribed pursuant to this Act.

RECORDS AND REPORTS

SEC. 11. (a) Every tire manufacturer shall establish and maintain such records, make such reports, and provide such information as the Secretary may reasonably require to enable him to determine whether such manufacturer has acted or is acting in compliance with the provisions of this Act and regulations prescribed pursuant to this Act.

(b) All information reported shall be considered confidential for the purpose of section 1905 of Title 18 of the United States Code, except where such information is related to other officers or employees concerned with carrying out this Act or when relevant in any proceeding under this Act.

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 12. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $5,820,000 for the period ending June 30, 1971, to carry out the purposes of this Act and a sum not to exceed $750,000 for each fiscal year thereafter.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 13. This Act shall take effect on the date of its enactment except that section 6 shall take effect on such date as the Secretary of Commerce shall determine, but such date shall be not less than thirty days nor more than ninety days after the date of publication of regulations first prescribed pursuant to section 3 of this Act.

The summary presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED TIRE SAFETY ACT OF 1966

The act establishes minimum safety standards for new tires for passenger cars and station wagons. The act adopts the existing standards promulgated by the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission, an interstate compact established under a 1958 congressional resolution. (Section 3), The Secretary of Commerce must revise this standard within 2 years. (Section 4a).

Research and development programs in the following areas are authorized: (1) minimum new tire safety standards (section 4); (2) retreading safety standards (section 4c); and (3) a uniform grading system for tires (section 5).

The following acts are prohibited (section 6): (1) manufacture or sale of noncomplying tires; (2) selling new cars with tires that do not comply with the tire load standards to be promulgated within 2 years (section 4.b); and (3) failure to permit inspection (section 10).

Violations of the act are punishable by the following: (1) seizure of the noncomplying tires in an action conforming to a libel in admiralty, with jury trial upon demand (section 7); and (2) injunction and criminal contempt for violation of the injunction (section 8).

Compliance is enforced by giving the Secretary of Commerce the following authority: (1) testing tires (section 10a); (2) authority to enter tire and auto factories, warehouses, and so forth, on written notice (section 10b); and (3) authority to prescribe recordkeeping procedures (section 11).

Excluded from the act are truck and bus tires (section 2b), and tires for exports (section 7).

The bill authorizes the expenditure of $5,820,000 for the period ending June 30, 1971, and not more than $750,000 annually thereafter (section 12).

APPROVAL OF CONTRACT NEGOTIATED WITH EL PASO COUNTY WATER IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 1, TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to approve a contract negotiated with the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1, Texas, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2670) to approve a contract negotiated with the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1, Texas, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the proposed contract designated "FSTO31765" negotiated by the Secretary of the Interior with the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1, Texas, to extend the period for repayment of reimbursable costs incurred on the Rio Grande project for construction and for rehabilitation and betterment work and to establish a variable repayment schedule for such costs allocated to this District is approved and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to execute such contract on behalf of the United States.

The letter presented by Mr. YARBOROUGH is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., October 5, 1965.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed for your consideration is a draft of bill to approve a contract negotiated with the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1, Texas, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes.

We recommend that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee and we recommend that it be enacted.

This bill would approve, and authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute a contract that has been negotiated with the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1, Rio Grande project, Texas, pursuant to section 7 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. The contract would establish a variable formula, based on water availability, for computing annual repayment installments on the district's construction and rehabilitation and betterment obligations to the United States. Under the formula, the amount of the base annual charge under the contract would be payable as the required annual installment if the estimated water allotment (as of July 10) were equal to a full water supply. If the water allotment were less than a full water supply (3 acre-feet), the base annual charge would be reduced proportionately.

Because of periodic extreme water shortages and an apparent shrinking water supply, adoption of the variable formula is expected to extend the district's existing repayment schedule by about 15 years. Under present contracts, repayment will be completed in about 23 years. However, the formula is flexible so that the ultimate repayment period would depend on the actual quantities of water available year by year.

Construction of the Leasburg diversion dam in New Mexico for the Rio Grande project was authorized by the Secretary of the Interior December 2, 1905, under the provisions of the Reclamation Act, and funds were allocated to initiate construction of the first diversion unit. The Reclamation Act was extended to Texas on June 12, 1906. Congress authorized the construction of Elephant Butte Dam on March 4, 1907, at which time $1 million of nonreimbursable funds were appropriated from the General Treasury as the State Department's share for allocation by treaty of 60,000 acre-feet of water annually to Mexico. Additional project works have been authorized by Congress through the years with the most recent authorization being the construction of recreation facilities under Public Law 87–542 (76 Stat. 171).

Principal features of the project include Elephant Butte and Caballo Dam and Reservoirs, Elephant Butte powerplant, power distribution facilities, four project diversion dams, plus the American Dam operated by the International Boundary and Water Commission, 141 miles of main canals, 462 miles of laterals, and over 460 miles of drains. The project was initially planned to provide full irrigation service for 159,650 acres and supplemental irrigation water for 18,340 acres of land in New Mexico and Texas. Project purposes include irrigation, power and recreation.

The repayment contract of November 10, 1937, as amended by the contract of October 1, 1939, and subsequently supplemented, provides for the district to pay its construction obligation in annual installments of $98,863. Deferments have been granted by the Secretary under authority given him by section 17 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, as amended, on the basis of prevalent water-shortage conditions. The district also has an obligation to the United States for repayment of rehabilitation and betterment costs. The cost of the program is limited to $2,300,000 and the first repayment installment is scheduled in 1966. A portion of the rehabilitation and betterment repayment obligation will be repaid concurrently with construction cost repayment. By contract of May 15, 1959, district repayment of the rehabilitation and betterment obligation was scheduled at the annual rate of $133,860 less the amount payable under the construction cost repayment contracts. The proposed variable repayment arrangement would apply to both the construction and the rehabilitation and betterment installments.

The variable repayment plan incorporated in the proposed amendatory contract is considered an equitable solution of the district's repayment problem. The variable repayment plan relates each payment to the water supply actually available in project reservoirs and allotted for use on the project. This plan has the support of the district's water users and does not entail a writeoff or reduction in the district's repayment obligation.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

Kenneth Holum,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill proposing an amendment to section 13(a)(5) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

Section 13(a)(5) of the Fair Labor Standards Act is codified as title 29, section 213(a)(5) of the United States Code, and is one of the exemptions written into the Fair Labor Standards Act. As it is presently worded, this provision exempts from the minimum wage and maximum hour sections of the act "any employee employed in the catching, taking, propagating, harvesting, cultivating, or farming of any kind of fish, shellfish, crustaceas sponges, seaweeds, or other aquatic forms of animal and vegetable life, or in the first procssing, canning or packing such marine products at sea as an incident to, or in conjunction with, such fishing operations, including the going to and returning from work and loading and unloading when performed by any such employee."

The bill which I have introduced would add after the word "harvesting" the following: "including shelling in the case of shellfish."

Prior to the 1961 amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act, all employees engaged in harvesting, processing or canning operations in the seafood industry were exempted from coverage of the act. The 1961 amendments severely limited the exemption and has resulted in coverage, for minimum wages only, of some employees who have never before earned as much as the minimum wage. This has caused a severe hardship in some of the smaller operations in the industry. For example, in a newspaper article which appeared in the city of Columbia, S.C., on September 3, 1965, industry spokesmen attribute the shutdown in major crab packing plants in North Carolina to the application of the minimum wage. I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "Minimum Wage Blamed for Industry Failure," be printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the Congressional Record.

This amendment would exempt only those who are engaged in the shelling of shellfish. This is a very limited number of individuals who stand to lose their job and the income that they now enjoy unless an exemption of this nature is approved by Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the article will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2671) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in order to exempt employees employed in the shelling of shellfish from the minimum wage provisions of such act, introduced by Mr. Thurmond, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The article presented by Mr. Thurmond is as follows:

NORTH CAROLINA: MINIMUM WAGE BLAMED FOR INDUSTRY FAILURE

Raleigh.—North Carolina crab industry shut down Thursday and officials blamed it on an increase in the Federal minimum wage. They said the move threatened the entire commercial fishing industry in North Carolina.

The shutdown came after the Crab Packers Association voted unanimously Wednesday night to close all 18 major crab packing plants in North Carolina immediately.

W. F. Whorton, president of the association, said the crab processors were victims of economic strangulation and that the breaking point will come Friday when the Federal minimum wage takes another jump from $1.15 to $1.25 an hour.

Whorton said the closing of the crab plants will mean the end of the State's commercial fishing industry because crabbing constitutes such an important part of the fishing industry's income.

He added the shutdown "is permanent, unless the Government chooses to make some adjustments for us, chooses, in other words, to let us work."

INTERSTATE LAND SALES FULL DISCLOSURE ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to require registration of real estate subdivisions, sold through the mail or by the instrumentalities of interstate commerce, with the Securities and Exchange Commission. This bill is primarily aimed at correcting abuses in the "mail-order" land sales industry. It is based on the full disclosure principle established by the Securities Act of 1933 and in many instances this bill parallels the provisions of that act. As this bill is intended to regulate the sale of lots in large tracts of land, which are often raw and undeveloped, certain types of land sales are especially exempted from its provisions. For example, sellers of land for industrial and commercial use, the owner selling his own property, or a developer selling lots on which houses were already built or selling a lot with an agreement to build would not be required to register with SEC.

A developer of a subdivision, defined as land divided into five or more lots, would file a registration statement with the SEC. The registration statement would contain a legal description of the land, its topography, the availability of sewage facilities, utilities, proximity to towns and villages, state of the title, and a description of encumbrances on the land, the names of persons having an interest in tne land and the extent of their interest and other information.

It would be illegal to sell the land unless the registration statement was in effect. If it appeared to the SEC that the registration statement contained omissions or misstatements of fact or was inaccurate and incomplete, the Commission could prevent the sale of the land by issuing an order refusing to permit the registration statement to become effective.

After a hearing, the SEC could require appropriate amendments to the registration statement before allowing it to become effective. Even if the registration statement were in effect, the SEC could suspend its effectiveness if misstatements or omissions of fact, or misleading statements were discovered.

The developer would be required to give the prospective buyer of a lot in a subdivision a prospectus containing the information contained in the registration statement. Although the prospectus would not constitute approval of the merits of the land by the SEC, it would give the buyer clear and accurate information on the condition of the land he was buying. It would be a realistic companion piece to the glossy brochures and high pressure sales pitches which are often used to sell "retirement paradises" and investment acreage.

Agents selling land for a developer would also register with the SEC, which could deny or revoke registration for past criminal activity or violation of the provisions of the act.

The SEC would have the power to investigate statements made in the registration statement of the developers or in an application for registration as an agent. As in the Securities Act of 1933, opportunity for a hearing is provided during these administrative proceedings. And, of course, the bill provides for review by the courts of the actions of the SEC.

Another protection for the purchaser would be the right to sue the developer for damages if his purchase was made on the basis of misstatements or omissions of fact. In addition, this bill would make it unlawful to sell lots in a subdivision by the use of fraudulent devices or practices, or by using misstatements of facts or misleading facts.

Mr. President, this bill is not intended to eliminate State regulatory action, but to encourage it. The Securities Exchange Commission is directed by section 8 to cooperate with the appropriate State authorities and may accept registration of a developer with a State agency in lieu of registration with the Commission if it is in the public interest. I know that the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws has been developing a model full disclosure statute for the States, and I would hope that such a statute would be eventually enacted by the States. Federal regulation in this area is necessary to deal with an interstate problem, but it is my hope that passage of adequate State regulations and cooperation between the States will lessen and ultimately eliminate the need for an active Federal role in this field.

Mr. President, this bill applies to the sale of land the same method of investor protection which has worked so well in the securities industry. For the past 30 years, the buyer of common stock has had available to him the full facts concerning a new stock issue. He can buy stock, confident that the facts he has are true and accurate. The full disclosure principle has the support of the securities industry and the investing public. It is my belief that this legislation will be welcomed by the many hundreds of real estate developers, who have been conscientiously seeking to rid their industry of the unscrupulous and deceitful salesmen of worthless land. I know it will be supported by the thousands of prospective buyers of lots as investments or as sites for their retirement homes. We are not attempting to tell anyone what he can or cannot buy. We are simply making sure that when a person does buy he is in full possession of all the facts and that the facts are honestly and fairly described.

I have had a short explanation of the provisions of the bill prepared, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. This bill, Mr. President, is more than a proposal to combat excesses that have already partially damaged the reputation of the mail-order land sales industry.

It is an attempt to assist the respectable majority of land-by-mail developers to maintain high ethical standards without being put at a disadvantage by those less scrupulous than they.

It is also an attempt to help the industry better perform its important service to a highly mobile population, a population which more and more may be inclined to buy unfamiliar sites in faraway States if the industry can assure them of fair, honest treatment.

The group that stands most in need of such treatment are retired persons or those planning for retirement. These elderly Americans dream of a haven in a climate and surroundings far different than they have known all their lives. They are seeking sites on which they can live less expensively than they did when they raised their families. Quite often they must move because of health problems. Usually, every dollar of their income is accounted for; they move in order to make those dollars go further.

Whatever their reason, they depend to a large degree on the honesty of the seller or the effectiveness of regulation, where it exists, at the State level.

Quite often, the honesty and foresight of the seller is protection enough for such buyers. Many thousands of Americans now live securely in communities built entirely through mail-order sales by developers who had the vision and the finances required to transform vacant and oftentimes unpromising land into attractive environments for comfortable living. Other thousands of Americans, young and old, have bought undeveloped land and have good reason to believe that it will yield rich investment returns, or serve as a site for a home far in the future.

Heartening as such experiences may be, the U.S. Senate Committee on Aging, of which I am a member, has found that they are far from universal.

Concerned about possible abuse of elderly persons who are seeking retirement security, the committee took preliminary testimony on mail-order land sales in 1963. The initial findings gave ample evidence that our concern was warranted. To continue the investigations, the committee established a subcommittee on frauds and misrepresentations affecting the elderly, on which it has been my pleasure to serve as chairman.

The subcommittee, given a mandate to investigate mail-order land sales in some detail, conducted a 6-month study which concluded in May 1964 with 3 days of hearings in Washington, D.C.

In a report, "Frauds and Deceptions Affecting the Elderly; Investigations, Findings, and Recommendations: 1964," issued on January 31, the subcommittee offered findings that may be summarized as follows:

First. The installment mail-order and sales industry is already a big business. Estimates vary, but it is well established that hundreds of millions of dollars have been invested in land, sight unseen, for a few dollars down and a few dollars a month.

Second. Approximately 5 or 6 years ago, in the early days of the boom, speculators and others looking for a killing engaged in blatant and sometimes reckless schemes.

The "free lot" technique, for example, was widespread in 1960 and 1961. Victims were told that they had "won" small lots that could be theirs if they paid so-called closing costs of anywhere from $40 to $100. Investigation showed, however, that quite often the closing costs were spurious and that the land in question was so remote, or so barren, or so inaccessible that it was worth far less than the fee they paid for it.

Other promoters sold land they did not own, claimed that water or utilities existed on the site when in fact they did not, or made other statements so obviously false that they invited action under the postal fraud statute.

Thus, thousands of persons—many of them near or past retirement age—became owners of desert or swampland far different from the homesites they dreamed of. Their plight was summed up by one reporter who, after traveling dozens of miles over rough desert paths, found a sign attached to a lonely stake that marked the property bought by one disenchanted buyer.

The sign said: "My God, this is it. We have been took."

Third. Action by postal authorities, as well as new laws in several States, have had a salutary effect in discouraging the raw deceptions of the past. But the subcommittee felt that land-by-mail promotions still offer many opportunities for those who deliberately wish to deceive their prospective customers. The new methods may be technically within the letter of the postal fraud law, and they may be difficult for State authorities to deal with. But the buyer may find himself just as thoroughly deceived as if he had been bilked by more obvious methods.

The subcommittee report gave special attention to those sellers of "investment acreage" who take pains to point out that the land they offer is undeveloped and, in some cases, highly speculative. Witnesses told the subcommittee, however, that some of the land now sold as investment acreage faces virtually inseparable barriers to development, even in the distant future, because of scattered ownership, inaccessibility, unusual topographical problems, and special situations, such as impediments to development caused by regional drainage programs.

Subcommittee members also heard witnesses describe tricks of the trade, that can be employed to give prospective buyers a thoroughly distorted picture of the land in question and the terms under which that land is bought. The subcommittee concluded that omission as well as subtle distortion of facts, can lead a layman far afield, even in cases where outright fraud cannot be proved.

Fourth. Some States have attempted to cope with the problem by requiring sellers of land to give full information so that a public report can be issued to buyers. This is a sound principle and it is, indeed, the principle of the legislation offered here today.

But even the most determined State regulatory agency, with the most far-reaching powers, encounters difficulties. Those difficulties were summarized in the following testimony at a hearing on May 20, 1964, by Alton Van Horn, then a commissioner and now president of the New Jersey Real Estate Commission, and Robert Peacock, secretary-director of the commission:

> Senator WILLIAMS. * * * I wonder if you could amplify a little on just how the New Jersey Commission operates and how it becomes operative in any of these cases where an out-of-State seller wants to do business in selling this out-of-State land in New Jersey.
>
> Mr. VAN HORN. Under our law, 45–16–15–1 he is required to seek release of the State. Fundamentally, he must work under a New Jersey licensee or become licensed himself. He is required to file through the channels of the New Jersey licensee a request seeking release of the subdivision, seeking the right to physically come into New Jersey to promote the land. And then he must submit the data required by the questionnaires that I demonstrated earlier which is a rather searching thing.
>
> He must file certain other documentary material with it and then submit to an on-site examination of the property. After the on-site examination of the property, the commission has the right—and as we see it, the mandate—to impose restrictions and conditions, where warranted, and he must submit to those restrictions and conditions in order to promote the land within the State of New Jersey.
>
> Senator WILLIAMS. Is this true of any seller, no matter how he wants to come in, by mail, or ad, or phone?
>
> Mr. VAN HORN. We haven't yet determined any way in which we have any legal right to require a person to do it unless he comes physically into the State of New Jersey. So the great mail flood goes just observed but untouched by us.
>
> Senator WILLIAMS. So there is a gap? You cannot reach all of the sellers from out of State who are indeed selling in New Jersey?
>
> Mr. VAN HORN. The gap, Senator, is much wider than the fence. It is practically all gap.
>
> Senator WILLIAMS. Do you want to address yourself to that?
>
> Mr. PEACOCK. Yes, sir. I would like to comment on that. I think, in our opinion, we are trying to keep up with this situation in New Jersey with the enactment of new legislation early this year which we consider full disclosure legislation which will require the commission to file a public report after we have investigated a development and have released. In New Jersey a copy of that report must be turned over to every purchaser and signed for.
>
> We feel that we have almost complete control of the developer who is physically going into New Jersey to sell his lands. But when it comes to the mail-order type of operation, we are almost helpless here. We are of the opinion that this is where the Federal Government should step into the picture and try to develop some legislation that would restrict or control this type of advertising, if it is fraudulent, of course, but also if it is misleading and misrepresents the case.
>
> Because a great number of people, not only in New Jersey, but in other States, are buying land through the mails on a $10 down basis and $20 a month, as you have probably heard in testimony many, many times. But I think this is the area where legislation is needed.
>
> New Jersey, I don't believe, can produce this type of legislation, because we can't go beyond our borders. But I think the Federal Government can. And I think it is a question here of filling a very big loophole in this whole operation of land development throughout the country.
>
> I believe Congress should address itself to this problem.

Differing standards of State regulation have caused some concern within the industry itself. The subcommittee has received statements expressing industry complaints about the complexity and duplication of State requirements.

SUMMARY

Mr. President, the mail-order land sales industry is still, in my opinion, in the early stages of its growth. Already it has lived through an infant period marred by the excesses of a ruthless and relatively small group of promoters who deliberately set out to dupe their customers.

At the same time, however, more substantial developers have proven that mail-order land sales can open new land areas for good living by satisfied customers. The outward push of population and the demands of a dynamic and highly mobile society should make mail-order selling of land even more desirable in years to come, if suitable safeguards are taken.

The bill would establish a safeguard very similar to that provided to the securities industry three decades ago. Must we wait for another wave of scandals and prosecutions before we recognize the need for Federal action, or shall we act now to prevent them? Mr. President, I believe that this legislation will provide a fair and effective affirmative answer to that question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2672) to provide full and fair disclosure of the nature of interests in real estate subdivisions sold through the mails and instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce, and to prevent frauds in the sale thereof, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXHIBIT 1

EXPLANATION OF S. 2672

This bill is based on the Securities Act of 1933 and many of its sections are identical to those in the 1933 act.

SECTION 1: SHORT TITLE

SECTION 2: DEFINITIONS

Defines a "subdivision" as land, improved or unimproved, which is divided into five or more lots or parcels for residential development. A "developer" is defined as any person who, having an interest in land, causes it, directly or indirectly, to be divided into a subdivision, or who acquires an interest in such a subdivision; or a person who sells or leases subdivided lots. An "agent" means any person who represents, or acts for or on behalf of, another person in selling or leasing, or offering to sell or lease, any interest, lot, or parcel in a subdivision; but shall not include an attorney at law whose representation of another person consists solely of rendering legal services.

SECTION 3: EXEMPTIONS

The following transactions are exempted from the coverage of the act: sale or lease by a property owner in a single transaction; sale or lease of improved land on which there is a dwelling; sale or lease of unimproved land under contract to erect a dwelling on it; sale of real estate under a court order; sale of evidences of indebtedness secured by a mortgage or deed of trust on real estate; sale of securities issued by a real estate investment trust regulated by State or Federal statute; or the sale or lease of real estate for commercial or industrial use.

SECTION 4: PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO THE SALE OR LEASE OF INTEREST IN SUBDIVISIONS

Section 4(a) prohibits any developer or agent to use the mails or interstate facilities to sell or lease any lot in a subdivision unless a registration statement has been filed and is in effect in accordance with section 6.

Section 4(b) prohibits the use of the mails or interstate facilities by a developer or his agent unless a prospectus, described in Section 7, has been furnished to the investor before he signs a contract or sales agreement.

Section 4(c) requires that an agent for a developer must be registered in accordance with the SEC, in accordance with section 11.

SECTION 5: REGISTRATION OF INTERESTS IN SUBDIVISIONS

Section 5(a) provides for the filing of a registration statement with the SEC by the developer.

Section 5(b) provides for a registration fee of 1/50th of 1 percent of the maximum aggregate price at which the lots, parcels, or interests in the subdivision will be offered. In no case can the fee be less than $100.

Section 5(c) requires that the filing be accompanied by the fee.

Section 5(d) provides that the information in the registration statement be available to the public.

SECTION 6: INFORMATION REQUIRED IN REGISTRATION STATEMENT

Provides that the registration statement must contain:

1. The names of persons having an interest in the subdivision, the extent of the interest, and its purchase price.

2. A legal description of the subdivision, including a map showing the size of the lots to be sold, the topography of the land, the relation of the lots to existing streets and roads.

3. A statement of the condition of the title including encumbrances.

4. A statement of the selling price of the lots and the terms and conditions of sale.

5. A description of the sewage facilities and public utilities in or available to the subdivision, and a statement of the prox-

imity of the subdivision to cities, towns, or villages.

6. A description of the consequences to the investor if the developer fails to fulfill the obligations of blanket encumbrance, and what protection the investor would have if that happened.

7. A copy of the articles of incorporation.

8. Copies of the developer's deed to the subdivision.

9. Opinion of counsel as to title, or title insurance.

10. Copies of forms to be used in selling.

11. Such other information as the SEC may require.

SECTION 7: TAKING EFFECT OF REGISTRATION STATEMENT AND AMENDMENTS THERETO

Section 7(a) provides that a registration statement becomes effective 20 days after filing.

Section 7(b) empowers the SEC, after opportunity for a hearing, to stop registration from becoming effective if it appears incomplete or inaccurate, and to require that the registration statement be amended before becoming effective.

Section 7(c) after the effective date of registration, requires the developer to file an amendment if there is any change in the material facts. The SEC could stop further sales until amendment became effective.

Section 7(d) empowers the SEC to issue a stop order suspending effectiveness of a registration statement, after opportunity for a hearing, if the statement contains untruthful statements or omissions of fact.

Section 7(e) gives the SEC the power to make an examination to determine whether a stop order should issue. The developer would pay the reasonable costs of such an examination.

SECTION 8: INFORMATION REQUIRED IN PROSPECTUS

Requires that prospectus contain the same information as registration statement.

SECTION 9: COOPERATION WITH STATE AUTHORITIES

Requires cooperation of the SEC with State authorities regulating the sale of interests in subdivisions, and allows the SEC to accept a State registration statement, in lieu of the registration statement described in Section 6, if it finds it appropriate in the public interest.

SECTIONS 10 AND 11: CIVIL LIABILITIES ON ACCOUNT OF FALSE REGISTRATION AND ON ACCOUNT OF A FALSE REGISTRATION STATEMENT (PARALLEL SECTIONS 11 AND 12 OF THE 1933 ACT)

These sections give the purchaser the right to sue the developer and his associates if the registration statement contained untrue statements or omissions of fact for damages. The purchaser could also sue anyone who sold lots in unregistered subdivisions or who used false or misleading statements either orally or in a prospectus.

SECTION 12: REGISTRATION OF AGENTS

Section 12(a) provides for the registration of agents with the SEC.

Section 12(b) after opportunity for hearing, the SEC may refuse, or revoke, registration if an agent has willfully made false statements to the SEC, or within 10 years previous to the filing of an application, has been convicted of a felony or misdemeanor involving real estate or securities dealings, embezzlement or fraud; or has violated any provision of this act.

Section 12(c), the SEC may postpone the effectiveness of registration or suspend registration after opportunity for a hearing.

SECTION 13: COURT REVIEW OF ORDERS

Parallels section 9 of the Securities Act of 1933.

SECTION 14: LIMITATION OF ACTIONS

Parallels section 13 of the Securities Act of 1933.

SECTION 15: CONTRARY STIPULATIONS VOID

Parallels section 14 of the 1933 act.

SECTION 16: ADDITIONAL REMEDIES

Parallels section 15 of the 1933 act.

SECTION 17: FRAUDULENT INTERSTATE TRANSACTIONS

Makes it unlawful for any person to use the mails or the means and instruments of interstate commerce to sell lots in subdivisions by fraudulent devices, to obtain money by misstatements of fact, or to use practices which defraud or deceive the purchaser.

SECTION 18: INJUNCTIONS

Empowers the SEC to seek an injunction in a district court enjoining acts or practices in violation of this act.

SECTION 19: INVESTIGATIONS

Provides the power, including subpena power, to investigate violations of provisions of the act.

SECTION 20: HEARINGS BY COMMISSION

Provides for public hearings by the SEC.

SECTION 21: UNLAWFUL REPRESENTATIONS

Makes it unlawful to make any representation that registration with SEC means that SEC has passed on the merits of, or approved of, the lots in the subdivision.

SECTION 22: PENALTIES

Violations of the act can be punishable by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or a fine of not more than $5,000.

SECTION 23: RULES, REGULATIONS, AND ORDERS

Parallels section 211 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940.

SECTION 24: JURISDICTION OF OFFENSES AND SUITS

Parallels section 22 of the 1933 act. Gives concurrent jurisdiction to State and Federal courts.

A VELODROME FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today I am introducing a joint resolution to provide for the construction of a velodrome in the District of Columbia. Representative JOEL BROYHILL is offering the same resolution in the House of Representatives. It is our intention that in doing so we will provide, at a cost of less than $100,000, a new facility which will benefit not alone the District but the Nation, including particularly the great international community residing here.

First, what is a velodrome?

The U.S. International Velodrome which we envision would be a specially designed track built and used for bicycle racing.

Why is there need for such an addition to Washington's facilities?

A major part of the answer may be found in that portion of the resolution which reads:

> One of the main factors which militates against an improved position by the United States in international cycling competition has been the lack of facilities—tracks and road space—for competition and practice.

Mr. President, did you know that bicycle racing is the world's second most popular sport, with only soccer outrunning it in number of participants? Did you know that throughout Europe and Latin America there are velodromes in scores and hundreds of cities, on whose tracks are developed the international competitions in which we do not participate for lack of facilities? Did you know that in all of the United States there are only about seven velodromes, and that only one of them in the East? Did you know that the United States has won only one gold medal in bicycling in Olympic competition—in 1900? Or that the last Olympic medal won by this country in this great international sport was a third-place bronze medal in 1906?

I have in my possession a copy of the "Sports Profile" on cycling prepared for the U.S. Olympic Committee in June 1964, by Arthur D. Little, Inc. Among its recommendations is one for the construction of six new tracks, which by strategic placement could more than double competitive participation.

Washington is in such a strategic location. It is the ideal place for a topnotch international velodrome. More than 20 embassies have expressed an interest in bringing teams here if a suitable track can be made available. If such a track had been available last year, the Olympic trials for the mid-Atlantic area would have been held in Washington. There is already in existence here a strong organization of cyclists, the Federation of Washington Area Cycle Clubs, whose president is Raymond Matthews, Virginia State Senior Champion of 1965, and a prime mover in the effort to secure a suitable track. His organization was chosen to organize and direct the international bicycle events during the 10th International Games for the Deaf, or the Deaf Olympics, held here in June. Of the 101 men entered in the track races in the Olympic trials in the fall of 1964, 10 were from Washington and adjacent Virginia.

Furthermore, there is a great new interest in cycling as a means of recreation and as a sport. In 1959 some Yale students set up a triangular meet among Harvard, Princeton, and Yale, which led to formation of the Eastern Intercollegiate Cycling Association. It now has membership in about 20 schools in the Northeast. There are similar organizations in southern California and in the Midwest. An Intercollegiate Division was created by the Amateur Bicycle League of America, which now sanctions all serious intercollegiate races.

About 80 percent of the ABL's 143-member cycling clubs conduct club championship trials for seniors, juniors, and girls. In the Washington area there are 400,000 youths in our high schools, and probably few of them have never ridden a bicycle. We need to improve the opportunities for healthful recreation by both young and old, and bicycling is a sport advocated by such health leaders as the eminent heart specialist, Dr. Paul Dudley White, who spoke to many of us last year at the Congressional Conference on Bicycling in America.

I took note of the growth of bicycling when I pointed out to this body on September 20 the recent publication, following a study by the American Institute of Park Executives, of the book "Bike Trails and Facilities: A Guide to Their Design, Construction, and Operation."

I noted that in his February 8, 1965, message to the Congress on natural beauty, President Johnson called the country's cyclists "the forgotten outdoorsmen of today," and urged the construction of a system of hiking and biking trails to span the country.

Mr. President, if you were a member of one of the clubs which form the Federation of Washington Area Cycle Clubs, with a 10-speed racing bicycle, where would you go to enjoy your sport? We have municipal golf courses in the District of Columbia. We have a magnificent stadium, built at a cost many, many times greater than the modest cost for an Olympic-size bicycle racetrack, or velodrome. We are even to have an aquarium. But here is how you would find conditions for cycling, as described by the Arthur D. Little study:

> In areas where a velodrome is not available, cyclists have to get up early in the morning to find a stretch of road on which to race. The racers have to line up and wait for the traffic to thin out and then quickly sprint for a quarter or a half mile. Most cyclists who are forced to practice under such conditions maintain that the construction of an additional half dozen tracks would give an enormous impetus to racing in this country.

In the Washington area there are 11 schools with cycling teams, but they have no place designed for the sport. The director of physical education in the District schools is prepared to put bicycle riding on the regular athletic schedule if a velodrome becomes available. Such a track, covering a 250-meter course or approximately a fifth of a mile, requires only a space 300 by 500 feet. A half-mile track with bleachers, of course, would require a larger space, and certainly planning should include the necessary elements to make the project truly a U.S. International Velodrome, drawing racers from foreign countries and becoming the center of this growing sport for the entire eastern part of the country.

Where cycling has "caught on," it has become a spectator as well as a participant sport. At least three tracks have lights for night racing. Kenosha, Wis., has a 10-week program which draws an average weekly attendance of 4,000 to 6,000 persons, with 25,000 viewing a recent national championship. In foreign countries, of course, where bicycle tracks are often as large in their seating capacity as our stadiums, such crowds are consistently surpassed in many places.

Every one of the existing velodromes in the United States has been built, quite properly, on public park property and in cooperation with public authorities. The only one in the East is that recently constructed on a Queens County tract, financed by an appropriation of $70,000 from the New York City Board of Estimate and Apportionment. A track built to Olympic standards could very easily be produced for as little as $50,000, and it is even possible to have a serviceable velodrome for much less, with figures in the Arthur D. Little study ranging as low as $15,000. The sum of $100,000 would surely afford us a velodrome suitable for service as the U.S. International Velodrome.

But as it is, even Representatives and Senators who go in for bicycle racing here must find some improvised place, such as the Ellipse. You may recall, and I am sure that our distinguished colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell] will recall, the great congressional bicycle races of April 19, 1964. On that occasion, riding special racing bikes in an event to raise funds for the U.S. Olympic team, Congressmen Ken Gray, Dante Fascell, and Richard Ichord represented Democrats in competition with Congressmen Silvio Conte, Robert T. Stafford, and Donald Rumsfeld.

They raced on the Ellipse, and the Republican team won. But our Rhode Island colleague won the best notice in the Associated Press report of the mile-long race. That dispatch, from the April 20, 1964, issue of the Washington Post, is worth quoting:

> The Republicans whipped the Democrats yesterday in a bicycle race around Washington's picturesque Ellipse—but Senator Claiborne Pell saved some face for the administration.
>
> The Rhode Island Democrat turned in the best individual performance of all seven panting performers. He was crowned with a laurel wreath and presented a bouquet of gladiolas.

That occasion was arranged by the Federation of Washington Area Cycle Clubs, which has done a great deal of the spadework needed to implement the joint resolution Mr. Broyhill and I are offering today. Among those who have already indicated an active interest and support are:

Stan Musial, consultant to the President on physical fitness.

Nicholas Rodis, special assistant for athletic programs, Department of State Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs.

The Washington Convention and Visitors Bureau.

Milo F. Christiansen, superintendent of recreation, District of Columbia.

Ambassadors of various countries.

Mr. President, Indianapolis has its Speedway, Louisville has its Derby, Delaware, Ohio, has its Little Brown Jug, and Akron has its Soap Box Derby. The United States International Velodrome which I propose can bring to Washington a spectacular sport which, with an international flavor, would be distinctively unique.

In order that I may indicate more fully the extent of the interest and support which this proposal has aroused, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may appear at the close of my remarks letters addressed by various persons to Mr. Raymond Matthews, president of the Federation of Washington Area Cycle Clubs, and to Mr. H. L. Coe, its director. Among them are the Netherlands Ambassador; the First Secretary of the Argentine Embassy; the Commercial Minister of the Italian Embassy; the Cultural Counselor of the Embassy of Switzerland; the Minister of the Embassy of Uruguay; the First Secretary of the Belgian Embassy; and the Ambassador of Venezuela.

I further ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may remain at the desk for 1 week in order that other Senators may join me as cosponsors, and that the text of the joint resolution may appear in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution, article, and letters will be printed in the Record, and the joint resolution will lie on the desk, as requested.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 118) to provide for the construction of a velodrome in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. Hartke (for himself and Mr. Pell), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S.J. Res. 118

Whereas United States participation in Olympic cycling has the potential for a bright future;

Whereas cycling, as a pastime or as a means of transportation, is engaged in by millions of persons;

Whereas cycling is a feasible form of activity for persons of all ages, and one which has widespread medical support not only for physical fitness but also for general health; and

Whereas one of the main factors which militates against an improved position by the United States in international cycling competition has been the lack of facilities—tracts and road space—for competition and practice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to take such action as may be necessary to provide for the construction in the District of Columbia of a velodrome.

Sec. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated such sum as may be necessary to carry out the provision of this joint resolution.

The article and letters presented by Mr. Hartke are as follows:

BICYCLE MAKERS ROLLING UP RECORD SALES AS ADULTS DISCOVER NEW WAY TO KEEP FIT

(By Martin J. Shannon)

New York.—When those shiny new bicycles under the Christmas tree are unwrapped this year, a lot of people may be in for a surprise. Nearly as many will be labeled "to mom and dad" as are addressed to the smaller fry of the family.

Bitten by the physical fitness bug, the Nation's adults are proving to be a major factor in a bike sales boom that is setting records. This year sales of the two wheelers are expected to hit 6 million, up from 5 million last year and more than double the 2.5 million sold in the United States in 1954.

The industry gives some credit to the soaring birth rate and a growing national economy for the bike boom, but the new market of grownups—ranging from college students and housewives to middle-aged executives and retired couples—is what the bicycle makers look to for another doubling of sales in the next 5 years.

This adult market currently accounts for about 25 percent of total U.S. bicycle sales, says the Bicycle Manufacturers Association, "and it's growing faster than a lot of people realize."

HOW IMPORTS HELPED

Also, as so much icing on the sales cake, U.S. manufacturers appear to be recapturing some of the market lost to imports, notably from England, Japan, and West Germany. In 1964, sales of imported bicycles fell to just under 1 million units from 1.3 million in 1963. They are expected to stay under the 1-million level this year, says the association.

But even the imports had a good effect, says the trade group, because they opened the eyes of U.S. companies to a new variety of bicycle designs, including the lightweight English-type racer with its thin tires and multiple gears, now a big seller for many of the U.S. concerns. Prior to these postwar imports, domestic manufacturers stuck pretty close to the standard balloon-tired bike.

Murray Ohio Manufacturing Co., of Nashville, Tenn., for instance, started producing the lightweight models last year to cater to the adult market. Murray Ohio, generally conceded to be the largest U.S. bicycle producer, said 1965 sales may be down slightly from the "very good" volume of 1964 because of a 7-week strike last March and April. But other major U.S. bike makers see only rising sales.

HIGH RISERS POPULAR

Norman A. Clarke, president of Columbia Manufacturing Co. in Westfield, Mass., expects sales this year to be up 18 to 20 percent from 1964, "and then a year or two of leveling off to digest gains of the past several years." The executive adds, "We've always had the child market, but now it's the adults who are boosting sales."

American Machine & Foundry Co.'s wheel goods division in Oley, Ill., indicates its 1965 bike sales will be up about 20 percent from last year's nearly $15 million. Norman Wintermantle, division president, says much of the gain will come from sales of high risers—two-wheelers with high handlebars and long, banana-shaped seats.

"The adult market certainly is an important part of our sales area," says Mr. Wintermantle, "but this new design in bicycles is leading to the two-bike boy."

The high risers, introduced by some companies last year and now made by practically all of them, are described by some makers as "a novelty that may fade out in another year." Others say the bikes, which have small frames and small wheels topped by high-set seats and handlebars resembling the horns of a longhorn steer, are extremely maneuverable, more fun for younger cyclists to buy the lightweight, geared models.

Frank V. Schwinn, president of Arnold Schwinn & Co. in Chicago, one of the top bike producers, says the adult market "has actually been growing steadily for the past 6 or 7 years." Schwinn's sales this year, he says, will be up about 14 percent from 1964 with "possibly not so large a gain next year." The company recently formed a special department to assist communities and individuals interested in developing bicycle trails and forming clubs.

Schwinn's current best sellers are the lightweight, racing-type bike and the high riser. Mr. Schwinn noted that adults tend to buy the lightweight, geared models.

The Bicycle Manufacturers Association estimates that 57 million children and adults ride bicycles in the United States today, a figure expected to reach 63 million by 1970. This proliferation of cyclists is leading to the establishment in many cities of special bike paths and "bikeways."

PATH MILEAGE GROWS

Bike paths are special trails, mostly in State and municipal park lands, set aside exclusively for bicycling. Bikeways, a recent innovation, are specially marked street routes through or around a city that avoid heavy-traffic areas.

In Milwaukee, for example, the county parks commission has laid out a 64-mile bicycle route running through parkways, little-traveled roads and scenic areas that encircle the city. In Waukesha County, Wis., adjacent to Milwaukee, a 65-mile bikeway that is 90 percent on county roads was opened last May.

New York City has a total of about 50 miles of bike paths in 28 parks, Boston has some 30 miles of them and Chicago claims 15 miles of lake front trails. Concord, Mass., has a city ordinance calling for the construction of bicycle paths on one side of every new road built in the city.

Other communities where bike trails are either planned or already in existence include Palm Beach, Fla.; St. Louis; Silver Spring, Md.; Cleveland; Westfield, Mass.; Philadelphia and Abington, Pa. In Florida, some 75 miles of interconnecting bikeways have been laid out between Coral Gables, Coconut Grove, Miami, and South Miami.

EMBASSY OF SWITZERLAND,
Washington, D.C., March 12, 1964.

THE FEDERATION OF WASHINGTON AREA BICYCLE CLUBS,
Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COE: Thank you for the interesting information about your plans for a Velodrome in Washington, D.C.

I have asked my friend Mr. Fritz Mathys, director of the Swiss Museum for Gymnastics & Sports, Missionsstrasse 28, Basel, a real specialist in his field, to provide me with some information material on the development of bicycle sports in our country which I then shall forward to you.

Sincerely yours,
LUKAS F. BURCKHARDT,
Cultural Counselor.

BELGIAN EMBASSY,
Washington, D.C., February 26, 1964.

Mr. H. L. COE,
Director, the Federation of Washington Area Bicycle Clubs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COE: Thank you very much for having informed me of your project to set up a Velodrome in the Washington area.

International races will undoubtedly appeal to a great number of people, and we are looking forward to having some of our Belgian athletes come over and compete with the U.S. teams. Please keep us informed of the developments in your plans.

Best wishes for the success of your endeavor,

Sincerely yours,
HERMAN NOPPEN,
First Secretary.

EMBASSY OF URUGUAY,
Washington, D.C., February 12, 1964.

Mr. H. L. COE,
Director, the Federation of Washington Area Bicycle Clubs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COE: We are delighted to learn that in the Washington area there is a Federation of Bicycle Clubs such as those we have in Uruguay and that your federation is working to secure an international type velodrome for training cyclists and for competition.

Bicycle racing is one of the most popular sports in Uruguay and our teams go all over the world to compete in international events.

We wish you every success in your venture and look forward to the time when some of our athletes may compete with your riders in the United States. And in the same hand we hope to have your riders in our country some day.

Again, may we wish you the best of luck in your project.

Sincerely yours,
MARIO GALBIATI,
Minister.

ROYAL NETHERLANDS EMBASSY,
Washington, February 17, 1964.

Mr. H. L. COE,
Director, The Federation of Washington Area Bicycle Clubs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COE: Thank you for your letter of February 8, informing me about the project sponsored by the Federation of Washington Area Bicycle Clubs to build a bicycle racing track in the Washington area.

As bicycle racing is a most popular sport in my country, I am sure that racing enthusiasts in The Netherlands will welcome the news of the construction of the U.S. International Velodrome in Washington and the impetus this will give to bicycle racing in this country. I hope that one day Netherlands teams will be able to compete with American teams in the new velodrome.

Sincerely yours,
DR. J. H. VAN ROIJEN,
Netherlands Ambassador.

EMBAJADA DE VENEZUELA,
Washington, D.C., March 31, 1964.

Mr. RAYMOND MATTHEWS,
President, The Federation of Washington Area Bicycle Clubs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MATTHEWS: I have recently learned of a project of building an international type velodrome for the training of cyclists and for competition in this area through the efforts of the Federation of Washington Area Bicycle Clubs. Never before I had known of the existence of such an organization and activities in this city, like those we have in Venezuela. I am delighted, indeed, of knowing of these plans.

Bicycle racing is one of the most popular sports in Venezuela together with athletic and baseball. Training for the races has been important in improving the physical condition of the thousands of young people who participate in or watch the development of these teams.

Racing teams are organized among schools and colleges and there are teams representing workers, community groups, etc., whenever suitable tracks are available.

Races between local teams and those from other countries attract large and enthusiastic audiences.

The velodromes are used not only for training racers but by many others who ride for exercise and pleasure.

A velodrome in the Washington area, built to olympic standards would be welcome not only by cycling enthusiasts in Venezuela but certainly by those of many other countries where bicycle racing is so popular. International races would appeal to the large number of residents who are here for tours of duty but have a limited opportunity to become acquainted with the people of the United States. The chance to enjoy a sport with which they are familiar would be an excellent opportunity for developing friendships.

When the velodrome is ready you may be certain we shall be most interested in encouraging teams from our country to compete here.

We wish you every success in your venture and look forward to the time when some of our athletes may compete with your riders in the United States.

Sincerely yours,
ENRIQUE TEJERA-PARIS,
Ambassador of Venezuela.

EMBAJADA DE LA REPUBLICA ARGENTINA,
Washington, D.C., February 18, 1964.

Mr. RAYMOND MATTHEWS,
President, the Federation of Washington Area Bicycle Clubs, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MATTHEWS: I was delighted with the visit of Mr. Keith Kingbay, representative of the Federation of Washington Area Bicycle Clubs, who informed me of your project to have the U.S. International Velodrome built in Washington in the near future.

As you probably know, bicycle racing is one of the most popular sports in Argentina, and races between local teams and those from other countries attract large and enthusiastic audiences. Racing teams are organized among the schools and colleges as well as among factory workers and different community groups.

A velodrome in Washington, D.C., built to Olympic standards would be welcome by cycling enthusiasts in Argentina wishing to participate and enjoy the international competitions. The exchange between our two countries would be such an important step toward the achievement of a deep understanding between our peoples, which is also the goal of the Alliance for Progress started by the inspiration of a great American, President Kenendy.

I warmly congratulate you for this idea, and I wish you all success in carrying out such an interesting project.

Sincerely yours,
JUAN J. MATHÈ,
First Secretary, Director—Cultural Affairs.

ROYAL NETHERLANDS EMBASSY,
Washington, February 17, 1964.

Mr. H. L. COE,
Director, the Federation of Washington Area Bicycle Clubs, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COE: Thank you for your letter of February 8, informing me about the project sponsored by the Federation of Washington Area Bicycle Clubs to build a bicycle racing track in the Washington area.

As bicycle racing is a most popular sport in my country, I am sure that racing enthusiasts in the Netherlands will welcome the news of the construction of the U.S. International Velodrome in Washington and the impetus this will give to bicycle racing in this country. I hope that one day Netherlands teams will be able to compete with American teams in the new velodrome.

Sincerely yours,
DR. J. H. VAN ROIJEN,
Netherlands Ambassador.

AMBASCIATA D'ITALIA,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1965.

Mr. H. L. COE,
Director, the Federation of Washington Area Bicycle Clubs, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COE: I am very pleased to learn that in the Washington area there is a Federation of Bicycle Clubs much like those we have in Italy and that your federation is working to secure an international-type velodrome for the training of cyclists and for competition.

Bicycle racing is a very popular sport in Italy, probably second only to soccer. Training for the races has been important in improving the physical condition of the thousands of young people who participate in or watch the development of these teams.

Racing teams are organized among the schools and colleges and there are teams representing factory workers, community groups, etc., wherever suitable tracks are available.

A velodome in Washington, D.C., would certainly be welcome by cycling enthusiasts of the many other countries where bicycle racing is so popular. International races would also appeal to the large number of foreign residents who are here for tours of duty but have a limited opportunity to become acquainted with the people of the United States. The chance to enjoy a sport with which they are familiar would be an excellent opportunity for developing friendships.

When the velodrome is ready you may be certain I shall be most interested in encouraging teams from our country to compete here.

I wish you every success in your venture and look forward to the time when some of our athletes may compete with your riders in the United States.

Sincerely yours,
UGO MORABITO,
Commercial Minister.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 27, 1964.

Mr. RAYMOND MATTHEWS, Jr.,
President, the Federation of Washington Area Bicycle Clubs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MATTHEWS: I was pleased to learn that you plan to develop a track suitable for bicycle racing in Washington. Such a track would be a welcome addition to the sports and recreation facilities of this area.

Cycling is an excellent conditioning activity and one which can be enjoyed by people of all ages. We welcome your support in the effort to stimulate greater interest and participation in this fine sport.

I send my best wishes for the successful conclusion of your project.

Sincerely yours,
STAN MUSIAL,
Consultant to the President on Physical Fitness.

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA,
Norman, Okla., January 28, 1964.

Mr. HARRY LEE COE,
Washington Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COE: The lack of a velodrome in this country is obviously a great handicap to the development of talented, Olympic caliber cyclists.

It is my hope that you will be successful in your efforts to errect a U.S. velodrome in Washington. I will certainly be pleased to do everything I can to support your efforts.

Sincerely,
C. B. WILKINSON.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
December 4, 1963.

Mr. RAYMOND MATTHEWS,
McLean, Va.

DEAR MR. MATTHEWS: Mr. Harry Coe has brought to my attention the efforts of your organization to have a velodrome built in the Washington area for cycling. I certainly agree that such a track built to Olympic standards would be excellent for the Washington area. Cycling is a very popular sport in the world and having a track in this area would make it possible to hold national and international competitions here.

The Department of State recognizes the important role that international sporting events play in developing mutual understanding and therefore strongly support this project. Regrettably, however, funds are not available to aid in the construction of a velodrome.

I wish you every success in making the project a reality.

Sincerely yours,
NICHOLAS RODIS,
Special Assistant for Athletic Programs.

WASHINGTON CONVENTION & VISITORS BUREAU,
November 15, 1963.

Mr. RAYMOND C. MATTHEWS, Jr.,
President, Federation of Washington Bicycle Clubs, McLean, Va.

DEAR MR. MATTHEWS: It is my understanding that Mr. Otto Elale, olympic committee chairman of the Amateur Bicycle League of America, has offered the 1964 South Atlantic Olympic Trials to Washington, D.C., contingent upon there being constructed here before June of 1964 a velodrome of olympic standards and specifications.

I feel that an area facility of this type would certainly provide sports attractions of an international flavor which would add significantly to our tourist promotion program.

I predicate this statement upon the fact that bicycling is second only to soccer as a participant sport taken on a worldwide basis. I have had the opportunity to witness firsthand the great enthusiasm and spectator appeal of this sport in Europe and Japan.

It is reasonable to assume that the proposed Washington, D.C. International Velodrome would attract visiting amateur and professional teams from South and Central America, Europe, and Japan. This would in turn establish the Nation's Capital in the minds of bicycle enthusiasts around the world and prompt them to visit our city to attend scheduled racing events.

The organized and carefully supervised youth activities envisioned by the Federation of Washington Bicycle Clubs at the proposed Washington International Velodrome could very well be a pilot project to be followed by other cities across the Nation. This undertaking would be a concrete example of what we in this community are doing for our youth.

Sincerely yours,
CLARENCE A. ARATA,
Executive Director.

MEMORIAL TO HUNGARIAN FREEDOM FIGHTERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for consideration by the Senate, a joint resolution to authorize the creation in Washington of a memorial in tribute to the Hungarians who died 9 years ago this month in the valiant but futile effort to extirpate the Communist tyranny which rules their nation.

October 22—a week from today—is the ninth anniversary of the beginning of what has become known in history as the Hungarian revolution. Hungarians in every State hope that in the next year a monument can be erected in the Capital City of the United States as a reminder to all Americans and to people of every nation that when there is a yearning for freedom in the heart, there will be a fight for freedom in the streets.

The resolution, which was introduced in the House October 7 by Representative FRANK HORTON, of New York, would authorize the Hungarian Freedom Fighters' Federation to erect a monument in the District of Columbia or in its environs. What I introduce today is identical to the Horton resolution. I ask that its text be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, the Hungarian Freedom Fighters' Federation will host a dinner in Washington on October 22 to open the organization of an American Citizens' Committee to Commemorate the 10th Anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution. I am advised that the occasion will be highlighted by a major foreign policy statement by my distinguished colleague Senator DODD.

I ask, Mr. President, that the resolution lay on the table for 3 days for the benefit of other Senators who might wish to become cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Wyoming.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 119) authorizing the Hungarian Freedom Fighters' Federation to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs, introduced by Mr. SIMPSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Congress and the people of these United States are sympathetic toward the efforts of the people of Hungary to become free of the chains of Communist totalitarianism; and

Whereas we in America are reminded of our commitment to the purpose of the Hungarian revolution by the presence of nearly fifty thousand refugees from that revolution within our borders; and

Whereas we are mindful of the memories of the more than twenty-four thousand Hungarian freedom fighters who died in their valiant attempt to win freedom in the fall of 1956, and of countless thousands of other human beings who were jailed or deported by Soviet forces which overran Hungary and foiled her revolt against communism; and

Whereas we have stark evidence that, despite claims of Hungarian Communists to the contrary, not one of the goals of human freedom which the Hungarian nation fought for in 1956 have been realized—evidence that is well illustrated by the curtain of barbed wire which today surrounds Hungary, in plain view of the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the year 1966 will mark the tenth anniversary of the defeat of the valiant freedom fighters of Hungary by the brutal power of the Soviet Army: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Hungarian Freedom Fighters' Federation is authorized to erect a memorial on public grounds in the District of Columbia, or its environs, in honor and commemoration of the men and women of Hungary who fought so bravely ten years ago to win the rights and privileges of self-government.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to select, with the approval of the National Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission, a suitable site on public grounds in the District of Columbia, or its environs, upon which may be erected the memorial authorized in the first section of this Act: *Provided,* That if the site selected is on public grounds belonging to or under jurisdiction of the government of the District of Columbia, the approval of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall also be obtained.

(b) The design and plans for such memorial shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the National Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Capital Planning Commission, and the United States or the District of Columbia shall be put to no expense in the erection thereof.

SEC. 3. The authority conferred pursuant to this joint resolution shall lapse unless (1) the erection of such memorial is commenced within two years from the date of enactment of this joint resolution, and (2) prior to its commencement funds are certified available in an amount sufficient, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, to insure completion of the memorial.

SEC. 4. The maintenance and care of the memorial enacted under the provisions of this Act shall be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] introduced a joint resolution. On his behalf, I ask that that joint resolution lie on the table for 3 days for the benefit of Senators who may wish to become cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 474

Mr. DOUGLAS proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 11135) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, which is pending.

NEW SUPPORT FOR THE HUMAN INVESTMENT ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF S. 2509

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be added as cosponsors of S. 2509 at its next printing:

The senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr FANNIN], the senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the junior Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that a list of all the sponsors of the Human Investment Act in both House and Senate be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPONSORS OF HUMAN INVESTMENT ACT (S. 2509, H.R. 10934)

SENATE (21 SPONSORS)

WINSTON L. PROUTY, of Vermont.
GORDON ALLOTT, of Colorado.
CLIFFORD CASE, of New Jersey.
JOHN S. COOPER, of Kentucky.
NORRIS COTTON, of New Hampshire.
EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois.
PETER DOMINICK, of Colorado.
PAUL FANNIN, of Arizona.
HIRAM FONG, of Hawaii.
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa.
ROMAN HRUSKA, of Nebraska.
LEN B. JORDAN, of Idaho.
THOMAS KUCHEL, of California.
JACK MILLER, of Iowa.
THRUSTON B. MORTON, of Kentucky.
KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota.
GEORGE MURPHY, of California.
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts.
HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania.
MILWARD SIMPSON, of Wyoming.
JOHN TOWER, of Texas.

HOUSE (80 SPONSORS)

THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri.
JOHN B. ANDERSON, of Illinois.
JAMES F. BATTIN, of Montana.
ALPHONZO BELL, of California.
JACKSON E. BETTS, of Ohio.
FRANK T. BOW, of Ohio.
WILLIAM BROOMFIELD, of Michigan.
JOEL T. BROYHILL, of Virginia.
HOWARD H. CALLAWAY, of Georgia.
DONALD D. CLANCY, of Ohio.
JAMES CLEVELAND, of New Hampshire.
HAROLD R. COLLIER, of Illinois.
SILVIO CONTE, of Massachusetts.
WILLIAM CRAMER, of Florida.
BOB DOLE, of Kansas.
JOHN DUNCAN, of Tennessee.
JACK EDWARDS, of Alabama.
ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, of Kansas.
PAUL FINDLEY, of Illinois.
PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey.
CHARLES E. GOODELL, of New York.
JAMES R. GROVER, JR., of New York.
EDWARD J. GURNEY, of Florida.
CRAIG HOSMER, of California.
MELVIN R. LAIRD, of Wisconsin.
ROBERT MCCLORY, of Illinois.
CLARK MACGREGOR, of Minnesota.
CATHERINE MAY, of Washington.
CHESTER MIZE, of Kansas.
F. BRADFORD MORSE, of Massachusetts.
ROGERS C. B. MORTON, of Maryland.
THOMAS M. PELLY, of Washington.
RICHARD H. POFF, of Virginia.
ALBERT QUIE, of Minnesota.
ED REINECKE, of California.
DONALD RUMSFELD, of Illinois.
HERMAN SCHNEEBELI, of Pennsylvania.
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, of Pennsylvania.
JOE SKUBITZ, of Kansas.
ROBERT STAFFORD, of Vermont.
J. WILLIAM STANTON, of Ohio.
BURT TALCOTT, of California.
JAMES B. UTT, of California.
PRENTISS WALKER, of Mississippi.
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of New Jersey.
CHARLES GUBSER, of California.
FLORENCE DWYER, of New Jersey.
GARNER SHRIVER, of Kansas.
VERNON THOMSON, of Wisconsin.
JOHN RHODES, of Arizona.
DON CLAUSEN, of California.
FRANK HORTON, of New York.
J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, of California.
ED DERWINSKI, of Illinois.
GLENARD LIPSCOMB, of California.
LESLIE ARENDS, of Illinois.
CHARLOTTE REID, of Illinois.
ODIN LANGEN, of Minnesota.
E. Y. BERRY, of South Dakota.
WILLIAM CAHILL, of New Jersey.
JIM MARTIN, of Alabama.
HOWARD ROBISON, of New York.
GERALD FORD, of Michigan.
HASTINGS KEITH, of Massachusetts.
CHARLES MATHIAS, of Maryland.
GEORGE HANSEN, of Idaho.
J. IRVING WHALLEY, of Pennsylvania.
FRANCES BOLTON, of Ohio.
ANCHER NELSEN, of Minnesota.
WILLIAM SPRINGER, of Illinois.
BOB WILSON, of California.
JIMMY QUILLEN, of Tennessee.
ELFORD CEDERBERG, of Michigan.
JOHN ERLENBORN, of Illinois.
CHARLES TEAGUE, of California.
JAMES HARVEY, of Michigan.
BARBER CONABLE, JR., of New York.
ARCH MOORE, of West Virginia.
JOSEPH M. MCDADE, of Pennsylvania.
H. ALLEN SMITH, of California.

PROVISIONS OF THE ACT

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the purpose of the Human Investment Act is to provide an incentive to American business to invest in the improvement of the Nation's human resources by hiring, training, and employing presently unemployed workers lacking needed job skills, and by upgrading the job skills of and providing new job opportunities for workers presently employed.

To achieve this purpose, the act provides for a 7-percent tax credit toward certain allowable training expenses of employers, up to a maximum amount of $25,000 plus 25 percent of the taxpayer firm's tax liability in excess of $25,000. These provisions are identical to the investment tax credit provisions of the Revenue Act of 1962.

There are at present six categories of "allowable training expenses," paraphrased as follows:

First. The wages and salaries of employees who are apprentices in an apprenticeship program registered with a State apprenticeship agency or the Federal Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training.

Second. The wages and salaries of employees who are enrolled in an on-the-job training program pursuant to section 204 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

Third. The wages and salaries of employees who are participating in a cooperative education program involving alternate periods of academic study and employment in cooperation with a secondary school, college, university, business school, trade school or vocational school.

Fourth. Tuition and course fees paid by the taxpayer to a college, university, business school, trade school, or vocational school for instruction of any individual in job skills necessary for his employment by the taxpayer or for his continued employment with the taxpayer.

Fifth. Home study course fees paid by the taxpayer to any college, university or accredited home study school for instruction of any individual in job skills necessary for his employment by the taxpayer or for his continued employment with the taxpayer.

Sixth. Expenses to the taxpayer of organized group instruction—including classroom instruction—including expenses for the purchase or lease of books, testing and training materials, classroom equipment, and instructors' fees and salaries incurred in training any individual in job skills necessary for his employment by the taxpayer or for his continued employment with the taxpayer.

OTHER FEATURES OF INTEREST

Five other features of the act are also of interest:

First. Allowable employee training expenses must be tax deductible under section 162 of the code, relating to trade or business expenses.

Second. To claim credit toward the expenses of training a given individual, that individual must remain on the payroll for at least 3 months after completion of the training. A taxpayer could claim credit toward tuition and group instruction expenses of individuals not employees, provided that at the completion of training the taxpayer puts the trainees on his payroll for at least 3 months. Exceptions are made for death, disability, voluntary separation, and firing for cause.

Third. Tax credit could be carried back 3 years and carried forward 5 years.

Fourth. No credit would be allowed for the training of managerial, professional, or advanced scientific employees. The intent of the act is to encourage business to upgrade the skills of those at the bottom end of the skill and income ladder, not middle management or professional employees.

Fifth. Employers could not claim a credit when the training expenses are reimbursable by the Government under a training contract, et cetera.

Mr. President, this bill is an attempt to meet the increasingly serious problems of structural unemployment caused by a labor force ill-fitted for existing and developing job opportunities. Its intent is to advance workers up the skill ladder, thus opening vacancies at the bottom for the presently unskilled and unemployed. Its major premise is that private business has, over the years, learned how to obtain the most results per training dollar, and should now be encouraged to expand its training programs to meet this national need. Rather than to expand Government-operated training programs, with all their bureaucracy, inefficiency, and expense, the philosophy of this act is to revise the tax structure to stimulate increased investment in "human capital" by the private sector of the economy.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRESENT ACT

This bill is actually a third version of the Human Investment Act. On February 17 of this year I introduced the prototype bill, S. 1130. After several months of discussion and refinement by Members of Congress, their staffs, businessmen, labor leaders, economists, tax experts, and manpower specialists, a second version was drafted and circulated. The comments received led to further changes, which were incorporated in the third version, the bill introduced by me on September 9 in the Senate and by Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS and 45 other Members of the House on the same day.

STRONG REPUBLICAN SUPPORT

Today I am happy to announce that 101 Members of Congress have given their support to this legislation: a total of 80 Members of the House have introduced identical bills, and 21 Senators, including myself, have now joined as cosponsors of S. 2509.

I am gratified, Mr. President, at the tremendous support this measure has obtained from the official congressional leadership of the Republican Party. The Human Investment Act now numbers among its sponsors the minority leader of the House of Representatives [Mr. GERALD R. FORD]; the House minority whip [Mr. ARENDS]; the House Republican Conference chairman [Mr. LAIRD]; the House Republican Policy Committee chairman [Mr. RHODES of Arizona]; the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee chairman [Mr. BOB WILSON]; the ranking Republican on the House Rules Committee [Mr. H. ALLEN SMITH]; the distinguished minority leader of the Senate [Mr. DIRKSEN]; the minority whip of the Senate, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]; the chairman of the Senate Republican Conference [Mr. SALTONSTALL]; the Senate Republican Policy Committee chairman [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]; and the Senate Republican Campaign Committee chairman [Mr. MORTON]. In addition, this measure now has the support of seven of the eight Republican members of the House Ways and Means Committee and two of the six Republican members of the Senate Finance Committee, to which the bills have been referred.

EDITORIAL COMMENT

In addition to this impressive list of sponsors, Mr. President, support is growing in the press. The St. Louis Globe Democrat, which circulates in the district of my good friend and principal sponsor of this measure in the House, Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, said in an editorial on September 20:

> The Curtis-Prouty approach appears to be by far the more efficient way to handle the job training program now being attempted by the Office of Economic Opportunity. It eliminates the need for new Government bureaus and redtape, and bypasses politics and waste that result from inexperienced, unqualified agencies attempting to do a job that can best be done by free enterprise. It is also in the American tradition, something that cannot be said for many of the social experiments in progress under the OEO.

The Chicago Daily News, in an editorial on September 27, said:

> The human investment bill, introduced in Congress by a group of Republicans of virtually all shades of party opinion, is a sound approach to one of the Nation's most nagging problems—structural unemployment.
>
> The proposed act has several advantages over programs under direct Government control. It accomplishes an important objective without the waste of collecting tax money and then disbursing it, and without the increase in Federal control inherent in other programs. It stipulates that a successful trainee must be offered a job and that no tax credit will be allowed for the training of management, professional, or advanced scientific employees. The emphasis is thus placed on new and better jobs for those at the bottom of the skill ladder. By encouraging private industry's role in retraining, the bill involves the people who know best what skills are needed and how to get the greatest results for the money.

On October 4 the Human Investment Act received the support of the Ledger-Enquirer of Columbus, Ga., which circulates in the district of one of the early House sponsors of this legislation, Representative "Bo" CALLAWAY. The Ledger-Enquirer stated:

> CALLAWAY's bill represents a positive approach to a national need, but it also demonstrates that the Federal Government does not have to assume full responsibility for every program designed for the improvement of the country. Free enterprise can do the job, and should be encouraged to do it. A tax

> credit is a logical, honorable means of sharing the burden with private business * * *. Conservative Democrats and Republicans are often accused of being negative because they vote against many Federal programs. But they are positively seeking to retain as much independence as possible for the free enterprise system; and incidentally, to keep the Federal Government from getting weighted down with tasks that can be done by other means * * *. The most effective war on poverty is being waged—as it has been for two centuries—by America's free enterprise system. Final victory will be won on that front, and the Government can provide the surest aid by bolstering that effort.

Columnist Jack Mabley, writing for Chicago's American, which covers the district of another sponsor of the act, Representative ROBERT MCCLORY, noted in his column on October 7 that this approach had a number of advantages, and commended Congressman MCCLORY for his sponsorship. The next day the American gave its editorial support, saying:

> This program is admirably designed to get an important job done without the unpleasant side effects, and we hope Congress hurries it along.

A GROWING NEED FOR THE HUMAN INVESTMENT ACT

I am heartened by this support, Mr. President, because the need for this legislation is growing. Despite recent declines in the unemployment rate, the structural unemployment problem continues to be one of the usmost gravity.

According to the Wall Street Journal, there is a growing uneasiness among economists that a rising ratio of manufacturer's labor costs to productivity may lead to inflation, as the same circumstances have in the past.

The article goes on to say:

> Aggravating the situation, many economists say, is a worsening scarcity of skilled workers in today's fast-stepping economy Martin R. Gainsbrugh, chief economist at the National Industrial Conference Board, says that "shortages of skilled workers—and the increasing use of less trained and efficient labor—have begun to plague the economy." Less efficient workers, of course, tend to be less productive, and without good productivity gains manufacturers normally are hard put to offset wage rate increases.

The Human Investment Act is designed to combat this aggravating factor by upgrading the skills and performance of these less efficient workers. The entire Wall Street Journal article, by Alfred A. Malabre, Jr., has been inserted in the daily RECORD by Representative TOM CURTIS, at page A5659, October 7.

There is some worry, too, that the shortage of skilled workers—which the Human Investment Act would attempt to eliminate—is having a serious effect on the Nation's economy. Business Columnist William B. Dickinson, Jr., writing in the Burlington, Vt., Free Press on September 23, has noted:

> The growing shortage of skilled workers already threatens to slow down the Nation's general economic growth. Thousands of openings for skilled and semiskilled workers in industrial and service enterprises are going begging at a time when 4.5 percent of the labor force is unemployed. There would be virtually no unemployment today if the jobless men and women had the skills now sought by business and industry.

A week or 2 ago one of my staff members was talking to the executive vice president of the Associated Industries of Vermont. My State, I am proud to say, has one of the finest precision machine tool industries of any State in the Nation. My staff member asked this gentleman how much demand there was in Vermont industry for machinists and tool and die makers:

> If you gave me a list of 100 qualified machinists today—

He said, and it was a Friday—

> I could have every one of them on the job on Monday.

In this connection I should like to recognize the energetic support of the Human Investment Act approach that has been given by Mr. John Dewhurst. Mr. Dewhurst is president of the Arrow Tool Co., of Wethersfield, Conn., and a past president of the National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association. He has certainly been one of the pioneers in developing this approach to job training. Through his efforts, in large measure, the Federal Committee on Apprenticeship has recommended this approach to the Secretary of Labor. Mr. Dewhurst is in frequent demand as a congressional witness and is generally recognized as an expert in the job training problems of his industry, and his support is certainly most welcome.

THE CONTINUING PROCESS OF REFINEMENT

While the present version of the Human Investment Act, S. 2509, is a great improvement over the earlier versions, a continuing process of refinement and improvement is going on. Over 200 copies of the bill itself have been distributed through business, labor, government, and professional channels, and literally dozens of experts in tax policy, tax administration, manpower training, accounting practice, vocational education, and economics are considering the bill and sending recommendations to me for improvements.

In some cases these experts have pointed out oversights and unintentional omissions. Some of these will be corrected at the time of congressional hearings, when a fourth version—a clean bill—of the act may be presented. In this category are:

First. Language making it clear that the training expenses for upgrading an employee's job skills to qualify him for a better position are clearly covered, as intended by the present sponsors.

Second. Provisions that permit an employer to claim credit for training even though his trainees fail to remain on the payroll for the requisite 3 months, when their termination is the result of circumstances beyond his effective control, such as strikes or natural disasters.

Third. Language to insure that no taxpayer could claim a credit toward training expenses for which he is reimbursed in some other way by the Government.

Fourth. Language defining more clearly the nature of cooperative education programs, with respect to the amount of time spent in schooling and in employment.

Fifth. Provisions to insure that trade associations and joint labor-management councils would have full opportunity to benefit from the act.

MAJOR POLICY QUESTIONS UNDER DISCUSSION

In addition to these improvements, a great deal of thought is being given in several other areas, where major policy decisions must be made. These areas include:

First. The maintenance of effort question, and the possibilities of making any such language administratively workable.

Second. The need for specifying "allowable training expenses" as precisely as possible, in order to reduce to a minimum any uncertainty which the taxpayer may have as to what is includible.

Third. Assured equality of treatment as between large and small firms, corporations, partnerships, sole proprietorships, subchapter S corporations, affiliated groups, and so forth.

Fourth. The value of the 3-month rule, which requires at least 3 months employment of each trainee in order for the taxpayer to claim a credit toward the training costs.

Fifth. The percentage amount of the tax credit needed to provide an effective stimulus to training, balanced, of course, with the probable net revenue loss.

To list these areas, Mr. President, is not to imply that the present bill is going to be changed in any or all of those respects. It is simply to emphasize that a great deal of careful thought is needed, and is being given, to insure that whatever becomes the final version of this legislation is the best possible legislation that can be produced.

My staff is currently circulating technical memos on many of these points to a select group of experts on the Hill; in Treasury, HEW, and Labor; in the business community, among union leaders, and with universities and foundations. The first two, on "Maintenance of Effort" and "The 3-Month Rule," are currently in circulation. I would consider it a favor—and I know I speak for Representative CURTIS and the other sponsors when I say this—if persons who have constructive suggestions on this legislation would contact us and share with us the benefit of their expertise.

In closing, Mr. President, I wish to express my sincere appreciation to the 99 other Members of the House and Senate who have contributed their talents, support, and sponsorship to this legislation. I am hopeful that it may be possible to hold hearings on this bill before the appropriate committees early next session, and that at that time we can present a measure worthy of the support of the great majority of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at the conclusion of my remarks the aforementioned editorial from the Columbus, Ga., Ledger-Enquirer, applauding the Human Investment Act and one of its distinguished sponsors in the House, Representative "Bo" CALLAWAY, of the Third District of Georgia.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbus (Ga.) Ledger-Enquirer, Oct. 3, 1965]

TO AID WORKERS: CALLAWAY'S POSITIVE APPROACH

Representative "Bo" CALLAWAY has introduced a bill in the House of Representatives which would effectively shift part of the war on poverty to private enterprise, rather than having the entire burden placed in Government hands.

He calls the bill the Human Investment Act of 1965, and basically, it would grant a tax credit to employers for financing training programs to prepare workers for new jobs.

CALLAWAY's bill represents a positive approach to a national need, but it also demonstrates that the Federal Government does not have to assume full responsibility for every program designed for the improvement of the country.

Free enterprise can do the job, and should be encouraged to do it. A tax credit is a logical, honorable means of sharing the burden with private business.

Strangely, the Federal Government has usually resisted the tax credit as a means of Federal aid, although it offers the most direct, economical type of aid.

Tax credits for college students, or teachers, or other beneficiaries of Federal aid might have eliminated the creation of several complicated new bureaucracies.

But there seems a reluctance to leaving the money with the taxpayer rather than taking it to Washington and shifting it back through channels.

Conservative Democrats and Republicans are often accused of being negative because they vote against many Federal programs. But they are positively seeking to retain as much independence as possible for the free enterprise system; and incidentally, to keep the Federal Government from getting weighted down with tasks that can be done by other means.

Presently, of course, the Federal Government is very active in the field which Representative CALLAWAY's bill covers.

But he is asking: "Why not help private enterprise do the same job?" The tax credit would undoubtedly prove a bargain for the Government, since its own retraining programs are admittedly quite expensive. The credit would be granted only after a firm had made the necessary expenditures and could show positive results.

Certainly, the administration and the congressional majority should give attention to this potential method of sharing the governmental burden with private enterprise.

The theory today seems to be that the Government can do it best. But most of the evidence refutes that idea, particularly in some areas.

The most effective war on poverty is being waged—as it has been for two centuries—by America's free enterprise system. Final victory will be won on that front, and the Government can provide the surest aid by bolstering that effort.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of October 11, 1965, the names of Mr. SCOTT and Mr. MUNDT were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2619) to establish a system for the sharing of certain Federal tax receipts with the States, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. HARTKE) on October 11, 1965.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1735) relating to the use by the Secretary of the Interior of land at La Jolla, Calif., donated by the University of California for a marine biological research laboratory, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution to authorize placing temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol the statue of the late Senator Dennis Chavez;

S. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution to authorize the acceptance by Congress of the statue of the late Senator Dennis Chavez; and

S. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document the proceedings of the presentation, dedication, and acceptance by Congress of the statue of the late Senator Dennis Chavez.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1758) to provide for the right of persons to be represented in matters before Federal agencies with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 516. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the Saint Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), to provide that eight members of such Commission shall be appointed by the President, to provide that such Commission shall not terminate prior to December 31, 1966, and to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of such joint resolution;

S. 1004. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and nonpersonal services by executive agencies, and for other purposes; and

S. 2150. An act to discontinue or modify certain reporting requirements of law.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3993. An act to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone;

H.R. 5026. An act to authorize the Burt County Bridge Commission, a public body politic and corporate in the county of Burt and State of Nebraska, to refund the outstanding revenue bonds of said Burt County Bridge Commission heretofore issued to finance the cost of the construction of a bridge, together with the necessary approaches and appurtenances therefor, from a point located in the city of Decatur, Burt County, Nebraska, across the Missouri River to a point located in Monona County, Iowa;

H.R. 7526. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of San Antonio;

H.R. 8317. An act to amend section 116 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern and Western Districts of Oklahoma;

H.R. 9424. An act to provide for the conservation, protection, and propagation of native species of fish and wildlife, including migratory birds, that are threatened with extinction; to consolidate the authorities relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of the National Wildlife Refuge System; and for other purposes;

H.R. 10722. An act to authorize the payment of an allowance of not to exceed $10 per day to employees assigned to duty at the Nevada Test Site of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission; and

H.R. 11267. An act to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove certain limitations.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 23. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate with the several States a cooperative program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9022. An act to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster; to eliminate inequities in the application of Public Law 815 in certain military base closings; to make uniform eligibility requirements for school districts in Public Law 874; and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3993. An act to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone; and

H.R. 8317. An act to amend section 116 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the United States District Court for the Eastern and Western Districts of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5026. An act to authorize the Burt County Bridge Commission, a public body politic and corporate in the county of Burt and State of Nebraska, to refund the outstanding revenue bonds of said Burt County Bridge Commission heretofore issued to finance the cost of the construction of a bridge, together with the necessary approaches and appurtenances therefor, from a point located in the city of Decatur, Burt County, Nebraska, across the Missouri River to a point located in Monona County, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 7526. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of San Antonio; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9424. An act to provide for the conservation, protection, and propagation of native species of fish and wildlife, including migratory birds, that are threatened with extinction; to consolidate the authorities relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of the National Wildlife Refuge System; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 10722. An act to authorize the payment of an allowance of not to exceed $10 per day to employees assigned to duty at the Nevada Test Site of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 11267. An act to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove certain limitations; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SCHOOL FOR BUSINESS AMBASSADORS

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "School for Business Ambassadors," written by Jack Long, and published in the magazine The Lamp by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.

This informative article deals with what is being done to educate American businessmen to make them more effective U.S. representatives abroad.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOL FOR BUSINESS AMBASSADORS

(By Jack Long)

An American businessman in southeast Asia was showing a local visitor through his office. The visitor pointed to the air conditioner and said, "I'm sorry to see this example of selfishness. You suck in the cool air from outside for your comfort and leave the rest of us only the hot air to breathe."

Another American executive, arriving in a different part of the world and not trusting his command of the language, used an interpreter to make an introductory talk to his staff. He was coldly received and learned his mistake later; to speak English was considered the hallmark of an educated man, and by imputing lack of comprehension to his listeners he had insulted them.

Questions, problems, and misunderstandings such as these are faced daily by representatives of some 3,300 American companies doing business overseas. They find that their words and actions often don't mean what they do at home. They discover that different rules for business and social conduct must be learned, and that they must recognize and overcome many hidden barriers in order to communicate with the people around them. The difficulties they face often seem trivial, but the cost in time, effort, and money can be high.

As international business has grown, so has management's awareness of the importance not only of picking the right man for the job but of giving him the necessary training for his assignment. Some companies with large international interests have had their own programs of orientation, but most have depended on experience as the teacher. Both approaches are expensive. The cost of replacing a man who fails in his new assignment is high. The business loss involved in such a failure is impossible to estimate. A wife's contribution to her husband's success abroad can also be crucial.

To help solve this complex problem, a group of U.S. corporations engaged in world trade (including Jersey Standard) set up a new kind of training course in 1958 open to all executives involved in international operations. The organization, supported by more than 50 companies, is the nonprofit Business Council for International Understanding, and its educational program is conducted at American University's School of International Service in Washington, D.C. The 4-week course, offered 5 times a year, is private industry's school for foreign service, somewhat comparable to the State Department's Foreign Service Institute for Government personnel. So far, 671 executives and wives from 85 companies have graduated and are stationed in 66 countries around the world. The men range from technical specialists to managing directors of overseas operations. Some are home-office managers with international responsibilities; others are foreign nationals employed by U.S. corporations. Altogether, they represent a cross section of American industry—oil, steel and rubber, food and soft drinks, clothing, aluminum and copper, pharmaceuticals and chemicals, banking, and many others. Most of the wives attend a related 1-week seminar in international living, and an increasing number of them take the entire course.

There is evidence to show that BCIU graduates are doing a better job than those who jet away unprepared to distant posts. Companies are even bringing back old hands who have spent 15 or 20 years abroad in order to update their knowledge of world affairs and equip them with the newest techniques in cross-cultural communications. In Washington they study the history and customs of different civilizations; they analyze current social, political, and economic trends around the globe. Both husbands and wives devote more than a week to specific problems of the areas to which they are assigned. Specialists trained in those areas test them with probing questions about the United States that they are likely to be asked overseas, so that they will be prepared to deal with both friendly and hostile critics abroad.

Language study is an important part of the program, and participants are offered 2 or more weeks of intensive work in any required tongue before a regular session begins. Conversational skill is the objective, and instructors native to each language are employed. It is recognized that every language reflects the culture from which it springs, and that an understanding of another man's language is an important step in understanding his way of thinking.

There are seldom more than two or three students in each language class, which meets 4 hours a day, 5 days a week, for as long as the participant chooses. Additional hours are spent in the university's language laboratory with its electronic teaching aids. Tape recorders are used for after-hours drill. How much can be learned in a few weeks depends on individual aptitude, but even students starting from scratch find that they can lay a solid foundation for further practice and training abroad. Several graduates have reported that within 6 months to a year overseas they are able to conduct all business in the local language.

The birth of the BCIU goes back to a White House conference in 1955, when President Eisenhower called in a group of business leaders to discuss what might be done to increase understanding of free enterprise around the world. Among other things, it was agreed that advance preparation for executives going abroad could help them do a better job for both their companies and their country. It became evident, however, that facilities for such training hardly existed, particularly in a form suited to mature men with a limited time to cover a broad range of subjects. The BCIU chose Dr. Harold M. Randall, an Iowa-born educator and former career diplomat, to direct its training course for international executives. His deputy is John S. Walter, a former Jersey Standard executive. Washington was picked as the location in order to draw on the faculties of the six universities in the area plus the Foreign Service Institute, other Government agencies, and the staffs of foreign embassies. Several days are devoted to studying the organization and working methods of various departments and agencies of the Federal Government, especially those involved in foreign affairs. Participants visit the White House and Capitol Hill and are briefed by members of congressional committees and officers of the State Department, AID, and the USIA.

Once installed in their Washington hotel rooms, the BCIU students, whose ages range from the thirties to the sixties, are in for a busy time. They have already received an armload of books for advance reading. They will hear some 50 different lecturers—anthropologists, sociologists, historians, linguists, information and public opinion specialists, and professors of art, literature, and music.

A basic aim of the course is to prepare the international executive and his wife for "culture shock." This term sums up the package of miseries—disturbing as weightlessness in outer space—that afflicts an individual transplanted to a new environment. People who have lived abroad say that it occurs when their own behavior and manners—which they have always assumed to be more or less universal—turn out to be only local customs, and they find that others take an entirely different view of what is "normal behavior." The result can be a breakdown in personal relations in the new culture, and frustration and failure in both business and social life.

Course lecturers cite many examples of cultural differences that affect the conduct of business abroad. They point out that in many parts of the world Americans must adjust to a new tempo in business negotiations. They must adopt a more formal approach than they are used to at home. In the Orient, for example, lengthy conversations over tea usually precede important business transactions. Any subject may be discussed so long as it has nothing to do with the business at hand. The foreigner who loses patience runs the risk of failure.

A woman lecturer, with long experience abroad, made a similar point while talking recently to a group of wives. She explained that, when shopping in Asian countries for a piece of furniture or a painting, the direct approach is usually inadvisable. A shopkeeper will probably not discuss price until perhaps the second or third visit to his shop. He must grow to like the prospective purchaser before he will sell her any item of real value.

Another problem for an overseas American is the different concept of time that exists in many other cultures. In some regions promptness is the rule in keeping appointments, but in other areas to arrive on the dot is looked upon as rude and inconsiderate.

Students learn that in a number of countries a great deal of deference is paid to age and rank in business organizations. American junior executives, who are used to expressing their opinions frankly to the boss, often find themselves in hot water through lack of tact in dealing with older men abroad.

Even the distance at which people stand from one another while engaged in conversation can be a problem. A Foreign Service linguist explains that an American or an Englishman is accustomed to a face-to-face talking distance of about arm's length, or approximately 30 inches. Latins, on the other hand, like to discuss things at a range of about 18 inches. When living in the other man's country, therefore, it is necessary to adjust to his "invisible boundary."

The BCIU seminar for wives is directed by Dr. Esther Cole Franklin, associate professor of international relations at American University. Her course includes specific, practical information on housing, clothing needs, health facilities, schools, and other subjects that will make it easier for a woman to run a home in a new country. The wives learn the status of women in the area where they will live. They are told that in one country a servant customarily receives a month's pay as a Christmas bonus. In another the labor laws make it difficult to discharge a servant. Opportunities for community service are outlined, and many alumni of the course are abroad today teaching English, cooking, sewing, and nursing, or engaging in other types of voluntary welfare work.

Social pitfalls are explained. In certain Oriental countries it is risky to admire any object too enthusiastically in a home that one visits, because the host will feel compelled to give it to his guest. In some countries a wife is expected to know nothing of politics or business, while in others she will be asked penetrating questions about the American system.

The overseas wife is warned that as an American woman abroad she will be watched and criticized, and her mistakes will seldom be overlooked or forgotten. "There have been many charming and discreet American women in Rangoon," Dr. Franklin says, "but the one they have never forgotten there is a young creature who, some years ago, wore Bermuda shorts on a visit to the bank. She is the one they still talk about."

The course teaches that, for better or worse, Americans abroad are a highly visible minority wherever they go. The international executive in his foreign post is looked upon by most local people as an American first and a businessman second. He is judged and measured, not by the standards he has been accustomed to, but by standards that are meaningful to people with different yardsticks of conduct. This is inevitable in a world that is 95 percent non-American, 70 percent nonwhite, and 65 percent non-Christian.

As Fred C. Foy, chairman of BCIU and head of the Koppers Co., has said, there are nearly a billion people in the uncommitted and developing nations who are potential friends and customers for American enterprise. Our businessmen abroad are working hard to win them.

How are they doing? Better all the time, it seems. A recent check of BCIU graduates indicates that fewer than 1 percent have failed and been brought back from their overseas assignments.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for an additional 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Nebraska is granted.

NEBRASKA AGRICULTURE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, a short while ago, I was invited to speak at the State convention of the Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts of Nebraska. This meeting was held at Ogallala, Nebr., on October 4, 1965.

During this fall, I have also spoken to a number of local farm organizations, and on October 6 I spoke to the State convention of the Grange, which met at Lincoln, Nebr. At all of these meetings I had the opportunity to visit with a number of individual farmers. I was able to get the reaction of many farmers to a number of problems that the Congress faces.

Mr. President, in speaking today, I wish to state the things that I said at these meetings to which I have referred.

Nebraska is one of the important agricultural States of the Union. Nebraska and the other States that make up the Missouri River Basin constitute one-sixth of the land area of the United States. This area provides a major contribution in making America the best fed nation in the world. The quality and the quantity of the American diet are unexcelled anywhere in the world.

I join with the hopes of other Nebraskans that our State can attract industry. I think we need to increase job opportunities and supplement our agricultural income. The fact remains, however, that agriculture will continue to be the backbone of the economy of Nebraska.

I wish to speak up in behalf of Nebraska farmers. There are many erroneous ideas circulated among our nonfarming population. Sometimes the writers of newspaper stories paint a picture of the American farmer that puts him in a false light. The notion that the American farmer is not willing to do his best to solve his own problems and instead is a willing dependent upon the Government is false. Actually, the American farmer has been producing the best food in the world at a cost to the consumer that is the lowest in relation to the consumer's income of any place in the world. The farmers have actually been subsidizing the consumers through prices that are too low.

I believe that we need a farm program. I deeply feel that that farm program should have as its central objective the raising of the prices of the farmers' products in the marketplace. Farm programs were brought into being because the prices the farmer received were too low.

There are conflicting views on how the farm problem should be met. There are many who believe as I do that everything the Government does in the field of agriculture should be a contribution toward higher prices in the marketplace. A recent specific example of this can be cited. I joined with Senators MUNDT of South Dakota, PEARSON of Kansas, and YOUNG of North Dakota, in offering an amendment to the recent farm bill to provide that the Commodity Credit Corporation could not dump surplus wheat on the market at less than 115 percent of parity. We did not have enough support to carry the amendment. If it had passed, it would definitely have helped in raising the price that farmers are paid for their wheat.

Now, the other view on dealing with the farm problem, as contrasted to doing those things which raise the price, is that we should have a system that lets prices fall to more or less the world level and then make up the difference to the farmer in a direct payment from the U.S. Treasury. This was called the Brannan plan. It did not originate with Mr. Brannan. It does not bear his name now, but it has been advocated through the years. Recently farm legislation has moved in this direction. The most recent farm bill actually provides for lower prices. For several years now farm prices have been going down and direct payments going up. I do not believe this trend is wise.

The plan of lower prices and increased direct payments from the Treasury has not succeeded. It has not solved our basic problems. For instance, since 1961 more than 2½ million farmers and their families have left the farm. During this same period the number of farms has decreased by more than 500,000. Farm parity has gone from an average of better than 80 to below 75 percent and in the past 3 years it has averaged 76½ percent. During these same years farm production costs have increased by $3 billion and farm debt has increased by $12 billion.

I know of no farmer who is happy about the present setup. I know of no farmer who contends that a satisfactory solution has been arrived at.

It is true that from 1961 through 1964 total net farm income increased by $700 million. It must be pointed out, however, that without the increase in direct Government payments, total net farm income for 1964 would have been $775 million less than in 1960. In other words, in spite of increased cost to the Government, farm prices in the marketplace were depressed $775 million in 1964 as against 1960.

It is pointed out that total cash receipts from livestock have increased, but the point is the number of livestock marketed has increased still more so that farmers have actually received less per unit marketed and less for their labors, and not more.

There is a great deal of legislation every year in Congress that vitally affects agriculture. There is legislation that deals with other subjects such as right-to-work laws, taxes and trade agreements. While not labeled as agriculture legislation, they have a direct effect upon agriculture. Then, of course, there is the direct agriculture legislation which is designated as such.

The direct designated agriculture legislation falls into two classes—appropriations for agriculture and the enactment of farm plans. Each and every year the Congress passes an agriculture appropriations bill. It is usually only about once every 2, 3, or 4 years that we are given the opportunity to vote on authorization legislation or what is called a farm plan. These votes provide an opportunity to express a view on the theory of a farm program.

I have voted for most of the farm bills that have come before Congress since I have served Nebraska. I have not voted for all of the plans advanced. My support has been directed toward those farm programs and factors thereof that would raise the price of the farmers' products. I have not used my vote to advance the theory and the practice that farm prices should fall and that the difference should be made up with a direct payment from the Treasury.

I take the position that I do for several reasons:

First, I think most farmers would prefer an adequate and decent price for their products.

Second, I think that farmers are entitled to a fair price for the food that they produce just the same as workers are entitled to fair wages and businesses are entitled to fair prices.

Third, I think that it is more fitting in the American system to reward the farmer in the marketplace rather than put him in the position of being supported by the Government.

There is a fourth and important reason why I believe that low prices and increased Government payments are unwise. The nonfarm population is growing so rapidly and the farm population has constantly declined. In spite of the good intentions of the political leadership in both parties, a consumer-dominated Congress may someday put an end to the direct Government payments to farmers. We would then find ourselves with no permanent solution to our basic agricultural problems and disastrously low prices. My belief as to what theory a farm program should follow has not always prevailed. I have been on the losing side sometimes. Nevertheless, I will continue to wholeheartedly support what I believe to be the best interests of agriculture as I have in the past.

I will continue to support each and every annual agricultural appropriations bill. These appropriations bills provide the funds for soil conservation, water conservation, the extension service, research in plant and animal diseases, rural electrification, marketing research, and the countless other necessary and important programs of our Agriculture Department. These bills also appropriate the money for the Commodity Credit Corporation to make the commodity support loans and also make the appropriations for the direct payments from the Treasury to the farmers. These appropriations have always had my support and will continue to have my support. This is true, even though my theory as to how we should solve the farm problem has not always prevailed and even though I have disagreed with some plans for farm programs.

Agriculture's problems are so great that they must be attacked upon all fronts. Some of our efforts have been disappointing. For instance, I was very active in the fight on sugar legislation in 1962 that made it legally possible for Nebraska to increase her sugar acreage, but other factors have prevented an increase in sugarbeet raising. Plant diseases, low sugar content, and weed control have seriously plagued sugarbeet growers. We have lost one sugar factory. The efforts to get a new modern plant in Nebraska have not been successful. We were even turned down by one of the largest farmer cooperatives, so what was an accomplishment legislatively has not brought the desired results for other reasons. I still believe that we should grow more of the things that we are in need of and grow less of those crops of which we have a surplus.

For more than a year I have been working with a group of Nebraskans who need improved weather forecasting geared to agriculture. We have made considerable progress. I think it will come about. I believe the time will come when some additional help will be provided the Weather Bureau and the Agricultural Extension Service at North Platte so that they can be of greater service to our farmers, our vegetable growers and our ranchers in Nebraska and increase their income measurably.

In the field of trade agreements and tariffs, I have never contended that we should shut off all trade. I have always felt, however, that there should be reasonable controls over imports. The importation of beef and veal was an important factor in causing cattle prices to reach their lowest point in 18 years, a little more than a year ago. We have been able to accomplish something on import controls even though it was not all we fought for.

I would like to see the time come when the farmer would not only receive a good price for his products but when he could operate his entire farm subject only to sound soil conservation practices.

I have long fought for a program of greater industrial uses of farm products. I believe that the magic of chemistry and research can find a multitude of new uses for products that we produce on the farm. Such a program can provide raw materials to meet needs which are now being met by materials taken from beneath the surface of the earth which are exhaustible. Many people are interested in this program. We have had our opposition and the Department of Agriculture has never been completely sold on an all-out industrial uses program. My faith in such a program has not wavered and I expect to keep at it.

There are so many agricultural programs that have done such a splendid job. Rural electrification is one. It has overwhelming support in Congress, and it will always have my support.

I want to say something about conservation because it is very dear to my heart. I spearheaded the flood control and irrigation program for the Republican Valley that was needed so badly. I was the author of the resolution that brought about the Pick-Sloan plan for the Missouri River Basin. I am also very much interested in the conservation work of the Department of Agriculture and so I want to talk about that a little bit.

The Soil Conservation Service is one of the best run of all Government programs. I have always supported it. Soil conservation districts are constituted under the law in such a way that they are managed by the conservation leaders in the various communities. The Soil Conservation Service is definitely a farmer-run operation through these districts.

The technical services to provide expert engineering for conservation operations in the Soil Conservation Service and technical assistance to soil conservation districts and others represent about only one-seventieth of our total agricultural appropriations.

Nebraska has 86 soil and water conservation districts covering the entire State. The State has been completely covered by soil conservation districts since March of 1950.

Nationally, about 94 percent of the land in farms and 98 percent of the farms in the United States are now in soil conservation districts.

I am a conservationist because I believe it is better to conserve and save than to waste. We have an obligation to hand on the soil in just as good shape, or a little bit better, than when this generation came upon the scene. Conservation benefits are long-range benefits and are in the public good.

I took part in writing the Small Watersheds Act of 1954. At that time I was a Member of the House of Representatives. I introduced one of the bills creating the small watersheds program. My bill went to the Committee on Agriculture where all the bills were under study and then, of course, the committee reported out their own bill. While the Small Watersheds Act was being written, the Congress appropriated $5 million in 1953 for some pilot watershed projects. There was a limited number of them, but four were placed in Nebraska. Three of the four happened to be in my congressional district. Of these pilot projects, Brownell Creek, Dry Creek, and Indian Creek are completed and the Upper Salt-Swedeburg tributaries of Salt Creek is scheduled for completion in 1966.

As of September 22, 1965, the Department of Agriculture had received 66 applications for project assistance under the Small Watersheds Act in Nebraska watersheds covering 4.1 million acres. Twenty-five projects have been planned and approved for installation of works of improvement, one of which has been completed. Seven are in the planning stage, and three have been withdrawn. This leaves a total of 31 applications for assistance that have not yet been given authorization for planning.

Within the past few weeks, two more Nebraska projects have been approved for operations. They are the Cub Creek watershed in Gage and Jefferson Counties, and the Brule watershed in Keith County. Additionally, the plan for works of improvement on the Zeigler Creek watershed in Otoe County was approved by Congress recently.

Landowners and operators in 58 Nebraska counties participate also in the Great Plains conservation programs. As of the end of March this year 2,600 contracts had been signed involving over 3 million acres in this program. Another 766 applications were pending. One of the objects of the Great Plains conservation program is the removal from crop production land that should be used for other purposes.

Over 1.1 million acres of cropland have been planned for conversion to other uses.

The Bureau of the Budget recommended certain cuts in the Soil Conservation Service for fiscal 1966. I helped to restore those cuts. When one considers the entire budget of the Department of Agriculture, these items are not sizable but their deletion would be damaging to a fine program.

I was coauthor of the recently enacted amendments to the Farmers Home Administration Act which broadened and increased the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans and grants to public agencies and nonprofit organizations for the development of water systems serving rural areas.

Farmers have a stake in everything that takes place in Government these days. Our Government has become large and it affects the lives of all our citizens. It affects our pocketbooks, too. Farmers, like all other taxpayers, are influenced by the growth of Government.

I was quite disappointed in the Federal aid to education bill that the Congress enacted. Federal aid to education has been urged over the years on the grounds that there were many localities and many States that did not have the property, income, and other resources to support good schools. The bill that passed was not geared to this objective.

The 10 wealthiest counties in the United States will receive twice as much Federal aid as the 10 poorest counties. The formula adopted was such that those localities best able to pay their own education costs will receive the most.

Many Nebraskans thought that if Federal aid to education were enacted it would relieve the heavy financial burden on local and State taxpayers in order to carry on their schools. This will not be accomplished. The bill is so worded that the Federal money must go for new expenditures and not in place of expenditures now being made by the locality or the State.

Social security taxes are going to be greatly increased. This is of primary concern to farmers because as self-employed persons they pay 1½ times the rate an employee pays. The bill that embodied the so-called medicare program brought about this great increase in taxes.

When social security started 30 years ago the maximum tax that either an employee or an employer could pay was $30 per year. Under this medicare bill the maximum employee tax for the calendar year 1966 will be $275.55, and a similar amount would have to be paid by the employer. The maximum social security tax on the self-employed farmer in 1966 will be $404.25. As time goes on, these taxes will increase without any additional legislation. By 1973, which is not far off, the maximum tax on self-employed persons such as a farmer will be $501. By 1987, without any increase over the present act, the maximum annual tax for the self-employed person such as a farmer will be $518.10.

Under this medicare program an individual can be worth millions of dollars, he can have the highest income of his life, he need not retire, but if he is 65 his hospital and medical expenses will be paid as provided by the Medicare Act. We will soon have 20 million citizens over 65 years of age. None of them have had the opportunity to contribute a single cent heretofore into a fund for medicare purposes. This entire load will have to be carried by the present and future workers, the self-employed and the employers.

I am for assisting our older people with their medical expenses for those who do not have the income or resources to pay it themselves. I do not suggest that they be required to prove they are paupers. I want my Government to be generous in determining need but I do not believe that the working people, the farmers, the other self-employed and the employers should be taxed to pay the medical expenses of the well to do, the wealthy and the people who are well able to pay their own bills. The social security tax falls on the first dollar of income, for all employees and self-employed. There is no personal exemption. The tax is collected on the earnings of the crippled, the blind, and every handicapped person.

During the course of consideration of the medicare bill, I offered an amendment which would have eliminated the benefits for those people who are well able to pay their own bills. My amendment lost by a vote of 51 to 41. There were 25 Republicans and 16 Democrats who voted for it. I hope to try again with this proposal before the medicare program gets too far intrenched into our system.

A pending issue down at Washington and an issue that will be with us in 1966 and in which Nebraskans have a great interest involves the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law.

Nebraska has a right-to-work law. It is a part of the constitution of Nebraska. It was placed in our constitution by an overwhelming majority of the voters of Nebraska. A provision of the Taft-Hartley law permits the States to have right-to-work laws if their people so choose. This particular section of the Taft-Hartley law is known as section 14(b). The administration seeks to do away with Nebraska's right-to-work law. This would set aside not only a statute enacted in Nebraska but a provision of the constitution of our State.

There have been three national polls taken on the question of repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law. In every one of these polls a substantial majority of the citizens who expressed an opinion were opposed to repeal. Two or three thousand newspaper editorials have been published opposing repeal, yet these men who grasp for power, who want more money in their coffers, and who seek first of all not the public good but political and union monopoly, seek to deny the will of the people and override the States rights and bring an end to our right-to-work laws.

A right-to-work law means just what it says. The Nebraska constitution says in substance that no individual shall be required to join a union to secure a job or to keep and hold a job, and it prohibits contracts that would require that to be done. This is basic freedom. To abolish it means compulsory unionism. We do not stand for compulsion in connection with church membership, membership in fraternal orders or business associations because it violates the principle of individual liberty.

In States that do not have right-to-work laws, it is possible for the union leaders to demand and receive from management a contract that provides that if the worker fails to stay in the union and pay his dues he must lose his job. Thus the worker is a captive. He cannot resign his membership in the union as a protest against the policies of his union or because he does not want to belong, without losing his job. The free choice is taken from him.

There are many individuals who are opposed to a right-to-work law. I respect their views. What is really involved, however, is the right of the people of a sovereign State to decide whether or not they want a right-to-work law. The effort to repeal is the very antithesis of true liberalism. It is reactionary to the *n*th degree. It is a backward movement. I shall do everything in my power to prevent repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law.

The ideas and opinions of Nebraskans on all legislation, including agricultural legislation, are most helpful. I hope that whether an individual agrees with me on details or not, we will continue to have respect for each other's opinions as we have always had in the past. Our objective is the same, a sound and prosperous and growing agriculture for the State of Nebraska.

ABANDONMENT BY WHITE HOUSE OF FILM ON 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in yesterday's Washington Post appeared an article, written by Ward Just, entitled "White House Admits It Dropped Film on 89th." I wish to read that article:

> WHITE HOUSE ADMITS IT DROPPED FILM ON 89TH
>
> The film celebrating the 89th Congress was abandoned by the White House at the last minute because "it didn't come off," a White House spokesman said today. The hostile reviewer, other sources said, was Presidential Assistant Jack Valenti.
>
> The 17-minute movie, whose working title was "The Fighting 89th—The Congress That Wouldn't Wait," was to have been shown at the salute to Congress reception in the State Department last week. Today, in confirming the story in yesterday's editions of the Washington Post, the White House said that the film was incomplete and "didn't seem to be what was contemplated."
>
> Elsewhere, it was learned that the original narrator was to have been President Johnson. At the last minute the resonant baritone of Gregory Peck was substituted.
>
> Initially, the White House requested "visual aids" to assist the President in a McNamara-like presentation designed to pat congressional backs. But as the project developed, "visual aids" became films and L.B.J. was jettisoned in favor of Actor Peck. The eventual spectacle involved a complicated, three-screen apparatus.
>
> There were at least half a dozen outside consultants, most of whom were told "it's for the President" and most of whom expected "honoraria" for their contributions. The film and the script were put together in 2 weeks. Gregory Peck taped his narration in the basement of the west wing of the White House.
>
> "We were auditioning at every stage," said Producer John Naisbitt, who is a special assistant to HEW Secretary John W. Gardner. The film is currently in the possession of Naisbitt.
>
> It was understood that the cost of the film was under $1,000. Most of the footage came from departmental and agency files. The major expenditure, according to one of the moviemakers, was time.
>
> There were two screenings last week. The first was on Wednesday, when without explanation, Valenti told the producers he didn't think the film could be used. Presumably the reason was connected with the President's admission into Bethesda Medical Center the following night.
>
> The second screening was on Friday in the State Department auditorium. The reviews on that occasion were mixed. One participant said it was "impressive but not slick. It was not really up to the L.B.J. style."
>
> This was understood to mean that while the film was appropriately reverential toward

the Congress, it was at times technically inexpert. It was not, said the source, avant-garde. Nor, he confessed, was it nouvelle vague. It was said, however, that there were certain techniques of the cinema verite.

These apparently went awry at the Friday showing.

With Peck extolling the great natural beauties of America (and the manner in which the 89th Congress has preserved them) on the sound track, the film shows tornado-stricken farmlands, hurricane-lashed beaches and the ravages of windstorms.

"Something went wrong in the projector," one of the consultants said yesterday. "It was just a little thing, not terribly important."

Mr. President, to clear up the confusion, what stopped the film is that they were reminded of a joint resolution dated September 23, 1965. This joint resolution, acted on by Congress, approved the showing in the United States of the film "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums."

However, this resolution also had another purpose. When it was being considered I offered an amendment which appears as section 4. It reads as follows:

> Any documentary film which has been, is now being, or is hereafter produced by any Government department or agency with appropriations out of the Treasury concerning the life, character, and public service of any individual who has served or is serving the Government of the United States in any official capacity shall not be distributed or shown in public in this country during the lifetime of the said official or after the death of such official unless authorized by law in each specific case.

That is the law enacted by Congress, and the White House found that this film was a violation of this law. Let us stop shadowboxing. They suddenly realized there was a law which prevented such a film from being shown at the taxpayers' expense.

They were caught with their hands in the cookie jar.

SENATOR RANDOLPH HONORED WITH SERVICE AWARD—VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY PRAISES LEGISLATIVE RECORD

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, my colleagues will be gratified to learn of the high commendation accorded the senior Senator from West Virginia, Jennings Randolph.

At the 32d anniversary of the District of Columbia Trucking Association, Senator Randolph was presented with the Service Award in recognition of his outstanding leadership and devoted public service to his country, to his State of West Virginia, and to the District of Columbia.

John E. Amos, distinguished West Virginian and president of American Trucking Associations, spoke of the Senator's many achievements in public life. Frank L. Grimm, ATA vice president from the District of Columbia and last year's recipient of the award made the presentation to Mr. Randolph.

Vice President Humphrey stated in a telegram to Secretary Andrew Johnson:

> I am gratified to learn that your fine organization is honoring a truly great legislator, Senator Jennings Randolph, of West Virginia. His leadership in the 89th Congress was responsible for the Appalachian and highway beautification bills. Senator Randolph's energetic and effective labors have contributed much to the progressive programs enacted into law this year. His stature in the Senate has increased with his service. I join the members of your group as you honor your friend and my friend and America's benefactor.

More than 400 persons, leaders in the trucking and allied transportation fields, were in attendance at the notable event which took place Saturday evening at the Sheraton-Park Hotel.

Senator Randolph is most deserving of this award and I take this opportunity to add my congratulations.

THE RIGHT TO DISSENT

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, on October 6, 1965, on this floor I spoke in defense of the right of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations to dissent from the foreign policy of the President on the intervention in the Dominican Republic crisis. I stated that while I disagreed with the views expressed by the junior Senator from Arkansas and I supported and applauded the President's action in that crisis, I deplored the manner in which the junior Senator from Arkansas had been attacked for even daring to dissent.

I concluded my remarks by stating:

> God forbid that the U.S. Senate ever become so shackled by conformity or so dominated by a tyranny of the majority that any Senator has to become a mental mute with his voice silenced for fear of being castigated for expressing convictions that do not conform with the overwhelming majority.

A week later in its October 14, 1965, issue the Portland, Maine, Evening Express had an excellent editorial defending the right to dissent with respect to an issue in the State of Maine. It discusses the right of some Maine citizens to dissent against the proposed Dickey Dam project—a project that I support.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be placed in the body of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Portland (Maine) Evening Express, Oct. 14, 1965]

The Right To Dissent

Announcement that Kenneth Holum, assistant secretary, water and power development, Department of the Interior, will be the featured speaker at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner Saturday offers another example of the shifting standards so common in politics.

Peter N. Kyros, chairman of the Maine Democratic Committee, reports that Mr. Holum will discuss the Dickey Dam project and the future development of power in Maine and New England. In view of Mr. Holum's employment and the nature of the occasion it does not seem rash to expect that Mr. Holum will recommend the hydroelectric project.

"Mr. Holum has an outstanding background in this field and I am sure his discussion of the subject will be of interest to all the people of Maine," said Mr. Kyros in his announcement.

This is the same Mr. Kyros who only last Monday took to task his Republican counterpart because Harold F. Schnurle, a Central Maine Power Co. representative and outspoken critic of Dickey, was to address the Portland Club. Mr. Kyros told Roger N. Putnam, Republican State Committee chairman, that he should "not permit Mr. Schnurle to confuse and smudge the issues before an audience consisting largely of members of his own party."

In his uncommon trespass on the territory of the opposition party, Mr. Kyros did no service to himself or his fellow Democrats. Instead he joined in what has become a distressing attempt to discredit or silence any and all sources who hold views contrary to the Democratic position on Dickey.

What Mr. Kyros is saying, by implication at least, is that it is perfectly proper for an advocate of Dickey to extol its virtues before a predominantly Democratic audience but it is improper for an opponent of the project to criticize it before a predominantly Republican audience.

If Mr. Kyros anticipated that Mr. Schnurle would "confuse and smudge the issues," surely there are others in Maine who may feel that Mr. Holum will do the same thing. And just as Mr. Kyros predicts that Mr. Holum's discussion "will be of interest to all the people of Maine," so was Mr. Schnurle's discussion of general interest.

But we are not concerned here with personalities or the merits of the Dickey proposal. What we do find frightening is the growing effort, from State level to the White House, to silence all expression of contrary opinion on any major issue. The right to dissent, in orderly manner, is fundamental and essential unless this Nation is to scrap its fine tradition of democratic principles and ideals and degenerate into one-party rule.

Nothing is made right or made wrong merely because it is conceived or advocated by a particular group. An intelligent decision can only follow free discussion of all aspects of an issue. Any attempt to impede discussion must be viewed as a grave threat to the individual and national interest.

When politics reaches the point where it openly divides right and wrong not by what is done but by who does it, the time has come for genuine concern.

A CLOSE SHAVE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, is there a boy who does not dream of breeding a beard? And is there a man who, having remained beardless throughout his life, one day does not regret that he never allowed that dream to blossom into reality?

Who among the men in this body have not reveled in the luxury of shaveless days when our travels have taken us from the harsh glare of conformity?

How many of us have been led back to water and made to shave because of public scorn or by a wife who prefers the skin of a boy to the beard of a man?

But, Mr. President, despite the absence of beards in this body today, I am certain no Senator would quarrel with a citizen's right to grow one.

I say that knowing full well beards are not in good standing at present. They are suspect in some quarters because Fidel Castro wears one and because they have become badges of beatnikdom. But I also know that the strong feeling of this body against invasion of privacy offsets any prejudices harbored against beards.

Also, no prudent politician, even if he felt inclined to, would speak out against beards, for Van Dykes, goatees and full, fuzzy bushes have a way of bouncing back into fashion.

History also shows that during periods when the smooth shaven have ruled the fashion roost, dissenters have been treated unfairly and harshly.

Bearded Frenchmen were once given the choice of losing their whiskers or their heads. The order was issued by King Louis XIII when he was 9 years old.

A Mr. Palmer, of Fitchburg, Mass., was refused communion at his church and jailed because he insisted upon his right to wear a beard. That happened in 1830.

A civilian working on a military post near a booming frontier town was fired because he would not shave off his beard.

But, Mr. President, he was not fired because of a whimsy of a 9-year-old king. The incident did not happen in the early 1800's when superstition sometimes got the better of reason. It happened in September 1965, at Clear Air Force Station, Alaska.

It is not the first time a civilian has been fired at that station for growing a beard. A temporary employee was dismissed earlier in the year because he dared to violate the Air Force no-beard policy.

A no-beard policy. The words have a strange ominous sound in a nation which prides itself on being free.

Where is the freedom of choice in a no-beard policy? Where is the opportunity for self-expression and to strike out at confining conformity?

When I learned of the existence of this policy, I asked the Air Force for an explanation, hoping there was some misunderstanding.

There was not. The Air Force gave me two reasons for enforcing the policy, two reasons but no legal authorization, I might add.

The first reason was medical. According to the Air Force, beards interfere with recognition, diagnosis, and treatment of frostbite.

Mr. President, it would seem that the Air Force is more concerned with treatment than with preventive medicine.

It would seem that the Air Force has chosen to ignore the experience of thousands of sourdoughs who have grown beards for protection against the cold. It has chosen to ignore the collective judgments of members of great teams of explorers.

I would suggest that instigators of the no-beard policy take a look at pictures of the men on expeditions led by Admiral Peary to the North Pole, by Admiral Byrd to the Antarctica, and by Sir Edmund Hillary to the frigid crests of the Himalaya Mountains.

The narrow minds which dreamed of this policy might broaden the horizon on beards if they took time to glance at pictures of the men on the Government-financed expedition now in Antarctica. A glance is all that is needed. Beards abound.

Mr. President, evidently beards have satisfied their users for many generations, and, as they say on Madison Avenue, customer satisfaction is the best form of endorsement.

Even the Air Force apparently admits beards afford some protection against low temperatures. In the same letter of explanation, I was told:

> Individuals who go in and out of doors in severe cold climates accumulate frost in the beard hair which alternately melts and freezes. This wetness tends to cause a loss of insulation which favors the development of frostbite.

Mr. President, quite clearly, for something to lose its ability to insulate it must first perform that useful purpose.

Regardless of the validity of this breakthrough in knowledge about beards, the military has no business—let me be stronger—has no right to tell a citizen he cannot grow a beard for medical reasons. I would think that the American Medical Association, which has expressed some alarm recently about Government interference in doctor-patient relationships, would do well to investigate this incident.

However, I believe any investigation of this firing would lead to the conclusion that medical reasons played little or no part.

Remember that beards were not allowed because of alleged problems of frostbite. Also remember that the man was fired in September, and the rate of incidence of frostbite at Clear in September ranges between zero and none.

And surely the Air Force is aware that the U.S. Navy sees no intrinsic health hazard in beards. Crews of submarines often are allowed to grow beards, and I would think that considerations of health and cleanliness are paramount in the crowded quarters of a submarine.

No, frostbite was not the main reason for firing this civilian. There was a third reason given for the no-beard policy.

It was:

> In addition to the medical considerations, the site commander, acting within his authority has established and published personal appearance standards which prohibits the growing of beards.

Authority for setting up personal appearance standards. I was stunned. Were these words written in 1965 or 1830? Was this policy set by a military commander in the 20th century or by a 9-year-old king in the 1600's?

Mr. President, I know of no law passed by this Congress giving the military authority to establish civilian personal appearance standards. Unfortunately, it appears as if the Air Force is not alone in assuming this dictatorial authority. I have been told that the Army feels it has the power to set such standards.

If there is such a law on the books, let us repeal it today, before we are told what kind of pants to wear or what color ties to put on. The latter is of deep personal concern, for I am told by some of my younger friends that my taste in ties is not in keeping with the fashion of today. Perhaps if I were a braver man I would grow a beard as well, but I am content to limit my protest to ties.

As I said a few moments ago, the existence of a no-beard policy stunned me, and the more I pondered the why of it, the stranger the policy appeared.

Mr. President, I am not one prone to seeing conspiracy behind every strange event, but I decided to try my hand at the game of conspiracy conjuring which is fashionable in some segments of our society today.

I am sure that when I have outlined certain strange aspects of this incident, I will not be alone with the belief that a conspiracy exists.

First. A policy allegedly concerned with frostbite is implimented when the mercury is still above freezing. Question: Why the haste?

Second. The un-American policy was invoked in the interior of Alaska, an area which grows more beards with less comment than any area in the Nation. Question: Why Alaska, where the policy would have widespread effect and create widespread opposition?

Clearly, Clear must have been selected for some special reason. There must have been some compelling reason to strike at the heart of the beard country and to subdue it quickly. There must have been some great need for haste leading the creators of the policy to implement it several weeks before the alleged reason for it was valid.

Suddenly, the situation at Clear became clear. When haste breeds such recklessness, there is usually money involved.

Mr. President, I am only guessing, but imagination is an important prerequisite for conspiracy conjuring.

I am sure we all remember President Eisenhower's warning about the growing influence of the ballooning industrial-military complex.

Perhaps I should stop here, for I have no proof, but lack of proof is also part of conspiracy conjuring.

It is entirely possible that the no-beard policy is a result of a secret agreement between the military and razor industry.

Rest assured, I will keep my fellow Senators informed on this matter.

I am corresponding with the Secretary of the Air Force on the question. I have offered to testify on behalf of the fired employee when his appeal is heard by the Civil Service Commission.

I am thankful that the matter was brought to my attention at this early date.

I hope the clear breath of public exposure will bring a swift end to the no-beard policy.

Even if it does, a basic freedom of individual choice will have had a close shave.

COMMUNIST CHINA AND THE UNITED STATES: THE INFORMATION GAP

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] last week addressed the Senate on the question of the control of nuclear arms and the role that Communist China might play in such a program. His very useful contribution to our foreign policy deliberations has once again focused attention on a nation about which we know comparatively little. This lack of information would be unfortunate at any time, but it is tragic when it involves the most populous country in the world, for in a free society judgments are assumed to be based on a rational analysis of balanced evidence. How can the American people evaluate Chinese actions, words, and convictions without basic information?

The October 10 issue of the London Sunday Times carried a supplement section in color on Communist China, including a short article by the well-known British writer, Brian Crozier. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It Is Impossible To Opt Out of Politics: Brian Crozier Sums Up the Basic Realities About China

Those serried Chinese faces, earnestly smiling or hating, purposefully drilling, listening attentively to the teacher who tells them they must be Red as well as expert—what do they portend for the rest of us who are neither Chinese nor Communists?

Some of the answers come through the pictures on these pages, in the sense of purpose, the puritanism, the directed dedication of a great multitude, 750 million of them, the most numerous people that ever lived under one government. But the rounded truth does not emerge from mere statistics of grain production or literacy, or from a study of the constitution of the Chinese People's Republic. Mao Tse-tung's regime can arouse disquiet or enthusiasm, depending on whether one values privacy and the right of dissent, and whether one considers that centralized order and the equitable sharing of scarcity justify an ideology based on love of the people (meaning the Communist Party) and hatred of imperialism (meaning, for instance, Britain and America, or you and me).

There are good things and achievements to record. Every visitor to China has paid compliments to the cleanliness of the trains and hotels and noted that there is no longer a tipping problem. The vagrants and pimps have disappeared, along with the whores and beggars. The pickpockets have gone, too, and the tourist who drops a small coin will have it solemnly returned to him. Nor are babies left to die any more in the streets of Shanghai before the indifferent gaze of the fat compradore. The women have been emancipated, with new marriage laws giving them equality with men (and a soaring divorce rate to prove it).

Education has made giant strides. Before the liberation, probably 90 percent of Chinese could neither read nor write. Today an informed guess would put illiteracy at not much more than 60 percent. Most of the illiterates are the overforties, for adult education has had only limited success, the grown mind finding it difficult to retain Chinese characters (the test of literacy is retention of 1,500 characters). It follows that a very high proportion of young people can read and write. Probably nearly 90 percent of China's primary-age children are getting some schooling—many times the Indian or Pakistani percentage (though not as high as Japan's).

If the state budget is a reliable guide, the regime spends 50 percent more on education and science (which are lumped together) than on the armed forces, but if one remembers the high capital cost of producing a nuclear bomb—a science item—this figure may be less impressive than it looks. At the top level, China's scientists (many of them trained under the guidance of elderly Western-educated savants, such as Dr. Chien Hsueh-sen, a leading nuclear physicist) are as good as any in the Western World. But the average technological level, in school and factory, remains low. What is certain is that a gigantic effort is being made and that graduates are coming out of the places of higher learning at more than four times the preliberation rate.

Does all this mean that the Chinese people are better off than they used to be? It depends what is meant by better off. It is misleading to compare the ordered, authoritarian China of today with the chaotic country of the 1930's and 1940's, devastated and impoverished by war and civil war. Certainly the ghastly famines of a generation ago, which sometimes claimed millions of victims, seem to be a thing of the past. There were acute shortages of food between 1959 and 1963 and in May 1962 thousands of refugees suddenly poured into Hong Kong, to the embarrassment of the British authorities. But the interesting thing is that these people, though undernourished, were not starving. Scarcity, when it comes, is rationed, as it was in war-time Britain.

The poorest Chinese, then, no longer die of hunger. But the explosion of new mouths to feed, the chronic shortage of fertilizer and Communist theories of agriculture, between them, have brought disappointing results. Colin Clark, perhaps the world's foremost agricultural economist, has worked out that never since the war have the Chinese people had as much to eat, on the average, as they had even in the starving 1930's. In a good year, the statistical average Chinese has about a pound and a half of rice or potatoes to eat per day. Lately, it is true, the city markets have bulged with poultry, cabbages and other good things. But this, though the authorities have been shy of mentioning it, has been due to a new (and presumably temporary) policy of letting farmers sell what they produce on their tiny plots, within the communes, on the open market.

To see these and other achievements in perspective, one must never lose sight of the great central fact of life in Communist China: it is impossible to opt out of politics. This is the fact that overshadows and conditions all else, accounting for the successes and vitiating them. There has been nothing quite like it before in history. By and large, the regime does not liquidate its dissidents, as Stalin did (though some hundreds of thousands of people considered irreconcilables were physically disposed of in the early years). Lenin murdered or exiled Russia's capitalists; Mao makes factory managers of them and pays them interest on their confiscated assets. Mao's way is to try to reclaim people by thought reform. The entire population of China is constantly subjected to the relentless process of mass persuasion. Every village, every street in every town, every factory, every school has its committee of watchful, patient Communist Party men and women, lecturing, exhorting, cajoling or denouncing recalcitrants.

No more effective way of ruling an underdeveloped country has yet been devised. But if the clean, bright, tidy and smiling new China which visitors see is the product of mass persuasion, so too is the new China of hate demonstrations, politicised religion, and gross political and economic misjudgments. Every achievement has to be set against the permanent political encroachment on all aspects of living, for that is the yardstick by which the regime itself measures achievement. China's world-conquering table-tennis team were told, day in day out, to "learn from the writings of Mao Tse-tung," arm themselves with ideology and remember that table tennis was a revolutionary endeavor. In all phases of education, "expertness" is subordinated to "redness." The nuclear scientist can no more opt out of politics than the humble village teacher, for the party has said it: "In China a man who adheres to bourgeois individualism and does not strive energetically to reform cannot become an expert."

Religion, too, is harnessed to politics. All church property is now in state hands and the National Christian Council supports socialism, though Christians may not join the party. The Chinese Catholic Patriotic Association ignores the Vatican. Buddhist temples, on the other hand, are carefully maintained, together with a small priesthood, as quaint museums of the feudal past. As for China's 50 million Moslems, they may join the party, but only if they embrace atheism.

For good or evil, the potentialities of such a system are almost limitless. When the system works, it accomplishes apparent miracles. When it goes wrong, it can go berserk. This was true of the great leap forward in 1958, when a note of hysteria seized the apparatus of persuasion and the people, egged on by the party, almost literally dropped everything to build backyard furnaces and reach crazily inflated target figures for steel. The great leap became the great fall. Fields were neglected. The transport system was clogged with deliveries of useless metal and exports fell months behind schedule. The extravagant statistical claims made at the time were later scaled down and no valid statistics have been published since. At least a third of China's factories were thrown idle. Today production is rising again and is believed to have kept pace with the population increase of the past 3 years.

There was something heroic about the great leap forward and something tragic about its failure. The Chinese leaders had tried, with one mighty effort, to turn China into an industrial great power overnight, and had failed. But the attempt was a disastrous lapse of judgment by the leadership, for which the patient Chinese people, as in the feudal past, has had to pay the price.

Who are these leaders? The strange thing is that they are the same aging band of men who knew each other in the revolutionary 1920's and later followed Mao across China in the famous long march. But age and infirmity are beginning to cause gaps. A number of Deputy Premiers, including Marshal Lin Piao, hero of the anti-Japanese and Korean wars, are probably holding sinecure appointments. Mao Tse-tung himself resigned as Chairman of the Republic after the collapse of the great leap forward, but remains Chairman of the party's Central Committee and Politburo. Clearly, he no longer deals with day-to-day decisions. But his prestige as the sage of Chinese communism and the most successful revolutionary of his age is enormous. No major policy could be launched if he disapproved of it.

The man who really runs the Chinese state, however, is Liu Shao-chi, who succeeded Mao as Chairman of the Republic in April 1959 and is vice chairman of the politburo. The perfect party organizer, Liu lacks Mao's charisma, but at 67 is 5 years younger and will probably succeed him as chairman of the politburo and the real power in the Chinese People's Republic.

Able men though they are, China's leaders, including the suave and personable Premier, Chou En-lai, are blinkered men, bounded as much by their ideology and ignorance of the outside world as by their traditional view of China as the center of the universe. In foreign policy they have achieved the negative feat of hostility on two fronts, for if America remains "the main enemy," relations with Russia are as bad as international relations can be, short of military conflict.

Neither Khrushchev's removal nor the Vietnam crisis has mended the breach. Khrushchev's successors have refused to pay China's price for reconciliation, which amounted to acceptance of China's leadership of the world Communist movement (to the extent that it still exists). As for Vietnam, the Chinese press continues to accuse China's former Soviet brothers of merely wanting to make a deal with the Americans at the expense of the Vietnamese people. There is no graver charge in the Communist book.

And now, China has the bomb. Is this disquieting fact likely to make Peiping more or less aggressive than in the past? That China already is an aggressive power seems to me to be beyond doubt, in the sense that it has shown, in Tibet, in Korea and in India, that it is ready to use armed force to gain its ends, when it can get away with it.

It is true, on the other hand, that China's armed forces—2.7 million strong—are ill equipped for prolonged war beyond China's borders, or indeed for modern war as the United States and the Soviet Union understand it? True again the great emphasis today is on building up the civilian militia, already millions strong, and whose purpose is defensive in the political as well as the military sense, since it is designed to maintain the party's authority in the event of an invasion (and, of course, even if there is no invasion).

But the technological weakness of China's forces is to some extent beside the point, as is the argument that China has no interest in territorial conquest and would be content to be surrounded by reasonably docile states. The point is that if the Americans withdrew from East Asia, there would be nothing to stop the Chinese invading any neighboring country at will, should this be necessary to enforce obedience. Meanwhile, what the Chinese will not risk getting by open war, they try to get by indirect war and subversion: Africans in large numbers are being trained in China in terrorism and guerrilla warfare and sent home to prove that Chou En-lai is right when he says that "revolutionary prospects are excellent in Africa."

Against this background, China's possession of the bomb is not of immediate relevance, since it will presumably take some years to build a delivery system. In the meantime, the Chinese leaders are likely to be more, not less, cautious in challenging the United States and Russia.

By the time China really has a nuclear arm, rockets and all, the younger men will be emerging from behind the present aging leaders. There could be comfort or deeper disquiet in this knowledge. Nobody can tell. Certainly there is nothing comforting in the current campaign to condition the young to permanent revolution—mass persuasion for 10 or more generations. This seems a long time to live with a China problem.

THE AUTO PARTS TREATY WITH CANADA

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, last night the respected economics columnist, Eliot Janeway, commented at length in the Washington Star and other newspapers on the auto treaty with Canada. I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the Record so that all Senators may have an opportunity of sharing Mr. Janeway's incisive comments on a matter on which I also had considerable to say.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

As Janeway Views It: Auto Parts Treaty a Booboo

(By Eliot Janeway)

New York.—Every President is entitled to a booboo, and President Johnson used up his ration for 1965 when he signed the Canadian auto treaty as a public relations gesture toward an eventual North American common market.

Presidential grandstand plays can serve a useful public relations purpose—so long as they don't stir up more trouble than they're worth. The Canadian treaty doesn't pass the pragmatic test. Its fine print guarantees a windfall to Canada at our expense. Costly dislocations and liquidations are in store for American automotive operations. But no treaty savings will trickle through to the consumers.

TIMING WAS CLUMSY

Altogether, the impact of the treaty will illustrate the monetary theory put forward at the Investment Bankers Association by Donald Cook, president of the American Electric Power Co., that a currency is as strong as the productive power of the national economy behind. The Canadian treaty will expand Canadian production at the expense of American production, and, therefore, it will strengthen the Canadian dollar at the expense of the American dollar. It's a snafu, and it seems to be par for the Washington course.

Moreover, the timing of this negotiated giveaway was as clumsy as its drafting was amateurish. Giveaways cost money; and this giveaway of a portion of the American auto and parts market is big enough to cost a great deal of money—first, for investment in the new facilities to be subsidized in Canada and, then, to pay for the favored nation import flow.

Of course, Canada is short of funds to finance her present boom, let alone to support a large new expansion pyramided on top of it. There's only one place that capital can come from, and that's America. But a new dollar outflow is the last thing the Johnson administration wants to promote. On the contrary, for months before the Canadian treaty was signed, the administration had been committing its most prized asset—its prestige—to its voluntary program to limit the outflow of business dollars into established investment and trade channels.

So deep is this prestige commitment that, when the "voluntary" limitations failed to limit outflows, powerful forces within the administration began to push for direct controls, even at the price of forfeiting Johnson's hold over business confidence as of course controls over business would do.

Meanwhile, no one in the administration warned the President of a dilemma. Was he to concede the claim of business, that he had waited too long to declare that the "voluntary" restraints on dollar outflow had served their purpose?

Or was he to concede the claim of the treaty's Senate critics that he had not waited long enough to audit its fine print and assess its import. Either way, he was in for a loss of face, a policy reversal, and a good lesson on the limitations of a one-man Presidency in today's complex international political economy.

SCUFFLE WITH SENATE

The Senate, ever practical, passed the buck right back to the President. "Back up the President on foreign relations" was the note on which the Canadian treaty went through, packaged with an amendment putting him on explicit notice not to take another chance with another half-baked treaty.

The administration's scuffle with the Senate suggests that Johnson's defeats over the District of Columbia home rule and repeal of 14(b) are symptoms of a widening rift with an increasingly independent Congress. This is a portent of a new politically induced sinking spell for the stock market, which thrives on Presidential honeymoons with Congress and vice versa.

A renewal of a strain on the dollar also is bound to be bad for the stock market, not least because it will be taken to justify Washington's crackdown on the capital markets. A tight money market and a weak foreign exchange market don't go with a strong stock market. Perhaps the stock market has been taking too much for granted in Washington.

PLENTY—IN THE MIDST OF STARVING

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, Congressman Lynn Stalbaum, a freshman member from Wisconsin, spoke out recently on the immediate need in the world for all the food which can be produced, including the productive potential of the United States.

In his speeches before the YMCA International Crossroads Breakfast here in Washington on Sunday, September 26, and to the annual meeting of the Dairy Society International in Montreal, Canada, on Sunday, October 17, Congressman Stalbaum stressed the humanitarian reasons for such a program as well as the practical one from our Nation's standpoint in containing communism and in ultimately leading to increased commercial sales of our American farm productivity.

Congressman Stalbaum brings an excellent background to Congress in the field of agriculture. Born and raised on a Wisconsin dairy farm, he served for 8 years as an administrator of Federal farm programs and for 14 years as executive secretary of the Racine, Wis., Milk Producers Cooperative before coming to Washington.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the Congressman's constructive views on the potential use of America's agricultural production in feeding the world's hungry be printed in the Record:

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Plenty—In the Midst of Starving

Ten thousand people will die of hunger in the poor countries of the world today. Tomorrow, 10,000 more people will die from the same cause, and so on, day after day. As the population grows this hunger explosion will grow, unless men are willing to act strongly and act soon.

In fact, more people will have starved to death in the world in the next 15 minutes (about the length of my remarks) than are here this morning.

That same 15 minutes is about the length of time it takes an American farmer to sign up for a Federal program for his farm, having as its purpose the reduction of his production.

In 1964 and again in 1965 I took my family to the New York World's Fair. Our favorite was the Pepsi-Cola exhibit, with its display of puppets from all over the world. And, as one rode a boat on this 8-minute trip, all puppets danced to one song. Here are the words:

"It's a world of laughter, it's a world of tears
It's a world of love, it's a world of fears
They dance and they sing
And they laugh till it rings
It's a small world after all."

Three seemingly unrelated facts—starvation in the world, a farmer signing up for the Federal farm program, a song emphasizing the smallness of the world. But let's take these few minutes to pull them together—to see why they mesh.

The shrinking of the world has many ramifications. Hunger in the world has always been with us, but people from those areas now wonder why it must be so. Exposure to more affluent areas of the world has made them realize that the old order of poverty need not continue to exist. There is no greater breeding ground of revolution than among these hungry people.

Let us now turn to our present farm programs, to the farmer signing up for a Federal program. The plain and simple fact, well accepted by nearly all economists and by all studies with which I am familiar, indicates that our agricultural plant in America—the total productivity of our farms and our farmers under present operating conditions—is about 5 percent greater than we have economically been able to utilize. In other words, if we were to leave the farmer completely on a free market, the economics of his 5-percent overproduction is such that it would drive his gross income down about 20 percent and his net income down about 50 percent. Therefore, we have had programs geared toward an economics of limited production—limited to fit our abilities to use the production here and in commercial export fields. We have done this through three main devices. One is the imposition of acreage quotas on commodities that tend to run in long supply. Second, we have attempted to take land out of production. And third, where surpluses still tend to occur which will depress the farmer's price to the detriment of the family type farm, the Commodity Credit Corporation has purchased and stored such commodities, holding them in storage until other uses could be found such as we have done under food for peace, or until the market price in the free market warranted returning these stocks to the market.

One fact to be reckoned with in this entire area is that the American farmer's ability to produce crops continues to grow at a rapid rate—about 3 percent a year. It grows about twice as fast as our own population increase of 1½ percent. So in our farm programs, we are sort of on a treadmill, having to impose programs which are ever more restrictive merely to stand still in our race with the farmer's technological improvement.

During the past decade we have had in America a program known as food for peace. This program has been sucessful. Therefore, as we now move forward to make this a better world, we are able to build for the future, not on the wreckage of some past failures, but on the foundation of the successes we have had with the food-for-peace program. President Johnson, on March 31, sent us the latest annual report, from which I quote: "The food-for-peace program is one of the most inspiring enterprises ever undertaken by any nation in all of history—and every American can be proud of it, without regard to partisanship or political persuasion. One hundred million persons are now recipients of our donated foods. Of this total, 70 million are children, including more than 40 million in organized national school lunch efforts."

In addition to donations, we have sold $8.5 billion worth of food for local currencies in countries which simply could not pay dollars for them. We go even one step further. We say, in many instances, we will give a nation food if it will agree to use the money which the food would have cost to develop specific projects—schools, highways, improved agricultural technology.

And so, you see, we have come up with an interesting concept. We have made our surplus food available to these nations, we have improved their living standards, and in so doing, we have relieved the need for use of American funds.

The list of projects we have carried out as a result of food-for-peace sales is long. We have built experiment stations and dams, we have supported international student exchanges, and we have distributed U.S. textbooks through the United States Information Agency. So the program is a broad one, and it has worked extremely well.

Bear in mind that such a program is not quite that simple. Safeguards have to be written in. We have to take great care that we do not disrupt the normal commercial trade channels which our country has with these nations. In other words, if we are already selling wheat to Brazil, for example, or dairy products to Nigeria, we must be careful that the programs we now develop will supplement rather than supersede those already in effect.

The concept of farm programs to limit production is being challenged and given a new look in Washington these days. The food-for-peace program was aimed, as I have indicated, toward distributing our surplus commodities—and only surplus commodities—in such a manner that the distribution of them did not disrupt the commercial sales. The thought, after 10 years of successful operation of food for peace, is simply this: Why limit this to surpluses? Can we now, or shouldn't we now, be thinking in terms of making greater use of our potential abundance of production? We know that all that we can produce would not be sufficient to wipe out famine and malnutrition in the world, but it could go much further than it has. The latest survey of the United Nations FAO—Food and Agricultural Organization—shows that about one person out of eight in the world is undernourished and that up to one-half are hungry, suffering from malnutrition, or both. Every day in the world there are 180,000 new mouths to be fed, which means that every week we have an increase in population in excess of the total population of the Metropolitan Milwaukee area. In the next 10 years, food supplies will have to rise by more than 35 percent just to equal today's inadequate diet levels. It is true that America's abundance of agricultural commodities is helping fill some of that food gap. This year, based on the success of food for peace, there are several bills and proposals in the Congress, some getting assistance from very top-level people, about whom I will comment a little bit later, with the thought that we might consider encouraging the all-out production of certain commodities for use in fighting world famine. This is particularly true in the field of proteins and specifically true in the area of dairy products. When you recognize that I come from that great dairy State of Wisconsin, this is the one that has intrigued me the most.

Some men have made bold and imaginative proposals. Among these men are Senator McGovern, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, and Vice President Humphrey. Senator McGovern was the original administrator of the food-for-peace program, and has come forward with a proposal which would cost a half billion dollars the first year and increase by that amount each year until 1970, bringing the cost to about $3 billion for that year, to be used to purchase American farm commodities for distribution overseas. When he introduced his bill on June 17, he said that he was convinced that war against want would do more to encourage peaceful progress and immunize the less-developed countries against Communist agitation than anything else we could do, and he cited the recent Dominican crisis as an example. He contended, and I quote here since it is a sentence well worth repeating: "Parents—good parents—cannot be expected to sit and watch their children die without protest or effort to change their lot."

Senator McGovern went on to point out some severe food production problems in the world this year and declared that moving toward a program of his type would permit us to ease restrictions, which I have just enumerated, on agricultural production of many kinds here at home. He further stated, and this has been borne out by the food-for-peace programs, that assistance in development of this type would create millions of new customers for our American agricultural exports. He singled out Japan as the most outstanding example.

He pointed out that we helped Japan rebuild her agriculture, along with her industry, after World War II. As a result, her own production of agricultural items has increased but she has also become the best commercial customer of American foodstuffs.

The Economic Research Service of the USDA points out that in five countries—Greece, Israel, Formosa, Poland, and Spain—distribution of commodities under title I of the food-for-peace law dropped from $435 million in 1956 to $20 million in 1963. During this same period, commercial sales to those five nations increased from $682 million to $1.3 billion. This is an example of how as we develop the economy of those nations, and as we develop their use of American food items, they change from being recipients of our surplus distribution programs to commercial buyers.

A recent study of 54 less developed countries showed that for each 10 percent increase in their national income, there was an increase of 21 percent in their purchases of agricultural products from the United States.

Think now, think big, think if our entire agriculture programs were geared to producing commodities not just to be put into storage for shipment overseas, but had as one of their objectives that they be distributed overseas. Think of what has happened in market development where we have had our wonderful but limited food-for-peace program for the past 10 years. As we expand the food-for-peace program, and as we develop the economy of other nations, doesn't it follow that commercial sales will drastically increase?

Thus the advantages of an expanded food-for-peace program such as Senator McGovern proposes, would run the gamut from the highest type of humanitarianism to the most practical commercial aspects. The program will not only feed the hungry—it will ultimately lead to improved commercial sales of American food products, along with curbing communism.

Any program of the type we are considering must also lend technical assistance to the underdeveloped nations in improving their own food production ability. Nor can we overlook the whole matter of the population explosion, which brings us to the subject of birth control. These items I consider equally important to the program of using our American food productivity. However, because I am talking on this latter point today, I am only acknowledging the importance of these other features without detailing them.

And so I want to leave with you some fundamental thoughts this morning. I recognize that we must afford our farmers reasonable return. When he produces food and fiber in abundance he gives us a blessing—not a curse. For this blessing he, as the producer, should not be the one who must carry the full burden of reduced income which his overproduction brings. This cost should be distributed throughout our entire society. If we now move to a program of greater production for use to feed starving people, the American farmer must still be assured that his economic return is preserved. This detail must be worked out, and it is not a simple one.

For the suggestions made here—that we move away from Government restraints on agricultural production to a program of using our agricultural technology to feed hungry people—comes mighty close to a 180° turn from the course we have followed for the past 30 years. And any such change in course will, if you please, cause a certain rocking of the boat. There are practical considerations which must be made.

We must assure the farmer of a reasonable return.

We must make certain that such a program is supplementing rather than superseding commercial programs. This is one of the most critical practical problems which must be solved. If we are going to, in effect, give away tons and tons of food and fiber, how can we do it without, for example, destroying the world wheat market, or the world rice market, or the world cotton market? This perhaps more than any other is the reason why this program has not yet moved.

But I contend that these obstacles can be overcome. If we as a Nation can think in terms of sending men to the moon, certainly we are capable of developing programs which will use our abundance to mitigate starvation in the world without destroying related commercial activities.

On the approach I have discussed, we are just beginning to scratch the surface. But I firmly believe that it creates a challenge to all of us. It is the challenge of putting our beliefs to work. Let us, therefore, be a strong society, using our power to be partners, so that other peoples around the world can have what we have, so that they can be free, and have a strong economy, and democracy, and live in peace. This, in my opinion, is an approach which will not only be good for the world but will also be good for the interests of our Nation and our people.

INDIVIDUAL, PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the philosophy that not the individual but society and social conditions are responsible for all of our human woes is one too widely accepted today and threatens the moral character of our Nation excusing individuals from personal responsibility.

I agree with the Reverend Robert Kennedy, of Findlay, Ohio, who expresses his views on this subject in an excellent letter to the editor of the Republican-Courier, of Findlay, Ohio.

I ask unanimous consent that Reverend Kennedy's letter be printed at this point in the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Findlay (Ohio) Republican-Courier, Sept. 15, 1965]

THE EDITOR'S MAIL

To the EDITOR:

In a recent number of the Republican-Courier, there was an article, entitled "Crime Increases, Convictions Are Decreasing." In this editorial there is a quotation from Chief Justice Earl Warren, as follows: "We note a tendency today to blame the courts and the rulings of the courts for the vast amount of crime. Thinking persons and especially lawyers, know that this is not the fact. They know that crime is inseparably connected with factors such as poverty, degradation, sordid social conditions, the weakening of home ties, low standards of law enforcement, and the lack of education."

The author of the editorial disagrees with the Chief Justice and so do I. The above statement from the Chief Justice contains a false and dangerous philosophy, namely that not the individual but society and social conditions are responsible for all of our human woes.

This false philosophy is dangerous because it has become so widespread. It permeates to a very large extent all the departments of our Federal Government, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. Even many of our opinion-making agencies, such as newspapers, magazines and radio and television, are falling prey to it. Many of our professors in colleges and universities are propounding this doctrine of social responsibility for all of our human ills. This false philosophy is even infiltrating the church and many ministers are proclaiming it from their pulpits. Instead of trying to make people feel responsible for their own sins and shortcomings, as Nathan the prophet did when he said to David, "Thou are the man," they talk about "social concerns." When I returned fresh from graduate school and began my ministry, I started to preach against the sins of society. Soon I learned that society was not there to hear me so I began to preach to the people with a larger degree of effectiveness.

As a preacher I have always tried to reinforce my convictions by an appeal to the Bible. Earlier prophets addressed themselves to the state, but Jeremiah became the prophet of individualism. In Jeremiah 31: 29–30 we read, "In those days they shall say no more, 'The fathers have eaten a sour grape and their children's teeth are set on edge,' but every man shall die for his own iniquity; every man that eateth the sour grape, his teeth shall be set on edge." Evidently people are blaming their sins on their fathers. This is a human trait. We are always trying to blame someone else when we do wrong. When God walked in the Garden of Eden and accused our first parents of the sin of disobedience, Eve blamed it on the serpent and Adam was so ungallant as to blame it on Eve, and so it has been going on ever since.

So this is the danger of an overemphasis on social responsibility. It only gives the erring individual an excuse for his wrongdoing. This is borne out by the fact that since 1958 crime has increased six times as fast as the population.

So let us not be afraid to espouse the doctrine of individual responsibility. If those who profess great knowledge raise their eyebrows, and accuse us of ignorance, let us tell them to read their history of philosophy and theology and learn of the conflict between nominalism and realism. We espouse the philosophy of realism. There is no objective reality corresponding to society. It is only a common term which we use for the purpose of thought. It is the individual that is real, and society exists only by virtue of the individuals that compose it. We agree with John Oxenham who wrote:

"But to every man there openeth
A highway and a low
And every man decideth
Which way his soul shall go."

Of course there are extenuating circumstances for some wrongdoing and it is the function of government to correct these as far as is possible. But legislation can only open the door of opportunity, and it is up to each individual to decide whether he shall enter that door, and endure the toil and sacrifice essential to make him a member of the "Great Society." It is up to each individual to decide whether he wants to become a mere pawn or a real person.

DR. ROBERT KENNEDY,
Retired Minister.

FINDLAY.

PRESIDENT OF MASSACHUSETTS STATE SENATE OPPOSES REVISED DIRKSEN AMENDMENT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on October 5, I inserted in the Record the responses I had received from individuals and organizations concerning the revised Dirksen amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 103. I had not at that time received the thoughtful comments of the Honorable Maurice A. Donahue, president of the Massachusetts State Senate.

Last spring, Senator Donahue submitted to the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee a statement opposing the original Dirksen amendment. He is equally opposed to the revised amendment. In a thoroughly researched, well-documented speech before several Massachusetts Leagues of Women Voters, Senator Donahue reviewed the major arguments for and against the reapportionment amendment.

Because of his unique experience as president of the Massachusetts Senate, I found particularly interesting his comments upon the argument made by proponents of the Dirksen amendment that a fairly apportioned legislature in an urban State will vote as a bloc and overwhelm a rural minority. Senator Donahue says this has not happened in Massachusetts, which is a predominantly urban State that has been fairly apportioned for many years. He says:

> But in practice no massive bloc of urban representatives votes as a unit. Such a bloc breaks up on various issues and coalesces with rural supporters in differing combinations. This practice has been demonstrated time and time again by the actions of both branches of the Massachusetts General Court which have historically been on a register voter basis, close to the population approach. There has been no claim of our legislature overriding the rights of rural towns and small cities.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator Donahue's letter to me and his speech before the Leagues of Women Voters be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: Thank you for your letter of August 25 inviting my comments on Senator DIRKSEN's new constitutional proposal relative to legislative reapportionment, namely, Senate Joint Resolution 103 providing that in bicameral legislatures the members of one house may "be apportioned among the people on the basis of population, geography, and political subdivisions."

I regret very much that official duties prevent my giving wholly adequate attention to this very important renewed attack on the sound one-man, one-vote decision of the U.S. Supreme Court. If time permitted, I would submit extended views on the score, just as I did when I opposed vigorously Senator DIRKSEN's predecessor Senate Joint Resolution 2, during related past hearings of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

However, I have carefully examined Senate Joint Resolution 103 and am convinced it should be rejected. In my judgment practically every one of my detailed arguments with respect to Senate Joint Resolution 2 also holds for the modified constitutional proposal—with only minor adjustments being needed to adjust to the frequently obscure or uncertain new proposed language.

Basically, I believe the one man, one vote decision of the Supreme Court protects an inalienable right of every citizen of our democratic society which should never be abridged in any way. That Court decision reversed the spreading and deepening of State legislative malapportionment throughout the Nation. In various States malapportionment has brought control by a minority of the people in both legislative branches; in other States that minority control in one branch has by its veto power destroyed the significance of majority control in the other branch. I protest strongly against both the earlier and the new Dirksen proposals which tamper with our revered Federal Constitution by permitting the above "veto" alternative in each State and thereby upsetting the efficacy of the one man, one vote decision in correcting our rotten borough situation.

One more comment on new Senate Joint Resolution 103, which I cannot omit from even this short discussion, is the uncertain phraseology in which the proposed amendment is couched. I hope the proposal will be immediately rejected, but if it is to be considered further, I urge strongly that its occasionally vague and indeterminate provisions be subjected to the normal type of detailed committee consideration. Only in this way can it be benefited by the suggestions and criticisms of the best possible minds throughout the Nation.

For the defeat of the prior Senate Joint Resolution 2, I grasp this opportunity to express to you and to Senators Douglas and Proxmire my heartfelt gratitude for your leadership of the gallant band of liberals who held the fort in the public interest on the reapportionment issue. I devoutly wish you continuing success in the continuing fight that probably lies ahead.

Sincerely yours,

Maurice A. Donahue,
President of the Senate.

Reapportionment Remarks of Senate President Maurice A. Donahue at Joint Session of Four League of Women Voters of Dedham, Dover, Needham, and Wellesley, on Thursday Evening, October 7, 1965

Madame Chairman, I greatly appreciate your invitation to discuss State legislative apportionment this evening with the members of your four Leagues of Women Voters of Dedham, Dover, Needham, and Wellesley. Meetings of this sort reflect democracy at its best. They throw light for your lawmakers on how your thoughts are shaping up on important issues. They give me, as one such legislator, the chance to explain my convictions to you on tonight's subject.

Before presenting those views, I want to commend the recent excellent LWV printed supplement discussing both sides of this apportionment question in a July 1965 supplement of your regular publication, titled the "National Voter." I urge your study of that informative four-page supplement. In formulating my remarks I have in general followed its outline; namely, (1) general background and existing State malapportionment, (2) the one man, one vote Supreme Court decision, (3) State readjustments, (4) congressional attacks, and (5) the arguments, both pro and con, which your chairlady has asked me to present.

By way of an opening general statement, let me say first that I strongly approve the very important recent one man, one vote decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in favor of fair legislative reapportionment and am therefore vigorously opposed to attempts by Senator Dirksen and others to upset that finding. Hence, my remarks will concentrate on the efforts of the minority leader of the U.S. Senate to authorize the reapportionment of legislative districts on bases other than population.

On his first constitutional proposal, Senate Joint Resolution 2, Senator Dirksen failed just 2 months ago, after extended committee hearings and Senate debate, to obtain the necessary two-thirds vote for its adoption. Undaunted by this defeat, he soon filed a second proposal, Senate Joint Resolution 103, again with the cosponsorship of a large group of fellow Senators. Inasmuch as the defeated resolution attracted support of more than a majority of the U.S. Senate, the issue remains a live one and all of us must maintain our interest since the attack may be renewed at any time.

GENERAL BACKGROUND

Senator Dirksen's proposals and the court action which motivated them stem from the serious legislative malapportionment that has been allowed to develop. On this score, much statistical and other evidence has been assembled which analyzes the development of the so-called rotten borough situation in many States in recent decades. The reports show a condition far removed from the truly representative approach of our early colonial period when legislative districting followed a uniform one man, one vote basis. I shall give only a few of the many facts in support of that statement that you will find, if you consult the growing literature in this area.

In our colonial epoch the Founding Fathers provided in the great Northwest Ordinance of 1787 that "the inhabitants shall always be entitled to a proportionate representation of the people in the legislature." Two outstanding authorities of the colonial period—Presidents Jefferson and Madison—among others, were of the same general persuasion. During a complete century—from 1790 to 1889—every State admitted to the Union entered with a constitutional provision requiring that representation be based on population written into its constitution. Accordingly, the constitutions of 36 States came to so provide. Massachusetts followed suit over that long period, but unfortunately I do not have time to cite the interesting details thereof which were presented in the recent Senate speech of Senator Edward M. Kennedy during debate on the defeated Dirksen Senate Joint Resolution 2.

In line with this early spirit of these many State constitutions, most of the successful efforts concerned with representation during the last century have centered on a major effort throughout the Nation to expand the scope and freedom of personal suffrage. Thus, of the 14 amendments which have been adopted subsequent to approval of the original Federal Constitution with its accompanying Bill of Rights, 9 were designed to make the franchise more democratic and to expand America's voting citizenship. The Dirksen effort seeks to reverse that whole trend and to start reapplying old restrictions we have managed to banish.

Since 1890 great population shifts have swept over this Nation. Within the lifetime of our senior citizens initial national population ratios of 70 percent rural versus 30 percent urban, have been completely reversed, and become 30 percent rural versus 70 percent urban. Nevertheless, the apportionments of State legislatures were allowed to remain frozen in their 19th century dominant rural patterns. As a result, malapportionment has become widespread and pronounced.

As I have said, the extent of that malapportionment is portrayed in many statistical and other studies which I do not have time to present. As a matter of fact, even if I had ample time I would not attempt to do so for fear of putting you all to sleep. For our purposes, it will suffice to say that the voters in some State legislative districts, usually rural, have come to have 50, 100—up to 1,000 times—the voting strength of the voters in other districts of the same States, for the most part urban.

Frequently only 15 or 20 percent of the voters in given States have been electing the majority of at least one of their two legislative branches in recent years. In short, malapportionment has become really serious. Many students of State problems have expressed great concern over the atrophy weakening State government during this 20th century, an atrophy threatening to speed up unless corrective measures are applied to apportionment aspects of the elective process.

COURT INTERVENTION

Despite this worsening democratic picture, the U.S. Supreme Court avoided judicial intervention down through the years. However, in 1962, the Court finally accepted general responsibility by technically deciding, in the Tennessee case *Baker* v. *Carr*, that the apportionment question was a justifiable issue—in other words, that the Court had the right to take action.

That very important judicial breakthrough was soon followed in more specific terms by various far-reaching decisions, notably the Alabama case in *Reynolds* v. *Sims* in June 1964, along with related cases in 14 other States. The great scope of this judicial activity is indicated by the fact that, since the *Baker* v. *Carr* decision of 1962, 17 volumes of text of Federal and State court opinions on legislative apportionment have already accumulated. And, those texts have in turn stimulated voluminous discussions in the newspapers, the magazines, and the law journals, in State and Federal legislative chambers, and in many other places.

The central theme of the U.S. Supreme Court findings with relation to reapportionment is that the existing malapportionment is "invidiously discriminating" and violates the 14th amendment of the Federal Constitution which guarantees equal protection to all citizens. The Court therefore requires that the States must reorganize their election districts to accord substantially with one-man, one-vote basis in order to achieve the basic doctrine of political equality. Such equality, the Supreme Court opinion points out, has pervaded our national political thought "from the Declaration of Independence and the Lincoln Gettysburg Address to the 15th, 17th, and 19th amendments."

STATE READJUSTMENTS

In the light of the one-man, one-vote decision, practically all of the legislatures have been under duress to so reapportion their districts that legislators will be elected from areas containing substantially equal population. Although only in effect a little over 1 year, progress has been made by the States to correct their so-called rotten borough setups, as these malapportionment conditions are characterized in Great Britain.

To give you a quick idea of the State reapportionment changes which are underway let me summarize very briefly a detailed tally published in the current issue of the National Civic Review, dated September 1965, which I commend to your detailed study. This tally shows that 25 States have adopted reapportionment plans, most of which have received Court approval. Another 13 States are reported to have been ordered by Federal district or other courts to act, and work is said to have progressed quite far.

Of the dozen remaining States of the Nation, five have long acted fairly close to a one-man, one-vote basis without Supreme Court compulsion. I am happy to report Massachusetts is one of this select group, along with Kentucky, Oregon, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. Incidentally, let me at this point invite use by all members of the League of Women Voters of the extended documentation gathered by us on this and other aspects of the apportionment problem. The material is available to interested members of your League of Women Voters at the offices of the Legislative Research Bureau in room 236 of the statehouse.

CONGRESSIONAL ATTACKS

Given the court decisions which are forcing many readjustments of State malapportionment, much political resentment has been aroused. Such resentment is particularly to the fore among the rural State legislators who have long improperly controlled so many State houses of representatives.

Let me quickly run through the negative efforts which the Court decision has roused in the Congress. Initially, the Tuck bill in the U.S. House of Representatives was the rallying point to defeat the one-man, one-vote decision almost immediately after its announcement by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1964. Representative Tuck, former Governor of Virginia, promptly brought in a bill in the House of Representatives to deny Federal courts any jurisdiction over reapportionment.

After only 2 days of hearings in the House Judiciary Committee, the reactionary Rules Committee yanked the proposal away from that committee and forced it to a close House vote of 218 to 175. In the Senate, the Tuck bill got nowhere as the liberals under the brilliant leadership of Senators Douglas, of Illinois; Tydings, of Maryland; and Proxmire, of Wisconsin, started lengthy debate which gradually alerted the country to the tremendous issue at stake in the reapportionment situation. That debate continued with Senator Dirksen's resolve which I have already mentioned and Senate Joint Resolution 2 was the subject of lengthy hearings by a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee which rendered a pro-Dirksen report, only to have the full committee fail by a tie vote to bring the resolve to the Senate floor for debate.

To overcome the setback Senator Dirksen as Republican minority leader managed to attach his proposed amendment as a rider to an irrelevant pending bill calling for a National American Legion Baseball Week. And in that form the fight raged long and hard in the Senate. Finally, 2 months ago that constitutional proposal was defeated by a vote of 57 to 39 on August 4, or 7 voted shy of the necessary two-thirds vote required for affirmative action on all constitutional proposals.

During the debate strong support was forthcoming on both sides. The pros included business and farm groups, along with the house of delegates of the American Bar Association. In addition, 28 State legislatures passed resolutions condemning the one-man, one-vote decision.

On the other side, support for fair apportionment methods centered in organized labor, and in civil rights organizations. These groups included various Christian and Jewish religious groups, along with the American Civil Liberties Union.

Analysis of the final Senate vote shows that almost all Senate Republicans including our Senator Saltonstall, voted unfavorably with Dirksen (28 to 3), and that Senate Democrats were badly split into two camps with 33 votes for and 29 against the amendment. The Democratic split registered most northern Senators, including our Senator Ted Kennedy and his brother as anti-Dirksen in attitudes, and all southern Senators, with the exception of three Senators from marginal States, as pro-Dirksen. This southern reaction indicates why Negro groups have so solidly opposed the Dirksen proposal as a subterfuge to take from them the fruits of the new and important voting rights statute.

The defeat of Senator Dirksen's Senate Joint Resolution 2 by no means deterred him. He refused to accept this rejection and soon introduced Senate Joint Resolution 103, a revision of his defeated proposal. This revision is cleverly baited with amendments designed to attract enough marginal senatorial votes to achieve the required two-thirds support. The Senator states that he "may or may not try at this session to attach this constitutional resolution * * * to other legislation. * * *" Whether he will then succeed is the $60 question. Certainly our continued interest is essential as the proposal slumbers until our opponents feel the time is right to strike again.

PROS AND CONS

I turn now to a brief analysis of the two Dirksen proposals, and of the more outstanding arguments about them. The most essential section of the defeated Dirksen amendment provides, "The people of a State may apportion one house of a bicameral legislature using population, geography, or political subdivisions as factors, giving each factor such weight as they deem appropriate." After some intervening words dealing with the only unicameral legislature in the Nation, in Nebraska, the proposal then requires submission of two statewide referendums after each decennial census; namely, one legislative reapportionment plan based on factors other than population, and another plan based substantially on population. Senator Dirksen's second and pending constitutional proposal, Senate Joint Resolution 103, has the same basic approach. With respect to both resolutions I shall now summarize the more important arguments pro and con.

Proponents of the Dirksen approach argue that population is but one of the considerations that should enter into an apportionment system. They hold that further bases of apportionment are justified by political philosophies and by practices of representation. Thus, one commentator of this school speaks of the one-man, one-vote slogan being a much more subtle and many-faceted concept than is generally realized, with a reach far beyond its present dimension. He contends, therefore, that apportionments should be based not only on population but "on geography or political subdivisions."

Opponents of apportionments applied on these three bases are baffled by the justification of basing elections on such inanimate considerations. Presumably this approach would, for example, give weight to a political subdivision like a county boundary. But in what way is that boundary related to social and political conditions implicit in an apportionment formula? And in what proportions should the separate criteria be embraced in the three-way combination. In short, this view causes bewilderment both in fundamental concept and practical application.

A second major argument of the supporters of the Dirksen amendment is that the people of each State have a fundamental right to decide for themselves what apportionment system they desire, regardless of how erroneous their referendums decisions may be. They are unimpressed by the fact that such action might override the inalienable right of each citizen, guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States and supported by the moral law which constitutes part of the inherent dignity of man. As emphasized by Senator Douglas during his attack on the Dirksen proposal, the issue concerns the absolute right of each citizen to equal protection of the laws under the Government of the Nation. The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that such equal protection is not present if some citizens are denied equal voting rights in contrast with other citizens in their selection of lawmaking legislative bodies.

On a third major point the Dirksenites argue that Senate Joint Resolution 2 applies an accepted doctrine of checks and balances imbedded in the Federal Constitution, and therefore should be adopted. In response, the opponents emphasize that the proposal would permit malapportioned houses of bicameral legislatures under minority control to veto the actions voted by the opposite branch under majority control.

Thus, throughout both committee hearings and Senate debate, it was emphasized that in State after State—in Missouri, Illinois, Iowa, New Jersey, Michigan, and other States—the fairly apportioned houses of their bicameral legislatures have frequently enacted progressive and badly needed legislation, only to have their opposite malapportioned houses kill it. In the case of Michigan, Governor Williams was reelected three times on forward-looking programs, only to have successive legislatures under control of minorities prevent his making progress.

Madam Chairman, a fourth argument of the Dirksenites is that the one-man, one-vote principle for State apportionment violates the Federal arrangement which the Founding Fathers applied to the organization of Congress. Under this so-called Federal plan the apportionment provided for the House of Representatives was fixed close to a population basis, but for the U.S. Senate each State was given only two votes whether it was a small State or a large State. Hence, so argue the Dirksenites, one State legislative branch is justifiably placed on a population basis, and the other branch on some other basis.

In reply, the other side emphasizes that this Federal plan is not relevant. To obtain original acceptance of the new Constitution under colonial conditions the Founding Fathers had to face the cold, hard fact that the smaller colonies refused as sovereign powers to accept statehood unless the Constitution guaranteed them equal voting power with the big States. Actions forced under such conditions cannot be used to justify giving special authority and power to geographical or other nonsovereign political subdivisions of a State to promote malapportionment.

Next among the arguments over the Dirksen resolve, is the claim that application of the one-man, one-vote decision merely replaces the present usurpation of power by minorities, with such usurpation by majorities. Actually, the very content of the one-man, one-vote decision reflects the protection extended by the Supreme Court to the basic constitutional rights of the majority. And the Court will do the same in the future to protect against any future malapportionments which apply to minorities. Beyond this consideration, if in any plan of representation it ever becomes necessary to bow to any tyranny, I would prefer to bow to usurpation by a majority.

In this connection, it is argued by some, that a legislature with large urban delegations will have them voting as a unit to overwhelm the rural minority. But in practice no massive bloc of urban representatives votes as a unit. Such a bloc breaks up on various issues and coalesces with rural supporters in differing combinations. This practice has been demonstrated time and time again by the actions of both branches of the Massachusetts General Court which have historically been on a register voter basis, close to the population approach. There has been no claim of our legislature overriding the rights of rural towns and small cities. To conclude this argument, let it be remembered that if a general court under majority control supports a new program, that majority must foot most of the added bill, not the minority.

Finally, among the arguments for which I have time this evening, the Dirksenites argue that under the population formula the concentration of large urban populations in small congested parts of our large States means that the representation allowed outlying, huge, sparsely settled areas would be too small. Thus, to provide for the large populations of a New York City or a Chicago, with its suburbs, these urban areas would have to be granted as many representatives as is provided for the rest of their respective States.

But the other side of this argument is that mere abstractions like area are not entitled to representation. As the Supreme Court decision has stated, people can be the proper basis of representation, not inanimate objects.

Madame Chairman, these comments cover the highlights of the arguments that rage back and forth in the discussion of the apportionment problem, and of the earlier and defeated Dirksen proposed, Senate Joint Resolution 2, to permit apportionment on other than a population basis. They hold in almost equal degree for the new and pending Dirksen proposal, Senate Joint Resolution 103, which is now a threat because it may be unexpectedly maneuvered toward adoption. Some of the new text raises questions of interpretation. Since modifications of the basic organic law is here involved, one-man, one-vote proponents urge that it be submitted to the same extended committee hearings, as held for the earlier resolve, before any action was taken. Only through the detailed analysis and discussion thereby stimulated will sufficiently careful scrutiny be obtained of the modified language now being urged.

Both the earlier defeated Dirksen proposal, and the latter amended version reflect an unwillingness to abide by the impartial decision of a Supreme Court after long delay. Concerned is a malapportionment which it seems very unlikely that the States will move to correct after so long a period of neglect.

In conclusion, I am glad the one-man, one-vote decision has provided us with a sound way out of an increasingly serious dilemma for this country. We must not lose out on that solution because minority groups fight a fair reform of the voting process which will remove their distorted power. Fortunately, time runs against proponents of the Dirksen amendment. Thus, it is estimated that by the end of 1966, apportionments on a sound population basis will have been worked out in all except a few States. And, once that changeover has occurred, it is hoped that the amended Dirksen proposal will attract less and less support in the Congress.

Meanwhile, I urge your local leagues to hold firm. I urge that as individual Members you seize the opportunity to applaud the important vote of Senator Edward M. Kennedy of our State against the Dirksen proposal on August 4, 1965, and that you urge Senator Leverett Saltonstall to mend his ways and change his bad vote in the future.

And now I welcome any questions you may have, particularly on tonight's reapportionment subject, but also on any other State legislative problems.

DEMOCRATS' 1964 PLATFORM ENACTED BY DO-IT-ALL 89TH

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the October 17, 1965, Washington Post article, entitled "Democrats' 1964 Platform Enacted by Do-It-All 89th," be printed in the Congressional Record.

Mr. Robert C. Albright has aptly and succinctly summarized the record of this Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 17, 1965]

Democrats' 1965 Platform Enacted by Do-It-All 89th

(By Robert C. Albright)

The landmark 89th Congress will be going home soon after having virtually enacted the 1964 Democratic platform into law.

There has never been anything quite like it.

Some Congresses may have been more innovative, such as Woodrow Wilson's pioneering 63d (1913–15) or Franklin D. Roosevelt's revolutionary 73d (1933–34).

But for sheer legislative output the incredible 89th shattered all records. It brought to harvest a generation's backlog of ideas and social legislation.

For 40 weeks its Members labored under the prod of the most exacting taskmaster in modern politics, Lyndon B. Johnson, to build the stage for the Great Society.

DEMOCRATIC MAJORITIES

During most of that time, sprawling Democratic majorities did his bidding almost to the letter. Democrats came back 294 to 140 strong in the House and 68 to 32 in the Senate following the 1964 Johnson landslide. Many of the new Democrats owe their elections to Republican defections in 1964 from the Goldwater ticket. In Congress they voted their loyalty to Lyndon Johnson.

Much has been written about the Johnsonian arm twist. But this young army of new legislators also helped to spread the new laws on the books—voting rights, medicare, repeal of the old national origin immigration quotas.

The legislative dreams of many men were reaped in the resulting harvest—F.D.R.'s, Harry S. Truman's, John F. Kennedy's. A few bore the L.B.J. brand.

Within the Senate a new generation of leaders was clearly staking a claim in national political life—among them the two younger brothers of the late President Kennedy. The ironbound hierarchy of elders dubbed by its critics "the Senate establishment" was receding into history. In fact the establishment had given way to the fraternity, one in which freshmen ignored the time-honored Senate convention that they were to be seen but not heard.

Although consensus had been the prevailing theme of the 89th, it began to crack in the final weeks of the session. Members who had yielded before to Presidential blandishments decided that they had done their all for the Great Society.

HOME RULE SCUTTLED

There was never any open revolt, but the President surely got the message—especially during the recent days when he was immobilized in the hospital by his gall bladder operation.

The change of tone came during the last mile of the session. The scuttling of the President's home rule bill was one omen.

So was the House GOP filibuster against the President's and Lady Bird Johnson's highway beautification bill, which was finally passed on the night of the President's operation. Rental subsidies ran into unexpected preadjournment trouble.

Finally, after the Senate defeated the President's bill nullifying State power to ban the union shop, the signal came loud and clear to fold up the session.

Did the President push his luck too far? His leadership confidantes at the Capitol don't think so. In January, they say, the same big Democratic majorities will be back, as loyal to the President as ever.

As a reward to Congress for standing by and working with him, Mr. Johnson has promised a pre-June 1966 adjournment, the earliest "school's out" for legislators in decades. The President and his lawmakers will spend most of this free time on the hustings. For this is an "off year," always a time of election peril for the party in power.

How did Mr. Johnson, and his predominantly like-thinking Democratic Congress, translate so much of the Great Society into law?

The answer, so far as the House was concerned, came not only in those runaway majorities, but in a little foresightedness in changing the rules.

With the administration and the leadership teaming up in support of the changes, the House at the very start of the session clipped powers of its diehard Rules Committee.

Ever since, House legislative committee chairmen have been able to bypass the once powerful unit if it fails to act on a bill in 21 days. Another new House rule revokes the House "traffic" committee right to hold up a conference report.

The endless catalog of achievements by the 89th includes:

Air and water pollution control; highway beautification; Appalachia assistance; an expanded war on poverty; new hospital centers; regional development and area assistance programs; a new Department of Housing; aid to elementary education; and excise tax reductions to further bolster the economy.

Then, just to make certain nothing was being overlooked, Congress submitted a proposed new amendment, designed to clear up two centuries of doubt about presidential succession and continuity during the illness of a President.

A POSITIVE APPROACH

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, back in the frontier days of this country, a man who came knocking on your door might want a job or a place to spend the night. The early settlers understood the problem. They had been like the man knocking on some door and asking favors. They had proved themselves, built their homes—and were willing to help others.

The stranger, wanting a job had the right to prove his worth. By his skills he was known, and appreciated, and from whence he came was not really important.

The new immigration bill reaffirms our belief that what is important about a man is his character, his skills. Also, it reaffirms the faith that the stranger here will be welcomed—and can contribute to our society.

The Portland Oregonian recently had an editorial on "New Rules at Gate" which I found of interest, and I ask permission to insert it in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Oregonian, Oct. 6, 1965]

New Rules at Gate

The new Immigration Act signed by President Johnson Sunday on Liberty Island, site of the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor, is historic on at least two points: (1) It abolishes the discriminatory national origins quota system, and (2) it imposes a limit on immigration from nations in the Western Hemisphere.

Henceforth, applicants for admission will be received in first-come, first-served order on the basis, primarily, of their relationship to U.S. residents or their beneficial skills, rather than that of their nationality. The 41-year-old quota system opened the doors to a few less than 158,000 a year from outside the hemisphere. But 80 percent of these were from Great Britain (65,361), Germany (25,814), and Ireland (17,756). France qualified for only 3,069, Japan for 185, Israel for the minimum 100.

The bill contains a special provision to accommodate the Cuban refugees invited by Mr. Johnson in a special declaration Sunday. Immigrants will be permitted later to adjust their status—i.e., become citizens—if they are bona fide refugees fleeing from persecution or fear of persecution, because of race, religion, or political belief, in Communist or Communist-dominated countries. It is estimated that a maximum of 75,000 Cubans will respond. They would be outside the hemisphere's quota.

The ceiling on Western Hemisphere immigration will not become effective until July 1, 1968. Its 120,000-a-year level is well below current totals—more than 200,000 a year, well over half from Canada and Mexico. The total from outside the hemisphere, on the other hand, will be higher than that of recent experience—170,000 a year as compared to about 158,000.

Total immigration is expected to be between 300,000 and 400,000 a year—including near relatives of U.S. citizens, exempt from the limitations. This is higher than the 250,000-to-300,000 range over the past decade. But it is well below the high tides of the early years of this century in which as many as 1,200,000 entered annually, year after year.

U.S. society should be well able to absorb the flow, especially with the new emphasis on uniting families and on favoring needed skills.

THE RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM AS A PART OF THE 1965 HOUSING ACT

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I should like to express my great disappointment in the action of the House of Representatives in undertaking to kill the rent supplement program by failing to fund it as part of the supplemental appropriations bill for the coming year.

The rent supplement program is an important part of the 1965 Housing Act.

For 30 years, the Congress has been struggling to develop a formula to rid our cities of slums and blight and to provide decent shelter for the poor. In 1937, the public housing program was launched as a method of providing rent supplements to help the poor get decent shelter. It has done yeoman work but its impact has been watered down by so many restrictions and local conservative opposition that now, after 28 years, only 600,000 units have been built.

It was obvious that a new approach was needed to house the poor. Earlier this year, after extensive consideration and debate in committee and on the floor of both Houses of Congress, approval was given to a new rent supplement program but under private enterprise auspices.

Our homebuilders, our mortgage bankers, our financial institutions, our nonprofit church groups, labor unions, and elderly housing sponsors all agreed to help launch this new and imaginative endeavor to provide housing for the poor and the elderly.

Uppermost in the minds of these supporters was the private enterprise feature of the rent supplement program. With Government help, private enterprise was given the opportunity of doing a job that had long been neglected and which our great Nation could no longer ignore. The projects were to be privately sponsored, privately financed and privately managed. FHA was to insure the private lender against default and HHFA was to help meet the cost of decent housing for the poor by supplementing the rent.

Preliminary estimates on cost indicated that private enterprise could produce housing under the rent supplement program at less cost to the Government than could be provided under the public housing program. The Agency submitted estimates to the effect that the average cost per unit under the rent supplement program would be $40 whereas under public housing it would be $58 per month.

The principal reasons for the savings is the expected lower land costs and construction costs of rent supplement housing as well as the higher monthly payments by rent supplement families over public housing families. To avoid it being a giveaway program, families benefiting under rent supplements are required to pay 25 percent of their income for rent. The Government subsidy would make up the difference needed to meet the full economic costs of the project. Public housing tenants pay 20 percent of their income for rent.

Mr. President, I want to reemphasize this 25-percent requirement in the law. A family head making $300 a month would be required to pay 25 percent or $75 rent. If the total rent were $100, the Government would pay $25. This requirement plus that which gives the sponsor full responsibility for selecting tenants removes the possibility of the program being taken over by irresponsible freeloaders who are unwilling to make some sacrifice to live in decent housing.

The basis for the House action in cutting our rent supplement funds can be boiled down to three items: First, premature issuance of regulations; second, net worth limitations too high; and third, family income limitation too high.

PREMATURE ISSUANCE OF REGULATIONS

The critics were most unfair in twisting the facts relative to the issuance of a proposed set of regulations by the Federal Housing Administration. A draft of regulations clearly labeled as "proposed" and subject to revision were sent to all field offices on September 28. At the same time, copies were sent to interested public officials and industry representatives as well as to congressional committees. There was nothing secret about these regulations—anyone could have gotten a copy if it was requested. The agency was anxious to have the widest distribution, hoping to uncover any obvious faults or unworkable features before preparing a final set once the Congress appropriated the necessary funds.

NET WORTH LIMITATION

The critics of the program had a field day on the interpretation of a relatively minor item included in the draft regulations—the net worth limitation for eligibility for rental assistance.

The preliminary regulations established a ceiling not only for income, but also for assets or net worth. Because of the variation in cost of living by area, a net worth limitation was established in direct proportion to the income limitations for each area. For nonelderly, net worth could not exceed two times the income limit, and for elderly, it could not exceed three times the income limit.

Dr. Weaver made it clear that he would welcome suggestions on the criteria to use and said he would not oppose using the public housing approach. Under this program, the average ceiling for proposed assets is around $2,000 with a higher allowance for the elderly, because of the special needs of old folks living in retirement off their savings. He said consideration should be given to retired persons whose only income is derived from investments and yet who cannot afford decent housing.

The asset issue should not be used to kill the program. It is a red herring to confuse the issue. The poor do not have stocks and bonds. They are lucky to have furniture and perhaps a refrigerator or a television. The applicant for rental assistance whose income is low but who may have extensive personal assets is a rare case. Such cases have been handled fairly over the years by public housing authorities and I have no doubt that they will be properly screened under this program.

FAMILY INCOME

The more important eligibility criterion is, of course, family income. The law is clear on this, requiring the application of the Federal public housing law to each area and individual case. This has been done but the opponents continue to criticize. Despite the amendment authored by me which limited eligibility to families under the public housing ceiling, they voted against the authorizing legislation and now 3 months later they are at it again.

Repetition is their weapon and it paid off on the House floor during consideration of the supplemental bill.

They wrap together allegations on high assets and high income requirements with misstatements on higher construction cost to give the impression that it is a rich man's program financed with the taxes of poor Mr. John Q. Public.

To prove otherwise is easily done by referring to income limits furnished by the Agency and placed in the RECORD of July 14 during Senate debate of the housing bill. Families with two children earning between $3,700 and $5,000 per year are not rich. Requiring such families to pay annual rent of between $925 and $1,250 for housing costing on the average of $12,500 is not a program for the rich.

In closing, let me show how foolish and irresponsible it is to urge delay in funding the program and, at the same time, to urge approval of administrative funds presumably to be used by the FHA in the preparation of regulations.

This is utterly ridiculous. The FHA does not need 6 months or $170,000 to study and write regulations. Most of the work is already done. After receipt of comments now being solicited, the Agency could issue final regulations immediately provided the Congress has approved program funds.

We have delayed long enough in carrying out the national housing policy of a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family. We cannot keep postponing the job. The Congress has acted—the President has signed the bill into law and there is no excuse for further dickering and obstructing the will of the majority. There are plenty of problems to be solved and the sooner we get started the better.

Mr. President, I urge Members of this body to pay heed to this call. Last summer the Congress arrived at a consensus and approved the rent supplement program as part of one of the greatest housing bills ever conceived. Now that it is fall, let us not back down and change our direction and cut the heart out of this great bill.

Mr. President, I have some material pertaining to the rent supplement program and, without objection, I would like it included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

HOW THE RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM WILL WORK

Scope of program

This is a program authorized by the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 under which private enterprise can design, construct, finance, and operate modest new dwelling units to house poor families. The rent supplement feature is, in effect, a type of subsidy paid by the Government directly to the builder-owner to make up the difference between the fair rental of the property and what the poor family can afford. A family living in a rent supplement unit will pay 25 percent of its income toward the fair market rental of the unit it occupies. The tenants will occupy these homes under lease.

Families eligible for rent supplements

Low-income families who are either—(a) elderly; (b) handicapped; (c) displaced from their homes by government action; (d) occupants of substandard housing; or (e) victims of natural disasters.

The act establishes an income ceiling identical with the ceiling for low rent public housing.

Housing eligible for rent supplements

1. Housing must be constructed according to FHA mortgage insurance standards.

2. Housing must be either (a) new, or (b) substantially rehabilitated.

3. The average unit cost is expected to be around $12,500.

4. Sponsors are limited to (a) private nonprofit, (b) limited dividend corporations, or (c) cooperatives.

Administration of programs

1. Supplements will be paid by the Federal Government to the nonprofit sponsor, not directly to the individual.

2. The contract between the Federal Government and the sponsor will call for periodic review and will insure against windfall to any tenant who might enjoy a sudden increase in income.

3. The maximum income permitted will not exceed public housing criteria.

Major issue

Regulations were issued prematurely.

Comment

1. No final or firm regulations have been issued. The draft regulations have been withdrawn.

2. Draft regulations were printed and distributed for review and comment but with the caveat that they would be revised and that until Congress appropriated funds, there would be no program. These were unsigned and not sent to the Federal Register—so they had no legal effect.

3. The distribution of these draft regulations to the interested parties was made mainly to secure comments and suggestions for revisions. (A practice followed by other agencies like Internal Revenue, Federal Home Loan Bank Board.)

4. Regulations will be revised and will reflect the sense of Congress.

Major issue

Families with assets of $25,000 or more would be eligible.

Comment

1. This is not so.

2. The fuss was caused by a provision in the draft regulations which stated that eligibility could be established in the case of an elderly or handicapped family if they had net assets up to three times the "maximum annual income ceiling" set by the Administrator for the family and housing unit.

3. The point is that the "maximum annual income ceiling" set by the Administrator would be less than $5,000 for the elderly, and hence only assets of under $15,000 would be permissible. HHFA would not establish an income ceiling as high as $8,000 (and $24,000 net assets) as Congressman HARVEY suggests.

Major issue

Families with high incomes would be admitted.

Comment

1. There are many safeguards built in to prevent this.

2. The guidelines will be at least as stringent as those in the public housing program.

3. The only families eligible are those who:

(a) Have incomes below the maximum specified for occupancy in the Housing Act of 1937 (the act that has established eligibility for public, low income housing); and

(b) Are elderly, handicapped, living in slums, or displaced from their homes by Government action, or who are victims of a natural disaster.

INCOME LIMITS UNDER RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

The only families eligible for rent supplement payments will be those who meet both of these requirements:

(1) Have incomes below the maximum amount which can be established for occupancy in public housing under the Federal public housing law, the U.S. Housing Act of 1937, and

(2) Are elderly, handicapped displaced from their homes by governmental action, living in slums, or victims of natural disasters which have destroyed or damaged their homes.

Determining the maximum income

The maximum income a family may have and still receive a rent supplement will be determined in each area as follows:

(1) A market analysis will be conducted to determine the rentals at which there are available a substantial supply of private decent, safe, and sanitary housing consisting of one-bedroom, two-bedroom, three-bedroom, and four-bedroom units for families of low income.

(2) The maximum income limit will be established, for the corresponding sized unit in the rent supplement program, at four times the rental determined by such market analysis.

For example, assume the market analysis for the area shows that $80 per month is the lowest rental at which a substantial supply of private, decent, safe, and sanitary two-bedroom units is available in an area. The maximum annual income limit for a family of the size that requires a two-bedroom unit will be $3,840 (4 times $80 times 12 months).

In administering the rent supplement program, the Housing Agency will count all income of an individual or family, from every source, whether taxable or not, as against the income ceiling administratively established for an area.

Preliminary estimates of income limits for families of different sizes under proposed rent supplement program in 26 cities

Cities	2 persons (1 bedroom)	3 or 4 persons (2 bedrooms)	5 or 6 persons (3 bedrooms)	7 or 8 persons (4 bedrooms)
Atlanta, Ga	$3,100	$3,800	$4,900	$5,500
Bangor, Maine	3,400	4,300	4,800	5,700
Batavia, N.Y	3,400	4,100	4,800	6,000
Boston, Mass	4,400	4,800	5,300	6,000
Bridgeport, Conn	4,100	4,600	4,800	5,300
Chicago, Ill	4,300	5,000	5,800	6,500
Columbia, S.C	3,400	3,700	4,600	5,000
Columbus, Ohio	3,700	3,900	4,500	4,900
Fresno, Calif	3,900	4,400	5,100	6,100
Huntington, W. Va	3,200	3,700	4,200	4,700
Jefferson City, Mo	3,600	4,100	4,600	5,500
Kansas City, Mo	3,600	4,100	4,800	5,500
Louisville, Ky	3,700	4,300	5,600	6,200
Milwaukee, Wis	3,600	4,100	4,600	6,000
Mobile, Ala	3,900	4,000	4,600	5,100
Newark, N.J	4,600	5,000	5,500	6,000
Providence, R.I	3,200	3,700	4,300	4,800
Paterson, N.J	4,300	4,800	5,300	5,800
Pittsburgh, Pa	4,200	4,600	5,000	5,600
Port Arthur, Tex	2,400	3,700	4,300	5,800
San Antonio, Tex	3,300	3,700	4,400	4,800
St. Louis, Mo	4,000	4,500	5,500	6,300
Terre Haute, Ind	3,600	3,900	4,300	4,900
Toledo, Ohio	4,000	4,500	5,500	6,000
Waco, Tex	3,400	3,700	4,600	5,800
Utica, N.Y	2,900	3,700	4,500	5,300

THE NEED FOR CRITICS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the great strength of a democratic society is its capacity for dissent and diversity. If there is any one characteristic which sets off the free society from the closed societies of the Communist world it is our long tradition of free public criticism, discussion, and dissent. The more crucial an issue is to our national interest, the more important it is that we keep alive the spirit of open inquiry and intellectual honesty. For that reason, all of us are indebted to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. Throughout his public career he has consistently honored the Nation and served his country by vigorous and honest analyses of public questions. Most recently he has turned his great talent to the difficult questions that have confronted us in the Dominican Republic in recent months.

I think Senator Fulbright's contribution to our understanding of that and other issues has been well described by the respected editor of the Christian Science Monitor, Mr. Erwin D. Canham. I ask unanimous consent that his editorial entitled "The Need for Critics" be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Need for Critics

(By Erwin D. Canham)

You can take it for granted that Senator J. William Fulbright, of Arkansas, though a Democrat, a close and old friend of President Johnson, and longtime chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, will not be the next Secretary of State. He has burned his bridges. His recent outspoken criticism of administration policy in Santo Domingo, on top of several other recent dissents, has undoubtedly disturbed the President if it has not angered him.

It is by no means certain that Senator Fulbright ever wanted to be Secretary of State. He is no administrator. He hasn't administered anything since he was president of the University of Arkansas in 1939–41. He has been in Congress since 1943. The legislative life suits him fine. And he may well believe he can be of more help in criticizing American foreign policy as a sovereign Senator and chairman of his powerful committee, than if he was working for a President as Secretary of State.

WRY COMMENTS

For some time, Senator Fulbright has been rather frustrated. He does not think the President or the State Department pay much attention to his ideas. He comments on the situation wryly. His latest statement puts him farther out of line than ever.

But Senator Fulbright's may be the voice of honest, critical perception and of common sense. What he says about the misevaluation of the situation in Santo Domingo is confirmed by most responsible correspondents who were on the spot and tried to untangle the facts.

The Arkansas Senator may be in advance of American public opinion on many issues. But American policy is badly in need of critical examination. It has been rigid and defensive for many months. Secretary of Defense McNamara may have been making foreign policy more than Secretary of State Rusk. Mr. McNamara is a powerful personality. He has a sharper cutting edge than Mr. Rusk, although the Secretary of State's quiet intellectual power and character should not be underestimated.

ORIGINAL VIEW

Senator Fulbright always comes with a fresh and original mind, and an experienced political touch, to problems that are jaded and frozen. His analysis is just what the administration needs, whether he is always right or not. It should not be resented.

Senator Fulbright's speech in Vienna in May, outlining ways for easing the central Europe situation and opening wider doors through the formerly Iron Curtain, was attentively studied in Budapest and Prague. I know because officials in the Hungarian and Czech Foreign Offices told me so. Senator Fulbright said: "I only wish they studied it as attentively in Washington."

Senator Fulbright's name will be remembered for the most massive international scholarship program the world has ever seen. His was almost a lone voice arguing behind the scenes against the Bay of Pigs misadventure. (But he was in favor of invading Cuba at the time of the missile crisis, writes President Kennedy's assistant, Theodore C. Sorensen).

DISSENSION EXISTS

The senatorial group of Democrats which is unhappy about foreign policy, for sometimes conflicting reasons, is impressive. The Senate leader, Senator Mansfield is discreetly but definitely in disagreement on aspects of the Vietnam problem. Senator Church has long been off the reservation, and Senator Morse, as usual, is a violent dissenter. There are several others. This is a far cry from the little band of obdurate men who blocked Woodrow Wilson's hopes for an organized peace. But it is a faction which might someday coalesce, though not necessarily behind Senator Fulbright.

It would be interesting to know Vice President Humphrey's ideas on the necessity of a reevaluation of foreign policy methods and goals. He has long been an imaginative critic of set policies, but now his lips are sealed.

Long-established policies have a way of gaining a life of their own, riding juggernaut-like over the humans who administer them. Now and then somebody throws a brick at the juggernaut and it turns out to be of paper. It is time to challenge the juggernaut now, to call for candid rethinking. Senator Fulbright may have made a beginning, frank and provocative.

PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURATION DAY, A NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of my colleagues to a petition I have received from the Jackson County Democratic Central Committee, asking the U.S. Congress to declare Presidential Inauguration Day a legal national holiday.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this noble request be printed in the Congressional Record, together with names and addresses.

There being no objection, the petition, names, and addresses, were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Petition

We, the officers, members and supporters of the Jackson County Democratic Central Committee, having heretofore, in regular meeting assembled on May 25, 1965, determined and resolved to memorialize and request the Congress of the United States to declare Presidential Inauguration Day a legal national holiday, by its proper action, and in witness whereof we now submit the names of our organization in support thereof:

Bernard Lucas, Freetown, Ind.
Ruby McCory, Brownstown.
Amos Lambing, Brownstown.
Mary Jo Manion, Brownstown.
Ray Greathouse, Medora.
Helen L. Toon, Medora.
Albert Wolka, Vallonia.
Janet Brewer, Vallonia.
Carl Rosemeyer, Brownstown.
Blanche Rosemeyer, Brownstown.
Ralph O. McKain, Seymour.
Mary Jane McKain, Seymour.
Garrett G. Fee, Medora.
Ruby Jones, Medora.
Omill, Albening, Medora.
Alma Russell, Medora.
Billy K. Trisler, Crothersville, Ind.
Cleo Huls, Crothersville, Ind.
Harry Schepman, Route 2, Brownstown.
Irene Christopher, Route 3, Seymour.
Mrs. Harlan Bergsieker, Sr., president, Jackson County Democratic Women's Club.
Mary C. Jones, 418 West 5th Street, Seymour, Ind.
Arthur R. Jones, 418 West 5th Street, Seymour, Ind.
Charles Grein, Route 2, Seymour, Ind.
Alta Cole, Route 3, Seymour, Ind.
Elizabeth Moenning, Seymour, Ind.
Clarence Moenning, Seymour, Ind.
Guy Weekly, Norman, Ind.
Alice Aiken, Norman, Ind.
Harold J. Baker, 210 Cabin, Seymour, Ind.
V. Thomas Fettig, president, Jackson County Young Democrats.
Bruce Hanners, treasurer, Brownstown, Ind.
J. Dietrig, co vice chairman, Seymour, Ind.
Lester E. Greathouse, chairman, Brownstown, Ind.

THE VALUE OF THE DOLLAR

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Honorable Henry J. Taylor, former Ambassador to Switzerland is one of the most highly respected commentators of our times on national and international affairs.

Mr. Taylor is a man of wide experience in the fields of government and diplomacy, industry, and literature, and he is now the author of a syndicated column.

As a newspaper columnist he is a man of incisive mind and trenchant pen. A column by Mr. Taylor appeared in newspapers this week which I think is worthy of note, and for this reason I ask unanimous consent that it appear in the body of the Record as part of these remarks.

The column appeared in numerous newspapers. It follows as it appeared in the Winchester, Va., Star of October 4, 1965, under the heading "Value of Dollar Melting Like Butter in the Sun."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Value of Dollar Melting Like Butter in the Sun

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Among President Johnson's innumerable wars—on ignorance, poverty, disease, crime, etc.—he'd better begin at long last his war to save the American dollar.

Who is kidding whom?

On the same day that our rubber stamp Congress raised the national debt ceiling to $328 billion the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures reported that civilian agency employment had leaped to 1,441,886.

Is the welfare state a feasible state or merely the state of mind of the Government spenders?

The Area Redevelopment Administration was a temporary agency hailed to boost unemployment in depressed areas. It was given $400 million 4 years ago.

There has seldom been such a mess. Senate investigators found that it created jobs which, on inspection, proved nonexistent, and often it continued spending for years after the "distressed area" designation had been removed.

Mr. Johnson changed its name to the Economic Development Administration and put through $655 million more for it for the next 5 years. Yet—hey—that's our money.

Two years ago Mr. Johnson promised drastic elimination in the 95 countries getting our foreign aid. Today, 82 still get it.

Then there's Sargent Shriver with his vague hundreds of millions, the effect of which is as elusive as an electric eel. All we know for sure is that much of the war on poverty is being operated with an enchanting feyness others describe as loony.

Even in the Defense Department the costly Vietnam tragedy does not seem to register if dreamy programs beckon.

As if that war were not enough of a drain, along with such costs as $320 million for the nuclear cruiser U.S.S. *Long Beach,* Secretary Robert S. McNamara and his Whiz Kids sponsored 60 dips into dreamland from which our overloaded taxpayers were finally rescued, largely by newspaper revelations and the protests from countries where Mr. McNamara staged his projects.

These included the famous $6 million Camelot project in Chile "to determine the cause of revolutions" and the incredible "Rex Americanus" (the official name, no less) study of Latin-American types of society to see which type is "most congenial to U.S. influence."

The gigantic, sprawling Central Intelligence Agency is often accused of operating with similar nonchalance.

Nowhere in the Federal budget is any money ever allotted to the CIA. Yet cost estimates approach $800 million to $1 billion a year and that Agency certainly spends at least twice as much as the State Department and is a great deal larger.

The CIA is putting about $2 billion into its A11 spy plane alone and not a penny of this outlay has ever showed up in the Federal balance sheets.

Meanwhile, the Rangers' lunar photographs cost $270 million. After an 8-year, $20 billion crash program, our two astronauts are to be on the moon less than 6 hours; it will cost more than $3 billion an hour to have them there.

Scientists say we should send up instruments to make their finding instead for about one-hundreth the cost.

Our deficit dollars fly into Washington's stockpiles on an equivalent scale. The stockpile inventories now exceed $13.5 billion. Senator HARRY F. BYRD's watchdog committee finds that of 76 categories, 63 are stockpiled in excess of their objectives.

Take the overbuying of machine tools; an unrevealed scandal. Col. Robert J. Kaut, chief of the Defense Department's grant-aid division, has been trying to liquidate some of this hoard. It has represented 300,000 machine tools that cost more than $3.5 billion. All 1964 U.S. machine tool shipments were worth less than a third of this frozen mass.

Old programs never die, they just spend away. And Mr. Johnson adds a new program nearly every day. Yet think what this nation could do with the $11 billion in interest we pay each year on the money Washington has already borrowed.

Mr. Johnson talks about the welfare state. Whose welfare? Most of this is doubletalk at the double time.

We are trapped in the backwash of deficit financing, juggled books, pork barrel spending and a politicians' paradise in which the value of our dollar is melting like butter in the sun.

THE "HELP A YOUTH" PROGRAM

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, cities throughout the Nation might well note and adopt a "help a youth" program comparable to the plan initiated in the city of Springfield, Ohio, under the leadership of Mr. Harry Rittoff.

The objectives of this program as well as its organizational structure are well described in an article appearing in the Springfield News-Sun on Sunday, October 3.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCAL "HELP A YOUTH" PROGRAM STARTS MONDAY

(By Art Christen)

"Help a Youth," a program uniquely Springfield's, which is designed to aid in locating employment for young men and women in the 16 to 25 age bracket, opens its doors Monday.

Its chairman is Harry Rittoff, also chairman of David's Gloves, Inc., who has donated office space at his plant at 23 West Pleasant Street, and who has financially underwritten the program.

Assisting him in its actual operation will be Carl Trautman, of 4702 Mesa Lane, a veteran of 25 years with the Ohio State Employment Office, currently working with the Town and Country Day School, who will be in the office or in the field contacting potential employers.

Working with Mr. Rittoff and Mr. Trautman in the project's initial stages as an advisory committee are Common Pleas Court Judge Ben J. Goldman; Probate Judge Glenn Detling; Sam McNab, of the Ohio Employment Service; Rolland Wilson, from the Springfield Chamber of Commerce; Willis Mozier, of the UAF; Charles Zartman, representing the board of education; Horace W. Morris, executive director of the Springfield Urban League, Inc.; Attorney Daniel I. Rosenthal; Mrs. Virginia McCumber, Mr. Rittoff's secretary; and Douglas Crabtree, representing local union interests.

Why such a program?

"That's easy," Mr. Rittoff said. "Take a look at national statistics * * * the highest unemployment rate exists in this 16 to 25 year age bracket and it's impossible to ignore the increasing problem of the high school dropouts of both sexes."

This program is one which will require no donations in cash from the general public, from industry or businesses. The only thing it needs is job opportunities, Mr. Rittoff said.

"If every Springfield and Clark County industrial plant or store could create just one single extra job position, even in a trainee capacity, we feel certain that this could handle all the unemployment among the young in the area," Mr. Rittoff stated.

"Of course, it's a real challenge," Mr. Trautman added.

"We certainly don't intend to turn the world upside-down overnight with 'Help a Youth,' but we're positive that, with the cooperation of the area, it can work and accomplish an infinite good."

Here, in essence, is how the project will operate:

Local industries and businesses are currently being contacted to line up possible job openings and then applications will be taken at the Pleasant Street office with interviews by appointment only. It's a process then of locating the jobs, then collecting the applications, and by screening, getting the proper persons for the proper job with the least amount of confusion which sometimes occurs in placement circles.

Mr. Trautman has set his office hours for Monday, Wednesday, and Friday from 3 to 4:30 p.m. and will spend Tuesdays and Thursdays in the field. Help a Youth's telephone number is 323–7401, and Mrs. McCumber will aid in the interviewing and filing.

There also has been established a bank account by Mr. Rittoff which will be used for loans to needy applicants which will be repaid on an interest-free basis.

"Help a youth's" project staff will be vitally interested in those young persons unemployed or underemployed because of a lack of a high school diploma, an inability to meet employment entrance requirements, a lack of motivation, a lack of knowledge of employment possibilities, inadequate reading or writing skills, and an inability to improve potential skills.

After orientation with potential employers and employees, the applicants will be placed in positions especially designed to improve their employability.

And there will be a followup which includes, if necessary, employee and employer counseling, financial assistance to help employees acquire tools and clothing if they are unable to furnish them themselves; help in the solution of personal and work-associated problems, and training in improving reading, writing and mathematics skills.

"We want no financial donations," Mr. Rittoff said. "In fact, I've turned down several. What we need most of all are volunteer workers who will give of their time in contacting local businesses and industries to spread the information concerning the project. After all, a personal contact oftentimes means so much more than a phone call."

The project is also geared to the teenage youth, both male and female, who is dangerously close to becoming a high school dropout. Through the program, he or she can be instructed in the procedure of gaining a work permit and suitable employment. And the employment could carry into the summertime giving the youth inspiration and motivation to finish his important education.

Initial indications show that many local industries are enthusiastic concerning the program and its potential in solving a critical problem within the city and county.

And the news is spreading.

From Kansas City, Mo., Charles Hipsh, president of the Empire State Bank, and a longtime friend of Mr. Rittoff wrote:

"My heartiest congratulations for your generosity and your evidence of a big heart in starting 'help a youth.'

"I think it is a wonderful thought and a great movement and I would appreciate it if you would keep me informed as to developments because if the idea works out, as well as I predict, I may want to get the same thing started in Kansas City.

"Again, I want you to know how wonderful it is of you to be thinking of your fellow men and assuring you of my warm regards, I am,

"Sincerely,

"CHARLES HIPSH."

"Help a youth" is Harry Rittoff's dream, his own creation in which he feels so strongly that he has invested both finances and time in getting the project underway.

"It is my sincere hope that if this program proves successful locally, it will spread to other cities and eventually become nationwide," he said. "We do need volunteer help, not cash, and again I say, if each business or industry in Springfield and Clark County could create just one, only one additional job opportunity, we'd have the situation well in hand."

This was not just a man who has become a success in his own chosen field speaking, it was a humanitarian.

And now it's up to Springfield and Clark County business and industry to give its own youth a break which they desperately need.

LARGE NEW CHRISTMAS DRAFT CALL HERALDS NEED FOR NEW GI EDUCATION BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, with the announcement by the Pentagon of a 45,224-man draft call for December 1965, the need for prompt enactment of a new GI bill is magnified. The opportunity for intellectual advancement which the cold war GI education bill (S. 9) affords veterans of cold war military service must, in the spirit of justice, be granted these dedicated Americans without further delay. Inequities forced upon our service men and women through the draft and the personal disrupted careers and lives which these capable individuals bear for their country cannot remain pending while we proceed to take a legislative vacation. We simply should not in good conscience adjourn this Congress while millions of men and women who have been economically and educationally disadvantaged by military service to their country, are seeking daily to recommence their educational careers and carry out their desires to become useful instruments in the expanding civilian economy. S. 9 passed the Senate by a vote of more than 4 to 1; it now languishes in the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. In good conscience it should be reported out.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article appearing in the October 15, 1965, issue of the Washington Post be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

December Draft Calls 45,224

The Pentagon announced a 45,224-man draft call for December yesterday, 10,000 more than the monthly level set by President Johnson in July and the highest levy since the Korean war.

Normally, December calls are light, to ease family separations during the Christmas holidays. Last December only 7,800 men were inducted. But military chiefs want to complete the 340,000-man buildup in the Armed Forces—to 3 million men—as soon as practicable. That will be next September.

In July, the President announced that draft calls would be doubled from the then current level of 17,000 men a month.

Actually, 27,600 men were inducted in September. The October call is 33,600, and 36,450 men will be inducted in November.

The Army will draft 40,200 men in December, compared to November's call for 28,400 men. Army chiefs want a total of 47,900 new men in December including an expected 7,700 volunteers.

The Marine Corps will take 5,024 men under the draft in November and expects to obtain 3,400 volunteers. The Navy has asked for 4,600 draftees in November but believes it can get enough volunteers to meet its needs in December. The Air Force has not had to use the draft in the Vietnam buildup.

Higher draft calls almost always serve as a prod for volunteers.

The Air Force recruited 13,828 men in September, nearly half again as many as in recent months. Navy chiefs report they recruited 15,801 volunteers in September, 4,200 more than their original quota.

FINANCING FOR THE FUTURE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an informative address given by the Honorable Norman M. Clapp, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, in Indianapolis before a regional meeting of the National Electric Cooperative Association. Mr. Clapp cites the progress made in the last 4½ years in rural electrification and outlines the future financial requirements for meeting the goals of the rural electric cooperative system.

Widely recognized as one of the remarkable achievements of the past 30 years, rural electrification has helped to modernize the American farm and bring greater comforts to rural homes and communities. Mr. Clapp's speech gives us a perspective on the continuing importance of this program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that "Financing for the Future" be printed in full in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Financing for the Future

(Address of Norman M. Clapp, Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, before NRECA Regional Meetings, 1965)

It was approximately 1 year ago that I met with you at your last regional meeting. On that occasion I observed that in my service as Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration I had not missed a single regional meeting of NRECA and it was my fourth time around. With the fate of this great rural electrification program hanging in the balance of an historic public decision at the polls I expressed the hope that I might be back for a fifth.

This is the fifth, and I am happy to be with you again.

We have covered a lot of ground together—both figuratively and literally—these last 4½ years, and we have made significant progress in getting on with the job of rural electrification.

We have connected the 5 millionth consumer to be served by REA-financed rural systems. In fact the number has now reached beyond 5,300,000.

We have met a recordbreaking demand for power. Your power sales have risen from 27 billion kilowatt-hours during 1960 to nearly 40 billion in 1964. Average monthly kilowatt-hour consumption by farm and residential consumers on REA-financed lines increased by nearly 100 kilowatt-hours in the 4 years—to a current average of 456 kilowatt-hours per month.

To do all this your distribution line mileage has grown to 1,466,000, an increase of 52,000 miles since January 1961, and your systems have been strengthened generally.

Your generating capacity has grown from 1,513,201 kilowatts in January of 1961 to 2,022,298 kilowatts in January of this year, and loans have been approved for an additional 836,000 kilowatts of capacity.

Your transmission line mileage has increased over 20 percent in the same period to a total mileage of 43,110 as of the beginning of 1964. Still more transmission facilities are on the way, under loans already approved.

The investment in total utility plant has gone up $1 billion, from $3,700 million to $4,700 million.

The net worth of your systems increased from $690 million to pass the $1-billion mark. It was $1,058 million, or 24.8—nearly 25—percent of total assets, as 1965 began. In 1960, your net worth was only 19.7—under 20—percent of system assets.

In the vital field of wholesale power supply, the cost of which accounts, on the average, for over 40 percent of the distribution system's total costs, we have brought the average cost of wholesale power purchased from all sources down to a new low of 6.6 mills, from 6.9 mills in 1960.

And in spite of the fact that REA-financed generating facilities have historically had to face the handicaps of isolated requirements with small units and consequent relatively high production costs, the largest reduction these last 4 years has been in the cost of power from REA-financed power-type borrowers, a reduction from 9.2 mills in 1960 to 8.5 mills in 1964. The net projected power cost from loans made to power-type borrowers in 1964 and in 1965 to date averages 7.6 mills. Taking this year alone it is down to a net of 7.2 mills.

We have made great progress in improving the terms of wholesale power contracts with commercial suppliers and freeing REA-financed rural systems from crippling restrictions and dual rates. In 1961 there were 19 companies which had put such provisions in 189 contracts with your systems. Today the number of companies is down to six, and the number of restrictive contracts has been cut from 189 to 52.

These gains in improved wholesale power supply, coupled with mounting resources and better, more purposeful management, have opened the way for cutting the cost of electricity to your member-consumers.

Our records show that only 14 of REA's electric borrowers in the entire country made rate reductions to their consumers during fiscal year 1961. In 1962, 31 reduced their rates. In 1963, the number climbed to 77, and there were 111 reductions in 1964.

In fiscal year 1965, which ended last June 30, a record total of 126 rural electric systems made rate reductions for a record savings of more than $5,100,000 annually in their consumers' electric bills. This is not only a measure of your increasing strength, but it is also a magnificent contribution to the rural economy of this Nation.

All this, in itself, has been a potent force in the economic development of rural America. Parity of opportunity for the people of rural America is directly affected by the ready availability of electric power at costs that are comparable with the costs of this vital service in the urban areas of the Nation. Electricity provides a vital key to better living and greater economic opportunities.

But even beyond this general—though basic—contribution to rural areas development and the national welfare, we have achieved some very specific and demonstrable gains. Through your local interest and leadership, in many cases with the assistance of REA's staff, 1,580 local rural area development projects have been launched and are coming to fruition. They amount to a total new investment in rural areas of an estimated $1,100 million, of which 92 percent is from non-Federal sources. These projects mean the creation of 151,000 direct and indirect new jobs in rural America, and their success offers new hope for the future stability and growth of countless rural communities.

With greater recognition of your importance, not only to the millions of Americans in the rural areas of this country, but to the Nation as a whole, and even to the service of America in aiding the underprivileged of other lands, has come greater recognition of your need for territorial integrity—and the justice of your claim to it. In six States this year laws were enacted which, one way or another, recognize and strengthen the territorial rights of rural electric cooperatives in continuing to serve the areas they were built to serve. Not since the days of the early REA enabling acts has so much State legislative progress been made by rural electric cooperatives in a single year.

We have forged a greater unity of purpose within the rural electrification program and developed a greater public understanding of it outside the program itself.

This is a record of growth and accomplishment of which you can well be proud. It is the product of a joint venture between you and your Federal Government. We in REA have been proud to have had a part in it.

And I believe it can be said REA, first under the administration of President Kennedy and now under President Johnson, has played a vital role in the resurgence of the rural electrification program in these last 4½ years.

In refocusing attention on the still critical handicaps of rural electric service, we have helped win a greater public understanding of the equalizing role of REA financing and technical assistance.

In translating the purposes of rural electrification into current concepts, not only of area coverage, but of parity of rates and service from stable and secure systems that can assure future as well as present service, we have made the task of rural electrification more understandable to the general public and have helped give your management a clearer sense of purpose and direction.

The new REA policy relating to the general fund levels of its borrowers, with which you have, on the whole, cooperated so splendidly, has laid to rest an old public misunderstanding, and at the same time has helped get your total resources pulling their full weight in our progress toward program objectives.

The five-star member service program has added a new dimension to REA technical assistance to help you do more effectively the job your organizations were created to do.

The third criterion of our generation and transmission lending policy faced up to the fact that favorable power supply is more than just a matter of cost and kilowatts or kilowatt-hours. The value of independence for ultimate survival and freedom to accomplish the purposes of rural electrification must also be considered. The position of rural electric cooperatives in the electric industry is stronger, by far, today because we have added the third criterion to REA generation and transmission loan policy.

Crucial, of course, to the whole effort has been the availability of new loan capital to meet your needs for growth and greater effectiveness. In this, too, the record speaks for itself.

During the 5 fiscal years 1692–66 the total amount of funds made available by Congress for electrification loans add up to $1,800 million, an increase of 42 percent over the authorizations of the previous 5 fiscal years.

We have made more loans for generation and transmission. During the 4½ years whch ended last June 30, we approved loans for more generating capacity than was provided in all the previous 25½ years of the program. In those 4½ years, REA approved a total of $765 million for G and T loans. This averages out to $170 million a year for generation and transmission.

We have encouraged you to make more arrangements for interchange of power and to plan and enter power pooling arrangements. We have encouraged you to take full advantage of the economies of size in generation and transmission, and we already have made loans to finance a 300,000-kilowatt plant for Dairyland, a 200,000-kilowatt plant for Basin, and a 150,000-kilowatt plant for United.

But impressive as this record of achievement is, great as the capital resources are which have been available to you, they are far short of what will be needed to meet the needs of rural electrification in the years immediately ahead.

We estimate at REA that within the next 15 years, 1965 to 1980, the existing rural electric systems will require an aggregate of new capital of over $8 billion. Add to that the new capital which may be required for new systems, particularly new G and T systems, and the requirements go still higher. Some of this capital will come from your own resources, but most of it will have to come from new loans.

We fully expect that your annual requirements for loan capital will rise from present levels to approximately $700 million by 1980.

Rural electrification and its needs have never had a greater champion than President Johnson. No President of the United States has ever had such an intimate association with the REA program. He has worked among you, with you, and for you throughout his long and distinguished career of public service. He is a member of a rural electric cooperative in Texas, which he himself helped organize. He has been close to the REA program throughout its history. He understands it, and he supports it.

This Congress has proved to be one of the most understanding and sympathetic Congresses of recent years in considering the needs of rural electrification.

But there is grave doubt whether any President—or any Congress—can be expected, in view of the great and serious budgetary pressures the Federal Government is under in these times, to provide the full amount of your rising future capital needs through the Federal budget—under existing budget procedures and at existing interest rates.

Now it is important that we all understand this is not a problem which has been created by anyone—the President, the Congress, or your national association. It is a problem which has grown out of a state of the public mind, a public concern over the costs of Government, and a perfectly understandable interest of the taxpayer in the bills he pays.

The task we face is finding a solution to this problem which the majority of American citizens, whether they live in the country or in the city, will accept as fair and reasonable—and in the public interest.

Years ago there was a national advertising campaign built around the theme "Even your best friends won't tell you." Whatever the other merits of that slogan may have been, it recognized one basic truth: the greatest test of friendship is a willingness to face the unpleasant as well as the pleasant necessities of life together.

So it is with the problem of future financing needs of the rural electrification program.

You have recognized this problem. You recognized it 2 years ago when you prepared to direct your national association to undertake a study of possible supplemental financing from private sources.

We have recognized it in REA and have been proceeding with our studies of the possible development of a form of intermediate financing to bridge the gap between the present basic 2 percent REA financing and your ultimate access to the private money market.

At your last annual meeting of NRECA at Miami Beach your national board of directors acted to expand the scope of your study to include intermediate financing from public sources and thus cover all the available alternatives for your consideration.

You—and your national association—are to be commended for the foresight, the mature sense of responsibility, and the courage which has marked your willingness to face up to this problem at this time.

The heart of the problem from your standpoint—from the standpoint of the rural electric cooperative systems—is the need for an assured source of greater loan capital in the immediate future at interest rates compatible with the achievement of the purposes of rural electrification. Added to this is the further need of greater flexibility in the use of new capital so that it may be used with maximum efficiency.

Your Federal Government shares this concern with you, for it, too, is interested in the achievement of the purposes of rural electrification. The REA program was undertaken 30 years ago because of that interest. It continues true to that interest.

The Federal Government, however, has an added responsibility. The President, the Congress, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Administrator of REA, where public assistance or public cost is involved have an inescapable responsibility to the public for wise and prudent stewardship of its resources.

The Federal Government is committed to the task of achieving the purposes of rural electrification, and in the words of President Johnson, "The objective of the REA program throughout its existence has been to achieve parity of electric service and costs between city and country."

We are committed to assist you in getting this done, and REA's favorable financing and technical assistance are provided for that purpose. But in the discharge of our responsibilities to the public there must be a continual balancing of assistance against need. We must be careful not to waste the taxpayer's dollar either by giving assistance that is not needed to accomplish the public purposes of rural electrification or by overlooking a means of providing equal assistance at less public expense.

And knowing from experience the high sense of public responsibility the rural electric cooperative leaders have themselves shown over the years in the success of the REA program, I am sure you would expect us—and want us—to do our full duty.

It is in that spirit that we have approached our own studies of future rural electrification needs and watched with interest your studies. It is in that spirit we welcome the opportunity to counsel with you now to see if we can develop acceptable solutions which will meet your needs, our responsibilities, and the aims and purposes of rural electrification.

Our common objective is to build a stronger rural electrification program with greater resources and greater flexibility.

Our common aim is to use these resources as efficiently and as effectively as we can devise, accomplishing the purpose of rural electrification at a minimum of cost —to you and to the public.

I have no proposal to offer—or to sell. We in REA have been studying the problem, as you and your national association have been studying it. In our studies we have established some significant facts and reached some general conclusions on possible approaches to its solution.

My observations offered here today are by no construction to be considered as a proposal to change or not to change the existing law covering REA financing. They are offered simply as matters to be considered by you in shaping your own conclusions and course of action.

Our studies have shown that even with the growing strength of the rural electric cooperatives, the great majority of them still need 2 percent capital if they are to accomplish the objectives of area coverage, parity of rates and service, and develop the reserves necessary to assure stable and continuing operation on into the future.

There is, however, a significant number of borrowers which have now developed a capability of doing all these things and still pay a rate of interest on future financing greater than 2 percent.

If a two-price, or even a multiple-price, financing plan is developed, it is quite possible, in my judgment, to determine on a completely objective, impartial basis, the interest rate needed by each individual loan applicant to accomplish program objectives.

Through the normal feasibility study, which has been a part of REA's loan evaluation procedure since the inception of the program, it is possible to project the costs of full area coverage, the revenues from parity rates, and the margins necessary to develop adequate reserves, and then determine if the applicant has beyond that the revenue capability for paying a rate of interest on the loan in question greater than 2 percent.

Tied to firm concepts of these essential program objectives, which are subject to specific definition and measurement, this determination need not be left to administrative whim or arbitrariness. It can be done by plain, old-fashioned arithmetic.

The NRECA board of directors, as quoted in the report of your "Rural Electric Financing Study," makes three recommendations:

"1. That the present REA 2-percent interest program be kept unchanged for those systems needing it;

"2. That an intermediate financing plan be set up to provide more flexibility in loans; and

"3. That a mechanism be established to provide a way to bring supplemental private money into the program at terms that will enable the systems to grow and carry out their program objectives."

These are important recommendations. They are both thoughtful and constructive. They are the product of exhaustive and expert study and evaluation.

On the basis of our studies of the future financing needs of rural electrification I would certainly concur that the present 2-percent financing available through REA should be continued to the full extent it is needed to accomplish the purposes of the rural electrification program.

I would add that the need for 2-percent financing must be measured in terms of its need to accomplish, in the case of each loan applicant, the program objectives of area coverage, parity of rates and service, and adequate reserves. Need for this assistance must be tied clearly to program purposes and not be left to be decided on the basis of what the traffic will bear.

I would concur, too, in the wisdom of an intermediate financing plan at an interest rate equal to the Federal Government's cost of borrowed money, allowing you in return for the higher interest rate a greater flexibility of use.

I recognize the desirability of bringing supplemental private capital into the program. I would caution you, however, that any device for bringing private capital into the program—to be acceptable—must be able to offer financing at rates of interest that are realistic and usable. The range of usable interest rates for rural systems certainly cannot exceed what the urban-based power companies pay for their long-term borrowed money. This currently runs in the neighborhood of 4½ to 5 percent. Even within the usable range, the usefulness of loan capital in achieving program objectives against the handicaps of even the more mature rural systems is going to be progressively curtailed to the extent it rises above 3½ and 4 percent.

All these thoughts you will want to consider most carefully in forming your own judgment, but there can be no escaping the necessity of coming to a decision. The problem of meeting the future financing needs of your rural systems must be solved, for the needs are already upon us for all to see. They cannot be wished away.

To do nothing, to simply sit tight with the present financing pattern, in my humble judgment, is just a ticket to slow starvation.

Delay involves grave risks. No one can predict the temper of the next Congress with respect to rural electrification matters. The present Congress has demonstrated an understanding of and sympathy for the aims of rural electrification that adds greatly to the prospects for reaching some sound and lasting solution to this problem if it can be done within the next year.

Let no one confuse our consultations in these weeks ahead with the efforts made 7 and 8 years ago to change the interest rate on REA financing.

That was part of a Government-wide drive to apply the fiscal recommendations of the Hoover Commission in which fiscal consideration came first, and program objectives only second, if at all.

There was no real assurance then that the administration would continue the availability of 2 percent financing on any condition, and what individual protests were heard that 2 percent financing could be continued under the proposal advanced were hardly reassuring because there were no clearly defined program objectives, other than area coverage, to which the need for such financing could be related.

And equally important, you were not consulted.

What we are doing now—in 1965—is quite different. We are exploring together not only the need for future financing but the ways and means that can best meet them.

We are agreed, I believe, on what our program objectives are.

We have developed workable measuring sticks for determining the appropriateness of higher cost financing or the need for the present 2-percent financing on any loan application.

And this administration is prepared to assure you again—and again—that it supports the continuation of 2-percent loans for rural electrification to the full extent of that need.

It also stands ready and urges you to join in developing a suitable pattern for supplemental financing to provide additional loan resources for those borrowers which no longer are dependent upon the 2-percent rate.

I could close with no better bit of advice than that offered last July by President Johnson, when he spoke to the NRECA Board of Directors in the Rose Garden of the White House.

The President said: "If you do not look far into the future and provide the necessary leadership, there is not going to be much rural America * * * You must take the lead in planning today for what is going to happen 35 years from now. You must take the lead in planning for a fuller utilization of rural America—providing the power and the service to meet your share of the future's demands."

On that basis your studies and ours should provide a common ground on which we can move forward together toward a stronger, greater rural electrification program to the benefit of rural America—and to the credit of all America.

ABOLITION OF THE DEATH PENALTY

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in 1964 the voters of my State abolished the death penalty. This pattern is running through the legislatures of many of our States. One of the active proponents of the long-needed reform was the capable young district attorney of Multnomah County, Portland, Oreg., George van Hoomissen.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Journal of the National District Attorneys issue for August 1965 be included in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Death Penalty: Reformation or Vindictive Justice?—With No Effective Deterrence Exhibited, Capital Punishment Only Assuages Society's Vindictive Bent

(By George Van Hoomissen)

(Note.—The author, a graduate of Portland University and Georgetown University Law Center, has been the district attorney of Multnomah County, Portland, Oreg., since 1962. He is an instructor in criminal law at the Northwestern College of Law in Portland. While district attorney he accepted the cochairmanship of the lawyers' group associated with the Oregon Committee To Abolish the Death Penalty. In 1964 the Oregon voters abolished the death penalty by a vote of 455,654 to 302,105. Under the provisions of the repeal measure, life imprisonment with the possibility of parole after 10 years was automatically substituted as the penalty for first-degree murder.

Within a few months after I assumed office, I found myself flanked by reporters wanting to know "Will the State ask for the death penalty in this case?" Though unrehearsed my answer seemed almost automatic. "It seems to me that it would be rather presumptuous for me to tell a jury that the people of my State require the death of anyone. Under our law the jury determines the penalty for first-degree murder under comprehensive instructions from the trial judge. If the jury is sufficiently competent to determine the guilt or innocence of the accused, they are equally competent to assess the appropriate penalty without any assistance from the district attorney."

This position represented a rather dramatic change in the policy of the office. Less than a year earlier I had been on the opposite of the table, serving as court-appointed counsel for a young man accused of the "butcher slaying" of a Portland housewife. This was my third first-degree murder defense in less than 2 years. My client was charged with having raped, murdered, and dismembered his victim. We offered to plead guilty to second-degree murder, which under Oregon law would have meant an automatic life sentence. My predecessor in office refused to even consider the matter. "The State will demand the death penalty," he advised the press. The trial lasted 3 weeks and the jury deliberated 3 days before returning a verdict of murder with recommendation for mercy—an automatic life sentence.

After the jury was discharged I had an opportunity to discuss the case with several of the jurors. At no time, they told me, had they ever seriously considered imposing the death penalty on my client. Seven of the 12 jurors had voted to find the defendant not guilty by reason of insanity.

AS A STUDENT OF CRIMINAL LAW

When I studied criminal law under Edward Bennett Williams at Georgetown, I never dreamed that 10 years later I would be the prosecutor in my State's largest county. While I was greatly impressed by Ed Williams' forensic ability and persuasive techniques, I did not accept without qualification everything he said about those "poor, innocent defendants languishing in our Nation's jails." But in reflecting I now realize from personal observations that a statement often made by Williams in class and now contained in his book "One Man's Freedom" paints an accurate picture of capital punishment as it is administered in this country today—a penalty which is inhuman, unjust and unequal.

As Williams puts it, "It is inhuman because its deterrent effects are now recognized as a myth. It is unjust because it leaves no remedy for a mistake. It is unequal because it is exacted almost exclusively of the poor and ignorant."

THE STATE AS AN EXECUTIONER

I do not believe that capital punishment is immoral per se. On the contrary, I believe that the State possesses the right of capital punishment in appropriate cases. The existence of a right, however, does not necessarily require the exercise of that right by the State. I believe there are clear and compelling reasons why the State should not exercise its right of capital punishment any longer. A dozen or more States have abolished capital punishment and nearly half the States now use the death penalty so sparingly that it plays almost no part in their program of law enforcement and criminal treatment. That the long-term trend is toward abolition is unmistakable.

Nor do I believe that capital punishment deters other persons from committing crimes which provide for the death penalty. While there has been some research into this matter, the paucity of reliable statistics precludes my acceptance of the "deterrence" theory. At least I feel that the proponents of the ultimate penalty have not proven their case in this regard. For every report which announces that the death penalty is a deterrent to the commission of capital crimes by others, I can produce an equally reliable survey which concludes that it is not a deterrent.

It seems to me that in this controversy the burden of proof must fall upon the advocate of the ultimate penalty. Taking another man's life can only be justified if other means of providing protection for society are not reasonably available or if it can be positively shown that the ultimate penalty provides a real deterrent to the commission of capital crimes by others. As a general statement our penal institutions are secure and life imprisonment does afford adequate protection for society from persons convicted of capital crimes. If convicted murderers are paroled prematurely, the parole system is deficient. The remedy, of course, is to improve parole procedures rather than execute the offender.

Another argument which persuades me that the State should not exercise its right of capital punishment is the ever-present danger of our executing an innocent person. The finality of the death penalty makes it impossible to correct those errors of judgment which occasionally find their way into the administration of the criminal law. In the words of Judge Jerome Frank, "No one knows how many innocent men, erroneously convicted of murder, have been put to death by American governments, for once a convicted man is dead, all interest in vindicating him generally evaporates."

I have spoken with many prison officials—wardens, counselors and guards, and almost without exception, they have advised me that they are opposed to capital punishment. The warden of the Oregon State Penitentiary, Clarence T. Gladden, a veteran of over 40 years of State and Federal institutional service, has testified on several occasions before the Oregon Legislature in opposition to capital punishment. Clinton T. Duffy, who presided over 90 executions while he was warden at California's San Quentin Penitentiary, has campaigned nationally against the ultimate penalty. Warden Duffy's case against capital punishment is a convincing indictment of the ultimate penalty because it is spoken by a professional who found himself repulsed each time he was required to serve as executioner under statutes he believed unjust and unnecessary.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT DOES NOT DETER

Until I can be convinced that capital punishment actually deters other persons from committing capital crimes—until I can be persuaded of the infallibility of our system of criminal justice which will insure that no innocent person will be executed—until I can be certain that the poor, the friendless and the ignorant will receive equal protection of the law and until I can be certain that the ultimate penalty is required for the protection of society and that other means of providing that protection are not reasonably available—I will not ask any judge or jury to order another man's execution.

To me an individual's attitude toward capital punishment, like his preference of religion, is a matter of individual conscience. This article was not written with the idea in mind of attempting to convince any advocate of the ultimate penalty that his position is immoral, unjust or uncivilized. It is an appeal for consideration of the thinking of professionals such as Dr. Sheldon Glueck, who tells us, "The presence of the death penalty as the keystone of our penal system bedevils the administration of criminal justice all the way down the line and is a major stumbling block in the path of general reform of the treatment of crime and criminals."

Capital punishment is a manifestation of society's reluctant admission that it has utterly and completely failed to cope with the problems of the individual who has committed a most heinous crime. Yet society must cope with the offender and it does so by using the expedient of removing the offender permanently from its midst. Out of sight, out of mind. Remove the offender, remove the problem. Who are we trying to kid but ourselves?

REFORMATION NOT VINDICATION

I have still another, somewhat provincial, basis for opposing the death penalty. Article I, section 15 of the constitution of Oregon, provides: "Laws for the punishment of crime shall be founded on the principles of reformation, and not of vindictive justice." I have never been able to reconcile capital punishment with this policy contained in our State constitution.. I will accept that the more specific provisions of constitutional law will prevail as against the general statement of policy contained in article I, section 15. Nevertheless, it seems clear to me that the Founding Fathers intended maximum emphasis be placed upon reformation and rehabilitation rather than upon an "eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" approach to the administration of criminal justice.

THE END OF THE DEATH PENALTY

In a 1960 message to the California Legislature on the subject of capital punishment, Gov. Edmund G. Brown concluded: "The naked, simple fact is that the death penalty has been a gross failure. Beyond its horror and incivility, it has neither protected the innocent nor deterred the wicked. The recurrent spectacle of publicly sanctioned killing has cheapened human life and dignity without the redeeming grace which comes from justice meted out swiftly, evenly, humanely."

I will predict that within a decade the majority of States will abolish capital punishment for all crimes save a few minor exceptions, such as killing a police officer. The legislatures of a dozen or more States have flirted with repeal this year. As increasing demands for abolition are heard throughout the Nation, proponents of the ultimate penalty will be expected to prove their claims of deterrence and necessity. The burden of proof will naturally and logically shift to the advocate of the supreme penalty rather than remain with the abolitionist. Thoughtful voters will be favorably impressed with the premise that the State must affirmatively justify executions. The increasing emphasis upon the sanctity of human life and individual dignity which is being manifested in so many other areas these days in the United States and around the world will compel many thoughtful people to conclude that the State, in this instance at least, has failed to sustain the burden of proof, not only beyond a reasonable doubt but even by a preponderance of the evidence.

Warden Lewis E. Lawes of Sing Sing fame expressed my sentiments forcefully when he observed that "the death penalty is a relic of savagery, perpetrated by custom and in ignorance, maintained by false assumptions and consummated in a killing that is legal in name only; it is illogical and inconsistent with religion and morality; it condones an act of an agent that would be murder for an individual; it carries out in secrecy what would be revolting in public; it is manmade and fallible and, therefore, subject to gross miscarriage of justice; it is ineffective and sets an example for murder."

WHY CAN'T WE MAKE CARS SAFER?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, a recent New York Herald Tribune article was headlined: "Highway Safety—Nation's Mood for Improvement." The hearings on the Federal role in traffic safety which we began 8 months ago in the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization have convinced me of this fact—that the people are fed up with excuses and inaction and they are demanding that something be done to stop the terrible carnage that takes place daily on the roads and streets of our country. The ugliest aspect of American highways today is its death toll and we must begin to pay as much attention to it as we do to other aspects of highway improvement and beautification.

The Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations intends to delve into every aspect of the traffic safety problem. We have already heard testimony from the heads of various Federal agencies involved in the traffic safety area, the President's Committee for Traffic Safety, and the leading officials of the Nation's big four automakers. Next year we intend to hear from State and local officials, representatives of the insurance industry, private safety organizations, and experts in the field of traffic safety and accident research.

All the members of the subcommittee: Senator John L. McClellan, Senator Ernest Gruening, Senator Robert F. Kennedy, Senator Fred R. Harris, Senator Joseph M. Montoya, Senator Jacob K. Javits, Senator Milward L. Simpson, and Senator Carl T. Curtis, have taken an active role in the hearings, evidencing the fact that the problem of traffic safety exists in all our States and throughout the Nation. The Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy] has been especially helpful and, in the current issue of Popular Science magazine, has written an article expressing his views and ideas on how to improve the traffic safety situation. His strong support and endorsement as cosponsor of my bill, S. 2231, is encouraging and I am confident that in the next session of Congress this measure will receive the attention and support of the administration and Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator Kennedy's article, "Why Can't We Make Cars Safer?" be inserted in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Why Can't We Make Cars Safer?

(By Senator Robert F. Kennedy)

(P.S.—Exclusive: A Senator's bold plan to create a National Highway Safety Center—a $150 million program for safer cars and roads.)

Nearly half of the 47,000 Americans who die in automobile accidents each year might survive if they were riding in cars that were properly constructed for survival.

This surprising fact should shock the conscience of all of us who have prided ourselves on American engineering and technical competence. Even though traffic safety experts tells that the biggest cause of auto fatalities is driver error, the fact remains that many of the victims die under survivable conditions. Elmer Paul of the U.S. Public Health Service Accident Prevention Bureau estimates that if our cars were built differently and certain safety devices were used, 43 percent of those killed in autos might be alive today.

Passenger car fatalities are shockingly high in contrast to other forms of transportation. A comparison of all forms of transportation reveals that autos are the deadliest vehicles to ride in. Here are the startling figures:

Fatalities per 100 million passenger miles:	
Private cars	5.7
Bus	0.13
Railroad	0.05
Domestic airlines	0.14

In actual numbers there were 172 persons killed on domestic flights last year, while ship accidents took 43 lives and 700 people were killed in railroad accidents.

These statistics reveal that our present approach to traffic safety is not dong the job. We also know that our auto accident rate will climb as more and more drivers pour onto our streets and highways.

I do not think that we have to accept this unnecessary toll of dead and wounded on our roads as inevitable. We must act promptly to make our highways safe.

Why don't we use the same imaginative techniques that we are using to win the race to the moon to eliminate the most deadly features of today's cars?

As Senator Abraham Ribicoff stated recently, it is incomprehensible that we have not been able to develop a steering wheel that does not impale the driver in crashes at 60 miles per hour when we have known about this problem for a decade.

The automobile manufacturers maintain research and testing divisions to make their autos safer. They also contribute to nonprofit research organizations which investigate highway safety. The industry has used some of the findings to produce somewhat safer cars since 1955. But the improvements have not gone nearly far enough.

Although the industry earned about $2.5 billion last year, a Senate subcommittee I am serving on learned, from the Department of Commerce's Highway Safety Board, that the industry spent only about $11 million on basic safety research. During the Senate subcommittee hearings last July, the head of one of the automobile manufacturing companies could not even tell me how much his firm was spending on safety investigations.

The automakers have been slow to adopt many of the recommendations arising from the research of safety groups.

Immediate action is vital because our traffic-accident rate has begun to climb again. Twenty years of progress in annually reducing the fatality rate was broken in 1962. This was reflected in both absolute numbers and the number of fatalities per mile traveled, as shown in this chart:

Deaths per 100 million miles:	*Total fatalities*
1961: 5.2	38,091
1962: 5.3	40,804
1963: 5.5	43,564
1964: 5.7	47,700

Our increasing accident rate will not be improved by the additional drivers that will be licensed as our population rapidly climbs toward 300 million. Of the 93 million licensed drivers today, over 30 percent are located in seven States that already have well developed highway systems. There will be many more cars on these roads in the coming years. And this will mean more accidents if we continue on our present path of self-destruction.

A BOLD NEW APPROACH TO CAR SAFETY

To reverse this deadly trend, I believe we need a Federal traffic-safety research agency, patterned on Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory's automobile crash injury research program. This group could institute a massive information system to give us necessary facts on all but minor accidents. Our experience with other Federal agencies that conduct research on foods, drugs, air travel, and disease has demonstrated that this is an effective way to solve our most vital problems of health and safety.

A comprehensive traffic-safety program will be expensive. We now spend about $5,500,000 on public auto-safety research. An increase to $150 million a year, as I recommended to the Senate, would give us an effective auto-safety program. Yet even a program that cost twice that amount would be a small price compared to the $8 billion that traffic accidents cost us each year—$40 for every American.

This figure includes measurable property damage and medical and hospital costs. It does not include costs to employers of off-the-job accidents, absenteeism, training, recruiting, and the permanent loss of irreplaceable talent, or the human suffering.

A $150 million program would cost the equivalent of 75 cents per person, or $1.62 per driver each year. I think we can afford this to make our cars and highways safe.

Once established, the Federal auto-safety agency could conduct research on how the auto industry can build a car which is less likely to crash and in which driver and passengers can better withstand the damaging impact of collisions; recommend legislation setting standards for production of better cars and safer highways.

WHERE WE COULD SAVE LIVES

The most urgent areas in which research might save lives are:

Seat belts: The use of these, harnesses, or other methods of controlling occupant movement during a collision. Belts and harnesses are fairly primitive methods of restraint. A more effective method would not depend on leaving it up to the individual to take positive action such as fastening a belt. One promising approach is a balloon-like device that inflates automatically in a crash and holds the occupant firmly in the seat. But a lot more research is needed to perfect it.

Interior padding: To what extent can the inside surfaces of the passenger compartment be made safe for high force impact?

Door locks: How to keep doors closed and keep people from being thrown out of cars on impact.

Bodies and chassis: We need to know more about how energy from an impact can be absorbed in external structures and still keep the passenger compartment intact in a crash.

Seats: How can they provide better support for the driver and how can they be kept from tearing loose from their anchorages, or jackknifing?

Brakes: We need brake systems that: (1) stop a car traveling at high speeds more quickly, reliably, and without swerving; (2) do not fail totally when one component of the system fails.

Visibility: How can we give the driver a better view of the road and traffic ahead of him and behind him? Especially acute is the problem of drivers being blinded by oncoming headlights at night.

A SAFER CAR IS ONLY PART OF THE ANSWER

Besides conducting its own research into these areas, the new agency could effectively monitor the private research and sponsor research projects that are best performed by private institutions.

But building a safer car is only part of the answer to the overall problem. Additional research is needed into improving roads, median dividers, road signs, and above all, human driving factors.

We find now that very little is actually known about what automobile models are dangerous, or the location of dangerous places on our highways and streets so they can be promptly corrected. A relatively simple information system could tell us if a particular automobile model is dangerous. We could borrow from aviation and "ground" that model until the problem is solved.

Right now safety experts believe that mechanical failure, such as a broken tie rod, bad brakes, or tire failure, ranks low as a cause of accidents. The largest single factor, experts believe, is driver error—including the 7.4 percent of traffic accidents caused by drinking. But we really do not know whether it is the road, the driver, or the vehicle that causes the accident. We need this information if we are to make our highways safe.

The Federal Government can help to clarify the great confusion in traffic-safety planning, regulation, and enforcement. Only 18 States require annual safety inspections and standards differ widely. In some areas inspections are performed in private garages, and in others by public officials.

Some States don't require automatic turn signals that may be mandatory in the next State. Other States prohibit four-way blinker systems for tail and headlights, while some States encourage motorists to use them.

All 50 States have their own licensing requirements for vehicles and operators, and over 8,000 local and State police forces enforce these regulations. Standards for planning and constructing highways and streets vary widely. All this results in confusion.

The Federal Government has helped to standardize some elements which may lead to greater highway safety. The Bureau of Public Roads, which oversees the construction of the Federal Highway System, has contributed greatly in cutting the death toll on highways built under this system. The Bureau's recommendations on grading, banking of lanes, and other safety standards have helped hold down the fatality rate for these highways to 2.8 persons for every 100 million miles traveled compared with the 5.7 for all roads combined.

The General Services Administration, which is the purchasing agent for the 60,000 cars the United States buys each year, has announced it will require 17 safety features on its 1967 models. As a result of these requirements, most of the major automobile manufacturers will incorporate many of these features in the 1966 models.

There are other precedents for Federal action to promote car safety. The Division of Accident Prevention of the Public Health Service, the Commerce Department's Office of Highway Safety, and the Interstate Commerce Commission all play a role in highway safety. But the total annual expenditures of these agencies aren't quite $5,500,000.

I think that our high fatality and accident rate can be lowered if our car manufacturers place greater emphasis on car safety. Even a small portion of the industry's $2.5 billion profits, spent on auto safety, could make a major difference.

There is also much that research has revealed that hasn't been put into use to cut fatal auto accidents. The auto industry could effectively implement many of these safety features now.

IS SAFETY REALLY MORE EXPENSIVE?

What appears to be stopping them is the conviction held by each company that they would be at a competitive disadvantage if they increased their costs with safety features that the general public has demonstrated an unwillingness to pay extra for. Obviously, the only way out of this dilemma is to require proven safety features so that they are removed from the area of price competition. This would spike the principal auto industry excuse that safety doesn't sell. We may also find that safety doesn't cost more—on a mass scale.

Disk brakes, standard equipment on some European economy car models, are used only on a few higher priced American cars (they are extra cost options on some lower priced cars). These brakes offer more stability in stopping than the standard drum brakes. Many American cars now lose directional control under heavy braking.

More stability and better control of the car at high speeds can be achieved with present hardware and technical know-how. One big factor is the lack of adequate shock-absorber control on American production cars. On moderately rough roads they bounce around dangerously and sway enough in high-speed maneuvers to risk loss of control by the average driver. Even the modest amount of control exercised by the shocks on new cars is soon diminished seriously because they wear out too soon. Better and more durable shock absorbers than those furnished as original equipment are available.

Enough research has already been done to enable manufacturers to equip cars with tires that meet basic safety standards. Senator GAYLORD NELSON has introduced a bill that would set Federal standards for tires. But even if manufacturers meet these standards, more safety education and better inspection regulations are also needed to remind drivers that tires must be checked often and replaced when unsafe.

Very often passengers can't benefit from the cushioning effect auto bodies afford on impact because they are thrown from the car when the doors fly open. It's standard practice in stock car races for all cars to be bolted and strapped shut. The average driver can't do this, but perhaps a bank-vault type sliding-door latch would offer greater protection than those in use.

Regulations for safety: For all other means of transportation we have a pattern of cooperative State-Federal regulation. Planes buses, trains, and ships are kept safe through the enforcement of basic safety regulations. We require today that railroad passenger cars be made of steel instead of wood that can splinter in crashes. Minimum lifeboat standards exist for steamships, and licensing and operating standards have been set up for private and commercial aviation. We know what these regulations have accomplished.

The Federal Aviation Agency spent over $6 million this year on research. With this fairly small sum, the FAA helps to provide an almost accident-free commercial aviation system in our country. We spend $1.3 billion for health research. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration is spending several billion dollars to insure a high degree of safety for our astronauts. I think we can afford $150 million each year to make our cars and highways safe.

And we can make cars safer. If it takes Federal regulation in order to reduce our tragic traffic injury and fatality rate, responsible Americans will demand that these regulations be established.

As a first step, I hope that all Americans join me in supporting a bill I am cosponsoring that will create a National Highway Traffic Safety Center.

NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, a recent column by the distinguished journalist Roscoe Drummond, Washington Post, August 29, 1965, recounts a series of suggestions by Dr. Edward Teller as to how the United States should respond to the problem of nuclear proliferation. In particular, Dr. Teller suggests that the United States should not start a preventative war with Red China and should not provide nuclear explosives to selected smaller countries. These suggestions appear both sensible and compatible with long-range U.S. interests.

The column goes on, however, to ascribe to Dr. Teller two further suggestions: do not rely on a nonproliferation treaty which, without enforcement, is "likely to be as self-defeating as was prohibition in the United States"; do, without delay, put the greatest possible stress on the defense against missiles as a means of securing the lives of the great majority of American people against a nuclear attack by China or other new nuclear powers. It is these two suggestions which deserve to be examined in light of the issues which the prevention of nuclear proliferation involves.

While an international pledge not to disseminate or accept nuclear weapons may not be sufficient by itself to prevent further nuclear proliferation, such an agreement would be a key component of any effective nonproliferation program. For a country to decide against going nuclear, it is necessary that the voices of moderation in that country prevail over those interests which, for a variety of reasons, favor pursuit of a nuclear weapons program. The fact that such voices of moderation can cite an international obligation which subjects them—and their potential adversaries—to international opprobrium for pursuing a nuclear weapons program may well be crucial in such internal debate. In the absence of an international nonproliferation treaty, the factions favoring the pursuit of nuclear weapons programs would be in a far stronger position to play upon regional rivalries and mutual suspicions as a means of edging a country toward a nuclear weapons program.

The second suggestion, that the United States should, without delay, put the greatest possible stress on defense against missiles, cannot be decided only in light of current fears regarding a future nuclear threat by China or other new nuclear powers. As President Johnson and other Government officials have pointed out, a Chinese capability to threaten the United States with ICBM's is many years in the future. Whereas a Chinese nuclear threat may be an important factor in some future decision on U.S. missile defense policy, there are other more immediate considerations which appear to be far more relevant to such decisions at the present time.

In particular, it is to be hoped that any United States or Soviet decision regarding missile defense would take into account the likely consequences of such decisions for the United States-Soviet arms competition. While the Soviets are believed to have some missile defense installations under development, these installations would not be effective against the existing U.S. arsenal of intercontinental missiles. In the event that the Soviets were to deploy a large-scale defensive system which did appear to be effective against existing U.S. forces, then the United States could be expected to increase its offensive forces to compensate—or perhaps overcompensate—for such Soviet defenses. We must expect that similar considerations will guide Soviet responses to missile defense deployment by the United States.

For these reasons, pursuit of a large-scale program of missile defense by either the United States or U.S.S.R. involves a very immediate danger that another spiral in the nuclear arms race would follow. Aside from the dangers inherent in such an arms race, increased emphasis on nuclear weapons by the existing nuclear powers is also likely to increase substantially the pressures for nuclear acquisition in countries not now possessing nuclear arsenals. By thus encouraging proliferation, pursuit of a large-scale program of missile defense could also be a self-defeating response to the proliferation problem.

The degree to which nonproliferation pledges and other nonproliferation measures would be "as self-defeating as was prohibition in the United States" may depend largely upon how addicted nations become to nuclear power before appropriate agreements are reached. It is for this reason that time is a crucial issue and that those countries which have developed nuclear arsenals must take a sober look at the problems which nuclear proliferation poses.

It is also important to remember that policy problems such as these must be resolved by national leaders and not by scientists who, while free to express their opinons, are no source of extraordinary wisdom on such matters. As Dr. Teller himself has stated in connection with another crucial decision; namely, the decision to proceed with the construction of the hydrogen bomb:

> It is not the scientist's job to determine whether a hydrogen bomb should be constructed, whether it should be used, or how it should be used. This responsibility rests with the American people and with their chosen representatives.

Such sentiments would seem to run counter to Mr. Drummond's contention that "in light of his—Dr. Teller's—special credentials, his views carry great and urgent weight."

I ask unanimous consent that this article by Mr. Drummond be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 29, 1965]

THE TELLER WARNING: NUCLEAR PHYSICIST OUTLINES WAY TO PROTECT UNITED STATES AGAINST A RED CHINA ATTACK

(By Roscoe Drummond)

When Dr. Edward Teller talks about nuclear weapons, he knows what he is talking about. When he warns against the spread of nuclear weapons and the possibility of their use by a reckless nation, we ought to heed his views.

Dr. Teller knows that at least a dozen more nations have it within their potential to produce atomic bombs and he does not believe that any self-denying, unenforcible treaty will prevent their spread.

He is profoundly concerned that in the foreseeable future Red China will have the means to threaten and to attack the United States with nuclear weapons and he urges that we not just sit around hoping it won't happen.

He believes there are things we can and ought to be doing. He first warns against doing the wrong things. In a special report he prepared for the American Security Council, he says:

Don't rely on the unreliable. Don't assume that the spread of nuclear weapons will be stopped by a treaty pledging not to produce them because such a pledge without the possibility of enforcement "is likely to be as self-defeating as was prohibition in the United States."

Don't start a preventive war with Red China. Don't bomb Peiping's nuclear plants. Such action "would create discord, hate, and it would plant the seeds of disorder rather than point the way toward law."

Don't encourage proliferation by providing nuclear explosives to selected smaller countries on the theory that this would provide an "equalizer" between the strong and the weak. One objective is that the Soviet Union has already developed a missile defense against anything short of saturation bombing.

If these are the wrong things to do, what can and should be done? Perhaps only the experts can judge Dr. Teller's proposal, but in light of his special credentials, his views carry great and urgent weight.

"Specifically," he says, "the United States should, without delay, put the greatest possible stress on the defense against missiles. At present we are spending on this important enterprise less than 1 percent of our military budget.

"By appropriate research and by reasonably early installation of units near our big population centers, we can secure the lives of the great majority of the American people against a Chinese attack and we can make sure that the less cautious partner of the Communist axis will not be able to cripple the United States by a surprise move. In this way we can remain safe from the Chinese for at least two decades. We shall also be safe from any additional powers that are going to acquire nuclear explosives in the coming years."

Two extra dividends would come from this development.

With a missile defense for the big population centers of the United States, it would mean that our nuclear deterrent would be far more credible both to our allies and our enemies.

It would also mean that we would be able to help our Atlantic allies acquire a missile defense for their principal cities.

At this point, Dr. Teller strongly urges a common Atlantic research project.

"What we urgently need," he concludes, "is meaningful research to establish such a missile defense. Why don't we do it together?"

THE ENDURING SIGNIFICANCE OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, in a letter dated August 30, 1965, Adm. H. G. Rickover informed me of the successful completion of the first sea trials of the U.S.S. *Benjamin Franklin*, our 30th polaris nuclear submarine. All of us are familiar with the key role which Admiral Rickover has played from the very beginning in our nuclear submarine program. Not so well known is his keen knowledge of American history.

In his letter to me of August 30, the admiral gave an inspiring account of the life and continuing significance of Benjamin Franklin which I think every school boy should read. I well remember my own first reading of the remarkable Franklin autobiography. It is my hope that Americas young men and women will become familiar with this important book and that Franklin's life will remain an inspiration to future generations of Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that Admiral Rickover's letter be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S.S. "Benjamin Franklin,"
At Sea, North Atlantic, August 30, 1965.

The Honorable George S. McGovern,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator McGovern: We have just successfully completed the first sea trials of U.S.S. *Benjamin Franklin*, our 30th Polaris nuclear submarine. We also have in operation 22 attack type nuclear submarines, making a total of 52. The *Benjamin Franklin* was built by the Electric Boat Division, General Dynamics Corp., Groton, Conn.

This ship is named for Benjamin Franklin (1706–90), one of the most illustrious of our Founding Fathers. A plain man of the people, his life was the American success story writ large. In his autobiography he speaks of his "lowly beginnings" and notes with quiet pride that he "emerged from the poverty and obscurity" of his birth to "a state of affluence and some degree of reputation in the world." He did so purely on merit for he was, in every sense of the word, a self-made man, owing little if anything to luck or the assistance of others, never pushing ahead at the expense of a fellow man.

Franklin was the youngest son of a poor tallow chandler who had migrated to Boston from England and married as his second wife the daughter of a former indentured serving maid. With 17 children to raise, he could give Benjamin only 2 to 3 years of schooling, but he encouraged him to study on his own, a habit which was to remain with Franklin all his life. At 10 the boy went to work in the family shop; at 12 he was apprenticed to his half brother to learn the printing trade, this being considered a suitable vocation for one whose love of books was already manifest.

In later life Franklin often remarked that he could not remember a time when he did not read. Books were his teachers. Through them he made himself a well-educated man. Taking the best authors as his models, he worked hard at perfecting his writing, eventually achieving a simple, lucid style. His thirst for knowledge never ceased. Since he wanted to read foreign books, he decided at 27—a busy young merchant—to teach himself to do so. "I soon made myself so much the master of the French," he remarked, "as to be able to read the books with ease. I then undertook the Italian." Later on, "with little painstaking, acquired as much of the Spanish as to read their books also." He read not only for instruction but for enjoyment. His taste was catholic. All his life, men of learning and position, who would ordinarily not bother with an artisan, sought Franklin's company. He supposed it was because "reading had so improved my mind that my conversation was valued."

At 17 Franklin had learned all his brother could teach him and was ready to make his own way in the world. He went to New York but could find no work there, so continued on to Philadelphia. This is how he describes his arrival there after a long and uncomfortable trip—walking 50 miles, getting nearly shipwrecked, and helping to row a boat part of the way: "I was dirty from my journey; my pockets were stuffed out with shirts and stockings; I knew no soul, nor where to look for lodging. I was fatigued with traveling, rowing, and want of rest. I was very hungry and my whole stock of cash consisted of a Dutch dollar * * *." He bought three large bread rolls. Wandering about town, munching, he met a fellow traveler. He gave her and her child two of his rolls. Thus did Franklin enter the town that was to become his permanent home, where he would rise to wealth and fame.

Seven years later he owned his own printshop, a stationery store, and a newspaper. He had in the meantime perfected his art by working for 18 months in England and could do the most intricate and difficult print jobs. At 26 he began the highly profitable annual publication of Poor Richard's Almanac. He managed his affairs so ably that at 42 he retired with an income equivalent to that of a royal Governor. Though he was good at it, moneymaking never interested him, except as a means to obtain leisure for the things he really enjoyed: reading, study, scientific experimentation, social discourse, and correspondence with men of similar interests.

While still a journeyman printer, he had founded a club for sociability and self-improvement, called the Junto, of which he later said that it was "the best school of philosophy, morals, and politics" then existing in Pennsylvania. Its membership of about 12 consisted of alert, intelligent young artisans, tradesmen, and clerks who liked to read and debate. They met Friday evenings to discuss history, ethics, poetry, travels, mechanic arts and science (then called natural philosophy). It has been said of this group that it "brought the enlightenment in a leather apron to Philadelphia."

Franklin, who was full of ideas for improving life in Philadelphia and the Colonies in general, submitted all his proposals to the Junto where they were debated. Once accepted, members worked hard to get them put into effect. As a result, improvements were made in paving, lighting, and policing the town; a volunteer fire department and militia were formed; a municipal hospital was established; the foundations were laid for what became the University of Pennsylvania and the American Philosophical Society. Of most lasting importance, perhaps, was Franklin's plan for a subscription library, the first in the Colonies. Access to books, he felt, meant that "the doors to wisdom were never shut." The idea caught on. He noted with satisfaction that the numerous libraries springing up everywhere "have improved the general conversation of Americans, made the common tradesmen and farmers as intelligent as most gentlemen from other countries, and perhaps have contributed in some degree to the stand so generally made throughout the Colonies in defense of their privileges." The value of knowledge to man and society has never been put more succinctly.

When he was 40, Franklin discovered electricity. It was then a sort of magic, a parlor trick. Franklin—ably supported by his Junto—threw himself into experimentations and developed a workable theory which he proved in his famous kite experiment. In the 6 years between 1746 and 1752 his contributions to electricity changed it from a curiosity to a science, and in the process made him world famous. His writings on electricity were compared with Newton's optics; he became the friend of most contemporary scientists, was made a member of virtually every scientific society and received honorary degrees from 20 universities. He was the first American scientist to win universal acclaim; the first American author to have his books translated and read as widely in Europe as in America. When he was sent to Paris, as America's first Ambassador to a major power, the admiration of France for Franklin's scientific achievement in catching lightning and putting it to man's use contributed not a little to the success of his mission: winning the help of France to the revolutionary cause.

As a man of leisure, Franklin found himself more and more drawn into public service, this being expected of anyone who had the time and ability to serve. He became a member of the Pennsylvania legislature, the Committee of Five charged with drafting the Declaration of Independence, the Second Continental Congress and the Constitutional Convention. In one way or another, he represented America abroad a total of 25 years, becoming an exceedingly skillful diplomat. His statement, in hearings before Parliament, of the case of the colonies against the hated Stamp Act was masterly and helped bring about the repeal of this act. He was among the first to recognize that not merely "taxation" but "legislation in general" without representation could not be borne by Englishmen, whether they lived at home or abroad. The bond uniting England and its colonies, he argued, was the King, not Parliament. Had his "dominion status theory" been accepted, the war might have been prevented but, as he sadly remarked, "there was not enough wisdom."

At 65, Franklin began his autobiography, intending it for his son. When pressure of public duties interrupted work on the book, one of his friends pleaded with him to complete it. All that had happened to Franklin, he urged, was of great historic interest since it was "connected with the detail of the manners and situation of a rising people." Moreover, the way he had planned and conducted his life was "a sort of key and explained many things that all men ought to have once explained to them, to give them a chance of becoming wise by foresight."

His philosophy of life, the virtues he cultivated—competent workmanship, honesty, industry, and frugality—are within everyone's grasp; they are as important to a good and successful life today as in his time. No American child ought to grow to adulthood without having read the autobiography of this talented, wise, and good man, who personified all that is best in America. "Merely by being himself," wrote Mark van Doren, "he dignified and glorified his country."

Respectfully,

H. G. RICKOVER.

BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DEFICIT—DECLINE OF EXPORTS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I have often brought to the attention of the Senate the fact that U.S. exports of manufactured goods abroad is dependent upon the ability of the exporters to obtain the credit necessary to finance these exports. But our Government is now pledged to a "voluntary program of restraint" in making this credit available to the exporters. And what has been the result of this program? In 1964 our country enjoyed a $6.9 billion trade surplus. In 1965, we are faced with a prospective reduction of that trade surplus by some $1½ to $2 billion; a loss which more than covers the anticipated 1965 balance-of-payments deficit. I have always maintained that the inclusion of export credit under the voluntary program is both shortsighted and self-defeating, and a policy which could only lead to the stagnation of exports with the resultant effect this would have upon employment, income and tax revenues in this country. It is indeed gratifying to learn that the Vice President agrees with me in this respect. I would like to call your attention to an article which appeared in the Journal of Commerce on October 19, 1965, under the headline "If Export Trade Suffers HUMPHREY Hints Easing of Foreign Loan Curb" in which were printed excerpts of the Vice President's speech before a meeting of the National Export Expansion Council during which he stated:

> We must restore the dynamic, upward movement of exports which we experienced in 1963 and 1964.
>
> If, as some businessmen and bankers contend, the inclusion of export financing within the foreign loan restraint program is adversely affecting exports, we would like to know about it with specific cases and examples so that appropriate remedies may be applied.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to insert the remarks made by Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY to the National Export Expansion Council in Washington, D.C., on October 18, 1965, in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY TO THE NATIONAL EXPORT EXPANSION COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 18, 1965

The National Export Expansion Council is helping to achieve a solution to one of the highest priorities we face: I mean reducing our balance-of-payments deficit and maintaining world confidence in the dollar.

We can help do this by expanding our exports and increasing our favorable trade balance.

More than ever we need your advice and recommendations.

I will speak frankly: This year our export expansion program is lagging.

The President and I are deeply concerned that the $1½ to $2 billion reduction in our trade surplus—which is the prospect for 1965—may be greater than the total deficit we will incur this year in our international accounts.

If we could have maintained the $6.9 billion trade surplus we achieved last year we could have achieved this year a surplus in our payments accounts for the first time since 1957.

Imports continue to rise as our national prosperity increases—which is natural.

But our exports have not risen as they did last year.

We must restore the dynamic, upward movement of exports which we experienced in 1963 and 1964.

I understand that you are concentrating much of your attention on three of the major institutional problems which may be making it difficult for American business to compete abroad.

You are setting up action committees to assess how U.S. overseas sales are being affected by Government policies related to export financing and credit, by disparities which exist in ocean freight rates, and by tax policies pursued by our Government and the governments of our foreign competitors.

Because these action groups will include businessmen, bankers, accountants, lawyers, and others expert in the problems of international trade, their recommendations can pave the way for further improvements in each of these program areas.

President Johnson, in his balance-of-payments message in February, emphasized the importance of two of these areas when he said "We will step up our efforts to assure American industry sound and fully competitive export financing," and that we will "strive to eliminate such artificial barriers to U.S. exports as discriminatory freight rates on ocean traffic."

When I was campaigning a year ago I discussed the importance of sound, fully competitive export financing for many of our important industries—especially those in the capital goods field.

In many areas of the world—especially in the less-developed countries—credit is frequently the decisive element in winning a sale.

I said then: "In today's world marketplace, it is not possible to realize the full export potential of a product—no matter how superior it is—unless suitable and adequate financing can be arranged on terms which are competitive with those offered by other nations."

I then stated the intention of this administration to provide fully competitive export financing for our industries engaged in international trade.

Thus far this year, we have made some progress in carrying out this commitment. On June 1 the Export-Import Bank set aside the limits which had previously been placed on the size of transactions and on its exposure in foreign countries which represent a higher-than-normal credit risk. Under this new policy, American businessmen can now obtain financing guarantees for exports to such countries provided they themselves assume a higher proportion of the credit risk. Eximbank also increased the proportion of the risk it would cover in normal export transactions.

Notwithstanding these improvements, we welcome any suggestions or recommendations you may have for further improving our export financing programs.

If, as some businessmen and bankers contend, the inclusion of export financing within the foreign loan restraint program is adversely affecting exports, we would like to know about it with specific cases and examples so that appropriate remedies may be applied.

We recognize that, as opportunities increase in world markets, so will the competition for such markets.

We know we cannot ignore competition.

To remain competitive in world markets we can afford nothing less than a working partnership, in full and mutual confidence, between Government and business. I think today we enjoy that partnership.

I am most grateful to you for the time and energy you are putting into this effort and I want you to know that the President and I look forward to receiving your recommendations.

WEST VIRGINIA GLASSBLOWER

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in an era of mass production, such as presently exists in the United States, experienced and talented artisans are become scarcer. West Virginia is fortunate, however, in still having such workmen attached to its glass industry, and an article in the October 3 Wheeling, W. Va., News-Register reports on a glassblower who, at 77 years of age, is still practicing his art.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) News-Register, Oct. 3, 1965]

GLASSBLOWER, 77, STILL GOING STRONG

(NOTE.—There are two important steps in the manufacture of a hand-blown sherbet glass. John Schlosser, 77-year-old master of glass, at the Imperial Glass Corp., takes a glowing globule of glass, on the end of an unseen blowpipe and, as he rotates it, forms a stem with the "pull out tool" in his right hand. One of the final steps in the maufacture of the sherbet cup, or similar articles, takes a man with strong lungs. Schlosser places the somewhat cooler glass in a water-cooled iron mold, and rotates the glass, as he blows it into its final form.)

(By Monroe Worthington)

At 77, John Schlosser still gets a big kick out of working.

And despite his age, he has no plans for joining the ranks of the retired.

Schlosser is one of the foremost glassblowers in the Nation and still works frequently at the Imperial Glass Co. plant in Bellaire.

Schlosser's journey to and from work is a chore in itself.

He lives at the very top of 12th Street hill. Many a younger man would huff and puff before he makes the climb, and complain if he had to do it once a year. Schlosser climbs the hill each day he works.

There are two reasons why Schlosser does not work every day. The most important one is that there is not too much of a market for blown stemware. It is costly, and not everyone can afford it. The time is long since gone when only an emperor or his favorites was permitted to own a creation in glass. But it is still the mark of the favored family, fortunate in possessing great taste, and having more money than the bare cost of food and clothes.

Schlosser, who is extremely proud of his German descent, would probably be the first one to burst out in derision if anyone compared him to a Mountain Michelangelo. But there are certain valid comparisons, just the same.

The Italian sculptor and artist, born in 1475, was apprenticed in 1488—at the age of 12 or 13. Schlosser, born in 1888, was apprenticed at the age of 12, at the old and famed Central Glass Works, 13th and McColloch Streets, in Wheeling.

Glass is a somewhat impersonal medium, in that only one piece in a million is signed. Michelangelo signed only one of his early Pietas.

As said, Schlosser is still working, at age 77; Michelangelo worked until the day he died, at 89.

But, even though Schlosser will probably never win immortal fame, he has won a measure of distinction. When Carl Gustkey, president of Imperial Glass, conceived the idea of recreating America's first industry, the making of glass at Jamestown, as it was first done in 1607, he called on Schlosser to do this work. Another Imperial glassworker, Ernie Thompson; and one from Fostoria, John Bumgardner, made the trip to the pioneer American Colony.

Actually, Schlosser worked at the revived glassworks at Jamestown for 7 weeks in 1957; and then for the whole season, in 1958. His wife, the former Nellie Mae Greenwald of Wheeling, spent most of the second season there, but didn't like it too well.

Schlosser's specialty is in blowing hollow stemware. When you see a thin goblet, and the rich red of the wine penetrates down into the stem, that is an example of hollow stemware.

Just 1 year after Schlosser started to work at Central, the building burned. He made 62½ cents for a 9-hour day, incidentally, and worked 5½ days a week.

He was glad when the building was rebuilt. When he was 18 years old, he became a "flint," which is to say, he was considered a master craftsman, and was taken into the Flint Glass Workers Union. He was to become an official of the local No. 9, in later years.

Central stayed in business until 1939, and Schlosser stayed with it. When the company ceased operations, he went with the Fenton Art Glass Co., at Williamstown, for 6 months. But Imperial purchased Central's molds and other assets, and the artists in glass who had been with Central so long were glad to work for Imperial.

"It's a good company" he says.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am about to move that the Senate go into executive session. I would like to make that request on a unanimous-consent basis, with the proviso that a quorum call would be immediately asked for.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nomination of David G. Bress, of the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

William M. Rountree, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of South Africa;

Hermann F. Eilts, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia;

William H. Weathersby, of California, a Foreign Service Reserve officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of the Sudan;

Franklin H. Williams, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Ghana;

Dr. Joseph R. Smiley, of Colorado, Dr. Luther H. Foster, of Alabama, Dr. Rufus C. Harris, of Georgia, and Arnold M. Picker, of New York, to be members of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs; and

Executive G, 89th Congress, 1st session, and Executive I, 89th Congress, 1st session, Tax Protocols with Belgium and Germany (Executive Rept. No. 7).

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—NOMINATION OF DAVID G. BRESS TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. David G. Bress, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. May I say, before the clerk starts to call the roll, that, instead of sending telegrams, as has been done, at least on the Democratic side, on four or five occasions, I ask all Senators who are in the city to remain here. I ask all Senators who are out of the city to return, and that all Senators who have plans made for this week cancel them, to the end that, if it is at all possible, we may be able to adjourn by the end of the week. That is a hope, not a certainty. Of course, we cannot expect Senators who are ill to come back, but I hope all other Senators will be in attendance.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RIVERS AND HARBORS ACT OF 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 20, 1965, pp. 27668-27707, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, conferees of the Senate and the House met in two very long sessions Thursday and Friday to consider differences in S. 2300, the rivers and harbors omnibus bill.

These differences were essentially ones of general policy rather than project versus project.

Basically, this measure is composed of projects which have the approvals of all necessary agencies, hearings by at least one House, and which stand the test of long-term policy.

The total dollar authorization for all projects, surveys, and other matters is $2 billion.

For specific projects, the total is $10 million less than the original Senate version of $1,989 million, and about $225 million more than the original House version of $1,754 million.

The Senate receded on one major project, that of Devils Jumps. It did so in the face of adamant House opposition to action now, and the promise of hearings and consideration without prejudice of the project for next year.

The House receded, at Senate insistence, on all changes in general policy relating to local cost sharing and reimbursing.

The House's major recession was with regard to maintaining 50 years as the base for amortization of navigation projects.

Thus, the Trinity River project's navigation feature must now meet the same test as all other navigation projects before it can be undertaken.

The flood control aspects of the Trinity, however, can be started upon the appropriation of funds.

The Senate also insisted on and obtained agreement to restoration of the Dickey-Lincoln School power project to be located in Maine. This will be the first public hydropower project in New England and will have a substantial effect in boosting that section's economic capability.

Mr. President, I submit that S. 2300 is a good bill, well thought out, and the projects carefully analyzed. I urge the Senate to adopt the conference report.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it was with regret that I noted the action of the conference in deleting from the amendments of the House of Representatives to S. 2300 the authorities to extend the period of authorization during which certain bridges could be constructed across the Mississippi River which would serve the people of Illinois and of Iowa. Both of these authorities were passed by the House of Representatives in separate bills this year.

The first authority extended by the House amendments was that already passed by the House earlier this year in H.R. 3788, reviving and reenacting the act approved December 21, 1944, authorizing construction of a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Ill., by the City of Clinton Bridge Commission. The second provision which has been deleted is that already passed by the House earlier this year in H.R. 3976, amending an act of July 26, 1956, extending the period of time during which a bridge may be constructed across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and Drury, Ill., by the Muscatine Bridge Commission.

The City of Clinton Bridge Commission was created in 1944, and authorized to construct, reconstruct, acquire, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Ill. The commission has constructed the Gateway Bridge—south bridge—and has acquired the Lyons-Fulton Bridge—north bridge—both of which are presently operated by the commission as toll bridges. The Lyons-Fulton Bridge is in a state of disrepair; and has been further devastated by fire. The City of Clinton Bridge Commission proposes to construct a new bridge to replace the present Lyons-Fulton Bridge, after which the old bridge will be removed. The commission plans to issue negotiable interest-bearing notes to defray the cost of designing, engineering, and planning the new bridge and to acquire land for construction of the bridge and approaches thereto, and, subsequently, to issue bonds to finance construction of the new bridge and approaches. The bonds, notes, and interest will be paid from toll revenues of both the Gateway Bridge and the proposed new bridge.

Continued authority to finance, construct, and maintain a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River, in the vicinity of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Ill., is badly needed. The existing bridges, particularly in view of the antiquated nature and structural incapacity of the Lyons-Fulton Bridge, are no longer adequate to meet modern traffic demands.

The present Muscatine Bridge was originally constructed in 1890, reconstructed by the Muscatine Bridge Commission, and reopened to traffic in 1956. The bridge has a width of only 16 feet 9 inches between curbs, and the load-bearing capacity is far below that necessary to accommodate vehicles that can legally operate in both Illinois and Iowa. The commission plans to replace the present bridge by construction of a new bridge. The lack of adequate bridge facilities at this point constitutes a serious hindrance to the economic development of the surrounding communities.

I deeply regret the action of the conference because these facilities are strongly desired by the people in these areas, and there would be no additional cost to the Federal Government as a result of the enactment of the House amendments or of H.R. 3788 and H.R. 3976.

I note however, in the report of the House conference managers—House Report No. 1170—this language with respect to the provision to revive and reenact the authority of the City of Clinton Bridge Commission to construct a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Ill., and to provide for the financing of such bridge or bridges:

> The proposed conference substitute does not contain such a provision. The conferees agreed that the deletion of this provision is not to be construed to prejudice in any way the full consideration of the necessity for this legislation and the conferees on the part of the House agreed to this deletion only after having received assurances that at an early date of the second session of this Congress the Committee on Public Works of the Senate would hold full and complete hearings on H.R. 3788, as passed the House, July 19.

Similarly, I note this language in the House report with respect to the provision to extend the period of time during which a bridge may be constructed across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Ill., by the Muscatine Bridge Commission:

> The proposed conference substitute does not contain such a provision. The conferees agree that the deletion of this provision is not to be construed to prejudice in any way the full consideration of the necessity for this legislation, and the conferees on the part of the House agreed on this deletion only after having received assurances that at an early date of the second session of this Congress the Committee on Public Works of the Senate would hold full and complete hearings on H.R. 3976, as passed the House, May 17.

I understand this to be firm assurance that the action of the conferees is not to be taken as prejudicing further and full consideration of these proposals, and I understand it to be a commitment from the Senate Committee on Public Works to hold full and complete hearings on the two House bills in the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

I wish particularly to commend the Congressmen who have so skillfully and vigorously argued for these bills. The bill for the Muscatine Bridge Commission was introduced by Congressman SCHMIDHAUSER and supported ably by Congressman SCHISLER. The bill for the City of Clinton Bridge Commission was introduced by Congressman CULVER.

These gentlemen have served their constituents well in these matters, and hopefully their efforts to extend the powers of these commissions will meet with success during the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am appreciative that the motion to reconsider has been agreed to by the Senate, in view of the fact that it was impossible for me to be present when the conference report was agreed to.

I thought that I had made arrangements for a quorum call to be held prior to action on the conference report. However, those arrangements apparently broke down somewhere and I did not have an opportunity to be present at the time of the agreement.

Mr. President, I realize that at this late hour in the session of the Senate, the conference having been already delayed for a long time, the temper of the personnel of the Senate, as well as that of the House of Representatives, will not permit enough time within which to consider the amendments which I believe the measure needs very badly.

The particular item that I shall discuss at this time at some reasonable length appears on page 53 of the bill, as reported by the House Committee on Public Works, commencing at line 9. It concerns the John Martin Reservoir project in Colorado.

Mr. President, the John Martin Dam lies 20 miles west of my own home. My interest in this project is more than cursory. In 1930 I began the practice of law in the city of Lamar. However, I had been practicing in Pueblo for a few months previous to that.

A great portion of my legal experience since 1930 has been in relation to natural resources, and particularly in relation to water, irrigation, and drainage law of the State of Colorado. At least 80 percent of my practice during that entire period related to water, water law, and drainage matters. Up to 1954 when I was elected to the Senate—a period of 25 years—I had the privilege of representing water users, water rights owners, and various people in the Arkansas Valley, and particularly in the lower part of the Arkansas Valley in which I reside.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to make a comment on the statement of the Senator. However, I shall not be able to be present later, and I wish to make a comment on the issue that the Senator has raised.

The Senator has stated that he is referring to the John Martin Reservoir in Colorado. This is a project which was considered by the Senate Committee on Public Works and also by the House committee. This reservoir was considered in the conference.

I am not too familiar with the laws concerning the appropriation of water in the West. However, remembering my old law days, I do have some recollection of the process concerning the appropriation of water. I know that it is an entirely different problem in the West than it is in the part of the country in which I live where there is a great supply of water.

I know that it is of the greatest importance to water users—whether they be individual farmers or small communities—to be assured, if not of an adequate supply of water, at least all the water that can be made available.

The Senator from Colorado desires to preserve the rights which have already accrued to the water users. Although the John Martin Reservoir conserves and holds water, at times there is not enough water for users who live below the reservoir.

The Corps of Engineers proposes to raise the water level in that reservoir chiefly for recreational purposes, and perhaps for wildlife enhancement. I understand that the Senator from Colorado feels that the raising and holding of the water level in the John Martin Reservoir might deprive users below the reservoir of water rights which are now theirs and might deprive them of an additional supply of water which they so desperately need.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is essentially correct in that statement.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is to be commended for his recognition of this danger to water users. Almost singlehandedly, he has made the fight to protect water users of his own State and those who live below in another State. The Senator sent to the conference a very adequate and comprehensive amendment, which in my judgment would have protected those water users, or given them the maximum protection possible.

The matter was discussed in the conference. I raised the issue myself, and presented to the conference the amendment and the views of the distinguished Senator from Colorado. The Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], one of the conferees who lives in the West and is acquainted with the water laws, vigorously supported the position of the Senator from Colorado. On the other side of the table, Representative BALDWIN, of California, who also has knowledge of the problems of water users in the West, took up the fight to support the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, as did also Representative CRAMER, of Florida.

I too believe that the importance of the use of water to those citizens who live below the reservoir is more important than the recreational purposes which might be realized if the water level were raised. But those of us who held that view were not able to sustain the position of the Senator from Colorado although, in addition to voting for it, we made as strong a fight as possible for his position.

I understand, though, that there are certain rights which have accrued to the users who have appropriated the water; and, so far as I am concerned, I should like very much to see their rights tested in the courts. I would hope that their rights would be protected there. I am sorry that the conference did not sustain the position of the distinguished Senator from Colorado. I should say, though, that his people should know that he made a great and strong fight for them, and while I am not apprised of the full context of the law relating to water rights in the West, at least from general principles I know that we cannot take away the rights of property owners without compensation. Though I can suggest no method to provide compensation to such water right holders, I feel sure that the Senator from Colorado will keep up the fight, and do everything he can to protect the water users of his own State and others who are affected along the Arkansas River.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, and wish to express publicly my appreciation to those Senate conferees who did understand the problem and attempted to do something about it.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator for yielding. I merely wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], who correctly stated what took place in the conference. The Senate conferees, insisting on the amendment supplied by the Senator from Colorado, presented it to the conference and it went to a vote, but the vote was on the question of amending the House language; therefore, the House conferees voted on it, and the vote was 5 to 3 in opposition to adopting the amendment. I think that should appear in the RECORD.

If the Senators will read the language of the conference report and the House language in the bill, it appears to me that there is very definite protection in the conference report for those water users with whose rights the Senator is concerned. Perhaps I do not read it as the Senator does, but that is the argument that the House conferees made, which argument the Senate conferees were not successful in refuting.

Mr. ALLOTT. I intend to discuss the matter in some detail, and show in the course of the discussion why that is not true.

Mr. McNAMARA. Very well.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, as I explained a few moments ago, there is a markup of the supplemental bill involving an appropriation of $4.2 billion now being considered. As the ranking minority member of one of the subcommittees, I point out that much of the proposed expenditure lies within the area for which our subcommittee is responsible, and that is the reason I was not able to reach the floor before this time.

However, I intend to discuss this matter at length. I hope that out of the discussion will come some understanding of the water situation in the West.

The people in the East, for the first time this summer, have begun to feel the problems involved in a shortage of water. In the West, where water shortages have always existed, we have an entirely different system of water use and water law than that which prevails in the eastern States. The Eastern States have a doctrine of law which is known as the riparian system. The Western States follow a different doctrine, which originated in the great State of Wyoming, represented by my friend [Mr. SIMPSON], and my State of Colorado. Under that system, and as provided in the State constitutions, the State owns the water, and it is made available to the people of the State upon their performing certain administrative processes, and appropriating and using the water. The first man who appropriates and uses the water has the prior right to it. That may be a peculiar philosophy to those who are accustomed to the riparian system, but nevertheless it is the system of water usage which has permitted the West to develop, and it is the one which prevails in all the Western States.

In the constitution of the State of Colorado, it is provided that priority shall be given first to the domestic user, then to the agricultural user, and then to the industrial user. The constitution does not provide for any use of water for recreational purposes. I shall discuss the history of such uses of water.

The John Martin Dam was completed in approximately 1939—not completed in the full sense, because at that time there were such demands for steel that the gates could not be put in, and they were not put in until a year or two after the conclusion of World War II.

The Arkansas River, between Salida and the Kansas line, is probably the most overappropriated river in the State of Colorado, and in fact one of the most overappropriated rivers that I know of anywhere. There are many decreed priorities, priorities decreed by a court, which must find that the water has been applied or is in the process of being applied for a beneficial use before it may grant a man what is known as a water decree.

A water decree, when granted, gives to its holder a certain date from which his rights stem. There may be a man drawing water under an 1870 decree, another drawing water under an 1890 decree, or one's decree may date from 1902, or some other date. An appropriator along the river may have one, two, or even three decrees, as some of the mutual ditch companies have.

With that situation, about 1952—and I am sorry I cannot supply the exact date, because many of my records have been destroyed, part of them in the recent flood in the State of Colorado—representing one of the irrigation companies in the Arkansas Valley, I was one of several artisans responsible for drawing together representatives of all of the ditches of the Arkansas Valley at a meeting in Las Animas, Colo. We met at the courthouse all one afternoon, discussing the subject. As I was one of the movers in the matter, the principal subject discussed was my interest in establishing a recreational pool at the John Martin Dam for the purposes of fishing, hunting, and other recreational activities.

I recognized, as does every knowledgeable person, that the John Martin Dam, on an average, is empty at least a part of the year approximately 12 out of every 15 years. No one can predict how much water the Lord will provide, but that has been the average experience. I realized, with that situation, since the dam was likely to be completely empty during at least part of 12 out of 15 years, that the operation of a recreation pool in the dam would be a very difficult matter.

Thus, that afternoon, after much conversation, many speeches and many remarks, this particular plan was finally adopted. It fell to my luck to draw up for the ditches and the appropriators of the Arkansas Valley a resolution in the form of an agreement whereby it was agreed to leave a certain number of acre-feet of water in the dam for recreational purposes.

No one purchased this water. The State did not provide it. The appropriators, the users, the owners of the water actually donated it themselves. The administration of a river, where there are various decrees broken up into various dates over the length of a river 130, 140, or 150 miles long, is a most complex undertaking. Men study it for a lifetime. The only knowledgeable lawyers I have ever known in this field are those who have studied it for many years.

Actually, administration of the river is archaic. We are basically administering the river under the same system that was in effect in 1900. There are, perhaps, ways to improve it, but they would be fantastically expensive. Therefore, we operated under the agreement which I drew up. We operated the river and the recreational pool during that year, in order that we might have some recreation in this part of the State of Colorado where it is difficult to find outdoor sports in which to participate.

I digress for a moment to say that possibly no one understands this subject better than I, because I have utilized for myself and my family every possible recreational advantage that there is in that area, from boating, to swimming, to fishing, to hunting for ducks and geese. Fortunately, it is one of the great duck and geese areas of the country, which makes it attractive to the citizens of Colorado.

Thus, after we had put this agreement into effect, we found that the administration of the river was such that it placed a burden on the ditches to the east, under the dam, to maintain the pool. In other words, water which was supposed to get down to the John Martin Dam did not get down to it. Since the ditches had agreed to maintain the pool, it was they who were east of the dam and below the dam who had to make up this water. The water which was lost by one ditch with which I was acquainted amounted to some 15,000 acre-feet or more during that year.

Fifteen thousand acre-feet for that particular ditch amounts to half an acre-foot of water for every acre of land under that ditch.

Mr. President, in a year when there may be 3 or 3½ acre-feet of water available for crops, the loss of half an acre-foot of water might not be significant. But, in a year when water is short and there is no surplus of water in the dam—which will be the case a great majority of the time—and there is available for the farmers, perhaps, only 1 or 1½ acre-feet of water, which is not sufficient to grow crops in the area, the loss of half an acre-foot is not merely a shortage; it is a calamity for the farmers involved.

I repeat this fact, that under Colorado law, as in the State of Wyoming and in most other Western States, the right to the use of water is a property right. It is just as tangible a right as the ownership of real estate, a house, or anything else. The usual custom of passing title to water is to include it in the deed. If it happens to have been converted to ownership by a mutual company, which is a nonprofit corporation specifically authorized by the State of Colorado, we usually include the ownership of water by describing the certificate representing the shares in the deed itself.

Accordingly, with this situation and this background, realizing that we had had an opportunity for a voluntary pool, and, realizing also the losses which it meant in this particular year to all of the ditches east and below the dam, we come into this last year.

One of the Representatives from the State of Colorado introduced a bill in the House which became a part of the public works bill now before the Senate. The bill which was introduced was H.R. 7162.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from this bill—which I intend to discuss—which begins on line 9 on page 53 and goes through line 20 on page 54 of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The John Martin Reservoir project (formerly known as Caddoa Reservoir), Arkansas River, Colorado, as authorized by the Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1570), is modified to authorize and direct the Chief of Engineers to use not to exceed ten thousand acre-feet of reservoir flood control storage space for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a permanent pool for fish and wildlife and recreational purposes, at such times as storage space may not be available for such permanent pool within the conservation pool as defined in article III F, Arkansas River compact (63 Stat. 145) except that—
>
> (1) The State of Colorado shall purchase and make available any water rights necessary under State law to establish and thereafter maintain the permanent pool.
>
> (2) The rights of irrigators in Colorado and Kansas to those waters available to them under the terms of the Arkansas River compact and under the laws of their respective States shall not be diminished or impaired by anything contained in this paragraph.
>
> (3) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed so as to give any preference to the permanent pool over other project purposes.
>
> (4) No permanent pool as herein defined shall be maintained except upon written terms and conditions acceptable and agreed to (A) by the Chief of Engineers in the interest of flood control, and (B) by the Colorado State Engineer, the Arkansas River Compact Administration, and the Colorado Water Conservation Board, in the interest of establishing, maintaining, and operating the permanent pool for recreational and fish and wildlife purposes.
>
> (5) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed so as to limit the authority of the Chief of Engineers to operate John Martin Reservoir for the primary purposes of the prevention of floods and the preservation of life and property.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, coming into this year, let me say in all frankness that I had told the water rights owners of the valley that, if it was humanly possible, there would be hearings in the valley before any legislation was ever passed concerning the subject.

I have been bedeviled in the press from every source. I realize that I am talking, perhaps, against the greater number of persons who wish this recreational pool. I have repeatedly said that I should like to see a recreational pool there. But I do not care if there is only one person who has a property right in water who would be damaged by a recreational pool, I will stand on the floor of the Senate, or anywhere else, and defend that property right.

There is too much of this going on in this country now. Merely because a group of people wish something, we go out and take the property of other people away from them without regard to the due process clause of the Constitution.

Therefore, analyzing the bill, it is a beautiful sounding bill, but it does not do what it is supposed to do. I am sorry that the chairman of the committee has left the Chamber because, perhaps, he would benefit from understanding what the water laws of the West and the rights of the people in the West are.

In the pending bill, one of its "cute" phrases begins on line 23:

> The rights of irrigators in Colorado and Kansas in those waters available to them under the terms of the Arkansas River Compact and under the laws of their respective States, shall not be diminished or impaired by anything contained in this paragraph.

I had an active part in drawing up the Arkansas River Compact mentioned in that phrase. The dam is operated under the administration of representatives of both Colorado and Kansas.

I call particular attention to this language in subparagraph 4:

> No permanent pool as herein defined shall be maintained except upon written terms and conditions acceptable to and agreed by the Chief of Engineers in the interest of flood control—

No one can quarrel with that, because this is a flood control dam. Naturally, the flood control portion of the dam cannot be invaded, or should not be invaded, to the detriment of the flood control purposes of the act—

> by the Colorado State Engineer, the Arkansas River Compact Administration, and the Colorado Water Conservation Board, in the interest of establishing, maintaining, and operating the permanent pool for recreational and fish and wildlife purposes.

The great weakness of this provision is that while it seems as though the man who owns water rights is caged in by protections, there are no protections at all under this provision.

The Chief of Army Engineers is responsible only for flood control, and he is not interested in this provision, except to the extent of flood control.

What is the obligation of the Colorado State Engineer? He does not represent the interests of those who own and use the water. His only responsibility under the laws of the State of Colorado is to administer the river in accordance with the decrees that I have already commented on.

Let us consider the Arkansas River Compact Administration. That administration does not represent the water owner or the water user in the Arkansas Valley. It is responsible, under the compact between Kansas and Colorado, for administering the terms of that compact, which provides for the release of water when there is water in the dam and determines at what time the dam shall be declared empty, so the administration of the river comes under the normal priority system.

So no one on the administration represents in any sense the water owners or water rights owners on the river.

The next one is the Colorado Water Conservation Board. It is endowed by statute in the State of Colorado, and it has as its primary and basic purpose the conservation and development of water for the entire State. But in no sense is it given statutory authority to represent an individual owner, nor does it represent an individual owner.

So in this bill it is stated that four persons or groups—the Chief of Engineers, the Colorado State Engineer, the Arkansas River Compact Administration, and the Colorado Water Conservation Board—shall develop operating agreements which are satisfactory to them under their particular obligations. But nowhere is the man who owns the water—whose ox will be gored, who may be left, in a dry season, without a means of bringing his crop out of the land—represented in this bill.

It has been my position from the first time that if we are to have a pool, there should be operating principles for that pool which will assure the water right owner that he will be protected and that it is futile to do anything until we have done that.

Many times I have told people who were enthusiastic about the recreation pool, not only this year, but over a period of 5 or 6 years, that if they want a pool, they should sit down with the water right owers in the valley and start working out operating principles.

Frankly this is, and will be, one of the most difficult and technical problems that I can possibly imagine in the administration of water resources.

Those who do not understand water, and those who are interested only in recreation will not concern themselves with what is the necessity before this can become a fact.

Perhaps I should make one further thing clear in this discourse. That is the particular value of water. The bottom lands of the Arkansas River are beautiful and highly productive. From that valley come some of the finest canteloupes and watermelons, as many people know. It has great areas of hay and sugarbeets, vegetables, grains. It is a beautiful land.

The land itself is probably worth $20 or $30 an acre without the water. Usually a man pays $250 or $300, or perhaps more, an acre for the land with the water.

This is one thing so many people seem not to understand. The land is only dry grazing land without the water. With the water it has developed the wealth which has maintained the cities all up and down the valley—Hoily, Granada, Lamar, Las Animas, La Junta, Rocky Ford, Fowler—all those wonderful little cities along the valley. It was the water which made it possible for those cities to grow and expand.

Having said all that, I wish for a few moments to refer to the matter of hearings. When I heard it was the intention to put the provisions of the bill H.R. 7162 into the omnibus public works bill, I wrote to the chairman of the subcommittee in the other body and asked him to have hearings on the matter. I think I have discussed this matter enough to the point that the problems must be detailed and delineated and recognized. Many of those who have advocated the recreation pool have stated, falsely, that there have been hearings on this matter. It is true that various persons have met at one time and another and beat this matter over.

But the cold facts are—and let us spread it out cold on the Record—that there has never been a congressional hearing in the Arkansas Valley upon this matter. The only hearing on it consists of a statement by the Representative who introduced the bill; a short, innocuous, say-nothing statement by an Assistant Secretary of the Interior; and an even worse statement by a representative of the Corps of Army Engineers, which also says less than nothing.

There has never been a hearing. The reason I wanted hearings on the Arkansas Valley was to pinpoint the difficulties and the problems so that we could start the development of a real set of operating principles, if, in fact, we wanted a recreation pool in the John Martin Dam.

Personally, I do not know where the water would come from to create a recreation pool. The director of the Colorado State Conservation Board sat in my office about 2 weeks ago and told me twice in the same conversation that he did not know where to get the water.

There will be water available. There is water available if one pays enough money, just as any kind of property is available if one wishes to pay enough money for it. If we assume that the Colorado Fish and Game Department might want to put out enough money, it could bring in money in order to do it.

What sort of problems do we face in operating principles? First, if we beef up and modernize the administration of the river enough we can be sure the water that is supposed to get down into the dam gets there. That is the first thing that should be done. This means gaging stations every few miles on the river. It means accurate accounting for all water on the river.

To date no such plan or system has ever been worked out on the Arkansas Valley, and the operators of the ditches are fighting and scrambling for water almost every day during the irrigating season. This involves totally, in one way or another, directly or indirectly, about 350,000 acres of land, and as many as 951 separate priorities.

Another element in the problem that has to be pinpointed is the following: I have a document in my hand which shows that in 1960 inflows to the reservoirs amounted to 102,980 acre-feet, and outflow was 117,717 acre-feet. The inflows were measured at Las Animas, 7 or 8 miles above the upper reaches of the reservoir, and the outflow was measured at the dam. There were 15,000 acre-feet more flowing out of the dam than was measured flowing in.

In 1961, the inflow was 136,460 acre-feet; the outflow was 147,700 acre-feet. Over 11,000 acre-feet more flowed out of the dam than was measured into it.

In 1962, the inflow was 124,300 acre-feet. The outflow was 149,500 acre-feet, so in that year over 25,000 acre-feet more water flowed out of the dam than flowed into it.

This may seem quite a paradox, Mr. President, but the facts are that the accretions in sites unmeasured, side streams and drainage areas, have increased the flow to that extent and more, because evaporation and seepage are not considered in those figures.

During years of larger inflow there would be greater storage in John Martin Dam. There are undoubtedly large amounts of water not measured in the two gages at Las Animas.

The next problem that has to be delineated by hearings—and I am still talking about hearings—is the matter of evaporation and seepage. This is one of the most difficult matters to ascertain.

One person said that we can put evaporation pans at the dam and see how much water evaporates out of a pan. Then we could tell whom to charge for the water.

But, evaporation varies from day to day. It varies from week to week and month to month. It varies from year to year.

Senators may say that this is fantastic, but during the years 1941 and 1942 I saw one rather shallow reservoir—and the recreation pool will be a shallow reservoir—lose almost a foot of water in 1 day during a period in the summer when the temperature was in excess of 100 degrees and there were high winds of 35 to 40 miles an hour.

How do we keep track of a high rate of evaporation under conditions like this as against a low evaporation during a relatively cool and wet summer? Someone has to decide how to determine and somebody has to decide the method by which this water will be charged to the recreation pool, rather than to force those who have laid out their money for their farms to make up the water that is lost by evaporation.

Another question with respect to the hearings on the evaporation matter is, Who is going to be given the power to determine what the rate of evaporation is? This, I believe, is probably one of the most difficult questions that will be involved.

I have only suggested in this discourse a few problems that arise. I shall discuss another.

If we maintain a recreation pool at John Martin Dam, it means that rather than irrigating with muddy water, as is now done most of the time, water users will always be drawing clear water out of the reservoir.

Those who are not knowledgeable about irrigation may view this as an insignificant point. The fact is that muddy water is preferred by the farmers, first, because it always adds new mineral content to their soil, and, second, because it goes over farther in spreading over the land. I know of no man with experience in irrigation who will not verify this.

But when they revert to irrigation with clear water, not merely for a few months or a year, but over a period of 5 to 10 to 20 years, the result will be that there will be a serious scouring of the ditches below the dam and the laterals. This is based on a simple principle of physics. We all know that water in motion will carry a certain number of solids. If the water is stopped the solids will drop. But while this water is, we might say, soaked up or saturated with solids or minerals, it cannot pick up more from the ditch bottoms and, therefore, it does not scour the ditches.

But if we face a situation—and I believe this is something to be contemplated—where farmers are irrigating with clear water over a period of 5 to 10 years or more, there is no question in my mind that the farmers will have to start lining their ditches with concrete. When it is contemplated that some of the ditches are 65 and 75 miles long, and when we consider all the radial laterals into the farmland, it can be seen that a great amount of money is involved.

Who is going to pay for the changeover to line the ditches and laterals? This is a subject that ought to be discussed and settled by the operating principals.

But more than anything else, the farmers, the water right owners of the valley, have a right to hearings in the valley on this subject. There have really been no hearings on the bill. Hearings in the House, such as they were, were pitifully short—short of facts and short of knowledge. The hearings were not previously announced, because I certainly would have been in attendance had I had the opportunity to do so.

This subject was not even considered in the Senate, but that was not the fault of the chairman, because the bill was not pending before the Senate. There were only the inadequate, and perfunctory hearings in the House, followed by the insistence of Members of the other body that the Senate accept the bill. So the bill was crammed down our throats, as so many other bills have been crammed down our throats by the other body.

After the other body had passed the bill, I communicated with Members of the Senate. I had previously asked the chairman of the House committee to hold hearings in the Arkansas Valley. I prepared an amendment which I thought would protect the water right owners in the Arkansas Valley against this incursion of their own property rights. It is a wholly reasonable amendment, because all it provides, in addition to asking that the principles be approved by the people I have previously mentioned, is that the plan shall be approved by two-thirds of the water right owners above the dam and two-thirds of the water right owners below the dam. It would be completely reasonable to say that it should be approved by every water right owner; but I thought that if the two-thirds figure were used that it might appeal to reasonable men.

Nevertheless, we sit here today with a bill that is about to become law, a bill which is an incursion upon private property rights, a bill which will deprive people, or which stands a chance to deprive them of their property over a period of years without any protection. One vital question is: What good will it do to tell a man, as the bill does, that the rights of the irrigators in Colorado and Kansas to the waters available to them under the terms of the Arkansas River compact and under the laws of the respective States shall not be diminished or impaired by anything contained in this paragraph?

What good would it do to write a clause like that into a bill, when the only recourse that is left to a man is a lawsuit? That is what has been written into the bill. Instead of protecting people who have rights that are about to be infringed upon, we have left them with the possibility and right of bringing lawsuits after they have been damaged, after they may have lost a large amount of water during one summer through bad administration, and have thus not had sufficient water, have no crops, and are mortgaged up to the hilt at the bank. They will be left with the wonderful right to bring lawsuits, because that is all the bill provides. It provides that the water rights shall not be infringed upon, and leaves the water right owner with the right of a lawsuit—the right of a lawsuit not against the State engineer, because he cannot be sued for money; the right of a lawsuit, perhaps, against 1, 2, 10, 12, or 15 ditches; and perhaps injunctive relief against the compact administration, although I am not sure of that.

Furthermore, I am not certain that we have a constitutional piece of legislation before us. As I read the bill, it would amend the Arkansas River compact. That compact was ratified by the Legislatures of Kansas and Colorado, and was later confirmed by Congress. When it came before Congress, it was referred in the Senate, under the rules of the Senate, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. That committee has had no opportunity to act upon the proposal; yet we are here modifying a compact between two States for the operation, storage, and release of water in a reservoir—a compact ratified by both State legislatures and confirmed by Congress.

I do not know how Congress, in a single legislative act, can modify a compact between the States. I thoroughly believe that this provision is unconstitutional, and that if that question ever comes before any court in the land having appropriate jurisdiction, that court will declare it to be unconstitutional.

We who live in this rather arid area realize the value of recreation. Perhaps there is a way, although it will be a tedious, hard way, to work out operating principles so as to protect irrigators. But I fear that what has been developed now is only the possibility of a multiplicity of lawsuits, not only between individual irrigators, who always have this right, but between ditch companies and the State of Colorado and the State of Kansas. So the bill might, perhaps, generate a multiplicity of lawsuits, not only after actual damage has been done to the irrigator or to a ditch company, but even before that, because of the unconstitutionality of this particular provision. I only wish that those who were so enthusiastic had not permitted their enthusiasm to run away with their sense of justice and, most of all, with their sense of fairness. I fail to see how a multiplicity of lawsuits will further the cause of a permanent pool.

It does not matter that there are, I suppose, some 900 or 950 different water rights in the Arkansas Valley. If only one man had paid $200, $250, or $300 or more an acre for his land with a property right of water attached to it and if that man were in imminent danger, I would feel compelled to speak with as much force and feeling as I speak today.

I am sorry that a majority of the conferees from the House of Representatives made such short shrift of this matter and gave so little consideration to it. I am completely aware that, at this late hour in the session, there is no possibility of getting the Senate to send this measure back to conference for 2, 3, or 4 days of conference. However, a great injustice has been done by this piece of legislation.

I cannot understand the thinking of people who get so far away from the American system that they can say that the people in the Arkansas Valley are not entitled to hearings in the Arkansas Valley on this matter.

We cannot bring every farmer from the valley to Washington, D.C. There is not that kind of money in the valley. However, they are entitled to hearings before Congress, in which hearings the problems and perhaps the solutions to the problems may be set down in writing on the record. It would not be a big bull session participated in by farmers and other people who have gotten together to talk generally about this matter. The facts should be put in writing so that they may be analyzed by the experts and the problems may be separated, studied, and perhaps solved. This is all that the hearings would mean. However, the hearings have never been held, and, under this legislation as it now exists, the hearings will never be held.

I regret that I have had to take the time of the Senate on what is a relatively small matter in relation to the entire scheme of our legislation. However, it is only because I feel deeply that this question must be brought to the attention of the Senate and that a record should be made on the matter that I have taken this time for the purpose of informing the Senate about the law and the facts in this case, and particularly the members of the Committee on Public Works who may have to deal with this matter in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment which I proffered to the conferees, which amendment would make this legislation at least partially acceptable, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proposed amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO S. 2300

On page 54, strike lines 7 through 15, and insert in lieu thereof:

"(4)(a) No permanent pool as herein defined shall be established or maintained except upon written terms and conditions, including operating principles, acceptable and agreed to (A) by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in the interest of flood control and (B) by the Colorado State engineer, the Arkansas River Compact Administration, the Colorado Water Conservation Board, and the appropriators of water (evidenced, in the case of mutual or corporate entities, by the adoption of resolutions by their boards of directors) representing in the aggregate two-thirds of the total decreed priorities (exclusive of storage rights) in the upper and lower Arkansas River, in the interest of establishing, maintaining, and operating the permanent pool for recreational and fish and wildlife purposes while preserving the integrity of decreed water rights for other beneficial purposes. For the purposes of this Act, the 'upper Arkansas River' shall include only the main stream of the Arkansas River between the city of Pueblo, Colorado, and the John Martin Dam and 'lower Arkansas River' shall include the main stream thereof from the John Martin Dam to the Kansas-Colorado State line.

"(b) Upon agreement as provided in subsection (a), the Representative of the United States and chairman of the Arkansas River Compact Administration shall make a report to the Congress of the agreement and the proceedings leading thereto and of any changes or modifications to the Arkansas River compact (63 Stat. 145) made necessary by said agreement to such terms and conditions including operating principles: *Provided*, That any such changes or modifications to said compact shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto unless and until the same shall have been ratified by the legislatures of each of said States and approved by the Congress of the United States."

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the position which the Senator from Colorado has taken is one which is shared by many people. There exists in the Arkansas Valley an organization known as the Arkansas Valley Ditch Association, which association is composed of the member ditches. This association has represented the individual ditches and individual rights up and down the river for many years.

I received from this association on the 23d of September a telegram which reads as follows:

> Arkansas Valley Ditch Association wishes to applaud your stand on John Martin recreational pool. Operating principles to protect irrigators' water rights are absolutely necessary.

This wire is signed by Lloyd Barnhart, secretary-treasurer of the Arkansas Valley Ditch Association.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a copy of a letter written by me under date of July 28, 1965, to Mr. Felix L. Sparks, a director of the Colorado Water and Conservation Board. In this letter I set out the position that I have consistently taken since this matter was first raised.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 28, 1965.

Mr. FELIX L. SPARKS,
*Director, Colorado Water Conservation Board,
215 State Services Building, Denver, Colo.*

DEAR LARRY: Thank you for your letter of July 19, relative to the action taken by the Colorado Water Conservation Board on July 12, 1965, in support of my request and the action of the corps to discontinue releases from John Martin in excess of irrigation needs.

I have also had handed to me a copy of a letter from Ray Moses to you dated July 17 and a copy of the letter from Mr. Smrha, chief engineer of the Division of Water Resources, State of Kansas, and a member of the Compact Commission, dated July 14 and addressed to Lieutenant General Cassidy, Chief of Engineers.

First, let me make it very clear that I realize as well as anyone what a recreational pool could mean to the people of southeastern Colorado, and have always favored it. There are, however, certain problems in the establishment of a permanent pool, which cannot be ignored, nor passed over, without resultant long and expensive litigation, which, in the long run, would not only delay the establishment of the permanent pool, but would also endanger its eventual realization.

There is a common assumption that the dam operates on the conservation pool only for the benefit of the irrigators below the dam. This is a completely erroneous assumption because historically it can be shown that in some instances the ditches above the dam have been able to increase their diversions two- to three-fold by the wise and prudent use of the conservation pool under the direction of the compact commission.

The first question that has come up since the recent floods is the question of ownership of the waters that were in the Setchfield Dam. Laying aside for a moment the nature of its decree, with which I am not personally acquainted, there is the issue proposed by some of our more enthusiastic conservationists that this water belongs to the State, i.e., the people, since it is now in the John Martin Reservoir. The second question arising out of the Setchfield Dam is the one raised in your letter as to whether this decree could be properly transferred to an inferior use under article XVI; section 6 of our Colorado constitution, and I am assuming that your letter is correct in stating that there are no irrigation rights between the Setchfield and John Martin. It seems to me that an early attempt should be made to solve these two questions.

Of historical interest, it was in 1950, I believe, with my own active, personal participation, that representatives of all the ditches on the Arkansas were brought together at the district courtroom in Las Animas to try to formulate an operating agreement for a voluntary conservation pool on the John Martin. Largely upon my own urging, many of the ditches agreed to go along and all then finally agreed to operate such a pool. The compact commission assented to treat John Martin as empty when it had reached a minimum of 8,000 acre-feet (I am not absolutely certain of the figure of 8,000 acre-feet, not having access to my file).

The various gaging stations on the river have always been somewhat inaccurate and the result has been that when there was a certain amount of water in the river at Pueblo, which would indicate that there should be a certain amount of water in the river for each of the ditches in the valley, a hole in the river invariably occurred and the river did not produce the amount of water at John Martin which would have satisfied the apportionment of the demands of ditches below the dam. Since all had agreed to contribute a certain amount of conservation water in the pool, the ditches below the dam invariably ended up short, and, as a consequence, lost many thousands of acre-feet of water during that irrigation season. This deficiency in the river above was caused, in my opinion, by (1) inaccurate gaging stations, (2) an archaic system of water administration, and (3) the inability to effect an immediate cutback by ditches between Pueblo and John Martin when the river was falling upon the orders of the division engineer in Pueblo.

Within limits, the middle paragraph on page 2 of your letter is true. However, the evaporation pans do not necessarily take into consideration the effect of high, hot winds, which cause an abnormal amount of evaporation. But, assuming that this could be corrected, the question then becomes: "Who determines the evaporation?" It must be remembered that the shorting of ditches below the dam eventually also depletes the river above the dam and reduces subsequent diversions for them.

It seems to me that the most important thing for those genuinely interested in a recreation pool is to meet with the Arkansas ditches and attempt to set up operating principles which will protect the vested right of the people who have purchased lands with water attached thereto. An agreement to a set of operating principles by the ditches themselves to me is a necessary part of the consideration of such a pool, and should be included in the legislation, just as operating principles were included in the Arkansas River Compact, as approved by Congress. This would, of course, have to have the concurrence of the compact commission, now legally charged with the operation of the conservation pool.

These are some of the questions that must be resolved and deficiencies that must be remedied in the State before any meaningful congressional action can be taken with regard to the establishment of the permanent pool.

Also, in a public meeting on this matter in Lamar with all the ditch companies on January 31, 1964, I promised those present that I would do my best to see that a public hearing was held in the area before any legislation passed the Senate. I still feel that I am obligated to this promise.

I will be very happy to have your comments on these thoughts. Since the entire Arkansas Valley is a farming area, we cannot ignore the fact there are certain rights protected under the due process clause or that every farmer has a vital interest in the Arkansas River, which is already probably the worst overappropriated river in Colorado.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

Gordon Allott,
U.S. Senator.

cc: Hon. John A. Love.
Mr. Ray Moses.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record numerous letters which I have received concerning this matter. These letters support the position I have taken with respect to the John Martin Dam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Harris in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

John Martin Permanent Pool

1. John Martin Dam (formerly known as the Caddoa Dam) is located in the Arkansas River in the State of Colorado, Bent County, about 20 miles west of Lamar, Colo.

2. Construction of the John Martin Dam was authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1570).

3. Since May 31, 1949, the waters of the Arkansas River impounded behind the John Martin Dam are controlled and apportioned by the Arkansas River Compact (63 Stat. 145), and administered by the Arkansas River Compact Administration as established by the Compact. The Administration consists of 3 members from Colorado, 3 members from Kansas, and an ex-officio Federal member who shall act as chairman, without vote (Art. VIII).

4. As set forth in Article I, the major purposes of the Compact are to:

"A. Settle existing disputes and remove causes of future controversy between the States of Colorado and Kansas, and between citizens of one and citizens of the other State, concerning the waters of the Arkansas River and their control, conservation and utilization for irrigation and other beneficial purposes.

"B. Equitably divide the apportion between the States of Colorado and Kansas the waters of the Arkansas River and their utilization as well as the benefits arising from the construction, operation and maintenance by the United States of John Martin Reservvoir Project for water conservation purposes."

And to implement the opinion of the U.S. Supreme Court entered December 6, 1943, in the case of *Colorado* v. *Kansas* (320 U.S. 383) concerning the relative rights of the respective States in and to the use of waters of the Arkansas River.

5. Division of waters and operating principles are contained in article V.

6. Article III F of the compact defines the "conservation pool" as that portion of total storage lying below the "flood control storage" pool. The demarkation is set at elevation 3,851 m.s.l. in article IV C.

7. The compact was not intended to impede or prevent future beneficial development of the Arkansas River, "Provided, that the waters of the Arkansas River, as defined in article III, shall not be materially depleted in usable quantity or availability for use to the water users in Colorado and Kansas under this compact by such future development or construction."

8. H.R. 7162 (Evans of Colorado) seeks to invade the Flood Control Storage pool to the extent of 10,000 acre-feet for the purpose of establishing a permanent recreation pool. It does not establish operating principles for the permanent recreation pool, nor does it amend the Arkansas River Compact which is the controlling instrument for the conservation pool. It does attempt to offer some protection by requiring that the permanent pool be operated on "written terms and conditions" agreed to by the Corps of Engineers, the Colorado State Engineer, the Arkansas River Compact Administration, and the Colorado Water Conservation Board. However, since the conservation pool (all the water below elevation 3,851) is to be administered strictly in conformance with the operating principles set forth in the compact (article V) and these principles do not provide for the maintenance of a permanent pool, a conflict would exist between the "written terms and conditions" (amounting to a supplemental agreement without formal sanction of Congress and the original negotiating parties: i.e., State of Kansas and State of Colorado) and the provisions of the Arkansas River Compact. The compact, as a superior instrument, would be controlling.

9. H.R. 7162 contains this provision: "(2) The right of irrigators in Colorado and Kansas to those waters available to them under the terms of the Arkansas River compact and under the laws of their respective States shall not be diminished or impaired by anything contained in this Act." This is only the empty expression of a pious sentiment unless measures are taken to insure that in actual practice the rights of the irrigators are preserved. Among the measures that must be taken are:

(a) the installation of accurate gaging stations with continuous recording devices;

(b) the updating of an archaic system of water administration;

(c) the developed and proven ability to effect immediate cutback of diversions when the river is falling;

(d) the establishment of a greatly improved communication system between the division engineer and head gatekeepers so that orders are carried out immediately;

(e) the development of realistic operating principles that are binding upon all parties to eliminate as far as possible the likelihood of costly and extended litigation which could frustrate the establishment of the permanent pool for many years if not indefinitely.

10. Sedimentation has already diminished the capacity of the reservoir by 38,000 acre-feet or more. The conservation pool has had to absorb 36,000 acre-feet of this, reducing its capacity from 400,000 acre-feet to 364,000 acre-feet.

Question: "Will a permanent pool increase sedimentation, thereby shortening the life of the reservoir?

"If so, how much will it increase sedimentation, and how many years will it shorten the life of the reservoir?"

11. It is indicated that 10,000 acre-feet of water will have a surface area of approximately 1,600 acres and therefore an average depth of about 6 feet. Maximum depth would be about 20 feet, but nearly 15 feet of the 20 feet would be silty.

Question: "During low water periods (such as 1963–64) will 10,000 acre-feet be sufficient to support fish in any consequential numbers?"

An act to grant the consent of the United States to the Arkansas River compact

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the compact, signed (after negotiations in which a representative of the United States, duly appointed by the President, participated, and upon which he has reported to the Congress) by the Commissioners for the States of Colorado and Kansas on December 14, 1948, at Denver, Colorado, and thereafter ratified by the legislatures of each of the States aforesaid, which said compact reads as follows:

"Arkansas River Compact

"The State of Colorado and the State of Kansas, parties signatory to this Compact (hereinafter referred to as 'Colorado' and 'Kansas', respectively, or individually as a 'State', or collectively as the 'States') having resolved to conclude a compact with respect to the waters of the Arkansas River, and being moved by considerations of interstate comity, having appointed commissioners as follows: 'Henry C. Vidal, Gail L. Ireland, and Harry B. Mendenhall, for Colorado; and George S. Knapp, Edward F. Arn, and William E. Leavitt, and Roland H. Tate, for Kansas'; and the consent of the Congress of the United States to negotiate and enter into an interstate compact not later than January 1, 1950, having been granted by Public Law 34, 79th Congress, 1st Session, and pursuant thereto the President having designated Hans Kramer as the representative of the United States, the said commissioners for Colorado and Kansas, after negotiations participated in by the representative of the United States, have agreed as follows:

"ARTICLE I

"The major purposes of this Compact are to:

"A. Settle existing disputes and remove causes of future controversy between the States of Colorado and Kansas, and between citizens of one and citizens of the other State, concerning the waters of the Arkansas River and their control, conservation and utilization for irrigation and other beneficial purposes.

"B. Equitably divide and apportion between the States of Colorado and Kansas the waters of the Arkansas River and their utilization as well as the benefits arising from the construction, operation, and maintenance by the United States of John Martin Reservoir Project for water conservation purposes.

"ARTICLE II

"The provisions of this compact are based on (1) the physical and other conditions peculiar to the Arkansas River and its natural drainage basin, and the nature and location of irrigation and other developments and facilities in connection therewith; (2) the opinion of the U.S. Supreme Court entered December 6, 1943, in the case of *Colorado* v. *Kansas* (320 U.S. 383) concerning the relative rights of the respective States in and to the use of waters of the Arkansas River; and (3) the experience derived under various interim executive agreements between the two States apportioning the waters released from the John Martin Reservoir as operated by the Corps of Engineers.

"ARTICLE III

"As used in this compact:

"A. The word 'State line' means the geographical boundary line between Colorado and Kansas.

"B. The term 'waters of the Arkansas River' means the waters originating in the natural drainage basin of the Arkansas River, including its tributaries, upstream from the State line, and excluding waters brought into the Arkansas River Basin from other river basins.

"C. The term 'State line flow' means the flow of waters of the Arkansas River as determined by gaging stations located at or near the State line. The flow as determined by such stations, whether located in Colorado or Kansas, shall be deemed to be the actual State line flow.

"D. 'John Martin Reservoir Project' is the official name of the facility formerly known as Caddoa Reservoir Project, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1936, as amended, for construction, operation and maintenance by the War Department, Corps of Engineers, later designated as the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, and herein referred to as the 'Corps of Engineers.' 'John Martin Reservoir' is the water storage space created by 'John Martin Dam.'

"E. The 'flood control storage' is that portion of the total storage space in John Martin Reservoir allocated to flood control purposes.

"F. The 'conservation pool' is that portion of the total storage space in John Martin Reservoir lying below the flood control storage.

"G. The 'ditches of Colorado Water District 67' are those ditches and canals which divert water from the Arkansas River or its tributaries downstream from John Martin Dam for irrigation use in Colorado.

"H. The term 'river flow' means the sum of the flows of the Arkansas and the Purgatoire Rivers into John Martin Reservoir as determined by gaging stations appropriately located above said reservoir.

"I. The term 'the administration' means the Arkansas River Compact Administration established under Article VIII.

"ARTICLE IV

"Both States recognize that:

"A. This compact deals only with the waters of the Arkansas River as defined in Article III.

"B. This compact is not concerned with the rights, if any, of the State of New Mexico or its citizens in and to the use in New Mexico of waters of Trinchera Creek or other tributaries of the Purgatoire River, a tributary of the Arkansas River.

"C. (1) John Martin Dam will be operated by the Corps of Engineers to store and release the waters of the Arkansas River in and from John Martin Reservoir for its authorized purposes.

"(2) The bottom of the flood control storage is presently fixed by the Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, at elevation 3,851 feet above mean sea level. The flood control storage will be operated for flood control purposes and to those ends will impound or regulate the streamflow volumes that are in excess of the then available storage capacity of the conservation pool. Releases from the flood control storage may be made at times and rates determined by the Corps of Engineers to be necessary or advisable without regard to ditch diversion capacities or requirements in either or both States.

"(3) The conservation pool will be operated for the benefit of water users in Colorado and Kansas, both upstream and downstream from John Martin Dam, as provided in this Compact. The maintenance of John Martin Dam and appurtenant works may at times require the Corps of Engineers to release waters then impounded in the conservation pool or to prohibit the storage of water therein until such maintenance work is completed. Flood control operation may also involve temporary utilization of conservation storage.

"D. This Compact is not intended to impede or prevent future beneficial development of the Arkansas River basin in Colorado and Kansas by Federal or State agencies, by private enterprise, or by combinations thereof, which may involve construction of dams, reservoirs, and other works for the purposes of water utilization and control, as well as the improved or prolonged functioning or existing works: *Provided,* That the water of the Arkansas River, as defined in Article III, shall not be materially depleted in usable quantity or availability for use to the water users in Colorado and Kansas under this Compact by such future development or construction.

"ARTICLE V

"Colorado and Kansas hereby agree upon the following basis of apportionment of the waters of the Arkansas River:

"A. Winter storage in John Martin Reservoir shall commence on November 1st of each year and continue to and include the next succeeding March 31st. During said period all water entering said reservoir up to the limit of the then available conservation capacity shall be stored: *Provided,* That Colorado may demand releases of water equivalent to the river flow, but such releases shall not exceed 100 c.f.s. (cubic feet per second) and water so released shall be used without avoidable waste.

"B. Summer storage in John Martin Reservoir shall commence on April 1st of each year and continue to and include the next succeeding October 31st. During said period, except when Colorado water users are operating under decreed priorities as provided in paragraphs F and G of this Article, all water entering said reservoir up to the limit of the then available conservation capacity shall be stored: *Provided,* That Colorado may demand releases of water equivalent to the river flow up to 500 c.f.s., and Kansas may demand releases of water equivalent to that portion of the river flow between 500 c.f.s. and 750 c.f.s., irrespective of releases demanded by Colorado.

"C. Releases of water stored pursuant to the provisions of paragraphs A and B of this article shall be made upon demands by Colorado and Kansas concurrently or separately at any time during the summer storage period. Unless increases to meet extraordinary conditions are authorized by the administration, separate releases of stored water to Colorado shall not exceed 750 c.f.s., separate releases of stored water to Kansas shall not exceed 500 c.f.s., and concurrent releases of stored water shall not exceed a total of 1,250 c.f.s.: *Provided*, That when water stored in the conservation pool is reduced to a quantity less than 20,000 acre-feet, separate releases of stored water to Colorado shall not exceed 600 c.f.s., separate releases of stored water to Kansas shall not exceed 400 c.f.s., and concurrent releases of stored water shall not exceed 1,000 c.f.s.

"D. Releases authorized by paragraphs A, B and C of this Article, except when all Colorado water users are operating under decreed priorities as provided in paragraphs F and G of this article, shall not impose any call on Colorado water users that divert waters of the Arkansas River upstream from John Martin Dam.

"E. (1) Releases of stored water and releases of river flow may be made simultaneously upon the demands of either or both States.

"(2) Water released upon concurrent or separate demands shall be applied promptly to beneficial use unless storage thereof downstream is authorized by the administration.

"(3) Releases of river flow and of stored water to Colorado shall be measured by gaging stations located at or near John Martin Dam and the releases to which Kansas is entitled shall be satisfied by an equivalent in State line flow.

"(4) When water is released from John Martin Reservoir appropriate allowances as determined by the administration shall be made for the intervals of time required for such water to arrive at the points of diversion in Colorado and at the State line.

"(5) There shall be no allowance or accumulation of credits or debits for or against either State.

"(6) Storage, releases from storage and releases of river flow authorized in this article shall be accomplished pursuant to procedures prescribed by the administration under the provisions of article VIII.

"F. In the event the Administration finds that within a period of fourteen (14) days the water in the conservation pool will be or is liable to be exhausted, the Administration shall forthwith notify the State Engineer of Colorado, or his duly authorized representative, that commencing upon a day certain within said fourteen (14) day period, unless a change of conditions justifies cancellation or modification of such notice, Colorado shall administer the decreed rights of water users in Colorado Water District 67 as against each other and as against all rights now or hereafter decreed to water users diverting upstream from John Martin Dam on the basis of relative priorities in the same manner in which their respective priority rights were administered by Colorado before John Martin Reservoir began to operate and as though John Martin Dam had not been constructed. Such priority administration by Colorado shall be continued until the Administration finds that water is again available in the conservation pool for release as provided in this Compact, and timely notice of such finding shall be given by the Administration to the State Engineer of Colorado or his duty authorized representative: Provided, that except as controlled by the operation of the preceding provisions of this paragraph and other applicable provisions of this Compact, when there is water in the conservation pool the water users upstream from John Martin Reservoir shall not be affected by the decrees to the ditches in Colorado Water District 67. Except when administration in Colorado is on a priority basis the water diversions in Colorado Water District 67 shall be administered by Colorado in accordance with distribution agreements made from time to time between the water users in such District and filed with the Administration and with the State Engineer of Colorado or, in the absence of such agreement, upon the basis of the respective priority decrees, as against each other, in said District.

"G. During periods when Colorado reverts to administration of decreed priorities, Kansas shall not be entitled to any portion of the river flow entering John Martin Reservoir. Waters of the Arkansas River originating in Colorado which may flow across the Stateline during such periods are hereby apportioned to Kansas.

"H. If the usable quantity and availability for use of the waters of the Arkansas River to water users in Colorado Water District 67 and Kansas will be thereby materially depleted or adversely affected, (1) priority rights now decreed to the ditches of Colorado Water District 67 shall not hereafter be transferred to other water districts in Colorado or to points of diversion or places of use upstream from John Martin Dam; and (2) the ditch diversion rights from the Arkansas River in Colorado Water District 67 and of Kansas ditches between the Stateline and Garden City shall not hereafter be increased beyond the total present rights of said ditches, without the Administration, in either case (1) or (2), making findings of fact that no such depletion or adverse effect will result from such proposed transfer or increase. Notice of legal proceedings for any such proposed transfer or increase shall be given to the Administration in the manner and within the time provided by the laws of Colorado or Kansas in such cases.

"ARTICLE VI

"A. (1) Nothing in this Compact shall be construed as impairing the jurisdiction of Kansas over the waters of the Arkansas River that originate in Kansas and over the waters that flow from Colorado across the Stateline into Kansas.

"(2) Except as otherwise provided, nothing in this Compact shall be construed as supplanting the administration by Colorado of the rights of appropriators of waters of the Arkansas River in said State as decreed to said appropriators by the courts of Colorado, nor as interfering with the distribution among said appropriators by Colorado, nor as curtailing the diversion and use for irrigation and other beneficial purposes in Colorado of the waters of the Arkansas River.

"B. Inasmuch as the Frontier Canal diverts waters of the Arkansas River in Colorado west of the Stateline for irrigation uses in Kansas only, Colorado concedes to Kansas and Kansas hereby assumes exclusive administrative control over the operation of the Frontier Canal and its headworks for such purposes, to the same extent as though said works were located entirely within the State of Kansas. Water carried across the State line in the Frontier Canal or any other similarly situated canal shall be considered to be part of the Stateline flow.

"ARTICLE VII

"A. Each State shall be subject to the terms of this Compact. Where the name of the State or the term 'State' is used in this Compact these shall be construed to include any person or entity of any nature whatsoever using, claiming or in any manner asserting any right to the use of the waters of the Arkansas River under the authority of that State.

"B. This Compact establishes no general principle or precedent with respect to any other interstate stream.

"C. Wherever any State or Federal official or agency is referred to in this Compact such reference shall apply to the comparable official or agency succeeding to their duties and functions.

"ARTICLE VIII

"A. To administer the provisions of this Compact there is hereby created an interstate agency to be known as the Arkansas River Compact Administration herein designated as 'the Administration'.

"B. The Administration shall have power to:

"(1) Adopt, amend, and revoke bylaws, rules and regulations consistent with the provisions of this Compact;

"(2) Prescribe procedures for the administration of this compact: *Provided,* That where such procedures involve the operation of John Martin Reservoir Project they shall be subject to the approval of the district engineer in charge of said project;

"(3) Perform all functions required to implement this Compact and to do all things necessary, proper or convenient in the performance of its duties.

"C. The membership of the Administration shall consist of three representatives from each State who shall be appointed by the respective Governors for a term not to exceed four years. One Colorado representative shall be a resident of and water right owner in Water Districts 14 or 17, one Colorado representative shall be a resident of and water right owner in Water District 67, and one Colorado representative shall be the Director of the Colorado Water Conservation Board. Two Kansas representatives shall be residents of and water right owners in the counties of Finney, Kearney, or Hamilton, and one Kansas representative shall be the chief State official charged with the administration of water rights in Kansas. The President of the United States is hereby requested to designate a representative of the United States, and if a representative is so designated he shall be an ex-officio member and act as chairman of the Administration without vote.

"D. The State representatives shall be appointed by the respective Governors within 30 days after the effective date of this Compact. The Administration shall meet and organize within 60 days after such effective date. A quorum for any meeting shall consist of four members of the Administration: *Provided,* That at least two members are present from each State. Each State shall have but one vote in the Administration and every decision, authorization or other action shall require unanimous vote. In case of a divided vote on any matter within the purview of the Administration, the Administration may, by subsequent unanimous vote, refer the matter for arbitration to the Representative of the United States or other arbitrator or arbitrators, in which event the decision made by such arbitrator or arbitrators shall be binding upon the Administration.

"E. (1) The salaries, if any, and the personal expenses of each member shall be paid by the Government which he represents. All other expenses incident to the administration of this Compact which are not paid by the United States shall be borne by the States on the basis of 60 percent by Colorado and 40 percent by Kansas.

"(2) In each even numbered year the Administration shall adopt and transmit to the Governor of each State its budget covering anticipated expenses for the forthcoming biennium and the amount thereof payable by each State. Each State shall appropriate and pay the amount due by it to the Administration.

"(3) The Administration shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements and shall include a statement thereof, together with a certificate of audit by a certified public accountant, in its annual report. Each State shall have the right to make an examination and audit of the accounts of the Administration at any time.

"F. Each State shall provide such available facilities, equipment and other assistance as the Administration may need to carry out its duties. To supplement such available assistance the Administration may employ engineering, legal, clerical and other aid as in its judgment may be necessary for the performance of its functions. Such employees shall be paid by and be responsible to the Administration, and shall not be considered to be employees of either State.

"G. (1) The Administration shall cooperate with the chief official of each State charged with the administration of water rights and with Federal agencies in the systematic determination and correlation of the facts as to the flow and diversion of the waters of the Arkansas River and as to the operation and siltation of John Martin Reservoir and other related structures. The Administration shall cooperate in the procurement, interchange, compilation and publication of all factual data bearing upon the administration of this Compact without, in general, duplicating measurements, observations or publications made by State or Federal agencies. State officials shall furnish pertinent factual data to the Administration upon its request. The Administration shall, with the collaboration of the appropriate Federal and State agencies, determine as may be necessary from time to time, the location of gaging stations required for the proper administration of this Compact and shall designate the official records of such stations for its official use.

"(2) The Director, U.S. Geological Survey, the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, are hereby requested to collaborate with the administration and with appropriate State officials in the systematic determination and correlation of data referred to in paragraph G (1) of this Article and in the execution of other duties of such officials which may be necessary for the proper administration of this Compact.

"(3) If deemed necessary for the administration of this Compact, the Administration may require the installation and maintenance, at the expense of water users, of measuring devices of approved type in any ditch or group of ditches diverting water from the Arkansas River in Colorado or Kansas. The chief official of each State charged with the administration of water rights shall supervise the execution of the Administration's requirements for such installations.

"H. Violation of any of the provisions of this Compact or other actions prejudicial thereto which come to the attention of the Administration shall be promptly investigated by it. When deemed advisable as the result of such investigation, the Administration may report its findings and recommendations to the State official who is charged with the administration of water rights for appropriate action, it being the intent of this Compact that enforcement of its terms shall be accomplished in general through the State agencies and officials charged with the administration of water rights.

"I. Findings of fact made by the Administration shall not be conclusive in any court or before any agency or tribunal but shall constitute prima facie evidence of the facts found.

"J. The Administration shall report annually to the Governors of the States and to the President of the United States as to matters within its purview.

"ARTICLE IX

"A. This Compact shall become effective when ratified by the Legislature of each State and when consented to by the Congress of the United States by legislation providing substantially, among other things, as follows:

"'Nothing contained in this Act or in the Compact herein consented to shall be construed as impairing or affecting the sovereignty of the United States or any of its rights or jurisdiction in and over the area or waters which are the subject of such Compact: *Provided,* That the Chief of Engineers is hereby authorized to operate the conservation features of the John Martin Reservoir project in a manner conforming to such Compact with such exceptions as he and the Administration created pursuant to the Compact may jointly approve.'

"B. This Compact shall remain in effect until modified or terminated by unanimous action of the States and in the event of modification or termination all rights then established or recognized by this Compact shall continue unimpaired.

"In Witness whereof, The commissioners have signed this Compact in triplicate original, one of which shall be forwarded to the Secretary of State of the United States of America and one of which shall be forwarded to the Governor of each signatory State.

"Done in the City and County of Denver, in the state of Colorado, on the 14th day of December, in the Year of our Lord 1948.

"Henry C. Vidal,
"Gail L. Ireland,
"Harry B. Mendenhall,
"Commissioners for Colorado.
"George S. Knapp,
"Edward F. Arn,
"William E. Leavitt,
"Roland H. Tate,
"Commissioners for Kansas.

"Attest:

"Warden L. Noe,
"Secretary.

"Approved.

"Hans Kramer,
"Representative of the United States."

SEC. 2. Nothing contained in this Act or in the compact herein consented to shall be construed as impairing or affecting the sovereignty of the United States or any of its rights or jurisdiction in and over the area or waters which are the subject of such compact: *Provided,* That the Chief of Engineers is hereby authorized to operate the conservation features of the John Martin Reservoir project in a manner conforming to such compact with such exceptions as he and the Administration created pursuant to the compact may jointly approve.

Approved May 31, 1949.

COVER MENDENHALL, ATTORNEY AT LAW,
Rocky Ford, Colo., August 2, 1965.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senator from Colorado,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: Thank you for your letter of July 29 enclosing copy of letter dated July 28, 1965 to Mr. Felix L. Sparks.

After reading it, I think you have taken the only logical position that can be taken by one interested in the development of southeastern Colorado. There is no question in my mind as to the desirability of a permanent pool in John Martin Reservoir. I think probably an equal amount of water for that purpose would have greater economic benefit to the area than an equal amount of water used for irrigation purposes. It goes without saying that the recreational advantages to the area would be great in addition to the economic advantages, which are created by people seeking recreation.

However, there is the unfortunate truth that at the time the dam was built and planned the various recreation type agencies were not interested in it and no provision was made for such use. As you know even better than I, the rights to that water then vested in irrigators and municipal corporations. To attempt to deprive any of those people of those rights at this time would be closely akin to declaring the homestead act void in retrospect.

If, and only if, there is other water which can be made available to maintain a permanent pool without injury through lack of return flow, etc., from the change in use of that other water, I would be wholeheartedly in favor of the pool. As you mentioned to Mr. Sparks, a "hole" always seems to appear in the river. I am not sure whether this is because of archaic administration, unanticipated appropriation of water or just whatever, but I do know that it appears and must be avoided because often the loss of water to an irrigator at a critical period can lose him his crop for a year.

If there is anything that I can do to aid or assist in anyway in the resolution of these differences, I would be most happy to do so.

Very sincerely yours,

COVER.

THE FORT BENT DITCH CO.,
Lamar, Colo., August 3, 1965.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT,
c/o Committee on Appropriations,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GORDON: Thank you very much for your good letter of the 29th ulto, and for the interest you show in our problem here of a permanent pool in the John Martin Reservoir.

Needless to say, we of the Fort Bent Ditch Co., as well as all other ditches below John Martin, are against any permanent pool. We can't see where it would be possible, even though the State Game and Fish Department bought water for that purpose, to maintain and regulate the reservoir so there would be a permanent pool of 10,000 or 20,000 acre-feet. The factor of seepage and of evaporation would be so great (and so indeterminable) that we can't see how it could be maintained, and at the same time give us the water that we might need for the purpose of growing crops.

I might add here that after we all attended your called meeting at the district courtroom in the courthouse here, on January 31, 1964, we all felt pretty good about this deal, because of your promise made there. Then later on, after Frank Evans was elected as Representative from this district, he called a meeting of the Ditch companies and water users (I don't remember the date) in the rear room of Bosley's cafe here in Lamar, at which there must have been some 50 or 60 present, and at that time he made the statement that he would not introduce, or support, a bill in favor of a permanent pool. However, from what the press says, he did introduce the bill, and I am informed that he is working to have such a bill passed by the House. I can't go along with such tactics as this. I would like to see a man stick with his convictions, and not be "wishy-washy" and try to ride both sides of the fence in a matter that is as important as this one is.

You are correct in that the Arkansas is the most overappropriated river in the State of Colorado, and we here at the lower end of the valley need this water to raise crops, rather than to use what we need for irrigation for recreational purposes.

Our board of directors will meet this coming Saturday evening, and I will read your letters to them when they meet, and I am sure that they will be pleased to know that you are still looking after the interests of the farmers below John Martin.

I know that Felix Sparks is out working mighty hard to have a permanent pool created above the dam, but we here below the dam are all interested in irrigation. Sure, we would like to have a place to fish and boat ride, but we feel that raising crops is a whole lot more essential than fishing and boating, and especially when we have other places in this territory where fishing and boating are available.

Again I want to thank you for your letter, and for your stand for agriculture versus recreation.

With kindest personal regards to both you and Welda, from Joyce and myself, I am,

Your very sincerely,

GROVER L. CARRICO,
President.

HOLLY, COLO.,
August 30, 1965.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ALLOTT: Thank you very much for information concerning the actions on a permanent pool in John Martin.

I could probably write a very large book on reasons why I do not want the permanent pool, but I'll say a permanent pool would be an asset to the valley. It is doubtful that I mention anything that you do not already know and possibly more about it.

We know the U.S. Government is pushing recreational projects all over the United States and rightly so. I would think local citizens should know the needs of their particular locality. However, in case of permanent pool in John Martin it is very apparent that the sportsmen that are pushing it are doing so out of spite or mockery. A few years ago it was necessary to drain the reservoir to meet irrigating needs and to help in cleaning some of the mud from the lake. At that time many fish lost their home. Most was caught by the public. I myself got about one hundred pounds, all carp. I tried to find a game fish but got none. Nevertheless the pool pushers made big news of the tons of fish the "dirty" farmers has destroyed. The fact the fish and game department went to great cost to seine and destroy tons of carp from other pools nearby seemed all fair and good to the sportsmen maybe we farmers should have charged the taxpayers for our services.

If this pool was capable of creating any recreational facilities and harboring some game fish, I for one would be for it. It can never be anything but a mud hole. Where is the shoreline? Where is the sandy beach? Where are the trees? Where is the wading pool, swimming pool, and picnic grounds, etc.? At present the permanent pool has about 400,000 acre-feet of water on top of it. When this water is lowered to leave the 10,000 acre-feet permanent pool it will take a full year for the mud beach to dry so the lake can be reached. I would like a pool, but by all means not a big mud flat down under a changing reservoir.

It is understandable why we have all carp and no game fish in this valley. Water that has been held 2 weeks or more becomes very strong with chemicals that are severe on humans as well as fish. One needs experience only a few days of irrigating in this water and note how the hands crack open to bleeding depth within the first day.

Sure a permanent pool will work just fine for the next year due to the fact that there is plenty of water, and no one knows the difference whether there is a pool or not. The backers don't need the pool; the farmers don't need the water. Only when the farmers need the water badly will the pool be needed. Why not direct pool backers attention to an off stream storage or another dam on the river. It seems unfair to the cities of Lamar, Granada, Holly, and many others for flood control to be impaired by robbing it of 10,000 acre-feet. Surely the past 3 months has proven that more flood control is needed; also enough water has run by this summer to more than fill another John Martin.

Your letter to Mr. Sparks, July 28, proves to me you are on guard for all interests. Page 2 states a permanent pool was tried and failed. You seem right in stating that upper river couldn't let water go by when they were dry. I noted once last month the report gave 3,000 second-feet passing Pueblo; 500 second-feet passing Las Animas, this 2,500 second-feet being used in a rainy spell with lighter demands in the upper divisions.

Too, in considering the evaporation; that alone could ruin everything for the pool. I believe the Amity Canal has records to show that they at one time stored an amount of water in the lakes north of Lamar. From 18 months to 2 years later 75 percent had been lost. The canal recovered only 25 percent of its stockpile. Records should be available also to show that the river flow was not sufficient to supply a 10,000 acre-feet permanent pool, plus evaporation for the summer of 1964.

It is also my opinion that the Colorado Fish and Game Department would welcome the chance to point out to the public that a fish pool in John Martin is of the lowest possible value to anyone. The great expense to the taxpayers to change this thing should by all means be used toward something with recreational features. Tourists would certainly sneer at a mud flat with not a shade in 2 miles.

I appreciate your efforts for trying to stage some hearings in this valley and will welcome the chance to attend any and all that may be scheduled.

Hoping to see you on your return to Lamar.

Sincerely yours,

PALMER P. PENDERGRAFT.

THE ROCKY FORD DITCH CO.,
Rocky Ford, Colo., October 13, 1965.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: Under direction of the board of directors of the Rocky Ford Ditch Co., I have been instructed to advise you our company is not opposed to a permanent pool at the John Martin Dam. We do, however, feel strongly that this has to be done in such a way that it does not interfere with the irrigation or ditch company priorities and operation of the Arkansas River. Our company concurs with your handling of this and wish to express our thanks for the manner in which you are working out this issue.

Sincerely yours,

William Madonna,
Secretary-Treasurer.

The Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp.,
Denver, Colo., August 27, 1965.

Senator Gordon Allott,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: This is in reply to your letter of July 29, 1965, addressed to Mr. S. A. Ott, vice president of operations, the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp. I am taking the liberty of answering that letter since I recently assumed the position of vice president in charge of operations.

We have given serious thought to the questions and matters discussed in your letter of July 28 to Mr. Sparks. Needless to say, the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp. has a vital interest in the matter of water rights in the Arkansas Valley and we appreciate having the opportunity of making a few comments.

We have become increasingly concerned for the last few years with regard to the protection of Colorado Fuel & Iron's water rights from the Arkansas and its tributaries. There are various reasons for this concern, but among these are the problem of the enforcement and protection of water priorities in the entire river system and the adverse effect on existing water rights resulting from wells which are permitted to draw water from sources which are tributary to the river.

With specific regard to the establishment of a permanent recreational pool in the John Martin Reservoir, we feel that any such action must be taken very carefully and only with proper regard to and safeguards for the protection of existing water rights. Certainly water for any such permanent recreational pool should be acquired from existing sources and should be used in a manner that would not adversely affect the vested rights of other water users. What I am saying is basically that if a permanent recreational pool is to be established, water must be purchased for this purpose and when the use and point of diversion of the water are changed for this purpose, such must be accomplished in accordance with basic Colorado water law. This would mean that there could not be any enlarged use and that other appropriators would not be adversely affected. Specifically, the new use should not result in any greater call on the river or in any existing appropriator having the conditions changed insofar as the water available for his appropriation is concerned.

In line with the foregoing, it would seem that careful consideration should be given as to the point from which the water was taken to supply the permanent recreational pool. If an irrigation right were acquired, then the land which had been previously irrigated by this right would presumably have to be retired as irrigated land. Here again we might have the problem of wells being drilled to make up for the loss of water involved in the surface right that was sold. If these wells were tributary to the stream, there could be an adverse effect on existing appropriators. If the water right were acquired from a user below the John Martin Reservoir, particular attention should be given to the question of whether appropriators above the reservoir would be injured.

As I have said, we are basically concerned with the strict enforcement of priorities in the Arkansas River to protect existing appropriators and with the complete recognition of basic water law principles having to do with change of use and change of point of diversion in connection with the acquisition of any water right and its transfer to the reservoir for the permanent recreational pool.

We note you suggest that there be hearings on the matter in the area before any definitive action is taken. This, we feel, would be advisable in almost any case, but it is particularly so in connection with any proceedings on the Arkansas River at this time due to the many controversies and problems that exist.

We do appreciate having the opportunity to comment to you and will look forward to hearing further regarding developments in this matter.

Very truly yours,

Clay Crawford.

Welborn, Dufford & Cook,
Attorneys at Law,
Denver, Colo., August 31, 1965.

Senator Gordon Allott,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Allott: This is in reply to your letter of July 29 with which you sent me a copy of your letter of July 28 to Mr. Sparks dealing with the John Martin Reservoir situation.

I consulted with Mr. C. Clay Crawford, vice president in charge of operations of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp., in regard to his letter of August 27, 1965, to you on the same subject. I concur in the views expressed by Mr. Crawford.

The basic concern which I have as a representative of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp. and also as an attorney interested in water law is with the administration of water rights in the Arkansas Valley. As you know, the Colorado Legislature this past spring enacted significant legislation dealing with underground water. It is expected that these new laws will not only clarify the authority of the State engineer and his department but will also provide the State engineer with additional power to deal with waters which are tributary to a natural stream.

Perhaps the most serious problem that has confronted surface appropriators in recent years is the encroachment upon the water available to satisfy their priorities as a result of pumping from wells which are either in the bed of the Arkansas River or which are drawing from sources tributary to it. Many of these wells have been permitted to take water without regard to priorities and thus adversely affect surface appropriators. This adverse effect is felt by Colorado Fuel & Iron even though its water rights are upstream a great distance from the well diversions. The reason for this, of course, is that appropriators upstream are required to curtail their diversions to satisfy senior appropriators downstream whose source of water has been depleted by wells.

I am not thoroughly familiar with the John Martin Reservoir problem and all of its ramifications. Of course it would be desirable from many standpoints to establish a recreation pool in that reservoir to benefit people who can derive pleasure from it. Certainly the establishment of any pool must, however, be achieved with due recognition of the constitutional and statutory rights of other water uses.

I appreciate having the opportunity to comment on this important matter. If there is anything further I can do, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

Bob Welborn.

Bristol, Colo.,
August 26, 1965.

Senator Gordon Allott,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Allott: I received your letter of July 29 and also a copy of the letter you sent to Mr. Felix Sparks in regard to the permanent pool behind John Martin Dam.

I am in full accord with the principles you have stated in this letter and I do not think any action should be taken to secure a permanent pool without a public hearing to protect the interest of all.

No person who is familiar with this area could conscientiously say that irrigators below the dam would not be adversely affected by a permanent pool.

It is my belief that ditches above the dam benefit more from the dam than those below. In periods of drought I believe that the dam is a definite liability to irrigators below, because under the provisions of the Arkansas River compact the upstream ditches run the winter water while those below cannot get any from November 1 to April 1.

I would like to thank you for your interest in this matter and appreciate your efforts to represent all the people.

Very truly yours,

Orville Hopkins.

Manzanola, Colo.,
August 23, 1965.

Senator Gordon Allott,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Gordon: In reply to your letter of July 29, 1965, enclosing a copy of your letter to Mr. Felix L. Sparks, I wish to say that I am very pleased with the attitude you have taken on all of these irrigation problems.

It appears that you favor a permanent recreational pool at the John Martin only in case that certain problems are properly solved beforehand. I think this is so important that the recreation pool should not be built unless these problems you suggest are previously correctly solved.

I think that holding a public hearing in the area is one of the important things that should be done before any legislation is passed by the Senate.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

John C. Vroman, Jr.

Holly, Colo.,
August 14, 1965.

Hon. Gordon Allott,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I agree with your stand on the water situation at John Martin Dam. I feel that you will do everything possible to protect our water rights.

I am not interested in boating or fishing, but I am vitally interested in irrigation water.

Sincerely,

Philip Flint.

Cruikshank Farms,
Granada, Colo., August 23, 1965.

Hon. Gordon Allott,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Gordon: I am sorry that I am late in answering your letter but it was missent to Koen and I just now received your correspondence.

This fish pool question is still a hot topic of conversation in the lower Arkansas Valley; however, the sentiment compared to a few years ago when you had the hearing in the Prowers County courthouse has changed quite a bit in favor of the pool. I would say that half of the irrigators in all the ditch companies except the Amity would be in favor of a permanent pool providing the necessary water rights could be obtained and a solution could be worked out on the administration of the pool. Perhaps the best idea is your own suggestion that they hold hearings in the valley. I think this is a must.

We all appreciate very much your interest in this matter and know that you will look out after our interests.

Best regards,

C. G. CRUIKSHANK.

HARTMAN, COLO.,
August 19, 1965.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GORDON: Thank you for your letter of July 28, relative to your stand on a permanent pool and your letter to Mr. Felix Sparks. Thank you for taking a long look at the different angles which would be created by the establishment of a permanent pool.

I feel that the majority of the people below the dam would favor a permanent pool, if a feasible plan could be adopted which would not jeopardize the lifeblood of our economy. Such a plan would have to include such items as (1) revamping our system of water administration to the extent that changes in flow of streams could be affected every 6 to 8 hours instead of every 20 hours, (2) relatively accurate gaging stations with more frequent reports given on same, (3) a supervisor, who could be hired by the ditches below the dam at a nominal cost to each to work concurrently with upstream interests, to more efficiently distribute water to those who have a legal right to same, (4) a clause for evaporation, such a clause would by necessity of its nature, have to be worked out with engineers who have some formula which would most nearly fit our climatic conditions. Several other aspects should be given consideration but I am sure that with a meeting or series of meetings among intelligent men a set of operating principles could be arrived at which would be of best interests to all concerned.

Let's not leave a stone unturned, lest we injure the rights of someone anywhere along the Arkansas. If I may be of any service please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

WILFORD O. RANDLE.

HOLLY, COLO.,
August 10, 1965.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ALLOTT: In reply to your letter to Mr. Felix Sparks, I am opposed to the permanent pool, mainly because the operating procedure could cost us a great loss of water. Many times during the dry years the dam would be empty, then receive a rain impounding some water in the dam, as the dam was going empty, we would call for our riverflow. Sometimes 1 to 2 days of water are lost because the water was not released soon enough. During the dry years this occurs often, so the river would have to be administered very careful.

Also in a dry period, on the Amity Canal, during a 24-hour period the amount of cubic feet may vary from none up to 500 and back to 100 or an amount similar. Do you think the Army Engineers would raise and close the gates so that we could run water in this manner? This is a long way from normal but does happen and sometimes on holidays and Sundays. Would the Army Engineers handle this?

If the permanent pool becomes a reality, I agree with you 100 percent, on having the ditches handle the operating principles.

I was in Denver about 2 years ago to attend a Colorado Water Conservation Board meeting. Jim Romer was spokesman for the Amity Ditch Co. at the meeting. His argument opposing the pool was: we would not receive the silt, which would settle in the dam. In irrigating, a certain amount of silt is much more beneficial and too much silt prevents the water from soaking in the ground, causing the water to just run off.

In my understanding, in agreeing for the permanent pool, then finding it would not work satisfactory, we would be stuck with it.

Yours very truly,

FLOYD THOMPSON.

QUINN OIL CO.,
Lamar, Colo., August 12, 1965.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GORDON: Thanks for your letter and invitation for my comments on the permanent pool at John Martin. We are all aware of the fact that the Arkansas Valley is farming area, and the water to this community is a very important item. People who own land with ditch rights should be considered, because these rights date back for a good many years.

GORDON, there is something else that we have to consider in our thinking on the water problem. That is the domestic use of water. The homes, businesses and industries are using more and more water and here in Lamar our long-range outlook isn't very bright. This necessitates a good look be given to this problem.

Frankly, GORDON, it is hard to tell you anything that is new on the water problem for southeast Colorado. Not only have you served on a ditch company's board, but you have kept up with the water problems in the area admirably. However, I would like to express a few thoughts on the various problems.

Hunting, fishing, boating, camping, and picnicking bring a lot of money into our area. It is about 200 miles to the mountains and we feel that this part of the State should have more to offer in the way of recreation facilities. I think John Martin Lake with a permanent pool would help provide this.

Poor management of our water is another problem. There is enough water wasted in opening and closing the gates at the dam to provide water for a permanent pool. It is my wish that a permanent pool be created at John Martin Lake and that a closer and better management of all our water be put into force. New laws should be created for the ditch companies at the same time so that they won't suffer unduly by the changes made with an established permanent pool. It is my hope that all these aforementioned changes would provide a better business climate and a more enjoyable place to live in southeast Colorado.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. QUINN.

ORDWAY, COLO.,
August 6, 1965.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: I have received a copy of your letter dated July 28, 1965, to Felix L. Sparks in relation to the proposed permanent pool in John Martin Reservoir for recreation purposes.

Referring to paragraph 1 on page 3, and to the last paragraph on page 3 of the aforesaid letter, you have therein clearly outlined the problems in connection with the establishment and operation of such a pool, with but one exception.

In order to protect vested rights along the river and to overcome any legitimate complaints from these water users it is the opinion of a number of us that (1) we must know the source, or sources, from which water will be obtained to make the initial pool filling of 10,000 acre-feet, or whatever amount is selected, (2) we must know the source, or sources, from which water will be secured to offset annual losses to the pool from evaporation and seepage.

In relation to items 1 and 2 above it is my opinion that such a pool can only be established and maintained by purchases of water imported from Colorado's western slope, or from some other source foreign to the Arkansas River surface water basin. It is not to fantastic to propose that the original pool be established with imported surface water and, following its establishment, seepage, and evaporation losses be replaced annually through the use of water from wells.

In relation to the possible purchase of such imported water for this purpose and, had an agreement to purchase been previously negotiated, the pool could easily have been filled this current year. A municipality and two irrigation companies on the Arkansas River, who import western slope water, were forced to waste thousands of acre-feet of such water because of the lack of reservoir storage space. This is, of course, a tremendous water year because of the series of floods and because of the very high water content of the snowpack in the mountains.

A possible source of water to establish and maintain such a pool could be the Southeastern Colorado Water Conservancy District at such time as it has imported water for sale. John Martin Reservoir is theoretically eligible for such purchase since it lies within the said district.

We are entirely sympathetic to the need and desire of these people for such a recreational facility in the area and we know many of them are very puzzled and quite upset because to date they have failed to get any concrete results.

Please feel free to contact us if we can be of assistance.

Very truly yours,

THE TWIN LAKES RESERVOIR & CANAL CO.
WALLACE A. DOE,
General Manager and Engineer.

HARTMAN, COLO.,
August 12, 1965.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: You are to be commended on your stand concerning the permanent pool at John Martin Dam.

As you have consistently said, until the river regulations are changed and better gaging stations maintained the residents below the dam would surely be the losers in dry times, which seems to be the case about 90 percent of the time.

Again, thanks for sticking to your beliefs against a lot of pressure.

Respectfully yours.

N. L. MCTAGGART.

P.S.—Farmer below the dam who likes to fish as well as any one.

DONOHOE CHEVROLET CO.,
Holly, Colo., August 7, 1965.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GORDON: In regard to your letter of July 29, 1965 concerning my comments on your letter to Mr. Felix Sparks, I find that I am in complete accord with you.

As you well know, agriculture is the base of our whole economy here in southeastern Colorado and the conservation of water is of prime importance to everyone.

I have talked to many people, farmers, businessmen, employees, etc., and I have yet to find anyone who is not in favor of a permanent pool behind John Martin Dam. These people all realize its signifiance and its potential for recreation for themselves and as an added attraction for tourists.

As you can understand most townspeople are not very much interested in the ways or means of such a pool, they just want it one way or another.

The farmers, on the other hand, are in favor of a permanent pool only if it will not deprive them of their legal rights.

I have talked to the superintendent of the Amity Mutual Irrigation Co., Mr. Bill Howland, and he said that they have no objection to the pool but the reason they have balked so far to the idea is that the game and fish department has not indicated to them where the water will come from and how it will be administered when they do get it.

I think that as soon as the question of the availability of the water is settled and a set of operating principles have been drawn up you will have no conflict with anyone. I know that it will be difficult to satisfy everyone and I wish I had an easy solution to the problem, but I am not well enough acquainted with the law and how you go about getting things like this done.

GORDON, we want and need this permanent pool behind John Martin Dam and I know you will do everything in your power to see that we get it and that it will be in the best interest of the people of southeastern Colorado.

I hope I have been of some assistance in this matter.

JOHN DONOHOE.

LA JUNTA, COLO.,
August 5, 1965.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GORDON: I have reviewed your letter of July 28, 1965, directed to Larry Sparks concerning a permanent pool at John Martin. As you know, I represent the Holbrook Mutual Irrigating Co., which diverts water above the dam with a rather late priority.

Our concern with regard to a permanent pool is not so much the source of water which creates the pool, but the source which will replenish it. The only thing that I have heard is that water will be bought to replenish evaporation and seepage loss. The source of this purchased water is of prime concern to us. If water rights are acquired from an appropriator diverting below Pueblo, then one must consider the loss to the river of the return flow.

I am aware of any number of small decrees in the Canon City area and if such a water right were acquired, the accompanying transportation and shrinkage problem is immediately apparent. Unless the items above mentioned are given consideration by the conservationists, I am sure that upstream appropriations would be deprived of water which would be rightfully theirs in order to maintain a permanent pool.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH N. WADLEIGH,
Attorney-at-Law.

ROCKY FORD, COLO.,
August 6, 1965.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter addressed to me under date of July 29, 1965, together with a copy of your letter to Mr. Felix L. Sparks relative to a voluntary conservation pool of 8,000 acre-feet proposed to be retained in the John Martin Reservoir.

I have read your letter to Mr. Sparks several times and it is my opinion that your position as therein related is sound and reasonable. I presumed to discuss this letter at length with members of the board of directors of the Catlin Canal Co. They took no official action thereon for the reason that none was asked. I inferred that they took no exception to your position as therein stated.

The president of Catlin Co. expressed his unqualified opinion to the effect that he, personally, would not consent to such a pool until it shall have been made clearly to appear who will contribute the water and from what source it will come. Following the establishment of the above points, he would then, personally, insist on knowing who would operate the same and the plan of operation thereof.

It seems to me that this position coincides with the position you took in the letter to Mr. Sparks and that such a position is a very sound one for the reasons stated in your said letter.

Extending warm personal regards and best wishes, I am

Respectfully and sincerely,

PERRY E. WILLIAMS,
Attorney-at-law.

GUYMON, OKLA.,
August 6, 1965.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GORDON: I appreciate your letter of July 29 enclosing a copy of your letter to Mr. Felix Sparks concerning the action taken by the Colorado Conservation Board on July 12. I appreciate your statements in regard to the permanent pool in John Martin Reservoir. I know you understand the problem of being on the end of an irrigation ditch or the end of the river.

I would like to comment on the meeting July 23 in Lamar, Colo., of the Colorado-Kansas Compact Commission at which Mr. Sparks represented the State of Colorado. In pushing quite hard for a resolution favoring a permanent pool, he made the statement that the water belonged to the United States Government and they could do with it what they saw fit. He also stated that he would consider no permanent pool of any type on any side stream until the permanent pool was in John Martin Reservoir.

I have always said there may be places off the main stem of the Arkansas River where recreation areas may be bought for fewer dollar expended and not complicate the administration of the main stem.

When a man refuses to consider a project on its merits and so publicly states that he will not listen to any until they please him with a permanent pool in John Martin and who says that the water does not belong to the States with the right of appropriation thereof, he is not a fit person to represent the State of Colorado in negotiations between States. If Mr. Sparks represents the opinion of the State water board, this board may well be disbanded and all instructions for the administration of water shall come from Washington.

This is not the first water meeting in Colorado where Felix Sparks has been off base in his statements and he is a black eye to States rights. I certainly recommend that he be removed from any position representing the water rights of Colorado.

Yours truly,

JIM ROMER.

HOLLY, COLO.,
August 6, 1965.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: I appreciate your consideration in sending me the correspondence concerning a permanent pool in John Martin Reservoir. This issue is of vital concern to the southeast Colorado area and most people, including myself, below the dam, are in complete agreement with your position of insisting that operating principles be included in any legislation. The pool would undoubtedly bring recreational benefits, but I believe such benefits could only accrue at the expense of irrigators and water appropriators in the Arkansas Valley.

Sincerely,

EVLLYN COX.

ROCKY FORD, COLO.,
August 6, 1965.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: Thank you for sending the information on a permanent pool at John Martin Reservoir. I have read with interest your comments on this problem and its possible solution.

I was happy to learn that you were in favor of a permanent pool if it can be obtained without injury to existing property rights of irrigators in the Arkansas Valley. It has been my observation that the irrigators also favor a permanent pool if it can be shown in operating principles that their existing property rights will not be injured with the establishment of the pool.

It appears as though the recreational interests desire for a permanent pool has clouded any sense of obligation concerning other's existing property rights. They cry long and loud that the pool will not harm the irrigators but will make no effort to formulate the necessary rules to insure that harm will not be done to their fellow citizens.

I admire you for your continued resistance to rough-shod tactics which attempt to ignore or evade the laws which established freedom for all in our country.

Sincerely,

WAYNE W. WHITTAKER.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO.,
August 9, 1965.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GORDON: Thank you for your letter of July 29 together with a copy of your letter to Mr. Felix L. Sparks, director of the Colorado Water Commission Board. I agree with the contents of your letter and think it is excellent.

Warm personal regards.

Sincerely,

RUSSELL T. TUTT.

LAMAR, COLO.,
August 10, 1965.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GORDON: My apologies for not having replied any sooner but I was out of town and did not return until just a couple of days ago.

In reference to your letter concerning the permanent pool at John Martin, I sincerely believe after talking to farmers during the past few weeks both before and after the June floods that the water rights which the farmers are now receiving full benefits from should remain the same. The farmers as a whole feel that they will not receive full benefits from the dam if a permanent pool is put into effect and furthermore it would be a detriment to them.

However, most farmers on the ditches are willing and would like the opportunity to express their views and possibly work out a solution whereby a permanent pool could be retained. At this time a great many of the farmers have become very unhappy with the statements of FRANK EVANS and are unwilling to cooperate so long as they receive no recognition. The feeling as I wrote you several weeks ago is that the game and fish department, FRANK EVANS, and Felix L. Sparks are no longer concerned with the farmers problems, or the potential loss to them.

At the same time the businessman, the rancher, and the laborer and those who do not depend on the ditches believe that they are entitled to the permanent pool and they are being cheated not only of their recreation but of potential tourist trade which might exist once a permanent pool was established.

My personal belief is that the problem can be solved and both segments of the community can be satisfied if the problems are openly expressed and resolved.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES E. BRADBURN.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

PROPOSED SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that I cannot support H.R. 11135, the proposed Sugar Act Amendments of 1965.

There is no question that this bill is a great improvement over the version approved earlier by the other body. Credit for this goes to the Senate Committee on Finance, which has removed several of the most outrageous and obnoxious features of the House-approved bill, especially with respect to the assignment of foreign sugar quotas.

But even so, too many basic inequities remain in the bill for me to support it. For several years, I have been uneasy about our basic policy in sugar, that has made it the most tightly controlled and heavily subsidized commodity in the country.

H.R. 11135 would continue this unhappy situation for an additional 2 to 5 years.

My fundamental objection to this legislation—and the program it perpetuates—is that it is horribly unfair to the American consumer. The American housewife is forced to pay twice under this program.

First. Her own tax dollars are being used to pay a huge subsidy to foreign producers of sugar—a subsidy of more than $70 a ton.

Second. These subsidies that she is forced to pay, act to drive up the price she must pay for sugar at the grocery store.

As of yesterday, October 18, the price of sugar was 15.5 cents a pound in the local chain stores and 18.5 cents a pound in the independent stores.

This does not make sense to me.

Under this legislation, the American taxpayers will be paying out more than $280 million a year in sugar subsidies to foreign producers.

It seems to me that it would make a great deal more sense if we were to cut back the subsidy and use at least part of this huge amount to develop an adequate sugar substitute that eventually would make us independent of the world sugar market.

At the very least, we could expand our domestic production to lessen our present dependence on foreign sugar producers which now supply about 40 percent of our total consumption.

A second basic objection to this bill is that there is no need for us to act at this time—in haste and without careful consideration.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I firmly favor approval of H.R. 11135, the Sugar Act Amendments of 1965.

Although there are some features of this bill on which I have reservations, I believe the quota provisions to be generally fair to both domestic and foreign producers.

Further, as a Senator from a major sugar-producing State, I consider it essential that the Congress enact Sugar Act extensions this year.

Because I believe this to be necessary, I introduced on August 18, a bill, S. 2430, which contained provisions similar to those in the legislation now before us.

Last year, the domestic sugar-producing and refining industry was divided on the question of what amendments to the Sugar Act should be passed. In contrast, there is now complete unanimity of opinion in the domestic sugar industry in support of this bill. Uniting the industry was a difficult assignment. The interests of various segments of the industry diverge on many points. There is intense competition between them. It was only after weeks of conferences that the legislative recommendations were hammered out which are represented in this bill.

Upon introducing S. 2430, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of organizations representing the U.S. sugarbeet industry, the mainland sugarcane industry, the Hawaiian sugarcane industry, the Puerto Rican sugarcane industry, and the U.S. cane sugar refining industry. That list contains 70 names of companies and associations.

Over the years, the objectives of the U.S. sugar program have been achieved. These objectives include: the production in the United States of a substantial portion of the requirements of our market; and the assurance of a reliable supply of the balance of those requirements from the production of friendly foreign nations. This program has given us an adequate supply of sugar and stability of price.

The rise of Castro, however, disrupted U.S. relations with the nation from which we had obtained some half of our imports of sugar. The international sugar market was thrown into a state of near chaos.

With a shortage looming, American growers were encouraged to produce all the sugarbeets they could plant. This effort produced such volume that a surplus resulted. Further, the United States entered the world market to seek some 15 percent of our requirements.

Our buying in the world sugar market was accompanied by a rapid rise in prices. American consumers were forced to pay prices for sugar which had not been in effect since the 1920's.

We found ourselves in the midst of the only really unstable sugar market to which we have been subjected since the sugar program was initiated.

This bill returns to the principle of assigning the entire quantity to be imported—including the withheld Cuban quota—to specific foreign countries. The bill will allow the rapid liquidation of any remaining surpluses of beet and mainland cane sugar; it will make unnecessary excessive acreage cutbacks in sugar producing areas; and it will allow refiners to adjust gradually to import volume.

Best of all, it will guard the stability of the U.S. sugar market, and the U.S. sugar industry, for a period of 5 years.

There are two questions which have had the spotlight of publicity played on them during consideration of this legislation. Both are discussed in the report of the House Committee on Agriculture on H.R. 11135, and the minority views attached thereto.

The first of these is the so-called import tax which it is said the administration was prepared to propose. The purpose of such a tax is to recapture some of the profit which foreign sugar producers enjoy by selling at the U.S. market price rather than at the world market price.

The question of a world market price is, of course, a complex one. Most sugar is produced for consumption in the country of origin or for export to known customers. Only a minor portion of world production is sold on what could be called a world market. The United States could never depend on any present world market to obtain all of the sugar we need, in addition to that produced domestically.

This year, the import tax has been rejected, principally on the theory that it is our policy to assist other Nations, especially those friendly to us in this hemisphere, through trade as well as aid.

The second question concerns lobbyists. It has been charged that excessive fees are being paid to some who are able to obtain unreasonably large sugar quotas for favored nations. It is also charged that lobbying tends to bring into production too many foreign sources.

As I have already said, the quotas in this bill appear to me to be generally fair.

But we should not forget that our objectives are to provide stability in the sugar market and prices that are reasonable for American consumers. If the prices that we are paying for foreign sugar are too far above the prices foreign producers may obtain elsewhere, it may well be that we are encouraging excess foreign production and a proliferation of foreign-producing nations at the same time that we are overcharging American consumers and taxpayers.

I believe both of these questions—sugar lobbying and the so-called import tax—should be given further consideration in the near future by Congress and by the House Committee on Agriculture and the Senate Committee on Finance. But these matters should not delay passage of this bill at this late stage of our deliberations. The bill is needed now, to forestall rapid price fluctuations and assure stability to the industry.

Almost 40,000 domestic farms grow sugarcane or sugarbeets. Some 235,000 farmworkers—mostly on a seasonal basis—are required to cultivate and harvest these sugar crops.

The farm investment in sugar crops in all domestic areas was estimated in

1959 to be $750 million. It has increased considerably since then.

In 1964, 63 beet sugar factories, 110 cane sugar mills, and 28 refineries were in operation in our domestic areas. The housewife, the commercial sugar user, the domestic sugar grower, and the foreign nations friendly to us who are favored with quotas, will benefit by enactment of this legislation this year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am very pleased that the Senate Finance Committee has been successful in coming to an agreement on the difficult, complex, and controversial legislation governing our domestic sugar production and supply. I support the amendments approved by the Finance Committee, for I find this legislation to be far superior to that which earlier passed the House of Representatives. I express every hope that the provisions of the Senate version will prevail.

I express the further hope that the Senate-House conference can be quickly convened and that the differences between the Senate and House versions can be resolved expeditiously. I represent in part the State which produces the most cane sugar in the continental United States. The Sugar Act Amendments of 1965 are sorely needed to protect not only our growers and processors but also our household consumers, our industrial users, our refiners, and many other groups. No one knows better than I that the sugar marketing quota increases provided in both the House and Senate versions of the bill are greatly needed and long overdue for both our mainland cane and beet sugar areas. There is no longer any contention over this. The increases for our domestic producers were proposed by the executive branch and agreed to by the House of Representatives, and all segments of our domestic industry support them.

The section of the pending measure now before us dealing with quota increases and approved by our Finance Committee and the House of Representatives is very commendable. But the Finance Committee's action in disapproving other provisions in the House-passed bill is also very commendable. I refer specifically to those provisions in the House bill which have to do with congressional distribution of the cane sugar quota and acreage among both processors and farmers. I do not believe the inclusion of these provisions by the House represents either wise or desirable legislation and I would like to take a few minutes here to outline my opposition to these sections of the House bill and my reasons therefor.

The House bill would amend the Sugar Act to authorize the establishment of a 25,000-ton marketing allotment reserve and a complementary acreage reserve for the mainland cane area, purportedly to take care of hardships and inequities. Such reserves are not needed and are not desirable.

The Sugar Act now provides for legitimate hardship cases and requires the Secretary of Agriculture, after public hearings at which all pertinent facts may be presented, to make a fair, efficient, and equitable distribution of the mainland cane area's quota among the processors of the area and the area's acreage among the growers. The language in the House bill pertaining to the reserves singles out certain corporations for preferred treatment and would actually prevent the Secretary from attaining fairness, efficiency, and equity in the distribution of the area's quota and acreage.

It would be a mistake for Congress to adopt the practice of legislating sugar marketing allotments and acreages to individuals. The determination of individual allotments and acreages should be the result of careful and adequate investigation and public hearings. The Sugar Act now assigns that responsibility to the Secretary of Agriculture. This has proven to be wise.

The House bill would further amend the Sugar Act to provide that the first 25,000-ton increase above the 1,100,000-ton mainland cane area quota shall be assigned to a new cane-processing facility. This is unfair in view of the fact that the 1,100,000-ton quota will not allow established cane processors to market as much sugar as they produced in 1963 or 1964 or their estimated production for 1965. Any small increase which may accrue to the 1,100,000-ton mainland cane area quota during the period of the proposed extension of the act should go to established processors. The size of the quota proposed for the mainland cane area is not large enough to create a need for new processing facilities.

In closing, let me say as I have said many times before, the sugar program is one of our most successful farm programs. Many groups benefit from this program. They include the domestic producers and processors of sugarcane and sugarbeets, the cane sugar refiners in the continental United States, the housewives, and the industrial sugar users.

The sugar program is financed by a tax on sugar, and tax collections since 1938 have exceeded expenditures by more than $500 million. I wish we could make such a statement about all farm programs.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I believe the leadership wishes to go back into executive session to consider the nomination of Mr. Bress, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so move?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I so move.

Is that agreeable to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Does that mean that the Senate is not going back into executive session? Has that been dropped?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That has been dropped for the nonce.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understood we were going to discuss the nomination of Mr. Bress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Are we going to do that?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, but it will be delayed somewhat, if the Senator does not mind.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But I have already canceled a couple of meetings that I was supposed to attend today. What has developed in the last half hour to necessitate postponing the matter? Is it postponed until later today, or until tomorrow, or when? I intended to suggest the advisability of the nomination going back to the committee. What is the procedure? I thought we were to discuss the Bress nomination today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We were. The majority leader had it laid before the Senate. It was then laid aside temporarily for the purpose of taking up a conference report, which I understand has been agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It was my understanding that the Senate would then return to the Bress nomination.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct; but if the Senator will indulge me, I should like to take up the sugar bill for the time being. I am not in a position as yet to make a definite statement on the floor of the Senate about the Bress nomination, except that it is anticipated that it will be taken up later.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Is it anticipated that it will be brought up later today?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I doubt it, today. Once we get on sugar, I think we will have to stay with it. But it may well follow the sugar legislation; either that or the Morrissey nomination.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. May the Senator's statement be interpreted as an indication that the administration has finally agreed with me that this nomination should not be brought before the Senate for confirmation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; I would not go that far.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator would go part of the way; is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator's interpretation of affairs is better than mine, in many instances. Not in this one, however.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill (H.R. 11135) will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, Mr. President, I—does the Senator object?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. I shall not object, if the leadership wishes to lay aside the nomination and take up the sugar bill. I do think, in all fairness, it should be made clear that the leadership and the administration are asking for this postponement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is the majority leader only.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 895, H.R. 11135.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11135) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Sugar Act Amendments of 1965".

SEC. 2. Section 201 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out of the first sentence the words "month of December in" and substituting the words "last three months of"; and (2) by striking out of the second sentence "October 31" and substituting "September 30".

SEC. 3. Section 202 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended as follows:

(1) Paragraphs (1) and (2)(A) of subsection (a) are amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) For domestic sugar-producing areas, by apportioning among such areas six million three hundred and ninety thousand short tons, raw value, as follows:

"Area	*Short tons raw value*
Domestic beet sugar	3, 025, 000
Mainland cane sugar	1, 100, 000
Hawaii	1, 110, 000
Puerto Rico	1, 140, 000
Virgin Islands	15, 000
Total	6, 390, 000

"(2)(A) To or from the above total of six million three hundred and ninety thousand short tons, raw value, there shall be added or deducted, as the case may be, an amount equal to 65 per centum of the amount by which the Secretary's determination of requirements of consumers in the continental United States pursuant to section 201 for the calendar year exceeds ten million four hundred thousand short tons, raw value, or is less than nine million seven hundred thousand short tons, raw value. Such amount shall be apportioned between the domestic beet sugar area and the mainland cane sugar area on the basis of the quotas for such areas established under paragraph (1) of this subsection and the amounts so apportioned shall be added to, or deducted from the quotas for such areas."

(2) Subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For the Republic of the Philippines, in the amount of one million and fifty thousand short tons, raw value, plus 10.86 per centum of the amount, not exceeding seven hundred thousand short tons, raw value, by which the Secretary's determination of requirements of consumers in the continental United States pursuant to section 201 for the calendar year exceed nine million seven hundred thousand short tons, raw value."

(3) Subsection (c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1) For foreign countries other than the Republic of the Philippines, an amount of sugar, raw value, equal to the amount determined pursuant to section 201 less the sum of the quotas established pursuant to subsection (a) and (b) of this section.

"(2) For the calendar year 1965, for individual foreign countries other than the Republic of the Philippines, by prorating the amount of sugar determined under paragraph (1) of this subsection among foreign countries on the basis of the quotas established in sugar regulation 811, as amended, issued February 15, 1965 (30 F.R. 2206).

"(3) For calendar years 1966 and 1967, for individual foreign countries other than the Republic of the Philippines, by prorating the amount of sugar determined under paragraph (1) of this subsection among foreign countries on the following basis:

"(A) For the following countries in the Western Hemisphere—

Country	*Per centum*
Cuba	57. 77
Dominican Republic	7. 90
Mexico	7. 29
Peru	5. 08
Brazil	5. 08
British West Indies	2. 28
Argentina	1. 19
Ecuador	. 93
Nicaragua	. 76
Guatemala	. 66
Costa Rica	. 65
Colombia	. 52
Haiti	. 35
El Salvador	. 32
Panama	. 27
British Honduras	. 08
Venezuela	. 05

"(B) For the following countries—

Country	*Per centum*
Australia	3. 03
China, Republic of	1. 26
South Africa	1. 24
India	1. 21
French West Indies	. 80
Fiji Islands	. 66
Mauritius	. 28
Southern Rhodesia	. 12
Swaziland	. 12
Ireland	. 04
Belgium	. 03
Turkey	. 03

Provided, That in no event shall the quotas established under this subsection for Australia, South Africa, the French West Indies, and Belguim exceed the following:

Country	*Short tons, raw value*
Australia	68,478, plus 0.73 per centum of the amount, not exceeding 700,000 short tons, raw value, by which the Secretary's determination of requirements of consumers in the continental United States pursuant to section 201 for the calendar year exceeds 9,700,000 short tons, raw value.
South Africa.	28,024, plus 0.30 per centum of the amount, not exceeding 700,000 short tons, raw value, by which the Secretary's determination of requirements of consumers in the continental United States pursuant to section 201 for the calendar year exceeds 9,700,000 short tons, raw value.
French West Indies.	18,080.
Belgium	678."

(4) Subsections (d), (e), and (f) are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

"(1)(A) During the current period of suspension of diplomatic relations between the United States and Cuba, the quota provided for such country under subsection (c) shall be withheld and a quantity of sugar equal to such quota shall be prorated to other foreign countries named in paragraph (2) of subsection (c) on the basis of the percentages stated therein: *Provided*, That in no event shall the quota established under this subsection for Australia, South Africa, the French West Indies, and Belgium exceed the following:

Country	*Short tons, raw value*
Australia	93,674, plus 1.00 per centum of the amount, not exceeding 700,000 short tons, raw value, by which the Secretary's determination of requirements of consumers in the continental United States pursuant to section 201 for the calendar year exceeds 9,700,000 short tons, raw value, less a proportion of that sum equal to the proportion of the Cuban quota, if any, restored pursuant to subsection (e) of this section.
South Africa.	38,560, plus 0.41 per centum of the amount, not exceeding 700,000 short tons, raw value, by which the Secretary's determination of requirements of consumers in the continental United States pursuant to section 201 for the calendar year exceeds 9,700,000 short tons, raw value, less a proportion of that sum equal to the proportion of the Cuban quota, if any, restored pursuant to subsection (e) of this section.
French West Indies.	24,890, less a proportion of that amount equal to the proportion of the Cuban quota, if any, restored pursuant to subsection (e) of this section.
Belgium	927, less a proportion of that amount equal to the proportion of the Cuban quota, if any, restored pursuant to subsection (e) of this section.

"(B) Whenever and to the extent that the President finds that the establishment or continuation of a quota or any part thereof for any foreign country, or the importation of any sugar from any foreign country under paragraph (2)(A) of this subsection, would be contrary to the national interest of the United States, such quota or part thereof shall be withheld or suspended, and such importation shall not be permitted. A quantity of sugar equal to the amount of any quota so withheld or suspended shall be prorated to the other countries listed in subsection (c)(3)(A) on the basis of the quotas then in effect for such countries.

"(C) The quantities of sugar prorated pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall be designated as temporary quotas and the term 'quota' as defined in this Act shall include a temporary quota established under this subsection.

"(2)(A) Whenever the Secretary finds that it is not practicable to obtain the quantity of sugar needed from foreign countries to meet any increase during the year in the requirements of consumers under section 201 by apportionment to countries pursuant to subsections (b) and (c) and the foregoing provisions of this subsection, such quantity of sugar may be imported on a first-come, first-served basis from any foreign country, except that no sugar shall be authorized for importation from Cuba until the United States resumes diplomatic relations with that country and no sugar shall be authorized for importation hereunder from any foreign country with respect to which a finding by the President is in effect under subsection (d)(1)(B): *Provided,* That such finding shall not be made in the first nine months of the year unless the Secretary also finds that limited sugar supplies and increases in prices have created or may create an emergency situation significantly interfering with the orderly movement of foreign raw sugar to the United States. In the event that the requirements of consumers under section 201 are thereafter reduced in the same calendar year, an amount not exceeding such increase in requirements shall be deducted pro rata from the quotas established pursuant to subsection (c) and this subsection.

"(B) Sugar imported under the authority of this paragraph (2) shall be raw sugar, except that if the Secretary determines that the total quantity is not reasonably available as raw sugar, he may authorize the importation for direct consumption of so much of such quantity as he determines may be required to meet the requirements of consumers in the United States.

"(3) No quota shall be established for any country other than Ireland for any year following a period of twenty-four months, ending June 30 prior to the establishment of quotas for such year, in which its aggregate imports of sugar equaled or exceeded its aggregate exports of sugar from such country to countries other than the United States.

"(4) Whenever in any calendar year any foreign country fails, subject to such reasonable tolerance as the Secretary may determine, to fill the quota as established for it pursuant to this Act, the quota for such country for subsequent calendar years shall be reduced by the smaller of (i) the amount by which such country failed to fill such quota or (ii) the amount by which its exports of sugar to the United States in the year such quota was not filled was less than 115 per centum of such quota for the preceding calendar year: *Provided,* That (i) no such reduction shall be made if the country has notified the Secretary before August 1 of such year (or, with respect to events occurring thereafter, as soon as practicable after such event), of the likelihood of such failure and the Secretary finds that such failure was due to crop disaster or other force majeure, unless such country exported sugar in such year to a country other than the United States, in which case the reduction in quota for the subsequent years shall be limited to the amount of such exports, as determined by the Secretary, and (ii) in no event shall the quota for the Republic of the Philippines be reduced to an amount less than nine hundred and eighty thousand short tons, raw value, of sugar.

"(5) Any reduction in a quota because of the requirements of paragraphs (3) and (4) of this subsection shall be prorated to other foreign countries in the same manner as deficits are prorated under section 204 of this Act. For purposes of determining unfilled portions of quotas, entries of sugar from a foreign country shall be prorated between the temporary quota established pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection and the quota established pursuant to subsection (c).

"(6) If any foreign country fails to give assurance to the Secretary, on or before December 31, 1965, that such country will fill the quota as established for it under subsections (c)(3) and (d)(1) of this section for years after 1965, the quota for such country for such years shall be reduced to the amount which the country gives assurance that it will fill for such years. The portion of the quota for such country for which such assurance is not given shall be withdrawn for such years and a quantity of sugar equal to such portion shall be prorated to other foreign countries in the same manner as deficits are prorated under section 204 of this Act. For purposes of applying paragraph (4) of this subsection, any reduction in the quota of a foreign country under this paragraph shall be disregarded.

"(e) Whenever the President finds that it is no longer contrary to the national interest of the United States to reestablish a quota or part thereof withheld or suspended under subsection (d)(1) of this section, and, in the case of Cuba, diplomatic relations have been resumed by the United States, such quota shall be restored in the manner the President finds appropriate; *Provided,* That the entire amount of such quota shall be restored for the third full calendar year following such finding by the President. The temporary quotas established pursuant to subsection (d)(1) shall, notwithstanding any other provision of this section, be reduced pro rata to the extent necessary to restore the quota in accordance with the provisions of this subsection.

"(f) Whenever any quota is required to be reduced pursuant to subsection (e) or because of a reduction in the requirements of consumers under section 201 of this Act, and the amount of sugar imported from any country or marketed from any area at the time of such reduction exceeds the reduced quota, the amount of such excess shall, notwithstanding any other provision of this section, be deducted from the quota established for such country or domestic area for the next succeeding calendar year.

"(g) The Secretary is authorized to limit, through the use of limitations applied on a quarterly basis only, the importation of sugar within the quota for any foreign country during the first and second quarters of any calendar year whenever he determines that such limitation is necessary to achieve the objectives of the Act: *Provided,* That this subsection shall not operate to reduce the quantity of sugar permitted to be imported for any calendar year from any country below its quota, including deficits allocated to it, for that year.

"(h) The quota established for any foreign country and the quantity authorized to be imported from any country under subsection (d)(2) of this section may be filed only with sugar produced from sugarbeets or sugarcane grown in such country."

SEC. 4. Section 204 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary shall from time to time determine whether, in view of the current inventories of sugar, the estimated production from the acreage of sugarcane or sugarbeets planted, the normal marketings within a calendar year of new-crop sugar, and other pertinent factors, any area or country will be unable to market the quota for such area or country. If the Secretary determines that any domestic area or foreign country will be unable to market the quota for such area or country, he shall revise the quota for the Republic of the Philippines by allocating to it an amount of sugar equal to 47.22 per centum of the deficit, and shall allocate an amount of sugar equal to the remainder of the deficit to the countries listed in section 202(c)(3)(A) on the basis of the quotas then in effect for such countries: *Provided,* That if any quota is restored to Cuba, the maximum per centum of 47.22 of the deficit to be allocated to the Republic of the Philippines shall be reduced to a per centum equal to that which the Philippine quota under subsection (b) of section 202 bears to the sum of such Philippine quota and the quotas then in effect for all foreign countries pursuant to subsection (c) of section 202. If the Secretary determines the Republic of the Philippines will be unable to fill its share of any deficit determined under this subsection, he shall allocate such unfilled amount to the countries listed in section 202(c)(3)(A) on the basis of the quotas then in effect for such countries. If the Secretary determines that neither the Republic of the Philippines nor the countries listed in section 202(c)(3)(A) can fill all of any such deficit, he shall apportion such unfilled amount on such basis and to such foreign countries as he determines is required to fill such deficit. Any reallocation of deficits pursuant to this subsection shall be subject to the import restrictions of subsection (d)(1) of section 202. The Secretary shall insofar as practicable determine and allocate deficits so as to assure the availability of the sugar for importation during the calendar year. In any event, any deficit, so far as then known, shall be determined and allocated by August 1 of the calendar year. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, if the President determines that such action would be in the national interest, any part of a deficit which would otherwise be allocated to countries listed in section 202(c)(3)(A) may be allocated to one or more of such countries with a quota in effect on such basis as the President finds appropriate.

"(b) The quota established for any domestic area or any foreign country under section 202 shall not be reduced by reason of any determination of a deficit existing in any calendar year under subsection (a) of this section: *Provided,* That the quota for any foreign country shall be reduced to the extent that it has notified the Secretary that it cannot fill its quota and the Secretary has found under section 202(d)(4) that such failure was due to crop disaster or other force majeure."

SEC. 5. Section 205 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended (1) by inserting after the third sentence thereof the following new sentence: "The Secretary is also authorized in making such allotments of a quota for any calendar year to take into consideration, in lieu of or in addition to the foregoing factors of processing, past marketings, and ability to market, the need for establishing an allotment which will permit such marketing of sugar as is necessary for the reasonably efficient operation of any nonaffiliated single plant processor of sugarbeets: *Provided,* That the marketing allotment of any such processor of sugarbeets shall not be increased under this provision above an allotment of twenty-five thousand short tons, raw value: *Provided further,* That the total increases in marketing allotments made to processors in the domestic beet sugar area pursuant to this sentence shall be limited to twenty-five thousand short tons of sugar, raw value, for each calendar year."; and (2) by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following sentence: "If allotments are in effect at the time of a reduction in a domestic area quota for any year, the amount marketed by a person in excess of the amount of his allotment as reduced in conformity with the reduction in the quota shall not be taken into consideration in establishing an allotment in the next succeeding year for such person, and any allotment established for such person for the next succeeding year shall be reduced by such excess amount."

SEC. 6. Section 206 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 206. (a) If the Secretary determines that the prospective importation or bringing into the continental United States, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico of any sugar-containing product or mixture will substantially interfere with the attainment of the objectives of this Act, he may limit the quantity of such product or mixture to be imported or brought in from any country or area to a quantity which he determines will not so interfere: *Provided,* That the quantity to be imported or brought in from any country or area in any calendar year shall not be reduced below the average of the quantities of such product or mixture annually imported or brought in during the most recent three consecutive years for which reliable data of the importation or bringing in of such product or mixture are available.

"(b) In the event the Secretary determines that the prospective importation or bringing into the continental United States, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, of any sugar-containing product or mixture will substantially interfere with the attainment of the objectives of this Act and there are no reliable data available of such importation or bringing in of such product or mixture for three consecutive years, he may limit the quantity of such product to be imported or brought in annually from any country or area to a quantity which the Secretary determines will not substantially interfere with the attainment of the objectives of the Act, provided that such quantity from any one country or area shall not be less than a quantity containing one hundred short tons, raw value of sugar or liquid sugar.

"(c) In determining whether the actual or prospective importation or bringing into the continental United States, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico of a quantity of a sugar-containing product or mixture will or will not substantially interfere with the attainment of the objectives of this Act, the Secretary shall take into consideration the total sugar content of the product or mixture in relation to other ingredients or to the sugar content of other products or mixtures for similar use, the costs of the mixture in relation to the costs of its ingredients for use in the continental United States, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, the present or prospective volume of importations relative to past importations, the type of packaging, whether it will be marketed to the ultimate consumer in the identical form in which it is imported or the extent to which it is to be further subjected to processing or mixing with similar or other ingredients, and other pertinent information which will assist him in making such determination. In making determinations pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall conform to the rulemaking requirements of section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act."

Sec. 7. Subsections (d) and (e) of section 207 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, are amended as follows:

"(d) Not more than fifty-nine thousand nine hundred and twenty short tons, raw value, of the quota for the Republic of the Philippines may be filled by direct-consumption sugar.

"(e) None of the quota established for any foreign country other than the Republic of the Philippines and none of the deficit prorations and apportionments for any foreign country established under or in accordance with section 204(a) may be filled by direct-consumption sugar: *Provided,* That the quotas for Ireland, Belgium, and Panama may be filled by direct-consumption sugar to the extent of two thousand three hundred and eleven short tons, raw value, for Ireland; one hundred and eighty-two short tons, raw value, for Belgium; and three thousand eight hundred and seventeen short tons, raw value, for Panama."

Sec. 8. Section 209 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended by striking from subsection (e) thereof the words "any sugar or liquid sugar" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "any sugar or liquid sugar in excess of one hundred pounds in any calendar year".

Sec. 9. (a) Section 212 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", or for the production (other than by distillation) of alcohol, including all polyhydric alcohols, but not including any such alcohol or resulting products for human consumption".

(b) Section 6418(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended—

(1) by inserting "OR PRODUCTION" after "DISTILLATION" in the heading of such section, and

(2) by inserting after "the distillation of alcohol," in the text of such section the following: "or for the production of alcohol (other than alcohol produced for human consumption),".

(c) The heading of section 6511(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by inserting "OR PRODUCTION" after "DISTILLATION".

Sec. 10. Section 213 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is repealed.

Sec. 11. Section 302 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended as follows:

(1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) The Secretary shall determine for each crop year whether the production of sugar from any crop of sugarbeets or sugarcane will, in the absence of proportionate shares, be greater than the quantity needed to enable the area to meet its quota and provide a normal carryover inventory, as estimated by the Secretary for such area for the calendar year during which the larger part of the sugar from such crop normally would be marketed. Such determination shall be made only with respect to the succeeding crop year and only after due notice and opportunity for an informal public hearing. If the Secretary determines that the production of sugar from any crop of sugarbeets or sugarcane will be in excess of the quantity needed to enable the area to meet its quota and provide a normal carryover inventory, he shall establish proportionate shares for farms in such areas as provided in this subsection, except that the determinations by the Secretary of proportionate shares for farms in Hawaii and the Virgin Islands in effect on January 1, 1965, shall continue in effect until amended or superseded. In determining the proportionate shares with respect to a farm, the Secretary may take into consideration the past production on the farm of sugarbeets and sugarcane marketed (or processed) for the extraction of sugar or liquid sugar (within proportionate shares when in effect) and the ability to produce such sugarbeets and sugarcane."

(2) The first sentence of paragraph (3) of subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) In order to make available acreage for growth and expansion of the beet sugar industry, the Secretary in addition to protecting the interest of new and small producers by regulations generally similar to those heretofore promulgated by him pursuant to this Act, shall reserve each year from 1962 through 1966, inclusive, from the national sugarbeet acreage requirement established by him, the acreage required to yield sixty-five thousand short tons, raw value, of sugar."

(3) Paragraph (5) of subsection (b) is amended by striking the words "In determining farm proportionate shares" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Whether farm proportionate shares are or are not determined".

(4) Subsection (b) is amended by adding new paragraphs (8) and (9) as follows:

"(8) In order to protect the sugarbeet production history for farm operators (or farms) who in any crop year, because of a crop-rotation program or for reasons beyond their control, are unable to utilize all or a portion of the farm proportionate share acreage established pursuant to this section, the Secretary may reserve for a period of not more than three crop years the production history for any such farm operators (or farms) to the extent of the farm proportionate share acreage released. The proportionate share acreage so released may be reallotted to other farm operators (or farms), but no production history shall accrue to such other farm operators (or farms) by virtue of such reallocation of the proportionate share acreage so released.

"(9) The Secretary is authorized to reserve from the national sugarbeet acreage requirements for the 1966, 1967, and 1968 crops of sugarbeets a total acreage estimated to yield not more than twenty-five thousand short tons, raw value, for each such crop to provide any nonaffiliated single plant processor of sugarbeets with an estimated quantity of sugar for marketing of not to exceed twenty-five thousand short tons of sugar, raw value. The Secretary shall allocate the acreage provided for in this paragraph to farms on such basis as he determines necessary to accomplish the purposes for which such acreages are provided under this paragraph."

Sec. 12. Title IV of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) of section 402 of such Act is amended by adding the following sentence thereto: "The Secretary is authorized to use the services, facilities, and authorities of Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of making disbursements to persons eligible to receive payments under title III of this Act: *Provided,* That no such disbursements shall be made by Commodity Credit Corporation unless it has received funds to cover the amounts thereof from appropriations available for the purpose of carrying out such program."

(2) Subsection (a) of section 408 of such Act is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "During any period that the operation of the provisions of title II is so suspended by the President, the Secretary shall estimate for each year the amount of sugar needed to meet requirements of consumers in the United States and the amount the quota for each country would be if calculated on the basis as provided in section 202 of this Act. Notice of such estimate and quota calculation shall be published in the Federal Register. If any country fails to import into the continental United States within the quota year, an amount of sugar equal to the amount the quota would be as calculated for such country by the Secretary for such year, the quota established for such country in subsequent years under the provisions of title II shall be reduced as provided in section 202(d)(4) of this Act: *Provided,* That quotas for subsequent years shall not be reduced when quotas are suspended under this subsection and reimposed in the same calendar year."

(3) Subsection (b) of section 408 of such Act is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof and substituting in lieu thereof the following: "Any quantity so suspended shall be allocated in the same manner as deficits are allocated under the provisions of section 204 of this Act."

(4) Subsection (c) of section 408 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) In any case in which a nation or a political subdivision thereof has hereafter (1) nationalized, expropriated, or otherwise seized the ownership or control of the property or business enterprise owned or controlled by United States citizens or any corporations, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens or (2) imposed upon or enforced against such property or business enterprise so owned or controlled, discriminatory taxes or other exactions, or restrictive maintenance or operational conditions not imposed or enforced with respect to the property or business enterprise of a like nature owned or operated by its own nationals or the nationals of any government other than the Government of the United States or (3) imposed upon or enforced against such property or business enterprise so owned or controlled, discriminatory taxes or other exactions, or restrictive maintenance or operational conditions, or has taken other actions, which have the effect of nationalizing, expropriating, or otherwise seizing ownership or control of such property or business enterprise or (4) violated the provisions of any bilateral or multilateral international agreement to which the United States is a party, designed to protect such property or business enterprise so owned or controlled, and has failed within six months following the taking of action in any of the above categories to take appropriate and adequate steps to remedy such situation and to discharge its obligations under international law toward such citizen or entity, including the prompt payment to the owner or owners of such property or business enterprise so nationalized, expropriated, or otherwise seized or to provide relief from such taxes, exactions, conditions, or breaches of such international agreements, as the case may be, or to arrange, with the agreement of the parties concerned, for submitting the question in dispute to arbitration or conciliation in accordance with procedures under which final and binding decisions or settlement will be reached and full payment or arrangements with the owners for such payment made within twelve months following such submission, the President shall suspend any quota, proration of quota, or authorization to import sugar under this Act of such nation until he is satisfied that appropriate steps are being taken. Any quantity so suspended shall be allocated in the same manner as deficits are allocated under section 204 of this Act."

(5) Section 412 of such Act (relating to termination of the powers of the Secretary under the Act) is amended by striking out "1966" in each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1971".

Sec. 13. Section 4501(b) (relating to termination of taxes on sugar) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out "1967" in each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1972".

Sec. 14. Except as hereinafter provided, the provisions of this Act shall become effective January 1, 1965. The amendments made by section 4 of this Act shall become effective January 1, 1966.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 O'CLOCK TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in adjournment until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR SENATOR RIBICOFF TO ADDRESS SENATE TOMORROW AT 9 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the period between 9 o'clock and 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, not to exceed 10 o'clock, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] may have the floor for a speech he wishes to deliver.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the information of the Senate, I anticipate that the real business of the Senate will begin at approximately 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of of quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL PARKINSON WEEK

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the chair lay before the Senate House Joint Resolution 571.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Joint Resolution 571 to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning October 25, 1965, as National Parkinson Week, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there was an identical Senate bill, but there is no objection to the substitution of this one. It merely declares that the last week of October shall be National Parkinson Week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 571) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11135) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this bill extends the Sugar Act of 1948 through December 31, 1971. It fixes quotas for domestic areas and the Philippines during this period, but establishes foreign quotas only for 1966 and 1967.

The domestic quotas under the bill as amended by the committee are identical to the quotas approved by the House. The Philippine quota also is identical. The foreign country quotas under the committee bill differ substantially from those in the House version, both as to quantity and duration.

Before describing the details of the committee bill, I shall outline briefly the circumstances leading up to the pending bill and the considerations which justify its prompt passage by Congress.

For many, many years the United States relied almost solely on Cuba for its sugar import needs. Until the Communist takeover in Cuba in 1959 and 1960, that country was our principal supplier, furnishing more than one-third of our total consumption. Cuba received a premium for sugar she sold us which enabled her to survive many economic crises. When it became clear that Cuba was to have an anti-American government Congress empowered the President to terminate sugar imports from that country. Since the middle of 1960 we have not relied on Cuba for any of our sugar.

In 1962, when Congress last amended the Sugar Act, we departed from complete reliance on specified countries for our sugar and embarked upon a new program under which a part of our sugar would be acquired from any nation willing to sell it to us. This "global" quota was a new concept, which we felt was essential to assure adequate sugar supplies at reasonable prices.

Unfortunately, about this same time much of the Cuban sugar crop was destroyed in a Communist effort to diversify the island's economy. A drought seriously cut back European sugar production for 2 successive years. These factors combined to set off a sugar crisis. World sugar prices soared. In February 1963, they went above U.S. prices and stayed there for 16 months. U.S. prices began to rise in anticipation of a serious worldwide sugar shortage. The Secretary of Agriculture appealed to free countries all over the world to export sugar to us. Many countries, which before 1962 had never supplied the United States with sugar, came to our assistance and committed themselves to sell sugar to us for less than they could have received had they sold it for the so-called world market price. In the light of the tremendous quantities committed to us, U.S. sugar prices remained far below the world price and then began to decline. This reflected the confidence of our consumers that the Sugar Act was able to do its job under the most trying circumstances in its long existence.

While it is true that many foreign countries did aid us when we needed it, I would be remiss if I did not applaud the tremendous response of the mainland cane and beet sugar producers during the crisis. In response to urgings by the administration, and partly as a result of federally financed loans, domestic sugar production zoomed. This further buoyed confidence of sugar consumers and brought prices back within reason. But there was one barrier to their efforts—the law would not permit the increased quantities of domestically produced sugar to be marketed. The extra sugar could not be taken out of the processors' warehouses.

Three times the President recommended amendments to permit this sugar to be marketed. First in December 1963 and again in January 1964. Although the Senate approved legislation in September of last year, the House would not act on the Senate amendment.

Today we are responding to the President's third request. H.R. 11135 carries out the promise to our sugar producers and processors that the extra sugar produced in our time of need can be sold.

Mr. President, here is what the bill reported by the Committee on Finance would do: It would extend the Sugar Act through December 31, 1971. It would provide an immediate increase in new marketing allowances for the domestic beet and the mainland cane areas totaling 580,000 tons. These domestic quotas and the quota for the Republic of the Philippines would be in effect through 1971. The bill would provide new rules for allocating other foreign quotas through 1967 among supplying countries primarily on the basis of their performance in sending us sugar in our time of greatest crisis.

So far as the domestic features of the bill are concerned, we are in agreement with the House version. But we disagree with the House on the distribution of foreign quotas—other than the quota for the Republic of the Philippines. We could find no discernible criteria in the House bill which would apply to all the producing nations. We feel that such a criteria is important. We feel that the criteria represented in the committee bill, and also stoutly supported by the administration, is such a criteria. It is based generally on the performance of foreign countries in our period of shortage.

The House of Representatives took the position in its version of the sugar bill that the old global quota system under the 1962 act was responsible for the crisis of 1963 and 1964. There are some who disagree with the House. They look on the global quota more as a salvation.

Had it not been for our ability to go into the world market and buy sugar from countries that had never furnished it to us before, and to get extra amounts from our old suppliers, we might not have been able to get through the period of shortage as well as we did. In those 2 years—1963 and 1964—any friendly nation on earth which wanted to sell us sugar had the right to do so. They were told—and this was something of a commitment at the time—that if they did furnish us sugar when we needed it, they would be remembered when it came time for the administration to recommend amendments and extension of the Sugar Act. In effect, under the committee bill, the countries of the world generally have fixed their own sugar quotas by their own performance during that period of shortage.

The House bill ignores performance and fixes quotas on no uniform basis. It brought in new countries that had never sold us sugar. The House distribution of foreign quotas has been criticized not only on Capitol Hill but also very vehemently in the national press. The Committee on Finance concluded the House distribution of foreign quotas would be difficult to defend and that a more objective formula was essential.

What better way to fix an objective criteria could be found than to base it on experience in our most critical time of need? If we want to be certain of a source of supply for sugar in a critical period, then we should generally look to how countries performed in a critical period. That is exactly what the Finance Committee bill does.

The Finance Committee bill also changes the method of distributing deficits from that approval by the House. Deficits are to be divided between the Philippines and the rest of the world. The Philippines are to get 47.22 percent of any deficit and the remainder would be distributed amoung the countries of the Western Hemisphere. The House bill distributed non-Western Hemisphere deficits outside the Western Hemisphere.

This change, together with the few modifications made by the committee in the foreign country quotas urged by the administration, reflects the view of the committee that while performance is to be our chief guideline, we also have a strong interest in furthering the economies of Western Hemisphere countries.

The committee bill, like the House bill, allocates all the growth in sugar consumption between 9.7 million and 19.4 million tons to foreign countries. The Philippines get 10.86 percent of this growth and the rest is shared by our foreign suppliers, other than the French West Indies and Belgium. The committee bill does place special limits on the share of growth going to South Africa and Australia so that a greater share can go to developing countries.

One innovation approved by the committee as an amendment to the Sugar Act requires foreign countries to commit themselves in advance that they will fill their quotas for the period specified in the bill. Thus, if before January 1, 1966, the Secretary of Agriculture has not received assurance that 1966 and 1967 quotas will be filled, the quotas for the countries involved will be reduced to the amounts the countries assure us they can supply.

Taken together with the provisions for reducing a country's future quota for failure to fill its current quota, this new feature will give us better control over our supplies of foreign sugar.

We have included in the committee bill two important provisions of the House bill. One of these creates a special 25,000-ton reserve for the beet sugar area to aid in solving certain problems of small, nonaffiliated single plant processors of sugarbeets and farmers supplying them. The other continues and extends the authority of the President to suspend quotas of any country which expropriates property of U.S. citizens or discriminates against them.

In addition to this specific authority, both the committee bill and the House bill empower the President to withhold the quota of any country if he feels it is necessary to protect the national interest. He may also allocate the Western Hemisphere's share of a deficit differently than the bill provides if he finds it to be in the national interest.

Mr. President, these are the important features of the sugar bill approved by the Committee on Finance.

Before concluding my remarks, I should like to speak briefly about the matter of import fees. Attempts were made to attach a fee rider to the bill before it passed the House. These attempts failed. Similar attempts were made in the Committee on Finance. These also failed.

The stated objective of a "fee" amendment is to "recapture" the so-called U.S. price premium, and prevent it from going to foreign suppliers. The premium is described as the difference between the U.S. price and the lower world price. Proponents of a fee generally ignore the fact that the world price for sugar is not rational. Sugar sold on the world market is fugitive sugar—sugar that has no home—sugar that often is dumped by Communist countries in their efforts to get foreign exchange.

Ninety-five percent of sugar is sold in the production market, or at a loss for protection of the domestic sugar industry of the Soviet Union, or it is sold under arrangements such as the U.S. Sugar Act, the British Commonwealth system, the French system with its former colonies, or the Russian arrangement with Cuba, all of which guarantees a price far above the so-called dump price, or distress price, or fugitive price, which formula is referred to as the "world market," of which only 3 million tons, or less than 5 percent, move on the world market.

The world price for sugar often fails to cover the cost of its production in the country of origin. At present, the world price for sugar is only about 2 cents per pound, while the costs of production in most countries is more than 4 cents; in some cases it is more than 5 cents.

No one can make his plans to produce sugar for the so-called dump world price, or the fugitive price. Half the world price of sugar is sugar produced in Communist countries which can be sold by Cuba to Russia at a price perhaps 3 times as high as the so-called world market price, although it is sold at a loss. This sugar is sold in the free world to obtain dollars, in many instances, to be used to buy items which this country does not wish sold to Communist countries.

For example, when Castro confiscated American investments in Cuba, he found it difficult to obtain spare parts for the machinery involved because it would be expensive for the Communist bloc countries to produce parts to fit machinery manufactured in the United States. We have made efforts to keep down that kind of support, to make it difficult for a country confiscating American property to benefit.

If we impose a fee under these circumstances on our friends in Latin America, Africa, Asia, Australia, the Fiji Islands, and India, to sell sugar to us below their cost of production, we put ourselves somewhat in the picture or the cartoon in some parts of the world that depicts Uncle Sam as a fat, bloated person, in a high hat, with a big diamond stickpin in his tie, seeking to squeeze the lifeblood out of the peons in various parts of the world. The price the British pay is somewhat on a par with the price we pay. The French pay an even higher price to their former colonies and those associated with France in world affairs. The Russians pay an even higher price to Cuba, and in some respects they pay for it through a barter arrangement with that country.

So it does not behoove this country, which is one of the great trading countries of the world, to force people to sell sugar to us below the cost of production. In the long run, if we sought to do it in an effort to protect the American consumer, for example, if we tried to tell people around the world that we would buy sugar from them at a price that was below their cost of production, any businessman in his right mind, knowing that that was our position, would know that he could not produce sugar at a profit.

Sugar must be planted a year in advance. In Louisiana, it is done on a 3-year basis. The stalks are harvested for 3 years before new cane is planted. In some areas it is done on a 5-year basis.

So people need between a year and 5 years' notice in advance as to what the price will be. When people stop planting their sugar and a smaller amount of sugar is sold at the so-called world market price, or the dump price, that price is below the cost of production. People will cease planting sugarcane. When that happens, sugar will become in short supply. That is what happened when sugar was in short supply not too long ago, and we were under the so-called global quota system. I do not think there was enough opportunity to see whether that system would work. Poor weather conditions were encountered, and there were poor results in sugar production under Castro. Those two factors played a major part. Those were the main factors, but I am informed that other people cut down sugar production because they did not have any assurance that would, ahead of time, justify their making a profit.

In this connection, I remember talking with one producer in Louisiana who showed me a field which had been planted to sugarcane. Most of the workers had been let go, and he told the remainder to plow the stalks. He said, "I never want to see another cane again."

So when enough people are taken out of the supply of sugar, there will be another experience such as we had under the global quota system when sugar was in short supply.

If people cannot depend on their customers to give them a decent price, there is no reason to feel that they should have a loyalty for them. They have a right to expect to sell it to that same individual, under a commitment that the sugar will be bought, under which we tell them that if they sell us their sugar at that time they can rely on our buying it later. So they proceed to rely on this arrangement and on commitments that we will pay a better price for that sugar than the so-called world market price or dump price. This would enable the American housewife to obtain sugar at a lesser price than other people around the world were able to buy sugar for.

The bill delivers a commitment and an expectation that they will be able to deliver sugar to us. In addition, the arrangement is on the basis that our friends in Latin America, for example, can be assured of a price so that they will not have to reduce their standard of living or perhaps go out of business.

We want a bill that will be a good deal for both our country and the suppliers of sugar to us.

I shall provide for the RECORD a compilation to show that most of the developed countries of the world pay a higher price for sugar than does the United States, even though they do not feel the same burden or responsibility to help less fortunate nations and less developed nations that we do.

I hope this bill will be looked upon as a part of an arrangement that is good for the producers and good for the consumers.

It was said, even though it is not on the record, by Mr. Mann, who represents this Government in dealing with our Latin American friends, that for every dollar which would be saved by compelling these people who sell us sugar to sell it at a lower price, it would be better to cut the Alliance for Progress by $2. The reason is that so much damage would be done by lowering the price of the sugar, with respect to people who are among our best friends, that our image around the world would be greatly damaged. It would be better to reduce the amount paid under the Alliance for Progress by twice as much as would be saved by the lower price of sugar, than by paying a price for sugar that the people cannot produce it for. In the long run, I do not think we would really save money for our consumers or other individuals.

So I urge the Senate to adopt a forward-looking policy, which will be beneficial to both the producer and the consumer, which will do justice to the Alliance for Progress as well as other operations that we have with friendly nations around the world.

I hope the Senate will swiftly approve the bill, in order that it may be taken to conference.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment be agreed to en bloc and that the bill as thus amended be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, my colleague the Senator from Louisiana, who had the responsibility of handling the sugar bill in the Finance Committee, has given us a clear picture of the complexity of the problems the committee faced, and particularly with respect to the allocation of foreign quotas.

The sugar bill allocates 65 percent of the needs of our country to the domestic producers. I believe the RECORD would not be complete without a review of the solution of the problems involved in that allocation. Fortunately this solution was reached without any particular difficulty and with great unanimity.

The Senate provisions relating to the domestic quotas are essentially the same as the provisions in the House bill. So we should have no conference problem on the domestic sugar quotas.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has pointed out that many of the problems involved in our distribution to our foreign friends have grown out of the fact that in 1963 and 1964 the world market for sugar arose above the domestic market and we had problems and difficulty in persuading some of our friends to supply us with the sugar we expected them to supply.

At the same time, the Department of Agriculture appealed to domestic producers to step up their production so that the volume of sugar needed by the American people would not be short and force our domestic prices up into the range of world prices.

As a result the marketing quota was taken off domestic producers and acreage allotments were taken off and everybody on the mainland who was in a position to produce sugar was encouraged to do so.

SUGAR INVENTORIES

This has created a situation with which we were faced in both the House and the Senate. There is an excess of sugar inventory in the warehouses of domestic producers, which under the marketing allotment they were not permitted to sell. This had to be handled and cleared away.

The bill increased the domestic share to 65 percent. Specifically, it increased the domestic beet sugar allotment from 2,650,000 to 3,025,000 tons; and mainland cane sugar from 895,000 to 1,100,000 tons.

The allotments for Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands were not changed because those sugar producers have not been able during the last few years to exceed their allotments.

The result of this is that after a good deal of negotiation between the various domestic producers involved and the Department of Agriculture, we have been able to work out a program with which no country is completely satisfied—of course, no one ever is—but which would enable us not only to take care of the overproduction that the Department of Agriculture pleaded for in 1963 and 1964, but, to a certain limited extent, we were able to give some relief to those who came into sugar production without a previous history—at the request of and sometimes at the encouragement of the Department of Agriculture—and who now find themselves with no history.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. At the time when we had a shortage of sugar and realized that we needed to be in a better condition to protect the American consumer, the Department of Agriculture and other agencies of the executive branch urged that American concerns go into business.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. For example, in my State I helped to obtain an area redevelopment loan to help a concern to go into business to produce more sugar. Then, when we helped them to go into business with Government money, everyone assumed there would be no problem. Many of the people had to resort to bankruptcy because they had sugar and could not sell it.

Mr. BENNETT. This problem had to be solved. I know that there are people in the mainland cane areas who found themselves in that situation. This problem had to be solved by negotiations outside of the actual legislation itself, so that those who had allotments would be willing to share some of their privilege with those who needed it. This has been done.

Domestic producers will be given an increase this year of 580,000 tons, but they will not share in any further increases from the growth of market until the total consumption has exceeded 10,400,000 tons.

In other words, they have been helped over the hurdle, but they are going to be paid for it by freezing present levels until the total demand reaches the point where the present level would be 65 percent of 10,400,000 tons.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. FONG. Does that mean that this is substantially the same as the House measure?

Mr. BENNETT. The domestic portion of the bill is substantially the same as the House bill.

Mr. FONG. Except for the 25,000 tons kept in reserve, this is the same as the House bill?

Mr. BENNETT. We have an amendment retaining reservations. I was about to refer to that next.

Mr. FONG. That is the only difference from the House bill?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We are omitting a provision that had to do with the 25,000 ton cane sugar in the House bill. That would be in the conference between the House and the Senate. We put in our amendment involving the beet sugar problem.

Mr. FONG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator referred to the other amendment. I wish to refer briefly to page 33 of the Senate report. I ask unanimous consent that paragraphs 8 and 9 of section 302, as found at page 33, may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(8) In order to protect the sugarbeet production history for farm operators (or farms) who in any crop year, because of a crop-rotation program or for reasons beyond their control, are unable to utilize all or a portion of the farm proportionate share acreage established pursuant to this section, the Secretary may reserve for a period of not more than three crop years the production history for any such farm operators (or farms) to the extent of the farm proportionate share acreage released. The proportionate share acreage so released may be reallotted to other farm operators (or farms), but no production history shall accrue to such other farm operators (or farms) by virtue of such reallocation of the proportionate share acreage so released.

(9) The Secretary is authorized to reserve from the national sugarbeet acreage requirements for the 1966, 1967, and 1968 crops of sugarbeets a total acreage estimated to yield not more than twenty-five thousand short tons, raw value, for each such crop to provide any nonaffiliated single plant processor of sugarbeets with an estimated quantity of sugar for marketing of not to exceed twenty-five thousand short tons of sugar raw value. The Secretary shall allocate the acreage provided for in this paragraph to farms on such basis as he determines necessary to accomplish the purposes for which such acreages are provided under this paragraph.

Mr. BENNETT. This amendment was put into the bill to solve the problems of some farmers who, for instance, found themselves with a farm in two States. They had an allotment in one State, but their allotment was cut back in the other State. Certain farmers found themselves unable to utilize their allotment and wanted to be in a position to pick it up later, if they were able to use it.

BEET SUGAR RESERVE

The effect of this amendment is to permit the Secretary—not require him, but permit him—to put the allotment of such farmers in a reserve for not more than 3 years, after which it must return to the producer from whom it was taken; and that from this reserve there would be an allowance of not more than 25,000 short tons which could be available to the Secretary to distribute in areas where he thinks it might be needed.

The domestic portion of the bill is extended for 6 years. The foreign portion was extended only 2 years, on the theory that we would like to have an opportunity to take a look at this complex foreign problem again within that time. But by extending the domestic portion 6 years we assume we have taken care of it until consumption begins to approach 10,400,000 tons, at which point the domestic share of the total sugar consumption might again be increased.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. It seems to me that the Finance Committee has done quite a job on this bill. The net effect, as I understand it, is to make it possible for the domestic industry at least to salve some of their wounds which were created by the administration urging them to overplant at a time when world price was so high. Is that approximately accurate?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes. I believe that that is the effect of the domestic portion of the bill both in the Senate and in the House, and fortunately this feature of the bill will not be in conference.

Mr. DOMINICK. The domestic portion will not be in conference. It will be mostly the foreign portion of the bill.

Mr. BENNETT. The language affecting domestic quotas is almost the same in both versions of the bill.

Mr. DOMINICK. I am happy to hear the Senator report that. I have been concerned with the Senate getting a bill in the past few weeks and being urged to pass it without adequate consideration.

I believe the Finance Committee and the distinguished Senator from Utah have done a magnificent job on it.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] was the chairman of those meetings. I was happy to support him in our program on which we had worked.

In conference, there will be some problems concerning the foreign section of the bill; but fortunately, we who represent States which produce sugar need have no fear about the effect of the conference upsetting the domestic program that the bill contains.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I would like to continue with the prepared text of my speech.

DOMESTIC QUOTAS

With our intense interest in the controversial sections of this bill—that is to say, the provisions concerning foreign quotas—we have not given the attention we should to the great contribution made by the domestic sugar-producing industry toward meeting and alleviating the sugar shortage of 2 years ago. We should remember that the domestic producers' response to the Government's pleas for increased domestic production during that emergency has made necessary the temporary increases in the beet and mainland cane quotas—over which there is no controversy—provided in this bill.

We have heard and read some references to "surpluses" of sugar in the domestic beet and mainland cane sugar industries, and we should remember that the production of those "surpluses"—the extra sugar now on hand, that cannot be marketed under the present law—was induced and encouraged by the Government. The Wall Street Journal made reference to this on Monday of this week.

Unless some bill is enacted—

The Journal said—

domestic growers won't be able to market surpluses generated by Government-encouraged production to overcome sugar shortages in 1963 and 1964.

Mr. President, for the record I should like to document some of the actions the Government took, and some of the announcements it made, in order to encourage greater beet sugar production and enlargement of the production capacity of the beet sugar industry.

For example, on March 14, 1963, the Government announced that there would be no restrictions on sugarbeet planting in 1964, and the announcement contained the following specific urging for greater beet sugar production:

It is assumed that the industry will attempt in 1963 to produce at the maximum capacity of its plants. Today's action is expected to encourage plant expansion. First, it should encourage existing plants to modernize and expand their facilities since they can now be assured of at least 2 years of unrestricted operations. Second, new plants under construction for operation in 1963 and 1964 could be expanded immediately to their ultimate capacity so as to take advantage of this opportunity for full production and the building of production and marketing history in excess of the tonnage provided from the national acreage reserve.

USDA suggests that when acreage restrictions are reimposed, major consideration should be given to production history in the period immediately preceding the resumption of controls. That should provide fair treatment for those who increase production sufficiently to meet prospective marketing quotas and stock requirements.

On May 6 of that same year the Government announced there would be no restrictions on sugarbeet planting in 1965, as another inducement to increasing beet sugar production and production capacity. There is no doubt that was the intent of these acreage announcements. The then Under Secretary of Agriculture, Charles Murphy, emphasized this in testimony before the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, on June 5, 1963. Mr. Murphy said:

> One of the major objectives of the Department in announcing that restrictions would not be imposed on sugarbeet production in 1964 and 1965 was to encourage the modernization and expansion of existing factories and the enlargement of factories now under construction.

That afternoon, in a continuation of the same hearing, Lawrence Myers, who then was director of the Department of Agriculture's sugar policy staff, reemphasized Under Secretary Murphy's statement in these words, in response to a question:

> And it was for exactly that reason, as the Secretary pointed out in his testimony this morning, that the industry is assured that acreage restrictions would not be applied in either 1964 or 1965, to encourage this modernization and expansion immediately, so that they would get on this higher basis of production.

These statements were further verification of what Under Secretary Murphy had told the Senate Finance Committee a few days earlier, on May 29, 1963. In response to a question from a member of the committee, the Under Secretary said:

> If I may respond to that, Senator, we have already taken restrictions off production of beets for this year, 1964, and 1965, and cane for this year and 1964. Certainly, we would hope that production will increase as a result of this action.

Mr. President, I believe that is sufficient documentation to show why production was increased by the domestic beet sugar industry. It was increased in direct response to Government urging and inducements. I think the RECORD should clearly show this.

The temporarily increased marketing rights provided in this bill for the domestic beet sugar industry—and the mainland cane industry—are necessary because, except during 1963, the domestic producers have not been permitted to market any of the additional sugar they produced at the request of the Government.

Mr. President, I do not wish to open old wounds. I recognize that the domestic quota provisions in this bill are the result of compromises, and that they have the support of all segments of the domestic sugar producing and refining industries as well as the support of the administration. They also have my support, although I wish the domestic quotas were larger and were on a permanent rather than temporary basis. I have personally been disappointed that some of the foreign sugar interests who, after prodding by our Government, shipped us sugar when we needed it, have been rewarded by the administration with enlarged basic quotas—while domestic producers are receiving only temporarily increased marketing rights. Nevertheless, I do vigorously support the domestic quotas—and this bill, as the Finance Committee reported it.

WORLD MARKET AND DOMESTIC SUGAR PRICES

Mr. President, whenever the Sugar Act comes up for discussion by the Senate, the old bugaboo of so-called world versus domestic sugar prices is raised, and an attempt is made to draw odious comparisons between the price paid by domestic cane refiners for raw sugar, as quoted in New York or New Orleans, and the price for raw sugar on the so-called world market. It is implied that the world market provides some kind of worldwide price standard, and that any price higher than the world price is too high. It is also implied that everybody else in the world pays only the so-called world market price—and that only the United States pays more. The impression is left that American consumers pay more for sugar than anybody else in the world.

Such statements and implications are erroneous and unfair. They simply are not true. Persons who make them are either first, ignorant of the true facts about sugar markets; or, second, deliberately trying to deceive the Congress and the American public.

Let us examine the facts, let us explore the truth—first, about the so-called world market:

Sugar is one of the most regulated commodities in the world, everywhere in the world. Producing countries all have some kind of internal arrangements concerning production and marketing—ranging from special taxes, production subsidies, and the like, to export subsidies and Government trading corporations. Importing countries, most of them, have some kind of special arrangements with exporters to assure supplies. All these national systems affect price.

For example, there is the British Commonwealth system, under which a price is negotiated annually with producers in the Commonwealth countries for specified quantities of sugar sold in the United Kingdom. And there is the French system, with special price and quota arrangements between Metropolitan France and the nations of the French community. The Portuguese have still another system. The nations of the Communist bloc have special arrangements, some on a barter basis, for the movement of sugar among the nations of the bloc.

In addition, there are many special bilateral arrangements and deals between importers and exporters.

As a result of all these special systems and special arrangements, only a very small part of total world sugar consumption moves in international trade without restrictions of some kind. Usually only 10 to 15 percent of all the world's sugar is traded on the so-called world market. This is sugar that is homeless, that is not covered by any of the special arrangements. It is sugar that is seeking a market. Since it is a small and thin market it is extremely sensitive to changes in the world supply and demand situation. Usually there is more sugar than there is a demand for; the so-called world market is depressed. World market prices are often below the actual cost of production—which is the situation today. Producers that sell at these depressed prices can do so only because they also sell in one or more of the protected markets, where the price is higher.

It is extremely interesting to me—and I believe it is highly important to our obtaining a true picture of the world sugar situation—to note that the sugar experts of the Department of Agriculture testified, under questioning, before the Senate Finance Committee last week, that raw sugar prices in the other great protected markets, such as the British and French, are comparable to U.S. raw sugar prices. There is very little, if any, difference. Therefore, Mr. President, it is utterly misleading for anyone to imply that all the rest of the world buys raw sugar at $70 a ton less than U.S. refiners do. It simply is not the truth.

It is equally untrue to imply that the American housewife pays more for her sugar than do the housewives of most other countries. The truth is, Mr. President, that the retail price of sugar in the United States is about the same as the average of prices in other major consuming countries around the world. A study made for the Senate Finance Committee of retail prices in the 22 largest sugar-consuming countries is especially revealing in this respect.

It compares retail sugar prices in these countries on January 1 for each of the last 5 years. In 3 of the 5 years, the U.S. price was lower than the average of prices in all 22 nations—from one-tenth of a cent to four-tenths of a cent a pound lower. And in one of the other 2 years, the U.S. price was three-tenths of a cent higher than the average of all the countries, and in one year our price was only one-tenth of a cent higher.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the table which appears on page 29 of the excellent compilation of data relating to the Sugar Act Amendments of 1965 compiled by the diligent staff of the Senate Finance Committee.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Retail price of sugar for selected countries arranged in descending order of total sugar consumption, Jan. 1, 1961–65

[U.S. cents per pound]

	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965
United States	11.9	11.6	11.8	14.1	11.6
United Kingdom	9.3	10.0	10.0	11.1	11.1
Brazil	4.5	5.0	5.0	6.1	6.1
India	10.5	10.0	10.2	11.6	(1)
West Germany	12.9	14.0	13.9	14.1	14.0
Japan	18.7	18.4	18.7	22.0	14.2
France	10.5	11.8	12.3	12.6	12.6
Italy	15.4	15.0	14.9	15.6	16.0
Mexico	5.5	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6
Poland	13.5	13.5	13.5	14.6	(1)
Canada	9.6	9.0	10.3	17.9	8.8
Netherlands	11.7	12.2	13.7	13.9	14.0
South Africa	6.4	6.5	7.0	7.0	7.0
Australia	9.3	9.3	10.3	10.3	10.2
Yugoslavia	25.4	25.4	25.4	25.4	13.3
Belgium	13.0	14.1	12.7	12.5	13.9
Pakistan	17.0	14.1	15.3	17.1	18.0
Sweden	12.6	12.2	13.7	20.2	15.0
Hungary	20.2	20.2	20.2	20.2	(1)
Peru	2.8	3.7	3.7	5.1	5.8
Switzerland	9.1	8.6	8.8	12.7	11.2
China	9.1	10.0	12.3	13.4	13.4
Simple average	11.8	11.8	12.2	13.8	11.8

[1] Not available.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, this study bears out an even more comprehensive study made by the United Nations a number of years ago of sugar prices in 121 nations around the globe. Again, the U.S. price was almost identical with the average of the prices in all the countries.

On another basis of comparison—the amount of time a workman must labor to earn enough to buy a pound of sugar—the price of sugar in the United States is the lowest in the world.

Mr. President, let us not be misled by the attempts of the perennial carping critics of the sugar program to mislead us. Let us not swallow the fantastically contrived figures purporting to show the "cost of this program to the American consumers." Such figures simply do not present a true picture, because inevitably they are based on a comparison of our prices wtih prices on the so-called world market—which is only a dumping ground for homeless sugar, and not a normal market.

I repeat, Mr. President, that those who seek to mislead through the use of such erroneous comparisons do so either through ignorance of the true world sugar situation or through deliberate intent to mislead.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, it is with somewhat mixed feelings that I speak in support of H.R. 11135 as reported by the Committee on Finance. In most respects the bill represents a most important strengthening of the Sugar Act. In most respects the lessons of the past 3 years—the lessons to be learned from our experience under the Sugar Act Amendments of 1962—have been learned.

The bill abandons the global quota concept and substitutes instead a formula allocation of the entire foreign sugar quota among specified foreign countries. This makes it possible for those countries to which we look for our supplies of foreign raw sugar to know what is expected of them and to plan to meet their obligations under the act. Indeed, the present bill calls on countries receiving quotas to expressly commit themselves to fill their quotas. Under the old system, where we looked to all countries for our sugar, in effect we could look to none. What is everybody's business is nobody's. The assignment of responsibilities made by the present bill is an important improvement in the act.

The bill also abandons the closely related import fee of the 1962 act. In doing this, it accepts the recommendations of President Johnson as announced to the Ambassadors of the Latin American nations on August 17 of this year. In effect, the bill declares that we will not seek to buy raw sugar from our friends at distress prices, at prices which are less than the costs of production, at prices which do not permit our suppliers to make a decent living. This decision is, in effect, a declaration for trade instead of aid. In effect, it declares that we intend to deal fairly with our suppliers. With such a policy on our part, I am confident that our foreign suppliers will, in their turn, deal fairly with us.

The bill makes a sound division of quotas as between our domestic producing areas and our foreign suppliers. It grants substantial and immediate quota increases to the domestic beet area and to the mainland cane area. This will permit these two areas to work off, in an orderly fashion, over a period of years, the surplus sugar they now have on hand. The bill also strengthens domestic production controls, to make more certain that burdensome surpluses are not produced in the future. The bill extends quotas for domestic areas through 1971, thus giving these areas some measure of certainty as to what the rules for sugar will be through that year. All of this is good, and I commend the Committee on Finance for these highly desirable provisions.

But it is just here that I believe a most dangerous weakness has been permitted to enter the bill. As reported to the Senate, the bill, while extending domestic quotas through 1971, extends foreign quotas only through 1967.

In limiting foreign quotas to 1967 the committee has chosen to ignore the recommendations of the Department of State, the Department of Agriculture, the entire domestic sugar industry, including the domestic beet producers and processors, the sugar producers of Hawaii and Puerto Rico, the cane growers of Louisiana and Florida, and the U.S. can sugar refining industry—to say nothing of the views of the House of Representatives as expressed in H.R. 11135 as passed by that body. With the greatest respect for the distinguished members of the Committee on Finance, it is my judgment that on this point the wiser course would be to extend foreign quotas through 1971. The action now recommended by the Committee on Finance almost exactly parellels the action taken by the Congress in 1962. In the middle of that year the Sugar Act was extended through 1966. Domestic quotas were set for the full term of the extension; foreign quotas were established only for the years through 1964. When the time came, in 1964, to take action on foreign quotas, what was done? Nothing. Congress, for reasons which are understandable, if not particularly creditable, found itself unable to come to any decision. In the absence of congressional action, it became necessary for the executive branch to establish foreign sugar quotas by regulation, thus moving into a subject which had been the sole province of Congress for more than 30 years.

The 1962 extension of foreign quotas for less than the full term of the act teaches us something else: That when an act is open on one subject, it is all too likely that it will be opened on other subjects as well. It is a little like trying to crack half an egg. The Sugar Act is a single entity. When it is open, it is open, and efforts to limit legislative consideration to a single subject, such as foreign quotas, are most difficult to sustain.

We learned this also in 1964. It was only foreign quotas which expired in that year, but the bills which were offered dealt with almost every aspect of the act, and in the course of doing so, developed so much opposition that not even foreign quotas were dealt with.

I am very much afraid that the decision to limit foreign quotas to 1967 will destroy much of the certainty that all elements of the sugar industry so greatly need, and which an extension of the whole act through 1971 would give them. Business plans cannot be made on any efficient basis if they have to be made from year to year. The sugar industry is a major industry, in which many millions of dollars have been invested by hundreds of thousands of Americans. It gives direct employment to many thousands, and indirect employment to a vastly larger number. It has been disrupted and disturbed by sugar legislation in 1962, attempts at legislation in 1964, and now by the present legislative effort. If the bill as reported by the Committee on Finance becomes law, the industry can look forward to 1967 as another year of uncertainty. I say give the industry a little peace, and in the course of doing so perhaps we can have a little ourselves. I think an extension of the whole act through 1971 would do this. It would make the stability which the extension of domestic quotas through 1971 promises into a reality, and it would be an act of fairness to our foreign suppliers, to whom planning is just as important as it is to our domestic industry.

I would hope that when H.R. 1135 goes to conference with the House, the conferees representing the Senate would approach the question of the duration of foreign quotas with minds which are responsive to the argument favoring extension of the whole act through 1971. It is my own conviction that this is the only way in which we can really meet the needs of our domestic sugar industry for legislative stability; it is the only way we can avoid executive encroachment on what should be legislative decisions.

Mr. President, if I may impose upon the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, the acting chairman of the Committee on Finance, who is in charge of the bill, I should like to ask him a question.

Do I correctly presume that the Senator will be in charge of the conferees representing the Senate?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I hope to be one of the conferees.

Mr. INOUYE. Can the Senator give the Senate some indication as to whether the conferees would be sufficiently flexible as to consider extending the foreign quota section to 1971?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This would be a subject that would be very much in conference. So far as I am concerned, I have no strong feeling about the matter one way or the other. This is one of the questions that could be resolved to either extreme, or it could be resolved, perhaps, as a compromise, on a 3- or a 4-year basis, rather than on a 2- or a 5-year basis.

I should imagine that the Senate conferees would be guided in some measure by the degree of success they have had with respect to other matters in conference.

As the Senator well knows, there is a vast difference between the action of the Senate and the action of the House of

Representatives on the foreign quotas. If we could arrive at an agreement that is more in accord with the action of the Senate and the recommendation of the administration—the two of which are much more closely in line—I should think that the Senator would feel more like yielding, at least to some extent, with respect to the duration of the foreign quotas.

I am sure the Senator realizes that if we were to wind up with an agreement on foreign quotas that we thought was unreasonable and unfair, at least to some degree, we would be inclined to want to stand by the 2-year limitation.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I would be very pleased if the Senate were to adopt this concept. I believe this would give the foreign countries an idea of our good faith. It would provide them with some stability so that they would produce the sugar we need so badly.

I should think we would bring about greater stability and reliance if we were to extend this act on a 5-year basis, as we do with respect to the domestic portion.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from Hawaii for the very fine statement he has made. He has given much thought to this matter. I agree with almost everything the Senator has said in his very fine speech.

I shall keep in mind the fine suggestions that the Senator has made, when the bill is in conference. I shall, of course, feel compelled to support the position of the Senate and of the committee, as the Senator knows. However, the Senate is not inflexible on this matter. There is nothing immutable about the 2-year limitation.

I quite agree with what the Senator has said to the effect that the foreign countries have the same situation as we do in Louisiana and in Hawaii, in which States the cane is in the ground for several years, and we sometimes have difficulty knowing just what our situation will be when we produce the sugar.

It is an unfortunate situation. Not knowing where they stand has caused a lot of people in Louisiana to be in a very distressed situation at this time.

I can appreciate that people would like to know where they stand before they produce the sugar.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. INOUYE. I yield.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I subscribe wholeheartedly to the very fine and excellent remarks of my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Hawaii.

I voice his sentiment that the committee has done a good job. I also am quite fearful concerning the extension of the foreign quotas for only 2 years. I believe that the quotas should be extended through 1971 to coincide with the termination of the domestic quota provisions.

The sentiments expressed by my colleague concerning the reopening of the Sugar Act at the end of 2 years are well founded. I hope that the conference committee will look into that matter very thoroughly and come forward with the same time limit on the foreign quotas as has been recommended for the domestic program.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I thank my senior colleague for his fine comments and for his support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

END OF SESSION SUGAR BILL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as usual, this bill comes to us virtually at the end of the session and the Senate is not given adequate time within which to discuss the very basic features of the sugar program and the specific details of the bill.

This is generally the result of the practices of the House Committee on Agriculture which holds back to the end of the session and then stands firmly in conference. In justice, we must say that the administration was very slow in producing its bill this year. I believe the administration bill was not presented until late in September.

The administration has also reversed its provision on the general features of the sugar program. Last December the administration announced that it intended to have an import fee system so far as general importations were concerned, and to impose an import fee amounting to a part of the difference between the world price and the American price which, as I shall shortly show, was very considerable.

I have advocated this global quota rather than specific countrywide quotas for at least 5 years. I have associated with that the import fee of the difference between the world price and the domestic price. This difference would be paid into the U.S. Treasury and would save the taxpayers many tens of millions of dollars a year.

FORTY-ONE MILLION DOLLARS SAVED IN RECENT PAST

On one occasion the Senate Committee on Finance approved this global quota system. On another occasion the Senate, on its first vote, approved of it, and later made modifications in it. Nevertheless, the global quota and the import fee system were used for 1962 and for part of 1963. This use netted the Treasury $41 million during that period of time. However, the import fee provisions expired last December 31. But the administration did announce it would propose such a system again this year. But in September, in the bill which came up, we had once again the system of paying the foreign producers the high American price without any recapture of the difference in assigning the slices of the pie to specific countries.

HOW WERE QUOTAS DETERMINED?

I believe that the Senate bill is not quite as bad a bill as is the House bill. During the period of time in which the House considered the bill, there was a strange juggling of national quotas. Venezuela, which had produced little or no sugar before, found itself with a very large quota, having had the services of a skilled and well-known Washington lobbyist.

Argentina, which had not hired a lobbyist, had its Ambassador represent his country, without having hired high-priced Washington lawyers. Argentina came out very badly.

There are a number of other interesting assignments which are difficult to explain, and which I shall not attempt to go into at this time.

The Senate has improved these features. We have eliminated many of the inequities in the House bill. It is still a bad bill. The Senator from Louisiana did very good work on the bill, but he inherited a bad system. He is a good man who is serving the wrong system.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask this question as a lawyer. Fortunately I am paid to serve in the Senate and do not have to practice law and do not do so.

I ask the Senator whether he is contending that a lawyer should be denied the right to seek employment and earn a fee?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not contending for any such system. The system under which we operate inevitably results in various countries securing the services of the most skillful and able people to represent them.

It is the system which is at fault, and not the individuals.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator knows that, so far as the Senate Committee on Finance is concerned, the Argentine Government which had no lobbyist got exactly what the administration recommended. I think it is a very good quota and very fine treatment.

HOUSE USUALLY WINS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I believe that the hands of the Senate Committee on Finance are clean in this matter.

The Senate conferees will meet in conference with the House conferees. Past experiences has always shown that it is the House quotas which are retained, and the Senate is forced to abjectly surrender. In spite of the firm view on sugar which has been taken by the Senator from Louisiana, I think it is probably going to be the experience again.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I do not agree with the Senator from Illinois that the Senate conferees, the senior members of the Senate Committee on Finance, have not succeeded in having a considerable amount of influence on what the quotas would be. Generally speaking, we have brought back from conference a compromise between the House recommendation and the Senate recommendations.

I should hope that the Senator would not presume that because the House assumed its responsibility—as did the Senate committee—in arriving at some difference of opinion with those who administer these laws, the House is necessarily evil, or that they did not exercise good logic in taking the position they did.

SYSTEM PRODUCES LOBBYISTS

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is resorting to his usual device of caricaturing the position of the opposition. If the

Senator will permit me, I intend shortly to demonstrate that the whole system upon which the Sugar Acts have been based has been basically wrong, costing hundreds of millions of dollars each year to American consumers, the cost having amounted, over the last 30 years, to probably at least $10 billion taken out of the pockets of American consumers; and that, in the distribution of the foreign sugar bonuses, it is helpful to have influential friends. As soon as that system prevails, they are going to have lobbyists and lawyers—and I do not blame them. One man is getting $125,000. I do not object to that; it is inevitable.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, would the Senator agree that we have passed other laws, which have nothing to do with foreign governments, in connection with which somebody might have received $125,000 for a fee? Anyone is entitled to hire a lawyer—in fact, I think many times one is a fool not to hire a lawyer. There were a number of cases in which our Senate committee, looking at a change that the House had made, agreed that the House was right, and in some instances the Senator from Illinois voted to reduce the cuts even below the House figure. So we cannot very well say that those people were necessarily controlled by lobbyists, or that the lobbyists exercised any undue influence, when in a number of instances we agreed with what the House did and in some instances the Senate wished to go even beyond that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If my good friend from Louisiana will permit me to proceed with an analysis of the whole system and of the bill, I shall be glad to answer his questions as I proceed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I hope the Senator will be charitable—

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am always charitable.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. When the debate might, in some manner, impugn the honor and motives of Members of the House of Representatives, because I believe them to be honorable men.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I agree.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I think they are doing the best they can, as the good Lord gives them to see it. As one Senator and as a lawyer by profession, it is my belief that whoever wants to hire a lawyer to represent him has a right to do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, certainly.

Mr. President, I know that the way is greased for the passage of this bill, and that we shall probably face, in a few days, the bill agreed upon in conference, which will probably be much closer to the House version than the Senate version, because the House generally assumes in these matters that its action is an accomplished fact.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, I shall not yield further. I wish to develop the matter.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator is being most unkind. I had hoped he would be charitable, and would yield for a short interruption. Then I would let him make his speech.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I cannot resist such a plaintive request.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana has on a number of occasions gone to conferences representing the Senate and defended Douglas amendments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I particularly have in mind the Douglas amendments to the social security and public welfare laws. My recollection is that while in earlier years we have not had much success, the last time we prevailed on almost all of them, and they are now important and valuable additions to the law of this country.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is essentially correct, and I wish to thank the Senator from Louisiana for taking the position he did on the medicare bill also. But the sugar bill is something else. When a sugar bill comes to conference between the House and the Senate, it is the House which almost always prevails.

If I may be permitted to continue, I would appreciate it.

NEED PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING

I know the bill will be passed by the Senate. One may well ask, therefore, why should I take the floor to discuss it? I take the floor to discuss this measure because the American public does not understand what the sugar program is. If the public understood the program, there would be such a wave of public indignation that in the long run it could not be maintained. Therefore, I am speaking to the future.

I hope that a very mild amendment I intend to offer will be adopted. It would net the Treasury about $20 million a year.

I understand at this time that there will not be any fundamental change made in the bill. But public opinion, when it is informed and aroused, can do a great deal. Therefore I should like to speak concerning the sugar program in general, and then come to the details of the bill.

CARIBBEAN HAS NATURAL ADVANTAGES

The sugar program for both domestic and foreign suppliers is the most highly subsidized commodity program of all. If this were a rational world—and unfortunately it is not—sugar would be grown in the Caribbean, where soil and climate cause costs to be low—and probably also in Hawaii, I may say to my good friend from Hawaii—because sugar is much better grown in the tropics, and Hawaii is on the edge of the tropics, as is Puerto Rico also; then sugar would be imported into the United States, and also produced in Hawaii, and the funds obtained by Caribbean countries for the sale of their sugar, amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars a year, in turn would be used to buy American wheat, machinery, equipment, medicines, and other commodities in which we have a great natural advantage over them as they have a natural advantage over us in the production of sugar.

SUBSIDIES NEEDED TO PRODUCE DOMESTICALLY

Instead, however, we have a domestic sugar program which pays tremendous subsidies to producers in order that it may be possible for sugar to be grown within the United States at all. In turn, under almost all features of past sugar programs and under the administration bill, the House bill, and the Senate bill, foreign producers are in turn granted this highly subsidized American price.

That is the point. It is a subsidized American price, far above world costs. Foreign producers are paid the high American price—not the world price, and not their own cost, but much more than that; and in effect this is a tremendous windfall for most foreign producers.

LIKE GROWING BANANAS ON PIKES PEAK

If bananas were grown on Pikes Peak and if the American Government subsidized the domestic producers in order to make it profitable for them to grow bananas on Pikes Peak, and if we then, in turn, paid the producers of bananas in the Caribbean this same price, we would have almost an identical analogy to the sugar program.

The sugar program also has direct subsidies which former Secretary of Agriculture Brannan, whose proposals for other commodities have been heavily criticized by almost the same groups who support the domestic sugar program, never dreamed of.

TOTAL CONSUMPTION SET

First of all, total consumption for the country of sugar is set by the Department of Agriculture at 9.7 million tons a year. That comes out almost precisely to 100 pounds of sugar per capita—per man, woman, and child—in the country. High prices are thus assured by limiting the amount of sugar available to refiners and consumers.

PRODUCTION QUOTAS AND PRODUCTION PAYMENTS

Second, production quotas are provided for each grower.

Third, production payments in the form of direct payments are made to growers. This amounts to from 30 to 80 cents per hundredweight or from $6 to $16 per ton depending upon the size of the farm or production unit.

In the 1964 crop year, $90.5 million was paid in direct payments to producers. The average is about $15 a ton—or three-quarters of a cent a pound on the amount produced domestically, including Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

In the years since 1937, $1.6 billion has thus been paid to producers under our domestic program.

MARKETING QUOTAS APPLIED

Fourth, in addition to all this, marketing quotas are provided in order to limit the amount which is available for consumption. All this results in a domestic raw sugar price which, at present, is 6.85 cents a pound.

I repeat, the price of raw sugar in New York is 6.85 cents a pound. The refined price of sugar is approximately 4 cents a pound more.

PROTECTIVE TARIFF

Fifth, in order to further protect the domestic producers and to increase the price to the consumer and to make it possible for sugar to be grown domestically at all, a protective tariff of 62½ cents per hundredweight is assessed against all foreign sugar except for Philippine sugar which now comes in at 50 cents per hundredweight and which will not reach 62½ cents per hundredweight until 1975.

All of these provisions mean that the U.S. price on the average and over the years is considerably higher than the world price, which in the Caribbean is now about 2.1 cents a pound.

The American price is 6.85 cents a pound. To get a fair comparison, of course, we should take the cost of moving sugar from the Caribbean to New York plus the tariff, because the quotation of 2.1 cents in the Caribbean is what is known as the FAS price, or "free alongside the ship." The shipping costs plus insurance from the Caribbean to New York approximate half a cent a pound.

The tariff, as I have said, is .625 cents a pound, and therefore, taking freight, insurance, and tariff, Caribbean sugar would be delivered to New York at approximately 3¼ cents a pound, but under the arrangements, the foreign shippers receive the highly subsidized American domestic price of 6.85 cents a pound. This amounts to a subsidy of 3.6 cents a pound, or $72 a ton over the world price.

BONUS OF $25 A TON OVER 15 YEARS

I have made a comparison for the 15-year period, from 1950 to 1964—if the year of 1965 is objected to. The bonus to foreign producers over the 15 years has amounted to 1¼ cents a pound on the average, or $25 a ton. We were at one time importing approximately 5 million tons from the Caribbean, or giving them a bonus of $125 million.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table of the U.S. price for sugar and the world price for sugar since 1948, and the averages for these prices over various periods, be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Average prices of raw sugar, domestic and world and quota premiums or discounts, calendar years 1948–64

[Cents per pound]

	Domestic sugar duty paid New York	World sugar	Quota premium or discount [1]
Year:			
1948	5.54	4.23	+0.41
1949	5.81	4.16	+.78
1950	5.93	4.98	+.11
1951	6.06	5.67	−.60
1952	6.26	4.17	+1.18
1953	6.29	3.41	+2.02
1954	6.09	3.26	+1.95
1955	5.95	3.24	+1.76
1956	6.09	3.48	+1.62
1957	6.24	5.16	+.14
1958	6.27	3.50	+1.91
1959	6.24	2.97	+2.38
1960	6.30	3.14	+2.21
1961	6.30	2.91	+2.45
1962	6.45	2.98	+2.58
1963	8.18	8.50	−1.23
1964	6.90	5.87	+.11
17 years, 1948–64 average	6.29	4.21	+1.16
January to September 1965	6.73	2.18	+3.60
Average:			
15 years, 1950–64	6.37	4.22	+1.24
10 years, 1955–64	6.49	4.18	+1.39
10 years, 1956–65 [2]	6.57	4.07	+1.58

[1] Difference after world price is adjusted to New York basis (freight, insurance, and duty).

[2] 1965—Average January–September.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Most of this money went to Cuba. Castro is not correct, therefore, when he declares that we abused Cuba. We have paid large premiums to Cuba.

As a consequence of the features of the system, not only in this year but also over a very long peiod of time, foreign producers have received tremendous bonuses or windfalls amounting to billions of dollars for the sugar they sell in the American market. This is the reason why—as I was trying to tell my good friend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long]—they are so anxious to sell here and why there is such tremendous lobbying for a slice of this highly subsidized price.

That is the basic reason. Granted that situation, it is inevitable that these countries would search for able and influential lawyers and lobbyists to press their case. There is gold in "them thar" provisions. They are willing to pay for it. I do not blame the countries. I do not blame the attorneys. My good friend the Senator from Louisiana has tried to lead me down the garden path to refer in noncomplimentary terms to lawyers and lobbyists. I make no such charges. I say that it is inevitable, if one places a bowl of sugar out in the sun on a hot day, the flies will come to it. That is what is happening here.

There is a western expression that where the carrion lies, there the vultures flock to feast.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield right there?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield, briefly.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Illinois has just stated that he did not make any invidious comparisons in referring to lawyers and lobbyists, yet he has just finished referring to them as flies on the one hand and vultures on the other. If those are not invidious comparisons, I do not know what they are.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is a figure of speech, only an analogy. If it has application in this case, the Senator from Louisiana can draw it. It was merely an analogy on my part, but it is true that if we put a bowl of sugar out in the sunshine, the flies will flock to it. Put large bonuses in the sugar bill, and we can be certain that the countries will rush for them.

If the Senator from Louisiana would prefer, I can use a more porcine analogy and say that when the swill is abundantly distributed, the four-legged creatures rush to get at it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should imagine that those people would more appreciate being referred to as a hog than a fly or a vulture. If I do say so, that is not a particularly complimentary term, even on that basis.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am merely using figures of speech to make what is happening more vivid to the common understanding.

PROCESSING TAX ADDED

Mr. President, the American consumer, therefore, is not only saddled with this high price, but, in addition, there is a processing tax of ½ cent per pound which is on top of the highly subsidized price and which is passed on to the consumer in the price he pays at retail. Last year this tax cost the American taxpayer and sugar consumer $95.8 million and in the period from 1938 through 1964 these tax collections have amounted to $2,144,533,392.

The consumer gets it in the neck. He pays an artificially high price in order that there be any domestic production at all. Foreigners who normally produce sugar at a cost of at least $24 a ton below this highly subsidized price receive the subsidy also.

And then the poor consumer pays through the nose by way of a processing tax. The poor consumer, the housewife, is not able to hire a $125,000 lawyer and lobbyist, and is commonly ignorant of the fact that her pocketbook is being picked, and is not able to defend herself.

WHO GETS THE SUBSIDY?

The main facts of allocation of sugar under the proposed program are known.

Domestic beet gets 3,025,000 short tons.

Mainland cane gets 1,100,000 tons.

They struggle with each other, but they have reached a temporary alliance.

Hawaii gets 1,110,000 tons.

I congratulate the able Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye] for his part in obtaining a high quota for his people.

Puerto Rico gets 1,140,000 tons.

The Virgin Islands get 15,000 tons.

This is a subtotal of 6,390,000.

Then, by treaty, the Philippines receive 1,050,000 tons, making a total so far of 7,440,000 tons.

Foreign countries, upon whose quotas this differential is paid, receive 2,260,000 tons.

So the total is 9,704,000 tons, as the following table, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point, indicates.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

	Short tons
Domestic beet	3,025,000
Mainland cane	1,100,000
Hawaii	1,110,000
Puerto Rico	1,140,000
Virgin Islands	15,000
Subtotal	6,390,000
Philippines	1,050,000
Subtotal	7,440,000
Foreign	2,260,000
Subtotal	9,704,000

Mr. DOUGLAS. Roughly 6.4 million tons is allocated to what is termed the American domestic market. The Philippines, under treaty arrangement, receive another 1,050 million tons. Finally, the remainder of 2,260 million tons is allocated to foreign producers.

At present world prices and at the $72 per ton bonus, foreign suppliers will receive a bonus of about $160 million a year, or $800 million over the 5-year span of the House and original administration proposal, which my friend the Senator from Ohio, expects to reinstate instead of the bill proposed by the Senate.

Since the present world price is probably artificially low, just as the price in 1963 and 1964 was artificially low—it is perhaps fairer to use the average bonus of $24 a ton over the past 15 years, which amounts to $54 million a year and $270 million over the 5 years of the proposed program.

It is true that France and Great Britain have national systems in which they favor their colonies and pay above the world price, and that this reduces the amount of sugar available in the world market. That fluctuation in the total production of sugar over the world produces great fluctuations in the world price. That is perfectly true, and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has made a good point in bringing it forward.

I would like to raise the question as to why we must agree to adopt the British and French system. As I understand, there has recently been a conference in Geneva among the great sugar consuming countries in which it was proposed that the price on sugar should be fixed at between 4 and a little over 5 cents a pound, but not at 6.85 cents a pound. I would like to know what position the U.S. State Department took in this conference, whether it said one thing at Geneva and is now saying another thing before the Congress..

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. The position the U.S. State Department has taken has been that which was dictated from the White House.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I did not raise that question. I said I would be interested to know what the position was. I do not wish to emulate Julius Caesar, but I can say that Caesar's sword spares no one.

To, repeat, since the present world price is probably artificially low, it is perhaps fairer to use the average bonus of $24 a ton over the last 15 years, which amounts to $54 million a year—$270 million over the 5 years of the proposed program.

I know some people will say, "What is $54 million a year?" It is a great deal. So far as the consumer is concerned.

TOTAL BURDEN HEAVY

So far as the consumer is concerned, this is only a small part of the price he pays both to domestic and foreign producers. At the present bonus of $72 per ton for 9.7 million tons the consumer would pay almost $700 million a year, or almost $3.5 billion for 5 years in the form of total subsidies over the present world price.

One must add to both of these figures the approximate $95 million per year, or $475 million over the 5-year span of the program which the consumer pays by way of the processing tax.

These are indeed high prices and high charges with which the American consumer and taxpayer must be burdened for one of his basic needs of life.

PRODUCTION PAYMENTS

Now let me say something about who gets this one-half cent processing tax, levied upon the consumer and distributed to producers.

During the Senate hearings on the bill, the Department of Agriculture spokesman agreed that the following list of 25 companies and the production payments they received for the 1963 crop year were substantially correct. That list follows:

U.S. Sugar Corp., Florida: $1,104,613.05.

That is a small producer; is it not?

Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Co., Ltd., Hawaii: $1,074,520.77.

I suppose that is owned by one of the big five families.

Oahu Sugar Co., Ltd., Hawaii: $574,552.89.

C. Brewer Puerto Rico, Inc., Puerto Rico: $569,233.42.

Lihue Plantation Co., Ltd., Hawaii: $559,892.84.

Waialua Ag. Co., Ltd., Hawaii: $549,392.78.

Okeelanta Sugar Refinery, Florida: $548,282.33.

Luce & Co., Puerto Rico: $539,645.20.

Ewa Plantation Co., Hawaii: $460,721.35.

Pioneer Mill Co., Ltd., Hawaii: $444,611.23.

Kekaha Sugar Co., Ltd., Hawaii: $399,285.52.

Grove Farm Co., Ltd., Hawaii: $368,795.14.

Pepeekeo Sugar Co., Hawaii: $362,866.55.

Hawaiian Ag. Co., Hawaii: $359,090.02.

South Coast Corp., Louisiana: $356,593.10.

Louisiana is getting into the act.

Antonio Roig Sucrs. S. en C., Puerto Rico: $346,517.03.

Laupahoehoe Sugar Co., Hawaii: $344,705.63.

Kohala Sugar Co., Hawaii: $332,175.94.

Olokele Sugar Co., Ltd., Hawaii: $312,628.01.

Puna Sugar Co., Ltd., Hawaii: $298,803.48.

Wailuku Sugar Co., Hawaii: $296, 631.39.

McBryde Sugar Co., Ltd., Hawaii: $294,161.87.

Hutchinson Sugar Co., Ltd., Hawaii: $287,647.39.

Suc J. Serralles, Puerto Rico: $273,404.51.

Onomea Sugar Co., Hawaii: $268,893.31.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to yield for a question, but not a speech.

Mr. INOUYE. May I make a comment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, if it is not too long.

Mr. INOUYE. It is apparent from the statement just made by the Senator from Illinois that the plantations in Hawaii are particularly large ones. We do not deny this.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that virtually all the land in Hawaii is owned by five families?

Mr. INOUYE. This is not true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought the Senator used to make speeches to that effect.

Mr. INOUYE. That was some time ago.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The five families, through the passage of time and the marriage of their daughters expanded, but is it not true that the families of the original missionaries who came out to do good, and did well, have virtually all the land in Hawaii?

Was there not a subtle exchange? When the missionaries went out there, they had the Christian religion and the natives had the land; but when they were through, did not the natives have the Christian religion and the missionaries have the land?

Mr. INOUYE. I believe that this is quite unfair to some of our business leaders in Hawaii. I would like to point out a few things not in the statement of the Senator.

The compliance payments range from approximately $6 a ton to $16 a ton.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is what I said.

Mr. INOUYE. In the case of Hawaii, most of our plantations, because of size, are receiving the minimum amount——

Mr. DOUGLAS. But getting large returns.

Mr. INOUYE. Whereas the small plantations, such as sugarbeets, are receiving the maximum.

Mr. DOUGLAS. How many sugarbeet growers are there in Hawaii?

Mr. INOUYE. None.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand. They are on the mainland.

Mr. INOUYE. Secondly, the Senator brought up the matter of excise taxes and processing taxes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. INOUYE. Hawaii pays $9.3 per ton in excise taxes and we are averaging presently in receipts $6 per ton in compliance payments.

So far as I am concerned, if the U.S. Government were willing to do away with excise taxes and compliance payments, we would be ahead.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the Senator will join us sometime.

Mr. INOUYE. By taking away the compliance payments, in Hawaii there would be a penalization of the high standards set up for the workers.

As the Senator knows, our workers are the highest paid in the world. We have the best working conditions for our workers, the best medical benefits and dental benefits, and we have the highest wages for a workweek.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe that is probably true.

Mr. INOUYE. We also produce, because of the mechanization and technological strides we have taken, 17 tons of raw sugar per acre, whereas in the Caribbean they produce about 4 tons. Taking away the compliance payments would result in a penalty.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the open market Hawaii would be a sugar power tomorrow. The Hawaiian sugar industry can look the whole world in the face and fear no man.

Mr. INOUYE. We are willing to subsidize sugarbeet production on the mainland.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad the Senator states that they are subsidizing.

Mr. INOUYE. We are paying in taxation $9.30 a ton and receiving $6 a ton.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But the American consumer is paying higher prices than she would have to pay if the United

States bought sugar in the world market at world prices.

Mr. INOUYE. I bow to the Senator from Illinois for his background in economics.

I am sure the Senator realizes that the world market is determined by less than 5 percent of all the sugar in the world. It is not a firm basis to determine world market prices. It involves manipulative prices.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not manipulative prices, but it is true that it is subject to excessive fluctuations.

Mr. INOUYE. I believe sugar prices have been the most stable of all commodity prices, with the exception of the last 3 years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But the point is that they have been excessive all along.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. I followed the Senator from Illinois in certain motions that he made or amendments he offered in the Finance Committee. There is much to be said for his point. It is the consumer who will be the beneficiary if we do away with the whole program. But we have a program, and we are going to keep the program.

I, as one who does not have a sugarbeet in his State, or sugarcane in his State, or refineries in his State, wish to say that I believe that the job that has been done in the State of Hawaii, the 50th State, is one of the greatest jobs I have seen. They are paying $24 a day to men in the field.

But we can talk about the five families and always get a good laugh from the press gallery on that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is true.

Mr. MORTON. It may be true, but I am saying they are getting twice as much and shipping it 2,600 miles across the sea to refineries and still beating the prices of this country where wages are about half of that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not attacking the five families who formerly ruled Hawaii before our good friend appeared on the scene.

Mr. MORTON. I am not defending them. I am defending the State.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not attacking the State. I am merely pointing out that the American consumer is denied the opportunity to get low-cost sugar from the Caribbean and Hawaii. I hope we can enlist the Senator from Hawaii in the cause of free trade in sugar at some time, which would greatly benefit Hawaii instead of being a restriction of 1,100,000 tons.

SECOND 25 COMPANIES GETTING PRODUCTION PAYMENTS

Mr. President, I have a list of 25 companies that are receiving bonuses ranging from $251,883 to Southdown, Inc., of Louisiana, and through another Hawaiian company such as Hilo Sugar Co., Honokan Sugar Co., Kilauea Sugar Co., Hamakua Mill Co., and so on, down to Savoie Industries in Louisiana, which got $77,729.

I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sugar Act payments—1963 crop

	Payment
Southdown, Inc., Louisiana	$251,883.28
Hilo Sugar Co., Ltd., Hawaii	219,527.59
Kahuku Plantation Co., Hawaii	200,247.80
Honokau Sugar Co., Hawaii	194,321.46
Gay & Robinson, Hawaii	176,998.25
Kilauea Sugar Co., Ltd., Hawaii	169,638.86
Hameka Mill Co., Hawaii	162,312.03
Talisman Sugar Corp., Florida	154,980.47
Florida Sugar Co., Florida	153,802.09
Pasuhau Sugar Co., Ltd., Hawaii	139,831.57
Sterling Sugars, Inc., Louisiana	136,333.69
Heirs of Gabriel Pla, Decd, et al, Puerto Rico	123,096.72
Vicorp, Virgin Islands	120,479.24
A. Duda & Sons, Florida	111,248.35
Closter, Farms, Inc., Florida	109,001.18
Ramon Gonzalez Hernandez, Puerto Rico	108,392.20
Milliken & Farwell, Inc., Louisiana	104,974.05
A. Wilbert & Sons L & S Co., Louisiana	99,725.55
M. Mercado E. Hijos (partnership), Puerto Rico	94,819.57
Osceola Farms Co., Florida	93,579.29
South Florida Sugar Co., Florida	93,306.84
Antonia Cabassa Vda Fajardo et al, Puerto Rico	92,588.87
Sugarcane Farms Co., Florida	80,359.60
715 Farms Ltd., Florida	80,105.02
Savoie Industries, Louisiana	77,729.96

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall yield in a moment. The 50 largest producers received almost $14.7 million, or 16 percent of the $90.8 million paid to producers under the act in the 1963 crop year. All this indicates that the bonus subsidies are received by comparatively few big producers. It can hardly be argued that in these cases the program supports the small farmer.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I promised first to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator speaks of bonuses. The bonus goes to the man who has the acreage or the refinery.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The man who has the land.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The fact is that he must split up that bonus with his laborers. People talk about the high wages in Hawaii. The workers over there have a strong union. That union wants to see the books of the company. They say, "You received $300,000. We want $250,000 of that for ourselves."

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is hardly that big a split.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator would be surprised how well that union does. It is one of the strongest unions in America.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. INOUYE. I should like to point out, with respect to the list of the 50 great producers, who have amassed $15 million, as the Senator says, that I am certain that all the producers must have paid processing taxes far in excess of what they received.

CONSUMER PAYS THE TAX

Mr. DOUGLAS. But it is the consumer who pays the processing tax. The processor advances it, but he recoups it from the higher price which he receives. It is the housewife who pays it. The child munching a 5-cent candy bar pays it. The lumberman who puts a spoonful of sugar in his coffee pays it. The switchman on the railroad is the one who pays the tribute.

It is true that the proceeds are more widely distributed than they once were. It is true that the Senator from Hawaii, who is one of the heroes of the great book "Hawaii" by James Michener, did a great deal to bring about a more equitable distribution of the money.

I recognize that because of the longtime institutional arrangement involved, it is impossible to make any fundamental change in the domestic program at this time. I do not contemplate that such a change will be made. I am not proposing any change in the domestic program.

But I think the facts should be aired, so that public opinion in the future may be able to move on this subject.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator realizes, of course, does he not, that the increase in production, both in the beet and the cane sugar industry on the mainland, came in large part because of an invitation by the Department of Agriculture to produce more sugar at a time when it was not certain that we would have enough?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Fundamentally, it came from the fact that Castro adopted an attitude highly antagonistic to the United States and the U.S. Government very properly imposed a boycott on the purchase of Cuban sugar. I approved of President Eisenhower's doing that. Therefore, we distributed the Cuban production into three parts—some to domestic producers of both cane and beet sugar some to cane sugar producers in the Western Hemisphere; and some to countries outside the Western Hemisphere. I understand that.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad the Senator does not object to that, because I know of my own knowledge that although there is rather generous treatment of domestic producers, it is not sufficient to meet their increased production, which in large part results from the invitation or suggestion by the Department of Agriculture itself that they produce more for a better serving of the needs of this country.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was merely placing the facts in the RECORD, so that people may know them and make up their own minds. We have little time in which to act. The session is so near the end that it is impossible to make any fundamental change in the domestic program. I am not proposing one. No one knows how far in the future the domestic program should be reconsidered. As one who believes fundamentally in trade between nations, I believe the sound and rational policy would be to draw our sugar from Hawaii and the Caribbean, where costs are low, and to sell in return goods which we can make at a positive comparative advantage.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I agree entirely with the Senator in his attitude with respect to Hawaii. It is one of the 50 States and is entitled to the same generous treatment accorded to producers everywhere in the United States. I agree that the same attitude should be extended to Puerto Rico, an independent Commonwealth, in a way, yet truly a part of the United States.

I merely make the point that I am glad the distinguished Senator from Illinois is not finding fault with the rather modest increases in domestic allotments that do not fully meet the increases in production which were accomplished by both the beet and the cane sugar industries as a result of the Castro incident and as a result of the deliberate invitation and effort on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture, with which I find no fault at all. The Secretary was trying to take care of domestic needs by having domestic producers produce more sugar. I am glad that the Senator is not seeking to find fault with that situation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Florida. I merely wanted to place the facts in the RECORD.

However one may justify the domestic program—and I admit that it is impossible to change it at this time—as I see it, there is no justification whatsoever to extend the highly subsidized price to other countries, especially to countries outside the Western Hemisphere, and we already know how to prevent this.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the text of my remarks the justification for foreign sugar quotas as recommended by the administration in the bill introduced by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

There being no objection, the justification was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When asked for a justification of these grants, the administration witnesses first argued that this was a form of aid. When such countries as Australia, the Republic of China, South Africa, Belgium, and others, were mentioned to them and when they were asked to justify aid to these countries, they were unable to do so.

They were then questioned as to why both British and French protectorates, possessions, or dependencies were included, as they already are under both the French and British subsidized program. Here it was argued that we have a policy of nondiscrimination and make no distinction between and among countries to receive this largess. It was quickly pointed out to them that both the British and the French in their sugar programs do not practice such a policy of nondiscrimination. In the case of the French, they buy sugar only from their domestic producers or foreign possessions. In the case of the British, 80 percent of their sugar is purchased from their own possessions at a premium price, but the remaining 20 percent is purchased on the world market at world prices which, of course, are below their subsidized prices.

At one point, it was argued that balance-of-payments considerations played a part in determining which country was on the list. It was shortly pointed out to the administration spokesmen, especially in the case of French possessions, the dollar exchanges they receive will go to the French treasury and, under the present policies of General de Gaulle, will then be used as claims on the American dollar which, in turn, will harm—not help—our balance of payments.

In the case of South Africa, such an argument is absurd for they are the largest gold producing nation in the world and do not need further increases in their balance of payments at our expense.

With respect to the administration argument that the highly subsidized price is helpful to these countries economically, it was pointed out that, in most countries, the payments go to a relatively small number of sugar producers in these countries and that it is only fortuitous if such payments end up in the hands of the workers and consumers of these countries; that in many cases large sums have gone into Swiss banks; and that no conditions of any kind—namely, that the countries use the funds for schools or roads or needed public facilities, or agree to proceed with tax reforms or land reforms, or that they help in any way to support or defend interest of the United States or our common interests in defense and foreign policy—are imposed.

Finally, the administration supporters fell back on the argument that their quotas were based on the fact that the formula they produced gave additional credit to certain countries for helping to supply sugar to us in 1963 and 1964 when supplies were short, at some cost to them. But it was quickly determined by simple calculation that they had already recouped in 1965 for any profits foregone in 1963 and 1964. And that under the projected 5-year program of the House and administration bills and the bonuses which would be provided, each of these countries would recoup in the 5-year period many times any monetary loss they might conceivably have suffered in the 1963–64 period.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Committee on Finance met so late yesterday that I do not have in tabular form the changes which the committee made.

I observe that the quota for Venezuela is down and the quota for Argentina is up; and that, on the whole, the quotas outside the Western Hemisphere have been somewhat reduced, and the quotas within the Western Hemisphere increased. I regard these as modest improvements.

To summarize, the quotas outside the Western Hemisphere have been reduced by 119,000 tons from the administration figure, but increased 28,000 tons from the House figure.

I ask unanimous consent that a tabulation which has just been handed to me by a member of the committee staff be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tabulations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sugar quotas for foreign countries under H.R. 10496, H.R. 11135, and provisions under Senate committee's S. 2567 at sugar requirements level of 9,700,000 short tons, raw value (assuming in all those cases that domestic quotas have been increased by 580,000 to 6,390,000 tons), also reflects changes in S. 2567 from administration's recommendation

[Short tons, raw value]

	Administration's H.R. 10496	Agriculture Committee's H.R. 11135	Senate committee's S. 2567	Changes in S. 2567 from administration's recommendation	
				Increased	Decrease
A. For countries in the Western Hemisphere:					
Mexico	390, 135	340, 925	390, 135	0	0
Dominican Republic	385, 854	340, 925	422, 512	36, 658	----------
Peru	240, 824	272, 013	272, 013	31, 189	----------
Brazil	221, 558	340, 925	272, 013	50, 455	----------
British West Indies	122, 017	150, 397	122, 017	0	0
Ecuador	49, 770	50, 267	49, 770	0	0
Colombia	27, 829	42, 970	27, 829	0	0
Costa Rica	34, 786	42, 159	34, 786	0	0
Nicaragua	40, 672	38, 511	40. 672	0	0
Guatemala	35, 321	32, 836	35, 321	0	0
Venezuela	2, 676	30, 809	2, 676	0	0
El Salvador	17, 125	30, 403	17, 125	0	0
Haiti	18, 731	28, 782	18, 731	0	0
Panama	14, 449	25, 134	14, 449	0	0
Argentina	63, 685	21, 485	63, 685	0	0
British Honduras	4, 281	19, 864	4, 281	0	0
Bolivia	0	4, 054	0	0	0
Honduras	0	4, 054	0	0	0
Subtotal	1, 669, 713	1, 816, 513	1, 788, 015	118, 302	0
B. For countries outside the Western Hemisphere:					
Australia	186, 772	162, 152	162, 152	----------	24, 620
China, Republic of	67, 431	67, 293	67, 431	0	0
France, French West Indies, Reunion [1]	50, 841	42, 970	42, 970	----------	7, 871
India	96, 865	64, 861	64, 861	----------	32, 004
South Africa	96, 865	29, 593	66, 584	----------	30, 281
Fiji Islands	45, 489	24, 323	35, 489	----------	10, 000
Thailand	0	19, 864	0	0	0
Mauritius	14, 985	14, 188	14, 985	0	0
Swaziland	9, 098	6, 081	6, 081	----------	3, 017
Southern Rhodesia	9, 098	6, 081	6, 081	----------	3, 017
Malagasy Republic	7, 492	6, 081	0	----------	7, 492
Ireland	2, 141	0	2, 141	0	0
Belgium	1, 605	0	1, 605	0	0
Turkey	1, 605	0	1, 605	0	0
Subtotal	590, 287	443, 487	471, 985	0	118, 302
Global quota (Cuban reserve withheld from net-importing countries and for nonperformance), subtotal	2, 260, 000	2, 260, 000	2, 260, 000	----------	----------
Republic of the Philippines	1, 050, 000	1, 050, 000	1, 050, 000	----------	----------
Total foreign, including Philippines	3, 310, 000	3, 310, 000	3, 310, 000	----------	----------

[1] Administration recommendations treat these as an entity and included in countries outside Western Hemisphere.

THE MOVING TARGET

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the quota for countries within the Western Hemisphere has been increased above the administration figure but has been reduced below the recommendation of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. This is a minor improvement.

In general, countries within the Western Hemisphere are given, in the Senate bill, just short of 1,800,000 tons—to be precise, 1,788,015 tons. Countries outside the Western Hemisphere are given virtually 472,000 tons. I have for many years questioned the justification of these grants. It was interesting to observe the shifting defense which the administration made for them. First, it was implied by the Department of Agriculture that it was a form of aid.

Then I questioned the Department about Australia. Australia is a prosperous country, fortunately. The Department's reply was that Australia is an ally.

Then I questioned the Department about the Republic of China. We have discontinued aid to China.

Then I questioned the Department about South Africa, which is probably one of the worst countries in the world. I raised the question of Southern Rhodesia, which has been granted a quota of 6,100 tons. Highly important negotiations are now being conducted between the British Government and the Government of Southern Rhodesia. Southern Rhodesia, under the premiership of Ian Smith, has threatened to secede from the British Empire.

Mr. Wilson, in his very able and impressive appearance the other night, in a firm, though nonprovocative manner, implied that Great Britain would resist any declaration of independence by Southern Rhodesia with economic sanctions.

Ambassador Goldberg, representing the United States in the United Nations, was instrumental in having a resolution passed by a vote of 107 to 2, to put pressure upon Southern Rhodesia not to secede. The press dispatches from London stated that the American Government was in full support of the attitude of the British Government. I hope that is true. However, here we come with a bill at the same time that this is going on, by which we seek to give to Southern Rhodesia a quota of over 6,000 tons of sugar at a bonus price. This would be far from applying sanctions to Southern Rhodesia. We would be giving Southern Rhodesia a bonus. I fail to see the logic in that approach.

BRITISH AND FRENCH HAVE OWN PROGRAM

What shall we then say about the French and British possessions? We include the British West Indies. They would receive a very large quota—122,000 tons. Great Britain has a sugar program under which they buy sugar at approved world market prices from their colonies. They do not buy sugar at approved world prices from countries outside the British Empire, but only from those inside the British Empire.

However, we are asked to pay world prices to countries inside the British economic empire and to give them these bonuses which, as I have said, amount to $72 a ton at present, which, on this assigned quota, would give a bonus of approximately $8.5 million.

What about the French West Indies? The French West Indies—namely Martinique and Guadeloupe inside the French system—have been held up to us by my good friend, the junior Senator from Louisiana, as a model system, which pays its people more than we pay them. Here we come along and grant to them a quota of 43,000 tons of sugar at a bonus of $72 a ton. That would amount to approximately $3 million.

France gives no bonus to countries outside the French colonial empire. However, we, in our generosity, would extend this to them.

BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS ARGUMENT FAILED

It may be said that the administration spokesmen say: "Yes, but we give these bonuses to improve our balance-of-payments position." On the face of it, that is somewhat ridiculous. We pay more than the market price, and thus worsen our balance-of-payments position.

This would be particularly objectionable in the case of France because we know what happens to the payments which are made to Martinique and Guadeloupe.

The French planters there take these payments and send them to Paris. They become claims of the French banks and of the Bank of France against America. The policy of General de Gaulle is very clearly to take every claim against the United States and ask for gold. He has drawn out from the United States, during these past 9 months, close to $1 billion worth of gold.

The amount of the bonus payments which we would make would go into French hands and would increase the drain on our gold. Yet, the administration spokesmen have the nerve to say that their program is intended to help our balance of payments. Nothing could be more adverse to our balance of payments. This applies particularly to the payments made to the French colonies. Just as the payment to Rhodesia is a bonus for breaking up the British Empire, so is the bonus to Martinique and Guadeloupe a bonus to General de Gaulle with which he can make a further raid on the American dollar.

Even if we wanted to help South Africa—and I do not see any reason why we should—South Africa, as the largest gold producer in the world, has enough foreign exchange to take care of itself. I believe it is true that approximately two-thirds or three-fourths of the world's annual production of gold comes from South Africa. South Africa does not need an artificial bonus on sugar.

My Republican friends, with some exceptions, for once seem to join with the administration. This is a bipartisan raid on the Treasury.

DOES PROGRAM REALLY HELP THE POOR?

It is said that this program is designed to help the poor people. If we were to examine the ownership of land in most of these countries, we would find that the ownership is highly concentrated. There may be some individual mitigations of this general rule. Costa Rica is a most democratic and enlightened Latin American country with wide distribution of land. Mexico has a land program, but many Mexican politicos have title to enormous amounts of land.

In the main the land in Latin America is held by a tightly concentrated group, and the bonus payments which go to them would go into its hands—indeed, do go into its hands—and would still further increase the inequality in the distribution of wealth and income.

In a large portion of the cases, that money is not invested in the countries which ostensibly receive it. The money is shipped to Paris and to Switzerland and is deposited in the accounts of those families.

The big landowners of Latin America have not been investing in their own countries. They have been sending their rent money abroad and getting themselves ready in case they are ousted from their native lands.

They do not make any concessions in return for the enormous bonuses which we are paying. They do not have to use the funds for schools, roads, or public facilities. They do not have to proceed with tax reforms or land reforms. They do not have to pledge that they will in any way support or defend the interests of the United States, or our common interests in defense of foreign policy. None of these conditions are imposed. It is a Christmas tree with substantial presents hung upon it.

PAST HELP ALREADY REPAID

The supporters of this bill fall back on the argument that their quotas are based on the fact that the formula which they have produced would give additional credit to certain countries for helping to supply sugar to us in 1963 and 1964 when supplies were short, at some cost to them. However, we can quickly determine by a simple calculation that they have already recouped in 1965 any profits which were foregone in 1963 and 1964.

Under the projected 1964 program of the House and the administration bills, which my good friend from Hawaii would try to reinstate, these countries would recoup, in the 5-year period, many times any monetary loss they may have suffered in the 1963–64 period.

WEAKNESS IN PROGRAM

Mr. President, I think I have said enough to indicate the grave weaknesses, indeed the scandalous wastes, contained in the present sugar programs. But it may properly be asked, as Boss Tweed once said, "What are you going to do about it?"

I happen to believe that, as a miminum, which is all I shall suggest, that the 2¼ million tons which the United States buys abroad should be purchased at the average world price over the last 15 years, or at about 4.22 cents a pound. I grant that shipping costs and tariff are also proper costs of laying down sugar in our market. The difference between the average world price, on a 15-year moving average, and the highly subsidized American price, would be recouped by way of an import tax or import fee, and placed in the Treasury.

Since the present world price is probably deflated, I would accept a 15-year average instead of the current world price. That would include the high prices of the Korean war period, the post-Korean war period, and also 1963-64, and it would come out at approximately 4¼ cents a pound.

FORMULA PROVIDES FAIR PRICE

I do not pretend to know intimately every detail of the sugar industry in the Caribbean, but I have visited most of the Caribbean countries, have talked with people there, and have gone into the canefields; and I am not totally uninformed on the subject. Senators will find that a very large quantity of sugar can be produced for 4¼ cents a pound; and I again emphasize that at least the International Conference on Sugar which was held a few days ago had under discussion a price range between 4 cents and a little over 5 cents. It apparently did not consider a price of 6.85 cents a pound.

What I am saying is that the difference should be recouped for the U.S. Treasury. That would amount to, allowing for shipping, insurance, and tariffs, about 1½ cents a pound, or $30 a ton, and on the 2¼ million tons taken in from abroad, if we apply the formula to all sugar from abroad, it would net slightly less than $70 million a year. I am not one who can regard $70 million a year as a mere bagatelle.

Ah, but the administration says, "These are poor countries; We must give them assistance, so we should pay the sugar planters this $70 million a year in order to help the poor people."

TRICKLE-DOWN THEORY

That is adopting the trickle-down theory with a vengeance. Enrich the small group of big planters, so it is said, and the money will trickle down to the common peons, the campesinos in the field.

I do not think much of the trickle-down theory as applied to the United States. The members of my party have historically, with few exceptions, contended against it in this country. But now it is revived for foreign countries. For most of the Latin American countries, where there exists almost a state of feudalism, it certainly would not apply. Unlike in Hawaii, there is very little power of organization of the plantation workers in those countries. The government, in all too many cases, is an agency of the planters, the military being the political expression of that group, and the money being largely sent out of the country or spent in luxury on the Riviera, or on yachts in the Mediterranean and on the dolce, bon vivante life, rather than on the life of production.

PROCEEDS OF FEE FOR ALLIANCE

That is the program now. Therefore, I am proposing, since I am concerned about the people of Latin America, that the proceeds be used for the Alliance for Progress, so that the premium payments will in fact go to the people in the Alliance for Progress countries, not to the wealthy overlords.

I am proposing that we return to the original concept of John F. Kennedy, that the strength of American economic aid should go to the forgotten people of Latin America, the people who bear the burdens of toil and suffer under abject poverty, and whom President Kennedy wanted to help.

Apparently the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State last December held to that point of view. But a deep change has come over them. Again, I shall not indulge in personalities. I regard it as lamentable that the present policy of the Department of State—I hope it is not also the policy of the administration—seems to be one which favors the possessing landowners and the military powers, who have established dictatorships in all too many countries in Latin America in the last 2 or 3 years, and deals with those who have rifles and machineguns, and have military power, and those who have economic power, and has largely forgotten or pushed into the background the need of the great masses of the people in Latin America.

I hope that we shall return to the original vision of John F. Kennedy. I plead for that. The amendment which I intend to offer provides that the amounts thus collected in import fees shall be earmarked for the Alliance for Progress, to be used for the benefit of the people, for education, for the building of roads, for the establishment of building and loan associations, and for productive enterprises, and not be siphoned off to Switzerland and to Paris.

As I have said, unfortunately this would not reduce prices to the American consumer. It is hard to do that when the foreign and domestic programs are interwoven. However, it would provide funds for the Alliance for Progress, which the consumer as a taxpayer would otherwise have to pay. I would like to make this, in part, a net addition to the other funds.

My amendment would assure that the funds went to the people and not to the big landowners and/or into Swiss banks.

It would help to do away with the unseemly lobbying and pressures which have brought this program into disrepute. These pressures and high fees for lobbyists naturally exist when such huge subsidies and windfalls are at stake.

HELP TO FREE CUBA

In addition the present foreign quotas are basically the old Cuban quota, redistributed among the producers. Countries which receive a quota at the present high prices are naturally not anxious to lose the quota. To this degree, there is less interest than there would otherwise be on the part of those who receive quotas for Cuba to become free again and to regain her old quota at the expense of those who now have a slice of it.

Let me make that clear. When Cuba comes back into the family of nations as a free country, having overthrown Castro—which I hope will be soon and decisive—we cannot turn Cuba loose. We shall have to restore her old quota, or a very large portion of it. That is the minimum we can do. But, since these quotas are already being redistributed to other countries who are receiving huge bonuses because of it, it will be to their economic interest not to have Cuba come back as a free country but to have Castro stay there; because, as long as Castro stays, the countries will get their quotas and their bonuses. Thus, I believe that this proposal would be a mighty instrument of foreign policy as well.

OBLIGATION TO LATIN AMERICA

I believe, with the recent developments in Santo Domingo, we have now probably adopted a policy in which we will not permit, by a variety of means, communism to dominate a country, at least in the Carribbean.

I believe that history will have to record whether the decision in April was a wise one. I have never been able to say that it was not a wise decision. It may well have been. I believe it will be for the future to determine. However, we now seem to be committed to prevent communism from getting a foothold at least in the Caribbean and possibly throughout Latin America.

I say this as an old anti-imperialist. The first dollar I ever earned as a boy I contributed to the American Anti-Imperialist League which played a leading part in getting our marines withdrawn from Haiti during the late twenties and early thirties. But at the present time, events have grown to international stature. In the interests of national security we must prevent communism from getting established in the Caribbean.

It can be argued, therefore, that if this is our policy, we should give economic advantages to them as well. I believe that this is a fairly decisive factor.

Therefore, I have an amendment which would allow the paying of the American price for sugar drawn from the Caribbean with the exception of the French and British possessions, and in Haiti, and that we should not give a bonus to countries outside the Western Hemisphere to which we owe no obligation whatsoever, so far as I know, unless in the case of certain small countries, where we have tracking stations, there may be some implicit, under-the-table agreements that if they let us put up tracking stations on their soil, we will give them something economic in return.

We have certainly no special obligation under the sugar program to those British and French possessions in the Caribbean which are already under the British or French programs. This is especially true since the British and French take no sugar at their highly subdized price from any but British or French possessions.

We certainly have no obligation to a country such as Haiti with its cruel dictatorship and which could hardly qualify under any of the loose arguments put forward by the State and Agriculture Departments' witnesses.

I believe that we should try our best to do what is best in this program and to impose an import fee on all of the foreign producers. It seems that that is impossible and it can be argued that we have a special relationship to Latin America, but we should at least impose such a fee on the sugar we receive outside the Western Hemisphere and from the British and French possessions inside the Western Hemisphere and Haiti.

If the Senate or Congress is unwilling to do any of these things, we believe Congress should postpone the foreign aspects of the bill until such time as the Senate committee and the Senate as a whole have the time to make a determination on this complicated subject in a rational way, but of course permitting the domestic part of the program to go into effect.

I am happy to say that I am joined in the general sentiments I have expressed in the minority report by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and possibly by other members of the committee. The Senator from Tennessee, unfortunately, cannot be in the Chamber today, but he signed the minority views with me, and we are together both in our criticisms and in our recommendations.

Mr. President, I am ready to yield the floor and to proceed to the question of the amendments, but before they are considered I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield first?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MORTON. I agree with much that the Senator from Illinois has said. He has certainly studied the problem, as have many of us. I would not go as far as the Senator goes in believing that the program should perhaps be done away with.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not proposing that.

Mr. MORTON. I realize that the Senator is not. I share his current concern for the consumer, but in other areas the consumer is concerned, especially in wheat, corn, rice, tobacco, cotton, and so on.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the Senator will forgive me for interjecting, but it is extraordinary that the American Farm Bureau, which criticizes the wheat and corn program, goes for the sugar program in a big way. It seems to me that sugar has a great attractive power, unlike the humble grains of corn and wheat.

Mr. MORTON. Kentucky does not have any sugarbeet or sugarcane refineries so I can perhaps be more objective. I certainly wish to support the point which the Senator so eloquently made, that we have an obligation in this hemisphere. The Alliance for Progress was launched and we all supported it, or at least most of us did. The program was sent to us. It was further implemented by the Agriculture and Forestry Committee, and the House takes it away from this hemisphere by every historic formula it can devise. We had a formula proposed by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], which was described in the committee. I also had a proposal which was printed and introduced. I did not press it, because after the proposal of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] was voted down, I saw no reason to further delay the committee. Both proposals would have done more for this hemisphere without any concept as to whether one country had a dictatorship or another had a democracy; but at least it kept it in this hemisphere. I commend the Senator for making that point so eloquently and so well.

As to the importance of whatever sugar program we are going to have offshore, let us see to it that the hemisphere gets its historic share, and even more, because this is our first responsibility.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This is the second amendment which I intended to propose. I shall probably not propose the first one if we can get considerable support for the second one, namely, to pay a premium price on all sugar imported from the Western Hemisphere to us, with the exception of the British and French possessions and Haiti, and then to pay at the world market price for sugar imported from outside the Western Hemisphere, and levy an import fee, and use the fee of about $20 million for the Alliance for Progress.

Mr. MORTON. If the Senator will yield, I think that amendment would have a better chance than the first one.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it would. Then, purely for the record, I may have the first one printed, but first propose the second one.

Mr. MORTON. One problem with respect to Haiti is that the people in that country are probably at the bottom of the economic ladder.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If I can get the Senator's support, I may be willing to strike out Haiti.

Mr. MORTON. I shall discuss that with the Senator in the cloakroom.

Let us remember that the British West Indies and the British possessions in this hemisphere have a preferential market in London. I believe that the French sugar in this hemisphere is produced in Guadeloupe and Martinique. I think the sugar there has a degree of preference. If not, Charles de Gaulle can give it to them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. My question is why we should give them preference in our own market when the French do not extend a similar preference to countries outside the French colonies.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. FONG. I regret that I was not present in the Chamber when the Senator from Illinois referred to what Hawaii receives under the Compliance Act. As I understand, the Senator from Illinois believes the payments under the Compliance Act to producers in Hawaii are too large. Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I merely mentioned that they exist. Hawaii can produce sugar, even with the high wages which are paid there, more cheaply than can other American producers.

Mr. FONG. With respect to the question of what is paid to Hawaiian sugar workers, we pay the highest wages in the sugar-producing countries. With fringe benefits, the wages exceed $25 a day. That is higher than is paid to agricultural workers elsewhere.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That may be true since the Agricultural Act was passed with reference to Hawaii. I do not think it was true the big five families ran Hawaii.

SAINT AUGUSTINE QUADRICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 30 seconds?

Mr. FONG. I am happy to yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I think technically I still have the floor. I yielded to the Senator from Hawaii for a question. I am also glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to S. 516.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives the bill (S. 516) to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the Saint Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), to provide that eight members of such Commission shall be appointed by the President, to provide that such Commission shall not terminate prior to December 31, 1966, and to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of such joint resolution, which were, on page 2, strike out lines 6 through 9, inclusive, and insert:

> SEC. 2. Section 4(b) of such joint resolution is amended by inserting, immediately after "Congress" in the last sentence thereof, the following: ", except that the Commission may continue in existence until December 31, 1966."

On page 2, strike out lines 10 through 15, inclusive.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to establish the Saint Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, and for other purposes', approved August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), to provide that eight members of such Commission shall be appointed by the President, and that such Commission may continue in existence until December 31, 1966."

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senator concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11135) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. FONG. The Senator from Illinois said that he merely mentioned the very large compliance payments paid to the sugar producers in Hawaii. But to say that he merely mentioned them could leave the wrong impression in the minds of certain people. Prior to the Jones-Costigan Act there was no tax on the processor of raw sugar. With the passage of the Jones-Costigan Act, the Federal Government imposed a tax on processors of sugar. This money was placed in a special fund to be paid to the producers and processors if they complied with certain restrictions in the matter of labor and marketing and other factors.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true, but Senator Costigan would turn over in his grave if he knew what happened to the law he sponsored 30 years ago.

Mr. FONG. I do not agree with the remark that Senator Costigan would turn over in his grave. I think he did a very fine piece of work. It was through his efforts that the money was collected, which was placed in a special fund. From the fund, the money was paid over to producers if they complied with certain restrictions contained in the act. However, that law was declared unconstitutional. So the money was then paid into the Treasury, and the payments could be made from the General Treasury funds to the producers, to get away from the unconstitutionality of the procedure as ruled by the Supreme Court.

The money which has been collected under the processing tax is more than the amount which has been paid back to the sugar producers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not very much more—$95,791,000 was collected, and $90,519,000 was distributed. So there was only a difference of $5 million. I quote from the bulletin prepared by the staff of the Finance Committee on the Sugar Act, page 23. But the consumer pays the tax.

Mr. FONG. Since 1934 the Federal Government has collected over $2 billion in taxes and is ahead to the tune of over half a billion dollars.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe that is true.

Mr. FONG. So far as producers in Hawaii are concerned, last year the Federal Government collected from producers under the processing tax over $10 million and returned to the producers in Hawaii $8 million. So the Federal Government is ahead $2 million in last year's collections.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator's colleague [Mr. INOUYE] introduced the figures earlier. However, it is not, ultimately, the producers who pay these taxes; it is the consumers who pay the taxes, because the costs are passed on to the cost of the refined sugar and the tax is paid by the consumers. So it is not correct to say that the producers pay the tax. It is the consumers who pay the tax.

Mr. FONG. Although the distinguished Senator is correct when he says that the consumers pay the tax, the whole sugar concept is a concept in which we are trying to balance the needs of producers and consumers and also meet our international obligations. Considering all the facets of the problem, we have produced a sugar bill which we think will take care of our international commitments and take care of the fact that we must produce sugar as a strategic commodity for our Nation and also take care that we do not gouge our consumers.

At present, there is a Federal excise tax of one-half cent per pound on raw sugar processed in the United States. In 1964, the U.S. Treasury collected $10,837,210 on processing of cane sugar produced just by Hawaii sugar companies. The tax collected by the Federal Government on sugar produced each year by each company in Hawaii is more than the same company receives in compliance payments.

The purpose of the tax is to provide funds to pay U.S. sugar producers or processors for maintaining good wages and working conditions, promoting orderly development of the sugar industry and stabilizing the price of sugar for consumers.

Federal law permits conditional compliance payments to producers, or to processors who are also producers, when they first, comply with sugar production and marketing restrictions; second, pay at least the official minimum wages to workers; third, do not employ child labor; and fourth, in the case of processors, pay at least the official minimum prices for sugarbeets or sugarcane.

Compliance payments received by 25 of the 26 Hawaii sugar producers in 1964 totaled $8,679,132. Figures are not available for one company.

Thus, in 1964 the U.S. Treasury collected on Hawaii sugar processed some $2 million more than Hawaii sugar companies received in compliance payments.

In fact, since 1937, the Federal Government has collected more in processing taxes on Hawaii sugar than has been paid to Hawaii sugar producers. So it is clear compliance payments do not represent a net drain on the U.S. Treasury.

On the other hand, compliance payments are crucial to the continuance of the Hawaii sugar industry. In 1964, compliance payments to Hawaii companies ranged from $51,000 to $1,074,000, with the majority of the companies receiving more than $200,000.

While these payments are large, the cost to the U.S. Treasury per ton in Hawaii is substantially less than any other domestic producing area.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President, is who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Hawaii, but I do not want to have his squatter's rights turned into proprietary rights.

Mr. FONG. I still recognize that the distinguished Senator from Illinois has the floor.

I ask that the Senator from Illinois yield to me 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield with the understanding that this is not a proprietary right and exists by sufferance.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois be relieved from the floor and that the Senator from Hawaii be recognized in his own right.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sorry. I cannot.

Mr. MORTON. I thought the Senator wanted to go to lunch.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is not the problem.

Mr. FONG. I thank the Senator from Illinois for yielding to me 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, with the understanding that I have the floor.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, payments in 1964 to Hawaii producers per ton were $8.96, whereas compliance payments to sugar producers in other areas of the United States ranged from $12.93 a ton to $16.20 a ton.

It can be seen that the producers in Hawaii receive far less than the producers in other States of the Union. They are only paid $8.96 a ton and I believe almost all of our companies in the State of Hawaii only receive $8.96 a ton.

Even with these compliance payments, the return on invested capital in Hawaii's sugar industry is extremely nominal. In a substantial number of years, the majority of Hawaii sugar companies have wound up in the red despite receiving compliance payments.

I would also like to point out that production of cane sugar in Hawaii is vastly different from production of other commodities, which can be grown by thousands of small farmers on small acreage.

Hawaii sugar can be efficiently produced only by corporate entities. They cannot operate on a fragmented basis. Thousands of acres are needed for efficient and profitable operations. Also, sugarcane requires 22 to 24 months before harvest; other crops only a single growing season.

This is why Hawaii's sugar yield of 1,110,000 tons annually is produced by only 26 companies in operations integrating production and processing.

The sugar industry in Hawaii provides year-round employment for some 12,500 workers. The payroll totals about $65,500,000. Hawaii's sugar workers are the highest paid in the world—at least $25 a day.

These workers would face unemployment if Hawaii's sugar industry collapses, as it would if these compliance payments were eliminated. Where would these workers find jobs?

Hawaii's sugar industry, although owned by only 26 companies, is owned by about 12,300 individual stockholders, of whom almost two-thirds live in Hawaii.

Hawaii's sugar industry is a world leader in sugar technology and mechanization. It has served America well in war and in peace to help supply our Nation with sugar, so basic to human needs.

I have attempted to show that the Federal excise taxes paid on processed sugar more than pay for the compliance payments going to domestic producers who pay good wages.

The excise tax and compliance payments operate in tandem. If the compliance payments were abolished Hawaii's sugar industry would be ruined.

The compliance payments paid for Hawaiian sugar in effect represent money taken away from Hawaiian sugar. It is a self-supporting program. Excise taxes collected, as I have stated, more than pay for the compliance payments. If the compliance payments and the excise tax are abolished, our State will come out far ahead. In fact, Hawaii would be almost $2 million ahead if the excise tax were abolished and the compliance payment were abolished.

The compliance payment is necessary to the welfare of the thousands of sugar workers in Hawaii and to the welfare of the 12,300 stockholders who own the 26 corporate entities in Hawaii.

So far as Hawaii is concerned, production of sugar is quite a unique agricultural enterprise, different from the usual enterprise conducted by the small farmer.

We have the world's largest entities which are efficient enough to pay the plantation field worker $25 a day. The compliance payment made to our sugar producer is a fair way of compensating the producers of sugar when we tax them one-half cent per pound in the processing of raw sugar.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois for yielding to me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Hawaii.

Since the matter was not really before the body, I am not proposing at present to eliminate the domestic quotas, the production payments, the processing tax, or any feature connected with the domestic program.

I was interested in ventilating some of the facts so that the American public might have a better view of the actual situation and at some time in the future be better able to make a long-term judgment.

I shall try to let what I said sink in for a time.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, without losing his right to the floor, will the distinguished Senator from Illinois yield to me for 6 or 8 minutes?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield, with the understanding that I still retain my right to the floor.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, little more than 4 years have passed since this administration created the much-vaunted Alliance for Progress. Throughout that period, in its public statements the administration has treated the Alliance nations as favorite children. But more often than not, in its public actions the administration has treated them as orphans.

The Alliance for Progress is rapidly becoming a string of broken promises.

Recently, the administration established a new record for breaking the promises it has made to our Alliance partners by breaking one within 24 hours.

On August 17, 1965, the President, speaking on the fourth anniversary of the establishment of the Alliance, promised that the United States would "maintain a regularly expanding market for sugar produced by Latin America." The following day he transmitted to Congress the proposed 1965 Sugar Act which would do just the opposite.

It would reduce the Alliance for Progress nations' share of the foreign sugar quota from 77.8 percent in the 1962 Act to 63.8 percent. This means a reduction of over 600,000 tons per year in sugar exports by Alliance nations to the United States.

Even if this reduction represented a net savings to the United States, one would wonder whether the administration was justified in breaking its promise. But the reduction does not represent a savings. Far from it. The very same bill proposes to reallocate much of the sugar trade the Alliance nations would lose to protectorates of France, which at this very moment is trying to aggravate our balance-of-payments problem and scarcely needs to be handed even more dollars, or to British Commonwealth nations which enjoy preferential treatment in sugar exports to Britain and cannot pretend that they need the trade bonus offered by the administration.

Whatever may be said about the administration's aid program, one thing is clear beyond argument. When the United States has an opportunity, without cost to itself, to provide much needed trade opportunities to the underdeveloped countries of Latin America, it should not take these opportunities away from Latin America and give them to countries that are under the wing of Britain or France. To do so makes a mockery of the Alliance.

The administration's bill is the result of the administration using a computer, rather than its head or its heart, to allocate foreign sugar quotas. The quotas are the product of a proposal by the Department of Agriculture—to which the President appears to have assigned major foreign policy responsibilities that might just as rationally be assigned to the Post Office Department—that foreign sugar allocations be based on 1963–64 sugar shipments to the United States.

These were years of utter chaos in our sugar program, aptly described by the House Committee on Agriculture as the "two most unusual and abnormal years in the history of the U.S. sugar program." While I am not expert in the use of computers, it seems reasonable to presume that if you feed abnormal data into a computer you obtain an abnormal formula. That, to put it mildly, describes the administration's formula.

Furthermore, the concept of the administration's bill that nations should be rewarded or punished for their willingness or lack of willingness to export sugar to the United States in 1964, when our price was lower than the world price, ignores the fact that these rewards and punishments have already been meted out. Sugar quotas in 1965 have been based on 1964 performance. South Africa, for example, has made twice as much on sugar exports to the United States this year as it lost in 1964. Other countries have earned similarly disproportionate rewards.

And the Latin American nations which the administration would punish have already been punished. Many of these nations have had substantially reduced quotas in 1965 and are faced with rising unemployment in their sugar industries. We have a stake in helping these countries hold the line against communism and one wonders whether the Department of Agriculture, by taking action designed to increase unemployment in Latin America and thus strengthening the hands of the Communists, is punishing just Latin America or the United States as well.

Indeed, one wonders whether the various departments ever consult each other in this administration. Not long ago Secretary of State Rusk observed that the 1964 world sugar crisis played a major part in the Dominican uprising. Yet the Department of Agriculture proposes to perpetuate that crisis and spread it through Latin America.

The sugar bill passed by the House would allocate to the Alliance for Progress nations 100,000 more tons of sugar annually than would the administration's bill. It is therefore an improvement over the administration's bill but one which lacks any consistent logic. In several instances, quotas are apparently allocated by whim rather than on the basis of any consistent rationale.

I propose an amendment to the House bill that gives the Congress the opportunity to make good on the administration's August 17, 1965, promise. I propose the amendment with the firm belief that we indeed should make good on that promise. And I submit that the allocation of foreign quotas in my amendment has logic to commend it as the House bill has not.

My amendment would not change the domestic industry quotas proposed by the administration and included in the House bill. It also leaves unchanged the Philippine quota established in the House bill. For other foreign quotas it substitutes a formula based on the 1962 Sugar Act.

The quotas established in the 1962 act reflected historic sugar shipments. They were, by and large, fair quotas. To the extent there is any discernible thread in the history of sugar shipments since 1962, it is a thread spun by the 1962 act. In short, as the House Committee on Agriculture suggested, 1962 sugar quotas provide the only reasonable basis for assigning quotas in 1965.

With a few exceptions my amendment is based on the assignment to each country of its 1962 quota percentage. In addition, the amendment adopts the House proposal that the Cuban quota be reduced from 57.77 percent to 44.25 percent. That change makes sense for it would reduce somewhat the disparity between the quota available for Cuba when it again becomes a friendly nation and the quotas for the rest of Latin America. But where the House bill distributes these 13 percentage points harumscarum, my amendment would reallocate them to the Alliance for Progress nations based solely on their relative quotas in the 1962 act. There is no reason why the 13 points shared from Cuba's quota should be given to nations outside the Western Hemisphere, particularly since most of the non-Western Hemisphere countries listed in the House bill have preferential markets other than the United States. Nor is there any reason to allocate any of the 13 Cuban points to non-Alliance countries in the Western Hemisphere, every one of which can sell sugar to Britain or France at a price virtually equal to the U.S. price. And there is every reason why the 13 Cuban points should be given to our Alliance partners as my amendment would do. In sum, my amendment would allocate over 300,000 more tons of sugar annually to the Alliance nations than would the administration's bill and 175,000 more tons than the House bill.

The only exceptions to reliance on the 1962 act in the amendment I propose are the allocation of quotas to countries which were not in the 1962 act but have developed a record of sugar exports to the United States since that date and were included in the administration's bill: Venezuela, Argentina, Mauritius, Swaziland, Southern Rhodesia, and Malagasy. For the first two countries I have proposed the quota percentages contained in the administration's bill; for the last four I have used the percentages in the House bill which are practically the same as those in the administration's bill. Furthermore, in recognition of the increased importance of Bolivia and Honduras in Latin America, and of Thailand in southeast Asia, my amendment would allocate to these countries the yearly quotas allocated to them under the House bill, even though these countries have not previously exported sugar to the United States.

This country has a deep and permanent stake in the Alliance for Progress. Many of the Alliance nations have developed democratic governments and free enterprise economies in the face of stiff and growing Communist opposition.

We have an opportunity in the 1965 Sugar Act to assist those countries. Our alternative is to assist those who do not need our help. Furthermore, in this act we can render assistance to the Alliance nations without additional cost to ourselves. I fear that if we do not seize upon this opportunity we will pay dearly in the years ahead.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator has made a fine statement. While I, of course, support the bill that the committee reported, I believe the Senator recognizes that, for the most part, both the Senate and House committees, insofar as they amended the bill, tend in the direction that the Senator had in mind, toward providing more adequately for the economy of Latin America, to which countries we are committed under the Alliance for Progress.

Mr. MORTON. I agree that the House, as I pointed out, made it better by more than 100,000 tons. We, in our actions in the committee this morning, yesterday, and last week, went beyond that.

We have approached what I am seeking to do here. I do not know that I shall press this amendment. I certainly shall not press it until the Senator from Illinois, who has the floor, has his amendments decided one way or the other.

I felt that I wanted to make this point because it seems utterly ridiculous to me to go beyond the hemisphere merely because the Cuban situation upset the sugar picture when Castro took over Cuba. It it utterly ridiculous to grant these quotas on a worldwide basis. If we once again have a friendly Cuba, the chickens will really come home to roost when we have to give them a quota of more than 1 million tons. Where would we obtain such a quota? We would have to take it from other countries.

Why should we spread our sugar quotas all over the world when we can confine them to this hemisphere? It would be easier to talk with our friends in this hemisphere later and say to them: "You know that we have to take care of one of your neighbors." It would be easier to do that than to take the quota away from a country out in the Indian Ocean.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a very attractive document printed in white with gold letters. It contains beautiful pictures of the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Under Secretary of State, and the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, as well as individual Latin American ambassadors.

The book contains a group picture of these people and it also contains pictures of them holding meetings.

This book contains the remarks of the President made at this meeting which commemorated the fourth anniversary of the Alliance for Progress. This is the statement of President Lyndon Johnson. He urged that the so-called import fee arrangement be eliminated because it was thought that it would be very helpful to the economy of their countries.

This is what the President said, and all of these people were present. The pictures of these people were printed in color so that they could see themselves.

President Lyndon Johnson said, under a heading, "Healthy Commodity Price Structure":

> First, we must step up our efforts to prevent disastrous changes in the prices of those basic commodities which are the lifeblood of so many of our economies. We will continue—as we did this week in London—to strengthen the operation of the coffee agreement and to search for ways to stabilize the price of cocoa.
>
> We will try to maintain a regularly expanding market for the sugar that is produced in Latin America. And, consistent with the CIAP recommendations, I will propose this afternoon that Congress eliminate the special import fee on sugar so that the full price will go to the Latin American producers.

The Senator from Kentucky is a responsible legislator who, at one time, served in a responsible post in the State Department under a previous administration. Would it not make us look like a bunch of geese before the world for our President to have his picture taken with these people when he is telling them what we will do, and then we try to tell them that we will make them provide sugar at a certain price?

Mr. MORTON. That question should be addressed to the Senator from Illinois. I am not arguing that point. My amendment would have nothing to do with the price or duties.

I stated that the President said on one day that he would do a certain thing and the next day he sent a message to Congress to cut the Latin American sugar quota. That is my point.

If the Senator wants to quarrel on this issue, he had better do that on his own side of the aisle.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If we say we are going to do something, we ought to do it.

Mr. MORTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If we tell people that we will do a certain thing, we had better keep our word.

Mr. MORTON. The Senator is correct. I am all for us keeping our word and giving these countries the quotas provided under the 1962 act. That was also implied in the book to which the Senator referred.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in reply to my good friend the Senator from Louisiana, I am not seriously opposing altering the amount of sugar which we get from Latin America or the price which we will pay for this amount of sugar or the proposal that they receive the American price. However, I do propose that on sugar from outside Latin America, we levy an import fee, which would be used for the Alliance for Progress and would therefore give more resources to Latin America than is now proposed. I do not want this to be portrayed as being a means of taking money away from the poor Latin American peons. I have proposed that we give them more.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, is the Senator abandoning his proposal to impose a fee, which he has heretofore made?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have abandoned that.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I rejoice that the Senator has come to see the light.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have not come to see the light, because the light was always on my side. It was behind my shoulder. I recognize that we cannot do this because the President has committed us. I therefore have made this proposal.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. While the Senator was absent from the Chamber, I had a colloquy with the Senator, and he has now offered his amendment as—to use an expression from the French Quarter of New Orleans—lagniappe to get my vote.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it was a judgment as to what the parliamentary possibilities were. I am ready to strike out Haiti and let Haiti come in.

The Senator from Oregon wishes to speak, and I shall yield the floor, but I hope to speak later in the afternoon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield without losing my right to the floor to the Senator from North Dakota.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I thank the Senator from Oregon very much. I should like to ask a few questions of either the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, who is in charge of the bill, or the ranking minority member. My questions have to do with allotments for new growers.

Is there anything in the act providing allotments for new growers? Or does the act establish any new areas?

Mr. BENNETT. If I may reply to the Senator's question, it does not establish any new areas, but it does provide that the Secretary will have the right—and I read from page 33 of the report:

> (8) In order to protect the sugarbeet production history for farm operators (or farms) who in any crop year, because of a crop-rotation program or for reasons beyond their control, are unable to utilize all or a portion of the farm proportionate share acreage, established pursuant to this section, the Secretary may reserve for a period of not more than three crop years the production history for any such farm operators (or farms) to the extent of the farm proportionate share acreage released. The proportionate share acreage so released may be reallotted to other farm operators (or farms), but no production history shall accrue to such other farm operators (or farms) by virtue of such reallocation of the proportionate share acreage so released.
>
> (9) The Secretary is authorized to reserve from the national sugarbeet acreage requirements for the 1966, 1967, and 1968 crops of sugarbeets a total acreage estimated to yield not more than twenty-five thousand short tons, raw value, for each such crop to provide any nonaffiliated single plant processor of sugarbeets with an estimated quantity of sugar for marketing of not to exceed twenty-five thousand short tons of sugar raw value.

In other words, the Secretary may acquire a reserve from people who are not in a position to use their full allotments, and make that reserve available to any single plant processor of sugarbeets, which I assume to be necessarily a new processor, or a processor who has recently started operating, but who does not have the required acreage or the required tonnage necessary to make his operation profitable. The Secretary has available up to 25,000 short tons for such allocations. I do not think that would permit him to authorize acreage that is new as of now, but it would permit him to make available acreage that was authorized earlier, which has not been in sufficient supply to support a new plant that may have been set into operation under the conditions that existed during the last 2 years, when there were no allotments or restrictions.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. As the Senator knows from visiting the Red River Valley in North Dakota, there is a great desire there to establish new refineries and new acreage.

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I understand there were amendments of that kind offered in the committee, which were rejected.

Mr. BENNETT. The reason they could not be accepted on the basis of completely new acreage—at least that is the way it appears to me—is that we are facing a situation under which, as a result of the fact that we had no acreage restrictions and for a brief period of time no distribution limitations under the pressure of the higher world price which existed for awhile, people rushed in, some new refineries were started, new processing plants started, and they have piled up an inventory of half-a-million tons which they cannot now dispose of. It was necessary to write the bill in such a way that the existing half-million tons could be made available for marketing and distribution; otherwise, we would have put a tremendous burden on the existing processing plants and the existing producers.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is very helpful. May I ask one more question: If there should develop a worldwide shortage, with high prices, could there then be extra acres allotted, under the present act, or would there have to be a new law?

Mr. BENNETT. The Secretary still has the right to remove all acreage allotments and all marketing quotas, and it is my impression that, if there were another situation such as we faced 2 years ago, when the world market price was very high because of crop failures in foreign countries, the Secretary's first move would probably be to take off existing acreage restrictions. When those go off, people who are interested can build their new plants and increase their production.

The risk in that, of course, is as we see it in our present situation: They do come in, they produce more than the market can absorb, and then there has to be some kind of a holdback until the market can be leveled out again.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. If there were a world situation where we had a short supply and high prices, again of course, there might be new legislation, too.

Mr. BENNETT. That is always possible.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I thank my friend from Utah very much for his helpful information.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for having yielded to me.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I made to the committee, which appears in the hearings at page 169, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram I received today from the domestic sugarbeet growers.

There being no objection, the statement and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. MILTON R. YOUNG, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Senator YOUNG. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you in support of legislation extending the Sugar Act.

I am most pleased that the Senate now has before it a bill which would authorize a 5-year extension of the Sugar Act. The task of rewriting and extending sugar legislation would have been far less difficult if the Department of Agriculture had submitted its proposals much earlier to the House Agriculture Committee where this legislation must originate. I fully appreciate the problem which this committee faces in considering sugar legislation in the closing days of this session. This is a highly complex subject and one over which there certainly are many divergent views.

I believe it goes without saying that the Sugar Act has been one of the most successful of our farm programs. Over the years it has provided domestic producers of sugar, both cane and beet, with a fair price for their sugar, and it has also assured the consumers of adequate supplies at a very reasonable price. In addition, the program has resulted in a net profit to the Federal Government through excise taxes and tariff duties.

I am very pleased that the pending legislation does provide for an increase in the basic marketing quota for domestic cane and beet sugar producers. This will enable these producers to dispose of the inventories accumulated in excess of their marketing quotas under the old act which were built up in response to the Secretary of Agriculture's urging of greatly expanded production commencing in 1962 to offset an international sugar shortage. The domestic industry responded admirably and to the extent that they accumulated stocks beyond their marketing quota.

Unfortunately the increase in quotas for our domestic producers, although sufficient to take care of accumulated stocks, will not provide for any additional acreage for new growers or for new areas and new sugar refineries.

There are many areas of the United States which are most capable of producing sugar economically. I think it is most important that the U.S. quota be high enough to permit some acreage over the term of the act to be allocated to new growers and new areas.

Earlier this week the Senate adopted the conference report on the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 which contains a huge land retirement program. In my opinion, it hardly makes sense to embark upon a huge land retirement program which will cost a billion dollars a year and, at the same time, import about one-half of our sugar requirements a good deal of which could be produced in this country on acreage otherwise either devoted to the production of crops which may be in surplus, or on acreage which the Federal Government otherwise would be spending huge sums of money to retire from production of all commodities. I know of no other country in the world which would take similar action in making possible substantial imports of a commodity which its farmers could produce economically.

As I have mentioned to this committee in years past, the Red River Valley of North Dakota and Minnesota is ideally suited to the production of sugarbeets. The producers in this area are most desirous of increasing their production and there are thousands of additional farmers who are extremely anxious to have an opportunity to commence production of this crop. This area has sufficient rainfall to produce beets in dryland farming and has the type of soil and level land which facilitates large-scale mechanized production. It should also be pointed out that in this area, 1 year prior to planting sugarbeets, the producer must summer fallow the land on which he proposes to plant beets. This, in effect, means that it requires 2 acres to produce 1 acre of sugarbeets. Any acreage planted to beets, in most cases, therefore, would relieve the production of crops that are in surplus. Sugarbeet production, in addition, furnishes employment for a sizable number of people in the cultivation, harvest, and refining of beets. Considerable employment is also furnished through the great amount of expensive machinery required for the production of sugarbeets.

In view of the unsettled international situation, I would hope that we could reach a point where we could, to a much greater degree, rely upon our domestic sugar industry to meet our requirements. This can be done by increasing the allocations given to the domestic sugar industry. I hope that it will be possible for this committee to approve a much greater allocation for our domestic producers—both cane and beet producers. I believe this would be in the best overall interests of the Nation.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
October 18, 1965.

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Understand sugar bill, H.R. 11135 as reported by the Finance Committee, may come to the floor Tuesday or Wednesday. This bill includes quota increase desperately needed by domestic sugarbeet industry. Unless beet sugar quota increase authorized, domestic beet industry will be unable to market burdensome sugar surpluses generated by Government-encouraged production.

Urgently solicit your support of this vital legislation.

For sugarbeet growers: Gordon Lyons, executive manager, California Beet Growers Association, Ltd., Stockton, Calif.; Richard W. Blake, executive secretary, National Beet Growers Federation, Greeley, Colo.; Loren Armbruster, director of grower affairs, Farmers & Manufacturers Beet Sugar Association, Saginaw, Mich.; Aldrich C. Bloomquist, executive secretary, Red River Valley Sugarbeet Growers Association, Inc., Fargo, N. Dak.

For beet sugar processors: Robert H. Shields, president and general counsel, U.S. Beet Sugar Association, Washington, D.C.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, without losing my right to the floor, I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the pending bill, and in the event the question is not resolved this afternoon, I ask that the amendment be printed.

My amendment contemplates restoring to Malagasy the quota of sugar sales recommended for it by the President of the United States.

Malagasy has been our friend. It has alined itself with the free West. It has repeatedly stood by our side in the United Nations. It has made available its land adjacent to the eastern shore of Africa for our use in more than one way.

The quota recommended is 7,492 tons.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for yielding to me.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, without losing my right to the floor, I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the floor leader of the bill, the assistant majority leader.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, before the Senator from Tennessee proceeds, with reference to the amendment which the Senator from Ohio has sent to the desk, I should like to suggest, having discussed the matter with the Senator and also with some of those on the other side of the aisle, as well as with members of the committee on this side of the aisle, that I am persuaded that the Senator is correct in his amendment. In this particular case, the committee was not fully aware of the foreign relations implications of striking the tonnage for the Malagasy Republic. It should be restored. The conferees, rather than conferring between the 6,081 tons that the House allowed and the zero figure of the Senate, should confer between the administration figure of 7,492 tons and the House figure. If there is no objection, I urge that the Senate agree to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio submit his amendment at this time?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes; I submit it for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 33, strike out lines 3, 4, and 5 and insert the following: "by prorating 3,164 short tons, raw value to the Malagasy Republic and by prorating the amount of sugar determined under paragraph (1) of this subsection (less 3,164 short tons, raw value) among foreign countries on the following basis:".

On page 34, line 13, before "percentages" insert "quantity or".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am glad that the Senator from Louisiana accepts this amendment. I think it is one of serious consequence. Malagasy has stood by us, as I previously said. President Tsiranana of Malagasy has been loud in his proclamations of loyalty and friendship to the free West. He has refused to join the African nations in their principle of nonalinement. Courageously, he has spoken up and voiced his antagonism to the Chinese Communists and his friendship to the United States.

Prior to 1964, the Malagasy Republic—also known as Madagascar—had not exported sugar to this country, and thus had not benefited from the opportunity enjoyed by many other countries to sell sugar to the United States when U.S. prices were higher than world prices. During the 1964 shortage, however, when the U.S. price for sugar was 2.3 cents per pound below the world market price, the Malagasy Republic responded to our appeal for sugar, shipping us 11,500 tons initially, and subsequently offering us an additional 5,500 tons. In recognition and appreciation of this assistance during the 1964 shortage, Madagascar has enjoyed a quota of 7,781 tons during the current year, a quota disappointing to Madagascar because it is less than a full cargo of 10,000 metric tons and thus uneconomical to ship. Because of this fact, administration officials recommended a quota of 7,492 tons in the pending legislation based upon her shipments in 1964.

Now in its sixth year of independence from France, the Malagasy Republic probably is as closely alined with the free world as any other independent African state, and it has repeatedly given the United States important political support on a variety of international issues, both in the United Nations and in other international fora. Madagascar has voted with us on the issue of Chinese representation at the U.N. since their admission to that body in 1960. Malagasy President Tsiranana, whom many of you may recall from his most successful state visit to the United States in the summer of 1964, has rejected nonalinement as a policy for his country and has publicly proclaimed the latter to be alined with the West. His voice has been one of the loudest and strongest, warning the Organization of African Unity against the dangers of Chinese Communist penetration and subversion of the continent of Africa. United States policies in the Congo, in Vietnam, and elsewhere around the globe have regularly found a sympathetic ear and outspoken support from President Tsiranana.

Trade and contacts between our two countries have increased significantly since Madagascar's accession to full independence in 1960. U.S. naval visits to ports of this strategically located western bastion in the Indian Ocean are also increasing and, with the full approval and cooperation of the Malagasy Government, we have established on the island a major NASA tracking station, which is critical both to our unmanned satellite and space probe programs and to our manned Apollo and Gemini projects. This station played a vital role in making possible the recent awe-inspiring orbital flight of Gemini 5—a contribution recognized by President Johnson in sending Astronauts Cooper and Conrad to Tananarive, personally to express this Government's appreciation of the cooperation of the Government of the Malagasy Republic in making these facilities available.

In sum, the Malagasy Republic is a tried and tested friend of the United States which has assisted us in time of need. It would be ironic were we to repay this friendship by withdrawing from Madagascar its sugar quota. Gentlemen, I urge that Madagascar's quote be restored at least to the level recommended by the House. I believe it would be a serious mistake to delete this quota from the bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, may I say that since the Senate Finance Committee has acted, I have not heard a single complaint form the executive branch of the Government about what we did, except on this particular item. I am happy to urge that the amendment be agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished floor manager of the bill. I refer him to page 31 of the committee report. In discusing the quotas for sugarbeet growing, if I remember correctly, in the previous sugar bill there was a provision whereby a certain number of allotted acres, additional acres of beet sugar production, were to be given to new sugarbeet growers. Is there any provision in the pending bill which would allow the Secretary or require the Secretary, as the case may be, to allot any acres to new sugarbeet growers?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We do not have it in this bill, and the reason we do not is that the bill cuts back on acreage. We asked our producers to expand their acreage at a time when the price was high, when the world price was above the United States price. So they expanded. Now they are stuck with 580,000 tons of sugar which we cannot allow them to market. So the bill seeks to stabilize the situation by reduction of acreage, and both the cane producers and the beet producers are reducing acreage in order to live up to their agreements, which are basic to the pending legislation.

Mr. BASS. This would reserve under the bill, according to the report, 65,000 short tons for the future, so what happens to the growth in the sugarbeet areas?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That provision merely preserves what Congress did in 1962. The authority that existed has been exhausted. In other words, that acreage has been assigned and the producers to whom it has been assigned are undertaking to produce it.

Mr. BASS. What the Senator is saying to me now is that under the act, there will be no additional acreage for new beet producers.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BASS. Is this because of the surplus that now exists in the domestic sugar growth?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes, that is the problem. That is the cause of it. We have a law which forbids us to market sugar we already have on hand. We have 580,000 tons of it on hand, which is a large amount of sugar. This law would permit us to market the sugar which is on hand.

Mr. BASS. In lieu of the growth figure?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. In cane sugar areas such as Louisiana, acreage will be cut 13 percent below the 1964 level. Sugarbeet acreage will be cut by 5 percent. Therefore we cannot be cutting farmers by 13 percent in sugarcane in Louisiana and 5 percent in the sugarbeet areas and at the same time providing additional acreage for new areas.

As consumption of sugar grows beyond these years, there may be an opportunity to provide for additional acreage for others, but the refiners are determined that production, particularly of sugarbeets, will not increase beyond some firm figure, because they do not process sugarbeets. The producers in the sugarcane areas, in order to get a bill to which refiners would agree—and we cannot pass a bill without their acquiescence—are willing to take a 13-percent cut against a 5-percent cut for the sugarbeet producers.

Mr. BASS. I sympathize with the position of the Senator from Louisiana, but what I am talking about is the possibility of acquiring a future growth in Tennessee. There is an area in western Tennessee and southeast Missouri, just across the river, which has produced sugarbeets for the past 3 years. It has been demonstrated that it can produce sugarbeets in quantity, with a sugar content, so that it would be profitable to have a sugar refinery come in and process the sugar.

I hope, therefore, that we will not pass a bill in the Senate with a 5-year life span which would have the effect of locking quotas in the bill whereby new sugarbeet areas could not enter the bill in the future and come in and receive new quotas. As the Senator well knows, because of what has happened over a period of years, in the West we have a real surplus of sugar. There is, therefore, a freight differential in transporting it to the area, and the area I am talking about is one within a radius of 500 miles, where some 15 million American citizens live, and no sugarbeet or sugarcane is produced there.

I am, therefore, of the opinion that under the provisions of the bill, if we have a growth factor of 65,000 short tons, an area such as western Tennessee and southeast Missouri could come in and qualify and be in an eligible place to build a sugar factory.

That is what my personal interest is in this bill, as well as my interest in trying to disperse this commodity throughout the Nation, in case of a transportation or other emergency, where sugar could be made readily available to areas in which it is being consumed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This would not be a particular problem if we could commit ourselves to farm legislation which would guarantee a decent price for farm commodities which are now being produced in Tennessee. So far as I am concerned, I will vote for any workable arrangement which will help farmers to obtain a decent price for what they produce, even though we do not produce an acre of that product in Louisiana, because I believe that every farmer is entitled to a decent living.

Mr. BASS. I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have supported and will continue to support measures which will help every farmer in every part of this country, whether the crop he produces is a great amount or very small compared to those grown in Louisiana. Fortunately, under the Sugar Act, and the amendments to it, we have kept sugar under such complete control——

Mr. BASS. It is a monopoly.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It has been under control. There are a great number of companies which produce sugar but they are completely controlled. We not only control the acres the farmer can plant, but we also control the amount of sugar he can produce. So that there is control on both ends. In other commodities, the farmer can plow on more fertilizer using less acreage, and produce more wheat, or corn——

Mr. BASS. Or tobacco.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Or cotton; and he can sell it. But in sugarbeet and sugarcane areas, no matter how much the farmer fertilizes or increases his produce, if he produces more he is stuck with it.

Mr. BASS. He can feed it to the cattle, which cannot be done with a commodity such as tobacco.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes, he can feed it to the cattle, but it is expensive to feed it to cattle. They cannot eat sugarcane. It must be squeezed out and, by the time it has been processed, it becomes a most expensive feed.

Mr. BASS. Let me capsule what I wish to say, because I wish to impress upon the Senator from Louisiana—who is one of the leaders not only in the Senate but also in handling sugar legislation—that we in Tennessee would like to have a sugar quota, and I hope that the Senator will use his influence with the powers that be who distribute quotas to try to see if he cannot get one for Tennessee. We would like to produce sugar down there.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I shall be glad to cooperate in every way I can, with the understanding that it does not come off the Louisiana quota.

Mr. BASS. I understand completely.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We could take it off the quota of South Africa or the Fiji Islands, or some other country, perhaps, so that we could give a quota to Tennessee.

Mr. BASS. I have the greatest respect for the refining industry, as I have for all other industries, but they do not have a vote on the Senate floor, so that we do not have to worry too much about that.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator would be surprised how many votes they have in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BASS. I worked on this kind of legislation in the House for 8 years, so I understand a little of the mechanics in the committee there, but we wish to please them now.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me say that I should like to be helpful in what the Senator is seeking to achieve, with the understanding that I would not want to prevent us from having a sugar industry, or the necessary sugar legislation. That is one of the factors with which we sometimes have to contend. We have to get the various elements of the industry together, in order to get a Sugar Act passed at all in Congress.

Mr. BASS. There is a way we can restrict to a degree the influence of the refineries in distributing quotas.

There is one thing that disturbs me, and since the Senator has brought it up, I should like to say, regarding the criteria established by the Department in issuing quotas under the 1962 act, that the Department stated that, if Tennessee could get a mill that would process and manufacture sugar, it could get a quota. In my opinion, this is largely strictly up to the refineries, because they can say to the Department, "We do not wish to go to this area and build a factory."

By that action, they could veto the establishment of a new sugar quota. This should be reversed. The Secretary should say to a factory producing sugar in a given area, "If you do not wish to go in and manufacture it, then we are going to move you out from where you are and you will not have any authority to manufacture, because this business of controlling the establishment of quotas should not be in the hands of the refiners."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The last time we passed a sugar act in Congress it was done because we were then able to bring in new areas and increase the acreage. We did it in that bill.

Mr. BASS. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. So far as this Senator is concerned, when we are in a position to expand acreage, I would expect to vote to take in new producing areas; but in a bill such as this, where those of us from the cane producing areas have been asked to take a 13-percent cut, we cannot be expected to be favorable to bringing in new producing areas.

Mr. BASS. I can understand that under present circumstances, but I hope, if the growth factor changes the situation, the Senator will help us do something along that line.

I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Oregon in yielding to me. I know he has an important message to deliver. I shall listen to him with interest.

PROTESTS AGAINST VIETNAM POLICIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the agitation in today's news about the nature of the Vietnam protests and the action of the U.S. Government to suppress them is indicative of the use of a straw man by both sides.

The youthful protestors who ignore the many means of peaceful and orderly protest open to them under the first amendment to the Constitution, are affording to the entire Nation the opportunity to dismiss all dissent from Government policy as lawless, reckless, and bordering on sedition.

The near hysteria with which these demonstrations are being met by Government officials suggests that they are anxious to tag all dissent as lawless, reckless, and bordering on sedition. To bring the full weight of Government police power down upon a few noticeable individuals can, they hope, spread disrepute to the whole idea of dissent or objection to a policy in Vietnam that is producing not peace but only war and the prospect of more war.

I do not doubt that the agitators on the one hand and their prosecutors on the other serve each other's purposes quite well. Many of the youths about whom the public has been reading so much in recent days have for their purpose little more than agitation, leading to jail. There are ample laws on the books to deal with anyone who evades or resists the draft, and these young men know that perfectly well. If that is their chosen means of expression, the law will deal with them.

And the administration, too, needs an extremist and violent faction against which to act, for then it can act with something like public support. No one can condone violation of the law in the form of evasion or resistance to selective service. For those who are bona fide conscientious objectors, the law permits an alternative to combat service. But the right to violate selective service laws because of a disagreement with the use to which they are put cannot gain support or approval in this country. Therefore, the administration is safe in cracking down on that type of dissent from its Vietnam war. I expect that in the weeks ahead, the Nation will be treated to a vast public relations campaign that will seek to create the impression that anyone who questions what is being done in Vietnam is a draft evader, or is the tool or dupe of Communists, or trying to further Communist objectives. A few prosecutions and a barrage of high-level statements will be central features of the campaign.

It is in these terms that the administration thinks it can best consolidate public support for its war.

RIGHT OF PROTEST IS PROTECTED BY CONSTITUTION

In this situation, it is well for those of us who believe our Vietnam policy is aiding the Communist cause in the long run to remember that there are ample means of registering protest, means that are protected by the first amendment to the Constitution.

These means have been protected time and again by the Federal police power in the last decade when they were used in connection with civil rights. They take the form of peaceful, nonviolent protest It is the sound of feet marching in protest, the use of the right of peaceful assembly, and of petition that are protected not only by the Federal courts, but by the same FBI and Justice Department that are now investigating the violation of draft laws and other forms of illegal or violent action in connection with Vietnam demonstrations.

What America needs to hear is the tramp, tramp, tramp of marching feet, in community after community, across the length and breadth of this land, in protest against the administration's unconstitutional and illegal war in South Vietnam. Those protests must be within the law. Those protests must not violate the law. But the administration must also act in keeping with the rights of the protesters under the first amendment.

Let me say to the administration that it owes a responsibility of seeing to it that, under the guarantees of the first amendment, the legal rights of the protesters are protected. I know there will be incidents. That always has happened from time immemorial when people have protested against what they considered to be unsound government policies. Those who violate the law must be held accountable to the law. But also I forewarn the administration that it cannot, because of the actions of some of these demonstrators who may be law violators, breach the rights of the legitimate protesters; that it has the obligation to see that the rights of the legitimate protesters are protected, even though the Government itself is violating the Constitution of this country.

Beyond that, there are the rights of dissent that are exercised in political debate, open and public forums, and eventually at the ballot box.

I say to this administration that it should keep its eye on the ballot box, for, in my judgment, there will be an exercise of public opinion at that ballot box in 1966 and 1968, if this administration does not reverse itself in its policy of international outlawry, that will awaken this administration to what I think is a great miscalculation on its part, if it thinks that at the grassroots of America the people want war and not peace.

These are means of protest and dissent that cannot be squelched by Federal police power. I am satisfied that the longer the war in Vietnam fails to produce peace, the more these methods of dissent will be used by the American people, no matter how much the Federal authorities try in the meantime to discredit opposition by condemning and campaigning against those who conveniently provide a grounds for criminal prosecution.

Those means should be used. They should be used by an American people that wishes to abide by the rule of law. They should be used by people who believe their Government should itself abide by the Constitution of the United States, which permits war to be pursued only upon a declaration of war by Congress, and by people who believe that the United States must take the lead in furthering, not destroying, the rule of law in relations among nations.

It can hardly be wondered at that an administration that engages in war in violation of the means outlined by the Constitution is met with protests taking the form of violation of the draft laws.

But jungle law is usually met by more jungle law. This will be true not only here at home, but among the nations of the world, who see the United States in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter.

PEACEFUL PROTESTS SHOULD CONTINUE

These events of illegality being countered by more illegality should not deter the rest of us from continuing our quest for a return to the procedures of the Constitution and the United Nations Charter. We have ample means for making our views known. There is no need to resort to violence or violation of the law.

Some weeks ago I said as much to a group of young people who were organizing a Vietnam war protest in my home State of Oregon. They were planning a sit-in at the Portland post office last February, and while I recognize their status as adults able to choose their own course of action, I commented as I shall read.

At the time of the incident I discussed it on the floor of the Senate, and I discussed it last Friday in my speech on the floor of the Senate, but I did not have the telegram in my possession at the time.

As I said last Friday, the U.S. district attorney in Portland, Oreg., called me to report what these students were doing. He pointed out that it would be necessary for him to arrest them because, at 5 o'clock, he would have to close the building where they were protesting. He told me that he did not like to have to arrest them because that arrest would be on their record all through their adulthood, and he did not think that they realized the great mistake they were making.

He said:

> I think they might listen to you.

I said:

> I am not going to establish the precedent of involving myself in every protest in which some of the protesters move outside the law and do not stay within the framework of their legal rights. But I will send, through you, a telegram to them, if you will read it, stating once and for all my position in regard to my dedicated belief that no protester has the right to violate the law.

I shall read the telegram. I do not know if it has had any effect on them as to their subsequent conduct, but the fact is that subsequent to reading the wire they left the building and proceeded thereafter to continue their protest within the law. The telegram reads as follows:

> I am concerned over the reports of commission of unlawful acts by a group of young people in Oregon in an attempt to dramatize their disagreement with U.S. policy in Vietnam.
>
> The use of so-called "civil disobedience" techniques is not only inappropriate but also highly ineffective in bringing about changes in national policy in a constitutional democracy. Students have a right freely to publicize their views in a lawful manner and may perform a service in making a reasonable presentation in an attempt to influence public opinion. But irresponsible and unlawful actions do not contribute to intelligent discussion of the issues and can only hurt the cause which is propounded.
>
> I do not doubt that the flouting of the Constitution and the United Nations Charter by the administration through its Vietnam policy will breed much more disrespects for the draft laws and for the obligations of citizens to stick to peaceful means of protest. A country that takes the law into its own hands is no example for its citizens to do differently.

But there is no justification, in my opinion, for any young man in this country to violate the law by burning draft cards, or by defying the draft; then the youth who is able to establish that he is a conscientious objector within the meaning of the existing law is not exempt from a substitute service.

Let there be no mistake. The Senator from Oregon holds no brief for these law violators who are using these means of protest against our war policies in South Vietnam. I condemn it. To those who protest within the law I say you must not be dissuaded by the scofflaws because we are going to have extremists in our administration who will smear the lawful along with the unlawful.

But there are many Americans who recognize where such a course is going to take this country if it continues in its course of action. Many of us recognize that it is this country that has the most to gain in world affairs by adhering to a standard of respect for the United Nations and for international agreements and insisting that others do the same. To the extent that we depart from that standard in our international conduct, we damage our long-range purposes and objectives.

We are fighting in Vietnam without benefit of a declaration of war. That alone cannot help but breed disrespect for our domestic laws among those who disagree with the policy. But we are fighting that war in violation of the United Nations Charter, and that is going to breed disrespect for peaceful settlement of disputes among all nations, not the least of them the new nations of the world we are so anxious to influence and to guide in the ways of adherence to the rule of law.

EFFECT ON MORALE OF U.S. FORCES

Much will be heard, and has already been heard, about dissent at home having a demoralizing effect upon American forces fighting in Vietnam. This argument has nothing to do with the rightness or wrongness, or success or failure, of a policy, but is supposed only to shut off comment. If it does, then the supremacy of the military over the civilian in government will truly be established in this country.

I hope the time will never come when the wisdom of sending American soldiers into a war situation will become a forbidden subject of discussion. I hope the time will never come when the purpose of sending American soldiers into battle will be a forbidden topic among the civilians who support them and who may eventually have to join them. I hope the time will never come when the objective to be achieved by war is no longer a fit matter of debate, because if it is, the men who think they have gone 10,000 miles away to serve American interests will have gone in vain.

I repeat my position in connection with supporting the fighting men in South Vietnam.

There have been Senators who have said, "Are you not pretty much boxed in, because you are in a position where you will have to vote against appropriations for the war in Vietnam?"

I have said that I shall vote for appropriations for the war in Vietnam only because it is my trust and duty to provide the maximum protection for our troops in whatever situation they find themselves. They are not there on their volition but on the volition of their civilian commanders.

I shall continue to protest the war. I shall continue to vote against giving the President any vote of confidence for what I think is his inexcusable course of action involving us in the war in South Vietnam in the absence of a declaration of war.

That has been my policy. I voted for the defense appropriation bill. I voted against the President's two requests for a vote of confidence. Although it was concealed, he frankly admitted that he sent up the request to compel a vote of confidence, and said at the time he did not need the $700 million, because he had transfer power. When he sent a bill based upon his need to finance the war in South Vietnam, I voted for the appropriation bill, but at the same time I filed again what I am filing this afternoon, my protest to his course of action in southeast Asia.

I repeat that protest, because it needs to be repeated, in view of the tremendous propaganda drive that is being conducted against those of us who are protesting the outlawry of our Government, the violation by our Government of our Constitution, the violation by our Government of the United Nations Charter.

The propaganda, of course, continues to mount. However, the senior Senator from Oregon will continue to protest, in the hope that at long last my country will return to the rule of law and that my country will return to keeping its pledges to its ideals in regard to the settlement of disputes that threaten the peace of the world through existing procedures which are designed to promote settlement by peaceful means, rather than by bullets.

That is the position which I stated last night at Princeton University, which I stated last Saturday in my own State, and which I have stated over and over again across the country, and will continue to state.

The views of those who are protesting the administration's course of action will never receive the attention or the emphasis that the propaganda of the administration, coming out by the reams from the Pentagon and the State Department and the White House, receives on the desks of American editors—the same editors who are remarkably silent on the censorship that has been imposed upon American war correspondents to a degree never before experienced in the history of American journalism and American foreign policy.

I can well understand why the guilty consciences of so many editors cause them to follow the propaganda line of the administration.

But there are some who do not, and I shall have something to say about editors who have demonstrated that they understand the importance of preserving another great constitutional freedom in this country—the freedom of the press. I shall discuss them briefly before I finish.

I wish to make clear once more my views as to why this administration is not declaring war. There are two main reasons, as I have said many times. The administration knows that to ask Congress for a declaration of war would start a historic debate at the grassroots of America. The administration would soon come to recognize that the American people want peace, not war.

Second, a declaration of war would completely change the international law relationships immediately with every noncombatant nation in the world. The administration knows that. The administration knows that those relationships with every other country would change overnight, if war were declared, because then the United States would be treated as a combatant. Other countries would have to deal with us as a combatant. That would cause great changes in trade policies. It would cause great changes, for example, in the relationship between the United States and the British Commonwealth in North Vietnam, and between the United States and Canada in North Vietnam.

It would change the relationships between the United States and France, the United States and Italy, and the United States and every other country in every area of the world that could be considered an area of the war. In my judgment, that, probably more than anything else, is of great concern to the administration.

But that does not justify the President of the United States making war without a declaration of war. That is why there is a need, not only for the officials of the executive branch of the Government, but for Members of Congress, as well, to reread that great war message of Woodrow Wilson of April 2, 1917, when he came before a joint session of Congress and read his recommendations for a declaration of war, stating in the message that he was without the constitutional authority to make war in the absence of a declaration of war. He was right. That is why I have recommended that officials of the executive branch of the Government and Members of Congress again read the great war message of Franklin Delano Roosevelt following Pearl Harbor, when Franklin Roosevelt also pointed out that without a declaration of war he was without authority to make war, and recommended his reasons for asking for a declaration of war. That, from the very beginning of this historic debate, has been the position of the senior Senator from Oregon.

The effort to suppress debate about the Vietnam war is taking increasingly blatant forms. One reason why the talk about morale has become necessary is the lack of general support for the war at the grassroots of America. The only time support for the war can be gained is when it is described as forcing the Vietcong to negotiate. But they are not negotiating; and that calls for a scapegoat.

Read the polls. Read the interesting semantics. Read the way the questions are put in the polls, with a subtlety that is easily detected. The person questioned is left with the impression that the administration's policy is the way to attain peace.

A part of the burden of the argument of the senior Senator from Oregon is that making war will never attain peace. In my judgment, there is no battle in South Vietnam that the American military force we have there, which is now taking over the war, cannot win. As I have said many times, we are shooting fish in a barrel. Our so-called opposition is without an air force, it is without a navy, it is without heavy artillery, it is without tanks. Of course it cannot possibly stand up to American military force.

But when we finish winning, when we finish leveling, when we finish devastating South and North Vietnam, will we have won a peace? I am satisfied that history will say that we have removed for decades the possibility of winning a peace. History will show that after all the military victories which we shall win, and after that time has passed, we shall still have to occupy, occupy, and continue to occupy areas of Asia. Then, sooner or later, we will be driven out. That may occur 25 or 50 years from now.

But I do not want to leave that heritage to future generations of American boys and girls. That is why I have been urging the stopping of the killing. I have been urging multilateral support for peacekeeping. I have been urging that we bring in multilateral forces. I think we have been reduced now, with the failure of SEATO, and with the apparent impossibility of reconvening the 14-nation conference that established the Geneva accords in the first place, to resorting to the Security Council of the United Nations, and from there, if there should be a veto, to the General Assembly. I am confident that if we have to go to the General Assembly, we will get an overwhelming majority of support for peacekeeping operations in South Vietnam.

I believe that that will lead, first, to a cease-fire, and then to the establishment of some form of administration for that area of the world, which can be called, for want of a better description, a United Nations trusteeship. But it will provide for a termination of hostilities. That is what the war hawks in the United States do not like. That is what the nationalists in the United States do not want. It is interesting how we talk about nationalism in Asia but so little about America's own nationalism.

Mr. President, our operations in southeast Asia are operations based upon nationalism, and nationalism, in my judgment, has no place in our foreign policy when it comes to the course of action which we are following in southeast Asia.

If we accept it on a multilateral approach, and change the status from that of warmaking to peacekeeping, of course the Communists will have a voice in the determination of operations during a period of time, for however many years it may take to finally determine what kind of system of government shall prevail.

Yes. I, too, would like to wishfully think the Communists off the earth. I, too, would like to go to sleep some night and wake up in the morning and have a dream come true during the night that there are no more Communists. However, they happen to be an ugly reality. We are not going to wishfully think them out of existence. We are never going to be able to shoot them out of existence, for the more shooting we do, the more Communists we make.

The U.S. shooting in southeast Asia, in my judgment, has increased the number of Communists in the world by the millions.

The underdeveloped areas of the world, with their mass of ignorant, illiterate people, with their youngsters and, in many instances, their starving people, with their diseased children, and with their longevity of 30 to 35 years do not intend to permit the United States to shoot its way into dominion and domination over any segment of Asia.

If we have not learned what the French, the British, the Dutch, and the Belgians and the other colonial powers have learned from the pages of history at such a great cost in blood and materiel, then, let me say most respectfully, that we do not wish to learn. However, I believe that we have a trust, and I think that our trust is to keep faith with our ideals. Our trust is to practice our professings about morality.

We are a great people to ring church bells. However, we had better be on guard that the church bells do not start tolling the decline of America. I want to ring the church bells, too, but I want to ring them in jubilation over our practicing of the spiritual teachings from the pulpits of those churches.

In my judgment, we cannot reconcile America's foreign policy in South Vietnam with Christianity, nor, for that matter, with any other religion that believes in one Supreme Being.

I will not be silenced in his constant plea for peace as a substitute for the jungle law of military might that the United States is practicing in southeast Asia.

In my judgment, the only time that support for the war can be gained is when it is described as forcing the Vietcong to negotiate. However, they are not negotiating. That calls for a scapegoat in the administration's propaganda.

It is an American characteristic that when a U.S. foreign policy fails to achieve its goal, someone here at home must be blamed for it. We had to find Americans to blame for the takeover of China by the Communists, and then for the takeover of Cuba by Castro. By our standards, nothing abroad ever happens unless some American or group of Americans wills it. If an American policy flops, it is only because it was sabotaged by someone in the State Department, or was designed to fail in the first place, or was frustrated by some other Americans.

Today, we are seeing the failure of the "peace through war" policy in Vietnam being blamed upon those Americans who simply disagree that peace in Asia can be achieved by a unilateral American war effort. The longer the war is stalemated, the more blame will be placed upon those who thought it was misconceived in the first place.

But I am confident that the good sense and judgment of the American people will recognize that we are alone in this war in Asia, and that despite all our claims that we are saving Asia from communism, not a single major Asian country is fighting with us.

When the Pope made his appeal for peace, he did not make it to the Pentagon, or even the White House. He made it to the United Nations. Many of the phony sophisticates in high office are given to nodding at speeches like that of

Pope Paul, and intimating that while the Pope had to say all that churchy stuff, it is really a question of who has the power to make their views prevail in the world. That is the attitude of the war hawks. That is the position of the warmongers. Like Stalin before them, many Americans are wont to ask how many divisions the Pope has.

But I do not believe that Pope Paul came to this country on a fool's errand. I think he knew the right place to come, the right words to say, and the right appeal to make to further the cause of peace. The United States stands outside the framework of the United Nations today. Until we get back in it with regard to Vietnam, we are not furthering the cause of peace any more than the Communists are.

It is regrettable that those who believe in lawful protest under the first amendment are bound to be smeared by two forces in this country. The first force is the small group of agitators or outright Communists who undoubtedly, whenever we have a situation of protest, would seek to termite their way into the foundation. However, our FBI knows who they are. Our intelligence service knows who they are.

They are such a small minority that those of us who believe that we have a trust and a duty to carry on our life under the first amendment must continue the protest. The senior Senator from Oregon intends to so continue.

Then, of course, we are smeared by the rightists and extremists within the administration and outside the administration who would seek to create the impression that, unless one bends his knee at the altar of the political expediency of this administration and sanctions what he considers to be wrongful acts in the field of foreign policy, he is guilty of some kind of sedition.

I have been called names before, and I have never surrendered to ad hominem arguments, and I do not intend to do so on this occasion. I intend to continue, short of a declaration of war, to protest, in the hope that, at long last, my administration will change its course of action and proceed to lay this whole threat to the peace of the world before the Security Council and call upon it, as the charter provides, to take jurisdiction over this threat to the peace of the world in Asia.

The general thesis of my remarks appears in an editorial published in this morning's Washington Post entitled: "Demonstrators and the Law."

I shall read certain excerpts from the editorial and then, when I close, I shall have the entire editorial printed in the Record.

The editorial begins:

> The Department of Justice is properly interested in and concerned about the possibility of a Communist conspiracy to obstruct the operation of the draft law. It ought to conduct an appropriate investigation, make arrests where warranted, and institute prosecutions where required.

The senior Senator from Oregon agrees. The senior Senator from Oregon wants to make very clear that where one can advance proof to show that we have those—not only Communists, but anyone else in the list of protesters—who are seeking to violate the law, they should be investigated and prosecuted.

The editorial continues:

> The law is quite clear on the responsibilities of registered citizens, and burning draft cards and illegally avoiding service is not an acceptable way of expressing disagreement with Government policy.

The senior Senator from Oregon wants the Record to show that he agrees. However, that is a long way from the position taken by some that it would silence lawful protest. It is a long way from the position taken by some that no one should exercise the constitutional right under the first amendment to protest a foreign policy of his Government that he thinks is a grossly mistaken foreign policy.

The editorial continues:

> What it ought not to do is to continue illegal defiance and perfectly lawful demonstration. Nor should it use the fact that many of the weekend marchers against the war in Vietnam are known Communists to discredit the marchers who simply differ with Government policies, without being disloyal to the country.

Madam President (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair), I seriously doubt that many of the marchers are known Communists, and, if they are, let the FBI present the evidence. I have no doubt that there probably was a sprinkling of them among those marchers, but it is easy to build up to the false conclusion that because people march in protest to the foreign policy of this Government—within the law—that they are honeycombed with Communists.

The editorial continues:

> Surely the overwhelming number of the demonstrators were not Communists and many probably writhed at their association with Communists in the demonstrations. The coercive power of Government law-enforcement agencies must not be used to inhibit disagreement and dissent when the expression of that dissent is limited to perfectly lawful means.

The senior Senator from Oregon agrees and heartily applauds this wise observation by the editorial in the Washington Post.

The editorial continues:

> As a practical matter, the Government should be careful to avoid giving the demonstrations the attention that ought to be reserved for major threats to national unity. Demonstrations as large as those held over the weekend could be mobilized to protest the manufacture of straight pins on almost any pleasant autumn day. The dissent in the country is relatively minor; but the Government risks exaggerating its significance by reacting too strongly.

I say most respectfully that in my judgment, the administration is overreacting as a means of silencing all objections to its policy. The soundings at the grassroots of America indicate that the dissent is of great proportions, from coast to coast.

The editorial continues:

> After a long and searching examination of the courses available in South Vietnam, the overwhelming majority of the American people have come to the conclusion that there is no acceptable alternative to the policy the Government is pursuing.

I do not think the Washington Post could be more mistaken, Madam President. In fact, even the polls, with their slanted and weighted consideration in favor of the administration's position, show a close division in this country in regard to public opinion vis-a-vis the administration policy in South Vietnam.

The Post says:

> That majority is bound to be impatient with critics of that policy whose credentials, like those of the Communists, will not stand examination. It is likely to resent and prone to overreact to extremists who imply that their own country is indifferent to considerations of humanity. But whatever the majority's resentment, it must tolerate criticism from those who, in good faith, have a different point of view.

And so it must. And so, also for the sake of discussing a hypothesis, and accepting what I consider to be an unsound major premise factually, let us assume that a majority favors the administration's policy at the present time. One of the precious safeguards of freedom in this Republic is that a minority must not be suppressed in its lawful right to change into a majority. This great foreign policy issue is in a state of flux. This is one Senator who believes that when the American people get the facts—and this administration has not started to give the American people the facts about the war in South Vietnam—when they get the facts, in my judgment, an overwhelming majority of the American people will repudiate the administration's policy. I believe the repudiation will start at the ballot box in 1966, and continue at the ballot box in 1968. And it should, unless this administration changes what I consider to be its illegal, unconstitutional course of international outlawry in South Vietnam, along with the Communist nations, which are likewise engaged in outlawry, in their prosecution of a war. What they should be doing on both sides is submitting the issues of that war to the council table, under the procedures provided for in the United Nations Charter.

Until we are willing to try it, I do not accept the argument of those who say it will not work. We will never know until we try to make it work.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire Washington Post editorial be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 19, 1965]

DEMONSTRATORS AND THE LAW

The Department of Justice is properly interested in and concerned about the possibility of a Communist conspiracy to obstruct the operation of the draft law. It ought to conduct an appropriate investigation, make arrests where warranted and institute prosecutions where required. The law is quite clear on the responsibilities of registered citizens, and burning draft cards and illegally avoiding service is not an acceptable way of expressing disagreement with Government policy.

What it ought not to do is to confuse illegal defiance and perfectly lawful demonstration. Nor should it use the fact that many of the weekend marchers against the war in Vietnam are known Communists to discredit the marchers who simply differ with Government policies, without being disloyal to their country. Surely the overwhelming number of the demonstrators were not Communists and many probably writhed at their association with Communists in the demonstrations. The coercive power of Government law-enforcement agencies must not be used to inhibit disagreement and dissent when the expression of that dissent is limited to perfectly lawful means.

As a practical matter, the Government should be careful to avoid giving the demonstrations the attention that ought to be reserved for major threats to national unity. Demonstrations as large as those held over the weekend could be mobilized to protest the manufacture of straight pins on almost any pleasant autumn day. The dissent in the country is relatively minor; but the Government risks exaggerating its significance by reacting too strongly.

After a long and searching examination of the courses available in South Vietnam, the overwhelming majority of the American people have come to the conclusion that there is no acceptable alternative to the policy the Government is pursuing. That majority is bound to be impatient with critics of that policy whose credentials, like those of the Communists, will not stand examination. It is likely to resent and prone to overreact to extremists who imply that their own country is indifferent to considerations of humanity. But whatever the majority's resentment, it must tolerate criticism from those who, in good faith, have a different point of view.

This toleration will be misconstrued in North Vietnam. The officials of the National Liberation Front may misinterpret the open expression of opposition as a sign of weakness and division in this country. It is, on the contrary, a sign of strength and unity in the country. The National Liberation Front must be made to see that. Perhaps the best way to make this understood would be more manifestations of public support for the Government's policy that would show how united the people of this country are behind the Government's determination to defend the people of South Vietnam against conquest from the North. It is a better alternative than any sort of repression of lawful and orderly dissent.

TRIBUTE TO THE ST. LOUIS POST DISPATCH AND THE YORK GAZETTE AND DAILY

Mr. MORSE. Turning to another but somewhat related matter, Madam President, I said earlier that I would have something to say about some courageous editors in America.

The two newspapers I now mention are not the only two which meet the test of objectivity and journalistic courage, but I know of no two newspapers which I would be more inclined to suggest for this year's Pulitzer Prize in American journalism. One is that great newspaper, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch; the second is a much smaller but most remarkable newspaper for its objectivity, for its presentation of facts, for its journalistic courage—a little newspaper up in York, Pa., known as the York Gazette and Daily. I have referred to some of its editorials in the past.

I again pay high honor and tribute to the editor of that newspaper, Mr. Higgins, for I know of no editor in this country more daring, more objective, or more factual than the editor of the York Gazette and Daily.

This afternoon I wish to pay my tribute once again to the editors of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. On October 14, 1965, they published an editorial dealing with our Latin American policy. I consider it to be completely sound. It is highly critical of the administration. Criticism of the administration is due. The editorial, entitled "Lame Rebuttal," reads as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

LAME REBUTTAL

The Johnson administration would do well to stop trying to defend its intervention in the Dominican Republic, and start developing a hemisphere policy based on something more substantial than confused and frantic anticommunism. That is the conclusion we draw from Under Secretary of State Mann's lame reply to the FULBRIGHT critique of the Dominican adventure.

Mr. Mann did not rebut, he confirmed the main points of Senator FULBRIGHT's analysis, one of which was that President Johnson in this case was the victim of bad advice, poor judgment, and immature understanding. The Under Secretary exhibits symptoms of all three.

Senator FULBRIGHT concluded, from a careful study of the facts, that President Johnson's advisers exaggerated the danger of a Communist takeover of the revolt in Santo Domingo last April. He offered evidence to support his view. 'Tain't so, replies Mr. Mann; but the evidence he offers is simply that all the President's advisers were convinced that a danger was clear and present.

There is no argument that the advisers were convinced. The question is whether they were correct, and we suspect that Juan Bosch will have the last word on that. He has declared that American intervention created more Communists than ever were involved in the attempt to restore his constitutional government, and we expect that history will bear him out.

The basic issue, however, is not the extent of Communist involvement, but Mr. Mann's implicit assumption that Communist involvement somehow gives the United States an automatic license to put down a Latin American revolt by the unilateral use of American armed force. How can any such doctrine possibly be squared with the principle, which Mr. Mann himself claims to support, that unilateral intervention is illegal under the OAS charter and that nonintervention is the keystone of the inter-American structure?

The administration appears to contend that any Communist activity in Latin America must by definition represent intervention by a Communist state. But no evidence has been presented of any substantial involvement in Santo Domingo of Cuba, China, Russia, or any other Communist government. If such evidence had existed, the proper response would have been collective action under the OAS charter and not unilateral action by the United States. Our Government simply does not have the right to set itself up as the sole judge of what kind of revolution or reform our Latin American neighbors shall be permitted. Attempts to play this role can only alienate us steadily from the peoples of the hemisphere.

Senator FULBRIGHT was profoundly right in saying that the policy followed in Santo Domingo, consistently pursued, would make the United States "the enemy of all revolutions and therefore the ally of all the unpopular and corrupt oligarchies of the hemisphere." When will our leaders learn that, quite apart from international law and the treaty obligations that argue against such a policy, pursuing it in an age of social revolution means deliberately choosing the losing side? There are going to be social revolutions in Latin America and elsewhere, whether we like it or not, and the surest way to encourage Communist capture of them is to aline American armed power everywhere on the side of the status quo.

Madam President, I completely agree with the premises stated in the editorial. On the very day the tickers began to tell the story of the sending of American marines to the Dominican Republic, and of the story of the protests from Chile, Ecuador, Venezuela, and Peru, some of our best friends among democratic governments have charged us with intervention.

If the marines were being sent in for the limited purpose which the President had announced, he had a right to send them in, and sending them in did not constitute intervention under the meaning of the term in international law. For the announcement of the President was that the marines were being sent in to evacuate American nationals when the Government of the Dominican Republic was supposed to have announced to the American Government—and we did not know what was subsequently disclosed at the Foreign Relations Committee hearings on this subject—that it could not give protection to American nationals. We did not know then, as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has since brought out, that the American Ambassador suggested to the military junta in the Dominican Republic that such a message be sent.

Madam President, some of us consider that course of action to be entirely inexcusable on the part of the American Ambassador in the Dominican Republic.

Subsequent events have shown that we went far beyond evacuating American nationals, and that we did take part in the revolution. History will so record.

Many editorials published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch have rightfully pointed it out. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has also pointed it out.

I have agreed with him, as I stated in a major speech the day following the historic speech of the Senator from Arkansas on the floor of the Senate, not so many days ago, in which he expressed criticisms of our Dominican Republic policy.

Madam President, this is another area of great controversy in the field of American foreign policy. As I stated Friday, and as I repeat today, I hope that the American Secretary of State, before he arrives in Rio de Janeiro on November 17, will clarify our policy, because Under Secretary of State Mann, in his speech at Los Angeles the other day, did not clarify it but only added confusion to an already very confused situation.

Nevertheless, I said on that day that we had the right to send in our marines under international law to bring out American nationals when we had been advised that the government of that country could not protect their lives.

If Senators will read my speech, they will see that although I defended my President in the sending in of the marines to evacuate American nationals, I also pointed out that it should not take long. I also pointed out that it would not require many marines to do the job. I also warned the Johnson administration that if it went beyond that purpose, it would become involved in the revolution itself and would be guilty of intervention. Further, by participating in any aid to the revolution, it would be in violation of the Rio de Janeiro Treaty and the Charter of the Organization of American States.

Madam President, what we need before the Secretary of State goes to Rio de Janeiro is a clear-cut statement from the State Department that we stand foursquare on our commitments under the Rio de Janeiro Treaty, the Charter of the Organization of American States, the agreement at Punta del Este, and the Washington Agreement of Foreign Ministers of 1964.

We need this clarification in order to reestablish the confidence of the world in us; a confidence which has been badly shaken by events following passage in the House of Representatives of the unfortunate resolution which has created grave doubts in Latin America as to exactly what our position is on the issue of intervention.

Madam President, I close by saying that I am never happy to find myself in a critical posture in relation to my Government on foreign policy. However, I take some solace from the fact that if we were to add up all the issues on American foreign policy, it would be found that I am, in an overwhelming majority of the issues, in agreement with the administration.

But, in the area of Latin America, and in the area of southeast Asia, I find myself in substantial disagreement on a great many issues.

Madam President, there is an area for agreement, and I see some trends of such a prospect within the developing policies of the administration. I pray that I am right in my hope that in the not too many months ahead we shall find ourselves of one mind again.

I believe that I see a growing recognition on the part of the administration that great trust must be placed in Ambassador Goldberg at the United Nations, that every support must be given to him as he seeks to carry out what we have been led to believe are the clear instructions of the President of the United States, to see what can be done by way of conversations and diplomatic negotiations with members of the United Nations, and particularly with members of the Security Council, to find a way to bring an end to the killing in southeast Asia, the ending of the bombing, the adoption of a ceasefire, the promulgation of an administrative policy that will lead to the setting up of a United Nations trusteeship.

There are some straws in the diplomatic winds that indicate that an analysis is being made of that approach. If I am correct in my understanding—and I am not merely acting on the basis of straws taken from the blue sky, but this understanding is based on conversations I have had in regard to this matter with high people in the administration—I believe there is some hope.

I trust that every diplomatic channel will be exhausted to the end of bringing of the hope into fruition. I am satisfied that we must end the war in southeast Asia, but on a basis that will protect the millions of people there from what I think would be history's worst blood bath if we left the parties to themselves in southeast Asia. Now that we have been a party to the creation of that situation, we cannot leave the situation to the parties themselves. That is why I have never, in my speeches of protest, advocated that we withdraw abruptly from southeast Asia, but that we change our own status and get others to come in with us to keep the peace.

I would return to that ideal, the proposals of Franklin Roosevelt, for a trusteeship over Indochina by the United Nations. I hope my administration will proceed to do everything it can, within the framework of the United Nations, to attaining that ideal.

THE PUERTO RICAN CHILD IN THE AMERICAN SCHOOL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I recently received a most interesting article discussing the serious problems faced by the Puerto Rican child in our public school system. The authors, Dr. Frank M. Cordasco and Mr. Charles R. Kelley, are both prominent New Jerseyites who have long been active in the field of education and public service.

I ask unanimous consent that this informative and useful article be included in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Puerto Rican Child in the American School

(By Frank M. Cordasco, professor of education, Jersey City State College; and Charles R. Kelley, educational consultant to the New Jersey Office of Economic Opportunity)

I. THE MIGRATION

In 1960 some 900,000 Puerto Ricans lived in the United States including not only those born on the island but also those born to Puerto Rican parents in the States. Until 1940, the Puerto Rican community in the United States numbered only 70,000, but by 1950 this had risen to 226,000, and over the decade to 1960, the net gain due to migration from the island amounted to nearly 390,000. The census of 1950 began the recording of second generation Puerto Ricans (those born on the continent to island-born parents) and counted 75,000; in 1960, the figure stood at 272,000, so that by 1960 3 out of every 10 Puerto Rican residents in the United States were born in the States.

Although, there has been a dispersal of the migration outside Greater New York City, the overwhelming number of Puerto Ricans are New Yorkers; the 1960 census showed 612,574 living in New York City (68.6 percent of the U.S. total). New York City's proportion had dropped from 88 percent in 1940 to 83 percent in 1950 and to 69 percent in 1960.[1] If there is no serious setback in the American economy the dispersion will undoubtedly continue.[2]

The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico neither encourages nor discourages migration. As an American citizen, the Puerto Rican moves between the island and the mainland with complete freedom. If his movement is vulnerable to anything, it fluctuates only with reference to the economy on the mainland. Any economic recession or contraction graphically shows in the migration statistics.[3] It is at best invidious to suggest that "the Puerto Rican migration to Nueva York, unchecked by immigrant quotas, is a major source of the island's prosperity," but there is truth in the appended observation that the migration "* * * upgraded the migrants, converted them from rural to urban people, relieved the island of some of its labor surplus, and sent lots of cash back home."[4]

For the American schools, the Puerto Rican migration presented a distinct and yet in many ways a recurrent phenomenon. With the imposition of immigration quotas in the early twenties, the non-English-speaking student had gradually disappeared. The great European migration and the manifold educational problems to which the American schools had addressed themselves had in a manner been resolved; with the increasing Puerto Rican migration and the recurrent pattern of the ghettoization of the new arrivals, the migrant child, non-English-speaking and nurtured by a different culture, presented the American schools with a new yet very old challenge.[5]

II. PUERTO RICANS AND MAINLAND SCHOOLS

The Puerto Rican journey to the mainland has been (and continues to be) the subject of a vast literature.[6] For the most part, the Puerto Rican child reflects a context of bitter deprivation, poor housing, high unemployment, and a record of disappointing educational achievement. It is the poverty context to which the Puerto Rican community has been relegated in our cities that explains its problems and graphically underscores its poor achievement in the schools. Not only is the Puerto Rican child asked to adapt to a cultural ambience which is strange and new, he remains further burdened by all the negative pressures of a ghetto milieu which educators have discerned as inimical to even the most rudimentary educational accomplishment.[7]

---

[1] U.S. Bureau of the Census. U.S. Census of Population: 1960, "Subject Reports: Puerto Ricans in the United States." Final report, PC (2)-1 D, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1963.

[2] The 1960 census reported Puerto Rican-born persons living in all but 1 (Duluth-Superior) of the 101 standard metropolitan statistical areas of over 250,000 population. Particular concentrations were reported (1960) as Chicago, 35,361; Paterson-Clifton-Passaic, N.J., 6,641; Los Angeles-Long Beach, 7,214; San Francisco-Oakland, 4,068. For an illuminating study of Puerto Rican dispersal in New Jersey, see Max Wolff, "Patterns of Change in the Cities of New Jersey: Minorities—Negroes and Puerto Ricans Affected by and Affecting These Changes," N.Y., mimeographed, 1962.

[3] See in this connection migration figures for 1953–54. The best source on Puerto Rican migration is the Migration Division of the Department of Labor, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, which maintains a central mainland office in New York City and offices in other U.S. cities. It also maintains an office in Puerto Rico to carry out a program of orientation for persons who intend to migrate to the States.

[4] Patricia Sexton, "Spanish Harlem: Anatomy of Poverty," N.Y., Harper & Row, 1965, p. 15.

[5] Although one of the greatest achievements of the American common school has been the acculturation and assimilation of the children of non-English speaking immigrants (largely European), it has received little study. See F. Cordasco and L. Covello, "Educational Sociology: A Subject Index of Doctoral Dissertations Completed at American Universities, 1941–63," N.Y., Scarecrow Press, 1965. Of over 2,000 dissertations listed, only a few clearly concern themselves with the non-English immigrant child, or generally with the educational problems of the children of immigrants.

[6] One of the best accounts is Clarence Senior, "The Puerto Ricans," Chicago, Quadrangle Books, 1965, which includes an extensive bibliography. See also Christopher Rand, "The Puerto Ricans," N.Y., Oxford, 1958; Don Wakefield, "Island in the City,"

How the Puerto Rican child has fared in the mainland schools is best illustrated in the experience in New York City, where Puerto Ricans have the lowest level of formal education of any identifiable ethnic or color group. Only 13 percent of Puerto Rican men and women 25 years of age and older in 1960 had completed either high school or more advanced education. Among New York's nonwhite (predominately Negro) population, 31.2 percent had completed high school; and the other white population (excluding Puerto Ricans) did even better. Over 40 percent had at least completed high school.[8]

In 1960, more than half—52.9 percent—of Puerto Ricans in New York City 25 years of age and older had less than an eighth grade education. In contrast, 29.5 percent of the nonwhite population had not finished the eighth grade, and only 19.3 percent of the other whites had so low an academic preparation.[9]

If the schools in New York City were to correct all of this (the numbers in the second generation who have reached adult years is still small, only 6.4 percent of persons 20 years of age and older in 1960), there is still evidence that Puerto Rican youth, more than any other group, is severely handicapped in achieving an education in the New York City public schools. A 1961 study of a Manhattan neighborhood showed that fewer than 10 percent of Puerto Ricans in the 3d grade were reading at their grade level or above. The degree of retardation was extreme. Three in ten were retarded 1½ years or more and were, in the middle of their third school year, therefore, reading at a level only appropriate for entry into the second grade. By the eighth grade the degree of retardation was even more severe with almost two-thirds of the Puerto Rican youngsters retarded more than 3 years.[10]

Of the nearly 21,000 academic diplomas granted in 1963, only 331 went to Puerto Ricans and 762 to Negroes, representing only 1.6 percent and 3.7 percent, respectively, of the total academic diplomas. In contrast, Puerto Ricans received 7.4 percent of the vocational school diplomas, and Negroes, 15.2 percent. For the Puerto Rican community, these figures have critical significance since Puerto Rican children constituted in 1963 about 20 percent of the public elementary school register; 18 percent of the junior high school register; and in keeping with long discerned trends, Puerto Rican youngsters made up 23 percent of the student body in vocational schools and 29 percent of that in special (difficult) schools.[11]

Clearly, the critical issue for the Puerto Rican community is the education of its children, for the experience in New York City is a macrocosm which illustrates all the facets of the mainland experience.[12]

III. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS TO MEET THE NEEDS OF PUERTO RICAN CHILDREN

In the last decade a wide range of articles have reported special educational programs to meet the needs of Puerto Rican children; [13] although many of these have been of value, the more ambitious theoretic constructs have largely come from the school boards and staffs which have had to deal with the basic problem of communication in classes where a growing (and at times preponderant) number of Spanish-speaking children were found. As early as 1951 in New York City, a mayor's Advisory Committee on Puerto Rican Affairs turned its attention to this major problem of communication; [14] and this problem was periodically reexamined during the years which followed.[15]

In New York City (as in other cities)[16] the board of education turned its attention to the Puerto Rican child because communication had to be established, and (in this context) the most ambitious study of the educational problems presented by the Puerto Rican migration became (for New York City) "a 4-year inquiry into the education and adjustment of Puerto Rican pupils in the public schools of New York City * * * a major effort * * * to establish on a sound basis a citywide program for the continuing improvement of the educational opportunities of all non-English speaking pupils in the public schools." [17]

If the major emphasis of "The Puerto Rican Study" was to have been the basic problem of language (English), its objectives were soon extended to include the equally important areas of community orientation and acculturation. The study's objectives were summed up in three main problems:

1. What are the more effective ways (methods) and materials for teaching English as a second language to newly arrived Puerto Rican pupils?

2. What are the most effective techniques with which the schools can promote a more rapid and more effective adjustment of Puerto Rican parents and children to the community and the community to them?

3. Who are the Puerto Rican pupils in the New York City public schools? [18]

For each of these problems, "The Puerto Rican Study" made detailed recommendations (problem III, largely an ethnic survey, resulted in a profile of characteristics of pupils of Puerto Rican background and fused into problems I and II).[19]

PROBLEM I: HOW EFFECTIVELY TO TEACH ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

"The Puerto Rican Study," concluded that an integrated method (vocabulary method; structured or language patterns method; and the functional situations or experiential method) was to be employed, and it developed two series of related curriculum bulletins, keyed to the prescribed New York City course of study.[20] But in the course of its considerations, it dealt with the ancillary (and vital) need "to formulate a uniform policy for the reception, screening, placement and periodic assessment of non-English speaking pupils." [21] It recommended (until such time as the Bureau of Educational Research may find or develop better tests or tests of equal value) the use of the USE test—ability to understand spoken English; the Gates reading test—primary and advanced; and the Lorge-Thorndike nonverbal test. It proposed, too, three broad categories of class organization; considered the need of adequate staffing (substitute auxiliary teachers [SAT]; Puerto Rican coordinators; school-community coordinators and other teaching positions [OTP]; and guidance counselors, particularly in the senior high

---

Boston, Houghton-Mifflin, 1959; Elena Padilla, "Up From Puerto Rico," N.Y., Columbia University Press, 1958; Jesus Colon, "A Puerto Rican in New York and Other Sketches," N.Y., Mainstream Publications, 1961; an older but invaluable documented study of Puerto Ricans in New York City is that of C. Wright Mills, Clarence Senior, and Rose Kohn Goldsen, "The Puerto Rican Journey," N.Y., Harper, 1950.

[7] For a graphic commentary on the debilitating environmental pressures and the "ghetto milieu" see David Barry, "Our Christian Mission Among Spanish-Americans," mimeographed, Princeton University consultation, Feb. 21–23, 1965. The statistical indexes of Puerto Rican poverty (and the related needs) are best assembled in "The Puerto Rican Community Development Project," N.Y., the Puerto Rican Forum, 1964, pp. 26–75.

[8] See "The Puerto Rican Community Development Project," p. 34.

[9] Ibid., pp. 34–35.

[10] Ibid., p. 39. The study was undertaken by the Research Center, Columbia University School of Social Work.

[11] "Puerto Rican Community Development Project," p. 41, and tables, pp. 43–44.

[12] The situation would not be significantly different in other cities where the Puerto Rican community is encapsulated in poverty, e.g., Camden, N.J., Philadelphia, Chicago. A different dimension would be added in the educational problems presented in those areas where Puerto Rican migrant workers, contracted for agricultural labor, live for varying periods of time. The best source of information on the Puerto Rican agricultural migrant worker is the Migration Division, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. See footnote No. 3, supra. The New Jersey Office of Economic Opportunity completed a study of the needs of migrant workers in that State in terms of its projected programs. The report ("Herdman Report") has not yet (October 1965) been released.

[13] Typical is Jack Cohn, "Integration of Spanish Speaking Newcomers in a 'Fringe Area' School," National Elementary Principal (May 1960), pp. 29–33. See also F. Cordasco, "Helping the Language Barrier Student," the Instructor, vol. 72 (May 1963), p. 20; S. L. Elam, "Acculturation and Learning Problems of Puerto Rican Children," Teachers College Record, vol. 61 (1960) pp. 258–264; James Olsen, "Children of the Ghetto," High Points, vol. 46 (1964), pp. 25–33; John A. Burma, "Spanish Speaking Children," in Eli Ginzberg, The Nation's Children, vol. 3 (1960), pp. 78–102.

[14] "Puerto Rican Pupils in the New York City Schools, 1951." The Mayor's Advisory Committee on Puerto Rican Affairs, Subcommittee on Education, Recreation and Parks. This was a survey of 75 elementary and junior high schools as well as a report on day classes for adults, evening schools, community centers and vacation playgrounds. The report was directed by Dr. Leonard Covello, principal of Benjamin Franklin High School in East Harlem. See in this connection, Covello's "The Heart Is The Teacher," N.Y., McGraw Hill, 1958, passim.

[15] See Martin B. Dworkis, ed., "The Impact of Puerto Rican Migration on Governmental Services in New York City," N.Y., New York University Press, 1957.

[16] Particularly, Philadelphia, Chicago, Newark, and Camden, N.J.

[17] J. Cayce Morrison, director, "The Puerto Rican Study (1953–57): A Report on the Education and Adjustment of Puerto Rican Pupils in the Public Schools of the City of New York," New York: Board of Education (1958), p. 1.

[18] Ibid. See "Summary of Recommendations Made by the Puerto Rican Study for the Program in the New York City Schools," (New York, Board of Education). Dec. 8, 1958.

[19] The profile was separately published in 1956, and reprinted in the final report (1958).

[20] A series of nine resource units and four language guides. Each resource unit bulletin contains three or more resource units. See "Puerto Rican Study" (Publications of the Puerto Rican Study) for list.

[21] See summary, supra, p. 3.

schools), and found essential the "coordinating [of] efforts of colleges and universities * * * to achieve greater unity of purpose and effort in developing both undergraduate and graduate programs for teachers who will work with non-English speaking pupils." [22]

PROBLEM II: HOW TO PROMOTE A MORE RAPID AND MORE EFFECTIVE ADJUSTMENT OF PUERTO RICAN PARENTS AND CHILDREN TO THE COMMUNITY AND THE COMMUNITY TO THEM

In its recognition of this problem, "The Puerto Rican Study" struggled with providing answers to the basic anxieties and preoccupations of a group of people beset with problems of housing, adequate employment, health, and "assimilation." That the study found difficulty in providing answers is perhaps explained in its inability to relate the answers it found most effective to the mandate of the school. If it was possible to revise curriculums and discern the problems implicit in the learning experience of the Puerto Rican child, it remained an altogether different matter to attempt the solution of broad socioeconomic problems, or to attempt the amelioration of community ills. In essence, the following statement suggests how far the schools have retreated from the community: "On the relation of Puerto Rican parents to schools, 'The Puerto Rican Study' holds that because Puerto Rican parents are preoccupied with problems of learning English, finding apartments, finding employment, and with problems of providing their families with food, clothing, and proper health protection, they are not ready to set a high priority on their children's school problems. The schools can't wait until they are ready." [23]

If "The Puerto Rican Study" is not thought of as a finished guide to the solution of the problem it investigates but rather as a beginning, it must be characterized as the best assessment of the educational challenges which the Spanish-speaking child poses to the American school. In this sense, it is both a guide and a blueprint for effective reform.

IV. A POSTSCRIPT

Basically, the Puerto Rican child is not a newcomer to the American school. In many ways he presents himself to a school and a society whose very nature is heterogeneous and variegated and to which the non-English-speaking child is no stranger. In this sense, the acquisition of English for the Puerto Rican child (if necessary and inevitable) is not a great problem; certainly, it is a soluble problem to which the American school brings a rich and successful experience and "The Puerto Rican Study" affirms how successful and resourceful American schools can and have been. What is more important to the Puerto Rican child (and to American society) is the process of acculturation. How does the Puerto Rican child retain his identity? his language? his culture? In substance this remains the crucial problem, and in this crucial context, the role of the school in American society needs to be carefully assessed. If the Puerto Rican child is sinned against today, the tragedy lies in the continued assault against his identity, his language, and his cultural wellsprings. In this sense, his experience is not fundamentally different from that of millions of other children to whom the American school was a mixed blessing. This is in no way a deprecation of the egalitarianism of the American "common school," but rather a reaffirmation of the loss of the great opportunity that a free society afforded its schools to nurture and treasure the rich and varied traditions of its charges. The "melting pot" theory is at best an illusion measured against the realities of American society, and a true discernment of its strengths.[24]

In another light, the Puerto Rican child is the creature of his social context: its opportunities or lack of opportunities. If his needs are to be met, they can only be effectively met insofar as the needs of this context are met. A school which is not community-oriented is a poor school. If this is so for the middle-class suburban school, it is even more so for the urban school which is the heir of the myriad complexities of a rapidly deteriorating central city. More important than the Puerto Rican child's lack of English, is the lack of that economic security and well-being that relates him to a viable family structure. If the Puerto Rican child's major disenchantment does not result from the segregated schools into which his poverty has placed him,[25] still one would have to deplore the school's inability to cope with the alienation that segregation spawns, and the bitter destitution that poverty brings to its children. Perhaps, the Great Society really emerges from a strengthening of the school by its joining hands with all the creative agencies of the community.

---

[22] Ibid., p. 5.

[23] Ibid., p. 7.

[24] See Milton M. Gordon, "Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion and National Origins," New York, Oxford University Press, 1964; and review, F. Cordasco, Journal of Human Relations, vol. 13 (winter 1965) pp. 142–143.

[25] See Joseph Monserrat, "School Integration: A Puerto Rican View," conference on integration in New York City public schools, Teachers College, Columbia University, May 1, 1963.

PROGRESS IN VIETNAM

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, recently, I had the rare opportunity to visit extensively is southeast Asia on behalf of the Armed Services Committee and the Preparedness Subcommittee of which I am a member.

Yesterday, I made preliminary comments on some aspects of the trip which impressed me, and I am preparing a more detailed written report. However, I do feel I can assure the Members of this body that the tremendous cost of the Vietnam war in both manpower and money is not being expended vainly and without results.

My overall impression is that we are making progress there and I have the feeling of cautious optimism about achieving our objective in Vietnam which is to use our military might to reach a peaceful, negotiated settlement at the conference table.

I traveled extensively in many areas where combat operations were involved on land, sea, and air, and I came away in unhesitating admiration of the quality of our fighting men and of their ability to satisfactorily perform their mission. I do not believe, from what I saw, that freedom can be bought cheaply in that troubled part of the world, but I believe we are inspiring confidence among our SEATO allies and that our enemies and our friends know that we mean what we say and that we are not afraid to fight to keep our commitments.

The distinguished Senators from Ohio and Maryland, Senator YOUNG, and Senator BREWSTER, with whom I was associated, looked long and hard into reports of shortages of ammunition, boots, and other equipment, and were unable to substantiate any claims of deficiency. On the contrary, it seemed to me that our boys were being supplied with the finest materiel available and the equipment was suitable for accomplishment of their mission.

I found morale extremely high but one question continued to arise wherever we were able to visit the fighting men. It was one of concern, disappointment, disillusionment, and sometimes anger over the student demonstrations and the mockery of draft cards which has been so much in the news of late. I could not help but wonder what our enemies must think, let alone what our friends wonder when they learn of these outrageous misuses of the privileges of citizenship.

Of course, I attempted to explain that these vulgar and sickeningly unpatriotic gestures were the rare exceptions and not the rule among our youth and on our campuses. I still believe that, but I do not think we can minimize the damage and misunderstandings that these wanton acts provoke.

The magnitude of our effort in helping the South Vietnamese achieve both military and political stability is truly impressive. American ingenuity is being demonstrated every day in the construction of airfields, ports, communications networks, and the coordination of all these factors in a manner which will inspire confidence and create the necessary morale to sustain the people of that troubled country. It is true that the performance of our allies in this fight has so far been disappointing, but I hope that in due time they will be inspired, as were all of us on this visit, with the example of the South Korean nation, which sent a division, including marines, to South Vietnam, and plans to step up its fighting personnel there to 20,000 men.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that each day brings additional strength to our resolve to strive toward an honorable peace without weakening our determination to discourage aggression. As a result of this trip, I am convinced more than ever before that our active presence in southeast Asia is the only acceptable course, and the correct one for this Nation.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 337. An act for the relief of F. F. Hintze;

S. 343. An act for the relief of Paride Marchesan;

S. 374. An act for the relief of Dr. Guillermo Castrillo (Fernandez);

S. 711. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hertha L. Wohlmuth; and

S. 2039. An act for the relief of Ken Allen Keene (Yasuo Tsukikawa).

The message also announced that the House concurred in the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, and 13 to the bill (H.R. 168) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes; that the House disagreed to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6 and 11 to the bill, and that the House concurred in the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 12 to the bill, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House concurred in the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 to the bill (H.R. 227) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to entitle the children of certain veterans who served in the Armed Forces prior to September 16, 1940, to benefit under the war orphans educational assistance program, and that the House disagreed to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to the bill.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5493. An act to provide that the flag of the United States of America may be flown for 24 hours of each day in Lexington, Mass.; and

H.R. 6568. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on copra, palm nuts, and palm-nut kernels, and the oils crushed therefrom, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 5493. An act to provide that the flag of the United States of America may be flown for 24 hours of each day in Lexington, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6568. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on copra, palm nuts, and palm-nut kernels, and the oils crushed therefrom, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11135) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, I have technical amendments at the desk. I have cleared them with Senators on both sides of the aisle. I do not think there is any objection to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendments, as follows:

Page 32, line 4, after "from" insert a comma.

Page 34, line 12, strike out "(2)" and insert "(3)".

Page 37, line 1, strike out "subsection (d)(1)(B)" and insert "paragraph (1)(B) of this subsection".

Page 37, line 14, strike out "(2)".

Page 39, line 15, strike out "subsections (c)(3) and (d)(1) of this section" and insert "subsection (c)(3) and paragraph (1) of this subsection".

On page 46, line 22, after "are amended" insert "to read".

On page 49, line 20, strike out "(3)".

On page 55, line 4, after the period insert the following: "The amendments made by section 9 of this Act shall become effective on the date of the enactment of this Act."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, may I ask the Senator from Louisiana if I am correct in my understanding that these are technical amendments only?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They are purely technical. They correct language that should be corrected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Louisiana en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 474

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, I ask the clerk to state an amendment which I have at the desk, but before the clerk reads the amendment, let me say that substitute numbers should be inserted at the appropriate places, because the original pagination followed the original bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, first, the yeas and nays on the amendment should be ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator has not offered it yet. I would like to ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois requested that his amendment be read. The clerk had not completed the reading of the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be suspended while the yeas and nays are asked for, and then that the amendment be read in full.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, I now ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays may be ordered even though the amendment has not been read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will continue reading the amendment.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the amendment offered by Mr. Douglas, which is as follows:

On page 48, strike out lines 12 and 13, and insert the following:

"Sec. 10. Section 213 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

" 'IMPORT FEES

" 'Sec. 213. (a) Except as hereinafter provided, as a condition for importing sugar into the United States under this Act from any foreign country, an import fee, computed as provided in subsection (b), shall be paid to the United States by the person applying to the Secretary for entry and release of such sugar. Payment of such fee shall be made in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary. This subsection shall not apply to sugar imported from the Republic of the Philippines or from any country in the Western Hemisphere (other than any possession, protectorate, or dependency of France or the United Kingdom).

" '(b) The import fee under subsection (a) with respect to any suger imported into the United States under this Act shall be an amount (computed on a per pound, raw value basis) equal to the amount by which the domestic price for raw suger on the date of importation exceeds the higher of—

" '(1) the world market price for raw sugar on the date of importation (determined by the Secretary and adjusted for freight to New York, insurance, and customs duties imposed by the United States), or

" '(2) the average world market price for raw sugar during the 15-year period preceding the year of importation (determined by the Secretary and adjusted for freight to New York, insurance, and customs duties and import taxes imposed by the United States).

" '(c) The import fees received by the Secretary under subsection (a) shall be covered into the Treasury into a special fund to be known as the Alliance for Progress Fund. There are authorized to be appropriated from such Fund, solely for the purposes of the Alliance for Progress, such amounts as may from time to time be provided by appropriation Acts.' "

ANALYSIS OF AMENDMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, the amendment which I have suggested would not affect the domestic beet and cane sugar programs, nor would it affect the allocation and payment on sugar with respect to the Philippines, which is regulated by treaty.

The amendment would not impose an import fee on any sugar coming from the Western Hemisphere with the exception of the French colonial possessions and the British colonial possessions; but it would impose an import fee on sugar coming from countries outside the Western Hemisphere and on what comes from the British West Indies and the French West Indies.

In all, the amendment would impose import fees on 471,985 tons allocated to countries outside the Western Hemisphere and on the 126.017 tons allocated to the British West Indies, and British Honduras.

The French West Indies are included in the tabulation under "French" and outside the Western Hemisphere, which is a printer's error. It would, therefore, apply to approximately 598,000 tons out of the total.

The amendment would levy this import fee on the difference between a 15-year moving average of the world price, which would be 4.22 cents, plus the shipping cost and insurance cost of about half a cent a pound, plus the tariff of five-eighths of a cent, or a total of approximately 5.3 cents a pound.

The present price is 6.85 cents, so there would be a return of approximately one-half cent a pound or $30 a ton, or on just short of 600,000 tons, about $18 million, if my arithmetic is correct.

That money, of course, would not be appropriated automatically. We have no authority to appropriate it now, but it would go into a fund, and we would authorize appropriations from that fund for the Alliance for Progress.

LATIN AMERICA BETTER OFF UNDER AMENDMENT

I point out that Latin America would come out much better under the plan which I am suggesting than under the plan proposed by the Committee on Finance, for Latin America would receive everything which it would otherwise get. The independent countries of Latin America would be receiving everything they would be getting under the administration bill, the Senate bill, or the House bill. In addition, they would be getting the import fees collected from sugar imported from outside the hemisphere. This money would go to the common people of Latin America instead of to the rich landlords, as is contemplated in the bill proposed by the Committee on Finance.

First, I wish to take up the question as to what economic responsibility, if any, in the form of sugar subsidies we have to countries outside the Western Hemisphere. I know of none. We assume no automatic military or economic protection over them.

Australia is an independent country, and an extremely prosperous country. They do not need aid. They would not ask for aid. They would be offended if aid were suggested.

Formosa is a republic, to which we no longer give economic aid.

South Africa is a country to which we owe no obligation. As the great gold-producing area of the world it needs no artificial stimulants. I believe it produces at least two-thirds of the gold supply of the world. It has enough purchasing power to buy materials from the rest of the world.

With respect to India, I have always supported aid to India. I believe that I was the first Senator to come to the support of Senator HUMPHREY over a decade ago when he began his campaign first, to give wheat to India, and then, when he was prevented from doing that, to sell wheat to India in soft currency terms. That is putting food in the mouths of Indians.

But this proposal would take nutriment away from the mouths of Indian children. It calls on India to export sugar and deprives its own people of sugar. It may be too much sugar.

This is supposed to be one cause for American obesity. But the Indians are not troubled, or very few of them are troubled, with obesity. They have trouble with malnutrition and they need all the calories they can get from the sugar which we would take away from them.

We would be taking away nourishment of sugar from the mouths of Indian children in order to put money in the pockets of Indian landlords.

As to the Fiji Islands, which are allotted 35,489 tons, I believe Senator FULBRIGHT is quite correct when he says that all the sugar in the Fiji Islands is owned by one big Australian company.

There are the Mauritius with about 15,000 tons. I am told we have a tracking station there. We can buy sugar from them but buy it at the 15-year-average world price.

WHY HELP SOUTHERN RHODESIA?

Then, there is Southern Rhodesia, which is down for 6,000 tons. Earlier today I mentioned the fact, which is known to all, that Southern Rhodesia is in a critical period in which the white supremacy government representing some 250,000 white settlers in Rhodesia is threatening to secede from the British Empire. The British Government is carrying out the policy previously announced by the Tory government, namely, that they will resist with all methods short of physical force the declaration of independence and in effect will apply economic sanctions to Rhodesia if they carry through this program.

In the United Nations a few days ago, Ambassador Goldberg proposed that we should condemn Rhodesia if it attempted to secede from the British Empire. Mr. Goldberg clearly foresaw the possible inflammatory effects of such a secession, the aim of which would be to impose the white rule of 250,000 white people upon 4 million blacks, for an indefinite future, which might touch off a racial struggle through all of Africa, including South Africa and the new black republics of Central Africa.

I believe Ambassador Goldberg's position is correct. I am very glad that the United Nations, by a vote of 107 to 2, approved the resolution. I was cheered also by the fact that press dispatches from London indicated that the U.S. Government was alining itself with the British Government in its opposition to Rhodesian secession. There is the possibility that, faced with British opposition, faced with the United Nations opposition, and faced with the American opposition, Mr. Smith will have second thoughts and that his white supremacy party will not force secession.

They are going through a period of agonizing reappraisal, so to speak, in Salisbury, Rhodesia, and in other sections of that country.

We say to them: "Enter into the charmed circle. We will give you 6,000 tons of sugar with a subsidy, at the present time, of $72 a ton, and, on present figures, of $430,000."

Instead of invoking sanctions, we would be giving them bonuses. That is hardly the way to establish unity in foreign policy. This is what I call schizophrenic foreign policy. It is like the character in Stephen Leacock's novel who mounted his horse and rode off in all directions.

I see no reason why Southern Rhodesia should be included; nor Swaziland.

I am told that the Senate has restored the allotment to the Malagasy Republic, because of certain strategic benefits which we derive from that country.

I am not proposing to take the sugar away from them. I am merely proposing that they have it at a moving average of the last 15 years, giving them the bonus of $25 or $30 a ton, instead of $72 a ton.

That is all that is involved. They can sell their sugar for more than they can get now. They can sell their sugar for what they can get, or almost as much as they can get, under the French system.

RETAIN BONUS FOR WESTERN HEMISPHERE

I see no reason why we should pay bonuses to countries outside the Western Hemisphere. My amendment retains the bonuses for countries inside the Western Hemisphere. We have all been forced to think deeply about developments in the Caribbean and the Western Hemisphere by the presence of Castro. I agree that in the future we probably must prevent communism from getting a foothold in Latin America, particularly from getting a foothold in the Caribbean, because the experience we had in Cuba, in the autumn of 1962, has taught us the danger of any such development. Therefore, it is probably in order that we provide additional economic benefits to those countries.

I do not propose that the 1,788,000 tons of sugar allocated to the Western Hemisphere should be thrown into a global pool. Neither am I proposing that an import fee be levied upon this sugar, although personally I should like to see that done, and I should like to see the funds thus collected really used for the Alliance for Progress. However, I have canvassed the Senate somewhat, and I do not believe that such an amendment could be carried. There is a possibility that the amendment which I have proposed might poll a substantial enough vote so as to influence future policy.

Madam President, almost always the discussion of a sugar bill occurs near the end of a session, when Senators and Representatives are tired. They want to go home. They have great pressure of work in their offices. It is hard to get them to come to the Chamber to listen to the debate. That has been the usual experience. It is the experience this afternoon. If the vote on my amendment could be postponed until tomorrow, perhaps we would be in a better position to form a mature judgment. Senators would have had a chance to read the RECORD—and I believe that most of them do read the RECORD in the morning. They would understand the issue somewhat more clearly than if they were asked to vote now, not having been in touch with what the issues actually are.

I am wondering if my good friend the acting majority leader would not agree to a vote 1 hour after the Senate convenes tomorrow, with the understanding that the debate in the intervening hour be evenly divided between the proponents and the opponents of the amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, I do not feel that I should agree to that proposal. I have some responsibility to the Senate. This is a proposal that should be debated and voted upon. Senators hope that the Senate will adjourn sine die this week. If we begin the consideration of a measure of this sort, adjourn for the night, and then return tomorrow in the hope that Senators will have read the RECORD, my impression is that only a small percentage of Senators will have read the RECORD overnight.

I should be happy to suggest the absence of a quorum and help to obtain a larger attendance of Senators to listen to the Senator's argument. The Senator's argument is subject to a response, and I shall respond to it. I flatter myself to think that on occasion I might be even as persuasive as the Senator from Illinois. Perhaps he would lose votes by the time Senators had heard my side of the argument.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am willing to take my chances.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If we proceed on the basis of taking up a bill and debating it from 11 o'clock in the morning until 5 or 6 o'clock in the evening, with no votes taking place, but merely general debate—if we do not try to push ahead and do business—we shall not be able to adjourn Congress sine die this week; we shall be in session for an additional period of time.

I had hoped to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement. I observe the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and other Senators in the Chamber. I had been advised that it would not be possible to get a unanimous-consent agreement anyway.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What was that?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I had been advised that a request for a unanimous-consent agreement would be objected to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator not want to try?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think it would be possible to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement, which is what the Senator from Illinois suggests. It seems to me that it is a reasonable request. It is true that the Senate wants to adjourn. I am just as desirous of adjourning as is the Senator from Louisiana.

But, after all, the bill was reported by the Committee on Finance yesterday. It had hardly been printed until 11 o'clock this morning, while we have been in session. In the interest of orderly procedure and of expediting the consideration of the bill, if we could obtain a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the Senator's amendment tomorrow morning, and then move on to a consideration and votes on other amendments, after a reasonable discussion of each of them, we could perhaps move much faster than we would by trying to push the bill through tonight. I do not believe that could be done. I believe it would be much better to have a unanimous-consent agreement to vote sometime tomorrow. That would be much better all around. I hope that such an arrangement may be made.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Perhaps we might obtain an agreement to limit debate on each amendment. I would suggest that beginning when the Senate convenes tomorrow, assuming that it convenes at 9 o'clock, there be 1 hour of debate on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, the time to be equally divided, and that the Senate vote at 10 o'clock.

Madam President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that, without prejudicing the right of the Senator from Illinois to the floor, I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that starting at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning the debate on all amendments be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between the sponsor of the amendment and the Senator from Louisiana, and that the debate on the bill itself be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided between the senior Senator from Illinois and the junior Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, reserving the right to object, and it is not my present intention to object, is the pending amendment included in the request?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct. It would include any amendment on which the Senate would vote. It would be our intention to vote on that amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I wish to be perfectly certain that I understand the unanimous-consent request. Would this request refer only to amendments already introduced, or are we free to introduce amendments tomorrow?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is free to introduce all the amendments he wants to introduce tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I want to be very frank. I am inclined to go along with the proposed agreement. However, I am very much concerned about the possibility that I may find myself in a position in which, in order to get the necessary time, I may have to introduce a series of amendments.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I hope that the Senator will not find that to be necessary.

Mr. MORSE. I do, too. However, if I do find that it is necessary to protect what I think is the public interest, I want to be free to do so.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Under the proposed unanimous-consent request, the Senator would have that right.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I think that the request should provide for perhaps 30 minutes for the morning hour.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be very few Senators present at that time of the morning. The hour of 9 o'clock in the morning was set as a special favor to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] who has a speech that will take perhaps 45 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, the answer of the Senator from Louisiana to the Senator from Oregon left unclear whether the 1-hour limitation would be applicable not only to the pending amendments, but also to any new amendments that may be offered.

Mr. MORSE. It would apply to all amendments. It was on that condition that I consented to the agreement.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It was at least unclear in my mind.

Mr. MORSE. That is different.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I believe the RECORD will show that the Senator's understanding of the language used is erroneous.

Mr. MORSE. We will let the RECORD speak for itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request proposed by the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That effective at 10 o'clock a.m. on Wednesday, October 20, 1965, during the further consideration of the bill H.R. 11135, to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]: *Provided,* That in the event the Senator from Louisiana is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to two hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

ARGUMENTS FOR AMENDMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, the amendment which is now pending is a very modest one. It would save, at a minimum, $25 a ton on approximately

600,000 tons, or approximately $15 million a year, or possibly $30 a ton for a total of $18 million. It would use these additional funds for the common people of Latin America. It would strengthen the Alliance for Progress. But it would deprive the countries outside the Western Hemisphere of this unearned bonus.

SENATE BILL HURTS BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Perhaps I should say a word about the French West Indies, which are scheduled to receive, under the Senate Finance Committee bill, a quota for approximately 43,000 tons of sugar, and to receive this big bonus on all of it.

The amounts paid to the planters in these areas will be claims of the French Government upon the United States. We know very well what General de Gaulle will do. He will demand that the claims be paid in gold. The inclusion of the French West Indies would worsen our balance-of-payments position and adversely affect the gold flow.

Also the bill would include the British West Indies. The British West Indies, like the French West Indies, are included in the separate sugar plans of their respective countries. They also receive a bonus price on the sugar which Great Britain and France purchase from them. Great Britain and France do not give such bonuses to countries which are not colonial possessions or inside their respective spheres of influence. So, in effect, the Finance Committee, the administration, and the House of Representatives are proposing that we give large bonuses to the planters in these colonies, which bonuses are not reciprocated by the arrangements of those colonies, or the mother countries, and which are already the responsibility of Great Britain and France respectively. I do not see how any Englishman or Frenchman can legitimately object to this provision.

This is only a modest step in the direction of attempting to prune the parasitic arrangements which have fastened themselves around the sugar program. It is a far cry from the tremendous saving which we could make if we applied the domestic price strictly to all the 2,260,000 tons imported from countries outside the Western Hemisphere, and in the Eastern Hemisphere as well. It is only about one-fourth of that program. However, it is a beginning. It is an attempt to prune our responsibilities to our areas of greatest need.

I hope very much that Senators will read today's debate before a vote is had tomorrow. Unlike my colleague the junior Senator from Louisiana, I have greater faith in the reading habits of our colleagues than he has. I believe that the vast majority of the Senators read the Record.

I regret very much that the Senator has cast aspersions upon the reading habits of our colleagues.

The Senator from Louisiana previously tried to defend the lawyers and lobbyists and said that I was maligning their character because they were receiving checks from the planters in foreign countries.

I had no such intention. However, I rise to defend Members of the U.S. Senate from the reflection of the Senator from Louisiana that we do not read the Record. I say that is a libel on the good name of the U.S. Senate, unworthy of the great Senator from Louisiana, who is now the acting majority leader. I helped to elect him as majority whip.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, if I said it, it was an honest statement, it was no effort to malign anybody. I suppose it was probably gaged by some of the experiences of this Senator in the Senate. On one occasion, the Senator from Illinois and I were holding the floor for about 3 days hand-running against a bill we thought was a very bad bill. One of the Senator's colleagues, who at that time was majority leader, said, in response to my point that we were making a wonderful Record, "Senators seldom ever read the Record. About the only time Senators read the Record," he said on that occasion, "is to review their own remarks."

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Louisiana is making matters worse in trying to extricate himself from his base slander on the Senate. He is dragging in a former majority leader of the Senate, and impugning not merely the present Senate, but past Senates. I beg my colleague not to indulge in such comment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, I dislike to damage one of our favorite myths, which has existed so long in this body. I was merely judging the Senate by myself.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I cannot believe it. I think the Senator from Louisiana does himself injustice.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I suppose the Senator is judging the Senate by himself. The Senator tells me that he reads the Record religiously, and never misses an issue.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not religiously, but continuously.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I stand corrected. But let me say to the Senator that if I was in error in saying that practically all Senators read that which appeared in yesterday's Record, I apologize to the Senate. I did not know I was in error, and if I was in error it was merely in telling the truth as the good Lord gave me light to see it. Had I known myself to be in error, I should not have said that to the Senator. As I recall, when the matter came up, it was a matter of personal conversation between the two of us, and I had not particularly cared to destroy the myth that all Senators read everything that appears in the Record.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, since we have reached an agreement on orderly procedure for tomorrow—for which I thank my good friend, the Senator from Louisiana—I yield the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, in the hope that the Senator from Illinois is correct in his assumption that Senators practically always read the Record, I should like to respond to the Senator's argument and demonstrate in a small way why in my judgment the Senator is erroneous in the position he takes.

The Senator relies heavily upon the concept of a world market price. As a practical matter, the so-called world price for sugar is in fact a misnomer. If Senators will look at the sugar production of the world, they will find that each year, throughout the world, about 64 million tons of sugar are produced.

Of that 64 million tons, 48 million tons is consumed in the country where it is produced.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question? Let us get the figures straight. Does the Senator's total not include beet sugar?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Beet sugar does not enter into international trade to any appreciable extent. What does enter into international trade is cane sugar. So it is not 6 out of 64 but 6 out of 16.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, beet sugar is not the 48 million tons. Beet sugar is only a part of the 48 million tons to which I refer.

Mr. DOUGLAS. How large a part?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is a part. Only a small part; a small amount from France, a small amount from Belgium, and some from Ireland.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What about West Germany?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There is some beet production, not a great amount.

Madam President, I ask that the Senator's interruption appear at the conclusion of my remarks, and related to my presentation, so that my presentation may continue uninterrupted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This has been good, but I did not want to have this error perpetuated.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We shall see if I am in error. I do not think I am. I think I am going to prove the Senator is in error.

Forty-eight million tons of sugar is consumed in the country where it is produced, and that is mostly cane sugar. That 48 million tons is produced for protected markets, subsidized and protected by the laws of those countries, just as we subsidize and protect our farmers.

For example, in this country, on our price for sugar, the subsidy works out to 6.5 cents. What we are paying foreigners for this sugar is about 5.7 cents, about eight-tenths of a cent below what we pay our people to sell their sugar. But the bulk of the sugar, 48 million tons, is produced by the people who consume it.

Ten million tons of the world's sugar is traded under special agreements. One of them is the Sugar Act which we are discussing now. Countries agree to sell us sugar, we agree to buy sugar, and we give them a price we think will permit them to stay in business and not go broke. The price which we pay them is about 5.7 cents, and our experts tell us that they cannot produce it any cheaper than that, and sell it at a profit consistently. We do not want them to lose money producing sugar, because we want a dependable, reliable source for sugar, which will not be cut off in bad years or when they can sell it at a higher price somewhere else when sugar is scarce.

That takes care of 10 million tons. The remaining 6 million tons is what the Senator would like to regard as the world market for sugar, that is, the world dumping ground.

One-half of that, or 6 million tons, is produced in Communist countries, including Cuba, which is sugar produced for dollar exchange. Those Communist countries need dollar exchange.

The primary thing they would like to get in exchange for their sugar is American spare parts, not manufactured in the Soviet Union, to repair the American machines and American equipment in those American refineries that they have confiscated down there in Cuba. We do not wish them to have those parts. We would like to have those things they confiscated break down and not be repaired. We have gone to some effort to keep them from getting the dollar exchange, on the one hand, and the trade on the other, through the black market or in any other way, to be able to obtain spare parts to keep operating the American capital investments which they confiscated.

That leaves about 3 million tons of sugar that the Senator would like to regard as the world market. That 3 million tons is surplus sugar. No one has a contract to sell that sugar, no one has a customer to whom he can sell that sugar. It is sugar without a home, it is fugitive sugar, which, if a person can sell it, must be sold at a loss. The world market price for sugar is about 2½ cents a pound. This year it has been as low as 2 cents a pound. Testimony before our committee showed that it costs many a producer 5 cents a pound to produce it, even if he operates in a country like the Dominican Republic or Panama, where costs should be low.

No one will testify that anyone can produce sugar and make a profit at 2 cents a pound. No one will testify that anyone can sell it for 2½ cents a pound and make a profit. That is the world price to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I must protest. I am not proposing that it be sold at 2½ cents a pound, but on a 15-year moving average, which is approximately 4.2 cents.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is retreating from his own argument.

So the Senator is now surrendering when he proposes to pick a price somewhere between the price we would pay and the current world market price. So he compliments the Senate committee by his amendment in suggesting that he would not wish Latin people to sell it at the world market price, because he knows that would be ridiculous. He now says that the world market price for 15 years, which is really taking the world market price and advancing it by 1 cent. The Senator says that if we take out the 15-year average, including those years when the price of sugar went through the sky under the Douglas amendment, we will get a price which is reasonable. He believes that would be approximately correct, based on his logic and intention. He has concluded that would be a fair price for sugar.

Now that is what the Senator thinks. I do not know where he gets his economics, but he will not find a single witness to testify—at least, I have not found anyone who will—that 4.2 cents a pound would permit our trading partners in the world to make a profit.

This Nation does not care to trade with its trading partners on a basis that they could not make enough money to pay for expenses except by squeezing the lifeblood out of pitiful peons working in canefields. In trading with Cuba, we arrived at an agreement on price, under the Sugar Act which is now in existence. That was during the time when Cuba was almost entirely dependent upon the United States for everything it imported. That was the time when Americans used practically the entire production of sugar in Cuba.

From the time Cuba was taken over by the Communists, we said that we would let other friendly countries have the same arrangement we had with Cuba, when we felt a direct responsibility for that country's economy.

Thus, we permitted those people to trade for a price which was fair to us and fair to them. Those countries would like to continue to trade with us. They like the arrangement, and we like it.

We tried an import fee, as the Senator has stated. It was extremely unpopular. The countries felt that we were asking them to sell their sugar below the cost of production. We helped to stabilize the price of coffee as a result of the coffee agreement for which the Senate voted, although the Senator from Illinois opposed it. That was to see if the countries could make enough selling coffee to stay in business.

The President got the Latin American Ambassadors to come to the White House to discuss the Alliance for Progress. They took beautiful color pictures. They talked about the fine efforts and achievements of the Alliance for Progress. Then, in the course of the discussion, we said that we were going to see to it that the so-called import fee of the Douglas amendment was eliminated. The President said this in the speech he made to the Ambassadors, which included every Latin American country:

> First, we must maintain our steps to prevent disastrous changes in the price of these basic commodities which are the lifeblood of so many economies. We will continue, as we did conclude in London, the operations of the Coffee Agreement and to search for ways to stabilize the price of cocoa. We will try to maintain regularly expanded markets for the sugar produced in Latin America and consistent with the CIAP recommendations; I will propose this afternoon that Congress eliminate the special import fee on sugar so that the fall price will go to Latin American producers.

I am sure that a part of the President's speech met with a vast ovation from our partners in the Organization of American States. The President sent them all a picture. Here is one taken in the flower garden, with the President sitting with the senior members of the Latin American countries—the senior diplomatic delegates here, and the representatives of every Latin American country in the flower garden.

This document is beautifully printed in gold leaf, on beautiful white stationery of the finest quality, and inside are the pictures. I am sure that the Latin American delegates sent it to every friend they had in Latin America, including their President and their Congress, saying, "Look how well I have done with the President. We came down and explained our problem to him, how badly we were being treated under the Douglas amendment, and the President, thank the merciful Lord, is going to declare an end to that. Look how well the President is going to treat us. Look what a fine job we have done representing our country."

Notwithstanding the wonderful speech made by the President, notwithstanding the meeting at Punta del Este, where we said we were going to help them stabilize the price of their basic commodities, notwithstanding the commitments, notwithstanding the beautiful pictures the President sent to the Latin American Ambassadors where he signed all these statements, the Senator from Illinois now suggests that we break our word and tell those people that we are going to get sugar from them at a price below their cost of production.

What could be more unpopular at a time when we are trying to get the OAS to uphold our hand and work with us as a partner to help solve the Communist problem in Cuba, and to help keep the Dominican Republic from going Communist, and then for Uncle Sam to be pictured around the world, even by our best friends and our usual traditional trading customers, as a sort of top-hatted, overnourished, wealthy man with a diamond stickpin in his tie, squeezing the lifeblood out of Latin American peons to make them produce and deliver sugar to him below their cost of living.

I believe that this would be the most unpopular thing that anyone could dream of. Yet the Senator suggested this idea to Thomas Mann, our former Ambassador to Mexico, who served at the State Department Latin American desk for a great many years and is a State Department expert on these matters. The Senator suggested that we squeeze this money out of the sugar producers and give it back to them as direct aid to their government under the Alliance for Progress.

Ambassador Mann said:

> Senator, if I had my choice, I would rather have you take $60 million of aid away from the Alliance for Progress countries than to try to pick up $30 million this way. I think the injury you would do to the image of America, and to our good will, the friends you would lose would be so great and hurt us so badly that I would rather you took the $60 million away from the Alliance for Progress countries than to make $30 million by this scheme.

I am happy to say that the Senator has finally seen the light. So, he comes before us now and suggests that we no longer do this to our Latin American partners but take some other poor devil and do it to him. So, what have we to work on?

India is a very poor nation. We give them a large amount of foreign aid, recognizing the many problems they have. They probably are near the top of the list for aid. But when we had a shortage of sugar, and called on India to sell its sugar to us, India came through and delivered 230,000 tons of sugar when she could have made a better price to someone else. However, she delivered that sugar to us.

So here is a Senator who has made an outstanding record in voting against discrimination saying that, so far as the people in this hemisphere are concerned, let us give them a price that we think is fair, but so far as the Indians are concerned, let us take away from them the price they would have received if they had been able to trade with us in the normal way. We are going to pay them less than we pay the others.

The Senator's proposal would do that in spite of the fact that, since the enactment of the Sugar Act, we have committed ourselves to GATT, in which we stated that we would treat all favored nations alike; and India is one of them. We would be breaking our word under GATT, because we would be giving India a low price while a higher price is paid to the others.

What are some of the other nations that the Senator from Illinois would discriminate against? Australia is one of them. We are in a death struggle in Vietnam, trying to resist Communist aggression. One of the few countries which came to our aid in that struggle over there happens to be Australia. Australia even sent troops there, to fight and die alongside our troops. The people who would be favored by the Senator's amendment do not even have any representatives there, and I do not see why we should be paying them a better price than we pay to Australia, which happens to be one of our best friends.

The committee reduced the amount that was made available to the Fiji Islands. Those people acted magnificently at a time of sugar shortage. They could have made more money by selling sugar to someone else.

So here are the Indians—nobody could be poorer—and the Senator's amendment would take away from them to give to the Alliance for Progress. I am in favor of helping nations that are less better off, but if we are to have a foreign aid program, it does not make sense to tax the poorest people in the world under a foreign aid program in which to help people who are better off.

The Senator's amendment would place a tax on the Fiji Islands to help somebody who may be better off.

This amendment is a tax on farmers and laborers of Africa and India to benefit countries in Latin America. It is a tax the Communists can increase at any time it chooses by dumping the sugar on the world market, thereby forcing the world price down, because the Communists have the sugar available to dump.

The proposal would eliminate any incentive a country would have to sell us sugar. This could lead to instability of our sugar supplies and could operate contrary to the long-term interest of our consumers.

It would not benefit consumers in this country. Prices would not be cut by reason of the recapture. They could well go up as instability of prices lead to shortages. Inasmuch as the money under the Senator's proposal would go into the Alliance for Progress, it would not benefit the taxpayers or the consumers.

The amendment would make the United States the only country in the world, so far as I know, that would force farmers and laborers of a large part of the world to accept a distress price for what they sell us while other nations pay a premium for their sugar.

Furthermore, the amendment would force planters in a large part of the world to cut the wages they pay their laborers in the sugar fields. They would have to do this to cut their costs of production.

This is essential because the world price is below the cost of production four-fifths of the time. Not even a 15-year average world price is sufficient to cover the cost of production.

The arrangement the committee has brought to the Senate was carefully studied by the administration. It has been studied down through the years. It has been studied by the industry. It is an arrangement which is advantageous to both sides. That, after all, is what we want to do. We do not want a deal that is good for us but bad for the other fellow, or vice versa. We should seek an arrangement that is favorable to both sides.

I would like to put into the Record a letter written by Mr. Cooley to the Speaker of the House, Hon. John W. McCormack. He explains in this letter why he thought that this proposed arrangement would be disastrous. He explains that he thinks the proposal for the import fee is illegal, immoral, and unsound economics, and why it would break faith with our commitments. He mentions the fact that it is opposed by Mr. Mann. He ends the letter with this paragraph:

> This proposal for an import fee on sugar is illegal, immoral, unsound economics, an insult to our friends in Latin America, and would result in the eventual breakdown of our sugar program. I will not introduce a bill containing this proposal and if it is advanced I will do my utmost to defeat it in the committee, in the House, and in conference with the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

July 19, 1965.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: In accordance with your request during our recent conversation, I am outlining herein my position on the proposed import fee on sugar.

1. In 1962, when amendment and extension of the Sugar Act was under consideration, certain persons in the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State advocated a variable import fee on all sugar entering the United States, except from the Republic of the Philippines. This fee would have assessed against imported sugar the full difference between the world price and the United States price—whenever the so-called world price is lower—thus removing any advantage to the exporting country of filling its United States quota.

2. This proposal ignored not only our posture of friendship for the Latin American countries which are our chief foreign suppliers but also the basic principle which has made our Sugar Act operate so beneficially for 30 years—that the higher price which may usually (but not always) be expected in the United States market is the incentive which causes foreign suppliers to ship to the United States year in and year out—whether world prices are higher or lower than our price—and assures U.S. consumers of ample supplies of sugar at stable and reasonable prices. If there is no price incentive in shipping to the United States, foreign producers will have no reason to favor this market over any other.

3. In spite of the fact that the persons originally advocating this proposal were not among the top officials of either of the Departments involved, their views (for reasons which have always been a mystery to me) became the administration's position and were espoused by spokesmen for both Departments before the House Agriculture Committee.

4. The proposal was unanimously rejected by the House Agriculture Committee and the House upheld our position.

5. In the Senate, however, the advocates of this variable import fee were able to sell a bill of goods and in conference (in order to have any bill at all—which was urgently needed) we were forced to accept a slightly modified version of this proposal.

6. The authority for this import fee expired on December 31, 1964, and we had hoped that (since the persons who had originally advocated it had now left their positions in both departments) there would be no request for its removal in the bill which the administration will send up this year.

7. I am now informed, however, that there will be such a proposal in this bill, differing in degree but not in kind from that advanced in 1962. It would impose an import fee of one-half of the difference between the world price and the U.S. price, up to a maximum of 1 cent per pound.

8. I wish to protest with all the vigor at my command against adoption by the administration of this position. It is illegal and immoral and can lead only to serious deterioration of friendly relations with our Latin American suppliers and to the eventual destruction of our Sugar Act.

9. It is in violation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). This was admitted by the acting legal adviser of the Department of State in a letter to me dated December 30, 1964.

10. It is in violation of the charter of Punta del Este, establishing the basis for the Alliance for Progress.

11. It is contradictory to the principles of the resolutions adopted unanimously by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development on June 16, 1964.

12. It has been protested officially by the Organization of American States and by the sugar-supplying countries in that Organization.

13. It has been protested in an official communication to the Secretary of State by the President of the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress.

14. It is opposed by Thomas C. Mann, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs and one of the foremost authorities on Latin American relations. (What forces in the State Department are strong enough to prevail over Mr. Mann's position?)

15. It would impose a tax on a primary export of the countries we are trying most to help which would have to be compensated fully, I assume, by further grants-in-aid out of the U.S. Treasury.

16. This proposal for an import fee on sugar is illegal, immoral, unsound economics, an insult to our friends in Latin America, and would result in the eventual breakdown of our sugar program. I will not introduce a bill containing this proposal and if it is advanced I will do my utmost to defeat it in the committee, in the House, and in conference with the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. What Mr. COOLEY said in effect was that this amendment could well mean that we would have no sugar program at all.

I have heard the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee maligned. I do not agree with those criticisms. In my judgment he is an honorable man. He has as much right to have his opinion as does any Senator, whether he agrees with it or does not agree with it. The logic of the letter makes sense—that the adoption of the proposal would not help the situation. It would hurt our image around the world. We would be better off to proceed on the basis that we were not trying to force people to sell sugar, or any other commodity for that matter, at less than its cost of production. We want to proceed on a basis that is mutually beneficial to both sides. People understand proceeding on that basis. We would like to pursue a program which would work to the advantage of ourselves, our new trading partners, and our old trading partners.

Furthermore, we would not want to embarrass the President by submitting a bill that carries with it a concept which he thinks is wrong and which would force him to impose a tax on people which he says he does not want to impose. He told the people of Latin America that he does not want a fee.

In addition, we are signatories to international agreements which provide that we will not discriminate. All nations that sell us sugar are to be treated alike under the most favored nation clause of GATT. They should not be discriminated against. They would regard us as a pretty poor trading partner and a pretty poor partner in defense of the free world after we had made a commitment and did not live up to it.

Those people would feel they had been pretty badly done in, and for good reason.

I know the Senator is sincere. Down through the years he has made speeches against the sugar industry and sugar production. He has argued that we should not produce sugar in this country.

If we are to have a sugar industry at all, it will not be because the Senator from Illinois wanted it that way. For a great number of years, the Senator from Illinois argued that this Nation should not have a sugar industry; that we should buy all sugar at world market prices from people who can produce sugar cheaper than we can. We heard vestiges of that argument in his statement today.

The Senator has now retreated from that position. He now contends that there be an American sugar industry and that we shall be permitted to produce sugar, for which I am grateful.

If the Senator had his way there would not be a price for sugar that any producer could count on to permit him to make a living and to pay his expenses.

The Senator from Illinois fought for world market prices, but nobody can produce sugar and live on that basis. They would have to go out of business or else squeeze the blood out of the little peons to produce the sugar, based on the statement of the Senator.

I am happy to hear that the Senator has retreated from that position. We do not have to worry about that.

I am happy to hear that the Senator has retreated from that argument. He now proposes that we buy sugar at 1 cent above the market price. Now, he has retreated from the dump market.

I cannot understand why he arrives at the conclusion that the price we pay our allies around the world should be 1 penny above the dump market price. One would think that he would look at the cost of production, and the facts with regard to the cost of production.

If we allow these pepole to earn the cost of production plus a fair profit, the price that we believe would be right would be 5.7 cents, which is provided for in the bill.

What do the British think? They have never been known as being too generous as traders. Their price is above ours. But as the Senator pointed out, the cost on their market is higher and their price is about the same as ours. I have never known the British to be regarded as generous traders. They make a fair deal, but they do not give away what they do not have to.

What about the French? I understand that that figure works out to 5.8 cents, which is a little higher than ours. That is how they treat their colonies in the West Indies, Africa, and elsewhere. How about the French? They are paying higher prices than the United States is paying for sugar.

The Russians have never been known as the most generous souls on earth. As much as we decry the Communists, in dealing with Cuba, their price would appear to be 8 cents a pound. But, when there is discounted the fact that Cuba was taking in barter things from Russia that she might have bought cheaper in the world market, our people come up with the fact that the price appears to be about 6 cents a pound, which is about 5 percent above the price we propose to pay our trading customers.

I am informed that the Communist Chinese promised they would pay Cuba what amounts to the equivalent of 6 cents a pound.

We heard the discussion today with regard to what we would do if Cuba came back into the fold. Where would we find a market for Cuban sugar? It is interesting to note the price that Communists pay for it, which is above the price that the Senator would have us pay, would put us in a bad light, making us the only major power having people sell sugar below the cost of production.

The Senate committee wanted nothing to do with it. The chairman of the House committee wanted little to do with it. The House rejected it by an overwhelming margin after they had heard it discussed. The Committee on Finance heard these proposals. They rejected them by a considerable margin. I believe the Senate would not depart from a trade pattern which is good in dealing with nations.

Something has been said about sugar prices. Mr. President, every great nation protects itself on its sugar and seeks to guarantee its source of supply and to do a certain amount of producing itself.

When one looks at the price people pay for sugar in the world the U.S. price is not out of line. In fact, it is less than that of a great number of countries. The current price which the housewife is paying for sugar in the United States is 11.6 cents a pound. In West Germany the price is 14 cents a pound. West Germany has not been known as a generous trader. In Japan the price is 14.2 cents per pound. In France the price is 12.6 cents a pound. In Italy, the price is 16 cents a pound. In Holland, the price is 14 cents a pound. In Yugoslavia, the price is 13.3 cents a pound. In Belgium, the price is 13.9 cents a pound. In Sweden, the price is 15 cents a pound. In Switzerland, the price is 13.4 cents a pound.

Furthermore, while the Senator may think that the housewife is very much upset about paying 11.6 cents a pound retail, the fact is that the United States has enjoyed a very stable price on sugar.

I ask unanimous consent that table XV be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE XV.—*Retail price of sugar for selected countries arranged in descending order of total sugar consumption, Jan. 1, 1961–65*

[U.S. cents per pound]

	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965
United States	11.9	11.6	11.8	14.1	11.6
United Kingdom	9.3	10.0	10.0	11.1	11.1
Brazil	4.5	5.0	5.0	6.1	6.1
India	10.5	10.0	10.2	11.6	(1)
West Germany	12.9	14.0	13.9	14.1	14.0
Japan	18.7	18.4	18.7	22.0	14.2
France	10.5	11.8	12.3	12.6	12.6
Italy	15.4	15.0	14.9	15.6	16.0
Mexico	5.5	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6
Poland	13.5	13.5	13.5	14.6	(1)
Canada	9.6	9.0	10.3	17.9	8.8
Netherlands	11.7	12.2	13.7	13.9	14.0
South Africa	6.4	6.5	7.0	7.0	7.0
Australia	9.3	9.3	10.3	10.3	10.2
Yugoslavia	25.4	25.4	25.4	25.4	13.3
Belgium	13.0	14.1	12.7	12.5	13.9
Pakistan	17.0	14.1	15.3	17.1	18.0
Sweden	12.6	12.2	13.7	20.2	15.0
Hungary	20.2	20.2	20.2	20.2	(1)
Peru	2.8	3.7	3.7	5.1	5.8
Switzerland	9.1	8.6	8.8	12.7	11.2
China	9.1	10.0	12.3	13.4	13.4
Simple average	11.8	11.8	12.2	13.8	11.8

[1] Not available.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, although one may feel that the price of sugar could be less—and I doubt that it could be—I believe everyone will agree that it is well to have a stable price for sugar. If one looks at the chart to which I have referred, he will notice that the price for sugar in the United States has been very stable.

In fact, about the only time when the price began to get out of line was when this Nation started the global quota arrangement, and began to depart from the dependable supply arrangement under which we paid a price at which sugar could be produced.

In that period we find that we paid as much as 14.1 cents a pound, during the shortage period, a price that the housewife resented.

We can guarantee a stable price and a reasonable price, and we can have good trading relations with all the world under the arrangement we have had.

I submit that this is a better arrangement—and, of course, experience has proved it—than under the various proposals that have been made. I submit that it would be disastrous to follow the proposals that have been made.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana has made what seems on the surface to be a powerful argument. But if one examines it closely, he will find that it consists of sophism upon sophism and, I believe, certain alleged facts which are not in reality true.

FIGURES MISLEADING

Let me take up his first point, that the cane sugar which is traded in the international market is only a small fraction of the total supply of sugar that is produced and traded. He gives a figure of 64 million tons of sugar produced in the world, of which he states that 48 million tons are consumed in countries where the sugar is produced, 10 million tons are traded under special agreements, and 6 million tons are sold in the so-called free market for sugar, to which he attaches the opprobrious term of "dumping ground" or "distress sugar market."

It will be remembered that when I first interrogated the Senator from Louisiana, he admitted that almost all of the 48 million tons of sugar consumed in the countries where it was produced was beet sugar. Then he withdrew from that and said it was almost all cane sugar.

I think that a review, country by country, will reveal that it is almost all beet sugar. Great Britain is certainly one of the countries. Great Britain does not produce a pound of cane sugar so far as I know. It is all beet sugar, and sugar that is imported. It might be sugar that is traded under special agreements, and I think it probably is, but it is not sugar that is consumed in the country where it is produced.

The British workman likes sugar in his tea and sugar in his cakes, and that sugar comes almost exclusively from cane, because beet sugar is seldom exported.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, does the Senator from Illinois contend that there is any real difference between cane sugar and beet sugar?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I am merely saying that what the Senator from Louisiana calls dumping ground sugar, what I call world market sugar, is a much larger proportion of that which is internationally traded than the Senator has assumed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator from Illinois is not contending that there is any real difference between cane sugar and beet sugar—I contend that one cannot tell the difference; if one has two sugar bowls in front of him, he cannot tell the difference—what difference does it make what the division is?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Louisiana is very adroit. I am trying to prove that sugar which is internationally traded, which is really world market sugar, is a much larger fraction of the total supply that is internationally traded than the Senator would say; and that the 48 million tons is primarily beet sugar produced at higher costs, with a series of protective tariffs, which enables it to be consumed at home, but not exported abroad. It is not cane sugar at all.

I know something about the sugar policy of Bismarck.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Can the Senator tell me what conceivable difference that makes. One cannot tell the difference between beet sugar and cane sugar. He will pay the same price for either one.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator will have a little patience, which I know is a little difficult to come by at a quarter to 6 in the evening, I will make this statement: The German people like sugar. They get it primarily from beets, the cultivation of which Bismarck encouraged back in the days of the old German empire.

Most of the 48 million tons is highly protected, high-cost beet sugar. The sugar that is internationally traded is not the 64 million tons, but the 16 million tons, 10 under "special agreements," and 6 in the free market. So instead of its being only 10 percent of the total world trade in sugar, it is approximately 40 percent of the trade in international sugar. Therefore, it is not merely a small remnant or a leftover; it is a portion of that which is world traded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would the Senator mind telling us what is the world production of beet sugar?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not quite certain. Since the Senator from Louisiana is an expert, will he tell us?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator will yield, I contend that it does not make the least bit of difference; but since the Senator proposes to advise the Senate that there is some difference between the two kinds, would he mind telling us how much beet sugar there is? He gave an overall figure on sugar production. How much of it is beet sugar?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I did not think the Senator from Louisiana would be guilty of such false logic as to include any highly protected beet sugar in the total volume of world trade, so I did not look up the figures on beet sugar.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am sending for the figures now.

If the Senator will look at the table, as to which he made his speech, I do not know why he would want to discuss it, unless he had his figures together.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator's statement contains such an obvious fallacy that I could not help commenting on it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Will the Senator look at the chart? It shows the amount of sugar in millions of tons. Forty-eight million tons were consumed in countries where produced. I did not say it was traded on the international market.

The next two words are "Protected Markets."

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct; beet sugar markets.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Also cane sugar.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not much.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator will be surprised how much there is.

Mr. DOUGLAS. How much cane sugar is grown in Italy? How much is grown in Great Britain? How much is grown in Germany? How much is grown in Scandinavia?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The answer is "none."

How much is grown in India?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not know.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. All the sugar that is consumed in India is cane sugar.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Louisiana proposes to take some of the sugar that is grown in India out of the mouths of Indian children and put it in the stomachs of Americans.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is because India wants to trade its sugar for protein foods. So far as those people are concerned, it is sugar which could be sold, but most of it is consumed at home.

How much sugar is produced in Argentina? Argentina produces a large amount of sugar, and consumes a large amount.

Mr. DOUGLAS. How much beet sugar is grown in Pueblo, Colo.?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator desires to know how much is produced in the whole State of Colorado, the figure is much larger.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is responsible for his own chart. He can develop its meaning; I am not required to interpret it for him. If he has any doubt about his figures, let him explain them.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Will the Senator from Illinois explain to me what difference there is between beet sugar and cane sugar?

Mr. DOUGLAS. In terms of chemical substance, not much. However, concerning the proportion that the sugar freely traded on the world market forms, the total sugar on the world market is not six sixty-fourths. It is six-sixteenths, or approximately 40 percent, and not slightly less than 10 percent. That makes a big difference.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator that we produce both beet and cane sugar in this country. We sell both beet and cane sugar at the same price. If one were to put beet sugar and cane sugar in front of me, I would not know one from the other.

There was a time when there was a differential, but no longer.

WEATHER BROUGHT HIGH PRICES

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is the first sophism of the argument of the Senator from Louisiana. I shall take up another, which concerns whether the global quota system further increased the sugar prices in 1963 and 1964. We developed that point in the Committee on Finance. It has nothing to do with it.

What happened was that there was a bad beet sugar crop in France and West Germany because of the weather. There was, therefore, a demand for cane sugar from the tropics. That raised the price. It had nothing whatsoever to do with the import fee system.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. May I suggest that it did.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator may suggest it, but he cannot prove it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I said it did.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Louisiana has listened to too many fairy tales.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have been told by people who possess knowledge of the situation.

Furthermore, under the global quota that the Senator advocated, and that I voted for at the time, people felt they would not get more, selling sugar to us than they would in selling it to anyone else. Others who were firmly committed to selling our sugar in our country quit selling it at a price that might be less than they might get from somebody else, because they saw the world market price skyrocketing. They felt that they did not owe us anything, and they did not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I state another sophism?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator did not prove that to be a sophism, unless he is going to be his own judge.

HEADS I WIN—TAILS YOU LOSE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not unless I follow the practice of the Senator from Louisiana, who applauds his own points.

The supporters of the Senator from Louisiana attack the idea of a world market price when it is below the American price, but, oh, how happy they are when it is above the American price, as it has been on a few occasions. How happy they were at the time of the Korean war when, for a brief time, world prices were above American prices. How happy they were in 1963 and 1964, when world prices were above American prices.

They only want to play a "heads I win, tails you lose" game when the world price is below the American price. But, when the world price is above the American price, they demand the world price. In other words, it is "heads I win, tails you lose" with the foreign sugar planters and their American exponents.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. At the time when the world price went far above the American price, I was on the committee. I sat there and demanded that the representatives of the Department of Agriculture tell me, if they were going to sign the contract to buy the sugar at a certain price from those people, why they did not write a provision into the contract to the effect that the other people would agree to deliver the sugar.

I said it was ridiculous to have a contract of that sort, agreeing to buy sugar, when the other man could not agree to sell it.

The Senator will notice that we have the Long amendment in the bill. I suggested that amendment, to provide that when we agree to buy sugar, the other fellow would agree to deliver it. The Senator voted for that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I said that the foreign sugar producer accepted that when the world price was above the American price. I did not say that the Senator from Louisiana thought so. I did not necessarily include the Senator from Louisiana among the exponents of the foreign sugar producers.

I made that language vague and indefinite so that it would not bruise the sensibilities of my friend, the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It sounded as though the Senator included me in his statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I did not include the Senator from Louisiana. However, I did include some of his allies.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am frank to say that I think we ought to make a bilateral contract to the effect that we agree to buy and the other fellow agrees to sell. We will agree on what the price will be, and no matter what the world market price will be, that is all they will get.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I now proceed to the fourth sophism?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator well knows that this bill has been amended with that in mind.

PROPOSING REASONABLE STABLE PRICE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I proceed to the fourth sophism of the Senator from Louisiana. He said that my price would not be a stable price. I point out that what I propose now is that they get a 15-year yearly average. What could be more stable than that? It would still take account of supply and relative demand.

I would establish an extremely stable price. The Senator from Louisiana would have a high price, probably stable, but high. I want it to be stable and fair, and the Senator from Louisiana wants it to be stable and excessive.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Assuming that the people cannot produce the sugar for the price that the Senator proposes and they go out of business and sugar becomes in short supply, what makes the Senator think that the Nation can get this sugar at any price except the kind of extortion price that we had to pay back in 1964?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is very easy to cry "wolf." I should like to know what price the various delegates to the Geneva Conference were advocating. Is it not true that some people proposed a price of 4 or 4¼ cents?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have no knowledge of that. Secretary Mann said that, from the best information available to him, it looks as though the cost of producing sugar in the Latin American countries would be about 5 cents, and 6 cents in the Dominican Republic.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is a horseback opinion, not based upon any statistical study of cost. Which firm can we look to? Which types of plantations? Which types of sugar grinding mills?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would assume that we would have to look at the production situation in more than one or two places. We could not accept those which are not sufficient. I hope to see some of the market afforded to the Dominican Republic. Their sufficiency is not as great now as it was last year. However, they may be able to improve it. I should like to let them have a profit also, in addition to their cost of production.

ONE-WAY ARGUMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. I now come to the fifth sophism of the Senator from Louisiana, that this would be a violation of the GATT agreement because we would be paying different prices to different producers. We would be paying 6.8 cents to the Latin American producers, and only 5.3 cents to countries outside the Western Hemisphere. The Senator wishes that the countries outside of the Western Hemisphere would come up in price. He would not bring the prices of the Western Hemisphere down to that of the other countries. The Senator insists on bringing the price of the other countries up to the Western Hemisphere price of 6.8 cents.

Only a few days ago my distinguished friend stood on the floor of this body and put through the automobile treaty with Canada. Under the automobile treaty, Canada takes our automobiles and gives up a tariff, although she would not give up a tariff on the automobiles from any countries. We take our automobile parts from Canada and do not impose a tariff on them. It is a tariff situation mutually confined to the United States and Canada, and moreover is confined to identical manufacturers on both sides of the line. It is a clear violation of GATT. However, my dear friend the Senator from Louisiana stood here and defended it. GATT is appealed to when it means more money for foreign producers. The GATT agreement is violated when the Senator wants to have it serve that purpose.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator and his supporters at that particular time had a great deal of say about a little technical violation of GATT. That is all that would have been. We knew that we could get the parties involved to agree to it. The Senator is talking about discrimination against a great number of countries with whom we had actually made commitments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would not necessarily be a technical violation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Our State Department says it is only technical.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, the State Department. They can produce any argument they want, to justify any course that they take. They could have the wind blowing from the north one day, and the next day they will say, "Oh, it blew from the south." They produce arguments in great profusion to justify policies which they have already decided upon.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They proceeded to prove that nobody had been injured; and people can certainly show injury if we adopt the Senator's argument.

BRITISH AND FRENCH DISCRIMINATE

Mr. DOUGLAS. The British and the French do not abide by GATT, either, because they purchase from their colonial possessions at a higher price than they purchase from the world market.

So why does not the Senator from Louisiana insist on hauling Britain and France into GATT, instead of saying that we are going to be hauled into GATT? The argument of the Senator will be listened to with great interest by the British and the French.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Will the Senator concede that this is a violation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No more a violation than was the automobile agreement, and no more a violation than the British and the French are committing, without being hauled before GATT.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator will find, if he studies the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, that the British and French are not in violation of it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So the British say.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No; I believe he will find they do not violate it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator in one breath accuses me of trying to take economic resources from the peons of Latin America, and on the other hand, argues that in the amendment I have proposed, Latin America is going to get precisely what it would obtain under his bill.

But it is going to get something more: it will get an earmarked fund from the Alliance for Progress on the import fees collected from sugar derived from outside Latin America. We are giving Latin America more. But instead of limiting it to the big planters who are now the favorites of the U.S. State Department, we are going to try to build up the Alliance for Progress in accordance with the ideas of John F. Kennedy, and save something for the poor people of Latin America. There has been a degeneration of American policy in its attitude toward Latin American in the last 9 months.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the Latin American governments are not as backward as they once were? A number of those governments have passed laws requiring sugar producers to share profits with their workers. Other countries have instituted minimum wages, which compel the producer to increase the price at which he was selling. In other countries, they have passed very liberal social security laws and other liberal benefits, as in the Dominican Republic. That nation can relate many of its problems to the high cost of production which followed higher wages and the necessity of providing greater benefits for workers and employees of the sugar companies. It was the efforts on the part of the Cabral government to eliminate some of the higher costs and some of the inefficiencies which accompanied those higher costs that, to a considerable degree, caused the downfall of that government. Under the Bosch government, as the Senator knows, many of the benefits were voted in, and when the successor attempted to get the cost down from 11 cents to around 6 cents a pound, his efforts were so unpopular that he was thrown out.

Mr. DOUGLAS. My friend the Senator from Louisiana, in the statement which he has circulated on the desks of all the Senators, says the adoption of the import fees "would make us what the Communists around the world have pictured us to be in their cartoons: A fat, rich imperialist, wearing a tophat, squeezing the lifeblood out of starving peons."

I point out that under the proposal which I have submitted, the wealthy in Latin America would still get their ounces or their quarts or their gallons of blood that the Senator would give them, but we are trying to get something more for the common people—$20 million a year, roughly, for the common people, through the Alliance for Progress. That is sharing the wealth.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator realize that the way he would obtain this wealth sharing is by squeezing it out of the poor Indians, squeezing it out of the Nationalist Chinese, squeezing it out of the Fiji Islanders and the South Africans—those poor Negroes down there in South Africa—and giving it to Latin Americans, many of whom are better off than they?

Mr. DOUGLAS. In Latin America, only a very few drops would fall from the mouth from Dives into the mouth of Lazarus. In Latin America, most of those gains would be kept by the wealthy planters and used for their own luxuries; in many cases sent abroad and deposited in Swiss banks. The poor would never see it.

The Senator has never believed in the trickle-down theory so far as this country is concerned. But now he is saying that the way to help the poor abroad is to gorge the rich abroad, in the hope that they will disgorge some of it and give it to the poor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator is about 20 years behind the times in the arguments he is making. Earlier in the day the Senator put into the RECORD the subsidies paid to the Hawaiian planters. The fact is that the planters do not get those subsidies. The ILU, that powerful international union, drove a hard bargain with those people. Some of the producers are not even making a profit, while the laborers receive $24 a day.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Latin American workers do not receive $24 a day. The people who have been in Latin America indicate they get somewhere between 80 cents and a dollar a day, at the peak of the cutting season.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. And they would not be getting that much, had the Senator been able to prevail with his full program to cut the price even those nations are getting for their sugar. Those countries have passed laws and are passing laws now, to provide higher minimum wages, profit-sharing arrangements, and various other proposals to assure those laboring people that they will be taken care of.

There is no way by which we can see to it that the business people in Latin America pay their laboring people a decent wage for their labor, unless we hold the price high enough so that those people can make enough money to pay the labor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is not even true in a free society. It is much less true in a society where control of the rights of the working people is exercised by the planter aristocracy.

What the Senator is saying is that there is no further need for the Alliance for Progress, that everything is marvelous in Latin America, that we should enrich the wealthy and they will pass the money on to the poor. He is saying that the rich are so benevolent that they will do that.

It is like the argument of the old British colonials, and like the argument of the rich Latin Americans, who gamble great sums of money on the Riviera in places like Monte Carlo, and then say how good they are to the peons back home.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If those people are so powerful that they can exploit their laboring people, they must be in the position of controlling those governments, and if those governments are that corrupt—and I do not believe they are—then the Senator is making a bad mistake in paying any money to those governments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator will join me, we will do exactly that. It is because of the Senator's intransigence that we are not able to do it. I am begging for a little money for the poor in Latin America. The Senator and the great forces behind him are saying they are not willing to show any mercy to these people.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Illinois must realize that if the planters in any country in Latin America are so powerful that they are able to live in the lap of luxury——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Which they do, of course.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. And make these fantastic profits, and are not willing to share their earnings and profits with their workers, that situation can be the result only of the tremendous power and control they have over their governments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Through the military; yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Those governments have the power to pass laws to provide a minimum wage, to provide for a profit-sharing arrangement, and for taxing profits. If a government were so corrupt——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not corrupt, but selfish.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If they are so selfish and greedy that they have little or no regard for the masses of the people, the Senator is making a mistake in suggesting that we pay any money to those governments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would like to apply the fee to all sugar importers. However, I have canvassed the Senate, and I find that I cannot get very far with such a proposal. Therefore, I am taking this mild step.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator has not gotten very far with that program. The Senator started about 17 years ago by trying to put the Louisiana sugar farmers out of business.

We were to go out of business, and after we went out of business presumably we would have bought from Latin American countries.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They would have been able to produce a great deal of it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. At least, we are willing now for the Latin American countries to obtain a price that will enable them to earn a living, but now the Senator is proposing that we take other people who were friendly, helpful, and loyal to us in times when we called upon them to sell us sugar, and make them settle for a price less than their cost of production.

I submit that in a great many countries where the Senator's amendment would be applicable, he would be taxing some of the poorest people in the world such as the Indians and the Africans, in order to benefit Latin Americans.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is making quite a series of assumptions. He is assuming that the import fees would come out of the pockets of the poor and not out of the swollen income of the wealthy. It would be expended for the benefit of the poor in Latin America.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator was in the committee room when I asked a witness from the Department of Agriculture if the Department was going to require these people to sell for a still lower price, below their price of production, and if they cut their price below the price of production where would the cut be taken from? His testimony was that the only place would be to take it out of the pockets of the working people by reducing their wages.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Take it out of the profits. Take it out of the rents. The Senator made the statement that this was immoral. What were the other adjectives?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I did not say it was immoral. Representative COOLEY wrote the letter in which he said it was immoral. I said that it would break our word.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator implied that the State Department was bitterly opposed to it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The State Department is opposed to it.

STATE DEPARTMENT SHIFTED

Mr. DOUGLAS. The interesting thing is that last December the State Department was in favor of it and remained in favor of it until this summer. The State Department was strongly in favor of it. The Department of Agriculture was also in favor of it. When I devised my plan of import fees, I consulted both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State. They helped me work out the details. They were for the plan as late as last December. It was not immoral then. It was not a violation of international agreements then. No; that was their plan then. But, something happened.

Frankly, I believe that what happened was that Thomas Mann became Under Secretary of State and he has always been opposed to the plan. He has consistently opposed the plan. He helped defeat it in 1961. He was not around in 1962. But we passed it in 1962 with the help of the State Department. It was upheld on the Senate floor. The State Department wanted it passed then. There was an uproar on the floor of the Senate as I remember. I will not go into the nature of that uproar except to say that it met with great opposition from the planters.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I helped to pass the plan which the Senate put into effect. I regret to say that it did not work out the way we believed it was going to work out. In my judgment, it created a great deal of ill will in Latin American countries. They wished very much to be relieved of the import fee. Here is the document in which the President himself went on record against import fees.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The ill will came from the big planters.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It created ill will in Latin American countries.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The ill will came from those who, in general, come to this country as Ambassadors and Ministers representing their countries. They are the ones who give the cocktail parties, and so on. They are the ones who wear the long tail coats and the striped trousers and call upon the State Department. They are the "buddies" of our Foreign Service officers. They wield great influence. In spite of all that, the State Department held strong until this summer.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I regret that Representative COOLEY must be held up to censure in order to get this bill passed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have never held him up to censure.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Drew Pearson——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I like Mr. Pearson, but Mr. Pearson and I are not in partnership.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Drew Pearson said that the man should be censured. Many persons have criticized him viciously. A popular cartoonist has drawn some of the most horrible cartoons depicting corruption about him, just by doing what that man thought he should do. I think he is an honest man.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now the Senator is getting out his "crying towel." He is weeping into the "crying towel" because he says there are persons libeling Mr. COOLEY.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We all know that every Washington lawyer, even though he is completely legitimate in every way and has never been known to engage in any improper practice whatever, when he represents his clients, is sometimes held up to opprobrium and scorn. Then, some of us, because we represent States which produce sugar have felt some of the offshoot of that kind of criticism. However, I regret to say that now, even the President, in addition to these fine Ambassadors, have to be placed in the light that even they have no interest in the people they represent. I would hope that some day we could look upon this kind of legislation as being just what it is——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope so, too.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. A vital adjunct to the Alliance for Progress——

Mr. DOUGLAS. A steal from the American consumer.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I deeply regret that the Senator takes that attitude.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not take the attitude that price supports on corn are a steal from the American consumer.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not, either. I think we should do everything possible to help the honest farmer try to make an honest living.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not take the attitude that price supports for wheat are of that sort.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I never have taken the attitude that the minimum wage law is a steal from the American consumer on the theory that he might get things a little cheaper if labor worked for reduced wages.

I am pained to hear anyone suggest that when a Senator stands on the floor of the Senate and tries to see that his sugarcane farmers and his sugarcane mills operate at a price which will permit them to stay in business, they are stealing from the American consumer.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President—Mr. President——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. What about the high interest rates that benefit the high money market in the North?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask leave to withdraw the words "steal from the American consumer," and to substitute instead, "legal purloining of monetary purchasing power from the indigent."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I suggest that the Senator leave it the way it is. Let me say to my good friend from Illinois that I do not know why, when someone comes from a State which produces oil, he has to be placed in the category as though he were trying to do something criminal or corrupt simply because he tries to represent the legitimate interests of his people. Why should anyone representing a State which produces sugar, cotton, or any other commodity for that matter, be held up as being something evil? The Senator does a magnificent job representing the State of Illinois and the people of his State.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now the Senator is crying over the much abused oil industry, and I am going to give him a handkerchief into which he can shed his tears.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It reminds me of the lines from Alice in Wonderland:

> "I weep for you," the Walrus said:
> "I deeply sympathize,"
> With sobs and tears he sorted out
> Those of the largest size,
> Holding his pocket-handkerchief
> Before his streaming eyes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I regret to say that the profits of the oil industry are less than the average of those for all manufacturers. That is certainly true of the domestic oil industry. That is a very much misunderstood fact.

I have heard people say that because it does not pay as much taxes as it should, the oil industry is a highway robber. The fact is that the oil industry pays more taxes than do other industries, on the average. The oil industry pays a great deal more of local, State, and property taxes, than does average, overall industry. When one takes all those factors into account, the oil industry is a far heavier taxpayer.

The Senator from Illinois opposes the domestic sugar industry. I fear the fact that he has had little success in that opposition has led him to make his present proposal. I hope the Senator will not proceed to squeeze the life blood out of the Indians, the Fiji Islanders, the Negroes——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I offer the Senator a second handkerchief.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana (continuing). In order to take care of the Alliance for Progress. If we want to help the Alliance for Progress, let the people of this country do it. We can afford foreign aid, but the Indians cannot afford it.

The Senator from Illinois had made me several gifts of handkerchiefs. I do not need the gifts. I probably could do without them better than he. Instead of taking this money away from the starving Hindus, the Fiji Islanders, the Mozambiques, and other African people, the Senator would be in a better position to take these gifts and send them to India, the people who would be further impoverished as a result of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this discussion has gone on long enough. Every time I show up one of the sophisms of the Senator, he slides off to another subject and ranges all over the world, and he has accomplished what my friend may have wanted to do in the first place, namely, to get the Record so cluttered up so that no Senator will be able to get any sense out of it and will miss the strong logical argument which I have made. So I postpone this discussion until tomorrow.

Very large amounts of money are at stake. We entered into the coffee agreement, which will mean a cost of tens of millions of dollars a year. We will have the sugar agreement, costing many tens of millions of dollars. We have been warned that a cocoa agreement is coming. The burden of supporting the food prices of the world is too much for the United States to bear.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I started to take note of the Senator's speech by saying that the Senator was so generous in yielding to me that I do not think I would be justified in discussing the matter more than a few additional minutes.

I believe I started by saying that the world market that the Senator talks about is not really only 6 million tons, but the world market amounts to 58 million tons, which is produced and sold under the laws of the various countries which produce it and under international arrangements, such as our arrangement, and such as the British, French, and Russian arrangements. So the price is represented by the 58 million tons paid for by consumers all over the world, and not by the 6 million tons of dumping ground sugar that is properly the world price for sugar.

If one looks at the prices that the different nations that are large importing nations pay for sugar, the price is in line with what this country pays.

When the Senator from Illinois suggested that beet sugar had something to do with the matter, I say he was moving from sophistry to sophistry. He was not discussing the issue. Some farmers cannot produce cane sugar, but they can produce beet sugar, and there is a large amount of beet sugar produced in this country.

So while the Senator from Illinois has said that I moved from sophistry to sophistry, it seems to me he moved from fallacy to fallacy.

Then he proceeded to make the argument which suggested that the global price system would produce a higher price. It is basic to the law of economics—and the Senator from Illinois is an eminent economist; he was a professor of economics; it would be sophomore economics, or freshman economics at Louisiana State University—that if someone tries to buy something at a very low price, he cannot expect the person producing that product to continue to produce it. When that producer stops producing it, the supply becomes scarcer. When the supply becomes scarce, the price goes up. If the people cannot get enough of that product, the price skyrockets. That is what happened when we had a scarce supply before. It was not because of the price so much as the conditions of weather and the failure of the Communist sugar crop in Cuba. They were the main factors for the scarcity.

But people will not produce sugar if they are not paid a price that makes it worthwhile. I have known of producers who have had their people plow up the remaining stalks in the ground, which could have produced two or three more times, simply because there was no reasonable price and they were not making a profit. I have known of people who could have had two or three more harvests out of the same seeds, but they simply plowed them up. They did not want to get into that production again.

That is what would happen if we forced our trading partners to sell us sugar below the cost of production.

CHANGE OF CONFEREE—SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] be substituted for the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] as a conferee on S. 2118.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN NICKEL FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask that a message from the House on H.R. 10305 be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10305) to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 124,200,000 pounds of nickel from the national stockpile, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Symington, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Miller, and Mr. Tower conferees on the part of the Senate.

RELEASE OF CERTAIN QUANTITIES OF ZINC FROM EITHER THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE OR THE SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE, OR BOTH

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 9047.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9047) to authorize the release of certain quantities of zinc from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Symington, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Miller, and Mr. Tower conferees on the part of the Senate.

STATUS OF H.R. 7502 RELATING TO CERTAIN CASUALTY LOSSES ARISING AS A RESULT OF MAJOR DISASTERS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I thought it might be well if I made a statement as to my understanding of the status of H.R. 7502. As passed by the House, this bill dealt only with the treatment of certain casualty losses arising as a result of major disasters. Generally, the House bill applied to taxable years ending after November 30, 1964, in order to be sure and make provision for certain floods and storms in the Northwest occurring in December of 1964. In one minor area where this bill gave a more limited rule than under present law, the House bill provided that the amendment be applicable in taxable years ending after the date of enactment of the bill.

The Committee on Finance has made no change in this bill as passed by the House, but has added a series of other amendments to the bill. At the time the committee tentatively added these provisions, we thought that it would be possible to complete action on this bill this year. However, due to problems we have had with the Dirksen amendment, No. 426, relating to consolidated returns, the committee decided to postpone completion of its action on this bill until early next year. This was done without prejudice toward those provisions which had already been tentatively adopted by the committee and may still be adopted by the committee.

The committee also decided that in taking this action the fact that final action would not be taken on this bill until next year would not affect the effective dates of amendments already tentatively adopted by the committee this year. The committee is often reluctant to adopt retroactive provisions and had we merely postponed the action on the bill until next year, some might have argued that provisions which applied in 1965, for example, were retroactive. The point is, however, that had we been able to complete our action this year as initially contemplated, such amendments would not have been retroactive.

I thought it might be useful if I summarized my understanding of the effective dates of the principal provisions tentatively added to this bill by the committee for purposes of record.

One provision added by the committee to this bill dealt with recoveries of foreign expropriation losses. The effective date for this provision in most cases is for recoveries in taxable years beginning after December 31, 1964. However, one aspect of this provision dealt with the restoration of value of certain securities. This is the new section 80 which would be added to the Internal Revenue Code. This amendment is made effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1965.

A second amendment added by the committee relates to the deductibility of assessments by soil and water conservation districts. This provision, in general, applies to amounts paid or incurred after December 31, 1963. It also applies to assessment payments made after December 31, 1960, and before January 1, 1964, if these assessments could have been paid in a series of payments after December 31, 1963, but only to the extent so payable.

A third amendment added by the committee enlarges the limitation on the 7-percent investment credit. The committee amendment provides that instead of $25,000 plus 25 percent of tax liability in excess of that amount, the new limit is to be $25,000 plus 50 percent of the tax liability in excess of that amount. In addition, the amendment extends the period over which the unused credit may be carried forward by regulated transportation companies from 5 years to 7 years. The 50-percent limit is to apply with respect to computations made in taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1965. The amendment applying with respect to the investment credit carryovers will apply to computations made in 1965 and subsequent years even though the carryovers of unused credits may have arisen in the years 1962, 1963, or 1964. A special provision is also inserted which has the effect of providing that the 50-percent limitation and the 25-percent limitation will be prorated where the taxpayer's fiscal year straddles the January 1, 1965, date.

A fourth amendment added by the committee enables universities to treat for tax purposes, as if they were qualified plans, certain unfunded retirement programs for their employees where specified conditions are met. This affects the status of these plans for income, estate, and gift tax purposes. This amendment also makes sure that the 20-percent limit in present law applicable in the case of tax-exempt organizations take into account all of the pension payments which may be paid to a teacher or professor and not merely the funded portion. The income tax amendments made insofar as they provide more liberal treatment apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1964. Insofar as they restrict present law, the income tax amendments apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1965. The estate tax amendment applies to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1964, and the gift tax amendments apply with respect to calendar years after 1964.

A fifth amendment added by the committee amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to change the fraud penalty under the estate tax provision from "50 percent of the tax" to "50 percent of the deficiency." This will apply to all estates which were open in August of 1965.

The sixth amendment added by the committee provides that distributions made by a subchapter S corporation within 3½ months after the close of the corporation's taxable year are to be treated as if they had been distributed on the last day of the taxable year. This is designed to eliminate the "bunching" of income in a single year. This amendment applies with respect to all distributions made on or after the date of enactment of the bill. It also applies on an elective basis with respect to distributions made on or after January 1, 1965. Some consideration was also being given to applying this to certain earlier years.

A seventh amendment added by the committee also relates to subchapter S corporations. In general terms, it prevents a corporation from electing subchapter S treatment for 1 year, making a capital gains distribution in that year, and then reverting in the following year to ordinary corporate treatment. Under specified conditions, it provides for the imposition of the capital gains tax at both the corporate and individual level. The amendments made by this provision apply with respect to taxable years beginning after the date of enactment of this bill.

An eighth amendment added by the committee provides that certain proprietorships and partnerships electing to be treated like corporations can subsequently actually become corporations without the payment of capital gains tax on the appreciation in value of the property and without payment of a tax on the accumulated earnings. It also provides that subchapter R of the code which provides this treatment is to be repealed. The provision for converting one of these partnerships or proprietorships to a corporation is to be effective with respect to transactions after the date of enactment of the bill. The repeal of subchapter R is to be effective on January 1, 1969.

A ninth amendment added by the committee provides that income derived from tangible personal property arising from the creative efforts of the individual involved is to be treated as earned income for purposes of the self-employed retirement provision commonly referred to as H.R. 10. This amendment is to apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1964.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon convening tomorrow and immediately after the prayer the time up until 9:15 a.m. be allocated for the transaction of routine morning business and that the statements made therein be limited to 3 minutes; that at 9:15 a.m. the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] be recognized and that the time up to 10:00 a.m. be allocated to the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]; and that at 10 a.m. the time limitation on the sugar bill previously agreed upon commence to run.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the discussion and the vote on the sugar bill, the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 11588, the supplemental appropriation bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 20, 1965, at 9 a.m.

* * *

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used these words of Scripture: John 3: 17: *For God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through Him might be saved.*

Eternal God, as we invoke Thy blessing, inspire us to have a greater faith in the primacy and potency of the moral and spiritual values which Thou hast ordained.

Grant that in this turbulent and troubled world in which many of the old securities and foundations are being severely shaken, may our own minds and hearts be tempered with that calm and serene spirit which finds its refuge and strength in Thee.

May the principles of democracy, which we profess and affirm, be a more vital force in our own land and in all places where men and nations are struggling for freedom and peace.

Show us how the selfish and supercilious spirit, which engenders hatred and strife, may give way and be superseded by a spirit that fulfills itself in peace and good will.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5217. An act to permit the vessel *Little Nancy* to be documented for use in the coastwise trade;

H.R. 9495. An act to increase the appropriation authorization for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9545. An act providing for the acquisition and preservation by the United States of certain items of evidence pertaining to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy;

H.R. 10198. An act to amend the requirements relating to lumber under the Shipping Act, 1916;

H.R. 11420. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide certain mailing privileges with respect to members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 397. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the United States to transfer from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency title to certain real property in said District.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the House amendment with an amendment to the bill S. 2092, an act to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit marketing orders applicable to celery, sweet corn, limes, or avocados to provide for paid advertising, in which concurrence of the House is requested.

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, one of the items remaining on the list of bills reported by committee and pending action on the House floor is S. 2294, a bill to extend the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949, as amended, for 1 year.

In view of our efforts to complete the first session of this Congress as soon as possible and in doing so to complete action on those bills which are essential to the continuation of the orderly business of this Government in the months ahead—until the 2d session of the 89th Congress is back here to work—we will not be able to act on S. 2294. In making this announcement I would also like to emphasize that this in no way should be interpreted as an indication of the attitude of the majority toward the matter of the International Wheat Agreement. It is, instead, a matter of priority scheduling.

The purpose of S. 2294 is to extend the basic wheat agreement authority until August 1 of 1966. The U.S. Senate has ratified the protocol extending the treaty. Under our Constitution the effect of the ratification by the U.S. Senate is to approve the terms and conditions of the agreement and to permit and authorize our Government to obtain the benefits and to carry out our obligations and responsibilities under it. Failure by the House to act on S. 2294 will in no way interfere with those responsibilities and obligations. There is ample authority under the basic CCC Charter Act for the Secretary of Agriculture to meet our responsibilities and obligations under the International Wheat Agreement. This does not mean that S. 2294 is unnecessary or could or should be tabled permanently. It does mean that it is a matter which could be dealt with early in the 2d session of the 89th Congress without causing any undue harm or damage to our responsibilities under that international agreement.

Again, Mr. Speaker, to avoid any misunderstanding on the part of U.S. farmers or on the part of other peoples throughout the world, may I again emphasize that our deferment of action on this legislation should not be interpreted as indicating that the House is opposed to the agreement negotiated by our representatives and ratified by the Senate early this year. There may be judgments or opinions as to whether this type of agreement should be continued in the years ahead. This we will have ample time to deal with, but it is not appropriate to do that with regard to S. 2294.

Mr. **ASHLEY**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **ALBERT**. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. **ASHLEY**. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Trade, which has jurisdiction over this legislation, I would like to reiterate and give emphasis to the comments of our distinguished majority leader.

BANK MERGER ACT

Mr. **ASHLEY**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill S. 1698, as amended.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD**. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader as to the schedule for tomorrow for the benefit of the Members.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, will my distinguished friend yield to me?

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD**. I am glad to yield.

Mr. **ALBERT**. I am glad that the distinguished minority leader has made this inquiry, because we do want to keep Members of the House informed on the prospective program. It is our plan tomorrow to call up two very important conference reports; first, the conference report on the higher education bill and, second, the conference report on the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill, the public works bill, in that order. Beyond that I will say to the distinguished minority leader that I am unable to advise when other conference reports may be made in order.

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD**. There is no other business aside from the Private Calendar that is anticipated today?

Mr. ALBERT. I think the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has two matters to be brought up under unanimous consent. Also, perhaps the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] have some unanimous-consent matters to bring up.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And after the two conference reports tomorrow it would be the plan or the program of the majority to continue down the business scheduled on the whip notice?

Mr. ALBERT. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. As I understand it, one of the conferences as announced by the majority leader to be brought up is that on the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill. The conferees met. They were not in disagreement. It is my understanding that under the rules of the House, and I have the rules before me in Jefferson's Manual, in all cases of conferences asked, the conferees of the House asking it are to leave the papers with the other body. In this instance the Senate asked for the conference and the House concurred in it. The conference was held, and it is my understanding in that instance under the rules it is customary and it is the rule that the House should first act on the conference report. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not his understanding that despite that general rule that the other body in fact keeps the papers, in fact the Senate acted on the conference report contrary to what is the House rule today. Therefore, the matter before the House tomorrow will be the conference report on which the other body has already acted. The only action available to the House is to vote the conference report up or down with no opportunity to offer an amendment to uphold the House position on the Dickey-Lincoln project.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2300) entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

RIVERS AND HARBORS CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CRAMER. In just a moment. I think it is rather fortuitous that the Senate action was just announced. I think there are some basic issues involved here of great importance to this House. First, it was understood at the conference, because the question was asked by a conferee, if it was not true the papers were to be returned to the House under the rules, and the chairman of the conference, the Senator from Michigan, Mr. MCNAMARA, made a statement that that was correct. Despite that the other body kept the papers and I understand the majority members of the conference on our side requested the papers but they were refused. The other body acted first, after refusing to turn over the papers to the House for our action first under the rules. I ask the distinguished majority leader, is it not true the only issue before us now—the Senate having acted—is to vote up or down the conference report, and, of course, the major issue involved is the Dickey-Lincoln project which the House voted down but the conference included? Now the question is to vote the conference report up or down with no opportunity to offer a motion to recommit and thus vote on a motion relating to Dickey-Lincoln separate from a vote on the total conference report.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. BURKE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma to answer the inquiry I have just propounded?

Mr. BURKE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, of course, the final question which the gentleman asks is a question which I think should be addressed to the Chair because it involves an interpretation of the rules. On the first question, whether the Senate did pass the bill first, I think we have the answer. It is my understanding that we will have the opportunity to vote up or down the report, but any question of construction of the rules, of course, should be addressed to the Chair, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I propound my question to the Chair as a parliamentary inquiry. No. 1: Is it not the rule that the body that did not ask for the conference is to receive the papers of the conference? And No. 2: If the other body does act and does not turn the papers over to the House in this instance, is it not true that the only action available in order to consider an individual matter within the confines of the conference is to vote the conference report up or down, in this instance to vote down, the effect being the appointment of new conferees, and perhaps then the issue of Dickey-Lincoln can be raised?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has no knowledge of what happened at the conference. In response to the question of the gentleman from Florida, the Senate having acted first, when the conference report comes up, it will be a question of either approval or disapproval of the conference report.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry, if I may.

No motion relating to a specific matter would be in order, the Senate having acted on the conference report?

The SPEAKER. The answer is that no motion to recommit would be in order, the Senate having acted first.

Mr. CRAMER. And a further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. If, in fact, the House voted down the conference report and we went into a new conference, conferees would be appointed and the bill would be considered anew?

The SPEAKER. That would be a matter for the will of the House.

Mr. CRAMER. But it is possible to do so?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, of course, knows the answer to that question himself; the answer to it is "Yes."

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 372]

Abbitt
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Aspinall
Baring
Bell
Berry
Bingham
Blatnik
Bolling
Bonner
Brock
Brown, Calif.
Callaway
Casey
Clevenger
Culver
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Diggs
Duncan, Oreg.
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Evans, Colo.
Findley
Flynt
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gathings
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Halleck
Hansen, Iowa
Henderson
Herlong
Hosmer
King, N.Y.
Laird
Lindsay
Love
McCarthy
McEwen
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Miller
Mills
Mosher
Nelsen
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Pike
Poage
Powell
Reifel
Resnick
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Schisler
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Va.
Talcott
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tunney
Utt
Vivian
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 353 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MEMORIAL TO FATHER EDWARD J. FLANAGAN, FOUNDER OF BOYS TOWN

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House

Administration, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 641) authorizing Father Flanagan's Boys' Home to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman from Missouri cleared this with the ranking Member on our side?

Mr. **JONES** of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the ranking Member on the Republican side was present at the meeting of the committee this morning when the resolution was unanimously adopted. There was no formal statement agreed to, but he was present at the meeting and, as I say, the joint resolution was unanimously adopted. I did contact the Republican whip and advised him that it would be called up.

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman, under my reservation, give us the aim and objective of the proposal?

Mr. **JONES** of Missouri. I should be happy to do that. I think most people are familiar with who Father Flanagan is. He was the founder of Boys Town. I think most of us are familiar with the fact that Father Wegner succeeded Father Flanagan, came to Washington, and for some time they have planned to erect a memorial to Father Flanagan. This will be without any cost to the Federal Government whatsoever.

The plans and the site of location will be approved by the usual agencies here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD**. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 641

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Father Flanagan's Boys' Home of Boys Town, Nebraska, is authorized to erect a memorial on public grounds in the District of Columbia, or its environs, in honor and commemoration of Father Edward J. Flanagan, founder of the world famous home for underprivileged and homeless boys.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to select, with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission, a suitable site on public grounds in the District of Columbia, or its environs, upon which may be erected the memorial authorized in the first section of this joint resolution. If the site selected is on public grounds belonging to or under the jurisdiction of the government of the District of Columbia, the approval of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall also be obtained.

(b) The design and plans for such memorial shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Capital Planning Commission, and the United States and the District of Columbia shall be put to no expense in the erection thereof.

SEC. 3. The authority conferred pursuant to this joint resolution shall lapse unless (1) the erection of such memorial is commenced within five years from the date of enactment of this joint resolution, and (2) prior to its commencement funds are certified available in an amount sufficient, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, to insure completion of the memorial.

SEC. 4. The maintenance and care of the memorial erected under the provisions of this joint resolution shall be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. **JONES** of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this joint resolution authorizes Father Flanagan's Boys' Home of Boys Town, Nebr., to erect a memorial on public grounds in the District of Columbia, or its environs, in honor and commemoration of Father Edward J. Flanagan, founder of the world famous home for underprivileged and homeless boys.

The selection of the site is the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capitol Planning Commission on public grounds in the District of Columbia, or its environs. If the site is under the jurisdiction of the government of the District of Columbia, the approval of the Board of Commissioners shall also be obtained.

The design and plan for the memorial shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Capitol Planning Commission.

Neither the United States nor the District of Columbia shall be put to any expense in the erection of the memorial.

The maintenance and care of the memorial shall be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior.

BIOGRAPHY OF FATHER FLANAGAN

Born July 13, 1886, Roscommon, Ireland; son of John and Honora (Larkin) Flanagan. Educated: Summerhill College, Sligo, Ireland; Mt. St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md., A.B. 1906, A.M. 1908, LL. D. 1938; St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, N.Y., 1906–07; Gregorian University, Rome, Italy, 1907–08; Jesuit University, Innsbruck, Austria, 1909–12; ordained priest, July 26, 1912, Innsbruck, Austria; St. Benedict's College, Atchison, Kans., L.L. D., May 31, 1939; Creighton University, Omaha, Nebr., LL. D., June 5, 1941. Began career as Catholic priest, 1912. Served at St. Patrick's Church, O'Neill, Nebr., until March 1913. Assistant pastor, St. Patrick's Church, Omaha, Nebr., until spring of 1916. Assistant pastor, St. Philomena's Church, Omaha, Nebr., until December 10, 1917. Started Workingmen's Hotel, Omaha, in 1914. Founded Father Flanagan's Boys' Home for homeless boys, December 10, 1917. Director, December 10, 1917, to May 15, 1948.

Honored by Pope Pius XI on October 23, 1937, by being elevated to domestic prelate with title of right reverend monsignor.

The motion picture, "Boys Town," was made to portray the work of Father Flanagan and his Boys Town, in 1938. Second Boys Town film, "Men of Boys Town," was produced in 1941. Helped to establish Boy Scout movement in Omaha. President of the Omaha Welfare Board for 10 years. Received Humanitarian Award from Variety Clubs of America in 1939. Served as national chaplain of American War Dads, 1945. Named on national panel for study of juvenile delinquency problems by U.S. Attorney General Tom Clark, February 2, 1946. Appointed member of Naval Civilian Committee by Secretary of Navy James Forrestal, April 7, 1947. Member of executive board of Covered Wagon Council of Boy Scouts of America, also national council representative.

In 1947 made trip to Japan and Korea to study child welfare problems at invitation of Gen. Douglas MacArthur and U.S. War Department. Left for Austria and Germany to perform similar mission in spring of 1948. Died, Berlin, Germany, May 15, 1948.

Funeral services for the Boys Town founder were held in the Dowd Memorial Chapel. The sarcophagus is sealed with a marble slab bearing the inscription: "Father Flanagan—Founder of Boys Town—Lover of Christ and Man—July 13, 1886—May 15, 1948."

FACTS ABOUT BOYS TOWN

A home and school for homeless, abandoned, neglected and underprivileged boys, regardless of race, color and creed.

HOW BOYS TOWN WAS STARTED

Boys Town was founded by the late Right Reverend Monsignor Edward J. Flanagan, better known throughout the world as Father Flanagan of Boys Town, on December 10, 1917, with a borrowed $90 to pay the first month's rent on a building at 25th and Dodge Streets in Omaha. The home was started with five boys, three from the juvenile court and two homeless newsboys. In a short time the quarters were crowded, and the home was moved to the German-American Club on South 13th Street, which stood vacant as a result of the war. Here 150 boys could be cared for, but soon quarters became crowded again, and Father Flanagan decided that his next move would be the last, so he purchased the 160-acre Overlook Farm, 10 miles west of Omaha, where the boys would live in a more healthful environment, and where the home could expand as the need required and finances permitted. From this humble beginning, Boys Town has grown until today it comprises 1,500 acres, of which 900 are under cultivation, and more than 50 buildings.

DIRECTOR

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Nicholas H. Wegner, P.A., S.T.D., J.C.L., became director of Boys Town September 15, 1948, succeeding the late and beloved Father Flanagan, Boys Town founder, who died in Berlin, Germany, on May 15, 1948, while engaged in a youth welfare mission for the U.S Government.

Father Wegner was born in Humphrey, Nebr., July 6, 1898. He attended high school and college at St. Joseph Seminary, Teutopolis, Ill., studying philosophy and theology at St. Paul Seminary, St. Paul, Minn., and the Gregorian University at Rome, and church law at the Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C. He was ordained a priest on March 7, 1925, in Rome, and he was assigned as assistant pastor at St. Cecilia's Cathedral in Omaha on September 1, 1925.

Father Wegner's first administrative post was as assistant chancellor of the Omaha archdiocese in 1929. He was promoted to the chancellorship in 1939 and held that position until he was named director of Father Flanagan's Boys' Home in 1948. In 1944 he was honored by Pope Pius by being named a domestic prelate and invested with the title of right reverend monsignor. On September 5, 1959, he was elevated to the dignity of protonotary apostolic by Pope John XXIII, and January 19, 1960, he was named vicar general of the archdiocese of Omaha.

In addition to his office as chancellor, Father Wegner served as director of St. James Orphanage in Omaha for 12 years. He was a close friend of the late Father Flanagan and was associated with him on the board of diocesan consultors for many years. Upon the death of Archbishop James H. Ryan in November 1947, Father Wegner was administrator of the Omaha archdiocese until the installation of Archbishop Gerald T. Bergan.

In addition to his wide administrative experience, Father Wegner is a boy's man. In his youth he turned down two major league baseball contracts to study for the priesthood. As a boy he engaged in all sports.

PRESENT LOCATION

Moved to present location, 10 miles west of Omaha, on U.S. Highways No. 6 and 30–A, on October 17, 1921.

AGE OF BOYS

Boys are accepted between the ages of 10 and 16. Boys can remain until they have completed their high school education.

NUMBER CARED FOR

More than 9,000 boys have called Boys Town their home. One thousand Boys Town graduates saw service during World War II, and 40 gave their lives for their country; several hundred graduates saw service during the Korean war, and four lost their lives in military service.

PRESENT FACILITIES

Boys Town has facilities for 900 boys, 500 of high school age, and 400 of grade school age.

BUILDING FACILITIES

Grade school section: Grade school building gymnasium, dining hall, four apartment buildings, each having four apartments, chapel, dental and medical center, and orientation center.

High school section: Modern high school building to accommodate 500 students, trade school building, dining hall and recreation center, auditorium, administration and welfare building, 25 cottages to house 20 boys each, reception center, field house and visitors' center.

Farm: Dairy barns pasteurizing building, root cellar, farm residences, miscellaneous storage barns, 900 acres of farm land, including a 60-acre vegetable garden.

HOW BOYS TOWN IS SUPPORTED

Boys Town is supported entirely by voluntary contributions from people who believe in Father Flanagan's philosophy that "there is no such thing as a bad boy." Boys Town has never received any support from any church, or local, State, or Federal agency.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF FATHER FLANAGAN'S BOYS' HOME

The board of trustees is interdenominational and consists of 10 members. "Father Flanagan's Boys' Home, Boys Town, Nebr.," is the legal name of the community. Boys Town has its own post office, and you will find Boys Town, Nebr., listed in your postal directory.

RELIGIOUS TRAINING

Boys Town is nonsectarian. All boys are required to attend religious services. Catholic boys attend their services, and services for non-Catholic boys are conducted by a Protestant minister. Both services are held simultaneously.

SCHOOL SYSTEM

The school system begins with the fifth grade and continues through 4 years of high school. It is fully accredited by the State of Nebraska. The school is conducted by lay teachers, both men and women. In addition to the academic curriculum, Boys Town has an extensive vocational training program, with ceramics, printing, machine shop, auto mechanics, shoe rebuilding, baking, tailoring, vocational agriculture, wood shop, sheet metal and heating and air conditioning, arboriculture, and radio and electronics among the trades taught.

The Boys Town High School is a member of the Nebraska School Activities Association, and participates in activities of the association's program, and also is a member of the North Central Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges.

SELF-GOVERNMENT PROGRAM

The Boys Town self-government program includes a mayor, 4 councilmen, and 25 commissioners, elected for a 6-month term from among the boys, by the boys themselves. Duties of city officials include actual administration of the student government program. A similar self-government program, with a junior mayor, councilmen, and commissioners, is followed in the grade school section. In addition, both the grade and high schools have student government programs.

BOYS TOWN TIMES

The Boys Town Times is published the second Friday of each month by Father Flanagan's Boys' Home. It is a mirror of the activities of Boys Town citizens. Subscription rates are $3 per year.

WHERE BOYS COME FROM

Boys come from every State of the United States and the territorial possessions of the United States.

ATHLETICS

A comprehensive grade and high school athletic and intramural recreation program is directed by Maurice H. "Skip" Palrang, athletic director and head coach. Football teams have played from coast to coast. Other interscholastic sports in which Boys Town high school teams participate are basketball baseball, track, wrestling, swimming, and tennis.

WELFARE DEPARTMENT

Father Flanagan's Boys' Home maintains a professional welfare staff, with qualified social workers.

VISITORS

Visitors are always welcome to visit Boys Town to inspect our facilities. Visitors are requested to register at the visitors' center, which is located at the main entrance to Father Flanagan's Boys' Home, just beyond the Boys Town pylon. Visiting hours are from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. on week days, and from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Sundays.

BOYS TOWN BAND

A 50-piece concert band, a 15-piece concert orchestra, and a 15-piece Pep band have appeared throughout the Midwest.

BOYS TOWN CHOIR

The Boys Town Choir of 50 voices made a concert tour of the Midwest and East in 1946. Since that time, the choir makes an annual concert tour which has taken the choristers into most of the principal music halls of the United States, as well as many Canadian cities, and a concert tour of Cuba. In addition to the concert choir, 150 other Boys Town singers are members of the chancel and repertoire choirs.

EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

In addition to the grade and high school extracurricular activities and the Boys Town recreation program, many special programs are maintained to provide leisure-time opportunities for all Boys Town citizens. These include a Boy Scout and Explorer program consisting of eight units, stamp club, a comprehensive 4–H Club program for boys interested in agriculture, model airplane club, and other hobby and craft activities.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank our distinguished Speaker, the Honorable JOHN McCORMACK; the chairman of the Library and Memorials Subcommittee, the Honorable PAUL JONES; and the chairman of the House Administration Committee, the Honorable OMAR BURLESON, and all of my colleagues who have today supported the legislation I introduced to provide a site for a fitting memorial to the founder of Boys Town.

This legislation would authorize Father Flanagan's Boys' Home of Boys Town, Nebr., to erect a memorial on public grounds in the District of Columbia or its environs in honor and commemoration of Father Edward J. Flanagan, who founded the world famous home for underprivileged and homeless boys in 1917.

The legislation would authorize the Federal Government to provide an appropriate site for the monument; Boys Town would then pay all expenses in having a beautiful monument designed and erected upon such ground.

Boys Town, the "City of Little Men," opens its arms and heart to homeless, abandoned, and neglected boys without regard to race, color, or creed. It is supported entirely by private contributions and receives no Federal, State, city, or church aid.

Many of you have seen the famous statue that symbolizes this home-school-city where America's homeless, underprivileged boys are given a good home and are trained and educated for good citizenship. It shows a boy carrying his brother to the entrance of Boys Town. The now famous quotation that accompanies it reads, "He ain't heavy, Father, he's m' brother."

Reporter-columnist, Bob Considine, aptly described Boys Town when he wrote:

BOYS TOWN'S ENTRANCE

Boys Town is a haven. It opens its big, wonderful heart to boys in need of help. It offers comfort, friendship, companionship, training, and a home.

A boy's acceptance is not determined by his religion, nationality, or the color of his face. It is concerned with the boy himself and the task of mending him, if that is needed; gently steering him away from his previous way of life, if that is required; and returning him to society better fitted to face life and its problems than when he entered.

Boys Town is not a fanciful experiment. It has been a going concern for 40 eventful years. Its proud alumni number in the thousands. Its fame has spread across the world in the fields of the arts, sciences, trades, and sports.

FATHER FLANAGAN

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward J. Flanagan, beloved founder of Boys Town, was born in Roscommon, Ireland, July 13, 1886. The end of his remarkable life came on May 15, 1948, while at work in Berlin.

The work he crowded into those 62 years of complete dedication to God and the needs of neglected boys shaped him into an international symbol of spiritual and material hope for millions. Officials of many lands sought the wisdom of plain-spoken Father Flanagan in solving their countries' juvenile problems. The priest gave untiringly of his fountains of natural warmth, holiness, and intelligence. His creation of Boys Town was a miracle. It will stand forever as a monument to this unique humanitarian who gave America and the world a new understanding of the proper care and training of bereft and bewildered boys in need of a friend.

FATHER WEGNER

The torch that dropped from the grasp of Father Flanagan was picked up before it hit the ground by the strong, willing, and sympathetic hands of Rt. Rev. Msgr. Nicholas H. Wegner, father's friend for 25 years. At least two big league baseball clubs had tried to keep this strapping young athlete from Humphrey, Nebr., from entering the priesthood. But his religious call was infinitely stronger. Ordained in 1925 after intensive training that included work at Rome's Gregorian University, Father Wegner held many important posts in the Omaha Archdiocese. His work as chancellor of the archdiocese, and as director of St. James Orphanage from 1936 until his Boys Town appointment brought him in close contact with Father Flanagan, whose funeral oration he was destined to deliver.

Steadfast follower of Father Flanagan's footsteps and philosophy that "there's no such thing as a really bad boy," Father Wegner's duties and responsibilities expand each year—for the simple reason that Boys Town never stops growing.

ADMINISTRATION, WELFARE DEPARTMENT, POST OFFICE

Probably no structure in Boys Town better symbolizes the enormous growth of Father Flanagan's dream of four decades ago than the above building. This is the general headquarters of a mammoth operation which now, among other things, must provide more than 1 million meals a year, full hospital and dental care for hundreds of boys, coordinate the work and curricula of more than 125 teachers, instructors and counselors, and run a big flourishing farm.

The same building houses Boys Town's widely recognized welfare department, whose staff includes a graduate psychiatrist and psychologists trained and experienced in boy guidance work. Complete case histories of all boys are kept here.

The same handsome structure is the home base of one of the more treasured U.S. post offices, the one whose cancellation stamp reads, "Boys Town, Nebr."

RECEPTION CENTER, CAFETERIA FOR VISITORS, PHILOMATIC CENTER

No person was more aware of first impressions than Father Flanagan. His successor, Monsignor Wegner, operates on the same line. The boy's first brush with life at Boys Town may begin in this building.

There is also a cafeteria for visitors located here. Boys Town now ranks as one of the foremost tourist attractions of the Middle West, so far-flung is its fame, so close has it come to the good hearts of Americans everywhere.

HIGH SCHOOL COTTAGE

The first citizens of Boys Town, two lads from the Omaha juvenile court and three homeless newsboys, were sheltered by Father Flanagan in an old red brick building at 25th and Dodge Streets, Omaha. He had borrowed $90 to commence the great work. Today, on its big plot of land outside this thriving Nebraska city, the boys of Boys Town are housed in a manner calculated to make them forget the perhaps tragic past and anticipate the happy future.

GRADE SCHOOL APARTMENT BUILDING

A young, growing boy needs room to breathe and romp to his heart's content, and Boys Town has managed through the years to provide same. Here are the modern, homey apartments housing our grade school boys—and a portion of the wide lawns which are never marred with a "Keep Off" sign.

Here are children going through the process of being reborn. They, who knew poverty, broken homes and even the temptation of crime, now know security, affection, the guidance of good teachers.

HIGH SCHOOL

Five hundred young Americans who might never have made it to high school are now preparing—at beautiful Boys Town High—for college and careers in industry.

They, who once must have felt they had little or no chance to gain the advantages of more fortunate boys, now populate a school duly accredited by the State of Nebraska. Its curriculum compares with any school of its size in the United States.

The march of modern science is keenly understood and appreciated at Boys Town High, whose science classes have been the important steppingstones to more advanced studies. The high school student at Boys Town is a proud, hard-working youngster, determined to take full advantage of the educational opportunities offered by religious and lay teachers. Boys Town's well-used library reflects that zeal.

GRADE SCHOOL

From the very inception of education at Boys Town the keenest kind of attention has been paid to the grade school.

What began largely with Father Flanagan and a few well-worn elementary textbooks has now become a big, first rate, modern grade school filled to the brim with lads developing into fine citizens.

TRADE SCHOOL

Boys Town takes the realistic view, in its educational program, that every boy is not cut out to be a doctor, lawyer, merchant, or chief.

Thus, through the years, it has notably increased its ability to instruct young men in trades which enable them to join the Nation's skilled workpool upon graduation.

TRADE SCHOOL CLASSES

There is abundant reason to believe that many of the boys are now headed for useful lives as good citizens and wage earners.

They are being instructed in the remunerative mysteries of draftsmanship, machine shop and woodworking, sheet metal work, printing, and ceramics.

But there was a time only a few years ago when their prospects were dim indeed. They had no access to such training, no stimulation to embrace it, no encouragement, little guidance that was helpful.

Now they stand on the threshold of a life in which they can make their own way, with apologies to no one. Your contribution to Boys Town's work will make continuation of this training possible.

Give a boy a chance to make something, fix something, improve something, and you can't stop him. That has been a part of Boys Town's philosophy from the start.

Each year about 100,000 loaves of bread, a third of a million sweet rolls and 75,000 donuts, plus 20,000 pies, emerge fragrantly from Boys Town bakeries manned by boys.

Boy barbers give their fellow citizens 20,000 haircuts a year. Boy butchers prepare well over 100 tons of meat each year, plus better than 25 tons of poultry and 10 tons of fish.

The mechanically minded and "fix it" type boy is lured easily enough to stripped down cars, Boys Town vehicles, a complete shoemaking plant, and the "care and feeding" of balky radio and TV sets.

FARM AND DAIRY

One of Father Flanagan's great dreams in the early days of Boys Town was to get his little flock out of the city of Omaha and into the green of the countryside beyond.

His first venture in that direction was the purchase of a 160-acre farm 10 miles west of the city. It has now expanded to more than 1,000 acres, including a modern farm and dairy herd which would have astounded the first Boys Town citizens.

ANIMAL HUSBANDRY

The farm provides meat, milk, poultry products and all varieties of vegetables for the population of Boys Town.

The facilities are proudly manned by the boys of Boys Town, who have set records of efficiency and won scores of prizes in State and national 4-H competitions.

HIGH SCHOOL DINING HALL

The Boys Town High School dining hall has a fine record for perfect attendance.

"The grub is real good," as several generations of Boys Town citizens have attested. It is also plentiful, as plentiful as the contributions of interested Americans can provide.

BOYS TOWN CHAPEL

Boys Town, though directed by Father Wegner, a Catholic priest, is by no means restricted to Catholic boys. Its religious staff includes a Protestant minister, and services for Protestant boys are held at the same time as those for Catholic boys. The guiding rule is that each boy, no matter what his religion, must practice its precepts and regulations. Illustrated is one of the Nation's most beautiful churches, Dowd Memorial Chapel, where thousands at Boys Town have worshipped or found solace, and where rest the mortal remains of Father Flanagan.

MEDICAL AND DENTAL

During a typical year Boys Town Hospital received 1,063 boy patients who spent a total of 3,533 days there. Some 349 boys visited the hospital's medical specialists 636 times. Such medical treatment was unheard of in the previous lives of most of the lads.

During the same year, our dentists pulled 271 teeth, filled 1,597 others, made 912 X-rays and gave 896 complete examinations.

FIELDHOUSE

Athletics are as much a part of Boys Town training as is the classroom, the chapel, the shop, and the farm. At Boys Town, attention is paid to General MacArthur's creed, expressed years ago at West Point, that the important battles are won in later life by those who, in school, learned their lessons "on the friendly fields of strife."

Hence this magnificent fieldhouse and gym. Herein blossom nationally famous basketball teams, and hosts of other athletes. Here the boys of Boys Town gain health, a new concept of sportsmanship, and team spirit which were denied them because of their previous environment and insecurity.

ATHLETICS

Sports at Boys Town runs the gamut. The Boys Town football team has played in many of the bigger cities of the United States before enormous crowds.

Boys Town varsity basketball teams have several times been Nebraska high school champions, and their basketball nines, swimmers, and other athletes have competed successfully throughout the country.

But it is equally important to Father Wegner that every boy at Boys Town engage in sports competition, no matter how far below varsity caliber he might be.

Consequently, there is lively competition in all sports on the intramural level, and first-class instruction right down the line.

MUSIC

Music has a tremendous impact on the boys of Boys Town. Boys who were abandoned, homeless and completely remote from music and its charms flock to Boys Town Music Hall and all that it offers to listener and participant in a huge musical appreciation and instrument instruction program.

Tops in high school bands—the crack young band of Boys Town. It has traveled all over the United States with the Boys Town sports team, is versatile enough to break up into dance bands for the proms or combos for jam sessions.

CHOIR

The U.S. Navy's classic slogan, "Join the Navy and See the World," has been borrowed and rephrased by Boys Town. At Boys Town they say, "Make the Concert Choir and See the World."

The voices of the young men of Boys Town have been heard in most of the principal cities of America and around the earth on television and radio. Choir work is a "varsity" undertaking at Boys Town, engaged in by plunging fullbacks as well as fifth grade boy sopranos. In a recent year, 200 of the 900 citizens of Boys Town "went out" for choir.

BOYS TOWN COUNCIL MEETING

Father Wegner believes that boys should learn as soon as possible the rights and duties of life in a democracy. Good citizenship, he feels, can be taught by turning many phases of the government of Boys Town over to the boys themselves. Boys Town has its mayor, its council, its commissioners. There are two elections a year, a safeguard against "monopoly" and "machine." Candidates for office follow hallowed American traditions: they make speeches, pledge reforms, provide entertainment.

SCOUTING AND HOBBIES

All healthful enterprises are encouraged at Boys Town. Here, Father Wegner congratulates a well-decorated Boy Scout (one of more than 300 at the school).

Companionship and teamplay, two priceless ingredients in the American character, are given every chance to bloom at Boys Town.

Since its very origin, Boys Town has created a family atmosphere of share-and-share-alike which has bound its citizens together with warm affection, so desperately needed by most of those who come to Boys Town.

COMMENCEMENT

Each year, in June, those boys who have completed their education at Boys Town receive their high school diplomas. In addition, many of them also receive a certificate of proficiency in one of the 15 trades taught here.

All of these boys had tough going as children, or they would not have been at Boys Town. They came here as youngsters in overalls or whatever clothing they had. Many have been here 7 or 8 years; the average stay is 4½ years.

Now they are sure of themselves because they have known friendship and love, have lived under their own self-government, and are not worried about the future or their ability to earn a living.

They are "Men of Boys Town," more than 8,000 of whom are found in all the professions and walks of life.

PHILOMATIC CENTER

The Philomatic Center, which was opened 5 years ago, is one of the major attractions for many visitors. Among its exhibits are very valuable stamps and currencies collections from almost every country; hundreds of articles of historical interest; the "Golden Oscar," the award given to Spencer Tracy for his superb acting in the movie "Boys Town"; and many other items of interest both to young people and adults.

Mr. Considine concludes his remarks with the following:

Boys Town opens its arms and heart to homeless, abandoned, and neglected American boys between the ages customarily covered by the fifth grade of grammar school and the fourth year of high school.

It has been my privilege off and on for the past 20 years to see this magnificent dream of Father Flanagan grow into the reality of the fine organization which Father Wegner heads today. Boys Town is a thrilling American success story, but it differs from other success stories in that it can never lower its standards, never cease working, never turn away a boy in true need of its care.

It has literally prospected among the dregs of U.S. youth and mined pure gold. It has made fine citizens out of thousands of boys simply by recognizing their inherent goodness and giving the the opportunity to develop it.

Father Wegner's bill of particulars is more to the point:

"Our program at Boys Town is simple," he says. "We strive to give the boys a good education, both academically and from a trade standpoint. We believe that every boy deserves encouragement, religious guidance, direction, love, and care."

Boys Town is supported entirely by the freewill donations that come to it from people in all walks of life who believe an underprivileged boy has a right to make the most of his life. It gets no Federal, State, city, or church aid. On you and me depend its life.

It is very appropriate to have a monument in our Nation's Capital in memory of Father Flanagan, a man who spent practically his entire life in the rehabilitation and education of homeless and unfortunate boys. During his 62 years of life, Father Flanagan's complete dedication to God and the needs of neglected boys shaped him into an international symbol of spiritual and material help for millions.

Father Flanagan served with distinction as a member of a national panel for the study of juvenile delinquency sponsored by the Federal Government. He was a member of the Naval Civilian Committee, national chaplain of American War Dads, and was the recipient of the Humanitarian Award of the Variety Club of America.

Father Flanagan passed away suddenly in Berlin, Germany, on May 15, 1948, where he had gone at the request of our Government to advise with our military and civil authorities regarding the best methods to properly care for the thousands of homeless children there who were the victims of World War II. He was buried in the Boys Town Chapel.

It is hoped the memorial to this dedicated American can be erected in time for the 50th anniversary of the founding of Father Flanagan's Boys Town in 1967.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the resolution prior to its adoption, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 9567, THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House conferees of the Committee on Education and Labor have until midnight tonight to file the conference report on H.R. 9567, the Higher Education Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

INCREASES IN RATES OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 168) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and consider the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, line 9, strike out "315(a) (1)" and insert "315(1)".

Page 4, line 5, strike out "315(a) (1)" and insert "315(1)".

Page 6, strike out all after line 8 over to and including all of the table following line 10 on page 7.

Page 8, line 1, strike out "SEC. 5" and insert "SEC. 4".

Page 8, strike out lines 4 to 11, inclusive.

Page 8, line 12, strike out "SEC. 7" and insert "SEC. 5".

Page 8, line 19, strike out all after "area" down to and including "Attaché" in line 21.

Page 9, strike out all beginning with line 1 over to and including 12 on page 11.

Page 11, strike out lines 13 and 14, and insert:

"SEC. 6. (a) Subsection (c) of section 5033 and paragraph (3) of section 5035(b) of title 38, United States Code, are hereby repealed; and paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 5035(b) of such title are hereby redesignated as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively."

Page 11, strike out all after line 17 over to and including line 10 on page 12.

Page 12, after line 10, insert:

"SEC. 7. Section 503 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting '(a)' after '503', and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, in the case of any individual—

"'(1) who, for the month in which the Social Security Amendments of 1965 was enacted, was entitled to a monthly insurance benefit under section 202 or 223 of the Social Security Act, and

"'(2) who, for such month, was entitled to pension under the provisions of this chapter, or under the first sentence of section 9(b) of the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959,

there shall not be counted, in determining the annual income of such individual, any increase in benefits under such sections of the Social Security Act which resulted from the enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1965.'"

Page 12, line 11, strike out "SEC. 11" and insert "SEC. 8".

Page 12, line 12, strike out "4, and 5" and insert "and 4".

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in Senate amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, and 13.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to disagree to Senate amendments 6 and 11.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the gentleman's motion. Senate amendment No. 11, Mr. Speaker, added a section providing that the recent social security increase shall not be counted as income for veterans' pension purposes. For those veterans who were in receipt of pension on July 30, 1965, the gentleman's motion would place the House in disagreement with this Senate amendment. My first inclination, Mr. Speaker, was to support this Senate amendment because it permits approximately 30,000 persons on the Veterans' Administration pension rolls to receive the minimal increase in monthly Social Security benefits without affecting their veteran's pension. After careful analysis of the Senate amendment, the controversial atmosphere in which it is being considered, its discriminatory aspects insofar as they concern the income of pensioners who are not in receipt of social security as well as other factors compel me to reluctantly agree with the gentleman's motion.

I firmly believe, Mr. Speaker, that the receipt of this small increase in monthly social security benefits should not serve to reduce or eliminate the veteran's pension received by a veteran or a widow. Senate amendment No. 11, unfortunately, does not help the pensioner who came on the rolls after July 30, 1965. It does not help the pensioner who receives an increase in his monthly Civil Service Retirement Annuity. It does not help the pensioner who receives an increase in his private retirement income. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it helps only 30,000 of the more than 2 million pensioners on the rolls today. This is a stop-gap measure. I would prefer that we provide the relief sought for this relatively small group of pensioners through measures that will apply equitably to all pensioners.

I am particularly concerned about the plight of the widow of a war veteran who must have income of less than $600 annually to qualify for a pension of $64 monthly. I believe that our committee should explore the entire subject of income limitations for pensioners. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to learn that the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veteran's Affairs, has given members of our committee his assurance that the entire subject of income limits for pensioners will be explored early in the next session.

The Nation's major veterans organizations, Mr. Speaker, have proved to be a rather accurate weathervane of the feeling of the Nation's veterans on any issue. I believe it is significant that these organizations, though feeling strongly about the need for providing relief to these 30,000 pensioners, have communicated the view that they would prefer that the fate of the compensation bill not be jeopardized by Senate amendment No. 11.

The bill before us today is basically a bill that provides much needed increases in rates of compensation for the Nation's service-connected disabled and their dependents. Senate amendment No. 11 relates to non-service-connected pension. There is divided opinion in this body as to its merits. I would prefer that the measure of relief sought by this amendment for pensioners be considered separately so as not to delay the service-connected compensation increase upon which there appears unanimous agreement that it is long overdue. In view of the assurance of the gentleman from Texas that the entire subject of income limitation for pensioners will be explored early in the next session, I will not contribute to delaying the approval of compensation increases for disabled veterans. I therefore support the gentleman's motion.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] for their promptness in bringing H.R. 168 to the floor for our action on Senate amendments thereto which were adopted in that body only last Friday. This prompt action offers tangible evidence that the gentlemen share my firm conviction that this bill authorizes a well-deserved and long overdue increase in the monthly rates of compensation payable to the Nation's service-connected disabled veterans. No segment of our population is more deserving of favorable consideration than are these warriors who shed their blood or sacrificed their health in protecting the security of this Nation. Members of this body as well as the other body have repeatedly stressed the fact that the Nation's war-disabled veterans warrant our highest priority consideration. Despite this well-meaning philosophy, the Congress has been required to vote upon social reforms, welfare programs, and increased benefits for various segments of our population. I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, that we show our high regard for the Nation's disabled veterans and their dependents. The bill before us today does just that. I am hopeful that the Senate will assign the highest priority to this measure and send the bill to the White House without further delay.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in Senate amendment No. 5 with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, and on page 8, line 4, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "SEC. 6" and insert "SEC. 5".

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in Senate amendment No. 7 with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken by the Senate amendment, strike out lines 12 through 21, inclusive, on page 8 of the House engrossed bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in Senate amendment No. 8, with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter proposed to be stricken by the Senate amendment, and on page 9, line 1, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "SEC. 8" and insert "SEC. 6".

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in Senate amendment No. 9 with an amendment, as follows:

Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken by the Senate amendment, insert the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and on page 2, line 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "SEC. 6" and insert "SEC. 7".

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in Senate amendment No. 10 with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter proposed to be stricken by the Senate amendment, and on page 11, line 18, of the House engrossed bill strike out "SEC. 10" and insert "SEC. 8".

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in Senate amendment No. 12 with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert "SEC. 9".

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the motions which I have just made in connection with this bill are at the direction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs which specifically considered what action should be taken with regard to the Senate amendments to H.R. 168 in an executive session of the committee, Thursday, October 14, 1965.

Mr. Speaker, I invite the House's attention to the following section from the Senate committee report on H.R. 168, Senate Report No. 861:

> Section 4 of the bill as passed by the House proposes certain changes in the income levels used for determining entitlement of parents to dependency and indemnity compensation. The committee was advised that the Veterans' Administration has presently under examination the question of adequacy of income limitations, exclusions, and rates generally for beneficiaries under the dependency and indemnity compensation program. Accordingly, pending development of the details of any justifiable liberalization of this program, the committee has deleted section 4 in accordance with the Veterans' Administration's recommendation that the limited action provided by that section be deferred at any time.

It is based on the definite understanding that the Veterans' Administration is studying the question of the adequacy of the income limitations and will make recommendations in time for action in the 2d session of the 89th Congress that I have agreed, reluctantly, to concur in the action of the Senate deleting the income limitation increase.

Section 106, title 38, United States Code, subsection (b) provides coverage for compensation and other benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration for any person—

First, who has applied for enlistment or enrollment in the active military, naval, or air service and has been provisionally accepted and directed or ordered to report to a place for final acceptance into such service; or

Second, who has been selected or drafted for service in the Armed Forces and has reported pursuant to the call of his local draft board and before rejection; or

Third, who has been called into the Federal service as a member of the National Guard, but has not been enrolled for the Federal service.

Any person who has suffered injuries or contracted a disease under any one of the three conditions listed above would be entitled to the wartime or peacetime rates of compensation. Section 6 of the House passed version, proposes to make such individuals also eligible for the full benefits of the Veterans Preference Act relating to preference in Federal employment. Section 6 is identical to H.R. 3413 which passed the House May 17, 1965.

The Senate committee removed this section on the grounds of jurisdiction. Our committee disagrees with the Senate committee action and urges the House to again insist on the inclusion of this meritorious provision.

When H.R. 168 was reported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to the House, the committee amendment included a new section proposing to amend the provisions of 38 U.S.C. 230(c). This section had previously authorized the Veterans' Administration to establish and maintain an office in Europe to render technical advice and assistance in administering the various veterans programs in that area. Experience has demonstrated a need for the Administrator to be able to expand the operations of the office now maintained in Rome, Italy, if adequate service to our veterans in Europe would so require. The Rome office serves more than 9,000 veterans residing throughout the 22 nations of Western Europe. I understand that this small office processed nearly 1,600 requests for medical care during the last fiscal year, prepared some 7,000 communications and, during the last two years, the manager or his representative has visited more than 50 embassy and consular posts throughout Europe in an attempt to indoctrinate their personnel, discuss problems, and establish a necessary close liaison between the Veterans' Administration and the Department of State.

Accordingly, the committee proposed to amend the law to state specifically that the head of the European office will be responsible for the performance of any and all duties the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs deems necessary and appropriate. The amendment also provided that the head of the office would be accorded the diplomatic designation of attaché by the Secretary of State, during his tenure in that position.

When the bill was considered by the Senate Committee on Finance, the provision relating to the diplomatic designation was deleted at the request of the Department of State, but with the firm assurance by the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations that prompt administrative action will be taken by the Department to accord such diplomatic designation to the manager of the European office.

It is understood that the other employees of the Veterans' Administration office will be accorded necessary cooperation and recognition to assist their travel in the various countries of Europe.

In light of this assurance, I now feel that the entire section of H.R. 168 relating to the European office may now be deleted. It is my belief that the language of existing law is sufficiently broad to permit that office to perform whatever duties the Administrator deems necessary and appropriate for the adequate administration of Veterans' Administration programs in Europe. As a matter of fact, rendering "technical advice and assistance in the administration of veterans programs" actually amounts to performing the agency's operations in the field of veterans benefits. In addition to the matter of diplomatic designation, the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations has assured me that the Department of State concurs in this conclusion and will in the future interpose no objections to the European Veterans' Administration office performing any and all duties the Administrator delegates to it, or in any way attempt to impede the operations of that office.

With this firm assurance, and since I see no need for a revision of the language of this section, I recommend that section 5 of H.R. 168—as that bill passed the Senate—be deleted.

Mr. Speaker, section 8 of the bill as passed by the House provided that doctors, dentists, and nurses employed in the Department of Medicine and Surgery should be provide protection against malpractice suits by having the district attorney in the appropriate district defend such actions. This section was modeled on the Drivers Liability Act previously enacted. As I understand it, there was no question about the merits of this section but only one of jurisdiction.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs advises me that the Agency strongly supports this legislation, and it is suggested by the Bureau of the Budget that the scope be enlarged to cover paramedical personnel.

It seems to me desirable at the present time that this provision be written into law at the earliest possible opportunity and that any broadening be left for a later date.

Section 9 as passed by the House has been amended by the Senate in a technical fashion, and this relates to funds available for the construction of nursing home beds by the States. I am happy to accept this clarification.

Section 10 sets a ceiling of 125,000 hospital beds and 4,000 nursing care beds. The nursing care beds clearly being in addition to the hospital beds. The Congress has a firm understanding and appreciation of this section, certainly Members of the House do, and this language has been reported to the House in two separate bills and passed the House once.

Section 10, as I understand it, was not deleted in the Senate on the grounds of merit but rather on the grounds of jurisdiction. It seems important to me that the legislative intent in this matter, and which both Houses have agreed, is more important than the jurisdiction question involving two committees. I therefore urge that the House insist on the language appearing in section 10 as reported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and passed by the House.

Members of Congress have received considerable correspondence concerning the effect of the increased social security on the non-service-connected pensions which approximately 2 million people are receiving today under the non-service-connected pension program. Perhaps it is well to bear in mind in the beginning that out of this 2 million we are talking about a group of approximately 29,000—17,000 veterans and 12,000 widows.

In the closing days of the 88th Congress there was enacted Public Law 88-664. It is not necessary in this connection to go into all the details of this legislation. It did increase the rates of pension and provided for the first time a 10-percent exclusion from retirement income in determining the annual income which is countable toward eligibility of a pensioner. The 10-percent exclusion to which I referred permits any individual who is receiving social security, civil service retirement, teacher retirement, railroad retirement, State, municipal, or county retirement, or a retirement annuity from any other source to exclude 10 percent of such amount in determining eligibility under the Veterans' Administration pension program.

There are 1,160,000 veterans receiving disability pension today. Of this number 754,000, or 76 percent, also receive social security; 35,000, or 3 percent, receive railroad retirement; 27,000, or 2.3 percent, receive civil service retirement; and 149,000, or 12.8 percent, receive other retirement from commercial sources.

In the case of death pension, there are currently 878,000 widows and children on the rolls—531,000, or 60.5 percent, receive social security; 37,000, or 4.2 percent, receive railroad retirement; 30,000, or 3.5 percent, receive civil service retirement; and 26,000, or 2.9 percent, receive retirement from other sources.

It is readily apparent to me the injustice these veterans and widows will suffer if we adopt a preferential amendment such as the Miller proposal.

While its application is broad, as I have indicated, it was inspired by the belief that there was to be in the 88th Congress a 7-percent increase in payments being made to beneficiaries under the Social Security Act. All of us know that this expected social security increase legislation did not materialize in the 88th Congress. The pension bill, Public Law 88-664, however, was passed with this 10-percent excursion factor.

There is a new social security law today which was effective October 1. It is Public Law 89-97, and while its main emphasis in the press was on medicare, it did provide a 7-percent increase in social security payments.

The first thing that is evident in this allegation of some pensioners that they have been mistreated is that the 10-percent exclusion is greater than the 7-percent increase.

The second thing that needs be said is that most of the people who are complaining today about having to take a reduction in their Veterans' Administration pension as a result of moving from one income bracket to another have enjoyed a higher rate of pension for 9 months, higher than they would have received had the Congress not enacted Public Law 88-664.

Other additional factors need to be made crystal clear at this time. These are that in comparing 1964 with 1965: Every person gets more pension; everyone gets more social security; a few, approximately 1½ percent, got an additional windfall; everyone continues to get more pension and more social security than they got in 1964; everyone in 1966 will get more pension than he did in 1964.

The amendment added by the Senate would protect forever this discriminatory windfall for these favored few 30,000 pensioners.

It has been the consistent policy of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to recommend to the House, and I am glad to say that the Congress has followed this policy, of endeavoring to make uniform all of the benefits applicable under the pension and compensation programs. We pay these benefits on the basis of proven need and proven disability. If this amendment should be written into law it would be grossly unfair, in my opinion, to the thousands of others who are on the pension rolls who are receiving civil service retirement; railroad retirement; city, State or county retirement; retirement from a teaching position; or retirement from one of the corporations that has its own retirement program. These programs are, as we all know, increased from time to time. Inevitably such change makes a man who is receiving a pension under the Veterans' Administration pension system move from one bracket to another automatically when a change in his income occurs with the resultant reduction in most instances of his Veterans' Administration pension because of increased income from other sources.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard many eloquent pleas in behalf of widows who have allegedly suffered under enactment of these two laws. I feel that the net result of these two laws is a great benefit for all concerned and not a mistreatment. All widows will have more income in 1966 from pension and social security than they had in 1964.

It is the policy of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to periodically review changing economic conditions as they affect both pension and compensation. The bill which we are considering today can be said to have resulted in many of its provisions from changing economic conditions. Pension bills have been enacted such as the existing basic law on this subject, Public Law 86-211, in an effort to modernize this system and bring it up to date based on the economic factors of life. This has been reviewed in the immediate past through the enactment of Public Law 88-664, and in the 2d session of the 89th Congress, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will review the pension program again. However, I am sure that when this review takes place the committee will follow its historic policy in regard to widows and veterans of seeing that any new limitations which may be enacted apply to one and all on an equal basis. It is inconceivable to me that after reviewing such a program that the committee would recommend preference to a few. Rather it will make recommendations to treat everybody in similar circumstance in the same way.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I have made the motion to disagree with this particular Senate amendment. It is certainly unfair to over 98 percent of the non-service-connected pensioners.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point various statements and the text of the letters I have received from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Eastern Paralyzed Veterans, which relate to this subject:

STATEMENT REGARDING MILLER AMENDMENT

At the end of the 88th Congress, when it was thought that social security rates would be increased, Congress amended the VA pension law to permit a 10-percent retirement income exclusion which was designed to offset the proposed social security increase. Originally it was thought that both the VA pension amendment and the social security rate increase would become effective at the same time. The social security increase was delayed until September of this year; however, the VA pension amendments became effective January 1, 1965. For a period of 9 months, certain veterans and widows gained a temparary advantage by using their 10-percent exclusion while waiting for the social security increase to become effective. Comparing 1964 with 1965, we find that—

1. Everyone gets more pension;
2. Everyone gets more social security;
3. A few, 1½ percent, get an additional windfall because of the 9 months difference in the effective dates of the two provisions;
4. Everyone continues to get more pension and more social security in 1966 than they received in 1964. It is not true that the social security rate increase has caused VA pensioners to get less money. All pensioners will get more money as a result of the pension and social security amendments.

The amendment which has been proposed would protect the 1½ percent who have enjoyed the windfall for 9 months.

These points can be demonstrated by reviewing a typical case. This is the case of a single veteran whose only other income, other than pension, is social security:

In 1964, he received $648 per year social security, $840 per year VA pension, with a combined annual income of $1,488 per year.

In 1965, his social security was increased to $696, his veterans' pension was increased to $1,125 as a result of the 9-month windfall which he gained by applying his 10-percent exclusion before the social security amendments took effect. His combined annual income for 1965 is $1,821.

In 1966, social security will be $696, his VA pension $900, and his combined annual income, $1,596.

In comparing income expected in 1966 with income in 1964, we see that this veteran gets $48 per year more money from social security, he gets $60 per year more money from his VA pension, and his total income for 1966 will be $108 per year more than it was in 1964. In addition, for the first 9 months of 1965, he got an extra $225 while waiting for his social security rates to become effective. This is the kind of case that some are saying is losing money, and it is not true,

The so-called Miller amendment added by the Senate is considered inequitable by the Veterans' Affairs Committee. This amendment was carefully considered by the committee, and rejected for the following reasons:

1. It creates a favored few. Those entitled to both pension and social security in July 1965, get their windfall pension protected forever.

Dollars available to meet need do not count for these few (less than 1½ percent of those on the pension rolls).

2. It discriminates against other social security and VA pension recipients identically circumstanced except for the date they qualify for either benefit.

3. It discriminates against all other types of retirement income. No special favor for company pensioners, civil service retirees, city and State retirees, or retired teachers.

4. Designed to protect a few this year—its effect can be widespread and even more discriminatory in future years. Only 1½ percent would benefit from the amendment. But in future years, even 20 years from now, a few dollars of other income could bring this current exclusion into effect for this small group. Administrative problems of controlling this discriminatory exclusion in over 2 million cases and for the lifetime of all potentially affected would be extremely costly.

COMBINED EFFECT OF VA PENSION INCREASE OF 1964 AND SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The 10-percent retirement income exclusion for pension was designed to compensate for 7-percent social security increase.

Bills originally contemplated simultaneous passage and effect.

Pension law passed earlier effective January 1, 1965. Social security delayed to August 30, 1965.

Pension is monthly benefit based on annual income.

COMPARING 1964 WITH 1965

1. Everyone gets more pension.
2. Everyone gets more social security.
3. A few (1½ percent) get an additional windfall.
4. And everyone continues to get more pension and social security in 1966 than they got in 1964.

This amendment would protect forever this discriminatory windfall for these favored few.

A TYPICAL CASE: VETERAN ALONE, SOLE COUNTABLE INCOME IS SOCIAL SECURITY

For 1964: Social security, $648 per year; VA pension, $840 per year; annual combined, $1,488 per year.

For 1965: Social security, $696; VA pension, $1,125 [1]; annual combined, $1,821.

For 1966: Social security $696; VA pension, $900; annual combined, $1,596.

NOTE.—He gets more social security ($48 per year); he gets more VA pension ($60 per year); his total income is increased by $108 per year over 1964.

INEQUITIES OF SECTION 7, SENATE PASSED VERSION H.R. 168

1. Creates a "favored few": Those entitled to both pension and social security in July 1965, get windfall pension protected forever. Dollars available to meet need do not count for these few (less than 1½ percent of rolls).

2. Discriminates against other social security and VA pension recipients identically circumstanced except for date they qualify for either benefit.

3. Discriminates against all other types of retirement income: No special favor for company pensioners, civil service retirees, city and State retirees, or retired teachers.

4. Designed to protect a few this year—its effect can be widespread and even more discriminatory in future years.

Only 1½ percent benefit from amendment. But in future years, even 20 years from now, a few dollars of other income could bring this current exclusion into effect for this small group.

Administrative problems of controlling this discriminatory exclusion in over 2 million cases and for the lifetime of all potentially affected would be extremely costly.

OCTOBER 12, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is to advise you that the Veterans' Administration concurs in the desirability of legislation such as contained in section 8 of H.R. 168, which is identical to H.R. 1800, and is designed to provide for the defense of suits alleging malpractice or negligence in furnishing medical care and treatment against physicians, dentists, and nurses in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

We feel that this legislation would be improved if its protection were extended to paramedical and other supporting personnel.

Sincerely,

W. J. DRIVER,
Administrator.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, D.C., October 14, 1965.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House Veterans' Affairs Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: On October 8, 1965, the Senate Finance Committee favorably reported, with amendments, H.R. 168 to increase the rates of disability compensation to reflect the increase in the cost of living from the year 1933, and for other purposes.

One of the proposed amendments would, in substance, provide that the increases under the Social Security Amendments of 1965 (Public Law 89–97) shall not be counted in determining the annual income of persons entitled to both pension and social security benefits.

The Disabled American Veterans take strong exception to the above described amendment. We think it is not only ill advised and ill considered, but we see it as a positive threat to passage of the bill during the present session of Congress.

The principle purpose of H.R. 168 is to extend a justifiable and desperately needed compensation increase to a large number of veterans who are seriously disabled as a result of military service. To see the bill's chances of approval jeopardized by attaching to it an entirely unrelated pension proposal is indeed a disappointing occurrence for these veterans who have been looking all year to the Congress for a degree of financial relief. It is particularly unfortunate in view of the fact that the so-called Miller amendment, which would serve the same purpose, was attached as a rider to H.R. 227, a bill that was given Senate approval on August 20, 1965.

Moreover, the 88th Congress approved an amendment to the Veterans Pension Act of 1964 which provided for a 10-percent exclusion of payments received under any public or private retirement plan (including social security) in computing income for pension purposes. This 10-percent exclusion was added to the bill in anticipation that legislation to increase social security payments would be enacted during 1964. In view of this, any proposal to grant another exclusion of social security payments for pension purposes is completely superfluous.

Additionally, adoption of the proposed pension amendment would be patently unfair for the following reasons:

It gives no consideration to those veterans whose income is derived from sources other than social security. This is so, despite the fact that these veterans may have the same degree of disability, the same income level, and be in the same age bracket as those veterans whom the amendment seeks to benefit. It totally ignores any veteran who may be eligible for the pension rolls in 1966 or any subsequent year.

Another point of interest which we think merits mention is the fact that only 18,000 veterans of World War I would be affected by the proposed amendment, while 128,000 veterans of the same war would receive increases in their service-connected compensation payments upon passage of the bill. This, we think, is all the more reason why passage should not be imperiled by attaching an impertinent amendment to this most worthy legislation.

For the reasons expressed above, we respectfully urge and fervently hope that you will bring influence to bear upon your colleagues to strike from the bill the pension amendment.

Sincerely,

CHARLES L. HUBER,
National Director of Legislation.

EASTERN PARALYZED
VETERANS ASSOCIATION,
New York, N.Y., October 13, 1965.

Hon. OLIN TEAGUE,
Chairman, House Veterans' Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to express my deep appreciation for your work in providing service-connected compensation increases embodied in H.R. 168. We know that you will continue your efforts to have these increases made law, if at all possible, in this calendar year.

We regret the action of the Senate Finance Committee in attaching a rider, to eliminate the 7 percent social security increase from income computation for non-service-connected pension purposes, to this bill. As you know, we are on record as supporting the elimination of counting social security or other retirement income for non-service-connected pension received by paraplegic or quadriplegic veterans. However, we recognize and appreciate the fact that you anticipated the problem that could arise from the social security pension increase last year by including, in Public Law 88–664, a provision to eliminate 10 percent of social security payments from income computations. Thus, no non-service-connected veteran has been hurt by such benefit increases and, in fact, most are receiving greater pension payments than they did prior to January 1, 1965.

We enclose a copy of a letter written to all members of the Senate Finance Committee stating our position on this issue and requesting that they defer to the House on this item.

We wish to thank you, again, for your continuing regard for, and labors on behalf of, the wheelchair-bound veteran.

Cordially yours,

ROBERT CLASSON,
Executive Director.

OCTOBER 13, 1965.

Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of our wheelchair-bound veteran membership, I would like to express our sincere gratitude for your efforts in having H.R. 168 reported favorably by the Senate Finance Committee. We know that you shall continue your efforts to have these greatly needed compensation increases enacted into law before adjournment of the 1965 session of Congress.

We note that a rider, to eliminate the 7 percent social security increase from income computation for non-service-connected pension purposes, was added to this bill in committee. Although we certainly support any measure which will liberalize pension payments to the non-service-connected veteran, a provision to eliminate 10 percent of social security payments was included in Public Law 88–664 in anticipation of this situation. Therefore, no non-service-connected veteran has been hurt by the 7 percent social security benefit increase and, in fact, most are receiving greater pension payments than they did prior to January 1, 1965.

Realizing that the addition of this rider to what is essentially a service-connected compensation bill might well jeopardize its chances of enactment into law, we respectfully request that this rider be receded in by the Senate.

Thank you again for your deep interest in, and efforts on behalf of, the paraplegic veteran.

Cordially yours,

ROBERT CLASSON,
Executive Director.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Texas, concerning amendment No. 11.

---

[1] The 9-month windfall in 1965 (application of 10-percent exclusion in Public Law 88–664 preceding social security amendments produced the temporary eligibility for windfall rate) is $225.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following those of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AMENDING TITLE 38 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 227) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to entitle the children of certain veterans who served in the Armed Forces prior to September 16, 1940, to benefit under the war orphans educational assistance program, with Senate amendments thereto, and move to concur in Senate amendment No. 1, and disagree to Senate amendment No. 2.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 8, strike out all after "thereof" down to and including "war" in line 10.

Page 3, after line 5, insert:

"SEC. 3. (a) Section 503 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting '(a)' after '503', and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), in the case of any individual—

"'(1) who, for the first month after the month in which the Social Security Amendments of 1965 is enacted, is entitled to a monthly insurance benefit payable under section 202 or 223 of the Social Security Act,

"'(2) who, for such month, is entitled to a monthly benefit payable under the provisions of this chapter, or under the first sentence of section 9(b) of the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959, and

"'(3) whose insurance benefit referred to in clause (1) for any subsequent month is increased by reason of the enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1965,

there shall not be counted, in determining the annual income of such individual, so much of the insurance benefit referred to in clause (1) for any subsequent month as is equal to the amount by which such insurance benefit is increased by reason of the enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1965.'"

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, amendment No. 1 is technical in nature and is made necessary by the enactment of Public Law 89-222 which increased the educational assistance allowances payable under the War Orphans Education Act. It also liberalized the standards of eligibility.

Mr. Speaker, the remarks which I have previously made in connection with the bill H.R. 168, the so-called Miller amendment, are equally applicable to amendment No. 2 of this bill, and do not need to be repeated at this point.

The basic purpose of H.R. 227, to make eligible for the benefits of the War Orphans Education Act, the sons and daughters of veterans who died during peacetime periods after the Spanish-American War, and prior to September 16, 1940, was not changed by the action of the Senate.

As indicated at the time the bill was considered originally in the House, the total cost is not expected to exceed $400,000.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

EXPENSES OF CONDUCTING STUDIES BY THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Administration Committee I call up House Resolution 511, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 511

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service authorized by H. Res. 510 acting as a whole or by subcommittee not to exceed $5,000, including expenditures for employment of staff assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "H. Res. 510" and insert "H. Res. 245 and and H. Res. 595".

Amend the title to read: "To provide funds for expenses of studies authorized by H. Res. 345 and H. Res. 595".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to recommit was laid on the table.

EXPENSES OF AN INVESTIGATION INCURRED BY THE AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE POVERTY WAR PROGRAM

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Administration Committee I call up House Resolution 609 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 609

Resolved, That the expenses of an investigation authorized by H. Res. 94, Eighty-ninth Congress, for the purpose of making a complete evaluation and study of the administration of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, incurred by the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Poverty War Program of the Committee on Education and Labor, not to exceed $200,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistance, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees who will be engaged in the activities of the subcommittee, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House. All amounts authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund by this resolution shall be paid on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$200,000" and insert "$100,000".

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). This is Private Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

BENJAMIN A. RAMELB

The Clerk called the bill (S. 149) for the relief of Benjamin A. Ramelb.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 149

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Benjamin A. Ramelb, of Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii, the sum of $68,240 in full settlement of all the claims against the United States of the said Benjamin A. Ramelb arising out of injuries he received when struck by a United States Army truck at Waialua, on July 2, 1944. The said injuries caused damage to the brain resulting in total and permanent disability: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of $1,500 shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike "legal" and insert "court appointed".

Page 1, line 6, strike "$68,240" and insert "$50.000".

Page 2, line 1, strike "Act" and insert "section".

Page 2, following line 8, insert:

"Sec. 2. That, additionally, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Nicholas Ramelb, father of Benjamin A. Ramelb, the sum of $5,000 in full settlement of all his claims against the United States for expenses incurred in providing necessities for his son, Benjamin A. Ramelb, since the said Benjamin A. Ramelb attained his majority. No part of the amount appropriated in this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. COL. WILLIAM T. SCHUSTER, U.S. AIR FORCE, RETIRED

The Clerk called the bill (S. 919) for the relief of Lt. Col. William T. Schuster, U.S. Air Force, retired.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 919

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Lieutenant Colonel William T. Schuster, United States Air Force (retired), is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $4,153.83, representing the amount of overpayments of longevity pay received by the said Lieutenant Colonel William T. Schuster (retired), for the period from December 27, 1941, through August 31, 1960, as a result of administrative error in the computation of his creditable service for pay purposes. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Lieutenant Colonel William T. Schuster (retired), referred to in the first section of this Act, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 10: After "Act." insert: "No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIGIO CIARDIELLO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1918) for the relief of Eligio Ciardiello.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1918

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a) (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eligio Ciardiello may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARIA FINOCCHIARO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4211) for the relief of Mrs. Maria Finocchiaro.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from California [Mr. Talcott], I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross]?

There was no objection.

ENZO (ENZIO) PEROTTI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4926) for the relief of Enzo (Enzio) Perotti.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from California [Mr. Talcott], I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross]?

There was no objection.

PARIDE MARCHESAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 343) for the relief of Paride Marchesan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 343

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Paride Marchesan may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act, and a petition may be filed in behalf of the said Paride Marchesan by Master Sergeant and Mrs. Harry Simpson, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAVORING THE SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 49) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from California [Mr. Talcott], I ask unanimous consent that this Senate concurrent resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross]?

There was no objection.

EMILIA D'ADDARIO SANTORELLI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2768) for the relief of Emilia D'Addario Santorelli.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2768

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act Emilia D'Addario Santorelli shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JACK RALPH WALKER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5231) for the relief of Jack Ralph Walker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5231

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jack Ralph Walker shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on September 16, 1930.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. HERTHA L. WOHLMUTH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 711) for the relief of Mrs. Hertha L. Wohlmuth.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 711

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of section 32(a)(2)(D) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, Mrs. Hertha

L. Wohlmuth of Munich, Bavaria, United States Zone, shall be held and considered to have been a United States citizen at all times since December 7, 1941, and any notice of claim filed under such Act by the said Mrs. Hertha L. Wohlmuth within six months after the enactment of this Act shall be deemed to be timely filed.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALBERT CARTER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3537) for the relief of Albert Carter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3537

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Albert Carter, of Bemidji, Minnesota, the sum of $430.28. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Albert Carter against the United States for refund of the Federal tax (imposed by section 4081 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) paid by him on ten thousand seven hundred and fifty-seven gallons of gasoline, which drained out of his storage tank and was lost as a result of an accident caused by an unknown trespasser on the said Albert Carter's property on March 24, 1963. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY F. THOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3758) for the relief of Mary F. Thomas.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall]?

There was no objection.

OSMUNDO CABIGAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5838) for the relief of Osmundo Cabigas.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from California [Mr. Talcott], I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall]?

There was no objection.

FRANK E. LIPP

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1407) for the relief of Frank E. Lipp.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross]?

There was no objection.

F. F. HINTZE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 337) for the relief of F. F. Hintze.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 337

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That F. F. Hintze, 112 University Street, Salt Lake City, Utah, is relieved of all liability to the United States with respect to accrued rentals in the amount of $1,280.00 claimed to be due the United States under oil and gas lease, serial Cheyenne 066038.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT DEAN WARD

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2349) for the relief of Robert Dean Ward.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2349

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the limitations of time applicable to the filing of claims under subsection (f) of section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Robert Dean Ward of Seaside, California, and his claim for benefits thereunder shall be acted upon, without regard to such time limitations, if he files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor, within the six-month period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, strike "Act." and insert "Act: *Provided,* That no benefits except hospital and medical expenses actually incurred shall accrue for any period prior to the date of enactment of this Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. EMILIE BOULAY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3500) for the relief of Mrs. Emilie Boulay.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3500

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for purposes of determining the entitlement of Mrs. Emilie Boulay, of Berlin, New Hampshire, to benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after November 1960 on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of the late Napoleon Boulay (social security account Numbered 001–12–7112), if the said Mrs. Emilie Boulay files application for such benefits within six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the marriage entered into by the said Mrs. Emilie Boulay and Napoleon Boulay on May 15, 1905, shall be held and considered to have been a valid marriage under the laws of the State in which the said Napoleon Boulay was domiciled at the time of his death.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BECKY JO AND CHARLES R. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8353) for the relief of Becky Jo and Charles R. Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 8353

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Becky Jo and Charles R. Smith, 1112 North Walnut Avenue, Kannapolis, North Carolina, are relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $198.10, representing an overpayment of class Q allotment for May 1964, due to an error in computation by the United States Army. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this section.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Becky Jo and Charles R. Smith the amount certified to them by the Secretary of the Army as the aggregate amount paid to the United States by the said Becky Jo and Charles R. Smith, or withheld by the United States from amounts due them, on account of the liability referred to in the first section of this Act: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Committee amendent:
Page 2, line 4, strike "to them."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. GUILLERMO CASTRILLO (FERNANDEZ)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 374) for the relief of Dr. Guillermo Castrillo (Fernandez).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 374

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Doctor Guillermo Castrillo (Fernandez) may be naturalized upon compliance with all of the requirements of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, except that no period of residence or physical presence within the

United States or any State shall be required, in addition to his residence and physical presence within the United States since September 17, 1960.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KIM SUNG JIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1647) for the relief of Kim Sung Jin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1647

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kim Sung Jin may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F), and a petition may be filed in behalf of the said Kim Sung Jin by Mr. and Mrs. Joe Sims, Junior, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, for the purposes of sections 203(a)(2) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kim Sung Jin shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien son of Mr. and Mrs. Joe Sims, Junior, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KEN ALLEN KEENE (YASUO TSUKIKAWA)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2039) for the relief of Ken Allen Keene (Yasuo Tsukikawa).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 2039

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 205(c), relating to the number of petitions which may be approved in behalf of eligible orphans, shall be inapplicable in the case of a petition filed in behalf of Ken Allen Keene (Yasuo Tsukikawa) by Mr. and Mrs. C. D. Keene, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORA ISABELLA SAMUELLI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 619) for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 619

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nora Isabella Samuelli shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

SEC. 2. The time Nora Isabella Samuelli has resided and been physically present in the United States since July 31, 1963, shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, strike out all of lines 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIS SHCHUCHINSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3236) for the relief of Louis Shchuchinski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3236

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Louis Shchuchinski shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of October 3, 1960.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVID GLENN BARKER (JAI YUL SUNG) AND RICHARD PAUL BARKER (PIL SU PARK)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6112) for the relief of David Glenn Barker (Jai Yul Sung) and Richard Paul Barker (Pil Su Park).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6112

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, David Glenn Barker (Jai Yul Sung) and Richard Paul Barker (Pil Su Park) may be classified as eligible orphans within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of that Act, upon approval of a petition filed in their behalf by Sergeant First Class and Mrs. Allen N. Barker, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of that Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans. Section 205(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, relating to the number of petitions which may be approved, shall be inapplicable in this case.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MORRIS L. KAIDEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6728) for the relief of Morris L. Kaiden.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

VIVIAN COHEN KAIDEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6729) for the relief of Vivian Cohen Kaiden.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

KI SOOK JUN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9442) for the relief of Ki Sook Jun.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 9442

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ki Sook Jun may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Charles Hood, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans. Section 205(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, relating to the number of petitions which may be approved, shall be inapplicable in this case.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMANENT RESIDENCE IN THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 606) opposing the granting of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 606

Resolved, That the House of Representatives does not approve the granting of permanent residence in the United States to the aliens hereinafter named in which cases the Attorney General has submitted reports to the Congress pursuant to section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended by Public Law 87-885 (8 U.S.C. 1254(a)(1)):

A-10044988, Alhosaini, Shafi.
A-10845497, Chew, Philip Fong.
A-8827004, Pang, Richard.
A-8926609, Pannu, Harpal Singh.
A-12150099, Cabana, Benedicto Quipanas.
A-6958169, Acosta-Duarte, Francisco.
A-13553919, Madrigal-Guevara, Belen.
A-10085453, Yuen, Kum Wing.
A-10657458, Popovich, Dragomir.
A-6436409, Polychroniades, George Christ.
A-13414030, Pao, David Sien Chin.
A-10144616, Lee, Duck Jun.
A-13697103, Yee, Yuk Jue.
A-10350042, Watt, Thyra.
A-10130984, Yu, Shirley.
A-12943927, Chin, Bo Ming.
A-10825983, Chin, Kwok Shun.
A-10825990, Chin, Nuey Doy.
A-13715215, Fong, Wing Bong.
A-11436412, Gee, Jip Loon.
A-11811246, Huey, Park Yee.
A-12072176, Lee, Nee Nang.
A-7483240, Ortiz-Gomez, Miguel Angel.
A-13693799, Woo, Gar Hong.
A-11407946, Yee, Bing Chee.
A-126483242, Yee, Hee Ngew.
A-12642213, Tom, Yuen Poo.
A-12255912, Won, Dai Chun.
A-10491352, Louie, Gong Shek.
A-3971694, Chan, Wing Cheung.
A-13679199, Wong, Soon Ho.
A-13130619, Ang, Nguey Gong.
A-8897379, Huang, Chung Liang.
A-10825941, Foo, Huey.
A-10411988, Han, Kim Yo.
A-11292557, Helguera-Baldor, Adela.
A-10437021, Whang, Kyu Whan.
A-10152447, Tseliou, Eleni.
A-10044376, Tandon, Omkar N.
A-13079135, Peng, Kean Lim.
A-12757519, Eng, Gang Fung.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARKANSAS IS HAPPY NOW

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, Arkansas has moved from third place up to first place in the college football ratings. I mention this with pride and with humility.

The University of Arkansas is in the district which I am honored to represent. Since my boyhood days when I was a student there that football team has always been first in my heart and of the people of Arkansas. Now to achieve that in reality is something that we shall always cherish.

Our congratulations go to Coach Frank Broyles and the lads who, under his direction, encouragement, and coaching, carry the ball.

Arkansas is proud today.

MEAT INSPECTION LAWS

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, nearly 20 percent of the meat slaughtered and processed in the United States is not now covered by adequate inspection laws. Many large establishments that are subject to other Federal laws, are exempt under the peculiar jurisdictional standards of our meat inspection laws.

For reasons why legislation is needed to stop the sale of meat processed from cancer-eyed cows, lump-jawed steers, eyeballs, lungs, blood and chopped hides to unsuspecting consumers from these large and medium size establishments, I invite your attention to my comments in the Congressional Record on January 7 of this year.

Since 1961, I have been the promoter of legislation to extend consumer protection in this area and Senator Neuberger has joined in recent years to advocate this legislation in the Senate.

The Agriculture Department has been conducting investigations as to the need for these bills and President today is proposing new legislation. The administration's proposal embraces the provisions of my bill and also covers some additional jurisdiction.

I am today also introducing the administration's bill, will insert an analysis of it in the Record, and have asked for hearings on both it and my original bill early next year.

I hope others will join in supporting this legislation.

NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include certain communications and that my remarks appear in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the conference report, particularly those provisions dealing with the National Teacher Corps. It has received the careful consideration of the general Subcommittee on Education of the U.S. House of Representatives and the House Education and Labor Committee. Hearings were conducted on the teacher fellowship program and the National Teacher Corps on July 7, 13, 14, and 15 of this year. The general Subcommittee on Education considered it in executive session on August 23 and reported H.R. 9627 without a dissenting vote. Legislation to establish the Corps was reported favorably by the House Education and Labor Committee on September 2 (H.R. 9627, H. Rept. 953).

Let me here review the major provisions of the Teacher Corps program:

THE CONCEPT

Experienced teachers and highly qualified college graduates like those who made the Peace Corps such a success would be enrolled for 2 years of service and training to improve the educational opportunities for children living in areas having a concentration of families with low incomes. Effective professional training for the teacher interns will be provided in the most deprived rural and urban slum schools through cooperative arrangements between those schools and local colleges and universities.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

To attract and train bright young people who might not otherwise enter the teaching profession or choose to teach in deprived schools.

To bring able and spirited teaching help to our most needy schools.

OPERATION OF THE TEACHER CORPS

Recruitment: College graduates and experienced teachers will be recruited for the Teacher Corps in a national campaign. A Corps of some 6,000 members is eventually contemplated. An expected enrollment of 3,750 Teacher Corps members is expected the first year.

Interns: College graduates will serve in teams under the direction of an experienced Teacher Corps member. They will receive 3 months of intensive teacher training at a college or university before going into local school districts requesting their services. They will be paid at the lowest rate paid by that district for a full-time teacher.

Experienced teachers: They will serve either individually in schools requesting them, or as leaders of Teacher Corps teams. Individual experienced teachers will be paid at the prevailing local rate for teachers of comparable experience and training. Team leaders may receive additional compensation in keeping with their added responsibilities.

Local control: Teacher Corps members will serve only at the request of local educational agencies. They will be under the same local authority as any other teacher in the system. Members will be employees of the local school district and these districts will retain full authority over curriculum and will have the customary rights of firing and hiring. At this point in the Record, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert a communication of October 15, 1965, from the Secretary of HEW:

The Secretary of Health,
Education, and Welfare,
Washington.

Hon. Carl Perkins,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Perkins: This is in response to your inquiry regarding the Teacher Corps provision of H.R. 9567, as approved by the House-Senate conferees.

The Teacher Corps will impose no Federal control over the authority of the local school district. In particular, the local school district retains full authority to select and reject, to appoint and fire those recruited through the Teacher Corps program. Local school authorities will be free to set the criteria for members they may wish to employ. No community need accept any teacher unsuitable to its needs.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will seek to guarantee maximum participation of local school authorities by (a) requesting them to indicate the teacher qualifications they judge to be desirable; and (b) submitting to them for approval the names of individual Teacher Corps members who are available for service.

Thank you for your interest. I believe the Teacher Corps program will greatly improve the educational opportunities for our Nation's disadvantaged schoolchildren. At the same time, it preserves the valuable tradition of local control over the schools in each community.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. GARDNER,
Secretary.

Training: College and universities will carry out the intensive 3-month teacher intern training program. It is modeled on the successful programs in teacher education for college graduates now operated by some 40 institutions of higher education. After being accepted by local school districts, interns, while working in local schools, will participate in in-service training programs carried out by the experienced teacher team leader and in cooperation with a college or university. It is expected that at the end of two years of teaching and further academic study. Teacher Corps interns will be able to earn advanced degrees and receive professional certification. Tuition and university program costs will be paid by Federal grants.

Let me emphasize, the Teacher Corps is a means of securing the trained teacher program required to meet the special education needs of children in schools where there are large numbers of children coming from low-income families. The evidence before the House Committee in extensive hearings on this subject, clearly shows that these educationally deprived children require special instructional services such as remedial reading instruction, tutoring, and speech therapy. School districts serving large numbers of these educationally deprived children are the very districts which are least able to afford such in-service teacher training programs—or are the least able to recruit and attract specialized and qualified teaching personnel. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the record questions and answers concerned important aspects of the Teacher Corps proposal:

TEACHER CORPS

Question. What is the Teacher Corps?

Answer. Under title V–B of the Higher Education Act, dedicated and able young men and women—like those who have made the Peace Corps such a success—will be recruited and trained to teach where they are most needed, in city slums and areas of rural poverty across the Nation. Teacher Corps members will be recruited nationally on the basis of talent and promise and will be trained by the Nation's colleges and universities. They will serve up to 2 years—side by side with local teachers—on request from State and local educational authorities. Some will be experienced teachers; others, teacher interns who will work in teams under the direction of experienced teachers. And will get university preservice training as well as a program of in-service graduate education leading to an advanced degree.

Question. How much money is available for the National Teacher Corps?

Answer. Just over $36 million has been authorized for fiscal year 1966 and there will be $64.7 million for fiscal year 1967.

Question. Why is the Teacher Corps necessary?

Answer. In 1964, there were more than 82,000 full-time teachers with less than standard certificates. The majority of these were concentrated in low-income areas, those areas which need the best teachers. The National Education Association estimates that there is a shortage of 128,000 teachers this year. Moreover, the new Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has created a need for an additional 30,000 teachers to staff the new programs funded.

Question. Who will pay the teachers' salaries?

Answer. Local school districts will employ Teacher Corps members and pay their salaries. The local district costs for the program will be covered by Federal grants to the district. This is in line with the precedent set by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which provides that Federal funds may be used by local districts to pay teachers salaries in low-income areas.

Question. Will this program lead to Federal control of the schools?

Answer. Teacher Corps teachers and teams are employees of and under the direct control of local school authorities. The authorities of these districts request Teacher Corps members in the first place and have the right to fire them at any time, thus assuring that local control of education will be preserved.

Section 516 of title V–B specifically states:

"LOCAL CONTROL PRESERVED

"SEC. 516. Members of the Teacher Corps shall be under the direct supervision of the appropriate officials of the local educational agencies to which they are assigned. Except as otherwise provided in clause (3) of section 513(a), such agencies shall retain the authority to—

"(1) assign such members within their systems;

"(2) make transfers within their systems;

"(3) determine the subject matter to be taught;

"(4) determine the terms and continuance of the assignment of such members within their systems."

Question. Will Teacher Corps members be adequately trained?

Answer. All inexperienced teacher interns will receive 3 months of intensive training at a college or university before going into local schools requesting them. Their training will continue in the school under the close supervision of an experienced teacher and in cooperation with the university.

Question. Are there any precedents for this kind of training program?

Answer. Yes. Intern training programs for college graduates have been operating successfully in the country since 1895. Now more than 40 institutions including Harvard, Yale, Stanford, and the University of Wisconsin have such programs leading to master's degrees.

Question. Who is eligible to be a Teacher Corps member?

Answer. A college graduate with a bachelor's degree, whether or not he has had teaching experience, will be eligible to become a teacher intern. Experienced teachers will also be eligible to be Teacher Corps intern team leaders or to serve individually.

Question. Where will the Teacher Corps members work?

Answer. Local schools, both urban and rural, having the highest concentration of low-income children will be eligible to request Teacher Corps members.

Question. Will this program take away competent teachers from other areas?

Answer. No. While some experienced teachers will be drawn to schools in poverty areas for 2 years of service, it is expected that they will be returning at the end of that period to their home districts. By encouraging dedicated college graduates, who would not normally enter the teaching profession, to become teachers and work with the disadvantaged youth of this country, it is expected that the Teacher Corps will strengthen significantly the Nation's teaching resources.

Question. What will be the role of State educational agencies in National Teacher Corps?

Answer. The State educational agencies will act as advisers and consultants on every step in the program-recruitment, selection, training, and assignment.

Question. How has this measure been given adequate consideration by Congress?

Answer. The bill was considered at length by the Congress. Four days of hearings on this legislation were held before the General Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor. Further, the bill was reported out by the committee. As a result of careful scrutiny in the Senate, the bill was included in the Higher Education Act of 1965. The majority of the members of the House-Senate conference agreed to its inclusion.

Question. Does the Teacher Corps really belong in the Higher Education Act of 1965?

Answer. Yes. For two reasons: First, this measure will give the grade and high schools of this country supplementary teaching services. It will provide extra teachers and extra teaching skills in these areas; second, for higher education, the Teacher Corps will stimulate and encourage college graduates to enter the teaching profession—supplementing their classroom experience with on-the-job contact with students. Further, the program also includes fellowships and grants for individuals seeking to improve their teaching ability through further academic training. It is an education measure on all of these counts.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point a number of wires and messages that I have received from educators and concerned citizens throughout the Nation urging this body to adopt the conference report and retain those provisions for the National Teacher Corps. I think these messages are evidence of the great need for this program and the prevailing belief among those who know best that it not only is a worthwhile program, but is greatly needed:

BATON ROUGE, LA.,
October 16, 1965.

Representative CARL PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Urgently request you support conference report on H.R. 9567, Higher Education Act of 1965.

DR. JAMES PERRY,
Council for Exceptional Children.

VISALIA, CALIF.,
October 16, 1965.

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge your support in conference report H.R. 9567 on October 19.

COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN,
Chapter 225.

BALTIMORE, MD.,
October 15, 1965.

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge your support of Higher Education Act, as amended, when it comes before House of Representatives for action. Both Teachers Corps and fellowship provisions are advantageous to Maryland.

JAMES A. SENSENBAUGH,
State Superintendent of Schools,
Maryland State Department of Education.

Hartford, Conn.,
October 15, 1965.

Congressman Carl Perkins,
Subcommittee on Labor and Education,
Washington, D.C.:

Hope you will favor Higher Education Act now before you. The National Teacher Corps section particularly will effectively stimulate the recruitment and training of teaching personnel for areas where urgently needed.

William J. Sanders,
Commissioner of Education, Connecticut.

Little Rock, Ark.,
October 15, 1965.

Representative Carl Perkins,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I sincerely hope you will support the higher education bill which has been reported out of conference committee between House and Senate and which is due for a vote in the House early next week. Arkansas would benefit from all aspects of the proposal especially that part of the bill which would provide a Teacher Corps. It is my understanding that approval of local school board of individuals assigned as interns is a requirement of the proposed legislation. I strongly urge your favorable consideration of this bill as it is badly needed in many sections of our Nation, especially in our school districts located in economically and culturally deprived areas.

A. W. Ford,
Arkansas Commissioner of Education.

Albany, N.Y.,
October 15, 1965.

Hon. Carl Perkins,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I strongly urge passage of proposed Higher Education Act as it has emerged from conference. Its total provisions will do much for the quality and equality of educational opportunity. I am assured that in carrying out the Teacher Corps program the U.S. Office of Education will provide complete local option and full State consultation.

Best regards.

Ewald B. Nyquist,
Acting Commissioner of Education.

Salem, Oreg.,
October 18, 1965.

Carl Perkins,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Horrified and dismayed by move to recommit higher education bill rumored here. Makes no sense to equip schools with materials, learning devices, under 111 National Defense Education Act; reorient and reteach them under title XI, bolster and broaden local level organization, cooperation, concept and conditions under 1, 11, 111, ESEA—then refuse basic lifeblood of better college instruction and preservice experiences to succeeding generations of teacher and school patrons. Strongly urge you, other battlers for better education in House, to stand firm and demand that will of majority, reflecting will of Nation, override parliamentary political tactic.

Association of Chief State School Audiovisual Officers,
Henry C. Ruark, Jr.,
Executive Secretary.

Blue Island, Ill.,
October 18, 1965.

Carl Perkins,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

South Cook County Chapter 377, Council for Exceptional Children, urgently request your support of House bill 9567.

Marie McPherson.

Frankfort, Ky.,
October 18, 1965.

Hon. Carl D. Perkins,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Understand conference report on H.R. 9567 will come before the House on October 18 or 19. Request you to vote against effort to recommit and for the conference report.

Harry M. Sparks,
Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Tiffin, Ohio,
October 18, 1965.

Hon. Carl D. Perkins,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Vote against motion to recommit H.R. 9567.

Richard Pfeiffer,
Tiffin University.

Providence, R.I.,
October 18, 1965.

Hon. Carl D. Perkins,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Request you vote against possible motion to recommit higher Education Assistance Act of 1965 (H.R. 9567) at Tuesday, October 19, session.

Johnson and Wales Junior College of Business,
Edward P. Triangolo, *President.*

New Kensington, Pa.,
October 18, 1965.

Congressman Carl D. Perkins,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please be present October 19, vote and support H.R. 9567. This is important and necessary to the youth of the Nation.

Harry Ryan,
New Kensington Commercial School.

Madison, Wis.,
October 18, 1965.

Representative Carl Perkins,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Urgent that higher education bill as reported by conference committee be passed. Trust effort on Tuesday to recommit for purpose of eliminating Teachers Corps will fail. We heartily endorse Teacher Corps and believe unequivocally that local control is assured in present version.

Fred Harvey Harrington,
President, University of Wisconsin.

Chattanooga, Tenn.,
October 18, 1965.

Hon. Carl D. Perkins,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

May I urge your presence and your vote against recommitting H.R. 9567, Higher Education Assistance Act of 1965, scheduled to come up tomorrow.

Kindest regards.

Roy McKenzie, Jr.,
McKenzie College.

White Plains, N.Y.,
October 18, 1965.

Hon. Carl D. Perkins,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully request your support of conference committee bill of Higher Education Act, H.R. 9567.

Philip C. Martin,
President, Westchester Community College.

Rochester, N.Y.,
October 18, 1965.

Hon. Carl D. Perkins,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

As one committed to the interest of higher education I should like to urge that you vote approving H.R. 9567.

Arthur L. Assum,
Dean, University School,
University of Rochester.

Salem, Oreg.,
October 18, 1965.

Carl Perkins,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Rumored move in House to recommit higher education bill deeply concerns and puzzles professional throughout educational world. Reporting for readerships of oldest, largest professional AV magazine. On basis of 5 years of national surveys, be assured that those dedicated to better instruction through modern media know higher education badly in need of same stimulation assistance, support as accorded public schools since 1959 under title 111, other National Defense Education Act titles.

Please let your colleagues in House and Senate know groundswell of demand which exists throughout Nation for just the kinds of action taken in the higher education bill long overdue.

Henry C. Ruark, Jr.,
Editor,
AFL Screen AV Guide Magazine.

Wapato, Wash.,
October 18, 1965.

Hon. Carl Perkins,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Washington State Federation of Council for Exceptional Children lends its wholehearted support to H.R. 9567.

Albert H. Marshall, Jr.,
President.

Muncie, Ind.,
October 18, 1965.

Congressman Carl Perkins,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We would appreciate your support of the conference committee request on higher education bill (H.R. 9567) provision regarding National Teachers Corps, fellowships for teachers and grants to institutions of higher education for improved teacher education particularly significant to Ball State and the quality of our teacher education program.

John R. Emens,
President, Ball State University.

Casper, Wyo.,
October 18, 1965.

Hon. Carl Perkins,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Will appreciate your assistance and support of conference report on H.R. 9567, the Higher Education Act of 1965, regarding scholarships for teachers in special education.

Verda James,
Legislation Chairman,
Special Classes for the Handicapped, Inc.

Minneapolis, Minn.,
October 18, 1965.

Representative Carl Perkins,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Sincerely hope you and your colleagues accept the conference committee report on the higher education bill as given.

Wesley J. F. Grabow,
Director of Audiovisual Education Service,
University of Minnesota.

EAST ST. LOUIS,
October 18, 1965.

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Our members urge you to support the conference report on House bill 9567.

CAHOKIA CHAPTER,
Illinois Council for Exceptional Children.

CASPER, WYO.
October 18, 1965.

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge support of conference report on H.R. 9567, scholarships for teachers in special education.

PAUL E. ELLENBERG,
Wyoming Association for Retarded Children.

LINCOLN, NEBR.,
October 18, 1965.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

All Nebraskans urging support and passage H.R. 9567, Higher Education Act, Tuesday 19th, and opposing recommitment to committee.

FRANK A. LUNDY,
University of Nebraska Libraries.

HENNIKER, N.H.,
October 18, 1965.

CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, House Subcommittee on Education, Washington, D.C.:

Urge quick passage of amended higher education bill of 1965, the one bill in support of small colleges.

H. RAYMOND DANFORTH,
President, New England College.

IOWA CITY, IOWA,
October 18, 1965.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Higher Education Act must meet House test Tuesday. Hope you will support passage of act in present form, which could be of enormous benefit to higher education. Apparently critics are attacking Teacher Corps provision on ground that local control of education jeopardized. In my judgment, local control fully assured, and Teachers Corps would make significant contribution.

HOWARD R. BOWEN,
President, University of Iowa.

GAS CITY, IND.,
October 18, 1965.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
Representative, House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please be present and vote against motion to recommit H.R. 9567.

INDIANA NORTHERN UNIVERSITY.

BOSTON, MASS.,
October 18, 1965.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
Representative, House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Re H.R. 9567, Fisher Junior College urges you to vote against motion to recommit this bill.

S. L. FISHER,
President.

GROTON, MASS.,
October 18, 1965.

Representative CARL PERKINS,
Washington, D.C.:

Vote "Yes" on higher education bill.

LODEMA BIXBY.

FITCHBURG, MASS.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
October 19, 1965.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The National Education Association's Board of Directors, by formal resolution on October 17, reaffirmed the NEA's support of the conference report on H.R. 9567, the Higher Education Act of 1965, including the Teacher Corps program. The NEA board represents the 940,000 members of the association. We urge your continued outstanding leadership to secure enactment of this vitally important legislation before the close of the first session of the 89th Congress.

JOHN M. LUMLEY,
Director, Division of Federal Relations, National Education Association.

ROCKFORD, ILL.,
October 18, 1965.

Representative CARL PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

TCEC No. 39 of the Rockford area encourages your support of H.R. 9567 when it comes out of the conference committee, Tuesday, October 19, 1965.

NAOMI THALEN,
Secretary.

MOREHEAD, KY.,
October 18, 1965.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.:

The industrial arts faculty at Morehead State College takes this opportunity to urge you to vote against the motion to recommit H.R. 9567 and to vote for the conference report on H.R. 9567. We certainly are grateful to you for the leadership you have so ably demonstrated in supporting legislation affecting other phases of education and trust that you will support the provision for the NDEA Institute for Industrial Arts in the same manner.

NORMAN ROBERTS,
ROBERT NEWTON,
CLYDE HACKLER,
ED NASS,
DR. C. NELSON GROTE,
J. T. MAYS.

LEXINGTON, KY.,
October 18, 1965.

Representative CARL PERKINS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I was happy to talk with you about H.R. 9567. If you can, in conscience, continue to oppose recommittal of the bill and vote for its passage. Higher education in Kentucky, including the university and all our new community colleges, will benefit therefrom.

STUART FORTH,
Director of Libraries, University of Kentucky.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
October 19, 1965.

CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We strongly support conference bill H.R. 9567 for higher education and urge its prompt ratification by the Congress.

CLARENCE C. WALTON,
Dean, School of General Studies, Columbia University.

HARRISBURG, PA.,
October 19, 1965.

Representative CARL D. PERKINS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We respectfully urge prompt action on the Higher Education Act of 1965 in the version agreed upon by the conferees. It will provide essential support to higher education in areas of strategic need. Title VI, by assisting use of new media, will update instruction, vitalize teaching, and provide increased educational opportunity for more students. We request your support.

MARCUS KONICK,
Director, Bureau of Instructional Materials and Service, Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction.

NEWTON, MASS.,
October 18, 1965.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House Office Building,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We call your attention to Tuesday's motion to recommit H.R. 9567 to ask your support in voting against this motion.

Sister ROBERTA DEAN,
Quinas School.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
October 19, 1965.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Pennsylvania State Federation CEC with over 2,000 members urge supportive action on Higher Education Act, H.R. 9567.

LORRAINE R. BRISKMAN,
State Legislative Chairman.

STUDENT DEMONSTRATIONS MUST NOT BE MISINTERPRETED

Mr. **BOGGS.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BOGGS.** Mr. Speaker, press reports today indicate that the radio and other forms of propaganda communication in the Communist world have given a great deal of publicity to the so-called student demonstrations held in this country during the past several days.

I am certain that I speak for all Americans when I say that Moscow, Peiping, and Hanoi will have badly misread the determination of the American people if they give any significance to these so-called demonstrations.

The Congress of the United States, as represented by both political parties, has affirmed time and time again the dedication of the American people to live up to the commitments which we have in southeast Asia. Let there be no doubt about that. These demonstrations have been infiltrated by the Communists, but they will have no success whatsoever. They represent a tiny but vocal minority. The President of the United States is pursuing a policy which has the support of the overwhelming majority of the American people. I think it well that the Communist world understand that we shall not retire from Vietnam or anywhere else in the world as long as the commitments that they have made there as elsewhere are not honored. We intend to keep our word—we do not intend to bow to Communist pressure or Communist propaganda.

Mr. **GERALD R. FORD.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Louisiana yield?

Mr. **BOGGS.** I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Over the past weekend, on several occasions, I, as a leader on this side of the aisle, was asked for my reaction to the student demonstrations. My reply has been that those who acted irresponsibly by the burning of draft cards and violent language have acted in a shameful and disgusting manner. They have been doing a great injustice to those who are fighting in Vietnam and those who are trying to be sure and certain that Communist aggression does not pay off.

I wish to assure the gentleman from Louisiana and the President that as long as our policy is one of firmness in South Vietnam or elsewhere throughout the world, we on this side of the aisle will stand forthrightly in opposition to the Kremlin and to Peiping.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his very fine statement.

STATEMENT OF ONE SERVING IN VIETNAM

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I should like to read a letter I received from a young man who is serving in Vietnam.

BIEN HOA AIR FORCE BASE,
September 16, 1965.

Hon. ELMER J. HOLLAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: My travels upon graduating from the Academy last year have carried me from Fort Benning to Hawaii to Vietnam. I'm now serving with a helicopter company at Bien Hoa. I have a platoon of volunteer "shot gunners" from the 25th Infantry Division in Hawaii. We ride as door gunners on the helicopters during assaults. We are all well equipped, well clothed, and well fed here. Our company just received the latest UH-1D helicopters made by Bell. They are faster and more powerful than our old ones.

We work 7 days a week, with our people flying every day. It's pretty much the same all over, but some people don't have the advantage of hot meals and a dry place to sleep that we enjoy here at the air base. It's a tough life, but no one complains. People do feel disappointed though when we read in the papers about students trying to stop troop trains and people rushing to get married to avoid the draft.

It seems as though our strategy is working and we've turned the tide, but there is still much to be done. The biggest mistake we could make now is to stop bombing North Vietnam. We learned in Korea that negotiations can last for years if you let up the pressure when you go to the conference table. The American troops here are doing real well. There is a growing impatience with the armed Republic of Vietnam lack of competence and initiative. It's a shame Americans have to do all the dirty work, but then these people have been fighting for many years and probably don't realize the gravity of the situation.

The pay raise was thoroughly appreciated by all. I know it helped me a lot. I got married in August. My wife's parents are stationed at Schofield Barracks in Hawaii.

I enjoy my work as an officer in the Army and wish to thank you again for providing me with an appointment to the Academy. Many of my classmates from West Point are serving here now and I run into them occasionally at the most improbable places.

Respectfully yours,
THOMAS G. FAULDS,
2d Lieutenant, U.S. Army.

STUDENT DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to say I am very happy that the distinguished Democratic whip and the distinguished Republican leader have expressed what I believe is not only the sentiment of the leadership but, I am sure, the sentiment of this House with respect to the military and political situation in Vietnam and also with respect to the misguided, if not, in the case of some participants in teach-ins and other demonstrations, subversive acts which almost amount to treason.

I believe the country and the world should know that not only the leadership but also the Congress is united in supporting the President and the action he has taken and in announcing to the world that these recent demonstrations reflect only a minute sampling of sentiment within the ranks of a very small minority of our people and particularly of our young people. Let friend and foe alike know that our people are united in their patriotism and in support of the strong policies of the President.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I am glad to yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I believe it is very important to reaffirm what the gentleman from Oklahoma has said. These demonstrators do represent a very, very small percentage of the students and the youth of this country. It would be a serious mistake on the part of the enemy to believe that these demonstrators represent a substantial part to any degree of the youth of America.

If the enemy should make a miscalculation, in the belief that there was a division or a lack of unity in our opposition to Communist aggression it would be a serious error for them. We should warn the young people of the serious consequences, if their demonstrations and their irresponsible actions do lead to a miscalculation on the part of the Communist, whether in the Kremlin or Peiping.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman. I certainly agree.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to concur in the remarks made by both the minority and majority leaders.

DEMONSTRATIONS ON VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my distinguished colleagues, the majority leader, Mr. ALBERT, the whip, Mr. BOGGS, and Mr. GERALD R. FORD, the minority leader, in the statements they made to the House with reference to the demonstrations, teach-ins, and draft card burnings in the United States. I think there is a very definite connection between these demonstrations and the worldwide Communist conspiracy.

HOUSE SHOULD INVESTIGATE "PEACE DEMONSTRATIONS"

Mr. Speaker, the present wave of teach-ins, draft card burnings, and demonstrations against our policy in Vietnam are designed to directly aid the military aggression of Peiping and Hanoi. These demonstrations are carefully timed with the ending of the monsoon season when the Communist aggressor in South Vietnam will be faced with increasing American military pressure.

Mr. Speaker, we are winning in South Vietnam. We prevented a Communist takeover in Santo Domingo, we are winning the economic war, we are gaining in space, and the Communists out of desperation are instigating worldwide demonstrations. These demonstrations are a dangerous and sinister part of the Communist war against civilization.

Yesterday official newspaper mouthpieces of Moscow and Peiping praised the demonstrators in the United States and again lambasted our Vietnam policy. North Vietnam in its official newspaper at Hanoi paid tribute to the American demonstrators and referred to our policymakers here in Washington as "bloodthirsty."

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it. These teach-ins, peace demonstrations and draft card burnings are supported by Kosygin, Mao Tse-tung, and Ho Chi Minh. It is a diabolical scheme to undermine the morale of our men on the fighting front and dupe innocent people in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a House resolution which would provide for a complete investigation of the connection between teach-ins, peace demonstrations, draft card burnings, and the Communist world conspiracy. This resolution would create a select committee of 13 Members of this House to thoroughly investigate these demonstrations and related activities and report to the Congress and to the people of this country for remedial action.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, there has been of late a great deal of concern evidenced here about students and other demonstrators who in order to protest U.S. involvement in Vietnam lie in front of trains, disrupt communications and so forth. Recent newspaper headlines proclaimed what apparently was a great victory when the FBI arrested one such demonstrator for burning his draft card.

Were it up to me, Mr. Speaker, I would instead call to the attention of the Members of the House another article that was carried by UPI on October 14 wherein it was stated that a soldier in the U.S. Army had gone on a hunger strike to protest being sent to Vietnam, was subsequently charged with neglect of duty, tried, convicted and sentenced to prison. Yet, a U.S. Army commanding general went behind the court-martial, did away with the convicted accused's punishment and an official Army spokesman gave as the reason that "the whole idea—was to play it as low key as possible and avoid publicity." What he meant was that the Army, too is afraid of the "demonstrations" which have been influencing our national policies for the past few years.

Mr. Speaker, today, with Communist-misled youngsters demonstrating violently against our war with the Communists in Vietnam, it would seem that our Federal authorities would do everything possible to maintain the morale of our fighting troops.

I wonder how the men in U.S. uniforms in the ambush-ridden jungles of South Vietnam feel about the deal made with Pvt. Winstel R. Belton which has made it possible for him to escape the legally imposed consequences of his despicable actions.

Private Belton, described by UPI as "a former civil rights worker from Milwaukee," went on a hunger strike August 13 to 18 to avoid serving his country when he learned that his unit, the proud 1st Cavalry Division, was being shipped to Vietnam. Private Belton, as I noted, was tried by a military court on October 6 on charges of neglect of duty, was found guilty, and sentenced to 5 years' imprisonment, a bad-conduct discharge, and loss of pay.

As the inevitable storm of protest which seeks to protect such sacrosanct demonstrators as Private Belton began to burst forth, however, it was learned that the Army, unknown to the court-martial, had made a deal with Private Belton promising him a sentence not to exceed 1 year in prison, a bad-conduct discharge and loss of pay in return for his plea of guilty to the lesser charge of malingering.

But even this was apparently not enough. Incredible as it may seem, shortly thereafter, 4th Army commander Lt. Gen. R. W. Colglazier suspended the entire sentence and made it possible for Private Belton to receive an honorable discharge without a blot on his record if only he successfully completes the remaining 8 months of his tour of duty. The only punishment whatsoever is to be a loss of rank from private first class to private. How can this possibly be justified?

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the mothers and wives whose sons and husbands have been killed and wounded in Vietnam find very little solace in the fact that the Army was able to dispatch the matter of Pvt. Winstel R. Belton in "as low key as possible and avoid publicity." I would suggest that Private Belton's fellow soldiers who are serving their country with valor and honor in Vietnam find very little comfort in the fact that one of his lawyers feels Belton has taken the "first step toward rehabilitation by pleading guilty." Who wants to fight alongside a man who might turn and run? Why endanger the brave Americans in Vietnam with the presence of a man who might decide in the face of enemy fire that a "surrender-in" demonstration might be in order?

I suggest, my distinguished colleagues, that Lieutenant General Colglazier has now capped his career with his actions in these premises. It should be the subject of a congressional investigation.

As for Private Belton, possibly it would be in order to strike a new official award from the Government of the United States and present it to him. It could be called, Mr. Speaker, the "Benedict Arnold Award."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to introduce in the RECORD the UPI report on this matter published in the Alabama Journal in Montgomery, October 14, 1965.

HUNGER STRIKER FROM FORT BENNING ORDERED TO COMBAT DUTY IN VIET

> SAN ANTONIO, TEX.—Pvt. Winstel R. Belton, 26, who went on a hunger strike to keep from going to Vietnam, today was under orders to rejoin his old outfit, the 1st Cavalry Division, now fighting in the Vietnamese central highlands.
>
> Belton, a former football player and civil rights worker from Milwaukee, was convicted by a court-martial October 6 on a charge of neglect of duty and handed a 5-year prison term.
>
> But in the pre-arranged deal, the Army suspended the sentence in return for a guilty plea by Belton. The Army said Belton had implied a willingness to fulfill his duty by serving in Vietnam.
>
> Belton received no penalty except loss of rank from private first class to private. He will be honorably discharged if he successfully completes his remaining 8 months of his hitch, the Army said.
>
> Lt. Gen. R. W. Colglazier, commander of the 4th Army, issued the order Wednesday after studying the prenegotiated court-martial sentence against Belton.
>
> Belton went on a hunger strike at Fort Benning, Ga., last August 13–18 when the 1st Cavalry Division shipped out to Vietnam.
>
> Belton, a studious-looking Negro who holds a bachelor's degree in fine arts from Arizona State University, asked to be tried in the 4th Army District.
>
> At the trial, one of Belton's military lawyers, Capt. Joseph Caneba, Jr., said Belton realized he made a mistake but took "the first step toward rehabilitation by pleading guilty."
>
> "The whole idea of it was to play it as low-key as possible and avoid publicity," an Army prosecutor said. Before the negotiated plea was announced, the defense had questioned the legality of U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

UNIVERSITY STUDENTS WHO SUPPORT OUR COUNTRY'S POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I share the concern of others in this body regarding the demonstrations which have taken place over last weekend. It is tragic to see some of our professors and young men and women who fall prey to an ideology that is dedicated to the destruction of a fundamental right that we have in this country, the right of freedom of assembly and to demonstrate. These misguided citizens are abusing this right.

However, Mr. Speaker, it is heartening to find on the wire services today, on the UPI service, a statement to the effect that 500 Boston University students have signed their names to a resolution supporting President Johnson's policy in Vietnam.

The wire states as follows:

> A resolution was circulated by leaders of the university's Young Democrat and Young Republican Clubs to counter weekend demonstrations by students against U.S. policy in Vietnam.
>
> Officials of the 2 clubs, after 4 hours of signature collecting, said they hope to obtain 3,000 signatures by the end of the week.

Then, Mr. Speaker, there is included in that release the following article:

> VILLANOVA, PA.—Villanova University students plan to send 20,000 greeting cards to U.S. servicemen in Vietnam for Christmas as a countermeasure to the demonstrations against the Vietnam fighting.

Also contained in the release is a statement as follows:

> Frank Eck, of Richmond, Va., president of the Student Government Association, said each of the 4,500 undergraduate students at the university will be urged to send 5 Christmas cards to the servicemen.
>
> The cards will be delivered by "mail call Vietnam," at nearby Bryn Mawr, an organization formed about 1 week ago to "see that every serviceman in Vietnam receives a greeting at Christmas."

Mr. Speaker, I commend these students who are indicating their support of their country's policy which emphasizes the fact that the outstanding and overwhelming number of our young people support our Government in this action.

I want to commend both the Boston University and the students at Villanova University, and other universities, for taking this stand. We know that they are in the majority and that the misguided young people who are using this demonstration technique are in the minority, but they seem to be getting the press. I hope the press will give more attention to our dedicated students who are actively supporting their Government and appreciate the precious heritage that is theirs.

EXTENSION OF FEDERAL MEAT INSPECTION

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

ANALYSIS OF H.R. 11670, A BILL TO EXTEND FEDERAL MEAT INSPECTION

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, following is an analysis of the adminis-

tration's proposal to extend Federal meat inspection. The bill I have promoted for several years covers slaughter in those plants large enough to be covered for labor-management relations purposes by the Taft-Hartley law. The administration's bill covers most other establishments also unless they are subject to adequate State inspection or the Secretary of Agriculture exempts them because their volume of operation is too small for inspection to be practicable or necessary to protect the public. The detailed analysis follows:

ANALYSIS OF BILL AMENDING THE MEAT INSPECTION ACT

Section 1. The legislation authorizing Federal meat inspection consists of provisions in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act of March 4, 1907, as amended. The first section of the bill would designate such provisions as the Meat Inspection Act and assign section numbers to the presently undesignated paragraphs.

Section 2. This section makes statutory findings regarding the interstate nature of commerce in meat and meat food products, the burdening effect of intrastate commerce in unwholesome meat upon interstate commerce in meat and the need to regulate intrastate commerce in order to effectively regulate interstate commerce in furtherance of the purpose of the act.

Section 3. This section would extend the inspection requirements of the act to the slaughtering of cattle, sheep, swine, or goats, and the preparation of the carcasses, parts thereof, meat or meat food products of such animals, for intrastate commerce. The present act applies to such operations for purposes of interstate or foreign commerce. The section also makes ante mortem inspection mandatory whereas it is now discretionary.

Section 4. This section would delete limiting language to make it clear that the post mortem inspection provisions of the act apply to articles "capable of use as human food" rather than intended for such use and eliminate other restrictive terminology.

Section 5. This section would clarify authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to restrict entry of carcasses, parts thereof, meat, and meat food products into federally inspected establishments to federally inspected articles moved directly from other federally inspected establishments or from other locations under conditions necessary to assure that the articles were federally inspected and are not adulterated, and otherwise in compliance with the act. Authority to regulate the entry of other materials would also be clarified.

Section 6. This section would clarify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate all aspects of the labeling, marking, and packaging of articles specified in the bill, to prevent the use of false or misleading labels, marks, or containers. Controls have been exercised by the Secretary over such matters for many years and these changes will not have any impact on the regulated industry. Provision would be made for appeal and judicial review of disapproval of marks, labels, and containers comparable to that contained in the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 457) which served as a model for many of the provisions in this section of the bill. Specific authority is vested in the Secretary to establish standards of identity and fill of container not inconsistent with such standards as may be established under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Secretary of Agriculture and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare are to consult prior to issuance of standards under these acts to avoid inconsistency.

Section 7. This section would strengthen the principal prohibitory section of the act by (a) including horses, mules, or other equines and specifically prohibiting the slaughtering of animals or preparation of articles, specified in the bill, except in compliance with the act; (b) prohibiting sale, transportation, and other specified transactions with respect to meat and other specified articles capable of use as human food if they are adulterated, unfit for human food, or misbranded; (c) prohibiting the doing of acts which are intended to cause or have the effect of causing such specified articles to be adulterated, unfit for human food, or misbranded. (The provisions in this section of the bill are comparable to provisions in section 301 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 331) although they would apply somewhat more broadly to intrastate as well as to interstate or foreign commerce.)

Section 8. This section of the bill would (a) clarify the application to brand manufacturers and printers, of a prohibition now in the act against counterfeiting official marks, etc.; (b) clarify the provisions of the act with respect to forgery, unauthorized use or failure to use official marks, etc., and similar offenses; (c) add a restriction upon possession of official devices, or devices, labels, meat, meat products, or other articles bearing counterfeit official marks, and similar items, and add a prohibition against knowingly making any false representation that any article has been inspected and passed under the act. (These provisions are modeled after provisions in section 203(h) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1622(h)); and (d) clarify prohibitions with respect to false statements in official or nonofficial certificates.

Section 9. This section disqualifies for inspection under the act the slaughtering of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines, and the preparation of the carcasses, or parts or products thereof, not intended for human food, and would require such articles to be denatured or otherwise identified as prescribed by the Secretary to deter their use as human food, unless they are naturally inedible by humans.

Section 10. This section would clarify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of carcasses, parts thereof, meat and meat food products which are prepared at a federally inspected establishment when not under the supervision of an inspector or are prepared otherwise in violation of the regulations. This could include condemnation of the articles if they were so prepared that their fitness for human food and freedom from adulteration could not be ascertained. This section also preserves the general authority for rules and regulations conferred by the act notwithstanding the provisions for specific kinds of regulations.

Section 11. This section and section 14 of the bill (which would add section 31 to the act) would make uniform provision in the act for the responsibility of principals for acts of their agents.

Section 12. Paragraph (a), in conjunction with the definition of a "farmer" and a "retail dealer" in section 14 of the bill (which would add section 34 to the act) would clarify and restrict the present authority for exemptions from inspection for farmers and retail dealers. Exemptions would also be authorized for farmers and retail dealers from other specific provisions of the act. Exemptions under this paragraph would apply to operations for interstate, foreign or intrastate commerce. Paragraph (b) concerns exemptions from inspection or other specific provisions of the act with respect to establishments slaughtering cattle, sheep, swine, or goats or preparing products solely for distribution within the State, territory, or District of Columbia in which the establishment is located and provides for such exemptions in specified alternative situations: (1) in case of adequate regulation by the State or other jurisdiction concerned; or (2) in case the volume of operations is so minor as not to substantially affect interstate or foreign commerce.

Paragraph (c) would authorize exemptions for operations and transactions at a retail store, restaurant, or similar place of business if inspection or application of the other specific provisions of the act is found to be unnecessary for protection of the public or impracticable. It is not contemplated that continuous inspection would be maintained over the preparation of meat, etc. at retail stores. The authority for inspection of retail level activities should be available, however, for the occasional instances in which it is necessary for the protection of consumers.

Paragraph (d) would authorize the Secretary to impose conditions and restrictions upon any exemptions under this section. Paragraph (e) would prohibit distribution of exempted articles contrary to any such condition or restriction upon such exemption. Paragraph (f) would exclude from regulation under the act certain operations by any farmer in preparing meat or other specified articles for use by his family and certain other persons; and also would exclude from the act, with certain restrictions, the distribution of the unused portion of such articles prepared incidental to such use.

Section 13. This section and the definition of "adulterated" in section 14 of the bill (which would add new section 34 to the act) would clarify the regulatory authority of the Department to prevent adulteration of carcasses, parts thereof, meat, and meat food products and commerce in such articles when adulterated.

Section 14. This section would add 15 new sections to the act.

New section 22 would transfer the import meat provisions from section 306(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1306(b)) to the Meat Inspection Act, clarify their application to carcasses, parts thereof, and meat food products, as well as meat, and clarify the authority of this Department to impose labeling (including foreign origin labeling) requirements and requirements to bar adulterated articles.

New section 23 would prohibit the distribution in interstate, foreign or intrastate commerce of carcasses, parts thereof, meat or meat food products of horses, or other equines unless they are identified to show the kinds of animals from which they were derived and authorize requirement that they be handled separately from other animals or meats.

New section 24 would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to prescribe conditions for storage and other handling of carcasses, parts thereof, meat and meat food products of the specified animals, which are capable of use as human food, by persons engaged in the business of buying, selling, freezing, storing, transporting or otherwise handling such articles.

New section 25: Paragraph (a) would authorize recordkeeping requirements with respect to, and afford access to the records and premises of, slaughterers and processors of carcasses, or parts or products of carcasses of the specified animals; inedible products renderers; meat brokers; importers; transportation agencies; and other specified classes of operators. It would also make applicable in enforcement of the Meat Inspection Act, provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, authorizing requirement of reports and administrative subpenas and conferring other investigative and hearing powers.

(b) This paragraph would require registration of meat brokers, inedible products renderers, animal food manufacturers, wholesalers, and certain public warehousemen handling carcasses, or parts or products of the carcasses of the specified animals, and other specified classes of operators.

New section 26 would permit regulation of the distribution of dead, dying, crippled, or diseased animals or parts of carcasses of animals that died otherwise than by slaughter, e.g., of natural causes.

New section 27 would authorize the refusal or withdrawal of inspection services with respect to any establishment if the applicant or recipient is found unfit to engage in any business requiring inspection under the act because of the commission of certain types of crimes or specified degrees of association with persons convicted of certain crimes, or for other specified causes. Opportunity for hearing would be provided in connection with such actions. Authority to refuse or withdraw inspection for other specified reasons would be preserved and clarified.

New section 28 would provide authority for the temporary detention of carcasses, parts thereof, meat or meat food products, or articles exempted from the definition of a meat food product, when there is reason to believe that they may be adulterated, unfit for food, misbranded or otherwise in violation of the act or other Federal or State acts dealing with the wholesomeness of such products.

New section 29 would authorize judicial seizure and condemnation proceedings for certain carcasses, parts thereof, meat and meat food products that are adulterated, unfit for human food, misbranded or otherwise in violation of the act, while being transported or held for sale or donation at any level of distribution in the United States.

New section 30 would authorize injunctions to enforce, or restrain violations of, the act and specify the courts to have jurisdiction of cases arising under the act other than labeling cases within the jurisdiction of the U.S. Court of Appeals under section 5(e) of the act.

New section 31 as noted earlier, would provide for the responsibility of principals for acts or omissions of their agents.

New section 32: Paragraph (a) would authorize cooperation with the States or other jurisdictions in initiation or administration of adequate State or local meat inspection laws with respect to cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines and carcasses, parts thereof, meat and meat food products.

Paragraph (b) would provide for, and outline conditions of, cooperation with the States or other jurisdictions in the conduct of inspection required under the Federal act.

Paragraph (c) "State" is defined for purposes of the section to include any governmental subdivision thereof.

New section 33 defines the relationship between the Meat Inspection Act and the laws of the States and other jurisdictions. It includes provision that as to articles inspected under the act States may not have additional or inconsistent labeling, packaging, or ingredient requirements.

New section 34 contains definitions of numerous terms used in the act. The definition of meat food product in paragraph (a) is in accord with long continued practice in administration of the act and clarifies the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to except articles from the definition. Such excepted articles are subject to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may require under section 18 of the bill that meat or meat food products used therein must have been inspected under this act. The term applied to products of equines has the same comparable meaning as to cattle, sheep, swine, and goats.

Paragraph (b) would provide a definition of the term "prepared" which would determine the kind of establishments required to be inspected or exempted under the act.

Paragraphs (c), (d), and (e) define the terms "official mark," "official inspection legend," and "official certificate" and are self-explanatory.

Paragraphs (f) through (i) would define the territorial applicability of the act and would extend it to the unorganized unincorporated possessions of the United States. The term "commerce" would be defined to include interstate, foreign, and intrastate commerce.

Paragraphs (j) through (m) would define the terms "adulterated," "misbranded," "label," and "labeling" in a manner almost identical to the definition of the term in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Paragraph (n) defines the term "Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act."

Paragraph (o) defines the terms "pesticide chemical," "food additive," "color additive," and "raw agricultural commodity" identical to the definition of the terms in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Paragraphs (p) through (w) define the terms "capable of use as human food," "farmer," "retail dealer," "household consumer," "firm," "meat broker," "inedible products rendered," and "animal food manufacturer" and are self-explanatory.

New section 35: This section reduces the penalties for violation of provisions of the act to a misdemeanor level except that if the violation involves intent to defraud or mislead or the distribution or attempted distribution of an article that is adulterated the violation is then subject to felony penalties. An exception is made for a person, firm, or corporation that receives in good faith any article for sale or transportation which is in violation of the act, and furnishes upon request of a representative of the Department of Agriculture the name and address of the person from whom he purchased or received such article and any other pertinent information. The Secretary need not refer for prosecution or other enforcement action minor violations where it is decided a warning will be in the public interest.

New section 36 would authorize the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act. The costs for overtime and holiday work and for supervising the application of official inspection legends to domestic or imported inspected articles subdivided, repackaged, or relabeled elsewhere than where they were originally inspected by inspectors of this Department, and the portion of the costs of inspection that exceeds appropriations therefor are to be borne by those receiving such service.

Section 15. This section would provide penalties for assaults and similar offenses against inspectors and others who perform official duties under any act administered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Section 16. This section of the bill would repeal the present Horse Meat Act, the act of June 5, 1948, relating to cost of inspection, the overtime pay provisions of the act of July 24, 1919, and the import meat provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, since they relate to matters covered by other provisions of the bill.

Section 17. This section is the usual separability provision.

Section 18. (1) Provides that the enactment of this bill shall not derogate from authority vested under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act prior to such enactment.

(2) Makes articles misbranded or adulterated under this act subject to action under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

(3) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is also vested with the detainer authority under section 28 with respect to carcasses, parts thereof, and products thereof.

(4) Secretary may authorize Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to exercise factory inspection authority in plants under inspection.

(5) With respect to articles exempted from definition of "meat food product" because of minor nature of meat content the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in exercising his authority over such articles may require that the meat used therein be only such as has been inspected under this act.

Section 19. Paragraph (a) specifies an effective date which is upon enactment, except as otherwise provided in new subparagraphs (1) through (8).

Subparagraph (1) provides for not imposing certain requirements of the amendments of the Meat Inspection Act to any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia until the expiration of 180 days after the enactment.

Subparagraph (2) provides additional extension of time for the application of the Meat Inspection Act in order for a State or Territory to develop a meat inspection system at least the substantial equivalent of the requirements under the Meat Inspection Act.

Subparagraph (3) provides for 90 day further extension of time for inspection in any establishment when the Secretary determines it is impracticable to provide such inspection.

Subparagraph (4) provides for an additional 2 years of relief with respect to facility requirements beyond subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3) under adequate safeguards for then existing plants which prepare regulated articles for distribution solely within the State or other jurisdiction and which cannot fully meet the plant construction and facilities requirements under the bill.

Subparagraphs (5) through (8) specify effective dates for specific sections and provisions of the act.

Paragraph (b) would not preclude the application of State or local laws not in conflict with the act during the periods provided for in (a).

DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, it is very heartening to me to see the concern expressed here on the floor about the demonstrations over the weekend. I remember some weeks ago when I spoke out against certain Members of this body holding hearings, public hearings, in the guise of congressional hearings, to allow these people to air their views, I stood almost alone.

I am sure that some of the so-called teach-ins and other demonstrations over the weekend were encouraged by the fact that Members of Congress themselves were encouraging this kind of thing a few short weeks ago.

I think it is interesting to note that these same Members of Congress have dropped this ill-advised procedure, and we have not heard much about so-called hearings for people to express their displeasure with what is going on in Vietnam.

I agree with the gentleman from South Carolina, we are winning the war in Vietnam, and that is why the Communists are getting excited. I think it is also significant that the Communist newspaper in New York took after me when I made my statement before.

I welcome that kind of criticism.

MEDICAL EDUCATION IN THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], my chairman, for his leadership and foresight in introducing a bill which seeks to provide a new day for the medical care available to the veterans of this country. I wish to associate myself completely with him in this effort, and consequently I have introduced an identical bill.

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, the bill seeks to provide for closer cooperation between the medical schools of this country and the Veterans' Administration. This cooperation, which has existed for nearly 20 years, has been of tremendous value and importance in providing for the care of the sick and disabled veteran of all of our wars. For many years now, the Veterans' Administration has been cooperating to the limit of its resources by taking money from the only source which was available in its appropriation. Namely, this has been the medical administration item—to finance the necessary cooperation between the 78 medical schools with which the Veterans' Administration is affiliated. Great advances in medicine have been made during the past 20 years, and in order for the Veterans' Administration to keep up, there have been ever-increasing demands for the expenditure of larger sums of money for medical education. It is not fair or reasonable that this money should come out of funds intended primarily for patient care. I do not offer any criticism but rather commendation for the Veterans' Administration for its action in the past. By spending this money for medical education the Veterans' Administration has saved the lives of countless veterans who otherwise might have died.

I would like to read at this point the eloquent statement made by Dr. John L. Parks, member of the executive counsel of the Association of American Medical Colleges, and dean of the School of Medicine of George Washington University here in Washington, before the Subcommittee on Hospitals in May of 1964:

> For more than a decade, immediately following World War II, a highly effective working relationship developed between the Nation's medical schools and the Veterans' Administration hospitals. Deans' committees helped establish, in the medical school affiliated VA hospitals, very capable professional staffs. Academic appointments attracted highly qualified physicians who were interested in the combined Veterans' Administration-medical school services. With the establishment and demonstration of the principle that an individual's health needs are best served by physicians who have inseparable responsibilities for teaching, research, and patient care, VA hospital became important educational as well as patient care centers. Over a 10- to 15-year period, academically minded full-time Veterans' Administration staff physicians, assisted by medical-school-appointed attending and consultant staffs provided the veteran with superb medical care. Many advances in our knowledge of cardiac conditions, infectious diseases, hypertension, psychiatric illnesses, circumstances of aging and chronic diseases such as rheumatoid arthritis and tuberculosis have resulted from research conducted in VA hospitals. A large number of the Nation's leading medical educators have served as Veterans' Administration staff physicians. A close working relationship has been maintained throughout all the 17 years of affiliation between the Veterans' Administration and the Nation's medical schools. The importance of the medical schools to the VA organization and in turn the significance of utilization of Veterans' Administration hospital facilities for educational purposes is attested to by the following information from a 1964 AAMC survey of the Veterans' Administration hospital-medical school relations.
>
> Ninety-six VA hospitals are affiliated with 78 medical schools. More than three-fourths of the junior medical students in the United States receives part of their clinical experience in veterans hospitals. A total of 3,885 out of 7,321 registered senior medical students have a part of their fourth year clinical training in VA hospitals. Approximately 10 percent of all residencies are in VA hospitals. Many of America's best specialty training programs have developed through combined university and affiliated VA hospital programs; 15 percent of all practicing physicians have received part of or all of their specialty training in Veterans' Administration hospitals.
>
> The importance and magnitude of this partnership arrangement between the medical schools and the Veterans' Administration have been stressed to demonstrate the tremendous contributions that have been made not only to the health of the veterans but to the advancement of medical science and medical education in the United States through these affiliations.
>
> Over the past few years the deans have been concerned by a series of circumstances that have developed in the VA hospitals which have decreased the effectiveness and the stability of the medical school-VA affiliation. University and community hospital resources have rapidly expanded making available for the teaching of clinical medicine many excellent resources that were not present 10 years ago. Some of the VA-university affiliated hospitals have not kept pace with the advances of other medical schools resources. Personnel, equipment, and space that formerly provided an excellent care program for veterans are inadequate in some respects to meet present-day needs. For example, it has been very difficult to maintain high quality personnel to staff clinical laboratories, departments of anesthesiology, and diagnostic and therapeutic X-ray services. VA salary scales have remained too low. The competition for physicians who have academic interests and excellent clinical abilities is increasing. It is our understanding that the pay bill currently before Congress would provide appreciable salary increases for senior personnel. The association believes that an upward adjustment of the salary scale for VA physicians is essential to the maintenance and advancement of health services for American veterans.
>
> The advantages of the Veterans' Administration-medical school partnership become abundantly apparent. With 169 hospitals and 6,500 physicians, the Veterans' Administration maintains the largest hospital service under a single organization in the world. Out of this vast VA hospital service program, it would seem advantageous for all concerned to concentrate on making the 96 VA hospitals affiliated with medical schools special health centers where diagnostic and research problems receive the immediate and comprehensive attention of highly qualified physicians and research scientists working with the best equipment. These hospitals form a major training area for manpower in the health fields. At a time when all resources must be used to the fullest to provide America and the world with physicians, nurses, dentists, and allied health personnel, the veterans facilities must advance at a high level of academic effectiveness. Medical educators have enthusiastically volunteered to help develop and maintain medical school affiliated VA hospitals as model medical centers serving the health needs of American veterans and contributing to the progress of medicine through research and education. You may count on the medical schools to continue this mutually advantageous partnership with the VA hospitals.

The bill which I have the honor to sponsor with the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs seeks to make our intent crystal clear to those myopic individuals in the Bureau of the Budget who insist on doing everything in their power to hamper the legislative activities of the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. Speaker, with all due humility, I want to say that I have a deep interest in and perhaps a unique insight into this problem. It is my good fortune to serve on the Veterans' Affairs Committee and also on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. This latter committee has reported and enacted into law numerous pieces of legislation in this Congress, which represent a tremendous advance in the scientific and medical world and which represent billions of dollars in expenditures. All of us, of course, are willing to support legislation which will extend or better the lives of mankind, which will make more likely the cure of cancer or stroke or heart disease or any other of the numerous maladies which affect the people of this world. but largely due to the efforts of the little group of "willful men" centered in the Bureau of the Budget, the Veterans Administration is being cut off, hampered and harassed at every stage by some faceless bureaucrats in the Bureau of the Budget who cannot and will not see problems—or even the solutions to the problems, as proposed. Their primary concern, it seems, is to stifle congressional intent.

By their own arbitrary actions, these Budget Bureaucrats virtually halt the flow of lifeblood in these and other well-founded programs. I do not think it is an exaggeration, Mr. Speaker, to say that these individuals are in fact thwarting the will of the President and doing great damage to his concept of a Great Society.

Consider, if you will, the fact that the Veterans' Administration has 160 hospitals now operating in 48 States of the Union, that these hospitals are affiliated with 78 of the 86 accredited medical schools, that it hospitalizes 112,000 people every day in the year, that it has general hospitals, psychiatric hospitals and hospitals devoted to the treatment of tuberculosis, that in addition to operating a system of domiciliary homes, numerous outpatient clinics for the examination of individuals suffering from service-connected disabilities are operated in many cities in this country in conjunction with the Regional Offices of the Veterans' Administration. Now any practical logical man would come to the conclusion that this vast medical resource should be the heart, or if you please, the very core of a medical program which has as its purpose the improvement of the health of all of the people of the United States. Yet, these individuals in the Bureau of the Budget each year turn the screws a little tighter and privately boast of constricting the old programs to finance new programs more to their liking or to fit their own choice set of prejudices.

Mr. Speaker, I have had many conversations with the dean of the Medical School of the Duke University. I think all who are familiar with this field will agree that this is one of the great medical schools of the country. The dean of that school is seriously concerned about the lack of progress in the Veterans' Administration, the lack of availability of funds to keep up with the rapid pace of medical advances which the country has had the good fortune to experience in recent years. Rumors are rife around the country that if the Veterans' Administration is not able to finance medical education on a more realistic basis in the future than it has in the past and unless it is able to do so in the immediate future, there will be many medical schools which will no longer affiliate with the Veterans' Administration hospitals. I can think of no greater disservice to the veterans of this country than to have a mass withdrawal from the medical program of the Department of Medicine and Surgery by the various medical schools of the several States. The quality of patient care would drop as surely as the sun rises and sets.

So, Mr. Speaker, the bill which I am proud to cosponsor is simple in purpose—to give the Veterans' Administration the authority to proceed in the medical education field on a more realistic basis and to take the necessary steps to assure the continuing cooperation of the various medical schools not only for the benefit of patient care, but also for the general benefit of all of the sick and ill people of the United States.

DEDICATION OF RADIO TELESCOPE AT GREEN BANK, W. VA.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, on October 13, a 140-foot radio telescope was dedicated at the National Radio Astronomy Observatory, Green Bank, W. Va. This was a notable occasion for West Virginia, and I am pleased to include the dedicatory address by the Director of the National Science Foundation, Dr. Leland J. Haworth:

REMARKS OF DR. LELAND J. HAWORTH, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

It is always an agreeable experience to participate in the dedication of a new scientific research facility. To me this occasion is more than usually gratifying. I say this because I was personally and rather intimately involved with some of the growing pains associated with the planning and developmental stages of the project, as Director of the Brookhaven National Laboratory and as vice president and president, rather briefly, of Associated Universities, Inc.

The 140-foot radio telescope which is the center of our attention today brings a significant additional research capability to the National Radio Astronomy Observatory, and introduces a new potential for exploring the nature of the universe. Even to the eye of a casual observer, the instrument represents a major engineering achievement. The base contains 5,700 tons of concrete and 170 tons of steel resting on solid rock 30 feet below the ground. The moving parts total more than 2,600 tons. It is the largest equatorially mounted radio telescope in the world, and the most precise instrument of its kind in existence.

But for me, this instrument and the occasion of its dedication serve to rekindle memories of the devotion to duty and perseverance of people who guided the project through some rough waters, who gave unselfishly of their time, their talents, and their loyalty in doing all the things necessary to get the job done.

I am speaking now of people like Max Small who have helped us build facilities at Brookhaven, and who then moved over to head the project staff for the National Radio Astronomy Observatory. I am speaking of people like Jerry Tape, a wartime colleague at MIT and close associate at Brookhaven, who played a crucial role as vice president and president of Associated Universities. And I. I. Rabi, Ted Reynolds, Dick Emberson, Charles Dunbar, and Loui Burchill and many others of that earlier period and later to whom I would now like to express a hearty "well done."

The ground rules covering dedication ceremonies are weighted in favor of the speaker. By tradition he is entitled to assume that among his listeners there is at least one individual who knows nothing whatever of the circumstances, but who is waiting eagerly to be informed. On the basis of this assumption, the speaker is then free to say at least some things that may be familiar to many members of his audience and know that he will be forgiven.

With this apology I should like to point out the interesting way in which the achievement we are celebrating resulted from several separate, though parallel and often overlapping developments that had their genesis in World War II. Let me speak first of radio astronomy itself.

Radio astronomy is a new branch of a very old science. In the single generation since Karl Jansky announced his first findings, we have witnessed revolutionary changes in our way of life which can be attributed to the fruits of science. We have moved into the age of jet-air travel, manned orbiting satellites, and space probes capable of traveling to Mars and beyond. On the more mundane level, television sets and automatic dishwashers now rank right along with the kitchen stove as essential items of household equipment.

But here at Green Bank, as at the other 20 or so radio astronomy installations in the United States, we have rather a good illustration of how the feedback from technology, the fruit of science, can be applied, in turn, to fostering and promoting the further development of science.

When Karl Jansky presented his original paper on mysterious extraterrestrial electrical signals to the International Scientific Radio Union in 1932, there was no immediate great stir of interest in the scientific community. The optical astronomers were busy with their own affairs, and the implications for physicists, chemists, and mathematicians in Jansky's findings were as yet unseen. As a matter of fact, the various scientific disciplines in those times were still living pretty much in separate households. In some cases, professionally speaking, there was hardly even a nodding acquaintance. Besides, while Jansky was a physicist, the problems of radio static upon which he had been working for Bell Telephone Laboratories seemed more related to engineering than to science.

In any event, except for some follow-on work by Grote Reber in the later 1930's, Jansky's fundamental discovery lay dormant for about 15 years. An important contributor to the revival of interest was the same phenomenon that has had so much impact on every aspect of our lives, the explosive scientific and technical developments that grew out of World War II. The electronic arts mushroomed, bringing much more highly sensitive radio and radar receivers—especially at the higher frequencies, new types of and much larger antennas, electronic computers, and many other electronic wonders. It is not surprising that numerous people began to realize that here were the means for effectively exploring the nature and sources of Jansky's mysterious astronomical signals.

The United States has always done well in optical observational astronomy. The discoveries from which the present general picture of the universe has emerged have largely come from observatories in this country. This came about because a few inspired and imaginative men in the first half of this century secured the private funds to build the large telescopes which enabled us to reach our present position in astrophysics.

With so many other irons in the postwar fire, we were frankly late in entering the field of radio astronomy, and the first large telescopes and antenna arrays were built in Australia, England, and the Netherlands.

First serious efforts in radio astronomy in the United States took place in the early 1950's, with modest projects at the Naval Research Laboratory and at Cornell University. A radio astronomy project at Harvard, started in 1953, produced the first Ph. D.'s in the new specialty, but even by 1956 we had only about 20 professional radio astronomers in the country, and about 20 graduate students doing research in the subject.

In the early 1950's the scientific community began to make concerted efforts to study the growing needs in the field. An especially crying need was for more and larger, highly-sophisticated equipment. Much of that equipment would be so expensive in money and technical manpower that it could be provided only in small numbers—sometimes only singly—even with substantial increases in the support from the Federal Government. But it was rightly deemed essential that the most advanced equipment be available to the best radio astronomers, wherever based, and that it would not be in the national interest for them to be concentrated in one or even a few places.

This situation was strikingly similar to that in the nuclear sciences as World War II was ending some years earlier. At that time farsighted scientists foresaw the fact that advancements resulting from nuclear research would result in the need for large and complicated equipment such as nuclear reactors, large accelerators, and special laboratories whose construction and operation would involve vast expenditures in money and human effort and whose effective utilization could be accomplished only by the cooperative efforts of large groups of scientists working in many fields. Consequently, in contrast to the prewar period, much of the more advanced research in the nuclear and related fields would be beyond the scope of most universities and other private institutions and would have to be conducted in large, specialized centers. It was, however, essential both to the effective advancement of science and to the health and vigor of the traditional institutions that they continue to participate in such advanced fields. Thus was conceived the idea of national cooperative laboratories in which the requisite equipment would be provided for use not only by the resident staff but also by the scientific community at large.

Encouraged by Gen. Leslie Groves, then still head of the Manhattan District, and backed by their individual universities, scientists in several of the leading northeastern universities developed the idea of such a laboratory, to be financed by the Government but operated by a private organization. In keeping with the concept of cooperative research it was deemed logical to provide cooperative management. Thus were born the first federally supported cooperative laboratory, Brookhaven, and the first multiple-university sponsored nonprofit research organization, Associated Universities, Inc., which operates it. The Atomic Energy Commission, established about the same time, has financed the Laboratory through a long-term contract with AUI.

The concept of cooperative research was also applied, in varying degrees to others of the Commission's research centers, notably at the Argonne and Oak Ridge National Laboratories and the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Berkeley.

With the passage of time the worth of this concept was strikingly demonstrated. For example, a great bulk of our most advanced research in high energy physics has been conducted at these national centers. Literally thousands of university scientists have participated. The national laboratories have also been vital to most of the research involving nuclear reactors, again with much university participation. Relatively less importantly, the cooperative aspects of the work has extended to many other areas of both the physical and biological sciences.

In their deliberations of the early fifties, those interested in radio astronomy, recognizing the applicability of the national laboratory concept, suggested to the Government the creation of a national observatory for radio astronomy.

The agency to which they turned, the National Science Foundation, itself results from new concepts growing out of World War II. In his report to the President—"Science, the Endless Frontier," made in 1945, Vannevar Bush had forcefully pointed out that not only would the applications of science become of increasing importance to the people and hence to the Federal Government, but also it was essential that basic science grow and flourish, both as the underpinning for technology and for its cultural and intellectual values. From his suggestions ultimately came the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, establishing the Foundation and charging it with the nourishment and support of basic science and science education. This charge is unique among those of Government agencies in that whereas all others support science in pursuit of specific practical missions, the NSF supports science in order that science itself be strong and that we are liberally endowed with capable scientists and engineers. It has strong organizational ties to the scientific and academic communities; indeed it is governed by a board drawn from that and other sectors of the public at large. I need not say that this concept and its fulfillment have been vital to the progress of basic science and of science education in this country.

The Foundation accepted the idea for a national observatory and set about its establishment. Associated Universities, Inc., was invited to develop and operate the new institution. After considerable research the present site was chosen and a national radio astronomy observatory was established in 1956. My good friend, Lloyd V. Berkner, at that time president of Associated Universities and himself scientifically interested in atmospheric physics and astronomy, was a moving force in all of these activities.

Thus we see the coming together to produce a remarkably fruitful result the various separate postwar developments of which I spoke—the electronic advances that made modern radio astronomy possible, the concept of the national cooperative laboratory, the concept of a consortium of universities working together to achieve a national scientific goal, the concept of a government agency devoted to science itself and guided by knowledgeable members of the public at large. I hope you will pardon me for saying that I take great pride in having at various stages partaken in each of these developments.

During its short lifetime the Observatory has made great progress under its successive Directors, Dr. Berkner, Dr. Otto Struve, and Dr. David Heeschen. Starting with modest equipment, including the 85-foot telescope which was wisely installed at a very early date, it has progressed to have the largest movable telescope in the world, the 300-foot reflector, and now the great fully steerable and highly precise telescope we are dedicating today. Excellent auxiliary equipment has been designed and fabricated, very significant scientific results have been achieved.

At this point, I would like to say that the NSF's pride in the accomplishments at Green Bank is equaled by its pride in the Kitt Peak National Observatory, built on the same concepts and operated by another university consortium, Associated Universities for Research in Astronomy. We look forward to increasing cooperation between these two observatories which will undoubtedly be heightened by the millimeter wave telescope which the NRAO will establish on Kitt Peak.

While these developments have been unfolding, progress in optical astronomy, in astrophysics in general and in our knowledge of the universe at large has been truly amazing. Such discoveries as that of quasers have astonished the scientific world and intrigued the general public. The great advances made in observational techniques and in scientific results have helped to bring about a resurgence of interest in the subject of astronomy. It is fitting that this be so. The world owes a great debt to astronomy in both the scientific and the general sense.

In the remainder of this talk let me trace for you some of the historical trends and natural interconnections which have led to the current interlocking relationship of science and technology—and to point out the great importance of reconsolidating the "house of intellect" so that presumed real cultural gaps between science and other crucially important areas of human activity can be bridged once more.

In the early days of Western culture, there was no distinction made between the sciences as they were then known and other intellectual pursuits of man. Indeed the physical sciences were long known as natural philosophy. Science and technology were not closely interlocked as they are today. Development of tools, conveyances, and other appurtenances of everyday life was conducted by craftsmen and lowly inventors. The natural philosophers, or scientists, lived on a plane apart, and it would have been beneath the dignity of most such intellectuals to turn their talents to utilitarian uses.

Of course there were a few exceptions to the pattern. For example, since man lived by the seasons, kings and emperors supported large astronomical projects to insure that the calendar was accurate, so that the advent of spring could be predicted precisely and the crops planted accordingly.

Even in this early period, however, with science and what we now call technology so far apart, science gradually began to have an effect on the way man viewed himself in relationship to the universe. The great discoveries, the transforming changes brought about by the intellectuals, were slow in making an impact on society. The impact was delayed by the character of the social structure, which was not simply inimical to progress but incapable of comprehending the idea. The whole idea of progress—the concept that conditions of life can be improved as time goes on—is relatively new. Peasants of the Middle Ages did not look forward to any marked improvement in their circumstances within their lifetime or the lifetime of their children. Elements of society with the power to initiate or encourage change were quite content with the status quo. The seasons and the years came and went, and the conditions of life at one springtime were essentially the same as those of the preceding ones. Modest changes in craftsmanship and simple inventions were slow to be adopted. Human progress was almost imperceptible so that most people were unaware of any improvement from one generation to the next.

Although unrecognized by the people as a whole, the ideas and progress of science were to change their circumstances. The theories of Copernicus published in 1543 constituted one of the great transforming ideas. His assertion that the earth was not the center of the universe—as most men supposed—cast doubt on a belief that had been accepted for countless centuries without reservation. Galileo, nearly a hundred years later, confirmed and expanded the Copernican theory that the sun was the center of the planetary system inhabited by man. Galileo, as history tells us, was not acclaimed by his contemporaries. After defying an edict of the church against holding or defending the Copernican theory that his telescopes had verified, he was arrested by the Roman Inquisition and, under threat of torture, was forced permanently to recant. But the seeds of change had been planted. Scholars such as Newton and Kepler followed in turn to build on the work of their predecessors and—slowly at first—mankind began to question his relationship with the world around him.

A major early and continuing result was the contribution of the new mode of thinking to the unfettering of the human mind. Even religion has been basically affected. Galileo's theories have long been accepted by all but the most backward. It is heartwarming and an example of my point that a few months ago Pope Paul VI, the first of that name since Galileo was condemned, displayed again his own greatness by formally praising Galileo as one of the "great spirits" of "immortal memory."

Even at the beginning of the Industrial Revolution, there was little communion between science and what we call technology although there were occasional bridges connecting the two. Technology was based largely on the application of various forms of nonbiological energy through increasingly complex machines to accomplish tasks that had formerly been done by man himself or by beasts of burden. As time went on, human ingenuity and improvements derived from experience gradually increased the range of possibilities. But for a long time, new developments continued to be largely the result of invention based on observation and on knowledge that was familiar, qualitatively at least, even to relatively untrained minds. Most advances into the unknown were empirical in nature, and usually occurred in gradual steps.

Gradually, beginning in the last century, some of the inventors—importantly among them Edison—began to find ways of applying to practical objectives the findings of the scientists then studying the laws of nature in a basic way.

As more people became active in research over the years, things began to change, slowly at first and then with greater and greater rapidity. Today the pace of change is almost beyond our capacity to keep abreast. Unlike the situation earlier, we now find our lives intimately affected by scientific applications, meaning applications derived directly from scientific research as distinct from technological innovations based on generally known fundamentals.

For decades now there has been an increasingly close and symbiotic relationship developing between science and technology. New discoveries in science open up new vistas in application. In turn, these practical developments often make possible the construction of new tools of research which are of great significance to the progress of science.

All this is as it should be. But the world must not forget the other side of science—that it has a dual nature. On the one hand it has an enormous intellectual, cultural and educational value, something it shares with other forms of knowledge, with literature and the arts; on the other hand it is the foundation on which rests all of our technological advances. I am reminded of a remark often attributed to Michael Faraday, although at times to Benjamin Franklin. According to the Faraday version, he once demonstrated his first electromagnetic induction equipment to someone who asked, "Of what use is it?" and Faraday replied "Of what use is a new-born baby?" Now this is usually interpreted to mean that his device, like a new-born baby, might grow up to be useful to society, as indeed it did. But I believe there is a second meaning, namely, that a new-born baby is wonderful and useful in itself. When we go down the street and see a little child smiling and gurgling and laughing, and we smile in sympathy and are attracted to that child, it is not because we think it will grow up to become something useful in the world. It is because that child is something highly worthwhile in its own right; and so is basic science.

There has unfortunately been another change. For many centuries, as I have said, science was an integral part of the broad spectrum of advanced knowledge. There was no separation between science and the humanities; they were intellectually indistinguishable as branches of scholarship. But in recent times—beginning at some point in the 19th century which is difficult to pinpoint accurately—two related things have been happening. Science has been somewhat pushed away—or has pulled itself away, depending on one's pointe of view—from the arts and "the other humanities."

This is unfortunate, for science is not inhumane, and it is easily demonstrated that the life of the human race has been enriched by the ideas of science, as well as the material benefits which science has made possible. In a deeply meaningful sense, science is one of the humanities.

In placing science and the humanities in separate compartments, so to speak, those who do so frequently overlook the many ways in which science impinges on the mind of man in the same manner as music, literature, and art. Let me illustrate by a personal experience.

Some two years ago I spoke on a scientific subject to an annual "Alumni Institute" at Indiana University. In my talk I alluded to the intellectual and cultural values of basic scientific research. I pointed out that the objective of the fundamental scientist is an understanding of nature without regard to possible practical application. His reward is one of the mind and of the spirit rather than of material thnigs.

Later in the evening, an artist on the faculty gave a very interesting illustrated talk on what interests and inspires the artist. Quoting from my talk, he concluded, with some surprise, that the artist and the scientist are not so far apart as is generally supposed, that their objective and their rewards are much the same. I thoroughly agree. It seems to me that the only basic difference is that the scientist seeks to learn and understand the intrinsic beauties found in nature's laws, which are immutable, whereas the artist is free to create beauty by combining nature with his own imagination.

Acknowledging that the scientist and the artist both derive pleasure and satisfaction from their creative efforts, we might well then ask: "What of the spectators?" Many will view—and some will understand at least in part—the artist's work. On the other hand, there is a fairly widespread belief that science can be viewed and understood only by the initiated few. I disagree. Science can be made understandable, but not easily. It is necessary for scientists and educators—including the special kind of educators who are engaged in writing stories for newspapers and magazines and scripts for television commentators—to work together to insure that the advances of science, its great and truly wondrous spirit of adventure and conquest, are conveyed at least to some extent to the public.

It is also important that the public learn to understand the scientists themselves, that they are simply highly educated men working in a specialized field. Today there is no question as to the skill, capability, efficiency, and natural endowment of American scientists and engineers. The public is proud of the remarkable achievements they have made. Their successes have instilled in the average citizen a feeling that scientists and engineers can accomplish almost any technical result.

This image of the scientist is, of course, exaggerated. But it is important that we continue to take advantage of our great opportunities in science, for it is certain that this is the best way to improve our lot in life and to maintain our security.

This will entail increased public investment in science and its applications, and I would be the first to say that it is not fair to ask the public to pay taxes for what it does not and cannot understand. But one does not have to be an astronomer to understand in reasonable detail what is exciting and important about discovery of quasers, those super-bright objects radiating fantastic amounts of energy as they recede from us at speeds almost beyond imagining and on the outskirts of the observable. Can we ever put such objects to use? Of course not. Is their discovery nonetheless significant? Of course it is. And it take no more specialized knowledge to understand and become impressed by this discovery—this accomplishment of man's intellect—than it does to learn about the scaling of Mount Everest and to share vicariously the joy of accomplishment with those who first accomplished this feat. The point is that those who speak for science—the communicators—must make the information available to the audience in palatable and digestible form.

Clearly the leadership of our society as a whole needs to work hard to bring back together the areas of activity we nowadays commonly call the humanities and the sciences. At the same time, we should also address ourselves to the task of making certain that we have in fact this time erected the house of intellect in complete and inclusive form. Two centuries ago it excluded the technology of the day. As we bridge the gap that is today said to exist between the humanities and science, we will be doing only part of the job if we perchance fail to make sure that technology also is made part of the intellectual family.

A distinguished scientist and past president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Chauncey Leake, envisions an intellectual partnership in coping with the need for understanding. "When the sciences and the humanities," he points out, "are used like the two eyes of man's remarkable bifocal vision, we can expect that we shall be able to discern much wiser policy decisions at the various social levels than we can when these two major dimensions of human experience are isolated from each other."

This mutual understanding can be achieved only by movement from both directions. The humanist who scorns—as some do—the usefulness of science is wrong. The practical man who scorns intellectual and cultural values is also wrong. In both cases their vision is too circumscribed.

In years gone by, it was not uncommon to hear the claim that science is inimical to the welfare of human society. There are still a few among us who would turn back the clock to an Arcadian era when life was simpler. This sentimental but misguided nostalgia for oil lamps, outdoor plumbing, and germs in the milk helps account for sporadic outbursts of reaction we have witnessed in the United States from time to time. In spite of such small pockets of resistance to progress, it is certain that in the absolute sense man is today closer to meeting his fundamental needs and satisfying his less fundamental wants than ever before. Moreover, science has brought to thoughtful men and women the realization that man can put an end to existing ills and make the planet on which we live a better habitat for the human race.

We must bear in mind that useful work, good health, and survival are not guaranteed in nature. Millions of unfortunate people are still wholly occupied with the desperate effort to obtain enough food to hold body and soul together. Such things as productive jobs, medical services, and the thousand and one characteristics of a highly developed society are manmade. Here in the United States it has been demonstrated that science in concert with other intellectual elements can alter the social and economic balance of a nation, providing a fuller opportunity for personal fulfillment and the pursuit of happiness.

Clearly, science and scientists have changed the world. They have created untold opportunities for good, and enormous potentialities for evil. As a result of their efforts, we enjoy longer and healthier lives; we have such conveniences and tools as abundant electricity in the home, safe and speedy surface and air transportation, nuclear reactors propelling surface and subsurface oceangoing vessels; instantaneous communication, including live television to and from Europe via orbiting satellites; space vehicles traveling millions of miles to inspect the planets and relay their observations back to earth; giant accelerators probing deep into the subnuclear world; ultra-high-speed computers solving complex problems in science, in business, and in many other spheres.

Scientific advances over the fairly recent past have brought with them a sweeping egalitarian influence here in the United States. Although the process is by no means complete, we are approaching more closely to a classless society than any nation since the beginning of the end of feudalism. The gap between the rich and the poor has become progressively narrower as the standard of living for all people has been raised. Judy O'Grady and the colonel's lady patronize the same hairdresser and occupy adjacent seats at the theater. The banker, once an aloof and unapproachable ogre, has become a friendly corner merchant. This dramatic improvement in the standard of living can be directly attributed to science and the benefits it has bestowed. I do not need to remind you that wide class distinctions—the chasm that yawns between the rich and the poor—is a major source of the many problems of undeveloped countries.

But science has also made possible intercontinental ballistic missiles with nuclear warheads, world-ranging submarine armed with similar weapons, and a wide variety of death-dealing devices making use of biological and chemical agents. These levels of technological sophistication have been achieved in a world whose inhabitants are not all intellectually mature. The world is still growing up, and growing up can be dangerous. Throughout the centuries history has shown us that the human race never moves forward uniformly; hence increasing scientific knowledge brings both opportunity and danger. Only by the most arduous efforts can opportunity be strengthened and danger lessened.

In connection with this potential for good or evil, let me here draw an analogy between science and another of man's great intellectual achievements. No one would seriously dispute the inherent value of an expressive and versatile language. It is an essential element of civilized society. Without a good command of language, no man can realize his full potential either culturally or professionally. But language, too, can be used for differing purposes. It is the basic means of communicating knowledge and ideas. In the hands of some, it has reached sublime cultural and intellectual heights. Wrongly used, it can express evil and obscene thoughts. It can by a Hitler spur men on to base and evil deeds. But it can also be used by a Churchill to inspire others to great and noble sacrifices for the common good.

Thus it is the minds of good or evil men—who use the magic of language to inspire or debase the souls of others—which determine whether communication is used to accomplish good or evil in the world.

And so it is also with science, society as a whole—including both the scientists and the humanists—must determine the course of science. Its application for good or evil inevitably reflects our social morality. What uses we now make of science will demonstrate to future generations the kind of moral values we hold in the 20th century.

I am sure that as we move forward together to achieve our common goals astronomy will continue to be enormously important. It is one of the vital contributors to our understanding of the universe about us; it has profound intellectual and cultural depths; it intrigues not only scientists but laymen; its goals are clearly peaceful; they are shared internationally.

I am equally sure that as astronomy continues to move forward an important role will be played by the National Radio Astronomy Observatory and by the great instrument that we dedicate today.

CONDITIONS AT THE SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Administration Office of the Assistant Administrator for Management and Evaluation, Internal Audit Service, conducted an investigation at the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Salt Lake City, Utah, on May 19, 1965, through July 23, 1965, which revealed, I regret to say, some very shocking conditions. The following statements are quotations from that report and other related reports made within the agency. They speak for themselves.

Officer of the day responsibilities: The departmentalization of the medical school and its effect on the coordination and cooperation between the professional services, and the degree of control exercised over these services by the university department heads, has created a serious situation directly affecting patient care. Responsibility for the care of geriatric patients has been transferred from the psychiatric service to the medical service in accordance with central office instructions. This amounted to a paper transaction only, and psychiatric service continues to provide patient care. A serious problem has arisen, however, in the care of these patients after hours. The head of the department of psychiatry has recently refused to allow the psychiatric officer of the day to attend these wards, and has given strict instructions to the resident OD's to discontinue seeing these patients. The head of the department of medicine will not allow the medical OD's to provide this coverage, and they have been instructed not to respond to calls from geriatric wards. As a result, there have been several instances when nurses have faced emergency situations, called for a physician's assistance, and the physician has refused to respond.

The following is an incident that occurred on May 26, 1965: A nurse on ward 4B (geriatric ward) reported that a patient's condition had become serious, and at 8:45 p.m. she placed a call for the OD. At 9:10 p.m. the medical OD answered her call and refused to come to the patient's aid. The nurse called the registrar assistant who in turn contacted the medical OD. He refused to respond but again called the nurse on ward 4B. He said, "I tell you, as well as I will tell the registrar that I am not responsible for building 4."

The registrar assistant called the psychiatric OD who stated that he was not responsible and refused to respond. Another call was placed to the medical OD and the registrar assistant reiterated the situation and informed the doctor that it was his responsibility. The medical OD continued to decline and the registrar assistant asked him point blank, "Then you refuse to go see the patient in ward 4B?" To which the doctor replied, "That is correct." The registrar assistant then called the surgical OD, explained the situation and asked if he would make the call. He immediately reported to the ward and administered to the patient. Two hours and fifteen minutes elapsed from the time of the first call until the services of a physician were obtained.

Similar incidents have occured since March 1965, and a more recent incident took place on the evening of June 30, 1965, when the chief, psychiatry service, was called from his home to attend a patient whom the OD's had refused to see. Each of these incidents were brought to the attention of the chief of staff; however, he has taken no decisive action, and this serious situation continues to exist.

Admission of non-Veterans' Administration patients: A small but significant number of non-VA (noneligible) patients have been seen in the VA hospital as outpatients. This activity, which dates back to 1959, is coordinated through the office of the chief of the medical service, and key records are maintained by the secretary in this office. These patients fall into at least three categories: (1) Welfare cases from Salt Lake City General Hospital; these are indigent patients referred from teaching clinics because equipment and/or skills for their handling are not available at Salt Lake City General Hospital; (2) part-pay cases from the same source; (3) full-pay (private) cases referred from Salt Lake City General Hospital and from individual practitioners in the area.

The patients in question appear to be referred for two principal purposes: (1) Pulmonary function studies; and (2) gastrointestinal studies, including a rather broad spectrum of diagnostic procedures, such as g.i. X-ray series, gastroscopic examination, etc. There was some hint that radioisotope studies are occasionally done on these patients, but I was unable to definitely confirm this. The staff was fully cooperative and offered no excuses and made no attempt to conceal the activity. As a matter of fact, they seemed genuinely astonished to learn that these matters are of questionable legality.

The registrar at the hospital says that he has not been aware of the activities in question, and his records reflect no unauthorized patient care. It seems clear that the non-VA patients come and go according to schedules handled by the secretary to the chief, medical service. Indeed, this secretary quite proudly reviewed for me her records and procedures in the handling of ineligible patients, and it was obvious that she was still totally unaware of the fact that these activities may be of doubtful legality.

VA equipment, supplies, and technical personnel are definitely involved in the care of the ineligible patients. I visited with technical personnel and examined typical records to verify this point. I made no attempt to quantitate the activity or to get tangible documentation since I understand that all of this will be taken into account by the VA investigator.

When patients are able to pay, they are billed by VA physicians on a University of Utah form. The amount of any bill is computed from the local Blue Cross schedule with adjustments made in relation to an ability-to-pay scale determined at Salt Lake City General Hospital. All billing is handled by the secretary to the chief, medical service, under the direct supervision of the chief, medical service. The chief of the medical service believed this activity to be fully authorized by the former hospital director.

Non-VA patients make checks payable to the responsible full-time VA physician. These are endorsed to one of two funds (Pulmonary Disease or Gastroenterology) administered by the University of Utah School of Medicine. The payments are delivered to the university, and the secretary to the chief, medical service, keeps a file of receipts returned from the office of the university comptroller.

Disbursements from the two funds are made on memorandum requests from the VA physicians involved. The university comptroller's records show disbursements by date, amount, and object. The actual details of these records are being reported by Investigation Service.

The VA physicians concerned, although they receive checks payable to themselves from patients, do not report these as personal income. It was my understanding also that subsequent disbursements from the university-controlled funds are not reported as income even when used to supplement travel and other essentially personal expenses.

The Chief, Medical Service, with whom I had a 2-hour interview, has taken over these activities from his predecessors and has never seriously questioned their validity. Cooperation with the university and alleged unavailability of comparable diagnostic facilities in the community were the two general motives given. The activities date at least from 1959.

Dr.——— stated he provided non-Va patients with consultant services at private hospitals and non-VA patients have received pulmonary function tests at VA hospital, Salt Lake City, with fees from these activities being deposited to the "pulmonary disease fund" maintained and controlled at the University of Utah; $1,378.50 in fees from non-VA patients for pulmonary function testing at the VA hospital have been deposited to the fund. Dr. ———'s professional liability insurance premiums and expenses for professional society dinner meetings have been paid from the fund but Dr. ——— advised he did not consider these personal benefits. He claimed travel expenses from the fund for a period when he also received VA per diem but advised, and records tend to confirm, he claimed only expenses in excess of VA per diem from the fund.

Drs. ——— and ——— stated use of VA services for ineligibles was part of an agreement approved by Dr. ——— (former Director) who denied this. Dr. ——— (former Director) stated he improperly authorized VA physicians to do pulmonary function studies on non-VA patients several years ago on a free basis without central or area office approval. Present hospital Director and the chief of staff denied knowing of VA services provided non-VA patients.

Work outside the hospital: Senior Bacteriologist ——— and Microbiologist ———, Research Service, stated they worked for $2.25 per hour at the University of Utah during VA duty hours since 1963 at the request of Dr. ———, Acting Chief, Surgical Service, who told them the employment was proper. Dr. ——— confirmed this and stated, and ——— and ——— confirmed, they were told university hours would have to be made up through extra work for VA. VA time and attendance reports do not reflect hours taken to work at university or claimed VA makeup hours and Dr. ———, who signed reports, stated they do not reflect ——— and ——— time accurately. ——— and ——— stated they have not made up VA hours taken to work at university. Salaries paid them were drawn from U.S. Public Health Service grants.

Medical care program: Some service chiefs state that their primary responsibility is to the teaching program first, research second and the care of the veteran third. This philosophy has affected the control of the medical care program, the admission policy, and the utilization of employees, funds, and equipment.

Waiting lists: Veterans have been chosen from the waiting list and hospitalized without regard to priority group or standing on the list. The chief, registrar division, advised the hospital director of this deviation by memorandum in January 1964. A review of admissions of psychiatric patients from the waiting list shows that this practice continues. The chief, registrar division, should continue to advise management of out-of-line or improper practices on every occurrence and actively press for their resolution.

Adherence to required policies: Some of the professional staff have refused to accept administrative responsibilities and resent the controls imposed by VA regulations and, in some cases, the standards for hospital accreditation. For example, some vital hospital committees have required participation by key professional staff members. These committees provide an essential medical audit and control function that is designed to provide the chief of staff and the hospital director with a means to evaluate patient care. Some service chiefs, although appointed to these committees, consistently fail to attend meetings.

A tissue committee has not been established and the medical records committee does not perform the basic responsibility of evaluating patient treatment. The medical records committee concerns itself only with the completeness of the medical record and does not evaluate the treatment program. Tissues are reviewed by a pathologist and selected cases are discussed in the surgical-pathology conference; however, minutes of this conference are not taken and no report is made to the chief of staff. Standards for hospital accreditation requires a review and evaluation of all surgery performed and complete documentation of the tissue committee's deliberations concerning the preoperative, postoperative, and pathological diagnosis, and the acceptability of the procedure undertaken. Reports must be furnished the chief of staff for his evaluation of the medical care program.

There is currently a backlog of operation reports that have not been dictated. One of the operations was performed over 1 month ago. The standards for hospital accreditation require that operation reports be dictated as soon as possible following the operation.

This problem was brought to management's attention in the last systematic review of the surgical service conducted in 1959. It was recommended at that time that procedures to correct this deficiency be established.

Office of the chief of staff: Administrative management is unsatisfactory. Insufficient attention is given to policies of higher authority. Indecisive action has resulted in conditions which are detrimental to patient care. Required committees are not established, and others are not performing assigned functions. Among deficiencies noted are: excessive intervention by medical school department heads, refusal of officers of the day to see patients when called, failure to observe admission priorities and delays in examining veterans applying for admission. Controls over investigational drugs and tax-free alcohol are inadequate. The administrative assistant to the chief of staff does not function in a manner commensurate with his position.

Nursing service: Long-standing problems relating to personnel management have been responsible for low employee morale and an exceptionally high turnover rate. Concessions have been made to employees which deviate from agency policy. Staffing improvements are indicated in both the professional nurse and clerical staff. Fund control is inadequate.

Housekeeping division: Weak leadership has failed to provide a full-scale program. Direction is inadequate and has resulted in failure to develop work schedules, poor sanitary controls, abandonment of the exchange cart system, and loss of control over the use of Government-owned uniforms. Improvement is needed in organizational structure. Formal short- and long-range plans must be developed.

Supply division: Unsatisfactory management and weak leadership have been responsible for serious deficiencies in all segments. The division chief has failed to perform his staff and program responsibilities. All equipment programs remain largely undeveloped. Training of division personnel and consumers is virtually nonexistent. Staffing adjustments are essential. Procurement procedures are not in accordance with agency requirements. Inventories have not been given the required attention. Security of warehouse property has been compromised.

Mr. Speaker, the charges enumerated above are serious and damaging enough to need no further elaboration. As of this date, the chief medical director has, to my knowledge, taken no action other than a letter dispatched to the hospital director, dated August 30, directing that the practices described above cease.

It is my understanding that the hospital director, as well as the assistant hospital director—for most of the period and who is now at another station—both deny any knowledge of the treatment of ineligible non-VA patients in the Veterans' Administration hospital. The former hospital director, later promoted as an area medical director, who admits authorizing some of this practice, denies any knowledge of the magnitude but admits some of these actions took place when he was director. With all due charity, it seems to me that the three individuals above, if they did not know of these practices, should have known, and have adequately proved that they are incapable of giving the sort of leadership that an institution such as a Veterans' Administration hospital demands. It is hard for me to imagine what positions of responsibility or trust these individuals, as well as the other individuals involved, could expect to hold in the Veterans' Administration in the future.

The four residents who refused to respond to call for the care of a veteran as indicated above, should be dismissed with prejudice. I have a strong feeling, Mr. Speaker, that any doctor who adopts this attitude has completely removed himself from any usefulness which he may have had to the Veterans' Administration. I earnestly hope these four residents will not have the opportunity to treat veteran patients again or, perhaps more accurately, to refuse to respond to a call for assistance.

Mr. Speaker, the charges reveal a sad and shocking situation at this hospital. The reports are available to the chief medical director and have been since early August. The minimum requirement, it seems to me, is for a complete restaffing in the higher echelons of this hospital. Several resignations, voluntary or involuntary, are in order.

TEACHER CORPS PROPOSAL IN HIGHER EDUCATION CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor of the House this afternoon to speak with respect to a proposal upon which the House will be voting tomorrow afternoon. I refer to the Teacher Corps provision in the Higher Education Conference Report on which we are scheduled to act tomorrow. One of the reasons I take the floor this afternoon is my distress at a memorandum which was circulated to all of the minority Members of the House by my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], in which the gentleman from Minnesota sets forth some of his arguments in support of a motion he proposes to make tomorrow to recommit the conference report on higher education with instructions to kill the Teacher Corps.

I regret very much, because of my respect for the gentleman from Minnesota, and because of the fine support that he has given in so many ways to education legislation, to have to point out to the House that this memorandum which has been circulated to the Republican Members is in a number of ways inaccurate and misleading.

For example, I fail to understand the logic behind the criticism contained in this memorandum in the following respect. It is apparently the position of the gentleman from Minnesota that because the local school district will receive a grant under the Teacher Corps proposal in the amount of the salaries the local educational agency will pay to the Teacher Corps members whom the local educational agency will employ, that this amounts in some way to Federal control. If I remember correctly, the gentleman from Minnesota urged on members of the Committee on Education and Labor that we should accept his proposal that members of the Teacher Corps be paid by check directly from the Federal Government, and—what is to me astonishing—that they should be considered as Federal employees.

In this respect I might make clear that the Washington Post editorial this morning is 100 percent inaccurate in its suggestion that under the language of the conference report the members of the Teacher Corps are to be Federal employees. I have opposed the idea that members of the Teacher Corps should be Federal employees, and I would not even have taken the floor this afternoon to speak of the position of the gentleman from Minnesota in this respect had it not been for the fact that this inaccurate, misleading, and erroneous memorandum was circulated among some Members of the House.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. With respect to the comments just made about the memorandum and about the editorial in this morning's Washington Post being erroneous, I believe it would be helpful to many of us who want to support this program if we can to have some information from the distinguished gentleman on the committee about who will make up this Teacher Corps, where they will work, under whose supervision they will work, and under what conditions they will be paid. First, will they be employees of the local school district?

Mr. BRADEMAS. That is correct. If I may respond to the gentleman from Georgia in the following way, I believe it will be helpful in response to all of his questions.

I have before me a letter which will be inserted in full in the RECORD by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Gardner, in which Mr. Gardner says that the Teacher Corps "will impose no Federal control over the authority of the local school district. In particular"—and I believe this is the point the gentleman from Georgia has in mind—

> The local school district retains full authority to select and reject, to appoint and fire those recruited through the Teacher Corps program. Local school authorities will be free to set the criteria for members they may wish to employ. No community need accept any teacher unsuitable to its needs.

Mr. LANDRUM. Will any community be required to accept a teacher at any time if the community itself does not want and does not request him?

Mr. BRADEMAS. The answer is "No." The local school authorities must request of the Commissioner of Education that members of the Teacher Corps be sent into a particular community. Uncle Sam is not going to jam the Teacher Corps members down the throats of any local school district in this country.

In plain English, the local school district has the authority to hire them and the authority to fire them. That does not seem to me to be evidence of Federal control.

Mr. LANDRUM. Under just what conditions will these local communities be entitled to one or more members of the Teacher Corps?

Mr. BRADEMAS. The local school districts in which there are high concentrations of low-income families, along the lines of the Perkins-Morse Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, are the kinds of districts which will qualify to receive Teacher Corps members.

Mr. LANDRUM. Will some reference to the teacher-pupil load or ratio be considered or made in determining whether or not there is a need for teacher corps assistance?

Mr. BRADEMAS. The answer to that question is that a local educational agency may utilize members of the teacher corps assigned to it in the same manner as that set forth in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Now I want to yield to my friend from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] if I may do so, because I did feel constrained to call attention to the memorandum which was circulated under his name. Perhaps he is not responsible for it. If so, I am glad to yield him this opportunity to say so.

Mr. QUIE. I will say to the gentleman that anything that appears over my name I will take responsibility for. The Washington Post was inaccurate in another way. They stated that the Teacher Corps would be "paid from local school district funds." The facts are that the Federal Government would reimburse the local school district for the salaries of the Teacher Corps which they have working in their school district. So my concern is, and the Federal Government's influence over the local school district stems from this fact, that the Federal Government will recruit, select, and enroll the teachers and the teacher interns. They will also send the money to the school district and the Federal Government can withhold the money from the school district at any time it feels that the school district is not operating in the proper manner. Also it can influence the kind of teachers which will be available since the Commissioners would "recruit, select, and enroll" the members of the National Teachers Corps.

Mr. BRADEMAS. If the gentleman is so deeply concerned about the problem of Federal control—and I agree he is from long service on the committee with him, and I think he knows that I share his concern in that respect—will he be kind enough to explain to me and to the Members of the House how he could possibly suggest to other colleagues on the Committee on Education and Labor that members of the Teacher Corps, as he would conceive it—and he did indicate he could conceive of the Teacher Corps and would under certain circumstances like to see a Teacher Corps—that they should be Federal employees and, moreover, should be paid a national minimum rate. I cannot understand how anyone can take that kind of a position on the one hand and circularize Members of this House complaining about another Teacher Corps proposal which has built into it language which makes clear that the teachers are not to be Federal employees but are to be employees of the local school district, under local school control, must be hired and can be fired locally and assigned at the direction of the local school authority. I do not understand the consistency of the gentleman's position, and if I misunderstand or misrepresent him, I want him to straighten me out on it.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman for yielding further. In answering this, let me say first that I did not urge upon you that you take my idea. Rather, in the meeting of the conferees I was asked what kind of teacher corps would I feel would be acceptable. I worked on the idea of a teacher corps for some time in trying to develop one with the least amount of Federal control. I came to the conclusion it could not be done. This is as far as I have gotten with it. I have not introduced it because I still have a general concern with some parts of it.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Will the gentleman answer my question?

Mr. QUIE. I am going to answer your question. It is my purpose, and I will be glad to do it now. I feel in the area of preschool education where local school districts have not assumed the responsibility, I do not feel well qualified teachers trained to reach the culturally and socially deprived and who would be Federal employees so everybody would know the involvement of the Federal Government, could be of assistance to any school that wanted to use them for a period of 1 to 3 years, this would then be a Federal program which everybody could see operating. It never would be expanding into possibilities of the Federal Government assuming responsibility for teachers' salaries in the school districts.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to be sure that I understand the gentleman from Minnesota. He says, if I do not misrepresent him, that it is perfectly all right with him if we have a program under which preschool teachers are full-time Federal employees; is that correct?

Mr. QUIE. Will the gentleman restate that question?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I asked the gentleman how he can possibly oppose a

Teacher Corps, which we are proposing in the conference report that we will consider tomorrow, which provides that the teachers will be employees of the local school districts, and at the same time take the posture that he would favor a corps which would be made up of Federal employees. To this the gentleman in effect responded, "It is all right with me if they are Federal employees as long as they are teaching at preschool levels where everybody can see them."

I fail to understand that as a logical answer to my allegation; because, what is the difference if they are teaching in preschool programs or elementary school programs or secondary school programs? They are still, under his view, Federal employees. Moreover, it may well be true, as I think many educators would argue, that a teacher may have far more impact on the life of a growing child at the preschool level than at the elementary or secondary school level.

Indeed, we are considering in the subcommittee only this morning legislation introduced by Mr. GIBBONS, of Florida, to provide for support of child development specialists for preschool programs and the first three grades. Will the gentleman from Minnesota tell me why it is all right to have exclusively Federal employees teaching in preschool programs—that seems to him all right—but he opposes them for elementary and secondary school programs?

Mr. QUIE. First, my proposal is not going to be a substitute.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I am trying to understand the gentleman's position.

Mr. QUIE. May I say that what the gentleman from Minnesota has been working on is his own conclusions that he had reached after studying the work of men who have done research in this field and from the experience in Prince Edward County, Va. The fact that I mention preschool is only because I feel that this is an area in which local school districts have not yet assumed responsibility. If you want to see what experienced teachers can do in this field, this is the opportunity for the Federal Government to have such teachers available to a school district with culturally and socially deprived preschool children for a short period of time.

Mr. BRADEMAS. The gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. QUIE. The answer to the gentleman's question is this. My concern over Federal control in this is not a question of preschool versus elementary or secondary schools. My proposal was limited to preschool since this is the level of education which has been neglected by so many school districts and States. My concern over Federal control is that the Federal Government puts money into the school district to reimburse them for the salaries they pay their teachers. That is really the control they have over them. They can decide not to give them the money after the district has accepted the teachers. They can do as the OEO has done, hold up the money for awhile and compel the district to comply with Federal proposals. I have seen the use of withheld Federal funds often disrupt district budgets until it was straightened out.

In other words, the use of Federal money in a school district gives the Federal Government an undue influence over the educational system and I think it is unwise to give the impression that no Federal influence will come to bear. The only reason for the program is to bring about change.

Mr. BRADEMAS. The gentleman from Minnesota is trying to persuade me that there would be no Federal control latent in the kind of fully Federal employee teachers corps that he is suggesting for preschool programs? I find it difficult to accept the gentleman's conclusion.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to propound a question to the gentleman from Minnesota. As I understand him, he advocates a special teaching group for preschool children. He is advocating that the teachers for that group may be direct Federal employees.

Now I ask the gentleman this question. Who would control the curriculum, the subject matters that are taught in order to direct those Federal employees while they are teaching these preschool children?

Mr. QUIE. That is obvious for everybody to see; the same people who are going to select the trained teachers in the Corps who, in turn, will influence the teacher interns, who will have a great effect on the schools. In other words, the Federal Government will, in both cases provide for the training of teachers who will teach according to their training. But remember I am not asking that we accept the version whereby the Federal Government pays teachers salaries directly or indirectly. I say drop the section.

Mr. LANDRUM. The gentleman from Minnesota is actually advocating a system that would bring about complete Federal control of education.

Mr. QUIE. No; I want no Teacher Corps in the bill. The suggestions I made during conference would have the Federal Government pay the salaries where everyone can see it. There is going to be Federal influence in the Senate bill just as sure as you use the Federal Government to train, enroll and recruit these teachers and send them into the school districts.

Does the gentleman suppose that they are going to teach any differently than the way they have been trained by the Federal Government? They are going to train these internees, with their own instruction and their own purposes to be accomplished.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further to the gentleman at this point, but I shall yield further to the gentleman later.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman just made a statement, which like several others of his statements, is wholly inaccurate, and I refer the gentleman to section 516 of title V the the bill entitled, "Local Control Preserved."

> Members of the Teacher Corps shall be under the direct supervision of appropriate officials of local educational agencies to which they are assigned, except as otherwise provided in clause (c) of section 513, such agencies—

The local school districts—and this is the point which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] made very well—

> shall retain authority to assign such members within the system and (2) make transfers within their systems and (3) determine the subject matter to be taught.

So, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] very erroneously and inaccurately in his response to the gentleman from Georgia suggested that the Federal Government was going to determine what subject matter would be taught. That is not true.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there, because the gentleman from Minnesota did not say the subject matter which they will be taught, but he said the way they are trained.

Mr. BRADEMAS. In that event, I want to apologize, but that is what I thought I heard the gentleman from Minnesota say.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] and then I shall be glad to come back and yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, first, let me commend my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] on his decision to take this time today in an effort to clear the air with reference to the confusion that exists with regard to the Teacher Corps provision.

No one has worked more diligently, intelligently, and hard to bring this legislation to the floor of the House than the gentleman from Indiana. The gentleman from Indiana knows this bill and just as wisely, as he indicates now, there is no element of Federal control contained in this bill.

Let me speak to this point as to how this system would operate in my own home city, the city of New York. The school system of the city of New York is the largest system in the United States. It, of course, has a great many deficiencies right now. For instance, we have 600 classrooms with no homeroom teacher in attendance. We need desperately 600 teachers, well trained, to come from somewhere, because the children simply are not getting proper and full instruction.

This Teacher Corps would fulfill that very great need and would fulfill such need from system to system throughout the country, as indeed this same situation exists elsewhere.

I see no element of Federal control here. However, if we adopt the kind of provision suggested by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] we then would not have a Teachers Corps. You would have a system of restrictive education and teaching.

In order to avoid that, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] in hearings, in study and in draftsmanship made it very, very tight and very secure, that there would be no element of Federal control or interference in this bill.

I would defy anyone in Washington to try and interfere in the control in any way with the school system in my city. Why, we have more people involved in the administration of that system than there are in the entire Office of Education here in Washington. There is no way you can interfere with a procedure, when the teachers come in, they will come in as invited teachers and will stay so long as they satisfy the needs and requirements which have been set for one particular system and they will only respond to the demands and needs and direction of our local authorities.

I am so glad that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] has come to the floor today to make these points categorically.

I rise in support of the Teacher Corps because I think it is time we did something about the needs in America which will only be fulfilled by good teachers.

The House has overwhelmingly supported the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. But as good an act as it is it can only operate through trained teachers and qualified teachers.

Where are the teachers coming from? The system is unable to supply the teachers now. The act, if carried out properly, will be no better than the teachers who are selected to administer and operate the act. Where are they going to come from?

This is our last chance at this session to produce a Teacher Corps which will truly make meaningful the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. STEPHENS. The people who will do the teaching will be trained in their colleges in the various States. They will be attending the University of Illinois, the University of Georgia, they will not be trained by the Federal Government.

Mr. BRADEMAS. That is correct.

Mr. STEPHENS. Is there not some analogy between a program I have always found most acceptable at home and all over the United States, and that is your vocational teaching and your home economics teaching? I know that there is some slight difference, for instance, the local authorities pay half of the salary, and the Federal Government pays half of the salary. But are not those boys and girls taught in the methods of teaching in the schools that they attend that are not Federal Government controlled?

Would this not be somewhat analagous to these people except for the fact they will have a total salary paid by the Federal Government?

Mr. BRADEMAS. The gentleman is quite correct. The fact of the matter is, and I think we are all aware of it, this Congress has supported legislation which has made possible a number of fellowship programs, for example, title IV of the National Defense Education Act, which has helped train a number of teachers for our colleges and universities. The Teacher Corps proposition we bring to this House tomorrow in no way contemplates that the Federal Government is going to set up some kind of national university or Federal university, or to determine the curriculum, or to decide the qualifications of both the teachers and the college graduates who are to be recruited. This legislation provides for both preliminary and in-service college-level training assigned to equip the teachers with the special insight essential to the teaching of disadvantaged children and providing special types of instruction necessary to teach these children.

I think the gentleman from Georgia has made a telling point.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I think that the gentleman ought to know, however, that in the vocational education program the Federal Government does not recruit, select, or enroll the teachers. Also, it is not true that the House has given the National Teacher Corps serious study. There was only one person who testified on the Teacher Corps in the House, and that was Senator NELSON of Wisconsin, not even an educator. We did not spend more than 5 minutes on the Teacher Corps in the full committee, and the House never took it up.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I do not think that is a telling argument at all, I am constrained to say to the gentleman, because as the gentleman knows, there are a number of parts to the higher education bill. He is one of the hardest working members of the committee, and he knows what the record is. There are other parts of this bill which received no consideration in either body. The fact of the matter is in a conference report situation we are often confronted with this kind of situation.

I want to say a word as well to another part of the memorandum which I must say distressed me. I point out that the amount of money which the memorandum says is authorized by this bill is inaccurate. The number of years of authorization for the Teacher Corps which the memorandum signed by the gentleman from Minnesota alleges is inaccurate.

Moreover, the amount of money authorized by the bill for the Teacher Corps is not accurately stated in the Quie memorandum.

It seems to me if we have this kind of inaccuracy in a number of the passages in this memorandum, we ought to consider with particular care the arguments that are set forth in an effort to cripple this legislation tomorrow.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. I know there is no excuse for inaccuracy. The authorization being for 3 years at $165 million is inaccurate.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I thank the gentleman for that statement.

Mr. QUIE. I must say the reason why this came about was that in our haste to finish the conference, I had not heard the 2-year provision for the Corps. I knew we had agreed to a 3-year authorization on all the titles with the exception of title III which we had given a 1-year authorization. I had assumed that the Teachers Corps being a part of title V would also be for 3 years.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I know the gentleman is normally very careful and very accurate and that is one reason I said at the outset of my remarks that if he wanted to announce to this House that perhaps this was a memorandum sent out under his name but without his authorization, I would be the first to give him the opportunity to make a public confession.

Mr. QUIE. I might also say to the gentleman if you are worried about the word "teachers" instead of the word "teacher" I happened to be reading the hearings you conducted when the letter was written, which, as you can see by the copy I am holding, it bears the word "teachers" rather than "teacher" and, therefore, made that inadvertent mistake as well.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his response. I hope he appreciates the spirit in which I have raised some of my questions.

Mr. Speaker, in discussing the Teacher Corps proposal today, I should like to remind my colleagues that several months ago we passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, conceivably the most important education legislation ever passed by Congress. It holds forth the promise of full and equal educational opportunity for all Americans. It offers new hope to the children from the low-income areas who have not had the opportunity in the past.

A great area of concern remains, and that is the lack of experienced teachers for the areas where underprivileged and culturally deprived youngsters live.

We can buy the extra books.

We can build or remodel the facilities these schools may need.

We can train the teachers and special aids for remedial and other services.

But these efforts will be of little avail if the local school agencies cannot find, attract, and employ both experienced and enthusiastic young teachers, men and women eager to undertake the challenging tasks of teaching the underprivileged and culturally deprived youngster. Finding these teachers takes time and money, and the local school districts, particularly the poorer ones, are running out of both. They are already behind. If we do not make a special effort for these low-income areas, both rural and urban, the gap between the fortunate and the deprived can only increase.

Consider, if you will, that in 1964 there were more than 82,000 full-time teachers with less than standard certificates. The majority were concentrated in low-income areas, where the best teachers are needed. The National Education Association estimates that we are short 128,000 teachers this year. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has created a need for an additional 30,000 teachers to staff its new programs.

Mr. Speaker, the Teacher Corps is a practical start at closing the gap.

As President Johnson said in recommending the legislation in July:

> The National Teacher Corps draws on that spirit of dedication which has been demonstrated time and again in peace and war, by young and old, at home and abroad * * * (It) can help improve the quality of teaching where quality is most needed and most often is in short supply, in city slums and in areas of rural poverty.

It is not generally understood why quality teaching is missing from the poorer school districts. I suggest that the reasons are simple: the best teachers naturally gravitate toward assignments in schools in the better residential districts. The working conditions are better. The pupils may be better behaved. Parents are interested and often the pay may be better for the experienced teacher.

Why should not a teacher with many years of experience, with status in the profession, look for openings in the wealthier school districts? And why should not these wealthier districts put those experienced teachers to work?

Although many teachers are eager to face the stimulating work of educating the underprivileged, the poorer school districts cannot compete for experienced teachers on a permanent basis. These districts cannot offer the salaries, the parental support, the bright, well-fed students, the well-stocked libraries. They can offer only hard work under difficult conditions.

And so those very schools where the greatest experience and effort are so badly needed are the very schools where we find the least experienced teachers. And they enter their grim, crowded classrooms without enough guidance or experienced and continuing help.

The Teacher Corps attacks this serious problem at the roots by recruiting 1,000 experienced teachers to work with 5,000 college graduate teacher-interns in team assignments exclusively in low-income areas. A team could, for example, have one experienced, master teacher, and five interns working together in a district for as long as 2 full school years. Corps members will serve side by side with local teachers, after special training for their difficult work.

These Teacher Corps members, the experienced teachers as well as the interns, will be recruited on a nationwide scale. The whole program will be federally financed. But teachers will be assigned only on the request of a local school district, which will consider their qualifications just as though they were being hired directly without Corps help. The State educational agencies will act as advisers and consultants on every step in the program, from recruitment to selection, from training to assignment.

Local school districts will employ Teacher Corps members and pay their salaries. The local school district costs will be covered by Federal grants to the district. The same approach is contained in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which provides that Federal funds may be used by low-income districts to pay teachers' salaries.

Furthermore, Corps teachers will be employees of the local school district and subject to its authority. I point out for the record, Mr. Speaker, that section 516 of title V–B specifically, entitled "Local Control Preserved," provides the following:

> SEC. 516. Members of the Teacher Corps shall be under the direct supervision of the appropriate officials of the local educational agencies to which they are assigned. Except as otherwise provided in clause (3) of 513(a), such agencies shall retain the authority to—
>
> (1) assign such members within their systems;
>
> (2) make transfers within their systems;
>
> (3) determine the subject matter to be taught;
>
> (4) determine the terms and continuance of the assignment of such members within their systems.

The exception cited in clause 513(a) provides assurance that the teacher-intern will have the opportunity to participate in the continuing training program while he is teaching. This training will be under the close supervision of the experienced teacher and in cooperation with State educational agencies and institutions of higher education. It is in addition to the 3 months of intensive training at a college or university which the intern will receive before going to the local school which requests them.

Any Corps member who does not live up to legitimate expectations can be fired by the local board.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I do not expect any difficulty on that score because the Corps is designed to attract dedicated, mature teachers and able enthusiastic young people to a unique service in the teaching profession. These teacher teams will be beneficial to the disadvantaged children directly served in the schools and to the other teachers in the schools as well.

The Corps should also benefit all community school relationships and will undoubtedly have other side effects of lasting positive significance.

On the subject of training, I should like to point out that intern programs for college graduates have been operating successfully since the late 19th century. More than 40 institutions including Harvard, Yale, Stanford, Wesleyan, and the University of Wisconsin have such programs which lead to master's degrees.

Some have expressed concern that the program will take away competent teachers from other areas, but fear is unfounded. While some experienced teachers will temporarily be drawn to schools in low-income areas they will most probably return at the end of their service. Quite to the contrary of weakening our teaching resources, the Teacher Corps is expected to enlarge them. It will encourage dedicated college graduates, who might not otherwise enter teaching, to become teachers and work with the disadvantaged youth of the country. If the idea succeeds, we will have more teachers, not fewer, and many areas will benefit.

This program has been considered at length by Congress. Hearings were held before the General Subcommittee on Education and the House Committee on Education and Labor, and the bill was reported out by the committee. After careful scrutiny in the Senate, it was included in the Higher Education Act; the majority of the House-Senate conference committee have agreed to its inclusion.

Perhaps the greatest indicator of the need, the acceptance, the welcoming of the Teacher Corps comes from the master teachers and teacher-interns who will be part of it. Our Nation's teachers have shown their dedication and their enthusiasm for the Teacher Corps by volunteering for work even before we have made it law. There are thousands of energetic and capable teachers who are only waiting for us to act before meeting the challenge of our schools.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will not disappoint the thousands of dedicated men and women—and the millions of children—who will benefit from this important measure. The Teacher Corps deserves our wholehearted support, as does the entire Higher Education Act. I ask every Member of the House to consider this legislation of prime importance to our schools and to support the conference report on the higher education bill tomorrow and to vote against the motion to recommit the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and I ask unanimous consent at this time that there be included following my remarks and some telegrams from my district in support of the Teacher Corps, the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LAFAYETTE, IND.,
October 18, 1965.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Purdue University and other Indiana colleges and universities have a great stake in the general provisions of the Higher Education Act of 1965. This act gives us great hope for solving some of the seemingly insurmountable problems we now face. I hope you will act favorably on the Higher Education Act conference report.

FREDERICK L. HOVDE,
President, Purdue University.

MUNCIE, IND.,
October 18, 1965.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We would appreciate your support of the conference committee request on higher education bill (H.R. 9567) provisions regarding national Teachers Corps, fellowships for teachers, and grants to institutions of higher education for improved teacher education particularly significant to Ball State and the quality of teacher education program.

JOHN R. EMENS,
President, Ball State University.

TERRE HAUTE, IND.,
October 18, 1965.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of Indiana State University and its many constituents I ask your favorable vote for higher education bill, H.R. 9567, now before the Congress. Passage of this bill will provide the impetus and vital support so necessary to the important higher education of our Nation.

ALLAN C. RANKIN,
President, Indiana State University.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.,
October 18, 1965.

Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We believe it imperative that H.R. 9567 on higher education be passed. We know your great interest in this subject and we urge you most respectfully to support the conference committee report and to help prevent recommitment. Thanks for your great contributions of the past.

ROBERT H. WYATT,
Executive Secretary, Indiana State Teachers Association.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.,
October 18, 1965.

JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Your vote against recommital and support for conference report on H.R. 9567 strongly urged by the Indiana Classroom Teachers Association.

MERIUM FREDERICKS.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in commending the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS], a distinguished member of our committee, for the contribution he is making here today and the contribution he is making to education in sponsoring this Teacher Corps legislation. It is only by an unfortunate circumstance that the Teacher Corps legislation could not come out as a separate measure under his own name. I am delighted that the Senate has put this program into its bill so that we can have a vote on it tomorrow as part of the higher education package.

The gentleman in the well has been a member of the Committee on Education and Labor for some 7 years. In those 7 years he has given living meaning to the philosophy expressed by a great scholar who once said that human survival has become a race between education and catastrophe. The gentleman has worked hard and diligently on the Committee on Education and Labor to bring forth sound, fresh, and exciting ideas which indeed have given this whole Congress, quite properly, the name of the "Education Congress of America." I believe it is true that our survival today has indeed become a race between education and catastrophe. The Teacher Corps is an important element of that philosophy. I happen to be chairman of a task force that is now studying the poverty program in the District of Columbia and the schools in the District of Columbia. We find here in the District the same problems with which communities all over America are confronted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Teacher Corps.

There has been some uninformed talk of Federal control during this debate on the Teacher Corps. I believe we must attack this problem directly and keep the record clear of misunderstanding and misinformation.

It is true that the corps will be established in the Office of Education. It is also true that the Office will recruit master teachers and teacher interns and get the training programs underway.

But the Federal responsibility remains limited to these areas, as anyone can see if they will but read and analyze the proposed legislation before us, title V–B of the Higher Education Act.

Corps teachers will always be under the direct and complete control of local educational agencies. They will serve only at the request of these local school districts. Local authorities may specify the types of teachers they desire and pass on the qualifications of these teachers in advance of their assignment. A teacher not requested will not be sent.

Teacher interns will be paid at the lowest rate for full-time teachers in the area to which they are assigned. While many of us sincerely want to see teacher salaries go up around the country, there is absolutely nothing in this proposal that makes the Teacher Corps a salary-raising gimmick. Quite the contrary: the accent is on service, not on pay.

An experienced teacher who is not leading a team may be paid at a rate equal to that given a teacher with similar training, experience, and duties in the local schools. That is true enough and fair. Leaders of teaching teams will receive salaries agreed upon by the local agency and the Commissioner of Education. But such team leaders will have additional after-school responsibilities; such as counseling the interns, keeping their records, and coordinating work with other teachers.

An advisory council representing urban and rural school administrators, professors of education, the universities, and the general public will assist the Commissioner of Education in drawing up standards for the Teacher Corps and its members.

Here, then, is yet another safeguard against the Office of Education assuming too great a control over the program. This is a partnership program and there is every kind of language in this measure to make sure that the partnership becomes a fact upon enactment.

The essential role of the Federal Government will be to supply the thrust and the funds for a vitally needed program. The success of this program will depend on our local school districts, communities, and universities. They will be largely responsible for its conduct. They will make it work.

The Congress has made a commitment to provide equal educational opportunity for all Americans. Our greatest challenge in meeting that commitment is poverty, urban poverty, and rural poverty.

Good teachers are—now as always—the most vital factor in providing educational opportunities. But good teachers are not rushing to areas of poverty. And that is the overriding purpose of the Teacher Corps.

The Corps will provide many of the teachers so desperately needed in our slum schools. It will permit many fine young Americans to serve their country by helping those children who need the help the most. It is a most essential part of the program of educational assistance for which this Congress will be remembered for generations to come.

I sincerely hope that my colleagues here will not be swayed by uninformed charges of Federal control concerning the Teacher Corps. The responsible committees which have drawn this measure would not allow such a program to come before us in this most sensitive area of education.

I see no such specter of control, but I do see bright hopes of success. And I urge everyone to join me in an affirmative vote for the Teacher Corps on that basis.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Teacher Corps.

We must spare no effort in attracting, training, and keeping in teaching all of those young people who have the talent, desire, and qualifications for it.

Who can count the number of young people with high potential of becoming good teachers who never entered the profession at all? What of the teachers who after experiencing some minor initial failure because the needed encouragement, extra training, or wise counsel was not there when needed?

The Teacher Corps would invite the dedicated, experienced teacher to devote part of his career toward strengthening the schools that need his services most crucially and of contributing to the development of intelligent young talent into seasoned teachers like himself.

To the young college graduate, the Teacher Corps offers the challenge of taking on a difficult job that needs to be done. Along the way, he gains the advantages of being a member of a team made up of others like himself and headed by a master teacher who provides mature leadership, counsel, and instruction.

Formal training allied to the program puts the young Corps member, or "intern" as he would be known officially, in line for an advanced degree conferred by a college or university participating in the program.

The Teacher Corps is expected to enroll about 6,000 in its initial year—1,000 experienced teachers and 5,000 college graduates inexperienced in teaching. Following an initial 3 months of intensive training at a college or university, up to five interns at a time led by an experienced teacher will go in teams to the schools requesting them. This beginning training would emphasize practice teaching and personal familiarity with the circumstances of poverty.

All of the corps members—interns and experienced teachers alike—would teach part-time. Instruction in teaching techniques, curriculum development, subject matter, and other elements as needed would be provided through seminars taking place at the school and conducted by the master teachers and faculty from nearby institutions.

Interns would receive salaries from their employer school in the amount usually paid to its beginning full-time teachers. The experienced teachers leading the teams would receive pay in keeping with their increased responsibilities.

While the corps members receive their salaries from the schools, the entire costs of the Teacher Corps program are paid by the Federal Government.

Critical to the success of the Teacher Corps program is the close working relationship between the schools and the cooperating institutions of higher education. The college or university would continue its interest in the interns after the 3-month on-campus phase. This would be done through seminars held at the local school and by providing additional course work so that those who complete the program successfully could earn an advanced degree in their 2-year volunteer period.

While the Teacher Corps may be viewed by some here as a new idea, it is by no means to be seen as a gamble. As a matter of fact, it mixes the zeal and enthusiasm of healthy, intelligent, young people with professionally respected concepts of education for teachers of the disadvantaged. Programs of the corps pattern have proved successful in many of our colleges and universities, including Harvard, Yale, and Wisconsin.

The specific program recommended for the Teacher Corps had 2 years of actual testing at Cardozo High School here in Washington. At Cardozo, returned Peace Corps volunteers served on intern teams. They taught part time while studying in the school under experienced teachers—who were also working teaching themselves. Some 80 percent of these interns elected to remain in teaching. In particular they chose to work with disadvantaged children.

While the Office of Education would recruit nationally for the Teacher Corps and make all arrangements with the schools and institutions of higher education, the program would be carried forward under local initiative, leadership, and control. While enrolled in the corps, all participants would be employees of the local schools. They would not be on any Federal payroll.

The Teacher Corps offers a most unique opportunity to blend the resources of the Federal Government, our colleges and universities, and local schools to serve the immediate needs of our disadvantaged children. It can brighten the future for education at all levels.

"THE SINGING ANGELS" AND THE NORTHERN OHIO CHILDREN'S PERFORMING MUSIC FOUNDATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, Cleveland, Ohio, has long been a cultural center where the performing arts are enjoyed and promoted. One of the latest cultural activities launched in Cleveland has attracted great community interest. Known as "The Singing Angels" this venture is only 1 year old and shows promise of winning national recognition.

The Singing Angels is a children's chorus composed of 100 boys and girls, ages 5 through 14. To be admitted, a child must carry a tune pleasantly and have a real desire to sing. Children are selected without reference to racial, religious, or ethnic origin, from an open audition announced in Greater Cleveland newspapers.

This chorus was conceived and founded by William Boehm in the fall of 1964, to stimulate the interest of talented children in good music by offering them an opportunity to perform under qualified professional direction. Mr. Boehm felt the popular music standards of young people were too often failing to encourage growth in music appreciation, and in self-discipline.

After a series of successful Christmas concerts in 1964, "The Singing Angels" presented a benefit concert in Severance Hall on May 2, 1965, with the nationally famous pianist, Eunice Podis, and the distinguished violinist, Dr. Jerome Gross, as guest artists. The concert was sponsored by the Cleveland Friends of Music, a nonprofit organization dedicated to the promotion of good music. The program included religious, patriotic, and folk songs, and selections from the musical comedy hit shows, "The Sound of Music" and "Mary Poppins". Response to the concert was tremendous. Eunice Podis was moved to tears, as were many in the audience of 1,200. Miss Podis wrote to Boehm, "The future of the Singing Angels is as bright as their shining faces."

The Singing Angels have presented successful concerts in Hoover Auditorium at Lakeside, Ohio; at Musicarnival Summer Theater, a nationally recognized musical arena theater; and at the Cleveland Public Auditorium for the Golden Wedding program sponsored by the Cleveland Press.

To give this project greater range and stability, in order to accomplish its objectives more effectively, William Boehm organized the Northern Ohio Children's Performing Music Foundation, Inc., a nonprofit organization. The Singing Angels are the voice of this foundation.

Mr. Boehm conducts The Singing Angels. He is assisted by a hired staff of professional people. Richard Resseger, member of the Musicarnival staff, is choral director and associate conductor. Mrs. Leonore Vannice, who holds a degree in dramatic art from the University of Iowa, is administrative secretary. Other members of the staff include a stage manager, a pianist, and a publicist. In addition, a parents' committee serves in a supporting capacity.

After one season, this group has registered a dynamic impact on the Greater Cleveland community. Seven concerts are booked. These include programs for two Catholic and two Protestant churches, the Shrine Luncheon Club of Cleveland, the Lutheran Children's Aid Benefit Dinner, and the "Night in Budapest" program, starring actor Tony Curtis and Hollywood producer Joseph Pasternak. During the 1965 Christmas season, stage programs and a television spectacular are planned, and the group will sing from atop the new Erieview Plaza in behalf of the antituberculosis campaign.

Because of the enthusiastic response to The Singing Angels, Mr. Boehm has organized a reserve wing to the performing chorus, totaling an additional 100 voices. Eventually, the two groups will be combined.

The standards of performance as established by Mr. Boehm are completely professional, and the children work in a disciplined and orderly manner. Their respect for such discipline is remarkable. After one season, fewer than 10 singers dropped out, and most of these had exceeded the age limit.

William Boehm holds a master's degree in Dramatic Arts from Western Reserve University. He is a singing star of the Chicago Theatre of the Air, and has soloed many times with the Cleveland Symphony "Pop" Orchestra. He sang the tenor lead in the NBC–TV presentation of Verdi's opera, "Macbeth." The original staging director of Musicarnival Summer Theatre, he has sung leading roles in more than 100 musical productions.

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY AT THE 21ST ANNUAL DINNER OF THE ALFRED E. SMITH MEMORIAL FOUNDATION, NEW YORK CITY, OCTOBER 13, 1965

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding events of the year in the city of New York always is the annual dinner of the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation held each year at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. This year's, the 21st, annual Al Smith dinner was no exception. The principal speaker was the distinguished Vice President of the United States, the Honorable Hubert Humphrey. His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, who was a close friend of the late Governor Al Smith and who helped establish the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation, presided. The main purpose of the occasion has always been to raise funds for the Smith Memorial Wing of St. Vincent's Hospital, the oldest Catholic hospital on the east coast.

Vice President Humphrey's interesting remarks on this occasion follow:

> Tonight we honor a great American, a man two generations ahead of his time.
>
> I have lately been rereading Al Smith's messages as Governor of this great Empire State. They are as timely as if they had been written today.
>
> In 1928 he wrote: "The Old World concept of government was that the people existed for the government. The underlying theory of American democracy is that the government exists for the people * * *."
>
> Al Smith spoke and lived in the tradition of Thomas Jefferson, who in his time defined the role of government: "The care of human life and happiness is the first and only legitimate object of good government."

This is precisely what the struggle for freedom is all about. That was the issue in Jefferson's time, in the era of Al Smith, as today.

Al Smith practiced as well as preached his democratic philosophy. In the 1920's he wrote a series of courageous and hard-hitting messages, vetoing legislation enacted in the hysteria of that time. He said, among other things:

"The safety of this Government and its institutions rests upon the reasoned and devoted loyalty of its people. It does not need for its defense a system of intellectual tyranny which, in the endeavor to choke error by force, must of necessity choke truth as well * * *."

It was because of his deep commitment to brotherhood, to human dignity, to opportunity for all that he became the target of the haters, the bigots, the Ku Klux Klan.

In 1919 he wrote the legislature: "It is the duty of the State to protect the poor, the helpless, and those who are without knowledge of the law, and without any idea of their rights."

Here again, he practiced what he preached. Both as a member of the assembly and as Governor, he was a pioneer, an initiator of social legislation through which New York set a good example for the whole Nation.

He was a man who richly merited, by his ability, his warm humanity, and his outstanding record of achievement, the highest office in the land. I do not know whether, in the complacency—the self-satisfaction—prevailing in 1928, he could have been elected, whatever his faith. I do know that his religious faith was made, unfairly and disgracefully, a major issue in that campaign. Indeed, my own father—who admired Al Smith and campaigned for him in South Dakota—had firsthand and painful experience of this. He, too, was attacked, vilified, and ridiculed.

I remember—yes, I remember.

And that is one of the reasons my campaign plane last year bore the name "The Happy Warrior."

Al Smith would have been profoundly pleased to know that this Nation and its people have declared war on bigotry, prejudice, discrimination and poverty.

He would rejoice in learning that we had matured sufficiently to elect a brilliant young man of Catholic faith as President in 1960 and a powerful, gifted leader—a southerner, a Texan—as President in 1964.

And imagine his joy and excitement if he could have been with us Monday, October 4, when for the first time in the history of our Republic, the Holy Father, Pope Paul VI, visited this city and Nation and gave new life and spirit to the United Nations.

Yes, we have come a long way in making this one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Tonight, in the spirit of this occasion, I should like to reminisce.

Just a little less than 7 years ago, I had a conversation with a man whom all of us remember vividly—even though he has been rather conspicuously and deliberately forgotten in his own country.

I am speaking, of course, of Nikita Khrushchev.

I had quite a talk with him—8 hours of it, in fact.

He declared then that our two systems should not compete on the field of battle. Rather, he challenged us to what he called "peaceful competition," to show which system could yield more rapid progress and higher living standards to its people.

As to the outcome, he seemed to have—in the words of the Gilbert and Sullivan song:

"* * * no manner of doubt,
No probable, possible shadow of doubt,
No possible doubt whatever."

Our system, he told me, was worn out and played out. It was communism, he said, which was new, young, vital, and brimming with energy.

"Chairman Khrushchev," I replied, "we haven't even begun to compete yet. When we do, we'll compete you right out of Gorki Park."

I don't think that he believed me for one instant.

But, I had my reasons for confidence. I knew the competitive vigor of our businessmen. I knew the skill of our workers. I knew the productivity of our farmers. I knew the spirit of our people.

I was confident that, if Government did its part, our economy could move ahead. As I used to say in those days: "Let's take modern economic policy out of the doghouse and put it in the White House."

Well, almost 7 years have passed since then. Taking a leaf from Al Smith's book, let's look at the record.

As I speak to you tonight, we are enjoying our 56th month of continuous economic growth. Profits are up, wages are up, farm income is up, savings are up, the stock market is high, unemployment is down, and the balance-of-payments deficit is sharply reduced.

The primary credit for this belongs to the American people—for ours is a free economy, drawing its vigor from personal initiative and private enterprise. But Government has a vital part to play, in creating and maintaining the kind of economic climate in which private initiative can flourish.

I think the most important thing we have done in these years is to establish the fact that Government, business, and labor can do much better working with each other than against each other.

Second, I think we have rejected the idea, shared by old-fashioned conservatives and old-fashioned liberals alike, that the national income is like a cake whose size is fixed—and that, if one sector of the community (say labor) gets a bigger slice, another (say business) will have a smaller one. We have come to realize, instead, that if we can keep the national income steadily expanding everyone can get a bigger slice of cake.

Or, as a farmer friend of mine put it. "There's room for everyone at the hayrack."

A number of positive Government policies have played an important part, as well—the tax cuts, investment credit, the wage-price guidelines, the sophisticated management of our difficult balance-of-payments problem.

And the gains we have made are real gains—because, so far, we have held down inflation better than any other major country.

I do not say that I can promise you, here and now, that this expansion can last forever.

I do say that what we have learned to do pretty well, we can learn to do even better. I hope that, at some future date, we shall have to explain to our children what the word "recession" means—just as we now have to explain to them what the great depression of the 1930's was, and (if we can) how and why we got into it.

I do most emphatically reject the view of some old-fashioned economists that there must be recessions because there always have been—to me, this seems as dogmatic as Marxism.

Economic growth has brought us prosperity and well-being unknown in our previous history. But economic growth cannot be expected to solve all our problems—even all our economic problems.

That is why today we make great national investments in the American people—through education, through medical care, through legislation for equal opportunity and equal rights, through programs to make our cities liveable.

We are building an America to live up to its promise—through cooperation, through creative public and private leadership, through free institutions.

We are seeking new ways to release the unlimited creative and productive potential of the American people.

We are doing this through a new partnership between Government and the people, through understanding and cooperation—not by dogma or domination.

We move forward toward a Great Society—a society characterized by a love of beauty and the arts, a richness of culture as well as of industry and commerce, a fullness of joy as well as of employment, a sense of justice as well as of purpose.

We are building. We are growing. We are changing. We are pioneering.

We are alive and once again filled with hope and optimism.

This is our message—this would be my response to the challenge leveled at me by Mr. Khrushchev 7 years ago.

And what do Mr. Khrushchev's successors have to report?

Well, first of all, they have learned, the hard way, that all the answers are not in Marxism.

They have come to recognize that Russian consumers should be able to buy what they want—rather then what some bureaucrat thinks they ought to want. They have found that the old-fashioned emphasis on quantity rather than quality has resulted in a flood of shoddy goods which look good in statistics but not in the shops. They are finding merit in the profit concept as a measure of the efficiency and performance of individual factories or enterprises.

According to a pronouncement by the Soviet Prime Minister, Mr. Kosygin, last month, these "revolutionary" new ideas are going to be applied across the board in the Soviet economy.

Even more revolutionary ideas are being talked about—unemployment insurance where there are supposed to be no unemployed, yes, even legal private ownership of land. Once started, such ideas gain momentum.

Historically, the free market in goods has been associated with the emergence of a free market in ideas. People will not be content only to be free to buy what they want. They will seek freedom to speak, to write, to associate with others of their own choosing, and freedom to go where they please, to worship where they please, without interference.

Today we see clearly the great movement of our age: the striving by all men, in all countries, toward a life of greater individual freedom and greater individual happiness.

We must recognize this common striving—and we, who possess the means, must act to create conditions of human betterment and happiness.

In the words of that great Pope, John XXIII:

"The solidarity which binds all men and makes them members of the same family requires political communities enjoying an abundance of material goods not to remain indifferent to those political communities whose citizens suffer from poverty, misery, and hunger, and who lack even the elementary rights of the human person.

"It is not possible to preserve lasting peace if glaring economic and social inequality among them persist."

Pope John emphasized "the sense of responsibility which weighs upon each and every one, especially upon those who are more blessed with this world's goods."

America is so blessed. And I am proud when America steps forward and says to the less fortunate of the world: "We are our brothers' keeper."

We hear many voices these days saying that America is overextended in the world, that other people's problems need not be our problems, that we ought to close up shop overseas and enjoy our fruits here in the good old U.S.A.

My friends, when that time comes, this Nation is doomed. Who in the world will work for democracy if we do not? Who in the world can preserve the peace if we do not? Who in the world can set the example, can offer the needed hand, if we do not?

We live in a time when everything is complex, when there are no more rapid or easy answers. We live in a time when we must exert our patience as never before.

We must be firm without being belligerent. We must be resolute without being arrogant. We must be humble without being weak. We must be strong without being domineering.

We stand for something not seen before in the world.

We stand for dignity and fulfillment of individual man and woman. We stand for the chance for each man to make something better of himself.

We stand for free speech and government of the people.

We stand for belief that others, too, in less fortunate places should have opportunity for the blessings of abundance and should be free of tyranny.

We stand for the pledges made by men and women who left the old ways and fought a living out of the soil of a new continent.

Yes, we stand for the belief that the world need not destroy itself by war, and that we Americans can help others, too, find a better society.

We must, in this time of danger, devote ourselves, to converting man's hopes for peace, for progress, for social justice into reality—despite discouragement, despite dissatisfaction, despite weariness.

Man must be free.

Man will be free.

NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point and also to revise my remarks made previously.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from Indiana for bringing this subject to the floor at this time, because tomorrow we shall be limited by the rule of the House of only 1 hour to consider the conference report, and the time will be controlled by the chairman.

Let me point out that you can tell by the comments and the questions that were asked by our colleagues that there are questions—and grave questions—which should be raised about the National Teacher Corps.

The National Teacher Corps, as I pointed out—and if the gentleman from Indiana has any information to the contrary, I would like to have him bring it up—and as I read from the hearings on "Teacher Fellowships and the National Teacher Corps," I note that on only 1 day was there any mention of a National Teacher Corps, and on that day there was only 1 person who came to testify for the bill. That was Senator NELSON of Wisconsin. There was no educator who came before the House to testify on the National Teacher Corps—not one.

The men who were there that day were questioned by my colleague from Indiana and others about their feelings on the matter, but they did not show much knowledge of it. It was only the Senator from Wisconsin who came specifically to testify on the National Teacher Corps.

No one can claim this as full and thorough hearings on a program that is such a great change from anything the Federal Government has been involved in before.

I also wish to point out that on that particular day the bill came before us—not the Higher Education Act of 1965, which we in the House considered and passed, but rather the Teacher Fellowships and National Teacher Corps bill, which has never reached the House—it received only 5 minutes of consideration in the Committee on Education and Labor. The bill was not read. I brought up some comments about it in that 5 minutes but it was reported out of the committee without any further consideration.

That is all the consideration which the House has given this matter.

If Members will check the hearings in the Senate, they will find that there was a little more in the Senate.

What a drastic change for the Federal Government to get involved in a National Teacher Corps, and how can the House accept the proposal without any study?

After the experience in Prince Edward County, Va., and the effect on the school system and the improvement of the young people with some well-trained outside teachers coming in, I pursued the idea of a National Teacher Corps, fully intending to introduce legislation. However, never could I get away from the very questions that are haunting us today about the National Teacher Corps. So I did not introduce a bill.

Unless you just plain limit the money, will we not see teachers all over the country wanting to transfer into the National Teacher Corps, all the qualified teachers, to work with the culturally and socially deprived, teachers who would like to have the title given to them—"National Teacher Corps"—because they would be looked upon by their colleagues in the school as somebody special whom the Federal Government has recognized as special individuals? They would even find among the interns these young people with baccalaureate degrees without any education courses, without any experience, which they would be training to go in there also with this label on them: "special individuals recognized by the Federal Government."

In order to protect the integrity of the local school system, I became very concerned about the question of the Federal Government sending money to school districts, which in turn would be used to pay the salaries of such people. To me, that would give the greatest amount of control that the Federal Government could exact.

We saw in Chicago the withholding of $30 million because they did not send the children to the schools so that they would get the proper mix between the races. If it had not been for Mayor Daley, the money would probably still be withheld. If there had been a Republican mayor of Chicago, probably the money would still be withheld. From what I read in the newspapers, Mayor Daley was strong enough politically so that he could get in touch with the President, and he demanded that the Office of Education release the $30 million for the city of Chicago.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I believe the Chicago affair was a very fortunate affair, because it demonstrates to all of us—perhaps it ought to demonstrate to the gentleman in the well more than anyone else—the fact that when we pass these programs in the Congress, local responsibility does not end. The people of Chicago, including the mayor, the congressional delegation, the Senators and everyone else, quite properly responded to this effort and quite properly put the whole Federal program in its proper perspective.

We will see the very thing the gentleman fears, Federal control, only when local governments and local communities forfeit, surrender, and abandon the responsibility of eternal vigilance.

I do not say that we should kill these programs simply because local communities are afraid to stand up. Chicago was not afraid to stand up. We rolled back that decision because we were right, and the law was with us. So long as local communities exercise that kind of vigilance we do not have to worry about the "bugaboo" of Federal controls following Federal aid to education or any other program.

The gentleman is correct. We stood up. We will stand up again whenever we feel that the Federal Government is violating the principles laid down in the acts passed by the Congress.

So it seems to me instead of always fearing Federal control the gentleman and all of us ought to keep reminding the local communities that they have a responsibility and that Federal control will fill the vacuum which they create if they abandon or forfeit that responsibility.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman really has made a good point as to why we should not accept the National Teacher Corps. This was very evident to my mind as the kind of power the Federal Government will use with respect to money which it has agreed to appropriate to local school districts for payment of the teachers.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I believe I understand the point the gentleman is making, but perhaps he will clarify for me why he believes there would be no Federal control latent in the Quie full-time Federal employees for preschool teachers proposal, as distinguished from the proposal set forth in this bill.

If there were a Teacher Corps of full-time Federal employees, who would be sent into communities for preschool programs—the kind of proposal which I understand the gentleman from Minnesota suggests, as distinguished from this one—why would it not be possible for the Federal Government, under the Federal employee proposal, to pull the rug out from under a local school district which was receiving the full-time Federal employees for its preschool programs at any point Uncle Sam wanted to do so?

Mr. QUIE. I point out that there is a difference. I preface this by saying that I have not introduced or even promoted that proposal. The gentleman knows that the suggestion was in a development of my thinking, as to the kind of corps that would work, and that I came to him and said I did not believe there would be any Republican support for this proposal and so there was no use in my proposing it. I have not introduced it.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I understand.

Mr. QUIE. I do not feel it is refined to the point that I would want to give it that kind of backing.

Since I visited about it and talked about it, these were suggestions of my ideas.

The reason why I do not believe that kind of Federal control would be involved is because the school district would know, when it contracted for the use of the teacher, exactly what that teacher was. The teacher would be a Federal teacher, paid for by the Federal Government, who possessed certain qualifications which could be used for a period of time, as they wanted to use them.

That is the same thing now as when they ask an individual who is an expert from an institution of higher learning to come to spend a period of time there, during which they utilize his services.

That is not true in the Senate provision. The local school would receive the money. They would budget accordingly. The school district would begin to depend on those teachers, within the 2 years that the teachers were there it would be an economic hardship if the money was withheld and would surely cause the school to adjust its thinking to the possibility of Federal disapproval of anything they did.

It is surely new to me that the school district could select the individual, as I understood the Secretary's letter to say.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I am not surprised at what the gentleman says, because from the nature of his criticism it does not seem to me, if I may say so, that the gentleman has read the language of the bill very carefully.

Mr. QUIE. I read the language of the bill, which says that the Commissioner "shall recruit, select, and enroll." Now the word "select" comes into the Secretary's letter giving the impression that the school could select the teachers.

The Secretary is sending a letter up here to give his interpretation now. So this will again be legislation by decree from the Secretary of HEW.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I think the gentleman has it 100-percent wrong. Is the gentleman trying to make the distinction between the kind of preschool Federal employee proposal we were discussing earlier and that contemplated in the Teacher Corps proposal contained in the report? Is he suggesting that in the first proposal it would be better for the local school district to know and understand it was taking on a Federal employee and thereby to plan with that knowledge, whereby he suggests that under the Teacher Corps proposal which we have in the conference report they would become unwittingly saddled somehow with a Teacher Corps member? They know in advance under our proposal what they are asking if they want a Teacher Corps member, because they must request a member. They must say we want this many and this kind, and we want them for this period. If they come in and the local school district decides it no longer wants that Teacher Corps member to be teaching, it can fire them. It seems to me, in simple, plain English, that the gentleman is not making a very telling argument that there is no Federal control in the proposal of the kind to which he was earlier sympathetic and there is in the present proposal.

Mr. QUIE. No. The gentleman from Minnesota did not say there was no Federal control, but he said that it would be obvious for everyone to see.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Is that any better, and does it become beneficial thereby? I disagree completely with the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. I find that I like to know what any individual has up his sleeve when he comes to talk to me. I know if he lays the matter out on the table, I have no fear that after I become dependent on his services he will be able to use something on me that I had not expected. Now, the Federal Government is going to be involved in "recruiting, selecting, and enrolling" teachers, and if they are, they should put their cards fully on the table, which is something that is not done here. When the committee considered the Teacher Corps, as little as they did consider it, the bill the gentleman from Indiana offered and which was reported out of the Committee on Education and Labor provided that the school district would pay the entire salary of the teachers. I understood he had concern at that time with too great a Federal involvement if the Federal Government paid the salaries, but we find that in the Senate bill which we are asked to accept, 100 percent of the salaries is paid by the Federal Government. The Federal Government will reimburse the school for the money they pay the teachers.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, having listened to the discussion for the last 45 minutes, I am more convinced than ever that the proper route to follow is to instruct the House conferees, when the conference report comes before the House tomorrow, to return the conference report to the conference deleting the Teacher Corps provision. This is not of such urgency, whether it is a good program or a bad program, that it has to be handled in this higher education bill. As the gentleman from Minnesota knows, and I believe the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, there have been those who said that the deletion of the Teacher Corps was a deliberate attempt to defeat the entire higher education bill. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, we have an identical situation when the House conferees are instructed to delete this and hold by the House position in conference as we had in the so-called antipoverty bill. At that time we had the same rumor going around, that if the conference report was reported back, it would defeat the antipoverty program. We all knew that was not true. Almost within hours there was an agreement between the House and the Senate, with the Senate realizing perhaps, the House vote being as strong as it was, they acceded to the House position. This will be the exact procedure taken on this particular proposal. I would hope when the gentleman from Minnesota offers the motion instructing the conferees to hold to the House position and take out the Teacher Corps, that the House would express the same confidence in the Committee on Education and Labor that they have seen fit to do on other issues that have come before this body, because, as I said before, whether this program is good or bad, a few months are not going to make the difference.

If the conference report is sent back with instructions to delete the Teacher Corps, then the House Committee on Education and Labor will have ample opportunity next year to go into this very thoroughly. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], and also the gentlelady from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], will all be here—there are no elections between now and January—so that you can get into this subject in depth.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman for bringing this out, because this is the most important thing we have before us right now. That is, what do we do about the Teacher Corps?

What do we do tomorrow? Should we send the bill back to conference with instructions to delete the Teacher Corps?

If Members have the same reservations that I have about it, and the serious concern that I have about it, they should vote to recommit. Now you have all received telegrams stating that if we recommit the conference report, the bill is dead. That is a bunch of nonsense, such threats are always used on us in order to try to pass a certain section of a bill. What I am really concerned about is, Are all of these educators who have been sending telegrams in such large volume, so subservient to the administration that they immediately send these telegrams as soon as they hear from the administration? It could only occur if the administration had called them or an organization to which they belong and asked them to send the telegrams.

Mr. Speaker, if the motion to recommit prevails and we go back to conference, then a flood of telegrams should come from all over the country, where educators are justly concerned, that the bill be passed this year. They should let the Congress take time enough at least to study, debate, and amend a Teacher Corps bill and only put pressure on Members to bring out of conference and pass a bill which proved its merit in the House. The Corps has not.

If the leadership in the House and in the Senate refuse to go to conference, there would be a tremendous onus put on them by the higher education community, and there is no reason why we cannot go back to conference, immediately after the motion to recommit prevails and that afternoon have a conference and report the bill back to the House the next day, which would resolve this question.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to make this observation with respect to the distinguished ranking minority member of our committee, and also with respect to what the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota has said. In the first place, I am delighted that the gentleman is so prescient that he can assure this House that if this bill were recommitted tomorrow—and I am confident it will not be—he can give us a 100-percent guarantee that it would not be the end of the higher education bill for this session, in view of the fact that we are hopeful that we will adjourn this week.

The second point I want to make is this, and I would have once again reluctantly to disagree with the gentleman 100 percent. I think it is most unfair to the many distinguished educators in this country who have wired and written to their Representatives to the Congress of their support of this conference report with the Teacher Corps, to suggest that they are doing so only, to use the words of the gentleman from Minnesota, because they are subservient to the administration.

I received a telegram from the distinguished president of Purdue University, Fred Hovde—he is subservient to no man. And I have received other telegrams from distinguished educators in my State. I strongly defend them against what I think is a most unfortunate charge raised against them that they are somehow paid to jump to the piper's tune when it is played. I beseech the gentleman to ask himself, may it not be that they support the Teacher Corps, that they support this higher education conference report, that they agree with the majority of the House and the Senate conferees that the Teacher Corps is a soundly conceived program to help provide improved opportunities for the children in areas of low-income in our country?

So I would hope that the gentleman would perhaps reconsider the language with which he describes the expressions of opinion that are being sent to Members of Congress by many of the outstanding educators of our country.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana, do we not have a similar situation that we had when the so-called antipoverty bill was sent back to conference?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, we do not, because we were not obviously in the last week of the last session of the Congress. That is the difference. The gentleman from Ohio, with all of his many years of experience and his great wisdom and knowledge of these matters knows far better than I, a junior member of our committee, that the difference is very great, indeed, between the two situations.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, may I recall to both the gentlemen who are asking me to yield that we have had the experience of the last few Congresses and have seen what happened when sugar legislation was considered. We do not adjourn exactly at the time we expect to adjourn. The other body has passed a sugar bill different from the House bill. Conferees have not yet been appointed. If the gentleman thinks that this Congress is going to adjourn quickly so that we will not have time after tomorrow to go back to conference, the same afternoon or the next day, and report back a bill, then the gentleman is forgetting the experience of this House.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield.

Mr. BRADEMAS. In this instance the gentleman may be correct, and I hope very much that he is. I should like to ask the gentleman if he will be good enough to yield to me for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, the remarks of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS] may follow and that Members may be permitted to include extraneous matter in their remarks who have taken part in the special order that I sought and that the gentleman from Minnesota sought.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. In answer to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] regarding what goes on in the last few days when we are hopeful of adjournment, it has been my experience over the years that usually the conferees come to much faster agreement in the latter days of the session than they do when we are in the midst of a session.

I have every reason to believe that if the conferees are called back, based upon the action of the House on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], it would only be a matter of minutes after they once meet that some agreement would be reached and a conference report would be brought back to the House. I at no time said that the House conferees would agree to the position that the House took, because I have seen some pretty odd things happen around here in the last 15 years.

I remember one time when the House of Representatives passed a minimum wage bill overwhelmingly and it went to conference and the House position was not even considered.

With the majority we have here in the House, the majority, of course, can do anything they want and in the other body with its majority which is even greater than it is here in the House can do anything it wants.

So, if the conferees meet, whatever the majority wants, regardless of the vote that is taken in the House, that is what will prevail. But it does not take but a few minutes to meet and it will not take but just a few moments for the majority to decide what they want to do.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for bringing up a very important and valid point.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I certainly disagree with the statement just made by the gentleman from Ohio, because there is grave doubt in my mind that if the motion to recommit this bill, sponsored by the gentleman from Minnesota, were to prevail we would not have any bill at all. In fact, I do not believe we would have any bill at all this year, because the gentleman from Ohio well knows that the other body has been quite adamant on the so-called National Teacher Corps provision.

Let me say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that this motion to recommit should not prevail, if we are going to do anything toward improving the quality of education at the elementary and secondary levels.

I further want to state that we do not have any Federal control involved in connection with the National Teacher Corps. This is entirely left up to the local boards of education.

No teacher who is a member of the National Teacher Corps will be involved in any local school system unless that local school system specifically requests the presence of that teacher or a team of teachers to participate in a certain school system. In all events the local school board will have complete jurisdiction as to where and what subject matter that teacher will teach, and it can fire that teacher on any occasion. The members of the Teacher Corps are completely under the jurisdiction of the local school board.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman may make those pious statements, but I think he will find many people who disagree completely with him. As far as the Senate refusing to recede on the National Teachers' Corps, remember that the House has receded on every major provision in the Senate bill that the House did not have in its bill. For instance, on developing institutions, the House receded and took the inclusion of the 2-year institutions. On student assistance we made scholarship a part of the National Defense Education Act loan program. We accepted the Senate version which made it a separate program. The Senate also provided for 100-percent forgiveness on National Defense Education Act loans for persons who became teachers in any school that received money under the Elementary and Secondary School Act passed earlier this year. The House accepted the Senate amendment on all of the amendments, including National Defense Education Act loan repayments. The House receded, and accepted the Senate language on teacher fellowships. The House receded and accepted the Senate amendment on aid for purchase of equipment on just about every academic subject there was. The House receded on everything. Such new provisions as fellowships, were considered at length in the House and in the hearings there was substantial testimony on fellowships.

In connection with the equipment title, the House has had experience on that. We enacted an equipment title, title III of National Defense Education Act, back in 1958 for elementary and secondary schools. That has not been new. The House passed a provision on forgiveness on National Defense Education Act loans in 1958 and has had substantial testimony since then. The House has had testimony on the other provisions on which the House conferees could make our decision. However, on the Teachers' Corps there was no previous House consideration. The House has never had an opportunity to consider it on the floor. The House Members have never been notified until this time that such a bill was going to be considered on the floor.

This will be considered under rules governing conference reports which we will not be able to debate at length nor amend the bill. There will be 1 hour of time, controlled by the chairman of the committee [Mr. Powell]. The committee itself did not give adequate consideration to the Teacher Corps, only 5 minutes. A Senator was the only one who testified in subcommittee. If there were ever a time when the House ought to stand firm and say "let us wait until next year so that we can take up the bill of the gentleman from Indiana, which is out of the committee," this is it. The Members can check with the educators and come back on the floor of the House and offer amendments, and try to develop it into a type of program that the majority will accept.

The majority may accept the bill as the gentleman from Indiana wrote it which is different from this bill. They may accept the Senate language, but the House will not have an opportunity to work its will under the rules of the conference report that we will have before us. Even the conferees themselves did not offer any amendments to the National Teacher Corps with the exception of one, to delete a provision that provides for consultants.

The only sensible thing to do at this late date is to recommit the report to conference, delete the National Teacher Corps, and pass the Higher Education Act of 1965.

ATTEMPT TO HOLD RUMP SESSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Price). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the desperation of the banking lobby grows hour by hour. This morning, it reached a peak when a handful of members of the Banking and Currency Committee attempted to hold a rump session.

This was the rump session of all rump sessions.

These members, representing a minority of the committee, gathered in secret without notifying other members of the committee, in an attempt to bulldoze bank merger bill to the floor. This so-called meeting was purportedly called under rule I of the Banking and Currency Committee Rules which calls for a regular meeting of the committee on every first and third Tuesday of the month. However, I canceled this regular meeting yesterday in pursuance of rule I, which specifically gives the chairman of the committee the power to cancel meetings of the Banking and Currency Committee. This minority of the committee did not even bother to notify the chairman of the committee, or any of the committee staff of their desires for this meeting. The press, likewise, was kept in the dark about the so-called meeting.

I understand that the first few minutes of this rump affair were conducted in the dark—that is, without the lights on—and behind closed doors. I must admit that some of the legislation being proposed on bank mergers does not stand up too well in the light.

I am really saddened by this disgraceful performance. Such secret meetings and maneuverings have no place in the rules and the procedures of the House of Representatives. This so-called meeting casts a reflection on the whole House.

The so-called meeting was totally illegal. The so-called meeting was never called legally. Most important, this so-called meeting never did have a quorum. When the group, purporting to be the Banking and Currency Committee, voted on various measures, they had no more than 15 members present by count of the committee staff.

A senior member of the committee, Representative Reuss, learned of the so-called meeting after it had started. He went to the rump session and, as senior member, presided briefly. After discovering the nature of the session, Representative Reuss declared the meeting to be an illegal session and declared it disbanded. Another member of the committee, Mr. Annunzio of Illinois, abided by Representative Reuss' ruling and withdrew. Other members of the committee also refused to lend themselves to such outrageous and arbitrary action.

Yet, this minority force, led by the Republican and Democratic Representatives Ashley and Moorhead, continued to defy the rules and the rulings of Representative Reuss. With only 15 members in the room, they pretended to be acting on legislation. Their actions had no force of law.

Mr. Speaker, I submit again that this strange performance is another example of the extreme pressure being brought to bear on the bank merger legislation. We cannot allow the American Bankers Association to make such mockery of the rules and the procedures and the deliberations of the House of Representatives.

Let us consider these bills in the open light. Let us have full and open hearings.

I stood on the floor yesterday and called for open hearings on the bank merger legislation. Let those who are so anxious for a bill to grant special favors for the big banks join me in calling for open hearings. If their bills have so much merit, then I am sure that they can at least stand up in an open hearing.

I understand that immediately upon the opening of today's session of the House, Mr. Ashley rose and obtained unanimous consent to file an illegal report on S. 1698. This was not proper action under the rules of the House. The report Mr. Ashley proposes to submit is not a legal report of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

It violates section 407—Jefferson's Manual—that a bill cannot be reported from a committee "but what has been agreed to in committee actually assembled." The action of this so-called committee meeting also violates Rule XI, No. 26(e) "No measures or recommendations shall be reported from any committee unless a majority of the committee were actually present."

After Mr. Reuss ruled this meeting illegal and disbanded it, there were not, at one time, more than 15 members present to vote on any matters. Therefore, we find another clear violation of the rules. There are others which I will not go into at this time, but I fully intend to pursue this shocking and unprecedented action by all means possible through the Rules Committee and to pose timely objections on the floor of the House if this becomes necessary. I cannot believe that this body would condone such lawless action on the part of a minority of the members of any of its standing committees.

House of Representatives,
Committee on Banking
and Currency,
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1965.

MEMORANDUM

To: Paul Nelson, clerk.
From: Wright Patman, chairman.

Rule I of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee on Banking and Currency for the 89th Congress states that the committee shall meet at 10 a.m. on the first and third Tuesdays of each month unless canceled by the chairman.

The Banking and Currency Committee will not meet on October 19, 1965, which is the third Tuesday in the month.

Since it is customary only when a committee meeting is scheduled to notify the members, it will not be necessary for you to notify the members that the meeting has been canceled.

DEMONSTRATIONS ON WEEKEND

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from

California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, apropos of the demonstrations that were held over the past weekend, it seems to me that the articles written by Reporter Jerry LeBlanc and published in the Evening Outlook of Santa Monica, Calif., should be of interest to every thoughtful person who desires to understand the background for those demonstrations. Mr. LeBlanc joined the extreme left incognito, met and picketed with them, so his articles are from firsthand observation.

The reports were published in a series of 12 articles, which follow:

WRITER INFILTRATES LEFT—"FIRED" REPORTER JOINS REVOLUTIONARY RANKS

(By Jerry LeBlanc)

Two months ago I stripped off my necktie and jacket and stepped into a strange, totally different world.

It is a world peopled with bearded radicals and longhaired social rebels marching against the society most Americans perhaps too blindly take for granted.

From the Watts uprising to the Vietnam protests, wherever the picket signs were paraded, whenever unrest sparked demonstrations, I was with them.

I joined their organizations, their picketlines, strategy sessions, coffee discussions, public forums, parties, and endless committee meetings, and watched as they pressed their cause on every soapbox, and even door to door.

This is the world of the extreme left. I joined these revolutionaries because today more than ever they are making news, and news is the business of a reporter. I went in blindly, objectively, not knowing who I'd meet or what I'd find.

I BECAME "UNEMPLOYED"

I didn't reveal that I was a reporter on assignment by the Evening Outlook. A newsman on an investigation knows that if he identifies himself as a reporter, or is found out to be one, he is told only what is considered appropriate, or "safe," for him to hear. Only if he can penetrate inside the subject he is investigating, can he learn what really makes it tick.

I had a perfect "cover" to preserve my anonymity, too. The editor "fired" me one day, then quietly reemployed me the next day. As far as everyone inside and outside the paper was concerned, I was no longer on the payroll.

And it helped to take my wife, Renee, along with me at times.

My cover proved its worth later, when I found myself under deep suspicion.

The members of the extreme left that I became acquainted with through the weeks I was with them are not monsters or raving fanatics, and just as surely as every schoolchild believes the Boston Tea Party was a righteous assault against an oppressive enemy, they sincerely believe they are working for justice.

For the most part, I found, the object of their animosity is the U.S. Government and virtually all duly constituted authorities within the country.

HE'S PROFESSIONAL REVOLUTIONARY

Earlier, I called these people revolutionaries. I did so because that is what they call themselves. One day I asked a fellow committeeman what he did for a living.

"I consider myself a professional revolutionary, actually," he replied, "but for a living I do anything: social work, youth work, drive taxi."

Many of the people I encountered are moved by sincere idealism and love for their fellow man.

One night, after I had reached the committee level of the extreme left, a sweet-voiced teenager telephoned me. "I want to join your demonstration," she said, "but my mother won't let me go if we're going to get arrested."

"Don't worry, honey," I told her, "my mother wouldn't let me go either if we were going to do anything that would get us arrested."

A few nights later I was jolted when a man stood up at a meeting and publicly advocated what I consider treason.

HOW I GOT "IN"

It's easy to enter into this world of revolutionaries, but acceptance in their "in group" is another thing. That investigative agencies of law enforcement bodies have penetrated them is certain, but the revolutionaries accept this with a certain wry humor.

"Our hardest workers are FBI men," one comely female leader, Margaret Thorpe, area organizer for the Students for a Democratic Society, told me with a smile. "Whenever we spot one we load him down with work."

My tenure with the extreme left began on the night of July 9 at 5 Dudley Avenue, Venice, headquarters of the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs in southern California?

I just walked into a meeting.

It seemed as good a place as any to start, since I was familiar with the area, and since FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has described the DuBois Clubs as Communist born.

HAAG A GENTLEMAN

I had purposely donned the shabbiest clothes in my limited wardrobe, but by comparison, I was a standout contender for the best dressed award of the night, the only competition in the neatness department coming from John Haag, who was conducting the meeting.

Haag, 34, a Harvard graduate and owner of a coffee house at 7 Dudley Avenue, next door to DuBois headquarters, is chairman of the Los Angeles area DuBois organization—and is possibly one of the most gentlemanly, dedicated men I've ever met.

In addition to his DuBois Club activity, I was soon to learn that Haag is a leader of the committee to end the war in Vietnam and an ad hoc committee against police brutality.

And John Haag is a self-declared enemy of the state, if one is to believe a lapel button he wears from time to time.

He is also intelligent and soft spoken, has a talent for poetry and a boundless sympathy for victims of society's ills. And he produces a good cup of coffee.

At that first meeting, I was apparently looked on as being just a curious stranger, but I soon learned that all groups, in the extreme left are wary of possible infiltrators.

FIRST WARNING COMES

One of the first warnings I received of this came conversationally, it seemed, at a meeting several days later in the middle-class home of an attorney in Burbank.

Myself, Carol Eaton, Morris Moses, Richard Hayden, and the host and hostess, were present. "You know," said Carol Eaton, chairman of the Vietnam protest publicity committee, "DuBois is awfully worried about infiltration. Haag always has to watch out for the FBI, because they're poking their noses into everything Red, particularly something like DuBois, where they're 40 percent Communist."

"Sixty percent," someone corrected.

When I heard those figures, I wondered if they had been tossed out in that casual manner to surprise me and perhaps make me ask questions that would indicate too much curiosity.

I didn't comment on them, and my guess now is that they are far too high.

But not long after this meeting I was confronted directly as a suspected infiltrator.

It happened after a routine session at Haag's Venice coffee house, where I had become a regular visitor. I started to leave and Haag called, "Wait a minute, I'll walk along a ways."

AN ANSWER NEEDED

We passed several groups of tough-looking Venice denizens clustered outside the DuBois office and on the sidewalk farther down. They all recognized Haag and made room for us to pass.

I got the distinct impression he was ushering me through the groups, and I had heard among snatches of conversation the phrase "paid informer."

But Haag and I talked about Vietnam, society, poetry and the difficulties of operating a beatnik coffee house, until he said what he evidently came with me to say: "I hear the Evening Outlook is looking for someone to infiltrate the club."

I stopped walking. I needed a casual reply, right away.

"That sounds like something they'd do," I said. "I know, because I worked there until I was fired about a month ago."

"Oh?" he questioned, but I was sure he knew that much about me.

"Why would they infiltrate anyway, John?" I asked. "You've got nothing to hide; your meetings are open to the public, aren't they?"

CONTINUES ACTIVITIES

I wasn't sure right way, but I thought I was in the clear. There was a look of doubt in his eyes and we gradually shifted to another subject.

I made it a point to continue my activity in Venice as though Haag had said nothing which applied to me.

If anyone asked, I told him I was a free lance writer for the classical music magazine Virtuoso and for Reuters Wire Service, which is true.

After that time, I was able to edge into the "in-group," a term the leaders use to differentiate between themselves and the hangers-on.

On the Vietnam protest, I was named to their publicity and literature committees. In the Congress of Unrepresented People I was appointed to the publicity committee and was made a torchlight parade monitor.

The DuBois Club named me cochairman of a special committee to prepare a Watts riot brochure for national distribution.

The local scene of mysterious lettered organizations opened to me, SNCC, SDS, SP, SWP, YSA, YPSL, and others began to unravel as:

Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, Students for a Democratic Society, Socialist Party, Socialist Workers Party, Young Socialists of America and Young People's Socialist League.

Amid investigation of the Los Angeles extreme left, I flew to the San Francisco Bay area to view firsthand the parallels in operations there, and then I broadened my field into a nationwide probe.

POTENTIAL IS GREAT

The most obvious goal of the extreme left, I saw, is to form a coalition uniting the ultraliberals, the civil rights fighters, the peace movement, the university rebels and the Socialist leaders.

The potential is great:

From the civil rights workers comes a proven willingness to die for a cause, and many of them, disillusioned with Dixie efforts to correct racial ills, have seized upon the greater idea of changing society itself.

University of California rebels, also versed in civil disobedience and teeming with animosity for policemen who took them to jail, contribute numbers to the cause and the challenging spirit of youth.

The pacifists and the disillusioned further enlarge the "antiestablishment" organization.

The ultraliberals and Socialists provide the philosophy, organizational talent, and a long trained core of leaders for this new revolution.

COUP Emerges as Superfront for Protestors

(Editor's Note.—Jerry LeBlanc, Evening Outlook staff writer, spent 2 months underground as a member of the extreme left in Los Angeles. This is the second of a series of articles on who the leaders are, what they are attempting to do, and how they are trying to do it.)

(By Jerry LeBlanc)

Early last month, I joined a new leftist organization called the Congress of Unrepresented People (COUP), which unfurled its banner simultaneously in Washington, D.C., and Los Angeles with the battle cry:

"We intend to have a government that truly represents us even if we have to create it for ourselves."

Out of nowhere the organization suddenly appeared in a dozen communities across the Nation and, on the weekend of August 7, while I marched in a demonstration here, 2,000 persons massed in Washington and a tenth of them landed in jail.

Simultaneously, in Berkeley, attempts were made to halt troop trains. In San Francisco hundreds gathered in opposition to their government. At Oakland, San Diego, the United States-Canadian border and other points, COUP staged rallies.

I learned this was only a dress rehearsal of things to come.

I could move without suspicion in COUP—and other organizations of the extreme left—because everyone thought I had been fired by the Evening Outlook. I had been—but what people didn't know was that I had been reemployed immediately on an undercover basis for this special report.

IT'S ALL SAME THING

I became deeply involved in COUP. I traced its origin to Berkeley and Washington, and in the end discovered that actually COUP is just another name the extreme left can use.

Membership in the group fans across the broad spectrum of peace groups, free speech champions, civil rights fighters, and socialist action groups.

The 30-odd men and women who met in Washington early this summer to set up the framework of the organization at 107 Rhode Island NW., have been involved in virtually every controversial cause of the decade:

The Free Speech Movement, W. E. B. DuBois Clubs, Vietnam Committee, Socialist Party, Communist Party, Students for a Democratic Society, the Anti-House Committee on Un-American Activities movement, pro-Cuba factions, police brutality protests, and many others.

Every cause that tends to undermine existing authority comes within the scope of COUP.

COUP ORGANIZATION

It all started not in Washington, but on the Berkeley campus of the University of California last May, I learned.

One night, I sat on the floor at the home of Jimmy Garrett, a personable young Negro whose courage has been tested in the Dixie civil rights frontlines.

I asked him how COUP really began. There were four of us there, awaiting an organizing meeting in his apartment at 3825 Effie Street, Los Angeles.

"Bob Parris and I and a couple of other guys were sitting around like we are, on the campus grass at Berkeley, talking about all the things wrong with society, and we decided to do something about it," Garrett said.

"We decided to try to organize all the disorganized opposition to the Government into a solid front."

Garrett, like Parris, was working for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. Parris, also called "Moses," is another battle-scarred veteran of Southern racial clashes.

CHANGE SOCIETY

They admit coming away from the civil rights front confused as to where the line is drawn between violence and convinced that society as a whole must be changed, not just Dixie.

Moses went to Washington to organize COUP, while Garrett came here.

Moses says this about Mississippi: "Most liberals think of Mississippi as a cancer * * * but we think (it) an accurate reflection of America's values and morality. Sheriff Rainey is not a freak; he represents the majority. And what he did is related to the napalm bombings of objects in Vietnam."

Garrett echoes this belief. "Not only the Negroes in America are victims of this society," he said. "The whole middle class is trapped the same way. I call it 'slavery with a smile.'"

Prof. Staughton Lynd, of Yale, voiced the COUP idea before the thousands of students assembled for the Berkeley teach-in last May 21.

He congratulated the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs for publication of a diatribe called "The U.S. War in Vietnam," and the DuBois monthly magazine, Insurgent, reprinted Lynd's speech.

YALE PROFESSOR

"For the benefit of FBI agents present," the professor said, "let me make it clear that I am not advocating violent overthrow of the U.S. Government."

Laughter exploded. He went on to propose "that there come together in Washington a new Continental Congress, made up on representatives from community unions, freedom parties, and campus groups, which would say in effect: 'This is a desperate situation; our Government no longer represents us. Let us see what needs to be done.' Under its aegis mass civil disobedience could take place. * * *"

TWO HUNDRED ARRESTED

It did. Lynd and some 200 other demonstrators were arrested in Washington August 9 at a sit-in at the Capitol. Originally they had planned to storm the House of Representatives and occupy the seats.

Lynd, who has been affiliated with the Progressive Labor Party and the Socialist Workers Party, cited by the Attorney General as subversive, voiced the general sentiment of the movement with:

"I think all of us should search our hearts and souls for the courage and clarity of spirit to go to the White House, to go to the Army Terminal * * * if possible to go to Vietnam and stand in front of the flamethrowers and say, 'If blood must be spilt, let it be mine. * * *'"

I marched with COUP from South Park in the heart of the Los Angeles Negro district to Exposition Park, where headquarters were set up for a weekend of public workshops, from which were to emerge the people's resolutions and demands for solving their divergent problems.

WALKED 30 BLOCKS

Relays of police squad cars ushered 200 of us all the way, and I paced off more than 30 blocks. Having been a committee member from the start, I was made a monitor for the march, wearing a blue arm band and urging stragglers to keep up the pace.

Young students, elderly ladies, bearded radicals, and Negroes joined the parade. We marched along Avalon Boulevard and wherever Negroes gathered they were handed leaflets or a verbal explanation of what COUP stood for.

This was Friday, August 6. Within a week, in an unrelated development, the street was a burning shambles, wrecked by mobs of Watts Negroes running wild in the worst riot in the history of the United States.

When our marching group arrived at Exposition Park, John Haag of the DuBois Clubs was introduced as chairman for the evening. Carl Bloice of the Communist-line People's World newspaper and Jimmy Garrett were among the first speakers.

GROUNDLESS FEAR

At the meeting at which final plans for the rally were made, one member had voiced the fear, "Suppose the persons attending come up with some kind of a resolution that we don't want"

This fear proved groundless. As people turned out for the event, they were guided by the hard core revolutionaries and the outcome was never in doubt. The deck was stacked by the in-group—regulars of the Vietnam Committee, DuBois, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, Students for Democratic Society and Young Socialists (virtually the identical membership of the Vietnam Committee).

After the first night, attendance dwindled to half on Saturday, a fourth on Sunday. But it was not considered a failure.

NATIONAL SUCCESS

A few new recruits had been added to the mailing lists. A few more could be counted on to show up at meetings and picket lines. And a permanent type of COUP organization was formed with an agreement to meet again and press further for the demands brought up at the rally.

On the national level the success was more noteworthy. Agreement was reached in Washington to hold a national convention of antiwar forces in Madison, Wis., on Thanksgiving weekend.

Plans, suggested by the Berkeley Vietnam Day Committee, the Nation's most active group of its kind, were formulated for civil disobedience rallies on October 15–16.

Within 2 weeks, I, having risen to the status of committee member in the local Vietnam group, was contacted by a man from New York who was setting up a National Coordinating Committee on Vietnam Protests.

SAME ADDRESS

It was formed at COUP, in Washington, with temporary headquarters at 1728 Van Hise Avenue, Madison, Wis.

Oh, yes, Madison also has a DuBois Chapter at the University of Wisconsin, headed by Mrs. Eugene Dennis, Jr., 202 Marion Street, daughter-in-law of the former head of the national Communist Party.

Also out of COUP, at the prompting of the Berkeley Vietnam Day Committee headquarters, came a call for massive nationwide civil disobedience display on October 15–16, centered on the campuses.

In both San Francisco and Los Angeles, I discovered first hand, COUP leaflets were printed and distributed by the DuBois and Socialist Workers Party.

Why do they always intertwine, the activities of clubs like DuBois, the Committee to End the War in Vietnam, the Socialist Workers Party, I wondered?

I March on Picket Lines

(By Jerry LeBlanc)

(Editor's Note.—Jerry LeBlanc, Evening Outlook staff writer, spent 2 months underground as a member of the extreme left in

Los Angeles. This is the third in a series of articles on who the leaders are, what they are attempting to do, and how they are trying to do it.)

My initial experience as a picket for the extreme left occurred on the night of July 12 when I carried a hand-lettered sign in front of the Palladium in Hollywood that read "End the War in Vietnam."

I concur with the sentiment on the sign, but I wasn't there for the same reason as the 250 other persons in the demonstration. I was there to learn as much as I could about who is behind the tide of protests against our foreign policy.

The occasion of the demonstration was the appearance of Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY at a Democratic Party fund-raising dinner. It was an eye opener for me.

HE GETS HIS SIGN

Basically, I'm shy, but when I arrived I pushed through the gathering crowd of spectators and, waiting for a break in the long parade, stepped in.

After two turns around the front and side of the Palladium, I was handed my sign.

I recalled then that I had met the Vice President only a few months before while covering a speech for the Evening Outlook. I was uneasy about possibly running into him as a picket.

Virtually everyone in the picket line carried signs similar to mine. It was a very successful demonstration.

MARCHERS DESCRIBED

With me in the march were well-heeled clubwomen with the aura of Encino all but stamped on them, and students from Young Democrat organizations and the socialist youth groups. There were the denizens of Venice, women pushing baby strollers and kindly senior citizen types.

Beards were plentiful and Negroes were few. A full-suited gentleman marched in the line reading a book as though he were completely alone on the street.

Elderly church women straggled and chattered, unable to maintain the pace.

It was colorful. The professional demonstrators compared past experiences with conversation like, "Did you get arrested? I did."

As flashbulbs popped, the pickets speculated on which cameramen were from newspapers and which were FBI.

You could buy your "I Am An Enemy of the State" button for 50 cents, or you could invest in literature like the Young Socialist, the Militant, the Movement or the Free Press.

And an antipicket picket carried his sign high, declaring, "Reds Go Home."

The demonstration was well organized.

Some 200 hand-painted protest signs were quickly stacked in the Palladium parking lot, then a man with a staple gun banged away at them while another man hurriedly passed them out neatly attached to slats.

SONGS BEGUN

Armbanded picket captains, stationed at regular intervals, urged marchers to maintain the pace and keep in single file.

At the Palladium entrance leaders tried to set up chants and songs, which were picked up and died away as the pickets moved on. The songs were from the civil rights movement or the peace movement: "We Shall Overcome," "I Ain't Going to Study War No More."

Demonstrations of this sort are put together with skill, I learned later as an official member of the Congress of Unrepresented People (COUP).

Having stepped into the publicity committee of the Vietnam protest group, and having begun to take a vocal part in its activities, I naturally fitted into the newly organized COUP.

GARRETT'S EXPLANATIONS

I had first heard of COUP at a DuBois Club meeting in Venice. The next week, joining the Committee To End the War in Vietnam, I heard about COUP at greater length.

Jimmy Garrett of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Council (SNCC), addressed the group and explained COUP. The most striking statement in his talk was that the idea of concentrating on the Vietnam protest alone had been considered but set aside:

Because, he explained, if Johnson pulled the troops out of Vietnam, then the group would have nothing to fight.

So other issues were brought in: poverty, racial inequality, political organization, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, police brutality.

In other words, I surmised, the idea was to oppose the Government on as many fronts as possible.

The Vietnam protest was fine by itself, but a broader organization was needed to plunge into these other fields. DuBois Clubs, which play a strong role in the Vietnam protest, are handicapped by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover's characterization of them as Communist, especially when it comes to working with a broad range of public interests.

Virtually every one of the 28 organizers of the national COUP already were involved in the Vietnam issue and/or nonviolent action committees. But a new organization was born.

For our Friday, August 6 march from South Park to Exposition Park, we swiftly formed a publicity committee, program committee, district breakdown committee, and other work groups.

These set up interim meetings for planning the COUP demonstration, and a general meeting to gather all possible participants in COUP was called for the end of the week.

ASSIGNMENTS MADE

At that time, specific assignments were dealt: creating posters, writing leaflets, and reproduction of the leaflets.

Provisions were made for loudspeaking equipment, lighting, food catering, and a dozen other details, including telephone contacts and mailings.

I was appointed to the publicity action committee and my suggestions for bumper stickers and poster wordings were adopted with applause.

My press release went to all area newspapers and radio-television stations, carrying my name and phone number for further information.

Meanwhile, I helped in mailings and managed to get a list of target organizations which COUP sought to bind together.

Picket signs were to be painted, and, for this a sign-painting party was called at the home of a talented young art student, Bob Bigelow.

My wife joined the sign-painting party with me and designed a peace poster with a globe representing the world, flanked by a dove on one side and an atomic cloud on the other. It won immediate praise and, when the COUP march was ended, her poster was chosen for the spot of honor and was attached to a light standard behind the speaker's post.

GROUPS SOUGHT

These are the groups which we invited to participate in COUP (but it must be made clear that not all participated. The list is given only to illustrate the aims of the COUP organization):

Artists Protest Committee, Youth for Peace, Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, American Friends, War Resistors League, Women's Strike for Peace, Fellowship of Reconciliation, Women's International League for Peace. UCLA Student Committee on Vietnam;

Unitarian Peace Committee, Community Discussion Project, Human Relations Club, Physicians for Social Responsibility, the Lawyers Guild, American Civil Liberties Union, National Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, South African Freedom Action, Afro-American Cultural Association, Nation of Islam;

Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, Congress of Racial Equality, United Civil Rights Committee, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Mexican-American Political Association, DuBois Clubs, Californians for Liberal Representation, Socialist Party, Socialist Workers Party, Young Socialists of America, Young People's Socialist League, California Democratic Council, Students for a Democratic Society, and unions like the ILWU, the ILGWU, and even the UAW and IAM.

As has been stressed, not all of these organizations participated. About a dozen, however, were in from the founding stage.

To encourage participation of individuals without the official sanction of their organizations, it was made clear that members of the establishing unit would identify themselves as, for instance, John Doe, a member of CORE, rather than a representative.

The demonstration and the organization itself succeeded, and that's what counts. Activists care little about labels, so long as the job is done.

LEFTISTS SEEK SOCIALIST UNITED STATES—DUBOIS MEMBERS WORK TO CREATE NEW GOVERNMENT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Jerry LeBlanc, Evening Outlook staff writer, spent 2 months underground as a member of the Extreme Left in Los Angeles. This is the fourth of a series of articles on who the leaders are, what they are attempting to do and how they are trying to do it.)

(By Jerry LeBlanc)

It is not against the law to overthrow the U.S. Government, provided you do it on election day with ballots.

Only a little more than a year ago a new youth group dedicated to this cause held its founding convention in San Francisco and almost immediately was characterized by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover as a Communist tool.

The infant organization named itself after W. E. B. DuBois, one of the founders of the NAACP in 1909 who later repudiated the civil rights group and joined the Communist Party.

DuBois, winner of a Lenin Peace Prize in 1959, is dead now and buried in Moscow.

WE STRIVE FOR SOCIALISM

"With the vision of DuBois," the club states officially, "we are striving toward a world of socialism and peace."

In the interests of truth, I lived the life of a DuBois Club enthusiast for 2 months, finding myself wending through a maze of kindred organizations, overlapping in function and all having in common this one thing: Creation of a new political force.

The DuBois Club makes no bones about its aims: "By courageous dedication to, and militant action in, the fight to solve the immediate problems of Americans of all races, ages, and nationalities, a socialist movement will win the democratic majority which alone can make a socialist America."

The aim of the group is quite clear and overtly stated.

Hoover put it this way: "The (Communist) party is making every effort to increase its influence in the racial struggle and continues to promote the false impression that it is a legitimate political party."

He added, "It has assigned priority to a recruitment campaign aimed at gaining new members from the ranks of American youth. To implement this program, it initiated a new national Marxist youth organization last June—the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America."

Former FBI counterspy, Herbert Philbrick said in San Francisco that the DuBois Club is filling the void that once was the Young Communist League.

Called on for an example, he said. "One basic Communist strategy is to deliberately violate the law, provoke the police into cracking down and then hurling charges of 'police brutality.' "

CALL FOR POLITICAL FORCE

Speaking for the club itself, the editors of Insurgent take a broader view:

"Until now, the focus for activists was the sporadic picket, sit-in, strike, march—the movement growing from action to action, slumping, then gaining larger life in some new and unexpected spot.

"But behind these outbursts of ever-growing action, something new is coming.

"The time is ripe for political organization, incorporating all of the experiences of recent years, but building on far stronger foundations; uniting activists, racial minorities and great numbers of working people—and those who can't find work—into a permanent political force.

"Such work will spread, and with it the possibility for the people to assume the power and transform America into a real democracy—a socialist democracy."

INSIGNIA DESCRIBED

The insignia of the DuBois Club is a half-white, half-black circle with a white hand and a black hand reaching for a dove, symbolizing brotherhood of man and peace, or civil rights and Vietnam, depending on your interpretation.

The founding convention of the organization was held June 19–21, 1964, in San Francisco.

Among those on hand for the initial meeting was Terence Hallinan, son of Vincent Hallinan, once Progressive Party (a cited Communist front) candidate for President and an ardent pro-Soviet.

Another DuBois Club founder was Mike Myerson, author of the publication, "The U.S. War in Vietnam."

Bettina Aptheker, daughter of top-ranked Communist theoretician Herbert Aptheker and a leader in the Free Speech Movement at the University of California, is another founder. She coauthored the DuBois book on the FSM crisis.

LOS ANGELES REPRESENTATION

Carl Bloice, People's World writer, frequent Moscow visitor and editor of the DuBois semimonthly publication "Insurgent," was another founder of the organization.

Attending the founding convention from Los Angeles, according to reliable reports, was Bob Duggan, recently appointed coordinator for Los Angeles area DuBois programs. A summer ago he was working with Puerto Ricans in New York City helping organize rent strikes.

At an end-of-the-summer conference this year, Hugh Fowler, an organizer of the Congress of Unrepresented People and a UC Berkeley student, was elected DuBois national chairman; Terence Hallinan became organizations secretary; his brother, Matthew, educational director; Bloice, publications director, and Sue Borenstein, of Philadelphia, treasurer.

Miss Aptheker was in attendance at the national session, according to the People's World, and her father was named literary executor of Dr. W. E. B. DuBois and is in custody of all his papers.

I visited the San Francisco DuBois headquarters this summer. It worked out rather oddly how I got there in that I was on Vietnam Committee business and figured I would deal with the largest Vietnam Committee in the country only a few miles away in Berkeley.

IN POOR DISTRICT

When I contacted Terence Hallinan to ask him whom I should see, he directed me without hesitation to the DuBois office in San Francisco.

I found it in a basement storefront of a dilapidated building in a Negro district that makes Watts look like Bel-Air.

Opening the door at 1853½ McAllister Street, I introduced myself to Celia Rosebury, managing editor of Insurgent.

Editor Carl Bloice was not present, so Miss Rosebury and I discussed an article I wished to submit with authority from the Vietnam protest group in Los Angeles.

She perched on a high stool while an attractive blonde assistant worked nearby and an artist occupied a desk in an adjoining room.

PROPAGANDA ABUNDANT

Civil rights and police brutality propaganda was abundant on the walls. In the front window hung a get out of Vietnam poster. A freshly mimeographed stack of leaflets on behalf of a Congress of Unrepresented People rally sat beside the machine, and boxes full of the DuBois publication, "The U.S. War in Vietnam," were ready for distribution.

Celia Rosebury was definitely interested in my proposed article, based on a legal brief by Los Angeles Attorney Hugh Manes describing alleged U.S. treaty violations in the Vietnam conflict.

I agreed to send in the story. She directed me to the Berkeley Vietnam Day Committee offices, and I left, having learned only that DuBois nationally is involved in basically the same diverse causes as DuBois in Los Angeles.

ACTIVITIES OUTLINED

The political efforts in both northern and southern California are progressing on a broad front. The Venice DuBois Club has initiated a neighborhood canvass with an eye to political organization right now. And John Haag, area chairman, was actively leading club members in political activity in the Los Angeles City elections last spring.

The West Los Angeles and Central Los Angeles DuBois organizations, and those in San Francisco and Berkeley, are also involved in neighborhood canvassing.

The Congress of Unrepresented People's platform calls for political organization as one of its efforts.

And last month, tying the whole ball of wax up nationally, Rick Wolff, of New Haven, Conn., coordinator for the nationwide Vietnam protest movement, stressed in a private meeting with me that political organization will become the focal point for the peace drive.

STRENGTH OF LEFTISTS SHOWN—SURVEY REVEALS VARIED PURSUITS OF DUBOIS CLUBS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Jerry LeBlanc, Evening Outlook staff writer, spent 2 months underground as a member of the extreme left in Los Angeles. This is the fifth in a series of articles on who the leaders are, what they are attempting to do, and how they are trying to do it.)

(By Jerry LeBlanc)

As one minor participant in the extreme left, a pursuit I undertook in a search for facts rather than social change, I had to wonder how big the W. E. B. DuBois Club is.

The answer I came up with is this: "Growing." It is now small in numbers, but its ability to work with allied organizations in pressing its causes multiplies its strength by thousands.

To find out what the DuBois organization is doing nationwide, I wrote to newspaper editors in 100 cities, all of them either metropolitan centers or university towns.

On the Los Angeles question, the process was simpler. I asked John Haag, area coordinator.

ONE HUNDRED ACTIVE MEMBERS IN LOS ANGELES

"We only have about 100 members in the Los Angeles area," said Haag. He told of an embryo South Los Angeles club that had "become inactive," but pointed out that the West Los Angeles and Central Los Angeles clubs are "on the move."

The momentum makes it hard to distinguish DuBois from other movements, particularly from the view of direction, if not leadership.

San Francisco and the Alameda-Oakland-Berkeley areas are far more active, both in terms of the DuBois Club and the Vietnam Committee, and their allies, the Free Speech Movement organizers.

At least three DuBois Clubs are located in the area, one in San Francisco, one in Berkeley, and one on the campus of the University of California.

NATIONWIDE SURVEY RESULTS

Besides being national DuBois headquarters, the San Francisco Bay area has what is undoubtedly the Nation's biggest, most active Vietnam protest unit, with offices of its own and a full-time paid staff of four.

As my survey results poured in, letter by letter I learned these facts:

Across the country, New York is the location of five well-spaced DuBois Clubs, one each in the Lower East Side, upper Manhattan, Queens, Bronx, and Brooklyn.

They, too, are active in the Vietnam protest, under the direction of Robert Heisler, State coordinator, of 3477 Corsa Avenue, Bronx.

In Chicago there are two clubs, one headquartered at the home of Ted Pearson, area coordinator, 1808 North Cleveland Avenue, and at the Modern Book Store, 56 East Chicago Avenue. Their 50 members are concentrating on the war on poverty.

PHILADELPHIA UNIT

Philadelphia also has a DuBois unit, headed by Sondra Patrinos, 516 West Coulter Street, with a small membership—about 20. They tried to join the NAACP in picketing a boys' school in a segregation dispute, but the civil rights group spurned their offer of help.

(The NAACP nationally has been reluctant to ally itself with other groups.)

St. Louis, Mo., also has its group of about 50 DuBois members under the guidance of James E. Peake, Jr., area coordinator, with headquarters at 1910 North Grand Avenue.

Very active and pledged to "techniques of direct action, including street demonstrations," according to Peake, the St. Louis DuBois is trying to organize Washington University students, is working on political organization in Negro neighborhoods, and on the widespread Vietnam protest.

COMMUNIST KIN INVOLVED

In Madison, Wis., a 33-member DuBois club, headed by Mrs. Eugene Dennis Jr., daughter-in-law of the ex-chieftain of the American Communist Party, meets at her home, 202 Marion Street, and concentrates on the University of Wisconsin campus, where some 50 midwest DuBois delegates held a convention last February to organize Vietnam demonstrations.

Also on the campus, a Vietnam protest was led by DuBois member Daniel Friedman.

Mrs. Dennis' husband operated a separate, noncampus DuBois Club but apparently left Madison this summer. He is regional coordinator of the DuBois clubs, but a New Yorker.

There is also reliably reported to be a functioning DuBois group in Newark, N.J., and there probably are others.

Returning to the West Coast again, we find a small club with 20 members in Portland, Oreg., most of them ex-Reed College students.

Headed by Jeffery Sachar of New York, they expect to organize another unit on the campus of Portland State College this semester.

The DuBois Club survey did not include asking for information on organizations with similar aims, such as the Vietnam protest committees. That there are connections between the groups is an inescapable conclusion, however.

EXAMPLE GIVEN

Just as one example, Carl Oglesby, president of the Nationally-organized Students For A Democratic Society, stated a few months ago that SDS is considering action "that may involve deliberate violation of one or more of the nation's espionage laws" to show opposition to the U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Oglesby, who lives at Ann Arbor, Mich., where a massive Vietnam "teach-in" protest was held last spring, is a signer of the original Washington call for the Congress of Unrepresented People (COUP). As earlier articles in the series showed, COUP is an organization combining all DuBois club goals under one banner.

I saw no direct evidence that DuBois is in charge of operations of other groups, but it is certainly true that DuBois leaders are in almost all the major activist organizations.

The common membership of some groups is large and in a situation where each group guards its independence, no one seems eager to emerge as an over-all commander, so long as the groups can be organized together on their common projects.

IT'S SAME THING

Once John Haag, Los Angeles area DuBois chairman, said to me, after telling of an upcoming DuBois-organized Venice neighborhood survey on the Vietnam issue: "We'd like to meet somewhere else, so it doesn't seem we're behind everything, but I guess they know anyway."

Another time, following a strategy meeting of the Congress of Unrepresented People, Tom Garrison, formerly of the Congress of Racial Equality and now prominent in DuBois activities, invited me to a COUP sign-painting party on a Tuesday night.

"Sorry, I can't make it," I told him. "The Vietnam committee meets Tuesday night."

"Skip it and come to our DuBois steering committee meeting Wednesday night—it's the same thing."

I believe him. In my head I tried to multiply the Los Angeles situation by the number of other communities where DuBois and the peace groups are linked.

My talent as a computer failed, but the effective strength of such an alliance is far more powerful than the relatively tiny DuBois Club itself.

Profiles of Active Leftists—Meet People of Far Left

(Editor's Note.—Jerry LeBlanc, Evening Outlook staff writer, spent 2 months underground as a member of the extreme left in Los Angeles. This is the sixth of a series of articles on who the leaders are, what they are attempting to do, and how they are trying to do it.)

(By Jerry LeBlanc)

An FBI infiltrator in the extreme left has to be awfully careful how he goes about trying to keep tabs on who's who in the movement.

One little mistake and he'll expose himself.

As an undercover reporter probing the ultraleft—its people, aims, and activities—I met more than 3 dozen persons I can still remember by name, most of them in the category of "activists."

One, I'm positive, was an FBI man who had penetrated the "in group" of the extreme left just as I had. I had wanted very much to meet him because, from what I kept hearing, he was a leading figure in the revolutionary council.

HE TIPS HIMSELF OFF

Our first direct encounter came about when he telephoned. "Jerry," he said, "Bert in Berkeley suggested we get together."

He tipped himself off by telephoning me at a number of a next-door neighbor which I didn't even know myself, and saying he got it from a guy I never met in Berkeley.

The only way he could have gotten the number, I knew, had to be through police facilities, but I went along with this line and we agreed to contact each other at a meeting.

From the instant we shook hands, I knew he knew I was suspicious of him, and every time I tried to corner him for a question, he started talking to someone else.

HE PLAYED ROLE CAREFULLY

He seemed less worried about my suspicions than the possibility that I might expose him to another fellow whose acquaintance he was trying to cultivate.

When the session was over, he seemed so relieved to extend a hand in farewell that I was tempted to wink at him.

I never saw him again, and for all I know, he's still a trusted member of the leadership clique.

I met a lot of interesting people in the ultraleft. Despite the stereotype, bearded males and stringy-haired females were the exception, not the rule.

The police of the ultraleft are professors and poets, professionals and shirt-sleeve workingmen, bums and the opulent, men and women, boys and girls, Negroes, whites, and orientals.

I met them in colorful coffeehouses, artistic hillside homes, cluttered offices, tract houses, sparsely furnished apartments, in the Negro district and the Hollywood hills, and on the campus and street corners.

It's amazing how much you can find out about these people if you try. Here are profiles of three I consider interesting:

John Haag: Clean shaven, well educated, he came to Los Angeles in 1959 with his wife and worked at Space Technology until his security clearance was revoked.

POLICE ENCOUNTERS

He was involved in a couple of minor skirmishes with the police and was fined in one case, with charges dropped in the other, both linked to his beatnik Venice West coffeehouse at 7 Dudley Avenue.

He has a small son named Thomas Paine Haag.

Haag, who I found very likeable, is area DuBois chairman, Venice chapter president of the American Civil Liberties Union, chairman of an ad hoc committee against police brutality, and involved in the committee to end the war in Vietnam and the Congress of Unrepresented People and probably a half dozen other causes.

MONEY DONATED

Once I asked Haag if the coffeehouse he operates next door to the DuBois headquarters supports him financially. He replied with a shrug. "People give me money from time to time—people interested in what I'm doing." Haag told me one night why he was part of the ultraleft. He sat at a crude wood table in his dimlit coffeehouse.

Nearby was a bulletin board, a mixed collection of antipolice and anti-Vietnam war literature, leaflets announcing upcoming meetings and demonstrations, notices of fundraising parties, and personal notes from transient acquaintances and lovers.

VAGABOND NATURE

Winos, wandering youths, guitarists and poets pursued their interest at the other table. These are people I sympathize with, having spent my own youth as a vagabond.

"They come here looking for something that doesn't exist anymore," Haag said of his clientele. "They're looking for a beatnik community like Greenwich Village once was.

"A lot of them end up on wine or dope in 3 weeks. That's what causes most of the trouble here: the ones on wine and pills. They mix cheap wine and seconal and go out of their heads. There was a bunch I had to throw out last night and I think the same group stomped a kid sleeping on the beach, nearly killed him, for no reason."

Pondering the senselessness of it, he continued, "The beats are hopeless. They come up with plenty of justified criticism of society, but they don't take part in changing things, and they never even suggested an alternative. That's one of the reasons I turned to politics and social reform for the answer."

POLICE CHECK

Our conversation was interrupted when a police car rolled up to the door, motor running, radio blaring. Haag's attractive wife, Anna, a fiery brunette, limping on one crutch as the result of an accident, called from the door, "John, will you talk to this ——— cop?"

Haag left and the coffeehouse resounded to the rafters with a cheer for Anna, who loudly slammed the door on the police.

Police do display a great deal of interest in this coffeehouse and its inhabitants, but then, it is the unofficial headquarters for the rebels, the downtrodden, the idle, the winos, pot and pill users, and, concomitantly the troublemakers.

Harassment is the term the coffeehouse habitues use to describe the police activities, and it is obvious the police bear down on the place as though it should not be permitted to exist.

POLICE ARE COMFORTING

I have never been there when police did not make their presence known. But I felt a lot safer that they were around.

In any event, it became quite clear that the police are part of "the enemy" in the area and that Haag, who may agree philosophically with the lawmen that such neighborhoods should not exist, serves as unofficial champion of the "outcasts" of Venice in their undeclared battle with the police.

And now that the coffeehouse and its next door political annex have become a center of operations for DuBois, the Vietnam protest and the new Congress of Unrepresented People (COUP), not to mention the Watts issue, the police-citizen tension is heightened.

"Why is it any better to hate cops than to hate Negroes?" I asked once, "most of them are people, aren't they?" The question went unanswered.

OUTSPOKEN DISLIKE

Darrell Myers: Los Angeles chairman of the Young Socialist Alliance (YSA), he is outspoken in his dislike for police, branding them as "the enemy."

Myers, from Stockton, is 22, blond, collegiate looking and has a militant speech to make at every function, whether it be YSA, the Vietnam Committee or COUP. He is a detail man and a stickler for parliamentary procedure.

At 19, he squatted in the door of the Atomic Energy Commission in Berkeley, challenging arrest. He achieved arrest at the well-remembered Cadillac and Sheraton-Palace Hotel rights demonstration in San Francisco.

Since 1962 he has been picketing as a pacifist.

He said he believes the Socialists will one day have to take up arms to fight off Government suppression. I nominate him for the most belligerent pacifist of the day award.

ATTORNEY DESCRIBED

Hugh Manes: A zealous and tireless attorney constantly seeking to reform society, he is a lawyer with offices in Hollywood and is an associate of A. L. Wirin in the American Civil Liberties Union.

Manes, a participant in Socialist Workers Party-backed Military Labor Forum events, also helped defend suspended Los Angeles policeman Mike Hannon, whose Congress of Racial Equality activities came under fire.

Manes is a 1964 member of the National Lawyers Guild, a cited Communist legal front, and helped prepare a thick dossier documenting alleged U.S. treaty violations in the Vietnam conflict.

He is a member of the Los Angeles Vietnam protest committee. An enthusiast for the cause, he turns red-faced when arguing a point.

One of his best friends is not Los Angeles Police Chief William H. Parker. When my committee was starting a DuBois brochure on the Watts riots, one member said, "I'll talk to Manes; he's got a file 15 years back on Chief Parker."

The people involved in the ultraleft are diverse, and as interesting as they are numerous.

Leftist Recruits Yanks To Battle Viet GIs

(Editor's Note.—Jerry LeBlanc, Evening Outlook staff writer, spent 2 months underground as a member of the extreme left in Los Angeles. This is the seventh of a series of articles on who the leaders are, what they are attempting to do, and how they are attempting to do it.)

(By Jerry LeBlanc)

As a reporter, I don't consider myself easily shocked, but I admit being badly shaken one night recently when a man stood before me and tried to enlist an international brigade pitting Americans against Americans in a struggle to the death in Vietnam.

As an undercover reporter probing the extreme left, I went with my wife to the Militant Labor Forum on July 30 at 1702 East Fourth Street, Los Angeles.

In an upstairs hall, we passed through a propaganda-filled book store and entered a crowded back room.

We paid a dollar each to get in and I'm not sure if it's tax deductible because the forum is operated by the Socialist Workers Party, which is listed by the Attorney General as a subversive organization. In any event, I entered the two bucks as one of the items on my expense sheet to the Evening Outlook.

Leaflets advertising the forum were handed out at Congress of Unrepresented People sessions.

The hall was complete with a bust of Leon Trotsky, who was assassinated in 1940 by employes of a one-time Communist bigwig named Stalin.

Midway through the forum, a bearded spectator arose and declared that his organization, called the Freedom Fighters, is negotiating with North Vietnam envoys in Switzerland for permission to send a military brigade to fight on the side of the Vietcong.

He was Ron B. Ramsey of 112 North Culver Boulevard; Compton, a man who looked like a Cuban guerrilla but says he is a Ph. D. and is known to have been on the Berkeley campus, although neither as professor, which he calls himself, nor student.

"We'll have our guns in our hands within a few weeks," he vowed and he offered to enlist volunteers on the spot.

No one seemed particularly shocked at Ramsey's proposal. No one but me, maybe.

The principal activists of the Los Angeles area youth movement were all present at the speakers' table.

PRINCIPALS NAMED

They were Jimmy Garrett of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and the Congress of Unrepresented People; John Haag, area chairman of DuBois Clubs; Margaret Thorpe of the Students for a Democratic Society; Dorothy Balassa, who with Miss Thorpe is cochairman of the Committee To End the War in Vietnam; Darrel Myers, Los Angeles organizer for the Young Socialist Alliance, and Cathy Gallagher of the Young People's Socialist League.

Moderator for the panel, on the topic New Youth and the Old Left, was Hugh Manes, one of the American Civil Liberties Union lawyers who helped defend Michael Hannon, Los Angeles police officer ousted for participating in Congress of Racial Equality activities.

Manes was a 1964 member of the National Lawyers Guild, a cited Red front. He is now circulating nationally among other lawyers a 35-page legal brief documenting alleged U.S. violations of international law in the Vietnam action.

Ramsey's statement was far more sensational than most I heard from the radical left, and perhaps he is not representative of it.

However, the next morning I phoned the office of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee in Hollywood and who answered? None other than Ron Ramsey.

INFORMATION GIVEN

He gave me the information I wanted about a Federal building rally that day, connected with the Vietnam protest, and with suspended police Officer Michael Hannon as the featured speaker.

To further the connections, Ramsey also said he helped send three autos full of Los Angeles representatives to the Washington Congress of Unrepresented People march August 7–9.

Mrs. Balassa was among the sponsors of the Federal Building rally which was promoted by the Committee to End the War in Vietnam. Attorney Manes, also a committee member, was present, as were the rest of the cast from the previous night.

Ramsey, a Free Speech Movement activist, spent the early part of this year in an Algerian jail. The Ben Bella aid he went to Algeria to work for has since been ousted.

His travels also include Vietnam, he says, and he states that he was educated in Asia.

He also was in Zanzibar, now Tanzania, after the Mohammed Babu coup.

ACTIVE IN UNITED STATES

In this country, he has been active in the peace and disarmament movements, apart from his volunteer army, and sometimes simultaneously.

Another outspoken party to the Militant Labor Forum, which, by the way, reprints and circulates COUP pamphlets, is Myers, a one-time pacifist from San Francisco, active in the Vietnam protest at Berkeley, and, one of those arrested in the Sheraton-Palace Hotel and Cadillac civil rights demonstrations.

Myers, at the Militant Labor Forum, cheered the stoning of police by Harvey Aluminum Co. pickets in July, declaring, "They don't have to wait to be told who the enemy is."

Myers does not believe the ultraleft activists should go and fight against Americans in Vietnam. He believes they should fight them on the home front.

"WE MUST BE READY"

"Sooner or later," Myers said, "the Government will come to regard the movement as the same kind of enemy as the forces it fights overseas.

"At that time," he said, "we must be prepared to take up arms and defend ourselves to keep the movement alive. But let the Government decide when the terror starts."

As I said, Myers calls himself a pacifist, and has participated in picketing in numerous sit-ins in the cause of peace.

The fine line between peace and war against their own government is one which several activist leaders straddle.

Garrett, for instance said, "I'd like to go into the Negro district and set up a school for draft dodgers—to teach them how to keep out of the Army."

HE WON'T GO

"Me, I'm not going, because I don't want to be killed and I don't want to kill anybody. But some of these draftees don't know how to stay out."

The burning of draft cards is a defiant demonstration of protest which has been advocated and carried out in many parts of the country, prompting new legislation making such acts a crime.

Perhaps one day, draft-dodger schools also will have to be banned.

Another tactic in the formative stage with the Vietnam committee was described by James Gallagher of the Socialist Party. "The leafleting of soldiers and sailors themselves, urging them to refuse to participate in the war, which means disobeying orders. The committee wants to offer to put them in contact with people who will help them plead themselves as conscientious objectors."

MANES ROLE TOLD

Manes was to look into the legal ramifications of such advocacy.

The committee also hopes to enlist union aid in boycotting ships and refusing to load munitions on ships used in the Vietnam supply operation.

And, in San Francisco, the Vietnam committee has started the practice of trying to halt troop trains.

They also suggest, "If for example, in Berkeley on October 16, thousands of students and others block the gates of the Oakland Army Terminal where munitions are shipped to Vietnam, and are arrested, we think that attention will be focused dramatically on the issues in Vietnam."

The possibility of sabotage has been openly hinted by the national leader of the Students for a Democratic Society, and men like Staughton Lynd, a leftist Yale professor, before an audience of thousands, suggested storming Army terminals.

TARGET OF IDEAS

Once upon a time, people believed some wars had to be fought, but now, even those en route to die for their country are targets in the war of ideas.

Picture a draftee's reaction, for instance, after giving up his schooling or work, being separated from his friends and family, leaving his hometown and training for Army service. Bad enough luck being drafted; then he is chosen for the hottest front: Vietnam. And with all these sacrifices, en route to a foreign nation he is confronted by pamphlets from the extreme left telling him the war is not worth dying for.

Vietnam: Key Protest Issue—Direct Reports From Red Bloc Guide Activists

(Editor's Note.—Jerry LeBlanc, Evening Outlook staff writer, spent 2 months underground as a member of the extreme left in Los Angeles. This is the eighth in a series of articles on who the leaders are, what they are attempting to do, and how they are trying to do it.)

(By Jerry LeBlanc)

Reports direct from Moscow and North Vietnam are among the benefits received by in-group members of the DuBois Clubs and other extreme left organizations.

One Saturday night in August, at 5555 Green Oak Drive in the Hollywood Hills, I listened with fascination to such a report.

Speaking was Carl Bloice, national publicity director of the DuBois Clubs and a staff writer for the Communist-line newspaper People's World.

"North Vietnam has a special North American affairs representative, and he knows more about the peace movement and youth movement in the United States than I do," Bloice told the 30 or so persons at the meeting.

KNOWS OFFICERS, ACTIVITIES

"I saw him in Helsinki," Bloice said. "He even knows the officers and when they were elected and what every group is doing."

Bloice said he and Don Smith, chairman of the Los Angeles Congress on Racial Equality (CORE) had just returned from the Communist-dominated "World Peace Congress" in the Finnish capital. They had made side trips to Leningrad and Moscow.

With me on the grassy back yard of the fashionable hillside home was my wife, Renee, who often accompanied me during my investigation of the extreme left. All of us were gathered around on benches and patio chairs to hear the latest from this top-echelon figure in the peace movement.

LEADERS ATTENDED MEETING

Among the spectators were the leaders of every Vietnam picket line and protest in the Los Angeles area.

Before Bloice himself had returned from Helsinki, I had picked up a copy of the World Peace Congress resolution on Vietnam being distributed by the San Francisco DuBois Club national office.

Point by point and almost word for word, the resolution duplicates the current stand of the Vietcong. It calls for:

1. An immediate end to U.S. aggression in South Vietnam.

2. Immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops and those of their satellites from South Vietnam.

3. Removal of U.S. military bases from South Vietnam.

4. Immediate ending of bombing and other aggressive acts against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

No mention of negotiations is made, and Bloice explained why:

"If the U.S. imperialists gain anything from this intervention, even if they only manage to bring about negotiations, that will be a gain and and they will have established a pattern for intervention in all future people's revolutions, wherever they happen."

LANGUAGE NOTED

The Helsinki resolution, which was swiftly circulated to all DuBois Clubs for a rubberstamp approval, is replete with such language as:

"The U.S. imperialists * * * crimes against peace-loving people * * * brilliant victories that the Vietnamese people have gained over an aggressive enemy * * *. The National Liberation Front (Vietcong political arm) is the only true representative of the South Vietnamese people."

The Helsinki Congress also warmly acclaimed, "The mass movements which are continually gaining in broad support and intensity among the people of many lands, including the United States of America itself, who are expressing their solidarity with the people of Vietnam against the imperialist U.S. aggressors."

KNEW OF PROTESTS

Oh, yes, they knew in Helsinki about attempts to organize a volunteer brigade of Americans to join the Vietcong against American troops. This plan, it will be recalled, was aired by Ron B. Ramsay of Compton at a meeting of the extreme left I attended.

And they knew about and saluted efforts to halt troop and arms trains, by the Berkeley Vietnam protests committee, I could see from a report of the Congress I found in the San Francisco DuBois office.

They knew in Helsinki about these efforts 3 weeks before they happened.

The Los Angeles DuBois officially states that "many of the resolutions passed at the Helsinki peace congress have particular relevance to the future of the DuBois clubs."

The extreme left in the United States is preoccupied with the Vietnam issue, obviously, and not only through the traditional Socialist-oriented groups, but through the civil rights movement and pacifist groups based on moral and religious sentiment.

Elsewhere in this series I spell out the links between these various peace movements. The links between the anti-Vietnam war effort and Moscow are a matter of public record.

However, because the Communist Party and its sympathizers are using this cause to further their own aims does not necessarily mean that all pacifists are pro-Communist—as perhaps Robert Welch of the John Birch Society would have us believe.

Here is an official pronouncement on this point:

"There is an unfortunate tendency to pin the Communist label on any radical organization with which one may disagree.

"The complete foolishness of this attitude is as dangerous and reprehensible as that which insists that everyone who joins a Communist front organization is necessarily subversive."

COMMITTEE STATEMENT

That statement is from the most recent report of the Senate Factfinding Committee on Un-American Activities of the California Legislature.

Not all of my investigation of the ultraleft was carried on in coffee houses and private homes. Some of it was hard, dull work documenting the movement from a hundred different written sources.

But the task was rewarded with the uncovering of gems like this in research from the House of Representatives report on Vietnam protests:

"While most individuals who have taken part in demonstrations of this type were not directly influenced by the Communist Party, the Communists have endorsed and supported any group which organizes such a demonstration.

"This policy was established (at a meeting of the top Communist Party leaders in June 1964, the month DuBois Club was born) when Jack Stachel, member of the party's national committee, proposed the formation of a united front of Communists, other leftist groups, trade unions, peace organizations, Negro organizations, and churches to promote a campaign in opposition to U.S. policy in southeast Asia."

The quote is from Representative H. ALLEN SMITH of California before the House last May 3.

COMMUNIST LINE

He went on to cite DuBois Club participation in the demonstrations "following the Communist Party U.S.A. line on Vietnam just as it has paralleled Communist policy since its founding."

Dorothy Healey, southern California district chairman for the Communist Party, and Gus Hall, national spokesman, also pressed for action on the Vietnam protest.

This article started in Helsinki and now is leading back there again.

The previous peace festival in Helsinski was attended by, among others, a core of leaders who met to organize the DuBois clubs last year. They were the Hallinan brothers, Michael and Terence, sons of Communist-linked attorney Vincent Hallinan of San Francisco; Mike Myerson, DuBois Club leader and Vietnam writer; and Kenneth Cloke, from the Bay Area, also a DuBois publication writer.

ACTIVISTS JUMP TO CAPITALIZE ON WATTS RIOT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Jerry LeBlanc, Evening Outlook staff writer, spent 2 months underground as a member of the extreme left in Los Angeles. This is the ninth in a series of articles on who the leaders are, what they are trying to acomplish and how they are trying to do it.)

(By Jerry LeBlanc)

On Thursday, August 12, I witnessed a startling abrupt change in the whole operation and direction of the DuBois Clubs, Congress of Unrepresented People (COUP) and Committee to End the War in Vietnam.

Los Angeles was erupting in its most violent rampage in history and, as a part-time correspondent for a foreign wire service, I plunged into coverage of the riot scene at Watts.

I had completely forgotten for a brief few hours that my principal reporting job was an inside story on the organization of the extreme left for the Evening Outlook, a job which required joining these organizations.

But when I returned to my home that night, the phone rang and I was immediately recalled to my primary job.

It was Ann Smith of Burbank, a pacifist and member of the Committee to End the War in Vietnam. She often did telephone contact work.

CAN YOU PICKET?

Excitedly she told me, "We've called an emergency meeting and we're going to set up picket lines right away. Can you make it?"

"Picket lines?" I asked.

"We're picketing Chief (W. H.) Parker on the police brutality issue in Watts," she said.

I said, "I don't get it. What's Watts got to do with the Vietnam protest committee?"

"You know," she replied, "it's all the same thing."

NEWSMAN BECOMES ANGRY

I said I'd try to make it. She gave me an address and I jotted it down. But I was personally angry at the idea of anyone trying to take political advantage of the Watts upheaval I had just witnessed.

From that moment on, at DuBois or Vietnam committee meetings, I never heard Vietnam mentioned again.

With reluctance I joined the picket lines at the police station in downtown Los Angeles.

"Chief Parker Must Go," "End Police Brutality," the signs read. Some of the signs had been hastily painted on the back of used "Get Out of Vietnam" posters.

Although I was surprised at the time, I can understand the connection between Watts and Vietnam. I recall the dozens of incidents I saw that show much of the "enemy" as are the extreme left's belief that the police of America are as those who establish our Asian foreign policy.

THEY HATE SYMBOL

These people are not particularly against the men and women who wear the police uniforms, but the uniform itself is a symbol of authority in the United States, and they hate it.

From the very first contact with the DuBois Club in Venice I recall the police brutality poster prominently displayed. There were identical posters in the office of the national DuBois in San Francisco, and in the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (NVAC) office in Hollywood.

I remember flipping through a Congress of Racial Equality booklet, a devastating portrait of Dixie in pictures. One picture showed a police officer making an obscene gesture at the photographer, probably confident the picture would never appear in print.

That kind of action by one police officer is seized upon and turned to the advantage of the extreme left.

POLICE DOWNGRADED

In their rough work, police everywhere are being likened to the "villian-cops" of the South, who are cast as "heavies" because they enforce unpopular and sometimes, it's been proven, unconstitutional laws.

There was a vague comprehension in the extreme left before the Watts riots of some kind of potential for agitation against the police.

One night a month before the outbreak—on July 15—the subject came up while I was at the home of Jimmy Garrett, a Negro field man for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and an organizer of the Congress of Unrepresented People.

I noted at the time that Garrett had a sarcastic "Support Your Local Police" sign on his door, the same as in the Venice West coffee house operated by Los Angeles area DuBois Chairman John Haag.

CONVERSATION RECALLED

My notes on my conversation with Garrett read as follows: "Garrett offered the suggestion that the hatred of poverty-stricken south and east Los Angeles residents for police could be the basis for a cause, i.e., 'Stop police murder of Negroes.' "

But the extreme left was depressed about the possibilities. For example, the day before the riots started, Robert Hall, a member of the Vietnam committee, told his fellow members:

"The idea of political organizing in south Los Angeles is hopeless. They'll listen to anybody, but then they just walk off and forget it."

Hall, who is also a member of the Nonviolent Action Committee, which is headquartered in the riot zone, suggested to the committee that the organizing be done through clubs and churches in the area.

THEY WERE UNAWARE, TOO

No one I know in the ranks of the extreme left knew in advance that that Negro uprising would take place, or if they did, they kept it secret.

But once the uprising was a fact, the picture changed immediately. I know several extreme left Negroes who were in the thick of the rioting, or said they were, starting Thursday. They said they were there as observers only, but they participated in bringing Negroes in the area to march in the picket line I joined in front of Chief Parker's headquarters.

At an emergency meeting of the Vietnam Committee, a Negro spokesman for the Nonviolent Action Committee told the Caucasians present, "If you don't get down there (to picket) right away, don't ever show your white faces in the Negro district again."

PAMPHLETS PUBLISHED

Picketing isn't all we did.

The scene shifts to the Venice DuBois headquarters, where their mimeograph machine immediately began spouting pamphlets making it clear that the extreme left is on the side of the Negro.

The pamphlets were the customary fact-starved, slanted appeals aimed more at making friends among the Negroes than at helping them.

Before the fires stopped smouldering, the extreme left crews were in action in the riot area trying to help, to blame and to organize.

John Haag, area DuBois chairman, directed members to channel funds for freeing jailed rioting suspects through the swiftly created "South Side Defense Committee."

The committee, formed to assist riot area Negroes in getting legal assistance, set up headquarters at 326 West Third Street, the location of the Committee to Protect the Foreign Born, a cited Communist-front organization.

CRASH PROGRAM

I was appointed to another committee to prepare a comprehensive booklet of some 50 pages on the causes of the rioting and "police abuses" before and during the rioting.

According to our instructions, it was to be a crash production, modeled after the DuBois San Francisco booklet, "The War in Vietnam," and would be distributed throughout Negro and white areas nationally.

The same night we drew up and mimeographed a questionnaire to be used in interviews with Negro rioters.

My fellow committee members were Tom Garrison, Marvin Treiger, Vic Oliver, Chris Davis, Ron Ridenour, and Robert Hall.

We represented not only DuBois, but NVAC, the Vietnam protest, COUP, and I don't know how many other causes.

As we planned the booklet, I winced in watching a format pieced together that would only further arouse animosity toward the harassed police.

PROPAGANDA MACHINERY

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Jerry LeBlanc, Evening Outlook staff writer, spent 2 months underground as a member of the extreme left in Los Angeles. This is the 10th article in a series on who the leaders are, what they are attempting to accomplish and how they are trying to do it.)

(By Jerry LeBlanc)

Until I talked to the Vietnam Day Committee in Berkeley early in August, they didn't even know there was a separate Vietnam protest group in Los Angeles.

They were eager to meet me. "Let's set up a contact right now and keep in touch," one of the Berkeley full-time staffers said.

"Where do you meet?" he asked me.

I was taken aback by the apparent lack of contact between Los Angeles and San Francisco Vietnam protests, having gone there to see if there were parallels, as seemed evident.

"Up to now," said another of the four Berkeley full-time staffers, "our only contacts in Los Angeles have been Darrel Myers and Jim Gallagher. Know them?"

"Oh," I said. That explained everything.

GETS TO RIGHT PLACE

Myers is the Young Socialist Alliance chairman and Gallagher the Socialist Party board member on the Los Angeles Committee to End the War in Vietnam.

Berkeley's protesters had been sending all their pamphlets and propaganda to them, and, of course, it got to the right places.

This is one of a hundred similar links between extreme left organizations, whose mimeograph machines day and night spew out each others propaganda and pamphlets.

COLLABORATORS RECKLESS

Sometimes the collaboration in propaganda borders on the reckless.

One San Francisco Vietnam protest leader complained to me that the Progressive Labor Movement had asked for his group's support in an upcoming event, and he told them he'd think about it.

"Then, before I made up my mind, they went ahead and printed everything with our name on it," he said.

When the Vietnam committee in Los Angeles was organizing the local congress of unrepresented people (COUP) we were thrashing about for a name.

I stood and spoke out, "How about 'the committee for a new government?' "

MORE SUBTLE TITLE

A cheer, approving laughter and applause swept the gathering at Mount Hollywood Church.

But something more appropriate finally appeared on the handbills: "COUP."

The initials of my proposed name for the committee would work out as CNG, which is meaningless. The meaning of COUP is about as subtle as a hammer.

COUP literature was printed and circulated by the Socialist Labor Party, DuBois, and other groups.

In San Francisco, DuBois mimeographed handbills promoting the August 7 rally of the congress of unrepresented people in Union Square, with the Vietnam Day Committee supplying the speakers.

DuBois' tieup with the Vietnam issue in the San Francisco Bay area also is evident in the distribution of the Michael Myerson pamphlet, "The U.S. War in Vietnam."

VIET ISSUES PRESSED

In Los Angeles and San Francisco areas alike, one-sided questionnaires on the Vietnam issue are being carried around door to door, in the former by DuBois Clubs, and in the latter by the Vietnam protesters.

Jimmy Garrett of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, speaking at a rally led by the Socialist Workers Party, pointed out that the Vietnam questionnaires were slanted, calculated to find people who might join the cause. Such people then are asked to sponsor neighborhood coffee discussions on the ills of the Vietnam situation.

The questionnaire is an obvious recruiting device. Propaganda is a fertile tool in the left's war of ideas. The principle of free speech, however, works both ways.

Take, for example, a Vietnam protest rally I attended the afternoon of July 31 at the Federal Building in downtown Los Angeles.

HANNON SPEAKS

When I arrived, an antipicket picket line of American Nazis was storming back and forth, chanting, "Reds must go."

As soon as the television cameramen lost interest in them, the Nazis packed up and left.

All the "in group" extreme left was in attendance, I noted, and we were using for the most part the same picket signs we used at the Hollywood Palladium earlier in the month.

When suspended Police Officer Mike Hannon stepped to the microphone as the main speaker, he won my admiration for sheer guts.

Hannon, suspended for his Congress of Racial Equality activities, knew he was addressing a crowd of militant leftists.

"I don't think the United States has any legitimate business in Vietnam and we are supporting a government there that is not the government of the people," he started out.

Then, as an expectant hush fell on the audience, he said: "But Ho Chi Minh's government would be no improvement. And under his type of government, people like you and me wouldn't get a chance to speak out like this. Troublemakers like me are taken off somewhere and shot."

THREE APPLAUD

A decided coolness settled on the bright afternoon crowd at this lack of endorsement for a glorious Red leader. In the pause, three people applauded briefly: a woman with the

Strike for Peace, a curious young male passer-by who had stopped, and a man I suspected as a police infiltrator.

Hannon had made a good point.

The writers of the radical causes, perhaps leaning too far to correct what they consider to be false pictures painted in the rightist press, generally are guilty of one-sidedness and omissions in their own reports.

CLOKE'S VERSION

Witness this lovely picture of the World Youth Festival for Peace and Friendship, as told by Kenneth Cloke, of Berkeley, in the DuBois magazine, Insurgent:

"For 10 days Israelis will hug Egyptians, South Africans will dance with the Dutch, Englishmen will kiss their Irish brothers."

The truth is that the Arabs threatened to boycott the scene if their Israeli brothers poked one Jewish nose into the affair. The whole peace festival was canceled abruptly when Ben Bella was overthrown and all the Reds went into hiding.

I personally saw one effect of propaganda when interviewing rioters at Lincoln Heights Jail for News Limited of Australia.

Halting a Negro just freed on bail, I introduced myself and asked for his view of the riot story.

"It was a frame-up man," he told me, and went on to describe in monosyllabic, clear-cut language how the cops got the goods on him.

But in this genuine flow of words he dropped phrases like "police brutality," "economically deprived," and others, which struck a note of unnatural expression.

These are the terms harped on in hundreds of leftist circulars and by repetition have become part of the idiom. It is not a far stretch of the imagination to envision "U.S. imperialists" becoming a common phrase.

Skilled propagandists are at work in many phases of the extreme left movement. They quote Asian Red newspapers for an inside view of what really is happening in Vietnam, and seemingly exposing secrets of a hush-hush massacre, neglect to point out that an American verion of the same atrocities is available in American newspapers.

Which version is true? I never met an American reporter who wouldn't break his neck to uncover a scandal such as a massacre of villagers would create in this country's government circles.

I can't say if the official Communist press in other countries is a stickler for accuracy.

But, a British expert in oriental affairs reports in Time magazine, July 16, "Hanoi's three dailies take up great swatches of space reporting U.S. teach-ins and predicting the ultimate rejection of the war by the American people."

So the Vietnam protest propaganda is having its effects on both sides of the ocean.

PEACE LEADERS SET NATIONWIDE EXPLOSION DATE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Jerry LeBlanc, Evening Outlook staff writer, spent 2 months underground as a member of the extreme left in Los Angeles. This is the 11th in a series of articles on who the leaders are, what they are attempting to accomplish and how they are trying to do it.)

(By Jerry LeBlanc)

The peace movement has declared war.

If the extreme left has its way, the Vietcong will gain a big victory 2 weeks from now not in the jungles of South Vietnam, but on a "front" here at home.

During my 2 months as an undercover reporter inside the organizations of the extreme left, I learned a lot about what can be expected.

"The next step for us must be massive civil disobedience," urges the Berkeley Vietnam Day Committee in literature distributed in Los Angeles and elsewhere.

Organizing a nationwide "militant direct action" for October 15–16, the Berkeley spokesmen trumpeted that "Our massive civil disobedience aimed at blocking the U.S. war machine will send shock waves from Maine to California, and from the United States to all parts of the world."

PROTEST AGENDA OUTLINED

"For example," suggests Berkeley's committee, "we might consider en masse breaking of the Espionage Act of 1917 and the Selective Service Act."

Also on the agenda for the protest is a massive demonstration at the Oakland Army Terminal in an effort to tie up shipment of equipment to Vietnam.

I "unjoined" myself from the extreme left early in September, but I've heard since through the grapevine that President Johnson will get the "picket treatment" personally if he visits the west coast as scheduled the same weekend.

The idea is to carry the Vietnam protest to the doorway of the Beverly Hilton Hotel, where plans call for him to speak October 15, and to his San Francisco hotel the next day.

(Subsequent to the writing of this article, President Johnson announced he would be operated on to remove his gall bladder, forcing the cancellation of his plan to come to the west coast.)

These bold proposals are being voiced by an organization which 6 months ago existed only in the minds of some civil rights and Berkeley free speech movement activists.

I first learned of the October 15–16 plans in August from Rick Wolff, of New Haven, Conn., then a newly appointed national coordinator for the protest movement.

He met me on the roof of Dykstra Hall, a UCLA campus dormitory. He said he was from out of town and had picked up my name as a contact man for the Congress of Unrepresented People (COUP) in which I was active.

"I can't stress enough the importance of the October 15–16 protests," he said. "This can be the turning point in our development as a political force."

"Are you from the Berkeley unit?" I asked.

REVEALS BACKGROUND

He said he was a Yale graduate student and he and another man had been appointed at the COUP rally in Washington to coordinate the Vietnam protest nationally.

"We've been going from city to city across the country stressing the need for concerted action," Wolff told me.

I remembered that the Communist-line newspaper Peoples World had reported the formation of a coordinating unit, upon the suggestion of the Berkeley leaders.

Pledging my full cooperation, I obtained from him the necessary facts to set up a connection with the temporary headquarters in Madison, Wis.

Frank Emspak is the man to contact there, he told me.

NAMES MENTIONED

Wolff asked me if I knew about Jim Berhand, UCLA free speech movement activist and West Los Angeles DuBois member. I told him I knew who he was. Wolff said he had Berland's name and that of Lucy Cloyd, also of West Los Angeles DuBois, and Bob Niemann, of the UCLA Vietnam Committee.

It would have been difficult to pursue the name game with Wolff much longer.

I didn't want to tell him that I deliberately steered clear of the campus Vietnam activists because of my past assignments as an Evening Outlook reporter.

I had covered the free speech movement developments there during and after the Berkeley crisis and had interviewed student leaders—some of whom, I suspected, I might run into as a Vietnam protestor.

That might have led to recognition and embarrassing questions and a lot of explaining, and I didn't want to have to do that if I could avoid it.

The Vietnam Protest Committee and allied organizations are gathering momentum with astounding speed and rapidly expanding their physical facilities.

The Berkeley Vietnam Committee, which formally organized last May after a campus speak-in, now has a fully staffed office at 2407 Fulton Street.

In Los Angeles, the Vietnam Committee meets regularly at the Mount Hollywood Church, 4601 Prospect Avenue.

DuBois, which opened its Venice headquarters at 5 Dudley Avenue only last July, opened a central Los Angeles office at 1733 Temple Street, September 14.

JOINT HEADQUARTERS

Students for a Democratic Society late in July announced plans to open a Los Angeles office and offered to join the Congress of Unrepresented People in a general "movement" headquarters.

And there's a fully-staffed Marxist school now operating in Los Angeles.

I found out about this development after the Federal Building rally in downtown Los Angeles July 31. We proceeded from there to 1853 South Arlington Avenue for a "painting party."

COURSES DESCRIBED

On the second floor, we slapped some dozen rooms with a coat of paint in preparation for opening of the New Left School.

It offers to the public courses in Marxism, "imperialism" and the strategy for opposing it internationally, American Negro history, and labor, among other fields.

Most of the organizers of the New Left School already have been mentioned in this series:

Darrell Meyers, of the Young Socialist Alliance, John Haag of DuBois, Jimmy Garrett of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, Don Smith of the Congress of Racial Equality, Hugh Manes of the American Civil Liberties Union, Margaret Thorpe of the Students for a Democratic Society, James Gallagher of the Socialist Party, and Dorothy Healey, Southern California Communist Party chairman.

Writers John Howard Lawson and Harvard Wheeler also are among the 17 listed "associates" of the New Left School, but the only other organizations represented are the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, and Unitarians.

The instructors will include Marvin Treiger, who was on the DuBois committee with me preparing a slanted antipolice booklet on the Watts riots.

He also was chairman of the Youth for Peace and Socialism and has spoken at UCLA in that capacity. A Marvin Treiger was 1 of 98 arrested in the rights demonstration at the Federal Building in Los Angeles last March.

Paul Perlin, another instructor, has been active in the Young Communist League and Communist-front activities since the 1930's.

Others include "Failsafe" author Wheeler, Dorothy Healey, Socialist Workers Party Chairman Theodore Edwards, and Don Wheeldin, Pasadena CORE chairman.

POLITICAL INVASION

Meanwhile, on the political front, formation of a new party, with the respectability of the civil rights cause and the fire of the peace movement is being pressed in Los Angeles.

Stepped up ultra-left activity on all fronts is in the offing, particularly in the police brutality issue in the aftermath of the Watts violence, and in the Vietnam issue due to the escalating pace of the war.

Vietnam is perhaps the key issue, since the war there is considered a test of whether

U.S. counterinsurgency tactics can force "people's revolutions" to the negotiations table.

PRESSES POINT

I heard Carl Bloice of the DuBois national office press the urgency of the point.

"There are other people's revolutions in the offing," he said after returning from Helsinki and Moscow this summer.

Bloice's statement was recalled to my mind by this one from the Berkeley plans for October 15–16:

"Vietnam, like Mississippi, is not an aberration—it is a mirror of America. Vietnam is American foreign policy; it is only that in Peru, Bolivia, and South Africa the revolutionary movement has not yet progressed to the point where napalm and marines are necessary."

Bloice brought the following piece of news from the Comunist World to a select DuBois gathering, including myself and my wife, one night recently:

"I can promise you this. There is going to be a revolution in South Africa. I can't say exactly when, but it will be before next July 4."

Vietnam Issue Is Test Case for Revolution

(Editor's Note.—Jerry LeBlanc, Evening Outlook staff writer, spent 2 months undergound as a member of the extreme left in Los Angeles. This is the 12th and final article in a series on who the leaders are, what they are attempting to accomplish and how they are trying to do it.)

(By Jerry LeBlanc)

Early in September I withdrew abruptly from my activities in the DuBois Club, the Committee to End the War in Vietnam, and the Congress of Unrepresented People.

A coworker on my DuBois committee to prepare a Watts riot brochure came to my door and I just handed over my files to him.

I told him I had to drop the project and he reacted with surprise, but I explained: "I know it's sudden but I've taken on a job writing a series of articles, and it's going to take all my time for the next few weeks. It's an impossible conflict."

So instead of a Marxist-slanted riot booklet, I sat down and wrote this series.

If any of my revolutionary acquaintances would now like to punch me in the nose, I urge him to remember the peace movement.

"I'M NOBODY'S ENEMY"

I am nobody's enemy, only a reporter. I wrote of what I saw and participated in.

Those still unable to restrain their aggression toward me should make an appointment with the switchboard operator. She can fight better than I can.

Looking back over this series, browsing through more than 50 pages of notes, hundreds of leaflets and brochures that the extreme left put out, and stacks of other source materials, I reflected on my brief 2-month stand with the revolutionaries.

Early in my undercover assignment, an attractive brunette said to me, "Isn't it great how this peace issue is bringing every Socialist in town out of the woodwork?"

ALLIANCE UNDENIABLE

"Yeah," I replied, "there seems to be a lot of different interests all getting out and working together on the same thing."

The fact of an alliance of the pacifists, the militant civil rights workers, the campus rebels, and the variegated Socialist groupings has been amply indicated in this series.

As I have stated, I never knowngly met a Communist Party card-carrier, but that's old hat anyway. The new left snickers at the idea.

Steve Roberts, 67, a member of the "old" left for years and onetime Socialist Workers Party candidate for Governor of California, still keeps up with the modern-day leftists, showing up at all their major functions.

"You young people," he told one gathering, with a paternal smile, "you have really got the spirit. My generation tried its best and now we are just sort of sitting back and watching, but you youngsters have really got something going."

Roberts also was prominent in the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, the biggest leftist concentration preceding the Vietnam protest.

One of that organization's national sponsors, by the way, was the late Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, for whom the DuBois clubs were named.

A new type of revolutionary may be emerging in organizations such as the DuBois and Vietnam committees, my observations indicate.

The new extreme left organizations across in the wake of the McCarran-Smith Acts, which ban the Communist Party as a subversive organization dedicated to the violent overthrow of the Government.

Today's revolutionaries openly vow the overthrow of the Government, but through political action which aims to bring the Socialist movement into power.

This tactic would seem to be the only practical approach for carrying out such an aim in this country.

In smaller, undeveloped nations, where one major city dominates, a student riot, for instance, can lead to the seizure of radio stations and swift declaration of a coup. In the United States there are just too many cities.

HAAG VIEW REVEALED

Talking with John Haag, Los Angeles area DuBois chairman at his Venice coffeehouse one night shortly after the Watts riots, I pointed out, "The Negroes literally took over a 50-square-mile section of the city before the National Guard got here.

"Suppose," I suggested, "a core of 1,000 or 1,500 trained guerillas or rebels, or whatever you'd call them, moved in and took command. They could have seized the radio and television stations, the police would be outnumbered, and the rebels would have control of the city."

"Then what would you do?" said Haag. "You'd just have Los Angeles—until the National Guard moved in."

He smiled. The possibility of simultaneous revolts in all of the major cities could not be taken seriously.

But then, from what I saw, no one, not even the Socialists, expected Watts to revolt either.

I do believe there is abundant evidence that the old-school Communists enjoy and take advantage of the strife caused by the civil rights youth and peace movements.

As for Vietnam, and why the extreme left is able to build a growing protest around the situation, even the Communist party liner I have quoted admits this is a new type of war, "a test case" for the future of "people's revolutions."

Ignorance of the facts in the war and natural sympathy with the underdog may be taken advantage of.

Perhaps the Federal Government is experiencing a breakdown in communications with a segment of the people who do not find the current war has been justified to them, because the people of the extreme left I met generally are sincere in this belief.

LACK OF COMMUNICATIONS

Similarly, I heard that lack of communication between local law enforcement directors and a segment of the people has been suggested as a probable contributing factor in the Los Angeles riots, which have been described as a protest.

I can understand that the tactic of using political muscle to upset the capitalist power structure is perfectly legitimate in this democracy. But I have cited the growing trend to use civil disobedience as a tool to overthrow conditions which are believed to be wrong, a move which tends to undermine confidence in all authority and particularly in the representatives of the law.

This seems to be the heart of the new revolution, when these self-appointed minorities proclaim, as they have, that their cause is so right it exceeds the law itself, and tears down the whole system as the enemy, rather than trying to correct things through the legal process provided in a society which the majority decree.

The results always resemble riots, it seems, whether they occur in Dixie, Berkeley or Los Angeles.

At all the meetings and diverse functions I attended, despite all the talk about the bleeding Vietnamese people, no one ever took up a collection to send material aid to the people there. No one organized a food or clothing drive, or suggested an orphanage.

The 250 people who joined in on one Palladium picket line in July for 5 hours put in a total of roughly 1,250 hours of hard walking. I remember figuring as I walked that this represents 156 working days, enough effort to make a major contribution to the cause of relieving misery, frustration, and ignorance among humans.

The picketers couldn't all go to Vietnam with the Red Cross, but they could have gone to Watts.

And with that little bit of philosophy, I'll sign off.

AMERICAN ART EXHIBITION TRAVELS TO JAPAN—A PERSON-TO-PERSON CULTURAL EXCHANGE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Mailliard] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, cultural exchange programs are an important part of America's effort to favorably project its image to the peoples of the world. All too often, it is the large, public-supported program that receives the greatest amount of publicity and support.

Yet the action of a few individuals may do as much to foster good will and understanding. I would like my colleagues to know of a forthcoming cultural event which will be the result of a person-to-person cultural exchange program.

On October 22, an exhibition of American art sponsored by Dr. Frits A. Winblad, of San Francisco's Winblad Galleries, will open in Tokyo, Japan, at the Ichibankan Galleries. This event is most significant because it represents the first time in art history that a gallery-to-gallery showing has traveled from this country to Japan. The work of 30 contemporary American artists from throughout the United States will be displayed.

This exhibition will be the culmination of several years of effort by the popular Japanese artist, Takohito Mikami. Mr. Mikami came to San Francisco in 1957 under State Department auspices. Since that time, he has taught at the Presidio at Monterey, Calif., and his art classes at both Stanford and the University of California were very well-received. He has taught art nationwide on television under the aegis of the National Educational

Television Network. And his accomplishments as an artist are well known; his paintings hang in many of the world's great collections.

In December of 1964, a selection of Mr. Mikami's oils were shown in San Francisco at the Winblad Galleries. This showing was one result of the 30 years of friendship between the artist and members of the Winblad family which began at the first American-Japanese Student Conference held in 1934. Since his arrival in this country, Mr. Mikami has worked continually toward increased understanding between the people of the United States and the citizens of Japan. Last December's exhibition of his paintings gave impetus to an idea which he had nurtured since his arrival; the result will be the forthcoming exhibition.

San Francisco, itself a center of culture, has responded enthusiastically. A group of well-wishers flew to Tokyo earlier this month where educator-artist Mikami is taking them on a tour of Japan's cultural centers. The tour will reach its high point on October 22, when these visitors will take part in the history-making first showing of contemporary American artists in Japan.

ATLANTIC UNION DELEGATION

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Zablocki], the gentlemen from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser and Mr. Quie], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Ellsworth] and myself together with several Members of the other body, introduced resolutions to establish an Atlantic union delegation of 18 citizens. The delegation would be authorized to organize and participate in a convention made up of similar delegations from our NATO allies in order to explore the possibilities of developing their present alliance into a Federal union and to establish the institutions necessary to achieve this goal.

NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS' CONFERENCE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Gerald R. Ford] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, Representative Charles E. Chamberlain, was a member of the U.S. delegation at the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference in New York early this month. On October 8 he made a significant statement to the Conference which I am sure is of interest to all of us.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Chamberlain's statement:

Remarks of Congressman Charles E. Chamberlain, of U.S. Delegation, at the NATO Parliamentarians Conference, New York, N.Y., October 8, 1965

It has often been said the Atlantic Community Alliance began in the late 1940's in response to a military threat from Soviet Russia. It is my opinion that this thought is in partial error. The Atlantic Community, in a most realistic sense, is a civilization many hundreds of years old. It spread across the Atlantic in a meaningful way about 3 centuries ago, and today that civilization influences the lives of about 495 million persons, living in 15 Western countries, who share many similar values, similar political institutions, and similar beliefs in individual liberty and the dignity of man.

Today the Atlantic Alliance is a living reality of modern international politics, whose importance and influence extends far beyond the geographical boundaries of the member nations. The effects of this Alliance are felt throughout the world.

Most of all, the Atlantic Alliance has, in the words of President Johnson, "a common interest in the peace of the world." The Atlantic Alliance might better be called the Alliance for Peace or the Alliance for a Better World. The future of this Alliance depends not on whether or not the Soviet Union will attack one of the members, but whether or not the world remains at peace. The Alliance, I firmly believe, can function properly and successfully only if two conditions are met: One, the world remains free from war, and, two, all member states cooperate fully and completely toward a peaceful world.

Thus it is that NATO is something more than 15 nations pledged to support one another in the common defense of their lands and their peoples. Rather NATO is 15 nations with a similar concept of man, committed to defend their civilization, but just as committed to live in peace with all men.

In a word, imperialistic communism anywhere in the world should be the concern of the Atlantic Community countries individually and collectively. The United States, like most countries I am sure, did not join the NATO Alliance solely to save Europe from Soviet militarism, but to show the free world determination in the face of aggressive and forceful communism.

As we meet here today, events affecting the whole world are taking place 13,000 miles from this city. In southeast Asia, as you know, there is a real war in which the United States is involved, and to which the United States has committed its material wealth, its manhood, and its word. We have categorically stated, for all of the world to hear and read, that we will not permit communism to expand by forceful means in southeast Asia, and to this end we are subscribing our effort, our wealth, our material and our lives.

For some months, I have been increasingly concerned with free world shipping into North Vietnam's ports. To be truthful with you, I don't like to talk about the extent of this trade, because, quite frankly, it is most unpleasant, and it is not my purpose to cause offense. But, my fellow delegates, I feel impelled to discuss this unpleasant truth.

In the year 1964, unclassified figures show that 401 ships flying flags of free world nations called at North Vietnamese ports.

From information available, I'm advised that 284 of these 401 ships flew the flags of nations represented at this table.

During the first 8 months of 1965, 88 ships, according to reports from published commercial sources, flying flags of free world nations have sailed to North Vietnam. Of these 88 ships, 81 of them flew flags that are displayed on our platform today. And may I emphasize that this is unclassified information. I have seen the secret reports and that is why I am so disturbed.

In an unclassified report accompanying legislation recently considered in the House of Representatives, we were told that 45 percent of all of North Vietnam's seaborne imports and 85 percent of all their seaborne exports were carried in free world bottoms.

According to our State Department, as of July of this year, free world shipping to North Vietnam accounted for 17 percent of all nonstrategic goods flowing into that country by sea.

Because we are of the same family related not only by blood but by tradition and belief, and because I sincerely believe the NATO nations are fathers and brothers and friends to each other, I believe this subject deserves our careful consideration.

Whether or not we can carry the war in Vietnam to a successful completion—that is, convincing Hanoi and Peiping that communism in southeast Asia will not be permitted to expand by force—depends on many factors. This war may indeed be a protracted conflict, but there should be no doubt in our minds that if certain conditions are met, the Communists will back off, and peace will return to southeast Asia. One of those conditions is a fully united, fully cooperating, fully determined free world. This alliance was founded and built with such unity, cooperation, and determination. It is this unity, cooperation, and determination that has preserved us. We must not now in the face of our successes become complacent because the scene of confrontation may have temporarily changed, or because the major antagonist lives on the other side of the Urals. Today the world is much too small for us to be secure if the smaller countries in Asia are insecure; we cannot stand if the smaller countries in Asia are permitted to fall; we cannot be free in the West if we stand by and watch the East become a slave.

We in the United States do not want to be unreasonable in what we ask of our Atlantic friends in the prosecution of the war in Vietnam. The message I leave with you is simply that it's most difficult to do this alone. We need your help. Help is the substance of friendship, and our friends can help by insuring that no goods reach the enemy in free world bottoms.

We cannot alone do the job that must be done, yet we do not ask for much. We are rising to the challenge before us, but our task is much more difficult when our closest and most-valued friends contribute to the material well-being of the very enemy who seeks to destroy freedom as we know and enjoy it.

In concluding may I say, with all deference and respect to our friends at this table, that our alliance, with which we are all so deeply concerned, will be a stronger, more viable force when peace is again established in southeast Asia.

POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wydler] may extend his his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, there has been much controversy over the so-called poverty program. Of all its many parts, the one that appears to be the soundest and the best conceived is Operation Head Start.

This program is designed to give preschool instruction to culturally deprived children and prepare them to enter kindergarten on an even level with other children.

On October 17, 1965, the Long Island Press reported that Operation Head Start was stalled on Long Island. It appeared there were no Federal funds available and Federal funds constitute 90 percent of the total cost of these programs. Without Federal funds, no year-round programs could be started as a follow-on to the programs conducted last summer.

This past summer some $220,000 was spent in Nassau and Suffolk Counties in Operation Head Start. There were 10 Suffolk schools with an enrollment of 549 boys and girls which cost $85,000. There were 14 Nassau schools with 883 boys and girls at a cost of $135,000.

In Nassau County 12 of the programs were run by school districts. One of them, however, was run by CORE in the village of Hempstead, which is in my Fourth Congressional District.

There was in the village of Hempstead a program run by the Hempstead Board of Education which was very similar.

I believe that these two programs operating side by side presented a good basis of comparison and had a staff member well qualified in this field conduct an investigation for me. I now wish to present to my colleagues in Congress his analysis of these two programs:

COMPARISON OF THE HEMPSTEAD BOARD OF EDUCATION DISTRICT NO. 1 PREKINDERGARTEN PROGRAM, AND THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PREKINDERGARTEN PROGRAM (OPERATION HEAD START) CONDUCTED BY CORE

BOARD OF EDUCATION

Director Dr. Robert Cody, assistant superintendent of Schools, Ph. D. in education.

Age group: 4 to 5.

Prekindergarten, classes 9 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.

School	CE	C	W	CT	TA	V[1]
1. Marshall	26	23	3	1	2	0
2. Ludlum	19	2	17	1	1	0
3. Jackson	16	14	2	1	1	0
4. Jackson	14	11	3	1	1	0
5. Washington	23	9	14	1	1	0
6. Fulton	11	4	7	1	1	0
7. Franklin	20	20	0	1	1	0
8. Franklin	21	21	0	1	1	0
9. Prospect	14	13	1	1	1	0

O.E.O. CORE HEAD START

Director, Miss Annette Triquere, Common Branch certification as teacher and elementary supervisor. Teacher Glen Head Public Schools.

Consultant: Marguerite Rhodes, preschool and early childhood consultant, New York City Public Schools.

Age group: 4 to 5.

Prekindergarten classes 9 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

School	CE	C	W	CT	TA	V[1]
1. Marshall	18	18	0	1	2	4 to 5.
2. Marshall	17	17	0	1	2	3 to 5.
3. Marshall	16	16	0	1	2	3 to 5.
4. Marshall	16	16	0	1	1	3 to 4.

[1] Enrollment and staff.

Symbols: CE, class enrollment; C, colored; W, white; CT, certified teachers; TA, teacher aids, all were education or literature majors; V, volunteer senior high students.

NOTE.—Volunteers' programs varied.

COMPARISON OF PREKINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS

PROGRAM BOARD OF EDUCATION

At 9 to 9:20: Opening circle, discussion planning, sharing, (finger play poem or song).
At 9:20 to 10:00: Work play period.
At 10 to 10:20: Outdoor play.
At 10:20 to 10:40: Snack.
At 10:40 to 11:00: Storytime.
At 11 to 11:15: Rest.
At 11:15 to 11:25: Rhythm.
At 11:30: Dismissal.

ENROLLMENT

White	117
Colored	47
Total	164

COST

Total cost	$7,850.00
Per pupil cost	47.8658
Local tax cost	47.8658

If all pupils were in board of education operation, cost to taxpayer: $47.8658×231=$11,056.

PROGRAM CORE

At 9 to 10: Free play.
At 10 to 10:03: Clean up.
At 10:00 to 10:15: Juice and snack.
At 10:15 to 10:30: Bathroom.
At 10:30 to 11:00 Outdoors.
At 11 to 11:15: Rest.
At 11:15 to 11:30: Music.
At 11:30 to 11:50: Storytime.
At 11:50 to 12:00: Wash up.
At 12 to 12:30: Lunch.
At 12:30 to 12:45: Discussion.

ENROLLMENT

White	0
Colored	67
Total	67

COST

Total cost	$10,764.00
Per pupil cost	160.6567
Local tax cost	25.2239
Federal tax cost	$135.4328

If all pupils were in OEO Operation Head Start, cost to taxpayer: $160.6567×231=$37,112.

Basically there were three fundamental differences in the two programs:

1. Cost to the taxpayer: OEO Head Start Program, per pupil cost: $160.66. Board of education program, per pupil cost $47.87. average to taxpayer: $112.79 per pupil.

2. Education: OEO, CORE program had an additional 1 hour and 15 minutes which was essentially devoted to a free lunch period.

3. Segregation: Pupils in the OEO, CORE program were all colored and were from "poor" neighborhoods.

It appears that CORE did not purposely screen the children for color nor did they actually screen them for economic status. Their children were selected as a result of neighborhood residence. Most of the pupils came from public housing and CORE took for granted that this automatically qualified them as poor.

My staff member reported to me that teaching in both programs was excellent with the fine utilization of the teacher aids for individual attention. It was further reported that Eleanor Tolbert in the CORE program and Patricia Dawson in the board of education program were fine early childhood teachers.

The CORE program was unique in that it employed volunteer workers. These were volunteers in the truest definition of the word and not paid volunteers, as are hired in the so-called VISTA program.

Finally, it was reported to me that both programs were well planned for variation in group interest and changes in weather conditions. Neither of the programs charged any tuition fee and were available to all.

SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATION PROGRAM

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I have proposed a unique antidropout program on the elementary school level, called Project Prevention, to be conducted with Federal financial assistance during the summer months.

The program which I have proposed would aim at correcting reading deficiencies in grades 1 through 4. Educators agree that if a child's reading disability is not identified and corrected by the fourth grade there is a good chance he or she will drop out of high school before grade 11.

Reading skills are the key to prevention of high school dropouts. All studies of the problem indicate that the most noticeable trait of the dropout is his hostility toward and fear of learning. Reading is the key to learning. When the child cannot read with ease, he becomes annoyed, frustrated, and—finally—actively hostile to reading and learning. And then he drops out. A Maryland school survey revealed that 36 percent of all high school dropouts tested on a third to sixth grade reading level.

Not all of Project Prevention's summer program would be classwork since a well-balanced program of recreation, games, and other constructive activity would serve to make the remedial instruction more palatable and therefore more effective. A staff of fully trained reading specialists, psychologists, sociologists, and other personnel would be necessary to provide the program with the firm and intelligent leadership it would require. Children would be invited to join the program by school authorities working with the parents and the child's teacher. A trained staff member would work with the family to provide the background it would need to help their child obtain greatest benefit from the program.

Financing the program would be on a Federal-to-State grant basis. A State would submit a plan to the U.S. Office of Education to implement Project Prevention in the existing school systems of the State. The funds could be made available under part 2 of the Wydler educational program establishing an educational assistance trust fund. A bill to establish such a fund was introduced by me on October 5. The bill would make a share of Federal revenues available to a State on a fixed formula. Part 1 of my comprehnsive plan was for tuition tax credits to give those paying tuition a reduction in income taxes and was introduced last spring.

My plan for supplemental education is a sound, locally controlled education program. It is not a poverty program, although a good many of those affected would be from the poverty group.

A dropout is committing economic suicide. Operation Head Start has shown that preschool education can be useful. My program would carry this work on in regular education channels.

There are precedents for Project Prevention. In addition to operation Head Start, there are the North Carolina summer State-sponsored Governor's school for gifted children, the summer programs presently conducted at the Stewart School in Garden City, and Project Up-Lift in Harlem, sponsored by Haryou-ACT. Recently New York City announced a program devoting up to 40 percent of its time to reading correction.

I consulted with two prominent and experienced educators living in the Fourth Congressional District in formulating my proposal. They were Dr. John L. David, of 288 Peters Avenue, East Meadow, presently adjunct professor of education at Hofstra University and director of pupil personnel services for the South Huntington Schools; and Dr. Joseph P. Eulie, of 723 Park Lane South, Franklin Square, former chairman of the social studies department at Elmont Memorial High School, and currently the associate professor of history and education and coordinator of student teachers at the State University of New York at New Paltz.

I hope to organize a symposium on this program for supplemental education at one of our local universities to explore ways to make the program most effective and to make recommendations for Federal legislation. I will draft Project Prevention legislation with the aid of the House Education and Labor Committee for introduction in the next session of Congress.

I have fully explained this proposal in a letter to Congressman ALBERT H. QUIE, chairman of the House Republican education task force.

The text of the letter follows:

OCTOBER 18, 1965.

DEAR CHAIRMAN QUIE: The flow of constructive and sound educational proposals which have emanated from the unit you so ably chair has been a source of immense personal gratification to me as a member of the Task Force on Education. The fabulous Fourth Congressional District of New York, which I have the honor to represent, is an area maintaining a deep and well-informed interest in all aspects of education. Because of this concerned interest, and because of my own involvement in the problems of modern education as both a parent and a legislator, I have greeted with great enthusiasm all of the reports of our task force.

I have also looked with expectation toward the administration for additional programs of improved educational techniques, and advancement of the start well-begun in Project Head Start. But even after continuous prodding by educators and legislators[1] and after a White House Conference on Education, no further steps have been announced as being under consideration. And there is a great need for such additional steps.

One of the most pressing problems in education today is that of the high school dropout. Knowledge of its existence is legion, but solutions of it are not nearly so commonly spoken of. The conventional strategy is to dissuade the potential dropout from the act in an 11th-hour plea which offers him job-training, a work-while-in-school plan, and other inducements to remain in school until graduation. But these measures do not even come close to eliminating the problem: even the dissuaded dropout is likely to raise a family in which the whole dropout cycle will repeat itself.

In a recent data survey of Maryland school dropouts, it was found that the fathers of 63 percent of the dropouts attended school for no more than 9 years, and that, of the mothers, 57 percent never went past the 9th grade either.[2] The dropout's problem is obviously not one of making a ruinous choice, but rather, of succumbing to forces which have troubled him for years. Forces such as antipathy toward school, fear of learning, dislike of academic disciplines. And these do not develop in the 1 or 2 years before the majority of dropouts leave school after grades 10 or 11.[3]

The key to this problem's solution lies not in action on the high school or junior high school levels, but rather in the elementary, or grammar school. By the time the dropout hears ballplayers, politicians, and educators urge him to stay in school, it's too late.

What is the dropout like? A composite portrait might run something like this: a quiet boy, about 16 or 17 years old, living with his parents. His parents live together. His father is likely as not an unskilled or semiskilled laborer, or a merchant, who never finished high school. He has no job outside of school, takes little or no part in athletics or extracurricular activities. He has average or below average mental ability, and his achievements in school are less than normal. He makes poor grades, usually flunking up to four subjects in the term prior to dropping out. He always moved ahead with his class; he was never "left back." He dislikes school, teachers, and doesn't feel comfortable in a classroom. He hates to read. He is afraid to speak in class. He panics during exams. Neither parent can help him, so he is alone. There are few books at home; his parents don't like to read either. He is afraid, and very much alone in his fear. His parents are against his dropping out, but it makes no difference to him at that point.[4]

So the dropout is alone, and fears learning, and hates to read. And he drops out, still alone, and very much afraid.

I believe, in agreement with many prominent educators, that this fear of learning is the basis for the dropout problem. I further concur in the opinion of many educators that a lack of reading ability is the cause of this fear of learning. Statistics bear this out: in that same Maryland study previously mentioned, 36 percent of all dropouts read on a third to sixth grade reading level, and 10 percent read on a level below the third grade.

All studies of this problem indicate that the most noticeable trait of the dropout is his hostility to and fear of learning. Reading is the key to learning. When the child cannot read with ease, he becomes annoyed, frustrated, and—finally—actively hostile to reading and learning. And then he drops out. This frustration builds from year to year from the time the child begins to learn to read in the first grade.[5]

Most educators in the field agree that if a child's reading disability is not identified and corrected by the fourth grade, there is a good chance that he or she will drop out of high school before grade 11.

In order to remedy this condition by at least making an attempt to break the vicious cycle of the dropout, I would urge the House Republican Task Force on Education to immediately begin considering the possibility of a summer remedial program for children in grades 1, 2, 3, and 4 to correct reading disability and to provide an enriched educational experience for children who, if otherwise left alone, would soon become very much alone and very much afraid.

I propose that this program be called Project Prevention, inasmuch as it will—hopefully—prevent a high incidence of dropouts.

This program would be of from 6 to 8 weeks' duration during the summer months, being conducted by regular qualified elementary schoolteachers in the existing school structures across the Nation. It would be administered by individual school districts, under the supervision of the respective State departments of education. The Federal Government would provide the funds necessary for the project upon submission of a suitable plan of action to the U.S. Office of Education by State authorities. It would be an educational rather than a poverty program, although a good many of those it would help are in the low family income category.

Let it be clearly understood that under no circumstances would any of the provisions of the civil rights bills of 1957, 1960, and 1964 or the voting rights bill of 1965 be abrogated if the program functions properly. No segregated schools, or school districts under indictment by a Federal grand jury for a civil rights violation, would be eligible for funds.

The basic purpose of the program would be to correct reading and related deficiencies before the critical fifth year of schooling. This would be accomplished by a basic curriculum of remedial help in reading and speech. Special training programs must be made available on an inservice basis to educate the regular teachers in the most efficacious methods of teaching in Project Prevention. In addition, a complete staff of fully trained and experienced reading specialists, sociologists, psychologists, and other personnel must be part of the project to provide the firm and intelligent leadership so very necessary in enterprises of this kind. Because of the need for carefully trained and prepared workers, volunteers would only be used in an auxiliary capacity.

---

[1] Report of the Republican Task Force on Education: The White House Conference on Education.

[2] Leonard M. Miller, "The Dropout: Schools Search for Clues to His Problems," School Life, May 1963.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Consultation with Dr. Joseph P. Kulie, former chairman of the social studies department at Elmont Memorial High School, Elmont, N.Y., at Mineola, N.Y., on August 19, 1965.

[5] Consultation with Dr. John L. David, director of Pupil Personnel Services for the South Huntington Schools, at Mineola, N.Y., on August 19, 1965.

By no means would this Project Prevention be a mere extension of the school year. Summer is summer, and relaxation—even for 8-year-olds—is necessary. I believe that a well-balanced program of recreation, games, and other constructive activity would serve to make the remedial instruction more palatable and therefore more effective.

Children with disabilities would be invited to join the program by school authorities after consultations among the child's teacher, parents, and school authorities. A trained staff member would be assigned to work with each family during the course of their child's participation in the program to insure maximum retentive benefits. It is neither our right nor responsibility to barge unwanted and uninvited into the lives of either a child or his family. Therefore, this whole program would hinge on the cooperation of the parents. And it has been proven that parents, when faced with a crisis in their child's life, will become aware of the best course to take for the child. Family life has much to do with each child's academic and behavioral deportment. If a problem in the home environment can at least be identified, the benefits of the project to the child will not be negated.

Physical disabilities are often responsible for those in reading and speech. A complete and thorough physical examination of every child in Project Prevention would be required. The cursory examination usually provided by school authorities is insufficient to disclose any physical defects which would cause a reading disability. An eye ailment, even though minor, can retard reading progress. A child who does not see the blackboard clearly will soon lose interest in learning, and then the syndrome start. Success in this area has been evidenced in Project Head Start.

Extensive testing programs, administered and formulated by each individual school district but conforming to a statewide minimum standard, should be required on a year-round basis of those districts participating in Project Prevention so as to facilitate identification of problem readers and the so-called underachievers. No Federal test should be required, and the respective State departments of education should establish the guidelines for the testing programs of the individual districts participating. This would, of course, be part of the project's appropriation.

Such a summer program is not novel. Ecclesiastes tells us that there is nothing new under the sun, and this is so. But it is novel in this form. Other similar and related efforts have shown that a program like Project Prevention is both feasible and necessary.

Project Head Start has met with success with the children involved, although the redtape has bogged down the program in many areas and has detracted from its value. But while Head Start has an economic basis, Project Prevention must be founded strictly on need—need for correction. It is a sound, locally controlled educational program.

Summer programs are currently in use in many school districts, but constitute in most cases only a kind of free day camp. Nature study, cartoons, and baseball are stressed. There is, however, a rather progressive effort taking place in Garden City, N.Y., in the Fourth Congressional District, wherein a limited number of children are exposed to a learning experience similar to that described in the foregoing. However, the emphasis in this and other programs like it is on the exceptionally gifted and intelligent child with enrichment and accelerated mental development as the keynote. The average or below average child has little or no place in these projects. The Cleveland plan, in operation for many years in that Ohio city, has like aspects, but does provide a year-round remedial program. In North Carolina, the summer State-sponsored Governor's School in Raleigh is another program for gifted young people on the secondary school level. Begun some years back by Gov. Terry Sanford, it has achieved a great success.

Project Up-Lift, conducted by the HARYOU-ACT organization [6] in New York City's Harlem, is more an effort to keep children off the streets than to correct reading and other deficiencies. Emphasis and direct action on grades 1 through 4 is lacking in this and other programs, although there is remedial reading as a part of the total project.

Mr. Chairman, there are many details to be worked out. There is much that I, as a layman, might have overlooked or not evaluated. But we must make a start, and I offer Project Prevention as a possible starting point. One-half of our Nation is aged under 25 years. We must start now for them and for their children.

I look forward to your comments, and to disscussing this with you in the near future.

Sincerely,

John W. Wydler,
Member of Congress.

U.S. WORLD FOOD STUDY COMMISSION

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, October 14, the House Republican task force on agriculture recommended the establishment of a bipartisan U.S. World Food Study Commission to plan the future U.S. role in the approaching world food crisis.

This 18-member Commission would be made up of 8 Congressmen and 10 members to be appointed by the President—these 10 from the Agriculture and State Departments, universities, and other agricultural groups.

The Commission would study world food and agricultural needs, coordinate present U.S. agricultural and food assistance programs, and recommend ways in which U.S. agriculture could help meet both U.S. and world food needs in the future.

I am encouraged and deeply gratified with the widespread approval which this proposal is receiving both within and outside of Congress. While the measure is rapidly gaining support in the House, the numerous inquiries and comments about it which we continue to receive daily, indicate a growing public recognition of the need for a realistic and responsible approach toward meeting this world challenge.

Through the U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission, one of the major problems of our time could be dealt with on a sound and rational basis, while at the same time, U.S. agriculture might be afforded the opportunity of enjoying a new economic vitality.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, legislation to create this Commission has been introduced in the House by more than 60 Members, and is strongly endorsed by 16 others. The names of those 16 Members follow:

John F. Baldwin, Jr.
Alphonzo Bell.
Don H. Clausen.
Del Clawson.
Thomas B. Curtis.
Charles S. Gubser.
Craig Hosmer.
Glenard P. Lipscomb.
James H. Quillen.
Ed Reinecke.
Howard W. Robison.
Herman Schneebeli.
H. Allen Smith.
Charles M. Teague.
James B. Utt.
J. Arthur Younger.

ADEQUATE MEDICAL CARE FOR VIETNAM

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, as a "doctor in the House" and member of the Armed Services Committee, after interviewing returnees from southeast Asia, having a son-in-law there, and learning during my last trip there—late 1962—and from individual physicians of the AID and/or Department of State USCOM plan for bilateral care of our special forces and the Vietnamese civilians; I called upon the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Department of Defense—Health and Medical—and the three surgeons general of the uniformed military forces for an analysis of their bilateral effort to supply the South Vietnamese civilians and our own forces with adequate medical care. This has become most intriguing and of the greatest interest, in view of our rapid buildup "without mobilizing the Reserves, Guard units, or declaring any type of an emergency."

Much of the information is classified, but I can assure the Members of the Congress that adequate and bilateral effort is being made in the true tradition of keeping the most able-bodied men on the front line, and at the same time providing the best medical care for our sick and wounded, as well as battle casualties, in our effort to aid the South Vietnamese and their fight for freedom, concomitant with our Nation's tradition. My hat is off to the surgeons general, to the men and women of medicine and its ancillary branches, as well as to the Vietnamese themselves, who are doing the best possible job, in view of the number of casualties, the savagery of the guerrilla-type warfare and their diversity of training. I predict that soon, facilities, training, materiel, and personnel will complete the ideal job as we would have it at home, which is indeed the beacon light and acme of worldwide professional capability at this time.

---

[6] Frank L. Stanley, Jr., "Half-Way Progress Report of Project Up-Lift," August 1965, HARYOU-ACT.

Mr. Speaker, the remarks by the Surgeon General of the U.S. Navy, Rear Adm. Robert B. Brown, on the occasion of the recommissioning of the U.S.S. *Repose* AH–16 in San Francisco, Calif., on October 16, sets forth beautifully the bilateral effort that is being made, to say nothing of recreating for all who would read the history of the *Repose* and hospital ships in general, to say nothing of close support of the seamen and our allies around the world. I think all will be interested:

Remarks by Rear Adm. Robert B. Brown, Medical Corps, USN, Surgeon General and Chief, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery at Commissioning of U.S.S. "Repose" (AH–16), San Francisco, Calif.

It was with great personal as well as professional pride and gratification that I received Secretary Nitze's invitation to speak at the commissioning of the U.S.S. *Repose*. It has been my privilege to serve on three of our fine hospital ships—two in World War II, and one, this very one, in Korea. Mr. Nitze's invitation reached me in Hawaii as I was returning from a visit to our medical facilities in Vietnam and the western Pacific, more firmly convinced than ever of the great contributions a hospital ship will make to the medical support of our important military operations in southeast Asia.

The concept of a floating hospital is not a recent one; in fact, hospital ships can be traced back to 1741 when the English fleet invaded Cartagena. Commodore Preble gave the American Navy its first hospital ship during the war with Tripoli. When the fleet left Sicily in 1803, the U.S.S. *Intrepid* was left behind to serve as a hospital. The fleet returned 2 months later, and the *Intrepid* resumed her place as a ship of the line. True, this first hospital ship was created by designation rather than planning, but a hospital ship nonetheless.

Regulations for hospital ships were published in 1818, but it was not until the Civil War that these vessels again appeared with the fleet. Perhaps the most famous of this era is the *Red Rover*, captured from the Confederates and converted to a Navy hospital ship. Commodore Foote described her as "the most complete thing of the kind that ever floated * * * the icebox holds over 300 tons. She has bathrooms, laundry, elevator for the sick from the lower to the upper deck, amputating room, nine different water closets, gauze blinds to the windows to keep the cinders and smoke from annoying the sick, two separate kitchens for sick and well, a regular corps of nurses, and two water closets for every deck."

There followed a succession of hospital ships, converted from liners, each an improvement over its predecessor. When the U.S.S. *Relief* joined the fleet in World War I, it was the first ship of our Navy which had been constructed at the outset for hospital purposes.

At the start of World War II, the Navy had two hospital ships in commission, the *Solace* and the *Relief*. The *Solace* was at Pearl Harbor when the Japanese made their infamous attack and she served most capably in caring for casualties. At the height of World War II the Navy manned a fleet of 18 hospital ships and included in these were the 6 of the *Haven* class, of which the *Repose* is one. These ships were designed and built from the hull up as 800-bed modern hospitals.

Three of these fine ships served during the Korean war, the *Repose*, the *Consolation*, and the *Haven*. Each was equipped with a helicopter landing platform, a recommendation of Vice Adm. Joel T. Boone, one of our most distinguished naval medical officers. Casualties could now be flown directly from the battlefront to a floating hospital facility where they received definitive medical and surgical care, frequently only 20 to 30 minutes after they were wounded. Initial evacuation by helicopter, immediate and thorough professional care on the hospital ship, and further evacuation to shore-based hospitals by trained aeromedical teams, undoubtedly saved hundreds of American lives.

When the *Haven* was placed in the reserve fleet in 1957, to function as a dockside hospital at Long Beach, it marked the first time since the Civil War that the U.S. Navy lacked the capability of a complete and modern floating hospital, a medical facility that could be underway to an area of need within a few hours after the call for help went forth.

When the *Repose* sails for Vietnam she not only will be adding another illustrious chapter to her long career of humanitarian service, but her new "facelifting" will provide American servicemen with the finest and most advanced medical treatment in history. Scores of men working around the clock at this shipyard have completely overhauled the gallant veteran of World War II and Korea. They have probed, painted, and polished her until she looks like new. And she is literally better than ever.

The *Repose* is provided with the most recent hospital equipment and supplies and with a superbly qualified staff. Her medical spaces are designed and located to afford centralized functions and to guarantee maximum patient-care benefits. She is truly a modern diagnostic and treatment facility. Her helicopter pad can receive the heavier craft now in use. If the weather precludes patient transportation by air, ambulatory patients can come aboard by way of one of four ladders and electrically driven hoists will bring litter patients aboard.

There are two crews aboard the *Repose:* the crew responsible for the operation and maintenance of the ship is commanded by Captain Maher and includes 16 officers and 200 enlisted personnel; the 750-bed hospital is commanded by Captain Engle, and is staffed by 24 physicians, 3 dentists, 7 Medical Service Corps officers, 2 chaplains, 29 nurses and 250 hospital corpsmen and dental technicians.

In addition to providing the basic facilities and capabilities of a large modern hospital, the *Repose* will carry several innovations to frontline diagnosis and treatment. For years the Navy has pioneered in the preservation of blood by freezing. As yet we have not used frozen blood in Vietnam but we will have the capability for storing and reconstituting frozen blood aboard this ship. I wish to emphasize that this is an additional means of meeting peak requirements; it is a supplement not a replacement for the effective whole blood program that has been and is the responsibility of the Army medical laboratory in Japan. Frozen blood can be stored for an indefinite period of time and reconstituted, ready for use, within a matter of minutes.

The *Repose* will carry a portable pump-oxygenator, an artificial heart, with the trained personnel to utilize it. The feasibility and importance of repairing damaged blood vessels in the arms and legs in forward medical facilities was definitely established during the Korean war. We believe it should now be determined whether a front-line capability to artificially support the circulation of the patient and do direct surgery on the heart (and the large vessels connected to it) is also important.

Aboard the *Repose* will be the most modern laboratory equipment. Included in the advanced diagnostic techniques available is the one which utilizes an antigen-antibody reaction and a fluorescent dye to rapidly identify the causative organisms of such diseases as tuberculosis and malaria.

Located beneath the helipad is a recompression chamber. This chamber can be used for treatment of flying and diving casualties and also for providing oxygen under pressure for the treatment of certain types of infection including tetanus and gas gangrene.

Finally, the *Repose* will afford an interesting opportunity for the staff to participate in the civic action program. When the workload permits, the doctors, nurses, and corpsmen will be able to go ashore, into the villages, help and train the local people to solve their medical problems. When it can be done without interfering with our primary mission, care and treatment of the sick and injured members of the Armed Forces, we will make the *Repose* facilities available for training selected Vietnamese doctors and nurses. Civic action activities are winning for us many new and valuable friends; they also provide professionally rewarding outlets for our medical department personnel. Naval medical personnel are already participating in civic action programs with AID-USOM, at the station hospital in Saigon and with the Marines.

In closing, I express my appreciation to all of those who have so capably planned and accomplished the rebuilding of the *Repose*. My congratulations and best wishes go with the splendid crews that have been selected to operate this fine ship and to carry out the professional duties inherent in the mission of her hospital.

FEDERAL-STATE TAX SHARING

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on October 14, I introduced a bill, H.R. 11600, to establish a system of Federal-State tax sharing. As I pointed out at that time, under the formula of this bill about $2.5 billion would be returned annually to the States under present conditions and the amount would grow as the tax base grows. The State governments are given complete control over expenditure of this revenue. Under the bill's formula Kansas, for example, would receive about $24.5 million which could be used for any project approved by the State.

I rise today to point out to my colleagues the part played in the introduction of this legislation by my own constituents. Last June, when most of those responding to my periodic poll favored the Federal Government sending a portion of its revenues to the States, I decided it was time for tax-sharing legislation to be drafted. This important bill is directly in line with the wishes of the people of the Third District. I am bringing this to the attention of the House of Representatives because I believe it to be evidence that there can be meaningful interchanges between Congressmen and constituents on vital legislative issues.

BICENTENNIAL OF ABIEL ABBOT, FOUNDER OF THE WORLD'S FIRST TAX-SUPPORTED, FREE PUBLIC LIBRARY IN PETERBOROUGH, N.H.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on next Sunday, October 24, there will be ceremonies in Peterborough, N.H., to mark the 200th anniversary of the birth of the Reverend Abiel Abbot who, in 1833, led the founding of the first, tax-supported, free public library in the world. Up to that time, free public libraries were maintained by private charities and organizations such as churches, privately endowed universities, monasteries, corporations, and individual patrons.

Under the leadership of Abiel Abbot, however, a new era in library science and public policy was begun on April 9, 1833, when the town of Peterborough, at Mr. Abbot's urging, voted to establish a public library supported by public funds. This action placed the Peterborough Town Library in a unique class as the first library in the world not only to be patronized by all the people but also supported and managed by all of them.

Mr. Abbot was a truly remarkable man, filled with a sense of public service which he pursued indefatigably to the lasting benefits of his fellow man then and now.

Born in Wilton, N.H., December 14, 1765, he came to Peterborough in 1827 when he was 61 to become the minister of the Unitarian Church. He was a leader in many efforts to improve the community and the original library he founded was primarily for children.

He also created and made available to the townspeople a ministerial library and a Sunday school library. He was a member of the school committee and founded a county common school association and helped to establish a normal school. Mr. Abbot also worked with the Lyceum movement which was a sort of adult education program. He headed the Peterborough Tree Society, which planted many shade and fruit trees in the town. He conducted numerous experiments in agriculture and was a noted historian.

During the active years of his ministry—until 1839—and during his retirement years—until his death at 94 in 1859—he gave generously of his time and money to numerous worthy causes.

Sunday's ceremonies will be conducted under the auspices of the Peterborough Historical Society and the principal speaker is to be Mr. Samuel Abbot Smith, of Chelsea, Mass., a great-great-grandson of Abiel Abbot.

It is an honor and privilege to have this opportunity for paying tribute in the House of Representatives to the memory of so influential a man as the Reverend Abiel Abbot. That his work continues to flourish and grow, enriching the whole of our society is due in large measure to the leadership of Mrs. Charlotte Derby, president of the Peterborough Historical Society. She has done a magnificent job in organizing this tribute and bringing before the public knowledge of the life of Abiel Abbot and his pioneering work in Peterborough.

THE SECOND DUBLIN CONFERENCE—A DECLARATION FOR WORLD PEACE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, during the first week of October, when Pope Paul was in New York to issue his eloquent appeal for world peace and morality before the United Nations, another event of great significance to the cause of world peace occurred in Dublin, N.H.

This was the Second Dublin Conference held just 20 years after the First Dublin Conference once again under the leadership of the distinguished Mr. Grenville Clark. A very distinguished company of 54 men and women gathered under the general chairmanship of President Kingman Brewster, of Yale, for the purpose of reviewing the troubled state of the world after 20 years of seeking international order through the United Nations.

The reports of the work of the Second Dublin Conference were blanketed by the publicity given to the Pope. Therefore, I take this opportunity of inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent account of the conference which appeared in the Peterborough Transcript, an editorial from the Transcript, the text of the declaration of the conference as published in the Transcript, and a column by the distinguished commentator Max Freedman, which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star on October 10:

DUBLIN DECLARATION SEEKS END TO WAR—SUPPLEMENTS POPE'S MESSAGE—WORLD PEACE PLAN NEARLY UNANIMOUS

In the echoes of Pope Paul's thunderous world peace message the previous day, the Second Dublin Declaration was released Tuesday morning in the Alexander James studio, where the Dublin conference had been meeting since early Saturday.

Almost a supplement to the Pope's plea for peace to originate in the hearts of man, the statement etched the outlines of "an effective world organization to prevent war."

Of the 54 conferees, 52 announced that they would sign the declaration. "The other two may sign at any time, for all I know," said conference secretary Grenville Clark.

In 1945, 30 of 48 delegates signed the First Dublin Declaration.

Mr. Clark held out hope that the conference's conclusions would encourage more interest in the problem of reaching and maintaining peace.

Sunday the group sent a greeting to Pope Paul, emphasizing their common concern with world peace through universally applicable law.

The first declaration was presented to President Truman, congressmen, leaders of other nations and U.N. delegates. Before such distribution of the second declaration, however, Mr. Clark announced he would make soundings of the "efficacy of the document in other parts of the world," and if the response was favorable, a Third Dublin Conference might convene in 3 or 4 months.

Several conferees were critical of the declaration's approach, even while praising it.

W. H. Ferry, onetime Manchester and Concord newsman, now vice president of the Center for Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, Calif., told his colleagues that the document was hampered by a "made in America" imprint.

"HEARTS OF MEN"

He challenged whether the message would reach the "hearts and minds of men," an aspect also emphasized by clergymen at the conference.

Edgar A. Snow, author and expert on Communist China, who had flown in from Geneva, attacked the document's special mention of Red China and was instrumental in having a reference to China toned down.

Although urging a strengthened U.N. charter to implement its recommendations (with another world body to replace the U.N. if it failed), the declaration pointed out six U.N. deficiencies.

Its first point is that nations having one-fourth the population of the world are not in the U.N., an obvious suggestion that China should have U.N. membership.

Mr. Snow punctured more than one myth in the 5-day peace discussion. Although most Americans don't believe there is a force in the world such as "American nationalism," or "imperialism," as Russia and China term U.S. military activities, many nations "shiver in an atmosphere of oppression and fear" of American interference in their affairs.

OUTSIDE TWO-THIRDS

World federalism is held in suspicion in the two-thirds of the world—China and the underdeveloped, nonwhite nations—which is on the "outside" of the rich North Atlantic community, Mr. Snow emphasized.

These nations have just gained their independence and they are not going to surrender their precious sovereignty to a world government, he said. The Chinese have just found their national unity for the first time in 300 years.

Mr. Snow said that war was not in China's interest, because the Chinese are at last solving their centuries-old problems, especially in agriculture.

What the "outside" two-thirds of the world wants and needs are (1) security for its various national sovereignties and protection from outside interference, (2) the means to catch up quickly with the advanced third of the world.

CALL FOR DEVELOPMENT

The declaration calls for a world development agency, which would answer the second need, although the call is not so strongly stressed as some conferees wished.

The Dublin statement also calls for the freedom for nations to have their own revolutions, unless their internal conflicts threaten world peace.

Mr. Snow pointed out that the present tendency to charge into a country and prevent overthrow of an established government by a militant minority would have prevented the American, French, and Russian revolutions from occurring.

The peace document was produced by a conference drafting committee, which went into the early morning hours on two occasions to polish up the controversial and highly important language involved.

THE DRAFTERS

Stanley A. Weigel, judge of the U.S. district court in San Francisco, was chairman of the drafting group, the members of which were

A. J. G. Priest, professor of law, University of Virginia Law School; Abraham Wilson, lawyer and counsel for United World Federalists, New York; George C. Holt, columnist and executive director, New England branch, United World Federalists; Robert H. Reno, Concord lawyer; Charles Bolte, executive vice president, Viking Press, New York, and Louis B. Sohn, Bemis professor of international law, Harvard University Law School.

Consultants included Norman Cousins, Saturday Review editor; John K. Jessup, Life magazine chief editorial writer; James P. Warburg, author, Greenwich, Conn., and Gerard Piel, publisher, Scientific American.

In ex officio roles were Mr. Clark, Mr. Brewster, and Thomas H. Mahony, Boston lawyer.

HIGHLY PRAISED

The first draft was highly praised by a number of conferees including Mr. Clark, who termed it "a superb document," presenting "a superbly balanced consensus of views."

However, the final declaration revealed the influences of the draft's most vocal critics, among them the Reverend Rodney Shaw, of the board of Christian Social Concerns, Methodist Church, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Shaw noted that the draft was cast too much in security terms to appeal to U.S. church groups. He wished to see more emphasis on the release of man's energies to meet the needs of the human community. The masses of money, brainpower and resources available to the world once the arms race is suspended could be the positive note which would challenge the world.

The Reverend G. G. Grant, S. J., associate professor of philosophy, Loyola University, Chicago, also pleaded for more stress on the other benefits to mankind.

Mr. Snow objected that the declaration, before final revisions, was "basically a legal document."

RESIDENTS ATTEND

A number of residents attended the conference as observers during the three and a half days of public meetings in the James studio. Teachers and students from Dublin School were well represented during the Saturday and Sunday meetings.

Many observers expressed appreciation of the opportunity to be witnesses to the most brilliant minds in the Nation gathered to draft a document of world importance.

Each audience member tended to pick his "favorites" among the delegates, who ranged from revered elder statesmen to young, pretty workers for world federalism, and included a nun with a sparkling sense of humor, and a solid, crewcut young man who looked like a college football player.

ATTENDED AS BOY

The latter was in fact, a college wrestling coach. Dwight M. Scandrett, assistant professor of physical education at Amherst, told the conference Monday, "if you're wondering what a college wrestling coach is doing here," that he had attended the first conference—at the age of 12—when his father, Richard B. Scandrett Jr., Cornwell, N.Y., lawyer, "encouraged me to play hooky from school."

He urged a special plea in the statement to enlist youth in the cause of world peace through law. His father was a 1945 and 1965 delegate. The youth message was not included in the declaration.

Erwin N. Griswold, dean of Harvard University Law School, set off an image that persisted through the conference.

CANYON OR CHASM?

As an alternative to Boulder, Colo., writer James Spear's reference to "crossing a chasm in two or three steps," Dean Griswold said that he had a brother who walked across the Grand Canyon.

"He walked down one side and up the other, and he was pooped when he got there." The brother referred to is the father of Mrs. Donald Patterson, who has just moved to West Rindge with her husband, who is photographer-in-residence at the Meeting School for 1965–66.

Two days later, lawyer Philip W. Amram, member of the United World Federalists advisory board, Washington, D.C., one of the liveliest wits and gadflies of the conference, said he didn't like the Grand Canyon "here to there" metaphor, because you had to go down first, then rest for a while before going up, he said.

"HERE TO THERE"

The "here" referred of course to the present tense and volatile state of the world, the "there" being the state of world peace and world order sought by the conferees.

The ubiquitous Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review, a short, unobtrusive-looking man, shattered any complacency those present may have slid into every time he spoke.

In a booming voice, he several times pulled the days' discussions into a neat list of incisive points. At one time, he cried, "mankind is sick and tired of war. People want peace with justice," and urged the conferees to give mankind "legalism with compassion."

NONE "WEAK KNEED"

In fact, a truculent war lover would have found it difficult to find a single delegate to pin a "weak-kneed appeaser" label on.

Again and again, two-fisted speakers and thinkers like Cousins, Amram, Ferry, Speer, Snow, and others urged their ideas with a power seldom seen in a compromising and political world.

The Russians are approachable, said Harvard Scientist Ross McFarland, of Dublin, citing the International Geophysical Year and other cooperative ventures that have born fruit.

Hudson Hoagland, codirector of Worcester Foundation for Experimental Biology and past president, American Academy of Arts and Sciences, another powerhouse speaker, articulately presented the scientists' point of view.

NEGLECTING ESSENTIALS

He said too many essential matters are not being coped with because of our obsession with the arms race—education, the water supply, oceanography and food from the sea, urban renewal, health problems and population control need attention now, the scientist stressed.

The towering Rev. Donald S. Harrington, honorary vice president, United World Federalists, and minister of New York's Community Church, shared Mr. Ferry's views on the moral imperatives of transferring mankind's resources from arms toward alleviating man's ills.

The ladies, though attractive and feminine, proved to be among the toughest fighters for their ideas. Mrs. William P. Bray of the Council of the World Association of World Federalists, Cincinnati, and Mrs. Arthur Lall. of the School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, underlined today's sense of urgency for world peace, even greater than that surrounding the first Dublin conference.

U.N. EXPERIENCE

Mrs. Edward W. McVitty, who says she spends nearly every day at the U.N. as "an international lobbyist" for world federalism, urged the conference not to abandon the U.N., and offered a number of suggestions culled from her vast experience at the international organization.

The great Grenville Clark, revered by all at the conference, spoke often, always pointedly, and sat on the platform overseeing the proceedings he had done so much to bring about.

Chairman Kingman Brewster, Yale University president, who looked as if he had been cast for the part by Hollywood, was a master statesman who managed to bring the varying points of view to focus on the declaration.

The only delegates missing from the meetings were J. Robert Oppenheimer, Princeton atomic scientist, whose wife was said to be ill, and Harold W. Dodds, former Princeton president.

Quiet Dublin had made history for the second time in 20 years.

[From the Peterborough Transcript, Jaffrey Recorder-Transcript]

Mr. Clark's Conference

Dublin's Grenville Clark is a remarkable man. The fact that at 82 he is still eager to organize, direct, lead, and to a considerable extent mastermind a conference of intellectuals many years his junior is a feat in itself.

And the fact that Grenville Clark, an immensely practical man, has never been deterred from his semiutopian philosophy of universal peace through world law—or world federalism, as it is called—is most remarkable of all.

In the last 20 years, militant nationalisms and climbing tensions in a hostile world cannot have given much comfort to Mr. Clark's point of view.

What has occurred, though, is new impetus to the need for men of wisdom and courage, such as Mr. Clark and his colleagues, to grapple with the immense problems of attaining international understanding and tranquillity.

Grenville Clark, in the eyes of those with whom he met this week for 5 days at the James Studio, is one of the "great men" of our time. We heard conferees compare him with the likes of Adlai Stevenson, John Foster Dulles, Bernard Baruch, and such other giants of this generation.

"I came to Dublin as much to be with Mr. Clark, as to discuss the issues of the conference," said one delegate, adding that he had learned as a young man never to miss an opportunity to "sit at the feet of great men."

Grenville Clark did not disappoint the conferees in his handling of the peace deliberations. It was Grenville Clark who contributed the decisive decisions when the conference was struggling with controversy over the second declaration's extent and approach. It will be Grenville Clark who will now make "soundings," as he describes it, throughout the world to determine the "efficacy" of the document.

If the reception for the new declaration is encouraging, Mr. Clark may call another Dublin conference.

Unfortunately this week's Dublin deliberations were overshadowed by the dramatic peace trip of Pope Paul to New York City. The news importance of the conference was obviously drowned out by the unprecedented papal tour. But while immediate public attention may be delayed, it nevertheless seems certain that the work accomplished this week at the James Studio will eventually have important audiences with men of thought and foresight.

[From the Peterborough Transcript, Jaffrey Recorder Transcript, Oct. 7, 1965]

Declaration of the Second Dublin Conference

The Second Dublin Conference on the essentials of an effective world organization to prevent war declares:

The rights of man and the conditions of life itself on this planet are imperiled by lawlessness among the nations. World anarchy is manifested by the growing frequency of international crises as well as by the number of nations with the capacity to build arsenals of nuclear weapons. One serious adverse effect of that anarchy has been an increasing acceptance of violence and, thereby, a cheapening of the worth of human life.

Protection of the safety and dignity of human beings is generally acknowledged as the highest obligation of governments. The growing inability of nation states to provide this protection, particularly in the face of the nuclear threat, emphasizes the need to replace world anarchy with enforceable world law.

The highest sovereignty on earth resides with the peoples who inhabit the planet. National sovereignty is justified only as it safeguards this basic sovereignty of the peoples themselves. Since, in a nuclear age, national sovereignty alone cannot serve its highest obligation, it must be buttressed by an international authority.

Even if there were no threat of nuclear destruction hovering over the future of the human race, the increasing complexity of international life, the general welfare of mankind and the requirements of orderly growth impose on the nations and on their leaders an imperative to establish world peace and order under an adequate authority.

We therefore affirm the imperative need for a world federation equipped with the powers necessary to enforce world law against international violence and the threat of it. We call upon all heads of governments to move swiftly and persistently for the creation of a world authority capable of maintaining world peace through world law. We call upon people everywhere to recognize the indispensable link between peace, justice and meaningful survival, on the one hand, and the existence of the instrumentalities of world law on the other. And we call upon them, as well, to make known by every means at their command, their insistence that world peace through enforceable world law shall become the first business of their governments.

THE REASONS

Peace means more than the temporary absence of major war in an armed world. Genuine peace requires enforcible law, order, and justice. In short, peace requires government. In its absence, law, order, and justice cannot exist.

The world must be made safe for the diversities of mankind—diversities of race, nationality, religion, forms of government, economic systems, and social values. The positive worth of these diversities cannot be preserved without enforcible world law.

History demonstrates the necessity for enforcible law as the prerequisite of order within community, province, state, and nation. Experience, reason, and commonsense compel the conclusion that such law is also the prerequisite for genuine peace on the world level.

Yet it is precisely at the world level that enforcible law is nonexistent. The absence of any system of effective world law precluding international violence makes arms races and recurrent wars inevitable. Failure to correct this basic defect in the organization of human society has now become a threat to civilization itself.

Developments since the Second World War confirm and emphasize the growing need for an effective world federal authority.

Nuclear problems have been compounded by the beginnings of man's conquest of space. Effective world law is requisite: (a) to keep space from becoming a jungle of nuclear weaponry, (b) to head off danger of war from rival nationalist claims to uses of space and planets in it, and (c) to guarantee that scientific achievement in space shall serve the progress of mankind.

Other developments since the Second World War which emphasize the need for such an authority include:

1. The economic disparity between the industrialized and the underdeveloped nations has increased.

2. The breakup of colonial empires has resulted in the creation of a large number of new nations.

3. Five nations have developed nuclear technology and others are at the threshold.

4. The People's Republic of China has emerged as a world power with a population potential of almost a billion human beings by 1980.

The possession of nuclear weapons spreads. World tension does not subside. The arms race continues at an annual cost of at least $140 billion. With world law, the massive savings from disarmament could be made available to help close the dangerously widening gap between the "have" and "have-not" nations.

THE UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations has helped to stave off major war and has served many social and humanitarian purposes. Through the development of its charter by interpretation, it has overcome some of its original limitations: It has evolved new peacekeeping methods not foreseen in the charter. The United Nations has facilitated the liberation of many colonial areas. There have been important declarations of human rights. New impetus has been given to the codification of international law and to new ways of developing such law.

However, the United Nations Charter, drafted before Hiroshima, is inadequate for its avowed purpose; to maintain international peace and security. The United Nations has neither effective nor reliable means to prevent war. Specifically, the United Nations as presently constituted is deficient in the following respects:

1. Nations having more than one-fourth of the population of the world are not members.

2. The Security Council has often been paralyzed by exercise of the veto.

3. There is no standing peace force to take effective action against agression.

4. The one-nation-one-vote rule in the General Assembly makes unrealistic the conferring of needed legislative powers on that body.

5. There is no court system with the jurisdiction and powers required for the peaceful settlement of disputes among nations.

6. There is no system to provide sufficient and reliable revenues.

THE ESSENTIALS OF AN EFFECTIVE WORLD ORGANIZATION

The experience of the United Nations demonstrates that the following elements are essential to an effective organization for the prevention of war:

1. Universal and complete disarmament: The charter must provide for total national disarmament, not merely for "arms control" or "limitation." This means the elimination of all national armaments by every country in the world down to the level of police forces necessary for internal order only. This total disarmament must be subject at all stages to an effective inspection system. The accomplishment of each stage must be carefully verified before proceeding to the next stage.

2. An adequate world police force: Parallel with the disarmament process, a strong, sufficiently armed police force should be established. It should be composed of individual recruits and not of national contingents. There should be careful safeguards against any undue proportion from any nation or group of nations.

3. Universal membership: Membership should be open to every nation. Citizens of member nations should also be citizens of the world organization. No member nation should be expelled or allowed to withdraw.

4. A world legislative body: The legislative body should be the core of the world organization. It could be either unicameral or bicameral. It should have a system of representation and voting procedures whereby the peoples of all the member nations will be fairly represented. It should be given adequate power to provide for the maintenance and enforcement of world law relevant to the prevention of international war.

5. The executive branch: The executive branch should be chosen by and be responsible to the legislative body and should exercise the authority delegated to it. It must be free from the veto power of any nation.

6. Judicial branch: There should be a court system with the jurisdiction and powers required for the settlement of all disputes among nations and for the enforcement of world law against nations and individuals with respect to conduct which threatens the peace of the world.

7. Reliable world revenue: There should be provision for sufficient and reliable revenues to maintain the institutions and carry out the functions of the world organization. Revenue obligations should be allocated among member nations in accordance with their ability to pay.

8. Safeguards: Important as it is that an effective world organization to prevent international war shall possess powers fully adequate to that purpose, it is equally important that such powers be carefully limited so as to insure against abuse of power and interference with the purely domestic affairs of the member nations. All powers not granted to the world federation should be reserved to the member nations and their peoples. Judicial redress against abuse of the powers of the world authority should be provided.

The world federation should have no power to interfere in any internal revolution or conflict unless the legislative body of the federation declares that such revolution or conflict seriously threatens world peace. The world federation should, in such cases, have the authority to intervene for the purpose of terminating any violence and to bring about a just solution through conciliation, arbitration, or adjudication.

9. Charter adoption: The charter of the organization should come into effect only when ratified by a preponderance of all nations and of the peoples of the world.

Every one of these elements is essential to an effective organization for the maintenance of peace.

The prevention of war requires the establishment of an affiliated world development authority. It should be adequately financed and staffed in order to mitigate the growing economic disparities between the "have" and "have not" nations, the continuance of which causes world instability and conflict.

Appropriate steps should also be taken in the interest of eliminating those threats to peace which arise out of discrimination based upon race, creed, color, or ancestry.

WAYS TOWARD WORLD ORDER

We believe that the United Nations, through amendment of its Charter, is the best instrumentality for the achievement of the goals we seek. If those goals cannot thus be attained, with reasonable effort and with reasonable promptness, the endeavor to go forward should be pursued resolutely through a supplemental organization or by any other fruitful means.

The time has come for political leaders to put meaning and substance into their generalized statements as to the need for the rule of law in world affairs. Statesmen should now make concrete proposals to bring about world peace through world law.

This document has been drafted by a group of private American citizens. It is offered as a basis for discussion. We invite the reactions of citizens of all nations.

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 10, 1965]

Effective World Law Is the First Step

(By Max Freedman)

DUBLIN, N.H.—Twenty years ago a group of distinguished men and women met in this gracious little town in New England, under the leadership of Mr. Granville Clark, to consider the best ways to protect mankind from war and to build a truly functioning world community. They were able to take a long view, even at the risk of being thought visionary and impracticable, because they were acting with the independence of private citizens without any fettering obligations to any political party or government.

When that group first met, the United Nations stood at the pinnacle of hope. It was supported by a universal faith that it would always be able to preserve the peace, and this hope had yet to be tested by the cruel realities of an unstable world. The Dublin group did not choose the easy course of echoing this belief in the United Nations as if it alone could guarantee a future free from poverty and free from war. It was convinced that the United Nations could never achieve all its goals while it had to work within the restrictions imposed by national sovereignty. It therefore issued an impressive and influential declaration of principles calling for a much swifter movement toward world government on the principles of federalism.

No one then thought that a world federal government would soon be formed. But in these 20 years an increasing number of us have come to believe that national sovereignty must be tempered and replaced by regional and international systems of cooperation. The doctrines of the world federalists are not always persuasive; they do not carry conviction on every point; yet somehow their advocates seem to have caught a glimpse of a few large truths on which the future of this generation may rest.

Meeting once again at the call of Mr. Granville Clark, and with President Kingman Brewster of Yale as chairman, the second Dublin conference, with some of the first participants again in attendance, has now presented another statement of principles. What do these men and women, with their great experience in public affairs, have to say about the needs of our times?

The basic point, from which the entire declaration derives its philosophic authority, is that no enforceable system of world law now exists. "The absence of any system of effective world law precluding international violence makes arms races and recurrent wars inevitable. Failure to correct this basic defect in the organization of human society has now become a threat to civilization itself."

The Dublin conference points out that the United Nations Charter, drafted before Hiroshima, is inadequate for its avowed purpose of maintaining peace and security. While appreciation of what the world organization has accomplished, it finds the United Nations now deficient in these respects:

1. Nations having more than one-fourth of the population of the world are not members.

2. The Security Council has often been paralyzed by the veto.

3. There is no standing peace force to take effective action against aggression.

4. The one nation, one vote rule in the General Assembly makes unrealistic the conferring of needed legislative powers on that body.

5. There is no court system with the jurisdiction and powers required for the peaceful settlement of disputes among nations.

6. There is no system to provide sufficient and reliable revenues.

The conference's first recommendation was for universal and complete disarmament subject at all stages to an effective inspection system. The accomplishment of each stage must be carefully verified before proceeding to the next stage.

Parallel with the disarmament process a strong police force should be established. It should be composed of individual recruits and not of national contingents. There should be safeguards against any undue proportion from any nation or group of nations.

The third recommendation stated that membership should be open to every nation. Citizens of member nations should also be citizens of the world organization. No member nation should be expelled or allowed to withdraw.

Then there would be a legislative body as the core of the world organization. It would have a system of representation and voting procedures whereby the peoples of all the member nations will be fairly represented. This formula would allow weighted representation as well as representation by population.

No veto power could be exercised by any member of the executive branch. The court system would have all the powers and jurisdiction required to settle all disputes which threaten world peace. Revenues would be levied on member nations on the basis of their ability to pay.

But there would be no interference with the purely domestic affairs of member nations who would retain all rights and powers not specifically granted to the world organization. Any abuse of power could be reviewed and redressed by the international court system.

The conference also proposed as an urgent matter the establishment of a World Development Authority to narrow the gap between the industrialized and the emergent nations.

Independent citizens should be ahead of their government in their thinking and in their plans for the future. The second Dublin conference, in this spirit, has given us a standard to which the wise and the progressive can rally.

PRESIDENTIAL ITEM VETO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a special order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, as we complete the work of this first session, it is acutely apparent that the Congress stands in need of effective reform in the appropriations process.

This year we have witnessed the sharpest rise in appropriations since the Korean conflict.

It is urgent that in the forthcoming session we focus attention on improving the means to control the Government spending structure. Earlier in this session I reintroduced a joint resolution which would authorize a Presidential veto over individual items in appropriations bills. For several years I have been pressing for the enactment of this alteration, believing that it will save millions of dollars annually.

Last May 27 I addressed the House on this matter and the arguments in favor of a Presidential item veto are more convincing than ever. House Joint Resolution 477, referred to the Judiciary Committee, would amend the Constitution in this manner.

It is a recurrent theme of politics that every year we vote increased appropriations and then complain about the evils of runaway Government spending and deficit financing.

I do not presume to judge at this point the various Federal programs and related necessary funding. The Nation has a growing population and we are going to be faced every year with fresh domestic problems as well as old ones which yearn for attention and ultimately require the expenditure of money. Realistically, we cannot expect the Nation's needs to diminsh in the years ahead; nor can we expect a lessening of our own sense of responsibility in meeting those needs.

I think there is an inevitable tendency of dangerously enhancing the channels of indiscriminate or careless spending when real expenditures increase as a whole. Those of us who advocate a Presidential item veto are not denying the merit and legitimacy of Government programs requiring Government money. We do insist, however, that all revenue be appropriated in a sound and responsible manner.

Throughout our history, the President has been faced with an "all or nothing" approach to money bills. Manifestly, an alarming portion of these appropriated sums represent "porkbarrel," horse trading and bargaining, implicit or explicit. The public has a great deal to lose in the process. And we in the Congress put ourselves in the rather contradictory position of favoring prudent, belt-tightening economy.

Granting the President some discretionary authority over appropriations bills is an effective way to counter this persistent and harmful tendency. Under the item veto option, the Congress of course maintains its constitutional power of the purse. We would not be abdicating our major responsibility.

We have been faced with a system whereby the President, and consequently the taxpayer, must accept the bad with the good on an all-or-nothing basis. The inherent tendency is for the President to sign large spending measures in order to avoid further wrangling with Congress on programs he believes to be vital, despite his disagreement with many scattered items which Members of Congress have managed to tack on, often at the last moment and often unjustifiable.

I believe that we should attempt to face this situation and deal with it rationally. The legislation I have introduced would create an additional checkpoint, a final reviewing station before the public purse is irrevocably committed. We have witnessed this year a large increase in Federal appropriations. We cannot expect any substantial lessening of this trend.

Therefore, it has become essential that we insure effective control over expenditures, stiffen our procedures and plug up the leaks which drain the Treasury of public moneys. As legitimate Government outlays rise, it becomes ever more important to manage our business responsibly and eliminate unsound fiscal practices.

THE KLAN MASK IS OFF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a special order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the mask is off. The big talk and braggadocio of Robert M. Shelton became a cold and fearful silence when the first ray of light hit this leader of the United Klans of America. On this, the first day of the public hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities into the Ku Klux Klan, many of us thought this man would in some small way live up to the boast he had made that he had nothing to hide. He obviously has a great deal to hide for he took the fifth amendment on even the most simple questions propounded to him by counsel.

At one point, Mr. Speaker, I quoted from his own statement in Klan literature in which he was extending to all "uncommon" Americans the opportunity to join his organization. His words were prophetic and he said in this misleading pamphlet:

> It is our heritage to stand erect, proud and unafraid; to think and act for ourself; to enjoy the benefits of our creation and to face the world boldly and say, "This I have done."

I could point out the plagiarism of this statement but for purposes here it is enough to note that Mr. Shelton did not stand erect, proud and unafraid. He did not proclaim to the world boldly, "This I have done." He was so clearly in contempt of Congress that it would seem patently certain that he will be cited for this unlawful conduct.

At the conclusion of this first day of hearings, I directed the following statement at the uncooperative imperial wizard, Mr. Shelton, who cowered in fear before the very proper questions directed to him. My statement was as follows:

> The moment of truth has arrived and Mr. Shelton has failed to live up to previous billing. This is a little like the old gag "will the real Robert Shelton please stand up."
>
> You, Mr. Shelton, are now sadly aware of what we have individually and collectively known for some time. It doesn't take much courage or intelligence to get out in a cornfield and rant and rave about the Negro or to condemn the President of the United States and brag that you have nothing to hide. You probably have enjoyed this role in the past. There is an old saying that talk is cheap. You are living proof of this statement. We are all seeing you and the Klan in your true nature today—uncooperative, afraid of the light of day, unable to live up to your public bragging and self-serving proclamations. The mask is off. The real Mr. Shelton couldn't stand up to the truth so we now must proceed to paint the true picture as we, and obviously you, know it to be. You probably will go back home and return to the cornfield and cottonfield circuit throughout the country and continue your tirades but I doubt that many fairminded Americans will take you seriously. You are as clearly in contempt of this committee and the Congress as your obnoxious ravings are in contempt of the thinking of all good Americans.

TEN MONTHS OF INTENSIVE INVESTIGATION

The pattern of the Klan has been clearly demonstrated in our intensive investigation over the past 10 months. The subcommittee has held closed door hearings for the past 2 months. It is very clear to me that legislation is needed in this field. I have requested that the committee subpena Ohio Klan leaders and others from the North because we must know how their activities fit into the overall Klan picture. Any law would be national in scope.

These past 10 months have given me a very clear picture of the Ku Klux Klan. We have had many revelations in our closed-door hearings which are nothing short of unbelievable. The minute I walk into these hearings it is like entering another world where all of the values which are meaningful to me—law and order, respect for your fellow human being, justice—go out the window. You enter an eerie world where guns, beatings, exhortations to violence, hate, arson, bombings, shootings, blacklists, sugar in gas tanks, night rides become common place and traditional values are scoffed at. The Klan pattern has been shown and I am confident that it will be meticulously developed during the months which lie ahead.

Chairman WILLIS made a fine opening statement today and it is contained at the conclusion of these remarks as appendix I. We both noted in our statements today that the staff has done an incredible job in preparing all of the factual detail for presentation. Few people realize how hard our work is and how careful we must be. The House Committee on Un-American Activities is different from other standing committees. We are continually dealing with hostile subject matter and witnesses whether it be in the field of communism, illegal travel to Cuba, or the Klan. Therefore, since we cannot count on cooperation of witnesses—such as Imperial Wizard Shelton demonstrated today—our committee must collect information piece by piece and fit the pieces together. This requires on-the-spot investigation by our own men and cooperation with the FBI and other governmental agencies. It is unbelievable to review all of the evidence we have compiled thus far. While we have had the close cooperation of the FBI, our men have uncovered many activities and incidents which are not in the FBI files.

Particularly reprehensible is the deception of the Klan which is used to cloak its sordid activities. Deceit would be the byword of the Klan leadership. They use the Bible and religious inspiration to ordain their activities. Equally bad is their effort to paint themselves as anti-Communists. They said they are fighting communism but it is my strong opinion that they aid communism more than any group in this country because of their intolerant philosophy and their unfounded accusations. They have been inclined to label witnesses before the House Committee on Un-American Activities as Communists when they took the fifth amendment. I wonder what they think of Mr. Shelton after his repeated use of this protective cover? The Klan lives in a different world from most law-abiding and right-thinking Americans. When we are done with our investigation we will have developed the information necessary to make proper recommendations for remedial legislation. As a side dividend, people—including Klan members who may not know the true side of their organization—will also see the Klan and its other world in its true light.

In all of the research that I have done on the Klan, no better statement has been made than that which is contained in a Federal grand jury presentment which followed a 1952 and 1953 investigation of the Florida Klan. This presentment said, in part:

> We cannot believe that all of its members know what is done by some of them. But the results are inherent in the nature of the order. It is founded on the worst instincts of mankind. At its best, it is intolerant and bigoted. At its worst, it is sadistic and brutal. Between these two poles it has its existence. Out of the wells of prejudice it draws its inspiration. It is a foul pollution in the body politic. It is a cancerous growth that will not be cured until the hand of every decent man is raised against it and the whole power of the law is marshaled to stamp it out.

On the basis of 10 months of intensive study of the Klan, Mr. Speaker, I would merely add a ringing "Amen." I am fully aware that we have only scratched the surface thus far but what we have seen has a very bad odor. It is often alleged that the southerner will not take an objective view of the Klan. I must admit that one of the things which is the hardest for me to understand is the reluctance on the part of the good people of the South to speak out on the Klan. Based on the number of members the Klan has, its poor leadership and its lack of any solid accomplishment it would seem that good people would automatically rise to the challenge. They do not appear to do this but possibly after these hearings are concluded the hold of the Klan on this section of American will be lost.

There has been sort of a mystique buildup through the years which gives the Klan a power which it does not deserve. The Negro is led to believe that the Klan sees all, knows all, and can bring retaliation. Fear and intimidation have been its tools, oppression its goals. Yet, some southerners have spoken out in the past. I cite as a particularly good example the grand jury presentment which I referred to earlier in this address. It devastated the Klan and it will be included as appendix II following these remarks.

Mr. Speaker, our first day of hearings showed that the Ku Klux Klan is flying under false colors. All of the bluff and bluster which these hooded bigots demonstrate in the cornfields and cottonfields where they meet to burn crosses and rave about the Negro melted away when the imperial wizard ducked and hid behind the fifth. The mask is now off and we will proceed to do our duty.

The material referred to follows:

APPENDIX I

CHAIRMAN'S OPENING STATEMENT, WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 19, 1965, COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

This subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities is convened to hold hearings pursuant to a resolution unanimously adopted by the full committee on March 30, 1965. That resolution reads as follows:

"Whereas at the commencement of the 89th Congress the chairman instructed the staff to commence a preliminary inquiry into the activities of the Ku Klux Klan organizations in the United States to assist the committee in determining whether it should authorize an investigation of the Klan organizations; and

"Whereas the committee on February 2, 1965, by resolution, unanimously directed the chairman to continue the preliminary inquiry; and

"Whereas the chairman has today made a report to the committee on the results of this preliminary inquiry, which report clearly indicates that the nature and scope of the Klan organizations' activities are such that the committee should authorize an investigation; and

"Whereas the President's recent public appeal also demonstrates that such an investigation is justified and necessary; and

"Whereas the President has offered the full cooperation of the executive branch of the Government in such an investigation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the committee undertake an investigation of the various Klan organizations and their activities with the view of holding hearings for the purpose of aiding Congress in any necessary remedial legislation; and be it further

"Resolved, That inasmuch as the appropriation for the committee's work for this session is not sufficient to enable it to undertake this investigation in addition to other investigations already approved and underway, the chairman is directed to request a supplemental appropriation of $50,000 to conduct an investigation of Ku Klux Klan organizations; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chairman is directed to continue the preliminary inquiry into the activities of the Black Muslims, the Minutemen and the American Nazi Party previously authorized by the committee, for the purpose of determining whether an investigation of these groups is called for."

As this resolution indicates, the committee's decision to undertake an investigation of Ku Klux Klan organizations in this country was made only after careful consideration and on the basis of certain information concerning Klan activities then in its possession. Late last year, the committee discussed the growing activities of the Ku Klux Klans and a suggestion was made by Mr. Pool that an investigation be considered. Before any formal investigation is authorized by the committee, it is usual to make a preliminary inquiry. The staff was therefore directed to do so in this instance. Other Members of Congress subsequently expressed themselves on the subject, particularly Mr. WELTNER, who called the matter to the attention of our colleagues on the floor of the House.

At its organizational meeting on February 2 of this year, the committee unanimously authorized the continuance of this preliminary inquiry. Thereafter the staff reported to the committee from time to time and, on March 30, the committee voted unanimously that a formal investigation be undertaken for the purpose of holding hearings which would assist the Congress in drafting such remedial legislation as it deemed appropriate and necessary to deal with the problems created by Klan activities.

On April 14 of this year, the House of Representatives, by a vote of 312 to 43, adopted House Resolution 310, authorizing the expenditure of $50,000 for the committee's investigation of Ku Klux Klan organizations.

What must Congress know to determine whether legislation is called for in this area and, if so, what type legislation will be effective?

It must know the objectives and purposes of the Ku Klux Klans, their structure and organization, their affiliated organizations, and groups created or controlled by them, or organized to support, defend, and assist them. It must know their constitutions and bylaws, the type of activities in which engage, how they are controlled, who their key officers are, how Klan groups are financed, and what their funds are used for. It must know whether the Klans subscribe to—and use—illegal means to achieve either declared or concealed objectives. The Congress must know whether the operations and actions directed and carried out by Klan leaders, and certain members, are in accord with the wishes of the membership as a whole, or whether certain activities are engaged in without the knowledge and approval of the membership. It must know whether Klan recruits are informed of the true nature and purposes of the Klans—or whether they are hoodwinked into joining them. It must also know, of course, something of the size, strength, and scope of the Klan movement. These are the matters which are the subject of this inquiry.

At the time the committee decision to conduct this inquiry was announced, certain Klan leaders stated publicly that they welcomed the investigation. Those statements were encouraging, if true. It is the committee's hope that they really meant them.

The investigative work done by the committee preparatory to these hearings, in my belief, has been thorough. It is my intention that these hearings will be fair in every respect. For this reason, Klan leaders and members will have nothing to fear or lose by cooperating fully with the committee by telling all, and everything, they know about Klan operations. They have nothing to fear or lose, that is, if they have nothing to hide—nothing to hide from the Congress, nothing to hide from the American people, and nothing to hide from the rank-and-file Klan membership.

I would point out to all witnesses summoned to testify in this inquiry that it is being conducted by a duly and lawfully constituted committee of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, the lawmaking branch of our Government, and that the courts have held, over and over again, that every American citizen has a duty to answer all pertinent questions asked him in such an inquiry.

The Supreme Court, in a 1957 decision growing out of another inquiry by this committee, reiterated a fundamental principle of our Government when it stated:

"The power of Congress to conduct investigations is inherent in the legislative process."

It then went on to say:

"It is unquestionably the duty of all citizens to cooperate with the Congress in its efforts to obtain the facts needed for intelligent legislative action. It is their unremitting obligation to respond to subpenas, to respect the dignity of the Congress and its committees and to testify fully with respect to matters within the province of proper investigation." (*U.S.* v. *Watkins,* 354 U.S. 178.)

That this was not a new or novel holding by the Court is indicated by many much earlier rulings of similar nature and, for example, by a relatively recent report of a special committee of the American Bar Association which in 1953—without evoking any protest—stated that:

"Every citizen, when called as a witness, has the duty to disclose any facts within his knowledge sought by a court or by a duly constituted legislative committee."

Generally, the committee recognizes only one valid reason for a witness' refusal to answer pertinent questions—the invocation of the fifth amendment, a statement by the witness that it is his belief that an honest answer to the question might lead to his being prosecuted for a criminal act.

The various Klan organizations operating in this country today proclaim that they are patriotic, 100-percent American, Christian, moral, and law-abiding. I hope, therefore, that we will not, in these hearings, experience what we have so often seen in practically all of our investigations in other areas of the committee's jurisdiction—witness after witness finding it necessary, or feeling the need, to invoke the fifth amendment, again and again, when asked, not about his beliefs, but about his actions.

All witnesses, as I have said—and I stress this—will have the right to make proper invocation of the fifth amendment in this inquiry. The American people, however, are not likely to look with favor on such recourse by persons who proclaim from the rooftops that they are saviors of America and patriots second to none. The public cannot be expected to approve such action in these hearings any more than it has in other inquiries in which witnesses have taken refuge in constitutional provisions even while conspiring to destroy the Constitution.

And talking about conspiracy, I would add this point. There are various kinds of conspiracy, in addition to that which is aimed at the destruction of our Government, and all kinds are outlawed. As Justice Robert H. Jackson stated in his concurring opinion in the case of *Dennis* v. *United States*:

"The Constitution does not make conspiracy a civil right."

In his concurring opinion in another case—that of *American Communications Association* v. *Douds*—Justice Jackson pointed out that:

"The conspiracy principle has traditionally been employed to protect society against all 'ganging up' or concerted action in violation of its laws. No term passes that this Court does not sustain convictions based on that doctrine for violations of the antitrust laws or other statutes." (*A.C.A.* v. *Douds,* 339 U.S. 382.)

Conspiracy to take a man's life, to injure him, or to deny certain groups of people their rights is no more protected by the Constitution than is conspiracy to destroy our Government. Conspiracy, in and of itself, is so inimical to ordered society that there is a broad Federal statute which makes it a crime to conspire to commit any offense against the United States. (18, U.S.C., 371.)

And there is a third, specific kind of conspiracy I must mention here—the secret ganging up of any group to punish or harm a person in any way because that person has, in line with his duties as a citizen, testified before a congressional committee, giving the committee the kind of information the Congress must have to enact laws for the general welfare.

That kind of conspiracy, like all other forms, is outlawed. In fact, influencing or injuring witnesses is so destructive of the American way of life, eating away at its legislative foundation, that it is a criminal act even when there is no conspiracy involved in it. The very act of harming—or of attempting to harm, influence, or intimidate—a subpenaed witness to keep him from talking or of injuring or threatening a witness because he has cooperated with the Congress by giving testimony, is punishable by 5 years in prison and/or a fine of $5,000.

And I want to state for the record, here and now, that no one had better attempt to violate this law in regard to any witness under subpena to testify in this inquiry. If anyone does, then just as certainly as I am sitting here today, I will do all in my power to see that the guilty party, or parties, are punished according to the law. And I know that all other members of the committee feel the same way.

Being informed as they are of the facts developed to date in this investigation, the subcommittee members have quite naturally formed certain tentative opinions of some Klan groups and their leaders. However, we are not going to prejudge the issue. These facts have raised questions in our minds, but in any human undertaking there can be error, and it is also possible that there might be some explanation for certain of the facts we have uncovered. This is one reason why this public hearing is being held—to test the accuracy of our investigative effort and to give the persons concerned an opportunity to answer the questions that have been raised in our minds—to deny, to qualify, to confirm, to explain.

This is as it should be. Congress cannot legislate on the basis of investigation alone. It should, and must, test the results of its investigations, except when national security precludes it, in public hearings. This is what we have done in the past; it is what we will do in the future. This is in conformity with the Rules of the House and with court decisions. We are engaged in the business of the people of the United States and they have a right to be able to see and judge for themselves how that business is being conducted.

Let me remind all that this is an inquiry, not a prosecution. We are an investigating committee. We are charged with the duty of developing facts about the Klans and making them a part of a public record, not to convict anyone of anything but for the purpose of assisting the Congress in the performance of its legislative function.

In conclusion, let me urge all witnesses summoned to testify in these hearings to testify fully and honestly, without evasion or subterfuge, and without fear. This is your duty. If you truly have the national interest at heart, this is what you will do. By way of both encouragement and warning I want to say that this is a country of law, that it is strong and secure, and that no individuals, groups or conspiracies within its borders can, or will, prevail against its laws.

APPENDIX II

REPORT OF THE GRAND JURY TO THE HONORABLE JUDGES OF THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA, MIAMI DIVISION

On October 6, 1952, this grand jury commenced an inquiry into the various acts of terror and violence that occurred in south Florida during the preceding year. The investigation is not completed but because the evidence we have heard is of grave concern to the people of the State and to its lawmakers, and because of the approaching biennial session of the State legislature, we deem it timely to make this report.

We have been primarily interested in the explosions at Carver Village on September 22, and November 30, 1951, the death of Harry T. Moore and his wife from a blast of dynamite (or other high explosive) on the night of December 25, 1951, and the various attempts to dynamite synagogues and churches in the Miami area in the fall and winter of 1951. We heard evidence of other acts of violence stretching back over a period of years. We explored the subversive character of the Ku Klux Klan for its impact on the Federal employees loyalty program. We learned something about housing conditions in the city of Miami and elsewhere, and have heard a great deal about the easy acquisition and criminal use of dynamite.

We have been in session (on these matters alone) for a total of 28 days and have listened to approximately 100 witnesses, and have taken more than 3,200 pages of testimony. We hope to retain our official existence for the entire tenure of 18 months if necessary, for the purpose of hearing additional witnesses as occasion may arise and considering criminal aspects over which there may be Federal jurisdiction.

We wish to commend the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its agents whose devoted and persistent efforts have made these inquiries possible.

We were amazed to learn that there are no restrictions of any consequence on the purchase and sale or the use of dynamite. It is bought and sold over the counter like any other commodity. There is no requirement for the keeping of an inventory of stock on hand and no safeguards to prevent its theft. There is no record of the persons to whom it is sold except such records as are kept by legitimate concerns in the ordinary course of business. There is no accounting for its use by those who acquire it.

In recent years dynamite has become an instrument of terror, not only in Florida, but, so we are advised, in other States as well. As an instrument of terror it has certain advantages over the more old-fashioned types of mob violence. With it criminal designs can be carried out by small groups of ruthless men in utmost secrecy and in the darkness of the night. The design may be harbored for months and finally carried out only when the time and circumstances are propitious. Dynamite leaves no traces. In its wake is only wreckage and death. It destroys clues along with life and property. Its victim is helpless against it. The perpetrators may be far from the scene of the crime when the blast occurs. Such crimes are difficult to solve. They will continue difficult as long as explosives can be bought or stolen with no more difficulty than the buying or the stealing of a sack of citrus fruit. It is a matter which must be considered seriously by authorities everywhere. Local ordinances can help. A State law with comprehensive requirements and with real teeth would go far to control it and it may be that Federal statutes relating to interstate shipments should be reexamined.

We learned that the simple need for housing can result in tension and strife. In the city of Miami 40,262 people are members of the Negro race (1950 census). They occupy less than 5 percent of the available residential area. It is no secret that some of their housing is of a type so primitive as to be called slums. Negro shacks can be built at small cost. Their facilities for comfort and sanitation are generally an absolute minimum. They command a high rental and are generally rated as a highly profitable investment. It is a type of exploitation that ought to shock the conscience of any community.

Adequate housing for the Negroes, as well as for others, is a subject which ought to command the earnest attention of city authorities and of the public generally. Slum areas are festering sores in any city, producing disease and giving rise to resentments and tensions that may be far reaching in their adverse effects. Much can be done by intelligent planning. The citizens of Orlando have set an example in this regard that might well be followed in other communities. There, through a combination of private enterprise, Government assistance under the FHA, and city planning, was created the development on Lake Mann, which could well be a model for other cities to follow.

So large a segment of the population cannot long remain in less than 5 percent of the available housing area. Their facilities must of necessity be expanded. If it is not done according to some intelligent planning it will be done in a haphazard manner giving rise to such tension and stress as resulted from the conversion of a part of Knights Manor to Carver Village. (Knights Manor was a huge 446-unit, garden-type apartment development located in northwest Miami, adjacent to Edison Center.) It is a social problem of grave importance affecting the welfare of the whole community. It should receive the most earnest attention of the authorities. Private individuals or companies actuated solely by the desire for personal gain often create such explosive situations. The affair of Carver Village simply points up the urgent need for slum clearance and adequate housing. Apathy and inaction is an open invitation for another Carver Village. Such things can be avoided but only by statesmanship of a high order on the part of those in authority and by a genuine, sympathetic understanding on the part of the public plus a will to get the problem solved.

We learned much about the Ku Klux Klan. Its organization and structure was examined at length with its weird names, its perverted psychology, and its methods of action. Every local klavern is headed by an exalted cyclops. The other officers are the klaliff, the kligrapp, the klabee, the klokard, the kludd, the kladd, the klarago, the klexter, the klokan, and the night-hawk. Its meetings are said to be opened with prayer, it has a woman's auxiliary and its mission in life now is to fight communism. It has a klokann committee, sometimes called the wrecking crew. This committee performs the normal functions of a membership committee but it is also an investigating committee. It investigates complaints made to the local klavern and takes whatever action may be deemed necessary. The action may take the form of burning a cross, or a K (the burning of crosses was recently outlawed by the Florida Legislature), or the call of a delegation on some person who has been neglecting his family, or running around with other women, or other acts of alleged misconduct, or the action may take more violent forms. There is a standing klokann committee but its chief may recruit others from the general membership for special jobs. Acts by individual members, singly or in groups, on their own initiative are not unknown, but such action by ambitious young members new to the order may draw a reprimand with an admonition to leave such things to the shock troops. Members frequently take weapons to meetings and in at least one klavern it was customary for the outer guard (night-hawk) to be armed.

We deem it proper to give a brief account of the acts of terror and violence that have come under our scrutiny. Not all of them are attributed to the Klan. The plaintive wail has been often heard that the Klan does not stand for lawlessness but is blamed for acts committed by others. We, therefore, do not attribute any act to the Klan, or to its members, except in instances where one or more of its members have admitted participation.

In May of 1947, a group of klansmen, about nine in number, from the John B. Gordon Klavern of Hialeah, Fla., waited upon a citizen of that community and discussed with him certain domestic difficulties he was having at that time. The discussion was not friendly.

In 1947, the home of Mamie Woodward, located on 75th Street, Miami, between 14th and 15th Avenues, was burned to the ground. The house was in a white residential area but was occupied by a Negro family. The fire appears to have been of incendiary origin.

In the fall of 1950 a Negro family moved into a residence at 5260 NW. 32d Avenue, Miami. This was a white residential area. The John B. Gordon Klavern received a letter of complaint from certain of the residents of the area. A delegation of the Klan met with the complaining parties. The Klan was requested to take action, whatever might be necessary to move the residents out. The Klan delegation countered with the proposition that if the neighbors would furnish one man for each man supplied by the Klan direct action would be taken. The complaining parties declined and the matter was dropped. But in the meantime the occupants of the residence received a number of telephone calls threatening violence.

In 1946 a group of four Klansmen from the John B. Gordon Klavern burned a cross in the front yard of a fellow member because he had been talking too much. It was a warning and a threat.

On July 14, 1951, a number of large "K's" were burned in various locations in the city of Miami by members of the John B. Gordon Klavern. The burnings were in or on the fringes of Negro residential areas. These burnings were incident to a membership drive.

In April of 1950 Klan stickers were found plastered on a picture show in Fort Lauderdale, Fla. which was then running a picture by the name of "Pinky." The picture dealt with crossing the color line.

On the evening of August 8, 1951, there was a gathering of Klansmen at Carver Village. These Klansmen were members variously of the John B. Gordon Klavern at Hialeah, and Dade No. 2 in Miami. The first was affiliated with the Southern Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, and the second with the Association of Georgia Klans. This demonstration occurred at a time when a part of Knights Manor was being converted from white to Negro residential property and renamed Carver Village. A Negro man who had just driven up to the curb and was alighting from the car was assaulted by a member of the Klan and a stone was thrown through his windshield. A policeman undertook to arrest the assailant but he tripped the officer and fled into the darkness of an adjacent area. The demonstration was for the purpose of preventing a riot.

On June 5, 1951, an explosion occurred in the incompleted building of the Tifereth Israel Northside Center, located at 6500 North Miami Avenue, Miami. The charge was placed in a small projection of the unfinished building and damage was done to the floor and walls.

On the morning of October 9, 1951, four grade school children, while on the way to school observed two sticks of dynamite in the east front entrance of Temple Israel in Miami. The children removed the dynamite and put it in water at the curb. Painted on the wall of Temple Israel in large red letters was the symbol KKK and a large red cross. The two sticks were wrapped together with twine. A fuse with blasting cap was attached.

On the morning of October 15, 1951, the sexton of the Miami Hebrew School and Congregation found in the doorway to the church two sticks of 60 percent Red Cross dynamite, to which was attached a fuse and a cap. One inch of the end of the fuse that was not crimped into the cap had been burned.

On December 2, 1951, there was an explosion at the Miami Hebrew School and Congregation. The explosion was outside the church. There was a hole in the lawn several feet from the wall of the church and about 2 feet from the edge of the sidewalk, indicating that the explosive had been thrown from a passing automobile. Windows of the church on the north side were shattered.

About midnight on December 8, 1951, the officer of Tifereth Israel Northside Center received a telephone call from an unknown person, who stated, "Tonight we are going to take care of them all." On the same night the chief of police of Coral Gables received a telephone call by an unknown person who said, "We will bomb the synagogue." On the following morning one stick of dynamite was found on the lawn of the Coral Gables Jewish Center. Several feet from the dynamite was a metal blasting cap into which had been crimped a length of fuse.

On the morning of December 23, 1951, the sexton of St. Peter and Paul Catholic Church, 900 SW. 26th Road, Miami, found a stick of dynamite in the entrance of the church. Attached to the dynamite was a cap and fuse similar to those found at the Jewish centers and synagogues.

On the night of September 22, 1951, two tremendous explosions occurred in rapid succession at Carver Village. A 16-unit apartment building was wrecked. The explosions were at opposite ends of the building. Between these two locations and up against the wall of the building, was found a box containing 88 sticks of dynamite. This had failed to explode but it was equipped with fuse and cap. These explosions climaxed a long controversy between the owners of the Knights Manor housing development and the residents of the adjacent residential area, over the conversion of a part of the development into colored residential property. The controversy had been characterized by protest meetings, motorcades, and much agitation. The situation at Carver Village had been discussed at meetings of the John B. Gordon Klavern and members of both Dade County Klans were present at the demonstration at Carver Village on the night of August 8.

The conversion at Carver Village proceeded apace and on the night of November 30, 1951, a second apartment building was wrecked by an explosion. Both buildings were vacant at the time of the explosions and there was no loss of life.

On the night of December 25, 1951, Christmas night, at Mims, Fla., the home of Harry T. Moore was partially wrecked by a blast of dynamite or other type of high explosive. The charge was placed under the floor of a bedroom at a point directly under the bed occupied by Moore and his wife, Harriet. Present in the huose at the time of the explosion were Moore and his wife, his daughter, and his mother. The latter two were in another part of the house and were unaffected by the blast except by way of physical and mental shock.

The Moores had spent a festive day with friends and relatives at a neighboring home and had returned to their own cottage in the early evening. One by one the family retired to rest and silence settled on the household. The explosion literally blew the bedroom apart. It was a complete shambles with the floor demolished, the walls shattered and the ceiling collapsed. The bed upon which Moore and his wife slept had evidently been blown against the ceiling and had fallen back into the wreckage. The mother was stunned but the daughter went screaming into the night in search of help. Relatives arrived, those with whom the Moores had spent the day. Harry T. Moore never regained consciousness. He died as he was being rushed to a hospital in Sanford. His wife died there a few days later.

From all accounts Moore was a man well liked by people of both races who knew him. So far as is known he had no personal enemies. He was quite and studious and a prolific letterwriter. He sought to advance his race but his methods were not violent or subversive. But he was persistent. He helped to raise money for the defense of the Groveland rape case and he sought to promote a Progressive Voters League.

We have summoned before us certain members from various Klaverns in central Florida, for these Klaverns were known to have evinced a malevolent interest in the activities of Harry T. Moore. In the summer of 1949, shortly following the trial of the rape case at Groveland, a floor plan of the Moore home was exhibited at a meeting of one of these Klaverns. On a subsequent occasion a member of another Klavern said he had visited Mims and indicated that his interest had been the Moore home. Newspaper clippings of Moore's activities were read at Klavern meetings. Mention was made of him on other occasions and in other places.

We inquired into other acts of violence in central Florida. We learned that there are such things as expert loaders, men adept at seizing a victim from his front door or elsewhere. With one man on either side a sort of double half nelson, or other kindred hold, is clamped upon the victim's head so he cannot look up. This prevents identification. He is crowded into a car face down with a gun sometimes held at the back of his head. He is then driven to some secluded spot selected in advance where he is forced to crawl from the car face down. His clothing is partly removed and a beating is administered with the official strap, rubber hose, or other instrument, while someone or more of the assailants hold him down. The guardians of private morality then drive away leaving the victim to find his painful way home, or sometimes to a hospital. Shots are fired at times as a parting admonition.

Such things have gone on in central Florida for many years. In 1943 a white man was beaten near Oviedo, Fla., by a group of six Klansmen. The reason given was the molesting of a white girl. Again, in 1943 a white man and woman were beaten near Winter Garden by three Klansmen, perhaps others. Memories are vague after such a lapse of time. Again, near Winter Garden in 1944, a white man was beaten by a group of five Klansmen. The reason given was drinking and neglecting his family. In 1945 near Winter Garden, a white man was beaten by four Klansmen for molesting a girl.

In 1947 two white girls were taken from a secluded lake near Ocoee, by five Klansmen, driven to a lonely spot in an orange grove, and severely beaten. It was nighttime and the reason given, "They were bathing in the nude." In 1948 near Ocoee, a white woman was beaten by five Klansmen. The reason given was drinking and neglecting her family. In 1949 a large group of Klansmen participated in the burning of a shack near Apopka because the occupant, a white man was said to be molesting girls. Later, the same group undertook to administer a treatment but the victim escaped through the woods. Again, in 1949 near Apopka, a Negro man was beaten by five Klansmen for sassing white women.

In July of 1949, Klansmen from many points in central Florida converged on Groveland. The genesis of the rape case had just occurred. They carried weapons. Some had gasoline. The purpose was to prevent a riot. Several houses were burned. The National Guard was called out.

In August of 1949 three carloads of Klansmen undertook to waylay a car traveling from Tavares to Orlando. The passengers in this latter car were attorneys who had conducted the defense in the Groveland rape case and one or more newspaper reporters. There was conjecture among the Klansmen that Harry T. Moore might be a passenger in the car. On the hill beyond Lake Ola a car blinked its lights. This was a signal that the victim car was approaching. A road block was supposed to be formed at the foot of the hill by the other two cars. But this could not be done because the two cars were traveling too fast. It would have been dangerous to life and limb. Across a rolling country of surpassing beauty went the chase, past Lake Ola and through Apopka, at high speed. It was abandoned only when the intended victims reached the safety of Orlando.

In 1950 two attempts were made to beat a Negro man near Apopka each time by the approximately same group of Klansmen. On the first occasion the victim escaped unharmed, but a shot was fired at him as he ran. On the second occasion the loaders were successful, and the whipping began according to the usual formula, but the victim escaped when headlights signaled the approach of a car. Reason for beating—union activity.

On Easter Sunday, 1950, an orange picker of Winter Garden was taken out by a group of men and was later found with a fractured skull. A shoeshine boy of Winter Garden was given a treatment.

In April of 1951 a Negro man was pulled from his bed at a home in Winter Garden by a group of unidentified men. He was driven to a lonely spot in an orange grove and severely beaten. On the following morning he was reported missing to local peace officers by his common law wife. He was quickly found in the orange grove by a peace officer and taken to a hospital in Orlando. There it was found that he had not only been beaten but shot—in the back. He died.

In November of 1951 a creamette, located on the Orange Blossom Trail in Orlando, was bombed after the management had been warned to provide a window each for its white and Negro trade. This window situation had been discussed on the floor at meetings at the Klavern. A janitor of the First National Bank in Winter Garden was beaten by unidentified persons, and in 1952 a cabdriver, also of Winter Garden, was flogged by Klansmen. An employee of an iceplant in Sanford was taken out and beaten. Reason unknown.

One man withdrew from the hooded order, because he drew the line at flogging white people, and another was sometimes restrained even by his fellow Klansmen, because he was too brutal. Another withdrew, because the Klansmen indulged in practices for which they punished others.

We are well aware that this catalog of terror seems incredible. It is not complete. Details grow monotonous through sheer repetition. We heard evidence of other outrages both in the Miami area and in central Florida. Our inquiries were limited to those areas. We are advised, however, that such practices occur in some other parts of the State. It is obvious that all of these acts are primarily within the jurisdiction of the State police power. Federal jurisdiction where it exists, is only incidental to some other offense and is wholly inadequate. It is inherently a problem for State and local authorities.

We feel impelled to make some observations about the Klan. It seems probable that not all of its members are bad and vicious men. Some business and professional men belong to it. Peace officers of high and low degree have been numbered among its members. Some of these get in for political reasons. The attendance at meetings is generally small in relation to its total membership. We cannot believe that all of its members know what is done by some of them. But the results are inherent in the nature of the order. It is founded on the worst instincts of mankind. At its best, it is intolerant and bigoted. At its worst it is sadistic and brutal. Between these two poles it has its existence. Out of the wells of prejudice it draws its inspiration. It is a foul pollution in the body politic. It is a cancerous growth that will not be cured until the hand of every decent man is raised against it and the whole power of the law is marshaled to stamp it out.

The Ku Klux Klan has been placed on the list of subversive organizations prepared by the Department of Justice and issued by the U.S. Attorney General. Its place there is well deserved. In its own perverted way it is as destructive of basic American liberties as communism itself, and its very existence is calculated to breed more communism. It is without any doubt the duty of all good and patriotic American citizens, including those members of the Klan who retain a sense of decency, to furnish evidence of its evil practices whenever such shall come within their knowledge.

We think it not improper that these facts be made known to the public, for public opinion is a powerful force. Some of them are already bywords. Others are brought to light for the first time. It does no good to cover these things up and pretend they do not exist. We make no recommendations. The facts are recommendation enough. For these reasons we ask leave of the Court to file this report.

Authorized and respectfully submitted in behalf of the grand jury, this the 25th day of March 1953.

HUGH F. PURVIS,
Foreman.
RANDOLPH B. RAILEY,
Deputy Foreman.
L. L. OWENS,
Secretary.
L. E. BROOME,
EMORY S. AKERMAN,
Special Assistants to the Attorney General.

FEDERAL AID, POWER POLITICS, THE CARROT AND STICK AND RUBBERSTAMPS BRING FEDERAL DICTATION

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, for years we have been told that Federal aid and Federal involvement does not bring control. We have seen some very good examples of this control in recent days. U.S. Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel asserted a bald power grab recently in withholding over $30 million in Federal educational aid from the city of Chicago. He failed but the pattern is clearly there. This is what they want to do and sooner or later, unless something is done to check this trend, they will accomplish this goal.

This morning we saw a good example of what is happening to us in two isolated news stories in the New York Herald Tribune. A front-page story proclaims the happy support of Mayor Wagner and Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL for Democrat mayoral candidate Abraham Beame. What did the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] use for reasoning? Just listen to his own words:

> I know he's (referring to Republican-Liberal candidate JOHN LINDSAY) pretty. I know he's glamorous. I know he's glib. But that ain't gon' bring him that Federal money here.

Get that—that ain't gon' bring him that Federal money here. The truth of the matter is that the administration and the majority party are endeavoring to use Federal expenditures to elect Democrats to Congress. I know a little about this bald grab for power because they have been announcing post offices and Federal grants in my district through a Democrat candidate who is not representing the 17th Ohio District. People are intelligent enough to see that this is an effort to bribe you with your own money and this power politics is offensive to most right-thinking people. It is certainly a long way from the intention of the framers of our Constitution when we see this type of political chicanery. This is the way to get rubberstamp obedience and its resultant one-party rule.

We not only witness this at the legislative and executive level, we see groups demanding that we give them poverty money or they will riot. On page 2 of the same issue of the New York Herald Tribune, an account of the Haryou 5 percenters is carried. Livingston Wingate is administering that program in Harlem, Mr. Speaker. I know him to be a conscientious and hard-working public servant and while I am not in complete accord with all he is doing I am sure that he is doing the best possible under the circumstances. Last night he met with some of his problems. They heckled and shouted. As the News Perspective feature reported, Mr. Wingate tried to explain the organization's difficulties when a youth jumped onto the stage and told him:

> We know what we want. Go to Washington and tell them what we need. If you come back without an answer, we'll tell you another message to take to Washington: We want culture or death, equality or death.

LeRoi Jones, one of the storm centers in the Harlem situation talked about what he called "killer logic." He said:

> If that's what the white man understands, perhaps its time we take on that mantle; and if they make one shaky move, Watts will look like a picnic.

This is a good indication of what we are coming to and it parallels the deplorable situation in Washington whereby statesmanship is forgotten and expediency is triumphant.

Then we see the spectacle of the labor bosses threatening to withhold funds from the Democrats if they fail in their effort to repeal 14(b) next year. This is a good indication of why they contribute to candidates. They do not want good government; they do not even want good men who will use their best judgment in representing the people back home. They want rubberstamps who will deliver when they demand it.

Yes, these are indeed strange times we live in. As I said before, it is not exactly what the Founding Fathers had in mind. Will the citizen learn in time and rise in indignation? I think the giant is lumbering. They do not want a rubberstamp Congress subservient to a President or to union bosses. They do not want a government which succumbs to threats whether it be from the likes of LeRoi Jones or some small nation which tells us how much foreign aid we will have to give them to keep them from going over to communism.

The people want honesty and statesmanship; they want independence on the part of their elected officials; they want candor. Above all, they want programs which are responsive to real needs and are designed to operate free from political maneuvering. They want one criteria observed at all times: the public interest. They do not want a proliferation of bureaucratic agencies controlling them from the cradle to the grave.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of cheese in the Federal mouse trap but you rarely see a happy mouse there.

I include the Haryou article at this point:

HARYOU AND THE 5 PERCENTERS

(By James W. Sullivan)

When Livingston Wingate tilted the lid on the 5-percenter problem last week, he indicated that members of the Negro youth terrorist group had been employed last summer in Haryou-ACT's crash antipoverty program, Project Uplift.

This not only brought charges from Dr. Kenneth Clark, Mr. Wingates predecessor as director of Haryou, that the youths were being paid off to prevent riots, but partly confirmed persistent reports of a relationship between Haryou-ACT and the followers of Clarence (Puddin') Smith.

There were many reports in Harlem that 5 percenters were employed in Project Uplift, so many that Basil Patterson, president of the New York chapter of the NAACP, felt compelled to reply to them.

"If Haryou-ACT did not employ 5 percenters during the summer, then there certainly is something seriously wrong with Haryou-ACT," he said "because these are the kind of youngsters that the program is designed to reach."

The reports say, however, that many present members of the 5 percenters were recruited into the organization while they were working for Project Uplift and that the hate group actually dominated the antipoverty program.

A somewhat conflicting report is that Project Uplift was so crowded with 5 percenters that nonmembers could not get the summer jobs.

"It was rough for the decent kids who wanted paying jobs," said one member of the Negro community, "It seemed to them that they were being penalized for being good."

Some police sources say that the 5 percenters regularly turned their Project Uplift pay over to the adults who lead the terrorist group.

Mr. Wingate's statements about the armed group that is ready to move have been brief and so generalized that he has not even named the group. A reporter attempting to investigate the 5 percenters called him several times before the Haryou-ACT director made his first statement Thursday, and has called him since. Mr. Wingate has not returned any of the calls. His comments on the various reports about Haryou-ACT and the 5 percenters therefore are not known.

But Mr. Wingate must be credited with at least making a public statement about the group. Nearly every other civic leader or public official refuses to talk about it, especially on the record.

One reason for this may be that New York City now is in the last stages of a bitterly fought mayoral campaign.

The police department's only official statements on the 5-percenter problem are the comment by Assistant Chief Inspector Harry Taylor that the situation was not dangerous and Deputy Commissioner Joseph Martin's declaration that the department would not cooperate in getting information on the group because it was too dangerous an organization.

Harlem's Congressman, Representative Adam Clayton Powell, said at a press conference yesterday that he had never heard of the 5 percenters. The press conference had been called to announce his support of Democrat Abraham Beame.

Mr. Powell added, incidentally, that he had talked to 4,000 Harlem residents in the last few days and found nothing to substantiate Mr. Wingate's contention that cutting off Haryou-ACT funds would bring a revolt.

In Harlem, one reason for the refusal of civic leaders to discuss the group appears to be fear of retaliation. Mr. Wingate said Thursday that if he said too much about it, "It'll be the late Wingate." At a rally supporting Haryou-ACT Saturday night, he rephrased his fear. "My body is not impervious to bullets," he said.

Another fear of responsible people is that public knowledge of the group may inflame racial tensions and that publicity may swell its membership.

The refusal of officials to talk about the 5-percenters has made it difficult for newspapers to fulfill what they consider their responsibility to inform the public of the menace from a dangerous organization. But a reporter's two-week investigation, involving cross-checked information from sources who would not allow their names to be used indicated the 5 percenters are a very dangerous organization.

There are plenty of traffickers in racism in Harlem who would be willing to talk about the 5 percenters, but their statements and their information would be calculated to inspire the fear and racism that serves their particular purposes.

Some of this was apparent at the Haryou-ACT rally Saturday night. It was attended by about 200 adults, 100 teenagers, and 100 preteens. The youngsters were described by one man as 5 percenters and by others as members of the Black Arts group headed by poet-playwright Le Roi Jones.

The youngsters heckled the speakers, including Sammy Davis, Jr., and Mr. Wingate. When Mr. Davis told them they needed lobbyists for Haryou-ACT, they shouted, "we need some gangsters." When Mr. Wingate tried to explain the organization's difficulties, a youth jumped onto the stage and told him:

"We know what we want. Go to Washington and tell them what we need. If you come back without an answer, we'll tell you another message to take to Washington: We want culture or death, equality or death."

Mr. Jones was not heckled when he talked about using "killer logic."

"If that's what the white man understands, prehaps it's time we take on that mantle; and if they make one shaky move, Watts will look like a picnic," he said.

But for anyone who thinks Harlem is populated entirely by Negroes seething with resentment of the white man and lusting for government money, the attendance at that rally does as much as anything to put Harlem in perspective.

The committee supposedly sent out 100,000 pieces of literature advertising the meeting. Only 400 persons attended. The committee was disappointed.

LET US PROTECT THE AMERICAN PATENT SYSTEM

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, at a ceremony held recently in Pearl River, N.Y., the New York State Civil Defense Commission presented a Ten-Year Industrial Preparedness Award to Lederle Laboratories Division of American Cyanamid Co.

Speaking to a large number of Lederle employees and Federal and State officials including Governor Rockefeller, Rear Adm. E. W. Sutherling, commanding officer of the U.S. Naval Supply Center in Bayonne, N.J., pointed out the great role that Lederle has played in preparing our country for any emergency that may arise in these perilous times.

The admiral's observations were certainly true and applicable to all American industry. Let me go on to emphasize, moreover, that in relying on the ingenuity and products of industry for our national security, the Defense Department and its various procurement agencies must be keenly aware of the fact that our patent system has for 175 years been the very basis of our industrial progress, a progress unmatched anywhere in the world.

The American patent system is based on the principle, accepted since the foundation of our country, that the inventor should be protected by law in the exclusive use of his invention for a stated number of years. It is in this fashion that we have created an incentive system that has become a prime factor in our unparalleled economic growth. We are this very week observing the 175th birthday of this system.

Yet we find today that the Government gives with one hand but takes away with the other. For a number of years now, the U.S. Government, and ironically enough, the Defense Establishment in particular, have systematically bought medical supplies, such as broad-spectrum antibiotics, in foreign countries where they have been produced in flagrant breach of U.S. patents developed by American companies after expenditures of millions of dollars in research and testing.

By purchasing supplies produced from stolen patents and pirated processes, our Government has deprived our own industry of substantial income; has caused the unemployment of several thousand workers in the pharmaceutical industry alone; and has, in effect, actively encouraged the larceny of American patents by unscrupulous foreign companies.

In order to stem this serious outflow of U.S. resources caused by the breach of our patent system by our own Government, I have introduced a bill which would prohibit these practices. The measure is still in committee and I should like to express my hope that it will be given the green light in the foreseeable future.

We can be grateful that the Defense Department, and Rear Admiral Sutherling, are appreciative of what industry is doing for our preparedness; but I hope that the contradiction between thinking and practice will come to an early end. Mr. Speaker, I include Rear Admiral Sutherling's remarks as part of the Record at this point:

Remarks by Rear Adm. E. W. Sutherling

Dr. Parker, Governor Rockefeller, General Asensio, Chairman Slocum, Mr. O'Connor, distinguished guests, I am particularly pleased to attend this award ceremony, as the occasion emphasizes a condition of preparedness so vital to our country, the State of New York, and our Armed Forces. The Navy is ever aware of the need for readiness. We are impressed that the New York State Civil Defense Commission has singled out Lederle Laboratories, here at Pearl River, for its 10-year industrial preparedness award. We are proud to be asked to participate in this occasion and extend to Lederle Laboratories a well-deserved traditional Navy "Well done."

As many of you are aware, the Chief of Naval Material is directly responsible for industrial readiness planning within the Department of the Navy. The Inspector of Naval Material, New York, has the responsibility of monitoring the effectiveness of the industrial readiness program at Lederle.

Production schedules and requirements pertaining to mobilization or M day have already been established for the Pearl River plant. Should that day come, the mobilization schedule will be placed in effect. The Navy's surveys have shown that you at

Lederle are well prepared for this eventuality. Lederle proved that point during the Cuban crisis when you quickly and effectively responded to a call for a large amount of medical supplies.

This kind of preparedness is essential to our freedom. It is the difference between our sense of security and national trepidation.

Today, in this period known as peacetime, Lederle supplies the U.S. Navy with vital drugs and medical supplies. Your efforts here in Pearl River are well known. Products supplied here are utilized and recognized by the U.S. Navy operating forces afloat throughout the world. Today, we have the 2d Fleet in the Atlantic, the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean, and the 7th Fleet in the western Pacific. All of these fine sailormen rely on your products.

The Inspector of Naval Material, New York, is responsible for industrial defense and disaster planning. At Lederle, the Navy production representative confers with management on the potential problems of continuing production. We must anticipate all possible disasters, either of a natural origin, such as hurricanes, fires, and floods—or a national emergency. Lederle Laboratories not only has such an emergency plan but has indicated that it has the capacity for backing up such preparedness in any emergency.

Preparedness for any disaster or emergency is a prerequisite for survival in today's world. The Navy has trained personnel to deliver this message to industrial concerns in all parts of the country. It certainly is gratifying to see the results of these efforts. However, the high degree of cooperation at Lederle is a very significant factor in the procurement planning of the Armed Forces.

The planning of Lederle Laboratories is outstanding and I hope that your example to others whose production capacity is essential will inspire them to more effectively assist the United States in the challenges of today and the future.

The award you receive today from the State of New York has been well earned.

We in the Navy salute you.

VIETNAM: PFC. RICHARD BURGANS AND CAPT. WILLIAM NICHOLS VS. THE DEMONSTRATORS

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, recently two fine young men from New Jersey gave their lives in Vietnam. Pfc. Richard Burgans, a paratrooper and a Negro, and Capt. William Nichols, a white career officer, were ambushed by the Vietcong while on patrol. They both knew why they fought so far from home. They both believed they were fighting to preserve freedom not only for our country but for all humanity. On October 8, the Newark Evening News, in a moving editorial, paid tribute to these two valiant soldiers.

It is particularly shameful that we should see demonstrations such as took place last weekend while brave young Americans risk their lives daily in Vietnam for the very principle which permits these demonstrations directed against them. An editorial in today's Newark Evening News, "The Demonstrators," places in proper perspective the reaction of the majority of Americans to such demonstrations, purportedly held in the interest of peace. As the editorial states:

> Most Americans share a revulsion to war. The point of departure is that most Americans realize peace cannot be waged unilaterally.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all want the situation in Vietnam to move from the battlefield to the conference table. The majority of the American people have demonstrated their support for President Johnson's persistent efforts to achieve this end, but at the same time their realization that we cannot abandon the Vietnamese people to Communist terrorism and proceed to negotiation at the point of Vietcong guns. It is the words and thoughts of Private First Class Burgans and Captain Nichols we must listen to if we are to bring about a just and honorable resolution of the Vietnamese conflict. All the misguided, pointless, and callous protests and demonstrations add up to nothing when placed against the beliefs for which Private First Class Burgans and Captain Nichols were willing to make the ultimate sacrifice. Under unanimous consent, I include these two editorials from the Newark Evening News of October 8 and October 18 in the Record at this point:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Oct. 8, 1965]

In Vietnam

Two men from New Jersey went out on a patrol in Vietnam this week. One was an enlisted man, Pfc. Richard Burgans, of Newark, a paratrooper and a Negro. The other was white, a career officer, Capt. William Nichols, of Ridgewood.

Both knew why they were fighting in Vietnam, far from home and family.

In a letter to his mother, Private First Class Burgans expressed it this way:

"I'm glad I'm here to do what I can for my country and humanity."

Captain Nichols' father spoke for his son in saying: "Bill felt if we did not oppose a Communist takeover in Vietnam, before long we'd be fighting on our own territory."

Both men, it appears, went out on that patrol feeling they were fighting not just for themselves, or family, or country, but for all humanity. Of course, it would be better for humanity if there were no fighting in Vietnam or anywhere else in the world.

But to these men the origin of the war was clear, the necessity for making a stand self-evident.

They died on that patrol in Vietnam, killed in ambush by the Vietcong.

There are those who say we should get out of Vietnam; that Americans like Private First Class Burgans and Captain Nichols should not have to die there. Indeed they should not.

But so long as there is an enemy embarked on the destruction of freedom, that enemy must, for the sake of humanity, be stopped. That is what Private First Class Burgans and Captain Nichols believed.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Oct. 18, 1965]

The Demonstrators

The Nation was exposed over the weekend to the sight of thousands of its youth marching in protest against U.S. policy in Vietnam. It was, in many respects, an ugly sight, one a majority of Americans found repugnant.

Reluctance to fight in any war is natural. To fight in defense of a principle thousands of miles from our seemingly secure shores lacks the compulsion of responding to a Pearl Harbor. Negotiation, nonviolence, pacificism—all are far preferable to bloodshed, to humans killing fellow humans.

The marchers are not the only ones who believe this. Most Americans share a revulsion to war.

The point of departure is that most Americans realize peace cannot be waged unilaterally. They know that if this country were to lay down its arms, none of its avowed adversaries would follow suit. Where, for example, are the peace marchers in Hanoi or Peiping?

It is one thing to urge our withdrawal from South Vietnam and quite another to consider the consequences of such action. It is these consequences that the demonstrators choose to ignore.

What would be the state of our world if freedom were not defended in Berlin and the Communist tide that still engulfs Eastern Europe were permitted to roll to the Channel and beyond?

What would be the status of Africa's emerging nations if Communist incursions on that continent were not checked?

Finally, and more to the point now at issue, what chance would our way of life have if the United States were to forsake South Vietnam and the rest of southeast Asia? One glance at a map should be enough to indicate what security free nations would enjoy if Chinese Communist influence were to extend down through southeast Asia and across Indonesia.

There's nothing glorious about fighting dirty little wars like the one in Vietnam. Understandably youths who are called upon to serve must question whether it's worth the sacrifice.

The answers come in many forms. Not the least of them is provided by those at Berkeley and elsewhere who have conscientiously set about to weaken our will and fragment our resistance to an alien ideology.

REMARKS ON RECEIVING THE A. B. C. KNUDSEN NATIONAL REHABILITATION AWARD

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a speech which I delivered at the Triscientific and Clinical Conference, Statler-Hilton Hotel, New York, July 15, 1965:

Remarks of John E. Fogarty, Member of Congress From Rhode Island Upon Receiving the Dr. A. B. C. Knudsen National Rehabilitation Award at the Triscientific and Clinical Conference, New York, N.Y., July 15, 1965

I am happy to be here tonight and I thank you for honoring me with the Dr. A. B. C. Knudsen National Rehabilitation Award.

Dr. Knudsen, as director of the Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Service of the Veterans' Administration, has made many contributions to rehabilitation of the disabled. His career is a fine example of professional achievement. His concepts and application of total rehabilitation to the lives of thousands of disabled veterans has earned the great admiration of his colleagues in health and rehabilitation. It is fitting that these awards be made in his name.

The respect I have for those who cultivate the fields of rehabilitation is profound. I have come to know them well. I have had the opportunity to gain an understanding of their problems and their aspirations for rehabilitation. Through the work of the appropriations subcommittee which I have chaired for several years, I too have endeavored to serve the disabled people of the country. I shall continue to regard it as a privilege.

In the pageant of medical achievement which has passed before us in recent years, I have listened to hundreds of experts in many fields discuss all phases of health and rehabilitation. I am greatly impressed with the volume of knowledge that is unfolded and made available to the health professions. I am equally impressed with the forward thrust of planning for those professions—particularly in the great complex for health research at the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Md., just outside Washington.

Within their scope is comprehensive planning for improved national health for the 200 million people who will soon populate the United States. I have seen the funds appropriated for this important work increase dramatically, from $4 million in 1946 to more than a billion dollars in 1965.

Throughout all fields of health, including the rehabilitation of disabled people, 1965 is and will be a year of intense activity. Those of us concerned with rehabilitation—and I have been very much concerned for these many years—the pace of change around us is impressive. Some of this change is coming from the laboratories of the scientists. Some of it is being generated in the Congress, in response to widespread demands by the American people. Many of these changes will have prompt and substantial effects upon the programs and practice of rehabilitation in the United States.

As we meet here tonight, the Congress is in the final stages of enacting one of the most important pieces of legislation in our Nation's history. The older people of the United States will soon have available a national system of hospital insurance, guaranteeing covered workers under social security at least a minimum and basic protection against the financial and other hazards of illness and injury in old age. The legislation supplements the basic health insurance program with numerous other forms of protection and service. Taken together, this vast addition to our social security system will dramatically improve the health care given to our older people, while at the same time it protects and strengthens the patterns of medical practice and service which have produced our present-day high level of medical care.

While this legislation is being readied, the Nation is in the early stages of developing a massive attack on the problems of poverty among our people. It is inconsistent with our whole approach to a self-respecting society that large numbers of Americans should live at a poverty level while our country generally enjoys a high degree of affluence. When one looks at the causes of poverty there are many component parts. Certainly inadequate education is at the root of the problem for large numbers of young people and adults. It is for this reason that the Congress has recently enacted several major pieces of legislation in the field of education. These range from elementary and secondary schools, through vocational and technical training and into higher education. Taken together, these new laws as well as some of the pending legislation reflect the determination of the American people to make a full and complete education available to every young American and to provide the kind of skills which our economy will need in the coming years.

In 1962 the Congress enacted the public welfare amendments which made important changes in our approach to the problems of those who must depend upon public funds for their support. The new law authorized an increased Federal share in the costs of rehabilitative services and certain other service programs, designed to encourage the States to get at the cause of poverty as well as to deal with the results of it through a relief check.

For several years I have insisted in the Congress that the Nation make some special provisions for our aging citizens. I have introduced bills for this purpose. This year I introduced a bill to provide for a new separate agency to give the special attention that is required for our senior citizens.

I am happy to say that the President has just signed into law a new act to carry out the legislation I introduced. It will establish the Administration on Aging as a new agency of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Through this new Administration on Aging, we expect to see a much better coordination of governmental activities concerned with the aging and the process of aging. We expect to see its research and other grant programs contribute materially to much more effective programs for the aged in this country.

New legislation has been enacted to improve the working conditions and the health of migratory workers. Congress has concerned itself with the problems of juvenile delinquency and has authorized a special program to deal with these problems. We have launched new grant programs to help train more teachers, with specific provisions for training more teachers of handicapped young people. The Public Health Service is now conducting special programs to expand and improve community health services. Through other recent laws, the Nation is endeavoring to create new and more modern mental health facilities, located in a community setting where all the other health and social resources for dealing with mental illness are close at hand.

We have given special thought to the problems that exist in the Appalachian region of the United States, where mountain terrain and rural conditions have held back economic progress and largely stifled the growth of adequate health services. At the same time we have made numerous special provisions for dealing with the problems in our large cities, where crowded conditions and social problems have produced a state of economic and human decay.

Throughout all these problems which we recognize in our society, there runs a thread that is common to all—the need for better health services and a more constructive rehabilitation approach. Poverty and ill health are old friends; they have been supporting each other for centuries. We cannot deal effectively with one without giving proper attention to the other. One of the most important things contributed by rehabilitation programs in the last several years is an understanding of disability as the normal outcome of neglect of health. In the process we are coming to realize also that neglect of rehabilitation goes hand in hand with public dependency.

As our fund of knowledge in rehabilitation has grown during the last decade, we have less excuse for ignoring the needs of the several million disabled people in this country. For most of them, we know what to do.

Now, today, we are setting about the task of doing it. Many of the new programs I have mentioned briefly will help in this tremendous task. Perhaps the most important single step we can take is still pending before the Congress. I refer to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1965. We expect this important legislation to be enacted by the Congress this year and I should like to describe it briefly, for it promises to have tremendous impact on the Nation's effort to adequately serve its disabled citizens.

The Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, which is the Federal partner in this Federal-State program, would have several new programs to strengthen the work being done to restore more handicapped people to activity and employment. A basic improvement would be in the financing of this public program, by providing a 75-percent Federal share of the costs of the total program. For most States, this will mean a substantial increase in the funds they will have available—and it will mean that thousands more disabled people will be served each year. This improved financing should also encourage States to provide more State funds, so that in a few years this national program of vocational rehabilitation should have the funds it needs to serve all disabled people who can be rehabilitated to employment.

A special program of grants to States would be available, financed 90 percent by Federal funds, to assure rehabilitation services to the large number of very severely disabled people who so often do not get services today. This is aimed at paraplegics, the deaf, the mentally retarded, the deaf-blind, severe arthritics and others where the rehabilitation task is especially difficult and expensive.

The pending legislation also would make a major national effort to improve sheltered workshops in this country. Funds would be available to help construct new workshops, and to alter and expand and equip existing ones. Grants would be available to provide expert technical assistance in various phases of workshop operations. A separate system of grants would be provided to enable individual workshops to improve their work in a variety of ways.

Separate funds would be available for projects to provide job training for handicapped people in workshops. As part of this, handicapped persons would, for the first time, be able to receive a training allowance, payable weekly, to provide the financial help and encouragement which so many severely handicapped people need if they are to become trained and ready for work.

Perhaps as important as any other single provision is the plan to establish a National Policy and Performance Council on workshops. This advisory body would draw up the criteria and standards for an adequate workshop. These would be considered by the vocational Rehabilitation Administration in deciding whether to make grants for the training services I have just mentioned. At the same time the work of this council should speed up the adoption of proper standards by the whole workshop movement in this country.

The legislation would set new patterns in many other ways. Each State would have grant funds available for a 2-year statewide planning effort, aimed at developing the resources needed to rehabilitate all people in the State who need this help, and to do it not later than 1975.

Through a new provision of the bill, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration would establish a nationwide data system on rehabilitation. This new service would provide comprehensive information on the Federal-State program, on research in rehabilitation, on rehabilitation centers and workshops, on the field of prosthetics and orthoptics and various other phases. It would function as a service for the public program, for private agencies and for individual researchers in the field.

I believe you can see the tremendous potential here for a broad expansion and improvement of rehabilitation in this country. It comes at a time when rehabilitation workers, individually and as a professional field, need to modernize their programs and their ways of reaching and serving the disabled people who need their help.

You and your colleagues will be called upon to respond to many national needs.

One of these is before all of us now. I know you are familiar with the work of the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke. The extensive report of the Commission calls for a large-scale attack on these three categories of health problems. They are not only the Nation's leading killers, but they are also in the forefront of causes of severe disability. Not only has the Congress called upon our Nation's scientists to mount a large-scale program to combat these three—but we also have asked the rehabilitation community to do its share. The appropriation subcommittee, which I chair, recently took testimony on a supplemental request for funds to carry out the first steps of this new effort against heart disease, cancer, and stroke. The request included funds for a beginning in rehabilitation and I am encouraged by this favorable start.

It is the nature of my work, as chairman of an Appropriations Committee, to consider the costs of programs and to evaluate them many times in dollars and cents. But I am as much aware as you of the humanitarian aspects of health programs and rehabilitation. I realize, as you do, that rehabilitation starts with hope and a belief in the future of an individual. I know that, through your efforts, hundreds of thousands of disabled people have gained new hope in themselves and new confidence in the future. I know that the modern rehabilitation programs you direct are able to convert hope and confidence into achievement.

Let me say that I am pleased and proud to be a part of this whole process. Along with you, I look to a future for rehabilitation that will be as successful as intelligent planning, hard work, sound fiscal policies and the ingenuity of devoted people can make it.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcalls No. 168 and No. 169 on September 24, 1965, I was absent because of duty with the Public Works Committee inspecting hurricane damage in Louisiana. Had I been present, on rollcall No. 168 I would have voted "nay" and on rollcall No. 169 I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 191 on October 12, 1965, I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

LABOR POLICIES OF THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised, in the most pleasant way, to learn of the interest of the senior Senator from Oregon, the distinguished WAYNE MORSE, in the labor policies of the State of Texas. Senator MORSE's interest was demonstrated during the Senate debate on the proposed repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Interest in the deplorable and regressive labor policies of the State of Texas could not be more timely or well taken. As a native Texan, born and raised in San Antonio, who served as a city councilman and a State senator, I can testify as an eye witness, victim, observer, and legislator to the brutal and shocking labor conditions that exist in the State of Texas. Senator MORSE stated in his speech of October 11:

> Texas maintains some of the most shocking low labor standards in the country.

That statement is pathetically true.

When I was in the State senate, in 1957, I introduced the first minimum wage bill that had ever been introduced in the State senate. My bill would have provided for a minium wage of 40 cents an hour. Some of my colleagues may wonder why it was necessary to legislate a minimum wage so low as 40 cents an hour. The reason it was necessary was because there were persons in Texas actually receiving less than that amount in wages, and that a wage floor even that low would have been of considerable help to those people. Yet, I could not even get a committee hearing for the bill. I could not get the Governor's support for the bill. Today, there is still no minimum wage law, other than the Federal law, in the State of Texas. This situation, in my opinion, is illustrative of the entire labor policy of the State of Texas.

The State governmental machinery would fight as hard today against a State minimum wage law as it did in 1957 when I proposed one for 40 cents an hour. It would fight against such a law for real, practical reasons. Namely, to maintain a large portion of the labor force in a perpetual state of depression.

The State of Texas is failing to provide for the welfare of countless numbers of its citizens through its repressive labor policies. For this reason, the failure on the part of the State to act, it is necessary for the Congress to assume the responsibility. Thus we are now considering extending the scope of the Federal minimum wage law to cover persons not now protected.

I also support repeal of section 14(b), and I so voted when the bill passed the House. The so-called right-to-work law is used in the State of Texas in the same way the absence of minimum wage legislation is used: to repress the worker. In the city of San Antonio alone, just prior to the enactment of 14(b) there were 11 local unions in the garment factories located in town. Today, there are no unions in the local garment factories.

The traffic of Mexican citizens across the border to work in U.S. factories at substandard wages has also been mentioned by the senior Senator from Oregon. Everyone in Texas who cares to know knows it is true that such human exploitation exists in Texas. Of course, it is true that Mexicans are carted across the border to work in Texas factories, and are sent home to Mexico each night. These Mexican citizens take jobs away from American citizens because of the inferior wages paid. It is no use to quibble over the name of the factories in which these Mexican citizens work. Whether they work in textile mills or garment factories, they are in the United States taking jobs away from Americans, because their pitiful condition is taken advantage of.

I applaud the senior Senator from Oregon.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT IN THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on September 30 I spoke out on the floor of this House to protest the failure of the State of Texas to properly implement the Manpower Development and Training Act in Texas. This constructive and highly successful program was designed to equip unemployed men and women with the skills they must have to find employment. The success of the program is demonstrated by the fact that cumulative data through June 30, 1965, indicates that 74 percent of those persons trained under the program throughout the Nation have been placed in jobs. Clearly this is a program which should be supported, expanded and fully implemented.

In the State of Texas, I am sorry to say, the manpower training program is not being properly or fully implemented. In fact, State officials responsible for the operation of the program in Texas are today wilfully violating the intent of Congress in passing the act and the Federal policy. Specifically, noncompliance with Federal policy consists in the total exclusion of all private business and training schools from participation in Manpower Development and Training Act programs. Contrary to the plain language of the act, and particularly the amendment to the act passed this year, Texas State officials have taken the position that the public schools shall have a monopoly in the field of manpower training and that the private business and training schools, who are in the taxpaying sector of the economy, shall be excluded. This situation is well documented and I have been complaining about it and bringing it to the attention of the appropriate Federal and State officials for more than 5 months.

Some time ago I received a letter from the U.S. Office of Education, in response to an inquiry I made, stating that:

> Responsible State officials are now giving active consideration to the involvement of private schools in manpower training.

I was gratified to learn that after almost 3 years from the time the act was first passed that the State of Texas was now giving consideration to proper implementation of the act. But I served notice on the Office of Education as well as the State agencies involved that I would not be satisfied until private schools in Texas were in fact given an opportunity to contribute to the program.

Today, I am pleased to report that after additional inquiries, the Office of Education has informed me that it has notified all the States that Federal approval and funding of projects will be withheld where the State refuses to permit private business and training schools to participate in Manpower Development and Training Act programs. It should be noted that Manpower Development and Training Act is funded 100 percent with Federal funds. This fact should be marked with more than passing interest by all the Federal and State officials concerned with the program.

I have also been informed that a meeting has been scheduled by Texas State officials with the private school community at Austin, Tex., on November 2, to resolve the question of utilization of private schools in the manpower program.

It should be remembered that the act was amended this year for the specific purpose of establishing guidelines for the States to follow in determining whether to use public or private schools, and to further encourage the use of private schools where they can provide equipment and training not available in public schools, or where at comparable cost they can provide substantially equivalent training, or an expanded use of the individual referral method, or aid in reducing more quickly unemployment or current and prospective manpower shortages.

State and Federal officials throughout the Nation, not only in Texas, should take cognizance of these guidelines. This is no time to smother our manpower program under clouds of regulations interpreted with narrow vision. It is my hope that the letter being circulated by the Office of Education will serve to invigorate the manpower program and to encourage State officials to make full use of it.

With unanimous consent I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of the circular letter of the U.S. Office of Education, dated October 14, 1965.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., October 14, 1965.

C.L. 4093.

Sent to: State directors of vocational education.

Sent by: Walter M. Arnold, Assistant Commissioner for Vocational and Technical Education.

Subject: Use of private educational or training institutions for manpower training.

Statutory provisions and congressional intent: Section 231 of the Manpower Development and Training Act as amended provides that "* * * State agencies shall provide * * * training through public educational agencies or institutions or through arrangements with private educational or training institutions where such private institutions can provide equipment or services not available in public institutions, particularly for training in technical and subprofessional occupations, or where such institutions can, at comparable cost, (1) provide substantially equivalent training, or (2) make possible an expanded use of the individual referral method, or (3) aid in reducing more quickly unemployment or current and prospective manpower shortages."

Senate Report No. 123 contains the following explanation of this action: "The committee adopted an amendment setting forth specific guidelines for the States to follow in determining whether to use public or private facilities for institutional training. The committee feels that the present requirement that private facilities can only be used if they make possible reduced Federal expenditures is too restrictive and tends to discourage the States use of private institutions where existing private facilities might have advantages over public facilities. Specifically, private institutions may have equipment or services not available in public facilities. Furthermore, training of individuals may be facilitated where a particular training course is available at a private school."

House Report No. 170 states: "Congress, when it passed the act in 1962, intended that the facilities of properly qualified, private training institutions could be used for Manpower Development and Training Act training. In 1963, Congress reemphasized its desire to have private institutions participate in the program by specifically amending the act to authorize the State vocational education agencies to contract for training with such institutions where they 'can provide substantially equivalent training with reduced Federal expenditures.'

"Hearings on this bill indicated that private training institutions have so far played a small but valuable role in the Manpower Development and Training Act program. These institutions can be especially helpful in achieving the purposes of the program in certain situations. One of these situations arises when private institutions possess more modern equipment and facilities than public training institutions. Another exists when a private institution can readily absorb into one of its ongoing programs an individually referred Manpower Development and Training Act trainee, or a small group of Manpower Development and Training Act trainees, and thus prevent these approved trainees from waiting until a specific new Manpower Development and Training Act project can be gotten underway in a public institution. An additional case is found when the capacity of public vocational schools and other public institutions in an area becomes too fully utilized to allow them to take on the desired number of Manpower Development and Training Act trainees. * * * In certain States, however, legal or other barriers may prevent a State's contributing (after June 30, 1966) the required 10 percent of training costs to a Manpower Development and Training Act project assigned to a private institution. In view of this situation, the committee has acted to authorize full Federal financing, where necessary, of training projects that can best be carried on in private institutions."

Project development and approval procedures: To insure that the intent of the Congress is complied with Office of Education regional Manpower Development and Training Act representatives may not approve projects unless the project application contains a statement signed by the State director of vocational education, or his authorized representative, documenting: (1) the names of private training institutions or agencies contacted to provide training; (2) that when the State agency proposes to award the training project to a private agency or institution, it is because of a finding that such institution can provide equipment or services that are not available in public institutions, particularly for training in technical and subprofessional occupations, or that such institution or agency can, at comparable or reduced cost,[1] (a) provide substantially equivalent training or, (b) make possible expanded use of individual referral procedures or, (c) aid in reducing more quickly unemployment or current and prospective manpower shortages.

This statement is to be inserted in each project file presented for final review and funding immediately before the training plan (Form OE-4014).

General or blanket certification to the effect that alternate facilities were considered in the selection of the training facility will no longer be accepted as meeting the requirement of article II-C of the agreement.

This procedure is to become effective immediately.

Copy of circular letter sent to chief State school officers.

POLAND'S MILLENNIUM

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, 7 years ago Americans of Polish ancestry solemnly commemorated the 350th anniversary of the arrival of the first Poles to the shores of America. They landed at Jamestown, Va., in September 1608.

Poland at that time was one of the great powers of Europe and had been contributing to the growth and development of Western civilization and culture for over 600 years, and existed as a state for at least eight centuries.

We are now approaching Poland's millennium of Christianity.

The year 1966 will mark the 1,000th anniversary of the baptism of the Polish Nation. Through this act, Poland linked her destiny with that of the West and became an integral and creative force in its culture, keeping at the same time, watch on the eastern ramparts of Christendom.

One thousand yesteryears represent one-half of our Christian era, spanning the early Middle Ages through our times.

In human equation, the millennium represents 40 generations.

These generations of Poland have built one of the most powerful and enlightened states in Europe. They basked in the glories of victories, knew the rich rewards of spiritual progress, the joy of intellectual attainments, the sorrow of defeats, the depth of suffering, the sustaining power of heroism and of faith in the face of mortal dangers.

In time of glory and in periods of adversity they learned how to put into practice the ideal of the brotherhood of man—"Za Wasza Wolnosc i Nasza"—For your freedom and ours.

---

[1] Training cost comparisons of public and private agencies or institutions considered shall be documented in terms of cost per trainee hour of instruction as well as total project costs.

This is our heritage.

Generally, only the highlights of Poland's history are known. Generally, we are aware only of the spectacular attainments and of the deep tragedies that were the lot of the land of our Polish ancestry.

This history is replete not only with military victories and political achievements attained in the formulation of the first Commonwealth of Nations in the European annals; this history does not end with the tragedy of partition and the transitory disintegration of the Republic, nor with the Soviet occupation.

To a sincere student, Poland's history discloses unexpected depths of political and sociological philosophy, and surprising lights of genius that foretold the development of modern thought and concept.

Preparations have begun for a nationwide observance of the 1,000th anniversary of the baptism of Poland. The message the Americans of Polish descent will bring to their fellow Americans will be based upon the theory that they should know and evaluate Poland, her past and her potentialities for the future, based on exploring the little known, the generally appreciated aspects of her thousand-year-long history.

The Polish-American Jamestown observance called to the attention of Americans the contribution of the Poles in the founding and development of the United States.

The millennial commemorations should bring to full light and recognition Poland's contribution to the Western World not alone as the sentinel upon the eastern ramparts of Western culture, but as a truly creative pioneering force in the development of Western thought—in political philosophy, in precepts of social justice, in concepts of the brotherhood of man, and in arts and sciences.

This in a proper perspective constitutes the purpose in organizing a nationwide observance of Poland's millennium. To bring this commemoration into focus of the widest range of our American citizens, I am introducing, this afternoon, House Joint Resolution 775 to authorize the President to issue a proclamation to commemorate this auspicious occasion and calling upon the people of the United States to observe this millennium with appropriate ceremonies and activities. I am also introducing H.R. 11654, a bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in observance of this occasion.

I certainly hope that these two proposals will receive favorable consideration of the committees to which they are assigned and that this honorable body will act upon them as early as possible after Congress reconvenes in January.

THE CONGRESS APPROVES UNANIMOUSLY OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 571—NATIONAL PARKINSON WEEK PROCLAMATION

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend my colleagues for their speedy approval of House Joint Resolution 571, my resolution that would authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning October 25 as National Parkinson Week. This bill was also cosponsored by my distinguished colleague, also from Miami, Mr. Fascell.

I am now proud to announce to this distinguished body that the Senate has today, acted on this resolution and approved it unanimously.

With this proclamation for a National Parkinson Week we will help to bring the full light of national publicity to bear on Parkinson's disease, and we have always found that national attention and concern focused on a serious problem will eventually lead to a solution.

National Parkinson Week will be the start of a national campaign to control this disease, uniting the medical profession, the press, and all agencies and individuals interested in a national program for the control of Parkinson's disease—certainly this proposal is in full accord with President Johnson's program to eradicate disease and improve the Nation's health.

Mr. Speaker, as one of the original sponsors of the Federal Government's National Cancer Institute and the National Heart Institute, I feel that this bill ranks in importance in the field of medicine, and the Government should not and must not limit its interest in Parkinson's disease.

This past weekend I was honored to speak at the National Parkinson Foundation Dinner held at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York City. Many outstanding figures attended this very successful dinner including the senior Senator from New York, Senator and Mrs. Jacob Javits.

At that time I pointed out that Parkinson's disease, which strikes without warning and is still a mystery to the medical profession, has afflicted more than a million and a half Americans. Too often these individuals are forgotten by all but their families and close friends, because most people, if they have heard of the disease at all, know only that it is incurable. Parkinson's disease affects each individual differently, sometimes taking a number of years to bring helplessness, sometimes moving much more quickly. The person with Parkinson's disease suffers little physical pain, but much mental anguish, for he no longer controls all movements of his body, and his frustration increases as the disease progresses. Sometimes drugs help, but all too often doctors can only shake their heads in despair.

But it is far too early to give up hope for an eventual cure. We have seen time after time that incurable diseases finally succumb to the weapons of modern science and the investigation of determined and dedicated men and women. Today, thousands of men and women are attacking the problem of Parkinson's disease on two fronts: rehabilitation of the individual who already has the disease, and research into the causes of the disease and possible cures. These committed scientists and lay workers know that there is always a solution to even the most heartbreaking and hopeless problem.

The National Parkinson Foundation has been in the forefront of the fight against the disease for almost 10 years. In 1962, the foundation opened the first Parkinson Rehabilitation, Diagnosis and Research Institute in the world. This institute, located in my district of Miami, serves every patient who has the disease. Many medical disciplines are united as a team in order to individualize treatment for each patient. This is essential, for the disease takes many different courses and affects each person in a different way. The institute also serves as a great research too, for it is a reservoir of Parkinson patients available for direct information, and the institute staff has also compiled useful statistics about each patient. The institute cares for about 40 percent of its patients at no cost to the individual.

Mrs. Jeanne Levey, founder of the National Parkinson Foundation, deserves the thanks of every one of us concerned for the welfare of those with the disease. She became aware of Parkinson's disease, and the lack of adequate medical knowledge to treat it, when her own beloved husband, S. Jay Levey, president of Chicago's Beck-Lee Corp., developed a strange tremor in his hands. After consultation with many specialists, the Leveys finally learned that Mr. Levey had Parkinson's disease. Mrs. Levey, with rare courage and fortitude, began the struggle to gain national support for a program to conquer Parkinson's disease. Her efforts have met with notable success: certainly there is much more to be done, and Mrs. Levey and her friends still push ahead with determination. The past few years have seen the growth of the National Parkinson Foundation, the beginnings of the institute, and a great increase in research and rehabilitation efforts.

Mrs. Levey has received help from many people in all walks of life. I am glad that the National Parkinson Institute has received two Hill-Burton hospital grants from the Federal Government, with the assistance of Florida health officials. Bob Hope, whom we know as a warm and very funny man, has donated his services to the National Parkinson Foundation many times, and his efforts have brought in thousands of dollars. Many individuals have contributed time and money to the foundation, enabling it to expand operations and to grant even more money for research at universities across the country and at their own institute.

Parkinson's disease was first described in the early 19th century, but until recently it has been ignored by society as a whole. Through the efforts of those like Mrs. Jeanne Levey, Parkinson's disease is now fought with all the weapons the Russian people and the American people to live peacefully with one another. In addition it will afford added protection to American citizens traveling in the Soviet Union.

We urge the U.S. Congress to strongly condemn Russian discrimination against Soviet Jews.

Foreign trade

We urge the nations of the world to work for the reduction of tariffs. We believe that the only effective trade policy this country can have is one that will be practiced by our allies as well. Therefore, the President should do all in his power to bring about a common trade policy toward the Communist block among nations of the Western World.

We support the sale of wheat and other food products to the Soviet Union and the Eastern European nations and the extension of long-term credit by the Export-Import Bank to the Eastern European nations and the Soviet Union.

It is time for the United States to reexamine its attitude with regard to trade with Russia and her allies. Increased trade means that our economy will improve. Also, by helping the Soviet citizens to live better lives we will be giving them all the more reason to hope for peace. This is in the interest of everyone.

We believe that the Johnson Act, which forbids long-term loans to nations in default of debts dating from World War II, should be repealed.

President de Gaulle's refusal to allow Britain to join the Common Market means that under the provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 the only commodities for which the United States and the Common Market can substantially cut tariffs are aircraft and margarine.

The presence of the balance-of-payments deficit and the growing independence of the Common Market means that increased trade with these nations is needed for the United States to help maintain its leadership in the free world. We therefore call upon Congress to pass the Reuss-Douglas amendment to the Trade Expansion Act allowing the United States to bargain with the Common Market down to the zero tariff level on 26 major categories of U.S. exports.

We hope that the Common Market will not become a closed trading association which would prevent the small nations of the world from reaping the fruits of trade.

We urge that trade with Communist China and other restricted nations, be begun on a pilot project that later could be expanded if successful.

Asia

We believe that no solution can be reached in Vietnam without discussion with the parties concerned including, if need be, the Vietcong. It is important to any understanding of the Vietnamese situation that we realize that the Vietcong are at least to some degree autonomous. The war should be fought in the south with the Vietcong and we support the President in his efforts to maintain our position in southeast Asia. However, we believe that the bombing of North Vietnam is ineffectual, a danger to world peace and a violation of international law. We condemn Red China and North Vietnam for any aid they have rendered the Vietcong in violation of the Geneva treaty of 1954.

We urge the Johnson administration to reexamine carefully the present U.S. policy with respect to Communist China, and to give consideration to the possibility of a "two China" policy. This policy would mean the diplomatic recognition of Red China and the government of Taiwan as two separate governments, each renouncing its claims to the other's territory. Both of these nations would be admitted to the United Nations, and the seat in the Security Council now held by China would go to India. At a time when the nations of the world are striving for cooperation it becomes increasingly difficult for such ventures to be successful when the United States fails to recognize the existence of a nation with over 700 million people and great military potential.

The United States must continue to protect the government on Taiwan from invasion by the Communist Chinese. While we support the continuance of military aid to Taiwan, we believe that such aid should be made contingent on the government's initiation of substantial political and civil reform. We also urge that the Government of Taiwan grant true civil and political equality to the native Formosans.

We urge the United States to recognize Outer Mongolia.

We support the persistent efforts of the United States to have India and Pakistan peacefully settle their border dispute. We find it ironic that while both these nations are advocates of policies of conciliation among the major powers, they are unable to enter into meaningful negotiation of their own problems.

We support the newly created State of Malaysia and believe that the United States and the United Nations should guarantee its independence. We regret Indonesia's behavior over the past few months, and hope that within the next year she will develop a wiser policy toward Malaysia and the United Nations. It is indeed unfortunate that President Sukarno has become so obsessed with imperialism that he has begun to practice it.

Latin America

We agree with Senator Robert Kennedy that the President should have obtained the approval of the Organization of American States before sending U.S. troops to the Dominican Republic. We furthermore urge the creation of a permanent OAS military force to help keep the peace in Latin America in the future.

We believe that in the future the United States should pursue a policy of consultation and collective action with its southern neighbors. Such a policy is more in consonance with the goal of the Alliance for Progress which seeks to establish democratic and progressive governments in Latin America.

If the United States is to promote a true Alliance for Progress stressing democracy and social reform in Latin America, our Government must realize that it will frequently be necessary to deal with Latin American leaders who are not as stringently anti-Communist as we are. No loyal American wants another Castroite government in this hemisphere, but the solution is not the support of right wing military governments instead.

We believe that the United States should consider the possibility of reestablishing diplomatic relations with Cuba, when Cuba demonstrates by its actions that she will permit the people of each Latin American nation to determine their own destiny free from external pressure.

We support the policy of the United States with respect to Cuba. We hope that the Cuban people will rejoin the ranks of free people in the future; however, we do not believe that Cuba is today the major threat to the United States in Latin America. We believe that ignorance, poverty, famine, and the recalcitrance of the ruling and landed classes in Latin America are the true threats to the security of the United States. It is through the failure to eradicate these propagators of turmoil and tyranny that communism gains its great impetus. Cuba is, however, a threat to Latin American nations because of its infiltration and sabotage. We urge the OAS to use all its powers to stop Communist infiltration of Latin America.

Latin America is desperately in need of leaders who are non-Communist social reformers. The United States must support such leaders wherever they exist. We must be equally alarmed by both Communist coups and right-wing coups. Our reaction to the overthrow of President Bosch was not comparable to our reaction in the present crisis, and this can hardly serve as an inspiration to other non-Communist social reformers in Latin America. We, therefore, propose that aid and diplomatic recognition to governments which have come to power through the overthrow of democratically elected governments be permanently withheld.

PROTESTS OF VIETNAM WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is growing concern, and properly so, throughout the country about the rash of demonstrations we have witnessed this weekend, and continue to witness, protesting our country's policy in Vietnam. These demonstrations have taken on extremely serious proportions and are quite properly of growing concern to all Americans. I have spoken here in the well of the House on numerous occasions warning about the trend in America toward what I have described as mobocracy—impatience with the established order, impatience with the established procedures of our democracy, impatience of people who take the law into their own hands, and, through mob rule, try to correct whatever grievances they have.

No one quarrels with the right of any American to speak out and express his grievances, whether he does it individually or collectively. This is not the issue. The issue is the impression which is being created around the world when, as a result of these various demonstrations, we actually announce to many parts of the world that those participating in these demonstrations do not have confidence in the established order of a democracy.

There are ample protections in our form of government for every American to make known his views and his grievances.

I submit that these young people and, yes, some of the professors who have been participating in this latest rash of demonstrations against our policy in Vietnam, must be prepared to assume full responsibility for the consequences of their actions.

President Johnson and other responsible Americans—those charged with the responsibility of carrying out our foreign policy—quite properly have warned that these demonstrations against our policy in Vietnam, even though participated in by a relatively small number of people, might be misinterpreted by our enemies as an expression of American will. Consequently, whatever hope we may have of negotiating a solution of the problem in Vietnam in the near future may be that much delayed.

We have every reason to believe, from current reports from Vietnam, that the situation is markedly improved. Secretary Rusk made a most significant announcement when he said that the Hanoi Government has withdrawn one of its most serious obstacles to negotiations—its original insistence that American troops must be withdrawn from South Vietnam before we can begin negotiations. Many observers of the scene in Vietnam consider this a major breakthrough, in our efforts to get this dispute from the battlefield to the negotiating table. Increasingly, there has been an air of confidence from many sources all over the world, that the successes of the South Vietnamese and the American troops in Vietnam are hastening the day when we can resolve this tragic dispute by bringing it to the negotiating table.

Therefore, it would seem to me that the young people who have taken to burning their draft cards and staging demonstrations ought to weigh the consequences of their actions. All of them should understand that they may be unwittingly prolonging the conflict.

I was very happy to see that the Attorney General has announced a full-scale investigation of this whole rash of demonstrations and civil disturbances. The uniformity with which they appeared over the weekend throughout the country would surely indicate there has been some advance planning. I am very happy to note that our Government is going to look into this advance planning, because it is entirely possible that this outbreak of demonstrations has been triggered by those who have feared the worst in Vietnam—victory for freedom.

It is significant that when the struggle in Vietnam seems to be improving for the allies, for the South Vietnamese and our American troops, we suddently see this outpouring of opposition to our policies.

I subscribe to the warning issued by the Attorney General, Mr. Katzenbach, that while this widespread movement is, of course, not Communist controlled, it is his strong belief that the Communists are operating in the fringes and certainly inspiring this movement.

It would be my hope that those Americans who profess to have such a great concern for peace will remember that our Constitution provides that the responsibility for foreign policy rests with the President, not with college students, however well intentioned.

We here in this Congress have developed a certain discipline. There are many temptations in the legislative branch of government to legislate foreign policy. Yet wiser voices prevail and in most instances we realize that the Constitution of the United States entrusts to the hands of the Chief Executive, the President, the responsibility for making these major decisions. What more could these young people in the streets engaging in these demonstrations know about this conflict than the President of the United States, who has all of the facts at his disposal? No man has made a greater and more sincere effort to resolve this dispute in Vietnam than our great President, Lyndon B. Johnson. He has said repeatedly that the loss of a single American life or the loss of any life in Vietnam is a national tragedy. No one among us treats lightly the casualties there. There is not a Member of this Congress on either side of the aisle who would not do all in his power to conclude these hostilities in Vietnam as quickly as possible. So when these young people take to the streets in their violent demonstrations and make a mockery of the law by burning their draft cards, are they really giving strength to the foes of democracy? In effect they are saying, "We do not have confidence in the established order of this republic. We know better than you what the facts are." However, most tragically, they are giving aid and comfort to an enemy who is determined and dedicated to destroy the very freedom which guarantees these people the right to demonstrate in the streets. It would be my hope that these professors who have been stirring these youngsters up would give some thought to the fact that by these demonstrations they are indeed weakening the very foundation of the democratic process. We in this Congress, the President, and our Secretary of State have spoken out time and again in an effort to bring this dispute to the bargaining table. No man has tried harder than Secretary of State Dean Rusk here in Washington and our ambassador to the United Nations in New York, Justice Goldberg, to try to resolve this dispute and bring the hostilities to an end. They have made every single offer and have really tried, but the enemy thinks that somehow or other they can wear us down. President Johnson said repeatedly that we are willing to sit down at the negotiation table whenever the opposition is ready for it.

So it seems to me these young people are today actually prolonging the war. More tragically, it appears to me that many of these young people are the unwitting victims of a Communist plot, a conspiracy somehow to try to resolve the problems of Vietnam in the streets of America.

I think we can all be proud of the American people. The overwhelming majority of the American people have watched these demonstrations with great concern but also with considerable self-discipline. They recognize the right of these young people to participate in these demonstrations. Most Americans have great pity for these young people. I think these young people themselves should be pitied, but I am delighted, I am proud and happy, that the Attorney General is undertaking a vast investigation to find out who are the people who have put together this eruption of demonstrations simultaneously all over the world. We have seen this happen before in America whenever we have had the Communists on the run in various parts of the world. We have had other demonstrations and there were great movements during the fifties and the early sixties. I think that the time has come to expose the perpetrators of this. We should accelerate our activities in Vietnam because indeed the policy laid down by President Johnson clearly demonstrates it is the policy to bring peace to this troubled part of the world and secure Vietnam for freedom. It would be my hope that these young people will stop to consider what would happen if Vietnam should fall into Communist hands. There has been ample evidence that if the American forces would be withdrawn from Vietnam, within 24 hours this bastion of freedom would go down into Communist hands and it would be no time at all before the whole of southeast Asia would be in Communist hands. So it is my hope that the American people in their traditional, good-mannered way will be able to impress on these young people the great damage that they are doing not only to the democratic processes in this country but more importantly what they are doing to the morale of our boys in Vietnam.

I can just imagine how tragically sickening it must be to young Americans who are risking their lives for the sake of freedom, putting their lives on the altar of freedom in Vietnam, to hear over the radio, or to see on TV or read in the press about the demonstrations in this country. This, to me, appears to be a serious act against the best interests of this country.

I hope that Mr. Katzenbach will move with dispatch to complete his investigation.

And I hope those participating in these demonstrations will recall Plato's sound advise.

> You are young, my son, and, as the years go by, time will change and even reverse many of your present opinions. Refrain therefore awhile from setting yourself up as a judge of the highest matters.

BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE MEETING

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, at 10 o'clock this morning I attended a meeting of the House Committee on Banking and Currency where the committee reported out a bank merger bill. This meeting was not called by the chairman after due notice to all members. The basis for holding the meeting was the rules of the committee itself, which provided for regular meetings on the first and third Tuesday in the month. To my knowledge, however, this rule has not been observed during the past 5 years that I have served on this committee of the House.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that I was the first Member of the House to introduce bank merger legislation during this session of Congress. The bill which I introduced, H.R. 7563, on April 22, 1965, was substantially the same as the Senate bill, S. 1698. I explained to our committee that although I was not wedded to this particular bill as a solution to the problem, I have felt it imperative to all concerned that bank merger legislation be enacted in this session of Congress.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I joined a majority of the committee in a petition to force the chairman of our committee to call a special meeting to consider this legislation. I have regularly attended these special meetings of the committee, but it is apparent that our chairman, who has openly expressed his opposition to S. 1698 and the Ashley amendment thereto, has thwarted all attempts by a majority of the committee to report this legislation this year. In fact, it is my personal belief that the chairman of our committee, by his actions at these meetings, actually precipitated the meeting that was held this morning.

Thus, the meeting provided in the rules for the third Tuesday in the month was the only meeting in the time remaining in this session of Congress when this bill could be considered by a majority of the committee. Despite my recognition of the need for such legislation and my previous support, I voted against reporting such legislation at the meeting this morning. I did so without regard to whether it was a legally constituted meeting and without regard to the merits of the legislation itself, solely because I felt that in the spirit of fairness to other members who had not received adequate notice of the meeting, the legislation should not be considered.

I do not condone the manner in which the chairman has conducted these special meetings on S. 1698. I am impressed, however, that "two wrongs do not make a right."

CLEVELAND SHOWS THE WAY WITH WOMEN'S JOB CORPS CENTER

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a very detailed article by Tom Nolan of the Washington Daily News of Tuesday, October 5, 1965. It describes the operation of the Cleveland Women's Job Corps Center. I am quite familiar with the operation of this Office of Economic Opportunity project and I am delighted to note that it is winning some degree of national recognition as a model for other cities to imitate.

Mr. Speaker, on thousands of occasions throughout this year, the Office of Economic Opportunity has been the subject of critical comment in our press. I am delighted to note that in this instance, at least, recognition is being paid for a job being carried out quietly and effectively, and which will in the ultimate, guarantee a more realistic chance for success and a happy life for thousands of young women of America.

The article by Mr. Nolan follows:

Job Corps Gives Girls a Break for the Future

(By Tom Nolan)

Cleveland.—While its more publicized counterparts in Los Angeles and St. Petersburg are reeling under charges ranging from rowdyism to payroll padding, the Women's Job Corp Center in Cleveland is quietly giving 325 girls a good chance for a happy life.

"Of course we've had disciplinary problems," says Mrs. Mary Chambers, director of the center. "You're bound to have them any place you get 300 teen-aged girls together, and these teenagers happen to come from the worst possible conditions."

Although there has been some drinking and other misconduct among the girls, discipline has not been a big problem. Four girls have been dismissed in the 5 months the center has been open, three for failing to observe restrictions placed on them after unexplained absences.

MARIHUANA

The fourth girl was found to be receiving marihuana in the mail, was turned over to the police and then sent home. Local papers reported the incident, but there was no scandal.

All the girls are between 16 and 21. Some come from broken homes, some from northern slums and others from southern rural poverty pockets. Most of them are high school dropouts, although several have no more than a sixth-grade education. None has skill enough to hold a steady job.

To most, growing up means getting married and going on relief, or having a child or two and going on relief. "If we didn't get them out of where they were, they'd be on welfare all their lives," says Mrs. Chambers.

QUIET DISTRICT

The center, formerly a Salvation Army home for young working women, is located in a quiet residential district. It looks like an apartment house and it's run like a college dorm.

"I was afraid to come," says one recent arrival. "I thought it would be more closed in—like a jail." Some of the girls had never had a bed of their own. Others had never slept on sheets.

The girls enroll in the center voluntarily and can withdraw whenever they want. Many do—from homesickness. Of the 380 who have come to the center so far, 53 have gone home.

Job Corps officials insist the girls must be sent away from their homes to accomplish the desired change in their lives.

FREEDOM

Those who remain are given considerable freedom with their own time. After classes they may go out until dark as long as they sign out and give their destination. On weekends they can date and boys may visit them Wednesday evenings and weekends.

The girls are trained for secretarial, business and clerical work, retail sales, food preparation and service, health and medical service, serving and dress designing, graphic art skills, cleaning and laundry trades, hair dressing, and child care.

After initial classroom instruction they receive on-the-job training in Cleveland businesses.

POCKET MONEY

Each girl is given $30 a month pocket money. Another $50 a month is put aside for when she leaves. Of the latter, up to $25 can be sent home with the Government matching this amount. Each receives a $75 clothing allowance when she arrives and another $65 later this autumn for winter clothing. Training, room, and board are free.

No girl can remain at the center for longer than 2 years. Most finish their training at the end of 1 year.

The early success of the Cleveland center can be traced primarily to two assets: a sound professional organization and good community relations.

The center is under a $4 million contract to Alpha Kappa Alpha, a national sorority with 57 years of experience in social service. Mrs. Chambers, a former biology professor at Alabama A&M, is a member of the sorority, as are most of the center's administrative staff.

LOCAL FIRMS

Cleveland businesses and civic organizations have helped out. Local firms, including a beautician, printer and laundry, have offered their establishments for on-the-job training.

Through the Council of Catholic Women, some 25 girls attend church each Sunday with Cleveland families and are guests for dinner afterwards. Local libraries and museums offer special orientation tours.

But it will take more than cultural enlightenment to train most of the girls and the center's 96 staff members have no illusions that their jobs will be easy or successful in the end.

For nearly every girl has to develop a sense of direction. Counselors and teachers have found that they must become the mother, father, friend and confidante that most girls never had.

"It will take a good bit of daily counseling to help them," says Mrs. Chambers. "Most of them tend to downgrade their capabilities because they think they are stupid.

"We know we can't reach them all. But if we can just reach half of them—or even only 25 percent of them—we'll have done our job."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, for October 20 through October 23, 1965, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Brademas, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Feighan, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Feighan, for 15 minutes, tomorrow, October 20, 1965; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Rooney of New York, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Quie, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Cohelan (at the request of Mr. White of Texas), for 60 minutes, October 20, 1965; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Patman, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Pucinski, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Hall), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. HALL), for 10 minutes, on October 20, 1965; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RUMSFELD (at the request of Mr. HALL), for 15 minutes, on Wednesday, October 20, 1965.

Mr. RUMSFELD (at the request of Mr. HALL), for 20 minutes, on Thursday, October 21, 1965.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. HALL), for 40 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter and requests permission to caption two separate subjects.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ROBERTS and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 23. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate with the several States a cooperative program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9022. An act to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster; to eliminate inequities in the application of Public Law 815 in certain military base closings; to make uniform eligibility requirements for school districts in Public Law 874; and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5457. An act for the relief of Maria del Rosario de Fatima Lopez Hayes;

H.R. 5554. An act for the relief of Mary Frances Crabbs;

H.R. 5904. An act for the relief of Nam Ie Kim;

H.R. 6229. An act for the relief of Kim Sun No;

H.R. 6235. An act for the relief of Chun Soo Kim;

H.R. 6819. An act for the relief of Dr. Orhan Matin;

H.R. 7707. An act to authorize the appointment of crier-law clerks by district judges;

H.R. 7888. An act providing for the extension of patent No. D-119,187;

H.R. 8350. An act for the relief of the successors in interest of Cooper Blyth and Grace Johnston Blyth otherwise Grace McCloy Blyth;

H.R. 8457. An act for the relief of Robert G. Mikulecky;

H.R. 9220. An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Delaware River Basin Commission, and the Interoceanic Canal Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9521. An act for the relief of Clarence Earle Davis.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 20, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1681. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on the activities of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, during the period July 1–December 31, 1964, pursuant to section 4(b)(5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act (H. Doc. No. 306); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

1682. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1683. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to clarify and otherwise amend the Meat Inspection Act; to extend Federal meat inspection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1684. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to clarify and otherwise improve chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, relating to the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1685. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to permit deduction by brokers of certain costs and expenses from rental collections on properties acquired under the veterans' loan programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1686. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Indians of Oklahoma, suing on its own behalf and as representative of the Confederated Tribes of Cheyenne and Arapaho Indians of the Upper Arkansas, also known as the Southern Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Indians, and on behalf of the *Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Indians, Petitioner* v. *the United States of America, defendant*, docket Nos. 329-A and 329-B, pursuant to 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 641. Joint resolution authorizing Father Flanagan's Boys' Home to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs; without amendment (Rept. No. 1174). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 511. Resolution to provide funds for expenses of studies authorized by House Resolution 510; with amendment (Rept. No. 1175). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 609. Resolution to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by House Resolution 94; with amendment (Rept. No. 1176). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 9149. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1177). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POWELL: Committee of conference. H.R. 9567. An act to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education; without amendment (Rept. No. 1178). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ASHLEY: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 1698. An act to establish a procedure for the review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1179). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ULLMAN: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4599. A bill to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass for the Congregation Emanuel of Denver, Colo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 5831. A bill to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass and cement windows for Our Lady of the Angels Seminary of Glenmont, N.Y.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURKE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8647. A bill for the relief of the Troubadors Drum and Bugle Corps of Bridgeport, Conn.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRALEY:

H.R. 11648. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to grant the franking privilege to the Washington representative of the territory of Guam; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 11649. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Frederick Douglass home as a part of the park system in the National Capital, and for other purposes," approved September 5, 1962; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 11650. A bill to amend Public Law 87–752 (76 Stat. 749) to eliminate the requirement of a reservation of certain mineral rights to the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11651. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to establish a Commission on National Economic Goals; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 11652. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 11653. A bill to make permanent the existing suspension of duty on certain natural graphite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 11654. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of millennium of the Polish nation in the calendar year 1966; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 11655. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of Commerce to carry out a survey and investigation of the feasibility of constructing and operating a passenger monorail train system between Suffern, N.Y., and Hoboken, N.J., over the right-of-way of the main line of the Erie-Lackawanna Railroad; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 11656. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study and formulate a comprehensive plan containing recommendations regarding the action that should be taken to preserve, develop, and make accessible for public use and benefit the Long Island Sound and related shoreline areas in the States of New York, Connecticut, and Rhode Island; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 11657. A bill to clarify and otherwise improve chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, relating to the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11658. A bill to clarify and otherwise improve chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, relating to the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 11659. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 11660. A bill relating to interest on income tax refunds made within 45 days after the filing of the tax return; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 11661. A bill relating to interest on income tax refunds made within 45 days after the filing of the tax return; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 11662. A bill to provide a program of Federal assistance to elementary schools throughout the Nation to improve educational opportunities through provisions for the services of child development specialists and to provide a program of Federal assistance for the training of such elementary school personnel in the institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 11663. A bill to mobilize and utilize the scientific and engineering manpower of the Nation to employ systems analysis and systems engineering to help to fully employ the Nation's manpower resources to solve national problems; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 11664. A bill to confer additional jurisdiction upon the Superintendent of Insurance for the District of Columbia to regulate domestic stock insurance companies and to exempt such companies from section 12(g)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H.R. 11665. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to payments under certain contracts for the sale of stock; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 11666. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to exempt persons with religious convictions against union membership from any obligation to do so; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 11667. A bill to preserve the domestic gold mining industry and to increase the domestic production of gold; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 11668. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to clarify the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the training and education of health service personnel; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 11669: A bill to regulate bank mergers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 11670. A bill to clarify and otherwise amend the Meat Inspection Act; to extend Federal meat inspection; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITE of Texas:

H.R. 11671. A bill to approve a contract negotiated with the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1, Texas, to authorize the execution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 771. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.J. Res. 772. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.J. Res. 773. Joint resolution to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to study world food and agriculture needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.J. Res. 774. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.J. Res. 775. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation for the commemoration and observance of the millennium of the Polish nation in the calendar year 1966; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.J. Res. 776. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H. Con. Res. 524. Concurrent resolution to establish an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DORN:

H. Res. 611. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of public manifestations of discontent with national foreign policy with respect to Vietnam; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII.

373. Mr. CUNNINGHAM presented a memorial of the Nebraska State Legislature urging the calling of a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States that no provision of this Constitution, or any amendment thereto, shall restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 11672. A bill for the relief of Stavras Soukas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11673. A bill for the relief of Leowidas Kotsasiannis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 11674. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Catsadimas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 11675. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Giuliana Tribalsi and her son, Francesco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 11676. A bill for the relief of Johnny R. Bradley and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 11677. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Rodio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 11678. A bill for the relief of Claudio Silvestri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 11679. A bill for the relief of Walter B. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 11680. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Newal Neder Mourad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Production of Oil and Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY ROBERTS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 19, 1965

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, my purpose is to speak some words of wise counsel to those who have been misled about an important business activity in my district—the production of oil and gas. What I have to say will not be expressed from the narrow, selfish viewpoint of local interest. My words are directed to the national interest. My hope is to wake up all Americans and alert them to mistakes that are being made in attitudes and policies affecting the petroleum industry.

Let us put this industry in perspective first of all. Let us take note of the fact that oil and gas now supply about three-quarters of all this Nation's energy. Therefore, if mistakes are being made in policies and attitudes relating to the oil- and gas-producing industries, those mistakes jeopardize the well-being of our entire society. Those mistakes directly threaten people in the consuming States—people who do not produce a drop of oil but who depend upon petroleum for their industry, their jobs, their transportation, their heat.

These are the people who are being told that their interests are served when this country opens the floodgates and lets cheap foreign oil pour in. They have even been told by some high-powered bureaucrat that the conservation policies of States like my own are entirely misguided and self-serving. The word—from these overnight experts—is that we should abandon all stripper wells, forget about secondary recovery projects, drop the prorationing program, throw the domestic producing industry to the dogs, and place our dependence on that cheap foreign oil.

Now I want to ask a question that seems never to have occurred to these high-talking experts. I want to ask: If we follow their advice, if we let ourselves become completely dependent upon foreign sources for the bulk of our petroleum supplies, if we reduce our domestic producing industry to a decaying skeleton—will foreign oil remain cheap?

Can we count on that? Can we count on those who control these overseas supplies—and I mean those foreign governments who own that oil—to play the game our way? Can we depend on them not to take advantage of the situation if we let our own domestic petroleum industry decay and have to rely completely on these foreign sources for all the oil we need just to keep our industrial society going? Are we sure these people will not increase the price of their oil once they do not have a domestic producing industry to compete with?

This is a question that really has to be explored. But you will never hear it touched on by those who favor the present tide of foreign oil imports—much less by those who think this tide should be allowed to rise even higher. They like to talk about cheap foreign oil. They are less fond of discussing the dependability of those supply sources, or the stability of the governments that control these foreign reserves. The Suez crisis is a chapter they would like to tear out of the history books.

Yes, these are questions that some people would like to forget because these are questions that conflict with the policies these same people are trying to sell to the American people. And that is all the more reason why these questions should be forcefully brought before these same Americans who are being lulled into complacency by talk of cheap foreign oil.

It would not be cheap if America got into a war and had its foreign oil supplies cut off—after its own once vigorous domestic industry had been tossed on the scrap heap. It would not be cheap if the situation in Vietnam should escalate into another Korea and meanwhile our domestic producing industry was allowed to decline so that we had to depend on the loyalty and good will of other nations for the oil we need to fuel our own military machine. True, most of the governments of countries with this cheap foreign oil are friendly now, but have not we seen enough examples of how former allies can turn their faces against us? Remember, China once ranked high on the list of our most steadfast friends. Cuba was also once a dependable ally. Indonesia may owe its very existence as a nation to the good offices of the United States. But where do these countries stand today? How far can we depend on them or any other foreign friends?

Today we have a domestic petroleum industry that makes us independent of any foreign source for the oil and gas we need for normal requirements or a sudden emergency. This is a national blessing. It has been one of the roots of America's economic supremacy. It was a major factor behind the Allied victory in World War II.

I hope many other voices will join mine in sounding the alarm. For I would dread a day when Americans had to go begging to buy at any price the oil our country needs to keep its planes in the air, its cars on the road, its families from freezing.

It is not just our money we could lose, it is our freedom, it is our security, it is our chance to keep going forward industrially. We cannot—we dare not—sell our domestic petroleum industry down the river for the sake of bringing in a deluge of cheap oil.

This is the land of free speech. It should be the land of frank speech also. The American people deserve the whole truth, and they most certainly deserve this in connection with a matter as important to them as their petroleum resources.

Are they getting that whole truth now? I submit that they are not. They are not getting it about foreign oil imports. They are not getting it about the condition of the domestic petroleum industry. They are not getting it about percentage depletion. They are not getting it about natural gas regulation.

I, for one, am more than a little weary of these jokes about the rich Texas oilmen. How about a new kind of joke—a joke that is based on what is really going on in the oil country of Texas these days—a joke about the downward trend of crude oil prices, a joke about the number of independent producers who are selling out in despair, a joke about the idle rigs and idle workers, a joke about an industry that is having its own private depression.

Maybe that does not strike anyone as good material for a joke. I agree. The folks in my district do not think it is very funny either. But they are also not amused at the misleading information that is going around the country about them.

They do not enjoy hearing people say the oil producer takes advantage of a tax loophole when he deducts for percentage depletion on his income tax.

It is time the American people got the real lowdown on percentage depletion. I mean the real lowdown. It is time they were informed that this is no tax loophole at all, but a tax deduction clearly and deliberately specified in a law duly enacted by both Houses of Congress. It is also time the American people were told this is not a special oil depletion allowance. That is another false claim that really ought to be exploded. The percentage depletion provision applies to practically every extractive industry in the United States. It is no oil depletion allowance. It is a mineral depletion allowance. And those who really want the American people to have the full facts should bring that out.

How unfair that while the domestic producing industry is practically being drowned by a flood of foreign imports some people should try to undermine it further by giving the public a totally false and misleading picture of percentage depletion. Perhaps they do not agree with that tax provision. It is their right to disagree. No one disputes that. But I do heartily dispute their right to misrepresent the facts. I challenge their right to try to deceive the American people by giving out half-truths and distortions and propagandistic accounts of the percentage depletion law.

The fact is—this tax provision has served America as well and successfully as any part of our Tax Code. It made possible the growth of the domestic petroleum industry that played such a decisive part in the victory of World War

II, that has kept us strong enough to avert world war III, that makes our country without a rival in the world for progress, prosperity, and living standards.

These are facts about percentage depletion that the American people are rarely told. Yet these are the very facts the people most urgently need to know if they are to pass intelligent judgment on this tax provision.

As for natural gas regulation—it provides one of the most alarming examples I know of the public's interest being beclouded by misunderstanding and misconceptions. The people in the nonproducing States have been told a great deal about gas regulation. They have not been adequately informed of the essential facts.

How many of these people know—for instance—that natural gas producers are today being regulated under a law that was written to regulate interstate pipelines, a law that Congress never intended to apply to gas producers? How many Americans—if they knew the facts—would feel that it makes sense to regulate one business under a law that was written for an entirely different form of enterprise?

They have not been told the facts because if they were told those facts they would form a quite different opinion from the one advocates of present natural gas regulation want them to form. Americans are a practical people. They like laws to make sense.

They have heard a lot of praise of the recent Permian Basin decision. But again the full impact and the potential consequences of that decision have not been brought out to people in the nonproducing States. Have the interests of consumers really been served by a decision that can only aggravate the sharp downward trend in the ratio of gas reserves to gas production? The advocates of gas regulation in its present form brush these reserve ratio statistics off as meaningless—insignificant. Perhaps they prefer to wait until the gas supply situation reaches the same critical stage that the water supply situation has reached in some Eastern States. Then—when the emergency is acute—then the people will have to be told the facts. But meanwhile, the theory seems to be, let them be lulled with comforting illusions about the effect of the Permian Basin decision.

Those who really have the best interests of the American people at heart believe those people are entitled to the truth about the natural gas situation. We believe they should have that truth now—today—and not at some future time when a full scale crisis in gas supply forces the facts out into the open.

If the issue were put before them frankly, the American people would see the folly of an arbitrary new gas-old gas pricing system that disregards production realities for the sake of bureaucratic convenience.

The people would see the injustice of a 2½-year moratorium on natural gas price increases in the Permian Basin, when there is no similar moratorium on cost increases for the natural gas producer.

And if they had the full story forthrightly put before them—without flimflam or distortion—the people would see this fact: A decade after the Supreme Court decision that made gas producers subject to Federal control, the FPC is no closer to finding the answer to the problem the Court handed it. The FPC is caught in a spider's web of regulatory confusion, and the harder it struggles to find a way out the more hopelessly it becomes entangled. The obvious answer today is action by Congress to revise the regulations dealing with natural gas producers, and free them from regulation under a law that was never meant to apply to them.

This is one answer that would free gas producers from unworkable regulation, and that would free gas consumers from the threat of curtailed supply now hanging over their heads due to the discouraging effects of present regulation on the search for new gas reserves.

The domestic petroleum industry has its problems all right. But there is nothing wrong with this industry that good judgment and commonsense cannot cure. The big problem of this industry has been the refusal of some to look at the facts squarely. The industry has been the victim of policies based on daydreams and delusions whereas here—if anywhere—the course of recommendations should follow the ground of hard fact.

I intend to do my part—and hope that others will join me—in insisting that the American people be given the whole story, the full facts—even when those facts do not conform with the theories and wishes of some in positions of influence.

You can fool the people some of the time, but sooner or later the facts catch up with the deception. And it would be a far more popular course, over the long haul, to give the people the full, honest story now than to have them ask later—in tones of bitter recrimination: "Why did you not tell us?"

Let us tell them now. Let us tell them about the hitch in that supposedly bargain-basement foreign oil. Let us tell them what they would really lose if the domestic petroleum industry continued in its present decline. Let us tell them the other side—the side they rarely hear—about the origin and purpose of percentage depletion. Let us take them into our confidence about the great gas bungle—so they will see the urgent need for remedial legislation.

Let us play fair with the American people, so they will have the information they should have to support realistic and enlightened petroleum policies. And let us do it now.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1965

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God who, above all the wild commotion which sweeps across the face of the earth, doth still control the evil forces which for any one hour seem to defeat Thy purpose, and hinder the coming of Thy kingdom, help us so to confront the baffling problems that face us that from them may come final victory to our own souls and spiritual gain for the whole world.

Even in these latter days when darkness seems to lie on so much of the earth, the shadows of tyranny, of hypocrisy, and of materialism, open our eyes to the gleaming lights which in every land are stabbing the darkness. Grant that our own hearts may be shrines of prayer and our free Nation a bulwark for the oppressed, a flaming beacon of hope whose beam shall battle the darkness in all the world.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday, the time until 9:15 a.m. is allocated for the transaction of routine morning business, with statements made therein limited to 3 minutes.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, October 19, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a request has been made by a Member of the minority to object to authorization for this committee meeting. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

On request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the following committees and subcommittee were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Committee on the District of Columbia.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The Small Business Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTER-AMERICAN CULTURAL AND TRADE CENTER

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, pending before a committee of the Senate is a bill known as Interama, which contemplates the assignment of $15 million to the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Florida for the building of an international commercial mart. That bill has not come from the Foreign Relations Committee.

I have felt that the amount asked is excessive, and that the whole purpose of the project, from the standpoint of serving the international interests of the United States, is doubtful. Today I rise to point out the means which have been chosen by the promoters of Interama for its promotion. I make no reference to my fellow Senators from the State of Florida, or to Members of the House of Representatives.

Yesterday morning, I received a call from a banker in Oakland, Calif., who stated that he had been contacted and asked to contact me to urge me to give my support to the program. Within a half hour thereafter, I received a call from the president of a Cleveland bank who told me that someone from Florida had called him, requesting him to call me so that I would let up in my opposition.

The president of this Cleveland bank told me that he had confidence in my judgment, that he was making the call, and that he had performed his mission.

Whoever this person is in Interama making these calls, thinking that I am going to be beaten down in the execution of my honest judgment, might as well dismiss it from his mind. But that was not all, Mr. President.

In Cincinnati, Ohio, I have a very dear friend, whom I have known for 20 years. I have great respect for him. In the mail yesterday, I received a letter from this friend in Cincinnati, enclosing a letter which he had received——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I have 2 more minutes?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. He had received a letter from an officer of Interama, asking him to call me in Washington, urging that I let up in my opposition.

I think I know who at Interama is indulging in this practice. I have had other words about him. He is contriving every conceivable scheme to get the proposal through during this session.

To summarize: The Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. SMATHERS] have been fair, direct, and objective in presenting their arguments on the merits. However, there is a man by the name of Irving Muskat, head of Interama, and he has been very busy. I cannot say that he is the one who has contacted these people, but the evidence points toward him. I serve notice on him that the more he attempts to beat me down, the greater my opposition will be to his program.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. CLARK. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I have some morning hour business I should like to transact.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This will take only a minute.

Mr. CLARK. I ask unanimous consent that the request of the Senator from Louisiana may be granted without curtailing the amount of time available for morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I shall need 3 minutes, and that is all I want, Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that all executive business be passed over except nominations for the Department of State and the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

John W. Reynolds, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin.

By Mr. JAVITS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Marvin E. Frankel, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York.

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Bernard L. Boutin, of New Hampshire, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity; and

Dr. Philip Randolph Lee, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Charles W. Halleck, of Maryland, to be associate judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of State.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CLARIFICATION OF MEAT INSPECTION ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to clarify and otherwise amend the Meat Inspection Act; to extend Federal meat inspection, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the

National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO VETERANS

A letter from the Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to clarify and otherwise improve chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, relating to the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter from the Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 111 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the prepayment of certain expenses associated with the travel of veterans to or from a Veterans' Administration facility or other place, in connection with vocational rehabilitation or counseling, or for the purpose of examination, treatment, or care (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter from the Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3203, title 38, United States Code, to restrict the conditions under which benefits are immediately reduced upon readmission of veterans for hospitalization or other institutional care (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"ENROLLED SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION O

"A joint resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to Presidential succession

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, That the 89th Congress of the United States of America, at its session, in both Houses, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof has made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States:

"'JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO SUCCESSION TO THE PRESIDENCY AND VICE PRESIDENCY AND TO CASES WHERE THE PRESIDENT IS UNABLE TO DISCHARGE THE POWERS AND DUTIES OF HIS OFFICE

"'Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as all amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"'"Article —

"'"SECTION 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

"'"SEC. 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

"'"SEC. 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

"'"SEC. 4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

"'"Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within 4 days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within 48 hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within 21 days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within 21 days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office.'" Therefore, in the name of, and on behalf of, the people of the State of Michigan, we do hereby ratify, approve and assent to the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"Resolved further, That certified copies of this joint resolution be transmitted by the Governor of the State of Michigan, to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

"I hereby certify that on the 30th day of July, 1965, the foregoing joint resolution was agreed to by the senate.

"Beryl I. Kenyon,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"I hereby certify that on the 5th day of October, 1965, the foregoing joint resolution was agreed to by the house of representatives.

"Norman E. Philleo,
"Clerk of the House of Representatives."

Two resolutions of the 1965 Mariana Islands District Legislature; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"RESOLUTION 43–1965

"Resolution relative to memorializing and requesting the United States Congress to favorably consider changing the political status of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands

"Whereas one of the basic objectives of the international trusteeship system, established under chapter XII of the Charter of the United Nations, is to promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories, and their progressive development towards self-government or independence according to the wishes as freely expressed by the peoples concerned; and

"Whereas the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands has been administered by the United States of America since 1947 and the people of the Mariana Islands district have consistently expressed their desire to live under democracy and desire closer ties with the people of the United States; and

"Whereas the people of the Mariana Islands district have demonstrated their ability to accept the responsibilities of an informed, alert freedom loving citizenry; and

"Whereas the inhabitants of the Mariana Islands district are fully informed of the choices open as to the nature of their political future and wish to become citizens of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Mariana Islands District Legislature, That the administering authority of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the United States of America, is hereby memorialized and requested to favorably consider changing the political status of the inhabitants of the Mariana Islands district by making them citizens of the United States of America; and be it further

"Resolved, That the legislative secretary attest to the passage of this resolution and send a copy thereof each to the President of the United States of America, the President of the Senate of the United States of America, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America, the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, the Secretary of the Department of State, the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the heads of the District Legislatures of the Marshall Islands, Ponape, Truk and Palau, the President of the Yap Islands Congress, and the Secretary General of the United Nations.

"Passed by the Mariana Islands District Legislature August 19, 1965.

"Vicente N. Santos,
"President.
"Herman Q. Guerrero,
"Secretary."

"RESOLUTION 56–1965

"Resolution relative to memorializing and requesting the legislature of the territory of Guam to request the U.S. Congress to amend the Organic Act of Guam and extend its boundaries to include the northern Marianas

"Whereas under the trusteeship agreement between the United States and the United Nations, the United States agreed to develop the inhabitants of the trust territory toward self-government or independence according to the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned; and

"Whereas island-wide plebiscites were held in the Mariana Islands District in the years 1961 and 1963, and the people voted to have the Marianas reintegrated, restored, and reinstated back to their former status as one people who are the actual inhabitants of the Mariana Islands; and

"Whereas in the course of human events and the inevitability of social, political and economic affinity, and by virtue of the natural pursuit of life and happiness, the inhabitants of the Mariana group who are called Chamorros, were of Guamanian descendants and similar in culture, language, and customs; and

"Whereas the people of the Mariana Islands District wish to join the territory of Guam as full citizens of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Mariana Islands District Legislature, That the eighth Guam Legisla-

ture is hereby memorialized and requested to request the Congress of the United States to amend the Organic Act of Guam and extend the boundary to include the northern Marianas as a part of the territory of Guam; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the President be and he hereby is instructed to sign this resolution and that the legislative secretary be and hereby is instructed to attest to the adoption of this resolution and to transmit copies hereof to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of the Interior.

"Passed by the Mariana Islands District Legislature August 23, 1965.

"VICENTE N. SANTOS,
"*President.*
"HERMAN Q. GUERRERO,
"*Secretary.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 103

"Joint resolution ratifying an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to Presidential succession

"Whereas both Houses of the 89th Congress of the United States of America, at the first session, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds, made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit.

" 'S.J. RES. 1

" '*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

" ' "*Article —*

" ' "SECTION I. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

" ' "SEC. II. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

" ' "SEC. III. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

" ' "SEC. IV. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

" ' "Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within 48 hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within 21 days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within 21 days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office" '; and

"Whereas the people of the sovereign State of Wisconsin, represented in senate and assembly, have studied said proposed addition to the Constitution of the United States and have reached a consensus that the Federal Government be permitted thus to alter the Constitution of the United States; Now therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the assembly, the senate concurring,* That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be and the same is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this joint resolution, certified by the secretary of state, be forwarded by the Governor to the General Services Administration of the Government of the United States, in Washington, D.C., and to the presiding officer of each House of the Congress of the United States.

"ROBERT T. HUBER,
"*Speaker of the Assembly.*
"JAMES P. BUCKLEY,
"*Chief Clerk of the Assembly.*
"PATRICK J. LUCEY,
"*President of the Senate.*
"WILLIAM P. NUGENT,
"*Chief Clerk of the Senate.*"

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Orange County, Calif., relating to funds for tax relief and alcoholic rehabilitation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the Hongwanji Buddhist mission, of Honolulu, Hawaii, opposing any amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit Bible reading and prayers in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

H.R. 11267. An act to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove certain limitations (Rept. No. 913);

S. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of additional copies of the hearings held by the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs during the 89th Congress, 1st session, on S. 9, the cold war GI education bill (Rept. No. 926);

S. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution providing additional copies of hearings on antitrust and monopoly (Rept. No. 927); and

S. Res. 154. Resolution providing additional funds to investigate juvenile delinquency (Rept. No. 925).

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

H.R. 7475. An act to name the authorized lock and dam No. 6 on the Arkansas River in Arkansas and the lake created thereby for David D. Terry (Rept. No. 916); and

H.R. 11539. An act to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane (Rept. No. 917).

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment:

H.R. 5026. An act to authorize the Burt County Bridge Commission, a public body politic and corporate in the county of Burt and State of Nebraska, to refund the outstanding revenue bonds of said Burt County Bridge Commission heretofore issued to finance the cost of the construction of a bridge, together with the necessary approaches and appurtenances therefor, from a point located in the city of Decatur, Burt County, Nebr., across the Missouri River to a point located in Monona County, Iowa (Rept. No. 915).

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

S. 2394. A bill to provide for the acquisition of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States (Rept. No. 914).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 5493. An act to provide that the flag of the United States of America may be flown for 24 hours of each day in Lexington, Mass. (Rept. No. 918); and

H.J. Res. 671. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the month of November as "Water Conservation Month" (Rept. No. 919).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H. Con. Res. 448. Concurrent resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating September 3, 1965, as Crusade for Safety Day (Rept. No. 920).

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 8353. An act for the relief of Becky Jo and Charles R. Smith (Rept. No. 924).

By Mr. KUCHEL, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 797. An act to establish the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area in the State of California, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 922).

By Mr. SIMPSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 33. Joint resolution to cancel any unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, chargeable against certain non-Indian lands (Rept. No. 923).

MAXIMUM FLOOD DETENTION CAPACITY OF WATERSHED PROJECT STRUCTURES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 921)

Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, reported an original bill (S. 2679) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, and submitted a report thereon, which report was ordered to be printed, and the bill was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 2673. A bill for the relief of Nevenka Pucnik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 2674. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to make discrimination because of age in employment an unlawful employment practice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 2675. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to assist States and communities in meeting the initial cost of establishment and operation of programs for the care of patients with kidney diseases and to train professional personnel needed to conduct such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. JACKSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 2676. A bill for the relief of Wha Wang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 2677. A bill for the relief of Kathleen Styles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 2678. A bill to clarify and otherwise amend the Meat Inspection Act; to extend Federal meat inspection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 2679. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended; placed on the calendar.

(See reference to the above bill when reported by Mr. ELLENDER, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 2680. A bill for the relief of Lucille P. Steele;

S. 2681. A bill for the relief of Aris Spyridon Fafoutis; and

S. 2682. A bill for the relief of Dr. Timoteo L. Galvez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS:

S. 2683. A bill for the relief of Mostafa Mirhashemi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS (for himself and Mr. GORE):

S. 2684. A bill to amend section 320 of title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highway bridges on Federal dams, in order to increase the amount authorized in such section; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 2685. A bill to provide for an extension of Interstate Highway No. 29 into Nebraska, including a bridge; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 2686. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. BREWSTER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S.J. Res. 120. Joint resolution requiring a cost-of-living survey to be made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics before the cost-of-living allowance for Federal employees in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands may be reduced; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

KIDNEY ACT OF 1966

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, next week in Seattle, a group of citizens will gather to decide the fate of one or more of their fellow citizens. Examining evidence which has been painstakingly gathered, documented, and summarized, they will cast their votes and make a life-or-death decision. A jury deciding the fate of a killer? No. This group—a lawyer, a clergyman, a housewife, a businessman, a physician—will be deciding which of a number of medically suitable candidates will be chosen for treatment on the artificial kidney. The chosen will live, the others will die. The Admissions Advisory Committee of the Seattle Artificial Kidney Center, aptly christened the "Life or Death Committee" by a national magazine, has had to make this decision many times over the past 4 years.

This committee is a unique solution to an increasingly common dilemma facing American medicine. It is a dilemma that is now limited to the artificial kidney, but which may become increasingly more common in the future.

Each year the Federal Government pours over a billion dollars into health and health-related research programs. The scientists of this country have moved forward with astonishing speed to develop new and exciting techniques for preventing disease, disability, and death. Medical scientists have drawn on the knowledge of the space program, the atomic energy program, and other technological fields and have developed successful methods of treatment for diseases thought incurable not long ago. Many of these treatment methods are exceedingly expensive because they are exceedingly technical and require highly trained personnel for their application. Theatment with the artificial kidney is a case in point—in the best of the artificial kidney programs, it costs more than $10,000 per patient per year to maintain an individual so that he can continue to work and provide for his family.

It is this latter problem, high cost and lack of trained personnel, that has given rise to the problem that requires a life or death committee as a solution. Doctors tell us that each year 5,000 to 10,000 Americans in the productive age group die because of kidney failure. They die—not because there is no treatment for their disease, but because they cannot afford the treatment or cannot obtain it in their community. They die at the height of their productivity. They die and leave young families.

Seattle was the first community in the country to face this problem. The selection by committee was their solution when they found that the opportunities for treatment were limited while the need for treatment was great. They found that even when one sets strict criteria—a patient under the age of 45; a patient with no other disease; a patient with the drive and psychological stability to persevere in this treatment program—that the demand for treatment still exceeded the opportunities. They were faced then with a moral and socioeconomic decision in regard to which patient was to receive treatment. The lay committee was a method of taking the problem to the community and asking the community to decide which of its members contributed the most to its economy and culture.

This is a terrible burden for any committee of laymen to bear. It is a burden they should not have to carry.

As early as 1960, when the Seattle program was beginning, the physicians involved recognized that this was an intolerable situation. Then, they were a voice crying in the wilderness; now they have been joined by a chorus of physicians spanning the continent who seek help in establishing treatment programs for the victims of kidney failure. The Public Health Service has tried to meet this need under existing authority, but requests for grants far exceed the funds available. Congress has reacted sympathetically in increasing the appropriation for this activity to $3,400,000 for fiscal 1966. Although the Public Health Service has received applications for support from a score of communities, the funds available are not enough. Communities which need treatment centers have been unable to seek Federal funds because there is no room in the hospital to establish such a center. Still others who recognize the need for artificial kidney centers have been unable to find the trained personnel to begin operating the center.

The Kidney Act of 1966 which I am introducing today with the cosponsorship of my colleague, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], would begin to meet the need for artificial kidney centers in the United States. It would provide funds which are sorely needed to construct these facilities. It would provide funds which are sorely needed to equip such centers, and to train the skilled physicians, nurses, and technicians that are needed to bring this treatment to the community.

It would only be a beginning. Not every one of the 5,000 or more new patients each year would benefit from this program. Many would still die, but this act would permit the development of centers which would be training facilities as well as treatment facilities; centers which would provide a testing ground for further developmental research directed towards reducing the cost of this treatment; and centers which would demonstrate this successful treatment and the benefits derived from it, to community agencies and insurance companies who must begin to play a role in the support of such programs.

Although the artificial kidney treatment centers represent the most obvious need for added Federal assistance, the entire field of kidney disease must be examined. The artificial kidney is only needed in those cases where kidney disease has progressed to a point of total kidney destruction. If the diseases can be detected earlier, and can be treated adequately, then fewer patients will reach the point where the expensive treatment program is needed to sustain life.

Recently, the National Kidney Foundation released statistics that indicated that 100,000 Americans die each year of kidney disease. Even more shocking, 3 million Americans have undetected kidney infections which potentially can destroy these vital organs. Kidney-related diseases are the leading cause of work loss among American women. Bacteria which cause kidney infection, when present in the blood, are the most common cause of death from infection in American hospitals. Pregnant women with urinary tract infection have twice the rate of premature births and still-births as uninfected women.

Despite these facts, and many others which are known about kidney diseases, the Government has only recently begun to develop programs for the detection and treatment of these diseases. The financial resources that are at the disposal of the Public Health Service for this purpose are limited. The Kidney Disease Act will also provide additional funds to be made available to universities and communities for improvement of programs aimed toward attacking kidney disease in the early treatable stage. In the long run, these programs of early detection and adequate treatment may save more lives than the artificial kidney treatment centers ever will. The late Dr. Homer W. Smith, professor of physiology at New York University and a pioneer in the field of kidney physiology, summarized the vital role of the kidneys to the individual when he said:

> Bones can break, muscles can atrophy, glands can loaf, even the brain can go to sleep without immediate danger to survival. But if the kidneys fail * * * neither bones, muscle, gland, nor brain can carry on.

Mr. President, in introducing this proposed legislation which is of such vital importance to the health of our Nation, I would like to compliment the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], and the members of his Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Health for their recognition of this great area of need in years past. In this session, the Senate approved $3.4 million for new treatment centers and provided $3 million for research. This was an excellent start, and I believe it provides a firm base for the legislation my colleague and I introduce today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2675) to amend the Public Health Service Act to assist States and communities in meeting the initial cost of establishment and operation of programs for the care of patients with kidney diseases and to train professional personnel needed to conduct such programs, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Jackson (for himself and Mr. Magnuson), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY, U.S. MARINE CORPS RESERVE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, August 29, 1966, will mark the 50th anniversary of the formal establishment of the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve. I have today introduced a bill in the Senate calling on the Postmaster General to issue a stamp at the appropriate time next year to commemorate this highly significant event in the history of a great organization, an event which is equally great and significant in the history of the United States and in the struggle of all free people to defend freedom with life's blood or with life itself if need be.

The U.S. Marine Corps has written on the pages of history of this Nation feats of dedication and heroism unsurpassed in the annals of man, and the citizen marine has shed his blood and offered up his life side by side with the regulars on every beachhead and in every battle from Chateau Thierry to Iwo Jima to Vietnam. Today, more than at any other time in its history, the Marine Corps Reserve stands equipped, trained, and ready to answer the call of its country to defend once again that freedom which has been won by so costly a sacrifice.

In 1916, at the urging of the then Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels and the Commandant of the Marine Corps, Maj. Gen. Commandant George Barnett, the Congress passed an act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes. One of the other purposes was to set forth provisions regarding a Marine Corps Reserve. President Woodrow Wilson signed the act into law no August 29, 1916, and Secretary Daniels promptly issued Navy Department General Order No. 131 on August 31, 1916, which contained the following statement:

> A U.S. Marine Corps Reserve to be a constituent part of the Marine Corps and in addition to the authorized strength thereof, is hereby established.

The first official strength report of the Marine Corps Reserve shows only 3 officers and 32 enlisted men as of April 1, 1917. From that small beginning, however, the Reserve grew to 6,467 in World War I and to a peak strength of 357,417 during World War II. At the present time, the Marine Corps Reserve numbers 141,000, of which 7,000 are now on active duty; 100,190 are in Ready Reserve, and the remaining 33,810 are in Standby Reserve or retired.

The Marine Corps has always claimed the proud distinction of being ready to fight for its country whenever and wherever needed, and the Reserve has stood ready to back up that claim, and it continues to do so today. I think it is entirely fitting that we should honor such an organization.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2686) to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve, introduced by Mr. Brewster, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] be added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2636) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to make construction grants available for reimbursement of State and local funds used for certain construction.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleagues, Senators Javits, Kennedy of Massachusetts, McCarthy, Nelson, Scott, and others in cosponsoring S. 2636, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. This bill will permit the Federal Government to reimburse State governments for the Federal share of water pollution control facilities constructed after enactment of this amendment.

A number of States are recognizing that they must begin construction of needed waste treatment facilities if their waterways are to be saved from irreversible pollution.

New York State voters will be asked next month to approve a $1 billion State bond issue that will be used to construct water pollution control facilities. These voters would like some assurance that New York State will receive its fair share of Federal funds that may be made available for the construction of pollution control facilities.

This bill will make it possible for those communities that construct sewage treatment facilities now to obtain Federal assistance for these projects when funds are available.

This bill can be of assistance in helping each State meet water pollution problems.

It should be pointed out, however, that more than money is required to clean up pollution. Unless our industry takes steps to control their pollution, money spent on sewage treatment by communities will be wasted. It should be fairly obvious that unless we have standards for each waterway and effective enforcement of regulations to maintain these standards, additional funds will not significantly aid us in pollution control.

This bill, S. 2636, can provide a temporary solution to financial problems faced by States now constructing municipal sewage treatment facilities.

I believe, however, that a more permanent solution to this problem can be reached during the second session of this Congress. The Senate Committee on Public Works is working on legislation that will provide additional Federal financial assistance for water pollution control. I am hopeful that this legislation will couple this assistance with effective regulations governing pollution so that we can begin a nationwide cleanup of pollution.

In the meantime, I hope that this bill will receive prompt consideration by the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 20, 1965, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 337. An act for the relief of F. F. Hintz;

S. 343. An act for the relief of Paride Marchesan;

S. 374. An act for the relief of Dr. Castrillo (Fernandez);

S. 516. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the Saint Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), to provide that eight members of such Commission shall be appointed by the President, and that such Commission may continue in existence until December 31, 1966;

S. 711. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hertha L. Wohlmuth;

S. 1735. An act relating to the use by the Secretary of the Interior of land at La Jolla, Calif., donated by the University of California for a marine biological research laboratory, and for other purposes; and

S. 2039. An act for the relief of Ken Allen Keene (Yasuo Tsukikawa).

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. SCOTT:

Statement issued by Senator Morton, of Kentucky, on the John Birch Society.

FAMILY PLANNING AND THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the failure of the OEO to face up to the problem of family planning as an inseparable part of the war on poverty is receiving increased attention in the press. I ask unanimous consent that a column which appeared in the Washington Star on the 17th of October, under the byline of Hobart Rowen, entitled "OEO's Failure on Birth Issue," and a news article in the Tuesday, October 19, 1965, issue of the Washington Post entitled "Family Plans Held Inseparable Part of War on Poverty," be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Oct. 17, 1965]

OEO's Failure on Birth Issue

(By Hobart Rowen)

This has been a kind of open season for criticizing the antipoverty program, and I don't relish joining in the fray. On the whole, with all its stumbling and fumbling, I think the Office of Economic Opportunity is doing some desperately important work.

And I'm not particularly concerned if six top aids to Sargent Shriver resign, because six other men will soon replace them.

But I am concerned with what appears to be OEO's great timidity in coming to grips with the problem of birth control.

In fighting what Shriver and the President like to call the war against poverty, there are many high-priority objectives. Education, jobs, housing would be on anyone's list. But there is hardly a sociologist or educator who would not agree that without some kind of concerted effort to control population in the slums, the war may be lost.

All we need, to make it simple, is an agreement that the poor are entitled to the same kind of birth-control information and devices that are available to the middle class and the rich—of all religions—in this country.

But the OEO, with a worried look over one shoulder to Capitol Hill, and over the other to various church groups, does not aggressively push family planning. Out of more than 700 local poverty programs approved to date, only 11 involve birth control, and only 12 others are pending.

There is no such OEO program, for example, in New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, and other major cities with large poverty blocs.

Some at OEO take cheer that the agency has been able to move at all in this touchy area. But Shriver's office must do more. At the moment, it fails to encourage local communities to apply for birth control money. Instead, OEO is guided by a 10-point set of rules that is a veritable maze of discouragement to any local group nervy enough to propose a birth control program.

Point No. 6, for example, prohibits the use of OEO funds to announce or promote, through mass media, the very existence of a birth control program. Whispers, presumably, are permissible.

Point No. 8 bars the use of OEO funds to buy devices or pills for unmarried women, or married women not living with their husbands.

Yet, the precise problem in the major Negro slums of the big cities is that the nicely defined family unit of other layers of society is often nonexistent.

Clearly, point No. 8 ought to be put aside. As it is, in its few approved programs, OEO gets around its own ruling by providing advice, as distinct from devices, for unmarried women—and then sending them to other private or public agencies that will put up the money.

Typical of OEO's lack of courage in these matters has been its failure to approve a well-rounded program in Milwaukee, because of opposition of some church groups. There, a mobile truck that would have moved, as needed, among four birth-control centers, was labeled a "Sex Mobile" by opponents.

OEO seems to wilt under this kind of attack. It worries also about the opposition of some churchmen, which occasionally takes a peculiar turn. One distinguished member of the Washington, D.C., clergy recently suggested that birth control is really anti-Negro, because it tends to hold down the growth of the Negro population.

OEO needs to disassociate itself from this pattern of thought by reaching out and pushing birth-control programs. It should provide local communities with the kind of technical assistance that will assist them in submitting good proposals.

This is one part of the poverty war that won't be won unless Shriver commits himself to it—and lets everybody know it.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 19, 1965]

Family Plans Held Inseparable Part of War on Poverty

The Government's fight against poverty must include family planning programs because large families cause millions of Americans to be poor, Michael Harrington said yesterday.

Author of "The Other America," Harrington emphasized this link between poverty and overpopulated families in an address at the annual meeting of Planned Parenthood-World Population in New York City. His book told of the Nation's poor and helped stir the national concern that led to the war on poverty.

"There are millions of Americans who are poor because they are in large families," Harrington said, "and these families are large not because the mother and father wanted it that way, but because they were effectively denied access to family planning information."

STATISTICS CITED

He cited these statistics:

Almost half the poor people in America—48 percent—are under 18 years old.

Some 1,650,000 children live in families headed by a woman who has 5 children. In this group, 92 percent live in poverty.

In contrast, families headed by a man who has three or four children show only 14 percent incidence of poverty and those by men with one or two children have an 8-percent rate of poverty.

"What is at stake," Harrington emphasized, "is not the imposition of special rules upon the family life of the poor, but giving the people in the economic underworld the right to the same choice that middle-class people have."

SOME FUNDS PROVIDED

The Office of Economic Opportunity has provided funds for about a dozen family planning programs so far. Harrington called this a step in the right direction, but called for increased Government effort. He has been a consultant to Sargent Shriver, Director of OEO on planning the antipoverty war.

The OEO requires a community consensus to include a birth-control program in poverty program in poverty services. Only married women are eligible to participate.

At the 4-day meeting, a research team reported that poor women want birth control as much as their better off sisters and will use a pill faithfully and with high continuity.

The study of 14,000 pill users was made by Dr. Richard Frank, medical director of Planned Parenthood of Chicago, and Dr. Christopher Tietze, research director for the National Committee on Maternal Health.

About four out of five were still using the pill after 30 months, they reported. Dr. Tietze said the results should answer once and for all the question whether low-income mothers will take the pill regularly.

Mr. CLARK. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article from the Washington Star, issue of September 30, 1965, entitled "New Statement by Pope Urged on Birth Control."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

New Statement by Pope Urged on Birth Control

Vatican City.—The Vatican Ecumenical Council was asked today to scrap its entire text on birth control and let Pope Paul VI make a final pronouncement on the subject.

The request came from John Cardinal Heenan, of Britain, who also asked that the Roman Catholic Church urge childless couples to adopt orphans and illegitimate children.

Cardinal Heenan was among 14 prelates who spoke in the council on the marriage and birth control section of the assembly's schema on modern world problems.

The document speaks of couples having the right to determine the number of children they should have. But there is no mention of contraception.

Clearly alluding to contraception, Cardinal Heenan told the prelates in St. Peter's:

"Would it not be better to say nothing at all about marriage in this document rather than discuss it while leaving the really big problem without mention?

"If we act in this way, there is surely some danger that the faithful will feel they are being defrauded."

He said non-Catholic critics might even "sneer at us and say 'the Catholic Church claims to be infallible in teaching faith and morals, yet it cannot make up its mind about this question.'

"It would be better to leave out this whole chapter on marriage until the Pope, having received the guidance he has sought from scientists and theologians, is ready to make a proclamation on this subject."

Another speaker, Angelo Cardinal Rossi of São Paulo, Brazil, said the final word on birth control properly belongs to the Pope, but that the bishops at the council "must have some word before we leave and go back to our people."

Conservatives in the council complain that the birth control document is vague and leaves the way open for use of contraceptives.

Possibly it does—and possibly on purpose.

As general and vague as the document might seem to be, a striking fact is that it does not specifically bar the use of contraceptives and suggests marriage involves other basic values than the perpetuation of the human race.

The document, originally described as a broad one without specific direction, has turned out to be different. This is made apparent in an official summary of the still secret text. The summary was made public Wednesday as the council began debate of the issue.

The summary says that the document stresses the value of those acts which realize the intimate and normal union of the spouses and at the same time are a symbol of their reciprocal giving of one another.

"The institution of marriage and conjugal love are ordained to the procreation and the education of children," the document says, but it doesn't limit marriage to that end.

NATO AND BONN ISSUES CALL FOR U.S. CANDOR

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have been gratified to see the mounting opposition to continuing the MFL as a part of American foreign policy. A major speech on that issue was made by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] last week, following which I participated in the colloquy.

I ask unanimous consent that a column written by Walter Lippmann, entitled "NATO, Bonn Issues Call for U.S. Candor," be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATO, BONN ISSUES CALL FOR U.S. CANDOR

WASHINGTON.—No one can doubt that there are coming important changes in the structure of the Western Alliance. But serious examination of the changes has not yet begun because neither in West Germany nor in this country is there a consensus about what to do.

Thus, Chancellor Ludwig Erhard has not yet found a way to reconcile the factions out of which he must fashion his government, and the divisive issue among these factions is West German foreign policy—toward Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union, France, and the United States. In Washington, the administration is divided basically over how to deal with the conflicting views of the West Germans.

The initiative and the preponderant influence in the work of reforming and renovating the Western Alliance has fallen by default into the hands of Gen. Charles de Gaulle. For Britain is unable for the time being to play a leading role in the world, and the United States is prevented by the controversies in Bonn and in this country from taking a clear stand. But this is not an impossible thing to do, and as compared with many tragic issues elsewhere in the world, it is not even an exceedingly difficult thing to do.

It would be a good beginning if Washington ceased to treat the modernization and reform of NATO as an attack on the alliance and as a manifestation of General de Gaulle's personal ambitions and prejudices. The NATO treaty and the military establishment constructed upon it were put together half a generation ago, and the international situation of 1965 is obviously very different from what it was in 1949. Much has happened since then. Notably, there has been the great schism in the Communist world and the Soviet-American detente which followed the nuclear confrontation of 1962.

We ought to be the first, not the reluctant last, to be arguing for the modernization of NATO, and we should be thinking about how to do this, not about how to stand off General de Gaulle. A clear change of posture on our part would do much to clear the air and also to help the West Germans make up their minds.

In the next installment of clarification must come the abandonment of the misconception that there exists a choice for Germany between defiance and reconciliation in Eastern Europe. There is a faction in Germany, which has its counterpart in Washington, which nurses the illusion that the Soviet Union can be forced behind its own frontiers and that East Germany can then be united with West Germany—all this to be done by a special German-American military combination. Probably very few Germans, even among those who give lipservice to this notion, really believe in the idea. More likely, they harbor the idea that by being joined to us in some special relationship, the West Germans will have something to trade off when they sit down to bargain with the Soviet Union.

On our side, our German policy has become a mixture of anti-German prejudice and of appeasement. That military absurdity, the multilateral mixed-manned nuclear force of surface ships, was conceived in distrust of the Germans with the intention of fooling them. Its basic assumption is that the Germans will follow another Hitler unless the present-day Germans are given the illusion that they, too, are a first-class, that is to say a nuclear, power.

In the interests of the hygiene of German-American relations, we should give up the idea of deceiving the Germans and of appeasing them lest they do the horrible things we impute to them.

The honest and healthy basis of German-American relations is mutual candor. Such candor requires us to recognize that a nation which is partitioned must have no access to nuclear weapons. Its vital interest is reunification which must be achieved by reconciliation with its former enemies, most particularly those to the east. Reunification cannot be achieved by any kind of German nuclear threat, either real or fictitious. It can be achieved only by the President's policy of building bridges, and therefore, it is incumbent upon the Germans to stop complaining and wondering about every bridge we try to build.

The Germans will find, as we, too, shall find, that as Germany and America seek the solution of the problems of security and reunification in an increased agreement with the Soviet Union, Gaullist France will not be our enemy and our inveterate opponent. We shall then all be realined together.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Lippmann takes the same view as do I and a great many others, that it is far more important to obtain a nuclear nonproliferation treaty with Russia than to go on further with the MLF, an ill-conceived and obsolete effort to solve a part of the German problem.

BOSCH PLAYS KEY DOMINICAN ROLE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the newspapers carry word of new disorders in the Dominican Republic. Juan Bosch is back there playing a key Dominican role. My dissent from administration policy on the Dominican Republic, which seems to be engineered by Under Secretary of State Thomas Mann, is a matter of public record.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in last Sunday's New York Times, entitled "Bosch Plays Key Dominican Role," under the byline of Paul Hofmann.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOSCH PLAYS KEY DOMINICAN ROLE

(By Paul Hofmann)

SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, October 16.—"Comrades, please check your weapons here," reads a sign at the foot of a stairway that leads up to former President Juan Bosch's second-floor office and home in a green downtown house.

The large hall upstairs looks like the waiting room of a popular lawyer, except for a couple of bodyguards who did not check their rifles. The green house is a new political power center.

Many Dominicans view it as a potential source of new trouble for a nation that is painfully trying to recover from a savage 4-month civil war. Others are convinced that Professor Bosch, since his dramatic homecoming September 25, has restored true perspective in the Dominican political picture.

POPULAR FORCE

No observer of the Dominican scene will deny that Mr. Bosch, for better or worse, represents a strong and genuinely popular force.

Right now, the Dominican Republic is not supposed to have any domestic politics. The transition regime of Provisional President Hector Garcia-Godoy, strongly backed by the United States and the Organization of American States, is pledged to impartiality in its labors to restore some normalcy.

This week, significant progress was made when Government police entered downtown Santo Domingo for the first time since early in the civil war, and rebel forces left the area that they had been controlling for more than 5 months.

On Friday the long-divided capital was at last reunified when the Inter-American Peace Force lifted its cordon around the rebel sector.

The Garcia-Godoy regime is committed to preparing elections for next June, and since the provisional president cannot be a candidate, and very few other Dominicans have any chance of becoming the future head of state, Mr. Bosch inevitably will play an important role in the forthcoming electioneering.

Most U.S. officials here are, to say the least, unenthusiastic about the prospect of a Bosch comeback to power. Washington became involved militarily in the Dominican civil war last spring mainly to prevent a Communist takeover, and for some time seemed to side with Dominican rightists who simply equated Mr. Bosch with communism.

Mr. Bosch won about 60 percent of the votes cast by a million or so Dominicans in December 1962, when the little Caribbean country had its first democratic elections in nearly 40 years. On September 25, 1963, a proclamation signed by 25 high armed forces officers accused him of weakness in the face of a Communist takeover threat and declared him deposed. The coup was bloodless. It was also useless, most Dominicans agree today.

Mr. Bosch's reinstatement as constitutional President was the basic issue of the civil war that erupted after Donald Reid Cabral's military-backed regime—the result of the 1963 coup—collapsed in another army coup last April 24.

More than 1,000 armed forces members fought on the side of Mr. Bosch's left-of-center Dominican Revolutionary Party and other leftists, including Communists, against the bulk of the 30,000-man armed forces whose conservative chiefs had vetoed the formed President's return.

The Dominican Reconciliation Act, negotiated between the civil war contenders by the Organization of American States, paved the way for Mr. Bosch's return. On coming home the former President proved at once that he had lost neither his charismatic touch with the Dominican masses nor his sharp and voluble tongue.

This week Mr. Bosch complained that Mr. Garcia-Godoy, his Foreign Minister in 1963, was favoring the Reformist Party of former President Joaquin Balaguer, and that the army and police were making pro-Balaguer propaganda.

Mr. Bosch has not yet formerly declared his candidacy for the coming election, but it is generally thought that he will run. Dr. Balaguer has already said he is a candidate.

COMMUNISTS GAINING

Mr. Bosch's party defines itself as Socialist and democratic. In the 1962 elections it swept Santo Domingo and the poorer parts of the interior. The civil war has radicalized the rank and file. The Dominican Communists are still numerically weak, but they are gaining influence among the young generation, especially among intellectuals and students, and may try to "capture" Mr. Bosch by backing his candidacy.

Dr. Balaguer was initially a figurehead for Generalissimo Rafael Leonidas Trujillo. When the 31-year Trujillo dictatorship ended, Dr. Balaguer won prestige by honesty and moderation. His party has now the support mainly of the upper and middle classes. The Balaguer party advocates prudent social reforms, but does not reject the backing of former Trujillists and the military. If the general elections are held as scheduled, a close race between Mr. Bosch and Dr. Balaguer is likely.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, consideration of the Dominican Republic problem leads one inexorably to a consideration of our whole Latin American policy, which I believe is in grave need of overhauling. An excellent article which provides much valuable background on this subject was published in the Monday morning, October 18 issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer, entitled "Cuba and Latin America: Our Neighbors to South." The article, to my way of thinking, is the most balanced, reasonable, and readable summary of the problems which confront us in Latin America that I have seen in a long time, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Cuba and Latin America: Our Neighbors to South—Economic Gains Offset by Rise in Population

(By Joseph C. Goulden)

Simon Bolivar, dying en route to exile after ending Spanish domination of the South American continent in the 1820's, said bitterly, "America is ungovernable. Those who served the revolution plowed the sea."

After 135 years little has happened to disturb the chilling pessimism of Bolivar's judgment. Latin America remains the New World's problem child. The Alliance for Progress, the United States first earnest effort to lift the bulk of Latins into the modern era, is foundering. The inertia created by decades of maladministration, disorganization, and downright poor government is stifling and discouraging, and at the moment seemingly insumountable.

Latin America is so diverse (280 million persons in 20 nations) as to defy capsulization. Yet certain generalizations hold true for most of its countries:

Under his present government the average Latin (and this excludes a handful of countries notably Mexico) is condemned to poverty, ignorance and hunger—based on normal Western standards.

The nations are writhing on the threshold of the 20th century, and they are going to enter it. Few will emerge as U.S.-patterned democracies; the best the United States can expect is U.S.-oriented governments.

A number of ingredients exist for perversion of Latin nationalism into the state socialism of Cuba, or the anthill collectivization of Communist China and its negation of the human spirit. Other of the ingredients, however, are lacking, and the Latin masses have shown no inclination to unfurl a Red flag.

NEGLECTED NEIGHBORS

If Latin America indeed does tilt to the side of the United States—but this is by no means guaranteed—it could serve as what former Presidential adviser and diplomat Adolf A. Berle calls the principal demographic counterbalance to the rising and somewhat unpredictable power emerging on the Asian mainland.

Two decades of preoccupation with Asia and Europe left an imbalance in U.S. global commitments. Now Europe has stabilized, and the United States is learning in Vietnam the bitter sum of Communist domination of what started as a nationalistic movement.

In July 1964, Hubert H. Humphrey said the United States must seek to avoid a similar impasse in its Latin policy. Writing in Foreign Affairs, the then Senator said:

"Our policy should be designed to discourage intrahemispheric rivalry which would Balkanize the continent, as well as to prevent Communist subversion which would divide the hemisphere into an endless struggle between Communist and non-Communist states."

The United States has both inherent advantages and disadvantages in dealing with Latin Americans. Economically it overwhelms the remainder of the Western Hemisphere as merchant and customer. Militarily it has been both protector from foreign aggression and chaperon against what it considered unwise ventures for the Latins. (In this century U.S. troops have entered Cuba, Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Mexico, and Panama.)

EFFECT OF DISCRIMINATION

Yet something is lacking in the United States-Latin relationship, despite all the formal protestations of "good neighbors," and backslapping businessmen and diplomats, Prof. Frank Tannenbaum of Columbia University, speaking as a 50-year observer, says Americans trying to fathom the resentful feelings of Latins toward the United States fail "to point to the most serious source of our difficulties—the treatment of Latin Americans as inferiors."

Tannenbaum continues: "We are heirs to a tradition about colored people and it influences all of our attitudes, feelings, notions, habits, gestures and verbal expressions about them." The manifestation of Tannenbaum's theory comes in the condescension of businessman, tourist and ambassador alike, and is reciprocated in the sotto voce insult directed at the Yankee's turned back.

The Latin American situation is a product of both history and geography (and here again there are exceptions to general statements applied to the entire region). After Bolivar put to flight the Spanish colonial governors the lack of an effective replacement enabled wealthy caudillos—the upper-class Spanish-parent landowners and merchants—to seize power economically and politically. The caudillos used slave and peon labor to work large haciendas in a system that rivaled, for brutality and impoverishment, the feudal fiefdoms of Dark Ages Europe. Indians and freemen were shunted into the highlands and remote and unarable areas.

TRADITIONAL ARMY ROLE

But the caudillos' power was limited, confined to villages and provinces. The army, as the only force of nationwide scope, was the cohesive that enabled loose confederations of the caudillos to make up a government. The army also slipped into the habit of living off the land by exaction. When the army could not get what it wanted, it simply changed governments, and took for itself extra military functions.

The officer corps gave the illborn the opportunity to achieve power and wealth, and the ranks gave allegiance to the strongest officer-politician in their midst. The intrigue was endless. An officer would muster enough support to seize the presidency, then grab what he could in a hurry and distribute the remainder to his followers. But there was seldom enough to satisfy, prompting new intrigues from which would emerge a new strongman.

Between the independence period of 1820-25 and the First World War the Spanish-American countries experienced 115 successful revolutions and many times that number of abortive revolts.

None resulted in any reforms, however. The caudillos ranged in caliber from tyrant to benevolent despot, and the military did nothing to change them. Writes historian Edwin Lieuwen of the University of New Mexico:

"With the great majority of the population inarticulate, poverty-stricken and politically apathetic, the military were under no popular pressure to change the existing social system, nor did they show any inclination to do so."

Whatever social changes have come have resulted from the sheer weight of the burgeoning urban masses (principally in Brazil and Argentina). Yet the military continues to hold an effective veto power over a majority of Latin governments.

Latin American government may be summed up, "rigid in structure, unstable in personalities."

GEOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND

Geographically, however, conditions are even worse, and South America can best be described as a basket case, a series of isolated nations clinging to the coastline of a hostile continent. A formidable mountain range, the Andes, splits its interior for the entire 4,500-mile north-to-south length, with peaks of up to 23,000 feet. Passes are few and high, 12,000 to 14,000 feet—not trade routes, but precarious scratches through which creep roads, mule tracks and rare railroads.

To Latin America, vastness is synonymous with worthlessness. The Amazon River Basin of Brazil contains 2 million square miles, two-thirds the size of the continental United States. The river system has 40,000 miles of navigable water, and the Amazon itself stretches the equivalent of the distance from New York to Liverpool, England. Yet the basin is a nonproductive hothouse, its rains so heavy they leach the soil of soluble minerals, its temperatures so hot they prevent the buildup of fungi and humus essential to fertility.

Because of the poor transportation created by geographic barriers, South America is a coastal continent, the majority of its people living within 200 miles of the sea. There are no inland counterparts of Chicago, Detroit, or even Kansas City. Thirty of the provincial capitals of Peru, in 1964, had no road contact with the rest of the nation; people live a lifetime in 2-mile-high Andean villages without once descending into modern civilization.

INDIAN POPULATION

The isolation leaves enclaves of unassimilated Indians (14 to 30 million of them, by guess and count), which form non-Spanish-speaking subcultures living apart from the formal structure of the nation. For four centuries the Indians have successfully resisted attempts to make them Europeans or even Latin Americans. Tiny Guatemala, with only 2.7 million persons, has within its cramped borders 21 different Indian groups, descended from the Maya-Quiche tribe. Gen. Lazaro Cardenas, while president of Mexico in 1934–40, said after visiting a tribe of Yaqui Indians: "Somos extranjeros aqui"—we are strangers here.

Despite its vastness, Latin America's third grave handicap is population imbalance. The flap of the stork's wings signal impending disaster for the continent, which has the fastest-growing population of any major subdivision in the world. According to the Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA), a U.N. group, between 1953 and 1964 the population increased by 2.8 percent per year, compared with 0.8 percent in Western Europe, 1.67 percent in the United States, and an estimated 2.1 percent in Communist China.

ECLA projects a threefold increase in the population by 2000—meaning 630 million Latins at the dawn of the 21st century, compared with some 69 million in 1900.

In the decade of the 1950's Brazil alone increased by an astonishing 36.5 percent, from 52 to 71 million persons. Some two-thirds of this new growth was in urban areas (19 to 32 million, or 70 percent), four times more than the countryside (33 to 39 million, or 18 percent).

The growth is attributable to better health programs that widened the gap between birth and death rates—DDT, antibiotics, improved sanitation and water supplies. Liberal sexual mores also contribute. Illegitimacy hasn't been frowned upon since the first Portuguese and Spanish colonizers made friends with Indian women. Latin American women marry early and bear often; a 1960 survey by the United Nations found the average Brazilian woman had six live births. El Nacional, leading paper in Venezuela, reported in July that only 20 of 100 births in that country are to married couples.

The affluent United States, with the educational and governmental services structure built during decades of economic boom, is hard-pressed to absorb its population increase—which is minuscule by Latin standards. The new Latins must be squeezed into facilities that are already overcrowded.

BURDEN FOR ALLIANCE

Thomas Mann, President Johnson's chief adviser on Latin America, says of the population spurt:

"This arithmetic has a direct and important bearing on the ability of the American states to achieve the Alliance for Progress goal that the increase in the income of every man, woman and child in the hemisphere shall not be less than 2.5 percent per capita per year."

The composition of the Latin populace, resultantly, is markedly different from the United States. Speaking to a birth-control group recently, Mann noted, "For example, about one-fourth of the population is less than 10 years old. A large portion of the population therefore contributes little to production; rather, it is essentially a consumer.

"This means that the working force has a heavier burden to bear. Because a higher percentage of production must be consumed on the necessities of life, there is less available to invest in farms and factories that are needed to increase production."

In 1960, the United Nations estimated, the housing deficit in Latin America was 40 million units; this shortage is increasing in proportion to the population boom, despite frantic homebuilding projects under the Alliance for Progress. The Latins also must find teachers and classrooms for another 400 million persons who will pass through childhood between now and 2000. Urban centers, with a 14-percent average annual growth rate, must provide transportation, streets, electricity, sewerage.

A NEW SOCIETY

Thus, then, is posed the Latin dilemma: A continent aware of its shortcomings and misery, and groping for a solution. Three pathways, appear open to Latin leaders, each overlapping the other in part, and each with the same goal, a new society.

The makeup of that new society—and one is coming, most Latin American scholars agree—is the crucial question, from the U.S. point of view. The paths reaching toward it are commuism and/or state socialism; rebuilding under the Alliance for Progress, with U.S. leadership, in fact if not in form; or a uniquely Latin creation of a new force, neither pure democracy nor pure socialism, but one which can cope with the problems of a continent. In order, here is an assessment of the present status and future of each path.

Communism is not a newcomer to Latin America. Parties were formed there as long ago as 1918, generally on the periphery of the labor movement. In 1935 the Reds were strong enough in Brazil to attempt a coup, which collapsed in 1 day. But only in the last decade has the Red influence among Latins become a concern to the United States. In 1954 the Central Intelligence Agency was instrumental in overthrowing a Communist-alined government in Guatemala which was importing arms from Soviet-bloc nations.

The Communists got their strongest foothold beginning in 1959, when guerrillas led by Fidel Castro, then 32 years old, overthrew Cuban dictator Fulgencio Batista. The Castro regime started as a broad-based popular front, but soon disintegrated into a Communist movement. As Castro set about remolding Cuban society he alienated first, American business interest on the island, secondly, the U.S. Government, and finally, broad sections of the middle and upper classes who had aided his revolution against the corrupt Batista.

TRAPPINGS OF COMMUNISM

The CIA this time wasn't successful in its attempt to toss out a Red government. Cuban exiles, organized and armed by the CIA, attempted an invasion of Cuba in April, 1961, but were repulsed by Castro's militia and army. Some 1,200 men were captured, to be ransomed a year later in exchange for drugs and medicines. In May 1961, Castro declared he was a Marxist and Cuba took on the trappings of a Communist state, with the hammer and sickle flying over public buildings and Soviet-bloc weapons in the hands of its soldiers and militiamen.

Externally, Fidel Castro's strategy has been consistent since 1959—that of converting the Andes into the "Sierra Maestra of the Americas," alluding to the mountain range which sheltered his 2-year-long guerrilla war against Batista's numerically superior army. Castro's tactics, however, have reflected sophisticated flexibility.

In the first 6 months of 1959, flushed with his triumph over Batista, Castro hurled armed expeditions against several other Caribbean countries also ruled by military strongmen. All failed, and the Organization of American States, the regional peacekeeping group, slapped Castro's wrists. Castro then launched upon a different tack, subtler in tone. The State Department lists four main channels for his activity:

The formation of front groups both in the United States and Latin America in the guise of friendship societies or committees for the defense of the Cuban revolution. Lee Harvey Oswald, the assassin of President Kennedy, was a member of one of these fronts, the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

An intensive propaganda program, using Prensa Latina, a Cuban news wire service, and powerful radio transmitters. One broadcast series, "Radio Free Dixie," is aimed at southern Negroes in the United States.

Covert material support, largely financial, to subversive groups abroad, is funneled in through diplomatic corridors. Small boats from Cuba also haul arms to revolutionists in other Latin countries, principally Venezuela.

Indoctrination and training of hundreds of Latin Americans in Cuba, including schooling in sabotage, terrorism, and guerrilla tactics. The trainees, mostly in their late teens and twenties, go to Cuba via Prague ostensibly to study agricultural or industrial techniques. Once there, however, they are put through realistic offensive and defensive exercises, taught how to survive in the jungles and given weapons and map instruction. They are also schooled in the art of infiltrating and subverting student, labor, and other groups in their own countries.

TERROR IN VENEZUELA

Edwin M. Martin, former Latin American expert in the State Department, said in a talk on this problem, "Venezuelans seem to be the most numerous national group among these trainees, and we do not consider it sheer coincidence that Venezuela's democratic government and the Venezuelan people are being subjected most heavily to the terrorist and guerrilla activities of the Castro Communists in that country."

Cuba's technique for Latin insurrectionists is based on three premises:

A guerrilla band, by its very existence, can create a revolutionary situation where none existed previously. Peasants, not urban workers, make up the revolutionary force in Latin America. (Here Cuba differs from the Soviet concept and alines with the Communist Chinese, who support agrarian rather than urban revolution.) Lastly, a guerrilla band can whip a regular army.

COUNTERING CASTRO

The State Department, as a matter of national policy, works briskly to counter Castro's export of revolution. And it claims considerable success in the United States attempts to weaken and discredit the Cuban Government.

The October 1962, crisis, in which former Soviet Premier Khrushchev capitulated to President Kennedy and withdrew potentially offensive missiles, "proved to be of inestimable value in unmasking the Castro regime, previously regarded by many as a model for a new Latin American revolution, as just one more tool of Moscow." The confrontation displayed that the then-Soviet leadership was not ready to risk nuclear war to protect Latin comrades.

(In the framework of the Sino-Soviet policy split, the backdown was costly to the Soviets. The Venezuelan Communist Party, for instance, immediately switched to a policy of revolution through violence, as advocated by the Chinese, rather than revolution through political change, as advocated by the Soviets. There were similar splinters of the Reds from Soviet to Chinese orientation in Brazil, Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Chile.)

The State Department also claims it is gradually bankrupting Cuba, saying, "The ineptitude of Cuban leaders, coupled with the success of our efforts to deprive Cuba of access to the industrialized markets of the free world, has brought about serious economic deterioration in the island." The United States won't trade with Cuba; ships from other nations which call there aren't admitted to U.S. ports. Nonetheless, United States allies such as Great Britain and Canada trade regularly with Fidel Castro, and he uses the economic shortages as a rallying point for anti-U.S. propaganda.

ANTIGUERRILLA TRAINING

To help Latin governments protect themselves against Castro terrorists and subversion, the United States trains military and police personnel in riot control and counterguerrilla tactics. These courses are given at U.S. military schools at Fort Gulick, in the Canal Zone of Panama, and at Fort Bragg, N.C.

Martin noted, however, that guns and police aren't the sole antidote for Castroism. "Theoretically we could put vast amounts of arms and riot equipment into Latin American hands today (he was talking in 1963) to stamp out rebellion and to shoot down the Communist leaders and followers. But into whose hands would we put these arms? How can we be sure that the riot quellers of today will not be the rioters tomorrow? What good are arms and security controls in a permanently unstable society?"

(Martin was prophetic. During the last year a sizable portion of the Guatemalan Army has been tied down fighting a guerrilla leader named Marco Antonio Yon Sosa, head of the Movimiento Revolucionario 13 de Noviembre—MR-13. Yon Sosa, who is opposing the military rule of Col. Enrique Peralta Azurdia, is a graduate of the U.S. antiguerrilla school at Fort Gulick.)

DOMINICAN INTERVENTION

The existence of a Communist state only 90 miles south of Florida is a political embarrassment to the United States and one which it doesn't want to see repeated elsewhere. For that reason President Johnson responded quickly last April when he got information, later questioned, that Communists threatened to take control of a revolt in the Dominican Republic. He dispatched 18,000 U.S. marines and soldiers in a unilateral action which was roundly denounced by other intervention-wary Latin states.

The State Department's generally alarmist view of Communist subversion in Latin America isn't universally accepted by other authorities. Juan Bosch, the only freely elected president in the history of the Dominican Republic (he was thrown out by a coup in September 1963, 9 months after he took office) claims rightists use the word "communism" as a tarbrush with which to smear opponents. Bitter over the U.S. intervention in his country, Bosch wrote in Saturday Review last summer:

"Today there has spread over the countries of America a fear of communism that is leading us all to kill democracy for fear that democracy is the mask of communism." Bosch maintains that a democratic society, and its accompanying guarantees of freedom, ultimately will smother communism.

Another dissenter is Ernst Halperin, research associate at the center for international studies at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who says flatly that the chances of a Communist-dominated regime are slim indeed in Latin America.

Halperin supports his thesis with conclusions that differ sharply from the popular image of Latin America. The poverty-plenty contrast, while frightening to the outsider, isn't necessarily the harbinger of social cataclysm, Halperin maintains.

Why? Halperin argues: The city slums are many cuts above the rural poverty from whence came their inhabitants. Despite the squalor, there are health centers and other social services, and also chances for jobs and eventual homeownership.

Strong unions on the docks and in the railroads and oil fields, have created a relatively well-paid middle class which acts as a counterbalance to Communist agitation. Marxism, which calls for the overthrow of the existing order as a means of improving man's lot, has a hollow ring. The slum dwellers, according to Halperin (who studied them firsthand for 2 years), are more comfortable than they were on the farm, and "cannot be made to believe that revolution is necessary to achieve the further material improvements they desire * * * they are realists on the lookout for material improvement, and in politics they tend to support the man who is in a position to provide such improvement, even if he is a dictator or a politician with an unsavory record."

Halperin cites results of three recent elections to question the Communists' appeal in the slums: the 1963 Peruvian presidential race, where the slum districts of Lima, worst in Latin America, voted for Gen. Manuel Odria, most conservative of four candidates; the Venezuelan presidential election a few months later, when Arturo Uslar Pietri, conservative intellectual and business candidate, got a majority of the Caracas slum votes; and in Chile, in 1964, when Christian Democrat Eduardo Frei Montalva won over Marxist Salvador Allende in the Santiago and Valparaiso slums.

GUERRILLAS' ADVANTAGE

The great imponderable, however, is the future of the scattered guerrilla bands such as that led by Yon Sosa in Guatemala. Ralph Sanders, associate professor of political science at the College of the Armed Forces, wrote recently: "The available evidence indicates that insurgents can operate with relatively little popular support. The assistance of a fraction of the population to provide sustenance and intelligence is sufficient as long as the remainder of the local inhabitants do not actively oppose him."

Roger Hilsman, former Director of Intelligence and Research for the State Department, led an effective partisan movement in Burma during the Second World War with 10 percent of the people pro-West, 10 percent proenemy, and the rest "indifferent or turned inward toward their own family and village." The latter category encompasses much of rural Latin America today.

The four largest Communist parties in Latin America (exclusive of Cuba, where membership is estimated at 35,000) are Argentina (60,000 to 70,000), Brazil (30,000, plus 150,000 to 200,000 sympathizers), Chile (25,000 to 30,000) and Venezuela (30,000).

Mere numbers, however, aren't the sole yardstick of Communist influence. Communists helped keep alive the anti-United States turmoil in Panama in early 1964 over whether flags of both Panama and the United States should be displayed in the Canal Zone. The Communist-influenced tin miners' union in Bolivia has kept that unhappy nation in chaos for more than a year. The danger in Communist intermingling with any movement feeding on emotionalism is that the Reds could be hurled into leadership if established order collapses.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Put concisely, the Alliance for Progress is (or was) an attempt by the United States to "assist free men and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty" in Latin America, using President Kennedy's inaugural address phraseology. The Latin nations (excepting Cuba) signed the charter of the Alliance August 17, 1961, in Punta del Este, a Uruguayan resort town. The cost over a decade was put at $100 billion, of which the United States would provide $10 billion in public funds. Hopefully, U.S. private industry would put $10 billion additional into Latin America.

The U.S. dollars, as Mr. Kennedy put it, were to satisfy the basic needs of the Latin American people for homes, work and land, health and schools. With this help the Alliance planners hoped the Latin nations would be able to increase their industrialization to the level of that of Western Europe. Their target was a 2.5 percent increase in the gross national product.

The dollars had strings tied to them when they went southward. Unless Latin governments agreed to tax the local tycoons on a realistic scale (and actually make collections), and carve up nonproductive haciendas, no money.

The scent of U.S. money was ignored by dictatorships in Paraguay, Haiti, Ecuador, Bolivia and Guatemala; government vanished altogether in the Dominican Republic last April 24 and didn't reappear until September. The idealism of the Alliance didn't take into account the preference any incumbent Latin power has for the status quo.

To Latins, the Alliance's disappointment is doubly biting because they expected so much from it.

RELUCTANT INVESTORS

Business has shied from investment in Latin America, reflecting fears both of governmental instability and of Communist terrorists who regularly blast U.S. oil installations in Venezuela. The no-compensation expropriation of U.S. properties by Fidel Castro is a raw memory for U.S. businessmen. Latins themselves prefer to send their extra dollars to the United States or Europe for safekeeping or investment.

Of the 17 countries which signed the Alliance charter, only 7 met the 2.5 percent growth goal in 1964. But one of the seven, Bolivia, was gripped with political chaos, and another, Argentina, still shows a 1.1 percent decrease for the past 6 years. In the last decade the Latin share of exported goods on the world market slumped from 11 to 6 percent.

There is a semblance of compliance in some nations with a key pledge of the Alliance charter: "To reform tax laws, demanding more from those who have the most, to punish tax evasion severely, and to redistribute the national income in order to benefit those who are most in need." Guatemala, although run by a military clique, took in $9 million the first year a graduated income tax was in effect. Peru is giving 511,000 acres of Andean land to 14 Indian communities built upon it.

Yet several Latin authorities now maintain that the United States violated the basic principle of the Alliance by its intervention in the Dominican crisis in the spring. Joseph Grunwald of the Brookings Institution, a nonpartisan Washington research institute, said of this:

"There is no more pretense. The Alliance is dead in some countries already. It's just another aid program. For intellectuals, it's dead as a revolutionary image." Even rightists "can't tell the difference between our response there and that of Communists in a similar situation."

RIGHT OF DEFENSE

Latins opposed to the Dominican intervention cite article 15 of the charter of the Organization of American States, to which the United States is a signatory: "No state or group of states has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other state. The foregoing principle prohibits not only armed forces but also any other form of interference or attempted threat against the personality of the state or against its political, economic and cultural elements."

Another OAS treaty, however, gives member states the right to defend each other against an armed attack from outside. Adolf Berle, U.S. negotiator when this treaty was signed, says a "coup" aided and abetted from outside is considered an armed attack, and give rise to the right of defense by other nations.

The State Department's Thomas Mann thinks the Alliance is beginning to make headway, opinions of other observers notwithstanding. In his 1964 report to President Johnson he spoke of a "new unity of purpose in making the Alliance not just a statement of goals but a reality."

Mann also threw in a line which Latins upset over the Dominican intervention might find puzzling: "We need better understanding of the impediments to progress and a greater will to sacrifice short-term political advantages and personal gain so that solid and enduring foundations of progress in freedom can be laid."

A THIRD FORCE

What, then, is the alternative path that Latin Americans can choose instead of Castroism or the Alliance for Progress?

Observers see a dynamic third force making itself felt—Christian Democracy, which has as its tenets the Papal encyclicals advocating social and economic justice for the underprivileged masses of the developing nations.

The Social Democrats, in 1964, won the presidency of Chile when Eduardo Frei Montalva beat a Marxist candidate; they are also strong and growing in Venezuela, Peru, Brazil, and Argentina. The party has common interests with the Roman Catholic Church, but it is not a church movement. Leadership in social reform by young Catholic priests in Latin America gives the church a bond with the Christian Democrats—yet similar support comes from the Latin American Episcopal Church.

Christian Democracy is both an alternative and a safety valve. It permits young university students to be critical of the existing order (even capitalism) without reverting to the extreme of communism.

Frei's motto in Chile, for instance, was "Revolution with Liberty," and he has been carrying out left-of-center policies which mesh the Alliance for Progress with Chilean ideas about the future of their hemisphere. To Latin Americans Christian Democracy stands as a "solution" that is essentially Latin American—suited to their history, temperament and special conditions.

The growth of Christian Democracy bears out beliefs of men such as Ernst Halperin that communism has no spiritual appeal to Latins, and of such men as Tannenbaum that the existing order will not change itself.

MEXICAN SYSTEM

But even Christian Democracy pales in comparison to the unique Mexican system of government, which combines elements of democracy, socialism and aristocracy. Frank Brandenburg of American University, writing in Orbis, called the Mexican power structure simply, "The revolutionary family."

The usual head of the family is the president, assisted by about 20 favorite sons—national and regional politicians, wealthy individuals, some labor leaders and intellectuals. There are subgroups of business, the professions, the press, veterans' groups, and the government bureaucracy itself. The head of the family, by dint of defining the relative power of these vested interests, names the President, who serves for a sole 6-year term. (The election is through the machinery of the Party of Revolutionary Institutions or PRI, which collects more than 90 percent of the vote in any national balloting.) The president, in effect a dictator for 6 years, names state and municipal heads and has a rubber-stamp legislature at his service.

Economically, the revolutionary family permits a mixture of state ownership and private enterprise, and a social welfare system unsurpassed anywhere else in Latin America. Brandenburg writes, "Parochial and splintered interests are submerged in the larger unity of nationhood. * * * Motivated by a deep sense of pride in his nationality, the Mexican fuses patriotism with humanism in a way that redounds to the common and individual good."

The state, for instance, owns the oil and electric power industries and railroad and telegraph systems; slaughterhouses and public marketplaces. Public and private ownership compete in steel, paper, chemicals and electrical products. Private enterprise has as its preserve the hotel, glass and aluminum industries, among others.

The ruling elite is dedicated to social progress—but "keep its feet on firm political, social and economic ground when issues concerning expansion of social security benefits, labor rights and public welfare measures are at stake."

Mexicans are fond of saying that other Latin nations would benefit from following its system, but Brandenburg maintains this is not necessarily true. The main point, he suggests, is that "Mexico found a workable solution based on its own inheritance and on its need and realities. This is the key to development elsewhere in Latin America."

PHILADELPHIA: A BEAUTIFUL AND HISTORIC CITY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, much to my gratification, the Chicago Tribune—a rather unusual source—published on Sunday, October 3, 1965, an excellent article entitled "Philadelphia: A Beautiful and Historic City," written by H. P. Koenig, with the subtitle "Visitor Will Find 1-Day Tour Is Much Too Short."

Mr. President, it is heartening, indeed, to read these comments about Philadelphia, the birthplace of American liberty, in that fine journal, the Chicago Tribune. Although I often find myself frequently in disagreement with that newspaper, I wish to commend it for this excellent article.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA: A BEAUTIFUL AND HISTORIC CITY—VISITOR WILL FIND 1-DAY TOUR IS MUCH TOO SHORT

(By H. P. Koenig)

PHILADELPHIA.—This is being written in a hotel room in Philadelphia. I hadn't planned it that way. By this time of the evening I had expected to be back in my own apartment in New York thinking of other things beside the conceit of travel writers who spend months banging about continental Europe, examining cities and countryside in microscopic detail, and then, when they return to their own country, feel they can do one of the most important and most beautiful cities in the United States in a single day.

So you might say guilt and shame keep me here tonight; but it is more than that, really. It is a matter of curiosity and anticipation, too. There is so much to be enjoyed and appreciated in and around Philadelphia that one needs more time.

When we first decided to come here it had been my intention to take an early morning train from New York, spend the day exploring the city, and then return the same way in the evening. After all, we had been in Philadelphia before. This was to be merely a refresher course in what William Penn's "City of Brotherly Love" had to offer the traveler.

It was my wife's suggestion that we go by car. In that way, she felt, we might get to know a little more about the lovely countryside outside the city. And she was right.

By car is the ideal way to approach the city. For it turns out that there are in reality three separate Philadelphias. There is the historic old city, the bright modern one, and then, along the outskirts, what may well be the most beautiful suburbs in America.

No one has really seen Philadelphia without passing through that pastoral region of rolling hills and green parks bordering the Schuylkill River as it winds its way into, through, and out of the city like a lazy snake. And anyone who has not visited Philadelphia over the past 4 or 5 years can have no idea of the changes that have taken place in this city which played such an important part in our history.

We started from New York after breakfast, sped along the turnpike off across the Delaware River and soon found ourselves approaching Philadelphia from the north, sailing through the green acres of first Pennypack Park and then Tacony Creek Park, skirting along the edge of Germantown, then giving ourselves up to the meandering drives of Fairmount Park.

All around were tall trees, trim lawns, impressive estates, and colonial mansions. The spacious homes set amidst serene scenery must surely be among the most beautiful in America. The shimmering river was never far away. I can think of no other metropolis that has so much greenery practically at its doorstep and is so close to the real country. There were times when it seemed we were miles removed from the city streets, then around a bend would be the river again and there on the other side one saw the slightly fantastic skyline of Penn's original "Green Countrie Towne," and, in the foreground, the magnificent classic facade of that Greek temple of Philadelphia's Museum of Art.

That was where we headed. We paid our admission and went inside. I am not sure I was prepared for what we found. I know sophisticated New Yorkers who trudge about from museum to museum in Antwerp, Amsterdam, Brussels, Paris, Munich, and Rome, wearing out shoes, emerging with watery eyes, setting themselves up as smalltime authorities on the works of Pieter Brueghel the elder, Hieronymus Bosch, Georges Rouault, and Rembrandt van Rijn, and yet chances are these same people have not bothered to make the less than 100-mile journey from their own city to one of the truly great museums of the world. The Philadelphia museum houses a collection of paintings as exciting as many to be come upon abroad.

There are striking Picassos, Cezannes, and Braques one has seen only in reproduction before. Then come works of contemporary American artists equally as important and impressive in their own right.

We had to leave all too soon. Reluctantly we went out between those stately columns and down steps looking out across the city displaying a vista of statuary and fountains, wide avenues trimmed with lawns and trees.

Here are America's own grand boulevards, and examples of elegance and grandeur to match the European capitals.

We drove along Benjamin Franklin Parkway into the bright, new rebuilt part of the city, followed Chestnut Street past those enduring monuments out of the past where the story of the United States as we know it began. The area around Independence Mall has been called the most historic square mile in America. We went almost as far as the Delaware, then swung back up Walnut Street to park across from Old Original Bookbinders, generally considered to be one of the half dozen or so top restaurants in the country.

Seafood is the specialty of this century-old establishment. Snapper soup is the perfect way to start a meal. One couldn't ask for a more pleasant atmosphere. Early

American decor, burnished walls hung with ancient firearms and other memorabilia, sets the scene. Portions are generous; prices remain within reason. Whoever comes this way will not be disappointed in either the quality of the food or the caliber of the service. It easily rates three stars in anyone's guidebook.

After lunch we wandered off across that corner of the old city to visit all those "must see" landmarks in and around Independence Square, scene of the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, meeting place of the Continental Congress and of the Constitutional Convention of 1787 and seat of the Government of the United States from 1790 to 1800.

History lives here. It is in the mellow brick of Independence Hall, in the bronze of the famous Liberty Bell. The men who founded our country walked these quaint alleys, worshiped in the nearby churches. Tarry in the hall where the Declaration of Independence was signed, visit Congress Hall where Washington was inaugurated for his second term. Stop off on tree-shaded benches out back to ponder what it means to be so close to our past.

Not far away is Carpenters' Hall, the old Custom House, the Stock Exchange, Christ Church, Franklin's grave, the tiny brick residence where Betsy Ross was said to have made the first American flag. Then comes Elfreth's Alley. Neat Colonial homes date as far back as the 17th century and are still lived in today.

The entire area can be covered on foot in an hour or two; but that means crowding it, absorbing too much within too short a period of time. These reminders of our national heritage deserve better. And those travelers who have been here before should know that this entire end of the city is being reshaped, rebuilt, cleaned up, trimmed, and beautified in every possible way in order to display these historic monuments to far greater advantage.

But the truly new look of Philadelphia is to be discovered at the other end of town. In the sector between City Hall and the Schuylkill River, a 22-acre area has been demolished to make way for a complex of new structures that are the very latest in the way of architecture and city planning.

Penn Center turns out to be an ultramodern city within a city. The gleaming buildings in aluminum, enamel, and stainless steel blend perfectly into the landscape of remaining structures that have lent distinction to downtown Philadelphia for generations. The broad avenues are reminiscent of Europe. Tree-dotted esplanades run between buildings. There is a lovely, light, wide-open, airy mood to the entire project that the visitor is sure to appreciate.

And then, not far away, along those quiet side streets running off from Rittenhouse Square, one comes to the sedate old Colonial mansions that have so much character and dignity and seem to fit into one's concept of what the cradle of the Nation should look like.

Late afternoon found us wandering along those streets. We reached Walnut Street just as men and girls were leaving offices. Shops were preparing to close. The mood seemed a million miles removed from the restlessness of our native New York. We knew then we had gotten to know only a small part of the city. We had come close to only the most obvious and external aspect of the life of Philadelphia. There was still that entire other side to be searched out—the city of people who live and work here, the good stores and quiet taverns they patronize, the theater, "Antique Row," and the very special mood one cannot hope to touch on a whirlwind tour of sights and scenery.

It was my wife who said at last, "Why must we go home tonight? Suppose we were to stay over, and then tomorrow * * *."

And that is why I am writing this report at night from a hotel room in downtown Philadelphia. No one can hope to do Paris or London or Rome in a single day. Nor is it possible to do more than scratch the surface of one of this country's most interesting and complex cities in so short a time. To sightsee is only the beginning, as any traveler must know.

WAR AGAINST HUNGER

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on September 23, 1965, the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] made an excellent speech on the subject of the war against starvation and hunger.

His talk was entitled "The Most Important War."

Mr. President, I rise to commend the Senator from South Dakota for his admirable address and also to point out that earlier this year, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the pertinent consultative subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations held a hearing at which Tomas M. Ware, chairman of the Freedom from Hunger Foundation, and also an executive officer of the International Minerals & Chemicals Corp., testified in the same vein.

The hearings before the subcommittee received little attention, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a summary of Mr. Ware's testimony, which in general follows the same line as that of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern]. I believe that it is worth the consideration of all Senators and those who read the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Summary of Testimony of Thomas M. Ware

The population crisis and the food crisis are essentially the same crisis. The food shortage is already immensely serious, and will be made more so by the speed of the population increase. Even the most optimistic forecasts suggest that the most to be hoped for, in the expansion of arable, food-producing land, is from 3.5 percent of the earth's surface to 5 percent (4 billion to 5½ billion acres); and this will be a slow and expensive process.

To prevent the further spread of famine, let alone to eliminate it, we must devote far more time and effort to maximizing the use of every acre of productive land: to the prevention of soil erosion, the elimination of flood damage, the avoidance of waste, the intelligent use of all resources. Population control is vital to famine control, but it must be accompanied by better production and distribution of food. Here are some suggestions for policy:

1. Education for the primitive and illiterate: an essential prerequisite of any campaign to introduce better agricultural practices. True education would take decades, but what about the use of film vans—which have been very successful where they have been used. Use should be expanded by 20 or 50 times, for imparting information and instruction on agriculture and public health. AID this year will operate only 187 units in 48 countries: average cost per unit is $4,200.

2. Open up new land—reclaim—irrigate: Pursue these familiar goals with much more speed.

3. Develop agriculture as the basis of the economy in developing countries. There is too much infatuation with industrialization and machinery which uneducated people cannot run, and which does not help them feed themselves. Also, simple hand tools are often more appropriate than tractors.

4. Food from the sea: expand its use to overcome the shortage of animal protein. Estimated shortage, with present population, is 80 million tons a year. At the moment, 50 million tons of fish—equalling 10 million tons of protein—are being taken from the sea. Yet, according to testimony before Senate Commerce Committee on April 12, 1965, 400 million tons of protein could be taken annually without depleting resources. The proposed National Oceanographic Council should be given this task to study.

5. Agricultural reform: let the peasant become the owner of the land he tills—as in Japan and Taiwan, the greatest agricultural producers in Asia. Encourage private enterprise cooperatives, providing easy credit and more economic buying and selling systems.

6. Seeds and crops: Develop and spread more productive seed strains; e.g., hybrid corn, various strains of which have been developed in various countries with U.S. foundation help, and scored great successes—in India, Mexico, Thailand, etc. Encourage the principle of multicropping; i.e., end the tyranny of the one-crop economy (Thailand, which was a rice country, now has hybrid corn as well, resulting in Thailand becoming the fourth largest corn exporting country in the world).

7. Weed and pest controls: This notion, pace Rachel Carson, needs to be spread far more widely, by better education, more credit facilities, greater production. Pesticides which are nontoxic and nonresidual to warm-blooded animals or humans need to be developed more rapidly than at present.

8. Planned production and distribution of resources and surpluses: It is clear that the few overproducers of food must pool their resources for a planned export program. The problems of planning, politics, and organization must be overcome. Also the problem of payment—very few of the grain-importing countries are able to pay in dollars.

9. Fertilizers: Chemical fertilizers can do more than anything else to increase world food production. FAO experiments have shown the sensational improvements in output they have caused—even without any other improvements in farming methods; e.g., Turkey: wheat yield increased by 73 percent per hectare, returning to farmer 2.5 times what he spent on the chemical. Lebanon: wheat yield increased 101 percent, giving 7 times gain in value. Likewise in other countries and with other crops.

FAO report on its trials: "The average response [to the most economic treatments of fertilizer, holding everything else steady], for all countries, crops and seasons was 74 percent increase in yield."

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a most stimulating column is published in the Washigton Post this morning, written by Joseph Kraft, entitled "Agenda for the Future."

Mr. Kraft points out that once the 1st session of the 89th Congress adjourns, all the problems of the United States will not have been solved, and that starting next year we in Congress have an important oversight role to play, as was pointed out earlier by our distinguished majority leader.

In connection with the oversight function, the vast Federal bureaucracy is badly in need of overhauling. We need to see to it that the large number of laws which we have enacted are properly administered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] is recognized. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I have no objection. Interestingly enough, my speech is addressed exactly to the point the Senator from Pennsylvania is now making.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me for not to exceed 1 minute?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania, provided that in doing so I shall not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. President, the article written by Mr. Kraft points out that not only the Federal Government but also State and local governments' activities must be coordinated with the Government of the Great Society. I believe that the article is well worth the attention of all Senators.

I commend the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] for the speech he is about to make on this same subject, which I am sure will contribute a great deal of light to a situation with which I believe Congress should be concerning itself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article to which I have referred printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGENDA FOR THE FUTURE

(By Joseph Kraft)

The staggering accomplishments of Congress in the last 2 years have not, as some seem to imagine, wiped clear the agenda of the future. On the contrary, the congressional actions have served to define new goals.

In particular, if only to smooth the way for the programs just adopted, there will have to be a major improvement in bureaucratic performance at the Federal, State and local levels.

At the Federal level, the principal problem is what is known as hardening of the categories. Despite rapidly changing problems, powerful bureaucratic corps with connections in Congress and the public at large tend to do year after year exactly what they were doing in the past. For example, the U.S. Employment Service of the Department of Labor, because it grew up as a placement agency for white high school graduates, has almost completely ignored the central problem of employment—jobs for Negro dropouts.

In the past, the Federal Government has met this bureaucratic problem by tearing up and building anew. Thus, because no existing unit of Government is addressed primarily to the problems of the cities, a new Department of Urban Affairs has finally been created.

As that example suggests, however, the emergence of new problems far outruns the speed of Congress in setting up new departments. The Department of Urban Affairs represents a shadow of the past, not a model for the future.

The model for the future, on the contrary, is the poverty program that groups personnel from many departments in temporary alliance for meeting specific problems. But to make this technique of temporary merger effective, the walls that segregate bureaucratic corps will have to be broken down. Personnel policies and pay scales will have to be reworked so as to foster a continuous process whereby different agencies are always and easily moving in and out of cooperative relationships with one another.

At the local level, the difficulty is somewhat similar. Units of city, town, and county government have grown up along lines that complicate the approach to present problems.

Segregation in schools, for example, is entrenched rather than eased by the pattern of maintaining separate educational authorities in the cities and suburbs that comprise a single metropolitan district. A principal obstacle to the Federal program for clearing up polluted rivers and streams, to cite another case, has been the multitude of local agencies involved. That pattern repeats itself in virtually every modern problem from natural beauty to taxes. Sooner or later, accordingly, there is going to have to come a massive administrative reapportionment at the local levels.

Logically, State governments should be the beneficiary of the changes impending at the Federal and local levels. The States are not only large enough as units, or working in compact, to deal effectively with most modern problems. They are also the traditional counterweight against the increase in Federal authority that is bound to come with a growth in the effectiveness of the Federal bureaucracy.

But the States have long been the weakest link in the chain of government. Almost universally, State officials are paid less, and are of lower caliber, than city and Federal authorities with comparable responsibilities. State legislatures tend to be part-time affairs, heavily mortgaged to commercial and industrial interests.

It is a question even now whether the States have the administrative capacity to handle effectively some of the burdens thrust upon them by the congressional action of the last 2 years. The new education act, for example, obliges State governments to pass on local plans for using Federal funds to improve school conditions in impoverished neighborhoods or regions. But there are some States that do not even have a commissioner of education, not to mention a bureaucracy competent to examine a major educational program.

To be sure, the measures necessary to improve the caliber of government have none of the appeal and sweep that has marked the President's program during the last 2 years. They involve consolidating gains more than breaking new ground. But for all of that, there is plenty to do. Far from being bare, the agenda of the future is already black with important items.

ERNEST J. CARLIN

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield me 1 minute?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I notice that Calendar No. 894, H.R. 2303, has been cleared on both sides of the aisle, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2303) for the relief of Ernest J. Carlin, reported without amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 908), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to add to the leave amount of Ernest J. Carlin, a post office employee, 133 hours of annual leave which through administrative error was not credited to his leave account. The bill would further bar the cash payment for any of the leave referred to in the bill which would remain unused in the event that the beneficiary might die or leave the Federal service.

"HAPPY BIRTHDAY, IKE" CELEBRATION, TOLEDO, OHIO

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am glad to yield to the Senator from California, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on October 14 last, I had the honor to speak at the "Happy Birthday, Ike" Republican Dinner in Toledo, Ohio.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a portion of the remarks which I made at that dinner.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROUD HERITAGE—AN OPPORTUNITY FOR THE FUTURE

Tonight Republicans gather all across America to honor a man who has given a lifetime of service to his country, and, to the cause of freemen. As the successful leader of a grand alliance of free nations which emerged victorious from a bloody conflict convulsing almost all the globe, as the architect of a peacetime combination of Western nations intent on standing together to face new dangers from Soviet imperialism, as head of a great American university, as Chief Executive of our beloved Republic for eight splendid, constructive and happy years, and now in an active retirement, Dwight D. Eisenhower, by precept and example, and by the deeds of his lifetime, illustriously has typified the best that is in American life. Duty, service, country: those are the watchwords of this gallant man whose 75th—diamond jubilee—birthday we celebrate this evening. Our best wishes go also to his devoted wife of almost half a century, Mrs. Mamie Eisenhower, who captured the hearts of the American people during her 8 years in the White House.

During Ike's administration, we sought, as our 1960 Republican platform forthrightly said, "to secure the free institutions of our

Nation against every peril, to hearten and fortify the love of freedom everywhere in the world, and to achieve a just peace for all of anxious humanity." That is what our Nation, with considerable success, labored to accomplish under his leadership. In his tenure of office, we marked milestones of accomplishment. We stood fast to forestall aggression and Communist strangulation of Berlin. As the storms approached, we stood fast in the Formosa Straits, in Lebanon, in Guatemala, and in southeast Asia. Eisenhower acted with dispatch. In all those distant lands, where Red aggression was on the move, we demonstrated a determination and firmness to help free peoples remain free. America used her strength to seek a just and decent peace to which good men in all ages have aspired.

That is what our Nation did under Eisenhower, as we worked to further a mutual security program of economic help and technical assistance, to establish the Development Loan Fund, to create the Inter-American Bank, to originate the International Development Association, and to implement and expand the food for peace program. That is what we stood for in his proposal to use atoms for peace. We followed a doctrine that compassion, the teaching of self-help to those less fortunate than we, could aid the cause of freemen and free nations. We believe in the independence of the United States, and the interdependence of our allies. Eisenhower built this country's defensive might to a high point, unparalleled in history. He sought peace through strength. He sought peace through assistance to the humble and the lowly, to those lands, some newly emerging, struggling to keep their own independence and their own liberty. Under Eisenhower, we did these things, because we believed that American self-interest here was simply a reflection of the self-interest of all humanity, as they have continued their halting journey on this earth.

What Eisenhower and the Republican Party stood for then, and what we must stand for now, if we are to deserve the faith of the people, is best illustrated in our 1960 platform, written after 8 years of Republican responsibility for America's affairs. We looked ahead, earnestly desiring that our party might truly help to build, in our generation, a better America and a better world.

Our Republican gospel called for support of the United Nations; for making known our desire to advance the cause of peace as we did in Ike's creating an agency to study the problem and the possibility of arms control and multilateral disarmament, under dependable controls; for "an early agreement by all nations to forgo nuclear tests in the atmosphere, and the suspension of other tests as verification techniques permit," as we did when we approved the nuclear test ban treaty, after long, patient years of negotiation which Eisenhower began in his early White House days; for the peaceful use of Antarctica as we did when we approved the Antarctic Treaty, negotiated in its entirety by the Eisenhower administration.

Our Republican commitments, in those days, called for broadened cultural and technical exchanges between the nations of the world. This, too, Republicans have supported, as they supported Eisenhower's proposals by which the military and economic resources of free nations have been mustered to deter or to combat the constant marauding and attempted encroachment by totalitarian communism. Republicans approved the resolution of ratification of the Convention on the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development engineered by Eisenhower in the closing days of his second term. So, too, with expanded reciprocal trade among free countries.

In domestic fields, such as labor-management reform, enforcement of the law, expanded social security and minimum wage coverage, aid to education, Republicans stood together, under the leadership of Ike.

The Republican Party was founded because it sought to preserve the Union, not to dismantle it. We resolved, in the 1860's, as we need to reaffirm now, that ours is one Nation, under God, and that we can best serve the cause of her perpetuation by being a truly national party, seeking to serve the national interest, unswervingly committed to solving, or to trying to solve, the needs of the many, rather than those of the few.

As I come tonight to Ohio, I am honored to recall another American hero, who combined, in his public career and in his private life, devotion and courage, and who gallantly served his State, his country, and his party. The late Robert A. Taft was dedicated to the national interest. His was a refreshing zeal for the public welfare and for correcting wrongs which plagued our society. He believed in fair play.

I recall this evening, for example, how Robert Taft's brave leadership prevented railway workers from being drafted into the Army because they sought to exercise an American right, the right to strike. You will recall Robert Taft's pioneer efforts on behalf of Federal aid to education so that American youth, regardless of the State in which they happened to live, would have an opportunity to develop their own potential to the fullest. We can all recall this evening the work of this Republican humanitarian on behalf of decent housing for lower income people in our cities, and on behalf of an equitable balance in the conduct of labor-management relations.

Bob Taft was uniquely qualified for any office he ever sought. He demonstrated that fact in the service and the leadership he so long gave to our party in the U.S. Senate.

President Eisenhower, in "Mandate for Change," his book on his first term in office, noted in his diary on February 7, 1953: "Senator Taft has been the model of cheerful and effective cooperation." He recalls that Senator Taft and he "worked together to rebuild unity in the Republican Party and to put through legislation we both felt necessary to the welfare of the country."

He recalls that—"In some things I found him unexpectedly 'liberal,' specifically in his attitudes on old-age pensions, school aid, and public housing—attitudes, incidentals, which were miles away from those of some self-described 'Taft stalwarts.' One day after a legislative leaders meeting, he walked into my office to continue the discussion.

" 'You know, I hate Federal bureaucracy,' he said. 'The best way I can think of to combat its growth and at the same time help people would be to have the Federal Government pay a flat fee to the States for every child in school, and automatically to send out a monthly pension check, also of a fixed amount, to every man and woman who reached the age of 65.'

"When I heard these things, I had to chuckle. 'Why, Bob, with those views you're twice as liberal as I am. How did you ever come to be called a conservative?'

" 'Oh, you know how it is,' he replied. 'A label like that gets applied to you, and afterwards you just have to live with it.' "

On Senator Taft's passing, Dwight D. Eisenhower sadly wrote:

"I could not help feeling that with the loss of Senator Taft—with his dedication to the principles of the Republican Party, his determination that the Republicans would act virtually as a unit under the leadership of the President, his towering stature in the Senate—the party, and, more importantly, the Nation had suffered a blow which would be felt for a long time, a loss which possibly could never be made good."

Dwight D. Eisenhower and Robert Taft were not splinter Republicans. They were Republicans working for the common good of all, following the forward-looking Lincoln theme, "Think anew, act anew."

But this is past, and now, we, you and I, and all Americans who want to further a two-party system to promote freedom in this land, must face the future. These Eisenhower meetings are designed to serve as an opportunity for a rebirth of the Republican Party. In urban America, and in the small towns across this land, there are needs which must be met at either the local, State, or Federal level, whichever may be most appropriate, if we are to continue our forward progress as a free society.

While the unemployment rate is lower than it has been, the fact is that millions of Americans are still without work, and millions more, as our advanced industrial society becomes increasingly complicated, may face unemployment unless they receive the education and training so necessary for survival in this technological age.

Water is no longer a problem solely to the arid West from which I come. Now it is a problem in the urban centers of the East and Midwest as well. An ever-dwindling water supply threatens our households, our farms, and our industries.

Air pollution hovers over our cities. The needless pollution of our rivers and streams can no longer be tolerated. Tensions between citizens of different ethnic and racial origins remain. We need painstakingly to labor for their relaxation and their removal. Meanwhile, I feel compelled to observe that civil wrongs do not strengthen civil rights. Respect for law and order, by all our people, in every part of our land must be maintained, and the same standards must be uniformly applied.

How will we provide useful work for millions of young Americans who will join our work force this year, and in those following, as a result of the high birth rate after the Second World War? How will we encourage people to live as neighbors under our free American system, and work together in harmony regardless of diverse origin? How will we best provide the decent housing and the decent education which the late Bob Taft envisioned for us all? Doles will not solve such dilemmas. Neither will turning our backs on such problems. Neither will ill-advised schemes like federally sponsored rent subsidies, which, incidentally, most Republicans in the Congress opposed when they came before us not too long ago.

What can be done to help solve these modern day dilemmas which demand solution? One thing will be a reinvigoration of the Republican Party where ideas will be welcome, and where all citizens, high and low, will be encouraged to join our ranks. By 1968, half of the American people will be under 25 years of age. If there is to be a Republican future and, indeed, a future for this country, then we—as a party—need to attract the young to our banner. Once again, from every part of our society, from every rung of the economic ladder, from every race and faith, must come new Republicans, eager to follow a forward looking Lincoln-Eisenhower creed.

There is a need for a thorough rethinking of the social legislation which has largely existed and grown since the early 1930's. Thought, direction, purpose, leadership, and a willingness to inspire people to help each other, and to help themselves, is what is needed, if we are truly to meet the plight which faces us in the slums and in the clogged streets of this last third of the twentieth century.

There are some in our party who not only object to any Federal Government concern with the needs of people, but who refuse to concede the duty of any level of government to deal with them. This zealous handful objects to any efforts which reasonable people might want to make so that man might live a better life on this earth. The same group which has reviled the beloved Eisenhower for his views would abuse Bob Taft for what he tried to do in the fields of housing and education for his fellow Americans. Theirs is the ugly dogma of obstruction. It has no place in the party which Lincoln and Eisenhower and Taft sought to build.

This group usually demands that our two parties have a realinement, shifting all so-called liberals into the Democratic Party and all so-called conservatives into the Republican Party. It would be a tragic thing for our country and for our party if such a realinement were to occur. We cannot have, in America, class pitted against class, race against race, or the poor against the rich. The best answer to this unrealistic demand came from Gov. Thomas E. Dewey in his lectures at Princeton several years ago:

"These impractical theorists * * * want to drive all the moderates and liberals out of the Republican Party and have the remainder join forces with the conservative groups of the South. Then they would have everything neatly arranged indeed. The Democratic Party would be the liberal-to-radical party. The Republican Party would be the conservative-to-reactionary party. The results would be neatly arranged too. The Republicans would lose every election, and the Democrats would win every election. It may be a perfect theory but it would result in a one-party system." By and large, the overwhelming majority of Republicans seek to resolve our problems by application of commonsense, intelligence, energy, and compassion. One of my Republican colleagues in the Senate aptly expressed this view when he said that Republicans, traditionally, have been conservative in their thinking and liberal in their hearts. This is a pretty good description of the thinking process which motivated Abe Lincoln, Dwight Eisenhower, and Bob Taft. And it represents a pretty sound guide for all of us, the across-the-board Republicans in our land.

Republicans, ours is a proud partisan heritage. More important, ours is a great opportunity and a greater challenge. The future of our Republic greatly rests on the future which we—you and I—make of the Grand Old Party.

LOS ANGELES DODGERS—SUPERB WORLD SERIES CHAMPIONS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, during the last several weeks, I have exchanged some correspondence with that great American baseball leader, Walter O'Malley.

On this occasion, I salute the World Series champions, the Los Angeles Dodgers, who captured the fancy of the American people as they became champions last week.

The famous Horace Greeley advice that young men should go West for better opportunity was uttered when baseball, like the preponderance of the Nation's population, was largely anchored east of the Mississippi. During the several subsequent decades, circumstances have changed, as the sports world noted last week.

Look presently at the record. California is first in population and for the third time in 7 years at the top in our national sport. The fact is, since the westward migration began, California professional baseball teams have been first in the National League on four different occasions. San Francisco, parenthetically, has not fared too badly, although the Giants cannot match Los Angeles' Dodgers in glory.

From sixth place last year to the head of the hit parade this fall is a soul-satisfying experience for both the Los Angeles team and the fans of southern California. Undoubtedly, this recovery shows the rehabilitating effects of our salubrious climate, but it stands also for a supreme team effort, topped off by as effective and superb a pitching staff as baseball has ever seen.

With the world championship banner again flying over Chavez Ravine, I congratulate Walter O'Malley and his resurgent, never-say-die Dodgers. This magnificent ball club won because it refused to lose. The World Series was a great thrill to the millions of Americans who watched the games on television.

In the spirit of California's slogan—men to match our mountains—I exchanged communications with Mr. O'Malley as the regular season ended and the championship series got underway. His messages to me portrayed the confidence of an owner bold enough to follow Horace Greeley's injunction with a transcontinental jump from the heights of Brooklyn to the Pacific shores. I echo the emotions of California devotees of our Nation's leading pastime when I say: Long may the championship banner wave on the far side of the Rockies.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the correspondence between myself and Mr. O'Malley.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
September 27, 1965.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Would you jointly represent me in extending an invitation to the President to attend the World Series at Dodger stadium. Some folks think that this is iffy but we have confidence.

WALTER F. O'MALLEY,
President, Los Angeles Dodgers.

SEPTEMBER 28,1965.

Mr. WALTER O'MALLEY,
President, Los Angeles Dodgers,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR WALTER: With the inexorable movement of the sun—and, considering the schedule for the remainder of the nearly finished season, of the moon—through the heavens, California's prospects for playing host to the National League portion of this year's world series are increasingly bright to the point where all sports followers in our State can be delighted that westward migration finally affected baseball.

As a native son, I am especially proud that the laws of probability make it virtually certain one of our great cities will be the locale for some of the crucial championship engagements. But those very same laws strengthen my innate sense of caution when it comes to extending an invitation at this moment to the President to attend one of the contests.

Of course, I would be most happy to join in asking the Chief Executive to warm up his airplane for a trip to witness a game, but I do feel I would be in a better position to suggest a destination to his pilot if I waited just a bit longer. From glancing at the sports pages, I note it should be possible very shortly to make firm travel plans.

With good wishes,
Sincerely,

THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
October 4, 1965.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington D.C.:

Re your letter of the 28th—"Oh ye of little faith"—will you attend LAX games?

WALTER F. O'MALLEY.

OCTOBER 5, 1965.

WALTER F. O'MALLEY,
Los Angeles Dodgers,
Minneapolis, Minn.:

Hot Senate contest will keep me busy fielding hard drives in legislative league and deny me pleasure of joining you in relishing reward from your unbounded confidence in resilient team. Hearty congratulations on cliff-hanging season finish which I trust foreshadows disappoints for Twins commensurate with anguish administered Yankee invaders 2 years ago.

THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator.

A PERSPECTIVE ON REORGANIZATION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, whether we like it or not, the Federal Government is now the biggest going concern in the United States. Congress will vote nearly $118 billion in appropriations—the largest increase in any one year since the Korean war. The Federal Government employs more than 2.5 million people and is under constant pressure to become still larger.

We have initiated a vast number of new programs this year—programs that for the most part were long overdue and designed to meet urgent needs in American society. But let there be no mistake about it: the crucial test of the success of our efforts is yet to come. Our programs will stand or fall on the basis of their administration—the strength of their organization—the abilities of their leaders.

We have merely given the "go ahead" signal. These new programs—if they meet real needs and solve true problems—should and will be expanded. It is our job in Congress to insure not only that the programs are responsive to demands, but equally as important, to make sure that not $1 is wasted on inefficiency.

There is no substitute for a strong, certain executive structure in the Federal Government. It determines whether its leaders can perform efficiently—or at all. It determines whether there will be economy—or waste.

Before this session of Congress adjourns, Mr. President, it is worthwhile to take a closer look at the progress we have made in 1965 toward trimming and tailoring the executive branch of Government into an efficient, modern mechanism. Such a review is as valuable for the disorder it shows as for the order.

In terms of overall achievement, the 89th Congress has already become a historic session, one that has earned the title of "the Congress of Accomplishment," and I am proud to have served in it. Together, we have made notable progress toward the goals of the Great Society—in civil rights, education, economic opportunity, medical care for our older citizens, regional development, improvement of our cities, the arts and humanities, and elsewhere.

But we recognize that the goals of the Great Society cannot be achieved by legislation alone. Laws can only point the way; as President Johnson has said of the Great Society.

> It will not be the gift of government or the creation of presidents. It will require of every American for many generations, both faith in the destination and the fortitude to make the journey. Like freedom itself, it will always be challenge and not fulfillment.

As Amitai Etzioni, of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford University, pointed out in the Washington Post of October 3:

> Passing a bill does not assure Federal action and Federal action, even if taken may not yield the expected results. * * * Domestic policy deserves the same systematic strategic thought that our military policy has.

I ask unanimous consent to have Dr. Etzioni's article printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. RIBICOFF. If the Federal Government is to help meet the critical challenges of our time effectively and economically, we cannot afford an executive branch that does not keep pace with the floodtide of scientific, economic, social, agricultural, population, and urban growth. It is the executive branch that develops plans and translates laws into action; it must respond fast and flexibly to changing circumstances, or we will never meet the challenge of the 1960's. The governmental machinery of the 1950's or 1940's—and, in some cases, even the 1900's—simply cannot handle the job.

So I have been glad to enlist in President Johnson's war on waste. The people and the Congress deserve his efforts to guarantee them full value for every dollar spent. That effort is already paying dividends; the President reported last month that in the 18 months beginning January 1964, civilian government agencies saved more than $1.1 billion and the Defense Department more than $5 billion.

But dollars-and-cents savings are only one measure of an effective executive branch. They are important but not conclusive, any more than a neat, logical organization chart guarantees an efficient organization. Government agencies are not static, inanimate, and abstract; they are living, growing groups of people with histories, habits, and even personalities of their own. Any reorganization worth talking about has to consider these personal qualities too.

For organizational arrangements are not neutral—we do not organize in a vacuum. Organization is one way of emphasizing one program over another, of ordering priorities among many competing policy objectives. Organizational arrangements tend to give some interests and perspectives greater weight than others in the councils of government, in the competition for resources.

So, when we talk about organizing the executive branch of Government, we are really talking about making sure the Government does what we intended it to do in the first place. When Congress creates a new agency or orders up a new program, it expects a specific policy to be carried out, along specific priority lines. The policy determinations of the President and the Congress should properly be built into the organizational structure of Government. Otherwise, the policymakers may lose control of their child in its infancy.

No single blueprint could possibly serve to organize every part of the executive branch. In the past, major contributions have been made by two Hoover Commissions and the Brownlow Commission, but we cannot leave the continuing job to temporary special groups. Frequent reappraisal of the Government's structure is essential to the cultivation of new activities and the careful pruning of old ones. The task of organizing and reorganizing never ends.

Reorganizing by itself cannot guarantee the goals it seeks to achieve: better planning, more efficiency, greater economy. Only able men in the top offices of Government can do that. Structure is no substitute for men, but structural improvement can improve the work they do.

In looking for that kind of structural improvement, we should keep in mind these seven basic aims:

First. Fix responsibility for decision and action on department and agency heads, as individuals accountable to the President and Congress, rather than on colleagues, subordinates, or committees.

Second. Stress the rule that responsibility attaches individually to the man in charge of each operation at every level, from the White House to the departmental bureau.

Third. Give each executive authority commensurate with his responsibilities, plus the staff and other resources to enable him to exercise it.

Fourth. Place the duty of coordination on the men with authority, holding them responsible for failure to consult others or consider others' responsibilities.

Fifth. Give new programs enough high-level autonomy to encourage a vigorous beginning, while maintaining enough contact with permanent operating units to avoid governmental isolation.

Sixth. Scrap organizational arrangements that dilute authority or blur responsibility, and consolidate related functions unless separate programs might benefit from competition.

Seventh. Adapt organizational arrangements to the special needs of diverse Federal programs.

We often hear that the Federal Government is too strong. Preliminary studies indicate, however, that in some instances it may be too weak. There are major Government departments that are nothing but loose holding companies headed by officers without enough authority to really run them.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. First of all, let me compliment the Senator from Connecticut for the magnificent job he is doing in the subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee. It has been my high pleasure to serve with him. Our comradeship goes back to the days when we were both serving as Governors of our respective States.

Let me ask the Senator a question. Does he not find that the organizational reports of committees passed in former days, while they were good reports, have become sort of passé, and that there is a need for continual authority for reorganization?

Mr. RIBICOFF. The Senator is correct. The Hoover Commissions and the Brownlow Commission did good jobs, as far as they went. Since the Hoover Commissions and the Brownlow Commission we have experienced great changes—both in and out of government. Whether one disagrees or agrees, the Government has grown generally and has entered into many fields. There has even been a contention that we are overloading the Government.

I feel, as the Senator does, that it is not enough for the Executive or for the Congress to appoint a commission to do the job of creating proper organization. The Congress of the United States has a direct responsibility to see to it that the job of administering the programs it passes is done properly, with efficiency and economy. We sit here day after day and pass many measures. We pass laws to set up various bureaus and agencies, but we take little account of the overlapping, how they should work, or the duplication of effort. It seems to me that it is one of our functions and responsibilities to do the job ourselves, and not wait for the executive branch or some commission to do the job for us. The people who send us here expect that we are going to do our whole job.

It is my hope that the Congress of the United States will do so. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is a very able member of the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization. He attends all the meetings, does all his work conscientiously, and brings background and great knowledge to the work of the committee. I know the Senator from Wyoming will make his contribution to see to it that we in this Congress do the job we are supposed to do, and not put it on someone else's shoulders.

Mr. SIMPSON. Under the able leadership and guidance of the Senator from Connecticut, I do not think we can go wrong.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SIMPSON. We are concerned with the fact that the Government has become so big and prolix that there has been confusion at times. Liaison between the various agencies has become almost impossible, and Congress must try to alleviate the situation as rapidly as it can. I commend the Senator for leading us in that direction. I compliment him for what he has already done. I am not unmindful of the work that people in private industry and Government agencies have done in that regard.

When Congress reconvenes for the 2d session of the 89th Congress does the Senator intend to delve deeper into the question?

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is my intention. I have been asked why it is that in the closing days of this session I make this type of speech. Frankly, this is a foundation for what we propose to do next year. It seems to me we have presented to the people so much legislation of such deep import that I fear we could very well develop a case of indigestion. Basically, what we have devised in the way of bills and legislation is good and is needed. Some laws have been 25 years in the making. The test is yet to come. Will the laws work and how well will they work for the benefit of the people for whom they were passed, and, in the final analysis, for the entire country?

I do not believe that merely passing bills is enough. Our job is to follow up, to make sure that what we have passed brings about the results we intend to bring about.

We must eliminate the diffuse, conflicting, and scattering of authority. We should know who has the authority and responsibility; and he who has the responsibility and authority should be given the power.

I have said it time and time again. I said it in our committee. I said it in speeches, and I say on the floor that it is not enough to shrug our shoulders and say that organization is a job for the executive branch. I believe this is a job for the Congress and the executive branch working together. I believe that the time has come for Congress to share in the responsibility.

Mr. SIMPSON. I want the Senator to know that I concur in many things he is saying. I want to join in relieving some of the diffusion.

I have to go to a committee meeting at this time. I am sorry that I cannot be present to hear the discourse and the colloquy, but I have read the document. I believe the Senator has hit the problem on the nose. I am glad I was able to serve with him on the committee.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am delighted that the Senator has chosen to devote himself to this field, because he is eminently correct that there is great need for a consolidation of some of these functions, and elimination of the conflict that exists among various persons who have parallel responsibility.

At this moment I am working on a bill in an effort to do something for people who suffered from the effects of Hurricane Betsy.

First, we must obtain an authorization, and then an appropriation. Then somebody must be appointed to administer it. Then, we find we have three persons to administer it. One man in the Bureau of the Budget finds somewhere in small print in the act that there was reference to such funds as may be appropriated by Congress. By some quirk the President signs the appropriation prior to the authorization bill. Some little lawyer in some department discovers there is a technicality that frustrates the entire administration.

There are three departments willing to agree, and one will not agree. Unless they all get together the entire program fails.

I compliment the Senator for the fine job he has done in this field.

The Senator has proved that he can be a fine Governor, administrator, and head of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. He administered the program. He has proved that he can legislate.

The Senator said that perhaps we had a case of indigestion because we did so much legislating.

We passed the Social Security Act, which is the most significant bill of this Congress. It was my privilege to manage that bill on the floor of the Senate.

I recall that one morning we met and found that in 4 days we had voted on only three amendments. We decided to go into business and move. That particular morning, in 90 minutes, we voted on 94 amendments. I believe 30 of them were amendments that the Senator from Connecticut proposed. I believe that when the bill passed the Senate it had more amendments offered by the Senator from Connecticut than any other Senator even though the Senator from Connecticut is the most junior member of the committee. It should be that way, because the Senator from Connecticut knows more about that subject than any other member of the committee. He administered the program, and he understands it. He did not protest about things that to him made sense. He proceeded to offer amendments to laws that made sense to him out of things that were incongruous in this area.

I salute the Senator from Connecticut for the fine job he did. I am glad to see him devote himself to this subject. He is one of the best students in the Senate. I know that he will bring us a great number of helpful suggestions. He has suggested them in his speech.

There were a great number of laws. The conference report was 50C pages long, and amended the laws in a myriad of places. Now that we have passed these laws we should get into the matter of coordinating them.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I thank the Senator for his gracious statement.

The example which the distinguished Senator cites points up another problem. It is commonly thought that national policy is made only by the President and the members of the Cabinet. Actually, policy, on a day-to-day basis, on some of the broadest and most basic issues, is made by individuals far down in the lower echelons of the bureaucracy. They are making policy in their decisions to Members of Congress, and in their rulings and their decisions.

The social security law that the Senator talks about is, in my opinion, the greatest landmark of social legislation ever passed by Congress.

Yet, the Senator from Louisiana, who mentioned that bill, realizes as well as I do that we must work on that bill year in and year out to make sure that its weaknesses—both substantive and organizational—are strengthened. We must solve problems, and we must make sure, if something needs to be added, that it is added.

I consider it a great privilege to have served on the Finance Committee with the Senator from Louisiana and other committee members, all of whom are thoughtful, hard-working Senators who come to hearings and come to executive sessions, and do their work on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator about the Finance Committee. That committee has the most liberal liberals, the most conservative conservatives, and the most moderate moderates in the Senate.

Mr. RIBICOFF. In the overall field of reorganization, the 89th Congress has compiled a record that is a start but not a good deal more. The broadest public attention has been focussed on its establishment of a new Department of Housing and Urban Development, which will give the communities of the Nation an official voice at the highest levels of Government for the first time. This was the first addition to the President's Cabinet since the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was formed a dozen years ago.

We also extended the President's authority to submit reorganization plans to Congress until December 31, 1968. This was the longest extension of this kind granted any President since 1949.

During the year, the President submitted five reorganization plans to Congress, and all of them went into effect. This is what the plans accomplished:

Plan No. 1 placed the entire Federal Customs Service on a career basis, replacing 53 Presidential appointees with civil servants. Treasury officials estimated that it could result in a $9 million annual saving.

Plan No. 2 established a new Environmental Science Services Administration, combining in a single agency the Weather Bureau, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Central Radio Propagation Laboratory. Estimates of savings range from $1.8 to $2.2 million.

Plan No. 3 transferred to the Interstate Commerce Commission all Federal locomotive inspection activities, which had been operated by Presidential appointees since 1911, at an approximate saving of $170,000 a year.

Plan No. 4 abolished nine obsolete interagency committees, transferring their remaining functions to existing officials or agencies, at a saving that was termed substantial.

Plan No. 5 eliminated eight advisory committees attached to the National Science Foundation and gave the Foundation Director increased authority to delegate his growing responsibilities.

But this work, however useful, has barely scratched the surface of the reorganization problem. At a very minimum today, we need a broad and stringent reworking of the Federal machinery that attempts to deal with education, transportation, natural resources, environmental science, consumer protection, and urban and community development. Critical problems in these six areas—and there are many more—are simply not being solved today because the governmental attack on them is confused, diffused, and disorganized.

Take education as a classic example. There are presently no less than 42 Federal departments, agencies, and bureaus involved in some aspect of education. The current Federal budget includes more than $4.1 billion for education. This is new obligational authority; actually a good deal more is being spent.

Yet this vast and all-important effort has no central base of operations. The 98-year-old Office of Education, now a component of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has been an honorable and constructive agency, but it simply does not have the status, authority or responsibility to deal with the multifacet, multiagency, multibillion-dollar Federal education program. And that program, of the greatest significance to the Nation, is multiplying every day. Simply naming the Commissioner of Education as an additional Assistant Secretary of HEW, while worthy, is not the answer.

That is why I have sponsored legislation to establish a Department of Education. I am convinced that education needs and deserves a voice at the Cabinet table. It will not be easy to bring together in an orderly fashion all the education activities that have grown up, sometimes helter-skelter, all over the Washington governmental landscape for years, but it must be done.

The situation in transportation is, if anything, worse, for this critical area of national concern has no real Federal home at all. Transportation policymaking is divided between the Department of Commerce, the Federal Aviation Agency, the Coast Guard, the Army Engineers, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Maritime Commission, and the new Department of Housing and Urban Development. How can we ever expect to build a coordinated national transportation policy—much less a system—on such a disjointed foundation?

And this sorry disarray exists at a time when there was never greater need for coordination of transportation on the national level. Our cars are choking our highways, our highways are strangling our cities, and our commuter railroads are consumed by neglect and disuse. Never has a unified transportation policy been more essential, and seldom has it seemed farther away.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Committee on Commerce, of which I am a member, has jurisdiction in matters of transportation—that is, transportation by water, rail, air, pipeline, and truck. The same uncoordinated approach to the problem exists in our committee as exists in the executive branch. A separate subcommittee has been created for each type of transportation. Thus, one subcommittee follows a course that is completely in conflict with the course followed by another. When we help one method of transportation, we place an added burden on another. So the whole objective of an improved, coordinated system of transportation does not succeed because of such a disjointed approach.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The Senator makes an excellent point. Before he came in to the Chamber, I pointed out, in a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], that organization is as much, the responsibility of the Congress as it is that of the executive branch. It is not enough to say that it is the responsibility of the President to reorganize. Congress has the responsibility to pass laws; we vote the money; and we also have the task and the responsibility to make certain that a policy works.

It is not for me to say how any committee of Congress should be organized; but as the Senator from Ohio has said, the field of transportation is so important that all elements of it must be dealt with as a unified whole, and not as fragments.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It helps not at all to assist one segment, and while it is being aided, to proceed to destroy another segment because of a lack of coordination.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The Senator is correct.

It is much the same story with efforts to conserve natural resources—a debilitating dispersion of responsibility for the conservation, development and use of such resources among several Federal agencies. Chief among our concerns in this area today is the water supply problem—a field that is so involved with interstate aspects that the Federal Government must play an ever expanding role. A Department of Natural Resources may or may not be the answer, but some answer must be found.

Along the same lines, I am not really satisfied that we have accomplished our objective of making the new Environmental Science Services Administration "a single national focus for our efforts to describe, understand and predict the state of the oceans, state of the lower and upper atmosphere and the size and shape of the earth."

For example, research in rain-making and the allied sciences, now classed as "weather modification" remains divided among the new Environmental Administration, the National Science Foundation, and the Interior Department. Federal map-making responsibility remains divided between the new Administration and Interior's Geological Survey. There may have been sound historical reasons why these divisions developed, but that is no reason to freeze them into the Federal structure indefinitely.

Now, the Environmental Science Services Administration makes an impressive title, and its creation indicates appropriate Federal interest in a field of great importance to us all. But is this new agency really anything more than a new roof over the Weather Bureau, the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Central Radio Propagation Laboratory? Though it may prove productive over the long run, is not this really another example of "box juggling," shuffling agencies around on an organization chart into a new pattern that looks tidier but does not, in fact, represent any change, much less advance? Perhaps we should be looking instead toward some version of the Department of Marine and Atmospheric Affairs that has been proposed by my colleague, Senator MUSKIE.

We all have high hopes for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, particularly as its establishment represents an implicit pledge that the Great Society cares about its cities. But—we might as well be frank—this is largely another case of a shiny new roof on the same old building. It is true that the new Secretary of Urban Development will have more centralized authority in the housing and urban development field than any single official has held before, but in the beginning he will be presiding over the same old Housing and Home Finance Agency dressed with a new, more prestigious name.

In recent years there has been a rash of congressional activity over urban and community development programs—mass transit, regional and local economic development, school aid, civil rights, open spaces, poverty, recreation, air and water pollution, just to collect a few. In the long run, these must mesh with one another and with State and local programs too Before the Department of Housing and Urban Development bill was passed, the Senate amended it to require the President to examine all housing and urban development activities in the Federal establishment and make recommendations to Congress about moving programs into or out of the new department. I trust the President's survey will not be limited merely to transferring activities but will also attack the broader and more fundamental problem of coordinating these community development programs that tend to cut across agency lines.

There are many other areas crying for attention in the reorganization field. Take the new-born poverty program. Ostensibly concentrated in the Office of Economic Opportunity, which was expressly created for the purpose, substantial parts of its programs are carried out by the Departments of Interior, Labor, Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare.

Take highway and traffic safety. For a thorough look at what Federal authorities are doing—and are not doing—about it, you would have to survey the Departments of Commerce, Defense, Post Office, Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, plus the Interstate Commerce Commission, the General Services Administration, the Federal Trade Commission, the Interdepartmental Highway Safety Board, the Federal Safety Council, and the President's Committee for Traffic Safety.

In the pesticide field, the Department of Agriculture, the Food and Drug Administration, the Public Health Service, and the Interior Department all vie with one another, not only in their day-to-day operations but in the policy area too. Interior forbids its constituent agencies to use in National Forests the same poisons that the Agriculture Department urges the public to spray on lawns, trees, and rose bushes. The Public Health Service spends public funds to study the possible connection between the cancer toll and the increased use of pesticides, while the Food and Drug Administration says the housewife's market-basket is "safe" from pesticide residue.

All told, there are 33 Federal agencies engaged in 296 such consumer protection activities. Is it any wonder that there has been proposed still another Cabinet-level agency: a Department of Consumers that could encompass all efforts to preserve the health and safety of the purchasing public?

These are not only problems, they are opportunities, and I firmly believe that President Johnson will go down in history as the man who contributed most to making our Government work. Never before have we had in the White House a man whose knowledge of the Federal structure is so broad and detailed, whose concern for efficiency and economy is so keen.

Today there is mounting evidence that the President will place major emphasis when Congress reconvenes next January on recommendations for a substantial overhaul of the basic machinery of the executive branch. In the Wall Street Journal of September 29, the President was quoted as saying that Congress this year "put more new legislation on the statute books than anyone ever dreamed possible" and next year we have to "make sure it works properly." Government reorganization proposals will have a high priority position on the administration program for 1966, the article predicted, both in terms of potential substantive achievement and the fact that they do not entail any new Government spending.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal article, written by Alan S. Otten, the able and shrewd member of that paper's Washington bureau, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, much the same sort of goal has been set for the 2d session of the 89th Congress by the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. In a speech to the Democratic conference, he called for devoting next year's session to the following:

> The perfection, the elaboration, and the refinement of the basic legislation which underpins major Federal programs.
>
> It is hardly possible to set in legislative motion so many new Federal approaches to the Nation's problems, as we have done in recent years, without leaving a number of gaps and rough edges, overextensions and overlaps. The best time to catch these shortcomings, it seems to me, is before they become solidified by repetition into the administrative practices of the departments and agencies.
>
> The executive branch itself, under the eye of the President and his administration, will, of course, be alert to these problems. In the Senate, the Appropriations Committee and the Government Operations Committee will, of course, be concerned with them.

It now seems likely that we shall be dealing early next year with just the kind of problem to which Senator MANSFIELD referred. Two weeks ago, in a memorandum to the President, Vice President HUMPHREY recommended the submission to Congress of a civil rights reorganization plan to transfer the Community Relations Service from the Commerce Department to the Justice Department and to assign some of its clerical functions to the Civil Rights Commission.

Mr. President, such a plan is a perfect example of "making sure it works properly." The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was a monumental achievement of principle, but we have already discovered that some of the machinery it put into motion was imperfectly designed. What are we doing about it? We are taking the first possible opportunity to correct the situation, to reorganize our civil rights activities so that they can render the highest degree of public service.

To this and other efforts at eliminating the "gaps and rough edges," the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization stands ready to lend its full resources, as, I know, does the full Government Operations Committee under the able leadership of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. The need to reshape our executive structure into a logical, workable, economical enterprise is clear and commanding. The people are paying for such a Government; they deserve nothing less.

Mr. President, this is going to be a big job. It will require the combined efforts of all of us—the President, the Congress, the leaders of the business and academic communities and, most seriously, all the people of our Nation whose stake in well-run Government is the highest of all.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 3, 1965]

THE GREAT SOCIETY NEEDS MECHANICAL BRAINS—OUR FRAGMENTED DOMESTIC OPERATIONS NEED A RAND CORP. JUST AS MUCH AS THE SATISFIED AIR FORCE

(By Amitai Etzioni)

President Johnson's domestic program is more favorably regarded than his foreign policy, but getting Congress to pass bills is not equivalent to domestic success. Passing a bill does not assure Federal action, and, Federal action, even if taken, may not yield the expected results.

Thus Congress could pass another civil rights bill but desegregation remains token; antipoverty funds might be tripled but poverty not significantly decline; a Department of Urban Affairs may be instituted but not achieve a substantial reduction in air pollution, drought effects or traffic jams.

One significant element still largely lacking on the domestic front is comprehensive strategic thought, without which key levers cannot be located and new resources effectively used.

PIECEMEAL INEFFICIENCY

Many of the problems that the Nation has decided to attack under Mr. Johnson's leadership are what social scientists refer to as the system type. Such problems have deep roots, are widespread throughout the society and cannot be handled conveniently by taking them one at a time with a dozen agencies each trying to trim its branch of the societal tree.

Example: Many of the poor to be helped by the antipoverty drive are Negroes. What is less often stressed is that the other major group of poor people are diehard segregationists. The more effective the amelioration of their poverty, the less violent desegregation is likely to be.

Most other domestic problems are of a similarly intricate system nature in which affairs handled in one sector of the society are affected by and affect matters in other sectors. It is a commonplace among students of American Government that the Federal approach to national problems is just the opposite of a system approach: each Federal agency focuses on one or a few aspects of a total problem.

While Federal coordination on the domestic front might be increased to a degree, as has been done in the defense area, we must assume, at least for the short run, that it will remain more or less low, as it is now. A score of agencies will each continue to reform its slice of America, jealously guarding its empire from encroachment and exposure by the others.

One major way to provide the system approach is to include at the level of policy what cannot be provided at the level of executive action. What is needed is more studies of the Nation as one combination of societal forces and processes, all interacting with each other, all affecting each other.

This is not a question of one more research job: many Federal agencies have research and development divisions and all have some form of intellectual input in the form of expert advice, consultants or advisory boards. The problem is that this thought input itself is fragmented along the same lines as the agencies.

Relatively little investment is made in studying the way things hang together, the changes in one section that hinder or assist those in others. On the domestic front, we still study each weapon rather than entire weapons systems.

UNFRUITFUL CONFERENCES

The conditions under which the system approach thrives can be specified. They are rarely satisfied by a White House conference in which a large number of eminent men are flown to Washington for 3 days of discussion. Nor can such an approach be fruitfully developed by White House advisory committees whose members have scores of other assignments.

And whatever the value of such reports, they rarely have a "system" quality. Needed is a much more continuous, professional, systematic effort. The Air Force provides a good example.

I do not favor either the general posture or the specifics of the strategy the Air Force "think factory" (the Rand Corp.) turns out, but I greatly respect the systematic way it goes about it. The Air Force has retained for more than 10 years a sizable professional staff drawn from a large variety of disciplines. These researchers are paid comparatively high salaries, which is necessary to compete with rising academic salaries and to retain the same personnel over long periods. The Air Force gave this "think" corporation considerable autonomy and put it 3,000 miles from Washington and its daily political life.

REPORT TO PRESIDENT

What seems to be needed is a similar institute for domestic problems. The ratio of social to natural scientists would have to be much higher than in the Rand Corp. and the domestic Rand might well report to the White House rather than to any one Federal agency.

This group would study questions that cut across the responsibilities of any one Federal agency and examine the effects that programs planned by one agency could have on those of another. It would also ask, using the tools of modern social science, what will be the cumulative effect on our society of increased population, migration to cities, automation, mass education, etc., not independently for each process, as if the others do not exist, but as they work on each other.

These relationships are now occasionally explored in a "system" fashion by nonprofessionals or as a rush job by not fully qualified research organizations, often with a partisan or commercial bias. It seems worth the $2 million or so that it would cost to find out what could be achieved if a team of the best social scientists the Nation can recruit were put on the job on a full-time, fully professional basis.

Domestic policy deserves the same systematic strategic thought that our military policy has.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Wall Street Journal]

JOHNSON'S 1966 GOALS—CONSOLIDATING PROGRAMS ALREADY ENACTED LIKELY TO GET MOST EMPHASIS—DEFENSE NEEDS, POVERTY WAR PROBLEMS MAY RESTRICT GREAT SOCIETY EXPANSION—BUT SOME NEW PLANS MULLED

(By Alan L. Otten)

WASHINGTON.—"In the past year, we've put more new legislation on the statute books than anyone ever dreamed possible. In the next year we have to digest it slowly and carefully, to make sure it works properly and is accepted by the Nation."

This was President Johnson, talking recently to a secret meeting of an administration task force setting out to shape his 1966 program for the Nation's cities. During the past few weeks, Mr. Johnson has given the same surprisingly cautious message to each of some 15 other task forces pondering problems in fields ranging from health to transportation to Government reorganization.

The important thing, the President tells these groups, is not to accelerate too quickly, not to provide huge sums that can't be spent intelligently, not to create swollen bureaucracies that produce chaos rather than results. He asks the task forces to find ways to organize these programs sensibly, to assess how fast to prudently proceed, to determine what is needed but avoid what would be too much.

NO GREAT SOCIETY CUTBACKS

This caution note, clear as it is, does not portend any outright cutbacks in Great Society operations. Come January, in fact, the Administration is certain to propose sizable increases in both military and civilian spending for the fiscal year starting next July. Total budgeted outlays will mount to a new high, surely several billion above this year's expected total and probably well over $105 billion. But Mr. Johnson's talk indicates that the ascent on the civilian side will still be milder than many liberals hope or expect.

Administration officials working closely with Mr. Johnson suggest two simple reasons for his rather temperate tack. One is his reading of recent history—a belief that many New Deal programs failed to become popular or took so long to win broad acceptance because they were poorly administered or grew too fast.

The President frequently cites the scorn heaped on the old Works Progress Administration and says he'd like to avoid any such fate for any Great Society program. He worries that confusion in the antipoverty campaign may become an issue in the 1966 elections; in one effort to bring more order into the program, he has asked his top talent scout, Civil Service Commission Chairman John Macy to work with Poverty Boss Sargent Shriver on all future top-level appointments.

The other and more obvious reason for the President's wary words is budgetary. Rising costs of the Vietnam war are eating deeply into the annual $7 billion increase in Federal revenues, leaving less than expected (and far less than the $5 billion to $8 billion estimated as needed) to finance Great Society programs without deepening the budget deficit.

GETTING TOOLED UP

"The important thing next year is to get these new programs tooled up properly," says a top administration official in close touch with L.B.J.'s thinking. "The President knows we're not going to have as much money as we'd like, but even more he knows that some of these programs—poverty, aid to education, medicare, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the rest—are going to fall on their face unless we get a good administrative structure and good people and proceed cautiously, both here in Washington and out at the local level."

Many White House men naturally turn skeptical when they hear the President take this tack and declare, as he did at his August press conference, that he will give Congress next year a legislative shopping list sufficiently short for the lawmakers to quit far ahead of the end of the fiscal year in June. They suspect that when the time for the state of the Union and budget messages rolls around in January, the President will want not only all the items that may be left over from this year—liberalized unemployment compensation, a higher minimum wage, and the rest—but also a raft of new ones.

"Will he settle for reorganizing and digesting and building slowly?" a White House aid asks rhetorically. "Hell, no. He'll want new ideas, a lot of them, and we better have them ready for him."

So the administration task forces are busy thinking up new ideas—ones that would entail big spending ultimately, even if small initial outlays. They are searching for new answers to urban congestion and decay, Negro unemployment and the breakup of Negro families, the pollution of air and water, and many other problems. Among ideas now under consideration, many of which will ultimately be rejected as too costly or impractical, are these:

A variety of make-work programs to give jobs to older unskilled workers, mainly Negroes; these might even include old-fashioned leaf-raking type projects under a new "beautification" label. Designation of pilot cities where massive grants of Federal funds may spotlight new approaches to urban rehabilitation. New Federal aid to States, cities, and private groups to push birth-control programs.

A requirement that States give aid to dependent children even where there is a breadwinner capable of working; few States now extend such aid, and many unemployed fathers leave home to enable the children to qualify for it. Added financial inducements to States to set up counseling services aimed at preserving marriages in poorer families.

A new approach to overseas farm surplus sales, with underdeveloped recipient nations required to use technical aid, fertilizer, and other U.S. help to increase their own agricultural output. New Federal aid for playgrounds, swimming pools, and other recreation projects in urban areas. Another increase in social security benefits.

Federal aid to local governments to raise police pay scales and to train police in community relations work. New plans to raise health standards of slum children, with greater emphasis on preventive care, including more mass immunization campaigns.

A program to help big northern cities build schools in new locations to reduce the de facto segregation resulting from segregated neighborhoods. Efforts to translate Great Society health, education, housing, and other programs into the international field, partly by bringing more foreign students and teachers to this country to get the necessary training.

One solution for the President's budgetary problems, some administration men suggest, may be to bear down heavily next year on legislation that requires little or no spending: Government reorganization proposals, a new transportation policy, and consumer protection bills such as the long-discussed truth-in-lending and truth-in-packaging measures. "If the program is rather sparse anyhow," a Presidential aid asserts, "these are good ones to throw in."

In a way, the current task force deliberations may mean more than did those of last year's preelection and postelection era. For the members now are practically all Federal officials. In the summer and fall of 1964, the task forces consisted mainly of outsiders—men from universities, foundations, State and local governments, business, unions and farm organizations; Government officials served as staff helpers and in a few cases as members. After the recommendations were submitted, Government groups winnowed out the impractical ones.

INTRA-GOVERNMENT WORK

Now the chairmen of last year's groups are unofficial consultants, and members of those groups and other outsiders are called on for help as needed, but the major work is all intra-Government. Thus the present education task force is made up of Education Commissioner Francis Keppel, White House Aid Douglass Cater, Assistant Treasury Secretary Stanley Surrey, and half-a-dozen men from the Budget Bureau, Space Administration and other agencies.

Part of the task forces' problem is simply the wide range of legislation enacted during the past 5 years, using up not only many ideas that have been kicking around Washington for decades but even many dreamed up by the 1964 task forces. "In a few fields there are still task force proposals that may be useful," a Presidential aid asserts, "but in others, such as education, we've either already used or have discarded as impractical or too expensive just about everything the last task force suggested."

Though many administration men question how serious Mr. Johnson may be in his current caution talk, they concede there is some supporting evidence besides his words. Last year, after then Budget Director Kermit Gordon cut back substantially on agencies, fund requests for antipoverty, education, and other new welfare programs, Mr. Johnson cut still more deeply. "They can't spend that much money so soon," he asserted.

Now, accelerating spending for the Vietnam war tends to reinforce administration misgivings about a too rapid increase of money for recently enacted Great Society programs. For the past year or so, a decline in defense outlays has yielded much of the cushion for rising nondefense spending. Now, with so many new welfare programs on the statute books and demanding more dollars, the cushion is gone. Defense spending is rising rapidly and eating into the $7 billion of extra revenue that Federal economists now count on getting each year from expansion of the national economy.

MILITARY SPENDING OUTLOOK

Even though much of the new military money voted by Congress will go for hardware that won't be delivered and paid for until after mid-1966, a lot will go for pay, food, ammunition, oil, and other items involving early expenditures. For this fiscal year, officials think a $2 billion jump in actual military spending over the $47.9 billion budgeted in January is quite likely. A larger jump is considered inevitable for the year starting next July.

Still, the President obviously wants a projected budget deficit for next fiscal year no bigger than the one for this year. That means that any increase in Great Society spending must come out of what is left over from the $7 billion of expanded revenues after the increased military outlays are deducted, plus whatever can be saved from economies or cutbacks in older civilian programs.

No one has totted up the maximum possible cost of the Great Society in fiscal 1967—the total expense if all programs were allowed to expand to the maximum allowed by law; officials insist there are too many unknowns to permit such calculations. The general guessing, though, is that the Great Society could easily eat up an extra $5 to $8 billion of Federal money in the next fiscal year, if that much were available.

Thus budget pressures serve to strengthen the President's political inclination to go slowly. Nonetheless, the spending buildup may be enough to consume nearly all the prospective increase in Federal revenues, and it will be far faster than most Republicans and conservative Democrats would like.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the distinguished junior Senator from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Although I was not present during the entire speech of the Senator, I am familiar with the speech, as the Senator from Connecticut was kind enough to send me a copy before he delivered it.

The Senator from Connecticut is performing a major service for the Senate and for the country as a whole. He is eminently qualified to discuss this matter. The Senator has not only been the Governor of his State, but he has also been a member of the Cabinet in the executive part, in which post he demonstrated great leadership ability. He now serves in the legislative branch of our Government.

The Senator has put his finger on what will be a major problem over the next 5 years. We have passed a good deal of legislation which will have a great impact on all the citizens of the country. Unless there is coordination and unless we know in which direction we are going and what we are trying to accomplish, much of the effectiveness of the program will be lost.

The suggestion of the Senator, the effort that he is making, and his assuming the lead in this matter perform a major service for all the citizens of the country.

I should like to ask the Senator a number of questions in connection with this matter.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I shall be pleased to try to answer them.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator spoke concerning education. Is the Senator aware that when the committee was having its hearing on the education bill, it requested the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to furnish us with a list of the education acts and programs that are now in effect under the Federal Government alone, and that the Secretary furnished the committee a list of more than 200 different programs?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Yes. The extent to which education is spread throughout the Government causes me great concern.

I recall the interest the late great President Kennedy, under whom it was my great privilege to serve as Secretary, had in the subject.

When I told President Kennedy of my desire to become a Senator and mentioned to him some of the things that I would like to do, with a twinkle in his eye he said: "Well, ABE, when you get to the Senate, perhaps you can do something about education."

I want to do something about education. I believe that we miss the point when we talk about education and encompass only what is included within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or within the Office of Education. The Office of Education has responsibility for only a small part of the educational program of the United States. As a matter of fact, 42 different Departments, bureaus, and agencies of the Government, included Health, Education, and Welfare, have a part in the educational program.

This year alone, there is some $4,100 million of new obligational authority for education. There is no question that this Congress has committed the country to a national effort and a national program on education. This is a beginning. It will become larger and larger.

People do not always understand me when I talk about the need for a Department of Education. They assume that I am criticizing the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I am not. When I talk about the Department of Education, it is not merely for the purpose of making the present Office of Education a Department of Education.

What I have in mind is eliminating the competitiveness, the overlappings, and the diffusion in the field of education throughout the entire Federal Establishment.

I believe that all students of education have been aware of this, as is the distinguished Senator from New York, who has served on a Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. We recognize that there is diffusion of our educational efforts throughout the Government.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Is it not correct that the kind of program and action suggested by the Senator from Connecticut would be an attempt to bring some order into all the existing programs?

Mr. RIBICOFF. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I should like to cover a few other points. Is it not correct that the responsibility for the construction of college dormitories rests not only in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, but also in the HHFA?

Mr. RIBICOFF. The Senator is correct. Construction of college "housing" is in the housing agency—not in HEW. Here again we have diffusion. I am very much interested in seeing that both Senators from New York are on the floor. We discussed this particular matter when we considered the bill to establish the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The two Senators from New York and I, in setting up a new Department of Housing and Urban Development, were putting a shiny new roof on and giving a more prestigious name to an already existing agency.

We contemplated that the new Department, in order to have any meaning and be effective, had to make a start toward centralizing all the problems which affect our urban society. We knew that merely establishing a Cabinet position would not solve the problem. I think the Senator's amendment to the bill is a beginning of that effort.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I do not want to take a great deal of time. However, this is an extremely important matter.

A number of Government agencies are concerned with and have responsibility in the field of transportation. Is there any coordination between those agencies and departments of Government which have a responsibility for depressed areas so that we may be sure that we know what they and the other agencies are doing?

Mr. RIBICOFF. There is not adequate coordination. There are eight different departments of the Government that have responsibility for a part of the transportation puzzle, and, to my knowledge, each is operating to a large extent in a vacuum. Not only are they inconsistent and competitive with one another, but also they are sometimes doing harm to one another. The field of transportation is so important that there must be a coordinated effort in the entire field.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I made an effort to obtain a list of some of the agricultural programs in existence in the rural areas in the State of New York. I asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Agriculture for a list of the programs which have an effect on community development.

Ultimately, we obtained a booklet. I believe that there is only one of these booklets. However, I thought it would be of interest. This booklet is published by the Office of Economic Opportunity. It is a catalog of the Federal programs for individual and community involvement.

This is merely a list. It does not give any real detailed information on any of the programs. It is merely a list of the programs that have an effect on community development in rural and urban areas.

Mr. RIBICOFF. For the purpose of the record, I should say that that booklet is about 6 inches thick. If the Senator has a list which is that thick—which list the Senator has obtained in an effort to be helpful to his constituency—we can well imagine how difficult it is for people who must work in these fields to try to find out what is actually being achieved and accomplished.

This is another example of the problems facing us. It is another example of the work that must be done in both the legislative and the executive branches of the Government. We must really go to work and do something in an effort to bring the organization of our Government up to date.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator from Connecticut has performed a great service. I am very grateful to him for his speech. I know that I speak on behalf of all my colleagues.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak beyond 10 o'clock. I am limited, under the agreement, to 10 o'clock.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is asking unanimous consent that he may modify the unanimous-consent agreement to extend it for 5 minutes?

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will it be limited to 5 minutes?

Mr. RIBICOFF. The Senator is correct. I do that because the distinguished senior Senator from New York wants to ask a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do not object providing the full hour is preserved for debate on the amendment which I have submitted. I would not like to have the time which the Senator from Connecticut will consume charged against that hour.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. As the Chair understands the unanimous-consent agreement, the full hour would be preserved.

Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 10 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 11135) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

A PERSPECTIVE ON REORGANIZATION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I shall use only a minute.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I served with the Senator from Connecticut on the Government Operations Committee and congratulate him on the job he has done in pulling together the facts and figures to demonstrate the diffusion of responsibility in the Federal establishment on such important matters as education, transportation, and the other items he has mentioned.

What I should like to ask the Senator is this: In view of the fact that he has mentioned so many functions and demonstrated a diffusion of responsibility which is so very broad, does the Senator feel we ought to think, possibly, about a new commission for executive reorganization of the Federal Government, with a view toward tightening the lines of authority and control, much like the Hoover Commission of some years ago?

In other words, is the situation beyond the point where it can be dealt with by separate reorganization plans originating in the Federal Government? Do we really have to go at it in a massive way, is that the thrust of the Senator's view?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Basically, we should use the tools at our disposal. Reorganization plans are one method. We have given the President authority to submit them. But we need not sit and wait for plans to be sent us in order to act. Commissions, temporary in nature, such as the Hoover Commission and the Brownlow Commission which did excellent work, are really not the answer. The thrust of my speech today is that organization is a continuing responsibility of not only the executive branch but the legislative branch as well. When a new law is passed, establishing a new program, I think it is our duty, instead of creating a new bureau immediately, to ask ourselves, Can this program go into an agency that already exists? When the purpose of a program is gone, should its agency be continued, or should we eliminate that agency?

It is my feeling that while a commission could do excellent and outstanding work, we in Congress also have a responsibility, a continuing responsibility, and the President has a continuing responsibility. What I am pleading for is that we assume our continuing responsibility, not only for what has been done in the past and is being done in the present, but for the future, to bring some sense into this proliferating Federal establishment.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator does not feel that the situation has reached the point where some broader commission approach is needed, which Congress could then implement, remembering that the Hoover Commission was a joint agency of the Congress and the executive department?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I would not be opposed to such a commission. I think a commission could do a useful job. I should certainly be in favor of considering establishing such a commission.

But in the meanwhile, I think there is much that can be done, that we can do and for which we must accept responsibility.

The senior Senator from New York is a most valued member of our subcommittee. Every time we have a meeting, his contributions show his commonsense, deep knowledge, and practicality. I feel that the Senator from New York, with the other members of the committee, can achieve much working in the committee; and I do not propose that we wait to get organized until a new commission is created.

I should like to see the Congress of the United States and our committee undertake this task as soon as we come back in January.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator, and I join with him in his views on both the work of the Congress and the sponsoring of a commission next year.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I thank the Senator very much; and I thank the Senator from Illinois for yielding.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TODAY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Manpower Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11135) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order controlling time, who yields time? The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Being somewhat overawed by the large numbers of Senators sitting in serried ranks about me, I open the debate on my amendment by saying that I intend to speak for 20 minutes, and then I hope that the majority whip [Mr. Long of Louisiana], who is opposing the amendment, will take 20 minutes; that I will then take 5 minutes and he take 10 minutes, and that I be permitted to conclude the debate for the final 5 minutes. So I intend to speak now about 20 minutes.

Mr. President, this matter was very thoroughly discussed yesterday on the floor of the Senate. It takes up a great many pages in the Congressional Record, and I assume that one reason why other Senators are not present today is that they have been spending their time in their offices, reading the Congressional Record.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will yield on the Senator's time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Fine; yield on my time.

May I say to the Senator that I regret that I am 5 minutes late, but I was here at 9 to open the Senate, and I had to leave the floor in order to talk with some of the technicians, to find out how completely in error the Senator is.

Let me ask the Senator——

Mr. DOUGLAS. On the Senator's time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; on my time. He says that his 15-year moving average works out to a price which he is willing to pay for sugar——

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I be permitted to develop my argument?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Hold on just 1 minute, and let me ask the question, because I am trying to understand the Senator's argument. I merely want his answer to a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. On the Senator's time?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. On my time.

Now, if I understand correctly, the Senator says that his 15-year moving average price for which he thinks people should sell their sugar is arrived at by taking the prices that sugar has sold for on the world market during the preceding 15 years.

Are the figures to which the Senator is referring based upon the prices that are published in the Wall Street Journal as the Caribbean price for sugar?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is my understanding.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. After averaging that out, the price on the Caribbean market, over 15 years, does he arrive at 4.2?

Mr. DOUGLAS. 4.22.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. 4.22?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator realize that he overlooked two important factors?

Mr. DOUGLAS. What are those?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We do not buy the sugar there; we buy it here. So, if we are buying the sugar here, we must add the freight, and the tariff of .625 cents per pound.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If my dear friend the Senator from Louisiana had listened to what I was saying, he would have seen that I allowed for the tariff of .625 and the shipping costs of .50, making a total of approximately 1.25 which, added to the Caribbean price of 4.2, would come to a little less than 5.5, and effect savings, therefore, as compared to the present price, of 1.35 cents.

The trouble with the Senator is that he did not take time to understand what I was saying; he was so eager to refute it that he failed to understand it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My impression is that what we are paying is 5.7, so, as I understand, the Senator is talking about a difference of 0.2 cents.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; we are paying 6.85, which includes the 1.25. So we would pay 5.6, but that includes shipping costs, insurance, and tariff. I am not certain about the tariff, whether it includes the tariff. It does include shipping costs.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. May I say to the Senator that if he wants to make everybody in the world sell sugar at the price he arrives at, he should know what he is talking about.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am quite sure of what I am talking about.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator just finished saying he did not know whether his price includes the tariff or does not, or whether it includes the shipping costs.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It does include the shipping costs.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As to the tariff, the Senator would not know?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; it includes the tariff. The price includes the tariff.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is satisfied that it includes the tariff. Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. Is the Senator from Louisiana ready to come clean on what proportion of the 48 million tons of sugar produced in the domestic market is beet sugar? How much of that is beet sugar?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would say to the Senator that when he raised the point I asked him if he knew.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Those were the Senator's figures, I remind him.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator produced them. He should be responsible for those figures.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I will send for the chart I used yesterday.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator had overnight to study it. What are the results of his study?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Hold on a minute, please. Let me tell the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. How much of that is beet sugar, and how much of it is cane sugar?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I said that 48 million tons of sugar was consumed in the country where it is produced. I was exactly right.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; but under high tariffs that do not enter into the world trade. The total volume of the world trade is not 64 million tons, but 14 to 15 million metric tons or 16 million short tons. The 6 million metric tons outside the preferential system are 40 percent of the total, not 10 percent, as the Senator from Louisiana tried to palm off on us on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Hold on a minute, please.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This is on the Senator's time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Very well. I will do this on my time. This is the chart I used. This is what I said.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is the same chart; yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I said 48 million tons of sugar was consumed in the country where it is produced. That is a protected market.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; it does not enter into the world trade.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator said that. Like both of his arguments, he told a half truth.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, the Senator told a half truth.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator should discuss the amendment on his time, not on mine.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; that is correct.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time is now coming out of the time of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Illinois gets up and states that I am in error because part of that 48 million tons is beet sugar. Therefore, I ask the Senator: What conceivable difference could that make? Beet sugar sells for the same price in the world market as cane sugar. It makes no difference whatever. Therefore, I ask the Senator from Illinois, since he made the point, to tell me how much of that 48 million tons is beet sugar. The Senator asks me that question. Let him tell me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not know the answer because——

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator knows it now.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Hold on 1 minute. This is all on my time. I just said I do not know the answer and it could not possibly make any difference whatever.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It makes a great deal of difference, because the beet sugar is produced under high tariffs for domestic markets to keep out the cane sugar. The great volume of sugar traded in world markets is not beet, but cane, and the 6 million tons is out of the 16 million tons totally traded, 10 million under special agreements, notably with France and Great Britain.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Illinois should be making these comments on his own time, not mine.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All this time is coming out of the time of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not wish to discuss the amendment until I am through with my arguments, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator on his own time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If he takes the floor away from me——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Illinois yielded to me, and I asked that I be permitted to proceed on my own time, which request was granted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senate usually follows the rules of orderly debate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would not do anything to offend the Senator from Illinois. I shall be very glad to respond to his questions when I am through. I shall be glad to yield to him at that time. I regret that I asked the question. Perhaps I should withdraw from any colloquy whatever.

Mr. DOUGLAS. "And with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I was trying to explain something——

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator can do it on his own time—go ahead.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Illinois asked me a question and I was merely trying to explain to him something about it. If the Senator does not wish me to answer his question, I will not answer it. I shall wait until he is through, and then do the best I can.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. How much time have I?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois has 29 minutes remaining. He has used 1 minute. The Senator from Louisiana has consumed 7 minutes.

MODEST PROPOSAL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is a very modest proposal that I am making. Yesterday, I showed that the American consumer is paying 6.85 cents for sugar produced at home which probably could be produced in the Caribbean or in Hawaii for somewhere between 4 and 5 cents a pound approximately, and that if added shipping costs and tariffs it would come to a little over 5 cents a pound and, therefore, we are paying a bonus of approximately 1½ to 1⅔ cents a pound on all sugar produced at home and abroad. This would come to approximately $30 a ton on the nearly 10 million tons consumed, or total excess payments of approximately $300 million coming out of the pockets of the consumers.

We all know that the beet and sugarcane interests are so deeply entrenched in this country, particularly in the Senate, that it is impossible politically to change the entire system, at least at present, until the consumers of the country become more aware of what is happening to them.

Therefore, as a practical measure, the most that could be done is in connection with the foreign quotas which amount to approximately 2,300,000 tons. Even on the 2,300,000 tons, with the excess payments of 1½ cents a pound, or $30 a ton, the $67 million excess payments coming from the American consumers to foreign producers which, in the majority of these cases goes to the rich planters of Latin America, means that this is a subsidy from poor Americans to rich Latin Americans.

Sugar is being eaten by the poor people and grown by rich Latin Americans.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. On the Senator's time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized on his own time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator from Illinois make the same contention with regard to the coffee agreement?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Substantially the same. I voted against the coffee agreement.

This sugar subsidy is a big subsidy, but it is difficult to marshal public opinion when what is happening is that we take only a few cents away from the average American family. The subsidy seems so small, starting with only a small lump of sugar for tea or coffee, and then with each cooky, and then with each candy bar; yet, when these small amounts aggregate what 195 million people consume, it becomes a huge bonus, going primarily to a relatively small group of people who are already wealthy.

That is really what this issue is. It is really substantially what the coffee agreement is, and it may be what the coming cocoa agreement will be like.

LIMITED IMPOSITION OF FEE

Mr. President, I know how strongly "dug in" the Latin American sugar planters are in the State Department. I know how the cocktail lobby operates. I know how strongly they are "dug in" at the Agriculture Department. I know that they have great influence within Congress itself.

As I have done in past years, I should like to apply the import fee to all sugar coming into this country, but I recognize that it is a political impossibility in view of the strength of the sugar lobby.

Accordingly, I have come up with a modest proposal—extremely modest, I believe; namely, that we place an import fee not on the total amount of sugar imported, but on the sugar imported from outside the Western Hemisphere, together with sugar imported from the British and French West Indies. The amendment would apply the import fee not to the 2,250,000 tons but to approximately 600,000 tons.

The import fee under my amendment would not consist of the difference between the present market price, which is 2.1 cents in the Caribbean, plus 1.1 cents shipping and tariff costs, for a total of 3.2 cents or 3.3 cents and the present 6.85 cents paid in New York. The difference, therefore, is not one of 3.5 cents a pound, or approximately $70 a ton, but what I am choosing is the difference between the American price of 6.85 cents, which, incidentally, does include tariffs and shipping, and the 15-year average world price plus shipping and tariff, and therefore would be a net of approximately 5.7 cents. The 15-year moving average foreign price would be a difference of 1.5 cents a pound, or $30 a ton. This would save, at present prices, approximately $18 million a year, a small sum in comparison with the total losses of American consumers, and a small sum in comparison with the amounts which we pay in bonuses to foreign producers. But it is still something.

Very frankly, I think, in view of the power of the sugar lobby and of the sugar planters in the administrative branches of government and in the Congress of the United States, this is probably the most we can hope for at the present time; and it is certainly all that I propose. But it would be something.

WHAT AMENDMENT WOULD NOT DO

I point out that the amendment would not change the domestic allotments inside the United States, or to Puerto Rico or the Philippines.

It would not alter the allotments as between beet and cane sugar.

It would not reduce the domestic price of sugar.

It would not reduce the production payments to domestic producers.

It would not change any foreign quota allotments, whether inside or outside the Western Hemisphere.

It would not change the bonuses above the world price given in the countries in the Western Hemisphere, except in the case of the French West Indies and British West Indies, which are already included under the respective highly subsidized sugar plans of France and Great Britain.

WHAT AMENDMENT WOULD DO

But by collecting an import fee representing the difference between the high American price for sugar and the lower 15-year moving average of the world prices for countries outside the Western Hemisphere, and the French and British West Indies, the amendment would bring in from $15 to $20 million a year to the Treasury. This could be used to help the common people of Latin America, who receive so little from the present program, which goes overwhelmingly to the rich planters, who spend it either in luxury or send it abroad for deposit in the Swiss and Parisian banks.

I am waiting for the Senator from Louisiana to tell us how large the world market is and how much of that is beet sugar which is destined almost entirely for domestic markets of the various countries, and not for export.

I challenge him to do that. We were going to get the figures overnight. I suspect the Senator has them somewhere about his person. I would really like to have that information produced for public inspection.

I am glad to yield now. I shall be glad to hear the salvos from our distinguished friend.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

It is a somewhat difficult and unpleasant task to speak for sugarbeet and sugarcane farmers. It has become an accepted fact that a Senator has a right to speak for cotton farmers, wheat farmers, corn farmers, feed-grain farmers, tobacco farmers, or any other kind of farmer, except a sugar farmer, without criticism; but if he comes from a State where sugar is a principal crop and speaks for the sugar farmers, immediately the question of sugar lobbyists comes up.

I must say that I am for the sugarcane producers, processors, and industry, because we produce quite a bit of sugar. I would be willing to help the sugarbeet industry even if we had no sugarbeet industry. I am for the farmer because he is the lowest subsidized person in this country. The Federal Reserve Board subsidizes bankers about 2 to 1 on interest rates. Various and sundry industries get by with private patents as a result of research paid for by the public and charge the public for the cost of research.

But when it comes to paying the farmer, when it comes to helping him make a decent living so he can have an electric light bulb in his home, I am for that. I am for the farmer being able to operate a raw mill. So if I am to go to jail for being for that, let them do it, but I hope they will let me finish my speech first.

I hope a certain Senator will pardon me for saying this, but he said:

> I have not had occasion to have a single lobbyist call me, or a single ambassador.

He said:

> I will admit that the sugarcane farmers have been driving me wild.

Let us remember that we encouraged sugar production. We called on them to produce more sugar when there was a shortage and the price went up. So we said we wanted more sugar produced, so that the housewife would not be victimized by high prices. So we put them in business. We have a law which is entirely different from every other agricultural law, which provides that not only can they not plant, but they cannot sell the sugar unless they have a marketing quota. Some of them borrowed money under the Area Redevelopment Administration loans, and some of them are going bankrupt because they cannot sell the sugar under the law.

There are two sugar concerns in my State, one in bankruptcy and the other about to go into bankruptcy unless we pass this bill. There are 12 other concerns like that.

We are paying 5.7 cents for the sugar. That is the price. That is the price when the sugar is delivered to us here.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Those people bring the sugar here and sell it for 6.85 cents. That 6.85 cents includes 1½ cents, some of that additional cost being for the tariff and the rest for transportation. So we usually get it at around 5.65 to 5.7 cents.

We do not think the producers can produce sugar and make a profit by selling at a lower price.

Perhaps some people can produce sugar at 4.2 cents, but they have to ship it and pay a half to a full cent for transportation. That price would break some sugar producers.

I tried to point out yesterday that the so-called world market price is a myth, a phony, and a fraud. The Senator from Illinois admitted that. For example, the so-called world market is a dump price. It is the price one can pick up sugar for at Havana, Cuba, and represents sugar that no one needs. It is about 2.2 cents a pound at this moment. I assume the same thing would be true if sugar were being sold in the Dominican Republic by one who did not have a market.

I said yesterday that of 64 million tons, which is the whole world production of sugar, 48 million is consumed in the same country where it is produced. The Senator got up and said that this was erroneous and misleading, because some of that was beet sugar.

Mr. President, from the point of view of a sugar producer or consumer it does not make the least bit of difference on the world market. Beet sugar and cane sugar are identical. Nobody can tell the difference. Unless it were labeled, one would not know if it were beet sugar or cane sugar.

Down through the years the cane sugar producers were in business first and then the beet sugar producers started producing sugar. They had an inferior product, and their sugar sold for less than cane sugar. But now one cannot tell the difference. One is just as good as the other.

There is a slight price differential in this country, which is based on competitive factors and history, because historically people were accustomed to thinking of cane sugar as a better product.

They considered cane sugar to be slightly above beet sugar because people still have in their minds that cane sugar might be a superior product.

All that we produce is cane sugar, and I am here to admit that it is not better than beet sugar. Nobody can tell the difference unless there is a label on the package.

Foreign countries found they had to have a greater supply of sugar. When Napoleon fought his wars, Britain imposed a blockade against him so he could not get sugar from the Colonies, one of which was Louisiana. They proceeded to develop sugarbeets. They could not get to it. The British Navy would sink their ships.

So, over a period of time, it came to the point where one was as good as the other. The price of beet sugar has as much to do with the world price as the price of cane sugar. A year and a half ago the price of sugar went to the ceiling, when we were operating under the Douglas global quota scheme. It went to the ceiling, not so much because of the Douglas global quota scheme, but because there was a crop failure in Europe which caused the crops to be bad, and the beet producers could not produce what they traditionally produced. That made prices rise high.

Considering the competitive factors involved, beet sugar is the same as cane sugar.

I asked the Senator a question last night and he did not know the answer. I did not know the answer. I could not get the answer until 9 o'clock this morning. The reason I could not, as I told the Senator from Illinois last night was that it does not make any difference.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Sugarcane is still the major source of world sugar, accounting for 54 percent of total production. Its importance, however, is continually diminishing. In 1963 and 1964, sugarcane as a world source of sugar, accounted for only 57.3 percent. In 1955 through 1959 it accounted for 59.1 percent.

The remainder is beet sugar, which is about 46 percent of the 64 million tons I have on the chart. Of the 6 million tons of sugar sold on the world dump market—which is what the Senator wants to base his price on—1¾ million tons, or more than 25 percent of that dump sugar, is beet sugar.

Beet sugar is 25 percent of the sugar moving on the world market and it is as good as cane sugar.

The people cannot produce sugar for the Senator's price. The Senator knows it, and he wants to rely on a price which is a disaster price. He does not know if he includes all the factors. He just told us he did not know whether it included certain items or not.

We know what 5.7 is. We know that is the price which the producer in Panama, Peru, India, South Africa, Australia, the Fiji Islands, and anybody who produces sugar should be able to sell at and make a profit.

That is the price we want to sell to them for. We do not want to make a contract with anybody that is not a good deal on both ends, certainly not if we do it by an act of Congress.

We want that price to include their price to produce plus a fair profit so they can stay in business.

It may be that in some countries—I suspect the Senator may be correct—there may be a situation that existed several years ago, in which rich planters made vast sums of money and did not pass on the profits in fair proportion to their cost to let their poor peons in the fields make a profit.

That is the entire idea of the Alliance for Progress. This Nation is putting pressure on our allies in the world to let the workers of their nations share in the benefits of capitalism, just as workers share in this country.

The Senator read into the RECORD yesterday something about producers in Hawaii. I would like to have the Senator from Hawaii listen to this.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield myself 2 minutes.

The Senator read into the RECORD yesterday that some of the producers in Hawaii were receiving large subsidy payments. They were making a fortune, and the poor workers in the field were making practically nothing.

I would like to ask the Senator from Hawaii how much workers in the fields make in Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. I am happy to reply to the question of the Senator.

The workers in Hawaii are the highest paid agricultural workers in the world. If fringe benefits are included, the gross take home per day would amount to $24 a day for the fieldworker.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. So the workers are now earning $24 a day. Some of those whose names the Senator read lost money. They did not make a penny on that subsidy. The workers are receiving a high wage. It is not the person getting the subsidy. If he did not get the subsidy he would be out of business. Is that correct?

Mr. INOUYE. The Senator is correct. In addition, our workers have medical benefits and dental benefits and other benefits under the workers' program.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am happy to see that.

If the Senator from Illinois had been successful down through the years, instead of getting $24 a day the workers would be getting $12 a day because the Senator would cut the price in half, as we pay in this country. Instead of making $1 an hour they would be making zero.

The same thing would be true in the States of Montana, South Dakota——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has again expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield myself 2 more minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. And also in California and anywhere else. If the Senator had been able to put over his full program, he would have put every beet sugar farmer and every cane sugar farmer out of business. Thank the merciful Lord that he could not put over his whole scheme. Then he came along with the Douglas global quota scheme. He said it would do everyone good. What happened? The price of sugar went from 4 cents a pound to 14 cents a pound under his scheme. Everyone became angry, because they said to us, "You are exactly what the Communists say you are. You are a big fat man with a top hat, trying to squeeze the lifeblood out of people."

Representatives of Latin American countries came to talk with our President, and he sent a beautiful picture of them around the world and said, "We are no longer going to do this to you." He said, "We will give you a fair price for sugar."

As the Senator explained the other day, he would have broken that commitment made by the President of the United States. Thank the merciful Lord that he could not get away with it. The only reason he did not try to do it was because he knew he could not put it over.

Now he comes in with a world market scheme. He admits it is a phony, because he proceeds to add a penny on top of the world market price.

Theoretically, the world market price is a decent price. The only reason why it makes any sense at all is that when the Douglas global quota price scheme was followed, the price went through the ceiling, and people had to pay an outrageous, unreasonable price. In the 1 year of the ridiculous global scheme that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] had included in the Sugar Act, the price went through the ceiling. When we consider all the other years of the world global price, there was a disaster price. The disaster price makes little sense when we add in the 1 year when the consumer had a disaster under the Douglas amendment.

So the Senator now retreats from his so-called world market scheme and admits that the whole thing is a fraud. There is no logic or no merit; nobody can produce sugar that sells for 2.2 cents without going broke. So the Senator retreats from that position.

Now we come to the last stand of his particular argument. What is it? That this is a foreign aid program; a share-the-wealth program in reverse. I am an old share-the-wealth man myself; my daddy thought of that idea.

I am willing to vote any day to take some money from a rich man to help some poor devil who has nothing to hold hide and hair together. I have voted for foreign aid programs on occasions when I thought they made some sense. I am like the Senator from Illinois: If I think a program is taxing Americans to help some rich scoundrels in South America to get rich, I am against it. But if it can be arranged so that the rich people in this country will pay a tax to help some poor soul get into business and improve his condition, I am willing to vote for it.

But what does the Senator from Illinois want to do? He wants to tax the poor Hindus in India. He wants to tax the folks in Nationalist China, one of our best allies. He wants to tax the poor natives in the Fiji Islands, some of the poorest people in the world.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield myself 2 more minutes.

The Senator from Illinois wants to tax the poor, ignorant Negroes. While he is a champion of Negroes in this country, he wants to tax the very last cent out of Negroes in Africa so as to enrich somebody in Latin America. The Latins do not expect it. If they thought that that was how they were going to be given aid, they would turn us out.

Our own Ambassador testified that he would rather spend $1 in legitimate trade than $2 in the Alliance for Progress. He is the man who has the responsibility for the operation of the Alliance for Progress.

AMERICAN CONSUMER PAYS THE BILL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we have all enjoyed the speech by our good friend from Louisiana, which has all the characteristics of the emotionalism of a revival meeting in the woods of his native State.

What the Senator from Louisiana is proposing is that the poor American consumer—the child who eats a 5-cent candy bar; the lumberman down in the turpentine woods of Louisiana, who puts a teaspoonful of sugar in his coffee cup; the switchman out on the railway, who drinks coffee to keep him warm in the morning—must pay tribute to the rich planters abroad.

The Senator from Louisiana proposes foreign aid, but foreign aid in reverse; foreign aid from the poor American consumer to the rich foreign planter. That is the proposal of the Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will yield on the time of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. How much would the Senator's amendment save the American consumer?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Twenty million dollars.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It would not save a penny.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would save the American people $20 million. The money could then be used to really help the people of Latin America.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is wrong, based on his own amendment; and I can show him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator will have to do it on his own time. Earlier the Senator from Louisiana had his figures confused. He spoke about a total world sugar production of 64 million tons. He did not say that they are metric tons. The figures generally used are in short tons. I have been using short-ton figures. So my good friend from Louisiana was not accurately informed about the figures he was using.

ONLY 17 MILLION TONS TRADED INTERNATIONALLY

I have been doing some research on this subject. The present world production in short tons is 70 million tons, and the total amount of sugar that crosses national lines is 17 million short tons. The remaining 53 million tons is produced and consumed inside the same countries.

Incidentally, of the 17 million tons, only 1,750,000 tons consists of beet sugar. This is the movement of beet sugar from Holland and Belgium into France and Germany, and vice versa. Seventeen million tons of sugar crosses national lines, and that includes French and British preferences. But no one preferance amounts to 7 million tons.

So the dump sugar the Senator from Louisiana refers to, in his opprobrious language, amounts to slightly more than 40 percent—not 10 percent, not 5 percent, but more than 40 percent—of the world's effective supply of sugar which goes into international trade. That is an appreciable amount.

The Senator says that I am confused about the figures; that there is no difference between my total and what the total is now. If so, I do not know why he went into such a paroxysm of frenzy. But there is a difference. It is the difference of 1½ cents a pound. Let us take the computations in reverse fashion from what he gave. The 6.85 cents now paid will net foreign producers, after paying a tariff of 0.625 and 0.50, approximately 5.7 cents. The Senator from Illinois would propose to pay 4.2 cents, which would be a saving of 1½ cents a pound, or $30 a ton. On the tonnage to which I apply this, around 600,000 tons, the total amount would be $18 million. I would like to apply it to the full 2¼ million tons, and have us net roughly $67 million. But the sugar lobby, which my friend from Louisiana tries to deny, but which is very powerful, has such a hold upon the administrative branches of our Government and upon Congress that I recognize that that is probably impossible.

CONSUMER SUFFERS

So I am confining myself to a very modest proposal; namely, to apply the difference between the domestic price of sugar—6.85 cents—and the 15-year moving average of the foreign price—4.2 cents—plus shipping, insurance, and tariff costs. I propose to use that as a basis rather than the current Caribbean price of 2.1 cents, or the delivered price of 3.2 cents in the United States. This would be a beginning toward reform. It would awaken the American people to what is involved—one of the most gigantic pickings of the pockets of American consumers that have ever been carried out. It is glossed over now in the name of altruism, foreign aid, our obligations to our allies, and the rest.

The Senator is saying that I was repudiating the administration. I am certainly not doing so. I am a very strong supporter of the administration. I think that my record in the past as to votes in support of the administration has been somewhat better than that of the Senator from Louisiana on crucial issues. However, I do use discriminatory judgment in voting. I believe that I am right.

STATE DEPARTMENT SHIFTED

The State Department thought I was right last December. The Department of Agriculture thought I was right last December. It was some time during the winter, spring, or summer, that they changed. I do not try to single out anyone for opprobrium. I think they changed when Mr. Mann was made Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. I am trying to save this administration from itself.

This is not an isolated occurrence. A few months ago we passed the Coffee Agreement, which I think is susceptible of inflicting great abuse on the American consumer.

The Senator referred to the Cocoa Agreement. I do not think it is possible for the United States to hold up the raw material price of the world to the American level. It is hard enough to hold our own domestic production to their current levels. Great weaknesses are developing in our farm program. However, to attempt to take an inflated domestic price and try to hold the world price up to that level is really more than we can assume.

We are already in great trouble. I am trying to right the tremendous amount of trouble that we will get into.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am on limited time. However, I yield.

Mr. INOUYE. I note that in the bill all foreign suppliers are required to give written assurance to the Government on or before December 31, 1965, that they would furnish the specified quota at our price.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct. The Senator from Louisiana had that placed in there. He deserves great credit for that.

Mr. INOUYE. Would the Western Hemispheric countries which are covered by the agreement, and also the British and French possessions, be required to give such assurance?

Mr. DOUGLAS. They would not be required to do so. It would be at the 15-year average market price.

Mr. INOUYE. I do not believe that the amendment of the Senator provides for that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe that it does. It would not change that provision. That provision would still stand.

Mr. INOUYE. If the provision would still stand, would the people receiving this quota on sugar be required to furnish sugar to our country at the world price?

Mr. DOUGLAS. There would be no obligation to furnish it at the American price.

Mr. INOUYE. However, there is an obligation to furnish it at the world price.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If they want to do so.

Mr. INOUYE. So they are not obligated to sell it to us.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct. I do not believe they are. They can accept or reject the quotas.

Mr. INOUYE. How would the Senator assure our consumers of a stable quantity of sugar all the time?

Mr. DOUGLAS. In only 4 years out of the last 15 years has the world price risen above the American price. If the world price rises above the American price, we will pay the world price. We will abide by the market. We put a floor on the price, but not a ceiling.

Mr. INOUYE. Is it not true that at the present time the so-called world price is less than the cost of production?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No one knows. I think it is a very low price. It is 2.1 cents in the Caribbean. I would not like to continue with that price and my amendment does not do so.

Mr. INOUYE. Does the Senator feel that these countries would furnish sugar to the United States at a price lower than their cost of production?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think they will furnish sugar at 4.22 cents a pound, which is 2 cents a pound above the world price.

Mr. INOUYE. I thank the Senator.

SUMMARY OF AMENDMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, let me summarize what my amendment would and would not do. My amendment would impose an import fee only on sugar coming in from countries outside the Western Hemisphere and the British and French protectorates inside the Western Hemisphere.

This fee would be based on the difference between the 15-year average world price—presently 4.22 cents, plus shipping and tariff—and the presently highly subsidized American price of 6.85 cents.

This difference would amount to 1.5 cents a pound, or $30 per ton, on approximately 600,000 tons of the total of 9.7 million tons allocated in the bill.

This would bring into the Treasury approximately $18 million a year.

These funds would be authorized to be used for the Alliance for Progress. The money would therefore be used for needed schools, roads, and other projects in Latin America.

The amendment provides that, if world prices are higher than the 15-year moving average, world prices shall be paid. That is an answer to the question I have just been asked.

The 15-year moving average world price to be paid would, therefore, be a stable price—which covers 40 percent of the world sugar internationally traded—but would reflect, over a time, changes in the price of sugar. This would create a relatively stable price.

NO SPECIAL OBLIGATION OUTSIDE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

My amendment is based on the premise that, while we have some special economic obligation to independent countries inside the Western Hemisphere—although altogether too much of this goes to the top dogs, and all too little to the underdogs—we have no such special economic obligation either to countries outside the Western Hemisphere, or to the British and French protectorates or dependencies inside the Western Hemisphere which are already taking part in the highly subsidized programs of the British and the French.

The amendment would not change the domestic allotments inside the United States, or those to Puerto Rico and the Philippines. It would not alter the allotments as between beet and cane sugar.

It would not reduce the domestic price of sugar. It would not reduce production payments to domestic producers. It would not change any foreign quota allotments, whether inside or outside the Western Hemisphere.

It would not change the bonuses above world price given to the countries in the Western Hemisphere, except in the case of the French West Indies and British possessions in the Caribbean. Those countries are already included under the respective sugar plans of France and Great Britain.

But by collecting an import fee equal to the difference between the high American price for sugar—6.85 cents a pound—and the lower 15-year moving average of the world price for countries outside the Western Hemisphere, and the French and British West Indies—plus, of course, tariffs and shipping costs—it would bring in from $15 to $20 million a year to the U.S. Treasury.

HELP COMMON PEOPLE

This could be used to help the common people of Latin America who receive so little from the present program, which goes overwhelmingly to the rich planters who largely spend it either in luxury or send it abroad for deposit in Swiss and Parisian banks.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, has the Senator given consideration to whether his proposal for dealing differently with the imposition of an import charge with nations in the Western Hemisphere as distinguished from those in the Eastern Hemisphere, might violate the favored-nations provisions?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not believe it would, because this has been a gratuity which we have granted. I do not believe it is necessary to universalize the gratuity. Furthermore, a treaty was recently put through by the administration—and the Senator from Louisiana supported it—to render preferential treatment between the United States and Canada on automobiles and automobile parts, for which we are now asked again to make an exception. This is an argument which they produce out of their hats when they want to turn something down. However, it is an argument which they disregard with respect to the policies which they want to establish.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Illinois for the studies he has made on this bill. Why does the Senator stipulate, in his amendment, that this money be assigned to the Alliance for Progress?

AMENDMENT WOULD HELP POOR OF LATIN AMERICA

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wanted to make it clear that we wanted to help the poor people of Latin America.

The Senator from Louisiana attacked the proposal on the ground that it would be taking something away from the poor people of Latin America. However, it would not do anything to Latin America. It would not even seek to remedy the conditions inside of Latin America. It would not appropriate. It would merely authorize.

Congress can appropriate if it wishes to do so. However, I wanted the word to go out that this was not an abandonment of the Alliance for Progress.

When we introduced the measure a few years ago, the Latin-American planters flew up here in airplanes. The skies were black with planes bringing planters here. Many lobbyists and lawyers descended on Congress and on the State Department. They said: "You are hurting the poor people in Latin America."

I went to Latin America a few days afterward. I found that my name was a hissing byword there. It was said that I was trying to take something from the peons of Latin America. Actually, I was trying to cut the big gains made by the large planters.

I wanted to make it crystal clear that this was not a measure against the peons of Latin America. It was not directed against the poor. It was merely intended to help them, because we heard the Senator from Louisiana charge me with grinding the faces of the poor. I wanted to make it clear that this was not so.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should like to use my 2 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then I do not yield back my time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator has admitted that his amendment would not save the consumer a penny. He has admitted it. He seeks to extract the money from one poor man and give it to another poor man. He wants to take it from the Fiji Islanders and from the Indians, and give it to the Latin Americans. This is a matter of robbing Peter to pay Paul. Paul does not expect it, and Peter will hate us for it.

This scheme will not save American consumers a red penny. It does not help anyone.

Furthermore, the amendment is immoral and contrary to our international commitments. Let me read what happened in 1964. The Senator had this global quota scheme. He said it would save us $124 million. It saved us $4 million. Do Senators know why? It was because we could not collect any more because prices went through the ceiling.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It saved $41 million.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We collected $4 million. The price went from 4 cents to 14 cents a pound. Housewives were screaming.

Mr. DOUGLAS. On my own time, I say we saved $37 million.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I know it is tough to take. but I wish the Senator would listen to me. Why did we dispense with that scheme? At a time when we were paying 5½ cents for sugar, we went to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade with these underdeveloped countries. We were trying to keep those countries from going Communist.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield myself 1 minute on the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator have the time?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes, I have the time on the bill.

We were trying to keep those countries from going Communist. I have in my hand the contract we negotiated at GATT in November 1964. I will read some pertinent parts of it. The amendment would break the contract in five or six places. I will read this pertinent part from the contract:

PART IV—TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT

Article XXXVI

Principles and Objectives

1. The contracting parties,

(a) Recalling that the basic objectives of this agreement include the raising of standards of living and the progressive development of the economies of all contracting parties, and considering that the attainment of these objectives is particularly urgent for less-developed contracting parties;

(b) Considering that export earnings of the less-developed contracting parties can play a vital part in their economic development and that the extent of this contribution depends on the prices paid by the less-developed contracting parties for essential imports, the volume of their exports, and the prices received for these exports;

(c) Noting, that there is a wide gap between standards of living in less-developed countries and in other countries;

(d) Recognizing that individual and joint action is essential to further the development of the economies of less-developed contracting parties and to bring about a rapid advance in the standards of living in these countries;

(e) Recognizing that international trade as a means of achieving economic and social advancement should be governed by such rules and procedures—and measures in conformity with such rules and procedures—as are consistent with the objectives referred to in this article;

(f) Noting that the Contracting Parties may enable less-developed contracting parties to use special measures to promote their trade and development;

agree as follows.

2. There is need for a rapid and sustained expansion of the export earnings of the less-developed contracting parties.

3. There is need for positive efforts designed to ensure that less-developed contracting parties secure a share in the growth in international trade commensurate with the needs of their economic development.

Article XXXVII

Commitments

1. The developed contracting parties shall to the fullest extent possible—that is, except when compelling reasons, which may include legal reasons, make it impossible—give effect to the following provisions:

(a) Accord high priority to the reduction and elimination of barriers to products currently or potentially of particular export interest to less-developed contracting parties, including customs duties and other restrictions which differentiate unreasonably between such products in their primary and in their processed forms;

(b) Refrain from introducing, or increasing the incidence of, customs duties or nontariff import barriers on products currently or potentially of particular export interest to less-developed contracting parties; and

(c) (i) Refrain from imposing new fiscal measures, and

(ii) In any adjustments of fiscal policy accord high priority to the reduction and elimination of fiscal measures,

which would hamper, or which hamper, significantly the growth of consumption of primary products, in raw or processed form, wholly or mainly produced in the territories of less-developed contracting parties, and which are applied specifically to those products.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield myself 1 more minute.

The Senator's amendment would break that treaty with Australia, whose men have been fighting side by side with our men in Vietnam; it would break that treaty with India, which we hope to keep from going Communist; it would break that treaty with every friendly nation in Africa; it would break that treaty with those who have sold sugar to us in times of scarcity, when they could have sold at higher prices elsewhere, when we were calling on them for help. This robbing Peter to pay Paul scheme would break that treaty all around the world. That is what the Senator's amendment would do.

DOUBLE STANDARD ARGUMENT ON GATT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to point out that I do not think this is a violation of GATT, but if it is a violation of GATT, then the British and French are also violating GATT, because they are paying a higher price to their associated nations and colonies than they do to the world market. Therefore, if they hale us into court, we will hale them into court.

Furthermore, the Senator from Louisiana has once again shed tears for the Melanesians of the Fiji Islands. The sugar in the Fiji Islands is owned by one Australian corporation; so what the Senator is shedding tears for is that big Australian corporation.

Mr. President, the Senator recognizes that there is a difference in saving of about 1.5 cents, or $30 a ton, in my proposal as compared to his, and that this would net the Treasury $18 million. I hope a large part of that, or all of it, would be used for the Alliance for Progress.

Congress need not appropriate the money. This is merely an authorization. What the Senator is trying to do is perpetuate the abuses of the present scheme, and not allow any change in it whatsoever. The present scheme is that where the high cost of producing domestic beet and cane sugar necessitates a domestic price of 6.85, we bring the whole world up to that level, though their production costs are lower.

That system has gone too far. We have trouble maintaining farm prices inside this country. To maintain raw material prices over the entire world, and to take the responsibility of keeping those prices up to a high level, is more than the shoulders of Uncle Sam can bear.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute on the bill.

Mr. President, I want the Senators to hear what the Senator from Illinois said earlier today. The tariff of sugar is 6¼ cents——

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator implies that the tariff on sugar is 6¼ cents? It is five-eighths of a cent. Is not the Senator wrong about that?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. 62.5 cents a hundred pounds. That is what it is.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh. That is quite a difference.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is what I am talking about. That is a great deal of difference.

This is what the Senator said earlier in the debate:

> I am not certain on the tariff, whether it includes the tariff—

"It" meaning the Senator's amendment.

> It does include shipping costs.

The Senator admits that he does not even know what his own amendment is.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I have 2 minutes on the bill?

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana yields 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yesterday I offered an amendment, which was agreed to, granting the Malagasy Republic, or Madagascar, a quota of about 7,000 tons. The House quota was slightly less than that. The committee recommended no quota for Madagascar.

My question is, If the Douglas amendment is adopted, will Madagascar have to pay an import duty on the sugar that we get from it?

Mr. President, I ask the question because Madagascar has been our friend in the African area. We have bases there for our Navy, going in and out, and for satellite tracing. That country has been our friend; it has refused to follow the course of nonalinement adopted by other African nations. It has alined itself with the United States.

Will the Senator answer my question?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The answer to that is "Yes." The same would be true for the Fiji Islands, with which the same problem exists, and for every other friendly nation in Asia and Africa.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] would each vote "nay".

On this vote, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay" and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea".

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] would each vote "nay".

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 62, as follows:

[No. 290 Leg.]

YEAS—23

Bartlett
Boggs
Case
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Fulbright
Gruening
Hart
Javits
McGovern
Mondale
Morse
Morton
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Proxmire
Smith
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—62

Aiken
Allott
Bass
Bennett
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Montoya
Moss
Murphy
Muskie
Pearson
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tydings
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—15

Anderson
Bayh
Church
Cooper
Gore
Harris
Hartke
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Miller
Mundt
Pell
Russell, Ga.
Sparkman
Tower

So Mr. Douglas' amendment was rejected.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Inouye in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] and myself, I offer an amendment, send it to the desk, and ask that it be read.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

> On page 33, beginning with line 1, strike out all that follows up to line 4, on page 34, and insert the following:
>
> "(3) For calendar years after 1965, for individual foreign countries other than the Republic of the Philippines, by prorating the amount of sugar determined under paragraph (1) of this subsection among foreign countries on the following basis:
>
> "(A) For Cuba, 57.77 per centum of such amount.
>
> "(B) For other foreign countries, 42.23 per centum of such amount, the quota for each foreign country to be an amount which bears the same ratio to 42.23 per centum of such amount as the amount of sugar imported from such country during the years 1960–1964, inclusive (with double weighting for the year 1964) bears to the total amount of sugar imported from all such other foreign countries during such years."
>
> On page 34, beginning with line 7, strike out all that follows up to line 4, on page 35, and insert the following:
>
> "(1) (A) During the current period of suspension of diplomatic relations between the United States and Cuba, the quota provided for such country under subsection (c) shall be withheld and a quantity of sugar equal to such quota shall be prorated to other foreign countries on the basis of the quotas in effect for such countries under subsection (c) (3) (B)."
>
> On page 36, lines 5 and 6, strike out "the other countries listed in subsection (c) (3) (A)" and insert "other foreign countries".
>
> On page 36, line 7, after "countries" insert "under subsection (c) (3)".
>
> [Make conforming cross reference changes in section 4 of the bill.]

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Who yields time?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARTHY. How much time have I?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Thirty minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, would the Senator mind explaining his amendment briefly? I understand he has sent for material. I shall be glad to speak in the meantime, after his explanation. If the material is not here by then, we can have a quorum call taken from the time of our side.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, as Senators know, I offered the amendment in committee. I offer it on the floor in behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] and myself.

The Senator from Kentucky also offered an amendment or proposal in the committee which would have based the allocation on the 1962 importation of sugar.

The formula which I used in a sense is an arbitrary formula, but it is based on the historic record of shipments into this country.

My formula takes the years from 1960 through 1964 and uses the average which each country shipped to this country during those years, with this addition: it gives double weight to the shipments in 1964.

With respect to the administration formula, insofar as they had a formula—at least they began with the formula—the main determination was based on deliveries in 1963 and 1964. But they gave double weight to 1964 imports.

My formula takes into account that disposition on the part of the administration to recognize those countries that responded during the acute sugar shortage in 1964, for a double weight. In addition it counts 1960, 1961, 1962, and 1963, as single years to be included in determining the quotas for 1966 and the duration of the bill.

In my opinion this is a fair formula. It takes into account the historic record of 5 critical years in the sugar industry. It in no way reflects the influence of lobbyists this year or last year.

Perhaps in 1962 the lobbyists' influence may have had a bearing on what happened. But it discounts the effect of the lobbyists on the sugar program this year.

The formula provides a good substitute for the administration formula, if that were applied, and a good substitute for the House bill, which used a base formula for a beginning, and then departed arbitrarily in many directions.

I believe that what would result from this formula would be satisfactory to the Senate and leave us free of any charge of favoritism or other charges, since the previous 5-year imports are used as the base on which the foreign quotas should be assigned.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the sugar quota for foreign countries which would be in effect under the administration proposal, the House bill, and the amendment which Senator MORTON and I are offering.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sugar quotas of foreign countries[1] when sugar requirements total 9,700,000 tons, administration's recommendations, H.R. 11135 as reported by House Agriculture Committee and based on 1960–64 average sugar importations

[In short tons, raw value]

Country	Administration's recommendations	H.R. 11135	Basis of 1960–64 average importations[2]
(A) For countries in the Western Hemisphere:			
Mexico	390, 135	340, 925	402, 370
Dominican Republic	385, 854	340, 925	433, 729
Brazil	221, 558	340, 925	233, 689
Peru	240, 824	272, 013	330, 630
British West Indies	122, 017	150, 397	138, 323
Ecuador	49, 770	50, 267	39, 378
French West Indies	[3] 50, 841	42, 970	40, 237
Colombia	27, 829	42, 970	30, 500
Costa Rica	34, 786	42, 159	27, 350
Nicaragua	40, 672	38, 511	36, 514
Guatemala	35, 321	32, 836	24, 915
Venezuela	2, 676	30, 809	1, 718
El Salvador	17, 125	30, 403	13, 890
Haiti	18, 731	28, 782	26, 061
Panama	14, 449	25, 134	9, 307
Argentina	63, 685	21, 485	40, 094
British Honduras	4, 281	19, 864	2, 005
Bolivia	0	4, 054	0
Honduras	0	4, 054	0
Subtotal	1, 720, 554	1, 859, 483	1, 830, 710
(B) For countries outside the Western Hemisphere:			
Australia	186, 772	162, 152	127, 870
Belgium	1, 605	0	1, 718
China, Republic of	67, 431	67, 293	76, 465
India	96, 865	64, 861	94, 077
Ireland	2, 141	0	2, 864
South Africa	96, 865	29, 593	66, 584
Fiji Islands	45, 489	24, 323	25, 059
Thailand	0	19, 864	0
Mauritius	14, 985	14, 188	11, 455
Swaziland	9, 098	6, 081	(4)
Southern Rhodesia	9, 098	6, 081	4, 439
Malagasy Republic	7, 492	6, 081	3, 437
Turkey	1, 605	0	10, 310
France	(3)	0	3, 580
Reunion	(3)	0	1, 432
Subtotal	539, 446	400, 517	429, 290
Total	2, 260, 000	2, 260, 000	2, 260, 000

[1] Excludes the Republic of the Philippines.

[2] 1960–64 average giving double weight to 1964.

[3] Quota for French West Indies includes quotas for France and Reunion.

[4] Approximately 8.5 percent of the South African exports may be attributed to Swaziland.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the amendment more or less the same as the bill committed by the House?

Mr. McCARTHY. The total amount of sugar allocated would be the same. The question is the proportion to be allotted among foreign countries.

The effect is this: it bases the quotas on performance over a 5-year period, with double weighting given to what they did in 1964, which was a year of sugar shortage.

We take the historic basis. It is a little like the national origins quota system in immigration. But I believe the 5-year base is the fairest that we could use unless we go back 15 or 20 years.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I spoke at some length on this subject yesterday. I introduced an amendment which was based on the 1962 formula.

I join the Senator from Minnesota, although I prefer my formula to his. But the Senate should vote on whether we are going to have an allocation of offshore sugar by some standard or whether we are going to do it by whim.

The administration bill, as I pointed out yesterday, cuts some 300,000 tons out of this hemisphere. The House bill reduced that to a 175,000-ton deficit. This is a bit better, but it was done indeed by whim.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota, in which I concur, at least has a formula. We do not say that we like this country or we do not like that country.

Yesterday we went through a procedure in the Committee on Finance. It was the only way to get it done. I do not criticize anyone on the committee, and I did concur. We went through the matter country by country. If we liked the country we voted "yea"; if we did not like the country we voted "nay."

This is no way to handle a matter that deals so much in economics as implementation of the foreign policy of this country.

I agree with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] that this is a matter that should not be in the hands of Congress.

We ought to say that 2,600,000 tons of offshore sugar are coming in. Then, the administration should divide it up.

But in the House bill, the administration bill, all the amendments deal with this country, that country, and the other country.

As to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota, which I have cosponsored, I do not approve of his formula as much as I agree with mine, but that is all right.

The principle is the same. It is a matter of formula. It is a matter of rationale. It can be justified and we do not say we like the way this person cuts his hair or do not like this dictator or that dictator.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. As I understand the Senator from Kentucky, his formula relates to the amount of tonnage that can come to this country from foreign countries, but the allocation is left to the administration.

Mr. MORTON. No. I pointed out to the Senator from Rhode Island that the allocation is according to a formula which the Senator from Minnesota worked out, which is each year from 1960 on and double credit for 1964. It works out according to a formula. Perhaps it is not the correct formula. It does not indicate that we like Haiti, or that we like this country or that country. It is worked out according to a historic formula. There is no change in the total tonnage.

Mr. PASTORE. I was interested in the observation made by the Senator that this was being left to the administration.

I did not understand that.

Mr. MORTON. I hope that some day we may achieve that end.

Mr. PASTORE. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. MORTON. The amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, which I supported, was defeated in the committee. But at least we are not acting according to caprice. We are basing it on the historic formula.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I hope that if Senators have any questions about the effect of the amendment on any single country, they will ask questions. The quotas under the amendment which the Senator from Kentucky and I propose differ somewhat from those in the House bill, from those in the original administration recommendation, and also from those in the Senate bill. I believe our proposal provides the most impartial approach on which the Senate might proceed to allocate sugar to any particular country.

Mr. PASTORE. I was not interested in any particular country. It is my understanding or my impression that sugar quotas are being used more as an implement of diplomacy than for economic reasons. My contention is that if that is the case, if sugar quotas are being used as an implement of foreign policy, I should prefer to leave it to the administration to decide how they should be allocated. Perhaps that cannot be done; but I think that would be the best thing to do.

Mr. MORTON. I agree with the Senator from Rhode Island. I believe this subject should be taken out of the hands of Congress. We are subjected to all kinds of influence on the part of lobbyists and of this, that, or the other dictator. I agree that we cannot achieve what we seek to do. I agree with the Senator from Rhode Island that that would be the most logical way of distributing quotas. It would not be done in a hit-or-miss way. It has nothing to do with the domestic picture at all.

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe the State Department would like the authority he says it would give to them.

They devised a formula which, in my judgment, is not a question of intent. They tried to determine a formula that would not get us into trouble with one country or another, related to what was delivered in 1963 and 1964. They were seeking to carry out strong independent judgment on each country.

The consequence of applying that formula results in unfairness, inequity, and bad policy.

The formula which the Senator from Kentucky and I propose is not on a country-by-country basis but rather on the history of imports.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator's formula, or his amendment in connection with a formula, include any nation to have a part in our distribution of quotas to foreign countries that was not included in the report of the able Committee on Finance?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; it includes two or three countries that were excluded by the Committee on Finance. But those countries would all be in conference because, as I recall, none of them was included in the House bill. So if it is desired to make such an adjustment—to take away the quota to France, for example—that could be done in conference. I do not seek to complicate the situation by taking countries out. I am applying it to all countries which have been in the program since 1960. This amendment would provide quotas to countries on the basis of the record each made. That would go to conference and could be adjusted there if necessary.

Mr. HOLLAND. The reverse question would be this: Does the Senator's formula or amendment exclude any country that was included in the bill reported by the able Committee on Finance?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not believe it excludes any country which was included, because every country included has some record of performance—at least, every country which was recommended by the administration.

I ask the Senator from Louisiana if the committee included any countries that were not recommended by the administration.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Florida asked if the amendment excludes any that the committee included.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No.

Mr. HOLLAND. If I correctly understand the answers of the two Senators, the amendment would add certain countries not included in the bill reported by the committee, and would not exclude any countries that were included in the report of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McCARTHY. The reason for that is that there are some countries that did not deliver any sugar in 1963 and 1964, but did deliver in 1960, 1961, and 1962, which were included by the administration. Those countries would be included in my amendment, because I used the 5-year basis. A quota for all of those countries could be in conference.

Mr. HOLLAND. Was the question of including all countries not now included in the Committee on Finance bill a question that was submitted to the committee and passed upon by it?

Mr. McCARTHY. The question of a quota for France, for example, raised a specific issue. The committee's decision was not to allocate any quota to France. The House did not provide any quota for France. My amendment, because we are applying the formula across the board, would provide a quota of 3,580 tons to France. But this item would be in conference and could be taken out in conference without any difficulty.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand that the Committee on Finance acted upon this very question of excluding countries which the Senator from Minnesota has mentioned?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Committee on Finance excluded France. The administration made no recommendation for France. The Senator from Kentucky and I supported the administration's position on this item.

Mr. HOLLAND. Were other countries in the same situation?

Mr. McCARTHY. The House version contained nothing for France. It is not a question of our really taking any positive action against France.

Mr. HOLLAND. Was France the only country that was excluded by positive action in the Committee on Finance?

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe it was the only country that was given single, special attention, although some of the French dependencies had the amounts allocated to them reduced by specific decisions.

Mr. HOLLAND. In all, how many countries included in the Senator's amendment were excluded by the Committee on Finance?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the only country is France. There may be a small quota assigned to some other country that I do not recall at the moment. But there are several adjustments of quotas between and among countries.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his answers.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Would one of the results of the Senator's amendment be to eliminate the activities of lobbyists before the House Committee on Agriculture? If quotas were fixed for a period of time, there would not be a need for such lobbyists.

Mr. McCARTHY. If we were to use the historic base, the only target the lobbyists would have would be the historic base. If we do not have some standard, I suppose countries could lobby on a country-by-country basis. If we adopted the historic base, countries might still hire lobbyists. But I do not know what they could do, except that there might be some problem of a redistribution of deficits.

Mr. CLARK. It occurs to me that one of the most disgraceful features of our perennial sugar bills is the activities of lobbyists. I was interested in the position taken by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], whose amendment has been printed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That, effective January 1, 1965, paragraphs (1) and (2)(A) of section 202(a) of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"'(a)(1) For domestic sugar-producing areas, by apportioning among such areas six million three hundred and ninety thousand short tons, raw value, as follows:

"'Area	Short tons, raw value
Domestic beet sugar	3,025,000
Mainland cane sugar	1,100,000
Hawaii	1,110,000
Puerto Rico	1,140,000
Virgin Islands	15,000
Total	6,390,000

"'(2) (A) To or from the above total of six million three hundred and ninety thousand short tons, raw value, there shall be added or deducted, as the case may be, an amount equal to 65 per centum of the amount by which the Secretary's determination of requirements of consumers in the continental United States pursuant to section 201 for the calendar year exceeds ten million four hundred thousand short tons, raw value, or is less than nine million seven hundred thousand short tons, raw value. Such amount shall be apportioned between the domestic beet sugar area and the mainland cane sugar area on the basis of the quotas for such areas established under paragraph (1) of this subsection and the amounts so apportioned shall be added to, or deducted from the quotas for such areas.'

"SEC. 2. (a) The President shall submit to the Senate and the House of Representatives, on or before April 30, 1966, recommendations for amendments to the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, providing for the periodic allocation, by the President or by a department or agency within the executive branch of the Government designated by the President, of quotas to foreign countries, other than the Republic of the Philippines, under such Act.

"(b) In submitting his recommendations under subsection (a), the President shall include criteria and procedures for allocating sugar quotas to foreign countries, other than the Republic of the Philippines, which will—

"(1) provide consumers in the United States with dependable supplies of sugar at reasonable prices, and

"(2) effectuate the foreign policy objectives of the United States.

"Amend the title so as to read: 'An Act to amend section 202(a) of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I myself would like to see the whole business of sugar quotas turned over to the executive branch to be handled, just as the executive branch handles tariffs, quotas, and that sort of thing, under the Reciprocal Trade Act.

In view of the fact that the Senator from Arkansas does not intend to offer his amendment, it would probably be foolish for me to offer it when he does not intend to do it himself. I shall, however, vote for the pending amendment, believing that it will at least shore up one of the worst features of the present system.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Pennsylvania and I completely agreed on this matter within the Committee on Foreign Relations. In my judgment, the Fulbright suggestion is completely sound. I am not so sure that I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania that the amendment should not be offered merely because the Senator from Arkansas may not offer it. I am thinking about offering it.

Mr. CLARK. I would encourage the Senator from Oregon to offer it. I would lend my support to it.

Mr. MORSE. I always find the views of the Senator from Pennsylvania to be encouraging. I do not know why we do not start to make a record on sugar legislation in this session. We ought not to be handling this subject in the way in which we have been handling it in Congress for many years. We ought to establish guidelines. We ought to make perfectly clear the framework in which the Department of State should work.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Florida. He may have noted this in the previous debate on the bill. We have included a provision which allows the administration, in the national interest, to take quotas away from countries and to reassign them to other areas or other countries. There is this protection built into the bill. Even though it is said that there is an absolute, historic base established, the administration could, in the national interest, withdraw a quota from a country which may have one. But it does specifically require that the original base on which the assignment of a quota was made should reflect the historic record from 1960 to 1964, with double weight given to 1964, the year in which some countries made a special effort to supply our own short market.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, briefly in response to the remarks made by the Senator from Pennsylvania, I am in agreement with what he had to say. However, to clarify this question, I believe that Congress should definitely decide what portion of our sugar should be domestic and what portion should be offshore.

I am sure that is what the Senator meant.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with that statement.

Mr. MORTON. In the allocation of offshore or foreign sugar, this decision should be left to the administration as, indeed, we leave other things, trade agreements, and whatnot, to the administration. If we got into a logrolling process between countries, it would not be a good thing. I have no criticism of any lobbyist. A country hires the best lawyer it can, and one does better than another. It is the system and not the lobby that is responsible for our problems.

Mr. CLARK. I agree.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I would vote for the Fulbright amendment if it were offered. However, I cannot vote for this amendment. A South American country was of assistance to us when we were short on sugar. The administration gave them a quota which was cut about two-thirds in the House. Under this formula, as drafted by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, part of that reduction would be restored, but by no means all.

From what I can gather the chief difference between this South American country's operation and that of others, some with increased quotas, was that they did not have any special representative. They handled it in a normal diplomatic manner. Therefore, although I see merit in the ultimate aim of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, I cannot vote for this particular amendment. I agree, however, that the Fulbright amendment would be an improvement over what has been going on in recent years.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I certainly appreciate the views of the distinguished Senator from Missouri. If I were advising Argentina, I would rather go to conference with the 40,000 tons provided by my amendment than to go into conference with the 21,000 tons provided by the House bill, or the 60,000 tons provided by the Senate bill, and negotiate on a kind of ad hoc basis with the chairman of the committee.

I understand the position of the Senator from Missouri. However, the Government of Argentina would be better off if it would say, "Let us take a solid, historic base and ask for our quota with that justification." I appreciate the views of the Senator from Missouri and understand his position.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, my attention has been called to the fact that the bill reported by the Committee on Finance covers only a 2-year period for the distribution of foreign commodities. I am anxious to know whether the amendment of the able Senator from Minnesota departs from the 2-year principle.

Mr. McCARTHY. I was just about to ask to modify my amendment. That was an oversight on the part of the drafter. I modify my amendment to make it applicable only for the years 1966 and 1967. That would be a 2-year program, the same as that provided by the Finance Committee bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is modified accordingly.

The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, as modified, reads as follows:

On page 33, beginning with line 1, strike out all to line 4, on page 34, and insert the following:

"(3) For calendar years 1966 and 1967, for individual foreign countries other than the Republic of the Philippines, by prorating the amount of sugar determined under paragraph (1) of this subsection among foreign countries on the following basis:

"(A) For Cuba, 57.77 per centum of such amount.

"(B) For other foreign countries, 42.23 per centum of such amount, the quota for each foreign country to be an amount which bears the same ratio to 42.23 per centum of such amount as the amount of sugar imported from such country during the years 1960 to 1964, inclusive (with double weighting for the year 1964), bears to the total amount of sugar imported from all such other foreign countries during such years."

On page 34, beginning with line 7, strike out all that follows up to line 4, on page 35, and insert the following:

"(1) (A) During the current period of suspension of diplomatic relations between the United States and Cuba, the quota provided for such country under subsection (c) shall be withheld and a quantity of sugar equal to such quota shall be prorated to other foreign countries on the basis of the quotas in effect for such countries under subsection (c) (3) (B)."

On page 36, lines 5 and 6, strike out "the other countries listed in subsection (c) (3) (A)" and insert "other foreign countries".

On page 36, line 7, after "countries" insert "under subsection (c) (3)".

Make conforming cross reference changes in section 4 of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am disappointed with one part of the amendment. As I understand the Senator, he wants to compensate, by a larger sugar allotment, those countries in Latin America which sold us sugar at less than the world price when we were in short supply.

My understanding is that Under Secretary of State Ball, in negotiations with Latin American countries, asked them to do that, and then made a promise which, in my judgment, he had no right to make. However, that is one of the problems which we have with the State Department continually. It makes promises and enters into understandings, and then says: "We made this commitment. It was very difficult to work out. You must not let us down."

I do not like that kind of secret diplomacy. Mr. Ball said: "If you sell us this sugar, when we come to the next allotment, we will make it up to you."

I do not quite approve of that kind of diplomacy.

Furthermore, this would do some injustice, in my judgment, particularly to some democratic regimes in Latin America, such as Peru. Peru did not buy the bill of goods that Mr. Ball tried to sell. There was a good reason why it would not buy it. Peru was sorely in need of money at that time. Peru had her own balance-of-payments problems.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the administration formula would reward these countries, I thought, in extreme measure. The formula which I used takes into account the 1964 performance of these countries, but also the record of 1960 through 1963.

Under the administration proposal, Peru would have received 240,000 tons. Under the House recommendation, it would have been 272,000 tons. The Senate Committee on Finance recommends the same as the House. The application of my formula—with the 5 years, to be double weighted for 1964—would give Peru a quota of 330,000 tons.

I think they would be treated much more fairly under my formula than under that of either the Senate Committee on Finance, or the House bill, and certainly much more fairly than they would be treated under the administration proposal.

Mr. MORSE. The principle of my argument still stands, I respectfully submit. What we are really doing under the amendment of the Senator is making an additional payment to countries which helped us when we were short of sugar. We could have obtained the sugar at that time. We could have gone on the world market and obtained it. I do not believe that this kind of diplomacy is a wise precedent.

We should not go to countries and say, as Mr. Ball did, "If you sell to us below the world price, we will give you a larger quota to make up for it later." I do not approve of that. That is why I have trouble in agreeing to this amendment.

If the Senator can clear that up, I shall vote for his amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. I agree with the Senator.

I raised the point in the committee. I noted that it was indicated in testimony that the State Department and the Department of Agriculture had gone to the House Committee on Agriculture to see whether it would approve this kind of bargaining operation in Latin America. The House committee refused to concur. The Departments did not even bother to ask the Committee on Finance. I was critical of them for using this device as a pressure technique in inter-American politics, as is the Senator.

The application of my formula would discount that approach more than would the administration proposal, and more than the proposal incorporated in the House bill, or in the recommendation of the Senate Committee on Finance.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota understands what is bothering me. Because of my work on the Committee on Foreign Relations in Latin America, I receive a great many complaints from Latin American interests when they think we are following a course of action that is unfair.

I received a number of protests from representatives of those countries, not lobbyists, but official government people, that the Ball program was unfair to them, that it was a kind of hijack program, that it was a penalty program, that "If you don't do all we are asking you, we will penalize you in the future; if you do what we are asking you, we will reward you in the future."

What I wish to know—and I have not had time to study the figures applying to the Senator's amendment——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield the Senator 10 minutes on the bill.

Mr. MORSE. What I wish to know is, if we take all those Latin American countries that did not sell their sugar below the world price, and we apply the Senator's amendment to them, will they be penalized by receiving lower quotas than they would receive under the Finance Committee's bill? The Senator says that is not true of Peru. I want to know if it is true of any country.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is not true of any country that has been supplying us over the 5-year period. They would be treated better under my bill. The administration formula gives very special credit for what they did in 1964 when, as the Senator said, they were in trouble because of so-called global policy. The shortage which resulted increased sugar prices from 2.5 cents to 12 cents a pound. They had been warned that the rising prices could cost the consumers of this country several hundred million dollars. So then the administration went out and said, "If you will sell us more sugar, thereby reducing our sugar prices at home, we will reward you with future quotas." I do not think they had authority to make that offer.

Mr. MORSE. I do not think so, either. Not unless they obtained approval of Congress.

Mr. McCARTHY. Not only that, but they wish to compound it now by extending it for 5 years, by providing that the countries to which they made the promise they did not have a right to make, shall receive special treatment over the 5-year period provided in the administration bill. Those countries have already received more by way of remuneration, because of the special quotas the administration gave them in 1965, than they lost by giving special consideration to us in 1963 and 1964. So, in the name of equity, they no longer have a special case. They would receive some credit by application of my formula, to get the bill passed.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator. That answers my question.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. In further response to the question of the Senator from Oregon, the amendment which I offered went to 1962, and left out any extra benefit for the turbulent years of 1963 and 1964. But the principle is the same as the principle that has been encompassed in the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is supporting his amendment?

Mr. MORTON. Yes; I am cosponsoring it. I have no illusions as to what is going to happen, but at least there is a formula, and not caprice.

I hope the Senator will, as he has indicated, persuade the Senator from Arkansas at least to put to a vote his proposal, because if we are to deal out benefits on the basis that we like a man's eyes or the color of his hair, we are in trouble.

Mr. MORSE. I agree.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator has one good argument for his amendment, and that is that it works on a formula. Nevertheless, in my judgment and the judgment of the Senate Finance Committee by overwhelming vote, the administration formula makes considerably better sense.

The approach the administration took was directly by a formula; and it stuck to it. The administration said, "We are not going to buy sugar from any new country. If we did we could not explain to other countries why we do not buy sugar from them."

Mr. McCARTHY. Those countries would not get anything under my formula.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct. Up to this point I agree with the Senator. I am only trying to explain to him how the administration arrived at its formula. It has a formula; the Senator from Minnesota has a formula.

The administration proceeded to say, "We are only going to talk about the people with whom we have been trading.

We are not going to talk about new customers; that would create all sorts of international problems."

The Senate Finance Committee agreed with that part of the formula, and so did the Senator from Minnesota. So we are together up to that point.

This is how the administration approached the matter. It said, "We would prefer a nearby source of sugar, but above all, we want a dependable source of sugar. We do not want the American housewife to pay a good, fair price for sugar in surplus years, and end up having to pay 15 cents or 50 cents a pound in years of crop failure. We want a stable source; and the way to get a stable source in a critical period is by looking at our trade pattern in a critical period.

All right; in 1964, we called upon those whom we had been favoring down through the years to deliver more sugar, because in that year there was sugar shortage around the world. We called upon those who had sugar to deliver; and most of them were delivering, and selling below the world price.

Who came through? Mexico came through in fine style. The Dominican Republic did very well. Brazil gave us a disappointing performance. So it went.

When we looked to see who had provided us with sugar, we found that Australia had been extremely helpful to us; South Africa was helpful to us; India was very helpful to us. Those people performed in fine style.

The Department of Agriculture called on those people and said, "We want you to commit sugar; and if you do, we will not forget it. We will remember you later."

So the administration came up with a formula weighting those factors.

The Senate Committee on Finance looked at the proposal. We agreed to work from the administration's formula as our starting point. So we went down through that formula on a country-by-country basis, and asked ourselves, "Which countries does this formula reward too much? To which countries is it giving too much benefit?"

In 23 cases, the Committee on Finance, by overwhelming vote, expressed its feeling that the administration has arrived at a fair figure, and those figures we did not change. In that respect, I believe we protected the U.S. Senate as well as the Finance Committee from the kind of vicious and unfair criticism that was heaped upon the House of Representatives and its very fine committee, the Committee on Agriculture—and I regret very much that the press has been as vicious as it has to a very decent, honorable gentleman, the chairman of that committee.

But in 10 instances, we felt that the administration formula rewarded overgenerously the nations involved.

Which nations did we feel had been rewarded more than the circumstances justified? We felt that France and her colonies had been rewarded too much, and that that could not be justified. We felt India should be rewarded, but not as much as the formula would provide.

With regard to South Africa, we felt that the McCarthy formula was exactly right. That is one nation with respect to which we took the McCarthy figures.

When we got down to the Fiji Islands, we felt that the McCarthy formula seemed to be just about right.

These are not precisely the same figures, but they are nearly the same.

There is nothing particularly illogical about the McCarthy formula. I do not believe it makes as much sense as the administration formula. However, if we accept the McCarthy formula, we find that we add 12,000 additional tons to the amount that will go to Mexico. Mexico will be happy, of course, and highly pleased to get the additional tonnage. Oscar Chapman represents Mexico, and he is a very able man. I am sure that he would be glad to get the extra tonnage. However, he has said that he is content with the 390,000 tons that we give Mexico. If we were to give this additional tonnage to Mexico, he would be happy.

This would also help Peru. We have been generous to Peru. The administration recommended 240,000 tons for Peru. We felt that if we could make some reductions outside the Western Hemisphere we could possibly allocate it to those countries which perhaps had been penalized too much because they could not deliver as much sugar as we hoped they could deliver in 1964. Therefore, we raised Peru by 31,000 tons above the administration's recommendations.

The amendment would reward the British West Indies. It would put them 16,000 tons above what the committee recommended. The committee thought that the administration figure for the British West Indies was exactly right and therefore took the administration's recommendations.

The amendment would treat Colombia more generously. Why do it?

Some people are not too happy with the Government of Haiti. I am not upset about that Government, but some people seem to believe that it is not a very good Government, and they would like to take Haiti out completely because they do not like the Government. The McCarthy formula would give Haiti approximately 6,000 additional tons, to which I say: Why? There is no particular reason to do that.

In my judgment, if we are to assign additional tonnage somewhere in this hemisphere, we would do well to give it to Bolivia or Honduras. If we wish to assign a few additional tons of sugar somewhere—and we would have to confer with the House conferees on this matter anyway—why do we wish to give France that tonnage? De Gaulle is trying hard to make a run on the dollar and is trying hard to put us out of business if he can.

The fact is that De Gaulle does not seem to like the United States very much these days, and we found out that the Government of Malagasy—which has always been friendly to the United States—had its tonnage taken out, so we put it back in to correct the mistake that we, perhaps, had made. So, why include France? The administration recommended 1,600 tons for Turkey. The McCarthy formula would give Turkey 10,310 tons. There was little support for the amendment in the committee.

I suppose that if the administration had recommended it, we might very well have "bought" this trade pattern, but the administration felt that the formula brought before the committee made better sense. Even though the Senator's amendment does have logic to recommend it, I submit that to do this could very well lay the Senate open to the same sort of unfair criticism which was heaped upon the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Are we to understand that the so-called McCarthy amendment now offered by the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] was offered in committee?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Was it rejected by the committee?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It was. I do not believe it had a rollcall vote, but there was a decisive vote on it.

Mr. McCARTHY. There was a rollcall vote on it. The vote was 7 to 4, with the Senator from Louisiana voting; and as I recall, he had 3 proxies. Therefore, we did not really have an opportunity to explain the amendment to the full committee. I believe that if we could have gotten them to see the merits of the amendment——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe that the Senator from Minnesota also voted a proxy, too.

Mr. McCARTHY. I had one, and the Senator had 3 or 4.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator from Louisiana or the Senator from Minnesota state for the RECORD what the vote was in the committee?

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe that the original vote was 7 to 4. Then there was a polling of the members.

Mr. LONG of Louisana. If I recall correctly, on this particular amendment, there was not a rollcall vote. There was a vote by a show of hands. I thought the Senator from Minnesota had one vote for himself, but he also had a cosponsor, so he obviously had two votes; and if he had a proxy, he had three. I was holding a proxy myself, so that made us even.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida feels this way about it. He wishes the record to show it. He does not believe that it is sound or in the interest of the country to discuss on the floor of the Senate the question of apportioning out this kind of thing among friendly nations. He is perfectly willing to abide by the judgment of the committee, which he understands now was a rather heavy expression of judgment against the proposed amendment. He feels that since this question has to go to conference anyway, the sound thing to do would be to stand by the committee which has discussed problems which should not be discussed on the floor of the Senate with justice to all concerned, and he hopes that that course will be followed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I can defend before the Senate the amount recommended for every nation in the pending bill as reported by the committee. While I understand the Senator's formula, I am not sure I could say the same thing for it.

The Senator's formula would benefit France. Why do we wish to do that for France? De Gaulle is doing everything he can to make a run on the dollar, anyway, and there is no particular reason why France should have a portion. France is a deficit sugar area, anyway. It had a surplus one year—it is not our normal supplier—and it shipped us some sugar one year but there is no particular reason why France should be included.

Let us take the formula and look at South Africa. It works out just about right. We felt that the administration's recommendations were too generous for South Africa, so we put them on the McCarthy formula. For that country, the formula works out exactly right.

I therefore submit that if we adopt the McCarthy formula, the Senate should start all over again and do just what the Committee on Finance did. It took every one of these countries—as the committee did—and carefully considered the inequities of one country against the other, their location, how they performed in time of scarcity, and if they did not, why they did not perform. In some countries, they did not ship the sugar at a time when we were calling on them to ship their sugar, because they did not have any.

That being the case, we said that they should be considered, so we considered country by country, saying, "Let us see what the administration's formula does," and worked it out on that basis.

I submit that to adopt the McCarthy amendment would put the Senate in the position of having to start all over again and trying to do on the floor of the Senate the kind of work which is better performed by a committee. That is why we have committees. If the Senator believes that some particular country is not being treated fairly, he should offer an amendment to take care of that country, rather than start all over again as his amendment would require us to do.

Mr. McCARTHY. If this is to be the approach, then the presence of lobbyists should receive the Senate's consideration. This would be an open invitation for lobbyists to come, because they have received special consideration for the countries they represented. I am not one who is saying that lobbyists should be driven out of town, but some are complaining about the lobbyists. They have said that Argentina should be "rewarded" because she did not have lobbyists. The Irish did not have a lobbyist. If countries are to be rewarded for not having lobbyists, I think I shall offer an amendment to have a 10,000-ton quota given to Ireland.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Offer it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator support it? Ireland did not have a lobbyist. Will the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy] support it? [Laughter.]

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If someone is going to talk about what lobbyists did or did not do, I point out that in 23 cases the bill now before the Senate could not have been affected by lobbyists, because the committee reported what the administration recommended and as the bill was first introduced in the House. Some of the countries which did not have lobbyists, for example, Argentina, got what the administration recommended. So did Ireland.

So far as I know, there is no figure in the bill as reported by the committee that has anything to do with lobbyists. I do not believe the Senator's amendment has anything to do with it, but, conceivably, somebody might suggest that the reason he offered it was that some countries would be treated better under the amendment. It would be an unfair criticism, but if we adopted the amendment, we should be prepared to go over the quota country by country, as the committee did, and see what each country should be allocated.

Mr. President, I yield back my time.

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield back my time, and ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Minnesota for himself and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay," and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 57, as follows:

[No. 291 Leg.]

YEAS—25

Aiken
Bartlett
Boggs
Clark
Cotton
Fulbright
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Kuchel
McCarthy
Mondale
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Prouty
Robertson
Smith
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NAYS—57

Allott
Bass
Bennett
Bible
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Montoya
Moss
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—18

Anderson
Bayh
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Church
Cooper
Dodd
Gore
Hartke
Hayden
Long, Mo.
McGovern
Miller
Mundt
Pell
Russell, Ga.
Sparkman
Tower

So the amendment of Mr. McCarthy and Mr. Morton, as modified, was rejected.

TIRE SAFETY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced a bill, S. 2669, to be known as the Tire Safety Act of 1966. It is a composite bill, made up of bills before the Commerce Committee. I stated yesterday that the committee had before it three or four other bills, including one by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], which I believe to be a major approach to the problem. All these bills are in committee.

There have been some hearings on the bills, and we have made up a composite bill, which is not in conflict with the other bills.

We do not expect to hold any hearings on the bill which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] has introduced or any other bills until the Senate returns next year. At that time all of us expect to go into this subject in some detail.

I wish to have the Record clear that there is no intention on the part of the committee to bypass the very fine efforts of the Senator from Wisconsin on this subject matter. We have experienced a little technical problem, and that is why I introduced the bill yesterday.

I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill the name of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I have studied the bill which was prepared by the senior Senator from Washington, to establish some reasonable standards of safety for tires used on automobiles in this country. It is a creative and fruitful and sensible approach. I am pleased to join him as a cosponsor of the bill.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11135) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and myself I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 32, beginning with line 14, it is proposed to strike out all that follows through line 19 on page 43.

On page 47, it is proposed to strike out lines 3 through 13.

On page 51, beginning with line 21, it is proposed to strike out all that follows through line 19 on page 52.

On page 55, it is proposed to strike out the last sentence of section 14.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The amendment is quite similar to the one which I offered some time ago and had printed, of which copies are available, except that it extends the domestic program through 1971, or for 5 years. It is the same as the administration bill, except for the foreign quotas.

I offered the amendment in committee. The vote on it, as I recall, was 9 to 3.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. 9 to 6, I believe.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. The amended amendment, which is similar to the one I am offering, which gives the domestic industry everything it wanted, and which is included in the administration bill, was voted down by a vote of 9 to 3. The amendment is the same with respect to the domestic industry, but it cuts out the foreign quotas.

I believe the amendment, which was the second one that I offered in committee, was turned down by a vote of 9 to 6.

So the amendment was considered by the committee, and it is true that the committee did not accept it. But I believe it is proper for the Senate to pass upon this issue. All the criticism of the sugar program that I am aware of arises from the method of allocation of foreign quotas, and the insinuation of influence on Congress arises out of the allocation of foreign quotas. There are complaints from foreign countries. For example—and this is not a secret at all; I stated it in committee—the Ambassador from Argentina told me that his country's quota was cut from 60,000 tons to 20,000 tons. He believes that that is because Argentina did not employ a lobbyist or a representative to appear before the House committee. I do not know whether that is true or not, but it leaves a bad impression.

This method of handling foreign allocations is bad for our foreign relations, aside from whatever the cost may be with respect to the sugar quota itself. That is why I have interested myself in the subject. Foreign countries argue that they now have the impression that in order to prevail in the obtaining of quotas, they must employ high-powered lobbyists.

The quota for Venezuela has been discussed in the press. Venezuela had a rather small quota, not having been a supplier of sugar to the United States, not being a large producer of sugar, and not having the economic conditions of other countries, although Venezuela is the largest exporter of petroleum to this country. It had not been the traditional practice for Venezuela to obtain a quota; but this year that country hired a high-priced, high-powered, well-known lobbyist, and Venezuela's quota was substantially increased.

It is not for us to examine into the motives or to prove them. I could not prove anything in that respect. But the fact is that it is believed by many countries that that is the way to operate before Congress. That is bad for Congress. As a Member of Congress and of the Senate, I do not like it. It is bad for our relations abroad. It does great harm to our relations with the countries of Latin America, in particular.

All I seek to do is what the industry wants and the administration recommends—to leave out foreign quotas. The effect would be to allow existing law to continue until December 1966, in this respect. The administration has the authority to set quotas next year for all these countries, just as it did for the current year. But at the end of 1966, if Congress chooses to do nothing further, the situation will be left wide open. I am not at this time advocating that the quotas not be renewed next year. I advocated before and provided in the original amendment that the administration try to develop by next April a permanent system for the allocation of quotas; some kind of formula that would be based upon historical experience and other economic and political considerations; but that it not be a matter of trading as among lobbyists with Members of Congress. That is not the purpose of the proposal

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Last Friday, I placed in the RECORD differences between the administration's recommendation and decisions as rendered in the House bill. It appears to me the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, are pertinent to what I presented Friday. I should like to be associated with the Senator from Arkansas in the offering of his amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate that very much.

This is a fine program for our domestic producers of both beet and cane sugar producing States, but I think it is too bad that this great program should be associated with the problem of allocation of foreign quotas. I have spoken with some Members of this body who represent States which are large producers of sugar, and they have said to me that they themselves wish that the program were dissociated from all the stories and difficulties surrounding the allocation of foreign quotas. Foreign quotas do not really mean anything to them. They are not an integral part of their program. They are of no interest to domestic producers, so long as they receive their tonnage and payments of subsidies, as the bill provides. That is all they are really interested in.

Foreign quotas are merely a kind of appendage that tends to discredit the whole bill, in the eyes of domestic producers. Whether every one of these allegations is justified by facts, I do not know; I would not say. But I know that the effect is bad upon the whole sugar program and upon our foreign relations. I hope that the Senate will accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield myself 1 more minute.

The committee bill extends foreign quotas for 2 years. If the quotas were cut out altogether, and we then went to conference, the Senate would be in a stronger position if it adopted this amendment, because I know there will have to be some trading. But I hope that in conference the Senate conferees will try to prevail upon the House conferees to accept language similar to that contained in my amendment, so that the domestic program can be dissociated with the problem of foreign quotas.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I support the Senator from Arkansas and am glad to cosponsor his amendment. It is a sensible solution to a dilemma in which Congress finds itself every time we handle this sugar legislation. We are in the closing days of the session. We did not have adequate time in committee to consider the requests and recommendations of the representatives of foreign countries. In fact, as the Senator from Arkansas well knows, their representatives or witnesses did not appear but filed statements instead. The members of the committee did not have a chance to read the statements until the committee began to vote on the bill.

By the adoption of the amendment all the requests of domestic producers will be taken care of for a full 5 years, as is proposed both by the House and by the Senate bills. Domestic producers will be taken care of in their entirety.

The administration could act for foreign producers under existing law for the next 12 months. Foreign producers could be assigned the quotas they now have, and during the next session the Congress in an orderly fashion could reach a permanent solution to the problem of foreign quotas. That could be done away from the atmosphere of the adjournment of Congress or of lobbying, as is now the case.

As a member of the Committee on Finance I hope the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas will be approved, not with the thought of going to conference and dropping the amendment there but with the intention of retaining it. As one who expects to be a conferee I would support the amendment in conference and would expect to bring it back to the Senate.

I believe it provides the solution to our problem. It would remove from Congress the stigma that countries who pay the largest lobby fees get the largest quotas. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Delaware for his statement.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes. The amendment of the Senator from Arkansas would divest Congress of the responsibility which it shares with the executive branch.

This amendment would, in effect, suggest that Congress is unworthy of voting on sugar quotas because Congress cannot be trusted, while the administration can be trusted.

We have here a pattern that has been worked out, as the Senator suggested it should be worked out, considering our normal trading pattern and considering whom we can rely upon to provide us with sugar.

How did the Senate committee handle the problem? I have heard some criticism of the House Committee on Agriculture. I have yet to hear anyone criticize what the Senate committee did, with the exception of Mr. Mennon Williams, who said that we made a mistake with regard to the Malagasy Republic, and he explained why he thought so. We agreed to an amendment on the floor to take care of that.

I have not heard a word of criticism concerning what the Senate Committee on Finance did with the bill.

What did we do with regard to Latin America? We gave every country exactly what the administration recommended with the exception of three countries. We gave those countries more than the administration recommended. We did this because we thought that the formula would unjustly penalize at least one of those countries. We thought, as between the Dominican Republic—where we hope to keep the forces of freedom alive, and where we would withdraw any quota they had in the event they went Communist—and the people in Australia, South America, and other far-away places, it would be better to have more sugar from Latin America and thereby do a little more for the Dominican Republic.

There has not been a word of criticism. I have not heard any suggestion that a lobbyist was able to affect one of the quotas suggested by the Committee on Finance. That is the bill that we are talking about.

We talked about lobbyist Charles Patrick Clark. We talked about a former Cabinet member, Oscar Chapman.

If we were to agree to the amendment, we would be telling them: "Do not come up to the Hill any more. Go to the White House and the President will assign you a quota. Get in touch with the President's man, the man who speaks for him, and see if you can arrange an appointment with the President or someone speaking for him and have a quota assigned to you."

What would happen to a little country which has no quota? Honduras supported us in the Dominican Republic crisis. It sent soldiers there to help solve that problem. Those people would say, "We sent troops to help you out. We are helping you. Why do you not buy sugar from us?"

The President does not want to be subjected to that kind of pressure. He wants us to share that responsibility. That is why he sent the bill to Congress. It is a traditional pattern that has always been followed. The President recommends to Congress what he thinks we should do. The President proposes to Congress, and Congress votes the measure up or down, or amends it and settles for something in between.

If we were to agree to this amendment, we would place our conferees in a hopeless position. For example, the Senator just got through saying that he thought Argentina had been treated shabbily by the House committee. The House committee cut the quota from 63,685 tons down to 21,485 tons. The Senator said that happened because they had no lobbyist.

If we were to go into conference with the Fulbright amendment and come out with any quota at all, it would not be within our power to restore the injustice done to Argentina.

The Senate committee treated Argentina as if Argentina had retained the finest lobbyist in the world. We gave it exactly what the President recommended, no more and no less. Argentina thinks that the treatment is just and fair and proper for what she did to support us in our hour of need.

The committee worked hard on the bill. We provided a 2-year limitation on the foreign quota so that we could come back and take a look at the matter in a couple of years to see how it is working out and see if we would perhaps recommend a change in one quota or another, and the administration could make recommendations.

Furthermore, the bill could not be passed, and it will not be enacted if we cannot assume the refiners of a reliable supply of raw sugar. The refiners are even better represented in the House of Representatives than are the producers. The refiners, for example, are represented by the distinguished Speaker of the House, JOHN MCCORMACK.

If the refiners are against the bill, we will not get it through Congress. The refiners want to know where they will buy sugar so that they can make contracts and know from who they can get sugar.

There is a relationship between cane and beets which requires that the producers and refiners get together and agree. The cane people must agree on how much they will produce. They have agreed to take a 13-percent cut in acreage. The beet people took a 5-percent cut. The refiners do not refine beets, and they want the tightest limitation they can get on beets. They want a firm control on how much beet sugar will be produced, because the law limits how much sugar can be sold.

The refiners will go along with what they think is fair control of beet production. They are in agreement at this time. If we are going to enact any legislation, we must proceed with the bill as it is. We have tried in the past to deal with the producers without dealing with the refiners. We have tried in every way that we could. It cannot be done.

If we want a bill, I submit that there must be a quota system in it.

It was suggested that Charles Patrick Clark exercised great influence. He is a highly paid lawyer. Let us see how his country made out. He represented Venezuela.

The administration recommended 2,676 tons for Venezuela. The House committee gave Venezuela a quota of 30,809 tons. What did the Senate Committee on Finance recommend? Two thousand and six hundred and seventy-six tons, exactly what the administration recommended, and approximately 10 percent of what the House recommended.

We thought the House figure was about right with regard to Southern Rhodesia, and we worked out a compromise figure with regard to the Fiji Islands.

We have what we think is a good bill, a bill that does not show the influence of anybody except the 17 Senators who tried to discharge their responsibility as the merciful Lord gave them the light to do so. We presented this bill. If we go to conference with the House, we would be a lot better off with this bill as the administration recommended, rather than buying the recommendations, as the Senator from Arkansas would do, like a pig in a poke.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Delaware whatever time he wishes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana raised a question about this amendment interfering with the sugarbeet and cane agreement. This amendment would not in any way affect the agreement reached between the cane and beet sugar industry, the provisions in the House and the Senate bill are identical. It would leave the domestic exactly the same for 5 years.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It certainly would affect it. Refiners buy sugar offshore for refining purposes. They would want to know where they could get that sugar.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am not talking about offshore sugar. I am talking about the production of domestic sugar in this country. It would not in any way be affected by the amendment.

The Senator from Louisiana said we would not have these quotas in conference. The purpose of agreeing to the pending amendment would not be to have quotas in conference. We propose to strike out these foreign quotas entirely.

I hope that we can come back with a bill to take care of the domestic program for 5 years and leave the foreign quotas out entirely.

The administration would still have under the existing law exactly the same authority under which they have operated under during 1965. They would have that same authority for all of 1966 to administer the foreign quotas in exactly the same manner that they do now. While, far be it from me on this side of the aisle to defend his administration, I do not join with the Senator from Louisiana in distrusting them to the extent he indicates in objecting to them administering the program for another 12 months. If so, perhaps he will join me next year about November, and we will make a change.

Under this amendment Congress is delegating any authority to the administration which it does not already have; Congress will have complete jurisdiction over extension and reallocation of these foreign quotas, after next year, if we wish to do so. We could start that consideration of the bill early in the next session, rather than wait until the last day or two of the session and get deadlocked in a logjam.

I think the best bet for the domestic producers in this country is to take this opportunity of protecting their industries for 5 years. They are protected both in the House and the Senate bill—we made no changes—they are fully protected, and I think we will come far nearer getting a piece of legislation down to the White House by eliminating these foreign quotas and the criticism about the foreign quotas, and carrying that problem over until next year, than we will by trying to insist on Congress dealing with the package now. By the time the bill gets back from conference, it will be the very last days of the session, if I know the conferees, and I venture to say we will come nearer getting a bill passed with the foreign quotas left out than with it in. Otherwise, there is a possibility we will be going home without having enacted any sugar bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time on the bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The Senate committee version is certainly better than the House bill. What I am trying to do, really, is establish a precedent that this matter might be adjusted in a way different from the way the House has done it year after year and, as I say, to dissociate it from the domestic program.

I am not the source, nor is this amendment the source, of the criticism of the way the matter has been handled. We have been criticized by the press every year since I have been in the Senate, it seems to me. It certainly did not arise with the introduction of this amendment, or from anything I have said. I am merely reflecting what has already been said. I think the amendment is a way to deal with it.

The allocation of these quotas, if we are going to have it in the future—of course, I also favored, I may say, the global quota, which I think worked better than this direct allocation by Congress—I think would be much more suitably an executive function, where the responsibility is pinpointed on a particular official, and particularly where the President takes the responsibility and appoints someone in the Department of Agriculture and someone in the State Department. One or two men will probably review the matter.

As for the action of the Senate committee, it largely took the administration's recommendation, in this instance, in the cases which were mentioned by the Senator from Louisiana. I believe the result is an improvement over the House bill; but what I was looking to in this case was to try to get away from the annual practice of having this kind of hassle over the bill. It always, to the best of my memory, comes up in the last few days of the session.

In this instance, we had 1 day of hearings, and most of the day was taken up by two witnesses from the administration, Secretary Mann and Mr. Schnittker; and we never did have an opportunity to talk with the representatives of the foreign countries. I am not at all sure that if we had, it would have proved very much insofar as the validity of the particular allocations was concerned. But, nevertheless, I think the procedure, the way in which this is done, is really what is at fault. If we are going to have that kind of procedure, of course we shall always have lobbyists. I do not think my remarks should be interpreted as a reflection upon some of the people whose names have been mentioned by the Senator from Louisiana. Their existence is merely a reaction to the system which has been established. If it was not those people, it would be someone else like them, playing a similar role. My criticism goes, not to the individuals as such, but to the system which is utilized in arriving at the quotas. So I hope the Senator will accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I merely wish to make it clear that under our system of checks and balances, a matter of this magnitude should be passed on by Congress.

Under our scheme of government, a great responsibility of this sort should be shared, and be subject to the checks and balances of the American system. The President negotiates these agreements; he has his experts make the studies, and then he sends down to us what he thinks the recommendation should be. Suppose there were a corrupt person at the Department of Agriculture who made improper recommendations, or someone at the White House who might do something improper. The Congress is a check on that. That is why we look at the quotas, and why we go through the whole thing and ask if this or that makes sense, and ask, "Why was Peru given such a small quota?"

Then we hear the administration's argument, and we hear from the one who speaks for that country. If he makes a good case, we call on the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State and say, "Here is what the man said; what is your answer to that?" We get their rejoinder, and by the time we are through, we are able to say whether we think those people were unjustly penalized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did the committee hear any testimony from representatives of any foreign countries?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It certainly did. I sat right there and heard it. I wish the Senator had been there. Let me show the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator referring to the statements they filed?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No; I am talking about the statement the man read. Let me read from the hearings.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. From representatives of how many countries did the Senator take testimony in open session?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. About eight of them. Everybody who wanted to read his statement stood there and read it. The Senator mentioned the Peruvian representative. Let us talk about him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not believe there were but two. As I recall, there were six or eight witnesses, but I do not believe there were more than two representatives of foreign countries. I may be in error. I think most of them merely filed their statements.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How long did that testimony take?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, we had planned 1 day of hearings. We thought that we would meet 1 day, because the Senate was not going to be in session that day, and that we would go ahead in the morning and see how far along we would get, and how much time was necessary in order that everybody could be heard.

The first witness who presented himself was Mr. Thomas Mann. One Senator interrogated Mr. Mann for a solid hour after Mann had made his statement and explained his views. By the time the various Senators who wanted to interrogate that witness at considerable length got through, they had had him sitting there for hours—and some of the Senators who took the most time wished to have a long lunch hour. So by the time they got through, 6 hours after he got there, we finally finished hearing Mr. Mann.

We heard from Mr. Schnittker first, and then from Mr. Mann. By the time the day was over we had heard two witnesses. We had heard a statement from one, and he was asked only about one question, so we got that over fairly rapidly.

The following day we met again, and I will frankly tell the Senator, I encouraged the people to get the hearings over. I said, "If you are for this bill, please do not kill it. If you sit around here and testify forever, we will never get the bill reported."

So some of the witnesses came in and filed their statements. But if anyone wanted to ask them a question, he could have asked any question he wanted.

The Senator from Arkansas wished to talk to these lobbyists, and find out how much they were paid, and who employed them, and when they were employed, and who they had talked to, I suppose. I have been on the committee of which the Senator is chairman when he spent a whole hearing investigating lobbyists. That is all right with me. I should be happy to support the chairman if he wants to go back, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and investigate lobbyists until this time next year. That is all right with me; the Senator has done a wonderful job with that sort of thing. But sugar producers are going bankrupt while the Senator fiddles and faddles.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. With regard to the Senator's remarks about the Senator from Arkansas investigating lobbyists, I took part in that investigation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I salute the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I assure the Senator that it was our investigation and our attempts to control the nefarious plots of lobbyists which resulted in the Senator's interest in who paid the sugar lobbyists, and how much they were paid; and I think that was a very proper effort on the part of the committee.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Everyone is entitled to hire himself a lawyer, and he is not a crook because he does. There are many persons languishing in jail because they did not have a good lawyer.

Mr. President, as I say, we heard from all these people. We took testimony and heard arguments. Since we have reported the bill and amended it, and have also amended it to take care of one mistake which we thought we made, I have not heard one hint of criticism of what the Senate committee has done. The committee has discharged its responsibilities in the tradition of one of the most responsible committees. It deserves better treatment, when it comes out with a recommendation on responsible legislation in the history and tradition of the Senate, than merely to be brushed aside in favor of a small functionary in the Department of Agriculture discharging our responsibilities for us.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to set the record straight. There were only two foreign representatives of lobbyists who were heard in person. They appeared before 10 o'clock on a Friday morning. When I got there, about 5 or 10 minutes after 10, the committee had already been dismissed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield at that point?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am only trying to set the record straight. The Senator from Louisiana does not deny that, does he?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We adjourned at 6 o'clock the evening before.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I stated that.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In view of the fact that the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] wished to ask so many questions of these witnesses, I said that we would come back at 9 o'clock tomorrow, hoping that there would be plenty of time for the two Senators to ask as many questions as they wished of the witnesses.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The hearing had just begun and the Senator dismissed the hearing by 10 minutes after 10.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me ask the Senator: What does the Senator do with all the witnesses——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has made his statement, and I merely wish to state the facts for the record. There were two witnesses. The House committee had 27 witnesses appear before it.

I hold in my hand a list of witnesses who testified before the House committee and did not appear before our committee, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE HEARING ON H.R. 11135, TO AMEND AND EXTEND THE PROVISIONS OF THE SUGAR ACT OF 1948, AS AMENDED, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1965

The Honorable John Schnittker, Under Secretary of Agriculture.

The Honorable Thomas Mann, Under Secretary of State.

Frank A. Kemp, in behalf of all segments of the domestic sugar-producing and refining industries.

John C. Lynn, American Farm Bureau Federation.

John Bleke, National Confectioners Association.

W. D. Pauly, Talisman Sugar Corp., Belle Glade, Fla.

Rudolph Miller, Imperial County Sugar Cane League, El Centro, Calif.

William L. Shea, Osceola Operating Corp., Belle Glade, Fla.

John Fleming Kelly, National Sugar Co., Sugar City, Colo.

Edwin H. Seeger, Peruvian Sugar Producers Association.

H. C. Laughlin, Owens-Illinois of the Bahamas, Ltd.

Oscar Chapman, Association of Sugar Producers of Mexico.

George Grant, Minister of Industry of Thailand.

Charles H. Brown, Sugar Industries of Fiji.

J. W. Riddell, Indian Sugar Mills Association.

Charles Patrick Clark, Venezuelan Sugar Distribution Association.

Robert C. Barnard, Australian Sugar Industry.

John R. Mahoney, South African Sugar Association.

Ganson Purcell, Rhodesia Sugar Association.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE HEARING ON H.R. 11135, TO AMEND AND EXTEND THE PROVISIONS OF THE SUGAR ACT OF 1948, AS AMENDED, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1965

John Bleke, National Confectioners Association.

Rudolph Miller, Imperial County Sugar Cane League, El Centro, Calif.

William L. Shea, Osceola Operating Corp., Belle Glade, Fla.

John Fleming Kelly, National Sugar Co., Sugar City, Colo.

George Grant, Ministry of Industry of Thailand.

Edwin H. Seeger, Peruvian Sugar Producers Association.

H. C. Laughlin, Owens-Illinois of the Bahamas, Ltd.

FOREIGN LOBBYISTS NOT ON FINANCE COMMITTEE WITNESS LIST WHO TESTIFIED IN THE HOUSE COMMITTEE

1. Miss Dina Dellale represented: Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica.
2. James M. Earnest represented: Mauritania.
3. Robert L. Farrington represented: Republic of China.
4. Seymour S. Guthman represented: Malagasy Republic.
5. John G. Laylin represented: Colombia.
6. Albert S. Nemir represented: Brazil.
7. John A. O'Donnell represented: Philippines.
8. Arthur L. Quinn represented: British West Indies.
9. Walter Surrey represented: Guadeloupe and Martinique.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, among the names is John A. O'Donnell, who represents the Philippines, and still does, and who was also the subject of considerable study by the Foreign Relations Committee before. But there are other witnesses listed here who testified in the House committee. Of those on the list, only two appeared before the Senate committee. Mr. Edwin H. Seeger, of the Peruvian Sugar Producers Association, and George Grant, of the Ministry of Industry of Thailand. The others submitted written statements.

I fully expected the opportunity to discuss some questions with some of them in the hearing on Friday which, as I said, was adjourned.

These are just the facts. The chairman feels that he has proper justification for that, and I am not trying to criticize the chairman. I am stating what actually happened.

The Senator from Louisiana declares that Congress fiddles and faddles until everyone goes broke. Congress has not fiddled and faddled. The bill came over only last Tuesday or Wednesday, I believe. It is a very important bill involving many, many hundreds of millions of dollars to the people of this country, and we spend 1 day on it, with the usual hours, from 10 until 6, as the Senator said, and about an hour the next morning. That was all the hearings. I submit that this is a rather short time.

It is too bad that every year—and this is not the first year—but every one that I can remember, the bill has nearly always been brought up in the last 2 or 3 days or the last week of a session, and we are always told that if we do not act immediately, without any hearings or much discussion, disaster will overtake the industry.

This condition is certainly not the fault of the Senate, so far as I know. I would not wish to begin to say whose fault it is, but it is unusual, it seems to me, that this particular bill follows this course so often. I know of no other bill of comparable importance which is presented year after year—sometimes more than a year, but every time it comes before the Senate at a very late date, which does not allow us enough time to consider it, or to develop questions.

One of the points I should like to ask about these lobbyists—and I am not saying, and have never said, that they were around here corrupting everyone—is: What does a lobbyist do to justify paying him $125,000 in the course of, let us say, 2 years, to get a quota, say, for Venezuela? What does he do?

Surely, most of the people who hire these lobbyists are not so rich that they can afford to throw away money like that. But, what kind of service does a lobbyist perform to earn that money? It seems to me a most pertinent question.

From past experience with similar lobbyists, what they do is convey to their clients, to their employers, or whichever country it may be, the fact that if they are in a position to purchase a sugar quota, they can arrange for one through Congress, which gives the implication that they have control over Congress.

To my own knowledge, in the cases we investigated, the lobbyists exerted no such influence over Congress but were preying upon their employers.

This situation I believe, is one which often influences our foreign relations. Regardless of the truth of the matter, in many cases which I had looked into, I do not believe there was a word of truth in what the lobbyist told his employer. He would write his employer—we had a case involving Trujillo—and he virtually said, "I am going to see Senator so and so, and Senator so and so will do whatever I say," the implication being that he had complete control over him.

This goes back to the various conclusions on some 27 cases which were heard which created the impression that Congress is for sale, and which creates the impression in foreign countries that Congress really is for sale.

This is what I meant about the procedure and the method followed here, which I believe to be bad, and also to be bad for our relations. It can be bad without a single thing being done which is improper in the way of the purchasing of influence in Congress itself.

Nevertheless, this does result in a bad impression being created in many foreign countries. This bad impression results, regardless of whether anything actually takes place, but I do not believe that the procedure followed in the handling of this kind of bill is sound.

The amendment I am suggesting is much better.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do both Senators yield back their time?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I wish to say one or two words. I regret that the Senator is not happy about the way the committee held its meetings.

Let me say that I serve on the Committee on Foreign Relations. I regret to say that I cannot always attend its meetings as much as I should like to do so. However, the distinguished chairman of that committee is always most fair, and I am happy to follow his procedures. I do not object to them for a moment. I cannot recall that I ever asked the Senator from Arkansas to keep his committee in session in time for me to get over there because, so far as I am concerned, if I cannot be there, I know that the Senator from Arkansas is going to do a fine job and do what his conscience dictates.

Many times I have sent him a proxy, sight unseen, if I cannot be there, if he needs my vote, because he is an honorable and a conscientious Senator, who does the best he can.

With regard to the hearings we held, if the Senator had so much as telephoned the committee saying that he would be late and was not going to be able to attend the meeting which would start at 9 o'clock and would not be able to get there until 10 or shortly after, I would have been happy to have kept the committee in session until he arrived. If he had wished to question more than one particular witness, say, to ask him how he earned his $125,000, I would have been happy to see that the session was kept open and the witness available, until the Senator had arrived.

But the Senator is chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and he has done a fine job with the lobbyists. I do believe that he has exposed some of the chicanery and some of the improper representation that some lobbyists have been known to make.

While I am very much in favor of the legal profession, I am also against any shyster or anybody who conducts himself improperly. So I hope Congress will not prejudice people who have conducted themselves completely appropriately and honorably, as I think the executive branch has, and as I think the House has, and as the Senate committee and the Senate have, in seeking to act responsibly on this measure.

There will always be somebody hiring a lobbyist, but the bill before the Senate puts the Senate in as favorable a light as we could achieve, no matter how we approached the problem.

If we agreed to the Senator's amendment, we would be relinquishing a responsibility that we ought to share with the Executive. If we proceed in this way we shall be doing justice and fairness to all countries. If someone thinks a certain country is treated unfairly, he can show it. This is a very popular bill. All the trading countries think it is a good bill.

Here is a pamphlet put out by the President, relating to the vital alliance, wherein are shown, in color, pictures of the President with the various Ambassadors from the countries. The President told them he was going to dispense with the import fee, so that the producers in those countries would have a price they could live under.

I hold in my hand a treaty providing that we were going to help these people get a price for commodities under which they could exist.

I hold in my hand the speech the President made. Here is a picture taken with the Ambassadors that the Ambassadors could send back to their governments to show what a fine job they were doing in representing their countries and getting a decent price for sugar so the people could get a decent price on the sugar shipped to the United States.

It would be better for Congress to share this responsibility with the President and take the burden off the President of having Ambassadors come knocking on his door four or five time a year, trying to squeeze a greater sugar quota out of him. They would put a burden on the President, whenever there is a crucial vote in an international body, of having some representative say, "I will vote with you if you will give us 10,000 tons."

If we follow this procedure, for example, and ask Venezuela to help us on a certain matter, the representative of Venezuela could say, "We will help you, but we want a bigger sugar quota."

If the President gives it to one country, he will have to take it away from another, and we may be accused of having turned our backs on a lifelong friend. Our approach is to share responsibility with the President. If we want to share responsibility, let us pass this bill, and have the President sign it, so he can deal with this problem.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute on the bill?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

VISIT BY HIGH SCHOOL SAMOAN DANCERS FROM AMERICAN SAMOA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate is extremely fortunate to have visiting us today some fellow Americans, some fellow citizens, from American Samoa.

The Samoan Dancers are a selected group of high school students from American Samoa, and Mrs. Morris Scanlan is in charge of the group.

The purpose of the group coming to this country was to participate, last year and this year, in the New York World's Fair, which has just been finished, and also to establish scholarship funds for students in Samoa.

We are delighted to have these citizens visiting us today. We are happy with the impression they have made, and we are proud of the progress they have made, on their own responsibility, to make their own islands a better place in which to live and for contributing their labor and efforts to a worthy cause.

So, on behalf of the Senate, I extend a warm welcome to them at this time.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11135) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas has been yielded back. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay," and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachuetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 43, as follows:

[No. 292 Leg.]

YEAS—38

Aiken
Bartlett
Boggs
Byrd, W. Va.
Case
Clark
Cotton
Douglas
Fulbright
Hart
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Morse
Morton
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Scott
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—43

Allott
Bass
Bennett
Bible
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Gruening
Harris
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Long, La.
McCarthy
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Moss
Murphy
Muskie
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell, S.C.
Simpson
Smathers
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tydings
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—19

Anderson
Bayh
Brewster
Church
Cooper
Dodd
Gore
Hartke
Long, Mo.
McGee
Miller
Mundt
Pell
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Sparkman
Tower
Williams, N.J.

So Mr. FULBRIGHT's amendment was rejected.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 47, lines 23 and 24, it is proposed to strike out "products for human consumption" and insert in lieu thereof "byproducts for human food consumption."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield back all time on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr President, I offer an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> On page 34, it is proposed to strike out the closing quotation marks in the table following line 3, and after such table insert the following:
>
> "(C) For calendar years 1966 and 1967, by reducing the quotas provided by subparagraphs (A) and (B) by 844 short tons, raw value, and by prorating to Bolivia 422 short tons, raw value, and to Honduras, 422 short tons, raw value. For purposes of subsection (d) of this section and section 204 of this Act, Bolivia and Honduras shall be treated as countries listed in subparagraph (A)."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes. I understand that I should ask unanimous consent in order to offer this amendment, because yesterday a line in the bill relating to the Malagasy Republic was amended, and my amendment pertains to the same part of the bill. I shall ask unanimous consent, but before Senators decide whether they wish to deny unanimous consent, I hope they will listen to my plea.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I do not believe there will be any objection. The Senator from Oregon can accomplish his purpose by amending any section of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may offer this amendment to a line of the bill that has previously been amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the amendment provides only that Honduras and Bolivia shall receive some allotment in the Senate bill. I plead with Senators not to let the bill leave the Senate with those two Latin American countries stricken from it. To do so would have a highly detrimental affect on our relationships with those two countries if they are not included.

Bolivia and Honduras are doing their best to promote some economic stability. If there are any two countries in Latin America that we ought to be trying to help, they are Bolivia and Honduras. Bolivia is struggling nip and tuck not only from the standpoint of her entire economic stability, but is struggling nip and tuck from the standpoint of political stability, too. The administration in Bolivia ought at least to have this assistance from the Senate.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MORTON. I did not hear the reading of the entire amendment. Does it provide for Bolivia and Honduras?

Mr. MORSE. Bolivia and Honduras. I propose that Bolivia receive 422 short tons and Honduras 422 short tons. That is less than the House offers them.

I did not want the bill to leave the Senate with Bolivia and Honduras omitted. If Senators will ever take my word for anything, I hope they will take my word that in United States-Latin American relations, the omission of Bolivia and Honduras would be a serious mistake. As chairman of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs, I have spoken with officials of those countries, and they are deeply distressed. The question will be in conference anyway. I am not offering the House figure.

I cannot speak for him, but I understand that the Senator from Louisiana, who is in charge of the bill, will not raise any objection to my amendment, because he knows that the question will be in conference anyway.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon further yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MORTON I support the Senator's amendment. I would support it if he restored the House figure. But the question will be in conference.

Am I not correct in saying that Honduras is one country that has furnished troops in connection with the Dominican Republic uprising?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. MORTON. Is not Bolivia a member of the Security Council?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I associate myself with the remarks of the able Senator from Oregon. In committee we wrestled with the problem and did not quite know how to proceed. We agreed that the question would be in conference. There is much sympathy in committee for the effort to do something to help Honduras and Bolivia.

I hope the Senate will accept the amendment and come out of conference with something in the nature of the authorization provided in the Senator's amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I do not often say this on the floor of the Senate; I usually say it to Senators in the cloakroom. However, I will say it in the Senate: I do not want my subcommittee to be placed in a position where those countries can say we did not try to do something for them on the floor of the Senate. It is very important.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to have the Senator from Louisiana comment on the amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If new producers are to be included in the bill, these are the first two that ought to be added. I am convinced that we would have to agree in conference with the House to include something for those two countries. For that reason, I urged the Senator from Oregon not to offer his amendment. But I think we would agree to at least 1,000 tons in conference, so I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Louisiana further recalls that we added the Malagasy Republic yesterday, and I supported that amendment. A cipher was added to its amount, and I thought that was a mistake.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 33, in the table following line 8, it is proposed to strike out

"South Africa______________________ 1.24"

On page 34, line 2, strike out "South Africa,".

On page 34, in the table following line 3, strike out the matter relating to South Africa.

On page 34, strike out the closing quotation marks in the table following line 3, and after such table insert the following:

"(C) For calendar years 1966 and 1967, by prorating to South Africa 4,223 short tons, raw value, to Bolivia 422 short tons, raw value, and to Honduras, 422 short tons, raw value, and by prorating 23,151 short tons, raw value, to the countries listed in subparagraph (A) on the basis of the quotas then in effect. For purposes of subsection (d) of this section and section 204 of this Act, South Africa, Bolivia and Honduras shall be treated as countries listed in subparagraph (A)."

On page 35, in the table following line 3, strike out the matter relating to South Africa and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"South Africa____ 5,777, less a proportion of that amount equal to the proportion of the Cuban quota, if any, restored pursuant to subsection (e) of this section."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senate has already covered the Honduras and Bolivia aspect. What I now propose to do is to reduce the allotment for South Africa from 66,584 tons to 10,000 tons, and distribute the saving in the allotment on a pro rata basis among Latin American countries.

I am at a loss to understand why this allotment has been made to the Union of South Africa. We ought not to be giving this sort of aid to the Union of South Africa. We all know the serious foreign policy problems the Union of South Africa presents. We know of her apartheid policy. We know of the great threat the Union of South Africa poses to Africa. In my judgment, there will be serious trouble in a few years over her policy.

I had some experience with the diplomacy of the Union of South Africa when I was a delegate to the United Nations. South Africa will not allow a U.N. inspection team to go into southwest Africa, which the Union of South Africa controls under an old League of Nations mandate. She claims, in effect, that the United Nations has not inherited the League of Nations mandate. I am satisfied that as a matter of international law the Union of South Africa is absolutely as wrong as she can be.

It is a great mistake to make this large allotment of sugar to the Union of South Africa. We ought to be helping our neighbors to the south. Therefore, I propose to reduce the allotment to the Union of South Africa to 10,000 tons, and to prorate the saving among Latin American countries.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, there was a recommendation that South Africa receive a quota of 96,865 tons. When we were short on sugar and the housewife had to pay an outrageous price for sugar, we called upon South Africa to deliver sugar. South Africa came through magnificently and delivered sugar at a price below what they could have sold it for on the world market. They came through as good friends and allies. They have been our allies many times in war and in peace. I know that many get up and march out when a South African gets up to explain the problems which exist there. I have seen the indignities that those people are subjected to because certain practices are in existence there that are not in existence in other countries. The South Africans have been good friends of the United States.

Our committee did not treat the South African countries as well as we treated other countries. It was recommended that South Africa receive a quota of 96,865 tons. We cut that back to 66,584 tons. Instead of giving them full credit for what they did for us in our years of shortage, we took a 5-year average in which they had shipped us very little sugar.

We were not traditional customers of South Africa. We honored a commitment made by the Department of Agriculture which said: "If you deliver us sugar now, we will not forget you when sugar is in full supply."

We worked it out on about the basis of the McCarthy formula. This would have given South Africa exactly that figure of 66,584 tons. It was about midway between the big slice the House gave them and the administration recommendation. The amendment of the Senator would in effect say, "We want to discriminate against South Africa contrary to the commitment."

That would be most unfortunate. It would cause our good friends to think extremely poorly of us.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, without injecting myself into any parliamentary difficulty later, I want it understood that I have modified my amendment to eliminate all reference to Bolivia and Honduras. The previous amendment would take care of that. That would in effect take the saving derived in the Union of South Africa and prorate it among Latin American countries.

Further debate with regard to the Union of South Africa is not needed. I do not believe we can justify this large allotment to the Union of South Africa.

I know what the Senator from Louisiana has said. However, if we can be delivered from our friends, we can take care of our enemies.

I cannot fail to protest this assistance to a country which, in my judgment, should not be receiving this kind of foreign aid. This program amounts, in effect, to foreign aid.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the senior Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Wyoming such time as he may require.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I am pleased with the sugar bill as reported by the Senate Finance Committee.

Wyoming which has some of the best sugarbeet lands in the Nation, has been for many years seeking to get an increase in the amount of sugar that can be marketed by our growers and processors. I cosponsored the Senate sugar bill because I too, was eager that the domestic producers get a far greater proportion of the American market.

The provisions of this bill, which I hope the Senate will pass, gives 65 percent of the American sugar market to our own producers. This is a substantial improvement over past allocations. The Wyoming beet growers and all those who have tasted the superior beet sugar will be glad to know that of the 65 percent of the market allocated to our domestic producers, two-thirds of it will come from sugarbeets.

When we had the sugar crisis in 1963, caused by the failure of several of the foreign suppliers to meet our demands, the U.S. Department of Agriculture asked our beet sugar industry to increase its production.

Our Wyoming beet growers responded to the requests of our Government officials and increased their production in 1963 some 42 percent over 1962 levels. This increase amounted to nearly 700,000 hundredweight of refined sugar. This additional production could only come about with additional capital outlays for equipment, machinery, and other expenditures on the part of our beet farmers in Wyoming.

Unless this legislation, which would increase the beet sugar marketing quota, is passed, our Wyoming beet growers will be required to take a 13-percent cut in acreage this year and further reductions in following years. Mr. President, it is important that we permit our own farmers to produce a sugar supply which can be depended upon by our American consumers at all times.

It is my understanding that there are hundreds of thousands of tons of refined sugar which have been produced by American farmers that under present law cannot be marketed. It is important that we permit this sugar to be marketed before we allow the foreign suppliers to fill the quotas.

Because sugar beets are extremely important to the economy of Wyoming and the Nation, I urge the Senate to pass this bill, H.R. 11135.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I support H.R. 11135 as reported by the Finance Committee but I do so with serious reservations about the action of the committee which limited the duration of the foreign quota provisions through 1967 instead of extending them along with the domestic provisions through 1971. Except for this one aspect the measure before us is a good bill and enjoys the support of the entire domestic sugar industry as well as the administration. Its passage is needed at this session.

However, it should be noted that the bill recommended by the administration and the domestic industry provided for a 5-year extension of both the foreign and domestic quotas. One of the purposes of the identical term was to enable the industry to plan ahead with some degree of assurance and stability. But the most important reason for this unanimous recommendation was to enable the cane sugar refining industry and the foreign raw sugar suppliers to gradually regain the tonnage increases they gave at great sacrifice to the beet and mainland cane areas to enable them to work off the heavy surpluses they had accumulated. It is axiomatic that any increase in beet quota causes a corresponding decrease in the volume of domestic cane sugar refining. The only way that refiners can regain their relative position in the industry is to recoup this initial loss over a term of years and it takes a full 5 years to do it.

The bitter legislative stalemate of 1964 came about as the result of provisions in the 1962 Sugar Act Amendments which provided for a reopening of the foreign quota provisions after 2 years instead of providing for the expiration at the end of the full term of the act in 1966. The opportunity was taken to seek increases in domestic quotas at that time.

Let us not invite a repetition of that experience. That the industry and the administration could agree to a common legislative proposal is a notable achievement. I hope that the conferees will do their best to restore this important 5-year term to the foreign quota provisions of the act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is not present in the Chamber, and under the unanimous-consent agreement, he has control over half of the time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I know of no request for time. That is the reason why I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida withhold his request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Florida withhold his request momentarily?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I withhold my request.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have no request for time in which to debate the bill any further. I shall be glad to yield time to Senators who want to speak against the bill, if there are any other speeches.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah is handling the matter for the minority leader.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I shall be happy to yield back the time, if it is within the power of the minority leader, who appointed me to be a floor watcher during the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest that all time be yielded back and that a brief quorum call be instituted and that, if the Senator from Illinois shows up on the floor and desires time, he be allowed any time that he desires.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] does not desire any further time. I make the request on that basis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea," and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 16, as follows:

[No. 293 Leg.]

YEAS—69

Aiken
Allott
Bass
Bennett
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Clark
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong

Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGovern
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Murphy
Muskie
Pearson
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—16

Bartlett
Boggs
Case
Cotton
Douglas
Fulbright
Javits
McIntyre
McNamara
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Proxmire
Symington
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—15

Anderson
Bayh
Church
Cooper
Gore
Hartke
Hayden
Long, Mo.
McGee
Miller
Mundt
Pell
Russell, Ga.
Sparkman
Tower

So the bill (H.R. 11135) was passed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair) appointed Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS of Florida, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. BENNETT of Utah conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in order that Senators may know precisely what the House did and what the Senate has achieved on the bill which has just been passed with regard to foreign quotas, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table which I have prepared for that purpose.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sugar quotas for foreign countries under H.R. 10496, and the House and Senate versions of H.R. 11135 at sugar requirements level of 9,700,000 short tons, raw value (assuming in all those cases that domestic quotas have been increased by 580,000 to 6,390,000 tons)

[Short tons, raw value]

	Administration's H.R. 10496	House bill	Senate bill
A. For countries in the Western Hemisphere:			
Mexico	390, 135	340, 925	390, 135
Dominican Republic	385, 854	340, 925	422, 512
Peru	240, 824	272, 013	272, 013
Brazil	221, 558	340, 925	+272, 013
British West Indies	122, 017	150, 397	122, 017
Ecuador	49, 770	50, 267	49, 770
Colombia	27, 829	42, 970	27, 829
Costa Rica	34, 786	42, 159	34, 786
Nicaragua	40, 672	38, 511	40, 672
Guatemala	35, 321	32, 836	35, 321
Venezuela	2, 676	30, 809	2, 676
El Salvador	17, 125	30, 403	17, 125
Haiti	18, 731	28, 782	18, 731
Panama	14, 449	25, 134	14, 449
Argentina	63, 685	21, 485	63, 685
British Honduras	4, 281	19, 864	4, 281
Bolivia	0	4, 054	1, 000
Honduras	0	4, 054	1, 000
Subtotal	1, 669, 713	1, 816, 513	1, 790, 015
B. For countries outside the Western Hemisphere:			
Australia	186, 772	162, 152	162, 152
China, Republic of	67, 431	67, 293	67, 431
France, French West Indies, Reunion [1]	50, 841	42, 970	42, 970
India	96, 865	64, 861	64, 861
South Africa	96, 865	29, 593	66, 584
Fiji Islands	45, 489	24, 323	35, 489
Thailand	0	19, 864	0
Mauritius	14, 985	14, 188	14, 985
Swaziland	9, 098	6, 081	6, 081
Southern Rhodesia	9, 098	6, 081	6. 081
Malagasy Republic	7, 492	6, 081	7, 492
Ireland	2, 141	0	2, 141
Belgium	1, 605	0	1, 605
Turkey	1, 605	0	1, 605
Subtotal	590, 287	443, 487	479, 477
Global quota (Cuban reserve withheld from net-importing countries and for nonperformance):			
Subtotal	2, 260, 000	2, 260, 000	[2] 2, 260, 000
Republic of the Philippines	1, 050, 000	1, 050, 000	1, 050, 000
Total foreign, including Philippines	3, 310, 000	3, 310, 000	3, 310, 000

[1] Administration recommendations treats these as an entity and included in countries outside the Western Hemisphere.

[2] Totals do not add because a proportionate share of each country's quota is used to provide new quotas for Bolivia, Honduras, and the Malagasy Republic.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, two things are abundantly clear in the wake of passage of the Sugar Act amendments. First, the bill involved questions as complicated and involved as any bill we have seen. Second, in the face of immense complexities and a wide spectrum of views, the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] did a magnificent job of managing the bill.

This is not the first time this year, by any means, that I have had the pleasure of rising to congratulate the able majority whip on his management of a bill. The Finance Committee seems to be a fertile spawning grounds for bills which are both highly technical and vitally important to this Nation. And Senator LONG, ably assisted by the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], has been the committee's prime workhorse. I refer specifically to at least three other bills managed by the Senator from Louisiana: the Social Security Act amendments, which included medicare; the bill providing for excise tax reductions; and the legislation implementing the Automobile Parts Agreement with Canada.

Mr. President, that, indeed, is quite a record, and it is fitting, I believe, to take this occasion—passage of the Sugar Act amendments—to commend Senator LONG and Senator SMATHERS for their clearly demonstrated ability and their great teamwork.

As is always the case in this great body, the legislation passed would not be possible without the assistance—by way of committee work, amendments, or debate on the floor—of many other Senators of both parties. With respect to this bill, I especially want to thank and congratulate the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and many others.

The bill was treated thoroughly and efficiently. I commend this entire body.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 619. An act for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli;

S. 919. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. William T. Schuster, U.S. Air Force (retired); and

S. 1647. An act for the relief of Kim Sung Jin.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 149) for the relief of Benjamin A. Ramelb, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1918. An act for the relief of Eligio Ciardiello;

H.R. 2349. An act for the relief of Robert Dean Ward;

H.R. 2768. An act for the relief of Emilia D'Addario Santorelli;

H.R. 3236. An act for the relief of Louis Shchuchinski;

H.R. 3500. An act for the relief of Mrs. Emilie Boulay;

H.R. 3537. An act for the relief of Albert Carter;

H.R. 5231. An act for the relief of Jack Ralph Walker;

H.R. 6112. An act for the relief of David Glenn Barker (Jai Yul Sung) and Richard Paul Barker (Pil Su Park);

H.R. 8353. An act for the relief of Becky Jo and Charles R. Smith;

H.R. 9442. An act for the relief of Ki Sook Jun; and

H.J. Res. 641. Joint resolution authorizing Father Flanagan's Boys Home to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 337. An act for the relief of F. F. Hintz;

S. 343. An act for the relief of Paride Marchesan;

S. 374. An act for the relief of Dr. Castrillo (Fernandez);

S. 516. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the Saint Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), to provide that eight members of such Commission shall be appointed by the President, and that such Commission may continue in existence until December 31, 1966;

S. 711. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hertha L. Wohlmuth;

S. 1735. An act relating to the use by the Secretary of the Interior of land at La Jolla, Calif., donated by the University of California for a marine biological research laboratory, and for other purposes; and

S. 2039. An act for the relief of Ken Allen Keene (Yasuo Tsukikawa).

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 1918. An act for the relief of Eligio Ciardiello;

H.R. 2349. An act for the relief of Robert Dean Ward;

H.R. 2768. An act for the relief of Emilia D'Addario Santorelli;

H.R. 3236. An act for the relief of Louis Shchuchinski;

H.R. 3500. An act for the relief of Mrs. Emilie Boulay;

H.R. 3537. An act for the relief of Albert Carter;

H.R. 5231. An act for the relief of Jack Ralph Walker;

H.R. 6112. An act for the relief of David Glenn Barker (Jai Yul Sung) and Richard Paul Barker (Pil Su Park);

H.R. 8353. An act for the relief of Becky Jo and Charles R. Smith;

H.R. 9442. An act for the relief of Ki Sook Jun; to the Committee on the Judiciary; and

H.J. Res. 641. Joint resolution authorizing Father Flanagan's Boys Home to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 898, H.R. 11588 and that it be laid down and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11588), making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York, provided that in doing so I shall not lose my right to the floor.

UNITED STATES-ISRAEL RELATIONS AND FOREIGN AID

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Israel is the country most often cited as an example of how our foreign aid program has worked to help change the face of a nation. Ambassador John Kenneth Galbraith, in an article which appeared in Foreign Affairs in April 1961, said it well:

> One country that has shown great advance since the war, including great capacity to make effective use of aid, has been Israel. It is singularly unendowed with natural resources. It has no oil wells, few minerals, insufficient water, and not much space. But all of the four elements mentioned—high literacy and a highly educated elite, the sense and the reality of social justice, an effective government, and a strong sense of purpose—are all present. So there is rapid progress.

Israel has indeed made good use of our aid. It has built a country that could serve as a model to its neighbors, if only those neighbors would transform their continuing hostility into peaceful cooperation. Israel does serve as a model to many of the new nations of Asia and Africa, who look to her for guidance and technical know-how because they know that many of their problems were once Israel's problems and that these problems can be surmounted by modern skills—and in what can only be called record time.

We recognize Israel's phenomenal accomplishments and we salute her. But this is not the time to turn away with compliments for a job well done.

Although Israel's economy has prospered—her currency reserves have increased to about $700 million—there is another side to the picture.

Israel's foreign currency debt rose in 1964 from $919 million to $1,097 million, a debt burden that, per capita, is the highest in the world. And despite rising exports, her trade deficit is still about $450 million a year.

Israel is faced with a security problem that is unique and seriously threatens her economic viability. She is surrounded by hostile nations who are busily stockpiling arms—which they receive either as gifts or at discount prices. Israel pays top prices for the arms she must have to protect herself. No country gives her arms. No country sells her arms at a discount.

It is a hard fact of life that Israel cannot ignore the hate of which she is the target or the vulnerability of her position. She must arm herself to deter the aggression that otherwise might overwhelm her. And so the resources that could go into creating soil out of sand and settling people on reclaimed desert must perforce go for arms.

It is astonishing to realize that in a country as small as Israel, 60 percent of the land is uninhabitable. Israel needs this area, now desert; it cannot afford to let it lie fallow. It needs the land to settle refugees who still look to Israel for a haven—for farming, for industrial use. This will be possible only through irrigation. And in this connection, I want to stress that our cooperation with Israel in a desalting project may well be the answer—not only in Israel but in many places throughout the world.

We are now extending to Israel 20-year development loans at 3.5 percent interest. If we continue making these loans, that country can continue to build. And if we continue selling her our surplus foods for Israel pounds, she can continue to increase her imports from us. There has been a lot of talk in Congress about the waste of counterpart funds. But Israel has used these funds well; she has increased her imports from the United States and we have been a beneficiary.

The Near East Report of October 4, 1965, contains an analysis of Israel's economic problems and what our aid has done to help her economy. This article, I believe, makes it clear that premature termination of our aid can be a serious setback to a country which still faces difficult economic hurdles, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS: A DEBT IS REPAID

Last Thursday, on September 30, Ambassador Avraham Harman of Israel handed a check for $60,000 to Harold F. Linder of the Export-Import Bank.

It was the final payment on the $135 million Export-Import Bank Loans which President Truman authorized when the United States extended de jure recognition to Israel in 1949.

The bank charged interest at the rate of 3.5 percent. Over the years, the Israelis paid $43.4 million in interest along with the $135 million principal.

When that loan was first extended, many people had grave doubts about the prospects of Israel's survival, let alone its ability to make ends meet and pay its debts. For the new state was still subject to the threat of hostilities. There was an uneasy truce and the U.N. armistice agreements had not been consummated. Israel was resettling tens of thousands of Jewish refugees, survivors of the Hitler concentration camps. Its economy produced little to feed and support its people and its new immigrants. Its imports totaled $156 million—about six times its exports of $25 million.

In those early years there were no governmental grants or soft loans to Israel. The Marshall plan was restoring the economies of Western Europe. The United States had not begun to extend economic aid to the Near East.

GRANT AID BEGINS

The change came in 1951. In that year, the Israel economy was overwhelmed by the 3-year influx of some 600,000 refugees and immigrants from D.P. camps, from Arab lands, from behind the Iron Curtain. Israel was in desperate need of grant assistance. Congressional leaders Senators PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, and the late Robert A. Taft, Republican, of Ohio, were joined by 34 other Senators and by House leaders JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, and JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Republican, of Massachusetts, in sponsoring legislation to aid Israel. Congress approved a grant for $65 million.

Grant aid was continued for a number of years, but it began to drop and ended in 1961. Meanwhile, the character of U.S. aid changed. The United States began to provide Israel with surplus foods, and it extended Israel development loans. At first these loans were repayable in Israel pounds, over long periods, and at minimal interest rates. Gradually, the interest rates were raised and Israel was required to pay in dollars.

For the Israel economy began to gain. There were other sources of aid.

West Germany paid reparations to the Israel Government as well as restitution to individuals.

Contributors to the United Jewish Appeal and other philanthropies continued their generous assistance to settle the refugees, to rehabilitate and to educate them.

In 1951, Israel floated its first bond issue. At first, many bond buyers regarded the purchase of a bond as a form of philanthropy. But Israel always met its interest charges, and in 1963 it began to redeem the bonds when they first fell due. As of last week, the annual report of the Israel treasury showed that $758 million of bonds had been sold, of which $298 million had been redeemed. The sale of Israel bonds has been rising every year. It reached $85 million last year, but 42.9 million was redeemed. Private investment has also increased.

American aid to Israel has always had broad support in Congress because Israel's striking progress has demonstrated how aid can be used effectively. And it has been of value to the free world, for it has shown the new countries of Asia and Africa that economic progress can be gained best through the free exercise of democratic institutions rather than under Communist and Fascist controls.

OUR AID DECLINES

Moreover, over the years Israel has been repaying its loans and the total cost of our aid to that country has been declining.

It is customary to say that U.S. aid to Israel has exceeded a billion dollars, but that is imprecise. While AID figures show that the total stood at $1,024 million, as of June 30, 1964, about one-third of that, $363.6 million, was grant, while $660.8 million was loan; of that total, $231.7 million was repaid, so that the net total of our loans was $429.1 million. Accordingly, our total aid, as of June 30, 1964, was down to $792.7 million. It will continue to go down.

What about the future?

Critics of our foreign aid program argue that aid to Israel should now come to an end—that Israel's economy has reached the state where it can afford to borrow at conventional interest rates. For its part, Israel is still hopeful that it may continue to receive development loans, on the current basis—20-year loans at 3.5 percent interest, repayable in dollars.

There is no doubt that Israel's economy has made rapid progress.

Thus the report of the Israel treasury shows that in the last fiscal year Israel's exports increased by $50 million and her imports declined by $58 million. Israel's foreign currency reserves increased during the last year to the $700 million mark.

But this is only one side of the story. The trade deficit is still about $450 million a year.

Israel's reserves have increased not so much because of the earnings of the Israel economy but because of her borrowings. Moreover, a substantial part of these reserves have accumulated because of reparations and restitution payments which are tapering off.

The hard fact is that Israel's foreign currency debt last year rose from $919 million to $1,097 million, and it is a safe estimate that the average Israeli—each man, woman and child—owes more in foreign currency than any other person in the world.

There are two other considerations. Much of Israel's funds must be used for abnormal security purchases. Unlike her Arab neighbors who threaten her with destruction, and who receive Soviet, American, and British arms either free or at a 40-percent discount, Israel must pay top prices for her weapons. Thus, her reserves are not high when considered in relation to her security needs and her exposed military position.

Moreover, despite her economic progress, Israel is far from being a developed country. She must spend a large part of her foreign currency income on the creation of an economic infrastructure essential to support her people.

Ambassador Harman stressed that fact as he made the loan payment in Washington last week. He pointed out that only 100,000 of Israel's 2.5 million people live in the Negev south of Beersheba, although it comprises 60 percent of Israel's territory, much of it now desolate and uninhabitable but capable of development.

SALE OF FOODS

One of the issues now confronting the administration is whether and under what terms to renew surplus food sales to Israel. Back in 1962, Israel and the United States entered a 3-year agreement providing for the sale of surplus commodities to Israel in exchange for Israel pounds. This totaled about $80 million. Most of the proceeds from these sales are then loaned back to Israel—its public institutions and its private enterprise.

The administration is always under pressure from Congress to harden the terms of these food sales—to require payment in dollars. But experience has shown that our soft currency sales of surplus commodities have had the effect of boosting U.S. exports.

Thus, just as our development loans to Israel have been tied to the purchase of U.S. machinery and other U.S. commodities, so our sales of surplus foods to Israel have increased our hard currency exports to that country.

A good case for continued soft currency sales was made by Adin Talbar, Israel's economic counselor, in an address to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations on June 8.

"While the size of the annual program remained static throughout the decade," Talbar said, "cash imports from both the United States and third countries increased from year to year as the Israel economy gained in strength. This applies to the imports of feed grains, rice, tobacco, oil seeds and meat."

He gave examples. In 1954, Israel's total worldwide imports of meats amounted to 4,100 tons. In 1964, Israel made cash purchases of 10,500 tons in free world third countries and 2,800 tons in the United States.

In 1954, Israel imported 3,700 tons of rice from third countries and 300 tons from the United States. In 1964, it imported for cash 6,600 tons from third countries—and 5,900 tons from the United States.

In the 1950's, Israel purchased about 25,000 tons of feed grains from the United States. In 1964, the cash purchases totaled 170,000 tons.

In that paper, Talbar showed how sales of surplus foods for Israel pounds played an important role in Israel's progress. And he commented on the view that Israel's development had reached the point where she no longer needed aid. He said:

"A young economy cannot advance without long-term loans for the development of its infrastructure. Israel is a land relatively poor in natural resources. Vast urgent pioneering projects, such as afforestation of hills that were eroded over centuries, have to be undertaken. Half of the country is desert and can only be cultivated if expensive irrigation schemes are carried out. Our marginal mineral resources are to be found in remote areas; and as they are exploited, costly communication networks and settlements are put up in their vicinity. Private capital from abroad will not and cannot carry out this development task. Israel is completely dependent on a net inflow of capital and will remain so for many years to come. Unless this net inflow continues, development must stop, since the economy base is too small to create substantial savings from within."

CUTTING OUR GAINS?

Political thinking about the U.S. foreign aid program is often affected by the argument that aid is a "giveaway" and that the sooner it is stopped the better off the United States will be. Thus, any suspension of aid is hailed as a triumph. But this is a perverse view. If our aid program has been successful, it should be continued until the task is done. Its premature termination can undo the progress that has been made. It is in the U.S. interest—political and economic—to make certain that Israel's economy does not falter. She is a showcase for U.S. aid, as well as for democracy itself.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield now to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

ADDRESS BY HON. FRANKLIN H. WILLIAMS AT WINDHAM COLLEGE, PUTNEY, VT.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on October 9, Hon. Franklin H. Williams, whose nomination was confirmed as Ambassador to Ghana earlier in the day, made an excellent speech at the presidential inaugural of Dr. Eugene C. Winslow at Windham College, at Putney, Vt. I ask unanimous consent that the address of Mr. Williams be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RERORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE FRANKLIN H. WILLIAMS AT THE PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURAL OF DR. EUGENE C. WINSLOW, WINDHAM COLLEGE, PUTNEY, VT., OCTOBER 9, 1965

When I was invited to speak to you today I thought back to my own undergraduate days at Lincoln University, Pa. Lincoln was, and is, a small college and was originally established at a station on the underground railroad to educate runaway male slaves. Then, as a student, it would have been hard for me to imagine being here today, in the heart of Yankee New England, addressing the inaugural of a new president of an institution of higher learning.

Yet, it occurs to me that perhaps it is not so odd at all. Vermonters were active supporters of the underground railroad before and during the Civil War. And here in Putney the experiment in international living was born—long before the Second World War came along to change our outlook on the world.

Both the Vermonter and the experiment reflect the same respect for human dignity and concern for human understanding which motivated the founders of my alma mater.

And that must be the concern of each of us as we move through today's world.

That should be the objective, too, of a liberal arts education—and the concern of a liberal arts educational institution.

In the United Nations we often used the phrase "self-determination" of nations, or of peoples. This was appropriate at that time and place.

But Windham's strength will be found in its concern with the self-determination of the individual.

It is in the development of individual excellence; in the instillation of a deep commitment to integrity, creativity, and intellectual adventure, that the liberal arts college must succeed.

This is a prime function of Windham College. As I see it, this is the very heart of its existence, its essential reason for being. Personally, I wish there were a thousand Windhams in every section of our land. A thousand Windhams, producing America's most important natural resource—the young; and, specifically, students who have had a chance to think for themselves, to communicate with their professors, to agree or dissent, to speak and, equally as important, to be heard. The chance here for students and faculty to meet and talk, to exchange ideas, to "touch each other," so to speak, is enormously important. From this kind of experience will come the kind of student who will reject mass cliche and mass thinking. It is these students, matured as individuals in a sympathetic climate, who often, in the professions, in business, and in government itself, become the leaders of tomorrow. Windham is a small college, yes. But often the most valuable products in human synthesis come out of small crucibles.

Robert Hutchins, the former president of the University of Chicago, once said of that great institution that "this is not a very good university—but it is the best there is."

Windham too must be the best there is, for, in a way, you are part of a national experiment in education. It is colleges such as this that will determine whether or not Federal aid to education in the liberal arts can assist in producing the desirable result—a higher quality of excellence among our graduates.

Don't misunderstand me, I am not against mass education. I believe it is necessary in a world ever more complex, ever more sophisticated. But there are danger signals that our educational system has become too impersonal, in fact, almost dehumanized. The rebellion at Berkeley was partly a protest in this direction. Increasingly, students in large universities have felt themselves alienated from the faculty. They have come to think of themselves, resentfully, as IBM cards. One student even carried a placard saying: "I am a U.C. student. Please do not fold, spindle or mutilate me."

This is, perhaps, extreme. Yet, the students of our day are saying something, and we must listen. They want to be heard, as individuals. They want to be treated as individuals. They want the chance to think and to be educated, as individuals. And precisely here is where Windham can be the best there is.

After all, this world of ours is not made up only of nations. It is not only made up of governments, or peoples. Its basic and most important component is the individual. When there is the understanding that in the end it is the individual that is important, no matter what the color of his skin, or his race, or his persuasion, then and only then can there be peace on earth. The well-being of the individual man, materially and spiritually, a deep concern not only for his stomach but for his heart, his soul, and his immortal spirit is, and must be the prime concern of our Nation's educators. It would be a disaster if our educational system was geared to turning out an endless parade of mindless stereotypes with "safe" political views, who will fit without complaint into pre-built niches society has waiting for them. Most educators today are aware of this danger, and are on guard against it. But a college like Windham is excellent insurance that this will never happen again here.

Yes, I repeat. I wish this Nation had a thousand Windhams.

And Windham has another responsibility—no, another opportunity.

The paramount issue in the world today is not whether we have the military capability to deter aggression, but whether or not we have the intellectual, moral, and spiritual resources to insure not only our own continued existence, but to fulfill for all individuals in the world the promise of a better life—the better life that science has put within our reach, but has so far eluded our grasp. To do this, the world, I suggest, has a dire need for a new conceptual framework of international relations that transcends all national boundaries and ideological divisions.

The full emancipation of man everywhere must either become a reality, or the civilization we know will dissolve in chaos. We have been witness in our land to the revolt of the disinherited and the disfranchised, who have risen to claim their rightful share in the freedom and abundance of our great country. We have been served ample notice that the disinherited and the disfranchised of the world everywhere will not grant us, who are more fortunate, the opportunity to enjoy the fruits of our labors until they have come into their own share.

Man can change history, however—for good as well as for evil.

There is in the Charter of the United Nations the germ of an approach to the problems of the age that is both loftily idealistic and eminently practical. It is summed up in the words "international concern with human rights," which means the concern of the world with the fate and welfare of the individual human being, whoever and wherever he may be.

In my opinion most of the world's political, economic, and social problems are ultimately problems of human rights.

If everybody has the right to life, a world preoccupied with the rights of man has no place for war. If everybody has a right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, a world concerned with human rights cannot tolerate the perpetuation of hunger and disease. If everybody has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, opinion and expression, and peaceful assembly and association, a world concerned with the dignity of the human person cannot know oppression and tyranny. And if everybody is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights can be fully realized, a world concerned with the fate of man cannot permit the quest for power or the assertion of selfish national interests to arbitrate its destiny.

The responsibilities and opportunities, then, of an academic institution such as this are clear. In this free and exciting atmosphere students and faculty together can explore the application and implications of the concept of international human rights. Such an exploration may result in a reconciliation of the internal and external inconsistencies which may surround it. Windham may be able to devise institutions for its implementation and propose national and international cooperative programs in the frame of human rights and formulate the terms of their execution.

In short, Windham's challenge is to provide creative international leadership of the highest order.

We are in the midst of the most profound scientific revolution in the history of man. The rush of new inventions, new techniques and new products dazzles and confounds the human mind. Sputnik was the trigger which fired this interest in the exact sciences. In the last decade we have turned out thousands of scientists of every kind, nuclear physicists, vector analysts, computer programmers, experts in conquering the infinite reaches of the heavens. Outer space has become the new frontier. Windham's frontier must be inner space.

Not the space of galaxies of stars and the Milky Way, but the space in the mind of man. This is the great frontier of all time. It is the study of the humanities which we need now, more than ever. To expose him to the riches of human thought throughout human history. To let his mind think, roam, flow-free instead of merely being a storehouse of empirical data. To reflect on the miracle of how a man thinks, and why, and by what processes he reaches his conclusions. This is where the light belongs, this is where the thrust of its illumination should go. For the human mind is the most sophisticated Sputnik of them all. After all, a man is not a machine. And he is not simply an extension of that machine. He cannot function by combustible fuel, nor can the wheels by which he reasons be lubricated by some petroleum product. His mind can only be nourished and nurtured by ideas, self-engendered, self-examined, and self-powered. He must be taught to think, helped to think, encouraged to think. And this is where we need the humanities.

We in this generation bear a responsibility that none before us have borne—for if we do not succeed in producing a preponderant balance of creative leadership, the extermination of life on earth may be the price.

President Johnson recently said:

"We are at the threshold of a new America—new in numbers, new in dimensions, new in its concepts, new in its challenges."

We stand, too, at a threshold of a new international world. Man's desire to escape war is surely universal; his desire to achieve peace is perhaps less universal, but the very closeness of his neighbors makes it impossible for him to hold himself in bristling isolation; he must find ways to work with others for peace.

This is not an age for cowardice, nor indeed for caution. Freedom and democracy offer no free rides.

This is an exciting, challenging and exhilarating era which is now beginning. I envy you the opportunities as yet untried, and the years as yet unused. There will be long days and times of discouragement and perhaps of anger and bitterness. But perhaps the greatest gift of the educated mind is the ability to see things in perspective, to set oneself in the stream of history, and in so doing keep an eye upon a hopeful tomorrow.

Perhaps together we may yet see the day that Benjamin Franklin foresaw almost 200 years ago when he said:

"God grant that not only the love of liberty but a thorough knowledge of the rights of man may pervade all the nations of the earth, so that a philosopher may set foot anywhere on its surface and say, 'This is my country.'"

The academic community must seize the opportunity to help chart the new course in domestic education and in international relations. This is a bold adventure. Mr. President, faculty and students of Windham College, I challenge you to dare it and envy you the experience.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2092) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit marketing orders applicable to celery, sweet corn, limes, or avocados to provide for paid advertising.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4170) to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system.

INCREASES IN RATES OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask that a message from the House on H.R. 168 be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 168, which was read as follows:

In the House of Representatives, U.S.,
October 19, 1965.

Resolved, That the House concur in the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, and 13 to the bill (H.R. 168) entitled "An Act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes."

Resolved, That the House disagree to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6 and 11 to aforesaid bill.

Resolved, That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, and on page 8, line 4, of the House engrossed bill strike out "Sec. 6" and insert "Sec. 5".

Resolved, That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken by the Senate amendment, strike out lines 12 through 21, inclusive, on page 8 of the House engrossed bill.

Resolved, That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken by the Senate amendment, and on page 9, line 1, of the House engrossed bill strike out "Sec. 8" and insert "Sec. 6".

Resolved, That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken by the Senate amendment, insert the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and on page 2, line 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "Sec. 6" and insert "Sec. 7".

Resolved, That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken by the Senate amendment, and on page 11, line 18, of the House engrossed bill strike out "Sec. 10" and insert "Sec. 8".

Resolved, That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert "Sec. 9".

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and disagree to the amendments of the House, and request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Williams of Delaware, and Mr. Carlson conferees on the part of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11588) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is Calendar No. 898, H.R. 11588.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island will address himself to the pending business.

Mr. President, the bill before the Senate is the supplemental appropriation bill for 1966, H.R. 11588. It was reported to the House on Wednesday, October 13, and passed by the House on Thursday, October 14. The Senate Committee on Appropriations, immediately upon receipt of estimates addressed to the Senate covering items not previously considered by the House, began hearings by its various subcommittees to expedite Senate consideration of the bill. The first of these hearings was held on Monday, October 11, and the concluding hearing was on Monday, October 18.

The committee held its executive markup session on Tuesday, October 19, and the committee bill, report, and hearings are available to Senators today.

The committee recommendations total $4,782,218,102, a reduction of $188,985,750 from the budget estimates and an increase of $567,788,492 over the House bill. This increase over the House bill is largely attributable to new items, not previously considered by the House and submitted directly and originally to the Senate. The total of such estimates was $607,083,742.

Briefly, the following recapitulation will highlight the bill and major committee amendments:

Economic opportunity program: The committee recommendation of $1,510 million—31.6 percent of the total—includes an increase of $10 million over the House bill, with the increase earmarked for the initiation of the conservation work program.

This $10 million additional is a result of the amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], which was adopted in the Senate, and the House accepted in conference. We are adding $10 million to the $1.5 billion total.

Urban renewal administration: $1,400 million—29.3 percent of the total—is the amount allowed by the House and recommended by the committee for grants for fiscal years 1966 and 1967.

Higher educational activities: $173,200,000 was recommended by the committee of a budget request for $274 million transmitted to the Senate and not previously considered by the House.

Grants to States for public assistance: $222 million was provided in both House and Senate committee recommendations.

Economic Development Administration development facilities grants: The budget estimate, $254,500,000, was recommended by the committee, which is an increase of $51,300,000 over the House allowance of $203,200,000—in other words, we restored the cut.

Civil supersonic aircraft development: $140 million was recommended, as requested and as provided in the House allowance.

Economic development revolving fund: $105 million is provided in the House allowance and in the committee recommendations, along with appropriate language to permit the fund to operate as a revolving fund.

Rural housing insurance fund: $100 million is recommended as proposed in the House allowance.

Grants for basic water and sewer facilities: $100 million is recommended for this Housing and Home Finance Agency program as provided in the House bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I would like to ask a question or two with reference to the rural water and waste disposal program. As I understand, of the $30 million, $25 million is provided for grants and $5 million for planning. I believe that should be adequate to get the program well under way. However, with reference to salaries and expenses, it appears the bill carries $5 million. The question is, How do we divide that? I have consulted the Farmers Home Administration. They have the idea that it would require $3.5 million to administer the $100 million revolving fund in the new business which they expect in loans for home and farm operations, which would leave only $1.5 million to carry on the rural water and waste disposal program. They consider this amount inadequate by at least $1 million.

Can the Senator tell us just how that $5 million which the committee has included in the bill is to be divided between what I would call the old regular Farmers Home Administration, program with its new authorization, and the rural water and waste disposal program?

Mr. PASTORE. Before I answer the question categorically, let me say it is my fervent hope that we shall be able to retain in conference the $30 million, which was adopted on the motion of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young].

Once we have the $30 million, I think a good question has been raised as to whether there are adequate funds so far as administration is concerned. We do not want to be pennywise and pound foolish. The program must be administered frugally and in a businesslike way. There is no question about that. I refer to page 5 of the committee report, relating to the $5 million item:

> The amount recommended includes $2 million for water grants and $3 million for the housing activities.

The contention is being made—and I suppose there is substance to the contention—that it is not sufficient. We encountered that question in the markup of the bill. However, this measure comes up more or less in the twilight of the present session. I do not suppose it was calculated with perfection, and the figures may not be precise. We think it is a reasonable figure. However, we are coming back in January, with the grace of the Lord, and we can consider any problem at that time.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope there will be enough appropriated in time to meet the salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the increased program. I understand the chairman of the Deficiency Appropriations Subcommittee to say that he will consider it—I expect favorably—for whatever may be necessary to make these programs workable.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct; in the public interest.

Mr. AIKEN. I notice, as the Senator has said, that the committee intended to provide $2 million for administering water grants and $3 million for housing and farm activities.

That might leave each of those programs about $500,000 short. We also face the possibility——

Mr. PASTORE. But these appropriations are being made to be available until June of 1966.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. And we can always reconsider it in January or February of next year if it becomes necessary to do so.

I emphasize at this point that our primary effort should be to try to keep the $30 million.

Mr. AIKEN. I read in the House report, and it seemed encouraging, that they were looking for the Senate to report the amount necessary for these programs because the President had not signed the bill at the time the House acted on the deficiency bill.

Mr. PASTORE. I make the pledge to the Senator that if it becomes necessary to have further programs and administrative expenses resources, I shall support them vigorously.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I might say that in urging the increase for this program sponsored by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], and Congressman Poage, of Texas, I did not press for additional funds for administration because Mr. Burch, the Administrator of the FHA testified a few days ago that they could transfer funds from one activity to another.

It may be some time before they can assemble all of the personnel necessary to carry out this program. It might be that they would have sufficient funds for the balance of the year.

Mr. AIKEN. I appreciate the attention that the chairman of the committee and his full committee gave to this matter. I believe it is an important program and I am glad to hear him say what he has already stated about providing additional funds in the event that those already included in the bill are not sufficient to provide for effective administration.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island has the floor.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Relative to the matter just discussed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], and the chairman of this committee, I wish to say the committee granted more to the Farmers Home Administration than the budget recommendation.

The budget recommendation for rural water and waste disposal systems was $17 million. The committee recommendation, of which the chairman was not a part because he felt that the $17 million was more than could be committed between now and the first of the year, was $30 million.

Once that had been made, the chairman requested that the salary and expense item be stepped up by $500,000 from the amount which the committee had recommended because the chairman felt there would be an additional salary request. So instead of recommending $4.5 million, which the committee had previously recommended, I suggested we allow $5 million, and that was done.

Three million dollars was provided in the House bill for salaries and expenses on the items covered in Senate Document No. 278, and $1.5 million was requested for this purpose in the supplemental Senate Document No. 62, making a total of $4.5 million. But, as I stated previously, when our committee raised the amount for rural waste disposal systems to $30 million, I felt that additional administrative funds would be necessary and recommended $5 million, which was accepted.

I see no reason why this amount should not be adequate to take care of the situation. If it does not prove to be adequate, as the chairman of the committee now handling the bill has stated, we will be back with a supplemental request the first part of the year. There will be a supplemental bill during the first 2 or 3 months of the year, and any shortage of funds to administer the new program may be reported at that time.

But I would call attention to the fact that the action of the full committee in this instance was to allow $500,000 more for salaries and expenses than had the subcommittee, which reported these various agricultural items to the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. To set the record straight, I had overlooked the $500,000 item increase for administration expenses.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. I suggested that addition because after the committee outvoted the chairman I felt we should provide additional salary expenses. Obviously, if they had a larger program they would require more personnel to handle that workload.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct. I thank the Senator from Florida for his contribution. I believe we all agree.

Mr. AIKEN. In view of the comments made on the floor by the Senator from Florida, the Senator from Rhode Island, and the Senator from North Dakota, it appears that the Farmers Home Administration can proceed efficiently and without any more delay than necessary to carry out the program with the assurance that they will be permitted to continue in a proper manner.

Mr. PASTORE. There will be only a small amount. As the Senator from Florida explained, we were quite generous.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PASTORE. I return to my statement.

Revolving fund, Small Business Administration: The House bill included a requested $76 million for disaster loan needs; the committee recommendation includes approval of this amount and further provision of $84 million, as requested in an estimate submitted directly to the Senate. This latter amount is contingent upon the enactment of authorizing legislation.

The brief résumé just completed accounts for $4,164,700,000—87 percent—of the total $4,782,218,102 recommended.

The supplemental bill as reported by the House committee included $6 million of a requested $30 million for annual contract authorizations for rent supplement payments, and $180,000 of a requested $900,000 for rent supplement payments. This item was deleted during consideration of the bill on the floor of the House. Following considerable discussion, the committee recommendation provides annual contract authorization of $12 million and $360,000 for rent supplement payments.

The committee report accompanying the bill describes the above and all other items in this bill. I shall, with the assistance of other subcommittee chairmen who heard testimony on these items, try to answer any questions Senators may have with regard to this bill or report.

Mr. President, before we proceed with amendments to be offered by Senators, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded for purpose of amendment as original text, provided that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to this order.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, after line 14, to insert:

"OFFICE OF INFORMATION

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $200,000 for part 2 of the Annual Report of the Secretary for 1965 (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture) as authorized by section 73 of the Act of January 12, 1895 (44 U.S.C. 241) including not less than 232,250 copies for the use of the Senate and House of Representatives."

On page 3, after line 7, to insert:

"Rural water and waste disposal grants

"For grants pursuant to sections 306(a)(2) and 306(a)(6) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, $30,000,000."

On page 3, line 14, to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$5,000,000".

On page 5, after line 10, to insert:

"CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $125,000."

On page 5, line 18, to strike out "$2,200,000" and insert "$2,630,000".

On page 6, after line 19, to insert:

"Salaries and expenses, automatic data processing coordination

"For necessary expenses of carrying out Governmentwide automatic data processing activities within the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration, $450,000."

On page 7, after line 4, to insert:

"Rent supplement program

"For rent supplements pursuant to section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, $360,000: *Provided,* That the maximum payments in any fiscal year for rent supplements required by all contracts which may be entered into under such section shall not exceed $12,000,000."

On page 8, line 1, after "(12 U.S.C. 1701q et seq.)", to strike out "$35,000,000" and insert "$50,000,000"; and, in line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$125,000".

On page 8, line 9, after the word "expended", to strike out "$675,520,000" and insert "$675,570,000"; in line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$520,000" and insert "$570,000"; and, in line 15, after the word "paragraph", to strike out "*Provided further,* That not to exceed $1,500,000 of the amount provided for each fiscal year in this paragraph for grants shall be available for rehabilitation grants pursuant to Sec. 115 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, and not to exceed $75,000,000 shall be available for code enforcement grants pursuant to Sec. 117 of such Act".

On page 8, at the beginning of line 24, to strike out "$6,325,000" and insert "$10,000,000".

On page 9, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "$26,975,000" and insert "$36,000,000, to remain available until expended".

On page 9, after line 11, to insert:

"Rehabilitation loan fund

"In addition to the amount otherwise available for administrative expenses for the current fiscal year in connection with loans pursuant to section 312 of the Housing Act of 1964, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1452b), $190,000 shall be available from the 'Rehabilitation loan fund' for such expenses."

On page 9, line 21, after "1965", to strike out "$9,000,000" and insert "$15,000,000".

On page 10, line 4, after "(5 U.S.C. 55a)", to strike out "$1,971,500" and insert "$2,500,000".

On page 10, after line 12, to insert:

"Natural disaster study

"For necessary expenses to enable the Administrator to conduct studies with respect to methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of natural disasters, as authorized by law, $1,600,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 408, 89th Congress, or similar legislation."

On page 11, line 2, after the word "Administrator", to strike out "$170,000" and insert "$450.000".

On page 11, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,200,000".

On page 11, after line 13, to insert:

"INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $185,000."

On page 12, after line 6, to insert:

"CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE

"For an additional amount for 'Construction and maintenance', $4,500, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That not to exceed this sum shall be available for reimbursement to the city of Winnemucca, Nevada, for the cost of improvements to streets and appurtenant facilities, adjoining property under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior in that city to be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable."

At the top of page 13, to insert:

"BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

"Construction

"For an additional amount for 'Construction', $638,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 13, line 7, after the word "Construction", to strike out "$10,500,000" and insert "$11,347,000".

On page 13, after line 8, to insert:

"BUREAU OF MINES

"Solid waste disposal

"For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the Secretary of the Interior under the Solid Waste Disposal Act, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $1,400,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 14, after line 2, to insert:

"OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for carrying out the provisions of the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 329), $1,000,000."

On page 14, after line 10, to insert:

"Forest protection utilization

"For an additional amount for forest research, $75,000."

On page 16, after line 1, to insert:

"PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

"Construction of Indian health facilities

"For an additional amount for 'Construction of Indian Health Facilities', $146,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 17, after line 14, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

"Office of the Secretary

"Federal Contract Compliance Program

"For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the Department of Labor under Executive Order 11246 of September 24, 1965, including service as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $444,000."

At the top of page 19, to insert:

"Higher educational activities

"For grants, contracts, payments, and advances under titles I, III, IV (except payments under parts C and D), V and VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for grants under part C of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, $173,200,000, of which $10,000,000 shall be for grants and contracts for college and university extension education under title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, $5,000,000 shall be for the purposes of title III, $60,000,000 shall be for programs under part A of title IV of that Act, $10,000,000 shall be for loan insurance programs under part B of title IV of that Act of which $2,500,000 for the student loan insurance fund and interest payments shall remain available until expended and $7,500,000 for advances shall remain available until June 30, 1968, $15,000,000 shall be for the purposes of title VI of the Act, and $40,000,000 shall be for grants for college work-study programs under part C of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964: *Provided,* That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H.R. 9567, Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation: *Provided,* That in administering the appropriation included in the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966, related to elementary and secondary educational activities, the amount authorized to be appropriated by title II of the authorizing Act shall be deemed to include amending provisions contained in section 6 of H.R. 9022, Eighty-ninth Congress."

On page 20, after line 6, to insert:

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $2,935,000: *Provided,* That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H.R. 9567, Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation."

On page 20, after line 11, to insert:

"VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

"Grants to States

"For an additional amount for 'Grants to States', including grants to public and other nonprofit agencies, institutions and organizations, $8,310,000, of which $500,000 is for grants to States for vocational rehabilitation services under section 2 of said Act; $5,000,000, which shall remain available for the periods specified in section 1(3) of said Act, is for grants for planning for the development of comprehensive vocational rehabilitation programs, and for grants for planning, preparing for, and initiating special programs to expand vocational rehabilitation services, as authorized by section 4(a)(2) of said Act; $1,500,000, which shall remain available for the period specified in section 14(i) of said Act, is for grants with respect to workshops and rehabilitation facilities as authorized by section 14 of said Act; and $1,310,000 is for grants to workshops for improvement projects under section 15(b) of said Act: *Provided,* That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H.R. 8310, Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation."

On page 21, after line 7, to insert:

"Research and training

"For an additional amount for 'Research and training', $1,000,000: *Provided,* That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H.R. 8310, Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation."

On page 21, after line 12, to insert:

"Grants for correctional rehabilitation study

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of section 12 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended, $560,000, of which $500,000 is for grants to initiate a program of research and study in correctional rehabilitation."

On page 21, after line 18, to insert:

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $390,000, together with not to exceed $115,000 to be transferred from the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, as provided in section 222(d)(5) of the Social Security Act, as amended: *Provided*, That the amount appropriated by this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H.R. 8310, Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation."

On page 22, after line 16, to strike out:

"For an additional amount for 'Community health practice and research', $12,000,000, of which $3,000,000 shall be for carrying out section 310 of the Public Health Service Act, and $9,000,000 for carrying out section 314(c) of the Act with respect to home health service programs; together with $2,100,000 to be transferred, as authorized by section 201(g)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, from any one or all of the trust funds referred to therein and to be expended for functions delegated to the Surgeon General by the Secretary under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, as amended."

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

"For an additional amount for 'Community health practice and research', $24,000,000, of which $3,000,000 shall be for carrying out section 310 of the Public Health Service Act, $9,000,000 for carrying out section 314(c) of the Act with respect to home health service programs, $1,000,000 for carrying out section 314(c) of the Act with respect to grants to schools of public health, and $11,000,000 for carrying out parts C, E, and F of title VII of the Act and of which $200,000 shall be available for scholarship grants to eligible schools for award to first-year students in the current academic year only; together with $2,100,000 to be transferred, as authorized by section 201(g)(1) of the Social Security Act, from any one or all of the trust funds referred to therein and to be expended for functions delegated to the Surgeon General by the Secretary under title XVIII of the Social Security Act: *Provided*, That the sums appropriated for carrying out parts C, E, and F of title VII of the Public Health Service Act shall be available only upon enactment of H.R. 3141, Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation.

"Grants and payments for the next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after March 31 of the current fiscal year, grants and payments under part F of title VII of the Public Health Service Act for the next succeeding fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, and the obligations incurred and expenditures made hereunder shall be charged to the appropriation for that purpose for such fiscal year."

On page 24, after line 5, to insert:

"Air pollution

"For an additional amount for 'Air pollution,' $625,000, of which $470,000 is for carrying out the Motor Vehicle Air Pollution Control Act."

On page 24, after line 9, to insert:

"Environmental engineering and sanitation

"For an additional amount for 'Environmental engineering and sanitation', for carrying out the functions of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under the Solid Waste Disposal Act, $4,000,000."

On page 24, after line 14, to insert:

"Water supply and water pollution control

"For an additional amount for 'Water supply and water pollution control', $628,000."

On page 24, after line 17, to insert:

"Grants for waste treatment works construction

"For an additional amount for 'Grants for waste treatment works construction'. $50,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1966, and of which $30,000,000 shall be for grants for construction of sewage treatment works in accordance with the allotment formula set forth in the third sentence of section (8c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and $20,000,000 shall be for grants and contracts pursuant to section 6 of such Act to demonstrate new and improved methods of controlling the discharge into water of sewage or other wastes from sewers."

On page 25, after line 3 to insert:

"Foreign quarantine activities

For an additional amount for 'Foreign quarantine activities', $125,000."

On page 25, line 9, after the word "Health", to strike out "$19,700,000" and insert "$20,200,000"; and, in line 12, after the word "Act", to insert a comma and "and $500,000 shall be to carry out the provisions of section 231 of the Social Security Amendments of 1965".

On page 25, after line 14, to insert:

"Regional medical programs

"To carry out title IX of the Public Health Service Act, $25,000,000, of which $24,000,000 shall remain available until December 31, 1966, for grants pursuant to such title."

On page 27, after line 9, to insert:

"Assistance for repatriated United States Nationals

"For an additional amount for 'assistance for repatriated United States nationals', $120,000, of which $40,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), only to the extent necessary to provide for requirements not anticipated in the budget estimates."

On page 27, line 23, after the word "welfare", to strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$10,000,000"; and, on page 28, line 2, after the word "children", to strike out the comma and "and $15,000,000 for special project grants under section 532 of the Social Security Act, as amended, for comprehensive health care and services for school age and preschool age children".

On page 28, line 15, to strike out "$163,000" and insert "$275,000."

On page 29, line 14, after the word "amended", to strike out "$1,500,000,000" and insert "$1,510,000,000" at the beginning of line 16, to insert "not less than $10,000,000 to carry out the purposes of section 205 (d) of title II, and"; and on page 30, line 18, after "1965", to insert a colon and "*Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for any grant until the Director has determined that the grantee is qualified to administer the funds and programs involved in the proposed grant: *Provided further*, That all grant agreements shall provide that the General Accounting Office shall have access to the records of the grantee which bear exclusively upon the Federal grant."

On page 31, after line 2, to insert:

"SENATE"

On page 31, after line 3, to insert:

"Expense allowances of the Vice President, and Majority and Minority Leaders

"For an additional amount for expense allowances of the Majority and Minority Leaders, $1,000 each; in all, $2,000."

On page 31, after line 7, to insert:

"SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

"Office of the Vice President

"For an additional amount for clerical assistance to the Vice President, $30,750."

On page 31, after line 11, to insert:

"CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

"Miscellaneous items

"For an additional amount for 'Miscellaneous items', $225,000."

On page 31, after line 15. to insert:

"For an additional amount for 'Miscellaneous items', fiscal year 1965, $200,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Salaries, officers and employees, Senate', fiscal year 1965."

On page 33, after line 12, to strike out:

"CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

"Extension of the Capitol

"For an additional amount for 'Extension of the Capitol', $300,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 33, after line 16, to insert:

"Senate Office Buildings

"For an additional amount for 'Senate Office Buildings' $405,000, to remain available until expended."

At the top of page 34, to insert:

"The paragraph contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1960 (73 Stat. 407) which reads "Hereafter, the Architect of the Capitol is authorized, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to fix the compensation of one position under the appropriation 'Senate Office Buildings' at a basic rate of $7,020 per annum" is hereby amended by striking out the amount $7,020 and inserting in lieu thereof the amount $7,700."

On page 35, after line 5, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

"Department of the Army

"Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control

"Construction, general

"For an additional amount for 'Construction, general', $1,950,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment of S. 2300, Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation."

On page 35, after line 14, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

"Bureau of Reclamation

"Construction and Rehabilitation

"For an additional amount for 'Construction and rehabilitation', $500,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 36, after line 13, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF STATE

"Administration of Foreign Affairs

"Salaries and Expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $500,000."

On page 36, after line 18, to insert:

"INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

"Facilities for International Pacific Halibut Commission

"For provision of office and other facilities necessary for carrying out the Northern Pacific Halibut Act, as amended, $500,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 37, line 24, to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$100,000".

At the top of page 38, to insert:

"OFFICE OF BUSINESS ECONOMICS

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $165,000."

On page 38, after line 20, to strike out:

"For grants as authorized by title I of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, $203,200,000, of which not to exceed $3,200,000 shall be for administrative expenses."

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

"For grants as authorized by title I of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, $254,500,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $4,500,000 shall be for administrative expenses during the current fiscal year."

On page 39, at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "$18,125,000" and insert "$19,325,000, to remain available until expended,".

On page 39, after line 13, to strike out:

"ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

"For the purpose of extending financial assistance under sections 201 and 202 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, $105,000,000, of which not to exceed $3,200,000 shall be available for administrative expenses and of said administrative expenses not less than $1,600,000 shall be advanced to the Small Business Administration for the processing of loan applications: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for administrative or any other expenses in the creation or operation of an economic development revolving fund."

And insert in lieu thereof:

"ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVOLVING FUND

"For capital for the revolving fund created by title II of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, $105,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $3,700,000 shall be available for administrative expenses during the current fiscal year."

On page 41, line 6, after the word "statistics", to strike out "$18,250,000" and insert "$20,000,000".

On page 41, after line 7, to insert:

"HEMISFAIR 1968 EXPOSITION

"For expenses necessary for planning the extent of participation by the United States in HemisFair 1968, as authorized by law, $125,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H.R. 9247, Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation."

On page 41, after line 13, to insert:

"BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

"Control of outdoor advertising and junkyards

"For control of outdoor advertising and junkyards, as authorized by the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, including payments to the States, $10,000,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 2084, Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation."

On page 42, after line 4, to insert:

"Landscaping and scenic enhancement

"For carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, section 319, as amended by the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, $60,000,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 2084, Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation."

On page 42, after line 11, to insert:

"Administrative expenses, highway beautification

"For necessary administrative expenses for carrying out the provisions of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, $750,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 2084, Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation."

On page 42, after line 18, to insert:

"Highway safety

"For necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, section 135, $290,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 2084, Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation."

On page 43, after line 16, to insert:

"Revolving fund

"For additional capital for the revolving fund authorized by the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended, to be available without fiscal year limitation, $84,000,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of authorizing legislation."

On page 45, line 7, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 64 and", and in line 8, after the word "Congress", to strike out "$6,130,470" and insert "$11,508,212".

On page 46, after line 5, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 1202. The appropriations, authorizations, and authority with respect thereto in this Act shall be available from July 1, 1965, for the purposes provided in such appropriations, authorizations, and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1965, and the date of enactment of this Act in anticipation of such appropriations, authorizations, and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms hereof, and the terms of Public Law 89-58, Eighty-ninth Congress, as amended."

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I ask unanimous consent that the following three corrections be made, which were inadvertently omitted from the printed copy of the bill:

On page 30, line 8, strike out "one year" and insert "twenty-four months".

On page 39, line 12, strike out "$5,100,000" and insert "$6,300,000".

On page 39, line 11, strike out the words, "to remain available until expended".

I offer the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to considering the amendments en bloc?

Without objection the amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 43, line 16, immediately preceding the period insert a comma and the following: "such additional capital to be available for the forgiveness of disaster loans made to victims of the Hurricane Betsy disaster during 1965 to the extent authorized by law".

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the bill carries additional funds for the Small Business Administration in order that that agency might make loans to victims of Hurricane Betsy. This was the greatest loss sustained, from a monetary point of view, which has occurred in any disaster in the history of this country, measured in terms of dollars and cents. Insurance companies suffered their greatest insurance loss. They have said that the Government has been trying to get into the insurance business, and that if they suffer any more losses like this, they will be out of business in Louisiana.

Florida also was injured by the disaster. The President recommended assistance to the poor people whose homes were flooded by the hurricane and were subject to uninsurable losses. One can insure against a hurricane disaster to his home, as happened, and no help is requested for such persons, other than under the ordinary authority. But for uninsurable losses, such as resulted from the tidal wave that was pushed forward by Hurricane Betsy, there is no way in which many people could repay. They were powerless to protect themselves from it. Even though Congress passed an act to provide such insurance, it has never been implemented.

The President recommended legislation, and it was passed by the House, to provide as much as $1,800 for loans that had to do with the uninsurable part of the risk. That bill was sponsored by Senators from the six States affected, and it has been reported to the Senate unanimously by the Committee on Public Works, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara]. Seventy-six million dollars has been authorized for the Small Business Administration to make disaster loans.

I do not believe that Congress or the President had any intention to assist only those who suffered from Hurricane Betsy. The reason for increasing the SBA revolving fund was that in the event the Senate should see fit tomorrow to pass the same bill which passed the House unanimously, and which has been reported unanimously by the Senate Committee on Public Works, its language would make it possible to implement the forgiveness feature of the other bill.

In the event the Senate should think otherwise, and the matter would be in conference, I presume it would be dropped out.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator explain more fully the words "forgiveness to the extent of the authority of the law"? What does that mean? Will that language be in the bill before us?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; it is in the bill which passed the House and which has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Public Works. The amendment does not increase the amount of money in the bill at all.

Mr. PASTORE. Oh, yes, it does.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Oh, no. I discussed that with the Senator. I do not believe it will increase the amount in the bill. The amendment provides, in the section which authorizes the appropriation of $76 million to the Small Business Administration, from which the loans will be made, that the appropriation of $76 million is not to be regarded as an increase in the revolving fund to the extent that loans are forgivable under the bill which passed the House unanimously, and which will be before the Senate.

Mr. PASTORE. That is not the way I understood it at all. From the discussion I had on the floor of the Senate concerning the Senator's amendment, I understood that this would be a forgiveness, that the money would be appropriated to the President, and that he would reimburse the revolving fund. Otherwise, the revolving fund would not be adequate to take care of other needs. Has the Senator modified that provision now?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. The Senator told me that he would accept the amendment in this fashion. At least, I thought that was what the Senator had said.

Mr. PASTORE. No, I said nothing about accepting anything.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thought that was what the Senator had said.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. As I understand, first of all, this item was not brought to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations. It was brought to my attention about an hour ago. I consider it to have considerable merit. It relates mostly to losses suffered by a number of victims of Hurricane Betsy.

The bill passed the House. It provides for the forgiveness of certain obligations with respect to loans made by the Small Business Administration. Under the authorization legislation, the President would be empowered to reimburse the revolving fund to the extent to which the forgivenesses are consummated. The authorization requires $70 million, as I understand.

When the Senator from Louisiana and I discussed it, I said I thought it was new matter and should be discussed on the floor of the Senate. It was wholly new to us.

This is an emergency situation. If we pass the authorizing legislation and then turn our backs and go home, we cannot do much about the condition before next spring. In the meantime, the recovery or rehabilitation of the victims would be delayed for that period of time. I am convinced that we should consider providing relief.

It was my understanding that we would add $70 million to be assigned to the President so as to reimburse the fund under the provisions of the authorization legislation. We planned to discuss it in the Senate; and if Senators felt we should approve it now, I would be perfectly willing to accept the amendment. But I did not make any commitment one way or the other, because I have not talked over the proposal with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who is a stranger to the whole proposal.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This is a penciled amendment and provides for additional capital to be available for the forgiveness of disaster loans as a result of Hurricane Betsy, of 1965, to the extent authorized by law.

Following what the Senator from Rhode Island has said, if this language is added to the $76 million provided on page 43, the section would read:

> For additional capital for the revolving fund authorized by the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended, to be available without fiscal year limitations, $76 million—

Then there would be added:

> such additional capital to be available for the forgiveness of disaster loans,

And so forth. Why does that not mean that we are going to add capital to the $76 million, as the Senator from Rhode Island may have suggested?

Mr. PASTORE. If the appropriation is used for the forgiveness of $70 million, we will end with $6 million. We will drain the revolving fund, because there will be no reimbursement. If something is forgiven, it is not paid back. If it is not paid back, the revolving fund will be drained.

This matter ought to be talked over, so that it can be acted upon correctly. If the Senate is of a mind to include something new in the appropriation bill, what we ought to do is to add $70 million and explain why.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to read, in the presence of the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Louisiana, the following:

> AUTHORIZED APPROPRIATIONS.—The Small Business Act presently authorizes appropriations to the SBA revolving fund in an amount of $1,721,000,000. Appropriations made to date, including $150 million recently provided in the annual appropriation act of 1966, total only $1,645,000,000, leaving a balance of $76,000,000 authorized but not appropriated.

That is what we have provided in the act. As the Senator from Rhode Island has said, it seems to me that if we are to forgive something, we are changing the purpose or the amount involved in the $76 million that we are appropriating.

I do not object to what the Senator has said, if the authorization will come through; but we ought to change the language a little.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Permit me to expain. My amendment was prepared by the legislative counsel. I discussed it with the Parliamentarian. Our problem is that the President agrees to do something, the Bureau of the Budget agrees to it, the House agrees to it, and the committees agree to it. But in drafting the proposal, we find that someone has included such language that the House does not want to go to conference and the Senate does not want to go to conference. We would like to pass the House bill.

> There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $70 million out of this amount, and such sum shall remain available until expended.

That is in the bill that I introduced along with five cosponsors. That language means that the President said, "We will help you people," and the House and Senate said that also. However, we then find that we cannot do it because we did not appropriate the money because somebody, in drafting the measure, put section 6 in the Hurricane Betsy relief bill.

That being the case, if we do not amend the bill, which the chairman of the committee does not want to do, and if the House does not want to go into conference, we shall be unable to do anything. We must amend the bill so that it will relate to the authority in the appropriation bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the Senator would now get the authorization in with the appropriation. I do not believe that we should do that. I suggest, if the Senator will consider this, that we are all in accord as to our objectives. We could reach our goal better if we were to get our staff members to discuss this and call up the agency and find out how it should be done. We can then put in the proper language.

I am sympathetic, and the Senator from Massachusetts is sympathetic. Once this has been accomplished, we shall have a sympathetic bit of legislation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I am much encouraged. I thank the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill and the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana withdraw his amendment?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. An amendment is proposed by the senior Senator from Oklahoma, as follows:

> Page 45, line 7, strike the word "and" and insert a comma.
>
> Page 45, line 8, after "Eighty-ninth Congress" insert a comma and the following: "and final judgment of the Indian Claims Commission in Docket Numbers 329-A and 329-B".
>
> Page 45, line 9, strike "$11,508,212" and insert "$26,508,212".

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the Senator in charge of the bill affording me an opportunity to introduce my amendment which would merely carry out an appropriation in behalf of a final award made by the Indian Claims Commission.

Although the Indian Claims Commission final award was not released until October 18, the claim of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Indians of Oklahoma goes back more than a hundred years, and the final judgment of the Indian Claims Commission is based on a petition filed by these Indians 14 years ago.

There is no question but what under the law this payment has been authorized by the Congress. This authorization is set forth in section 70(u) of title 25 of the United States Code, and I quote:

> When the report of the Commission determining any claimant to be entitled to recover has been filed with Congress, such report shall have the effect of a final judgment of a court of claims, and there is authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to pay the final determination of the Commission.

I am also reliably informed that this is not the first time that this procedure has been adopted in the appropriation of funds to cover an award made by the Indian Claims Commission.

I have a letter from the presiding judge of the Indian Claims Commission, Hon. Arthur V. Watkins, addressed to Hon. CARL HAYDEN, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, in which the presiding judge states:

> This final judgment was entered today and has been reported as required by the Indian Claims Commission Act to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter under date of October 8, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1965.
Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CARL: I am sending you herewith a certified copy of the final judgment in the case filed before this Commission entitled "Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Indians of Oklahoma, suing on its own behalf and as representative of the confederated tribes of Cheyenne and Arapaho Indians of the upper Arkansas, also known as the southern Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Indians, and on behalf of the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Indians, petitioner against the United States of America, defendant, docket Nos. 329-A and 329-B."

This final judgment was entered today and has been reported as required by the Indian Claims Commission Act to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate.

The law has been fully complied with and the final judgment of $15 million should be a part of the Supplemental Appropriation Act which is now pending before your committee.

As you know, the Indians have been waiting a long time for an adjudication of their claims. This claim has finally been finished and under the law as soon as the money is appropriated it begins to bear interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum. This Commission is being constantly urged to speed up the disposition of these cases and as a part of the stepped-up program, we are requesting that this judgment be made a part of the current supplemental appropriation bill. I might add, that you have very kindly responded to similar requests in the past and it has been most helpful.

In connection with this judgment I would like to call your attention to the fact that the Indian Claims Commission is a legislative judicial body which the Congress set up for the express purpose of determining these Indian claims. We are not in any sense an executive agency, and as we see it, and according to past practice, it is not necessary to have an estimate from the Budget Bureau on claims which are paid or can be paid in connection with the activities of a legislative body such as this Commission.

Many thanks for your assistance and if there are any questions I will be glad to answer them.

With kind personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Chief Commissioner.

Mr. MONRONEY. Hon. Arthur V. Watkins, Chief Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission, notified the President of the Senate in a letter dated October 18, 1965, and in accordance with the statute, filed with the Congress the determination of the Indian Claims Commission.

Commissioner Watkins pointed out at the time that the Cheyenne-Arapahos have been waiting a long time for an adjudication of this claim. He also pointed out that the Commission joined in requesting that this judgment be made a part of this supplemental appropriations bill. The willingness of Congress to respond to similar requests in the past has been most helpful to the Indian Claims Commission, according to Commissioner Watkins.

May I remind the Senate that the Indian Claims Commission is a legislative-judicial body which the Congress set up for the express purpose of determining these Indian settlements. The Commission is not in any sense an executive agency, and it is not necessary to have an estimate from the Bureau of the Budget in order for this appropriation to be considered and approved. As a matter of fact, Budget Bureau approval of awards made by the Commission acting as an arm of Congress, has been literally pro forma.

The net effect of approval of this appropriation in this bill will be to set aside the $15 million in the U.S. Treasury owed to the Cheyenne-Arapahos pending a determination of the method of distribution. The Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes are now negotiating with the appropriate authorities in the Bureau of Indian Affairs concerning these matters. The members of the tribes, some 5,000 citizens of the United States, most of whom are located in Oklahoma but others scattered throughout the Nation, have under advisement several suggestions to establish commercial enterprises, nursing homes, and other institutions which would be of long-term benefits to the Cheyennes and the Arapahos.

Approval of this appropriation at this time will reinforce, in my opinion, the determination of tribal members to make maximum use of the money in a manner that will help the Cheyennes and Arapahos achieve long-sought economic and cultural goals. This approval will be a reaffirmation of the good faith that the Congress has in longstanding treaties with these great Indian nations who once held sway over vast reaches of the Western Plains and mountains. The Cheyennes and Arapahos have become good citizens of the United States, and are entitled to this favorable action at this time on basis of the outstanding authorization found in the statutes previously quoted.

I ask the distinguished chairman of the committee if he will consider taking this amendment to conference.

Mr. PASTORE. This is a fixed obligation.

Mr. MONRONEY. This is an obligation that has been finally determined by the last court in this regard, the Indian Claims Commission, and filed with the Speaker of the House and with the President of the Senate, which is the approved method of getting it before the Senate.

Mr. PASTORE. This is a full obligation?

Mr. MONRONEY. This is a full obligation of $15 million. However, the money deposited in the Treasury will draw 4-percent interest, and that is the purpose of the amendment, so that the Indians will not be compelled to carry on without any interest benefit, for a year or so, on the award that they won on October 18.

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator will yield, this matter was discussed before our committee on the initiation of our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Oklahoma.

It was the sense of the committee that we should discuss the matter on the floor and bring it up as an independent amendment, rather than to adopt the proposal in committee. The procedure was agreed upon by the members of the committee who were present at the time, that in the event there was no serious objection to adopting this proposal on the floor, I would be permitted to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I agree with what the Senator from Rhode Island has said. The only thing I wish to make clear is that these are final results.

Mr. MONRONEY. They are final determinations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There would be no appeals or anything else.

Mr. MONRONEY. This is from the presiding judge.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the senior Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I commend my distinguished senior colleague for his statement, and I am pleased to cosponsor with him this amendment which would appropriate $15 million for the Cheyenne-Arapaho Indian Tribes. This sum of money was awarded by the Claims Commission on October 18, 1965, too late to be included in the committee bill. It is based on two claims, one filed as early as November 1958, and the second in 1963. The first and largest of these claims, representing settlement of $10,725,000 is based on inadequate compensation by the Federal Government to the tribes for land ceded to the Government in 1891. The second claim is based on inadequate compensation for land ceded by the tribes to the Federal Government in 1869. The award under this claim was $4,275,000.

Favorable action by the Senate on this amendment would appropriate the total $15 million to be deposited in the U.S. Treasury to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes. As soon as the Congress appropriates these funds, tribal members and the Bureau of Indian Affairs can begin developing the program by which this money will be distributed. Distribution legislation can then be introduced early next session and at long last, after nearly 20 years of work on this claim, the Indian people can recover the funds rightfully theirs.

There is now no question whatsoever concerning the right of these people to this money. In a real sense, it already belongs to them and has been held too long by the Federal Government. But, over and above that, at a time when we are spending millions of dollars on an antipoverty program, I daresay that no $15-million investment against poverty can be conceived which will be more needed than this appropriation. The Cheyenne-Arapaho people, for the most part, live in northwestern Oklahoma. They occupy land which has been low in agricultural yield and are concentrated in small communities where the general income is low and industrial opportunities few.

On the other hand, I am pleased to say that in recent years their determination to improve themselves is high and dramatic. A few years ago, with a minimum of outside assistance, they organized an effective adult education program, still active and reaching well over 100 persons scattered throughout the tribal areas. In addition, they have effective and dedicated tribal leadership. I feel that this money will be used to the great benefit of these Indian people. Given their entitlement to this settlement, the long and difficult efforts they have made to secure it, their need, and their desire and readiness to help themselves, I hope that they will not now suffer disappointment by needless delay at the hands of the Federal Government.

We have discussed this matter with the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] and I appreciate his comments today. Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I do not have any questions as to any particular item in the bill. However, for a number of years I have been very concerned with the expenditures made by Congress which have been greater than our income.

Can the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations and well versed and knowledgeable on the appropriations enacted by Congress, tell us the total appropriations for the year 1966 and the estimated income for that year?

I have been told that there will be a possible deficit of between $5 billion and $10 billion. Has the Senator any exact figures as to the amount?

Mr. PASTORE. I have no figures at the moment. All I can do is give the figure on this particular supplemental appropriation. However, I assure the Senator that, because of his interest, I shall attempt to secure the most recent information available and provide it to him.

Mr. THURMOND. I appreciate that very much. I thank the Senator.

We have been falling behind in this regard during the past 36 years. There has been a balanced budget, as I understand, in only 6 years out of the past 36 years.

Has the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island or the Committee on Appropriations given any thought to the question of perhaps devising some way by which we can keep a more accurate check on appropriations and income so that, if possible, we can come within our income each year?

Mr. PASTORE. The only answer I can give to the Senator from South Carolina is that he knows the composition of the Committee on Appropriations. I do not have to read the roster. However, I assure the Senator, and I think he well knows, that the most conservative-minded Senators are on the Committee on Appropriations. We go through every item with a fine-tooth comb. We do not accept a figure because it is sponsored or submitted to us.

We investigate everything, and wherever we can save a dollar, we try hard to do so. Sometimes we save $2 when it is only necessary to save $1. However, that is the philosophy of our committee.

There are present at this time many members of the Committee on Appropriations. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd], are all present. These are some of the most conservative men whom I have ever met in my life.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And they are led in this instance by the somewhat thoughtful but very liberal Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I am glad the Senator used the word "somewhat."

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the thing that has disturbed me is that I do not see how we can keep on going, in the future, year after year, more in debt, at the rate of $5 or $10 billions a year. It seems to me that payday will come some day, and that we should begin to devise some method by which we can balance the budget. The sooner we can do that, the better. I believe the interest on the national debt now runs about $11 billion a year, and that is a sizable sum in itself. If possible, we should devise a system whereby we could pay something on the debt each year—even if it is only a billion dollars, it would be something. I do not think it is right for our generation to be spending the substance that belongs to the children of the future, the children of Senators and of the other citizens of this Nation. I do not think it is just to be placing this burden on their backs. I believe we should pay our own way as we go along. If the Senator and his committee would give some consideration to that, I feel it would be a great service to the Nation.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator for his fine contribution. I could not agree with him more. I think it is absolutely incumbent upon us, in dealing with the taxpayers' money, to be very careful to do only what is absolutely necessary in the interest of the national welfare.

Regrettably, we have a situation in Korea; regrettably, we have a situation in South Vietnam; and those are things we have to meet with prudence—and with parsimony, too. The fact remains that we try hard to do our job, and to do it in the interests of the people. I assure the people of that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will yield as soon as the amendment is stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 7, it is proposed to delete lines 5 through 10.

On page 11, line 2, it is proposed to delete "$450,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$850,000".

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi, after which I shall explain my amendment.

LT. COL. WILLIAM T. SCHUSTER, U.S. AIR FORCE (RETIRED)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 919) for the relief of Lt. Col. William T. Schuster, U.S. Air Force (retired), which was on page 2, line 10, after "Act." insert:

> No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 1218. An act for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co. and/or Holt Import & Export Co.;

H.R. 4088. An act for the relief of Irving M. Sobin Chemical Co., Inc.;

H.R. 9545. An act providing for the acquisition and preservation by the United States of certain items of evidence pertaining to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy;

H.R. 10369. An act to give the consent of Congress to the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont to become parties to title II of the Compact on Taxation of Motor Fuels Consumed by Interstate Buses and the Agreement relating to Bus Taxation Proration and Reciprocity;

H.R. 11303. An act to amend section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended;

H.R. 11420. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide certain mailing privileges with respect to members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 571. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning October 25, 1965, as National Parkinson Week.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11588) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, my amendment is concerned with rent subsidies. I ask that when the vote be taken, it be by the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the amendment which I propose is to cut out the funds voted by the Committee on Appropriations for the rent supplement program in the sums of $12 million for contract authorization for grants and $360,000 for rent payments all during fiscal year 1966. My amendment would give the full budget estimate of $850,000 to the FHA instead of $450,000 as voted by the committee, so that adequate funds would be available during the remainder of this fiscal year to allow FHA to plan and develop criteria in the various communities in the United States for implementation of this program.

In short, I do not believe that this program is ready to be funded for implementation at this time. To support this contention I would like to quote from the justification for this supplemental budget request issued by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Under "Administration of the Program" they state that the FHA will:

> 1. Establish maximum per unit mortgage limits in each locality to assure that projects will not be of extravagant design.
>
> 2. Screen the sponsors to see that they are bona fide nonprofit, limited-dividend, or cooperative organizations with necessary knowledge and capability to carry through proposed projects.
>
> 3. Review the qualifications of any proposed management firms to see that they are qualified.
>
> 4. Process the project in accordance with applicable underwriting standards.

This justification further states that the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency will retain responsibility for—

> 1. Regional and local allocations of rent supplement funds, based on findings as to need in various areas and adjusted in accordance with active demand;
>
> 2. The establishment of income ceilings in each local housing market area; and
>
> 3. Market surveys necessary to set such income ceilings and make allocations of rent supplement funds.

Mr. President, this is a tremendous undertaking that can affect up to 4 million American citizens. That was the figure given to us by Mr. Weaver. It is a complicated program and one that will necessitate independent surveys, studies and evaluation of each local community or city or area in which this program will be undertaken to determine existing rent levels, to determine what an economic rent level should be, to determine average incomes and the ability of people to pay rent, and many other considerations.

Mr. President, that appealed to me as a reason why we should have a study before we appropriate any funds, either for active payments or for contract authorizations, which the House objects to in any event, because it means—or so I understood from listening to Mr. Weaver; and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] were there—that different standards must be established in every locality and every city in the United States if this is to be done fairly and equitably; and that, it seems to me, will take time. That is why I propose to increase the amount for study to $850,000 from $170,000 allowed in the House and $450,000 allowed in the Senate. I believe we must work those problems out before we appropriate any money for either contract authorization, allowing them to make contracts to pay, or for the amounts they are obligated to pay, a total of $360,000.

It is not certain at all from the hearing we conducted with the Administrator of HHFA that the necessary and proper regulations have been formulated as yet. In fact, during the hearing the very able subcommittee chairman, Senator PASTORE, made the point that there was no provision for any obligation on the part of a recipient of a rent supplement to report an increase in his or his family's income even though such an increase in income would put him at an economic level where he should no longer be receiving rent supplement payments.

Mr. President, I speak only for myself, but I say that the hearing mystified me, because I wanted to understand this program, and it was very difficult because of the many details involved to understand, really, how it was going to be carried out, no matter how meritorious we may conceive it to be.

I believe that this program should be further studied and prepared and that only then should we undertake to fund actual rent supplemental payments. This is why I have introduced my amendment to eliminate the contract authorizations and rent payment appropriation and have provided $400,000 more than the committee recommended—$850,000 in all—for FHA to further develop the criteria and the plans for the program.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Massachusetts in support of his amendment. No matter how meritorious this rent-subsidy program may be, it is one of the most difficult programs to administer that the Government has ever undertaken; and I do think that even the sponsors of the program—I did not vote for the authorizing legislation—would want to be very prudent and careful about starting it out right.

If we hurry into this program, we will have the same experience we had with the Antipoverty Act—the Office of Economic Opportunities program. I believe there are very few States in the Union where there has not been a scandal regarding wasted funds under that program. Had that program been put into operation a little more slowly, we could have avoided many serious and tragic mistakes. It could be a good program, but it was put into effect too soon and too hastily. I believe that this program contains the same pitfalls—perhaps even worse. We should take more time to study it in every city in the United States before we put it into effect.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Under the Senator's amendment, what committee would conduct the study?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Federal Housing Administration.

Mr. MORSE. To what committee would it report?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It would report for appropriations to the Independent Offices Subcommittee.

It is pointed out to me that it is already authorized, so it is a question of appropriation only, and I assume the report would come to the Appropriations Committee.

I assume that the report would come to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MORSE. It sounds as though it is only a question of appropriation, but is it, in fact? I assume that the study, if a study is authorized, would involve a considerable amount of determination of legislative policy, and not be limited entirely to the question of money. I should think that if we are going to have a study of this kind, it should be understood that we should go back to the legislative committee for determination as to whether it wished to make any suggestions by way of amendments to the rent subsidy program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe that the Senator is absolutely correct. The purpose of appropriating money for a study is to permit the housing agency to make a study as to how it will carry out the law. The thing which appeals to me the most of anything I have heard discussed during the past hour is the fact that a standard had to be set up in every community which would be able to take advantage of the bill. That appeals to me very much.

As I understand, it is estimated that it would apply to 4 million citizens in this country over 62 years of age, with certain limitations of income, and so on. I agree with the Senator 100 percent that if there are to be any changes in the law, the proposals should go to the authorization committee.

What we are doing is saying, in substance, that we leave it to the Housing Administration to work out how it will carry the law into effect, before we are asked to appropriate any money.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the rent support is to apply to approximately 4 million people——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is the total, Mr. Weaver says.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is the maximum. How will we take care of the 4 million who are to be helped with the $12 million, which I understand is in the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The 4 million people would come in over a period of years, not this year. Under the bill submitted by the committee, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], it is my understanding that there is $360,000 which they have already owed, so to speak. Then there are contractual authorizations for the $12 million more for contracts that might be needed before next June 30. My assistant tells me that it would provide for a possibility of 20,000 units.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I believe that everyone must understand what the program is all about, and what the Senate is trying to do today.

I realize that when the program was proposed by the President, there were many Members of Congress whose philosophy is opposed to this kind of program. I do not believe there has ever been a program that has come before Congress which has been so poorly explained, in many instances, and so badly misunderstood. It has been characterized as a rich man's program. The impression has been created abroad that someone who owns one of those extravagant ivory tower apartments overlooking the East River on Sutton Place in New York City, or persons paying rents of perhaps $1,000 a month, are going to get the Government to subsidize their rent.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

The purpose of the proposed legislation would be to help the elderly.

The purpose of the proposed legislation would be to help the disabled.

The purpose of the proposed legislation would be to help those who are displaced by a Federal project such as a road being built through slums, the people being displaced and having to go elsewhere, but they cannot find a place to live cheaply enough because the slum in which they were living has been eliminated. Therefore, they do not have the money to pay the rent. That problem, therefore, becomes the concern of the Federal Government.

As our beloved President Kennedy said, "If a free society cannot take care of the many who are poor, how are we going to save the few who are rich?"

Not everyone in America drives around in an air-conditioned Cadillac.

The proposed legislation is a poor man's program. The basic requirements for eligibility are the same rules which apply to public housing.

In other words, if a person makes 1 penny more than anyone who is entitled to public housing, he is out, under the proposed legislation. He is absolutely out.

Once a person has qualified under that criterion for eligibility to receive one of these rent subsidies, then he has got to fit into one of five categories besides the income classification.

First, a person must be over 62 years of age; otherwise he is out. In other words, if he makes $4,000 a year and he has five children and he can go into public housing, he will not be entitled to the benefits of the proposed legislation, even though he could get into public housing, unless he is over 60 years of age, unless he is disabled, unless he has been displaced, or unless he lives in a slum. Those are the categories.

Therefore, Mr. President, when any Member gets up on the floor of the House or the Senate and characterizes the proposed legislation as a rich man's program, he does not know what he is talking about.

I do not believe that the Senate is so stupid as to bring that kind of bill before it. It did not bring that kind of bill before the Senate. It brought a good bill before the Senate.

Mr. President, we now come to the question raised by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]: Why are we asking for money in the bill? I can go along with his logic. He states that this is a new law, that it needs some consideration, that it needs some thought, that it needs some planning, and that it needs further development.

I realize that we are not going to stop paying rents tomorrow. I realize that implicitly. But we know that we have had experience in this field. I have been a Governor and the Senator has been a Governor. I have been a Senator for 15 years, and the Senator has been my senior in the Senate for many more years than that. I am sure that if we do not appropriate money we cannot get into a contractual obligation. What we are trying to accomplish by the proposed legislation is to take care of elderly people by letting private industry do it, instead of the Government building and owning public housing.

Who qualifies to do it?

It must be a nonprofit organization, or a corporation will have to be created which will be confined to a 6-percent return on its money. A 6-percent return on our investment will never make us rich.

Unless we appropriate money, no one is going to begin to build the housing. No one is going to build an apartment, or rehabilitate the slums in Harlem by 50 percent of their value in order to get people in there so that they can live decently.

That is the reason we are asking for the money.

The minute we take the money out, we set up an organization. It is true they can set up rules, which they should do, at any rate. They can take care of the developing and the planning, but they will not get one apartment. They will not get one unit built. That is why we put this money in the bill.

When the proponents came up here, they asked for $30 million to provide for 50,000 units. We thought that was going a little too fast. The argument was made that there are 4 million people in the United States of America who are poor and, therefore, inasmuch as we cannot take care of all of them we should take care of none of them.

Mr. President, I cannot buy that. We must start somewhere. Many people are entitled to public housing and cannot get it. Every day, I receive many letters from elderly persons who would like to get into Dexter Manor, or Bradford Manor. We do not have enough projects of that kind. We should have more. But merely because we do not have enough—let us have some. Let us get started.

Mr. President, the proposed legislation happens to be one of the jewels of President Johnson's administration. It is a part of his war on poverty. The idea is to take care of the poor, let me emphasize that. The idea is to take care of those who are displaced and who cannot pay the new rents in a new community.

Accordingly, what does the Federal Government intend to do? It intends to pay for a part of that rent. Why? In order that those citizens may live in respectability and not have to break up their families.

We build jails and reformatories, we do everything to house delinquents; yet we are parsimonious when it comes to doing something to prevent delinquency.

That is what the Federal Government is trying to do by means of this proposed legislation.

Mr. President, at the bottom of my street, in the town where I grew up, a freeway was built through the area where so many people used to live.

I often wondered, Where are they going? Who finds houses for these people? There are no houses. Wherever they go, the rent is more. They cannot move. They do not want to move. But those people are pushed out of there because some people want to drive on a freeway at 60 miles an hour.

Take the $12 million out of the appropriation today, and we will delay the appropriation for another year, because by the time we get to appropriating a single dollar that will lead to a contract, it will be 1967 before we have anything.

So I say to my colleagues, if they did not like this bill from the beginning, please get up and say so; but do not destroy it now. Now that we need the money, are we going to kill it? Thirty million dollars was wanted; 20,000 units are involved. We have proposals for 10,000 units.

It is calculated by the Housing and Home Finance Agency that it will receive proposals for 25,000 units. We are providing for 20,000 units.

I realize that my friend the Senator from Massachusetts is of good heart. He makes a rather good argument that we should proceed in a calm, prudent, and decisive way to develop the program. I am for that. But he slipped when he believes that we can build one unit without appropriating any money. That is why we insisted in having a bill that provides money for that program.

If Senators think the amount should be $12 million, or $6 million, or $3 million, or any other amount, that is another argument. But if we do not put any money in the bill for that program, we do not put life in the program, and we leave it a corpse, and nobody will invest one penny in it.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. I am sure I could not add anything to the description of the program and its purposes which the Senator from Rhode Island has so eloquently described, but I would like to emphasize one point.

As I understand the point of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, first of all, he says we need a study. I am a member of the Banking and Currency Committee and of the Housing Subcommittee. We know how to write a bill to authorize a study. If we thought as the authorizing legislative committee, that we would not allow for a program, but only for a study, we knew how to write such a bill. We could have brought such a bill to the floor of the Senate.

There has been no legislation in the housing field in the 7 years that I have been a member of the committee and subcommittee which has had more study, because the subcommittee and the full legislative committee and the Senate as a whole considered this matter. So we knew what the issue was. We decided that we had to move, on a much narrower basis than the administration had recommended, with a program, and not with a study.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Maine has my respect and liking, but I point out that the law was not passed and signed until August 10, 1965, this year. The regulations which I have mentioned have been changed or delayed. They were not supposed to go into effect until this month. They have been delayed. There are no regulations now that could be in effect. I point out to my friends from Rhode Island and Maine that there will be another supplemental bill in January. The way to do it is to make the regulations effective and make sure they are right, and get this program on a sound basis, as the Senator from North Dakota so well stated, rather than on a basis that will bring us trouble.

That is my only point. I appreciate the Senator's allowing me to make this comment.

Mr. MUSKIE. I appreciate the comment of the Senator, but may I point out that in all housing programs, including this one, a great amount of lead time is involved after the administrative agency starts moving. But if it has no authority to move and has no commitment or promise on which the agency can make contracts with private industry, the administrative agency must rest on its oars and wait until it has a green light. Until an appropriation is made and the agency receives a green light in addition to the authorization, that agency cannot move at all into the lead-time period, which is a condition and a prelude to the implementation of the program.

I have in my hand a letter from the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, written to the chairman of the subcommittee, the floor manager of the bill [Mr. PASTORE], in which he states:

> A delay in funding this program would come as a great blow to many of the families who have looked forward with hope and anticipation to the decent housing that this program would provide. Many private builders and nonprofit sponsors stand ready to proceed and have already announced their intention to permit the construction of several thousands of units under the program.

If we do not provide this money, the program will come to a screeching halt. They will have to stand on the sidelines until Congress decides to provide the money authorized by the legislation, which was passed this year, to start putting the program into action.

That is the question involved.

The Senator from Massachusetts, like all New Englanders, is prudent and cautious, but I point out that the law provides for rent supplements at the rate of $150 million a year over a 4-year period. The supplemental bill involves less than 10 percent of that amount—$12 million a year. So we are proceeding at a rate which is only one-tenth of the total amount authorized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I have visited with the Senators on the legislative committee, including the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE]. I would like to have the Senator verify or deny the correctness of the conclusions I have reached.

My first conclusion of the authorization bill is that it had a sufficient statement of policy and criteria and clarity of expression as to what the purpose of the bill was—to help the very people he has mentioned, those over 62, the crippled, the handicapped, and the displaced.

Does the Senator from Maine share that conclusion of the senior Senator from Oregon?

Mr. MUSKIE. I do. I may further supplement the statement made by the Senator from Oregon by pointing out we already had surveys community by community in order to establish eligibility, rent ceilings, and so on. These surveys have been made under the public housing law, which has been on the books since the 1930's. Exactly the same approach is involved as to income and rental charges, as are necessary for the rent supplement program. We have had the public housing program for more than 25 years. We do not need new experience.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator got ahead of me, because I was about to ask for a clarification of this very point. However, I want to make legislative history.

It is also my understanding, from talking with members of the legislative committee, that the legislative procedures involved herein are no different from a whole series of programs we have authorized. The Senator mentioned public housing. I might mention procedures which exist in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in regard to programs we have authorized and for which the Appropriations Committee has appropriated money. They have administrative duties of preparing regulations and rules in keeping with the policy criteria Congress has set forth in the legislative committee.

Therefore, I have come to the conclusion—and I ask if I am correct—that administrative problems in this program are no different from those in programs for which we have provided money in somewhat comparable fields.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct. I again supplement what he said by pointing out what I believe to be true. The Senator from Rhode Island can correct me if I am in error. This bill includes other appropriations to implement other new programs enacted by Congress without the study and delay that is urged by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MORSE. I would like to intervene once more, if the Senator will permit.

I should be at a hearing of the District of Columbia Committee now, rather than on the floor of the Senate, but this bill is of too great a concern for me to be there. The District of Columbia Committee is holding hearings today on the District of Columbia revenue bill.

I did a little cross-examining of Mr. Tobriner, the President of the District of Columbia Commissioners, this morning because we have a serious problem in regard to highways. Everyone knows what the traffic conditions are in the District of Columbia.

Some objections are being raised about the District of Columbia revenue bill by those who feel that it is going to displace some people in some of the very low income areas of the District of Columbia, in some of the slum areas through which the highways are to go.

One of the criticisms is that we displace people but we never find places for them to live, and that instead of helping the situation in the District of Columbia, and the social, economic, and crime problems in the District of Columbia, we make them much worse.

I was gratified to hear Commissioner Tobriner say this morning, first, that they cannot build these highways, for example—they cannot follow other programs in the District of Columbia revenue request for funds—unless the District Commissioners can certify that the displaced persons can be and will be put in other housing equal to, and we hope better than the housing from which they are being displaced. We have to have money for that.

Therefore, we cannot start any of these appropriations until the Appropriations Committee gets approval to appropriate the money.

That has to be done first. If we get the money appropriated, the administrative agencies agree on each of those, and then we can proceed with the study and examination of who is eligible, community by community, to the extent of $12 million.

I believe that the Committee on Appropriations recommended in an amount too small. The Senator from Massachusetts would hold that in abeyance, in effect, and it could not be passed until there was a long study. I believe the study should be made by the agency. If they do not do a good job we have a check on them.

The Senator from Rhode Island educated me on this point.

I shall enthusiastically support his opposition to the amendment.

Mr. MUSKIE. If, indeed, we are not ready to move with this program to help poor families who are displaced by reason of governmental action, we should be willing to follow through logically and hold up programs that displace them. We ought to hold up the highway program, the urban renewal program, and programs that displace people in this country until we are ready to accept the responsibility for dealing with their problem in the public interest.

There has been no suggestion from those who support the delay as to how these families could be taken care of. This is more than a delay. It follows on the action of the House in trying to kill this program a short time ago. The action of the Senate, if it were to follow the recommendation of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, would be interpreted as a defeat of the program.

I want to remind the Senate that in considering this provision in the housing bill that justification for the program was established after a full, vigorous, and sometimes heated debate both in the committee and on the floor of the Senate. There was a close debate before it was decided, but there was a decisive vote favoring the rent supplement program.

I say that we should not take this means of reversing the action taken by the Senate at that time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will not debate the question further. My amendment would provide for $850,000 as opposed to $450,000 in the committee report and $170,000 in the House bill in order that the detailed plans for this program may be carefully worked out.

Mr. MUSKIE. I understand, but I say to the Senator from Massachusetts that because of the doubts created by the House action as to the future of the program, if the Senate were to agree with the House, the administration could not deal in a meaningful way with the representatives of private industry who are ready to go forward. The agency would be powerless to move ahead. It could not deal with industry people with any assurance that even if they could work out new procedures Congress would permit them to operate.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. That is exactly the fault I find with the amendment. I realize that he is being generous in the engagement of personnel, and the work and planning of the Department.

I do not believe he means a study in the sense that we are going to debate this question again. He means a study of the development and the planning. I realize that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator expresses my views better than I express them.

Mr. PASTORE. I realize that, but it is not enough. Unless we put up the money to encourage the building of these units, we have nothing.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I rise to support the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. I do this as a member of the Independent Offices Subcommittee, which has jurisdiction over this particular matter.

There are two parts to the amendment of the Senator. The first is to strike out the $12 million for rent subsidies. The second is to raise the amount for planning and research, and the compilation of factual material, from $450,000, which the committee, I believe, compromised upon unanimously finally to $850,000, so that the job can be adequate.

Lest I be accused of sailing under false pretenses, I did not vote for the rent subsidy bill. I believe the authors of it received all the blame that the need deserved because there was no limitation on the qualifications of the people in the program.

I wish to make it clear that I do not believe the distinguished chairman, the Senator from Rhode Island, intends to divert anybody's attention unfairly. But listening to him in committee and again on the floor of the Senate, I get the impression that no one under 62 years of age could get the benefits of this act. I know he did not intend to say that.

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator will yield. I never said that.

Mr. ALLOTT. I said, listening to the Senator I got that impression. I am sure the Senator did not intend to give that impression, but the fact is that there are five categories, A, B, C, and D, and E.

The first category is that they have to be displaced by governmental action. That is the classic example.

Mr. PASTORE. Freeway.

Mr. ALLOTT. The freeway going through his hometown.

The second is that they can be 62 years of age or older. The third is that they must be physically handicapped. The fourth is that they are occupying substandard housing. Fifth, an occupant or former occupant of a dwelling which was extensively damaged or destroyed as the result of disaster subsequent to April 1, 1965.

There are five categories, each of which includes people. One of the criteria is that of being over 62 years of age.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator repeat the fifth category, please?

Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. The next category is that of an occupant or former occupant of a dwelling, which was extensively damaged or destroyed as a result of a natural disaster subsequent to April 1, 1965.

Two or three things bother me about this particular appropriation. Even granting that I myself was not in favor of the legislative bill when it was passed, the fact is that as a Member of the Senate and as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I have to determine whether an appropriation should be made under it. When I read the fourth standard—"occupying substandard housing"—and I believe that we have to consider the present state of affairs in the Housing and Home Finance Agency—I believe we are taking a terrible chance on leaving everything to Mr. Weaver.

Last Friday a hearing was held on this subject before the Subcommittee on Supplemental Appropriations. I do not know exactly what page the testimony begins on, but it is approximately at page 1,001 of the hearings. I suggest to Senators who think there is no justification for the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts that they read that testimony. It is quite apparent that even the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee was put out by the developments, the facts that were stated, and how they were stated at that time. It is quite apparent that the development of standards, criteria, and plans has not proceeded to the point where we ought to appropriate money. That is the real purpose of the amendment. It is not to kill the appropriation forever. That is not the purpose. The purpose is to produce definite plans, compilations of figures, and tables, so that we can move ahead.

What is the proof? The proof is in the eating of the pudding. Yesterday afternoon, the FHA sent a letter to all approved mortgages under the rent supplement plan, saying that the regulations as promulgated are "not to be considered as effective or governing" and that "appropriate revisions" are to be made, although as originally promulgated they were to have become effective September 28. Therefore, it is quite clear that as of last night the FHA has rescinded all its regulations with respect to this program. As a result of rather disastrous hearings had before the subcommittee last Friday, they are reconsidering and are yet to begin to write regulations for the program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask the Senator to refer to page 1033 of the printed hearings, in which the precise facts that he is mentioning are shown. The committee was confused about the proposed regulations, and Mr. Weaver was somewhat confused in trying to explain them. He said:

> Mr. Chairman, may I make two observations at the end of this? The first is that the regulations which the FHA sent out are not the final regulations. They are proposed regulations. They have not been put in the Federal Register. Since there has been some confusion about this matter, I am asking Mr. Brownstein to withdraw them.

Could anything be clearer than that the HHFA did not have regulations and was proposing to restudy the regulations that should be issued to govern this highly complicated subject, but failed to see that different standards prevail in practically every community in the Nation?

Mr. ALLOTT. I completely agree with the Senator from Florida. That is the point I made. Even last night or late yesterday afternoon, those who had been approved for mortgages were called and were notified that the regulations were being rescinded and were not to be considered as effective or governing.

The position of the chairman of the subcommittee—and heaven knows, he is acting in good faith—is that we should proceed, even though there have been several months in which to consider the particular problem, and the HHFA still has not been able to move forward.

Two things were said on the floor of the Senate that I wish to correct. It has been said that the amendment would delay the program by a year. It would not. Congress will meet in January, and in all probability, a supplemental appropriation bill will be passed sometime around the first of March. It may perhaps mean a delay, but not a delay of a year, as has been said, or that there will not be any construction until 1967. The latter statement may be true. But if a beginning were made today, perhaps construction could begin by late next fall. But actually the program would be delayed only during the period from now until March, 4 or 5 months, and the ultimate construction would be delayed for only that length of time.

Mr. PASTORE. That would depend upon where the building took place. If it took place in Florida, the delay might not make much difference. If it were in Maine, it might make much difference. It is necessary to obtain architects.

Mr. ALLOTT. If the program were delayed until spring, it would be possible to take advantage of the building season.

Mr. PASTORE. It is my firm conviction that if the program were delayed until next March or May, it would be delayed, in many parts of the country, by a year, and perhaps in places where the construction is most needed.

Mr. ALLOTT. With due deference to the chairman, my firm conviction is that the program would be delayed only by the time spent until we acted on it next spring. But the price we shall pay if we do not take that time will be the price of rushing into a program the standards, criteria, plans, and regulations for which are not yet formulated.

It has also been said this afternoon that all this information is available. The Government has been engaged in this activity for 25 years. I wish to read an item from the hearings, page 1018, about the middle of the page. In response to a question asked by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], Mr. Weaver said, with respect to setting income limits for families:

> That refers to assets. The present discussion refers to maximum income limitations. In setting income limits for families we will first establish in a community what the rental level is for, say, a one-bedroom unit, where there is not a supply of standard housing on the market.
>
> Let us say that is at $102 a month. Then we will establish that we will not build under this program units that rent for as much as $102 a month, so that we will not be competing with what the private market already provides.

It is perfectly obvious from a reading of that statement that that agency still has to provide, for every community in the United States, standards for a one- or two-bedroom house; and it is also perfectly obvious that the agency has not done so and will not be prepared to do so for the next several months.

We can proceed in a rapid way and pay little attention to what we should do, or we can proceed with sense and with some degree of prudence.

I know that there are poor people. However, I also know that this would not constitute a killing of the program.

I know that more money is needed for planning and for ascertaining the rent and income levels all over the United States and in every community in the United States. I know from the testimony that they have not done that, and that there is still something to go on in the future.

For these reasons, and because as of last night the FHA has withdrawn all of its criteria and standards and regulations for the administration of this program, it seems to me that, rather than doing harm to the program, we would be doing harm to ourselves. We would be doing an injustice to our office if we were to pass on this question at this time without waiting until we know that they were ready to go ahead with the program.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, while I understand that the authorization bill has been passed, and it probably should be considered and that it is a bridge which should not be crossed again, I understand also from the record that there was a discussion before the committee, which discussion dealt with who would qualify for rental support under the bill.

On page 1017 of the transcript of the hearings, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] asked Mr. Weaver the following question:

> You have taken care of the elderly?

I interpolate here that on page 1016 and partly on page 1017, there appears a discussion of the elderly who would qualify. On page 1017, the Senator from Rhode Island continued:

> Let us take an ordinary family of a man with a wife and two children, minus, and let us assume that he earns $10,000 a year. Now, is he going to be subsidized in any way?
>
> Mr. WEAVER. No, sir. If he earns $10,000 a year and he has two children, he would not be eligible under this program.

I interpret that answer to mean that a situation may arise in which, if a man has enough children, he will qualify for rental support, even though his income is $10,000 a year.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I continue?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the answer given by Mr. Weaver unequivocally justifies the inference that, if the beneficiary has only two children, he certainly will not qualify if he is earning $10,000 a year.

Reading from page 1018, it is indicated that the Senator from Rhode Island was not satisfied with that answer. He wanted to know where the breaking point would be and when a person would become disqualified because of his income from receiving subsidized rental support.

Because of that dissatisfaction, the Senator from Rhode Island asked—and I read from page 1018:

> Mr. PASTORE. Where would you bring the breaking point for help?

I want this point left with those who are listening. The answers given by Mr. Weaver do not enable anyone to conclude with certainty what the breaking point is for either qualification or disqualification.

Mr. Weaver answered as follows, reading from page 1018:

> Mr. WEAVER. We have already brought in our regional economists and talked to our regional directors—and let me say that the rent and the income levels on this are to be determined by my office in the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and not by FHA. So, therefore, they are not covered by the proposed regulations.

Commenting upon this answer, I would say that it lends support to the arguments made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. There are unresolved elements connected with what the program would be.

I continue to read Mr. Weaver's answer:

> Here we have said that even in the highest income areas, the highest cost areas, if there is an income ceiling of over $8,000, regardless of the cost of the housing and rental or the size of the family, this will not be approved and it will have to be sent to Washington and we are going to have a cutoff point that will be recognized as one restricting the program to low-income families.

I now would like to construe that answer. It definitely implies that one can have an income of $8,000 a year and still qualify for a rent subsidy.

I suppose that it depends upon the number of children that one has. The greater the number of children, the greater will be the allowance for a subsidy.

With all of the talk of the population explosion, I wonder whether this provision will be an inducement to give further impetus toward the population explosion. It is not implied. It is directly expressed.

The greater the number of children, the greater will be the latitude of qualifying for the subsidy.

Mr. Weaver states:

> We will not allow the regional office to go beyond $8,000 a year income.

If they go beyond that, they have to send the proposal to Washington for approval.

I submit that that is a rather nebulous and tenuous base on which to work, especially when we want some certainty and some guidelines in trying to cast our vote on this measure.

Mr. Weaver further said:

> There will not be $10,000 a year income families involved.

However, he still does not give the breaking point. Will it be $9,000 a year, $8,000 a year, or $7,000 a year?

Mr. President, I come from a neighborhood in Cleveland, the place of my birth, in which the houses are painted white, the lawns are beautifully groomed, and there are hedges and flowers. However, it is modest in every respect.

When I go back there and tell them that if someone is earning $8,000 a year and has enough children, he will qualify for a rent subsidy, those people will begin to wonder: "Why should I work in my yard, groom my property and take pride in the fact that I own it?"

I am afraid that it would be an inducement for the man to let his property run down, let the paint begin to peel, and then go into what would be a better neighborhood and a better house and receive a rent subsidy.

Then the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] asks the question:

> As the Senator from Rhode Island said, where is the cutoff?

That is quite interesting. Where is the cutoff?

Mr. Weaver answered:

> The cutoff depends upon the size of the family and the cost of rental in each community.

He still does not give an answer as to the cutoff amount. It still can be $10,000, under extraordinary circumstances.

Mr. Weaver further states:

> Let me give you some actual figures. I think that is much easier to follow.
>
> Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Chairman, I don't know if Senator MAGNUSON or Senator PASTORE understand, but I still don't understand this three times business.

There they are in that committee, and they are trying to find out the cutoff amount. Nowhere does it appear in the record what the guidelines show to be the maximum income that one may receive and still qualify for rent subsidies.

I will read a bit further, because I should like to find the cutoff amount.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator yield on that point? He is not going to find it if he reads the whole book. I can explain it to him in 2 minutes, and we can save a great deal of time. There is no such thing as a cutoff. That is the question we put to him.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Just one moment. I have listened to the Senator argue.

Mr. PASTORE. I wanted to help the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes; the Senator wants to help me into the pit. The Senator wants to help me into destruction.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not, I do not wish the Senator to read the whole book and not find it. I want to tell him now.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The admission is very frank. There is nothing in here showing a cutoff.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So when newspapermen and editors write that people with incomes of $10,000 or more will qualify, it is possible that that will happen, because there is no cutoff amount.

I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts. But a reading of this record and the admission that there is no cutoff fortifies the judgment which I reached when I voted against this measure when it came before the Senate for authorization.

It may be said that cutoff income is unimportant. My answer to that is, Mr. MAGNUSON thought it was important, Mr. PASTORE thought it was important, Mr. SALTONSTALL thought it was important, and it is important to me now.

What is the maximum income that one can have and still qualify for rent subsidy?

The answer: "It all depends upon the number of children," and it may go up to $10,000, $11,000, or $12,000.

I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island for a question.

Mr. PASTORE. I would rather have the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Take the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—and I have discussed this with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, the distinguished Senator from Ohio, the distinguished Senator from New York, and others—that to make sure that the Senator from New York will get his 10 minutes and the Senator from Pennsylvania his 13 minutes, that there be a time limitation of 45 minutes with respect to the time under the charge of the manager of the bill and the opposition.

Mr. PASTORE. Let me review the Senator's request. Ten plus thirteen is twenty-three. Out of 45 minutes, there are only 22 remaining. Where do I come in?

Mr. MANSFIELD. For 1 hour.

Mr. PASTORE. Now the Senator is talking.

Mr. MORSE. Is this on the amendment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield, if I have the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island has the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. The unanimous-consent request, I understood, was made by the distinguished majority leader.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who was yielded to by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. HOLLAND. Very well. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I do not expect to be heard on this matter, though I wish to support the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, but I do wish to be heard on another matter that will not involve an amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Oh, yes. The request was as to this amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator's unanimous-consent request obviate that possibility?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not at all.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I have no objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if we belabor this program wrongly, we can get ourselves into a labyrinth of confusion. The fact of the matter is this that no matter what this "cutoff" is conceived to be, there is no such thing, as I said before in my opening; and I believe even Mr. Weaver made that clear. Eligibility for rent subsidy is predicated upon eligibility for public housing at the given moment. It is the same thing.

The trouble is that it varies. It might be a $4,000 income, let us say, in Ohio or Rhode Island, for a family of two people, and it might be $5,000 for that same family of two people in New York, because the rents are different. The situation is entirely different. We have had much experience with public housing, and the premise of eligibility for the subsidy, to begin with, is predicated upon the same rules as eligibility for public housing.

What happens? Suppose a man earns $10,000 a year, and no one earning $10,000 a year were to apply. I understand that in New York, for some public housing, it can go up to $8,000. But let us assume the person earns $10,000 a year, as an example. That is $200 a week, or $800 a month.

The man himself must pay one-quarter of his earnings toward the rent. That means he must pay $200 rent out of his own pocket. Where is the man with five or six children, who makes $10,000 a year, who pays more than $200 a month for rent? There is no such thing.

We can make this program very ridiculous. The amount involved is merely a supplement, a subsidy of the rent over and above a certain amount which the family can afford to pay; and we are calling upon each family to pay the maximum. We are saying, "One-quarter of your gross salary you must pay toward your rent." That much must come out of their pockets. Then if, in the location involved, they cannot find quarters within that one-quarter limit, and the rent for available quarters happens to be $10 or $15 more, the Government will subsidize that $10 or $15.

I do not think we ought to leave the impression that the Government of the United States is going to pay the full rent for people. They must pay one-quarter of their gross weekly income toward their rent themselves. Suppose they cannot afford to pay more. Let us assume a family has six or seven children—and I hope that, despite the program on birth control, this program will encourage more and more families.

Let us have them, I say. I am one who really believes in big families. All we are saying is that there are certain people who, living in a community, find themselves in a very hard situation, which the President and the administration recognizes and about which they feel something must be done.

We want these people to pay to the fullest extent of their ability to pay. They must pay, toward the rent, one-quarter of their gross salary. Over and above that amount, if they cannot find accommodations in an area where the rent is a little higher than that, the Government subsidizes the rent to that extent. That is all it amounts to. We can kick this around and kick it around, and in the end we shall make it all look ridiculous.

No one who is rich or who owns a Cadillac will get a penny out of this program. This is for poor people. If anyone in the Government gives this money to anyone who can afford to pay the full amount of the rent, he ought to go to jail. This is not what Lyndon Johnson wants. He wants to help the poor, who in some instances cannot help themselves, so that they may be able to get into good living quarters. They have been displaced through no fault of their own.

There are many poor families in this country. There are many poor families in Providence. There are many poor families in Columbus, Ohio. This is not a program designed for the rich. It is a program designed for the poor. The idea that the program is full of abuse is nonsense.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is some confusion as to the figures. One reason why no interpretation has been reached as to the figures that will be used is that the law was passed as recently as August 10. I inquired into the public housing situation, which is the criterion of eligibility, and also inquired as to the number of people that would be eligible.

At first, Mr. Weaver thought that the program would be predicated on the rule of thumb that the income had to be three times over the amount that would be paid for rent.

That is clear in the testimony, but we could not nail it down because they had not done the research yet, but they are doing it. It varies in different areas. I found out that the highest possible area, if we make it 4 times in this case, where a one-room or a two-room apartment per family would be available, would run around $5,600.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). Who is yielding time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Rhode Island is yielding me time.

Mr. PASTORE. How much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. MAGNUSON. One minute.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

I hope the Senator from Ohio will listen. I am sure that I can almost guarantee, when the regulations have been established—if they are established under the same criteria we have been led to believe—that the average person eligible for the rent subsidy will have an average income lower than $3,400 per year. Even then, there may not be a place available for him, but it is predicated upon that principle. The amount could be higher.

One economist said that it could be $5,600 or $5,400 in New York. In Seattle, which would be an average city, or my own hometown of Tacoma, the average there runs about $3,400. I am hopeful that that is what will happen. If they come in next year with cases wherein it might be suggested that they could stretch it and run into incomes over that amount on the average, I believe that the Appropriations Committee would not even make the $12 million available. I hope that will be true. It is a difficult thing to establish these criteria, because it varies throughout the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Washington has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I cannot help saying to all Senators present that this points up the whole business of Appropriations Committee meetings when the ink is hardly dry on the authorizations.

This is a program which I believe should proceed as rapidly as possible. I voted for the $12 million, but it points out more than ever all the supplementals coming around and around. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] knows that when we first started out in appropriations, we had one deficiency. Now we talk about supplementals in January and February, and the main appropriation bill becomes lost.

I believe that the Senate had better give serious consideration to the Magnuson plan. I hope it will do that next year, so that it will have a legislative session and a fiscal session, and let the ink become dry on what is authorized before it sits down to appropriate.

Every parliamentary body in the world enjoys the benefits of such a system except the Congress of the United States. In this way, I am sure that the Senate will know what it is going to spend, why it is going to spend it, and how it is going to spend it. We would have all the regulations necessary to do it.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, at this point I should like to read into the RECORD a part of the law pertaining to the discussion we just had.

This is a basic law, which is found under section 101 of title I. It reads as follows:

> To have an income below the maximum amount which can be established in the area, pursuant to the limitations prescribed by section 2(2) and 15(7)(b)(ii) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 for occupancy in public housing dwellings;—

Mr. President, that is basically the law. In other words, that is the guide, that is the ceiling and the floor in that particular area.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 13 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, for 4 years I served as mayor of the city of Philadelphia. For 8 years I served as a member of the Housing Subcommittee, whose chairman is the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Without undue arrogance, let me say that I know something about the problems of housing the poor in our larger cities.

The new rent supplement program embodied in the proposed legislation is essential if the war on poverty is going to meet with any success. This new program is essential if we are to supplement public housing and provide adequate shelter in safe and sanitary homes for the relatively low-income people of the United States of America.

Mr. President, 15 Senators appeared before the Subcommittee of the Appropriation Committee to urge restoration of the entire $30 million for the rent subsidy program which was asked for by the administration and authorized by the basic Housing Act of 1965. Many of those Senators, unfortunately, cannot be in the Chamber today, but here are their names:

Senators BAYH, CLARK, DOUGLAS, HART, JAVITS, the two KENNEDYS, MCNAMARA, MONDALE, MORSE, MUSKIE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, PELL, TYDINGS, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

We pled with the committee to restore the full $30 million which the administration had asked for.

The Vice President of the United States, a man who had been mayor of Minneapolis in his day and was intimately familiar with the housing needs of the poor people of this country, wrote a letter to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] in which he said:

> The administration feels that this is the most important new measure in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. The President called the rent supplement program the most crucial new instrument in our effort to improve the American city.
>
> A delay at this time would dash the expectations of countless poor families and elderly people who are looking forward to this promised assistance. And such delay would set back a substantial number of private builders and nonprofit sponsors who have begun plans to produce housing units under this program.
>
> Your support was crucial to the enactment of the legislation which authorized the rent supplement program. I am sure that you will do all you can to restore the full amount of appropriations authorized by the Congress and requested by the administration for the program, and to defeat efforts to delay this much needed program.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. President, there has been a great deal of talk this afternoon about the fact that the HHFA does not know what to do about the necessary regulations to carry the program into effect.

Let me make two points.

First, as the Senator from Rhode Island has stated, this is merely an extension of the public housing program to five specific categories listed in the basic act. A housing program has been in effect in the United States for over 30 years. Of course, the administration knows what kind of regulations it needs. Moreover, the specific regulations which will be required to carry the program into effect are substantially the same as the regulations for the low-cost, middle-income housing for displacees created by section 221(d)(3) of the Housing Act of 1961.

In my opinion, the argument that they do not know what kind of regulations are needed to determine whether a man has too much in assets on the one hand or too much in income on the other and that, therefore, the program should be postponed, is merely a smokescreen to prevent the new program from ever going into effect, generated by those who voted against it in the first place and were defeated.

Mr. President, let me say in behalf of the 14 Senators who joined me in the statement which was filed with the Appropriations Subcommittee, that the most significant and imaginative proposal in the Housing Act of 1965 is the rent supplemental program.

We stated that this is the program which was designed to employ the brains and the energy of private enterprise, and particularly the Nation's private builders, in the massive job of meeting the housing needs of large numbers of our low-income families. The legislation authorized $30 million for contracts for rent supplement payments to be entered into between the date of enactment of the bill and July 1, 1966, with the necessary funds to be approved and provided in appropriation acts.

The House-passed appropriation bill fails to provide any funds at all for this new program.

We urged the committee to restore the full amounts requested by the Administration. We believe that this new and untried program deserves at least the fair test which the administration requests would permit. In addition, we would like to stress to the committee the importance of avoiding any legislative limitations such as those proposed by the House committee which would hamper the effectiveness of the program.

I am delighted to see that when the $12 million was recommended for the program the Senate committee did not put in legislative language to limit the effectiveness of what it is supposed to do.

We—the 15 Senators—believe that it is essential that the rent supplement program be adequately funded now so that we can carry out the commitment Congress made in 1949 to insure a decent home for every American family. Existing programs have not provided an adequate volume of housing for low-income families.

The new rent supplement program, which will basically be a private enterprise effort, can, if adequately funded:

Give 350,000 families a chance to break out of the slums and raise their children in a decent environment.

Rescue families caught in the endless chain of poverty, ignorance, and crime, and permit them to realize the full promise of American life.

Renew the vitality and vigor of our American cities and make them better places in which to live and work.

This was the intent of the Congress in enacting the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. We continue to subscribe to that intent, and we urge the committee to give this new program a chance to succeed by acting favorably on the administration's funding request.

We could spend all the entire $30 million in useful efforts to improve the lot, shelter, and housing situation of thousands of American families; but I understand why the committee has curtailed the appropriation from $30 million to $12 million. They are faced with the fact that politics is the art of the possible and that $12 million is all they can get out of conference with the House.

I urge the committee to stand firm for the $12 million in view of the fact that there is a need for the entire $30 million.

I had intended to offer an amendment which would have raised the amount to $30 million, but the able manager of the bill, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] persuaded me—and he is a wise negotiator—that we stood a better chance of coming out with a larger amount if I did not offer my amendment. I will follow his judgment, but I urge the Senate to stand firm in providing the amount which the committee has recommended in order that the program of the administration may be funded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the agreement, the Senator from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is too bad that debate in the Senate is carried on with so few Members present as soon as a unanimous-consent agreement is entered into because those who favor a certain proposition are anxious to have a unanimous-consent agreement and have a vote, and Senators who have an argument to make are confined by the fact that more Members are not present to hear the debate.

I would like to address my remarks to my side, the Republican side, because rent supplement assistance seems to me to be uniquely a Republican type of housing approach, and ought to receive major support on this side of the aisle.

In the first place, let us remember that the very same arguments which were made by my friend the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and by other Senators who are for the Saltonstall amendment—which I shall vote against—were exactly the same arguments which were invoked against public housing as far back as 1949—namely, that public housing would be used by families with high incomes; that it would be abused; that it would be used as a political tool; that there would be no roof over the amount of money put into the program.

Nevertheless, year after year since 1949 we have authorized money for public housing, because it was obvious that for the 10 percent of the population in the lowest economic level there was no other way for them to have housing except to supplement their housing needs.

The very same Senators who argue for this amendment now have asked the question why there is not some alternative to public housing, why private enterprise cannot be used to take over where public housing has taken over heretofore. One of the very first creative proposals that comes up in which private enterprise can be introduced into the picture in order to take over from public housing, is immediately opposed on the same grounds that public housing has been opposed.

In short, we are dealing with problems of 10 percent of our people who must have public help in their housing needs. We are dealing with built-in problems in terms of deprivation in housing. It has been argued that it is good for the people, and that therefore there should be a reduction in the housing program because thereby we would increase their morale and give them an incentive to work.

Mr. President, that thinking went out of American life 30 years ago. We hear in the Chamber today echoes of those reverberations. All we have is echoes.

One of the most distinguished and outstanding conservatives was the author of the housing bill, which provided for 800,000 units. I refer to the famous Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, of which I was a cosponsor in the House.

In all the years since, we have not met the standard which Senator Taft, one of the most distinguished conservatives of our time, was urging was needed by the people in the lowest economic level of our country, and was the only way to obtain housing for them.

As an inheritor of that tradition, I feel that it is my duty to stand on the floor and urge my colleagues on the Republican side to support the concept of such constructive legislation, which is a way of interesting private enterprise to help deal effectively with the housing needs of those who cannot get it any other way.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from New York makes an excellent point. He has put his finger on the crux of the whole problem. It ought to be stated that there will be no gouging of these occupants by excessive rents, because the program is predicated upon nonprofit public housing organizations where the return on the investment cannot be more than 6 percent. So in the establishment of these loans, nobody is going to fall into a bonanza. As I understand, the participation will be by nonprofit organizations like churches and similar organizations.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator for his kind expression in regard to what I am saying. But I point out to the Senator that this is nothing new.

There are thousands upon thousands of housing units in New York City and in other cities built by unions, church groups, and by limited dividend corporations. These organizations have done an outstanding job. Under the New York law and the laws of other States incentives are provided.

There are two other points that I would like to make in the same connection.

This is the first program passed by the Congress that has introduced private enterprise into the public housing picture.

Second, it provides an incentive for the poor family to pull itself out of the doldrums. It would enable them to live in a good place and have the dignity of improving their lot.

Finally, the program is a modest one. There are 400,000 housing units in New York which we call old law tenements, which were built before the turn of the century.

When a country which is resisting communism is analyzed, almost invariably it will be found that housing for the people will give an indication of how the country is going.

It is one of the proudest aspects of our free society that we are making so much more progress in housing than has been made behind the Iron Curtain, because it is a private enterprise in the full tradition of Senator Taft.

I urge that the amendment be rejected.

On the issue of whether the actual program ought to fund a study, and that our efforts should be to accelerate this program to the maximum extent, we should not stand by idly and hold it off merely because we are reluctant to put up a modest sum of money which may be required to get it underway.

The results of the proposed program would be far ranging. It will be cheaper than building public housing projects. It is socially much more desirable, and it is much more fully in accord with the concept of the author of this program, Senator Robert Taft.

I should think it would appeal strongly both to the conservative members, as well as to the liberal members in finding a new way that private industry can be made a part of the effort to deal effectively with the housing needs of those who have been public housing clients.

For those reasons, the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall be brief. It is my understanding with the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island that we should be brief in bringing this matter to a conclusion.

The rent subsidy law was passed on August 10, 1965. It became law on that day.

Another factor that we should remember is that this is a supplemental budget, concluding this session of Congress. There will be another supplemental budget in January, and a deficiency budget sometime in June.

It seems to me important that we work out a proper regulation under which the new program, obviously a very difficult program to understand and complicated to work out in regulations, will be thoughtfully considered for the regulations and for the methods of handling it on a regional and State basis before appropriations are made for actual payment by the Government on the subsidies.

The bill, as reported by the committee, calls for a payment of contract authorization on money available by contract authorization of $12 million, and provides $360,000 for actual payment.

My amendment would provide for $860,000 for a careful and thoughtful method of devising regulations that would put the bill into effect.

The bill of the committee provides for $450,000. My amendment would almost double the study money and the methods of working out the bill, but leaves out any direct appropriation at this time.

I believe this is a wise way to proceed on this fundamental bill that will affect up to 4 million of our citizens over the years to come.

Furthermore, we should remember that the regulations, as brought out in the testimony before the subcommittee last Friday—the Senator from Rhode Island, the Senator from Washington, and myself, were present—will have to apply in different standards in every community of our country.

As to the amount of income available if a man has 2, 6, or 10 children he goes off of income and subsidy.

It requires a careful and thoughtful regulation to make the program effective. I shall not continue further at this time.

I believe that every Member of the Senate knows how he will vote on the amendment, because, in substance, it was before us previously when the actual rent subsidy bill was passed some time in the latter part of July or August.

I hope my amendment will be adopted. I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time, if the Senator from Rhode Island is prepared to yield back the remainder of his time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I shall be very brief.

First, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table entitled "Preliminary Estimates of Income Limits for Families of Different Sizes Under Proposed Rent Supplement Program in 26 Cities."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Preliminary estimates of income limits for families of different sizes under proposed rent supplement program in 26 cities

Cities	2 persons (1 bedroom)	3 or 4 persons (2 bedrooms)	5 or 6 persons (3 bedrooms)	7 or 8 persons (4 bedrooms)
Atlanta, Ga	$3,100	$3,800	$4,900	$5,500
Bangor, Maine	3,400	4,300	4,800	5,700
Batavia, N.Y	3,400	4,100	4,800	6,000
Boston, Mass	4,400	4,800	5,300	6,000
Bridgeport, Conn	4,100	4,600	4,800	5,300
Chicago, Ill	4,300	5,000	5,800	6,500
Columbia, S.C	3,400	3,700	4,600	5,000
Columbus, Ohio	3,700	3,900	4,500	4,900
Fresno, Calif	3,900	4,400	5,100	6,100
Huntington, W. Va	3,200	3,700	4,200	4,700
Jefferson City, Mo	3,600	4,100	4,600	5,500
Kansas City, Mo	3,600	4,100	4,800	5,500
Louisville, Ky	3,700	4,300	5,600	6,200
Milwaukee, Wis	3,600	4,100	4,600	6,000
Mobile, Ala	3,900	4,000	4,600	5,100
Newark, N.J	4,600	5,000	5,500	6,000
Providence, R.I	3,200	3,700	4,300	4,800
Paterson, N.J	4,300	4,800	5,300	5,800
Pittsburgh, Pa	4,200	4,600	5,000	5,600
Port Arthur, Tex	2,400	3,700	4,300	5,800
San Antonio, Tex	3,300	3,700	4,400	4,800
St. Louis, Mo	4,000	4,500	5,500	6,300
Terre Haute, Ind	3,600	3,900	4,300	4,900
Toledo, Ohio	4,000	4,500	5,500	6,000
Waco, Tex	3,400	3,700	4,600	5,800
Utica, N.Y	2,900	3,700	4,500	5,300

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, we are in the twilight of the present session. We shall return in January. Our experience has been that a few weeks pass before a supplemental bill comes to us. It must be considered in the House, and then it comes to the Senate. By the time we go to conference on it, it is late spring before we are able to enact a supplemental bill.

I realize that we are asking for $12 million. This is only a very small part of the authorization money. We took many of these things into account. Let me say to my dear friend from Massachusetts that we have been talking about a very human problem.

There are many dilapidated buildings in Harlem and in other places in the country. Under the law that we passed, these can be rehabilitated to 50 percent of their actual value by nonprofit organizations. We can begin to make life more livable for some of the poor families.

This program can be started tomorrow, or the next day, or the day after that.

Unless we appropriate the money, we shall not have put any life into the program; we shall not have given this program any life at all.

It is for these reasons that I ask that the amendment be voted down, and that we go to conference with the $12 million proposal. I do not believe we would hold the $12 million in the bill. The subject would have to be discussed further. Even the $6 million appropriation was knocked out on the floor of the House.

I say to Senators: Do not delay this program any further.

I realize that this should not be a crash program. I am not recommending that it be a crash program. The yearly authorization is $150 million. We are asking for $12 million. This proposal will take care of only 20,000 units. Spread over the country it will amount to a pilot program.

I say, Mr. President, let us get going. Let us begin. There are many places in the country where we can spend this money judiciously.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (when his his name was called). On this vote I have a live pair with my senior colleague from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If present and voting the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay" and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and and voting the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 45, as follows:

[No. 294 Leg.]

YEAS—37

Allott
Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
Morton
Murphy
Pearson
Prouty
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smathers
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NAYS—45

Aiken
Bartlett
Bass
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Case
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hayden
Inouye
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Scott
Smith
Symington
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—18

Anderson
Bayh
Byrd, W. Va.
Church
Cooper
Ellender
Gore
Hartke
Long, Mo.
McGee
Miller
Mundt
Pell
Randolph
Russell, Ga.
Sparkman
Tower
Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. SALTONSTALL's amendment was rejected.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I should like to announce to Senators that this is a new amendment designed to reduce the figure to $6 million instead of $12 million. There is not very much to discuss that has not already been discussed. I believe that if Senators remain in the Chamber we can have a yea-and-nay vote in short order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] proposes an amendment as follows:

On page 7, line 7, delete "$360,000" and insert "$180,000" in its place; and

On page 7, line 10, delete "$12,000,000" and insert "$6,000,000" in its place; and

On page 11, line 2, delete "$450,000" and insert "$850,000" in its place.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

NORA ISABELLA SAMUELLI

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 619, a bill for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 619) for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli, which was, on page 2, strike out lines 3 through 7, inclusive.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, this bill, as originally passed by the Senate, would have granted the status of permanent residence in the United States to the beneficiary, and would have deemed her residence and physical presence in the United States since 1963 to meet the naturalization requirements. As amended by the House of Representatives, the bill merely grants the status of permanent residence.

I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House of Representatives and request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. DODD, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and Mr. JAVITS conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8370) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments numbered 27 and 55 to the bill, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11588) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have discussed this with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and, with their approval, I ask unanimous consent that there be a 10-minute limitation on the pending amendment, the time to be equally divided.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, very briefly, the amendment which has just been rejected was to eliminate all appropriations for contract authorizations on the rent subsidy for the rest of this fiscal year, and to eliminate the $360,000 for rent payments. The rest of my amendment which has just been rejected included $850,000, which was the full amount of the budget request, for working out the regulations for rent subsidies.

The amendment I now propose is for $6 million for contract authorization and $180,000 for supplemental payments. Those are the same amounts that were recommended by the House committee, but were killed on the floor of the House. I have left in the full amount of the budget request for providing new regulations and for working out the method by which the rent-subsidy program can be carried out.

The amendment I now propose provides $6 million for contract authorization, which is one-half of the amount voted by the Senate committee, and

$180,000 for supplemental payments, which is again one-half of what was voted by the committee.

The committee included $450,000 for working out regulations. I would add to that, and make the amount $850,000, which is the same amount as was requested in the budget.

What I am trying to do is cut down the amounts that would be used for payments, but increase the amount that would be available for study and working out methods of regulation.

In addition, my amendment would provide, during this fiscal year, an estimated 10,000 subsidized units. I quote from the House report:

> This level of operation in the first year will provide much needed experience as a basis for refining and perfecting program standards and demonstrating the merit of this type of housing assistance before embarking in subsequent years on a program of the magnitude envisioned.

I repeat what I have said before, that there are more than 4 million people, according to Dr. Weaver, who may be eligible for the rent subsidy program. I think we should proceed carefully. My proposal allows for some payments, and it allows the full amount for devising regulations.

I would add one further word: The present regulations, which were supposed to go into effect in October, have been pushed along and delayed, so that at the present time, as far as we know, there are no regulations for carrying out this program, although I assume that there will be at some time in the future. That certainly makes it advisable to move a little more slowly than the Senate Committee on Appropriations would have us go.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question. Not all of us have as accurate figures as we would like, because this bill was prepared in August, but when Dr. Weaver talked about 4 million people, he was talking about the number of people in the United States who might potentially be eligible for this program and/or public housing.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say to the Senator that I did not understand it included public housing. If the Senator says that is correct, I take his word for it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; and/or public housing.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It would cover up to 4 million people, I understood.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If everybody found themselves dispossessed, if everybody found themselves over 62, if everybody found themselves in a slum area, there would be the 4 million. But if we did not do this, this is the prime thing in this program—

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is the Senator speaking on his time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. If we did not do this, we would probably have to do the same sort of thing in public housing.

Mr. PASTORE. He is speaking on the Senator's side.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am speaking on both sides.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Several other Senators wish to speak.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Ohio on his time?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, one of the questions that is frequently being asked is, When does a person, by virtue of the amount of his income, become disqualified from receiving rent subsidy benefits?

As a matter of information, I suggest that the Senator look at pages 1017 and 1018 of the report of the hearings. The title of the subject is "Income Limits for Eligibility."

I quote from the report:

> Senator Pastore. You have taken care of the elderly. Now let us take a family that is not elderly. Let us take an ordinary family of a man, a wife, and two children, minus, and let us assume that he earns $10,000 a year.
>
> Now, is he going to be subsidized in any way?
>
> Mr. Weaver. No, sir; if he earns $10,000 a year and he has two children he would not be eligible under this program.

The implication of the answer is that if he has enough children, he may become eligible.

> Senator Pastore. Where would you bring the breaking point for help?
>
> Mr. Weaver. We have already brought in our regional economists and talked to our regional directors—and let me say that the rent and the income levels on this are to be determined by my office in the Housing and Home Finance Agency and not by FHA, so, therefore, they are not covered by the proposed regulations.

That answer, properly interpreted, means that no decision has been made.

Mr. Weaver continues:

> Here we have said that even in the highest income areas, the highest cost areas, if there is an income ceiling of over $8,000, regardless of the cost of housing and rental or the size of the family, this will not be approved, and it will have to be sent to Washington.

That means that if the income is over $8,000, the regional director will not be able to approve it, and the application will have to be sent to Washington. It means that a breakoff point has not been determined.

In Washington the $8,000 income may be approved and subsidies granted.

Mr. Weaver continues:

> We are going to have a cutoff point that will be recognized as one restricting the program to low-income families. There will not be $10,000-a-year-income families involved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I have 2 additional minutes?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am sorry. I have only 1 minute remaining. Perhaps the Senator from Rhode Island will give me 2 minutes of his time.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator is recognized for 4 additional minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] wished to learn about the cutoff point:

> Senator Magnuson. As the Senator from Rhode Island said, where is the cutoff?

The Senator from Washington expected Mr. Weaver to tell him what the cutoff point was. Mr. Weaver answered:

> Mr. Weaver. The cutoff depends upon the size of the family and the cost of rental in each community.

Therefore, Mr. President, there is no positive guideline as to how high the income may be to still qualify an individual for rent support.

Mr. Weaver said that the cutoff depends upon the size of the family and the rent in each community.

I submit that this is a very nebulous and uncertain basis upon which to approve a program, if it is implied that a person may have an income of $10,000 a year and still be qualified under the program.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there are two reasons why we should turn down the amendment. The first reason is that the language of the amendment which is in the bill concerning the $12 million is already only 40 percent of what the administration has asked for. Therefore, the cut has already been made. The second reason is that the Senate has done what the House did not do; namely, legislate for the program by a vote of 45 to 37. Thus, my point is addressed to the 45 Senators, because the 37 Senators probably cannot be persuaded. But the 45 Senators are persuaded that 20,000 units is a fair start. That is what they voted for. Therefore, why cut it down and make it half a loaf instead of a whole loaf?

Any man who sponsored the original housing program—and former Senator Robert A. Taft was one of its principal sponsors—would bless us today because at least we are trying to get private enterprise into the program.

That is what this is all about. That is what Senator Taft would have wanted. That is what I want. That is what many other Senators want. Let us not kill it off aborning. Let us do what the committee in its best judgment said was a fair and decent start for which 45 Senators have now voted affirmatively.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Maine.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, in the authorization bill approved by the Senate earlier this year and signed into law was a 4-year rent supplement authority of $150 million a year. The administration had requested $30 million for fiscal year 1966. The Senate committee cut that to $12 million, which is less than 10 percent of the total amount authorized over the 4-year period.

This is a program which was thoroughly considered in the Committee on Banking and Currency. It was thoroughly discussed the last time it came before the Senate in the authorization bill. It was thoroughly considered in the Appropriations Committee. This figure, conceding now that we have authorized the bill, represents, it seems to me, a modest beginning—a prudent beginning, prudent being a word which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] and I both recognize, coming from New England.

Twelve million dollars is a prudent beginning toward the implementation of a program which has been thoroughly discussed and approved prior to this time.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge the Senate not to go back on the votes it has already cast for the authorization, and that it turn down the pending amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am going to take only 2 or 3 minutes and then will be ready to vote.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield the balance of my time to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I need only 1 minute, and will confine myself to that time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, this is a reasonable compromise which is now before the Senate.

In view of the fact that a housing bill to provide for the rent supplement is over 60 days old, and in view of the fact that as of late last evening the Housing Administration withdrew all instructions and regulations—which I had previously read on the floor of the Senate—governing the whole program, it demonstrates conclusively that they themselves do not have the criteria or the plans formulated upon which to proceed.

If we limit the amount to $6 million, we give them adequate money. Next spring, if and when they come up with adequate planning, determination of income levels, determination of housing levels which Mr. Weaver himself says they have not done yet, we can look into the situation further, but meanwhile let us wait for them to do their planning.

Six million dollars is an adequate start and we will not be profligate in throwing money into a program which as yet has no adequate plans.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I implore Senators to let the amount stay at $12 million. We have to go to conference on it. We have already taken a significant vote. If I may use an expression which I do not use with impertinence, I believe that we are nit-picking a little bit at this point.

After all, we must understand the problem. If we do not understand it, then we should vote against the program.

Mr. President, this is a poor man's program.

The argument has been made about the cutoff. The cutoff is already in the law and I read it. Title I, section 101 states explicitly:

> To have an income below the maximum amount which can be established in the area, pursuant to the limitations prescribed by Section 2(2) and 15(7)(b)(ii) of the United States Housing Act of 1937.

In other words, anyone who is qualified to be a beneficiary under the program must also be qualified to be eligible for public housing.

As the Senator from New York stated, this is a step forward because now we are going to bring private investment into the area.

We are an affluent society. We constitute only 6 percent of the world's population, we occupy 7 percent of the world's mass, and yet we possess 40 percent of the world's wealth; but, 25 percent of our people live on the edge of poverty.

Whom are we talking about?

We are talking about those people living in Harlem, those who are displaced when a freeway is built, those who are over 62 years of age, those who are physically disabled.

We are talking about the poor.

The breaking point has been discussed on the floor of the Senate. What do we mean by "breaking point?"

If the proposed legislation is defeated, we will break the backs of the poor. That is the breaking point.

This program has nobility. If it did not have nobility, Lyndon Johnson would not have made it one of the jewels of his administration.

I say that we will have enough work to do in the committee when we go back to conference. I say, give us something to work with. The Senate has already sustained the $12 million. Do not cut it down. I appeal to the 47 Senators who voted for the program to let us take this amount to conference, and let us discuss it in view of the enlightened atmosphere which we have experienced since we have held the hearings.

Mr. President, there has been a great deal of misunderstanding about this bill. Yes, it has been poorly explained. I regret that some Senators were not in the Chamber when I explained the bill in detail. I do not wish to take time to do it again, but I give all Senators my word of honor that this is a poor man's program. It is not a rich man's program.

That is the reason why Pastore is for it. If it was a scandalous program, or a wasteful program, Pastore would be the first one to be against it.

If the Senate votes the $6 million and we go to conference, and it is cut down to $3 million, we will be discussing trying to help people who must have immediate housing. But what can we do with only $3 million?

If we are going to do that, let us not be hypocritical, let us do the right thing and cut out the amount entirely. If we are going to vote for a $3 million program on housing—I say we would be better off, and not fool ourselves, and cut out the entire amount.

I say to the Senate that I would rather we knocked the $12 million out entirely than send it to conference with $6 million.

I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield me 5 minutes?

The VICE PRESIDENT. All time has now expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio proceed for 30 seconds.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Ohio is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article published in Time magazine for October 22, 1965, entitled, "The Congress—A Program for the Rich."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Congress—A Program for the Rich

Only after an unusually high-pressure vote-gathering drive in June did the Johnson administration's rent-subsidy bill pass the House—and then only by a hairsbreadth 208-to-202 margin. When the bill authorizing the Government to help low-income, elderly, and handicapped families pay their rent, cleared the Senate by a 54-to-30 vote July 15, it was a particularly prideful victory for Lyndon Johnson.

The President exulted too soon. Last week, thanks to an incredible blunder by Housing and Home Finance Agency Administrator Robert Weaver, the program was dead. Its demise was hastened by the curiosity of Michigan Republican James Harvey, 43, who found HHFA experts suspiciously reluctant to circulate the regulations covering financial eligibility for rent aid. Harvey demanded a copy and, as a member of the House's Housing Subcommittee, got one immediately. To his astonishment, Harvey found that under Weaver's HHFA-approved rules relating to the elderly and the handicapped (who could collect up to 70 percent of their rent from the Government), applicants might qualify for Federal subsidies even if they had personal net assets as high as $25,000.

Harvey was appalled. "I don't think 90 percent of the Members of the House have $25,000 in net assets," he gasped. "The regulations were clearly contrary to the bill as passed by Congress." Since the House had yet to appropriate funds for the program. Harvey moved to cut off all $6 million earmarked for rent subsidies. "The Congress of the United States has decided that this was going to be a program for low-income people of America," he declared. "They have made this program one for the rich people of America."

Though the Democratic leadership tried gamely to defend Weaver's gaffe, Harvey's motion to cancel rent funds passed by 185 votes to 162. Twenty-five House Members who had backed the bill last summer now voted to kill it.

Weaver could easily have avoided the fiasco by discussing the bill's income provisions with congressional leaders in advance—or simply by waiting to write them until after the funds were appropriated. At any rate, Robert Weaver, hitherto considered a leading candidate to become the United States' first Negro Cabinet officer as Secretary of the new Department of Housing and Urban Development, could hardly have dealt the boss a more painful blow if he had tried.

Mr. PASTORE. That, Mr. President, is where the confusion grows.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All time has now expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts. The yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. INOUYE. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay" and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 41, as follows:

[No. 295 Leg.]

YEAS—37

Allott
Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
Morton
Murphy
Pearson
Prouty
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smathers
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NAYS—41

Aiken
Bartlett
Bass
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hayden
Inouye
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Smith
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—22

Anderson
Bayh
Byrd, W. Va.
Case
Church
Cooper
Ellender
Gore
Hartke
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
McGee
Miller
Mundt
Pell
Randolph
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Scott
Sparkman
Tower
Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. Saltonstall's amendment was rejected.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. I should like to apprise my colleagues in the Senate that we can conclude action on the bill in a half hour, if they remain in the Chamber.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall take only 2 minutes to make some legislative history. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Last winter—almost 10 months ago—devastating floods hit the Pacific Northwest. Snow, followed by rain, literally washed the Northwest away. The storm hit the forest logging roads, essential to the Bureau of Land Management, especially hard and extensive road damaged occurred. The additional $6,320,000 in this bill will bring to $16,870,000 the funds Congress has provided to the Bureau of Land Management to repair logging roads on the forests it manages in western Oregon.

However, I am hopeful that these funds, $2 million less than the administration requested, will be adequate to restore the damaged roads.

I appreciate that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] has provided an amount identical with the House action.

Last spring when the first supplemental for $8,500,000 was being acted upon, the Senator from Oregon received reports from Oregonians, in whom he has great personal confidence, that this Agency—the Bureau of Land Management—had been stopped at the local level from requesting all the funds needed to repair roads. The Department of Interior and the Bureau of the Budget were supposed to have prevented the local Agency people from listing all damage.

The senior Senator from Oregon went directly to the Budget Director, Mr. Kermit Gordon, who submitted evidence that this simply was not the case. There were no bars to the local office requesting every cent for flood damage restoration needed. In fact, the request before the Congress was for the exact amount that local office has requested.

The senior Senator from Oregon acknowledged that the case had been overstated—yes, oversold—to him and he immediately withdrew his request for consideration.

Today I feel an obligation to make clear why the Senate committee has agreed with the House Committee on Appropriations that there be a $2 million reduction in this request.

The reason is simple. A supplemental request for funds is appropriated in order to provide emergency funds needed immediately that cannot await the next regular bill. Taking the regular road program and the flood restoration program of this agency on these Oregon and California revested grant lands, the record of performance in obligating funds for flood restoration and on their regular program over the last several months, quite frankly, borders on being abysmal. Here we are in mid-October, with the good construction season gone, and this agency holds an unobligated balance of over $22 million made up of $9,810,000 for flood restoration, including the $6,320,000 in this bill and $10,571,000 in its regular road program plus $1,850,000 in other accounts.

One reason why I wish to make this legislative history is so that Mr. Stewart Udall, the Secretary of the Interior, can get to work. It is far more important for him to get to work on this program than it is for him to plant a few trees on terraces along the highways of America. The economy of my State is dependent upon lumber. The economy of my State is crying for the restoration of these access roads to the lumber mills. The Department of the Interior, in my judgment, on this issue has simply failed to live up to its responsibility. I want Mr. Udall to know it. This is not the last he will hear from me on this subject.

This money is to restore flood damaged roads needed to manage Federal timber. Regular funds, too, can be used for this work. The burden is on the agency to show us why its regular road program priorities cannot be adjusted. The senior Senator from Oregon knows that a slowdown in the regular program will hurt this agency's vital timber selling obligation to feed 1 billion board feet of timber into Oregon's economy. He knows that this serves the national interest.

But let me issue a warning now that this agency had better have a good accounting ready to show the people of Oregon that this flood restoration money has been used for the purpose it has been appropriated. But even more to the point, they had better get on with their job.

I have not had the same detailed figures on the Forest Service, and its disaster restoration operation covers a wider area. However, if this admonition would cover that agency, too, it had better take note.

The Senator from Oregon is mindful that in 1962, on Columbus Day to be exact, a windstorm toppled several billion board feet of magnificent old growth timber in the Northwest. This threw public and private timber sales awry. Then insects settled in some of the trees before they could all be logged and sales had to be changed because the best way to rid the forest of this epidemic is to remove the source of infection—the down timber. That job is not yet complete—it almost is. Then in December 1964, virtually on Christmas Eve, the floods hit the logging roads.

However, I do not intend for 1 minute to defend poor performance.

Last spring I got complaints via the Oregon Division of the Bureau of Land Management that its fund request had been cut from around $20 to $8½ million for flood repair. However, as of June 30, 1965, it had an unobligated balance of $5,218,516 in flood repair funds plus $4,106,728 in regular road funds.

Frankly, I am more than satisfied that the committee has provided an additional $6,320,000. However, there are some people in my State who will say that "MORSE can't get money for Oregon." They will say that "$2 million was cut from a request by President Johnson for essential log-haul roads." They will say that "the Oregon delegation let this cut happen."

Well, the Senator from Oregon is not running for reelection and even if he were, he is not going to propose spending money in Oregon that cannot be justified. So I appreciate the opportunity to make the record clear. The reduction of $2 million is clearly a result of what has not been accomplished by those directly responsible for restoring these roads.

I want the manager of the bill to tell me whether or not I am right in the observation that the reduction of the $2 million is clearly a result of what has not been accomplished by those directly responsible for restoring these roads, because there was the opportunity for the money that was available to be spent on these roads. The Bureau of Land Management had this large unobligated balance available to repair the roads that had been damaged by the floods. If that is true, let me say that the Bureau of Land Management is at fault, and Stewart Udall ought to get to work to carry out his clear responsibility as Secretary of the Interior in regard to coming to the disaster assistance of the people of my State. The major economy of my State is the lumber industry, and these funds were made available for the restoration of the roads destroyed by the floods.

This road construction is not a new program; it has been going on for years. I shall watch with keen interest to see whether this work is moving ahead so that timber operations are not hampered by failure to promptly restore roads.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks a letter with exhibits from the Director of the Bureau of Land Management. In addition, to reinforce this statement, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the testimony of the Senator from Oregon on S. 327, the Northwest disaster relief bill, letters in support of it from Oregonians and the unsatisfactory substitute dealing with timber roads recommended by the Acting Secretary of the Interior, John A. Carver, Jr., who, the Secretary of Interior knows, is persona non grata in my office. I intend to discuss further on the floor at a later date my great dissatisfaction with certain policies of the Department of the Interior, which I think are being bungled by the Under Secretary of Interior, Mr. Carver.

There being no objection, the letter and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT,
Washington, D.C., October 19, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In answer to a telephone request from Mr. Berg on October 15, we have enclosed the following information:

1. Justification for fiscal year 1966 supplemental request covering emergency road repair in western Oregon.
2. A tabulation showing the status of O. & C. funds for fiscal years 1965 and 1966.

Work plans have been prepared covering the balance of the fiscal year 1965 supplemental flood damage funds. Identification of projects proposed for repair under the fiscal year 1966 supplemental request has been completed.

The House committee has recommended a reduction of $2 million in the fiscal year 1966 supplemental flood damage request. The Department has not appealed this action since the House report said a request for additional funds may be submitted at a later date when total actual cost can be determined.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES H. STODDARD,
Director.

(Enclosures.)

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS
JUSTIFICATION

Emergency road repair and reconstruction.................. $8,320,000

Road systems on land administered by the Bureau of Land Management in western Oregon were severely damaged by the floods which struck the Pacific Northwest during the months of December 1964 and January and February 1965.

Types of damage include washed out or badly damaged bridges and culverts, roadbed and road surface destruction, and minor trail destruction. These road systems are essential to the flow of resources to conversion points. Until the systems are repaired there will be marked adverse economic effects on the communities throughout the entire flood area.

The total damage to roads now stands at $19,500,000. Of this total $16,100,000 is required for repair of Bureau road systems; $2,150,000 is required for repair of cooperator roads needed for the BLM timber sale program; and $1,250,000 is required for the reconstruction of timber sale roads.

Restoration of the existing segments of these vital road systems is necessary to insure the capacity of the Bureau and industry to sustain a regular flow of timber to the mills during the next 2 to 3 years. All of this road system serves areas where timber is already under contract as well as to serve continued timber offerings. Such action is essential to—

(a) Maintain a pattern of timber sales that is consistent with sound forest management;

(b) Facilitate an early and orderly restoration of the timber industry dependent on timber resources administered by this Bureau; and

(c) Assist the timber industry to contribute positively to the economic strength of the area during the critical period of rehabilitation following the floods.

BUREAU ROAD SYSTEMS

Preliminary justifications were submitted on an estimated road damage in excess of $15 million. Supplemental funds for this purpose in the amount of $8,500,000 were included in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, Public Law 89-16 approved April 30, 1965. Since then our overall estimates have been firmed based on detailed engineering examinations.

The total damage now stands at $16,100,000 and is summarized below:

Area	Number of road system	Mileage	Number of bridges and large culverts	Damages
Salem	28	268	15	$3,435,000
Roseburg	15	140	18	3,430,000
Medford	12	191	11	2,335,000
Coos Bay	19	330	9	4,683,000
Eugene	10	335	10	1,565,000
Bonanza	1	70	2	150,000
Miscellaneous roads		110		502,000
Subtotal	85	1,444	65	16,100,000
Supplemental amount, fiscal year 1965				8,500,000
Additional funds required, fiscal year 1966				7,600,000

COOPERATOR ROADS

The checkerboard ownership pattern of western Oregon, the location of industrial conversion plants and the silvicultural needs for effective management of the Federal forests are factors that dictate full availability of forest road systems. To process annually 1.2 billion board feet of timber valued at $32 million on approximately 600 separate tracts, it is important that full use be made of all existing roads both public and private. Federal roads under the administration of BLM total 4,000 miles.

Approximately 7,600 miles of forest roads are encompassed under access agreements with private owners, about one-half of this mileage being on privately owned lands. These agreements are premised on the policy that existing roads should be mutually used wherever possible because the duplication of existing road systems reduces the value of Federal timber. Under these agreements both parties have use of these roads for moving commercial timber at set fees based on replacement costs of the roads and on the proportionate share of tributary timber BLM and the private parties own.

Total damage to private roads including cooperator roads in western Oregon may exceed $40 million; $2,150,000 represents that portion on agreement roads of critical need to BLM to maintain the full committed cut for 1965–66 fiscal years. Of this amount, $720,000 is requested; the balance of $1,430,000 will be met partially through cost sharing with cooperators, where possible, and presently available funds.

Every effort will be expended to implement equitable cost sharing of road damage repair on the respective ownerships within an agreement system. Where the private party road damage prevents the movement of large volumes of Federal timber and the owner is unable to restore the road to full usable condition in a timely manner, the requested funds will not be invested before an easement over the proposed reconstruction is obtained. After the easement has been obtained over the private lands, the respective fees on the agreement area will be computed to reflect the Government's investment in that system. The portion of subsequent fees collected that represent this new investment will be returned to the Government as miscellaneous receipts. The estimate for cooperator roads is summarized below:

Cooperator roads

District	Miles	Damaged bridges	Damages
Coos Bay	15	1	$349,000
Medford	122		425,000
Roseburg	4	5	113,000
Salem	284		800,000
Eugene	648		463,000
Total damages	[1] 1,073	6	2,150,000
Fiscal year 1966 request			720,000
Cost sharing or available fund			1,430,000

[1] Mileage of cooperator road systems on which damage has occurred.

OTHER REQUIREMENTS ABSORBED

Public Law 89–41 approved June 17, 1965, provides authority to reconstruct roads that were damaged by the floods which at that time were under construction by timber sale contractors. The Bureau is meeting these requirements from presently available funds to the extent of the current estimate of $1,250,000.

In addition to these various programs for the repair of roads the Bureau estimates that approximately $500,000 will be spent for debris clearance and $80,000 for repair to damaged recreation sites. These requirements are being absorbed as they are performed within presently available funds.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES H. STODDARD, DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ON SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS, FISCAL YEAR 1966

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we appreciate this opportunity to appear before you in support of our request for fiscal year 1966 supplemental funds to complete repair of roads in western Oregon damaged by floods. Last spring, the Congress granted $500,000 for road repair in California, Idaho, and eastern Oregon and $8,500,000 to initiate repair work in western Oregon. This request for $8,320,000 is to meet the balance of requirements in western Oregon.

The total damage to roads affecting the Bureau in western Oregon now stands at $19,500,000. Of this total $16,100,000 is required for repair of Bureau road systems; $2,150,000 is required for repair of cooperator roads needed for the BLM timber sale program and $1,250,000 is required for the reconstruction of timber sale roads in accordance with Public Law 89–41 approved June 17, 1965.

Restoration of the existing segments of these vital road systems is necessary to insure the capacity of the Bureau and industry to sustain a regular flow of timber to the mills during the next two to three years. All of this road system serves areas where timber is already under contract as well as to serve continued timber offerings. Such action is essential to—

(a) Maintain a pattern of timber sales that is consistent with sound forest management;

(b) Facilitate an early and orderly restoration of the timber industry dependent on timber resources administered by this Bureau; and

(c) Assist the timber industry to contribute positively to the economic strength of the area during the critical period of rehabilitation following the floods.

This request for $8,320,000 is composed of the following:

(a) For Bureau road systems, $7,600,000. This amount when combined with the $8,500,000 appropriated last spring provides $16,100,000 for repair of Bureau road systems.

(b) Seven hundred and twenty thousand dollars which represents one-third of the present estimates of $2,150,000 required for the repair of cooperator roads needed for the current BLM timber sale program. The balance of $1,430,000 will be met partially by cost sharing with cooperators where possible and the balance from presently available funds.

The Bureau is making provision within available funds to finance reconstruction of timber sale constractors' roads, the balance of cooperator road requirements as well as debris clearance work and repair of damaged recreation sites. These expenses which are scheduled to be absorbed may exceed $3,000,000:

O. & C. grant lands

	Unobligated balance brought forward	Appropriated	Total available	Obligations incurred	Unobligated balance, June 30, 1965
Fiscal year 1965:					
Roads, regular	$4,174,485	$7,947,577	$12,122,062	$8,015,334	$4,106,728
Emergency road repair	0	8,500,000	8,500,000	3,281,484	5,218,516
Forest development and protection	105,049	1,800,000	1,905,049	1,719,795	185,254
Operation and maintenance	139,384	700,000	839,384	675,176	164,208
Total, fiscal year 1965	4,418,919	18,947,577	23,366,495	13,691,789	9,674,706
					Unobligated balance as of Oct. 19, 1965
Fiscal year 1966 (estimated):					
Roads, regular	4,106,728	8,225,000	12,331,728	1,760,000	10,571,728
Emergency road repair	5,218,516	[1] 6,320,000	11,538,516	1,728,000	9,810,516
Forest development and protection	185,254	1,600,000	1,785,254	859,000	926,254
Operation and maintenance	164,208	800,000	964,208	44,000	924,208
Total, fiscal year 1966	9,674,706	16,945,000	26,619,706	4,391,000	22,228,706

[1] Amount recommended by House committee.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., March 31, 1965.

Hon. PAT MCNAMARA,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCNAMARA: There is pending before your committee S. 327, a bill to provide assistance to the States of Oregon, Washington, California, and Idaho, for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters.

We recommend that the bill be enacted with our proposed amendments.

The bill provides that the Federal Government will pay from the emergency fund under the Federal Aid Highway Act 100 percent for the repair or reconstruction of highways of the Federal aid highway system to the States mentioned, which highways were damaged or destroyed by floods and high waters, in lieu of the percentages now payable to the States for such repair or reconstruction under existing law, i.e., California 59.78 percent, Idaho 62.91 percent, Washington 53.51 percent, and Oregon 63.45 percent.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture, from funds and authorizations available to him for the construction and maintenance of forest development roads and trails, to restore or reconstruct to the extent he deems appropriate, either directly or in cooperation with timber purchasers, any roads and trails which were in the process of construction by purchasers of national forest timber and which roads or trails were destroyed or severely damaged by the floods.

The bill contains an authorization for appropriations to carry out the foregoing purposes, in addition to the amount authorized by the emergency relief section of the Federal Aid Highway Act, the sum of $200 million for the period ending July 1, 1966.

The bill amends subsection 120(f) of title 23, United States Code, and subsection 125 (c) of title 23, United States Code, by making the emergency relief provisions of section 125 and the 100-percent Federal share provisions of subsection 120(f) applicable to highways, roads, and trails on public lands, and to roads and trails on wildlife refuge system lands. This provision is apparently intended as permanent legislation, despite the time limitation of June 30, 1936, embodied in the bill.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to compromise or release through the Farmers Home Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration the indebtedness of their borrowers to enable them to overcome losses suffered as a result of the floods and high waters. The Secretary of Agriculture, through the Farmers Home Administration, is further authorized to refinance loans for the repair, reconstruction, or replacement of dwellings or farm buildings affected by the floods and high waters. The bill authorizes the Small Business Administration to make loans with a maximum maturity of 30 years for the purpose of replacing, reconstructing, or repairing dwellings in the States affected. The bill provides that it shall not be in effect after June 30, 1966, except with respect to payment of expenditures for obligations and commitments entered into under the bill before such date.

The bill embodies some of the same provisions as the Alaska earthquake relief legislation, Public Law 88-451, 78 Stat. 505 (1964).

As indicated above, the bill provides 100-percent Federal funding of repairs or reconstruction of Federal aid highways damaged or destroyed by the floods and high waters. When the State of Alaska was faced with the need for similar restorative action as a result of the earthquake of March 27, 1964, Congress provided in the act of August 19, 1964, Public Law 88-451, 78 Stat. 505, section 3, that Federal assistance should be on the same matching basis which would be applicable to new construction. For the State of Alaska the Federal assistance was 94 percent. Subsection (f) of section 120, title 23, United States Code, was amended by the act of October 13, 1964, Public Law 88-658, 78 Stat. 1090, as permanent legislation. Under that law the four States concerned, and all other States, now enjoy the same payment formula afforded Alaska with respect to repairs or reconstruction on the Federal aid highway system. As indicated earlier, the Federal share for the four States ranges from 53.51 to 63.45 percent.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to repair or restore roads built by timber purchasers. It contains no similar authority for this Department. We have a large timber sale program particularly on the revested Oregon and California Railroad and the reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands. We need similar authority and are suggesting an appropriate amendment. Our proposed amendment authorizes the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture separately to expend funds to restore or reconstruct highways, roads, or trails, built by a timber purchaser on lands administered by the Secretary, where damaged by the floods and high waters. The amendment also permits the Secretary to reimburse any timber purchaser who effectuated such repair or reconstruction prior to the effective date of enactment of the bill. We think it would be inequitable to deprive a timber purchaser of the benefits of the bill on the basis of his diligence in acting to restore promptly the damage caused to such roads. The precise extent to which relief could be granted is spelled out in our amendment. It provides that a timber purchaser shall bear the estimated cost of the uncompleted work on the portion of the road damaged, and an amount equal to the first 15 percent of the estimated cost incurred by timber purchaser on the damaged or destroyed portion of the road. The Secretary would bear the next $1,000 of the estimated cost of reconstruction, restoration, and completion, and 50 percent of the remaining costs thereof. Where the costs of reconstruction, restoration, and completion are less than $500, the section would not apply.

Fifteen percent represents approximately the risk and profit allowance envisaged by the road provisions of the timber appraisal. It also takes account of normal winter damage. The $1,000 is designed to afford a larger measure of relief to the small timber operator who presumably is less able to withstand catastrophic loss. The rationale for the 50-percent division is that neither the Government nor the timber purchasers envisaged the catastrophe. It seems equitable, therefore, that each party should bear 50 percent of the loss sustained. The exclusion of claims under $500 is based upon the position that such damage is relatively minor.

It is the position of the administration that relief legislation along the lines of the bill is not an appropriate vehicle for amendments to the emergency fund provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act relating to the operation of this Department. We are therefore recommending the deletion of section 2(d) of the bill.

Because of the havoc wrought by the floods and high waters, persons seeking to perfect their rights in entries under the public land laws may have been disadvantaged. This Department should be in a position to suspend the time limits embodied in those laws for the performance of certain acts where appropriate in cases where the entryman's ability to comply has been interfered with by the floods and high waters. We are suggesting an appropriate amendment below.

We understand that some damage was caused by floods and high waters in the four States during February 1965. We therefore believe that the bill should be amended by deleting the words "December 1964, and January 1965" wherever they appear in the bill and substituting therefor "December 1964, January and February 1965".

We recommend that the bill be amended as follows:

1. Delete subsections (b) and (d) of section 2, redesignate subsection (c) as "(b)," delete therefrom "July 1, 1966" and substitute therefor "June 30, 1966," which marks the end of the fiscal year.

2. Add a new section reading as follows:

"Sec. 7. Notwithstanding provisions of existing contracts, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, separately, may, with funds and authorizations available to him for the construction and maintenance of highways, roads, and trails, provide for the restoration, reconstruction, and completion of highways, roads, or trails, and for reimbursement of timber sale contractors for such work performed prior to the effective date of this Act, on lands administered by the Secretary in Oregon, Washington, California, and Idaho, if the highways, roads, or trails were constructed but not accepted by the Government, or were in the process of construction under the terms of a timber sale contract, and if the highways, roads, or trails were damaged or destroyed by the floods of December 1964, January and February 1965. The estimated cost of restoration, reconstruction, and completion of the damaged or destroyed portion, as determined by the Secretary, shall be borne as follows: the timber purchaser shall bear (a) the estimated cost of the uncompleted work, as determined by the Secretary, on the portion of the highway, road, or trail damaged or destroyed, and (b) an amount equal to the first 15 percent of the estimated cost incurred on the damaged or destroyed portion of the highway, road, or trail prior to the floods. The Secretary shall bear the next $1,000 of the estimated cost of restoration, reconstruction, and completion, and the Secretary shall bear 50 percent of the remaining estimated costs. This section shall not apply where the estimated cost of restoration, reconstruction, or completion is less than $500."

3. Add a new section reading as follows:

"Sec. 8. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to give any public land entryman such additional time in which to comply with any requirement of law in connection with any public land entry for lands in Oregon, Washington, California, and Idaho, as the Secretary finds appropriate because of interference with the entryman's ability to comply with such requirement resulting from floods and high waters during December 1964, January and February 1965."

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

John A. Carver, Jr.,
Acting Secretary of the Interior.

Senator Bayh. We are honored to have the distinguished senior Senator, Senator Morse, before the subcommittee to give us his thoughts on the matter.

Statement of Hon. Wayne Morse, a U.S. Senator From the State of Oregon

Senator Morse. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, as a Senator from the flood-stricken State of Oregon, I am deeply appreciative of your courtesy in having scheduled this hearing, although the disaster relief bill, which I introduced on January 7 with my colleague, Senator Neuberger, as cosponsor, has not been officially referred to the subcommittee, I am addressing my remarks to the general subject before the committee today but I shall make some comments on S. 327 because it is only a matter of time before it will be before your subcommittee.

We have been waiting for reports from departments downtown. Since arriving at this hearing, I understand that the Bureau of the Budget's long-looked-for report has been received this morning. I haven't had a chance to look at it, but I will.

Mr. Chairman, with your consent, I would like permission to offer any supplemental statements that I may have after reviewing the report.

Senator Randolph (presiding). Senator Morse, that will be done.

Senator Morse. I appreciate that very much, Mr. Chairman.

I have to leave this room to convene the Subcommittee on Education because we hope today, before the day is over, to complete the subcommittee's action on that bill. However, I shall be glad to have your questions, Mr. Chairman.

The bill Senator Neuberger and I have introduced, S. 327, is very appropriate to consider along with S. 1638. It is designed to provide assistance for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent floods and high waters in the Pacific Northwest. I must admit, however, that my testimony may not be as complete as it should be.

This is due to the difficulty I have encountered in securing factual information from the Bureau of the Budget and other agencies on the extent of the damage which resulted from the devastating floods of December 1964 and January 1965. I digress for a moment, Mr. Chairman, to make the record crystal clear that the President of the United States, with whom I just talked this morning before I came here, has done everything that he can to be of assistance to the two Senators from Oregon in pushing along action at the executive department level in regard to the flood damage situation in the Pacific Northwest. On one occasion he sent the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to my office personally to talk to me about the situation and to find out what it was that the Senators needed from downtown in order to supply us with the information that we needed to have in order to get congressional action.

Just last week I asked the President to obtain further action from the departments downtown. In fairness to the President, I want to say he immediately requested the information that I sought from the departments. The President of the United States is fully apprised and fully aware of the very serious situation that exists in California and Oregon, and parts of Washington and Idaho.

There is no basis at all for any implication that the President of the United States is not doing everything that he can; there is no basis for any implication that he is not working in complete cooperation with the two Senators from Oregon on this matter.

I have read newspaper stories to the effect that because I may take certain positions on certain matters of policy within this administration, it is affecting the support of this administration in connection with the flood problem. These stories involve gross injustice to the President of the United States. I do not intend to remain silent when that kind of unfair attack is made on my President.

Mr. Chairman, it should be of interest to the committee that the two Senators from Oregon, and several Members of the House, were able to draft and introduce legislation within 2 weeks after the occurrence of the west coast flood disaster. It is not unusual for disasters to occur, although it is unusual to have one as large as the one we experienced on the west coast last December.

Ample precedent for legislation of this type is provided in the Alaska earthquake legislation, and it is no secret that we relied heavily upon that legislation in preparing our bill.

Over 3 months have elapsed since the date of the flood. The Bureau of the Budget, as of last week, had not been able to submit its views on S. 327. At long last, it has come in this morning, just a few minutes ago.

In the meantime, the Federal agencies have been unable to make the necessary long-term plans to go ahead swiftly with work to alleviate the catastrophic damage that swept from the State of Washington well down into California.

A MAJOR FLOOD DISASTER

Before giving the subcommittee an analysis of our bill, I should indicate the nature and extent of this catastrophe. As I pointed out to the Senate on January 6, the floods resulted from usual forces of nature which converged so as to create a condition that was almost unprecedented in the history of the West.

First we had a long hard freeze, which is not at all common in our State. The Willamette Valley, which normally has a relatively mild climate, had a deep hard freeze which extended from the valley far up into the Cascade Range to the east. After this freeze we had what is known as a Chinook wind which carried with it warm air and a heavy volume of water. The sudden rise in temperature brought not only the rain, but melted the heavy snow packs in the mountains.

The water that was formed from the rain and melting snow did not absorb into the ground. It flowed in enormous volume through the watersheds and into the valleys of the Willamette and its tributaries. Similar developments occurred in eastern Oregon. The result was floods of enormous proportions in areas such as the John Day River Basin, the Grande Ronde River, and other major streams of eastern Oregon.

It is to the everlasting credit of the Congress, and particularly the Public Works Committees, that the flood control dams for which we obtained authorizations and appropriations, saved enormous flood losses. For example, the major multipurpose flood control dams in the Willamette River Basin cut 14 feet off crest of the December floodwaters at Eugene, Oreg.; they reduced the crest at Portland by 7 feet.

One major flood of this type can reflect, through flood damages prevented, the cost of an entire system of multipurpose river dams. Had this committee and the Congress not had the wisdom and foresight to provide the State of Oregon with these invaluable dams, I would have relayed a much more somber picture and story of flood damage this morning.

The damage occasioned by the December and January floods was enormous. Here are estimates of the damages suffered by the four western States of Oregon, Washington, California, and Idaho, as supplied by the Office of Emergency Planning on March 29:

	Public	Private	Total
Oregon	$95,000,000	$147,000,000	$242,000,000
Washington	9,000,000	3,000,000	12,000,000
California	140,000,000	60,000,000	200,000,000
Idaho	5,000,000	2,000,000	7,500,000

These California statistics are very important statistics, Mr. Chairman, because of some misinformation that is abroad. Public damage is $140 million, private is $60 million, and the total is $200 million. The Government can come to the aid for emergency repair of damage to public facilities.

Note the total damage of $242 million for Oregon, $147 million of which is damage to private property. California's total damage was $200 million—less than Oregon—but it received more relief than Oregon. Therefore, some who don't want to state the true facts seek to give the impression that the Oregon delegation isn't doing its job because California is getting more money although its total damage is $42 million less than Oregon. The truth is that Oregon's public damage was only $95 million, whereas California's was $140 million. That explains the situation, Mr. Chairman. California isn't getting one bit more on a pro rata basis than Oregon is on damage to public property which qualifies for emergency Federal aid. I want to stress that in my testimony because it has resulted in some misunderstandings in my State with reflections upon the administration on the false charge that they are discriminating against Oregon or in favor of California.

It just isn't so, Mr. Chairman, and let the record so show.

HIGHWAY REHABILITATION

Turning now to an analysis of S. 327, our bill proposes under section 2(a) that Federal share payable from the emergency fund in section 125 of the act shall be 100 percent of the cost of flood damage restoration. As the committee knows, the present authority under the law does not permit emergency contributions to equal, in each instance, the original Federal share of road construction cost.

For example, the original cost of the interstate highway system in Oregon is federally financed to the extent of 92.25 percent. Forest highways are financed at a 100-percent Federal level. My position is that the committee could find it in the public interest to permit up to 100 percent of the cost of highway restoration to be borne by the Federal Government.

In no event, however, should the Federal share be less than the original Federal contribution to the class of road being restored.

The present law relative to the Federal share payable from the emergency fund produces anomalies. For example, if a bridge on an interstate highway had been constructed in Oregon, under the 92.25-percent Federal grant-in-aid and was substantially destroyed in the December flood, the Federal Government would pay only 63.45 percent of the cost of rebuilding the bridge.

The State of Oregon, already staggering under the terrific burden of flood losses, would have to contribute a larger share to the restoration of the bridge than it did for the original cost of the bridge. Section 2(a) of our bill would correct this inequity.

The relief to be provided by section 2(a) is urgently needed, especially when we recall that roads and highways eligible for Federal rehabilitation aid for the States of Oregon, Washington, California, and Idaho, totaled an estimated $114,211,754 in floods of December and January.

As the law now stands, these States would be called upon to make the following payments toward repairs and reconstruction of these highways and roads: Oregon, $6,622,466; Washington, $709,903; California, $9,770,645; Idaho, $522,718; a total of $17,625,732. These States have suffered overwhelming losses in the floods. They should receive help of the type proposed in this bill.

TIMBER PURCHASER ROAD RECONSTRUCTION

Section 2(b) of our bill would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to assist timber purchasers, to the extent he deems appropriate, in the restoration of roads and trials being constructed under timber sales.

The committee should take several factors into account in arriving at the final language of this section. First, whatever authority is granted to the Secretary of Agriculture is also needed by the Secretary of the Interior; I am advised that approximately 225 contracts are involved in flood damage to roads in the process of construction. The estimated damage to these timber-purchaser constructed roads is $1.25 million. This is primarily in western Oregon.

On the national forests, I have been told that there are approximately 334 contracts, 225 involving more than $1,000 damage, where the total road damage is approximately $4 million. I emphasize that in these two situations the only roads involved are those in the process of construction by timber purchasers under timber contracts.

S. 327 does not set standards for the Secretary to use in determining the extent to which he will assist timber purchasers. It would be most agreeable to me and Senator NEUBERGER to have such standards spelled out in the legislation so that a uniform and equitable treatment can be given to all.

We are not competent and qualified to do it. It takes the experts in the Forest Service and the Interior Department and Agriculture Department to do that, Mr. Chairman.

The system used by the Federal agencies in pricing their timber is to reduce the price for their timber by the estimated cost of constructing essential roads.

This is called an allowance by the technical people. The contracts contain no disaster clause and thus, if a timber purchaser suffers a disaster such as this, he is obligated to restore the road out of his own pocket. That isn't fair.

Legally, I suppose the timber purchaser-road contractor would be bound by the strict terms of his contract, but the Government has to do equity, too. We are talking about a disaster and we are talking about timber and access roads owned by people of this country. We have an obligation to these purchasers to be fair and equitable.

The sponsors of S. 327 seek an equitable adjustment, not legal technicalities, in these timber-access roadbuilder cases.

In my discussions with Federal officials and with people in the industry, I find unanimous agreement that they have never before been confronted with a situation of this magnitude. In the past, there have been individual instances of slides or small washouts, but these have usually been quite minor when compared to the areawide catastrophe produced by the winter floods of 1964 and 1965. Consequently, I think that there is a clear case for recognizing that the contracting parties simply never contemplated damage of this sweep and magnitude.

In my opinion it would be fair and reasonable to provide substantial assistance to the timber purchaser-road contractors. These roads, are in effect, to be paid for out of Federal timber and are the property of the Federal Government. They will continue to be useful to the Federal Government in the management of its forests, in future sales of timber, for protection and other uses of forest lands such as fire roads. The roads on these lands will continue to be used by the Federal Government in the years ahead. Thus, there is a direct Federal interest in these roads.

This, I think, justifies doing equity to the private builders of these roads who are the purchasers of the timber. They have to build the roads to get the timber out. Where the timber purchaser has undertaken the construction of one of these roads as required by his contract, and all or a portion of the road under construction has been washed out, he has used up the allowance in the timber appraisal and should not be expected to shoulder the full burden of flood restoration.

Thus I believe that an excellent case can be made for substantial allowances to timber purchasers for rehabilitation of flood-damaged roads on Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management roads.

It was my intent that any damage restored by the timber purchaser prior to the enactment of this legislation would be eligible for compensation as damage restored after the enactment of this bill.

There is some question as to whether S. 327 makes that point clear. Therefore, I suggest that, when the committee gets to this bill, it adopt clarifying language. Failure to specify that rehabilitation work undertaken prior to the enactment of this law would be the subject of compensation to the timber purchaser-road contractor, could penalize the timber purchaser who restored the road promptly.

This would be inequitable. Of course, the arrangements for compensation should require substantiated evidence upon which the Secretaries could reach their determinations of the estimated value of work claimed to have been performed.

I have been told that some Federal officials suggest a 50-percent compensation for damaged timber-purchaser roads and that the first $1,000 of the cost be absorbed by the timber purchaser. This appears to be rooted in part in a new section proposed for Forest Service contracts.

I view both components of this suggestion as clear examples of parsimony and would urge that the committee carefully study their impact. It might be preferable to have the committee authorize and direct the Secretaries to pick up in full the first thousand dollars in damage. This requirement that purchasers absorb the first thousand dollars could work a hardship on small business operators because they don't have the finances, they don't have the operation and, of course, they don't have the investment either. It is going to be pretty tough on them if they have to pay the first thousand.

As to the balance where the damage is great, the committee should weigh the impact that only a 50-percent reimbursement will have. Here, one test should be the measure of damage. The timber purchasers have kept their contracts as far as the road allowance is concerned. An act of God has occurred. The roads they built have been washed out.

It is unfair to say, "All right, we are going to hold you to the technical requirements of the contract. Rebuild the road," which means that all you are saying to them in many instances is that as far as this particular purchase is concerned you are going to lose your shirts. I don't think that we should take advantage of a disaster by producing that effect.

To me, the salient point is that the road allowance has been used. Where this occurs, and if there is a subsequent Federal need for the road, the allowance should, in effect, be reinstated to a substantial degree.

It has been suggested by some that the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior have ample authority to make, through administrative determinations, equitable adjustments for timber operators, who restore flood-damaged roads. If the committee should decide that this authority exists and that an amendment such as that suggested in section 2(b) is unnecessary, a statement to that effect in its report on this proposed legislation would be helpful.

As this point, Mr. Chairman, I submit, for inclusion in the record, materials which have been furnished to me by various associations, firms, and individuals in the timber industry. I believe the suggestions contained therein warrant careful study. I ask that they be inserted in the record.

Senator RANDOLPH. That will be done, sir.

(The exhibits referred to follow:)

INDUSTRIAL FORESTRY ASSOCIATION,
Portland, Oreg., January 18, 1965.

Re S. 327 and H.R. 798

To: Oregon, Washington, California, and Idaho Congressional Delegations.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Your attention is invited to the attached memorandum to Senator MORSE which is identical to a telegram sent to Senator NEUBERGER and similar to one sent to Representative HAROLD T. JOHNSON.

We urge your full support of S. 327 and H.R. 798, with consideration of the broadening we have suggested in our memorandum to Senator MORSE for helping us get restoration of the forest access road system in the three Pacific coast States and Idaho to minimize the effect of the recent disastrous floods upon our economy. More than 400,000 people depend upon the forest industry for their livelihood in these States, and to the extent that access has been impaired it lessens our chances of keeping people on their jobs. In this disaster we need the same kind of support that we in the Northwest gave to the people of Alaska during their tragedy of last year.

Appreciating your assistance, I am,
Very truly yours,
W. D. HAGENSTEIN,
Executive Vice President.

JANUARY 16, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your introduction of S. 327 on heels of disastrous flood to help restore access to timber harvesting operations promptly is most appreciated. Our industry employs 80,000 people with a $450 million annual payroll in Oregon alone. We generate 60 percent of State's economy. Government owns two-thirds of Oregon timber. Our industry, as part of its Government timber sale contracts, builds roads worth $27 million annually on national forests and $9 million on BLM lands. When floods hit, hundreds of timber sale purchasers had roads in all stages of construction. Slides, washouts, and high water damaged or destroyed hundreds of miles of such roads, thousands of culverts, hundreds of bridges, and removed surfacing. Total damage not known yet because many flooded areas are covered with heavy snow. Under existing timber sale contracts operator has responsibility for repair of normal winter damage and does it at his own expense. But because of catastrophic flood damage, if he were required to restore roads or perform extraordinary maintenance it will burden him with additional costs which will jeopardize his operation and the jobs of his employees.

We vigorously support your bill. To carry out its obvious intent to get a maximum number of flooded-out industrial workers back on the job in the shortest time by restoration of access to Government forests we want to suggest you consider broadening section 2(b) of your bill to vest identical authority in both Agriculture and Interior as follows: "The Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior are authorized, with funds and authorizations available to them respectively for the construction and maintenance of roads and trails on lands administered by them, to undertake either directly or in cooperation with timber purchasers, provisions of existing timber sale contracts notwithstanding, to restore or reconstruct to such extent as they deem appropriate any roads and trails which were in the process of construction by purchasers of timber from lands administered by the Secretaries and which were destroyed or severely damaged by the floods of December 1964 and January 1965."

We also suggest you consider broadening section 2(d) to provide equal coverage for Agriculture and Interior and to cover situations where the agencies have cooperative road agreements with other landowners. We are suggesting here that section 120(f), title 23, read in the pertinent part: "*Provided further,* That the Federal share payable on account of any repair or reconstruction of highways, roads, or trails on lands of the United States administered by the Secretaries of Agriculture or Interior or on other lands over which the United States holds easements, permits, or other rights of use for the benefit of such lands of the United States, provisions of existing cooperative road agreements notwithstanding, may amount to 100 percent of the cost thereof, whether or not such highways, roads, or trails are on any Federal-aid highway system," etc. Further, we would suggest the following for amendment of section 125(c): "The Secretary may expend funds from the emergency fund herein authorized, either independently or in cooperation with any other branch of the Government, State agency, organization, or person, for the repair or reconstruction of highways, roads, or trails on lands of the United States administered by the Secretaries of Agriculture or Interior or on other lands over which the United States holds easements, permits, or other rights of use for the benefit of such lands of the United States, provisions of existing cooperative road agreements notwithstanding, whether or not such highways, roads, or trails are on any of the Federal-aid highway systems."

We have discussed addition of language for coverage of cooperative road agreements with local officials of Forest Service and BLM. They are in substantive agreement with our suggestion. We are sending an identical telegram to Senator NEUBERGER and a similar one to Congressman JOHNSON suggesting he incorporate your section 2(d), as broadened by our suggestion thereto herein in H.R. 798. The flood is a disaster of greater impact on Oregon's economy than the Columbus Day windstorm of 1962. We need the same cooperative attitude on the part of the Government, industry, and all citizens now, as then, to repair the damage with the goal of getting everyone back to work in the shortest possible time.

PAUL F. EHRINGER,
President, Industrial Forestry Association.

LAW OFFICES, MCLEAN, KLINGBERG,
HOUSTON & BERGMAN,
Longview, Wash., January 19, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Hon. MAURINE NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE AND SENATOR NEUBERGER: As you know, I am one of the attorneys representing International Paper Co. on the west coast, and I am writing you at the request of Mr. A. J. Sandoz, manager of Woodlands, Long-Bell Division, International Paper Co., Longview, Wash.

You promptly recognized the scope and severity of the problem by the introduction of S. 327. Large and small operators are involved and there will be a serious impact on some communities if logging and milling operations must be curtailed because of short log supplies resulting from impeded access.

There has been major damage or destruction of roads and bridges. It is so extensive that it is catastrophic, similar to that of the Alaska earthquake of last year. The cost of restoration, replacement, or repair is so great that it cannot be borne by private operators—in some manner it must be absorbed by the Federal Government.

We are suggesting that the scope of S. 327 be broadened to cover these situations:

(1) A purchaser of Government timber is required, by the terms of his timber sales contract, to construct certain roads. The road is substantially damaged by flood after construction is completed or was "in the process of construction" within the meaning of section 2(b) of S. 327. The Government should bear the loss attributable to flood catastrophy. S. 327 now appears to restrict relief to roads "in the process of construction." In the interest of speed, the legislation should also provide that the Government could negotiate for reconstruction and repair rather than be required to put the contract up for bids.

(2) A landowner and the Government (U.S. Forest Service) have entered into a cooperative road agreement under which the Government is the owner of a road and one or more landowners have paid for a share of the road either by payment of cash or constructing a portion of it. Such arrangements exist in the States of Washington, Oregon, and California. In these situations where the Government is the proprietor of the road, it should bear the disaster loss.

(3) A landowner and the Government (Bureau of Land Management) have entered into a joint road agreement, under which the Government has a perpetual easement to the road and is the owner of it. The road was constructed with Federal appropriated funds. The landowner who conveyed the easement has agreed that its share of the road cost is a specified sum and that, until such sum is paid, it will continue to pay a road amortization fee, plus interest. In this situation also, the Government is the road proprietor. It should restore the road at its expense. The landowner would still be obligated to pay its share of the investment, but some provision should be made for waiver of interest.

In order to accomplish these suggestions, it would be necessary to amend S. 327 to establish congressional authority for the release of such road debts or obligations. Additionally, it might be advisable to strengthen the language by specifying in the statute the policy of such forgiveness. As now written, the heads of departments and agencies are granted only discretionary power.

Attached is a draft of an amendment to cover the release feature outlined above.

Certain amendments have already been suggested.

Industrial Forestry Association of Portland has recommended that S. 327 be expanded to give the same power to the Secretary of the Interior to apply to lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management. This is desirable.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter so important to your State.

Sincerely yours,

JUDSON T. KLINGBERG.

AMENDMENT TO S. 327 AND H.R. 798

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to compromise or release such portion of any person's obligation to pay for or build any forest road, trail, or bridge in California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho under an agreement, easement or permit to or from the U.S. Forest Service as he finds necessary because of the loss, destruction, or damage thereof or thereto, resulting from floods and high water during December 1964 and January 1965.

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to compromise or release such portion of any person's obligation to pay for or build any forest road, trail, or bridge in California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho under an agreement, easement or permit to or from the Bureau of Land Management, or any other agency under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, as he finds necessary because of the loss, destruction or damage thereof or thereto, resulting from floods and high water during December 1964 and January 1965.

SOUTH COAST LUMBER CO.,
Brookings, Oreg., March 8, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We understand that there will soon be hearings held in Washington on legislation designed to provide funds to the Department of Agriculture, U.S. Forest Service, for the repair of road damage that occurred during the recent severe Christmas floods.

Our company is located in Brookings, Oreg., and our main Forest Service timber comes from the Siskiyou National Forest, though we do operate some in the Sixes River National Forest as well. In our dealings in these two forests we work with four separate ranger districts.

The road damage falls into two general classifications, that is damage to access roads leading into sale areas (Government roads) and damage to roads required to be built by the successful bidders on Forest Service sales (operator roads). In the latter category, there are many in-process sales where operator road damage is extensive. Forest Service takes the attitude that there are simply no funds available for the repair of such damage and that the repairs must be made by and at the expense of the operators. Actually, this pushes the overall road cost to the point where it is intolerable for the operator. In those instances where the Government roads leading into the sale area are damaged, there is a special operator problem. Forest Service advises us that it has no presently available funds to make repairs. If the operator has to get into the sale area to remove the logs, Forest Service will usually generously allow him entry but at his own expense. Operators simply don't have the money to repair Government roads simply to get access.

The above problems are further compounded by the price-adjustment provisions in the standard U.S. Forest Service contract. For example, in our case, we have two or three sales where we would presently be removing substantial quantities of timber at a base price computed from last quarter of 1964 figures. However, since we cannot get into our sale areas because of the road problems we are not able to remove the logs. By the time the roads are repaired, the base price then will be adjusted to reflect prices in effect for the first quarter of 1965 which was higher. This will substantially increase our overall stumpage costs. This cost squeeze is caused solely by the failure of Forest Service to reopen their Government roads into the sale areas and allow us to come in and complete our contracts. This seems grossly unfair to us.

May we respectfully suggest that a disaster of this magnitude justifies the appropriation of funds in a sufficient amount to allow the Forest Service not only to promptly repair the damage to the Government's roads but also provide funds to reimburse operators for the catastrophic losses on sale access roads.

Our company is one of the two major employers in the entire county. We employ between 150 and 200 people and we feel a real obligation not only to our employees but to our town to keep in continuous operation. At the present time we are down to about a 30-day log supply and our problem of getting into sale areas seems no closer to solution than it did 2 months ago. Anything that could be done by you to help us would be most sincerely appreciated.

Very truly yours,

C. L. FALLERT, *President.*

OREGON LOGGING CONFERENCE,
Eugene, Oreg., March 8, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The 27th annual session of the Oregon Logging Conference, membership in excess of 1,850, in meeting on February 26, 1965, at Eugene, Oreg., unanimously passed the following resolution:

"FLOOD DAMAGE

"Whereas the December 1964 flood damaged forest access roads in excess of $100 million in Oregon and the President of the United States declared this a disaster area.

"Whereas, it is vital, to insure a continuous healthy economy in the State, that the damaged roads be repaired immediately to facilitate the transportation of logs to the processing centers.

"Whereas it is essential these damaged roads be immediately repaired to provide adequate fire protection during the 1965 fire season: Be it

"*Resolved,* That the Oregon Logging Conference urge the Oregon congressional delegation to press for quick passage of S. 327 and H.R. 798, with amendments to include lands administration under the Bureau of Land Management."

Very truly yours,

ROBERT CROSS,
Secretary-Manager.

CUDDEBACK LUMBER CO.,
Eugene, Oreg., February 12, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing you in regard to money needed by the Forest Service to repair damages caused by the recent flood. As you probably know, the economy of this area is strongly effected by lumber. I feel sure the Government will eventually allow enough money to get things going properly, but I am concerned because I don't think many people in Government realize the speed that is needed to get things going. The Forest Service has done a good job of getting things going so far, but unless you can get them the money they need now, their program will bog down, and in turn, this will hurt all who are dependent on Forest Service timber.

Knowing that you and Congressman ROBERT DUNCAN are people who get things done when necessary, I am writing to you, feeling sure you will investigate and get things going.

Thanks and keep up the good work.

Very truly yours,

S. A. CUDDEBACK.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 20, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of the board of directors of the Portland Chamber of Commerce I urgently request your help in getting prompt action on S. 327 and H.R. 798. We fully endorse the broadening of these bills as suggested by Oregon's forest industry. Unless we get Oregon's forest road system repaired by spring, unemployment will surely result.

D. E. ABRAM,
President, Portland Chamber of Commerce.

COUNTY OF COOS,
Coquille, Oreg., February 9, 1965.
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to express our thanks to you for the prompt action you have taken for us in Washington to speed up the repairs on timber access and other roads, severely damaged by the December and January floods in Western United States.

The county judges and commissioners of the O. & C. counties met in Portland on Friday, February 5, 1965, and agreed to allow the Bureau of Land Management to dip into planned moneys for recreation and some extended roads to hurry the repairs on damaged access roads to get logs moving before more mills have to shut down.

There are areas in the State now that are unable to get needed supplies of timber. Hope you will be able to get sufficient facts to speed up the needed appropriations for restoring these roads.

Thanks again for the good work.

Yours sincerely,
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
CHARLES W. MAHAFFY,
Commissioner.
J. J. GEANEY,
Chairman.

PUBLISHERS PAPER CO.,
Oregon City, Oreg., January 19, 1965.
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have read with much interest H.R. 798, introduced on January 4, 1965, by HAROLD T. JOHNSON, to make funds available for the restoration of flood-damaged areas of the States of Calfornia, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, and have likewise reviewed comparable measure S. 327, introduced by yourself and Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER. The contents of both bills were reviewed further by a special committee of industry, of which we are a member, with representatives of the U.S. Forest Service and of the Bureau of Land Management.

The net result of these meetings led to proposed amendments which have been submitted under the name of the Industrial Forestry Association, of which we are a member, and which amendments we would encourage be regarded as appropriate supplements to this legislation. We cannot overemphasize the urgency of getting this legislation passed, making it possible for the areas affected to be restored to their normal economy, which undoubtedly was the basic reason for the legislation being introduced. A good portion of raw material requirement comes out of the Mount Hood area which was hit very hard. Progress reported by the public agencies in road restoration to main arteries is very encouraging but the funds necessary to go beyond and bypass existing contracts for necessary restoration of roads now under construction is imperative.

You are to be commended for your immediate and forthright approach to the problem, which we are hopeful can be promptly passed by Congress.

Respectfully yours,
HENRY E. BALDRIDGE,
Timberlands Manager.

ASSOCIATION OF OREGON COUNTIES,
Salem, Oreg, January 19, 1965.
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The executive committee of this association met Sunday and adopted a resolution in support of S. 327 and similar legislation introduced in the House.

We sincerely appreciate the efforts of our congressional delegation in securing increased Federal participation in the repair of flood damage to our country roads and bridges.

Sincerely yours,
KENNETH C. TOLLENAAR,
Executive Secretary.

REPAIR OF COOPERATIVE TIMBER ROADS

Senator MORSE. Some of the materials I have submitted for the record suggest an amendment to our bill which would provide that where there are cooperative timber road agreements, the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior should shoulder 100 percent of the cost of restoration of such cooperative roads.

I would point out to the committee that these roads are cooperatively constructed and used by the Federal agencies and private timber companies. The normal method of computing the share of costs on such roads is to relate it to the benefits each obtains from the agreement. The usual measure is the proportion of timber each party has.

Thus, if a road serves an area where the Federal timber is 60 percent of the volume and the private timber 40 perecnt of the volume, costs and road maintenance are shared on this basis. Of course, there are many special provisions which occur when, from time to time, one party or the other makes heavy use of a road. In such cases the maintenance cost is related to its use.

It is my position that the Federal Government has an obligation to share in the restoration of these cooperator roads but I believe that equity would be done if the Federal contribution were held to the terms of the original agreement. To do more, when unrelated to a directly measured Federal benefit, would be to award a subsidy to the private land owner. In an original agreement that involves 60 percent Federal and 40 percent private cost of the road, the rehabilitation costs should be borne on a 60–40 basis.

The suggestion that the Federal Government assume 100 percent of the cost of repairing or reconstructing these cooperator roads, would only have my support as part of a general Federal policy which would give a 100-percent Federal grant to other segments of the private economy suffering from floods disasters such as store owners, homeowners and business, farmers and people who suffered disaster losses generally.

Section 2(c) of our bill would increase the emergency fund to $200 million for the period ending July 1, 1966. The Bureau of Public Roads has requested an increase in the limitation to provide for $80 million for fiscal year 1965 and $50 million annually thereafter.

If the committee should determine that the Bureau's request is completely adequate to provide emergency funds sufficient to take care of the situation in the Pacific Northwest and other probable developments, I would support the recommendation by the Secretary of Commerce.

However, the committee may wish to raise this limitation so as to cover fully all possible contingencies.

Section 2(d) of our bill would expand the types of roads upon which emergency funds can be expended.

In lieu of the language in S. 327, I would suggest that the committee consider the possibility of amending sections 120(f) and 125(c) of title 23, United States Code, by inserting after the words, "forest development roads and trails," the following: "highways, roads, and trails on lands administered by the Secretary of Interior."

This language would be in lieu of the phrase, "park roads and trails, and Indian reservation roads,". This would continue the use of these funds for these two classes of roads and would add the other roads on public lands, wildlife refuge, and other special classes of land administered by the Secretary of the Interior.

This seems to me to be a simpler and briefer way of stating the availability of the emergency fund since all of the roads represent Federal responsibility, being on Federal land.

OTHER PROVISIONS OF S. 327

The balance of S. 327 relates to programs coming within the jurisdiction of the Farmers Home Administration, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Small Business Administration.

It is my understanding that the Senate Public Works Committee, when it gets this bill referred to it, prefers to have these special topics reviewed by the respective committees of the Senate having primary jurisdiction over the subjects of the remaining sections of our bill. Therefore I have confined my statement to the portions of our bill which come clearly within the jurisdiction of this committee, although the bill isn't before you yet, the amount of money involved in it is similar, in fact, identical, to the amount of money involved in S. 1638.

I want you to know I appreciated the opportunity to have presented this statement on behalf of an extremely important segment of the flood-stricken State of Oregon and I know that the subcommittee and its very able chairman will give thorough and sympathetic consideration to the requests made herein.

As I close I ask that a press release of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads approving California and Oregon flood repair projects be inserted in the record. I call your attention to just one item because it so clearly buttresses what I have testified to here this morning.

The Bureau of Roads says normally the Federal share of the California projects would be $1,144,739. The forest highway project costs involve 100 percent Federal grants, while the Federal share of the others is 59.78 percent of the cost. However, Mr. Whitton said, only 5 percent of the total cost can now be made available for the work because the Bureau's emergency relief fund is almost depleted.

As a result, he said, California's allotment of Federal funds is $74,250. Oregon, which ordinarily would receive a 100-percent Federal grant for its $434,000 forest highway projects, now gets 5 percent or $21,700.

(The press release referred to follows:)

"U.S. BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS APPROVES CALIFORNIA-OREGON FLOOD-REPAIR PROJECTS

"Six projects to repair flood-damaged highway facilities in California at a total cost of $1,485,000, and four to repair damage in Oregon at a cost of $434,000 have been approved by the U.S. Department of Commerce's Bureau of Public Roads, Federal Highway Administrator Rex M. Whitton said today.

"Both States suffered heavy highway damage last December when struck by floods.

"Two of the California projects are on State Route 96, a forest highway in Humboldt County. One calls for fixing approaches and replacing a bridge over Willow Creek at a cost of $306,000, and the other for repairs to 6 miles of roadway from the bridge to the boundary of the Hoopa Indian Reservation at a cost of $333,000.

"The other four projects are in Mendocino County. Three of them on secondary routes will cost an estimated $726,000. The fourth is on State Route 128, a primary highway, and consists of repairing intermittent sections of 35 miles of roadway at a cost of $120,000.

"The four Oregon projects are on forest highways. Two of them in Jackson County are on State Routes 62 and 227 and call for repair of sections along 30 miles of roadway at a cost of $293,000. The third project provides for repairing two bridges and fixing roadway on U.S. Route 26 in Wheeler and Crook Counties at a cost of $130,000. The fourth is in Josephine County and calls for repairs to roadway and one bridge on U.S. Route 199 at a cost of $11,000.

"Normally, the Federal share of the California projects would be $1,144,739. The forest highway project costs are 100-percent Federal grants, while the Federal share of the others is 59.78 percent of the cost. However, Mr. Whitton said, only 5 percent of the total cost can now be made available for the work because the Bureau's emergency relief fund is almost depleted. As a result, he said, California's allotment of Federal funds is $74,250. Oregon which ordinarily would receive a 100-percent Federal grant for its $434,000 forest highway project now gets 5 percent or $21,700.

"Mr. Whitton said an agreement had been reached between the Bureau of Public Roads and both States for the latter to accept the 5 percent so that repairs could begin immediately. If Congress should authorize more money, he added, the States would receive additional funds.

"A continuing emergency fund $30 million annually is provided the Bureau of Public Roads by Congress to repair highway facilities damaged by natural disasters to such an extent as to tax a State's resources. Because of the heavy losses suffered this fiscal year from disaster by a number of States, nearly all the money in the fund has been disbursed.

"The newest allotments bring to $3,968,970 the amount of Federal money Oregon has received since the floods struck. California has received $1,359,500."

Senator Morse. I don't ring a bell of alarm, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee. I just state a reality. The fact is, unless we get the authorizations so that these funds and these Government departments can be replenished and from the authorizations get the appropriations we are going to have this 5-percent treatment of a dire emergency confronting the economy of my State and California and Washington and Idaho.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee, I cannot impress too strongly upon this committee that men are out of work. Do you know why they are out of work? Because damaged roads leading into the mills make it impossible to get the timber in there so that the logs can be processed.

This damage is just unbelievable unless you go out there and see with your own eyes. Now, the two Senators from Alaska were in the same position last year that the two Senators from Oregon are in this year. They pleaded, too. Mr. Chairman, I will go down on my knees and crawl on my stomach if it will help speed up help for my State.

May I say respectfully and ask how long do you think it will take to get emergency funds to Chile? How long did it take to get them to Chile during the last earthquake? They are not confronted with the kinds of checks we are confronted with when we are trying to relieve domestic disasters in the United States.

I am for those checks. I am for applying them to foreign aid, too. That is another question. But the point needs to be driven home. May I say, most respectfully to you as my colleagues, we have a duty to speed up the action here, to get this relief for these States in the Pacific Northwest, because they have a claim upon the Congress morally. They have a claim upon the Congress equitably. Also, when you assist in this disaster you help the economy of the entire United States.

I want to thank you, very much. I will be glad to take any questions you wish to give me.

Senator Randolph. Senator Morse, you have addressed the members of the Subcommittee on Public Roads with your characteristic vigor and knowledgeability. We realize with you the urgency of this problem. That is why we have proceeded as we have today and will continue to give the degree of urgency which we believe this matter deserves as we consider testimony which you have given and that which will be given by other witnesses.

I think it important for the record to reflect that S. 327, which you have introduced for yourself and for your colleague, Mrs. Neuberger, has been referred to the Senate Public Works Committee, but has not been referred to its Subcommittee on Public Roads, the reason being that we have awaited certain administration reports for which we have been pressing heavily.

Senator Morse. You have been very cooperative and I want the record to show that.

Senator Randolph. Thank you. I have introduced S. 1638 which goes to the same subject matter.

I realize the schedule the Senator from Oregon has today. I am privileged to work under his leadership in the Senate Subcommittee on Education and it is difficult to be in two places at one time. But you are the chairman and I understand the necessity for you to go to that subcommittee. I will not, therefore, ask questions.

Senator Morse. I will be very glad to be recalled at the convenience of the committee, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Randolph. If it seems that later it would be helpful to you and the members of the subcommittee and then ultimately to the committee, we would want to have the opportunity of going into these matters further. I want the record to reflect also, I think I can speak for all members of the subcommittee in this instance, that we appreciate the leadership of the senior Senator from Oregon in this important matter.

We know the degree of guidance that he can give to us in understanding the facts in this matter. I am hopeful that we may bring this situation to the attention of the committee in executive session next week.

Senator Morse. I appreciate that.

Senator Randolph. Other matters, of course, will enter into that hoped-for answer to the plea which is made by the Senator this morning. I am sure that the Senators sitting with me want to accommodate the Senator from Oregon.

Senator Cooper—the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Public Roads as well as of the Committee on Public Works—has a brief statement which he would like to make before going to another committee meeting. Other members realizing your obligation would withhold. We may have written questions.

Before you leave, Senator Cooper will make a statement.

Senator Morse. I will be happy to hear the statement.

Senator Cooper. I beg your indulgence because I must go to a Committee on Agriculture where we are voting on a bill; we are trying to get a quorum. Before I leave, though, I just want to say all of us were shocked by the terrible tragedy of the floods in Oregon, California, Washington, and Idaho, and the Western States last year. I will agree with my chairman and the members of this subcommittee that I think we are under a duty to act quickly and to assist these States.

I would like to say to you that I think you are to be commended for your usual diligence and promptness in introducing legislation last year after this tragic flood. We also remember your strong fight for the construction of dams on the Willamette River, which at least had some effect in alleviating this damage. I think we do want you back to explain to us in more detail your position on the private roads, because as you have stated there is no legislation which envisaged this awful tragedy and disaster and there are inequities involved.

I hope I can get back to hear some of the other witnesses but I did want to say this about the fine work of our colleague.

Senator Morse. I welcome the opportunity to come back and, again, thank you from the bottom of my heart for this courtesy.

Senator Randolph. Thank you. I think I may say for Senators Moss and Bayh we are conscious of the problem you have this morning. We all feel the need to move this legislation forward and we believe it is imperative to do so.

Thank you, very much.

(Subsequently the following communication was received from Senator Morse:)

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1965.

Hon. Jennings Randolph,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Roads, Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: On April 1 when I testified on S. 327, I told you I would examine carefully the reports submitted by the Bureau of the Budget, and the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and Commerce with respect to certain sections of my bill. I studied these reports and I appreciated having the benefit of the views of the agencies, but in all candor I should indicate that I cannot agree with them on a number of matters of primary importance to the flood-stricken States of the west coast. I am particularly concerned over the lack of any real assistance contained in the administration's proposed formula to allegedly provide relief to timber purchasers holding contracts for road construction where substantial road damage has occurred due to the floods and storms of last winter. The formula proposed by the administration is even worse than the original suggestions I mentioned in my testimony of April 1.

The position I take is that we should have a consistency, a uniformity of position, on these highway and road rehabilitation grants which are related to the west coast flood disaster. On ABC road repairs the law now permits a full 100-percent grant of the original Federal share of the cost (63.45 percent in Oregon) of the road. On the Interstate System I proposed a full 100-percent repair grant of the original Federal share of the cost (92.25 percent in Oregon) rather than the 63.45 percent which is now authorized under the law. On forest highways I propose a full 100-percent grant on repair work equivalent to the original 100-percent Federal contribution. On timber purchaser roads needed for long-term public forest management, I urge reimbursement to purchasers equal to 100 percent of the original allowance less the estimated profit and risk allowance factor in the timber appraisal.

Section B5.233 of the new proposed Forest Service contract includes a full adjustment provision, except that the first $1 per thousand board feet up to a limit of 3 million board feet per contract ($3,000) will be borne by the timber purchasers, and no loss under $1,000 will be adjusted. This $1,000 concept is burdensome on small business and I question its use. For the subcommittee's information I quote sections B5.233 and B5.234 of the March 8, 1965, draft of the proposed Forest Service contract:

"B5.223—Cost Adjustment for Physical Change.—If prior to approval, under B5.24, a major physical change, such as slide, washout, landslip, or fire, not due to negligence of purchaser, results in additional work by purchaser with an estimated cost (1) of more than $1,000 for sales under 1 million board feet, or (2) of more than $1 per thousand board feet for sales of 1 to 3 million board feet, or (3) of more than $3,000 for sales over 3 million board feet, the estimated cost of construction in table 6 shall be revised.

"In such event, construction specifications and drawings may be revised when necessary to meet the new conditions and such revised estimates and drawings shall be calculated by Forest Service using unit rates comparable with those used in the preparation or revision of table 6.

"B5.234—Design Change.—If purchaser and Forest Service agree on changes of a substantial nature in location or design of roads or other development facilities specified in table 5, estimated costs in table 6 shall be revised to the estimated cost resulting from such location or design change."

I can understand the desirability of a percentage deduction from a portion of the damage that the Government will not absorb. Although a 15-percent deduction of this type has been suggested to the subcommittee I would not venture to offer my judgment on such a technical matter as to the exact percentage that would be appropriate. However, I feel that equity and commonsense suggest the following approach:

For those roads which have future and continuing value to the Federal Government for the management of its lands, the timber purchaser road contractor should receive reimbursement equal to the damage that occured plus the cost, without a profit, for the additional work required due to a relocation made necessary by the flood.

This proposal will treat large and small firms alike, large and small damage alike, and does no more than reconstitute the original allowance without profit and risk while similarly covering situations wherever additional work is needed. I am attaching computations outlining this approach, which my office has worked up based on the examples furnished on pages 5, 6, and 7 of the testimony of Mr. W. D. Hagenstein, executive vice president of the Industrial Forestry Association of Portland, Oreg. For the sake of convenience I have rounded out to even numbers the figures supplied by Mr. Hagenstein. I have used the 15-percent cost and risk figure, but I offer it only as an example.

In this connection I submit for the consideration of the subcommittee a draft of language which amends the administration's proposal on this topic as contained in the Bureau of the Budget's letter of March 31, 1965, to Chairman McNamara of the Senate Public Works Committee on S. 327:

"Notwithstanding provisions of existing contracts, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, separately, may, with funds and authorizations available to him for the construction and maintenance of highways, roads, and trails, provide for the restoration, reconstruction, and completion of highways, roads, or trails, and for reimbursement of timber sale contractors for such work performed prior to the effective date of this act, on lands administered by the Secretary in Oregon, Washington, California, and Idaho, if the highways, roads, or trails were constructed but not accepted by the Government, or were in the process of construction under the terms of a timber sale contract, and if the highways, roads, or trails were damaged or destroyed by the floods of December 1964, January and February 1965. The estimated cost of restoration, reconstruction, and completion of the damaged or destroyed portion, as determined by the Secretary, shall be borne as follows: The timber purchaser shall bear (a) the estimated cost of the original uncompleted work, as determined by the Secretary, on the portion of the highway, road, or trail damaged or destroyed, and (b) an amount equal to the first 15 percent of the estimated cost incurred prior to the floods on the damaged or destroyed portion of the highway, road or trail. [prior to the floods.] The Secretary shall bear the balance [next $1,000] of the estimated cost of restoration, reconstruction, and completion. [, and the Secretary shall bear 50 percent of the remaining estimated costs.] This section shall not apply where the estimated cost of restoration, reconstruction, or completion is less than $500." (Old language bracketed.)

With reference to the problem of cooperative roads used by the Government and private timber operators, my office was pleased to learn from the Forest Service, after I testified on April 1, that it has entered into agreements with almost all road cooperators who suffered damages. These agreements reflect the cost-sharing proposals set forth in my testimony of April 1 where I pointed out that, in my opinion, equity would be done "if the Federal contribution were held to the terms of the original agreement." I am also advised the Bureau of Land Management will be able to proceed similarly. This demonstrates, in my opinion, the reasonableness of the approach I suggested on the problem of damage to roads jointly serving public and private timber under agreements.

In conclusion, I wish to express again to the chairman and the members of the Public Roads Subcommittee my deep appreciation for the very fair and courteous hearing which they gave me on April 1. I am particularly grateful for the chairman's assurance and those of his colleagues on the subcommittee that every effort will be made to take prompt action on the subject of S. 327. Oregon and other Western States have suffered tremendously due to the floods of last winter and I can assure the subcommittee and the full committee that whatever action they take to assist the flood-stricken Western States will be deeply appreciated by the people of those areas and those who represent them in the Congress of the United States.

Best personal regards,

Sincerely,

Wayne Morse.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I intend to assure that this program of flood repair gets moving.

I have two questions to ask the Senator from Rhode Island. First, am I to understand that the reason or a major reason for the cut of $2 million in this bill in regard to this matter is because the Committee on Appropriations found the failure to spend these funds which had already been obligated for flood disaster?

Mr. PASTORE. I am informed that receipts available for road repairs have increased $2,300,000. The estimate for the work was $8,320,000, which I assume includes work which has been elaborated upon by the Senator from Oregon. That was $8,320,000. The House allowed $6,320,000 which was a cut of $2 million. But with added receipts of $2,300,000, which is added revenue, there is no excuse for not doing this work.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator. My second question is: I am correct, am I not, in my understanding that in January or shortly thereafter, there will be another supplemental appropriation bill before Congress, and if a case can be made for funds, there will be an opportunity to make a case then?

Mr. PASTORE. Just as surely as the sun will rise tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. My colleagues know that I am not given to flattery. However, I want to tell the Senator from Rhode Island that I think he handled this bill in a magnificent fashion, and I thank him for the manner in which he handled it.

If I were on the Appropriations Committee, although I would like to have funds for my State, I would vote as I know the Senator from Rhode Island votes.

I never asked for funds when we did not have a case for funds. A case cannot be made for funds when there is a jackpot of unexpended funds which the Department of Interior has to carry out its obligations.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Rhode Island.

I direct the attention of the Senator to the committee report, under the heading of Urban Renewal Administration on page 12. I commend the Senator and his associates for recommending that there be stricken the proviso limiting to $1.5 million the amount available for rehabilitation grants, and limiting to $75 million the amount available for code enforcement grants.

The Senator will recall that 15 Senators appeared before the subcommittee with a statement, which I had the honor to present on their behalf, requesting the committee to strike this language in the appropriation bill.

I strongly commend the committee for taking this action and I urge the Senator from Rhode Island to stand firm when the matter is brought to conference.

I call attention to page 12, Urban Planning Grants, and point out that the committee has, to some extent, complied with the request of the 15 Senators who presented the statement by increasing by $3,675,000, the amount of grants provided for in the House bill.

I regret very much that the Senate committee felt unable to provide the entire amount requested by the administration. However, the action which was taken is a definite improvement, and I hope that the conferees will stand firm.

As to the next subhead, "Open Space Land Grants," I am happy, indeed, to see, possibly in part because of the action taken by 15 Senators, that the Senate committee has increased to $36 million the $26,975,000 appropriation provided in the House bill. There is no program which is in more active administration in the whole housing field today than the open space land-grant program. It is important for the future health and well being of the residents of our cities. Again, I regret that the entire amount requested could not be provided. I hope, though, that the Senate will stand firm in conference.

Finally, in connection with the grants for neighborhood facilities, on page 13, I am happy to see that the Senate committee, possibly influenced to some extent by the statement of the 15 Senators, has increased the House allowance from $9 million to $15 million. To my way of thinking, these neighborhood facilities are one of the most civilizing influences in the whole urban development program. These provisions of the law enable day care centers, health centers, and other neighborhood facilities to be built with Federal assistance. Such facilities do much to upgrade the whole level of living in urban communities.

Again, I thank the Senator for what he did for all of us. We urged an increase in appropriations, and we sincerely hope that the Senator from Rhode Island will stand firm in conference. We hope further that when the regular appropriation bill comes before the Senate next year, it will contain more adequate funding for these facilities.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that we would have liked to do more, but, after all, this is a supplemental bill. We are hearing testimony on a budget item even this month. We felt that if we could make an adequate argument to the House, we could come from conference with a fairly good sum for these programs, particularly the neighborhood service programs.

Mr. CLARK. The only thing that concerns me about the position the committee took, having had some experience on conference committees myself, is that there is a tendency to split the difference. I had hoped the Senate would start with a little higher figure.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We are like lawyers who sue for $10,000 and settle for $5,000. We did the best we could. We ought to realize that this is a supplemental appropriation bill, and that these are interim amounts. We had to be as cautious as we could. I do not believe the programs will be handicapped.

Mr. CLARK. I do not wish to criticize the Senator from Washington. Quite the contrary. I thank him for the assistance he gave these programs. But in my opinion, the administration made an excellent case for appropriating the entire amount requested.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield for the purpose of answering questions on the appropriation for the civil supersonic aircraft development, which is discussed on page 9 of the report?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] handled that item.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As I understand, the committee appropriated $140 million, which is the biggest appropriation by far, to date, for the civil supersonic transport. This plane would be used by private industry. Estimates are that such a plane will be highly profitable. It is estimated that the Federal Government will spend close to a billion dollars for its development. I merely wish to make a record on the recovery of this Federal money at this point, since so much is being appropriated.

I should like to know whether the Federal Aviation Agency will come forward with a program by next January, or whenever the next appropriation is made, showing, first, whether the Federal Government expects to recover the amount involved; and, if possible, showing whether or not the FAA will have a specific plan to have this amount repaid, and just what this plan might involve.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Wisconsin posed the same question in committee. We asked the Administrator what his plans were. The chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation [Mr. MONRONEY] held long hearings on the subject. The history is that the late President Kennedy made a speech in Colorado Springs a few years ago, in which he announced that the Government, for good and sufficient reasons, should go into the supersonic field. For some reason, he said that 75 percent of the cost of this huge program ought to be taken care of by the Government, and 25 percent by the manufacturers. The manufacturers got out their sharp pencils and decided that this might be a project that they could not handle; that it would be a program, if we went ahead with it, that might involve greater participation by the Government in the beginning, and that then the manufacturers would pay back the amount advanced. In that way, they might even get more.

Lengthy hearings were held, and the manufacturers stated distinctly that this was not the right formula, or could not be. Some said it should be 90–10; some said the Government should advance the whole amount; some said the proportion ought to be 85–15. Finally, we concluded with the idea that an objective group should look into the situation.

President Johnson appointed Secretary of Defense McNamara, Mr. Eugene Black, and one other person as a committee. I forget at the moment who the third member is. They have been studying the ability of private manufacturers to absorb the cost of this great new development, as is done in the case of defense and space contracts, and many other contracts.

Mr. McKee says he expects the Committee to submit a report, which he will then submit to our committee in, he said, January, when we meet again. He hopes that the President's Committee will submit or suggest a formula.

The only difference between the two ideas is, first, whether the purchasers of the plane, which would be the commercial airlines, would be required to repay the Government the purchase price. In other words, if the plane costs $32 million, should $5 million be added to the cost of each plane as the amount to be repaid? Or should the Government make it easier for the commercial operators to buy the plane which they will have to finance? This question is not easy to settle in terms of a cost of this magnitude. Or should the cost be made a sort of revenue obligation, with the top 5 percent of the gross revenue to be taken from every plane?

These are questions that are being discussed. We all agree that the Government should be repaid in this particular case; there is no question about that.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is the further question as to whether the Government would be paid back in full or be paid back in full with interest, which might make a difference of $500 or $600 million with such a huge amount of money involved over a substantial period.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That question would be given serious consideration, particularly with respect to the royalty revenue feature. This is information which we expect to get from the Administrator, General McKee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It was also my understanding that a report would be made to Congress before an additional appropriation was made.

Mr. MAGNUSON. General McKee said—I think I can quote him almost exactly—"I am sure you fellows will practically throw me out the window if I do not come in with a program." I not only expect this, but I also believe the Senator from Wisconsin is right in asking for it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I estimate that this item would involve billions of dollars. Has a decision been made as to whether we should have a mach 2-plus or a mach 3-minus airplane?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That decision has not been actually made. I presume that these people have some idea. The reason for the inclusion of the $140 million for the 12-month period of research is to determine some of these things.

I understand that these people are not so much concerned about the airframe of the plane, or the prototype, as they are about some trouble with the powerplant. When we talk about mach 3 and mach 2, we are talking about different heat and temperature ranges. The problem with the powerplant is that we know what we can do in certain areas of temperatures, but a new field is involved in certain other areas. This is one of the reasons for the inclusion of this amount.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I say to my able friend that the question of temperature with respect to the frame itself would also be involved in mach 3 as against mach 2. We would have to give up our aluminum alloys and go to steel and titanium.

I raised the question because I believe the competition from abroad—which has been a great incentive—is working on a mach 2 plus airplane. If we stick to the mach 3 airplane, we will have a great number of theoretical engineering problems as well as applied engineering problems to solve. We would have to put additional billions of dollars into research and development.

This money would have to come out of the taxpayers' pockets. I hope that a decision will be made on this as soon as possible. If we do come to a mach 3 airplane, it will be many years before we shall have as good an airplane as our mach 2 airplane.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree with the Senator. If we go into the supersonic field, a part of the reason would be that America has had this great prestige in air power. That is what this bill presently plans. The British and the French are now committed to a certain type of plane which might be very economical.

We now have 99 firm orders. The conservative break-even point on a supersonic plane is 220 planes.

General McKee testified that if this works the way he believes it will there is a strong possibility of the sale of 400 supersonic airplanes. When one considers that when we first started the 707 jets and the other jets, we started considering the project on those terms. Now everybody orders those planes. However, American superiority in the air is at stake.

I believe the distinguished former Secretary of the Air Force will agree that if we are to build a plane, we should build the best plane that we are able to build, even though it would cost more.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the able chairman is very modest concerning his knowledge in this field. He knows a great deal about the subject. However, the Senator speaks about having a break-even point on the sale of 220 planes. That would depend upon how much research and development was had.

Many people, whose opinion I respect, are apprehensive about the fact that we are going in for a mach 3 airplane, because of the tremendous expense and delay involved in production. That is the reason I asked the question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I believe that it will work out. I am convinced that it will. I get my information from listening to those who are knowledgeable in the field. They believe that there will be a spin-off of these planes in the new field. There is already a spinoff.

We hope that the formula will accomplish this and that we can keep American air superiority.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I join my colleague, the Senator from Pennsylvania, in paying tribute to the senior Senator from Rhode Island and his associates for the magnificent work which they have done on this bill, and, in particular, for the items in dispute this afternoon, and also urban renewal, urban planning, open-space, rehabilitation, grants for neighborhood facilities, and others.

I believe that they showed a rare understanding of the issues involved and an appreciation of the problems of subsidies. Considering all the difficulties which they faced in the committee and on the floor of the Senate, I want to thank them from the bottom of my heart.

I know that they are well aware of the Biblical adage that one should not be weary of well-doing.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, the Senator from Illinois.

It is regrettable that these things are not said before an election. I regret that this could not have been said before my last election.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

FUNDING OF H.R. 9567

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have one other item on which it is important to make legislative history.

As Senators are aware, the House of Representatives this afternoon has passed the conference report on the Higher Education Act, H.R. 9567 by a vote of 312 to 63. In a few moments, I shall give the Senate an opportunity to agree to it unanimously.

I note that funds have been provided in the supplemental appropriations bill to cover on a minimal basis only programs we are authorizing in H.R. 9567. First, Mr. President, I am grieved to see that the administration did not see fit to fund the Higher Education Act in the amount at this time which I would have wished to see. Two hundred seventy-four million dollars, given the scope, breadth and cost of the various titles in the higher education bill, is to say the least very modest.

I regret exceedingly that the time pressures were such that the Appropriations Committee was unable to consider for more than a short half hour prior to mark-up session the justifications for these new programs as brought out on page 25 of our report. I am particularly disturbed, however, that despite these adverse circumstances it would appear that no money is being provided in this supplemental appropriations bill to fund title II of the higher education bill, the library title.

One of the greatest needs in our entire educational system is to do something as of yesterday, rather than now, with regard to the library funds.

It would be my earnest hope that even at this late date a way could be found to insert at least a token amount to permit this program to get underway without delay. I plead with my good friend who is managing this part of the bill on the floor to indicate a procedure whereby we can avert what is at the very least a 3-month period before a start can be made on getting college and medical library programs initiated. Is there not a parliamentary way open to us to place a $10 or $15 million item for each purpose in this bill, together with a slight increase in the administrative cost items which are servicing both types of library programs?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point in my remarks a table setting forth the authorization under each title of H.R. 9567, together with the text of the letter dated October 16, 1965, from the Director of the Budget, in which he sets forth the budget requests to cover the Higher Education Act and the material appearing on pages 24 and 25 of report No. 912, dealing with this subject. And materials from pages 13–24 of the Senate committee report No. 673 detailing the library needs which led to our conference authorization of $70 million for title II of H.R. 9567.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Authorizations under Higher Education Act of 1965

	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1968
Title I	$25,000,000	$50,000,000	$50,000,000
Title II:			
Part A (library resources)	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000
Part B (training)	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
Part C (Library of Congress)	5,000,000	6,315,000	7,770,000
Title III	55,000,000	0	0
Title IV:			
Part A (grants)	70,000,000	140,000,000	210,000,000
Part B:			
Advances	17,500,000	0	0
Interest subsidy	42,000,000	42,000,000	42,000,000
Part C (work-study)	129,000,000	165,000,000	200,000,000
Part D (NDEA titles III and XI)	27,250,000	27,250,000	27,250,000
Title V:			
Part A (Teacher Corps)	36,100,000	64,715,000	0
Part C (teacher fellowships)	40,000,000	160,000,000	275,000,000
Title VI	43,500,000	66,000,000	76,000,000
Title VII	290,000,000	0	0
Total	845,350,000	786,280,000	953,020,000

NOTE.—Total 3-year authorizations in bill, $2,584,650,000.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., October 16, 1965.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1966 in the amount of $277,600,000 for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as follows:

"DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

"Office of Education

"Higher Educational Activities

"For grants, contracts, payments, and advances under titles I, II, III, IV (except payments under parts C and D), V and VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for grants under part C of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, $274,000,000, of which $15,000,000 shall be for grants and contracts for college and university extension education under title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, $2,500,000 shall be for transfer to the Librarian of Congress for the cataloging of library materials under part C of title II of that Act, $70,000,000 shall be for programs under part A of title IV of that Act, $15,000,000 shall be for the purposes of title VI of the of title IV of that Act, $15,000,000 shall be for grants for the purposes of title VI of the Act, and $69,000,000 shall be for grants for college work-study programs under part C of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964: *Provided,* That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H.R. 9567," Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation."

This proposed appropriation will provide for initiation of new programs that will be authorized in the Higher Education Act of 1965, currently pending before the Congress, including scholarship, work-study and loan insurance financial aid for college students; support of college library acquisitions, training of librarians, and library research; grants for urban extension services, educational equipment, and related purposes, and strengthening of certain colleges; graduate education for elementary and secondary teachers and development of a National Teacher Corps.

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $3,600,000: *Provided,* That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H.R. 9567, Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation."

This proposed supplemental appropriation will provide for administrative expenses of activities that will be authorized in the pending Higher Education Act of 1965. It also provides for an expansion of the loan service of captioned films and related special activities for education of the deaf, as authorized by S. 2232, passed by the Congress and awaiting Presidential approval.

Excluding supplementals and budget amendments to finance our efforts in Vietnam, the amounts requested herein when added to the amounts previously requested will not increase the total new obligational authority proposed in the 1966 budget.

I recommend that the foregoing proposed supplemental appropriations be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES L. SCHULTZE,
Director of the Bureau of the budget.

TITLE II—COLLEGE LIBRARY ASSISTANCE AND LIBRARY TRAINING AND RESEARCH

Part A—College library resources

The Need

The importance of libraries in our society has been appropriately stated by Prof. Gilbert Highet who writes that "every library is an assertion of man's durable trust in intelligence as a protection against irrationalism, force, time, and death." Yet the quality of our college and university libraries has been progressively deteriorating. Adequate funds simply are not available to meet the new demands placed on our libraries.

As one witness stated (p. 596):

"In the past and in keeping with curricular demands, librarians have concentrated on accessions devoted principally to Western civilization; now, however, they are faced with a dual task of continuing these and of either inaugurating and/or increasing their holdings in Latin American, Asian, and African areas as related programs of study are developed. Primary and secondary source materials in huge quantities—indeed whole libraries—have to be acquired. This is not a matter of reading materials alone but also of trained, competent personnel to handle the foreign languages concerned. As the need for greater international understanding and cooperation grows, even greater impetus will be given to the establishment of educational programs, institutes, and centers for the purpose of meeting this new trend. The effective implementation of such programs will depend a great deal for their success on the quality of libraries and their staffs.

"Another salutary of the current educational scene is the manifest and growing interest in fine arts. Painting, sculpture, music, and the ballet are all enjoying unprecedented popularity. This not-to-be-discouraged feature of our day leads to an increased demand for expensive art books, records, and magnetic tapes on the part of students and faculty, and has placed an added financial burden on library budgets. These media require specialized equipment which is an added financial burden. We need not advert to the impact of automation and the ensuing leisure time problem, both of which will influence educators to consider the enhancement of fine arts programs.

"Concomitant with these educational trends is the role of the United States in world leadership. The course of history has placed us at the forefront of Western civilization whose survival is at stake in the existing political confrontation. It has become our destiny as it has been in the past for Spain, France, and England, to assume the task of giving leadership to the peoples of the world not only to safeguard our own national security and to preserve the heritage of Western civilization, but also to lead the world, prudently along the path of future history. In this context higher education becomes a precious national resource essential to the achievement of great national goals, so that wise and competent leaders are clearly necessary. The development of such leaders is directly related to the quality of higher education, which in turn is contingent upon the facilities and the quality of our libraries."

Although the Nation contains some of the finest university libraries, the number of inadequate college and university libraries is overwhelming. Fifty percent of our 4-year institutions of higher learning and 82 percent of our 2-year institutions fall below accepted minimum standards in the number of volumes in their libraries. Current national statistics indicate a decline in the number of college and university library books per student, resulting from enrollments that are increasing faster than per-student expenditures for books. Statistics presented to the committee indicated that well over $200 million is needed merely to stock the shelves of our universities with the books necessary for the present student and faculty population—this is not taking into account the fact that college and university enrollments are expected to increase from today's 4.8 to 6.9 million by 1970. If an institution of higher learning desires to have an up-to-date library collection, evidence shows that the institution should reserve 5 percent of its total annual operating expenditures for this purpose. However, the average national expenditure is only 3.5 percent and a number of institutions spend less than 1.5 percent.

There are two basic factors that account for the decline, rather than the improvement, in the adequacy of our institution's libraries. The surging growth in enrollment creates a situation in which the institutions are unable to meet, unaided, the increasing demand for study and research materials. Student enrollment is increasing at a phenomenal rate, the numbers of faculty are necessarily increasing to accommodate the increased student population, and new institutions are being established. All of these developments, in turn, increase the need for greater library resources.

The second basic factor can be attributed to the "knowledge explosion" and the resulting floodtide of new publications. The number of book titles published in the United States rose from 10,000 in 1930 to 15,000 in 1960; and to nearly 28,500 in 1964. Throughout the world about one-quarter million books were published in 1962 and more than 100,000 journals are now released annually. Chart A (not in RECORD) illustrates the publication explosion.

Further, the cost of all library materials has considerably increased. The average book costs are now 31 percent more than in 1957–59 and the average periodical subscription increased by 35 percent. Chart B (not in RECORD) presents this situation graphically. To acquire the same materials, the average college or university library, servicing now more students, faculty, and researchers, has to spend one-third more than 5 years ago. In addition, these libraries should have purchased more to keep abreast of the publications and knowledge explosions, the curriculum expansion and the growing emphasis on independent study programs.

There are still other factors contributing to the pressures on our institutions' libraries. New departments are being established and new subject areas are increasing. There has been a phenomenal growth in research, particularly contract research in science and technology, in universities. Much of this research has been encouraged and supported by the Federal Government. All these factors have multiplied the demands for library service and for adequate collections of books and other library materials.

The Congress has wisely made an investment in graduate education through the National Defense Education Act and the many fellowship and traineeship programs of the various Federal agencies. As a result, the number of doctoral degrees is doubling every 10 years. Yet at least 15 universities which offer a Ph. D. degree have libraries with fewer than 150,000 volumes, barely enough for a small liberal arts college. This inadequacy is further compounded by the 6 million professionals whose careers depend upon the availability of superior library resources.

The proposed legislation will be of substantial educational significance to our present 5 million college students and their 350,000 teachers. The materials placed in these libraries will serve present and future classes. They will be of particular significance to the 2-year junior and community colleges and predominantly Negro institutions where 80 percent of the 4-year institutions and all 2-year institutions are below standard. The proposed legislation will substantially help to close this national educational gap existing in our libraries.

A recently published State by State tabulation of academic library needs in both 4-year and 2-year institutions are shown in tables 1 through 4. Key national summary data are presented in tables 5 through 7.

TABLE 1.—*Library needs in volumes and cost of 4-year institutions of higher education with libraries of under 300,000 volumes* [1]

[Aggregate United States, 1962–63]

State	Number of libraries		Volumes in libraries not meeting standard		Retrospective deficiency		
	Total number of libraries	Number not meeting volume standard	Total number of volumes	Number of volumes required to meet standard	Number of volumes (difference between cols. (4) and (5))	Dollars at $9 per volume deficiency [2]	Dollars at $5.20 per volume deficiency
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Alabama	19	16	896,902	1,310,000	413,098	$3,717,882	$2,148,110
Alaska	2	2	111,476	190,000	78,524	706,716	408,325
Arizona	3	3	119,851	310,000	190,149	1,711,341	988,775
Arkansas	16	15	651,870	1,360,000	708,130	6,373,170	3,682,276
California	96	72	3,946,184	7,280,000	3,333,816	30,004,344	17,335,843
Colorado	14	11	766,616	1,300,000	533,384	4,800,456	2,773,597
Connecticut	19	17	714,092	1,900,000	1,185,908	10,673,172	6,166,722
Delaware	1	1	42,900	50,000	7,100	63,900	36,920
District of Columbia	11	8	322,879	650,000	327,121	2,944,089	1,701,029

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Library needs in volumes and cost of 4-year institutions of higher education with libraries of under 300,000 volumes* [1]—Continued

[Aggregate United States, 1962–63]

State	Number of libraries		Volumes in libraries not meeting standard		Retrospective deficiency		
	Total number of libraries	Number not meeting volume standard	Total number of volumes	Number of volumes required to meet standard	Number of volumes (difference between cols. (4) and (5))	Dollars at $9 per volume deficiency [2]	Dollars at $5.20 per volume deficiency
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Florida	14	14	806,981	1,440,000	633,019	$5,697,171	$3,291,699
Georgia	25	19	1,060,033	1,600,000	539,967	4,859,703	2,807,828
Hawaii	2	2	42,239	120,000	77,761	699,849	404,357
Idaho	4	4	452,057	620,000	167,943	1,511,487	873,304
Illinois	74	53	2,887,999	5,010,000	2,122,001	19,098,009	11,034,405
Indiana	35	27	1,602,159	2,540,000	937,841	8,440,569	4,876,773
Iowa	28	23	1,243,974	1,910,000	666,026	5,994,234	3,463,335
Kansas	24	21	1,257,031	1,870,000	612,969	5,516,721	3,187,439
Kentucky	25	21	1,075,934	2,010,000	934,066	8,406,594	4,857,143
Louisiana	18	14	1,058,608	2,080,000	1,021,392	9,192,528	5,311,238
Maine	16	12	201,501	630,000	428,499	3,856,491	2,228,195
Maryland	27	18	632,236	1,400,000	767,764	6,909,876	3,992,373
Massachusetts	61	47	1,699,653	4,120,000	2,420,347	21,783,123	12,585,804
Michigan	41	36	1,894,410	3,790,000	1,895,590	17,060,310	9,857,068
Minnesota	30	21	1,014,073	1,980,000	965,927	8,693,343	5,022,820
Mississippi	16	16	904,167	1,600,000	695,833	6,262,497	3,618,332
Missouri	44	37	1,661,517	2,900,000	1,238,483	11,146,347	6,440,112
Montana	9	8	405,643	710,000	304,357	2,739,213	1,582,656
Nebraska	16	13	679,097	1,140,000	460,903	4,148,127	2,396,696
Nevada	2	1	189,288	250,000	60,712	546,408	315,702
New Hampshire	8	8	230,216	480,000	249,784	2,248,056	1,298,877
New Jersey	25	21	1,119,353	2,860,000	1,740,647	15,665,823	9,051,364
New Mexico	7	7	489,091	720,000	230,909	2,078,181	1,200,727
New York	122	90	4,745,903	9,180,000	4,434,097	39,906,873	23,057,304
North Carolina	37	31	1,902,160	2,880,000	977,840	8,800,560	5,084,768
North Dakota	9	9	665,517	960,000	294,483	2,650,347	1,531,312
Ohio	56	44	2,661,407	4,440,000	1,778,593	16,007,337	9,248,684
Oklahoma	18	16	985,017	1,820,000	834,983	7,514,847	4,341,912
Oregon	18	15	666,198	1,210,000	543,802	4,894,218	2,827,770
Pennsylvania	108	79	3,828,597	7,290,000	3,461,403	31,152,627	17,999,296
Rhode Island	9	9	438,875	990,000	551,125	4,960,125	2,865,850
South Carolina	24	19	859,656	1,430,000	570,344	5,133,096	2,965,789
South Dakota	13	11	519,960	870,000	350,040	3,150,360	1,820,208
Tennessee	35	31	1,503,177	2,790,000	1,286,823	11,581,407	6,691,480
Texas	50	44	3,082,654	5,160,000	2,077,346	18,696,114	10,802,199
Utah	4	4	120,852	350,000	229,148	2,062,332	1,191,570
Vermont	13	11	303,826	600,000	296,174	2,665,566	1,540,105
Virginia	33	20	1,113,480	1,900,000	786,520	7,078,680	4,089,904
Washington	15	14	1,041,737	1,660,000	618,263	5,564,367	3,214,968
West Virginia	16	15	684,016	1,360,000	675,984	6,083,856	3,515,117
Wisconsin	34	28	1,186,949	2,450,000	1,263,051	11,367,459	6,567,865
Wyoming	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
U.S. service schools	6	3	273,736	340,000	66,264	596,376	344,573
Canal Zone	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	3	3	146,148	460,000	313,852	2,824,668	1,632,030
Grand total	1,355	1,084	56,909,895	104,270,000	47,360,105	426,240,945	246,272,546

---

[1] Libraries with more than 300,000 volumes are excluded from tables 1 through 4 since collections of this size are assumed to be adequate.

[2] Includes the cost of the volume at $5.20 plus the cost of processing.

TABLE 2.—*Library operating expenditure needs of 4-year institutions of higher education*

[Aggregate United States, 1962–63]

State	Number of libraries		Expenditures of libraries not meeting standards		Current deficiency
	Total number of libraries	Number not meeting support standard	Current expenditures for operation of libraries	Standard—5 percent "Educational and general" expenditure	Current expenditure deficiency below 5 percent (difference, cols. (4) & (5))
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Alabama	21	12	$1,285,331	$2,184,775	$899,444
Alaska	2	0	0	0	0
Arizona	5	4	1,337,713	1,769,511	431,798
Arkansas	17	11	747,707	1,557,418	809,711
California	101	33	9,731,067	14,506,838	4,775,771
Colorado	16	10	1,962,125	3,631,115	1,668,990
Connecticut	23	13	1,240,059	1,538,485	298,427
Delaware	2	1	375,052	486,361	111,319
District of Columbia	15	6	1,505,057	2,771,600	1,266,543
Florida	17	10	2,637,304	4,317,202	1,679,898
Georgia	27	13	1,645,551	2,775,852	1,130,301
Hawaii	3	2	698,390	917,528	219,138
Idaho	4	3	431,379	484,104	52,725
Illinois	79	46	8,955,117	17,481,534	8,526,417
Indiana	39	23	4,559,001	7,597,974	3,038,973
Iowa	30	18	2,455,443	3,952,637	1,497,194
Kansas	27	16	2,203,051	3,249,668	1,046,617
Kentucky	27	10	1,718,215	2,613,117	894,902
Louisiana	20	12	2,855,897	3,687,932	832,035
Maine	17	6	$541,588	$810,088	$268,500
Maryland	29	15	2,362,853	4,936,545	2,573,692
Massachusetts	69	45	4,441,899	12,454,070	8,012,171
Michigan	44	29	7,038,478	10,906,903	3,868,425
Minnesota	31	16	2,637,788	5,306,524	2,668,736
Mississippi	17	7	769,397	1,588,307	818,910
Missouri	47	28	3,559,025	5,719,249	2,160,224
Montana	9	5	298,145	551,491	261,346
Nebraska	17	14	1,397,354	2,152,219	754,865
Nevada	2	0	0	0	0
New Hampshire	10	6	379,987	609,622	229,635
New Jersey	28	11	3,004,711	4,930,508	1,925,797
New Mexico	8	6	460,393	589,180	128,787
New York	134	73	16,573,619	28,629,652	12,056,033
North Carolina	39	16	2,088,812	3,489,187	1,400,375
North Dakota	9	6	417,910	852,444	434,534
Ohio	64	38	6,317,711	10,412,474	4,094,763
Oklahoma	20	12	1,643,690	2,315,010	671,320
Oregon	20	11	1,818,060	2,494,268	676,208

TABLE 2.—*Library operating expenditure needs of 4-year institutions of higher education*—Continued

[Aggregate United States, 1962-63]—Continued

State	Number of libraries		Expenditures of libraries not meeting standards		Current deficiency
	Total number of libraries	Number not meeting support standard	Current expenditures for operation of libraries	Standard—5 percent "Educational and general" expenditure	Current expenditure deficiency below 5 percent (difference, cols. (4) & (5))
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Pennsylvania	113	56	$7,916,054	$14,148,423	$6,232,369
Rhode Island	10	5	497,896	824,488	326,592
South Carolina	25	13	985,633	1,822,242	836,609
South Dakota	13	10	560,565	763,497	202,932
Tennessee	37	15	2,082,142	2,914,038	831,896
Texas	59	17	3,996,344	5,602,490	1,606,146
Utah	7	6	1,667,957	2,477,405	809,448
Vermont	13	10	590,337	919,317	328,980
Virginia	36	20	2,078,925	3,376,054	1,297,129
Washington	17	10	3,385,469	4,878,158	1,492,689
West Virginia	17	14	$1,117,393	$1,910,116	$792,723
Wisconsin	36	16	2,485,027	5,169,179	2,684,152
Wyoming	1	1	260,525	421,547	161,022
U.S. service schools	7	7	1,181,879	3,529,249	2,077,370
Canal Zone	0	0	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	4	2	973,625	1,643,025	664,400
Grand total	1,484	794	131,871,649	224,400,630	92,528,981

TABLE 3.—*Library needs in volumes and cost of 2-year institutions of higher education with libraries of under 300,000 volumes*[1]

[Aggregate United States, 1962-63]

State	Number of libraries		Volumes in libraries not meeting standard		Retrospective deficiency		
	Total number of libraries	Number not meeting volume standard	Total number of volumes	Number of volumes required to meet standard	Number of volumes (difference between cols. (4) and (5))	Dollars at $9 per volume deficiency[2]	Dollars at $5.20 per volume deficiency
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Alabama	5	5	44,991	100,000	55,009	$495,081	$286,047
Alaska	1	1	7,992	20,000	12,008	108,072	62,442
Arizona	2	2	54,922	95,000	40,078	360,702	208,406
Arkansas	2	2	23,637	40,000	16,363	147,267	85,088
California	72	68	1,574,654	3,565,000	1,990,346	17,913,114	10,349,799
Colorado	5	5	56,968	105,000	48,032	432,288	249,766
Connecticut	7	6	44,618	120,000	75,382	678,438	391,986
Delaware	2	2	14,689	40,000	25,311	227,799	131,617
District of Columbia	6	6	43,114	120,000	76,886	691,974	399,807
Florida	25	25	237,693	635,000	397,307	3,575,763	2,065,996
Georgia	14	12	140,250	240,000	99,750	897,750	518,742
Hawaii	1	1	12,300	20,000	7,700	69,300	40,040
Idaho	5	2	28,563	40,000	11,437	102,933	59,472
Illinois	34	29	233,869	785,000	551,131	4,960,179	2,865,881
Indiana	1	1	13,819	20,000	6,181	55,629	32,141
Iowa	20	20	137,467	400,000	262,533	2,362,797	1,365,172
Kansas	18	17	148,380	340,000	191,620	1,724,580	996,424
Kentucky	9	8	95,186	160,000	64,814	583,326	337,033
Louisiana	1	1	18,907	20,000	1,093	9,837	5,684
Maine	2	2	9,400	40,000	30,600	275,400	159.120
Maryland	15	14	119,948	300,000	180,052	1,620,468	936,270
Massachusetts	20	19	137,972	395,000	257,028	2,313,252	1,336,546
Michigan	19	17	211,161	480,000	268,839	2,419,551	1,397,963
Minnesota	12	10	83,882	200,000	116,118	1,045,062	603,803
Mississippi	27	25	259,426	505,000	245,574	2,210,166	1,276,985
Missouri	16	12	168,095	260,000	91,905	827,145	477,906
Montana	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nebraska	6	6	31,692	120,000	88,308	794,772	459,202
Nevada	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	9	7	85,888	140,000	54,112	487,008	281,382
New Mexico	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
New York	55	51	620,373	1,455,000	834,627	7,511,643	4,340,060
North Carolina	20	16	213,441	325,000	111,559	1,004,031	580,107
North Dakota	4	3	36,456	65,000	28,544	256,896	148,429
Ohio	3	3	22,470	60,000	37,530	337,770	195,156
Oklahoma	13	13	138,423	265,000	126,577	1,139,193	658.200
Oregon	6	6	58,908	120,000	61,092	549,828	317,678
Pennsylvania	15	12	122,371	250,000	127,629	1,148,661	663,671
Rhode Island	1	1	3,300	20,000	16,700	150,300	86,840
South Carolina	4	4	41,069	80,000	38,931	350,379	202,441
South Dakota	3	3	20,214	60,000	39,786	358,074	206,887
Tennessee	6	4	40,371	80,000	39,629	356,661	206,071
Texas	37	33	417,623	725,000	307,377	2,766,393	1,598,360
Utah	3	3	21,665	60,000	38,335	345,015	199,342
Vermont	3	3	23,583	60,000	36,417	327,753	189,368
Virginia	9	8	99,839	160,000	60,161	541,449	312,837
Washington	12	12	153,927	320,000	166,073	1,494,657	863,580
West Virginia	3	3	35,408	60,000	24,592	221,328	127,878
Wisconsin	27	26	120,572	565,000	444,428	3,999,852	2,311,026
Wyoming	5	4	29,682	85,000	55,318	497,862	287,654
U.S. service schools	1	1	14,617	25,000	10,383	93,447	53,992
Canal Zone	1	1	12,500	20,000	7,500	67,500	39,000
Guam	1	1	13,071	20,000	6,929	62,361	36,031
Puerto Rico	1	1	10,371	20,000	9,629	86,661	50,071
Grand total	591	537	6,309,737	14,205,000	7,895,263	71,057,367	41,055,367

[1] Libraries with more than 300,000 volumes are excluded from tables 1 through 4 since collections of the size are assumed to be adequate.

[2] Includes the cost of the volume at $5.20 plus the cost of processing.

TABLE 4.—*Library operating expenditure needs of 2-year institutions of higher education*

[Aggregate United States, 1962-63]

State	Number of libraries		Expenditures of libraries not meeting standards		Current deficiency
	Total number of libraries	Number not meeting support	Current expenditures for operation	Standard—5 percent educational and general expenditure	Current expenditure deficiency below 5 percent (difference, cols. 4 and 5)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Alabama	5	1	$11,468	$29,381	$17,913
Alaska	1	1	10,283	16,200	5,917
Arizona	2	2	75,230	111,020	35,790
Arkansas	2	1	5,903	12,386	6,483
California	72	62	3,442,747	6,150,862	2,708,115
Colorado	5	3	57,855	93,654	35,799
Connecticut	7	3	34,321	40,066	5,745
Delaware	2	2	15,099	51,624	36,525
District of Columbia	6	6	48,606	248,012	199,406
Florida	25	8	266,938	326,612	59,674
Georgia	14	8	98,961	122,083	23,122
Hawaii	1	0	0	0	0
Idaho	5	2	71,003	100,959	29,956
Illinois	34	20	419,950	1,719,374	1,299,424
Indiana	1	1	18,654	24,813	6,159
Iowa	20	10	69,234	94,082	24,848
Kansas	18	8	71,992	125,359	53,367
Kentucky	9	2	15,423	16,017	594
Louisiana	1	1	5,936	7,484	1,548
Maine	2	1	591	1,560	969
Maryland	15	0	0	0	0
Massachusetts	20	14	207,671	546,653	338,982
Michigan	19	9	282,429	434,523	152,094
Minnesota	12	5	70,474	96,326	25,852
Mississippi	27	19	177,120	343,403	166,283
Missouri	16	11	177,909	383,201	205,292
Montana	1	0	0	0	0
Nebraska	6	3	20,507	27,593	7,086
Nevada	0	0	0	0	0
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	9	5	$98,189	$123,483	$25,294
New Mexico	1	1	16,474	86,751	70,277
New York	55	27	733,035	1,620,655	887,620
North Carolina	20	9	137,538	175,589	38,051
North Dakota	4	3	33,429	69,454	36,025
Ohio	3	2	11,273	44,747	33,474
Oklahoma	13	7	102,814	161,189	58,375
Oregon	6	3	45,466	124,825	79,359
Pennsylvania	15	9	123,724	215,920	92,196
Rhode Island	1	1	8,866	11,577	2,711
South Carolina	4	2	18,789	38,127	19,338
South Dakota	3	2	5,420	10,398	4,978
Tennessee	6	2	25,377	57,271	31,894
Texas	37	24	428,200	631,657	203,457
Utah	3	3	14,862	40,832	25,970
Vermont	3	2	36,600	81,820	45,220
Virginia	9	6	70,491	125,785	55,294
Washington	12	10	374,186	451,666	77,480
West Virginia	3	2	29,206	36,331	7,125
Wisconsin	27	11	77,753	143,626	65,873
Wyoming	5	2	17,830	32,982	15,152
U.S. service schools	1	1	22,208	176,796	154,588
Canal Zone	1	0	0	0	0
Guam	1	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	1	1	14,901	16,988	2,087
Grand total	591	338	8,122,935	15,601,716	7,478,781

TABLE 5.—*Summary costs of library needs of 4-year institutions of higher education*

[Aggregate United States, 1962-63]

Total number of 4-year institutions	1,484
With libraries over 300,000 volumes	129
With libraries under 300,000 volumes	1,355
RETROSPECTIVE DEFICIENCY	
1. Volumes:	
Institutions meeting volumes standard	400
Over 300,000 volumes	129
Under 300,000 volumes	271
Institutions not meeting volumes standard	1,084
Under 50,000 volumes	711
Over 50,000 volumes	373
Volume deficiency	47,360,105
Dollar deficiency, at $5.20 per volume	$236,272,546
Dollar deficiency, at $9 per volume	$426,240,945

There are 413,414 students (FTE) in 711 4-year institutions with libraries of under 50,000 volumes each.

CURRENT DEFICIENCIES	
2. Staff:	
Institutions meeting professional staff standards (FTE)	419
15 or more professional staff members	145
Under 15 professional staff members	274
2. Staff—Continued	
Institutions not meeting staff standards:	
15 or more professional staff members	0
Under 15 professional staff members	1,065
Staff member deficiency	2,753
Dollar deficiency, at $6,000 per person	$16,518,000
3. Operating expenditures:	
Institutions meeting support standards	663
Institutions not meeting support standards	794
Insufficient financial data	27
Operating expenditure dollar deficiency	$92,528,981
In volumes, staff, and operating expenditures the 4-year institutions had a total dollar deficiency of:	
Volumes, at $5.20 per volume	$246,272,546
Volumes, at $9 per volume	$426,240,945
Staff	$16,518,000
Operating expenditure	$92,528,981
Grand total, at $5.20 per volume	$355,319,527
Grand total, at $9 per volume	$535,287,926

TABLE 6.—*Summary costs of library needs of 2-year institutions of higher education*

[Aggregate United States, 1962-63]

Total number of 2-year institutions (each has under 300,000 volumes)	591
RETROSPECTIVE DEFICIENCY	
1. Volumes:	
Institutions meeting volumes standard	54
Institutions not meeting volumes standard	537
With fewer than 20,000 volumes	485
With over 20,000 volumes but below standard for their size	52
Volume deficiency	7,895,263
Dollar deficiency, at $5.20 per volume	$41,055,367
Dollar deficiency, at $9 per volume	$71,057,367

There are 338,054 students (F.T.E.) in 485 2-year institutions with libraries of under 20,000 volumes each.

CURRENT DEFICIENCIES	
2. Staff:	
Institutions meeting staff standard	83
Institutions not meeting staff standard	508
Each had fewer than 15 professional staff.	
Standard called for	1,809
They had	714
Staff deficiency	1,095
Dollar deficiency, $6,000 each	$6,570,000

TABLE 6.—*Summary costs of library needs of 2-year institutions of higher education*—Continued

[Aggregate United States, 1962–63]

3. Operating expenditures:	
Institutions meeting support standard	239
Institutions not meeting support standard	338
Insufficient data	14
Each used less than 5 percent of education and general expenses for its library.	
Standard called for expenditure of	$15,600,000
They spent for library	$8,100,000
Operating expenditure dollar deficiency	$7,478,781
In volumes, staff and operating expenditure the 2-year institutions had a total dollar deficiency of:	
Volumes, at $5.20 per volume	$41,100,000
Volumes, $9 per volume	$71,057,000
Staff	$6,600,000
Operating expenditure	$7,500,000
Grand total at $5.20 per volume	$55,104,148
Grand total, $9 per volume	$85,106,148

TABLE 7.—*Summary costs of library needs of 4- and 2-year institutions of higher education*

[Aggregate United States, 1962–63]

Total number of 4-year and 2-year institutions	2,075
With libraries over 300,000 volumes	129
With libraries under 300,000 volumes	1,946
RETROSPECTIVE DEFICIENCY	
1. Volumes:	
Institutions meeting volume standard	325
Institutions not meeting volume standard	1,621
Volume deficiency	55,250,000
Dollar deficiency, at $5.20 per volume	$287,327,913
Dollar deficiency, at $9 per volume	$497,298,312
CURRENT DEFICIENCIES	
2. Staff:	
Institutions meeting staff standard	502
Institutions not meeting staff standard	1,573
Staff member deficiency	3,848
Dollar deficiency, at $6,000	$23,088,000
3. Operating expenditures:	
Institutions meeting support standard	902
Institutions not meeting support standard	1,132
Insufficient financial data	41
Operating expenditure dollar deficiency	$100,007,762
There were 751,468 students (F.T.E.) in 1,196 institutions with libraries below the lowest minimum standard for a college library.	
In volumes, staff, and operating expenditure the 4- and 2-year institutions have a total dollar deficiency of:	
Volumes, at $5.20 per volume	$287,327,913
Volumes, at $9 per volume	$497,298,312
Staff	$23,088,000
Operating expenditure	$100,007,762
Grand total, at $5.20 per volume	$410,423,675
Grand total, at $9 per volume	$620,394,074

Higher educational activities

1966 appropriation	None
Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. No. 65)	$274,000,000
Committee recommendation	173,200,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $173,200,000, a reduction of $100,800,000 from the budget request. The House did not consider this item.

This supplemental request came to the Senate on October 19, and the justifications in support of the request were delivered to the committee a half hour before the hearing; the subcommittee handling the item considered this and other items for markup in the afternoon. Members were concerned that they were forced to consider the matter on such short notice, before the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses was filed and with inadequate time to study and analyze the request.

The funds approved will provide $10 million for title I, community service and continuing education program; $5 million for title III, strengthening developing institutions; $58 million for educational opportunity grants, and $2 million for cooperative motivational programs under part A, title IV; $40 million for the college work-study program under part C, $10 million for guaranteed reduced interest loans under part B of title IV; $33,200,000 for title V, the national teacher program; and $15 million for title VI, for improvement of undergraduate instruction.

Legislative authorization was enacted by the Congress during the current session for aid to medical libraries and for higher education libraries. No budget request was submitted to the Congress for funds for the medical library program, and the committee felt that it should have for concurrent consideration estimates for both programs and did not approve the request contained in the estimate for this item for financial assistance for libraries. It is expected that supplemental estimates will be presented later in the fiscal year to fund both these programs.

Salaries and expenses

1966 appropriation	$26,612,000
Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. No. 65)	3,600,000
Committee recommendation	2,935,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $2,935,000, and 200 positions, a decrease of $665,000, and 100 positions, from the budget request.

The supplemental appropriation is for funds to support the administrative expenses of activities that will be authorized in the Higher Education Act of 1965, H.R. 9567, still pending in Congress.

It also provides for an expansion of the loan service of captioned films and related special activities for the education of the deaf, $1.5 million, as authorized by S. 2232, passed by the Congress and awaiting approval by the President. The request for $100,000 for a National Conference on Education of the Deaf is approved.

The reduction in funds and positions is a corollary to the reduction in program funds for "Higher educational activities."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me recapitulate for Senators the discrepancies:

Title I authorization is $25 million; budget request $15 million; committee recommendation $10 million.

Title II—libraries: Total authorization under the bill, $70 million; the budget request notes $2.5 million for cataloging and is silent on the specific amount for parts A and B of title II; the committee recommends no funds for title II.

As we shall see from the Senate committee report, which I shall not take the time to read, but which I have had printed in the RECORD, there is a crying need for this money to help our college libraries and also to help the Library of Congress perform the cataloging service that we have authorized to help the libraries of this country. The cataloging authorization of $5 million will save university libraries many millions of dollars because it will end present costly duplication of effort. Yet, under this bill, we cannot get started with the library aid program at all and only half started on the cataloging problem.

Title III of the act authorizes $55 million for a program which will terminate next June 30, 1965; the budget request asks for $15 million and the committee recommendation but $5 million. Surely, these are drastic cuts, both on the part of the administration and on the part of the committee for a program whose authorized life is not much more than 8 months.

That part of the program will live, anyway. But if we cut from 8 months of life the first 3 months, it seems to me that we would do great damage to the program.

In title IV, for scholarships, the Higher Education Act provided an authorization of $70 million; the administration recommended $70 million; the committee has recommended but $60 million. The work-study program authorized by H.R. 9567 at $129 million, was given a budget estimate of $69 million, $60 million already being available under transfer from the Office of Economic Opportunity. The committee is bringing us a recommendation of $40 million.

These young people need to be put to work. Without it, they cannot go to college.

In title V, for Teacher Corps and fellowships, H.R. 9567 provided $76.1 million; the Administration did not specify an amount but the committee did provide $33.2 million.

In title VI, which was added to H.R. 9567 through the efforts of my good friend, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the act authorized $42.5 million; the budget estimates were only $15 million, the amount allowed by the committee in its recommendations.

I will not comment on the additions made in H.R. 9567 for additional construction money for our college facilities, which came to some $290 million, for which the administration made no requests and for which no money was allowed by the committee.

I cite these figures, Mr. President, because it seems to me that the Bureau of the Budget was exceedingly conservative in its requests for this supplemental, and I fear that the Appropriations Committee has brought us recommendations which are restrictive to the point, for some of the programs at least, that we must face the charge of wasting 1 more year of college opportunity and talent.

Let me make clear to the Senator from Rhode Island and to every member of the Appropriations Committee that the Senator from Oregon is not criticizing them individually or collectively. I am merely making the plea for their advice as to whether or not they think there is any parliamentary procedure whereby they can get some more money on some of these items in conference. The library item, if no other, ought to have some money, and no money has been provided.

The work-study program should have more; the scholarship program should have more; because we are at the very stage when, if we are really going to do something about the college crisis in this country, we ought to do more now.

I am fully familiar with the fact that the committee has had very serious problems. But is there any hope the Senator can extend to me for getting any more money prior to the next appropriation?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. We were confronted with this situation: The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee gave notice to the administration, about Friday, October 8, that they would no longer consider any new requests made by the administration.

This item for higher education came to our committee as a Senate document. It was considered by the committee, even though the authorization is not yet law. The paradox of the moment is that here we are, appropriating the money, even before we pass upon the authorization.

Mr. MORSE. I know that.

Mr. PASTORE. Which we will take up sometime this afternoon.

Mr. MORSE. I see that.

Mr. PASTORE. At the time the request for $274 million was made of our committee, we went into it categorically, that is, categorically in the sense that it comes up here in the twilight of our session. Ordinarily, appropriation bills or requests originate in the House. We explored that situation, and we determined at the time that this was predicated pretty much on an estimate.

What we wanted to do was get some of these programs, or practically all that were submitted to us, going; so we determined that the figure should be approximately $175 million, but before we agreed on that figure, we communicated with the Commissioner of Education and expressed to him what our predicament was.

We feel that we have appropriated enough money here to carry this deeply enough into next year to give us time to scrutinize these projects very carefully.

Mr. MORSE. I say to the Senator from Rhode Island that I am making this record so that it will show that the question was discussed while the bill was before us. The important thing is to get the Senator's comment. If the administration comes forward, between now and the next supplemental, which will be February, March, or thereabouts, and can show to the Appropriations Committee that the need is what I discussed when I made my plea for the Library Service and for other educational financial needs, will the Appropriations Committee treat the request on the merits? The denial of funds does not in any way indicate an attitude on the part of the Appropriations Committee that it is not in favor of appropriating what money for educational needs the administration can justify.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is absolutely correct, and I predicate my answer upon the attitudes of the various members of the subcommittee when we discussed this amount of $274 million.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PASTORE. There was a general feeling that this disposition was without prejudice.

Mr. MORSE. Again I say to the Senator, as I said in connection with the last item, that I appreciate his cooperation, and I praise him for his magnificent leadership on his bill.

I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I want the record to show at this time that these very large items did not reach the Senator from Rhode Island or his committee until Monday of this week. The authorization which the Senator from Rhode Island is talking about has not yet passed the conference. It has just passed the House today, and as I understand, is over here on the desk now.

The Senator from Rhode Island did a wonderful job to conduct hearings as far as he could on all these details, and to confer, in the meantime, with the House committees and see what was possible. Considering the limitations of time on a bill calling for an appropriation of nearly $5 billion, gotten up so quickly, I doubt whether a comparable job has been done in the time I have been in the Senate, insofar as the time factor is concerned. I highly compliment the Senator from Rhode Island and the other members of the committee; and I want the record to show just what the committee has been up against.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am not reflecting on the Senator from Rhode Island or the other members of the committee. I have pointed out, however, that the committee did not bring forth some items with respect to which we could almost take judicial notice that there is a need for what the administration asked for.

Also, this is not the first time we have had a situation in the Senate in which the Appropriations Committee has recommended the appropriation of funds prior to the authorization bill. There are precedents for that.

I agree with the Senator from Florida, because I believe it is implied in his remarks that it is a bad practice. But it has been done in the past by the Appropriations Committee, when it was thought the emergency warranted it.

I am making an argument in regard to some of the items, particularly the library item, with respect to which I believe the emergency is clear.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I have finished.

Mr. HOLLAND. I want the record to show that there will be another supplemental bill early next spring. This year, as I remember, we passed the first supplemental bill early in February.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. That will give an early opportunity for consideration of the items now absent from this bill.

I wanted the record to show what difficulties the Senator from Rhode Island was confronted with. I want the record also to show that many of the members of the committee voted for appropriations, so far as they felt they could, even for objectives which they had opposed in their authorization state, because the Appropriations Committee feels that it is its clear duty to try to provide for activities which a majority of both Houses of Congress have approved, and which the President has also approved.

Thus, it has not been an easy task. The matter will be open for hearings early next spring. I am sure that a much more adequate job can be done at that time by all of us, and we shall be glad to view with a complete lack of prejudice any matters which have been left out at this time.

Before I take my seat, let me say that since I have voted with the Senator from Massachusetts against a provision which I thought was the most unjustifiable one in the bill and which was established by the testimony, I wish it to be clear that as for the Senator from Florida, he finds many items in the bill which he thinks are fine and expects to vote for the bill. I was merely trying to make it a little better by insisting on some further delay, because I believe that anyone who reads the evidence notes that the Administrator was withdrawing his tentative regulations because they had been shot so full of holes that the committee is bound to know that it is not ready for the heavy appropriation which was requested.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. From this side of the aisle, I would merely say to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that I would confirm what the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Rhode Island have said, that we particularly put a few sentences in the suggestion to show that we were doing the best we could with the estimate, with another supplemental to come in January, and another in February; and that was the basis on which we made the appropriations.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there are many fine programs in the appropriation bill and I compliment the Senator from Rhode Island upon his customary skill, fortitude, and eloquence.

There is one item in particular which I would like to comment on and which I know will also interest many people living in metropolitan areas near airports. That is on page 13 of the bill and represents $100,000 for the study of relief to homeowners who live in proximity to airports. As this is not in the House bill, I hope that the conferees will study this problem which is of critical importance to the cities and will include these very important funds for the HHFA study authorized by section 1113 of the Housing Act of 1965. The House Banking and Currency Committee in considering the housing bill noted this problem in some detail in its report on that bill.

This is the first time that we have really done anything in the field of airport noise abatement through improved methods of housing construction. An English Government commission recently recommended exactly this method—of improving soundproofing and other housing construction approaches. This study would also be helpful concerning problems arising from the flight of supersonic aircraft, funds for which are also included in this bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I call up my amendment at the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 43, after line 22, insert the following:

SOUTHEAST HURRICANE DISASTER

> For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Southeast Hurricane Disaster Relief Act of 1965, such amount as may be necessary but not to exceed $70,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of authorizing legislation.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. This matter has been thoroughly discussed in the early part of the afternoon, and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has indicated his acceptance of the amendment; and so have I.

While I am not saying that I am accepting it, I have no personal objection to it. I have not consulted with other members of the committee on it. I should like to put it to a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], I call up my amendment at the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 20, in line 9, after the figure "$2,935,000" insert the following: ", of which not to exceed $100,000 shall be for the National Advisory Committee on Education of the Deaf, and not to exceed $100,000 shall be for the National Conference on Education of the Deaf".

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Alabama will yield, this matter has been discussed with myself and the Senator from Massachusetts. This would not require additional money. It is merely an earmarking amendment. It is acceptable to me, and I understand that it is also acceptable to the Senator from Massachusetts. We are ready for a voice vote on it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama to include my name as a cosponsor of his amendment.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I would also like to have my name added as a cosponsor, as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the names of the cosponsors will be added to the amendment.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I have a small but very important amendment at the desk. I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 35, after line 9, insert the following:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

> For an additional amount for "General Investigations", $30,000.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, this amendment would allow the Corps of Engineers to make a study to determine whether improvements in the nature of flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power, and other purposes and related land resources in the Red River Basin, located in Kentucky and Tennessee, are advisable at this time. It involves only $30,000 to be expended for this purpose during fiscal year 1966.

I have checked this matter with the Corps of Engineers, and they have assured me that they have the capability to utilize $30,000 for the study in fiscal year 1966.

I hope, therefore, that the distinguished chairman of the committee will accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I do not know the basis on which the amendment is being offered, but I understand that this money is needed to carry out an investigation under a law which has just been enacted.

Mr. BASS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Therefore, I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I must invite the attention of the Senate to one item of great concern to myself and, I believe, to the great majority of New Hampshire residents.

Provision is made in this bill for the appropriation of $1,850,000 to be expended for preconstruction planning for the construction of a public hydroelectric project known as the Dickey-Lincoln School Dam and Reservoir on the St. John River in Maine. The total cost of this project, incidentally, is estimated to be $300 million. My initial concern with this matter is one of "haste makes waste." It is evident, from information available to me, that the entire question demands further study before the Federal Government is committed to an expenditure of this dimension.

The facts are that the Dickey-Lincoln School plan has never been thoroughly studied as an independent project, but always as an increment of the Passamaquoddy tidal power complex. This is one reason, I believe, why the House of Representatives refused to authorize construction of this project to proceed, but rather insisted that it be returned to the Corps of Engineers for additional study. It is appropriate to mention that at this very moment the question of authorizing the expenditure of money to start this project is still in dispute between the Senate and the House.

As I have indicated, the Dickey-Lincoln proposal is a spinoff of the Passamaquoddy project, which has been rejected repeatedly as uneconomic.

It is interesting to note how Dickey-Lincoln came to the attention of the Congress during the present session. In July of this year, Secretary Udall of the Department of the Interior filed a report to the President, entitled "Conservation of the Natural Resources of New England" and subtitled "The Passamaquoddy Tidal Power Project and Upper St. John River Hydroelectric Development." In this report, it was indicated that the cost-to-benefit ratio for Passamaquoddy was 0.89 or less than unity. The ratio on Dickey-Lincoln was alleged to be 1.86, and the ratio of both projects combined was 1.23. The fact that construction of Passamaquoddy was not suggested to the Congress is self-explanatory. Even the wildest proponents of public power development could hardly justify a less-than-unity cost-to-benefit ratio. Accordingly, only a segment of the Passamaquoddy project has been offered.

But, the Dickey-Lincoln School project will not stand up under scrutiny. The heart of the matter is contained on page 4 of Mr. Udall's report, and I quote:

> A composite power value would be $23.50 per kilowatt-year and 2.6 mills per kilowatt-hour. Using this value and the applicable interest rate of 3⅛ percent, the annual benefits, costs, and benefit-cost ratios of the proposed developments were as shown below.

As I have indicated, by an arbitrary determination of cost and benefit figures, the Secretary determined that Dickey-Lincoln would enjoy the benefit-cost ratio of 1.86. His cost figures apparently are based on costs to private utilities in the late 1950's. These figures no longer are valid. He assumes, and so states, that construction of an alternate power-producing project by private enterprise would cost $23.50 per kilowatt-year. In fact, this figure is just about double the actual and true cost of plants now under construction. I am informed that the Public Service Co. of New Hampshire, the largest electric utility in my State, presently has under contract the construction of a coal-burning steam plant at Bow, N.H., which will cost $12.34 per kilowatt-year. This plant is designed for a capacity of about one-half of Dickey-Lincoln. If it were to have the capacity programed for Dickey-Lincoln, its costs per kilowatt-year would be substantially less. These facts speak for themselves.

Finally, it should be made clear that the administration has never submitted a budget estimate on this item. Apparently, the figure of $1,850,000 is one tendered by the Corps of Engineers as representing the amount that could be spent in this fiscal year, should the project be authorized. Why, then, is it necessary that we proceed during the closing days of the session to make available the seed money for a project of this dimension, when even the administration has been unable or unwilling to give it adequate study?

Mr. President, I have yet to be confronted with any compelling evidence that this public power is either necessary or desirable, and I regret that precipitous action is being taken without its receiving full and comprehensive study. It is my hope that the project will not be authorized, at least until such study has been completed and the true facts have been determined. If it is authorized and we appropriate the money to commence it, I feel strongly that we will have embarked on a dangerous and illogical course.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I want the record to show that I am opposed to the passage of H.R. 11588, the supplemental appropriation bill.

There are some necessary items included in this bill of which I approve, but there are many other items which are not as necessary or urgent. They should be studied in greater detail and reduced considerably.

It is long past time that Congress exert more authority over the purse strings of the Treasury and cut down on some of the enormous outlays for questionable programs. This country cannot afford to continue spending, year after year, more than it receives and expect to maintain any semblance of confidence in the stability of the dollar. The day of reckoning will have to come.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I was happy to learn that the Senate Appropriations Committee has agreed to the House language contained in H.R. 11588, increasing the Civil Defense Operation and Maintenance allocation by $3,375,000 in fiscal year 1966.

I am also pleased by the inclusion of additional funds for schools of public health. This is very important to Hawaii.

Earlier this year, in the Independent Offices Appropriation bill, the House of Representatives approved only $9.25 million for civil defense operation and maintenance. This was approximately 42 percent below the $16 million approved in fiscal 1965. Although the Senate increased this allocation to $16 million, the conference on this measure compromised on $12.625 million. To leave the allocation for civil defense operation and maintenance at $12.625 million would have dealt a critical blow to the Federal-State cooperative civil defense effort.

All of the county governments in the State of Hawaii wrote me on this subject pointing out the real need for restoration of the civil defense allocation in fiscal 1966 to at least the 1965 level of $16 million. Without this restoration valuable ground would be lost in Hawaii's efforts to produce a meaningful and effective civil defense program.

I believe that the people of Hawaii know as well as any other citizens of her sister States the need for a good civil defense program. The leaders of our Hawaii county governments who wrote me recall very well firsthand experiences when civil defense was in reality a matter of life and death.

I commend the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee for approving this additional allocation of $3.375 million for civil defense operation and maintenance in fiscal year 1966. I know I voice the appreciation of Hawaii's county officials and the citizens of Hawaii in this matter.

I urge my colleagues to approve this action of the Senate Appropriations Committee on H.R. 11588.

Mr. President, before concluding I should also like to express my appreciation to the members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations for approving an increase of $1 million for public health schools in America.

There are now 12 such schools and soon it is expected there will be 13, for the public health school at the University of Hawaii is due to be accredited this month.

By increasing the appropriations for schools of public health, grants can be made for the University of Hawaii school without diminishing the Hill-Rhodes grants of the other 12 public health schools.

The increase is, of course, based on the recently enacted statute increasing the annual authorization for schools of public health from $2.5 million to $5 million.

I commend Senators on the Committee on Appropriations for their prompt action in response to a clear and definite need in the field of public health instruction and training.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I commend the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare and Related Agencies for restoring in the second supplemental appropriation we are now considering, an item which is relatively small as Government budgets go. But it is one which is close to my heart—and all of yours as well. It is an item for $500,000 funding the Joint Commission on Mental Health for Children.

This Commission grew out of the terrible tragedy of the Kennedy assassination, the tragedy which made us conscious of many things that are weak in our society.

One of the most devastating parts of the story of the assassination was reported authoritatively by the Warren Commission: Lee Oswald, as a 13-year-old, had come to the attention of the welfare and psychiatric authorities in New York City. But, for many reasons, he had slipped through society's fingers, left to disintegrate and eventually to become the assassin of a great and beloved President.

And so I introduced a bill in the Senate, S. 488, under which we could mount an attack on the problems of emotionally disturbed children. There are an estimated half million such children in the country; only 10,000 or 2 percent of them are known to be receiving treatment. Since my bill provided health services for children, it seemed logically to fit into the childcare program I proposed in the Senate as amendments to H.R. 6675—or medicare. Incidentally, the response to this proposal has been enormous. The mail I have received indicates a part of the suffering and tragedy caused by emotional illness. People have written about this subject with intense feeling—you could read between the lines that this sort of problem had in one way or another touched their lives, too.

My amendment No. 199 to H.R. 6675 originally approached this mental health problem through an expansion of the authorization in H.R. 6675 for health services for school-age and pre-school-age children. An extra annual $5 million would have gone to projects for identifying and providing care and treatment for emotionally disturbed children, to be administered by appropriate agencies. And the amendment also set up a top-notch Commission to do a definitive study of the country's resources for emotionally disturbed children. Once the facts are in from this distinguished source, we could take another look at the problems and what additional steps must be taken to solve them.

Mr. President, the Senate adopted this amendment. In conference with the House, however, part of it—the part providing for actual services—was deleted. But the Joint Commission remained. I was very pleased at this, for the chief people in this field desperately want and need such a study. The Joint Commission on Mental Health and Illness wanted it; this distinguished group said it had neither the time nor funds even to study the needs of children. The outstanding professionals of this country want it; a few years ago a conference held by the American Academy of Child Psychiatry and the American Psychiatric Association urged that it be made. So the Joint Commission was authorized, and all the organizations in the field cooperated to launch it.

The American Psychiatric Association, the American Psychological Association, the American Medical Association, the American Orthopsychiatric Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the National Association of Social Workers, the National Association of Mental Health, and the National Association of Retarded Children and a number of other national professional organizations have joined together as a Joint Commission on the Mental Health of Children. The Commission is now incorporated in the District of Columbia, and as I understand it, is ready to start work.

But the Commission was without funds for the $500,000 item authorized by the Congress for this purpose. It was originally part of the Labor-HEW second supplemental bill for fiscal 1966 and was deleted by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. President, it was not the intention of the Congress that this important item be dropped, and it is certainly not the function of the Congress to propose so that the Bureau of the Budget can dispose.

It would be tragic, Mr. President, if this important Commission were jeopardized before it can even get off the ground. We are in a particularly bad position here, Mr. President, because the authorizing legislation makes the money for the Commission available only in fiscal years 1966 and 1967. In other words, if the item were not restored in the second supplemental, we would lose the chance to get started this year.

This Commission has been authorized by the Congress, and should be funded so that it can do a desperately needed job.

I appeared before the distinguished Appropriations Subcommittee chaired by Mr. Hill to urge that these funds be added to the supplemental appropriation. I am very pleased that the subcommittee recommended this action be taken.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL PROVIDES FUNDS FOR GREAT SOCIETY PROGRAMS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this final appropriation bill of the 1st session of the 89th Congress appropriates money for many of the important new programs which were authorized this year. Therefore this is a very important bill, and I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona, the chairman, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], who is floor managing the bill, and the other distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee who held hearings on the bill, for the dispatch with which they have brought it to the floor.

The sum of $173,200,000 is appropriated for higher education to begin the implementation of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Since the request was submitted so late in the year and since so little time was available for consideration of the requests, the committee did not feel justified in appropriating the full amount requested by the administration, $274 million. When the committee considered the bill, the conference report on the bill had not yet been filed. The bill authorizes over $800 million per annum, so I hope that we will have an additional supplemental bill early in 1966 to carry out this great and vital law.

As the author of title VI of the Higher Education Act, which provides matching grants for the purchase of audiovisual and other types of laboratory and classroom equipment, I am especially gratified that $15 million has been appropriated to get this program started.

The committee has recommended $10,700,000 for the new National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. This should allow the Foundation to get off to a good start, and they may come back later to request additional funds within their authorization.

WATER AND SEWER FACILITIES

Mr. President, in my travels around the country and around my State, the one question I am asked most is: "Senator, what can we do to get sewage facilities and water facilities for our town?"

In the small cities especially, these facilities are desperately needed. The 89th Congress enacted four programs to enable cities and towns to acquire these facilities. Public Law 89-240 authorized grants to assist rural areas to finance projects for works for the development, storage, treatment, purification, and distribution of water and the collection, treatment, and disposal of wastes in rural areas. The committee recommends $30 million for this purpose, which is $17 million more than the request. In view of the need for these funds I am very happy that the committee has recommended the more ample amount. I commend the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] for his great leadership in this program.

The housing bill authorized a program to aid medium-sized towns to acquire basic water and sewer facilities. The committee concurs with the House in recommending the full $100 million.

The Public Works and Economic Development Act authorized these facilities for areas which suffer from high unemployment and low income. The committee recommends $254,500,000 for title I of the act, which includes other programs in addition to sewer and water facilities. This is above the House figure of $203,200,000.

The Water Quality Act of 1965 amends the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize increased funds to aid construction of municipal waste treatment facilities, and authorized a program of grants and contracts to develop new or improved methods of controlling wastes. The committee recommends $30 million for the first purpose and $20 million for the latter.

The Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments Act of 1965, H.R. 8310, is now in conference. I am hopeful that we can get agreement on the bill during this session of Congress. The full request of $8,310,000 is recommended for the expanded vocational rehabilitation program.

HEART, CANCER, AND STROKE

Perhaps the most important bill which Congress passed this session in the field of health, in a year in which many, many important health bills passed Congress under the leadership of the distinguished chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee [Mr. Hill], was the Heart, Cancer, and Stroke Amendments of 1965. This legislation will make possible the creation of regional medical complexes in all parts of the country. These will contain research facilities and treatment facilities for heart disease, cancer, and stroke. A major purpose of this program is to disseminate the latest results of scientific research to the practicing physician. The committee recommends the full request of $25 million for this purpose.

The Economic Opportunity Act was greatly expanded this year. The sum of $1,510 million is recommended for this program.

The city of San Antonio is celebrating its 250th anniversary in 1968 with a hemispheric fair. The sum of $125,000 is appropriated for covering the expenses necessary for planning the extent of participation by the United States in HemisFair 1968. The fair has extensive local support. A total of $54 million in State and local funds has already been raised or pledged. The fair is being carefully planned so as to receive the sanction of the Bureau of International Expositions, which is necessary in order for foreign governments to sponsor exhibits at the fair.

MORTGAGE RELIEF FUND

The new Housing Act provided authorization for mortgage payments on the behalf of distressed homeowners who are unemployed as a result of the closing of Federal installations. This assistance is limited to the payment of principal and interest for up to 1 year on federally insured mortgages. The mortgagor must enter into a binding agreement to repay the aggregate amount advanced by the FHA in his behalf.

This assistance is badly needed in those communities in which a military base was closed down by the recent base closings. I have two such communities in my own State—Amarillo and Waco.

When a base closes many people are thrown out of work. Others are forced to move to another community. They are placed in a serious financial bind. This money can help them through a difficult period. The money will be paid back to the Federal Government after the crisis is over.

The House denied funds on the grounds that no applications had been filed. The reason why no applications had been filed is that no forms were available. I have here a letter from Mr. Rhea Smith, the VA County Service officer for Potter County, Tex., which states that they have had dozens and dozens of calls wanting to know where and to whom applications should be made.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letters be printed at this point in the Record, together with another letter from Mrs. Charles E. Gross of Amarillo.

There being no objection the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

County of Potter,
State of Texas,
Amarillo, Tex., October 18, 1965.

Hon. Ralph Yarborough,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Yarborough: In our Amarillo paper under a Washington dateline was a headline, "Base Home Owners Hit by House Rule." This concerns the appropriations for mortgage relief payments to phased out base homeowners. .Five hundred thousand dollars was knocked out for the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration to make a year's mortgage payments for financially strapped homeowners. The Appropriations Committee claims this is due to the fact there had been no applications for these payments. The reason there were no applications is because we have not been authorized to file any applications. As far as we can ascertain there are no application forms available.

Our office here in Amarillo has had dozens and dozens of calls wanting to know where and to whom application should be made. Had we had application forms this office would have sent in at least 100 applications already.

There is no question in my mind concerning the need for this legislation. There will be many, many servicemen as well as civilian personnel who will be desperate if this legislation is not passed. There have been some already who were forced to abandon their homes due to Congress slowness in passing legislation as well as information on how to make application for payments on their homes.

I am in hopes that Congress and the Senate will do everything they can to rectify the error that the House committee made last week.

Yours truly,

RHEA SMITH,
Veterans County Service Officer.

AMARILLO, TEX.,
October 16, 1965.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I do hope this letter will come to your personal attention because it relates to an important matter with which you are directly connected as a member of the Appropriations Committee. I refer to an article in the Friday, October 15, 1965, edition of the Amarillo Globe-Times regarding the deletion of funds for the mortgage relief program for Amarillo Air Force Base home owners. This deletion was due to the fact that no applications had been received. Included in this article was a statement from our Representative, WALTER ROGERS, in which he said, "If someone wants to file an application he should get in touch with the VA or the FHA and explain his situation. If he is eligible under the program he will be allowed to make application for funds."

But it doesn't work that way—and I feel you need to be aware of what is happening.

We represent a family who is being displaced by the base closure here in Amarillo. My husband is a civilian employee who was given only 1 week notice of transfer. I immediately called the local FHA office to see what arrangements could be made about our house because Amarillo is currently in a housing depression. With nine houses already standing vacant on our street we have little hope of selling ours.

When I called the FHA office and requested information about the program that Congress had passed I was given a very curt and rude reply that they had no information on this and couldn't do a thing for me. Now, I would like for you to tell me how a person can file an application for anything if the local FHA office won't even talk to them?

My husband was able to get a little information before he left from the legal officer at the base and we do fit all requirements for aid. The legal officer told him, however, that nothing could be done until the funds were apppropriated. And now we find that Congress won't appropriate the funds until the applications are received. Does that make sense?

I would certainly appreciate your taking the time to reply on this. Because in January when the second half of this program (in which we are interested) comes up relative to purchase of homes of those employees unable to dispose of them, this same situation will probably occur again. It all looked good when Congress passed this relief program, but in reality it appears to be a farce. As a result my husband is gone and I am left behind with four small children trying to do something with a house that is impossible to sell.

Very truly yours,

MRS. CHARLES E. GROSS.

AMARILLO, TEX.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, no good answer could be given to these requests for applications because authorization has not been given to file any applications. As far as Mr. Smith could ascertain, there are no application forms available. There seems to have been a serious breakdown in the operations of the Veterans' Administration. But this foulup on the part of a Government bureau should not result in no funds being granted. These people, who through no fault of their own, are forced to abandon their homes in a depressed market, need help—and they need it now.

Mr. President, I am very disappointed that the Senate Appropriations Committee did not appropriate funds for this item, since it is so badly needed. It was done without prejudice to the program, however, and I am hopeful that it can be funded at the earliest opportunity in the next session of Congress. I urge the VA and the FHA to come in ready to justify the need for this program at that time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee explanation from the Senate committee report be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORTGAGE RELIEF FUND

Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 278) (authorized by sec. 107, Public Law 89-117)	$500,000
House allowance	None
Committee recommendation	None

The new Housing Act provides authorization for a new program of mortgage relief under the FHA and VA loan programs. The budget estimates propose $500,000 in each agency to establish mortgage relief funds. This program would make loans to pay principal and interest for 1 year on federally insured mortgages of distressed homeowners who are unemployed as the result of the closing of a Federal installation. The committee denies the request for these funds without prejudice, in order to give FHA and VA the opportunity to justify the need for this program at some later time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall not detain Senators long, but my able colleague [Mr. SMATHERS] and I have a prepared statement which we would like to have incorporated in the RECORD, but first I should like to outline it, and I shall do so as quickly as I can.

Title 3 of the bill covers an item of $12,600,000 as requested by the President to take care of the immediate expenses in connection with the new influx of Cuban refugees. On this subject I wish to make a few comments. First, my colleague and I wish it distinctly understood that this is the best that could be done in estimating the immediate expenses. This subject can be considered again by the Congress next spring, and if the movement of Cuban refugees is as large as all who seem to know something about it are now predicting—they now predict approximately 45,000, and it may grow greater—it will be necessary to appropriate additional funds.

The second comment I should like to make is that we are hoping that the emphasis on prompt resettlement will be a strong emphasis as laid down by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and all Federal offices concerned.

The area of Miami, Dade County, has received approximately 270,000 Cuban refugees under the earlier influx of refugees and approximately a third of them are back there now.

Although the resettlement covered much more than two-thirds, a great many have come back. It has been disturbing, especially to the people of low-income economy.

For example, elevator operators in hotels and large buildings are now largely Cubans. Similar positions in hotels for maids and in hospitals for service there, and numerous categories of that kind, are filled by Cubans who are amply eligible to do finer tasks, but cannot because of language deficiency.

The Government has done a fine job in many respects, but I want it distinctly understood, as distinguished Senators who know about the situation are aware, that the impact on the community has been terrific, and that the continuation of the impact in the near future by 45,000 is going to be something that will be difficult to handle.

I hope that emphasis will be placed on the prompt resettlement of those fleeing from Castro's tyranny.

The second point I want to make is the great impact employment of the Cuban refugees is having, largely on our colored citizens. I shall include in the RECORD a letter written by the president of the local NAACP in the Miami area. I have not filed many such statements in the RECORD during the course of recent years, but this one happens to be one that I can vouch for, because I know how seriously the people directly represented by the NAACP have been affected, and how adversely they have been affected, and how they look with such dread upon the situation now confronting them again. I hope our Federal officials may be mindful of that fact.

The third point I wanted to make is that there is in Tampa a community of Latins by the thousands, many of whom are well to do, who have relatives in Cuba now trying to get out.

Only the other day the State senator from that area, along with two able attorneys, one of English background and the other of Latin background, were here to show petitions by people in that area asking help to get some 800 of their relatives out of Cuba. They are anxious to guarantee that they will not be public charges. They are willing and able to take care of them.

I hope those in charge of this important program will do what they can to accelerate the movement of those 800—there may be others—if they can come indirectly to Tampa, or if they cannot, so they can be cleared out of the reception centers in Miami as quickly as possible.

It would ease the problem if they could come just as fast as possible to the homes opened to them by their relatives in Tampa.

Mr. President, the gentlemen who came from Tampa told us about owners of some small boats who are seeking to collect $1,000 a head for going down to Cuba and bringing back relatives. With all the urgency that there is in the problem, good people will be abused if we do not act promptly. Already some people have been imposed upon by paying $1,000 apiece for, let us say, a mother and four children, to come that relatively short distance from Cuba. The possibilities of this kind of abuse are obvious when people are anxious to get out before Castro changes his mind, which is what they are afraid of.

I hope the President will move with all possible speed to accept the offer of Mr. Castro.

Mr. President, there are many things I would like to cover, which are mentioned in my statement. I shall ask that the entire statement be included in the RECORD. I state this at the special request of my colleague [Mr. SMATHERS] and myself, and the entire Florida delegation, so those in charge of the program at the Federal level may realize immediately that, no matter how generously the Federal Government may move, a great part of the problem falls heavily upon the receiving community and the receiving people, so anything that can be done to speed up resettlement to ease the problem should be done.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement to which I have referred be included in the RECORD in toto, for my colleague [Mr. SMATHERS] and myself.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATORS HOLLAND AND SMATHERS

The $12.6 million contained in chapter 3 of the supplemental appropriation bill we are considering is the result of an announcement by the President to accept additional refugees from Cuba, our first concern being for those Cubans who have been separated from children, parents, husbands, or wives who are already in this country.

It is estimated that up to 2,500 refugees will arrive in Miami during this month and that up to 5,000 may arrive each month thereafter. The HEW estimates the total number of these new refugees may reach 45,000.

I note, that of the $12.6 million, $7 million will be utilized for welfare assistance, $4 million for resettlement out of the Miami area, $1.3 million for educational assistance and to increase the capacity of the refugee center in Miami, and $300,000 to provide health services.

In testimony before the House Appropriations Committee, the Department of HEW representatives testified that some 270,000 Cuban refugees were now in this country. They have entered since the first program was actually started in February 1961.

The influx of these Cuban refugees has been handled by our Government in a most commendable manner. However, there has been a tremendous burden placed upon the greater Miami area, Dade County, and the State of Florida as a result of the refugee program.

As an example, I read into the RECORD an article by Juanita Greene, in the Miami Herald of October 6, 1965, entitled "A Third of U.S. Cuban Refugees Now Live in Dade":

"More than a third of all the alien Cubans in the United tSates live in Dade County. Almost half live somewhere in Florida.

"These figures from the U.S. Immigration Service cast a significant shadow over the success of the Federal Government's present plans to put even more emphasis on resettlement as it awaits the arrival of an expected 5,000 new refugees a month to Miami.

"Compiled from last January's alien registration, they include all native-born Cubans who have not become U.S. citizens. The great majority are refugees.

"The nationwide total was 244,806. Of these, 94,987 gave a Dade County address and another 11,628 were living elsewhere in Florida.

"The Tampa area had the next largest number in Florida with 3,825. Third was Palm Beach County, where some of the wealthier refugees are concentrated in Palm Beach and many laborers work the newly developed sugar fields and mills near Lake Okeechobee.

"The only State to approach Florida in Cuban population is New York with 48,380, most of them concentrated in the three counties of New York, Queens, and Kings.

"New Jersey had 24,200, California, 11,377, Illinois 5,985.

"No other State had more than 5,000. Thirteen had less than 100.

"In nine States, the number of registered Cuban aliens was less than the number of Cuban refugees officially resettled there, indicating that some of the refugees returned to Miami or went elsewhere. These were States where the number of Cubans was small and the climate cold.

"For example, the local refugee center reported at the end of last year that it had resettled 2,942 Cubans in Massachusetts. Yet only 2,782 alien Cubans registered with the immigration department there in January.

"It is doubtful that any had become citizens in the meantime, because that takes 5 years after an alien had entered the country as a permanent resident.

"Most of the refugees do not have permanent resident status but are parolees. To become permanent residents they must leave the country and reenter under resident visas.

"Of the 94,987 Cuban nationals in Dade, for example, only 33,589 have resident status. They could, if they applied, become citizens and voters in 5 years or less. Last year 2,600 were naturalized.

"Though the exact number of Cuban refugees in the United States is not known, the refugee center reported it had registered 175,485 between January 1, 1963, and January 8, 1965. The remaining 69,321 Cubans in the United States are either not refugees or refugees who failed to register at the center.

"At the end of last year the center reported that about 85,500 persons had been resettled to other parts of the country. Most of them went to urban centers, especially New York, Los Angeles, Chicago and cities in northern New Jersey. Here their assimilation was aided by the fact that Cuban colonies already existed.

"Included in the national figures is Puerto Rico, which took in 8,392 resettled refugees and has a Cuban population of 18,000.

"The flow of refugees into Miami began to quicken in 1961, and reached a peak in the fall of 1962, when they poured in at the rate of about 7,000 a month. Then it stopped abruptly after the Cuban missile crisis, when Pan American Airways planes stopped their daily runs to Havana.

"There was another, but briefer flood in 1963 when refugees were allowed out in ships which delivered material for the exchange of Bay of Pigs prisoners. Arrivals since then have trickled in from other foreign countries, principally Mexico, and by small boat.

"Refugees came first to Miami not only because of its many sociological and climatic amenities, but because they had to register here to get on welfare. The checks would then follow those who were officially resettled to other parts of the country.

"In 1958, the last year of the old Cuban regime and 1959, the first year of Castro, the number of Cubans in the United States was not considered sufficiently important to be included in the immigration breakdown. First available figure is for 1961, when 11,521 Cuban aliens registered.

"The other eight areas which, according to the registration figures, proved unpopular with the refugees were: Colorado, where 913 were resettled but only 756 were registered; Iowa, which got 313 and later counted 304; Oklahoma, 363 and 347; Oregon, 466 and 457; South Dakota, 48 and 34; Vermont, 38 and 14; Wyoming, 14 and 5, and the District of Columbia, 1,007 and 504."

I read also a letter I received from Donald Wheeler Jones, president of the Miami branch, NAACP, under date of October 13, 1965, which I believe reports the effect that the Cuban refugee program is having on the Negro race in the Greater Miami area.

I quote:

"DEAR SIR: We are writing this letter in behalf of what we believe to be the best interests of the citizens and residents of Miami, Dade County, Fla., with particular emphasis on the problems that the Negro people here can be expected to face in view of the pending, additional influx of Cuban people to this community as refugees.

"We have noted with great concern President Johnson's positive statements regarding an additional accommodation of Cuban refugees by this country. We feel that despite efforts at resettlement, a great majority of these newly arrived refugees will remain in the Miami, Dade County area for reasons of kinship and proximity to their native country.

"A cursory observation of the employment patterns of many Miami and Miami Beach hotels, restaurants, and other businesses will substantiate the fact that the Cuban has displaced the Negro and other personnel formerly employed there in many capacities such as waiters, bellhops, doormen, elevator operators, and other similar occupations. There are many other categories of employment, almost too numerous to mention, that Negroes no longer enjoy as a direct result of the Cuban influx which apparently is about extended. In short, the Cuban influx immigrants to this country have had their most severe effect upon that group of citizens least able to afford it, the uneducated, nonhighly skilled, nonprofessional Negro who prior to the Cuban influx could eke out a fairly decent standard of living through menial, service type jobs that require a minimum of formal education or training.

"We are aware that the exigencies of the crucial situation following the rise of the Cuban dictatorship in Cuba did not allow sufficient time for the erection of all of the safeguards that perhaps the Federal, State, county, and municipal governments could have conceived to protect their citizens from the displacement in their jobs and the consequential economic wants.

"We would like to make it abundantly clear that we are in favor of our national policy of admitting the oppressed of the Castro regime, and we will be among the first to be of whatever assistance we can in making the next arrival of Cuban refugees a pleasant one.

"We are confident that the Cuban people and the Negroes of this community can live and work together as brothers.

"We feel, however, that the Federal Government must exercise its responsibilities toward the economically oppressed of this community as well as toward the politically oppressed of Cuba.

"The average Negro citizen of this community who lost his job to a Cuban has, by and large, borne his burden in silence as a sacrificial lamb for the extension of freedom and democracy to refugees from another land. I feel that the Negroes and other citizens of this community can always be depended upon to sacrifice a maximum amount to help fulfill the promises of our great Nation to the oppressed. However, it does seem, since the Federal Government, acting without the pressure of an immediate crisis in this area, but rather with great calmness and deliberation, has decided to further accommodate the Cuban people in their mass exodus from tyranny to freedom, that now is the time to look to the freedom of all of our citizens from economic oppression that will almost certainly be caused by this addition to our labor market.

"This additional competition, we feel, will be felt most acutely at the menial level where too many of our Negro and other citizens have already been eliminated due to the previous admissions of Cubans to the Miami, Dade County area.

"We feel that now is the time when plans should be formulated to insure, as much as is practically possible, the economic stability of our community and the job security for all of our citizens, including Negroes, so that the extension of freedom to those from a foreign land does not result in the extension of poverty among our own citizens at home.

"We feel that it is of equal importance that there be no ill will between the citizens of this community and the Cuban population. While there is only the slightest indication of such ill will at the present time, history has amply illustrated time and time again that when groups in want are involved in fierce competition for jobs, friction almost inevitably occurs. This seems to be true without regard to the racial, religious, and language differences or similarities that may be involved. While we of the local NAACP are always optimistic concerning the ability of Negroes to give additional forebearance in difficult times, it must be indicated that there is absolutely no basis for the bland assumption from any quarter that the seemingly inevitable friction, to which I have previously alluded, will not come to pass despite the best efforts of the local authorities and the general populace.

"We ask that full consideration be given to the matters alluded to herein in the interests of all our citizens.

"Please be assured that we stand anxious to be of whatever service that we can in the formulation of meaning solutions in the hope that the reality of freedom for the Cuban and for Negroes in our community can be equal, free of oppression, economic or otherwise, and peaceful and harmonious.

"Sincerely,

"Donald Wheeler Jones,
"President, Miami Branch, NAACP."

Our Government is doing a commendable job in assisting the Cuban refugees to reach a haven from Communist aggression. I support this action, as I am sure all Floridians support it. However, I am hopeful that the Government will take cognizance of the situation this program has created in the State of Florida and will exert stronger efforts toward the prompt resettlement of the refugees to other areas of the country.

I am hopeful that the unemployment problem in the Miami area will be lessened to a degree by the work that will be provided in the construction of the Inter-American Trade and Cultural Center, better known as INTERAMA. I will dicuss in more detail at such time as the legislation which I introduced for myself and my colleague to enable Federal participation in this cultural center may be considered by the Senate.

I do wish to point out several salient facts in connection with the construction that have a direct bearing on the unemployment problem in Greater Miami and which I placed in the Record on June 26, 1963, at the time the Senate favorably considered an amendment which I introduced for myself and my colleague, Senator Smathers, to amend the Area Redevelopment Act of 1963.

During the debate on that amendment, I placed in the Record statistics compiled by the Florida Industrial Commission based on a survey made in March 1963. They showed that in Dade County there were 43,300 unemployed persons of employable age, of which 19,300 were Cuban refugees of employable age. The continued influx of refugees and the steady movement of the resettled Cubans back to the Miami area has not lessened this unemployment problem. The remaining 24,000 represented our own people in modest positions such as elevator operators, porters in hotels, custodial workers, and positions of that kind who had been displaced by Cuban refugees.

As indicated in Donald Jones' letter to which previously referred, the problem among our own residents and citizens is among employees in those modest positions such as maids in hotels and the like, who are mostly members of the colored race, who are generally employed in such positions, and who want to be reemployed.

A program for resettlement of the new influx of Cuban refugees was discussed with me as late as yesterday. State Senator Tom Whittaker, of Tampa, Fla., and William E. Henson and Andrew Garcia, all highly reputable lawyers, came to Washington for the purpose of seeing the appropriate Government officials in order to expedite the movement of refugees from Cuba to Tampa, Fla., where they have relatives and where those relatives, by affidavits, have indicated the names of their relatives in Cuba and have guaranteed that the refugees will not become public charges. It appears to me that with such affidavits and with the list of names, which I understand is about 800, it would be a simple matter to set the appropriate machinery in motion for the movement of these refugees from Cuba direct to Tampa and avoid resettlement problems. There is adequate medical personnel in Tampa as well as hospital facilities and with the augmentation of the immigration and inspection service for a minimum period, resettlement could be accomplished with little effort.

I might also add that transportation arrangements at no cost to the Government could be made and that such should be done as rapidly as possible to prevent the continued efforts of a few boatowners to move the refugees out of Cuba at, I am told, $1,000 per person.

The State Department officials with whom these gentlemen I referred to met gave little assurance of an early decision, but were hopeful of being able to give an indication of the Department's position during the week.

Here is an example of a community desiring to assist, in every possible way, in the program announced by the President to a point that they have taken it upon themselves to obtain affidavits from those Cubans already in Tampa who have indicated their desire to have their families with them and who have vouched for their support.

Again I repeat, action should be taken immediately, for those Cubans now in this country are fearful that Castro will soon clamp down on the mass exodus and they are therefore taking the unnecessary risk of hiring small boats to go to Cuba in an effort to remove their parents and loved ones from the grips of the Communist-dominated island.

I bring this matter to the attention of the Senate at this time, not for the purpose of opposing the humanitarianism of our Government, for I believe I speak for all Floridians and all free people in saying that we should do everything in our power to assist those oppressed persons, our neighbors to the South and only 90 miles off the shores of Florida. I do so only to stress the importance of those responsible for the administration of this program to exert every possible effort to resettle promptly these refugees in other areas of the country, which, I am sure, would welcome them just as the good citizens of Florida have done in the past and will continue to do in the future.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I heartily congratulate the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] on the magnificent manner in which he handled the bill, under most trying circumstances.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I join in the statement of the Senator from Alabama. I have observed the work of the Senator from Rhode Island with complete pride.

Mr. HILL. It is impossible for one not a member of the committee to realize the difficulties that confronted the chairman and the subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 11588) was passed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Pastore, Mr. Holland, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Russell of Georgia, Mr. Ellender, Mr. Hill, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Young of North Dakota, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Kuchel, and Mr. Hruska conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. PASTORE and Mr. MORSE moved to lay the motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] is quite a favorite in this body, as demonstrated by the many compliments he has already received on his management of the supplemental appropriation bill. We might, indeed, refer to him as a real legislator's legislator. He has proved worthy of that title again this afternoon. In very short but thoroughly complete fashion, he has shepherded through to passage an almost $5-billion supplemental appropriation bill.

This bill, Mr. President, was of tremendous importance to the Nation, because it contained appropriations for much of the dramatic, progressive legislation passed by this Congress. It covered the needs of many, many agencies of the Government with respect to a wide variety of the administration's programs.

I have the pleasure, Mr. President, of serving on the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, and I know, therefore, from personal experience, of the hard work, the long hours, and the breadth of comprehension required to understand and master a bill as important and involved as this. The Senator from Rhode Island has done this, and I highly commend him for it.

Others worked on this bill with equal diligence, Mr. President; that we all know. As is always the case on appropriations measures, the ranking Republican on the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has cooperated in an exemplary fashion. Without his cooperation and constructive suggestions and criticism, many appropriations measures, including this supplemental bill, would not receive the effective and expeditious treatment they traditionally do receive. I sincerely thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his constructive assistance in the work of this Senate.

It would take me some time to thank each Senator who has played an important role in passing this bill. Many, including the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], played an active part in debate on the measure.

I thank and congratulate each of these Senators, as well as everyone in this body. It has been through the constructive work of all of you that this bill has passed. I appreciate it; the Nation appreciates it. This bill and your hard work on it has made today a most productive one.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9567) to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11135) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOLEY, Mr. POAGE, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. PURCELL, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. DAGUE, Mr. BELCHER, and Mr. TEAGUE of California were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9567) to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

REPUBLICAN CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the conference report on the Higher Education Act of 1965 should be most gratifying for Senate Republicans who, in the historic tradition of Republican support of higher education dating back to the Morrill Act and the National Defense Education Act, supported the measure solidly when it passed the Senate last month.

The minority has a right to take understandable pride in the fact that the bill, as finally approved, includes some 24 major provisions sponsored by Senate Republicans in addition to many minor and technical amendments. Included among these major Senate provisions proposed by Members of the Republican minority are the following:

Additional National Defense Education Act loan forgiveness for those who teach in poverty-impacted areas.

Recognition of outstanding students by making available an additional $200 scholarship per annum grant for those students ranking in the upper half of their class.

Postponement of the cutoff of the Institutes for School Librarians established by the National Defense Education Act to permit a phaseout rather than a sudden disruption.

Broadening the scope of the Higher Education Facilities Act to include arts and humanities.

Reduction to 3 percent of the maximum interest rates for construction loans under title III of the Higher Education Facilities Act.

Authorization for a college to transfer 25 percent of its scholarship fund to its National Defense Education Act student loan fund.

Broadening of the title VI equipment grant provisions to include the arts and humanities, in addition to other areas of instruction.

Enhancement of the role of State and private, nonprofit institutions in guaranteeing low-cost student loans.

Increase in the authorization for fiscal year 1966 of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963.

Broadening of the title V fellowship program to include nonpublic school teachers.

Several sections streamlining and reforming National Defense Education Act loan procedures.

Making more flexible the use of funds for construction grants to public community colleges and public technical institutes under the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963.

Addition of "industrial arts" of title XI of the National Defense Education Act.

Authorization of payment in kind by colleges under the work-study program.

Addition of "economics" to titles III and XI of the National Defense Education Act.

Addition of "civics" to title XI of the National Defense Education Act.

Emphasis on high quality substantive courses in the title V teacher fellowship program rather than on the so-called educational method courses.

Broadening of title II so that institutions with modest resources can obtain maximum library assistance without a matching requirement and requiring institutions with resources to match Federal funds.

Training of college administrators for developing institutions.

Barring of title I extension course funds from use for sectarian instruction, religious worship, or divinity school courses.

Moderately decreasing Federal matching contribution under title I to encourage greater college participation in accord with recommendations of land-grant colleges.

FRATERNITIES AND SORORITIES

I am also highly gratified that in the bill as agreed to by the conferees, the section exempting certain college fraternities and sororities from title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, regarding cutoff of Federal funds from discriminatory activities, has been very narrowly limited. The final provision, section 804(b), is limited to those fraternities and sororities which are financed exclusively by funds derived from private sources and whose facilities are not owned by an institution of higher education. Inclusion of the important word "exclusively" in the final version carries out specifically the intention I had stressed when the provision was before the Senate.

LAW SCHOOLS

Also important is the language on page 78 of the conference report which makes it clear that the 1963 Higher Education Facilities Act provisions for construction of graduate schools includes all graduate schools, including those offering programs leading to a first degree in law.

BIPARTISAN SUPPORT

Mr. President, this is truly a bipartisan bill and as such has gained bipartisan support. The rivalry between Republicans and Democrats has been only to find which could contribute the most constructive means to achieve the goals we seek.

A special tribute is due the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] who, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, captained this legislation through committee, on the floor and through conference, utilizing in the best traditions of team play the resources of his colleagues from both sides of the aisle. As the "Mr. Education" of the Congress, Senator Morse indeed merits the approval of the Senate and the Nation.

I wish also to pay tribute to the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] who, as the ranking minority member of the Education Subcommittee, contributed so much to this legislation. He serves the cause of education in the tradition of his distinguished predecessor from Vermont, Justin S. Morrill, the author of the pioneer Morrill Act of 1862 which allotted substantial land grants to the States for the establishment of agricultural and mechanical colleges. While this Congress cannot boast a second Morrill Act, in Senator Prouty we can boast a second Morrill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very glad I yielded to the Senator from New York. I did not have the slightest idea what he was going to say when I yielded to him. I thought he was going to make an argument on the conference report.

Mr. President, I shall yield to the Senator from Tennessee, then to the Senator from Mississippi, then to the Senator from Alaska, then to the Senator from South Carolina, and then the Senator from Texas.

I yield now to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass].

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, first I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Oregon for the outstanding way he has handled the bill, from its very conception, through its passage in the Senate, and in the conference committee. Now it is on the floor of the Senate. I know of no man in the Senate or in the entire Congress who has contributed more in the field of higher education than has the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, recently I have given a great deal of thought to the needs of higher education in this Nation. I have conferred with educators, not only from my State of Mississippi, but also from other parts of the country. These conferences and my own independent studies have convinced me that the needs and demands of higher education in the immediate future are going to be so great that the State and local governments will not have the financial resources to provide the necessary facilities and student assistance programs.

Only a brief examination of the projected college and university enrollments for the years ahead is required to demonstrate the problems facing every State.

For example, it is estimated that by 1970 the number of students in our institutions of higher learning will increase by approximately 50 percent over present enrollment. This tremendous increase will place an overwhelming burden on the already overcrowded facilities unless we engage in an immediate program to improve and enlarge our public and private institutions.

So the critical demands of higher education are clear, Mr. President, and I believe the inability of State and local governments to meet these demands, under our present tax structure, is just as clear.

The Higher Education Act of 1965 is designed to provide limited assistance to meet some of these needs. I believe several significant changes were made by the House-Senate conferees which generally improve and strengthen the bill.

I shall vote for the bill on final passage.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, because of the beneficial effect which will flow from the bill and the conference report now being considered, ours will be a better nation, its citizens will lead better lives, happier lives and lives that will be much improved economically.

I believe what has been said by the Senator from New York concerning the magnificent work performed by the Senator from Oregon and those associated with him should be recognized by all Americans.

The Senator from Oregon has addressed himself to this task for years, but I think this is the crowning year. This is the year of the most complete success of all. We are all indebted to him.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate very much the help that the Senator from Alaska has given me on educational matters. He has performed a great service to the committee.

I thank him for that and for his kind remarks.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the higher education bill which passed the Senate on September 2 was one of the most complex and comprehensive education bills ever to come before Congress. When we went to conference, it immediately became apparent that there were many important differences between the House and the Senate bills about which both the Senate and the House conferees felt quite strongly.

Many of the seven titles were not in the House bill. One, the scholarship program, had been voted down on the floor of the House in the 87th Congress. This program did appear in different form in both bills, however.

We were told that the House would not accept certain parts of the Senate bill and that if the conferees accepted them they would be voted down on the floor.

Due to the legislative skill and patience of the distinguished Senator from Oregon the conference went forward day after day, week after week. Sessions were held until the House came around basically to every title in the bill, including the Teacher Corps.

The Senate conferees were fortunate to have as their chairman a Senator skilled in the persuasive arts. The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] once again demonstrated his mastery of difficult legislation, his delicate sense of timing, his ability to bring about compromise, his seemingly endless patience, and his strength in standing firm.

I agree with what has already been said about the appropriation to implement the bill.

I am a member of the Appropriations Committee but not a member of the subcommittee that heard this matter. The conference report had not been filed when the Appropriations Subcommittee held a hearing on the higher education bill.

There was no authorizing legislation at the time the subcommittee marked up this item.

On a total authorization for the first year that we are about to pass of $841 million, the committee put $173 million in the bill. In the Appropriations Committee I asked the senior members if they would fight for the retention of these moneys. They said they are going to make a fight with the House to retain the $173 million. I believe that we are in better shape with a small appropriation that our conferees will desire to hold fast on, than with a larger amount that they might not really have their heart in to protect fully.

The Senate bill was more comprehensive than the House bill, including as it did the National Teacher Corps, fellowships for study leading to the masters degree, a program of financial assistance for the purchase of equipment to improve the quality of undergraduate instruction, and amendments to the National Defense Education Act and the Higher Education Facilities Act. In addition, there were important differences in each of the titles that appeared in both bills. Since the House had acted first, the Senate Subcommittee on Education had the advantage of being able to take into consideration the House bill in its markup of the legislation. The Senate bill incorporated many of the provisions of the House bill, as well as the aforementioned parts which were added by the Senate.

The bill which we have brought back from conference contains all of the Senate-added programs, some in modified form.

I commend the members of the Senate Education Subcommittee for the creative work they have done on this bill; this legislation has been improved in countless ways from the bill which was originally sent up by the Office of Education. I have long argued that the most urgent aim of congressional reform should be to make Congress a more creative branch of the Government, and that the first thing to do toward this end is for Congress to vote itself more staff so that it can hire enough competent personnel to do the job. The complexity of the problems of today's world has increased over what it was only a few decades ago; our population has grown; the involvement of the Federal Government in dealing with society's problems has been expanded. Congress is going to be left behind if it does not wake up and take steps to equip itself to confront the modern world.

The creative work which the Senate accomplished on this bill indicates what can be done; the development of this bill indicates that Congress is no rubber-stamp. Yet the need remains for more adequate staffing to enable Congress to assume its responsibilities in the challenging years which lie ahead.

TITLE VI: FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION

Mr. President, I would first like to discuss title VI, which authorizes a program of matching grants to colleges for the acquisition of classroom equipment. This title was in the Senate bill but not in the House bill. The House accepted the Senate provision, with the proviso that the Federal share be up to 50 percent rather than a straight 50 percent. The Senate accepted this modification. I believe it is an improvement, in that it provides greater flexibility. Many needy colleges conceivably can be helped with less than 50 percent Federal funds, and if they can, then the money saved can be put to use elsewhere.

The conferees also agreed that the funds should be available for the leasing as well as for purchase of equipment. Again, this is desirable in that it provides added flexibility. The Office of Education is requested, however, to look closely at all financial arrangements to make sure that equipment is being acquired, either through lease or through purchase, at the least cost for the type and quality of equipment acquired.

The types of equipment which will be purchased under this title are similar to those authorized under the highly successful title III of National Defense Education Act for elementary and secondary schools—equipment for science, language, mathematics, and other laboratories; audiovisual equipment, such as projectors, screens, and recorders; specialized equipment for audiovisual centers; audiovisual materials, including films, filmstrips, transparencies, slides, tape and disk recordings, and other materials now existing or to be developed. Necessary minor remodeling of classrooms or other space is authorized.

Title VI also authorizes small amounts for planning studies for closed-circuit TV, for administration of State plans and for faculty development programs.

As the principal author of title VI, I was honored to have as cosponsors Senators CLARK, LONG of Missouri, MORSE, PROUTY, MCCARTHY, and RANDOLPH.

The authorization for fiscal year 1966 is $43.5 million. The 3-year authorization is for a total of $185.5 million. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a table showing the amounts for the 3 years authorized in the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Authorizations for title VI of H.R. 9567

[In millions of dollars]

	1966	1967	1968
Purchase of equipment	35.0	50	60
Closed circuit TV	2.5	10	10
Grants for administration of State plans	1.0	1	1
Faculty development programs	5.0	5	5
Total	43.5	66	76

NOTE.—3-year total, $185,500,000.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I would like briefly to turn to some of the other major differences in the Senate and House bills which were resolved in conference. The Senator from Oregon has dwelt in his usual thorough manner on all the differences which were resolved, but I would like to comment briefly on several that I deem particularly important.

TITLE I—COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS

There were some major differences with regard to Senate and House provisions of title I. The House bill was defined as limited to community service programs specifically designed to assist in the solution of urban or suburban problems. The Senate bill covered extension and continuing education activities and services designed to assist in the solution of rural and urban community problems. The Senate bill was much broader, encompassing both urban and rural community problems and, through the words "extension and continuing education programs," taking in more than the more narrowly defined House language, "community service programs." A protracted discussion ensued over what the scope of the bill should be.

A compromise was finally reached, in which the Senate took basically the House language, but the term "community service programs" was defined to include university extension and continuing education programs. The geographic scope of the program encompasses rural, urban, and suburban areas, with particular emphasis on urban and suburban problems.

As one Senator who wishes to represent both the rural and the urban sectors of his State, and as one who recognizes the acute nature of the problems which confront our large cities, I wish to say that I shall watch closely the administration of this title to see that the rural areas are not slighted. In this age of urban crisis, many of the problems of the cities are caused by large numbers of people moving from rural areas into urban areas. If we could do something to halt this exodus, we would solve part of the cause of our urban difficulties. We should take a positive approach to the problem. With the size of cities increasing to enormous proportions, with the sense of insignificance and alienation that besets many people in our large cities, small towns could come to have enormous appeal to millions of people if we could make them more attractive places in which to live. We have the means of doing just that through the inclusion of rural areas in this part of the bill, the purpose of which is to solve community problems.

The Senate bill contained a provision suggested by the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], to authorize a National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education for the purpose of eliminating duplication and effectuating coordination of programs of this sort. This provision was retained in the bill. I commend the Senator from New York for his very worthwhile and sensible amendment.

TITLE II—COLLEGE LIBRARY ASSISTANCE AND LIBRARY TRAINING AND RESEARCH

The library title is one of the most desperately needed in the bill. Our college libraries are badly in need of expansion and improvement.

The House bill repealed the authority for the National Defense Education Act training institutes for elementary and secondary school librarians, on the ground that this training could now be carried out under new authority created in title II. The fact is that this program has just gotten off the ground, and has generated considerable enthusiasm among teacher-librarians, that is to say, people who are not full-time librarians, but who both teach classes and also run the school library. We are not just manipulating numbers when we start programs of this kind, we are dealing with real flesh and blood people, and I believe that the fact that this program has generated so much enthusiasm among school librarians is sufficient reason for continuing it for one more year. The National Defense Education Act comes up for review next year, and this whole problem can best be reviewed at that time. The conference extended the life of this program through this fiscal year.

TITLE III—STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS

In title III, to strengthen "developing institutions," the conferees were quite concerned to make clear just what was meant by the term "developing institution." The conference report is very specific that the Commission of Education should adhere to the House and Senate committee reports as to what constitutes eligible institutions. Especially important are the words from section 302(f): "colleges which for financial and other reasons are struggling for survival and are isolated from the main currents of academic life."

The other major differences of title III was over the inclusion of junior colleges as eligible institutions in the Senate bill but not in the House bill. A compromise was finally reached in which 22 percent of the authorization was to be for junior colleges, rather than the 45-percent figure in the Senate bill. The inclusion of junior colleges is an important victory, I feel, because all of the testimony which our committee has received over the past few years has indicated that our junior colleges are a most important innovation in American education, a vital new force which is breathing new life into higher education, and that these junior colleges which are offering opportunity to hundreds of thousands of young Americans who otherwise would not have an opportunity to go to college, need assistance if they are to thrive.

TITLE IV—STUDENT ASSISTANCE

The House bill called for a program of opportunity grants which were tied to the National Defense Education Act Student Loan Fund in which the authorization for loans would be increased and 25 percent of the total authorization would then be made available for the educational opportunity grants. The Senate bill set up an independent program. The drawback to the House bill was that the National Defense Education Act Student Loan Fund calls for 10-percent matching by the institution. For this and other reasons, many colleges do not participate at all in the National Defense Education Act loan program. Of those that do have loan programs, there are great differences in the size of the loan fund as compared to the size of the student body. This would result in disproportionate percentages of the opportunity grants going to various schools, if the program were to be part of the National Defense Education Act in the manner prescribed in the House bill. The House yielded on this point, and the conference agreed upon an independent program to be administered by the colleges.

In the guaranteed reduced interest loan program an amendment which I sponsored was retained in conference. This would provide a moratorium on repayment of loans if the student goes to graduate school, into the Peace Corps or into the Armed Forces. The moratorium shall not exceed 3 years. This provision is identical to one contained in the National Defense Education Act student loan program.

TITLE V—TEACHER PROGRAMS

The National Teacher Corps has been fully explained by its authors, Senator NELSON and Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I congratulate them on their imagination and initiative in conceiving this idea, and upon formulating it and seeing it through to fruition.

The fellowship program was the creation of our subcommittee chairman, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. No man in Congress has done more for education than has WAYNE MORSE. I salute him for his inspired leadership in guiding through Congress more education legislation than has been heretofore enacted in the entire history of our country.

Neither of these programs was in the House bill. They were accepted in conference by the House.

TITLE VII—AMENDMENTS TO HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT

A number of meritorious amendments to the Higher Education Facilities Act were accepted by the House. A provision giving desirable flexibility to the act will empower the Governor or the State commission on higher education to transfer allotments for public community colleges and technical institutes to other public institutions of higher education, and conversely from 4-year institutions to public community colleges and technical institutes. This will allow each State to channel funds where they are most needed.

Another provision sets a maximum interest rate of 3 percent per annum for loans under title III of the Higher Education Facilities Act.

Both bills increased the authorization and both deleted the categorical limitations in the original bill.

I wish to thank the majority staff, Jack Forsyth and Charlie Lee, and the minority staff, Steve Kurzman and Roy Millenson, for the more than competent assistance which they rendered during the consideration of this bill. The job of a Senator is made easier and we are more effective to the extent to which we have such able staff assistants working with us.

CONCLUSION

Part of the job of Congress is passing new laws. In the field of education we have done this in abundance during the 88th and thus far in the 89th Congress. An equally important part of Congress' job is keeping watch over the administration of laws: the job of legislative oversight. The Office of Education, the elementary and secondary schools of the country and the colleges and universities of the country are in the spotlight now. Congress can pass laws, but in the last analysis it is those who administer and those nongovernmental parties who cooperate in the administration of the laws who determine whether the laws achieve the purpose for which they were enacted. Congress has created a multitude of new programs in the field of education which, if they receive wise, imaginative, and energetic treatment from those who run them, can greatly improve the quantity and the quality of American education.

The job of creating new programs to fill still unmet needs goes on; the job of legislative oversight increases in intensity. I am convinced that we do have the talent in this country to put these programs to work in a way that will fulfill their promise. But it will take energy, courage, imagination, daring. We must rouse ourselves from sleep; shake ourselves loose from easy habits into which we have fallen. The challenge is there. The means to meet it is there. Whether we succeed or fail depends upon our capacity as human beings to rise to new heights to deal with the crucial issues of the mid-20th century.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am glad that the Senator from Texas has made this legislative history with respect to the appropriation item. With regard to his very kind remarks about me tonight, we have the conference report before us only because of the unanimity of effort in the subcommittee and in the full committee and in the final action that we took.

There were differences among us from time to time with regard to specific provisions of the bill. However, we presented a unity of action on the floor of the Senate and in committee and in conference. I believe that is why we have a bill. To every member of the committee goes an equal share of credit for the final result.

I now yield to my friend the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, as a member of the subcommittee and of the full committee studying the bill, I have admired at all times the courtesy and patience of the Senator from Oregon, and his fairness and his bipartisan approach to this subject.

The net result was a bipartisan bill. The Republican side contributed very substantial improvements to it, I believe.

Mr. MORSE. I have stamped this bill in place after place with contributions made by Republican members of the committee.

Mr. DOMINICK. I was happy to be able to persuade some of my colleagues on two or three points, and perhaps more. I enjoyed working on the bill. This is an extremely important program. It was a difficult bill to begin with. It was worked out, in my opinion, as well as it could be worked out, taking into account the differences between the House and the Senate, and even the differences in committee.

There is one point about which I am concerned, and that is the Teacher Corps provision, which was approved in the House. It strikes me that this will prove to be quite a troublesome portion of the bill, because of two reasons.

In the first place, I am concerned—and I have said so on other occasions—that the result of this provision could be the pirating of teachers from one district to another. This could create quite a troublesome situation, from a budgetary standpoint and otherwise, in some school districts.

For reasons that never were clear to me, we injected the provision for the Teacher Corps with relation to elementary and secondary schools in a bill which deals with higher education. I realize that we cannot have higher education without having good elementary and secondary schools.

I believe this provision may prove to be quite troublesome.

The other matter that may prove to be troublesome is the allegation that will be made without doubt—whether the chairman agrees with me or not—that this is an injection of the Federal Government into our local school system, because whether the actual pay of this Teacher Corps is made available by the district or not, the money for it will come from the Federal Government directly. This, I believe, will create a problem before we are through.

I believe that the library title is of extreme importance in the bill. I say to my good friend the senior Senator from Oregon, and to other members of the committee, that what we have done here may be the first step in the field of making an overwhelming mass of written material available for research and study to college students and graduate students.

I believe this is a real step forward in that direction.

The only other comment I wish to make to the Senator from Oregon—and I make it with all deference—is that the passage of the higher education bill in no way diminishes my enthusiasm for the idea of providing a tax credit for the cost of higher education. I plan to follow this next year as hard as I can, to see if we can get what I call "the fourth leg" under the table of the education program.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Colorado. I do not share his concern or fears concerning the Teacher Corps. There are some 26,000 school districts, and only 3,000 teachers will be involved in the Teacher Corps not all of whom are experienced teachers. I would hope that "pirating" of personnel would not become a problem. As for the threat to local control of education, I think we covered that pretty well in the conference bill when we wrote:

LOCAL CONTROL PRESERVED

SEC. 516. Members of the Teacher Corps shall be under the direct supervision of the appropriate officials of the local educational agencies to which they are assigned. Except as otherwise provided in clause (3) of section 513(a), such agencies shall retain the authority to—

(1) assign such members within their systems;

(2) make transfers within their systems;

(3) determine the subject matter to be taught;

(4) determine the terms and continuance of the assignment of such members within their systems.

The determination of whether or not to participate will be made by local officials. They will assign or terminate the teachers. They will have complete control over them. Surely, the teachers will be paid out of Federal aid funds, but other teachers, including those employed in the public elementary and secondary schools, under some Public Law 89–10 projects are paid in that way.

But this program will be conducted for only a short 2-year authorized time. If it is not successful, we can change it; but I feel certain that it will be successful and that we will extend and expand it.

As I look around at the large attendance of Senators, I am reminded of the comments that appear from time to time in the press that I sometimes talk to an empty Chamber. I have never been so highly complimented in all my 20 years' membership in the Senate as I am now that so few Senators are in attendance. They are aware of the great importance of the bill. To think that they would all absent themselves and leave the consideration of this conference report to 3 or 4 Senators shows their confidence in the bill. Their support pleases me more than anything else they could do to demonstrate their enthusiastic support of my subcommittee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I hope that the Senator from Oregon is not being facetious, but rather is serious, because what he is saying is the truth. All that is necessary is to go back to the comments made by other Senators before they left the Chamber. The Senator from Oregon is to be commended.

Mr. MORSE. Although I may have had a smile on my face, I am delighted that they have let me put this conference bill through, a bill of great importance, considering the billions of dollars that eventually will be involved, with only the few comments that have been made. That shows, I say to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], how well the members of the committee did their work.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I agree with the majority leader. This is a serious remark, because Senators who are not now in the Chamber have previously said that they would vote for this education bill, although they had not voted for education bills before. That shows the tremendous progress of competent leadership.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have brought to the Senate this afternoon the conference report on the Higher Education Act of 1965 as the culmination of a long process of legislative activity. I place it before the Senate confident that the Senate conferees on both sides of the aisle can take pride in bringing honorable compromise of differences without compromise of principle, for final Senate action.

I hasten to add, however, that we were unable to achieve all that we would have liked to in each of the titles, but by the same token the concepts involved in the Senate version of the bill were not sacrificed to expediency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks the text of the conference report on H.R. 9567, and that it be followed by a table setting forth the appropriate titles in which State-by-State allocation provisions are to be found.

There being no objection, the conference report and tables was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. POWELL, from the committee of conference, submitted the following conference report, to accompany H.R. 9567:

* * * * *

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Higher Education Act of 1965'.

"TITLE I—COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS

"Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 101. For the purpose of assisting the people of the United States in the solution of community problems such as housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health, and land use by enabling the Commissioner to make grants under this title to strengthen community service programs of colleges and universities, there are authorized to be appropriated $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for the succeeding fiscal year. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and the succeeding fiscal year, there may be appropriated, to enable the Commissioner to make such grants, only such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

"Definition of Community Service Program

"SEC. 102. For purposes of this title, the term 'community service program' means an educational program, activity, or service, including a research program and a university extension or continuing education offering, which is designed to assist in the solution of community problems in rural, urban, or suburban areas, with particular emphasis on urban and suburban problems, where the institution offering such program, activity, or service determines—

"(1) that the proposed program, activity, or service is not otherwise available, and

"(2) that the conduct of the program or performance of the activity or service is consistent with the institution's over-all educational program and is of such a nature as is appropriate to the effective utilization of the institution's special resources and the competencies of its faculty.

"Where course offerings are involved, such courses must be university extension or continuing education courses and must be—

"(A) fully acceptable toward an academic degree, or

"(B) of college level as determined by the institution offering such courses.

"Allotments to States

"SEC. 103. (a) Of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 101 for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot $25,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands and $100,000 to each of the other States, and he shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the remainder of such sums as the population of the State bears to the population of all States.

"(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this title shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under such subsection for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year for carrying out the State plan; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to section 101 shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

"(c) In accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, any State may file with him a request that a specified portion of its allotment under this title be added to the allotment of another State under this title for the purpose of meeting a portion of the Federal share of the cost of providing community service programs under this title. If it is found by the Commissioner that the programs with respect to which the request is made would meet needs of the State making the request and that use of the specified portion of such State's allotment, as requested by it, would assist in carrying out the purposes of this title, such portion of such State's allotment shall be added to the allotment of the other State under this title to be used for the purpose referred to above.

"(d) The population of a State and of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available from the Department of Commerce.

"Uses of Allotted Funds

"SEC. 104. A State's allotment under section 103 may be used, in accordance with its State plan approved under section 105(b), to provide new, expanded, or improved community service programs.

"State Plans

"SEC. 105. (a) Any State desiring to receive its allotment of Federal funds under this title shall designate or create a State agency or institution which has special qualifications with respect to solving community problems and which is broadly representative of institutions of higher education in the State which are competent to offer community service programs, and shall submit to the Commissioner through the agency or institution so designated a State plan. If a State desires to designate for the purposes of this section an existing State agency or institution which does not meet these requirements, it may do so if the agency or institution takes such action as may be necessary to acquire such qualifications and assure participation of such institutions, or if it designates or creates a State advisory council which meets the requirements not met by the designated agency or institution to consult with the designated agency or institution in the preparation of the State plan. A State plan submitted under this title shall be in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary and shall—

"(1) provide that the agency or institution so designated or created shall be the sole agency for administration of the plan or for supervision of the administration of the plan; and provide that such agency or institution shall consult with any State advisory council required to be created by this section with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of such plan;

"(2) set forth a comprehensive, coordinated, and statewide system of community service programs under which funds paid to the State (including funds paid to an institution pursuant to section 106(c)) under its allotments under section 103 will be expended solely for community service programs which have been approved by the agency or institution administering the plan;

"(3) set forth the policies and procedures to be followed in allocating Federal funds to institutions of higher education in the State, which policies and procedures shall insure that due consideration will be given—

"(A) to the relative capacity and willingness of particular institutions of higher education (whether public or private) to provide effective community service programs;

"(B) to the availability of and need for community service programs among the population within the State; and

"(C) to the results of periodic evaluations of the programs carried out under this title in the light of information regarding current and anticipated community problems in the State;

"(4) set forth policies and procedures designed to assure that Federal funds made available under this title will be so used as not to supplant State or local funds, or funds of institutions of higher education, but to supplement and, to the extent practicable, to increase the amounts of such funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for community service programs;

"(5) set forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State or by the Commissioner to institutions of higher education) under this title; and

"(6) provide for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

"Payments

"SEC. 106. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), payment under this title shall be made to those State agencies and institutions which administer plans approved under section 105(b). Payments under this title from a State's allotment with respect to the cost of developing and carrying out its State plan shall equal 75 per centum of such costs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, 75 per centum of such costs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and 50 per centum of such costs for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, except that no payments for any fiscal year shall be made to any State with respect to expenditures for developing and administering the State plan which exceed 5 per centum of the costs for that year for which payment under this subsection may be made to that State, or $25,000, whichever is the greater. In determining the cost of developing and carrying out a State's plan, there shall be excluded any cost with respect to which payments were received under any other Federal program.

"(b) No payments shall be made to any State from its allotments for any fiscal year unless and until the Commissioner finds that the institutions of higher education which will participate in carrying out the State plan for that year will together have available during that year for expenditure from non-Federal sources for college and university extension and continuing education programs not less than the total amount actually expended by those institutions for college and university extension and continuing education programs from such sources during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, plus an amount equal to not less than the non-Federal share of the costs with respect to which payment pursuant to subsection (a) is sought.

"(c) Payments to a State under this title may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments, and they may be paid directly to the State or to one or more participating institutions of higher education designated for this purpose by the State, or to both.

"Administration of State Plans

"SEC. 107. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this title, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State agency or institution submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency or institution administering a State plan approved under section 105(b), finds that—

"(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 105(a), or

"(2) in the administration of the plan there is no failure to comply substantially with any such provision.

the Commissioner shall notify the State agency or institution that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this title until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

"Judicial Review

"SEC. 108. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under section 105(a) or with his final action under section 107(b), such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

"(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

"(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

"National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education

"SEC. 109. (a) The President shall, within ninety days of enactment of this title, appoint a National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education (hereafter referred to as the "Advisory Council"), consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, one representative each of the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Labor, Interior, State, and Housing and Urban Development, and the Office of Economic Opportunity, and of such other Federal agencies having extension education responsibilities as the President may designate, and twelve members appointed, for staggered terms and without regard to the civil service laws, by the President. Such twelve members shall, to the extent possible, include persons knowledgeable in the fields of extension and continuing education, State and local officials, and other persons having special knowledge, experience, or qualification with respect to community problems, and persons representative of the general public. The Advisory Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman but not less often than twice a year.

(b) The Advisory Council shall advise the Commissioner in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this title, including policies and procedures governing the approval of State plans under section 105(b), and policies to eliminate duplication and to effectuate the coordination of programs under this title and other programs offering extension or continuing education activities and services.

"(c) The Advisory Council shall review the administration and effectiveness of all federally supported extension and continuing education programs, including community service programs, make recommendations with respect thereto, and make annual reports commencing on March 31, 1967, of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this title and other Federal laws relating to extension and continuing education activities) to the Secretary and to the President. The President shall transmit each such report to the Congress together with his comments and recommendations.

"(d) Members of the Advisory Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on the business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, members may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(e) The Secretary shall engage such technical assistance as may be required to carry out the functions of the Advisory Council, and the Secretary shall, in addition, make available to the Advisory Council such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as it may require to carry out its functions.

"(f) In carrying out its functions pursuant to this section, the Advisory Council may utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary and the head of such agency.

"Relationship to Other Programs

"Sec. 110. Nothing in this title shall modify authorities under the Act of February 23, 1917 (Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act), as amended (20 U.S.C. 11–15, 16–28); the Vocational Education Act of 1946, as amended (20 U.S.C. 15i–15m, 15o–15q, 15aa–15jj, and 15aaa–15ggg); the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (20 U.S.C. 35–35n); title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964 (Public Law 88–560); or the Act of May 8, 1914 (Smith-Lever Act), as amended (7 U.S.C. 341–348).

"Limitation

"Sec. 111. No grant may be made under this title for any educational program, activity, or service related to sectarian instruction or religious worship, or provided by a school or department of divinity. For purposes of this section, the term 'school or department of divinity' means an institution or a department or branch of an institution whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation, or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

"TITLE II—COLLEGE LIBRARY ASSISTANCE AND LIBRARY TRAINING AND RESEARCH

"Part A—College library resources

"Appropriations Authorized

"Sec. 201. There are authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to make grants under this part to institutions of higher education to assist and encourage such institutions in the acquisition for library purposes of books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, audiovisual materials, and other related library materials (including necessary binding). For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and the succeeding fiscal year, there may be appropriated, to enable the Commissioner to make such grants, only such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

"Basic Grants

"Sec. 202. From 75 per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for any fiscal year, the Commissioner is authorized to make basic grants for the purposes set forth in that section to institutions of higher education and combinations of such institutions. The amount of a basic grant shall not exceed $5,000 for each such institution of higher education and each branch of such institution which is located in a community different from that in which its parent institution is located, as determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, and a basic grant under this subsection may be made only if the application therefor is approved by the Commissioner upon his determination that the application (whether by an individual institution or a combination of institutions)—

"(a) provides satisfactory assurance that the applicant will expend during the fiscal year for which the grant is requested (from funds other than funds received under this part) for all library purposes (exclusive of construction) (1) an amount not less than the average annual amount it expended for such purposes during the two-year period ending June 30, 1965, and (2) an amount (from such other sources) equal to not less than the amount of such grant;

"(b) provides satisfactory assurance that the applicant will expend during the fiscal year for which the grant is requested (from funds other than funds received under this part) for books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, audiovisual materials, and other related materials (including necessary binding) for library purposes an amount not less than the average annual amount it expended for such materials during the two-year period ending June 30, 1965;

"(c) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this section; and

"(d) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may require to carry out his functions under this section, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"Supplemental Grants

"Sec. 203. (a) From the remainder of such 75 per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for any fiscal year, plus any part of such sums as the Commissioner determines will not be used for making grants under section 204, the Commissioner is authorized to make supplemental grants for the purposes set forth in section 201 to institutions of higher education and combinations of such institutions. The amount of a supplemental grant shall not exceed $10 for each full-time student (including the full-time equivalent of the number of part-time students) enrolled in each such institution, as determined pursuant to regulations of the Commissioner. A supplemental grant may be made only upon application therefor, in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may require, which application shall—

"(1) meet the application requirements set forth in section 202 except for the matching requirement set forth in paragraph (a) (2) of that section;

"(2) describe the size and quality of the library resources of the applicant in relation to its present enrollment and any expected increase in its enrollment;

"(3) set forth any special circumstances which are impeding or will impede the proper development of its library resources; and

"(4) provide a general description of how a supplemental grant would be used to improve the size or quality of its library resources.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve applications for supplemental grants on the basis of basic criteria prescribed in regulations and developed after consultation with the Council created under section 205. Such basic criteria shall be such as will best tend to achieve the objectives of this part and they (1) may take into consideration factors such as the size and age of the library collection and student enrollment, and (2) shall give priority to institutions in need of financial assistance for library purposes.

"Special Purpose Grants

"Sec. 204. (a) (1) Twenty-five per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for each fiscal year shall be used by the Commissioner in accordance with this subsection.

"(2) Of the sums available for use under paragraph (1) sixty per centum may be used to make special grants (A) to institutions of higher education which demonstrate a special need for additional library resources and which demonstrate that such additional library resources will make a substantial contribution to the quality of their educational resources, (B) to institutions of higher education to meet special national or regional needs in the library and information sciences, and (C) to combinations of institutions of higher education which need special assistance in establishing and strengthening joint-use facilities. Grants under this section may be used only for books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, audiovisual materials, and other related library materials (including necessary binding).

"(3) Any sums available for use under paragraph (1) which are not used for the purposes of paragraph (2) shall be used in the manner prescribed by the first sentence of section 203(a).

"(b) Grants pursuant to paragraph (2) shall be made upon application providing satisfactory assurance that (1) the applicant (or applicants jointly in the case of a combination of institutions) will expend during the fiscal year for which the grant is requested (from funds other than funds received under this part) for the same purpose as such grant an amount from such other sources equal to not less than 33⅓ per centum of such grant, and (2) in addition each such applicant will expend during such fiscal year (from such other sources) for all library purposes (exclusive of construction) an amount not less than the average annual amount it expended for such purposes during the two-year period ending June 30, 1965.

"Advisory Council on College Library Resources

"Sec. 205. (a) The Commissioner shall establish in the Office of Education an Advisory Council on College Library Resources consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, and eight members appointed, without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

"(b) The Advisory Council shall advise the Commissioner with respect to establishing criteria for the making of supplemental grants under section 203 and the making of special purpose grants under section 204. The Commissioner may appoint such special advisory and technical experts and consultants as may be useful in carrying out the functions of the Advisory Council.

"(c) Members of the Advisory Council, while serving on business of the Advisory Council, shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Accreditation Requirement for Purposes of This Part

"Sec. 206. For the purposes of this part, an educational institution shall be deemed to have been accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association if the Commissioner determines that there is satisfactory assurance that upon acquisition of the library resources with respect to which assistance under this part is sought, or upon acquisition of those resources and other library resources planned to be acquired within a reasonable time, the institution will meet the accreditation standards of such agency or association.

"Limitation

"SEC. 207. No grant may be made under this part for books, periodicals, documents, or other related materials to be used for sectarian instruction or religious worship, or primarily in connection with any part of the program of a school or department of divinity. For purposes of this section, the term 'school or department of divinity' means an institution or a department or branch of an institution whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation, or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

"Consultation With State Agency

"SEC. 208. Each institution of higher education which receives a grant under this part shall periodically inform the State agency (if any) concerned with the educational activities of all institutions of higher education in the State in which such institution is located, of its activities under this part.

"Part B—Library training and research

"Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 221. There are authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, for the purpose of carrying out this part. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and the succeeding fiscal year, there may be appropriated for such purpose only such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

"Definition of 'Librarianship'

"SEC. 222. For the purposes of this part the term 'librarianship' means the principles and practices of the library and information sciences, including the acquisition, organization, storage, retrieval, and dissemination of information, and reference and research use of library and other information resources.

"Grants for Training in Librarianship

"SEC. 223. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education to assist them in training persons in librarianship. Such grants may be used by such institutions to assist in covering the cost of courses of training or study for such persons, and for establishing and maintaining fellowships or traineeships with stipends (including allowances for traveling, subsistence, and other expenses) for fellows and others undergoing training and their dependents not in excess of such maximum amounts as may be prescribed by the Commissioner.

"(b) The Commissioner may make a grant to an institution of higher education only upon application by the institution and only upon his finding that such program will substantially further the objective of increasing the opportunities throughout the Nation for training in librarianship.

"Research and Demonstrations Relating to Libraries and the Training of Library Personnel

"SEC. 224. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education and other public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations, for research and demonstration projects relating to the improvement of libraries or the improvement of training in librarianship, including the development of new techniques, systems, and equipment for processing, storing, and distributing information, and for the dissemination of information derived from such research and demonstrations, and, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5), to provide by contracts with them for the conduct of such activities; except that no such grant may be made to a private agency, organization, or institution other than a nonprofit one.

"(b) The Commissioner is authorized to appoint a special advisory committee of not more than nine members to advise him on matters of general policy concerning research and demonstration projects relating to the improvement of libraries and the improvement of training in librarianship, or concerning special services necessary thereto or special problems involved therein.

"(c) Members of the committee appointed under this section who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on the business of the committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Commissioner, but not in excess of $100 per diem, including travel time; and they may, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Repealer

"SEC. 225. Effective July 1, 1967, section 1101 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by adding the word 'or' at the end of clause (2), by striking out clause (3), and by renumbering clause (4) as clause (3).

"Part C—Strengthening college and research library resources

"Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 231. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $6,315,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $7,770,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, to enable the Commissioner to transfer funds to the Librarian of Congress for the purpose of—

"(1) acquiring, so far as possible, all library materials currently published throughout the world which are of value to scholarship; and

"(2) providing catalog information for these materials promptly after receipt, and distributing bibliographic information by printing catalog cards and by other means, and enabling the Library of Congress to use for exchange and other purposes such of these materials as are not needed for its own collections.

"For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and the succeeding fiscal year, there may be appropriated, to enable the Commissioner to transfer funds to the Librarian of Congress for such purpose, only such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

"TITLE III—STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS

"Statement of Purpose and Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 301. (a) The purpose of this title is to assist in raising the academic quality of colleges which have the desire and potential to make a substantial contribution to the higher education resources of our Nation but which for financial and other reasons are struggling for survival and are isolated from the main currents of academic life, and to do so by enabling the Commissioner to establish a national teaching fellow program and to encourage and assist in the establishment of cooperative arrangements under which these colleges may draw on the talent and experience of our finest colleges and universities, and on the educational resources of business and industry, in their effort to improve their academic quality.

"(b)(1) There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $55,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, to carry out the provisions of this title.

"(2) Of the sums appropriated pursuant to this section for any fiscal year, 78 per centum shall be available only for carrying out the provisions of this title with respect to developing institutions which plan to award one or more bachelor's degrees during such year.

"(3) The remainder of the sums so appropriated shall be available only for carrying out the provisions of this title with respect to developing institutions which do not plan to award such a degree during such year.

"Definition of 'Developing Institution'

"SEC. 302. As used in this title the term 'developing institution' means a public or nonprofit educational institution in any State which—

"(a) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a secondary school, or the recognized equivalent of such certificate;

"(b) is legally authorized to provide, and provides within the State, an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, or offers a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or other technological fields which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles of knowledge;

"(c) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association determined by the Commissioner to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered or is, according to such an agency or association, making reasonable progress toward accreditation;

"(d) has met the requirements of clauses (a) and (b) during the five academic years preceding the academic year for which it seeks assistance under this title;

"(e) is making a reasonable effort to improve the quality of its teaching and administrative staffs and of its student services;

"(f) is, for financial or other reasons, struggling for survival and is isolated from the main currents of academic life;

"(g) meets such other requirements as the Commissioner may prescribe by regulation; and

"(h) is not an institution, or department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

"Advisory Council on Developing Institutions

"SEC. 303. (a) The Commissioner shall establish in the Office of Education an Advisory Council on Developing Institutions (hereinafter in this title referred to as the 'Council'), consisting of the Commissioner who shall be Chairman, one representative each of such Federal agencies having responsibilities with respect to developing institutions as the Commissioner may designate, and eight members appointed, without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

"(b) The Council shall advise the Commissioner with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this title and in particular shall assist the Commissioner in identifying those developing institutions through which the purposes of this title can best be achieved and in establishing priorities for use in approving applications under this title. The Commissioner may appoint such special advisory and technical experts and consultants as may be useful in carrying out the functions of the Council.

"(c) Members of the Council who are not otherwise full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Council, receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, members may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Grants for Cooperative Agreements to Strengthen Developing Institutions

"SEC. 304. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to developing institutions and other colleges and universities to pay part of the cost of planning, developing, and carrying out cooperative arrangements which show promise as effective measures for strengthening the academic programs and the administration of developing institutions. Such cooperative arrangements may be between developing institutions, between developing institutions and other colleges and universities, and between developing institutions and organizations, agencies, and business entities. Grants under this section may be used for projects and activities such as—

"(1) exchange of faculty or students, including arrangements for bringing visiting scholars to developing institutions;

"(2) faculty and administration improvement programs utilizing training, education (including fellowships leading to advanced degrees), internships, research participation, and other means;

"(3) introduction of new curriculums and curricular materials;

"(4) development and operation of cooperative education programs involving alternate periods of academic study and business or public employment;

"(5) joint use of facilities such as libraries or laboratories, including necessary books, materials, and equipment; and

"(6) other arrangements which offer promise of strengthening the academic programs and the administration of developing institutions.

"(b) A grant may be made under this section only upon application to the Commissioner at such time or times and containing such information as he deems necessary. The Commissioner shall not approve an application unless it—

"(1) sets forth a program for carrying out one or more projects or activities which meet the requirements of subsection (a) and provides for such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the program;

"(2) sets forth policies and procedures which assure that Federal funds made available under this section for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available for purposes which meet the requirements of subsection (a), and in no case supplant such funds;

"(3) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this section; and

"(4) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may require to carry out his functions under this title, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(c) The Commissioner shall, after consultation with the Council, establish criteria as to eligible expenditures for which grants made under this section may be used, which criteria shall be so designed as to prevent the use of such grants for expenditures not necessary to the achievement of the purposes of this title.

"National Teaching Fellowships

"SEC. 305. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to award fellowships under this section to highly qualified graduate students and junior members of the faculty of colleges and universities, to encourage such individuals to teach at developing institutions. The Commissioner shall award fellowships to individuals for teaching at developing institutions only upon application by an institution approved for this purpose by the Commissioner and only upon a finding by the Commissioner that the program of teaching set forth in the application is reasonable in the light of the qualifications of the teaching fellow and of the educational needs of the applicant.

"(b) Fellowships may be awarded under this section for such period of teaching as the Commissioner may determine, but such period shall not exceed two academic years. Each person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this section shall receive a stipend for each academic year of teaching of not more than $6,500 as determined by the Commissioner upon the advice of the Council, plus an additional amount of $400 for each such year on account of each of his dependents.

"TITLE IV—STUDENT ASSISTANCE

"Part A—Educational opportunity grants

"Statement of Purpose and Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 401. (a) It is the purpose of this part to provide, through institutions of higher education, educational opportunity grants to assist in making available the benefits of higher education to qualified high school graduates of exceptional financial need, who for lack of financial means of their own or of their families would be unable to obtain such benefits without such aid.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $70,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to make payments to institutions of higher education that have agreements with him entered into under section 407, for use by such institutions for payments to undergraduate students for the initial academic year of educational opportunity grants awarded to them under this part. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for the succeeding fiscal year, there may be appropriated, to carry out the first sentence of this subsection, only such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law. There are further authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for payment to such institutions for use by them for making educational opportunity grants under this part to undergraduate students for academic years other than the initial year of their educational opportunity grants; but no appropriation may be made pursuant to this sentence for any fiscal year beginning more than three years after the last fiscal year for which an appropriation is authorized under the first sentence. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection for any fiscal year shall be available for payment to institutions until the close of the fiscal year succeeding the fiscal year for which they were appropriated. For the purposes of this subsection, payment for the first year of an educational opportunity grant shall not be considered as an initial-year payment if the educational opportunity grant was awarded for the continuing education of a student who had been previously awarded an educational opportunity grant under this part (whether by another institution or otherwise) and had received payment for any year of that educational opportunity grant.

"Amount of Educational Opportunity Grant—Annual Determination

"SEC. 402. From the funds received by it for such purpose under this part, an institution of higher education which awards an educational opportunity grant to a student under this part shall, for the duration of the grant, pay to that student for each academic year during which he is in need of grant aid to pursue a course of study at the institution, an amount determined by the institution for such student with respect to that year, which amount shall not exceed—

"(1) the lesser of $800 or one-half of the sum of the amount of student financial aid (including assistance under this title, but excluding assistance from work-study programs) provided such student by such institution and any assistance provided such student under any scholarship program established by a State or a private institution or organization, as determined in accordance with regulation of the Commissioner, or

"(2) in the case of a student who during the preceding academic year at an institution of higher education received grades placing him in the upper half of his class, the amount determined under paragraph (1), plus $200.

"If the amount of the payment determined under the preceding sentence for an academic year is less than $200 for a student, no payment shall be made under this title to that student for that year. The Commissioner shall, subject to the foregoing limitations, prescribe for the guidance of participating institutions basic criteria or schedules (or both) for the determination of the amount of any such educational opportunity grant, taking into account the objective of limiting grant aid under this part to students of exceptional financial need and such other factors, including the number of dependents in the family, as the Commissioner may deem relevant.

"Duration of Educational Opportunity Grant

"SEC. 403. The duration of an educational opportunity grant awarded under this part shall be the period required for completion by the recipient of his undergraduate course of study at the institution of higher education from which he received the educational opportunity grant, except that such period shall not exceed four academic years less any such period with respect to which the recipient has previously received payments under this part pursuant to a prior educational opportunity grant (whether made by the same or another institution). An educational opportunity grant awarded under this part shall entitle the recipient to payments only if he (1) is maintaining satisfactory progress in the course of study which he is pursuing, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the institution from which he received the grant, and (2) is devoting essentially full time to that course of study, during the academic year, in attendance at that institution. Failure to be in attendance at the institution during vacation periods or periods of military service, or during other periods during which the Commissioner determines in accordance with regulations that there is good cause for his nonattendance (during which periods he shall receive no payments) shall not be deemed contrary to clause (2).

"Selection of Recipients of Educational Opportunity Grants

"SEC. 404. (a) An individual shall be eligible for the award of an educational opportunity grant under this part at any institution of higher education which has made an agreement with the Commissioner pursuant to section 407 (which institution is hereinafter in this part referred to as an 'eligible institution'), if the individual makes application at the time and in the manner prescribed by that institution.

"(b) From among those eligible for educational opportunity grants from an institution of higher education for each fiscal year, the institution shall, in accordance with the provisions of its agreement with the Commissioner under section 407 and within the amount allocated to the institution for that purpose for that year under section 406, select individuals who are to be awarded such grants and determine, pursuant to section 402, the amounts to be paid to them. An institution shall not award an educational opportunity grant to an individual unless it determines that—

"(1) he has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student at such institution or, in the case of a student already attending such institution, is in good standing and in full-time attendance there as an undergraduate student;

"(2) he shows evidence of academic or creative promise and capability of maintaining good standing in his course of study;

"(3) he is of exceptional financial need; and

"(4) he would not, but for an educational opportunity grant, be financially able to pursue a course of study at such institution of higher education.

"Allotment of Educational Opportunity Grant Funds Among States

"SEC. 405. (a) (1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to the first sentence of section 401(b) for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount so appropriated as the number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in such State bears to the total number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in all the States. The number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education for purposes of this section shall be determined by the Commissioner for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available to him.

"(2) If the total of the sums determined by the Commissioner to be required under section 406 for any fiscal year for eligible institutions in a State is less than the amount of the allotment to that State under paragraph (1) for that year, the Commissioner may reallot the remaining amount from time to time, on such date or dates as he may fix, to other States in such manner as he determines will best assist in achieving the purposes of this part.

"(b) Sums appropriated pursuant to the third sentence of section 401(b) for any fiscal year shall be allotted or reallotted among the States in such manner as the Commissioner determines to be necessary to carry out the purposes for which such sums are appropriated.

"Allocation of Allotted Funds to Institutions

"SEC. 406. (a) The Commissioner shall from time to time set dates by which eligible institutions in any State must file applications for allocation, to such institutions, of educational opportunity grant funds from the allotment to that State (including any reallotment thereto) for any fiscal year pursuant to section 405(a), to be used for the purposes specified in the first sentence of section 401(b). Such allocations shall be made in accordance with equitable criteria which the Commissioner shall establish and which shall be designed to achieve such distribution of such funds among eligible institutions within a State as will most effectively carry out the purposes of this part.

"(b) The Commissioner shall further, in accordance with regulations, allocate to eligible institutions, in any State, from funds apportioned or reapportioned pursuant to section 405(b), funds to be used for the educational opportunity grants specified in the third sentence of section 401(b).

"(c) Payment shall be made from allocations under this section to institutions as needed.

"Agreements With Institutions—Conditions

"SEC. 407. (a) An institution of higher education which desires to obtain funds for educational opportunity grants under this part, shall enter into an agreement with the Commissioner. Such agreement shall—

"(1) provide that funds received by the institution under this part will be used by it only for the purposes specified in, and in accordance with, the provisions of this part;

"(2) provide that in determining whether an individual meets the requirements of section 404(b) (3) the institution will (A) consider the source of such individual's income and that of any individual or individuals upon whom the student relies primarily for support, and (B) make an appropriate review of the assets of the student and of such individuals;

"(3) provide that the institution, in cooperation with other institutions of higher education where appropriate, will make vigorous efforts to identify qualified youths of exceptional financial need and to encourage them to continue their education beyond secondary school through programs and activities such as—

"(A) establishing or strengthening close working relationships with secondary-school principals and guidance and counseling personnel with a view toward motivating students to complete secondary school and pursue post-secondary-school educational opportunities, and

"(B) making, to the extent feasible, conditional commitments for educational opportunity grants to qualified secondary school students with special emphasis on students enrolled in grade 11 or lower grades who show evidences of academic or creative promise;

"(4) provide assurance that the institution will continue to spend in its own scholarship and student-aid program, from sources other than funds received under this part, not less than the average expenditure per year made for that purpose during the most recent period of three fiscal years preceding the effective date of the agreement;

"(5) include provisions designed to make educational opportunity grants under this part reasonably available (to the extent of available funds) to all eligible students in the institution in need thereof; and

"(6) include such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States and promote the purposes of this part.

"(b) (1) An institution, which has in effect an agreement for Federal capital contributions for a student loan fund pursuant to title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, may use, as an additional Federal capital contribution for the purposes of such loan fund, not to exceed 25 per centum of the funds paid to it for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1970, for the purpose set forth in section 401(b). The requirement in section 204(2) (B) of such Act shall not apply to such a Federal capital contribution.

"(2) For the purpose of making payments from amounts appropriated pursuant to the third sentence of section 401(b), any institution electing for any fiscal year to use an amount of its payment as a Federal capital contribution pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be paid an equal amount for each of the succeeding three fiscal years from such amounts appropriated pursuant to such third sentence, if the amount so paid to the institution for each such year is used by such institution as such a Federal capital contribution.

"Contracts To Encourage Full Utilization of Educational Talent

"SEC. 408. (a) To assist in achieving the purposes of this part the Commissioner is authorized (without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)), to enter into contracts, not to exceed $100,000 per year, with State and local educational agencies and other public or nonprofit organizations and institutions for the purpose of—

"(1) identifying qualified youths of exceptional financial need and encouraging them to complete secondary school and undertake postsecondary educational training.

"(2) publicizing existing forms of student financial aid, including aid furnished under this part, or

"(3) encouraging secondary-school or college dropouts of demonstrated aptitude to reenter educational programs, including post-secondary-school programs.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

"Definition of 'Academic Year'

"SEC. 409. As used in this part, the term 'academic year' means an academic year or its equivalent as defined in regulations of the Commissioner.

"Part B—Federal, State, and private programs of low-interest insured loans to students in institutions of higher education

"Statement of Purpose and Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 421. (a) The purpose of this part is to enable the Commissioner (1) to encourage States and nonprofit private institutions and organizations to establish adequate loan insurance programs for students in eligible institutions (as defined in section 435), (2) to provide a Federal program of student loan insurance for students who do not have reasonable access to a State or private nonprofit program of student loan insurance covered by an agreement under section 428(b), and (3) to pay a portion of the interest on loans to qualified students which are made by a State under a direct loan program meeting the requirements of section 428(a) (1) (B), or which are insured under this part or under a program of a State or of a nonprofit private institution or organization which meets the requirements of section 428(a) (1) (C).

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out this part—

"(1) there are authorized to be appropriated to the student loan insurance fund (established by section 431) (A) the sum of $1,000,000, and (B) such further sums, if any, as may become necessary for the adequacy of the student loan insurance fund,

"(2) there are authorized to be appropriated, for payments under section 428 with respect to interest on student loans, such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and succeeding fiscal years, as may be required therefor, and

"(3) there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $17,500,000 for making advances pursuant to section 422 for the reserve funds of State and nonprofit private student loan insurance programs.

"Sums appropriated under clauses (1) and (2) of this subsection shall remain available until expended, and sums appropriated under clause (3) of this subsection shall remain available for advances under section 422 until the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

"Advances for Reserve Funds of State and Nonprofit Private Loan Insurance Programs

"SEC. 422. (a) (1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to clause (3) of section 421(b), the Commissioner is authorized to make advances to any State with which he has made an agreement pursuant to section 428(b) for the purpose of helping to establish or strengthen the reserve fund of the student loan insurance program covered by that agreement. If for any of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1966, June 30, 1967, or June 30, 1968, a State does not have a student loan insurance program covered by an agreement made pursuant to section 428(b), and the Commissioner determines after consultation with the chief executive officer of that State that there is no reasonable likelihood that the State will have such a student loan insurance program for such year, the Commissioner may make advances for such year for the same purpose to one or more nonprofit private institutions or organizations with which he has made an agreement pursuant to section 428(b) in order to enable students in that State to participate in a program of student loan insurance covered by such an agreement. The Commissioner may make advances under this subsection both to a State program (with which he has such an agreement) and to one or more nonprofit private institutions or organizations (with which he has such an agreement) in that State if he determines that such advances are necessary in order that students in each eligible institution have access through such institution to a student loan insurance program which meets the requirements of section 428(b) (1).

"(2) Advances pursuant to this subsection shall be upon such terms and conditions (including conditions relating to the time or times of payment) consistent with the requirements of section 428(b) as the Commissioner determines will best carry out the purposes of this section. Advances made by the Commissioner under this subsection shall be repaid within such period as the Commissioner may deem to be appropriate in each case in the light of the maturity and solvency of the reserve fund for which the advance was made.

"(b) The total of the advances to any State pursuant to subsection (a) may not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to 2½ per centum of $700,000,000 as the population of that State aged eighteen to twenty-two, inclusive, bears to the total population of all the States aged eighteen to twenty-two, inclusive. If the amount so determined for any State, however, is less than $25,000, it shall be increased to $25,000 and the total of the increases thereby required shall be derived by proportionately reducing (but not below $25,000) the amount so determined for each of the remaining States. Advances to nonprofit private institutions and organizations pursuant to subsection (a) may be in such amounts as the Commissioner determines will best achieve the purposes for which they are made, except that the sum of (1) advances to such institutions and organizations for the benefit of students in any State plus (2) the amounts advanced to such State, may not exceed the maximum amount which may be advanced to that State pursuant to the first two sentences of this subsection. For the purposes of this subsection, the population aged eighteen to twenty-two, inclusive, of each State and of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him.

"Effect of Adequate Non-Federal Programs

"SEC. 423. The Commissioner shall not issue certificates of insurance under section 429 to lenders in a State if he determines that every eligible institution has reasonable access in that State to a State or private nonprofit student loan insurance program which is covered by an agreement under section 428(b).

"Scope and Duration of Federal Loan Insurance Program

"SEC. 424. (a) The total principal amount of new loans made and installments paid pursuant to lines of credit (as defined in section 435) to students covered by Federal loan insurance under this part shall not exceed $700,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $1,000,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $1,400,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. Thereafter, Federal loan insurance pursuant to this part may be granted only for loans made (or for loan installments paid pursuant to lines of credit) to enable students, who have obtained prior loans insured under this part, to continue or complete their educational program; but no insurance may be granted for any loan made or installment paid after June 30, 1972.

"(b) The Commissioner may, if he finds it necessary to do so in order to assure an equitable distribution of the benefits of this part, assign, within the maximum amounts specified in subsection (a), Federal loan insurance quotas applicable to eligible lenders, or to States or areas, and may from time to time reassign unused portions of these quotas.

"Limitations on Individual Federally Insured Loans and on Federal Loan Insurance

"SEC. 425. (a) (1) The total of the loans made to a student in any academic year or its equivalent (as determined under regulations of the Commissioner) which may be covered by Federal loan insurance under this part may not exceed $1,500 in the case of a graduate or professional student (as defined in regulations of the Commissioner), or $1,000 in the case of any other student. The aggregate insured unpaid principal amount of all such insured loans made to any student shall not at any time exceed $7,500 in the case of any graduate or professional student (as defined in regulations of the Commissioner, and including any such insured loans made to such person before he became a graduate or professional student), or $5,000 in the case of any other student. The annual insurable limit per student shall not be deemed to be exceeded by a line of credit under which actual payments by the lender to the borrower will not be made in any year in excess of the annual limit.

"(2) If in any academic year or its equivalent a student receives a loan which is insured by the Commissioner under this part, no loan to that student in that year may be made or insured by the Commissioner under the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965; and if in any academic year or its equivalent a student receives a loan which is made or insured by the Commissioner under the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, no loan to that student in that year may be insured by the Commissioner under this part.

"(b) The insurance liability on any loan insured by the Commissioner under this part shall be 100 per centum of the unpaid balance of the principal amount of the loan. Such insurance liability shall not include liability for interest whether or not that interest has been added to the principal amount of the loan.

"Sources of Funds

"SEC. 426. Loans made by eligible lenders in accordance with this part shall be insurable by the Commissioner whether made from funds fully owned by the lender or from funds held by the lender in a trust or similar capacity and available for such loans.

"Eligibility of Student Borrowers and Terms of Student Loans

"SEC. 427. (a) A loan by an eligible lender shall be insurable by the Commissioner under the provisions of this part only if—

"(1) made to a student who (A) has been accepted for enrollment at an eligible institution or, in the case of a student already attending such institution, is in good standing there as determined by the institution, and (B) is carrying at least one-half of the normal full-time workload as determined by the institution, and (C) has provided the lender with a statement of the institution which sets forth a schedule of the tuition and fees applicable to that student and its estimate of the cost of board and room for such a student; and

"(2) evidenced by a note or other written agreement which—

"(A) is made without security and without endorsement, except that if the borrower is a minor and such note or other written agreement executed by him would not, under the applicable law, create a binding obligation, endorsement may be required,

"(B) provides for repayment (except as provided in subsection (c)) of the principal amount of the loan in installments over a period of not less than five years (unless sooner repaid) nor more than ten years beginning not earlier than nine months nor later than one year after the date on which the student ceases to carry at an eligible institution at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload as determined by the institution, except (i) as provided in clause (C) below, (ii) that the period of the loan may not exceed fifteen years from the execution of the note or written agreement evidencing it and (iii) that the note or other written instrument may contain such provisions relating to repayment in the event of default in the payment of interest or in the payment of the cost of insurance premiums, or other default by the borrower, as may be authorized by regulations of the Commissioner in effect at the time the loan is made,

"(C) provides that periodic installments of principal need not be paid, but interest shall accrue and be paid, during any period (i) during which the borrower is pursuing a full-time course of study at an institution of higher education or at a comparable institution outside the States approved for this purpose by the Commissioner, (ii) not in excess of three years, during which the borrower is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, or (iii) not in excess of three years during which the borrower is in service as a volunteer under the Peace Corps Act, and any such period shall not be included in determining the ten-year period or the fifteen-year period provided in clause (B) above,

"(D) provides for interest on the unpaid principal balance of the loan at a yearly rate, not exceeding the applicable maximum rate prescribed and defined by the Secretary (within the limits set forth in subsection (b)) on a national, regional, or other appropriate basis, which interest shall be payable in installments over the period of the loan except that, if provided in the note or other written agreement, any interest payable by the student may be deferred until not later than the date upon which repayment of the first installment of principal falls due, in which case interest that has so accrued during that period may be added on that date to the principal (but without thereby increasing the insurance liability under this part),

"(E) provides that the lender will not collect or attempt to collect from the borrower any portion of the interest on the note which is payable by the Commissioner under this part,

"(F) entitles the student borrower to accelerate without penalty repayment of the whole or any part of the loan, and

"(G) contains such other terms and conditions, consistent with the provisions of this part and with the regulations issued by the Commissioner pursuant to this part, as may be agreed upon by the parties to such loan, including, if agreed upon, a provision requiring the borrower to pay to the lender, in addition to principal and interest, amounts equal to the insurance premiums payable by the lender to the Commisioner with respect to such loan.

"(b) No maximum rate of interest prescribed and defined by the Secretary for the purposes of clause (2)(D) of subsection (a) may exceed 6 per centum per annum on the unpaid principal balance of the loan, except that under circumstances which threaten to impede the carrying out of the purposes of this part, one or more of such maximum rates of interest may be as high as 7 per centum per annum on the unpaid principal balance of the loan.

"(c) The total of the payments by a borrower during any year of any repayment period with respect to the aggregate amount of all loans to that borrower which are insured by the Commissioner under this part shall not be less than $360 or the balance of all of such loans (together with interest thereon), whichever amount is less.

"Federal Payments To Reduce Student Interest Costs

"SEC. 428. (a)(1) Each student who has received a loan for study at an eligible institution—

"(A) which is insured by the Commissioner under this part;

"(B) which was made under a State student loan program (meeting criteria prescribed by the Commissioner), and which was contracted for, and paid to the student, within the period specified by paragraph (4); or

"(C) which is insured under a program of a State or of a nonprofit private institution or organization, which was contracted for, and paid to the student, within the period specified in paragraph (4), and which—

"(i) in the case of a loan insured prior to July 1, 1967, was made by an eligible lender and is insured under a program which meets the requirements of subparagraph (E) of subsection (b)(1) and provides that repayment of such loan shall be in installments beginning not earlier than sixty days after the student ceases to pursue a course of study (as described in subparagraph (D) of subsection (b)(1)) at an eligible institution, or

"(ii) in the case of a loan insured after June 30, 1967, is insured under a program covered by an agreement made pursuant to subsection (b),

"and whose adjusted family income is less than $15,000 at the time of execution of the note or written agreement evidencing such loan, shall be entitled to have paid on his behalf and for his account to the holder of the loan, over the period of the loan, a portion of the interest on the loan. For the purposes of this paragraph, the adjusted family income of a student shall be determined pursuant to regulations of the Commissioner in effect at the time of the execution of the note or written agreement evidencing the loan. Such regulations shall provide for taking into account such factors, including family size, as the Commissioner deems appropriate. In the absence of fraud by the lender, such determination of the adjusted family income of a student shall be final insofar as it concerns the obligation of the Commissioner to pay the holder of a loan a portion of the interest on the loan.

"(2) The portion of the interest on a loan which a student is entitled to have paid on his behalf and for his account to the holder of the loan pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be equal to the total amount of the interest on the unpaid principal amount of the loan which accrues prior to the beginning of the repayment period of the loan, and 3 per centum per annum of the unpaid principal amount of the loan (excluding interest which has been added to principal) thereafter; but such portion of the interest on a loan shall not exceed, for any period, the amount of the interest on that loan which is payable by the student after taking into consideration the amount of any interest on that loan which the student is entitled to have paid on his behalf for that period under any State or private loan insurance program. The holder of a loan with respect to which payments are required to be made under this section shall be deemed to have a contractual right, as against the United States, to receive from the Commissioner the portion of interest which has been so determined. The Commissioner shall pay this portion of the interest to the holder of the loan on behalf of and for the account of the borrower at such times as may be specified in regulations in force when the applicable agreement entered into pursuant to subsection (b) was made, or if the loan was made by a State or is insured under a program which is not covered by such an agreement, at such times as may be specified in regulations in force at the time the loan was paid to the student.

"(3) Each holder of a loan with respect to which payments of interest are required to be made by the Commissioner shall submit to the Commissioner, at such time or times and in such manner as he may prescribe, statements containing such information as may be required by or pursuant to regulation for the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to determine the amount of the payment which he must make with respect to that loan.

"(4) The period referred to in subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1) of this subsection shall begin on the date of enactment of this Act and end at the close of June 30, 1968, except that, in the case of a loan made or insured under a student loan or loan insurance program to enable a student who has obtained a prior loan made or insured under such program to continue his educational program, such period shall end at the close of June 30, 1972.

"(5) No payment may be made under this section with respect to the interest on a loan made from a student loan fund established under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

"(6) In no event shall interest payments with respect to the same student loan be made under both this section and under section 9 of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965.

"(b)(1) Any State or any nonprofit private institution or organization may enter into an agreement with the Commissioner for the purpose of entitling students who receive loans which are insured under a student loan insurance program of that State, institution, or organization to have made on their behalf the payments provided for in subsection (a) if the Commissioner determines that the student loan insurance program—

"(A) authorizes the insurance of not less than $1,000 nor more than $1,500 in loans to any individual student in any academic year or its equivalent (as determined under regulations of the Commissioner);

"(B) authorizes the insurance of loans to any individual student for at least six academic years of study or their equivalent (as determined under regulations of the Commissioner);

"(C) provides that (i) the student borrower shall be entitled to accelerate without penalty the whole or any part of an insured loan, (ii) the period of any insured loan may not exceed fifteen years from the date of execution of the note or other written evidence of the loan, and (iii) the note or other written evidence of any loan may contain such provisions relating to repayment in the event of default by the borrower as may be authorized by regulations of the Commissioner in effect at the time such note or written evidence was executed;

"(D) subject to subparagraph (C), provides that, where the total of the insured loans to any student which are held by any one person exceeds $2,000, repayment of such loans shall be in installments over a period of not less than five years nor more than ten years beginning not earlier than nine months nor later than one year after the student ceases to pursue a full-time course of study at an eligible institution, except that if the program provides for the insurance of loans for part-time study at eligible institutions the program shall provide that such repayment period shall begin not earlier than nine months nor later than one year after the student ceases to carry at an eligible institution, at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload as determined by the institution.

"(E) authorizes interest on the unpaid balance of the loan at a yearly rate not in excess of 6 per centum per annum on the unpaid principal balance of the loan (exclusive of any premium for insurance which may be passed on to the borrower);

"(F) insures not less than 80 per centum of the unpaid principal of loans insured under the program;

"(G) does not provide for collection of an excessive insurance premium;

"(H) provides that the benefits of the loan insurance program will not be denied any student because of his family income or lack of need if his adjusted family income at the time the note or written agreement is executed is less than $15,000 (as determined pursuant to the regulations of the Commissioner prescribed under section 428(a)(1);

"(I) provides that a student may obtain insurance under the program for a loan for any year of study at an eligible institution; and

"(J) in the case of a State program, provides that such State program is administered by a single State agency, or by one or more nonprofit private institutions or organizations under the supervision of a single State agency.

"(2) Such an agreement shall—

"(A) provide that the holder of any such loan will be required to submit to the Commissioner, at such time or times and in such manner as he may prescribe, statements containing such information as may be required by or pursuant to regulation for the purpose of enabling the Commisisoner to determine the amount of the payment which he must make with respect to that loan;

"(B) include such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States and promote the purposes of this part and as are agreed to by the Commissioner and the State or nonprofit private organization or institution, as the case may be; and

"(C) provide for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his function under this part and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commisisoner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"Certificates of Federal Loan Insurance—Effective Date of Insurance

"SEC. 429. (a)(1) If, upon application by an eligible lender, made upon such form, containing such information, and supported by such evidence as the Commissioner may require, and otherwise in conformity with this section, the Commissioner finds that the applicant has made a loan to an eligible student which is insurable under the provisions of this part, he may issue to the applicant a certificate of insurance covering the loan and setting forth the amount and terms of the insurance.

"(2) Insurance evidenced by a certificate of insurance pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall become effective upon the date of issuance of the certificate, except that the Commissioner is authorized, in accordance with regulations, to issue commitments with respect to proposed loans, or with respect to lines (or proposed lines) of credit, submitted by eligible lenders, and in that event, upon compliance with subsection (a)(1) by the lender, the certificate of insurance may be issued effective as of the date when any loan, or any payment by the lender pursuant to a line of credit, to be covered by such insurance was made. Such insurance shall cease to be effective upon sixty days' default by the lender in the payment of any installment of the premiums payable pursuant to subsection (c).

"(3) An application submitted pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall contain (A) an agreement by the applicant to pay, in accordance with regulations, the premiums fixed by the Commissioner pursuant to subsection (c), and (B) an agreement by the applicant that if the loan is covered by insurance the applicant will submit such supplementary reports and statements during the effective period of the loan agreement, upon such forms, at such times, and containing such information as the Commissioner may prescribe by or pursuant to regulation.

"(b)(1) In lieu of requiring a separate insurance application and issuing a separate certificate of insurance for each student loan made by an eligible lender as provided in subsection (a), the Commissioner may, in accordance with regulations consistent with section 424, issue to any eligible lender applying therefor a certificate of comprehensive insurance coverage which shall, without further action by the Commissioner, insure all insurable loans made by that lender, on or after the date of the certificate and before a specified cutoff date, within the limits of an aggregate maximum amount stated in the certificate. Such regulations may provide for conditioning such insurance, with respect to any loan, upon compliance by the lender with such requirements (to be stated or incorporated by reference in the certificate) as in the Commissioner's judgment will best achieve the purpose of this subsection while protecting the financial interest of the United States and promoting the objectives of this part, including (but not limited to) provisions as to the reporting of such loans and information relevant thereto to the Commissioner and as to the payment of initial and other premiums and the effect of default therein, and including provision for confirmation by the Commissioner from time to time (through endorsement of the certificate) of the coverage of specific new loans by such certificate, which confirmation shall be incontestable by the Commissioner in the absence of fraud or misrepresentation of fact or patent error.

"(2) If the holder of a certificate of comprehensive insurance coverage issued under this subsection grants to a student a line of credit extending beyond the cutoff date specified in that certificate, loans or payments thereon made by the holder after that date pursuant to the line of credit shall not be deemed to be included in the coverage of that certificate except as may be specifically provided therein; but, subject to the limitations of section 424, the Commissioner may, in accordance with regulations, make commitments to insure such future loans or payments, and such commitments may be honored either as provided in subsection (a) or by inclusion of such insurance in comprehensive coverage under this subsection for the period or periods in which such future loans or payments are made.

"(c) The Commissioner shall, pursuant to regulations, charge for insurance on each loan under this part a premium in an amount not to exceed one-fourth of 1 per centum per year of the unpaid principal amount of such loan (excluding interest added to principal), payable in advance, at such times and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Commissioner. Such regulations may provide that such premium shall not be payable, or if paid shall be refundable, with respect to any period after default in the payment of principal or interest or after the borrower has died or becomes totally and permanently disabled, if (1) notice of such default or other event has been duly given, and (2) request for payment of the loss insured against has been made or the Commissioner has made such payment on his own motion pursuant to section 430(a).

"(d) The rights of an eligible lender arising under insurance evidenced by a certificate of insurance issued to it under this section may be assigned as security by such lender only to another eligible lender, and subject to regulation by the Commissioner.

"(e) The consolidation of the obligations of two or more federally-insured loans obtained by a student borrower in any fiscal year into a single obligation evidenced by a single instrument of indebtedness shall not affect the insurance by the United States. If the loans thus consolidated are covered by separate certificates of insurance issued under subsection (a), the Commissioner may upon surrender of the original certificates issue a new certificate of insurance in accordance with that subsection upon the consolidated obligation; if they are covered by a single comprehensive certificate issued under subsection (b), the Commissioner may amend that certificate accordingly.

"Default, Death, or Disability of Student Under Federal Loan Insurance Program

"SEC. 430. (a) Upon default by the student borrower on any loan covered by Federal loan insurance pursuant to this part, or upon the death of the student borrower or a finding by the insurance beneficiary that the borrower has become totally and permanently disabled (as determined in accordance with regulations established by the Commissioner) before the loan has been repaid in full, and prior to the commencement of suit or other enforcement proceeding upon security for that loan, the insurance beneficiary shall promptly notify the Commissioner, and the Commissioner shall if requested (at that time or after further collection efforts) by the beneficiary, or may on his own motion, if the insurance is still in effect, pay to the beneficiary the amount of the loss sustained by the insured upon that loan as soon as that amount has been determined. The "amount of the loss" on any loan shall, for the purposes of this subsection and subsection (b), be deemed to be an amount equal to the unpaid balance of the principal amount of the loan (other than interest added to principal).

"(b) Upon payment by the Commissioner of the amount of the loss pursuant to subsection (a), the United States shall be subrogated to all of the rights of the holder of the obligation upon the insured loan and shall be entitled to an assignment of the note or other evidence of the insured loan by the insurance beneficiary. If the net recovery made by the Commissioner on a loan after deduction of the cost of that recovery (including reasonable administrative costs) exceeds the amount of the loss, the excess shall be paid over to the insured.

"(c) Nothing in this section or in this part shall be construed to preclude any forbearance for the benefit of the student borrower which may be agreed upon by the parties to the insured loan and approved by the Commissioner, or to preclude forbearance by the Commissioner in the enforcement of the insured obligation after payment on that insurance, or to require collection of the amount of any loan by the insurance beneficiary or by the Commissioner from the estate of a deceased borrower or from a borrower found by the insurance beneficiary to have become permanently and totally disabled.

"(d) Nothing in this section or in this part shall be construed to excuse the holder of a federally insured loan from exercising reasonable care and diligence in the making and collection of loans under the provisions of this part. If the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to an eligible lender, finds that it has substantially failed to exercise such care and diligence or to make the reports and statements required under section 428(a)(3) and section 429(a)(3), or to pay the required Federal loan insurance premiums, he shall disqualify that lender from further Federal insurance on loans granted pursuant to this part until he is satisfied that its failure has ceased and finds that there is reasonable assurance that the lender will in the future exercise necessary care and diligence or comply with such requirements, as the case may may be.

"(e) As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'insurance beneficiary' means the insured or its authorized assignee in accordance with section 429(d); and

"(2) the term 'default' includes only such defaults as have existed for (A) one hundred and twenty days in the case of a loan which is repayable in monthly installments, or (B) one hundred and eighty days in the case of a loan which is repayable in less frequent installments.

"Insurance Fund

"SEC. 431. (a) There is hereby established a student loan insurance fund (hereinafter in this section called the 'fund') which shall be available without fiscal year limitation to the Commissioner for making payments in connection with the default of loans insured by him under this part. All amounts received by the Commissioner as premium charges for insurance and as receipts, earnings, or proceeds derived from any claim or other assets acquired by the Commissioner in connection with his operations under this part, and any other moneys, property, or assets derived by the Commissioner from his operations in connection with this section, shall be deposited in the fund. All payments in connection with the default of loans insured by the Commissioner under this part shall be paid from the fund. Moneys in the fund not needed for current operations under this section may be invested in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States.

"(b) If at any time the moneys in the fund are insufficient to make payments in connection with the default of any loan insured by the Commissioner under this part, the Commissioner is authorized to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury notes or other obligations in such forms and denominations, bearing such maturities, and subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities during the month preceding the issuance of the notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations issued hereunder and for that purpose he is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such notes and obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this subsection. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States. Sums borrowed under this subsection shall be deposited in the fund and redemption of such notes and obligations shall be made by the Commissioner from such fund.

"Legal Powers and Responsibilities

"SEC. 432. (a) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this part, the Commissioner may—

"(1) prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this part;

"(2) sue and be sued in any court of record of a State having general jurisdiction or in any district court of the United States, and such district courts shall have jurisdiction of civil actions arising under this part without regard to the amount in controversy, and any action instituted under this subsection by or against the Commissioner shall survive notwithstanding any change in the person occupying the office of Commissioner or any vacancy in that office; but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Commissioner or property under his control, and nothing herein shall be construed to except litigation arising out of activities under this part from the application of sections 507(b) and 2679 of title 28 of the United States Code and of section 367 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 316);

"(3) include in any contract for Federal loan insurance such terms, conditions, and covenants relating to repayment of principal and payment of interest, relating to his obligations and rights and to those of eligible lenders, and borrowers in case of default, and relating to such other matters as the Commissioner determines to be necessary to assure that the purposes of this part will be achieved; and any term, condition, and covenant made pursuant to this clause or any other provisions of this part may be modified by the Commissioner if he determines that modification is necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States;

"(4) subject to the specific limitations in this part, consent to the modification, with respect to rate of interest, time of payment of any installment of principal and interest or any portion thereof, or any other provision of any note or other instrument evidencing a loan which has been insured by him under this part;

"(5) enforce, pay, or compromise, any claim on, or arising because of, any such insurance; and

"(6) enforce, pay, compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, lien, or demand, however acquired, including any equity or any right or redemption.

"(b) The Commissioner shall, with respect to the financial operations arising by reason of this part—

"(1) prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act; and

"(2) maintain with respect to insurance under this part an integral set of accounts, which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions, as provided by section 105 of the Government Corporation Control Act, except that the transactions of the Commissioner, including the settlement of insurance claims and of claims for payments pursuant to section 428, and transactions related thereto and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all accounting and other officers of the Government.

"Advisory Council on Insured Loans to Students

"SEC. 433. (a) The Secretary shall establish in the Office of Education an Advisory Council on Insured Loans to Students, consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, and eight members appointed, without regard to the civil service laws, by the Secretary. The membership of the Council shall include persons representing State loan insurance programs, private nonprofit loan insurance programs, financial and credit institutions, and institutions of higher education.

"(b) The Advisory Council shall advise the Commissioner with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this part, including policies and procedures governing the making of advances under section 422 and the Federal payments to reduce student interest costs under section 428.

"(c) Members of the Advisory Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on the business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, members may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Participation by Federal Credit Unions in Federal, State, and Private Student Loan Insurance Programs

"SEC. 434. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Federal credit unions shall, pursuant to regulations of the Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, have power to make insured loans up to 10 per centum of their assets, to student members in accordance with the provisions of this part relating to federally insured loans, or in accordance with the provisions of any State or nonprofit private student loan insurance program which meets the requirements of section 428(a)(1)(C).

"Definitions for Reduced-Interest Student Loan Insurance Program

"SEC. 435. As used in this part:

"(a) The term 'eligible institution' means an educational institution in any State which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such certificate, (2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, (4) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association approved by the Commissioner for this purpose or, if not so accredited, (A) is an institution with respect to which the Commissioner has determined that there is satisfactory assurance, considering the resources available to the institution, the period of time, if any, during which it has operated, the effort it is making to meet accreditation standards, and the purpose for which this determination is being made, that the institution will meet the accreditation standards of such an agency or association within a reasonable time, or (B) is an institution whose credits are accepted on transfer by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited. Such term also includes any public or other nonprofit collegiate or associate degree school of nursing and any school which provides not less than a one-year program of training to prepare students for gainful employment in a recognized occupation and which meets the provisions of clauses (1), (2), (4), and (5). If the Commissioner determines that a particular category of such schools does not meet the requirements of clause (5) because there is no nationally recognized accrediting agency or association qualified to accredit schools in such category, he shall, pending the establishment of such an accrediting agency or association, appoint an advisory committee, composed of persons specially qualified to evaluate training provided by schools in such category, which shall (i) prescribe the standards of content, scope, and quality which must be met in order to qualify schools in such category to participate in the program pursuant to this part, and (ii) determine whether particular schools not meeting the requirements of clause (5) meet those standards. For purposes of this subsection, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.

"(b) The term 'collegiate school of nursing' means a department, division, or other administrative unit in a college or university which provides primarily or exclusively an accredited program of education in professional nursing and allied subjects leading to the degree of bachelor of arts, bachelor of science, bachelor of nursing, or to an equivalent degree, or to a graduate degree in nursing.

"(c) The term 'associate degree school of nursing' means a department, division, or other administrative unit in a junior college, community college, college, or university which provides primarily or exclusively an accredited two-year program of education in professional nursing and allied subjects leading to an associate degree in nursing or to an equivalent degree.

"(d) The term 'accredited' when applied to any program of nurse education means a program accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner of Education.

"(e) The term 'eligible lender' means an eligible institution, an agency or instrumentality of a State, or a financial or credit institution (including an insurance company) which is subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or of any State.

"(f) The term 'line of credit' means an arrangement or agreement between the lender and the borrower whereby a loan is paid out by the lender to the borrower in annual installments, or whereby the lender agrees to make, in addition to the initial loan, additional loans in subsequent years.

"Part C—College work-study program extension and amendments

"Transfer of Authority and Other Amendments

"SEC. 441. Parts C and D of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88–452) are amended as follows:

"(1) By striking out 'Director' in the first sentence of setcion 122(a) and inserting in lieu thereof 'Commissioner of Education (hereinafter in this part referred to as the 'Commissioner')', and by striking out 'Director' wherever that word appears in the other provisions of such part C and inserting in lieu thereof 'Commissioner';

"(2) By amending that part of section 121 that follows the section designation to read as follows: 'The purpose of this part is to stimulate and promote the part-time employment of students, particularly students from low-income families, in institutions of higher education who are in need of the earnings from such employment to pursue courses of study at such institutions.';

"(3) By striking out section 123 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Grants for Work-Study Programs

"'SEC. 123. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to enter into agreements with institutions of higher education under which the Commissioner will make grants to such institutions to assist in the operation of work-study programs as hereinafter provided.

"'(b) For the purposes of this part—

"'(1) The term 'institution of higher education' means an educational institution in any State which (A) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such certificate, (B) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (C) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, (D) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (E) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association approved by the Commissioner for this purpose or, if not so accredited, (i) is an institution with respect to which the Commissioner has determined that there is satisfactory assurance, considering the resources available to the institution, the period of time, if any, during which it has operated, the effort it is making to meet accreditation standards, and the purpose for which this determination is being made, that the institution will meet the accreditation standards of such an agency or association within a reasonable time, or (ii) is an institution whose credits are accepted on transfer by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited. Such term also includes any public or other nonprofit collegiate or associate degree school of nursing and any school which provides not less than a one-year program of training to prepare students for gainful employment in a recognized occupation and which meets the provisions of clauses (A), (B), (D), and (E). If the Commissioner determines that a particular category of such schools does not meet the requirements of clause (E) because there is no nationally recognized accrediting agency or association qualified to accredit schools in such category, he shall, pending the establishment of such an accrediting agency or association, appoint an advisory committee, composed of persons specially qualified to evaluate training provided by schools in such category, which shall (I) prescribe the standards of content, scope, and quality which must be met in order to qualify schools in such category to participate in the program pursuant to this part, and (II) determine whether particular schools not meeting the requirements of clause (E) meet those standards. For purposes of this subsection, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.

"'(2) The term "collegiate school of nursing" means a department, division, or other administrative unit in a college or university which provides primarily or exclusively an accredited program of education in professional nursing and allied subjects leading to the degree of bachelor of arts, bachelor of science, bachelor of nursing, or to an equivalent degree, or to a graduate degree in nursing.

"'(3) The term "associate degree school of nursing" means a department, division, or other administrative unit in a junior college, community college, college, or university which provides primarily or exclusively an accredited two-year program of education in professional nursing and allied subjects leading to an associate degree in nursing or to an equivalent degree.

"'(4) The term "accredited" when applied to any program of nurse education means a program accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner.';

"(4) By striking out section 124(a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(a) provide for the operation by the institution of a program for the part-time employment of its students in work for the institution itself or work in the public interest for a public or private nonprofit organization under an arrangement between the institution and such organization, and such work—

"'(1) will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services,

"'(2) will be governed by such conditions of employment as will be appropriate and reasonable in light of such factors as type of work performed, geographical region, and proficiency of the employee, and

"'(3) does not involve the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or is to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;';

"(5) By redesignating clauses (2), (3), and (4), of paragraph (c) of section 124 as clauses (1), (2), and (3), and by striking out so much of such paragraph as precedes such redesignated clauses and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(c) provide that in the selection of students for employment under such work-study program preference shall be given to students from low-income families and that employment under such work-study program shall be furnished only to a student who';

"(6) By inserting before the period at the end of section 125 a comma and the following: 'and such share may be paid to such student in the form of services and equipment (including tuition, room, board, and books) furnished by such institution', and

"(7) By striking out 'provided for in' in section 131 and inserting in lieu thereof 'for which he is responsible under'.

"Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 442. There are authorized to be appropriated $129,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $165,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, to carry out the purposes of part C of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-452). Any sums which are appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, for the purpose of such part C pursuant to an authorization in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, or are allocated for such purpose from any appropriation for such year, shall be made available, to the extent unexpended on the date of enactment of this Act, to the Commissioner for carrying out such part C, and the total of such sums (including amounts expended prior to such date) shall be deducted from the authorization in this section for such year. Sixty million dollars of the authorization for title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, as contained in section 131 of such Act, shall be only for the purpose of part C of such title. No provision in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 which authorizes the appropriation of funds to carry out that Act shall apply to such part C after June 30, 1966.

"Part D—Amendments to National Defense Education Act of 1958

"Definition of Institution of Higher Education

"SEC. 461. Section 103(b) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such certificate, (2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, (4) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association approved by the Commissioner for this purpose or, if not so accredited, (A) is an institution with respect to which the Commissioner has determined that there is satisfactory assurance, considering the resources available to the institution, the period of time, if any, during which it has operated, the effort it is making to meet accreditation standards, and the purpose for which this determination is being made, that the institution will meet the accreditation standards of such an agency or association within a reasonable time, or (B) is an institution whose credits are accepted on transfer by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited. For purposes of title II, such term includes any school of nursing as defined in subsection (l) of this section, and also includes any school which provides not less than a one-year program of training to prepare students for gainful employment in a recognized occupation and which meets the provisions of clauses (1), (2), (4), and (5). If the Commissioner determines that a particular category of such schools does not meet the requirements of clause (5) because there is no nationally recognized accrediting agency or association qualified to accredit schools in such category, he shall pending the establishment of such an accrediting agency or association, appoint an advisory committee, composed of persons specially qualified to evaluate training provided by schools in such category, which shall (i) prescribe the standards of content, scope, and quality which must be met in order to qualify schools in such category to participate in the student loan program under title II, and (ii) determine whether particular schools not meeting the requirements of clause (5) meet those standards. For purposes of this subsection, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.'

"Conditions of Agreements; Administrative Costs

"SEC. 462. Clause (3) of section 204 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"'(3) provide that such student loan fund shall be used only for (A) loans to students in accordance with such agreement, (B) capital distributions as provided in this title, (C) routine expenses incurred by the institution in administering the student loan fund, except that the amount withdrawn from such student loan fund for such routine expenses by an institution in any fiscal year may not exceed either (i) one-half of such routine expenses as estimated for that year by the Commissioner with the advice of an advisory committee which the Commissioner is hereby authorized to appoint on an annual or such other basis as he may deem appropriate, or (ii) 1 per centum of the aggregate of the outstanding loans made from that fund as of the close of that year, whichever is the lesser, and (D) costs of litigation, and other collection costs agreed to by the Commissioner, arising in connection with the collection of any loan from the fund, interest on such loan, or charge assessed with respect to that loan pursuant to section 205(c);'.

"Technical Amendments for Part-time Students

"Sec. 463. (a) The portion of section 205(b)(2) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 which precedes clause (A)(ii) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"'(2) such a loan shall be evidenced by a note or other written agreement which provides for repayment of the principal amount, together with interest thereon, in equal installments (or, if the borrower so requests, in graduated periodic installments determined in accordance with such schedules as may be approved by the Commissioner) payable quarterly, bimonthly, or monthly (at the option of the institution) over a period beginning nine months after the date on which the borrower ceases to carry, at an institution of higher education or at a comparable institution outside the States approved for this purpose by the Commissioner, at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload as determined by that institution, and ending ten years and nine months after such date, except that (A) interest shall not accrue on any such loan, and installments need not be paid during any period (i) during which the borrower is carrying, at an institution of higher education or at a comparable institution outside the States approved for this purpose by the Commissioner, at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload as determined by the institution,'.

"(b) Clause (D) of such section 205(b)(2) is amended by striking out 'periodic', and by striking out 'part-time' and inserting in lieu thereof 'less than half-time'.

"(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply to a loan outstanding on the date of enactment of this Act only with the consent of the borrower and the institution which made the loan.

"Minimum Rate of Repayment

"Sec. 464. (a) Section 205(b)(2) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is further amended by striking out 'and' before '(E)' and by inserting at the end thereof before the semicolon ', and (F) the institution may provide, in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, that during the repayment period of the loan payments of principal and interest by the borrower with respect to all the outstanding loans made to him from loan funds established pursuant to this title shall be at a rate equal to not less than $15 per month'.

"(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to loans made after the date of enactment of this Act.

"Cancellation of Loans for Teachers

"Sec. 465. (a) Section 205(b)(3) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended—

"(1) by inserting 'total' before 'amount' and by striking out ', which was unpaid on the first day of such service';

"(2) by inserting 'or its equivalent (as determined under regulations of the Commissioner)' after 'academic year'; and

"(3) by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'except that (A) such rate shall be 15 per centum for each complete academic year or its equivalent (as determined under regulations of the Commissioner) of service as a full-time teacher in a public or other nonprofit elementary or secondary school which is in the school district of a local educational agency which is eligible in such year for assistance pursuant to title II of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, and which for purposes of this clause and for that year has been determined by the Commissioner, pursuant to regulations and after consultation with the State educational agency of the State in which the school is located, to be a school in which there is a high concentration of students from low-income families, except that the Commissioner shall not make such determination with respect to more than 25 per centum of the total of the public and other nonprofit elementary and secondary schools in any one State for any one year, and (B) for the purposes of any cancellation pursuant to clause (A), an additional 50 per centum of any such loan (plus interest) may be cancelled but nothing in this paragraph shall authorize refunding any payment'.

"(b) The amendments made by clauses (1) and (3) of subsection (a) shall apply with respect to service performed during academic years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, whether the loan was made before or after such enactment. The amendment made by clause (2) of subsection (a) shall apply with respect to service performed during academic years beginning after the enactment of the National Defense Education Act Amendments, 1964, Public Law 88–665, whether or not the loan was made before or after such enactment.

"Charges

"Sec. 466. (a) Section 205 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is further amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"'(c) Pursuant to regulations of the Commissioner, an institution may assess a charge with respect to a loan from the loan fund established by the institution pursuant to this title for failure of the borrower to pay all or any part of an installment when it is due and, in the case of a borrower who is entitled to deferment benefits under section 205(b)(2) or cancellation benefits under section 205(b)(3), for any failure to file timely and satisfactory evidence of such entitlement. The amount of any such charge may not exceed—

"'(1) in the case of a loan which is repayable in monthly installments, $1 for the first month or part of a month by which such installment or evidence is late and $2 for each such month or part of a month thereafter; and

"'(2) in the case of a loan which has a bimonthly or quarterly repayment interval, $3 and $6, respectively, for each such interval or part thereof by which such installment or evidence is late.

The institution may elect to add the amount of any such charge to the principal amount of the loan as of the first day after the day on which such installment or evidence was due, or to make the amount of the charge payable to the institution not later than the due date of the next installment after receipt by the borrower of notice of the assessment of the charge.'

"(b) Clause (2) of section 204 of such Act is amended by striking out 'and (D)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(D) charges collected pursuant to section 205(c), and (E)'.

"(c) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be applicable only with respect to loans made after the date of enactment of this Act.

"Economics, Civics, and Industrial Arts

"Sec. 467. (a)(1) Clauses (1) and (5) of section 303(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 are each amended by inserting 'economics,' after 'geography,'

"(2) Section 301 of such Act is amended by striking out 'and $90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof '$90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years'.

"(b) Section 1101 of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'each of the three succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof '$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years; and

"(2) by inserting 'economics, civics, industrial arts,' after 'geography,'.

"TITLE V—TEACHER PROGRAMS

"Part A—General provisions

"Advisory Council on Quality Teacher Preparation

"Sec. 501. (a) The Commissioner shall establish in the Office of Education an Advisory Council on Quality Teacher Preparation for the purpose of reviewing the administration and operation of the programs carried out under this title and of all other Federal programs for complementary purposes. This review shall pay particular attention to the effectiveness of these programs in attracting, preparing, and retaining highly qualified elementary and secondary school teachers, and it shall include recommendations for improvement of these programs. The Council shall consist of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, and twelve members appointed for staggered terms and without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. Such twelve members shall include persons knowledgeable with respect to teacher preparation and the needs of urban and rural schools, and representatives of the general public.

"(b) Members of such Advisory Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while attending meetings or conferences of such Council or otherwise engaged on business of such Council, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including travel time, and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(c) The Council may appoint an Executive Secretary and such other employees as the Council deems necessary to carry out its functions under this title.

"Limitation

"Sec. 502. Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to authorize the making of any payment under this title for religious worship or instruction.

"Part B—National Teacher Corps

"Statement of Purpose and Authorization of Appropriations

"Sec. 511. (a) The purpose of this part is to strengthen the educational opportunities available to children in areas having concentrations of low-income families and to encourage colleges and universities to broaden their programs of teacher preparation by—

"(1) attracting and training qualified teachers who will be made available to local educational agencies for teaching in such areas; and

"(2) attracting and training inexperienced teacher-interns who will be made available for teaching and inservice training to local educational agencies in such areas in teams led by an experienced teacher.

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out this part, there are authorized to be appropriated $36,100,000 for the fiscal year ending June

30, 1966, and $64,715,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

"Establishment of National Teacher Corps

"SEC. 512. In order to carry out the purposes of this part, there is hereby established in the Office of Education a National Teacher Corps (hereinafter referred to as the 'Teacher Corps'). The Teacher Corps shall be headed by a Director who shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for grade 17 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, and a Deputy Director who shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for grade 16 of such General Schedule. The Director and the Deputy Director shall perform such duties as are delegated to them by the Commissioner.

"Teacher Corps Program

"SEC. 513. (a) For the purpose of carrying out this part, the Commissioner is authorized to—

"(1) recruit, select, and enroll experienced teachers, and inexperienced teacher-interns who have a bachelor's degree or its equivalent, in the Teacher Corps for periods of up to two years;

"(2) enter into arrangements, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education or State or local educational agencies to provide members of the Teacher Corps with such training as the Commissioner may deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of this part, including not more than three months of training for members before they undertake their teaching duties under this part;

"(3) enter into arrangements (including the payment of the cost of such arrangements) with local educational agencies, after consultation in appropriate cases with State educational agencies and institutions of higher education, to furnish to local educational agencies, for service during regular or summer sessions, or both, in the schools of such agencies in areas having concentrations of children from low-income families, either or both (A) experienced teachers, or (B) teaching teams, each of which shall consist of an experienced teacher and a number of teacher-interns who, in addition to teaching duties, shall be afforded time by the local educational agency for a teacher-intern training program developed according to criteria established by the Commissioner and carried out under the guidance of the experienced teacher in cooperation with an institution of higher education; and

"(4) pay to local educational agencies the amount of the compensation which such agencies pay to or on behalf of members of the Teacher Corps assigned to them pursuant to arrangements made pursuant to the preceding clause.

"(b) Arrangements with institutions of higher education to provide training for teacher-interns while teaching in schools for local educational agencies under the provisions of this part shall provide, wherever possible, for training leading to a graduate degree.

"(c)(1) Whenever the Commissioner determines that the demand for the services of experienced teachers or of teaching teams furnished pursuant to clause (3) of subsection (a) exceeds the number of experienced teachers or teaching teams available from the Teacher Corps, the Commissioner shall, to the extent practicable, allocate experienced teachers or teaching teams, as the case may be, from the Teacher Corps among the States in accordance with paragraph (2).

"(2) Not to exceed 2 per centum of such teachers or teams, as the case may be, shall be allocated to Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs. The remainder of such teams or teachers, as the case may be, shall be allocated among the other States in proportion to the number of children counted in each State for the purpose of determining the amount of basic grants made under section 203 of title II of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, for the fiscal year for which the allocation is made.

"(d) A local educational agency may utilize members of the Teachers Corps assigned to it in providing, in the manner described in section 205(a)(2) of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, education services in which children enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools can participate.

"Compensation

"SEC. 514. (a) An arrangement made with a local educational agency pursuant to paragraph (3) of section 513(a) shall provide for compensation by such agency of Teacher Corps members during the period of their assignment to it at the following rates:

"(1) an experienced teacher who is not leading a teaching team shall be compensated at a rate which is equal to the rate paid by such agency for a teacher with similar training and experience who has been assigned similar teaching duties;

"(2) an experienced teacher who is leading a teaching team shall be compensated at a rate agreed to by such agency and the Commissioner; and

"(3) a teacher-intern shall be compensated at a rate which is equal to the lowest rate paid by such agency for teaching full time in the school system and grade to which the intern is assigned.

"(b) For any period of training under this part the Commissioner shall pay to members of the Teacher Corps such stipends (including allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such members and their dependents) as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported training programs.

"(c) The Commission shall pay the necessary travel expenses of members of the Teachers Corps and their dependents and necessary expenses for the transportation of the household goods and personal effects of such members and their dependents, and such other necessary expenses of members as are directly related to their service in the Corps, including readjustment allowances proportionate to service.

"(d) The Commissioner is authorized to make such arrangements as may be possible, including the payment of any costs incident thereto, to protect the tenure, retirement rights, participation in a medical insurance program, and such other similar employee benefits as the Commissioner deems appropriate, of a member of the Teachers Corps who participates in any program under this part and who indicates his intention to return to the local educational agency or institution of higher education by which he was employed immediately prior to his service under this part.

"Application of Provisions of Federal Law

"SEC. 515. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this section, a member of the Teacher Corps shall be deemed not to be a Federal employee and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

"(b)(1) Such members shall, for the purposes of the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (5 U.S.C. 751 et seq.), be deemed to be civil employees of the United States within the meaning of the term 'employee' as defined in section 40 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 790) and the provisions thereof shall apply except as hereinafter provided.

"(2) For purposes of this subsection:

"(A) the term 'performance of duty' in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall not include any act of a member of the Teacher Corps—

"(i) while on authorized leave; or

"(ii) while absent from his assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity authorized by or under the direction or supervision of the Commissioner; and

"(B) in computing compensation benefits for disability or death under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the monthly pay of a member of the Teacher Corps shall be deemed to be his actual pay or that received under the entrance salary for grade 6 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, whichever is greater.

"(c) Such members shall be deemed to be employees of the Government for the purposes of the Federal tort claims provisions of title 28, United States Code.

"Local Control Preserved

"SEC. 516. Members of the Teacher Corps shall be under the direct supervision of the appropriate officials of the local educational agencies to which they are assigned. Except as otherwise provided in clause (3) of section 513(a), such agencies shall retain the authority to—

"(1) assign such members within their systems;

"(2) make transfers within their systems;

"(3) determine the subject matter to be taught;

"(4) determine the terms and continuance of the assignment of such members within their systems.

"Maintenance of Effort

"SEC. 517. No member of the Teacher Corps shall be furnished to any local educational agency under the provisions of this part if such agency will use such member to replace any teacher who is or would otherwise be employed by such agency.

"Part C—Fellowships for teachers

"Statement of Purpose

"SEC. 521. The Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to improve the quality of education offered by the elementary and secondary schools of the Nation by improving the quality of the education of persons who are pursuing or who plan to pursue a career in elementary and secondary education. The purpose of this part is to carry out this policy by awarding fellowships for graduate study at institutions of higher education and by developing or strengthening teacher education programs in institutions of higher education. For the purpose of this part the term "career in elementary and secondary education" means a career of teaching in elementary and secondary schools, a career of teaching, guiding, or supervising such teachers or persons who plan to become such teachers, or a career in fields which are directly related to teaching in elementary or secondary schools, such as library science, school social work, guidance and counseling, educational media, and special education for handicapped children.

"Fellowships Authorized

"SEC. 522. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to award not to exceed four thousand five hundred fellowships for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, ten thousand fellowships for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and ten thousand fellowships for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. Fellowships awarded under the provisions of this part shall be for graduate study leading to an advanced degree other than a doctor of philosophy, or equivalent degree, for persons who are pursuing or plan to pursue a career in elementary and secondary education. Such fellowships shall be awarded as provided in sections 523 and 524 of this part and for such periods as the Commissioner may determine but not to exceed twenty-four months.

(b) In addition to the number of fellowships authorized to be awarded by subsection (a) of this section, the Commissioner is authorized to award fellowships equal to the number previously awarded during any fiscal year under this part but vacated prior to the end of the period for which they were awarded; except that each fellowship awarded under this subsection shall be for such period of study, not in excess of the remainder of the period for which the fellowship which it replaces was awarded, as the Commissioner may determine.

"Allocation of Fellowships

"SEC. 523. The Commissioner shall allocate fellowships under this part to institutions of higher education with programs approved under the provisions of section 524(a) for the use of individuals accepted into such programs, in such manner and according to such plan as will most nearly—

"(1) provide an equitable distribution of such fellowships throughout the States, except that to the extent he deems proper in the national interest after consultation with the Advisory Council on Quality Teacher Preparation the Commissioner may give preference to programs designed to meet an urgent national need, and

"(2) encourage experienced teachers in elementary or secondary schools and other experienced personnel in elementary or secondary education to enter graduate programs, attract recent college graduates to pursue a career in elementary and secondary education, and afford opportunities for college graduates engaged in other occupations or activities to pursue or return to a career in elementary and secondary education.

"Approval of Programs; Grants

"SEC. 524. (a) The Commissioner shall approve a graduate program of an institution of higher education only upon application by the institution and only upon his finding—

"(1) that such program will substantially further the objectives of improving the quality of education of persons who are pursuing or intend to pursue a career in elementary and secondary education,

"(2) that such program gives emphasis to high-quality substantive courses,

"(3) that such program is of high quality and either is in effect or readily attainable, and

"(4) that only persons who demonstrate a serious intent to pursue or to continue a career in elementary and secondary education will be accepted for study in the program.

"(b) or the purpose of obtaining an appropriate geographical distribution of high-quality programs for the training of personnel for elementary or secondary education, the Commissioner is authorized to make grants to and contracts with institutions of higher education to pay part of the cost of developing or strengthening graduate programs which meet the requirements of subsection (a).

"(c) The Commissioner may employ experts and consultants, as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), to advise him with respect to the making of grants and contracts and the approving of programs under this section, and he shall set forth in regulations the standards and priorities which will be utilized in approving such grants and contracts. Experts and consultants employed pursuant to this subsection may be compensated while so employed at rates not in excess of $100 per diem, including travel time, and may be allowed while away from their homes or regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Stipends

"SEC. 525. (a) The Commissioner shall pay to persons awarded fellowships under this part such stipends (including such allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such persons and their dependents) as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs.

"(b) In addition to the amounts paid to persons pursuant to subsection (a), the Commissioner shall pay to the institution of higher education at which such person is pursuing his course of study an amount equivalent to $2,500 per academic year, less any amount charged such person for tuition and nonrefundable fees and deposits.

"Limitation

"SEC. 526. No fellowships shall be awarded under this part for study at a school or department of divinity. For the purposes of this section, the term 'school or department of divinity' means an institution or department or branch of an institution whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

"Fellowship Conditions

"SEC. 527. A person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this part shall continue to receive the payments provided in section 525(a) only during such periods as the Commissioner finds that he is maintaining satisfactory proficiency and devoting full time to study or research in the field in which such fellowship was awarded in an institution of higher education, and is not engaging in gainful employment other than such part-time employment in teaching, research, or similar activities related to his training as has been approved by the Commissioner.

"Appropriations

"SEC. 528. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this part $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $160,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $275,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and such sums for the two succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary to enable persons who have been awarded fellowships prior to July 1, 1968, to complete their study under the fellowships.

"TITLE VI—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION

"Part A—Equipment

"Statement of Purpose and Authorization of Appropriations

"SEC. 601. (a) The purpose of this part is to improve the quality of classroom instruction in selected subject areas in institutions of higher education.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, to enable the Commissioner to make grants to institutions of higher education pursuant to this part for the acquisition of equipment and for minor remodeling described in section 603(2)(A).

"(c) There are also authorized to be appropriated $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for the succeeding fiscal year, to enable the Commissioner to make grants to institutions of higher education pursuant to this part for the acquisition of television equipment and for minor remodeling described in section 603(2)(B).

"(d) There is also authorized to be appropriated a sum not exceeding $1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to make grants in such amounts as he may consider necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plans approved under this part including expenses which he determines are necessary for the preparation of such plans.

"(e) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for the succeeding fiscal year, there may be appropriated for the purposes set forth in subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section, only such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

"Allotments to States

"SEC. 602. (a)(1) Of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsections (b) and (c) of section 601 for any fiscal year one-half shall be allotted by the Commissioner among the States so that the allotment to each State will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-half as the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education in such State bears to the total number of students enrolled in such institutions in all the States; and the remaining one-half shall be allotted by him among the States in accordance with paragraph (2) of this subsection. For the purposes of this subsection, (A) the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education shall be deemed to be equal to the sum of (i) the number of full-time students and (ii) the full-time equivalent of the number of part-time students as determined by the Commissioner in accordance with regulations; and (B) determinations as to enrollment shall be made by the Commissioner on the basis of data for the most recent year for which satisfactory data with respect to such enrollment are available to him.

"(2) For the purposes of this paragraph the Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year an amount which bears the same ratio to the funds being allotted pursuant to this paragraph as the product of—

"(A) the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education in such State, and

"(B) the State's allotment ratio,

bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States. For the purposes of this paragraph the allotment ratio for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (i) 0.50 and (ii) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per person for the State by the income per person for all the States (not including Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam), except that the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than 0.33⅓ or more than 0.66⅔, and the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam shall be 0.66⅔. The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner as soon as possible after enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, on the basis of the average of the incomes per person of the States and of all the States for the three most recent consecutive calendar years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

"(b)(1) A State's allotment under subsection (a) from funds appropriated pursuant to section 601(b) shall be available in accordance with the provisions of this part for payment of the Federal share (as determined under section 604) of the cost of equipment and minor remodeling described in section 603(2)(A).

"(2) A State's allotment under subsection (a) from funds appropriated pursuant to section 601(c) shall be available in accordance with the provisions of this part for payment of the Federal share (as determined under section 604) of the cost of television equipment and minor remodeling described in section 603(2)(B).

"(c) Sums allotted to a State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, shall remain available for reservation as provided in section 606 until the close of the next fiscal year, in addition to the sums allotted to such State for such next fiscal year. Sums alloted to a State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, or for any succeeding fiscal year, which are not reserved as provided in section 606 by the close of the fiscal year for which they are allotted, shall be reallotted by the Commissioner, on the basis of such factors as he determines to be equitable and reasonable, among the States which, as determined by the Commissioner, are able to use without delay any amounts so reallotted. Amounts reallotted under this subsection shall be available for reservation until the close of the fiscal year next succeeding the fiscal year for which they were originally allotted.

"State Commissions and Plans

"SEC. 603. Any State desiring to participate in the program under this part shall designate for that purpose an existing State agency which is broadly representative of the public and of institutions of higher education in the State, or, if no such State agency exists, shall establish such a State agency, and submit to the Commissioner through the agency so designated or established (hereafter in this part referred to as the 'State commission'), a State plan for such participation. The Commissioner shall approve any such plan which—

"(1) provides that it shall be administered by the State commission;

"(2) sets forth, consistently with basic criteria prescribed by regulation pursuant to section 604, objective standards and methods (A) for determining the relative priorities of eligible projects for the acquisition of laboratory and other special equipment (other than supplies consumed in use), including audiovisual materials and equipment for classrooms or audiovisual centers, and printed and published materials (other than textbooks) for classrooms or libraries, suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, foreign languages, history, geography, government, English, other humanities, the arts, or education at the undergraduate level in institutions of higher education, and minor remodeling of classroom or other space used for such materials or equipment; (B) for determining relative priorities of eligible projects for (i) the acquisition of television equipment for closed-circuit direct instruction in such fields in such institutions (including equipment for fixed-service instructional television, as defined by the Federal Communication Commission, but not including broadcast transmission equipment), (ii) the acquisition of necessary instructional materials for use in such television instruction, and (iii) minor remodeling necessary for such television equipment; and (C) for determining the Federal share of the cost of each such project;

"(3) provides (A) for assigning priorities solely on the basis of such criteria, standards, and methods to eligible projects submitted to the State commission and deemed by it to be otherwise approvable under the provisions of this part; and (B) for approving and recommending to the Commissioner, in the order of such priority, applications covering such eligible projects, and for certifying to the Commissioner the Federal share, determined by the State commission under the State plan, of the cost of the project involved;

"(4) provides for affording to every applicant, which has submitted to the State commission a project, an opportunity for a fair hearing before the commission as to the priority assigned to such project or as to any other determination of the commission adversely affecting such applicant; and

"(5) provides (A) for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State commission under this part, and (B) for the making of such reports, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions under this part.

"Basic Criteria for Determining Priorities, Federal Share, and Maintenance of Effort

"SEC. 604. (a) As soon as practicable after the enactment of this Act the Commissioner shall by regulation prescribe basic criteria to which the provisions of State plans setting forth standards and methods for determining relative priorities of eligible projects, and the application of such standards and methods to such projects under such plans, shall be subject. Such basic criteria (1) shall be such as will best tend to achieve the objectives of this part while leaving opportunity and flexibility for the development of State plan standards and methods that will best accommodate the varied needs of institutions in the several States, and (2) shall give special consideration to the financial need of the institution. Subject to the foregoing requirements, such regulations may establish additional and appropriate basic criteria, including provision for considering the degree to which applicant institutions are effectively utilizing existing facilities and equipment, provision for allowing State plans to group or provide for grouping, in a reasonable manner, facilities or institutions according to functional or educational type for priority purposes, and, in view of the national objectives of this Act, provision for considering the degree to which the institution serves students from two or more States or from outside the United States; and in no event shall an institution's readiness to admit such out-of-State students be considered as a priority factor adverse to such institution.

"(b) The Federal share for the purposes of this part shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost of the project, except that a State commission may increase such share to not to exceed 80 per centum of such cost in the case of any institution proving insufficient resources to participate in the program under this part and inability to acquire such resources. An institution of higher education shall be eligible for a grant for a project pursuant to this part in any fiscal year only if such institution will expend during such year for the same purposes as, but not pursuant to, this part an amount at least equal to the amount expended by such institution for such purposes during the previous fiscal year. The Commissioner shall establish basic criteria for making determinations under this subsection.

"Applications for Grants and Conditions for Approval

"SEC. 605. (a) Institutions of higher education which desire to obtain grants under this part shall submit applications therefor at such time or times and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, and such applications shall contain such information as may be required by or pursuant to regulation for the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to make the determinations required to be made by him under this part.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve an application covering a project under this part and meeting the requirements prescribed pursuant to subsection (a) if—

"(1) the project has been approved and recommended by the appropriate State commission;

"(2) the State commission has certified to the Commissioner, in accordance with the State plan, the Federal share of the cost of the project, and sufficient funds to pay such Federal share are available from the applicable allotment of the State (including any applicable reallotment to the State);

"(3) the project has, pursuant to the State plan, been assigned a priority that is higher than that of all other projects within such State (chargeable to the same allotment) which meet all the requirements of this section (other than this clause) and for which Federal funds have not yet been reserved;

"(4) the Commissioner determines that the project will be undertaken in an economical manner and will not be overly elaborate or extravagant; and

"(5) the Commissioner determines that the application contains or is supported by satisfactory assurances—

"(A) that Federal funds received by the applicant will be used solely for defraying the cost of the project covered by such application,

"(B) that sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal portion of such cost and to provide for the effective use of the equipment upon completion, and

"(C) that the institution will meet the maintenance of effort requirement in section 604(b).

"(b) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Commissioner may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulation, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

"Amount of Grant—Payment

"SEC. 606. Upon his approval of any application for a grant under this part, the Commissioner shall reserve from the applicable allotment (including any applicable reallotment) available therefor, the amount of such grant, which (subject to the limits of such allotment or reallotment) shall be equal to the Federal share of the cost of the project covered by such application. The Commissioner shall pay such reserved amount, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments as he may determine. The Commissioner's reservation of any amount under this section may be amended by him, either upon approval of an amendment of the application covering such project or upon revision of the estimated cost of a project with respect to which such reservation was made, and in the event of an upward revision of such estimated cost approved by him he may reserve the Federal share of the added cost only from the applicable allotment (or reallotment) available at the time of such approval.

"Administration of State Plans

"SEC. 607. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this part, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State commission submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State commission administering a State plan approved under this part, finds—

"(1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 603, or

"(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify such State commission that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this part until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

"Judicial Review

"SEC. 608. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under this part or with his final action under section 607, such State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The Commissioner shall forthwith certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action.

"(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the transcript and record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

"(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"Limitation on Payments

"SEC. 609. No grant may be made under this part for equipment or materials to be used for sectarian instruction or religious worship, or primarily in connection with any part of the program of a school or department of divinity. For purposes of this section the term 'school or department of divinity' means an institution or a department or branch of an institution whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation, or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

"Part B—Faculty development programs

"Institutes Authorized

"SEC. 621. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to arrange, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education for the operation by them of short-term workshops or short-term or regular-session institutes for individuals (1) who are engaged in, or preparing to engage in, the use of educational media equipment in teaching in institutions of higher education, or (2) who are, or are preparing to be, in institutions of higher education, specialists in educational media or librarians or other specialists using such media.

"(b) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for the succeeding fiscal year, there may be appropriated for the purposes of this part, only such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

"Stipends

"SEC. 622. Each individual who attends an institute operated under the provisions of this part shall be eligible (after application therefor) to receive a stipend at the rate of $75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute and each such individual with one or more dependents shall receive an additional stipend at the rate of $15 per week for each dependent. No stipends shall be paid for attendance at workshops.

"TITLE VII—AMENDMENTS TO HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

"Expansion of Grant Purposes

"SEC. 701. (a) Section 106 of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended to read as follows:

" 'Eligibility for Grants

" 'SEC. 106. An institution of higher education shall be eligible for a grant for construction of an academic facility under this title only if such construction will, either alone or together with other construction to be undertaken within a reasonable time, (1) result in an urgently needed substantial expansion of the institution's student enrollment capacity or capacity to carry out extension and continuing education programs on the campus of such institution, or (2) in the case of a new institution of higher education, result in creating urgently needed enrollment capacity or capacity to carry out extension and continuing education programs on the campus of such institution.'

"(b) The first sentence of section 101(b) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by striking out 'and each of the two succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'and for the succeeding fiscal year, and the sum of $460,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966'.

"(c) The second sentence of section 201 of such Act is amended by striking out 'and the sum of $60,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the succeeding fiscal year' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the sum of $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the sum of $120,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966'.

"Technical amendments

"Making Section 103 Allotments Available for Section 104 Institutions Under Certain Circumstances

"SEC. 702. (a)(1) Section 103(b) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by inserting '(1)' immediately after '(b)' in such section and by adding at the end thereof:

" '(2) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, any portion of a State's allotment under this section for a fiscal year for which applications from an institution qualified to receive grants under this section have not been received by the State Commission by January 1 of such fiscal year, shall, if the Commission so requests, be available, in accordance with the provisions of this title, for payment of the Federal share (as determined under sections 108(b)(3) and 401(d)) of the development cost of approved projects for the construction of academic facilities within such State for institutions of higher education other than public community colleges and public technical institutes.'

"(2) The first sentence of section 103(c) is amended by striking out 'for providing academic facilities for public community colleges or public technical institutes' and inserting in lieu thereof 'for the purposes set forth in subsection (b) of this section'.

"(3) Section 105(a) is amended by striking out 'hereinafter' in the matter preceding clause (1).

"(4) Clause (3) of section 105(a) is amended by inserting '(except as provided in section 103(b)(2)' after 'section 103 will be available'.

"Making Section 104 Allotments Available for Section 103 Institutions Under Certain Circumstances

"(b)(1) Section 104(b) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by inserting '(1)' immediately after '(b)' in such section and by adding at the end thereof:

" '(2) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, any portion of a State's allotment under this section for a fiscal year for which applications from an institution qualified to receive grants under this section have not been received by the State Commission by January 1 of such fiscal year, shall, if the Commission so requests, be available, in accordance with the provisions of this title, for payments of the Federal share as determined under sections 108(b)(3) and 401(d)) of the development cost of approved projects for the construction of academic facilities within such State for public community colleges and public technical institutes.'

"(2) The first sentence of section 104(c) is amended by striking out 'for providing academic facilities for institutions of higher education other than public community colleges and public technical institutes' and inserting in lieu thereof 'for the purposes set forth in subsection (b) of this section'.

"(3) Clause (3) of section 105(a) is amended by inserting '(except as provided in section 104(b)(2))' after 'section 104 will be available'.

"Revising Federal Share for Public Community Colleges and Public Technical Institutes

"(c)(1) Section 105(a)(2) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by striking out 'other than a project for a public community college or public technical institute'.

"(2) Section 107(b) of such Act is amended (1) by striking out 'other than a project for a public community college or public technical institute', and (2) by striking out 'shall be 40 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof 'shall in no event exceed 40 per centum'.

"(3) Section 401(d) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before '40 per centum' the following: 'a percentage (as determined under the applicable State plan) not in excess of'.

"Three-Year Availability of Sums Appropriated Under Section 201

"(d) The last sentence of section 201 of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended to read as follows: Sums appropriated pursuant to this section for any fiscal year shall remain available for grants under this title until the end of the second succeeding fiscal year.

"Two-Year Availability of Title III Funds

"(e) Section 303(c) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: 'Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection for any fiscal year shall remain available for loans under this title until the end of the next succeeding fiscal year.'

"Coordination With Part A (Grants for Expansion and Improvement of Nurse Training) of Title VIII of the Public Health Service Act

"(f) Effective with respect to applications for grants and loans submitted after the date of enactment of this Act, clause (E) of section 401(a)(2) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended to read as follows: '(E) any facility used or to be used by a school of medicine, school of dentistry, school of osteopathy, school of pharmacy, school of optometry, school of podiatry, or school of public health as these terms are defined in section 724 of the Public Health Service Act, or a school of nursing as defined in section 843 of that Act.'

"Change in Interest Rate for Title III Loans

"SEC. 703. (a) Subsection (b) of section 303 of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by inserting '(1)' after 'shall bear interest at', and by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'or (2) the rate of 3 per centum per annum, whichever is the lesser'.

"(b) The amendment made by this section, shall be applicable only with respect to loans made after the date of enactment of this Act.

"TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"Definitions

"SEC. 801. As used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'institution of higher education' means an educational institution in any State which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate, (2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, (4) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited. Such term also includes any business school or technical institution which meets the provisions of clauses (1), (2), (4), and (5). For purposes of this subsection, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.

"(b) The term 'State' includes, in addition to the several States of the Union, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

"(c) The term 'nonprofit' as applied to a school, agency, organization, or institution means a school, agency, organization, or institution owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"(d) The term 'secondary school' means a school which provides secondary education as determined under State law except that it does not include any education provided beyond grade 12.

'(e) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(f) The term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Education.

"(g) The term 'local educational agency' means a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or such combination of school districts or counties as are recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public elementary or secondary schools. Such term also includes any other public institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a public elementary or secondary school.

"(h) The term 'State educational agency' means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law.

"(i) The term 'elementary school' means a school which provides elementary education including education below grade 1, as determined under State law.

"Method of Payment

"Sec. 802. Payments under this Act to any individual or to any State or Federal agency, institution of higher education, or any other organization, pursuant to a grant, loan, or contract, may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, and, in the case of grants or loans, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

"Federal Administration

"Sec. 803. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to delegate any of his functions under this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

"(b) In administering the provisions of this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary and the head thereof.

"Federal Control of Education Prohibited

"Sec. 804. (a) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution, or over the selection of library resources by any educational institution.

"(b) Nothing contained in this Act or any other Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the membership practices or internal operations of any fraternal organization, fraternity, sorority, private club or religious organization at an institution of higher education (other than a service academy or the Coast Guard Academy) which is financed exclusively by funds derived from private sources and whose facilities are not owned by such institution."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Adam C. Powell,
Carl D. Perkins,
Edith Green,
John Brademas,
Hugh L. Carey,
John H. Dent,
Sam M. Gibbons,
Carlton R. Sickles,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Wayne Morse,
Lister Hill,
Pat McNamara,
Ralph Yarborough,
Joseph Clark,
Jennings Randolph,
Robert Kennedy,
Winston L. Prouty,
J. K. Javits,
Peter H. Dominick,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9567) to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment strikes out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserts a substitute. The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. The differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below except for clerical corrections, incidental changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees, and minor drafting and clarifying changes.

TITLE I—COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Declaration of Purpose

Section 101 of the House bill contained a number of congressional findings. These were that a greater involvement of institutions of higher education in the solution of problems brought about by increasing urbanization is essential to the rapid and effective solution of such problems, that an increase in the availability of educational offerings by such institutions for persons in the community is necessary in order to insure that the latest knowledge and techniques are brought to bear on urban and suburban problems, and that the strengthening of the resources of such institutions is desirable to facilitate a more effective utilization of such resources in meeting the growing needs of our urban and suburban communities. For these reasons it was declared to be the purpose of the title to provide a program of support for institutions of higher education in their establishing and maintaining community service programs designed to achieve these ends.

The Senate amendment provided that the purpose of the title is to assist the people of the United States in the solution of community problems, such as housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health, and land use, by enabling the Commissioner to make grants and contracts under the title to strengthen continuing education and extension methods and teaching and the public service resources of colleges and universities.

The conference substitute adopts the Senate provision, except that instead of speaking of strengthening continuing education and extension methods and teaching, and the public service resources of colleges and universities, it mentions strengthening the community service programs of such institutions.

Authorization of Appropriations

The House bill authorized the appropriation of $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1966 to enable the Commissioner to make grants under the title. For the 4 succeeding fiscal years there was authorized to be appropriated only such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law. The Senate bill authorized $25,000,000 for fiscal 1966, and $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1967 and each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years.

The substitute agreed upon in conference authorizes the appropriation of $25,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, and $50,000,000 for each of the next 2 fiscal years. For the fiscal year 1969 and the succeeding fiscal year it provides that only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

Use of Funds

The House bill provided that the funds granted from the State's allotment must be used to provide new, expanded, or improved community service programs. "Community service program" was defined to mean an educational program, activity, or service including a research program, specifically designed to assist in the solution of urban or suburban problems, or an educational program, activity, or service designed to assist in the solution of community problems where the institution offering the program, activity, or service determines that the proposed program, activity, or service is not otherwise available and that the content thereof is consistent with the institution's overall educational program and is appropriate to the effective utilization of its special resources and the competencies of its faculty. Under the House bill if the educational program, activity, or service involves course offerings, they must be university extension or continuing education courses and must be acceptable toward an adademic degree or of a college level, but in no event can the course be of a frivolous nature.

The Senate amendment provided that funds granted from the State's allotment must be used for extension and continuing education activities and services designed to assist, particularly through new and advanced approaches, in the solution of rural and urban community problems.

The conference substitute adopts the term "community service program" and defines it to mean an educational program, activity, or service, including a research program and a university extension or continuing education offering, designed to assist in the solution of community problems in rural, urban, or suburban areas, with particular emphasis on urban and suburban problems, but only where the institutions offering the program, activity, or service determines it is not otherwise available and that carrying it out is consistent with the institution's overall educational program, and that it is of such a nature as is appropriate to the effective utilization of the institution's special resources and competencies. Where course offerings are involved, they must be university extension or continuing education courses and either fully acceptable toward a college degree, or of college level as determined by the institution offering the course. The reference to rural, urban, and suburban areas includes rural nonfarm areas.

The requirement that an institution determine that its proposed program is not otherwise available is intended to preclude duplication of existing effort, including overlap with the Agricultural Extension Service. It is not designed to prohibit the use of funds to expand existing community service programs for which there is an unsatisfied demand.

The restriction of courses to those of college level should not be construed to exclude non-secondary-school graduates from participation in programs carried out under this title.

The omission of the prohibition against courses of a frivolous nature should in no way be interpreted as permitting courses to increase the competence of an individual in purely recreational or social activities.

Allotments to Puerto Rico

Under the House bill, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico would be given a preliminary allotment of $25,000, as was the case for Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands. The Senate amendment provided that the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico would receive a preliminary allotment of $100,000. The Senate recedes.

Matching

The House bill provided that the Federal share of the cost of programs under the title would be 75 percent in the fiscal year 1966, and 50 percent in the fiscal years 1967, 1968, 1969, and 1970. The Senate bill provided that the Federal share would be 75 percent in the fiscal years 1966 and 1967, and 50 percent in the fiscal years 1968, 1969, and 1970. The conference substitute adopts the provisions of the Senate amendment on this point.

Maintenance of Effort

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment required that the State plan submitted under the title set forth policies and procedures designed to assure that the Federal funds made available will not supplant State or local funds or funds of institutions of higher education. The Senate amendment in addition provided that no payments could be made to any State from its allotment until the Commissioner finds that the institutions of higher education which will participate in carrying out the State plan have available during that year for expenditure from non-Federal sources for university extension and continuing education programs not less than the total amount actually expended by those institutions for such programs from non-Federal sources during the year 1965, plus an amount equal to not less than the non-Federal share of the costs with respect to which payment under the title is sought. The conference substitute includes this provision.

The Senate amendment also prohibited use of fee-related funds to meet the above requirement. This provision is dropped in the conference substitute.

Funds To Cover Administration of State Plans

The House bill provided that no payment could be made to any State for developing and administering a State plan which exceeds 5 percent of the cost of developing and carrying out the States' plan for that year. The Senate amendment contained the same provision but added a provision to authorize the expenditure of $25,000 in any State where that amount is greater than 5 percent of such cost. The Senate provision is retained in the conference report.

Funds for Experimental Approaches and Supplemental Grants

The Senate amendment reserved 20 percent of the sum appropriated for purposes of the title for grants and contracts for experimental projects and for supplemental grants. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The Senate recedes.

Advisory Council

The House bill provided for the establishment in the Office of Education of a National Advisory Committee on Community Service Programs to advise the Commissioner in preparing general regulations and in the administration of the program provided for in the title. The Senate amendment directed the President to appoint a National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education to advise the Commissioner in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of the title and also with respect to approval of State plans, and policies to eliminate duplication and effectuate coordination of programs under the title and other programs of extension or continuing education. The Council would also advise the Commissioner on approval of projects and activities under the title. The Council was required to review all federally supported extension and continuing education programs. Beginning on March 31, 1967, it would file an annual report of its findings and recommendations to the Secretary and to the President. This report would be transmitted to the Congress with the comments and recommendations of the President.

The Senate amendment also authorized the Secretary to engage such technical assistance as might be required to carry out the functions of the Advisory Council. It also authorized the Advisory Council to utilize the services and facilities of other Federal agencies.

This section of the Senate amendment is included in the conference report with only minor and conforming changes.

The House bill contained a provision, nothing comparable to which appears in the Senate amendment, under which the Secretary is required, during 1968, to appoint a Review Council on Community Service Programs to review the administration of community service programs carried out under the title and make recommendations for the improvement of that administration. The Council was to include persons knowledgeable in the field of extension and continuing education, State and local officials having special knowledge, experience, or qualification with respect to community problems, and persons representative of the public. The Secretary was also authorized to engage technical assistance. The Council would make its report to the Secretary not later than March 31, 1969. This provision is not included in the conference report.

Limitation

The Senate amendment contained a provision, not present in the House bill, prohibiting the use of funds for activities and services related to sectarian instruction or religious worship, or provided by a school or department of divinity. This provision is retained in the conference report.

TITLE II—COLLEGE LIBRARY ASSISTANCE AND LIBRARY TRAINING AND RESEARCH

Part A—College library resources

Authorization of Appropriations

The House bill authorized the appropriation of $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, and only such sums as may be hereafter authorized by law for the succeeding 4 fiscal years. The Senate amendment authorized $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1966 and each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years. The substitute agreed upon in conference authorizes the appropriation of $50,000,000 for the fiscal year 1966 and the 2 succeeding fiscal years. It provides that for the fiscal year 1969, and the next fiscal year, only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

Basic Grants

The House bill provided basic grants to institutions of higher education for acquisition of library materials. It provided that the basic grant to an institution could not exceed $5,000 for each institution. The comparable provision of the Senate amendment provided that the basic grant could not exceed $5,000 for each institution of higher education and each branch of such institution which is located in a community different from that in which its parent institution is located. The conference substitute adopts the Senate version, with an amendment under which what constitutes a "branch" will be determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner. In permitting grants to be made to branches the conferees intend that grants be limited to branches which have college level programs for which library facilities are necessary, and that the proceeds of a grant on account of a branch be used to increase the library resources at the branch.

The Senate amendment also required the institution applying for a basic grant to provide for joint use of library facilities with other institutions where feasible. The House bill contained no comparable provision, and it is not included in the conference report. However, the managers on the part of the House expect that there will be joint use of library facilities where feasible.

Supplemental Grants

The Senate amendment provided that funds remaining after making basic grants, plus any funds not needed for special purpose grants, could be used for supplemental grants. The House bill provided for the use of funds remaining after making basic grants to make supplemental grants, but did not permit the use of funds not needed for special grants for this purpose. It provided, instead, that funds not needed for the other types of grants be used for special purpose grants. The provision of the Senate amendment is included in the conference report. The conferees do not expect an institution to qualify for supplemental grants unless it has received basic grants in excess of $1,500 on a matching basis.

The House bill provided that in awarding supplemental grants the Commissioner shall take into consideration the endowments and other financial resources of the institution. The Senate amendment required the Commissioner to give priority to institutions which need financial assistance for library purposes. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Special Purpose Grants

Both the House bills and the Senate amendment provided for use of 25 percent of the funds appropriated to carry out the part for special purpose grants. The House bill also permitted the use of funds not needed for the other grant programs to be used for special purpose grants. The Senate amendment, in contrast, provided that funds not used for special purpose grants could be used for supplemental grants.

In lieu of these provisions, the conference substitute provides that 25 percent of the sums appropriated to carry out the part for a fiscal year shall be used by the Commissioner as follows:

1. 60 percent may be used to make special purpose grants.
2. The sums not used for special purpose grants will be used in the manner prescribed for supplemental grants.

The Senate amendment specifically includes physical and social sciences as being among those eligible for special purpose grants. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The Senate recedes.

The Senate amendment provided that special purpose grants must be matched on the basis of one institutional dollar for every three Federal dollars, and required that the institution maintain its effort in this area. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts the substance of the Senate amendment on this point.

State Agency Consultation

The House bill required consultation by institutions of higher education with State higher education agencies where they exist. The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute requires these institutions to inform periodically the State agency (if any) concerned with higher educational activities in the State of such institution's activities under the part.

Part B—Library training and research

Authorization of Appropriations

The House bill authorized the appropriation of $15,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, and only such sums as may hereafter be authorized for the succeeding 4 years. The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation of $7,500,000 for fiscal year 1966 and $15,000,000 for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.

The conference substitute authorizes the appropriation of $15,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, for carrying out this part. For the fiscal year 1969 and the next fiscal year only such funds may be appropriated as the Congress hereafter authorizes by law.

Training Grants

The Senate amendment specifically includes training of specialists in the communications of information in the physical and social sciences as eligible training programs. The House bill did not specifically include these programs. The Senate recedes.

Research

The Senate amendment permitted research grants and contracts to individuals. The House bill did not. The Senate recedes.

The House bill permitted the Commissioner to appoint one nine-member advisory committee to assist in the administration of the program. The Senate amendment allowed the Commissioner to appoint the necessary number of technical advisory committees and panels of experts. The House provision is included in the conference report.

NDEA Library Institutes

The House bill repealed the authority for training institutes for elementary and secondary school librarians now contained in the National Defense Education Act of 1958, effective July 1, 1965. The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision. The conferees agreed to the House provision, but delayed its effectiveness until July 1, 1967. The conference committee expects that after June 30, 1967, the librarian institutes now authorized under the National Defense Education Act will be carried on under part B of title II of this act.

Part C—Cataloging

Authorization of Appropriations

The House bill authorized the appropriation of $5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1966, and only such sums as may hereafter be authorized for the succeeding 4 fiscal years. The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation of $5,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, $6,315,000 for the fiscal year 1967, and $7,770,000 for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years. The conference substitute authorizes the appropriation of $5,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, $6,315,000 for fiscal year 1967, and $7,700,000 for fiscal year 1968. For the fiscal year 1969 and the next fiscal year, only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

Purpose of Program

The Senate amendment authorized the use of funds transferred under this part for distributing bibliographic information by printing catalog cards and by other means. The House bill did not authorize the use of these funds for such purpose. The conference report includes this provision of the Senate amendment.

TITLE III—STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS

Authorization of Appropriations

The House bill authorized the appropriation of $30,000,000 for the fiscal year 1966 to carry out the title. For the 4 succeeding fiscal years only such sums could be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation of $25,000,000 for the fiscal year 1966 and each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years for carrying out the provisions of the title with respect to developing institutions which plan to award one or more bachelor's degrees during the year. It authorizes $25,000,000 for the fiscal year 1966 and each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years for carrying out the provisions of the title with respect to developing institutions which do not plan to award such degrees during the year. It authorized the appropriation of $5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1966 and $10,000,000 for the fiscal year 1967 and each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years for either of the foregoing purposes, or both, as determined by the Commissioner.

The substitute agreed upon in conference contains an authorization of $55,000,000 for 1 year—the fiscal year 1966. It provides that 78 percent of the sums appropriated for the title may be used only for developing institutions which plan to award one or more bachelor's degrees during the year. The remainder may be used only for other institutions.

Qualifications of "Developing Institutions"

The House bill provided that for an institution to be a developing institution eligible for this program it must, among other things, (1) have been awarding bachelor's degrees for 5 years, and (2) be seriously handicapped in its efforts to improve its staff and services by lack of financial resources and a shortage of qualified professional personnel.

The Senate amendment permitted an institution of higher education (including a junior college or other 2-year institution) to be considered a "developing institution" if it met the accreditation requirements of the bill during the 2 preceding academic years.

The substitute includes the 2-year institutions within the scope of the title, but provides that all institutions must meet the accreditation requirements and must have been in existence for 5 academic years. This reflects the committee's determination that funds be used to support programs which will assist those institutions which are developing in the sense that they are unable to offer quality instruction, not simply because they are rapidly expanding.

The committee intends that the Commissioner in prescribing regulations defining the term "developing institution" will strictly adhere to the description of such institutions contained in both the House and Senate reports.

Types of Programs

The Senate amendment, unlike the House bill, specifically included programs to strengthen the administration of developing institutions. The conference substitute includes this provision.

The Senate amendment permitted cooperative programs under which persons from developing institutions may receive fellowships leading to advanced degrees. No specific authority was contained in the House bill. This provision is retained in the conference report.

TITLE IV—STUDENT ASSISTANCE

Part A—Educational opportunity grants

General

The House bill and Senate amendment both include programs to provide financial assistance to enable deserving students to attend college. However, the two programs differ completely as to the manner in which this assistance would be provided. The House bill amended the student loan title of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, to provide that 25 percent of the amount authorized for student loan funds could be used to make educational opportunity grants to needy students. The Senate amendment, in contrast, did not amend the National Defense Education Act, but instead provided an independent program under which grants would be made to institutions of higher education to enable them to provide scholarships.

The substitute agreed upon in conference adopts the general structure of the Senate amendment, while retaining (as explained hereafter in detail) most of the requirements of the House bill relating to qualifications for and amounts of educational opportunity grants.

Authorization of Appropriations

The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation of $70,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, and each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years for paying for the initial year of scholarships awarded under the program. The conference substitute authorizes the appropriation of $70,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, and each of the next 2 fiscal years, for making payments for the initial year of educational opportunity grants (the name given these grants in the House bill and adopted in the conference report). For the fiscal year 1969, and the next fiscal year, the conference substitute permits the appropriation of only such sums as may hereafter be authorized by law.

Amount of Grant

Under the House bill the maximum educational opportunity grant which could be made to a student for any year was $800; and in no event could the grant constitute more than one-half of the total financial aid provided the student by the institution (excluding assistance from work-study programs) and by any State or private scholarship program. Under the Senate amendment the maximum size of a scholarship for a year was $800, but the maximum size was increased to $1,000 in the case of a student in the upper half of his class.

The conference substitute provides that the maximum amount of an educational opportunity grant may not exceed the lesser of $800 or one-half of the sum of the amount of student financial aid (excluding assistance from work-study programs) provided by the institution or by a State or private scholarship program. If the student is in the upper half of his class, the maximum amount will be increased $200, if needed.

Allotments Among States

Since the House bill provided that educational opportunity grants would be made from NDEA student loan funds, the effect was to allot funds for this program on the basis of the NDEA formula. Under that formula, funds are allotted among the States on the basis of the relative number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education in the several States. The Senate amendment allotted the funds among the States, one-third as funds for NDEA student loan programs are allotted, one-third on the basis of relative numbers of secondary school graduates in the several States, and one-third on the basis of the relative number of related children under 18 years of age living in families with annual incomes of less than $3,000.

The conference substitute provides that all the funds will be allotted according to the formula used for allotting NDEA student loan funds.

State Scholarship Funds

The Senate amendment permitted payment (with 50-percent matching and maintenance of effort) of up to 15 percent of a State's apportionment for use in the State's scholarship programs which are comparable to the Federal program. The House bill did not contain this provision, and it is not included in the agreement reached in conference.

Coordination of Student Assistance Programs

As mentioned above, under the House bill educational oportunity grants had to be supplemented by assistance under other programs. The Senate bill did not include the House provision, but did require institutions, where appropriate, to combine financial assistance under this program with assistance derived from other public and private programs. Since the House provision referred to above was retained in the conference report, the Senate provision was dropped.

Cooperative Motivational Programs

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment contained provisions requiring institutions of higher education to make vigorous efforts to identify qualified youths from low-income families and to encourage them to continue their education beyond secondary school. The provision in the Senate amendment which permitted institutions to use up to 5 percent of their grants for these activities is not included in the conference report.

Transfers to NDEA Student Loan Funds

The Senate amendment permitted an institution to transfer 25 percent of funds granted it under the part to its NDEA student loan fund. The conference report retains this provision.

Part B—Guaranteed reduced interest loans

General

The House bill and Senate amendment contained generally similar provisions for Federal, State, and private programs of low-interest insured loans to students in institutions of higher education. There were a number of technical differences between the two versions, but the conference report accepts the provisions of the House bill, except as noted below.

Moratorium for Repayment

The Senate amendment provided a moratorium on repayment of federally guaranteed loans during the time the borrower is a full-time student and for a period of not to exceed 3 years during which the borrower is a member of the Armed Forces or a volunteer in the Peace Corps. This provision is retained in the conference report.

Beginning Date for Repayments

The House bill provided that repayments cannot be required to begin before 6 months after the end of the student's educational program. The Senate amendment substituted 9 months for the 6-month figure in the House bill. The 9-month figure is adopted in the conference report.

Advisory Council on Insured Loans for Students

The Senate amendment established an Advisory Council on Insured Loans for Students to advise the Commissioner in preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy needs arising in the administration of the program. There was no comparable provision in the House bill.

The conference substitute accepts this provision with two changes. It deletes the requirement that the Council advise the Commissioner in the preparation of general regulations, and inserts a provision giving the members of the Council the usual per diem rates of pay.

Definition of "Eligible Institution"

The House bill limited the institutions which would be eligible to participate to 4-year and 2-year institutions which are accredited and provide courses acceptable for credit toward a bachelor's degree.

The Senate amendment broadened the definition of "eligible institution" to include (1) institutions which are not yet accredited but which, in the judgment of the Commissioner, will be accredited in a reasonable time; (2) collegiate and associate degree schools of nursing; and (3) other schools which provide not less than a 1-year program of training to prepare students for gainful employment in a recognized occupation. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

Part C—College work-study program extension and amendment

Authorization of Appropriations

The House bill authorized the appropriation of $129,000,000 to carry out the part during the fiscal year 1966, and such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law for the next 4 fiscal years. The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation of $129,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, $165,000,000 for fiscal year 1967, $200,000,000 for fiscal year 1968, and $235,000,000 for the fiscal year 1969 and the next fiscal year. The conference report authorizes the appropriation of $129,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, $165,000,000 for fiscal year 1967, and $200,000,000 for fiscal year 1968.

Limitation on Types of Work

The Senate amendment made applicable to all work carried on under work-study programs, the requirements now applicable to off-campus work. It also adds a requirement that the work be such as would not otherwise be performed by nonstudents. The Senate provision was accepted in conference with an amendment deleting the requirement that the work be such as would not otherwise be performed by nonstudents.

Payment of Institutional Share

The present law requires institutions to bear 10 percent of the cost of work-study programs. The Senate amendment permitted institutions to pay this share to students in the form of services and equipment furnished by the institutions. This provision is included in the conference report.

Part D—Amendments to National Defense Education Act of 1958

Conditions of Agreements; Administrative Costs

The Senate amendment contained an amendment to clause (3) of section 204 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (referred to as the NDEA) which required that agreements between the Commissioner and institutions participating in the loan program provide that student loan funds may be used for routine expenses (within specified limits) incurred by the institution in administering the student loan fund, and for collection costs (in addition to costs of litigation) agreed to by the Commissioner. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Technical Amendment for Part-Time Students

The Senate amendment contained an amendment to section 205(b)(2) of the NDEA to authorize institutions to determine whether loans shall be repaid in equal (or if the borrower requests, in graduated periodic installments determined in accordance with schedules approved by the Commissioner) quarterly, bimonthly, or monthly installments. It also amended section 205(b)(2) to provide that repayment of principal, together with interest, is to commence 9 months after the date on which the borrower ceases to carry at least half the normal full-time academic workload, and end 10 years and 9 months after such date except that interest shall not accrue and no installment need be paid while the borrower is carrying (at an institution of higher education or comparable institution outside the States, approved for this purpose by the Commissioner) at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload, as determined by the institution. The amendments made by this provision would apply to loans outstanding on the date of enactment only with the consent of the borrower and the lending institution.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Minimum Rate of Repayment

The Senate amendment contained an amendment to section 205(b)(2) of the NDEA to authorize institutions to require that the rate of repayment by a borrower on all title II loans extended him must be not less than $15 per month. The amendment made by this provision would be applicable only with respect to loans made after the date of enactment.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Cancellation of Loans for Teachers

The Senate amendment contained an amendment to section 205(b)(3) of the NDEA in three respects: First, to provide that the portion of the loans to be forgiven teachers is to be calculated as a percentage of the original total of the loans in question rather than, as the law now provides, of the amount of the loan remaining unpaid on the first day of service as a teacher; second, to provide that the prescribed portions of the loan to be forgiven shall be forgiven for each academic year "or its equivalent"; and third, to provide that the cancellation rate for teachers shall be 15 percent for each complete academic year, or its equivalent, of service as a full-time teacher in a public or other nonprofit elementary or secondary school which is in the school district of a local educational agency eligible in such year for assistance under title II (financial assistance to local educational agencies for the education of children of low-income families) of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, and which has been determined to be a school in which there is a high concentration of students from low-income families. Such a determination may be made only with respect to 25 percent of the schools in a State. For purposes of such cancellation, an additional 50 percent of any loan (plus interest) may be canceled.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment, but with a limitation that no borrower may receive a refund by reason of subsequent forgiveness of amounts he has repaid.

Charges

The Senate amendment contained an amendment to section 205 of the NDEA by adding a new subsection (c) to authorize institutions to assess charges against borrowers who fail to pay all or any part of an installment when due, and against borrowers who are entitled to deferment benefits or cancellation benefits but who fail to file timely and satisfactory evidence of such entitlement. Such charges may amount to $1 for the first month of late payment and $2 each month thereafter, except that for bimonthly or quarterly repayment intervals, the charge may be $3 and $6, respectively. Institutions would be authorized to elect whether to add these charges to the principal amount of loans as of the first day after the day on which such installment or evidence was due, or to make the amount of the charge payable to the institution not later than the due date of the next installment after receipt by the borrower of notice of the assessment of the charge. The amendment would be applicable only with respect to loans made after the date of enactment.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Economics, civics, and industrial arts

The Senate amendment contained an amendment to clauses (1) and (5) of section 303(a) of the NDEA pertaining to State plans under which financial assistance is extended for strengthening instruction in science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other critical subjects, to include "economics" among subjects which may be included in programs by State educational agencies. This provision also authorized increased appropriations (from $90 to $100 million) for fiscal years 1966, 1967, and 1968 for carrying out title III of the NDEA.

In addition this provision amended section 1101 of the NDEA (authorizing short-term or regular session institutes for advanced study) to provide for the authorization of $50 million (rather than $32,750,000) for fiscal 1966 and for each of the 2 succeeding years. It also amended section 1101 to expand the categories of eligible support to include institutes to improve the qualification of individuals who are engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching or the supervising or training of teachers, of economics, civics, and industrial arts.

The House bill contained no comparable provisions. The conference report adopts these provisions of the Senate amendment.

TITLE V—TEACHER PROGRAMS

Part A—General provisions

Advisory Council on Quality Teacher Preparation

The Senate amendment provided for the establishment of an Advisory Council on Teacher Preparation in the Office of Education. The Commissioner would be Chairman of the Council, and he would appoint (with the approval of the Secretary) the 12 members of the Council. Such 12 members would include persons knowledgeable with respect to teacher preparation and the needs of urban and rural schools. The purpose of the Council would be to review the administration and operation of the programs carried out under this title and under all other Federal programs for complementary purposes.

The provision also provided for compensation of Council members who are not regular full-time employees of the United States, and allowed the Council to appoint an executive secretary and such other employees as it deemed necessary to carry out its functions under this part.

The House bill contained no comparable provisions. The conference report adopts these provisions of the Senate amendment, but changes the name of the Council to the Advisory Council on Quality Teacher Preparation.

Limitation

The Senate amendment provided that nothing contained in this title shall be construed to authorize the making of any payment under this title for religious worship or instruction. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Part B—National Teacher Corps

Statement of Purpose and Authorization of Appropriations

The Senate amendment provided that it is the purpose of this part to improve the educational opportunities available to children in areas having a concentration of low-income families, and at the same time to encourage the development of broader programs of teacher preparation in colleges and universities, by attracting and training both qualified teachers and inexperienced teacher-interns who will be made available to local educational agencies in low-income areas.

The Senate amendment authorized, for the purpose of carrying out this part, the appropriation of $36,100,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $64,715,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopted this provision, but restricted the authorization to the first 2 years.

Establishment of National Teacher Corps

The Senate amendment provided that a National Teacher Corps, to be headed by a Director and a Deputy Director, would be established in the Office of Education in order to carry out the purposes of this part. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Teacher Corps Program

The Senate amendment authorized the Commissioner to (1) recruit, select, and enroll both experienced teachers and inexperienced teacher-interns (who have a bachelor's degree or its equivalent) in the Teacher Corps for periods of up to 2 years; (2) enter into arrangements with institutions of higher education or State or local educational agencies to provide members of the Teacher Corps with appropriate training, including a maximum of 3 months' training before undertaking their teaching duties; (3) enter into arrangements (including the payment of cost of such arrangements) with local educational agencies to furnish experienced teachers and teaching teams (consisting of one experienced teacher and a number of teacher-interns) for service during regular or summer sessions, or both, in the schools of such agencies in areas having concentrations of children from low-income families, and under which arrangements teacher-interns would be afforded time by the local educational agency for a teacher-intern training program carried out under the guidance of the experienced teacher in cooperation with an institution of higher education; (4) pay to local educational agencies the amount of compensation which such agencies pay to members of the Teacher Corps assigned to them; and (5) employ experts and consultants or organizations thereof to assist the Commissioner in carrying out his functions under this part. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment provided that, wherever possible, arrangements with institutions of higher education to furnish training to teacher-interns while such interns are teaching, shall provide for training leading to a graduate degree. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment, but omits authority for the employment of experts, consultants, or organizations.

The Senate amendment provided that when the demand for the services of Teacher Corps members exceeds the supply, the Commissioner shall, to the extent practicable allocate those members available among the States in proportion to the number of children counted in each State for the purpose of making basic grants under title II of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, for the fiscal year for which such allocation is made. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts a substitute for this provision of the Senate amendment which provides that if demand for Teacher Corps members exceeds supply, the Commissioner may allot up to 2 percent of the members to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. The remainder would be allotted in accordance with the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment provided that Teacher Corps members may be utilized by a local educational agency to provide educational services available to children enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools, in the manner described in section 205(a)(2) of Public Law 874, 81st Congress. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Compensation

The Senate amendment required that an arrangement with a local educational agency must provide that Teacher Corps members must be compensated by that agency at the following rates: (1) Experienced teachers must receive pay equivalent to that received by teachers with similar training experience and duties who are employed by the local educational agency; (2) experienced teachers leading teaching teams must be compensated at a rate agreed upon by the Commissioner and the agency; and (3) teacher-interns must be compensated at the lowest rate paid by such agency for full-time teaching in the school system and grade to which the intern is assigned.

The Senate amendment authorized the Commissioner to pay stipends to Teacher Corps members while such members are in training. Such payments may include allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such members and their dependents, and are to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported training programs.

In addition, the Senate amendment authorized the Commissioner to pay certain necessary expenses of Teacher Corps members, including travel, transportation of household goods, and readjustment allowances proportionate to service, and to arrange to protect the tenure, retirement rights, and similar employee benefits of any Teacher Corps member who wishes to return to the local educational agency or institution of higher education by which he was employed immediately prior to his service in the Corps.

The House bill contained no comparable provisions. The conference report adopts these provisions of the Senate amendment.

Application of Provisions of Federal Law

The Senate amendment provided:

(1) A Teacher Corps member is not to be deemed a Federal employee, except as is otherwise specifically provided in this section, and is not subject to those provisions of law relating to Federal employment.

(2) Teacher Corps members shall be deemed to be Federal civil employees within the meaning of section 40 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (5 U.S.C. 790) for the purposes of the administration of that act, and the provisions of that act shall apply except as hereinafter provided. For purposes of this subsection the term "performance of duty" in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall not include any act of a member of the Teacher Corps while on authorized leave, or while absent from his assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity authorized by the Commissioner. In computing compensation benefits for disability or death under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the monthly pay of a member of the Teacher Corps shall be deemed to be his actual pay or that received under the entrance salary for GS-6, whichever is greater.

(3) Members of the Teacher Corps shall be deemed to be employees of the Government for the purposes of the Federal Tort Claims Act.

The House bill contained no comparable provisions. The conference report adopts these provisions of the Senate amendment.

Local Control Preserved

The Senate amendment provided that members of the Teacher Corps would be under the direct supervision of the local educational agencies to which they are assigned, and such agencies would retain the authority to assign such members within their systems, make transfers within their systems, determine the subject matter to be taught, and determine the terms and continuance of the assignment of such members within their systems. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Maintenance of Effort

The Senate amendment provided that no member of the Teacher Corps may be used by any local educational agency to replace any teacher who is or would otherwise be employed by such agency.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Part C—Fellowships for teachers

General

Part C of title V of the Senate amendment provided for the establishment of a program of fellowships for elementary and secondary school teachers. The House bill did not provide for a comparable program. The conference report adopts a substitute for the provisions of the Senate amendment.

Statement of Purpose

The Senate amendment provided that the purpose of this part is to provide opportunities for advanced training, particularly in substantive field areas, for teachers and personnel serving in ancillary fields. The conference substitute states that it is the purpose of this part to carry out the policy of the United States to improve elementary and secondary education by improving the quality of career elementary and secondary school personnel by awarding fellowships for graduate study at institutions of higher education and by strengthening teacher education programs in institutions of higher education.

Fellowships Authorized

The Senate amendment authorized the award of fellowships to elementary and secondary school and post secondary vocational school teachers for master's degrees in education, in the subject which the recipient teaches, or in certain ancillary fields. 4,500 fellowships were authorized for fiscal year 1966; 10,000 for fiscal year 1967; and 15,000 for each of the 3 succeeding years. 40 percent of the fellowships were reserved for recent graduates. The remainder were to go to teachers with at least 5 years' experience, of whom 20 percent could be teachers displaced from their employment by reason of the enforcement of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, or court orders. Between 20 and 25 percent of all fellowships were reserved for persons in fields ancillary to elementary or secondary education or to post-secondary vocational education.

The conference substitute provides for fellowships for graduate degrees, other than doctor of philosophy (or its equivalent) for persons pursuing or who plan to pursue a career of teaching in elementary or secondary schools; a career of teaching, guiding, or supervising such teachers or persons who plan to become such teachers; or a career in fields which are directly related to teaching in elementary or secondary schools. 4,500 fellowships are authorized for fiscal year 1966, and 10,000 each are authorized for fiscal years 1967 and 1968. Recipients of fellowships must study at institutions whose programs are approved under section 524. The provisions of the Senate amendment relating to the reservation of portions of the fellowships for certain categories of teachers have been dropped, but the conference committee expects that up to 20 percent of the fellowships will be awarded to persons who have been displaced in their employment as professional employees of local educational agencies as a result of changes of school populations brought about by the enforcement of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, or the carrying out of the purpose of such act.

Allocation of Fellowships

The Senate amendment provided that the Commissioner should endeavor to distribute fellowships equitably throughout the Nation, and that he should give preference in such awards to persons already serving, or intending to serve, in low-income areas.

The conference substitute provides that the Commissioner shall allocate fellowships to institutions of higher education with approved programs for the use of individuals accepted into such programs, in a manner (1) which provides an equitable distribution of such fellowships throughout the States (except that he may, after consultation with the Advisory Council on Quality Teacher Preparation, give preference to programs designed to meet an urgent national need), and (2) which encourages experienced teachers in elementary or secondary schools and other experienced personnel in elementary or secondary education to enter graduate programs, attracts recent college graduates into the field of elementary or secondary education, and affords opportunities for college graduates engaged in other occupations or activities to enter or reenter the field of elementary or secondary education.

Approval of Programs; Grants

The Senate amendment (in pt. D of title V) authorized $5 million annually for a 5-year program of assistance, through grant or contract, to institutions of higher education for developing and strengthening graduate and high quality undergraduate teacher training programs, for the purpose of obtaining an appropriate geographical distribution of high quality programs for the training of elementary and secondary school personnel. The Commissioner was to set forth in regulations the standards and priorities which would be utilized in approving such grants and contracts.

The Senate amendment also set out the standards which the Commissioner was to use in determining whether or not a graduate program of an institution of higher education would qualify for assistance under this part. Such a program must (1) improve the quality of teacher education, (2) give major emphasis to high-quality substantive courses, (3) either be in effect or be attainable as a result of assistance received under this part, and (4) be open only to those with a serious intent to pursue a career in education.

Section 524 of the conference substitute adopts the provisions relating to assistance to graduate programs at institutions of higher education, but integrates this program of institutional assistance with the fellowship program by permitting assistance only to institutions participating in the fellowship program. The separate money authorization for assistance to institutions is omitted.

Stipends

The Senate amendment provided that a fellowship for recent graduates carries a stipend of $2,000 for the first academic year and $2,200 for the second year. A fellowship for experienced teachers carried a stipend of $4,800 for each academic year of study. An additional $400 per year would be paid to each fellowship recipient for each of his dependents.

The Senate amendment authorized the payment of $3,000 per academic year to the institution of higher education where a recipient of a fellowship is studying. This amount will be less any amount charged any such recipient for tuition. The Commissioner was also authorized to reimburse a fellowship recipient for necessary traveling expenses of the recipient and his dependents.

The conference substitute permits the Commissioner to pay to persons awarded fellowships such stipends (including such allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such members and their dependents) as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs. In addition, the Commissioner will pay to the institution of higher education at which such person is pursuing his course of study an amount equivalent to $2,500 per academic year, less any amount charged such person for tuition and nonrefundable fees and deposits.

Limitation

The conference report adopts the provision of the Senate amendment which provides that no fellowship shall be awarded for study at a school or department of divinity, which means an institution or department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to enter upon some religious vocation.

Fellowship Conditions

The Senate amendment provided that a recipient must, in order to remain eligible for his fellowship payments, maintain satisfactory proficiency in, and devote essentially full time to, study or research in the field in which such fellowship was awarded, in an institution of higher education, and must not engage in gainful employment other than part-time employment which has been approved by the Commissioner.

The conference report adopts this provision with an additional requirement that part-time employment be related to the recipient's training.

Appropriations

The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation of such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this part. The conference substitute authorizes $40,000,000 for fiscal year 1966; $160,000,000 for fiscal year 1967; $275,000,000 for fiscal year 1968; and such sums for the 2 succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary to enable persons who have been awarded fellowships prior to July 1, 1968, to complete their study under the fellowships.

TITLE VI—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION

Part A—Equipment

Statement of Purpose and Authorization of Appropriations

The Senate amendment stated that the purpose of this part is to improve the quality of classroom instruction in selected subject areas in institutions of higher education, and authorized:

(1) The appropriation of $35,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1967, and $60,000,000 for fiscal years 1968, 1969, and 1970, to enable the Commissioner to make grants to institutions of higher education for the acquisition of equipment and for minor remodeling.

(2) The appropriation of $2,500,000 for fiscal year 1966, and $10,000,000 for fiscal years 1967, 1968, 1969, and 1970, to enable the Commissioner to make grants to institutions of higher education for the acquisition (including purchase of lease) of television equipment and for minor remodeling.

(3) The appropriation of not more than $1,000,000 for fiscal year 1966 and for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to make grants for the proper and efficient administration of State plans approved under this part, including expenses which he determines are necesary for the preparation of such plans.

The House bill contained no comparable provisions. The conference report adopts these provisions of the Senate amendment, but limits all of the authorizations to the first 3 years. For the fiscal years 1969 and 1970 only sums may be appropriated as Congress hereafter authorizes by law.

Allotments to States

The Senate amendment provided that of the funds appropriated for any fiscal year for acquisition of equipment, one-half shall be allotted by the Commissioner among the States on the basis of the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education in each State. The remaining one-half would be allotted by the Commissioner among the States in accordance with a formula which would take into account the college enrollment of each State and its relative per capita income.

The Senate amendment provided that a State's allotment under the preceding paragraph would be available in accordance with the provisions of this part for payment of the Federal share of the cost of equipment and minor remodeling.

The Senate amendment also provided for reallotment of unused State allotments.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopt this provision of the Senate amendment.

State Commissions and Plans

The Senate amendment required a State desiring to participate under this part to designate for that purpose an existing State agency which is broadly representative of the public and of institutions of higher education in the State. If no such State agency exists, the State may establish such an agency. The agency so designated or established (hereafter referred to as the "State commission") must submit to the Commissioner a State plan for participation. The Commissioner must approve any such plan which meets the following requirements: The plan must provide that it shall be administered by the State commission. It must set forth, consistently with basic criteria prescribed by regulation (A) objective standards and methods for determining the relative priorities of eligible projects for the acquisition of specified laboratory and other special equipment, including minor remodeling of classroom or other space used for such materials or equipment; (B) objective standards and methods for determining relative priorities of eligible projects for (i) the acquisition of television equipment for closed-circuit direct instruction in specified fields (but not broadcast transmission equipment), (ii) the acquisition of necessary instructional materials for use in such television instruction, and (iii) minor remodeling necessary for such television equipment; and (C) objective standards and methods for determining the Federal share of the cost of each such project.

The plan must also provide (A) for assigning priorities solely on the basis of such criteria, standards, and methods to eligible projects submitted to the State commission and deemed by it to be otherwise approvable under the provisions of this part; and (B) for approving and recommending to the Commissioner, in the order of such priority, applications covering such eligible projects, and for certifying to the Commissioner the Federal share, determined by the State commission under the State plan, of the cost of the project involved. The plan must provide for affording to every applicant, which has submitted to the State commission a project, an opportunity for a fair hearing before the commission as to the priority assigned to the project or as to any other determination of the commission adversely affecting the applicant. Finally, the plan must provide for adequate fiscal control and fund accounting procedures and for the making of such reports as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions under this part.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Basic Criteria for Determining Priorities, Federal Share, and Maintenance of Effort

The Senate amendment provided that as soon as practicable after the enactment of this act, the Commissioner shall by regulation prescribe basic criteria governing the provisions of State plans setting forth standards and methods for determining relative priorities of eligible projects, and governing the application of these standards and methods to eligible projects. These basic criteria must be such as will best tend to achieve the objectives of this part while leaving adequate flexibility for the development of State plan standards and methods. The basic criteria must give special consideration to the financial need of the institution. Subject to the foregoing requirements, these regulations may establish additional and appropriate basic criteria.

The Senate amendment also provided that the Federal share for the purposes of this part would be 50 percent of the cost of the project, except that a State commission may increase this share to not more than 80 percent of that cost in the case of any institution proving insufficient resources to participate in the program under this part and inability to acquire such resources. An institution of higher education which obtains a grant for a project pursuant to this part in any fiscal year must agree to expend during that year for the same purpose an amount at least equal to the amount expended by such institution for that purpose during the previous fiscal year.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment, with one change which would permit the Federal share to be less than 50 percent.

Applications for Grants and Conditions for Approval

The Senate amendment provided that institutions of higher education which desire to obtain grants under this part shall submit applications at such times and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Commissioner.

The Senate amendment also provided that the Commissioner must approve an application covering a project under this part and meeting the requirements of the preceding paragraph if the following conditions have been met: (1) The project has been approved and recommended by the appropriate State commission; (2) the State commission has certified to the Commissioner the Federal share of the cost of the project, and sufficient funds to pay such Federal share are available from the applicable allotment of the State; (3) the project has been assigned a priority that is higher than that of all other projects within such State (chargeable to the same allotment) which meet all the requirements of this section and for which Federal funds have not yet been reserved; (4) the Commissioner determines that the project will be undertaken in an economical manner and will not be overly elaborate or extravagant; and (5) the Commissioner determines that the application contains or is supported by satisfactory assurances (A) that Federal funds received by the applicant will be used solely for the project covered by such application, (B) that sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal portion of such cost and to provide for the effective use of the equipment upon completion, and (C) that the institution will meet the maintenance of effort requirement.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Amount of Grant—Payment

The Senate amendment provided that upon his approval of any applications for a grant under this part, the Commissioner shall reserve from the applicable allotment the Federal share of the cost of the project covered by such application. The Commissioner's reservation of any amount under this section may later be amended by him.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Administration of State Plans

The Senate amendment provided that the Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan without first affording the State commission submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing. It also provided for terminating the eligibility of a State whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State commission administering the State plan, finds that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the requirements for State plans, or that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such requirement.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Judicial Review

The Senate amendment provided for judicial review if any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under this part or with his final action under the provisions relating to administration of State plans.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Limitation on Payments

The Senate amendment provided that nothing contained in this part shall be construed to authorize the making of any payment under this part for any equipment or materials for religious worship or instruction.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts a substitute for this provision prohibiting grants under this part for equipment or materials for sectarian instruction or religious worship, or primarily in connection with the program of a school or department of divinity.

Part B—Faculty development programs

Institutes Authorized

The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation of $5 million for fiscal year 1966, and for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years to enable the Commissioner to arrange, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education for the operation by them of short-term workshops or short-term or regular session institutes. These workshops and institutes would be for individuals who are engaged in (or preparing to engage in) the use of educational media equipment in teaching in institutions of higher education, or who are (or are preparing to be), in institutions of higher education, specialists in educational media or librarians or other specialists using such media.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment, but limits the authorization to 3 years.

Stipends

The Senate amendment provided that each individual who attends an institute operated under the provisions of this part shall be eligible to receive a stipend at the rate of $75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute, plus an additional stipend at the rate of $15 per week for each dependent. No stipends shall be paid for attendance at workshops. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

TITLE VII—AMENDMENTS TO HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

Authorization of Appropriations

The House bill increased the authorization of appropriations for making grants under the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 for construction of undergraduate academic facilities for the fiscal year 1966 from $230,000,000 to $460,000,000. The Senate amendment increased the authorization to $330,000,000. The conference substitute adopts the House figure.

The doubling of amounts for the construction of graduate academic facilities contained both in the House bill and the Senate amendment is intended to stimulate construction at all graduate schools, including those offering programs leading to a first degree in law.

Eligibility for Grants

The present act provides that one of the requirements a construction project must meet for approval is that it will result in an urgently needed substantial expansion of the institution's student enrollment capacity. The Senate amendment added, as an alternative, that it could result in such an expansion of its capacity to carry out extension and continuing education programs. The provision from the Senate amendment is included in the conference report, with an amendment making clear that the expansion of capacity must be for on-campus activities. The committee wishes to emphasize that the provisions of the existing act provide that special consideration will be given to projects designed to expand undergraduate enrollment capacity and that funds may only be used for the construction of "academic facilities."

Transfers of Allotments

The Senate amendment contained a provision, not present in the House bill, which permitted, at the discretion of the Governor, the transfer of allotments for public community colleges and technical institutes to other public institutions of higher education, and the transfer of allotment for 4-year institutions to public community colleges and technical institutes. The conference agreed to a substitute under which either a State's allotment under section 103 for public community colleges and public technical institutes or its allotment under section 104 for other institutions could be transferred for use under the other section if the State commission has not received an application for grants under the section in question prior to January 1 of the year, and it requests such transfer.

Period of Availability of Funds

The Senate amendment provided that funds appropriated to carry out title II of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 would be available for 3 years, and makes funds appropriated for title III thereof available for 2 years. These provisions are included in the conference report.

Change in Interest Rates

The present law provides that loans for construction of academic facilities shall bear interest at a rate related to the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States forming a part of the public debt. The Senate amendment added a provision, which was retained in the conference report, under which the interest rate on such loans would not exceed 3 percent a year.

TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Definitions

The Senate amendment contained definitions of the terms "local educational agency", "State educational agency", and "elementary school". These terms were used in the provisions added by the Senate amendment which relate to fellowships for teachers and the National Teacher Corps.

The conferees, in adopting the provisions of the Senate amendment relating to teacher fellowships and the Teacher Corps, also adopted these definitions, but in doing so they omitted all reference to postsecondary vocational education in the definition of local educational agency.

Federal Administration

The Senate amendment contained a provision permitting the Commissioner to contract out the printing of educational matter. The Senate receded.

Federal Control of Education Prohibited

The House bill provided that nothing contained in this act or any other act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the membership practices or internal operations of any fraternal organization, fraternity or sorority, any private club or any religious organization of any institution of higher education.

The Senate amendment limited the application of the House provision to fraternal organizations, fraternities or sororities, private clubs or religious organizations at institutions of higher education, whose facilities were not owned by the institution of higher education and whose activities were financed by funds derived from private sources.

The conference committee agreed to a substitute for the House and Senate provisions which provides that nothing contained in this act or any other act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the membership practices or internal operations of any fraternal organization, fraternity, sorority, private club or religious organization at an institution of higher education (other than a service academy or the Coast Guard Academy) which is financed exclusively by funds derived from private sources and whose facilities are not owned by such institution.

ADAM C. POWELL,
CARL D. PERKINS,
EDITH GREEN,
JOHN BRADEMAS,
HUGH L. CAREY,
JOHN H. DENT,
SAM M. GIBBONS,
CARLTON R. SICKLES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Authorizations under Higher Education Act of 1965

	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1968
Title I	$25,000,000	$50,000,000	$50,000,000
Title II:			
Pt. A (library resources)	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000
Pt. B (training)	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
Pt. C (Library of Congress)	5,000,000	6,315,000	7,770,000
Title III	55,000,000	0	0
Title IV:			
Pt. A (grants)	70,000,000	140,000,000	210,000,000
Pt. B:			
(Advances)	17,500,000	0	0
(Interest subsidy)	42,000,000	42,000,000	42,000,000
Pt. C (work-study)	129,000,000	165,000,000	200,000,000
Pt. D (NDEA title III and XI)	27,250,000	27,250,000	27,250,000
Title V:			
Pt. B (Teacher Corps)	36,100,000	64,715,000	0
Pt. C (teacher fellowships)	40,000,000	160,000,000	275,000,000
Title VI	43,500,000	66,000,000	76,000,000
Title VII	290,000,000	0	0
Total	845,350,000	786,280,000	953,020,000

NOTE.—Total 5-year authorizations in bill, $2,584,650,000.

Estimated Federal payments under H.R. 9567, the Higher Education Act of 1965, as reported from conference, Oct. 14, 1965, for fiscal year 1966

	Total	Title I—community service and continuing education program [1]	Title IV				Title VI—Improvement of undergraduate instruction [5]		Title VII—Amendment to title I, Public Law 88-204	
			A. Educational opportunity grants [2]	C. College work-study [2]	D. Amendment to NDEA		A. Equipment and minor remodeling	B. Television equipment and minor remodeling	A. Public community colleges and public technical institutes [6]	B. Institutions of higher education other than public community colleges and public technical institutes [6]
					Grants to public schools [3]	Loans to private schools [4]				
United States and outlying areas	$501,500,000	$25,000,000	$70,000,000	$129,000,000	$8,800,000	$1,200,000	$35,000,000	$2,500,000	$50,600,000	$179,400,000
50 States and District of Columbia	495,314,429	24,622,972	69,509,640	126,420,000	8,640,000	1,185,534	34,707,565	2,479,112	49,980,877	177,768,729
Alabama	8,950,379	449,510	936,069	3,029,566	225,583	5,893	491,672	35,119	1,103,589	2,673,378
Alaska	455,072	125,504	27,746	97,765	10,764	413	18,199	1,300	35,573	137,808
Arizona	4,865,574	258,126	768,675	1,140,977	88,087	6,220	415,680	29,692	412,398	1,745,719
Arkansas	5,575,516	297,811	628,261	1,874,014	119,766	2,405	325,725	23,266	688,208	1,616,070
California	48,037,325	1,943,751	7,142,144	10,439,829	574,835	77,129	3,982,867	284,491	3,898,398	19,693,881
Colorado	5,854,387	297,403	987,069	1,344,400	90,774	8,522	455,607	32,543	507,581	2,130,488
Connecticut	6,082,103	383,913	891,275	1,353,818	78,990	21,769	391,616	27,973	532,407	2,400,342
Delaware	1,136,273	150,600	137,300	261,495	15,231	3,780	62,734	4,481	84,874	415,778
Florida	12,660,002	676,395	1,597,150	3,355,431	257,293	17,095	869,972	62,141	1,416,638	4,407,887
Georgia	10,488,763	538,061	1,143,070	3,407,591	272,340	5,189	588,326	42,024	1,244,301	3,247,861
Hawaii	1,848,331	172,228	231,991	438,256	36,224	6,048	109,269	7,805	219,358	627,152
Idaho	2,104,924	170,188	278,479	498,841	44,361	1,752	144,753	10,339	248,834	707,377
Illinois	24,029,333	1,175,564	3,493,765	5,760,921	337,903	103,107	1,606,929	114,780	2,115,944	9,320,420
Indiana	12,811,175	593,966	1,977,240	3,030,536	231,112	25,136	916,944	65,496	1,315,490	4,655,255
Iowa	8,488,120	381,669	1,331,308	2,184,918	137,104	19,089	608,577	43,469	884,582	2,897,404
Kansas	6,967,004	327,192	1,147,010	1,695,883	107,839	10,120	545,024	38,930	694,392	2,400,614
Kentucky	8,495,343	422,373	1,031,923	2,635,634	196,912	17,267	540,351	38,597	987,748	2,624,538
Louisiana	10,253,671	455,631	1,342,456	3,118,731	232,316	27,800	697,290	49,807	1,152,320	3,177,320
Maine	2,446,879	200,895	279,357	619,550	53,374	7,062	143,613	10,259	313,838	818,931
Maryland	7,697,806	451,040	1,009,445	1,854,151	145,069	26,872	495,367	35,383	765,231	2,917,248
Massachusetts	15,051,233	641,506	2,624,724	3,338,757	170,172	51,494	1,179,636	84,260	1,271,102	5,689,582
Michigan	21,203,178	931,743	3,026,109	4,954,651	402,361	66,098	1,522,821	108,773	2,157,087	8,033,535
Minnesota	10,874,507	459,610	1,678,162	2,646,360	183,133	33,023	792,584	56,613	1,205,834	3,819,188
Mississippi	7,115,577	334,435	833,048	2,608,297	159,446	3,746	435,762	31,126	719,263	1,990,454
Missouri	11,781,416	556,322	1,752,600	3,154,942	177,670	32,680	822,666	58,762	1,080,912	4,144,862
Montana	2,136,896	171,616	316,719	508,523	40,030	4,089	146,853	10,490	223,394	715,182
Nebraska	4,364,380	249,965	657,488	1,115,886	69,282	11,134	315,603	22,543	427,444	1,495,035
Nevada	749,452	142,745	75,826	142,314	11,422	791	33,817	2,415	56,802	283,320
New Hampshire	1,862,806	167,229	288,789	387,522	30,260	6,942	131,689	9,407	195,672	645,296
New Jersey	11,948,521	779,840	1,319,222	2,796,100	199,287	58,263	641,177	45,799	1,419,796	4,689,037
New Mexico	2,888,306	203,343	360,430	758,766	69,750	5,326	193,365	13,812	305,768	977,746
New York	39,880,873	1,923,041	5,684,030	9,238,091	485,361	164,858	2,884,365	206,026	3,494,334	15,800,767
North Carolina	13,847,843	595,190	1,711,420	4,479,148	312,666	3,814	874,232	62,445	1,513,224	4,295,704
North Dakota	2,333,150	166,311	344,505	619,559	40,330	4,055	169,309	12,093	250,106	726,882
Ohio	24,455,004	1,135,471	3,432,966	5,715,356	465,958	74,826	1,658,946	118,496	2,652,781	9,200,204
Oklahoma	7,722,282	351,064	1,152,441	2,012,255	128,163	4,227	605,642	43,261	804,138	2,621,091
Oregon	5,702,672	291,792	916,775	1,270,059	87,512	6,907	432,915	30,922	564,296	2,101,494
Pennsylvania	27,539,278	1,272,276	3,636,394	6,696,149	471,322	120,375	1,786,082	127,577	3,395,160	10,033,943
Rhode Island	2,406,976	192,427	362,860	529,065	34,890	10,360	186,937	13,353	233,262	843,822
South Carolina	6,796,091	357,287	691,542	2,398,671	175,319	3,127	356,617	25,472	836,289	1,951,767
South Dakota	2,367,009	171,514	333,623	648,128	43,136	4,588	163,092	11,649	255,457	735,822
Tennessee	10,740,429	487,562	1,407,788	3,330,027	230,556	6,185	733,538	52,396	1,194,385	3,297,992
Texas	27,053,918	1,159,955	3,792,007	7,670,763	585,466	29,432	1,941,857	138,704	2,566,328	9,169,406
Utah	4,202,869	199,262	812,407	878,458	65,259	1,220	399,888	28,563	325,550	1,492,262
Vermont	1,438,133	140,399	232,950	329,370	22,047	3,539	109,919	7,851	130,448	461,610
Virginia	9,855,117	545,508	1,146,459	2,907,412	237,289	11,013	606,243	43,303	1,087,886	3,270,004
Washington	8,800,079	402,684	1,396,641	1,970,444	134,416	11,374	667,081	47,649	872,870	3,296,920
West Virginia	5,287,672	286,079	623,127	1,576,076	114,607	3,436	322,343	23,024	666,364	1,672,616
Wisconsin	11,581,219	519,187	1,743,943	2,722,735	201,808	50,188	826,789	59,056	1,281,365	4,176,148
Wyoming	1,029,634	134,482	144,568	226,387	17,728	756	67,522	4,823	87,858	345,510
District of Columbia	3,049,929	181,307	628,354	647,422	19,477	5,000	287,760	20,554	83,998	1,176,057
Outlying areas	6,185,571	377,029	490,360	2,580,000	160,000	14,466	292,435	20,888	619,123	1,631,271
American Samoa	47,148	27,255	------	------	------	237	------	------	6,930	12,706
Canal Zone	9,815	------	9,677	------	------	138	------	------	------	------
Guam	123,854	32,019	9,167	------	------	996	6,862	490	21,142	53,17
Puerto Rico	3,206,720	288,612	470,209	------	------	12,457	284,825	20,344	582,454	1,547,81
Virgin Islands	58,034	29,142	1,307	------	------	618	748	54	8,597	17,56

---

[1] Estimated distribution of $25,000,000, with a basic amount of $100,000 to the 50 States, District of Columbia; and $25,000 to American Samoa, Guam, Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico; and the remainder distributed on the basis of the total resident population, July 1, 1966 (P-25, No. 317, Aug. 27, 1965).

[2] Estimated distribution of $70,000,000 on the basis of fall 1964 full-time degree credit enrollment in institutions of higher education. Estimated distribution of $129,000,000 (2 percent reserved for distribution to the outlying areas) with ⅓ distributed on the basis of 1962-63 total high school graduates (table, rev. Mar. 31, 1964); ⅓ on the basis of fall 1964 full-time degree-credit enrollment in institutions of higher education; ⅓ on the basis of the estimated "related children under 18" in families with incomes of less than $3,000 p.a. (PC (1) D Series, 1960 census, table 140). This $129,000,000 includes the full authorization under an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

[3] Estimated distribution of additional amount of $10,000,000 with 1.6 percent reserved or allotment to the outlying areas and 12 percent reserved for loans to nonprofit private schools; the balance ($8,640,000) distributed on the basis of the products of the NDEA allotment ratios for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 and the 5-17 population, July 1, 1963.

[4] Estimated distribution of 12 percent of $10,000,000 on the basis of nonpublic school enrollment.

[5] Estimated distribution of $35,000,000 and $2,500,000 with ½ distributed on the basis of the total full time and full-time equivalent degree-credit and nondegree-credit enrollment in institutions of higher education, fall 1964 and ½ on the basis of State products of fiscal year 1966 allotment ratios (Public Law 88-204) and this fall 1964 enrollment.

[6] Estimated distribution of additional amount of $230,000,000 under title I, Public Law 88-204. 22 percent distributed on the basis of the fiscal year 1966 allotment ratios and the total high school graduates for public community colleges and public technical institutes; 78 percent distributed with ½ distributed on the basis of enrollment as in footnote 5, and ½ distributed on the basis of the total public and nonpublic grade 9 to 12 enrollment, fall 1964.

Estimated Federal payments under H.R. 9567, the Higher Education Act of 1965, for fiscal year 1967 [1]

	Total	Title I—Community service and continuing education program [2]	Title IV				Title VI—Improvement of undergraduate instruction [6]	
			A. Educational opportunity grants [3]	C. College work-study [3]	D. Amendment to NDEA		A. Equipment and minor remodeling	B. TV equipment and minor remodeling
					Grants to public schools [4]	Loans to private schools [5]		
United States and outlying areas	$355, 000, 000	$50, 000, 000	$70, 000, 000	$165, 000, 000	$8, 800, 000	$1, 200, 000	$50, 000, 000	$10, 000, 000
50 States and District of Columbia	349, 807, 046	49, 273, 191	69, 509, 640	161, 700, 000	8, 640, 000	1, 185, 534	49, 582, 235	9, 916, 446
Alabama	6, 771, 162	890, 810	936, 069	3, 869, 940	225, 583	5, 893	702, 389	140, 478
Alaska	353, 346	157, 707	27, 746	125, 517	10, 764	413	25, 999	5, 200
Arizona	3, 469, 205	457, 780	768, 675	1, 435, 849	88, 087	6, 220	593, 828	118, 766
Arkansas	4, 272, 510	547, 572	628, 251	2, 416, 131	119, 766	2, 405	465, 321	93, 064
California	32, 388, 324	4, 271, 721	7, 142, 144	13, 494, 720	574, 835	77, 129	5, 689, 813	1, 137, 962
Colorado	4, 154, 898	546, 649	987, 069	1, 740, 843	90, 774	8, 522	650, 867	130, 174
Connecticut	4, 177, 240	742, 389	891, 275	1, 771, 477	78, 990	21, 769	559, 450	111, 890
Delaware	815, 592	214, 490	137, 300	337, 247	15, 231	3, 780	89, 620	17, 924
Florida	9, 129, 875	1, 404, 167	1, 597, 150	4, 362, 787	257, 293	17, 095	1, 242, 819	248, 564
Georgia	7, 939, 376	1, 091, 167	1, 143, 070	4, 419, 051	272, 340	5, 189	840, 466	168, 093
Hawaii	1, 270, 029	263, 425	231, 991	545, 023	36, 224	6, 048	156, 098	31, 220
Idaho	1, 440, 060	258, 808	278, 479	608, 512	44, 361	1, 752	206, 790	41, 358
Illinois	16, 586, 322	2, 533, 600	3, 493, 765	7, 363, 212	337, 903	103, 107	2, 295, 613	459, 122
Indiana	8, 880, 520	1, 217, 660	1, 977, 240	3, 857, 468	2, 231, 112	25, 136	1, 309, 920	261, 984
Iowa	5, 993, 815	737, 311	1, 331, 308	2, 725, 728	137, 104	19, 098	869, 396	173, 879
Kansas	4, 912, 397	614, 050	1, 147, 010	2, 099, 050	107, 839	10, 120	778, 606	155, 722
Kentucky	6, 394, 748	829, 410	1, 031, 923	3, 392, 921	196, 912	17, 267	771, 929	154, 386
Louisiana	7, 775, 558	904, 660	1, 342, 456	4, 072, 972	232, 316	27, 800	996, 128	199, 226
Maine	1, 686, 336	328, 287	279, 357	772, 061	53, 374	7, 062	205, 163	41, 032
Maryland	5, 323, 236	894, 273	1, 009, 445	2, 400, 375	143, 069	26, 872	707, 668	141, 534
Massachusetts	10, 487, 022	1, 325, 225	2, 624, 724	4, 293, 176	170, 172	51, 494	1, 685, 193	337, 038
Michigan	14, 271, 717	1, 981, 925	3, 026, 109	6, 184, 673	402, 361	66, 098	2, 175, 449	435, 092
Minnesota	7, 566, 592	913, 662	1, 678, 162	3, 399, 898	183, 133	33, 023	1, 132, 262	226, 452
Mississippi	5, 751, 732	630, 438	833, 048	3, 378, 033	159, 446	3, 746	622, 518	124, 503
Missouri	8, 412, 679	1, 132, 485	1, 752, 600	3, 906, 961	177, 670	32, 680	1, 175, 236	235, 047
Montana	1, 516, 997	262, 040	316, 719	642, 372	40, 030	4, 089	209, 789	41, 958
Nebraska	3, 111, 380	439, 314	657, 488	1, 393, 128	69, 282	11, 134	450, 862	90, 172
Nevada	537, 064	196, 716	75, 826	194, 338	11, 422	791	48, 309	9, 662
New Hampshire	1, 316, 789	252, 114	288, 789	512, 932	30, 260	6, 942	188, 127	37, 625
New Jersey	7, 985, 232	1, 638, 225	1, 319, 222	3, 671, 074	199, 287	58, 263	915, 967	183, 194
New Mexico	2, 074, 706	333, 827	360, 430	973, 891	69, 750	5, 326	276, 235	55, 247
New York	27, 456, 572	4, 224, 863	5, 684, 030	11, 952, 834	485, 361	164, 858	4, 120, 522	824, 104
North Carolina	10, 441, 066	1, 220, 430	1, 711, 420	5, 694, 053	312, 666	3, 814	1, 248, 903	249, 780
North Dakota	1, 693, 097	250, 037	344, 505	763, 927	40, 330	4, 055	241, 869	48, 374
Ohio	16, 615, 651	2, 442, 885	3, 432, 966	7, 355, 109	465, 958	74, 826	2, 369, 923	473, 984
Oklahoma	5, 539, 790	668, 063	1, 152, 441	2, 548, 651	128, 163	4, 227	865, 204	173, 041
Oregon	3, 904, 026	533, 953	916, 775	1, 616, 740	87, 512	6, 907	618, 449	123, 690
Pennsylvania	18, 729, 919	2, 752, 423	3, 636, 394	8, 687, 551	471, 322	120, 375	2, 551, 545	510, 309
Rhode Island	1, 730, 002	309, 128	362, 860	692, 301	34, 890	10, 360	267, 053	53, 410
South Carolina	5, 260, 359	682, 143	691, 542	3, 096, 884	175, 319	3, 127	509, 453	101, 891
South Dakota	1, 739, 523	261, 809	333, 623	816, 782	43, 136	4, 588	232, 987	46, 598
Tennessee	8, 119, 148	976, 908	1, 407, 788	4, 240, 216	230, 556	6, 185	1, 047, 912	209, 583
Texas	19, 861, 110	2, 498, 284	3, 792, 007	9, 627, 023	585, 466	29, 432	2, 774, 082	554, 816
Utah	2, 984, 709	324, 594	812, 407	1, 095, 705	65, 259	1, 220	571, 270	114, 254
Vermont	1, 049, 856	191, 407	232, 950	411, 481	22, 047	3, 539	157, 027	31, 405
Virginia	7, 252, 819	1, 108, 018	1, 146, 459	3, 710, 766	237, 289	11, 013	866, 062	173, 212
Washington	5, 968, 056	784, 861	1, 396, 641	2, 497, 197	134, 416	11, 374	952, 972	190, 595
West Virginia	3, 823, 765	521, 027	623, 127	2, 008, 980	114, 607	3, 436	460, 490	92, 098
Wisconsin	7, 880, 039	1, 048, 464	1, 743, 943	3, 418, 284	201, 808	50, 188	1, 181, 127	236, 225
Wyoming	736, 386	178, 019	144, 568	279, 563	17, 728	756	96, 460	19, 292
District of Columbia	2, 254, 694	283, 968	628, 354	824, 593	19, 477	5, 000	411, 085	82, 217
Outlying areas	5, 192, 954	726, 809	490, 360	3, 300, 000	160, 000	14, 466	417, 765	83, 554
American Samoa	30, 358	30, 101	---	---	---	257	---	---
Canal Zone	9, 815	---	9, 677	---	---	138	---	---
Guam	62, 808	40, 881	9, 167	---	---	996	9, 803	1, 961
Puerto Rico	1, 592, 394	621, 455	470, 209	---	---	12, 457	406, 894	81, 379
Virgin Islands	37, 579	34, 372	1, 307	---	---	618	1, 068	214

---

[1] No authorization as yet for title VII, for fiscal year 1967.

[2] Estimated distribution of $50,000,000, with a basic amount of $100,000 to the 50 States, District of Columbia; and $25,000 to American Samoa, Guam, Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico; and the remainder distributed on the basis of the total resident population, July 1, 1964 (P-25, No. 317, Aug. 27, 1965).

[3] Estimated distribution of $70,000,000 on the basis of fall 1964 full-time degree credit enrollment in institutions of higher education. Estimated distribution of $165,000,000 (2 percent reserved for distribution to the outlying areas) with ⅓ distributed on the basis of 1963–64 total high school graduates; ⅓ on the basis of fall 1964 full-time degree-credit enrollment in institutions of higher education; ⅓ on the basis of the estimated "related children under 18" in families with incomes of less than $3,000 per annum (PC (1) D series, 1960 census, table 140). This $165,000,000 includes the full authorization under an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

[4] Estimated distribution of additional amount of $10,000,000 with 1.6 percent reserved for allotment to the outlying areas and 12 percent reserved for loans to nonprofit private schools; the balance ($8,640,000) distributed on the basis of the products of the NDEA allotment ratios for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 and the 5–17 population, July 1, 1963.

[5] Estimated distribution of 12 percent of $10,000,000 on the basis of non-public-school enrollment.

[6] Estimated distribution of $50,000,000 and $10,000,000 with ½ distributed on the basis of the total full-time and full-time equivalent degree-credit and nondegree-credit enrollment in institutions of higher education, fall 1964 and ½ on the basis of State products of fiscal year 1966 allotment ratios (Public Law 88–204) and this fall 1964 enrollment.

Estimated Federal payments under H.R. 9567, the Higher Education Act of 1965, for fiscal year 1968 [1]

	Total	Title I—community service and continuing education program [2]	Title IV				Title VI—Improvement of undergraduate instruction [6]	
			A. Educational opportunity grants [3]	C. College work-study [3]	D. Amendment to NDEA		A. Equipment and minor remodeling	B. TV equipment and minor remodeling
					Grants to public schools [4]	Loans to private school [5]		
United States and outlying areas	$400,000,000	$50,000,000	$70,000,000	$200,000,000	$8,800,000	$1,200,000	$60,000,000	$10,000,000
50 States and District of Columbia	394,023,493	49,273,191	69,509,640	196,000,000	8,640,000	1,185,534	59,498,682	9,916,446
Alabama	7,732,535	890,810	936,069	4,690,835	225,583	5,893	842,867	140,478
Alaska	385,170	157,707	27,746	152,141	10,764	413	31,199	5,200
Arizona	3,892,544	457,780	768,675	1,740,422	88,087	6,220	712,594	118,766
Arkansas	4,878,087	547,572	628,251	2,928,644	119,766	2,405	558,385	93,064
California	36,388,803	4,271,721	7,142,144	16,357,237	574,835	77,129	6,827,775	1,137,962
Colorado	4,654,340	546,649	987,069	2,110,111	90,774	8,522	781,041	130,174
Connecticut	4,664,900	742,389	891,275	2,147,246	78,990	21,769	671,341	111,890
Delaware	905,054	214,490	137,300	408,785	15,231	3,780	107,544	17,924
Florida	10,303,878	1,404,167	1,597,150	5,288,227	257,293	17,095	1,491,382	248,564
Georgia	9,044,844	1,091,167	1,143,070	5,356,426	272,340	5,189	1,008,559	168,093
Hawaii	1,416,860	263,425	231,991	660,634	36,224	6,048	187,318	31,220
Idaho	1,610,496	258,808	278,479	737,590	44,361	1,752	248,148	41,358
Illinois	18,607,337	2,533,600	3,493,765	8,925,106	337,903	103,107	2,754,734	459,122
Indiana	9,960,753	1,217,660	1,977,240	4,675,717	231,112	25,136	1,571,904	261,984
Iowa	6,745,878	737,311	1,331,308	3,303,912	137,104	19,089	1,043,275	173,879
Kansas	5,513,371	614,050	1,147,010	2,544,303	107,839	10,120	934,327	155,722
Kentucky	7,268,846	829,410	1,031,923	4,112,633	196,912	17,267	926,315	154,386
Louisiana	8,838,747	904,660	1,342,456	4,936,935	232,316	27,800	1,195,354	199,226
Maine	1,891,138	328,287	279,357	935,831	53,374	7,062	246,195	41,032
Maryland	5,973,940	894,273	1,009,445	2,909,546	143,069	26,872	849,201	141,534
Massachusetts	11,734,736	1,325,225	2,624,724	5,203,851	170,172	51,494	2,022,232	337,038
Michigan	16,018,709	1,981,925	3,026,109	7,496,573	402,361	66,098	2,610,551	435,092
Minnesota	8,514,235	913,662	1,678,162	4,121,088	183,133	33,023	1,358,715	226,452
Mississippi	6,592,787	630,438	833,048	4,094,585	159,446	3,746	747,021	124,503
Missouri	9,476,475	1,132,485	1,752,600	4,735,709	177,670	32,680	1,410,284	235,047
Montana	1,695,215	262,040	316,719	778,632	40,030	4,089	251,747	41,958
Nebraska	3,497,064	439,314	657,488	1,688,640	69,282	11,134	541,034	90,172
Nevada	587,950	196,716	75,826	235,562	11,422	791	57,971	9,662
New Hampshire	1,463,218	252,114	288,789	621,736	30,260	6,942	225,752	37,625
New Jersey	8,947,139	1,638,225	1,319,222	4,449,788	199,287	58,263	1,099,160	183,194
New Mexico	2,336,537	333,827	360,430	1,180,474	69,750	5,326	331,483	55,247
New York	30,816,127	4,224,863	5,684,030	14,488,285	485,361	164,858	4,944,626	824,104
North Carolina	11,898,676	1,220,430	1,711,420	6,901,882	312,666	3,814	1,498,684	249,780
North Dakota	1,903,516	250,037	344,505	925,973	40,330	4,055	290,242	48,374
Ohio	18,649,810	2,442,885	3,432,966	8,915,283	465,958	74,826	2,843,908	473,984
Oklahoma	6,253,454	668,063	1,152,441	3,089,274	128,163	4,227	1,038,245	173,041
Oregon	4,370,660	533,953	916,775	1,959,684	87,512	6,907	742,139	123,690
Pennsylvania	21,083,042	2,752,423	3,636,394	10,530,364	471,322	120,375	3,061,855	510,309
Rhode Island	1,930,264	309,128	362,860	839,153	34,890	10,360	320,463	53,410
South Carolina	6,019,166	682,143	691,542	3,753,800	175,319	3,127	611,344	101,891
South Dakota	1,959,377	261,809	333,623	990,038	43,136	4,588	279,585	46,598
Tennessee	9,228,168	976,908	1,407,788	5,139,655	230,556	6,185	1,257,493	209,583
Texas	22,458,021	2,498,284	3,792,007	11,669,119	585,466	29,432	3,328,897	554,816
Utah	3,331,385	324,594	812,407	1,328,128	65,259	1,220	685,523	114,254
Vermont	1,168,547	191,407	232,950	498,765	22,047	3,539	188,434	31,405
Virginia	8,213,162	1,108,018	1,146,459	4,497,897	237,289	11,013	1,039,274	173,212
Washington	6,688,360	784,861	1,396,641	3,026,906	134,416	11,374	1,143,567	190,595
West Virginia	4,342,011	521,027	623,127	2,435,128	114,607	3,436	552,588	92,098
Wisconsin	8,841,356	1,048,464	1,743,943	4,143,376	201,808	50,188	1,417,352	236,225
Wyoming	814,978	178,019	144,568	338,863	17,728	756	115,752	19,292
District of Columbia	2,511,827	283,968	628,354	999,508	19,477	5,000	493,303	82,217
Outlying areas	5,976,507	726,809	490,360	4,000,000	160,000	14,466	501,318	83,554
American Samoa	30,358	30,101	----------	----------	----------	257	----------	----------
Canal Zone	9,815	----------	9,677	----------	----------	138	----------	----------
Guam	64,769	40,881	9,167	----------	----------	996	11,764	1,961
Puerto Rico	1,673,772	621,455	470,209	----------	----------	12,457	488,272	81,379
Virgin Islands	37,793	34,372	1,307	----------	----------	618	1,282	214

---

[1] No authorization as yet for title VII, for fiscal year 1968.

[2] Estimated distribution of $50,000,000, with a basic amount of $100,000 to the 50 States, District of Columbia; and $25,000 to American Samoa, Guam, Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico; and the remainder distributed on the basis of the total resident population, July 1, 1964 (P–25, No. 317, Aug. 27, 1965).

[3] Estimated distribution of $70,000,000 on the basis of fall 1964 full-time degree credit enrollment in institutions of higher education. Estimated distribution of $200,000,000 (2 percent reserved for distribution to the outlying areas) with ⅓ distributed on the basis of 1963–64 total high school graduates; ⅓ on the basis of fall 1964 full-time degree-credit enrollment in institutions of higher education; ⅓ on the basis of the estimated "related children under 18" in families with incomes of less than $3,000 per annum (PC (1) D series, 1960 census, table 140). This $200,000,000 includes the full authorization under an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1965.

[4] Estimated distribution of additional amount of $10,000,000 with 1.6 percent reserved for allotment to the outlying areas and 12 percent reserved for loans to nonprofit private schools; the balance ($8,640,000) distributed on the basis of the products of the NDEA allotment ratios for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 and the 5-17 population, July 1963.

[5] Estimated distribution of 12 percent of $10,000,000 on the basis of nonpublic school enrollment.

[6] Estimated distribution of $60,000,000 and $10,000,000 with ½ distributed on the basis of the total full time and full-time equivalent degree-credit and nondegree-credit enrollment in institutions of higher education, fall 1964 and ½ on the basis of State products of fiscal year 1966 allotment ratios (Public Law 88–204) and this fall 1964 enrollment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in my judgment, the report of the House managers clearly sets forth the agreements arrived at and I shall take only a few minutes to discuss and amplify, for the purpose of legislative history, upon a few of the points.

TITLE I: COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS

As stated in the report of the House managers, title I has been rewritten in part to bring together the concepts of both bills. It was our concern in title I to protect to the best of our ability the great programs of continuing and extension education which need strengthening if they are to be used as an effective tool in the solution of community problems.

In the House version as we went into conference, the program was concentrated only in the urban and suburban areas. The Senate version broadened this concept to include all of the areas of our country. You will note from the House managers' report that it was our agreement that "the enumeration of rural, urban, and suburban is not intended to exclude rural nonfarm areas." In ordinary usage, we tend to think of the term rural as being synonymous with agricultural areas. The language in the report of the managers to which the Senate conferees fully subscribe makes it perfectly clear that rural nonfarm areas, such as those in which our small mining communities in many States are to be found, and small communities within the domain of our great forests, are also eligible, for the benefits of this act.

I should like to pay tribute at this point to Senator DOMINICK, who stood with us shoulder to shoulder in defending the Senate bill. His help was greatly appreciated by me in this and other areas of the bill.

I call to the attention of the Senate further the language of the House managers in the report where it is stated that "where course offerings are involved they must be university extension or continuing education courses and either fully acceptable toward a college degree or of college level as determined by the institution offering the course."

It was our agreement, and I am sure that it has been so stated by the chairman of the House managers in the House debate, that this restriction is not intended, however, to preclude the use of funds under title I to support workshops, meetings, and short-term institutes which are held in conjunction with a continuing education program of an institution of higher education, nor is this restriction intended to deny funds for use by an institution of higher education in connection with its educational TV programs. It was our intent to make sure that the courses offered to individuals under the authorities of this title be of high quality. It was further our intent and again it is my understanding that this was made clear during the House debate, that the conferees did not wish to have the authorities of this title used to fund programs being carried on under other Federal programs, and that it was specifically our intent that no funding of agricultural or home economics or courses in rural areas be permitted, but that home economics offerings in urban and suburban areas could be supported.

At this point, Mr. President, I should like to say a word about the duration of title I, and for that matter of all titles under this bill.

The Senate will recall that we went into conference with the Senate bill which provided for 5 years' duration and funding for each title. The House version of the bill in effect authorized programs for only 1 year, since only 1 year's funding was provided.

The matter was discussed at great length, and here I wish to pay tribute to the firm support given me by Senator RANDOLPH, particularly in making it clear that while the Senate was willing to arrive at an equitable compromise between the two figures, it was not prepared to surrender. Our final result then was that with the exception of two titles, a 3-year period of authorization and funding was had in the conference substitute.

The two exceptions to the 3-year concept are to be found in titles III and V, part A. I will be candid with the Senate with regard to title III. There was such resistance to the Senate addition of the junior and community college program that at one time it was suggested that perhaps the way of wisdom might be the dropping in its entirety of title III. This, of course, could not be accepted but we reluctantly agreed to making this a 1-year program on the understanding that next spring we shall do our best to reopen the question through separate legislation to seek to achieve a continuation of the program in fiscal years 1966 and 1967.

In a similar fashion, we reluctanctly agreed to accept only a 2-year duration for the Teacher Corps proposal in title V. This title, much to the surprise of the Senate conferees, early appeared to be in difficulty and as the Senate is aware, it was strongly indicated by the minority on the House side that in this area they would strive to have the bill recommitted to conference with instructions from the House to delete the program.

In the final areas of title I, which by and large bears the strong imprint of the Senate concept, there were two places in which we did not achieve all that we would have liked to achieve.

Despite the best efforts of all of us and particularly Senator JAVITS, we were unable to retain the administration recommendation that 20 percent of the funds appropriated under title I be reserved by the Commissioner for grants and contracts for experimental projects and supplemental grants. We indicated our willingness to accept less than the 20 percent and we indicated our willingness to accept language which would have reserved these funds for projects covering more than one State, but on this point we were unable to prevail and when we were advised that the administration would not consider this to be so vital as to imperil the bill, we reluctantly acceded, as in a similar fashion we accepted the change in section 105 on the use of tuition fees for matching purposes.

I am pleased to report, however, that we were able to convince the House conferees of the merits of many of the other Senate provisions which were not originally to be found in the House version of the bill, such as the Advisory Council language which was strongly urged upon us in our own deliberations by Senator KENNEDY of New York, which should result in recommendations for further legislative action to bring about what we all feel to be highly desirable: the coordination of all extension type programs.

The Presidentially appointed National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education will, I feel, serve a most useful purpose in achieving our desire.

I am also pleased that the conference version of the bill contains Senate language with respect to the prohibition of the use of these funds for activities and service related to sectarian instruction and religious instruction, and that the interests of our small States were protected through the adoption of the Senate provision which would authorize at least $25,000 in each State for the administration of the program.

TITLE II: COLLEGE LIBRARY ASSISTANCE AND LIBRARY TRAINING AND RESEARCH

The report of the House managers on title II is very clear and sets forth the basis of the agreements we reached. This was for the most part a noncontroversial title because both sides have recognized the importance in building library strength as an essential key to the sound education of our college and university students. In the long run, title II of the Higher Education Act may very well prove to be one of the most useful aids in the bill. In only one area was there a sharp difference of opinion, and that referred to the institutes for librarians now being carried on under title XI of the National Defense Education Act.

Under the House version of the bill, this program, which has just barely gotten underway, would have been terminated on June 30 of next year. It was our position that we would take no action on the repealer of the library institutes in this bill.

The House conferees felt that since we were giving, in title II–B, equivalent training authorities, the National Defense Education Act authority was a duplication.

The final conference reconciliation of these two viewpoints, I am sure, pleases neither party, but we were successful in delaying the termination date by 1 year. It is my hope that the administration will move rapidly and effectively in the title II area so that the training so many of our librarians need, if they are to perform their function under this and other acts, can be expedited.

TITLE III: STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS

As I previously noted, title III was a controversial title in conference. While we have authorized the funding of this program in the full amount of the Senate bill at $55 million, we gave ground on duration.

It is my intention as chairman of the Education Subcommittee to start work early next year to provide the additional time needed for this program so that this program may fulfill its promise. In passing, I am pleased to note that the conference version of the bill does contain language providing for the strengthening of the administration of these developing institutions and that the final version contains the language suggested to us by Senator FULBRIGHT with respect to the exchange of personnel between the developing institution and a host institution with whom it is working.

TITLE IV: STUDENT ASSISTANCE

I am pleased that the conference version of the bill which is now before the Senate contains in part A under the term "educational opportunity grants," the substance of the independently funded scholarship provisions of the Senate version of the bill.

This has been a long and deeply rooted source of disagreement between House and Senate. In the 87th Congress, similar provisions prevented the first higher education facilities construction act from becoming law. We have advanced a long way since that time.

I am particularly pleased that while we have adopted many of the details of the House language with regard to the criteria upon which youngsters will be selected for the benefits of the program and the formula under which these educational grants will be awarded to institutions, the main principle has finally become accepted by the Congress of the United States.

It is a most significant forward step in opening the door to talent of young people whose economic circumstances are such that without this aid they might never be able to attain their full potential of service to our society.

Part B of title IV, the guaranteed reduced interest loan provision, was resolved most favorably from the Senate standpoint. I am pleased to note that the effective support given by Senator YARBOROUGH, in particular to moratorium provision applying to members of the Armed Forces and members of the Peace Corps, is in the bill as it now stands.

The conference version of the bill contains one provision which lowers the insurance from 90 percent to 80 percent of the unpaid principal. This change, which will permit the State of Michigan to participate in the program, was urged upon us and we accepted it. This point should have been mentioned in the statement of the House managers, but I am informed, it was inadvertently omitted. Now, Mr. President, I should like to pay my personal tribute to the wonderful support Senator MCNAMARA has given me at every stage in the process of the legislation, from our hearings through committee, on the floor and in conference.

I should also like to say, Mr. President, that it is the expectation of the conferees that those who borrow under the insured loan program will borrow on the basis of need and not with any intention of reinvestment.

Part C of title IV, the college work-study program, is substantially as it passed the Senate.

Part D of title IV, concerns amendments made to the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to strengthen the administration of the title II student loan program.

None of these amendments appeared in the House version of the bill. All had the support of the administration and are in the conference substitute. There was, however, in this area one new concept which came from the distinguished ranking member on the minority side of the Education Subcommittee, the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. The Prouty amendment, which gives 100 percent forgiveness of a National Defense Education Act loan to a teacher who serves in a poverty-connected school, was resisted by our friends on the House side. However, the very able Senator from Vermont was able to show the value of this provision so clearly that the House receded on this point. It was not easy for them to do so. The fact that they did so is a great tribute to Senator PROUTY.

I am very much pleased to report that titles III and XI of the National Defense Education Act have been strengthened by adding to the former the subject matter of economics and to the institute provisions institutes for the training of teachers of economics, civics and industrial arts. Here, too, the able support of the Senator from Vermont was of material assistance in upholding the Senate language.

TITLE V: TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Title V, the teacher preparation programs, did not appear in the House bill. Consequently, the entire title V program was the subject of much discussion. Fortunately, the House Committee on Education and Labor had reported a bill which contained analogous provisions, and, therefore, we were able to come to a meeting of minds on the title V programs.

Essentially, the Teacher Corps provisions of part A reflect the hard work of Senators KENNEDY of Massachusetts and NELSON, of Wisconsin.

Part B, the fellowship concepts, are patterned upon the administration bill, which I had the privilege of introducing, together with Senators KENNEDY and NELSON and which was introduced in the House by Representative BRADEMAS. I regret that we were unable to retain in the fellowship provisions the provision relating to postsecondary vocational education teachers. I can only say that we tried hard, but it was the feeling of the House conferees that this area could perhaps be best dealt with in legislation we shall be considering next session in the vocational education field.

I would call particular attention in this fellowship area to the fact that although there are no longer percentage reservations for ancillary fields as in the Senate version, the conference bill in section 521 carries the language, "for the purpose of this part the term 'career in elementary and secondary education' means a career of teaching in elementary or secondary schools, a career of teaching, guiding, or supervising such teachers or persons who plan to become such teachers, or a career in fields which are directly related to teaching in work, guidance and counseling, educational media, and special education for handicapped children."

As chairman of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I want to place the Office of Education on notice that I shall be reviewing the fellowship program in the year ahead to assure myself and the members of my committee that these ancillary fields have not been neglected in the award of fellowships. I particularly want to make the point that in my view, as manager of the bill on the Senate side, the language in this part of title V is clearly designed to supplement other training sources which may be available under other acts and that I do not believe that the Office of Education would be justified in withholding fellowships under this part from career teachers or those intending to teach on the basis of any rationalization that training opportunities for these personnel may exist under other authorities. The need is too great for school librarians, guidance counselors, special education for handicapped children workers, and the other fields for us to neglect any possible assistance which can be given to dedicated teaching personnel specializing in these areas. We need all we can train and we should be imaginative in applying every resource at our command to assure that, to the fullest extent we can, we provide financial sinews to these disciplines.

TITLE VI: FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION

I am very pleased to be able to report to the Senate the House concurrence in title VI, a new title added by the Senate, has been secured.

Title VI was designed to bring to institutions of higher education the types and kinds of authorities now available to public schools under title III and title XI of the National Defense Education Act. The new title VI commanded a great deal of unified support on the part of the Senate conferees and I am able to say it had widespread acceptance on the House side.

In title VI, I note that it was the understanding of the conferees that the term, "acquisition of equipment" should be broadly construed to cover leasing arrangements as well as purchase.

I would also note that since we were extending this program to institutions of higher education, it is my hope, and I am sure that of my colleagues, that every effort will be made by the Office of Education to proceed speedily in the establishment of the institutes described under part B for faculty development programs. This portion of the bill, which is analogous to title XI of the National Defense Education Act, in my judgment offers the best route for bringing into being efficient use of the money expended for the acquisition and use of the equipment obtained under part A.

TITLE VII: AMENDMENTS TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

Mr. President, I now turn to title VII, the amendments to the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. I call attention to the language of the report of the managers on the House side with respect to this title.

While the Senate conferees acceded to House funding figures, we did so after having secured House approval of types of academic facilities construction which previously have been overlooked. I refer particularly to the eligibility added by the bill for continuing education centers to be built on campus, which was strongly urged upon the Senate committee by Dr. Flemming, the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, now president of the University of Oregon. I am very pleased that the conference bill contains provision for these badly needed facilities, and I would call to the attention of the Office of Education the provision in the report of the House managers which sets forth the conference intent with respect to graduate schools, which was designed to make perfectly clear our belief that graduate school construction is broad enough to comprehend construction of facilities to house programs leading to a first degree in law.

I am pleased to report also that the conference bill permits the interchange of 4-year money and 2-year money for undergraduate construction, if the State commission finds this desirable and if the State commission has not received an eligible application for the use of funds prior to January 1 of the year in which it seeks to transfer the money. This provision eliminated the type of situation which was brought to the attention of the committee by Senators from such a State as South Dakota. It will permit such States to utilize all of the funds allocated under the Higher Education Facilities Act for institutions within the State borders if they so desire without running the risk of losing a part of the money because they do not have institutions of the type for which reservations were previously made.

TITLE VIII: GENERAL PROVISIONS

Mr. President, under title VIII of the bill, general provisions I call to the attention of Senators the language of section 804. The conference bill, in my view, protects the legitimate interests of fraternities and sororities and conforms to the policy stated by the administration with respect to the operation of other statutes. It would be my hope that this rewriting of the provision will meet with Senate approval.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, this has been a rather lengthy report on the conference committee resolution of the differences between the House and Senate version of H.R. 9567. It has been lengthy because there is much in matter in this bill and it covers many areas, and many areas which were controversial. A careful review of the report of the House managers and this statement, which constitutes legislative history on this bill, will, I am sure, lay to rest many unfounded fears which have been expressed in the course of debate upon this landmark statute-to-be.

It is a bill which, in my judgment, represents an act of bipartisan educational statesmanship. In bringing this conference report to the floor of the Senate this morning, I can only repeat what I said previously when the bill passed the Senate. It is the work of many hands and many minds. I am tremendously indebted to the chairman of my full committee, the beloved senior Senator from the great State of Alabama, for his strong and effective support of the Senate position in conference. The children and young people of America owe a great deal to the long-range view of Senator Hill, whose name is synonymous with medical progress and whose work on this bill testifies to his abiding faith in the values of education as a tool of democracy. I want to thank him publicly again for his help on this bill, as I want to express to each of my colleagues on what was a most difficult conference, my deep appreciation for the support I was invariably given in our negotiations. Senators McNamara, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Kennedy, and my beloved friends on the other side of the aisle, Senators Javits, Prouty, and Dominick, stood shoulder to shoulder with me day after day in these sessions. That we were able to present as sound a bill as we bring to the floor this morning is due in major part to their efforts.

Mr. President, I am ready for the vote on the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. McNAMARA. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, many kudos have been handed out tonight. Standing to my right is the majority leader of the Senate [Mr. Mansfield], on whom I have relied from the very beginning to help pilot all the education bills through the Senate. This one is no exception. Without the help of Mike Mansfield, I would not have been presenting this report tonight.

I pay tribute also to Lister Hill, chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. He has always cooperated with me. For example, he refused to take over the chairmanship of the conference, to which he was entitled as chairman of the full committee, but insisted that I be the chairman of the Senate conferees. That is typical of the courtesy, generosity, and cooperation of Lister Hill.

Mr. President, these two men, along with the members of the committee whom I have thanked, are the ones who have made possible the passage of the higher education bill tonight.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, following the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, I can only compliment him upon his magnificent work in handling this and other pieces of legislation which have been before the Senate, not only this year, but for more than a decade.

In effect, the Senate has presented a birthday present to our distinguished colleague from Oregon by agreeing unanimously to the conference report on higher education. It is a testimonial to the work, skill, integrity, and ability of the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I am delighted that on his birthday the Senate and Congress have seen fit to extend to him a gift which I know he will value highly because of the intense interest he has shown in education throughout the years since he was a teacher at the University of Wisconsin and the University of Minnesota, and later as dean and professor of law at the University of Oregon. He has held other positions of trust. He is a man who, if any Member of this body is entitled to the name, could well be called "Mr. Education."

Mr. MORSE. I can only reply to the Senator from Montana by saying what the President of the United States said to me at the time we passed the higher education bill. He said, "This is the nicest birthday present anyone could give me," because that day was his birthday. The passage of this bill tonight is the nicest birthday present anyone could give me. I sincerely thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted that the vote on agreeing to the conference report was unanimous.

The title "Mr. Education" is a title well earned by Senator Morse, as is so amply proved by his work in conference on the bill and by the fact that he has brought the conference report on the higher education bill back to us in such good form and has managed it through to approval by this body in such short order. I thank him from the bottom of my heart, and I congratulate him for his tremendous understanding, knowledge, and ability on all matters, but especially on questions involving education.

I could not stop without adding an equal vote of thanks and congratulations to the bipartisan conferees who so ably assisted and cooperated with the Senator from Oregon. I refer to the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], and the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick].

To each of these Senators, as well as to this entire body, I give my heartfelt thanks and commendations for a great piece of legislation which will mean much to this entire Nation, and especially to our greatest asset, our youth.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly in commendation of the efforts of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], concerning the education bill. This is the culmination of a series of education bills that will mean a great deal to the boys and girls of America and to American parents, not only this year, but also in the future for many decades ahead.

For years and years I have been working for the advancement of Federal aid and Federal support of education at the elementary, the secondary school, and the higher education level.

Many Members of Congress and many in the education fraternity have also been working toward this end. Yet, all these efforts have been met with failure until the senior Senator from Oregon took over with his leadership and put through the most outstanding educational legislation that has ever been passed.

Sometimes we like to compare this with the Morrill Act of a century ago, and so forth. However, this Congress has demonstrated its support of education in a way in which no other Congress has ever done. Most of this is due to the efforts of the senior Senator from Oregon, whose birthday present this bill is. However, actually, if we are talking about birthday presents, this bill should have been passed on the 4th of July, because this a birthday present to every boy and girl in the United States. This is a birthday present to every American parent. This is a birthday present to the Nation.

This legislation will bring out and develop the talent of every one of our very talented young people. If we afford a greater opportunity to these young men and women who are being lost now because of dropping out of school because they cannot afford to go to college and because we do not have the research facilities to take care of them, we will not only contribute to the wealth and the welfare of this Nation, but we shall also make this country much stronger militarily, politically, and every other way.

The senior Senator from Oregon in his leadership has made the most outstanding contribution to the United States of

America that could be made in the passage of this series of education bills, of which this higher education bill is a culmination and the final development.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the passage of those bills on education legislation in the 88th and 89th Congresses is due to the combined efforts of all of us working together.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] was really special counsel to my Subcommittee on Education, although he was not even a member of the committee. Some may not be aware of that. However, the Senator from Montana when he was in the House of Representatives made education, his major specialty as far as legislative effort was concerned. He became known in the House as the man who was undoubtedly best versed in the education field as it affected the legislative problems in that field.

He brought that wealth of experience from the House to the Senate. Our committee relied upon him very heavily. He sat in consultation with our committee after he was no longer connected with our committee, having received other committee assignments.

I want the RECORD to show that Senator LEE METCALF has had much to do in helping with the architectural design for the legislation that we have come to pass here on higher education, as he did also in connection with the elementary and secondary bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, having served on the committee with the senior Senator from Oregon, I can say without any question that we would not have an education bill if it had not been for the patience, leadership, and knowledge of this subject on the part of the senior Senator from Oregon.

As a freshman Senator and a new member of the committee, it was one of the most impressive experiences that I have ever had, not only with the higher education bill, but also with the secondary education bill.

I think it is unanimously believed by the members of the committee, no matter of what political persuasion they might be, and no matter what disagreements there might be on other subjects, that if it had not been for his tact, patience, leadership, and general knowledge on the subject, which was unequaled by anyone else on the committee, as demonstrated by the senior Senator from Oregon, the young people of the United States would not have the benefit of this legislation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the stamp of ROBERT KENNEDY is all over this bill.

If the junior Senator from New York had not come forward with the Kennedy amendment to provide for the Presidential Review Council that is set up in title I of the bill, to give us legislative recommendations to assure effective coordination of all federally supported extension type activities and to advise the Commissioner of Education on the regulations to be issued in connection with title I of this act, I do not think that title of the bill would have been very effective. We did agree to the Kennedy amendment. The Review Council, in my judgment, will make possible the elimination of overlap, if any, in extension programs in the years ahead. Our continuing education programs will work more efficiently and effectively because of this amendment.

The Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], in his cross-examination—and I have never seen a more effective cross-examination in a legislative hearing—made those witnesses prove their case when they came before the subcommittee and asked for either a modification of the bill, or gave support to various sections of the bill.

Time and again, the Senator from New York offered, in the markup of the bill, language changes that perfected the bill. The Senator is entirely too modest but I very much appreciated his comments about my work. It was his kind of valuable contribution that made it possible to bring forth this bill.

Mr. President, I note that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is present. I am sorry that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] is not now present. They know title V of the act contained their Kennedy-Nelson amendment. It added the Teacher Corps to H.R. 9567. They are aware that this title became one of the controversial areas of the bill in the minds of some. It is my belief, however, that the overwhelming majority of the conference committee was in favor of the teaching corps from the very beginning.

I have not had a chance to tell the Senator from Massachusetts, but when we were in conference the other day, a little concern developed on the part of some of our House colleagues, and the statement was made by the opposition that if I did not yield on the Teacher Corps, they wanted me to know that, on the House side, they would move to recommit.

Some of our colleagues on the majority side were a little concerned about that. They were not so sure that the effort to recommit might not succeed. I said good naturedly that March and April were not so far away and that perhaps it would be best, if that were to happen, to wait until March and April and to let the college presidents and deans give their value judgment as to the Teacher Corps. I suggested that perhaps by March and April we might get a change of position on the part of the House conferees. It was still suggested to me by the leadership of the majority of the House that it would be helpful if I should get in touch with the President of the United States to make certain that the President would support me in my position of not receding. I had made it very clear that I would not recede.

I tried to do it pleasantly. I argued the merits of the Teacher Corps.

I said that I wanted it to be clearly understood that, in getting in touch with the President, I would make it clear to the President that I did not think we should recede. They said that was very reasonable.

I got in touch with the President.

I want the RECORD to show what his answer was. He said, "Stick by your guns."

We stuck by our guns, and when I came back and, in open conference, reported what the President's position was, there was no question then that the majority were ready to exercise their votes. And they voted.

Of course, I also said good naturedly of the opposition, "If they do not find that this is a basis for recommitting, they will find some other basis," because there were some who did not want the bill.

I thought the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Wisconsin are entitled to my explanation as to how the Senate conferees kept the Teacher Corps title in this bill. It is one of the strongest, most valuable sections of H.R. 9567, and I think time will prove its worth.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and his colleague on the bill, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], for their insisting on retaining the provision as they did all through the hearing, and in the committee markup stages, where it was thought by some that perhaps we ought to separate it from this bill and offer it next year as a separate bill. That I refused to do, because I thought in light of the teacher training aspect it was and should be an integral part of this program.

Someone said, "What is it doing in a higher education bill, when the teachers are going to go into elementary and secondary schools?" It is a part of the higher education bill because it is a very practical part; it is a training part of the education departments of our institutions of higher learning, and it will aid them in training many teachers.

The Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Wisconsin had great vision and sound vision when they struck upon this idea of a teacher corps, and I thank the Senator from Massachusetts particularly, because I see him on the floor, for the contributions he has made to this bill.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I should like to join in the accolades which have been paid to the distinguished Senator from Oregon this afternoon for the great contributions he has made in the fields of education.

As the Senator from Oregon has mentioned, this was a part of the bill which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] and I joined in initiating—an amendment to the higher education bill providing for a teacher corps.

Some time last February, during the closing days of the hearings on the primary and secondary school education bill, it occurred to Senator NELSON and myself to join and seize the opportunity of providing for professionally qualified teachers to work in disadvantaged areas. I remember that the distinguished Senator from Oregon was not present at the time, but was on an important mission, speaking on the fields of education in my neighboring State of Connecticut. In the brief time I had to outline the plan to the Senator from Oregon, he made some very worthwhile suggestions to the ideas we were contemplating at that particular time; he gave us the benefit of his wisdom and experience, not only in the field of education, but his views on how an amendment or an idea such as this could be enacted into legislation.

That was one of the important ingredients of this legislation, which has been fostered once more in the Senate, and one of the important reasons why the Senator from Oregon has made such an important contribution, because he understands what can be done and how it should be done. His commitment in the field of education is extremely significant.

As the Senator from Oregon has mentioned, when Senator Nelson and I approached him on this idea, even though we are members of the committee, he extended every kind of courtesy, interest, and help. Once the subcommittee embraced the suggestion, fought for it completely in the full committee, and has fought for it in the conference and here on the floor. I think it is reassuring to every Senator who shares his concerns in the field of education to know that when we do have an idea which is worthwhile, the Senator from Oregon is interested in encouraging convictions and giving suggestions and advice, is ready to embrace an idea if it is worthwhile, to fight for it in the Senate, and to see to its enactment after it passes the conference.

I know I speak for Senator Nelson as well as for myself in joining in the tribute to the Senator from Oregon for a job well done. I think every young American benefits from his extraordinary contributions in the field of education.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts very much.

INCREASE OF AUTHORIZATION TO BUILD HIGHWAY BRIDGES ACROSS FEDERAL DAMS

Mr. BASS subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today I introduced a bill and asked that it be referred, on behalf of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore] and myself, which would amend section 320, subsection (d) of title 23, United States Code.

The purpose of such an amendment would be to increase the authorization to build highway bridges across Federal dams from $13 million to $14,670,000.

The purpose of the increase is to widen the bridge across Chicamaugua Dam in Tennessee from two lanes to four lanes.

The State Highway Department reports that the average daily traffic over the present two-lane facility is over 15,000 vehicles, which is far beyond the practical capacity of the bridge.

BENEFITS TO CHILDREN OF CERTAIN WAR VETERANS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Russell of South Carolina in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 227, which was read as follows:

Resolved, That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 to the bill (H.R. 227) entitled "An Act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to entitle the children of certain veterans who served in the Armed Forces prior to September 16, 1940, to benefit under the war orphans educational assistance program."

Resolved, That the House disagree to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, to the aforesaid bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 2.

The motion was agreed to.

RIGHT OF PERSONS TO BE REPRESENTED IN MATTERS BEFORE FEDERAL AGENCIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1758) to provide for the right of persons to be represented in matters before Federal agencies, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That—

(a) Any person who is a member in good standing of the bar of the highest court of any State, possession, territory, Commonwealth, or the District of Columbia may represent others before any agency upon filing with the agency a written declaration that he is currently qualified as provided by this subsection and is authorized to represent the particular party in whose behalf he acts.

(b) Any person who is duly qualified to practice as a certified public accountant in any State, possession, territory, Commonwealth, or the District of Columbia may represent others before the Internal Revenue Service of the Treasury Department upon filing with that agency a written declaration that he is currently qualified as provided by this subsection and is authorized to represent the particular party in whose behalf he acts.

(c) Nothing herein shall be construed (i) to grant or deny to any person who is not qualified as provided by subsection (a) or (b) the right to appear for or represent others before any agency or in any agency proceeding; (ii) to authorize or limit the discipline, including disbarment, of persons who appear in a representative capacity before any agency; (iii) to authorize any person who is a former officer or employee of an agency to represent others before an agency where such representation is prohibited by statute or regulations; or (iv) to prevent an agency from requiring a power of attorney as a condition to the settlement of any controversy involving the payment of money.

(d) This section shall not be applicable to practice before the Patent Office with respect to patent matters which shall continue to be covered by chapter 3 (sections 31 to 33) of title 35 of the United States Code.

Sec. 2. When any participant in any matter before an agency is represented by a person qualified pursuant to subsection (a) or (b) of section 1, any notice or other written communication required or permitted to be given to such participant in such matter shall be given to such representative in addition to any other service specifically required by statute. If a participant is represented by more than one such qualified representative, service upon any one of such representatives shall be sufficient.

Sec. 3. As used in this Act, "agency" shall have the same meaning as it does in section 2(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act, as amended (60 Stat. 237, as amended).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tonight, it stands in adjournment until 9:30 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR FONG ON THURSDAY MORNING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period between 9:30 and 10 o'clock tomorrow morning be set aside for the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], who wishes to make a speech during that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR AIKEN ON THURSDAY MORNING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period from 10 to 10:30 o'clock tomorrow morning be set aside for the use of the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11588) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes; that the House agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Mahon, Mr. Kirwan, Mr. Whitten, Mr. Rooney of New York, Mr. Fogarty, Mr. Evins of Tennessee, Mr. Bow, Mr. Jonas, and Mr. Laird were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE EXPOSITION TO BE HELD IN ALASKA IN 1967—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 928)

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce I report favorably S. 2614, to provide for U.S. participation in the exposition to be held in Alaska in 1967. I submit a report thereon.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the Record, together with the individual views of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. MORSE, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 2687) to amend section 302 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, to broaden the permissible uses of trust funds to which employers contribute, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 2532, which would provide grants for the construction of elementary and secondary schools and supplemental educational centers, that the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] be added as a cosponsor. I am delighted to make this request and to have the helpful support of the very able Senator on this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

I understand that this has been cleared on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

WATERSHED PROJECTS APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in order that the Members of the Senate and other interested parties may be advised of various projects approved by the Committee on Public Works, I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, information on this matter, as follows:

Projects approved by the Committee on Public Works on October 19, under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Public Law 566, 83d Congress, as amended

Project:	*Estimated Federal Cost*
Bayou Boeuf, La	$3,235,327
Mauch Chunk Creek, Pa	444,067
Middle Creek, Pa	2,076,135
Oil Creek, Pa	2,241,580
Total	7,997,109

PUBLIC BUILDING PROSPECTUSES APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in order that the Members of the Senate and other interested parties may be advised of various projects approved by the Committee on Public Works, I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, information on this matter, as follows:

Resolutions approving projects under the Public Buildings Act of 1959, Public Law 249, 86th Congress

Prospectus:	*Total estimated cost*
Post Office and Federal Office Building, Denton, Tex	$1,211,000

STATUS OF THE NATO PARLIAMENTARIAN'S CONFERENCE PROJECT FOR GREEK-TURKISH ECONOMIC COOPERATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, during the week of October 4 the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference held its 11th annual session in New York City.

The Special Committee on Developing NATO Countries of the Conference of which I am chairman, met on the afternoon of Monday, October 5, to discuss the progress made in the Committee's efforts to encourage closer economic cooperation between Greece and Turkey since our last meeting at NATO headquarters in Paris.

Our progress has been considerable. The project received $150,000 from the Ford Foundation and smaller financial contributions from a number of American companies, bankers, and foundations. We now have as a fulltime Executive Director, Seymour Rubin, former U.S. Representative to the Development Assistance Committee—DAC—of the OECD; and a European Director, Albert Zumbiehi, financial adviser to a prominent French industrial firm, on loan to us for a period of time. Discussions held in Greece, Turkey, the United Kingdom, West Germany, and the United States with business leaders and international organizations indicate strong support for our efforts and we have already received invaluable cooperation from these quarters. There is every indication that substantial private assistance may be forthcoming from West German foundations for an important phase of the project, namely, the further development of the irrigation potential of the Maritsa-Evros River Valley, which forms the border between Greece and Turkey.

In view of the great importance of the project to the United States, to NATO and to peace and stability in southeastern Europe, I ask unanimous consent that a paper presented by me to the Special Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference on October 5 on the present status of the project as well as certain background information on our Executive Director and European Director, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATUS OF THE PROJECT FOR GREEK-TURKISH ECONOMIC COOPERATION

(Working paper presented by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS for the consideration of the Special Committee on Developing NATO Countries)

Since the report submitted by me to the Parliamentarians' Conference in November 1964[1] there have been many encouraging developments on the Greek-Turkish project. Much progress has been made.

The initial studies which were completed in September 1964 suggested the existence of several areas of constructive cooperation. In my visits to Greece and Turkey of November 1964 I was assured of close cooperation in the many talks with political, business, and academic leaders. The plenary session approved the project and set up the Special Committee to implement it, of which I have the honor to serve as Chairman, with Messrs. Spanorrigas of Greece, and Gulek of Turkey as Vice Chairman. Mr. Westerterp of the Netherlands was elected rapporteur.

The project swung into high gear in the spring of 1965 when the Ford Foundation approved a $150,000 grant to finance the necessary research in depth and feasibility studies. Since then substantial contributions (to date totaling $16,250) have been received from a number of American companies and foundations with a deep interest in the mutual economic development of Greece and Turkey.[2] In May 1965, at a breakfast meeting in Paris, attended by over 60 representatives of Turkish, Greek, United States, Canadian and European businesses, banks and foundations, there was organized the nongovernmental International Advisory Commission on Greek-Turkish Economic Cooperation.[3] An Executive Committee, to act for the Advisory Commission between its sessions, was also set up. The meeting, chaired by me and with Messrs. Spanorrigas and Gulek taking leading roles, was also attended by observers from international organizations and by members of the Special Committee. It was followed by a meeting at NATO headquarters of the Special Committee.

In the relatively short period of time since the end of May, major steps, both organizational and substantive, have been taken. Let me list some of these:

On the organizational side, pursuant to the mandate of the Special Committee and in consultation with Messrs. Gulek and Spanorrigas, I have designated an Executive Director and a European Director for the project.

The Executive Director is an American, Mr. Seymour J. Rubin of Washington, D.C. Mr. Rubin is a well-known lawyer with extensive economic background. He left the Department of State in 1948 to enter the private practice of law. He has since returned to the U.S. Government on several occasions, and in 1961–63 served first as General Counsel of the Agency for International Development and as the U.S. representative to the Development Assistance Committee in Paris. It is relevant to mention that he acted as the American representative on both the Greek and the Turkish consortia organized by the OECD.

---

[1] See NATO Parliamentarians' Conference Doc. No. G 126, EC (64)30–DNC 4.

[2] All contributions are deposited with the Governmental Affairs Institute, 1726 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. (a private nonprofit research organization), which acts as the administrator of the Ford Foundation grant. These funds are set aside to finance the cost of research and administration involving the project.

[3] For minutes of that meeting see NATO Parliamentarians' Conference Doc. No. H 67, EC (65)8–DNC 15, "Preparatory Meeting to the Proceedings of the International Consultative Committee on Increasing Economic Cooperation Between Greece and Turkey."

The European Director is Mr. Albert Zumbiehl, who is with a prominent French company which has kindly seconded him for a period of time. He has long experience in diplomacy and business, and particularly in development financing. He knows Greece and Turkey well.

(I have appended hereto the text of both a press release which I have issued concerning these appointments, and a subsequent editorial which appeared in the Washington Post.)

Second, in order to provide the necessary national support and contact with the business communities, we have had several meetings with national groups. I have met personally, together with Mr. Rubin, with leaders of the American business community (led by Mr. George James and other officials of Socony-Mobil Oil Co.) for searching discussions of the project. At our meeting of July 9, 1965, I was honored by the presence not only of distinguished leaders of the American business community, but also of Mr. Shepherd Stone of the Ford Foundation, Hon. Phillips Talbot, then American Assistant Secretary of State, now our Ambassador to Greece, and Mr. George Woods, President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. At our second discussion—progress report session, held on August 30, 1965—Mr. Zumbiehl also met members of the U.S. Advisory Group.[4] We were fortunate to have with us also Mr. Herbert Gray, our Canadian member of the Special Committee.

Although my congressional duties have prevented my leaving the United States since our Paris meeting on May 24, Mr. Rubin has visited with our United Kingdom member of the Executive Committee, Mr. Colville of Hill-Samuel Co., and with other business interests in England. Both Mr. Rubin and I have been in touch with interested business, scientific, and educational groups. Finally, Messrs. Rubin and Zumbiehl, after conferring with me in Washington, and after careful preparations, have made a preliminary trip to Turkey and Greece last month to make contact with business leaders in both countries, to apprise them of progress, and to receive, at the earliest stage possible, the views of these leaders on both the organizational and the substantive aspects of our program.

One of the main points made to them during this September 1965 trip was the necessity of coordination within Greece and Turkey. As is known, my own observations in November 1964 had shown the great good will and willingness to cooperate of responsible business elements in both countries. This good will and willingness was crystallized in the light of the progress made in organizing and starting the substantive work of the project. As a result, we are considering asking a qualified economist or administrator, in both Greece and Turkey, to act under the overall supervision of the Chairman and two Vice Chairmen of the Special Committee, as a consultant to the Executive Director and European Director, to serve as a focal point for local coordination, and to give help and expert assistance to the participating business leaders.

I should here make clear that we are relying for the major effort in Greece and Turkey on the business, academic, and similar groups in each of those countries. We hope to have the help at all times of the chambers of commerce, and of the industrial and agricultural financing institutions. This is also a private-enterprise effort, in that sense resembling closely the ADELA project which I had the honor to sponsor within the content of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference. Thus, we hope to set up a series of ad hoc committees, organized both nationally and internationally, which will advise and consult at all stages of our actual research or feasibility studies. Our consultants in Greece and Turkey will be able effectively to work with these committees, and to give to the business and academic leaders the kind of coordinative assistance which will clearly be needed.

I come now to the substantive aspect of our work, which has already developed along extremely interesting lines, despite the short period since our organizing meeting in Paris, and the appointment in July of Messrs. Rubin and Zumbiehl.

Here there are several main topics:

First, we have made rapid progress in developing proposals for exploration of several of the main topics which were foreseen in the preliminary reports—tourism, agriculture, and particular joint efforts in the transport and marketing of fruits and vegetables, and the further development of the Maritsa-Evros River Basin.

All of these matters were mentioned in my last report to the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference. Further discussion has been had with a wide variety of knowledgeable persons since then—officials of the World Bank, of the American AID organization, of the U.N. Special Fund, the Food and Agriculture Organization and economic experts of both Greece and Turkey. Also, Mr. Rubin has discussed prospects in these fields with private industry, with well-known consulting firms, and with a wide variety of persons possessing expert and impartial experience, including, for example, the engineering firm which originally drew up and supervised the 1953 Maritsa-Evros plan. Out of all this has come a series of specific proposals for research and for cooperation with private and international organizations.

In regard to the Maritsa-Evros study, we have been in close contact with our distinguished colleague from the Federal Republic of Germany, Dr. Kurt Birrenbach, and through him with the Thyssen and the Volkswagen Stiftungen (Foundations) in Germany. We hope in cooperation with them to be able to propose a useful and quite specific study, which will make recommendations in the fields of irrigation and of land management, as well as in such other fields of agricultural development as the study may show to be feasible. In the making of the study we expect, of course, the friendly cooperation of the Greek and the Turkish Governments.

In respect of fruits and vegetables, we have had extremely helpful conversations, promising much useful collaboration, with Mr. Paul Hoffman, Director of the United Nations Special Fund, and Mr. Paul-Marc Henry, his deputy. We have discussed with these eminent persons the projects already sponsored by the Special Fund in Greece and Turkey. We have been in touch with the Food and Agriculture Organization about its studies of problems of production, standardization, packaging, transport, and marketing of fruits and vegetables in the eastern Mediterranean. An immediate consequence has been a visit by Messrs. Zumbiehl and Rubin to the headquarters of the FAO, a discussion of such questions as that of refrigeration, and a real possibility of a feasibility study which would be of inestimable benefit to a mutually beneficial increase in the exports of fruits and vegetables from Greece and Turkey.

Tourism already contributes important sums to the economy of Greece, and, to a lesser but increasing extent, that of Turkey. Many studies have already been made in this field. We here propose to finance a special, preliminary study, which will take these other studies into account, will bring together in one report the ways in which a collaborative effort would benefit Greece and Turkey, and will make recommendations both for further feasibility studies and, if possible, in this preliminary report, for projects in the area of tourism. Here it is evident that governments and private interests, backed by national and international development finance institutions, must cooperate. Transport must be provided, hotels and motels must be built; roads must be improved; border formalities must be made easier; and a joint effort to advertise the cultural, religious, archeological and scenic aspects of the region—as a region—must be undertaken.

Other areas of work—such as fisheries—are also under study.

Second, we are taking advantage of the many offers of assistance which have come to us from the private business and academic communities to explore new areas of mutually beneficial cooperation. It is too early to say what specific projects will come out of this study. But it is already clear that there exists a vast reservoir of good will and expert knowledge and interest. This combination cannot fail, as the project moves forward, to have measurable results. It has already resulted in a demonstration of the willingness of scholars and businessmen, as well as government officials, to work together toward the mutual benefit of the Greek and Turkish peoples.

Third, we have explored, with highly encouraging results, the possibility of new channels of discussion of problems of mutual interest. Thus, we have had encouragement from the great international financing institutions, the national institutions of industrial and agricultural finance, and the private business communities for a series of international conferences. These conferences would seek to bring together the interested persons, from Greece and Turkey, from Western Europe and North America, and from the international institutions, to confer on possible cooperation in a number of areas. One such area which immediately suggests itself is that of the financing of industrial development. Another is tourism, and a vitally important one is that of agricultural development and financing of such development. Conferences of this sort, looking toward the exchange of information and the setting up of a permanent channel for that exchange, could be extremely useful. Moreover, they would take a first important step toward insuring that proposals which required financing, private, governmental or international, would have at least a part of the problem of financing solved. For there would be a mechanism to which specific plans, whether in the field of tourism, agriculture or elsewhere, could be presented.

The response to these suggestions has been so favorable that we hope, in the spring of 1966, to have one or two such meetings. Hopefully, we would like to have them in Greece and Turkey, preferably in surroundings where formal sessions can be supplemented by quiet conversations. For understanding, rather than any formal agreements, will be the optimum outcome of such sessions as these.

In this same connection, I should say that we wish to give every encouragement to cultural and education exchanges and cooperation. We are exploring the suggestions made by Mr. Spyros Skouras, a distinguished American citizen whose benign interest encompasses both Greece and Turkey. It is possible that a special group to work on cultural cooperation could be established, in close liaison with our own project. We may commission a study of the business and financial laws of Greece and Turkey, with the objective of a conference of leading lawyers and legal scholars to see whether cooperation here would be fruitful.

---

[4] See attached list, U.S. Advisory Group members, Greek-Turkish project.

All these are avenues to be explored. Some may prove to be blind alleys; but progress in the short time during which the project has been underway is highly encouraging.

There is one final thought I would like to express. That is that on all sides we have been cautioned not to be impatient, to recognize that feasibility studies take time, that specific results will be slow, that the consequences of our efforts will be measured over a long and not a short period of time. And this advice has come to us from those who are most strong in their support of the project.

We recognize that the results, in some senses, will show up only in some years. This has been known from the beginning. At the same time, we hope to be able to present quite specific results in a relatively short time. Some of these will be feasibility studies and recommendations. Some of these will be the establishment of better means of communication, of liaison groups, for example. Some will be the creation of ways and means of implementing study recommendations.

But the most important result is already, here and now, tangible. This is the demonstrated ability of businessmen, scholars and others from Greece and Turkey to work together, with the encouragement of this project, toward the solution of their mutual problems of economic development. That result, as I say, is already a fact. It must be extended and made more specific. But it is clear that it exists, and that the work due until now confirms its existence.

I thus feel that we can, on the record, be pleased with the establishment of the Special Committee of which I have the honour to be Chairman. I can appropriately commend my Vice Chairmen, our esteemed colleagues, Messrs. Gulek and Spanorrigas, and to other members of the Special Committee, the Executive and European Directors, Messrs. Rubin and Zumbiehl, and I can justifiably express a certain confidence for the future.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO GREEK-TURKISH PROJECT

D. S. and R. N. Gettesman Foundation, $5,000 (have pledged $10,000), March 1965.

Arthur and Gloria Ross Foundation, $1,000, March 1965.

U.S. Freight Co., $2,000, April–August 1965.

Socony-Mobil Oil Co., $5,000, August 1965.

Pfizer International Inc., $1,000, August 1965.

Twentieth Century Fox Film Corp., $500, August 1965.

Trans-World Airlines, $1,500, August 1965.

Singer Co. Foundation, $250, September.

Ford Foundation, $150,000, April 1965.

Total, $166,250, September 21, 1965.

MEMBERS OF U.S. ADVISORY GROUP FOR GREEK-TURKISH PROJECT

Mr. John B. Arnold, senior vice president, First National City Bank, New York City.

Mr. Amory Bradford, consultant to the Ford Foundation, New York City.

Mr. Tom B. Coughran, executive vice president, Bank of America, New York City.

Mr. Richard C. Fenton, president, Pfizer International, Inc., New York City.

Mr. Morris Forgash, president, U.S. Freight Co., New York City.

Mr. George F. James, senior vice president, Socony-Mobil Oil Co., New York City.

Mr. Henry W. Manville, vice president, the Singer Co., New York City.

Mr. Robert R. Mathews, senior vice president, American Express Co., New York City.

Mr. H. L. Nathan, vice president, Parsons & Whittemore, Inc., New York City.

Mr. Art Ross, executive vice president and managing director, Central National Corp., New York City.

Mr. Francis X. Scafuro, vice president, Bank of America, New York City.

Mr. Spyros Skouras, chairman of the board, Twentieth Century Fox Film Corp., New York City.

Mr. Charles C. Tillinghast, Jr., president, Trans-World Airlines, New York City.

Adm. John M. Will, U.S. Navy, retired, president and chairman of the board, American Export and Isbrandtsen Lines, New York City.

Mr. Sidney H. Willner, vice president and general counsel, Hilton Hotels International, New York City.

JAVITS NAMES SEYMOUR RUBIN AS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF GREEK-TURKISH ECONOMIC COOPERATION PROJECT—ALBERT ZUMBIEHL OF FRANCE IS EUROPEAN DIRECTOR

The appointment of Seymour J. Rubin, former U.S. Minister to the Development Assistance Committee and prominent Washington attorney, as Executive Director of the Greek-Turkish Economic Cooperation project was announced today by Senator Jacob K. Javits. Senator Javits is Chairman of the Special Committee on Developing NATO Countries of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, which is sponsoring the project.

Announced as European Director of the project was Albert Zumbiehl of Paris, formerly a member of the OECD Business and Industry Advisory Committee and an international financial expert.

Principal offices for the project will be in Washington, with European offices at the Atlantic Institute in Paris.

In making the announcement, Senator Javits said: "Mr. Rubin's decision to take on this important assignment is a giant step forward in developing participation of the public and private sectors in Western Europe, the United States, Canada, and other countries in economic cooperation between Greece and Turkey. With his expertise in international finance and his working knowledge of international organizations, Mr. Rubin has excellent qualifications to direct this project. The European Director, Albert Zumbiehl, also brings great experience and accomplishment in international economic cooperation to this assignment. Economic cooperation on a specific project basis between Greece and Turkey is logical, can be most beneficial to the people of each country, and can inaugurate a historic movement in binational cooperation."

The committee to oversee the Greek-Turkish economic cooperation project was set up at the plenary session of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference in November 1964 with Senator Javits as Chairman, Alexander Spanorrigas, member of the Parliament of Greece and Deputy Minister of Commerce, and Kasim Gulek, member of the Turkish National Assembly as cochairmen. With assistance from the Ford Foundation and contributions from major American corporations, the project has already researched possibilities for joint Greek-Turkish ventures that would economically benefit both nations.

A similar project initiated by Senator Javits in 1962 led to the establishment of the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America (ADELA), a private, multinational investment organization now channeling equity capital to Latin American private enterprise on a partnership basis with local businessmen.

Mr. Rubin, 51, was U.S. Representative to the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development until January 1964. During 1962 and 1963, he was the U.S. member of the OECD Consortia on Greece and Turkey. A native of Chicago, Mr. Rubin graduated magna cum laude from Harvard Law School and served in a number of Government posts until 1948, when he returned to private practice of law.

Since then Mr. Rubin has been frequently appointed by the Government to undertake special missions. He served as chief of the NATO Tax Delegation in 1951–52, with the personal rank of Minister; was Deputy Administrator of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act in 1952–53; and was a consultant in connection with the Hoover Commission Report on Foreign Aid and the task force on the same subject set up in 1961. He was named by President Kennedy as a public member of the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, and was nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate as General Counsel of the International Cooperation Administration and the Agency for International Development in 1961. He also served in 1962 as personal representative of the President to Bolivia, with the rank of Special Ambassador.

Mr. Zumbiehl, 45, was with the French Ministry of Finance from 1945 to 1955. Since then, he has directed important aspects of the international finance relations of a major French aluminum and nonferrous metals firm. Mr. Zumbiehl has also been a member of the Business and Industry Advisory Committee of the OECD.

A SYMBOL OF WELCOME AT HAWAII

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the Statue of Liberty on Liberty Island has long marked this Nation's eastern gateway to the land of liberty and freedom and has come to symbolize our democracy throughout the world.

Mr. John Barovich, vice president of the Computer Programers Association in Honolulu recently suggested that a memorial of similar significance be erected in Honolulu, our Nation's western gateway, as a symbol of welcome to our Pacific and Asian neighbors.

I believe that this suggestion is particularly timely in view of the passage of the recent Immigration Reform Act. I feel confident that the people of Hawaii would be most willing to support such a project. I believe that Mr. Barovich's suggestion is an excellent one and I wish to call upon my colleagues for their views and suggestions on this matter.

CIVIL DEMONSTRATIONS AGAINST U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, there are no words strong enough to express my personal contempt for those cowardly young people who demonstrate against their country and our national security.

They would be pathetic and unworthy of attention were it not for the fact that others are fighting and dying to preserve the freedom these inconsiderate and ungrateful people are abusing.

There may be some among this confused group who have been misled by Communists or unprincipled traitors, and because of their irresponsibility do not recognize what they are doing. If they are students, as some of them claim to be, then it is obvious they never studied American history.

If they devoted as much time on history books as they have in their disgraceful demonstrations, they might have learned something about how this Nation won and maintained freedom.

Liberty never has been and cannot now be preserved by crawling meekly before international bullies or power-mad dictators. We have freedom today for all Americans, even a misguided minority, because millions were willing to fight for it yesterday.

Nothing of value in all recorded history has ever been achieved or preserved without sacrifice. Those who are unwilling to fulfill their patriotic duty as Americans most assuredly do not deserve to enjoy the benefits made available by the responsible citizens of this Nation.

As for those few ingrates who actually have destroyed their draft cards, I hope they will be prosecuted swiftly and punished severely. The law of this Congress making such activity a Federal offense is one which I supported wholeheartedly.

ECONOMIC INEQUITIES

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, poor living conditions and solidified unemployment plague part of my home State of Kentucky, as they plague parts of some neighboring States. This is not a cause for despair, but it certainly is a real cause for positive analysis of the elements of employment as such. Unless we know the economic and social ingredients of total employment, no amount of Government pump priming is going to rid us of the one and only reason for poverty. That sole reason, of course, is unemployment.

It may sound odd to say simply that unemployment is the result of low employment. I submit to the Senate, however, that this is the real starting point in any solution of unemployment. We have been getting out of bed on the wrong side, and we have started the poverty program off on the wrong foot.

Instead of analyzing the vacuum of unemployment, we must analyze concrete employment. The first is a negative approach, but the second is a positive approach. If we can label, isolate, and measure the various elements that comprise total employment, then we can strengthen the weak elements and ignore the strong ones.

But no, we do not operate this way. Instead, we throw billions of dollars into one vacuum after another when we could easily spend only a fraction of the poverty program moneys to find out just where we are weak and where we are strong. This would be positive economic analysis, a type of work that apparently is quite foreign to the minds of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

If a businessman is forced by law to sell his output below the cost of production, then I say that law produces an economic inequity. The businessman goes broke, and we as a national economy are worse off because of it.

This is an obvious example, indeed, but there are many economic inequities in this land of ours that are not so obvious. In fact, some of them even look pretty good. One dandy-looking economic inequity of hideous proportions is the so-called poverty program that I mention and that is eating away the Nation's economic profit. This disjointed, political program is marching east on a train moving west. We are spending billions of dollars that represent the real wealth of the economy to keep the train moving and the marchers marching. The trouble with this extravagant inequity is that nobody is going anywhere. But that is not all there is to it, for our national economy is going somewhere because of it. That somewhere is down, way down.

The thoughts I have expressed here today were brought to mind by a newspaper article published recently in Harlan County, Ky. As most of you know, Harlan County long has been beset by unemployment of the worst and most protracted kind. The article was written by Mr. William D. Pardridge, whom many of us in the Senate know as the author of the newspaper series entitled "Economic Inequities."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Education, Not the Dole, Is Said Harlan County's Hope," written by William D. Pardridge and published October 14, 1965, in the Harlan, Ky., Daily Enterprise, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Harlan (Ky.) Daily Enterprise, Oct. 14, 1965]

AN ECONOMIC INEQUITY: EDUCATION, NOT THE DOLE, IS SAID HARLAN COUNTY'S HOPE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The author of the following article, William D. Pardridge, is a former editor of the Washington publication, Air Affairs. He has been working on a doctorate degree in economics at the University of Chicago, but left to spend 9 months writing a series of 50 articles on "economic inequities." This is one of the articles in the series, which is to be published in book form next year.)

(By William D. Pardridge)

Man-made economic inequities sometimes become economic iniquities.

Poverty is one of them.

Lack of education is another.

They are iniquitous because they tend to beget themselves as their carriers beget children.

Face it. No amount of bootstrap Government financing is going to get rid of poverty. Jobs come from business and industry, not from Washington executive orders.

And remember that personal education and personal employment do not go hand in hand. Youngsters must be members of the student body, not the labor force. At early ages, kids and teenagers cannot be both, and membership in neither is worst of all.

Just what is an economic inequity? It is an ogre of the materialistic world, like the devil is of another.

SALES TAX IS INEQUITABLE

Economic inequities are caused by laws that are enacted for willful political gain by legislative bodies completely ignorant of economic principles. They are shrouded with good intentions.

One vicious inequity is the sales tax. This monster reduces the purchasing power of the poor in order to raise public revenues for the not-so-poor, the not-poor-at-all, and the rich.

The iniquitous nature of the sales tax is that it seems to be so small. But small also are the bacteria that gradually rot your teeth.

All governments, local, State, and Federal, continually want to raise public revenues for ever larger social responsibilities that bring home the political bacon.

But every dime of such expenditures is axed off the general economic health of the Nation.

Take two extreme examples of governmental social responsibilities that cost real economic wealth.

WON'T RISK POCKETBOOK

Police protection is undeniably the responsibility of public bodies.

Our free economic way of life that helped produce the miraculous American political system, as did the latter system itself also yield that productive way of life, is based upon private property and the safeguarding of the individual's life and limb.

Police protection is a legitimate public expense. Even here a social inequity, not economic, appears when policemen—and firemen—are paid wages so low that this livelihood has never become the profession of respected trade or craft it certainly is.

The citizenry is quick to demand and order a policeman to risk his life arresting an armed maniac, but the stingy homeowner is reluctant to risk his pocketbook. Let's you and him fight, he says.

Far, far away from police protection is that economically grotesque social responsibility known as the farm pork barrel, the system that artificially regulates crop acreage and determines agricultural prices.

All this is done in a Washington smoke-filled room instead of at the grocery store counter.

A MAMMOTH INEQUITY

Across this land there are farmers who don't farm, farmers who regularly receive free Government checks, all the while low-income people pay taxes to increase food prices so that they'll have less money to pay for shoes.

If you think this makes economic sense, you're an idiot.

This whole tax structure is a mammoth inequity.

The near-rich and the rich have so many tax loopholes that the graduated income tax is a joke.

The wage earners pay income taxes, for instance, to send Midwest wheat to Communist Russia in foreign-flag ships. And the State Department thinks this is great.

Any poverty in Harlan County is not the fault of the people. It is caused by technological advances and by a flow of economic change that sometimes goes around your land and my land.

The remedies for such natural hardships are not gigantic economic inequities like second-generation dole, like handouts to nonfarming farmers, like expensive job training for jobs that are too few.

The remedy is the good riddance of all economic inequities and the pronouncement of an economic equity based on the rights and the freedoms of the individual—the businessman, the wage earner, the housewife.

Poverty, never forget, is caused only by a lack of employment and a lack of employment is caused only by the job and the worker not coming to terms with each other.

Jobs change relentlessly to more and more complicated technological, skilled duties.

Vocational education, not the world's greatest government handout, is the answer to these changes that man cannot stop.

The economic plenty that once was America can be returned to Harlan County by having two schools on every street corner.

One school is for the boys and girls who don't know what they want to be, except they don't want to be jellyfish.

The other school is for boys and girls who want to be technicians instead of jellyfish.

DOLE IS FATAL

If Uncle Sam in Washington, D.C., insists on giving you a lot of other people's money, tell him you want a big chunk of dough to hire the best teachers to teach your kids and to teach other teachers to teach your kids.

Tell him that, mister, and you'll be on your way to making Harlan County the place from which come the skilled workers for the American technology.

Tell him also, Ma, to keep his dole because it's making your kids lazy and your husband think he's got it made; he hasn't.

Man-made economic inequities are the total cause of poverty amidst plenty, and these economic inequities are the very life blood of the handout system.

Never, never forget that patriotism and the welfare economy cannot live long in the same nation. The first is based on individuality, and the second is based on group despair.

Don't just stand there, do something.

TRIBUTE TO MARVIN B. DURNING, CHAIRMAN OF THE WASHINGTON STATE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, today I rise to pay tribute to a man deeply engaged in the national effort to promote conservation and expand the opportunities for outdoor recreation. He is Marvin B. Durning of Seattle, chairman of the Washington State Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation, and a winner of the American Motors' 1965 Conservation Award.

Durning, a 35-year-old attorney, is a New Orleans native who came to Seattle in 1959. Since then he has been one of principal sources of energy and imagination in mapping outdoor recreation and conservation measures for the State of Washington.

In 1961 Durning helped to draft the highway advertising control act, one of the strongest State laws in the country. He helped defend the measure in both the 1963 and 1965 sessions of the State legislature.

Because of his interest in providing additional outdoor recreation facilities for the people of our State, Durning and others prompted the State administration to request the legislature to approve bills embodying such a program. When this request was denied, Durning organized Citizens for Outdoor Recreation, a nonpartisan organization devoted to mustering the requisite signatures for an initiative petition to have the bills placed on the ballot. Nearly 170,000 signatures were obtained, nearly twice as many as were needed. Citizens for Outdoor Recreation then launched an educational campaign to aid in the passage of the bills in November 1964. The bills—the outdoor recreation bond issue and the Marine Recreation Land Act—won overwhelming support from the people.

Early this year Durning assumed the chairmanship of a new committee consisting of representatives from six agencies of the State government and five citizen members charged with formulating the outdoor recreation program for the State. The committee is also responsible for allocating funds available from the two new State bills as well as the Land and Water Conservation Act administered by the Federal Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. The Interagency Committee this year has approximately $3.5 million from these combined sources to dispense. In the next 10 years the group may allocate as much as $50 million.

In recognition of his efforts Durning received the American Motors Conservation Award, along with 19 other individuals and 2 organizations. I am pleased to report that he has also received the 1965 Outstanding Service Award from the National Recreation Association.

In addition, Durning was one of the Seattle delegates and a panelist at the 1965 White House Conference on Natural Beauty. He has been a member of the Citizens Committee for the Rockefeller report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. Durning's latest brain child is an informal private group known as Seattle Natural Beauty Associates which hopes to sponsor some new thinking and provide citizen support for conservation and outdoor recreation.

Mr. President, I think my colleagues will agree that Washington State is fortunate to be one of the best endowed States of the Union when it comes to scenic wonders, natural beauty, and opportunities for outdoor recreation. With the growth of our population and the rising demands for recreation, however, it is more important than ever before to develop programs and facilities that are both wise and adequate to enhance these natural opportunities.

Marvin Durning has already established himself as a leader in this campaign. He has a notable record of success, and I know that the people of Washington State join me in commending him. I would only add that in my judgment his success is explained not only by his own considerable energy and good sense but also by the general public's interest in and commitment to conservation and outdoor recreation.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at the close of these remarks certain newspaper clippings and materials relating to Mr. Durning's achievements.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTDOOR RECREATION SUPPORTER FROM SEATTLE WINS AMERICAN MOTORS CONSERVATION AWARD

DETROIT.—Marvin B. Durning, of Seattle, Wash., chairman of Citizens for Outdoor Recreation, has been named a winner of an American Motors Conservation Award.

The awards are presented each year to 10 professional and 10 nonprofessional conservationists. In addition, two group awards are presented annually—one each to national and local groups. Winners will receive bronze sculptured medallions. Professionals and groups also receive honorariums of $500.

Winners are selected by an awards committee on the basis of dedicated efforts in the field of renewable natural resources which would not otherwise gain widespread public recognition.

Durning, a lawyer, long has had an interest in providing additional outdoor recreational facilities for the people of his State. His efforts led to an executive request to the Washington Legislature for passage of bills embodying such a program. The request was not acted upon.

Subsequently, Durning formed the citizen's group which circulated initiative petitions to have the bills placed on the ballot. Nearly 150,000 signatures were obtained—50 percent more than were needed.

Citizens for Outdoor Recreation then launched an educational campaign to aid in passage of the bills in the November 1964 election. The bills—outdoor recreation bond issue (referendum bill No. 11), and Marine Recreation Land Act (initiative No. 215) won overwhelmingly support at the polls.

American Motors Corp. President Roy Abernethy said in a letter of congratulations to Durning:

"A nation's true wealth and prosperity are measured in terms of its natural resources. Thus, the strength of our country is fundamentally related to the manner in which we manage our resources today and plan soundly for their use tomorrow.

"If we are to continue to enjoy our waters, forests, wildlife, and food-producing soil and rangelands, and to preserve this natural wealth for future generations, we must vigorously promote citizen and governmental interest in sound, progressive conservation practices.

"Your outstanding personal efforts in this direction, your understanding and dedication to conservation have been an inspiration to others. You personally have materially advanced the cause of conservation for the future."

Durning was selected for the American Motors Conservation Award by a committee of distinguished conservationists which includes Arthur H. Carhart, authority on national parks and forests, and consultant for the Conservation Library Center, Denver; C. R. Gutermuth, vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute; Carl W. Buchheister, president of the National Audubon Society; Richard H. Pough, Pelham, N.Y., director of the Natural Area Council, Inc., and Harold Titus, conservation editor of Field & Stream magazine.

The awards program is directed by Ed Zern, writer on conservation and outdoor sports.

AMERICAN MOTORS CORP.,
Detroit, May 19, 1965.

MR. MARVIN DURNING,
1411 Fourth Avenue Building,
Seattle, Wash.

DEAR MR DURNING: My warmest congratulations on your selection as a recipient of an American Motors Conservation Award.

It gives me great pride to review the accomplishments of our award winners, and to know that they will bring renewed inspiration to those in conservation everywhere.

Much of the fundamental strength of a nation lies in the manner in which its people manage its natural resources today and plan soundly for their use tomorrow.

If those of us in the United States are to continue to enjoy our lands, forests, waters, wildlife and other natural resources and preserve them for future generations, we must vigorously promote both citizen and governmental interest in broadscale progressive conservation practices.

Your outstanding personal effort and your understanding and dedication to conservation are an inspiration to others. You personally have materially advanced the cause of conservation for the future.

Sincerely,

ROY ABERNETHY.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times, June 17, 1965]

RECREATION GROUP GIVES LAWYER AWARD

Marvin Durning, Seattle attorney and chairman of the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation, today received the 1965

Outstanding Service Award from the National Recreation Association.

Mrs. Eleanor Berger, member of the State park and recreation commission presented the award at a meeting of the Association of Washington Cities in Tacoma. The commission had recommended Durning because of his efforts in promoting passage of the recreation-fund gas tax, and bond measures last November.

Durning headed the Citizens for Outdoor Recreation. He now heads the State agency assigned the task of administering the funds.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times, May 31, 1965]

A Goal To Be Exceeded

Can it be that Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, is unduly pessimistic in his view that it will take two decades and billions of dollars wisely spent to put across the concept of natural beauty to the American public?

Udall made his gloomy prediction as one of several cabinet officers to testify last week at the White House Conference on Natural Beauty.

Since the Kennedy administration took office in 1961, Udall has been the leader of Federal-Government conservation efforts. He has crusaded for many years to safeguard the dwindling glories of the American natural environment.

One need not be an expert, but need have only the senses of sight, smell, and hearing to recognize how right Udall is when he writes (in his book, "The Quiet Crisis"):

"America today stands poised on a pinnacle of wealth and power, yet we live in a land of vanishing beauty, of increasing ugliness, of shrinking open space, and of an overall environment that is diminished daily by pollution and noise and blight."

No, it is not possible to dispute Udall's view of the magnitude of the problem. But it is possible, we think, that the American people are more receptive to his point of concern than he imagines.

A strong case could be made—in this part of the country, at least—that much of the public is ahead of its political leaders on matters pertaining to preservation of natural assets.

One could point to the success of outdoor-recreation issues through the initiative process and at the polls, to the general acceptability of King County's large-scale parks-acquisition program, to the vigor of local conservation and beautification groups, to the care with which the average citizen tends the greenery in his own yard.

Udall and other administration leaders are doing well to sound the alarm. But if there is a strong and continuing follow-through at the national level to last week's conference, we think those leaders may be surprised at the strength of the response.

Congested living conditions have created among Europeans an overriding concern for safeguarding their remaining natural greenery and other natural assets. There are increasing signs a similar attitude is taking hold in the urban areas of America.

This country cannot afford to wait the two decades to attain the goal of full public awareness of the "quiet crisis."

As Marvin B. Durning, a Seattle delegate, told the White House conference, "Let us not underestimate the capacity or the willingness of Americans to work to preserve our natural heritage."

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times, June 4, 1965]

Seattle Needs Vision of What It Can Become

(By Walt Woodward)

Seattle citizens already have proven they have the capacity for the action necessary to preserve and develop their city's beauty. They lack only a vision of what the city can become.

So says Marvin B. Durning, a young attorney who already has demonstrated he has both vision and capacity for action. The fifth civic beauty advocate to talk to the Times on this subject, he says:

"With their support of Metro, of the marine-recreation-land initiative, and of the World's Fair, the people already have proven they will respond to exciting challenges. Now, they must pull back the veil of the future and envision what their city can be."

Durning, 35, a New Orleans native who came here in 1959, has reason to underscore the public's capacity of response. He led the campaign which resulted last fall in a 2-to-1 approval of an initiative earmarking more than $1 million annually in gasoline-tax refunds unclaimed by boatowners for purchase of marine-recreation areas.

Earlier, he drafted the Highway Advertising Control Act of 1961; subsequently, he aided in defending it in 1963 and 1965 legislative sessions.

He qualifies as an expert on civic beauty through his membership on Laurance S. Rockefeller's citizens committee for the report of the national Outdoor Recreation Review Commission, and in his participation as a panelist in the recent White House Conference on Natural Beauty.

Ask Durning to pull back Seattle's veil himself and this is what you hear.

"I see a waterfront open to the people to walk, boat, sit, look, fish. We need a public park and esplanade like the Langelinie in Copenhagen. I congratulate the central business district waterfront planners, but I don't think they have captured the potential. They should dream no little dreams.

"Second. I see a city where we have tamed the automobile and made provision for mass rapid transit. This may be a necessary condition for building a beautiful city. We must provide for the movement of people so that all our space is not surrendered to concrete highways, parking centers, automobile junkyards, and flag-fluttering 'gas' stations.

"We should plan now for the likelihood of Federal matching money for city beautification and for a law requiring that 3 percent of all Federal highway money be spent on landscaping. Why, that might amount to $1 million a year in King County, alone. Think how that might change a Rainier Avenue into a corridor of real beauty.

"Finally, I see a city with living trees, not dead ones holding up wires. Putting wires underground is a huge project, but its size shouldn't frighten us off. It should challenge us to get at it all the sooner.

"We should explore the spending of municipal funds for undergrounding as a local contribution to bring us Federal urban renewal matching funds. If the Federal program doesn't now permit this, we should ask for it; after all, the President asked for 'bold ideas.' If this can come about, we might find ourselves spending $2 million for undergrounding and getting $6 million in Federal matching funds."

Seattle faces nothing but change, Durning says. He cites predictions for 700,000 more persons in King County in just 20 years and of "hundreds of millions of dollars" in new construction.

"Save for retaining valuable old landmarks, Seattle will rebuild itself in the next several decades," Durning predicts.

This leads him, inevitably, to his firmly held conclusion that "now is the time, and Seattle is the place, to accomplish more for municipal beauty than ever has been done in any city of the United States."

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times, July 7, 1965]

Group To Seek Buried Lines, Street Trees

(Walt Woodward)

More civic-betterment projects have been talked to death than have been translated into meaningful action, but now there appears reasonable hope for action in the matter of preserving Seattle's civic beauty.

It is even reasonable to hope that this action will take place in the next few months. If so, this will be something. For it is summer.

Summer, as everyone knows, is no time—in this gorgeous Puget Sound country—to propel a volunteer civic-action program. Committee chairmen, along about now, usually throw up their hands in frustration. Half their committee members are off on vacations. The others much prefer playing twilight golf, sailing, or sitting on the patio in the cool of the evening to attending a meeting in some stuffy downtown room.

Yet there was such a meeting a few evenings ago.

Attending were about 20 people, including participants in a series of "Seattle Beautiful" articles which have been appearing in the Times.

Perhaps they have given themselves a name—Seattle Natural Beauty Associates. But that is relatively unimportant, for the group envisions no formal dues-paying organization. Most of its members feel that existing civic organizations are capable of providing the "muscle" for whatever action programs the group ultimately approves.

But there is nothing vague about the man who sits at the head table (call him the "chairman" if you must). He is Marvin B. Durning, 35-year-old attorney who already has proven himself to be a "doer" in the successful movements for highway advertising control and funds for acquiring recreational lands.

And there is nothing vague about what this little band of "doers" hopes to do. At that recent meeting, they put on the front burners both the placing underground of utility lines and street tree planting.

Jack B. Robertson, the man who led the highway advertising campaign, and J. Edwin Thonn, an attorney, were instructed to develop these lines of action on utility lines:

Determine the likely costs of urban-design studies for pilot projects in both Stewart Street and Rainier Avenue South, and ask the city council to authorize and finance both studies. Ask the council to approve a comprehensive ordinance which will require underground wires in all new and renewed construction and which will commit the city to gradual burying of utility wires in arterial streets.

Ibsen A. Nelsen, an architect who is president of Allied Arts of Seattle, Inc., and Mrs. Frederick M. Mann, Jr., chairman of that organization's street-tree committee, were asked to push into the task of preparing a complete new civic policy for street trees, including presentation of a model ordinance for city council adoption.

Still on the back burners are three other likely action programs: Inducing the city to embark on a program of creating viewpoints, open spaces, and green belts; land- and waterway-litter control and an industrial and waterfront paint-up campaign.

Among those participating in the group are four men who contribute the values they obtained as participants in the recent White House Conference on Natural Beauty. They, in addition to Durning and Robertson, are Thomas O. Wimmer and Robert Eyre.

There are others who are giving up pleasant summer evenings for civic beauty. But the time has not yet come for a great fanfare of publicity * * * and the danger of talking a fine thing to death.

Let's wait and see * * * and hope that, in reasonable time and in spite of summer, there soon will be action for a more beautiful Seattle.

CUBA IN FOCUS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, an articulate and dedicated Harvard-trained Cuban exile, Dr. Nestor Carbonell, Jr., delivered a speech early this year which escaped the attention of the Nation's press. Dr. Carbonell addressed the Second Annual Conference on Latin American Affairs at Princeton University on April 24, 1965. His four-part speech was entitled, "Cuba in Focus." I recommend it to the attention of my colleagues and readers of the RECORD and ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUBA IN FOCUS

(Address delivered by Dr. Néstor Carbonell, Jr., at the Second Annual Conference on Latin American Affairs, Princeton University, on April 24, 1965)

I. TRUTHS VERSUS FALLACIES

I welcome this opportunity to participate in this seminar on Cuba, organized under the auspices of a leading university which promotes the exchange of ideas, the confrontation of opinions, in an atmosphere of freedom and respect for all.

I value very highly the inalienable right to concur or dissent which we are exercising here today, for I come from a country where this right no longer exists. It has been abolished by a regime which boasts of having popular support, but does not dare to hold free elections; which claims to be fulfilling the economic and social needs of the people of Cuba, but has had to ration food, clothing, and other essentials of human life. A regime which promised to embrace the doctrine of humanism, but has resorted to purges, massive arrests and deportations, and to the firing squad. A regime which purported to convert the barracks of the Batista dictatorship into schools, but has transformed the island into the second military power of this hemisphere. A regime which announced the mass distribution of private estates and farms among the peasants, but which instead created large State cooperatives, policed by the government and opposed by an increasing number of peasants, whose resistance or lack of interest has determined a decline of more than 45 percent in the levels of agricultural production. A regime which raised the banner of national independence and self-determination, but has converted Cuba into a Soviet colony which threatens the peace and security of the hemisphere and disrupts the Alliance for Progress plans of economic development and social reforms for Latin America.

II. HOW DID IT HAPPEN?

You may still wonder how could this have happened to the freedom-loving people of Cuba; how could this Communist takeover have occurred only 90 miles off the coasts of the United States? The answer could be summarized as follows:

The Batista dictatorship weakened the democratic institutions and corrupted and demoralized the upper echelons of the army to the point where it collapsed when the dictator fled under the pressure exerted by national resistance and by the embargo upon shipments of arms to Cuba decreed by the Government of the United States.

Castro, entrenched in the mountains and portrayed as an evangelic redeemer by a formidable international propaganda apparatus, took advantage of the political vacuum which ensued. His promises of freedom, honesty in public administration and economic and social reforms under our 1940 Constitution, were only intended to give him time to place his men in key posts and to lay the foundations of the Communist regime.

When demagogic slogans did not suffice to calm the people of Cuba, the Castro regime resorted to class struggle and to the dissemination of terror. Thousands of Cubans from all walks of life were either arrested, executed, or exiled. In spite of this, internal resistance, which included sabotage in the cities and guerrillas in the mountains, began to undermine the regime. Then came the Bay of Pigs disaster which allowed Castro to defeat the invading forces and to capture many of the underground leaders who had not been informed of the details of the invasion. Notwithstanding this major defeat, internal resistance grew again, and it grew so powerful, that the Castro regime pierced the veil of Communist secrecy to secure the open and massive military aid from the Soviet bloc.

Even though the captive people of Cuba have not received the corresponding support from the Americas, in accordance with the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, the struggle against Communist domination continues inside Cuba, and the ramifications of the conspiracy against the Castro regime have reached the upper strata of the army and the militia, which at this very moment are being subjected to another violent and indiscriminate purge.

III. WHY CUBA?

Why was Cuba chosen by international communism as its launching pad for subversion and aggression in this hemisphere? A close look at the map of the Americas will give us the answer. From a geo-political standpoint, Cuba lies in the center of what has been called the American Mediterranean. Ever since its discovery by Columbus in 1492, Cuba has been regarded as a key to the new world.

In connection with the strategic importance of Cuba and the threat posed by its progressive fortification and subversive activities, a noted American strategist, Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, stated the following:

"Cuba stands astride the north-south sea lanes upon which the wartime survival and the economic well-being of the Americas depend. It commands the Caribbean and the Atlantic approaches to the Panama Canal."

"The Russian takeover of Cuba constitutes the most significant strategic achievement of world communism since the fall of mainland China in the Red orbit. What it means is that Russian communism has leap-frogged NATO, jumped the Atlantic, which historically has been our protecting moat, and established a bastion in the strategic heart of the Western Hemisphere." (Daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 25, 1963, pp. A4697–A4698.)

The entire hemisphere, especially the Latin American republics, have suffered the lethal effects of the Communist takeover of Cuba, which is used as a training center for Latin American terrorists, as an arsenal which supplies arms and ammunitions to Communist guerrillas, primarily in Colombia, Venezuela, and Guatemala, and as headquarters for Soviet espionage, propaganda and infiltration in the Americas.

Today, two and a half years after the October missile crisis, the fortification of the Island continues under the direction of Soviet experts. Military installations are still being constructed or enlarged, some of them connected with reinforced caves and tunnels, or with the deep bays of Cuba.

The Cuban underground has recently reported the arrival of a great variety of highly sensitive electronic equipment from the Soviet Union, supplementing those previously installed in Cuba. It is very difficult to determine at this time the purpose or implications of this electronic buildup. However, it is pertinent to recall that the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee of the United States disclosed not too long ago that "the potential exists to establish electronic warfare capabilities based on Cuba," and that "potentially, Cuba is a base from which the Soviets could interdict our vital air and sea lanes. It can now be used for the air, sea, and electronic surveillance of our military activities in the Southeast United States and the Caribbean." (Interim report on the Cuban military build-up issued by the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, May 9, 1963.)

IV. WHAT TO DO

Faced with this grave challenge, what can we do?

The majority of freedom-loving Cubans do not expect nor desire to turn back the clock of history, but rather look to the future for opportunities to attain social and economic progress and political stability under freely elected governments. With this in our mind and in our heart, we shall continue to exercise our inherent right to struggle against oppression.

This right, which is also a solemn obligation, shall not be relinquished now as it was not relinquished during the 30-year struggle against Spanish colonial rule. Resistance against the Cuban Communist regime shall continue through all possible means, including sabotage, infiltration and psychological and guerrilla warfare; with full knowledge that the odds are now against us, but with the firm conviction that the will of our freedom-loving people shall ultimately prevail.

Our objective is not only to recover our national independence and our right to self-determination, but also to prevent a major world conflagration which would certainly ensue if international communism is allowed to endure in Cuba and to make new inroads upon Latin America.

As we continue this bitter struggle, we trust that this great country will honor the 1947 Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance and the 1962 Congressional Joint Resolution on Cuba, whereby the United States committed itself to "work with the Organization of American States and with freedom-loving Cubans to support the aspirations of the Cuban people for self-determination."

From this powerful and generous country we expect the recognition of our belligerence and the aid consistent with its national interests and worldwide commitments.

International communism cannot and will not separate us. In times of peril and in times of peace, in times of sorrow and in times of joy, in times of despair and in times of hope, we shall remain united. For Cuba and the United States are indissolubly linked by geography, history, and the common ideals of freedom and progress under God.

WATER SHORTAGES

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I have addressed the Senate on several occasions during this session on the question of water shortages and the urgent need to increase our supplies of potable water. We must redouble our efforts in solving the problems of pollution. We must conserve our water through control of evaporation. We must experiment with weather modification in order to provide more water. We must divert from surplus areas to water deficient areas. We must desalinize our sea water and convert our brackish water into fresh, pure water. We must work with our neighbors to bring water from remote areas of the continent into the dry areas of this great North American Continent. Today, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to recent publications on water and suggest that they be read in full.

The first is the October 23 issue of the Saturday Review which contains a series of articles under the general heading, "The Crisis in Water." Since the articles are lengthy, I do not ask that they be reprinted in the RECORD, but I highly commend them for reading by my colleagues. I would hope that all of them could read the articles in there by Stewart Udall, Wallace Stegner, Gladwin Hill, and John Leer, as well as regional reports from various areas of our country.

The second is an article that appears in the current issue of the U.S. News & World Report, and is an interview with General Cassidy, the Chief of the Army Engineers. I ask unanimous consent that the article in the U.S. News & World Report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER PROBLEM IN UNITED STATES—WHAT CAN BE DONE ABOUT IT: INTERVIEW WITH THE CHIEF OF THE ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

(NOTE.—Is the United States running out of water? Will water troubles keep getting worse? Isn't there anything the country can do to assure adequate supplies of water, ready at the tap and free of pollution? What about floods? Can water problems be solved by trapping flood waters and then releasing them later when shortages threaten? These and related questions are on the minds of millions as water problems—drought, floods, pollution—spread across the country. To get authoritative answers, U.S. News & World Report invited Lt. Gen. William F. Cassidy, Chief of Army Engineers, to its conference room for this interview with staff members.)

Question. General Cassidy, as population skyrockets on the east coast, on the west coast, and in other areas, is there to be a water problem of major proportions in this country?

Answer. I would say that there are major water problems right now. There are parts of the United States, most of them in the West, where the balance between water supply and demand is now and always has been precarious. And now in a part of the country where we have always thought of water as being abundant we are faced with a difficult problem.

Question. Do you mean in the East?

Answer. That's right.

Question. Is the problem in the East one of water supply or proper utilization, or both?

Answer. Both. The drought has lasted for 4 years. But, basically, there is sufficient water in the East—both surface water and ground water. But some of the sources have become heavily polluted and are no longer usable. There is pollution by industry, pollution by municipalities, and there is salt-water pollution.

All these things are going on in the East, where we see a metropolitan area taking shape that stretches all the way from Boston down to Norfolk. To meet the needs of this vast strip city in the future, we must spread out and have a fully planned program of water development.

At the same time, we can't overlook problems that are developing all across the United States. Unless we get busy now, some parts of the country will face serious shortages by 1980, because by then our demand for water is going to double. And then demand will almost double again by the year 2000.

Question. What should be done to assure all parts of the United States enough water in the future?

Answer. Proper water management is the key. That means many things: pollution control and pollution abatement to protect the quality of water; transfer of water from one river basin to another; storage of heavy runoffs so that we prevent floods and, at the same time, save water for future use. Certainly the drought in the East illustrates the need for proper water management.

Question. Is the East going to face more severe shortages of water in the future than the West?

Answer. Not if water use and development is managed properly. There is more water in the East than there is in the West, so that, cared for properly—and this very definitely means conservation and pollution control—the East can go a long time before it becomes as short as the West.

Question. Where are the shortages most serious?

Answer. The areas of most serious shortage, taking them by basins, are these: the upper Rio Grande and the Pecos; the southern California area, although the California water plan will go a long way toward solving that problem; the upper Missouri area.

These are the areas that will suffer the earliest shortages, if we think of the way those areas would like to develop in the future. Their development may be limited by water shortages.

Question. When you listed the basins which face the worst shortages, you didn't mention the Delaware or the Hudson. Why not?

Answer. We were talking about severe water shortages. That area is not short on water. It requires development and proper management. As you get out in the West, it becomes a question of amount of water potentially available for development.

WHAT THE EAST CAN DO—

Question. Is the vast metropolitan area from Boston to Norfolk going to have to shift to some elaborate water plan such as the one in California?

Answer. I think they will have to come to combined systems of water management. Now we have individual systems of management. In northern New Jersey, for instance, there are many, many water companies. The problem there, if they're going to continue to supply the growing area, is for those people to get together and acquire and manage water, so that they can alleviate the shortages that might come in years of drought.

Basically, the problem is in the size of the water-collecting agencies. They don't have enough water within the area to run through a period of drought, so they'll have to reach out for more water and for more storage of water.

Question. Are there going to have to be more large dams and reservoirs in the East?

Answer. Yes, there will have to be more storage facilities and more development. There is a large amount of underground water in those States which can be tapped more heavily than it is at present. There must be a great effort in the Eastern States toward pollution control. This is one of their major problems. The water in many areas is now unusable without very heavy treatment.

Question. Take New York City. The Hudson flows by with plenty of water in it, yet the city has a water problem. Why?

Answer. Well, that has been mentioned quite often, but, if we go way back in history, we find that Henry Hudson was looking for fresh water as he sailed up the Hudson, but he found it was salt. The Hudson opposite New York City has a high salt content from the ocean. It isn't until you get pretty well up the Hudson that you begin to get water fresh enough for use. You see, that river is tidal all the way to Albany. But the Hudson will not become a good water-supply stream until pollution is abated.

Question. Where are new dams and reservoirs needed in the East?

Answer. Let's take the Delaware basin as one where we have a going project.

Now, the Delaware serves a four-State area, and for many years the States tried to get together to solve their water problems on the Delaware.

A study by the Corps of Engineers was authorized, and took quite a few years to carry out. In order to prepare the comprehensive plan it produced, we not only had to work with the States and get their full agreement on what would be done within the basin, but we had to work with all of the other Federal agencies concerned with water, so that we would come out with a truly comprehensive plan. The plan that has been worked out for the Delaware basin contemplates many headwater developments, and it contemplates, also, major storage dams down lower in the valley.

Question. By headwater development, do you mean dams on tributaries?

Answer. On tributaries, and on some quite small tributaries. These run into the hundreds, so that there will be the water storage in the upper areas and then major storage down in the lower basin. Tocks Island—near the Delaware Water Gap—is the largest one of these reservoirs. The proposed system of Federal reservoirs will provide a flow of a billion gallons a day from storage reservoirs during low-water periods. The total basin plan will provide almost double this supply.

Question. Would it meet the current emergency?

Answer. It would meet the current needs if the system were built.

Question. How much is this plan going to cost, overall?

Answer. The major Federal reservoirs called for by the plan will cost about a quarter of a billion dollars. To construct all of the reservoirs contemplated by the comprehensive plan will require expenditures exceeding a half billion. Additional large expenditures will be made for nonengineering activities.

Question. If the drought in the Northeast continues for another year or two, will that part of the country face a crisis of disaster proportions?

Answer. No, there is time to head off disaster. For the immediate future, if the drought continues, wells can be drilled to take care of northern New Jersey. Camden can probably take care of itself by drilling wells, too. Philadelphia could move its Delaware River intake upstream, or other measures—such as releases of upstream water—could be taken to hold the salt water wedge below the present intake at Torresdale.

Question. How about New York City?

Answer. New York City will have to conserve its water supply. I believe the city's best solution to another year of drought is to begin to correct its water system so as to conserve all the water possible. I think water meters would help, too.

For the long range in the Northeast, as far as the Federal Government is concerned, we are expediting the Delaware project as much as we can. Here we're talking on the order of 1969 and 1970.

Question. Does desalting of water offer an alternative, or a supplement, to the kind of projects that you've been describing?

Answer. Yes. The ocean is our primary source of water. So if we can develop saline water conversion plants to produce pure water at a reasonable cost, then cities and industries along the coast could certainly use that water. And in the interior there are many areas that have saline water that could be made usable. However, this is purely a matter of economics at the present time.

Question. How close are we to solving the economics of desalting water?

Answer. I think it is felt that if we can get the cost down to around 25 cents per thousand gallons, a well-developed municipality on the seacoast could afford to pay the price, after it had exhausted the sources normally utilized by cities. If you get it down to around 12 cents, then you might be able to use it for irrigation of certain high-value crops, but until costs can be brought within the 1- to 2-cent range it cannot be expected that desalinization will become an important factor in crop production by irrigation.

A plant now has been proposed for the San Diego area that would produce water at 22 cents a thousand gallons. That is the present estimate.

Question. Does this mean that we can count on desalinization of water in developing plans for the Nation's future water supply?

Answer. This may come in the future. But now, when we talk about the comprehensive development of a river basin, we are not considering desalinization. Remember that those figures are the cost of the water at the seacoast or other saline source. Then you must add the cost of transporting it to the point of demand.

Question. Aside from desalinization of water, can we develop new sources of water not now being tapped?

Answer. If you mean water sources that are unknown, the answer is "No." I do not think any exist. Now, there are ground water sources, such as those on the eastern seaboard, that are not being fully utilized. But in some Western areas we are overdeveloping ground water sources. We call it mining water—in other words, taking water out faster than it is being replaced by nature.

Question. In what areas?

Answer. The Central Valley of California, the Salt River Valley of Arizona and other areas.

Question. The high plains of Texas?

Answer. Yes.

Question. With the result that the water table is going down——

Answer. It is dropping very considerably.

Question. Are there other areas of the country where this is happening?

Answer. It is fairly general in the West. It does take place in areas of the East, but there it is more spotty.

REPLENISHING WATER SOURCES

Question. Is there anything you can do to replenish these underground reservoirs—aquifers?

Answer. There is, yes. The first thing is to control the use of the aquifer, and here we run into a question of water rights, water use and water law. But some of the States are moving in that direction. It is possible to recharge the aquifer by putting water on spreading ground so that it can sink down into the aquifer. Or you can actually pump water into the aquifer through special wells.

In the Los Angeles area, for example, where a good deal of the city's water supply comes from wells, the water that is brought over from the Colorado River is released into the Los Angeles River, and then is taken out of that river into spreading ground so that it will seep down and replenish the aquifer.

Question. General Cassidy, will proper management and use of water require more Federal control, since most rivers flow across State lines?

Answer. Not necessarily. The Water Resources Planning Act provides a method for solving water problems that cross State boundaries. Informally, we have done this before in the Delaware and the Missouri basins. We are trying to do it on the Potomac. But this act sets up the machinery for Federal-State coordination and then the reviewing of those things at the Federal level. And, in my mind, as we develop comprehensive plans, we must secure agreement of the States concerned in the basin before we can put in a sound plan.

Question. Are there development plans for all the major river basins of the country?

Answer. For most of them. There are comprehensive plans for the Columbia, the Missouri, and the Ohio. We have several studies underway in the North Atlantic region which will be combined in one North Atlantic regional study. Then there are studies in the Southern States, too.

These studies must be authorized and funded by the Congress, and while we have planned comprehensive studies for all of the basins, it still will be a step-by-step process, depending on budgetary processes and on the Congress itself.

Question. Are community restrictions on the use of water widespread across the country?

Answer. I would say the situation is widespread, intermittently. Right now, the East is suffering a drought. In Pennsylvania, New York, some of the New England States, there are many communities which are on a restricted basis.

A few years ago there was a very deep drought in the central area of the country, and many of the communities were restricted there. So this varies as the supply of water from rainfall varies.

Question. Is the problem more widespread than it was, say, 10, 15, 20 years ago?

Answer. Yes—because, as our population grows, as our industry grows, there is just a very rapidly increasing demand for more water.

Question. Demand for water has increased much faster than the population has increased, has it not?

Answer. Yes, because there are additional uses of water. Take food processing, for example. That's a very heavy demand now. There are additional uses within the home itself. As we get more bathrooms, we use more water. As we get more washing machines and dishwashers and disposals, we use more water. So, the per capita consumption has gone up tremendously from the days when you had to go out to the well and get your bucket of water. Now that you just have to turn a faucet, you use a lot more.

Question. Can you give us some figures on water use now, compared with past years?

Answer. I think I have some figures here. In 1950, we were withdrawing about 1,170 gallons per capita; 1960—1,520; 1980, estimated 2,250, and the year 2000 is estimated at 2,700. These figures include withdrawals for all purposes, including irrigation, manufacturing and cooling. The average water-supply system provides about 150 gallons per person each day.

Question. Do you have total-consumption figures?

Answer. I have a water-withdrawal figure. In 1950—175 billion gallons a day; 1960—270 billion gallons per day; 1980—550 billion gallons per day; the year 2000—890 billion gallons per day.

Now, this is the really critical figure. This is water withdrawal—what we take out of the systems of nature and put into our systems. We actually return somewhere in the neighborhood of 80 percent of that water to the streams after having mistreated it badly.

Question. Where does the other 20 percent go?

Answer. The biggest part goes into irrigation and becomes plants, becomes food. A good deal goes into tin cans. Beer is mostly water. There is liquid in a can of peas. This is your food-processing consumption. In cooling water and in other industrial uses, a lot of it is used up by evaporation.

Question. You talk about mistreating the 80 perecent of our water that goes back into rivers. Is there a major river in this country that isn't polluted?

Answer. Not if it has a man living beside it. I would say that the streams in the East, generally, are more polluted than the streams in the West, because there is more industry and more people around Eastern streams. In the West, the Columbia River, without much heavy industrial development along its banks, without many major cities, is a rather clean river. Most of the major streams in California are fairly clean. But, as you come East, you find more industry and more major cities using the water to carry their wastes.

Question. Can U.S. rivers be cleaned up if we just put enough money and energy into the effort?

Answer. Yes. The first thing, of course, is to clear up the source of the pollutant to the extent that we can. And here we talk in the order of 90-percent treatment. Then there must be enough water to carry the remaining 10 percent, to bring it back to a condition where it can be reused. About 70 million people in the United States use water that has been through a sewage-treatment plant, or used by some industrial plant, or steam powerplant at least once.

Question. Is it good water?

Answer. It is good water. When you take the Ohio River system, starting up in New York State and winding up, via the Mississippi, down at New Orleans, you can see that the cities along that system are going to have to use and reuse water as it moves down. Therefore, it is necessary that the water be kept at a certain quality so it can be reused. This is why low-flow regulation, dilution water becomes one of our greatest needs of the future.

COST OF CLEANING RIVERS

Question. We've heard a cost figure of $50 to $60 billion to control pollution in the streams. Is this about right?

Answer. I can only give you the figure for what we see as a requirement between now and 1980 for dilution water throughout the United States. This is about $15 billion. It's the cost of storing water so that it can be released during low-flow periods to carry away the waste that man will put into rivers even after 90-percent treatment. On top of this there's still another great cost in treating the water before it's returned to the stream.

Question. How much will such treatment cost?

Answer. That figure I don't know. This is the province of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department. But it would be a large figure. Take just one of the major problems in the older cities—the separation of storm flow from sewage systems. When you go into a city like Cleveland, for example, and think of building two separate systems, you are probably going to have to spend something on the order of a billion dollars.

Question. Are the older cities getting started on this?

Answer. I think they are studying the problem, and they immediately face the dollar problem.

Question. Over all, is the pollution problem getting better or worse?

Answer. We are so conscious of it that it is bound to get better, but it is going to cost a lot of money and take a lot of work before we can recover from what has happened in the past.

Question. As for the pollution problem in the Great Lakes——

Answer. This is part and parcel of the same problem. Heavy industry and large cities surround the lakes. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been studying the problem for some years now. Initially, their attention was given to Lake Michigan because of the diversion problem there.

Question. What do you mean, diversion problem?

Answer. The city of Chicago diverts 1,500 cubic feet a second from the lake down the Illinois River into the Mississippi to carry off its wastes. And then the waste water itself—the effluent from the factories and homes of the city—amounts to about 1,600 cubic feet per second. So, there's a total diversion there from Lake Michigan of about 3,100 cubic feet per second.

The other States bordering the lakes object to that diversion, because any change in lake levels has a great effect on the communities surrounding those lakes.

This is before a special master appointed by the Supreme Court. His findings will provide the basis for a subsequent decree by the Court.

HEW is now studying the problem of Lake Erie, which probably is more polluted than any of the other Great Lakes. Their study, of course, embraces only the American waters of that lake. But recently, the International Joint Commission has been asked to study the same problem in the area, in order to bring the Canadians in on the same study so that we can work together.

Question. Is Lake Erie so bad that its water is unusable for human consumption?

Answer. Sometimes they have to close beaches because of pollution. Of course, water for municipal use can be obtained by adequate treatment of even highly polluted water. But costs can become very high with increasing pollution.

Question. Can Lake Erie be saved?

Answer. Perhaps.

Question. Do you mean that, with all the vast knowledge and resources of this country, there is a question whether we can clean up Lake Erie?

Answer. No; we could do it if we were willing to spend enough money. You can always do a job from an engineering viewpoint if the cash is forthcoming. The study is underway to see how we can clean up the waters moving into that lake, and this will have to be both sides of the border. But I think the main pollution probably comes from our side.

Question. Here in Washington, fish are reported to be dying in the Potomac River from lack of oxygen. Is this happening in other rivers around the country?

Answer. It does happen in other rivers during periods of low flow, when dissolved oxygen drops below 3 to 5 parts per million. The measurement made at one point in the Potomac when they had that fish kill was 1 part per million of dissolved oxygen.

Question. Is this because drought had reduced the flow of the river?

Answer. It's the low streamflow plus the oxygen demand put on the river by the effluent dumped into it. It requires oxygen to "burn up" the organic matter in the effluent. Also, certain chemical compounds in the effluent feed algae, and the algae demand more oxygen.

Question. Could this be prevented if you build the dams and develop the Potomac River according to your plan?

Answer. I believe so. Our plan would provide for the release of 5,000 cubic feet per second right now at this time of low flow. If we provided that and if—on the HEW side—there was a 90-percent treatment of the effluent going into the river, yes, we would have a good river.

Now, when you get down into the estuary you have other problems. But down through the Great Falls of the Potomac you would have a clean river.

GROWING USE OF STREAMS

Question. General Cassidy, as you travel around the country, do you find that people want clean rivers?

Answer. I find that the great pressure for clean rivers is coming not only from those who want the water to use, but from those who want the water to play on for recreation.

Considering water as a commodity—the water you and I drink, the water we use in our homes—we don't care where it comes from. All we want is a quality and a quantity. The man who is interested in recreation, the man who is interested in beauty, wants quality and quantity within an environment. And we have to preserve that environment, too.

So, this tosses in another set of problems. We are very conscious of it, and have been for a long time. And, personally, I would be happy to see the passage of the Wild Rivers Act, because this would establish certain rivers to be left in their natural state. Now, this isn't going to happen unless somebody else takes a hand.

Question. What are some of the rivers that would be included under the Wild Rivers Act?

Answer. Among them are the Salmon and Clearwater in Idaho, the Rogue in Oregon, and the Upper Rio Grande in New Mexico. In addition, there are separate proposals to establish national scenic riverways along some streams; for example, the St. Croix between Minnesota and Wisconsin, and the Allagash in Maine.

If we are going to have wild streams in the future as this land becomes loaded with people, then we must take steps to preserve them now. And this does not mean just keeping dams away from them. It means ownership and control of the banks, because the beauty of a river can be destroyed by what happens on the banks. So the Federal, State and local governments must hold these rivers just as we hold the National and State parks.

At the same time, since there will be relatively few users of the wild rivers, we have to develop recreation on our reservoirs and lakes, which can offer fun for large numbers of people. There is growing pressure—as people in this country have more leisure time—for water that can be used for recreation.

Question. Can you give us some idea of how fast this pressure is growing?

Answer. Well, in 1950 we recorded about 16 million visitor-days at our water projects. In 1964, this figure jumped to 156 million. Now, these are just the reservoir areas on which we have placed recreational sites. This doesn't include the beaches we have improved, boat-navigation channels that we improved, our locks and dams, things like that.

Man wants, as he makes more money and has more time, to get out to see and to do. He wants water-based recreation close by and he wants it in a beautiful setting. So this is just another kind of pressure that is being pushed on us to clean up our rivers and to meet the demands of the future.

Question. Everything considered, what is our biggest water problem in this country now—floods or drought, or what?

Answer. I would say water management. While floods cause tremendous damage, the biggest demand of the future is probably low-flow regulation in dry periods. These problems go hand in hand, because you save the flood to use it later to regulate low flow.

FLOOD PROBLEMS INCREASING

Question. Where are the remaining major flood-control problems in this country?

Answer. Well, man is moving so fast in his development in the United States that he's occupying the flood plains of the streams all throughout the States. And every time he sits on a flood plain, he creates another flood problem. Actually, the flood problem is increasing faster than we're taking care of it.

Question. But along the Missouri, for example, you can sit on the flood plain at Omaha with a certain amount of assurance now, which you couldn't do 10 years ago——

Answer. But you get on some of the little tributaries along the Missouri where there's no levee in front of you and it's like sitting along the ocean in the tidal area. You know the tide is going to make your feet wet.

Question. Are the flood problems largely on the tributaries now?

Answer. Generally they're on the smaller rivers of the country. The larger rivers are pretty well taken care of.

Question. There were serious floods along the upper Mississippi this past spring, weren't there?

Answer. Yes. You see, there is no major flood-protection system on the upper Mississippi, and they had floods up there exceeding anything of record. But when the high water reached the lower Mississippi, without additions from the Ohio and Missouri—which are pretty well controlled—there wasn't any appreciable flood in the lower valley.

Question. Is there a plan for the upper Mississippi?

Answer. There are plans and there are projects, on which we expect to go ahead now at a faster rate.

Question. Can you foresee the time when there will be no great flood disasters in this country?

Answer. Great flood disasters, I think, can be eliminated along the major streams, but there will always be floods in some parts of the country as people live on the flood plains.

Question. Is there anything that the engineers could have done to prevent the flood damage caused by the tidal waves that Hurricane Betsy forced up the Mississippi River?

Answer. We have a plan proposed for the protection of that area against hurricanes. It is quite a large and costly plan. If this protection had been built before this hurricane, it is probable that the disaster would have been much less. Particularly, the flooding would have been much less.

Question. Would you describe this project to us?

Answer. It essentially consists of levees and sea walls along the Lake Pontchartrain front, and then back levees around other parts of the city. We are bringing the levees up to a height that will prevent overtopping, and we are making them stronger. A good deal of the flooding of New Orleans was caused by breaches in the back-levee system. This system will give a very high degree of protection. But, as in all protection systems, you can't guarantee that a storm won't come along that is able to top it.

Question. Is that plan before Congress now?

Answer. This plan is now before the Congress and it may be authorized by the omnibus bill now under consideration.

You see, all hurricane protection requires a 30-percent contribution by the local people. So that, after a project is authorized, you still must get the local cooperation, and local governments still must provide the easements and rights-of-way. There has been some problem of that kind in some areas.

Question. Are there plans for hurricane protection in other coastal areas?

Answer. Yes. Some are comparable to that for the New Orleans area and some are different types.

Question. What would be the estimated cost of the New Orleans project?

Answer. Eighty million dollars, including both the Federal and non-Federal shares.

Question. Can you foresee a situation in which the growth of the United States would actually be limited for want of water?

Answer. Not within the foreseeable future. We do have a good deal of water in this country. But growth in certain areas of the country will be limited.

On the other hand, you find that much of the country's rapid growth is taking place in areas where water is available in quantity and quality. The area along the Texas coast has been growing in petrochemical industries because there is water available. There's been tremendous growth of industry in the Ohio Valley—some $22 billion of investment in the last 15 years—because there is water there and there is also transportation and power. Another area of tremendous industrial growth is found down in the Mississippi, Alabama, and Georgia area.

A FEASIBLE WATER PLAN

Question. Have you looked at this so-called North American Water and Power Alliance proposal that involves collecting vast quantities of water in reservoirs up in Canada, and then bringing that water down into many parts of the United States?

Answer. Yes. It was initially conceived by one of the top engineering firms in this country, so we can say that it is feasible from an engineering standpoint. There is a considerable price tag on it.

Question. That price tag is reported to be around $100 billion. Is there a cheaper way to solve our water problems?

Answer. If there is an ultimate need for that amount of water to supply a continuously growing population, then we may have to pay the price for that plan or for some other method that would tap other resources.

THE FAITH OF FREEMEN

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, last night the sovereign grand commander of the Supreme Council 33° Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, Southern Jurisdiction, held an unusual meeting. Men from all over the United States were there. On that occasion a great man was honored. This man is the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover.

J. Edgar Hoover responded with a message of great importance to our country. It is a message that every thoughtful American should read and ponder upon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hoover's message entitled, "The Faith of Free Men" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FAITH OF FREEMEN

(Remarks of J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, before the Supreme Council, 33° of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, Southern Jurisdiction, U.S.A., in Washington, D.C., October 19, 1965)

This is the proudest moment of my 45 years' membership in the Masonic Order. To receive the Grand Cross of the Scottish Rite is an honor which I shall cherish always. This award is made all the more meaningful by the high respect which Freemasonry commands in the minds of all who have felt its wholesome influence and observed its good works.

The strong virtues of the Masonic movement are indelibly etched in every chapter of our Nation's history. Masons helped to carve our country's early settlements out of a hostile wilderness that was Colonial America. They added vital fuel to the fires of freedom which burned so intensely from Boston to Savannah some two centuries ago. They stood prominent among the bold colonists who affixed their signatures to the Declaration of Independence in 1776 and, 11 years later, to the Constitution of the United States.

George Washington, the Father of our Country, was a Master Mason—a statesman of greatest courage and dedication who envisioned America as a land where men of all creeds might live together and worship together in freedom under God.

The brave patriots who served under General Washington at Valley Forge—and their latter-day counterparts at San Juan Hill, Belleau Wood, Corregidor, the Yalu Valley—made grave sacrifices that liberty and justice might prevail. They fought then—as Americans stand prepared to fight today—to uphold a cause which draws its greatest strength from an abiding faith in man's ability to guide his own destiny with the help of God.

Today, our priceless heritage of freedom is under relentless attack both at home and abroad. In the jungles and rice fields of southeast Asia, Americans in uniform maintain a constant vigil against the Communist hordes of a modern-day Genghis Khan to whom no commodity is cheaper than human life.

In Europe and the Near East, our country's patience and determination are constantly strained by the taunts and provocations of Iron Curtain slavemasters who talk of peace while clandestinely plotting to spread their godless creed of utopia-in-chains.

Throughout Central and South America, we have had to erect guard posts of freedom against the sinister efforts of Communist henchmen to spread the malignant cancer of Marxism across the Western Hemisphere. Not only have we seen the results of their treachery in Cuba, but the Dominican Republic could be a Marxist satellite today were it not for the fast action taken by a courageous President and alert Americans to thwart a Communist takeover there earlier this year.

Communism is a vast international conspiracy which today dominates one-third of the earth's people. Here, in our own country, that conspiracy is represented by the Communist Party, U.S.A., a bold and defiant band of anti-American turncoats whose operations are directed and controlled by the Kremlin in Moscow.

The Communist profess to be a legitimate political organization. This is not so. Actually, the party constitutes a foreign outpost on America's shores. Its members—knowingly, deliberately, and willingly—are active tools of the Soviet Union.

Witness, for example, the programs which occupy the primary attention of Communist Party members in this country: withdrawal of American support from South Vietnam; noninterference with Communist terrorists in Santo Domingo; appeasement in all dealings with members of the Marxist world.

The Communists speak of peace, but peace at an exorbitant and heart-rendering price—submission to Communist domination. From 50 years of dealings with the Stalins, the Khrushchevs, the Brezhnevs, the Castros, the Mao Tse-tungs, this bitter lesson has been learned by the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

Yet, in country after country, there still remain the legions of uninformed, misinformed, and politically naive who are the non-Communist dupes and fellow travelers whom the Communists rely upon to carry forward their programs for world domination.

We find these dupes in shocking abundance in our own United States where Gus Hall, the Moscow-trained general secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., boasted to newsmen last fall that there are approximately 100,000 Americans within the party's influence. About 10 percent of them, he said, are dues-paying members. The remainder he described as close sympathizers.

These sympathizers include growing numbers of young people—because the major target of Communist propaganda and exploitation in the United States today is the Nation's youth.

Standing in the forefront of the Communist campaign to confuse the minds, distort the thinking and win the support of our young people is the DuBois Clubs of America—an illegitimate spawn conceived by the Communist Party and nurtured by a trusted band of youthful adherents to the cause of world Marxism.

Leaders of the DuBois Clubs of America were prominent among the Communists who attended a special youth leadership school sponsored by the party last June to prepare for a stepped-up campaign of recruitment and agitation among youth. Already, this fall, there are signs that these training sessions have begun to bear fruit—in the form of defiant protests against law and authority.

Today, as never before, the Communists are confident of their ability to win recruits among this country's youth. That is why the party has placed such intense emphasis upon its campus speech program—a program that has seen skilled hucksters of atheism and treason appear at scores of colleges and universities from New York to California, without objection by the authorities of those institutions of higher learning and often with positive encouragement by members of the faculties of such universities.

What do these party spokesmen have to say to our young people? In the State of Washington, one Communist speaker loudly condemned the United States for its actions in helping to defend the cause of freedom in the Far East. He charged his audience that it was their duty to demand immediate withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam.

In Missouri, another party functionary told a group of students that the United States is the "most hated country" in the world.

And in Rhode Island, a third Communist explained that the wall of Berlin had been built to hold back undesirables from the West who were infiltrating East Germany.

The Communist movement, Communist regimes, and those who knowingly support them are really ultrareactionary. They are the worst enemies of freedom and social justice.

Our university professors and students would serve their country and professions with fruitful distinction if they were to study this historic development and become not only academic but dynamic fighters against the Communist drive to dominate the world and impose on mankind the Soviet system of tyranny.

It is one of the glaring contradictions of our day that the same Communist spokesmen who are so glib-tongued in their appearances before groups of college students immediately lose their voices when placed under oath in a court of law or before a committee of Congress. They always take refuge behind the fifth amendment. Our moral atmosphere would be better if they knew as much about the Ten Commandments as they do about the fifth amendment.

Communists refuse to testify at any proceeding where they are subect to fines and imprisonment for deliberate lies and distortions. In the dark world of communism, there is no room for truth—just as there is no place for freedom and decency and God.

In their campaign to weaken and destroy the cause of democracy, the Communists actually are receiving invaluable aid from far too many intended victims.

I refer to the pseudoliberals of the extreme left, as well as the misguided zealots of the ultra right—modern-day Don Quixotes who mistakenly fight the transparent shadows of imaginary enemies rather than meet the challenge of the real and awesome problems confronting our beloved United States.

I refer to the Ku Klux Klan and other hatemongers, regardless of their color or creed, who practice a doctrine of intolerance, bigotry, and intimidation toward their fellow man.

I refer to the unkempt characters of pliable minds and persuasion who eagerly attach themselves to any cause which runs counter to convention—and to the morally corrupt opportunists who flagrantly exploit their naive enthusiasm and credulity for self-serving purposes.

I refer also to the highly vocal rabblerousers of dubious stability and motivation who encourage defiance of the law by counseling cynicism and disrespect toward family, law and order, and all forms of authority.

"Civil disobedience," a seditious slogan of gross irresponsibility, has captured the imagination of citizens who are morally, mentally, and emotionally immature. It has been spread at street corner rallies by those who would use it as an avenue to personal power and prestige. And it has been spread in the false guise of academic freedom in the halls of public and private institutions that have permitted emotional and often obscene harangues against morality and reason. What they really seek is license, not freedom.

I am greatly concerned that certain racial leaders are doing the civil rights movement a great disservice by suggesting that citizens need only obey the laws with which they agree. Such an attitude breeds disrespect for the law and even civil disorder and rioting. The citizen has no latitude as to what laws he must obey. If he feels a law is wrong or unjust, he has recourse to established constitutional procedures to have it changed through his legally elected representatives.

It is reprehensible for any person to select those laws he will obey and those he will ignore. Such defiance is a form of anarchy. It is shameful and disgraceful for persons in high authority to condone or urge the breaking of established laws.

I have also become increasingly concerned about the influence wielded upon the impressionable minds of our youth by some so-called educators, such as the college professor who reportedly urged a group of students at the University of California to burn their draft cards, refuse to pay income taxes, and, if necessary, go to jail for their actions.

Civil disobedience is not, and must not become, an accepted norm of behavior in a society of freemen. It leads to anarchy, and preempts all possibility of rational discussion or appeal.

No longer can respectable citizens complacently stand by while celebrity status is accorded those whose sick minds and corrupt souls who tamper with and ridicule our orderly processes of government under law.

We must choose between law and anarchy, freedom and chaos.

Is America as a nation being swept by an epidemic of spiritual malnutrition? I fervently hope not; but the danger signs are all too clear. I fear that the public may be coming to accept widespread lawlessness as an unavoidable adjunct to our way of life.

What has happened to the civic pride, the righteous indignation, of otherwise respectable citizens who turn their backs on helpless victims of beatings, robberies and sex crimes? The incredibly indifferent attitude of these people is exacting a heavy toll. It has helped to turn the streets and parks of many cities into virtual jungles of fear—where, according to a recent survey, nearly one-half of the residents are afraid to walk alone at night.

Despite the continuing efforts of some self-professed experts to minimize the crime problem, the undeniable fact remains that crime is increasing—in both numbers and intensity—at an alarming rate. It is growing six times as fast as our expanding population.

Last year, more than 2,600,000 serious offenses were reported to law enforcement agencies throughout the United States. This is the largest total on record. It means that more Americans felt the ravages of crime last year than ever before.

Today, the onslaught continues—with five serious offenses being recorded every minute. There is a vicious crime of violence—a murder, forcible rape or assault to kill—every 2½ minutes; a robbery, each 5 minutes; a burglary, every 28 seconds; and 52 automobiles are stolen every hour.

These figures are based on facts—unlike the illogical and inane criticism which has been voiced by that peculiar clique of sociologists and criminologists who are apparently suffering armchair fatigue. These impractical theorists who attempt to define away our crime problem should step from their paper castles into the world of reality.

No one is more keenly aware of, or more deeply concerned with, the ravages of crime than the President of the United States. Last month, in signing the Law Enforcement Assistance Act—a bill designed to help strengthen the delicate machinery of justice in this country—he declared, "The control of crime is a major target of this administration."

The President has appointed a special Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice to look into and seek answers for the problems of crime control. He has the support of every responsible law-enforcement official in this vital undertaking.

There is an urgent need today for realistic thought and realistic action in meeting the challenge of crime and immorality. This is especially true in the critical area of youthful criminality—where society has too long been asked to endure gross abuses of public and private trust by shallow-minded juvenile authorities.

The true meaning and intent of our great national holidays have been defiled by bands of defiant youths such as the arrogant young hoodlums who turned the Fourth of July this year into a nightmare of terror and destruction at resort communities in Ohio, Missouri, Iowa, and New York. Reports that participants in these orgies of lawlessness were being released after payment of small fine caused one great newspaper to observe, "About all that such slaps on the wrist will do is bring them out in force again next year. What they need, and what they ought to get, is 6 months at hard labor."

Whenever dangerous young hoodlums are encouraged to develop an attitude of "I can get away with anything—I'm a juvenile," society suffers and justice becomes a meaningless expression. Parental neglect, excessive weakness, categorical leniency, destroy respect for law and for those charged with its enforcement.

In complaining last year of what it termed "turnstile justice," a major newspaper in New York demanded, "it's time that the public was told just why so many young criminals and terrorists are passed through this turnstile and sent back to the streets to kill, rape, rob, and assault the innocent."

Exaggerated charges? Not in the least. From 1960 through 1964, no less than 225 police officers were killed in line of duty. Nearly one-third of the hoodlums arrested in connection with these murders were on parole or probation when the killings occurred.

The lives of six of these officers were claimed by criminals who had been paroled for a prior murder. Eleven lives were taken by offenders who had been paroled after confinement for felonious assault; and 32 of these officers were killed by paroled robbers.

We recently completed an examination of the records of nearly 93,000 criminals who were arrested in 1963 and 1964. This disclosed that 76 percent—more than three-quarters—had been arrested on at least one previous occasion. Over one-half of them had received lenient treatment, including parole, probation, and suspended sentences, at some point in their criminal careers—and these criminals recorded an average of more than three additional arrests after their first encounter with the school of soft justice and official leniency.

Forty-one years ago, an experienced attorney and jurist in New York issued the strong warning: "It is not the criminals, actual or potential, that need a neuropathic hospital. It is the people who slobber over them in an effort to find excuses for their crimes. The demand of the hour in America, above all other countries, is for jurors with conscience, judges with courage, and prisons which are neither country clubs nor health resorts."

The same "demands of the hour" continue to exist today. Tragically, the atmosphere of many courtrooms is still polluted by some jurors who deliberately close their minds to the evidence before them. Too many of our judges seek out technicalities rather than guilt or innocence. A trial should truly represent an enlightened search for truth so that deception, surprise, technicalities, and delay will be obliterated. The jousting in legal mumbo-jumbo resorted to by too many of our judges makes a farce of our judicial system.

But even if he should be convicted, the criminal knows that regardless of his past record there is steadily increasing hope for a suspended or a probationary sentence or an early release on parole.

The decent people in all sections of the country—East, West, North, and South—have suffered too long at the hands of terrorists set free with little more than a pretext of impartial consideration of their guilt.

They have tired of the street brawl tactics displayed by those lawyers-criminal who employ any means the courts will tolerate to defeat the interests of justice.

They are losing patience with systems of parole and probation that are little more than conveyor belts from our prisons and court chambers back to the underworld.

And they have become nauseated by the irresponsible actions of other "sometime" Americans such as those fair-weather patriots who eagerly grasp every right and privilege which our country guarantees its inhabitants—while ignoring the duties and obligations that citizenship necessarily entails.

Those who seek equal rights under the law should be taught to assume equal responsibility before the law. Certainly, civil rights and individual dignity have their vital place in life, but what about the common good and the law and order that preserve us all from lapsing back into the jungle?

We must have a world ruled by law. I am not one of those who believe in adding a great many more laws. The crux of the problem is that we do not observe the laws we already have; nor is the spirit of these laws interpreted by our courts to give equal justice to the criminal and to law-abiding citizens who are the victims of the savagery perpetrated on our streets and highways.

During my early years, a strong and lasting impression was made on my life by a schoolteacher who told our class one day that, in order to receive passing grades and qualify for graduation, each of us would have to master the "three R's" of reading, writing and arithmetic. "But," she continued, "I hope you learn far more than that in my classroom because, in order to achieve true happiness and success in life, you will have to master an additional set of 'R's,' the 'three R's' of Americanism—reason, respect, and responsibility."

Then she added, "You will also find that there is a fourth 'R' which is sacred to America. It is religion."

Today, there is a most urgent need for Americans to rededicate themselves to the strong moral principles upon which our Nation was founded.

As Ralph Waldo Emerson said, "The true test of civilization is not the census, nor the size of cities, nor the crops—no, but the kind of man the country turns out."

Faith dominated the atmosphere at Independence Hall in Philadelphia where the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution were framed.

Faith is our mainstay in the ideological struggle now raging between the camps of God-less communism and human freedom.

And faith remains our strongest bulwark against the criminal and subversive enemies who would destroy our priceless heritage of liberty and justice for all. But faith without work will be of no avail—there must be unity of purpose.

America will continue to progress in dignity and freedom so long as our people cherish liberty and justice and truth and honor God.

Faith in God. That is the fortress of free men.

COMPULSORY UNION MEMBERSHIP

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in the October 5 issue of the Chicago Daily News appeared an article entitled "Union Victory in Court Stirs Rights Issue," written by John M. Johnston. I quote especially one sentence from Mr. Johnston's article, in these prefatory remarks:

> However, these union shop contracts were originally sanctioned by the courts on the representation that the only obligation imposed on the unwilling members was the payment of dues. It was only fair, ran the argument, that all workers in a plant should share the cost of bargaining that presumably benefited all.

The decision of the circuit court of appeals in declaring that a union has a right to fine a member for crossing a picket line demonstrates how far beyond the original reasons given for the legitimacy of compulsory union membership the courts have gone.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article referred to printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNION VICTORY IN COURT STIRS RIGHTS ISSUE

(By John M. Johnston)

A labor contract that requires employees to join a union as a condition of keeping their jobs can be called compulsory unionism, for the element of compulsion is clear. The unions prefer to call this requirement a "union security" clause, although it is not clear why a union cannot be secure without lassoing unwilling members. A neutral description is "union shop."

So, when the U.S. circuit court of appeals here recently handed down an opinion in which it cited, among the facts of the case, the existence of a union security clause, you got a good idea at once of how the decision would fall.

And it did. The court upheld the right of the United Auto Workers to fine members who had crossed a picket line to work during a strike. A footnote in the opinion implied that the fines of $20 to $100 were modest, since the union constitution provides for fines up to $100, and each crossing of the picket line was a separate offense.

Now that the principle has been established, unions need not be so restrained, and a strikebreaker could be fined a ruinous sum—and one collectible through the courts.

The opinion, written by Circuit Judge Roger J. Kiley, gave the unions an exhilarating incidental bonus by its assertion that "a union is a form of industrial government" with its members having "duties * * * similar to those of citizens in a democratic society."

This is the contention the unions have been making in the fight to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. This section permits the States, through right-to-work laws, to prohibit these "union security" contracts. But if unions are to be a form of industrial government, no worker can be exempt from their jurisdiction.

However, these union shop contracts were originally sanctioned by the courts on the representation that the only obligation imposed on the unwilling members was the payment of dues. It was only fair, ran the argument, that all workers in a plant should share the cost of bargaining that presumably benefited all.

Now, however, unions have become a form of government and can compel obedience to the will of the majority by fines.

It seems to me that if a worker chooses voluntarily to subject himself to union discipline by joining, he has no complaint at being punished for violating the rules. But an unwilling member, dragooned into the union on the plea that he should help pay for its bargaining, is deprived of due process of law when he is subjected to fines.

The court asserted that unions must have the power to fine members in order to control wildcat strikes. Again, the argument may be valid for voluntary members. But a wildcat strike is in violation of contract, is subject to injunction, and strikers could be fired by their employer. No further union club should be necessary.

The questions raised in this case are fundamental to the issue of repeal of 14(b) which the U.S. Senate is considering this week. The decision ought to be proof enough that right-to-work laws provide a basic protection for the civil rights of a minority.

MILITARY OPERATIONS IN VIETNAM—ADDRESS BY GEN. HAROLD K. JOHNSON

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, one of the most encouraging reports which I have heard in recent weeks on our military operations in Vietnam is contained in an address by Gen. Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, before the 22d annual luncheon meeting of the National Security Industrial Association, October 7, in Washington.

General Johnson cited a resident of Hawaii, S. Sgt. James K. Akuna, 1st Battallion, 503d Infantry, Lanai City, Lanai, for the enterprise and bravery which he displayed in a rice paddy area not far from Saigon.

I am pleased to call this address to the attention of my Senate colleagues. If there are no objections I respectfully request that this address be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GEN. HAROLD K. JOHNSON, CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. ARMY

Last January it was my privilege to speak before the 17th annual Pacific coast regional dinner held by your association in Los Angeles. I had recently returned from my second trip to Vietnam, and what I had seen going on in that country was very much on my mind.

I felt impelled to talk about Vietnam, because I was not certain that people fully appreciated or had much knowledge about what we are trying to do in that part of the world. In the 10 months that have passed, events have moved so rapidly that while it is still important to explain why we are in Vietnam, it is perhaps more important to explain how we are doing there.

Much of my working time these days is taken up with our situation in Vietnam, and the efforts the Army is taking to improve its performance in this chapter of its history. Your forces are performing exceptionally well under the extremely trying and difficult conditions of a war in which the front is everywhere and remains difficult to identify.

I am certain you read one or more of our newspapers and news magazines and thus know as much as I do about the press coverage of the Vietnam situation. I must say that our press people in the field and here in Washington are doing a fine analytical job in keeping the American public informed. Unlike the criticism that has developed out of some past international crises, I can assure you that the Government is making available to the American press just about all the news that can be released without infringing on security.

Thus today I am not going to dwell in any detail on why we are in Vietnam. Instead, I would like to say a few words about the broader implications of the Vietnam event—why it exists at all; what along this line we can anticipate in the future; and what the Army is trying to do about it.

If we can stand back a bit from current events and take a broader look at our times, it is possible to see that Vietnam is just part of a pattern of events that have taken place since the end of World War II. In the span of the last 20 years there have been more than 240 wars of one kind or another. Discarding inconsequential conflicts, one can list over 100 significant instances of resort to violence in the political process. Almost all of these disruptions of the peaceful political process took place in relatively undeveloped countries located in the Southern Hemisphere—in Latin America, Africa, and southeast Asia. Ninety percent of these were revolutions—armed insurgencies—afflicting in total some 68 nations. Communists were identifiably prominent in at least 50 percent of these attacks against established government.

Whether we as Americans agreed with the policies of the governments concerned is not as important as the fact that both the frequency of this conflict, and the incidence of Communist participation are adverse. If we project the record of the past 20 years statistically into the future, we can reasonably expect a certain number of such conflicts in the months and years ahead of us, if this trend continues. There is no reason to expect that the trend will not continue, and we can regard the Vietnam event only as the largest, current manifestation of this turn in international politics.

Research into this phenomena of our times has been revealing. The causes of insurgency, and the ever-present danger of its "escalation" as we currently witness it, are basically twofold:

First, we are witnessing in our century something new in social evolution. In our generation there are large populations of formerly primitive peoples who are no longer satisfied with the life their fathers left to them. Advances in education and international communication have brought to them knowledge and realization that Western society as we know it is enjoying an incomparable prosperity and standard of living. Dissatisfied with their own economic status, these traditional societies—many of them newly organized into young, emergent nations—show a tremendous surge in desire to modernize themselves.

This desire for progress bears with it many internal pressures. The rising expectations of the people bring them to demand more of their community, more of their national government, more, indeed, of life itself. Often these aroused hopes are frustrated by political instability and economic stagnation. Feeling these internal pressures, some of the political leaders of these nations are attracted to proposals and assistance which appear to offer some quick relief to their plight.

It is at this point that the second cause of incipient insurgency frequently enters the international picture. This is the deliberate attempt of a Communist power to seize control of an emerging nation, either through economic blandishment or through armed force.

We have had a perfect example of this in the recent upheaval in the Dominican Republic. This was an instance where certain dissident elements in the Dominican Army mutinied in an attempt to overthrow the triumvirate which was the then established government of the country. Whether the government could have quelled this mutiny, particularly if it had acted a little faster, remains unknown. What is certain, however, is that the actions taken by the Communist elements in the country to seize control of the mutiny undermined the government's capability to control the mutiny and prevent national damage and loss of life.

The rebels were themselves divided, some wanting to restore former President Juan Bosch and others opposing his restoration. The Bosch supporters took to the streets, and the revolutionary movement took a tragic turn. Arms from the military arsenals were handed out to the civilian rebels. Communist leaders, many of them trained in Cuba, took increasing control of the revolution. What began as a popular democratic revolution that was committed to democracy and social justice moved into the hands of Communist conspirators.

In Vietnam we have seen quite a different situation, although the end objective has been the same—seizure of absolute power by a Communist government.

In Vietnam the Communists have been working underground ever since the withdrawal of the French following the defeat at Dienbienphu. Indeed, the Communists have been at work on their designs in southeast Asia ever since the Japanese moved in there during World War II.

Initial Communist attempts in South Vietnam did not take the form of attempted popular uprising. There is much evidence that, whereas the Central Government in Saigon was left alone, a subtly organized campaign was conducted to seize control of the country at the local governmental level. We know that the Communists—or Vietcong—have for some years been trying to take over control of the people. The tactics used are persuasion and terror. Communist cells operating within the villages systematically murdered the village chiefs and other local officials who did not cooperate. By the end of 1964 about 15,000 small officials had been assassinated in this way. These tactics might have been more noticeable to the outside world if the Chief of State had been assassinated, or if 15,000 soldiers had been killed in an organized military campaign, but the Vietcong did not operate that way. They subverted the countryside—in effect tried to isolate Saigon politically—and collected their own taxes. You might say that the Communists were not outfighting the Saigon Government by military means; it was not necessary. They were undermining the Government in many rural areas through terrorism.

The Government reacted eventually and we have seen a steady increase in counterguerrilla activity until other nations, including our own, have been drawn into the conflict in a most intimate way.

Thus, within the last few months we have had two entirely different examples of armed insurgencies, but they illustrate the types of international disorder we have been experiencing on an ascending scale since the end of the Korean war. Both were attacks against established government, and ostensibly by peoples within the Nation itself though Communist support was clearly evident. Both were undeveloped countries burdened with uncertain political stability and economic insufficiency.

You are fully aware that the Army is not a policymaking organization. It is merely an instrument of policy. As such an instrument we have learned that we, and the other services, are being employed today in operations which, although some military combat may be involved, cannot be classified as "war" as we have known it in the past.

Essentially, we are being employed by our Government to restore stability or to provide a climate of order in which government, under law, can function effectively in those instances where the United States has been asked for assistance and it is clearly in our national interest to provide assistance.

As you are aware, in the last few years considerable money has been spent in modernizing the Army and the other military services. Since 1961, the Army alone has invested over $9 billion in weapons, equipment, ammunition, and other supplies. I must add that we are not through procuring modern materiel. To support the war in Vietnam and other commitments, the administration has asked Congress for an additional $2,400 million of which more than $600 million will be spent on Army procurement.

These are big money figures. They represent taxes paid by all of us, and they represent, in part, the investment the American people have put into our capability to bring an end to Communist-supported insurgency as we have witnessed it in the Caribbean and in southeast Asia. Therefore, it is entirely proper for citizens to ask, "How are we doing?"

I am not going to be modest on this point, because our soldiers are doing a magnificent job around the world in everyday activities that speak louder than words. They are the men who stand on the firing line in some place like a street corner in Santo Domingo, or in a patch of jungle in South Vietnam. The manner in which they have conducted themselves gives me every conviction that we are doing very well, indeed.

To illustrate my general comment about "how we are doing," I want to describe very briefly several incidents which convey some feeling for the fighting spirit and morale of our soldiers who are manning freedom's defenses in Vietnam.

In the oppressive morning heat one day in early July, Sergeant Akuna's company of the 173d Airborne Brigade moved into position near a helicopter landing zone in a jungle and rice paddy area not far from Saigon. Before this operation by the 173d, the area—war zone D—had been a Vietcong stronghold for years and the Communists had been able to operate there without fear of attack. As the company began to occupy positions, Sergeant Akuna spotted a Vietcong guarding a rice cache. Someone shot the Vietcong in the leg after he tried to run, but he was brought forward, given first aid, and taken out by helicopter for interrogation. About the time he was being airlifted out, Sergeant Akuna came back with four more Vietcong. He was dragging them out of holes—tunnels—down in a terrace, toward the end of the landing zone. They were all young men between the ages of 18 and 29, very sturdy and obviously not rice farmers because of the ammunition and grenades they carried. After he brought these four in, word came back that Sergeant Akuna had gone back, found three more and was bringing them in. On another occasion, Sergeant Akuna saw a nearby Vietcong hamlet. He took a reconnaissance patrol outside of the battalion perimeter to investigate sounds he had heard at dawn and in so doing discovered the hamlet which contained food and medical supplies.

These incidents and fighting spirit displayed by our dedicated soldiers are not isolated. They occur every day and night in various parts of Vietnam. And the spirit is displayed by all our soldiers—combat and combat support alike. On these operations that Sergeant Akuna participated in, soldiers of the 173d Airborne Brigade support battalion were located in the rear area near the aid station. As the first combat casualties came in, many soldiers of the support battalion crowded around the aid station, and besieged the commander of the 173d, who was at the station, to let them go forward as replacements.

This commander wrote to me recently about the sense of purpose and performance of his soldiers:

"The U.S. Army soldier has conducted himself in such a fine manner that I actually become emotional with pride. Our country should have no fear at all as it develops a sense of purpose at the top as well as our people have accepted it at the lower level. We are doing well, and at least from my view point, we are winning in Vietnam."

In another report, though not from this commander, I read about the impressions received by the senior Vietnamese and American officials who observed the landing of the 1st Cavalry Division at Qui Nhon. "As the landing craft touched down on the beaches, soldiers from that fine division marched down the ramps eight abreast carrying their colors. At the same time, helicopters were being flown from the aircraft carrier *Boxer* to airfields in the vicinity and within 10 minutes the men were in the helicopters and on their way to An Khe, 50 miles inland. There was no delay, no confusion, and it all created a marvelous impression of efficiency and ability to deal with any situation. This great American presence on the ground brings a tremendous feeling of hope and inspires confidence and courage among Vietnamese troops. There can no longer be the slightest doubt that persistence will bring success."

We are doing well, and we are taking advantage of our progress to do even better. Our units in Vietnam prepare periodically detailed reports on lessons learned from combat operations. These reports contain recommendations for improvement in training and equipment, based on actual operations, and are distributed widely throughout our school system and our commands for use in training, and in equipment research and development. Aside from these reports, the majority of our senior enlisted men and officers returning from Vietnam are assigned to our school system and commands in the United States so that we can capitalize on their practical experience and motivational spirit.

In addition to the combat lessons learned aspect of these reports, there is often praise for the equipment provided to our soldiers and occasionally suggestions about new types of equipment or for some improvements to existing equipment. The suggestions are carefully evaluated in the context of existing programs for improved equipment and where the state of the art and production leadtimes permit introduction of the suggested items of equipment, they are programed for development and procurement. Praise for the existing equipment runs all the way from the new family of radios which operate particularly well in the demanding terrain and environmental conditions of Vietnam, to the helicopter and to the M-79 grenade launcher which allows the soldier to place accurately with lethal effect a fragmentation-type shell out to a distance of about 400 meters.

The helicopter has been one of our most valuable pieces of equipment. In addition to increased mobility and faster reaction time, it provides a close-in suppressive fire capability immediately preceding and during a helicopter troop lift into an assault area. The helicopter's battle staying capability is a matter of record. Between January 1962 and August 31 of this year, only 51 helicopters were lost to ground fire. The significance of this figure lies in the fact that when related to the actual sorties flown, this figure represents only one helicopter lost in battle for roughly every 16,614 sorties flown.

In an operation last July, over 3,000 of our combat troops in Vietnam were picked up in three different locations after a search and clear operation in war zone D, and returned to their bases in less than 3½ hours. This means that once they have searched multiple areas, soldiers do not have to waste time or energy reassembling. Moreover, they can move into combat with lighter loads because with helicopter resupply or extrication they do not need to carry in the extra supplies necessary to sustain them until ground supply or evacuation can take place.

If I can abstract a point from what I have said so far about how we are doing in Vietnam, it is this: The U.S. Army of 1965 is a highly professional, well-trained, and well-equipped combat force. The Army has deployed almost 44 percent of its strength overseas in 101 countries and territories, and it is fulfilling the investment in faith and money that has been made by the American people.

As the Army looks ahead to the tasks that the future probably holds, we do so with some measure of confidence. We know that we have the finest, best trained and equipped Army that this country has ever maintained in peacetime. Although we realize that the future may not be an entirely peaceful one, we are prepared to respond—in concert with the other agencies of our Government—to the requirements that may be demanded of us in building a community of stable nations, where political change can occur peacefully, and where nations have the right to determine their own destiny. Thus, as we move further into the nuclear age with its more sophisticated weapons systems, the Army finds that it must not only be prepared for general or limited war, but also be prepared for operations in unsophisticated situations and environments. In a sense, the Army must be prepared for missions unlimited, and if we are to continue to fulfill these missions with the best equipment obtainable, we will continue to need the assistance of the members of the National Security Industrial Association. I feel it appropriate to repeat, in this context, these words of the late Winston Churchill: "Give us the tools, and we will finish the job."

AIR TRANSPORT PROFIT AND LOWER FARES

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, United Air Lines is one of our Nation's best and soundest transportation systems. This great airline pioneered transcontinental air service in this country, and Denver was one of the pioneer cities in this service. United has been providing air service to my State's capital since 1938. Denver today is one of the principal operating bases of this fine company, and United employs approximately 2,300 persons at Denver.

Because of my lifetime interest in aviation and in all things which make Colorado a better place to work and to live, I have followed the development of United Air Lines since it first came to my State. I know the officials of this great company and its management philosophy, and believe that under the 37 years of leadership of William Allan Patterson, presently chairman of its board of directors, it has become one of the most progressive, alert, and public-conscious companies throughout our country's whole industrial complex.

I have just read a speech which Mr. Patterson gave before the Economic Club of Detroit on October 18, on "Air Transport Profit and Lower Fares." This historical exposition of the development of the commercial air transport industry and its contributions to the economic and technological advancement of our country is most interesting and informative. It proves that profit is a good word and a must if our country is to continue to move forward. Profit, as Mr. Patterson demonstrates, is particularly critical to the commercial air transport industry as it enters the threshold of the supersonic air transport, probably the most explosively expensive changeover ever required of any industry in our Nation's economic history. In light of the extremely heavy reequipment programs through which most of the air carriers are now passing, plus the heavy financial burdens which lie almost immediately ahead in the development of the supersonic air transport, the present earnings of the air carriers are rather meager indeed, approximately 9½ percent for the industry.

I was interested to note in Mr. Patterson's speech that since 1962 the trunkline average fare per passenger mile has declined by 6 percent; and that the average cost per mile to United's passengers has decreased from 6.4 to 5.7 cents, or 12 percent. Further, mail rates for the future have been reduced on United by about $2 million; and the new free baggage allowance means that an extra $3,600,000 will be retained annually by customers.

I am sure that the administration and the Civil Aeronautics Board are well aware of the acute importance of a financially strong commercial air transport industry to our national economy; and I have confidence that the regulatory agency will move forward slowly and most cautiously in the areas of their responsibilities so as not to create any major changes in the earnings situation of the air carriers in this extremely critical period of their development.

I request that Mr. Patterson's October 18 Detroit speech be made a part of my remarks and earnestly urge my colleagues to read this landmark speech because of its interest to all of us who want to maintain our commercial air transport industry as the greatest in the world, and to do this it must be kept financially sound, with the necessary resources to enable it to look to the supersonic age with confidence and eagerness.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Air Transport Profit and Lower Fares

(By William A. Patterson, chairman of the board, United Air Lines, Economic Club of Detroit, October 18, 1965)

After 37 years in air transportation—pioneering years with triumphs and disappointments, large and small—I'm beginning to near the end of the long flight. Next April, except for responsibilities as chairman of the board and chairman of our company's executive committee, I plan to become inactive. And the irony of the situation is that my inactivity will begin when the industry is attaining its greatest activity and greatest success.

Now, success is always welcome but I'm a little concerned about its interpretation. I'm sure that some persons—well intentioned but totally unfamiliar with the trials of the past—will view airline profits with an unsympathetic eye. If they had invested toil and time in the development of the air transport industry, they would view its success in a different light.

I've found that time is the great teacher of truth.

We had an unusual illustration of this fact last month when the rulers of Russia decided to place Soviet industry on a profit basis. Repeated failure, want and waste compelled them to repudiate a fundamental part of Marxist doctrine. And the long proclaimed ideal of production for use and not for profit became just another slogan on the scrap heap of history.

Time has forced even the Russian commissars to recognize that profits are essential to progress. Yet, in our country—the world's prime example of economic progress—there are those who regard profits with hostility. They seem to believe that normal healthy returns are rather sinful and that large returns are downright immoral. In their lexicon, as someone has said, profit is a dirty word.

If we could peer into their minds, I think we'd see an outmoded picture of the greedy Fat Man created by cartoonists some years ago. You may recall, he wore a high silk hat, a cutaway coat, and spats. The vest over his ample midsection was decorated with dollar signs and his pudgy fingers glittered with gems. Depending on the times, he was identified as a "capitalist," "the trusts," "profiteer," "monopolist," and "economic royalist."

This fellow became a myth in past years but he can be invoked for many merely by mentioning the word "profit." They immediately think of price gouging, cornered markets, and sand in the sugar. Their vision of silk-hatted swindlers blinds them to the fact that profit is the all-important fuel of our economic engine. Lean out the profit and the engine sputters. Given adequate fuel, it surges ahead over every kind of roadway.

Before condemning any profit, it would seem fair to inquire as to how it was derived and to what use it is put. No right-thinking indivdual would defend the profit that comes from unethical products and procedures; from grossly underpaid sweat-shop labor; or from contrived scarcities and the manipulations of privately controlled cartels and monopolies.

On the other hand, profit based on good personnel practices, efficient production of a quality product or service, and successful competition in an open market is an accomplishment that society should reward in full. Criticism of such profit as too big or excessive has the flavor of sour grapes.

Now as for the use of profit, it is important to consider dividend distribution. Is the payout reasonable in terms of technological advances, the company's present condition and its future competitive position? What part of profit is plowed back into the business for research, refurbishment, modernization and expansion? How much, if any, is diverted for purposes that serve community and nation?

On this last point, I believe that many who have the fat man complex would be surprised by the various end-uses of profit. They can begin their education by examining reports of foundations and philanthropic organizations. A survey of 465 companies several years ago disclosed that their contributions to health and welfare agencies, education, religious causes, and for civil and cultural purposes amounted to $154 million annually. And that total did not include the donations made by company executives as private individuals.

There are more than 5,000 foundations in this country and, in one way or another, they owe their existence to profit. They bear the names of large and small enterprises, business leaders, and industrialists—Ford, for example, Carnegie, Rockefeller, Alfred P. Sloan.

Not millions but billions in foundation funds have been expended for hospitals, schools, scholarships, medical research, mental health, science, the humanities and arts. Some of us who complain when Government enters social areas that have been neglected can be thankful that part of the slack is taken up by the work of foundations.

In touching on the derivation of profit a few moments ago, I reserved a special type for fuller discussion—the type that includes an element of Government subsidy. Now some may immediately classify such profit as objectionable and I can appreciate their point of view. However, let's examine a particular case, one I'm familiar with—the air transport industry.

The industry had its origin in the mid-1920's, after pilots employed by the U.S. Post Office had demonstrated the feasibility of air mail service. Congress wisely decided to entrust private enterprise with the task of developing a nationwide air transport system. An Air Mail Act, approved in 1925, authorized the post office to transfer its routes to private contractors on the basis of competitive bids.

Three obligations were placed on successful bidders. They were charged with the necessity to develop the art of flying; to establish a market for commercial air transportation; and to attain economic self-sufficiency.

The rates for hauling air mail were sweetened with subsidy, or perhaps I should say seasoned with subsidy, because the dish was not always nourishing. The maximum rate was $3 a pound but, to win their contract, most operators bid below the maximum and some found out there wasn't enough mail to pay expenses.

One of our predecessor companies, Varney Air Lines, began operations in April 1926. The Varney fleet consisted of six Swallow biplanes. They cruised at 90 miles an hour and, compared with jetliners that cost $4 to $6 million, the Swallow could be purchased for $4,500. Pilots were paid $250 a month and even this modest salary was sometimes in question because at the outset the Varney route failed to produce enough air mail revenue.

Pacific Air Transport, another of our predecessor companies, also began service in 1926 and also found it hard to make ends meet. The combined revenues of Varney and Pacific Air Transport for 1926 amounted to $230,000 in mail payments and $1,530 for carrying passengers.

Coast-to-coast air travel became possible in 1927 but it called for a strong back, an adventurous spirit and $400 to pay the fare. the trip took about 32 hours—at least, on paper—and there weren't any inflight movies to pass the time.

Today, you can travel by jet from one coast to the other at a fare 63 percent lower than in 1927 and at a speed increase of well over 500 percent. If the advance in safety comfort and other intangibles could be expressed mathematically, it would exceed that 500 percent. And as for mail, United now flies a ton of letters a thousand miles for about one-twentieth of what the Post Office paid in the early years.

Seldom have obligations been so abundantly fulfilled. The art of flying has been advanced from propeller planes of wood and canvas to subsonic turbine-powered aircraft that are triumphs of sophisticated technology. In developing a market, the airlines have reached the point where their share of domestic intercity common-carrier traffic is greater than the combined portion of rail and bus.

United became self-sufficient in the late 1940's and the Civil Aeronautics Board certified that fact in January 1951. With only one exception, mail payments of the Nation's 11 trunk lines have not included a dime of subsidy in the last 8 years.

It's a different story for the local service airlines. They operate over routes of lower traffic density, serving smaller cities. Congress and the Civil Aeronautics Board believe air transportation stimulates the economic growth of these communities, and that in all likelihood they'll eventually develop satisfactory traffic volumes. In that expectation, mail subsidy is paid.

When compared with other business operations, the airlines are unique in several ways. They're Government regulated, for example, but intensely competitive. They use very expensive machines to provide a service that's extremely perishable in the sense that a seat unsold when a flight departs cannot be stored and put up for sale again. But the most unusual feature of our business is that from time to time we deliberately render our machines obsolete.

Since World War II, we've gone through round after round of aircraft purchases, advancing from the DC–3 to the jets. Each round has been spurred by competition and the urgency to improve, rather than the necessity to replace something worn out. And each round has resulted in greater safety, speed, and comfort.

In the opening stage of the transition to jet operations, the industry invested $3½ billion on new aircraft and supporting equipment. This was followed by an outlay of about $2½ billion for additional planes, including short-haul jets. These expenditures and the industry's great appetite for supplies and materials have created work for an estimated 5,000 factories and jobs for 100,000 manufacturing employees. Since 1960 the Nation's airlines have added 25,000 to their payrolls and the prospect is that 50,000 more will be hired over the next 5 years.

Earnings in the transitional period have been a source of both gloom and encouragement. In 1961 the return on the total trunkline capital investment was a piddling 1½ percent. That was the low point and the outlook brightened thereafter. Last year the trunkline return was 9½ percent. That's an overall average, incidentally, and it doesn't mean that each company did that well. United's return was around 8 percent—somewhat lower than the 10¼ percent established by the Civil Aeronautics Board as fair and reasonable for the major carriers.

In the first 5 years of the jet age, 1959 through 1964, our company invested $677,569,000 in jets and supporting equipment. Net earnings for those 5 years totaled $78,400,000, of which 31 percent was paid out in dividends. The remaining 69 percent was retained to improve the business. Earnings accounted for approximately 10 percent of the funds necessary to finance the crucial first step from piston to turbine power. Huge additional sums had to be raised through sale of debentures and other securities, augmented by depreciation and amortization charges against earnings.

Last April we announced a $750 million program, covering the purchase, lease and option of 144 more aircraft. They're required to phase out our remaining propeller planes and convert to all-jet operations within 4 years from now. By that time our fleet of 308 jetliners will represent an investment of $1.6 billion.

That's part of an improvement program unparalleled in the history of transportation or, so far as I know, in general industry. And it's being accomplished without presenting higher and higher bills to the public.

Since 1962 the trunkline average fare per passenger mile has declined by 6 percent. In our company's case, the downtrend is even greater. In the last 3 years the average cost per mile to passengers on United has gone from about 6.4 to 5.7 cents, a decrease of 12 percent. In view of the extensive upgrading of service and the tremendous costs of equipment, I believe the industry's achievement in containing fares is little short of extraordinary.

To give specific items, United's fare reductions last year for passengers on certain long haul routes amounted to almost $6 million. Reductions in the current year, including a change in the family group discount, will save the traveling public approximately $8 million over a 12-month period.

Apart from fares, our airmail rate was reduced 3 cents per ton-mile last June and in August the basis for determining excess baggage charges was liberalized. A full year of the revised mail rate will save the Post Office about $2 million. And the new free baggage allowance means that an extra $3.6 million will be retained annually in the pockets of customers.

The airlines are entering the harvest time of their past efforts to advance and improve. Unquestionably, 1965 will be the industry's best year on every count. United, for example, expects to achieve total operating revenues of approximately $785 million, as compared with $669 million in 1964. Passenger revenues should top out around $705 million, an increase of perhaps 18 percent.

For an industry that was legislated into existence, so to speak, and then nurtured on subsidy until it could stand on its own feet, I think the record is very impressive. Congress, the Department of Commerce and the Civil Aeronautics Board can be justifiably proud of a philosophy of government that has encouraged private enterprise to create the best air transport system in the world.

It's one of the outstanding success stories of modern times but it would be misleading to tell you the airlines are going to live happily ever after. There are further challenges to meet, further improvements to undertake. The one that looms largest is the supersonic transport plane.

So far as I can detect, the traveling public isn't clamoring for supersonic speed—at least, domestically—but it nevertheless looks as though our decision will have to be made in the next 18 months. There's a question of national prestige involved and, on the economic level, there's the necessity to maintain this country's leadership in aircraft manufacturing.

Unlike previous types of commercial transports, development of the supersonic plane will not come as a byproduct of military aircraft design and construction. The total expenditure will be astronomical. In terms of the cost per aircraft, each seat on a supersonic plane could well represent an investment of up to $200,000. In comparison, cost per seat for the finest and fastest piston-engine plane was $34,000. For the

Boeing 707 and the DC-8, it amounted to $46,000.

But the supersonic is in the future and, meanwhile, as I've said, we have a record year coming up. We've already had indications that before the black ink dries on our statements—before we have time to analyze and reflect on the year's results—there will be hints, suggestions, and perhaps demands that we go further in lowering fares.

That brings us back to the dirty word, "profit." Those who will be heard suggesting reductions in this or that fare will actually be disturbed by the industry's profit.

My question is, would we have a better air transport system if there were no profits? Would it be better if the airlines made just a little profit, enough to keep them alive but feeble? Or is the industry entitled to a healthy profit that will permit it to pay ample dividends, liquidate debt expeditiously, and accumulate financial strength for further advances?

Airline earnings for 1965 should be viewed from the standpoint of past striving, present accomplishments and the demands of the future. But I know that visions of the fat man wearing a silk hat will prevent some from seeing the facts. They will not regard the success of this year we well earned, well deserved. They will regard it as pure gravy.

Well, I've been associated with air transportation since 1929 and I can assure you there have been years of bread and butter and years of bread without butter. But the only airline gravy I've seen is in the casseroles stewardesses serve at mealtime.

One final thought on our economic system: It has various names—free enterprise, mixed capitalism, and so on—but it's essentially a system of rewards and penalties, of profit and loss. President Johnson knows the advantages of that system and he is aware of the importance of business as a prime constructive force in the Nation's destiny.

You may have noted that one of the programs of his administration is designed to make unemployables employable. I think this is an indication of the President's philosophy that social improvement inevitably rests on the resources, profits and productivity of private enterprise. I don't believe there is major disagreement with most of his objectives but I'm convinced that his philosophy has not percolated through all levels of government.

And, in this, as in other matters, time will be the teacher.

THE SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE AT WORK IN APPALACHIA

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, on September 24 at the groundbreaking ceremonies of the Pine Creek watershed project in Scott County, Tenn., D. A. Williams, administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, gave an extremely informative talk on resource development in Appalachia.

In his talk he paid tribute to the people of Scott County for their leadership and their far-reaching plans for developing their resources—both natural and human.

I should like to commend the Soil Conservation Service for moving ahead rapidly in this area so soon after the Appalachian Regional Development Act was passed. The Public Law 566 watershed program, administered by SCS, offers much to the people in Appalachia in bringing about full use of their land and water resources for the economic benefit of entire communities.

Mr. Williams, SCS administrator for the past 12 years, deserves our gratitude for the fine leadership he has shown in directing one of our most vigorous and useful Federal agencies. The Soil Conservation Service has the key role in the dynamic program of soil and water conservation underway throughout the Nation.

Mr. President, I commend Mr. Williams' thoughtful and informative address to the Members of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE AT WORK IN APPALACHIA

(By D. A. Williams, Administrator, Soil Conservation Service, at groundbreaking ceremonies of the Pine Creek Watershed project, Scott County, Tenn., September 24, 1965)

It is always a pleasure to be in the great State of Tennessee. This summer I have had the good fortune to visit here twice. Last month I participated in ceremonies dedicating the first watershed project to be completed in the State.

Today it is my special pleasure to participate in groundbreaking ceremonies for your Pine Creek Watershed project. This project is also a first—with a special and broad significance. It is the first in Tennessee and one of the very first in Appalachia to receive accelerated help from the Department of Agriculture through the strengthened Federal assistance program to this region.

I congratulate the people of Oneida—for this is a community of action. Properly, you were recognized last year when you were named Tennessee's "outstanding community planned for progress." I commend the citizens of Oneida and Scott County for your far-reaching plans for developing your resources—both natural and human.

I congratulate you for the good leadership that has recognized the opportunities for developing your community—and has done something about them.

Few rural areas in America lack the potential for economic benefit through resource development. But it takes recognition of the assets that are inherent in the area. It takes an analysis of the need and potentials, and careful development of plans to fit the needs and resources. It takes leadership in coordinating the thinking and the desires of the community—and translating them into action. It takes enthusiasm, imagination, foresight, the support of the people in the community, and the willingness to work hard.

You have this spirit—these attributes—in this community. Only one obstacle has kept you from going ahead with the Pine Creek project before now—the need for sufficient financial assistance—and that has now been overcome.

The keen interest of both President Kennedy and President Johnson in Appalachia—the studies they initiated of the serious problems confronting it—and finally the passage of the Appalachian Regional Development Act by the Congress last spring—all have focused attention on this area. These actions have removed the final barrier to your moving ahead. They have made it possible to break ground here today for your multiple-purpose project.

President Johnson expressed strong support of water conservation projects on September 2 when he signed a bill authorizing a project in the West. He said: "I have never seen a dollar invested anywhere in this Nation in water conservation, in multiple-use projects, that in a period of even a decade didn't prove that it was a good investment, and would pay very high returns on what we had spent for it.

"So, this is not the last conservation project that we will approve. It is not the last legislation in this field. We are going to continue it until we have stopped the floods, until we have prevented the drought, and we have the kind of conservation program that is worthy of the 20th century, and worthy of the foresight of the American people."

The Pine Creek project will be an example in Appalachia. It will demonstrate the effect this type of action can have on developing a stable economic base that will be self-sustaining. You can be sure of the results, for watershed projects are not experiments. The Soil Conservation Service is gratified by the results that have been obtained in the many projects that we have helped plan, design, and carry out, such as we are doing here in Scott County. They are proven methods of stimulating community economy, halting erosion, and providing a sound base upon which to build.

The Department of Agriculture is gearing itself to fulfill the goals of the Appalachian Act. It will use every measure at its disposal to help raise the income level of the region and to provide opportunities to those who have been denied them.

The program for Appalachia will help expand job opportunities through loans, grants, technical services, and training programs that create new factories, new businesses, new recreational enterprises, and other new sources of income.

It will help readjust land use to assure the safe use of the land and to meet the needs of the community.

It will provide appropriate services and adequate financial support to fully protect and develop the soil, water, and forests.

It will help improve existing rural community facilities to assure people in the rural areas of pure water supplies, first-rate schools and hospitals, and other services that are standard in a modern community.

In other words, it will make systematic efforts to give people of rural Appalachia every opportunity to fashion a life that is equal to any other area in the country.

I am very pleased that the Soil Conservation Service will have a large part in this.

Appalachia has an abundance of natural resources that can be developed. Because of our long experience in working with private landowners and groups in developing soil and water and related resources, the Soil Conservation Service can contribute extensively to the success of the Appalachia program.

The provisions of the Appalachian Act open the door to a concentrated effort that has been delayed much too long.

Small watershed projects, such as yours, are particularly well adapted to many of Appalachia's basic resource development needs.

We estimate that about 800 watersheds in the 11 Appalachian States could be developed into projects. Water is generally plentiful in Appalachia. If controlled and developed, it can be a valuable resource instead of a hazard. Through watershed projects, it can become a valuable asset to agriculture, industry, town, and recreation.

The Soil Conservation Service will have the opportunity to speed up work in watershed activities. The Appalachia Act can break the logjam by removing some of the obstacles that you have known here in Scott County and that have been holding up many other projects also.

We expect to make vigorous efforts in other phases of our soil and water conservation programs as well. We have reexamined these programs to mesh them with the total effort for economic betterment of Appalachia. Soil conservation and water resource and recreation development will all have a place in the coordinated attack on problems of the area.

Financial help will be available to soil conservation district cooperators who are not financially able to carry out their conservation and development plans. Through long-term contracts, they will be assured of cost sharing of up to 80 percent of the cost of establishing certain approved measures on up to 50 acres. This will help accelerate land treatment in watershed projects, thereby enabling sponsors to go ahead with installation of structural measures. This cost-sharing provision of the act introduces into Appalachia a program similar to one that has proved so highly acceptable and workable in the Great Plains, where accelerated financial help is being extended to overcome the periodic problem of drought and duststorms.

A plant materials center to be built by the Soil Conservation Service at Quicksand, Ky., will be important to districts and others in healing the scars of strip mines and other eroded areas and in improving land and wildlife resources. At the center, SCS plant specialists will study and adapt plants that can be used in the Appalachian region to prevent erosion and to restore land to productive use.

Of basic importance to the region will be a water resource survey in which the Soil Conservation Service will cooperate with the U.S. Corps of Engineers and other agencies. This will provide the basis for planning and development of the region's total water resources. Such a plan will assure that the available water will be put to uses that will contribute most to the region's economy.

I would like to speak a moment about soil conservation districts and the part they will play in accelerating Appalachia's adjustment to a new economy.

Tennessee soil conservation districts have played an active part in the soil and water conservation program since the first district was organized about 25 years ago. Since 1959 all of the State has been within organized soil conservation districts. These districts will play a key role in the Appalachian program, as they have been doing in resource conservation in the State since they were organized. They are broadening their programs to fit the needs of the times.

They are in a position to supply the leadership that is required for this undertaking. They have the knowledge of the resources of the area, the experience in dealing with conservation and development problems and opportunities, and they have the organization to act. Indeed, they have unique qualifications for leadership to assure that all resources are making a maximum contribution to conservation and to the economy and needs of the community.

The Congress, with new legislation or amendments to the old, has from time to time, provided new tools that districts have successfully put to use in carrying out their conservation responsibilities. They have broadened the watershed program to include Federal assistance in installing water supply and recreation such as you have in the Pine Creek project that you are starting today. The Congress has provided for broadened assistance in developing income-producing recreation as a part of a regular conservation plan on rural private land.

The Congress has provided help to farmers who want to shift from crops to other suitable uses of land, such as grass, trees, wildlife, or recreation.

These and other assistance will help conservation districts respond to community aspirations for growth and development of human and natural resources.

State legislatures have recognized the importance of the work of soil conservation districts by giving them increasing financial and other help in carrying out their programs.

A few years ago Secretary of Agriculture Freeman offered new agreements with modernized services to districts that updated their programs. He did this because new problems and opportunities had emerged since districts had first drawn up their programs and he knew that districts had gained considerable experience with the passage of time. He believed that most district programs did not adequately reflect the needs of the community.

Consequently, he asked districts to take a look at their programs, and to consider conservation progress and fundamental changes taking place in uses of agricultural resources, patterns of community growth, and economic life.

Over 65 percent of the districts in the Nation have taken action. I was glad to note that over 93 percent have done so in Tennessee. I am sure that Appalachian districts with updated programs will find them particularly useful tools. The process of updating the programs entails an analysis of changing conservation needs, economic and land use trends, and shifting patterns of urban and rural life. This analysis—or inventory—often brings to light opportunities that probably would be uncovered in no other way. The program becomes a blueprint for long-term resource conservation and development action.

Today we need programs that reflect all of the long-time resource needs of the community—not just agricultural land, not just watershed projects and flood prevention needs, not just woodland needs nor farm needs—but all community needs—parks, playgrounds and other recreation facilities, tourism, water storage, and local industry to improve the economic welfare of the community—things that directly concern all citizens in all walks of life.

A soil conservation district program such as this can form the basis for the development of rural areas and make a valuable contribution to the future economy of the area.

The Appalachian Act will provide a significant degree of acceleration to the programs soil conservation districts in this region are striving to put into effect. The Soil Conservation Service expects to provide increased technical assistance to meet the larger workload.

In carrying out resource conservation programs, we should always remember that each conservation measure installed on the land brings us that much nearer to getting the job accomplished across the Nation. Each individual farm is part of a watershed, each watershed is part of a larger river basin. Each has its place—as the Appalachian region itself—in the development of our country. The development should blend all interests—the city man and the country man, the industrial man and the farmer, the sportsman and the housewife. Our goal today should be to use and manage resources in ways to get the greatest benefit from them. The key word here is "use," for idle resources make no contribution to economic growth.

The time has passed when we can deal independently with our resources. We must not overlook any of the implications—social, economic, or political—in planning the overall development and use of them.

Appalachia has been publicized and set apart during the last 2 or 3 years. Studies have been made of the resources and economic problems of the region and action has been set in motion to help remedy them. The Soil Conservation Service has participated in some of the studies and is already in the action. The studies have brought to light the many natural advantages of the region, its areas of wondrous beauty, and the talents, self-reliance, and resourcefulness of its people. These are all great assets. Many of them can be built upon and developed to your advantage and well being.

You are doing that here in the Pine Creek watershed project. You are taking advantage of the opportunity to develop your natural resources and put them to work for you. Your project will be the means of economic growth in this community. It will bring benefits to every resident of the county—rural and town people—whether or not in the watershed. It will provide a basis for new industry. It will provide jobs for local people and offer better opportunities for young people. It will give people the chance to help themselves.

That is the purpose of the small watershed program and the Appalachian Act. In Appalachia, the Soil Conservation Service is focusing every effort toward breaking the economic lock and helping the region step into a new world of economic development.

The Federal Government is trying to help in problems of health, education, and living standards in addition to those relating to agriculture and natural resources. These problems are all interrelated.

The potential impact of the drive to help Appalachia help itself will depend on all levels of government and the people in the region themselves. It challenges an all out effort at all levels to make it work. The Soil Conservation Service is proud to have a role in this grand undertaking. We shall do our best.

BILLIONS FOR MILLIONS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the serious drought which periled the middle Atlantic and northeast sections of our country in recent months emphasizes the need to explore all feasible means for preventing such threats in the future.

Brig. Gen. Norman M. Lack, who is executive director of the Water Research Foundation of Wilmington, Del., as well as the Delaware Governor's representative on the Delaware River Basin Commission, has worked out a plan for tapping the tremendous water supply of the Susquehanna River. His plan envisions adding to the fresh water supplies of Washington, Baltimore, the Eastern Shore of Maryland, Delaware, and portions of southern New Jersey.

General Lack's proposal reflects his extensive engineering background as well as his vital concern that we have enough fresh water for the future. It is worthy of serious consideration.

This plan is outlined in a pamphlet General Lack has written entitled "Billions for Millions."

Because of the significance of General Lack's plan I ask unanimous consent that his explanation of it, as contained in the pamphlet, be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Billions for Millions

Is it possible to provide billions of gallons of fresh water daily for millions of people on the coastal plain from Wilmington, Del., southward throughout the Delmarva Peninsula, the Eastern Shore of Maryland, southern New Jersey, and substantially augment future flows required for the metropolitan areas of Baltimore and the District of Columbia?

The present plight of New York City and northern New Jersey, Trenton, Philadelphia, and Camden gives warning to every inhabitant of the eastern coast. He must have water to survive. What are the sources of his supply?

For the New York City metropolitan area, a major source is Delaware River water. Now there are strong probabilities of a request for diversion of about 350 million gallons daily from the Delaware Basin to the Raritan Watershed in New Jersey.

A 1954 U.S. Supreme Court decree states that on the completion of the Delaware Aqueduct System, the city of New York may divert 800 million gallons of water per day but further states that the city shall release from its reservoirs sufficient water to augment the river flow at Montague from all sources, in order to maintain a basic recorded river flow of 1,750 cubic feet per second at that point.

Although it is probable that the city of New York's Delaware Aqueduct System will be completed in 1966, after 30 years of skillful planning and construction the water remaining in the two presently operative reservoirs of this system, the Pepacton and Neversink, on December 21, 1964, was only 0.9 percent of their combined capacities.

Four severe droughts in the past 8 years, instead of one in 25 years as we used to predict, have had disastrous effects on this water supply.

It is the insidious intrusion of salt water, as we descend from the Delaware River Basin to its estuary, which is our most serious threat.

Below Philadelphia, the city of Chester, which had long been denied the fresh water use of the Delaware River through salinity and pollution on one hand and the steady encroachment of industry and housing developments on the other, struck out boldly with a 35-mile conduit to the headwaters of the Octoraro Creek, a tributary of the Susquehanna River, for a present 30 million gallons per day.

It is for the people who live in the vast area down river from Chester, Pa., that this brochure is presented. The U.S. Army Engineers' Comprehensive 1956–60 plan for the Delaware Basin appeared to stop at the fall line extending from Newark, Del., to Wilmington. The Susquehanna River Coordinating Survey now in process by the U.S. Engineers is concerned mainly with areas adjacent to the river basin itself.

It is predicted that the coastal plain area of our concern will more than double in population and triple in industrial and farm growth during the next 50 years, and it is therefore reasonable to assume that it will require several times its present consumption of fresh water per day between 1965 and the year 2015. Moreover, the national trend indicates that this requirement will double and redouble in succeeding half centuries.

Our area has no large watersheds; it is crisscrossed by tidal streams from the Delaware Bay and from the Chesapeake Bay. In the face of ever-threatening salt water advances into its streams, it today relies entirely on ground water.

Is there a more dependable source of fresh water which can be tapped for man's survival on this important area of more than 5,000 square miles?

Yes.

The great Susquehanna River now empties its flow into the saline tidal fluctuations of the upper portions of the Chesapeake Bay at a point approximately 15 miles from the Delaware-Maryland line. What is this flow and what is its dependability?

During the year of 1931, the Safe Harbor Water Power Corp., owners of the Safe Harbor Dam, built a reinforced concrete well-type gaging station on the left bank of the mighty Susquehanna River at a point 1 mile downriver from the pleasant little town of Marietta, Pa.

In January 1932, the U.S. Geological Survey started to operate this station (Station No. 1–5760). For over 30 years it has accurately recorded the total flow of the largest water basin on the east coast below the St. Lawrence River, at a point only 45 miles above the Susquehanna River's final discharge into the saline tides in the upper portion of the Chesapeake Bay.

Although the Marietta gage records the flow of only 25,990 square miles of the basin's more than 30,000 square miles, it is probably one of the most important stations in the East because of its long recording history and the fact that it is the last device, downstream, to measure the accumulated flow of the entire watershed. The recorded average daily flow is 23.6 billion gallons per day.

Can this water be trapped for the needs of man? Yes. In view of modern techniques and materials, an economical barrier could be installed at a fraction of the cost of a concrete and steel dam.

As the small tidal rise and fall extends up the Susquehanna River to the vicinity of Port Deposit, Md., a low barrier can be constructed from Turkey Point to, and across, Spesutie Island to the Aberdeen shore, encompassing the present wet area of the Susquehanna flats totaling 46 square miles.

As the present average depth of water from the island to a point a short distance from Turkey Point is only approximately 9 feet, a 12-foot Fabridam barrier is proposed. An installation of this kind, made of neoprene and nylon, would prevent the intrusion of the brackish tidal water into the Susquehanna flats and would impound 130 billion gallons of water, at the same time creating a fixed shore line approximately 3 feet above the present water line. It would require a minimum of land acquisition.

The transportation of fresh water from the impoundment area could be made by two major conduits: one eastward with branch connections to the Eastern Shore of Maryland, State of Delaware and under the Delaware River to a point in southern New Jersey; the other southward for possible future use by the city of Baltimore and the District of Columbia.

A much shorter but deeper barrier, on the same axis, could be installed near Turkey Point with sections that would act as speedy type locks, affording little or no delay for the continuous passage of commercial or pleasure-type craft.

Fabridams of this type are in actual, successful use in several parts of the United States and in foreign countries.

By this relatively simple and economical approach, we can utilize the great natural source of fresh water now wasting into the Chesapeake.

The plan we are proposing could be expected to provide fresh water flows for centuries in the following magnitudes:

State of Delaware, one-quarter billion gallons per day; Eastern Shore Maryland, one-quarter billion gallons per day; southern New Jersey, one-quarter billion gallons per day; city of Baltimore, one-quarter billion gallons per day; District of Columbia, one-half billion gallons per day.

Have we the foresight to provide billions of gallons for millions of people?

BASIC FACTS ABOUT A FABRIDAM AND ITS INSTALLATION

(a) The material consists of a neoprene coated fabric using various layers of nylon, depending on the strength required.

(b) A 4-ply sheet of the fabric has a tensile strength of 2,200 pounds per lineal inch. Weight of material per square yard is 13.3 pounds.

(c) The life expectancy of a fabridam is approximately 25 years.

(d) Tubes, or sections, should be limited to about 400 feet to provide for economical emplacement, and replacement if required.

(e) Interior pressure is extremely low, about 2.0 pounds per square inch, which facilitates passage of ice or other heavy debris.

(f) Tubes are to be filled with water and air; the proportions one to the other may be varied at will.

(g) Fabridams now used in areas of heavy icing conditions have proved successful. Research by northern countries has resulted in new techniques to reduce icing at crests.

(h) Costs of material and installation are generally less than one-fourth of concrete and steel with operative gates.

AMERICAN SAMOA

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, a little more than 4 years ago, the Reader's Digest published an article about American Samoa. It was entitled "Samoa: America's Shame in the South Seas."

A new Governor, H. Rex Lee, former Deputy Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, was sent to American Samoa as a troubleshooter by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall.

Governor Lee wasted no time and soon acquainted Congress with the deplorable conditions which existed in American Samoa. He won quick support and soon many millions of dollars were being poured into American Samoa to help Governor Lee and the Samoan people carry out a rehabilitation program.

The results were outstanding. The story is told in the November issue of the Reader's Digest. The article, by senior editor, Clarence W. Hall, is entitled "Samoa: America's Showplace of the South Seas."

If there are no objections, Mr. President, I respectfully request that the article be published in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAMOA: AMERICA'S SHOWPLACE OF THE SOUTH SEAS—FROM A PACIFIC SLUM TO A POLYNESIAN PARADISE IN 4 YEARS—THE DRAMATIC STORY OF A MAN WHO HELPED AN ISLAND PEOPLE TO HELP THEMSELVES

(By Clarence W. Hall)

Somewhere on earth there may be a more spectacular example of revolutionary change in an area and its people, but in years of roving the world's far corners I have not seen it.

Five years ago the small cluster of exotic islands composing American Samoa was a national disgrace. Nestling deep in the fabulous South Seas, 8,000 miles from Washington, this tiniest, most forgotten U.S. territory slumbered in tattered neglect. Few tourists ever saw it; one who did stamped it "a Tobacco Road with palms." The handsome people, of purest Polynesian blood, had long since grown spiritless, were scorned and pitied as poor country cousins by their kinfolk on other island groups. Each year, hundreds of American Samoa's more ambitious youths quit the islands to seek education and employment in Hawaii and U.S. west coast cities.

Today, however, this former South Seas slum is the showplace of the Pacific. Young expatriates are flooding back to participate in the islands' bursting new life and prosperity. Other islanders come to stare enviously at American Samoa's new schools and roads. Educators come to observe Samoa's exciting experiment—the first anywhere—in almost total teaching by television. And with its storied capital, Pago Pago, now the main stop on the direct route from Hawaii to Australia, tourists by the hundreds will soon be tumbling off the jets at Oceania's finest airport, to relax in the new 100-room luxury hotel or just to savor life in an idyllic South Seas setting.

What brought about this magical metamorphosis? Two factors, mainly: the threat of a diplomatic disaster, and a remarkable man.

A GRAND DESIGN

The threat arose early in 1961 with realization that, in July of the coming year, American Samoa was slated as host for the triennial meeting of the South Pacific Conference. More than 200 delegates would be coming from other Pacific territories. Worldwide radio and press coverage would contrast America's vaunted concern for the world's underprivileged with the shabby neglect of her own.

Appalled at the prospect, President Kennedy rushed to Congress a request for an emergency appropriation of $465,000. He admonished the Department of the Interior to get a new governor out there to do a fast job of refurbishing. Secretary Stewart Udall picked a seasoned troubleshooter: H. Rex Lee, 52, then deputy commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Idaho-born Rex Lee is a man of steely determination masked by a soft-spoken manner. He arrived in Pago Pago 4 days before his inauguration, spent the time poking about the islands—"a melancholy vista if I ever saw one," Government buildings flying tattered American flags were rotted, termite-infested and peeling. Roads were rutty paths leading nowhere. Raw sewage was piped into Pago Pago's spectacular harbor, which was ringed by overwater latrines. Samoans suffered from unchecked disease and malnutrition. Agriculture had gone downhill, and heavy imports of even the barest necessities lifted the cost of living to ridiculous heights. The only private industry of any consequence was a small tuna cannery.

Most shocking were what passed for village schools—mostly sagging little grass-roofed shacks, crammed with children, taught by Samoan teachers who themselves had the equivalent of no more than 5 or 6 years of schooling. The single high school could accommodate fewer than a third of those students desiring to enter.

A man of lesser fiber might have thrown up his hands and quit. Ever since 1899, when Samoan chiefs asked the United States to take over their islands, Governors had come and gone with dismaying rapidity, unable to shake Samoa out of its doldrums or Washington out of its apathy. But Lee mapped out a grand design for Samoa's redemption. "Simply to fix this place up for the SPC meeting and then abandon it," he had concluded, "would be worse than nothing."

Calling the island chiefs together for a confab around the ceremonial kava bowl, he told them, "I'm not going to ask Congress for anything you can supply yourselves—land for roads and schools, for instance, and the labor to build them." Beguiled by the picture he painted of their future, but disbelieving, the Samoan leaders smiled indulgently and pledged full cooperation.

In 3 weeks Rex Lee was back in Washington, full of ideas and zest. The importance of American Samoa, he told members of the House Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations, was moral: "When the islands were necessary for our defense, up to and including World War II, we used them and used their people." But the territory's importance was also political: "For years the South Pacific has been a vacuum. Now our enemies are moving into that vacuum. Here's our chance to show the world how we can help underdeveloped peoples toward a self-sufficient life."

The result: a congressional downpayment on the $9,500,000 requested for the first year's budget.

FIRST-RANK MODEL

Stopping off in Hawaii, Lee corralled help from quarters long concerned with the territory's neglect. From Rear Adm. Henry G. Clark of the 14th Naval District came a pledge of aid in getting construction contracts, plus the temporary loan of a battalion of reserve Seabees and equipment. Albert B. Pratt, a former Seabee, promised to take a leave of absence as head of Pearl Harbor's public-works department to supervise road building and give Samoans on-the-job training. Architect George J. Wimberly, creator of some of Hawaii's most attractive Polynesian-type structures, was enlisted to design an auditorium for the SPC meeting, which later could be used for school and public functions.

Back in Samoa, Rex Lee called the island chiefs together, pointed to the boatloads of men and equipment arriving from Hawaii. "Now you're going to get some of the things you've yearned for—first of all, a road," he said. The chiefs quickly recruited 900 workers, and some joined in themselves as road-gang foremen.

With Lee everywhere at once, checking, prodding, approving, Pago Pago's appearance changed markedly. The waterfront was swept clear of the over-the-water latrines. Villages were made pin-neat and planted with flowers. Some 5,500 gallons of good paint were flown in, sold at cost, and Samoans painted everything in sight. Ready by the time the SPC delegates arrived were: the jet airport with its 9,000-foot runway; 15 miles of 20-foot-wide macadam roads leading to the beauty spots of the island of Tutuila; 29 new teachers' housing units with modern plumbing; three new buildings for Samoa's high school, capable of caring for 300 visitors; the handsome new civic auditorium; a new power plant—and 20,000 immensely proud Samoans.

Representatives from 23 Pacific states and territories, plus observers from the U.N., could scarcely believe their eyes. Critics who came to carp praised American Samoa as "a first-rank model of how to govern Pacific islands."

IN A HURRY

Now Lee plunged into his plan to make Samoa independent of outside support. Education, as he saw it, must be his main thrust. Reforming the primitive education system by gradual steps would take decades. An absolute necessity was "an explosive upgrading." But what kind?

The notion came to Lee in a flash that the answer lay in television—not as a supplemental aid but as the core of teaching. It was a revolutionary idea for Samoa, which had no television. But once the high cost of setting it up was met, TV education would be comparatively inexpensive, for a small group of instructors, of top quality, could reach a maximum number of students.

Impressed but skeptical, the congressional Appropriations Committee granted Lee $40,000 to explore the idea. A study team from the National Association of Educational Broadcasters, headed by Vernon Bronson, reported after on-the-spot examination that ETV was indeed "the best potential tool for the task." Congress then approved an appropriation of $1,583,000 for a three-channel system.

The NAEB began rounding up and training engineers, technicians, and ETV teachers from all over the United States. In early 1963, contracts were let for equipment and for the erection of a 226-foot transmitter atop 1,700-foot Mount Alava across the bay from Pagopago. When getting to the transmitter site proved a problem, engineers swung a 5,100-foot cable across the harbor, cannily estimating that the aerial tramway would pay for itself as a tourist ride. It provides a spectacular view as far as Western Samoa, 77 miles away.

The Samoans erected 26 consolidated schools to replace the 45 tumbledown village schools. And with the opening of the 1964 school year, KZVK–TV beamed its first signals to the new schools. The specially prepared elementary lessons are on three main levels; each lesson, whatever its subject matter, lays heavy emphasis on oral English.

Finding experienced top teachers eager to have a go at it proceeded rapidly. Typical are Roy and Mildred Cobb, of Louisville, Ky. While Mildred settled in at Utulei to supervise the production of ETV curriculums, Roy went to Nua, 15 miles distant, to get the first consolidated school ready. Today the Nua school, serving four nearby villages, is the standard by which others are judged. It comprises six concrete-and-redwood buildings of two classrooms each, playground, and beautiful flowered grounds planted and maintained by the villagers. There are 275 pupils, 9 Samoan teachers, and 6 trainees.

STANDING ROOM ONLY

After a year of trial, has Samoa's experiment in TV teaching been successful? "Outstandingly so," say authorities. Dr. John W. Harold, Samoa's director of education and formerly executive director of the Iowa State Education Association, reports: "Tests show that young Samoans not only are learning twice as fast as formerly, but are retaining their knowledge much longer." Attendance averages 98 percent in all schools.

Last September, Samoa's high schools also turned to TV teaching, served by three added TV channels. To the single high school at Utulei are being added three spanking new ones: one at Leone (now completed), another on the island of Tau, and a third at the eastern end of Tutuila. The basic plan calls for a complex of circular, Polynesian-style buildings, all hurricane proof, providing 5,540 square feet of space.

At night, the new schools become community centers, packed to the standing-room-only stage with older Samoans eagerly imbibing lessons in farming, home beautification, sanitation, the principles of government and democracy. Newscasts in both Samoan and English are featured nightly, as are travelogs showing how other people live and solve their problems.

American Samoa's ETV system has been studied by international agencies and by technicians from many countries. Its implications for underdeveloped areas everywhere are significant, since the broadcasts could just as well go to 2,500 schools simultaneously as to Samoa's 25, for only a modest additional cost. With the encouragement of Governor Lee, methods of adapting the TV teaching to their own needs are now being studied by Western Samoa, where KZVK–TV's telecasts come in loud and clear, and by the Tonga Islands.

MAKING MONEY

Other accomplishments in American Samoa have been scarcely less imposing. Attracted by generous tax incentives, a number of new companies have settled on Government-owned land, providing welcome work and wages for hundreds. Local commerce had long been a monopoly of a few island traders. With funds from the Government-owned Bank of Samoa, a number of vigorous young Samoans have started flourishing little businesses of their own. A pair of brothers, for example, now run a combined commission business and tours agency. Two others now operate their own construction business. Other private enterprises include an island newspaper, Samoa's first laundry, a barber and beauty shop, a retail clothing store.

With the islands' exotic beauty, attractive people, and the handsome new jet airport—finest in the South Seas—tourism was made to order for Samoa. Three years ago, Lee helped island leaders to form the Samoan Development Corp. "If anyone is to profit from Samoa's tourist attractions," he said, "it will be Samoans." Today, the fine new Polynesian-style hotel is 100 percent Samoan owned, with 1,200 shareholders, who purchased $10 shares through time payments and payroll deductions. All shops and services—Polynesian handicrafts, fishing boats, car rentals—will eventually be run by Samoans trained by an international hotel management concern.

Among SDC projects soon to be realized is a modern shopping center in Pago Pago, complete with laundromats and an air-conditioned supermarket. The broad base of stock ownership is already channeling dividends to the remotest villages; and scores of Samoans, partly supported by Government scholarships and partly by the SDC, are now in mainland and Hawaiian colleges learning the skills they need to run their own affairs.

FOOD AND FACILITIES

Most Samoan farms had produced only scant crops of such diet basics as taro, breadfruit, and bananas. One of Lee's first acts was to rejuvenate the Government's weed-grown experimental farms. Extension agents showed the islanders how to step up the quantity and variety of their products. Intercropping was started, free transplants of seedlings were provided, farm machinery was rented out, insecticides and fertilizers were sold at cost. Suitable strains of poultry and pigs were brought in.

The result: Samoa's average production per acre has almost doubled since 1961. Overall, food prices are at an alltime low. Many farmers now own machinery, bought on time. And today in Samoa's traditional open-air, grass-roofed shacks stand more than 500 large white refrigerators.

Another of Lee's early acts was to launch engineering studies for a comprehensive sewage-disposal system for the Pago Pago Bay area, then to begin a long-term program aimed at providing, largely with the people's own efforts, sanitary facilities in each village, including laundry and showers. The possession of a private water toilet has now become a Samoan status symbol.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

With the help of imported specialists, a control program has sharply reduced the incidence of pulmonary troubles, filariasis, intestinal parasites, anemia, and other diseases. Malnutrition in the young, due to faulty diet and alarmingly fatal to infants, was attacked through a school-lunch project and home-demonstration programs. To cut down the island's birth rate, long one of the world's highest, a drive to teach birth control was recently launched.

Lee wangled from Congress a $3 million appropriation to build a badly needed new hospital. The ancient hospital's services had been largely in the hands of a dozen "Samoan medical practitioners" (SMP's), bright young Samoans trained at the Central Medical School in Suva, Fiji, but without enough education to qualify for medical degrees. A number of scholarships have now been established for Samoans in stateside schools of medicine, to supply top medical talent for the future.

PRICE TAGS

Since his goal was to make Samoans self-sufficient politically as well as economically, Lee boldly surrendered many of his powers, laying in the lap of the legislature, formerly a rubberstamp body, the responsibility for enacting and enforcing its own laws. How well the Samoans have responded is indicated by the legislature's action in early 1963 when it overwhelmingly voted "to join our fellow Americans in paying Federal income taxes"—the only American territory voluntarily to take on this burden. When one legislator, egged on by a well-to-do island merchant, spoke against the income tax as "colonialist" and "undemocratic," whole phalanxes of his fellow chiefs arose to cry him down. "We have never been less colonialist or more democratic," declaimed High Chief Rapi Sotoa, president of the senate. "This makes us real Americans at last."

In 1963, the income tax produced $212,600; in 1964, $947,000; in 1965, some $1,186,000—an amount almost equal to the entire annual congressional appropriations for Samoa in pre-Lee days. The steady climb of Samoa toward economic independence is equally marked. For fiscal 1966, local revenues are estimated at $3,011,000, almost a fourfold growth over 1961.

Congressional appropriations over the past 4 years have totaled more than $30 million. With most of his construction program financed, Lee's budget request for fiscal 1966 is down to $3,795,000. "With the rate of economic growth anticipated," he says, "American Samoa should become self-sufficient by 1975." Says Congressman MICHAEL J. KIRWAN of the House Committee on Appropriations: "Seldom in our history has an investment in people shown such prompt and satisfactory returns."

KEEP IT SAMOAN

Word has spread. So many people from other South Sea island groups have tried to crowd in that Samoa has had to restrict immigration. Two delegations came recently from New Zealand's Tokelau Islands, nosed about for days, then sought our Governor Lee to say, "We are sent by our council of chiefs, who decided that we would like to cede our islands and become a part of the United States."

But will all this development mean the loss of Samoa's charm, the abandonment of its appealing culture? Not at all, says Lee. "All we do is aimed at keeping Samoa Samoan." The island chiefs unanimously agree. As High Chief T. Le'iato told me: "If we lose any of our old ways, it will be because we choose to, not because changes are being forced upon us."

When, last year, word reached Samoa that a representative of an Iron Curtain country had risen in the U.N. to call American Samoa "a familiar example of colonialist conquest," the legislature flew into an uproar, "Let us make it plain," said one spokesman, "that American Samoa is no colony, but a part of the United States—by choice. And let no one come calling here to force us apart from our brothers, the mainland Americans."

NEW CAREERS FOR LAWYERS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the Christian Science Monitor has been carrying a series of articles upon various careers. An article in the issue of Monday, October 18, 1965, entitled "Many Niches Await New Lawyer" and written by Mr. Peter H. Holme, Jr., a prominent attorney in Denver, is a very valuable addition to the discussion of the legal profession.

In it, he succinctly describes some of the changes in the legal profession in the last 30 years and then defines the possible areas in which lawyers of varying abilities may find a rewarding career.

I commend it to my colleagues, and particularly to those young men who are seeking a career in law.

I ask unanimous consent to include this article in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANY NICHES AWAIT NEW LAWYER

(NOTE.—More than ever before, today's lawyer is a part of his enlarging community. A distinguished lawyer and authority on legal education discusses what a law graduate faces as he enters his profession in the age of specialization.)

(By Peter H. Holme, Jr.)

DENVER.—The law is not—and never will be—what it was.

What was it? We think of it as a series of leisurely visits in a cluttered upstairs office between an often unkempt but keen-eyed sage and his client. Perhaps these chats culminated in an elaborately worded letter, a will laced with elegant phrases and verbal flourishes, or a deed to the back 40 acres.

Now and then, where a controversy was persistent and negotiations fell apart, or one of the parties was too contentious to be happy with a friendly, and thus drab, ending to an otherwise stimulating drama, the combatants could end up in court.

Many can still remember those beguiling scenes in a country courthouse where, depending on the locale, the lawyers might be shirt-sleeved or stiff-collared. The windows were open in summer and shut tight in winter. A generation before the controversy over televising court proceedings could have arisen, the wiles of the advocates and the fascinating predicaments of their clients slaked the community thirst for entertainment and gossip.

The pace, compared with today, was slow. The processes were often surrounded with gentle ritual—and if the lawyer was paid with a turkey or a basket of gourds, he may have been content, since his satisfaction came also from the knowledge that he was an integral and important part of the fabric of his community. Indeed he was called "judge" in many parts of the country simply because he had been around for a few years.

The current anomaly is that the lawyer now is even more than formerly a part of his enlarging community, but its members are probably less aware of this fact. Once a family counselor to some, he now seems to many to have become a remote, forbidding, and prohibitively expensive personage. Yet, because of changes in the economy and in society and the explosive growth of governmental presence in the affairs of the common man, the lawyer has become an immediate and essential part of the life of citizens who may know nothing of his function or even of his existence.

Specialization has begun to leave its imprint on the practice of the law. It is plain that this is but the beginning as the complexities of the craft multiply.

But before discussing what a lawyer does, we should look at what a lawyer is.

THE TRAINING OF A LAWYER

Something should be said about the formal education required before one can even call himself a lawyer.

There are 135 approved law schools in the United States and its territories now. While each State sets its own requirements for admission to its bar, all but a few now insist that an applicant for the bar examination must have been graduated with an LL.B. or a J.D. from a law school which has the approval of the American Bar Association.

These schools are of two types—and some schools operate a division of each type. The full-time law school requires 3 academic years of in-residence study. The part-time school, generally holding classes during evening hours for the working student, requires a minimum of 4 years. From the standpoint of curriculum requirements the two types of schools are comparable and lead to the same graduate degree.

That a degree in law is a graduate degree has often been overlooked because of the "B" in LL.B.—"bachelor of laws." This is an anachronism now being corrected in many schools by the change to "J.D."—"Doctor of Jurisprudence."

All law schools require at least 3 years of college prior to admission, and almost half now require 4 years and a B.A., B.S., or equivalent degree.

Today's law graduate who wishes to remain a lawyer may find himself in one or more of these situations:

1. The large law office.
2. The small, or individual law office.

3. The corporate law department—"house counsel."

4. Local, State, or national governmental office or legal staff.

5. On the bench.

6. Teaching.

THE LARGE LAW OFFICE

This is an establishment more venerable in the eastern communities or such cosmopolitan centers as San Francisco than in the Middle West, the South, and the other erstwhile frontiers. But the idea is spreading. The large law office may, by Wall Street standards, be composed of well over 100 lawyers, while by midcontinental standards it may contain from 20 to 50 lawyers. However, the similarities outweigh the differences, whether in New York, Dallas, or St. Louis.

These offices tend to be departmentalized according to legal specialties. For example, there may be departments for corporate tax, property, labor, estates, trial, admiralty, and maybe domestic-relations law, to mention a few—and each may have its inner subdivisions.

Next are the hierarchies of personnel. The front ranks range from the summer law clerks, working between their second and third year of law school, to the associates. The associates are young graduate lawyers who, in today's sellers' market for the bright student, have been wooed and won in a frantic and sometimes regrettably misleading recruitment effort.

Having been liberally and even lavishly entertained, the young associates show up for work following graduation. There they find they are commencing the first of a number of years of hard work while they "bridge the gap." The gap is that from the academic law-school world to the demanding, rewarding, challenging, but often immensely frustrating world of "the practice."

This maturing and seasoning process is doubtless the most difficult period in the career of today's lawyer. Later comes the daily atmosphere of crisis, decisionmaking, the midnight weighing of problems, the acute awareness of the human interests and concerns of the client—individual or corporate. These things are strenuous and can be hard, but along with them comes the satisfaction of personal and professional independence, and, it is to be hoped, a willingness and readiness by then to expect the difficult, and to accept its accompanying responsibility.

The "associate" toils on in an often-changing environment as he is seasoned—but the day does not go by when at least for a moment he does not contemplate the "goal." The goal is the opening of the door to partnership.

Some partners achieve greatness in their profession and communities. Some partners are duds. On the other hand, many lawyers who have endured the poignant experience of failing to achieve the coveted partnership status have gone on into other fields, legal or nonlegal, to become Senators, corporate presidents, and leaders in various fields.

While somewhat forbidding, the large law office seems to have what sociologist William Graham Sumner called "survival value." Its growth and spread throughout the country in recent years demonstrates its vitality, if not its charm.

THE SMALLER LAW OFFICE

This establishment ranges from the office of the single practitioner to the grouping of several lawyers who may be in partnership, or in some looser form of office-sharing arrangement. They both exist in urban and rural areas alike—and, as one would expect, may be exceedingly influential and busy, or at the other end of the scale, desperately unsuccessful. Some of the ablest and most renowned lawyers—and not just formerly—find themselves happiest as "loners" and could not abide in their professional lives the administrative detail and, sad to say, often restrictive surroundings of the large office.

From the ranks of the unreconstructed individualists in the legal profession should continue to come many of those who will lead the profession into new areas of legal thought and action—not only because their temperament and independence have directed them into the free and lonely world of the solo practitioner, but because this type of practice enables them to see the law and its relationships to society in a light less diffused by economic and organizational considerations.

HOUSE COUNSEL

"Kept lawyer," "captive counsel," and other disparaging terms have been applied to this group of lawyers by others who may have coined these terms as much from envy as from disdain.

The growth of the house-counsel concept may be laid directly at the door of the general practitioners—since there would have been little need for the former if the services of the latter had been sufficiently available and inexpensive to satisfy the corporate client.

The obvious solution was to hire a full-time lawyer, or several of them. These can become familiar with the daily affairs of their employer—and because they have no other clients, their service is instantly available. Their cost is also a known and readily budgetable item. Too, they may be freely consulted by junior executives without fear of criticism for committing the company to extra legal expense.

The cardinal disadvantage is the loss of the objective counsel of the lawyer who is not dependent upon any one client for his livelihood, and who is thus under less pressure to echo the wishes of the company executives in giving his legal advice. For this reason, many companies use both systems.

GOVERNMENT SERVICE

The countless areas in government or other public service which need the services of legally trained personnel, like any other governmental staffing situation, defy description—not to mention understanding.

For example, the Army alone, in its highly organized and well-trained Judge Advocate General Corps with its civilian adjuncts employs more than 3,000 top-flight lawyers. In addition to the Justice Department, consider the Departments of Interior; Labor; State; Health, Education, and Welfare; the Internal Revenue Service; counsel for congressional committees, and so on.

Thousands upon thousands of lawyers in government service find employment, and in many cases fulfillment of an urge to be of use in the public world.

The U.S. Government operates by far the largest law office on earth—and there is little likelihood of its getting smaller.

Counterparts, lesser in number but not necessarily in importance, are found in State and municipal governments—whether it be attorneys general advising Governors, legislators, and State agencies, or prosecutors at the district- and police-court level.

Regardless of the competence or lack of it brought by the particular lawyer to any of these varied positions, none of the tasks involving the relationship of the Government to its citizens can be dismissed as unimportant or trivial.

THE JUDICIARY

"Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"—the custody of these "unalienable rights" is entrusted under the American system to men, and these men are the judges. Also, no law passed by any Congress or legislature in the United States is immune from interpretation and, indeed, invalidation by the courts.

Men worship at the shrine of platitudes and in so doing, may lose sight of the fallacies inherent in them. One such concept in the United States is that "this is a government of laws and not of men."

This is an ideal which carries with it both a desirable objective and a pragmatic impossibility. The thought is good and must be embraced. Yet it is perfectly obvious that it is a paradox, since no law can enforce itself without the intervention—and fallibility—of men.

Here then is the essence of our society—and for its administration, the indispensable men are the judges of the major trial and appellate courts who must interpret, apply, and enforce the laws. This is an awesome assignment. Here again is a task which, thus far at least, only those trained in the law can perform.

TEACHING AND RESEARCH

One tends to save the most important for the last. Teaching is the field which should be the preserve of those who would derive the greatest satisfaction—human and intellectual—from their profession.

Economic barriers have kept many aspirants out of this branch of the legal profession, but happily in recent years, these barriers have been lowered to a considerable extent. Great advances have been made, in response to great need, and while the intellectual leader in the law cannot expect wealth in the teaching of law, he at least no longer need contemplate squalor and privation.

To the teacher and the researcher in the legal profession belongs the future—not only of "the law" but in a significant sense, of society, so long as society professes to be molded, guided, and governed by the law.

The legal profession has been a conservative one—but the need for exploration and development in law is creating an irrepressible force for change.

The triumphs of science have pointed up its failures in the areas most important to the future of mankind, including scientists. Law is not a science. Its practice may be an art. But whatever the law is, it is the irreplaceable ingredient in a free civilization.

Its practitioners have an abiding responsibility to oncoming generations. Its teachers have the task of developing, training, and inspiring those practitioners.

The law has been called a seamless web. Whatever its description, it is the pervasive presence in any society which calls itself civilized. In it must be found the means of enabling men to live together rather than apart. Because the law always must act upon human beings—and indeed has no meaning or function unless it does—it is as varied, perplexing, difficult, and fascinating as the facets of the human nature with which it deals.

AIRLINES BUY NEW JET EQUIPMENT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, in a press conference last week Mr. Stuart G. Tipton, president of the Air Transport Association, released a new study of airline equipment deliveries for the 1965–69 period, which forcefully points out the continuation of the massive equipment improvement and expansion program of the Nation's scheduled airlines.

Mr. Tipton's announcement that the airlines have so far announced plans for taking delivery of 704 airplanes valued at $3.75 billion during the last half of this decade is heartening news to those of us interested in aviation and a confirmation of Mr. Tipton's earlier testimony before the Senate Aviation Subcommittee that service to medium-sized intermediate cities will be improved by the introduction of this new equipment; 472

of the 704 airplanes on order are of the medium and short range category. This is an increase from the 342 medium and short range airplanes on order when Mr. Tipton testified before my subcommittee in July.

I am continually amazed at the dynamism of the airline industry and its willingness to risk capital to anticipate and help create public demand. The industry is presently experiencing record profits. I hope they will use these new airplanes to improve service to the medium-sized cities as well as to increase further their profits.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point an article from the Washington Star describing the industry's new equipment program.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Oct. 11 1965]

Airline Orders on 704 Planes Top $3.7 Billion

(By Lyle Denniston)

U.S. commercial airlines will buy 704 new jet and jet-prop planes costing $3,749,200,000 in the 5-year period ending in 1969, the Air Transport Association reported today.

The total, ATA figures showed, far exceeds the volume of plane-buying in any recent 5-year period.

In the 1955–59 period, when the airlines were converting from piston to jet power, they ordered 514 planes costing $1,500,800,000. In the 1960–64 period, orders for 603 craft were valued at $2,972,420,000.

MORE EXPECTED

ATA president Stuart G. Tipton, who released the results of a survey as of September 30, said the orders on manufacturers' books probably will grow larger.

"More orders can be expected, particularly for delivery in the latter part of the (1965–69) period," Tipton told a press conference this morning.

In answer to a question, Tipton said he would not be surprised if another $1 billion in orders comes in. That would push the 5-year total close to $5 billion.

Here is the year-by-year delivery schedule for planes now on order: 1965, 161 planes for $880.6 million; 1966, 239 planes for $1.2 billion; 1967, 187 planes for $1 billion; 1968, 97 for $531.9 million, and 1969, 20 for $101.2 million.

The 1965–69 orders cover 663 pure jet planes, 40 turbine-driven propeller craft, and one turbine-powered helicopter. Of the pure jets, 472 are "intermediate and short-range" craft. These planes, ATA said, will lead to "a major upgrading of the quality of service to the smaller and intermediate-sized cities of the country."

ATA's survey does not show options to buy additional craft. A number of carriers have taken options to buy the new supersonic transports when they become available.

CONFIDENCE SHOWN

"The massive airline re-equipment and expansion program," Tipton said, "expresses the confidence of airline managements in the future growth of the economy and their ability to generate continued enlargement of the market for air travel."

He also asserted that the plane-buying will increase airline employment. The airlines are planning to add 50,000 jobs over the next 5 years, Tipton reported.

The 1965–69 delivery schedule will give airlines new craft with a value adding up to 82 percent of the flight equipment they were operating at the end of 1964. The carriers were then using planes that cost $4.5 billion.

ATA's 5-year survey includes the planes already delivered to carriers this year. Since January 1, a total of 107 jets and turboprops have been turned over to airlines. Their value was $655.7 million. That left 597 craft, worth $3,093,500,000, to be delivered between now and the end of 1969.

VICTORY FOR FREEDOM SEEN

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the rights of the States and freedom of choice were ably defended when the 89th Congress persuaded the leadership to lay aside an administration bill which would have repealed section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. The weight of public opinion, overwhelmingly in favor of the continuation of the States to enact right-to-work laws, was brought to bear in this issue. Public opinion for a change found itself the victor.

Columnist David Lawrence examined this issue in an excellent column which appeared in the October 14 Washington Evening Star. Mr. Lawrence observes, in part:

> The change in the attitude of the Senate, where union leaders thought they had a stable majority, is a victory for an informed public opinion throughout the country.

I ask unanimous consent that the David Lawrence column be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Victory for Freedom Seen

(By David Lawrence)

Such words as "filibuster" and "cloture" and "repeal of 14(b)" may not mean much to the average man, so it can be simplified by noting that a victory has just been recorded for an individual freedom—which is something everybody can understand.

It was not just a temporary victory, either, when the Senate voted 47 to 45 against taking up the bill which, if enacted, would have deprived the States of their right to forbid compulsory unionization and thereby making it the price of a job in America. There is, indeed, something of far more significance than the issue of whether an employer shall be forced to do the bidding of a union in the hiring or firing of his employees. The real question that faces the country today is whether trade unions shall continue as a form of supergovernment which imposes a kind of tax on the individual worker and then does what it pleases with his money.

If the controversy was merely over the repeal of 14(b)—the section in the National Labor Relations Act which specifies that States shall have the power to pass their own right-to-work laws—there might be doubt that a delay of a few months would hurt the chances of taking up the measure in the next session of Congress. But the problem now goes deeper. It centers on the issue of what shall be done about the monopoly power of labor unions themselves.

The right of a group of workers in a given industry to form a union of their craft is unquestioned, but, when they strike, have they any right to conspire with other unions to keep other employees from going to work? A dispute may have no relationship to the collective bargaining objectives of another union, but the practice has grown up that, when one union strikes, all other unions in the same plant are virtually compelled to join in the work stoppage.

Yet if an executive of one business in a given industry even lunches with an executive of another company in the same line of business and they talk over prices, they can be sent to jail under the criminal provisions of the antitrust law. The laws of the land for decades have consistently barred monopoly on the part of business managers. Trade unions, however, have been exempt from the operations of such laws, though unions do fix wage costs throughout an industry, and this has a direct effect on prices. Hardly a settlement after a strike in a major industry occurs that isn't followed immediately by discussions of price changes. Congress, however, has been indifferent to this and hasn't even proposed any law to abolish such monopolistic power by forbidding unions to conspire with each other to fix wage levels by a process known as industrywide bargaining.

But what will happen next time? The labor-union leaders realize that the congressional election in November 1966, could have as a dominant issue the question of compulsory unionization. They know, too, that public opinion has been shifting and that, as a result of recent strikes, there has developed a public demand for some form of mediation or arbitration to be specified by Government in the event that a settlement is not reached within a reasonable length of time.

Labor-union leaders have been confident that the financial contributions made through their efforts in political campaigns all over the country would bring a majority in Congress to vote for repeal of 14(b). But they were wrong about the Senate, and it is not clear whether even in the House the majority which did vote for the bill was particularly enthusiastic about it and whether some representatives perhaps counted on the Senate to block the measure.

So there will be some soul-searching done between now and the January session of Congress. The Johnson administration itself, which has been indebted to labor and sponsored the proposal to make compulsory unionization applicable in all States, may have some second thoughts when the issue comes up again.

The change in the attitude of the Senate, where union leaders thought they had a stable majority, is a victory for an informed public opinion throughout the country.

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR TAWES, OF MARYLAND, AT THE DEDICATION OF ROSSMOOR LEISURE WORLD, MD.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on September 9, Maryland Governor Tawes spoke at the dedication ceremonies of Rossmoor Leisure World.

This is one of America's largest adult community developments and is located adjacent to our Nation's Capital in Wheaton, Md.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address given by Governor Tawes at this occasion be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address Given by Governor Tawes, on the Occasion of the Dedication of Rossmoor Leisure World, Md., September 9, 1965

Thank you very much, Mr. Cortese, the representatives of the clergy, the representatives of the Federal agencies of our Federal Government, of the government of Montgomery County, represented here in the person of Mrs. Hepburn, Mr. Simon, the other very distinguished members of the Leisure

World and the Leisure World Foundation, and distinguished guests, all.

Today is certainly a proud and happy day for the Leisure World Foundation and a happy day for not only the citizens of Montgomery County, but for the citizens of Maryland and the territory and areas adjacent thereto.

I had the good fortune to meet this very, very distinguished thinker and a person who thinks and puts his thinking into execution, Mr. Cortese, when he visited us at the statehouse in Annapolis, a few weeks ago Frankly speaking, I had no idea of the magnitude of this project. He invited me to be here on this occasion when Leisure World would be dedicated, and when I consulted my schedule for the day, at that moment I found it impossible. But then I began to have unfolded by those who are familiar with this project, the magnitude and the net results of what this all means; and then I left a very important extradition hearing I had scheduled this morning, turned it over to one of the assistant attorneys general, and I came; and I am happy, indeed, because this is a project which I believe would be impossible to describe in a brochure with words. I think it is the type of project that you must see to believe it; and our senior citizens, particularly, should note this day as an important day in our State.

I was pleased to pour into the fountain out here the waters from the Chesapeake, and let me say, Mr. Toastmaster, that that water came from the Chesapeake [laughter]. The only thing it lacked was a few our our Chesapeake Bay crabs, a few of our Chesapeake Bay oysters, our rock fish, and some of the other fine specimens from the Bay; but, that's beside the point. We hope that this project will be all that the citizens who will live here want it to be and I am sure it will.

This beautiful development is, indeed, unique, in that it is planned as a perfect community for persons of mature years. Practical as well as luxury features, I note, have been included in the plans to make Leisure World one of the finest communities in Maryland; and such practical features as we have observed—the shopping center, the full medical staff and facilities, free transportation within the community, as well as chartered bus service to the neighboring and metropolitan areas, and the single monthly payment plan that covers all activities, will certainly add much to the comfort and convenience of the residents of Leisure World. The golf course, the swimming pool, the riding stable and the other recreational facilities will provide them with much enjoyment and pleasure.

I want to say to Mr. Cortese, that I was honored, indeed, and it was no effort on my part to come today, when you asked that I officially open this project.

The first bill which I signed upon taking office as Governor of Maryland, and I don't think that I have related this to Mr. Cortese before, in 1959, was that which created the Commission on the Aging, and which designated as chairman the former senator from this county, Mrs. Margaret Sweet Sweinhout, from this county, as the first chairman. She proposed the legislation, she worked for its passage in the house and in the senate (she was in the house at that particular time) and then after the bill was passed, I don't think she slept until I signed that piece of legislation, because it was her goal that it would be the first bill that I signed; and the welfare of the older citizens of this State has always been a matter of deep concern, not only to those who are interested in projects of this nature, but of deep concern to all citizens.

I am keenly aware, as I know all of you are, that the vision and the labor of the older citizens of the day contributed much to making Maryland a great State in a great nation; and we should never forget the words of the Psalmist, when he said, "Cast me not off in time of old age, forsake me not when my strength faileth." It is the solemn duty of all of us to see that our senior citizens live out their lives in dignity. Moreover, it is our responsibility, insofar as we are able, to see to it that our older citizens, whose deepest desire is to remain independent and self-sufficient, have the opportunity to realize that desire.

Shortly after establishing the State Commission on Aging, and following its recommendations, we eliminated age, as such, as a requirement for eligibility in all State positions, with the exception of the Maryland State Police.

So it is that we know the value of creative activity for those who reach their mature years. We know that many who have completed their careers in business, who have launched their families into useful pursuits, whose endeavors in earning a living have achieved for them the right to leisure, wish still to continue to lead active, useful lives.

Leisure World is also a place where those who are still gainfully employed can come to live, to take advantage of its country club atmosphere, its many recreational facilities, while preparing for their retirement. Its medical plan, its security patrol, its complete program of exterior maintenance free the individual residents from the worries of the large medical bills that can come with prolonged sickness, the fears of intrusion, and the drudgery of keeping up with the Joneses. Here, everyone can find it extremely easy to keep up with the Joneses, for the Joneses have the same gardener.

But, the pleasant view and the leisure living that is afforded those who will live here in Leisure World is but the outer shell of a community that has a heart, a heart that goes out to those who wish to live out their lives in peace and enjoyment. Leisure World is indeed the community for those of mature years.

I wish it were possible some day for me to live in Leisure World.

Thank you.

PATENTS AND NEW DRUG DISCOVERIES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, in a recent editorial, stated with great perceptiveness the case for a strong and flexible patent system and pointed out how our historic U.S. system has contributed much to the development of new drugs, medicines and medical techniques, just as it has fostered advances in other fields.

As the Evening Bulletin editorial makes clear, unless our patent system is preserved, benefits we have come to take for granted may be lost.

The editorial makes references to the study now being conducted by the Senate Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. It warns that any Federal policy seizing rights to all drug discoveries whenever the Government contributes financially to the research ignores what may be the even larger contributions that frequently are made by individual scientists and drug companies not only to the discovery itself but in the inevitably costly development work that must be carried out before a new compound can become an effective medicine.

Our subcommittee, I am sure, will take such steps as are necessary to protect all equities and to advance scientific progress in any bill recommended to the Senate.

Mr. President, so that my colleagues may have the benefit of reading this clear and persuasive statement, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be included in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Evening Bulletin, Aug. 23, 1965]

PATENTS AND NEW DRUG DISCOVERIES

One of the principal reasons the United States has contributed so much over the years in the field of new drugs, medicines, and medical techniques has been the adequate incentives our patent system has offered to inventors, scientists, and the drug companies, who have devised elaborate and expensive systems for research and testing of the efficacy of new medicinal discoveries. The contributions of the various developed nations of the world have been closely related to the patent protection those nations provide.

Relatively recently, the U.S. Government has moved in a big way into the health research field—as it has into all fields of research—through such activities as the provision of Public Health Service and National Institutes of Health grants to individuals who conduct their research at universities and medical schools.

Simultaneously, there has evolved a policy that when the Government has contributed to drug discoveries through research grants, the principal or exclusive rights to the discovery should normally be taken by the Government. This seems fair enough on the surface, in that the aim is to protect the public investment in scientific studies.

It ignores, however, the relative contribution made by the individual researcher and the drug companies in developing new discoveries. A scientist on a $12,000 Government grant may, for example, come up with a hunch he has found an effective compound. This must be exhaustively tested according to methods which only the drug companies are equipped to employ.

A drug company may, quite often, spend between $4 and $5 million in testing the new compound, first on animals and then, in a carefully controlled program, on humans. It seems clearly unreasonable to expect the drug company to undertake such a substantial investment without some incentives of patent protection.

A fair system, and one which would provide the necessary incentives to all concerned, would provide for a division of patent rights for new discoveries arising from university-industry-government research projects according to the relative contribution made by each.

This could be done, for example, by giving ownership of the patent to the university or university scientist; the Government would receive a royalty-free license, and the collaborating drug company would receive an exclusive license for a reasonable period of time and would pay a royalty.

Thus the individual scientist would have an adequate incentive, the drug company would be given an opportunity to recover its huge research and development costs, and the public investment would still be protected.

This overall question is now being considered in Congress, which would do well not to forget the impact that adequate protection has had on stimulating beneficial discoveries in all fields over the years.

GOOD, SOUND POLICY

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, the new Panama treaty agreement is a sound and statesmanlike method of resolving problems. It recognizes problems. It recognizes the U.S. interests, and the Panamanian interests. Both are served well.

The Knoxville, Tenn., News-Sentinel said recently:

> More importantly, it provides a base for orderly development of the new, much larger sea level canal scheduled to be built within the next 15 years.

The editorial to which I have referred will be of interest to my colleagues and I ask permission that it be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) News-Sentinel, Sept. 26, 1965]

THE PANAMA TREATY

Both the United States and the Republic of Panama have legitimate, vital interests in the Panama Canal and the zone which surrounds it. But there is no reason why these interests should necessarily conflict—which is what the new treaty agreement announced by President Johnson recognizes.

The U.S. interest is in keeping the canal open to commercial and naval shipping, free from interference by riot, revolution or any other disturbance.

The Panamanian interest is that the Canal Zone is, after all, its territory and that the canal cuts the tiny country in two.

The agreement, with details to be worked out later, provides for recognition of Panamanian sovereignty over the zone and gives Panama a share in the canal's operation.

At the same time, it guarantees that both the existing canal and a new one now in the planning stage will be guarded by U.S. military forces.

This is a sound and statesmanlike method of resolving the problems which gave rise to rioting and bloodshed in the Canal Zone a year ago last January.

More important, it provides a base for orderly development of the new, much larger sea-level canal scheduled to be built within the next 15 years.

It appears likely that this canal will go through Panama. And if it does, the rules now agreed on should insure its construction with a minimum of differences between the two countries.

OBJECTIVES OF THE COMMUNIST RULERS OF MAINLAND CHINA

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, Communist China is exerting an ever-increasing influence in the capitals of nations throughout the world. Directly or indirectly, the rapacious Communist government, which controls what was once the proud and honored nation of the Chinese people, has its fingers in the boiling pots of revolution on virtually every continent. For the benefit of those who seek to know more of the designs of communism, I should like to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two items, one of which dates back more than 10 years.

The first item was printed in the RECORD of April 29, 1954, by then Senator William Knowland, of California. It purports to be an outline of Mao Tse-tung's memorandum on the new program for world revolution. The other item, which is essentially an updating of the earlier program, appeared in story form in the September 19 Washington Post. Chalmers M. Roberts, in reporting on the 20,000 word article, entitled "Long Live the Victory of the People's War," issued in Peiping September 2, compares it with Hitler's "Mein Kampf." The article was signed by Lin Piao, Communist Chinese Vice Premier and Minister of Defense.

As Mr. Roberts points out, its central theme is this:

> Communism came to power in China, the world's most populous nation, by Mao's tactic of surrounding the cities from the rural countryside, in far more than a mere military sense, embracing politics, economics, and psychological warfare. Now the time has come to apply this tactic to the whole world.

Mr. President, I request that the two items appear at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTLINE OF MAO TSE-TUNG'S MEMORANDUM ON NEW PROGRAM FOR WORLD REVOLUTION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, some information which came to me, purporting to be an outline of Mao Tse-tung's memorandum on the new program for world revolution, carried to Moscow by Chou En-lai in March of 1953. I believe the information substantially states the Communist policy on world revolution. In any event, I think the Senate may find this matter of interest.

There being no objection, the outline was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"AN OUTLINE OF MAO TSE-TUNG'S MEMORANDUM ON NEW PROGRAM FOR WORLD REVOLUTION

"(Carried to Moscow by Chou En-lai in March 1953)

"1. Asia to be the immediate goal

"Due to the profound leadership of Comrade Stalin, amazing achievements have been made in the great task of world revolution. The success that has been attained both in Europe and in Asia after World War II is entirely attributable to Comrade Stalin's able and correct guidance and direction. May his wisdom still guide us.

"It appears that time has come that we have to look upon Asia as our immediate goal. Under the present circumstances, any vigorous action in Europe such as internal revolution, effective infiltration, or intimidation into inaction or submission is now impossible (Communist terminology is different, this represents what it really means) more forcible measures may bring about a war. In Asia, on the contrary, such tactics will yield an abundant harvest.

"2. World war to be temporarily avoided

"There is no assurance of victory because of the higher rate of industrial production and larger stockpile of atomic weapons on the part of the capitalist countries, incompletion of antiatomic defenses of the industrial areas and oil installations in the Soviet Union, and immaturity of China's agricultural and industrial developments. Consequently, we have to, until we are certain of victory, take a course which will not lead to war.

"3. Diplomatic offensive

"The United States must be isolated by all possible means.

"Britain must be placated by being convinced that there is possibility of settling the major issues between the East and the West and that the Communists and the capitalist countries can live in peace. Opportunities for trade will have a great influence on the British mind.

"In the case of France, her warweariness and fear of Germany must be thoroughly exploited. She must be made to feel a sense of greater security in cooperating with us than with the western countries.

"Japan must be convinced that rearmament endangers instead of guaranteeing her national security and that, in case of war, the American forces distributed all over the world cannot spare sufficient strength for the defense of Japan. Rearmament is, therefore, an expression of hostility toward her potential friends. Her desire to trade will offer great possibilities for steering Japan away from the United States.

"4. Military preparedness

"As a final goal, there should be in east and southeast Asia (after these areas are liberated) 25 million well-trained men who can be immediately mobilized. These men are to be held in readiness for emergency. They will achieve two purposes. On the one hand they will force the capitalist countries to keep on increasing defense expenses until economic collapse overtakes them. On the other hand, a mere show of force, when time is ripe, will bring about the capitulation of the ruling cliques of the countries to be liberated.

"5. The Korean war

"The important reason that we cannot win decisive victory in Korea is our lack of naval strength. Without naval support, we have to confine our operations to frontal attacks along a line limited by sea. Such actions always entail great losses and are seldom capable of destroying the enemy. In March 1951 I suggested to Comrade Stalin to make use of the Soviet submarines in Asia under some arrangement that the Soviet Union would not be apparently involved in the war. Comrade Stalin preferred to be cautious lest it might give the capitalist imperialism the pretext of expanding the war to the Continent. I agreed with his point of view.

"Until we are better equipped for victory, it is to our advantage to accept agreeable terms for an armistice.

"6. Formosa

"Formosa must be incorporated into the People's Republic of China because of the Government's commitment to the people. If seizure by force is to be avoided for the time being, the entry of the Chinese People's Government into the United Nations may help solve this problem. If there should be serious obstacles to the immediate transfer of Formosa to the control of the People's Government, a United Nations trusteeship over Formosa as an intermediary step could be taken into consideration.

"7. Indochina

"We shall give the maximum assistance to our comrades and friends in Indochina. The experiences we have had in Korea should enrich their knowledge in fighting for liberation. The case of Indochina cannot be compared with that of China. In Indochina, as in Korea, there is serious intervention of the capitalist bloc, while in China there was nothing so direct and vigorous. The experiences in Korea tell us that so long as there is foreign intervention and so long as we have no naval support, military operations alone cannot achieve the objective of liberation.

"The military operations in Indochina should be carried out to such an extent as to make the war extremely unpopular among the French people and to make the French and Americans extremely hateful among the Indochinese people. The object is to force the French to back out of Indochina preferably through the face-saving means of an armistice. Once foreign intervention is out of the picture vigorous propaganda, infiltration, forming united fronts with the progressive elements in and outside the reactionary regimes will accelerate the process of liberation. A final stroke of force will accomplish the task. Two years may be needed for this work.

"8. Burma, Thailand, Indonesia, and Malay Peninsula

"After the liberation of Indochina, Burma will fall in line as good foundation has already been laid there. The then reactionary ruling clique in Thailand will capitulate and the country will be in the hands of the people. The liberation of Indonesia, which will fall to Communist camp as a ripe fruit, will complete the circle around the Malay Peninsula.

"The British will realize, under these circumstances, the hopelessness of putting up a fight and will withdraw as quickly as they can. We expect that the whole process will be completed in or before 1960.

"9. Japan and India

"By 1960 China's military, economic, and industrial power will be so developed that with a mere show of force by the Soviet Union and China, the ruling clique of Japan will capitulate and a peaceful revolution will take place. We must be on guard against the possibility that the United States will choose to have war at this moment. She may even want the war earlier. The defensive and offensive preparations of the Soviet Union and China must, therefore, be completed before 1960. Whether we can prevent the United States from starting the war depends upon how much success we have in isolating her and how effective is our peace offensive. If the war can be averted, the success of our plan of peaceful penetration for the other parts of Asia is almost assured.

"In the case of India, only peaceful means should be adopted. Any employment of force will alienate ourselves from the Arabic countries and Africa, because India is considered to be our friend.

"10. Arabic countries and Africa

"After India has been won over, the problems of the Philippines and the Arabic countries can be easily solved by economic cooperation, alliances, united fronts, and coalitions. This task may be completed in 1965. Then a wave of revolution will sweep over the whole continent of Africa and the imperialists and the colonizationists will be quickly driven into the sea. In fact, this powerful movement may have been under way much earlier.

"With Asia and Africa disconnected with the capitalist countries in Europe, there will be a total economic collapse in Western Europe. There capitulation will be a matter of course.

"11. The United States

"Crushing economic collapse and industrial breakdown will follow the European crisis. Canada and South America will find themselves in the same hopeless and defenseless condition. Twenty years from now, world revolution will be an accomplished fact. If the United States should ever start a war, she would do so before the liberation of Japan, the Philippines, and India. The courses of action in that event are outlined in the memorandum on military aid."

[From the Washington Post Outlook, Sept. 19, 1965]

A World in Mao Tse-tung's Image—A Definitive Chinese Communist Document Sets Its Sights on Destruction of the United States

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

Every now and then, the leaders of totalitarian states put their dreams on paper. Hitler wrote "Mein Kampf"; Nasser wrote "A Philosophy of Revolution"; Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev turned out a mass of articles and books.

Now comes the Chinese Communists.

A 20,000-word article entitled "Long Live the Victory of the People's War," issued in Peiping, September 2, is rated by China scholars in the United States as an extremely important document. They give it this rating even though many of its theses and much of its dogma are old and its central formulation was well anticipated in the West.

The comparison with "Mein Kampf" and other such writings is limited to the fact that they all are interpretations of history coupled with hopes for the future. Aims, methods, timetables are radically different. What the Chinese now have produced, fundamentally, is Mao Tse-tung's view of the world, a definitively doctrinal statement of China's aims on how to remake the world in Peiping's image.

FOCUS ON THE UNITED STATES

It behooves the West, above all the United States, to pay attention to what the document says, not just to cast it aside as "Mein Kampf" was cast aside, as a dream of the impossible. For the West, again above all the United States, is the focus of China's antagonism, and our destruction is China's goal.

What, then, is said in this document signed by Lin Piao, vice chairman of the Chinese Communist Party's Central Committee, Vice Premier and Minister of Defense? The central theme is this:

Communism came to power in China, the world's most populous nation, by Mao's tactic of surrounding the cities from the rural countryside, in far more than a mere military sense, embracing politics, economics, and psychological warfare. Now the time has come to apply this tactic to the whole world. Lin Piao put it this way:

"Taking the entire globe, if North America and Western Europe can be called 'the cities of the world,' then Asia, Africa, and Latin America constitute 'the rural areas of the world.' Since World War II, the proletarian revolutionary movement has for various reasons been temporarily held back in the North American and West European capitalist countries while the people's revolutionary movement in Asia, Africa, and Latin America has been growing vigorously.

"In a sense, the contemporary world revolution also presents a picture of the encirclement of cities by the rural areas. In the final analysis, the whole cause of world revolution hinges on the revolutionary struggles of the Asian, African, and Latin American peoples who make up the overwhelming majority of the world's population. The Socialist [that is, Communist] countries should regard it as their internationalist duty to support the people's revolutionary struggles in Asia, Africa, and Latin America."

PIECEMEAL AGGRANDIZEMENT

With those words in mind, it is simple to understand how China views the war in Vietnam, why Premier Chou En-lai and his fellows have been busy touring the African nations, why the Chinese are working so hard to control the Afro-Asian conference (once postponed and now set for November) and why Peiping loudly trumpets support for every guerrilla band in Latin America.

They call it all revolution or "national wars of liberation," in Vietnam and elsewhere. We use terms like rebellion or insurrection. The point is that Peiping is out to bring into its orbit the so-called underdeveloped nations, one by one, by encouraging any sign of indigenous rebellion against any government exhibiting pro-Western feelings.

But China is not proposing to do so overtly with Chinese armies, as Hitler tried to conquer Europe and the Middle East or as Stalin used the Red army in Eastern Europe. Rather, through the use of local revolutionaries employing the guerrilla tactics Mao developed in the Chinese civil war, the Chinese hope to destroy American and Western influence. Such revolutions, wrote Lin Piao, must employ the tactic of the united front and play upon local nationalisms but with Communists in actual control.

These formulations are now being applied by China in the Indian-Pakistani conflict. Peiping says the struggle in Kashmir is a "people's war" in which the largely Moslem Kashmiri are rising against their Hindu masters in India.

The Chinese are supporting Pakistan against India because India, a democracy, is China's chief rival among the big underdeveloped nations of Asia. And it is trying to destroy the influence in the Indian subcontinent of both the United States and the Soviet Union, its key enemies.

Chinese troops were used against India in 1962 and may be used again now, but not in an overt invasion to conquer India. Rather, they are being used to humiliate India, carefully controlled along disputed border lines in a way to avoid giving the United States a clear pretext to respond with American military power.

SPREAD TOO THIN

As Peiping sees the United States, it has "weakened itself by occupying so many places in the world, overreaching itself, stretching its fingers out wide and dispersing its strength, with its rear so far away and its supply lines so long."

While American "imperialism" in Peiping's view, is "stronger * * * than any imperialism of the past," "everything is divisible, and so is this colossus of U.S. imperialism." The fingers of the American hand, then, can be chopped off one by one—and Vietnam is the spot for the first chop.

The fingers imagery was used by Mao at the time of the Korean war. The Indonesian Communists used the country-surrounding-the-cities analogy over a year ago. And the Mao thesis that the United States is a "paper tiger" was promulgated long ago.

Yet for some reason, all these and many other well-known Chinese formulations have now been wrapped up together in Marshal Lin's definitive article. Why?

AN EBB TIDE DEVICE

Some think that Peiping realizes that, because of the major American commitment in Vietnam, China is entering on a period of uncertainty. Hence, to rally its forces at home and abroad, Peiping decided to issue this rationale of policy. It is recalled that Mao developed the theory of protracted war, reiterated by Lin, in 1938 when the Communists were suffering reverses.

Others suggest that Chinese fear of an American attack on China itself called for a primer on guerrilla warfare for people who may have to face it again. Lin wrote that, in case of an American attack, "we want to tell the U.S. imperialists once again that the vast ocean of several hundred million Chinese people in arms will be more than enough to submerge your few million aggressor troops.

"The naval and air superiority you boast about cannot intimidate the Chinese people, and neither can the atom bomb you brandish at us. If you want to send troops, go ahead, the more the better. We will annihilate as many as you can send."

Some observers note, however, that another Chinese pronouncement in May by the chief of staff of China's National Liberation Army, Lo Juiching, dismissed nuclear weapons less lightly than did Lin, but he nevertheless wrote that the American military is composed of "pampered soldiers far inferior to Hitler's Fascist army."

Lin's analysis of how Mao's army defeated the better armed Japanese occupying much of China supports the Communist thesis that the weak, in a military sense, can defeat the strong by using the proper all-inclusive revolutionary strategy. This principle would now accomplish the defeat of the developed, well-armed nations by the poor and the weak if only they would follow Mao's advice.

Mao rejected Stalin's advice on how to conquer China, devising his own strategy. Having succeeded at home, he now believes he has found a formula for universal application.

WORRIED ABOUT HANOI

Lin's document, as some read it, also suggests a sense of worry that North Vietnam may be moving toward the negotiating table with the United States. China has loudly rejected any negotiations, calling for what American observers characterize as a war to the last North Vietnamese.

The emphasis in Lin's article is on force. Marx is quoted: "Force is the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one." So is Mao: "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun." And Lin declares that, unlike the Soviet leaders ("the Khrushchev revisionists"), "revolutionary people never take a gloomy view of war."

The Lin document also was designed to counter those Communists as well as non-Communists who think that time will vitiate the Chinese revolutionary spirit as many believe has been the case in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

"It is sheer daydreaming," wrote Lin, "for anyone to think that, since our revolution has been victorious, our national construction is forging ahead, our national health is increasing and our living conditions are improving, we too will lose our revolution and discard Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism."

AN OLD MAN

Nonetheless, Mao has told a number of foreign visitors that the youth of China seem to be lacking in the fervor of their elders, who, led by Mao, lived through the long march and the hard years in the caves of Yenan before they conquered China.

Hence, one observer sees the Lin article as something of a last will and testament by Mao, who will be 72 in November. Many believe that Mao may have drafted the article signed by Lin.

Whatever the reasoning in Peiping behind the Lin article, there is no doubt that Peiping considers it highly important. It was simultaneously published in five languages of China for internal consumption as well as being fully broadcast to the world.

It is indeed a declaration of protracted war against the United States and all it stands for. It widens the breach, if that is possible, between China and the men who now run the Soviet Union. Let the reader in both nations beware.

THE EFFECT OF FEDERAL LABOR POLICIES IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the Sacramento Union is the oldest daily newspaper in California, and in fact, west of the Rockies. It has always been an eloquent, factual and forthright voice. It has demonstrated this in its excellent coverage—both on the news pages and the editorial pages—of the farm-labor crisis confronting California agriculture. The Sacramento Union's publisher, Leonard V. Finder, has written several excellent editorials on the failure of Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz's farm labor policies in California. He has documented the losses, the departure of farm industry to Mexico, the ridiculous recruitment efforts, and the dire need for supplemental labor during peak harvest periods.

Mr. President, I have many of the Union's editorials and ask unanimous consent they be made part of the Senate record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Sacramento Union, Sept. 1, 1965]

WIRTZ CONVICTS HIMSELF

The last-minute action of Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz in approving use of thousands of Mexican braceros to save what is left of California's tomato crop can, under no stretch of charity, be considered on the credit side of his ledger.

His belated action is, on the contrary, his own admission that he has been disastrously wrong from the start in his understanding of the domestic farm labor situation in the row crop fields.

His blind, intransigent insistence that there was plenty of available and competent American domestic labor to handle the situation was totally unrealistic. He was dealing only in numerical figures—not in actual willingness and physical fitness of such numerical armies to do the work.

His arguments that American vegetable and fruit farmers got along very well before introduction of the braceros were also equally naive. He forgets that the braceros were brought in initially because American workers had "weakened" to the point where crop emergencies had dictated some such action.

And Wirtz was still dreaming if he thought that, by some miracle of metamorphosis in worker psychology, these "weakening" laborers were just awaiting and eager to leap back into the fields today and to the work they virtually quit doing before the bracero program was begun.

The bald, indisputable fact remains that, despite all of Wirtz's mouthings, and despite the "let's unionize the American farmworker" support given him by American labor leaders, an American labor force to meet such labor demands no longer exists. Like the streetsweepers from Ireland and the fruit peddlers from Italy who eked out a precarious living in our eastern cities at the turn of the century, the oldtime migrant American farm laborer has graduated and will (at least, large numbers of him) go on relief today rather than return to grubbing in the earth. He evidently has read Edwin Markham's "Man With a Hoe," or maybe he has seen the picture which inspired Markham to write his famous lines, and he will have little or none of it.

In his evaluation of the situation, U.S. Senator George Murphy has seen with much clearer vision than has Wirtz. One would expect the head of the Department of Labor to have his feet on the ground, and if anyone's feet were to be in the air, they would be the ex-hoofer Murphy's. The situation is so completely reversed as to be funny, if there is any room for levity in the scene.

Senator Murphy is to be given full credit for his sympathetic understanding of farm problems, and he is right in his insistence that Wirtz is incompetent in his job and should resign.

[From the Sacramento Union, Sept. 2, 1965]

BRACERO BUNGLING HITS HOME

Statistics about the impact of the bracero blundering upon California's economy disclose such major loss, involving so many areas of the State, that their very proportions might cause some people to fail to realize the local significance of what is happening.

The tragedy of bureaucratic mishandling in Washington is not an academic theory nor a calamity affecting only other places. It is a direct blow to this community—even as it is to most areas of the State.

The Union related last Friday the story of one Sacramento tomato grower hurt badly because the domestic "labor force"—which Wirtz and the unions have kept assuring would be available—has proven to be inexperienced help, largely unable or unwilling to do the hard work necessary to harvest the crop.

His story can be repeated many times—of the pickers who come to have a day's outing, who damage the crops by improper handling of the tomatoes and the plants, and who quit any time they feel that the sun is too hot or the labor too inconvenient.

In the Union yesterday was another story of fiasco—of the $125,000 paid by the State to train 234 unemployed workers, who received $45 a week plus $1 a day spending money and free room and board during the course, but the great majority of whom never finished the course or else did not last more than a day or two in the fields.

Apart from the waste of money, there is the more serious damage to California's agriculture, its No. 1 industry—to the canners, the stores where the farmers and their helpers normally shop, and to the State as a whole. Wirtz's dictator powers are as harmful economically as they are contrary to our philosophy that Government should serve the interests of the people.

Responsibility does not rest upon Wirtz alone. It must be shared by the President, who allows him to continue his wanton course, and it must be shared as well by the State officials who deferred to their Democratic colleagues in Washington rather than standing up and fighting affirmatively for the interests of the State.

[From the Sacramento Union, Aug. 28, 1965]

WIRTZ'S DAMAGE HITS HOME

"Secretary of Labor Wirtz is the man who is knocking hell out of my business—"

This from a Yolo County farmer—not from some vague, faceless victim of Federal farm labor policies in the distant areas of the Delta or Salinas or Imperial Valley or Texas.

The irate farmer who spat out the above words is a man who tries to operate a comparatively small farm on the Yolo side of the Sacramento River who just now happens to be moving heaven and earth to get his tomato crop harvested.

The man's words are too explosive to be anything but true—words born of weeks of exasperation and frustration in his work as a farmer, frustration arising from his fruitless efforts to get adequate harvest help.

His story, which appeared in the Union, August 27, is not the story of a man who, as Wirtz alleges, is concerned primarily with stubborn refusal to make honest use of domestic labor; it is the story of a man who is trying domestic labor but whose crops are yet rotting in the fields, who is losing money as a result, and who expects to be out of business as a farmer if the present labor situation continues.

This man tells the same story as has been told all the way from Sacramento to the Rio Grande and eastward—most available domestic labor is either physically or emotionally unable to do stoop labor in the fields. They try, but they fold up in the sun, and large percentages of the fruit of the soil goes to ruin.

The Union sent a reporter into the fields to find out at firsthand about the farm labor situation. The Union is today more convinced than ever that the complaining farmers are right about the need for hardened, experienced bracero labor and that Wirtz is wrong.

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Union, Sept. 2, 1965]

BRACERO BUNGLING HITS HOME

Statistics about the impact of the bracero blundering upon California's economy disclose such major loss, involving so many areas of the State, that their very proportions might cause some people to fail to realize the local significance of what is happening.

The tragedy of bureaucratic mishandling in Washington is not an academic theory nor a calamity affecting only other places. It is a direct blow to this community—even as it is to most areas of the State.

The Union related last Friday the story of one Sacramento tomato grower hurt badly because the domestic "labor force"—which Wirtz and the unions have kept assuring would be available—has proven to be inexperienced help, largely unable or unwilling to do the hard work necessary to harvest the crop.

His story can be repeated many times—of the pickers who come to have a day's outing who damage the crops by improper handling of the tomatoes and the plants, and who quit anytime they feel that the sun is too hot or the labor too inconvenient.

In the Union yesterday was another story of fiasco—of the $125,000 paid by the State to train 234 unemployed workers, who received $45 a week plus $1 a day spending money and free room and board during the course but the great majority of whom never finished the course or else did not last more than a day or two in the fields.

Apart from the waste of money, there is the more serious damage to California's agriculture, its No. 1 industry—to the canners, the stores where the farmers and their helpers normally shop, and to the State as a whole. Wirtz's dictator powers are as harmful economically as they are contrary to our philosophy that Government should serve the interests of the people.

Responsibility does not rest upon Wirtz alone. It must be shared by the President, who allows him to continue his wanton course, and it must be shared as well by the State officials who deferred to their Democratic colleagues in Washington rather than standing up and fighting affirmatively for the interests of the State.

[From the Sacramento Union, Sept. 3, 1965]

"SUCCESS" IN BRACERO REPLACEMENTS

As reflected by statements of the Department of Employment officials, any program failure has to be pretty abysmal before a bureaucrat will admit that the project has not been successful.

To help replace the thousands of braceros needed to pick tomatoes, the department undertook to recruit men for a 2-week training course—financed by a grant from the Federal Manpower Development and Training Act.

Only 234 men could be found to attend the school, despite being given their room and board and $52 a week during the sessions. Of this number, 194 completed the course.

Answering criticism of this program, Donald Larin, farm placement chief of the department, said that on Tuesday 69 men were still working, so that he is reported to have declared, "Based on these figures, I wouldn't call the program a failure."

Since Larin's statement, many of the 69 have quit—and not all those who have stuck with the work can be classified as being exactly competent.

Especially considering the glib earlier reassurances and the farmers' needs, any person sounds like one of the world's leading optimists—or like a man unwilling to acknowledge facts—when he insists that the program is not a failure.

RETIREMENT OF COL. RALPH E. VANDERVORT, JR., CONGRESSIONAL LIAISON OFFICER FOR THE ARMY AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to comment briefly on the forthcoming retirement of a man known and respected by all of us in these Chambers. The gentleman I have in mind, of course, is Col. Ralph E. Vandervort, Jr., who will close out his long and distinguished military career later this month.

Colonel Vandervort has served his country long and well. As a matter of fact, his retirement comes after more than 24 years of active military service. This service, which commenced with his entry into the Regular Army just before World War II, encompassed distinguished service during that great conflict; and of course, it has continued through the Korean conflict and the critical and trying times of the cold war and incidents related to it. While his military career and the many honors which have been bestowed upon him are certainly most commendable, they are not the principal reason for my remarks here today.

While his duties have taken him to all areas of the country and the world, the thing which has brought Bud Vandervort so close to many of us has been his service as liaison officer to the U.S. Senate for the past several years. During the time in which he served as liaison officer between the Department of the Army and the Senate, I am certain all of us will agree that the service which he performed in that capacity was unsurpassed. He was always available to us on any problem any time of the day or night.

In addition to serving very ably in his official capacity, he became a close friend to many of us, and I am certain there were many occasions on which we imposed on this personal relationship; however, there was never any degree of complaint or hesitation his part.

When his tour of duty as Army liaison officer was concluded and in fitting tribute and recognition of his accomplishments in this regard, he was assigned the duties of liaison officer between the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Senate. Even though his base of operations and his office were officially transferred from the Senate Office Building to the Pentagon, he remained available and close to us, and his wisdom, counsel and loyal assistance continued.

It is for these reasons that I am sure my colleagues join me in my comments today. We want him to know that our every good wish goes with him upon his retirement and in any endeavors which he will undertake in the months and years ahead.

In closing, I would simply say to Colonel Vandervort—thank you for a job, rather many jobs, well done and best of luck.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], expressing his appreciation for the efficient service rendered by Colonel Vandervort during his service as liaison officer for the U.S. Army and for the Department of Defense.

I know of no officer or liaison representative who has been more efficient, alert, cheerful and friendly than Bud Vandervort. In addition to his day-today work as liaison officer in which Colonel Vandervort has shown great understanding for problems involving the military which have arisen in my State or have involved residents of Utah, he has been most friendly and has gone out of his way to do extra work in my behalf.

On two or three occasions Colonel Vandervort has been the official escort officer of a congressional group of which I was a member and his skill in managing transportation, appointments, personal accommodations and being well-informed on the customs and geography of the country is both surprising and pleasing.

Out of these relationships, my wife, Phyllis, and I have formed a close bond of friendship with Bud and his wife, Rusty. We consider them among our close friends and, therefore, are pleased at the decision of Colonel Vandervort to remain in the Washington area.

There is much much more that I could say about this fine man. He seems to know everyone and, yet, gives his personal friendship in a way that makes it seem special.

I am sure that my colleagues feel much as do I about his retirement. He has done his job well and I wish him continued happiness and success in whatever field he pursues after retirement. I do hope that I see him often.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute today to Col. Ralph E. Vandervort, who has rendered distinguished service as liaison officer of the U.S. Army to the U.S. Senate. Colonel Vandervort is retiring at the end of this month from the Army after 24 years of active service. Colonel Vandervort enlisted in the Army before the Second World War and has served his country with great dedication for almost a quarter century through periods of major conflict.

As liaison officer to the Senate, Colonel Vandervort has always made his help available to the offices of the various Senators, regardless of the time of day or night. I became better acquainted with Colonel Vandervort when he accompanied a group of Senators on an inspection trip, and know him as a first-class human being as well as a highly able officer.

I am sure that the other Members of the U.S. Senate share my feeling of gratitude to Colonel Vandervort for a job well done. We wish him well.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Col. Ralph E. Vandervort, Jr., has built for himself a magnificent record as an officer in the Armed Forces of the United States. He is one of the most personable, jovial, and knowledgeable officers that I have known.

I became a friend and admirer of his during the time he was assigned as escort officer to a group of Senators, of which I was a member, while we were visiting Venezuela, Peru, Bolivia, Chile, Argentina, Paraguay, Brazil, and British Guiana for 26 days in 1961. We Senators were occupied from morning to night but Colonel Vandervort was even harder working. He was indispensable in making the necessary arrangements which resulted in this being an extremely informative study mission.

For 24 years Colonel Vandervort has performed outstanding service for his country. His services as liaison officer between the Department of the Army and of the Senate for the past several years has been outstanding. During his recent assignment as liaison officer between the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Senate he continued to remain available to assist Senators even though his base of operations had changed.

I wish to join with my colleagues today in wishing a very happy retirement from the Armed Forces to Colonel Vandervort and Godspeed and happy landing to this fine officer in all things and at all times during many years to come.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, at the end of this month Col. Ralph E. Vandervort, Jr., will retire from active duty in the U.S. Army. Colonel Vandervort, who is perhaps better known as "Bud," has served as a liaison officer for the Senate for the past 6 years. He served as a liaison officer both for the Department of the Army and for the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Those of us who have known Colonel Vandervort admire him as a man of ability and integrity.

It has been my good fortune to have many dealings with Colonel Vandervort in his capacity as liaison officer, and I also value his personal friendship. Colonel Vandervort performs his assigned tasks good naturedly and is always cheerful and friendly. I want to join with the other Members of the Senate who have expressed regret over his loss and best wishes to him in his retirement.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, at the end of this month a good friend of many Members will retire from active duty with the Army after a distinguished career spanning nearly 25 years. Col. Ralph E. "Bud" Vandervort, Jr., has been a liaison officer with the Senate during the past 6 years and has provided invaluable service to all of us in that capacity. Indeed, few men who aid Senators in the discharge of their duty have been so cooperative and resourceful.

Bud Vandervort graduated from Oregon State College in 1941 and went on active duty immediately. As a young lieutenant he first reported to a "pack" artillery battalion at Fort Lewis where he learned the art of dealing with mules. This undoubtedly contributed to the development of the patience he has exhibited since that time.

The colonel participated in the campaigns leading to the defeat of Germany in 1945. During this period he was awarded the Purple Heart and the Croix de Guerre with Gold Star presented to him by the Government of France.

Following routine postwar assignments in the United States, Bud served a period of service in Korea.

Colonel Vandervort is a graduate of the Command and General Staff College and the Armed Forces Staff College.

During the period that he served in legislative liaison both with the Army and the Department of Defense, he has been immediately responsive to every request that my office has made of him. He has presented the position of the Department in a fair and objective manner on every occasion, and in dealing with constituents he has been completely aware of the position of each Senator and their responsibilities to members of their respective States.

I am sure that my colleagues join me in wishing Bud Vandervort and his family every success in the future.

We all wish him well.

CONGRESS LOSES AN AIDE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Col. Ralph E. Vandervort, Jr. will retire from the U.S. Army on October 31.

His departure from the Washington scene will be regretted by Congress as well as by his Army colleagues, for Colonel Vandervort had the difficult task of serving both institutions.

For the past 6 years he provided liaison between first the Department of the Army and then the Department of Defense and Congress.

I suspect that a congressional liaison position for a military man should be considered one of the more hazardous stateside assignments, for it is often caught in the crossfire between angry solons and entrenched policy.

If the position has its hazards, it also has its rewards in the form of satisfaction of doing an important job well. Those of us who have served in Congress know the value of good liaison with the military, and those of us who have worked with Colonel Vandervort know how well he carried out his duties.

That he did was to be expected from his record. When he retires he will have served his country for 25 years. A native of California, he entered the regular Army immediately after he was graduated from Oregon State University. He was commander of an artillery unit in Europe in World War II. Later he distinguished himself as professor of military science at Ohio State University and at Loyola College in Baltimore.

I consider Colonel Vandervort a good friend and valuable public servant. He will be missed, and I wish him well in his future endeavors.

THE BANK MERGER BILL

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on October 15, the Comptroller of the Currency, Hon. James J. Saxon, made an important statement before the Banking, Corporation, and Business Law Section of the New York State Bar Association on the subject of bank mergers.

In recent years, more than 2,000 banks have merged, involving assets in excess of $50 billion. With a view to placing greater restrictions on mergers, and to clarify the laws under which they could merge, the Congress passed a Bank Merger Act in 1960 when numerous Senators, including the then distinguished Senator from Texas, Mr. Johnson, said on the floor of the Senate that the pending bill made it crystal clear that the Clayton Act did not apply to bank mergers.

To the surprise of everyone, and over the protests of Justices Harlan, Stewart, and Goldberg, the Supreme Court held in the Philadelphia merger case that all bank mergers were subject to the Clayton Act, and in the Lexington, Ky., case applied the Sherman Act very strictly to another bank merger. In the simplest terms, under these rulings, the antitrust laws, when applied to a bank merger, mean that where you previously had two banks and they have merged into one, you have automatically decreased competition and, therefore, the merger is illegal.

All concerned with bank mergers, including the Attorney General, are now agreed that this is too harsh a rule to be applied to bank mergers and all are agreed that the courts and the administrative agencies should apply the same test to proposed mergers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed, at this point in the RECORD, excerpts from a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury to a director of a merged bank, in which he spells out that agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, while there is no statute of limitations applying to bank mergers and the Department of Justice has the privilege of attacking any of the more than 2,000 mergers, it has seen fit to attack only 6 of them. And, of course, in all of those cases the Department may win. As I have indicated, no merged bank has a defense against the harsh provisions of the Clayton Antitrust Act which Congress, of course, intended to apply only to commercial corporations and not to banks which cannot come into being except by Government permit and are strictly regulated and annually examined by Government agencies.

With a view to giving appropriate relief to banks which I felt had been subjected to treatment that was too harsh, and especially to three of them that had merged in good faith under the provisions of the 1960 Merger Act and before the Supreme Court had announced a different rule, I introduced a bank merger bill, adding some new tests on the subject of future mergers, giving clearance to all past mergers and making it crystal clear that the antitrust laws did not apply. In Committee, Senator PROXMIRE offered an amendment which was agreed to, which gave clearance to all past mergers, but which left future mergers subject to the antitrust laws should the Department of Justice proceed within 30 days after a regulatory agency, which had jurisdiction, had agreed to a merger. That bill passed the Senate without a dissenting vote but has been held, for the past 4 months, in the House Banking and Currency Committee even though a majority of the Committee wants to report legislation on this subject.

On yesterday, the majority which wanted legislation, met under a committee rule that the committee would meet on each first and third Tuesdays of the month unless such a meeting was canceled by the chairman, and reported out a bill which fixed uniform standards for future bank mergers and gave acquittance to all mergers which had occurred prior to the Supreme Court decision in the Philadelphia case. While that bill was not referred to by Comptroller Saxon in his New York statement last Friday, it has his approval. He said:

> Fortunately, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and the U.S. Senate have recognized the gravity of this problem and have made a genuine, constructive effort to resolve it. Unfortunately, similar efforts by the majority of the House Banking and Currency Committee have been blocked—at least for this session of the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full statement of Mr. Saxon on the subject may be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, before this session of the 89th Congress adjourns sine die, we will know whether or not the House passes the pending bill sponsored by Mr. Ashley and cosponsored by a majority of the members of the House Banking and Currency Committee. My earnest hope, of course, is that the House will pass that bill and that the Senate will promptly concur in the House action.

Exhibit 1

Excerpts From Letter From the Secretary of the Treasury

On September 24 the Attorney General sent a letter to the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee referring to a proposed bill by Congressman Ashley in which he said:

"Nonetheless, I think the appearance of conflicting standards is undesirable, particularly where it is seized upon by the industry and sincerely felt to be a substantial problem. Therefore, there is undoubted merit in Mr. Ashley's attempt to specify uniformity of standards and I have no objection to making it clear by statute that the standards applied by the court should be identical to those which the banking agencies are directed to apply by the Bank Merger Act of 1960."

As the Attorney General's letter stated, I concur in the position taken in the above quoted paragraph. With reference to provisions in pending bills which seek to forgive past mergers already found by the courts to be in violation of the antitrust laws or which are presently pending before the courts, I have taken no position believing that this "is a matter within the purview of the Department of Justice." In other words, with regard to the pending cases I felt it necessary to defer to the views of my Cabinet colleague.

My last comment with regard to this matter has been a public one made in an address to the American Bankers Association in Chicago last Tuesday. The excerpt is as follows:

"Having thus cited but a few of the important services you have rendered to the Treasury and the country, I am indeed happy to note some good progress on a matter of concern both to the legislative and executive branches of the National Government and the banking industry—the matter of bank mergers. As Attorney General Katzenbach made clear in a recent letter to Chairman Patman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, there is now a substantial meeting of minds between the Attorney General, the bank regulatory agencies, and the Secretary of the Treasury on the two central aspects of antitrust policy which have been of growing concern to the industry and those responsible for its regulation in the public interest. Without going into the details of this consensus—which are clearly outlined in the Attorney General's letter and have been well reported in the press—may I simply express my hope that this development will lead to a speedy resolution of the issues in a way that will both protect the legitimate interests of the Government and meet the legitimate needs of the banks."

Exhibit 2

Statement of James J. Saxon, Comptroller of the Currency, Before the Banking, Corporation and Business Law Section of the New York State Bar Association, October 15, 1965, Buffalo, N.Y.

As a result of certain court decisions within the past several years, the situation facing the banking industry today can be likened to the fabled sword that hung over Damocles. In a most important area of their operations—expansion through merger—bankers are uncertain as to what is legal and what is not legal. Although Government may rightly expect its citizens to comply fully with the law, there is a corresponding obligation of Government to make the law unambiguous.

The uncertainty in bank merger policy today is a result of the emphasis placed by the courts and by the Justice Department upon the desirability of preserving as much competition, in the quantitative sense, as is possible. They have applied to banking the same competitive concepts developed in the Sherman and Clayton Acts for the unregulated industries, despite the fact that banking is a regulated industry.

Five years ago, the Congress wrestled with this problem, and the results of their efforts were embodied in the Bank Merger Act of 1960. The pattern of that act was to require any combination of banks to be scrutinized by the three Federal banking agencies and the Department of Justice. Responsibility for approval of bank mergers rested in each individual case with a single banking agency, after consideration of the views of the other two banking agencies and the Department of Justice on the competitive factor—only one of the seven factors to be applied. The other factors, to be applied solely by the responsible banking agency are: The financial history and condition of each bank involved; the adequacy of the capital structure of the resulting bank; its future earnings prospects; the character and competence of the management; and the effect of the merger in meeting the convenience and needs of the community in which the resulting bank is located. After considering all of these factors, decisions were to be reached in terms of the public interest.

It was thought that by permitting only those mergers which a Federal banking agency deemed publicly beneficial in terms of the standards of the Bank Merger Act, the public interest would be amply protected. There is considerable evidence and opinion, however, that the Department of Justice has taken, or may take, the position that the scope of its functions is to consider only the effects on competition of a bank merger under the same tests as apply to mergers in all industries generally, and that the other considerations listed in the Bank Merger Act are irrelevant to its functions. And it is true that the recent decisions of the Supreme Court in the Philadelphia and Lexington cases seem to bear out this interpretation of the functions of the Department of Justice.

This leaves the banking industry in an anomalous position. Even though there are severe restrictions over bank entry and bank expansion, the banking industry is now subject to even greater jeopardy under the antitrust laws than any other regulated industry, or any unregulated industry. This results because the Bank Merger Act requires that applicant banks must present full economic data on the effects of a proposed merger, and these data are made available to the Justice Department before decisions are reached by the banking agency. Justice, therefore, if it decides that the merger is anticompetitive, has a fully documented case to present to a court. Such premerger notification is an advantage which Justice does not have in any other industry, despite prolonged and persistent efforts to gain congressional approval for this procedure.

Some reconciliation of these divergent approaches is urgently needed, and I should like to outline my own thoughts on this matter.

First, let me say that this is a conflict that only the Congress can resolve. We, in our office, have endeavored to meet the current inconsistencies of policy, by seeking to bring before the courts the banking factors which have not been considered in past court decisions on bank merger cases. This, however, is merely an expedient. What is needed is a clear statement of legislative policy.

In developing such a statement of policy, the prime consideration is to accord recognition to the fact that banking is a regulated industry, and that the banking authorities are responsible for shaping the banking structure—through their chartering, branching, and merger policies—in a manner which will safeguard the public interest in a viable banking system. For this reason, there is no way in which conventional antitrust standards suitable for the unregulated industries can be applied to banking without jeopardizing regulatory policies. A choice must be made whether to require the courts to take cognizance of all the factors the banking agencies consider in bank merger cases, or to move in the opposite direction and allow conventional antitrust standards to be applied to banking. If the latter course is chosen, it will be necessary to repeal the Bank Merger Act, and to allow free merging, free entry and free branching in banking subject only to antitrust limitations.

I should like to say a special word about the so-called failing bank test, which even the Department of Justice concedes may be applied in approving bank mergers. This is clearly an insufficient test if the purpose of bank regulation is to assure the public of an adequate supply of banking facilities and services. In the consideration of bank merger cases, we have encountered many instances in which banks, although not failing, were chronically troublesome, inefficient or unaggressive, so that they did not serve their communities satisfactorily. In many of these instances, merger with another bank appeared the most efficient and the most effective device to improve the functioning of banks in the affected communities without a threat to their solvency or liquidity.

Little public attention has been drawn to one of the most critical aspects of the statutory conflicts between the Bank Merger Act and the antitrust laws. Although the Bank Merger Act requires the banking authorities to consider a variety of factors beyond competition, the antitrust statutes—at least, as recently interpreted—consider that the public interest will be served wherever competition is maintained at its highest level in terms of the number of competitors. In the interest of sound jurisprudence, it is evident that the courts, in considering bank merger cases, should have the benefit of an exposition of the considerations which led to the approval of the mergers by the banking authorities. In no other way can the full panoply of public interest considerations be brought before the courts.

A final issue concerns the exoneration of bank merger cases now in litigation. It would seem logical that, in view of the reliance which the merging banks properly placed upon the decisions of the banking authorities, and considering the long-standing view that bank mergers were not subject to the antitrust laws, all mergers approved prior to new legislation should stand free of antitrust prosecution. Subsequent mergers, of course, should be treated under the principles embodied in the new legislation. This approach appears particularly appealing in view of the fact that new legislation would be designed to resolve a conflict over the application of the antitrust laws to banking, which has only recently appeared.

The issues which I have discussed are worthy of the most thoughtful consideration by those in the legal fraternity who are concerned with banking and the antitrust laws. Fortunately, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and the U.S. Senate have recognized the gravity of this problem, and have made a genuine, constructive effort to resolve it. Unfortunately, similar efforts by the majority of the House Banking and Currency Committee have been blocked—at least for this session of the Congress.

THE 1965 ANNUAL REPORT OF SENATOR JAVITS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, every year I make a report to my constituents in New York State on the current session of Congress and on my own activities during the past year.

This—my 17th such report—is in many ways one of the most gratifying because the first session of the 89th Congress was one of the most productive in history. It enacted major historic measures to which I have devoted years of work during my terms in the House and Senate. As ranking minority member of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and as a member of the Judiciary Committee, I was privileged to help guide much of this legislation through the Congress.

Among the major achievements of the session in which I was particularly active were: First, passage of health care program for the elderly, including my provision for supplementary, private medical insurance coverage; second, Federal aid to primary and secondary education, which I had worked for for many years; third, establishment of a National Foundation on Arts and Humanities which has been one of my major concerns for 16 years; fourth, the Voting Rights Act of 1965; fifth, elimination of the discriminatory national origins quota system for immigration; sixth, establishment of a Department of Housing and Urban Development; and seventh, enactment of the Higher Education Act.

Other important measures were the enactment of a constitutional amendment to improve procedures for presidential succession, and to provide orderly transition in case of presidential disability; extension of the antipoverty program; Federal assistance to States in eliminating water pollution; and a program to add economically hard pressed counties—including 13 in New York—in the Appalachian region.

This year, I was appointed to the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico, which is undertaking a comprehensive study of all aspects of the governmental status of the island Commonwealth. I feel that the future of the island must ultimately be determined by the desires of our Puerto Rican citizens and that these studies will help them make the best possible decision.

I again gave my support to home rule legislation for the District of Columbia, including the automatic Federal payment formula which unfortunately has been deleted from the House-passed bill.

While the record of the first session is certainly impressive the tendency of the administration to use its vast majorities in both Houses to prohibit necessary amendments produced some incomplete legislation and the loss, for this session, of some essential bills. A striking example is that the administration insisted in holding up all labor legislation until section 14(b), the so-called "right-to-work" section, of the Taft-Hartley Act was repealed and even prevented long-overdue labor reform amendments to the repeal bill. The result was that the vital bills on minimum wage and fair standards for migratory labor were not acted on and repeal of 14(b) was delayed due to the absence of the support that additional reform legislation would have attracted.

The foregoing represents the highlights of the past year; I will now go into the details of the 1st session of the 89th Congress:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Vietnam and the Indian subcontinent were the key world troublespots as the congressional session came to an end, while we continued to face grave problems in the Dominican Republic and the Middle East and in the United Nations and the Atlantic Alliance.

I have continually called for clear declarations of our willingness to negotiate an honorable settlement in Vietnam, and warned of the dangers of relying on military solutions alone, even while I backed the President's action in Vietnam. I introduced a resolution to get congressional backing for a defined U.S. policy in Vietnam, and proposed a program for settlement based on a guaranteed cease-fire, phased withdrawal of military forces, establishment of a reform government in the South, and the normalization of economic relations between North and South Vietnam. I urged the President to come to Congress before deciding to use U.S. combat troops, and when it became apparent that Congress was not going to be consulted, I submitted another resolution designed to provide hearings and debate leading to new policy guidelines to replace the outdated Bay of Tonkin resolution of August 1964. My resolution also urged a greater U.N. role and a return to the Geneva accords. In a Senate speech, I called attention to the "less visible economic and social war" in Vietnam and urged increased priority for our aid and refugee relief programs.

After many tense months, the Organization of American States has arranged a provisional government pending free elections in the Dominican Republic. I backed the President's decision to send U.S. troops into the Dominican Republic to protect American citizens and others, but I urged that beyond that purpose we act only as a trustee for the OAS. The Dominican crisis, I believe, pointed up certain weaknesses in the inter-American system, and I offered a resolution which sought to strengthen OAS action against Communist or ultrarightist takeovers of democratic governments; reaffirm our commitment to collective action and to the Alliance for Progress; and encourage common efforts to promote constitutional, democratic and progressive government in Latin America.

I introduced a resolution backing the President's decision to put the United States squarely behind the U.N. efforts to bring about a cease-fire between India and Pakistan, and to withhold military aid to both countries. I urged him to use the provisions of the Gruening-Javits-Morse amendment in determining if economic aid should be withheld. I also warned that the U.N. must now proceed to resolve the dispute over Kashmir, especially in view of Communist China's hostile activities along the India border.

During months of agonizing inactivity in the General Assembly, I reaffirmed support of the United Nations, voted for Senate approval of the charter amendments to give the Afro-Asian States more equitable representation, and supported the administration in acting to resolve the dispute over assessments. I also cosponsored a resolution requesting the President to present concrete proposals on disarmament and peace, and fought hard for a 4-year authorization for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. As rapporteur of the Political Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, I became active in discussions designed to strengthen this vital alliance.

The Williams-Javits bill was enacted to protect American business against the regulations of the Arab boycott office, and to curb participation by U.S. firms in the Arab boycott against Israel. Following United Arab Republic President Nasser's aggressive and insulting actions late last year, I voted to cancel our aid to the United Arab Republic and called attention to the United Arab Republic's shipments of large quantities of food grains to Cuba and Communist China in violation of our aid agreements.

I joined in sponsoring the resolution, passed by the Senate, protesting Soviet anti-Semitism and other antireligious activities, and have been active in the effort to call world attention to this effort at strangulation of Jewish faith and culture by the U.S.S.R. I also introduced a resolution to put Congress on record as favoring extension of the West German statute of limitations on Nazi war criminals and requesting the President to so inform the West German Government.

FOREIGN TRADE AND AID

Disappointed at the relatively slow progress of the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations, I urged that the tariff-cutting authority of the President be expanded and extended beyond the 1967 expiration date. I also introduced legislation authorizing the President to eliminate tariffs on industrial products among industralized nations and to negotiate a free trade area treaty with all countries pledged to abide by its rules, and a resolution urging the President to negotiate an international anti-dumping agreement. I strongly opposed as virtually valueless and contrary to our avowed liberal trade policy, administration proposals to reduce duty-free privileges of returning American tourists and worked to modify the enacted legislation and delay its effective date.

I strongly supported an administration measure, similar to one I introduced earlier, to allow the Federal Reserve Bank to reduce its gold reserves to strengthen the dollar in our balance-of-payments crisis and succeeded in amending the interest equalization tax to terminate it 6 months earlier than recommended and to free from its provisions State-chartered banks engaged in export leasing business. Two years after my resolution was introduced requesting the President to call an international conference to reform the world monetary system, the administration issued a public call for such a conference, with my full encouragement.

In testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee, I recommended establishment of a common Western policy including a code of fair trade practices on East-West trade in nonstrategic goods, and introduced a resolution asking the President to make recommendations to Congress on what legislation is needed to make more effective use of our trade with the East.

The United States-Canada trade agreement on automotive products was passed by the Senate with my strong support, and it contained my amendment to require full public disclosure annually of the workings of this agreement in terms of U.S. employment, price, and production.

My efforts to encourage international economic cooperation continued this year. As chairman of a Special Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, and with substantial support from the Ford Foundation, I have actively endeavored to increase economic cooperation between Greece and Turkey on specific projects. An international nongovernmental commission has been formed to assist this project. The Inter-American Economic Relationships Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee held hearings, at my request, to assess the prospects of economic integration of the hemisphere. The hearings noted that Adela, a multinational, private investment group formed at my initiative in 1962, has already raised $35 million in capital and invested some $8.5 million in 14 projects in seven Latin American countries.

The Foreign Assistance Act, calling for an expenditure of $3.2 billion in the next year, passed with my support. It contained an amendment I sponsored to assist in the advancement of regional economic development institutions including the African Development Bank, and another which I strongly supported authorizing $25 million to establish an Organization of American States peacekeeping force.

The report of the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid, established by my amendment to the 1963 Foreign Aid Act, called attention to a major weakness in our foreign aid program, lack of sufficient emphasis on private initiative. It also called for careful consideration of my bill to establish a $2.5 billion, joint Government-private enterprise Peace by Investment Corporation to allow small investors to share in the development of emerging nations. I have received assurances that hearings will be held on this measure, which was first suggested by my brother, Benjamin A. Javits, and Leon Keyserling.

DOMESTIC ECONOMY

To strengthen the ability of State and local government to meet the growing needs for new services and facilities, I introduced the so-called Javits plan implementing the widely discussed Heller plan for sharing a portion of Federal tax revenues with the States with a minimum of string attached. Under my plan, 1 percent of the Federal income tax base—about $2.5 billion under present circumstances—would be allocated to the States each year on the basis of their population, their performance in meeting their own financial requirements and their needs. These funds would be available for use in health, education, or welfare programs without constant Federal supervision; they would have to be shared with local governments and all applicable Federal laws, including the civil rights acts, would have to be observed. A detailed annual audit would also be required.

Drawing on the successful models of the Eisenhower administration's National Goals Commission and the British National Economic Development Commission, I sponsored a measure to establish a permanent, high-level Presidentially appointed, bipartisan Commission on National Economic Goals, which would provide a much-needed independent expert overview of all national economic and fiscal issues, their priorities, and costs. The Commission would have access to information on which Government decisions are made, but it would not be bound by the limitations of administration policy and politics, and would make annual reports of its findings and recommendations to the President and Congress.

I supported the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965 which repealed wartime-created excise taxes on cosmetics, luggage, and other items. Although the Senate failed to accept an amendment I supported to provide an income tax deduction for transportation expenses to and from work and to repeal the 5-percent tax on air travel, it did eliminate the 10-percent admissions tax on theatrical and musical performances which was incorporated in legislation I introduced earlier.

To enable the United States to mount a major national tourism effort, I introduced a bill to increase the United States Travel Service budget from $3 to $15 million annually, to promote travel within our country and to finance a travel resources inventory to lay the groundwork for a long-term national travel program.

To insure that consumers would have a full forum in the Congress, I introduced legislation on behalf of 18 other Senators to create a Senate Select Committee on Consumers, similar to the Select Committee on Small Business, of which I am a member.

URBAN AFFAIRS

The 89th Congress placed new and much needed emphasis on urban problems with the creation of a Department of Housing and Urban Development which will administer existing housing and urban mass transportation programs. As a cosponsor of the bill creating the Department and ranking minority member of the subcommittee which considered it, I successfully introduced amendments to strengthen machinery for full coordination of all Federal programs having an impact on urban communities and to define the important role of the States. At my suggestion, provision was also made in the legislation for informal public hearings on controversial projects administered by the Department.

New York's vital housing needs stimulated my introduction of legislation to establish a new national program of housing for moderate income citizens and for the elderly through Federal guarantees of bonds issued by local housing authorities. I actively supported the housing bill which: expanded housing programs for moderate- and low-income families, the elderly and the handicapped, encouraged rural and open space development, improved urban and community renewal programs and slum clearance, and provided for new Federal aid for community facilities and public water systems. It authorizes about 60,000 additional units of low-rent housing annually over a 4-year period. The act also permits lower interest loans for the construction of moderate income housing. It established a program of supplemental rent assistance for low-income families and those living in substandard housing when moving into existing private housing.

The new housing law included five of my amendments to provide particular help to metropolitan areas. They increased by $50 million funds available for rehabilitation and improvement of property in urban renewal areas; expanded relocation assistance to small businessmen displaced by renewal projects; raised the limitation on the per room construction cost of low-rent public housing to reflect higher construction costs and provide more livable public housing; permitted New York to obtain a greater share of low-rent housing by increasing the present allocation of housing units to a single State and allowing States needing increased housing units to use units already authorized but not constructed elsewhere; and assisted those who live near airports by authorizing Federal study of methods to reduce noise hazards by improved housing construction and of ways to reimburse property owners adversely affected by airports.

I also cosponsored legislation, which was enacted, to authorize a 3-year, $90,-million program of research and demonstration grants for the establishment of Boston to Washington high-speed rail service and for improved railroad equipment. Under the bill, demonstration projects were authorized for the New Haven and Pennsylvania Railroads. To meet our expanding surface transportation needs, I introduced a measure to increase the 41,000-mile interstate highway limitation and to give States like New York credit for highway systems, like the New York State Thruway, which were built prior to the Federal interstate highway program.

The Supreme Court, I believe, was legally correct in its landmark decision requiring that both houses of State legislatures be apportioned on a one-man, one-vote basis. But this is entirely consistent with my feeling that a majority of Americans may prefer to have one legislative house apportioned on an other-than-population basis, as is the U.S. Senate. I introduced a substitute for the proposed Dirksen constitutional amendment which would set a standard for a State's departure from the one-man, one-vote rule in one house and would therefore keep the Supreme Court in a position to avoid any recurrence of unfair representation of urban and suburban areas. With this as a safeguard, the people of the respective States, if they wished it, would be permitted flexibility in reapportioning one house to meet the needs of their States.

When the Senate considered the Dirksen amendment, my proposal was defeated. Since the Dirksen amendment did not, in my judgment, properly incorporate the necessary safeguards, I voted against it. Although the Dirksen amendment was defeated, it has been reintroduced in considerably modified form and will be considered again in the next session.

CRIME AND ADDICTION

A bill, similar to one I had sponsored, was enacted to authorize Federal aid to State and local law enforcement agencies for training to meet more effectively the increasingly serious challenge of crime and delinquency. I also cosponsored the enacted measure which authorized a major 3-year study of ways to improve techniques of helping former prison inmates to become useful members of society. The study would bring together for the first time diverse academic disciplines and practitioners to suggest improvements in what has been, up to now, a diffused effort.

I succeeded in amending the Juvenile Delinquency Act to increase funds available to university training institutes for those responsible for working with youngsters to stop delinquency.

My long fight to achieve a realistic Federal effort dealing with the grave national problem of drug addiction was continued. With my colleague, Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, and a bipartisan group of cosponsors, I introduced a comprehensive series of measures to deal with addiction as an illness, not solely as a crime. Our proposals called for civil commitment of addicts for treatment, flexible sentencing, and aftercare procedures, and Federal-State matching programs for construction of needed facilities, and medical, psychiatric, and job counseling services. The administration at last proposed a civil commitment and modified sentencing measure, which I also cosponsored, but I will continue to seek a more comprehensive program. I supported and helped to perfect a measure to strengthen Federal controls over psychotoxic drugs, barbiturates, and amphetamines—the so-called pep pills—which was enacted.

EMPLOYMENT AND LABOR

The Manpower Act of 1965, aimed at expanding training programs in the face of a high rate of unemployment in the midst of prosperity, was enacted with my strong support. Congress adopted my amendments to strengthen retraining efforts by: adding professional and technical personnel in areas of defense shutdowns; avoiding loss of funds to States with their own large-scale training programs; expanding on-the-job training efforts; and cutting redtape by giving States power to approve small projects.

To further bolster the promising technique of on-the-job training by employers, I sponsored a bill to make the 1962 incentive tax credit, now available only for investment in machinery and equipment, available for investment in manpower training. My proposal gives first priority to workers whose skills are needed for national defense, to those whose skills have been made obsolete by automation, and those laid off because of defense shutdowns. I am also awaiting with great interest the imminent report of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, created last year by a bill I sponsored.

I supported repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act because I favor a uniform national labor law which does not give some States an advantage over other States in attracting industry. But I viewed repeal of this so-called right-to-work section as part of the much larger problem of balanced labor law reform to insure that union responsibility matches the expansion of power inherent in repeal of 14(b). Therefore, I introduced bills and amendments to make "no-strike, no-lockout" clauses in labor contracts enforceable in Federal courts; provide secret ballot elections in lieu of card-check procedures to prove a union's majority; provide procedures for heading off or settling crippling national emergency strikes; and expand the coverage and enforceability of the equal employment opportunity provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Also, as a result of disclosures of misuse of employee benefit funds by certain union officers, I introduced a bill to protect fund assets for union members.

Two other bills I sponsored would have raised the minimum wage to $1.50 an hour and prohibited arbitrary discrimination in employment because of age. I also cosponsored the bill to provide minimum national standards of unemployment compensation, and introduced an amendment to extend unemployment compensation benefits for those made jobless by automation or depressed area conditions, if they are over 60 but not yet eligible for social security retirement benefits.

WAR ON POVERTY

As ranking minority member of the Senate committee having legislative responsibility over the antipoverty program, I sought a careful review of its first year of operation and then joined in expanding it twofold, for a total of $1.8 billion. At the same time, however, I pressed for amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act to bring the program back to its great promise of involving the poor to the maximum feasible extent in the self-help efforts. My amendments required maximum public disclosure about developing programs, including public hearings and open books and records; authorized direct program grants where citywide "umbrella" agencies neglect local groups; required State participation at all stages; provided for a hearing before the OEO Director before he may overrule a Governor's objection to a program proposed for his State; and restored the voluntary assistance program for needy children.

At my request, the minority staff of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee conducted a study of the controversial New York City poverty program which revealed dangers of political manipulation which were also apparent in other areas of the country. These findings helped to get the above amendments enacted.

I believe the antipoverty program will have to be continuously subjected to oversight by the Congress to assure that its funds are not diverted to political ends. I regret that an amendment to extend the political activity restrictions of the Hatch Act to the antipoverty program was opposed by the administration and deleted from the bill, but I shall continue my efforts to keep the program on the nonpolitical track. In view of the problems involved I urged the President to give both the antipoverty program and the Peace Corps the vital full-time direction they need by relieving Sargent Shriver of one of these vital full-time jobs.

CIVIL RIGHTS

It became obvious early this year that the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964, as effective as it was in most areas, was not able to assure the voting rights of Negroes in many areas of the South. Experience in Selma, Ala., for example, showed that the court action authorized by the 1964 act was inadequate to meet the challenge, since costly and time-consuming, separate suits had to be brought in each offending county.

On March 15, I joined a bipartisan group of Senators in introducing a bill to provide for the automatic appointment of a Federal voting registrar in any voting district where less than 25 percent of the Negro population was registered to vote. Less than a week later, President Johnson called for similar legislation and I joined in cosponsoring the administration's voting rights bill which provided for registrars if less than 50 percent of the district's eligible voters were registered. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, to which the measure was assigned, I attempted to strengthen it by providing for Federal poll watchers in areas where discrimination might occur and for a ban on State and local poll taxes. The poll watchers provision remained in the bill, but the poll tax ban was watered down on the Senate floor.

Along with Senator KENNEDY of New York, I sponsored a successful amendment to waive the voting literacy test for those who completed a sixth-grade education in American schools, such as those in Puerto Rico, where instruction in a language other than English is taught. It was unjust to require these citizens to prove English literacy, since the United States had determined that Spanish should be the language in their schools, and since Spanish language news media in New York could keep them well informed until they learned English.

Believing that with his record of segregationist policies and statements, he would not be able to judge fairly in cases involving civil rights, I led the fight in the Senate opposing the appointment of former Mississippi Governor Coleman as judge of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. Only a small group of Senators opposed the nomination, but I feel we focused attention on the importance of such judicial appointments, and hope that future appointments to the Federal bench in the South will be better because of our actions.

The safety of young civil rights workers in the South has been of particular concern to me, and my office has called on Federal officials to afford them protection and assistance in many cases. I also introduced legislation to make specific acts a violation of civil rights subject to criminal prosecution by the Federal Government; to make municipalities liable for civil damages for the wrongdoing of their policemen, and to increase to life imprisonment the penalty for civil rights violations which result in death.

I also cosponsored a successful appropriations amendment to restore half the funds cut from the request of the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission; and urged the President to expand the 1962 Executive order against discrimination in housing so that it will cover the large portion of the national housing market financed by federally insured lending institutions.

Along with a group of Republican colleagues in both Houses, I also urged the President to remedy the failure of the Agriculture Department to achieve compliance with the antidiscrimination provisions of the 1964 Civil Rights Act in a number of its programs.

EDUCATION AND THE ARTS

As ranking minority member of the committee handling education legislation, I supported the historic Federal aid to elementary and secondary education legislation and helped shape its provisions. Enactment was made possible by overcoming nettling church-state issues which had previously blocked approval. The new law provides $1.1 billion per year for the schooling of children from poor families and, under a provision I sponsored, handicapped children. I unsuccessfully endeavored to change the definition under the law of a "poor family" to include those making up to $3,000 a year, to make it more realistic for industrial States like New York.

The measure, which includes safeguards against Federal control of local education programs, contains Federal aid for textbooks, school libraries, supplemental education centers, cooperative education research, and for strengthening State departments of education. Language was included through my initiative in committee to prevent duplication with antipoverty programs, to require Federal authorities to cooperate with States in the textbook and library programs, and to include gifted children in the consultative and technical services program.

The important Higher Education Act, which had my active support, establishes a 3-year program of extensive assistance to colleges and college students, and aids industrial arts and civic programs under the National Defense Education Act of 1958. It contains many of my provisions, including: an additional $200 scholarship available to needy youth who place in the upper half of their classes; participation of junior colleges in the aid to developing institutions program; guaranteed 3-percent loans for college construction; and an enhanced role for State and private nonprofit institutions in guaranteeing low-cost loans to students from middle-income families.

I was gratified with the enactment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act, which brought to fruition a project I first pioneered in 1949. This legislation, which I cosponsored, provides matching grants to States, to nonprofit or public groups, and to individuals engaged in the creative and performing arts for the whole range of artistic activity. It also provides grants and loans for research, awards fellowships and grants to institutions for training, supports the publication of scholarly works, and fosters understanding and appreciation of the humanities.

HEALTH AND MEDICARE

Passage of the medicare bill saw the culmination of decades of effort to provide health insurance for older Americans, something which I have fought for throughout my career in Congress. As enacted, the bill provided not only hospitalization insurance through social security for those over 65, but a feature for which I have been the principal advocate: inexpensive, voluntary, supplemental insurance to cover doctor bills. The beneficiary will pay $3 a month for this coverage but the cost will be compensated for by the 7 percent increase in social security benefits also provided in the bill. Deleted from the bill was my amendment to include the cost of prescription drugs in the medicare program, but I received assurances that the proposal would be studied and considered for adoption later.

The amendment I have been offering for several years to continue social security dependents benefits to fulltime students until their 22d birthday, instead of their 19th, was enacted. Two of my other amendments were also included in the act: allowing waiters and similar employees to count tips as wages for purposes of determining social security benefits; and helping States finance Kerr-Mills old age assistance medical programs.

There was widespread support for my bill to supervise and license mail order clinical laboratories under standards set by the Surgeon General. This measure, patterned after the New York law, is necessary, in my judgment, to protect the public against false diagnostic reports, that can gravely affect their health.

As ranking minority member of the Health Subcommittee, I am proud of congressional action on health legislation this year. It included enactment of a cooperative program among medical schools, researchers, and hospitals to bring the latest scientific advances to patients suffering from heart disease, cancer, stroke, and related diseases; Federal help in staffing community health centers, in training teachers of the mentally retarded and the handicapped, in expanding medical schools, and in granting scholarships and loans to students with modest incomes. Two of my amendments were included in these laws, one doubling funds for schools of public health and the other easing burdensome paperwork requirements in the expanded national immunization program.

With my strong support, Congress established a postsecondary residential training school for deaf persons, and I joined in sponsoring a successful amendment to create a permanent National Advisory Commission on Education of the Deaf. I was gratified that a measure I have long advocated was enacted affording judicial review to States adversely affected by administrative decisions of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department. As a member of the House-Senate conference committee, I was instrumental in assuring that the Vocational Rehabilitation Act would be more beneficial to New York, as it increased the number of persons to be benefited from 120,000 to 200,000 annually.

IMMIGRATION

As a member of the Immigration Subcommittee, I was fortunate to be able to play an active role in developing the historic Immigration Act of 1965, which abolished the arbitrary and restrictive national immigration quota system established 41 years ago and perpetuated by the McCarran-Walter Act. Along with 48 other Senators, I cosponsored this legislation which removes place of birth as the primary criteria for admission to this country, eliminates major race and color discrimination, and provides a new system of allocation of 170,000 immigration visas per year giving priority to reuniting families, attracting those with special skills and talents and welcoming our fair share of refugees from persecution. It causes no relaxation in the qualitative standards which determine admissibility, nor does it increase to any great degree the number of immigrants eligible to come to this country. The act abolished national origins quotas over a 5-year period and eliminated immediately the discriminatory Asian-Pacific triangle provisions.

The bill includes for the first time a quota of 120,000 per year on immigration from the Western Hemisphere to take effect in July 1968. Along with other Senators, I opposed this because it would contribute to the impairment of close hemispheric relations which are so vital. I hope, the limitation will be lifted following examination by the Commission established by the bill to study future Western Hemisphere immigration.

Also, certain other reforms I urged are going to be especially studied, including the creation of a new Board of Visa Appeals in the State Department to review denial of visas by consuls, a 10-year statute of limitations for deportation of aliens, and a provision to allow Cuban refugees, many of whom fought against Castro, to adjust their status to permanent residence without being forced to first leave the United States.

GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Government employees who lose their jobs because of the closing of Federal installations would be aided by a bill I introduced which would allow these employees to obtain full civil service retirement benefits after 20 years of service without having to meet the existing 50-year age requirement. I cosponsored a bill to increase dependency and indemnity compensation payments to widows and children of deceased servicemen, and supported the 10-percent military pay raise bill, and the bill to increase the annuities of civil service retirees.

The 1965 civil service pay bill has my support. It includes an across-the-board pay increase, overtime for substitute employees, provisions for an increase in uniform allowances, and overtime pay for Sunday work by regular employees. I also introduced a bill to give Federal employees who are sabbatarians time off for religious observances on days not recognized as general religious holidays, if they arrange to make up such time.

A code of ethics is essential for the Senate as it is for the executive department. The Senate has appointed a Select Committee on Standards but the standards have not been set. So once again I introduced legislation to provide for an interim code of ethics for Members of the Senate and its employees requiring them to make their financial holdings in excess of $5,000 a matter of official record. In the spirit of this legislation, I made public, as I have for several years, a statement of my own family stock holdings.

I also introduced legislation to permit wider public participation in Senate proceedings by allowing television and radio coverage of selected Senate sessions during major debates on the most important national issues. The bill would permit the Senate Rules Committee to determine the times and conditions under which such broadcasting would be permitted to cover Senate proceedings.

AGRICULTURE

For a second successive year combined programs were proposed for wheat and cotton in an omnibus farm bill, which I could not support because of the possibility that increased costs of the wheat program under the Senate bill would be transferred to the processor and ultimately to the consumer in the form of higher bread prices. I opposed an amendment to establish a two-price milk plan with tight controls on the production of fluid milk because I was convinced it was not in the best interest of New York dairymen. I supported and voted for an amendment to implement a one-price cotton program which would improve the competitive position of this country's textile industry.

I also reintroduced legislation, which I first proposed in 1962, to create a U.S. Food and Fiber Policy Commission to review the effectiveness of our existing farm programs and the possibilities for a greater use of food in our foreign policy. The President proposed such a Commission in his farm message last February and I was given assurances during debate on the farm bill that this Commission would soon be appointed by executive order.

To aid drought-stricken farmers in the Northeast, I urged the Secretary of Agriculture to expand emergency low-interest rate loan assistance, to extend grazing privileges on land diverted from production and to provide feed grain at reduced prices. I also cosponsored legislation, enacted into law, to expand rural water distribution systems and testified in its behalf before the Agriculture Committee.

I testified against the proposed closing of several agricultural research stations in New York; the closings were reconsidered and research operations continued. I strongly supported increased funds for the special milk, school lunch, soil conservation, and food-for-peace programs. In addition, I worked with the Department of Agriculture to step up export shipments of flour from upstate ports.

NEW YORK STATE AFFAIRS

New York was hardest hit by the devastating Northeast drought, and early this year I suggested creation of a national task force to recommend emergency measures; and that the city of New York explore the possibility of constructing a large atom-powered desalination plant, modeled after the Los Angeles project, to process 100 billion gallons of fresh water daily as well as electric power. The President later appointed a high-level task force and city officials are now investigating possible sites for a desalination plant. Because of the drought emergency, I also introduced legislation to make funds immediately available to New York under the Water Resources Act, which now provides planning grants to the States only after 1967. Two of my amendments, which will greatly benefit New York, were included in the Water Pollution Control Act. They changed the fund distribution formula to give heavily urbanized States a more equitable share, and doubled the ceiling on individual grants from $600,000 to $1.2 million to aid the larger cities.

To meet the crisis facing New York City commuters, I introduced legislation to establish a New York-Connecticut Rail Authority to operate passenger rail services in financial difficulty and to link them with the city subway system. I also testified before the Interstate Commerce Commission against discontinuance of vital commuter services by the New Haven Railroad and urged those administering the Federal mass transit program and the Under Secretary of Commerce to make the full range of Federal resources available to solve the New Haven crisis.

I strongly opposed administration plans to close three veterans' hospitals in New York as unwarranted by the facts. As a result of congressional and public reaction, the President revoked some closing orders and the installations at Castle Point and Bath were allowed to remain open, but the hospital at Tupper Lake and several regional VA offices were closed.

An amendment, which I cosponsored with Senator KENNEDY, is now part of the Appalachia bill. It allows 13 New York counties to participate in the program if they and the Governor concur. I also sponsored a successful amendment to the public works bill directing the Corps of Engineers to survey damage and plan repairs to the American Falls at Niagara, and introduced a bill to authorize the appropriation of $5 million to New York for completion of improvements to the barge canal. Congress enacted another amendment I cosponsored to release 100,000 short tons of copper from the national stockpile, which was critically needed by New York industries.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 9:30 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, October 21, 1965, at 9:30 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 20, 1965:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Nathan M. Keffsky, of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

U.S. MARSHAL

Archie Craft, of Kentucky, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Kentucky for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

ORGANIZATION FOR EDONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Philip H. Trezise, of Michigan, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, vice John M. Leddy.

POSTMASTER

The following-named person to be postmaster:

Stanley J. Cybulski, Milwaukee, Wis., in place of F. C. T. John, deceased.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the staff corps indicated subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Medical Corps

Frank T. Norris

Supply Corps

George E. Moore II

Civil Engineer Corps

Robert R. Wooding

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Charles Joseph Denholm, O21293, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Patrick Francis Cassidy, O32809, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Julian Johnson Ewell, O21791, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Norton, O23858, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Leland George Cagwin, O23200, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Charles Gribble, Jr., O23695, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Eugene DePuy, O34710, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Irvin Forsythe, O24510, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Henry Augustine Miley, Jr., O22993, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles William Eifler, O32614, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Vincent Wilson, O23564, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Milton Hightower, O23531, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Jaroslav Thayer Folda, Jr., O21193, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Samuel Knox Eaton, O21132, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Fillmore Kennady Mearns, O21106, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Walter Edward Lotz, Jr., O21090, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Pershing Brown, O23544, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Keith Lincoln Ware, O33181, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Woodrow Wilson Vaughan, O23004, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Joseph McCaffrey, O22065, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Raymond Bradner Marlin, O21899, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Roderick Wetherill, O23158, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Bibb Pickett, Jr., O23932, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Carroll Hilton Dunn, O21427, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard Wayne Whitney, O31855, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Braden Latta, O21119, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard Thomas Cassidy, O23213, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Kenneth Howard Bayer, O23551, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Arthur Lorenzo West, Jr., O25269, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Dayton Willis Eddy, O24565, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Augustine Kenan, O22670, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Raymond Chandler Conroy, O33276, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard George Ciccolella, O34117, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Allen Corcoran, O31721, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Donald Ralph Pierce, O43332, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Hancock Hay, Jr., O25290, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3306:

To be brigadier generals

Maj. Gen. David Bennett Parker, O20571, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Chester Lee Johnson, O20681, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Jarvis Tolson III, O20826, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Donald Ralph Pierce, O43332, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard Wayne Whitney, O31855, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Richard Giles Stilwell, O21065, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Kenneth Gregory Wickham, O21073, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S Army).

Brig. Gen. Walter Edward Lotz, Jr., O21090, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Claire Elwood Hutchin, Jr., O21092, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig Gen. Fillmore Kennady Mearns, O21106, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Welby Beverley, O21107, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Roland Bennett Anderson, O21108, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Frank Wade Norris, O21110, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Braden Latta, O21119, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Samuel Knox Eaton, O21132, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ferdinand Joseph Chesarek, O21177, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Jaroslav Thayer Folda, Jr., O21193, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Charles Fremont Tillson III, O21196, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Milton Finn, O21252, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Arthur Sylvester Collins, Jr., O21260, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ben Sternberg, O21286, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Joseph Denholm, O21293, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Howard York, O21341, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Raymond Peers, O21366, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Peter Stone, O21376, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Carroll Hilton Dunn, O21427, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Lieut. Gen. Andrew Jackson Goodpaster, O21739, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Julian Johnson Ewell, O21791, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Frederic William Boye, Jr., O21891, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Raymond Bradner Marlin, O21899, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Edward Pickett, O21938, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Walter Thomas Kerwin, Jr., O21963, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Welborn Griffin Dolvin, O21980, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Harry William Osborn Kinnard, O21990, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Frank Thomas Mildren, O21992, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Henry Schellman, O22002, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Michael Shannon Davison, O22051, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Joseph McCaffrey, O22065, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Stanley Robert Larsen, O22094, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Augustine Kenan, O22670, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Allen Corcoran, O31721, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles William Eifler, O32614, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

The U.S. Army Reserve officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3384:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Benjamin Joseph Butler, O407344.

Brig. Gen. John George Cassidy, O309923.

Brig. Gen. Ian MacLeod Davidson, O317046.

Brig. Gen. Robert Paul Schultz, O330078.

Brig. Gen. Robert Cleland Tyler, O282150.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Arnold Tracy Barber, O351016, Infantry.

Col. William Howard Booth, O302516, Infantry.

Col. William Wirt Brock, Jr., O314981, Infantry.

Col. Edward Joseph Czerniuk, O336420, Armor.

Col. William Wiant Davis, O357449, Medical Corps.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Kenneth Louis Dedekind, O518645, Dental Corps.

Col. Joe Newton Frazar, Jr., O405975, Armor.

Col. Herbert Robert Hackbarth, O1167014, Artillery.

Col. Martin Richard Krausz, O369198, Medical Corps.

Col. John Thomas Pegg, O905691, Corps of Engineers

Col. Mackenzie Edgerton Porter, O340870, Infantry.

Col. Andrew Wier Rogers, Jr., O380566, Artillery.

Col. Edward Hill Thomas, O391315, Infantry.

The Army National Guard of the U.S. officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3385:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Ivan Hardesty, O399704.

Brig. Gen. Noble L Schlatter, O408711.

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Archibald Alexander Sproul, O406823.

Brig. Gen. Paul Robert Teilh, O361063.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. William Charles Doyle, O1307380, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Daniel Kramer Edwards, O401801, Infantry.

Col. Robert Lew Gamrath, O580755, Infantry.

Col. Robert Francis Hassard, O360866, Quartermaster Corps.

Col. John Vaughan Kean, O1004792, Infantry.

Col. Samuel Odell Robertson, O1634265, Signal Corps.

Col. Maurice Dana Tawes, O332136, Infantry.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

Col. Marvin John Evans, O1100975, Infantry.

Col. Edward Blaize Thorpe, O337914, Armor.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 20, 1965:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Hermann F. Eilts, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of American to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Franklin H. Williams, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ghana.

William M. Rountree, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of South Africa.

William H. Weathersby, of California, a Foreign Service Reserve officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Sudan.

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Dr. Joseph R. Smiley, of Colorado, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs for the remainder of the term expiring May 11, 1966, and until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

Dr. Luther H. Foster, of Alabama, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs for the term expiring May 11, 1966, and until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

Dr. Rufus C. Harris, of Georgia, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs for the term expiring May 11, 1966, and until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

Arnold M. Picker, of New York, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs for the term expiring May 11, 1966, and until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of Scripture: John 3: 16: *For God so loved the world that he gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.*

O Thou who art unchanging in Thy love and goodness, we beseech Thee for Thy companionship and counsel as we walk the ways of life which frequently seem so very dark.

May Thy spirit of peace and power descend upon our troubled souls and hearts, lifting us out of those fears which paralyze our energies into a faith which inspires us with confidence and joy.

Create within us and the Speaker and the Members of Congress those finer feelings and thoughts which are the progenitors of achievement in establishing a more stable and steadfast social order.

Give us the calm assurance that our whole universe is under the control of Thy omnipotent power and that our nobler instincts and capacities shall someday be victorious.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House and a joint resolution of the following titles:

H.R. 1317. An act to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer which was imported during May 1963 for the use of Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.;

H.R. 1386. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Pomona College;

H.R. 1393. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Eduvigis Aran Hefferman;

H.R. 1781. An act to amend section 113(a) of title 28, United States Code, to provide that Federal District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina shall be held at Clinton;

H.R. 2303. An act for the relief of Earnest J. Carlin;

H.R. 2565. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of the University of Chicago;

H.R. 2578. An act for the relief of Maxie L. Rupert;

H.R. 2762. An act for the relief of Manlio Massimiliani;

H.R. 2906. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lily Ning Sheehan;

H.R. 3079. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eleni Bacola Ciacco, doctor of medicine;

H.R. 3126. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the University of Washington;

H.R. 3905. An act for the relief of Bibi Daljeet Kaur;

H.R. 4832. An act to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer for the use of Saint Louis University;

H.R. 5006. An act for the relief of Diosdado F. Almazan;

H.R. 6312. An act for the relief of Mario Menna;

H.R. 6655. An act for the relief of Pieter Cornelis Metzelaar;

H.R. 6666. An act to provide for the free entry of a 90-centimeter split-pole magnetic spectrograph system with orange-peel internal conversion spectrometer attached for the use of the University of Pittsburgh;

H.R. 6720. An act for the relief of Ping-Kwan Fong;

H.R. 6906. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer and one split pole spectrograph for the use of the University of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y.;

H.R. 7282. An act for the relief of Richard D. Walsh;

H.R. 7357. An act for the relief Dr. Felipe V. Lavapies;

H.R. 7453. An act for the relief of Margaret Elizabeth and Frederick Henry Todd;

H.R. 7608. An act to provide for the free entry of one automatic steady state distribution machine for the use of the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.;

H.R. 8135. An act for the relief of Jennifer Rebecca Siegel;

H.R. 8232. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer-gas chromatograph for the use of Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Okla.;

H.R. 8272. An act to provide for the free entry of an isotope separator for the use of Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.;

H.R. 9351. An act to provide for the free entry of one shadomaster measuring projector for the use of the University of South Dakota;

H.R. 9587. An act to provide for the free entry of a Craig counter-current distribution apparatus for the use of Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo.;

H.R. 9588. An act to provide for the free entry of an electrically driven rotating chair for the use of the Louisiana State University Medical Center, New Orleans, La.;

H.R. 10256. An act for the relief of James D. W. Blyth, his wife, Jean Mary Blyth, and their daughter, Penelope Jean Blyth; and

H.J. Res. 571. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning October 25, 1965, as National Parkinson Week.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2571. An act for the relief of Ralph S. DeSocio, Jr.; and

H.R. 9903. An act to provide for the free entry of one multigap magnetic spectrograph for the use of Yale University.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 516. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the Saint Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, and for other purposes", approved August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), to provide that eight members of such Commission shall be appointed by the President, to provide that such Commission shall not terminate prior to December 31, 1966, and to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of such joint resolution.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 9047) entitled "An act to authorize the release of certain quantities of zinc from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both, disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. MILLER, and Mr. TOWER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to bill (H.R. 10305) entitled "An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 124,200,000 pounds of nickel from the national stockpile, disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. MILLER, and Mr. TOWER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that Mr. PROUTY be appointed a conferee on the bill (S. 2118) entitled "An act to amend sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920" in place of Mr. DOMINICK, excused.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 66-7.

ADJUSTMENTS IN ANNUITIES UNDER THE FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4170) to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, line 18, strike out all after "annuitant" down to and including "on" in line 19 and insert "prior to".

Page 3, line 21, strike out "during such period" and insert "prior to such date".

Page 3, lines 22 and 23, strike out "on October 16, 1960." and insert "at the time of such retirement."

Page 4, line 1, strike out all after "month." down to and including "date." in line 9.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman give us a brief explanation of the meaning of these amendments? Does this have to do with the bill providing for select-out procedure in the State Department and related agencies?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this is a bill which gave the Foreign Service officers who retired before October 16, 1960, when the law was changed, and who were married at that time, but made no provision for survivors' annuity, the opportunity to elect such annuity of $2,400 provided, first, they paid back for that annuity at the rate of $300 per year.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his explanation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] in urging the House to adopt H.R. 4170, a bill to provide for adjustments in the annuities of certain retired Foreign Service officers. Like the gentleman from Ohio, I, too, urge adoption with some reluctance. But given the attitude of the other body, it seems desirable that we salvage what we can of this bill.

One of the fundamental purposes of the bill as it passed the House last year and again this year was to provide a measure of equity for the older retired Foreign Service officers and their widows. Throughout the consideration of this measure the subcommittee was most anxious to relieve the Congress of private bills for the relief of distressed widows. Since I have served on the subcommittee during the past decade, we have had to consider many such bills. Our thought was to enact a comprehensive measure that would eliminate such bills. As a result of the Senate amendments, I anticipate that we may expect more private bills.

The Senate amendments affect those Foreign Service officers who retired before October 16, 1960, and who were married at the time but who, upon retirement, made no provision for a survivor annuity. The House bill would have permitted such individuals to elect a survivor annuity of $2,400 for which they would pay $300 a year from October 16, 1960 to the effective date of the measure and would also pay $300 a year as the current cost of such an annuity.

The effect of the Senate amendment is to require these retired officers who now make such an election to start their repayments from the date of their retirement which in some cases goes back 20 years and to repay at the old rate of $1,200 a year. Thus some individuals would have to pay back about $24,000 in order to provide a survivor annuity of $2,400. This approach clearly defeats the purpose that our subcommittee, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and this House has in mind.

I would expect that any retired Foreign Service officer who qualified for an election under the amended Senate language would proceed cautiously before making an election. He should be aware that his estate will be liable for any unpaid balances owed the Government. On the other hand, I would hope the Government would use restraint in seeking to impose a large liability on relatively small estates.

I am glad the gentleman from Ohio referred to the mechanics of repayment. The bill as it passed both Houses authorized the Secretary to make arrangements with annuitants who make an election to pay the cost of a survivor annuity in monthly installments. The House version made clear that this was to be in the form of a deduction from the annuitant's monthly check. The effect of the Senate amendment is to leave this matter unsettled. To require the Secretary to send out a monthly check and then have the annuitant send in a monthly check adds heavy administrative costs and burdens. I certainly should do nothing to increase paperwork in Government. I hope that nothing would be done to increase paperwork in Government.

There are many other commendable provisions in this bill that were not touched by the Senate amendments. On balance I think we have a measure that will help a number of the older retired Foreign Service officers and their widows. Therefore, I am urging my colleagues to support H.R. 4170 as amended by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, as H.R. 4170 passed the House, it gave to those Foreign Service officers who retired before October 16, 1960, and who were married at that time but made no provision for a survivor annuity, the opportunity to elect such an annuity of $2,400 provided, first, they paid back for that annuity at the rate of $300 per year dating from October 1960, and second, paid the current cost of such annuity which is $300 per year. Further if the annuitant died before completing his repayments, the widow and the estate were relieved of further payments. The House bill also made clear that the Secretary of State could deduct monthly repayments made by the annuitant from the annuity paid him, thus simplifying the bookkeeping of the Department.

The Senate struck all this out. The effect of the Senate amendments is to permit a Foreign Service officer who retired before October 16, 1960, and who had made no provision for a survivor annuity to make such an election for $2,400 annuity provided he paid $1,200 per year for the period since his retirement plus $300 per year for the current survivor annuity. Many of these officers retired 15 or 20 years ago at low annuities which is one of the reasons they were unable at the time of retirement to provide for their widows. Now they are required under the Senate amendment to pay back sums of $18,000 to $24,000 or more in order to provide $2,400 a year for their widows. They may, of course, pay in small monthly installments. But should they die before completing the repayments, their estate is held liable for the unpaid balance. The widow would receive a $2,400 annuity until she died.

I cannot imagine the Government proceeding against a small estate of an elderly couple whose life savings may amount only to a few thousand dollars. Certainly in these days of solicitude for our elderly citizens there must be greater sources of untapped revenue lying around. If the annuitant is wise, he will arrange his affairs so that the Government will not be able to establish any claim upon his death. There are provisions of law for compromise of claims in favor of the United States upon the recommendation of those having charge of the claims—31 U.S.C. 194. It is the intention of those who have handled the bill in the House that on the death of an annuitant, the surviving widow shall receive her appropriate monthly survivorship annuity payments and the Secretary of State will not have authority to make deductions from such payments to collect any balance that may have been due on the death of the annuitant.

There may be some confusion about the mechanics of how any repayments will be handled on the monthly installment plan provided for in the House bill. As a result of Senate amendment No. 4, this matter is left in the air. It is the understanding of the members who handled this bill in the House that the Secretary of State will now not have the authority to deduct the monthly repayments of any annuitant from his monthly retirement check.

The House is confronted with one of two choices. Either it accepts the Senate amendments which will attempt to extract every penny from many low-income annuitants or it rejects the bill in its entirety which contains some advantages for other older retired Foreign Service officers and their widows. Informal conversations lead me to believe that a conference would be a waste of time in view of the adamant attitude of the other body. I, therefore, reluctantly recommend to the House that it adopt the bill with the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. **KING** of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 612) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 612

Resolved, That Phillip Burton, of California, be and he is hereby elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Education and Labor.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE AGRICULTURAL MARKETING ACT OF 1937

Mr. **de la GARZA**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2092) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit marketing orders applicable to celery, sweet corn, limes, or avocados to provide for paid advertising, with Senate amendment to the House amendment thereto, and to concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 11, of the House engrossed amendments, after "limes," insert "olives, pecans,".

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment to the House engrossed amendments was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. **HALEY**. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 373]

Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Aspinall
Baring
Bell
Berry
Blatnik
Bolling
Callaway
Casey
Clausen, Don H.
Culver
Davis, Wis.
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Edwards, Ala.
Flynt
Ford, William D.
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Hagan, Ga.
Hardy
Hosmer
Leggett
Lennon
Lindsay
Love
Mackay
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Moeller
Mosher
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Poage
Pool
Reifel
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Roudebush
Schisler
Senner
Sisk
Sullivan
Talcott
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tunney
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Willis
Wilson, Bob

The **SPEAKER**. On this rollcall 373 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. **POWELL**. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9567) to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities, and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 1178)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9567) to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Higher Education Act of 1965'.

"TITLE I—COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS

"Appropriations authorized

"Sec. 101. For the purpose of assisting the people of the United States in the solution of community problems such as housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health, and land use by enabling the Commissioner to make grants under this title to strengthen community service programs of colleges and universities, there are authorized to be appropriated $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for the succeeding fiscal year. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and the succeeding fiscal year, there may be appropriated, to enable the Commissioner to make such grants, only such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

"Definition of community service program

"Sec. 102. For purposes of this title, the term 'community service program' means an educational program, activity, or service, including a research program and a university extension or continuing education offering, which is designed to assist in the solution of community problems in rural, urban, or suburban areas, with particular emphasis on urban and suburban problems, where the institution offering such program, activity, or service determines—

"(1) that the proposed program, activity, or service is not otherwise available, and

"(2) that the conduct of the program or performance of the activity or service is consistent with the institution's over-all educational program and is of such a nature as is appropriate to the effective utilization of the institution's special resources and the competencies of its faculty.

Where course offerings are involved, such courses must be university extension or continuing education courses and must be—

"(A) fully acceptable toward an academic degree, or

"(B) of college level as determined by the institution offering such courses.

"Allotments to States

"SEC. 103. (a) Of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 101 for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot $25,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands and $100,000 to each of the other States, and he shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the remainder of such sums as the population of the State bears to the population of all States.

"(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this title shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under such subsection for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year for carrying out the State plan; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to section 101 shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

"(c) In accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, any State may file with him a request that a specified portion of its allotment under this title be added to the allotment of another State under this title for the purpose of meeting a portion of the Federal share of the cost of providing community service programs under this title. If it is found by the Commissioner that the programs with respect to which the request is made would meet needs of the State making the request and that use of the specified portion of such State's allotment, as requested by it, would assist in carrying out the purposes of this title, such portion of such State's allotment shall be added to the allotment of the other State under this title to be used for the purpose referred to above.

"(d) The population of a State and of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available from the Department of Commerce.

"Uses of allotted funds

"SEC. 104. A State's allotment under section 103 may be used, in accordance with its State plan approved under section 105 (b), to provide new, expanded, or improved community service programs.

"State plans

"SEC. 105. (a) Any State desiring to receive its allotment of Federal funds under this title shall designate or create a State agency or institution which has special qualifications with respect to solving community problems and which is broadly representative of institutions of higher education in the State which are competent to offer community service programs, and shall submit to the Commissioner through the agency or institution so designated a State plan. If a State desires to designate for the purposes of this section an existing State agency or institution which does not meet these requirements, it may do so if the agency or institution takes such action as may be necessary to acquire such qualifications and assure participation of such institutions, or if it designates or creates a State advisory council which meets the requirements not met by the designated agency or institution to consult with the designated agency or institution in the preparation of the State plan. A State plan submitted under this title shall be in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary and shall—

"(1) provide that the agency or institution so designed or created shall be the sole agency for administration of the plan or for supervision of the administration of the plan; and provide that such agency or institution shall consult with any State advisory council required to be created by this section with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of such plan;

"(2) set forth a comprehensive, coordinated, and statewide system of community service programs under which funds paid to the State (including funds paid to an institution pursuant to section 106(c)) under its allotments under section 103 will be expended solely for community service programs which have been approved by the agency or institution administering the plan;

"(3) set forth the policies and procedures to be followed in allocating Federal funds to institutions of higher education in the State, which policies and procedures shall insure that due consideration will be given—

"(A) to the relative capacity and willingness of particular institutions of higher education (whether public or private) to provide effective community service programs;

"(B) to the availability of and need for community service programs among the population within the State; and

"(C) to the results of periodic evaluations of the programs carried out under this title in the light of information regarding current and anticipated community problems in the State;

"(4) set forth policies and procedures designed to assure that Federal funds made available under this title will be so used as not to supplant State or local funds, or funds of institutions of higher education, but to supplement and, to the extent practicable, to increase the amounts of such funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for community service programs;

"(5) set forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State or by the Commissioner to institutions of higher education) under this title; and

"(6) provide for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

"Payments

"SEC. 106. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), payment under this title shall be made to those State agencies and institutions which administer plans approved under section 105(b). Payments under this title from a State's allotment with respect to the cost of developing and carrying out its State plan shall equal 75 per centum of such costs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, 75 per centum of such costs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and 50 per centum of such costs for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, except that no payments for any fiscal year shall be made to any State with respect to expenditures for developing and administering the State plan which exceed 5 per centum of the costs for that year for which payment under this subsection may be made to that State, or $25,000, whichever is the greater. In determining the cost of developing and carrying out a State's plan, there shall be excluded any cost with respect to which payments were received under any other Federal program.

"(b) No payments shall be made to any State from its allotments for any fiscal year unless and until the Commissioner finds that the institutions of higher education which will participate in carrying out the State plan for that year will together have available during that year for expenditure from non-Federal sources for college and university extension and continuing education programs not less than the total amount actually expended by those institutions for college and university extension and continuing education programs from such sources during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, plus an amount equal to not less than the non-Federal share of the costs with respect to which payment pursuant to subsection (a) is sought.

"(c) Payments to a State under this title may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments, and they may be paid directly to the State or to one or more participating institutions of higher education designated for this purpose by the State, or to both.

"Administration of State plans

"SEC. 107. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this title, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State agency or institution submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency or institution administering a State plan approved under section 105(b), finds that—

"(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 105(a), or

"(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify the State agency or institution that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this title until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

"Judicial review

"SEC. 108. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under section 105(a) or with his final action under section 107(b), such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

"(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

"(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

"National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education

"SEC. 109. (a) The President shall, within ninety days of enactment of this title, appoint a National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education (hereafter referred to as the "Advisory Council"), consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, one representative each of the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Labor, Interior, State, and Housing and Urban Development, and the Office of Economic Opportunity, and of such other Federal agencies having extension education responsibilities as the President may designate, and twelve members appointed, for staggered terms and without regard to the civil service laws, by the President. Such twelve members shall, to the extent possible, include persons knowledgeable in the fields of extension and continuing education, State and local officials, and other persons having special knowledge, experience, or qualification with respect to community problems, and persons representative of the general public. The Advisory Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman but not less often than twice a year.

"(b) The Advisory Council shall advise the Commissioner in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this title, including policies and procedures governing the approval of State plans under section 105(b), and policies to eliminate duplication and to effectuate the coordination of programs under this title and other programs offering extension or continuing education activities and services.

"(c) The Advisory Council shall review the administration and effectiveness of all federally supported extension and continuing education programs, including community service programs, make recommendations with respect thereto, and make annual reports commencing on March 31, 1967, of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this title and other Federal laws relating to extension and continuing education activities) to the Secretary and to the President. The President shall transmit each such report to the Congress together with his comments and recommendations.

"(d) Members of the Advisory Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on the business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, members may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(e) The Secretary shall engage such technical assistance as may be required to carry out the functions of the Advisory Council, and the Secretary shall, in addition, make available to the Advisory Council such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as it may require to carry out its functions.

"(f) In carrying out its functions pursuant to this section, the Advisory Council may utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary and the head of such agency.

"Relationship to other programs

"SEC. 110. Nothing in this title shall modify authorities under the Act of February 23, 1917 (Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act), as amended (20 U.S.C. 11–15, 16–28); the Vocational Education Act of 1946, as amended (20 U.S.C. 15i–15m, 15o–15q, 15aa–15jj, and 15aaa–15ggg); the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (20 U.S.C. 35–35n); title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964 (Public Law 88–560); or the Act of May 8, 1914 (Smith-Lever Act), as amended (7 U.S.C. 341–348).

"Limitation

"SEC. 111. No grant may be made under this title for any educational program, activity, or service related to sectarian instruction or religious worship, or provided by a school or department of divinity. For purposes of this section, the term 'school or department of divinity' means an institution or a department or branch of an institution whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation, or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

"TITLE II—COLLEGE LIBRARY ASSISTANCE AND LIBRARY TRAINING AND RESEARCH

"Part A—College library resources

"Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 201. There are authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to make grants under this part to institutions of higher education to assist and encourage such institutions in the acquisition for library purposes of books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, audiovisual materials, and other related library materials (including necessary binding). For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and the succeeding fiscal year, there may be appropriated, to enable the Commissioner to make such grants, only such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

"Basic Grants

"SEC. 202. From 75 per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for any fiscal year, the Commissioner is authorized to make basic grants for the purposes set forth in that section to institutions of higher education and combinations of such institutions. The amount of a basic grant shall not exceed $5,000 for each such institution of higher education and each branch of such institution which is located in a community different from that in which its parent institution is located, as determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, and a basic grant under this subsection may be made only if the application therefor is approved by the Commissioner upon his determination that the application (whether by an individual institution or a combination of institutions)—

"(a) provides satisfactory assurance that the applicant will expend during the fiscal year for which the grant is requested (from funds other than funds received under this part) for all library purposes (exclusive of construction) (1) an amount not less than the average annual amount it expended for such purposes during the two-year period ending June 30, 1965, and (2) an amount (from such other sources) equal to not less than the amount of such grant;

"(b) provides satisfactory assurance that the applicant will expend during the fiscal year for which the grant is requested (from funds other than funds received under this part) for books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, audiovisual materials, and other related materials (including necessary binding) for library purposes an amount not less than the average annual amount if expended for such materials during the two-year period ending June 30, 1965;

"(c) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this section; and

"(d) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may require to carry out his functions under this section, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"Supplemental Grants

"SEC. 203. (a) From the remainder of such 75 per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for any fiscal year, plus any part of such sums as the Commissioner determines will not be used for making grants under section 204, the Commissioner is authorized to make supplemental grants for the purposes set forth in section 201 to institutions of higher education and combinations of such institutions. The amount of a supplemental grant shall not exceed $10 for each full-time student (including the full-time equivalent of the number of part-time students) enrolled in each such institution, as determined pursuant to regulations of the Commissioner. A supplemental grant may be made only upon application therefor, in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may require, which application shall—

"(1) meet the application requirements set forth in section 202 except for the matching requirement set forth in paragraph (a) (2) of that section;

"(2) describe the size and quality of the library resources of the applicant in relation to its present enrollment and any expected increase in its enrollment;

"(3) set forth any special circumstances which are impeding or will impede the proper development of its library resources; and

"(4) provide a general description of how a supplemental grant would be used to improve the size or quality of its library resources.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve applications for supplemental grants on the basis of basic criteria prescribed in regulations and developed after consultation with the Council created under section 205. Such basic criteria shall be such as will best tend to achieve the objectives of this part and they (1) may take into consideration factors such as the size and age of the library collection and student enrollment, and (2) shall give priority to institutions in need of financial assistance for library purposes.

"Special Purpose Grants

"SEC. 204. (a) (1) Twenty-five per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for each fiscal year shall be used by the Commissioner in accordance with this subsection.

"(2) Of the sums available for use under paragraph (1) sixty per centum may be used to make special grants (A) to institutions of higher education which demonstrate a special need for additional library resources and which demonstrate that such additional library resources will make a substantial contribution to the quality of their educational resources, (B) to institutions of higher education to meet special national or regional needs in the library and information sciences, and (C) to combinations of institutions of higher education which need special assistance in establishing and strengthening joint-use facilities. Grants under this section may be used only for books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, audiovisual materials, and other related library materials (including necessary binding).

"(3) Any sums available for use under paragraph (1) which are not used for the purposes of paragraph (2) shall be used in the manner prescribed by the first sentence of section 203(a).

"(b) Grants pursuant to paragraph (2) shall be made upon application providing satisfactory assurance that (1) the applicant (or applicants jointly in the case of a combination of institutions) will expend during the fiscal year for which the grant is requested (from funds other than funds received under this part) for the same purpose as such grant an amount from such other sources equal to not less than 33⅓ per centum of such grant, and (2) in addition each such applicant will expend during such fiscal year (from such other sources) for all library purposes (exclusive of construction) an amount not less than the average annual amount it expended for such purposes during the two-year period ending June 30, 1965.

"Advisory Council on College Library Resources

"SEC. 205. (a) The Commissioner shall establish in the Office of Education an Advisory Council on College Library Resources consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, and eight members appointed, without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

"(b) The Advisory Council shall advise the Commissioner with respect to establishing criteria for the making of supplemental grants under section 203 and the making of special purpose grants under section 204. The Commissioner may appoint such special advisory and technical experts and consultants as may be useful in carrying out the functions of the Advisory Council.

"(c) Members of the Advisory Council, while serving on business of the Advisory Council, shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Accreditation Requirement for Purposes of This Part

"Sec. 206. For the purposes of this part, an educational institution shall be deemed to have been accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association if the Commissioner determines that there is satisfactory assurance that upon acquisition of the library resources with respect to which assistance under this part is sought, or upon acquisition of those resources and other library resources planned to be acquired within a reasonable time, the institution will meet the accreditation standards of such agency or association.

"Limitation

"SEC. 207. No grant may be made under this part for books, periodicals, documents, or other related materials to be used for sectarian instruction or religious worship, or primarily in connection with any part of the program of a school or department of divinity. For purposes of this section, the term 'school or department of divinity' means an institution or a department or branch of an institution whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation, or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

"Consultation With State Agency

"SEC. 208. Each institution of higher education which receives a grant under this part shall periodically inform the State agency (if any) concerned with the educational activities of all institutions of higher education in the State in which such institution is located, of its activities under this part.

"Part B—Library training and research

"Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 221. There are authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, for the purpose of carrying out this part. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and the succeeding fiscal year, there may be appropriated for such purpose only such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

"Definition of 'Librarianship'

"SEC. 222. For the purposes of this part the term 'librarianship' means the principles and practices of the library and information sciences, including the acquisition, organization, storage, retrieval, and dissemination of information, and reference and research use of library and other information resources.

"Grants for Training in Librarianship

"SEC. 223. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education to assist them in training persons in librarianship. Such grants may be used by such institutions to assist in covering the cost of courses of training or study for such persons, and for establishing and maintaining fellowships or traineeships with stipends (including allowances for traveling, subsistence, and other expenses) for fellows and others undergoing training and their dependents not in excess of such maximum amounts as may be prescribed by the Commissioner.

"(b) The Commissioner may make a grant to an institution of higher education only upon application by the institution and only upon his finding that such program will substantially further the objective of increasing the opportunities throughout the Nation for training in librarianship.

"Research and Demonstrations Relating to Libraries and the Training of Library Personnel

"SEC. 224. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education and other public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations, for research and demonstration projects relating to the improvement of libraries or the improvement of training in librarianship, including the development of new techniques, systems, and equipment for processing, storing, and distributing information, and for the dissemination of information derived from such research and demonstrations, and, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5), to provide by contracts with them for the conduct of such activities; except that no such grant may be made to a private agency, organization, or institution other than a nonprofit one.

"(b) The Commissioner is authorized to appoint a special advisory committee of not more than nine members to advise him on matters of general policy concerning research and demonstration projects relating to the improvement of libraries and the improvement of training in librarianship, or concerning special services necessary thereto or special problems involved therein.

"(c) Members of the committee appointed under this section who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on the business of the committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Commissioner, but not in excess of $100 per diem, including travel time; and they may, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Repealer

"SEC. 225. Effective July 1, 1967, section 1101 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by adding the word 'or' at the end of clause (2), by striking out clause (3), and by renumbering clause (4) as clause (3).

"Part C—Strengthening college and research library resources

"Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 231. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $6,315,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $7,770,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, to enable the Commissioner to transfer funds to the Librarian of Congress for the purpose of—

"(1) acquiring, so far as possible, all library materials currently published throughout the world which are of value to scholarship; and

"(2) providing catalog information for these materials promptly after receipt, and distributing bibliographic information by printing catalog cards and by other means, and enabling the Library of Congress to use for exchange and other purposes such of these materials as are not needed for its own collections.

"For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and the succeeding fiscal year, there may be appropriated, to enable the Commissioner to transfer funds to the Librarian of Congress for such purpose, only such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

"TITLE III—STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS

"Statement of purpose and appropriations authorized

"SEC. 301. (a) The purpose of this title is to assist in raising the academic quality of colleges which have the desire and potential to make a substantial contribution to the higher education resources of our Nation but which for financial and other reasons are struggling for survival and are isolated from the main currents of academic life, and to do so by enabling the Commissioner to establish a national teaching fellow program and to encourage and assist in the establishment of cooperative arrangements under which these colleges may draw on the talent and experience of our finest colleges and universities, and on the educational resources of business and industry, in their effort to improve their academic quality.

"(b)(1) There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $55,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, to carry out the provisions of this title.

"(2) Of the sums appropriated pursuant to this section for any fiscal year, 78 per centum shall be available only for carrying out the provisions of this title with respect to developing institutions which plan to award one or more bachelor's degrees during such year.

"(3) The remainder of the sums so appropriated shall be available only for carrying out the provisions of this title with respect to developing institutions which do not plan to award such a degree during such year.

"Definition of 'developing institution'

"SEC. 302. As used in this title the term 'developing institution' means a public or nonprofit educational institution in any State which—

"(a) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a secondary school, or the recognized equivalent of such certificate;

"(b) is legally authorized to provide, and provides within the State an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, or offers a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or other technological fields which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles of knowledge;

"(c) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association determined by the Commissioner to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered or is, according to such an agency or association, making reasonable progress toward accreditation;

"(d) has met the requirements of clauses (a) and (b) during the five academic years preceding the academic year for which it seeks assistance under this title;

"(e) is making a reasonable effort to improve the quality of its teaching and administrative staffs and of its student services;

"(f) is, for financial or other reasons, struggling for survival and is isolated from the main currents of academic life;

"(g) meets such other requirements as the Commissioner may prescribe by regulation; and

"(h) is not an institution, or department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

"Advisory Council on Developing Institutions

"SEC. 303. (a) The Commissioner shall establish in the Office of Education an Advisory Council on Developing Institutions (hereinafter in this title referred to as the 'Council'), consisting of the Commissioner who shall be Chairman, one representative each of such Federal agencies having responsibilities with respect to developing institutions as the Commissioner may designate, and eight members appointed, without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

"(b) The Council shall advise the Commissioner with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this title and in particular shall assist the Commissioner in identifying those developing institutions through which the purposes of this title can best be achieved and in establishing priorities for use in approving applications under this title. The Commissioner may appoint such special advisory and technical experts and consultants as may be useful in carrying out the functions of the Council.

"(c) Members of the Council who are not otherwise full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Council, receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, members may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Grants for cooperative agreements to strengthen developing institutions

"SEC. 304. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to developing institutions and other colleges and universities to pay part of the cost of planning, developing, and carrying out cooperative arrangements which show promise as effective measures for strengthening the academic programs and the administration of developing institutions. Such cooperative arrangements may be between developing institutions, between developing institutions and other colleges and universities, and between developing institutions and organizations, agencies, and business entities. Grants under this section may be used for projects and activities such as—

"(1) exchange of faculty or students, including arrangements for bringing visiting scholars to developing institutions;

"(2) faculty and administration improvement programs utilizing training, education (including fellowships leading to advanced degrees), internships, research participation, and other means;

"(3) introduction of new curriculums and curricular materials;

"(4) development and operation of cooperative education programs involving alternate periods of academic study and business or public employment;

"(5) joint use of facilities such as libraries or laboratories, including necessary books, materials, and equipment; and

"(6) other arrangements which offer promise of strengthening the academic programs and the administration of developing institutions.

"(b) A grant may be made under this section only upon application to the Commissioner at such time or times and containing such information as he deems necessary. The Commissioner shall not approve an application unless it—

"(1) sets forth a program for carrying out one or more projects or activities which meet the requirements of subsection (a) and provides for such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the program;

"(2) sets forth policies and procedures which assure that Federal funds made available under this section for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available for purposes which meet the requirements of subsection (a), and in no case supplant such funds;

"(3) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this section; and

"(4) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may require to carry out his functions under this title, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(c) The Commissioner shall, after consultation with the Council, establish criteria as to eligible expenditures for which grants made under this section may be used, which criteria shall be so designed as to prevent the use of such grants for expenditures not necessary to the achievement of the purposes of this title.

"National teaching fellowships

"SEC. 305. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to award fellowships under this section to highly qualified graduate students and junior members of the faculty of colleges and universities, to encourage such individuals to teach at developing institutions. The Commissioner shall award fellowships to individuals for teaching at developing institutions only upon application by an institution approved for this purpose by the Commissioner and only upon a finding by the Commissioner that the program of teaching set forth in the application is reasonable in the light of the qualifications of the teaching fellow and of the educational needs of the applicant.

"(b) Fellowships may be awarded under this section for such period of teaching as the Commissioner may determine, but such period shall not exceed two academic years. Each person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this section shall receive a stipend for each academic year of teaching of not more than $6,500 as determined by the Commissioner upon the advice of the Council, plus an additional amount of $400 for each such year on account of each of his dependents.

"TITLE IV—STUDENT ASSISTANCE

"Part A—Educational opportunity grants

"Statement of Purpose and Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 401. (a) It is the purpose of this part to provide, through institutions of higher education, educational opportunity grants to assist in making available the benefits of higher education to qualified high school graduates of exceptional financial need, who for lack of financial means of their own or of their families would be unable to obtain such benefits without such aid.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $70,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to make payments to institutions of higher education that have agreements with him entered into under section 407, for use by such institutions for payments to undergraduate students for the initial academic year of educational opportunity grants awarded to them under this part. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969 and for the succeeding fiscal year, there may be appropriated, to carry out the first sentence of this subsection, only such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law. There are further authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for payment to such institutions for use by them for making educational opportunity grants under this part to undergraduate students for academic years other than the initial year of their educational opportunity grants; but no appropriation may be made pursuant to this sentence for any fiscal year beginning more than three years after the last fiscal year for which an appropriation is authorized under the first sentence. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection for any fiscal year shall be available for payment to institutions until the close of the fiscal year succeeding the fiscal year for which they were appropriated. For the purposes of this subsection, payment for the first year of an educational opportunity grant shall not be considered as an initial-year payment if the educational opportunity grant was awarded for the continuing education of a student who had been previously awarded an educational opportunity grant under this part (whether by another institution or otherwise) and had received payment for any year of that educational opportunity grant.

"Amount of Educational Opportunity Grant—Annual Determination

"SEC. 402. From the funds received by it for such purpose under this part, an institution of higher education which awards an educational opportunity grant to a student under this part shall, for the duration of the grant, pay to that student for each academic year during which he is in need of grant aid to pursue a course of study at the institution, an amount determined by the institution for such student with respect to that year, which amount shall not exceed—

"(1) the lesser of $800 or one-half of the sum of the amount of student financial aid (including assistance under this title, but excluding assistance from work-study programs) provided such student by such institution and any assistance provided such student under any scholarship program established by a State or a private institution or organization, as determined in accordance with regulation of the Commissioner, or

"(2) in the case of a student who during the preceding academic year at an institution of higher education received grades placing him in the upper half of his class, the amount determined under paragraph (1), plus $200.

If the amount of the payment determined under the preceding sentence for an academic year is less than $200 for a student, no payment shall be made under this title to that student for that year. The Commissioner shall, subject to the foregoing limitations, prescribe for the guidance of participating institutions basic critera or schedules (or both) for the determination of the amount of any such educational opportunity grant, taking into account the objective of limiting grant aid under this part to students of exceptional financial need and such other factors, including the number of dependents in the family, as the Commissioner may deem relevant.

"Duration of Educational Opportunity Grant

"SEC. 403. The duration of an educational opportunity grant awarded under this part shall be the period required for completion by the recipient of his undergraduate course of study at the institution of higher education from which he received the educational opportunity grant, except that such period shall not exceed four academic years less any such period with respect to which the recipient has previously received payments under this part pursuant to a prior educational opportunity grant (whether made by the same or another institution). An educational opportunity grant awarded under this part shall entitle the recipient to payments only if he (1) is maintaining satisfactory progress in the course of study which he is pursuing, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the institution from which he received the grant, and (2) is devoting essentially full time to that course of study, during the academic year, in attendance at that institution. Failure to be in attendance at the institution during vacation periods or periods of military service, or during other periods during which the Commissioner determines in accordance with regulations that there is good cause for his nonattendance (during which periods he shall receive no payments) shall not be deemed contrary to clause (2).

"Selection of Recipients of Educational Opportunity Grants

"SEC. 404. (a) An individual shall be eligible for the award of an educational opportunity grant under this part at any institution of higher education which has made an agreement with the Commissioner pursuant to section 407 (which institution is hereinafter in this part referred to as an 'eligible institution'), if the individual makes application at the time and in the manner prescribed by that institution.

"(b) From among those eligible for educational opportunity grants from an institution of higher education for each fiscal year, the institution shall, in accordance with the provisions of its agreement with the Commissioner under section 407 and within the amount allocated to the institution for that purpose for that year under section 406, select individuals who are to be awarded such grants and determine, pursuant to section 402, the amounts to be paid to them. An institution shall not award an educational opportunity grant to an individual unless it determines that—

"(1) he has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student at such institution or, in the case of a student already attending such institution, is in good standing and in full-time attendance there as an undergraduate student;

"(2) he shows evidence of academic or creative promise and capability of maintaining good standing in his course of study;

"(3) he is of exceptional financial need; and

"(4) he would not, but for an educational opportunity grant, be financially able to pursue a course of study at such institution of higher education.

"Allotment of Educational Opportunity Grant Funds Among States

"SEC. 405. (a) (1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to the first sentence section 401(b) for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount so appropriated as the number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in such State bears to the total number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in all the States. The number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education for purposes of this section shall be determined by the Commissioner for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available to him.

"(2) If the total of the sums determined by the Commissioner to be required under section 406 for any fiscal year for eligible institutions in a State is less than the amount of the allotment to that State under paragraph (1) for that year, the Commissioner may reallot the remaining amount from time to time, on such date or dates as he may fix, to other States in such manner as he determines will best assist in achieving the purposes of this part.

"(b) Sums appropriated pursuant to the third sentence of section 401(b) for any fiscal year shall be allotted or reallotted among the States in such manner as the Commissioner determines to be necessary to carry out the purposes for which such sums are appropriated.

"Allocation of Allotted Funds to Institutions

"SEC. 406. (a) The Commissioner shall from time to time set dates by which eligible institutions in any State must file applications for allocation, to such institutions, of educational opportunity grant funds from the allotment to that State (including any reallotment thereto) for any fiscal year pursuant to section 405(a), to be used for the purposes specified in the first sentence of section 401(b). Such allocations shall be made in accordance with equitable criteria which the Commissioner shall establish and which shall be designed to achieve such distribution of such funds among eligible institutions within a State as will most effectively carry out the purposes of this part.

"(b) The Commissioner shall further, in accordance with regulations, allocate to eligible institutions, in any State, from funds apportioned or reapportioned pursuant to section 405(b), funds to be used for the educational opportunity grants specified in the third sentence of section 401(b).

"(c) Payment shall be made from allocations under this section to institutions as needed.

"Agreements With Institutions—Conditions

"SEC. 407. (a) An institution of higher education which desires to obtain funds for educational opportunity grants under this part, shall enter into an agreement with the Commissioner. Such agreement shall—

"(1) provide that funds received by the institution under this part will be used by it only for the purposes specified in, and in accordance with, the provisions of this part;

"(2) provide that in determining whether an individual meets the requirements of section 404(b)(3) the institution will (A) consider the source of such individual's income and that of any indivdual or individuals upon whom the student relies primarily for support, and (B) make an appropriate review of the assets of the student and of such individuals;

"(3) provide that the institution, in cooperation with other institutions of higher education where appropriate, will make vigorous efforts to identify qualified youths of exceptional financial need and to encourage them to continue their education beyond secondary school through programs and activities such as—

"(A) establishing or strengthening close working relationships with secondary-school principals and guidance and counseling personnel with a view toward motivating students to complete secondary school and pursue post-secondary-school educational opportunities, and

"(B) making, to the extent feasible, conditional commitments for educational opportunity grants to qualified secondary school students with special emphasis on students enrolled in grade 11 or lower grades who show evidences of academic or creative promise;

"(4) provide assurance that the institution will continue to spend in its own scholarship and student-aid program, from sources other than funds received under this part, not less than the average expenditure per year made for that purpose during the most recent period of three fiscal years preceding the effective date of the agreement;

"(5) include provisions designed to make educational opportunity grants under this part reasonably available (to the extent of available funds) to all eligible students in the institution in need thereof; and

"(6) include such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States and promote the purposes of this part.

"(b)(1) An institution, which has in effect an agreement for Federal capital contributions for a student loan fund pursuant to title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, may use, as an additional Federal capital contribution for the purposes of such loan fund, not to exceed 25 per centum of the funds paid to it for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1970, for the purpose set forth in section 401(b). The requirement in section 204(2)(B) of such Act shall not apply to such a Federal capital contribution.

"(2) For the purpose of making payments from amounts appropriated pursuant to the third sentence of section 401(b), any institution electing for any fiscal year to use an amount of its payment as a Federal capital contribution pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be paid an equal amount for each of the succeeding three fiscal years from such amounts appropriated pursuant to such third sentence, if the amount so paid to the institution for each such year is used by such institution as such a Federal capital contribution.

"Contracts to Encourage Full Utilization of Educational Talent

"SEC. 408. (a) To assist in achieving the purposes of this part the Commissioner is authorized (without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)), to enter into contracts, not to exceed $100,000 per year, with State and local educational agencies and other public or nonprofit organizations and institutions for the purpose of—

"(1) identifying qualified youths of exceptional financial need and encouraging them to complete secondary school and undertake postsecondary educational training,

"(2) publicizing existing forms of student financial aid, including aid furnished under this part, or

"(3) encouraging secondary-school or college dropouts of demonstrated aptitude to reenter educational programs, including postsecondary-school programs.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

"Definition of 'Academic Year'

"SEC. 409. As used in this part, the term 'academic year' means an academic year or its equivalent as defined in regulations of the Commissioner.

"Part B—Federal, State, and private programs of low-interest insured loans to students in institutions of higher education

"Statement of Purpose and Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 421. (a) The purpose of this part is to enable the Commissioner (1) to encourage States and nonprofit private institutions and organizations to establish adequate loan insurance programs for students in eligible institutions (as defined in section 435), (2) to provide a Federal program of student loan insurance for students who do not have reasonable access to a State or private nonprofit program of student loan insurance covered by an agreement under section 428(b), and (3) to pay a portion of the interest on loans to qualified students which are made by a State under a direct loan program meeting the requirements of section 428(a)(1)(B), or which are insured under this part or under a program of a State or of a nonprofit private institution or organization which meets the requirements of section 428(a)(1)(C).

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out this part—

"(1) there are authorized to be appropriated to the student loan insurance fund (established by section 431) (A) the sum of $1,000,000, and (B) such further sums, if any, as may become necessary for the adequacy of the student loan insurance fund,

"(2) there are authorized to be appropriated, for payments under section 428 with respect to interest on student loans, such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and succeeding fiscal years, as may be required therefor, and

"(3) there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $17,500,000 for making advances pursuant to section 422 for the reserve funds of State and nonprofit private student loan insurance programs.

Sums appropriated under clauses (1) and (2) of this subsection shall remain available until expended, and sums appropriated under clause (3) of this subsection shall remain available for advances under section 422 until the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

"Advances for Reserve Funds of State and Nonprofit Private Loan Insurance Programs

"SEC. 422. (a)(1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to clause (3) of section 421(b), the Commissioner is authorized to make advances to any State with which he has made an agreement pursuant to section 428(b) for the purpose of helping to establish or strengthen the reserve fund of the student loan insurance program covered by that agreement. If for any of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1966, June 30, 1967, or June 30, 1968, a State does not have a student loan insurance program covered by an agreement made pursuant to section 428(b), and the Commissioner determines after consultation with the chief executive officer of that State that there is no reasonable likelihood that the State will have such a student loan insurance program for such year, the Commissioner may make advances for such year for the same purpose to one or more nonprofit private institutions or organizations with which he has made an agreement pursuant to section 428(b) in order to enable students in that State to participate in a program of student loan insurance covered by such an agreement. The Commissioner may make advances under this subsection both to a State program (with which he has such an agreement) and to one or more nonprofit private institutions or organizations (with which he has such an agreement) in that State if he determines that such advances are necessary in order that students in each eligible institution have access through such institution to a student loan insurance program which meets the requirements of section 428(b)(1).

"(2) Advances pursuant to this subsection shall be upon such terms and conditions (including conditions relating to the time or times of payment) consistent with the requirements of section 428(b) as the Commissioner determines will best carry out the purposes of this section. Advances made by the Commissioner under this subsection shall be repaid within such period as the Commissioner may deem to be appropriate in each case in the light of the maturity and solvency of the reserve fund for which the advance was made.

"(b) The total of the advances to any State pursuant to subsection (a) may not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to 2½ per centum of $700,000,000 as the population of that State aged eighteen to twenty-two inclusive, bears to the total population of all the States aged eighteen to twenty-two, inclusive. If the amount so determined for any State, however, is less than $25,000, it shall be increased to $25,000 and the total of the increases thereby required shall be derived by proportionately reducing (but not below $25,000) the amount so determined for each of the remaining States. Advances to nonprofit private institutions and organizations pursuant to subsection (a) may be in such amounts as the Commissioner determines will best achieve the purposes for which they are made, except that the sum of (1) advances to such institutions and organizations for the benefit of students in any State plus (2) the amounts advanced to such State, may not exceed the maximum amount which may be advanced to that State pursuant to the first two sentences of this subsection. For the purposes of this subsection, the population aged eighteen to twenty-two, inclusive, of each State and of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him.

"Effect of Adequate Non-Federal Programs

"SEC. 423. The Commissioner shall not issue certificates of insurance under section 429 to lenders in a State if he determines that every eligible institution has reasonable access in that State to a State or private nonprofit student loan insurance program which is covered by an agreement under section 428(b).

"Scope and Duration of Federal Loan Insurance Program

"SEC. 424. (a) The total principal amount of new loans made and installments paid pursuant to lines of credit (as defined in section 435) to students covered by Federal loan insurance under this part shall not exceed $700,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $1,000,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $1,400,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. Thereafter, Federal loan insurance pursuant to this part may be granted only for loans made (or for loan installments paid pursuant to lines of credit) to enable students, who have obtained prior loans insured under this part, to continue or complete their educational program; but no insurance may be granted for any loan made or installment paid after June 30, 1972.

"(b) The Commissioner may, if he finds it necessary to do so in order to assure an equitable distribution of the benefits of this part, assign, within the maximum amounts specified in subsection (a), Federal loan insurance quotas applicable to eligible lenders, or to States or areas, and may from time to time reassign unused portions of these quotas.

"Limitations on Individual Federally Insured Loans and on Federal Loan Insurance

"SEC. 425. (a) (1) The total of the loans made to a student in any academic year or its equivalent (as determined under regulations of the Commissioner) which may be covered by Federal loan insurance under this part may not exceed $1,500 in the case of a graduate or professional student (as defined in regulations of the Commissioner), or $1,000 in the case of any other student. The aggregate insured unpaid principal amount of all such insured loans made to any student shall not at any time exceed $7,500 in the case of any graduate or professional student (as defined in regulations of the Commissioner, and including any such insured loans made to such person before he became a graduate or professional student), or $5,000 in the case of any other student. The annual insurable limit per student shall not be deemed to be exceeded by a line of credit under which actual payments by the lender to the borrower will not be made in any year in excess of the annual limit.

"(2) If in any academic year or its equivalent a student receives a loan which is insured by the Commissioner under this part, no loan to that student in that year may be made or insured by the Commissioner under the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965; and if in any academic year or its equivalent a student receives a loan which is made or insured by the Commissioner under the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, no loan to that student in that year may be insured by the Commissioner under this part.

"(b) The insurance liability on any loan insured by the Commissioner under this part shall be 100 per centum of the unpaid balance of the principal amount of the loan. Such insurance liability shall not include liability for interest whether or not that interest has been added to the principal amount of the loan.

"Sources of Funds

"SEC. 426. Loans made by eligible lenders in accordance with this part shall be insurable by the Commissioner whether made from funds fully owned by the lender or from funds held by the lender in a trust or similar capacity and available for such loans.

"Eligibility of Student Borrowers and Terms of Student Loans

"SEC. 427. (a) A loan by an eligible lender shall be insurable by the Commissioner under the provisions of this part only if—

"(1) made to a student who (A) has been accepted for enrollment at an eligible institution or, in the case of a student already attending such institution, is in good standing there as determined by the institution, and (B) is carrying at least one-half of the normal full-time workload as determined by the institution, and (C) has provided the lender with a statement of the institution which sets forth a schedule of the tuition and fees applicable to that student and its estimate of the cost of board and room for such a student; and

"(2) evidenced by a note or other written agreement which—

"(A) is made without security and without endorsement, except that if the borrower is a minor and such note or other written agreement executed by him would not, under the applicable law, create a binding obligation, endorsement may be required.

"(B) provides for repayment (except as provided in subsection (c)) of the principal amount of the loan in installments over a period of not less than five years (unless sooner repaid) nor more than ten years beginning not earlier than nine months nor later than one year after the date on which the student ceases to carry at an eligible institution at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload as determined by the institution, except (i) as provided in clause (C) below, (ii) that the period of the loan may not exceed fifteen years from the execution of the note or written agreement evidencing it and (iii) that the note or other written instrument may contain such provisions relating to repayment in the event of default in the payment of interest or in the payment of the cost of insurance premiums, or other default by the borrower, as may be authorized by regulations of the Commissioner in effect at the time the loan is made,

"(C) provides that periodic installments of principal need not be paid, but interest shall accrue and be paid, during any period (i) during which the borrower is pursuing a full-time course of study at an institution of higher education or at a comparable institution outside the States approved for this purpose by the Commissioner, (ii) not in excess of three years, during which the borrower is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, or (iii) not in excess of three years during which the borrower is in service as a volunteer under the Peace Corps Act, and any such period shall not be included in determining the ten-year period or the fifteen-year period provided in clause (B) above,

"(D) provides for interest on the unpaid principal balance of the loan at a yearly rate, not exceeding the applicable maximum rate prescribed and defined by the Secretary (within the limits set forth in subsection (b)) on a national, regional, or other appropriate basis, which interest shall be payable in installments over the period of the loan except that, if provided in the note or other written agreement, any interest payable by the student may be deferred until not later than the date upon which repayment of the first installment of principal falls due, in which case interest that has so accrued during that period may be added on that date to the principal (but without thereby increasing the insurance liability under this part),

"(E) provides that the lender will not collect or attempt to collect from the borrower any portion of the interest on the note which is payable by the Commissioner under this part,

"(F) entitles the student borrower to accelerate without penalty repayment of the whole or any part of the loan, and

"(G) contains such other terms and conditions, consistent with the provisions of this part and with the regulations issued by the Commissioner pursuant to this part, as may be agreed upon by the parties to such loan, including, if agreed upon, a provision requiring the borrower to pay to the lender, in addition to principal and interest, amounts equal to the insurance premiums payable by the lender to the Commissioner with respect to such loan.

"(b) No maximum rate of interest prescribed and defined by the Secretary for the purposes of clause (2)(D) of subsection (a) may exceed 6 per centum per annum on the unpaid principal balance of the loan, except that under circumstances which threaten to impede the carrying out of the purposes of this part, one or more of such maximum rates of interest may be as high as 7 per centum per annum on the unpaid principal balance of the loan.

"(c) The total of the payments by a borrower during any year of any repayment period with respect to the aggregate amount of all loans to that borrower which are insured by the Commissioner under this part shall not be less than $360 or the balance of all of such loans (together with interest thereon), whichever amount is less.

"Federal Payments To Reduce Student Interest Costs

"SEC. 428. (a)(1) Each student who has received a loan for study at an eligible institution—

"(A) which is insured by the Commissioner under this part;

"(B) which was made under a State student loan program (meeting criteria prescribed by the Commissioner), and which was contracted for, and paid to the student, within the period specified by paragraph (4); or

"(C) which is insured under a program of a State or of a nonprofit private institution or organization, which was contracted for, and paid to the student, within the period specified in paragraph (4), and which—

"(i) in the case of a loan insured prior to July 1, 1967, was made by an eligible lender and is insured under a program which meets the requirements of subparagraph (E) of subsection (b)(1) and provides that repayment of such loan shall be in installments beginning not earlier than sixty days after the student ceases to pursue a course of study (as described in subparagraph (D) of subsection (b)(1)) at an eligible institution, or

"(ii) in the case of a loan insured after June 30, 1967, is insured under a program covered by an agreement made pursuant to subsection (b),

and whose adjusted family income is less than $15,000 at the time of execution of the note or written agreement evidencing such loan, shall be entitled to have paid on his behalf and for his account to the holder of the loan, over the period of the loan, a portion of the interest on the loan. For the purposes of this paragraph, the adjusted family income of a student shall be determined pursuant to regulations of the Commissioner in effect at the time of the execution of the note or written agreement evidencing the loan. Such regulations shall provide for taking into account such factors, including family size, as the Commissioner deems appropriate. In the absence of fraud by the lender, such determination of the adjusted family income of a student shall be final insofar as it concerns the obligation of the Commissioner to pay the holder of a loan a portion of the interest on the loan.

"(2) The portion of the interest on a loan which a student is entitled to have paid on his behalf and for his account to the holder of the loan pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be equal to the total amount of the interest on the unpaid principal amount of the loan which accrues prior to the beginning of the repayment period of the loan, and 3 per centum per annum of the unpaid principal amount of the loan (excluding interest which has been added to principal) thereafter; but such portion of the interest on a loan shall not exceed, for any period, the amount of the interest on that loan which is payable by the student after taking into consideration the amount of any interest on that loan which the student is entitled to have paid on his behalf for that period under any State or private loan insurance program. The holder of a loan with respect to which payments are required to be made under this section shall be deemed to have a contractual right, as against the United States, to receive from the Commissioner the portion of interest which has been so determined. The Commissioner shall pay this portion of the interest to the holder of the loan on behalf of and for the account of the borrower at such times as may be specified in regulations in force when the applicable agreement entered into pursuant to subsection (b) was made, or if the loan was made by a State or is insured under a program which is not covered by such an agreement, at such times as may be specified in regulations in force at the time the loan was paid to the student.

"(3) Each holder of a loan with respect to which payments of interest are required to be made by the Commissioner shall submit to the Commissioner, at such time or times and in such manner as he may prescribe, statements containing such information as may be required by or pursuant to regulation for the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to determine the amount of the payment which he must make with respect to that loan.

"(4) The period referred to in subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1) of this subsection shall begin on the date of enactment of this Act and end at the close of June 30, 1968, except that, in the case of a loan made or insured under a student loan or loan insurance program to enable a student who has obtained a prior loan made or insured under such program to continue his educational program, such period shall end at the close of June 30, 1972.

"(5) No payment may be made under this section with respect to the interest on a loan made from a student loan fund established under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

"(6) In no event shall interest payments with respect to the same student loan be made under both this section and under section 9 of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965.

"(b)(1) Any State or any nonprofit private institution or organization may enter into an agreement with the Commissioner for the purpose of entitling students who receive loans which are insured under a student loan insurance program of that State, institution, or organization to have made on their behalf the payments provided for in subsection (a) if the Commissioner determines that the student loan insurance program—

"(A) authorizes the insurance of not less than $1,000 nor more than $1,500 in loans to any individual student in any academic year or its equivalent (as determined under regulations of the Commissioner);

"(B) authorizes the insurance of loans to any individual student for at least six academic years of study or their equivalent (as determined under regulations of the Commissioner);

"(C) provides that (i) the student borrower shall be entitled to accelerate without penalty the whole or any part of an insured loan, (ii) the period of any insured loan may not exceed fifteen years from the date of execution of the note or other written evidence of the loan, and (iii) the note or other written evidence of any loan may contain such provisions relating to repayment in the event of default by the borrower as may be authorized by regulations of the Commissioner in effect at the time such note or written evidence was executed;

"(D) subject to subparagraph (C), provides that, where the total of the insured loans to any student which are held by any one person exceeds $2,000, repayment of such loans shall be in installments over a period of not less than five years nor more than ten years beginning not earlier than nine months nor later than one year after the student ceases to pursue a full-time course of study at an eligible institution, except that if the program provides for the insurance of loans for part-time study at eligible institutions the program shall provide that such repayment period shall begin not earlier than nine months nor later than one year after the student ceases to carry at an eligible institution at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload as determined by the institution;

"(E) authorizes interest on the unpaid balance of the loan at a yearly rate not in excess of 6 per centum per annum on the unpaid principal balance of the loan (exclusive of any premium for insurance which may be passed on the borrower);

"(F) insures not less than 80 per centum of the unpaid principal of loans insured under the program;

"(G) does not provide for collection of an excessive insurance premium;

"(H) provides that the benefits of the loan insurance program will not be denied any student because of his family income or lack of need if his adjusted family income at the time the note or written agreement is executed is less than $15,000 (as determined pursuant to the regulations of the Commissioner prescribed under section 428(a)(1));

"(I) provides that a student may obtain insurance under the program for a loan for any year of study at an eligible institution; and

"(J) in the case of a State program, provides that such State program is administered by a single State agency, or by one or more nonprofit private institutions or organizations under the supervision of a single State agency.

"(2) Such an agreement shall—

"(A) provide that the holder of any such loan will be required to submit to the Commissioner, at such time or times and in such manner as he may prescribe, statements containing such information as may be required by or pursuant to regulation for the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to determine the amount of the payment which he must make with respect to that loan;

"(B) include such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States and promote the purposes of this part and as are agreed to by the Commissioner and the State or nonprofit private organization or institution, as the case may be; and

"(C) provide for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his function under this part and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"Certificates of Federal Loan Insurance—Effective Date of Insurance

"SEC. 429. (a)(1) If, upon application by an eligible lender, made upon such form, containing such information, and supported by such evidence as the Commissioner may require, and otherwise in conformity with this section, the Commissioner finds that the applicant has made a loan to an eligible student which is insurable under the provisions of this part, he may issue to the applicant a certificate of insurance covering the loan and setting forth the amount and terms of the insurance.

"(2) Insurance evidenced by a certificate of insurance pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall become effective upon the date of issuance of the certificate, except that the Commissioner is authorized, in accordance with regulations, to issue commitments with respect to proposed loans, or with respect to lines (or proposed lines) of credit, submitted by eligible lenders, and in that event, upon compliance with subsection (a)(1) by the lender, the certificate of insurance may be issued effective as of the date when any loan, or any payment by the lender pursuant to a line of credit, to be covered by such insurance was made. Such insurance shall cease to be effective upon sixty days' default by the lender in the payment of any installment of the premiums payable pursuant to subsection (c).

"(3) An application submitted pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall contain (A) an agreement by the applicant to pay, in accordance with regulations, the premiums fixed by the Commissioner pursuant to subsection (c), and (B) an agreement by the applicant that if the loan is covered by insurance the applicant will submit such supplementary reports and statements during the effective period of the loan agreement, upon such forms, at such times, and containing such information as the Commissioner may prescribe by or pursuant to regulation.

"(b)(1) In lieu of requiring a separate insurance application and issuing a separate certificate of insurance for each student loan made by an eligible lender as provided in subsection (a), the Commissioner may, in accordance with regulations consistent with section 424, issue to any eligible lender applying therefor a certificate of comprehensive insurance coverage which shall, without further action by the Commissioner, insure all insurable loans made by that lender, on or after the date of the certificate and before a specified cutoff date, within the limits of an aggregate maximum amount stated in the certificate. Such regulations may provide for conditioning such insurance, with respect to any loan, upon compliance by the lender with such requirements (to be stated or incorporated by reference in the certificate) as in the Commissioner's judgment will best achieve the purpose of this subsection while protecting the financial interest of the United States and promoting the objectives of this part, including (but not limited to) provisions as to the reporting of such loans and information relevant thereto to the Commissioner and as to the payment of initial and other premiums and the effect of default therein, and including provisions for confirmation by the Commissioner from time to time (through endorsement of the certificate) of the coverage of specific new loans by such certificate, which confirmation shall be incontestable by the Commissioner in the absence of fraud or misrepresentation of fact or patent error.

"(2) If the holder of a certificate of comprehensive insurance coverage issued under this subsection grants to a student a line of credit extending beyond the cutoff date specified in that certificate, loans or payments thereon made by the holder after that date pursuant to the line of credit shall not be deemed to be included in the coverage of that certificate except as may be specifically provided therein; but, subject to the limitations of section 424, the Commissioner may, in accordance with regulations, make commitments to insure such future loans or payments, and such commitments may be honored either as provided in subsection (a) or by inclusion of such insurance in comprehensive coverage under this subsection for the period or periods in which such future loans or payments are made.

"(c) The Commissioner shall, pursuant to regulations, charge for insurance on each loan under this part a premium in an amount not to exceed one-fourth of 1 per centum per year of the unpaid principal amount of such loan (excluding interest added to principal), payable in advance, at such times and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Commissioner. Such regulations may provide that such premium shall not be payable, or if paid shall be refundable, with respect to any period after default in the payment of principal or interest or after the borrower has died or becomes totally and permanently disabled, if (1) notice of such default or other event has been duly given, and (2) request for payment of the loss insured against has been made or the Commissioner has made such payment on his own motion pursuant to section 430(a).

"(d) The rights of an eligible lender arising under insurance evidenced by a certificate of insurance issued to it under this section may be assigned as security by such lender only to another eligible lender, and subject to regulation by the Commissioner.

"(e) The consolidation of the obligations of two or more federally-insured loans obtained by a student borrower in any fiscal year into a single obligation evidenced by a single instrument of indebtedness shall not affect the insurance by the United States. If the loans thus consolidated are covered by separate certificates of insurance issued under subsection (a), the Commissioner may upon surrender of the original certificates issue a new certificate of insurance in accordance with that subsection upon the consolidated obligation; if they are covered by a single comprehensive certificate issued under subsection (b), the Commissioner may amend that certificate accordingly.

"Default, Death, or Disability of Student Under Federal Loan Insurance Program

"SEC. 430. (a) Upon default by the student borrower on any loan covered by Federal loan insurance pursuant to this part, or upon the death of the student borrower or a finding by the insurance beneficiary that the borrower has become totally and permanently disabled (as determined in accordance with regulations established by the Commissioner) before the loan has been repaid in full, and prior to the commencement of suit or other enforcement proceeding upon security for that loan, the insurance beneficiary shall promptly notify the Commissioner, and the Commissioner shall if requested (at that time or after further collection efforts) by the beneficiary, or may on his own motion, if the insurance is still in effect, pay to the beneficiary the amount of the loss sustained by the insured upon that loan as soon as that amount has been determined. The 'amount of the loss' on any loan shall, for the purposes of this subsection and subsection (b), be deemed to be an amount equal to the unpaid balance of the principal amount of the loan (other than interest added to principal).

"(b) Upon payment by the Commissioner of the amount of the loss pursuant to subsection (a), the United States shall be subrogated to all of the rights of the holder of the obligation upon the insured loan and shall be entitled to an assignment of the note or other evidence of the insured loan by the insurance beneficiary. If the net recovery made by the Commissioner on a loan after deduction of the cost of that recovery (including reasonable administrative costs) exceeds the amount of the loss, the excess shall be paid over to the insured.

"(c) Nothing in this section or in this part shall be construed to preclude any forbearance for the benefit of the student borrower which may be agreed upon by the parties to the insured loan and approved by the Commissioner, or to preclude forbearance by the Commissioner in the enforcement of the insured obligation after payment on that insurance, or to require collection of the amount of any loan by the insurance beneficiary or by the Commissioner from the estate of a deceased borrower or from a borrower found by the insurance beneficiary to have become permanently and totally disabled.

"(d) Nothing in this section or in this part shall be construed to excuse the holder of a federally insured loan from exercising reasonable care and diligence in the making and collection of loans under the provisions of this part. If the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to an eligible lender, finds that it has substantially failed to exercise such care and diligence or to make the reports and statements required under section 428(a)(3) and section 429(a)(3), or to pay the required Federal loan insurance premiums, he shall disqualify that lender for further Federal insurance on loans granted pursuant to this part until he is satisfied that its failure has ceased and finds that there is reasonable assurance that the lender will in the future exercise necessary care and diligence or comply with such requirements, as the case may be.

"(e) As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'insurance beneficiary' means the insured or its authorized assignee in accordance with section 429(d); and

"(2) the term 'default' includes only such defaults as have existed for (A) one hundred and twenty days in the case of a loan which is repayable in monthly installments, or (B) one hundred and eighty days in the case of a loan which is repayable in less frequent installments.

"Insurance Fund

"SEC. 431. (a) There is hereby established a student loan insurance fund (hereinafter in this section called the 'fund') which shall be available without fiscal year limitation to the Commissioner for making payments in connection with the default of loans insured by him under this part. All amounts received by the Commissioner as premium charges for insurance and as receipts, earnings, or proceeds derived from any claim or other assets acquired by the Commissioner in connection with his operations under this part, and any other moneys, property, or assets derived by the Commissioner from his operations in connection with this section, shall be deposited in the fund. All payments in connection with the default of loans insured by the Commissioner under this part shall be paid from the fund. Moneys in the fund not needed for current operations under this section may be invested in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States.

"(b) If at any time the moneys in the fund are insufficient to make payments in connection with the default of any loan insured by the Commissioner under this part, the Commissioner is authorized to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury notes or other obligations in such forms and denominations, bearing such maturities, and subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities during the month preceding the issuance of the notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations issued hereunder and for that purpose he is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such notes and obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this subsection. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States. Sums borrowed under this subsection shall be deposited in the fund and redemption of such notes and obligations shall be made by the Commissioner from such fund.

"Legal Powers and Responsibilities

"SEC. 432. (a) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this part, the Commissioner may—

"(1) prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this part;

"(2) sue and be sued in any court of record of a State having general jurisdiction or in any district court of the United States, and such district courts shall have jurisdiction of civil actions arising under this part without regard to the amount in controversy, and any action instituted under this subsection by or against the Commissioner shall survive notwithstanding any change in the person occupying the office of Commissioner or any vacancy in that office; but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Commissioner or property under his control, and nothing herein shall be construed to except litigation arising out of activities under this part from the application of sections 507(b) and 2679 of title 28 of the United States Code and of section 367 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 316);

"(3) include in any contract for Federal loan insurance such terms, conditions, and covenants relating to repayment of principal and payment of interest, relating to his obligations and rights and to those of eligible lenders, and borrowers in case of default, and relating to such other matters as the Commissioner determines to be necessary to assure that the purposes of this part will be achieved; and any term, condition, and covenant made pursuant to this clause or any other provisions of this part may be modified by the Commissioner if he determines that modification is necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States;

"(4) subject to the specific limitations in this part, consent to the modification, with respect to rate of interest, time of payment of any installment of principal and interest or any portion thereof, or any other provision of any note or other instrument evidencing a loan which has been insured by him under this part;

"(5) enforce, pay, or compromise, any claim on, or arising because of, any such insurance; and

"(6) enforce, pay, compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, lien, or demand, however acquired, including any equity or any right or redemption.

"(b) The Commissioner shall, with respect to the financial operations arising by reason of this part—

"(1) prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act; and

"(2) maintain with respect to insurance under this part an integral set of accounts, which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions, as provided by section 105 of the Government Corporation Control Act, except that the transactions of the Commissioner, including the settlement of insurance claims and of claims for payments pursuant to section 428, and transactions related thereto and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all accounting and other officers of the Government.

"Advisory Council on Insured Loans to Students

"SEC. 433. (a) The Secretary shall establish in the Office of Education an Advisory Council on Insured Loans to Students, consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, and eight members appointed, without regard to the civil service laws, by the Secretary. The membership of the Council shall include persons representing State loan insurance programs, private nonprofit loan insurance programs, financial and credit institutions, and institutions of higher education.

"(b) The Advisory Council shall advise the Commissioner with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this part, including policies and procedures governing the making of advances under section 422 and the Federal payments to reduce student interest costs under section 428.

"(c) Members of the Advisory Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on the business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, members may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Participation by Federal Credit Unions in Federal, State, and Private Student Loan Insurance Programs

"SEC. 434. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Federal credit unions shall, pursuant to regulations of the Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, have power to make insured loans up to 10 per centum of their assets, to student members in accordance with the provisions of this part relating to federally insured loans, or in accordance with the provisions of any State or nonprofit private student loan insurance program which meets the requirements of section 428(a)(1)(C).

"Definitions for Reduced-Interest Student Loan Insurance Program

"SEC. 435. As used in this part:

"(a) The term 'eligible institution' means an educational institution in any State which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such certificate, (2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, (4) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association approved by the Commissioner for this purpose or, if not so accredited, (A) is an institution with respect to which the Commissioner has determined that there is satisfactory assurance, considering the resources available to the institution, the period of time, if any, during which it has operated, the effort it is making to meet accreditation standards, and the purpose for which this determination is being made, that the institution will meet the accreditation standards of such an agency or association within a reasonable time, or (B) is an institution whose credits are accepted on transfer by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited. Such term also includes any public or other nonprofit collegiate or associate degree school of nursing and any school which provides not less than a one-year program of training to prepare students for gainful employment in a recognized occupation and which meets the provisions of clauses (1), (2), (4), and (5). If the Commissioner determines that a particular category of such schools does not meet the requirements of clause (5) because there is no nationally recognized accrediting agency or association qualified to accredit schools in such category, he shall, pending the establishment of such an accrediting agency or association, appoint an advisory committee, composed of persons specially qualified to evaluate training provided by schools in such category, which shall (i) prescribe the standards of content, scope, and quality which must be met in order to qualify schools in such category to participate in the program pursuant to this part, and (ii) determine whether particular schools not meeting the requirements of clause (5) meet those standards. For purposes of this subsection, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.

"(b) The term 'collegiate school of nursing' means a department, division, or other administrative unit in a college or university which provides primarily or exclusively an accredited program of education in professional nursing and allied subjects leading to the degree of bachelor of arts, bachelor of science, bachelor of nursing, or to an equivalent degree, or to a graduate degree in nursing.

"(c) The term 'associate degree school of nursing' means a department, division, or other administrative unit in a junior college, community college, college, or university which provides primarily or exclusively an accredited two-year program of education in professional nursing and allied subjects leading to an associate degree in nursing or to an equivalent degree.

"(d) The term 'accredited' when applied to any program of nurse education means a program accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner of Education.

"(e) The term 'eligible lender' means an eligible institution, an agency or instrumentality of a State, or a financial or credit institution (including an insurance company) which is subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or of any State.

"(f) The term 'line of credit' means an arrangement or agreement between the lender and the borrower whereby a loan is paid out by the lender to the borrower in annual installments, or whereby the lender agrees to make, in addition to the initial loan, additional loans in subsequent years.

"Part C—College work-study program extension and amendments

"Transfer of Authority and Other Amendments

"SEC. 441. Parts C and D of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88–452) are amended as follows:

"(1) By striking out 'Director' in the first sentence of section 122(a) and inserting in lieu thereof 'Commissioner of Education (hereinafter in this part referred to as the "Commissioner")', and by striking out 'Director' wherever that word appears in the other provisions of such part C and inserting in lieu thereof 'Commissioner';

"(2) By amending that part of section 121 that follows the section designation to read as follows: 'The purpose of this part is to stimulate and promote the part-time employment of students, particularly students from low-income families, in institutions of higher education who are in need of the earnings from such employment to pursue courses of study at such institutions.';

"(3) By striking out section 123 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" 'Grants for Work-Study Programs

" 'SEC. 123. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to enter into agreements with institutions of higher education under which the Commissioner will make grants to such institutions to assist in the operation of work-study programs as hereinafter provided.

" '(b) For the purposes of this part—

" '(1) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which (A) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such certificate, (B) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (C) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, (D) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (E) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association approved by the Commissioner for this purpose or, if not so accredited, (i) is an institution with respect to which the Commissioner has determined that there is satisfactory assurance, considering the resources available to the institution, the period of time, if any, during which it has operated, the effort it is making to meet accreditation standards, and the purpose for which this determination is being made, that the institution will meet the accreditation standards of such an agency or association within a reasonable time, or (ii) is an institution whose credits are accepted on transfer by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited. Such term also includes any public or other nonprofit collegiate or associate degree school of nursing and any school which provides not less than a one-year program of training to prepare students for gainful employment in a recognized occupation and which meets the provisions of clauses (A), (B), (D), and (E). If the Commissioner determines that a particular category of such schools does not meet the requirements of clause (E) because there is no nationally recognized accrediting agency or association qualified to accredit schools in such category, he shall, pending the establishment of such an accrediting agency or association, appoint an advisory committee, composed of persons specially qualified to evaluate training provided by schools in such category, which shall (I) prescribe the standards of content, scope, and quality which must be met in order to qualify schools in such category to participate in the program pursuant to this part, and (II) determine whether particular schools not meeting the requirements of clause (E) meet those standards. For purposes of this subsection, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.

" '(2) The term "collegiate school of nursing" means a department, division, or other administrative unit in a college or university which provides primarily or exclusively an accredited program of education in professional nursing and allied subjects leading to the degree of bachelor of arts, bachelor of science, bachelor of nursing, or to an equivalent degree, or to a graduate degree in nursing.

" '(3) The term "associate degree school of nursing" means a department, division, or other administrative unit in a junior college, community college, college, or university which provides primarily or exclusively an accredited two-year program of education in professional nursing and allied subjects leading to an associate degree in nursing or to an equivalent degree.

" '(4) The term "accredited" when applied to any program of nurse education means a program accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner.';

"(4) By striking out section 124(a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" '(a) provide for the operation by the institution of a program for the part-time employment of its students in work for the institution itself or work in the public interest for a public or private nonprofit organization under an arrangement between the institution and such organization, and such work—

" '(1) will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services,

" '(2) will be governed by such conditions of employment as will be appropriate and reasonable in light of such factors as type of work performed, geographical region, and proficiency of the employee, and

" '(3) does not involve the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or is to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;';

"(5) By redesignating clauses (2), (3), and (4), of paragraph (c) of section 124 as clauses (1), (2), and (3), and by striking out so much of such paragraph as precedes such redesignated clauses and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(c) provide that in the selection of students for employment under such work-study program preference shall be given to students from low-income families and that employment under such work-study program shall be furnished only to a student who';

"(6) By inserting before the period at the end of section 125 a comma and the following: 'and such share may be paid to such student in the form of services and equipment (including tuition, room, board, and books) furnished by such institution'; and

"(7) By striking out 'provided for in' in section 131 and inserting in lieu thereof 'for which he is responsible under'.

"Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 442. There are authorized to be appropriated $129,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $165,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, to carry out the purposes of part C of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88–452). Any sums which are appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, for the purpose of such part C pursuant to an authorization in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, or are allocated for such purpose from any appropriation for such year, shall be made available, to the extent unexpended on the date of enactment of this Act, to the Commissioner for carrying out such part C, and the total of such sums (including amounts expended prior to such date) shall be deducted from the authorization in this section for such year. Sixty million dollars of the authorization for title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, as contained in section 131 of such Act, shall be only for the purpose of part C of such title. No provision in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 which authorizes the appropriation of funds to carry out that Act shall apply to such part C after June 30, 1966.

"Part D—Amendments to National Defense Education Act of 1958

"Definition of Institution of Higher Education

"SEC. 461. Section 103(b) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

" '(b) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such certificate, (2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, (4) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association approved by the Commissioner for this purpose or, if not so accredited, (A) is an institution with respect to which the Commissioner has determined that there is satisfactory assurance, considering the resources available to the institution, the period of time, if any, during which it has operated, the effort it is making to meet accreditation standards, and the purpose for which this determination is being made, that the institution will meet the accreditation standards of such an agency or association within a reasonable time, or (B) is an institution whose credits are accepted on transfer by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited. For purposes of title II, such terms includes any school of nursing as defined in subsection (l) of this section, and also includes any school which provides not less than a one-year program of training to prepare students for gainful employment in a recognized occupation and which meets the provisions of clauses (1), (2), (4), and (5). If the Commissioner determines that a particular category of such schools does not meet the requirements of clause (5) because there is no nationally recognized accrediting agency or association qualified to accredit schools in such category, he shall, pending the establishment of such an accrediting agency or association, appoint an advisory committee, composed of persons specially qualified to evaluate training provided by schools in such category, which shall (i) prescribe the standards of content, scope, and quality which must be met in order to qualify schools in such category to participate in the student loan program under title II, and (ii) determine whether particular school not meeting the requirements of clause (5) meet those standards. For purposes of this subsection, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.'

"Conditions of Agreements; Administrative Costs

"Sec. 462. Clause (3) of section 204 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"'(3) provide that such student loan fund shall be used only for (A) loans to students in accordance with such agreement, (B) capital distributions as provided in this title, (C) routine expenses incurred by the institution in administering the student loan fund, except that the amount withdrawn from such student loan fund for such routine expenses by an institution in any fiscal year may not exceed either (i) one-half of such routine expenses as estimated for that year by the Commissioner with the advice of an advisory committee which the Commissioner is hereby authorized to appoint on an annual or such other basis as he may deem appropriate, or (ii) 1 per centum of the aggregate of the outstanding loans made from that fund as of the close of that year, whichever is the lesser, and (D) costs of litigation, and other collection costs agreed to by the Commissioner, arising in connection with the collection of any loan from the fund, interest on such loan, or charge assessed with respect to that loan pursuant to section 205(c);'.

"Technical Amendment for Part-time Students

"Sec. 463. (a) The portion of section 205 (b)(2) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 which precedes clause (A)(ii) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"'(2) such a loan shall be evidenced by a note or other written agreement which provides for repayment of the principal amount, together with interest thereon, in equal installments (or, if the borrower so requests, in graduated periodic installments determined in accordance with such schedules as may be approved by the Commissioner) payable quarterly, bimonthly, or monthly (at the option of the institution) over a period beginning nine months after the date on which the borrower ceases to carry, at an institution of higher education or at a comparable institution outside the States approved for this purpose by the Commissioner, at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload as determined by that institution, and ending ten years and nine months after such date, except that (A) interest shall not accrue on any such loan, and installments need not be paid during any period (i) during which the borrower is carrying, at an institution of higher education or at a comparable institution outside the States approved for this purpose by the Commissioner, at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload as determined by the institution,'.

"(b) Clause (D) of such section 205(b)(2) is amended by striking out 'periodic', and by striking out 'part-time' and inserting in lieu thereof 'less than half-time'.

"(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply to a loan outstanding on the date of enactment of this Act only with the consent of the borrower and the institution which made the loan.

"Minimum Rate of Repayment

"Sec. 464. (a) Section 205(b)(2) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is further amended by striking out 'and' before '(E)' and by inserting at the end thereof before the semicolon ', and (F) the institution may provide, in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, that during the repayment period of the loan payments of principal and interest by the borrower with respect to all the outstanding loans made to him from loan funds established pursuant to this title shall be at a rate equal to not less than $15 per month'.

"(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to loans made after the date of enactment of this Act.

"Cancellation of Loans for Teachers

"Sec. 465. (a) Section 205(b)(3) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended—

"(1) by inserting 'total' before 'amount' and by striking out ', which was unpaid on the first day of such service';

"(2) by inserting 'or its equivalent (as determined under regulations of the Commissioner)' after 'academic year'; and

"(3) by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'except that (A) such rate shall be 15 per centum for each complete academic year or its equivalent (as determined under regulations of the Commissioner) of service as a full-time teacher in a public or other nonprofit elementary or secondary school which is in the school district of a local educational agency which is eligible in such year for assistance pursuant to title II of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, and which for purposes of this clause and for that year has been determined by the Commissioner, pursuant to regulations and after consultation with the State educational agency of the State in which the school is located, to be a school in which there is a high concentration of students from low-income families, except that the Commissioner shall not make such determination with respect to more than 25 per centum of the total of the public and other nonprofit elementary and secondary schools in any one State for any one year, and (B) for the purposes of any cancellation pursuant to clause (A), an additional 50 per centum of any such loan (plus interest) may be cancelled but nothing in this paragraph shall authorize refunding any payment'.

"(b) The amendments made by clauses (1) and (3) of subsection (a) shall apply with respect to service performed during academic years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, whether the loan was made before or after such enactment. The amendment made by clause (2) of subsection (a) shall apply with respect to service performed during academic years beginning after the enactment of the National Defense Education Act Amendments, 1964, Public Law 88–665, whether or not the loan was made before or after such enactment.

"Charges

"Sec. 466. (a) Section 205 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is further amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"'(c) Pursuant to regulations of the Commissioner, an institution may assess a charge with respect to a loan from the loan fund established by the institution pursuant to this title for failure of the borrower to pay all or any part of an installment when it is due and, in the case of a borrower who is entitled to deferment benefits under section 205(b)(2) or cancellation benefits under section 205(b)(3), for any failure to file timely and satisfactory evidence of such entitlement. The amount of any such charge may not exceed—

"'(1) in the case of a loan which is repayable in monthly installments, $1 for the first month or part of a month by which such installment or evidence is late and $2 for each such month or part of a month thereafter; and

"'(2) in the case of a loan which has a bimonthly or quarterly repayment interval, $3 and $6, respectively, for each such interval or part thereof by which such installment or evidence is late.

The institution may elect to add the amount of any such charge to the principal amount of the loan as of the first day after the day on which such installment or evidence was due, or to make the amount of the charge payable to the institution not later than the due date of the next installment after receipt by the borrower of notice of the assessment of the charge.'

"(b) Clause (2) of section 204 of such Act is amended by striking out 'and (D)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(D) charges collected pursuant to section 205(c), and (E)'.

"(c) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be applicable only with respect to loans made after the date of enactment of this Act.

"Economics, civic, and industrial arts

"Sec. 467. (a)(1) Clauses (1) and (5) of section 303(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 are each amended by inserting 'economics,' after 'geography,'.

"(2) Section 301 of such Act is amended by striking out 'and $90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof '$90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years'.

"(b) Section 1101 of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'each of the three succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof '$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years'; and

"(2) by inserting 'economics, civics, industrial arts,' after 'geography,'.

"TITLE V—TEACHER PROGRAMS

"Part A—General provisions

"Advisory Council on Quality Teacher Preparation

"Sec. 501. (a) The Commissioner shall establish in the Office of Education an Advisory Council on Quality Teacher Preparation for the purpose of reviewing the administration and operation of the programs carried out under this title and of all other Federal programs for complementary purposes. This review shall pay particular attention to the effectiveness of these programs in attracting, preparing, and retaining highly qualified elementary and secondary school teachers, and it shall include recommendations for the improvement of these programs. The Council shall consist of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, and twelve members appointed for staggered terms and without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. Such twelve members shall include persons knowledgeable with respect to teacher preparation and the needs of urban and rural schools, and representatives of the general public.

"(b) Members of such Advisory Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while attending meetings or conferences of such Council or otherwise engaged on business of such Council be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including travel time, and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(c) The Council may appoint an Executive Secretary and such other employees as the Council deems necessary to carry out its functions under this title.

"Limitation

"Sec. 502. Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to authorize the making of any payment under this title for religious worship or instruction.

"Part B—National Teacher Corps

"Statement of Purpose and Authorization of Appropriations

"Sec. 511. (a) The purpose of this part is to strengthen the educational opportunities available to children in areas having concentrations of low-income families and to encourage colleges and universities to broaden their programs of teacher preparation by—

"(1) attracting and training qualified teachers who will be made available to local educational agencies for teaching in such areas; and

"(2) attracting and training inexperienced teacher-interns who will be made available for teaching and inservice training to local educational agencies in such areas in teams led by an experienced teacher.

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out this part, there are authorized to be appropriated $36,100,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $64,715,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

"Establishment of National Teacher Corps

"Sec. 512. In order to carry out the purposes of this part, there is hereby established in the Office of Education a National Teacher Corps (hereinafter referred to as the 'Teacher Corps'). The Teacher Corps shall be headed by a Director who shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for grade 17 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, and a Deputy Director who shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for grade 16 of such General Schedule. The Director and the Deputy Director shall perform such duties as are delegated to them by the Commissioner.

"Teacher Corps Program

"Sec. 513. (a) For the purpose of carrying out this part, the Commissioner is authorized to—

"(1) recruit, select, and enroll experienced teachers, and inexperienced teacher-interns who have a bachelor's degree or its equivalent, in the Teacher Corps for periods of up to two years;

"(2) enter into arrangements, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education or State or local educational agencies to provide members of the Teacher Corps with such training as the Commission may deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of this part, including not more than three months of training for members before they undertake their teaching duties under this part;

"(3) enter into arrangements (including the payment of the cost of such arrangements) with local educational agencies, after consultation in appropriate cases with State educational agencies and institutions of higher education, to furnish to local educational agencies, for service during regular or summer sessions, or both, in the schools of such agencies in areas having concentrations of children from low-income families, either or both (A) experienced teachers, or (B) teaching teams, each of which shall consist of an experienced teacher and a number of teacher-interns who, in addition to teaching duties, shall be afforded time by the local educational agency for a teacher-intern training program developed according to criteria established by the Commissioner and carried out under the guidance of the experienced teacher in cooperation with an institution of higher education; and

"(4) pay to local educational agencies the amount of the compensation which such agencies pay to or on behalf of members of the Teacher Corps assigned to them pursuant to arrangements made pursuant to the preceding clause.

"(b) Arrangements with institutions of higher education to provide training for teacher-interns while teaching in schools for local educational agencies under the provisions of this part shall provide, wherever possible, for training leading to a graduate degree.

"(c)(1) Whenever the Commissioner determines that the demand for the services of experienced teachers or of teaching teams furnished pursuant to clause (3) of subsection (a) exceeds the number of experienced teachers or teaching teams available from the Teacher Corps, the Commissioner shall, to the extent practicable, allocate experienced teachers or teaching teams, as the case may be, from the Teacher Corps among the States in accordance with paragraph (2).

"(2) Not to exceed 2 per centum of such teachers or teams, as the case may be, shall be allocated to Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs. The remainder of such teams or teachers, as the case may be, shall be allocated among the other States in proportion to the number of children counted in each State for the purpose of determining the amount of basic grants made under section 203 of title II of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, for the fiscal year for which the allocation is made.

"(d) A local educational agency may utilize members of the Teacher Corps assigned to it in providing, in the manner described in section 205(a)(2) of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, educational services in which children enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools can participate.

"Compensation

"Sec. 514. (a) An arrangement made with a local educational agency pursuant to paragraph (3) of section 513(a) shall provide for compensation by such agency of Teacher Corps members during the period of their assignment to it at the following rates:

"(1) an experienced teacher who is not leading a teaching team shall be compensated at a rate which is equal to the rate paid by such agency for a teacher with similar training and experience who has been assigned similar teaching duties;

"(2) an experienced teacher who is leading a teaching team shall be compensated at a rate agreed to by such agency and the Commissioner; and

"(3) a teacher-intern shall be compensated at a rate which is equal to the lowest rate paid by such agency for teaching full time in the school system and grade to which the intern is assigned.

"(b) For any period of training under this part the Commissioner shall pay to members of the Teacher Corps such stipends (including allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such members and their dependents) as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported training programs.

"(c) The Commissioner shall pay the necessary travel expenses of members of the Teacher Corps and their dependents and necessary expenses for the transportation of the household goods and personal effects of such members and their dependents, and such other necessary expenses of members as are directly related to their service in the Corps, including readjustment allowances proportionate to service.

"(d) The Commissioner is authorized to make such arrangements as may be possible, including the payment of any costs incident thereto, to protect the tenure, retirement rights, participation in a medical insurance program, and such other similar employee benefits as the Commissioner deems appropriate, of a member of the Teacher Corps who participates in any program under this part and who indicates his intention to return to the local educational agency or institution of higher education by which he was employed immediately prior to his service under this part.

"Application of Provisions of Federal Law

"Sec. 515. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this section, a member of the Teacher Corps shall be deemed not to be a Federal employee and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

"(b)(1) Such members shall, for the purposes of the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (5 U.S.C. 751 et seq.), be deemed to be civil employees of the United States within the meaning of the term 'employee' as defined in section 40 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 790) and the provisions thereof shall apply except as hereinafter provided.

"(2) For purposes of this subsection:

"(A) the term 'performance of duty' in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall not include any act of a member of the Teacher Corps—

"(i) while on authorized leave; or

"(ii) while absent from his assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity authorized by or under the direction or supervision of the Commissioner; and

"(B) in computing compensation benefits for disability or death under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the monthly pay of a member of the Teacher Corps shall be deemed to be his actual pay or that received under the entrance salary for grade 6 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, whichever is greater.

"(c) Such members shall be deemed to be employees of the Government for the purposes of the Federal tort claims provisions of title 28, United States Code.

"Local Control Preserved

"Sec. 516. Members of the Teacher Corps shall be under the direct supervision of the appropriate officials of the local educational agencies to which they are assigned. Except as otherwise provided in clause (3) of section 513(a), such agencies shall retain the authority to—

"(1) assign such members within their systems;

"(2) make transfers within their systems;

"(3) determine the subject matter to be taught;

"(4) determine the terms and continuance of the assignment of such members within their systems.

"Maintenance of Effort

"SEC. 517. No member of the Teacher Corps shall be furnished to any local educational agency under the provisions of this part if such agency will use such member to replace any teacher who is or would otherwise be employed by such agency.

"Part C—Fellowships for teachers

"Statement of Purpose

"SEC. 521. The Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to improve the quality of education offered by the elementary and secondary schools of the Nation by improving the quality of the education of persons who are pursuing or who plan to pursue a career in elementary and secondary education. The purpose of this part is to carry out this policy by awarding fellowships for graduate study at institutions of higher education and by developing or strengthening teacher education programs in institutions of higher education. For the purpose of this part the term 'career in elementary and secondary education' means a career of teaching in elementary or secondary schools, a career of teaching, guiding, or supervising such teachers or persons who plan to become such teachers, or a career in fields which are directly related to teaching in elementary or secondary schools, such as library science, school social work, guidance and counseling, educational media, and special education for handicapped children.

"Fellowships Authorized

"SEC. 522. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to award not to exceed four thousand five hundred fellowships for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, ten thousand fellowships for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and ten thousand fellowships for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. Fellowships awarded under the provisions of this part shall be for graduate study leading to an advanced degree other than a doctor of philosophy, or equivalent degree, for persons who are pursuing or plan to pursue a career in elementary and secondary education. Such fellowships shall be awarded as provided in sections 523 and 524 of this part and for such periods as the Commissioner may determine but not to exceed twenty-four months.

"(b) In addition to the number of fellowships authorized to be awarded by subsection (a) of this section, the Commissioner is authorized to award fellowships equal to the number previously awarded during any fiscal year under this part but vacated prior to the end of the period for which they were awarded; except that each fellowship awarded under this subsection shall be for such period of study, not in excess of the remainder of the period for which the fellowship which it replaces was awarded, as the Commissioner may determine.

"Allocation of Fellowships

"SEC. 523. The Commissioner shall allocate fellowships under this part to institutions of higher education with programs approved under the provisions of section 524(a) for the use of individuals accepted into such programs, in such manner and according to such plan as will most nearly—

"(1) provide an equitable distribution of such fellowships throughout the States, except that to the extent he deems proper in the national interest after consultation with the Advisory Council on Quality Teacher Preparation the Commissioner may give preference to programs designed to meet an urgent national need, and

"(2) encourage experienced teachers in elementary or secondary schools and other experienced personnel in elementary or secondary education to enter graduate programs, attract recent college graduates to pursue a career in elementary and secondary education, and afford opportunities for college graduates engaged in other occupations or activities to pursue or return to a career in elementary and secondary education.

"Approval of Programs; Grants

"SEC. 524. (a) The Commissioner shall approve a graduate program of an institution of higher education only upon application by the institution and only upon his finding—

"(1) that such program will substantially further the objective of improving the quality of education of persons who are pursuing or intend to pursue a career in elementary and secondary education,

"(2) that such program gives emphasis to high-quality substantive courses,

"(3) that such program is of high quality and either is in effect or readily attainable, and

"(4) that only persons who demonstrate a serious intent to pursue or to continue a career in elementary and secondary education will be accepted for study in the program.

"(b) For the purpose of obtaining an appropriate geographical distribution of high-quality programs for the training of personnel for elementary or secondary education, the Commissioner is authorized to make grants to and contracts with institutions of higher education to pay part of the cost of developing or strengthening graduate programs which meet the requirements of subsection (a).

"(c) The Commissioner may employ experts and consultants, as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), to advise him with respect to the making of grants and contracts and the approving of programs under this section, and he shall set forth in regulations the standards and priorities which will be utilized in approving such grants and contracts. Experts and consultants employed pursuant to this subsection may be compensated while so employed at rates not in excess of $100 per diem, including travel time, and may be allowed while away from their homes or regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Stipends

"SEC. 525. (a) The Commissioner shall pay to persons awarded fellowships under this part such stipends (including such allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such persons and their dependents) as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs.

"(b) In addition to the amounts paid to persons pursuant to subsection (a), the Commissioner shall pay to the institution of higher education at which such person is pursuing his course of study an amount equivalent to $2,500 per academic year, less any amount charged such person for tuition and nonrefundable fees and deposits.

"Limitation

"SEC. 526. No fellowships shall be awarded under this part for study at a school or department of divinity. For the purposes of this section, the term 'school or department of divinity' means an institution or department or branch of an institution whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

"Fellowship Conditions

"SEC. 527. A person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this part shall continue to receive the payments provided in section 525(a) only during such periods as the Commissioner finds that he is maintaining satisfactory proficiency and devoting full time to study or research in the field in which such fellowship was awarded in an institution of higher education, and is not engaging in gainful employment other than such part-time employment in teaching, research, or similar activities related to his training as has been approved by the Commissioner.

"Appropriations

"SEC. 528. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this part $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $160,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $275,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and such sums for the two succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary to enable persons who have been awarded fellowships prior to July 1, 1968, to complete their study under the fellowships.

"TITLE VI—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION

"Part A—Equipment

"Statement of Purpose and Authorization of Appropriations

"SEC. 601. (a) The purpose of this part is to improve the quality of classroom instruction in selected subject areas in institutions of higher education.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, to enable the Commissioner to make grants to institutions of higher education pursuant to this part for the acquisition of equipment and for minor remodeling described in section 603(2)(A).

"(c) There are also authorized to be appropriated $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for the succeeding fiscal year, to enable the Commissioner to make grants to institutions of higher education pursuant to this part for the acquisition of television equipment and for minor remodeling described in section 603(2)(B).

"(d) There is also authorized to be appropriated a sum not exceeding $1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to make grants in such amounts as he may consider necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plans approved under this part including expenses which he determines are necessary for the preparation of such plans.

"(e) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for the succeeding fiscal year, there may be appropriated for the purposes set forth in subsections (b) (c), and (d) of this section, only such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

"Allotments to States

"SEC. 602. (a)(1) Of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsections (b) and (c) of section 601 for any fiscal year one-half shall be allotted by the Commissioner among the States so that the allotment to each State will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-half as the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education in such State bears to the total number of students enrolled in such institutions in all the States; and the remaining one-half shall be allotted by him among the States in accordance with paragraph (2) of this subsection. For the purposes of this subsection, (A) the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education shall be deemed to be equal to the sum of (i) the number of full-time students and (ii) the full-time equivalent of the number of part-time students as determined by the Commissioner in accordance with regulations; and (B) determinations as to enrollment shall be made by the Commissioner on the basis of data for the most recent year for which satisfactory data with respect to such enrollment are available to him.

"(2) For the purposes of this paragraph the Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year an amount which bears the same ratio to the funds being allotted pursuant to this paragraph as the product of—

"(A) the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education in such State, and

"(B) the State's allotment ratio, bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States. For the purposes of this paragraph the allotment ratio for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (i) 0.50 and (ii) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per person for the State by the income per person for all the States (not including Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam), except that the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than 0.33⅓ or more than 0.66⅔, and the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam shall be 0.66⅔. The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner as soon as possible after enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, on the basis of the average of the incomes per person of the States and of all the States for the three most recent consecutive calendar years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

"(b)(1) A State's allotment under subsection (a) from funds appropriated pursuant to section 601(b) shall be available in accordance with the provisions of this part for payment of the Federal share (as determined under section 604) of the cost of equipment and minor remodeling described in section 603(2)(A).

"(2) A State's allotment under subsection (a) from funds appropriated pursuant to section 601(c) shall be available in accordance with the provisions of this part for payment of the Federal share (as determined under section 604) of the cost of television equipment and minor remodeling described in section 603(2)(B).

"(c) Sums allotted to a State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, shall remain available for reservation as provided in section 606 until the close of the next fiscal year, in addition to the sums allotted to such State for such next fiscal year. Sums allotted to a State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, or for any succeeding fiscal year, which are not reserved as provided in section 606 by the close of the fiscal year for which they are allotted, shall be reallotted by the Commissioner, on the basis of such factors as he determines to be equitable and reasonable, among the States which, as determined by the Commissioner, are able to use without delay any amounts so reallotted. Amounts reallotted under this subsection shall be available for reservation until the close of the fiscal year next succeeding the fiscal year for which they were originally allotted.

"State Commissions and Plans

"Sec. 603. Any State desiring to participate in the program under this part shall designate for that purpose an existing State agency which is broadly representative of the public and of institutions of higher education in the State, or, if no such State agency exists, shall establish such a State agency, and submit to the Commissioner through the agency so designated or established (hereafter in this part referred to as the 'State commission'), a State plan for such participation. The Commissioner shall approve any such plan which—

"(1) provides that it shall be administered by the State commission;

"(2) sets forth, consistently with basic criteria prescribed by regulation pursuant to section 604, objective standards and methods (A) for determining the relative priorities of eligible projects for the acquisition of laboratory and other special equipment (other than supplies consumed in use), including audiovisual materials and equipment for classrooms or audiovisual centers, and printed and published materials (other than textbooks) for classrooms or libraries, suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, foreign languages, history, geography, government, English, other humanities, the arts, or education at the undergraduate level in institutions of higher education, and minor remodeling of classroom or other space used for such materials or equipment; (B) for determining relative priorities of eligible projects for (i) the acquisition of television equipment for closed-circuit direct instruction in such fields in such institutions (including equipment for fixed-service instructional television, as defined by the Federal Communications Commission, but not including broadcast transmission equipment), (ii) the acquisition of necessary instructional materials for use in such television instruction, and (iii) minor remodeling necessary for such television equipment; and (C) for determining the Federal share of the cost of each such project;

"(3) provides (A) for assigning priorities solely on the basis of such criteria, standards, and methods to eligible projects submitted to the State commission and deemed by it to be otherwise approvable under the provisions of this part; and (B) for approving and recommending to the Commissioner, in the order of such priority, applications covering such eligible projects, and for certifying to the Commissioner the Federal share, determined by the State commission under the State plan, of the cost of the project involved;

"(4) provides for affording to every applicant, which has submitted to the State commission a project, an opportunity for a fair hearing before the commission as to the priority assigned to such project or as to any other determination of the commission adversely affecting such applicant; and

"(5) provides (A) for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State commission under this part, and (B) for the making of such reports, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions under this part.

"Basic Criteria for Determining Priorities, Federal Share, and Maintenance of Effort

"Sec. 604. (a) As soon as practicable after the enactment of this Act the Commissioner shall by regulation prescribe basic criteria to which the provisions of State plans setting forth standards and methods for determining relative priorities of eligible projects, and the application of such standards and methods to such projects under such plans, shall be subject. Such basic criteria (1) shall be such as will best tend to achieve the objectives of this part while leaving opportunity and flexibility for the development of State plan standards and methods that will best accommodate the varied needs of institutions in the several States, and (2) shall give special consideration to the financial need of the institution. Subject to the foregoing requirements, such regulations may establish additional and appropriate basic criteria, including provision for considering the degree to which applicant institutions are effectively utilizing existing facilities and equipment, provision for allowing State plans to group or provide for grouping, in a reasonable manner, facilities or institutions according to functional or educational type for priority purposes, and, in view of the national objectives of this Act, provision for considering the degree to which the institution serves students from two or more States or from outside the United States; and in no event shall an institution's readiness to admit such out-of-State students be considered as a priority factor adverse to such institution.

"(b) The Federal share for the purposes of this part shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost of the project, except that a State commission may increase such share to not to exceed 80 per centum of such cost in the case of any institution proving insufficient resources to participate in the program under this part and inability to acquire such resources. An institution of higher education shall be eligible for a grant for a project pursuant to this part in any fiscal year only if such institution will expend during such year for the same purposes as, but not pursuant to, this part an amount at least equal to the amount expended by such institution for such purposes during the previous fiscal year. The Commissioner shall establish basic criteria for making determinations under this subsection.

"Applications for Grants and Conditions for Approval

"Sec. 605. (a) Institutions of higher education which desire to obtain grants under this part shall submit applications therefor at such time or times and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, and such applications shall contain such information as may be required by or pursuant to regulation for the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to make the determinations required to be made by him under this part.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve an application covering a project under this part and meeting the requirements prescribed pursuant to subsection (a) if—

"(1) the project has been approved and recommended by the appropriate State commission;

"(2) the State commission has certified to the Commissioner, in accordance with the State plan, the Federal share of the cost of the project, and sufficient funds to pay such Federal share are available from the applicable allotment of the State (including any applicable reallotment to the State);

"(3) the project has, pursuant to the State plan, been assigned a priority that is higher than that of all other projects within such State (chargeable to the same allotment) which meet all the requirements of this section (other than this clause) and for which Federal funds have not yet been reserved;

"(4) the Commissioner determines that the project will be undertaken in an economical manner and will not be overly elaborate or extravagant; and

"(5) the Commissioner determines that the application contains or is supported by satisfactory assurances—

"(A) that Federal funds received by the applicant will be used solely for defraying the cost of the project covered by such application,

"(B) that sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal portion of such cost and to provide for the effective use of the equipment upon completion, and

"(C) that the institution will meet the maintenance of effort requirement in section 604(b).

"(b) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Commissioner may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulation, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

"Amount of Grant—Payment

"SEC. 606. Upon his approval of any application for a grant under this part, the Commissioner shall reserve from the applicable allotment (including any applicable reallotment) available therefor, the amount of such grant, which (subject to the limits of such allotment or reallotment) shall be equal to the Federal share of the cost of the project covered by such application. The Commissioner shall pay such reserved amount, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments as he may determine. The Commissioner's reservation of any amount under this section may be amended by him, either upon approval of an amendment of the application covering such project or upon revision of the estimated cost of a project with respect to which such reservation was made, and in the event of an upward revision of such estimated cost approved by him he may reserve the Federal share of the added cost only from the applicable allotment (or reallotment) available at the time of such approval.

"Administration of State Plans

"SEC. 607. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this part, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State commission submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State commission administering a State plan approved under this part, finds—

"(1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 603, or

"(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify such State commission that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this part until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

"Judicial Review

"SEC. 608. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under this part or with his final action under section 607, such State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The Commissioner shall forthwith certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action.

"(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the transcript and record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

"(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"Limitation on Payments

"SEC. 609. No grant may be made under this part for equipment or materials to be used for sectarian instruction or religious worship, or primarily in connection with any part of the program of a school or department of divinity. For purposes of this section the term 'school or department of divinity' means an institution or a department or branch of an institution whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation, or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

"Part B—Faculty development programs

"Institutes Authorized

"SEC. 621. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to arrange, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education for the operation by them of short-term workshops or short-term or regular-session institutes for individuals (1) who are engaged in, or preparing to engage in, the use of educational media equipment in teaching in institutions of higher education, or (2) who are, or are preparing to be, in institutions of higher education, specialists in educational media or librarians or other specialists using such media.

"(b) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for the succeeding fiscal year, there may be appropriated for the purposes of this part, only such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

"Stipends

"SEC. 622. Each individual who attends an institute operated under the provisions of this part shall be eligible (after application therefor) to receive a stipend at the rate of $75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute and each such individual with one or more dependents shall receive an additional stipend at the rate of $15 per week for each dependent. No stipends shall be paid for attendance at workshops.

"TITLE VII—AMENDMENTS TO HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

"Expansion of Grant Purposes

"SEC. 701. (a) Section 106 of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended to read as follows:

" 'Eligibility for Grants

" 'SEC. 106. An institution of higher education shall be eligible for a grant for construction of an academic facility under this title only if such construction will, either alone or together with other construction to be undertaken within a reasonable time, (1) result in an urgently needed substantial expansion of the institution's student enrollment capacity or capacity to carry out extension and continuing education programs on the campus of such institution, or (2) in the case of a new institution of higher education, result in creating urgently needed enrollment capacity or capacity to carry out extension and continuing education programs on the campus of such institution.'

"(b) The first sentence of section 101(b) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by striking out 'and each of the two succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'and for the succeeding fiscal year, and the sum of $460,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966'.

"(c) The second sentence of section 201 of such Act is amended by striking out 'and the sum of $60,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the succeeding fiscal year' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the sum of $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the sum of $120,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966'.

"Technical amendments

"Making Section 103 Allotments Available for Section 104 Institutions Under Certain Circumstances

"SEC. 702. (a) (1) Section 103(b) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by inserting '(1)' immediately after '(b)' in such section and by adding at the end thereof:

" '(2) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, any portion of a State's allotment under this section for a fiscal year for which applications from an institution qualified to receive grants under this section have not been received by the State Commission by January 1 of such fiscal year, shall, if the Commission so requests, be available, in accordance with the provisions of this title, for payment of the Federal share (as determined under sections 108(b) (3) and 401(d)) of the development cost of approved projects for the construction of academic facilities within such State for institutions of higher education other than public community colleges and public technical institutes.'

"(2) The first sentence of section 103(c) is amended by striking out 'for providing academic facilities for public community colleges or public technical institutes' and inserting in lieu thereof 'for the purposes set forth in subsection (b) of this section'.

"(3) Section 105(a) is amended by striking out 'hereinafter' in the matter preceding clause (1).

"(4) Clause (3) of section 105(a) is amended by inserting '(except as provided in section 103(b) (2))' after 'section 103 will be available'.

"Making Section 104 Allotments Available for Section 103 Institutions Under Certain Circumstances

"(b) (1) Section 104(b) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by inserting '(1)' immediately after '(b)' in such section and by adding at the end thereof:

" '(2) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, any portion of a State's allotment under this section for a fiscal year for which applications from an institution qualified to receive grants under this section have not been received by the State Commission by January 1 of such fiscal year, shall, if the Commission so requests, be available, in accordance with the provisions of this title, for payment of the Federal share (as determined under sections 108(b) (3) and 401(d)) of the development cost of approved projects for the construction of academic facilities within such State for public community colleges and public technical institutes.'

"(2) The first sentence of section 104(c) is amended by striking out 'for providing academic facilities for institutions of higher education other than public community colleges and public technical institutes' and inserting in lieu thereof 'for the purposes set forth in subsection (b) of this section'.

"(3) Clause (3) of section 105(a) is amended by inserting '(except as provided in section 104(b) (2))' after 'section 104 will be available'.

"Revising Federal Share for Public Community Colleges and Public Technical Institutes

"(c) (1) Section 105(a) (2) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by striking out 'other than a project for a public community college or public technical institute'.

"(2) Section 107(b) of such Act is amended (1) by striking out 'other than a project for a public community college or public technical institute', and (2) by striking out 'shall be 40 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof 'shall in no event exceed 40 per centum'.

"(3) Section 401(d) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before '40 per centum' the following: 'a percentage (as determined under the applicable State plan) not in excess of'.

"Three-Year Availability of Sums Appropriated Under Section 201

"(d) The last sentence of section 201 of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended to read as follows: 'Sums appropriated pursuant to this section for any fiscal year shall remain available for grants under this title until the end of the second succeeding fiscal year.'

"Two-Year Availability of Title III Funds

"(e) Section 303(c) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: 'Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection for any fiscal year shall remain available for loans under this title until the end of the next succeeding fiscal year.'

"Coordination With Part A (Grants for Expansion and Improvement of Nurse Training) of Title VIII of the Public Health Service Act

"(f) Effective with respect to applications for grants and loans submitted after the date of enactment of this Act, clause (E) of section 401(a)(2) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended to read as follows: '(E) any facility used or to be used by a school of medicine, school of dentistry, school of osteopathy, school of pharmacy, school of optometry, school of podiatry, or school of public health as these terms are defined in section 724 of the Public Health Service Act, or a school of nursing as defined in section 843 of that Act.'

"Change in Interest Rate for Title III Loans

"SEC. 703. (a) Subsection (b) of section 303 of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by inserting '(1)' after 'shall bear interest at', and by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'or (2) the rate of 3 per centum per annum, whichever is the lesser'.

"(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to loans made after the date of enactment of this Act.

"TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"Definitions

"SEC. 801. As used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'institution of higher education' means an educational institution in any State which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate, (2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, (4) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited. Such term also includes any business school or technical institution which meets the provisions of clauses (1), (2), (4), and (5). For purposes of this subsection, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.

"(b) The term 'State' includes, in addition to the several States of the Union, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

"(c) The term 'nonprofit' as applied to a school, agency, organization, or institution means a school, agency, organization, or institution owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"(d) The term 'secondary school' means a school which provides secondary education as determined under State law except that it does not include any education provided beyond grade 12.

"(e) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(f) The term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Education.

"(g) The term 'local educational agency' means a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or such combination of school districts or counties as are recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public elementary or secondary schools. Such term also includes any other public institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a public elementary or secondary school.

"(h) The term 'State educational agency' means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law.

"(i) The term 'elementary school' means a school which provides elementary education including education below grade 1, as determined under State law.

"Method of payment

"SEC. 802. Payments under this Act to any individual or to any State or Federal agency, institution of higher education, or any other organization, pursuant to a grant, loan, or contract, may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, and, in the case of grants or loans, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

"Federal administration

"SEC. 803. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to delegate any of his functions under this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

"(b) In administering the provisions of this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary and the head thereof.

"Federal control of education prohibited

"SEC. 804. (a) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution, or over the selection of library resources by any educational institution.

"(b) Nothing contained in this Act or any other Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the membership practices or internal operations of any fraternal organization, fraternity, sorority, private club or religious organization at an institution of higher education (other than a service academy or the Coast Guard Academy) which is financed exclusively by funds derived from private sources and whose facilities are not owned by such institution."

And the Senate agree to the same.

ADAM C. POWELL,
CARL D. PERKINS,
EDITH GREEN,
JOHN BRADEMAS,
HUGH L. CAREY,
JOHN H. DENT,
SAM M. GIBBONS,
CARLTON R. SICKLES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WAYNE MORSE,
LISTER HILL,
PAT MCNAMARA,
RALPH YARBOROUGH,
JOSEPH CLARK,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
ROBERT KENNEDY,
WINSTON L. PROUTY,
J. K. JAVITS,
PETER H. DOMINICK,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9567) to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The Senate amendment strikes out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserts a substitute. The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. The differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below except for clerical corrections, incidental changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees, and minor drafting and clarifying changes.

TITLE I—COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Declaration of purpose

Section 101 of the House bill contained a number of congressional findings. These were that a greater involvement of institutions of higher education in the solution of problems brought about by increasing urbanization is essential to the rapid and effective solution of such problems, that an increase in the availability of educational offerings by such institutions for persons in the community is necessary in order to insure that the latest knowledge and techniques are brought to bear on urban and suburban problems, and that the strengthening of the resources of such institutions is desirable to facilitate a more effective utilization of such resources in meeting the growing needs of our urban and suburban communities. For these reasons it was declared to be the purpose of the title to provide a program of support for institutions of higher education in their establishing and maintaining community service programs designed to achieve these ends.

The Senate amendment provided that the purpose of the title is to assist the people of the United States in the solution of community problems, such as housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health, and land use, by enabling the Commissioner to make grants and contracts under the title to strenthen continuing education and extension methods and teaching and the public service resources of colleges and universities.

The conference substitute adopts the Senate provision, except that instead of speaking of strengthening continuing education and extension methods and teaching, and the public service resources of colleges and universities it mentions strengthening the community service programs of such institutions.

Authorization of appropriations

The House bill authorized the appropriation of $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1966 to enable the Commissioner to make grants under the title. For the 4 succeeding fiscal years there was authorized to be appropriated only such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law. The Senate bill authorized $25,000,000 for fiscal 1966, and $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1967 and each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years.

The substitute agreed upon in conference authorizes the appropriation of $25,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, and $50,000,000 for each of the next 2 fiscal year. For the fiscal year 1969 and the succeeding fiscal year it provides that only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

Uses of funds

The House bill provided that the funds granted from the State's allotment must be used to provide new, expanded, or improved community service programs. "Community service program" was defined to mean an educational program, activity, or service, including a research program, specifically designed to assist in the solution of urban or suburban problems, or an educational program, activity, or service designed to assist in the solution of community problems where the institution offering the program, activity, or service determines that the proposed program, activity, or service is not otherwise available and that the content thereof is consistent with the institution's overall educational program and is appropriate to the effective utilization of its special resources and the competencies of its faculty. Under the House bill if the educational program, activity, or service involves course offerings, they must be university extension or continuing education courses and must be acceptable toward an academic degree or of a college level, but in no event can the course be of a frivolous nature.

The Senate amendment provided that funds granted from the State's allotment must be used for extension and continuing education activities and services designed to assist, particularly through new and advanced approaches, in the solution of rural and urban community problems.

The conference substitute adopts the term "community service program" and defines it to mean an educational program, activity, or service, including a research program and a university extension or continuing education offering, designed to assist in the solution of community problems in rural, urban, or suburban areas, with particular emphasis on urban and suburban problems, but only where the institutions offering the program, activity, or service determines it is not otherwise available and that carrying it out is consistent with the institution's overall educational program, and that it is of such a nature as is appropriate to the effective utilization of the institution's special resources and competencies. Where course offerings are involved, they must be university extension or continuing education courses and either fully acceptable toward a college degree, or of college level as determined by the institution offering the course. The reference to rural, urban, and suburban areas includes rural nonfarm areas.

The requirement that an institution determine that its proposed program is not otherwise available is intended to preclude duplication of existing effort, including overlap with the Agricultural Extension Service. It is not designed to prohibit the use of funds to expand existing community service programs for which there is an unsatisfied demand.

The restriction of courses to those of college level should not be construed to exclude non-secondary-school graduates from participation in programs carried out under this title.

The omission of the prohibition against courses of a frivolous nature should in no way be interpreted as permitting courses to increase the competence of an individual in purely recreational or social activities.

Allotments to Puerto Rico

Under the House bill, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico would be given a preliminary allotment of $25,000, as was the case for Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands. The Senate amendment provided that the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico would receive a preliminary allotment of $100,000. The Senate recedes.

Matching

The House bill provided that the Federal share of the cost of programs under the title would be 75 percent in the fiscal year 1966, and 50 percent in the fiscal years 1967, 1968, 1969, and 1970. The Senate bill provided that the Federal share would be 75 percent in the fiscal years 1966 and 1967, and 50 percent in the fiscal years 1968, 1969, and 1970. The conference substitute adopts the provisions of the Senate amendment on this point.

Maintenance of effort

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment required that the State plan submitted under the title set forth policies and procedures designed to assure that the Federal funds made available will not supplant State or local funds or funds of institutions of higher education. The Senate amendment in addition provided that no payments could be made to any State from its allotment until the Commissioner finds that the institutions of higher education which will participate in carrying out the State plan have available during that year for expenditure from non-Federal sources for university extension and continuing education programs not less than the total amount actually expended by those institutions for such programs from non-Federal sources during the year 1965, plus an amount equal to not less than the non-Federal share of the costs with respect to which payment under the title is sought. The conference substitute includes this provision.

The Senate amendment also prohibited use of fee-related funds to meet the above requirement. This provision is dropped in the conference substitute.

Funds to cover administration of State plans

The House bill provided that no payment could be made to any State for developing and administering a State plan which exceeds 5 percent for the cost of developing and carrying out the State's plan for that year. The Senate amendment contained the same provision but added a provision to authorize the expenditure of $25,000 in any State where that amount is greater than 5 percent of such cost. The Senate provision is retained in the conference report.

Funds for experimental approaches and supplemental grants

The Senate amendment reserved 20 percent of the sums appropriated for purposes of the title for grants and contracts for experimental projects and for supplemental grants. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The Senate recedes.

Advisory Council

The House bill provided for the establishment in the Office of Education of a National Advisory Committee on Community Service Programs to advise the Commissioner in preparing general regulations and in the administration of the program provided for in the title. The Senate amendment directed the President to appoint a National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education to advise the Commissioner in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of the title and also with respect to approval of State plans, and policies to eliminate duplication and effectuate coordination of programs under the title and other programs of extension or continuing education. The Council would also advise the Commissioner on approval of projects and activities under the title. The Council was required to review all federally supported extension and continuing education programs. Beginning on March 31, 1967, it would file an annual report of its findings and recommendations to the Secretary and to the President. This report would be transmitted to the Congress with the comments and recommendations of the President.

The Senate amendment also authorized the Secretary to engage such technical assistance as might be required to carry out the functions of the Advisory Council. It also authorized the Advisory Council to utilize the services and facilities of other Federal agencies.

This section of the Senate amendment is included in the conference report with only minor and conforming changes.

The House bill contained a provision, nothing comparable to which appears in the Senate amendment, under which the Secretary is required, during 1968, to appoint a Review Council on Community Service Programs to review the administration of community service programs carried out under the title and make recommendations for the improvement of that administration. The Council was to include persons knowledgeable in the field of extension and continuing education, State and local officials having special knowledge, experience, or qualification with respect to community problems, and persons representative of the public. The Secretary was also authorized to engage technical assistance. The Council would make its report to the Secretary not later than March 31, 1969. This provision is not included in the conference report.

Limitation

The Senate amendment contained a provision, not present in the House bill, prohibiting the use of funds for activities and services related to sectarian instruction or religious worship, or provided by a school or department of divinity. This provision is retained in the conference report.

TITLE II—COLLEGE LIBRARY ASSISTANCE AND LIBRARY TRAINING AND RESEARCH

Part A—College library resources

Authorization of Appropriations

The House bill authorized the appropriation of $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, and only such sums as may be hereafter authorized by law for the succeeding 4 fiscal years. The Senate amendment authorized $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1966 and each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years. The substitute agreed upon in conference authorizes the appropriation of $50,000,000 for the fiscal year 1966 and the 2 succeeding fiscal years. It provides that for the fiscal year 1969, and the next fiscal year, only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

Basic Grants

The House bill provided basic grants to institutions of higher education for acquisition of library materials. It provided that the basic grant to an institution could not exceed $5,000 for each institution. The comparable provision of the Senate amendment provided that the basic grant could not exceed $5,000 for each institution of higher education and each branch of such institution which is located in a community different from that in which its parent institution is located. The conference substitute adopts the Senate version, with an amendment under which what constitutes a "branch" will be determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner. In permitting grants to be made to branches the conferees intend that grants be limited to branches which have college level programs for which library facilities are necessary, and that the proceeds of a grant on account of a branch be used to increase the library resources at the branch.

The Senate amendment also required the institution applying for a basic grant to provide for joint use of library facilities with other institutions where feasible. The House bill contained no comparable provision, and it is not included in the conference report. However, the managers on the part of the House expect that there will be joint use of library facilities where feasible.

Supplemental Grants

The Senate amendment provided that funds remaining after making basic grants, plus any funds not needed for special purpose grants, could be used for supplemental grants. The House bill provided for the use of funds remaining after making basic grants to make supplemental grants, but did not permit the use of funds not needed for special grants for this purpose. It provided, instead, that funds not needed for the other types of grants be used for special purpose grants. The provision of the Senate amendment is included in the conference report. The conferees do not expect an institution to qualify for supplemental grants unless it has received basic grants in excess of $1,500 on a matching basis.

The House bill provided that in awarding supplemental grants the Commissioner shall take into consideration the endowments and other financial resources of the institution. The Senate amendment required the Commissioner to give priority to institutions which need financial assistance for library purposes. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Special Purpose Grants

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment provided for use of 25 percent of the funds appropriated to carry out the part for special purpose grants. The House bill also permitted the use of funds not needed for the other grant programs to be used for special purpose grants. The Senate amendment in contrast, provided that funds not used for special purpose grants could be used for supplemental grants.

In lieu of these provisions, the conference substitute provides that 25 percent of the sums appropriated to carry out the part for a fiscal year shall be used by the Commissioner as follows:

1. 60 percent may be used to make special purpose grants.
2. The sums not used for special purpose grants will be used in the manner prescribed for supplemental grants.

The Senate amendment specifically includes physical and social sciences as being among those eligible for special purpose grants. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The Senate recedes.

The Senate amendment provided that special purpose grants must be matched on the basis of one institutional dollar for every three Federal dollars, and required that the institution maintain its effort in this area. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts the substance of the Senate amendment on this point.

State Agency Consultation

The House bill required consultation by institutions of higher education with State higher education agencies where they exist. The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute requires these institutions to inform periodically the State agency (if any) concerned with higher educational activities in the State of such institution's activities under the part.

Part B—Library training and research

Authorization of Appropriations

The House bill authorized the appropriation of $15,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, and only such sums as may hereafter be authorized for the succeeding 4 years. The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation of $7,500,000 for fiscal year 1966 and $15,000,000 for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.

The conference substitute authorizes the appropriation of $15,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, for carrying out this part. For the fiscal year 1969 and the next fiscal year only such funds may be appropriated as the Congress hereafter authorizes by law.

Training Grants

The Senate amendment specifically includes training of specialists in the communication of information in the physical and social sciences as eligible training programs. The House bill did not specifically include these programs. The Senate recedes.

Research

The Senate amendment permitted research grants and contracts to individuals. The House bill did not. The Senate recedes.

The House bill permitted the Commissioner to appoint one nine-member advisory committee to assist in the administration of the program. The Senate amendment allowed the Commissioner to appoint the necessary number of technical advisory committee and panels of experts. The House provision is included in the conference report.

NDEA Library Institutes

The House bill repealed the authority for training institutes for elementary and secondary school librarians now contained in the National Defense Education Act of 1958, effective July 1, 1965. The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision. The conferees agreed to the House provision, but delayed its effectiveness until July 1, 1967. The conference committee expects that after June 30, 1967, the librarian institutes now authorized under the National Defense Education Act will be carried on under part B of title II of this act.

Part C—Cataloging

Authorization of Appropriations

The House bill authorized the appropriation of $5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1966, and only such sums as may hereafter be authorized for the succeeding 4 fiscal years. The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation of $5,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, $6,315,000 for the fiscal year 1967, and $7,770,000 for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years. The conference substitute authorizes the appropriation of $5,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, $6,315,000 for fiscal year 1967, and $7,700,000 for fiscal year 1968. For the fiscal year 1969, and the next fiscal year, only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

Purpose of Program

The Senate amendment authorized the use of funds transferred under this part for distributing bibliographic information by printing catalog cards and by other means. The House bill did not authorize the use of these funds for such purpose. The conference report includes this provision of the Senate amendment.

TITLE III—STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS

Authorization of appropriations

The House bill authorized the appropriation of $30,000,000 for the fiscal year 1966 to carry out the title. For the 4 succeeding fiscal years only such sums could be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation of $25,000,000 for the fiscal year 1966 and each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years for carrying out the provisions of the title with respect to developing institutions which plan to award one or more bachelor's degrees during the year. It authorized $25,000,000 for the fiscal year 1966 and each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years for carrying out the provisions of the title with respect to developing institutions which do not plan to award such degrees during the year. It authorized the appropriation of $5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1966 and $10,000,000 for the fiscal year 1967 and each of the 3 succeeding years for either of the foregoing purposes, or both, as determined by the Commissioner.

The substitute agreed upon in conference contains an authorization of $55,000,000 for 1 year—the fiscal year 1966. It provides that 78 percent of the sums appropriated for the title may be used only for developing institutions which plan to award one or more bachelor's degrees during the year. The remainder may be used only for other institutions.

Qualifications of "developing institutions"

The House bill provided that for an institution to be a developing institution eligible for this program it must, among other things, (1) have been awarding bachelor's degrees for 5 years, and (2) be seriously handicapped in its efforts to improve its staff and services by lack of financial resources and a shortage of qualified professional personnel.

The Senate amendment permitted an institution of higher education (including a junior college or other 2-year institution) to be considered a "developing institution" if it met the accreditation requirements of the bill during the 2 preceding academic years.

The substitute includes the 2-year institutions within the scope of the title, but provides that all institutions must meet the accreditation requirements and must have been in existence for 5 academic years. This reflects the committee's determination that funds be used to support programs which will assist those institutions which are developing in the sense that they are unable to offer quality instruction, not simply because they are rapidly expanding.

The committee intends that the Commissioner in prescribing regulations defining the term "developing institution" will strictly adhere to the description of such institutions contained in both the House and Senate reports.

Types of programs

The Senate amendment, unlike the House bill, specifically included programs to strengthen the administration of developing institutions. The conference substitute includes this provision.

The Senate amendment permitted cooperative programs under which persons from developing institutions may receive fellowships leading to advanced degrees. No specific authority was contained in the House bill. This provision is retained in the conference report.

TITLE IV—STUDENT ASSISTANCE

Part A—Educational opportunity grants

General

The House bill and Senate amendment both include programs to provide financial assistance to enable deserving students to attend college. However, the two programs differ completely as to the manner in which this assistance would be provided. The House bill amended the student loan title of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, to provide that 25 percent of the amount authorized for student loan funds could be used to make educational opportunity grants to needy students. The Senate amendment, in contrast, did not amend the National Defense Education Act, but instead provided an independent program under which grants would be made to institutions of higher education to enable them to provide scholarships.

The substitute agreed upon in conference adopts the general structure of the Senate amendment, while retaining (as explained hereafter in detail) most of the requirements of the House bill relating to qualifications for and amounts of educational opportunity grants.

Authorization of Appropriations

The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation of $70,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, and each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years for paying for the initial year of scholarships awarded under the program. The conference substitute authorizes the appropriation of $70,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, and each of the next 2 fiscal years, for making payments for the initial year of educational opportunity grants (the name given these grants in the House bill and adopted in the conference report). For the fiscal year 1969, and the next fiscal year, the conference substitute permits the appropriation of only such sums as may hereafter be authorized by law.

Amount of Grant

Under the House bill the maximum educational opportunity grant which could be made to a student for any year was $800; and in no event could the grant constitute more than one-half of the total financial aid provided the student by the institution (excluding assistance from work-study programs) and by any State or private scholarship program. Under the Senate amendment the maximum size of a scholarship for a year was $800, but the maximum size was increased to $1,000 in the case of a student in the upper half of his class.

The conference substitute provides that the maximum amount of an educational opportunity grant may not exceed the lesser of $800 or one-half of the sum of the amount of student financial aid (excluding assistance from work-study programs) provided by the institution or by a State or private scholarship program. If the student is in the upper half of his class, the maximum amount will be increased $200, if needed.

Allotments Among States

Since the House bill provided that educational opportunity grants would be made from NDEA student loan funds, the effect was to allot funds for this program on the basis of the NDEA formula. Under that formula, funds are allotted among the States on the basis of the relative number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education in the several States. The Senate amendment allotted the funds among the States, one-third as funds for NDEA student loan programs are allotted, one-third on the basis of relative numbers of secondary school graduates in the several States, and one-third on the basis of the relative number of related children under 18 years of age living in families with annual incomes of less than $3,000.

The conference substitute provides that all the funds will be allotted according to the formula used for allotting NDEA student loan funds.

State Scholarship Funds

The Senate amendment permitted payment (with 50-percent matching and maintenance of effort) of up to 15 percent of a State's apportionment for use in the State's scholarship programs which are comparable to the Federal program. The House bill did not contain this provision, and it is not included in the agreement reached in conference.

Coordination of Student Assistance Programs

As mentioned above, under the House bill educational opportunity grants had to be supplemented by assistance under other programs. The Senate bill did not include the House provision, but did require institutions, where appropriate, to combine financial assistance under this program with assistance derived from other public and private programs. Since the House provision referred to above was retained in the conference report, the Senate provision was dropped.

Cooperative Motivational Programs

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment contained provisions requiring institutions of higher education to make vigorous efforts to identify qualified youths from low-income families and to encourage them to continue their education beyond secondary school. The provision in the Senate amendment which permitted institutions to use up to 5 percent of their grants for these activities is not included in the conference report.

Transfers to NDEA Student Loan Funds

The Senate amendment permitted an institution to transfer 25 percent of funds granted it under the part to its NDEA student loan fund. The conference report retains this provision.

Part B—Guaranteed reduced interest loans

General

The House bill and Senate amendment contained generally similar provisions for Federal, State, and private programs of low-interest insured loans to students in institutions of higher education. There were a number of technical differences between the two versions, but the conference report accepts the provisions of the House bill, except as noted below.

Moratorium for Repayment

The Senate amendment provided a moratorium on repayment of federally guaranteed loans during the time the borrower is a full-time student and for a period of not to exceed 3 years during which the borrower is a member of the Armed Forces or a volunteer in the Peace Corps. This provision is retained in the conference report.

Beginning Date for Repayments

The House bill provided that repayment cannot be required to begin before 6 months after the end of the student's educational program. The Senate amendment substituted 9 months for the 6-month figure in the House bill. The 9-month figure is adopted in the conference report.

Advisory Council on Insured Loans for Students

The Senate amendment established an Advisory Council on Insured Loans for Students to advise the Commissioner in preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy needs arising in the administration of the program. There was no comparable provision in the House bill.

The conference substitute accepts this provision with two changes; it deletes the requirement that the Council advise the Commissioner in the preparation of general regulations, and inserts a provision giving the members of the Council the usual per diem rates of pay.

Definition of "Eligible Institution"

The House bill limited the institutions which would be eligible to participate to 4-year and 2-year institutions which are accredited and provide courses acceptable for credit toward a bachelor's degree.

The Senate amendment broadened the definition of "eligible institution" to include (1) institutions which are not yet accredited but which, in the judgment of the Commissioner, will be accredited in a reasonable time; (2) collegiate and associate degree schools of nursing; and (3) other schools which provide not less than a 1-year program of training to prepare students for gainful employment in a recognized occupation. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

Part C—College work-study program extension and amendment

Authorization of Appropriations

The House bill authorized the appropriation of $129,000,000 to carry out the part during the fiscal year 1966, and such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law for the next 4 fiscal years. The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation of $129,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, $165,000,000 for fiscal year 1967, $200,000,000 for fiscal year 1968, and $235,000,000 for the fiscal year 1969 and the next fiscal year. The conference report authorizes the appropriation of $129,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, $165,000,000 for fiscal year 1967, and $200,000,000 for fiscal year 1968.

Limitation on Types of Work

The Senate amendment made applicable to all work carried on under work-study programs, the requirements now applicable to off-campus work. It also adds a requirement that the work be such as would not otherwise be performed by nonstudents. The Senate provision was accepted in conference with an amendment deleting the requirement that the work be such as would not otherwise be performed by nonstudents.

Payment of Institutional Share

The present law requires institutions to bear 10 percent of the cost of work-study programs. The Senate amendment permitted institutions to pay this share to students in the form of services and equipment furnished by the institutions. This provision is included in the conference report.

Part D—Amendments to National Defense Education Act of 1958

Conditions of Agreements; Administrative Costs

The Senate amendment contained an amendment to clause (3) of section 204 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (referred to as the NDEA) which required that agreements between the Commissioner and institutions participating in the loan program provide that student loan funds may be used for routine expenses (within specified limits) incurred by the institution in administering the student loan fund, and for collection costs (in addition to costs of litigation) agreed to by the Commissioner. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Technical Amendment for Part-time Students

The Senate amendment contained an amendment to section 205(b)(2) of the

NDEA to authorize institutions to determine whether loans shall be repaid in equal (or if the borrower requests, in graduated periodic installments determined in accordance with schedules approved by the Commissioner) quarterly, bimonthly, or monthly installments. It also amended section 205 (b)(2) to provide that repayment of principal, together with interest, is to commence 9 months after the date on which the borrower ceases to carry at least half the normal full-time academic workload, and end 10 years and 9 months after such date except that interest shall not accrue and no installment need be paid while the borrower is carrying (at an institution of higher education or comparable institution outside the States, approved for this purpose by the Commissioner) at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload, as determined by the institution. The amendments made by this provision would apply to loans outstanding on the date of enactment only with the consent of the borrower and the lending institution.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Minimum Rate of Repayment

The Senate amendment contained an amendment to section 205(b)(2) of the NDEA to authorize institutions to require that the rate of repayment by a borrower on all title II loans extended him must be not less than $15 per month. The amendment made by this provision would be applicable only with respect to loans made after the date of enactment.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Cancellation of Loans for Teachers

The Senate amendment contained an amendment to section 205(b)(3) of the NDEA in three respects: First, to provide that the portion of the loans to be forgiven teachers is to be calculated as a percentage of the original total of the loans in question rather than, as the law now provides, of the amount of the loan remaining unpaid on the first day of service as a teacher; second, to provide that the prescribed portions of the loan to be forgiven shall be forgiven for each academic year "or its equivalent"; and third, to provide that the cancellation rate for teachers shall be 15 percent for each complete academic year, or its equivalent, of service as a full-time teacher in a public or other nonprofit elementary or secondary school which is in the school district of a local educational agency eligible in such year for assistance under title II (financial assistance to local educational agencies for the education of children of low-income families) of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, and which has been determined to be a school in which there is a high concentration of students from low-income families. Such a determination may be made only with respect to 25 percent of the schools in a State. For purposes of such cancellation, an additional 50 percent of any loan (plus interest) may be canceled.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment, but with a limitation that no borrower may receive a refund by reason of subsequent forgiveness of amounts he has repaid.

Charges

The Senate amendment contained an amendment to section 205 of the NDEA by adding a new subsection (c) to authorize institutions to assess charges against borrowers who fail to pay all or any part of an installment when due, and against borrowers who are entitled to deferment benefits or cancellation benefits but who fail to file timely and satisfactory evidence of such entitlement. Such charges may amount to $1 for the first month of late payment and $2 each month thereafter, except that for bimonthly or quarterly repayment intervals, the charge may be $3 and $6, respectively. Institutions would be authorized to elect whether to add these charges to the principal amount of loans as of the first day after the day on which such installment or evidence was due, or to make the amount of the charge payable to the institution not later than the due date of the next installment after receipt by the borrower of notice of the assessment of the charge. The amendment would be applicable only with respect to loans made after the date of enactment.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Economics, Civics, and Industrial Arts

The Senate amendment contained an amendment to clauses (1) and (5) of section 303(a) of the NDEA pertaining to State plans under which financial assistance is extended for strengthening instruction in science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other critical subjects, to include "economics" among subjects which may be included in programs by State educational agencies. This provision also authorized increased appropriations (from $90 to $100 million) for fiscal years 1966, 1967, and 1968 for carrying out title III of the NDEA.

In addition this provision amended section 1101 of the NDEA (authorizing short-term or regular session institutes for advanced study) to provide for the authorization of $50 million (rather than $32,750,000) for fiscal 1966 and for each of the 2 succeeding years. It also amended section 1101 to expand the categories of eligible support to include institutes to improve the qualification of individuals who are engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching or the supervising or training of teachers, of economics, civics, and industrial arts.

The House bill contained no comparable provisions. The conference report adopts these provisions of the Senate amendment.

TITLE V—TEACHER PROGRAMS

Part A—General provisions

Advisory Council on Quality Teacher Preparation

The Senate amendment provided for the establishment of an Advisory Council on Teacher Preparation in the Office of Education. The Commissioner would be Chairman of the Council, and he would appoint (with the approval of the Secretary) the 12 members of the Council. Such 12 members would include persons knowledgeable with respect to teacher preparation and the needs of urban and rural schools. The purpose of the Council would be to review the administration and operation of the programs carried out under this title and under all other Federal programs for complementary purposes.

The provision also provided for compensation of Council members who are not regular full-time employees of the United States, and allowed the Council to appoint an executive secretary and such other employees as it deemed necessary to carry out its functions under this part.

The House bill contained no comparable provisions. The conference report adopts these provisions of the Senate amendment, but changes the name of the Council to the Advisory Council on Quality Teacher Preparation.

Limitation

The Senate amendment provided that nothing contained in this title shall be construed to authorize the making of any payment under this title for religious worship or instruction. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Part B—National Teacher Corps

Statement of Purpose and Authorization of Appropriations

The Senate amendment provided that it is the purpose of this part to improve the educational opportunities available to children in areas having a concentration of low-income families, and at the same time to encourage the development of broader programs of teacher preparation in colleges and universities, by attracting and training both qualified teachers and inexperienced teacher-interns who will be made available to local educational agencies in low-income areas.

The Senate amendment authorized, for the purpose of carrying out this part, the appropriation of $36,100,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $64,715,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopted this provision, but restricted the authorization to the first 2 years.

Establishment of National Teacher Corps

The Senate amendment provided that a National Teacher Corps, to be headed by a Director and a Deputy Director, would be established in the Office of Education in order to carry out the purposes of this part. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Teacher Corps Program

The Senate amendment authorized the Commissioner to (1) recruit, select, and enroll both experienced teachers and inexperienced teacher-interns (who have a bachelor's degree or its equivalent) in the Teacher Corps for periods of up to 2 years; (2) enter into arrangements with institutions of higher education or State or local educational agencies to provide members of the Teacher Corps with appropriate training, including a maximum of 3 months' training before undertaking their teaching duties; (3) enter into arrangements (including the payment of cost of such arrangements) with local educational agencies to furnish experienced teachers and teaching teams (consisting of one experienced teacher and a number of teacher-interns) for service during regular or summer sessions, or both, in the schools of such agencies in areas having concentrations of children from low-income families, and under which arrangements teacher-interns would be afforded time by the local educational agency for a teacher-intern training program carried out under the guidance of the experienced teacher in cooperation with an institution of higher education; (4) pay to local educational agencies the amount of compensation which such agencies pay to members of the Teacher Corps assigned to them; and (5) employ experts and consultants or organizations thereof to assist the Commissioner in carrying out his functions under this part. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment provided that, wherever possible, arrangements with institutions of higher education to furnish training to teacher-interns while such interns are teaching, shall provide for training leading to a graduate degree. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment, but omits authority for the employment of experts, consultants, or organizations.

The Senate amendment provided that when the demand for the services of Teacher Corps members exceeds the supply, the Commissioner shall, to the extent practicable, allocate those members available among the States in proportion to the number of children counted in each State for the purpose of making basic grants under title II of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, for the fiscal year for which such allocation is made. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts a substitute for this provision of the Senate amendment which provides that if demand for Teacher Corps members exceeds supply, the Commissioner may allot up to 2 percent of the members to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. The remainder would be allotted in accordance with the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment provided that Teacher Corps members may be utilized by a local educational agency to provide educational services available to children enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools, in the manner described in section 205(a)(2) of Public Law 874, 81st Congress. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Compensation

The Senate amendment required that an arrangement with a local educational agency must provide that Teacher Corps members must be compensated by that agency at the following rates: (1) Experienced teachers must receive pay equivalent to that received by teachers with similar training experience and duties who are employed by the local educational agency; (2) experienced teachers leading teaching teams must be compensated at a rate agreed upon by the Commissioner and the agency; and (3) teacher-interns must be compensated at the lowest rate paid by such agency for full-time teaching in the school system and grade to which the intern is assigned.

The Senate amendment authorized the Commissioner to pay stipends to Teacher Corps members while such members are in training. Such payments may include allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such members and their dependents, and are to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported training programs.

In addition, the Senate amendment authorized the Commissioner to pay certain necessary expenses of Teacher Corps members, including travel, transportation of household goods, and readjustment allowances proportionate to service, and to arrange to protect the tenure, retirement rights, and similar employee benefits of any Teacher Corps member who wishes to return to the local educational agency or institution of higher education by which he was employed immediately prior to his service in the Corps.

The House bill contained no comparable provisions. The conference report adopts these provisions of the Senate amendment.

Application of Provisions of Federal Law

The Senate amendment provided:

(1) A Teacher Corps member is not to be deemed a Federal employee, except as is otherwise specifically provided in this section, and is not subject to those provisions of law relating to Federal employment.

(2) Teacher Corps members shall be deemed to be Federal civil employees within the meaning of section 40 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (5 U.S.C. 790) for the purposes of the administration of that act, and the provisions of that act shall apply except as hereinafter provided. For purposes of this subsection the term "performance of duty" in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall not include any act of a member of the Teacher Corps while on authorized leave, or while absent from his assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity authorized by the Commissioner. In computing compensation benefits for disability or death under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the monthly pay of a member of the Teacher Corps shall be deemed to be his actual pay or that received under the entrance salary for GS-6, whichever is greater.

(3) Members of the Teachers Corps shall be deemed to be employees of the Government for the purposes of the Federal Tort Claims Act.

The House bill contained no comparable provisions. The conference report adopts these provisions of the Senate amendment.

Local Control Preserved

The Senate amendment provided that members of the Teacher Corps would be under the direct supervision of the local educational agencies to which they are assigned, and such agencies would retain the authority to assign such members within their systems, make transfers within their systems, determine the subject matter to be taught, and determine the terms and continuance of the assignment of such members within their systems. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Maintenance of Effort

The Senate amendment provided that no member of the Teacher Corps may be used by any local educational agency to replace any teacher who is or would otherwise be employed by such agency.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Part C—Fellowships for teachers

General

Part C of title V of the Senate amendment provided for the establishment of a program of fellowships for elementary and secondary school teachers. The House bill did not provide for a comparable program. The conference report adopts a substitute for the provisions of the Senate amendment.

Statement of Purpose

The Senate amendment provided that the purpose of this part is to provide opportunities for advanced training, particularly in substantive field areas, for teachers and personnel serving in ancillary fields. The conference substitute states that it is the purpose of this part to carry out the policy of the United States to improve elementary and secondary education by improving the quality of career elementary and secondary school personnel by awarding fellowships for graduate study at institutions of higher education and by strengthening teacher education programs in institutions of higher education.

Fellowships Authorized

The Senate amendment authorized the award of fellowships to elementary and secondary school and postsecondary vocational school teachers for master's degrees in education, in the subject which the recipient teaches, or in certain ancillary fields. 4,500 fellowships were authorized for fiscal year 1966; 10,000 for fiscal year 1967; and 15,000 for each of the 3 succeeding years. 40 percent of the fellowships were reserved for recent graduates. The remainder were to go to teachers with at least 5 years' experience, of whom 20 percent could be teachers displaced from their employment by reason of the enforcement of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, or court orders. Between 20 and 25 percent of all fellowships were reserved for persons in fields ancillary to elementary or secondary education or to postsecondary vocational education.

The conference substitute provides for fellowships for graduate degrees, other than doctor of philosophy (or its equivalent) for persons pursuing or who plan to pursue a career of teaching in elementary or secondary schools; a career of teaching, guiding, or supervising such teachers or persons who plan to become such teachers; or a career in fields which are directly related to teaching in elementary or secondary schools. Four thousand five hundred fellowships are authorized for fiscal year 1966, and 10,000 each are authorized for fiscal years 1967 and 1968. Recipients of fellowships must study at institutions whose programs are approved under section 524. The provisions of the Senate amendment relating to the reservation of portions of the fellowships for certain categories of teachers have been dropped, but the conference committee expects that up to 20 percent of the fellowships will be awarded to persons who have been displaced in their employment as professional employees of local educational agencies as a result of changes of school populations brought about by the enforcement of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, or the carrying out of the purpose of such act.

Allocation of Fellowships

The Senate amendment provided that the Commissioner should endeavor to distribute fellowships equitably throughout the Nation, and that he should give preference in such awards to persons already serving, or intending to serve, in low-income areas.

The conference substitute provides that the Commissioner shall allocate fellowships to institutions of higher education with approved programs for the use of individuals accepted into such programs, in a manner (1) which provides an equitable distribution of such fellowships throughout the States (except that he may, after consultation with the Advisory Council on Quality Teacher Preparation, give preference to programs designed to meet an urgent national need), and (2) which encourages experienced teachers in elementary or secondary schools and other experienced personnel in elementary or secondary education to enter graduate programs, attracts recent college graduates into the field of elementary or secondary education, and affords opportunities for college graduates engaged in other occupations or activities to enter or reenter the field of elementary or secondary education.

Approval of Programs; Grants

The Senate amendment (in pt. D of title V) authorized $5 million annually for a 5-year program of assistance, through grant or contract, to institutions of higher education for developing and strengthening graduate and high quality undergraduate teacher training programs, for the purpose of obtaining an appropriate geographical distribution of high quality programs for the training of elementary and secondary school personnel. The Commissioner was to set forth in regulations the standards and priorities which would be utilized in approving such grants and contracts.

The Senate amendment also set out the standards which the Commissioner was to use in determining whether or not a graduate program of an institution of higher education would qualify for assistance under this part. Such a program must (1) improve the quality of teacher education, (2) give major emphasis to high-quality substantive courses, (3) either be in effect or be attainable as a result of assistance received under this part, and (4) be open only to those with a serious intent to pursue a career in education.

Section 524 of the conference substitute adopts the provisions relating to assistance to graduate programs at institutions of higher education, but integrates this program of institutional assistance with the fellowship program by permitting assistance only to institutions participating in the fellowship program. The separate money authorization for assistance to institutions is omitted.

Stipends

The Senate amendment provided that a fellowship for recent graduates carries a stipend of $2,000 for the first academic year and $2,200 for the second year. A fellowship for experienced teachers carried a stipend of $4,800 for each academic year of study. An additional $400 per year would be paid to each fellowship recipient for each of his dependents.

The Senate amendment authorized the payment of $3,000 per academic year to the institution of higher education where a recipient of a fellowship is studying. This amount will be less any amount charged any such recipient for tuition. The Commissioner was also authorized to reimburse a fellowship recipient for necessary traveling expenses of the recipient and his dependents.

The conference substitute permits the Commissioner to pay to persons awarded fellowships such stipends (including such allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such members and their dependents) as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs. In addition, the Commissioner will pay to the institution of higher education at which such person is pursuing his course of study an amount equivalent to $2,500 per academic year, less any amount charged such person for tuition and nonrefundable fees and deposits.

Limitation

The conference report adopts the provision of the Senate amendment which provides that no fellowship shall be awarded for study at a school or department of divinity, which means an institution or department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to enter upon some religious vocation.

Fellowship Conditions

The Senate amendment provided that a recipient must, in order to remain eligible for his fellowship payments, maintain satisfactory proficiency in, and devote essentially full time to, study or research in the field in which such fellowship was awarded, in an institution of higher education, and must not engage in gainful employment other than part-time employment which has been approved by the Commissioner.

The conference report adopts this provision with an additional requirement that part-time employment be related to the recipient's training.

Appropriations

The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation of such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this part. The conference substitute authorizes $40,000,000 for fiscal year 1966; $160,000,000 for fiscal year 1967; $275,000,000 for fiscal year 1968; and such sums for the 2 succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary to enable persons who have been awarded fellowships prior to July 1, 1968, to complete their study under the fellowships.

TITLE VI—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION

Part A—Equipment

Statement of Purpose and Authorization of Appropriations

The Senate amendment stated that the purpose of this part is to improve the quality of classroom instruction in selected subject areas in institutions of higher education, and authorized:

(1) The appropriation of $35,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1967, and $60,000,000 for fiscal years 1968, 1969 and 1970, to enable the Commissioner to make grants to institutions of higher education for the acquisition of equipment and for minor remodeling.

(2) The appropriation of $2,500,000 for fiscal year 1966, and $10,000,000 for fiscal years 1967, 1968, 1969, and 1970, to enable the Commissioner to make grants to institutions of higher education for the acquisition (including purchase or lease) of television equipment and for minor remodeling.

(3) The appropriation of not more than $1,000,000 for fiscal year 1966 and for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to make grants for the proper and efficient administration of State plans approved under this part, including expenses which he determines are necessary for the preparation of such plans.

The House bill contained no comparable provisions. The conference report adopts these provisions of the Senate amendment, but limits all of the authorizations to the first 3 years. For the fiscal years 1969 and 1970 only such sums may be appropriated as Congress hereafter authorizes by law.

Allotments to States

The Senate amendment provided that of the funds appropriated for any fiscal year for acquisition of equipment, one-half shall be allotted by the Commissioner among the States on the basis of the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education in each State. The remaining one-half would be allotted by the Commissioner among the States in accordance with a formula which would take into account the college enrollment of each State and its relative per capita income.

The Senate amendment provided that a State's allotment under the preceding paragraph would be available in accordance with the provisions of this part for payment of the Federal share of the cost of equipment and minor remodeling.

The Senate amendment also provided for reallotment of unused State allotments.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

State Commissions and Plans

The Senate amendment required a State desiring to participate under this part to designate for that purpose an existing State agency which is broadly representative of the public and of institutions of higher education in the State. If no such State agency exists, the State may establish such an agency. The agency so designated or established (hereafter referred to as the "State commission") must submit to the Commissioner a State plan for participation. The Commissioner must approve any such plan which meets the following requirements: The plan must provide that it shall be administered by the State commission. It must set forth, consistently with basic criteria prescribed by regulation (A) objective standards and methods for determining the relative priorities of eligible projects for the acquisition of specified laboratory and other special equipment, including minor remodeling of classroom or other space used for such materials or equipment; (B) objective standards and methods for determining relative priorities of eligible projects for (i) the acquisition of television equipment for closed-circuit direct instruction in specified fields (but not broadcast transmission equipment), (ii) the acquisition of necessary instructional materials for use in such television instruction, and (iii) minor remodeling necessary for such television equipment; and (C) objective standards and methods for determining the Federal share of the cost of each such project.

The plan must also provide (A) for assigning priorities solely on the basis of such criteria, standards, and methods to eligible projects submitted to the State commission and deemed by it to be otherwise approvable under the provisions of this part; and (B) for approving and recommending to the Commissioner, in the order of such priority, applications covering such eligible projects, and for certifying to the Commissioner the Federal share, determined by the State commission under the State plan, of the cost of the project involved. The plan must provide for affording to every applicant, which has submitted to the State commission a project, an opportunity for a fair hearing before the commission as to the priority assigned to the project or as to any other determination of the commission adversely affecting the applicant. Finally, the plan must provide for adequate fiscal control and fund accounting procedures and for the making of such reports as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions under this part.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Basic Criteria for Determining Priorities, Federal Share, and Maintenance of Effort

The Senate amendment provided that as soon as practicable after the enactment of this act, the Commissioner shall by regulation prescribe basic criteria governing the provisions of State plans setting forth standards and methods for determining relative priorities of eligible projects, and governing the application of these standards and methods to eligible projects. These basic criteria must be such as will best tend to achieve the objectives of this part while leaving adequate flexibility for the development of State plan standards and methods. The basic criteria must give special consideration to the financial need of the institution. Subject to the foregoing requirements, these regulations may establish additional and appropriate basic criteria.

The Senate amendment also provided that the Federal share for the purposes of this part would be 50 percent of the cost of the project, except that a State commission may increase this share to not more than 80 percent of that cost in the case of any institution proving insufficient resources to participate in the program under this part and inability to acquire such resources. An institution of higher education which obtains a grant for a project pursuant to this part in any fiscal year must agree to expend during that year for the same purpose an amount at least equal to the amount expended by such institution for that purpose during the previous fiscal year.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment, with one change which would permit the Federal share to be less than 50 percent.

Applications for Grants and Conditions for Approval

The Senate amendment provided that institutions of higher education which desire to obtain grants under this part shall submit applications at such times and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Commissioner.

The Senate amendment also provided that the Commissioner must approve an application covering a project under this part and meeting the requirements of the preceding paragraph if the following conditions have been met: (1) The project has been approved and recommended by the appropriate State commission; (2) the State commission has certified to the Commissioner the Federal share of the cost of the project, and sufficient funds to pay such Federal share are available from the applicable allotment of the State; (3) the project has been assigned a priority that is higher than that of all other projects within such State (chargeable to the same allotment) which meet all the requirements of this section and for which Federal funds have not yet been reserved; (4) the Commissioner determines that the project will be undertaken in an economical manner and will not be overly elaborate or extravagant; and (5) the Commissioner determines that the application contains or is supported by satisfactory assurances (A) that Federal funds received by the applicant will be used solely for the project covered by such application, (B) that sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal portion of such cost and to provide for the effective use of the equipment upon completion, and (C) that the institution will meet the maintenance of effort requirement.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Amount of Grant—Payment

The Senate amendment provided that upon his approval of any applications for a grant under this part, the Commissioner shall reserve from the applicable allotment the Federal share of the cost of the project covered by such application. The Commissioner's reservation of any amount under this section may later be amended by him.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Administration of State Plans

The Senate amendment provided that the Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan without first affording the State commission submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing. It also provided for terminating the eligibility of a State whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State commission administering the State plan, finds that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the requirements for State plans, or that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such requirement.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Judicial Review

The Senate amendment provided for judicial review if any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under this part or with his final action under the provisions relating to administration of State plans.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Limitation on Payments

The Senate amendment provided that nothing contained in this part shall be construed to authorize the making of any payment under this part for any equipment or materials for religious worship or instruction.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts a substitute for this provision prohibiting grants under this part for equipment or materials for sectarian instruction or religious worship, or primarily in connection with the program of a school or department of divinity.

Part B—Faculty development programs

Institutes Authorized

The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation of $5 million for fiscal year 1966, and for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years to enable the Commissioner to arrange, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education for the operation by them of short-term workshops or short-term or regular session institutes. These workshops and institutes would be for individuals who are engaged in (or preparing to engage in) the use of educational media equipment in teaching in institutions of higher education, or who are (or are preparing to be), in institutions of higher education, specialists in educational media or librarians or other specialists using such media.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment, but limits the authorization to 3 years.

Stipends

The Senate amendment provided that each individual who attends an institute operated under the provisions of this part shall be eligible to receive a stipend at the rate of $75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute, plus an additional stipend at the rate of $15 per week for each dependent. No stipends shall be paid for attendance at workshops. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

TITLE VII—AMENDMENTS TO HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

Authorization of appropriations

The House bill increased the authorization of appropriations for making grants under the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 for construction of undergraduate academic facilities for the fiscal year 1966 from $230,000,000 to $460,000,000. The Senate amendment increased the authorization to $330,000,000. The conference substitute adopts the House figure.

The doubling of amounts for the construction of graduate academic facilities contained both in the House bill and the Senate amendment is intended to stimulate construction at all graduate schools, including those offering programs leading to a first degree in law.

Eligibility for grants

The present act provides that one of the requirements a construction project must meet for approval is that it will result in an urgently needed substantial expansion of the institution's student enrollment capacity. The Senate amendment added, as an alternative, that it could result in such an expansion of its capacity to carry out extension and continuing education programs. The provision from the Senate amendment is included in the conference report, with an amendment making clear that the expansion of capacity must be for on-campus activities. The committee wishes to emphasize that the provisions of the existing act provide that special consideration will be given to projects designed to expand undergraduate enrollment capacity and that funds may only be used for the construction of "academic facilities."

Transfers of allotments

The Senate amendment contained a provision, not present in the House bill, which permitted, at the discretion of the Governor, the transfer of allotments for public community colleges and technical institutes to other public institutions of higher education, and the transfer of allotment for 4-year institutions to public community colleges and technical institutes. The conference agreed to a substitute under which either a State's allotment under section 103 for public community colleges and public technical institutes or its allotment under section 104 for other institutions could be transferred for use under the other section if the State commission has not received an application for grants under the section in question prior to January 1 of the year, and it requests such transfer.

Period of availability of funds

The Senate amendment provided that funds appropriated to carry out title II of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 would be available for 3 years, and makes funds appropriated for title III thereof available for 2 years. These provisions are included in the conference report.

Change in interest rates

The present law provides that loans for construction of academic facilities shall bear interest at a rate related to the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States forming a part of the public debt. The Senate amendment added a provision, which was retained in the conference report, under which the interest rate on such loans would not exceed 3 percent a year.

TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Definitions

The Senate amendment contained definitions of the terms "local educational agency", "State educational agency", and "elementary school". These terms were used in the provisions added by the Senate amendment which relate to fellowships for teachers and the National Teacher Corps.

The conferees, in adopting the provisions of the Senate amendment relating to teacher fellowships and the Teacher Corps, also adopted these definitions, but in doing so they omitted all reference to postsecondary vocational education in the definition of local educational agency.

Federal administration

The Senate amendment contained a provision permitting the Commissioner to contract out the printing of educational matter. The Senate receded.

Federal control of education prohibited

The House bill provided that nothing contained in this act or any other act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the membership practices or internal operations of any fraternal organization, fraternity or sorority, any private club or any religious organization of any institution of higher education.

The Senate amendment limited the application of the House provision to fraternal organizations, fraternities or sororities, private clubs or religious organizations at institutions of higher education, whose facilities were not owned by the institution of higher education and whose activities were financed by funds derived from private sources.

The conference committee agreed to a substitute for the House and Senate provisions which provides that nothing contained in this act or any other act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the membership practices or internal operations of any fraternal organization, fraternity, sorority, private club or religious organization at an institution of higher education (other than a service academy or the Coast Guard Academy) which is financed exclusively by funds derived from private sources and whose facilities are not owned by such institution.

ADAM C. POWELL,
CARL D. PERKINS,
EDITH GREEN,
JOHN BRADEMAS,
HUGH L. CAREY,
JOHN H. DENT,
SAM M. GIBBONS,
CARLTON R. SICKLES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I came before this House on August 27 to seek your support for the Higher Education Act of 1965, your response was overwhelmingly favorable—367 voted for passage; only 22 Members were against.

Today I bring this same bill back from conference tempered in the forge of 1 month's hard creative bargaining. Both Chambers and both sides of the aisle sought compromise with one goal in mind—the enactment this year of legislation that will revitalize the tired blood of our anemic colleges and universities and pump needy students into the all too upper class mainstream of academic life. I ask you to vote for this bill now as you already have done before.

The "care" package for higher education you will be approving contains contributions from Representatives, Senators, Republicans, and Democrats. It represents agreement by almost everybody, surrender by none. The House gave and got. Higher education in America will be the beneficiary of every change.

When Representatives prepare to engage in debate on an issue of national importance, they usually come armed with an arsenal of hard facts and stern logic, ready to meet every thrust and parry of the opposition. It is my sad duty today to report to this Chamber that my friends on the other side of the aisle are set to do intellectual battle without even knowing how properly to spell the name of the program they so vehemently attack. It is the "Teacher" Corps—not the "Teachers' " Corps.

Unfortunately for them and fortunately for us, their facts are no more accurate and their logic no more persuasive than their orthography. They have been informed by a colleague that the National Teacher Corps proposal contained in title V of the Higher Education Act would authorize $165 million to be spent over a 3-year period. I had assumed until now that we were all present at the same conference, for the bill I appended my signature to and which will be before you for consideration authorizes $100.2 million for 2 years. So much for reading, 'riting, and 'rithemetic.

The letter sent to all of our colleagues boasts of Republican solidarity against the Teacher Corps. It overlooked the fact that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] voted with us on this section of the act. It is my hope that even more Republicans will see the wisdom of this position and avoid being carried away by shibboleths.

I had thought that when we voted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act into law on March 26 of this year that at least 263 of us no longer saw red and stampeded at the slightest mention of Federal aid to education. Seven months ago 263 of us, many Republicans included, thought it fitting to allocate funds to pay for teaching personnel in elementary and secondary schools, for inservice training for teachers, for teacher institutes. What has happened since then to make it an anathema to help provide more and better trained teachers for these very same schools in the very same low-income areas?

It is not adequate to answer by stating that it is late in the session. It is even later in these schools, all too late to save some of the children unless we try our best this week, not January or February or March.

"Wait awhile," they caution, let the dangers be eradicated. What dangers are they referring to? The danger that the Federal Government will control local teachers? If I remember correctly it was the very same gentleman from Minnesota who suggested in conference that Corps members be paid directly by the Federal Government.

But where is this monster, this Federal control? Is it in the assignment of teachers to the school districts? No; they are free to accept and reject whom they will. They can refuse to participate in the program at all if they do not desire. The Federal Government only sees to the supply of available teachers, not to any demand component. The important fact to emphasize is that no school district—and I repeat— no school district—will receive a single teacher unless that school district requests such teachers and which it will supervise and can fire at will.

Does Federal control lurk in the supervision of the teachers? Not if the bill is read carefully. The local districts have the absolute, exclusive authority to assign the teachers within their systems, to determine the subject matter they will teach, to decide how long they will keep any teacher. If the boss is the man who hires and fires, then the local district is the boss, not the Commissioner of Education.

Is this mysterious danger present in federally paid for training of teachers? Then why do the same people who condemn this proposal willingly approve Federal fellowship and institutes under the National Defense Education Act and under the same title V of this bill? Inconsistency may be the hobgoblin of many minds, but there still is something to be said for intellectual clarity.

Is there a danger in routing Federal money through local educational agencies to the teachers? That would seem to be a major device for insuring that the teachers not bite the local hand that feeds them. That is what is currently and successfully being done with the VISTA volunteers who work in public schools.

Is there a booby trap in Federal recruitment of teachers? One of the needs that prompted this bill and was so starkly revealed in our hearings is the inability of many school districts to mount even the tiniest effective recruitment campaign. The teachers simply will not come to teach in tough areas as the system now functions. This program is designed to remedy this situation by relying upon one of the greatest American virtues—idealism.

We are not bribing persons to participate in the Corps by offers of fantastic salaries. They will earn in cash what their counterparts in the district in which they teach earn. But they will earn something more—a warm feeling of satisfaction in having tried to help where the need is greatest.

In line with the recognized problems posed by the Teacher Corps, I have asked the gentlewoman from Oregon, Representative EDITH GREEN, the distinguished chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Education, to maintain a continuing close scrutiny of the Teacher Corps as part of that subcommittee's investigation of the Office of Education. Hearings will begin shortly.

I want to take this opportunity to point out that we in the Education and Labor Committee are fully cognizant of the rapid changes taking place both in education in America and the Office of Education's administration of vast amounts of Federal funds. How well are these funds being administered? Is the Office of Education fulfilling its role as administrative watchdog of discriminatory practices in educational institutions receiving Federal funds? Is the Office of Education completely equipped within its administrative apparatus to shift from a comparatively unimportant agency to a major dispenser of Federal funds in American education? How professionally able and skilled are those administering the Office of Education? Does a cohesive ideological philosophy guide the Office of Education?

It is time to pause at this moment in our legislative deliberations and present to the Congress and the public a thorough and detailed picture of the operation of the Office of Education. Under Mrs. GREEN's subcommittee, this will be done.

I also want to state here today that the Senate conferees, in conference with the House for the higher education bill, agreed that it is now time for a joint Senate-House Committee on Education. Such a joint committee will be established in the next few weeks in cooperation with my distinguished and able counterparts in the Senate, Senators LISTER HILL and WAYNE MORSE.

The good qualities of this bill are manifest; its defects wildly overstated. As T. S. Eliot wrote:

> Where is the wisdom we have lost in knowledge? Where is the knowledge we have lost in information?

It is time to blow away the cloud of bombast that has surrounded this proposal, to ignore their nightmarish invocations of that old bogeyman, the Federal camel in the local tent. It is time to vote "nay" on the motion to recommit, and "aye" for final passage.

Mr. Speaker, what then does this revised bill contain? Title I, the provision encouraging institutions of learning to seek solutions for the problems faced by the communities they serve, is a perfect example of give and take. Even the name of the title has been changed to protect all parties concerned.

In fiscal year 1966 we will be authorizing $25 million—one-half of the House's previous figure—for community service and continuing education programs designed to aid our handling of crises in such areas as housing, poverty, employment, transportation, and health. In accordance with the Senate's wishes, community problems affecting rural areas will be encompassed by the program, although particular emphasis will be placed, as the House wanted it to be, on urban and suburban problems. The term "rural" is intended to refer to small mining communities and other nonfarm sections of the United States.

If any course offerings are to be funded under title I, they must be either of college level or acceptable toward a college degree, although participants might well include persons who lack high school diplomas, if their help is necessary in solving the problems under investigation.

Under no circumstances, however, do we intend to subsidize courses of the basket-weaving variety, which serve society only by filling people's idle time. It is the intent of the conferees that no funding of agricultural or home economics courses in rural areas be permitted, but that home economics offerings in urban and suburban areas could be supported. The use of the phrase "course offerings" as an example of one form of community service program is not meant to preclude the use of title I funds for workshops, meetings, or short-term institutes held in conjunction with an institution's continuing education program nor is it designed to prohibit funding of an institution's educational television offerings.

All of this was in accordance with the original House bill, as was the agreement to delete the reservation for grants for experimental approaches proposed by the Senate and the Senate prohibition against using fee-related funds to match Federal dollars. Although no money is specifically set aside for experimentation, it is expected that many States will allocate some of their resources for novel approaches to our age-old dilemmas, including interstate cooperative efforts to handle problems that transcend State boundaries. Actually, as this title stands, it is an experiment in its entirety.

While the bill permits the use of course fees for matching purposes, none of the conferees wants the cost of the courses to be borne entirely by the participating students, many of whom can ill afford to pay substantial tuition. To serve this objective, fees should be kept as minimal as is feasible, given the offering institution's financial condition.

The conferees determined to follow the Senate version in maintaining the Federal share of the cost of these programs at 75 percent for the first 2 fiscal years and at the same time, specifically requiring the colleges to continue their own financing of university extension and continuing education programs. To make absolutely certain that there will be no waste through duplication and that this new program will not merely be a carbon copy of the 50-year-old Agricultural Extension Service, the House conference members wholeheartedly accepted the Senate's creation of a National Advisory Council designed to coordinate all Federal extension and continuing education activities and services.

Our proposal for assistance to college libraries, library training, and research contained in title II is another excellent example of the fine art of mutual concession. Our authorizations for the purchase of library materials were identical, but both the House and the Senate versions of the act needed adjustment to assure that "the book gap" would be overcome or, at least, narrowed. To this end, the bill agreed upon would give each college in the country a basic grant of up to $5,000 on a matching basis and, in addition thereto, a nonmatching supplemental grant of up to $10 per full-time student with the allocation accent on the financial need of the institution with respect to its library resources. A minimal institutional contribution of $1,500 would be required as a token of good faith before the institution could qualify as a recipient of the supplemental grant.

The House conferees were willing to adopt the Senate's expansion of the category of institutional recipients of such aid to include branches located in different communities and offering college level programs which require library facilities. The distribution formula would work so as to allot 85 percent of the funds for library resources to the basic and supplemental grants, leaving 15 percent of the entire $50 million for special purpose grants to satisfy special national and regional needs and establish and strengthen joint use of combined library facilities. Our requirement of institutional consultation with State higher education agencies in carrying out this portion of the act was modified to a requirement of periodic informing.

The House $15 million authorization for library training and research was accepted by the Senate. None of the research grants are to be made to individuals. The training institutes for librarians which are currently being conducted under title XI of the National Defense Education Act will be phased out under that act and revived, perhaps in a new form, under this one, after June 30, 1967. The slightly stepped up Senate authorizations for the Library of Congress cataloging endeavors in fiscal years 1967 and 1968 have been adopted, as has the Senate permission for the Library to distribute bibliographic information by printing catalog cards.

Title III, the part to strengthen developing institutions, that is, smaller, inferior colleges that have been unable to provide quality education and are plagued by chronically inadequate teaching, course offerings, facilities, and equipment, was one of the major battlegrounds of the conference. The House had purposefully confined the operation of the title to 4-year institutions and accordingly limited the funds to $30 million for the first year. The Senate expanded the program to include junior colleges and a $55 million authorization.

The compromise we arrived at is intended to adhere closely to the original conception of the plan while, nonetheless, incorporating the Senate's inclusion of 2-year institutions and the Senate authorization. No institution can qualify as "developing" unless it meets the stringent standards described in the reports of both Chambers and unless it has been in existence for 5 academic years prior to its request to participate and receive assistance. It must either be accredited or making reasonable progress toward accreditation and, if a 2-year college, must have provided, for 5 academic years, a program acceptable for full credit toward a bachelor's degree. The conferees expect the Commissioner and the Advisory Council that will assist him to translate these standards into regulations that will make this title operative and effective only where there is a genuine need to upgrade the quality of instruction. In order to be certain that this title is functioning in the manner we would like it to, we have decided to review it next year before authorizing any appropriation for fiscal 1967.

Two other minor changes in this title should be noted. First, the House acquiesced in the Senate's specific inclusion of programs to strengthen the administration of developing institutions, since poor administration may prove to be a significant factor in causing their weakness. Second, we concurred in the Senate's determination that money should be available not only for scholars from the best colleges to teach at developing ones, but also for the flow of personnel to be routed in the other direction on this two-way street—for persons from developing institutions to study for advanced degrees at superior schools.

To many in the outside world who have been anxiously watching the progress of this bill through the Congress and hope, as I do, for its speedy enactment, title IV, authorizing a major multilevel program of student assistance, is the heart of this bill. It has come out of the conference essentially intact. The changes that have been made do not affect the basic tripartite structure of both the House and the Senate bills—the combination of outright grants of money with interest-subsidized, principal-guaranteed loans, and work-study earnings that will open the classroom doors to a whole new generation of young men and women who previously have been barred from going to college because their family resources were insufficient to sustain the great expense involved.

The grants will be labeled "educational opportunity grants" as we had originally called them, but they will be parceled out not under the National Defense Education Act, but through an independent program that will enable many colleges which, for various reasons, including matching requirements, have been unable to join in the defense act loans, to participate now. This expansion of the program was a contribution of the Senate's as was the option provision allowing institutions to transfer 25 percent of their grant funds to their National Defense Education Act student loan fund, if they preferred to make loans rather than outright grants. The grants would be supported by an authorized appropriation of $70 million in fiscal year 1966. This is the Senate figure.

The amount of grant that any individual could obtain would be ultimately determined in the context of his need and this not being financially able to pursue a course of study at the institution of higher education but for the grant. Within that framework, there would be a ceiling of the lesser amount of $800 per person or one-half of the total financial aid provided the student by the institution and by State or private scholarships, excluding work-study assistance. This maximum would be upped by $200 if the student is in the upper half of his class.

With the exception of this last bonus for excellence, all of these qualifications and limitations are taken directly from the House bill.

The allotment of scholarship funds among the States would be based on the National Defense Education Act formula as suggested by the House. There would be no optional transfer of Federal grant money to State scholarship programs, which the Senate had provided. The money—up to 5 percent of the grants—the Senate authorized each institution to spend on the bill-endorsed cooperative motivational program to identify qualified youths from low-income families and to encourage them to seek a higher education was deleted. It is, however, the expectation of the conferees that the financial backing necessary for the success of this program will be indirectly obtained through the efforts of the Office of Economic Opportunity in conducting its Project Upward Bound.

Part B of title IV establishing a comprehensive program of guaranteed, reduced interest loans was essentially the same in both bills and thus remains unchanged except in minor technical details. The Senate did add an amendment calling for a moratorium on repayment of federally guaranteed loans during a 3-year period while the student is a member of the Armed Forces or a Peace Corps volunteer. We accepted this because it is comparable to the moratorium in the National Defense Education Act, section 205(b)(2). We also agreed to hold the repayment requirement off for 9 months—not 6 months—in accordance with the Senate substitute and with the identical provision in the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965—H.R. 7743. An Advisory Council to help the Commissioner set up the policy lines to govern the implementation of this part was added by the Senate and we receded with the understanding that, in order to make sure that the loans will be available as soon as possible, the Commissioner need not have the regulations cleared by this Council. We further consented to the Senate's enlarging the category of institutions eligible to participate to include most nonprofit postsecondary educational institutions and to the Senate technical revisions to facilitate loans by Federal credit unions. There will be no overlap whatsoever with vocational student loans. The House specification that acceptable State and nonprofit guaranteed loan programs need only insure 80 rather than the Senate's 90 percent of unpaid principal was subscribed to by the Senate.

The work-study program contained in part C is no different than the one contained in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1965, which has already become public law. The Senate version was adopted for technical reasons. It also makes certain restrictions presently governing only off-campus work applicable to all work-study programs and permits institutions to pay their 10-percent, non-Federal share in the form of services and equipment. All the conferees want to be certain that the funds for this operation be controlled by the Office of Education, not the Office of Economic Opportunity.

In the course of the hearings on this act held by Mrs. GREEN's Special Subcommittee on Education serious problems in the collection of National Defense Education Act loans were pointed out. Various methods for tackling these problems were propounded and discussed, but no amendments to this end were tacked onto the House bill. The Senate, however, did add to its title IV certain amendments carefully tailored to achieve the goals of substantially lowering the delinquency rate and enabling institutions to establish sounder collection procedures. Since these amendments would achieve the identical objectives the House subcommittee had in mind, we decided to give our assent to them in the conference report.

The amendments would allow the colleges to recoup some of their loan administration costs by giving them up to the lesser of one-half of the estimated expenses or 1 percent of the aggregate of the outstanding loans made from the fund, thus providing the colleges with an incentive to intensify their collection efforts. They would reduce the 2-year, postcollege break before the borrower had to begin paying off principal to a pause of between 10 and 12 months depending on whether monthly, bimonthly, or quarterly payments were contracted for. The accrual of interest and payment of installments would be tolled for part-time as well as full-time students. There would be a minimum monthly repayment rate on National Defense Education Act loans of $15 per month per borrower. Colleges could charge small service fees to certain delinquent or tardy borrowers in order to spur them into timely repayment or prompt notification to the affected institution of factors changing their liability.

A major change would extend the loan forgiveness provisions to encompass teachers who serve in a full-time capacity in a public or other nonprofit elementary or secondary school with a high concentration of students from low-income families in the school district of a local educational agency eligible for educational assistance for children of low-income families under title II of Public Law 874, 81st Congress. This would serve to entice good teachers into such needy schools, since the forgiveness or cancellation rate would amount to 15 percent of the original total of the loan per academic year, although no borrower could receive any refund by reason of subsequent forgiveness of amounts already repaid. Eligible schools in which teachers desiring to have their loans forgiven might teach would be restricted to no more than 25 percent of the schools in a State.

The Senate also felt that it was advisable to broaden subject eligibility for support for special equipment and materials under title III of NDEA to include economics. An increase in the title III authorization of $10 million for the next 3 fiscal years would accommodate this broadening. Title XI short-term or regular session institutes for advanced study would be expanded to include institutes covering economics, civics, and industrial arts. A $17,250,000 increase is allotted for this purpose.

Title V of the conference report is new to the bill, although by no means new to our committee. We held 5 days of hearings on H.R. 9627, the National Elementary and Secondary Teacher Opportunities Act of 1965, which contained provisions quite similar to the ones the Senate inserted in this act. H.R. 9627 was approved by a voice vote of the full Committee on Education and Labor on August 26 and sent on to the Rules Committee. It has not been heard from since.

Title V of the conference report begins by creating an Advisory Council on Quality Teacher Preparation which would review the administration and operation of all of the programs carried out under title V and all other Federal programs for complementary purposes.

A major part of this title is devoted to the National Teacher Corps, a program whose operations were fully explained in every relevant detail by my colleagues, Messrs. PERKINS and BRADEMAS, yesterday. As it now stands, it appears that this is the only controversial portion of the bill. This controversy is a tempest in a teapot. The Federal control of local education that so many Republicans allege they have ferreted out is absolutely invisible from any reasonable point of view. I am unable to see how the Commissioner of Education or any other Federal official can force any school district to take a teacher of his choosing when the law specifically states that no teacher will go into any school unless the school district concerned both requests the presence of a Teacher Corps member and agrees to accept the particular team members who will work there. I am unable to understand how the Federal Government will be able to contol any Corps member's activities in a school district, when the law specifically gives the local districts the exclusive authority to assign the teachers wherever the districts choose within their systems and to determine the subject matter that will be taught. It escapes me how Washington is going to force any local school district to retain any Corps member already on the job, when the district is completely free to fire him in the same way that they fire any other teacher.

Where is this Federal hobgoblin? Where does he reside? In Federal teacher training? What are the National Defense Education Act fellowships and institutes all about, if not Federal teacher training? They have been in existence for 7 years and no one has voiced any loud objections to their continuance. Besides the training at stake here is only paid for by the Commissioner. It is to be administered by local colleges and universities. In Federal pay? There is none. Uncle Sam will not be signing a single Teacher Corps member's check. The hand that feeds him will be a local educational agency's hand.

All this much ado about nothing, about make-believe Federal control which is as real as a Halloween witch, completely ignores the excellences of this program—its attempt to attract into the teaching profession the brightest, most dedicated college graduates in this country, its effort to help the Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs get off the ground by providing experienced teachers where they are most needed and least likely to be available, its creation of a new type of on-the-job teacher training directed at teachers of the disadvantaged. It is time to be positive about the virtues of the Teachers Corps, not negative or defensive. This is a bill designed to help, not to harm.

Part C of title V is a skeleton idea contained in the Senate bill that has been fleshed out in the language set forth in H.R. 9627, sponsored by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS]. It would establish a program of 2-year fellowships for 4,500 elementary and secondary professional school personnel in fiscal year 1966, 10,000 in 1967, and 15,000 in 1968. The accent would be on high-quality substantive courses. The persons awarded fellowships would not be limited specifically to teachers but would also include persons engaged in the related professional vocations of, among others, teacher supervision and guidance, school library science, school social work, guidance and counseling, and special education for handicapped children. Up to 20 percent of the fellowships could and should be awarded to persons who have been displaced in their employment as professional employees of local educational agencies as a result of changes of school populations brought about by the enforcement of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, or the carrying out of the purpose of that act.

Equitable geographical distribution of the awards would be subordinated to any urgent national needs and to the general objectives of attracting into elementary or secondary education the cream of recent college graduates and college graduates who either left the field or have never entered as well as of encouraging experienced personnel to undertake graduate study. Fellowship stipends would be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs and, in addition, the institution attended by the fellow would receive $2,500 per fellow per academic year less any tuition or similar fee charged the fellow. Institutions who are participating in the fellowship program and want to develop and strengthen their graduate teacher training programs would receive appropriate assistance.

This concluding section of title V, while it was never part of the House bill, represents a significant accommodation on the part of the Senate to the views of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Title VI of the bill that came out of conference provides financial assistance, amounting to some $43½ million in this fiscal year and more in the 2 years thereafter, to improve the quality of undergraduate instruction through the use of the most modern laboratory and other special equipment, including audiovisual materials and nontextbook printed matter; $35 million would go into these equipment grants this year and the minor remodeling necessary to utilize these devices. The sum of $2½ million is allocated to closed-circuit television equipment and remodeling pursuant to the acquisition or lease of such equipment, and $1 million is for the administration expenses of State plans under the title and $5 million for educating the persons who will be employing this educational media equipment in the institutions, whether as teachers, specialists, or librarians. Institutes and workshops would be established by the institutions of higher education in order to develop the faculty equipped to handle such devices. This entire title was added by the Senate, but it was the unanimous opinion of the House conferees that it fulfilled the acute need for revising instruction methods to keep pace with the dizzying whirl of technological change.

The core of title VII amending the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is the amount of authorization for the construction of undergraduate academic facilities during the fiscal year 1966. The Senate agreed to accept our doubling of funds from $230 to $460 million and thereby recognized the burgeoning demand in this area for more and more aid. Bricks and mortar do not make a college, but without vital facilities no college can sustain high caliber education.

The House conferees were willing to adopt various Senate amendments to the 1963 act with certain House modifications. An alternative use of construction funds to finance a project that would result in the expansion of an institution's capacity to carry out extension and continuing education programs was subscribed to, with the understanding that such expansion would be strictly for on-campus activities and that special consideration would be given to projects designed to expand undergraduate enrollment capacity. Transfers of allotments from public community colleges and technical institutes to 4-year institutions, and vice versa, at the discretion of the State commission administering the State plan, was approved on the condition that the transfer be made only if the State commission had grant funds but no applicants in the relevant class as of January 1 of a given year. Another Senate amendment would permit funds appropriated for graduate facility grants and academic facility loans to remain available for 3 and 2 fiscal years, respectively, to enhance the prospects of fund raising. Finally, the interest rate on loans for classrooms, libraries, and laboratories would be reduced from 3⅞ to 3 percent to conform to the rate currently charged on college housing loans and prevent the anomaly of the facilities floor of a building being built at 3⅞ percent, while the dormitories cost 3 percent interest.

The final section of the bill, section 804, merely retains the thrust of the Waggonner amendment which I accepted on the floor in August—the prohibition against any Federal official's withholding funds under this or any other bill from an institution of higher education simply because a privately financed fraternity or sorority composed of students from that institution engaged in discriminatory practices. The section from the original bill has been reorganized to avoid the unintended result of nullifying any application of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to institutions of higher education and the Senate restrictive language employed to make certain that the fraternities or sororities involved really are private within the meaning of the 14th amendment and do not subsist on handouts from the institution in the form of cheap or no cost facilities.

The overall pattern of the bill as it has emerged from conference is thus quite mixed. The House adopted with alacrity those portions of the Senate bill which sought to service legitimate needs the House had inadvertently overlooked. By the same token, the House conferees steadfastly maintained their position on parts of the bill that the House, not the administration, had written. The result is a better bill in almost every way. Its duration is generally 3 years with the exception of the 1-year authorization of title III on developing institutions and the 2-year authorization for the Teacher Corps. Its cost for the first year, fiscal 1966, if the full authorizations are totaled, is somewhere in the neighborhood of $851 million. Its real value to the colleges and universities of these United States is incalculable.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRIFFIN. With reference to the Washington Post, the gentleman has incated that the Post was inaccurate yesterday. I should like to point out that it was not wholly accurate in its editorial today because, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor has indicated, the Post editorial this morning says that teachers in the Teacher Corps would be paid by the local districts. They may get their checks from the local districts, but I am sure the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor will agree with me that the money will come from the Federal Government. Is that correct?

Mr. POWELL. I agree 100 percent with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, a very valuable member of our committee. But that money goes to the local school district. The money paid to the teacher does not come from the Federal Government, and the local school district has the power to pay or not to pay—to hire and to fire. That is the way I believe education should be operated in this Nation. I do not believe in Federal control.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to my beloved friend, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER].

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. Section 804 of the Higher Education Act, which is the section having to do with Federal control of education and the prohibitions contained in the act, was amended on the floor of the House during the consideration of the legislation. The chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell], accepted an amendment which I offered at that time, calling attention to the fact then that he was the author on many occasions of the Powell amendment which I agree attempted to erase discrimination and made an honest effort to give protection to bona fide private organizations. The distinguished gentleman has made it abundantly clear that he never intended to penalize institutions because of the internal policies of bona fide private organizations.

The language in the conference report has been modified somewhat as compared to House language, inasmuch as the Senate adopted a little bit different version from that which the House adopted. In an effort to make legislative history and to clarify the subject in my own thinking, I should like to ask a couple of questions.

It is my understanding that under the amended language of the conference report, of section 804(b), privately owned facilities on long-term leased land would be exempt from any Federal supervision. Also, it is the intention of this language to prevent the subsidy of these organizations with public funds. Am I correct?

Mr. POWELL. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Then, to further prohibit the subsidy of these organizations, with public funds, a fair service and/or rental charge must be charged any organization which might use public facilities. Am I correct?

Mr. POWELL. Absolutely correct.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his clarification.

Mr. POWELL. I should like to read from page 55 of the conference report the amended language of the Higher Education Act of 1965 as it came out of the conference:

> (b) Nothing contained in this Act or any other Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the membership practices or internal operations of any fraternal organization, fraternity, sorority, private club or religious organization at an institution of higher education (other than a service academy or the Coast Guard Academy) which is financed exclusively by funds derived from private sources and whose facilities are not owned by such institution.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield further?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. When we talk about being financed exclusively through funds derived from private sources, we are talking about these organizations referred to rather than the institutions, are we not?

Mr. POWELL. Absolutely correct, yes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I think the language as amended is perfectly fair, and I thank the gentleman.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Price). Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 374]

Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Aspinall
Baring
Bell
Berry
Bolling
Callaway
Casey
Clausen, Don H.
Culver
Davis, Wis.
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Edwards, Ala.
Flynt
Ford, William D.
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Hagan, Ga.
Hosmer
Kastenmeier
Keogh
Leggett
Lennon
Lindsay
Mackay
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Mosher
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Poage
Pool
Reifel
Resnick
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Roudebush
Schisler
Sisk
Sullivan
Talcott
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tunney
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Willis
Wilson, Bob

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. Price). On this rollcall 373 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ayres].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to commend the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell]. In the years I have been on the committee more legislation has been passed out of that committee during this first session of the Congress than in any other session it has been my privilege to serve on the committee. Just what the effect of this legislation will be, of course, remains to be seen.

When we talk in the Congress about how many bills have been passed, oftentimes we neglect to mention the cost that goes along with the passage of these bills. Also just the enactment of legislation, although it sounds good on the surface, does not necessarily mean it is going to be proven to be good legislation.

As you all know, Mr. Speaker, we have passed out the antipoverty bill with an authorization of approximately $1,700 million. Already it has become apparent that this program is having many, many growing pains. In fact a special subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor is currently conducting a very thorough investigation of this program.

You will also recall, Mr. Speaker, that when that program passed the House there was a limited Governor's veto provision in connection with the bill. We went to conference and the House provisions were not included in the final legislation.

Now in the bill we have before us today, we are confronted, at least many of us are, with the identical position we were in on the conference report on the poverty bill. The House has not considered the so-called Teacher Corps. This was not in the House-passed bill. It was incorporated in the Senate bill. During the course of the conference, the Senate provision prevailed. The conference report that comes back to us today has the Teacher Corps provision in it.

In view of the fact that the House has not considered this and also in view of the fact that it has no direct connection with higher education, many of us feel that the Teacher Corps provision should be considered later on its own merits.

When the poverty bill came back in the conference report, a motion was made to send the conference report back to conference with the instruction that the House provision on the Governor's veto be incorporated. At that time it was argued that if the conference report was recommitted, it might possibly delay at least or perhaps kill the poverty program. Of course, we all know that was not the case. Now we hear the same rumors going around that if the motion to be offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] to send the higher education bill back to conference and delete the Teacher Corps provision prevails, it will kill the higher education bill. This is not the case. The conferees are still all in town. The conferees can be called together and whatever the majority of that conference decides, that will be what will come back to the House. That can be done if necessary in a matter of hours.

Regardless of how you feel on the Teacher Corps provision, I think we would all have to agree that this proposal should be considered on its own merits. That can be done and I am quite certain that our able chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor will see that that is done in the next session of the Congress.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] will discuss the pros and cons of the Teacher Corps. The only thing I want to make clear, Mr. Speaker, is that if Mr. Quie's motion prevails and the conference report is sent back to conference, with the instructions by a majority of the House membership that the Teacher Corps be deleted, this in no way jeopardizes the passage of the higher education bill in this session of the Congress. In fact, I will do my very best as the ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor and as a member of the conference to see that the bill is brought back as quickly as possible and certainly before the Congress adjourns.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are making a very grave mistake when we base the passage of legislation keyed to our anxiety to adjourn.

If this provision is bad, it should not be included; if it is good, it should be. But, either way, our position should not be based on the fact that we would all like to see this Congress adjourn.

I repeat. Adoption of Congressman QUIE's motion would not jeopardize final passage of the higher education bill in this session of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, on the seventh day, even the Lord sought rest.

Surely this Congress, as it nears its temporary sabbatical, shows signs of looking before it leaps, of pausing for the refreshment of contemplation, and of giving public affairs the benefit of a second thought. Whether this attitude is the result of weariness or wariness, it is long overdue.

We have enacted a flood of legislation dealing with education. If Federal law and billions of Federal dollars, plus the inevitable meddling and muddling of additional thousands of Federal bureaucrats, can solve all educational problems, the new age of enlightenment looms ahead. Only the worst pessimist would raise nagging problems. I hope my colleagues will pardon me for a few moments of pessimism.

We have now authorized far in excess of $50 million a year for educational research. Now, where do we find the researchers—notoriously in short supply—who can make a really profound, first-class contribution to basic knowledge about how people learn? A pessimist might suggest that we will end up paying for a good deal of third-class drivel.

We have now authorized thousands of additional Federal fellowships for graduate study, to add to the 50,000 or so graduate students already supported by Federal funds. Unfortunately, the additional fellowships do not solve the very difficult problem of the acute shortage of first-rate people to initiate, expand, and conduct graduate programs in our universities. If anything, it makes the problem even more acute, which again raises the question of whether by such quantity we do not seriously dilute quality.

In our Elementary Secondary School Act we authorized $100 million a year for supplementary education centers, but I do not think any of us have the faintest notion of where the experienced teachers and counselors are to be found for these centers in the face of a shortage of these people. I might add that the poverty program, with its unlimited expense account and fat salaries, is in heavy competition for the same people needed in our schools, particularly our vocational schools.

Once again, without much thought given to the problems, we are asked to approve a huge Federal Teacher Corps, composed in large part of experienced teachers who are in short supply. May I ask, Mr. Speaker, "Where are the teachers coming from?"

The question answers itself. They are coming from classrooms which will then have to be handled by a replacement, if one can be found. Experienced teachers already have jobs. In effect, the Federal Government proposes to remove a large number of them from the classrooms where they now teach and redistribute them in other classrooms, thereby refining the proverb of robbing Peter to pay Paul; we shall rob Peter to pay Peter.

Somehow this does not make a great deal of sense. Any experienced teacher licensed to teach in New York State who wishes to teach in central Harlem probably can get a job there. The National Teacher Corps offers to do no more than that. However, just to raise another problem, if a New York teacher wants to join the Teacher Corps to teach in a poor school in Mississippi—assuming this would meet with the approval of the local school board—she would have to do so for a Mississippi salary. The advantage to the teacher—however motivated by dedication to children—is hard to find.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal just has not been thought out and examined sufficiently for us to enact it into law. I join my colleagues on this side in urging that we send the bill back to conference with instructions to remove this one section. It is a large, complex, and in many ways experimental piece of legislation. It adds more responsibility on an already overloaded agency. It is enough to digest without including a program as controversial as a federalized Teacher Corps.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, since it is widely acknowledged that it will take us several years to correct the mistakes and flaws in the mass of legislation we have enacted, should not we simply avoid this one mistake now?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I wish to commend the gentleman for a statement that should be heard and understood around the country. Somehow or other, unfortunately, many of the organizations interested in higher education around the country have gotten the impression—I do not know where they got it—that a vote for the motion to recommit with instructions to strike out the Federal Teachers Corps will, somehow, be a vote to kill the higher education bill. The gentleman from Ohio served with me as one of the House conferees. I know he agrees with me that there is no justification at all for any conclusion that the higher education bill would be killed by a vote to recommit. The climate of the conference did not indicate that we would have no higher education bill if the motion to recommit is adopted. In fact, I believe, along with the gentleman from Ohio, that there is every reason to believe we would be back with a conference report, without the Teachers Corps within a few hours if the House were to stand up on this issue today. Does the gentleman agree with that statement?

Mr. AYRES. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan. There is no sense in any delay.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. There would be no conference unless the chairman of the House conferees agrees to go back to conference.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Do I correctly understand by the statement of the distinguished chairman that he would not go back to conference, and that he would be responsible for killing the bill if the motion to recommit were adopted?

Mr. POWELL. No, I am stating that no conferees go back to conference unless the chairman of the House conferees and the chairman of the Senate conferees agree.

With regard to killing the bill, every single Member of the other body who belongs to the distinguished gentleman's party signed this report, and every single one of them voted for the Teacher Corps. Only three votes in the other body were against it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I do not think that is the point.

Mr. POWELL. That is my point.

Mr. AYRES. I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman that the Senators were unanimous in their position, but I have never felt that merely because the other body was unanimous, this part of the legislative branch of the Government should be secondary. I think we not only have an obligation but we certainly have equal power when it comes to voicing our views.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman has talked for several minutes and I have listened attentively to what he has said. Though he has talked about the Teacher Corps, he has not stated his reasons for opposing it. As a former teacher, I would be interested to know what is wrong with it.

Mr. AYRES. I am glad my friend from Ohio is on the floor, because, as I announced in my opening remarks, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] will go into the details of the proposed legislation.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I appreciate the gentlemen yielding. I am sure that the gentleman would agree that we have a higher education program in this country primarily because of the bipartisan efforts of people such as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], the gentleman in the well [Mr. AYRES], and others who have worked very hard to develop a higher education program.

I was rather amazed to hear the chairman of our committee imply, as he clearly did, that if he did not have his way with reference to the Teacher Corps, he was willing to kill the higher education program, in which we believe so deeply.

The issue before the House today is not whether we are for or against the higher education bill. It is whether we are for this new Teacher Corps that has been added by the Senate and which was never adopted or considered in the House.

I wish to say to the gentleman that it is bad enough that we in this House at times seem to be a rubber stamp to the Executive, but I hope we will never reach the point where we automatically rubber stamp what goes on in the other body, whether it is the action of 100 Senators or fewer.

Mr. AYRES. I agree with the gentleman. When the gentleman from Minnesota makes his motion, the House will have an opportunity to determine whether or not they want to be considered merely a rubber stamp for the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the Federal Teacher Corps program added on to the Higher Education Act by the other body. Let me speak to some of the arguments made by proponents of the Federal Teacher Corps.

First. They point out that a teacher must be requested by the local school district. I will grant that, but the district can only request teachers who have been previously selected and trained by the U.S. Commissioner of Education according to standards established by him.

Second. They argue that once a Federal teacher is assigned to a local school he will be subject to local school authority. This is all but irrelevant, for the point is that local schools must make "arrangements" for the use and deployment of such teachers, "arrangements" that will be dictated by the one who has the money, the Commission of Education. Furthermore, the Commissioner will determine which school districts among those which have "concentrations of children from low-income families," will actually get the teachers.

Third. The proponents argue that a school district superintendent can fire a Federal teacher if he wishes. I suppose that is true, but he cannot fire a teacher from the Federal Teacher Corps. Teachers in a Federal Corps will not be in the same position as other teachers in a local school system because, in the final analysis, they are subject only to the control of the U.S. Commissioner of Education.

A federally selected, federally trained, and federally assigned corps of teachers would give Federal officials a powerful additional lever of control and direct influence over local schools. Suppose, for example, a local school district asks for a mathematics teacher who will teach mathematics in the traditional way. The Commissioner is likely to say: "Sorry, but our math teachers in the corps teach the new mathematics, and you will have to adopt the new system if you want to assign federally paid teachers to your district." The possibilities for Federal control must be obvious.

If one reads the Teacher Corps provisions carefully, he will find that the U.S. Commissioner will have sole authority to decide which school districts get this assistance. He needs no State approval, and he will have to consult with State education agencies only if he deems it appropriate.

This proposal is not only dangerous—it is impractical. Experienced teachers are not easy to find and they are already employed. The Federal Government will be luring a teacher from one area in order to assign a teacher in another area of the country.

The proposal has not been given enough consideration. It should be stricken from the higher education bill.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Of course, I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. POWELL. The gentleman is not totally accurate. The Commissioner will make the arrangements with the local school board, and the local school board will have the power to control and the power to fire immediately upon the arrival of the teacher.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, but I still say that in subparagraph 3 of section 513 the Secretary would be authorized to enter into arrangements; he could determine what those arrangements would be in advance, and in those arrangements, if he saw fit to do so, he could set forth the conditions under which the teacher would teach.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, it is not easy for me to stand before you and object to a higher education bill. I have worked hard for higher education legislation since I have been in Congress. I take pride in the influence I have had on higher education legislation. I wish I could stand before you and say that I agree with all of this conference report. Now, I realize it is not usual to fully agree with all details of legislation. I recognize that the majority prevails, and I have to take some things that I do not approve of. I do this as I go along.

However, the National Teacher Corps is too much to swallow. I cannot accept this higher education bill with the National Teacher Corps in it. Can you, as a fellow Member of the House, accept a National Teachers Corps? Can you go back home and say to your constituents, "We gave ample consideration to the National Teacher Corps after studying it thoroughly, that is, after the subcommittee studied it, after the full committee studied it, and after consideration on the floor of the House, and I decided it was good"? No, you cannot do it, because the subcommittee heard testimony on this bill for only 1 day.

On that day they heard from one person who came to testify on it. That was the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON]. The other people who appeared that day were asked about it but had not given it any prior study. That is the amount of consideration that was given to it in the subcommittee.

Now, what did we do in the full committee? Did we debate it and read the bill and go over it section by section? No. We gave 5 minutes to it in the full committee. Five minutes. Then it was reported out and the House never brought it up or considered it. So we have a bill before us today where you are being asked to buy a pig in a poke. Members of the House have never had a chance to give it consideration.

This conference report, which accepted the Senate language, is different. It is different from the bill which came out of the House committee. It is different to this extent: The conference report which we have before us provides that the Federal Government will pay 100 percent of the salaries of the teachers in the school districts. One hundred percent.

Now, under the bill that came out of the House subcommittee, the local school district would have paid for the salaries. I am concerned about this because I believe the amount of Federal control and Federal influence over our school systems which we can see here by the Federal Government paying the entire bill, is too great. When you talk about Federal control, I get the impression that you people who say there is no control at all, believe that the only way there would be control, is if the Federal Government stood there with a whip and said, you do this or else.

The Federal Government here will pay 100 percent of this bill. Think of the carrot that this places before every school district to bring in these Federal teachers. Just think of the idea of getting the additional teachers for which the school district will not have to put up 1 red cent. That is what is being offered to the school district, and I am concerned about it. Think of what the Federal Government did this year. We passed in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Public Law 89-10, a provision of which sets up Federal local schools where the Federal Government will again pay the salaries, will pay 100 percent of the schools and will have set up an arrangement of Federal-local schools.

We have already taken such a large leap toward Federal influence in our local school systems that we had better stop, look, and listen. This to me is the most dangerous step we would take this year if we pass a Federal National Teacher Corps.

I am not the only one who feels this way about it. Evidently the administration felt that way about it until they put pressure on us to accept the Senate National Teacher Corps.

In the report they put out on the question of whether the Federal Government should pay the entire cost of the teachers' salaries or not, I would like to read to you from the administration's statement. Here is what they say:

> Local districts should be required to give some support to the corps as an indication of their belief in it. Otherwise there will be a strong tendency for school districts to apply for the "free ride" taking all the experienced Teacher Corps volunteers they can get, all paid for by Washington.

I did not say this, the administration said this. Then they go on to say:

> We believe that it is an unwise precedent for the Federal Government to begin paying 100 percent of the salaries of local employees. While the administration is concerned with the improvement of teachers' salaries wherever they are inadequate, we question the wisdom of a precedent in which the Federal Government could ultimately be held responsible for 100 percent of the salaries of some 2 million local employees.

And they go on further and say:

> We also believe it would be better from the viewpoint of internal control of personnel—

Listen—

> from the viewpoint of internal control of personnel for the school district to be making the major payment of teachers' salaries.

This is not me saying this; it is the administration. People all over this government are concerned about the Federal Government's involvement in education and what can be done by executive decree. We all know what the Commissioner did in Chicago. He withheld $30 million because he did not like the way Chicago had located their school buildings and only after political pressure from the Mayor, did Commissioner Keppel send in the $30 million.

We also see in the Congressional Record of yesterday a letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in which he indicates that there is going to be an opportunity for the local school district to select the teachers in the Corps. However, the law, if you pass this conference report, will say that the Commissioner is authorized to select experienced teachers, and inexperienced teacher-interns.

I quote from section 513(a)(1):

> For the purpose of carrying out this part, the Commissioner is authorized to—(1) recruit, select, and enroll experienced teachers, and inexperienced teacher-interns who have a bachelor's degree or its equivalent, in the Teacher Corps for periods of up to two years.

Now it is most interesting to note that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Gardner's letter does not coincide with the bill which is before us. It is also interesting to note that the letter of Mr. Gardner quoted by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Perkins], in yesterday's Record supposedly dated October 15, is different from another letter dated October 15 by the Secretary, and the differences are these: The first letter said:

> We will assure the maintenance of local responsibility in the selection of the members of the Corps team by: (a) Asking the local school district to indicate the types of teacher qualifications that would be most desirable in the teaching team they are requesting; and (b) requiring the local school district's approval of individual team members proposed by the Teacher Corps.

The second letter which was placed in the Record yesterday stated:

> The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will seek to guarantee maximum participation of local school authorities by: (a) Requesting them to indicate the teacher qualifications they judge to be desirable; and (b) submitting to them for approval the names of individual Teacher Corps members who are available for service.

In the first letter he said:

> The local school district thus will have the right not only to indicate the type of Corps member desired in their local school situation, but will also have the right to reject any Corps member they feel is undesirable.

In the second letter it states:

> The local school district retains full authority to select and reject, to appoint and fire those recruited through the Teacher Corps program.

If the position of the administration can change that fast before the bill is passed, you can imagine what can be done by the Commissioner if the National Teacher Corps is passed into law. He will recruit, select, and enroll experienced teachers and inexperienced teacher-interns—that is what the law says, and he will seek cooperative higher educational institutions to get the people trained and into the program which will give them the kind of training he wants; the school districts will have the opportunity then to accept the teachers and interns or not, but the Federal Government will hold out the carrot and pay 100 percent of the bill.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POWELL. Will there be any teachers in the Teacher Corps sent into any school district where the school district does not want them?

Mr. QUIE. The chairman is absolutely correct. No teacher will go into any school district unless the school district wants him. What I am pointing out here is that the Federal Government puts up all this money, 100 percent of the salaries, and, mind you, these teachers are not going to be paid exactly what their colleagues in the school system are going to be paid. The only one who will be is the experienced teacher, if you can find someone in the school system with similar teaching duties. Otherwise there will have to be some arrangement made.

Second, an experienced teacher who is leading a teaching team shall be compensated at a rate agreed to by such agency and the Commissioner. When the Commissioner pays the entire salary, who is going to have the decision on the rates of pay?

Third, the teacher-intern shall be compensated at a rate which is equal to the lowest rate paid by such agency for teaching full time in the school system. But then it goes into subsection (b) of section 514 and says:

> For any period of training under this part the Commissioner shall pay to members of the Teacher Corps such stipends—

And, mind you, those interns will be in training in the Corps for 2 years, as you can read in section 513(a) (1) and (3). Let me repeat again—section 514(b):

> (b) For any period of training under this part the Commissioner shall pay to members of the Teacher Corps such stipends (including allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such members and their dependents) as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported training programs.

As you note, the stipend shall include allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such members and their dependents. The above evidently applies to anyone in training. This is the experienced teachers and interns during their original 3-month training period, and since the interns are to be in training for the total 2 years, it evidently applies to them during this entire time. The remaining provisions under section 514 apply to all in the Teacher Corps.

Subsection (c) reads:

> The Commissioner shall pay the necessary travel expenses of members of the Teacher Corps and their dependents and necessary expenses for the transportation of the household goods and personal effects of such members as are directly related to their service in the Corps, including readjustment allowances proportionate to service.

Subsection (d) reads:

> The Commissioner is authorized to make such arrangements as may be possible, including the payment of any costs incident thereto, to protect the tenure, retirement rights, participation in a medical insurance program.

So you can see, the National Teacher Corps will not be compensated exactly the same as local teachers, and with this amount of money even greater than local teachers would receive, it would be quite an inducement for local school districts to accept what the Federal Government decides is the kind of Teacher Corps this country ought to have operating in the local school districts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] knows, I have been privileged to serve in this House of Representatives for a number of years and during that time I had the opportunity of serving in this House of Representatives under the late great Speaker of the House, the Honorable Sam Rayburn. I recall so vividly and so many, many times having heard him say that never would he agree to the principle of Federal money paying teachers in these United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I always applauded the late Speaker Rayburn for this and I know that he stood firm in this conviction through the many, many years that he served as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to offer a motion to recommit, to send the bill back to conference again, with the instruction that the Teacher Corps be dropped. If we do this, I shall support strongly and wholeheartedly the conference report. I shall work with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle next year to develop a system of helping train teachers to go into the culturally and educationally deprived areas and teach the preschoolchildren where this program ought to be carried out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend to the attention of all the Members of the House the remarks that have just been made by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota has demonstrated by his record his commitment to Federal programs to help the field of higher education.

Mr. Speaker, it is largely due to the gentleman from Minnesota, and a few others who rose above many other considerations, that we have a higher education program today.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's statement is an eloquent one, because it points out how far we have gone from the initial principles that were laid down when we established a higher education program.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about teachers paid for 100 percent by the Federal Government, going into our high schools and our other schools to teach.

I would like to further point out that there is a section in here, section 516, that I know our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are going to point to, and it is the usual kind of provision. It is entitled "Local Control Preserved." It cites the powers that the local school officials will have. But, Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of the House to not neglect the phrase or clause that comes just before the listing of those four powers, and I quote:

> Except as otherwise provided in clause 3 of section 513(a) such agency shall retain the authority to—

And lists the four powers.

Mr. Speaker, clause or section 513(a) is the section which gives the power to the Commissioner to make such arrangements as he deems appropriate in making these grants and in setting up these teachers.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman will agree with me that all the powers guaranteed to local agencies are subject to the arrangements made by the Commissioner, and the power of the Commissioner to make those arrangements.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. QUIE. I yield further to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question in terms of legislative history, if I may.

Is there anything with reference to the Teacher Corps program here which refers to whether or not the teachers in the Teacher Corps, and paid 100 percent by the Federal Government, may serve in private as well as public schools?

Mr. QUIE. Yes, it provides that the teachers will serve in the primary, elementary, and secondary schools as well.

This is section 513(d), where it says—

> A local educational agency may utilize members of the Teacher Corps assigned to it in providing, in the manner described in section 205(a)(2) of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, as amended, educational services in which children enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools can participate.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman for his answer. It is a matter of legislative history, and I want to commend the gentleman again for his very forceful statement.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 375]

Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Aspinall
Baring
Bell
Berry
Bolling
Callaway
Casey
Celler
Clausen, Don H.
Corman
Culver
Davis, Wis.
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Edwards, Ala.
Flynt
Ford, William D.
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Hagan, Ga.
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Hosmer
Keogh
Leggett
Lennon
Lindsay
Mackay
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Mosher
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Poage
Pool
Reifel
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Sisk
Staggers
Sullivan
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tunney
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Willis
Wilson, Bob

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). On this rollcall 370 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the Teacher Corps.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that this time has been yielded to me so that I may outline my strong support for the Teacher Corps features of the higher educational bill conference report. The other aspects of the bill have been thoroughly reviewed. Since the Teacher Corps is the major item of controversy, and will be the subject of the motion to recommit, I want to set forth the reasons why I feel it is vital to establish the Teacher Corps.

As a former teacher, I would like to outline what this program would mean for West Virginia. During the first year of operation, 50 to 60 teachers could be recruited and assigned to West Virginia, with 100 to 120 being made available the second year. With the county school boards having full authority to hire and fire, and the Federal Government only paying the salaries of these highly trained teachers, I think the argument of Federal control or interference is a false one. Full control would be retained by the school board at the local level.

WEST VIRGINIA SCHOOLS WILL BENEFIT

Now on the positive side, I would like to point out how the Teacher Corps can directly benefit West Virginia schools. In our State, there are about 439,000 elementary and secondary school children taught by 16,400 hard-working and dedicated school teachers—most of whom do not receive as much of a salary as they really deserve. Throughout our Nation, under ideal circumstances, an equal education is afforded to all. But let us face it, there are some schools whose limited facilities and environment prohibit them from offering the same educational advantages and experiences to their students as those schools who can afford the very best in modern equipment, methods, and facilities.

We need a reserve of well-trained, enthusiastic teachers who can serve where they are needed, and they certainly are needed in localities which have been least able in the past to attract the best teachers. In various sections of West Virginia, these teachers of a high caliber could go to areas plagued by problems, and then work under the direction of local school officials who know best our needs and also need extra help to meet these needs.

SPECIAL SKILLS IN NEEDIEST SCHOOLS

A Teacher Corps gives us an opportunity to recruit on a national basis those dedicated teachers who have the special knowledge and skills to serve in our neediest schools.

Teacher teams will go into local school districts when their services are requested—and only when requested.

The local school district will specify its needs in teacher skills—a team can be shaped to fit those needs—and the local school administrations will be provided an opportunity to review the files of potential team members and make its own selections. No Corps member will be forced upon any district.

NO FEDERAL DICTATORSHIP IN TEACHER CORPS

Teacher Corps members, once assigned to a school district, will serve as local employees, subject to the authority of local school administrations. They are not Federal employees.

Teacher Corps members will be paid at a level in keeping with the pay for other teachers in the same school system. Interns will get beginner's pay.

School administrators are finding it increasingly difficult to staff the schools attended by large numbers of disadvantaged children with top-quality teachers. But recruitment for Teacher Corps volunteers will be for a period of 2 years. Hence it is possible that hard-pressed schools will have, at the end of 2 years, as many as five excellent, experienced teachers who might well remain on the job as ex-volunteers.

As a nation we are spending $39 billion a year or more on education. The cost of the Teacher Corps, an investment in children, can only be measured against the far greater costs of neglect and all the resultant social and economic ills associated with poverty and lack of education.

Of far greater significance than the cost are the benefits that will accrue to our country when youngsters who might have been cast aside become, instead, valued members of our society.

A CROWNING ACHIEVEMENT IN EDUCATION

The 89th Congress, which has accomplished so much in new strides for education, can—with the same sense of mission that we are seeking in our teachers—help perfect a good year's work with approval of the Teacher Corps and the entire Higher Education Act.

Mr. Speaker, this is a reasonable and sensible approach to the problem of enriching our teaching staffs. I cannot see any value in the arguments raised against it. Above all, I cannot agree that the Higher Education Act should be placed in jeopardy because of misunderstandings and misreadings of the Teacher Corps proposals.

I intend to continue to support this fine piece of legislation and I sincerely urge every Member of the House to join me in this effort.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, a member of the committee [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report and especially in favor of the concept of the Teacher Corps.

The Teacher Corps is a logical and necessary extension of the purposes of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which we passed earlier in this session of Congress. That act struck hard at the problems of the urban and rural slum schools. And we still have a long way to travel before all those problems are solved.

But the Teacher Corps is clearly consistent with our earlier legislative achievement and deals directly with the most pressing problem of the slum school: good teachers.

The Teacher Corps has two great objectives: to bring dedicated teaching help to depressed urban and rural areas where it is needed the most, and to attract able and idealistic young Americans into the teaching profession.

Many Americans young and old have responded successfully to the challenge of doing a difficult and useful job in service organizations at the local, State, and national levels. Probably the most obvious example is the Peace Corps, but there are many others, too. The Teacher Corps offers a similar challenge.

I am completely assured that the Teacher Corps will be made up of experienced teachers as well as able young college graduates. Its members will volunteer for 2 years of service and professional training.

We are not looking forward to putting green, untrained teachers into our most needy schools and then just leaving them there. As every Member here knows, we have quite enough of that going on already in our home States and home districts because of the great pressures of enrollment and the teacher shortage in general.

But under the Teacher Corps, we will have at least nothing less than college graduates go into our schools and our classrooms as teacher interns. And we will at least give each one of them an additional 3 months of intensive training at a university center. Then these interns will work in small, teaching teams led by an experienced teacher.

All Corps members will teach part of the time and spend the other part of their time attending seminars conducted by the faculties of cooperating universities. Corps teachers may also take additional university work to help them earn an advanced degree by the end of their 2-year Teacher Corps service.

It is increasingly apparent to me that we must make every effort to attract the most capable and the promising young Americans into the teaching profession. Last month the national supply of new teachers fell 118,000 short of the 248,000 we really needed. This shortage is most acute in the schools of our city slums and depressed rural areas.

The Teacher Corps will help fill the ranks of the teaching profession, yes. But it will also offer a worthy challenge to idealistic young Americans, providing them with valuable classroom service and professional training. It will also help place dedicated teachers in those very slum schools where they are needed most.

No other legislation enacted or contemplated by this Chamber contains provisions to meet this pressing problem of quality teacher supply.

The Teacher Corps may be a new program, but it does not contain untried ideas. The internship method of teacher training has been widely accepted for the past 70 years. The paid intern-team approach has been in operation at Cardozo High School here in Washington for 2 years. Nearly 200 other such programs are now operating in local schools around the country.

We are not legislating an experiment here. We are legislating what the schools want—what they need—and what they actually use today, despite the great pressures of limited money and time.

I am convinced that the Teacher Corps puts tested—not untested—ideas to work and so I support it wholeheartedly. I am convinced that its object is to train teachers for our disadvantaged children and we are already on public record as knowing this to be a great national need.

And I am also convinced that the Teacher Corps—without violating any of the rights and prerogatives of local school administration and control—that the Corps will make available these teachers to those districts where they are desperately needed.

I support this measure and I urge all my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished colleague from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the legislation before the House today and particularly that portion of the bill providing for a National Teacher Corps.

I feel there is a great need for this National Teacher Corps because of the unfortunate displacement of many Negro teachers by the changing conditions of our educational system. This distressing situation, which has thrown hundreds of Negro teachers out of jobs, and which threatens to displace thousands of Negro teachers in the very near future, has been directly caused by the desegregation of our schools.

As one of the first introducers of this legislation in the House, my feeling was and is that something must be done to raise the educational level of all of our teachers especially those who were threatened by the loss of their jobs by the desegregation of schools.

Dr. Gilbert Porter, former president of the Florida State Teachers Association, the Negro teachers organization in my State, pointed out in a meeting this summer that between 1,000 and 1,500 Negro teachers faced displacement because they did not have the qualifications to score 500 or higher on the national teachers examination, which is a requirement under Florida law for all Florida teachers.

I believe a National Teachers Corps would help guard against these displacement problems not only in Florida and other Southern States, but also throughout school systems across the country. I also believe that the mere fact that there are over 1,000 teachers in my State who cannot make an acceptable score on the national teachers examination is evidence that this National Teacher Corps was needed long ago.

The charge that this Teacher Corps would establish a federalized teaching system is unfounded. The authority to employ and dismiss teachers is retained by the local school boards.

What we are trying to do is to upgrade the teaching abilities of those who are threatened by displacement and to help Negro and white teachers provide for quality education in all our schools, insofar as this limited measure can accomplish this large objective.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI], a member of the committee.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, including the Teacher Corps on which the committee has done such an effective job.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon [MRS. GREEN], who has done a remarkable job in the field of higher education as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Higher Education and who is the author of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to our very distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Oregon has done such an excellent job in the field of higher education that it is my desire as chairman of the full committee to ask her to look into the Teacher Corps in depth. As we pass it today, it will only be for 18 months. In general, we have reached a Federal commitment to education which has grown from $450 million, when we started together as a committee, to $5.2 billion. This is the equivalent of the appropriation for NASA. I would like the gentlewoman to look into the entire Office of Education, and to support, if she will, a tentative agreement that the chairman has reached with the chairman of the committee in the other body, that we should set up, if the Congress agrees next year, a joint committee of the Senate and the House to look into the whole field of the expenditure of $5.2 billion for education.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the very able and gracious chairman of the committee. Of course, I wholeheartedly support his suggestion that there be a joint legislative committee of the House and the Senate on education, and I think through such cooperative efforts there could be accomplished the elimination of a great deal of overlapping and duplication. Also I am very pleased that the chairman has asked my subcommittee to look into the Teacher Corps and to start this study immediately.

There are criticisms and there are questions raised about this, and I think some of the criticisms are legitimate.

May I say, as one of the previous speakers has indicated, that hardly ever would a conference committee come out with everything that every member of the conference committee likes. When I weigh the advantages of this total conference report and the disadvantages it seems to me that the House would be well advised to support the higher education bill.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MATHIAS. The gentlewoman has referred to the fact that there are questions with regard to the Teacher Corps. One question which is settled on the surface but, in my opinion, is not settled securely is whether or not the pay, the compensation of members of the Teacher Corps would affect the salary scales of local teachers or would disrupt the pay arrangements of local boards of education.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I must say that I had intended to spend the time which the chairman yielded to me on other parts of the bill, because I think the House deserves an explanation of the conference agreement and also the other titles need the attention of the House as does the Teacher Corps. I had intended to leave the matter of the Teacher Corps explanation to the gentleman from Indiana the chief proponent in the House. But since the gentleman from Maryland has asked the question, and as I have discussed this with the chairman, and certain facts have led to the chairman's recommendation that my subcommittee look into this during the next few months, I must say to you in all honesty that the Teacher Corps provisions has been my chief concern over the higher education conference report. My subcommittee never even considered this Teacher Corps. We never had any hearings on it. Another subcommittee did consider it, however.

I do agree with the gentleman who spoke recently, the very distinguished member of the committee from Minnesota. There might very well be different salaries set up that would be paid within the local school district. I think that this is really one of my deepest concerns about this. I think that the ultimate goal, the purpose of having a Teacher Corps that would go into areas where there are disadvantaged children is very appealing on the surface—and certainly we know there is a shortage of teachers. But this must not be bought at the high price of ruining local salary schedules and destroying the morale of local permanent teachers who stay on the job not just for 2 years but for 20 and who are just as dedicated and contribute fully as much—if not more. However, the gentleman, I believe, is correct that the "leader teacher" of the Teacher Corps would have a salary which would be negotiated between the Commissioner of Education and the local educational agency, and it might or might not be the same as the local salary schedule would indicate. The chairman of the committee is absolutely right that the local school district does not need to accept the Teacher Corps.

However, I would point out that this is true in every single educational program that is before the House. There is not a single education program that the Congress has ever passed where it is mandatory that the local district or the State accept it, and this program is no different. They can accept it or not. But where there are millions and hundreds of millions of dollars involved, the districts will want to be involved in it if they are paying taxes to support it. So we are obligated to draw provisions that are educationally sound and indisputably fair.

The second provision which I think is an oversight—and this is why I am particularly appreciative of the chairman's suggestion of a few minutes ago for an immediate study of the Teacher Corps. In rereading the bill last night and this morning it does say that with the teacher-interns, there is a 2-year training program and those of you who have a conference report in front of you can read it. It is covered on page 40 of the conference report.

Beginning in section 513(a)(3) under item B the language reads:

> Teaching teams, each of which shall consist of an experienced teacher and a number of—teacher interns who, in addition to teaching duties, shall be afforded time by the local educational agency for a teacher intern training program developed according to criteria established by the Commissioner and carried out under the guidance of the experienced teacher in cooperation with an institution of higher education.

Then on the same page, section 513(b) reads:

> Arrangements with institutions of higher education to provide training for teacher interns while teaching in schools for local educational agencies under the provisions of this part shall provide, wherever possible, for training leading to a graduate degree.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me clear from this language in the conference bill that the interns are in a period of "training" for the full time in which they may be teaching in any district under the terms of this act.

Then on page 41, section 514(a)(3) reads:

> A teacher intern shall be compensated at a rate which is equal to the lowest rate paid by such agency for teaching full time in the school system and the grade to which the intern is assigned.

This is immediately followed by the language in section 514(b) that "for any period of training under this part." May I repeat that "for any period of training under this part" the Commissioner shall pay to the members of the Teacher Corps such stipends—including allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such members and their dependents—as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported training programs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I can read the law, this clearly says that while the intern will be paid with 100 percent Federal funds through the local school district, it also says that the Commissioner shall pay directly to the members of the Teacher Corps other stipends that he may determine to be consistent with other federally supported training programs. May I also point out this program is not part of the State plan and completely by-passes State department's of education.

Mr. Speaker, the very distinguished and able gentleman from Minnesota, in my judgment, has accurately pointed out that in a given school district this bill, as drafted may create a great deal of friction between the permanent teachers who are working under a fixed salary schedule and a Teacher Corps team of interns and one experienced teacher who may be paid salaries completely out of line with the local schedule. As I said a moment ago, I wish that there might have been time to more carefully consider these possibilities and there might also have been time to discuss this with teacher representatives and school superintendents to learn their reaction to such a provision. Again, may I repeat that it would be a very high price to pay for a Teacher Corps team if there were any possibility that the local salary schedule would be upset and the morale of the permanent teachers seriously impaired.

Let me add I think that the intent of the original Senate draft may have been to provide additional stipends only for the 3-month training program and not for the 2 years.

I think it was an oversight in the conference bill written in haste and under great pressure and I would hope that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] might later discuss this particular point.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. At that point I think the direct answer is that the gentlewoman is quite correct. The answer is "Yes."

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. That these additional amounts are for the full 2 years under the bill?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Training stipends would be paid during a 3-month training period.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. And during the 2-year period. The bill states the stipends are to be paid for any training period. It does not limit it to the 3-month training period.

Mr. BRADEMAS. That is not my understanding.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I would refer the gentleman to pages 40 and 41 of the bill and I would hope he would discuss it later. In section 513(a)(3) there is set forth a 2-year training program, which I would like to have the gentleman clarify and perhaps by legislative history we can do something even today on the floor of the House. Section 514(b) clearly says "for any period of training under this part the Commissioner shall pay to members of the Teacher Corps stipends."

I hope I have answered the question for the distinguished Representative from Maryland.

Mr. MATHIAS. I thank the gentlewoman for her very candid and helpful answer to my question.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Let me say again though I have questions about this particular provision, there are other provisions of the higher education bill that far outweigh the reservations and criticisms we have over this one part. May I point out other conference agreements and I shall quickly try to go over some of the other titles, because questions have been raised by the various Members as to what the conference report does provide. I know Members also have letters to answer on this.

Mr. Speaker, in title I, I think the House retained most of the provisions that were brought to the House a few weeks ago. Instead of a 1-year authorization, however, we compromised with the Senate. They had a 5-year authorization and now we have a 3-year bill, except in the two titles: the Teacher Corps will be a 2-year program and title III for "Developing Colleges," will be a 1-year program.

Also, Mr. Speaker, no part of the bill, as I suggested, is compulsory, whether it be the Teacher Corps or whether it be some other title of the bill.

The implementation of every single part of the bill would be up to the local school districts or the States to accept or reject as they wish.

Mr. Speaker, title I of the bill was specifically designed to respond to the President's plea that the time has come—and this is a quote from one of his speeches——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman 2 additional minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, title I of the bill was specifically designed to respond to the President's plea that "the time has come for us to help the university to face the problems of the city as it once faced the problems of the farm."

Mr. Speaker, we do know that 70 percent of the people of this country live in urban areas.

Mr. Speaker, we retain the House provision that the special emphasis shall be upon the urban and suburban areas, though it will also include the rural areas.

The compromise title retains the four most essential elements of the House bill.

Under the title $25 million in the first year and $50 million in each of the next 2 years is authorized to help institutions of higher education establish community service programs to solve community problems in rural, urban or suburban areas—however, and most important, let me repeat, the bill requires that particular emphasis be given to urban and suburban problems.

Where continuing educational courses are offered the conference report retains the House limitation on the use of funds to courses which are of college level. All of the funds becoming available will be allotted through a formula without any reservation for the Commissioner of Education as proposed in the Senate bill for experimental approaches in university and continuing education. The House conferees were also successful in maintaining the House position that fees can be used for matching purposes. One very desirable Senate amendment has been accepted which establishes a National Advisory Council which will result, at least hopefully, in the coordination of all federally supported community service programs including university extension and continuing education programs, and also including programs of the Commerce Department and the Department of Agriculture.

There were very few important differences in the House and Senate versions of title II—college library assistance and library training and research. The resulting compromise will provide $50 million each year for 3 years to help college libraries buy books and library materials. The design of the program has been modified to insure that the congressional intent is met to bring assistance to libraries. Over 50 percent of our 4-year institutions of higher learning and 82 percent of our 2-year institutions fall below accepted minimum standards in library materials, we are advised.

With respect to special purpose grants—grants to assist in meeting unique needs—national and regional needs and to establish or strengthen joint use facilities—institutions will be required to maintain their existing effort and to match $1 for every $3 in Federal funds. Fifteen million dollars a year will be made available for library training and research. In order to avoid overlap and duplication in Federal programs, the House conferees successfully maintained the House position with respect to the repeal of existing institute training authority in the National Defense Education Act. Under the conference report the authority for training institutes for elementary and secondary school librarians is repealed effective July 1, 1967, instead of 1965 as originally recommended by the House.

The conference report also provides $5 million in funds this year, $6.3 million in 1967 and $7.8 milion in 1968, to help the Library of Congress expand, speed up, and improve its cataloging services. This is vitally important to every library in the country.

I must report there has been a considerable modification of the House approved program of support to assist, through cooperative arrangements, in raising the academic standards of developing institutions. The original House bill was specifically designed to assist struggling 4-year institutions only. The Senate proposed assistance to junior colleges also. Under the conference report the authorization has been increased to $55 million for fiscal year 1966—and 22 percent of the funds are reserved for junior colleges. The inclusion of junior colleges concerned the House conferees greatly as it was feared that the objectives of the House provision were being distorted. I believe, however, that the provision before us today is acceptable. We did place a 1-year authorization on this title. It limits assistance to those institutions, both 4-year and junior college, which have been in existence for 5 years—thus assistance will not be made available to those institutions which are developing by virtue of their recent establishment or because of rapidly expanding enrollments. Rather the House intent is maintained—to assist developing institutions—outside of the academic stream which over the years have been struggling for survival. The fact that this program is only authorized for 1 year—and that the committee will have an opportunity to reexamine and reevaluate it next year also makes it more acceptable and satisfactory.

The House bill amended the National Defense Education Act of 1958, to provide that 25 percent of the amount authorized for student loan funds could be used to make educational opportunity grants to needy students. The Senate amendment provided an independent program under which grants would be made to institutions of higher education to enable them to provide scholarships.

The substitute agreed upon in conference adopts the design of the Senate amendment and authorizes an independent program of educational opportunity grants for the next 3 years. The substitute retains most—the majority—of the House requirements. Under the proposal, $70 million a year for 3 years is authorized for opportunity grants to promising, exceptionally needy students, plus sufficient funds to continue the awards beyond the first year so that recipients might complete their college education. Funds will be allotted to institutions under the National Defense Education Act student loan formula, which is based on the number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education.

In order for a student to be selected for an educational opportunity grant, the college or university must determine that the student first, shows evidence of academic or creative promise; second, is of exceptional financial need; and, third, would not, except for an opportunity grant, be able financially to pursue studies at an institution of higher education. The opportunity grants will range from $200 to $800, with an additional $200 available for students in the top half of their class who have demonstrated need for the added funds. The basic grant may not be more than one-half of the total amount of student assistance which the institution makes available to the student, excluding funds under work-study programs.

The provision will make it possible for the exceptionally needy student with promise to attend college. Costs at private colleges have increased 40 percent since 1954. And there is no relief in sight in either public or private colleges. In fact the estimate is that during this next decade there will be an increase of 50 percent in college costs.

It is important to note that of male students in families that have incomes of less than $3,000 and who are in the top 25 percent of the class academically, 29 percent of that income group do not go to college the first year after high school graduation; and of the girls in the top 25 percent of the class academically and who come from families with less than $3,000 income, 69 percent are not able to go to college within 1 year of high school graduation. We do not know how many of these never go to the university. All of the studies have indicated that financial need is one of the most important reasons why qualified students do not attend college. This high percentage of able students who do not go on is a loss that I think this Nation cannot afford. This proposal will insure that the full development and education of our most precious resource—our Nation's youth—is not lost. A qualified student who wants to go and is willing to really work and study can go under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, there were few substantive differences in the respective provisions authorizing guaranteed reduced interest loans. The program authorizes a Federal program of insured loans for students who do not have reasonable access to an equivalent State or private insured loan program and also authorizes $17.5 million for advances to the reserve funds of State and private nonprofit programs. The maximum annual insurable loan would be $1,000 for undergraduates and $1,500 for graduate students, and the maximum aggregate of insured principal would be $5,000 for undergraduates and $7,500 for graduate students. The maximum rate of interest may not exceed 6 percent. For students from families having annual incomes of less than $15,000 the Government would pay the interest while the student is in college and 3 percentage points of the interest thereafter. These provisions are very similar to the National Defense Education Act loans. However, there is no provision for forgiveness of loans for teachers in this part.

The repayment of principal on a federally guaranteed loan, which could begin no earlier than 9 months or later than 12 months after the student leaves school, could be deferred for up to another 3 years while the borrower is in the Armed Forces, the Peace Corps, or in graduate school.

The House provision that State and nonprofit private programs would be required to insure at least 80 percent of the principal of loans has been retained in the conference report. This guaranteed loan program is designed especially for the students from middle income families who are also having great difficulty in financing college education for perhaps three or four or more children.

Amendments to the college work study program will transfer the administration of the program from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education where it surely belongs and liberalize the program to permit participation by students other than those from very low income families. $129 million is authorized for the current fiscal year, $165 million in fiscal 1967, and $200 million in 1968.

The Special Subcommittee on Education gathered considerable testimony on the student loan program under the National Defense Education Act during the hearings on the higher education bill. At the time the subcommittee reported the bill to the full committee we believed that the subcommittee did not have sufficient evidence to make legislative recommendations for tightening loan procedures. We wanted more information. The Senate however, insisted on changes.

The Senate bill included the following National Defense Education Act amendments: First, to authorize use of Federal funds, up to 1 percent of outstanding loans, to pay up to half an institution's administrative costs, including collection costs, in the National Defense Education Act student loan program; second, to require minimum repayment of $15 a month to begin 9 months after the borrower stops carrying at least half the normal academic workload; third, to authorize 15 percent forgiveness for each year of teaching in an area where there is a high concentration of disadvantaged children. This means that for these teachers there might be a 100 percent forgiveness. May I be perfectly frank with my House colleagues and say that this is a provision that gives me some concern. First of all, the Senate language which was adopted in conference allows the 15 percent forgiveness for each year of teaching in a poverty area plus a 50 percent forgiveness. In effect this means if a teacher taught in a poverty area for only 2 years she would receive a 30 percent forgiveness and then if she went to another school or to a college and taught for 5 years she would have an additional 50 percent forgiveness, or a total of 80 percent. This seems to me to raise questions as far as equity is concerned. The other part which seems to me to be inequitable is that a college student may borrow up to $10,000 under National Defense Education Act loans if such student is needy and may have a 50 percent forgiveness or in the case which I just described, an 80 percent forgiveness—or a 100 percent forgiveness under certain conditions—and yet another student whose family income may be only slightly higher is not allowed to borrow under National Defense Education Act and must borrow under the guaranteed loan program and under the guaranteed loan program there is no forgiveness for any teacher.

A student coming from a family with a $7,000 income might validly raise the question as to why he cannot be forgiven at least one-half of his loan if he goes into teaching while another student classmate coming from a family with perhaps a $5,000 income may benefit to the tune of several thousand dollars by the forgiveness feature under the National Defense Education Act. This is a matter to which we did not give our attention in the conference report but one to which I think the attention of the committee and the attention of the House should be directed; fourth, the Senate National Defense Education Act amendments also include economics, civics, and industrial arts in the teacher institute program; fifth, and to add economics to the equipment purchase section for elementary and secondary schools.

The above five amendments are included in the conference report. I should point out, however, that the Special Subcommittee on Higher Education does intend to undertake a thorough and an in-depth study of the entire National Defense Education Act next year. We believe there may be several other changes that should be made in loan procedures and collections.

Finally may I say, Mr. Speaker, I believe the amendments to the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to be the most important and significant parts of the conference report. The original House-approved amendments to double the authorizations of funds to build undergraduate and graduate academic facilities have been retained. Such an increase was necessary and justifiable on the evidence presented to the special subcommittee. We also deleted the categorical limitations in title I which will result in an even greater demand for Federal funds for facilities—funds for the humanities as well as math, science, engineering buildings.

As I said during the original House debate on the higher education bill, I believe if we were to address the college presidents and administrators and ask them what they needed the most it would be Federal funds to provide classrooms, libraries, and laboratories so that they will be able to adequately accommodate the increasing college enrollments. The needs are well documented.

The conference report includes other amendments to facilitate better administration of this program at the State level. If finally enacted—Federal grants for the construction of academic facilities at public community colleges and technical institutes may be made up to 40 percent of construction costs rather than exactly 40 percent. We believe this was the original congressional intent in the 1963 bill.

Funds allocated for public community colleges and funds allotted for 4-year institutions may be transferred for use in the other sections if the State commission has not received an application for grants under this section in question prior to January 1 of the year and if the State commission requests the transfer.

A maximum interest rate of 3 percent will be charged on loans made under title III of the Facilities Act. This brings the program in line with the recently revised dormitory loan program. This, I believe, is a highly desirable change and has wide support.

Mr. Speaker, I have attempted to cover the ways in which the programs contained in the original House bill have been modified by the conference committee. The fellowship program and equipment grants will be discussed by others. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the goals and objectives we discussed on August 26, when the House considered the higher education bill, will be met by the provisions in the conference report. Without question the colleges and universities and the youth of this Nation will be helped immeasurably by this legislation. Today's challenge is a challenge of change. Let us help colleges to meet it. And even though not as completely satisfactory, perhaps as each of us would like it, I believe and hope the House will sustain the House conferees in their recommendations.

May I express my deep sense of gratitude to the staff of my subcommittee and to the members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle who have worked so diligently and contributed so much.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS].

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this higher education conference report.

This bill, which authorizes an expenditure of $841 million in the current fiscal year, contains a wide variety of programs to aid colleges and universities. Included in the bill are: Increased funds for college construction; purchase of library books and training of librarians; grants to developing institutions; grants to help colleges solve community problems, mainly through university extension programs; financial aid for the needy and the overburdened middle-income family; and proposals for a National Teacher Corps and a teacher fellowship program.

I point out to my colleagues in the House that all of the Democratic conferees in the House, all of the Democratic conferees in the Senate, and all of the Republican conferees in the Senate signed the conference report; so that this measure does have very strong bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to concentrate my remarks on title V of the bill, partly because I have been one of the chief sponsors and advocates of the two programs it authorizes and partly because one of them, the Teacher Corps, has come under heavy attack here in the past 2 days. These two programs, to both of which I give full support, are the teacher fellowship program and the National Teacher Corps.

The purpose of the teacher fellowship program is to improve the quality of the education offered by the country's elementary and secondary schools. To do so, we must improve the quality of the education available for persons who pursue or intend to pursue careers in elementary and secondary education. My colleagues should note that the fellowship program includes not only persons presently teaching in elementary and secondary schools but also those who teach, guide, or supervise such teachers. Further, persons who plan careers either as elementary or secondary teachers or in fields directly related to elementary and secondary education, such as library science, school social work, guidance and counseling, educational media, and special education for handicapped children, are also eligible for fellowships under the bill.

The purpose of this part of the bill is pursued, first, by awarding fellowships for graduate study at institutions of higher education and, second, by developing or strengthening teacher education programs in institutions of higher learning.

A total of 24,500 fellowships is authorized in the 3-year program: 4,500 in fiscal 1966 and 10,000 each in fiscal years 1967 and 1968. Total authorizations for the same 3-year period are $475 million, consisting of $40 million in the current fiscal year, $160 million in fiscal 1967, and $275 million in fiscal 1968.

The Commissioner is to allocate the fellowships to institutions of higher education with approved programs for quality graduate education for teachers. He is to encourage those presently pursuing a career in elementary and secondary education to enter these graduate programs and he is also to encourage recent college graduates to go into teaching as a career, as well as college graduates in other occupations to enter or return to a career in elementary or secondary education.

To gain approval for its program, the institution must show that its effort will improve the quality of education of elementary and secondary school teachers, and it must emphasize high-quality substantive courses, rather than the traditional methods courses. If any methods courses are offered, they must be directly related to the substantive courses and clearly secondary to them in the program.

In order to obtain equitable geographical distribution of the high-quality programs envisioned here, the Commissioner is authorized to make grants and contracts with institutions of higher education to pay part of the costs of developing or strengthening graduate programs which meet the requirements of approval and of developing or strengthening high-quality undergraduate programs for training those planning to pursue an elementary or secondary education career.

The stipends available, including subsistence and dependents allowances, are to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs. In addition, payments of $2,500 per participating student are to be paid to the institution of higher education for each academic year the student is in the program. The amount, of course, will be reduced by any tuition or other nonrefundable charges which the student must bear.

The grantee, for his part, must be a full-time student or researcher in his field, must not be engaged in gainful employment—other than part-time teaching, research, or similar approved activities related to his training—and must maintain satisfactory proficiency in his work.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the fellowship program, for we need the high-caliber teachers which it will help to prepare.

I should like now to comment on the National Teacher Corps provision, about which there has been some controversy. I shall not review its provisions at this time, for I believe the discussion in the House yesterday more than adequately outlined the nature and substance of this imaginative proposal. I refer in particular to the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], who outlined the major features of the National Teacher Corps as well as to the colloquy between the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and myself.

I want especially to address myself to what my colleague from Minnesota said a little while ago when he argued that he had to oppose the Teacher Corps proposal because, he said, it had not been considered in the House. The fact of the matter is that the Teacher Corps proposal was considered in hearings by the General Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor and was voted on by the full Committee on Education and Labor.

There are several items in this conference report which were not considered at all either by a House subcommittee or a full committee of the House. Yet it is very strange, Mr. Speaker, that I did not hear the gentleman from Minnesota attack any of these items. For example, I did not hear the gentleman from Minnesota or his Republican colleagues say a word in opposition to title VI of this report which, for educational equipment and minor remodeling of buildings, authorizes half again as much money than is authorized by the Teacher Corps part of the bill.

If failure of the House to consider a proposal is grounds for opposing it, why have our friends on the university side not announced their intention to kill title VI of the bill?

The point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that it is surely unfair to attack the Teacher Corps on the grounds that it was not considered by the House of Representatives when there are other parts of this bill which were either supported by the minority or not objected to in their proposed motion to recommit, that were not even considered by a House subcommittee, not to speak of winning approval of the full committee, as did the Teacher Corps.

I want to take this opportunity also to read into the Record a letter I have just received from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Gardner, with respect to the issue of local control.

This letter from Secretary Gardner, a distinguished Republican who is already serving with great distinction in President Johnson's Cabinet, reads as follows:

The Secretary of Health,
Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D.C., October 20, 1965.

Hon. John Brademas,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Brademas: In accordance with our telephone conversation I have reviewed the discussion which took place on the House floor yesterday between you and Congressman Quie.

I wish to reiterate that the Teacher Corps will impose no Federal control over the authority of the local school district. In particular, the local school district retains full authority to select and reject, to appoint and fire those recruited through the Teacher Corps program. Local school authorities will be free to set the criteria for members they may wish to employ. No community need accept any teacher unsuitable to its needs.

The Office of Education will seek to guarantee maximum participation of local school authorities by (a) requesting them to indicate the teacher qualifications they judge to be desirable; and (b) submitting to them for approval the names of individual Teacher Corps members who are available for service.

I believe the Teacher Corps program will greatly improve the educational opportunities for our Nation's disadvantaged school children. At the same time, it preserves the valuable tradition of local control over the schools in each community.

Sincerely,

John W. Gardner,
Secretary.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me here also clarify one matter raised in the colloquy between the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] concerning the use of Teacher Corps members in private schools.

I believe the question put by Mr. Goodell to Mr. Quie is answered by a simple reading of the language of title V, section 513(d) of the conference report, as follows: "A local educational agency may—" I believe Mr. Goodell here used the word "will"—

Sec. 513(d). A local educational agency may utilize members of the Teacher Corps assigned to it in providing, in the manner described in section 205(a)(2) of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, as amended, educational services in which children enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools can participate.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in my remaining brief time, I would like to say an additional word to clarify my earlier response to the question raised by the distinguished gentlelady from Oregon [Mrs. Green] with respect to the payments to be made to Teacher Corps interns during the time when they are both teaching and pursuing some training, as provided by the bill. Stipends may be paid to Teacher Corps members when they are undergoing full-time training, whether in the 3-month period preceding their employment or during the summers between the school years.

It is not intended that stipends would be paid concurrently with the times in which Teacher Corps members are receiving regular teachers' salaries.

The Federal Government would reimburse colleges and universities and local school systems for the entire cost of training, whether preservice or inservice, but it is of course not intended that Teacher Corps members would be receiving two different incomes.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Price). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. **AYRES**. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie].

Mr. **QUIE**. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out why I tried to get the gentleman from Indiana to yield to me.

I will say that while it is true that the subcommittee did consider the Teacher Corps, it did so for only 1 day and only one person came to testify on that subject. If you will all read a copy of the hearings which I am holding in my hand, you can see it yourself. The cover lists teacher fellowships and the National Teacher Corps which may appear to indicate 4 days of hearings but 3 days were only on the fellowships. The only witnesses who appeared other than Senator Nelson came prepared to testify on the fellowships and they were only asked about the Teacher Corps after they arrived.

The second part of my reason is that no matter what the Secretary says now the question is, Who are we going to believe and what are we going to believe? Are we going to believe as the Secretary says in a letter that the school districts will select the teachers? Or do we believe the bill itself which says the Commissioner is authorized to select the teachers? Who are we to believe? Is the 3-month preliminary period of training the only period where they will receive subsistence under section 514(b) as the gentleman indicates or will the period of training that the interns receive subsistence be for 2 years? The bill itself says subsistence will be paid for any period of training.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. **POWELL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the pending conference report.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. **POWELL**. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Perkins].

Mr. **PERKINS**. Mr. Speaker, we cannot claim for this or any other legislation that there are no imperfections. This bill is certainly not perfect. But let me point out that this bill has been carefully considered by the general Subcommittee on Education in 4 days of hearings and in extensive staff work. It was reported to the full committee and then reported to the Committee on Rules.

Perhaps we can find ways to perfect it and make it work more effectively in the future, guided by the experience gained in its administration. But I am satisfied that this legislation is urgently needed now to provide supplemental teacher services to the areas of this country, to the slum sections and to the rural areas where we have today a shortage of teachers in the elementary and secondary schools of the country. It is the purpose of this bill not only to increase the supply but also to improve the quality of the teaching service in the elementary and secondary schools in disadvantaged areas of the country. The evidence before us as to need is overwhelming and requires the wholehearted support of the conference report. Let me here recite a few pertinent facts as to need:

Five million American school age children are in families with annual incomes below the poverty line of $2,000.

They constitute 11 percent of the 5-to-17 age group.

They are distributed throughout 95 percent of the Nation's 3,100 counties.

Their parents and older brothers and sisters make up the one-fifth of America—one out of every five Americans—which has completed less than 8 years of formal schooling.

Eighty-two thousand full-time teachers in U.S. elementary and secondary schools have less than standard certification.

The national supply of new teachers this year fell more than 128,000 short of the 248,000 needed by our schools.

These are the facts but the need for a Teacher Corps can probably best be summed up in three words—people shun poverty.

From the ranks of the undereducated comes a vast army of chronically unemployed. Young men and women—the products of educational and economic poverty—lack simple reading, writing, and math skills, and the ability to communicate verbally as well. Without these they cannot get or hold jobs. When they do, the job contributes little or nothing to the individual himself, to our society, or to the national economy.

To break out of the tradition of poverty, disadvantaged youngsters must receive the best—not the least—in education. The Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 is a giant stride. Though it provides over a billion dollars in aid to low-income areas, it does not provide the means to attract the thousands of men and women with the enthusiasm, the dedication, the understanding, and the talent that are essential to make effective use of the newly available Federal funds.

To reach the poor child, to stir the child's curiosity, takes a very special quality in a teacher. It takes a warmth and insight which can only be the fusion of natural disposition, a sense of mission, and proper training. One of the most pathetic wastes of our times and our resources is that we have tried to teach every child, regardless of background and capabilities, by standards, conceived for children from a comfortable, middle-class, white background. In many cases the standards have been woefully inadequate for the children for whom they were intended. For the uneasy children of poverty, they have been disastrous.

By providing money, training, and opportunity the Teacher Corps would bring together qualified men and women who wish to meet and defeat poverty. Corpsmen would go, in President Johnson's words, "to the places in their country that need them the most."

As teachers gravitate in increasing numbers to wealthier schools, problems in poverty schools grow more acute. Attempts to recruit fresh personnel for poverty schools are generally fruitless. Even schools of affluence today have difficulty attracting and holding talented teachers. One result has been that slum schools have been forced to employ large numbers of substitute or temporary personnel. Many of the teachers in the schools of poverty have qualifications below standards acceptable for teaching children from middle-class families. More are completely ill equipped to deal with the special problems of the disadvantaged.

The Teacher Corps would give status and professionalism to teaching the poor. The 6,000 members of the Teacher Corps would demonstrate that America's desire to break the poverty cycle has a strong element of human understanding and compassion, as well as sound and practical techniques.

Equal educational opportunities for all could well be the most influential element in our program of equal economic opportunity for all.

I am hopeful that the Members of this body will not be led astray by the derogatory remarks and misinformation that has been related. Let me now turn to other important features of H.R. 9567 as reported by the House managers.

Mr. Speaker, title I authorizes $25 million for fiscal year 1966 and $50 million for each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968, to assist in the solution of community problems in such areas as housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health, and land use. States would designate a State agency or institution broadly representative of higher education in the State to administer community service programs developed under this title. This title has significance for all communities large and small, as the legislation would authorize provision of the new program in rural areas, and in those rural nonfarm mining communities seeking technical knowledge as to means of attacking community problems and needs.

A community service program is defined as an educational program, activity, or service, including a research program and university extension or continuing education offering, which is designed to assist in the solution of community problems in rural, urban or suburban areas, with particular emphasis on urban and suburban problems, where the institution offering such program, activity, or service determines—First, that the proposed program, activity, or service is not otherwise adequately available; and second, that the conduct of the program or performance of the activity or service is consistent with the institution's overall educational program and is of such a nature as is appropriate to the effective utilization of the institution's special resources and the competencies of its faculty.

When course offerings are involved, such courses must be, first, fully acceptable toward an academic degree; or second, of college level as determined by the institution offering such courses.

A National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education will be appointed by the President. Its main purpose will be the elimination of duplication, and the coordination of programs under this title and other programs of extension or continuing education. Further, the committee will advise the Commissioner on the approval of projects and activities under this title and will file an annual report which will recommend changes in Federal laws relating to extension and continuing education activities.

Federal funds will cover 75 percent of the costs of the program in fiscal year 1966, 75 percent in fiscal year 1967, and 50 percent in fiscal year 1978.

Up to 5 percent of the expenditures for which Federal payments are made, or $25,000, can be used for developing and administering the State plan.

Mr. Speaker, title II initiates a program to help institutions of higher education acquire library materials needed for their expanded responsibilities in research, teaching, and student use; to encourage new and enlarged college and university training programs to prepare individuals for service in the information sciences and in libraries; to promote research and demonstration projects relating to the improvement of libraries and library and information sciences; and to expand and improve the centralized cataloging service in the Library of Congress. The title is divided into three parts, each of which is designed to meet a special need for assistance.

Part A of title II authorizes $50 million for each of fiscal years 1966–68 for the purchase of library resources. Provision is made for basic grants of up to $5,000 to institutions of higher education for the purchase of library resources such as books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, audiovisual materials, and other related library materials.

The Commissioner is authorized to make supplemental grants not to exceed $10 for each full-time student. Supplemental grants will be made on the basis of such criteria as size and age of library collection, student enrollment, and endowment and other financial resources. The basic grants must be matched by the institution. Each institution or combination of institutions must give assurances that their previous year's expenditures for materials would be maintained.

Fifteen percent of the funds appropriated for this part are set aside by the Commissioner for special grants. These special grants might be made to institutions of higher education demonstrating a special need for additional library resources; or to institutions engaged in meeting special national or regional needs in library and information sciences; or to combinations of institutions which need special assistance in establishing joint facilities.

An Advisory Council on College Library Resources will be established to assist the Commissioner in the development of criteria for the making of supplemental grants and special-purpose grants.

Part B authorizes $15 million for each of fiscal years 1966–68 for grants to institutions of higher education for training students in librarianship, including the training of communications specialists in the physical and social sciences. The Commissioner will make grants to and contracts with institutions of higher education and other public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations for research and demonstration projects and for the dissemination of information derived from research. However, no grant can be made to a private group other than a nonprofit one. The Commissioner will appoint panels of experts to evaluate various types of research and demonstration projects.

Part C of title II authorizes $5 million for fiscal 1965, $6,315,000 for fiscal 1966, and $7,700,000 for fiscal 1968 to be used by the Library of Congress for two purposes: First, to expand and improve the centralized cataloging service which is already in operation, and second, to purchase library material from all over the world which would not otherwise be included in the Library of Congress collection and, therefore, not cataloged.

This part can relieve all types of libraries from much of the expensive cataloging process, since a larger number of catalog cards would be more readily available for purchase, at a minimal cost, through the Library of Congress.

Title III authorizes $55 million for fiscal year 1966 to assist in raising the academic quality of colleges which have the desire and potential to make a substantial contribution to the higher education resources of the Nation but which for financial and other reasons are struggling for survival and are isolated from the main currents of academic life. This is particularly important to the small 2- and 4-year colleges of the district I am privileged to represent.

The program will authorize the Commissioner to pay part of the cost of planning and carrying out cooperative arrangements for strengthening the academic programs of qualified developing colleges. These cooperative arrangements might be between developing institutions and organizations, agencies, and business entities.

The cooperative projects might include: exchange of faculty or students, including visiting scholars; faculty improvement programs; introduction of new curriculums; development of cooperative education programs involving alternate periods of academic study and employment; joint use of facilities such as libraries or laboratories; fellowships leading to advanced degrees for the faculties of developing institutions; or other arrangements which offer promise of strengthening the academic programs of developing colleges.

The Commissioner will be authorized to award national teaching fellowships to graduate students and junior faculty members to encourage them to teach at developing institutions.

Of the funds appropriated, 22 percent will be used specifically for junior colleges.

An Advisory Council on Developing Institutions will assist the Commissioner in identifying qualified developing institutions and in establishing priorities for use in approving applications for grants.

Title IV establishes a program of student financial assistance to make the benefits of higher education available to academically qualified students in need of financial assistance. The title provides four types of assistance:

First. Undergraduate educational opportunity grants;

Second. Reduced-interest loans to both undergraduate and graduate students through private lenders, insured by State and nonprofit private loan insurance programs;

Third. An expanded work-study program to provide part-time employment for students; and

Fourth. Improvements in the national defense student loan program. The "opportunity grants" are of vital importance to our students in eastern Kentucky many of whom will not be able to secure college opportunities without it.

This part authorizes $70 million for educational opportunity grants during fiscal year 1966—the first grants would be used during the academic year 1966–67. Institutions of higher education must determine that recipients of the grants show academic promise, are of exceptional financial need, and would not, but for an educational opportunity grant, be financially able to pursue a higher education.

Grants would be no less than $200, or more than one-half of the total amount of student assistance—excluding work-study—provided to the same student, or $800, whichever is the lesser; an additional $200 would be awarded to students who were in the upper half of their class during the preceding year. Funds would be allocated among the States on the basis of college enrollment. Institutions would be permitted to transfer up to one-fourth of their funds under this part to their national defense education student loan funds.

Institutions of higher learning would be expected to make vigorous efforts to identify qualified youth of exceptional financial need and encourage them to continue their education beyond secondary school. Colleges would establish close working relationships with secondary schools and could make tentative commitments of scholarships to qualified students enrolled in grade 11 or lower and to secondary school dropouts. An institution would be required to maintain its efforts in its own scholarship and loan program.

The Commissioner is also authorized to enter into contracts, not to exceed $100,000 per year, with State and local educational agencies and other public or nonprofit organizations for the purpose of, first, identifying qualified youths of exceptional financial need and encouraging them to continue their education, second, publicizing existing forms of financial aid, and third, encouraging secondary school and college dropouts to reenter educational programs.

Part B of title IV authorizes advances totaling $17,500,000 through fiscal year 1968 to assist in establishing or strengthening the reserve funds of State and private nonprofit student loan insurance programs. Advances would be made to the State program and, if for any year the State program were not comprehensive, to private nonprofit programs to the extent necessary to enable students in every eligible institution to be covered by an insured loan program.

A Federal insurance program would be authorized on a standby basis of adequate State and private plans are not reasonably accessible to students in every eligible institution of higher education. Total new federally insured loans could not exceed $700 million for fiscal year 1966, $1 billion for 1967, and $1,400 million for fiscal year 1968.

For students from families having adjusted family income of less than $15,000 the Federal Government would subsidize all of the interest while in school and 3 percentage points thereafter; for students from families having higher incomes there would be no interest subsidy but the insurance would cover loans to such students. Adjusted income would take into account number of family members and number attending institutions of higher education.

The interest subsidy would be available for federally insured loans and for loans insured under State and private nonprofit programs which meet specified standards as well as loans made by State programs. For the first 2 years of the program, the interest subsidy would be available for State and private plans which insure loans: first, charging no higher than 6 percent annual interest on the unpaid balance, and, second, requiring repayment to begin no earlier than 60 days after the student ceases his course of study. After June 30, 1967, the interest subsidy would not be available unless all specified standards are met.

State and private programs must be authorized to insure loans of not less than $1,000 and not more than $1,500 per year for any student and must be authorized to insure loans to any student for at least 6 years and would be required to insure 80 percent of unpaid principal in order to qualify for advances and—after June 30, 1967, under the legislation's 2-year transitional period—interest subsidies.

The Federal insurance program where operative would cover 100 percent of unpaid principal, excluding interest and would cover loans up to a maximum of $1,000 per year for undergraduates and $1,500 for graduate students and up to a maximum aggregate unpaid principal of $5,000 for undergraduates and $7,500 for graduates.

Federally insured loans, or loans over $2,000 insured by a State or private program, must provide for repayment period of not less than 5 years—unless sooner repaid—nor more than 10 years, beginning 9 months to 1 year after the student leaves school, with a maximum loan period of 15 years. Minimum annual repayment in the case of Federally-insured loans would be $360. The loan, whether insured Federally or by a State or private program, must be made without security, but endorsement may be required.

Maximum rate of interest chargeable by the lender would be set by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on a national, regional, or other appropriate basis, but it could not exceed 6 percent per year on the unpaid principal balance of the loan if insured under a State or private program. Federally insured loans would be subject to rates of interest no higher than 6 percent, except that under circumstances which threaten to impede the carrying out of the program rates may be set as high as 7 percent.

The revised program would be authorized to make advances to State and private plans and to insure loans for 3 years—until June 30, 1968.

The work-study program under part C of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 would be transferred from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education.

Under this program institutions of higher education receive from the Federal Government 90 percent of the cost of providing part-time employment opportunities. Institutions may pay their share to students in the form of services and supplies furnished by the institution. The proposed amendments would expand the opportunities for part-time employment but preference must be given to students from low-income families.

The appropriations authorization for fiscal year 1966 would be $129 million. Of this amount $60 million is carried in the budget requests for the Office of Economic Opportunity for fiscal year 1966.

The provisions concerning agreements with institutions establishing student loan funds under title II of the National Defense Education Act would be amended to provide that the fund may be used to pay one-half of the administrative costs incurred by the institution, including collection costs, up to 1 percent of outstanding loans.

The requirements for repayment of student loans would be altered to require payment to commence 9 months after the borrower ceases to carry at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload. The minimum rate of repayment would be $15 per month, and no interest would accrue while the borrower is carrying at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload. A provision would be added to permit institutions to assess delinquency charges.

The loan forgiveness provision of the national defense student loan program is expanded to permit persons who teach in areas of high concentration of low-income families to cancel their entire obligation at the rate of 15 percent per year.

The legislation amends the National Defense Education Act to include economics among the critical subjects to be covered in title III—equipment—and to include economics, civics, and industrial arts among the subject areas in title XI—teacher training institutes.

The National Defense Education Act title III authorizations are increased by $10 million and title XI authorizations by $17.25 million.

Part A of title V establishes in the Office of Education a National Teacher Corps with an authorization of $36,100,000 for fiscal year 1966, and $64,715,000 for fiscal year 1967. Experienced teachers and teacher-interns who have a bachelor's degree would be enrolled in the Teacher Corps for periods of up to 2 years.

Arrangements will be made at the option of local educational agencies to furnish experienced teachers and teaching teams to local schools in areas having concentrations of children from low-income families. Same concept as Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, title I.

Before undertaking their teaching duties, members of the Teacher Corps will be provided training by institutions of higher education or State educational agencies. For this period of training—up to 3 months—the Teacher Corps member will be paid stipends consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported training programs. Teacher-interns will, while working in local schools, participate in in-service training programs carried out by experienced teachers in cooperation with institutions of higher education.

Costs of the arrangements with local educational agencies—including salaries for Teacher Corps members—will be paid entirely by the Federal Government to the local school district. Members of the Teacher Corps will not be Federal employees but locally paid and supervised teachers. An experienced teacher who is not leading a teaching team will be paid a rate equal to a teacher with similar training, experience, and duties in that agency. An experienced teacher who is leading a teaching team will be compensated at a rate to cover his supervisory and training responsibilities. A teacher-intern shall be paid a salary equal to the lowest rate paid by such agency for full-time teachers in that school and grade.

Members of the Teacher Corps will be under the direct supervision of the appropriate official of the local educational agencies to which they are assigned.

Part B of title V authorizes the Commissioner to award 4,500 fellowships in fiscal year 1966 and 10,000 fellowships in each of fiscal years 1967 and 1968. These fellowships will enable persons pursuing or planning to pursue a career in elementary or secondary education to undertake 2 years of graduate study leading to a master's degree or its equivalent.

Experienced teachers and other experienced personnel in elementary and secondary education, recent college graduates, and college graduates engaged in other occupations who wish to enter or reenter elementary or secondary education are eligible to receive fellowships. Fellowships must be allocated so as to provide an equitable distribution throughout the States, except that the Commissioner may give preference to programs designed to meet an urgent national need.

Fellowship recipients will receive stipends consistent with prevailing practice under comparable federally supported programs. The Commissioner will pay the institution of higher education at which the fellowship recipient studies an amount equivalent to $2,500 per academic year less any tuition charged the recipient.

The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to and contracts with institutions of higher education to develop graduate programs that will substantially further the objective of improving teacher education.

Forty million dollars is authorized for this part for fiscal year 1966, $160 million for fiscal 1967, and $275 million for fiscal 1968.

Part A of title VI makes available to institutions of higher education $35 million for fiscal year 1966, $40 million for fiscal year 1967, and $50 million for fiscal year 1968, for the acquisition of laboratory and other special equipment, including audiovisual materials and equipment and printed materials—other than textbooks—suitable for use in undergraduate instruction in science, mathematics, foreign languages, history, geography, arts, humanities, government, English, or education.

This part also authorizes $2.5 million for fiscal year 1966 and $10 million each for fiscal year 1967 and 1968 to be used by institutions of higher education for the acquisition of television equipment and materials for instruction in the above fields and for minor remodeling necessary for the use of such equipment. An additional $1 million is set aside for administration of the State plans approved under this part.

One-half of the authorized funds will be distributed among the States on the basis of the ratio of students in institutions of higher education in each State to the number of students in institutions of higher education in all States. The remaining one-half will be allocated among the States by an allotment ratio based on relative per capita income.

A State desiring to participate in the program must designate or establish a State commission to administer the program, and this commission would submit to the Commissioner of Education a State plan setting forth basic criteria for determining the relative priorities of eligible projects.

The Federal share of approved projects will be up to 50 percent of the cost except that the State commissions may increase such share to 80 percent in the case of institutions which otherwise would have insufficient resources to participate in the program. The application of an institution of higher education must provide assurance that the institution will maintain its level of expenditures during the preceding fiscal year for the same purposes.

Part B authorizes $5 million for fiscal year 1966 and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years for the operation of short-term workshops or short-term or regular-session institutes for individuals preparing to use educational media equipment in teaching in institutions of higher education or individuals preparing to become specialists in educational media or librarians or other specialists using such media.

Each person attending such an institute will receive a stipend of $75 per week plus $15 per week for each dependent. No stipends may be paid for attendance at workshops.

Under title VII, authorizations for grants to construct undergraduate academic facilities will be increased from $230 million to $460 million for fiscal year 1966. Categorical restrictions on the types of facilities to be constructed will be removed. The title II authorization—grants for construction of graduate education facilities—is increased from $60 million to $120 million.

The Commissioner will be given discretion to transfer allotments for public community colleges and technical institutes to other public institutions and the allotments for 4-year institutions to public community colleges and technical institutes in States where the demand for one of the categories is not sufficient to use the appropriated funds.

Interest on loans for construction of academic facilities under title III will be set at a maximum of 3 percent rather than based on the going Federal rate.

Under existing law, the Federal share for construction grants to public community colleges and public technical institutes is fixed at 40 percent of the development cost. The bill amends the act to provide that the Federal share for such projects shall be a percentage as determined under the applicable State plan but not in excess of 40 percent.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the proposed Teacher Corps would be locally activated and locally controlled. It is an activity of vital interest to cities and towns. The program would be within the complete control of the local community. We see that the Republican members of the conference from the Senate are in agreement with it. It is amazing to me that my Republican friends in the House can oppose a meritorious project of this kind.

Mr. PERKINS. The Speaker is absolutely correct.

The teachers would be local employees. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie], has always advocated that the teachers be paid directly by Federal check from the Federal Government. He has always held fast to that belief. I cannot understand his argument here today in respect to Federal control in view of his past recommendations.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, this conference report on the higher education bill should be approved.

Every year brings stronger evidence of the need for enlarged opportunity for our young people in higher education, and the trend is likely to continue for years to come.

This Congress has already demonstrated its keen interest in meeting this problem by overwhelmingly approving H.R. 9567, with only 22 votes against it on final passage.

The conference has substantially accepted the House position on this bill, and its product is a good one fully deserving of our support.

I hope and trust the report will be approved by an emphatic majority vote.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, this Congress, through bipartisan effort for the most part, has distinguished itself as being the greatest education Congress of all time. The proposed Teacher Corps is another part of the total education effort. If I am not improperly advised, every Member of the U.S. Senate, including all Republican Members, supported the program when it was before that body.

One of the great legislative landmarks of this session was the Secondary and Elementary Education Act. This Teacher Corps provision, which provides for excellence in teacher training and excellence in teaching leadership, backstops that legislation. I urge all Members of the House to support it.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, as one who has been closely connected with education before I came here, I have listened with great interest to the arguments on the other side. The burdens of the argument of the gentleman from Minnesota seemed to be two: First, that it was not debated long enough in the House; that is, the Teacher Corps; second, that the Federal Government was going to pay for it.

The gentleman from Minnesota said, "How are you going to answer this when you go home?"

The question they are going to ask in the undermanned schools—and nearly everyone of them is undermanned, with too many pupils per teacher—is not how long it was debated in the House but, if it is killed, they are going to ask who killed it and why.

There is not an elementary school or a secondary school that I know of in the whole United States that does not need more teachers. I can remember when I taught in a high school that we got students there all the time who could not properly read. If they cannot read, they cannot learn. They were pushed on because the teachers had 40 to 45 students in a class and they could not devote the time they needed.

If there is anything we need, it is more teachers to lower the load on each teacher in the elementary schools and in the secondary schools, and to give the pupils in those schools the educational background that they need so that they can go on and be productive citizens.

I am for this measure, and I hope it passes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM], a former member of this committee, the balance of the time.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I support this conference report on higher education. I particularly support the provision with regard to the National Teacher Corps. We have strengthened and protected this country by the widest distribution possible of knowledge. We have done that through education. As the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], who just preceded me, said, the greatest need in the public schools of this country today is for more teachers. The Teacher Corps provision in the conference report would provide it.

The criticism I have heard from my Republican friends today on the Teacher Corps provision reminds me of the reply of the central character in Mildred Savage's novel, "In Vivo," when the central character, Will Caroline, was arguing with his board of directors about giving more money for research to discover some of the things he felt the company ought to have in its program. A member of the board of directors replied to him, "Oh, research is a shot in the dark." And Will Caroline said the very strong and true statement, "All progress beyond established knowledge is in the dark, and one man must see the light and creep forward with that light."

In this instance one Congress, one party, one administration has sought knowledge beyond the dark, beyond that which is established, and in seeking that has discovered needs crying out for the very things we are providing in this legislation. The Democratic Party, the administration in Washington, is inching forward with the light to spread the knowledge to a wider group of people to make this country stronger, to give it greater protection.

This conference report ought to be adopted overwhelmingly and there ought not to be a dissenting vote against providing the public schools of this country with additional well-trained, qualified teachers regardless of where the money comes from.

Why?

We have been paying money into vocational home economics and for vocational agricultural teachers, from the Federal Government, since 1917, and they have been working in the public schools. We just passed this year Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools with the highest authorization for money and education in the history of this country, and it has gone to pay teachers' salaries and to build classrooms.

I say to my friends, I hope and sincerely trust you will support this conference report and vote down overwhelmingly the motion to recommit.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Teacher Corps.

President Johnson has said:

> Just as ignorance breeds poverty, poverty all too often breeds ignorance in the next generation.

Education offers the children of the poor the brightest hope for escape from this bitter cycle of ignorance and poverty. Yet the shortage of good teachers is most acute where the children of the poor are most numerous.

The Teacher Corps can go far toward alleviating this shortage. It will not only recruit men and women to teach in areas where good teachers are in shortest supply and greatest demand—it will recruit the best possible men and women to teach in these areas.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind my colleagues that members of the Corps will be volunteers for teaching in city slums and depressed rural areas. They will be seeking assignments which others have shunned. They will bring to their classrooms a sense of mission which will support them in the face of whatever hardships and difficulties they encounter.

We know that dedicated teachers are the best teachers. We can assume, I think, that the best teachers of disadvantaged children will be those who have dedicated themselves to the teaching of disadvantaged children.

The Teacher Corps will be made up of both experienced teachers and young college graduates who may make a career of teaching. I think this is a very promising combination of forces.

The teacher interns will serve as members of teaching teams under the guidance of older teachers with many years of experience in education. Before starting on their teaching assignments these interns will undergo intensive 3-month training to equip them for their work. Later they will receive inservice training conducted by experienced teachers at seminars in the schools where they teach.

Thus, the program will also serve as a realistic training ground for young teachers, benefiting both themselves and the children they will be teaching in the years ahead.

It is likely that many of these devoted young teachers will choose to continue their careers as they have begun them—as teachers of disadvantaged children. In this way, Mr. Speaker, the Teacher Corps can serve as the nucleus of an expanding force which will bring education to those children who need it most—to the great benefit of our society for years to come.

The Teacher Corps is a natural extension of the wise and far-reaching legislation enacted earlier in this same session of Congress: the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1955. This act gives special attention to improving education in economically deprived areas.

The new programs and expanded resources made possible by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act will go far toward improving education in the areas where the greatest improvement is needed.

But no school can be better than its teachers.

Now, as always, our ultimate hopes for progress in education rest with the teachers in our classrooms. The most promising programs will fail without good teachers to run them. The finest textbooks are of little value without good teachers to guide children in their use.

The American people have challenged us to bring reality to the concept of equal educational opportunity. They have asked us to provide every child in every school with an education that matches the highest range of his ability. We have responded to that challenge by enacting the most comprehensive program of Federal assistance for education in our Nation's history. We must not undo that great program by omitting the keystone to that triumphal arch of accomplishment: more and better teachers.

That need for teachers can be supplied by retaining the Teacher Corps as an integral and necessary part of the Higher Education Act. It offers the only prospect of bringing more and better teachers to the schools where the jobs are waiting. It would supply school districts throughout the country with those very teachers who are hardest to obtain and who would carry out the most difficult assignments with the greatest promise of success.

Mr. Speaker, it remains for us to match the energy and idealism of our teachers with the need of our schools. We can do it and we should do it.

THE CONCEPT

Experienced teachers and highly qualified college graduates like those who made the Peace Corps such a success would be enrolled for 2 years of service and training to improve the educational opportunities for children living in areas having a concentration of families with low incomes. Effective professional training for the teacher interns will be provided in the most deprived rural and urban slum schools through cooperative arrangements between those schools and local colleges and universities.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

To attract and train bright young people who might not otherwise enter the teaching profession or choose to teach in deprived schools.

To bring able and spirited teaching help to our most needy schools.

OPERATION OF THE TEACHER CORPS

Recruitment: College graduates and experienced teachers will be recruited for the Teacher Corps in a national campaign. A corps of some 6,000 members is eventually contemplated. An expected enrollment of 3,750 Teacher Corps members is expected the first year.

Interns: College graduates will serve in teams under the direction of an experienced Teacher Corps member. They will receive 3 months of intensive teacher training at a college or university before going into local school districts requesting their services. They will be paid at the lowest rate paid by that district for a full-time teacher.

Experienced teachers will serve either individually in schools requesting them or as leaders of Teacher Corps teams. Individual experienced teachers will be paid at the prevailing local rate for teachers of comparable experience and training. Team leaders may receive additional compensation in keeping with their added responsibilities.

Local control: Teacher Corps members will serve only at the request of local educational agencies. They will be under the same local authority as any other teacher in the system. Members will be employees of the local school district and these districts will retain full authority over curriculum and will have the customary rights of firing and hiring.

Training: Colleges and universities will carry out the intensive 3-month teacher intern training program. It is modeled on the successful programs in teacher education for college graduates now operated by some 40 institutions of higher education. After being accepted by local school districts, interns, while working in local schools, will participate in inservice training programs carried out by the experienced teacher team leader and in cooperation with a college or university. It is expected that—at the end of 2 years of teaching and further academic study—Teacher Corps interns will be able to earn advanced degrees and receive professional certification. Tuition and university program costs will be paid by Federal grants.

FACTS AND FIGURES

The Teacher Corps provisions are contained in sections 513 through 517 of title V–B of the Higher Education Act as passed by the Senate. These provisions establish a National Teacher Corps in the Office of Education with authorizations of $36,100,000 for fiscal year 1966 and $64,715,000 for fiscal year 1967.

What is the Teacher Corps?

Under title V–B of the Higher Education Act, dedicated and able young men and women—like those who have made the Peace Corps such a success—will be recruited and trained to teach where they are most needed, in city slums and areas of rural poverty across the Nation. Teacher Corps members will be recruited nationally on the basis of talent and promise and will be trained by the Nation's colleges and universities. They will serve up to 2 years—side by side with local teachers—on request from State and local educational authorities. Some will be experienced teachers; others, teacher interns who will work in teams under the direction of experienced teachers. All will get university pre-service training as well as a program of inservice graduate education leading to an advanced degree.

How much money is available for the National Teacher Corps?

Just over $36 million has been authorized for fiscal year 1966 and there will be $64.7 million for fiscal year 1967.

Why is the Teacher Corps necessary?

In 1964, there were more than 82,000 full-time teachers with less than standard certificates. The majority of these were concentrated in low-income areas, those areas which need the best teachers. The National Education Association estimates that there is a shortage of 128,000 teachers this year. Moreover, the new Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has created a need for an additional 30,000 teachers to staff the new programs funded.

Who will pay the teachers' salaries?

Local school districts will employ Teacher Corps members and pay their salaries. The local district costs for the program will be covered by Federal grants to the district. This is in line with the precedent set by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which provides that Federal funds may be used by local districts to pay teachers' salaries in low-income areas.

Will this program lead to Federal control of the schools?

Teacher Corps teachers and teams are employees of and under the direct control of local school authorities. The authorities of these districts request Teacher Corps members in the first place and have the right to fire them at any time, thus assuring that local control of education will be preserved.

Section 516 of title V–B specifically states:

> LOCAL CONTROL PRESERVED
>
> SEC. 516. Members of the Teacher Corps shall be under the direct supervision of the appropriate officials of the local educational agencies to which they are assigned. Except as otherwise provided in clause (3) of section 513(a), such agencies shall retain the authority to—
>
> (1) assign such members within their systems;
>
> (2) make transfers within their systems;
>
> (3) determine the subject matter to be taught;
>
> (4) determine the terms and continuance of the assignment of such members within their systems.

Will Teacher Corps members be adequately trained?

All inexperienced teacher interns will receive 3 months of intensive training at a college or university before going into local schools requesting them. Their training will continue in the school under the close supervision of an experienced teacher and in cooperation with the university.

Are there any precedents for this kind of training program?

Yes. Intern training programs for college graduates have been operating successfully in the country since 1895. Now more than 40 institutions including Harvard, Yale, Stanford, and the University of Wisconsin have such programs leading to master's degrees.

Who is eligible to be a Teacher Corps member?

A college graduate with a bachelor's degree, whether or not he has had teaching experience, will be eligible to become a teacher intern. Experienced teachers will also be eligible to be Teacher Corps intern team leaders or to serve individually.

Where will the Teacher Corps members work?

Local schools, both urban and rural, having the highest concentrations of low-income children will be eligible to request Teacher Corps members.

Will this program take away competent teachers from other areas?

No. While some experienced teachers will be drawn to schools in poverty areas for 2 years of service, it is expected that they will be returning at the end of that period to their home districts. By encouraging dedicated college graduates, who would not normally enter the teaching profession, to become teachers and work with the disadvantaged youth of this country, it is expected that the Teacher Corps will strengthen significantly the Nation's teaching resources.

What will be the role of State educational agencies in National Teacher Corps?

The State educational agencies will act as advisers and consultants on every step in the program—recruitment, selection, training, and assignment.

Now has this measure been given adequate consideration by Congress?

The bill was considered at length by the Congress. Four days of hearings on this legislation were held before the General Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor. Further, the bill was reported out by the committee. As a result of careful scrutiny in the Senate, the bill was included in the Higher Education Act of 1965. The majority of the members of the House-Senate conference agreed to its inclusion.

Does the Teacher Corps really belong in the Higher Education Act of 1965?

Yes. For two reasons: First, this measure will give the grade and high schools of this country supplementary teaching services. It will provide extra teachers and extra teaching skills in these areas. Second, for higher education, the Teacher Corps will stimulate and encourage college graduates to enter the teaching profession—supplementing their classroom experience with on-the-job contact with students. Further, the program also includes fellowships and grants for individuals seeking to improve their teaching ability through further academic training. It is an education measure on all of these counts.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues today to finish the monumental work which this education Congress has begun for the children of the poor. This past spring, in title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, we made an historic effort to upgrade education for the disadvantaged and the culturally deprived.

But that effort will not suceed unless we address ourselves to the critical point of quality education, and that means quality teachers. Therefore, I urge the support of all my colleagues for the Teacher Corps. The Teacher Corps is designed to bring quality teaching where it is most needed and often least provided—to the city slums and the rural areas of poverty.

The goals of the Teacher Corps merit our approval:

To attract and train bright young people who might not otherwise enter the teaching profession;

To attract dedicated teachers to our deprived schools;

To bring able and spirited teaching interns to our most needy schools;

To develop public awareness of the dramatic challenges faced by those schools; and

To encourage greater contact and cooperation between universities and the schools of the disadvantaged.

The Corps will enroll experienced master teachers and teacher interns with no less than a bachelor's degree—able and dedicated young people who will make teaching a career. They will receive 3 months of additional, special training in education and in the complex problems of urban and rural poverty. In addition, the teacher interns, while working in local schools, will take part in university-level training programs given by experienced teachers from institutions of higher education.

Working in teams under the supervision of master teachers, the teacher interns will have the unique opportunity of meeting their future teaching challenge head on—but not all by themselves, as so often happens in our schools today. The young teacher will not be left to his own devices and his own wits. The children will not be left in the hands of inexperienced college boys.

The Teacher Corps is specifically set up to prevent this kind of thing from continuing. Interns will work with a master teacher, someone with responsibility and experience, a teacher not only dedicated to better education but also dedicated to enriching the classroom experience of every child.

I can think of no better way to insure quality teachers for our schools of poverty than through the proposed Teacher Corps.

Beyond serving the needs of the culturally deprived, the Corps is sure to stimulate a new spirit among the other teachers working in the same schools. Many teachers in the past have avoided serving in urban slum schools or remote rural schoolhouses. It meant less professional status for qualified teachers. The result is often a large number of substitute or temporary personnel—exactly where experienced and dedicated teachers are desperately needed.

Through the example of the Teacher Corps, teaching in deprived schools will become the new challenge for every member of the profession. It can stimulate other dedicated teachers to apply themselves to the educational problems of the disadvantaged.

We need those teachers now. We needed them yesterday. Certainly it is in our power and it is in the Nation's highest interests that we need and provide those teachers tomorrow with the help of the National Teacher Corps.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I support most strongly retention of the National Teacher Corps in this bill. I introduced legislation, H.R. 9879, that is nearly identical with this part of the present bill, because I believe that those experienced and new teachers who volunteer for service in economically and culturally deprived areas of our country will contribute immeasurably to the task we have undertaken to eliminate poverty and ignorance and their unspeakably deplorable consequences.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives—nearing adjournment after a long and fruitful session—will vote on the Higher Education Act of 1965.

I intend to vote for the bill. I support this measure because it will do for our colleges and universities what other legislation has done for our country's elementary and secondary schools.

I intend to vote for this bill because the Higher Education Act of 1965 is the final measure by this session of Congress that will help assure that every child in this country will have the best education we can offer—an education that will carry our children as far as their individual ability can be stretched.

I intend to vote for this bill because it is clear that we in the United States—legislator or farmer, city dweller or teacher—can never have a Great Society without having an educated society.

Thomas Jefferson once said that any nation that expects to be both ignorant and free expects "what never was and never can be."

Years later, President Kennedy termed our Nation's educational efforts the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress.

And, at the beginning of this Congress, President Johnson made it emphatically clear that education in the United States is "the first work of our times."

Education is important to our every endeavor. When the Nation gears for national defense to meet our critical role in the world, we call upon our schools to support this effort by providing the kind and quality of education required for competent, well-trained personnel.

When this Nation fights poverty, we turn to education as the most basic means to break the cycle of poverty and ignorance typical of culturally deprived children.

We want and expect the best for our children and when the Nation and the people of the State of Washington look for a place to provide this, we turn to our schools for the answer. And to help these schools play their part, this Congress has taken steps to meet their needs.

The heart of my concern for the people living in my congressional district is that education, first and foremost, is an investment in the future of my district and my State. The funds authorized by this Higher Education Act of 1965 will do much in my district and State just as it will do a great deal for the entire Nation.

In the State of Washington, nearly 100,000 students are enrolled in colleges and universities and junior colleges alone. We have a total of 31 colleges and universities, both public and private, where this money will be directed to help solve the educational problems of the next decade.

As a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I have helped to develop the other educational measures in this Congress, just as it was my privilege to work on the Higher Education Act of 1965.

I want to outline briefly the provisions and potential contained in this act.

Title I of the Higher Education Act will directly benefit our cities by turning to the most logical source of research, information, and guidance: our higher educational institutions. Over $400,000 is authorized for the State of Washington.

For example, in my congressional district, the fantastic problems created by the rapid growth of the area between Seattle and Everett would stun any city planner. An urban area such as this needs help to solve the intertwined problems of water and air pollution, of transportation and conservation, of proper schools and decent housing. Some men, and I suspect men of vision rather than visionaries, predict a day when the areas between Portland, Oreg., and Vancouver, British Columbia, in Canada will be one gangling metropolis. The problems that situation would conjure are nearly beyond comprehension.

Under title I, the University of Washington in Seattle and Western Washington State College, in Bellingham, can help solve these problems through community service and continuing education programs.

Both of these schools are eminently qualified in many areas to set a pattern for future development and both of these schools have a strong tradition of community service. This bill will aid that tradition of service by providing Federal funds to help solve community problems in a wide variety of topics.

I am also glad to see that the legislation contains a provision specifically stating that the operation of these programs will be consistent with the overall educational program of any participating institution. No one wants to, nor should the program be allowed to, impair the primary goal of a university—to educate the student. But, within the framework there is a great deal that can be done.

The second title of this legislation provides assistance for our college libraries and for library training and research.

This measure will help universities and colleges in several ways. First, it will allow them to acquire library materials needed for expanded responsibilities in research, teaching and student use. Second, it will encourage enlarged college and university training programs, and in other ways, is designed to help give the best to the center of any undergraduate program: a library with books in all fields to satisfy the thirsty minds of our young men and women.

The third title of the Higher Education Act has a provision which will directly assist the improvement of the academic facilities of certain "developing institutions" in the United States and I am happy to see that this legislation provides that 22 percent of the funds authorized will be reserved for junior colleges.

This title will, for example, help facilitate the exchange of faculty or students with smaller colleges. I am sure that the colleges of Washington State will be eager participants in this assistance to developing colleges in our State and throughout this Nation.

Every parent, every mother and father, knows the problems and costs of a college education. I believe this is the most urgent crisis facing our college students: just how can we insure that no child will be denied a college education simply because of lack of finances. I have been a strong supporter of the National Defense Education Act and for this reason indorse title IV of this bill which provides additional funds for student assistance.

The fourth title will give educational opportunity grants to needy students. Nearly $1,400,000 is authorized for Washington State. Finally, and most important, it is going to provide some technical amendments to improve the National Defense Education Act.

The fifth title of this legislation will establish the National Teacher Corps, a program through which dedicated college graduates can teach in areas of the United States having a concentration of low-income families.

This title also sets up fellowships for teachers to solve the crisis of the classroom. We all know that experienced teachers and other personnel in our grade and high schools need time to pursue graduate study and then reenter the teaching field.

In addition, this fellowship program will allow other college graduates—recent or otherwise—to go into the teaching profession after graduate study.

The three remaining titles of this legislation—VI, VII, VIII—are basic.

Title VI will give additional financial support to acquire laboratory and special equipment and materials to improve undergraduate instruction.

Title VII simply increases the funds authorized under the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, legislation which allowed the schools of the State of Washington to construct undergraduate academic facilities. I am happy to note that public community colleges and technical institutions will be eligible in this measure to States where the demands from four-year institutions is not sufficient to use the appropriated funds.

That, briefly, is the Higher Education Act of 1965, very significant and important piece of legislation because the foundation of our Great Society, as I have said, must be an educated society. This program is reasonable for it gives the money where it is needed most: to our colleges and universities and to our developing colleges in this country, to the students and to the people who want to pursue teaching careers.

A decade of education confronts us. Even this measure, it is clear, is only one strong step on the path of our education goal in this country.

That goal is the continued assurance that we will meet the challenge of the growing tide of students on our campuses. That challenge is—as the University of Washington describes its program of undergraduate instruction—the "years of discovery."

Let us, today, vote in concert to make sure that those "years of discovery" on the college campuses of this country are the best years in the lives of our young men and women.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, no matter what our individual views may be on the merits of the Teacher Corps proposal in the conference report now before us, I believe the House has an obligation to remove it from this bill. I shall, therefore, vote to recommit the conference report for that purpose.

As an idea, the proposal to enlist school teachers to go into school districts to teach culturally deprived children is a very attractive one. But can Congress legislate simply on the basis of an attractive idea? Can we enact laws which have too few conditions or standards, too little by which to control the administration of the program and measure its performance? Not, I suggest, if we take seriously our obligation as legislators.

There have been practically no hearings on this proposal in the House. There is a great deal of evidence that this was a sort of last-minute idea of the administration. There is very little evidence that the idea was thoroughly studied, carefully considered, and recommended to Congress in a manner which indicated the administration was prepared to administer the program effectively.

This has been a problem with a great deal of legislation this year. We have received recommendations from the executive branch but not the detailed proposals for the proper administration of the program which would give the Congress confidence in the readiness and ability of the administration to do the job. The majority leader of the Senate recently complained that Congress will have to spend much of its second session repairing the omissions and deficiencies of the legislation we passed this year. I see no reason to compound the problem.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today we are committed to the war against poverty in our country.

The different forms poverty takes are sadly familiar. There is hunger and undernourishment. Many schoolchildren arrive each day at school without any breakfast and return home to dinners of peanut butter and jelly. There is chronic ill health. There is unemployment and underemployment. For too many Americans there is no home and no joy.

The causes of this devastating poverty are many, surely. But, at the heart of this problem is lack of education. For lack of education and training is what, in most cases, makes it impossible for a person to qualify for available jobs. It is what limits a mother's knowledge of how to budget properly and how best to feed her family. And, it is what inhibits learning and putting into practice beneficial health measures.

A National Teacher Corps, specially trained and dedicated, can be one of the best instruments for providing disadvantaged youngsters in our urban and rural slums with the kind of education they need to lift themselves out of poverty.

The National Teacher Corps proposed by title V of the Higher Education Act is patterned after the Peace Corps.

The National Teacher Corps would give highly motivated individuals who are now teachers, or who want to become teachers, the opportunity to serve their country and their fellow man by teaching the children of our poor.

Basically, the program would operate in this way:

First, members of the National Teacher Corps will be specially trained and oriented for teaching service in schools with large numbers of underprivileged youth. Equipped with these special teaching skills, and with a broad understanding of the problems of the underprivileged, they will be ready to go into schools to teach.

Once in these schools, the members of the National Teaching Corps will apply specialized training to help give educationally underprivileged youngsters the particular enriched learning experiences they need in order to bridge the heritage of dispair. Understanding the children's handicaps, the teachers will be better able and prepared to teach these students the academic skills that must be mastered to be successful in school and in life, and to begin to enjoy both. And, they will introduce their pupils to the rewarding world of cultural life around them—a life which heretofore has been remote or unknown.

In order to attract a wide variety of dedicated teachers, and also, to train a new supply of teachers, the membership of the National Teacher Corps will comprise both experienced teachers and college graduates who wish to be teachers.

The experienced teachers will work in schools singly or as members or leaders of teaching teams. They will contribute both to the schools in which they will teach and to the young would-be teachers at their side.

To the classrooms of the disadvantaged the experienced teachers will bring their many years of teaching. The children and youth they teach will have the opportunity of being instructed by individuals who have had a wide range of educational experience and a deep knowledge of the art of teaching.

To the young teacher-interns in the program, these experienced teachers would also serve as instructors through leading inservice training programs carried out in cooperation with institutions of higher education. They would help to teach these young teacher-interns classroom skills while these young instructors are actually on the job in the schools of the underprivileged.

The teacher-interns, for their part, will contribute vigor and enthusiasm to the classrooms of the disadvantaged. Their original and fresh ideas and approaches will stimulate an atmosphere of excitement about learning which cannot help but communicate itself to children and youth who need to be convinced of the value, wonder, and pleasure of learning.

Teacher interns who will already have B.A. degrees would also be continuing their schooling at a nearby institution of higher education while they are actually teaching. At the end of their 2 years of service in the Corps teacher-interns would be able to have earned an advanced degree in education. With this degree, plus their training in the teaching of the disadvantaged and their actual 2 years of practicing this knowledge, members of the National Teacher Corps would be well prepared to teach underprivileged children. As a group, they would also provide a valuable supply of well-prepared future teachers for America's youth.

Although the cost of the program would be borne entirely by the Federal Government, the members of the National Teacher Corps will not be employees of the Federal Government but will be, in effect, a part of the local school system. Federal funds will go to the local education agency which will pay the Teacher Corps members and directly supervise them.

The pay of the teacher in the Teacher Corps will be the same as for teachers in the local school system. Members of the Corps who are experienced will be paid the same as a teacher with similar training, experience and duties in the local system plus an extra amount if they are leading a teaching team. Teacher-interns will be paid at the beginning of the scale at the lowest rate paid by the local agency for full-time teachers in a particular school and grade.

Mr. Speaker, the National Teacher Corps offers a concrete plan for attempting to raise the quality of education in our schools.

It will also stimulate respect for learning on the part not only of disadvantaged youngsters, but also on the part of youths and citizens in all parts of America.

I urge support for the Teacher Corps and trust that the Quie motion to recommit will be defeated.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. QUIE. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. QUIE, of Minnesota, moves to recommit the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9567) to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist upon the deletion of part B of title V of the bill, which would authorize the establishment of a National Teacher Corps.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 152, nays 226, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 376]

YEAS—152

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Glenn
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Ayres
Baldwin
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
de la Garza
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Findley
Fisher
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Gathings
Gettys
Goodell
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Herlong
Horton
Hull
Hutchinson
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Mathias
Michel
Minshall
Mize
Moore
Morton
Nelsen
Passman
Pelly
Pirnie
Poff
Pool
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roberts
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Saylor
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Watson
Whalley
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wyatt
Wydler
Younger

NAYS—226

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Bandstra
Barrett
Beckworth
Bennett
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bonner
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harris
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Krebs
Landrum
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackie
Madden
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Monagan
Moorhead
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain

St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Stalbaum
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sweeney
Teague, Tex.
Todd
Trimble
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Watts
Weltner
White, Idaho
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—54

Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Aspinall
Baring
Bell
Berry
Bolling
Callaway
Clausen, Don H.
Culver
Davis, Wis.
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Edwards, Ala.
Flynt
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Hagan, Ga.
Hébert
Hosmer
Keogh
Kirwan
Leggett
Lennon
Lindsay
Mackay
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Poage
Reifel
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Roudebush
Sisk
Staggers
Sullivan
Talcott
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex
Toll
Tunney
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Wilson, Bob

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hagan of Georgia for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Don H. Clausen for, with Mr. Leggett against.

Mr. O'Neal of Georgia for, with Mr. Tenzer against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Kirwan against.

Mr. Matthews for, with Mr. Staggers against.

Mr. Lennon for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey against.

Mr. Dorn for, with Mr. Culver against.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina for, with Mr. Mackay against.

Mr. Edwards of Alabama for, with Mr. Bell against.

Mr. Roudebush for, with Mrs. Sullivan against.

Mr. Davis of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Toll against.

Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Sisk against.

Mr. George W. Andrews for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mrs. May for, with Mr. Walker of New Mexico against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Reifel.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Callaway.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Robison.

Mr. Tunney with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. JONES of Missouri changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 313, nays 63, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 377]

YEAS—313

Abbitt
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Ayres
Baldwin
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Bennett
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clark
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Donohue
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Mathias
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morris
Morrison
Morton
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, N.Y.
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sweeney
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—63

Abernethy
Andrews, Glenn
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Belcher
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burleson
Byrnes, Wis.
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Collier
Colmer
Curtin
Dague
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Erlenborn
Findley
Fisher
Fountain
Gathings
Gettys
Goodell
Griffin
Gross
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Henderson
Hutchinson
Jones, Mo.
Laird
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McMillan
MacGregor
Martin, Ala.
Michel
Nelsen
Passman
Poff
Pool
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rogers, Tex.
Satterfield
Saylor
Smith, Calif.
Tuck
Utt
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Watson
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Younger

NOT VOTING—57

Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Aspinall
Baring
Bell
Berry
Bolling
Callaway
Clausen, Don H.
Culver
Davis, Wis.
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Edwards, Ala.
Flynt
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Hagan, Ga.
Harsha
Hébert
Hosmer
Jonas
Keogh
Kirwan
Leggett
Lennon
Lindsay
Mackay
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Poage
Reifel
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Roudebush
Sisk
Staggers
Sullivan
Talcott
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tunney
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Wilson, Bob

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Hagan of Georgia against.

Mr. Leggett for, with Mr. Don H. Clausen against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. O'Neal of Georgia against.

Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Matthews against.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Lennon against .

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Dorn against.

Mr. Tenzer for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. George W. Andrews against.

Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Edwards of Alabama against.

Mrs. May for, with Mr. Bob Wilson against.

Mr. Robison for, with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Tunney with Mr. Callaway.

Mr. Walker of New Mexico with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Mackay with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Jonas.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.

Mr. Culver with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Harsha.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Lindsay.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Morse.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Berry.

Messrs. TUCK and McCLORY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11135. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 11135) entitled "An act to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. BENNETT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE SUGAR BILL

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 11135) with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. COOLEY, POAGE, ABERNETHY, PURCELL, MORRISON, MATSUNAGA, DAGUE, BELCHER, and TEAGUE of California.

RIVERS AND HARBORS ACT OF 1965

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1170)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I—NORTHEASTERN UNITED STATES WATER SUPPLY

"SEC. 101. (a) Congress hereby recognizes that assuring adequate supplies of water for the great metropolitan centers of the United States has become a problem of such magnitude that the welfare and prosperity of this country require the Federal Government to assist in the solution of water supply problems. Therefore, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to cooperate with Federal, State, and local agencies in preparing plans in accordance with the Water Resources Planning Act (Public Law 89-80) to meet the long-range water needs of the northeastern United States. This plan may provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance by the United States of (1) a system of major reservoirs to be located within those river basins of the Northeastern United States which drain into the Chesapeake Bay, those that drain into the Atlantic Ocean north of the Chesapeake Bay, those that drain into Lake Ontario, and those that drain into the Saint Lawrence River, (2) major conveyance facilities by which water may be exchanged between these river basins to the extent found desirable in the national interest, and (3) major purification facilities. Such plans shall provide for appropriate financial participation by the States, political subdivisions thereof, and other local interests.

"(b) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall construct, operate, and maintain those reservoirs, conveyance facilities, and purification facilities, which are recommended in the plan prepared in accordance with subsection (a) of this section, and which are specifically authorized by law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act.

"(c) Each reservoir included in the plan authorized by this section shall be considered as a component of a comprehensive plan for the optimum development of the river basin in which it is situated, as well as a component of the plan established in accordance with this section.

"TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

"SEC. 201. (a) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain any water resource development project, including single and multiple purpose projects involving, but not limited to, navigation, flood control, and shore protection, if the estimated Federal first cost of constructing such project is less than $10,000,000. No appropriation shall be made to construct, operate, or maintain any such project if such project has not been approved by resolutions adopted by the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively. For the purpose of security consideration of such approval the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report of such proposed project, including all relevant data and all costs.

"(b) Any water resource development project authorized to be constructed by this section shall be subject to the same requirements of local cooperation as it would be if the estimated Federal first cost of such project were $10,000,000 or more.

"SEC. 202. Section 3 of the Act approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as amended by section 2 of the Act approved June 28, 1938 (Public Law Numbered 761, Seventy-fifth Congress), shall apply to all works authorized in this title except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project, provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said Act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law, the authorization for any flood control project authorized by this Act requiring local cooperation shall expire five years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the Department of the Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation will be furnished.

"SEC. 203. The provisions of section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law Numbered 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this Act, and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

"SEC. 204. The following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein. The necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this title with funds from appropriations hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program. The projects authorized in this title shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements. Penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

"Saint John River Basin

"The Dickey-Lincoln School project, Saint John River, Maine, is hereby authorized as approved by the President on July 12, 1965, and substantially in accordance with the plans included in the report of the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers dated August 1964, which is a supplement to the July 1963 report of the International Passamaquoddy tidal power project and upper Saint John River hydroelectric power development, at an estimated cost of $227,000,000.

"Housatonic River Basin

The projects for flood protection on the Housatonic, Naugatuck, and Still Rivers at Derby and Danbury, Connecticut, are hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 324, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,100,000.

"New England-Atlantic coastal area

"The project for hurricane-flood control protection at Westerly, Rhode Island, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 85, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,287,000.

"Long Island Sound area

"The project for hurricane-flood protection at Stratford, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 292, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,340,000.

"Hudson River Basin

"The project for flood protection at Yonkers, Saw Mill River, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 258, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,924,000.

"New York-Atlantic coastal area

"The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 215, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $32,620,000.

"The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Staten Island, Fort Wadsworth to Arthur Kill, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 181, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,230,000.

"Elizabeth River Basin, New Jersey

"The project for hurricane-flood protection on the Elizabeth River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 249, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,769,000.

"Rahway River Basin, New Jersey

"The project for flood protection on the Rahway River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 67, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,514,000.

"Neuse River Basin

"The project for the Falls Dam and Reservoir, Neuse River, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 175, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $18,600,000.

"The project for hurricane-flood protection at New Bern and Vicinity, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 183, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $10,400,000.

"Middle Atlantic coastal area

"The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Ocracoke Island, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 109, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,636,000.

"Flint River Basin

"The project for the Lazer Creek Reservoir, Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $40,378,000.

"The project for the Lower Auchumpkee Reservoir, Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $48,275,000.

"Central and Southern Florida Basin

"Comprehensive plan

"The comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida approved in the Act of June 30, 1948, and subsequent Acts of Congress, is hereby modified to include the following items:

"The project for flood protection in Hendry County, west of levees 1, 2, and 3, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 102, Eighty-eighth Congress, at a estimated cost of $4,986,000.

"The project for flood protection in Southwest Dade County, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 20, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,903,000.

"South Atlantic coastal area

"The project for hurricane-flood protection on Biscayne Bay, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 213, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,954,000.

"Phillippi Creek Basin, Florida

"The project for flood control on Phillippi Creek, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 156, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,592,000.

"Lower Mississippi River Basin

"Comprehensive plan

"The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River, adopted by the Act of May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 534), as amended and modified, is hereby further modified and expanded to include the projects and plans substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $181,109,000, except that (1) any modified easements required in the improvement of the Birds Point-New Madrid, Missouri, Floodway shall be acquired as provided by section 4 of the Act of May 15, 1928, (2) the pumping plant in the Red River backwater area shall be operated and maintained by the Corps of Engineers, (3) the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget shall apply with respect to improvements for fish and wildlife, and (4) the requirement of local cooperation for the improvements in the St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri, shall be reviewed by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, with particular reference to Federal and non-Federal cost sharing, and he shall report results of such review to Congress within one year after the date of enactment of this Act. No appropriation made pursuant to the authorization contained in this paragraph shall be available for any project other than those set forth in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319, Eighty-eighth Congress.

"The project for the St. Francis River, Missouri and Arkansas, within Drainage District No. 7, Poinsett County, Arkansas, is hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 57, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,372,000.

"General Projects

"The project for hurricane-flood protection at Grand Isle and Vicinity, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 184, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,500,000.

"The project for hurricane-flood protection at Morgan City and Vicinity, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 167, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,049,000.

"The project for hurricane-flood protection on Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 231, Eighty-ninth Congress, except that the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army in that document shall apply with respect to the Seabrook Lock feature of the project. The estimated cost is $56,235,000.

"Ouachita River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Ouachita River at Monroe, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 328, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $520,000.

"Red River Basin

"The project for flood protection on Bayou Bodcau and tributaries, Arkansas and Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 203, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,524,000.

"The project for Caddo Dam and Reservoir, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, as modified by the Secretary of the Army, in Senate Document Numbered 39, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,934,000.

"The project for Sanders, Big Pine, and Collier Creeks, Texas, as authorized in the Act of October 23, 1962 (76 Stat. 1187), is hereby modified in order to provide for a highway crossing Pat Mayse Reservoir to replace the present FM Highway 1499 across Sanders Creek, at an estimated cost of $310,000. Such crossing shall be constructed under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with such plans as may be recommended by the Chief of Engineers.

"Gulf of Mexico

"The project for flood protection on the Buffalo Bayou and tributaries, White Oak Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 169, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,800,000.

"The project for flood protection on Highland Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 168, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,500,000.

"The project for flood protection on Taylors Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, as modified by the Secretary of the Army, in House Document Numbered 206, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,004,000.

"Rio Grande Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Rio Grande at El Paso, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 207, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,493,000.

"Arkansas River Basin

"Comprehensive Plan

"The multiple-purpose plan for improvement of Arkansas River and tributaries, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, as amended, is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers, to provide replacement outfall facilities for the Kansas Street outfall sewer in the city of Pine Bluff, Arkansas, including such new pumping facilities as may be necessary, at the most economical Federal expense, but including in the Federal expense the reasonable capitalized cost of operation and maintenance of the pumping facilities over the cost of pumping now required in the existing system.

"General Projects

"The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Las Animas, Colorado, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 165, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,541,000.

"The project for flood protection on Lee Creek, Arkansas and Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 270, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $10,000,000.

"The project for flood protection at Little Rock, Arkansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 55, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $363,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Great Bend, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 182, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,030,000.

"The project for establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the John Redmond Dam and Reservoir, Grand (Neosho) River, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 27, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $730,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Walnut River, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 232, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $66,036,000.

"The project for the Shidler Dam and Reservoir, Salt Creek, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 242, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,150,000.

"The project for flood protection on Crutcho Creek, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 47, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,801,000.

"The project for Trinidad Dam on Purgatoire River, Colorado, House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-fourth Congress, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297) is hereby modified to provide that in lieu of the local cooperation recommended in paragraph 2(a) of the report of the Chief of Engineers dated July 22, 1954, published in said document, local interests shall maintain the channel of Purgatoire River through the city of Trinidad. The conditions set forth in paragraphs 2(b) and 2(c) of said report shall be applicable to the project.

"The John Martin Reservoir project (formerly known as Caddoa Reservoir), Arkansas River, Colorado, as authorized by the Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1570), is modified to authorize and direct the Chief of Engineers to use not to exceed ten thousand acre-feet of reservoir flood control storage space for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a permanent pool for fish and wildlife and recreational purposes, at such times as storage space may not be available for such permanent pool within the conservation pool as defined in article III F, Arkansas River compact (63 Stat. 145) except that—

"(1) The State of Colorado shall purchase and make available any water rights necessary under State law to establish and thereafter maintain the permanent pool.

"(2) The rights of irrigators in Colorado and Kansas to those waters available to them under the terms of the Arkansas River compact and under the laws of their respective States shall not be diminished or impaired by anything contained in this paragraph.

"(3) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed so as to give any preference to the permanent pool over other project purposes.

"(4) No permanent pool as herein defined shall be maintained except upon written terms and conditions acceptable and agreed to (A) by the Chief of Engineers in the interest of flood control, and (B) by the Colorado State Engineer, the Arkansas River Compact Administration, and the Colorado Water Conservation Board, in the interest of establishing, maintaining, and operating the permanent pool for recreational and fish and wildlife purposes.

"(5) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed so as to limit the authority of the Chief of Engineers to operate John Martin Reservoir for the primary purposes of the prevention of floods and the preservation of life and property.

"Missouri River Basin

"The project for flood protection on Big Creek at Hays, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 22, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,702,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Little Nemaha River and tributaries, Nebraska, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 160, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,524,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Big Sioux River and tributaries, Iowa and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 199, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,400,000, except that such portion of the project as relates to the area above the city limits of Sioux City, Iowa, shall be compatible with a fish and wildlife mitigation plan and also a flood control plan for the upper basin of the Big Sioux River, both to be approved by the States of Iowa and South Dakota.

"The project for flood protection on the James River and tributaries, North Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 266, Eighth-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,083,000.

"The project for flood control on the Fishing River and tributaries, Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 281, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,260,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers and tributaries, Iowa and Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army in House Document Numbered 238, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,167,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Grand River and tributaries, Missouri and Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 241, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $218,009,000. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the construction of Linneus Reservoir on Locust Creek, St. Catherine Reservoir on East Yellow Creek, the Honey Creek-No Creek local protection works, nor hydroelectric power facilities at Pattonsburg Reservoir on Grand River; the Secretary of the Army shall conduct a review of such reservoirs, local protection works, and hydroelectric power facilities, at an estimated cost of $75,000, and the funds authorized by this paragraph for project planning are authorized to be used for such review. The Secretary shall submit to Congress, at the earliest practical date, a new feasibility report on such projects based upon such review.

"The project for flood protection on the Platte River and tributaries, Missouri and Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 262, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $26,889,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Sun River at Great Falls, Montana, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297; Public Law 85–500) is hereby modified to waive the requirement that local interests contribute in cash 2.16 per centum of the actual construction cost of all items of work provided by the United States.

"Ohio River basin

"The project for flood protection on Chartiers Creek, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 302, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,207,000.

"The project for flood protection on Sandy Lick Creek at Du Bois, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 185, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,654,000.

"The project for the Hocking River, Ohio, in the vicinity of Athens, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 287, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,520,000.

"The project for the Lincoln, Clifty Creek, and Patoka Dams and Reservoirs, Wabash River, Indiana and Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 202, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $72,900,000.

"The project for the Lafayette and Big Pine Dams and Reservoirs, Wabash River, Indiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 29, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $44,800,000.

"The project for the Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir, Cheat River, West Virginia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 243, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $133,548,000: *Provided*, That the power features of this project shall not be undertaken until such time as the Federal Power Commission has completed action on any applications that may be pending before that agency for private development of the pumped-storage facility of the project: *Provided further*, That should the Federal Power Commission act in the affirmative on any pending applications, the authority for such project shall not include Federal power features and the estimated cost of such project shall be $88,402,000: *And provided further*, That in the event the Federal Power Commission dismisses any pending applications, Federal construction of such pumped-storage power facilities is hereby authorized and approved.

"The project for the Martins Fork Reservoir, Upper Cumberland River Basin, Kentucky, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 244, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,860,000.

"The Yatesville, Paintsville, and Panther Creek Reservoir projects and the Martin, Kentucky, local protection project on the Big Sandy River and Tug and Levisa Forks of Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of of $51,491,000. Prior to initiation of construction the Secretary of the Army shall prepare an analysis of benefits and costs of the proposed projects, including such reformulation as may be necessary to comply with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act.

"Red River of the North Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Roseau River, Minnesota, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 282, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,550,000.

"Upper Mississippi River Basin

"The project for flood protection at East Saint Louis and vicinity, Illinois (East Side levee and sanitary district), is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 329, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,180,000.

"The project for the Kaskaskia River, Illinois, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958 (Public Law 500, Eighty-fifth Congress), in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 232, Eighty-fifth Congress, is hereby modified substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 351, Eighty-eighth Congress, to provide for the deletion from the items of local cooperation the requirement of a cash contribution due to changed land use, at an estimated increased Federal cost of $3,498,000, if local interests make a cash contribution of an amount equal to the full cost of acquisition of flowage easements in those lands which are no longer needed for construction, operation, and maintenance of Carlyle Reservoir.

"The project for the Wood River Drainage and Levee District, Madison County, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 150, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $179,000.

"The project for Ames Dam and Reservoir, Skunk River, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, as modified by the Secretary of the Army, in House Document Numbered 267, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,893,000.

"The projects for flood protection at Marshalltown and Waterloo on the Iowa and Cedar Rivers, Iowa, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 166, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $17,570,000.

"The project for the Zumbro River, Minnesota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $975,000.

"The project for the Big Stone Lake and Whetstone River, Minnesota and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 579, Eighty-seventh Congress, and House Document Numbered 193, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,885,000.

"The project on the Des Moines River for flood protection of Des Moines, Iowa, House Document Numbered 651, Seventy-eighth Congress, authorized by the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), is hereby modified to eliminate the requirement recommended in paragraph 10(a) (2) of the report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 13, 1943, that local interests bear the expense of repairs and provision of gates on existing drains.

"Great Lakes Basin

"The project for flood control and navigation on the Chagrin River, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 35, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,200,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Grand River at and in the vicinity of Grandville, Michigan, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 157, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,373,000.

"Little Colorado River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Little Colorado River at and in the vicinity of Winslow, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 63, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,775,000.

"Gila River Basin

"The project for flood protection on Indian Bend Wash, Maricopa County, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 303, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,250,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Santa Rosa Wash, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 189, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,430,000, except that the development of recreation and fish and wildlife facilities shall be in accordance with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act.

"The project for flood protection at Phoenix, Arizona, and vicinity, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 216, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $58,310,000.

"Eel River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Eel River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 234, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,732,000.

"Sacramento River Basin

"The project for the New Bullards Bar Dam and Reservoir, Yuba River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 180, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,979,000.

"The project for the Lakeport Dam and Reservoir with supplemental channel improvements, Scotts Creek, Cache Creek Basin, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 259, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,360,000.

"San Francisco Bay Area

"The project for flood protection on Sonoma Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 224, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,400,000.

"The project for the Napa River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 222, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,950,000.

"Whitewater River Basin

"The project for flood protection on Tahquitz Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 223, Eighty-ninth Congress, except that the amount of local contribution required due to enhancement of land shall be reduced by the amount of contribution determined on lands under Indian ownership at the time of project authorization and not subject to taxation due to Federal statutory restrictions. The amount of contribution on this basis is presently estimated at $508,000. The estimated cost is $3,442,000.

"Santa Ana River Basin

"The project for flood protection on Lytle and Warm Creeks, San Bernardino County, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 53, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,750,000.

"San Diego River Basin

"The project for flood protection on San Diego River (Mission Valley), California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 212, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,600,000, except that the Secretary of the Army may reimburse local interests for the expenditure of funds used to construct such portions of the project as approved by the Chief of Engineers and constructed under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers.

"Columbia River Basin

"The projects for the Lower Grande Ronde and Catherine Creek dams and reservoirs, Grande Ronde River and tributaries, Oregon, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 280, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $20,440,000. The Chief of Engineers shall construct, operate, and maintain such projects.

"The project for flood protection on Willow Creek, Oregon, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 233, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,680,000.

"The project for acquisition of additional lands for water-fowl management at John Day Lock and Dam, Oregon and Washington, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 28, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $706,000, except that the parcels of land, in Oregon, between the Columbia River and the management area boundary within sections 3, 4, 10, and 11 of Township 4 North, Range 25 East, Willamette Meridian, as shown on plate 1 of Senate Document Numbered 28, Eighty-ninth Congress, estimated at 611.02 acres, shall not be part of the management area, and the Secretary of the Army is authorized to purchase such additional lands in sections 22, 27, 29, and

30, Township 5 North, Range 26 East, Willamette Meridian, outside the present indicated management area boundary on plate 1, as he determines necessary to replace the lands so excluded.

"Sec. 205. That the flood control project for the Scioto River, Ohio, authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962, is hereby modified to authorize the construction of the local protection works at Chillicothe, Ohio, at such time as the reservoirs on Alum, Mill, Big Darby, and Deer Creeks are under construction. In the event the Mill Creek and Alum Creek Reservoirs are constructed by an agency other than the Federal Government, the Federal Government shall not construct such local protection works at Chillicothe, Ohio, until said agency shall furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that (1) it will provide flood control storage in those reservoirs equivalent to that proposed for the Federal reservoir projects, as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962, in accordance with the plan set forth in House Document Numbered 587, Eighty-seventh Congress, and (2) that such reservoirs shall be operated for flood control in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

"Sec. 206. (a) That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to prepare under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, a comprehensive plan for the development and efficient utilization of the water and related resources of the region drained by streams which discharge, within the State of Michigan, into the Saint Clair River, Lake Saint Clair, the Detroit River and Lake Erie. Such plan may provide for importation of water from points not located within the region as defined above.

"(b) Said comprehensive plan shall be designed to meet the long-range needs of the region for protection against floods, wise use of flood plain lands, improvement of navigation facilities, water supplies for industrial and municipal purposes, outdoor recreational facilities, the enhancement and control of water quality, and related purposes; all with a view to encouraging and supporting the optimum long-range economic development of the region and enhancing the welfare of its people.

"Sec. 207. That the project for flood protection on the Minnesota River at Mankato and North Mankato, Minnesota, authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (Public Law 85–500, 72 Stat. 297) is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army to credit local interests against their required contribution to such project for any work necessitated by extreme high water done by such interests on such project between April 1, 1965, and February 1, 1966, if he approves such work as being in accordance with such project as authorized.

"Sec. 208. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its territorial possessions, which include the localities specifically named in this section. After the regular or formal reports made on any survey authorized by this section are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress, if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions.

"Watersheds of streams in the North Atlantic region draining northward in New York toward the Saint Lawrence River below the international boundary and draining directly into the Atlantic Ocean above the Virginia-North Carolina State line with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

"All streams flowing into the sounds of North Carolina between Cape Lookout and the Virginia line except those portions of the Neuse, Pamlico, and Roanoke Rivers above the estuarine reaches.

"Watersheds of streams in the South Atlantic region draining directly to the Atlantic Ocean below the Virginia-North Carolina State line and draining directly into the Gulf of Mexico east of Lake Pontchartrain with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

"The Rio Grande and its tributaries with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

"Watersheds of streams, washes, lakes, and their tributaries, which drain areas of the great basin region of Oregon, California, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

"The Colorado River and tributaries above Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

"The Colorado River and tributaries below Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

"Watersheds of streams in the Pacific Northwest region which drain directly into the Pacific Ocean along the coastlines of Washington and Oregon with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

"Watersheds of streams in California which drain directly into the Pacific Ocean and of streams, washes, lakes, and their tributaries, which drain areas in the eastern portion of the California region with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

"Kaneohe-Kailua area, Oahu, Hawaii.

"Terrebonne Parish, Louisiana (water supply).

"Boyer River, Iowa.

"Keokuk, Iowa.

"Mississippi River, north of Dubuque, Iowa.

"Black Hawk Creek, Iowa.

"Mount Vernon, Indiana.

"Orange Lake Basin, Florida.

"Mayfield Creek, Kentucky.

"Hatchie River and Tributaries, Tennessee and Mississippi.

"Spoon River, Illinois.

"Grand (Neosho) River, Oklahoma and Kansas (including navigation).

"Verdigris River, Kansas.

"Verdigris River, Oklahoma and Kansas (including navigation).

"Arkansas River and tributaries at and above Tulsa. Oklahoma.

"Sanderson, Texas.

"Abbeville, South Carolina.

"All streams which drain directly to Pacific Ocean from San Mateo County, California.

"Big Mineral Creek, Texas, particularly with reference to construction of a highway bridge.

"Irondequoit Creek, New York, and tributaries, including Allens Creek, New York.

"Coasts of Washington, Oregon, and California to determine advisability of protection work against storm and tidal waves.

"Sec. 209. Nothwithstanding the first proviso in section 201 of the Act entitled 'An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes', approved May 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 163), the authorization in section 204 of such Act of projects for local protection on the Yakima River at Ellensburg, Washington, shall expire on June 10, 1970, unless local interests shall before such date furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required local cooperation in such project will be furnished.

"Sec. 201. The Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers, is hereby authorized to replace the roads described and set forth in the provisions of their contract numbered DA–41–443–eng–939 with Hill County, Texas, which are subject to flooding; such roads being a part of the Whitney Dam and Reservoir project, Whitney, Texas, authorized by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, at an estimated cost of $130,000.

"Sec. 211. (a) The Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey to the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated, subject to the provisions of this section, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that portion of the tract of land lying above elevation 454 feet mean sea level now occupied by such Society at the Old Hickory lock and dam, Cumberland River, Tennessee, under a lease executed by the Secretary of the Army and dated February 10, 1958.

"(b) The conveyance authorized by this section shall be made upon payment to the United States of the fair market value of the property as determined by the Secretary of the Army, and upon such terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as he shall deem necessary to protect the interests of the United States. In determining the fair market value of the property, the Secretary shall exclude the value of any improvements made by or at the expense of the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated.

"(c) The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized by this section shall be borne by the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated.

"(d) Title to the property authorized to be conveyed by this section shall revert to the United States, which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon, if the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated, shall ever cease to use such property for recreation and camping purposes.

"Sec. 212. The authorized Justice Reservoir on the Guyandot River, West Virginia, hereafter shall be known and designated as the R. D. Bailey Reservoir. Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which the authorized Justice Reservoir is referred to shall be held to refer to such reservoir as the R. D. Bailey Reservoir.

"Sec. 213. In recognition of the flood control accomplishments of the water resource project proposed to be constructed on Calispell Creek, Washington, by the Pend Oreille County Public Utility District Number One, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a monetary contribution toward the construction cost of such project and the amount of such contribution shall be determined by the Secretary of the Army, subject to a finding by him approved by the President, of economic justification for allocation of the amount of flood control, such funds to be administered by the Secretary of the Army. Prior to making the monetary contribution or any part thereof, the Secretary of the Army and the Pend Oreille County Public Utility District Number One, shall have entered into an agreement providing for operation of the proposed project in such manner as will produce the flood control benefits upon which the monetary contribution is predicated, and such operation of the project for flood control shall be in accordance with rules prescribed by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to the provisions of section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 890). Unless construction of the project is undertaken within three years from the date of enactment of this section, the authority for the monetary contribution contained herein shall expire.

"Sec. 214. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to cooperate with the State of New York, political subdivisions thereof, and appropriate agencies and instrumentalities thereof, and with other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States, in the preparation of comprehensive plans for the development, utilization, and conservation of the water and related resources of drainage basins within the State of New York, and to submit to Congress reports and recommendations with respect to appropriate participation by the Department of the Army in carrying out such plans.

"SEC. 215. The Act entitled 'An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities at reservoir areas', approved September 14, 1961 (75 Stat. 509), is hereby amended by striking out 'before November 1, 1956,'.

"SEC. 216. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause to be made, under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, an investigation and study of San Francisco Bay, California, including San Pablo Bay, Suisun Bay, and other adjacent bays and tributaries thereto, with a view toward determining the feasibility of, and extent of Federal interest in, measures for waste disposal and water quality control and allied purposes.

"SEC. 217. (a) In the prosecution for projects of rivers and harbors and other waterways for the benefit of navigation, the control of destructive flood waters, hurricane protection, beach erosion control, and for other purposes, authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with plans adopted and authorized by the Congress, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress, that whenever such projects are located wholly or partially within an area which is eligible for financial assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans for a period not exceeding fifty years to enable responsible local interests to meet the requirements of local cooperation pertaining to contributions toward the cost of construction of such projects within such areas.

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, not to exceed $10,000,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter through and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

"SEC. 218. The Secretary of the Army shall reimburse any common carrier by railroad for the cost of protective works constructed by such carrier during the years 1965 and 1966 along the banks of the Eel River, California, to deter recurrence of damage to such banks by floods or high waters, but such reimbursement shall not exceed $3,000,000.

"SEC. 219. The Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized to accept orders from other Federal departments and agencies for work or services and to perform all or any part of such work or services by contract.

"SEC. 220. Section 206(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a) is amended by striking out '$1,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$2,500,000'.

"SEC. 221. The Joanna Dam proposed for construction at or near mile 63 of the Salt River near Joanna, Missouri, and the Joanna Reservoir to be created by such dam, authorized to be constructed by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1180), shall be known and designated hereafter as the Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir. Any law, regulation, map, document, or record of the United States in which such dam and reservoir are referred to as the Joanna Dam and Reservoir shall be held to refer to such dam and reservoir as the Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir.

"SEC. 222. Title II of this Act may be cited as the 'Flood Control Act of 1965'.

"TITLE III—RIVERS AND HARBORS

"SEC. 301. The following works of improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective reports hereinafter designated. The provisions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (Public Law Numbered 14, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

"Navigation

"Weymouth-Fore and Town Rivers, Boston Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Numbered 247, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,500,000;

"Providence River and Harbor, Rhode Island: Senate Document Numbered 93, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,900,000;

"Rondout Harbor, New York: House Document Numbered 288, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $20,000;

"New York and New Jersey Channels-Entrance to Kill Van Kull from Upper New York Bay: House Document Numbered 108, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,581,000;

"New York Harbor, New York (Anchorage Areas): Senate Document Numbered 17, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $44,852,000;

"Shrewsbury River, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 274, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,090,000;

"Tred Avon River, Talbot County, Maryland: House Document Numbered 225, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $323,000;

"Potomac and Anacostia Rivers—Removal of Drift in the Washington Metropolitan Area: House Document Numbered 286, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance;

"Channel to Newport News and Norfolk Harbor, Hampton Roads, Virginia: House Document Numbered 143, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,600,000;

"Channel to Newport News, Norfolk Harbor, and Thimble Shoal Channel, Virginia: House Document Numbered 187, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,600,000;

"Hampton Creek, Virginia: House Document Numbered 201, Eighty-ninth Congress, modification of items of local cooperation;

"Cape Fear River, North Carolina: House Document Numbered 252, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,510,000;

"Savannah Harbor, Georgia: House Documents Numbered 226 and 263, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,569,000. The plan recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 263, Eighty-ninth Congress, shall include facilities to mitigate damages to presently improved areas southeast of the Savannah Wildlife Refuge at an estimated additional cost of $40,000. The Chief of Engineers may include additional facilities to mitigate damages to additional lands southeast of the Savannah Wildlife Refuge if he determines them to be necessary and justified, at an estimated additional cost of $60,000. All such facilities to mitigate damages shall be maintained by local interests.

"Jacksonville Harbor, Florida: House Document Numbered 214, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,484,000;

"Ponce de Leon Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 74, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,104,000;

"Broward County and Hillsboro Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 91, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,093,000;

"East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Florida: House Document Numbered 194, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,151,000;

"Perdido Pass Channel, Alabama: Senate Document Numbered 94, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $625,000;

"Bayou La Batre, Alabama: House Document Numbered 327, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $262,000;

"Mermentau River, Louisiana: House Document Numbered 239, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,690,000;

"Alpena Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 151, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $806,000. In order to compensate for existing low water levels in Lake Huron, an additional increment of one foot in channel depth is hereby authorized;

"Frankfort Harbor, Michigan: Senate Document Numbered 16, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $237,000;

"Lexington Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 301, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $570,000, except that the modified recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army, contained in letter of April 5, 1965, from the Department of the Army to the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate, shall apply with respect to recreational fishing facilities on the main breakwater;

"Saginaw River, Michigan: House Document Numbered 240, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $437,000;

"Cedar River Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 248, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $664,000;

"Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 269, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,840,000;

"Rocky River Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 352, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $235,000;

"The project for Lorain Harbor, Ohio, authorized in section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (Public Law 86–645; 74 Stat. 480) is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to construct such bank stabilization works at cut numbered 1 as may be necessary in his discretion to keep the navigation channel in its proper alignment at an estimated additional cost of $1,600,000. Local interests shall contribute to the cost of the project an amount equal to the value of the land on the date of the original authorization of this project that would have been required for cut numbered 1, but for this modification.

"West Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 245, Eighty-eighth Congres, at an estimated cost of $544,000;

"Indiana Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 227, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $96,000;

"Burns Waterway Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 160, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,000,000. The Secretary of the Army may reimburse the State of Indiana for the expenditure of funds used to construct such portions of the project as approved by the Chief of Engineers and constructed under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers. Unless construction of the project is initiated within three years from the date of enactment of this Act, the authority to reimburse the State of Indiana contained in this paragraph shall expire. The State of Indiana shall furnish assurance satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that water and air pollution sources will be controlled to the maximum extent feasible in order to minimize any adverse effects on public recreational areas in the general vicinity of the Harbor. No appropriation is authorized to be made for the construction of this project until the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore has been voted upon by both Houses of Congress during the same Congress.

"Chocolate Bayou, Texas: House Document Numbered 217, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,254,000;

"Houston Ship Channel (Greens Bayou), Texas: House Document Numbered 257, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $470,000;

"Trinity River and tributaries, Texas: House Document Numbered 276, Eighty-ninth Congress, including navigation, except that the recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, dated March 14, 1963, shall apply, and there is hereby authorized $83,000,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the project. Prior to expenditure of any funds for construction of those features designed exclusively for navigation, the Chief of Engineers shall submit to the Congress a re-evaluation based upon current criteria.

"San Francisco Bay to Stockton, California: House Document Numbered 208, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $46,853,000. The works for wavewash protection within the limits of the modified San Joaquin River navigation project shall be repaired or restored by the United States as determined to be necessary by the Secretary of the Army over the life of the project.

"Crescent City Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 264, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,980,000;

"Bodega Bay, California: House Document Numbered 106, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $853,000;

"Port San Luis, San Luis Obispo Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 148, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,360,000;

"Oceanside Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 76, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to reimburse local interests for any work done by such interests on such project after August 1, 1965, if he approves such work as being in accordance with the project as otherwise authorized.

"Port Orford, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 62, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $696,000;

"Chetco River, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 21, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,308,000;

"Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 43, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,000,000;

"Edmonds Harbor, Washington: House Document Numbered 147, Eighty-eighth Congress, maintenance;

"Coasts of the Hawaiian Islands, harbors for light-draft vessels, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 353, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,737,000;

"Honokahau Harbor, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 68, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $680,000;

"Honolulu Harbor and Barbers Point Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 93, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,928,000;

"Kawaihae Harbor: House Document Numbered 75, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,291,000;

Beach erosion

"Cliff Walk, Newport, Rhode Island: House Document Numbered 228, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $340,000;

"Perth Amboy, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 186, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $82,000;

"Atlantic City, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-eighth Congress, periodic nourishment;

"Hunting Island Beach, South Carolina: House Document Numbered 323, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $319,000;

"Duval County, Florida: House Document Numbered 273, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,266,000;

"Fort Pierce, Florida: House Document Numbered 84, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $220,000;

"Evanston, Illinois: House Document Numbered 159, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $392,000;

"Haleiwa Beach, Oahu, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 107, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $572,000.

"Waikiki Beach, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 104, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,490,000.

"Sec. 302. Section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297, 300), as amended by section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1173, 1180), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

'Sec. 104. (a) There is hereby authorized a comprehensive program to provide for control and progressive eradication of water-hyacinth, alligatorweed, Eurasion watermilfoil, and other obnoxious aquatic plant growths, from the navigable waters, tributary streams, connecting channels, and other allied waters of the United States, in the combined interest of navigation, flood control, drainage, agriculture, fish and wildlife conservation, public health, and related purposes, including continued research for development of the most effective and economic control measures, to be administered by the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies. Local interests shall agree to hold and save the United States free from claims that may occur from control operations and to participate to the extent of 30 per centum of the cost of such operations. Costs for research and planning undertaken pursuant to the authorities of this section shall be borne fully by the Federal Government.

'(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts, not in excess of $5,000,000 annually, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. Any such funds employed for control operations shall be allocated by the Chief of Engineers on a priority basis, based upon the urgency and need of each area, and the availability of local funds.'

"Sec. 303. The consent of Congress is hereby granted for the purposes of section 9 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 401), to the State of Pennsylvania, to construct a dam on the Susquehanna River, downstream from the Bainbridge Street Bridge at Sunbury, Pennsylvania.

"Sec. 304. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys to be made at the following locations and subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950:

"Jonesport Harbor, Maine.

"Blue Hill Harbor, Maine.

"Great and Little Bays and their tributaries, New Hampshire, and adjoining tributaries of the Piscataqua River, New Hampshire and Maine, with a view to determining the advisability of providing improvements in the interest of navigation and allied purposes.

"Popponesset Bay, Massachusetts.

"Niagara River, New York, with respect to nature and extent of measures necessary to preserve and enhance the scenic beauty of the American Falls.

"Great Lakes and Saint Lawrence Seaway: Investigation and study of means of extending the navigation season on the waterways at an estimated cost not to exceed $75,000. Report to include a full and complete investigation and study of waterway deicing systems, including a review of any previous pertinent reports by the Department of the Army, any available information from any of the other Departments of the Government, and waterway deicing methods in use by private concerns and foreign governments, for the purpose of determining the practicability, means, and economic justification for extending the navigation season on the Great Lakes (including connecting channels and harbors) and the Saint Lawrence Seaway by eliminating ice conditions to the extent possible. The Chief of Engineers may submit such interim reports as may be deemed advisable, and shall submit his final reports, together with his recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions as he may deem advisable, not later than two years after funds are made available for the study.

"Lake Dauterive and Chareton Floodgate, Louisiana.

"Dickinson Bayou, Texas.

"Manchester Harbor, Washington.

"Gulfport Harbor, Mississippi.

"Calumet River, Illinois.

"Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, from about mile 29 West of Harvey Lock to U.S. Highway No. 90 in vicinity of Boutte, Louisiana.

"Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee River to the Withlacoochee River, Florida, with a view to determining the advisability of modifying the project, with particular reference to provision for a side channel or connecting channel improvement through Cross Bayou to Old Tampa Bay, in the vicinity of Howard Frankland Bridge, for navigation, flood control, and related purposes.

"San Francisco County, California (beach erosion).

"Lake Michigan Shoreline, Milwaukee County, Wisconsin (beach erosion).

"Indian River County, Florida (beach erosion).

"Marquette County, Michigan (comprehensive).

"Sec. 305. The first proviso in the paragraph which begins 'James River, Virginia:' in section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–874) is amended by striking out 'after a period of five years from the date of approval of this Act unless the Governor of Virginia has endorsed the project within that time' and inserting in lieu thereof 'October 23, 1971, unless the Governor of Virginia has endorsed the project by that date'.

"Sec. 306. Section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1174) is amended by striking out '$5,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$22,000'.

"Sec. 307. That portion of the East River, in New York County, State of New York, lying between the south line of East Seventeenth Street, extended eastwardly, the United States pierhead line as it existed on July 1, 1965, and the south line of East Thirtieth Street, extended eastwardly, is hereby declared to be not a navigable water of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution and the laws of the United States.

"Sec. 308. The old channel of the River Raisin in Monroe County, Michigan, lying between the Monroe Harbor range front light and Raisin Point, its entrance into Lake Erie, is declared to be not a navigable stream of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution and the laws of the United States, and the consent of Congress is hereby given for the filling in of the old channel by the riparian owners on such channel.

"SEC. 309. Section 111 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 303) is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 111. Whenever, during the construction or reconstruction of any navigation, flood control, or related water development project under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Engineers determines that any structure or facility owned by an agency of government and utilized in the performance of a governmental function should be protected, altered, reconstructed, relocated, or replaced to meet the requirements of navigation or flood control, or both; or to preserve the safety or integrity of such facility when its safety or usefulness is determined by the Chief of Engineers to be adversely affected or threatened by the project, the Chief of Engineers may, if he deems such action to be in the public interest, enter into a contract providing for (1) the payment from appropriations made for the construction or maintenance of such project, of the reasonable cost of replacing, relocating, or reconstructing such facility to such standard as he deems reasonable but not to exceed the minimum standard of the State or political subdivision for the same type of facility involved, except that if the existing facility exceeds the minimum standard of the State or political subdivision, the Chief of Engineers may provide a facility of comparable standard, or (2) the payment of a lump sum representing the estimated reasonable cost thereof. This section shall not be construed as modifying any existing or future requirement of local cooperation, or as indicating a policy that local interests shall not hereafter be required to assume costs of modifying such facilities. The provisions of this section may be applied to projects hereafter authorized and to those heretofore authorized but not completed as of July 3, 1958, and notwithstanding the navigation servitude vested in the United States, they may be applied to such structures or facilities occupying the beds of navigable waters of the United States.'

"SEC. 310. (a)(1) Subsection (a) of section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577) is amended by striking out '$2,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$10,000,000'.

"(2) Subsection (b) of such section 107 is amended by striking out '$200,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$500,000'.

"(b) Section 3 of the Act entitled 'An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property', approved August 13, 1946, as amended (33 U.S.C. 426g), is amended (1) by striking out '$3,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$10,000,000', and (2) by striking out '$400,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$500,000'.

"(c) The amendments made by this section shall not apply to any project under contract for construction on the date of the enactment of this Act.

"SEC. 311. The project for Calumet Harbor and River, Illinois and Indiana, as authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1173), is modified in order to authorize the Chief of Engineers, at his discretion, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to provide at Federal cost (1) such protection for the Elgin, Joliet, and Eastern Railway bridge over the Calumet River, Chicago, Illinois, as is necessary to permit dredging of the full width of the south draw to the depth of twenty-seven feet, (2) such temporary protection for the center pier and the south abutment of the New York, Chicago, and Saint Louis Railroad bridge (Nickel Plate) as is necessary to permit dredging of the full width of the south bridge draw to the depth of twenty-seven feet prior to its replacement, and (3) such modification of the channel limits as is necessary to insure full use of each such draw.

"SEC. 312. (a) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed to make a complete investigation and study of water utilization and control of the Chesapeake Bay Basin, including the waters of the Baltimore Harbor and including, but not limited to, the following: navigation, fisheries, flood control, control of noxious weeds, water pollution, water quality control, beach erosion, and recreation. In order to carry out the purposes of this section, the Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall construct, operate, and maintain in the State of Maryland a hydraulic model of the Chesapeake Bay Basin and associated technical center. Such model and center may be utilized, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems necessary, by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government or of the States of Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania, in connection with any research, investigation, or study being carried on by them of any aspect of the Chesapeake Bay Basin. The study authorized by this section shall be given priority.

"(b) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $6,000,000 to carry out this section.

"SEC. 313. The Secretary of the Army shall transmit to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than June 30, 1968, a suggested draft of legislation revising and codifying the general and permanent laws relating to civil works projects by the Corps of Engineers for navigation, beach erosion control, flood control, and related water resources development. The Secretary shall also submit a report explaining the proposed legislation, and making specific reference to each change in or omission of any provision of existing law.

"SEC. 314. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall make a study of the need for, and the feasibility of, the Federal Government reimbursing States, political subdivisions thereof, and other public entities, for expenditures incurred by them in connection with authorized projects for improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, hurricane protection, beach erosion control, and other water resources development purposes, to the extent that such expenditures are incurred after the initiation of the survey studies which form the basis for such authorized projects. The Secretary shall report to Congress, not later than January 31, 1967, the results of such study together with his recommendations in connection therewith.

"SEC. 315. Title III of this Act may be cited as the 'River and Harbor Act of 1965'."

And the House agree to the same.

GEORGE H. FALLON,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
ROBERT E. JONES,
ED EDMONDSON,
JIM WRIGHT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PAT MCNAMARA,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
FRANK E. MOSS,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment strikes out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserts a substitute. The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. The differences between the House amendment and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted in the following outline, except for incidental changes made necessary for minor technical, clerical, or clarifying purposes.

SAINT JOHN RIVER BASIN

The Senate bill authorizes the Dickey-Lincoln School project on the Saint John River, Maine, as it was approved by the President on July 12, 1965, and substantially in accordance with the plans included in the report of the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers dated August, 1964, which is a supplement to the report of July 1963 of the International Passamaquoddy Tidal Power project and Upper Saint John River hydroelectric power development at an estimated cost of $227,000,000.

The House amendment directs the Secretary of the Army to make a survey for flood control and allied purposes of the Saint John River, Maine, separate and apart from the Passamaquoddy tidal power project. This survey is to include a detailed study of alternative methods of providing power, including thermal power development using nuclear energy. This report is to be submitted to the Congress not later than March 30, 1966.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate bill.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

The Senate bill authorizes the modification and expansion of the project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, to include the projects and plans substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319, 88th Congress, at a cost not to exceed $181,109,100. This authorization is limited specifically to those projects set forth in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319. The Senate bill further provides that modified easements required in the improvement of the Birds Point-New Madrid, Missouri, floodway shall be acquired as provided by section 4 of the act of May 15, 1928, and that the pumping plant on the Red River backwater area shall be operated and maintained by the Corps of Engineers.

The House amendment is the same as the Senate provision with the following exceptions: First, the authorization for the total lower Mississippi River project is increased by the estimated cost of $181,109,000 and thus this authorization is not limited solely to the projects set forth in House Documents 308 and 319. The House amendment also provides that the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget shall apply with respect to improvements for fish and wildlife, and that the requirement of local cooperation for the improvements in the St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri, shall be the same as required in paragraph (q) under the heading "Lower Mississippi River" in section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House amendment with the following exceptions: First, it limits the authorization to those projects set forth in House Documents Nos. 308 and 319 and second, it provides that the requirement of local cooperation for improvements in the St. Francis Basin shall be reviewed by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, with particular reference to Federal and non-Federal cost sharing and requires a report of the results of such review to Congress within 1 year. The conferees expect that the Secretary will remain within the authorization in his expenditures for these projects and should there be necessity for expenditures in excess of the authorized amount, he will submit a request for additional authorization.

RED RIVER BASIN

The House amendment contains a revision of the Waurika project, Oklahoma, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to acquire lands for the establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the reservoir at an estimated cost of $418,000 whenever the Secretary of the Interior approves the establishment of this refuge.

The Senate bill does not contain this provision.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this provision.

GRAND RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MISSOURI AND IOWA

The Senate bill authorizes the project on the Grand River and tributaries substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 241, 89th Congress, at an estimated cost of $278,635,000.

The House amendment authorizes this project at a reduced figure of $218,900,000 and specifically provides that the Linneus River Reservoir, Saint Catherine Reservoir, the Honey Creek-No Creek local protection works, and the hydroelectric power facilities at Pattonburg Reservoir are not authorized.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House amendment with the exception that the Secretary of the Army is required to review the reservoirs, local protection works, and hydroelectric power facilities which are not authorized and to submit to Congress at the earliest practical date, a new feasibility report on these projects based on this review. The cost of this review is estimated at $75,000, and these funds are to come from those authorized for project planning for the authorized project.

SAN DIEGO RIVER BASIN

The Senate bill authorized the project for flood protection on San Diego River (Mission Valley), California, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 212, 89th Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,600,000.

The House amendment is the same as the Senate bill with the exception that the House amendment provides that the Secretary of the Army is authorized to credit local interests against their required contribution for any work done by them on the project after the date of enactment of this act if he approves such work as being in accordance with the authorized project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House bill with the exception that in lieu of the provision relating to crediting local interests for work done contained in the House amendment the proposed conference substitute provides that the Secretary of the Army may reimburse local interests for expenditure of funds used to construct such portions of the provision as approved by the Chief of Engineers and constructed under supervision of the Chief of Engineers. The conferees on the part of the House expect that the supervision by the Chief of Engineers required in this provision shall be only that which is necessary to insure that the actual construction is in accordance with the approved plan.

MINNESOTA RIVER AT MANKATO, MINN.

The House amendment provides for the modification of the project on the Minnesota River at Mankato in North Mankato, Minn., authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1958 to permit the Secretary of the Army to credit local interests against their required contribution to the project for any work done by them on the project after April 1, 1965, if he approves such work as being in accordance with the authorized project.

The Senate bill does not contain this provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House bill with the following modifications: The Secretary is authorized to credit local interests for any work necessitated by extreme high water which is done between April 1, 1965, and February 1, 1966, if he approves it as being in accordance with the authorized project.

MILFORD DAM AND RESERVOIR

The House amendment contains a section requiring the Secretary of the Army to pay to a lessee or permittee owning improvements situated totally or partially on a railroad right-of-way, the fair value of those improvements which are rendered or will be rendered inoperative or otherwise adversely affected by the construction of the Milford Dam and Reservoir project on the Republican River, Kans. In no case is the owner of such improvements to receive dual compensation and the Secretary of the Army is authorized to provide funds necessary from moneys appropriated for Milford Dam and Reservoir project.

The Senate bill contains no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute contains no such provision.

LOCAL COOPERATION REQUIREMENTS

The Senate bill contains a provision which authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans for a period not exceeding 50 years to enable responsible local interests to meet the requirements of local cooperation pertaining to contributions toward the cost of construction of water resource projects within those areas which are declared eligible for financial assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act or any similar act. There is no dollar limitation on the amount authorized to be expended for these purposes in the Senate bill.

The House amendment contains no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute contains a section which provides that in the case of river and harbor, flood control, hurricane protection, and beach erosion control projects which are authorized by Congress and which are prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and which are located wholly or partly in an area eligible for financial assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans for a period not to exceed 50 years to enable responsible local interests to meet the requirements of local cooperation pertaining to contributions toward the cost of construction of only those projects. Further, a limitation is imposed on the authorization of not to exceed $10,000,000 per fiscal year for this purpose for the present fiscal year and the next 4 succeeding fiscal years.

LORAIN HARBOR, OHIO

The House amendment modifies the project for Lorain Harbor, Ohio, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1960 to authorize the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to construct a steel bulkhead at cut No. 1. Local interests are required to contribute an amount equal to the value of the land on the date of the original authorization of the project that would have been required for cut No. 1 but for this modification.

The Senate bill did not contain this provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House amendment with the exception that instead of authorizing the Secretary of the Army to construct a steel bulkhead at cut No. 1, he is authorized to construct such bank stabilization works at that cut as may be necessary in his discretion to keep the navigation channel in its proper alinement, at an estimated additional cost of $1,600,000. It is the intention of the conferees on the part of the House that by this modification the Secretary of the Army is given a greater latitude to construct whatever bank stabilization works (including bulkheads) he determines necessary to protect the proper alinement of the channel, which is totally a Federal responsibility.

BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, INDIANA

The Senate bill authorizes the project for Burns Waterway Harbor, Indiana, House Document No. 160, 88th Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,000,000 with a proviso that any funds appropriated for construction are not to be utilized until such time as the Indiana Dunes have been preserved and protected as a national lakeshore by act of Congress.

The House amendment also authorizes this project at an estimated cost of $25,000,000, with provision for a monetary contribution toward the cost of construction of the harbor by the State of Indiana on condition that the design be agreed upon by the State of Indiana and the Secretary of the Army together with certain other conditions specifically designed to protect the interests of the United States. Further, the House amendment provides that this authorization is not adversely to affect or otherwise prejudice the establishment of all or any part of the Indiana Dunes as a national lakeshore.

The proposed conference substitute authorizes this project at an estimated cost of $25,000,000. It further provides that the Secretary of the Army may reimburse the State of Indiana for the expenditure of funds used to construct such portions of the project as are approved by the Chief of Engineers and constructed under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers. Construction is required to be initiated within 3 years from the date of enactment of this act or authority to reimburse the State of Indiana expires. The State is further required to furnish satisfactory assurances to the Secretary of the Army that water and air pollution sources will be controlled to the maximum extent feasible in order to minimize any adverse affects on public recreational areas in the general vicinity of the harbor. No appropriation is authorized to be made for the construction of this project until the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore has been voted upon by both Houses of Congress in the same Congress. The conferees on the part of the House expect that the supervision by the Chief of Engineers required in this provision shall be only that which is necessary to ensure that the actual construction is in accordance with the approved plan.

TRINITY RIVER, TEX.

The House amendment authorizes the project for the Trinity River and tributaries, Texas, in House Document No. 276, 29th Congress, including navigation, except that the recommendation of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, dated March 14, 1963, shall apply, and further authorizes $83,000,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the project.

The Senate bill does not contain this project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House amendment with the addition of a requirement that prior to expenditure of any funds for construction of those features designed exclusively for navigation the Chief of Engineers shall submit to Congress a reevaluation based upon current criteria.

CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, ILLINOIS AND INDIANA

The House amendment modifies the project for Calumet Harbor and River, Illinois and Indiana, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1963 to authorize the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to provide at Federal cost protection to two bridges over the Calumet River necessary to permit dredging of the full width of the south draw to a depth of 27 feet, together with modifications of channel limits necessary to insure full use of each draw.

The Senate bill contains no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House amendment with the exception that the phrase "at his discretion" has been inserted to grant the Chief of Engineers full latitude to determine the necessity for this work.

CHESAPEAKE BAY BASIN

The House amendment contains a provision authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to make a complete investigation and study of water utilization and control of the Chesapeake Bay Basin and to construct, operate, and maintain in Maryland a hydraulic model of the Chesapeake Bay Basin and associated technical center. It provides that this model and center may be utilized, subject to the terms and conditions of the Secretary, by the Federal Government and the States of Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania in connection with research, investigations, or studies being carried on by them on any aspect of the Chesapeake Bay Basin. This provision further authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed $8,500,000.

The Senate bill contains no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House amendment except that the authorization has been reduced from $8,500,000 to $6,000,000.

CITY OF CLINTON BRIDGE COMMISSION

The House amendment contains a provision which would revive and reenact the act approved December 21, 1944, as amended, to extend the period of time during which a bridge or bridges may be constructed across the Mississippi River, in the vicinity of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Ill., by the city of Clinton Bridge Commission, provided actual construction thereof is commenced within 3 years and completed within 5 years from the date of enactment of this act. It would also authorize the commission to use any available bridge revenues or other funds, or to borrow money and issue its negotiable interest-bearing notes in evidence thereof to defray the cost of designing, engineering, and planning a new bridge or bridges, and to acquire lands for the location and approaches thereto. It would further amend existing law, relative to the issuance of bonds, by removing the present limitations that refunding bonds shall mature within 25 years and shall not exceed in principal amount the principal amount of outstanding bonds replaced by such refunding bonds, and by authorizing the commission to issue refunding bonds to pay any indebtedness of the commission and to include as a part of the issue of bonds to finance the cost of a bridge additional bonds to refinance any outstanding bonds and notes. Also, the required weekly publication of advertisement for bids for the sale of bonds would be reduced from 4 to 2 consecutive weeks. It further provides for the payment, or a sinking fund sufficient for the payment, of notes, and interest thereon, issued to pay the cost of designing, engineering, and planning any new bridge or bridges and to acquire lands for the location and approaches thereto, in addition to bonds and interest, before the commission shall convey any bridge or bridges to the States of Iowa and Illinois, or any municipalities or agencies thereof, and keeps intact the requirement of existing law that any bridge or bridges shall be operated by the commission free of tolls, after all of the outstanding indebtedness thereon has been retired, until accepted by the States of Iowa and Illinois, or any municipalities or agencies thereof.

The Senate bill does not contain such a provision.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain such a provision. The conferees agreed that the deletion of this provision is not to be construed to prejudice in any way the full consideration of the necessity for this legislation and the conferees on the part of the House agreed to this deletion only after having received assurances that at an early date of the second session of this Congress the Committee on Public Works of the Senate would hold full and complete hearings on H.R. 3788 as passed the House.

MUSCATINE BRIDGE COMMISSION

The House amendment contains a provision which would amend the act of July 26, 1956 (70 Stat. 669, Public Law 811, 84th Cong.), to which the act of April 27, 1962 (76 Stat. 59, Public Law 87-441), was made applicable, to extend the period of time during which a bridge may be constructed across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Ill., by the Muscatine Bridge Commission, provided that actual construction of such bridge is commenced within 3 years and completed within 5 years from the date of enactment of this act.

The Senate bill does not contain such a provision.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain such a provision. The conferees agree that the deletion of this provision is not to be construed to prejudice in any way the full consideration of the necessity for this legislation, and the conferees on the part of the House agreed on this deletion only after having received assurances that at an early date of the second session of this Congress the Committee on Public Works of the Senate would hold full and complete hearings on H.R. 3976 as passed the House.

GEORGE H. FALLON,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
ROBERT E. JONES,
ED EDMONDSON,
JIM WRIGHT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us the conference report on the bill S. 2300. The work on this bill began back last January when the Members of the House started to introduce bills for projects in their districts, and reports from the Corps of Engineers began to accumulate. It was necessary to have reports from the different agencies in order for us to be able to make a comprehensive study of each project. I do not think there was a day when I came on the floor that a Member did not say something to me in regard to a project he had before our committee.

Hearings were held by the subcommittee chairman of the rivers and harbors [Mr. BLATNIK] and chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control [Mr. JONES]. These gentlemen held 6 weeks of hearings, at which time they considered every project that was before our committee.

Only those projects were included which had a favorable benefit-to-cost ratio and which in our judgment would further the economy of this country. In many instances, of course, these projects involve flood control to protect the lives and property of our citizens all over these United States.

The full committee met on a number of occasions to consider and mark up the reports of the subcommittees. On some of the projects contained in this bill, I differed with the committee's report and voted against them in committee. But when the bill was marked up and finalized, I supported the judgment of the full committee and supported the bill on the final vote in committee and certainly supported it on the floor of the House when it was brought to us for the consideration of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of the Committee on Public Works since the reorganization of the Rivers and Harbors Committee and Roads Committee and the formation of the Committee on Public Works. In all of that time I have never had a project in my district. Not because the committee would not listen or consider a project, if I had one, but because we did not need the type of projects that are considered in the omnibus rivers and harbors bills.

In my time spent here in the House of Representatives as a member of this committee, I have visited almost every State in the Union where we were asked to consider a public works project.

We visited those States and those areas because we wanted to have a better understanding of the needs of the particular district and the States so that we could come back to the House with the information so that the proper consideration could be given to these requests on the basis of the needs of the State and of the people. Of course, there were many times when I was not able to go but the subcommittee chairmen took the committees into the States where projects were being inspected. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, has visited every State that has suffered a catastrophe whether it was the result of a flood or hurricane so that he could bring back that firsthand knowledge and understanding that is so necessary for us to legislate properly.

Mr. Speaker, I think the committee did a good job when it brought the bill here to the House at first. When the bill went to conference, they did the best job that could be done under the circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this conference report.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I realize we have before us today an issue that is extremely difficult. Practically every Member of this House, as I am, is concerned as to what, on the merits, should be done. So far as I am concerned, the action taken leaves, in my opinion, if the proper rights of the House and the prerogatives of this great coequal legislative body, coequal with the Senate, if we are to sustain our rights as conferees and as a coequal body, little alternative but to vote down the conference report. It is my understanding and as you will see by the Record of yesterday at page 26442 that it will be in order, and I have no reason to believe such a motion would not be made, because there are many projects in this, some $2 billion worth, of which $1,700 million is relatively noncontroversial that has been approved by the conference. I support those projects. I do not support, however, the Dickey-Lincoln project. It is not a small project, for it involves $300 million—$233 million is the Federal cost and $73 million is the estimated transmission cost if it is a Federal project.

The merits of the Dickey-Lincoln School project have been discussed in previous debate. The House sustained the position of those in opposition to the Dickey-Lincoln project by a substantial vote of 207 to 185. The merits of Dickey-Lincoln remain exactly the same as they were at the time the House voted a few weeks ago on that specific project. Now we are in a parliamentary procedure position that if, in fact, we want again to assert the House position in opposition to this project, this 98-percent power—and very little other benefits other than that resulting from area redevelopment—we have no alternative but to vote down the conference report. I have reason to believe a motion would initially be made, and which is in order—and this was confirmed on my inquiry of the Speaker yesterday—to recommit the bill to the conferees with instructions that the previous House position on Dickey-Lincoln be sustained.

What was the position of the House on Dickey-Lincoln? It was very reasonable. On the Clark motion, which was adopted, we said that there should be a thorough study of the Dickey-Lincoln project. There was adequate money put into the measure for such a study. We committed ourselves as members of the committee to consider the matter in the Committee of the House soon, where the facts could be developed. There has never been a separate study relating to this Dickey-Lincoln phase of the Passamaquoddy project, so we are not talking about a small project. We are talking about $300 million. We are not talking about an insignificant issue, at least in my opinion. We are talking about a critical issue.

I repeat. The facts have not changed relating to Dickey-Lincoln. I wish to make sure that all the facts are brought before the Members. We had a letter submitted in conference by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], who is very much interested in the project, for it would be in his State. Although the people who would use the power are a long way off, the project would be in his State. The fact is that he submitted the Federal Power Commission letter which was written to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative O'Neill, to the effect that it appeared, after very brief consideration by the Federal Power Commission, that perhaps the cost of the power would be greater than that previously estimated if the private power people did it, compared with a public power project. But in analyzing the basis of those facts, they just do not hold up.

For example, consider the Federal interest cost of 3.8 or 3⅛ percent. The cost would actually be, as we all know, 4¼ percent, which is the cost of Federal money.

They did not consider taxes which would be foregone which private enterprise would pay. They included a total of $73 million for transmission lines which would be necessary if the project is a Federal project, but would not be necessary if it is a private matter. If it is private, it would be $3.8 million. So obviously they weighted the matter and tried to bring in different figures. But they did not ask the opinion of the Atomic Energy Commission, which states that, with the use of that power, you can do it at about one-fifth of the cost. As far as I am concerned, the facts are the same now as they were when the issue was considered before.

So we get to the parliamentary situation. What is the issue there? As I see it, the issue there is whether we in this body should accept the procedure that is being forced upon us by the other body, which is to take it or leave it, a blackjack approach of the other body. If we thus let them subvert the rules of this House, which are very clear, that the party asking for the conference, the other body has the right to act first on the conference report—and if that had been done, we would have had an opportunity to vote on a motion to recommit, for or against the Dickey-Lincoln School project a second time and so instruct the conferees—we will see that the other body is acting to prevent us from acting.

So if we are going to substitute, by accepting this conference report, for the rule that is on the books now, and which has generally been observed, a rule that might be termed the "If you kidnap the papers, you can keep these projects out," then Members will vote for the conference report. But if you are going to oppose such an approach, stand by the prerogatives of this House, and stand by the right of this body to have another vote on this project, then it is a very simple procedure. I think these issues are fundamental. The issue of Dickey-Lincoln is fundamental. But the issue of procedure is equally fundamental.

In conference a member of the conferees asked the chairman the question: "Is it not true that the other body, the Senate, having asked for this conference, we, the House, have a right to the papers and to act first?" The answer was "Yes" by the chairman of the conference, the distinguished Senator from Michigan, Mr. McNamara.

I am not charging anyone with bad faith. I am charging them with knowing precisely what they were attempting to do and what they will accomplish if we let them. I object to it. I do not believe we should substitute a "kidnap the paper" rule for a good faith relationship between these two bodies now and in the future.

These are the basic issues involved. The Dickey-Lincoln project can be considered under the study amendment that was adopted by the House, and it would be in order after the conference report is voted down, under instructions to the conferees. This project will get fair consideration, I am convinced, by the committee and by the House after adequate study has been had.

A question has been raised as to "What will happen to me, if I have a project in this bill? Will I or will I not have an opportunity to vote on this this year? Is my project going to be killed?"

I say to the Members, in all candor, I believe it is quite obvious that there are enough problems for enough Members involving enough projects so that it will be insisted on that the matter be returned to conference, not next year but this year. As soon as the conference report is voted down, in my opinion, a motion will be made, and the conferees will be able to immediately reconvene. Then the issue before the conferees will be Dickey-Lincoln.

The argument which I have heard in the Chamber and otherwise is, "Gee, I cannot vote against this report, or for the motion to recommit, because I have a project in it." I have a project in it, too—not a very big project, but I do have a project in it. That argument does not hold water. We are talking about a principle.

If the Members believe in these principles, if they are opposed to Dickey-Lincoln, as some 207 Members were, they will vote against the conference report.

This has been done before. Such an effort was made on the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961. The issue then was not nearly as clear. The issue here is clear. Either we are for or against Dickey-Lincoln. If we are for it, we will vote for the conference report. If we are against it, we should vote against the conference report. That is the issue which basically is before us.

It is my hope that this House will vote down the conference report and will then immediately vote for a motion to recommit the bill to the conferees with instructions that the study of Dickey-Lincoln be undertaken immediately, under the instructions of the Congress, as provided in the Clark amendment.

I understand that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] had intended to offer a motion to recommit. I ask the distinguished gentleman whether that is correct?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. He is denied the opportunity to do so by this procedure, intentionally. There is not any question about the intention.

As I say, I am not charging anyone with bad faith, but I do say they intended to keep us from voting, when we had, under the rules, a right to vote. If we do not vote down the conference report they will succeed.

A new unofficial statement of the Federal Power Commission, dated October 5, 1965, which purports to be a "Comparative Analysis" of the proposed Dickey-Lincoln School project is being circulated in Congress in an attempt to get the House to restore the authorization for the project in S. 2300, the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill. The statement contains figures supposedly representing comparative costs of four alternatives: First, the proposed Dickey-Lincoln School project; second, some theoretical steam plants in Massachusetts and Maine described in an FPC letter of February 16, 1965; third, a pumped storage-nuclear combination plan developed in an FPC staff study dated September 30, 1965; and, fourth, the New England utilities' plan. No supporting material is available showing how the FPC figures were derived. However, by reference to earlier very meager information contained in Interior's August 1964 report, the basic criteria used in their preparation is quite evident. They would represent for alternatives 2, 3, and 4 what FPC and the Government agencies consider power values or benefits—not costs of production. This is clear in the case of alternative 2 as shown in paragraph 2, page 4, of the Secretary of the Interior's July 9, 1965, report to the President on the "Conservation of the Natural Resources of New England—The Passamaquoddy Tidal Power Project and Upper St. John River Hydroelectric Development," which states:

> Since the initiation of this study, in 1961, the utility industry has developed generating units of 500,000-kilowatts capacity which are now scheduled for installation in the Boston area, and a unit of 125,000-kilowatts capacity is being installed in Maine. New steam-electric plants in the Boston area are estimated to cost $125 per kilowatt and plants in Maine $140 per kilowatt. On the basis of these larger more economical developments which have taken place during the course of these studies, the Federal Power Commission on February 16, 1965, furnished revised power values for application in Maine and the Boston area. The revised at-market values were computed to be $22.50 per kilowatt-year and 2.3 mills per kilowatt-hour in the Boston area, and $24.50 per kilowatt-year and 2.9 mills per kilowatt-hour in Maine. A composite power value would be $23.50 per kilowatt-year and 2.6 mills per kilowatt-hour.

These are the same figures appearing in the FPC October 5, 1965, statement for alternative No. 2 and were derived from the same factors used in the 1964 report but applied to more modern lower unit cost plants similar to those built by the electric companies in New England in recent years. These factors include allowances for taxes of all kinds and going market rates for cost of money. Obviously, FPC followed its traditional practice in using these same factors in estimating power values or benefits—not costs—for alternatives 3 and 4, but this is not the case with respect to the figures shown for the Dickey-Lincoln School project which are Federal production and transmission costs only. The Dickey-Lincoln School figures include no allowance for taxes and a 3⅛-percent rate of interest.

The factors used in arriving at annual costs and subsequently capacity and energy costs for alternatives, 2, 3, and 4, are 6.25 percent of the total investment costs for cost of money, 1.20 percent for depreciation and replacement, 5.72 percent for taxes, and 2 percent for operation and maintenance. Corresponding factors used in the case of Dickey-Lincoln School are 3.125 percent for cost of money, 0.86 percent for amortization, or depreciation, and replacements, nothing for taxes, and 0.45 percent for operation, maintenance, and insurance. In other words there is a 5.72-percent tax charge and a 3.125-percent additional interest charge for alternatives Nos. 2, 3, and 4 not applied to alternative No. 1. Obviously, the figures for alternatives 2, 3, and 4 cannot be compared to the figures for Dickey-Lincoln School project because they are not comparable things. The figures for alternatives 2, 3, and 4 also do not conform to the instructions contained in Senate Document No. 97, the Federal agencies' bible. For an interpretation of its requirements we can go to no less an authority than the Corps of Engineers. In its reply to certain questions propounded by Senator COOPER with respect to the Devils Jumps project, the Corps of Engineers stated:

> The comparability test which the Corps employs is designed specifically to show the relative economic efficiency of the project and available alternatives. In making this test for the power purpose the cost of producing equivalent power by the most likely alternative new power source is determined using the same method of financing (same interest rate, tax assumptions, etc.) as for the Federal project.

This reference is found on page 296 of the Senate hearings on S. 2300, dated April 21, 1965. Note that the Corps of Engineers says that the comparability test is designed to show the "relative efficiency" of the project and alternatives, and that for the power purpose the cost of producing equivalent power is determined by using the same interest rate, tax assumptions, et cetera, as used for the Federal project. This is the only way any meaningful conclusions can be drawn. The comparison must compare comparable things. This, the FPC statement of October 5, 1965 has not done.

Now for the specifics. The FPC statement claims that the New England utilities analyses omit transmission costs and losses, and project operation and maintenance expense, and that they do not "reveal the period used comparable to the payout period for the Dickey-Lincoln School project." The information on transmission costs and losses, and operation and maintenance expense, is contained in the material submitted by the companies to the House Public Works Committee. These figures are included in the estimates of the electric companies. Furthermore, if FPC staff had taken the time to read the record of the hearings of the House Committee on Public Works, it would have found on page 506 a table showing the true comparative costs of the New England utility companies' plan and the Dickey-Lincoln School project on a 50-year amortization basis, with and without taxes. It will be noted here, also, that the electric companies with full interest claim only a 30-percent tax load—1.3 mills more than the 4.3 mills for energy without taxes, or 5.6 mills with taxes.

In the case of alternatives 2, 3, and 4, taxes as computed by the FPC, represent some 40 percent of the total figure shown in the FPC statement. Failure to include taxes does not remove the burden on the economy. The cost to the general economy exists whether or not as a matter of policy it is paid by the Federal Government. Moreover, it is not a cost of production to the entities involved in any non-Federal development, but a cost of carrying on a business. If the comparison is to measure the actual costs of the various alternatives, it must accordingly be computed on a comparable basis.

The comparability analysis also has nothing to do with the question of whether or not taxes should be charged on Government operations. That is a matter of pricing policy and not of cost comparisons.

Another large discrepancy in the FPC October 5, 1965, statement is the fact that in the case of the Federal project an artificial interest rate of only 3⅛ percent is used, whereas the actual cost of money to the United States is 4¼ percent and for the non-Federal alternatives an interest rate of 6.25 percent is used, or twice the rate used for the Federal project. These widely divergent factors were employed even though the Corps of Engineers correctly states that for the comparability test the same method of financing is essential.

While no brief is held for the New England electric companies' plan or cost estimates, it appears that, except for operation and maintenance and transmission, FPC accepts the companies' figures. In this connection a simple comparison of the percentage of investment costs used in the FPC statement for the two sets of alternatives might be enlightening:

	Federal Dickey-Lincoln School project	Non-Federal alternatives
Cost of money	$3.125	$6.25
Depreciation and replacement	.860	1.20
Taxes		5.72
Operation, maintenance, and insurance	.450	2.00
Total	4.435	15.17

From the above it should be clear that even if greater allowances for transmission, operation, and maintenance were included, as proposed by the FPC, the cost, at least for alternatives 3 and 4, when corrected to provide for comparable taxes and interest, would still be far less than for the proposed Federal Dickey-Lincoln School project. This is the comparability test which the Corps of Engineers employs to show the relative efficiency of a project and its alternatives. It measures the cost of the economy of the various alternatives. Under such an analysis Dickey-Lincoln School is found wanting.

The short history of Dickey-Lincoln School is also very revealing. Under standard planning practice all possible alternatives are explored before a particular proposal is adopted. Among other things the alternative advanced by the New England electric companies had never been examined by the Government agencies. In fact, the first quickie study of something along these lines evidently came after the House Public Works Committee hearings in August 1965 on S. 2300. The FPC October 5, 1965, statement indicates that such a study was made on September 30, 1965. What more or better argument can be made as to the need for a real study of the Dickey-Lincoln School project? Furthermore, it is of interest to note that each time a new set of figures are supplied by the Federal agencies, the benefits from Dickey-Lincoln School go down and the costs of alternatives are reduced. As the planners become more familiar with the situation, Dickey-Lincoln School becomes progressively less attractive. The August 1964 Interior report used a composite power value for alternative non-Federal generating plants of $27.50 kilowatt-year. In Interior's July 1965 report the figure was reduced to $23.50 kilowatt-year. In FPC's October 5, 1965, statement a pumped storage nuclear combination—alternative 3—showed a value of $20.40 kilowatt-year. The New England utilities' alternate plan was shown as $11.70 kilowatt-year. If this trend continues, it might be that the project may eventually be priced out of the market even by the Government planners.

With such a shady record, the House can do no other than provide the time for a real objective, unbiased study of the Dickey-Lincoln School project by the Corps of Engineers, the agency which would be responsible for its construction. Certainly, we cannot afford to embark on a $300-million-plus venture on the basis of existing data, particularly when we can in several months have the material we need to make a sound judgment. Opposition to such a short delay can only be suspect and be interpreted as a fear of exposure of the truth about the project. If Dickey-Lincoln School is as good as claimed by its proponents, nothing will be lost by the proposed study as directed by the House in September. If it cannot stand such close scrutiny, it should not be authorized in any event. A 5-month deferment will do no harm and is not an exorbitant price to pay for verification of the project's claimed merits, and assurance that it will fulfill its promises. The earlier House action should be sustained.

First. A statement has been made that Maine Public Service Co. was purchasing hydropower from the New Brunswick Power Commission at a very low cost—5 mills per kilowatt-hour—and was reselling it to company customers at nearly three times what the company paid for it.

Maine Public Service Co. serves an area in northern Maine.

It reports that the 5 mill power referred to is dump power, so called, which cannot be relied to meet system requirements and therefore has little value. In 1964 this company's purchases of "dump power" at 5 mills represented only three-tenths of 1 percent of its total system input. For the 8 months ended August 1965, such dump-power purchases represented only three one-hundredths of 1 percent of its total system input.

For "firm power" which can be relied to meet system loads and, therefore, has a higher value, Maine Public Service Co. paid the New Brunswick Power Commission an average price of 9.8 mills per kilowatt-hour in 1964 and 13.4 mills per kilowatt-hour for the first 8 months of 1965.

Second. A statement has been made that Central Maine Power Co., the largest electric utility in Maine, has announced rate reductions only twice in its history; first, when the Passamaquoddy-St. Johns report was published, and secondly, prior to recent congressional hearings.

This statement is extremely erroneous. In a decree dated July 23, 1948 the Maine Public Utilities Commission stated:

> It (Central Maine Power Co.) has had no general rate increase in over 30 years but had effected substantial reductions in rates during that time. In 1945 and 1946 residential rates were reduced $600,000, commercial $150,000 and street lighting $53,000, a total of $803,000.

In just the 10-year period preceding the commission's decree, Central Maine Power Co., in addition to the specific rate decreases, listed by the commission, made eight general and six special rate decreases totaling over $800,000 per year. So, over the entire period 1937 to 1946, this company made 16 rate decreases aggregating over $1,625,000 per year.

Over the last 2 years it has made rate decreases totaling over $1,630,000.

Third. A statement has been made that a Maine housewife wrote to her Senator that she did not get a rate reduction in the 1963 decrease made by Central Maine Power Co., and discovered in subsequent bills that her rates had gone up, rather than down, after the announced rate reduction.

The company's answer is that this customer was probably one of the few customers in a water heating group owning large—80 gallon—water heaters who did not get a rate decrease; but actually because of a change in rate form got a small increase. This was corrected in the 1965 rate decrease—the problem having been worked out in two steps over the 2-year period.

Fourth. It has been stated that although the Electric Coordinating Council of New England was formed in 1948, for the purpose of bringing cheaper power to the area, power rates had actually increased in the area 18.3 percent during that period while they had increased in the United States by only 4 percent.

This is not a fact. During that period the average cost to the consumer of each kilowatt-hour of electricity actually decreased by 10.4 percent in the United States and by 6.92 percent in New England.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, your Committee on Public Works comes now to the end of many, many months of long, arduous, and painstaking study on many, many projects throughout the entire United States.

In an effort to serve the House we have done our very best to see that justice and fairness is performed in every instance. I believe it is important to stress that the bill whose fate we are deciding by the vote which will next be held contains not one project but 142 projects. It is a bill which affects the citizens residing in the congressional districts of some 240 Members of this House. So it is not a question of whether we like one given project; it is a question of whether we want to hold up and delay the development of the water resources of the United States in 240 of the congressional districts, on 142 different projects—or whether we want to have a bill this year.

The suggestion has been implicit in some of the things that have been said that this is a question of upholding the prerogatives of the House. The implication is present that your conferees, serving you and the Members of the House, have failed to uphold those prerogatives of the House. I should like to point out to you that the chairman of this committee, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], has never had a project in this bill nor has he ever asked for one.

I should like to stress to you further that the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], served long and hard and arduously in this conference committee, gaining in 9 cases out of 10 the side of the House over the side of the Senate. He has no project in this bill for his area, and he undertook to do this grueling work at a time when he was suffering severe physical pain.

I should like to point out also that the gentleman from Alabama, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, had spent several weeks in the hospital at a crucial point in the session and came back in order to hold hearings on these projects in this bill.

These men effectively upheld the position of the House in the conference. The House receded in conference on only six items. The Senate receded in conference on 67 items. For each time that the House conferees receded the Senate conferees receded on 11 separate counts. I ask you, have we failed to uphold the prerogatives of the House?

Obviously we could not get everything we wanted. Obviously we could not insist that the House position prevail every time when there is another body to consider. Henry Clay said:

> Do not despise compromise, for it is the cement that holds the Union together.

Now, particularly in a matter of a conference committee, compromise is the name of the game. If both bodies went to the conference table absolutely unyielding and absolutely unwilling to give in on a single point, why, there would be no purpose in having a conference committee. There would be no possibility of having legislation.

So, ironically, we have some groups coming in here and saying we should vote down the entire bill, the entire conference committee report, because it contains one project that they do not approve of personally. On the other hand, there are Members here who have been gravely disappointed because it does not contain projects that they wanted and felt entitled to. The House did not yield easily on any of these points.

On the two points at issue on which we did yield, we debated with the Senate conferees for 1 hour on one of them and for 2 hours on the other one. On one of them we got assurances from the other conferees that a separate bill would be considered by their body next year to accommodate the position of the House. We have done as well as we could, and I think we have brought before you a good bill.

The question is clear. The question you will answer when you answer the roll is, do you want a bill this year or do you not want one. That is just what it amounts to. It is just that simple. Let nobody deceive you into thinking that we can go back into conference at this late date and resolve differences that we were not able to resolve in 2 long days of difficult conferences.

So you decide and you give the answer. You answer your constituents, your conscience, and your country. When your name is called on that roll, you will be answering this question: Do you want to delay the development of the natural water resources of this country by another year? Do you want to assume that responsibility at a time when we need more desperately than ever in our history to develop the water resources of our land? If you do not, then vote for the conference committee report.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, sometimes we get inundated by all the verbs and adjectives of our orations. I would like to take a few minutes to draw a picture of what we are talking about on this Dickey-Lincoln project. The dams are located here on the St. John River, at the farthest end of Maine, over 400 miles away from the area in which the power would be used.

This huge land area encompasses nearly 700 square miles and is lightly populated, by less than 100,000 people. It could be roughly compared to the square-mile area of Connecticut and Rhode Island which have a combined population of 3,500,000.

The transmission problem involves some 400 miles to the major load centers at Boston, and so forth. Equivalent transmission spans would string across the country from Altoona, Pa., to Boston, or, for instance, from Buffalo to New York, or from Washington to Boston. There is a difference of over 400 miles.

I say to you when you are going to build a northern dam in the northern part of Maine where you are going to have a hydroelectric dam compared to what we already have in the Massachusetts-Connecticut-Rhode Island area of nuclear and thermo power, then I think you can see that in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., in DAN FLOOD's district, which has all this coal that we need so badly to be used, this coal cannot be used, but it could be used if we had a thermo plant in Wilkes-Barre, Pa. It would be closer from Wilkes-Barre, Pa., to Boston, the load area, than it would be from the Maine Dickey-Lincoln project.

I say to you not only in the transmission lines where you have a $80 million project from Dickey-Lincoln down into the load center areas of New England, where we have 24 of the Congressmen representing the New England area who are against this Dickey-Lincoln project, is it fair for the House to stick a project down these gentlemen's throats in order to help the Dickey-Lincoln project 400 miles from Boston?

Another thing I would like to bring up is the fact that a year ago we had on the floor another power project and it was stated that we had no agreement with Canada. I say to you that the Interior Committee, and no other committee, is going to say whether the Dickey-Lincoln project should be approved or disapproved because of the treaty agreement.

There is a 95-percent power factor in this project. Five percent is in what they call flood control and recreation.

Now look at that area. In the Dickey-Lincoln area we have 360 people. So 360 people are going to get 5 percent of recreation and flood control. Now we look across the river into the Canadian side, and what do we have? We do one thing. We are going to be helping the Canadians on the recreation and flood control, and we are not going to be helping our Maine Dickey-Lincoln supporters for flood control in Maine.

So as a result, I ask you to vote down this conference report, and I am sure, although the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] said if this report were voted down there would not be a conference report, I say to you that I feel that there would be because, if you remember, the Trinity River project is in this bill.

So I ask you to vote down the conference report, and I am sure we will get another chance to vote on this bill.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report on S. 2300. This does not mean that I agree with all portions of this conference report, because I do not.

For example, Mr. Speaker, I continue to be opposed to the St. John River public power project in Maine. I did not believe that the evidence presented before our committee was sufficiently conclusive to warrant the commitment of $227 million of Federal funds for this public power project, particularly when we had testimony before our committee that private enterprise in that area was working rapidly toward the development of nuclear powerplants to provide power and particularly because we had a letter submitted to us, and which is printed in the printed hearings, to the effect that the various public utilities in that area estimate that through the development of nuclear energy they can cut their cost and their rates by 40 percent over the next 15 years.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, it did not seem to me that we should commit the taxpayers to pay a $227 million commitment. I felt that the House of Representatives acted properly when it voted to eliminate this project and simply authorized a study of comparative costs of using other means of developing the power needed for the area.

However, Mr. Speaker, a conference is a matter of give and take. There were two major public power projects that had been authorized by the other body in their version of the bill that had not been authorized by the House in our version of the bill. One of them was the St. John project. The other was the Devils Jump project. The House conferees did succeed in upholding the position of the House as to the Devils Jump project, a $151 million project which had been authorized in the Senate bill. Therefore, that project does not appear in this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, as a whole, the House conferees upheld the position of the House on a majority of the disputed items.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss one particular aspect of this bill which may present a problem between now and the time when the President makes his decision as to his action on the bill.

Some of the conferees have been informed by at least one or more of the legal advisers of some of the administrative agencies involved in this bill that they may recommend to the President that the President veto this bill because of section 201 of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, section 201 of the bill authorizes a simplified procedure for the clearance of projects under $10 million. Those projects today have to wait for an omnibus bill. This is the first omnibus bill which we have had for a period of 3 years and, therefore, some projects have waited for 3 years for an omnibus authorization bill.

Under section 201 if a project is less than $10 million in scope, from now on it can be authorized simply by the passage of a resolution by the House and Senate Public Works Committee. When such a resolution is passed by those two committees, the project becomes an authorized project and can be carried out by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Speaker, these legal advisers who have contacted some of our conferees from the administrative agencies involved have implied that they may recommend a veto because they feel that the constitutional powers of the executive branch may be jeopardized by this provision. I do not feel that is the case at all. As a matter of fact we have two similar procedures regularly being followed as a result of legislation enacted years ago by the Congress and signed by the President. One is in the case of soil conservation projects. Such projects regularly only come before the House and Senate Public Works Committees if they involve dams of a certain size and they only require resolutions to be passed by the two committees, and then they become authorized projects, no matter what the projected cost may be.

This is the result of legislation enacted by the Congress and signed by the President.

The second example is the Public Buildings Act passed by the Congress and signed by the President, which provides that a public building, no matter what its cost may be, $40 or $60 million, only needs to be authorized by a resolution passed by the House and Senate Public Works Committees, and once this resolution is passed by those two committees the building is authorized, and does not require any further legislative act by this Congress. So it is clear a precedent has been established in this field, and section 201 of the present bill is consistent with that precedent.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from California on his statement on section 201 of this bill. That was carefully drawn as the result of the experience of the two public laws the gentleman referred to.

I would like to point out in addition to that that we have been faced with these reimbursement situations where a community will start a project in anticipation of the passing of legislation authorizing flood control, beach erosion, or some other type of project which would normally come from the Public Works Committee. The local community in anticipation of that project being authorized makes expenditures because we are dealing here for the first time in 3 years with a Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act.

We are not acting in good faith, so, consequently we are not keeping up to date, and not being responsive to the needs on this question of what we are supposed to cover, and section 201 is the most beneficial section, as far as I am concerned, and from my observation of these problems in that section of this bill. So I hope those Members who have fears and apprehensions that this is going to become a constitutional question from the executive branch of Government will lose their fears and look with favor upon the legislative act of being responsive.

I again commend the gentleman from California on the great work he has done on this committee.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding, because the gentleman now in the well of the House has rendered to this body and to the Committee on Public Works some of the most constructive services I have had the privilege of witnessing in my time of service in this body. Both the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, have been practically heroic in the dedication they have given to this committee in the face of very serious illness that both of them suffered earlier this year.

I particularly appreciate the contribution they have made in cosponsoring the section just commented on by the gentleman from Alabama, because I think it is a very constructive step forward. It recognizes the fact we need to expedite the handling of some of these flood problems across the country that have cost us so many millions of dollars in damages this year. It would be tragic if we were to delay approval of this conference report and thereby delay for even a single day the forward movement of the great flood control projects authorized by this report.

I hope that the report of the conferees will be approved by an overwhelming vote, and I congratulate the gentleman from California for the constructive attitude he has taken with reference to it.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from Alabama for their very gracious comments.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND].

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to protest the regrettable parliamentary situation that we find ourselves in here today, having the Dickey-Lincoln project back in this bill when it was taken out specifically as we all know by a specific vote of the House of 207 to 185 just a few days ago. Time has not changed that situation.

It is also regrettable that the time is controlled completely by the majority. I think the time is long overdue that the rules of this House be reformed so that there will be an absolute right of the minority to have time.

The need for a thorough study of the Dickey-Lincoln project by itself and separate from the combined Passamaquoddy project was established thoroughly during the September 22 debate. In recommending authorization of Dickey-Lincoln, the conference report relies on the report of the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers dated August 1964 and which is a supplement to the 1963 report on the Passamaquoddy project.

I have read that supplemental report with great care and find that far from resolving any discrepancies, it creates new ones. For example, on page 4 of the August 1964 report, the estimated cost of a privately developed steam-generating alternative to Dickey-Lincoln is given as $23.50 per kilowatt-year. In fact, this is about double what it ought to be. In my State of New Hampshire, Public Service Co. has signed a contract for a 350,000-kilowatt installation at Bow for a cost of $12.34 a kilowatt-year. The figure used by the Government report would have been accurate 10 years ago but costs are coming down, largely because it is cheaper to build large installations such as the project at Bow. Thus, the Government's effort to contrast the public versus private building costs is way off base. This particular figure is a key one to the Government's case but it is wrong and is just one more reason for undertaking a thorough study of the situation before committing the country to this $300 million project.

Another fallacy or erroneous assumption in the report is pointed out in a letter, which is included in the report, from former Secretary of the Treasury Dillon. He notes that the Government has assumed interest charges at the rate of 3⅛ percent per annum when, Mr. Dillon wrote:

> In this Department's judgment, the interest rate most appropriate for both cost-benefit analysis and the determination of reimbursement and cost sharing arrangements should reflect the Government's current borrowing costs and, therefore, should be determined on the basis of current market yields on outstanding long-term Treasury obligations. At the present time, the market yield on long-term obligations is close to 4¼ percent.

He finds, also, that:

> In view of past experience, that the costs, in particular, may be seriously underestimated.

In sum, if this House approves this project, it will be doing a very careless thing. It would be committing the Government to expenditures of upward of $300 million on a project which is more than 90 percent for electric power production but where there has been no proper analysis of the potential market for power in New England; where there has been no accurate consideration of alternative means for meeting the future power needs of the region; and where there appears to be no sound estimate of the actual costs.

In contrast, it is known that private, taxpaying companies with plans to meet the power needs of New England in the future can produce the same power at no expense to the Government and for a cost of only $71 million.

In my earnest opinion, it would be irresponsible and profligate to abandon the position we took not so many days ago in this House and accede to granting authority for this project without first conducting a thorough study.

Now, Mr. Speaker, because he was unable to obtain time from his own side, I am pleased to yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, my colleague [Mr. O'NEILL].

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in all the years that I have been a Member of the Congress I have always been a public power man. I have been one who believes that we need public power when you cannot provide private power. I have been one who, when the people of an area and the Congressmen from an area want public power, I have supported them.

Mr. Speaker, from the New England area there are 25 Congressmen. Twenty of them voted against this project. Why should you try to stick it down our throats? We are not trying to stick anything down your throats in Oklahoma. We are not trying to stick anything down the throats of you who come from Alabama. We are not trying to stick anything down the throats of you Members from Texas. This is a project, and we all realize what it is all about—

this will cost $303 million including the transmission lines—that is what it is going to cost—$303 million.

What will you be giving us in this project? You will be giving us a project by which we will be turning back the clock and going back to the days of the horse and buggy and the days of the high button shoes. This is an antiquated hydroelectric powerplant.

How much power is this proposed project going to produce? It will produce less than 1 percent of the power that is used in New England in the present time. As the population of the New England area increases, it is going to be even worse. This is one of the worst projects that I have ever seen in my life. We from New England, 20 out of the 25 Members from New England, have asked you not to give us this project.

Now what happened on this? You went to conference on this bill. What happened in the conference? I have been in public life for 30 years and any time there has been a rollcall vote on the floor of the House that was taken to determine what the will of the Congress was, the conferees went into the conference and upheld the will of the Congress. I can remember when we passed a bill here having to do with stockpiling of certain materials. The bill went to conference. Senator HAYDEN said, "Why, the Senate by a rollcall vote voted against this and I will not even bring the matter up." That is what the chairman of our committee and the members of the conference committee should have done.

If you give us this project, you will be selling out 20 Members of the Congress from New England. We do not want this project. We know our area better than you from Alabama and better than you from Oklahoma. We are well on the road of getting cheap electricity in our area. I have heard so many bleeding hearts talk about New England and our problems. High power costs have not been the cause of our problems in our area because I think the power in our area is not too much higher than the power out in the Midwest. There are four hundred reasons why industry has left New England—transportation, cheap labor, antiquated buildings, nearness to the market, and all kinds of reasons. But New England, because of its technical knowledge, its universities and colleges, is doing well. There is no cheap power here for Massachusetts. This is a waste of the taxpayers' money. I hope the conference report is defeated.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I agree with what the gentleman from Massachusetts has been saying. Let me also say that the gentleman has pointed out that the House conferees caved in. The conference caved in on this particular project. Why? Simply because the majority of the conferees were in favor of the Dickey-Lincoln project and, no doubt, were delighted and anxious to yield to the other body.

But worse still, Mr. Speaker, and I am not concerned too much about the House conferees yielding on this project—I am more concerned about the fact that we lost the papers and conveniently enough to the Senate. This has not been done—and I do not recall that it has ever been done at any time while I have been a Member of this House of Representatives. This action, of course, makes it impossible for the House to vote on the Dickey-Lincoln project. All that is left to us is to vote the conference report up or down.

I serve on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Public Works. Look at my record. I have voted for public power all over this country. I voted for the great dams of the Northwest and the Southwest. I have voted for flood control and navigation projects all over this country. I have consistently supported the Tennessee Valley Authority. So I am concerned about what we have done here. I think we should rightfully be concerned. Those who support this project should have been satisfied with the study proposed by the action of the House. There has never been a study of Dickey-Lincoln on its own merits. We ought to follow the will of this House and stick by its position for a study and report back to Congress by next March. I have said to those who are interested in this project, if the report is favorable and if it is economically feasible, I will vote for it and I will support it and defend it on this floor. That is exactly what I have been doing with all of the public works projects as provided for in appropriation bills for some 11 years. I intend to keep on doing so. But I do not intend to support this project at this time. Do you know what else happened yesterday?

Do you know what happened yesterday in the supplemental? The Senate has already put in $1,850,000 for this project. The supplemental bill is now being considered on the Senate floor. The bill will be passed in the Senate with the $1,850,000 intact for planning Dickey-Lincoln. Our Subcommittee on Appropriations on Public Works has not even seen the thing, and we will not get a chance to consider it at the rate we are going.

The gentleman from Texas made a great speech, but you can bet your bottom dollar that if we vote down this conference report, there will be another conference. And there ought to be.

Let us make this project stand on its own two feet. Sometime ago I said I would not get in a debate on this matter. but the way this matter has been handled by this committee, or by some of the Members, forces me to take this position.

Mr. Speaker, I have no illusions about the fate of this conference report. There are many, many worthwhile projects in this bill affecting a great number of the Members of the House. I can readily understand their reluctance at this late date—the waning days of this session—to vote against this report and hence, vote against themselves. And this is particularly so in the face of the remarks of the distinguished member of the committee, Mr. WRIGHT, that the some 200-odd Members with projects in the bill will be in the untenable position of losing the whole bill because of the disagreement on only the Dickey-Lincoln project.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD].

Mr. MACDONALD. I thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES]. I shall not take 5 minutes.

I hate to be in dispute with other Members from my native State of Massachusetts, and perhaps in dispute with some other members from New England. But I think what they say about the fact that this matter has not been studied and has not been evaluated by the Corps of Army Engineers and by the other people who are in charge of checking out whether this would be a good project or not happens to be in error. Actually this study, in my memory, started back in 1960. There was a study made under the request, I should say, of our late President Kennedy, who thought that this project would be a very good one. I think the fact that it is now being confused with the study made about Passamaquoddy must be in error.

I know that no one would do that on purpose. There were separate studies made of the Dickey project and of the Quoddy project. I am sure the Members from Massachusetts and other Members from New England who have spoken must not be speaking for the consumers of public utility power in Massachusetts and rest of New England, because it is clear beyond any doubt that we in New England, especially we in Massachusetts, have the highest rates charged to any consuming public in the United States.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACDONALD. I will yield in a second.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell the House how this bill would help Massachusetts rates any? Your home is 400 miles from where this project is.

Mr. MACDONALD. I will yield to the gentleman when I have time. He knows that what I am saying is correct. I am the first to say that Maine will be the primary beneficiary of this project when it is passed. But also in Massachusetts, including Greater Boston and in the other congressional districts from which other people have testified, it has been demonstrated that during the peak power period time, during the time that power is most used, which is from 4 o'clock in the afternoon to, perhaps, 8 o'clock at night, when this project is completed, the people of Greater Boston will get lower rates for the power than they are now receiving from private utilities.

I have no quarrel with private power. They have done a good job. In fact, they are so bright that it is my understanding they are now buying public power that is generated on the Canadian side of the border.

They are buying public power which is being generated, and selling it to the people of New England at private power rates. It is sold to the people of New England at the rates established by a quasi-judicial group which is very handily controlled from the statehouse in Boston, the Public Utilities Commission. I cannot see any possible reason why anybody from the New England States would object to helping another New England State.

I agree that this project will help primarily Maine. I ask anybody from the State of Massachusetts, what is wrong with helping a neighbor, when we have been consistently voting to help Wyoming, California, Nevada, Hawaii, and all the other States of the United States?

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman asked a question. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACDONALD. We are helping all the States of the United States. What is wrong with helping a neighbor, when the spinoff is going to help the Commonwealth of Massachusetts?

Mr. BOLAND. Will the gentleman yield so that I can answer the question?

Mr. MACDONALD. I understand that the people here who are talking against this bill also represent the people who would be benefited by lower rates.

Mr. BOLAND. Will the gentleman yield so that I can answer the question?

Mr. MACDONALD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. I will tell the gentleman why. You cannot point to another project like this, where we have helped other States, that has had such unreliable information that has been developed by the supporters and opposers. Despite what has been said, this project has not been studied on its own. It has been tied into the complex of the much talked about and controversial Passamaquoddy tidal power project. Projects that we voted on for other areas, in the majority of cases have had substantial flood control and navigation benefits. The record clearly shows and the figures prove that there is little flood control and no navigation benefits connected with Dickey-Lincoln School.

You cannot point to another such project that is as costly as this, has had more conflicting and chaotic testimony and that has been studied so little that has been approved, at least in my service here, by the House.

Mr. MACDONALD. I will say to the gentleman——

Mr. BOLAND. I am giving you the answer.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield no further.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield further.

Mr. MACDONALD. I point out to the gentleman that he cannot point out to me another State in the United States which has a higher rate for its public utilities than the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACDONALD. I promised to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] and I will yield to him.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts has declined to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD] has expired.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, your conferees bring back to this body today what we consider to be an excellent conference report on the River and Harbor and Flood Control Act of 1965, S. 2300.

What this body has before it today embodies in one form or another the legislation that was reported by the House Committee on Public Works and which passed this body a short time ago. The modifications agreed to by the conferees on the part of the House are ones that the House conferees believe in the long run would be helpful to the individual projects that were affected thereby.

The conferees agreed to the restoration of a most worthy project in its entirety rather than wait for a further study as originally intended by this body when it restored the authorization for the Dickey-Lincoln project on the St. John's River. Minor modifications were made in the overall authorization for flood control improvements on the Lower Mississippi River Basin. A provision relating to use of funds for the establishment of a National Wildlife Refuge on the Waurika project in Oklahoma was deleted by the conferees. A further study of projects already deleted from the bill covering Grand River and tributaries, Missouri and Iowa, is authorized by the conferees.

Several modifications in existing projects such as the San Diego River Basin, the Minnesota River at Mankato, Minn., dealing with reimbursement for local interests for work performed or to be performed were worked out by the conferees. In addition we believe this conference report brings a most satisfactory solution to the problem of the Burns Waterway Harbor project in Indiana while at the same time taking due recognition of the importance of a project for the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.

There are in addition several minor changes made in the legislation as it passed this body originally. This is a good conference report and one that I trust this body will accept. The disastrous floods and hurricanes of the last year have indicated quite clearly the pressing need for legislation such as that we are considering today. These projects that are authorized in this legislation will prove their value many times over as has already been shown by those which have been authorized by the Congress, constructed and provided emergency protection in property and human lives through the years.

I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to reiterate some of the merits of the Dickey project. Although many of these points have been made before when the omnibus rivers and harbors bill was debated in the House a few weeks ago.

History has shown that Federal hydroelectric plants bringing low-cost electricity into an area have stimulated the demand for power from fossil fuel generating plants, this is, plants using coal, oil, or gas, so that the demand for such fuel is enhanced.

The project was thoroughly reviewed by the Federal Power Commission which gave the project a green light only after making the finding that there was no better alternate.

All computations were made in accordance with Senate Document No. 97. Computation for the marketing of the power included load factor, capacity, and energy and repayment within 50 years which included both the cost of the project—$227 million—plus the transmission line—$73 million. All figures were studied and approved by the Federal Power Commission.

The project has the support of the appropriate executive agencies, including the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Interior, and the Corps of Engineers. Furthermore, the project has the personal endorsement of the President.

Power costs in New England are the highest of any region in the country; there is no public power yardstick in any of the six New England States.

The Dickey-Lincoln School project would be located in an economically depressed area where, for example, 33 percent of the families have incomes of less than $3,000 per year; 48.6 percent of the population is over 65 or under 15 years of age. This is an area where wholesale rates for electric energy average three times what Dickey-Lincoln School rates delivered would be.

Furthermore, and this point is extremely significant, the Dickey-Lincoln School project has a benefit-cost ratio of 1.86 to 1. The huge Colorado River storage project, authorized April 11, 1956, had a ratio of only 1.3 to 1. The Fryingpan-Arkansas project, passed by a voice vote in August 1962, had a ratio of 1.65 to 1.

The 1962 omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill, as passed by voice vote, included 13 multipurpose projects with power. Only three had better benefits-to-cost ratios than Dickey-Lincoln School; 10 had lesser benefits.

In the report now under consideration it is striking to note that of 133 projects for which a benefit cost ratio is given 72 have benefit-cost ratios below 1.86. Fifty-four percent of the projects in this report have benefit-to-cost ratios which are less than the Dickey project. Shall we draw the line at 1.86 and throw out all projects at that line or below thereby eliminating over half the projects in the bill?

In 1953, the New England and New York Interagency Committee took note of the upper St. John River and two possible sites for development were studied—Rankin Rapids and Big Rapids-Lincoln School. They submitted a report in 1955. In 1956 the Corps of Engineers undertook a study of the Passamaquoddy project and looked over several separate sites which would be desirable for development of the upper St. John River as a supplement to the Passamaquoddy project. The two sites chosen for further study were Rankin Rapids and Big Rapids-Lincoln School. There was at that time an engineering analysis of both sites. In 1959, the International Engineering Board filed a report with the International Joint Commission, recommending Rankin Rapids. However, in 1961 at the request of President Kennedy, the department of the Interior undertook a study of the upper St. John, including Big Rapids-Lincoln School and Rankin Rapids, and the alternate to Big Rapids, which was Dickey-Lincoln School was decided on. At that time an independent engineering and economic analysis was made on the Dickey-Lincoln River project which offers more storage and saves the Allagash. The economic benefits and feasibility studies were made separately for Dickey-Lincoln School and Passamaquoddy. These studies were completed in 1963 and submitted to the President. There was a subsequent analysis between 1963 and 1964 and this report was concurred in by the Corps of Engineers and submitted to the Senate Public Works Committee. The final stage came last winter and this spring when the Department of the Interior reevaluated Dickey-Lincoln as a separate project and separated it completely from Passamaquoddy.

It is important to note that even though the studies the Dickey-Lincoln School project was combined with the other projects. The engineering, benefit-cost and power generation studies were always made separately. The last analysis simply took all the background information and refigured the cost and benefits with the new factors involved and came up with the final benefit-cost ratio. Nothing more can be learned by further study.

The Corps of Engineers are satisfied that there has been enough study. The Department of the Interior is satisfied that there has been enough study. The U.S. Senate is satisfied that there has been enough study and President Johnson is satisfied that there has been enough study.

So much for the merits of the project. The real issue today is whether the managers on the part of the House have worked out with the Senate managers an acceptable compromise. We must realize that compromise plays a paramount role in legislation. Provisions in our Constitution as well as in our most significant laws have come about as the result of compromise. Obviously legislation coming from a legislative branch of government composed of two separate bodies must be the result, in many instances, of a give-and-take process. Neither this body nor the other body can dominate the legislative scene. During this session so far 46 bills have gone through conference and have been approved and signed by the President. Certainly these 46 conference reports were not wholly in accordance with the desire of all the Members of this body nor of the other body but they reflected final judgment of the agents of both Houses working together to bring about a rational settlement of their differences.

Conference is the instrument for final compromise between the House and the Senate, and we should respect the judgment of the conferees. Without such compromise we would not have passed the excise tax cuts, we would not have had the Medicare Act. In that act the conferees had to reach agreement on 513 differences between the House and the Senate versions. Conference reports have been accepted by the House, because we realize that not to accept a rational compromise might mean having no legislation at all.

The same is true with respect to the compromise now before the House. Initially, according to figures obtained from the public works committee staff, the Senate public works bill contained 113 projects. The House bill contained 144 projects which included the 113 of the Senate and in addition the House bill contained the northeastern U.S. water-supply provision and a flood control provision neither of which were contained in the Senate bill. The compromise, the conference report, which contains 142 projects plus the water-supply provision and the flood-control provision shows that managers on the part of the House were able to persuade the representatives from the other body to accept 28 of the 31 projects that were in our bill and not in the Senate bill, to accept title I, the northeastern U.S. water supply provision and to accept the flood control provision in exchange for losing only two projects, two bridge commission extensions and accepting one project, the Dickey-Lincoln School project hydroelectric dam, which had not been rejected by the House but had simply been postponed for future study. So that Senate managers in addition to the water supply and flood control provision accepted 28 projects which the Senate had not even considered and asked us only to accept one project about which we had manifested some hesitancy. Under such conditions, how could we in good conscience reject this entire report and ask for a new conference? We would be saying in effect that we have 90 percent of the hog but we want the whole hog or nothing at all, and I am sure the answer from the other body would be "nothing at all."

The managers on the part of the House should be commended for the excellent compromise they have been able to obtain and we should support them by voting to accept the conference report.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, there has been extended discussion of the Dickey project but since others have held themselves out as experts on power needs, in the State of Maine, I ask your indulgence to again remind the House that this hydroelectric project is desperately needed by my State. There has been a lot of sound and fury but the facts are that our people are paying 20 percent more than the average paid by electricity users throughout the Nation, and as much as 300 percent more than that paid in some areas.

For example, in Augusta, Maine, a family paying $15.70 for a months's electricity would pay $6.10 if living in Clarksville, Tenn., a city of similar size. In Rockland, Maine, a family paying $15.70 for a month's electric power would pay $5.50 if living in Hopkinsville, Ky. A family in Greater Portland paying this same amount of $15.70 would pay $7.46 in Tacoma, Wash.

We cannot expect to get sufficient industries to come to our State to provide jobs for our people with exorbitantly high power rates.

Maine private power companies have had many years to lower rates in a meaningful way and have offered only promises and token reductions when pressed.

Opponents have argued that thermal power will be cheaper—but the Atomic Energy Commission has stated, and I quote: "The Dickey-Lincoln School project which is being recommended will produce lower cost power than a nuclear alternative."

The Federal Power Commission approves construction of this project, as well as the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Department of the Interior. Certainly the expert advice of these Federal agencies can be relied upon. President Johnson and every New England Governor has endorsed this project—certainly these endorsements were not lightly given.

I think it is appropriate to remind those in the Appalachian region that Maine Representatives supported development of their area.

This project will not mean that less coal will be sold to Maine—none is now being used in Maine for development of electricity. On the contrary, if the project is built, it will increase use of coal through greater industrial growth.

And may I remind my fellow Republicans that if our party is to present itself as the party of all the people, we must show that we care for all the people. Republicans recognize that where private initiative has abjectly failed in a given area, there is nothing wrong in asking for a helping hand from our Federal Government.

And finally to my fellow New Englanders, may I remind them of the countless times Representatives from the State of Maine have cast their votes to help other New England States.

I ask all colleagues today to help us in Maine in our aspirations for a more equal share in the Nation's prosperity.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, a most significant provision in the conference report on the rivers and harbors bill now before this body contains the wherewithal to save one of our Nation's most valuable natural resources, the Chesapeake Bay.

The bill would authorize a thorough study of the entire bay basin, and the construction of a hydraulic model and associated technical center to serve as factual clearinghouse to deal with such problems as pollution, erosion and salinization which currently threaten this overburdened national asset.

Consideration of this legislation is the culmination of many months of research, of proposing, and of prodding since I first suggested the feasibility of this project in the early days of the 88th Congress in 1963. At that time, I became convinced that only by an all-out assault on the environmental factors that jeopardize the Chesapeake Bay could we save this productive waterway.

All along the way, evidence mounted to support my suggestion. First the Corps of Engineers agreed that a complete study of the bay and its tributaries was in order. A visit to the operating model of San Francisco at Sausalito, Calif., confirmed the view that such a scale reproduction would offer new and valuable insights into bay problems and would save untold millions of dollars in the process.

On February 19, 1965, with all of the information of 2 years of study at my disposal, I met with Gov. J. Millard Tawes of Maryland and with the top officials of the State agencies dealing with Chesapeake Bay matters. Their enthusiasm and support for a Bay study, and construction of a model and technical center were unanimous. The very next day, I met with members of the Maryland and Virginia delegations and submitted legislative drafts embodying the language and basic details of the Chesapeake Bay proposals now contained in the rivers and harbors bill. It has been a long, hard campaign, with new allies and fresh troops joining the fight at every turn. But the battle, while joined, is not yet won. The carefully prepared and widely sponsored legislation before us, dealing with the Chesapeake Bay is, I believe, the last, best hope for this much misused and irreplaceable resource.

Every day, pollution of the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries by an industrialized civilization is on the increase. Every day the recreational demands of a multiplying population are on the increase. Every day salinization and other phenomena take their toll of a weakened fishery. Every day acres of beautiful and valuable shoreline disappear beneath the water. Every day the burdens of men and nature increase while the resistance of the Chesapeake Bay declines.

For years, dedicated and able Federal, State, and local agencies have studied and attacked these exploding problems, but their individual and combined efforts have been unable to stem the tide. Now we have the chance to throw the full weight of science and technology into the fray in a last ditch coordinated assault.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report and in commendation of the House conferees for maintaining the position of the House so successfully.

The detractors of this report have used every argument that has ever been used against every public works bill ever introduced. If their views had prevailed over the years, then the progress of the Nation would have been fixed at 1860 levels.

There would have been no controlling of the Mississippi River. No Intercoastal Canal and our vast system of inland waterways. No development of the Missouri, no Erie Canal, and the hundreds of other programs that have meant so much to us.

The bill before you now is a continuation of this necessary progress and development of our national water resources.

This bill has received months and even years of study. It has selected those that are most vital to the Nation as a whole and with an eye ever out to insure that only those needed and economically feasible were included.

This bill represents another great milestone in our Nation's growth.

I sincerely urge your enthusiastic support of the bill before you.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I regret most exceedingly that the conferees on the part of the House were forced because of circumstances beyond their control to delete two most meritorious pieces of legislation. Those sections would authorize the Muscatine Bridge Commission in Iowa to construct, maintain and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Ill., and another somewhat similar bill which would revise and reenact previous legislation which had set up the city of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorized said commission to construct, maintain and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill.

Both of these measures which were agreed to by the House in S. 2300 as it passed the House had previously been acted upon as separate legislation earlier in the session of Congress, had been reported out unanimously by the Committee on Public Works, and passed this body by a unanimous vote.

Full credit for the action on these two important bridge commissions in Iowa belong to Congressman JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER, an outstanding freshman member of the Committee on Public Works and Congressman JOHN C. CULVER, of Iowa. Congressman SCHMIDHAUSER fought hard and vigorously for the enactment of the Muscatine Bridge Commission and his colleague from Iowa, Congressman CULVER, fought equally as well for the Clinton Bridge Commission.

The conferees on the part of the House felt strongly about the merit of these two bills and as a result a firm commitment was received from the Senate conferees; such a statement is included in the statement of managers on the part of the House on S. 2300 to the effect that early in the next session of the Congress the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works of the Senate would hold hearings on this legislation.

I personally believe most strongly in this legislation and I am certain that in the next session of Congress through the efforts of these two able Congressmen, JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER and JOHN C. CULVER, of Iowa, that the Senate, after full hearings are given to these bills, will approve them in the proper form and they will become the law of the land.

May I close by stating that the work of men such as Congressmen JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER and Congressman JOHN C. CULVER has been most effective in adding to the great record the Congress has compiled this year in the field of needed legislation and, in the case of my colleague, JOHN SCHMIDHAUSER, not only do I know his outstanding work as a Member on the floor of the House but I have seen him at close hand during long and arduous sessions of the Committee on Public Works contributing valiantly and most ably to the discussion of the very heavy workload the committee carried through so successfully this year.

I trust and I am sure that in the end both of these commissions will become law and when they do the tribute belongs to these two fine Members from Iowa.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, my vote today against accepting the Senate-House conference report on the omnibus public works bill is a matter of political conscience and personal integrity.

Earlier this month, I successfully joined together with a majority of the Members of the House to remove from the public works bill the Dickey-Lincoln School power project on the St. John River in Maine. I did so because this $300 million project was challenged on the grounds that it had not been approved by the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, and private power alternatives had not been thoroughly studied. Now the Senate-House conference has restored the Dickey-Lincoln project to the public works bill.

Under the parliamentary procedure of the House I am unable to vote specifically against the Dickey-Lincoln project and we are unable to vote to recommit the entire bill to committee for further study. Therefore, though I support the vast majority of the projects in the omnibus public works bill, I want to reaffirm my stand against the Dickey-Lincoln School power project. Earlier I gave the following reasons for my original vote and I have seen no evidence in the meantime to change that vote. Let me restate them now.

First. No public hearings were held on the Dickey-Lincoln power project in the Senate in 1965.

Second. As a separate project, the Dickey-Lincoln project has never been approved by the Corps of Engineers, and only belatedly by the Bureau of the Budget.

Third. The electric companies of the region have offered a tangible, practical, effective alternative to this project without the support of Federal funds. The New England utilities supplied much information regarding this project to the House Public Works Committee.

Fourth. This project, by the expenditure of $300 million of the taxpayers' money in direct competition with private investors would jeopardize the development of the atomic industry in New England where there are three nuclear powerplants in operation or under construction in Connecticut and Massachusetts.

Fifth. This is virtually a pure power project with less than 5 percent for recreation and flood control for a region that has no power shortage.

With all this in mind does it seem unreasonable to await further study by the Corps of Engineers before we examine alternative methods to this project that will cost the American taxpayer more than $300 million. I believe that my vote against the Dickey-Lincoln School power project is in the best interests of the citizens of Connecticut.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today contains many projects which I consider beneficial both to the residents in the specific areas where they are located and to the entire Nation. I regret, however, that the conference committee has reported a bill which still includes the Dickey-Lincoln School project, in northern Maine. This body voted to defer authorization of the Dickey-Lincoln School project until a detailed report could be prepared and considered, next year.

During the past few days, I have held discussions with representatives of the Electrical Coordinating Council of New England and of the Federal Power Commission, in an attempt to assess several different cost analyses prepared on the project. Just this morning, I received additional information from the Federal Power Commission, which provides new insight into the matter. It is clear to me that questions remain—important questions—relating to the amount of transmission line and equipment required by the various alternative proposals.

After analysis of the documents which I have obtained in the last few days, there appears to be little difference in cost between the Dickey-Lincoln School project and the nuclear pump hydro-storage project advocated by the coordinating councils. Furthermore, neither project supplies more than a small fraction of the total electrical demand for the area. Finally, I see no reason to believe that location of the dam in Maine will provide any significant industrial development in the State of Maine—a State I have learned to know and love from many months of residence there.

If this project had promised any substantial saving in the cost of power in New England, it would have had my complete support. Should the proposed study definitively indicate such potential savings, I shall support the project. But given the lack of pertinent information I must oppose the Dickey-Lincoln School project at this time. I can only express this opposition, I am sorry to say, by voting against the entire conference report on the omnibus public works bill.

Mr. **JONES** of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 221, nays 139, answered "present" 5, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 378]

YEAS—221

Abbitt
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Baldwin
Bandstra
Barrett
Beckworth
Bennett
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Bonner
Brademas
Bray
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Callan
Cameron
Carter
Casey
Celler
Chelf
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conyers
Corman
Craley
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Denton
Donohue
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Harvey, Ind.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hechler
Helstoski
Herlong
Hicks
Horton
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Krebs
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Mize
Moeller
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murray
Natcher
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olson, Minn.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Randall
Redlin
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Scott
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Stafford
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sweeney
Teague, Tex.
Trimble
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Waggonner
Weltner
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—139

Abernethy
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Glenn
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Ayres
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Betts
Boland
Bolton
Bow
Brock
Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Duncan, Tenn.
Erlenborn
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Gettys
Giaimo
Goodell
Grabowski
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Henderson
Hutchinson
Irwin
Jarman
Jennings
Jonas
Kastenmeier
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
Love
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
McMillan
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Mathias
Michel
Minshall
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morton
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien
O'Neill, Mass.
Pelly
Pirnie
Poff
Quillen
Race
Reid, Ill.
Reinecke
Rooney, Pa.
St. Onge
Saylor
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Tuck
Vivian
Walker, Miss.
Watson
Watts
Whalley
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wydler
Younger

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5

Holland
Murphy, N.Y.
Pike
Quie
Utt

NOT VOTING—67

Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Aspinall
Baring
Bell
Berry
Bolling
Callaway
Carey
Clausen, Don H.
Culver
Davis, Wis.
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Dulski
Edwards, Ala.
Flynt
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Hagan, Ga.
Harsha
Hébert
Holifield
Hosmer
Keogh
Kirwan
Landrum
Leggett
Lennon
Lindsay
MacGregor
Mackay
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
Multer
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neal, Ga.
Poage
Reifel
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Sisk
Smith, N.Y.
Staggers
Sullivan
Talcott
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tunney
Vigorito
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wyatt

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Murphy of New York for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Olsen of Montana for, with Mr. Pike against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Utt against.

Mr. Lindsay for, with Mr. Quie against.

Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Lennon against.

Mr. Don H. Clausen for, with Mr. Dorn against.

Mr. Martin of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Harsha against.

Mr. Roudebush for, with Mr. MacGregor against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Frelinghuysen against.

Mr. Multer for, with Mr. Bob Wilson against.

Until further notice:

Mrs. Sullivan with Mrs. May.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. Wolff with Mr. Wyatt.

Mr. Mackay with Mr. Reifel.

Mr. Walker of New Mexico with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Culver with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Aspinall.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Robison.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Rumsfeld.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Callaway.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Berry.

Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Smith of New York.

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Mosher.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Morse.

Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Baring.

Mr. Matthews with Mr. Toll.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Dulski.

Mr. RACE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. Keogh]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on S. 2300.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

SHIP MORTGAGE BONDS

Mr. DOWNING, on behalf of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Garmatz], submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2118) to amend sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority leader if he will advise us as to any changes in the program which may be anticipated.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. The distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris] has advised that he will call up, under unanimous consent, on Friday, S. 1098, to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes.

If the second supplemental appropriation bill comes over from the Senate subsequent to the commencement of special orders, we announce now that we will undertake to send it to conference.

Mr. ARENDS. May I ask the gentleman if there are any other changes in the program for tomorrow which he knows of?

Mr. ALBERT. We have listed for today, as the gentleman knows, a number of bills from the Committee on Ways and Means. The gentleman from Arkansas has advised that it is satisfactory to put those over until tomorrow.

We have another conference report today, so I am quite sure we will put over the Committee on Ways and Means bill until tomorrow.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, at this point let me say I have earlier received permission to file two resolutions from the Committee on Rules by midnight tonight, by direction of that committee, providing travel authority for two committees of the House, one the Committee on Agriculture and the other the Committee on Banking and Currency. I understood I would be permitted to call them up tomorrow if time permitted.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, as far as the gentleman from Oklahoma is concerned, I have no knowledge of that, but I am glad to have that information available from the distinguished gentleman from Virginia. Also I may advise that tomorrow we may have a conference report which will be eligible and may be called up from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I am advised also that we may have some printing resolutions tomorrow. As far as I know, those are the only immediate changes in the program. May I say also that if the supplemental comes over tonight, as I stated before, we are going to send it to conference even though special orders have already commenced. If it is ready, it will be in order to call it up tomorrow. We would like to dispose of that bill early, because it is very important.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I wonder if it is possible for the leadership on the majority side to make any predictions as to the time when the House might be called upon to consider a sine die resolution.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is why we are trying to take extraordinary procedures in the consideration of bills and sending bills to conference. We are hoping we can adjourn very soon, and we will if we dispose of our business.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. Bell] was absent when the debate today occurred on the education bill. Had he been here, he would have voted for the higher education bill.

The SPEAKER. You mean the gentleman from New York is stating how another Member would have voted if he had been present?

Mr. GOODELL. At the request of Mr. Bell I am making this statement as to how he would have voted if he had been here.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman makes that statement on his own responsibility?

Mr. GOODELL. That is correct.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1966

Mr. WHITTEN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 8370) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes:

Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 1186)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8370) "making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 12, 26, 30, 37, 38, 42, 45, 47 and 52.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17, 18, 24, 25, 31, 34, 41, 43, 53 and 54; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "$123,622,500, of which not to exceed $11,418,000 shall remain available until expended for plans, construction, alteration, and improvement of facilities, without regard to limitations contained herein"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$18,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$74,299,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "; and not to exceed $400,000 from funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, pursuant to Public Law 88-250 to be transferred and merged with this appropriation; $1,600,000 in addition to funds otherwise available"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$54,795,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$65,671,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$16,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,536,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,755,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$76,192,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$103,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$126,278,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$81,933,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$24,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$625,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,184,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,699,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$365,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$60,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$44,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That in the event the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Fund is insufficient to meet indemnity payments and other charges against such Fund, not to exceed $250,000 may be borrowed from the Commodity Credit Corporation under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, but repayment of such amount shall include interest at a rate not less than the cost of money to the Commodity Credit Corporation for a comparable period."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,800,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 27 and 55.

Jamie L. Whitten,
William H. Natcher,
W. R. Hull, Jr.,
Thomas G. Morris,
George Mahon,
Robert H. Michel,
Odin Langen,
Frank T. Bow,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Spessard L. Holland,
Richard B. Russell,
By S.L.H.
Carl Hayden,
Allen J. Ellender,
Milton R. Young,
Karl E. Mundt,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8370) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments; namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Research Service

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2: Research: Appropriate $123,622,500 instead of $114,394,000 as proposed by the House and $124,369,800 as proposed by the Senate and provide for the transfer of $18,100,000 from section 32 funds instead of $24,600,000 as proposed by the House and $16,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The amounts agreed to include the sums approved by the House for cotton and pesticide research facilities, plus $500,000 for the Water Pollution Laboratory at Durant, Okla.; $500,000 for the Poultry Laboratory at Georgetown, Del.; $300,000 for plans for the Animal Research Center at Clay Center, Nebr. (total cost $3,750,000); and $339,000 for repairs and alterations at Beltsville, Md. They also include planning funds for the following facilities: U.S. Range Livestock Experiment Station, Miles City, Mont., $40,000 (total cost $521,000); Poultry Research Facilities, Glendale, Ariz., $50,000 (total cost $750,000); Southwest Great Plains Research Center, Bushland, Tex., $25,000 (total cost $350,000); Grain Marketing Research Laboratory, Manhattan, Kans., $225,000 (total cost $3,385,000); Cereal Rust Laboratory, University of Minnesota, $50,000 (total cost $650,000); National Sedimentation Laboratory, Oxford, Miss., $100,000 (total cost $1,035,000); Soil and Water Research Laboratory, Pendleton, Oreg., $45,000 (total cost $425,000); Pasture Research Laboratory, University Park, Pa., $40,000 (total cost $400,000); and Human Nutrition Laboratory, University of North Dakota, $50,000 (total cost $633,000).

Increased funds are also provided as follows: Acceleration of research at Chickasha, Okla., and Madison, S. Dak., $105,000; research on salmonella to be conducted on a nationwide basis, $50,000; mechanization research on dates, $45,000; staffing new laboratories and expanding research facilities, $144,600; additional labor, subprofessional and junior scientific help. $1,000,000; Clay Center, Nebr., $100,000; research on wool fineness, University of Wyoming, $70,000; and

$225,000 each for the Southeast and Northeast hydrology research watersheds at Athens, Ga., and State College, Pa.

Funds in the amount of $224,700 are provided to continue activities of the Food Wholesaling and Retailing Branch. The conferees believe it be unsound to announce closing of research stations or other major research reductions in advance of committee hearings and request that in the future formal presentations be made prior to any such announcements.

Amendments No. 3 and 4: Plant and animal disease and pest control: Appropriate $74,299,500 instead of $71,119,000 as proposed by the House and $75,060,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes the following: Plant quarantine inspection, $182,500; Animal quarantine inspection, $128,000; Virus-Serum-Toxin Act, $50,000; fire ant eradication, $770,000; cereal leaf beetle, $75,000; hog cholera eradication, $230,000; and screwworm survey in Mexico, $70,000.

The bill includes $2,806,200 for the maintenance of a barrier zone to protect the screwworm-freed areas of Texas and New Mexico and other parts of the country from future infestations from Mexico. The bill also provides $1,000,000 for eradication activities in Arizona, $600,000 of which will be matched by funds from other sources, incident to the extension of the barrier zone to the west coast. The Department should plan, conduct and finance the Federal portion of the cost of barrier zone operations within the funds provided. The policy of requiring matching by State and local sources of funds expended for the production, irradiation and release of flies used to eradicate infestations within the areas involved is expected to be continued.

The cereal leaf beetle presents a serious threat to production of cereal grains in the United States. The host crops susceptible to attack by this pest are grown in all of the States and have an estimated value of $7 billion. It is essential that steps be taken to prevent further spread from the presently infested States of Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio, which States are expected to cooperate in financing eradication measures.

The conferees expect that the full amount of $3,270,000 appropriated in this bill will be required for the conduct of the cooperative fire ant eradication program and will be used only for that purpose.

Amendment No. 5: Special foreign currency program: Appropriates $3,000,000 instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House and $4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Cooperative State Research Service

Amendments No. 6 through 9: Payments and expenses: Appropriate $54,795,000 instead of $51,695,000 as proposed by the House and $55,695,000 as proposed by the Senate, including increases of $1,000,000 for Hatch Act pay adjustments, $500,000 for grants for forestry research, and $1,600,000 for grants for basic research, and restore House language authorizing the transfer of $400,000 from section 32 funds for basic research grants.

Extension Service

Amendments No. 10 and 11: Payments to States and Puerto Rico: Appropriate $75,600,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $72,800,000 as proposed by the House.

Farmer Cooperative Service

Amendment No. 12: Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $1,141,000 as proposed by the House instead of $1,241,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Soil Conservation Service

Amendment No. 13: Conservation operations: Appropriates $106,373,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $105,373,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 14 and 15: Watershed protection: Appropriate $65,671,000 instead of $64,171,000 as proposed by the House and $65,746,000 as proposed by the Senate; and provide loan funds of $5,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Separate funds for the Shelby County Tennessee river basin study have not been included in this bill, since it has not been the practice to carry separate amounts for individual projects under this program. The conferees agree that the Department should give consideration to the need for a river basin study in Shelby County, Tennessee, in formulating the overall plan for inclusion in the 1967 budget.

In its report language affecting the Yazoo-Little Tallahatchie watersheds, it was the purpose of the House Committee to point out that the intent of Congress in Public Law 712, 80th Congress, was to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out necessary work projects anywhere within the Yazoo-Little Tallahatchie river watersheds.

Amendment No. 16: Great Plains Conservation Program: Appropriates $16,000,000 instead of $14,864,000 as proposed by the House and $17,432,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 17 and 18: Resource conservation and development: Appropriate $4,303,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,813,000 as proposed by the House, and provide $1,500,000 for loans as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees do not intend for this to become a large program or to replace or duplicate any of the existing programs of the Department.

Economic Research Service

Amendment No. 19: Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $11,536,000 instead of $11,072,000 as proposed by the House and $11,591,000 as proposed by the Senate. The additional amounts agreed to include $44,000 for economic analysis of water management, $30,000 for economic analysis of exports and imports, $200,000 for a study of away-from-home markets to be fully matched by funds from industry sources, $40,000 for economic research on flowers and ornamentals—to be fully matched by funds from the floral industry, and $150,000 for a study of egg pricing.

Statistical Reporting Service

Amendment No. 20: Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $13,755,000 instead of $13,595,000 as proposed by the House and $13,875,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase includes $40,000 for one-half the cost of crop estimates on fruit, nuts and vine crops in California and $120,000 for one-half the cost issuing annual estimates on the mushroom crop and for full completion of the first phase of the long-range program for improving crop and livestock estimates.

Consumer and Marketing Service

Amendment No. 21: Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs: Appropriates $76,192,000 instead of $75,852,000 as proposed by the House and $76,412,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase includes $240,000 for meat and poultry inspection and $100,000 for administration of the U.S. Warehouse Act.

Amendment No. 22: Payments to States and possessions: Appropriates $1,750,000 instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the House and $2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23: Special Milk Program: Appropriates $103,000,000 instead of $100,000,000 as proposed by the House and $108,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments No. 24 and 25: School Lunch Program: Appropriates $157,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $155,000,000 as proposed by the House. The additional $2,000,000 for distribution to needy schools under Section 11 of the School Lunch Act is to be considered as an experimental program for the next year only and should not be considered a part of the regular permanent school lunch program.

Amendments No. 26 and 27: Food Stamp Plan: Provide $100,000,000 for the next year, of which $20,000,000 is to be derived from prior year funds.

Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service

Amendments No. 28 and 29: Expenses: Appropriate $126,278,500 instead of $111,714,000 as proposed by the House and $135,350,000 as proposed by the Senate, and limit the transfer of funds from Commodity Credit Corporation to $81,933,500 instead of $96,615,000 as proposed by the House and $75,390,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funds from both sources total $208,212,000 instead of $208,329,000 as proposed by the House and $210,740,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees note the change in the administration of certain commodity loan programs, so as to eliminate handling by convenient local financial institutions and the requirement that disbursements be made through the County offices frequently at considerable inconvenience to the producer. The conferees take further note that the surety bond of County office personnel is limited to losses from fraud, dishonesty, culpable negligence or breach of trust, and that facilities of County offices for protection of warehouse receipts are limited. The conferees call on the Secretary to restore the use of local financial institutions and to make certain that the Federal government is protected against loss in the handling of the documents involved.

The conferees wish to reaffirm the statements contained in both House and Senate Committee reports which call on the Department to retain present practices concerning skip-row planting of cotton. They agree that the elimination of such practice would increase production costs and would fail to utilize the results of extensive research in this area by the Department.

With new farm legislation just enacted, and with the many new problems related thereto, the conferees also agree that no changes should be made in prior year Agricultural Conservation Program practices which would tend to increase costs of farm production. Any changes from the 1965 practices should be made only where requested by the local county committee and approved by the State committee. The Committee recommends that full and complete information be submitted in the Congressional hearings before changes in practices are proposed in the future.

Amendment No. 30: Cropland Conversion Program: Appropriates $7,500,000 as proposed by the House instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31: Conservation Reserve Program: Appropriates $146,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $140,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 32: Emergency Conservation Measures: Appropriates $24,000,000 instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House and $30,000,000 proposed by the Senate based on a supplemental estimate of $20,000,000 submitted subsequent to House consideration (S. Doc. 38).

Rural Community Development Service

Amendment No. 33: Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $625,000 instead of $500,000 as proposed by the House and $750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Inspector General

Amendment No. 34: Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $10,491,000 as proposed by the

Senate instead of $10,416,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of General Counsel

Amendment No. 35: Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $4,184,000 instead of $4,139,000 as proposed by the House and $4,229,000 as proposed by the Senate.

National Agricultural Library

Amendment No. 36: Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $1,699,000 instead of $1,599,000 as proposed by the House and $1,865,000 as proposed by the Senate. The balance of the proposed expansion in library services has been deferred until the new library building is available.

Office of Management Services

Amendment No. 37: Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $2,483,000 as proposed by the House instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

General Administration

Amendment No. 38: Salaries and expenses: Eliminates Senate language earmarking $60,000 for agricultural services to Guam.

Rural Electrification Administration

Amendments No. 39 through 41: Loan authorizations: Provide $365,000,000 for electrification loans instead of $350,000,000 as proposed by the House and $380,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, including a contingency reserve of $60,000,000 and place $15,000,000 of telephone loan funds in reserve as proposed by the Senate instead of $7,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Farmer's Home Administration

Amendment No. 42: Rural housing grants and loans: Eliminates $10,000,000 proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Direct loan account: Authorizes real estate loans of $75,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $40,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 44: Rural housing for domestic farm labor: Appropriates $3,000,000 instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House and $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45: Rural housing for the elderly revolving fund: Appropriates $2,500,000 as proposed by the House instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments No. 46 and 47: Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $44,000,000 instead of $42,733,000 as proposed by the House and $44,692,000 as proposed by the Senate, and restore language prohibiting the use of funds for rural housing grants.

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation

Amendments No. 48 through 50: Administrative and operating expenses: Appropriate $8,000,000 instead of $7,478,000 as proposed by the House and $8,478,000 as proposed by the Senate, authorize the use of $4,000,000 of premium income for administrative expenses instead of $4,138,000 as proposed by the House and $3,638,000 as proposed by the Senate, and restore language to permit the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to borrow on a temporary basis not to exceed $250,000 from the Commodity Credit Corporation to meet indemnity payments under special or unusual circumstances.

Commodity Credit Corporation

Amendments No. 51 and 52: Reimbursement for net realized losses: Appropriate $2,800,000,000 instead of $2,300,000,000 as proposed by the House and $3,226,800,000 as proposed by the Senate and restores House approved language which eliminates cumulative interest charges on unreimbursed realized losses.

The conferees are of the opinion that future budget estimates for reimbursement appropriations for net realized losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation should include the full amount of the realized losses for any fiscal year as reflected in the accounts and shown in the report of the financial condition of such corporation as of the close of business of such fiscal year.

Amendment No. 53: Public Law 480: Restores language which would appropriate separate amounts for each title of P.L. 480 as proposed by the Senate in lieu of a single amount as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 54: Bartered materials for supplemental stockpile: Eliminates entire appropriation pursuant to budget amendment (S. Doc. 38).

National Commission on Food Marketing

Amendment No. 55: Salaries and expenses: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House intend to offer a motion to concur in the $1,500,000 proposed by the Senate with a proviso that $250,000 of this amount shall be used solely for preparation and submission of the final report and complete and final liquidation of the Commission's activities, including full salary and terminal leave payments, not later than June 30, 1966.

Jamie L. Whitten,
William H. Natcher,
W. R. Hull, Jr.
Thomas G. Morris,
George Mahon,
Robert H. Michel,
Odin Langen,
Frank T. Bow,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 8370) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, we bring to the Members of the House the conference report for the appropriation bill for the U.S. Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the 1966 fiscal year. Due consideration has been given in the figures contained herein to the fact that we have been operating under a continuing resolution for about 4 months.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say that the conference report we have here has been signed by all the conferees, both for the House and the Senate. I wish to thank the House conferees for their cooperation and assistance in working out the final conference settlement.

While the sum total of the figures in the bill are high, relatively, we feel we have held them in line with other agencies of Government, particularly in view of the fact that food, clothing, and shelter still remain the basic essentials of life and represent the best buy that the American people have.

Mr. Speaker, in this bill the regular activities total carries $1,685,251,500. This represents an increase of $51 million over the House figure and is $28.5 million under the figure of the other body. The total in the bill is $6,242,929,500. This is approximately $40 million under the budget and is about $471 million under the figure of the other body. It is over the House figure by about $525 million.

However, Mr. Speaker, subsequent to our going to conference the financial position of the Commodity Credit Corporation was reviewed and the Bureau of the Budget today sent down a request for an additional $500 million to meet its needs. This is the major item in the increase over the House bill. It will not be expended except in line with the requirements of the Commodity Credit Corporation which it is directed to carry out by law. This we felt was sound business in that it would probably prevent the Congress from having to consider a supplemental request or a deficiency early in the next session.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we have tried to give proper attention to the various research needs, the price support program, the extension service, meat inspection, soil conservation, and other programs, particularly with respect to those phases of the activities of the Department that have to do with the health and the protection of the consumer.

The amounts agreed to for research include the sums approved by the House for cotton and pesticide research facilities, plus $500,000 for the Water Pollution Laboratory at Durant, Okla.; $500,000 for the Poultry Laboratory at Georgetown, Del.; $300,000 for plans for the Animal Research Center at Clay Center, Nebr.—total cost $3,750,000; and $339,000 for repairs and alterations at Beltsville, Md. They also include planning funds for the following facilities: U.S. Range Livestock Experiment Station, Miles City, Mont., $40,000—total cost $521,000; Poultry Research Facilities, Glendale, Ariz., $50,000—total cost $750,000; Southwest Great Plains Research Center, Bushland, Tex., $25,000—total cost $350,000; Grain Marketing Research Laboratory, Manhattan, Kans., $225,000—total cost $3,385,000; Cereal Rust Laboratory, University of Minnesota, $50,000—total cost $650,000; National Sedimentation Laboratory, Oxford, Miss., $100,000—total cost $1,035,000; Soil and Water Research Laboratory, Pendleton, Ore., $45,000—total cost $425,000; Pasture Research Laboratory, University Park, Pa., $40,000—total cost $400,000; and Human Nutrition Laboratory, University of North Dakota, $50,000—total cost $633,000.

Increased funds are also provided for acceleration of reasearch at Chickasha, Okla., and Madison, S. Dak., $105,000; research on salmonella to be conducted on a nationwide basis, $50,000; mechanization research on dates, $45,000; staffing new laboratories and expanding research facilities, $144,600; additional labor, subprofessional and junior scientific help,

$1 million; Clay Center, Nebr., $100,000; research on wool fineness, University of Wyoming, $70,000; and $225,000 each for the Southeast and Northeast hydrology research watersheds at Athens, Ga. and State College, Pa.

I would also like to refer to several items contained in the conference report which were the subject of special consideration by the conferees.

The bill includes $2,806,200 for the maintenance of a barrier zone to protect the screw-worm freed areas of Texas and New Mexico and other parts of the country from future infestations from Mexico. The bill also provides $1 million for eradication activities in Arizona, $600,000 of which will be matched by funds from other sources, incident to the extension of the barrier zone to the west coast. The policy of requiring matching by State and local sources of funds expended for the production, irradiation, and release of flies used to eradicate infestations within the areas involved is expected to be continued.

Mr. Speaker, the conferees also reaffirmed the statements contained in both House and Senate committee reports which call on the Department to retain present practices concerning skiprow planting of cotton. They agreed that the elimination of such practice would increase production costs and would fail to utilize the results of extensive research in this area by the Department.

The conferees also agreed that no changes should be made in prior year agricultural conservation program practices which would tend to increase costs of farm production. They felt that any changes from the 1965 practices should be made only where requested by the local county committee and approved by the State committee and recommended that full and complete information be submitted in the congressional hearings before changes in practices are proposed in the future.

The conference report also called attention to the fact that, in its report language affecting the Yazoo-Little Tallahatchie watersheds, it was the purpose of the House committee to point out that the intent of Congress in Public Law 712, 80th Congress, was to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out necessary work projects anywhere within the Yazoo-Little Tallahatchie River watersheds.

In addition, the conferees noted the change in the administration of certain commodity loan programs, so as to eliminate handling by convenient local financial institutions and the requirement that disbursements be made through the county offices frequently at considerable inconvenience to the producer. The conferees further noted that the surety bond of county office personnel is limited to losses from fraud, dishonesty, culpable negligence or breach of trust, and that facilities of county offices for protection of warehouse receipts are limited. The conferees call on the Secretary to restore the use of local financial institutions and to make certain that the Federal Government is protected against loss in the handling of the documents involved.

Mr. Speaker, last week we considered the 1966 supplemental appropriation bill (H.R. 11588) in which $2 million additional was included for meat inspection. In the report on that bill we pointed out that in February 1965, meat inspection and poultry inspection activities were brought together under this agency for the purpose of better coordination and reduction of supervisory costs. We stated further that the committee is of the view that under present conditions consolidations below the supervisory level would not be best for the public, the service, or the industry, and for that reason should not be made.

Also in connection with the supplemental bill, the committee took note of the passage of the rural water and sanitation facilities legislation which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to provide assistance to nonprofit public and quasi-public agencies and corporations for water supply, water systems, and waste disposal systems in rural areas. While it did not have a budget estimate upon which to act, the committee recognized the need for and value of such program.

I would like to repeat that this conference report before you today represents a reasonable settlement between the amounts approved by the House and Senate. A summary table of the 1965 appropriations, 1966 budget estimates, amounts approved by the House and Senate, and final conference action, appears below:

Departments of Agriculture and related agencies appropriation bill, 1966

Item	1965 appropriation	1966 budget estimate	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						1965 appropriation	Budget estimate	House	Senate
Title I, general activities	1,565,032,200	1,707,486,000	1,633,693,000	1,713,835,800	1,685,251,500	+120,219,300	−22,234,500	+51,558,500	−28,584,300
Title II, credit agencies	59,367,000	79,626,000	60,367,000	77,826,000	62,634,000	+3,267,000	−16,992,000	+2,267,000	−15,192,000
Title III, corporations	5,173,629,000	[1] 4,494,022,000	4,023,022,000	4,920,822,000	4,493,544,000	−680,085,000	−478,000	+470,522,000	−427,278,000
Title IV, related agencies	700,000	1,500,000	750,200	1,500,000	1,500,000	+800,000		+750,000	
Appalachian regional development	28,320,000					−28,320,000			
Grand total, appropriations	6,827,048,200	6,282,634,000	5,717,382,000	6,713,983,800	6,242,929,500	−584,118,700	−39,704,500	+525,097,500	−471,054,300
Loan authorization	795,000,000	787,000,000	787,000,000	852,000,000	837,000,000	+42,000,000	+50,000,000	+50,000,000	−15,000,000

[1] Includes $500,000,000 budget amendment submitted on Oct. 20 (subsequent to passage of bill by House and Senate and while pending in conference).

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the conference report. As the chairman of our subcommittee indicated, while it may be somewhat distressing to some to learn this conference report is $525,097,500 over the bill passed by the House, the chairman has pretty well pointed out that the Senate bill was $926 million over our bill, in the main to restore net realized losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation. We did not feel we should go along with such a big amount if it was not altogether needed. You will realize that to restore a net realized loss you have already, in effect, spent the money, and this simply restores the capital structure of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I shall place in the RECORD the President's letter together with Budget Bureau's official supplemental request for an additional half billion dollars just received. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that if we do not do it now, sure as you are born when we come back in January we will have a request for either this amount or a bigger amount.

In January of this year you will recall we had the supplemental request for the fiscal year 1965 for the Agriculture Department for $1.6 billion to restore to CCC account for net realized losses.

The breakdown in title I reflects a $51,558,500 increase over the House bill. I would point out that $20 million of this has to do with that west coast conservation emergency measure passed earlier in the year. The balance is for research, extension, soil conservation, watershed protection, meat and poultry inspection, and other items.

In title II the report shows an increase of $2,267,000 over the House bill. This involves the two items of migrant labor and FHA salaries and expenses.

Under title III we have pretty well discussed the increase for Commodity Credit Corporation. While the conference report shows $470,522,000, the Senate took out an additional $30 million over the House reduction in the barter program which wipes out the program altogether. In agreeing with the Senate's further reduction of $30 million in the barter program, and with the supplemental request of $500 million added we arrive at the figure of $470,522,000 increase in this overall item in the conference report over the amount appearing in the House bill.

The letter and request mentioned above follow:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 20, 1965.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1966 in the amount of $500 million for the Department of Agriculture.

The details of this proposed appropriation, the necessity therefor, and the reason for its submission at this time are set forth in the attached letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with whose comments and observations thereon I concur.

Respectfully yours,
LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1966 in the amount of $500 million for the Department of Agriculture, as follows:

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—REIMBURSEMENT FOR NET REALIZED LOSSES

"For an additional amount to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for unreimbursed net realized losses sustained but not previously reimbursed, pursuant to the act of August 17, 1961 (15 U.S.C. 713a–11, 713a–12), $500 million."

This proposed supplemental appropriation is to provide needed funds to carry out the mandatory price support programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The funds would partially reimburse the Corporation for price support and related losses realized through the fiscal year 1964.

Based on latest estimates of record crop production it appears that the amount previously requested for the Corporation will not be adequate to finance price support operations during the remainder of the fiscal year.

I recommend that the foregoing proposed supplemental appropriation be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,
CHARLES L. SCHULTZE,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

In title IV under related agencies, there is an item of $750,000 over the House bill for the Food and Marketing Commission. This will fully fund the activities of that Commission. We require that they do come through on the appointed closing date with a final report.

In the loan authorization there is an item of $50 million over the House bill. Twenty million dollars of this is in rural housing. The other $30 million reflects itself in increases in the REA. To give you a quick summary of what the situation is with respect to the REA, in the House bill, in this year's bill we appropriated $350 million for the REA and included in that $350 million was $65 million for the contingency fund. The Senate voted $380 million for the REA with a $50 million contingency. We compromised on the $365 million figure with $60 million of that for the contingency. I would point out to the Members, this is exactly the amount of money appropriated last year for the REA, $365 million, although last year we retained $90 million rather than $60 million in the contingency.

In the rural telephone account, both the House and Senate agreed on the $97 million figure. While the House bill had $7 million in the contingency, the Senate earmarked $15 million for contingency and the conferees stayed with the Senate figure. So all in all, Mr. Speaker, I am glad we are able to come to an agreement even in this late closing hour of this session. I support the conference report and I would urge all Members to do likewise.

Mr. Speaker, the following table gives some measure of comparative figures for initial budget requests to fund the Department of Agriculture's activities, the net expenditures by fiscal year, new obligational authority, and changes between the years from 1951 through 1965.

Department of Agriculture and related agencies, new obligational authority (NOA)

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Initial NOA request [1]	Net budget expenditures	Enacted NOA [1]	Change between initial NOA request and enacted NOA in previous year	Change in enacted NOA from previous yea r
1951	1,670.3	649.8	1,408.0		
1952	1,682.0	1,151.2	1,886.9	+274.0	+478.9
1953	1,525.5	3,217.2	1,509.5	−361.4	−377.4
1954	1,659.2	2,917.1	4,283.2	+149.7	+2,773.7
1955	2,935.3	4,636.5	2,840.8	−1,347.9	−1,442.4
1956	1,515.6	5,176.8	3,597.6	−1,325.2	+756.8
1957	3,150.2	5,005.9	6,085.6	−447.4	+2,488.0
1958	5,157.6	4,874.9	6,796.1	−928.0	+710.5
1959	4,106.6	7,091.4	5,925.8	−2,689.5	−870.3
1960	5,514.5	5,418.9	5,683.5	−411.3	−242.3
1961	5,081.4	5,929.4	5,559.5	−602.1	−124.0
1962	5,509.0	6,668.7	7,409.7	−50.5	+1,850.2
1963	6,426.0	7,735.3	8,031.7	−983.7	+622.0
1964	8,144.5	7,896.9	8,051.6	+112.8	+19.9
1965	5,956.0	[2] 7,330.0	[2] 8,289.9	−2,095.6	+238.3

[1] From the budget of the United States 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966.

[2] From preliminary Treasury Department budgetary appropriations and other authorizations, expenditures, and unexpended balances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 27. Page 18, line 10, insert:

"*Provided*, That, in addition, not more than $20,000,000 of the amount appropriated under this head for the previous fiscal year may be transferred to and merged with this appropriation."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: ", of which $20,000,000 shall be derived from amounts appropriated under this head for the previous fiscal year, which amount shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 55. Page 38, line 5, strike out "$750,000" and insert "$1,500,000".

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, at this point I yield myself such time as I may require and yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and one of the conferees.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] and the entire subcommittee for the good work they have done on this very difficult bill.

May I call special attention to the following language in the statement of the managers:

> The conferees wish to reaffirm the statements contained in both House and Senate committee reports which call on the Department to retain present practices concerning skip-row planting of cotton. They agree that the elimination of such practice would increase production costs and would fail to utilize the results of extensive research in this area by the Department.
>
> With new farm legislation just enacted, and with the many new problems related thereto, the conferees also agree that no changes should be made in prior year agricultural conservation program practices which would tend to increase costs of farm production. Any changes from the 1965 practices should be made only where requested by the local county committee and approved by the State committee. The committee recommends that full and complete information be submitted in the congressional hearings before changes in practices are proposed in the future.

I wish to join Mr. WHITTEN, chairman of the subcommittee, in insisting that the Department follow the statement of the managers in the foregoing matters.

The skip-row practice to which reference has been made is absolutely vital in certain areas of the Cotton Belt and the agricultural conservation program is vital to farmers throughout the Nation.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "$1,500,000, of which $250,000 shall be available solely for preparation and submission of the final report and complete and final liquidation of the Commission's activities not later than June 30, 1966."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the several motions was laid on the table.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the conference report and include certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 8370.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

I DO NOT LIKE DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it was an extremely disagreeable thing to me to see the recent wave of demonstrations against U.S. involvement in Vietnam. America has been shamed by the spectacle of organized treason and blatant cowardice which we have witnessed. It should be obvious that nationwide demonstrations do not just happen. There is careful planning and organization back of it, and certainly it is Communist inspired. The press has played up pictures of young punks tearing up or burning draft cards. This sort of thing is encouraged by half-baked professors and Communist sympathizers, as well as by professional agitators.

Fortunately, such demonstrations involve an extremely small percentage of college students, but they make noise and attract attention. I am highly gratified to note that the administration has ordered the FBI to crack down on the ringleaders. The right of peaceful assembly envisions responsible and loyal Americans assembled together in righteous indignation against the elements of oppression and injustices; not a lot of crackpots who have little comprehension of world problems or American responsibilities. America needs a solid and unified front before the world. We cannot allow the American image to be dimmed and distorted by spectacles such as we have witnessed.

More than a crackdown is needed. We should be witnessing a tremendous outpouring of patriotism from the campuses of the Nation. University officials should be leading a crusade for America to give students an opportunity to show that the very great majority of them are sincere and patriotic young Americans who love this country and who refuse to be involved in the things we have witnessed.

RESTORE RENT SUPPLEMENTS

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter sent to the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I was most pleased to see the editorial in yesterday's New York Times urging the Senate Appropriations Committee to restore the full $30 million in rent supplement payments requested by the administration. The editorial reads as follows:

RESTORE RENT SUBSIDIES

In a surprise move, the House last week voted to kill the funds needed to start the new rent subsidy program for low-income families. The House Appropriations Committee had already reduced the figure far below the administration's request. Since the House had its opportunity to vote on the substantive merits of the program when it approved the housing bill, it was irresponsible and demagogic for opponents to exploit a vote on a routine money bill in order to reverse that decision.

We urge the Senate Appropriations Committee to restore the full $30 million requested by the administration. Rent subsidies are a promising innovation. They deserve a full and fair trial.

Mr. Speaker, the adoption of the Harvey amendment on the House floor last Thursday was most regrettable. Despite the fact that the House early in the year in a close battle had worked its will to authorize a rent supplement program and despite the further fact that the Appropriations Committee had drastically slashed the $30 million authorization for the first year to $6 million, the foes of this promising new program were able to mount a successful ambush.

The ammunition used by the supporters of the Harvey amendment was drawn from preliminary regulations issued by the agency which were purely tentative and distributed for discussion purposes and to stimulate early interest from prospective sponsors. The Members of the House will recall certain hypothetical "horror cases" the opposition dreamed up to argue that the benefits of the rent supplement program could in some cases go to families with very substantial assets.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to stress to my colleagues in the House on both sides of the aisle that because of apparent misunderstanding or misinterpretation these purely tentative regulations have in effect been withdrawn and I am confident they will be revised to make certain that the benefits of the rent supplement program are available only to families and individuals in the public housing income group and will rule out those with any substantial amounts of liquid assets. The attached letter sent on Monday by the FHA Commissioner clearly emphasizes the tentative and preliminary nature of the original regulations and that substantial revisions will be made before they are issued in final form.

Mr. Speaker, it is my deepest hope that the Senate will be able to restore a substantial amount of funds to launch the rent supplement program and that the final conference report will contain such funds. This program which would harness the resources of private enterprise and private capital to provide housing for low-income families is a crucial part of President Johnson's attack on urban problems and the Congress must not let him down.

The letter follows:

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1965.

To: All approved mortgagees.

Subject: Rent supplement program.

In the rent supplement program letter 65–11 which was distributed on September 28, 1965, it was emphasized that the material was being supplied so that preliminary discussions could be held with sponsors and other prospective participants. It also was to afford an opportunity for review within and outside the Agency so that the feasibility of the requirements and procedures could be reviewed and considered. This was because the program cannot be made operative until funding is authorized.

None of the distributed regulations or procedures should be considered as effective or governing. As a result of comment and suggestions received, appropriate revisions will be made to strengthen various provisions. In the event funding is provided the necessary regulations and instructions will be issued in final form.

Sincerely,
PHILIP N. BROWNSTEIN,
Commissioner.

SOVIET UNION PRACTICING A POLICY OF ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, for some time now we have been aware that the Soviet Union, despite its denials, has been practicing—consciously and deliberately—a policy of anti-Semitism. We have been uncertain about its reasons, although it would seem clear that Moscow is seeking to impose a terrible uniformity upon its citizens, while at the same time currying favor with the Arab countries. This week there occurred at the United Nations an incident which, in my view, exposes to the entire world the Soviet Union's hypocrisy. I see no means now for Moscow to deny that it has embraced the heinous doctrines that it fought so well in the war that ended only 20 years ago.

I am proud that in performing an act of great righteousness our own Government exposed the Soviet hypocrisy. On October 8, the United States introduced an amendment to the draft convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination. The U.S. amendment reads:

> States parties condemn anti-Semitism and shall take action as appropriate for its speedy eradication in the territories subject to its jurisdiction.

It was not easy, Mr. Speaker, for the United States to introduce that amendment. There are many countries besides the Soviet Union that do not sympathize with efforts to erase anti-Semitism from the earth. Political expediency might have demanded that the United States remain silent. That we did not remain silent merits the commendation of this House. The United States took a courageous stand.

I might note that, once it was submitted, the Arab countries did put pressure on the United States to withdraw the amendment. These countries rarely miss an opportunity to fan the flames of anti-Semitic hatred. But the United States stood firm. Ambassador Goldberg personally assured me that we will not withdraw our proposal, but will, on the contrary, do everything possible to press its consideration to a successful conclusion.

But barely had the United States introduced its amendment when the Soviet Union sought to change it. I read the text of the alternate Soviet proposal:

> States parties condemn anti-Semitism, zionism, nazism, neo-nazism and all other forms of the policy and ideology of colonialism, national and race hatred and exclusiveness and shall take action as appropriate for the speedy eradication of those inhuman ideas and practices in the territories subject to their jurisdiction.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, such an outrage as the equation of zionism with nazism and anti-Semitism? How does the Soviet Union dare to make such a shambles of honesty? How can it perpetrate such a thought? What hypocrisy. One would have thought that even the Soviet Union, in its unprincipled pursuit of political advantage, would have been less shocking or, at the least, less clumsy. Can there be any doubt in anyone's mind that the Soviet objective is to assist the Arabs in their efforts to destroy Israel? In mentioning zionism in the same breath with nazism, the Soviet Union surpassed even its own sorry record of deceit.

I need not dwell for my colleagues on the egregious effort to obscure truth. Let me say simply that zionism is not, like nazism, an expression of hate but an expression of love. It is not, like nazism, a message of destruction but a measure of construction. It does not, like nazism, seek to debase a people but to exalt them. It is not, like nazism, a philosophy of negation but of affirmation. Zionism is the movement to restore the Jewish homeland to the Jewish people. Its only relation to nazism is in its attempt to repair, in some measure, the wreckage that nazism caused. Zionism, Mr. Speaker, is—and I scarcely need say it—the very antithesis of nazism.

The Soviet Union knows, of course, what I have said to be true, but Moscow is attempting to exploit anti-Semitism both at home and now in the United Nations, to extend its influence into Africa and the Middle East. I am sure that the United States has succeeded in exposing its unworthy objectives for what they are and for all to see. The Soviet Union cares nothing about Jews or about justice. To Moscow, Jews and justice are merely tools to further its ignoble end.

The Bolivian Government, to whom we must all be grateful, took the initiative in countering the Soviet slander in the United Nations. Bolivia moved to amend the Soviet proposal to eliminate the distasteful reference to zionism, while retaining the noble thoughts in which Moscow has hypocritically wrapped it. I state the Bolivian text:

> States parties condemn anti-Semitism, nazism, in all its forms and manifestations, and all races involved in the policy and ideology of colonialism, national and race hatred and exclusiveness; and shall take action as appropriate for the speedy eradication of those inhuman ideas and practices in the territories subject to their jurisdiction.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the decent peoples of the world will take note of the Soviet Union's unprincipled deception. I hope it casts doubt on the integrity of that country and on its pretentions to lead oppressed peoples around the world. The Soviet Union's purpose was to exploit Jews to serve its national interest. It would not hesitate to exploit any peoples for that purpose. I think the events which I have described at the United Nations gives ample testimony to Moscow's real aims and methods.

ANNUAL AWARDS BY CLEVELAND CIVIC LEAGUE

Mr. **FEIGHAN.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FEIGHAN.** Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Civic League held its first annual civic award night banquet and ball on October 15, 1965, at the Pick-Carter Hotel. At an impressive ceremony the league paid honor to 11 Clevelanders for "Outstanding achievement in community service."

Those honored were: Louis B. Seltzer, editor of the Cleveland Press; our distinguished colleague, CHARLES VANIK, who ably represents the 21st Congressional District of Ohio; Leo Jackson, an outstanding councilman on the Cleveland City Council; Judge Paul D. White of the Cleveland Municipal Court; Helen Lyons, clerk of the Cleveland Municipal Court; State Representative Carl B. Stokes; Dr. Kenneth Clement; Ellsworth H. Harpole; John O. Holly; Joseph Polo, and Harold Williams.

The purpose of these awards, in the words of James W. Wilson, president of the league, is "to encourage other citizens to participate in civic activity in Cleveland thereby elevating its standards to the level that we may be proud to say, "Cleveland is the best location in the Nation."

The success of self-government is dependent upon citizen interest and participation in the many phases of community activities. This is particularly true in our large metropolitan centers such as Cleveland. When citizen initiative fails to encourage voluntary activities for the advancement of a community one of two results follow. Either government must take on more functions that can best be accomplished by voluntary action, or the community falls behind in meeting the challenges of progress. The Cleveland Civic League is dedicated to a six-point civic program which is aimed at encouraging maximum citizen participation in the affairs of the community.

The program of the league is as follows:

> 1. Voter registration: It is the purpose of this organization to foster and encourage as many persons of legal voting age to become registered voters. Good government can only result from maximum participation by all of its citizens.
>
> 2. Political evaluations: It is the intention of this organization to function as a screening and investigative body for the benefit of the public at large; as we feel that a well-informed public is an intelligent voting public.
>
> 3. Political endorsements: It is our intention to support and endorse political issues and/or candidates; without regards to political affiliation. We feel that all political parties have something of value to offer the general public. We, however, shall work for the best interest of the public at large.
>
> 4. Civil rights program: We favor full and complete implementation of all civil rights laws and programs of the Federal, State, and local governments with all possible speed. We feel strongly, that everyone's rights and freedoms are in jeopardy; so long as anyone's rights and freedoms are in jeopardy.
>
> 5. Community improvements: We the members of the Cleveland Civic League intend to assist and lend our every effort and support to any and all projects and programs initiated to improve and make our Cleveland community a better place in which to live.
>
> 6. Community cooperation: This organization stands ever ready to work in cooperation with other civic, social welfare, and other organizations in fostering and promoting a better environment, civic progress, and development of our city; for the good of all of its citizens.

GOVERNMENT BY CRONYISM

Mr. **RUMSFELD.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks President Johnson has made two appointments to high Federal office which have created considerable controversy. The first was the appointment of Mr. Francis X. Morrissey for a district Federal judgeship in Boston, and the second was the appointment of Mr. David G. Bress as U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia.

As reported in the press, a major qualification of each of these individuals was their excellent political connections. Mr. Morrissey is a close political associate of the Kennedy family and Mr. Bress was a former attorney for Bobby Baker and/or his business interests. The press has been filled with such comments as those which I will insert at the conclusion of my remarks from the October 15 Chicago Sun-Times, which describes the Morrissey appointment as a shabby affair, and the Chicago Daily News editorial of Friday, October 15, calling it an outrageous appointment. Certainly these appointments reflect seriously on President Johnson. Whatever his reasons may be, it is he who has affronted the American people by naming men of questionable qualifications for these high posts.

Mr. Speaker, today the Senate Judiciary Committee was supposed to meet in an extraordinary special session to reconsider the Bress nomination. This notwithstanding the fact that they had previously met and voted to approve his nomination. The basis for this second and most unusual committee meeting appears to have been the submission of a second U.S. Justice Department report on Mr. Bress. The second Justice Department investigation which culminated in the second Justice Department report appears to have been initiated as the result of the numerous press stories which brought forth information on Mr. Bress and his connection with Bobby Baker and questions as to the possibility of his involvement in a stock fabrication case, matters which apparently had not been fully investigated by the Senate Judiciary Committee during the first hearing on the subject. More significantly, these matters had apparently not been fully reported on by the initial Justice Department report. Even more significantly, it is reported that even in the second report the Justice Department may have failed to bring full details on these matters to the attention of the Senate committee.

The whole question of government by cronyism has been widely discussed in the press. What has not been discussed, and the question which I believe must be answered, is this: What faith can the American people and the Congress of the United States place in the Attorney General and his Department of Justice when they purportedly have checked out both Morrissey and Bress and gave them a clean bill of health? In fact, it is my understanding that the Attorney General himself testified on behalf of Bress. Apparently it was not until the press, Members of Congress, and other interested citizens turned up additional facts concerning these gentlemen that the Justice Department actually undertook the second investigation.

With respect to Mr. Morrissey, the question appears to involve his claim of residency in Georgia for a 6-month period standing in direct conflict with his certification that he was at that time a resident of Massachusetts. As to Mr. Bress, the problem seems to involve questions as to the degree of his possible involvement in the fabrication of corporation stock. Apparently this possibility is sufficiently serious to cause the Senate Judiciary Committee to reconsider the matter, notwithstanding the fact that they had already approved his nomination and it was pending on the Senate Calendar.

Mr. Speaker, public eyebrows were raised when the Senate Rules and Administration Committee issued a U.S. Justice Department report by Mr. Katzenbach, dated February 25, 1965, on their résumé of their investigation of Mr. Don Reynolds' testimony which seriously challenged his credibility, and at the same time appeared to whitewash the Bobby Baker case. Public eyebrows again today should be raised with respect to Mr. Katzenbach and the Justice Department and their conveniently inadequate background checks on both Morrissey and Bress.

Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Chicago Daily News indicates the types of details which the Department of Justice apparently failed to bring to the attention of the Senate committee in their first report:

(By Charles Nicodemus)

WASHINGTON, October 20.—The records of a Chicago printing company are playing a major role in the GOP drive to block Senate confirmation of President Johnson's candidate for the key post of U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia.

The records tied the nominee's law firm into secret efforts to fabricate corporate stock in the contest of a will and estate valued at $3 million, court documents show.

The degree of involvement by the nominee, Washington Attorney David Bress, in the stock manipulation was to have been explored in an extraordinary session today by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The meeting was postponed at the last minute, however, to allow committee members to further study the court records.

Scheduling the closed session was unusual because the committee already has voted to recommend Bress' confirmation to the full Senate.

It did so despite Republican protests that Bress had defended ex-Senate Staffer Robert G. (Bobby) Baker in the civil suit that touched off the exposé of Baker's extracurricular business activities.

Baker is now under investigation by a Federal grand jury in the District of Columbia—the jurisdiction Bress would head if the President's nomination is confirmed.

The Justice Department says Bress' contacts with Baker are immaterial because two attorneys from Justice Department headquarters are handling the Baker grand jury, not the District of Columbia District Attorney's office as would usually be the case.

Today's meeting of the Judiciary Committee was called by Chairman JAMES EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, at the demand of Republicans, to study new evidence in the Bress case dug up by the GOP's sleuthing Senator, JOHN J. WILLIAMS of Delaware.

Here is the picture, as pieced together from 10-year-old court records, and sworn, secret testimony taken by a Judiciary subcommittee that took a quick, preliminary look at the case last week.

On January 28, 1955, Melvin Viner, president of a Washington laundry firm, Sunshine Arcade, died leaving a widow and children plus two brothers who had been business partners.

Bress, then the Viner family lawyer and secretary of the corporation, was chosen to handle the estate. The two brothers, thanks to papers filed by Bress, were made executors of the will.

On February 28, 1955, the widow, Jeanne, suspicious of Bress' performance, dropped Bress and got a new lawyer, Bruce G. Sundlun, a former assistant U.S. attorney here.

One matter at issue was a sizable block of stock, about one-third of the total outstanding, held in the name of the brothers, Robert and Leonard Viner.

The stock, dated 1950 and 1951, mentioned, and appeared to support, the authenticity of a controversial "management agreement" signed by the three brothers in 1949. If still valid, the agreement would have required Mrs. Viner to sell her stock to the brothers at a cut rate, and end up with only $30,000 instead of at least one-third of $3 million.

Playing a hunch about the stock's authenticity, Sundlun flew to Chicago to query officials of the Goss Lithographing Co., which had printed the blank certificates used to prepare the stock.

Sundlun wanted to know if the stock blanks had changed over the years or remained the same. Goss officials at first said the forms hadn't changed since 1927.

But under persistent inquiry, they dug out the fact that they had used a new printing process since March 1953, and that the stocks in question were among those produced under the new process.

Without tipping his hand, Sundlun then maneuvered the Viner brothers and Bress into a deposition hearing in which the brothers swore that the stock had been issued in 1950 and 1951.

One week later, Sundlun went to another of Bress' law partners, Alvin Newmyer, disclosed his proof about the manufactured certificates, and warned that he'd make the whole thing public unless a settlement could be worked out.

After nearly a year of negotiation, the widow was given a settlement in excess of $1,300,000—instead of the $30,000 that first appeared likely.

The Viner brothers were then permitted to officially change their deposition testimony regarding the signing of the stock, with the explanation that the new stock was fabricated after Melvin Viner's death as replacement for old that had been misplaced.

In early 1957, after the case was closed, Sundlun, at the widow's urging, told the U.S. attorney's office here about the stock manipulation.

But no prosecution resulted, Sundlun says, because no one had actually been bilked through use of the fabricated certificates.

Bress now insists that he knew nothing about the stock manipulation, contending that a then-partner in the firm, Albert Philipson, handled that aspect of the matter.

Philipson affirmed for the judiciary subcommittee last week that Bress knew nothing about the stock matter, even though Bress had handled virtually every facet of the case.

He said replacement of the stock was routine because the originals were lost.

Philipson has not yet been asked why the brothers prevaricated about the stocks issuance date during the deposition and why the new stock was made without notifying the court, the widow, or the children, as normal procedure would require.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Oct. 15, 1965]

OUTRAGEOUS APPOINTMENT

The more that is revealed about Francis X. Morrissey, the Boston crony of the Kennedys, the more outrageous becomes his rose-strewn march toward a Federal judgeship. There is now the matter of a law degree from a Georgia "diploma mill" to add to the record of Morrissey's flunking the Massachusetts bar exams twice and his lack of judicial experience.

The American Bar Association, represented at the Senate hearing by Albert E. Jenner of Chicago, summed it all up by calling Morrissey the worst-qualified judicial candidate it had ever encountered. Yet the Senate Judiciary Committee approved his nomination for the U.S. district court in Boston by a vote of 6 to 3.

No one has questioned Morrissey's character or personality. He emerges as a likable fellow—just the type you'd want to take along on a fishing trip. And he's loyal; Speaker JOHN McCORMACK attests to that. He may also be thrifty, brave, clean, and reverent.

The trouble is that the Senate is not judging the merits of fishing companions or Eagle Scouts; it is judging a candidate for high judicial office. And men who know the law and the responsibilities of a Federal judge say he is not qualified.

What Morrissey has going for him, of course, is the power of the Kennedy family, to which he has indeed been loyal. His sponsor is Senator EDWARD (TED) KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, and no holds are barred.

The late President Kennedy backed away from nominating Morrissey for the Boston judgeship when it became apparent that he would be strongly opposed. The office has remained vacant since, evidently waiting for Morrissey, who was nominated just last month by President Johnson.

There is much speculation as to why the President, knowing the flurry it would cause, placed Morrissey's name before the Senate. One obvious theory is that he was repaying a political debt to the Kennedys. Another is that Mr. Johnson, in a Machiavellian mood, reasoned that the backfire might damage TED KENNEDY's political future and perhaps ROBERT KENNEDY's as well.

The whole affair reflects on the Kennedy brothers' wisdom—and on Mr. Johnson's. Whatever his reasons, it was he who affronted the people by naming a man so obviously unqualified in every respect.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, October 15, 1965]

A SHABBY AFFAIR

The proposed appointment of Francis X. Morrissey, now a municipal court judge in Boston, to the Federal district court has passed the Senate Judiciary Committee. The Senate must now vote on confirmation or denial of the appointment.

Judge Morrissey is sponsored by Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, Democrat of Massachusetts. The charge is made that Senator KENNEDY is paying off a political debt of long standing to Judge Morrissey. Of itself that is not cause for great concern. Many political appointees have given great and good service to the people. It depends on the man appointed.

In this case the American Bar Association says that Judge Morrissey is the wrong man. The ABA says he does not possess, in any measure, the background or qualifications it considers essential for service in the Federal district court.

Morrissey has been considered for this same position twice before. In sponsoring him in this third attempt Senator KENNEDY is playing precinct politics with a Federal position of great importance to reward a man whose only apparent qualification is that of a good precinct worker. Senator KENNEDY ignores the fact that the authority of the Federal district court cuts across State lines. As Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Republican of Illinois, pointed out, Illinois lawyers may have to have their cases heard before Judge Morrissey, if he is appointed, in such matters as citizenship, antitrust and patent cases, to name only a few. Nothing in Morrissey's background, as the ABA has documented, qualifies him for the exercise of such judicial responsibility.

The whole affair is politically tawdry. It demonstrates Senator KENNEDY's primary concern to reward a political hack and let the larger consequence of serving the people go by the board. Senator KENNEDY may win in his foray against principle but it might turn out to be a Pyrrhic victory.

THE RAPIDLY DETERIORATING POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of postal matters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, in August 1964 I took the floor of the House to discuss the rapidly deteriorating postal service in this country and to recount specifically a few of the dozens of complaints which had come to me from the 13th District of Illinois up to that time. I was extremely gratified shortly thereafter to read in the press that the Postmaster General had recognized the problem and that he was pledging himself to correct it.

I regret to report, 14 months later, that the situation has not improved. In fact, if anything, it is worse now than when I first spoke on the subject.

Mr. Speaker, there is no segment of our country, there is no individual or corporation or school or union or institution which does not rely on mail service for communication. We are the greatest Nation in the world. We not only need a modern, efficient, dependable system of communication through the mails; we virtually must have it, and there is no excuse for not having it.

Surely, if we can wend our way to the moon, and meet that schedule precisely, we should be able to move our mail 50 miles overnight. There is no reason why the people of this country should be forced to suffer with a second, third, or fourth rate postal system. And from the file I am building on this subject, it appears that this is exactly what we are burdened with. I stand here today, taking the floor of the House again, to report on the "progress" which has been made in our mail service in the past 14 months. I unfortunately do not have the answers as to how to run the Post Office Department. It is a congressional responsibility to legislate for that department, not to administer it. Further, I am aware that there are many fine men and women in the Department, both in Washington, D.C., and around the Nation earnestly trying to improve postal services and procedures. My remarks today are not a condemnation of them but rather an attempt to point out problem areas with the hope that together the administration and the Congress can take the steps necessary to correct the mess we find ourselves in.

Since I came to Congress in January of 1963, hardly a week has gone by without at least one letter of complaint about the postal service in the 13th District of Illinois. And the complaints, in many cases, are extremely serious. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the complaints are so numerous and so serious that I feel compelled to set forth here a few representative examples of the types of problems involved. I might add that, in addition to the following letters of concern, I have also received a variety of comments about political activity by postal employees—activity engaged in even while conducting postal business.

The comments and complaints include such concerns as:

> Advise me regarding the proper person to whom I would write concerning the archaic methods used in our local post office.
>
> It's 2:15 p.m. and the mail is not here. The phone answerer at the post office says there are vacancies and no one wants to work for $2.48 per hour. What can we do about it?
>
> This (a label enclosed) was sent from Watseka, Ill., about 115 miles away, on September 23, and arrived here on the afternoon of the 29th. The package contained my daughter's birthday present which was mailed to arrive on time. It didn't.
>
> My monthly salary check from Amsterdam, N.Y., is mailed direct to ——— Bank. * * * The stub of the check is forwarded separately to my attention at our offices in the Merchandise Mart in Chicago. For the past 6 months, I generally receive the stub of the check in the office 2 days prior to the actual check being received by the bank 18 miles way.

Other comments have included:

> One day last fall I received two mail deliveries in one day. The mail delivered the second time that day was all postmarked October 28 and I received it November 5. * * * Then at Christmas, my husband mailed his check to our bank. After 5 days and no confirmation from the bank, we called and they had just received our check that day.
>
> A package mailed to me from Chicago Heights, postmarked there July 14, and arrived at the Roselle Post Office July 27, via insured parcel post. That is a 55 mile trip.
>
> My mail is delivered between 3 and 4 p.m. even though I am living within the city limits of———.
>
> After waiting for 2 weeks for an important receipt from the bank in Chicago and expensive phone toll calls calling back and forth to see if it was sent, finally the bank found it in their returned mail. Our address is 502 West Thomas and the bank sent it to 503 West Thomas and the post office sent it back to the bank.
>
> Just recently my brother moved out here with me. He orders regular medicine from a Chicago drugstore. They mail the prescription first class. One day, he got the bill (mailed the same day the drug was mailed). He phoned the post office here and they gave him a lot of excuses. The next day the rural route man brought the package of medicine

> to the door, saying it was mailed to Rochelle, Ill. * * * Address was typewritten and easy to read, Roselle, Ill.
>
> My family in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, has a habit of writing to me by special delivery on weekends very frequently. Although postmarked in Cedar Rapids on Friday night, or early Saturday, these letters are rarely delivered before Monday morning (prior to regular service). * * * I would have received the same letter by 1st class mailing at 5 cents no later than this. * * * I have also had the same sort of experience with parcel post delivery. Although insured, sent special handling, etc. * * * in many instances packages sent to me from Cedar Rapids have not arrived here for more than a week. Cedar Rapids is only 225 miles from Chicago.

And the following comments:

> Recently before our vacation I went to the post office and requested that our mail be held for 2 weeks. * * * I signed a change-of-address card, etc., which they advised me to do * * * when we arrived home, much to our surprise, there was a large stack of mail that had accumulated. Also I went to the local post office and some of our mail (very little) had been withheld.
>
> During January the two most important items were an airmail special delivery parcel which cost over $1 to mail and was delivered by regular carrier and a large brown envelope which cost $1 for first-class postage and laid in the post office for 2 days. First-class postal service is expected when you pay for first-class service.
>
> If there is a substitute for the regular carrier, we can expect mail to be delivered at noon and without fail we always receive someone else's mail in addition to our own.

The reports of delayed mail—3, 4, 5, days; 2 weeks in some cases—are numerous. My own mail is evidence of the quality of the service, for it generally takes a letter from my suburban Chicago area 3 or 4 days to reach my Washington office. Last spring, I sent my annual questionnaire to the residents of the 13th District of Illinois; using the postal patron local mailing procedures, we tagged and bundled and labeled the packages of envelopes. To my utter amazement, hundreds of the envelopes were returned to my office—no postmarks—stamped "insufficient address," "undeliverable," and, of all things on a postal patron—local, 13th Congressional District, Illinois, address—"addressee unknown."

I have listed numerous examples of inadequate postal service from my recent correspondence. The instances I have listed dramatize the serious inconveniences which citizens of our area are suffering. I have more serious instances to cite, however, and these should give the Post Office Department and the Members of the House and Senate pause to reflect on just what has truly happened to the postal service of the United States of America in recent years. Last year, Mr. Speaker, the president of one of our banks wrote me, in part, as follows:

> Our monthly statements and cancelled checks for July were mailed on Monday, August 3. We have received telephone calls from 40 to 50 customers living in Chicago complaining that they have not received their July statements. We have been very much concerned over this and have been in touch with the Evanston post office every day and they have been most cooperative in their efforts to find the missing mail.
>
> One of my close friends * * * the letter continued, a well-known realtor, telephoned about 10 days ago to tell me that their Chicago mail on August 3, containing deposits of about 170 checks ranging from $50 to $8,000 representing rentals and mortgage payments was never received by their Chicago bank.
>
> It certainly puts this bank in a poor light with our customers.

On August 28, the same bank president sent the following report:

> On Wednesday morning, August 26, our Chicago customers started telephoning to inform us that the missing statements had been received in good order; the only mark on the envelopes being the August 3 postmark. The envelopes were not soiled in any way and there was no rubber stamp indicating that they had been missent to some other city.

On September 25, I received the following report from the Post Office Department:

> We are happy to inform you that subsequent to the complaint filed by the bank, the missing bank statements were delivered to all the addresses. Unfortunately, no endorsements were placed on the envelopes which would have explained the delay in delivery. We assume that they may have been located in supposedly empty postal equipment.

In March of 1965, the following report reached me:

> We purchased a home in the unincorporated area of Northbrook in 1959. On July 8, 1960, a letter containing a check was mailed to us * * *. It was never received. From that time on, we have not received 24 letters, letters that we actually know were mailed, most of them containing checks.
>
> We have notified the local post office a number of times, have had three postal inspectors come to my home, take notes, and never hear from them again.
>
> It appears to your writer that * * * our lost mail * * * is placed in someone's box who is not returning it to the mailman or to us. The strange part is, there never has been one check cashed.

My verbal report from the Post Office Department in July was that the investigation was in progress, but that the section of the Post Office Department which handles such matters has a heavy backlog—small wonder—and, therefore, there would be an unduly long delay.

I wrote to the Post Office again on September 20, 1965, Mr. Speaker, and I have not yet had an answer to that followup letter.

Another file contains correspondence with a large company in my district, and its latest letter follows:

> We have had previous correspondence on the subject of poor postal service here in * * *. You acknowledged my letters of April 23 and May 5, but there has been no sign of any postal inspectors as yet.
>
> A more urgent matter was brought to my attention yesterday morning (June 1, 1965). On May 19 we sent our usual daily deposit of checks to our bank in Chicago by first-class mail. This envelope has not been received by the bank as yet. In talking with officials at the bank yesterday morning, I was informed that a number of deposits have "disappeared" in the mail, starting with New Year's weekend and then on Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Good Friday weekend, and now May 19.

My last report on this from the Post Office Department, dated July 6, states in part as follows:

> The inspector in charge at Chicago, Ill., has advised there have been other losses of mail addressed to this bank. Postal inspectors have been working on this case for several months, but have not solved the case as yet.
>
> There is nothing further than can be done about this loss until the inspection service has solved the case.

In September, another large firm in my district wrote:

> Lately we have become very concerned about the poor mail service we are receiving. Customers who swear they have sent in their payments 4 or 5 days previously, are being needlessly antagonized by dunning notices. Merchants are angry because their charge vouchers arrive after our cut-off dates, when they were mailed 2 days early.
>
> In short, our system, which depends so much on the efficiency of the mail, has been completely upset. We implore you to take immediate corrective action.

This case is pending also, Mr. Speaker, although after the evidence which has piled up, I feel I can predict what the final report of the Post Office will be.

And yesterday I received two carbon copies of letters. One was addressed to the postmaster in Chicago, and I quote in part:

> Unfortunately, the same mail which brought your nice letter (about an earlier complaint) brought two other indications of extremely slow handling of mail matter, and we wonder what is happening. Here, for example, is a bid which we mailed to Vancouver, British Columbia on August 20, due at 5 p.m. on August 27, and it was declined by the recipient because it was received after the date of bid closing, which would mean that it was delivered on the 28th. On this bid, we were quoting on $660 worth of business.
>
> Here is another incident that is even more serious. We were low bidders on a quantity of microscopes desired by the Tacoma, Wash., public schools but they asked for a sample to be delivered within 5 days. We airmailed a sample microscope (air parcel post) on August 30, and it was not delivered until September 8. This is the 10th day following dispatch, and we would consider that this would be slow for even regular parcel post, and certainly almost inexcusable for air parcel post.

The second letter concerns the efforts of the Schaumburg National Bank, located in Schaumburg, Ill., with a population of over 7,000 to transact its business as any other bank does. The letter is quoted in full as follows:

> October 12, 1965.
>
> Mr. Donald L. Swanson,
> *Regional Director, Department of the Post Office, Main Post Office Building, Chicago, Ill.*
>
> Dear Mr. Swanson: The Schaumburg State Bank is a new bank which opened April 30, 1965, in the rapidly developing community of Schaumburg, Ill.
>
> Schaumburg, Ill., has an approximate population of 7,000, and we have over 2,000 accounts here at the bank. This puts the Schaumburg State Bank among the fastest growing banks in the State outside the city of Chicago. We endeavor to serve our customers as quickly and accurately as possible, but have run into several problems along this line due to improper post office facilities. We have discussed this problem with

> Mr. Atcher, village president, and he stated that DONALD RUMSFELD, 13th District Representative, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, has written you in regard to a post office in Schaumburg, and that you do not feel that post office facilities are necessary at this time.
>
> I do not believe that you understand the grave circumstances that can arise because of improper postal facilities. I would like to reiterate several things that have happened since we opened which could have cost us money, and criticism from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in Washington, D.C.
>
> We sold funds to the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, in the amount of $100,000, 6 days ago. These funds were credited back to our account yesterday, October 11, and the advice advising us of the $100,000 deposit was mailed from LaSalle National Bank and Trust Co., Chicago, Ill. yesterday. We have not yet received the advice of the $100,000 or the interest due us, and as a result our books will not correctly reflect our cash position. This is not the first time this has happened. On many occasions our "return checks," that is, checks which customers have presented to us on other banks and are being returned to us for various reasons which can include nonsufficient funds or account closed, are received 1 or 2 days later than they normally should be. This could cause us a loss of a considerable amount.
>
> Several weeks ago one of our customers had transferred $5,000 from a bank in California to our account through First National Bank of Chicago. First National Bank of Chicago mailed us an advice of the transfer. The advice was mailed to the "Schaumburg State Bank, Schaumburg, Illinois," and it was returned to the First National Bank marked "no town in Illinois." This could have caused us undue embarrassment and could have cost our customer considerable money as these funds were to be used for a real estate closing.
>
> Chase Manhattan Bank in New York mailed me a letter several weeks ago which was returned "no such town in Illinois." This could have caused them to wonder—was there such a bank in Illinois? This could cause any customer to ask—Is there such a bank in Illinois?
>
> We have mailed one of our loan customers in Chicago several overdue notices, and marked his credit that the payment is late, only to find that the Chicago Post Office returned his payment to him marked "no such town in Illinois."
>
> I do not know what is required for a town to be recognized by the Federal Government, but the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago has requested that we do not mail our remittance to them which is normal procedure. This remittance ranges from $25,000 to $100,000 daily. They have asked us instead to send it by armored carrier. It seems ironic that the Schaumburg State Bank, which is in a way a part of the Federal Government because of our membership in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, is discriminated against because of lack of postal facilities—a lack that could possibly cost us considerable money and does cause us considerable embarrassment.
>
> I realize that you have many problems facing you, and that your problems are ever as important as ours. I know you are trying to serve a region for which you are responsible as conscientiously as I am trying to serve the customers, directors, and stockholders of the Schaumburg State Bank, but I do hope that you will give your personal attention to the problem we have here in Schaumburg before the bank, or any of its customers, suffers a loss because of improper postal service.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> WARD A. WEAVER, *President*.

Perhaps the saddest commentary on the postal service is that evidenced by a certified letter—return receipt requested, incidentally—received on October 13, 1965, from a postal employee, who wrote in part as follows:

> In my position as postal clerk at the ——— installation, I have received many, many complaints from patrons about poor service; loss of mail; misdelivery of mail; pilfering of mail. This ranges from third-class to registered mail.
>
> I have also had similar experience—and can fully sympathize with each patron. Sympathy is not the answer. The patron is entitled to better service.
>
> Many of the residents have told me that they have written complaints to you about poor postal service. * * * Have you received these letters? With the great number of lost letters, it makes one ask if this is the reason why something hasn't been done to correct this situation.

I could go on and on and on, Mr. Speaker, for my files are full. I will not take the time of the House to explore this further now for I am sure there must be many who could submit similar files and similar complaints and similar evidence. I do believe, however, that I cannot close this statement without printing in the RECORD the following letter, received from the Post Office Department, concerning the loss in the mail of 2,754 mailings of Philadelphia Mint proof sets, containing 38,169 sets of 1964 coins. I submit this story for the consideration of the House:

> POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
> *Washington, D.C., August 11, 1965.*
>
> Hon. DONALD RUMSFELD,
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in response to your letter of July 27, concerning the loss of proof coins mailed to Mr. Thomas G. Goss of Wilmette, Ill.
>
> The Philadelphia Mint mailed 3,949,235 sets of 1964 proof coins through July 26, 1965. From 1 to 75 sets were included in the 549,387 insured mailings, and 3,754 such mailings containing 38,169 sets were claimed as not received.
>
> Each set of proof coins consists of five coins (one each of 50 cents, 25 cents, 10 cents, 5 cents, and 1 cent pieces) with a face value of 91 cents. The mint charges $2.10 per set. Claims are settled on the basis of $2.10 per set. Duplicate shipments were furnished to addresses in about 55 percent of the cases involving 1964 proof claims and refunds were made to the remainder of claimants.
>
> We have been aware that reported losses of coins in the mail were on the increase. Some months ago we arranged to give intensified attention to the handling of coin packages including those mailed by the mint. Investigation and observation of mint mailings were made on numerous dates. We also provided for coordination of investigations covering depredations involving coins to get the best practical results.
>
> Proof sets of coins were mailed by the mint as third- or fourth-class insured matter, depending on the weight. Slightly more than 50 percent of the parcels for which claims were paid were mailed as minimum fee insured mail. No record is made of this type of mail while in transit or upon delivery. The remaining such parcels, which contained the major part of the lost sets, were numbered insured parcels, and while again no transit record is made a receipt is obtained upon delivery.
>
> Our records show that 45 postal employees were arrested for theft of mail containing coins in calendar year 1964, and 43 such arrests were made in January 1 through July 30, 1965. A number of these cases directly involved proof sets of coins mailed by the mint. A number of factors aside from thefts by postal employees must be considered in relation to proof set losses. For example, on May 20, five mail handlers (nonpostal) employed at a large railroad terminal were apprehended for theft of coin and other parcels from the mail. Although no proof sets were directly involved, they had had access to a number of such parcels in transit through their terminal which were not received by addressees in Midwestern and Western States. In three other instances, employees (nonpostal) of star route contractors were apprehended for coin mail thefts. Also, there is likelihood of some proof coin mailings, particularly smaller ones, containing one to four sets, being lost or stolen after delivery into individual mail receptacles of the addressees. In this connection, postal inspectors made 12,790 arrests during fiscal year 1965 which included 7,850 apprehensions in cases involving theft, rifling or other mistreatment of mail or mail receptacles.
>
> In addition to depredations, other factors such as damage also contribute to the loss of numismatic coins. As an example, a railroad mail storage car caught fire in May 1965 and a postal inspector found loose coins totaling $54.13 in the debris. All but 16 coins bore 1964 mint dates and 21 were Kennedy 50-cent pieces. The coins no longer had numismatic value, however, as they were seared and blackened.
>
> When coins having unusual value are found loose in the mail they are sent to the postmaster at New York, N.Y., for disposition after awaiting possible claims by the owners. Sets of U.S. proof coins are considered in this category, and when ownership cannot be established, they are sold with other unusual coins at auction. No record is maintained of the type of coins sold but we do know that $3,956.87 was realized from such sales in 1964, and proof coins were included among those sold.
>
> The Philadelphia Mint has discontinued the manufacture and sale of proof coins in order to devote entire production capacity to the manufacture of coins for circulation. You may be sure that if such manufacture and sale resumes we will be in touch with Treasury officials beforehand to arrange the most secure method of mailing and handling. Meanwhile, we will continue to give intensive attention to the security of the mail and particularly that which is most susceptible to depredation.
>
> With kind regards,
> Sincerely yours,
>
> H. B. MONTAGUE,
> *Chief Inspector.*

I do not know the answer to these problems. I do know, however, that I cannot simply join one of my constituents who ended his letter of complaint and frustration by saying:

> Sound like a chronic complainer? A person can take just so much and when invited to comment will do so. If you had not inquired, I would have silently borne the burden of many others and said—Oh, well, at least we got it.

From the letters in my file and the numerous complaints which I have heard at meetings and from visitors to my office, he would seem to be one of the lucky ones.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is no problem which does not have a solution. There are problems of varying complexity—and this one is unquestionably one of the more complex. Many factors are undoubtedly involved in the breakdown in service, and the 13th Congressional District has been extremely vocal in pointing out a number of these.

Recently I took occasion to speak on the floor in connection with the civil service and postal pay increase bill which I supported. In part, I discussed one of the problems involved as follows:

> What may be a fair wage in one part of this country may not be a fair wage in another part of the country. The 13th District of Illinois, and the area around Chicago, is an area that has a very high cost of living.
>
> There is no question that the postal employees in our area do not make enough at the present time to have a reasonable standard of living. They just do not make enough money. The wages are inadequate. * * * Why has not (a proposal) come before the Congress * * * that takes into account the clear, well-known, and well-publicized differences in the cost of living in the various portions of this country?

I have heard from residents of our district that some postal employees, to augment inadequate incomes, have entered into "house-watching" agreements, whereby they take time from their delivery schedule at each particular house where so requested, and, for a fee, they will enter the house, check the heat and the pets and do other incidental tasks—a pleasant enough service if you are away from the city, but not so pleasant for the family at the end of the route which does not receive its mail until 4:30 in the afternoon, if enough people are out of town that day.

I would take occasion here, too, to object to that time-honored institution—the politically appointed "acting postmaster." Apparently, the proper administration of the postal service is more complicated and more demanding than one might at first be led to believe. The Civil Service Commission was established to prevent deterioration of Government services by appointment of unqualified or inadequately prepared personnel—and yet our postal service is being, in many cases, hastened in its deterioration by this very same type of political appointment.

The appointment of a postmaster lies in the hands of the administration's party—and in more cases than not, the appointment goes to a devoted party worker who—all too often knows little or nothing about the Post Office Department when he takes the job. We then have the convenience of appointing "acting postmasters" who serve indeterminate lengths of time until "postmasters" are finally appointed. Anyone can see that, whether originally qualified or not, if one does the job for 6 months or a year, he or she might very well know the ropes well enough at the end of that time to take the examination and at least end up on the register. And there is the third magic step—almost invariably, if the name of the acting postmaster appears on the register, no matter whether first, or second, or third, he wakes up to find himself postmaster.

I believe politics must leave the postal service. The spoils of political power almost wrecked the Government service until the Civil Service Commission was created. The rewards of faithful political service should not be unrelated positions of public trust. I cannot help but feel empathy for those dedicated, conscientious career employees of the Post Office Department as they watch while one after another takes over the top spot in their particular offices—one after another political appointees who, in many cases, had had little more to do with the post office than buy a stamp or send a package or accept delivery of mail.

In my testimony before the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, I recommended that consideration be given to relieving Members of Congress of responsibilities involving postmasterships and rural letter carriers. I strongly believe that such a step would be in the best interest of the country and of the postal service, as well as of the Congress.

I would be remiss if I did not further point out the inadequacy of existing postal facilities in my district. In some areas studies and surveys and consideration have gone on for years, and the towns—such as Schaumburg, referred to earlier—with populations presently of 5,000 to 6,000 to 7,000 people, cannot even get themselves listed in the postal directory as post offices, branch offices, or stations. In March of 1964, in response to communications from my office and from the village involved, I received the following comments concerning one of our post offices:

> There are no present plans for any additional facilities in the community at this time, as it is anticipated that the culmination of plans above mentioned will solve existing difficulties.

Similar problems exist in other townships in northern Cook County.

Mr. Speaker, the plans have been carried through, and the service is worse than it has ever been. Certainly, in this country, we ought to be able to effectively meet the needs of rapidly growing areas—not 3 or 4 or 5 years after growth has taken place, but when it is taking place, or at least immediately thereafter. The continued lag between growth and service is destructive of efficient mail service.

A review of the amounts of money appropriated for the operations of the Post Office Department over recent fiscal years shows the following: fiscal year 1963, $4,648,924,300; fiscal year 1964, $4,925,500,000; fiscal year 1965, $5,202 million; fiscal year 1966, $5,324,400,000—with more to be appropriated. The steady increase is requested and justified year after year on the premise that it is necessary in order to modernize operations and improve service. And still we appropriate more and hope for the best.

And so it goes on. The population increases. The rates increase. The cost of living rises. Facilities do not increase in relation to the population. Service does not increase in relation to rates. Employees do not spend their lives in positions where they do not earn a reasonable wage, and where the incentive to reach the top is taken away before they even start to climb.

Mr. Speaker, if the telephone communications system of this country were operating in this manner, there would be such a public outcry that A.T. & T. would become a Government agency. Thank heaven, and private enterprise, this is not the case. It is not a branch of the Federal Government, and it is making money, expanding operations, reducing rates, and providing efficient modern service. There must be a lesson here someplace.

The recently appointed Postmaster General, Mr. O'Brien, is a skilled politician and able public servant—which I admire. Let us hope that he will be an equally skilled Postmaster General and be successful in putting the Department back on the track of efficiency and reliability.

DRAFT YOUNG TOUGHS, PUNKS, AND HOODLUMS

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to amend the Selective Service Act to provide for the drafting of young persons now considered morally defective or deficient because of criminal records which include juvenile offenses, drunkenness, narcotic addiction, and serious moving traffic infractions. Such persons will receive training and serve in special combat units in the Armed Forces.

In the light of the crisis in Vietnam, I think it is absurd that the Army does not draft our Nation's oversize group of punks and hoods. I am not saying that most of them will be any great shakes as soldiers, but they can at least be of some use as extra manpower.

The Army presently refuses young men with records of juvenile, narcotics, drunkenness, and criminal offenses because it believes they are not morally qualified for the privilege of Army service. This is ridiculous in light of the Vietnam situation. The sooner the Army starts making use of America's large contingent of punks and young toughs, the better off we will be. Drafted punks will be good substitutes for persons who can make a greater contribution in other ways, and I personally feel that Army discipline and Army life may have something to offer to the punks and young hoods who now clutter up our streets. No doubt the Army can offer some training that will help rehabilitate young punks and teach the unemployable ones a trade.

I do not believe we can afford to continue drafting only those who satisfy high draft standards because this policy is self-defeating. It drafts those who could make a more valuable contribution elsewhere, and allows those who can make no other contribution and who might profit from service to escape it as morally deficient. The career soldier's concept of the military services as units in which membership is a privilege is inappropriate during wartime or during a period like the Vietnamese crisis. Besides, a unit like the Foreign Legion which took criminals and misfits without question enjoys a reputation as high as most of the best American units.

Nevertheless, I do not believe that punks and criminals who might be drafted under my proposal should be indiscriminately mixed with other soldiers. Most ought to go in special units, and it seems fitting to me that they be combat trained. Individuals with narcotics records particularly ought to be kept apart from other troops. I would suggest special "junkie battalions" for them.

This certainly should cut down our ever-increasing crime rate and make our streets and parks safe again.

PUBLIC REACTION TO RUMP ANTICS ON BANK MERGER BILLS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a handful of members of the House Banking and Currency Committee made a mockery of the rules of the House by sneaking into the committee room under false pretenses to hold a rump session.

This was a sad performance which hurts the reputation of the entire Congress. The session, of course, was totally illegal. That point has been firmly established.

The rump session did show plainly the desperation behind the move to bail out Manufacturers-Hanover Trust Co., the Nation's fourth largest bank, and the other big banks under prosecution for antitrust law violations. That frantic so-called meeting lays bare the massive pressures behind the bank merger bills.

Rice Odell, business editor for the Washington Daily News, tells about this session in today's editions. I place Mr. Odell's column in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Daily News, Oct. 20, 1965]

DARK PLOTS EMERGE ON CAPITOL HILL

(By Rice Odell)

A pint-sized melodrama, with farcical overtones, was acted out at the Capitol yesterday.

The main plot centered on a bitterly disputed bill before the 33-member House Banking and Currency Committee which would provide retroactive antitrust exemption for three bank mergers, and would also soften merger guidelines to be used by the Justice Department and the courts in the future.

Leading characters in support of the bill are Representatives THOMAS L. ASHLEY, Democrat, of Ohio, and WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, backed by Republicans and several other Democrats. In violent opposition is committee chairman, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, and other Democrats. The play begins.

ACT I

The morning before, Mr. Patman has abruptly adjourned a meeting of the committee before a quorum arrived, thereby apparently sounding the death knell of the bill this session. An angry Representative ASHLEY goes into a huddle with Mr. MOORHEAD and one or two others. They plot darkly.

It is a few minutes before 10 a.m. yesterday, and the handsome Mr. MOORHEAD strolls casually through the committee's office toward the hearing room. He is challenged by a member of the staff.

Just going in to pick up some papers I left there, Mr. MOORHEAD is said to have replied.

He enters the cavernous Rayburn Building meeting room, goes to the main door, unlocks it and lets in a dozen or so of his colleagues waiting in the hall. They start to hold a meeting.

Chairman PATMAN has not called it. He doesn't even know about it. In fact he is at the hospital visiting his wife. Mr. ASHLEY, as ranking majority member present, presides. A staff man reported that the lights were all out at the beginning.

Shortly, an opponent of the bill, Representative HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, arrives and, with his seniority, claims the chair. He rules immediately that the meeting is illegal.

Aha, says the Ashley-Moorhead group—rule 1 of the committee provides for regular meetings every first and third Tuesday of the month, unless canceled by the chairman. And this he didn't do.

Yes, he did, Mr. REUSS says, and a paper is produced to support the claim. But Mr. REUSS is outvoted and the group continues its meeting, voting favorably on the bank merger bill and to report it to the House.

ACT II

Mr. PATMAN returns, finding what he later calls a "rump session," illegal because he did cancel the regular meeting and also because there was no quorum present.

The Ashley-Moorhead forces issue a press release emphasizing that there was no cancellation, and that there was, indeed, a quorum present. Complete disagreement continues throughout.

Mr. ASHLEY, after the disputed meeting, goes to the House and obtains consent to file the report voted on. Mr. PATMAN says it's not a legal report.

Mr. REUSS calls a press conference to propose a compromise bill which, he says, its so important Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach should be called to testify.

He said he thinks he can get his proposal to the House "about as fast as that piece of paper that was acted on this morning."

Mr. PATMAN promises to fight the Ashley bill "by all means possible" anyway.

Representative HENRY B. GONZALEZ, Democrat, of Texas, says it must be the "silly season * * * we're acting like a bunch of State legislators."

Another well-known business writer, Lyle Denniston of the Washington Evening Star, also writes a very significant piece for today's editions. As you will note, the headline sums up the reasons behind the rush for this legislation and the obvious reasons for yesterday's rump session. The headline reads: "Merger Survival Chances Up for Manufacturers, Hanover."

I quote these paragraphs from Mr. Denniston's story:

Chances are gaining that the biggest bank merger ever—the one that joined New York City's Manufacturers Trust Co. and Hanover Bank—will be left undisturbed.

A plan to break up the merged institution is scheduled for filing in a New York Federal court on November 1—less than 2 weeks from now.

But a confusing round of contradictory action in Congress yesterday may lead to a postponement of the court filing. Such a postponement almost surely will mean that the merger will be saved, even though it was once ruled unlawful by a Federal judge.

Are we, the Congress, to allow an illegal act of a rump session help to overturn a court decision?

I do not believe this is the wish of the majority of the Congress. This would be shameful if true.

As the press has reported, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative MOOREHEAD, of Pittsburgh, is the Member who sneaked into the Banking and Currency Committee room in the dark, and unlocked the doors. Mr. MOORHEAD has made little secret of his interest in this legislation. Last week, the New York Times carried this significant quote:

Representative WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, said the lack of action on the legislation was particularly troublesome for banks, notably the Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co., in New York, the First National Bank of Lexington, Ky., and the Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co., of Chicago, which are under court orders to dissolve mergers.

"Courts may take into account the fact that the legislation is almost through Congress," Mr. MOORHEAD said, "but of course this is not certain."

These desperate acts of a handful of Members are putting the whole Congress on trial before the jury of public opinion. I predict that the reaction to yesterday's rump session will be heard for many months to come. I am convinced that the people of the United States do not want their affairs conducted in secret, lawless sessions in darkened committee rooms. The people will speak louder about yesterday's actions than anyone.

AMERICAN SAMOA

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise today to call to your attention a most unusual group of young people, the first group of this size, visiting the Nation's Capital today. These are some 40 American Samoan youngsters, with a number of their teachers and chaperones.

American Samoa joined the family of the United States at the turn of the century. Since that time it has been an unorganized territory of the United States and the people are nationals of the United States. Many of them have become citizens of the United States. They represent the only community under American sovereignty below the equator, and they are situated in the beautiful South Pacific midway between Hawaii, Tahiti, and Australia. These are the romantic islands of the South

Seas about which Robert Louis Stevenson, Margaret Mead, James Mitchener, and Somerset Maugham wrote so enthusiastically.

It is an American community that has largely continued to govern itself in terms of its own Polynesian culture. Some time ago a popular magazine, the Reader's Digest, referred to it as "America's shame in the South Pacific," which it attributed to a "half century of neglect." Now the Reader's Digest is featuring American Samoa again in its forthcoming November issue. It will report that an economic and social revolution has happened in American Samoa, and it is now America's showcase in the southwest Pacific.

Indeed American Samoa has combined the new with the old so splendidly that the World's Fair sought this group to represent all of Polynesia at the New York World's Fair. These bright, handsome, and charming people have been the feature attraction at the Polynesian Village for 2 years now, and they have brought credit to America in the image they have created for the hundreds of thousands of our citizens and foreign visitors who have been to the fair.

The youngsters are leaving tonight for Samoa. Chairman ASPINALL of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee asked me to inform the House that we are so concerned on our committee that the political transition now going on in Samoa be carried out under the best auspices, that a very substantial number of Members of the House and of the other body will be going to American Samoa in early December to consult with them about their political future. So, until that day, I want to say to these fine people of our American community, Tofa Soifua.

MISUSE OF THE FBI BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Justice Department is misusing and desecrating the good name of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Efforts are being made to give the impression that the FBI thinks Francis X. Morrissey is a fit and proper candidate for Federal judge, and that the FBI thinks that Morrissey has been truthful on matters of his residency when in fact reports in the Boston Globe and other newspapers indicate the accounts given by Morrissey as to his residency were contradictory. He could not be a bona fide resident of Georgia for the purpose of being admitted to the bar of that State during the same period he was a bona fide resident of Massachusetts for purposes of running for political office.

The blame for this misuse of the FBI's good name must fall upon Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach whose office directs and limits the extent of the FBI investigations on these nominations to Federal judgeships and on other matters. The present pattern of misuses of the FBI has brought the Justice Department to its lowest point since the Harding administration and the reign of Harry M. Daugherty as Attorney General.

It was Katzenbach who gave us an absurd interpretation of the FBI report on Morrissey that led him to conclude "that there is no basis whatsoever to question either Judge Morrissey's credibility or his recollection of events surrounding his studies in Georgia."

This was a desperate last-minute move to give the public and Congress the impression that the FBI is endorsing Francis X. Morrissey. This is the worst type of deception for political purposes for it degrades the FBI—a great investigative organization that can do a magnificent job if not handcuffed by a politically motivated Attorney General.

The Justice Department submitted an incomplete FBI report on the David G. Bress nomination prior to the first hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee. That report made no reference to the fabrication of the phony stock certificates by the law firm of Newmyer & Bress that were secretly slipped into the Melvin A. Viner estat

Even the second report submitted by the Justice Department was inadequate in its scope and did not call the attention of the Judiciary Committee to the full evidence and the full implications of the fabrication of the phony stock certificates in this estate. In fact, the Justice Department press office told the Washington Post that there was nothing illegal or improper in the actions of the Newmyer & Bress law firm fabricating the new stock certificates 2 weeks after the death of Melvin A. Viner and secretly slipping them into the estate without notice to the widow or to the children.

Attorney General Katzenbach has the responsibility for the inadequate and misleading reports to the Judiciary Committee, and for the limitations on the investigation that resulted in an inadequate investigation.

Mr. Katzenbach had the responsibility for the whitewash report on the Walter Jenkins matter a year ago when an effort was made to use the FBI for a clever coverup.

Mr. Katzenbach had the responsibility for the investigation, the reports, and the letters that were sent to the Senate Rules Committee in an effort to smear and discredit Don B. Reynolds and to protect Bobby Baker and some of his high-powered political associates.

Not since Attorney General Harry Daugherty have we had such a low standard of Justice Department operation.

Mr. Speaker, as a continuation of my remarks, I insert in the RECORD at this point an excellent article by Mr. Max Lerner in the Washington Evening Star of October 19, 1965, and another article by Mr. Julian Morrison of the Washington Daily News of the same date:

JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS FLAW OPENS

(By Max Lerner)

A civilization, like the fabled dike, shows its vulnerability not by any massive breakdown but by a seemingly slight flaw through which the floodwaters will, in time, course. Just such a flaw has opened up in the system of Federal judicial appointments, with the choice of Francis J. Morrissey of Boston for the Federal district court.

By one of those ironic twists in the ways of politicians, it has come about that what the hubris of the Kennedy family was unable to achieve while one of its sons was in the White House—the elevation of a legal cipher and a judicial nobody to the Federal court system—has now been all but achieved under the ready political largesse as well as the hubris of President Johnson.

To the credit of the American Bar Association, it has bitterly opposed the nomination through the testimony of the chairman of its important committee on the Federal judiciary.

What he dug up was an almost unbelievable record: That, after failing the Massachusetts bar exam, Morrissey went to Georgia, got a law degree after 3 months from a diploma mill there, and was admitted to the Georgia bar; that he had failed to report this diploma-mill episode to the ABA committee; that he had failed the Massachusetts bar a second time; that after being admitted to the bar after a third try he had never tried a court case as a lawyer; that after he became a municipal judge he had never tried a jury case nor an equity case.

If the American legal profession accepts a man with such qualifications on the prized Federal bench, it will accept anyone.

Morrissey, to do him justice, has many virtues. He slips in and out of the detailed biography of Joseph P. Kennedy, "The Founding Father," by Richard Whalen, as the worshipful friend and faithful retainer of that patriarchal figure, who arranged to get him his municipal judgeship. He was Jack Kennedy's political mentor when he started his career, and then his office manager. He watched over the political debut of TEDDY KENNEDY as well.

He is doubtless—as a number of witnesses testified before the Senate committee, including Representative MCCORMACK and Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts—a faithful and loyal friend and a fine family man. He is a fluent orator in the grand Boston tradition and a man of commanding charm.

He has all those qualities. But alas, the qualities he almost wholly lacks are exactly those he needs for the Federal court: Knowledge and training in the law and mastery of its traditions and procedures.

Some might say: Why raise so much fuss over a single appointment, especially when he is such a fine fellow?

They forget how complex, exacting, and crucial are the cases coming before the Federal judiciary and what stakes of fortune and fate are involved in them, not only for giant corporations but for ordinary unimportant men.

They forget also the dreams of young law students and lawyers, giving the fire of their excellence in brain and spirit in the hope that ascent up the judicial ladder will go to merit—or at least that it will not be bestowed on a nullity of merit. Break this hope and you kill the dream.

Another case has hit the news at the same time—one in which Judge Edward Weinfeld, a Federal district judge who is recognized as one of the sharpest and deepest judicial minds of the Nation, has been denied the appointment to the U.S. Court of Appeals, for which the best men in the legal pro-

fession recommended him, while a far less distinguished judge—with political weight behind him—got the post.

Thus in one case the exactly wrong man gets a judgeship for which he has nó qualifications, while in another the exactly right one is denied the judgeship which he would grace. I don't know what jokester, in Washington or wherever, shakes the dice that turned up so madly.

[From the Washington Daily News, Oct. 19, 1965]

AFFIDAVIT ON STOCK IS CIRCULATED—BRESS NOMINATION DEBATED TODAY

(By Julian Morrison)

An affidavit stating that stock certificates handled by the law firm of David G. Bress were not even in existence on the dates they bear has been shown to key members of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The Senate is expected to debate today Mr. Bress' controversial nomination as U.S. attorney for the District.

The affidavit bears the signature of an official of the Goes Lithographing Co. of Chicago, which printed the blank stock certificates used by the Arcade-Sunshine Laundry Co. of Washington.

Mr. Bress was secretary of and attorney for, the company during a bitter estate suit that followed the death in 1955 of one of three brothers who owned the laundry.

WIDOW DISAGREES

The surviving brothers, Robert and Leonard Viner, claimed their brother Melvin's stock must be sold back to the company at half its book value under an agreement signed in 1949. Melvin Viner's widow disagreed, and the suit followed.

A key point in the suit was the existence of stock certificates that bore the date of December 26, 1950.

In his affidavit, obtained by the widow's lawyer, Goes Lithographing Vice President Charles B. Goes III states that the certificates were first printed by his company in March 1953.

In depositions on file in U.S. district court here, Robert and Leonard Viner at first stated the certificates were signed on the date they bear.

AMENDED ANSWERS

Later they were allowed to amend their answers in ink on the depositions stating that the certificates were actually signed about the middle of January 1955, several weeks after their brother's death.

The brothers said in their revised depositions that the new stock certificates were issued as replacements for ones that had been lost but which, in fact, had been issued on the dates they bore. In the meantime, however, the suit had been settled out of court.

Mrs. Viner's attorney, Bruce Sundlun, said yesterday he obtained the settlement after presenting the Goes affidavit to Albert Philipson of the Bress firm.

The Goes affidavit also states that Mr. Philipson, on March 10, 1955, wrote the lithographing company to determine when the stock certificates that were made out 2 months earlier, but dated as of 1950, had first been manufactured.

The Philipson letter said, in part:

"Enclosed is a stock certificate blank which I have purchased from a local stationery store. I have been using this particular form for several years.

"I would like to know the year in which you first manufactured and sold in the Washington area this particular form GOES 509 in its present appearance. (If there has ever been any change in appearance).

"In addition, I would like to know if possible the date when this particular blank which is enclosed herewith was manufactured and sold in the Washington area."

The Chicago company replied that "we do not find that the design has been changed in any shape or form" since originally printed in 1927.

The Goes affidavit states, however, that a later examination of the certificates in question shows that they were part of an issue whose design varied in several particulars from the original stock certificates which had been used by the laundry company for a number of years.

Those original certificates made no mention of the agreement binding the brothers and their heirs to resell the stock only to the laundry and not to outsiders.

The new certificates, which the surviving brothers said were replacements of lost certificates, bear the restrictive clause.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF TITLE II OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, due to the deplorable conditions in the merchant marine, I have, today, introduced a bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to create the Federal Maritime Administration and for other purposes.

The purpose of this bill is to establish a new independent agency to be known as the Federal Maritime Administration. It will not be under any other department, agency or instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government or under the authority of any such department, agency or instrumentality.

When Congress enacted the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, it determined that our maritime policy could best be implemented and administered by an independent agency. It did so after a brief and unsatisfactory experience in attempting to carry out the promotion of the American merchant marine within the Department of Commerce in the early 1930's. During its period as an independent agency, the original Maritime Commission revitalized the merchant marine and produced a miracle of ship construction and operation which contributed so heavily to our victory in World War II. Following the war, criticisms of the activities of the then existing membership of the Commission brought about the adoption of a proposal to again place the maritime functions, both promotional and regulatory, within the Department of Commerce, but with a very high degree of autonomy.

I will not attempt in this brief statement to detail the effectiveness of the agency during the next period from 1951 to 1961, except to say that the results were spotty at best. And, as brought out in the investigations by committees of the House and Senate in the years 1958 through 1960, the regulatory functions were disclosed to be most inadequately handled.

So again we had a reorganization under plan No. 7 of 1961, which provided for granting completely independent status for the handling of the regulatory functions under the newly created Federal Maritime Commission. The promotional functions were left in the Department of Commerce.

At the time this plan was proposed, I was not entirely happy about it. I urged that, if it were adopted, the promotional functions of the Federal Maritime Administration, even though under the overall policy direction of the Secretary of Commerce, be administered as independently and autonomously as possible. I was assured that this would be the case even though the Maritime Subsidy Board would not be composed of Presidentially appointed and congressionally approved members. I felt at the time that the plan deserved a chance and, therefore, I supported its approval in the House.

Now, after 4 years of experience under Reorganization Plan No. 7, I must confess regrets over my support of that plan. I feel that our maritime policy must be implemented and administered by an independent agency composed of qualified people appointed by the President and approved in the customary manner with the advice and consent of the Senate and vested with responsibility and authority to carry out the policies and laws laid down by Congress. This does not seem to be possible under a subordinated bureau buried deep in a large department having many other various responsibilities in its jurisdiction.

Our merchant marine is too important a part of our national posture to be allowed to continue to drift in a sea of inaction as it has for the past 4 years.

I intend as soon as possible in the next session to hold hearings on this legislation with the hope that by giving everyone a full opportunity to express themselves we will be able to get our merchant marine policy back on course.

I include a letter published in the Washington Post of October 20, 1965:

SEA POWER AND SHIPPING

Your editorials "Purloined Wisdom" (Oct. 4) and "Subsidies and Benefits" (Oct. 11) displayed an amazing lack of understanding of the basic concepts of seapower. The objective of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was not "an efficient, economically competitive merchant marine," but to provide the maritime industrial support required by our Navy. Without this support, our mighty Navy may provide the uninformed with the comforting illusion of seapower, but that is all it would be, an illusion.

The logic of these editorials might have been quite persuasive had you not mistaken the means for the end.

C. H. MEAD,
Captain, USN (retired).

CHEVY CHASE.

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the chairman of my committee, Mr. Bonner, of North Carolina, in endorsing his remarks today concerning our sinking maritime policy.

I have had the opportunity of serving with Mr. Bonner on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries for 3 years. Mr. Bonner has always been a source of inspiration to every member of this committee and to me in particular. I have found his judgment, experience, and knowledge of the affairs of our Merchant Marine to be without peer in this country. Leading representatives of the maritime industry have on many occasions voiced these very same sentiments, and I know that they not only have admiration for his professional knowledge, but also they express a deep gratitude for his personal opinions.

Chairman Bonner has stated that the Maritime Administration in the past year and one-half has been making proposals and moving in a direction that is contrary to the best interests of the U.S.-flag vessels.

The veiled proposals which have been placed in the trade winds of American maritime policy have alarmed the American merchant marine industry and caused hesitancy and uncertainty in the continuance of American policy which was so forcefully stated in the 1936 act.

Last Friday in a speech in Hershey, Pa., I stated that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries would undoubtedly take up in great detail the reports requested and submitted to the Maritime Administrator in the special task force. This last report seems to be another probe into the economics of worldwide shipping whose thrust does not appear to be in the best interests of the U.S.-flag policy. It has always been my opinion that our regulatory agencies and the executive leadership in this country should function in the best interests not only of the United States, but within the agency for the best interests of the American indusry which they regulate.

I do not feel, and I am certain the industry does not feel, that the latest task-force proposal does anything in favor of the merchant marine, but in effect would destroy it. We have seen proposal after proposal with no firm policy emanating from these studies.

Accordingly, I am happy to cosponsor with Mr. Bonner, a bill to create the Federal Maritime Administration which will have at its head a Federal Maritime Board. The Board under my proposal shall be composed of five members.

Mr. Mailliard, of California, the ranking minority member of the committee and a member since 1953, whose judgment is always valued by members of the committee, made a statement on September 30 in agreement with those expressed by Chairman Bonner and myself. At that time, he submitted H.R. 11355.

AMBASSADOR FOSTER'S STATEMENT ON DISARMAMENT AT THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include an address by Ambassador Foster on disarmament at the United Nations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and the American public generally will be interested, I know, in having available the full text of the important and powerful statement before Committee 1 of the General Assembly of the United Nations by Ambassador William C. Foster, of the U.S. delegation to the 20th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

"The United States remains committed to the objective of general and complete disarmament," Ambassador Foster said, stressing that the highest priority is given to the question of nonproliferation—the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons. He remarked that the United States, while recognizing the difficulties, does not take a pessimistic view.

Ambassador Foster's statement follows:

> As we resume our discussion of disarmament questions—some 4 months after the meeting of the United Nations Disarmament Commission and 1 month after the recent session of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament—some of us may be tempted to ask, as did one of our colleagues at our first organizational meeting: Has any progress been achieved? Has any solution been arrived at? Must we start again from scratch?
>
> Without in any way minimizing the difficulties that lie ahead, the United States does not take a pessimistic view. Progress depends to a great extent on the political will for agreement. For its part, the United States has that will. We hope that in the course of our discussions others will manifest an equally strong and equally sincere will to work for the concrete results that all of our peoples desire and look to us to achieve.
>
> The United States remains fully committed to the objective of general and complete disarmament, and we continue to work toward that end. But there is one problem that is of such pressing urgency today and so vital to maintenance of the peace in the future and, indeed, to holding open the doors to progress toward general disarmament, that my Government—and, I am happy to say, almost all the governments represented in this room today—attach the highest priority to it. That question is nonproliferation—the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons.
>
> On June 15, 1956, the United Nations Disarmament Commission adopted by an overwhelming majority Resolution DC/225, in which it recommended that the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament "accord special priority to the consideration of the question of a treaty or convention to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, giving close attention to the various suggestions that agreement could be facilitated by adopting a program of certain related measures." Nonproliferation received major attention in the deliberations of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament when it reconvened in July, as you will note from the Committee's report which is before us.
>
> In his message to the opening session of the ENDC on July 27, President Johnson stated that the very first objective he had assigned the U.S. delegation was "to seek agreements that will limit the perilous spread of nuclear weapons, and make it possible for all countries to refrain without fear from entering the nuclear arms race." The President also said: "No difference among any of us, on any other issue, can be allowed to bar agreement in this critical area."
>
> That spirit motivated the U.S. delegation on August 17, 1965, when I had the honor of presenting to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament the U.S. draft treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. Our draft treaty embodies important contributions from Canada, Italy, and the United Kingdom. The text of the U.S. draft treaty may be found annexed to the report of the ENDC, which has been distributed as General Assembly Document A/5986 dated September 22, 1965.
>
> Also annexed to the report is a joint memorandum on nonproliferation submitted by eight members of the ENDC—Brazil, Burma, Ethiopia, India, Mexico, Nigeria, Sweden, and the United Arab Republic. We welcomed their memorandum as a useful contribution to the ENDC's discussions. In their memorandum, the eight expressed their deep concern with the problem of nonproliferation. Referring to the draft treaty which the United States tabled at Geneva, the eight countries expressed regret "that it has not yet been possible to reconcile the various approaches for an appropriate or adequate treaty on nonproliferation of nuclear weapons." We fully share their regret.
>
> Also submitted to the Eighteen-Nation Committee and appended to its report is a draft unilateral declaration of nonacquisition of nuclear weapons, submitted by the Italian Government at the initiative of its distinguished Foreign Minister and now President of the General Assembly.
>
> If we recall the long record of United Nations efforts to encourage a nonproliferation treaty, I am sure that all must agree that the offering of the U.S. draft treaty for negotiation at Geneva on August 17, 1965, was a very significant step. It marked the first time that an actual treaty text had been put on the table to implement the General Assembly's unanimous call 4 years ago in Resolution 1665 (XVI) for an international agreement to bar the spread of nuclear weapons. The U.S. draft treaty is our effort to respond to the renewed wish of the United Nations embodied in the June 1965 resolution of the United Nations Disarmament Commission.
>
> In tabling the U.S. draft treaty in Geneva, I made perfectly clear that it was offered "for discussion and negotiation." We were prepared and eager to begin negotiation for a nonproliferation agreement at Geneva. We remain so today.
>
> Let me now say a few brief words about the United States draft treaty. We sought to make it as simple and straightforward as possible. It would prohibit nuclear powers from transferring nuclear weapons into the national control of any country not having nuclear weapons, either directly, or indirectly through a military alliance. Nonnuclear states would have a corresponding obligation not to receive the transfer of nuclear weapons. The nonnuclear states would also be prohibited from manufacturing nuclear weapons and the nuclear states could not help them. Both the nuclear and the nonnuclear states could take no other action to increase the number of independent nuclear entities in the world, whether a state or some other kind of organization. Control over nu-

clear weapons, that is, power to use them, now rests only in national hands.

We believe it important that all parties undertake in a nonproliferation treaty to cooperate in facilitating the application to their peaceful nuclear activities of International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards or their equivalent. We recommend as strong a provision on this subject as is possible in the light of the views of all those interested in acceding. Many countries are increasingly accepting IAEA safeguards on their peaceful nuclear activities, and we welcome this trend. My own country has placed one of its large nuclear power reactors under IAEA safeguards, and the United Kingdom has done likewise.

In terms of a nonproliferation treaty, however, the application of international safeguards on peaceful nuclear activities should not be viewed as of interest to the nuclear powers alone. On the contrary international safeguards should be of special interest to the nonnuclear states as a means of assuring them that their neighbors and others are in fact complying with the treaty.

Our discussions at Geneva were most useful in clarifying points of view and in highlighting the major issues which must be resolved on the way to agreement on a treaty. Unfortunately, those discussions could not progress further toward agreement because the Soviet Union sought to impose certain prior conditions which are unnecessary and unreasonable. In doing so, the Soviet Union appeared to maintain its preoccupation with the achievement of certain of its political objectives in Europe, a preoccupation which unfortunately it has so far permitted to have priority over the worldwide danger of nuclear proliferation. Once more today, the Soviet representative has given priority to that preoccupation.

As I made clear at Geneva, the United States is opposed to any form of dissemination of nuclear weapons, direct or indirect. We seek no nuclear sharing arrangement in NATO which could involve such dissemination. The treaty we have suggested would bar such dissemination since it would prevent the creation of any additional entity, whether a state or organization, having an independent power to use nuclear weapons.

If the Soviet Government is as determined and prepared to prevent proliferation as its representative would have us believe today, then I think it would be highly preferable that we address ourselves objectively and dispassionately to the problem. Sterile polemics about the Federal Republic of Germany will not help us to achieve agreement, and to continue on this plan would not augur well for the future of our discussions.

The Soviet representative also sought to make us believe that his government is and has been second to none in its determination and readiness to act and prevent proliferation. The facts do not bear this out as regards the past. Judging by actions, rather than words, Soviet interest in halting proliferation is belated. But, if they say their interest today is deep and genuine, we do not question it.

I can only note with regret that the Soviet Union did not appear to be moved by the same sense of urgency as the United States in Geneva. However, the fact that the Soviet Union has now offered a draft treaty of its own for discussion may indicate that there is basis for hope that the urgency of countering proliferation is coming to be recognized. In its present form the Soviet draft continues to focus narrowly on Soviet preoccupations with NATO and does so in a manner which we cannot accept. Yet we are encouraged by the fact that perhaps the Soviet Union is now prepared to negotiate. If the possibility of real negotiation now finally exists, we can view this as a sign of progress. I propose that we return to Geneva as soon as possible with the firm resolve to seek to agree on a treaty text we can all support.

An important trend of recent discussions, whether in the United Nations Disarmament Commission or the 18-Nation Committee, has been to view the problem of nonproliferation in the context of a broad group of related measures of which a nonproliferation treaty would be the central measure. It has been suggested by some, however, that these related measures should be a necessary step on the part of the nuclear powers to accompany the foreswearing of nuclear weapons by states not possessing them. It seems to us that to pose the problem in this fashion obscures the essential fact that the spread of nuclear weapons is at least as much—and in some instances more—of a threat to the security of the present nonnuclear states of the world that it is to the nuclear powers. The probability of nuclear weapons being used will almost certainly increase as the number of fingers on the trigger increases. And so it is imperative to make progress where we can, when we can, remembering that agreement in one area can often be the catalyst to precipitate in another area agreement that may have long eluded us.

This does not mean that the United States does not attach equal importance to efforts to make progress as quickly as we can on other measures related to nonproliferation. We have, in fact, introduced new elements of flexibility into our positions to increase the possibilities of agreement.

The measure related to nonproliferation efforts that is foremost in the minds of most is a comprehensive test ban. I need not stress the great importance which we continue to attach to the limited test ban treaty, to which over 100 countries have subscribed. We continue to hope and to urge that it will be universally accepted. President Johnson stated only last week: "The nuclear test ban treaty of 1963 represents real progress and we are continuously trying to move forward to a comprehensive and lasting ban on the testing of nuclear weapons."

At Geneva my delegation indicated that we are ready to take current scientific capabilities fully into account in discussing the numbers and modalities of on-site inspections for verification of a comprehensive test ban. Representatives from many members of the United Nations attended the inauguration of our large aperture seismic array in Montana last week, which is one important phase of our research effort to improve our capabilities for monitoring a comprehensive test ban. President Johnson has announced that in following U.S. policy that our peaceful technological advances be shared with other nations, he has directed that data from this new installation be made fully available to all countries of the world. We support the suggestion made at Geneva by eight ENDC members, in another joint memorandum annexed to the ENDC report calling for an exchange of scientific and other information among the nuclear powers in an effort to facilitate agrrement on a comprehensive test ban.

The Soviet Union, which a few years ago was prepared to consider some on-site inspections, is now opposed to any on-site inspection whatsoever. We say to the Soviet Union once again—let us sit down together and compare our scientific data. Let us explore every opportunity to determine whether some accommodation can be found.

We will have more to say on this general subject when the agenda item specifically devoted to the test ban comes under discussion. I should like to note only at this stage that a moratorium on underground testing, either alone or combined with a ban on underground tests above a certain seismic threshold, is not a sound solution and is therefore not acceptable.

As we seek to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, we cannot forget the vehicles for delivery of these weapons of mass destruction. The United States has therefore proposed exploring a verified freeze of the numbers and characteristics of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles. As Ambassador Goldberg announced on September 23, if progress could be made on the freeze the United States would be willing to explore the possibility of significant reductions—I repeat, significant reductions—in the number of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles. Here is a measure that would give graphic assurance to the nonnuclear states of the willingness of the nuclear states themselves to halt and to turn back the nuclear arms race.

In working toward the effective limitation of nuclear weapons and nuclear delivery systems, we have also sought agreement to halt and reduce mounting stockpiles of fissionable materials for weapons purposes. I refer in this connection to our proposal for a verified cutoff in the production of fissionable materials for weapons use and for the transfer to peaceful uses of agreed sizable quantities of such materials. As illustrative figures we have proposed that the United States transfer 60,000 kilograms of U^{235} and the Soviet Union 40,000 kilograms to peaceful uses.

I should like to call particular attention to Ambassador Goldberg's announcement to the General Assembly on September 23 of the new U.S. proposal for the actual destruction of nuclear weapons. We propose the demonstrated destruction by the United States and the Soviet Union of nuclear weapons from their respective stocks to obtain the 60,000 kilograms of U^{235} to be transferred to peaceful uses by the United States and the 40,000 kilograms to be transferred by the Soviet Union. We are prepared also to include the plutonium from these weapons, if the Soviet Union would do likewise.

When the United States had earlier proposed a cutoff of fissionable material production and transfer to peaceful uses of these illustrative amounts of 60,000 kilograms and 40,000 kilograms, respectively, of U^{235}, the Soviet Union replied that this was not disarmament, but rather control without disarmament. We cannot agree with this Soviet contention. A cutoff in the production of fissionable material for weapons would, even by itself, be a very important step in halting and turning back the nuclear arms race. But if there were earlier misgivings on the part of the Soviet Union, unfounded though they may have been, everyone will agree that the new proposal made by the United States most assuredly is disarmament, for we are proposing that fissionable material be removed from actual weapons, that the weapons—the casing and all internal mechanisms—be destroyed, and that the fissionable material be transferred for exclusively peaceful purposes. I repeat, this is disarmament. The number of weapons to be destroyed would be very substantial, and I shall have more to say about this weapons destruction proposal later in our discussion.

Before concluding my remarks, I should like to touch on one or two other points relating to nonproliferation. The first is the problem of assuring the security of nations that forswear the manufacture of nuclear weapons. It has been suggested that nonnuclear states should have some assurance that their security will not be weakened by their forswearing of nuclear weapons. United States policy was stated last October by President Johnson: "The nations that do not seek national nuclear weapons can be sure that, if they need our strong support against some threat of nuclear blackmail, then they will have it." As Ambassador Goldberg has indicated, action by the General Assembly could be a useful part of such assurances and I wish to reaffirm today my Government's readiness to work to this end.

Nuclear free zones in appropriate regions of the world could also contribute significantly to the nonproliferation objectives we seek. While I shall wish to speak at greater length on this subject at a later time, it is pertinent to our present discussion to recall that several times in the past my Government has made clear its support for the creation under appropriate circumstances of nuclear free zones in such regions as Africa and Latin America.

To sum up, we now have the opportunity really to come to grips with concrete issues in our efforts to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons. We cannot let pass the present opportunity to press forward until agreement on a nonproliferation treaty is reached, for that opportunity may not present itself again under such favorable conditions as today, if ever. At the same time the United States wishes to move forward as rapidly as possible toward a comprehensive test ban; a freeze and then a reduction in strategic nuclear delivery vehicles; and a cutoff of production and transfer of fissionable materials to peaceful purposes, involving the demonstrated destruction of nuclear weapons. These involve complex and difficult negotiations. In the opinion of the members of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament at the end of its last session, as is stated in the Committee's report before us, "Extensive discussions on major problems relative to certain collateral measures were particularly valuable in clarifying the respective points of view of member governments." The report adds: "The Committee believes that these discussions and exchanges of view may facilitate agreement in the further work of the Committee."

My Government looks to the discussions commencing today in this Committee to contribute further to the better understanding and the will to succeed that are essential if negotiations at Geneva are finally to bear fruit. We hope that the General Assembly will therefore urge that the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament promptly reconvene upon completion of our discussions here and give renewed priority to the question of a nonproliferation treaty and related measures.

It is my Government's strong wish that the next report of the ENDC will contain an agreed nonproliferation treaty, acceptable to all governments which share our wish to act now to prevent proliferation.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor] spoke on the floor of the House concerning conditions at the Salt Lake City, Utah, Veterans' Administration hospital.

I am deeply concerned about his derogatory statements. In order to be fair to all sides concerned, I would like to here enter in the Record a telegram from Dr. Charles Francis, the director of the Salt Lake VA hospital, giving his answers to the above statements.

I plan to look further into this whole matter when I return to Salt Lake City at the end of the session. Dr. Francis' telegram is as follows:

> The following information is furnished as you request. In answer to certain allegations made Tuesday by Representative John T. Saylor, Dr. Charles Francis, Hospital Director, stated: "In reference to Representative Saylor's inference that a conflict exists between the teaching and the service sections of the hospital, let me say that no such distinction exists.
>
> "We make no distinction between teaching and service sections. Those who care for patients also teach. To teach medicine, one must first be an excellent doctor, and because this is a teaching hospital, treatment must be exemplary." Dr. Francis said that the VA hospital is a part of the University of Utah hospital complex and as such is intimately involved in patient care, research and teaching. "These three are inseparable in a good modern hospital" he said. "Veterans hospitals all over the country have had relationships of this kind for years and the great improvement in patient care dates from the time that our hospitals affiliated with medical schools back in 1946."
>
> In answer to Representative Saylor's suggestion that a small but significant number of VA and non-VA ineligible patients have been seen in the VA hospital as outpatients, Dr. Francis said: "This is because, again, the VA hospital and clinics are an intergal part of the medical school complex and, as such, we have provided service for an occasional patient from the university hospital or the county hospital in the only facilities available for them in the combined VA medical school program. This has been on an outpatient basis and without any way interfering with the care of the veteran patients—either hospitalized or outpatient, the patients were seen as part of research projects in pulmonary diseases and gastroenterology in the pulmonary disease and gastroenterology clinics of the VA hospital, pending the establishment of these clinics in the new medical center. Their care otherwise would have been interrupted with potential danger to the patient. Funds supporting these programs come from VA funds and university funds, since patients from both benefit. Much of the equipment for our clinics were purchased from university funds. The checks in payment accepted by physicians were endorsed immediately and turned over to the university to be used for advancing research. Some of these funds in support of research were used to defray travel expenses to research meetings in various parts of the country. None of it went to enhance the personal income of any member of the VA staff or the medical school faculty. In regard to the allegation that we failed to do what accreditation demands, the hospital is fully accredited and the accreditation has never been challenged," Dr. Francis pointed out. "The functions of a tissue committee have been carried by another committee of this hospital; its functions have been entirely acceptable to the Joint Committee on Accreditation." The VA hospital director said "doctors' reports of cases are written following surgery." One resident got behind, but he very quickly dictated his operative reports when this matter was called to his attention by the chief of staff, Dr. A. C. Thurman. Weekly reports concerning dictation of operative reports also are sent to the chief of staff. Representative Saylor made reference to our sanitary and housekeeping facilities which he said were poor. Up to this point the Congressman's remarks have been based on the report of internal audit. In answer to the Congressman the report states: "A reasonably good state of housekeeping exists throughout the hospital despite the additional attention to cleaning required by major construction projects now underway at the station."
>
> Charles Francis, M.D.,
> *Hospital Director.*

REPORT ON THE 89TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vanik] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the first session of this 89th Congress marks the most productive session in my legislative experience. The working majority, provided by the elections of 1964, produced a Congress more responsive to the President and to the Nation. This Congress has kept faith with the American people. It has responded amply to President Johnson's call for a Great Society.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

During the course of this session of Congress, we have witnessed and we have supported increased participation in the struggle against communism in South Vietnam. The wisdom of President Johnson's decision has been sustained by the course of events. America has not turned its back on the plea for democracy and freedom on the Asiatic mainland. A firm foothold has been maintained for the establishment of a strong and free government, capable of resisting Communist infiltration and attack. The earlier fears that our participation would lead to a broadening of the conflict have been dispelled.

As men and materials strengthen America's position, lines of communication are being consolidated and the casualty losses are being reduced. The Johnson administration is committed to limiting the conflict to the retention of a secure beachhead for democracy in southeast Asia. This action serves notice upon our enemies and upon our friends that we intend to stand by our commitments to liberty. In the meanwhile, we are providing valuable time for a careful reappraisal of solutions to this costly and painful conflict.

UNITED NATIONS

The recent Pakistan-India conflict threatened the whole fabric of world society. President Johnson wisely referred this conflict to the United Nations organization, which promptly ordered a cease-fire. This United Nations success proved its capacity for keeping the peace when member nations are sincerely joined in the effort.

The untimely passing of our United Nations Ambassador, Adlai Stevenson, created a void which could only be filled by an American of outstanding stature. The appointment of Justice Arthur Goldberg was a symbol to the world of our determination to provide this instrumentality of peace with our finest talent.

DEFENSE AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Our commitment in Vietnam has resulted in an increase in defense spending. Up to the present time this year, this conflict has involved a $3 billion expenditure by our Government. At the same time, our Defense Secretary McNamara has made every effort to reduce the defense budget which now exceeds $46 billion a year. In addition to this, approximately $2½ billion is spent for atomic energy research and development, while veterans services for past, present, and future wars total an expenditure of $5½ billion. To this must be added the foreign aid programs which are involved in our national security which involves approximately $3½ billion for military support and economic development of underdeveloped countries.

Of the defense appropriations, approximately $378 million was spent in the Greater Cleveland area for defense activities, the operation of the Lewis Flight Laboratory, the Coast Guard, the Navy Accounting Office, and the Veterans' Administration. Defense contracting has dropped in the Greater Cleveland area from $270 million in 1963 to $109 million in 1964. It is becoming more and more when member nations are sincerely incumbent upon Members of the congressional delegation to fight for a fair and proportionate share in defense spending for their communities. Of the foreign aid expenditures, approximately $5 million was spent for products produced in our factories, most of which are situated in the Greater Cleveland Area.

It is my sincere hope that world conditions will reduce the need for the defense spending which has become a tremendous burden upon our country. Over half of the Federal revenues are dissipated in this way. If world tensions should lessen and permit a contraction of our defense and security spending, ample revenues would be available without any added taxation to meet all of the contemplated needs of our country and provide the hope for future tax reduction.

STATE OF THE UNION

As a result of the legislative program and the policies of this administration, America is, today, approaching unprecedented levels of productivity and employment. The gross national product is nearing $670 billion in output. A total of 72 million Americans are fully employed. There are extensive and distressing areas of unemployment and underemployment, but they are being steadily reduced. The manpower retraining program and the antipoverty programs are beginning to touch the problem. In the Cleveland area, there still remain some 24,000 persons who have not yet found a suitable job: including unemployed young people, including dropouts who have not been trained for available employment and older workers whose jobs have been terminated by either automation or plant relocation. If the current productive wave continues it will soon call every available man and woman into the productive effort.

THE TAX CUT

The current wave of industrial activity was first stimulated by the reduction of income taxes last year. This permitted higher wages and higher profits at the same time and also increased spendable income without creating excessive pressure on price levels. The result has been most fortunate with gains registered throughout the entire spectrum of the American economy.

EXCISE TAX CUT

This year's excise tax cut of $4.6 billion eliminated the luxury taxes on jewelry, watches, toilet preparations, furs, handbags, refrigerators, radios, and TV sets, and provided for a schedule of reductions in the automobile excise taxes.

One of my objectives was to insure that these tax cut benefits would be passed on to the consumer, in accordance with the intention of Congress. In this effort, I directed national attention on those manufacturers and retailers who took the excise tax reductions as added profits. The fruit of these efforts is a matter of record. Up to the present time, the consumer is deriving most of the benefits he had a right to expect from the excise tax cuts. In the 1966 automobiles, the excise form of added safety devices, which are tax cut is substantially included in the now provided as standard equipment.

The excise tax cut had the additional effect of stimulating sales, productivity, and employment, continuing the economic uplift which began in 1961.

EDUCATION

The buildup of educational legislation is continued without restraint in the 89th Congress. The commitment of our President has been unprecedented. As a former teacher, he was well aware of the need for high-quality education and carried through his ideal in his congressional recommendations.

Cleveland institutions of higher education, including the new community college, are substantially provided for in the Federal-aid programs. The Cleveland school district and other school districts in the Cleveland area have been receiving substantial assistance. In addition, all of our institutions of higher education have been the recipients of educational grants for developing special educational projects under Government contract. Thousands of college students in the Cleveland area are attending college with scholarship loans provided through their respective colleges utilizing Federal college loan funds. Our educational programs are reaching more and more deserving people because of the impetus provided by Federal programs.

VOTING RIGHTS

The enactment of a voting rights bill by this Congress was another milestone in the preservation of human rights. This bill—the second major civil rights bill in 2 years—was directed at enforcing voting rights guaranteed by the 15th amendment. Under this law, Federal registrars and examiners are being sent to any State or locality where registration or voting participation is less than 50 percent of the voting-age population and that uses a literacy test or other devices to qualify voters.

It was my privilege to serve on the steering committee guiding this vital legislation through the House of Representatives.

SOCIAL SECURITY

As a result of extensive hearings before the Ways and Means Committee of which I am a member, we were able to report out for adoption the most far-reaching social security changes adopted since social security began in the mid-1930's. All social security recipients were granted a 7-percent increase in monthly awards with a minimum increase of $4. Those who exercised the option for earlier retirement, at age 62, received a slight reduction in this award of approximately 10 percent. In addition, Congress adopted the medicare program which provides every senior citizen with hospital care for a 90-day period. The patient pays only $40 of his hospital bill for the first 60 days and $10 daily for an additional 30 days of care. After 60 days out of the hospital, this eligibility is reinstated for another 90 days. The same program provides extended care in nursing homes after a hospital stay for 20 days and for $5 daily for an additional 80 days. Benefits under the hospital insurance begin July 1, 1966, while the extended nursing care program is effective January 1, 1967.

A second portion of this program pays up to 80 percent of the bills for physicians' and surgeons' services after a $50 deduction paid by the patient. In addition, the patient is entitled to 100 home health visits, under a plan approved by a doctor, diagnostic tests including X-rays, laboratory services, radium treatment, surgical dressings, casts, braces, artificial limbs, and the rental of medical equipment.

However, in order to be eligible for the medical or doctors insurance, every eligible person under social security must specially enroll for this program prior to March 31, 1966. This additional insurance coverage will cost each beneficiary $3 per month, which will be deducted from social security benefits. Application cards for enrollment will be mailed to those eligible directly by the Social Security Administration.

I urge every senior citizen in my community to enroll for the medical insurance coverage. This is an important program. The Federal Government is matching your $3 with an additional $3 paid out of the general revenue funds of the Government in order to create the necessary reserve for making these payments.

I would reliably estimate that the combination of benefits, including the 7-percent social security increase, the hospital insurance program with its extended care features, and the medical insurance benefits, the cost of which is being subsidized by a matching contribution of the Federal Government, will bring about total social security benefits equivalent to a 30-percent increase in social security benefits. Although this program does not provide total coverage and since it requires the payment of a $40 deduction for the first day's hospitalization, and a $50 deduction on medical and surgical services, it nevertheless provides a system of medical coverage more complete than was ever anticipated before this session of the Congress.

It was a great privilege for me to fly to Independence, Mo., with the President when this bill was signed in the Truman Library, in the presence of former President Harry S. Truman, a longtime advocate of this program.

In order to insure Cleveland's readiness to participate in the medicare program, on October 8, 1965, I organized a Greater Cleveland Conference on Medicare in the Cleveland community. It was my purpose to alert the community to the need of providing the additional extended care facilities which will be needed—between 600 to 1,000 beds—and the added personnel required to staff these facilities—estimated at 3,000 new hospital and convalescent care workers. This program resulted in plans for developing orderly extended care facilities and the training of the additional workers. Hon. Wilbur Cohen, Under Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Commissioner Robert A. Ball, of the Social Security Administration, and other leaders in the hospital, medical, and nursing fields, participated in the conference. One of the shocking disclosures in the course of this conference was the lack of adequate, licensed nursing homes available in Ohio. The objectives of this conference were achieved in directing the specific problems for community action.

IMMIGRATION

On Sunday, October 3, it was my privilege to fly to Staten Island and witness President Johnson's signing of the immigration bill to abolish the prejudical "national origins" provision of the immigration law.

The new law does not increase immigration. It redistributes the quota allotments to all nations on a fair and equitable basis. Eligibility for immigration is based upon family reunification, preference being given to the immigration of wives, parents, and children of American citizens. Eligibility is also based upon the usefulness of the prospective immigrant to the United States in order to insure that there will be no displacement of the American worker from his job.

CLEVELAND'S WAR ON POVERTY

Although the antipoverty program was adopted a little over a year ago, Cleveland has already received over $14 million in Federal funds as its share in this confrontation with poverty in our midst.

This hastily organized program is neither perfect nor complete—but it is a beginning effort in an area long overlooked. This year hundreds of school dropouts were given a second chance at employment and at skill improvement. Children are returning to the schools under programs brilliantly developed under the leadership of School Superintendent Paul Briggs. Preschool training is preparing poverty area youngsters with a better start toward educational achievement. These programs are costly in the short term—but they are expected to be most productive as a long-term investment in human betterment.

MANPOWER RETRAINING

This Congress renewed and expanded the Federal job retraining programs which was recently adopted. This law seeks to help workers made jobless through automation or plant shutdown.

More than 320,000 persons have been accepted in this program. Thousands of Clevelanders have been trained and readjusted through this law. One of the outstanding examples of the importance of this program occurred in the training and readjustment of the 1,500 former employees of the National Castings Co.

My office has been working closely with Federal, State, and Cleveland school officials to insure a full utilization of this important tool against unemployment.

THE POLLUTION PROBLEM

After my long and extended requests, the Governor of Ohio requested a Federal Water Pollution Conference to probe the alarming deterioration of Lake Erie. On August 2, 1965, at the Cleveland conference, I pointed out the contrasting standards of industrial control of water pollution in Lake Erie as compared with the Ohio River watershed. Downstream users of Ohio River water would never permit what Cleveland industries and other Great Lakes industries pour wantonly into our lake. I also protested the dumping of materials dredged from our contaminated Cuyahoga River, by the Federal Government itself, into Lake Erie.

As a result of these efforts, reports and directives should begin next year toward a water cleanup. It is my hope, also, that Cleveland will apply for necessary funds to provide a retaining wall at the Burke Lakefront Airport to receive contaminated dredged materials now being dispersed in the Lake Erie dumping grounds.

The Water Quality Act of 1965 increased Federal grants for sewage treatment. Individual cities may apply for grants up to $1.2 million, while multicity projects may be qualified for Federal grants up to $4.8 million. Under this program, I hope that suburban cities, like Parma and Garfield Heights, will develop eligibility for Federal grants. Eventually, a massive attack must be made to solve the water pollution problem. The costs will rise to staggering billions and will require drastic programs by our city, State, and National Governments.

AIR POLLUTION

While this year may become the turning point in our struggle to save Lake Erie, the struggle against air pollution has hardly begun. The central city of Cleveland continues to be a messpot of foul and dirty air, which accounts for much of our respiratory ailments in addition to the property damage involved. As an observer of the Cleveland air pollution problem for almost 30 years, I would say that conditions are no better today than they were at any time in the past. Cleveland and the entire community is threatened to be bypassed by new and sophisticated industries which require clean air as they require clean water. Our community health and our community growth are definitely related to our respect for these vital resources.

Federal contributions currently provide a substantial portion of the funds spent in air pollution research and control. The primary task remains, however, a local matter, subject to local regulations and enforcement. Washington can help—but, the people of Cleveland must, themselves, insist on a cleaner city.

HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

One of the last bills to pass in the current session is designed to limit and restrict outdoor advertising and junkyards along the Federal-Aid Highway System. Under this beautification program, the Federal Government will contribute 75 percent of the costs of removing such highway distractions in States which are willing to cooperate.

It is regrettable that the provisions of this law are not extended to cities and urban communities. The yet-unopened Willow Freeway extension to downtown Cleveland is already littered with huge billboards which serve to detract and destroy the usefulness of the road before it is opened. Cities must assume a sense of responsibility and develop freeways into parkways through the city.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

This session of Congress adopted legislation providing a group life insurance program for all members of the military service who are on active duty. This coverage is for either $10,000 or $5,000, with premium rates at $2 a month for $10,000 or $1 a month for $5,000 of group insurance. It is extremely wise for every member of the armed service to take advantage of this insurance program which cannot be duplicated in any other form of insurance.

Legislation was also adopted increasing service-connected disability compensation by approximately 10 percent. Education and training allowance for war orphans was increased by approximately 30 percent.

It is my hope that the next session will produce a GI education bill for all servicemen.

URBAN AFFAIRS

The special problem of cities and urban areas was recognized by this Congress by the creation of a Cabinet position on urban affairs. Within the next few years, approximately 80 percent of our population will be residing in urban areas. This new office will be designed to meet the special problems of city life and facilitate Federal-city programs of vital concern to our community.

AFTER THE SESSION

When this first session of the 89th Congress has ended, I expect to return to my Cleveland office and attend to the hundreds of inquiries which have accumulated during this long and busy session. I will be available at my office in room 506 of the Federal Building on Cleveland's public square.

When time permits, I will endeavor to tour the district, particularly those new areas added by the State legislature, including the city of Parma, Brooklyn Heights, and the Brooklyn sections of Cleveland. My next order of business will include visits to every Federal office and installation to observe the effect of existing programs and determine the need for future legislative action. The next session is just weeks ahead. Preparation must be made for the work ahead.

My success as your Representative depends upon your support and your advice. If you have an opinion or a recommendation on what I can do to better represent the 21st District of Ohio, please let me know. Your idea may very well result in a better law.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—A NEEDED TOOL FOR MORE EFFECTIVE CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, for more than 15 years now, there have been some Members of the Congress seeking to establish a Joint Committee on the Budget. I am one of those Members who feels that for the Congress to most effectively perform its responsibilities we need such a tool.

Along with many of my distinguished colleagues, I propose to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for a Joint Committee on the Budget. The purpose of this proposal is to provide Congress with the means to make a more efficient evaluation of the authorization and expenditure requirements of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a new proposal, it is not a new idea devoid of proper study and evaluation. Proposals, similar to mine, have been introduced in the Congress on a rather continuous basis for many years. The original bill was introduced by Senator McCLELLAN on January 19, 1950. Bills providing for a Joint Committee on the Budget have been passed by the Senate in 1952, 1953, 1955, 1957, 1961, 1963, and 1965. On the last six occasions, they have passed the Senate without recorded dissent. Senate bill No. 2, passed by the Senate in this session of Congress, was introduced by Senator McCLELLAN on January 6, this year, and cosponsored by 76 other Senators.

Unfortunately, all of the bills passed by the Senate and numerous bills introduced in the House have failed to receive favorable consideration by this body.

Let us take a brief look at the basic elements contained in the Joint Budget Committee proposal and the objectives it seeks to achieve.

The proposed Joint Committee on the Budget would be comprised of 14 members, 7 from the House and 7 from the Senate. The chairmanship would rotate between the House and the Senate, with the other legislative body holding the vice-chairmanship. There would be a staff director appointed by, and responsible to, the party of the chairman, and an associate staff director appointed by, and responsible to, the opposition party. In addition, the committee would have a staff of fiscal experts, technicians, and other personnel necessary for it to make continuing studies of the programs and expenditures proposed by the executive branch of the Government.

The committee would have these primary duties: First, to study and inform itself on all matters relating to the President's annual budget, including analyses of the details of individual programs and operations and of the actual administration of these activities, making sure that current practices conform with legislative authorizations; second, to provide the kind of information to the respective appropriations committees which they require for adequate consideration of items contained in the budget requests and justifications submitted in their support; third, to make reports and recommendations as to changes in existing laws which would result in greater efficiency and economy in Government; and fourth, compile cost estimates of all programs and projects authorized by Congress. Additionally, the joint committee proposal would authorize consideration for joint appropriation hearings and further provide more staff personnel for appropriations committee work.

Control over the Federal Government spending and revenue is a major function of Congress. This power of the purse is specifically reserved to the Congress under provisions of the Constitution. Therefore, we have not merely the option to determine the amount of Government spending, we have the inescapable responsibility. To accept and meet this responsibility, as the elected Representatives of the people, we must have the methods and tools to accomplish this job. If not, then we continue to abdicate our responsibility and leave more and more control of the financial policies of the Federal Government to the executive branch.

Today, the procedures used by the Congress in filling its vital responsibility of controlling public funds are much the same as they were 25 and 50 years ago. In 1940, our annual expenditures were $9 billion, now they are 11 times that much and continuing to increase. Fifty years ago, our annual expenditures were $746 million, now they are more than 130 times that much. We have not updated our methods to meet our increased responsibilities. Can you imagine us trying to serve the present-day needs of the American public with our transportation system or communication system of 1915? Needless to say, this would result in much waste and many unmet needs.

Mr. Speaker, if Congress is to take a positive approach to its vital function of control of public funds, it must have detailed and adequate technical information upon which to base its decisions. To do otherwise, we are only contributing to waste and inefficiency in Government, and assuring the neglect of other vital needs.

Our present appropriation system handles budget requests on a piecemeal basis. These segments are not considered in terms of the overall financial picture of the Government. This proposed amendment would provide for a study of the budget as a whole, estimated revenues, as well as proposed expenditures, and the joint committee's views on the total budgetary data would be disseminated to appropriation subcommittees prior to the time that they take action on the individual parts. Additionally, this information concerning proposed expenditures, and authorizations in relation to estimated revenues, could be furnished to all individual Members of the Congress. These data would reduce the dependence of Congress on information provided by the same agencies for which it is considering appropriations.

The joint committee, through its studies and reports, could help to coordinate the dual functions of authorizations and appropriations. Through its reports and recommendations, it is probable that a clearer and closer understanding could be developed between these two processes. Furthermore, the joint committee could facilitate cooperation and develop closer working relationships between the appropriation committees of the House and the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that the Congress will come to grips with this issue when we meet again next January. A Joint Budget Committee is an essential tool for review and control if we are ever to secure efficient and coordinated management of Federal expenditures. And we must not forget that this authority over the budget remains our most vital constitutional function.

The Congress needs a coordinated system of budget review, a modern system to acquaint all Members with annual Government expenditures and insure maximum efficiency and control.

TERMINATION OF BRACERO LAW

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include tables and extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to comment one last time before adjournment on what I firmly believe is an historic turning point in American agricultural life.

In 1965, with the demise of Public Law 78, the Nation made a first, significant step toward bringing the agricultural industry into the mainstream of our economic life.

Public Law 78—the so-called bracero law—was terminated last December 31. This was Congress wise decision, based on extensive experience and made only after thorough warning, to end the mass importation of foreign farmworkers.

For 14 years, this law, passed as a 2-year emergency measure during the Korean war and extended six times, has contributed to poverty, human indignity, and exploitation. This infamous program—perhaps necessary when adopted in 1951 but long since a menace to human decency—fed upon the poverty of neighboring Mexico and increased the plight of American agricultural workers by keeping wage levels low and working conditions at an intolerable state.

When this system of Government-guaranteed foreign labor ended, there were widespread grumbles. Farm employers and others cried that it was unfair, that Americans simply would not do "stoop labor," that crop losses would be astronomical, that prices of farm products would skyrocket, and that farmers would be forced to move outside the country to find labor.

And what has happened? These early fears have not materialized. These early arguments and vehement protests have largely been proved invalid, and often by self-admission.

As we prepare to adjourn this long and historic session of Congress, I feel we should set the record straight. I feel we should review the very substantial progress that has been made over the nine and a half months since termination of Public Law 78. For it is a heartening story of progress on many fronts.

Let us take a close look at some of the major developments in 1965.

FARM EMPLOYMENT

First, farm employment. Throughout the year, domestic farm employment has been up appreciably over 1964 and foreign employment has been down considerably. I will submit data to document this point. But in summary on August 15, for example, domestic employment, at 1,136,400 was up 86,200 over the same date in 1964. Foreign farmworkers, on the other hand, numbered a scant 1,200—contrasting sharply with the 68,700 working in the United States at the same time in 1964.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield briefly at that point?

Mr. COHELAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I have in my hand a little newspaper item which seems to be in some conflict with what the gentleman has said. It refers to 1,200 foreign workers. Perhaps it can be explained. But I note in California alone the number of wetbacks apprehended increased from a little over 5,000 in 1964, through September, to nearly 19,000 through September of this year. Those are only the wetbacks apprehended. Based on past experience—and I am sure the gentleman has had the same experience—I would venture to say there are many more in California.

Mr. COHELAN. I am glad to have the gentleman contribute and I am glad to comment on this. I say again that the figures I cited were as of August 15. I intend to extrapolate those figures. I intend to submit in the RECORD a complete time series of data on wages, farm employment, farm production, and farm income. It will show distribution on the basis of foreign workers and domestic workers, and there will be a total for the entire work force, by State and by crop. I submit to the gentleman that this will support the argument I am making this afternoon.

I say to the gentleman, as a member of the Appropriations Committee and the Subcommittee on Post Office and Treasury, that I am very aware of the enforcement problem we have with wetbacks, and I am quite surprised the figure was not larger than it turned out to be.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. If the gentleman will yield further, briefly, I would estimate, based on my long life in California, that if 19,000 wetbacks or illegal entrants were apprehended there are probably twice that many wandering around California, working on the farms under conditions very much worse than those of the braceros.

Mr. COHELAN. I say to the gentleman that I am optimistic enough to feel, because of the gentleman's well-demonstrated fairness in the debates we have had on this subject, and recognizing the longstanding arguments and differences we have had, that I may be able to convince him before the afternoon is gone.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I would doubt it.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAGEN of California. How does the gentleman account for the fact that it was necessary to import supplemental labor to West Virginia, which is supposed to be the most hard-core unemployment area in the country?

Mr. COHELAN. I will be glad to give some figures on West Virginia. The gentleman will be surprised to know they did import very few.

Mr. HAGEN of California. They imported some.

Mr. COHELAN. There are some structural labor problems, the distinguished gentleman, who is an authority on agricultural economics, knows very well.

But let me continue with my remarks which will amplify and document the statement I have begun.

Even on September 15, when nondomestic employment has been exceptionally high in the past, foreign employment was down substantially over a year ago. On this date in 1965, foreign workers numbered only 15,700—fully 77,000 fewer than the year before.

California, the major user of braceros in the past, showed on September 15 a rise of 5,400 domestic workers and a decrease of 52,000 foreign workers over the same date in 1964. Needless to say I am pleased with what this means for employment opportunities in my State. But the same advantages are shared by other States as well.

There is another bright sign in this improved employment picture and that is jobs for young people. For the end of the mass importation of foreign labor has meant more employment opportunities for American youths. And this came at a time when youth unemployment has been at a high peak across our country. By June 30, 1965, nearly 3,500 college men had been placed in farm jobs across the country. An additional 3,225 high school boys, members of "A-teams," had farm jobs this summer in a Federal-State program. And despite loud cries that these young people were not working out, these youths generally did a most creditable job performing hard but rewarding work. In Blythe, Calif., for example, 419 of 486 "A-team" boys completed their contract periods, drawing average wages of $1.85 per hour and enjoying good housing, living, and working conditions.

FARM WAGES

Second, let me turn to the matter of farm wages. One of the most encouraging lessons learned in this first year in the transition to the use of domestic farmworkers is that American workers are available if wages and working conditions are right. In many cases this year, they have been right and the results have been predictable.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture, as a matter of fact, reports that in the second quarter of 1965 the U.S. average hourly farm wage rate, at $1.17, was up 16 percent over the third quarter of 1964, the last years of the mass importation of foreign agricultural workers.

This rise is quite apparent in comparing 1964 and 1965 wage rates, both piece and hourly, in crops that formerly used foreign labor. Let us look at some of the increases in 1965:

For lettuce in Arizona, piece rates, at 30 to 31 cents a carton, are up at least 6 cents a carton over 1964.

For melons in Arizona, piece rates, at 45 to 50 cents a crate, have doubled since 1964 and hourly rates range between $1.25 and $1.40 compared to $1 to $1.25 in 1964.

For celery in California, the hourly rate, at $1.40 is up 40 cents over that of 1964.

For tomatoes in California, the hourly rate, reportedly over $2, is up substantially over last year's rate of $1.35.

For oranges in Florida, the piece rate, at 25 cents a box, is 7 cents greater than a year ago.

These higher wages and the striking increase in domestic seasonal agricultural employment mean, among other things, that as much as $50 million may stay in the United States instead of leaving it as has been the case under the bracero program.

It means, too, that a large body of nonproductive, tax-consuming unemployed, living on welfare through no fault of their own, have at last had the opportunity to become taxpayers and more productive citizens. This is a significant though frequently unnoticed aspect of the progress made so far. And nobody, not even the strongest proponent for importing foreign labor, has been able to argue against the merits of putting jobless Americans to work.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAGEN of California. It is my recollection in your very area there were large pressure groups opposing the requirements that people on welfare participate in employment on the farm as a condition of retaining their welfare eligibility. I do not know what the gentleman's position was, but there were people up there in your district opposed to that.

Mr. COHELAN. That may be although the gentleman has drawn the issue much toc narrowly. I have no knowledge right at hand of the specific details. But I can say that there is much work to be done in the area of farm labor recruitment. As my colleagues know, from the very beginning I have made it very clear that I, as much as and maybe more than most people, recognize that a labor market in transition involves some very painful adjustments. I state here today and I have stated here before, and I am going to conclude with this in my statement today, that a number of positive and constructive steps must be taken. But we have made a very encouraging beginning and I have some very detailed tables which break this progress down by crop and price and labor.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from California, Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. GUBSER. I think that the gentleman's figures are absolutely correct. Farm wages have gone up markedly. I think it is undoubtedly true, and I am certainly willing to accept his figures, that the number of farm employees has also gone up in the past year. However, I am wondering if the gentleman has any intention of placing in the RECORD figures as to the production of crops which normally have had labor problems. I am speaking in particular of tomatoes, pears, cling peaches, strawberries, and asparagus. I think since these are the principal crops which use bracero labor or which have used it in the past you will find that the production of these crops in the State of California at least is way down. So we then have the situation of needing more employees to harvest this lesser crop at a higher cost.

Mr. COHELAN. I cannot agree with the gentleman, because the data does not support what he is purporting to show. I must concede there were anomalies in relation to certain crops, but it was by no means in the proportions suggested by the gentleman. I do not want to get into all of this statistical data at this point because it will be covered in the tables which will accompany my statement.

But I want to say this to the gentleman and all those who have been kind enough to share this special order with me. All of us, even though we do not agree on everything on this particular subject, are gentlemen of good will and we all want to see that this matter is worked out satisfactorily in terms of price, in terms of production, and in terms of farm labor.

I honestly believe what I have just said, that you are going to find great progress has been made, and this will be reflected in the data which I will present.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. The gentleman made the statement about the fine housing conditions for the youth who are harvesting over in Blythe. Did they build new housing for the youngsters that came there to work?

Mr. COHELAN. As the gentleman knows, housing conditions throughout the country in respect to farm labor were far from uniform. But to the best of my knowledge, on this specific example that I have cited, housing was adequate and I think the performance that was reflected in the actual harvest bears this out.

Mr. YOUNGER. They had the same housing that the braceros used, in all probability; is that right?

Mr. COHELAN. I am no more sure of that than is the gentleman. Housing conditions were by no means uniform from one grower to another.

I would suggest to the gentleman, however, that if we are going to solve this problem, housing is one of our key problems. Even if you expect to get a nice instant-package form of labor, where you have all male workers coming into dormitory-type accommodations, you are not going to solve the problem. We are going to have family housing if we are going to meet the needs and develop an adequate and stable supply of domestic farm workers. I have absolutely no doubt that we can and that we are going to develop this supply, but we are going to have to deal with our critical problems and these include housing.

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes, but at the beginning of the gentleman's statement he made a generalized condemnation of housing in California. Now he says that it is not uniform, that there is some good housing as well, and I wanted to correct the record.

Mr. COHELAN. My good friend from California knows perfectly well that I would not get trapped in that kind of an argument. The gentleman knows that what I have said is that housing standards are by no means uniform. I have stood in the well of this House on two previous occasions this year and have pointed out to very distinguished Members who are involved, and quite properly so because of the interest of their districts in this subject, that about five of the large packers of California have not hired braceros for 5 years. One of the main reasons for this is that they provided attractive and adequate housing.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that if we continue to upgrade wages and working conditions, and if we provide the same safeguards and guarantees for farmworkers that have been available to industrial workers for years, we will eliminate the kind of problems that presently exist.

But let me again continue.

FOOD PRICES

Third, what about the prices of farm products? Despite cries of anguish from some quarters, the prices of fruits and vegetables on which foreign labor was used in the past are, on the whole, less than they were a year ago. While the cries of "wolf" have frequently been heard, the facts indicate, quite poignantly, that production is high and that field labor costs exert little, if any, pressure on the prices of produce.

For the week of October 11, 1965, for example, five crops that formerly used nondomestic labor were priced lower at wholesale than during the comparable week in 1964. Only three ex-foreign users were priced higher. Crops showing lower wholesale prices were grapes, lemons, California oranges, snapbeans, and Delicious apples. It is most significant to note, I think, that during this week grapes were at a 5-year low, oranges at a 4-year low, and snapbeans at a 3-year low.

The story has been pretty much the same in the wholesale price picture over the past few months. It has shown absolutely no connection between increased use of domestic farm labor and the prices of commodities.

Quite meaningfully, the average wholesale prices of fresh and dried vegetables declined this August some 14.2 percent over the same month a year ago. This meant that the average prices hit their lowest August level in 3 years. Furthermore, because of plentiful supplies from this year's crops, the average wholesale prices of canned fruits and vegetables were lower this August than for the same month in 1964.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. The gentleman is referring to Thompson's seedless grapes and that is the exception to the rule. Grapes generally are at an all-time high.

Mr. COHELAN. I would like to advise the gentleman that this data comes from the Employment Security Division of the U.S. Department of Labor.

Mr. GUBSER. It is the Thompson seedless grapes which are on this morning's market selling at $2.50 to $3.50 per lug, and that is a lower price.

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman would not deny that grapes in general as listed on the indexes—that grape prices are down; is that not correct?

Mr. GUBSER. No.

Mr. COHELAN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GUBSER. Thompson's are down, but that is all.

Mr. COHELAN. Thompson's represent fully 30 percent of the grape market. And my information states very clearly that grape prices are down because we have had a bumper crop. I am not attaching any degree of significance to grapes. Grapes are grapes and for statistical purposes that is the way they are listed on all of the accepted indexes and data. But I say again, according to Bureau of Employment Security Statistics, that grapes are at a 5-year low, oranges are at a 4-year low and snapbeans are at a 3-year low.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. Yes, I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I believe I understand the point which the gentleman is trying to make, which I assume is that some of the predictions about the cost of living going up may be difficult to sustain, although figures can be cited which would support a different conclusion.

But I would also like to point out that this is pertinent: One reason the price of citrus is low, which is not necessarily a good situation as far as our farmers are concerned, is due to the delay in picking oranges and lemons. The quality of fresh fruit which has not reached the market is inferior to what you get in the average year.

Mr. COHELAN. May I say to the gentleman that I flatly deny that. I want the gentleman to take a look at the data which I will submit and which will substantiate my point. I happen to have a very high regard for the gentleman but I do not think he will find anything to support his statement. The price of lemons has had a very peculiar pattern of constancy, and while there have been highs and lows in the year 1965, the price of lemons has definitely gone down. In September 1965 they are are listed at $2.94 and $3.01, but in 1962, at the same time of year, they were at $4.27. In 1963 they were $3.46 and $4.40. And last year they were at $5.48 and $4.69.

How does the gentleman account for that at a time when you had all the bracero labor you wanted?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, perhaps I misunderstood the gentleman. I had the impression he was making a point that the price of lemons and oranges is down, in contrast to the prediction we had made that they would be up; is this correct?

Mr. COHELAN. No, I am trying to make the point that as far as the labor component is concerned, it has not been a primary factor in terms of price fluctuations in any of these food commodities, including citrus.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. It is very much dependent on the weather.

Mr. COHELAN. Of course it is; weather is the primary reason, and we are going to show this later on when we get into costs.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Perhaps I do not make my point clear. What I was trying to point out is that the quality of citrus in the market this year is not as good as it has been in the last years, quite largely due to the fact of an unreliable harvest. We are not picking oranges and lemons at the time they should have been picked.

They have stayed on the trees, they have gotten too large, and were not the top quality fruit comparable to those which came in other years. That is attributable to the lack of labor.

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman's argument is a qualitative argument, and I disagree with him. There are standards that are accepted for quality and size, and we are taking into consideration all of the factors the gentleman is trying to introduce.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I do not like to interrupt the gentleman so often, but I would point out, and I think he will concede this, almost half the lemons in the United States are grown in my congressional district, and a large percentage of the oranges. None is grown in the gentleman's district. I admire his sincerity, but I think I know more about the citrus business than the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. I am sure the gentleman in his specialized field is most knowledgeable. I will not yield, however, on the basic data, on the general topic of prices and production, and on the standard measures that are used to make judgments in this field.

If the gentleman will allow me to continue, when I finish you can fire all the shots you want.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. I would like to inform the gentleman when I learned this morning he was taking this special order, I have taken one which will immediately follow him, and I will be just as generous in time with the gentleman as he has been with me.

On this question of prices related to the labor component, the gentleman is trying to determine the score of the ball game at the end of the third inning.

We have a situation where the tomato pack is down 216,000 tons. We have a situation where the raw product cost to the canner has gone up because of the labor problem, and nothing else, from $20 to $35 per ton. This, transposed into a can of tomatoes on the grocer's shelf, with all the commissions on commissions which are added, is going to raise the price of a 2.5 can of tomatoes exactly one nickel next year. But we have not yet distributed a single can of the 1965 pack. We are still working on the surplus of the 1964 pack. So, considering all of the added costs of the raw material due to labor will not result to the housewife until next year on tomatoes.

One more point: We have in California a 25-percent reduction in asparagus; 16,000 acres went out of production.

Mr. COHELAN. I disagree with that.

Mr. GUBSER. We have that impact on the price, and the increase is going to be tremendous.

Mr. COHELAN. I disagree with the gentleman categorically, and I will cite the reasons why before I conclude. But very quickly at this point, we need not have the problem next year that we have had in a few, limited areas this year if we have cooperation from the growers. I am just as concerned as the gentleman is in getting the facts of the situation and insuring that we have available a productive labor supply.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNGER. Perhaps I misunderstood what you are trying to prove. I gathered that you are trying to prove that the cost of living is down.

Mr. COHELAN. No. The gentleman knows better than that. What I am doing is making a general statement on the topic of farm labor, harvest, prices, and the general progress in all of these areas which is so important to an understanding of where we are going next year.

Mr. YOUNGER. Well if all prices of farm products and vegetables and fruits and so forth are down, then naturally the cost of living would be down; would that not be correct?

Mr. COHELAN. Insofar as those factors have an effect on the cost-of-living index, insofar as they are a component of it, the gentleman is quite correct. But this is only one of the factors in the cost-of-living index, as the gentleman well knows.

Mr. YOUNGER. It is a big factor; is it not?

Mr. COHELAN. It is an important factor but not the controlling one. Earlier this year when prices fluctuated, by far the biggest factor was weather, although artificial marketing quotas also had their impact. And the data bears this out.

Mr. YOUNGER. Here recently the Congress just gave a 7-percent increase in social security benefits to take care of the increased cost of living. I think one must add those two things together.

Mr. COHELAN. I would suggest to the gentleman that we keep our eye on the ball. We are talking about agriculture labor today, but I would be glad to discuss the gentleman's point on some other occasion.

Now I was talking about prices.

Wholesale prices of crops that formerly employed foreign labor have experienced this year, as in previous years, normal week-to-week fluctuations. This clearly reveals that weather, plant disease, market conditions and other factors exert far greater influence on produce costs than does field labor.

If, in some cases, consumers have paid more this year for farm commodities, the reason clearly does not lie back at the farm. The cost of field labor is an extremely small percentage of the consumer cost. The cost of raising agricultural wages this year up to levels between $1.25 and $1.40 an hour is roughly equivalent to about 1 cent per unit of most vegetables and fruits. This increase is very small indeed for what it means in bringing agricultural workers closer to a living wage in what it means to bringing them into the mainstream of American life.

In those instances this year where unusual price increases have come about, the reason has been, with few exceptions, special weather conditions. In May and June, for example, lettuce prices soared to 49 cents in eastern grocery stores, or 20 cents above normal. Much attention and fanfare was given to this development. But one of the basic causes of this increase was a temporary shortage of lettuce due to poor weather. Another was artificial marketing quotas. And within a very few weeks, the price dropped back to normal.

The fact, quite simply, is that too often this year American housewives have been denied the truth about the reasons they have paid more for some agricultural commodities. One of the tables that I will present at the close of my remarks will document this point further.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I wish to commend the gentleman in the well for presenting to the Congress such a comprehensive and most encouraging report. His report convinces me that I was right when I joined the gentleman in the well in the 88th Congress to fight against the extension of Public Law 78.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman for his most generous comment and remarks and for his unceasing support and help in this very important area of American farm labor.

FARM INCOME AND PRODUCTION

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to discuss farm income and production. During this changeover to increased reliance on American workers, agricultural employers have not suffered the heavy losses many persons predicted would come.

For the second quarter of 1965, the annual rate of net farm income, at $14.6 billion, was $2.5 billion higher than the rate for the same quarter in 1964.

In addition, farm production, as the wholesale prices indicate, has been quite high this year. This is not to say that some crop losses have not been suffered. There have been crop losses in 1965 just as there have been losses in previous years. But crop losses have not been triggered, as some have charged, by labor shortages resulting from termination of Public Law 78. Weather and market factors have been the major culprits.

All told, this has been a good year for American agriculture.

Al Edinger of the California Tomato Growers Association said in a recent interview that the State's tomato growers "will never again ask for braceros." The growers, he noted, "had a pretty fair year despite our screaming" and will probably produce a crop close to last year's record.

As a matter of fact, the reports I have received from California indicate that total tomato production this year will exceed the anticipated 2.3-million-ton yield; that farmer's total profits will be up; and that the domestic work force will be up as well by some 12,000 over a year ago. At the same time the use of braceros is down substantially. On September 15, 1964, 63,860 braceros were used to harvest tomatoes in California. A year later—this year—the figure was down to 11,370. On September 30, 1964, 59,080 braceros were used. This year on the same date there were only 17,150. So it is evident that plentiful crops and good profits are not only possible but a practical reality without foreign farm workers. And it is also evident that the end of Public Law 78 has substantially aided American farm workers.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that we have learned, in these brief months of 1965, that the law of supply and demand for labor applies just as much to agricultural employment as it does to employment in other American industries. And this should not be surprising, despite being so long denied.

The death of Public Law 78 did not merely mark the end of the mass importation of foreign farm labor. More importantly, it signaled the beginning of a new era in American agricultural economics. To accept this historic challenge, the agricultural industry must be brought fully into the mainstream of the Nation's economic affairs. And this can be accomplished only—

If agricultural employers compete for workers just as employers in other industries have traditionally done; and

If dignity is restored to farm employment through decent living wages and working conditions comparable to those in other American industries.

This year represents just a start, albeit a most auspicious one, on the way to improving employment opportunities and conditions for our own citizens.

As we view the job that lies before us, I am reminded of what Samuel Johnson once wisely wrote:

> He who waits to do a great deal of good at once will never do anything.

America cannot wait any longer to better the lot of those who toil the land for a living. We have begun but we have much to do and we must continue.

As I have indicated previously, if the recruitment and the movement of domestic workers from their homes to areas of peak demand is a problem, as it is, let us see how this can be solved without degrading American workers by shrill cries for foreign labor. If legislation is needed to assist this movement, let us develop appropriate measures.

If housing is a limiting factor on the availability of domestic workers, which it is, let us embark upon a program to assist growers in this regard.

If the problem of migrant family care is a problem, as it is, let us come up with imaginative programs to help the workers maintain their families in some degree of dignity and comfort while they toil in the fields and orchards.

If the status of agricultural labor has been downgraded over the years, as it has, let us work together toward giving farmworkers equal status with industrial workers in such essential matters as minimum wage protection, unemployment insurance coverage, workmen's compensation, and collective bargaining.

These problems are certainly not insurmountable. They can be solved by reasonable and practical means. So let us get on with the task of building a stable, reliable, and efficient farm labor force which can harvest the crops where and when they are ready.

Let us recognize that the difficulties of these past months have been relatively minor.

Let us begin now to plan how they may be overcome and how our farmers and farmworkers can share mutually in the benefits of our abundance.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

Mr. GONZALEZ. I wish to commend the gentleman from California for the long period of time during which he has contributed so much in pinpointing the area of need not only insofar as legislation is concerned but also insofar as some of the work which yet needs to be done in some of our States is concerned.

I do not have knowledge, with exactness, of the statistics with respect to the California picture, but those of us who have lived in Texas have long been aware of a very pathetic situation. Our interest in this problem has been evidenced from the beginning of Public Law 78, in the early 1950's. I happen to have witnessed some of the conditions which were suffered and permitted to endure in the State of Texas.

The most significant thing in my State was that in 1962, when the minimum wage was raised from 50 cents to 70 cents, within a 6-month period the percentage of braceros used in Texas dropped by 76 percent. That resulted from a minimal increase from 50 to 70 cents, which immediately discouraged the great and overwhelming use of this labor. This proved that domestic labor in Texas was available, once the wage was put above the 50-cent figure.

Now the State of California has standards, and I am very happy for the gentleman that it does have. He comes from a great State which has championed and pioneered in labor standards and employment standards. You have a minimum wage in California. We do not in Texas. In the State of Texas, in the senate in 1957 I offered the first minimum wage act in the history of that body setting a minimum wage of 40 cents. I could not even get a committee hearing on it. To this day I am sorry to report that we do not have a minimum wage law in Texas. We have people who are earning as little as 22 to 25 cents an hour. It used to hurt me very much personally to see a native Texan toiling in the fields where foreign workers had been imported where the foreign workers were guaranteed by law and by international agreement at least 50 cents an hour whereas the native Texan had no guarantee whatever and would be paid whatever the traffic would bear. Even to this day there are workers who are earning less than 30 cents and even 25 cents an hour. This is purely a domestic State matter. I felt there was a national interest in this inasmuch as there was a national policy that led to these contractual agreements which resulted in the wholesale importation of foreign labor under contractual conditions which had been outlawed by Congress in the 1880's. For that reason I have long heard of the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN], who has today rendered a service by bringing us up to date on some of the current conditions particularly in his own home State.

I want to make it patently clear that some of us have heard of his eminent and distinguished contribution ever since the days before we were fortunate enough and privileged enough to serve in this body. I end as I began, by complimenting and thanking the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely thank the gentleman, and may I say I have enjoyed working with the distinguished gentleman from Texas, who is so knowledgeable in this field. In commenting on his excellent contribution to this discussion, I want to point out to some of the brethren from my own great State, where we do indeed have higher standards and a more advanced agriculture in some commodity areas, that the problem is not a State problem; it is a national problem and it has to be looked at in that manner.

Lastly may I say to the gentleman from Texas, in appropriate gratitude, that I hope he will examine the RECORD very carefully because table No. 4 which I am submitting is a complete record of employment of seasonally hired workers for 1964 and 1965. My source is the Department of Labor's Bureau of Employment Security. This table lists every State in the Union, including Texas. He will find there a very interesting report on the distribution, first by expansion of domestic labor in his own State, and second, of the virtual elimination of the hiring of non-American labor.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I would like to round out the thought, which I never completed, that with the advanced legal and legislative conditions of standards in California some of the more deleterious effects of the wholesale importation of labor might be softened as compared to what it is in my native State. What I like about the gentleman's outlook and approach is that it has not been negative in just fighting a law and getting rid of a practice, but he has led the fight to offer constructive alternatives such as the introduction of the bill which I had the honor to join him in to provide a better approach on the part of our national authorities and our State governments in the recruitment of migratory labor so that we could make better use of the available labor that we have here among our native workers.

I wanted to say that before you rounded out your discussion, because I think in all fairness you should be recognized for this constructive and creative contribution. You have not only fought against a bad situation, but you have offered constructive and creative alternatives to help solve some aspects of this problem.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman wholeheartedly for his very fine contribution and very generous remarks.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a creative situation for the gentleman from Texas. I do wish you Texans did not love Texas as much as you do. You stated, I believe, that there are still areas where you are paying only 20 or 30 cents an hour. We have sent recruiters down there to do their best to get workers, good Texas workers, to come to California where I will guarantee the gentleman that they can get $2 or $3 an hour. But we cannot get them to leave Texas. I wish they would come to California.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, a brief, although I think a somewhat hurried effort was made sometime last year in some sections of Texas, but strange as it may sound, the workers in my particular district and in the immediate surrounding area for some years now, dating from the large and intensive period of the use of braceros have sort of written off the west coast.

Traditionally and for many years the workers went to California, but the migratory farmworker has sort of written off California and we have found that he has been going mostly into the Midwest, as well as Oregon; and to Minnesota, portions of Colorado, Kansas, Iowa, and some sections of Michigan. I have visited most of these areas and have discovered that you could not persuade anybody just on a promise that he would find employment in California to go to California because apparently the word had gotten around over a period of years that they were preempted. I know that recruiters came from California last year and went mostly into the valley of Texas, but not into my district, where the growers there reported that their own domestics for some time had not been forced to migrate out of the valley area of Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I realize that there is some merit in what the gentleman has had to say. The gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] has some more information on that and I hope that the gentleman will be able to encourage some of those people to give us in California another chance because we desperately need them and we will pay $2 or $3 an hour.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that I can inform some people in certain sections in my district, which is a one-county district, where we have 13-percent unemployment—as I say, I will be delighted to disseminate that information, because I think that you can recruit some workers for California in that district.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I want to reiterate before concluding that the gentleman in the well wants to do everything he can to meet the legitimate and demonstrated needs of our great agricultural industry while protecting and materially advancing the welfare of our domestic farmworkers who have been too long ignored and deprived.

What I have tried to show is that in spite of the difficulties, we have had a good year. And I want to pledge myself once again at this time to cooperate with all who are interested and concerned with the problem to take whatever steps are necessary in developing an adequate, stable and efficient domestic farm labor force that can harvest the crops where and when they are ready.

I cannot resist the opportunity of stressing again what our good friend, Congressman GONZALEZ, has mentioned, that the recruitment and transportation problem is one of the most critical we face and that it demands our immediate attention.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I include several tables which make very clear both our current status and the progress we have made during this last year:

UNITED STATES

TABLE I.—*Estimated employment of domestic migratory agricultural workers, by State, Aug. 15, 1965 and change from Aug. 15, 1964*

[Thousands of workers]

State	Migrant employment, Aug. 15	
	1965	Change from 1964
United States	270.7	+41.4
California	45.5	+7.6
Michigan	42.5	+17.5
Texas	22.7	+5.9
Colorado	6.6	+2.5
Connecticut	4.2	+.8
All other States	149.0	+7.2

NOTE.—Because of rounding, figures may not add to total.

Source: Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Department of Labor.

TABLE II.—*Foreign workers in United States by States as of Sept. 23, 1965, and Sept. 15, 1964*

	1965	1964
National total	23,567	92,800
California	16,911	63.900
Florida	552	885
Maine	3,926	4.642
New Hampshire	215	103
Vermont	50	81
Massachusetts	339	910
Connecticut	401	1,370
Rhode Island	44	59
Virginia	669	672
West Virginia	200	
New York	250	350

Source: U.S. Department of Labor.

TABLE III.—*Change in seasonal domestic farm employment 1964–65 in crops and States where foreign workers were concentrated in 1964*

JANUARY-JUNE

Crop	States	January		February		March		April		May		June	
		15	31	15	28	15	31	15	30	15	31	15	30
Asparagus	California	(1)	650	500	1,800	650	250	−1,100	−550	−590	370	2,400	−550
Beans	Florida	−360	−1,400	−1,170	670	−630	−1,260	70	1,240	2,400	−140	80	100
Celery	California and Florida	600	540	470	320	50	(2)	−120	−760	600	520	1,560	240
Citrus	do	5,400	6,700	8,700	9,600	10,600	5,500	7,900	7,800	7,200	9,200	7,900	5,900
Corn, sweet	Florida	1,400	550	520	600	910	910	1,890	1,570	2,200	1,450	1,420	510
Cotton	California, Arizona, Texas, and Arkansas	−2,590	−1,900	−630	280	690	500	(2)	−1,650	−2,300	−3,100	1,920	−580
Cucumbers	Texas	0	(2)	0	50	(2)	120	0	140	340	350	880	1,060
Dates	California	(2)	(2)	(2)	50	50	70	170	180	(2)	(2)	70	140
Grapes	do	1,400	2,400	3,800	3,400	1,400	400	470	−2,100	−650	450	2,200	−4,700
Hay and grain	Texas	580	440	440	470	240	670	2,200	750	590	−250	−1,640	1,160
Lettuce	California and Arizona	2,300	2,900	2,400	1,590	2,200	3,200	3,200	2,900	2,900	3,700	3,300	1,420
Melons	California, Arizona, and Texas	50	660	−290	−180	940	230	−780	−2,000	270	2,900	6,900	3,600
Onions	Arizona and Texas	160	620	80	440	640	100	−480	−400	590	1,660	390	560
Potatoes	Maine	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	−1,450	−880	−2,900	−2,900
Strawberries	California and Florida	790	1,280	1,000	1,640	830	400	320	1,390	2,400	3,100	3,400	3,600
Sugarcane	Florida	−290	1,630	580	670	100	−560	−1,570	−680	980	610	1,040	−380
Sugarbeets	California, Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming.	−300	200	550	350	−100	850	−920	80	2,800	6,000	7,800	5,400
Tobacco	Connecticut and Massachusetts	860	720	680	560	640	750	1,590	2,300	1,260	1,490	1,090	1,590
Tomatoes	California, Florida, and Texas	200	(2)	−1,920	−1,620	−4,500	−3,000	1,040	110	−960	570	700	5,200
Total increase		8,200	15,600	15,700	19,400	14,700	9,200	14,100	10,300	18,500	28,000	38,300	21,200
Percent increase		8	16	17	20	14	8	11	7	10	13	17	9
Percent of 1964 foreign worker employment in above crops.		82	82	82	82	86	86	88	84	85	87	86	84

JULY-SEPTEMBER

Crop	States	July		August		September	
		15	31	15	31	15	30
Apples	Michigan, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, and West Virginia	−100	(2)	120	−580	−810	
Beans	California and Texas	−140	−280	−160	320	−300	
Celery	California and Florida	260	(2)	−410	−280	820	
Citrus	California, Florida, and Arizona	6,150	5,470	5,000	4,150	3,380	
Cotton	California, Texas, Arkansas, and New Mexico	−3,560	10,290	4,320	−3,890	−11,600	
Cucumbers	Michigan, California, Texas, Colorado, Indiana, and Wisconsin	480	8,220	13,060	11,860	4,190	
Grapes	California	600	−450	−50	8,650	4,000	
Hay and grain	Texas	(2)	1,190	4,340	2,530	1,990	
Lettuce	California, Arizona, and Colorado	1,800	2,050	2,830	2,850	3,960	
Melons	California and Texas	3,960	4,020	3,660	1,050	1,060	
Potatoes	Maine and New Jersey	−2,900	−3,450	−3,480	−3,080	7,210	
Strawberries	California	3,650	2,800	2,110	1,400	1,050	
Sugarbeets	California, Colorado, Nebraska, Montana, and Wyoming	3,000	1,710	−450	−100	−300	
Sugarcane	Florida	960	340	290	130	−420	
Tobacco	Massachusetts and Connecticut	1,830	1,910	1,340	940	2,520	
Tomatoes	California	1,450	−150	3,850	13,600	12,350	
Total increase		17,450	33,610	36,390	22,240	29,120	
Percent increase		8	16	19	10	14	
Percent of foreign worker employment in above crops		80	83	87	88	88	

[1] Crop not active.
[2] Less than 50 workers.

NOTE.—Due to rounding figures may not add to totals.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security.

TABLE IV.—*Employment of seasonal hired workers, 1964 and 1965*

ARIZONA

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign	Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate				Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964							*1965*						
January	17,200	14,200	11,600	1,000	1,600	3,100	January	16,000	16,000	12,600	1,300	2,000	0
February	14,500	12,300	10,500	800	1,000	2,300	February	15,500	15,500	12,000	1,800	1,800	0
March	15,000	12,200	10,700	700	800	2,800	March	15,000	15,000	11,800	1,600	1,700	0
April	19,900	13,500	11,700	900	1,000	6,400	April	16,500	16,500	12,800	1,300	2,400	0
May	20,000	15,400	13,600	900	1,000	4,600	May	18,000	18,000	15,800	1,200	1,100	0
June	21,900	17,200	15,300	700	1,100	4,800	June	20,000	20,000	16,000	2,300	1,700	0
July	14,900	13,900	12,600	700	700	1,000	July	14,600	14,600	13,300	800	500	0
August	11,900	11,400	10,400	500	500	500	August	10,500	10,500	9,600	600	300	0
September	12,700	10,500	9,500	400	600	2,200	September	12,500	12,500	11,400	500	500	0
October	18,500	14,000	11,800	800	1,400	4,500							
November	23,700	16,500	13,800	900	1,900	7,200							
December	23,700	18,200	14,400	1,400	2,500	5,500							

TABLE IV.—*Employment of seasonal hired workers, 1964 and 1965*—Continued

ARIZONA—Continued

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED FARMWORKERS, BY MAJOR CROP ACTIVITY AND TYPE OF WORKER, 1964–65

Date	Lettuce cultivation		Lettuce harvest		Onion ph & h		Melon ph & h	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964								
January	700	800	1,300	1,400	1,200	0	0	0
February	900	500	700	1,200	1,400	0	300	(1)
March	900	600	900	1,400	1,900	0	200	500
April	500	300	1,400	4,400	1,500	(1)	800	1,200
May	100	100	1,000	2,200	1,400	200	800	1,100
June	0	0	100	400	1,600	300	900	3,100
July	100	0	(1)	(1)	0	0	400	700
August	100	200	0	0	100	0	200	0
September	900	1,300	0	0	100	0	0	0
October	1,700	1,900	400	800	500	0	(1)	(1)
November	1,000	1,200	1,700	3,800	800	0	(1)	(1)
December	400	1,200	2,900	2,800	1,500	(1)	0	0
1965								
January	1,400	0	1,900	0	1,300	0	0	0
February	1,500	0	1,800	0	1,300	0	0	0
March	1,000	0	2,300	0	1,700	0	400	0
April	400	0	4,200	0	1,200	0	800	0
May	(1)	0	1,200	0	1,900	0	1,400	0
June	0	0	600	0	1,200	0	4,200	0
July	0	0	0	0	200	0	1,000	0
August	200	0	0	0	100	0	100	0
September	2,300	0	0	0	300	0	0	0

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED FARMWORKERS, BY MAJOR CROP ACTIVITY AND TYPE OF WORKER, 1964–65

Date	Citrus harvest		Cotton cultivation		Irrigation	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964						
January	600	400	0	0	1,700	300
February	600	(1)	0	0	2,100	300
March	700	100	0	0	2,500	200
April	700	100	300	(1)	2,500	500
May	500	100	3,100	300	2,600	500
June	200	100	4,200	300	2,900	300
July	100	0	4,500	100	3,200	200
August	0	0	3,700	100	3,100	200
September	100	400	1,000	100	2,600	400
October	200	1,000	(1)	0	1,800	500
November	800	1,400	0	0	2,100	400
December	1,100	700	0	0	2,200	400
1965						
January	1,000	0	0	0	2,400	0
February	800	0	0	0	2,600	0
March	1,000	0	0	0	2,900	0
April	1,400	0	0	0	2,800	0
May	1,400	0	2,700	0	3,200	0
June	1,400	0	2,700	0	3,300	0
July	500	0	2,900	0	3,600	0
August	200	0	2,600	0	3,100	0
September	300	0	700	0	3,100	0

[1] Less than 50 workers.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security.

ARKANSAS—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
May	13,200	12,800	8,200	2,700	2,000	400
June	41,700	37,800	37,000	300	500	3,900
July	34,400	30,700	30,100	300	300	3,700
August	9,000	8,800	8,700	100	100	100
September	31,700	31,400	31,000	200	200	300
October	42,000	40,600	39,900	100	500	1,400
November	24,700	24,000	23,600	0	400	700
1965						
May	10,800	10,800	7,200	1,900	1,700	0
June	37,600	37,600	37,100	300	300	0
July	34,800	34,800	34,100	400	300	0
August	8,200	8,200	8,100	100	(1)	0
September	18,500	18,500	18,500	0	0	0

[1] Less than 50.

CALIFORNIA—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
January	98,000	87,600	69,100	13,600	4,900	10,300
February	85,200	74,500	59,300	11,000	4,200	10,600
March	76,500	65,200	53,000	8,100	4,200	11,200
April	97,100	78,000	61,400	10,600	6,000	19,000
May	150,200	120,400	93,500	17,900	9,000	29,800
June	165,600	127,800	94,100	21,000	12,700	37,800
July	156,600	122,600	87,800	23,900	10,900	33,900
August	161,300	124,600	86,700	25,400	12,500	36,700
September	225,200	161,200	110,000	33,600	17,700	63,900
October	175,900	124,400	93,000	20,900	10,400	51,600
November	89,000	70,000	55,700	8,500	5,800	19,000
December	93,400	80,700	64,800	11,000	4,800	12,700
1965						
January	90,200	89,300	70,100	13,900	5,300	900
February	83,000	83,000	63,800	13,700	5,500	0
March	73,800	73,200	55,800	12,000	5,400	600
April	84,800	84,600	63,000	14,700	7,000	100
May	140,200	139,400	100,200	25,500	13,600	800
June	166,200	162,800	114,700	30,400	17,800	3,400
July	142,000	141,300	96,400	26,900	18,000	700
August	146,100	145,500	100,000	29,200	16,300	600
September	178,000	166,600	113,100	34,600	18,900	11,400

CALIFORNIA—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED FARMWORKERS, BY MAJOR CROP ACTIVITY AND TYPE OF WORKER, 1964–65

Date	Tomato ph and h		Asparagus ph and h		Strawberry ph and h		Melon ph and h	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964								
January	400	200	0	0	300	0	0	0
February	0	0	0	0	200	0	200	200
March	0	0	1,800	0	400	600	300	400
April	1,000	0	4,500	3,500	2,000	2,800	800	0
May	2,600	1,000	4,300	3,700	2,900	8,500	2,400	100
June	1,800	1,200	1,400	4,200	2,100	10,400	3,200	200
July	6,600	3,200	0	0	2,000	6,200	1,100	3,200
August	5,800	11,200	0	0	1,200	4,500	1,200	2,800
September	6,400	38,000	0	0	800	3,600	500	1,600
October	4,600	26,600	0	0	400	2,200	0	0
November	1,600	1,600	0	0	500	0	0	0
December	1,000	1,000	0	0	100	0	0	0
1965								
January	800	0	0	0	100	0	0	0
February	400	0	500	0	400	0	0	0
March	400	0	2,400	0	100	0	700	0
April	0	0	3,400	0	3,000	0	0	0
May	2,000	100	3,700	400	5,400	300	1,800	0
June	3,200	0	3,800	1,000	5,500	2,200	2,800	0
July	8,000	0	0	0	5,900	200	4,400	0
August	9,600	400	0	0	3,300	0	4,400	0
September	18,700	10,800	0	0	1,800	400	1,400	0

Date	Grape ph and h		Lemon h		Orange h		Lettuce		Sugarbeets	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964										
January	16,700	200	600	2,800	4,200	400	1,400	2,000	300	700
February	11,000	0	1,000	3,400	3,600	1,000	1,200	1,800	800	600
March	1,800	0	1,000	3,800	3,300	1,200	2,200	1,500	3,300	400
April	100	0	1,000	4,600	2,600	1,200	2,000	2,000	6,300	800
May	5,400	200	800	4,500	3,800	1,200	1,800	3,300	4,500	1,400
June	7,300	400	600	3,600	600	2,200	1,700	4,200	1,600	2,000
July	1,300	900	400	2,000	800	3,000	1,800	3,700	2,100	2,500
August	12,500	0	200	900	600	3,000	1,600	3,500	1,400	900
September	51,200	1,200	200	1,000	600	2,700	800	4,600	800	0
October	32,600	2,500	200	1,100	200	1,400	1,400	6,400	1,200	2,100
November	3,400	100	200	900	0	0	700	3,900	2,400	2,600
December	6,200	0	400	2,000	7,200	100	1,000	2,200	1,200	1,000
1965										
January	18,100	0	1,500	0	3,700	0	2,400	100	0	0
February	14,800	0	3,600	0	5,500	0	2,000	0	1,300	0
March	3,200	0	4,100	600	5,400	0	2,800	0	3,200	0
April	600	0	4,000	0	3,700	0	2,400	0	5,400	0
May	4,800	0	3,600	0	4,000	0	4,600	0	5,200	0
June	9,600	0	3,800	0	5,300	0	4,500	200	2,500	0
July	3,600	0	3,600	0	2,800	0	3,900	0	3,000	0
August	12,400	0	2,500	0	3,000	0	3,700	0	1,200	0
September	55,200	0	1,200	0	2,700	0	3,000	0	600	0

Source: In-season farm labor reports as of midmonth.

TABLE IV.—*Employment of seasonal hired workers, 1964 and 1965*—Continued

COLORADO—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
May	8,700	6,200	3,300	500	2,400	2,500
June	15,900	9,900	4,800	700	4,400	6,000
July	14,100	11,400	6,600	800	4,100	2,600
August	13,900	10,400	6,200	1,000	3,200	3,500
September	13,200	10,400	5,400	1,400	3,600	2,900
October	9,300	8,400	4,900	1,100	2,400	800
November	1,200	1,200	1,000	100	100	(1)
1965						
May	8,000	8,000	3,400	300	4,200	0
June	14,100	14,100	5,000	600	8,400	0
July	12,800	12,800	6,100	900	5,800	0
August	12,300	12,300	5,600	1,200	5,400	0
September	12,900	12,900	5,800	1,400	5,800	0

[1] Less than 50.

CONNECTICUT—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
January	5,200	4,600	4,500	0	100	600
February	4,900	4,300	4,200	0	100	600
March	4,800	4,200	4,200	0	100	600
April	5,000	4,300	4,000	0	300	700
May	4,700	3,400	2,700	0	700	1,300
June	5,400	4,000	3,100	0	900	1,400
July	13,700	12,300	8,800	0	3,400	1,400
August	16,900	15,500	12,100	(1)	3,400	1,400
September	6,300	4,900	3,900	0	1,000	1,400
October	7,200	6,000	5,500	0	600	1,200
November	5,700	5,000	4,700	0	300	700
December	6,100	5,500	5,400	0	100	600
1965						
January	6,000	5,400	5,400	0	100	600
February	5,600	5,000	4,900	0	100	600
March	5,400	4,900	4,800	0	100	600
April	5,800	5,200	4,400	0	800	600
May	4,800	4,300	3,000	0	1,400	500
June	5,200	4,800	3,400	0	1,400	400
July	14,500	14,100	9,600	(1)	4,500	400
August	17,000	16,600	12,300	100	4,200	400
September	6,600	6,200	4,600	0	1,600	400

[1] Less than 50.

FLORIDA—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
January	66,500	54,200	40,000	5,000	9,100	12,300
February	69,300	58,100	43,000	5,500	9,600	11,200
March	70,200	59,700	44,600	6,000	9,200	10,400
April	66,600	57,900	48,200	5,000	4,600	8,800
May	61,000	54,200	47,100	3,300	3,800	6,800
June	38,800	36,100	33,900	1,600	700	2,600
July	36,800	36,000	35,800	100	100	800
August	19,900	19,200	18,800	100	400	600
September	23,100	22,200	20,700	600	900	900
October	33,300	31,600	28,000	1,800	1,900	1,600
November	57,900	47,600	39,400	3,000	5,200	10,300
December	73,800	60,500	45,600	5,700	9,200	13,300
1965						
January	83,600	69,500	51,700	6,400	11,400	14,100
February	84,400	70,700	53,800	5,100	11,800	13,700
March	76,000	66,900	51,900	3,900	11,100	9,100
April	78,000	70,200	56,500	4,800	8,900	7,800
May	83,100	77,900	65,500	7,500	5,000	5,200
June	48,500	48,200	46,400	1,300	500	300
July	23,900	23,900	23,400	400	100	0
August	20,300	20,300	19,700	400	200	0
September	23,100	22,500	21,900	400	300	600

FLORIDA—SEASONAL HIRED FARMWORKERS, BY MAJOR CROP ACTIVITIES AND TYPE OF WORKER, 1964–65

Date	Tomato ph and h		Celery ph and h		Strawberry ph and h		Citrus ph	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964								
January	10,900	600	1,800	600	1,000	300	7,700	0
February	11,700	700	2,400	600	1,500	300	8,000	0
March	13,300	1,000	2,500	600	2,100	1,300	9,900	0
April	8,000	900	3,000	600	1,700	1,300	9,500	0
May	8,200	400	2,700	600	400	(1)	8,300	0
June	2,600	0	1,300	100	0	0	9,500	0
July	400	0	500	0	0	0	10,700	0
August	700	0	700	0	0	0	10,300	0
September	1,400	0	900	0	200	0	9,600	0
October	3,100	0	1,100	0	500	0	9,300	0
November	5,900	0	1,300	300	900	0	8,700	0
December	9,100	100	1,800	500	1,800	100	8,600	0
1965								
January	10,400	200	2,300	500	2,000	400	7,800	0
February	9,400	200	2,500	500	2,400	400	7,600	0
March	8,500	200	2,200	500	3,300	700	8,900	0
April	10,100	0	2,300	500	1,000	1,000	9,300	0
May	8,200	0	2,600	500	400	0	9,500	0
June	1,500	0	2,200	0	(1)	0	10,800	0
July	300	0	500	0	(1)	0	11,200	0
August	600	0	600	0	(1)	0	10,600	0
September	1,400	0	1,100	0	(1)	0	9,800	0

Date	Citrus h		Sugarcane ph		Sugarcane h	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964						
January	10,200	2,800	1,100	300	800	7,400
February	9,600	2,600	1,900	100	800	6,600
March	5,200	1,500	2,200	800	1,300	5,000
April	7,800	2,000	2,900	2,800	0	700
May	7,000	2,900	1,900	2,200	0	0
June	3,500	600	2,400	1,200	0	0
July	100	0	2,200	700	0	0
August	(1)	0	2,600	500	0	0
September	0	0	2,200	800	0	0
October	2,800	0	2,500	1,500	0	0
November	8,000	1,400	1,600	100	1,500	8,300
December	10,800	2,800	700	(1)	2,000	9,500
1965						
January	13,200	3,500	400	(1)	1,200	9,400
February	14,400	3,500	700	0	2,600	9,100
March	11,600	0	600	0	3,000	7,800
April	11,800	3,200	1,300	3,100	0	0
May	10,000	3,500	2,900	1,300	0	0
June	2,400	0	3,400	300	0	0
July	200	0	3,100	0	0	0
August	0	0	2,900	0	0	0
September	0	0	1,800	600	0	0

[1] Less than 50 workers.

IDAHO—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
April	3,900	3,900	2,800	100	1,000	0
May	7,200	7,200	4,300	200	2,700	0
June	15,300	15,300	5,900	400	9,000	0
July	15,000	15,000	6,900	700	7,400	0
August	9,800	9,800	5,500	400	4,000	0
September	9,100	9,100	4,600	600	3,900	0
October	17,500	17,500	10,500	1,500	5,400	0
November	1,500	1,500	1,300	100	100	0
1965						
April	4,900	4,900	3,500	200	1,200	0
May	9,400	9,400	5,100	300	5,900	0
June	15,000	15,000	6,200	600	8,200	0
July	11,200	11,200	6,600	500	4,100	0
August	10,600	10,600	6,400	600	3,700	0
September	9,800	9,800	5,000	600	4,100	0

TABLE IV.—*Employment of seasonal hired workers, 1964 and 1965*—Continued

ILLINOIS—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
May	5,200	5,200	2,000	100	3,000	0
June	7,500	7,500	3,000	200	4,400	0
July	6,100	6,100	3,600	100	2,400	0
August	7,200	7,200	2,600	100	4,600	0
September	7,800	7,800	2,400	100	5,300	0
October	1,800	1,800	1,100	0	700	0
1965						
May	4,300	4,300	1,200	0	3,100	0
June	7,600	7,600	2,500	(1)	5,000	0
July	5,400	5,400	2,500	300	2,600	0
August	7,500	7,500	2,100	200	5,300	0
September	7,700	7,700	2,200	(1)	5,500	0

[1] Less than 50.

INDIANA—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
April	500	500	300	0	200	0
May	1,400	1,400	600	0	800	0
June	2,500	2,500	1,000	0	1,600	0
July	4,000	3,900	2,400	0	1,500	100
August	4,900	4,700	1,300	0	3,300	300
September	10,100	10,100	1,600	0	8,500	(1)
October	1,700	1,700	1,100	0	600	(1)
1965						
April	400	400	200	0	200	0
May	2,000	2,000	1,100	0	900	0
June	2,900	2,900	900	0	1,900	0
July	5,100	5,100	2,900	0	2,200	0
August	7,300	7,300	1,600	0	5,700	0
September	9,900	9,900	1,600	0	8,300	0

[1] Less than 50.

KANSAS—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
May	6,000	5,900	4,500	800	600	100
June	17,600	17,300	10,600	1,900	4,800	300
July	26,500	26,400	17,900	3,400	5,100	100
August	22,700	22,700	15,200	3,200	4,300	0
September	17,000	17,000	13,200	1,800	2,000	0
October	10,900	10,900	8,800	1,300	800	0
November	4,400	4,400	3,600	500	400	0
1965						
May	8,100	8,100	6,100	1,000	1,000	0
June	16,500	16,500	11,100	1,900	3,500	0
July	29,500	29,500	19,400	4,300	5,800	0
August	22,300	22,300	15,600	3,000	3,800	0
September	13,100	13,100	10,200	1,400	1,500	0

LOUISIANA—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
January	2,900	2,900	2,400	300	300	0
February	1,400	1,400	1,400	0	0	0
March	1,400	1,400	1,400	0	0	0
April	9,500	9,500	5,400	1,600	2,500	0
May	11,400	11,400	9,900	900	700	0
June	16,900	16,900	16,900	0	0	0
July	6,400	6,400	6,400	0	0	0
August	3,600	3,600	3,600	0	0	0
September	17,600	17,600	17,300	200	200	0
October	18,400	18,400	16,500	1,300	600	100
November	16,600	16,400	13,400	2,100	900	300
December	11,400	11,100	8,000	2,200	1,000	300

LOUISIANA—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965—Continued

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1965						
January	3,200	3,000	2,800	200	(1)	100
February	1,600	1,600	1,600	0	0	0
March	1,700	1,700	1,700	0	0	0
April	9,000	9,000	5,400	1,600	2,000	0
May	8,300	8,300	6,700	1,600	100	0
June	13,500	13,500	13,509	0	100	0
July	9,300	9,300	9,300	0	0	0
August	4,700	4,700	4,700	0	0	0
September	12,200	12,200	11,800	200	100	0

[1] Less than 50.

MAINE—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
May	6,900	6,400	6,400	0	(1)	500
June	7,000	6,600	6,500	0	(1)	500
July	8,700	8,400	8,400	0	(1)	300
August	10,100	9,800	9,800	0	(1)	300
September	13,700	9,100	9,100	0	(1)	4,600
October	5,300	3,300	3,300	0	(1)	2,000
1965						
May	5,000	5,000	5,000	(1)	(1)	0
June	3,700	3,700	3,700	0	(1)	0
July	5,400	5,400	5,400	0	(1)	0
August	5,900	5,900	5,900	(1)	(1)	0
September	19,000	16,300	16,200	0	(1)	2,700

[1] Less than 50.

MASSACHUSETTS—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
January	100	0	0	0	0	100
February	100	0	0	0	0	100
March	100	0	0	0	0	100
April	400	200	200	0	(1)	100
May	5,600	5,200	4,600	0	600	300
June	7,300	6,900	5,900	0	900	400
July	14,000	13,500	11,800	0	1,700	500
August	14,600	14,200	12,300	(1)	1,900	500
September	10,500	9,500	8,500	(1)	1,100	900
October	9,700	9,000	8,300	0	800	700
November	3,700	3,500	3,100	100	200	300
December	1,200	1,100	1,100	0	0	100
1965						
January	100	(1)	(1)	0	0	100
February	100	(1)	(1)	0	0	100
March	100	(1)	(1)	0	0	100
April	1,300	1,100	900	0	200	200
May	5,700	5,600	4,700	0	900	100
June	7,400	7,300	5,900	0	1,300	100
July	13,800	13,700	11,600	0	2,100	100
August	15,100	15,000	12,700	(1)	2,300	100
September	11,900	11,600	10,000	100	1,500	300

[1] Less than 50.

MICHIGAN—SEASONAL HIRED WORKER EMPLOYMENT IN PICKLE HARVEST, JULY TO SEPTEMBER 1964–65

	Domestic	Foreign
1964		
July 15	900	100
July 31	2,600	9,300
Aug. 15	3,400	12,800
Aug. 31	2,600	11,300
Sept. 15	500	2,000
1965		
July 15	900	0
July 31	8,300	0
Aug. 15	10,800	0
Aug. 31	11,600	0
Sept. 15	2,600	0

TABLE IV.—*Employment of seasonal hired workers, 1964 and 1965*—Continued

MICHIGAN—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
April	5,800	5,800	5,100	100	600	0
May	16,000	16,000	11,700	400	3,900	0
June	43,700	43,700	14,500	1,700	27,600	0
July	74,400	74,300	23,000	5,300	46,000	100
August	63,100	50,200	25,200	2,700	22,300	12,800
September	35,300	32,900	17,400	1,800	13,700	2,400
October	25,500	25,100	14,500	1,200	9,400	300
November	6,600	6,600	5,600	200	800	(1)
December	400	400	400	0	0	(1)
1965						
April	3,500	3,500	2,800	100	500	0
May	13,700	13,700	10,000	300	3,500	0
June	44,400	44,400	13,900	1,200	29,200	0
July	49,500	49,500	20,400	2,900	26,200	0
August	70,700	70,700	28,200	7,400	35,100	0
September	35,300	35,300	17,600	1,200	16,500	0

[1] Less than 50.

MISSOURI—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
May	6,200	6,200	6,000	0	200	0
June	15,700	15,700	14,400	300	1,000	0
July	8,100	8,100	8,100	0	0	0
August	200	200	200	0	0	0
September	16,300	16,300	15,700	200	500	0
October	19,300	19,300	18,300	300	800	0
November	5,100	5,100	5,000	0	200	0
December	500	500	500	0	0	0
1965						
January	200	200	200	0	0	0
June	16,800	16,800	15,300	800	600	0
July	13,300	13,300	12,800	200	300	0
August	1,000	1,000	800	0	200	0
September	8,900	8,900	8,600	100	100	0

MONTANA—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
January	1,300	1,300	1,000	200	100	0
February	1,400	1,400	1,100	200	100	0
March	2,100	2,100	1,500	300	300	0
April	3,800	3,800	2,300	800	700	0
May	5,600	5,600	2,800	900	1,900	0
June	10,000	8,300	2,700	1,200	4,400	1,700
July	10,000	9,800	4,100	1,700	4,000	200
August	9,000	9,000	4,000	2,000	3,000	0
September	6,300	6,300	3,200	1,700	1,400	0
October	5,500	5,500	3,100	1,500	900	0
November	2,400	2,400	1,600	400	300	0
December	2,000	2,000	1,400	300	300	0
1965						
January	1,900	1,900	1,300	300	200	0
February	1,600	1,600	1,300	200	100	0
March	2,200	2,200	1,700	300	200	0
April	3,400	3,400	2,400	600	400	0
May	5,000	5,000	3,000	800	1,200	0
June	9,400	9,400	3,300	1,300	4,900	0
July	9,900	9,900	4,200	2,100	3,500	0
August	9,400	9,400	4,500	2,200	2,700	0
September	7,100	7,100	3,400	2,000	1,800	0

NEBRASKA—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
May	1,100	1,000	300	0	700	100
June	5,600	4,200	2,200	100	1,900	1,300
July	6,600	6,400	4,300	300	1,800	200
August	2,900	2,900	2,400	200	300	0
September	1,900	1,900	1,700	(1)	100	0
October	2,800	2,800	2,500	(1)	200	0
1965						
June	6,300	6,300	2,400	(1)	3,800	0
July	5,300	5,300	3,600	200	1,500	0
August	4,000	4,000	3,400	200	400	0
September	2,000	2,000	1,800	100	100	0

[1] Less than 50.

NEW HAMPSHIRE—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
June	1,000	1,000	1,000	0	(1)	0
July	1,200	1,200	1,200	0	100	0
August	1,600	1,600	1,500	0	100	0
September	2,400	2,200	2,100	0	200	100
October	800	800	700	0	(1)	100
1965						
June	1,000	1,000	900	0	(1)	0
July	1,200	1,200	1,100	0	100	0
August	1,400	1,400	1,400	0	100	0
September	1,800	1,700	1,700	0	(1)	100

[1] Less than 50.

NEW JERSEY—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
April	2,000	2,000	1,200	0	800	0
May	10,900	10,900	3,400	0	7,500	0
June	18,100	18,100	6,500	100	11,500	0
July	24,000	24,000	13,400	100	10,600	0
August	24,900	24,900	11,300	100	13,500	0
September	16,900	16,900	8,100	100	8,700	(1)
October	11,100	10,300	5,800	(1)	4,500	800
November	2,200	2,000	1,100	(1)	800	200
1965						
April	1,900	1,900	1,000	0	900	0
May	10,800	10,800	3,500	0	7,300	0
June	17,400	17,400	5,700	100	11,600	0
July	23,600	23,600	12,500	100	11,000	0
August	24,600	24,600	12,100	100	12,400	0
September	16,100	16,100	7,200	100	8,800	0

[1] Less than 50.

TABLE IV.—*Employment of seasonal hired workers, 1964 and 1965*—Continued

NEW MEXICO—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
January	700	700	600	(1)	(1)	(1)
February	700	700	700	(1)	(1)	(1)
March	900	900	800	(1)	100	(1)
April	1,000	900	800	(1)	(1)	100
May	1,200	1,000	900	(1)	(1)	200
June	3,100	2,700	1,900	100	700	400
July	2,800	2,200	1,900	100	200	600
August	3,000	2,400	1,900	100	500	600
September	2,300	1,500	1,300	100	100	800
October	3,800	2,500	1,800	300	400	1,300
November	3,100	2,100	1,700	100	300	1,000
December	1,400	1,100	1,000	(1)	100	300
1965						
January	900	900	800	(1)	(1)	0
June	1,700	1,700	1,100	(1)	600	0
July	1,600	1,600	1,300	(1)	200	0
August	2,600	2,600	2,100	200	300	0
September	3,200	3,200	1,800	1,200	200	0

[1] Less than 50.

NEW YORK—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
May	7,100	7,100	4,600	200	2,200	0
June	12,700	12,700	7,200	600	4,900	0
July	24,900	24,900	12,300	1,000	11,600	0
August	25,600	25,600	10,500	1,200	13,900	0
September	31,700	31,400	9,800	1,200	20,400	400
October	31,200	30,800	10,500	800	19,500	400
November	400	200	(1)	(1)	200	200
1965						
May	7,100	7,100	4,800	300	1,900	0
June	12,100	12,100	6,900	400	4,800	0
July	23,000	23,000	12,400	900	9,700	0
August	25,200	25,200	11,400	1,000	12,800	0
September	30,500	30,300	10,800	1,200	18,200	200

[1] Less than 50.

NORTH CAROLINA—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
January	12,700	12,700	12,600	100	100	0
February	19,600	19,600	19,400	100	100	0
March	23,800	23,800	23,600	100	100	0
April	33,800	33,800	33,200	400	200	0
May	85,500	85,500	83,600	1,300	600	0
June	113,300	113,300	106,900	1,500	4,900	0
July	229,900	229,900	217,700	4,900	7,300	0
August	249,800	249,800	236,300	7,000	6,500	0
September	118,900	118,900	110,800	3,800	4,300	0
October	158,300	158,300	153,500	2,100	2,600	0
November	86,200	86,200	84,100	1,000	1,100	0
December	24,900	24,900	24,800	100	100	0
1965						
January	17,700	17,700	17,700	0	0	0
February	22,000	22,000	21,900	100	100	0
March	25,800	25,800	25,600	100	100	0
April	42,000	42,000	41,700	200	200	0
May	82,100	82,100	81,000	400	700	0
June	117,700	117,700	112,800	1,000	3,900	0
July	192,300	192,300	181,500	4,100	6,700	0
August	260,900	260,900	248,000	6,900	6,000	0
September	141,600	141,600	136,800	1,700	3,200	0

OHIO—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
May	16,500	16,500	14,700	200	1,700	0
June	25,100	25,100	20,700	300	4,200	0
July	23,300	23,300	18,100	400	4,800	0
August	25,700	25,700	15,700	300	9,800	0
September	28,500	28,500	16,400	400	11,800	0
October	17,400	17,400	15,100	300	2,000	0
1965						
May	17,200	17,200	15,100	400	1,800	0
June	24,400	24,400	20,100	400	4,000	0
July	24,600	24,600	19,100	400	5,000	0
August	32,500	32,500	17,000	500	15,000	0
September	33,500	33,500	17,300	600	15,600	0

OREGON—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
March	700	700	500	0	200	0
April	3,400	3,400	2,700	100	700	0
May	7,700	7,700	4,100	200	3,400	0
June	31,600	31,600	25,000	800	5,800	0
July	57,600	57,600	42,400	2,100	13,100	0
August	61,200	61,200	45,600	2,600	13,000	0
September	20,900	20,700	13,400	1,000	6,300	200
October	9,900	9,900	6,800	800	2,300	0
November	2,600	2,600	2,500	100	100	0
1965						
March	2,400	2,400	1,600	400	400	0
April	4,200	4,200	3,400	200	600	0
May	8,700	8,700	5,000	300	3,400	0
June	59,200	59,200	46,500	2,300	10,500	0
July	33,200	33,200	23,300	2,400	7,500	0
August	63,400	63,400	48,000	2,000	13,400	0
September	17,600	17,600	10,100	1,100	6,400	0

PENNSYLVANIA—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
May	8,100	8,100	7,600	300	100	0
June	11,600	11,600	10,500	500	700	0
July	19,200	19,200	16,600	1,000	1,700	0
August	16,000	16,000	11,100	600	4,400	0
September	20,400	20,400	14,600	1,000	4,800	0
October	17,300	17,300	12,700	900	3,700	0
November	5,800	5,800	5,300	200	300	0
1965						
May	9,100	9,100	8,600	200	300	0
June	12,400	12,400	11,600	300	500	0
July	18,600	18,600	16,400	800	1,400	0
August	16,500	16,500	12,000	900	3,600	0
September	20,300	20,300	14,100	1,000	5,200	0

RHODE ISLAND—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
September	400	300	300	0	0	100
October	200	100	100	0	0	(1)
November	100	100	100	0	0	(1)
1965						
September	400	300	300	0	0	(1)

[1] Less than 50.

TABLE IV.—*Employment of seasonal hired workers, 1964 and 1965*—Continued

TEXAS—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
January	70,100	67,000	66,900	100	100	3,000
February	71,500	69,900	69,800	0	100	1,600
March	85,900	84,300	84,100	200	100	1,500
April	105,800	103,000	102,500	500	(1)	2,800
May	129,400	124,200	121,700	2,300	200	5,200
June	156,400	149,400	140,500	7,900	1,000	7,000
July	156,800	149,000	127,500	20,000	1,400	7,900
August	144,800	134,400	117,600	15,800	1,100	10,400
September	113,800	103,800	97,900	5,600	300	10,100
October	129,000	116,800	101,300	14,200	1,200	12,200
November	131,100	117,700	101,200	15,100	1,300	13,500
December	99,500	91,900	86,200	5,300	400	7,500
1965						
January	69,300	69,300	68,700	400	200	0
February	72,300	72,300	72,200	100	0	0
March	85,700	85,700	85,500	200	200	0
April	102,200	102,200	101,400	700	100	0
May	125,100	125,100	122,400	2,500	300	0
June	153,200	153,200	142,800	9,600	800	0
July	146,200	146,200	121,700	23,000	1,600	0
August	143,800	143,800	121,100	21,600	1,200	0
September	108,300	108,300	101,100	6,600	700	0

[1] Less than 50.

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED FARMWORKERS, BY MAJOR CROP ACTIVITY AND TYPE OF WORKER, 1964-65

Date	Cucumber		Cotton ph		Cotton h	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964						
January	200	0	10,600	500	3,000	1,200
February	200	0	14,400	600	(1)	(1)
March	400	0	19,800	700	0	0
April	600	0	30,300	1,800	0	0
May	900	300	42,600	2,200	0	0
June	700	100	54,300	2,900	0	0
July	800	600	52,400	4,600	11,000	0
August	1,300	2,700	28,000	5,000	37,800	0
September	700	2,100	8,500	3,200	31,000	1,800
October	500	100	3,400	200	42,500	8,500
November	600	(1)	3,200	0	42,300	10,700
December	200	0	5,700	0	27,700	6,300
1965						
January	200	0	10,400	0	2,000	0
February	200	0	14,500	0	(1)	0
March	400	0	20,400	0	0	0
April	600	0	30,600	0	0	0
May	1,300	0	43,800	0	0	0
June	1,500	0	54,800	0	0	0
July	1,100	0	53,600	0	6,800	0
August	3,200	0	32,000	0	36,300	0
September	2,000	0	13,200	0	25,500	0

[1] Less than 50 workers.

UTAH—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
May	1,900	1,900	1,700	(1)	100	(1)
June	6,200	6,000	3,700	200	2,000	200
July	10,400	9,900	7,700	100	2,100	500
August	7,200	6,900	5,100	100	1,700	300
September	6,900	6,400	4,700	100	1,700	400
October	6,700	6,400	5,200	100	1,200	200
November	700	700	600	(1)	(1)	0
December	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
1965						
May	2,500	2,500	1,300	(1)	1,200	0
June	4,200	4,200	2,800	100	1,200	0
July	5,100	5,100	3,300	300	1,400	0
August	7,000	7,000	5,300	200	1,600	0
September	4,800	4,800	3,300	200	1,300	0

[1] Less than 50.

VERMONT—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
June	500	500	500		(1)	0
July	700	700	600	0	100	0
August	500	500	500	0	100	0
September	1,500	1,400	1,300	0	200	100
October	1,100	1,100	1,000	0	200	0
1965						
June	500	500	400		(1)	0
July	600	600	600	0	(1)	0
August	500	500	500	0	(1)	0
September	1,200	1,200	1,100	0	100	0

[1] Less than 50.

WISCONSIN—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
May	1,400	1,400	1,000	0	500	0
June	2,500	2,500	1,400	0	1,100	0
July	10,500	10,400	4,900	300	5,300	100
August	10,500	9,800	2,700	100	7,000	700
September	5,600	5,200	3,300	(1)	1,800	400
October	3,300	3,300	2,100	100	1,100	(1)
1965						
May	1,400	1,400	1,000	0	400	0
June	2,600	2,600	1,800	0	800	0
July	7,900	7,900	4,400	(1)	3,500	0
August	9,500	9,500	2,500	200	6,900	0
September	5,300	5,300	3,300	100	1,900	0

[1] Less than 50.

WASHINGTON—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
January	1,700	1,700	1,700	0	(1)	0
February	4,100	4,100	3,800	100	200	0
March	9,900	9,900	8,200	400	1,300	0
April	11,600	11,600	8,100	900	2,500	0
May	22,100	22,100	12,600	1,300	8,200	0
June	25,400	25,400	14,800	1,900	8,800	0
July	78,200	78,200	62,400	4,600	11,200	0
August	40,300	40,300	33,700	2,500	4,100	0
September	27,200	27,200	18,200	2,600	6,300	0
October	29,300	29,300	14,600	4,400	10,300	0
November	3,000	3,000	22,000	200	600	0
December	14,000	14,000	1,300	(1)	(1)	0
1965						
January	1,300	1,300	1,300	0	0	0
February	4,200	4,200	4,000	100	200	0
March	9,200	9,200	7,400	600	1,100	0
April	12,500	12,500	8,500	800	3,200	0
May	19,900	19,900	11,700	1,400	6,800	0
June	34,300	34,400	22,900	3,300	8,100	0
July	56,100	56,100	43,000	4,600	8,400	0
August	32,400	32,400	26,000	2,600	3,800	0
September	28,500	28,500	16,700	2,800	9,000	0

[1] Less than 50.

WYOMING—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
May	2,600	2,600	2,000	(1)	600	0
June	5,200	3,800	1,900	100	1,800	1,400
July	3,800	3,400	2,200	100	1,200	400
August	1,800	1,800	1,500	100	200	(1)
1965						
May	3,400	3,400	1,900	100	1,500	0
June	5,100	5,100	1,900	100	3,100	0
July	3,500	3,500	1,900	100	1,500	0
August	1,600	1,600	1.400	(1)	200	0

[1] Less than 50.

TABLE IV.—*Employment of seasonal hired workers, 1964 and 1965*—Continued

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED FARMWORKERS IN SUGARBEET CULTIVATION, SELECTED STATES, 1964-65

Date	Colorado		Montana		Nebraska	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964						
May	2,400	2,200	700	0	900	100
June	4,600	5,200	3,600	1,700	2,100	1,300
July	2,300	1,300	2,600	200	1,000	200
August	700	200	200	0	400	0
1965						
May	4,700	0	200	0	0	0
June	9,200	0	4,000	0	4,600	0
July	4,200	0	2,400	0	1,300	0
August	500	0	200	0	300	0

Date	Wyoming		Kansas		Utah	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964						
May	500	0	100	100	100	(1)
June	2,700	1,400	1,100	300	3,400	100
July	1,800	400	400	100	2,200	(1)
August	200	(1)	0	0	700	(1)
September	0	0	0	0	100	(1)
1965						
May	400	0	300	0	1,200	0
June	3,100	0	1,200	0	2,300	0
July	1,900	0	500	0	1,300	0
August	200	0	0	0	400	0

[1] Less than 50 workers.

Source: Inseason farm labor reports as of midmonth.

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS EMPLOYED IN APPLE HARVESTING, SELECTED STATES, 1964-65

Date	New York		Maine		Massachusetts		New Hampshire	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964								
Aug. 31	1,765	0	60	0	501	0	200	0
Sept. 15	5,872	350	245	81	1,643	408	1,097	103
Sept. 30	10,441	521	880	370	2,417	408	1,250	350
Oct. 15	9,375	356	262	187	1,262	314	454	46
Oct. 31	2,050	0	48	0	333	4	199	1
1965								
Aug. 31	1,575	0	73	0	0	0	200	0
Sept. 15	5,135	250	347	0	2,433	171	715	85

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS EMPLOYED IN APPLE HARVESTING, SELECTED STATES, 1964-65—Continued

Date	Rhode Island		Vermont		Virginia-West Virginia [1]	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964						
Aug. 31	0	0	10	0	92	0
Sept. 15	INA	19	1,159	81	1,594	672
Sept. 30	INA	19	1,124	76	1,824	1,178
Oct. 15	0	0	960	0	1,853	1,347
Oct. 31	0	0	120	0	1,799	1,283
1965						
Aug. 31	0	0	0	0	158	0
Sept. 15	INA	25	925	15	1,619	0

[1] Includes only Winchester, Va.-Martinsburg, W. Va., area.

NOTE.—60 percent of workers authorized used in New England minus New York.

Source: In-season farm labor reports.

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS IN TOBACCO ACTIVITIES IN CONNECTICUT AND MASSACHUSETTS, 1964-65

Date	Connecticut		Massachusetts	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964				
January	4,600	600	0	100
February	4,300	600	0	100
March	4,200	600	0	100
April	4,300	700	200	100
May	3,400	1,300	900	300
June	3,800	1,400	1,500	400
July	12,300	1,400	6,400	500
August	15,500	1,400	6,500	500
September	4,500	1,300	1,500	500
October	4,700	1,200	800	400
November	5,000	700	600	300
December	5,500	600	(1)	100
1965				
January	5,400	600	0	100
February	5,000	600	0	100
March	5,000	600	0	100
April	5,200	600	900	200
May	4,300	500	1,300	100
June	4,600	400	1,900	100
July	14,100	400	6,400	100
August	16,600	400	6,800	100
September	5,800	400	2,700	100

[1] Less than 50 workers.

TABLE V.—*Trends in employment of all seasonal hired workers, domestic workers, and foreign workers, January to June 1964 and 1965 United States*

Date	Employment (thousands)								
	Total seasonal			Domestic			Foreign		
	1964	1965	Change 64 to 65	1964	1965	Change 64 to 65	1964	1965	Change 64 to 65
Jan. 1	288.4	302.1	+13.7	255.4	285.8	+30.4	33.0	16.3	−16.7
Jan. 15	278.7	295.7	+17.0	249.3	279.8	+30.5	29.4	15.9	−13.6
Jan. 31	278.6	296.8	+18.2	250.8	282.1	+31.3	27.7	14.7	−13.0
Feb. 15	275.3	293.2	+17.9	248.8	278.8	+30.0	26.5	14.4	−12.1
Feb. 28	273.2	295.6	+22.4	248.0	281.8	+33.8	25.2	13.7	−11.5
Mar. 15	294.0	300.8	+6.8	267.3	290.4	+23.1	26.7	10.4	−16.3
Mar. 31	319.6	328.2	+8.6	289.5	319.8	+30.3	30.1	8.4	−21.7
Apr. 15	380.5	381.6	+1.1	342.5	372.9	+30.4	38.0	8.6	−29.3
Apr. 30	475.5	491.1	+15.5	434.0	484.8	+50.9	41.5	6.0	−35.5
May 15	748.0	733.1	−14.9	696.1	726.6	+30.3	51.9	6.7	−45.2
May 31	946.1	877.1	−69.0	879.1	871.3	−7.8	67.0	5.8	−61.2
June 15	1,068.6	1,084.7	+16.1	998.7	1,080.3	+81.6	69.9	4.4	−65.5
June 30	1,208.1	1,147.0	−61.1	1,142.9	1,144.9	+2.0	65.2	2.1	−63.1
July 15	1,290.9	1,149.3	−141.7	1,236.5	1,148.0	−88.5	54.4	1.3	−53.1
July 31	1,206.4	1,209.3	+2.9	1,147.6	1,208.0	+60.4	58.8	1.2	−57.6
Aug. 15	1,118.9	1,137.6	+18.7	1,050.2	1,136.4	+86.2	68.7	1.2	−67.5
Aug. 31	1,063.0	1,019.8	−43.2	977.8	1,018.7	+40.9	85.2	1.1	−84.1

NOTE.—Because of rounding, figures may not add to totals.

Source: In-Season Farm Labor Reports of the Bureau of Employment Security.

TABLE VI.—*Citrus production 1964–65, early-season [1] and end-of-season [2] estimates, United States, by State and crop*

[Million boxes]

State	Early-season estimate	End-of-season estimate	Yearly difference
ORANGES			
United States	113.2	121.5	+8.3
Arizona	2.1	2.4	+.3
California	28.5	32.0	+3.5
Florida	81.6	86.2	+4.6
Texas	1.0	.9	−.1
Louisiana	(³)	(³)	0
LEMONS			
United States	13.8	14.6	+.8
Arizona	1.3	1.1	−.2
California	12.5	13.5	+1.0
GRAPEFRUIT			
United States	40.6	40.7	+.1
Arizona	2.9	2.7	−.2
California	3.8	4.1	+.3
Florida	31.5	31.8	+.3
Texas	2.4	2.1	−.3

[1] Early season estimates refer to Dec. 1, 1964, when the first estimates were available for all varieties for the 1964–65 season.

[2] End-of-season estimates refer to July 1, 1965, and represent indicated production for the 1964–65 season.

[3] 10,000 boxes.

Sources: Crop Production—U.S. Crop Summary as of Dec. 1, 1965. July 1, 1965, Citrus Production Forecasts of SRS, USDA in Orlando, Fla.

TABLE VII.—*Wholesale prices selected fruits and vegetables for weeks June 28 through Sept. 27, 1965, and comparable weeks 1961–64*

	June 28	July 6	July 12	July 19	July 26	Aug. 2	Aug. 9	Aug. 16	Aug. 23	Aug. 30	Sept. 7	Sept. 13	Sept. 20	Sept. 27
Cantaloup (jumbo crate):														
1961	8.22	8.56	7.63	8.63	7.75	7.25	6.25	7.75	6.25	6.00	9.50	9.50	7.38	6.63
1962	5.63	5.56	5.42	5.25	6.38	6.25	7.13	6.00	6.75	6.00	6.13	6.50	6.06	5.75
1963	11.00	10.50	10.75	8.50	9.00	5.38	4.88	5.75	5.75	6.00	7.19	7.63	6.50	6.38
1964	9.40	8.58	8.19	8.75	7.63	6.00	5.75	5.63	5.75	7.50	7.63	8.25	6.63	5.00
1965	8.35	7.92	7.50	8.42	8.00	7.75	7.00	6.25	7.00	7.38	7.25	8.50	7.25	6.63
Carrots (48 1-pound bags):														
1961	4.75	5.13	5.00	4.87	4.50	4.25	3.69	3.28	4.13	3.54	3.67	4.13	3.71	3.83
1962	4.00	4.25	4.50	4.37	4.13	4.25	3.75	3.47	3.54	3.81	3.75	3.75	3.94	3.81
1963	4.25	4.00	4.06	4.00	4.13	3.75	3.55	3.33	3.42	3.36	3.28	3.31	3.41	3.48
1964	3.56	3.42	3.82	4.06	3.81	3.71	3.48	3.65	3.78	3.58	3.56	3.46	3.63	3.56
1965	5.10	5.21	5.25	5.41	5.44	3.65	3.69	3.60	3.68	3.39	3.02	3.33	3.15	3.25
Celery (crate):														
1961	3.96	3.42	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.38	4.50	4.25	4.13	4.25	4.29	4.63	3.84	3.63
1962	7.00	7.50	6.25	4.75	4.38	4.75	4.38	3.63	2.88	3.00	3.63	3.88	3.13	3.13
1963	4.13	5.19	5.00	3.75	3.38	2.63	2.75	3.63	3.38	3.56	3.87	3.88	4.13	4.13
1964	6.13	5.88	4.94	4.13	3.25	3.44	3.44	5.25	5.25	5.00	4.75	5.25	5.46	4.25
1965	5.16	4.83	5.25	5.13	4.00	3.83	4.17	4.29	4.50	4.25	4.13	5.25	4.31	3.94
Lettuce (24-head carton):														
1961	4.25	3.25	2.63	2.63	3.13	3.13	3.13	3.25	3.25	3.13	5.25	4.88	4.50	4.13
1962	3.13	3.50	3.38	3.38	3.25	3.38	2.38	2.88	3.25	3.88	5.75	4.63	4.25	4.88
1963	6.13	4.25	3.13	4.38	3.63	3.00	3.00	3.13	3.38	3.13	3.13	2.88	3.13	4.25
1964	3.50	3.38	4.38	3.75	3.63	3.63	3.25	4.13	4.50	4.13	4.75	4.00	4.38	3.38
1965	2.75	2.75	2.88	3.50	3.38	3.00	3.00	3.38	3.13	3.63	4.00	4.50	3.75	4.25
Tomatoes (40-pound carton):														
1961 [1]	(²)	4.80	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)	3.70	2.23	2.25	2.85	2.40	3.38	1.95	3.66
1962	6.72	3.61	2.55	2.05	1.83	2.40	3.20	1.74	2.72	1.89	2.12	2.12	2.59	2.45
1963	4.53	6.34	5.32	3.18	3.06	2.76	3.39	2.89	2.17	2.68	2.35	2.20	2.54	2.04
1964	4.73	6.49	4.03	2.89	4.43	3.88	4.15	2.72	1.99	2.53	(²)	3.43	3.51	2.18
1965	3.57	2.46	4.73	2.93	2.42	3.13	2.70	3.03	2.84	2.10	3.05	3.57	3.34	2.42
Strawberries (quarts):														
1961	.48	.65	.85	.75	.70	.65	.60	.65	.70	.75	.65	.63	.55	.63
1962	.60	.70	.75	.85	.90	.05	.65	.65	.65	.65	.58	.65	.70	.70
1963	.65	.90	.65	.80	.80	.75	.75	.75	.75	.75	.70	.75	.70	.75
1964	.78	.80	.75	.75	.75	.72	.75	.57	.62	.63	.90	.73	.64	.65
1965	.72	.85	.95	.85	.75	.80	.98	.75	.85	.85	.80	.70	.75	.85
Snapbeans (bushel hamper):														
1961	2.63	3.23	2.89	2.50	1.95	2.48	2.25	2.66	2.75	2.68	2.31	1.95	1.95	2.88
1962	3.13	2.71	2.63	3.63	2.94	3.38	3.00	2.46	2.85	2.63	3.40	2.35	2.41	2.23
1963	2.20	3.25	6.00	4.25	2.75	2.63	2.70	2.17	2.08	3.03	2.70	2.58	2.91	3.75
1964	4.62	3.25	3.08	3.00	2.75	2.25	2.29	4.56	3.16	3.06	2.70	2.75	3.33	3.25
1965	2.50	3.08	3.60	4.38	3.16	2.97	2.58	2.46	2.50	2.78	4.47	3.31	3.65	2.50
Oranges (California) (½-box carton):														
1961	3.32	4.36	4.28	4.68	4.58	5.06	4.77	5.02	4.29	4.10	4.18	4.18	4.23	4.26
1962	3.03	3.33	3.99	4.36	4.17	4.57	4.47	4.97	5.62	4.46	5.06	5.27	5.27	4.72
1963	4.00	4.44	3.66	4.30	3.99	3.77	3.55	3.37	3.48	4.12	4.41	4.43	4.03	4.63
1964	4.98	4.39	5.29	6.15	7.00	6.54	6.06	6.23	6.35	6.03	5.58	6.54	6.24	6.16
1965	3.18	2.83	2.82	2.91	3.19	3.98	5.46	3.07	4.60	3.38	3.66	3.98	3.50	3.21
Lemons (½-box carton):														
1961	3.31	3.18	3.17	2.93	3.44	3.20	3.49	3.54	3.60	3.30	3.97	4.38	3.88	2.97
1962	3.39	3.41	4.15	4.27	3.65	4.28	4.08	4.35	4.78	4.53	4.06	4.27	4.27	4.27
1963	4.67	5.11	3.83	3.36	3.27	4.14	4.22	3.49	3.22	3.00	2.77	3.05	3.46	4.40
1964	3.39	3.95	3.37	3.52	3.89	4.01	3.40	3.63	3.60	3.66	3.73	3.77	5.48	4.69
1965	4.24	4.09	4.34	3.67	4.24	3.85	3.74	3.59	4.36	4.28	4.24	3.44	2.94	3.01
Oranges (Florida) (bruce box):														
1961	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	3.33
1962	2.31	2.51	2.77	2.79	2.93	3.19	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	3.47
1963	4.93	4.43	4.15	5.51	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	3.29
1964	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)
1965	3.74	3.72	3.84	3.95	4.22	3.96	3.84	4.41	4.58	5.51	4.97	(²)	(²)	(²)
Onions (50-pound sack):														
1961	2.44	2.71	2.94	2.75	2.25	2.92	3.06	2.90	2.13	2.04	1.95	2.28	2.12	2.48
1962	2.22	2.22	2.19	2.20	2.40	2.68	2.33	2.18	1.66	1.61	1.69	1.87	1.69	1.70
1963	3.12	2.98	3.20	3.50	3.35	3.18	3.13	3.04	2.59	2.88	2.75	2.58	2.58	2.26
1964	2.04	2.00	2.16	2.11	2.03	1.96	2.19	2.38	2.53	2.29	2.06	2.13	2.16	2.08
1965	3.88	3.55	3.29	3.22	2.88	3.30	3.15	2.77	2.50	2.31	2.16	2.15	2.04	1.86
Cabbage (50 pounds):														
1961	1.63	1.58	1.63	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.02	1.50	1.00	1.20	1.08	1.13	1.25	1.13
1962	.88	.88	.88	.75	.92	.92	1.00	.88	1.17	1.13	1.25	.97	1.30	1.09
1963	1.38	1.33	1.38	.92	.92	1.04	.95	1.08	.88	1.08	1.10	1.22	1.00	1.17
1964	1.29	1.38	1.38	1.25	1.63	1.75	1.92	1.94	1.94	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.88	1.50
1965	.92	.86	1.00	1.13	.88	1.00	.83	.85	1.00	.85	1.19	1.19	1.00	1.16
Corn (crate):														
1961	4.75	4.75	3.08	2.13	2.13	(²)	1.88	(²)	(²)	(²)	1.00	1.13	1.07	1.07
1962	2.41	2.50	1.29	1.75	1.59	2.63	1.69	2.13	2.00	2.00	1.88	1.75	1.63	1.56
1963	3.94	4.08	3.42	2.17	1.75	1.50	1.38	1.75	1.25	1.75	1.44	1.21	1.38	1.50
1964	3.50	3.17	2.83	2.79	1.88	2.19	2.75	2.38	3.00	1.79	1.69	2.13	2.13	2.00
1965	3.94	3.13	2.31	1.88	2.38	1.88	2.21	1.75	1.46	1.68	2.31	2.63	1.63	1.75

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE VII.—*Wholesale prices selected fruits and vegetables for weeks June 28 through Sept. 27, 1965, and comparable weeks 1961–64*—Con.

	June 28	July 6	July 12	July 19	July 26	Aug. 2	Aug. 9	Aug. 16	Aug. 23	Aug. 30	Sept. 7	Sept. 13	Sept. 20	Sept. 27
Potatoes, western—New York (100 pounds):														
1964	7.50	6.25	6.50	7.25	7.00	8.12	7.25	7.10	6.21	5.83	5.25	5.50	5.75	5.68
1965	9.75	10.19	10.75	11.00	8.25	8.83	7.50	6.17	5.63	5.43	5.25	5.18	5.15	5.15
Potatoes, western—Chicago (100 pounds):														
1964	5.88	4.70	6.23	6.09	5.70	4.63	5.16	4.58	4.58	4.58	3.88	3.88	4.85	4.58
1965	8.55	9.25	9.13	7.25	5.50	5.44	3.83	3.55	3.25	3.50	4.00	2.65	4.25	3.75
Potatoes, midwestern—Chicago market (100 pounds):														
1964	(2)	(2)	5.30	4.88	3.72	3.35	3.25	2.53	2.53	3.25	3.33	3.54	3.09	3.45
1965	(3)	(2)	(2)	(3)	5.94	5.68	5.00	2.75	2.70	2.34	2.43	2.90	3.00	3.06
Potatoes, western—Los Angeles (100 pounds):														
1964	5.63	4.75	5.25	5.29	5.13	4.98	4.68	4.33	4.20	3.92	4.03	4.38	4.56	4.53
1965	7.88	8.71	7.88	7.38	6.00	5.03	4.13	4.13	3.40	3.28	3.94	3.71	3.68	3.53
Sweetpotatoes, Chicago (50 pounds):														
1964	--------	7.75	7.75	6.50	5.50	5.50	4.25	4.13	4.13	3.81	4.00	3.88	3.46	3.88
1965	--------	6.29	5.75	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.25	3.50	3.63	3.63	3.41	3.75	3.63	3.31
Potatoes, eastern—New York (100 pounds):														
1964	--------	5.28	5.64	5.39	4.58	4.18	4.05	4.21	3.94	4.20	4.05	4.05	3.77	3.55
1965	--------	8.29	7.81	5.98	3.67	3.78	3.39	2.75	2.53	3.00	2.50	2.90	2.70	2.20
Sweetpotatoes, New York (50 pounds):														
1964	--------	7.50	7.50	7.38	6.00	5.00	4.20	3.78	2.98	3.81	4.00	3.23	3.33	3.46
1965	--------	6.53	6.16	5.00	4.96	5.19	3.66	3.66	3.34	3.16	3.31	2.93	3.04	2.91
Peaches:														
1961	--------	(2)	2.75	2.54	2.75	2.50	3.00	(3)	2.45	2.80	2.05	2.08	(3)	(3)
1962	--------	(2)	(3)	(3)	(3)	3.75	2.95	(3)	(3)	(2)	3.38	(2)	(3)	(3)
1963	--------	2.32	2.79	2.97	3.10	3.40	3.54	3.55	3.36	3.32	3.19	3.27	(3)	(3)
1964	--------	(2)	4.13	3.98	4.00	3.23	3.07	2.91	2.72	2.54	3.04	2.83	(3)	(3)
1965	--------	2.06	2.25	2.69	2.56	2.81	3.12	2.64	2.75	3.15	3.80	3.59	(3)	(3)
Grapes:														
1961	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	5.57	4.89	3.76	3.48	4.14	4.59	(3)	(3)	(3)
1962	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	4.92	4.03	2.80	3.90	3.45	4.02	3.59	3.33	3.42
1963	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	7.20	6.47	5.87	3.91	3.77	3.74	4.38	4.23	3.77
1964	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	4.22	4.06	4.63	4.09	4.12	4.58	5.04	3.96	3.21
1965	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	4.36	4.49	3.59	3.61	3.71	3.75	3.79	3.05	3.07
Pears:														
1961	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	7.01	6.93	6.30	5.85	6.17	5.70	5.95	6.34	6.
1962	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	4.78	4.76	5.27	5.67	5.43	5.16	5.24	6.37	5.38
1963	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	7.33	7.93	8.25	5.89	6.56	7.12	7.13	6.56	7.25
1964	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	4.50	5.66	5.53	6.32	6.13	4.79	5.36	5.29	5.88
1965	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	8.94	8.12	8.89	9.22	7.10	7.86	8.13	7.72	7.35
														37

[1] 1961 prices represent a conversion from prices for 60-pound containers to 40-pound containers, the price base for 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965.

[2] Not available.

[3] Not priced.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security.

NOTE.—These prices represent average wholesale prices for the product on the first marketing day of each week. They are compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics from material supplied by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Marketing News Letter from New York and Chicago and the New York and Chicago Daily Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Reporters which are auction prices. With foreign agricultural employment in mid-September down nearly 70,000 over a year ago, these prices show that other factors—weather, markets, disease, etc.—exert far greater impact on the prices of commodities than farm labor.

Mr. COHELAN. With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank all those who participated in this special order and I yield back the balance of my time.

THE BRACERO PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, almost before the echo of the last vote which spelled the death of Public Law 78 had faded from this Chamber, I began to receive letters and communications and tables and charts from all sorts of groups, many of them leftwing extremist groups, which were designed to show how wrong those of us who favored Public Law 78 had been and how things we had predicted were not coming to pass.

I do not believe many of these communications have been accurate, nor do I believe some of them have been ethical.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to see my colleague from California [Mr. COHELAN] engaging in what I call high-level constructive debate on this subject, and attempting through the use of statistics and figures to prove a point that so many others have tried to prove with inconclusive evidence.

But, Mr. Speaker, like all of his predecessors, I feel that my colleague from California has made a premature judgment based on incomplete evidence. The difference is that he has done so sincerely.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated during his remarks, you cannot determine the score of a ball game at the end of the third inning. As yet we do not have all the evidence.

For the purpose of setting the record straight I would like to give to the Members of the House a few facts which I have authenticated and which I believe paint a little different story than that painted by my esteemed colleague from California.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to hear a lot about this in the next few months in California, because whether we like it or not it is going to be a political issue. We have a very likable, fumbling, and bumbling Governor out there by the name of Pat Brown, who has been about as inconsistent in his policies concerning farm labor as an ice cube on a hot stove. As a result he is in political hot water.

I suspect, perhaps, that in the next few months you will be hearing facts and figures emanating from State departments, which attempt to justify that inconsistency, and its final result.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I am going to have to leave at this time, but I do not want the gentleman to think I am withdrawing from the battle. I want to say to the gentleman I will be glad to stand by the record made here this afternoon, and I think I can anticipate some of the remarks he made and wants to make. As a distinguished colleague who has been familiar with some of the specialized problems I hope he will remember that this is a national problem and not a State problem. As to the remarks he made about our most distinguished Governor, I am willing to let the record speak for itself.

Mr. GUBSER. I do not think the fact that the gentleman is required to leave the Chamber at this time is in any sense a retreat from the battle. We have continued this battle for many, many years, and I have never known him to retreat in a single instance, though I think unfortunately the gentleman has been consistently wrong. I can assure the gentleman that the national implications of this problem do not escape me.

Let us take a look at the arguments that have been presented today. Perhaps in an oversimplification of them, I would say they can be summarized as follows: We have not suffered any severe crop losses in California, and there has been an ample supply of farm labor, and the price of farm produce has not been affected by labor considerations.

Let us look at the past year of history in California, and I think we can raise a very reasonable doubt that the conclusions drawn by my colleague are correct, and conclude they certainly are premature, and not properly supported.

Let us start back at the beginning of the crisis which has lasted all year when it was necessary in the Coachella Valley of southern California to hand pollinate dates. The fact is—and this is an indisputable fact—which the State Department of Agriculture will confirm—30 percent of the date crop did not get pollinated because there was an insufficient supply of labor. The 70 percent which did get pollinated was unfortunately the subject of a very poor job due to the fact it was done by inexperienced labor. So here is a record, here is a fact, that is not in the figures which the gentleman from California, [Mr. COHELAN] gave you. Thirty percent or more of the California dates will not be harvested because Mother Nature will not produce a date that is not pollinated.

Thus in a major industry in southern California, 30 percent of the crop to be picked this winter is gone before we start because of the abolition of Public Law 78.

Though they do not appear in the official crop records, and crop reports, I know personally of hundreds of acres of small, miscellaneous vegetables in the Watsonville, Salinas, Gilroy areas—crops like mustard greens, broccoli, endives, which were not harvested this season because there was no labor to pick them.

Strawberry production is one of the principal industries of central California. According to the Federal-State marketing news service—fresh strawberry production was down by 1,886 carlots during the just completed season—$7.9 million of strawberries which were not picked because there was no labor to pick them.

There were 5.7 million pounds of processing berries valued at $800,000 not processed because there was no labor to pick them.

The strawberry industry used 1,500 braceros. Even with these braceros, crops went to waste to the extent that I have just mentioned according to Federal-State marketing news service.

I understand that in the lemon and citrus harvest, the cost of harvesting has increased by approximately 25 percent. There was an argument earlier about whether this affected retail prices. ut if it did not and I assume it only for the purposes of argument, it certainly affected the profit margin of the producer of those lemons.

Consider the asparagus crop in California. There was a reduction in the pack of white asparagus of 1,200,000 cases for a 50-percent cutback from the year 1964. Ironically and unfortunately, most of that asparagus is shipped in export to West Germany. Certainly with the condition of our balance of payments and our balance of trade, such an export would have been in the best interest of the entire country.

There was a reduction of 2.6 million pounds of processed frozen asparagus. Frank Bennett of the State department of agriculture has estimated that cannery workers lost $1,200,000 in wages because of this reduction in the frozen asparagus pack and that the suppliers of cartons and labels and other items lost $1 million in sales.

The increase in the harvest cost of fresh asparagus is up 18 cents per pound. The authority for this is the California Asparagus Growers Association.

In addition, acreage was reduced last year by 10,000 acres. Another 5,000 acres of asparagus is being taken out of production this year which will leave 46,000 acres in California for the year 1966 as compared to a 61,000-acre normal. This is a 25-percent reduction in 2 years and a 16-percent reduction in 1 year. I ask you ladies and gentlemen of the House, if this does not presage and preordain the fact that asparagus prices will have to go up as the supply diminishes.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I would like to commend the gentleman for his statement and to associate myself with him in what he is saying. But I, too, find it necessary to leave the Chamber, but I am sure the gentleman knows I am not retreating. As a matter of fact, the gentleman knows I have been on his side in this battle from the start but apparently our opponents are no longer here to do battle with us.

Mr. GUBSER. I certainly thank the gentleman. May I say before the gentleman leaves that as a distinguished member of the Committee on Agriculture, he has certainly contributed a great deal to the enlightenment of the American public on this subject. There is no more knowledgeable man on the subject in this House of Representatives. I wish the gentleman could remain, but I certainly understand the fact that he must leave because of a previous engagement.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I thank my colleague.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, to conclude on the asparagus matter, a thousand braceros were used in the asparagus harvest. So an admission was made that supplemental labor was required. But even with it there has been a reduction of 25 percent in acreage.

Let us now talk about the tomato situation, California's largest crop, which uses supplemental foreign labor.

There are four things that have to be considered in talking about tomatoes.

You have to consider quality, you have to consider competition with Mexico, you have to consider what the total pack figures were this year as compared with last year, and you have to consider price.

Because of the abolition of Public Law 78, we have been forced to go to the use of tomato-picking machines, but these machines produce a quality of fruit—I might say a rather muddy quality of fruit which is suitable for catsup, puree, and hot sauce. It will not produce the type of quality pack which we refer to as whole peel and solid pack tomatoes. So processers must have handpicked tomatoes to get these quality packs.

I raise the question if they must go to Mexico to get this quality, will they not for economy's sake move their entire operation to Mexico?

The California Packing Corp., the Heinz Co., and Campbell's Soup already have tomato processing plants in Mexico. The Tri-Valley Packing Corp. is negotiating; so are several other companies negotiating for such a move.

With respect to the price of tomatoes, the price paid by the canners and the growers last year was $25 per ton for canning tomatoes. This year it is between $35 and $37. Without question—and Members might ask any canner they wish about this—it was because of grower resistance to the $25 price, and fear that he would not have the labor to pick his crop. So the abolition of Public Law 78 is directly responsible for the increase in the raw material to the canner from $25 to $35, or perhaps as high as $37. This, when translated into the finished product, means about $1 per case. When you consider that a canned product goes from broker to broker, and there is a retail price added to it and a retail profit, and always these commissions are commissions upon commissions, the effect of a raw material price increase mushrooms.

By this time next year—not now, because we are still consuming the 1964 pack—the price of canned tomatoes will have gone up considerably.

What is worse is that all of that increased cost will have to be borne by the solid pack and by the whole-peeled quality pack because the sauces, the purees, and the catsups have foreign competition. They must meet that competition and will not be able to add the increased raw material cost. So probably the nickel a can I have predicted will go even higher than I have predicted on quality pack tomatoes.

In 1964 there were 143,000 acres of tomatoes grown in California, and despite what the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] has said, there were only 116,000 acres grown in the year 1965. The tonnage and the acreage are down approximately 20 percent. Last year we harvested 3,083,000 tons of canning tomatoes. This year we will harvest and can 2.4 million tons.

On April 15, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] interviewed Secretary Wirtz on channel 2 in Oakland, Calif. By persistent questioning he drew from Secretary Wirtz a promise that supplemental labor would be furnished to California growers if they would plant the usual acreage of tomatoes. Up to that time the banks had refused to finance tomato growers. Upon hearing this assurance over television, they did turn loose financing for growers, who had then planted only half of what should have been planted. As a result we did come up to the 116,000 acres.

But then Mr. Wirtz gave evidence of reneging on the promise he had made April 15, and about the first of September it looked like we were not going to have enough braceros or enough supplemental labor to pick the tomato crop. So after he had appointed a team of three college professors to determine how many were needed, and they had said we needed 8,000, Mr. Wirtz established criteria which the growers were required to comply with before they could get any of these braceros.

The criteria were absolutely impossible, because the growers were required to go to every State west of the Mississippi River and to recruit available domestic laborers and then transport them at a transportation fee plus a per diem all the way from States on the Mississippi River to California. This cost was prohibitive, and the growers decided that they would just as soon take their chances without complying with these criteria.

The canners, who had a great stake in this matter, began to be very concerned, so they met at the Hotel Fairmont in San Francisco, and they decided they would voluntarily assess themselves 25 cents per ton based upon their 1964 pack. This allowed them to gather a fund which amounted to some three-fourths of a million dollars. It would finance going into 17 States to recruit, as Secretary Wirtz insisted they must do. So they did.

A recruiting team was sent first into the States of Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana and other States. These recruiting teams were composed of three people. One was furnished by Secretary Wirtz from the Bureau of Employment Security. One was furnished by the State department of employment. One represented the growers.

How many laborers do you think they got? They got 952. They got 109 from the State of Washington. Mind you, I repeat, a representative of Secretary Wirtz was a member of every recruiting team. They got 389 from the State of Louisiana. I might say in passing that at the same time Louisiana was importing labor to cut its sugarcane. They got 330 from the State of Oklahoma. They got 102 from the State of Texas, the State of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ]. They got 22 from the State of Missouri.

In frustration the canners realized that the 6,000 workers Secretary Wirtz had said were available were not and decided they must call upon Governor Brown.

Canners went to the Governor's mansion in Sacramento and sat down with Mr. Brown and said, "Look, we have done everything you have asked us to. They said that there were 6,000 workers ready to come to California. We have taken your man and Wirtz's man and done everything you asked, and we got 952 workers." So, with this Mr. Brown called Mr. Wirtz, or at least I presume he called him. It was at that point, this desperate point at the last minute, when they said, "All right, we will send 18,000 braceros to California." Prior to this, 20 million pounds or $2 million worth of tomatoes rotted in Merced County. Congressman SISK, of Fresno, and others were out there and saw it.

I would say that Mr. Wirtz and Governor Brown have played Russian roulette with the farmers' head at the end of the gun barrel. Now they are dreaming up a bunch of figures and averages which prove that they won this game of Russian roulette and they are getting ready to do it all over again.

Admittedly the losses were not as great as some predicted. They were not stupendous. But, let us consider some unusual facts which God Almighty had control of.

First of all, because of the lack of assurance early in the game that there would be labor available, the farmers planted late. The plantings were staggered. Instead of coming all at once, they were staggered over a long season. Fortunately, there was a long cool season, one of the coolest in California's history. Normally we have a terrific hot spell in September. There was none this year. Then there was a heavy rain in August, which is something that happens about every 75 years. As a result there were 200,000 tons of cling peaches which got a disease called brown rot. I am not making a pun on our good Governor. These 10 million canned cases of peaches representing 200,000 tons were not picked, so the people who would have picked them were moved to the tomato fields, thereby providing an unnatural and unusual situation which helped to alleviate a crisis.

The pear crop amounted to about 50 percent of what it normally does. Where we had 295,000 tons in 1964, we had 157,000 tons in 1965. This released additional labor, which was unusual.

Now let us figure in the 17,000 braceros which Mr. Wirtz finally released at the last minute.

Then, let us not forget the one factor which does not appear in anybody's official figures and which nobody wants to talk about—let us figure in the "wetbacks." According to the hearings of the Committee on Appropriations and the Assistant Director of the Bureau of Prisons, on page 90, part III, of the supplemental appropriation bill for 1966, which we passed last week, there were 19,174 wetbacks apprehended between January 1, 1964, and June 30, 1964. However, in the same 6-month period this year, 1965, there were 30,623.

The U. S. border patrol picked up 6,000 wetbacks in California in September alone. We all know that for every wetback you pick up there are five more that you do not get.

In these hearings that I referred to the Assistant Director of Prisons asked for and this House voted a supplemental appropriation of $180,000 for increased prison days for braceros who came here illegally, trying to get work because they would not come here legally under Public Law 78.

Let me quote Mr. Moeller, the Assistant Director of Prisons. He said:

> With the discontinuance of the bracero program in December and the elimination of the labor contracts, Mexican migrant labor continued to come into the country illegally and this placed new pressures on the three districts which we indicated in our submission. We had anticipated that this undoubtedly would result on the basis of past experience.

Then later on he said:

> The abolition of the Bracero Act has prevented their (the braceros) coming into the country legally, so they are coming in illegally.

Here is an additional fact that nobody is telling anybody about. Thirty thousand wetbacks in addition to 18,000 braceros, in addition to labor that came from peaches which were ruined by rain, in addition to the labor that came from the pear crop that did not exist. All of these were abnormal and the odds against them happening 2 years in a row are overwhelming.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman on a very fine and accurate statement of what happened in California and I associate myself with his remarks and the figures which he quoted. I am not a farmer as is the gentleman in the well, and I respect his views all the more. He has been and is now a farmer in California. He speaks not merely from statistics and not as a farmer of window boxes, but as a real farmer. So that his statement carries that much more conviction.

Mr. GUBSER. I certainly thank the gentleman for his kind words, but I want to offer one additional statement. I am a farmer who does not hire braceros and does not try to. I hire local employees.

So, Mr. Speaker, with reduced plantings, reduced acreage spread over a longer season, with unexpected labor from a peach crop ruined by brown rot, and because of a poor pear crop, with a long, abnormally cold harvest season, with 30,000 wetbacks, 276 brandnew tomato-picking machines, and 17,000 braceros, the California tomato harvest could not be completed except for those 17,000 braceros.

I say that Pat Brown and Willard Wirtz lucked out. Let us pray that they are men enough to admit it and do not press their luck by continuing the game of Russian roulette that they have played with the California farmer over the past year.

There was waste, and it can be documented. Admittedly the waste was less than expected. But let us look at the corollary to the argument that no crops were lost, and let us ask ourselves this question. Is it proper to place a major industry, and still California's largest industry, on such an unstable base that the whims of one man can make it or break it? Willard Wirtz nor any other Secretary of Labor, no matter who he may be, is entitled to become a czar of any industry. And that is what he is under present circumstances. This is wrong.

And a lucky and an unusual situation this year will not make it right for next year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us consider for just one moment the point which is repeatedly made that farm revenue is up.

Once again the people who want to justify their position before all the facts are in play fast and loose with averages. Averages are mighty funny things.

You might say that if you have one hand in a tub of boiling, scalding hot oil and the other one in a tub of ice water, on the average you ought to be reasonably comfortable. That is just about what they are doing with their figures here.

The increased farm revenue in the State of California is largely due to crops which are not involved in this labor problem. The grape crop is one of the largest in history, and with the exception of Thompson's seedless variety, the price is good. So, the dollar volume is good, but this crop is not one that has traditionally had labor problems.

The peach crop, due to brown rot, reached a point where, even with reduced production, the revenue was up because peaches skyrocketed to $69 a ton, an extremely high price.

The pear crop was down to 50 percent due to heavy and prolonged spring rains which spoiled the blossoms, but pears brought $125 per ton, almost double the average.

The lettuce crop, due to a combination of circumstances which the gentleman from California [Mr. Cohelan] mentioned earlier this afternoon, and he was absolutely correct, was very high. It was a one-in-a-25-year market, something that every lettuce grower hopes and prays for and hopes will come along some day so he can get "well" from some of those $1.50 markets that broke him when he could not pay off his bank loan. Lettuce sold for $5 for a 2-dozen crate, an unbelievable price.

Mr. Speaker, these figures are not involved with the labor problem at all. Yet they are using them to tell you that farm revenue is up since we have not had Mexican braceros.

And, Mr. Speaker, let us not forget the corollary to the argument that farm revenue is up. Let us not forget that farm costs are also up.

Asparagus costs 18 cents a pound more to harvest, lemons cost 25 percent more to harvest, tomatoes cost $10 a ton more to harvest. Let us not forget these costs, when they have run the course of the marketing channels, will be paid by the consumer. They have not yet run this course, but they are going to.

Then think of the effect on our balance of payments with reference to the asparagus and other crops which we did not ship to West Germany and other countries.

Think of the effect on the laboring man, the cannery worker who did not help to process the frozen asparagus or can those thousands of tons of tomatoes, or process the crops which were not planted on those acres, thousands and thousands of acres, because of a possible labor shortage.

Think of these things and be reminded of what Pete Andrade, the secretary of the Cannery Workers Union of the Western Conference of the Teamsters said recently. I am not sure I am quoting him directly, but I certainly am paraphrasing him accurately. He said that "for every bracero not authorized means a Teamster lost his job."

Mr. Speaker, the full truth is not in as to the final effects of the abolition of Public Law 78. But one thing is certain today. We have a new commissar of California agriculture who holds the fate of that great industry singly in his hands. His name is Willard W. Wirtz. Putting such power in the hands of one man is not the American, democratic way.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

> H.R. 11588. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 11588) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes," and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Pastore, Mr. Holland, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Russell of Georgia, Mr. Ellender, Mr. Hill, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Young of North Dakota, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Kuchel, and Mr. Hruska to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11588) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. Mahon, Kirwan, Whitten, Rooney of New York, Fogarty, Evins of Tennessee, Bow, Jonas, and Laird.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to consider the conference report on H.R. 11588 at any time after it is filed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may cancel my special order for this evening.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ARE THESE DEMONSTRATIONS REAL?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, during the past weekend America experienced one of the most shameful episodes in the history of our Nation.

Since the time that our heroic forebears fought to establish independence for this land and its people almost two centuries ago, traitors have been a rarity. Until the past decade or so, for every American Judas there have been a hundred million loyal patriots.

As Godless communism began the incipient drive into the Western Hemisphere, betrayal of country was one of the tenets that came with it. Cells of disloyal citizens were formed in Washington and in other key cities. Spies began to operate as teams. Eventually the conspiracy was exposed. Some of the guilty fled into the accursed sanctuary of the Iron Curtain. A few were imprisoned. There were even executions. But, for the most part, members of the Communist Party sought to creep back into the dungeon of anonymity in anticipation of another opportunity to strike venom into the bloodstream of their country. Only a despised few have remained identifiable in the cloak of the hammer and sickle.

Ugly signs of treason again appeared during the Korean war, but the sin was largely confined to the weak of heart and body whose minds finally succumbed to the cruelty and torture of Communist captors.

Today treason is again stalking the land, with the banner of betrayal arrogantly displayed by upstart youth who would impose their will in contradiction to a studied decision of the American President solidly supported by the Congress and by an overwhelming majority of the people of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the disgraceful protests against our involvement in Vietnam are an insult to the flag and seditiously inspired. They are a source of solace to the bestial Communist compact that even now destroys American lives and menaces our entire civilization.

Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach has announced that the Justice Department as begun an investigation into the nationwide demonstrations and has already uncovered some Communists and some persons very closely associated with Communists in at least one of the organizations behind the treasonous movement.

Mr. Speaker, I laud the Attorney General's action, though I must admit disappointment that the situation has been allowed to reach the proportions that now confront the country. I also applaud the arrest of the former college student who arrogantly destroyed his draft card to indicate his attitude on U.S. participation in the Vietnam hostilities. Last June 3, I inquired of the Selective Service System as to whether new legislation was required to deal with violators who deliberately tore up their draft cards, but I was assured that adequate authority then existed for enforcement of compliance with the selective service law. While the new law signed by the President on August 30 is now being utilized to prosecute the latest offender, I feel that proper legal action against those who previously committed the offense would have dissuaded the latest incidents and would already have brought violators to justice.

I am convinced also that college authorities have been entirely too lax in giving demonstrators the run of the campus. Communist riots at the University of California were tolerated needlessly and served only to encourage outbreaks at other institutions of learning. Sit-ins took place early last May at Ohio State University. They were followed by heckling and sit-ins when Ambassador W. Averell Harriman appeared at Cornell University. About the same time hecklers were taking control at the University of Wisconsin when a Foreign Service officer attempted to speak. The demonstrations spread from campus to campus, and officials remained disinclined to interfere.

At this point I should like to insert in the Record an article by David Lawrence that appeared in the Washington Star last April 29 in warning of the Communist uprisings at colleges and universities:

Red's Campus Influence Seen on Rise

(By David Lawrence)

The Communist influence on the campus in American universities and colleges has increased so substantially in recent months that it now has become an important factor in the organizing of student demonstrations.

The Communists have actually profited by the "free speech" doctrine which, through Supreme Court decisions, has been given preference over the right of the American people to be protected against speeches on the campus inspired by members of alien organizations that are financed directly or indirectly by the Soviet Government or its agents in this country.

The most outspoken comment on the whole subject from the educational world has just come from Dr. James M. Nabrit, Jr., president of Howard University here, which is one of the leading Negro institutions in the country. He explicitly blamed on "external disruptive forces" the recent unrest at the Howard campus. He said in a statement:

"They are people who cloak themselves in the mantle of civil righters and plot and plan in secret to disrupt our fight for justice and full citizenship. They must be unmasked for the frauds they are. They must be fought in every arena, and they must not be permitted to prevail."

At a news conference later, Nabrit said he was referring to an organization which had backed a campus demonstration. Nabrit stated that on one occasion he saw two known Communists in the student group's picket lines. He noted that the demonstrations thus far have been within university regulations, but he warned that he would not "sit idly by and see the university become a place of lawlessness and disorder."

It is surprising that the House Committee on Un-American Activities has not exposed Communist participation in various demonstrations. Maybe this is due to sensitivity about possible criticism that the committee was perhaps trying to discredit the movement for civil rights. Actually, it is fully understood that the Communists are by no means the originators of the civil rights controversy or of the use of street demonstrations of protest. Yet there have been instances in which these same demonstrations have been pushed to extremes through Communist influence. And it is this which can hurt the cause of civil rights, especially when idealistic students are brainwashed by Communist organizers.

The Communist Party in this country is beginning to work more and more out in the open. Originally its members were ordered to register with the Attorney General under the Internal Security Act of 1950, but court decisions during 1964 on some sections of the law were considered so favorable by the Communist Party that its leaders now feel there is a good possibility that all the provisions of this act will be nullified. For this reason, the Communists are optimistic of the future of their party and are beginning to speak out with the same defiance that was characteristic of them in the past.

Although the Communist Party has for years been trying to hide its connection with the Soviet Union, it nevertheless announced that it would send a delegation this year to Moscow to participate in an editorial conference there on the international Communist movement.

Leading members of the Communist Party are encouraged by the vast number of invitations they are receiving to speak at universities and colleges throughout the country. These give them the opportunity to spread the party line, obtain recruits and promote their claim that the Communist Party is just another political party on the American scene. The Communist leaders say they are receiving from colleges more requests to speak than they can possibly fulfill.

Congress can, of course, revise the existing statute and make it more specific, as certainly a legal distincton can be drawn between political parties which operate solely within this country without aid from abroad and those which have a direct connection with a foreign government.

Leaders of Negro organizations have repeatedly said that, while there may be Communist groups active in the racial controversy, they are not in any way influential. But information reaching Government sources here indicates that the tactics and techniques of the Communists are not always apparent even to Negro leaders, and that the real purpose of the Communists is to force the demonstrations into extremes so as either to provoke violence or to plunge the whole racial question into more and more bitter controversy.

More than a year ago, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, warned college presidents throughout the country of "an organized attempt by foreign money to disrupt the universities of America." He also has said that many colleges have provided some avowed Communists with "a platform from which to espouse their godless ideology of chicanery, deceit and treachery."

Perhaps campus officials will now attempt to retrieve their authority, but rather than wait for such action I would suggest that the Federal Government begin to examine its policies on aid to higher education to determine whether it is not possible under the law to withhold assistance to any student who absents himself from classes for the purpose of joining demonstrations against the Government of the United States. While it is unfortunate that a stronger limitation against financial help cannot be invoked against disloyal recipients, nonetheless every avenue of reprisal should be explored in an attempt to cut off money made available by loyal taxpayers that is going for sponsors and participants of insurgent meetings. If unwarranted absenteeism is the only answer, then let us resort to it. To reward disloyalty is to encourage disloyalty.

On the subject of Federal aid to students, Mr. Speaker, is it not alarming that State governments which support their own universities have not undertaken a determined campaign to rid those schools of the rebellious beatniks who are identified with the Communist movement against our Vietnam position?

Obviously there is a new need for classes at all levels of education that instill in our youth the meaning of love of country, dedication, and patriotism. It is time that our students are given to understand the true meaning of American democracy and to understand the responsibilities invested by the electorate in the Presidency and in Congress. By the same token every person in this country should come to realize and accept his own responsibility in our society.

I recall an article that appeared in the Christian Herald some years ago. It deplored the fact that some of our people have forgotten the spirit not only of our religion but of our patriotic faith. It proposed that we attempt to reinvigorate ourselves with the great truths and the great values which have made this Nation the envy of all the peoples on earth. Maybe it is time that our school systems, from the first grade through college, give special emphasis to a course of this nature. In this regard I believe that two editorials, one from the Johnstown Tribune-Democrat of June 28, 1965, entitled, "The Flag Is Passing—So What!" and the other, "On Flag Waving," from the Altoona Catholic Register of August 27, 1965, merit space in the Congressional Record. I ask unanimous consent that they be inserted at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, you and I are appalled at the disrespect for the flag exhibited by the Vietnam draft dodgers. Consider the heavy hearts of the mothers and fathers of military personnel now engaged in combat in southeast Asia. What of our young boys and girls whose minds are perplexed at the strange antics of grown men who would dare to defy a Government policy that involves the life and death of our youth and of the Nation itself.

If the President or Attorney General should determine that new legislation is required to meet the challenge, then let us stand ready to act at once. I say that we are solidly behind our commander-in-chief and that we will gladly remain in Washington for another week or another month if he feels that we should stand by until a way is devised to clear our streets, our parks, and our campuses of the dupes, the dopes, and the addicted Communists who parade under the colors of the Kremlin and without reverence to our flag, our national reverence, or our national security.

[From the Johnstown Tribune-Democrat, June 28, 1965]

THE FLAG IS PASSING—SO WHAT!

(By Dr. Max Rafferty)

"Hats on, the flag is passing by."

Apparently this is to be the marching slogan of our brave new world, at least if one West Coast court has its way. Recently a decision was handed down that freed school children from the bothersome obligation to salute their country's flag and to repeat the Pledge of Allegiance.

In the parlance of the day, it figures.

At about the same time, some of the creepier, just-out-from-under-a-rock types who infest the Berkeley campus of the University of California held a kind of beatnik version of the black mass in front of their local selective service headquarters, the ritual consisting of a public tearing-up of their draft cards. I must confess to a gentle glow of relief at the thought that these exalted exponents of existentialism would not be charged after all with the onerous responsibility of hemispheric defense. But I began to wonder just where it is all going to end.

Certainly if my son can now decline to salute the colors merely because he decides he doesn't want to, he can also refuse to do certain other things for the same reason—things like bearing arms in his country's defense, paying his taxes to support policies he disapproves of or, for that matter, keeping his mouth shut in school so that the teacher can get the lesson taught.

The learned judge has opened a veritable Pandora's box with this little juridical gem, much as old Justice Taney opened a humdinger of a hornet's nest a little more than a century ago when he decided that Dred Scott was forever a mere thing and chattel of his owner, wherever he might roam. Postscript: The American people decided differently. The court was overruled. As Lincoln remarked, "a judge is as apt to be right as any ordinary man, and no more so."

For the logical implication of this flag-salute decision is that every man—indeed every child—now is to be the sole arbiter of his own conduct. He is to be ruled only by his own conscience in his relation to organized society and to his fellow man, regardless of the wishes of the majority and the laws of the land.

Such a doctrine, if upheld, spells chaos for the Nation and a death blow to the concept of responsible citizenship, harking back at least to Plato, which the schools are rightly charged with the duty of passing from one generation to the next.

People rise to salute you, your honor, whenever you enter your courtroom, and rightly so. Is it too much to ask that a little of the same respect be taught to children as they rise in their places every morning to greet their country?

[From the Catholic Register (Altoona, Pa.), Aug. 27, 1965]

ON FLAG WAVING

New York has an ordinance requiring those who use its streets as a speaking platform to display conspicuously a large American flag. This ordinance is currently under court attack by one Nathan Weinstein, aided and abetted by the New York Civil Liberties Union.

Mr. Weinstein, an organizer for the Socialist Workers' Party, was arrested at a street-corner meeting at which American policy in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic was being attacked. That was his excuse for not displaying the flag.

If the case goes to the higher reaches of the American judicial system, where theorists dwell in Olympian detachment, it is likely to be struck down. The majority of the Supreme Court, dominated by libertarians such as Warren, Douglas, and Brennan—now likely joined by Fortas—have almost unanimously upheld the freedom of the individual to do everything, rather than the right of society to compel the individual to do anything. This attitude almost certainly has contributed to the growing breakup of the American social fabric, illustrated recently by fire and blood in Los Angeles, and reflected in the latest, horrendous statistics of national crime.

Our interest here, however, is not to discuss further the philosophic and judicial implications of such decisions. Rather, it is to tell why the New York ordinance should be upheld—indeed, should be extended nationwide by State or Federal law.

The most democratic State—as we fancy ours, or at least wish it—can and must tolerate opposition and dissent. No State, however, no matter how democratic and freedom loving, must tolerate disloyal opposition. A house divided against itself cannot stand.

What Mr. Weinstein's regard for the fundamental principles of this country is we do not know. But this country surely has the right, if he is going to speak publicly to other citizens, especially if using as a forum facilities paid for by the taxes of all citizens, to demand that he make a show of loyalty.

This beloved country is owed a place on a platform where actions it is taking in its own defense or the defense of freedom anywhere are being challenged.

Let the flag speak out, where deceit or ignorance disregards the truth about America. Those who speak out of love for America can feel nothing but pride in showing that flag; those who speak out of hatred of this country deserve the flag's rebuke.

It is a new idea that an ingredient of liberty is the right to challenge anything—any truth, any historical fact, any authority. Dissent is no longer seen as brave opposition based on intellectual conviction—which it properly is—but as the authoritative badge of the superior thinker, which it is not. For a scholar to uphold the status quo, or tradition, or loyalty to country automatically damns him in academic circles.

THE RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, during several visits this past year in our congressional district, I was surprised by the number of protests I have received from constituents against current legislation introduced in the other body that would impose controls against the movement of firearms in interstate commerce. These protests first came to me by letter, then by phone as well as in personal conversations with citizens on the street. Finally a protest meeting was called which was attended by a substantial number of my constituents.

One evening I was asked to meet with the group of men who were members of gun clubs, collectors of antique firearms, gun dealers, gunsmiths, and sportsmen. After about an hour's discussion, I came out of that meeting as the benefited recipient of some thoughts which have caused me to conclude that the Congress should take a very careful and deliberate look and perhaps a reappraisal of some of these proposals for legislation affecting the sale and use of firearms. In the interim, I have been able to locate some very interesting statistics which I think should be included within the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that it may be clear that it is not the gun alone that leads to crime but that when all is said and done it is the individual who is the criminal and who will find some way to commit a crime if he is intent upon it whether he uses a gun or not.

At the suggestion of some constituents including Mr. Neal Tait, of Raytown, Mo., Mr. Francis O. Blake, of Independence, Mo., Mr. Walter E. Carmack, of Kansas City, Mo., and James H. Curry, of Raytown, Mo., I turned to the FBI Uniform Crime Report for the year 1963, released July 20, 1964, as well as to subsequent reports. This is a statistical reporting of all criminal behavior. In the preface by J. Edgar Hoover, it is pointed out that the more the authorities of the law can categorize and identify criminal acts and criminal behavior the better these authorities are able to understand the crime problem and the means to control it.

The FBI report reached the following conclusions:

First. Cutting instruments, such as knives, together with blunt objects, were used in 68 percent of the 147,800 serious aggravated assaults committed in the United States in 1963. Separated into components, 44 percent of such 68 percent involved the use of knives or other cutting instruments, while the remaining 24 percent were blunt objects, for a total of 68 percent. Hands, fists, and feet accounted for 12.3 percent of the total. It is significant and most noteworthy that only 12.7 percent of the total number of aggravated assaults were committed with firearms. Poison, acids, and other means were involved in the remaining 7 percent among the total of all cases reported.

Second. Half of the States, numbering 25, have a per capita homicide rate less than the State of New York which has the unusual and unreasonably severe Sullivan law governing firearms.

Third. Commencing with the year 1930 and continuing through the year 1960, the FBI report revealed that homicide with firearms decreased 25 percent on a per capita basis while suicides involving firearms dropped 9 percent during this same period of time.

Fourth. The report in addition to the presentation of statistics reaches some conclusions which are quite interesting. It leaves the impression that there are numerous factors involved in the volume or extent of crime which are altogether unrelated to the use of firearms or for that matter the presence or absence of any other available instrument to be used in connection with an offense.

The report states:

> Crime is a social problem and the concern of the entire community. The law enforcement effort is limited to the factors within its control. Some of the conditions which will affect the amount and type of crime that occurs from place to place include such things as density or size of the community population and the metropolitan area of which it is a part. In addition such things are involved as composition of the population with reference particularly to age, sex,

and race; economic status and mores of the population; relative stability of population including commuters, seasonal and other transient types, climate, including seasonable weather conditions; educational, recreational and religious characteristics; effective strength of the police force; policies of the prosecuting officials and the courts; attitude of the public to law enforcement problems; the administrative and investigative efficiency of the local law enforcement agency.

The foregoing list is rather lengthy. It should be fairly inclusive of all the factors that contribute to make crime a social problem. Yet if you go back carefully over the list you will find that nowhere is gun availability cited as the cause of crime.

There has been some publicity about a recent questionnaire that was sent out to all law-enforcement officers throughout the United States. Quite different interpretations have been put upon the answers from the respondents. Perhaps some light can be shed on such interpretations when one takes the time to look at the joint resolution entered into and signed not long ago by the National Shooting Sports Foundation and joined by the National Police Officers Association of America, stating:

> We believe that an American citizen of voting age or a member of the Armed Forces of whatever age, should have the right to legally purchase without restriction, a handgun, rifle, air rifle, shotgun, or like item excepting fully automatic firearms.

Much of the recent deluge of firearm control legislation introduced in the 88th Congress and so far in the 89th Congress might be due to the great emotional impact caused by the assassination of our late President Kennedy. Because of the emotional situation created following November 22, 1963, it seems to me to be appropriate to go back to some words contained in a letter written in February of 1960 which was addressed to Guns magazine and authored by the then Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and now Vice President of the United States, who had this to say at a time when the emotions of the people of our country had not been inflamed by an assassination. He stated:

> Certainly one of the chief guarantees under any government no matter how popular or restricted is the right of citizens to keep and bear arms. This is not to say that firearms should not be carefully used, or that definite safety rules or precautions should not be taught and enforced. But the right of citizens to bear arms is just one more guarantee against arbitrary government, one more safeguard against a tyranny which now appears remote in America, but which historically has proven to be always possible.

It is my considered opinion that these words written by Vice President HUMPHREY in 1960 should be read and reread by the Members of both bodies of the Congress as they go ahead with hearings and perhaps later, debate, of the bills seeking control of firearms that has been introduced in this 89th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am firmly convinced that if it is our objective to reduce crime and if the effort of the Congress is to be directed toward control and suppression of crime then our preventative legislation should be directed against the criminal and not against the tools used by perpetrators of crime. Directed to this kind of thinking is a resolution approved by the New Hampshire Legislature on April 17, 1965. The president of the New Hampshire Senate, Stewart Lamphrey, pointed out that present proposed legislation would have conflicting effects in that some of the current legislation would be restricting the recreational use of firearms which would only hurt the domestic economy without having any effect on the suppression of crime. The resolution of the New Hampshire Legislature stated quite forthrightly that if the proposed restrictions on firearms were enacted into law they "would only result in further loss of American liberty, add to the workload of our law enforcement and police officers and inconvenience and penalize law abiding citizens." The resolution demonstrated clear thinking when it emphasized that "easy accessibility of firearms does not contribute to the crime problem of the United States. The target for preventive legislation should be the criminal, not the tool used by the perpetrators of crime." The New Hampshire Legislature goes right to the heart of the problem when it blasts away at the proposed legislation by saying "such could seriously impair the recreational economy of the State and Nation, infringe on the constitutional rights of the U.S. citizens, damage essential wildlife programs, intrude further Federal authority on powers reserved to the States." In my opinion the New Hampshire Legislature put this entire matter of firearms control in proper perspective. Their analysis of the situation deserves more credit, closer attention and greater respect than it has received.

An interesting bit of information which may have been overlooked and perhaps altogether neglected in this discussion of firearms legislation is the fact that the Swiss people all have guns and as was recently explained by a representative of the Swiss delegation of New York City when questioned about the matter said:

> For centuries the Swiss Constitution has provided that every mature male be issued a gun by the army reserve. Even though these guns are kept in every home, Switzerland has virtually no armed crime.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks by complimenting the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce over in the Senate who, at the time he announced his intention to hold hearings on gun legislation, stated:

> The solution must not be one conceived in hysteria, born of ignorance, intended to foster complacency, and destined to futility. It must be dictated by the voice of reason, not emotion. While it is right to prevent the use of firearms by the irresponsible, in so doing we should not unduly burden or inconvenience the responsible.

If I am to support any legislation involving guns, it will have to take into account, and proceed upon, the premise that the great majority of our people are law-abiding individuals. For my part I will support only such legislation as is reasonable and effective without unduly restricting the legitimate areas of freedom and action of the private citizens. I want it to be plain that for my part I cannot support any legislation which departs from or ignores the concepts and principles of personal rights and liberties expressed in our Constitution of the United States which states "the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

AN EXPENSIVE CONGRESS

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, it is undeniable that this Congress has accomplished a tremendous amount of work, for which it is being quite generally praised. It has also been the most expensive peacetime Congress in our history and it seems very much in order that this fact also be pointed out. It now appears that the total amount of money appropriated this year will run close to $120 billion. This fact is noted in a recent editorial which appeared in the Plymouth (N.H.) Record written by its able associate editor, Robert E. Wherland. He notes an earlier report of mine that, on a daily basis, this 1st session of the 89th Congress has appropriated in excess of $30 million each day.

It appears that the updated figure, on the basis of the session's total appropriations, is going to be in excess of $400 million a day. It should also be pointed out that, of the appropriations, the Congress is compelled to vote about $11.5 billion a year to pay the interest on the national debt. I commend Mr. Wherland and the Plymouth Record for bringing this side of the record of the 89th Congress to the attention of the public and offer the editorial at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Plymouth (N.H.) Record, Oct. 7, 1965]

AN EXPENSIVE CONGRESS

There's much to be said about the present Congress, but no one can accuse it of being stingy with the taxpayer's money.

Already it has appropriated over $100 billion, with modest estimates predicting the figure will reach $120 billion. Congressman JIM CLEVELAND states that this amounts to a congressional appropriation in excess of $300 million per day.

This would be the highest appropriation by a peacetime Congress in history, and only $30 billion below the 1942 outlay to meet the exorbitant costs of World War II.

At the same time, the 1965 lawmakers are certain to set a record low for cutting original budget requests. Estimates are that by the end of the session they will have trimmed authorizations by only about 2 percent.

The 1st session of the 89th Congress will not be finally judged by historians for many years. But auditors have already offered their opinion. Expensive.

THE POLITICS OF POVERTY

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker the heavy flavor of politics in the poverty program has become apparent throughout the country. It is undermining public confidence in the program and threatening the purposes for which it was created. The city of Berlin, N.H., had the unfortunate experience with one aspect of the program this summer. The public reaction is summed up well in an editorial by Mr. Brud Warner, able editor of the Berlin Reporter. Under unanimous consent, I offer the editorial for the RECORD. As Mr. Warner notes, it is hard to disagree with the purposes of the poverty program. It is, however, impossible to condone the manner in which so much of this program is being handled.

[From the Berlin (N.H.) Reporter, Oct. 13, 1965]

POVERTY'S POLITICS

It's hard to disagree with at least some of the principles of the war on poverty.

But it's becoming increasingly easy to disagree with the way a lot of it is being handled.

And that's probably because it is the biggest opportunity for political boondoggling since the days of F.D.R.

It's beginning to look as if the big political centers are the ones getting the funds and the rest can spend their time planning with nowhere to go.

Take this business of the Neighborhood Youth Corps. First there was a State project which was supposed to get rolling right after school let out. It was to give young people jobs, supposedly to help some of them, at least, to stay in school. But the program was delayed again and didn't start to get off of the ground until just before school opened this fall. Said principal Richard Bradley of BHS, who was one of many people who spent many hours in screening applicants, "I suppose the jobs can now be filled by encouraging young people to drop out of school."

Then there was Berlin's application for a Youth Corps to provide part-time jobs for 90 men and 90 young women who are still in school and for 100 young men who are out of school. It was a long process to compile job specifications and to determine the manner of selecting those who would get the jobs. Dozens of Berlin people put in a total of probably several hundred hours planning this program and writing up the application.

It was duly filed and the waiting period began. But Berlin people didn't know just how long that wait would be. It seems that funds ran out a month ago—and those who knew that fact were sworn to secrecy not to breathe a word of it.

There also have been some serious questions raised as to whether funds have been awarded on a first come basis and not on need. There has been much ballyhoo that the war on poverty is supposed to be just that—Federal taxpayers putting up their money to help those in need. Some of those close to proposed projects are expressing their doubts that it's working out that way.

Politics is playing a major role in this poverty business. When the board of directors of Community Act for Carroll, Coos, and Grafton Counties, Inc., was being expanded, members were getting lengthy phone calls morning and night from politicians pushing for their favorite party member.

Politics we can condone, if the politicians can come up with qualified people who can do a good job. But we would judge by past performances and present actions that some of the people within the war on poverty are there not because of their ability or knowledge but because they know the right people in the right political seats.

Perhaps that's why when Berlin was filling out its application for a Neighborhood Youth Corps the advice came down from higher places not to necessarily make the project fit the community's needs, but to make it big enough so that it would make an impression on those who had to review the application.

DU BOIS CLUBS NEED INVESTIGATION

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. DEL CLAWSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, when J. Edgar Hoover, according to reports of his speech last night, charged that the W. E. B. du Bois Clubs of America are "standing in the forefront of the Communist campaign to confuse minds, distort the thinking, and win the support of our young people," he touched a sensitive nerve for Californians.

Earlier this year in discussion and by letter I contacted the Honorable EDWIN E. WILLIS, our distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and expressed my growing concern over the operation of these clubs and their apparent progress on college campuses throughout the Nation. It is a matter of special apprehension to me that the unrest in several colleges in California, particularly the uprisings at the University of California in Berkeley, have been linked to the activities of Communist groups, and that the Du Bois clubs might be suspected to operate in the forefront of this dissension.

I am convinced that the demonstrations of the past week are representative of the thinking of only a misled, misguided, and misinformed minority of college-age youths, many of them brilliant and idealistic, with energies tragically unchanneled into constructive paths. The very fact that the President of the United States and the Secretary of State should be constrained to comment, and that our Government should need to explain these demonstrations because of their misleading effect upon world opinion, is reason enough for remedial action.

Therefore, it should be mentioned at this time that Chairman WILLIS in August informed me that he too is disturbed by the increase in Communist activity among youth and the particular operations of the W. E. B. du Bois Clubs on campuses, and that a preliminary investigation is underway so that the committee can hold hearings on the organization at the earliest appropriate time.

TOLL TRAPS ON THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 which launched our great highway construction program, the Secretary of Commerce was authorized to approve toll roads, bridges, or tunnels as part of the Interstate System upon a finding by him that such action would "promote the development of an integrated Interstate System." Pursuant to this act, the Secretary has designated a total of 2,332 miles of toll highways in 23 States as part of the Interstate System. In my opinion, the indiscriminate placing of toll traps on the Interstate System is not in the interest of the public or in keeping with the intent of Congress. This not only violates the concept of a toll-free Federal-Aid Highway System; it also makes road users pay twice—gas taxes and tolls—and adversely influences the planning and construction of needed highway improvements since highway officials try to avoid building highways which would compete with toll facilities.

Some years ago, it was felt by many persons that the building of toll roads in this country would end because of the construction of the 41,000 mile system of interstate highways. This, however, is not the case. Instead of ending, the building of toll roads is spreading. Some are under construction and a good many more are underway. The August 9, 1965, issue of U.S. News & World Report has an article on this subject and I quote a part of that article:

> In Oklahoma, legislation for five new toll roads recently won approval.
>
> In Kansas, the legislature has called for preliminary studies on three new toll road projects.
>
> In Texas, bonds have just been issued for the State's second stretch of toll highway.
>
> Other new projects are just finished, under construction or study in Florida, Louisiana, New Jersey, Virginia, Kentucky, North Carolina and Pennsylvania * * *
>
> If all the proposed turnpikes are built, more than a thousand miles will be added to the 3,772 miles of toll road already in operation in the United States.

To be candid, I must point out that so far as I know, none of these new toll facilities are being proposed as additions to the Interstate System. However, under the existing law, they could be added to the system. I do not believe that this would be in accord with the intent of the Congress but a change in the law is needed to preclude such a possibility.

Today, I am introducing a bill to correct this situation. I introduced legislation for the same purpose in the 87th Congress, the 88th Congress, and again early during this Congress. Basically, the previous bills would have required the States to agree not to construct toll facilities on the route of an interstate highway without the concurrence of the Secretary of Commerce and that the Secretary of Commerce would be required to report to Congress any violation of this agreement. His report would include recommendations as to effective enforcement action to be taken, which action would be carried out unless within 60 days either the House or Senate passed a resolution disapproving his proposed action.

The Department of Commerce, by letter dated July 1, 1965—signed by the general counsel of the Department—commenting on my bill, H.R. 2958, stated that:

> While this Department would have no objection to that portion of the bill which would require that all project agreements for projects on the Interstate System contain a clause prohibiting toll facility construction without concurrence therein by the Secretary, the remaining provisions of the bill would not be considered desirable.

In my opinion, H.R. 2958 contained effective desirable provisions which would go far toward correcting the possibility of additional toll traps on the Interstate System. Nevertheless, the chances of having the bill enacted over the objections of the Department of Commerce are remote. Accordingly, I am introducing a new bill which would delete the provisions objected to by the Department of Commerce and retain those parts to which the Department would have no objection. The text of the bill follows and I am hopeful that the Congress will take early and favorable action on the bill.

H.R. 11685

(A bill to amend section 129(b) of title 23, United States Code, relating to toll roads, bridges, and tunnels on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) of section 129, United States Code, is amended by adding the following material after the last sentence of the subsection: "After the date of enactment of this Act, all agreements between the Secretary and a State highway department for the construction of projects on the Interstate System shall contain a clause providing that no toll road, bridge, or tunnel will be constructed on the interstate highway route involved without the official concurrence of the Secretary. The Secretary shall not concur in any such construction unless he shall affirmatively find that, under the particular circumstances existing, the construction of such road, bridge, or tunnel as a toll facility rather than a toll-free facility is in the public interest."

THE KENNEDY ROUND IS THE FOCUS FOR WORLD TRADE PROBLEMS

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, October 13, our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] delivered a speech on the floor of the House entitled "Commercial Policy at the Crossroads: The Kennedy Round Is Focus for Solving Major Trade Problems." Although he outlined many of the problems facing successful trade negotiations at the Kennedy round, his conclusion, which I share, was that with tough bargaining many of our trade goals can be achieved through the Kennedy round.

In the course of his remarks, Congressman Curtis made another contribution to our understanding of the tactics which must be used by our negotiators. He laid to rest the notion first raised by an article in the October 11 Washington Post, that the United States was tentatively beginning planning to bypass the European Economic Community in some new form of trade arrangement.

The significance of this speech did not go unnoticed in the financial press. Mr. Peter Greenough, financial editor of the Boston Globe, in commenting on the speech in his column of October 14, reiterated the two reasons why this suggested notion to bypass the EEC would be unsound. First, it conflicts directly with the most-favored-nation principle, that duties applied on goods from one country apply to goods from all countries. This cardinal principle of our trade policy cannot be abandoned. Secondly, the rumor ignores the fact that one aim of the Kennedy round is to knock down Common Market trade barriers.

Mr. Greenough continued by saying:

> No such change has been made, and the authority for this is Congressman Thomas B. Curtis, Republican, of Missouri, the one Member of Congress who has kept a constant grasp on the Kennedy round's pulse.
>
> Curtis took to the House floor yesterday to knock down the notion anyone is trying to bypass Paris.

Greenough concluded that:

> In any case, the thing now seems to sit in a bit of a vacuum. And we as a nation cannot afford it. Tom Curtis is one of the few, all too few, in Congress who appreciate the big chips in this trade game.

I include the full text of the article from the Boston Globe of October 14 at this point:

VITAL IN TRADE TALKS—IGNORE FRANCE? NO EASY TASK

(By Peter B. Greenough)

Europe has been chewing on a hot rumor these last few days—that the United States may be contemplating an end-run around France in the Kennedy Round trade talks at Geneva.

The Washington Post started it. The idea, as the Post postulated things, is that we would go ahead and negotiate with other major trading nations and leave the door ajar for the European Economic Community (Common Market) countries to hop aboard later on, once their own internal scrapping had been settled.

Intriguing cocktail talk notion, except for a couple of practical realities.

First, in all our trade relationships there is a key item called the most-favored-nation clause. What it means is that the duties we apply on goods from one major exporting nation apply equally to imports from other sources.

By law, therefore, any two-tiered tariff arrangement would be illegal.

Then, too, the basic aim of the Kennedy Round is to knock down Common Market trade barriers. A strange way it would indeed be to let EEC's duties rise and others fall; the whole ball of wax might unravel.

Moreover, any such move—altogether too crass a piece of diplomatic pressure for any civilized nation—would also represent a major shift in U.S. trade strategy.

No such change has been made, and the authority for this is Congressman Thomas B. Curtis, Republican, of Missouri, the one Member of Congress who has kept a constant grasp on the Kennedy Round's pulse.

Curtis took to the House floor yesterday to knock down the notion anyone is trying to bypass Paris.

To illustrate how ridiculous this notion is in the first place, consider a remark made to the Globe recently by Otmar Emminger, member of the governing board of West Germany's Central Bank.

In view of the fact that Germany, the United States, and other members of the so-called Group of Ten managed to establish a prop for the British pound without France's help, we asked Emminger if it might be carried further, to the point that a new international monetary setup could be arranged without France's presence?

Emminger vigorously denied it.

By like token, you can apply this same reasoning to the Kennedy round. Increasing of trade and provision for more liquidity (or funds to support trade, in this case) are like Mike 'n Ike. Nothing meaningful could possibly be achieved without France.

Representative Curtis presently is less optimistic about the Kennedy round's successful outcome than he was last May while visiting Geneva. Nevertheless, he has not reached the degree of despair we have detected here and there.

The first order of business, he suggests, is for everyone to bend themselves toward a successful ending at Geneva. After that we should begin worrying about getting a new trade bill through Congress in 1967.

Conceivably the Congressman is pushing the wrong cart. The way Kennedy round talks drag, it looks as if authority for the United States to be a continuing part of them will be directly up to Congress in another year.

While trade promoters in Washington are about it, they also might start serious thinking on lumping all such efforts under one tent.

State Department (and the Executive) snatched away Congress' prerogative in connection with the Canadian auto parts pact.

Ambassador Christian Herter's office, created specifically to push the Kennedy round, seems to have lost some of its zip (conceivably due to Mr. Herter's ill health).

In any case, the thing now seems to sit in a bit of a vacuum. And we as a nation cannot afford it. Tom Curtis is one of the few, all too few, in Congress who appreciate the big chips in this trade game.

VIETNAM DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Chamberlain] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CHAMBERLAIN**. Mr. Speaker, these past few days have been filled with comments about the anti-Vietnam demonstrators who have so blatantly used their democratic freedoms to create confusion with respect to the determination of the vast majority of the American people regarding our presence in South Vietnam. The real damage, Mr. Speaker, comes not from their meaningless parades and their defiance of Federal law because these acts and their repulsive connotations are decried by every thinking American. No, their real damage is to the morale of American troops in South Vietnam. Rather than giving attention to the small minority who have seen fit to abuse their freedoms, I would like to reconfirm my gratitude to our boys in Vietnam who are bravely defending the cause of freedom for their generation. Certainly these boys do not like the idea of being in the jungles of Vietnam, but realizing the needs of their country they have accepted orders and displayed courage and valor in what is a seemingly endless battle for the right of men to choose their own government.

It is understandable that there have been some complaints among these soldiers, but those of us who have visited South Vietnam and have had the opportunity to talk with our service people have found a near unanimity of opinion supporting U.S. objectives in this troubled area. These boys realize that we must remain in Vietnam because, as one young man told me, "I would rather fight them here than at home." These boys are risking their lives and dying for the cause of freedom and no amount of irresponsible demonstrating should detract our attention from the service they are rendering to the American people.

DEMONSTRATIONS AGAINST OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. **BROYHILL** of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. **McDADE**. Mr. Speaker, over the past year we have seen the development of something new in the history of America. It began some months ago in a Midwestern university, when a teach-in was organized by a few members of the faculty and by some of the students, to parade their disagreement with our policies in the Vietnam war.

It has spread since then to a nationally televised teach-in, to a nationally televised debate on Vietnam, to a public burning of draft cards, and now to a threated march on Washington to protest our involvement in the war in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of these actions is one that has many faces.

There is a tradition in our Nation that says that freedom of speech is a sacred thing. Under this great doctrine, the people of America have debated every issue which has come before our Nation. But under it, too, there has grown an equally sacred tradition which says: "When the bullets start to fly, when our men are dying on the battlefield, the voice of America will be one voice that our enemies may hear clearly."

We are not speaking with one voice today. Our enemies are taking great consolation from a small divisive group among us. Daily the newspapers and radio stations behind the Iron Curtain report with glee the divisive influences in America. They are reporting them, not as the voice of a small minority of ill-comprehending youth and ill-advised professors, but as the voice of America—and they are deceiving themselves and their peoples in so reporting.

Out of this deceit may well come a prolongation of the war in Vietnam. Out of it may well come a new toll of death among our soldiers, our sailors, our marines, our airmen, who are fighting with bravery in one of the most difficult wars in the history of our Nation.

There is another tragedy to this which I must point out. It has long been true that trouble catches the headlines. So on the front pages of the papers of the Nation last Sunday there were headlines screaming about the parades and teach-ins protesting our involvement in Vietnam. It was not readily apparent from the reading of the headlines that the group involved was pitifully small. These headlines went to our men in Vietnam, the men who were marching out into the jungle or flying over North Vietnam in furtherance of our war effort; and as they marched out to possible death or torture, they could read their own noble commitments being denounced by fellow Americans.

It is difficult to speak in reasoned tones about these incidents. There is a swelling tide of anger in America over them, and I am one of those who has become angry.

It has been the tradition, not of America alone, but of the whole history of civilization that our teachers should lead the young into the paths of truth and righteousness. We have a tradition of teaching in America that has produced great minds, great souls, even noble souls. It is a monumental tragedy that a very small portion of our teachers in 1965 have lost sight of that tradition.

In the current Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists there is an article by Prof. Kenneth E. Boulding, who presided over the first teach-in at the University of Michigan. It is an article which is designed to show how splendidly and intelligently the teach-in was conducted, and how brilliantly it was geared to the Vietnamese war. But it is monumentally tragic that the essay on self praise spoke no one word about the vast problem of facing a Communist power in China which is pledged to dominate Asia, and eventually the world—through violence. There is no word about the thousands and thousands of murders committed by the Vietcong. There is no word about the ultimate question: Just what would happen to the people of South Vietnam if we did get out?

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time for the teachers involved in these teach-in programs to look to themselves again. If they are looking for sensationalism, then I believe they are in the wrong profession. Teaching is supposed to be a quiet search for truth. I do not believe these teach-ins are pursuing eternal verities.

There are nearly 150,000 of our brave men presently committed to the fight to save the people of South Vietnam from Communist slavery. We have made a pledge to save them. We must keep it, in the name of all that is sacred to our own traditions, and in the name of basic human decency.

It is not possible for me to be with our troops in Vietnam to tell them that America stands beside them in their fight, in our fight. But I would consider myself remiss if I did not state this in the Halls of Congress, where the men and women who represent the Nation may speak.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the cruel stupidity of the teach-in may soon become evident to the foolish teachers and the misguided students who are engaging in this work to give aid and comfort to the enemy.

I hope also, Mr. Speaker, that the agents of our Federal Government will take swift and proper action against those people who are destroying their draft cards as their protest against our involvement in Vietnam.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, a word about the proposed march on Washington. I have not bothered to note the date of this proposed march. I have no intention of noting the date. I merely wish to note that I shall not be in my office to meet any marchers coming to Washington. I hope none come from among the great patriots in my own 10th Congressional District, where my constituents know the meaning of this war, and know they must stand solidly with our fighting men. In any event, I have no desire to see any marchers, to discuss anything with any marchers. I shall make a conscious effort to be absent when they arrive. I have nothing to discuss with them. I would, however, suggest that if they really need conversation, they travel into the central highlands of Vietnam, to discuss their problems with our soldiers and marines in the jungles. That conversation should be profitable for them.

CRISIS IN OUR FISCAL POLICY

Mr. **McDADE**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. **McDADE**. Mr. Speaker, we are facing this year something of a crisis in our fiscal policy. We have voted the largest budget in the history of the Nation. No one can be unaware of the importance of saving wherever saving is possible. We have called upon the Departments of the Federal Government to exercise the wisest prudence in their expenditures. We have called upon them to do so in the past.

It is indeed a pleasure for me to report in this House that in the person of Mr. Frank C. Memmott, Acting Director of the Bureau of Mines, there is one man who is well aware of the need to save money and who is doing something about it today just as he did something about it yesterday. At my request, Mr. Memmott has made available to me certain documents and directives originating in the Bureau of Mines which are specifically aimed at saving as much money as possible. I am inserting those directives in the RECORD at this point for all of you to read:

APRIL 26, 1965.

To: Assistant directors.
From: Director.
Subject: Convention and foreign travel.

Travel to conventions and foreign countries to attend meetings of technical societies is worthwhile and the Bureau of Mines should be represented at the meetings where a definite benefit from such attendance is clearly demonstrable. However, the number of requests for convention and foreign travel being received for approval leads me to believe that insufficient thought is given by the persons involved to the need for the requested travel.

There has been and continues to be increased emphasis by the Congress on reduction of travel expenses of Government employees. Furthermore, it is the announced policy of President Johnson and Secretary Udall to utilize our manpower to the fullest extent in order to advance our technical programs as rapidly as possible with available funds. Personnel attending foreign sponsored meetings and conventions without good cause are not being utilized fully.

Supervisors at all levels of operation should carefully consider all applications for convention and foreign travel and forward only those which appear to fit the criteria for serious need for attendance. I am personally interested in making an all-out effort to reduce travel expenses to a minimum and owing to the comparatively large expense involved in both convention and foreign travel this naturally is an item which will bear close scrutiny.

FRANK C. MEMMOTT,
Director.

APRIL 20, 1965.

To: Director, through Assistant Director, Health and Safety.
From: Chief, Division of Coal Mine Inspection.
Subject: Reducing cost of travel.

On April 7, 1965, I attended a conference with officials of the Freeman Coal Mining Corp. and health and safety district D, Bureau of Mines, at the company's office, West Frankfort, Ill. When the conference was arranged, we anticipated that it would not be concluded until late in the afternoon which meant the only available return flight would be at 7:45 a.m., April 8, from Evansville, Ind.—a 2-hour drive from West Frankfort.

Inasmuch as we were able to complete the conference before 12 noon on April 7, I contacted the Eastern Air Lines office in Evansville and arranged to change my flight time from 7:45 a.m., April 8, to 3:30 p.m., April 7. My scheduled flight at 7:45 a.m. on April 8 returning from Evansville, Ind., was first class, the only available accommodation on that flight. Inasmuch as I was able to obtain tourist-class accommodations on the return flight on the afternoon of April 7, a saving of $10.70 in air fare and a saving of $8 per diem was realized.

I am giving you this statement to prove that we are quite sincere in our efforts to cut costs wherever possible.

H. F. WEAVER.

Control of travel

	Fiscal year 1964			Fiscal year 1965		
	Budget	Cost	Percent	Budget	Cost	Percent
Administration	$93,400	$65,694	70.3	$93,710	$62,573	66.7
Mineral resource development	271,700	221,375	81.4	279,090	183,787	65.8
Minerals research	402,500	356,491	88.5	389,500	325,525	83.5
Health and safety	336,900	355,054	105.3	366,800	308,575	84.1
Helium	61,300	53,676	87.5	85,900	62,755	73.0
Total	1,165,800	1,032,290	88.5	1,215,000	943,215	77.6

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF MINES,
Washington, D.C., July 6, 1965.

To: Assistant directors.
From: Director.
Subject: Travel.

You are aware of my insistence that every Bureau of Mines official charged with the responsibility of approving travel exercise prudence and care in the expenditure of such funds. With your cooperation, in fiscal year 1965 we did a good job of restricting travel only to those trips we considered absolutely essential for conduct of the Bureau's business. During the 1966 fiscal year, I am again soliciting your help in exercising a tight control over the expenditures of the Bureau's travel funds. One way to accomplish our goal is for you to alert all members of your staff to review carefully their requirements and plans for travel.

With respect to travel by assistant directors, starting immediately I will expect an absence from the office notice (form 6–536) to be on my desk at least 5 days before a proposed trip. In certain emergencies where such notification is impossible, verbal notice should be given if practical. I will expect the absence form to be prepared in enough detail to provide me with full information regarding the purpose of the trip.

Similar procedures should be set up for the personnel under your direction.

FRANK C. MEMMOTT,
Acting Director.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF MINES,
Washington, D.C., August 27, 1965.

To: Assistant Directors, Headquarters Division Chiefs, Area Directors, Research Center Directors.
From: Director.
Subject: Travel.

We are all well aware of our obligation to carefully and continuously monitor our travel commitments. In addition to our efforts in this direction and the concern expressed by the congressional committees, President Johnson and Secretary Udall, personally, have directed that travel be restricted to those instances that are clearly essential to the effective performance of the Government's most urgent programs.

The obligation to conform to this policy attaches to all persons to whom authority has been delegated to approve travel, as well as to their supervisors. The funds allotted to offices, laboratories, and projects are controlled by objects and we know that each supervisor establishes his work plans with the limitations on such objects as travel in mind.

Aside from the travel that is essential to the effective conduct and management of the Bureau's specifically authorized projects and programs, it is expected that our presence at certain public affairs, meetings and conventions is necessary to maintain appropriate Government, public, and industry relationships and to gain the scientific and commercial knowledge that is important to the planning and conduct of our work. But the fact remains that the total funds available for travel is fixed and we are expected to not only perform all of our obligations within that total but to implement controls that insure that expenditures are well below it.

This year a number of new national programs of particular significance, such as the wilderness investigations and the scrap studies, involves the need for extensive travel on the part of numerous people. Moreover, travel that is essential and clearly necessary to the conduct and management of our continuing research and investigative programs involves substantial expenditures. In approving travel for other purposes each of us recognizes that funds remaining for the conduct of our authorized work are reduced by a like amount. Therefore, in contemplating travel for any purpose, each of us must, in his own mind, be completely satisfied that his decision is correct.

In weighing the merits of individual instances of travel, ultimate approval of foreign trips rests with the Secretary and, in other cases, with this office. We expect in these instances that appropriate judgment has been exercised by the originator of the request as well as the supervising offices. The fact that approval might rest elsewhere in no sense relieves the proposed traveler of his obligation to objectively determine what the cost means in terms of our total obligations and if it is clearly essential.

FRANK C. MEMMOTT.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to give my own personal commendation to Mr. Memmott for his work in this direction. I hope that every Director in every section of the Federal Government will take note of his fine activities and will go and do likewise. It is certainly an effort that is well worth the commendation of this entire body.

THE WIZARD'S NEW ROBE

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News has a very incisive editorial in their October 20 edition. It deals with the 5th amendment testimony of Imperial Wizard Robert M.

Shelton before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I heard his entire testimony—or possibly I should say his lack thereof—and it is quite a contrast compared to his previous invective and loud talk. Like most demagogs, he issued a pious and self-serving declaration afterwards that he was fighting for freedom and so forth. He is not fighting for freedom, Mr. Speaker. By his own admission he is fighting to prevent the Negro from attaining his constitutional rights and protections.

It is quite ironic that he should endeavor to use the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment in his declinations to respond to questions dealing with everything from his title to mismanagement of funds. He is dead set against the Negro achieving any rights through the equal protection clause but he certainly found it a safe sanctuary for the time being. I am hopeful that he will be cited for contempt of Congress. The Daily News editorial hits the nail right on the head, and it follows:

The Wizard's New Robe

The U.S. Constitution surely is one of the most wondrous protective garments ever conceived by man. It shields alike the innocent and the guilty, the sheep and the wolf, the accuser and the accused.

Now it gathers under its capacious skirts even the Imperial Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan.

This in itself is irony of high degree. For the Constitution and its amendments are repugnant to every tenet and every trapping of the Klan.

Yet Mr. Robert Shelton, who heads the United Klans of America, has found the Constitution a more comfortable garment in which to wrap himself than the robe and hood of his organization.

He invoked not only the 5th but also the 1st, 4th, and 14th amendments to avoid giving the House Un-American Activities Committee any information about the Klan. It was an interesting selection, to say the least.

The first amendment guarantees freedom of religion, of speech, of press, of assembly and of petition for redress of grievances. Do Klansmen believe in these freedoms for Negroes, for Catholics, for Jews, for anyone who opposes them?

The fourth amendment safeguards the right of people to be secure against search and seizure except under full color of the law. Do Klansmen wait for warrants before starting on midnight forays?

The fifth amendment does more than protect a person against self-incrimination. It further pledges that no one shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. Do the noose and the whip, the torch and the gun comprise due process of law?

The 14th amendment's use in this instance is most ironic of all. It guarantees full citizenship to all persons born or naturalized in the United States—including Negroes—and forbids States to pass laws abridging this privilege. Was it not to thwart the purposes of this amendment that the Ku Klux Klan was born?

Mr. Shelton, of course, has the privilege of invoking these or any other constitutional provisions if he wishes. As a citizen, he is under the protection of the Constitution no matter what he may think of its application to others. So are his fellow Klansmen.

But the American people will form their own opinion of men who hide behind constitutional immunity as readily as they hide behind robes and hoods.

HOW THE UNITED STATES GOT INVOLVED IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a report published by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions of the Fund for the Republic, Inc., entitled, "How the United States Got Involved in Vietnam," by Robert Scheer. The author's background and qualifications were described thus:

> Robert Scheer is coauthor with Maurice Zeitlin of the book, "Cuba: Tragedy in Our Hemisphere." A correspondent for Ramparts and the Realist, Mr. Scheer has recently returned from a trip to southeast Asia.

Later I received an appraisal of the report, plus a much more generous rundown on Mr. Scheer's background, from another recipient of the report, the Honorable Richard H. Ichord, of Missouri, who is my colleague on the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He made an excellent reply to the letter we both received.

Because it is virtually impossible for a congressional office to thoroughly digest all informative materials which it regularly receives, the following insertions should prove useful in evaluating the report, "How the United States Got Involved in Vietnam":

Letter of Representative Richard Ichord

Recently I received from you a copy of "How the United States Got Involved in Vietnam," by Robert Scheer, which you described as "the best short treatment of this subject I have ever seen." After a very thorough reading of the material, I must strongly disagree with your conclusion.

The publication is filled with half-truths, distortions, implications, innuendoes, and inferences which lead one to believe that Ho Chi Minh is the George Washington of Vietnam and any American who has had any part in our involvement is guilty of stopping a legitimate revolution. For example, in the section entitled "The Lobby," Mr. Scheer implies that our involvement in Vietnam was the result of a plot carried out by such distinguished Americans as John F. Kennedy, Maurine Neuberger, Edna Kelly, Emanuel Celler, and Cardinal Spellman. I would also point out to you that the Fund for the Republic, which allegedly sponsored the publication of the material, has been denounced by the very people who provided the money for its establishment.

I am equally confident that you were also unaware of Mr. Scheer's previous efforts in behalf of the Vietcong, Fidel Castro, and Mao Tse Tung.

I enclose a brief résumé of Mr. Scheer's activities which I am also sending to all Members of Congress for their information. I am sending this to them as I believe they should be informed of the kind of material being printed and distributed by an alleged education organization which enjoys a tax-exempt status. I, of course, am sending it only to the Members who received a copy from you.

With warmest personal regard, I am

Sincerely yours,

Richard H. Ichord,
Member of Congress.

Enclosure Prepared by Representative Ichord on Robert Scheer

(The following is a brief résumé of the previous activities of Mr. Robert Scheer, based on documented evidence held in the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.)

1. Robert Scheer is a former executive committee member of the University of California at Berkeley chapter of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

2. Robert Scheer has traveled to Vietnam. He appeared as an introductory speaker at a showing of the film entitled "War in Vietnam." The film was prepared by the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, "Vietcong," and was confiscated by Federal authorities in New York.

3. Robert Scheer was among the first students to violate the Cuban travel ban. An investigation of this travel by the House Committee on Un-American Activities indicated the trip was financed to a large degree by a foreign power. While in Cuba, the students cheered at a film showing American aircraft being shot down.

4. Robert Scheer's book "Cuba: Tragedy in Our Hemisphere," damns the U.S. policies and deifies Fidel Castro.

5. Robert Scheer was among those who signed a petition urging President Kennedy to adopt a fairer policy toward Cuba.

6. Robert Scheer is actively engaged in the programs of the Women's Strike for Peace and appears in their "demonstrations," including the massive march in Times Square, New York City, coinciding with the march on Washington.

7. The following are but a few of the many quotes attributed to Robert Scheer:

"We cannot expect Jack Kennedy to feel the necessity of political freedom—he has never been threatened by the state, never questioned by the secret police (FBI), never seen his parents arrested as political prisoners."

"You must talk about the economic development of Communist China and the role of profit in the perversion of the American consumer."

"As imperfect as they may be, Nasser, Mao, Toure, and Castro have liberated their people for the first time in modern history and we as a people oppose them."

8. Robert Scheer is an announced participant in the coming international days of protest on October 15 and 16 which are sponsored by the Vietnam day committee. This is the committee which attempted to halt the troop trains in California.

FENCING AND SPRAYING POSE DUAL THREAT TO ANTELOPE ON PUBLIC GRAZING LANDS

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over the welfare of antelope herds on our federally owned public grazing lands in the West. I warned earlier that the erection of thousands of miles of fences on these public lands inhibited the movement of antelope herds which must range widely for the food and water they need to survive.

This concern prompted me on September 30, 1965, to introduce H.R. 11359, a bill to prohibit the erection of fences which impede the movement of wildlife on public lands used for grazing and other purposes.

On October 9, 1965, the Bureau of Land Management issued a position statement on its fencing policy on publicly owned lands in the West. I discussed this statement—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 14, 1965, pages 27052–27054—and reported that I was encouraged that the BLM was recommending a tightening of its fencing policy.

The threat to antelope posed by the network of fences on publicly owned grazing lands—over 6,100 miles of such fencing has been erected in Wyoming alone—is described in an excellent article in the October 15 issue of Conservation News, a publication of the National Wildlife Federation.

The article points out that the BLM and livestock operators have embarked on still another program that could cut down on the antelope population—aerial spraying to kill sagebrush. Cattle and sheep do not eat the hardy plant, but it is a staple in the antelope's diet.

Since an estimated two-thirds of our antelope live on public lands administered by the BLM, it follows that the Bureau's policy on management of this land will play an important role in determining the future of antelope herds.

Congress originally directed the BLM to manage these public lands for multiple uses, including livestock production, wildlife habitat, recreation and timber production.

The Conservation News article implies that this directive is not being followed by the BLM.

I include a copy of the article by Willard T. Johns, Assistant Chief of the Division of Conservation Education of the National Wildlife Federation:

WHERE THE LIVESTOCK, BUT NOT THE ANTELOPE, CAN PLAY

(By Will Johns)

The West, according to the popular ballad, is supposed to be the place where seldom is heard a discouraging word and the deer and the antelope play.

Not any more. At least not in Wyoming where the hottest controversy in years is boiling up among conservationists, sportsmen, ranchers, and the Bureau of Land Management. At stake is the future of the pronghorn antelope, America's only genuine and distinct mammal—a species which has no living relatives in any other part of the world.

The fleet-footed, graceful and colorful pronghorn antelope is a creature of the prairies and wide-open spaces. It once ranged over an area of 2 million square miles in the central part of the continent—north into Canada, south into Mexico, east to Iowa and west to Oregon, Washington, and some parts of California. Some estimates of its numbers in the early 1800's ran as high as 30 to 40 million animals. But less than 75 years later, a 2-year survey in 1922–24 by State and Federal conservation agenices revealed that only about 26,600 antelope were left in the 16 Western States. It looked like the end of the pronghorn as a game animal and almost all of the States moved quickly to close the seasons and give the antelope full legal protection. Within 30 years, however, the antelope came back. Between 1924 and 1957, Wyoming's antelope herd increased from less than 7,000 to 105,000; in Montana from about 3,000 to 59,000; in Arizona from about 650 to more than 9,000. Today, surveys indicate antelope herds on the remaining range may total over 300,000 animals.

Now, however, the fate of the antelope rests not so much with the hunter as it does with other users of its range, especially with Government agencies which control those uses. Today, it is not the hunting rifle that poses a threat to the welfare of these popular and important animals; rather, the doom of the antelope may well be determined by the erection of fences and the application of herbicides on its home on the range.

As with all wild birds and animals, habitat is the key to antelope abundance. But unlike many game animals, antelope habitat has but two simple characteristics—plenty of sagebrush and plenty of wide open space. Over most of its present range, these two simple requirements are also characteristics of federally owned land in the Western States—land still left in the public domain and administered by the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Land Management through its State directors and advisory boards. Indeed, two out of every three pronghorn antelope alive today are found on lands administered by this single Bureau.

Here is where the fate of the antelope hangs in the balance—a balance of uses for the public domain. Until fairly recently, there was little, if any, conflict but today new techniques and new materials spell the beginning of a rapid change. From pioneer days, the greatest single use of these lands has been (and still is) the grazing of sheep and cattle. It is a land use upon which a rich and powerful industry has been built and for years, many livestock operators have considered grazing to be the only use for which these lands are suited.

Fortunately for antelope, there has been no great problem in their sharing the range with cattle or sheep. Occasionally a feeling of resentment cropped up among some ranchers who felt the antelope were competing with their cattle or sheep for the available forage. Wildlife biologists, however, long since have proved that with proper stocking rates of domestic livestock and game there is little competition for specific food plants.

Still another ballad expressing the feeling of the old West contained the line, "Don't fence me in." And, until recent years, most of the people and all of the antelope felt that fences on the open range were too costly and really unnecessary. Where some control or watchfulness over flocks of sheep or herds of cattle was necessary, livestock operators used cowboys or sheepherders. Today, however, most of the cowboys and other "riders of the purple sage" are seen only on television, at dude ranches, or in rodeos. Control of grazing now is beginning to take the form of fences—wire fences strung mile after mile across the range in order to divide grazing units and keep sheep and cattle off the highways. These fences do keep livestock within well-defined areas, of course, and do eliminate the cost of hiring men to watch over them. But for the antelope, fences pose a serious problem. Unlike deer and other big game, antelope normally are not good high jumpers. Some pronghorns do have the ability to get across fences, even when running at full speed (up to 50 miles per hour) by projecting themselves through or under the strands of barbed wire. Most adults in time have learned how to jump over a 4-foot fence but many are still lost where fences corner during severe snowstorms. Young antelope, however, usually wind up entangled in the wire or are completely blocked from traditional migration routes.

Coupled with fencing is another, and equally serious, problem. In Wyoming, as in many other places, much of the public domain has been badly overgrazed. The better forage grasses are gone, the topsoil eroded away, and about the only plant that can survive is the tough sagebrush. Thus the Bureau of Land Management and the livestock operators are embarked on a major range rehabilitation program. Many techniques have been tried but currently the most popular, and least expensive, seems to be aerial spraying of the herbicide 2,4-D in an oil suspension. The objective is to kill out the sagebrush, then reseed the range in the hope that it will come back to grasses and other forage for livestock. The only hitch is that in many places the only topsoil left is the little bit held together under the sagebrush plants. When they are destroyed, wind or water erosion sweeps that soil away and no amount of reseeding will ever bring back suitable forage cover. One study in Montana, for example, showed that after a sagebrush spraying program had been completed, the grass cover increased only 1 percent.

With this background, it is not too difficult to understand the concern of Wyoming sportsmen, as well as that of conservationists everywhere, over current fencing and spraying programs in the "Equality State." In the Bench Coral area of Sublette County north of Big Piney, for example, the Bureau of Land Management has announced it plans to spray 2,4-D to kill out sagebrush on over half of the 64,000 acres in the next 8 years. Already, BLM has sprayed 5,000 acres and has scheduled application of the herbicide next year in the most important antelope fawning area on the Bench Corral. Three years ago, according to Wyoming Game Warden Dave Thomas, the antelope population on the Bench Corral totaled 530 animals. Last year BLM started, or permitted holders of grazing allotments to start, a fence building program as well as spraying to eradicate the sagebrush. The May 1965, spring census showed the antelope population had dropped to 437 and 5 weeks after the spraying of 5,000 acres, the count was 168 animals. Thomas points out that the spray doesn't actually kill the antelope, but it apparently does drive them out of the area and scatters them in small herds from which they don't seem to regroup.

Another "hot spot" in the controversy is located in the Rattlesnake Mountains on some 20,000 acres known as the Cabin Creek Allotment. This includes 18,240 acres of Federal land administered by BLM, 770 acres of State land, and 1,670 acres of deeded land. It was formerly operated by the Grieve family as the Diamond Ring Ranch, with cattle using the allotment. When the ranch was sold several years ago, the new owner applied to the Bureau of Land Management for permission to graze both cattle and sheep on the land, as well as permission to construct about 30 miles of sheep-tight fencing. Permission to graze sheep was granted. The Bureau, however, has an agreement of long standing with the Wyoming Game and Fish Department to consult with it before authorizing any fences on the public land. In this case, the department refused to give approval because the fencing would be detrimental to the antelope. Last summer, however, a survey of this area showed that the 30 miles of fence had been erected on the public domain without permission from BLM, the Wyoming department, or anyone else. To date, the fence is still up although affidavits have been filed against the Diamond Ring Ranch Company in the hope that the U.S. attorney will file a civil suit compelling the firm to tear it down.

To resolve a growing problem and insure the future of antelope in Wyoming, Tom Bell, president of the Wyoming Wildlife Federation, has called for a 10-point program, as follows:

1. An indefinite moratorium on sheep-tight fence on the public domain where antelope are involved.

2. Fencing on all important antelope ranges should be kept to a minimum. Where fences are absolutely necessary, they should

be no more than a four-strand wire fence, with the bottom wire no less than 16 inches above ground level.

3. A concentrated and intensive research effort to determine the effects on antelope of fences now in place.

4. A review of grazing fees, with the thought in mind that where minimum fences only are permitted, the fees would remain low; otherwise, where the public is subsidizing the building of fences, the fees would be scaled upward.

5. A modification of a number of fences lying on or across critical migration routes of antelope where these are known, the modification to be as above.

6. A posting of all roads on all lands in grazing districts where there is an interspersion of private and public lands. If the public allows grazing on its land, the private landowner should certainly allow access across theirs.

7. Immediate prosecution of any unauthorized fences and illegal signs.

8. Immediate installation of livestock "exclosures," 5 to 10 acres in size, on the public range in order to determine range rehabilitation through natural processes and then to compare results with present livestock allotments.

9. Immediate implementation of methods to obtain better control of livestock numbers on the public range. There is really no excuse for livestock owners receiving only a light slap on the wrist for consistently overstocking and overgrazing, and for willful trespass.

10. A concentrated and intensive research effort to determine the long-range effect of sagebrush spraying on all the ecological communities involved.

Echoes of the fight to save the antelope in the "Equality State" are now spreading across the Nation. They sounded through Pinedale in late August when the National Wildlife Federation's officers, staff and board of directors pledged support of the Wyoming Wildlife Federation's stand and carried the plea to save the pronghorn into the Washington offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

This conservation battle is far from over but it reached a new level of intensity on September 30 when Representative Henry S. Reuss of Wisconsin, introduced a bill (H.R. 11359) in the 89th Congress. The Reuss bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to ban from the public lands any fence which impedes the movement of wildlife. If the Secretary finds a grazing licensee has built such a fence, he shall require it to be removed by the licensee, and shall see that it is removed at the licensee's expense if the licensee fails to remove it himself within 30 days. Any future illegal fencing shall be the cause for a revocation of the grazing license.

As storm clouds gather over the home on the range for antelope, livestock, fences and sprayed sagebrush, one point should be made clear. This is not a fight for a single use of the public domain, but rather a fight based on the principle of multiple use a—principle which by law and regulation is supposed to be applied to all of the 18 million acres in Wyoming and 176 million acres in the 11 Western States administered by the Bureau of Land Management. Sportsmen of the Equality State and conservationists throughout the Nation are asking that the antelope be given equal consideration, along with cattle, sheep, horses and other creatures, both wild and domesticated, which live where the buffalo once roamed and the skies are not cloudy all day.

THE SUGAR BILL

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Hansen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, October 13 on the floor of the House we debated the sugar bill. I felt that the people in my district were entitled to information that would give them a true picture of what transpired and I therefore sent out on that day the following radio press release. I include it here for the benefit of my colleagues:

There has been a good deal of comment both in and out of Congress regarding the recently passed sugar bill. Most of this rhetoric has been by persons who are more interested in generating heat than they are in bringing light on this subject.

Heat in itself is not necessarily bad, because as President Truman is reported to have said, "If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen."

Unfortunately, however, numerous scurrilous and character defamation remarks were directed toward members of the Committee on Agriculture. This was uncalled for and was not worthy of the proper debate that should be observed in the House of Representatives.

It pleased me greatly to see a large number of Members from both sides of the aisle rise to the defense of members of this capable committee. In order to keep the record straight, I hope all who are interested in this debate will study carefully the entire text as it appears in the Congressional Record. It would be a grave mistake to rely only on the fragmentary and out-of-context reports that so readily abound.

This committee has worked long and hard on some excellent farm legislation. It would be tragic if we were to allow irresponsible comments to cloud the issue and detract from the work of these conscientious Members of Congress.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 11332

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, today I was honored to appear before our colleague's, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Perkins], Subcommittee on General Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, in support of H.R. 11332, a bill introduced by my distinguished fellow Floridian, Mr. Gibbons, and my bill, H.R. 11614. These bills are to create and provide for a program of Federal assistance to elementary schools throughout the Nation to improve educational opportunities through provision for the services of child development specialists and to provide a program of Federal assistance for the training of such elementary school personnel in the institutions of higher education, and for other purposes. This bill is commonly called the Elementary and Preschool Child Development Act.

In no way do I want to seem vain, but I would like to submit for the Record my testimony on this subject as I feel that this is one that should be called to the attention of all our colleagues and ask that unanimous support be given to this bill when it comes before this body for consideration, and a voice of thanks from every person should go out to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gibbons] for his work and forethought in this field of education.

Mr. Speaker, our country is today faced with the sad and frightening problems of our emotional and imbalanced children. Therefore, I now offer my statement at this point for the Record:

Statement of Hon. Claude Pepper, a Representative in Congress From the State of Florida

Mr. Pepper. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I thank you very much for your kind words of invitation and introduction, Mr. Chairman. It is a great privilege for me to be here today to testify in behalf of H.R. 11322 introduced by my distinguished colleague, Mr. Gibbons, and my companion bill H.R. 11614, which I have introduced to show my support of and my desire to help in any way I can in the progress of that very desirable and in my opinion very important legislation.

There are no more serious problems America faces today than those twin evils of delinquency and crime.

Not far behind taking their social toll are the tragic conditions of mental illness and other forms of emotionally debilitating and socially disruptive behavior.

There is not one American in this country who would not agree that these grave problems are threatening the survival of the very fabric of our democracy. Yet, what are we doing about these problems today?

The sad answer is, I believe, that we are now spending our resources simply to contain these problems once they have become rampant and done their damage. Crime costs us billions of dollars a year and our prisons are overflowing. And our mental institutions are also full—in this case of tragically afflicted human beings.

This is why I urgently support the bill which has been so ably introduced and sponsored by my distinguished colleague, Mr. Gibbons, for the proposals in this act, instead of dealing with these problems at the end of the line, aim to strike at the hearts of these problems at a stage before they have a chance to become full blown—that is, when children are still very young.

This would be done by sponsoring a program that would place child development specialists in our elementary schools to help them to discover and work with young pupils who have these potentially disruptive forms of behavior. By working with such children in the early school grades, these disruptive forms of behavior could be prevented before they had an opportunity to develop into serious problems.

Before discussing the excellent provisions of H.R. 11322 and companion bills, I would like to say I have been vitally interested in this early preventive approach to dealing with the problems we are talking about for a very long time. And the Congress has for some time considered this approach. In 1945 when I was privileged to be chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education, we investigated, among other things, the educational and physical fitness needs of our country, at that time and, in the report which resulted from this inquiry, we clearly indicated our feeling that early preventive program of mental hygiene were needed to solve some of our deep-rooted social problems.

Our report stated, and I quote directly, "From a longer range point of view, the establishment of child guidance clinics in all communities is urgently needed to prevent early social maladjustments. Such a step would pay tremendous dividends in decreased crime, delinquency, and costs of institutionalizing the mentally ill."

In line with this same thinking, even earlier, in 1939, I introduced in the other body a bill to offer Federal assistance for the promotion of kindergarten education. The report of the Committee on Education and Labor which accompanied this bill also made clear our belief that the answer to many of our social problems lay in acting in the early grades of school. It said, and again I quote directly:

"From information available to the committee, college presidents and other educators of note, penologists, and psychiatrists—furnish valid reasons for the contention that an increase in the number of kindergartens will mean a decrease in crime. The committee believes that by being given training in kindergarten and nursery schools, normal children will be better prepared to lead normal lives and that such training will prevent the development in children of dispositions toward unsocial acts."

The idea behind our present bill, H.R. 11322, and companion bills, is very similar to those motivating these earlier ones. But in the form of H.R. 11614, we have a much improved proposal for achieving the aims of early prevention of socially disruptive behavior in young pupils.

How then would H.R. 11322 and similar bills do this?

Basically, as I have said, it would attempt to accomplish this preventive action by initiating an original program that would help our elementary schools to identify and treat these problems as they become apparent in young pupils in our earliest grades.

The heart of this practical program would help to provide our elementary schools with the services of of child development specialists who would help elementary schools to carry out plans of preventive action. In addition to paying the salaries of such elementary school personnel, the program would also give assistance for training these needed child specialists in our institutions of higher learning.

These child development specialists would be persons who had successfully completed a postgraduate course of at least 2 years in an institution of higher learning, such course which would qualify them to help schools carry out a program of prevention.

These specialists would act in a number of valuable ways. First, they would help elementary school personnel with the individual learning or behavior problems of elementary school children, as well as with the educational progress of such children.

Second, they would assist school personnel to recognize elementary school children who have or who are developing serious emotional, learning, or behavior problems, and in making effective school related changes to help such children. And third, they would help teachers, parents, and school staff to become knowledgeable about community and other resources that might be used by such children and their families who required assistance in solving some of the problems of these schoolchildren.

By the terms of the proposal, the child development specialist would work only with children up until and through the third grade of elementary school. He would be assigned to serve no more than 350 children. And, he would perform duties appropriate only for child development specialists.

These specific limitations are extremely important—and extremely sensible. For, we feel that they will insure that the beneficial effects of the child development specialist's services will not be allowed to be dispersed ineffectively over too many grades and too many students, but will instead, be able to be focused on the primary aim of the program—to identify and treat incipiently disruptive behavior in some of its very earliest identifiable stages in very young schoolchildren.

These points cannot be stressed enough. For, we feel that if this program is to do any good, it must be strongly pinpointed on this one problem of early identification and treatment of young children before the fourth grade. Moreover, the persons who are to be the major leaders in this task—the child development specialists—must not be allowed to be diverted to other educational duties, no matter how important these may be. These limitations I have just described will help to assure that these fundamental purposes of the program will be accurately carried out. And, they will help to assure that the specialized knowledge of the child development specialists will really be appropriately used by the school for these purposes.

Those who have worked in this field believe that staffing our Nation's elementary schools with these highly trained child development specialists would be one of the most practical and effective ways of realistically helping elementary schools to identify and help troubled little children before their problems grow out of hand. Yet, the truth of the matter is, even if we wanted to put this program I have discussed into operation tomorrow, we would not be able to provide our elementary schools with these essential child development specialists for the simple reason that, at this time, we do not have sufficient personnel properly trained in this field.

This is why another very important part of H.R. 11322 provides assistance for training child development specialists in our institutions of higher education. Through a program of fellowships, to be awarded for not more than 2 years, we would help qualified persons pursue a program of graduate study that would appropriately prepare them to be child development specialists.

Although the act does not spell out all the details of the training a child development specialist would have, it does wisely set down some firm guidelines for such training. For instance, to qualify an individual as a child development specialist, the act specifies that, among other things, his training program shall make him competent in child growth and development, personality theories, behavior problems of children, learning disorders and their prevention and remediation, parent counseling, and the utilization of community resources.

The clear aim of the child development specialist's program is specified, however—it is to be to establish a high level of competence in these persons so that they can help school personnel to become more effective in the management and education of all children in the school, and especially so that they can be a major support and resource to the teacher and to the parent in the education of children with beginning, moderate, or serious learning, behavior, or emotional problems.

Another well planned part of the training provisions of H.R. 11322 and companion bills provides assistance for training and would make grants to State educational agencies so that they could sponsor in an institution of higher education programs that would provide special training for school and community personnel in the use of child development specialists. Since the idea of this program would be very new to many persons involved in running educational programs in the country, it would seem apparent that these courses would be extremely useful—if not indeed, essential.

Finally, H.R. 11322 and companion bills would establish an Advisory Council on Elementary School Child Development to review the administration and operation of the programs carried under this act and to advise and make recommendations to the Commissioner on the approval of programs authorized under the training provisions of the act.

It is, I think, clear that H.R. 11322 provides a carefully designed and comprehensive practical plan for helping our Nation's troubled children at the stage when they can be helped—in the early grades of elementary school. Its plan of providing child specialists for elementary school and the training to create them, and its provisions for training school personnel and the community as to the aims of the program, would all constructively contribute to providing this desperately needed help.

I urge every American concerned with finding a really effective solution to our national problems of crime, delinquency, mental illness, and other such social problems, to support H.R. 11322.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add on to this. I have been urging at the administrative level for some time that there be set up in each of the major cities of the country a Public Security Administration, or a public security director, or administrator, as I have called him, for lack of a better term. The purpose of that function would be to have someone of outstanding competence and responsibility who I hope would be paid something like $15,000 to $25,000 a year, and I prefer the latter figure, with the cost of that administration being divided between the Federal Government and under the recent anticrime bill that we passed and the local municipality.

I say the function of that overall administrator with a small staff but a comprehensive jurisdiction would be to recognize and to adequately deal with every facet of this multifaceted matter of what we call crime, the kind of maladjustment or antisocial behavior which we described as crime, and for a good long while I have been emphasizing and supporting this proposal, that one of the areas where such a person could serve advantageously is in working with the school authorities at these tender ages of children when criminals are being developed, when criminals are aborning, and when tragedy is also aborning in the life of the children who has that predisposition or predilection toward the kind of antisocial behavior that eventuates this crime. As it is now the school principal is one of the claimants for the public money that is available, and of course there are a lot of other claimants and he has to fight the battles from the point of view of the school man, but if the man I envisage was of the stature that he should be, he would have a hearing before civic clubs, before the press, the radio, and the TV media and before parent teachers associations, before community groups of influence and responsibility and concern to tell them, "listen, I am not fighting battles of education. I am trying to keep some of us from being killed. I am trying to keep someone, some woman or girl in your family from being attacked by some criminal youth or somebody who will manifest tendencies to commit crime."

If we don't work with these school authorities at these tender ages, when now it is that the psychiatrists tell us these antisocial predilections and predispositions are observable and maybe correctable, or at least perhaps to be ameliorated, why, eventually we are going to have to deal with a criminal and the tragedy again may be unspeakable or indescribable. Look at what has happened here in Washington. A teenage boy—

I think he was 17 years old—attacked a woman and killed her, murdered her. I am as sympathetic as anybody—I think I am—toward the problems of delinquency and toward judicial attitudes that take cognizance of those maladjustments in the mental and nervous derangements of those people but at any time when a local judge in Washington sentenced that boy only to incarceration until he got to be 21 years old and then made it possible for him to be turned loose on society without any psychiatric examination or any determination as to whether he has an inevitable compulsion to do the same thing, then I think it is a gross and a valid miscarriage of justice.

It might well have been that if that boy who performed that heinous act had had the kind of treatment that Mr. Gibbons' bill would wisely contemplate and envisage, that boy might have been saved from criminality and for a useful life and that lady might have been spared her life from his later criminal attack.

Take just one further instance. Take slums. Well, it just happens that I know of some areas right here in Washington. There are some areas to my knowledge, and the police tell me, where a shocking amount of criminality comes out of those slum areas. There must be somebody in the District whose problem it is to try to eradicate slums, but every time he goes before the board which dispenses the money they have a problem and he has a problem: Is there enough money to go around?

But some man speaking for the community should even be enabled to go out to the community and tell the story. I am not talking about more housing projects. I don't personally care whether you get them or not, but I don't want to be killed by some criminal that comes out of these areas. I am trying to help you and me save our lives or protect our property or our families. I think this is one of the most meaningful approaches that could possibly be made, start at the tender age when what will later become the hardened tree is only a tender twig which can be prevented perhaps or at least saved from deformity when it comes to full maturity, so therefore I commend my distinguished colleague for some more excellent work and farsighted contribution to our country.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

Mr. Perkins. Any questions? Mr. Scheuer.

Mr. Scheuer. No; I don't have any questions, except to say how pleased I am that our colleague, Mr. Pepper, came before us. To me this is the greatest evidence and if I had had any lingering iota of doubt that this bill is right as rain, then Mr. Pepper's appearance would have obliterated it.

Mr. Pepper. Thank you very much.

Mr. Perkins. Thank you very much.

Mr. Pepper. Thank you very much and members of the committee.

Mr. Gibbons. Thank you very much. It is an excellent presentation.

THE 7TH ARMY SAYS "THANK YOU"

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant pieces of legislation that this historic 89th Congress passed this summer was the pay increase for our Armed Forces. It has not received as much publicity, perhaps, as other legislation whose impact is measured largely in terms of our society here at home. But it was significant because it recognized the outstanding performance by a most important segment of our society, and attempted to nearer equate its pay with that of its contemporaries. Our dependence on that segment, our recognition of its daily, and often unsung, effort on behalf of us all can never be translated into any piece of legislation, even an increase in salary. Even our daily prayer of thanks and godspeed will never be enough to let the men of our Armed Forces know how we think of them and what we think of them.

Among the letters of appreciation that I have received from individual soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen, none has quite touched me as one I received this morning from the leader of one of the key units of our forces, Lt. Gen. William W. Quinn, commanding general of the 7th Army.

I do not know General Quinn, to my recollection have never met him, in fact. But any man who, amid the constant and considerable pressures of running one of the greatest teams in the history of our Army, can take the time to write such a thoughtful letter on behalf of the 170,000 men in his command, must be quite a commander. His military rank and assignment eloquently attest to his caliber as an officer and gentleman. His letter confirms this. He speaks for all of his men, and no group of men ever had a better spokesman. And, in order that all who read the record of our proceedings may know of the appreciation of those who daily stand on the eastern perimeter of the free world defending all Europe against the Communist threat, I include the text of General Quinn's letter at this point in the Record:

HQ, 7th Army, APO New York,
October 15, 1965.

Hon. Peter W. Rodino, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Rodino: On behalf of the 170,000 officers and me, of the 7th Army in Europe, I would like to express to you our collective appreciation for your active support of the military pay raise and the more recent insurance program.

As commander of this field army, which is the world's most powerful, I share in the responsibility for the maintenance of its high morale. Hence, I can appreciate the impact that these recent actions by the Congress have had on the troops that comprise this fine organization.

Although the material benefits derived from these two bills were more than welcome, the psychological benefits gained through the realization that the Members of Congress, and hence the people, are thinking of and are concerned for them, is of unestimable value toward increased morale and the long term goal of high retainability.

From the 7th Army therefore, please accept our best wishes and sincere thanks.

Respectfully yours,
William W. Quinn,
Lieutenant General, USA, Commanding.

COMPENSATION CLAIMS

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Burton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, it has recently been brought to my attention, by letter from the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union, Local 10, that a situation exists in the U.S. Bureau of Employees' Compensation, the 13th compensation district, which greatly hinders the prompt processing of compensation claims.

The problem lies not within the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, but is created by a lack of funds and personnel to adequately process claims.

If our compensation program is to be meaningful, we must have a prompt adjudication of claims. To hinder the proper functioning of the 13th compensation district at the hearing and conference levels is certainly unjustifiable and increases to a large extent the misery and suffering of those whose claims are not promptly processed.

I do not know the extent to which this difficulty exists in the other compensation districts. I would, however, urge the Bureau of the Budget to review the allotment of funds and personnel to these districts in light of existing backlogs and with the knowledge that these backlogs diminish the effectiveness and thwart the purpose for which our compensation laws were enacted.

LADY BIRD'S BILL

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Burton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, the San Francisco Chronicle on Friday, October 15, 1965, printed an editorial entitled "Lady Bird's Bill."

This editorial commends the First Lady for the "good fight" in behalf of the highway beautification bill. We are fortunate to have Mrs. Johnson assume the important task of providing leadership to the program to retain our national beauty.

The full text of the editorial follows:

Lady Bird's Bill

The highway beautification bill establishing controls over junkyards and billboards along 266,000 miles of roads finally has emerged from Congress, a bit tattered and torn. We deplore the weakening of the controls originally proposed, which were so ably advocated by Lady Bird Johnson, but we do regard the compromise as at least a good start toward preserving or restoring America's heritage of natural beauty.

The President, with Lady Bird stanchly by his side—or was it vice versa?—obviously fought a good fight, else the whole measure would have been killed forthwith by billboard lobbyists. San Franciscans well know the strength of that lobby, since it succeeded to a great extent in emasculating the citys' own billboard control ordinance only a few days ago.

Saved in the Federal bill were provisions which require States to control billboards along interstate and primary Federal-aid roads by January 1, 1968, or lose 10 percent of their Federal highway grants. Billboards will be banned within 660 feet of rights-of-way, except in areas zoned for industrial or commercial uses—and Federal officials will have an equal say as to what constitutes such areas. States must also agree, under the same penalty of curtailed aid, to remove or screen junkyards within 1,000 feet of the highway paving. Although the President had proposed these things be done by police powers of the States, the final version of the measure provides for compensating the billboard or junkyard or landowners involved. The bill also grants some extra funds to States to beautify all Federal-aid highways.

Regardless of the weakening amendments written in by Congress, the bill definitely is a forward step. Any measure that forces the slide-rule minds of Federal and State highway engineers to consider protecting instead of destroying natural beauty is well worthwhile.

PRESIDENTIAL "E" AWARD

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure as well as pride to put the remarks of S. L. Drumm into the RECORD. Mr. Drumm is the president of the West Penn Power Co. which serves my congressional district.

The remarks were made on the occasion of the presentation of the Presidential "E" Award by the Secretary of Commerce, John T. Connor, to the West Penn Power Co. for its contributions in the interest of export expansion.

This is the first time in history that this award has been awarded to an operating power company.

I join with my fellow Westmorelanders in congratulating Mr. Drumm and the West Penn family.

Mr. Drumm's remarks follow:

ACCEPTANCE OF "E" SERVICE AWARD FROM SECRETARY OF COMMERCE JOHN T. CONNOR

(By S. L. Drumm, president of West Penn Power Co., at National Export Expansion Council luncheon, Statler-Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., Oct. 18, 1965)

On behalf of West Penn Power Co. of the Allegheny Power System and my associates, we are most gratified to be the first electric utility in the Nation to receive the "E" Export Service Award for our contributions to the increase of U.S. trade abroad. It is a distinct honor to have had this presentation made at this luncheon with the many distinguished guests from both Government and business. To attach this importance to this award and its presentation attests not only to the importance of foreign trade promotion, but reaffirms the wisdom of our company's decision and subsequent action in this field. In addition, it provides a soundingboard on the essential nature of this activity for other utilities throughout the Nation, and emphasizes the vital importance of this undertaking in contributing to the national as well as local economic improvement.

Fred Foy has asked me if we could briefly describe our concept of the program, how it was put into operation, and how we feel it has worked. Many of these details are covered in an extensive brochure that has been put together for distribution to those in attendance at this meeting. Our area development manager, C. M. Fife, who incidentally is a member of the Pittsburgh Regional Council, is here today and will be glad to answer any questions concerning its contents.

I believe that the basis of our thinking and operation with respect to the program and its long-range advantages to us as a utility will be of some benefit in motivating others to undertake a foreign trade program. This program was undertaken more than 2 years ago as an integral part of our total concept of area development. Most important, the program was made a definite responsibility of our marketing function, with accountability for results. This was no casual approach, to be done as our personnel saw fit. If it had been, we would not have had the results, nor would we be on this platform today.

In most areas, the Regional Export Expansion Council has had to rely on the voluntary help of members, who are limited in number and whose time is already taken up with their own business, to do the grassroots selling with medium and small firms.

This is the key to our program. We use people that are already calling on these companies for other purposes to also promote foreign trade. There are about 50 men, and since it is made a part of calls for other purposes, can be done at very little incremental cost. They are Indians, not chiefs, and the same thing applied nationally to utilities would mean a sales force in the thousands.

Perhaps a few words of explanation of this total concept of area development will be helpful in telling why we embarked on such a venture. Utilities are fully aware that they can achieve growth in only two ways:

1. By expanding use of their present customers, and

2. By adding new customers.

An area development activity, to be total in concept, must contribute significantly to the attainment of both of these objectives—more use by present customers and adding new ones. Properly designed and implemented programs will do just that. The attraction of new commercial and industrial enterprises with attendant employment fills the need for new customers and, in turn, causes a general improvement in the economy. These changes then begin a chain reaction as they generate additional business for present service industries and trigger the establishment of new ones. Needs for schools, public services, and community facilities are also increased, providing greater sales opportunities in all the utility's markets—industrial, commercial, residential, farm, and municipal as well.

In addition to these growth benefits, however, other important values should accrue to a utility from an area development program that is broad in scope. Providing leadership and other help to community groups in programs directed toward economic development has an important byproduct—it is one of the best possible ways to build a company image which reflects full acceptance of corporate citizenship responsibilities.

Finally, a comprehensive area development program should also help to foster our American way of life and the competitive enterprise system.

You can readily see where the foreign trade program fits in, naturally and logically. It also serves a patriotic purpose and fills an obligation that we have in helping to improve the national balance-of-payments picture. As a service activity for our area, it helps us as a corporate citizen to assist our customers and generate confidence in West Penn Power as a utility interested in general improvement rather than just selling kilowatt-hours of electricity.

But even more important from the factual basis of business decisionmaking, it is only enlightened economic self-interest that motivates us to undertake, refine, expand, and improve our foreign trade promotion program. There are jobs created by the export business. One estimate has it that 135,000 jobs are created by a billion dollars in exports.

The Pennsylvania county where our general headquarters is located is Westmoreland County. There is no city larger than 25,000 in this county, which is on the fringe of the Pittsburgh metropolitan area and includes both industrial and rural areas in its breadth. Westmoreland County exceeds $25 million yearly in exports by only 16 percent of its manufacturers, and this provides 3,200 jobs in the county. Products shipped abroad range all the way from books and clothing to amusement park locomotives and church steeples.

It would be belaboring an obvious point to say much about this significance to our company, with expanded industries and additional jobs in the area in which we provide electric service. That is one good solid reason why it is sound long-range thinking for a utility to undertake an aggressive foreign trade program, because among its results if properly carried out is an indisputable direct economic benefit.

When our decision to innovate such a program was made, the first step was a major meeting and workshop announcing our interest and desire in cooperating with and asking the encouragement and support of the local field representatives of the Department of Commerce, as well as executives of banks and industries already involved, to capitalize on their experience and counsel. Employees to whom this work was being assigned were given training courses. Reference material that would provide background, encouragement, and answers was provided.

This was later supplemented by local workshops, staged in cooperation with chambers of commerce and other interested groups. Our methods of determining contacts for initial and primary emphasis were developed and sophisticated as experience in the program helped.

We not only continued to publicize various foreign trade opportunities and events as they arose, but also encouraged present and prospective exporters to expand their business by this route.

Contact reports with customers are required of our personnel assigned to the activity, with provision for followup to provide any help or encouragement necessary to obtain action. Advice on opportunities, particularly those in the standard industrial classification of the products they are already making, are promulgated.

These are but a few of the various tools and elements of our aggressive and continuing program. One other point that may have some significance is that West Penn Power Co. does not serve a port city or coastal area, although it is on the inland waterway.

It is difficult as yet to fully assess the results of our program. It is a long-range effort, and has only been underway since 1963. On the other hand, there are many evidences of increased interest and effort, and some examples that it is beginning to produce tangible results in getting companies to export that never had, and those that did to increase this phase of their business.

We have found there is a surprising variety of businesses that have export possibilities in our area, and that the promotion and support provided by our program has been most helpful in stimulating and motivating by raising the sights of even some very small companies which had previously given only passing thought to export profit possibilities. Here is, indeed, a fertile field for a well-executed program. After 2 years, we are learning new ways to accelerate the future results of this ongoing effort, and will adopt them as appropriate.

Our gratitude is expressed to Judge Roy Morgan and the Department of Commerce field services staff, and particularly to Newton Heston of the Pittsburgh field office, for their invaluable and enthusiastic support and cooperation. We are grateful to Fred Foy and his associates on the national council, and the Pittsburgh Regional Export Expansion Council headed by Bill Boyd, and are most appreciative of the honor and recognition you have so generously paid us here today.

Let me assure you that our program will be continually improved and refined so that it will be even more productive in all of our best interests in the future. A program such as this, with its manifold benefits to the Nation and its value to our service area clearly mandates our most dedicated continuing efforts.

Thank you.

ROOSEVELT LIBRARY ADDITION WOULD HONOR ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a joint resolution today to authorize an appropriation of $625,000 to pay half the cost of construction of an Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Addition to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park, N.Y.

This memorial addition will consist of two wings on the library, to house the papers and personal effects of Mrs. Roosevelt, whose warmth, understanding, and compassion made her known as the "First Lady of the World." The Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation will pay the other half of the cost of the addition, which would become the property of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library was a source of great interest and pride to President Roosevelt during his life, and it became Mrs. Roosevelt's first interest after his death. It is significant that President Roosevelt was the first American President to see the great value of preserving Presidential papers in a place accessible to scholars and historians, and to all interested Americans. President Roosevelt established a precedent, and libraries have been built to house the papers of Presidents Hoover, Truman, and Eisenhower. Libraries will be built for the papers of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, and, I am sure, for all our Presidents in the future.

I believe it is fitting and proper for the American people to recognize the debt the Nation owes to the strength and greatness of President Roosevelt, and the greatness and warmth of his wife, Eleanor, by helping to provide a fitting place for Mrs. Roosevelt's valuable papers and memorabilia at the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park.

WE HONOR EXCELLENCE

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the pleasure of participating in the presentation by the Administrative Management Society of Federal Government Paperwork Management Awards. Twenty-two officers of the Federal Government were honored for producing savings in Federal paperwork amounting to $100 million since the administration's war on waste began. The Honorable John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, made the principal remarks at the presentation ceremony, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Macy's important message be brought to everyone's attention by making it a part of the Congressional Record.

In recognition of their professional excellence, I should like to include also the name, agency, and hometown of those who received top honors and the other award recipients.

Chairman Macy's remarks and the award winners follow:

We Honor Excellence

Congressman Olsen, Mr. Poole, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a very great pleasure for me to be with you here this evening and to share in this wonderful occasion.

President Johnson has asked me to convey to you his high interest in the honors that are being granted tonight and to express his regrets that he could not be here personally. He has also asked that I extend his warm congratulations to each of the award winners for their exceptional achievements that will help to reduce the cost of paperwork in Government.

These outstanding accomplishments need to be identified and held up as examples that will inspire and encourage the efforts of others toward additional improvements and progress in paperwork management. We are very pleased with the Administrative Management Society's contribution to this objective and their initiation of this ceremony.

As I reflected on my remarks for this event, I kept thinking of the old statement, "Everybody talks about the weather, but no one does anything about it." It is a statement often attributed to Mark Twain, but actually it originated in an editorial in the Hartford, Conn., "Courant" in 1890. In any event, the statement was certainly true at the time it was made. Weather—hot or cold—wet or dry—was something people accepted as a fact. Sometimes it was helpful, sometimes burdensome, but the individual had to make his own personal adjustment to it.

Today, however, the statement is no longer true. We still talk about the weather, but we are also doing a lot about it.

First of all, we have learned to make more and more accurate predictions of what it will be. Second, with the advent of air conditioning, we have won a real battle over one aspect of the weather. Many people now step from an air-conditioned home, into an air-conditioned car, and ride to an air-conditioned office. They have to read the newspaper to find out that a new heat record was set for the day. Now, in Houston, Tex., we have an air-conditioned sports stadium. I understand that the city of Boston is next on the list for one of these exotic buildings of our age of progress. Before long, we may have air-conditioned domes over our city streets, and city children may grow up without really knowing the old-fashioned weather could be hot or cold or wet or dry.

Why do I call this current phenomenon to your attention? My purpose is to draw a comparison with paperwork management in the Government.

For years and years it could be said of Government paperwork that "Everybody talks about it, but no one does anything about it." I am told that John Paul Jones, one of the founders of our Navy, complained that paperwork interfered with the working of his ships. We didn't go back any further with our research, but I'll bet that Napoleon had trouble with paperwork—and Julius Caesar and—well you can go back as far as you like.

If you go back far enough, you will find at least one bright spot. Our ancestors did not have problems with making 10 extra carbon copies when they wrote their letters on stone tablets. But, on the other hand, I suppose they did have some of our current problems, such as: Trouble in carrying the stone tablets from office to office to get the clearance initials; long delays in the mail, and lack of file cabinets large enough to hold the tablets.

To get back to my theme, everybody talked about Government paperwork for years and suffered with it until the first and second Hoover Commissions came along. The Hoover Commission reports described the problem in a way that made some influential people decide it was time to do less talking and convert some of that energy to fighting the paperwork colossus.

We are still in the early stages of the war on paperwork but a great deal of progress has been made. The National Archives and Records Service of GSA has laid out strategy and tactics for this war, trained cadres of troops, and put weapons in their hands.

My friend Congressman Olsen, through his series of hearings, has done a tremendous job in scouting the paperwork enemy, describing the fortifications, and marking the maps for the campaigns.

Our troops have been in battle and we have been winning some victories. Tonight the people on the home front, in the form of the Administrative Management Society, are going to honor some of the heroes of the past campaigns.

I am delighted to be with you, to join in this salute to our heroes, and to applaud them as they receive their decorations.

Let there be no lack of clarity about the excellence of these outstanding people we honor tonight. They have demonstrated great ingenuity and imagination in preparing their campaign plans against paperwork.

They have trained and inspired their troops and fellow campaigners. They have shown high courage and skill in leading the charges. They can wear their medals proudly.

I also want to express the appreciation of all the Government service to the Administrative Management Society for doing a great deal of work to identify the war heroes we honor tonight and for pursuing with conspicuous gallantry all of the problems of administration of the fine tribute and ceremony we are enjoying here. It is most appropriate that a respected national professional society, representing many years of experience and judgment in paperwork management be the sponsor of this award. We will be grateful for their continuing interest.

As we look toward the future, we know the war must go on. We have many campaigns ahead of us. We are right in the middle of the campaign for the computers. Some of them are firing paperwork at us with 1,000-line-per-minute, high-speed printers, but we've infiltrated their forces and already have won over many of them to our side. We have discovered that current paperwork systems should not be converted directly to computer operations. We have found that redesign of systems for computer use often shortcuts and makes unnecessary some of our current paperwork routines and even some of our reports.

We are making good headway on the record-filing and preservation front and expect an early victory there. The turning point occurred a few months ago when the enemy was cut off from its supply of new filing cabinets.

There are still many battles and campaigns ahead of us on the "creation of records" front.

Congressman Olsen's report tells us that Federal agencies receive 1 billion reports per year. In looking over his report, I find my own agency—the Civil Service Commission—listed among the 10 largest paperwork agencies, and receiving 4,408,280 report responses annually. That's a lot of reports and I want to say to the Congressman that we have been working steadily in this paperwork area and we are making headway. We are very proud of the standardized statistical sampling process we developed within the last few years which gives us a base for accurately estimating various Federal statistics without asking for agency data on each and every personnel transaction.

We are also proud of the progress we are making with the establishment of ADP which is helping to reduce our paperwork requirements. In receiving statistical data from the agencies, we are striving for systems compatability. This means that a magnetic tape coming off one computer can be fed into another. Already, some agencies just mail us their computer tape and we feed it into our machine for processing. In the next step, agencies will send the computer information over the telephone lines and in the jargon of the trade "one computer will talk to the other." At that point—presto—the paperwork disappears. This won't happen tomorrow, but along with the other agencies in the ADP field, we are looking toward this development in the future.

Now in relation to the war on paperwork, I am particularly interested in the campaign against gobbledygook.

As some of you may recall, this campaign was opened by President Johnson at a Cabinet meeting in February. The President expressed his concern about the responsiveness of Government employees to public inquiries and requests for services. He asked me to survey the policies and practices of agencies in their relationships with the public and to report findings and recommendations.

There is no mistaking the President's active and personal interest. He wants improvement in our communications with the public. This means improvement of service to the public, whether we communicate by mail or by telephone or in person. When we achieve these improvements we will also have advanced our war on paperwork. Better communications—the first time—means less prospective correspondence to originate, to file, to dispose of. Better service to the public means fewer complaints and, if you have ever handled complaints, you know how much paperwork they can involve.

Our surveys show that a great deal of good work has been started on improving communications.

In Agriculture, Joe Robertson is waging his own one-man campaign to improve correspondence. His memos and bulletins are in line with the 4–S letterwriting principles—short, simple, strong, sincere. Everyone gets the message and the files are not cluttered up with pages and pages of obscure prose. Thirty thousand agriculture employees are getting training in how to write better letters.

Small Business Administration has been taking vigorous steps to upgrade the writing and the public contact work of its staff. Their program includes a review of their whole correspondence system and emphasis on employee ability to meet and deal when they consider their people for promotions.

Interior is reviving its training in plain-letter writing.

Post Office has an effective customer-relations program to monitor and improve service to its clients.

HHFA has centralized its facilities for handling requests for general information on its wide variety of housing and urban redevelopment programs.

VA has a time-tested, one-step contact service that is being studied by other agencies. It provides for continuing inspection and feedback on the effectiveness and conduct of its public employees. Also, a regular spot-check survey of its visitors to ascertain whether or not the customers feel that they were treated effectively and with courtesy.

Commerce has been engaged in a systematic review of its publications to improve content, appearance, and readability.

These are just a few samples of steps being taken in the campaign against gobbledygook. All of these actions also help in the war on paperwork. They are aimed at better communications and service to the public, but as they reduce correspondence there will be fewer records.

Many of you here tonight are leaders in the paperwork management field. I call on all of you to enlist in the President's war on gobbledygook. Don't wait to be drafted. Many of you have special skills in improving communications and service to the public. Your President is asking that your skills be used to the utmost. If you have uncompleted projects that will help fight the war on gobbledygook—simplification of form letters, training programs, informational leaflets, etc., this is the time to go to work with renewed energy—with a new flood of enthusiasm. If you have useful projects that are stalled, now is the time to get them in motion.

Many of you have responsibility for internal directives. Now is the time to put into effect the improvements you've been thinking about—improvements in readability, appearance, content. Your own employees, your own staff, are a primary public and your communications to them must be clear and effective. They are a main channel of communications to other publics. Every study that we've conducted shows that a positive or negative attitude by the public toward the Government is significantly promoted by the attitude of our own employees with whom they come in contact. Improve your communications with your own employees so they will not need to use gobbledygook in talking about your agency's mission and operations. Their knowledge and attitude can have a make-or-break impact on the opinions of the public they contact.

I have received a number of constructive suggestions from officials of various agencies on steps that need to be taken in the war against gobbledygook. Some have already been put into practice. We are working on others. You can help with many of these:

The first suggestion was that one top-level person in each agency be assigned the responsibility of improving that agency's communications and service to the public. This is a logical starting point and this step has already been taken in many agencies.

Second was a suggestion for setting up one-stop information centers in major cities so a citizen does not have to wander around among a series of buildings and offices to find the answers to his problem with the Federal Government. A capital idea that will be very well received by the public, and we are working on it. We need your support.

Third is the idea that we need some special evening and Saturday office hours to serve the public. If the department stores can stay open all day on Saturday and several evenings a week, why shouldn't the Federal information offices be open one evening a week and a half day on Saturday? This idea raised a lot of eyebrows when it was first mentioned—but after a little thought the eyebrows were lowered—and now there are some people rolling up their sleeves and wrinkling their forehead to work out plans for special hours. I'm proud to say that the Civil Service Commission's central and regional information offices are now open for 4 hours on Saturday morning and the Washington office is also open until 8 p.m., on Thursday evening. I hope to see other agencies follow the Commission's example with similar pilot projects in the near future.

Other suggestions covered items like improved selection of employees for their communications and public contact skills, additional training for employees in this work, special emphasis on awards for excellence in communications, and an interagency exchange of ideas on improving communications with the public.

Let me reemphasize the last point—we are looking for additional practical and useful ideas that will help fight our war on gobbledygook. In this audience there is a vast amount of brainpower and experience. I would be glad to have any specific suggestions you believe will be helpful.

In closing, I would like to bring your attention back to our 22 heroes of the battle of paperwork that we are honoring tonight and the six among them who are to receive the special honors.

Tonight is the night of glory for their achievements. We have a temporary lull in the battle to express our high appreciation for their great skill, their imagination, and their courage in overcoming the many obstacles we face.

And tomorrow—refreshed by this magnificent interval—let us take up our weapons again for the battles against paperwork and gobbledygook. Let the bugles sound "Charge" and we will go forth to further victories.

Top Honor Winners of Administrative Management Society Paperwork Savings Awards

Sam C. Beckley, Director, Paperwork Management Service, Veterans' Administration, New Castle, Ky.

Edwin G. Callahan, Assistant Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Arlington, Va.

Marden D. Kimball, Director, Administrative Services Division, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Phoenix, Ariz.

Thomas J. Pugliese, Chief, Records Management Branch, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Corona, N.Y.

Edward Rosse, supervisory management analyst, Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Baltimore, Md., Baltimore, Md.

Donald J. Simon, Chief, Division of Records Management, Department of State, Springfield, Va.

ADDITIONAL AWARD RECIPIENTS

Neil C. Tulloch, management analyst, Selective Service System, Arlington, Va.

Leonard W. Johnson, Chief, Management Analysis Section, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Hastings, Nebr.

Thomas J. Stratton, Chief, Management Engineering Division, National Security Agency, Fort George G. Meade, Md., Philadelphia, Pa.

Linné Ahlberg, Chief, Budget Division, Southwest Region, Federal Aviation Agency, Fort Worth, Tex., Fort Worth, Tex.

Capt. Edward R. Joshua, commanding officer, U.S. Naval Supply Depot, Yokosuka, Japan, Youngstown, Ohio.

William J. Hopkins, executive clerk of the White House Office, the White House, Netawake, Kans.

John S. Peters, Director, Rate and Routing Service Division, Transportation and Communication Service, General Services Administration, Monroe, Ga.

Thomas E. Murphy, Director, Statistical Operations and Analysis Staff, Business and Defense Services Administration, Department of Commerce, Hollis, Long Island, N.Y.

Mrs. Ruth C. Smith, supervisor, Files and Docket Section, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Arlington, Va.

Mrs. Agatha L. Mergenovich, Chief, Paperwork Management Branch, Interstate Commerce Commission, Fairmont, W. Va.

Miss Mary Hamilton, records administrator, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of the Army, Worcester, Mass.

Mrs. Velma DeBusk, paperwork management officer, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Tex., La Porte, Tex.

Maj. Robert B. Weathers, Director, Administrative Services, Defense Subsistence Supply Center, Defense Supply Agency, Chicago, Ill., Vincennes, Ind.

John J. Shurman, Chief, Communications and Records Management Branch, Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C.

Hugo Duhn, records officer, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, Clinton, Iowa.

Maj. Floyd H. Russell, personnel systems analyst, Department of the Air Force, Bentonville, Ark.

DEDUCTIONS FOR MINING TAXPAYERS

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 9 I introduced H.R. 4665 to allow mining taxpayers to elect to deduct all exploration expenditures as they are incurred. The Committee on Ways and Means considered H.R. 4665 in its executive sessions last week and ordered the bill favorably reported with certain amendments. Due to the press of time it is not anticipated that the report on the bill will be prepared so that the committee can formally report it to the House until the beginning of the next session in January. Today, I am introducing for the information of the Members and the interested public a bill that embodies the changes made by the Committee on Ways and Means in my original bill, H.R. 4665. I am reintroducing the bill in this form so copies of it will be publicly available for study before the formal report is filed by the committee.

I believe this bill will go a long way toward revitalizing the domestic mining industry—a goal shared by many of us, particularly including my good friend and colleague from the State of Idaho [Mr. WHITE], who also introduced the bill in its original form, as well as Senator GRUENING, of Alaska, and 18 cosponsors in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, present tax laws discourage the search for additional sources of domestic ores by prohibiting, except to a limited extent, the current deduction of amounts expended in the search for such minerals. A taxpayer may deduct the cost of exploratory work to the extent of $100,000 per year, with a lifetime limitation of $400,000. Most mining companies have made expenditures in excess of these limitations and must now capitalize exploration costs, which they may not recover for many years. This discourages exploratory projects and stifles the development of a sound and healthy mining industry.

My bill would allow mining taxpayers to elect to deduct all exploration expenditures as they are incurred, and not require them to wait to recover them through depletion deductions or, if the ventures are not successful, through eventual abandonment losses. As you know, approximately 9 out of every 10 mining ventures are unsuccessful in finding commercial quantities of ores and minerals. The risk of failure is high. Consequently, it is important that we do away with the tax barriers imposed against investments in mineral exploration. My bill would do just this.

The bill covers the entire mining industry with the exception of oil and gas and coal. The latter industry is omitted because we were advised that most coal companies have not utilized to the fullest extent possible the provisions of the present law and desire to be excluded.

Under my bill, where the exploratory project is successful and the mine reaches the producing stage, the mining company will have either to restore to income, or reduce their depletion deduction by, the amount of the exploration expenditures previously deducted. With respect to exploration expenditures that are unsuccessful, the mining company would not have to wait until abandonment of the project to obtain its deduction. What my bill does is to accelerate deductibility of exploration expenditures that are incurred. The bill has been limited to domestic mining to encourage the production of minerals in the United States and to better enable the mining industry to meet the needs of our domestic industry. The bill not only limits the current deductibility of exploration expenditures to domestic deposits but also repeals the application of section 615 to foreign operations. Under the bill the only mineral that will be covered by section 615 is coal.

While the bill will defer receipt of revenue by the Government, I want to emphasize that the recapture provision protects the Treasury from any absolute loss of revenue, and that the revenue that will be deferred temporarily by acceleration of these deductions will be more than made up by increased activity in searching for new mineral deposits within the United States.

In summary, I believe the present limited deduction under section 615 is inadequate in light of present-day exploration costs, and particularly so since most taxpayers doing mine exploration have reached the maximum limitation of $400,000. They may obtain a tax deduction for their expenditures on an unsuccessful project only by abandoning the project, frequently a number of years after the expenditures were made. Current deduction in full will encourage mineral exploration by reducing the immediate after-tax cost of exploration and increasing cash flow. Thus it will increase discovery of mineral resources, including metals in short supply, and income of taxpayers from new discoveries, thus increasing revenues in the long run.

JOB "WELL DONE"

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, all of us recognize that without great effort there can be no great accomplishment. When Congress goes home, it will have a well-deserved rest, and the rest will seem all the more sweet now that we are hearing accolades for the achievements of this session.

As chosen Representatives of the people, we hear about problems and trivial worrisome details. You might say that dealing with problems is our business.

Yet, from the problems we have arrived at answers and solutions, until the Congress now is being called the Fabulous 89th. President Johnson praised the work of this Congress by saying that:

> Your people will revere you and reward you, and the Nation will honor you long after you are gone.

In this vein, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a tribute to this Congress which appeared recently in the New York Times. Because I think they would like to see this editorial on the Congress that "broke the mold," I offer it for the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 18, 1965]

CONGRESS MEETS THE TEST

The 89th Congress, nearing the end of its first session, has been the best Congress since World War II.

For two decades Congress has been the object of severe but justified public criticism for its failure to face up to the needs of a highly urbanized national society undergoing swift economic and technological change, strained by the challenge of educating, housing and transporting a rapidly growing population, and beset by the complexities of admitting its Negro minority to full citizenship.

The country's needs called for imagination, flexibility, compassion; for vastly increased

Federal spending for schools, hospitals, low-income housing and special programs for the most impoverished and disadvantaged. But Congress, stalemated by a conservative bipartisan coalition drawing its strength from rural and smalltown constituencies and looking backward to a different America, was long unresponsive. Its fussy rules and rigid seniority system helped inhibit action.

The Congress elected a year ago broke the mold. A new majority coalition of Democrats and liberal Republicans has emerged. The seniority system remained, but the House rules were modified in a modest way that helped ease the flow of legislation to the floor. Rather than making a virtue out of sulky obstinacy, this Congress has cooperated with the executive branch to shape a constructive program.

The great measures were approved relatively early in the session. The lawmaking, the right to vote, effectively for southern Negroes, the law bringing Federal financial aid to the elementary and secondary schools, and the law adding the protection of medicare to the scoial security system were historic gains.

But Congress did much more. It submitted to the States a constitutional amendment providing for an orderly succession to the Presidency. It passed—by the narrowest of margins—a program of rent subsidies that may provide a useful approach to the stubborn problem of good housing for low-income families. A Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development was finally established.

The war on poverty, still in its early stages, received a vote of confidence in the form of an increased appropriation. In addition to medicare, much was accomplished for the Nation's health, including the establishment of regional medical centers, funds for staffing community mental-health centers and training more teachers for the mentally retarded. Congress approved a pilot project to rejuvenate railroad passenger service. The reform of the immigration law and a pioneering program of Federal aid for the arts were other high points.

The Congress had a few black marks on its record such as the defeat in the House of the home rule bill for the District of Columbia and the weakening of the bill to regulate highway billboards. The proposal to regulate the shocking trade in guns made little progress. Many conservative measures are needed; and control of water pollution, for example, is going to require a more aggressive and much more amply financed program despite the passage of this year's bill.

Yet these failings and unfinished tasks do not destroy the general excellence and comprehensiveness of this sessions record. At last the decks have been cleared of numerous old problems and old quarrels. At last the Nation has had the benefit of the work of a modern-minded Congress that addressed itself to the needs of a complicated industrial society entering the last third of the 20th century.

RENDER TO CAESAR AND TO GOD

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, last month, on September 3, I inserted a column of David Lawrence in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which concerned a sermon delivered by the Reverend Dr. Robert B. Watts, Reactor of St. James-by-the-Sea Episcopal Church, La Jolla, Calif.

Since that time, I have received a copy of Dr. Watts' sermon and find that, in its entirety, it is the most provocative assessment of the teachings of Christ on rights and duties that I have ever read.

Dr. and Mrs. Robert B. Watts reside at 7949 Princess Street, La Jolla, Calif. He was graduated from Bates College in Lewiston, Maine, and from the Yale Law School. Here he was a Phi Beta Kappa, and editor of the Yale Law Journal.

His illustrious career included being chief assistant U.S. attorney in New York City for several years and included repeated appointments as a special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States. He was National Labor Relations Board general counsel and argued many of its cases in the Supreme Court. For many years he practiced law in Chicago and New York. He was a director of General Dynamics Corp.

Father Watts was ordained in 1958 in the Episcopal Diocese of Los Angeles.

His sermon of August 15, 1965, "Render to Caesar and to God" follows:

Last night I laid aside the sermon which I had prepared for today, because of an irresistible feeling that I must offer certain suggestions and conclusions concerning the Christian response and reaction to the holocaust of riots through which we are passing—highlighted by the bloody events in Los Angeles.

Since this may well be regarded as a controversial sermon, I wish to make perfectly clear that it represents my own views as a lawyer and as a priest. None of my colleagues in this parish is aware of what I am about to say. My notes have not been reviewed by anyone.

My views are presented by the authority which was conferred upon me at my ordination and, I believe, follow the guidance and impulse of the Holy Spirit. Incidentally, no individual priest or bishop can rightfully claim to speak for the whole church under ordinary circumstances, and I make no claim to be doing so now.

There is no need for me to recount the horrors of the riots which have been occurring, particularly in Los Angeles, during this past week. We have all followed the unspeakable events which have been and still are taking place there as well as in Chicago and in Springfield, and we all must have clearly in mind the earlier riots in our Southern States.

I speak today because I believe that many Christians are desperately confused about what their position should be in respect to these events.

That they are confused is readily understandable when one looks about and reads and listens.

No later than last Friday evening, the bishop of California is reported in our press as having in San Diego criticized the stand of the Episcopal Church on civil rights. He is quoted as saying that "If people are kept busy making things for the ladies' bazaar they feel holy and good even though they may deny persons' rights to be persons." And he is quoted further as saying, "The secularist is just a nasty fellow when he demonstrates for civil rights."

You will note that the Right Reverend Sir leaves quite a blank—at least in his published remarks—what constitutes demonstrating for civil rights. He thereby leaves the readers of his quoted remarks under the unhappy conclusion that any demonstration involving civil disobedience is all right and should be supported and accepted by Christians.

Would he say that the wild and lawless demonstrations in Los Angeles are all right? Or if not, where would he draw the line? We simply don't know—and hence we are confused at what position a Christian should take.

But let us look at another ecclesiastical aberration, with which I desire to register complete opposition.

There has been advanced by various philosophical followers of the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., one of the most extraordinary suggestions ever made in Anglo-Saxon or American legal annals. As a mixture of sophistry and softheadedness, brewed by nonlegal or corroded legal minds, I assert that this suggestion has spawned the present wave of destruction now sweeping the country.

In brief, this proposed doctrine is that if any individual citizen or group of citizens, after meditation, come to the conclusion that any law is unjust, and further conclude that if apprehended he or they are willing to accept the penalty imposed for violation of the law—then it becomes morally justifiable to break the law openly and notoriously.

Of course the worst thing about this doctrine is that there are no dividing lines in it. If it is valid for a small violation, it applies equally to a more serious one. Once you start this approach there is no stopping. It is like a rollercoaster which nears the top of the track. Once you push it over a little bit, it plunges down all the way.

The amazing thing is that many clergy of this church, including both priests and bishops, have openly and officially accepted this doctrine. Episcopal clergymen have received written expressions of this doctrine for their guidance. And large numbers of clergy of this and other communions have been sent, or have gone on their own volition, to southern areas for the sole purpose of expressing racial concerns by open law defiance pursuant to this new assertion of moral right.

Finally, as sorely distressed Christians we see instance after instance of reluctance on the part of elected officials to meet lawlessness quickly and firmly lest there be an adverse effect upon their personal political careers at the ballot box. Thank God, not all our officials are of this character, but too many are.

All these things we see and hear and read. We are furthermore frequently assailed with bits and pieces of Scripture, with quotations which seek to justify a Christian "do nothing" attitude.

And the result is all too often complete confusion and deep concern over what is right for us to do as loyal Americans and good churchmen. We are morally disarmed and brainwashed. We are reluctant to act in defense of our liberties and our country. We are afraid to speak out and let our voices be heard in demanding a return to law observance by all citizens—white, yellow, black, red, priest, bishop or missionary.

What shall we do? What may we do as Christians?

In offering an answer, I do so humbly and with complete recognition of the right of others to reach the opposite conclusions which I have described, and with which I emphatically disagree. Moreover, what I offer does not assert to be the only answer. It is, however, an answer to which the Holy Spirit has given me guidance, and one which I believe to be valid both in law and in Scripture. And I shall be ready to defend it in any forum, whether ecclesiastical or otherwise.

Let us start with the basic legal fact that we live in a country where all ultimate power resides in the people.

By their representatives in constitutional convention, large areas of this power have been given over to the Federal Government, with other areas reserved to the several States.

Furthermore, certain individual rights and protections have been reserved for the people themselves, as set out in the Bill of Rights. Without naming them all, we are quite familiar with the fact that under our Constitution we are assured the protection of life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness (but with no guarantee that we shall be successful in that pursuit), freedom of speech and freedom of religion.

But we should be equally familiar with the fact that none of these rights is absolute. Every one of them is held subject to equal rights in others. Thus, if we kill or commit grave felonies we may lose our liberty and perhaps our life. If we enter business to make a fortune, our ineptitude may result in our becoming bankrupt. If, in a public place such as this large church or a theater, we falsely cry "fire" we have gone beyond the permissive limit of our right of free speech. And even though we feel deeply about our religion, we have no right to attempt to force others to believe or act as we do.

In brief, all of our rights are balanced by the protection of similar rights in others.

One final point requires mention. Since ultimate power is in the people they have the right, if a majority so desire, to overthrow their existing form of government and substitute another in its place. And if a majority have no such desire, they have the right to use all necessary power to suppress an insurrection or rebellion against them.

With these fundamental legal rules clearly in mind, we may proceed to evaluate for ourselves the legal and constitutional status of deliberate rioting, burning, looting, killing, and general destruction of the public peace—all in the name of civil rights demonstrations.

It should be perfectly clear that no asserted individual right can justify, under our system of government, the destruction of rights in others. It should be equally clear that neither you, nor I, nor any other persons—however exalted he may be or regard himself—has the right to say that what was wrong before becomes morally right if the acting party is willing to be punished if caught.

Should any such warped thinking protect me if I were caught setting fire to a hospital? Should any such claptrap justify me in hurling Molotov cocktails at innocent travelers on the public highways? Should any such reasoning morally justify me in stopping the whole process of law enforcement in a great city?

The answer is, I submit, that which not too long ago propelled a somewhat obscure New Englander into the Vice-Presidency—from which he succeded to the Presidency. Paraphrased only as to one word, his answer was, "There is no right to demonstrate against the public safety." And with that, Calvin Coolidge crushed a strike by the police in the city of Boston.

That ringing declaration electrified the country. It stopped short a vicious new idea. It was correct under our form of government.

Now we are face to face with a whirlwind largely fostered and encouraged by our vacillation, our attempt at appeasement and the participation of some us in this new theory of morally justifiable lawlessness.

As our own Governor says, we now face insurrection—an attack upon the very existence of our own government. When that point is reached, we must first use overwhelming force to crush and destroy every vestige of danger; and then destroy this sickness of mind which has led so many to defy law and order.

But what about the theological problem? Can we, dare we, protect our way of government and our individual rights and still call ourselves Christians? Here I part with many of my ecclesiastical colleagues and give you a ringing "Yes."

And what is my authority? The only ultimate authority which our church recognizes—the Holy Scriptures. Read for yourselves verses 13 through 17 of chapter 12 of the Gospel of St. Mark. You all know the story.

It is the one in which the Pharisees sought to trap Jesus in an inescapable dilemma by inquiring of Him whether they should obey the civil law of Rome or the law of God. It was believed that either answer which might be given would destroy Him.

You remember how Jesus then called for a Roman coin and asked whose face appeared on the coin. The answer was "Caesar's." And then came the divine response, just as valid today as then. "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's; and to God the things that are God's."

Jesus didn't tell them to decide whether they liked the Roman taxes, or whether the tax collectors were brutal and unjust—and, if so, to start a turmoil and demonstration by breaking the Roman law. He told them to obey the laws, and not to forget to carry out God's law as well.

Is that reconciliation of rights and duties impossible for us to follow? Is the formula unworkable today? Can we, as Christians, use that resolution of our confusions?

I say we can and should; and I offer these three concrete suggestions as to how we can do it:

First, we should stand solidly in support of the Constitution and laws of our Government, resorting to the courts and not the barricades if we feel grievances. We must once and for all reject the doctrine of a morally justified civil disobedience.

Second, we should counteract the pressure which already has tremendous effect with some of our political leaders—to temporize and compromise with lawlessness if only it be tagged "civil rights"—by exerting every ounce of our personal influence to encourage equal and courageous law enforcement.

Then third, having done these things, we should—as Christians—seek by all lawful and proper means to help our neighbors to achieve civic equality of treatment and betterment of opportunity for self-improvement. We should do as our young people of this parish are doing for 2 weeks, going to underprivileged people (in this case Indians) and helping them build schools and hospitals and other needed things. We should come to this and to other churches as powerhouses where we can worship God, be refilled with His power, and then go out into the world to teach His ways.

God's power is limitless. With it we can change the world, and if we are faithful it will surely prevail.

PANAMA CANAL SITUATION: GRAVE DANGERS INVOLVED

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the course of my work in the Congress on interoceanic canal problems, I have had significant correspondence with officials of the Executive Branch of our Government, including the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of State, and the President. Some of this has been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It long ago became apparent that successive Presidents of the United States in recent years have been badly advised as regards the Canal Zone and Panama Canal situation. In a series of surrenders to radical demands and following communistic revolutionary patterns, we have now reached the point where we have lost our bargaining power.

The most sensational of these yieldings were given away in 1955 of the terminal passenger stations and freight yards of the Panama Railroad, thus leaving the main line without its long established terminal facilities; the formal display in 1960 of one Panama flag in the Canal Zone as visual evidence of Panamanian titular sovereignty over the zone, followed by a widespread display of such flags; and, after the January 1964 Red-led Panamanian mob assaults on the Canal Zone, the hiring of alien Panamanians as members of the zone police force. The design has been one of piecemeal erosion of our treaty-based rights, powers, and authority over the Panama Canal enterprise to the point where we have seriously compromised our indispensable authority with respect to it and have become the laughing stock of the world.

As regards the replies to my various letters to executive officials, the least adequate were those from the Department of State. These were not only unresponsive but also definitely evasive. Moreover, they reflected the viewpoint that the United States is a great and powerful nation that can afford to be generous with Panama and a desire to appease the implacable by concession after concession. The January 1964 mob assaults were a direct consequence of this anti-U.S. policy.

In defending the lives of our citizens in the Canal Zone and the canal itself against the bloody mob assaults, our country was fortunate in having a capable and fearless commander in chief of the southern command on the scene to restore law and order. His effective measures showed that our Armed Forces when faced with a severe crisis would rise to the occasion regardless of appeasement-minded policymakers in the Department of State.

In this connection, it may be pointed out that if the 1903 Treaty with Panama is abrogated and a new one substituted therefor, the latter, under Panamanian interpretation, may be abrogated at any time that Panama desires regardless of the indemnities and benefits paid and accorded by the United States.

As our Government permitted Nasser to take over the Suez Canal before he had any legal right to do so, Panama will very likely cite this as a precedent. Hence, the negotiation of new treaties with Panama in substitution for the 1903 Treaty amounts to nothing so far as Panama is concerned.

The surrender of all our authority over the Canal Zone as provided for in the new treaties will undoubtedly be followed up by Panamanian demands for complete control of the canal and its abandonment by the United States. This would be inevitable as it is in line with inexorable communistic revolutionary policy. Also, if a new canal is built in Panama, this country will feel free to abrogate the treaty therefor although billions of the taxpayers' money may be used for building it. The State Department may consider any such loss to our taxpayers as of no consequence but I believe that the taxpayers will feel otherwise. Certainly, the proposed giveaway of the Canal Zone territory to Panama and the loss of the entire investment to our Nation in the canal enterprise, all paid for by our taxpayers, is complete evidence of the State Department's indifference in the premises.

To acquaint the Joint Chiefs of Staff with vital facts in the overall canal situation, I have written a series of letters to the Chief of Naval Operations summarizing key points and supplying documentation; also a letter to Hon. Robert B. Anderson, chairman of the United States-Panama Treaty negotiating team and of the recently appointed body to consider a so-called sea-level canal. The last letter of the Chief of Naval Operations and my reply of October 14, 1965, also the August 30 letter to Chairman Anderson will be quoted as parts of my remarks along with a copy of my September 27 press release.

In addition, I shall include an October 7, 1965, statement by Thurman Sensing of the Southern States Industrial Council on the subject of the proposed giveaway. This statement is specific evidence that the people of the United States are beginning to understand what is involved in the proposed abject surrender of our rights at Panama now proposed by the State Department, which has been practicing a policy of concealment of facts from the people of our country.

The indicated documents follow:

Chief of Naval Operations,
October 1, 1965.

Dear Mr. Flood: Thank you for your informative letter of September 9. The documents and bibliographic references forwarded to me on this and on previous occasions, have proven most useful. It goes without saying that the Navy is deeply interested in the present Panama Canal negotiations.

As you know, the President has now publicly announced U.S. agreement with Panama to abolish the 1903 Treaty and complete a new pact to "effectively recognize Panama's sovereignty" over the Canal Zone. Working within the confines of this Presidential commitment, the Navy and the JCS have advocated that the new treaties should in no way restrict or inhibit the effective discharge of our responsibilities for canal defense and hemispheric security. Adequate provisions for the defense and protection of the existing canal, as well as for any new canal, should be the paramount consideration in all treaty negotiations with Panama.

I wish to express my personal appreciation for your continued interest in the Navy. You may rest assured that we will do all within our scope of authority to achieve an acceptable solution to the Panama Canal problem.

Sincerely,

David L. McDonald.

October 14, 1965.

Hon. David L. McDonald,
Chief of Naval Operations,
Department of the Navy,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Admiral McDonald: Your letter of October 1, 1965, especially its statement that "the Navy and the JCS have advocated that the new treaties (with Panama) should in no way restrict or inhibit the effective discharge of our responsibilities for canal defense and hemispheric security," raises some very pertinent questions that must be faced by our Government in realistic manner.

Among such points are the following:

1. Where can the line be drawn between the actual needs for the maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal and "adequate provisions for the defense and protection of the existing waterway described by you as the "paramount consideration in all treaty negotiations with Panama"? Experience has clearly demonstrated that the canal could not have been constructed nor efficiently maintained, operated, sanitated, and protected except with the scope of authority granted under the 1903 Treaty. Hence, the treaties now proposed will render it impossible for our Government to achieve these ends for the further operation of the canal.

2. Precisely where could you separate the Canal Zone from the canal? All major activities in the Zone exist for only one purpose—to serve the canal, the personnel involved in its maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection, and vessels in transit or visiting the terminal ports. To separate the Canal Zone from the canal would be about as practicable as to separating the heart from the human body and expecting it to function.

3. How can our Government meet the "obligations" of the 1902 Hay-Pauncefote Treaty with Great Britain as regards the management of an interoceanic canal on terms of equality for all nations, if we "effectively recognize Panama's sovereignty" over the Canal Zone? Panama's chief aim in securing new canal treaties will be to derive pecuniary benefits from the canal, but without bearing any responsibilities to the world at large as are imposed by other treaties on the United States. Would not Panama have to negotiate its own treaty with Great Britain to correspond with the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty?

4. Would not "effective recognition" of Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone be in violation of the Thomson-Urritia Treaty (1914–22) with Colombia, which recognizes the title to the Panama Canal and Railroad as "vested entirely and absolutely in the United States of America, without any encumbrances * * * whatsoever"? Such recognition would mean that the United States would have to indemnify Colombia for the renunciation of her rights touching this matter.

5. Would not such recognition conflict with the rights of Colombia under this Treaty? It is clear that it would and the right of Colombia as stated in its provisions are considerable.

6. Where there are such grave responsibilities imposed on the United States by existing treaties how can such obligations be met without adequate authority? Certainly, the lessons of experience furnish the answer. Two masters cannot successfully operate and maintain the canal.

7. How could our Government under the proposed treaties with Panama prevent all significant positions in the canal enterprise from becoming political plums for Panamanian politicians? Realistic facts negate the idea of making the canal a political pawn of Panama.

8. Do you and other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff not know that the movement for the elimination of every civil activity of our Government on the isthmus is already underway? The erosions of our sovereign rights, power, and authority begun a few years ago have accelerated with ever-increasing velocity and the proposed treaties are merely the culmination of all that has recently preceded. Unless our policies are reversed, the worst is yet to come.

9. Are you and other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff familiar with the record of lawlessness and disorder on the isthmus since the ratification of the general treaty with new Granada in 1848, at times requiring the use of our Armed Forces in this area of endless bloody revolution? A study of this subject will prove illuminating to those directly responsible for the formulation of military policies, especially those of naval character, and is commended. See my addresses: "Panama Canal Zone: Constitutional Domain of the United States," Congressional Record, volume 104, part 4, pages 5498–5505 and supplementary remarks on the same subject in the Congressional Record, volume 104, part 5, pages 6152–6157. The latter gives a partial list of incidents of violence both before and after U.S. occupation of the Canal Zone.

While I would like to have your views on these matters if you care to give them after you have read and considered this letter, my main purpose in writing it is to give you and other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff vital facts and what I believe to be the inevitable outcome involved in the proposed complete reversal of our historic and successful policies as regards the Panama Canal.

The President has been grossly misled by his advisers in these matters and I cannot believe that our military and naval authorities have been adequately consulted. Therefore, I am unable to avoid the conclusion that before the proposed treaties are spelled into life these authorities should be consulted and their views considered. Why should we not prevent the surrender of the Panama Canal and all its protective benefits to ourselves and other nations of the Western Hemisphere and why should we not save the President himself from the consummation of one of the most tragic blunders in our national history? Would a Matthew C. Perry, Farragut, Dewey, or Ernest J. King hesitate thus to act when the world is on fire and the fate of Western civilization is everywhere at stake?

A copy of my press release of September 27, 1965, and tear sheets of the Congressional Record of September 30 and October 1, 1965, are attached inviting special attention to the marked statements of Representatives Leonor K. Sullivan, William H. Harsha, and H. R. Gross.

Be assured that I take no pleasure in opposing the indicated proposals, which have undoubtedly originated in the State Department, but the situation presented is so grave and the contemplated action is so destructive of the best interests of our Nation and, indeed, of the Western Hemisphere that I conceive it to be my duty to oppose them.

Sincerely yours,

Daniel J. Flood,
Member of Congress.

August 30, 1965.

Hon. Robert B. Anderson,
Chairman, Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

Dear Mr. Ambassador: Because you are now engaged in diplomatic negotiations with the Republic of Panama and serving as chairman of the five-man agency appointed by the President pursuant to Public Law 88–609, 88th Congress, approved September 22, 1964 (78 Stat. 990), to make a full and complete investigation as to a new canal across of so-called sea-level design, I address you in regard to some key elements in the situation. For emphasis, some of these points will be presented, following a statement of facts, in the way of questions.

FACTS

1. The Spooner Act of 1902, under the authority of which the 1903 treaty with

Panama was negotiated and the Canal Zone acquired, calls for the United States to perpetually maintain, operate, and protect the Panama Canal and Railroad.

2. The 1903 treaty reflects the perpetuity feature of the law, which originated with a 1902 recommendation of the Isthmian Canal Commission. (S. Doc. No. 123, 57th Cong., p. 9.)

3. In addition to the grant of sovereignty over the Canal Zone in the 1903 treaty, the United States obtained absolute title and ownership of all land and land under water in the zone from individual owners at generous prices.

4. The Canal Zone is our most costly territorial acquisition, estimated in 1964 at a total of $144 million exclusive of canal construction costs.

5. In 1912, pursuant to provisions in the Panama Canal Act, President Taft, by Executive Order, stated that all areas in the Canal Zone are needed for the operation, maintenance, sanitation, and defense of the canal.

6. Indispensable in the planning of any canal project wherever located are adequate terminal anchorages and port facilities.

7. As long as the sovereignty and perpetuity clauses in the 1903 treaty exist, the presence on the isthmus of the United States will assure the independence of the Republic of Panama.

QUESTIONS

1. Where on the Atlantic side of the Central American Isthmus can be found an arrival anchorage comparable to that in Limon Bay already protected by breakwaters?

2. Where could port facilities be constructed on the Atlantic side better than those now existing at Cristobal?

3. Where on the Pacific side of the isthmus could be found an arrival anchorage better than that in Panama Bay at the Pacific entrance of the canal?

4. Where on the Pacific side could port facilities be established better than those now obtaining at Balboa?

5. Does not the perpetuity clause in the 1903 Treaty bind the United States as well as Panama with equal force and effect?

6. Where there is responsibility for the efficient maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal must there not be adequate authority?

7. How can this treaty obligation (Hay-Pauncefote) be discharged satisfactorily in this area of endless bloody revolution with less than full sovereignty granted under the 1903 Treaty?

8. In view of the increased dangers of subversive infiltration, the needs for increased protection in this modern atomic age, and the necessity for safeguarding the water supply of the Panama Canal, why does not our Government demand the widening of the Canal Zone territory to include the entire watershed of the Chagres River, as was once recommended in 1915–17 by Gen. Clarence R. Edwards when he was in command of the U.S. Army in the Canal Zone?

9. Will not weakening our authority over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal inevitably weaken our Government in any condition of peril with corresponding increase of communistic or other anti-American influence not only on the isthmus but also throughout Latin America?

10. Will not nullification of the basic sovereignty and perpetuity clauses in the 1903 Treaty impair the independence of Panama for without the presence of the United States the Republic of Panama would, in all probability, disappear with Red control similar to that in Cuba?

11. Why should the United States acquiesce to Panamanian political blackmail by surrendering any of the Canal Zone territory or otherwise weaken our rights, powers and authority inherent in the grant of sovereignty and ownership of this key artery of transportation?

Mr. Ambassador, I trust that you and your fellow negotiators and members of the canal study group will ponder these questions, and many others could be added, all of which affect the canal and the entire Western Hemisphere.

I enclose for your perusal copies of my April 1 and July 29 addresses which deal with subjects involved in more detail, inviting special attention to their documentation.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, concerning the proposed treaties with the Republic of Panama, released the following statement today from his Washington office:

"The President's announcement on September 24, 1964, about the status of current treaty negotiations with the Republic of Panama, fully justify my fears for the security of our position on the isthmus and confirms my predictions on this subject.

"It means a complete and abject surrender to Panama of our indispensable sovereignty and authority with respect to the Panama Canal in favor of a so-called dual governmental and managerial setup for it in an area of endless bloody revolution and political instability. This can only lead to unending conflicts and recriminations that always accompany extraterritorial jurisdictions where two masters are involved.

"The Canal Zone is a territorial possession of the United States with sovereignty granted by treaty in perpetuity and ownership of all land in the zone obtained by private purchase at a total cost of some $144 million. Our investment in the canal enterprise and defense installations is in billions of dollars furnished by the American taxpayers but in the indicated agreements not a dollar is to be repaid to us.

"Under existing treaty, the United States is obligated to Panama for the perpetual operation and maintenance of the canal. The issues involved in the agreements under negotiations are so grave that candor is required. Panama gets everything it desires and the United States nothing but losses and ignominy.

"The Panamanian negotiators have written out what they demanded and our negotiators, figuratively speaking, have merely signed on the dotted line. We certainly should not have agreed to Panamanian sovereignty but, on the other hand, should have demanded the extension of the Canal Zone to include the watershed of the Chagres River.

"The grant of complete jurisdiction of Panama over the Canal Zone, means that all laws made by the U.S. Congress for the government of the zone and the operation and maintenace of the canal may be scrapped at any time by Panama, and superceded by Panamanian law. Also, all civil activities in the zone—courts, police, and fire departments, schools, roads, and public utilities—will be taken over by Panama.

"All this means, sooner or later, the elimination of the U.S. citizen employees in the canal enterprise with substitutions by Panamanians. It will be inevitable that all these positions will become political plums eagerly sought by Panamanian politicians with gross confusion and embarrassment. Yet, our negotiators were unable or unwilling to deal with the situation realistically and have agreed to leave our Government with responsibility without any adequate authority. Think what this means in time of war or other grave emergency? Even as to the matter of land in the zone, which may be required for canal purposes, we should have to buy back at exorbitant prices areas we already own by actual purchases from the owners. What a ridiculous situation.

"Panama, having secured such outstanding results in its claims, will, inevitably, demand all control over the canal enterprise with withdrawal by the United States. If such abandonment occurs, Panama and all of Latin America will go down the Communist drain.

"For our officials to proclaim that Panama, which since 1955 has not been able to collect its own garbage from the streets of Panama City and Colon, as a partner of this great interoceanic public utility, is, to say the least, unrealistic and really astounding; and it will evoke serious reactions from maritime countries as regards the fixing of tolls.

"The President's announcement, indeed, marks a sad day for the United States although it may bring rejoicing at Peiping and Moscow. He has completely yielded to the counsel of his advisers, sappers, and appeasers, who must be made to bear basic responsibility for what has occurred. Moreover, I predict that the expressed willingness to surrender control over the Panama Canal will be taken as a signal for accelerated activity among communistic revolutionary elements all over Latin America and the Caribbean.

"There should be only one flag flown over the Panama Canal and zone—the flag of the United States—and the proposed treaties should be defeated."

PANAMA CANAL SURRENDERS

(By Thurman Sensing, executive vice president, Southern States Industrial Council)

President Lyndon B. Johnson's decision to abolish the 1903 Panama Canal Treaty and to complete a new pact that will "effectively recognize Panama's sovereignty" over the Canal Zone is almost certain to do irreparable harm to U.S. strategic interests in this hemisphere. It can only lead to serious trouble for the people of the United States.

The Presidential action should be compared with the willingness of the British Government to allow Dictator Nasser of the United Arab Republic to take over the Suez Canal. In the case of the Panama Canal announcement, Fidel Castro of Cuba must be rejoicing. The Presidential decision plays right into the hands of Castro's Cuba.

Anti-American riots in the Canal Zone in January 1964 underlined the role of Communist elements in stirring trouble in Panama. It is not as though Panama were a stable country that could be counted on to act responsibly with its great hemispheric partner to the north. On the contrary, Panama is riddled with graft, corruption, Castroite communism, and a variety of social and political maladies. It is one of the most unstable countries in the Western Hemisphere. To entrust the Canal Zone to Panama is to ask for a series of irresponsible governmental acts calculated to injure the United States.

Panama is one of the Latin countries where Castroite communism can work most easily. Indeed, it is not out of the question that in time Panama may become in effect a Cuban satellite in Central America. It is small and disordered in its political life, thus presenting ideal conditions for the machinations of the Castro regime in Havana.

The U.S. Government knows full well that all the branches of communism—Castroite, Soviet, and Chinese—are zeroing in on Latin America as a prime target area. Only a few weeks ago, the Chinese Communist defense minister cited Latin America as one of the areas where his government expects to provoke revolutionary disorders.

Clearly, in the years ahead the United States may be called on to do considerable policing of its hemispheric backyard. It may be frequently required to move fleet units from the Pacific to the Atlantic, or the other way around. It will need the defense base represented by the Canal Zone. But Mr. Johnson's decision to hand over the Canal Zone to the Panamanians will rob the United States of its security position on the Panamanian Isthmus.

Consider the experience of Suez. Dictator Nasser closes the Suez Canal to nations that he dislikes. And the British, since losing Cyprus, have been enormously handicapped in policing the troubled Middle East region which—from the security standpoint—bears such a resemblance to Central America.

Mr. Johnson should know better than to turn the Canal Zone over to the Panamanians. It represents appeasement of the mob element in Panama, and appeasing mobs always is foolish. You cannot do it, for the mob always cries for more.

In surrendering the Panama Canal Zone, Mr. Johnson is surrendering a precious national asset—created at tremendous cost—in order to improve opinion in Latin America. It is a waste of time to court something so illusory as Latin opinion. What is needed is retention of the strategic advantages that we possess, chiefly the Panama Canal.

The public can only hope that the decision will be reversed through the pressure of an outraged Congress. Certainly, the abandonment of the Panama Canal is a very solid issue for Mr. Johnson's political opposition. If this issue of appeasement in the Caribbean is not brought before the voters in the 1966 congressional elections, a great mistake will be made. Appeasement of Panama could be even more costly than was appeasement of Castro's Cuba. Whereas the United States still retains the Guantanamo Naval Base on Cuba and has other bases in the Caribbean, the Canal Zone is the only U.S. position in Central America.

The United States cannot hope to win the cold war if it continues to do the enemy's work for him. Giving up our most precious strategic zone in this hemisphere certainly comes under the heading of making things easy for the enemy. Mr. Johnson is ill advised to take such a step in order to get a better image.

PANAMA'S SWEEPING DEMANDS REVEALED

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as a close student of isthmian history and problems over many years, I have been able to evaluate information and to make predictions that some have thought amazing. In no important development have I been surprised, for coming events cast their shadows.

The National Assembly of Panama is now in session and engaged in extensive discussions of the three recently proposed treaties with the United States, with Diogenes de la Rosa and his fellow negotiator, Dr. Roberto Aleman, appearing before the assembly.

In order that the Congress and the Nation may be alert to what is transpiring, I quote two highly significant news stories from a leading isthmian newspaper:

[From the Panama (R.P.) Star & Herald, Oct. 7, 1965]

Year 1903 Treaty Untenable Today, De la Rosa Tells R.P. Assembly

The 1903 Panama Canal Treaty, a remnant from the expansionist era of the United States, has become a historical anachronism that is untenable in the universal movement of submerged peoples to attain their own national personality, treaty negotiator Diogenes de la Rosa told the national assembly yesterday.

With the numerical and spiritual growth of the Panamanian people, De la Rosa declared, the national conscience has expanded through succeeding generations and now aspires to a Panamanian canal on Panamanian soil and under the Panamanian flag.

De la Rosa and another member of the Panamanian negotiating team, Dr. Roberto Aleman, appeared yesterday at the invitation of the assembly to answer questions on the Robles-Johnson statement of September 24 announcing areas of general agreement in the current negotiations.

Since the assembly began its current session, the opposition has been pressing for a full-dress debate on the negotiations. The government bench blocked an attempt to have opposition political leaders come into the assembly to participate in the debate on the negotiations and, instead, voted through a motion to have negotiators De la Rosa and Aleman to appear before the assembly.

Opposition deputies who had walked out of the assembly hall late Tuesday night protesting the majority's action attended yesterday's session and sat through De la Rosa's 5-hour dissertation on the historical background of the negotiations.

The majority bench voted at 10 p.m. to suspend the session until this afternoon, when De la Rosa will resume his presentation.

De la Rosa said he was saddened by the spectacle of a nation torn by politics over the issue of the negotiations.

He termed the canal the "national issue" by excellence and pointed out that Panamanians of every generation since 1904 have fought for correcting the injustices of the 1903 treaty. Hence, he declared, no one can claim exclusive credit for the body of doctrines that Panama has accumulated in the course of time to uphold its position.

De la Rosa recalled that in his youth he was one of the leaders against ratification of the 1926 treaty with the United States, which was rejected by the National Assembly. He said he had called the Panamanian negotiators of that instrument "traitors" and "turncoats" and had since come to realize that he had been unfair.

In all the negotiations with the United States, he declared, each team of Panamanian negotiators has given its best within the limitations of time and place, to carry on the nation's cause. And with each generation, as Panamanians have strengthened their nationality, the nation's demands with respect to the canal issue have grown, he added.

The current negotiations, De la Rosa declared, actually began in July 1961, not in January 1964, as some have said. The first contact was between personal representatives of the then Presidents Roberto P. Chiari and John F. Kennedy at a meeting of ministers of finance in Tegucigalpa, Honduras. Chiari sent word to Kennedy that Panama wanted to reopen the 1903 treaty question.

Two months later, in September 1961, De la Rosa recalled, Chiari sent a letter to Kennedy reiterating the request. The Panamanian chief executive warned that the 1903 treaty was the source of friction between Panama and the United States which, if not removed, could lead to regrettable situations.

In April 1962, Kennedy replied. His answer acknowledged there were grounds for complaint by Panama, but said the sea-level canal had become the vital question. Chiari answered that Panama's fundamental interest lay in a revision of the 1903 treaty. Eventually, De la Rosa declared a joint commission was appointed, but no results were attained.

Then came the crisis of January 1964, marked by clashes between Panamanian and United States troops along the Canal Zone boundary.

The "historical mission" of the January events, De la Rosa said was to "reactivate" Panama's aspirations.

In connection with the 1964 events, De la Rosa said there were those who participated out of pure idealism and those who participated to exploit and take advantage of the idealists. He promised to elaborate on this later.

The negotiations, De la Rosa declared, caught Panama psychologically and historically unprepared. Psychologically he said, the country is going through the period of impatience, expectation, uncertainty, and doubt that marks the universal movements of nationalism. This situation offers fertile ground for all sorts of theories, promises, and incitements. In addition he said, Panama, for reasons of spiritual necessity has made the issue of sovereignty the paramount one and thus has failed to grasp other vital questions connected with the canal issue.

Historically, he went on, Panama failed to heed warnings that the advent of the atomic bomb portended the end of the present canal. Thus, when the United States raised the issue of a sea-level canal, Panama was unprepared to evaluate the impact that this new question has on its life.

De la Rosa had just begun to discuss the start of the current negotiations when the Assembly voted to suspend the session until this afternoon.

[From the Panama (R.P.) Star & Herald, Oct. 8, 1965]

RP's Sweeping Treaty Agenda Revealed—1903 Treaty Settlement Is Paramount

Panama is insisting in the current negotiations with the United States that the solution of longstanding problems stemming from the 1903 Panama Canal treaty is the paramount issue and has priority over any discussion of a sea level canal, Panamanian negotiator Diogenes de la Rosa told the National Assembly yesterday.

Within that "tactical framework," De la Rosa reported, Panama submitted on January 25, 1965, a sweeping agenda which so far has been the basis of discussions between the negotiating teams.

De la Rosa and his fellow negotiator, Dr. Roberto Aleman, appeared before the Assembly yesterday for the second successive day to report on the treaty negotiations. They will resume their presentation at today's session, which starts at 9 a.m.

As far as is known, De la Rosa's disclosure of the detailed Panamanian agenda was the first revelation of the actual demands that Panama has presented in the negotiations.

The agenda is as follows:

I—MATTERS RELATIVE TO THE PRACTICES AND MODALITIES APPLIED BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE CANAL ZONE

1. Abolition of the existing regime in the Canal Zone, which has been clothed with the characteristics of a colonial enclave in the center of the Republic of Panama.

2. Legislation and the administration of justice in the Canal Zone will be Panamanian. For special matters connected with

the canal, a juridical system will be jointly agreed to by both countries.

3. The agencies of the U.S. Government will not exercise commercial, agricultural or industrial activities in the Canal Zone. Services will be provided exclusively under Panamanian authority, excepting those inherent to the transit of ships through the canal which will be furnished under joint administration.

4. The Canal Zone postal system will use exclusively Panamanian stamps. The Canal Zone will have no representation before international postal organizations, which representation will be exercised exclusively by Panama.

5. Spanish will be the official language in the Canal Zone.

II—QUESTIONS RELATIVE TO SOVEREIGNTY IN THE CANAL ZONE

1. It will be clearly established that the sovereignty of the Republic of Panama in the territory of the Canal Zone will not be affected by the rights, power, or authority granted to the United States with respect to the canal in Panamanian territory.

2. The Panamanian flag will be flown aboard ships transiting the canal and in the areas of the Canal Zone.

3. Panama's tax system will be enforced in the Canal Zone, in the same manner as in the rest of the Panamanian territory.

III—QUESTIONS RELATIVE TO THE RIGHTS, JURISDICTION, AND AUTHORITY EXERCISED AT PRESENT BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE CANAL ZONE

1. The authority necessary for the purposes of the maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal will be exercised jointly by Panama and the United States. Insofar as this authority is not directly related with such purposes, only the Republic of Panama will exercise such authority.

2. Return to Panama of lands, islands, waters, drydocks, ports airports, piers, and installations which are not strictly necessary for the maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the canal.

3. It will be expressly established that such lands and waters will include those necessary to maintain the continuity of the exclusive Panamanian authority over the two portions of the national territory bisected by the canal.

IV—QUESTIONS RELATIVE TO ECONOMIC AND COMMERCIAL BENEFITS THAT THE CANAL SHOULD PROVIDE FOR PANAMA BECAUSE OF ITS GEOGRAPHICAL POSITION

1. The United States will cooperate in order that Panama will benefit from the advantages inherent to its geographical position.

2. Panama will receive an adequate participation in the benefits derived from the operation of the canal and compensation in proportion to the benefits derived by the United States from the existence of the canal in Panamanian territory.

3. Joint formulation and application of employment standards, including salary scales.

4. Equal access for Panamanians and U.S. citizens to security positions.

5. The Canal Zone will constitute, primarily, a source of employment for Panamanians in all categories.

6. Equality of services for all employees.

7. Short- and long-range training of Panamanians in all occupations.

8. Establishment of a joint claims commission to adopt measures for the effective equality of treatment for Panamanians and U.S. citizens.

9. Panama should receive special treatment in the U.S. market with respect to the importation of goods produced in Panama.

10. The territory of the Canal Zone will be opened to the development of agriculture, livestock raising, commerce, and industry, and to all kinds of activities of goods and services, according to the laws of the Republic of Panama exclusively.

11. The United States will provide the cities of Panama and Colon of ports, piers, and auxiliary installations.

12. Construction, at U.S. expense, of a bridge across the canal on the Atlantic side.

V—QUESTIONS RELATIVE TO PANAMA'S PARTICIPATION IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE CANAL

1. The administration of the canal will be carried out jointly by the two governments.

VI—DURATION OF GRANTS MADE BY PANAMA TO THE UNITED STATES IN THE 1903 TREATY

1. A term will be fixed for the canal concession.

VII—MISCELLANEOUS TOPICS

1. Adequate solution to problems related with the furnishing of water (to Panama).

With respect to the sea-level canal question, repeatedly raised by U.S. negotiators, Panama has agreed to discuss it simultaneously but separately with the understanding, De la Rosa said, that the settlement of the problems resulting from the 1903 treaty will come first.

De la Rosa made no mention of specific counterproposals made by the United States. He said that since the presentation of Panama's agenda, the two negotiating teams have concentrated their discussions on the question of joint administration of the waterway.

The discussions on that point had advanced sufficiently that the Panamanian delegation felt that it could issue a declaration on the progress of the negotiations. After the Panamanian negotiators contacted the U.S. delegation on this possibility, the final result was the joint declaration issued by Presidents Robles and Johnson on September 24, dealing with areas of general agreement between the two countries.

In the final part of his presentation, De la Rosa said the people of Panama have been misled into believing that Panama will get everything that it has demanded. The people, he admonished, have not been told clearly that Panama and the United States are negotiating—that there are points on which Panama will have to yield in order to gain others.

The mere abrogation of the 1903 treaty, for example, De la Rosa declared, will not of itself solve Panama's problems. Panama's maximum aspiration, he repeated, is a Panamanian canal in Panamanian territory under the Panamanian flag, but the problem lies in how far that aspiration can be carried in the light of the present structure.

"We must avoid illusions which can be suicidal," the negotiator declared.

In that connection, he pointed out, one inescapable reality is the dependence of Panama's economy on the canal. In 1964, he said, total income derived by Panama from the Canal Zone amounted to $115.4 million which, in turn, generated activities totaling $233 million. This was 39 percent—"a fearful figure," De la Rosa termed it—of the gross national product of $578.8 million.

Treaty negotiator Aleman had just taken the floor to discuss the Robles-Johnson declaration in the light of Panama's demands when the session was suspended for resumption at 9 today.

THE NEW ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Hardy] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, last night the Administrator of the newly created Environmental Science Services Administration, Dr. Robert M. White, visited Norfolk. This agency formed in July through the consolidation of the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Weather Bureau has offices in Norfolk. I am confident that the program in Norfolk under Capt. John C. Bull, commanding officer of the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, Atlantic Marine Center, is going to contribute immeasurably to our study of the interrelation of the atmosphere and the ocean in weather formation.

Dr. White was interviewed by members of the press in Norfolk. I ask permission to insert at this point in the Record the news account from the Ledger-Star of October 19, of this interview including Dr. White's comments concerning this important new agency.

[From the Ledger-Star, Oct. 19, 1965]

Field Office Planned Also—ESSA Hydrographic Center in Norfolk

(By Donald Moore)

Norfolk.—The port of Norfolk is to be a focal point for hydrographic work by the newly formed Environment Science Services Administration, Dr. Robert M. White, ESSA's head, said here today.

White, here for talks with ESSA personnel at the Norfolk base of the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, known as the Atlantic Marine Center, added that a field office of CGS land surveys will also be based here.

No change is planned in the Weather Bureau facility at Norfolk Municipal Airport. CGS and Weather Bureau facilities simply become ESSA facilities, White said:

ESSA was formed in July, a consolidation of the Weather Bureau and the Coast and Geodetic Survey, with the addition of the Central Radio Propagation Laboratory at Boulder, Colo. White is the former chief of the Weather Bureau.

He said here that present air and water pollution in the United States is serious and will get worse unless something is done about it. He thinks something is being done.

"Congress is extremely interested," he said, noting passage of the Clean Air Act as an example.

White said the formation of ESSA will permit a unified effort to study the interrelation of the atmosphere and the oceans in weather formation.

He predicted increased efforts at both meteorology and oceanography in efforts to understand man's environments.

White noted that the United States has sent up 10 Tiros weather satellites—3 are currently functioning—and a Nimbus satellite in an effort to unlock further secrets of the atmosphere. ESSA, he thinks, will increase this program.

Concerning air pollution, he said the Weather Bureau is gathering information and issues bulletins on critical conditions, not to the public but to concerned agencies.

White said there will be an exchange of personnel within ESSA and the new agency will have a uniformed branch, such as the CGS has now. Thus some Weather Bureau personnel will be uniformed.

He noted that the CGS had a highly mobile function while the Weather Bureau operates from fixed stations. This will be taken into account in the consolidation.

White said ESSA is under the Department of Commerce and he will issue his reports to the Secretary of Commerce.

ESSA, he noted, will collect and evaluate information on environment, but will not enforce air and water pollution, but would instead supply data to Federal agencies concerned, such as the U.S. Public Health Service.

While here White discussed ESSA operation with personnel from stations along the Atlantic coast. Tomorrow he flies to New York for the same purpose.

A 35-HOUR WORKWEEK

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to establish a 35-hour workweek in the agencies operated by the Federal Government. While the lateness of this session will not permit committee action before we conclude, I am hopeful that the appropriate committee will give thorough attention to the measure when the 89th Congress reconvenes in January.

The 35-hour week is not a new phenomenom. Since the 1930's, various industries have maintained work schedules of less than 40 hours a week, notably ladies' garment, printing, coal mining, and construction. The practice has grown to a point where 8 million nonagricultural workers are estimated to be assigned to full-time workweeks shorter than 40 hours.

One recent survey by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in 82 metropolitan areas involving almost 14 million employees reveals that approximately 2 million are on less than 40-hour work schedules.

In 1962, Congress established the principle of "comparability" between pay and related conditions for Federal and postal employees and those in private firms. The President in his messages to this body has affirmed his endorsement of this rule.

In my view, "comparability" should not be based on conditions prevailing in private industry among substandard or average employers. Those who accept careers in public service by working for the Federal Government are entitled to salaries and benefits consistent with those adopted by progressive employers in the private economy.

Actually, the Federal Government can exert a beneficial influence on lifting the standards of workers generally by acting as the enlightened employer in some areas. Adoption of a 35-hour workweek for Federal employees would indicate the Government's willingness to accept the practice of many forward-looking employers and would set an example for many other employers to emulate.

Through firm steps taken by this administration, significant progress has been made in recent months in reducing the worrisome rate of unemployment in our country. However, the problem of creating employment opportunities for our youth remains. Unless we take action now to solve the problem, it will continue to grow as the number of young people entering the labor market increases by leaps and bounds.

Enactment of legislation to establish a 35-hour week for Federal agencies will provide additional opportunities for qualified young men and women to enter public service. In the decades ahead, we will need more highly skilled young people at all levels of Federal employment. The bill I have introduced affords an excellent opportunity for Congress to add to the attractiveness of a career in Federal Service.

SPEAKER McCORMACK LEADS 89TH CONGRESS TO HISTORIC RECORD

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Evins] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 89th Congress, now approaching adjournment, has been one of the most productive in the history of the Nation. The scope of legislation beneficial to the Amercan people is unprecedented and unparalleled. This has been a historic Congress.

President Johnson, who is wise, experienced, and knowledgeable in the workings and traditions of the Congress, has called this the greatest Congress.

I submit that the 89th Congress has indeed made history for the lasting benefit of the American people.

The volume of work accomplished has been tremendous. The House has been in session 154 days. There have been 13,031 measures introduced and 199 new laws created.

These new laws are more important, however, for what they will accomplish than for the sheer volume of number. These new laws reflect a willingness to face the problems that face this Nation at home and abroad. They represent a willingness and a determination to wage war on ignorance, disease, poverty, rural and city slums, on the effects of automation, the economic lag that retards huge sections of our Nation, unemployment, and all the other basic problems that harass our Nation despite its prosperous and vigorous economy.

And the leader of this body to whom we must give a lion's share of credit for the remarkable record of this session is Speaker John W. McCormack, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Speaker McCormack burns with the fire of patriotism and the love of his country. He wants to help build a better America—an America where all sections and all sectors will share in the good life.

He is dedicated to this ideal. But coupled with this idealism is an unexcelled knowledge and consciousness of what it takes to achieve this ideal. He understands the basic steps that must be taken—and he leads us up those steps by his example and by his great leadership.

Speaker McCormack has had an illustrious and distinguished career. He was first elected to the 70th Congress in 1928. He became Democratic whip and in the 81st Congress, he became majority leader, a position he held longer than any man in either party in the history of Congress.

Because of his dedicated and brilliant leadership, he was the logical choice to succeed the late Sam Rayburn—the great Texan who served his nation so ably and so well—as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Speaker McCormack is eminently fair. Power rests easily in his hands. He does not misuse it. Power in his hands is an instrument for the people and for America.

He is loved by his colleagues. I have the highest personal affection for Speaker McCormack. He has been my friend through the years. He has been a tower of strength in the Congress and a source of counsel and inspiration.

Under his guidance and leadership this Congress has enacted a legislative record which has been described as incredible, surpassing all records of previous Congresses.

This record includes medicare and other social security amendments, assistance to elementary and secondary education, reduction in taxes, a broadened housing program, and establishment of the Cabinet-level position of a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs, a great public works and economic development program, the voting rights bill, Appalachian Regional Development Act, continuation of the war on poverty, a number of health measures, water resources development, highway beautification, and many other enactments vital to our Nation.

And in addition, the Congress authorized nearly $1.8 billion for military construction and $15 billion for new aircraft, missiles, ships, and for research and development. The Congress has supported the President's position on Vietnam.

Speaker McCormack has ably drawn parallels between our present world situation and the situation prior to World War II. Prior to World War II, he has emphasized, the appeasement of Hitler fed the fires of aggression.

This lesson of history, Speaker McCormack emphasizes, underlines the importance of our battle in Vietnam for freedom and for the right of a smaller nation to self-determination.

Speaker McCormack has been a champion of freedom—a champion of liberty—a champion of America. He believes that to be strong abroad America must be strong at home, that America internally must be strong to maintain its strength and influence around the world.

Time magazine in commenting upon the work of Congress said:

> This is an outstanding record of accomplishment.

I agree with that assessment.

I would add, however, that the great role played by our distinguished and beloved Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, has been one of the major factors in the building of this great record of this historic Congress.

Congress and the Nation are indebted to Speaker McCORMACK.

The free world can look to the Speaker of the House of Representatives for liberty and freedom and progress.

CHAIRMAN MAHON: DEDICATED TO MAINTAINING A MIGHTY AMERICA

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, one of the great leaders in the Congress is our colleague, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable GEORGE H. MAHON, chairman of the important Committee on Appropriations.

I have known and worked with Chairman MAHON for many years. His progressive and practical leadership has been an inspiration to me and to other members of the committee—and, I am sure, to all Members of Congress.

With the completion of the several appropriations bills passed during this session, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has finished work on another milestone in his career. The appropriations bills breathe life into important legislation Congress has adopted.

They also provide the means with which to keep our Nation strong, to maintain a powerful defense posture. Chairman MAHON is dedicated to a strong America and the appropriations measures relating to defense bear out his dedication. We have the strongest defense establishment in the history of mankind, Mr. Speaker, and it is in great part a tribute to the foresight of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The Appropriations Committee also breathes life into our vital domestic programs—assistance to education, the war on poverty, our housing programs, our agriculture programs, our efforts to build a stronger rural and smalltown America—all the programs needed to make America strong and productive and prosperous.

Chairman MAHON has an appreciation of the problems of America. While he diligently represents the people of Texas, he also has a national perspective.

He protects the taxpayer. Like President Johnson he believes that the taxpayer should receive a dollar's value for a dollar spent and he carefully examines each and every proposal for appropriation with care and penetrating study. You can, therefore, rest assured that the monies appropriated under the scrutiny of Chairman MAHON constitute the best figures that can be arrived at after a careful analysis of programs and proposals.

Chairman MAHON is prudent, conservative and progressive.

He is a great American.

He is a great champion of the people.

He is a man of vision and understanding—but a man of realism and practicality.

This magnificent combination of qualities projects the chairman from Texas to the fore as we review the work of this Congress. I am sure Chairman MAHON will be recorded in congressional history as a leader who played a crucial role in building a mighty America to safeguard the American way of life and to assure smaller nations their right to choose their own destiny.

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES, 89TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed proud and feel privileged to have had the honor of serving the Seventh Congressional District, Queens County, N.Y. I am forever thankful to the people of my district for having given me the privilege to represent them and for their overwhelming vote of confidence in my reelection of last year.

I believe, from the record of this 1st session, that the 89th Congress is one of the most outstanding Congresses on record and that it has accurately reflected the mood and mandate of our citizens and has been responsive to the needs and wishes of our people in both domestic and foreign affairs.

At the end of each session, since I came to Congress almost 5 years ago, I have summarized the year's activities, reprinted them at my expense, and mailed them to my constituents. Each session has been a lengthy one, and my only regret has been that the lengthy sessions reduced the time I would have spent in my district personally discussing and obtaining the views and attending to the needs of my constituents. While I cannot possibly include every bill, I do try to include those of widespread interest or importance in my district. The rules under which the House of Representatives operates were changed enough at the beginning of the session so that some bills which had been blocked by parliamentary maneuvers in previous years came to a vote this year. Of course, there was also some change in the membership as a result of the election last November. As a result of these and other factors, the volume of general legislation passed was greater than it has ever been in any previous year in history.

MEDICAL AND HEALTH

Public Law 89–97 provides, first, a basic hospitalization program under social security for persons 65 and over effective July 1, 1966, under which they can go to any accredited hospital of their own choice instead of the county hospital; second, an optional medical care insurance program at $3 a month matched by the Federal Government to cover physicians' fees and various other services; third, a 7-percent increase in social security cash benefits; and fourth, expands and increases payments under Federal assistance programs for dependent children, blind and disabled. It will be financed partly by an increase in social security taxes and partly from the general fund.

Public Law 89–105 authorizes grants to community mental health centers for professional and technical personnel, and to train teachers, construct facilities, and perform research for handicapped and retarded children.

Public Law 89–74 regulates the production, purchase, and sale of depressant and stimulant drugs.

Public Law 89–115 is a 3-year extension of a matching grant program for construction of health research facilities with an authorization of $280 million.

Public Law 89–239 establishes regional medical research centers and clinics to fight heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major diseases.

Public Law 89-— extends program for construction of facilities and loans to students to increase the number of physicians, dentists, osteopaths, optometrists, pharmacists, and nurses.

EDUCATION

The record of this session in passing seven major bills pertaining to the education of our youth is unprecedented in the history of this or any other nation. In the future years, millions of American children from the elementary grades to high school and college can, if qualified, secure a finished education regardless of the handicap of short funds or the financial condition of their parents. Any youth with industry and desire for educational advancement can take advantage of legislation passed by this Congress and signed by President Johnson. This great educational expansion gives opportunity to American youth who wish to become doctors, nurses, or participate in scientific education in this atomic age of scientific progress. Time and space do not permit me to give all the details of the wide scope and complex provisions contained in the seven educational bills passed by this Congress.

Public Law 89-— increases grants to colleges to pay part of the cost of new classrooms and expands student loan program.

Public Law 89–10 authorizes Federal aid to local school districts mainly for special education courses to be distributed on basis of number of children from low-income families.

Public Law 89–209 provides the first real attempt to recognize the importance of general education programs in an era which has previously had a heavy emphasis upon space and atomic science.

VOTING RIGHTS

On August 6, 1965, President Johnson signed a bill aimed at enforcing voting rights guaranteed by the 15th constitutional amendment. It was the second major civil rights law enacted in 2 years.

Federal registrars, or examiners, can be—and are being—sent to any State or political subdivision that on November 4, 1964, had a registration or voter participation of less than 5 percent of the voting age population, and that used a literacy test or other device in qualifying voters.

LABOR

Public Law 89-212 amends the Railroad Retirement Act by eliminating the provision which produced annuities of spouses of retired employees who were eligible for social security.

Public Law 89-216 provides that a bond fully protecting union funds against loss due to fraud and dishonesty is sufficient and eliminates requirement of Landrum-Griffin Act for excessive coverage which was requiring unnecessary premium payments.

Public Law 89-15 extends the manpower development training program 3 years to June 30, 1969. This program provides training for the unemployed and partially employed persons whose jobs are in jeopardy due to automation.

IMMIGRATION

The recently passed immigration legislation, Public Law 89-236, would abolish the 41-year-old national origins provisions of our immigration laws. This new bill will equitably distribute immigration quotas to all nations without relationship as to nationality, race, or religion. After World War I, an isolation-minded Congress enacted immigration regulations wherein a few countries in northern Europe were extended superliberal immigration quotas, while other Nations less favored were restricted with unreasonable limited quotas.

Our migrant population will not be increased by the passage of this bill. But we provide for a fair and equitable distribution of the quota allotments to all nations. The bill places a limit of annual immigration at 170,000, inclusive of 10,200 refugees. A maximum of 20,000 will be allotted to any one country. To this number may be added the wives, children, and parents of the U.S. citizens. In that latter category there were about 35,000 last year. This bill prevents the permanent separation of families. In many cases the families have remained divided for indefinite periods during these 41 years that we have had the national-origins theory of immigration.

The State, Labor, and Justice Departments are authorized to exercise rigid control over immigrant applications under this new bill. No one can be admitted for citizenship unless the Secretary of Labor issues an individual certificate that there will be no displacement of an American worker from his job. There will be no adverse effect on working conditions, or American labor in general.

TAXES

Public Law 89-44, Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965. Although the President asked for a reduction of $3.5 billion excise taxes to help spur the economy, Congress sent him—and he signed on June 21—a measure reducing them by $4.6 billion. Most of these taxes were enacted and levied in World War II and the Korean war. Here is the partial schedule of reductions: jewelry, watches, furs, cosmetics, toilet preparations, luggage, handbags, business machines, sporting goods, phonographs, records, musical instruments, cameras, film, radios, televisions, pens, mechanical pencils, refrigerators, coin-operated amusement devices, bowling alleys, general admissions—theaters, athletic events—and cabaret bills.

SMALL BUSINESS

Public Law 89-78 increases SBA's loan funds for small business investment companies and State and local development companies.

HIGHWAYS

Public Law 89-139 provides for a $100 million increase in the amount authorized for the Interstate Highway System. It is hoped that with the increase, presently planned interstate mileage can be completed in 5 years.

Public Law 89- — provides that States will lose considerable Federal highway funds unless they eliminate most billboards on primary roads.

DEFENSE

Public Law 89-171 authorized funds for foreign economic and military aid for 1966. Amount slightly less than last year.

Public Law 89-27 authorized $30 million annually for 1966-68 for arms control and disarmament research and negotiations.

Public Law 89-214 provides free life insurance for members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones.

Appropriations for defense hardware and to pay for past wars continue to be about 80 percent of the budget. Although equipment is more complicated each year and costs more per unit, the cost reduction program is holding the overall cost of defense about the same.

VETERANS

Public Law 89-222 increases the educational assistance allowances payable under the war orphans educational assistance program.

Public Law 89-137 provides cost-of-living increases in rates of subsistence allowances paid to disabled veterans pursuing vocational rehabilitation training and to the dependents of deceased or permanently and totally disabled veterans pursuing a program of education under the war orphans educational assistance program.

Public Law 89-138 extends the time limitation for pursuing vocational rehabilitation training for totally disabled veterans.

CIVIL SERVICE

Public Law 89-205 provides cost-of-living increases based on the Consumer Price Index published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

At this date, a bill providing salary increases for Federal classified and postal field service employees has passed the House of Representatives and has been reported in the Senate. It has not been enacted into law, but there is little doubt that a raise will be approved together with some other fringe benefits such as a provision for severance pay for Federal employees not entitled to immediate annuities who are victims of base closure, and so forth, such as we have experienced in New York.

MISCELLANEOUS

Public Law 89-134 authorized $115 million for the Peace Corps for 1966.

Public Law 89-174 establishes a Cabinet-level department to merge and assume the functions of the Housing and Home Finance Administration and several constituent agencies.

Public Law 89-141 makes it a Federal crime to assassinate, kidnap, or assault the President, President-elect, Vice President, Vice-President-elect, and other officers next in order of succession.

Senate Joint Resolution 1 cleared for State approval a constitutional amendment permitting the Vice President to become Acting President if the President is disabled and provides for filling vacancies in the office of Vice President.

Public Law 89-73 establishes an Administration on Aging to provide information and services to the States relative to developing programs for the aged.

NATIONAL SOLVENCY

Critics continue to talk about the size of our national debt. They fail to mention in their pessimistic propaganda that our economy—or gross national product—has been advancing and improving over the last 20 years. In 1946 our gross national product was approximately $202 billion. Today, in 1965, our gross national product at the termination of this year will be approximately $660 billion. They also fail to mention that our national debt in 1946 was $270 billion and today, in 1965, it is approximately $318 billion. In other words, our national debt in 20 years has increased $48 billion while our gross national product, or our economy generally, has increased approximately $460 billion. This increase of gross national product means billions more in taxes coming into the Federal, State, and local treasuries. So when your neighbor talks about our Nation's fiscal policy "going to the dogs" you might quote figures of our great business, industrial, and employment expansion during the last 20 years.

Congress still spends most of its time working through money requests, and since I am one of the Appropriations Committee members, I spend a large share of my time helping decide which requests to approve. Sometimes we add a few items, but it is usually a matter of either approving, eliminating, or changing requests. The appropriations recap—or maximum that can be spent—for the fiscal year 1966 is as follows:

Total budget requests	$103,083,378,055
Total authorized by Congress	101,522,219,794
Total reduction by Congress	1,561,158,261

Appropriation bills, 89th Cong., 1st sess.

Title	Budget requests	Amount as passed (House)	Amount as passed (Senate)	Amount enacted
Agriculture, 1965 supplemental	$1,742,209,000	$1,600,000,000	$1,600,000,000	$1,600,000,000
District of Columbia	389,346,800	356,300,500	364,350,347	360,228,500
Interior	1,270,129,500	1,200,090,300	1,246,752,770	1,212,739,070
Treasury [1]	1,219,400,000	1,272,252,000	1,304,014,000	1,291,239,000
Post Office	5,383,000,000	5,313,400,000	5,340,850,000	5,324,400,000
Executive Office of the President	15,805,000	15,752,000	15,805,000	15,805,000
Independent agencies	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
2d supplemental, 1965	2,226,456,933	2,118,033,083	2,257,869,415	2,227,563,977
Defense supplemental, 1965	700,000,000	700,000,000	700,000,000	700,000,000
Labor	588,144,000	537,460,000	557,607,500	547,607,000
Related agencies	36,867,000	36,825,000	36,825,000	36,825,000
Health, Education, and Welfare	7,652,014,000	7,323,020,000	7,411,940,000	7,410,170,000
Independent offices	14,566,023,000	14,109,908,000	14,253,364,000	14,246,167,800
Agriculture	5,815,134,000	5,717,832,000	6,711,908,800	621,000,000
State	404,210,000	388,202,000	390,125,000	[2] 389,602,000
USIA	173,249,100	171,871,000	171,617,000	171,617,000
Justice	373,834,000	370,819,000	370,919,000	370,869,000
Judiciary	76,616,500	81,111,900	80,693,900	80,693,900
Commerce	937,030,000	889,522,000	851,122,900	856,851,250
Related agencies [3]	191,547,000	184,164,000	187,734,000	184,814,000
Legislative [4]	204,872,222	150,589,107	190,840,167	189,993,297
Defense	46,948,844,000	46,888,244,000	46,877,063,000	46,887,163,000
Public works [5]	4,373,805,000	4,241,636,500	4,327,589,000	4,292,866,500
Military construction	2,049,000,000	1,755,495,000	1,759,504,000	1,756,635,000
Labor-HEW supplemental, 1966 [6]	1,553,918,000	1,223,181,500	1,407,181,500	1,223,181,500
Foreign aid	4,188,923,000	4,001,453,000	3,857,188,000	3,932,188,000
Total [7]	103,083,378,055	100,650,161,890	102,275,864,299	101,522,219,794

[1] Does not include permanent appropriations for debt service, tax refunds, trust fund payments, etc.

[2] Estimated and includes several hundred million dollars for CCC that will not be spent this year.

[3] Includes Small Business Administration, Civil Rights Commission, Maritime Commission, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, Tariff Commission, and U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

[4] Includes funds for Architect of the Capitol, Library of Congress, Government Printing Office, Botanic Gardens, joint committees, in addition to the House of Representatives. Appropriations for the Senate added there.

[5] Includes funds for Atomic Energy Commission, Army Engineers' projects for navigation improvements and flood control, Tennessee Valley Authority, Bureau of Reclamation and power agencies of the Interior Department, Panama Canal, St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and Delaware River Basin Commission.

[6] Includes funds to finance elementary and secondary school programs, medical centers for heart disease, cancer, and stroke, and manpower development program.

[7] Does not include last minute supplementals for the newly passed education and other bills.

LOCAL ISSUES

When we think of local problems in the Seventh Congressional District of New York, we immediately think of noise from airplanes, especially jets, flying low over our homes as they land and depart John F. Kennedy International Airport. As in the past, I have been in constant touch with the Federal Aviation Agency, the Port of New York Authority, and our congressional committees having jurisdiction in this field. I shall continue to pursue every avenue which holds even a glimmer of hope for a solution to this problem. In this age of space travel, I am confident that research can eventually solve the problem of engine noise. Until the "breakthrough" in research, I shall continue to work for landing and takeoff patterns that are safe and bring the least amount of noise to those of us who live and work in the vicinity of large airports.

One item of major interest to our district which is included in the 1965 omnibus rivers and harbors bill is the authorization to proceed with hurricane protection in Jamaica Bay. The work authorized to be done will be under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers. Not only does this promise great relief from flooding for those communities bordering on Jamaica Bay but it also promises much for business in the area with the attendant recreation possibilities.

CONGRESSIONAL OFFICES

It has been—and continues to be—my desire to be readily available to any constituent who wishes to talk with me. Whenever time permits, I attend district civic, veterans, and fraternal organization meetings. For the convenience of my constituents, I maintain a full-time district office, and my office in Washington is always open. For those who may not have had occasion to contact me during 1965, I call attention to the change in office addresses: District office, 96–11 101st Avenue, Ozone Park, 11417; Washington office, 1727 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C., 20515.

This has been a fruitful session, and I look forward to an active 2d session of the 89th Congress. Through personal contact and mail, I hope to continue to work and reflect the needs of our community and the Nation.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. **Farnum**, for October 21–25, 1965, on account of official business in the district.

Mr. **Hagan** of Georgia (at the request of Mr. **Albert**), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. **O'Neal** of Georgia (at the request of Mr. **Albert**), for today, and the balance of week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. **Feighan**, for 15 minutes, tomorrow; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. **Gubser**, for 1 hour, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. **Saylor**, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. **Gray**, for 30 minutes, on October 22; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. **Williams**, for 25 minutes, tomorrow, October 21, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. **Bow**, for 60 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. **Randall**, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. **Ashbrook** (at the request of Mr. **Broyhill** of North Carolina), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. **Addabbo** (at the request of Mr. **Redlin**), today, for 30 minutes.

Mr. **Waggonner** (at the request of Mr. **Redlin**), for 30 minutes, October 21.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the **Congressional Record**, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. **Barrett** and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. **Secrest**.

Mr. **Everett** and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. **Thompson** of Texas (at the request of Mr. **Brooks**).

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. **Redlin**) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. **Carey**.

Mr. **McCarthy**.

Mr. **McGrath**.

Mr. **Hansen** of Iowa.

Mr. **Sweeney** in two instances.

Mr. **Morrison**.

Mr. **Roncalio**.

Mr. **Schmidhauser**.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 337. An act for the relief of F. F. Hintz;

S. 343. An act for the relief of Paride Marchesan;

S. 374. An act for the relief of Dr. Castrillo (Fernandez);

S. 516. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the Saint Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), to provide that eight members of such Commission shall be appointed by the President, and that such Commission may continue in existence until December 31, 1966;

S. 711. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hertha L. Wohlmuth;

S. 1735. An act relating to the use by the Secretary of the Interior of land at La Jolla, Calif., donated by the University of California for a marine biological research laboratory, and for other purposes; and

S. 2039. An act for the relief of Ken Allen Keene (Yasuo Tsukikawa).

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1218. An act for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co., and/or Holt Import & Export Co.;

H.R. 4088. An act for the relief of Irving M. Sobin Chemical Co., Inc.;

H.R. 9545. An act providing for the acquisition and preservation by the United States of certain items of evidence pertaining to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy;

H.R. 10369. An act to give the consent of Congress to the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont to become parties to title II of the Compact on Taxation of Motor Fuels Consumed by Interstate Buses and the agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity;

H.R. 11303. An act to amend section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended;

H.R. 11420. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide certain mailing privileges with respect to members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 571. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning October 25, 1965, as National Parkinson Week.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on October 19, 1965 present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1311. An act for the relief of Joseph J. McDevitt;

H.R. 1319. An act for the relief of Joseph Durante;

H.R. 1409. An act for the relief of Louis W. Hann;

H.R. 1644. An act for the relief of 1st Lt. Robert B. Gann, and others;

H.R. 1836. An act for the relief of Constantinos Agganis;

H.R. 2005. An act for the relief of Miss Gloria Seborg;

H.R. 2285. An act for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Cioffi Carson;

H.R. 2557. An act for the relief of Frank Simms;

H.R. 2757. An act for the relief of Maria Alexandros Siagris;

H.R. 2853. An act to amend title 17, United States Code, with relation to the fees to be charged;

H.R. 3288. An act for the relief of Hwang Tai Shik;

H.R. 3515. An act for the relief of Mary Ann Hartmann;

H.R. 3669. An act for the relief of Emilia Majka;

H.R. 3770. An act for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Navy at the Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, Calif.;

H.R. 4078. An act for the relief of William L. Minton;

H.R. 4137. An act for the relief of Dr. Jan Rosciszewski;

H.R. 4194. An act for the relief of Angelica Anagnostopoulos;

H.R. 4203. An act for the relief of Alton G. Edwards;

H.R. 4464. An act for the relief of Michael Harjichristofas, Aphrodite Hadjichristofas and Paniote Hadjichristofas;

H.R. 5167. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the administrative settlement of tort claims arising in foreign countries, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9526. An act for the relief of Raffaella Achilli.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 21, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1687. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1966, for the Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 307); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1688. A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting report of amount of Export-Import Bank insurance and guarantees on U.S. exports to Yugoslavia for the month of September 1965 pursuant to title III of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1965 and to the Presidential determination of February 4, 1964; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1689. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of procurement of fault locating indicators for the Nike-Hercules guided missile, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1690. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report of unauthorized expenditures for the repair and reconstruction of a section of the Inter-American Highway in the Republic of Costa Rica, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1691. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of examination of financial statements for the Southwestern Power System and related activities, fiscal year 1964, Southwestern Power Administration, Department of the Interior and Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1692. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting reports of negotiated contracts for disposal of materials during the period January 1 through June 30, 1965, pursuant to Public Law 87–889 (76 Stat. 587); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1693. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting report of tort claims paid during fiscal year ended June 30, 1965, pursuant to Public Law 79–601 (28 U.S.C. 2673); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1694. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 111 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the prepayment of certain expenses associated with the travel of veterans to or from a Veterans' Administration facility or other place, in connection with vocational rehabilitation or counseling, or for the purpose of examination, treatment, or care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1695. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3203, title 38, United States Code, to restrict the conditions under which benefits are immediately reduced upon readmission of veterans for hospitalization or other institutional care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 605. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; with amendment (Rept. No. 1180). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MACDONALD: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. A report on world newsprint supply-demand; without amendment (Rept. No. 1181). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 11664. A bill to confer additional jurisdiction upon the Superintendent of Insurance for the District of Columbia to regulate domestic stock insurance companies and to exempt such companies from section 12(g)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; without amendment (Rept. No. 1182). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1098. An act to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 613. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct certain studies and investigations; without amendment (Rept. No. 1184). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee of Conference. S. 2118. An act to amend sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920 (Rept. No. 1185). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee of Conference. H.R. 8370. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1186). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 11681. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to assist States and communities in meeting the initial cost of establishment and operation of programs for the care of patients with kidney diseases and to train professional personnel needed to conduct such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 11682. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to make discrimination in employment because of age an unlawful employment practice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 11683. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 7-percent increase in all annuities and pensions payable thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11684. A bill to provide that individuals entitled to disability insurance benefits (or child's benefits based on disability) under title II of the Social Security Act, and individuals entitled to permanent disability annuities (or child's annuities based on disability) under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, shall be eligible for health insurance benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 11685. A bill to amend section 129(b) of title 23, United States Code, relating to toll roads, bridges, and tunnels on the National Systems of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FARNUM:

H.R. 11686. A bill to provide a program of Federal assistance to elementary schools throughout the Nation to improve educational opportunities through provision for the services of child development specialists and to provide a program of Federal assistance for the training of such elementary school personnel in the institutions of higher education, and for other educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 11687. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act so as to provide for the induction into the Armed Forces of persons who would otherwise be deferred from such service because of being morally deficient or defective; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 11688. A bill to aid in the development of a coordinated system of passenger transportation for the northeastern corridor; to create a Northeastern Corridor Transportation Commission; to authorize negotiation to create an interstate agency; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 11689. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the amortization of reorganization expenditures of railroad corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 11690. A bill to establish a system for the sharing of certain Federal tax receipts with the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 11691. A bill to provide a program of Federal assistance to elementary schools throughout the Nation to improve educational opportunities through provision for the services of child development specialists and to provide a program of Federal assistance for the training of such elementary school personnel in the institutions of higher education, and for other educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 11692. A bill to provide that the fee increases prescribed by Public Law 89-83 shall not be effective in any case wherein the application was filed prior to the effective date of that act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 11693. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national historic site in or near South Pass, Wyo.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 11694. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove certain limitations on the amount of the deduction for contributions to pension and profit-sharing plans made on behalf of self-employed individuals and to change the definition of "earned income" applicable with respect to such plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 11695. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Sonoran Desert National Park in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 11696. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 11697. A bill to establish a procedure for the review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 11698. A bill to establish a basic workweek of 35 hours for Government employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 11699. A bill to provide for specific employment policies in order to promote maximum employment, to reduce unemployment to its minimum acceptable levels, to promote an adequate rate of economic growth, and to preserve reasonable price stability; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.R. 11700. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1958 to authorize the appropriation of $8 million for the repair and modification of certain structures along the Illinois and Mississippi Canal in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 11701. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of exploration expenditures in the case of mining; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 11702. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 11703. A bill to provide for specific employment policies in order to promote maximum employment, to reduce unemployment to its minimum acceptable levels, to promote an adequate rate of economic growth, and to preserve reasonable price stability; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 11704. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 11705. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.J. Res. 777. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.J. Res. 778. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the reprinting of Consumers All, the Yearbook of Agriculture 1965; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.J. Res. 779. Joint resolution providing for Federal participation in the construction of an addition to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library as a memorial to Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H. Con. Res. 525. Concurrent resolution condemning some tactics currently employed in certain demonstrations against official U.S. policy in Vietnam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 613. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct certain studies and investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 614. Resolution to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by House Resolution 94; tot he Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 11706. A bill for the relief of Grace M. Reyes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11707. A bill for the relief of Romeo de la Torre Sanano and his sister, Julieta de la Torre Sanano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 11708. A bill for the relief of Stella Dourou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11709. A bill for the relief of Branislav, Liljana, and Milan Stankovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARNSLEY:

H.R. 11710. A bill for the relief of Enrique C. Chico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11711. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Christine Pui-See Sottiurai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 11712. A bill for the relief of Angela Elosegui-Cortadi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 11713. A bill for the relief of Marcelo P. Antolin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11714. A bill for the relief of Julian S. Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 11715. A bill for the relief of Miriam Agatha Benn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11716. A bill for the relief of Maria Aida Gambino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11717. A bill for the relief of Theofanis Koystiaftis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 11718. A bill for the relief of Jack L. Philippot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 11719. A bill for the relief of Thomas M. Gilmore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 11720. A bill for the relief of Charles A. Noble and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF (by request):

H.R. 11721. A bill for the relief of Elena Affo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Birchers Disowned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 20, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, our able and esteemed colleague from Kentucky, Senator Thruston B. Morton, on October 1 issued a statement in which he deplored efforts by the John Birch Society to infiltrate the Republican Party, and expressed the opinion that the Republican Party has no room "for a clandestine organization engaged in character assassination." I ask unanimous consent that Senator Morton's statement together with an editorial from the Pittsburgh Post Gazette of October 4, 1965, commenting on Senator Morton's statement be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The American Political Science Association met recently in Washington. I had the high privilege of addressing a subcommittee of this group. It was the customary format—brief remarks followed by questions.

One of the first questions was aptly and sharply put: "What are you Republicans going to do about the John Birch Society?" I said, "Ignore them."

Now I have changed my tune. I have always agreed with my friend, Barry Goldwater, that there are probably more Democrats than Republicans in the John Birch Society.

As a partisan Republican, I am concerned by the fact that the John Birch Society has picked my party—the Republican Party—as the vehicle to promulgate its monolithic philosophy. In so doing, this group seems more dedicated to the defeat of Republicans than Democrats. As an American, I am convinced that the activities of the society will weaken and endanger representative government.

There are three organizations in this country which give me grave doubts as a citizen: the Communist Party, the Ku Klux Klan, and the John Birch Society. Although their goals differ, they have one thing in common, and that is secrecy. I am sure that Mr. J. Edgar Hoover has a fairly substantial list of the members of these organizations. Actually, if my life depended on it, I couldn't name 10 people in any one of these organizations. Secret fraternities or societies prevail in many of our colleges. This doesn't disturb me. On the other hand, when a politically activist group operates under the cloak of secrecy, I am disturbed.

The articulate conservative columnist, William Buckley, with whom I frequently disagree, performs a great service for the country by adding brilliantly to the political dialogue. And he signs his columns, making no attempt at clandestine persuasion. My Republican colleagues in the Senate represent many degrees of political thought. Their various views all go into the fabric of representative government. They, too, express themselves openly—open to examination and question. They, like Buckley, do not hide things in the realm of public life.

I served for 4 years in the House of Representatives with the late Vito Marcantonio. He was first elected to Congress as a Republican in 1934. He was defeated in 1936. He was again elected to Congress running under the American Laborite ticket in 1938 and served continuously until 1950. He certainly was the voice of Moscow in the Congress of the United States. During the 1940's, the Communist Party tried to infiltrate the great Democratic Party. They didn't do it. By 1950 the country had enough of Marcantonio. The Liberal Party, the Democratic Party, and the Republican Party all nominated Mr. James George Donovan as his opponent. This was the end of Marcantonio. I think that President Truman had something to do with that operation, and we all bless him for it.

What really concerns me is that a secret society should threaten and attempt to destroy one of our two great political parties. The Birchites label the late John Foster Dulles and Dr. Milton Eisenhower as Communists. They label Gen. Dwight Eisenhower as a Communist sympathizer. They imply that Barry Goldwater is a Socialist. In my book, these men are great Americans. I don't think that we have any room in the Republican Party for a clandestine organization engaged in character assassination.

I have been asked what proof I have in connection with infiltration by the John Birch Society of the Republican Party. Having to deal with a tightly controlled, secret organization, it is difficult to develop a documentation. I do know that in Harris County, Tex., Republicans had to make a tough fight to keep the Birchites from taking over. I know that Governor Romney of Michigan and Governor Evans of Washington, faced similar situation. I do know that a Californian moved to South Dakota and is trying to defeat Karl Mundt in the Republican primary.

If representative government is to prevail, it must prevail in the open. Secret societies motivated by hatred, distrust, selfishness and character assassination will never build a positive and dynamic society.

BIRCHERS DISOWNED

Republican leaders in the past few days have performed a service in saying they want no political alliance with the John Birch Society.

The society's image of respectability has been considerably downgraded by recent denunciations of it by Senate Republican leader Everett McKinley Dirksen, House Republican leader Gerald R. Ford, Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee Chairman Thruston B. Morton, and Gov. William Scranton, of Pennsylvania. When so many highly placed leaders of Republicanism are prepared to disown the Birchers, then conservatively oriented citizens should begin to appreciate why these extremists are unworthy of support.

The John Birch Society is objectionable not so much because of its views, which are bad enough, as because of its tactics. As Senator Morton suggested, it is comparable in many ways to the Ku Klux Klan and the Communist Party. It operates largely in secret. Its organizational structure is rigidly authoritarian. It functions through front groups. It seeks to infiltrate unrelated organizations and take them over for its own purposes. It uses vicious smear methods against its opponents.

If the John Birch Society really wants to be a respectable political organization, let it come out in the open and put up its own candidates and its own platform clearly identified with its own name. Such an open campaign would show whether citizens are ready to accept the shoddy slogans the Birchers are trying to peddle as political realities.

Let Us Rededicate Ourselves To Support for the "Man in Blue"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1965

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment upon the growing national problem of reinstating respect for authority in this land of the free and the home of the brave.

Article after article, speaker after speaker, have moralized with great accuracy that we live in an age of changing values in which our respect for law and civil authority is rapidly decaying.

Many point to the fact that the basic unit of our society, the home, has undergone great change in the recent decades, and that the exercise of parental discipline and the acceptance of parental authority within the home is no longer commonplace, but rather exceptional to find.

In a fast moving era such as ours, wherein technological advances are being reported daily, we seem to have been swept up in a constant emphasis on materialism; and spiritual values seem to be on the wane. Education as formerly understood seems hard pressed to encourage elementary discipline and unable to instill in young minds the simple concepts of "mine and thine."

Authorities in the field of law enforcement have repeatedly pointed out that policemen, teachers, and parents no longer get the respect that they did in the days of their youth; and it seems that these authorities are somewhat restricted by our ever-changing laws and concepts of legal enforcement which teach to punish the kids of today would be to in someway psychologically scar them.

Parental responsibility in a growing America concerned with life in suburbia and the three-car, three-television era, is on the obvious decline. Early in life, the child is physically, psychologically, spiritually, and practically on his own. He affiliates on the street corners of America with those of his age and generation who also are products of a discipline-starved homelife and who in those formative teen years are psychologically unequipped to face the problems of the age in which he lives.

Those of us in Government who deal daily with crime statistics react with shock over such things as demonstrations, rioting, street crimes, lawlessness, disrespect for the law, and the ever-increasing army of maladjusted misfits that pock our society. Today, more than ever before, men in Government are taking a close look at the growing problem of disrespect for law in present day America.

This is a problem that cannot be swept under the rug or excused away. The simple truth is that when the family and the neighborhood fail in the rearing of law-abiding citizens, then we must face the terribly obnoxious thought that possibly the future raising of our children ought to be also undertaken by Federal authorities.

I think it is about time that we call a spade a spade and rally to the rescue of the police of America who are constantly being cast in the role of villains and who are being badgered without interruption by the charge of brutality.

Let us put an end to the disgusting tendency that exists in every city of the land and let us identify those groups which seem to be busy in the "blame the blue" campaign. Let us ask ourselves whether or not certain changes of attitudes have occurred in neighborhoods and communities, which formerly frowned on criminals, and which today paint them as poor, misguided persons not deserving of punishment.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most spectacular oddities of our day and age is the sight of policemen protecting persons engaged in illegal demonstrations which actually break down public faith and confidence in the law and the officers who enforce it.

As Congressman at Large for the State of Ohio, I was most delighted to learn of a citizen's group recently formed in Cleveland, Ohio, which is conducting a concerted effort to facilitate a better understanding and connection between citizens and their police. This police-citizens relations committee is engaged in a very worthwhile service, and is effectively participating in the war on lawlessness, and encouraging better law enforcement in the areas where the crime rate seems ever mounting.

Studies and surveys indicate that America has been altogether too passive in the battle against crime, and that we must have greater citizen participation in the war against criminals. This war against crime is being waged in every city in the Nation.

The simple reality of our times is that our streets are not safe, that there are reasons to believe that crimes of violence are on the increase in all areas and that much more must be done nationally to protect the lives and property of our citizenry.

Up until now, the "man in blue" has fought a losing battle without much thanks and certainly without very little governmental or citizen support. Once the "man in blue" undertakes an arrest, it seems he subjects himself to possible suit for false arrest when the defense, through some legal technicality, secures the reduction or dismissal of the original violation.

The "man in blue" is indeed expert in his field and can guide us to understand such things as court leniency, abuses of probation and parole, suspended sentences, and special privileges which he encounters daily in the courts of our land and in his contacts with the public and private rehabilitation services which are adjuncts of them.

We can hardly expect respect for law unless we can demonstrate America's urgency that the laws of the land be enforced to the fullest extent. Society, in my judgment, must, without question, demonstrate its unwillingness to coddle criminals, but to deal with them both fairly and sternly at the same time.

The modern oddity is the lack of any militant group to further the obligations of an American citizen. The Citizens' Committee for an Adequate Cleveland Community Action program is the first organization I have noted which had dedicated itself to this purpose and is doing something effective to curb mob violence and gang rule.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that all America—north, south, east, and west—white and blue collar alike; young, middle aged, and senior citizens of all faiths and creeds and races—must draw this Nation together as one group to rededicate itself with a sense of moral and legal obligation. This Nation must react in unity against those bleeding hearts who have so mysteriously captivated our interests and have so effectively undermined sensible law enforcement.

There was a day in this land when boy and girl, with jump rope in hand, regarded the "man in blue" as a loyal and trusted friend. There was a day not too long gone when the parental support for education and discipline was a marvel to behold. There was a day in which the entire community developed a conscience against criminal behavior without finding psychological or social excuses for it; and Mr. Speaker, there shall again come a day in which America will once more appreciate the contribution of the "man in blue," who daily puts his life on the line for his community at low-level pay and receives in return, high-level abuse.

The role of the rank and file policeman as the balance wall of our society must somehow be reinstated. Judges, prosecutors, and district attorneys must pledge a more cooperative effort and forge a closer alliance with the "man in blue," who stands in the courtrooms of America in the enforcement of laws and ordinances.

In short, Mr. Speaker, America must wake up and adopt a different attitude toward discipline. The leaders of our Government on all levels and the leaders of our churches as well, must renew themselves with respect to law and order and their love for it. The father and mother in the home must not just tolerate law and its enforcement as it applies to those beyond their home, but must foster and apply it within the family to learn to adopt a zest for it, for the law is available and ready in the protection of the rights of us all, the poor and the rich, the intelligent and the misguided, the privileged and the deprived, the deserving and the undeserving, the very existence of the stability of our society depends upon our love of the law and our willingness to support police efforts to enforce it.

Back in 1880, the immortal Gilbert and Sullivan wrote an operetta which contained a line stating, "The policeman's lot is not a happy one."

Indeed, this has unique application in our time, but I might suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it would be of great consequence to the "men in blue" in this Nation for them to know that they enjoy broad public interest in these trying and difficult days.

An so on the way home tonight, Mr. Speaker, I intend to give the policeman on the corner of a friendly smile and a word of encouragement for the tremendous job that he is doing in every corner of the land in the protection of our lives and property.

Patman Praises National Association of Retail Druggists Warning Them To Protect the Interest of the Small Businessman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1965

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, my longtime and trusted colleague, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, addressed the National Association of Retail Druggists recently, praising them as a public-minded trade association representing 40,000 small business drugstore operators.

The gentleman from Texas, who is chairman of our Banking and Currency Committee, on which I proudly serve, is and has been—and will continue to be—one of the great champions of the small businessman. His many years of difficult, lonesome, yet persistent advocacy for what President Roosevelt called the "forgotten man" is a testament to his strength and character as a true public servant of all the people. A foe of monopoly and economic concentration, be it in banks or industry, and his forthright advocacy of effective antitrust laws, WRIGHT PATMAN stands as one of the great Members of this body.

The statement of the gentleman from Texas, following my remarks, is a fine outline of his philosophy. He warns small business to beware of the growing concentrations in industry, reporting to them on the attempt and pressures of the big bankers to exempt bank mergers from the antitrust laws.

Much has been made, Mr. Speaker, of our chairman's so-called filibuster effort to kill this bank merger bill. But I, for one, am grateful for the careful study that the hearings have brought to this complicated subject. These hearings were definitely needed, and I have profited greatly from them.

Mr. Speaker, I include Chairman PATMAN's statement in the RECORD following my remarks:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE WRIGHT PATMAN, REPRESENTATIVE, FIRST DISTRICT, STATE OF TEXAS, TO THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RETAIL DRUGGISTS, OCTOBER 14, 1965

I am delighted to address this great gathering of small businessmen. The National Association of Retail Druggists is, in my opinion, one of the really public-minded trade associations.

This organization is unique in that all of its 40,000 members are small businessmen, representing enterprises which are part of the heart and the strength of America.

I understand that the large chain-type drugstore operators are not eligible for membership in your organization. This is strictly a small businessman's organization.

I congratulate the NARD for its fine work in many areas. I know that a number of good laws in the States and in the Congress would not be on the books if it were not for the hard work of your national organization.

Of course, I am always pleased to be on the same platform with Willard B. Simmons, your executive secretary. As many of you know, Willard is my neighbor in Texarkana, Tex. Willard is one of our outstanding citizens and leaders in that part of the country, and I know he is doing an excellent job for NARD. I can tell you that he has a fine reputation with the Congress.

I am accused of being a champion of the small businessman—sometimes in praise, and other times in derisive terms. I am also accused of being a bitter foe of monopoly and economic concentration. I am accused of being a foe of high interest and a supporter of the idea that the people ought to control their own money system. I plead guilty to all of these accusations.

Admittedly, my positions on these issues evoke a variety of comment and opinion. There are powerful voices in this country who hold that WRIGHT PATMAN'S theories in favor of small business and against monopoly are outdated. Certainly there are vocal and strong interests who deride WRIGHT PATMAN'S ideas that the consumer should not pay unnecessarily high and burdensome premiums for the use of money. These same interests promulgate the theory that WRIGHT PATMAN'S ideas on the monetary system are all wrong and that the system should belong to the bankers and only to the bankers.

My opponents in these areas are indeed loud and powerful. I give them every right to their opinions, even those that come in the form of blatant self-interest appeals.

But I tell you here today that a system which provides for the survival of the small businessman is not outdated. I say to you that the dangers of monopoly and overconcentration of economic power are becoming greater, not lesser, dangers to the American competitive system.

This is why I was so happy to accept this invitation to address the 69th Annual Convention of the National Association of Retail Druggists. You people understand the dangers of monopoly and unrestricted concentration of economic forces. Your businesses came into being and survived because of the success in curbing the big trusts and chainstore monopolies. Today, the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the Robinson-Patman Act have as much meaning to your businesses as the day these laws were enacted.

I am deeply concerned about the growing apathy about all of these laws which have meant so much in keeping the American economy on an even keel and in protecting the legitimate rights of the small businessman. Many of these laws are today under attack. Many of these attacks are subtle, behind-the-scenes efforts to erode sections of the antimonopoly, antitrust statutes. Some publications and editorial writers have spread the idea that all is well and that the move toward concentration of economic power has been forever stopped.

This simply is not true. Pick up any newspaper and turn to the financial page. I will be surprised if you do not find two or three stories in every edition about some merger or consolidation. Corporate mergers are increasing by alarming rates in this country. Last year alone, there were 1,800 such mergers in manufacturing industries. And let me give you this startling figure—between 1950 and 1962, the 100 largest manufacturing corporations increased their share of the total assets of this industry from 38.6 to 45 percent. Now there are an estimated 165,000 different manufacturing corporations. One hundred of this number have almost 50 percent of the assets. The other half is divided by the remaining 164,900 manufacturing corporations.

The real danger of concentration of economic power is often lost in a mass of figures and legal technicalities. It is much more than that. It is a threat to every citizen of this country. Without question, it is a threat to the type of businesses which you people operate.

As the former head of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division, Bill Orrick, said, "Concentration of economic power has always been regarded as a threat to our most important social and political institutions." And Mr. Orrick also made this significant comment while he was in office: "Perhaps most important of all, Congress' dedication to antitrust goals as a means of preserving our way of life has always rested on its recognition that concentration of industrial power may lead to the police state. Can anyone doubt that the prewar experiences of Germany, Japan, and Italy have proven the wisdom of this Nation's concern over concentration of economic power?"

The big corporations which dominate many fields are becoming more and more defiant about the antitrust laws. Their attacks on the validity of these laws are becoming more widespread and vicious. They have mounted a campaign, I believe, to destroy or at least hamstring most of these laws. Only recently, some grocery chains argued in an antitrust case in this manner: "The antitrust officials are thinking nostalgically of a bygone age of 'Mom and Pop' corner groceries." Yes, many corporations are proceeding on the theory that the day of the small businessman is limited. I hope they are wrong. For the sake of the country they must be wrong. You and your organizations must prove them wrong. The small business is not something out of the horse-and-buggy era. It belongs to 20th-century America and it must continue.

Just after World War II, when I was chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I named the late Estes Kefauver chairman of a Special Subcommittee on Monopoly. Mr. Kefauver turned out one of the finest reports ever produced in the House. I think this section bears rereading today:

"Concentration is the very antithesis of the free enterprise system. It is a fundamental principle in America that the public interest is best served by the maintenance of competition and the prevention of the evils of monopoly.

"Economic concentration leads inevitably to the elimination of small business, the disappearance of competition, the fixing of prices, the restriction of production, and the creation of unemployment. It causes an uneconomic allocation of productive resources and prevents the full utilization of productive capacity. It obstructs adjustment to economic change and contributes to general industrial instability. Concentration blocks the possibility of improving the standard of living by failing fully to develop technological innovations. It attempts to control and limit technical experimentation and to withhold the benefits of increased production from workers and consumers, thus aggravating inequalities in the distribution of income. Finally, concentration of political power, with the result that small groups of powerful interests control the State and National political life. Industrial concentration thus inevitably comes to be paralleled by the concentration of political power in the hands of a small but powerful minority.

"Symptomatic of these evils of concentration are examples of the inflexibility of prices in concentrated industries, the deliberate deterioration of quality standards, and the withholding of technological advances from public use."

Nowhere is the growth of concentration more apparent than in the banking industry. And without question, concentration and monopoly in banking breeds concentration and monopoly in other industries. Concentration is extremely high in banking today and is becoming more so. In the Nation as a whole, the 100 largest banks control almost half of the total commercial banks' assets and deposits; 10 banks out of a total 14,000 account for nearly 25 percent of the demand deposits in the country.

Since 1950, there have been more than 2,200 merger of banks. New York City has been the center of an almost fantastic wave of mergers. In the Nation's biggest city, the concentration has reached the point where five banks account for more than 70 percent of the bank business. New York City is the Nation's largest financial center and the mergers in that city have wide repercussions throughout the country. Through interlocking directors these giant merged banks control many industries. I am convinced that concentration in banking triggers rapid concentration in industry. President Wilson recognized this point when he wrote in the New Freedom:

"A great industrial nation is controlled by its system of credit. Our system of credit is privately concentrated. The growth of the Nation, therefore, and all our activities are in the hands of a few men who, even if their action be honest and intended for the public interest, are necessarily concentrated upon the great undertakings in which their own money is involved and who necessarily, by the very reason of their own limitations, chill and check and destroy genuine economic freedom. This is the greatest question of all, and to this statesmen must address themselves with an earnest determination to serve the long future and the true liberties of men."

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, with whom I serve on the Joint Economic Committee, is a learned and highly respected economist. Recently, he had this to say on this relation between banking and other industries:

"Now, I have talked with a great many people in Great Britain and a few in Canada, and their almost unanimous opinion is that the concentration of banking led to a concentration of industry; that huge funds were accumulated, and the natural tendency of an investment official in a bank is to lend it out in large sums, too. It is easier to do."

Senator DOUGLAS is so right. The big bank, as the Senator notes, invariably prefers to deal with the big customer. In other words, big business. The loan officers of Morgan Guaranty Trust or Chase Manhattan National Bank would probably refuse to even consider a loan for a small independent drugstore operator. I am sure that they would much rather deal with a multimillion-dollar chain store enterprise. So, as sources of credit are eliminated through these mergers, your supply of credit dwindles. Small business is protected by a system that provides a multiplicity of financial institutions, among which there is a high degree of competition.

It is almost unbelievable that the Congress now has before it legislation which would grease the way to more and bigger mergers in banking. Undoubtedly, many of you have heard about these so-called bank merger bills, which the American Bankers Association has been attempting to ram through Congress this session. These measures are now pending before the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am chairman.

Earlier this year, a bill, S. 1698, was passed by the Senate on a voice vote after one of the briefest hearings of this session. We now have a variety of measures under consideration in the Banking and Currency Committee. One of the more extreme measures is being promoted by the 11 Republicans on the committee, and, THOMAS L. ASHLEY, a Democrat from Toledo, Ohio. This bill, would, for all practical purposes, eliminate the application of the antitrust laws to any future bank mergers. It would also exempt three banks which are under current prosecution for antitrust violations.

In one case, the Supreme Court has already decided that the banks violated the law. In another case which would be excused, the U.S. district court has entered a final decision against the bank. In addition, the other 2,200 bank mergers which have taken place since 1950 would be forever exempted from the antitrust laws.

The pressure to pass a bank merger bill in 1965 has been some of the heaviest in the history of the U.S. Congress. The American Bankers Association and the big banks most affected by this legislation have pulled out all of the stops to gain this extreme, favored treatment from the Congress. These bills are blatant, private legislation for the benefit of a powerful and special few.

I am personally convinced that Manufacturers-Hanover Trust Co. of New York, the Nation's fourth largest bank, is the number one ringleader in this pressure campaign. In June of 1963, the Supreme Court ruled in the Philadelphia National Bank case that the antitrust laws did apply to the banking industry, despite the Bank Merger Act of 1960. This decision removed all doubt about the antitrust application to banks, if indeed any doubt existed.

It is interesting that the banking industry did not come to Congress after the Supreme Court decision and ask for special exemption from the antitrust laws. No, it was not until April of this year that the banking industry sought to have a bill introduced. It is significant that the introduction of the bank merger bill came less than 1 month after the U.S. district court decision in New York holding Manufacturers-Hanover in violation of the law.

When they stepped on the toes of the Nation's fourth largest bank, the roar from Wall Street was heard in every congressional district.

The lawyers for Manufacturers-Hanover obviously thought the Congress would bail them out. They did not even bother to file a motion for rehearing or appeal from the district court ruling. Instead, they came to Congress seeking special privileges in the form of the bank merger bill.

These bank merger bills are bills for the big banks. Not once in 6 weeks of hearings, did I hear a witness explain how the bank merger bill would serve the public interest. It is antipublic interest and the banking industry knows this only too well. I hope that Congress realizes this before it is too late.

Frankly, S. 1698 and the Ashley bill and other similar measures place us at a crossroads in the efforts to control concentration in the banking industry. The proponents of this legislation encase it in nice-sounding legal and technical language. But it is an attack on the antitrust laws of the Nation It is a departure from the longstanding principle that competition is essential to the American economic system. It is a departure from the idea that monopoly and concentration and elimination of competition are the enemies of the consumer and small businessmen.

This attack on the antitrust laws comes in the Nation's most vulnerable economic area—banking, money, and credit. If this succeeds in the banking industry, then I predict that the opponents of the antitrust laws will move quickly in other areas of the economy. How will the Congress refuse exemptions to the big steel companies if it grants favors to the banking industry? How will the Congress turn away antitrust exemptions for the automobile manufacturers if Manufacturers-Hanover and other large banks are to receive this privilege? And can the Congress turn down exemptions for the chain drugstores and big drug manufacturers if the banks win this battle against the antitrust laws?

I cannot overemphasize my concern about what may well be the beginning of the end for major sections of our antitrust laws.

My concern about the banking industry, of course, goes beyond the question of antitrust. I am appalled by the failure of the so-called supervisory agencies to provide any kind of meaningful control over the activities of this industry.

Frankly, I believe there is great laxity in these agencies. I do not think they are doing their job of protecting the public. I include in this, the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Comptroller of the Currency.

When I talk about the banks, I do not mean to indict every bank and every banker. I firmly support the idea that banks must make a profit in our system. I recognize that there are many, many good banks and conscientious bank executives. But these facts do not alter my concern over the domination of the banking industry by a handful of huge banks. These big banks actually work to the detriment of other financial institutions as well as the rest of the economy.

The whole country, I believe, is appalled by the revelations of infiltration of banks by criminal elements. This infiltration is extremely serious for bank depositors, stockholders, FDIC insurance, and the general public. As you know, our Domestic Finance Subcommittee investigated this area earlier this year. This included a look at the Crown Savings Bank of Newport News, Va., which was closed a year ago. Our investigation showed clearly that over $2 million of this bank's funds were used to finance and facilitate loan-sharking, gambling, numbers rackets, fraudulent money order sales, and passing of forged securities. This activity was carried on all down the east coast from New York to Georgia.

This bank's situation is serious enough in itself, but such activities apparently exist in some other banks. During his appearance before our committee, Chairman K. A. Randall of the FDIC admitted that at the present time, FDIC has 199 banks on its problem list with aggregate deposits of $1.829 billion.

I am also appalled by the apparent cooperation of many banks with loan shark operations. In investigating the Federal Services Finance Corp.—a loan operation specializing in fast shuffle deals with military personnel—we discovered that nearly 100 commercial banks had been providing this finance company with substantial lines of credit.

Now these things must be stopped and the Federal banking agencies simply are not doing the job. I do not accuse these officials with wrongdoing or impugn their motives. But, I do say that the decisions of these agencies invariably carry the appearance of a rubberstamp for the positions of the banks. Seldom is the public interest taken into consideration.

The Congress should move now to bring reform to the banking agencies and to include safeguards for the public. First, I think all of these agencies should come to Congress for appropriations annually. This provides an annual review of their activity—or lack of activity. Under present conditions, all three are financed outside of the public domain. The FDIC and the Comptroller of the Currency are financed by funds provided by the banks they supervise. This is like having the television networks finance the Federal Communications Commission or the drug manufacturers, the Federal Trade Commission. This is terrible public policy and the Congress should correct this now. Every taint of banker domination should be removed from these agencies.

Now the Federal Reserve Board, of course, claims to be independent of everyone, the public, the Congress, and the President. They get their funds through interest from Government bonds they hold. They are not audited by any Government agency and they do not have to come to Congress for a dime.

Just how bad this situation has become is plainly illustrated by some recent hearings by the Banking and Currency Committee. The committee had been holding hearings on H.R. 7601, providing for cancellation of $30 billion of U.S. bonds held by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York for the Federal Open Market Committee. The total open market portfolio is now $40 billion, on which the taxpayers are required to pay almost $1.6 billion a year in interest.

In his testimony at the hearing, William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, admitted that the Federal Reserve had paid for these bonds once with the money and credit of the United States and that they would have to be paid again when due. This is similar to a situation where a houseowner paid off his mortgage and was then required to continue paying interest on it, and then pay it off again when the maturity date comes around. It would be illegal and absurd in the case of an individual, but that is exactly what the Government is required to do under our present banking structure.

Martin is openly definant about his ability to ignore public policy. He recently told me in a Joint Economic Committee hearing that, "The Federal Reserve Board has the authority to act independently of the President" even "despite the President."

Of course, the problem of the Federal Reserve System is of much greater magnitude than the other two agencies. The Federal Reserve, through its Open Market Committee, determines the Nation's supply of money and the interest rates. It has, in effect, near life and death control over economic policy.

In recent months, the Federal Reserve Board, led by its Chairman, has been tightening up on the supply of money, and forcing interest rates up.

The Federal Reserve Board's efforts to reconstruct their tight money line flies in the face of repeated statements by this administration in favor of plentiful credit at reasonable interest. Mr. Martin chooses to ignore these policies.

Once again, we have a prime example of the folly of allowing our monetary policy to be controlled largely by the bankers in disregard of a public policy as enunciated by the President and the Congress.

Through the years, tight money and rising interest rates have cost the American consumer billions of dollars. Tight money and high interest rates serve no useful public purpose. They have been a serious drag on the growth of the country, an out-and-out waste.

For an 11-year period from 1953 to 1963, inclusive, rising interest rates imposed an excess interest cost of $15.7 billion upon the Federal budget; $2.3 billion upon States and localities; and $32.1 billion upon all private borrowers. And the figures keep on growing.

Tight money hurts every housewife who buys a washing machine, every farmer who buys a tractor, every homeowner, every small businessman. Every taxpayer has paid his share of the rising interest costs on the national debt. And when the consumer's dollar is siphoned off in this manner, he can't spend in your stores.

Tight money and high interest strikes at the jugular vein of small business. You, the independent drugstore operator, are one of the first victims. Two years ago, the Small Business Administration put out a bulletin which noted:

"When money is tight, discrimination against small firms in the bank-loan market may take two forms. Banks may reduce the flow of loanable funds to small firms in order to maintain or expand the flow to larger firms. Or they may raise interest rates proportionately more on small-business than on large-business loans."

That bulletin went on to say:

"On long-term loans to the textiles, leather, and apparel industries, interest rates charged to small firms more than doubled in the 1955–57 period, while rates to the larger firms increased only moderately."

It is obvious that the small businessman is the one who suffers first and hardest in a period of high interest and tight money.

So long as the Federal Reserve System remains under banker domination and beyond the reach of executive and legislative control, our welfare is imperiled. In my view, the most important economic and governmental problem facing the Nation today is the need for immediate rehabilitation of the Federal Reserve System, so that it is again subject to the will of the people, acting through their elected representatives.

If the big bankers are able to have their way they will continue to encourage monetary policies that will produce larger and larger public debt and higher and higher interest rates. If they have their way, our national debt will be $600 billion in 15 years, which at a 6-percent rate of interest, will cost the taxpayers $36 billion a year. This would mean that so much of Federal revenues would be required for debt-carrying charges that insufficient funds, if any at all, would be available for veterans' programs, social welfare, housing, community health, and the many other services needed by our people.

Monetary policy is the public's business and it should not be controlled absolutely by a handful of bureaucrats operating independently of everyone but the big bankers.

As operators of important businesses in your communities, you are part of the leadership of this country. I hope that you will take a firm stand in favor of continuing vigorous prosecution of our antitrust laws in all areas of the economy. I hope also that you will lend your leadership to helping bring about reform of our monetary policies. This is an area that affects you directly and I hope you will not let these policies be turned against you through default.

Governor Hughes Guarantees the Secrecy of the Ballot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. McGRATH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1965

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, the State of New Jersey is one of the few States in which statewide elections are being held this year. There has been some concern noted by individual voters in New Jersey about the secrecy of their ballots.

Gov. Richard J. Hughes has pledged to personally stand behind the secrecy of the ballot guaranteed to every American voter by the statutes of the State of New Jersey and inherent in the Constitution of the United States.

I have urged every registered voter in New Jersey's Second District to exercise his responsibility to vote for the candidates of his choice and, thus, have his voice in selecting those who govern.

I am sure that the Governor's pledge will be fulfilled and that the secrecy of the polling booth will be rigidly maintained. No voter in New Jersey need fear consequences or reprisal for voting as his conscience directs on November 2.

Our Social Security Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1965

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Public Information Section of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social Security Administration, upon the publication of a small pamphlet entitled "Social Security Amendments, 1965—A Brief Explanation."

Because our work this year was of great importance historically and to every citizen of the State of Wyoming, I am pleased to help make possible a distribution of this document. It is important enough to make a distribution to my constituents under "postal patron law."

Mr. Speaker, I also want to take this opportunity on the eve of adjournment to report the estimated benefits to Wyoming of this needed legislation which I was happy to support, and to vote for.

The 1965 amendments to the Social Security Act will add $5 million in benefit payments during calendar year 1966 to residents of Wyoming, bringing the total payments under the newly enlarged program to $32 million in Wyoming in 1966. In calendar year 1967, additional payments resulting from the amendments will amount to $9 million and total payments will rise to $38 million.

An estimated 2,000 residents of Wyoming who could not receive monthly benefits under the Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance program as in effect before the 1965 amendments will be able to receive monthly benefits immediately under the program as amended. Additional OASDI benefit payments resulting from the amendments to persons living in Wyoming are estimated at $4 million in calendar year 1966 and $4 million in calendar year 1967. Total benefit payments in calendar years 1966 and 1967 under the OASDI program as modified by the 1965 amendments are estimated to be $31 million and $33 million respectively.

About 30,000 persons aged 65 and over residing in Wyoming will be eligible for hospital insurance protection under the basic plan on the effective date, July 1, 1966. Hospital insurance benefit payments under the plan will be about $1 million in July–December 1966 and $3 million in calendar year 1967, the first calendar year of operation.

Benefit payments under the voluntary supplementary medical insurance benefits plan will be about $500,000 in July–December 1966 and $2 million in calendar year 1967.

Because of the obvious and potential benefit to be derived under this act, I consider it my duty to supply the people of Wyoming with this and other information which would help them take full advantage of the new program.

Hospital Ship "Repose" To Be Recommissioned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1965

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, the entire Nation is grateful to all of the armed services for the wonderful medical attention they are giving to our wounded in all of our conflicts that we are now and have been engaged in, and also for the outstanding accomplishments of the Navy under the direction of Adm. R. B. Brown, the Surgeon General.

Admiral Brown is recommissioning the hospital ship *Repose*. Since 1957 the fleet has been without the services of an operating hospital ship and they have lacked the capability of a complete hospital that can be underway to another station within a matter of hours. When the *Repose* arrives in Vietnam waters she will provide the forces with the finest and most advanced medical and dental treatment. She has a 750-bed hospital complete with the latest in surgical and medical facilities and equipment; all patient and berthing spaces are air-conditioned; the mess hall will have the appearance of a modern dining room.

The *Repose* has a helipad that can receive the heavier craft now being used in Vietnam. And, when inclement weather precludes the use of helicopters, patients can board by gangways. Litters can be brought aboard by electrically driven hoists either dockside or at anchor.

The *Repose* will have facilities for open heart surgery. The feasibility and importance of repairing damaged blood vessels in the arms and legs in forward medical facilities was definitely established during the Korean war. They believe it should now be determined whether a frontline capability to artificially support the circulation of the patient and do direct surgery on the heart—and large vessels connected to it—is also important.

As yet the Navy has not used frozen blood in Vietnam, but they will have this capability aboard the *Repose* and at the 400-bed station hospital now under construction at DaNang. This is an additional means of meeting peak requirements; it is a supplement not a replacement for the effective whole blood program that has been and is the responsibility of the Army Medical Laboratory in Japan. Frozen blood can be stored for an indefinite period of time and reconstituted, ready for use, within a matter of minutes.

The *Repose* and the DaNang hospital will provide definitive treatment to many of our patients who now require emergency air evacuation to rear area hospitals.

The *Repose* will afford an interesting opportunity for the staff to participate in the civic action program. When the workload permits, the doctors, nurses, and corpsmen will be able to go ashore, into the villages, to help the local people solve their medical problems. When it can be done without interfering with their primary mission—care and treatment of the sick and injured members of the Armed Forces—they will make the *Repose* facilities available for training selected Vietnamese doctors and nurses. This program is winning for us many new and valuable friends. It is also a professionally rewarding outlet for their medical department personnel. Naval medical personnel are already participating in civic action programs with AID, USOM, at the station hospitals in Saigon and with the Marines.

Admiral Brown has a personal interest in the *Repose* as he was her chief of surgery in Korea in 1950 and 1951. Admiral Brown is doing such an outstanding job, along with his staff and his fellow workers, that I thought it should be brought to the attention of the Congress.

German-American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, on October 6, 1683, the first all-German settlement was established at Germantown, Pa., when Franz Daniel Pastorius landed on the shores of the New World after crossing the Atlantic with a group of 13 families. This date, October 6, has been designated as German-American Day, and this year commemorated the 282d anniversary of this first German settlement in America.

In keeping with this recent occasion, I would like to reflect on the contributions which those of German ancestry have made to our great Nation. I feel that the contribution of those of German nationality to the melting pot out of which our country was formed has been very significant to the development, growth, and strength of the United States.

The Germans, like many of the early immigrants who colonized our Nation, came to this country to escape the religious persecution and economic hardships which they faced in Europe and were, thus, outspoken in their advocacy of religious and human freedoms and industrious contributors to the economic strength of their communities. The German settlers in Pennsylvania drew up the first protest ever voiced against Negro slavery in America. The many skilled workmen in this group of German settlers made a distinctive contribution to the industrial growth of the colony of Pennsylvania.

Throughout the history of the United States, the Germans have continued to make significant contributions in every area of accomplishment. We need only mention a few names to realize how important the Germans have been to the molding and growth of our great Nation. Some distinguished German settlers were Jacob Leisler, Governor of New York, who called together the first Congress in America; Carl Schurz, who was an active leader in the abolition movement and also in the field of civil service reforms; Peter Zenger, who founded the first independent political newspaper in New York. And in recent history we might mention Albert Einstein, Wernher von Braun, Joseph Pulitzer, H. L. Mencken, Walter Lippmann, the Vanderbilt and Rockefeller families, and many others too numerous to list.

On German-American Day, I am sure that the many citizens in our Nation of German ancestry shared my pride in their rich heritage and the historic role played by those of German descent in American history. I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to all of these outstanding Americans today.

The 50th Anniversary—U.S. Marine Corps Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1965

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, August 29, 1966, will mark the 50th anniversary of the formal establishment of the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve. Yesterday I introduced a bill calling on the Postmaster General to issue a stamp at the appropriate time next year to commemorate this highly significant event in the history of a great organization—an event which is equally great and significant in the history of the United States and in the struggle of all free people to defend freedom with life's blood or with life itself if need be.

The U.S. Marine Corps has written on the pages of history of this Nation feats of dedication and heroism unsurpassed in the annals of man—and the citizen-marine has shed his blood and offered up his life side by side with the Regulars on every beachhead and in every battle from Château-Thierry to Iwo Jima to Vietnam. Today, more than at any other time in its history, the Marine Corps Reserve stands equipped, trained, and ready to answer the call of its country to defend once again that freedom which has been won by so costly a sacrifice.

In 1916, at the urging of the then Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels and the Commandant of the Marine Corps, Maj. Gen. George Barnett, the Congress passed "An act making appropriations for naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes." One of the other purposes was to set forth provisions regarding a Marine Corps Reserve. President Woodrow Wilson signed the act into law on August 29, 1916, and Secretary Daniels promptly issued Navy Department General Order No. 131 on August 31, 1916, which contained the following statement:

> A U.S. Marine Corps Reserve to be a constituent part of the Marine Corps and in addition to the authorized strength thereof, is hereby established.

The first official strength report of the Marine Corps Reserve shows only 3 officers and 32 enlisted men as of April 1, 1917. From that small beginning, however, the Reserve grew to 6,467 in World War I and to a peak strength of 357,417 during World War II. At the present time, the Marine Corps Reserve numbers 141,000, of which 7,000 are now on active duty, 100,190 are in Ready Reserve, and the remaining 33,810 are in Standby Reserve or retired.

The Marine Corps has always claimed the proud distinction of being ready to fight for its country whenever and wherever needed, and the Reserve has stood ready to back up that claim, and it continues to do so today. I think it is entirely fitting that we should honor such an organization.

Electronic Computer Provides Valuable Service for Post Office and Civil Service Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1965

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my appreciation and the appreciation of my staff to the Rich Electronic Computer Center at Georgia Institute of Technology. I want to thank in particular Mr. W. Thomas Wall and Mr. Bud Pass.

Several weeks ago this House passed and sent to the Senate the Federal pay raise bill of 1965. The object of this legislation is to render the Federal pay schedule comparable to that paid by the private sector of the American economy. In the preparation of this legislation, the staff of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee had the task of calculating the new pay scale to reflect a raise of a given percentage increase. There are nearly 500 separate items on each pay raise bill. This is a long, unpleasant job. At times one can find up to eight staff members busy with hand calculators when a new calculation of the scale has to be made in a hurry.

During the early hearings, I delegated to my staff the job of checking the accuracy of H.R. 10147. The task fell to my summer intern, Raymond Pierce. He did not like the idea of working an adding machine that much. He figured that it would be much better to calculate anew the pay scale then to take samples from here and there. He therefore enlisted the aid of some friends at the Rich Electronic Computer Center at Georgia Tech, his college. When the situation was explained, Mr. W. Thomas Wall and Mr. Bud Pass volunteered to run the pay scale through the Burroughs 5500 computer.

Both Mr. Wall and Mr. Pass are student programers employed at the Rich Electronic Computer Center branch of the Hinman Research Institute. The Hinman Research Institute is the development arm of Georgia Institute of Technology. Mr. Wall is a physics major from East Point, Ga., while Mr. Pass is a mathematics major from that section of Atlanta which is in De Kalb County, Ga.

My intern prepared the programs and the data and then sent it to Atlanta. Mr. Wall and Mr. Pass obtained authorization for computer time from Mr. Alton P. Jensen, research engineer. Later Mr. Walter S. Fleming, Jr., research assistant, approved more time for further study of the pay scales. Mr. Winston R. Howell arranged for the data to be keypunched and Mr. William Bezaire, head of operations and maintenance, expedited the keypunching. Credit must be given to those unsung key-punch operators who deciphered the data and placed it on IBM cards. Without the keypunch operators, there would be almost no electronic data processing done in the Nation.

The programs were then placed on the Burroughs 5500. Unfortunately for Mr. Wall, the programs sent down demonstrated that my intern had not yet mastered the art of programing. Mr. Wall spent one full night debugging the program, working the computer, and checking the data. This is far beyond the call of duty. The first program calculated a 4.5-percent increase. The second program compared the scale given by H.R. 10174 to that which the computer figured and compared the difference. A few days later, H.R. 10174 was replaced by H.R. 10281.

A few weeks later a third program was run. This program figured 40 separate percent increases for the entire pay scale. This meant the computer did 40 times the task it took the committee staff many hours to complete. The Burroughs 5500 did the entire task in several hundred seconds. I doubt that the committee staff could comfortably do the job in a month. Consider the toil saved. This is the fantastic capacity of modern electronic data processing machinery.

I want to emphasize that these programs were done as a courtesy to the House of Representatives. No compensation was asked; just private citizens giving a helping hand to their National Government.

Again I want to thank the entire staff of the Rich Electronic Computer Center. I want to thank Mr. A. P. Jensen, Mr. Winston R. Howell, Mr. Walter Fleming, and Mr. Bezaire. I want to especially thank Mr. W. Thomas Wall and Mr. Bud Pass, both of whom spent so much time on the project. Their manipulation of data helped H.R. 10281 more closely adhere to the intention of Congress.

Congressman John E. Fogarty Honored by Dedication of Fourth Institution in His Name

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 20, 1965

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, our esteemed and distinguished colleague from Rhode Island, Congressman John E. Fogarty, has again been honored by the officials of his State in having the John E. Fogarty School in Foster, R.I., named for him.

This brings to four the number of health and educational facilities that have been dedicated in Mr. Fogarty's name in the State of Rhode Island. The others are: The John E. Fogarty Occupational Training Center for the Mentally Retarded; the John E. Fogarty Medical and Rehabilitation Unit at the Joseph H. Ladd School for the Mentally Retarded; and the John E. Fogarty Health Science Building at the University of Rhode Island Colleges of Pharmacy and Nursing.

Under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include the address made by Mr. Fogarty on October 3, 1965, at the dedication of this latest institute bearing his name:

GOVERNMENT, PUBLIC SCHOOLS, AND PROGRESS

(Remarks by Hon. John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, at the dedication of the John E. Fogarty School, October 3, 1965).

The chance to be with all of you here today makes me both grateful and humble.

This school today being dedicated is an example that this Nation and the people of this State can heed the Biblical admonition of turning swords into plowshares, for it is on a Nike missile site that this building now stands.

I am grateful for the honor of having this school named after me. This gratitude is accompanied by a deep sense of humility since this school embodies a tribute to two forces: the cooperation of political parties on behalf of education in the Congress and also the American public school system.

A true bipartisanship has made American education the cornerstone of democracy. We must always remember that it was the late Senator Robert Taft of Ohio—Mr. Republican—who introduced and supported and fought for the first measures providing for general Federal aid to education.

Education knows no party. And, in line with this, I am glad to see that there have been no serious questions raised today about naming a school after a living legislator. The cooperation of both of our political parties has made it possible for this country to advance into a position of world leadership.

But, today, let us recall that it has not always been thus.

In 1640, when our country was quite young and untested, here in the State of Rhode Island, Newport established a public school, setting aside 100 acres for a house and lot for the schoolmaster.

Now this State has close to 152,000 public elementary and secondary school students.

From a meager start in 1640, it is clear that State and school departments like the Foster school department have continued to grow and advance and progress in education.

And this is right. The future of Rhode Island and this country—a future filled with fantastic opportunities which will be won or lost in our classrooms—is based on our schools and our educational system.

In dedicating this school here today, we add another tool in the struggle of this State. This struggle is to provide not an adequate educational system, not simply a good educational system, but an educational system that will permit the maximum development of the talents of every American boy and girl. This is not the only tool, for we also need good teachers, good textbooks, and students willing to learn, but it is an important tool.

The goal of providing for an educational system to keep us in the vanguard of world leadership is a goal to which, as a Member of Congress, I have long since pledged myself. Today, I repeat that pledge.

I want to first talk to you about the role of the Federal Government in strenthening our Nation's public school systems. This role is expanding and growing and changing to meet the pressing needs of our local and State education systems whether they are in this school department or in the State of Rhode Island or to the west in Wisconsin or Alaska or even Hawaii.

Second, I want to give you some idea of the education legislation that Congress and the current administration have enacted to help all of our young people. President Kennedy considered education the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress. During his short term, he worked to strengthen that arch by opening the doors for our youth to the richest treasures of our open society: the doors of the power of knowledge.

Well, this Congress has opened these doors further with the enactment of far-reaching proposals to help education in this country change to meet the demands of the time.

Finally, I want to take time to give you a brief glimpse of the educational problems of the future and the reasons why all of us should be concerned with these problems.

All of these problems are brought about by change. This country is not now static and never was. We have to adapt to meet these changes but—at the same time—we must be concerned that we hold fast to basic concepts of education while discarding outmoded practices. We have to be concerned that we have quality as well as quantity in education. We have to be concerned, finally, not only because this country needs all the talent and all the skills of our young people in the competitive cold war against a foreign ideology but because it is correct to give our children a sound start along the path of life.

The pressure for education in this country can be seen each day in the national mass of birth statistics. These figures represent—and we should always remember this—human beings. In each child who is born in the United States today, no matter what the circumstances of the home or whom the parents are, the potentiality of the human race is born again. And in each who is born, our terrific responsibility toward human life is renewed, a responsibility toward the idea of human goodness and of God.

The role of our public school systems in maintaining education for our children is being supported by our Federal Government. This is the first point I want to discuss today.

No one in this State or this country needs mystic powers to see that we need the Federal funds to improve education. This school—and others like it—represents a great sacrifice to the people who have taxed themselves heavily at the local level. But the concern of all of us should be a clear recognition that Federal aid to education does not necessarily mean control of education. Let me stress some of the aspects of this aid as it is related to the national problems of our public schools.

When this Nation fights poverty and unemployment, we need the public schools as one of our principal weapons.

When this Nation helps to provide for our national defense effort, we need the public schools.

When this Nation helps the people—striving as we are to open the gates to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for all of our citizens—we again call on the public schools.

This is no easy task for each one of these educational roles of the public school in our society is important. Out of this diversity of goals must come a strong system of education in every hamlet and town and village and city in this country.

To support this massive chore, this Congress and this administration have passed the far-reaching Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

This billion-dollar bill has a potential that will set us along the way of combating the destructive forces of poverty through education. The main components of this legislation are as strong and forthright as the effects we hope it will produce. First, here in Rhode Island and in other States it will help more than 5 million educationally deprived children; second, it will give to our children more than 30 million new books; third, it will provide badly needed supplementary services in our grade and high schools; fourth, it will help research and, finally, it will more than quadruple Federal assistance to our State educational agencies which are really the cornerstone in local educational efforts.

This measure will affect all of the 48 million children in our Nation's elementary and secondary schools. Here in Rhode Island alone, the educational effort will touch and affect and help each of the children in the schools of this State.

This legislation also alters quite substantially the role the Federal Government plays in supporting lower education. In 1964–65 the Government contributed approximately 4 percent to the cost of public elementary and secondary education. With the passage of this act, the Federal contribution will jump to almost 10 percent in 1965 and 1966. Now the passage of this legislation brings us to the second point of my discussion here today: The role Congress has to play in the improvement of our country's education.

Our Congress cannot adequately discharge our responsibility to provide for "the common defense and general welfare" unless schools do their part in producing educated men and women. We need—more than ever—an informed electorate who can cooperate with us in making the decisions in the complex and complicated world of government as we now know it.

In 1636, Roger Williams fled from Massachusetts to our State—banished for his political and religious opinions. Roger Williams' theory of criticism and hunger for freedom holds a lesson for us all. While we may disagree with them, we in Congress are not interested in banishing various political views. We welcome diversity. We want and need and seek the opinions of an informed electorate in solving the many problems before us, in both this present Congress as in past sessions of your legislative body.

Some of you know that I am chairman of a subcommittee on appropriations of the House of Representatives—a duty which allows me to supervise and oversee the many activities of our National Government in the areas of labor and health and education and welfare. To accomplish this duty in this space age effectively, we need the help and informed support of a citizenry who cares—whether it is on the local level or the broader national level.

Our national problems come into focus when we view the fruition and completion of such efforts as this school today. And—here on the local level—is where we must meet these problems.

And this brings us to the third point. I will be brief.

The educated citizen of today knows how much more there is to know. He knows that knowledge is power. He knows that only an educated and informed people will be a free people. If we can, as Jefferson said, enlighten the people generally, tyranny and the oppressions of the mind and body will vanish like evil spirits at the dawn of day.

The future of education in this country hopefully will meet this challenge. It will not be easy and I ask all of you here today to help in this national effort to meet the burgeoning enrollment, to confront the challenge of poverty in our cities and rural areas, to provide for the necessary amount of classrooms for your children and my children and to provide the best we can afford.

Remember that this commitment is not new. But it is renewable. In 1787, the Continental Congress declared in the Northwest Ordinance that schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged. We have to replenish that commitment because cold statistics today of growing school enrollment portend the challenge of tomorrow.

In the first place, one-quarter of all Americans are in the Nation's classrooms.

In the second place, high school attendance has grown 18 times as large since the turn of the century.

Finally, since the turn of the century college enrollment in the United States has advanced eight times and Americans today support a fourth of the world's institutions of higher learning and a third of its professors and college students.

We must move to meet these challenges.

And we must move in concert—with the help of all of you here today.

In a very true sense, this school being dedicated represents the efforts of those who have shown that they do care in sharing the light of education to others following after them.

This light—this fire—this zeal of sharing is our best hope, as the late John F. Kennedy put it in his inaugural address, to "truly light the world."

Congressman McCarthy Reports on 1st Session, 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to make a report to the men and women I represent in the 39th Congressional District of New York. It covers the activities of the Congress in general, and of their Congressman in particular, during the 1st session of the 89th Congress of the United States of America.

It could be that I see the accomplishments of this session of Congress through prisms made out of my own special interests, but it seems to me that its most notable advances have been in the fields of conservation and education.

CONSERVATION

From the beginning, we have been a people of the out-of-doors. The Bible told us: "Speak to the earth and it shall teach thee."

It was Gifford Pinchot who emphasized that the cause of conservation would eventually fail unless every generation of Americans made a conservation commitment to the future.

This Congress has written a notable record of conservation: It has acted to control the waste products of an age of effluence, to clean the air we breathe, the water we drink, to preserve our soil and wildlife, to rescue our cities from decay, to provide more parks and open spaces.

It passed the highway beauty bill which will enable the Nation to closet the skeletons of discarded cars which today litter our countryside, to control the proliferating signs which block the view of our fields, streams, lakes and hills, to landscape our highways and enhance their scenic beauty.

More and more, we are becoming an urban nation. But far too many city dwellers have been denied the chance to know the birthright of their forebears. We must act to preserve what we now have. Otherwise, many of our children will be denied the enriching contact with nature which has been so much a part of our past and is so necessary to the human spirit. In being cut off from nature lies the danger of man's isolation from his fellow men and from his Creator. We are the creatures of our environment. If it becomes sordid, the dignity of the human spirit and the deepest of our values become imperiled.

As automation takes more and more of the jobs of men, we are going to find the workweek further reduced. And we are going to find people wondering what they should do. We should make it possible for them to get in their cars, escape from the cities, and see green grass and the other rich resources of our land.

Our highways should have open windows so that Americans can see and enjoy their land.

Passage of the highway beauty bill signified more than the preservation and restoration of scenic areas we know and love. It accented our determination to elevate the quality of the American environment.

EDUCATION

While this Congress made great strides in the conservation and development of the Nation's natural resources, it moved boldly ahead to develop our most precious resource, our children.

The importance of education today in the United States is illustrated by the fact that this fall 25 percent of the entire population of the United States is in school. Just think, one quarter of the American people are now in school.

The twin thrusts of modern technology and automation have made an education an absolute essential to upward progress and gainful employment in our society. Recognizing this, the 89th Congress moved dramatically to accelerate our commitment to education by:

Passing the Nation's first general Federal assistance to primary and secondary schools.

Providing the first Federal college scholarships program and authorizing an expanded 5-year program to assist colleges and universities.

Creating a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities to foster progress in art, music, films, and the theater.

Extending and expanding the manpower training program to assist the unemployed to learn new skills to qualify them for jobs.

Developing a new program to provide Federal loan insurance to high school graduates to help finance their tuition at business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools.

Other significant legislation was passed by this Congress in these areas:

MEDICINE

Medical care and social security amendments: Provides hospitalization, surgical, and nursing home care for persons 65 years and older, financed through the social security system; increases social security benefits as of last January 1.

Regional medical centers: Authorizes a 3-year program of Federal grants to plan and develop a series of regional medical programs to fight heart disease, cancer, and stroke.

Health professions education: Extends and expands program of construction grants to medical, dental, and other similar educational institutions; establishes new program of scholarship grants for needy students, increases student loan program.

Mental health services: Provides for initial staffing grants for personnel serving in community mental health centers.

MILITARY AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Military pay increase: Provides an average 10.4 percent pay increase for some 4.2 million uniformed personnel of the Armed Forces, effective September 1, 1965—2.7 million on active duty, 1 million reservists, 500,000 retired.

Retired Government employees: Provides for cost-of-living increases in annuities to retired employees of Federal Government.

Post Office employees: Salary increases and overtime allowances for postal and other Federal employees.

TAX CUT

Excise tax reduction: Provides excise tax cuts totaling $4.7 billion on various consumer items such as appliances, telephone service, autos, and so forth; eliminates most Federal excises by 1969.

RAPID TRANSIT

High-speed rapid transit: Authorizes 3-year program of reasearch and demonstration projects for development of high-speed intercity railroad transportation.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Immigration Act amendments: Abolishes "national origins" quota system over 3-year period; establishes a 170,000 annual limit on immigrants, special preferences given to relatives of American citizens.

WAR ON POVERTY

Economic opportunity program: Increases authorization for antipoverty program with the accent on education, makes other improvements in the operation of various parts of the war on poverty.

MODERNIZING CONGRESS

Rules and reorganization: The 89th amended the rules of the House to expedite consideration of legislation and created a joint committee to study the organization and operation of Congress and to make recommendations to improve and streamline the work of Congress.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Presidential continuity: Adopted proposed amendment to the Constitution to establish procedure to permit Vice President to become Acting President if the President is unable to perform his duties; provides for filling the vacancy of the office of Vice President.

SUBURBAN GROWTH

New water and sewer lines: Set up a new program to provide Federal funds to cover 50 percent of the cost of new sewer and waterlines.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Voting rights: Strengthens machinery for guaranteeing right to vote to all citizens by prohibiting literacy tests; provides for Federal registrars in States where less than 50 percent of potential voters are registered or voted.

Other important new laws were written to assist farmers and older Americans, to fight juvenile delinquency and reduce the illegal use of dangerous drugs.

While I generally supported President Johnson there were frequent occasions when I opposed measures advanced by the administration and/or the leadership in Congress. Among them: The controversial sugar bill; unfair business competition created by the Area Redevelopment Administration; excessive Agriculture appropriations; rent supplements; and foreign aid to nations shipping to North Vietnam.

VIETNAM

Withdrawal from Vietnam is unthinkable. Three administrations have pledged their support to South Vietnam. The people of South Vietnam have staked their lives on our solemn commitment to them.

We should continue to make clear to North Vietnam, Communist China, and the Soviet Union that we are interested in discussions leading to an honorable settlement of the conflict. We should pursue peace with the same intensity as our efforts in the military field.

Until North Vietnam and Vietcong become convinced that a Communist military victory is impossible, we will continue to aid South Vietnam. The aggressor need only stop his aggression and accept our often expressed offer for honorable negotiations toward a just and fair settlement.

The National Liberation Front, for many months, has been counting on public opinion in the United States to accomplish what it has been unable to achieve by armed force. If it is misled into believing that we will falter, it is likely to hold out in the mistaken notion that it can achieve victory through U.S. withdrawal. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The fastest course to peace is through U.S. strength and firmness.

WATER POLLUTION

The main thrust of my activities here has been directed toward the restoration of western New York's greatest natural resource—Lake Erie.

I have taken these steps to accomplish this:

Cosponsored the Clean Water Act of 1965 which provides for an accelerated attack on water pollution.

Successfully amended the bill to channel an extra $100 million into the effort—mainly in large States like New York.

At the request of Senator ROBERT KENNEDY and me, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare held a Water Pollution Abatement Conference out of which emerged a firm plan for ending the pollution of the lake by January 1, 1969.

Introduced a bill to give tax incentives to industries that must install expensive pollution abatement equipment.

Introduced legislation calling for the drafting of a joint United States-Canadian plan to divert Hudson Bay-bound rivers into the Great Lakes to flush out pollutants, raise and control lake levels, and provide for the increased water needs of New York City, Chicago, and cities in Ohio.

HIGHLIGHT

For me the highlight of the 89th's first session came on Saturday, October 2, when President Johnson signed the Clean Water Act of 1965 in the White House. My 6-year-old son, Barry, and I were present and received pens the President used to sign this important bill.

CONTRACTS AND PROJECTS

During the 1st session of the 89th Congress, I was able to assist a number of our communities and industries in Erie County.

Here are some of the locally initiated, federally aided, or financed projects:

Clarence: Main Street site selected for new post office.

Marilla: Post Office Department studying possibility of creating a central post office.

Alden: Site selected for new post office; $32,194 aid to schools under new Elementary and Secondary Federal School Act.

Orchard Park: Planning started on obtaining 50 percent funds for new sewer lines.

Evans: Corps of Engineers survey of Big Sister Creek flood control project; $42,000 planning advance for new water facilities.

Brant: Corps of Engineers nearing completion of Cattauraugus Creek flood control planning.

Hamburg: $75,000 grant for Federal share of new library; $97,822 grant for downtown village urban renewal project. Frontier Central, $65,070 school aid.

Lackawanna: $161,400 for new pump station and interceptor sewers; $1,037,104 for Smokes Creek flood control.

Lancaster: Conditional approval of $1,200,000 grant for downtown urban renewal project. Lancaster schools, $58,125; Depew: $27,514 school aid.

Amherst: $7,900,000 Minuteman contract for Sylvania electric products; Erie County Technical Institute, $6,210, and Rosary Hill College, $4,276, for work-study programs to permit students with limited means to continue education. Amherst Central High, $31,240; Amherst District 13, $19,090; Amherst 18, $19,378; Sweet Home, $46,341, school aid.

West Seneca: West Seneca Central, $60,071 school aid.

Newstead: Akron schools, $35,540, school aid.

North Collins: $8,000 Project Head Start grant.

Boston: Post Office Department exploring possibility of establishing a central post office for entire town.

Cheektowaga: $54,000 planning advance to stop flooding; $38,200 for study of new storm sewers; $200,000 for Army helicopter station keeping system, and $1.1 million for Navy helicopter telemetry systems, both to Sierra Research Corp.; $111,962 to Birdair Structures, Inc., for air-supported structures; $5,430 to Villa Marie College for work-study program; $1.3 million contract for Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory to continue work on the Nike-X missile defense system. Cheektowaga Central, $32,465; Sloan, $50,173; Maryvale, $64,476; Cleveland Hill, $47,774, school aid.

Buffalo: State University of Buffalo, $105,640 for work-study program; $24,166 for graduate training in family and child welfare; $75,000 study of means to keep shipping lanes ice free; $824,000 modernization of the U.S. courthouse; $350,000 Buffalo Harbor operation and maintenance; $94,200 manpower retraining grant; and Fleet of America, $291,393 Defense supply contract for fabrication of bins, cabinets, and lockers.

KEEPING IN TOUCH

I have kept in touch with the people I represent through frequent trips home to the Niagara Frontier, through attention to my mail and careful reading of all Erie County daily and weekly newspapers. In turn, I have endeavored to keep the citizens of western New York informed of my activities in their behalf through visits throughout the 39th District. And I want to thank the press, radio, and TV for the superb job they have done in reporting on my activities. Both the daily and weekly press, the radio and television stations in Erie County do an excellent job in reporting on the activities of the Members of Congress from western New York.

THE ECONOMY

I think the Johnson administration has done a generally outstanding job in its management of the Nation's fiscal and monetary affairs. The U.S. business boom is in its 56th month of unlimited expansion. The Nation's output of goods and services in the third quarter of this year rose $11 billion to an annual rate of $676.9 billion, mainly on the strength of a $7.8 billion increase in consumer spending spurred by the recent excise tax cut.

Reflecting this national prosperity, the Niagara Frontier is experiencing a period of healthy economic growth. Unemployment has dropped sharply and the average weekly earnings of western New York production workers climbed to $126—sharply higher than the national average of $103.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, even though I see it several times daily I never fail to be moved by the sight of the gleaming white U.S. Capitol Building and its majestic dome. A glimpse of it summons up in my mind a flashing panorama of patriots engaged in purposeful and important activity on behalf of the country we all love. It is a very high honor to serve in the Congress of the United States. It has been a source of deep satisfaction and worthwhile meaning for me to be a Member of the 1st session of the 89th Congress of the United States of America.

These memorable words of Daniel Webster, etched in stone above your chair, Mr. Speaker, sum up my thoughts:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, last May in a speech before the Political Action Institute in Des Moines, Iowa, I urged a course in Vietnam that paralleled the one taken by the Johnson administration. It seemed to me then and it still seems to me that the United States could not ethically shrug off the mantel of world leadership that has been thrust upon us by the free world.

The wisdom of that administration policy has been pointed out in a recent column by Joseph Alsop in the Washington Post. I feel this article makes quite clear the need for and purpose of our action in Vietnam. I hope this will add to the understanding of those who were not afforded the opportunity of reading this column.

Mr. Alsop's column and my speech follow:

SMARTY'S PARTY

(By Joseph Alsop)

TOKYO.—Both in Hong Kong, and here in Tokyo, the China-watchers are currently playing a game that is both amusing and instructive. It starts with the fact that the Chinese Communists' great annual celebration of their revolutionary anniversary on October 1 was painfully like Smarty's party, to which nobody came.

Maybe that is going too far, for Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia was certainly on hand, there was also a commercial delegation from Pakistan, and there was a very minor member of the preupheaval Indonesian Cabinet.

But there were no Japanese or Filipinos or Burmans or Singaporeans. Africa, where Mao Tse-tung and his colleagues have lately been spending millions that China can ill afford, was strikingly poorly represented. The absence of the North Koreans—once the closest of Peiping's allies—and even the North Vietnamese—so widely supposed to be entirely under Peiping's thumb—was rather glaringly conspicuous.

In short, this was a party like one of the more ghastly diplomatic receptions in Washington, which are unattended by anyone except poor duty-State Department officials and old ladies who go to eat free canapes. The game of the China-watchers consists of making up the very different kind of guest list the Chinese Communists would surely have been able to announce, if only the Americans had duly proved to be "paper tigers" in Vietnam this winter and spring, just as Mao Tse-tung always said we would.

A minimum hypothetical guest list includes heads of state or foreign ministers from the two other Asian Communist countries and perhaps some Eastern European Communist states as well; plus heads or foreign ministers from all the unalined Asian counties except India and a good many in Africa too; plus discreetly inconspicuous yet highly significant delegations from Japan, the Philippines, and maybe one or two more westward-leaning states in Asia.

The China-watchers' game is no light joke. It is expertly played by men with long and intimate Asian experience. Hence it should be of interest to those lacking serious Asian experience, who are so constantly warning that the United States is "losing friends in Asia" by refusing to be a paper tiger in Vietnam.

The upheaval in Indonesia should also be vividly interesting to these same people. From the vantage point of Tokyo (and very likely in Djakarta itself) the final outcome cannot yet be predicted with confidence. But it is already quite clear that the Communist coup was attempted hastily and brutally, in the way people act when they are apprehensive and off balance.

It is equally clear that there would have been very little resistance, even to such an outrageous assault on Indonesia's independence, if the Indonesian nationalists had become convinced that communism was the wave of the future. A Communist timetable in Vietnam would have implanted just that without conviction. If Indonesia remains a truly independent state, in fact, Mao's error about Americans being paper tigers will have much to do with it.

Finally, there is the not unimportant matter of the vital American bases here in Japan and on Okinawa. Those who want the United States to justify Mao's thesis have told us we can take a catastrophic defeat in Vietnam, and still stay in business as a Pacific power with the aid of our ocean-wide net of naval and other bases. That view evokes tired grins from the extremely competent official Americans who have to concern themselves with the Japanese base-problem on the spot.

The United States bases in Japan are a very real problem—no doubt about it. A rising tide of nationalism, deriving from a justified sense of national accomplishment, is making more and more Japanese impatient of the present arrangements. Above all, the quasi-colonial status of Okinawa, where the Japanese Government's writ does not run, is daily becoming harder and harder to defend. Sensible adjustments are going to have to be, and ought to be, made in the base-agreements.

But in the present circumstances, there is time and room for maneuver to make these adjustments, about which our very able Ambassador, Edwin O. Reischauer, is already conducting a dialog with Washington. And in the very different circumstances that would have been created by U.S. acceptance of the paper tiger role in Vietnam, there would have been neither time nor room for maneuver.

After such a demonstration of American unreliability, the Japanese would surely have been driven to see to their own defense, without further reliance on U.S. strength. The American base agreements, instead of being sensibly adjusted, would soon have been torn up and thrown in our faces. Defeat in Vietnam would in fact have cost us the bases. Such, at any rate, is the unanimous judgment of those closest to the problem, who are by no means illiberal or hard-nosed men. Maybe that phrase, "losing friends in Asia," requires a little further definition.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN HANSEN OF IOWA

The problem in Vietnam is a complex one as we all have repeatedly been told. Vietnam is somewhat like marriage. It was easy to get into, and it is hard to get out of. We have so many emotional arguments going both for a stronger position in Vietnam and for an immediate withdrawal that it is sometimes difficult to take a long, hard, look at the situation there. Let us try to do this.

First of all, it should be clearly understood that part of the problem in the United States in accepting this position has to do with our changing role of leadership over the past 40 years. Our acceptance of responsibility in world politics has grown to the place where we now have almost completely replaced Great Britain as the leader of the free world. We are called upon to do what the British did prior to 1900. She was somewhat the world police force. Scandinavian seamen could rove the fishing waters in the North Atlantic because they knew the British Navy would protect them if any difficulty arose. We, in the United States, now fulfill this same role for many small nations. This may not be as we would prefer, but at the moment, we have no real alternative but to accept our obligation as a Nation to maintain peace and order and to develop a political and economic climate where people can work and live as they wish under a Democratic system.

One criticism has been that the Vietnamese themselves cannot and do not fight. This is simply not true. This is a tough war, and the Vietnamese are a tough people to have stood up under it and to be holding their heads above water after 20 years of violence and uncertainty.

To see the situation in true perspective, take, for example, one fact alone—that in the first 8 months of 1964 the Vietcong assassinated more than 400 local officials and kidnaped another 700. Now try to project what an equivalent amount of gangsterism would do to government performance in this country. Then attempt to project that effect, in turn, into the situation in a country such as South Vietnam which is just learning the art of self-government.

This procedure has been a continuation of the policy of the Communists, to weaken the country by reducing the number of trained administrators.

The Vietnamese military forces continue to fight well. Our own military men consider most of them as tough and brave as any in the world. Though there have been military reverses, there have also been victories—which sometimes do not make headlines.

Living conditions in the south are superior to those in the north. There has been a continued flow, or flight, of people from North Vietnam since the Communist takeover—to the south. There is no like movement to the north.

This shows that the Vietnamese people are not voting with their feet or their hearts for communism.

The campaign that is going on is sometimes referred to as a civil war. But this is a misnomer. If this were a true civil war, let me ask why then have not the majority of the Buddhist and Catholic leaders and their people joined this Communist cause? Discontent, there may have been—and local recruiting by the Vietcong, largely through intimidation, has taken place. This whole campaign, however, would never have been possible without the direction, personnel, key material, and total support coming from the north. Nor would it have been possible either, without the strong moral support and key material, when needed, provided by Peiping and, up to 1962 at least, by the Soviet Union. Thousands of highly trained men coming from the north, along with the crucial items of equipment and munitions, have been from the start the mainspring of the Vietcong insurgency. This has been all along a Communist subversive aggression, in total violation of the Geneva accords as well as general principles of international behavior.

Indeed the true nature of the struggle has been publicly stated many times by Hanoi itself, beginning with a 1960 Communist Party conference in North Vietnam which declared the policy of—as they put it—"liberating" the south. In February, President Johnson gave the anti-Communist war in Vietnam a new dimension. The significance of his action is both military and political.

By ordering American warplanes to attack targets in North Vietnam, Mr. Johnson destroyed any illusion that the Hanoi regime enjoyed a "privileged sanctuary" from which to continue to supply leadership and material for the Vietcong attacking American and South Vietnamese forces below the 17th parallel.

When he acquiesced in the decision to let South Vietnam's own air force join in the retaliatory strikes, he gave a much needed boost in morale to the military forces of that country, which were so long at the mercy of hit-and-run guerrilla tactics difficult to counter.

The immediate effect in the United States of the President's decision to retaliate against North Vietnam for the actions of its agents in South Vietnam was to lessen criticism from both ends of the spectrum.

Those who had been demanding more decisive action were pleased, although the limited retaliatory responses did not satisfy those who would like an all-out assault on Hanoi and even Red China. But it appreciably diminished the clamor of those critics who had felt the United States was turning the other cheek too often.

At the other extreme, Mr. Johnson's decision to demonstrate that the United States is not a "paper tiger" halted mounting speculation both in this country and abroad that Washington was inclined toward some sort of international negotiation which would lead to "neutralization of South Vietnam." This speculative trend had to be stopped before it sapped the will of the Americans and their South Vietnamese allies to continue the struggle.

Having had one unfortunate experience in negotiating a "neutralization" deal—the 1962 agreement of Laos—the United States wanted nothing like that at this point in the southeast Asian conflict.

It might be well at this point to recall what happened after the 1954 agreement when the south fulfilled its commitment to disarm—a circumstance which did not take place in the north. Recently McGeorge Bundy said that all wars eventually end by negotiation.

But wiser men than Bundy learned and said long ago that a nation never wins at the conference table anything that it was not prepared to win by force of arms on the battlefield if it had to. We suspect that President Johnson knows this.

When we analyze the Vietnamese situation as it prevails, we must not fail to take into account the Communist activities in Thailand which completely belie the assertion that they are only interested in liberation of peace-loving people from oppressors and are fostering a program of nationalism among the emerging nations. If there is any nation that has become a national state and whose people are peace loving and which has been living in peace with its neighbors, it is that of the Thai. Yet this country must operate almost in a state of war to prevent and halt Communist efforts to insidiously subject their land.

Thus we see that based on their own rationalization, the Communists have absolutely no business in Thailand.

As to the basic alternatives, so long as South Vietnam is ready to carry on the fight, withdrawal is unthinkable. A negotiation that produced a return to the essentials of the 1954 accord and thus an independent and secure South Vietnam would of course be an answer, indeed the answer. But negotiation would hardly be promising that admitted communism to South Vietnam—that did not control the Hanoi regime—that exposed South Vietnam, and perhaps other countries in the area, to renewed Communist aggression at will, with only nebulous or remote guarantees—this sort of negotiation is likewise unthinkable.

As for enlarging our own actions, we cannot speak surely about the future, for the aggressors themselves share the responsibilities for such eventualities. We have shown, in our reaction to North Vietnam's attacks against us in the Gulf of Tonkin and elsewhere, that we can act, and North Vietnam knows this and must know its own weaknesses.

The root of the problem is in South Vietnam. We must persist in our efforts there, with patience rather than petulance, coolness rather than recklessness, and with a continuing ability to separate the real from the merely wished-for.

As a great power, we are now and will continue to find ourselves in situations where we simply do not have easy choices, where there simply are not immediate or ideal solutions available. We cannot then allow ourselves to yield to frustration, but must stick to the job, doing all we can and doing it better.

The national interests that have brought us into the Vietnam struggle are valid, and they do not become less so just because the going gets rough, and the end is not yet in sight. President Johnson said in his state of the Union message, "Our goal is peace in southeast Asia. That will come only when aggressors leave their neighbors in peace. What is at stake is the cause of freedom, and in that cause, America will never be found wanting."

Trade Expansion Act—A Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. SECREST

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1965

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, earlier in this session I reintroduced a bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act, identical to a bill that I had introduced last year. It was designed to remove certain items from the President's list marked for a 50 percent tariff reduction. I am now introducing a bill that has also been introduced by some 15 to 20 other Members which repeats the earlier bill but goes further in amending the act of 1962 by modifying some of its extreme provisions and authorizing the imposition of import quotas under certain conditions.

The Trade Expansion Act has been a deep disappointment in what was to be one of its principal features, namely "adjustment assistance." This provision has become a dead letter. The Tariff Commission is now without a single case on its docket after nearly 3 years from the time the act was passed. This is not surprising because no case out of the 17 that have come before the Commission has succeeded in gaining any assistance. The turn-down has been unanimous in all cases but one, and that one was negative by a majority vote of the Commission. This record would hardly be conducive to further efforts to gain relief.

I can only conclude that the law was too strictly drawn. The bill I am introducing now would relax the severe requirements of the law so that its avowed intent could be carried out. This would be accomplished by striking the "major" where it is used to describe the degree of cause necessary to prove serious injury suffered by petitioning industries, firms or labor groups. The law says that a tariff reduction must have been the major cause of an increase in imports and the higher volume of imports must have been the major cause of the injury suffered by the industry or labor group seeking relief. This is a double condition and represents an excessive burden of proof. Today there may be a number of causes of disturbance or disruption of normal operations of a manufacturing enterprise. To be asked to identify one cause and then to establish it as a major cause not only once but twice, the second one dependent on the first, is to demand what no applicant to the Commission has been able to satisfy. The requirement must be relaxed if adjustment assistance is to come to life.

Mr. Speaker, I do not understand the reasoning of those who believe in the high labor standards of this country and yet lend support to a trade policy that undermines those standards. We call for full employment in this country and seek a good level of prosperity for business but then turn about and vote for a trade program that works in the opposite direction. While I say "we" do this, I am not among those who voted in this fashion. I mean the 1962 congressional majority.

I do not understand how we can expect to maintain our labor standards and achieve full employment by calling for a sharp reduction in the tariff. No one can question the wide margin by which wages in this country exceed those in all other countries except Canada. The day is past when this discrepancy could be dismissed by simply saying that our industry is much more productive than the foreign. Other industrial countries have escalated their technological development more rapidly than this country if for no other reason than their lower level as a starting point after the war. We assisted them immeasurably in this escalation. I think it is safe to say that we presented the countries of Europe and Japan with a technological leap that saved them two or three decades of research and development.

This leap increased the competitive advantage they already enjoyed in many lines of goods as a result of their lower wages; for while their wages have risen considerably, wages in this country have also gone up. If their wages have come up faster percentagewise than ours the increases here have exceeded theirs in actual dollars and cents.

Yet there are those who generally support the principle of high wages and full employment who seem to believe that growing import competition is economically not only harmless but beneficial. Granted that fair competition is a healthy economic factor and that some imports do no harm because they are not competitive or do not represent unfair competition; it is nonetheless true that import competition that owes its advantage to lower wages may retard employment in this country by discouraging industrial expansion while increasing pressure for more mechanization and automation.

I am not one who opposes mechanization or automation as such. The benefits of technological progress are too evident to take such a position. However, we must ask what is the purpose of our feverish modernization. Ideally, the purpose should be to lower the cost of production so that goods may be sold to the consuming public at lower prices. Our very system of mass production indeed got its inception from such efforts. When the link between mass production and mass consumption came to be appreciated we began also to appreciate the function of fair competition, which was to reduce prices and thus allow more production in relation to consumer income. More production soon meant more employment. The workers who were displaced initially by radical mechanization were in time rehired or replaced in greater numbers throughout the economy as a result of greater production and greater activity in the supporting activities, such as selling, distribution, insuring, financing, transporting, and so forth.

These benefits, however, do not accrue under all circumstances. For one thing, if the product is one for which the demand is inelastic, consumption will not be stimulated perceptibly. The price of salt, flour, or sugar, within reason, has little effect on consumption. The price of some other goods if dropped sharply may lead to a doubling or tripling of consumption, or, in time, even a yet higher multiple. Our industrial history as it moved into mass production, from automobiles to telephones, radio to television, all sorts of household appliances to a great variety of gadgets—I say, the industrial history of this country during the past two generations has been a succession of invention and innovation, producing new products under the impetus of efforts to bring the costs within the reach of the mass pocketbook. The result has been what we see before us. It brought us the industrial leadership of the world.

Now, however, confront these same industries with the alternative of reducing costs sharply or seeing their domestic market supplied in rising degree by imports and the situation is different. The advantage of imports may lie in the very objective that was looked to as opening up a broader market, that is, lower prices. The domestic industry then faces a double problem. First, it may for the time being have gone as far as it can in cost reduction. New developments that increase productivity do not spring up over night. The foreign producers may be technologically abreast of our industry and because of their much lower wages can undersell us.

Second, even though the time is inopportune and the industry must reduce its cost nevertheless it will scour the capital market for means of increasing productivity regardless of the state of unreadiness. It can hope to hold its share of the market only by cutting costs; and the principal source of cost reduction lies in the decreasing the number of workers. Yet, in doing this, sales will not respond as in the days when the market was virgin and free of already low-cost imported goods. Now these skim the cream, and the displaced workers remain displaced.

Two negative effects, rather than only one, are produced. The work force is reduced, and plans for expansion that seemed opportune before must now be put on ice. Therefore the impact on unemployment is double. Not only are workers displaced; new workers who would have been hired had the industry expanded are left unhired and are added instead to the unemployment rolls. Thus we add to the retraining and relocation burdens no less than the distress that marks the poverty-stricken areas.

Mr. Speaker, it is a common human weakness to wish to eat our cake and yet also have it left over for future consumption. We all know that this does not work. Yet there are economists, doctrinal free traders and others who are strong supporters, as I have already said, of the high-wage high-income economy that characterizes our national state today. They adhere at the same time to a contradictory position that demands an impossible competition with foreign systems that base their competitive position on low wages. We cannot maintain our system and at the same time adhere to policies that render our position untenable.

We can meet the challenge in one of two ways: we can reduce wages or do what I have already described, namely mechanize and automate as relentlessly as possible in order to bring down our costs. Either course would undermine the income base that is necessary to sustain our high level of production. The day of reducing wages is gone, not only because of the strength of labor organizations but because it would diminish the market by reducing the number of dollars in the hands of consumers.

Let us examine briefly the extent of the dependence of our economy on personal income, or more truly, disposable, that is, spendable personal income, on the one hand, and the preponderate dependence of personal income on employee compensation.

In 1964 disposable personal income in this country was $431 billion. In the second quarter of this year it had risen to an annual level of $455 billion. This compares with $384 billion in 1962. Wage and salary disbursements in 1964 were $331 billion, rising to an annual rate of $352 billion in the second quarter of 1965. In 1962 they were $297 billion. These figures are in current dollars and therefore exaggerate the real income and real wages by the amount of price increases since 1962.

It will be seen that wage and salary disbursements represent a very high proportion of all disposable personal income which includes proprietors' income, rental income and dividends—see Survey of Current Business, U.S. Department of Commerce, July 1965, table 3, page 4—the proportion during the years I have cited was 77 percent.

The percentage runs even higher when the comparison is made with personal consumption expenditures. In 1964, for example, wage and salary disbursements of $331 billion represented 82 percent of personal consumption expenditures of $399 billion.

It is obvious that our high wages represent the principal underpinning of total consumer purchasing power while the latter is what sustains our high volume of production from farms and mines to mills and factories.

This relationship between our wages and consumption is very important. If we wish to have high production we must have high consumer purchasing power or our factories will be idled. If factories are idled consumer purchasing power suffers and this in turn means a lower sales volume. Idle factories also mean fewer employed workers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the effect of a trade policy that pits low foreign wages directly against our high wage standards places the high standards in jeopardy.

Already a considerable number of domestic industries have been severely injured by imports. In my own district I can speak of two of them. One, the pottery industry, has been so hard hit in my area that most of the companies have been forced out of business. Imports mounted a relentless low-wage competition that crippled our industry and impeded its expansion. Now the tile industry is undergoing a similar bombardment and the industry is suffering seriously. The only reason for the difficuly in both industries has been the low foreign pay.

Considering the importance of both wages and employment to the well-being of our economy, and the triple threat embodied in imports, which is to say actual displacement of labor, the stimulation of mechanization and the discouragement of domestic expansion, it seems most unwise, first, to propose further sharp tariff reductions, especially when the effect of past reductions continues to produce injury, and second, to expect a lively expansion of the domestic economy in the absence of defensive measures in the form of import quotas that would replace the uncertainties of import competition with an assured share of the market for the domestic producers.

Our balance-of-payments trouble reflects to a great degree the poor competitive standing of domestic producers in both foreign and domestic markets. There can no longer be any doubt that if all governmental assistance in the form of AID, Public Law 480 and export subsidies were eliminated our imports would exceed our exports.

The only fields in which our exports have experienced really appreciable gains in recent years have been in farm products and machinery. The farm product exports have expanded solely because of governmental assistance in the form of subsidies, sales for foreign currencies, giveaway programs, and so forth. The boom in machinery exports is a direct echo from our growing foreign investments. These in turn have grown so lustily precisely because we are not satisfactorily competitive with foreign production at home.

Anyway we look at it, the fact is that competitively we are in a state of deep discomfiture. This state in turn owes its existence to the high plateau of our wage standards in relation to our competitors whose productivity has been rising more rapidly than ours.

Our merchant marine cannot compete despite governmental construction and operational subsidies. Our farmers compete only by dint of heavy subsidies, and in the case of wheat, cotton, dairy products, and peanuts can hold their own in this country only because of highly restrictive import quotas. Our shipping companies can compete when they transfer their ships to foreign flags. Why? Is it because they suddenly become more efficient or because they pay lower wages and can offer lower living conditions to their workers?

Our industries that invest abroad find themselves very competitive. Their foreign operations are handsomely profitable. Is it because they can hire skilled and unskilled labor more cheaply abroad? The answer to both questions is clear enough and there is no mystery about it.

Mr. Speaker, it is no longer debatable. Our competitive capacity is sharply handicapped by our higher costs and those come from higher wages. Which do we elect to sacrifice? Our high wages and our high standards or the theory of free trade? As I have said, we cannot have it both ways.

The legislation I am introducing in company with others will mark a long step in the direction of sanity in our foreign trade policy.

Let's Take a Real Good Look at Plastic Pipe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1965

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, in recent years there has arisen a substantial Federal interest in the use of ABS plastic pipe and fittings for DWV plumbing systems in residential and other structures. So profound is the general lack of knowledge about this question that even the vocabulary is a stumbling block to one of the uninitiated, like myself. The letters DWV stand for drain, waste and vent, and describe the plumbing system, with its pipe and fittings, which is used for these purposes in a structure. The letters ABS stand for "acrylonitrile-butadiene-styrene." I trust that a layman such as myself may be pardoned if he is unable to pronounce the name of this complicated chemical compound.

The area of legitimate and proper Federal concern with this problem has several dimensions.

A very important one arises from the fact that the Federal Housing Administration—FHA—must lay down conditions under which it will approve the insurability of home loans. I, for one, have become very much alarmed at the increased rate at which homes are being repossessed by the Federal Government under terms of the FHA home loan program. Certainly our Federal Government should be deeply and justifiably concerned with the materials that go into FHA-insured homes.

To my dismay, however, I have learned that in some instances negligence exists in properly safeguarding FHA home loans. For example, homes are being built today in certain sections in this country wherein the builder has failed to provide the homeowner with a 5-year warranty which he is required to give under Use of Materials Bulletin No. UM-33, dated December 15, 1961, of the Architectural Standards Division, FHA. Specifically, the builder must, under provisions of this bulletin, furnish a properly executed warranty to the homeowner which provides that the builder will "repair or replace any part of ABS plastic vent and drainage system, hereinafter referred to as 'system,' installed during construction in the house built by seller on the aforementioned lot, which, during a period of 5 years from the date of initial occupancy of original purchaser, proves to be defective in material or workmanship, provided that the defect shall be material to the intended use of the system and shall have occurred as a result of normal domestic usage for which the system was intended."

The sad commentary is that in many instances the builder, the mortgage lender, the purchasing public, and others are totally unaware of this FHA requirement. Cases have been called to my attention in which none of the parties involved had ever so much as heard of the FHA requirement of a 5-year warranty for ABS plastic drainage and vent pipe and fittings.

This lack of awareness of the 5-year warranty requirement in our building community is not surprising. Already one manufacturer of ABS plastic pipe has been sent a warning letter, as of July 29, 1965, from FHA Commissioner Philip N. Brownstein for circulating misleading advertising and statements relative to FHA's acceptance of building materials. The company involved in this case stated in its advertising copy that its plastic pipe was "FHA-accepted."

Even more astonishing to me—an item which the Commissioner could not take official notice of—was the preposterous claim by this manufacturer that his plastic pipe is "never affected by chemical action of household waste or drain cleaners or by boiling water."

For example, in the case of ABS plastic pipe carrying a different brand name, I have seen installation instructions issued by the manufacturer describing this pipe as an unsatisfactory conductor at 72° F., for such familiar agents as acetic acid, ammonia—both wet and dry—benzene, borax, chloroform, manufactured gas, iodine, naphtha, and a long list of other materials including the familiar cleaning compound, carbon tetrachloride.

Does ABS plastic pipe mean one thing in the case of this latter pipe and something entirely different in the case of the manufacturer cited in the letter of Commissioner Brownstein?

As recently as September 27 of this year, the independent testing laboratory, Smith-Emery Co., of Los Angeles, describes the results obtained by submerging specimens of ABS plastic pipe in separate containers of 28 different materials for a period of 48 hours. To me, the really disturbing observation is the number of materials which soften the plastic pipe to the point of disintegration in only half the time allowed for testing, that is, 24 hours. Materials having this effect included such diverse substances as Fireproof Energine, a Chicago-made household cleaner, creosote, a spot remover, Sears paint and varnish remover, and oil of cloves.

Cutex nail polish remover visibly attacks plastic pipe in 1 minute and eventually will completely dissolve it. The same source tells us that Absorbine, Jr., will swell and soften ABS plastic pipe, as will snail, slug and bug killer.

Metal Klean, manufactured by a Chicago firm, is used by housewives to remove baked-on grease from pots and pans and other cooking utensils. It visibly attacks ABS plastic pipe in 2 minutes, as does Fireproof Energine. Acetone does the job in half the time. All these materials, given sufficient time, will dissolve ABS plastic pipe.

The kitchen sink, or other household drain, is a common depository for carburetor and parts cleaners. Two different brands, one manufactured in Cleveland and the other in Los Angeles, were found to produce swelling, softening, cracking and eventual deterioration in ABS plastic pipe.

A problem of an entirely different kind is raised by a publication of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, designated as Home and Garden Bulletin No. 64, revised edition of August 1963. This publication is entitled "Subterranean Termites—Their Prevention and Control in Buildings." Authorship is attributed to three people from the Forest Service. On page 9 of this publication, we read:

> Many noncellulose materials, including plastics, may be penetrated and damaged by termites, even though they do not serve as food.

A related question is whether ABS plastic pipe is peculiarly prone to attack by gophers, rats, and other rodents. Apparently, there is little or no evidence to indicate that rodents find pipe and other materials made of plastic tasty or valuable as a food. A more substantial problem is whether rodents attack plastic materials obstructing their path. It has been brought to my attention that the Pacific Telephone Co. in a leaflet dated December 1961 admitted plainly that gophers were causing trouble by gnawing plastic covers of cables. It was the belief of the company at that time that gophers chewed cables merely to get to the other side of an obstruction without going under or over it. Or they may chew the cables just to keep their rapidly growing teeth worn down to comfortable length.

Possibilities of this type certainly justify the caution of FHA in requiring a 5-year warranty for installations of ABS plastic pipe and fittings, but has any further evidence been developed to corroborate or negate the fear of possible rodent and termite damage to plastic pipe installations?

A third major and very crucial area of inquiry concerns the combustibility of plastic pipe and the toxicity of resultant fumes.

There seems to be widespread agreement among impartial authorities that ABS plastic pipe not only does burn, but that the burning pipe itself contributes to the intensity of the fire and rapidly spreads flames throughout the entire structure. This observation was made by Dale R. Gatlin, a civil engineer of San Jose, Calif.

A much more important problem is the toxicity of plastic pipe when burning. After all, if a structure such as a family residence is destroyed by fire, it perhaps matters little whether the drain, waste, and vent system remains intact. It will have to be removed in any case before another structure can be erected on the same location. On the other hand, if a fireman should lose his life battling toxic fumes of a material which need not have been used in the first place, we are dealing with a matter of life and death.

I am told that ABS produces hydrocyanic acid upon burning, and that the fumes of this deadly poison have the same toxicity as hydrogen cyanide, which is used extensively by exterminators, and if I am not mistaken, also in criminal executions. Hydrocyanic acid is described as "intensely poisonous."

With respect to the toxicity of burning products, apparently it is rather easy for a layman such as myself to miss the point. All products of burning are toxic, if there is nothing else to breathe. Some products of burning, however, are poisonous even in very small amounts. This is true of hydrocyanic acid which ABS plastic pipe produces upon burning.

I trust then that these questions which I have raised may be taken to heart by the proper officials within FHA. No one is more aware than I of the commercial interests that are involved on all sides in this dispute. The relatively new and untried ABS plastic pipe has many competitors in the DWV field, many of them old and well established and representing millions of dollars worth of investment.

There is good reason to believe that millions of dollars have been poured into recent efforts in all parts of the country to gain approval of ABS plastic pipe for DWV systems from the various State and local code authorities.

This activity has led to a situation in which the public interest will no longer be served by opening the field to competition, and relying upon a Darwinian survival of the fittest. If it should turn out that plastic pipe is as unsatisfactory and dangerous as some evidence indicates, this result will inevitably show up in the future, but what of the damage to thousands of homeowners who have been left unprotected? What of the taxpayers equity in FHA-insured homes which are later repossessed just at the time that their plastic pipe DWV systems are ready to collapse?

In city after city across this great country in recent months, code authorities have heard these questions raised and they have sought a solution. Is ABS plastic pipe, as it is contended, really and truly nonresistant to a long list of common household materials, which are literally flushed down the the drain every day? Are plastic pipe DWV systems peculiarly prone to unseen attacks by termites and gophers and other rodents? Does ABS plastic pipe measure up in quality, strength, fire resistance, and so forth, as required by the various State and local health and safety codes? Has the problem of the combustibility of ABS plastic pipe ever been thoroughly studied and finally resolved? Have the noxious fumes arising from a plastic pipe fire ever claimed a human life? What would be the effect of a minor fire on the entire plumbing system within the walls of a building? What is the effect of expansion and contraction of ABS plastic pipe and how does this relate to the fatigue of the material?

What the Congress of the United States cannot and dare not forget is that ABS plastic pipe is manufactured for shipment in interstate commerce, and that it is actually transported in such commerce. If this were not the case, then there very well might be no solution to the dilemmas of so many plumbing code boards and authorities who look in vain to some impartial source, any impartial and nationally respected source, for trustworthy answers to the nagging questions which have been raised and which bear upon the health and safety of so many millions of American citizens. If the Federal Housing Administration did not insure home loans, or if builders seeking such insurance were not also seeking to install ABS plastic pipe for DWV systems, then the U.S. Congress might well be justified in assuming the posture of an ostrich. This is not the case; there is here a question of national importance which has become a Federal question under many titles; and the Congress cannot evade its responsibility.

Provision must therefore be made for a thorough investigation, financed by Federal money, and overseen by committees of the two Houses of Congress, into the usability and suitability of ABS plastic pipe for DWV systems. If upon balance there is some slight charge to the taxpayer at the Federal level, surely a commensurate saving will be realized at the State and local level, or else a commensurate saving might be realized in the protection afforded Uncle Sam's equity in repossessed homes. If the saving is not measurable in money, then it certainly will be even in the health and lives of our citizens.

ABS plastic pipe must be tested in independent laboratories of national recognition. It is not enough that this material be tested solely in tests paid for by the plastic pipe manufacturers and manufacturers of competitive products. It must be tested independently and it must be tested completely to convincing and satisfactory conclusions. Every effort must be made to assure that the tests are as impartial and objective as they can possibly be. If ABS plastic pipe is shown to be trustworthy and dependable and suitable for DWV plumbing systems, then by all means let this pipe be manufactured and transported in interstate commerce in competition with proven materials in the established American tradition. But if, on the other hand, this kind of pipe is found to be defective and unsatisfactory for the uses for which it is intended, then this august body has no choice but to face up to its duty to the American public and proscribe its manufacture for, and its shipment in, interstate commerce; and likewise its eligibility for use in structures intended for FHA insurance.

There is no time to lose; further delay can mean only additional floundering on the part of State and local code authorities; and additional jeopardy of the public interest in FHA insurance of structures equipped with such pipe.

It goes without saying that the FHA cannot fulfill its obligation to the public so long as it continues to insure loans on any structure having ABS plastic pipe DWV systems, until these questions are satisfactorily answered. The FHA policy and practice, as set forth in Use of Materials Bulletin No. UM-33, whereby ABS plastic pipe is deemed suitable for use in properties otherwise eligible for FHA mortgage insurance, should be terminated immediately.

This FHA document on suitability—FHA Use of Materials Bulletin No. UM-33—if that is the proper term, of ABS plastic pipe for this purpose, must stand suspended until reasonable men are satisfied that the public interest is adequately protected through impartial and reliable independent testing.